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SARACENIC ARMS AND ARMOR*

BY L. A. MAYER

IN ORDER TO AVOID MISUNDERSTANDINGS I SHOULD LIKE FIRST OF ALL TO OFFER TWO DEFINITIONS: by “Saracens” is to be understood “Muslims in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt during the period which began with the First Crusade and ended with the Ottoman conquest,” and by “arms,” such arms as were worn by Saracenic knights and soldiers as part of their battle dress. This excludes the particularly important Spanish type of Arabian arms and guns, as well as grenades and similar instruments of war.

In writing the following pages I used as my main sources such Ayyubid and Mameluke arms and armor as have survived and were accessible to me until the summer of 1939, Arabic sources, both literary and pictorial, and European monographs.

*A considerably abridged chapter from the manuscript of my “Saracenic Costumes.” I take this opportunity to thank gratefully all those to whom I am indebted for photographs of Saracenic arms and armor and permission to publish them, especially Mr. R. W. Hamilton, Director, Department of Antiquities, Jerusalem; Bay Aziz Ogan, Director General of Museums, Istanbul; Bay Tahsin Öz, Director, Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi, Istanbul; Mr. St. Grancsay, Keeper of Arms and Armor, Metropolitan Museum of Art; M. G. Salles, Director, and M. Jean David-Weill, Assistant Keeper, Oriental Section, Louvre Museum; M. Georges Paulillac, Paris; Director, National Museum, Copenhagen.

1 Not all the arms and pieces of armor attributed to the Mamelukes are theirs by date or even by style. As will be shown in my “Saracenic Costumes,” the helmet, lance, mace, etc., in the former Museum of Tsarskoye Selo, attributed to Sultan Tûmân-bay (F. de Gillie’s Musée de Tsarso-Selo [St. Petersbourg-Carlsruhe, 1835-53], Pl. 130, Fasc. 22, pp. 2 f., repeated by A. C. T. E. Prisse d’Avennes, L’Art arabe d’après les monuments du Kaire [Paris, 1877], p. 280 f., Pl. CLV; and W. Boehm, Handbuch der Waffenkunde [Leipzig, 1890], p. 318, Fig. 373), a scimitar in the Louvre (published by G. Migeon, L’Orient musulman [Paris, 1922], vol. Armes, p. 17, Pl. 19; G. Salles and M. Ballot, Les Collections de l’Orient musulman [Paris, 1928], p. 40, and dated thirteenth century), a helmet, until 1857 in the collection of Weizstein, then of Fleischer (Fleischer, “Arabische Inschriften,” Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft, XIII [1859], 267-70, Pls. 1-2), the sword in a private collection in Stockholm (A. F. Mehren, “Arabische Klingenschrift,” Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft, XVII [1863], 362), a chanfron in the Museum of the Topkapu Saray (H. Stöcklein, “Die Waffenschätze im Topkapu Saray Müzesi zu Istanbul,” Ars Islamica, I [1934], 213, Fig. 12) belong to other countries and periods. As to the Ayyubids the position is far worse. Owing to their connection with the Crusaders too many fairly modern and not at all Near Eastern arms have been claimed for them to permit a refutation in detail.

2 No attempt was made here to quote Arabic sources fully. I have merely tried by appropriate selection to cover the main periods during which a particular shape was known or a specific term applied to a piece of armor. In dealing with Arabic chronicles one must bear in mind that many Arab historians had a peculiar point of view and not all of them were as outspoken about their biases as was Suyûtî (Husn al-Muhádara [Cairo, 1599 II.], II, 226, ll. 15-17), who, winding up his chapter on the clothes of Muslim ecclesiastics, said: “But with regard to the robes of honor (scil. of the military) and those of viziers, I have omitted them from the text of Ibn Faḍl Allâh because they are made of silk and gold, which is forbidden by religious law, and I have taken upon myself not to mention anything in this book for which I shall be questioned in the next world.”

3 So far as I have made use of them the reader will find them quoted in the notes to the relevant paragraphs. For short chapters on Saracenic arms and armor in general, within the terms of the definition given above, cf. among the most recent publications E. Kühl, Die islamische Kunst in A. Springer, Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte (Leipzig, 1929), VI, 471; Stöcklein, op. cit., pp. 208-18, Figs. 1, 10, 11, 13-15; Tahsin Öz, Guide to the Museum of Topkapu Saray (Istanbul, 1936), pp. 14-24, Pls. XII, XIII; ’Abd al-Rahmân Zaky, “’Abd Kiţâ al-Asîlîa Al-Islâmiya fi Istanbul,” Al-Muhtâṣaf, April, 1940.
Armor was used by the Arabs even before the advent of Islam. It consisted then of a mail shirt (dir') covering the greater part of the body. Although mail used to be kept in a family for generations and treasured as a most valuable possession, and wars were waged and raids undertaken to get hold of a few coats of mail, there is not a single authentic piece of pre-Saracenic Arabic mail in existence today. Actual specimens or reliable pictures of Saracenic mail date back only to the beginning of the Ayyubid period. The fact that armor was handed down and remained in use for generations is largely responsible for the perseverance of types. This, in turn, makes it very difficult, even under the best circumstances, to assign the correct date to an Oriental mail shirt; changes were slight and insignificant, and there is no other guide than inscriptions and coats of arms to establish the general lines of development of fashions in armor. In any gathering of Mamelukes during the Circassian period it was possible to see plain mail shirts, mail reinforced by laminae, splint armor, and brigandines, side by side.

In Ayyubid and Mameluke society the wearing of armor seems to have been the privilege of the military aristocracy, and thanks to the memoirs of Usáma b. Munkídhh the armor of an emir during the Ayyubid age can be visualized. It consisted of a helmet (khawdha), a mail shirt (dir' or zardiya), stockings (ránät), leggings (sák al-múza, or kalsát al-zard), and boots (khuff) with spurs (mihmaz), while his arms comprised sword (saif), dagger (dáshan or sikh or nímdja), or knife (síkkîna), lance (rumî, šanîtârîya), javelin (zârba), and shield (turs or dârâk). Three kinds of armor were mainly in use at that time: the coat of mail, the splint armor, and the brigandine. The most common kind was the plain coat of mail, which was never abandoned and survived in the East almost to our own day. Although coats of mail are very often mentioned in Arabic sources, no detailed descriptions of them are given, especially during the Saracenic period. But from casual references, it may be inferred that they were worn singly or double, short or long, and that some of them were not merely long but drag-

---

5 Cf. e.g., the raid on Samaw'âl ibn 'Adiyyâ's castle al-Ablaḵ to obtain possession of Imru' al-Ḳâï's mail shirts.
6 E.g., pieces of arms and armor, former property of deceased Mamelukes, were distributed the following year among the khhâṣṣâkîya of the sultan (Ibn Iyâs, *Buddî Al-Zâhîrî fî Waḥîdî al-Duhûr*, ed. P. Kahle, Muhammad Mustafa, and M. Soberheim [İstanbul, 1931]), IV, 359–60; a similar instance is mentioned on p. 301, ll. 12–15.
7 In the following pages the edition of P. K. Hitti, Usâma’s *Memoirs Entitled Kitâb al-I’tîbâr* (Princeton, 1930), which is far superior to Derenbourg’s pioneer effort, will be quoted.
8 Usâma, *op. cit.*, p. 126, l. 8, perhaps “leggings.”
9 A man clad in armor was correctly called mudârâ (Usâma, *op. cit.*, p. 32, l. 7), but the usual word for a man in armor was lábîs, i.e., just “clad,” *ibid.*, p. 48, l. ult., 51, l. 4 b, 152, b (of Kazâghland); Maṭrîzî, *Sulâk*, ed. M. Zád (Cairo, 1934–39), I, 517, ll. 8, 18; Suyû, “Ta’rîkh al-Malik al-Ashraf Kâyrbây,” ed. A. Wahrmund, *Jahresber. d. K.K. öff. Lehranstalt für orientalische Sprachen* (Wien, 1882), p. 13, l. 4 (of the Arabic text); Ibn Iyâs, *op. cit.*, IV, 419, l. 4 and *passim*, showing what an important part was played by armor.
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ging (zardiyāt sābila, zardiyāt musbala), covering the horseman’s legs. Some of the late Circassian coats of mail have collars (Fig. 1).

Links of this and earlier chain mail sometimes bear a stamped ornament, invariably in relief, in the form of lines, grooves, dots, or scriptural texts (Fig. 2). Each link of Saracen mail is riveted, sometimes with two or more pegs, which pierce the metal right through. Coats of mail reinforced by rectangular overlapping splints (djawshan) had been known for a long time, but from the early Mamelukes onward they were on the increase, and some time later, under the Circassians, they were used almost exclusively for the expensive armor of high emirs (Fig. 3). To these belongs the second finest Saracen coat of mail I know. It is now in the possession of M. Georges Paulhac of Paris (Fig. 4). Although the emir for whom it was made cannot be positively identified, his coat of arms enables me to date it rather closely: it belongs to the third quarter of the fifteenth century. The coat of mail of Kāytbāy, which is of very much the same type, was made shortly afterward.

No mention is made of the second type, viz., the splint armor, in medieval Arabic literature, and there is no oriental proof that it formed part of the war equipment of the Saracens, within the limits of my definition. Nevertheless, they must have been well acquainted with it as is proved by two widely different sources. The first shows that their immediate neighbors, the Turks of Asia Minor, used to wear it, as evidenced by a relief in the Činili Köşk in Istanbul (Fig. 5). The second proof is provided by the stained glass windows in the church of St. Denis, Paris, of which nothing but eighteenth-century drawings are left (Fig. 6), showing Saracen emirs fighting Christian knights. In both the armor is almost

13 That this is the proper interpretation of the word djawshan is proved by the Turkish translation of the Kāmūs where one reads (III, 609): “The poor translator says that in Persian djawshan is the name of a kind of suit of armor made in the style of a mail coat (zirh). But although it is in the style of a mail coat, a mail coat consists of links only, whereas the djawshan consists of mail links between which are put small pieces of tin plate (tenek).” Additional proof may be found in expressions like ʾṣafī’ib ʿal-djawshan “laminae of the djawshan” (Usāmā, op. cit., p. 52, l. 12), further in Usāmā’s story about the djawshan of his father (ibid., p. 52, l. 5), which had hooks (kullāb) on its side. There was no place for clasps on the usual mail shirt, but they do appear on coats of mail reinforced by laminae.
14 Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 338 (and the passages quoted in n. 5, except the reference to Makrizi); Usāmā, op. cit., p. 52, II, 5, 12.
15 Makrizi, op. cit., I, 563, l. ult., 626, l. 11.
17 Originally in the collection of Baron Vidal de Lévy, acquired by M. Paulhac in 1902. The laminae are 25 cms. high and 135 mms. wide.
18 Stöcklein, “Waffenschätze,” p. 213, Fig. 10; ‘Abd al-Rahmān Zaky, op. cit., pl.
19 Cf. E. Kühnel, Die Sammlung türkischer und islamischer Kunst im Tschiñil Köşk (Berlin, 1938), p. 16 and Pl. 6, and G. Mendel, Catalogue des sculptures grecques, romaines et byzantines (Constantinople, 1914), II, No. 792, and the very full references to literature quoted in the latter.
20 B. de Montfaucon, Les Monumens de la monarchie française (Paris, 1729), I, 384, 390, 396, and especially Pis. L.1, LII.5, LIV.9.
identical and can only be understood as either splint armor proper or leather jazerans covered with large metal splints. It closely resembles various Central Asiatic Tartar and Mongol sets of splint armor.21

During the Mameluke period plate armor was either coming into fashion or was already well established in Europe.22 Plate armor proper, i.e., "armor composed in the main of large solid plates," was never made by Saracens; the unique specimen that seems to have survived, now in the Museo Stibbert 23 in Florence, is obviously of European make. The meaningless and incorrect composition of the coat of arms, the absence of Arabic inscriptions, the character of its ornamentation (although not the details of its design), all point in this direction. Herz was clearly wrong in publishing this piece of armor as unquestionably Muslim.

A problem sui generis is the surcoat in Muslim dress.24 That it served in the West as protection against the heat is now discredited.25 J. G. Mann kindly called my attention to the fact that in the earlier period armor was worn over a long coat,26 just as in the East, except for those cases, fairly numerous, when it was worn under the coat to hide the fact that the bearer was armed. A fifteenth-century author mentioned among the insignia of the sultan a coat of mail "of Davidian make,"27 worn by him under his clothes when traveling or appearing in public in parades, in order to be protected from treacherous enemies.28 Ibn Iyās recorded the story of the Emir Sūdūn, who in 791 H., mistrusting Yalbughā al-Nāṣirīr, then governor of Aleppo, refused to respond to his summons, until, called for the fourth time, he appeared wearing his coat of mail (zardīya) under his clothes.29 Ibn Taghrībirdī said expressis verbis that Emir Taṭār died of an illness caused by his wearing cold armor too long under his clothes.30

23 M. Herz, "Armes et armures arabes," Bull. instit. français d’archéol. orientale, VII (1910), 11, Pl. VIII.
24 A passage in Usāma’s memoirs (op. cit., p. 62, l. 1) mentions a Frankish knight with a coat of mail under the green and yellow silk tashghir. This, possibly, refers to a surcoat. The form shahhara is used for multicolored garments or clothes with trimmings in colors different from the dress itself. On the other hand, the story clearly points to the tashghir covering the coat of mail so completely that Usāma was convinced that the Frankish knight had no armor underneath this Garment.
25 Kelly and Schwabe, op. cit., p. 54. Abū Shāmā (Kitāb al-Rawḍfātān [Cairo, 1287–88], I, 166, l. 21) said that armies waited until the day became hot and the iron was burning on the bodies of men (ītahaba ‘ala adjād al-ridjāl). Similarly, the wounded father of Usāma (op. cit., p. 52, l. 12) at first believed that his pain was caused by the heat from the laminae of his armor, but it is doubtful whether such statements can be presssed very far.
26 Cf. Kelly and Schwabe, op. cit., PIs. XX, XXI bis. This is reflected in a fairly late Oriental source, the Arabian Nights, where a Christian knight is described as wearing a tight-ringed coat of mail over a long coat of blue satin (R. Dozy, Dictionnaire des vêtements [Amsterdam, 1854], pp. 359–60).
27 This is the highest praise that a Muslim could give.
28 Mukṣid, MS Paris, Ar. 4439, fol. 122 v., ll. 2–4, to a piece of armor.
29 Ibn Iyās, op. cit., I, 270, l. 2.
30 Ibn Taghrībirdī, op. cit., VI, 506–7. A similar instance of disguise is recorded with regard to Saladin, who used to wear his helmet (mighfar al-zard) under a pointed bonnet (kalamusa), cf. Ibn Ṭāhir, Chronicon, ed. C. J. Thornberg (Leyden, 1851–76), XI, 285, ll. 9 ff., and also Abū Shāmā, op. cit., I, 258, ll. 5, 24.
All the same, the surcoat could not have been a newcomer in Saracenic lands. On a rock near Firuzabad, the first Sasanian king, Ardashir I, is pictured as wearing a surcoat over his coat of mail while fighting the Arsacid Ardavan V.

The brigandine (kazaghand) so often mentioned by Usâma must have been a common garment in his days, although it was fine enough to be worn by sultans as well. The brigandine worn by Usâma's father consisted of two mail shirts, a short one on top of a longer one, each with its lining, felt cover, and padding of silk waste and rabbit's hair. Four thousand Arabs of the Mura tribe, who came with the Emir Ahmed b. Ḥadjdji from Iraq to the rescue of Kallûn (1280), wore red brigandines of Ma'dan-satin (al-ṭlas al-ma'danî) and brocade from Asia Minor (al-dibâdî al-rûmî). No actual specimen of an Ayubid studded jerkin is known; only one of a Mameluke brigandine, kept today in the storeroom of the Museo Nazionale in Florence and very fully described by Herz: a short jacket, not more than 70 cms. long, made of very strong material, with long sleeves and collar, covered with crimson velvet and sprinkled over with small brass nails. The inscription on the collar reads in translation: "Glory to our Lord, the Sultan al-Malik al-Ẓâhir Abû Sa'id Djiakmak, may God strengthen his victories," and dates the brigandine very closely, 1438–56.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the brigandine was called karkal. This is clear from the definition given by Kâlkashandî: the karkal armor is made of iron laminae covered with red and yellow brocade (dibâdî). Ibn Taghibirdi made specific mention of brigandines without sleeves. Speaking of the mail shirt, Kâlkashandî remarked that the Arabs used to wear it in battle, but that now (i.e., beginning of the fifteenth century) the manufacture of karkal armor made of iron laminae, joined together, prevails. It should be noted that on this occasion this author did not repeat his statement that the laminae of a karkal were covered with silk or velvet; nevertheless, the conclusion that the karkal could mean

---

22 Op. cit., pp. 46, n. 44. 56, l. 3, 100, ll. 1–3, 7–9, and passim.
23 Saladin used to wear it constantly when riding, Abû Shâmah, op. cit., II, 212, l. 17. It had a collar, and although a knife could cut it, the blade could not penetrate as far as the body. Ibn Aṯîr, op. cit., XI, 285, l. 13. The kazagh and of al-Malik al-ʿAṣî (d. 1236) and his coat of mail (zardiya) were sent after his death to Egypt, G. W. Freytag, Locumani Fabulæ (excerpts from Zubdat al-Ḥalab min Tdrîkh Ḥalab) (Bonn, 1823), p. 46, l. 14; Maḵrīzī, op. cit., I, 253, l. 16.
24 Usâma, op. cit., p. 100, ll. 7–9; cf. also P. K. Hitti, An Arab-Syrian Gentleman (New York, 1929), p. 130 and n. 188.
25 Maḵrīzī, op. cit., I, 690, l. 1.
26 Herz, op. cit., pp. 5–7, Pls. III–IV.
27 Kâlkashandî, ʿubāb al-ʿāshâ (Cairo, 1331–38 II.), IV, 11, ult. If used for special purposes it was covered with different material, e.g., soldiers using firearms had to wear a karkal covered with a kind of hair-cloth called balâs (J. R. Reinaud and M. Favé, "Du feu grégeois," Journ. asiatique, ser. IV, XIV (1849), 321, n. 1, quoting Muhammad b. Mankî[bahâ] al-Nâṣîrî, al Taḍîrît al-Sulṭâniya, and p. 323, n. 1, quoting Kitâb al-Mâkhzûn. In Arabic chronicles no difference is usually made between iron and steel. Although properly called fûlād, steel was more often called ḥâṣh ḥâṣkar "masculine iron," cf. Kâlkashandî, op. cit., II, 132, l. 56.
28 Ibn Taghibirdi, op. cit., V, 560, l. 11, VII, 417, l. 12 f. (karkal muḥkmal aḥbar bighair akmâm). In E. M. Quatremère's "Observations sur le fer grégeois," Journ. asiatique, ser. IV, XIV (1850), 269, a few more passages will be found, showing that the karkal was usually worn without sleeves.
29 Kâlkashandî, op. cit., II, 136, l. 6 f.
anything but the brigandine would be wrong. It has just been seen that mail shirts without laminae were called zardiya, those with laminae djawshan.49

Armor, as well as swords, had to be left in the anterooms before one appeared in the sultan’s presence,46 a very necessary precaution, as many events have shown. On the other hand it is known from many literary passages that Saracenic emirs used to go about unarmed and armor used to be put on at the last moment.42

A few capital pieces enable one to determine exactly the development of the shape of the helmet. Kalkashandi 49 distinguished two different kinds: (a) the ba’dja, protecting the head but not the neck or ears, and (b) the mighfar, offering such protection—if I understand Kalkashandi rightly—in camail. At the same time there was an older type of helmet in use, well covering the ears and the back of the head, but not in mail. This helmet lasted from the eighth to the fourteenth century, at least. An excellent early specimen can be seen on a piece of sculpture (Fig. 7) excavated by C. D. Baramki in the Umayyad palace of Khirbat al-Mafdjir, near Jericho, while very late specimens of the same type of helmet are best shown in miniatures representing Saracens in the history of Saint Louis by Joinville.47

The mighfar was sometimes made with a nasal as well. To these two terms a third, khawdha, should be added. Under the Saracens it became the common term for helmet, without implying any particular shape.48 It is not impossible that a fourth kind of armored headgear, consisting merely of iron laminae or scales, of which there is only a fairly late specimen in the Musée du Vleeschhuis, Antwerp, also existed in Ayyubid times.49 The earliest authentic specimen of a Saracenic helmet,47 that made for,48 or, as is much more likely, only in the time of, Muhammad b. Ḳalāʿūn, is a fairly tall,46 conical iron cap, with camail and two plume

49 Cf. n. 13.

46 Oeuvres de Jean Sire de Joinville, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 1867), LXVIII.
42 Abū Shāmā, op. cit., I, 108, l. penultimate; Usāma, op. cit., pp. 100, l. 3, 152, ll. 20–22 (said of a kazāghand). Cf. also Usāma, op. cit., p. 40, l. 1 pu: a horseman takes his mail shirt (dir’) off in order to be light enough (takhaifafa) to pass.
43 Kalkashandi, op. cit., II, 135, ll. 15–10.
44 MSS Paris, Fr. 5716 and 13568, reproduced in op. cit., pp. 88 and 659.
45 Among others Abū Shāmā, op. cit., p. 108, l. 16 (Crusading prisoners).
46 Ibid., I, 238, l. 24, but cf. note 30.
48 Both Herz and Macoir seem to take it for granted that this helmet was made for the personal use of the sultan, although Herz (op. cit., p. 14) said himself: “Nous devons donc admettre que la présence du nom d’un sultan sur une arme ou un ustensile n’implique pas qu’il ait appartenu au personnage nommé.” But, so far as I can see, there is no proof that any object bearing an inscription beginning with the formula ‘izz li-mawlānā, etc., was ever made for the personal use of the sovereign himself. The correct form would be either bi-rasm mawlānā, etc., or simply al-sulṭān al-malik, etc.
49 According to Macoir (“Casque . . .”) it is 19 cms. high and the two sections are 20 cms. and 22.7 cms. wide.
SARACENIC ARMS AND ARMOR

sockets, without ear guards or peak and originally probably without a nasal either. It is richly decorated with gilt arabesques and an inscriptional band in gilt relief. Although both plume sockets were added after the helmet was made, they are probably contemporary. The rich ornamentation of this helmet is by no means surprising; Saladin's helmet was gilt, and a reliable source of the fourteenth century mentions gilt helmets as worn by Mamelukes in battle, as, for instance, in 702 H. So far as can be seen, Saracens never used face guards, either under the Ayyubids or the Mamelukes, although they saw such helmets on the heads of Crusaders and Mongols. Even chain mail covering the whole face, as it is known, e.g., from Turkish and Persian specimens, does not appear on any undoubtedly Saracenic helmet.

A handbook of military art, written at the end of the fourteenth century, gives the following advice with regard to helmets:

The way to put the helmet on the head. It is necessary that the buttons of the skull cap of the helmet (kùba') be on the inner side of the lining of the helmet passed through loops (fi'l-'urā) so that the helmet be not detached from the cap. . . . The interlining of helmets should be made of fibre (ifsīnd) of fine holes (ďayyīk al-abbkāš). This will protect against the impression which a heavy blow would make on the helmet. . . . And the point of the device is that the numerous holes in the fibre will diffuse the substance of the blow.

Under the Circassians two main types ruled the fashion. The helmet of the Muhammad ibn Kalâ'ūn type became much taller, it received ear and neck guards made of one plate of metal each, and the nasal, together with the peak, became an essential part of it. It is best illustrated by a helmet in the Louvre Museum of Sultan Barsbây; it is 38 cms. high (that is twice as tall as the Brussels helmet) and is decorated with gilt inscriptions and ornament (Fig. 8).

A variant of the same type, probably half a century later, is a still taller helmet, ending in a long point, of which several specimens are known (in the Zeughaus, Berlin, and the Hall of Arms, Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi, Istanbul), unfortunately, not a single one bears a historical inscription.

One is probably justified in assuming that the next type, the so-called turban helmet,

---

50 The shape of this helmet fully justifies the term hajda (scd. egg), but since it had camail as neck and ear cover, it was obviously a migfar.
51 This does not mean that nasals are a later invention. Uṣâma (op. cit., p. 51, l. 4b) mentioned an "Islamic helmet with a nasal" as part of the armor of his father.
52 Abû Ṣhâmâ, op. cit., II, 225, l. 16.
54 That this type of helmet was known at least in Palestine and Syria is proved by the fragments discovered at Ḳal'at al-Kurain (Montfort), cf. B. Dean, "A Crusaders' Fortress in Palestine," Bull. Metropolitan Mus. Art, XXII (1927), Pt. II, 36 ff. The complete box-shaped headpiece is dated by Kelly and Schwabe, op. cit., p. 51, as after 1210-15.
55 F. Sarre and F. R. Martin, Meisterwerke Mümmedanischer Kunst aus der Ausstellung München 1910 (München, 1912), III, Pl. 230 and often elsewhere.
56 Muhammad b. Manṣūrīgâh, Al-Tadbîrāt al-Sulâniya, B.M. Or. 3734, fol. 14v, ll. 1 f., 6–9.
was also used by the Mamelukes, although the only published helmets of this type made before 1517 and bearing historical inscriptions are those of the Ottoman Sultan Bāyazīd \(^{68}\) and of Fārrukh Yāsār of Shirvan.\(^{68}\)

Toward the end of the Mameluke period a fairly low helmet (muwa‘ama) without the conical top (kawnas) but with ear and neck guards as well as peak and nasal (which often terminated in a fleur-de-lys) became dominant; it is best illustrated by the latest datable Saracenic helmet, viz., that of Khairbak, the last Mameluke governor of Aleppo, who betrayed his country to Selim I (Fig. 9).\(^{60}\)

A place of its own is due the small steel skull cap with camail, probably worn by soldiers only. To the best of my knowledge no historical inscription has ever been found on any of these caps, and their attribution to the Mameluke period is therefore open to discussion.

It is difficult to guess what prevented the Ayyubid or early Mameluke helmet from being lost in the fray of a battle. Under the late Circassians leather chin straps and buckles were used for fastening.

The Saracenic sword (Figs. 10, 11) was made of iron (saif anīth) or steel (saif fūlādh), or else, adopting a Frankish fashion, of iron with a steel edge (saif mudhakkar).\(^{61}\) Like the old Arabic sword, it was straight,\(^{62}\) as is amply proved by contemporary designs, especially in heraldry, where the straight sword remained dominant until the end of the fourteenth century. For ceremonial purposes the straight sword remained in use until the end of the Mameluke period, and the so-called saif badawī was constantly used in investitures of the sultans and caliphs. But at an early period scimitars were introduced, and there is documentary evidence of the scimitar from the early fourteenth century onward.\(^{63}\) On swords as well on scimitars the handle, as a rule very simple,\(^{64}\) is often distinguished by a prominent pommel and two sword knots.

\(^{68}\) O. de Penguilly l’Haridon, \textit{Musée d’Artillerie} (Paris, 1864), H. 173; Migeon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 420, Fig. 205.

\(^{60}\) Reproduced in color with a short note on special sheets, sold at the Army Museum, Istanbul.

\(^{60}\) Mentioned and reproduced in Stöcklein, “\textit{Waffen-schätze},” p. 213 f., Fig. 13; L. A. Mayer, “Huit objets inédits à blasons manluks en Grèce et en Turquie,” \textit{Mélange de Maspero} (Le Caire, 1934).

\(^{61}\) Numerous details in Schwarzlose, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 124 ff., and in Kalkandili, \textit{op. cit.}, II, 132 f., refer almost exclusively to the ancient Arabic sword and not to the Saracenic one; hence they are of no interest for a survey of Saracenic arms. In this connection, it may be recalled that the Chinese pin-čiě, literally “hard iron,” has been variously translated as “steel” and “damascene steel, especially sword blades.” Chau Ju-Kua,\textit{ Cru-fan-chi}, trans. F. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill (St. Petersburg, 1911), p. 19, n. 2, and literature mentioned therein.

\(^{62}\) Care should be taken not to consider certain swords as Saracenic merely because they have Arabic inscriptions. For the latest accounts of purely European swords which, having passed into Saracenic ownership, received Arabic inscriptions, cf. E. Combe and A. F. C. de Cosson, “European Swords with Arabic Inscriptions from the Armoury of Alexandria,” \textit{Bull. soc. royale d’archéol. d’Alexandrie}, No. 31 (1937), 225-40, 11 figs. and subsequently supplemented by E. Combe, “Nouveaux sabres européens à inscriptions arabes de l’arsenal d’Alexandrie,” \textit{Bull. soc. royale d’archéol. d’Alexandrie}, No. 32 (1938), 158-61, 1 pl.). Several such swords, still unpublished, are to be found in the Army Museum, Istanbul.


\(^{64}\) Usāma, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 173, l. 11, told a story about the Caliph al-Muṭṭaﬁ bi-Amr Allāh (died 1160 A.D.), who entered a mosque incognito girt with a sword an iron hilya, which Hitti (\textit{An Arab-Syrian Gentleman}, p. 205) translated “handle.” As the caliph wore a Damietta
Sumptuously decorated swords were no doubt to be found at all times, and, during the Saracenic period at least, swords were often praised for the luxury of their ornamentation, although hardly ever for the quality of the undecorated blade. Only foreign blades were esteemed for their excellence, especially Indian ones. Thus, e.g., when Saladin wanted to secure the help of the ruler of the Muslim West in 1190 he sent him, among many other things, Indian sword blades. The chroniclers make repeated mention of swords damascened with silver (musâkkaṭa bi-fiḍḍa) or gold (musâkkaṭa bi 'l-dhahab) and inscribed, or inlaid with jewels. The same applies to daggers.

I shall not dwell here on the thorny problem of damasked sword blades, but simply note that although Damascene swords were more famous than those made in any other part of the Mameluke empire, according to Idrīṣī iron and damasked sword blades, among many other things, used to be imported from China via Aden.

The sheathed sword was either attached to a waist-belt (band) which was worn on the coat or else suspended from either shoulder on a diagonal sword band (called šamila or niḍjād in early Arabic times). If we are to believe Abu 'l-Barakāt al-Hasan b. Muhammad b. Hībat Allah's story as related by Abū Shāma, the Saracens used to gird on their swords (yarbuṭūnahu bi-awsāṭihim), but Nūr al-Dīn having heard that Muhammad, in accordance with the prevailing Arabic custom, used to hang it from his shoulder (takallada), adopted this fashion for himself and his army. Pictorial evidence shows that this fashion did not prevail. In the furūsīya books, for instance, soldiers are represented as having girt their swords. The same applies to the early Mameluke bronze basin in the Louvre, called Baptistère de Saint-Louis, made either at the end of the thirteenth or at the beginning of the fourteenth century. But the Makāmāt of Harīrī (Br. Mus., Or. 9718) illuminated by the Damascene artist Ghāzī b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān shows a Saracen carrying his sword on a shoulder coat, which was expensive, the idea that only very poor men would have an iron handle to their swords is to be discarded. On the other hand, none of the dictionaries was able to consult renders šâliya as "handle."

Abū Shāma, op. cit., II, 173, l. 32 f.
Ibn Iyās, op. cit., IV, 301, l. 13; 358, l. 13; 359, last line.
Makrīzī, Khatīyat (Bulaq, 1270), II, 209, l. 22; Ibn Iyās, op. cit., IV, 456, l. 17.

The Fatimid Caliph al-'Āṣid offered Saladin on his appointment as vizier a robe of honor, including among other things a sword decorated with jewels (muḍjawhar) worth 5000 dinars, Abū Shāma, op. cit., I, 173, l. 14 f.
Ibn Iyās, op. cit., I, 306, l. 66 (nimṭsha); Dozy, op. cit., p. 302, n. 2, with further literature (khandjar).

Besides Arab praise for the Damascus sword an early European one should be quoted: B. de la Broquière, Voyage d'outremer (Paris, 1892), pp. 60-61.

Chau Ju-Kua, op. cit., p. 4, n.
Usāma, op. cit., p. 120, l. 9, 159, l. 6; Joinville, op. cit., LXVI, § 337. 182, LXXIV, § 377, 204; Ibn Iyās, op. cit., I, 126, l. 4 b; IV, 308, l. 5.

This was the rule, but there were exceptions, cf. Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 55.
Abū Shāma, op. cit., I, 11, l. 27 ff. Abū Shāma stated in another passage that Nūr al-Dīn's elder brother, Saif al-Dīn Ghārī b. Zengi, was the first to order his army, not to ride out unless every man had his sword girt on his middle (op. cit., I, 65, ll. 29 f.). This statement was repeated by Maṭrīz (op. cit., II, 99, ll. 21-24), with the addition that they had to wear their maces under the knees (al-dabābis tabt rukābihim). As I understand the passage, the order was to have the sword on, but the Arabic phrase (wa-l-saif fi wasṭîhi) shows that the custom was to gird it on.
belt (fol. 12or), and it is known from literary sources that on their coronation Mameluke sultans used to wear the straight Arab sword (saif badawi or saif ‘arabi) on a shoulder belt.  

Scabbards (djahāza, ghimād, kirāb) of Oriental make usually consisted of wooden cases covered with the finest leather, shagreen, damask, velvet, or metal.  The metal rings consisted of from two to six narrow bands. In the case of strongly curved blades the back part of the scabbard, next to the hilt, was so arranged as to open spring fashion when the sword was drawn. But the sword was not always kept in its scabbard. Joinville tells of thirty men of the ḥālka who came to the Frankish galley with their bare swords and with Danish axes at their necks. The shape of the Saracenic ax of the thirteenth or fourteenth century may be seen on a heraldic potsherd in the Benaki Museum in Athens and compared with a contemporary Danish ax in the National Museum in Copenhagen (Fig. 14).

Lances were made entirely of steel, or of wood, with steel points (bi-sinn or bi-sinn fūlādh); on special parades the khāṣṣakiya used to adorn them with streamers (shaṭfāt) as often as not made of colored silk, since yellow silk was reserved for the standard of the sultan. The heavy lance was called rumḥ, another kind, used by Crusaders as well, is known as ḫantāriya.

Besides lances Saracens used a kind of partizan as banner. It consisted of the ṭū, a broad blade as top, and as a rule a wooden shaft. It is known from thirteenth-century pictorial evidence and authentic late-Mameluke specimens. As seen on Figures 12 and 13 these ṭūs were made of steel and were richly ornamented with the design either perforated or damascened. Besides passages from the Koran and invocations, they contain inscriptions of

76 Maḵrīzī, op. cit., II, 209, l. 22; Suyūṭī, Ḫusn al-Muḥādara (Cairo, 1299 n.), II, 77, ll. 16 f.
77 The sword which the caliph offered Saladin was in a scabbard covered with gold. Kalkashandi, op. cit., III, 276, l. 11.
78 M. Jühn, Entwicklungsgeschichte der alten Trutzwaffen, mit einem Anhange über die Feuerwaffen (Berlin, 1899), pp. 248 f.
79 Another instance of bare swords during a procession, Abū Shāmā, op. cit., II, 238, ll. 28 ff.
80 Joinville, op. cit., LXX.
81 Cf. my “Huit objets . . .” Fig. 2.
82 Ibn Iyās, op. cit., IV, 359, l. pu, 412, l. 10, 413, l. 10.
83 Ibid., IV, 419, l. 5.
84 Ibid., IV, 420, l. ult., V, p. 79, l. 19.
86 Usāma, op. cit., p. 126, l. 3.
89 Cf. a famous page of the Schefer manuscript of al-Ḥārīrī’s Maḥāmāt, reproduced by Migeon, op. cit., I, Fig. 13 and often elsewhere.
90 Cf. also O. Sermed Mouktar, Musée Militaire Ottoman, Guide No. 2 (Constantinople, 1921), Pl. 3, No. 1, and pp. 67 f.; for texts of inscriptions and coats-of-arms on such ṭūs, so far as published, cf. my Saracenic Heraldry, p. 66, n. 2, s.v. Ḍabībī b. Alībāy; p. 103, s.v. Barqūq. The most magnificent specimens are in the Top Kapu Sarayi Müzesi, Istanbul; a very fine one passed with the collection of G. C. Stone to the Metropolitan Museum (Fig. 13).
historical interest, names of the emirs for whom they were made, their coats-of-arms, and sometimes even names of artists.\textsuperscript{95}

A popular weapon was the mace (dabbūs), and it is consequently often mentioned in the contemporary literature.\textsuperscript{96} According to Kalkashandi\textsuperscript{97} it served mainly to smash helmets. Ordinary maces were made of iron or steel, with heads either spherical or polyhedral, or formed of many triangular wings, and hafts, circular or polygonal in cross section, often fluted. At the same time there must have been a good many luxurious ones about besides, richly decorated and sometimes with heads curiously reminiscent of ancient Egyptian art.\textsuperscript{98}

Besides the mace, emirs and soldiers used to keep a steel staff (ghaddāra) in the saddle, a weapon strong enough to cut a man’s arm off. On July 9, 1512, Kānṣūh al-Ghawrī forbade its use, and the Emir Mughulbāy, the armorer (zardkhāsh), was ordered to prohibit the workmen (ṣunnā’) from making such staffs for the Mamelukes.\textsuperscript{99}

Members of the ṭabardārīya-corps of the army and possibly other classes of soldiers as well, used to carry an ax (ṭabar) (Figs. 15–17). The semicircular head, usually with a perforated or gilt ornament or both, and often with medallions containing inscribed shields, was fixed to a shaft either of metal or wood; the metal ones were often ornamented, the shaft, being partly of circular and partly of polygonal cross section, might have in addition, on its surface, various patterns such as diapers, cables, fluting, and in various combinations. In European literature it is sometimes called the “ceremonial ax.” This appellation is often fully justified, e.g., when it is described as having been carried in front of the Old Man of the Mountains (“a Danish ax with a long haft all covered with silver”),\textsuperscript{100} or in front of the sultan by his ax-bearer, or when the perforated ornament on some of these weapons indicates their character as objects of beauty rather than for practical use.\textsuperscript{101} Usually, however, the ax was a very serious fighting instrument designed to kill, as may be guessed from occasional references or the Muḥšid,\textsuperscript{102} the actual state of some of them shows eloquent signs of great wear and tear.\textsuperscript{103} So far as is known Saracens never used double axes; all the published specimens, at least, are Turkish, Persian, or Indian.

The shield\textsuperscript{104} (turs) was generally round and had a border. It had a horizontal handle inside and often a few bosses on the outside. It was made of wood or metal, occasionally of

\textsuperscript{95} For a detailed description of the objects mentioned in this as well as in other paragraphs of this article I refer the reader to my “Saracenic Costumes.”

\textsuperscript{96} Cf. e.g., Joinville, op. cit., XXXVII, CVI, CXII; Abū Shāmā, op. cit., II 225, l. 16 (among the personal arms of Saladin an iron mace); Maḥrizi, op. cit., 772, l. 16, p. 886, l. 9 and passim.

\textsuperscript{97} Kalkashandi, op. cit., II, 135, ll. 11–13.

\textsuperscript{98} Cf. Stöcklein, “Waffenkästchen,” Fig. 14.

\textsuperscript{99} Ibn Iyās, op. cit., IV, 267, ll. 13 ff.

\textsuperscript{100} Joinville, op. cit., XC.

\textsuperscript{101} Cf. e.g., the ax in Vienna with the inscribed shield of Muhammad b. Kāṭībhāy. Sarre and Martin, Meisterwerke, III, Pl. 244a (often reproduced since).

\textsuperscript{102} Fol. 122r, quoted in Quatremère, Sultans Mamlouks, I a, 100, n. 131.

\textsuperscript{103} Thus, the ax of the Emir Dawlātbāy in the Historical Museum in Dresden, Sarre and Martin, op. cit., III, Pl. 244 b, and another one, of the second half of the fifteenth century, ibid., IV, No. 532 (the latter wrongly dated sixteenth cent., but through no fault of Sarre or Martin).

\textsuperscript{104} Ibn Iyās, op. cit., IV, 359, l. 22, 413, l. 10.
various kinds of wood sewn together with cotton thread; if made of hide it was called darağa.\(^1\) Although there are no originals preserved, good reproductions, fortunately, are present on the Bāb al-Nāṣr of Cairo,\(^2\) dated 1087, on the gate of Kal‘at al-Gindi,\(^3\) dated 1187, and also on miniatures, which cannot be later than the twelfth century.\(^4\) These circular shields were slightly convex, but on a number of "Mosul" bronzes made in Syria or Egypt and on Mameluke miniatures one sees figures of armed men whose very small round shields show an almost triangular profile. The Saracens not only knew of,\(^5\) but actually used, the kite-shaped "Norman" shield, as may be safely inferred from various coats-of-arms granted toward the end of the thirteenth century (e.g., those of Asandamur, Ahmed b. Buraḵ or Kūlundžjak) or the beginning of the fourteenth (e.g., those of Tukuztamur or Karasunkur).\(^6\) This form, however, remained exceptional,\(^7\) and with the accession of the Cir-cassians it survived in a few early inscribed shields only (e.g., those of Yūnus al-Dawādār, the Sultan-Caliph al-Musta'īn). It should be pointed out that in each instance this shield has a rounded top; the straight or concave upper border is not to be found on any authentic Saracenic shield or drawing of one.\(^8\)

\(^1\) Kalkashandi, op. cit., II, 136, ll. 8 ff.

\(^2\) M. van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Égypte, I. Mém. . . . Mission archéol. française au Caire*, XIX (1903), 56 ff., Pl. XIX. As gates used to be decorated with arms (until the very end of the Mameluke period, cf. Ibn Iyās, op. cit., IV, 265–66, 383–84) it is not impossible that this is merely a case of monumentalization of an old practice, especially in view of the name of this gate: "Gate of Victory."

\(^3\) Cf. G. Wiet, "Les Inscriptions de la Qal 'ah Guindi," *Syria*, III (1922), 58 ff., Pl. IX, and a drawing of the same in J. Barthoux, "Description d'une forteresse de Saladin," *Syria*, III (1922), 51, Fig. 2.

\(^4\) J. Karabacek, "Ein arabisches Reiterbild des X. Jahrhunderts," *Mittell. aus der Sammlung der Papyren Erzherzog Rainer*, V (1892), 123–26; T. W. Arnold and A. Grohmann, The *Islamic Book* (Paris and New York, 1929), Fig. 4, pp. 61, 103 (with further literature); B. Gray, "A Fātimid Drawing," *British Mus. Quart.*, XII (1938), 91–96, Pl. XXXIII.

\(^5\) This is proved by the shields sculptured on the Bāb al-Nāṣr, Cairo, where they appear side by side with the round ones, cf. van Berchem, op. cit., Pl. XIX. The kite-shaped shield is probably called in Arabic tārīka (pl. tawārīk). To the passages quoted by Quatremère in his edition of Rashid al-Dīn, op. cit., pp. 288 f., and those given by Dozy, *Supplément*, s.v. add Abū Shāmā, op. cit., I, 107, l. 31, II, 139, l. 8. On Bāb al-Lūk in Cairo, painted tawārīk were visible until 740 H. (1339–40 A.D.), cf. Makriżī, *Khitat*, II, 118, l. 31, p. 198, l. 18; Rashīd al-Dīn, op. cit., p. 289. All the same it should be borne in mind that in several instances quoted by Quatremère and Dozy, tārīka indicates not a shield, but part of a besieging machine, as best inferred from Ibn Iyās, op. cit., II, 374, l. 24.

\(^6\) Mayer, op. cit., s. vv.

\(^7\) Asandamur and Karasunkur, for instance, used shields of both forms.

\(^8\) A notable exception is a dish in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin (cf. F. Sarre, "Drei Meisterwerke syrischer Keramik," *Berliner Museen*, [1927], 8 f. and frontispiece); but this dish shows several other details connecting it with the Crusader's pottery of 'Atlīf so that one may well question whether it is Muslim at all. Cf. the design on its rim with that of the circle of a dish in C. N. Johns, "Medieval Slip-ware from Pilgrims' Castle, 'Atlīf," *Quart. Dept. Antiquities in Palestine*, III (1934), Pl. LV, 3, the ornament on the top of the inner part with the border of another 'Atlīf dish (ibid., Pl. LV, 1), the shield of the Berlin dish with that seen on several dishes at 'Atlīf (ibid., Pl. LV, 1–3).
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Fig. 3—Circassian Coat of Mail with Splints. Istanbul, Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi

Fig. 4—Circassian Coat of Mail with Splints. Paris Collection of M. Georges Paulhac
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Fig. 7—Sculpture, Umayyad Palace of Khirbat al-Mafdjir

Fig. 8—Helmet of Sultan Barsbây
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Fig. 9—Helmet of Khairbak, Governor of Aleppo. Istanbul, Topkapu Sarayi Muzesi
Figs. 10-11—Saracen Swords. Istanbul, Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi

Figs. 12-13—Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi and New York, Metropolitan Museum
Figs. 15—17—Axes of the Țabărățiya-Corps

Fig. 14—Danish Ax. Copenhagen, National Museum

Figs. 15—17—Axes of the Țabărățiya-Corps
The Cruciform Plan

The difference between māristān—Nūrī and Kaimarī—and madrasa is that in the latter a prayer hall, necessary in a strictly religious institution such as the madrasa, is, but not in a hospital, takes the place of one of the four open iwāns. With this exception, only secondary elements, the corner rooms, differ: in the one instance bedrooms for the sick, in the other living rooms for the students. It is the practical needs that enforce emphasis on certain parts, the neglect of others, and in analogy to biological causation make them assume peculiar shapes. But the māristān is not an architectural type in its own right; both are varieties of the same species. It follows that the broad prayer hall actually replaced the fourth iwān of a more original phase of the type. Neglecting for the moment the question in which land this substitution took place—not in Baghdad (Mustanṣīriya without prayer hall) nor in Iran—we are entitled to group under madrasa the subspecies of māristān, and to include the three works of Nūr al-Dīn at Damascus all in the architectural family of the cruciform madrasa. One must never forget that cruciform here does not refer to a room, but only and always to a court with four iwāns, counterpart of an atrium with two alae.

There is nothing I could add to van Berchem’s classical exposition, “Origine de la madrasa.” Without knowledge of it one can neither write nor read things written on the subject.

The madrasa, i.e., school or college, is not the continuation of the old dār al-‘ilm of the early Abbasid caliphate, a universal academy of arts and sciences, itself a survival of Greek and Iranian academies. The madrasa is a product of orthodox scholasticism, of the “réaction sunnite” against internal heresies in Islam and against attacks from outside. Its beginnings were the private schools in the houses of the teachers, mostly in Khurasan, the East of the Muhammadan world; and the great grand vizier of the sultans Alp-Arslan and Malikshāh, Niẓām al-Mulk, the author of the Siyāsatnāmah (“Book on Politics”), was the man who had the vision of what could be achieved by developing such beginnings. He created the madrasas as political institutions of the state. They are mosques and theological seminaries, they are law schools where the doctrines founded in orthodox religion and approved by the church and the state are taught. They are under complete control of the founders and are, therefore, often chosen as their burial places. Professors and students, selected according to the provisions of the waqf, receive salaries and live in madrasas. The teachers, faqīh, all theologian-jurisconsults, are school teachers and at the same time judges, financial administrators, diplomats, ministers, and also spiritual guides. They educate the coming generation, there is no civil career but through the madrasa. The dār al-ḥadīth is a subservient institution, for studying the oral tradition and preparing it for the use of the faqīh.


† Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, I, Égypte, Mém. mission arch. franç. au Caire, XIX (1894–1903), 254–69 (1896) and 533–36 (1900). (Hereinafter cited as MCIA.)
Nizâm al-Mulk founded madrasas all over the Seljuk empire. The Nizâmiya in Baghdad was opened in 459 H. (1067 A.D.); the first ones were those in Khurasan, e.g., one at Nishapur, which he must have founded between 451, the death of Čâghri, and 456, the death of Ṭoghrul, when administrating the whole of Khurasan as vizier to Alp-Arslan, the designated heir.

Ibn al-Athîr writes: "The Nizâmiya madrasas are famous the world over, no town that had not one of them, even Djazïrat ibn ‘Umar, a town lost in a corner of the world."  

In Syria, resistance against the innovation emanated from, and was supported by, the Fatimid caliphate of Egypt. The historical coincidence of the crusader’s attack decided the victory of the idea of Nizâm al-Mulk. Neither the Baghdad caliphate nor the Seljuk sultanate—soon declining—was able to protect Syria. The crusades stirred the orthodox conscience and revived the feelings of the early Muhammadan conquest, the futûh. The Holy War, jihad, created great military leaders who, having gained independence, and realizing the importance of orthodox education for the men they needed to administer their kingdoms, introduced the Seljuk madrasa into Syria: Zengî, Nûr al-Dîn, Saladin, Gûkbûrî. With Saladin the madrasa as a symbol of the “orthodox reaction” conquered Egypt, the home of Fatimid, i.e., Shiite resistance. van Berchem adds: Acheté au prix d’une haute culture intellectuelle—viz. that of the preceding Abbasid period—ce triomphe cache le germe d’une longue décadence.”

When van Berchem wrote, only—cum grano salis—monuments from Egypt, all late and irrelevant for the problem of the origins, and a few from Syria were known. Of the purely archaeological side of the problem one could not foresee more than he did: no connection with the early Muhammadan mosque, connection with old Iranian buildings, provenance from Syria and the Seljuk empire beyond it. At a time when no building could be attributed to the Umayyad period, he considered the tetraptylon of Kaşr ʿAmmân in Transjordania, with its four ellipsoid ìwâns around a square court, as an antique model that gave to the Syrian architects of the thirteenth century A.D. the idea of the cruciform plan. In fact, ʿAmmân is an Umayyad building, Iranian in character, and it proves the existence of that plan in Iran long before there was any madrasa. But architectural types for new purposes, valid enough to persist for long periods, are not created in an eclectic and spontaneous way, but evolved by variation out of something already functioning, just as nature operates.

Most madrasas are founded for one of the four rites, Malikite, Hanbalite, Hanafite, and Shāfiite, some for two of them, exceptionally, for all four rites; but never is there an architectural distinction between a madrasa for one or for two rites. Today, whether in Constantinople, Tunis, Cairo, Damascus, Baghdad, Persia, or India, students squat in little groups

2 Ibn Khallikân mentions other Nizâmiyas in Isfahan, Mosul, and Herat.


4 Ibn Khallikân expressly mentions this resistance.

5 A development one might compare to the introduction of the Deuteronomium, or to the canonization of the Awesta under Shapur II, both leading to stagnation.
around their teacher in the courts, iwāns, halls, or chambers of mosque and madrasas, quite unconcerned and undisturbed by the presence of other groups next to them. One must avoid projecting the notion of the lecture room of a university, where the professor talks behind closed doors, into that world. The rooms are there for all, and their number and size are planned in relation to the expected number of students; there is more connection between the plan of a madrasa and the weather, than between it and the number of rites of law schools. van Berchem was misled by the belief that the existence of madrasas founded for four schools and of such with cruciform plan, divisible into four equal parts, was not a coincidence, and he inferred that, at the beginning, the cruciform plan answered all the exigencies of the “quadruple madrasa”—a rather exceptional case. Even in his error is a true recognition: that plan is not the multiplication of a simple one; the cruciform, fourfold plan is indeed the beginning, and he tried to explain the others as reductions.

Creswell in his discussion with van Berchem also believed in the connection of numbers. The Mustanširîya of Baghdad was destined for the four rites, for a dâr al-Kur'ân and a dâr al-ḥadîth. Hence he says: “Its six iwāns were no doubt for the lectures of the six professors.” Doubt may prove a thing right; undoubted things are probably wrong. The Mustanširîya, of which Figure 30 shows one quarter, has three iwāns on each of the long sides and one iwān on each of the short sides; since the middle one on the east side of the court is the main entrance, seven remain for possible use as lecture halls. In the cruciform examples, one of the four iwāns is always the entrance, a place entirely unfit for lectures and study. The numbers never agree.

On the basis of his material collected in Syria in 1918, together with lists of madrasas carefully excerpted from literature, Creswell states: “We have thus come down to the year 641 (1243) without having met with one cruciform madrasa,” and inferences lastly that “although the first four-rite madrasa is found at Baghdad, the first madrasa of cruciform plan is found in Cairo... the cruciform plan was Egyptian in origin and practically unknown outside Egypt.”

It was a chance that he missed the three works of Nūr al-Dīn in Damascus, the oldest madrasas that have come down to us. Exploration is a chance. Which monuments survive is equally chance. There must have been many hundreds of madrasas. Suppose, hundreds were preserved, it still might be that the few specimens able to answer our questions had perished. One cannot solve historical problems by a sort of statistical method. There is no other way but choosing, from the material that survives, the few specimens that matter, and, in order to avoid mistakes in choice, one must clearly define the problem.

Only when putting the question properly, may one hope to find an answer in the dumb material. When the Damascus madrasas were built, there were not only the Niẓāmīyas over the whole Seljuk empire as far as Baghdad and Dījazīrat ibn ʿUmar, but there were madrasas at Damascus since 491 (Ṣādiriya, under Duḵāk b. Tūtush, nephew of Malikshāh), in Aleppo since 516 (Zādjījāḏjīya, under Zengi), and in Mosul since 541–44 (Atābekiya, under Ghāzī, elder brother of Nūr al-Dīn, in addition to the Niẓāmīya). The madrasa did not come as a
bodiless, spiritual institution for which a form was to be found, but as a building that had already taken shape. The creation shifts back to the time of Niẓâm al-Mulk and to Iran, and the Iranian origin is an a priori necessity.

Every human creation grows out of something existing and needs time to find the form that is the perfect expression of its character. When the simple forms of the western madrasas do not explain the more complicated, cruciform type, and when the oldest preserved specimens belong to the cruciform, that plan must be the one closest to the original, while the others must be farther removed, by elimination and reduction to the dispensable. As will be seen, the cruciform plan is the Persian plan for everything. The problem of the cruciform plan thus becomes, on the whole, that of the madrasa.

None of the madrasas of Niẓâm al-Mulk, none of the whole Seljuk period, 6 none of the time of the Khwârizm-shâhs and even of the Mongol Îl-Khâns has been rediscovered in Iran, as far as I know, though one could draw up a long list from literature. Probably there are special reasons for their disappearance, first among them the discontinuance of the endowments of those Sunnite institutions when Shiism triumphed in Iran under the Safawids. The chronicles of Aleppo and Damascus speak of dozens of analogous cases there.

The Niẓâmiyya of Khargird, Khurasan

There is perhaps one exception: The expedition of Diez-Niedermayer in 1913 found a ruin at Khargird, Khurasan (southeast of Nishapur), 7 of which a sketch plan, a view, and two parts of an inscription were published, with some remarks by van Berchem on the inscription. Diez attributed the building to the twelfth century A.D., announcing a future proof. When studying the incomplete data, I saw that the inscription was one of Niẓâm al-Mulk’s 8 (450–85). In 1925, March 19–21, I explored the monument, 9 which is a building in sun-dried bricks, once coated not with really burnt bricks, but a material harder than the sun-dried bricks of the body of the walls. The building is in bad condition (Figs. 1 and 33–38). The inscription was, perhaps, the masterpiece of Kufic epigraphy in Iran.

Inscription 9

A frieze on three sides of the main ïwân, over the summit of the doors and under the windows, length originally 14 + 7 + 14 m., altogether about 30 m. is preserved; in the beginning 10 m. are missing, at the end a little more than 7 m. The letters are 82 cm. high and are made in three parts: one plate for the rich apices, 30.5 cm. high; one for the middle

6 The building at Kazvin of which Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe, ed. E. Combe, J. Sauvaget, and G. Wiet (Cairo, 1937), VIII, Nos. 2965–67, gives three waqf inscriptions from the Mirât al-Buldân al-Nâşiri (dedicated to Nâşir al-Dîn), all three beginning with the striking formula: “Speaks Khumartash b. ‘Abdallah,” like “speaks Darius, the king,” and dated in 509 H., is a madrasa, not a mosque, but no plan has been published to my knowledge.

7 E. Diez, Churasausische Denkmäler (Berlin, 1918), pp. 91–92, Pls. 18, 2; 19, 1 and 30.
of the shafts, 21 cm.; one for the lower parts, 30.5 cm.; depth of the plates, 10.6 cm., laid into a background 7.3 cm. deeper and consisting of a wavy scroll; material harder than sun-dried clay, but seemingly not burnt.

Fig. 1—Khargird, Niẓāmīya, Inscription of Niẓām al-Mulk

The style is official, Niẓām acted as founder, the sheikh as trustee. The first gap contained more titles and predicates of Niẓām, the second an imprecation only. ‘Amīd, translated by “loyal,” was at that time the title of the chief of police—Seljuk for older šāhib al-shurṭa, see the inscription of Imām Dūr.

The two lakāb, kiwām al-dīn and raḍī amīr al-mu’minīn were conferred on Niẓām al-Mulk by the Caliph al-Ḵā’im in Alp-Arslān’s reign, 455–65, seemingly before 460.

The title sadīd 10 is rare and ought to help to find the personage. Al-Rāwandi, the historian of the Seljuk dynasty, a great calligraphist like his two uncles, born about 555 h., calls

10 For the meaning see Balādhuri, Futūh al-Buldān, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1866), s.v. sadda II, “who strongly defends Islam.”
his maternal grandfather \(^{11}\) "our master the imâm . . . sadid al-dîn djamâl al-islâm . . . Muhammad b. 'Alî al-Râwandi." This man is one generation at least too late for our case. On page 136, speaking of the downfall of Nîzâm al-Mulk and the great *revirement* of ministers that followed at the end of Malikshâh's reign, Râwandi says: "Kâmal al-Dîn Abu 'l-Rîdâ, minister of the army [ʼârid, Seljuk for older diwân al-djund] was replaced by sadid al-mulk Abu 'l-Maʿâlî Naḥḥâs." Al-Bundârî \(^{12}\) mentions at the same occasion among the antagonists of Nîzâm al-Mulk "sadid al-mulk Abu 'l-Maʿâlî al-Mufaḍḍâl b. 'Abd-al-Razzâk b. 'Umar, ʼârid al-djund, minister of the army"; he calls him also Abu 'l-Maʿâlî Naḥḥâs, and gives him the title munshî.\(^{13}\) That is all I have found. The loyal ʼamîd sadîd al-dawla Abu 'l- . . . of the inscription may well be the disloyal ʼârid sadid al-mulk Abu 'l-Maʿâlî of 485, who joined the cause of Tâdj al-Mulk Abu 'l-Ghanâʾîm, the passionate enemy of Nîzâm al-Mulk, just as the names of both these two enemies appear in the inscription of the Great Mosque of Isfahan.\(^{14}\)

Thus, the exact date cannot be restored, but Nîzâm al-Mulk was concerned with Khurasan in the early years of his career, under Alp-Arslan as heir apparent, and I should place the building not later than 460 H.

It is equally difficult to decide whether one ought to reconstitute "has ordered to build this *masjid*" or "this madrasa." The plan (Fig. 33) shows what remains. Two piers of wall mark the corners of the southwest side of the court, giving a width of 22 m. There are traces of a wall on the northeast side, about 28 m. distant, but I saw no clue to assign it to one of the three periods of the ruins. The two piers mentioned correspond to each other, but the few others do not, and one cannot restore the plan by symmetrically complementing the two sides: the sides were not simply extensions of the rooms at both sides of the main iwân.

Only the oldest of the three periods is dated and important, that of Nîzâm al-Mulk. There is a large iwân of 6.72 to 13–14 m. (relation 1:2) in the axis of the southwest side of the court, flanked by lateral rooms of indeterminable extension. But each has, corresponding to the mihrab in the axis of the iwân, a mihrab in its backwall, whose center, together with the middle of the front of these parts of the court, establishes an axis parallel to that of the main iwân. The façade on the court, therefore, consisted of the large opening of the iwân between two smaller ones of the lateral rooms; that is, on a larger scale, the elevation of the two preserved façades of the court of the Dâr al-Ḥadîth al-Nûriya at Damascus.

The side walls of the iwân are 1.8 m. thick and have three larger openings (doors) below, 2.12 m. wide, and five smaller ones (windows) above. The relation between wall and width of room is 2 : 7.5. In the older mosques of Nâţîn and Damghan, barrel vaults are put on weaker supports. One may assume a barrel vault springing from a line above the windows,


\(^{13}\) The index separates, by mistake, al-Mufaḍḍâl and Naḥḥâs (before knowledge of Râwandi).

\(^{14}\) Of the period, but out of question here, are sadid al-mulk b. Munkîḏ of Shâizar; the faḵîh sadîd Muḥammad al-Salmâsî (Ibn Khallîkân, *Biographies*, ed. F. Wüs-
senfeld [Göttingen, 1835], No. 660); sadîd al-dawla Muḥammad ibn al-Anbârî, ambassador and vizier of al-
Mustarbûd and al-Muṭṭâfî (Ibn al-ʻAlîrî).
which means great height. The proportions of the doors and the mihrab require an original floor far beneath the actual level: the accumulated rubbish comes from the fallen vault. The very high arch of the front must have had spandrels.

If the lateral rooms were vaulted over by barrels parallel to this one, those could only spring from the same high line above the windows. Vaults perpendicular to that of the Īwān are inconsistent with the two far-spaced piers of the façade. Both assumptions, thus, are dissatisfying, and a flat roof is more convincing.

Diary:

Nashtafūn, March 18, 1925: seven hours march through uneventful steppe, now out of it. Here, Sangūn (ân), Barābād, Mihrbād, Nashtafūn, Khargird and others, lie all close together, Nashtafūn two hours from Khargird, every village visible from far away as a big black patch of vegetation. At first I could not believe it: those are a real forest of real firs; one feels transferred to Central Europe. They are not cedars, cypresses, nor southern pines, but a beautiful kind of fir, perhaps a pine growing in the shape of a fir. And at once appear, never seen in Sīstān, Kuḥistan, and Khurasan, flat ceilings over the same type of houses. It is quite clear that flat ceiling and vaults are not an essential distinction, but an accidental one, imposed by the conditions of the country, and flat ceilings are preferred wherever material is available.

The photographs of the inscriptions just show something of the brick coating of the walls below, the bricks being assembled like wickerwork. More complicated patterns of this kind are called hazârbâf “thousandfold-woven,” the first examples appear in Ukhaidir and Rakka—early Abbasid. This simple pattern covers for instance the whole walls of the mausoleum at Sangbast, built in the reign of Mahmud of Ghazni. The same coating of the first period is preserved on the outside of the same walls, facing the side rooms, high above the doors. There, the summits of two wide arches cut into it, which, if their lower parts were preserved, would spring from the inner and outer corner of the room, and the springing point in the middle, common to both, would fall on the void of the middle door. As real arches they ought to have been complete, which involves that the middle door was walled up, i.e., a second period, while the wickerwork assemblage contradicts that. Or, they may have been simply ornamental, incomplete, like the picture of a discharging arch, and that would support the assumption of flat ceilings over the lateral rooms. In that case the row of windows in the main Īwān, for which I do not recall an analogy, would have a raison d'être: as openings into the second story of a madrasa.

I leave the question open, only excavations could decide it. The building was a mosque or a madrasa, a very small mosque for that period in Iran, the more so as it is an official building.

But this unsolved problem does not prevent one from drawing conclusions. For our question, there is no difference between madrasa and mosque in Iran: if they have one large Īwān on one side of the court, there must be very special reasons not to have them on each side; they all belong to the cruciform plan.
MADRASA AL-GHIYÀTHIYA

The Great Mosque of Isfahan, built by Nizâm al-Mulk and his enemy Tâdj al-Mulk, may serve as a typical example for the Seljuk mosques, and the Madrasa al-Ghiyàthiyya at Khargird, close to the Nizâmiyya, as typical for the madrasa (Fig. 42).

First published by E. Diez. The inscriptions given by Sykes are not quite exact. I must postpone the publication of my much more complete material.

Inscription 10

Large frieze in mosaic of colored tiles around the opening of the door, and a window above it in the main entrance, large letters, 52 cm. high, white on lapis blue background, white vowel signs, dark yellow dots for fillings; the upper hastae of the letters interwoven with the repeated formula mubârak bâd (“be blessed!”) in Kufic, turquoise blue. The right half is destroyed, the inscription begins shortly before the summit:

After the eulogy following the name and titles of Shàhrokh, the scribe falls into Persian:

The sun of the religion and the government, the heaven of justice and law, the padishah of the inhabited quarter [of the earth], the Khusrau [al-zamân “of his time” evidently missing] the Sâhib-kirân, and in rhyming prose: “through the care of the humble slave Pîr Ahmed b. Ishân b. Madjd al-Dîn Muhammad al-Khwâfî, in the year 848.

The titles belong to Shàhrokh, the Timurid, and Pîr Ahmed al-Khwâfî, from Khwâf near Khargird, is known to have been his vizier; but there are not two trustees of the building, both viziers, as Sykes’ secretary noted and Diez took over.

Inscription 11

In the kundj right of the entrance, outside, small rectangle 17.45 cm. in the same kâshî technique, in Persian:

By the care of the humble slave khwâdja Pîr Ahmed Raihân

Khwâdja is the title of a vizier; Raihân, his surname, which I am unable to check, could be read in various ways.

15 Diez, op. cit., pp. 72, 76, Pis. 31-34.

**Inscription 12**

Signature of the architect, in the background of the west iwân, window-shaped panel in kâshî, five lines in Arabic:

1. بنت هذه المدرسة المباركة الغياثيّة 3. على يد عبد المرحوم استاذ 4 قوايم الدين شهريار Wareh 5. عبد استاذ غياث الدين شهريار 465

This blessed Madrasa al-Ghiyâthiyya has been built by the hand of the deceased master Kiwâm al-Dîn of Shiraz, and was finished by the work of the slave, the master Ghiyât al-Dîn of Shiraz, 846 [years in numerals].

The difference in date shows that the construction took at least two years. Kiwâm al-Dîn is known as the master of two of the most famous buildings in Khurasan, the Gôharshâdî mosque at Meshed, still existing, dated 821 h., and the Muşâllâ of Herat, of which little remains. I do not know of any other work signed by Ghiyât al-Dîn, who may have been the son of the old Kiwâm. Whereas in 460 h. it took an exceptional effort for the caliph to grant to the actual ruler of the East the laqâb Kiwâm al-Mulk, less than four hundred years later a simple craftsman is Kiwâm al-Dîn, “sustainer of the Faith.” It was certainly not the second architect, Ghiyât al-Dîn, that gave his name to the Madrasa al-Ghiyâthiyya, but the sultan whose title was ghiyât al-qašq wa’l-dunyâ wa’l-dîn “succour of the Truth (God) and the world and the religion.”

But it is a splendid achievement of the masters. The madrasa must have been sunnite, for vast surfaces are decorated with bricks in hazârbâf—or ‘câr ‘Ali”—all with Allah and Muhammad, but never the name of Ali. The cruciform plan of the court is evident. In such a large building, though a court measuring 28.4 m. square is not large according to Persian scale, there are plenty of living rooms between the iwâns, in two stories, and there is space enough to develop the actual corner rooms into pretty domed lecture rooms. Already before this time, the urge for symmetrical formation had passed the stage where it was satisfied with two normal axes; the symmetry affects the diagonal axes, the corners are beveled, and the next step is the octagonal plan.

Two vast domed halls flank, in symmetry and by repetition, the cupola over the dargâh of the front wing. In the [Archaeological History of Iran] I have confronted this plan with that of the palace of Ardashîr I at Firûzâbâd, about 218–28 a.d. The only difference between them is that there, the exterior iwân of the entrance is hypertrophied, because it functions as a place for the public audiences of the king, not only as an entrance; and the lateral iwâns in the court were either not yet invented or are suppressed.

The madrasa plan as represented by the Ghiyâthiyya Khargird existed in Iran long before Islam. That is why it appears at the Umayyad epoch in Kâşr ‘Ammân in Transjordania and long before that time, sporadically, in houses of Seleucia, Ctesiphon, Kish (near Babylon), or other Parthian and Sasanian towns. The type is the same, the purpose and meaning
have changed. But the palace is only a variety, with stress on throne hall and open audience hall, of a large house, and that must be the original designation of the type.

**Caravanserai of Zafarānī**

Not only mosques and madrasas are planned in Iran with a cruciform court. The caravanserai of Zafarānī is between Nishapur and Sabzawar (*Fig. 2*).
Diary:

April 22, 1925: Building of sun-dried bricks on a high foundation of burnt bricks, destroyed by brick diggers. Plan: exterior walls about 75 m. square, interior court 36. 38 m. On each of its sides one iwān, rather narrow for its depth, once barrel-vaulted. Kundjīs around the court and a closed room behind each one. Long stables along the outer walls. The arrangement of the corner rooms, though not clear, was certainly not symmetrical to the diagonal axis. To the right of the entrance are some rooms of different plan. Among the potsherds observed are some of a ware found on the citadel mound of Nishapur, tepe Alp-Arslan, Seljuk period.

N. de Khanikoff described Zafarānī on June 26, 1858:

... se trouve dans un état de ruine presque complet ... A droite de la porte d'entrée, regardant le sud, il y a une mosquée dans l'intérieur de laquelle, sous la coupole, on voit une belle inscription coufique assez bien conservée, verset 285 et 286 de Cor. II. La forme des caractères ... me paraît être identique avec celle des légendes tracées sur les monuments du IVe siècle de l'hégire. Dans une vaste niche qui se trouve dans la première cour, tout un mur est bâti avec des briques disposées de manière à reproduire les noms des quatre khalifes [orthodoxes] ١<sup>1</sup> ﷺ ﷽ ﷲ ﷿ abu Bakr, ʻUthmān, ʻUmar et ʻAli. Cela prouve d'une manière évidente, non seulement que le constructeur de cet édifice était un sunnite, mais aussi que la construction a été faite à une époque ou ce rite était toléré dans le Khorasan, donc bien avant l'époque des Séfévides ... Sur les murs d'un bain attenant au caravansérail, on voit le commencement d'une inscription en beaux caractères coufiques, dont il ne reste que ce peu de mots: basmala ... la construction pendant le règne du grand-sultan ... " Le style d'architecture de ce beau monument et le caractère de ses inscriptions permettent ... d'assigner avec beaucoup de probabilité le règne du Seljoukide Malikshāh comme l'époque de sa construction.17

Whether Malikshāh, Mahmud, or Muhammad, the title "al-sultān al-mu'azzam," involving a following shāhānsāh al-ʻazīm, "the exalted sultan, the august shāhānsāh," is enough to prove the Seljuk age of this caravanserai.

The court with the four iwāns is that of a madrasa or of a caravanserai; the distinctive feature is that the secondary rooms are made to satisfy the needs of travelers, stables for the animals, and open or closed rooms for the men instead of living rooms for students (madrasa) or prayer halls (mosque). In Syria we have observed the corresponding differentiation of the same genus into māristān and madrasa, the first being the older institution, both of Persian origin. Here one sees that in Persia the common type had a much wider range.

The caravanserais, doomed today by the intrusion of motor traffic, are an old Iranian institution, called by Herodotus katalyseis, by Ctesias emporia. They stood at regular intervals all along the carriage roads that Darius and his successors had built. "Royal Road" remained the term for high roads down into the Muhammadan period. Hecataeus describes the Royal Road from Sardis to Susa, the historians of Alexander mention the prolongation to Persepolis; another one started from Babylon to Agbatana, Ragā, Tōsa (Baghdad, Hamadan,

---

Teheran, Meshed) and continued to the easternmost limits of the empire. They were the roads of the official post, and, beside caravanserais for travelers, post stations, mansiones or stathmoi, stood along them. The Old Persian term is *avahāna* ("relais"; Syrian āwānā, Arabic wāna, Armenian Van, Kurdish Bāna—common local names). The system was kept in operation for two thousand years, and with the institution the material shapes and types existed, subject only to such changes of style as must occur in so long a lapse of time.

**KHĀN-I-KHURRA, NEAR DEHBĪD**

The Syrian caravanserais are the poorest. In Iraq the Persian type makes its appear-
ance, especially on the Khurasan road from Baghdad to Persia (Fig. 31). To substantiate the assertion that the tendencies, foreshadowed by a plan like the Ghiyāthīya at Khargird, lead to the octagonal plan, Figure 3 gives the plan of the Khān-i-Khurra, near Dehbid, on the Isfahan–Shiraz road (surveyed Nov. 11, 1923). It has no inscription, but is certainly late Safawid, like other specimens of that type along the roads Isfahan–Tabriz, Isfahan–Meshed.

The royal roads were under military guard, the soldiers were stationed in dastākrta, corresponding to a Roman castellum, whence the common place name Dastgird, Daskara, the most famous halfway between Ctesiphon and the Iranian frontier. Another term is Old Persian pārāraka ("guard-house, fort"), whence pahra, farhadj, etc., a name common at district and provincial frontiers. Since they served for controlling traffic and as custom offices, they often stood at bridgeheads.

At that time the great Seljuk Malikshāh, or indeed Niżām al-Mulk, who ruled for the young prince, reorganized the entire road and post system. He straightened it, e.g., the track of the road from Baghdad to Djalūlā (near Dastagird), called from that time Ribāt Djalūla, later Kyzyl Ribāt, "the Red Ribāt," because it was one of the lines of ribāts built by Malikshāh. Rabaṭa is "to peg one's horse," ribāt is the "soldier's camp," and replaces the old dastākrta.

**Ribāt Anōshirwān at Āhuān, east of Simnān**

(Fig. 43)

Diary:

May 15, 1925. Built of undressed stone in mortar, walls 1.5 m. thick, vaults in dark red bricks, assembled in herringbone and step patterns, slightly crenelled from the springing line, shape of arch 'adjāmānā with weak groins. Dimensions: outside, about 72 m. square, court, 35 by 37 m., almost or exactly the measurements of the caravanserais of Zafarānī. The gate strongly salient, with a bālākhāna (balcony, upper story) above, a good outlook, didbān. Three round buttresses between the corner buttresses on each side. The four iwāns are 17.28 m. deep, only 5.12 m. wide, the kundj, reduced in depth, are separated (as in the Baghdad palace) from the corresponding rooms behind by a passage 2.5 to 3.12 m. deep; the closed rooms are 10.8 m. deep. There are no special stables along the outer walls. On the right from the entrance is a fine bath with a peculiar vault: cross with rising groins. In the corners smaller rooms are arranged in the shape of a cross. A slight deviation from symmetry of plan, for which no coercion is apparent.

Ribāt is also the term for Sufi monasteries, yet this building with no marks of religious use, not even a mihrab, but clearly a fortified building, is a military post, or perhaps a post station. A ribāt differs from a caravanserai by being better equipped for defense. The buttresses are here a practical appliance, no mere exterior decoration. The same are used at a
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19 F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, *Archaeologische Reise im Euphrat-und Tigris-Gebiet* (Berlin, 1911–20), II, Fig. 223, Khān al-Mashāhīda, pp. 224–25, al-Maḥmūdīya, both on the Hilla road. (This book is hereinafter referred to as *Arch. Reise.*)
small fort of the first century A.D. on the Küh-i-Khwädja, Sistân (Fig. 4), and at a fort, near the fire temples in the Farāshband Valley, of the fifth century (Fig. 5). A military garrison, and still more a post station, must have held horses. There is room enough for them, but the planning of the stables is not that usual in caravanserais. I suppose that the horses were kept, for greater readiness, in the passage between the court and the closed rooms.

The inhabitants believe the building to be “pīsh az islām,” pre-Islamic; they evidently refer the name Anōshirwān to the only one known today: Khusrau I, but the name is genuine and not invented to express that belief. The building is pre-Safawid, and one can hesitate between two assignations, Seljuk or Mongol. The best known two are the Ziyārid Abū Kālidjār Anōshirwān, who owned that region in 420–26, at the time of the Seljuk conquest, a
Fig. 5—Fort in Parashband Valley
rather too early date in my opinion, and the very last Mongol Īl-Khān Anūshirwān, 745–54, rather too late.

Actually, there are few types of buildings in Iran that do not have the court with four iwāns. This plan was already typified during the Arsacid and Sasanian periods, and was fully developed at the Umayyad time. It is simply the Iranian plan. The extension to an almost catholic use must have a deep reason, and I have collected various evidence pointing to its being an aboriginal house. For this I adduce here some final material from my diary:

Febr. 5, 1924, Shusp: In Khunik, 5 km. south of Nih, I observed again the rustic houses of sun dried brick that had struck me already in Sīstān, especially around Dawlatābād: an open, barrel-vaulted iwān between square domed chambers on both sides (Fig. 6). The vault is either ellipsoid or a handkerchief vault resting on a pair of arches at the front and backwall of the room. This group of three rooms is often doubled, facing each other, on the court. To the three constituent rooms others may be added irregularly. The same houses are common in Shusp and Nih. [In Nih one sees many small stone doors, just as between Gulpaigan and Isfahan, and everywhere in northern Syria].

March 9, 1925, Birjand: In the whole district, all villages have the small ‘iwān-house.’ Their domes are very often cloister vaults of moderate height. Very high ellipsoid domes are reserved for ice stores, yakhdān. On the road Birjand–Kībk [thus pronounced, but written Ḵywk] I observed the same house four times repeated around the court (Fig. 7); the example sketched is from a village Dastgird; there a second court for caravans is added, because these houses serve as guesthouses for travelers.

A further note says the type continues between Khargird, Salāmī, Turbat-i-Haidari.

While this house is vaulted in the East, it has flat ceilings all over the wooded valleys of Luristan and Kurdistan in the West. I gathered many examples around Kermanshah, Kirind,
and Shahrazûr and illustrate them here by a pretty little house in Mosul (Fig. 44), on the high bank of the Tigris overlooking Nineveh and the Kurdish mountains, a house in which I lived for a while.

Between Bözd and Birjand, another type is also common: two small vaulted rooms behind each other in the axis of an open iwân at their front. This is a kind of domus in antis. In western Iran, too, the type "colonnade between two closed rooms" is linked to the domus in antis. On the other hand, it is only the transposition into different material (flat wooden roofs) of the eastern Iranian house (vaults). The same relation exists between the Achaemenian palace front (west Iranian) and the Sasanian (east Iranian). So this house must be aboriginally Iranian, whether pre-Aryan, or imported by the Aryans from Erânvëdj-Turkistan and then differentiated in east and west according to the material available. The double and quadruple composition around a court of this rustic house is reflected by the plans of Kûh-i-Khwâdjâ (first century), Firûzâbâd (third century), 'Ammân (seventh and eighth centuries A.D.). The cruciform grouping means always a court, never a room. The implication is: the Muhammadan madrasa is of Iranian origin.

When Niğâm al-Mulk put the Persian architects to the task of building his madrasas, they had houses, caravanserais, ribâts, and mâristâns. They made the indispensable alterations to adapt their plan to the different purpose of the new building. There was and is no other way.

One must understand the Mustansîriya as a testimonial that, with the Niğâmîya, the cruciform madrasa was imported from Iran to Baghdad. Its extremely elongated, instead of square, shape, and the triplication of the iwân on the long side, has nothing to do with the four rites, but is enforced by the shape of the premises, their peculiar situation between the Tigris (west), the great bazar (east) and the main bridge at the north point. Such are the forces that produce changes.

Again, Nûr al-Dîn's three buildings of madrasa type at Damascus testify, through their Iraqi muḫkârinas domes and their Iranian plans, that the architectural idea came from Baghdad. Our analysis of the domes has laid bare some significant differences between the
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A. Dâwlâtâbâd, Sîstân  
B. Khûnîk near NH  
C. Dastgird, Between Birjand and Kibk

Fig. 7—Plan of Houses  
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older dome of the märistän and the younger one of the madrasa: thus things are changed after transplantation. I did not answer, above, the question regarding the region in which the fourth iwan was replaced by the prayer hall: it was certainly in Syria. That is the gradual processus of naturalization of an imported product.

Typological descent is not identical with essence and character. An object may be purely Iranian in type and at the same time purely Syrian in character. A type may migrate and transform itself more than once: the line of descent is not cut off, but there comes a point in the slow progress of transformation where we must draw a line: although it is old, it has become something new. The institution and the type of the madrasa is Persian, but the Syrian madrasa is as inconceivable in Persia, as the Mädar-i-Shâh of Isfahan would be at Damascus.

The reason for the seeming contradiction is, that buildings as works of art have a horizontal connection with all the works of their period and region, beside the vertical connection of their pedigree.

SYRIAN ARCHITECTURE, PERIOD OF NUR AL-DIN
ALEppo, KAŠTAL AL-SHU‘AIBIYA
(Figs. 8, 45, and 46)

Inside the Bâb al-Antâkıya, at the bifurcation from which start the two parallel branches of the main bazaar, at the point of the triangle occupied by the Djami‘ Tûtî, former Masdjîd or Madrasa al-Shu‘aibiyâ.20

Ibn Shaddâd writes:

Masdjîd Shu‘aib is the first mosque built by the Muslims after the conquest of Aleppo. Al-‘Azîmî 21 says: “After forcing the Bâb Antâkıya [in 16 H.], they threw their shields on the spot where this masjid was built . . . .” Shu‘aib . . . . al-Andalusî was a jurisconsult, faqîh, and ascetic; Nûr al-Dîn became very fond of him, used to visit him, and gave him a waqf with which he instituted a madrasa.” 22 (In the detailed description of the antique “Great Aqueduct”: “In the track of this aqueduct, Nûr al-Dîn built the kaštal at the head of the Shu‘aibiyâ and conducted a branch toward the kaštal al-Khashshâbîn.” 23

20 Full publication prepared for MCIA.
21 The Târikh of Abu Abdallah Muhammad b. Ali al-‘Azîmî is quoted (1) by Zaid b. al-Hasan al-Kindî, 510–97, on the date of the foundation of the Great Minaret of Aleppo, 482 H., a quotation taken over by Ibn al-Adîm, (2) by Ibn Shaddâd, on the conquest of Aleppo in 16 H.: the first Muslims entering through the Bâb Antâkıya, and on the discovery of the head of John the Baptist at Baalbek in 435 H., and its transport to Aleppo (3) by Ibn al-Alhî, op. cit., X, 396: a poem to İlghâżî, fighting the crusaders in 513 H., (4) by Ibn Khallîkân, with the wrong spelling, al-Akîmî, op. cit., No. 244, p. 51, on Zengî’s appointment over Mosul in 521 H. Hence, the work apparently dealt with the Zengid period and was written in the early sixth century.

[Quite recently ‘Abbâs al-‘Azawî has published, in Revue de l’académie arabe de Damas, XVIII (1943), 199–209, a study “Al-Azîmî wa-târikhuhu.” The author, entirely ignored by occidental histories of literature, was born in 483 H., and his “History” goes down to 538 H.]
23 Ibid., p. 142.
Kašṭal, Latin *castellum (aquaes)*, *dividiculum*; the institution corresponds, on a much smaller scale, but with equal value and great beauty, to the *fontane* of Rome.

**Inscription 13**

On the principal entablature, for the greater part concealed by the modern roof over the fountain,24 Kufic, unpublished:

```
... أمير المؤمنين عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه... في سنة خمس واربعين وخمس مائة...
```

The text alludes to the story of the conquest, in 16 H., (637 A.D.) by speaking of the caliphate of Omar b. al-Khattab and gives the date of the new building as “in the year 545” (1150).

**Inscription 14**

Signature of the architect, in a small roundel on the summit of the arch of the porch, Kufic:

```
صنعة سعيد المقدسي بن عبد الله رضي الله الله
```

Work of Sa‘īd al-Muḳaddasī (of Jerusalem), son of Abdallah, Allah reward him!

Jerusalem, at that time in the hands of the crusaders, had been famous for its architects since the time of the ancestor of the great geographer and traveler al-Muḳaddasī, Abu Bakr al-bannā‘; the architect who built the gate of the ‘Akkā port for Ahmed ibn Tulun. The Kašṭal is built in the very best stone masonry, according to the solid Syrian tradition persisting from antiquity. The dressed stones have fine beveled edges accentuating their horizontal joints.25

The porch, to the right of which is the fountain, has three openings formed by a cross vault that rests on the back wall and two free pillars in front. The key stone is star-shaped. The high lintel of the door in the back wall is a horizontal arch of dove-tailed quoins, whose intricate joints form a geometrical ornament. The horizontal arch, used for straight architraves and lintels, together with the flat discharging arch, is a Roman invention. Here, the discharging arch is pointed, and its indented joints are of ornamental value. This simple play of lines, sheer mastery of stone cutting, is deliberately contrasted with the wealth of ornament poured out over every part of the entablature that crowns the wall (*Fig. 46*). The entablature belongs to the Ionic order. It differs from the antique in the following details: the architrave projects at an inclination; the frieze also projects as a cavetto; the Greek figural sculptures or the Roman scrolls are replaced by a very fine Kufic inscription. But the

24 This inscription exists, but is covered by the modern roof over the basin of the fountain, which ought to be taken away.

25 As in the Turbat ibn al-Muḳaddam at Damascus, cf. the first section of this investigation (*Ars Islamica*, IX [1942], 16), and some plaster imitations in other turbas.
cornice is tripartite as in classical style: dental, salient fascia on brackets, and sima. In Figure 8 a detail of the upper sima is compared with a small frieze from the entrance of Mashhad al-Ḥusain, Aleppo, dated 586 H., Zahir Ḥāzī, son of Saladin.

Fig. 8—Two Ornamental Friezes. Aleppo

Earlier visitors called this work “an antique arch” (gate), being unprepared for as late a survival of antique tradition. The expression “renaissance of the antique” has also been used for such works, quite wrongly: it is not the question of spontaneous imitation, but all these works are typical for their period and represent an uninterrupted antique tradition. To prove this I give in Figures 47, 49, and 50 details from the entablatures of the gates of Cairo, Bāb al-Naṣr and Bāb al-Futūb, built in 480 H. under Caliph al-Mustansir (the Fatimid) for the Grand Vizier Badr al-Ḏjamāli, by three brothers, architects from Urfa-Edessa; their third work is the Bāb Zuwailla (or al-Mutawalli), built in 484 H., all three together documenting the superiority of the Syrian architecture at that time. To me those are the most beautiful monuments of Cairo.

Dār al-Fuḳarā’

One could easily mistake for an antique work the door, drawn in Figure 9, of the Dār al-Fuḳarā’. The drawing is of 1914; in 1930, when coming back to check the position of the inscription and to take a photograph, I could not find it, the region outside the north gate of
the Great Mosque having been completely rebuilt. Since the *Monuments historiques de Damas* ignore the building and the *Répertoire* quotes the inscription (No. 2619) from the old receuil Schefer only, I assume it exists no longer. van Berchem read it in 1893, we in 1914.
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Good Kufic, 130 by 20 cm., either on the lintel or on the discharging-arch above:

_Inscription 14a_

Basmala . . . . the ground floor of this house is a waqf for the poor (fâkîr), the destitute of the Suîs. Allah reward him who founded it!

"Abû 'l-Kâsim Ali . . . . al-Sumaisâtî [from Samosata on the upper Euphrates], astronomer and mathematician, died the 10. Rabi' II, 453 (May 3, 1061) at Damascus and was buried in his house near the Bâb al-Nâtîfîyîn [north gate of the Great Mosque], which he had founded as waqf for Sufî pilgrims."

At the time of Tutush (Malikshâh's brother), the Sumaisâtiya was connected by a door with the northern arcade of the Great Mosque.

**Minaret of the Great Mosque of Aleppo**

(Figs. 51, 53, 55, and 58)

During the years when the gates of Cairo were built by the three brothers from Urfa, and the Kubbat al-Naṣr was restored at Damascus, an architect from Sarmîn, a place between Aleppo and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân, built the minaret of the Great Mosque of Aleppo.

The ground story was finished in 483, under the reign of Malikshâh, the governorship of Aksonkor, grandfather of Nur al-Dîn; the top story is dated in the reign of Tutush. Tutush took Aleppo in Djumâdâ I, 487 H. (May-June, 1094 A.D.) and was killed in battle near Rayy (Teheran) in Muharram 488 H. (January, 1095 A.D.); hence, the completion of the minaret is exactly dated without an epigraphical date.

The erection of this monument is entirely due to the great cadi Muhammad ibn al-Khashshâb.

Ibn al-'Adîm, on the authority of al-'Azîmî, writes:

In 482 the foundation for the minaret of the Great Mosque of Aleppo was laid by the cadi Abu 'l-Hasan Muhammad . . . . ibn al-Khashshâb, at the place of an older minaret. There was a fire temple [means Hellenistic temple], neglected and at last used as the furnace of a bath. The cadi saw himself compelled to use its stones for his construction, and some enemies denounced him to Malikshâh's lieutenant, the atabek Aksonkor, to incite the governor against him. Aksonkor called the cadi and said: You have demolished a sanctuary that belongs to me and the government! The cadi answered: O emir! it was a fire temple that had become the furnace of a bath; I took its stones to build a temple of Islam, from the height of which the name of Allah shall be proclaimed; and I have written your name on those stones in order that Allah's reward be yours. But if you wish me to reimburse the price of the stones, whereby Allah's reward would be mine, I am ready to do it! The emir was amazed by these words, approved the cadi, and said: Allah's reward at any rate shall be mine, do what you want!

The anecdote is literally true: the inscription originally mentioned both Aksonkor and the cadi, but the latter's name has been chiseled off. There are so many inhibitions against
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17 Ibid., p. 278 (Nu'aimi).

18 Ibid., p. 279.
erasing a written name, that it is never done but under exceptional circumstances, in this case no doubt by the author himself. Allah was not deceived; Aḵsonḵor was killed only four years later, but He rewarded the cadi with a long life.

The family of the Banu ʿl-Khashšāb played a great part in the history of Aleppo. They were ʿUḵailī Arabs like Muslim b. Ḵuraish. Their ancestor, ʿĪsā ibn al-Khashšāb, immigrated from Ḥiṣn al-Akrād under the reign of Saif al-Dawla Ḥamdān in 333–56. Ibn Shaddād says: “The family enjoyed always the greatest respect with the princes and governors, but never did one of them aspire at political power; they were much too proud and too honorable to lend themselves to such a thing.”

They were great characters. One of them lived as professor in Baghdad, where he died in 567. Yāḵūt quotes the cadi Djamāl al-Dīn b. Yūsuf al-Šaibānī of Aleppo:

He was a great scholar in Hadith, philology, logic, philosophy, mathematics, and engineering, perfectly sure in Hadith and extremely true in his arguments, but less reliable in his religion, not caring to observe the proprieties, frequenting inns and acrobats, a great chess player, miser, wearing his white ʿimāma (turban) till it was black, not even changing it when a bird had soiled it. He owned a very fine library and amused himself addressing poems to his books. When he went to see the bookshops, he took advantage of an inadvertence of the seller, tore a page out of the book in order to buy it cheap, saying “one page is missing.” When he borrowed a book and was asked to give it back, he used to say: it lost itself among my books, I can do nothing! Once somebody asked him whether he had the “book of mountains,” and he replied: don’t you see I have a mountain of books? At the end of his life he willed his library to students. After his death, he appeared to somebody in his dream, in all his beauty, and the man asked: What has Allah done with you? He said: He forgave me—And he let you enter paradise?—Surely, only, to say the truth, Allah contradicts me always!—Contradicts you?—Yes, He and many other ignorant scholars.29

The architect of the minaret was a master Hasan b. Muḵrī (?) al-Sarmānī, from Sarmin.30

His work has a double significance. It shows the fundamental difference between Syria and Iran during the Seljuk period, and it shows what the crusaders found and what they learned when they came first to the Near East. When Dubais, Jocelin, and Baldwin besieged Aleppo, it was only twenty years old. This minaret is the principal monument of medieval Syria.

Figure 52 compares it to the minaret of the Great Mosque of Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān, a little town, of which Sarmin is almost a suburb. This minaret, too, is the work of a Sarmanī. But first I insert here another small monument from Aleppo.

30 The description would require an article by itself, and is included in the MCIA. “Alep” (MS). Cf. my large photographs in Djamāl Pasha (T. Wiegand), Alte Denkmäler aus Syrien (Berlin, 1918), Pl. 40, and E. Herzfeld, “Mshattä, Ḥira und Bādiya, Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstlgs., XLII (1921), Pls. 7 and 8. (Hereinafter referred to as “Msh. Hir. Bād.”)
MAŞÂM IBRÂHÎM, ŞÂLÎHÎN, ALEPPO  
(Figs. 57 and 62)

In 479 H., Malikshâh came to Aleppo with a large attendance and installed there his mameluke, the atabek Aḵsonḵor. While these state proceedings took place, his little son, the crown prince ʿAḍud al-Dawla Abû Shudjâ' Ahmed, nine years of age, went sightseeing with the minister of the court, Tâdîj al-Mulk Abu ʿl-Ghanâʾîm, the enemy of Nizâm al-Mulk. He was shown the colossal footprint of Abraham and wanted to have a shrine built over the place. The child died not much more than a year later in Merv, and the court in Baghdad wore mourning for nine days. In Radjab, 505, a certain khwâdja Muwaffâk, client (mawlā) of the vizier Muʿayyad al-Mulk b. Nizâm al-Mulk, and possibly vizier to Ridwân or Dûkâk b. Tutūsh, gave a mihrab to this shrine (Fig. 62).31

The master is another man from Sarmîn, Fahd b. Salmân al-Sarmâni. It is a sober but good work. Proportions and balance of parts are carefully weighed. Works like this or the door of the Dâr al-Fuḵarâ’ are certainly made from exact drawings.32

Apart from the inscription and a tiny scroll, architectural moldings are the only decoration. There are other old examples, where the niche is put into a broad, not a high field. This is divided by moldings into the lower part that frames the niche, and the spandrels above. Cuspidated moldings, a term Butler invented for describing this motif common in late antique Syrian architecture, are used in the upper part. Below, a stepped fillet appears, almost a chain known from Byzantine moldings. The transformation of the Graeco-Roman horizontal and vertical, structural profiles into borders without a direction inherent to them, but with the value of a neutral frame, was accomplished before the Muḥammadan period.

MAʿARRAT AL-NUʿMÂN, GREAT MOSQUE, MINARET  
(Figs. 10, 11, 13, 52, 56, 60, and 63)

The Great Mosque of Maʿarra occupies the spot of an antique sanctuary, probably first temple, then church, as proved by the many antique pieces reused in it.

In the northeast corner of the court, two pieces of an antique architrave are built into the wall, bearing the letters:

![Architrave with Greek Letters](image)

A. IN THE COURT  
B. IN HARAM

**Fig. 10—MAʿARRAT AL-NUʿMÂN, GREAT MOSQUE, ARCHITRAVE WITH GREEK LETTERS**

31 The inscription in “Alep,” MCIA, No. 88; cf. Répertoire . . . , VIII (1937), No. 2947, taken from van Berchem’s Notebook, wrongly called “mosquée de Firdaus.”

32 My measurements are sufficiently accurate, but for establishing proportions measurements must be made ad hoc.
A fine door of basalt, 70 by 122 cm. (Fig. 11) is put into the floor near the minaret, in front of the stairs leading to the flat roof of the mosque. The second stone door in the figure is also from Maʿarra; a third one was at the shrine of Sidi Ghawth, Aleppo, a simpler door in the Maḳām Ibrāhīm, Šāliḥīn. The north Syrian volumes of the Princeton University expedi-

**Fig. 11—Maʿarrat al-Numān, Great Mosque, Two Basalt Doors**

A. Wandādīh  
B. Store in Quarry  
C. Simnān, Door of Garden  
D. Shahristān-Isfahan

...tion to Syria contain many examples. Above, similar stone doors in Kuhistan and Isfahan were mentioned (Fig. 12); one door from Simnān has the Greek letters ωη. The Jewish
Fig. 13—Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Fountain in Great Mosque
sanctuary at Lindjān near Isfahan has one. Most of them are so small that one must crawl through them on knees and elbows. Such doors are meant in Mark 10:25, by the words: trymalīα rhaphidōs ("eye of a needle").

In the court of the mosque a dome is built on ten columns over a water tank and fountain. The Kubbat Dūris near Baalbek is of a similar type. Every stone is antique (Fig. 13). To reuse antique material is a rule since the early Muhammadan period. Here it is done out of appreciation for the beauty of the pieces. But the antique style of the buildings of that period is something different; it is no spontaneous or learned imitation, but a continuous tradition of workmanship.

The great minaret is not dated, nor do I know of any literary reference to it. But it is twice signed by the architect, on a tablet above the pair of false windows of the lowest story, and on the tympan of the real window of the highest story, east side:

Inscription 15

صَنِّعَةٌ قَاعِرٌ تَابِعُ الْمَلِكِ رَجِبَة اللَّه

The same master has twice signed the madrasa of Ma‘arra, founded by malik al-mansūr Muhammad I in 595 H. (1199 A.D.). The date of both buildings cannot exceed the lifetime of the master, yet there are cogent reasons to separate them as far as possible.

The close relationship of the minaret with that of Aleppo, built between 483 and 487, is evident, especially if one has full knowledge of the details. This old, rich style, alive in the Kaṣtal al-Shu‘aibiya of 545, was definitely and deliberately abandoned a few years later. After 550 such a monument could only be explained as an exceptional remnant, a survival of the style of a past period. Without the name of the master on it, the minaret ought to be attributed to 550 at the latest.

The Minaret of the Dījāmī al-Dabbāgha al-ʿAtīka at Aleppo
(Fig. 54)

Further, the undated minaret of the Dījāmī al-Dabbāgha al-ʿAtīka at Aleppo is an indispensable link between the Great Minarets of Aleppo and Ma‘arra and the modest type represented by the minaret of the upper maqām on the Aleppo citadel, dated 610, Zāhir Ghāzī. Already before that date—in 594, Maqām Ibrāhīm, Śāliḥīn Aleppo (Zāhir Ghāzī, Fig. 57), 604, Nabī Yūsha', Ma‘arra (Zāhir Ghāzī), then, 620, Sultānīya, Aleppo (Zāhir and Ṭoghhrul)—the octagonal shaft appears, otherwise, the character is the same: simple

33 E. Herzfeld, Archaeological History of Iran (London, 1935), p. 166, Pl. XX.
34 The name Känit cannot be connected with an Arabic root, but it is four times clearly spelled with diacritical dots and vowels.
35 Plan and an illustration of the entrance will appear in the next installment of this study. Cf. M. van Berchem and E. Fatio, Voyage en Syrie, Mém. inst. franç. d’arch. or. du Caire, XXXVII–VIII (1914–15), I, 202. n. 3; Arch. Reise, II, 355, where 575 is an error for 595.
simas marking the stories, only one large cornice under the gallery. In the minaret of Fir-daws, Aleppo, built in 633–34 by Ghāzī’s cousin and widow Ḍaifa Khātūn, the shaft assumes cylindrical shape. The Dabbāgḥa minaret is older than 594 and younger than that of Ma’arra. I would by no means lower its date to more than 565: Kāhir b. Ali may have built it when thirty, the madrasa when sixty years old.

In view of this group of almost contemporary and closely related monuments—minaret of Aleppo, 483–87; mihrab Śāliḥīn, 505; minaret of Ma’arra, about 565; madrasa of Ma’arra, 595—all of them works of architects from Sarmīn, one may speak of a prominent architectural school of Sarmīn during the fifth and sixth centuries, which rivaled with the architects of Urfa and Jerusalem.

The detail (Figs. 60 and 63) reveals at once the relationship to the mihrab in Maḵām Ibrāḥīm of 505 h., and also to architectural moldings in Damascus. Their transformation is so gradual and logical that—a method long since applied in Greek, Roman, and medieval European architecture—they furnish an excellent instrument for dating. In the course of this article, I shall reproduce some moldings, without entering into a discussion. In an old study on Mšhättā, I illustrated the connection of its moldings with pre-Muhammadan ones,37 and just that group is intimately connected with the moldings here in question. I shall revert, later, to the capital on the engaged column in the axis of this false arcade.

**Hama, Ījāmī Nūrī**

(Figs. 14–18, 61, 64, 65, 68, 70, 73, 74, and 77)

Ibn Khallikān,38 ascribes to Nūr al-Dīn the building of the Ījāmī Nūrī at Hama, which still bears this name, on the Nahr al-ʿĀṣī (Orontes), as well as the mosques of Urfa (Ruhā) and Manbiğh. There is monumental proof of his reconstructing the mosques of Rakka and of Aleppo.

In the western part of the mosque of Hama, the pavement is laid almost straight on the natural soil; but in the east, the soil slopes quickly down toward the river, and the eastern parts are actually an upper story over a street that passes below them along the river bank (Fig. 65). The unevenness of the terrain causes the irregularity of the plan and makes steps necessary for reaching the door on the north front.

On the whole, the building retains the shape of its first period, its foundation by Nūr al-Dīn, though some parts may have been replaced. A second period, epigraphically dated, belongs to the two Ayyubids of Hama, malik al-muẓaffar II Mahmud (626–42) and Abu ʾl-Fidā Ismaʾīl (710–33). Malik al-muẓaffar probably altered the roofing of the main prayer hall, reinforcing the north wall by engaged piers on which cross vaults were put. It is more probable that he added the two elongated rooms beyond the east wing, over the street, and that Abu ʾl-Fidā put his mihrab into the room already existing, than that Abu ʾl-Fidā built that extension. The latest changes of a third, Turkish, period are a reconstruction of the west wing and the addition of a chamber for the khatib or imam.

37 *Ibid.*, Fig. 15.

38 Ibn Khallikān, *op. cit.*, No. 725, p. 91.
While working in the mosque in 1914, I had an experience that has some bearing on the archaeological problems. The mutawallî of the mosque, a most distinguished figure in green turban, whom I had not yet met, came over from that room to the mihrab of Abu 'l-Fidâ, and I asked the gendarme who accompanied me for formalities’ sake, “Isn’t he a Gilânî?" for I knew them well from Baghdad. He said yes and wrote into my sketchbook, “Gilânî zâdeh Sâlih Şarîf Effendi.” I asked, “What brings him from Baghdad?”—“Baghdad? They have been in Hama for seven hundred years!”—descendants, probably, of Mûsâ b. ‘Abd al-Kâdir, who settled in Damascus and died there in 587 H. (1191 A.D.). Those were mujâhidîn, crusaders seen from the Muslim side.

Only a few years later, having just studied the tombstones of the crusaders in the Dom, Kreuzgang, Deutschröchterkirche of Würzburg, the finest of them that of Gottfried von Hohenlohe, who died in 1198 (595 H.), I was in a Berlin hotel, when a Hohenlohe entered and sat down at our table: he could have been Gottfried risen from his stone. There must be a force in such old lines, age itself, that makes the types constant and immutable, and what holds good for man, also holds for his works.

At the northeast corner of the mosque, high above the river, are the lavatories, monumental evidence of the high standard of sanitation at that period, paralleled by those in the Mûristân Nûrî at Damascus.

The minaret (Fig. 68) very similar to the older one of the Great Mosque of Hama, square in plan, built in alternating courses of black basalt and yellowish limestone, after a manner peculiar to Hama, may be original to its very top; possibly, though, the gallery belongs to the Ayyubid period.

Inscription 16

Great inscription on Nûr al-Dîn in two lines, on the outside of the north wall beside the door, partly covered by the stairs. The entire length is 7.70 m. height, 35 cm. It is set into an exceptionally deep and ornamented frame (Fig. 14). Figure 15 is another, more clearly antique frame from an inscription of malik al-'Âdil Safadin in the east wall of the citadel of Damascus, dated 606 H. The date of Nûr al-Dîn’s inscription is 558.

The type of domes and vaults used in this mosque must be studied in relation to the Damascus and Aleppo buildings. There is nothing to substantiate assumptions as to the original covering of the long prayer hall, which equally well may have had vaults or a flat roof. But of the three domes over the sections of the eastern wing the two northern ones at least belong to the first period. The one has niches over the corners and a smooth dome over this octagon. This shape is applied in Masâ'had al-Mu'hassín, Aleppo, in the southeast part, dated by its inscription into the reign of Zengî and the first fortnight of Nûr al-Dîn’s reign. The room opened on the court by a pair of arches on a middle column, standing under the

39 Text in Répertoire . . ., IX (1937), No. 3248, taken from van Berchem’s Notebook.
40 Photographs of van Berchem and of mine show that these steps have been changed more than once between 1894 and today; I cannot describe the present state.
wide arch that supports the dome (*Fig. 70*). The other domed room may have had or may still have—**it** is walled up—the same motif. The east façade, then, may have originally presented an arcade with alternating piers and columns. The second dome is fluted, twenty-four sides, and rises over a dodecagonal drum with windows; this drum rests on pendentives formed by two triangular areas cut from the sides of a pyramid. An identical dome exists in the small shrine of al-Hasanain at Hama (*Fig. 67*), according to its inscription, also a work of Nūr al-Dīn, six years older.

![Fig. 14—Hama, Frame of Inscription, Nūr al-Dīn](image1)

![Fig. 15—Damascus, Frame of Inscription, al-ʿĀdil](image2)

**Inscription 17**

أَمَر بِعَمَّارَةٍ هَذَا الْمَسْجِدِ الْمُبَارَك بَعْدَ هَدُومِهِ فِي الْيَوْمَ الْخَالِدَةِ سَنَةَ أَتْبِنِ، وَخَمْسِينِ، وَخَمْسِينِ مِلَانَا

الملك العادل المجاهد نور الدين أبو القاسم بن ركي بن [اقتصر]

Our lord al-malik al-ʿĀdil, the fighter of the Holy War, Nūr al-Dīn Abu ʿl-Ḵāsim Maḥmūd b. Zengī b. Aksonḵor has ordered to rebuild this blessed masjīd after its collapse in the earthquake that happened in the year 552.

The earthquake is known from the chronicles, not quite as devastating and widespread as that of Shawwal 12, 565 (June 29, 1170), which caused a crack in the Great Minaret of Aleppo.
The walls of the prayer hall have a dado with a border of white marble, inscribed with letters engraved and filled with black paste, as described in the Mūristân Nūrî at Damascus. The fragment represented in the sketch (Fig. 16) is a part of the Koran (IX, 23–24), and its choice is significant for Nūr al-Dīn:

If you love your fathers and children, your brothers and wives, your relatives, the fortune you have acquired, the business whose ruin you fear, the houses you are pleased with—more than Allah, His apostle and the Holy War, then expect that Allah will visit His work upon you!

To the right of the mihrab of the prayer hall are the remains of a mimbar of Nūr al-Dīn (Fig. 73). The chair itself is fixed to the wall, but not used, since its steps are missing. The two parapets of that stair now serve as such to a modern sadda, constructed over the door of the hall (Fig. 64).

An inscription extends over the framework of the chair and that of the parapets, a unit, although the main part is given in two different redactions.41

_Inscription 18_

On the chair (Koran, XXV, 62–63):

Blessed be He that fixed to the firmament the constellations, who hung up the lamp, and the moon that shines. He has made night and day.

On the parapets. A:

Our lord al-malik al-ʿĀdil, the fighter of the Holy War, Nūr al-Dīn, pillar of Islam and of the Muslims, animator of law in the worlds, giver of justice to the oppressed against the oppressor, Abuʾl-ʿKāsim Maḥmūd b. Zengī b. Aḵṣonḵor, defender of the Commander of the Faithful, may Allah glorify his victories and double his power, has ordered to make this—in the year 559.

41 Répertoire . . . ., VI (1935), omits the part on the chair and gives the parapet inscriptions under Nos. 2355 and 2356, both from van Berchem's Notebook, as "sur la seddê," hence lacking all reference to the mimbar to which they belong.
The slave who needs Allah's mercy, who is humble before His greatness, who wages war against the enemies of His faith, Abu 'l-Kāsim Maḥmūd b. Zengī b. Akṣonḳor, defender of the Commander of the Faithful, may Allah double his recompense and reward and honor his place of return and abode, has ordered to make this, wishing to satisfy Allah and desiring His reward—in the year 559.

The first version is composed in the official style of the protocol used at that phase of Nūr al-Dīn’s reign, with the restriction imposed by its being destined for a holy place. The second is in his own words, his prayer; he uses none of his titles, save the one conferred by the caliph, “defensor.”

The protocols of Nūr al-Dīn, as in no other case, undergo an increasing simplification, ending with the simple al-zāḥid, the ascetic, or al-shahīd, the martyr, on his tomb. This reduction can be nothing but the execution of his order. The material is rich. It proves, by analogy, that other changes of the same tendency, such as the use of Nestkhi instead of Kufic, and the banishing not only of figural, but of almost all decoration, were equally caused by his personal taste and initiative.

The ornament of the mimbar, of which Figure 74 gives examples, always has two constituent elements, a geometric fillet and arabesque floral fillings. As a rule, the ornament of the fillings does not trespass the limits to which the fillet binds them. Two varieties are contrasted: flat carving of linear curves only, which dissect the area in members of arabesque floral shape, with no ground visible—a straight continuation of the old “first style of Samarra”; or deep carving that brings out the ground by reducing the width of the floral elements, which yet clearly preserve the character of the old configurations. In other examples the arabesque crosses and recrosses the fillet, which is no longer a boundary but a melody running through a fugue. While the old-fashioned arabesque makes flowers, leaves, and fruits without visible stems grow out of each other, contrary to nature, this arabesque is almost completely reduced to a stem, which in its flowing and recurrent movement, with bifurcations and involutions, but with only the most abstract indications of flowers and leaves at the end of the spirals, covers the ornamented area by a network in which positive and negative are perfectly balanced. The two styles are pole and counter-pole, the latter the negation of all the principles of the first. Yet even negation means dependency, it is gradually derived from the other.

Specimens of this style are: Great Mosque, at Mosul, miḥrab, in stone, dated 543, work of a master Muṣṭafā of Baghdad, in the reign of Saīf al-Dīn Ghāzī, elder brother of Nūr
al-Din; Great Mosque, at Mosul, brickwork on the cubic part of the shaft of the minaret. Further, a wooden chest, seen in 1916 in the shrine of imam Ya'hya, Mosul, is perhaps older than the shrine, dated 637 H.

GHAIBAT AL-MAHDI AT SAMARRA

Figure 76, drawn over a squeeze, illustrates a specimen of the wood carvings from the door, dedicated in 606 H. by Caliph al-Nasir li-Din Allâh to the inaccessible Ghaibat al-Mahdi at Samarra, the place where the Mahdi disappeared and whence he is expected to return. The panel is vertical, about four times higher than it is broad, the arabesque extends in the perpendicular, after a scheme derived from the Sasanian "tree." The homes of this style are Baghdad, Samarra, and Mosul.

The niche of the main mihrab in the Djami' Nuri is the old one; only the pair of columns have been replaced or added by Malik al-muzaffar II Ta'ki al-Din Mahmud (626-42), whose undated inscription they bear on a ring below their capitals. To this ring corresponds, below, a tiny ornamental frieze (Fig. 17) with an arabesque scroll through which move a deer (hare?), a hound, and a griffon. Such scrolls, with animals hunting or hunted, are a Hellenistic motif, which had been introduced before the Sasanian period into Iran. Their appearance in the wall paintings of Samarra is a retrograde movement.

---

43 Ibid., Fig. 260.
45 E.g., Uzundja Burdj, Cilicia, "Denkmâler aus dem Rauhen Kilikien," Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, ed. J. Keil and A. Wilhelm (Manchester, 1931), III, Pl. 32, Fig. 98; great temple of Korykos, Cilicia ("Msh. Hir. Bâd," Fig. 8, cf. 7 and 9; ibid., Pl. 32: fragment from the Bab al-Nasr, Aleppo, time of Zahir Chasîl).
46 A passage in al-Shâbushi (E. Sachau, Von Klosterversbuch des Schaubuch [Berlin, 1917]), pp. 34 H., not known to me when publishing the Samarra paintings (Die Ausgrabungen von Samarra [Berlin, 1927]), III, Pls. XI-XVII), reveals their exact date: the painted rooms of the Djussak, on the court called al-kânil "the perfect," were built by al-Mu'tazz, after a design of his mother Kabiha, and were destroyed, with all the "paintings covering the reception rooms" on order of al-Muhtadi (Mas 'idd, Murusj al-Dhabab, ..., ed C. Bardier de Meynard and A. J. B. Pavet de Courteille [Paris, 1861-77], VIII, 10). Thus, they existed from 251 to 255 only.
Another mihrab, in the south wall of the eastern annex (Fig. 18) is made only to receive a pair of small columns (Fig. 18), which bear the following inscription of Abu 'l-Fidā on their impost blocks, Neskhi, very small letters:

Inscription 19

�أمر بعبارة هذه الروس المبارك مولانا الملك الموتى عمام الدين والديني ابن مولانا الملك الأفضل
صاحب حبالة خلد الله ملكه بنظر العبد الغصير . . . . الملكي . . . .

Our lord al-malik al-mu'ayyad 'Imād al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn, son of our lord al-malik al-afḍal, lord of Hama, Allah make last his kingdom, has ordered to fabricate these blessed capitals—under the inspection of the humble slave . . . . al-malaki . . . .

A. Aleppo, Mashhad al-Husain B. Aleppo, Zahirīya, Mihrab C. Damascus, Citadel

Fig. 19—Three Romanesque Capitals

The prince is Abu 'l-Fidā, the historian and geographer, to whom his great friend, Sultan Nāṣir Muhammad, gave—an exception in the administrative system of the Mameluke empire—Hama, the home of his ancestors, as a feudal kingdom.

The little columns are, as my illustrations show, crusader's works. It is almost a custom to place such spolia in prayer niches. Figure 19 contains three examples from the citadel of

47 I could not decipher with certainty the name of the nāzir (Fig. 18).
Damascus, Mashhad al-Ḫusain, and the Žāhiriyya, Aleppo. There are many more. But Abu'l-Fidā did not need a special inspector to commit the mistake of setting them into the wall upside down. He had taken part in the siege and conquest of 'Akkā, Saint-Jean d'Acre, the last stronghold of the crusaders, by Sultan ashrāf Khalil, son of Khalîlân, in 690 H. (1291 A.D.) and had been present at Khalîl's triumphant entry in Damascus, where the Frankish prisoners of war carried their standards upside down, munakkas.48 Bahā al-Dīn ibn Shaddād, in his history of Saladin, says: "Saladin turned the cross that was on the Kubbat al-Šakhra in Jerusalem upside down, nakkasa, it was enormously large, and Allah made Islam triumph by his hands, an overwhelming victory." Khalîl brought the doorway of Saint-Jean d'Acre to Cairo, to serve as a door of the madrasa which Ketbogha had begun to build in 695 and which Khalîl's brother nāṣir Muhammad, the friend of Abu l'-Fidā completed in 703.49 So the columns of Hama were given to Abu l'-Fidā to let him have part in their barakāt, blessings or magical power. They were put into the wall upside down for reasons of sympathetic magic, in order to perpetuate the triumph.

In 1909, among the long row of massebahs at Assur, three small columns of basalt, Nos. 15 to 17, were discovered, apparently not works of Assyrian masons,50 No. 15 bears an inscription of Shamshi Adad, son of Tiglathpilesar I (about 1100 B.C.). They had been erected upside down, which means that they were trophies of a victory, just as were the columns of Abu l'-Fidā 51 two thousand years later, an example of the persistence of ideas, the continuity of patterns in lands of a history as old as that of the Near East.

**The Maḵām Ibrāhīm al-Asfal on the Citadel of Aleppo**

(Figs. 66, 80, and 81)

A vanished mosque: van Berchem has discussed the possible Arabic etymologies of maḵām: (1) usual theory: "Lieu de station ou de séjour," in a wider sense "monument commémoratif élevé en un lieu ou s'est arrêté un saint personnage." (2) "Lieu de prière, oratoire de ḫāmā 'prier' comme maṣdjīd de saḏjadi." (3) "Islamisation d'un sens beaucoup plus ancien, tel que 'pierre dressée,' comme mašṣāb de l'hbr. maṣšēbāḥ." None of the Muhammadan maḵām is a truly Muhammadan sanctuary, all have a pre-Muhammadan background, many referring to Ibrāhīm al-Khalîl, Abraham. The prototype of the word is

48 See M. van Berchem, "Égypte," MCIA., I, 551, 1. In his answer to a letter, telling about the discovery of this mihrab, he replied at once with the analogy of the Cairene gate of Khalîl, and with the explanation of the custom by "magie sympathique." Cf. Tacitus Annals III. 2, Agrippina landing at Brundusium with the ashes of Germanicus: *tribunorum centurionumque uemeris cineres portabantur, praecedebant incompta signa, versi fasces.*


52 Detailed history, inscriptions, and description in "Alep" (MS), *MCIA.*
ERNST HERZFELD

the Hebrew mākôm in Genesis (28:108), where Jacob erects as a massebah the stone on which he had dreamt of the ladder, vowing to make it a bēth ālōhîm, a “house of God.” In the same intense meaning mākôm designates the temple of Jerusalem; mākôm Kāspiyā [i.e., Kāspiya] in Ezra (8:17), is, as H. Winckler rightly saw, a great Jewish shrine at Ctesiphon, a town older than the neighboring Seleucia, and founded by Cyrus. The book of the Maccabees (e.g., 3:12. 18. 30, etc.) translates mākôm by Greek τόπος, a use followed by the New Testament (e.g., John 11:46; Acts 6:13). Thus, Arabic mākām ( = Greek τόπος) is the “islamization” of Hebrew mākôm.

Of old, two churches had been in the citadel of Aleppo, the “upper” and the “lower mākām Ibrāhîm.” It is strange that sanctuaries of Abraham have been churches, and that they are never claimed as Jewish sanctuaries. The Old Testament ignores Aleppo (= Beroea) entirely. I wonder whether they have to do with the Christian heresy of the Nazoraei at Beroea, mentioned, e.g., by Epiphanius (Adv. her. 29.7).

In the upper mākām a stone was shown on which Abraham used to sit when milking his sheep, in the lower one a fine stone on which he also used to sit, a ziyâra, place of pilgrimage. Ibn Butlân, the physician, in 440 h., saw both the churches. Ibn Shaddâd expressly states that the date of the conversion of the lower mākām was unknown. It may have been in 518, when, during the siege of Aleppo by Dubais, Jocelin, and Baldwin, the cadi Ibn al-Khashshâb converted into mosques four churches in town.

The shrine sheltered one of the many heads of St. John, discovered at Baalbek in 435 and deposited in a dîjurn, a reliquary of white marble, in a sacristy, khizâna, at the side of the mihrab. The relic proved its genuineness by alone remaining untouched by the fire that started on 11. Djumâdâ 609 H. (Oct. 9. 1212 A.D.) at the night of the wedding of Saladin’s son Ghâzi to his cousin Ğaifa Khâtûn, daughter of Safadin, and consumed the palace, the upper mākām, part of the arsenal, and, according to some writers, also the lower mākām. When the Mongols demolished the citadel in 659, the relic was taken and ceremoniously deposited left of the mihrab in the Great Mosque in town, where it remains.

It is easy to see why the literary tradition mixes up facts concerning the two mākāms. The inscriptions confirm that the Muhammadan shrine was founded by Nûr al-Dîn in 563. In 575, Shâhîb-bakht, a lieutenant of Nûr al-Dîn and governor under his son Sâliḥ Iṣma‘îl, built a cistern and well under the court. Zâhir Ghâzi, while he rebuilt the entire upper mākām in 610, after the fire, added only a wooden frame around a little window above the wooden mihrab of Nûr al-Dîn in the lower mākām. There was a restoration in 616 H. (1219 A.D.), under the regency of Shihâb al-Dîn Tâghrul, for Ghâzi’s minor son ‘azîz Muhammad, by Maḥmûd al-Khûltûkî, ancestor of the šâikh al-Islâm Zain al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Shi‘îna (father of the historian of Aleppo), who himself gave a new waqf to the shrine in 811 H. (1408 A.D.). Later repairs are dated 988 H. (1580 A.D.) and 1291 H. (1893 A.D.). I saw it in 1907, 1908, 1910, 1914, 1916, and 1917; and in 1918 I was asked by Enwer Pasha to excavate and partly restore the citadel. Once, in the twenties, I was prevented by a Sene-
galese from entering the citadel. And in 1930, I could only state that the mosque had vanished, only the bare walls were left.

None of the repairs had really altered the original structure. The shrine (Fig. 66) was an oblong room, opening on the court with three bays, the middle one the widest. Like the corresponding prayer halls of the Nūriya and ʿAdiliya at Damascus, each of the narrow sides had two doors, those to the left were wall closets only, those to the right led to a very narrow cabinet called ziyāra, probably the spot where the stone of Abraham and the head of St. John had once been kept.

Two antique columns were put against the north wall, as in the oldest rooms of Mashhad al-Muḥassin, of the time of Zengī, in such a way as to form the outer corners of a central square over the room. The lateral parts were covered by barrel vaults, into which smaller vaults cut at a right angle from the north wall, in such a manner that the capitals of the two columns became the impost of their intersection. At the same time, pendentives sprung from them, shaped from two sides of a dodecagonal pyramid, as are found in two examples at Hama. The dodecagon produced by the fronts of the barrel vaults and by these pendentives was the springing line of a dome, not raised above and separated from the lower vaults by vertical walls, but forming a unit with them.

The columns, remains of the earlier church, certainly stood in situ, as part of the original plan. They do not prove that the vault was original, but that, if the room was vaulted, its system was from the beginning the one described. This is unique among the Muhammadan buildings in Syria and has a certain taint of Byzantine vaulting. Only in the Ḥalāwīya, a Byzantine building, may distant analogies be found. With all respect to the head of St. John, the assertion that the reliquary was the only thing untouched by the fire is wrong: the wooden miḥrab of Nūr al-Dīn and old wooden soffits in the doors remained untouched, and the window of Zāhīr Ghāzī, if earlier than the fire, would prove that the ceiling remained untouched, if later, that no damage was done to the interior. More than the barakāt of the head it must have been the vaults that protected the building. The original tradition must have been that the presence of the head saved the makām from being burnt down. But the later version is a stronger proof of its genuineness.

Without the complication entailed by the pair of columns, the system, viz., dome on pendentives between two barrel vaults, is normal over rectangular rooms during the Ayyubid period in Aleppo and North Syria. The original conditions in Damascus are less clear; it seems that, besides flat ceilings, a row of cross vaults were used. The different treatment shows that both were local fashions, hence of secondary importance, not involving principles. It is, therefore, unnecessary to look for the origin of the type; that simple solution could be found at any time and at any place.

The design used in the māristān of Damascus under the large cupola is not immediately related to it. There, two deep recesses, right and left, large, but not large enough to make the square room an oblong, are covered by semidomes, and the main cupola rises over four vertical walls.
The Tomb of Şafwat al-Mulük
(Fig. 20)

This same disposition was used in another building of Damascus, the tomb of Şafwat al-Mulük,\(^5\) demolished only a few years ago.

---

**Inscription 20**

Répertoire, No. 2942, taken from van Berchem’s Notebook, with some errors. The historical part, leaving out the foundation of the waqf, runs:

\[
\text{أمر بعبارة هذا المشهد والمرندة فيه المخاون الأجلة السيدة صفرة الملك عربية نساء العالمين 2 والدة}
\]

\[
\text{في سنة أربع وخمس مائة [follows waqf]}
\]

[\text{أتم دامان بن تاج الدولة}]

\(^5\) Published in J. Sauvaget, Les Monuments historiques de Damas (Beyrouth, 1932), No. 17; idem, Les Monuments ayyoubides de Damas (Paris, 1938), I, 1; the demolition took place only a few years ago. It formed part of a compound bearing the old name Madrasa al-Zāhirīya.
The very mighty princess, the lady Šafwat al-Mulük, the power of the women of the worlds, mother of malik Duğāk b. Tādī al-Dawla [Tutush] has ordered this mashhad and the tomb chamber in it to be built ... in the year 504.

Šafwa, from šafā “to be pure, serene,” means “choice, the choicest piece” (related to šafi, “sincere friend”); those who choose are al-mulük, the kings, not as the Répertoire and Monuments ayyoubides have it “al-mulk,” the “government.” I have here the visiting cards of a grand- (or great-grand-?) daughter of Nāsir al-Din Shah, Furūgh al-mulük; furūgh is something like “leisure,” I hope she is at leisure with the kings in Hyderabad. As wife of Tutush, Šafwa was a sister-in-law of Malikshāh, hence her high title: “Power of the women of the worlds.” Titles like fakhr, “glory,” and sharaf, “honor of the women of the worlds,” are used at that period. According to Ibn Khallikān: “Duğāk was buried at Ḥakr al-Fahhādīn, extra muros, on the Baradā [where the tomb stood], they say, his mother poisoned him.”

She then married Toghtekin, the guardian of Duğāk, who succeeded in 497.

Sauvaget extends the evident analogy between the plans of this tomb and the entrance of the māristān to two more: (1) a building over the “well of Malikshāh” on the citadel of Aleppo; a doubtful case: Malikshāh’s inscription does not belong to that building, but either to the Bāb al-Arba’in or to a kašāl at its side; (2) the sanctuary of Karrār, Buzān, near Isfahan, which I would not include in that type.

54 Ibn Khallikān, op. cit., No. 121 (Tutush).
But the same scheme is used in the tomb chamber of the Makām Nabi Yūsha' at Ma'arra, 604 H. (see below). And there is a much older example of a cupola between two barrels over an oblong room in eastern Iran, viz., over the gateway of the palace on the Kūh-i-Khwādja, Sistān (Fig. 21). This vault was set into the originally larger room at a second period, the Sasanian. The lateral vaults are, more exactly, cloisters. The system differs from the medieval Syrian vaults only insofar as the dome, of the regular Sasanian type, springs here from four vertical surfaces over, not immediately from, the lateral vaults. The first, Arsacid, period (first century A.D.) can in this case only have had a simple barrel over the entire room.

But over the two T-shaped audience halls at the court, the combination was used already at the Arsacid period: high elliptic barrels over the three wings and in the center a dome springing from a horizontal level above their summit (Fig. 22).

Not more than a variety of this compound of three vaults is the one that covered the Sasanian Īwān-i-Karkh—Erān-āsān-kirkavāt—north of Susa, of about 490 A.D. It has already been treated by Phéné Spiers. The hall is very elongated, and the side wings have, instead of a simple barrel, a series of broad, parallel arches and between them transversal barrels high above, not broader than these arches. Here, the girder arches were seemingly chosen because simple barrels of such a disproportionate length would make the whole room look like a corridor.

This vaulting system has been considered, also by myself, as the most advanced achievement of Sasanian vaulting. As a matter of fact, it occurs on the Kūh-i-Khwādja in the first, Arsacid, period of the castle (Fig. 23), which means that Sasanian vaulting, from its beginning
in 230 A.D. to its end in 630, has made not a single step in advance over the level attained before 230; it is stagnant, nonhistorical, and therefore no conclusions as to the chronological sequence of the few monuments known can be drawn from the shape of their vaults.

Fig. 23—Kūh-i-Khwāja, Audience Room
Fig. 24—Spherical and Pyramidal Pedentives
The system of girder arches is prevalent in Muhammadan buildings of the second century of Islam, like Ukhaidir and Қyrқ Қyz, near Tirmidh, and it turns up again in the Mongol posthouse, yam, of Baghdad, mentioned above. The parallel arches with transversal barrels have a perfect analogy in the thin, wide-spanned stone arches that support beam-shaped, but short, stone slabs in late antique buildings of the Syrian hinterland and in Hatra, Mesopotamia. These are substituted to a flat ceiling, which one wanted, but was unable to produce. The Iranian type has one advantage over the barrel: it saves height, because the vertical wall sections between the girders give the impression of a higher room and allow the arches to spring from a lower line than a continuous barrel; at the same time it produces a flat roof and makes the construction of a second floor easier, and that is the reason for its use in Ukhaidir and Қyrқ Қyz. But it has no great architectural virtues, and the Syrian system, as well as the Iranian, always remains a poor substitute for something better that could not be attained. They are historically unimportant.

One might feel inclined to connect, but must not, the Sasanian experiments with the simple solution that became the fashion in Aleppo during the twelfth century. The presence of pendentives is enough to dissociate them.

Figure 24, an abstract design, is drawn to show that pyramidal pendentives are but a variant of the spherical. The Muhammadan architects preferred them, because they have the advantage of occupying only part of the quarter circumference, while the spherical pendentive becomes awkward unless it is full.

Figure 25 supports this strange thesis by an exceptional spherical pendentive, whose

---

radius is not the diagonal radius of the room. It is the remains at Korykos, Cilicia \(^57\) of a tetrapylon over a street leading from the east gate of the town to a number of churches and tombs.

Not a square pillar only, but two short sides of a right angle, ending in pilasters for the four archivolts, form the supporting piers. The radius of the pendentive, therefore, is determined by the “extrados” of the archivolts, and they would not touch the corners of the room in the diagonal, but would have at the level of the imposts of the archivolts an unsupported, triangular undersurface and would need a cylindrical support, filling the corner between the pilasters from the floor up. To avoid this inconvenience, a niche has been hollowed out of the pendentive, which reduces the suspended undersurface to almost nothing. They function like corner niches over an octagonal transition zone, that is to say this rare solution is a hybrid crossing between the spherical pendentive and the octagonal transition zone. The antique origin of this will be discussed later.

The other reason for preferring the pyramidal pendentive was that one can choose either the angle of the pyramid, or that of the intersection of its sides with the vertical walls, which makes the construction, graphically and materially, easy. Pyramidal pendentives are already employed in the antique tetrapylon of Laodicea-Lâdhîkiya, at the coast, not far from Antioch and Aleppo (Fig. 26), \(^58\) for solving the more complex problem of a dome over an ob-

\[\text{Fig. 26—Lâdhîkiya, Pyramidal Pendentives}\]

long room. This variant of the spherical pendentive, therefore, is occidental and one of the form handed down from antiquity. Pyramidal pendentives under a dome over an oblong room are common in Seljuk buildings of Asia Minor, e.g., Indje Madrasa, Konya. \(^59\)

The foot of the walls of the Mağâm Ibrâhîm was covered with a marble incrustation of

\(^{57}\) See E. Herzfeld and S. Guyer, Meriamlik and Korykos . . . ., Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua (Manchester, 1930), II, Figs. 128 and 129, and Arch. Reise, IV, Pl. CXXII (reproduced here). Only the illustrations in that book are mine, the text is entirely Guyer’s. It is unimportant, but to avoid the reproach of discrepancy between Guyer’s description and mine, I must remark that I believe the two stones, visible to the right of my sketch over the sima, to be remains of a stone dome, while he assumes a wooden roof.

\(^{58}\) Drawing by Fatio in van Berchem and Fatio, op. cit., Figs. 166–67 and Pl. 58; cf. the views of the fronts in Djamâl Pasha-Wiegand, op. cit., Pl. 100.

\(^{59}\) F. Sarre, Denkmäler persischer Baukunst (Berlin, 1910), Fig. 190.
the same Mosuliote style, but richer than those in the Djami' Nūrī, Hama, and in the Māris-tān, Damascus. On their upper border the āyat al-kursī, Koran II, 256, was written. Under the barrel vaults was a cavetto molding with Koran II, 119, in the same fine script, engraved in marble and with black inlay.

**THE MIHRAB OF NŪR AL-DĪN**

*(Fig. 81)*

But the main treasure of the shrine was the mihrab of Nūr al-Dīn. Figure 81 is from a photograph by Thévenot, taken before 1900; the photograph of the interior *(Fig. 80)* was made in 1908. Some of the fillings, especially the center of the semidome, a five-pointed star with the confession of faith, were lost in the meantime.60

Between the mashrabiya-work (trellis) at the foot of the niche were two little panels, only one of them preserved—the lost piece probably gave the date—with inscription in simple Kufic.

**Inscription 21**

صنعة معالي بن سلم رحمه الله

*Work of Mu'āli b. Salam, Allah reward him!*

Nūr al-Dīn had had a vision of "la erusalre name, but appears as patronymic in the signature of one of the masters of the famous mimbar of Nūr al-Dīn in the Aḵṣā in Jerusalem: "Work of Salmān b. Mu'āli."*

van Berchem has devoted a fascinating study to this masterpiece.61 It was begun in 564, one year after the date of the maḵām and was finished in 570, under Ṣāliḥ Isma'īl b. Nūr al-Dīn. Three more artists have signed it, all Ḥalabis, from Aleppo; two of them, Abū ʿl-Ḥasan and Abū ʿl-Faḍāʾil, sons of Yaḥyā al-Ḥalabī.

Nūr al-Dīn had had a vision of "la Gerusalemme liberata" and had ordered that the mimbar be ready for that goal of his life, which he did not live to see. It was achieved by Saladin, who loyally brought the mimbar to Jerusalem. Meanwhile, it had been kept in the Great Mosque of Aleppo, where Ibn Djubair saw it in 581. He describes the mihrab of that mosque as "covering the wall to the roof and to the mimbar" and adds that Aleppo was famous for the art of its cabinetmakers, nadjdjār, and ebony workers, an art he calls ǧarbāṣiya,62 perhaps an Andalusian dialect word.

---

60 Detailed description in "Alep," *MCIA*.; here the illustration must be enough.
62 Ǧarbāṣa, karbasa is explained: "to measure length and width of a building—to make its opposite walls parallel," and "to make a ceiling, to decorate it with interfaced designs." This term of architecture as well as carpentry, a loanword apparently from Greek, but scarcely, as proposed by Fleisher, from *krēpis*, must have an original signification that covers both techniques. In Baghdad the Persian term kārzuwān is used, "tongue work," meaning "dove-tailed."
van Berchem adduced a passage of Abu Shāma, Kitāb al-Rawi'datīn:

There was at Aleppo a carpenter, nadjīdar, al-Akhtarīnī (from Akhtarīn), unequaled in the mastership of his art; Nūr al-Dīn ordered him to prepare a mimbar for the Holy House of Allah (Jerusalem) ... . So he gathered collaborators around him, invented beautiful designs, and devoted several years to the completion of his work.

It follows that Muʿālī b. Salam, of the mihrab in the makām, was the father of Salmān b. Muʿālī of the mimbar of Jerusalem. The mimbar of Hāma is not signed, as far as I noticed, but was evidently a work of the same school. The door of the māristān 63 is another one.

Now, on the mihrab in marquetry of variegated marble and porphyry, in the Mashhad al-Ḥusain, dated between 569 and 596 and blown up in 1919 or 1920, was the signature.

Inscription 22

صنعة أبي عبد الله رأيي الرجاء إبني خمي المزراي رحه الله

Work of Abu Abdallah and Abu 'l-Ridjā', sons of Yahyā al-... , Allah reward them both!

The same two brothers have signed the similar mihrab in the Madrasa al-Shādhabakhtiya, founded in 589 by Shādhabakht, who made the cistern in the makām. There, the father, Yahyā, bears no nisba. Evidently, the two brothers, Abu Abdallah and Abu 'l-Ridjā', were the sons of the same Yahyā al-Ḥalabi, father of the two brothers Abu 'l-Ḥasan and Abu'l-Faḍā'īl that signed the mimbar of Jerusalem. Of the two nisbas the one, al-Ḥalabi, is the adjective of sojourn, the other, al-akhtarīnī, that of provenance. And there is scarcely any doubt that this ambiguous nisba of the inscription is identical with al-akhtarīnī of Abu Shāma. 64

Akhtärīn is the modern name of an insignificant village 65 never mentioned in oriental literature. I prefer to read al-djibrīnī, or-ānī, referring to one of the many Djibrīn of that region. But the provenance does not matter. The unequaled master was Yahyā; Muʿālī was his partner; the atelier was at Aleppo, and Yahyā, Muʿālī, and sons produced not only the most famous masterpieces of medieval Islam in marquetry of wood, but also of marble.

Figure 82 gives five specimens of this marble work. 66 The two great works of Sassanian art, the Tāk-i-Kisrā at Ctesiphon and the Tāk-i-Bustān at Kirmānshāhān, are involved in

63 Herzfeld, "Damascus, Studies in Architecture," Fig. 54.
64 The ending -ini or -ānī makes no difference, cf. Sarmīn, Sarmānī; Mārdīn, Maridānī, etc. It is merely the question of an initial dīf, unnecessary, or like Aʿzāz: 'Azāz, and of diacritical dots.
65 Akhtärīn appears first on Rousseau's map, beginning of the nineteenth century, now a railway station on the line to Nisibin.
66 Other specimens: the mimbar of Mashhad Ḥusain, Aleppo; doors of the Madrasa Karāṭāi and the 'Alī al-Dīn Mosque, Konya; İkbağiya and Şuhaib Rūmi, Damascus, both in second use; Kubbat al-Silsila and Ten-giţiya, Jerusalem, two mihrabs, both in second use. Cf. "Msh. Hir. Bād, Fig. 17."
any explanation of these designs, and since their date has been recently questioned by Oscar Reuther and Otto Kurz, a long parenthesis cannot be avoided.

Kurz assigns the Tāk-i-Kisrā to Khusrau I, on the erroneous assumption that the well-known passage in Theophylakt V, 6 referred to Ctesiphon. Theophylakt expressly speaks of “the new rhomaīkē building not far from Ctesiphon,” i.e., Arabic al-Rumīya, old Antiochea-Khosroo, about seven miles distant from the Tāk-i-Kisrā, which is described as standing “in the Madīna al-ʿAtīḵa, the Old Town (popular name for Taisafūn), between the tombs of Hudhaifa and Salmān Pāk,” the counselor and the barber of Muhammad, where it actually stands.

Reuther tried to prove the same date. His attitude towards the historical tradition is “accepting as historically correct the tradition embodied in the name Tāk-i-Kisrā, identifying it as iwān built by Khusrau I Anūshirwān.” Only in the name Tāk-i-Anūshirwān such a tradition could be embodied. Tāk-i-Kisrā is a popular name and means nothing but “arch of the Sasanids,” Kisrā being one of the Akāsira, just as Kaṣiṣar—Caesar—one of the Kaṣāṣira. Further, “the attribution to Khusrau I has been denied”; it cannot be denied, because it has never been proved. The only truly historical statement extant is that of Ibn al-Muḍaffa’ Rōzbīh (ca. 140 h.), translator of the Sasanian Khvātγynāmak, saying that the Tāk-i-Kisrā was built by Shapur I, i.e., middle of the third century a.d. Ḥamza of Isfahan (280–360 h.), who transmits this note (quoted by Yāḵūt, probably from the Kitāb al-Muwāzana), was incapable of denying it, as his friend the mōbedhān mōbedh Umēdh, or as we today. The mōbedh gives his reason: “Al-Manṣūr demolished the old palace.” Others tell that famous story of al-Rashid, but the point is that the caliphs were unable to destroy what the Akāsira had been capable of building. The story is told a third time, greatly exaggerated, of Ali al-Muktāfī (289–95), who is said to have used the bricks of the crenellations of the “White Palace” (which?) for the foundations, and those of the foundations for the crenellations of his new Kaṣr al-Tāḏj in Baghdad, thus turning the entire palace upside down, magically, as Abu ʿI- Ḥidā did with the little columns of Saint-Jean d’Acre. Besides, as an erudite, the mōbedh knew that Kisrā is muʿarrab of Khusrāy, he probably knew also the story of Khusrau the Just and the old woman. His reasoning is transparent, but his opinion has no authority, and the remark of Ibn al-Muḍaffa’ stands unchallenged.

Equally inconclusive, and moreover inaccurate, are Reuther’s archaeological arguments. Point 1: “Combination of very large and very small elements of the same type [meaning their opposition within the inter-columnia of colossal orders] is not found in the Mediterranean countries before the sixth century.” It exists wherever triple city gates or triumphal arches with windows or niches over the side doors have four huge columns with entablature at their front, e.g., Nîmes, Augustus; Timgad, Trajan; Hatra, first century A.D.: or where in thermes the vaults between colossal columns have a colonnade under the tympan, e.g., Caracalla, An-


toninus; or where *scenae frontes* have small side doors, with niches above, between the colonnade of their façade. In Petra two or even three stories of doors and windows appear between the colossal orders.

Point 2: "Coincidence of vertical axes, a principle to which classical architecture adhered rigidly, was not rejected until the sixth century." It is rejected in the first century in Assur and Petra, half a millennium before western architects were guilty of such abominations.

Point 3: "Arcade-moldings [those illustrated here in Figure 40] do not appear in western buildings prior to the sixth century, and then only in Syria," that means not at all in the real West.

The underlying axiom is that these forms must come from the West. Otherwise, these features would only show how late eastern barbarisms intrude into western art. It would not make the slightest difference, if the three points were accurate.

The closest analogy to the Tāk-i-Kisrā is the palace-front of Assur,69 a Parthian work. Its exact date is not relevant here, but I place all the phases of Arsacid Assur and Hatra still nearer to the beginning of our era than the excavators do.

The reconstruction of that façade, the walls of which are not preserved, from the excavated parts of its plaster decoration is conscientiously made, the recovered fragments are clearly indicated. One cannot reconstruct asymmetry and irregularity; symmetry and correspondence of axes are necessary suppositions. This supposition is contradicted by the largest piece preserved of the decoration, left side, from second to third story, which clearly shows, contradicting at the same time Reuther's point 2, that "coincidence of vertical axes" had been "rejected." Therefore, the reconstruction can only be accepted as an approximation substituting coincidence for actual irregularity, a thing nobody can reconstruct.

Of the lower two stories so little is preserved, that a subdivision into two stories between the extremely elongated, engaged columns is not out of question. If not with certainty in the same story, but, opposition of "very small and very large elements of the same type" is displayed between those elongated shapes and the dwarfed forms over the huge arch, exactly as in the Tāk-i-Kisrā.

The third point, the "arcade-molding" is no argument at all; it is no western form, and applying Reuther's principle strictly, could not appear at all.

Again, my old arguments hold good: it is an archaic character that the whole six-storied system of the Tāk-i-Kisrā employs horizontal architraves, not round archivolts, over the huge columns of the lower double stories, and that the original distinction between vertical and horizontal elements is intact, while in Syria, long before the sixth century, this feeling vanishes, and vertical and horizontal elements were transformed into frames without sense of direction.

The fault of the contrary deduction is in its axiom: oriental buildings like the Tāk-i-Kisrā are not links of the chain of western movements. No date can be derived from such a comparison: first *peccatur extra muros*, then *intra*. One must not transfer to the contrary

situation principles and notions abstracted from the study of ascending evolutions, where art grows step by step to greater achievements. He who studies Hellenistic art in the Arsacid empire does not study movement, but stagnation, not evolution, but decomposition; he makes autopsies, and the livid spots may appear any time in a body in which life blood ceases to pulse. Time is a quality of life, death, beyond chronology, is eternity.

Hellenistic architecture in the East begins with and goes on using hybrid forms, and it is only in Syria and not before our era that canonical forms are introduced, apparently as an effect of western study, such as embodied in Vitruvius' De Architectura. This is only natural. In Europe, people know how to wear their type of dress; but when European dress was lately enforced upon Orientals one could see amazing combinations of incoherent parts. After all, Hellenistic art in Arsacid Iran was but a costume. But since it is thoroughly possible, it would be worth while discussing whether the Ţāk-i-Kisrā might be older than the date Sasanian tradition gives to it. No doubt, the Arsacids had their palace on the very spot.

The spandrels in marble marquetry with entrelacs (Fig. 82) appear either over the barrel vault of an īwān, or over the niche of a mihrab. In the simplest and largest piece, from the great īwān that stood on the west side of the court of Mashhad al-Ḥusain, Aleppo, dated 596 h., the arch is a true vault of huge quoins, and their linear decoration is a flat projection of the molding of an archivolt. In all other cases an intersection of two groups of half circles, with their points against the opening, surrounds the arch. Figure 40 shows the origin of this device, a series of small arches in relief around the big arch of the Ţāk-i-Kisrā.

This idea is evidently connected with the lobed outline of a conch. The conch over a small niche generates the multilobate arch (of which the trifoliate is but a reduction in number). In small scale, the outline is actually lobed. In a large scale this is unfeasible, and the lobes are put on the arch as an ornament in relief. The frequency of the lobate arch in early Muhammadan buildings, such as Ukhāidīr, Samarra, Rakka, Egypt, North Africa, proves it to be a form inherited from Sasanian architecture, though I do not know of any Sasanian example. One multilobate arch has been encountered at Samarra, the Great Mosque of al-Mutawakkil; in Figure 20 there is another one from the tomb of Ṣafwat al-Mulūk, Damascus. Figure 41, from the interior gate of the Bāb Ḫinnasrīn, Aleppo, built by malik al-nāṣir Yūsuf II in 624 h., illustrates the use of the large scale motif, in relief, not in actual outline, and at the same time the advanced assimilation of the design to the architectural ornament of the period. Analogous forms are frequent in northern Jazira: Āmid, Maiyāfārḵīn, and more so at Mosul, where already about 600 h. a peculiar form appears that survives to

---

70 Herzfeld, Archaeological History of Iran, Lect. II, and E. Herzfeld, Iran in the Ancient East (London-New York, 1941), pp. 276–306, also below, remark on the date of the oldest parts of the Umayyad mosque.

71 "Damascus, Studies in Architecture, I," Fig. 78.

72 When applied to a horizontal architrave, the motif becomes a small "suspended arcature," e.g., in the door of Mashhad Ḫusain, Aleppo, Zāhir Ghāzi, 596 h., see "Msh.Hīr.Bād.," Pl. 10; when it encroaches upon a whole façade, it produces such "suspended arcades" as in the upper story of the Great Minaret, Aleppo (Fig. 51). This tendency is natural to the motif, because it is related to the decorative arcade (arches on columns) greatly favored in Hellenistic Iran.
the present day; it is now called mukandal, from ğandil ("candle," or "lamp") because of its imaginary resemblance to a suspended lamp.

But in the Tâk-i-Bustân, proved to be a typical, not an exceptional specimen of the very last phase of Sasanian architecture by the reoccurrence of its shapes in stucco-work, e.g., at Kish, a further step is made, which reveals that the last feeling for the old structural value of the archivolt had been lost.\(^{73}\) The archivolt is interpreted as a huge garland, a wreath (Fig. 39), with the symbolical value of the royal diadem, therefore provided with floating scarves at both ends, and with the crescent of the crown and similar floating fillets on the summit.

The combination of these two Sasanian thoughts, the multilobate arch and the diadem archivolt, is the scheme of composition followed in the interlaced spandrel ornaments of Aleppo. The crescent is immanent in the never omitted circle on the summit. The flamboyant curves of the two specimens below, Firdaws—Aleppo 634, and İkhnağiya—Damascus, clearly suggest a nimbus or crown. The two pairs of floating fillets are evolved and knotted together: there enters a third idea, the magic knot, ‘ükđa, of which there are some good contemporary examples (Figs. 84 and 85).

The ideas and the elements of these Aleppine works all come from Iran. Taifûrî tells, in Kitâb Baghdâd (fol. 62*) how, at the time of al-Ma‘mûn, Yahyâ b. al-Hasan b. Ali b. Mu‘âdh b. Muslim and Muhammad b. Ṭâhir (1) once were sitting at a fountain in Rakka, talking Persian together, when Abu ‘Amr al-‘Attâbî, who had studied in the libraries of Merv and Nishapur, entered and joined their conversation. Asked why he had copied Persian books, Abu ‘Amr answers: “Are there thoughts but in Persian books? The rhetorics, the classical language are ours, but the thoughts are theirs!”

Although Iranian in their typological aspect, these works could never have been produced outside northern Syria and at another period. They are entirely Ayyubid-Arabic in essence. The oldest dated example, that of the Shâdhsbakhtiya, is the most original. Mashhad al-Muḥassîn and Sulţâniyya are already a standardization, a classical form. Firdaws and İkhnağiyya show traces of decline, and this downward movement quickly gains speed. One may assume that with the Mongol conquest in 658 H. (1260 A.D.) the atelier came to an end.

A work of woodcarving, half kârabâşîya, half mashrâbiya, is a maşşûra transferred to the Damascus Museum, ‘Adîlîya, from the muṣâllâ south of the town (Figs. 76 and 81).\(^{74}\) Such screens were put around tombs on open cemeteries.

The usual explanation of mashrâbiya (or mu-, mi-), “Parce qu’on y place les cruches poreuses qui servent à rafraîchir l’eau par évaporation” (Dozy), is not convincing, the less so...
as mashrab is not cruche poreuse, but locus bibendi, and for that vicious purpose the bay windows are just the place to avoid. It may be derived from sharab, a word for a striped pattern of woven linen, or from sharab (“cord”) metaphorically used for woodwork, as hazárbať (“thousandfold-woven”) for brickwork.

**Inscription 23**

On the upper border, simple Kufic:

... Abu Dja’far Muhammad b. al-Hasan b. Ali, the sincere friend (ṣafī) of the Commander of the Faithful, may Allah accept (it) from him, and that (was) during the months of the year 497.

The style of the inscription is less that of an epitaph, than of a gift or endowment. The maksūra does not seem to come from the tomb of the donor himself.

There could be no more vulgar names than his, but he bears one of the highest titles, such as nobody but the atabeks of Syria themselves could have borne at that time, without being one of them. In 416, the ruling Buyid, Bahā al-Dawla Fīrūz b. ‘Aḍud al-Dawla received that title. Ṭoghtekin, the ruling atabek of Syria in 497, was saif, “the sword,” of the Commander of the Faithful. Nūr al-Dīn, himself nāṣir amīr al-mu’minīn, is called in his Ḥalāwīya inscription, Aleppo, ṣafī al-imām bi-naṣrihi, literally, “who makes serene the caliph by the victories he achieves through Allah’s help”¹⁵ in the Ulu Dājamī, Van, ṣafī al-khilāfa al-mu’azzama, “sincere friend of the exalted caliphate.”

Evidently, the father was not “some,” but “the” Hasan b. Ali, viz., Niẓām al-Mulk, himself raḍī amīr al-mu’minīn, “in whom the Commander of the Faithful is well pleased,” the actual ruler of the Seljuk empire and the first man of a rank below a ruling king to receive such a title. Abū Dja’far Muhammad is one of his many sons. At Aleppo, the mihrab of Šāliḥin was dedicated to the Maḵām Ibrāhīm by a vizier Muwaffāk, client of the vizier Mu’ayyid al-Mulk, another of the sons of Niẓām al-Mulk. Their exact surnames and titles are unexplored; the two lists, that of von Zambaur and that of Harold Bowen in the *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, differ widely, and for my purpose it is enough to state that the ṣafī amīr al-mu’minīn was one of them.

The ornament is much more archaic than in the works of the Aleppo atelier; it resembles rather that on the door from the Aẓhar Madrasa in the Cairo Museum. An analysis reveals unexpected things. Just as in Samarra, the ornament is a one-dimensional pattern (border) evolved into a two-dimensional one by parallel repetition and vertical connection of the alternating two elements of the border: lotus bud and flower. In the course of this transformation some of the elements grew together vertically, in the form of vases. All that is a

¹⁵ Cf. Ṣafwat al-Mulūk: “She who makes serene the kings.”
Fig. 27—Aleppo, Maqâm Ibrahim, Wooden Panel
survival of third-century style. It helps in estimating the progress made by the Ḥalabī master “who had no equal and invented beautiful designs.”

In the Ḍākām ʿIbrāhīm were more wood carvings: the doors right and left and the soffits in the two lateral doors of the north wall. One of them, a panel from the southern door of the east side, is drawn in Figure 27. It is linear pattern only, never having had fillings, and it must be assigned to the period of repair under Toghrul, 616 H.

It is the most complicated design ever produced by that branch of art. The almost unsolvable problem of a design based on horizontal groups of eleven-pointed stars is solved by alternative intercalation of a parallel group of twelve-pointed and one of ten-pointed stars between them.

Figure 27 gives a larger area than is actually executed to make the design clearer. I would give the following recipe: construct the circle $A$ circumscribing an eleven-pointed star (dakumī), draw its vertical axis (middle-axis of the existent panel). Draw the $32° 44'$ radii $(a)$ of that star right and left of the axis to their intersection with the circle. Draw, below, tangents to that intersection and, from the same point and from the intersection of the tangents and the middle axis, the radii $(b)$ under $30°$ and $66°$. The intersection of these radii right and left are the centers of the twelve-pointed stars $B$. The circumscribed circles of the eleven- and twelve-pointed stars do not touch each other. The horizontal axis of the twelve-pointed stars is the lower limit of the actual panel, while their vertical axes are the lateral limits. Extend, above, the $32° 44'$ radii by such under $36°$ $(c)$; their intersections with the vertical axes of $B$ are the centers of the ten-pointed stars $C$, whose circumscribed circles touch those of the eleven-pointed stars. Their horizontal axis is the middle axis of the whole design.

Al-Dżazarī, Ḥismaʿil b. al-Razzāz, describes a pattern simpler than ours on his bronze door at Ṣāmud, speaking of the general design as an intersection of two linear systems, one khāt musaddas, hexagonal, the other khāt muthamman, octagonal, and mentioning $A$: a six-pointed star, musaddis, in the center, $B$: six eight-pointed stars, muthamman, around it, and $C$: three lozenges, lawza, inserted to connect their points, all of them ornamented. But he omits as unornamented a secondary group of fillings, ḫuswā, produced as negative between the primary group, viz. six saddle-shaped elements (similar to a diraghlī) around the mu-

76 There is only one more example known of this class, a soffit in the Hakim’s bath at Fatehpur Sikri, India, described by E. H. Hankin, “The Drawing of Geometric Patterns in Saracenic Art,” *Archaeol. Surv. India*, XV (1925), Fig. 38. Hankin tries to find out the way in which the artists actually constructed these designs. My own inquiries lead me to believe that they start from the fillings, experimenting with them as with a jigsaw puzzle, but do not start from the geometrical framework.

saddis, and six triple saddles (similar to an abu thalâtha kunâd) between the muthamman; only in a later passage he calls those musarradj, “saddle-shaped.”

A modern oriental craftsman would say: I need two full dakumîya abû hidâshr (A, compound group around an eleven-pointed star); two half dakumîya abû ‘asâr (C, ten-pointed star); four quarters of abû thnashr (B, twelve pointed); one tabl with two shawla (between the eleven-pointed stars), four pairs of diraghliyât (around the ten-pointed stars); four half shawla (joining them); two full and two half abû thalâtha kunâd (between the eleven- and twelve-pointed stars); four full and two half tabl with two lawza (between the last).

The sizes of the elements depend upon the length of the sides they have in common, the determining factor being the size of the eleven-pointed dakumi, freely chosen. The composite polygonal formation around a star is called (in Bagdad and Mosul) dakumiyâ, from Turkish, degermi, “roundel, circle.” They consist of the star in the middle, called zuhra “Venus,” when eight-pointed, shamsa, “sun,” when ten or more pointed, the number of points being expressed by abû ‘asâr (10), abû hidâshr (11), thnashr (12), etc.; of a second zone of lozenges, lawza or bâdâm (both = almond; lawzandj is Persian “almond-cake”); and a third zone of symmetrical hexagons of unequal sides; — tabl, drum, is the figure ⊙; diraghli is ∆; the Kamûs explains al-diraka by “a children’s game,” hence apparently a mutilation of Greek astragalos; shawla, ⊙, almost the same as the elements of the third zone around the stars, means “scorpion’s sting”; finally, kunda (pl. kunâd), ⊙, with thalâtha, etc., according to their number, may be Persian kund, “blunt, obtuse.”

The mašûra of the son of Nizâm al-Mulk and the mihrab and mimbar of Nûr al-Dîn are representative of two phases, 497 and 563, of the art of woodcarving. To a third phase, a hundred years younger, belongs a cenotaph at Himîş.

**Himîş, Shrine of Khâlid b. al-Walîd**

(Figs. 28, 29, and 85)

Khâlid b. al-Walîd b. Mughîra al-Makhzûmî was a Kûraish; his mother Lubâba, the younger, was a sister of Lubâba the elder, wife of ‘Abbâs b. al-Muṭṭalib (ancestor of the Abbasids), and of Maimûna, a wife of the Prophet. Though orthodox tradition has made him one of the first Muslims, a miracle worker, and almost a saint, he was a great infidel, great general, and great enemy of the greatest of caliphs, Omar b. al-Khattab. The Prophet, recognizing his military genius, overlooked his shortcomings and called him saif Allâh, “sword of Allah,” almost as prophetic as Mark (3:16): “And gave Simon the name Petrus.” When seeing no place for himself at Medina, where Abu-Bekr, Omar, and Abû ‘Ubaida held full power, Khâlid left his homeland, Hejaz, went to Iraq and Syria, and began without order of

78 It is the old Sumerian sign hi, the gunû (increased form) of which has the phonetic value h, ideogram for “poison,” usually, but erroneously considered to represent the jaw of a snake, instead of a scorpion’s sting, cf. P. Deimel, “Keilschrift-Palaeographie,” *Scripta Pontif. Inst. Bibl.*, 1929, p. 23, No. 83.
the caliph and perhaps against his will, his unequaled conquests. So it was his personality that actually started the movement which resulted in the establishment of the Muhammadan empire. Don Leone Caetani has written his necrology.  Khälid was one of the few men that have determined the fate of great parts of the world for now exactly thirteen hundred years. The Caliph Omar succeeded in subordinating the military activities, of which Khälid was the main exponent, to his political leadership, and Khälid withdraw into private life, no longer partaking in public affairs, and died young at Ḥims in 21 H. (642 A.D.)

A number of places in Syria have been connected, rightly or wrongly, with his name. Already in the seventh century the chroniclers disagree about the attribution and situation of these places, probably because legend had at that time obliterated historical tradition.

There is a masdjid at Damascus, mentioned in the list of Ibn Shākir al-Kutubi, “The house of Khälid b. al-Walid and his mosque, inside the Bāb Tūmā,” northeast gate of Damascus, outside of which is the shrine of sheikh Rasīlān. This indication is inaccurate; Gertrude Bell found the building—no plan, and apparently no old parts preserved—identified by two inscriptions “outside the walls, near the mosque of sheikh Rasīlān” (so inscribed on the back of the photograph I owe to her friendship).

**Inscription 24**

Fifth century Kufic, four lines:

![Image of inscription](image)

This is the masdjid of Khälid b. al-Walid, the companion of the Prophet, blessings.

---

79 Annali dell' Islam (Roma, 1905-26), IV, year 21, pp. 85 f. and 517-22.
81 First discovered in 1850 by A. von Kremer (Mit- telsyrien und Damaskus [Wien, 1853], p. 156 f.): "Shaikh Rasīlān, eigentlich Arslān, dessen Grab sich mit dem von zwei seiner Genossen vor dem Bāb Tūmā befindet, unmittelbar vor dem Stadtthore, gegenüber der Ecke, welche die Stadtmauer daselbst macht. Besteht aus drei Kuppeln. Dort kopierte ich die folgende Inschrift, nach welcher an dieser Stelle das Zelt des Khälid b. al-Walid gestanden haben soll, als er Damaskus belagerte." Kremer’s drawing leaves no doubt as to the identity of the inscription, but likewise to his inability to read it; there is no mention in it of Khälid’s tent. Of the Neskhi inscription he quotes a few words, which establish the identity with mine, though it is not quite exact.
82 Cf. Répertoire, . . . VIII (1937), No. 2918 from receuil Schefer.
Inscription 25

Neskt, four lines:

The humble Abu 'l-... b. Abi 'l-Barakāt b. abi Ali, the disciple of sheikh Rasīlān... has rebuilt this blessed mosque of Khālid b. al-Walīd... at the epoch of malik al-nāṣr Sālah al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn, and he constituted as waqf the court situated east of the burdāl al-... for the expenses of the mosque... blessings.

I am unable to decipher on the small photograph the name of the founder of the waqf, which possibly could be traced in literature, nor the name of the “tower,” burdāl. Both inscriptions are undated, but the first surely belongs to the fifth century h., and the second, on account of Salādīn's title in al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn, which, I believe, the caliph only conferred on him after the conquest of Jerusalem, to his late years.

But the main shrine of Khālid is that at Hīmāls, standing on the outskirts of the town and considered to contain his tomb and that of his wife Faḍā, whose name I cannot find in literature. In 1908 the old crumbling building was demolished and the new one, a rather pretentious work in Turkish style, today figuring on Syrian postage stamps, was under construction. Some of the old inscriptions, photographed in 1899 by von Oppenheim, and copied in 1905 by M. Soberneim, were carefully preserved, others had disappeared.

van Berchem and Oppenheim (No. 2): Inscription of Sultan Baibars, dated 664 h. (1265 a.d.), the building of the “hāram of the tomb of saīf Allāh, the companion of the apostle of Allah, our lord Khālid b. al-Walīd”; corrigé (in line 4): Sāhib al-Furāt “lord of the Euphrates” instead of al-Курсān “of the Koran.”

Inscription on a wooden board, copied by Soberneim (photograph) 1905, 90 by 100 cm., in the portal (of the old building) over the door: same text as van Berchem (2).

Inscription 26

أَمَرُ بَانْشَاتِهِ عَلیٰ صَرْعَ سِفَفِ اللَّهِ

“Has ordered to build over the cenotaph of saīf Allāh, ...” instead of “over the hāram of the tomb,” and omitting saiyidnā before Khālid and malik al-bāḥrāin in the title of Baibars.

Inscription 27

On stone, 60 by 50 cm., right and left lower corner broken, five lines, small characters (photograph).
Our lord the sultan malik al-żāhir, pillar of the world and the religion, sultan of Islam and the Muslims, killer of the infidels and polytheists, Baibars al-Ṣāliḥī, partner of the Commander of the Faithful, . . . has ordered this dome to be built over the tomb of Faḍā—peace upon her!—and that in Dhu 'l-Ḥijdja of the year 664.
Part of the cenotaph of Faḍā is preserved⁸³ (Fig. 85). The inscription in rich Kufic, full of ‘uḵda, magic knots, is entirely koranic, in the following disposition: A (head, short board), Koran, II, 256; B (left side, long board), end of II, 256 and IX, 21; C (foot, short board), IX, 22; D (right side, large panel), XXXIX, 73.

At the first sight one is struck by the contrast in quality between the carving of the framework and of the fillings. These represent a mihrab with suspended lamps, a motif rather in favor at that time, cf. Djami Khazām, Mosul, Nūr al-Dīn’s time,⁸⁴ Sittnā Zainab, Sindjār, 637–57,⁸⁵ Pandja ‘Ali Mosul, Sultan Arghūn, 686.⁸⁶ The frieze in the entrance of Mashhad al-Ḥusain, Aleppo, 596 h., showed a small suspended arcade with lamps in each arch, an illustration of cornices of mosques illuminated during Ramadan.

A cenotaph in Mashhad al-Muḥassin, Aleppo, like that of Ḥimṣ a gift of Baibars,⁸⁷ has almost identical fillings, the whole work is inferior, but there too one is struck by the contrast between framework and fillings. Therefore, the natural assumption that the fillings were a later repair is precluded, and a closer study reveals that the first impression is misleading. The ornament consists, as in foregoing phases, of a geometrical fillet and of floral arabesques, but the way the fillets are traced (Fig. 29) is very baroque and, compared with the older works, decadent. Already in 664, the great phase of that art has passed.

⁸³ Since part of this cenotaph has been published by G. Contenau, “L’Institut français d’archéologie et d’art musulmans de Damas,” Syria, V (1924), 203, as “fragment de cénotaphe de Khālid b. Walīd,” it seems that the true attribution to Faḍā has been lost during the reconstruction of the mausoleum.

⁸⁴ Arch. Reise, II, 286.
⁸⁵ Ibid., Pl. IV.
⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 276.
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MATERIAL FOR A HISTORY OF ISLAMIC TEXTILES UP TO THE MONGOL CONQUEST

BY R. B. SERJEANT

CHAPTER IV*

TI RAZ CITIES IN KHUZISTAN

At the head of the Persian Gulf lies the small but very important province of Khuzistan, a textile manufacturing center in no way inferior to the great Tinnis-Damietta group of factories in Egypt, and containing one of the most eminent of all cities, Tustar, which at one period in its history manufactured the covering for the Kaaba. Like the Tinnis and Damietta stuffs, Tustar (or Shustar) materials occur frequently in historical works and seem to have been almost universally worn by the moneyed classes. In style they were not unlike the Egyptian textiles, and this may have been due to the fact that the district was settled with prisoners of war from eastern Byzantium, which area probably also exerted the same influence on Egyptian textiles. The situation of this little province on the great Baghdad-China trade route must have extended the range of its influence and facilitated the diffusion of its products to all quarters of the Islamic world (Map 1; see also Map 2 of Chapter III).

Ahwāz, the capital of the province, seems to have possessed no țirāz factory, but rather to have been the collecting center for all the manufactures of the province. Makdisī¹ called it the “storehouse (khizāna) of Basra,” where “silks (khazz) and brocades are collected, and goods and merchandise are brought. It is an emporium and place for the meeting of merchants.” He added ² that “beautiful cloths (fūṭa) of silk (kazz), which women wear, are made in al-Ahwāz.” The Thimār al-Kulūb ³ tells that “the silk (khazz) of Sūs and the brocade of Tustar are some of the precious things attributed to Ahwāz.” The town was known as Sūk al-Ahwāz (the “Market” of Ahwāz) to the Arabs, a tribute to its commercial importance. Kazwini ⁴ went so far as to say: “You will find there no science, culture, or fine craft (al-ṣanā‘i‘ al-sharīfa).” In Egypt the term “šarīf” is used to describe the țirāz factories (al-‘amal al-sharīf). Dżahiz ⁵ is the earliest author to mention that silken brocade (dibādji al-khazz) comes from it.

The seaport of Khuzistan and of Fars was Mahrūbān, whence merchandise of Khuzistan

* See preceding chapters in Ars Islamica, Vol. IX (1942).
² Ibid., p. 416.
³ Tha‘alibi, Thīmār al-Kulūb (Cairo, 1326 H. [1908 A.D.]), p. 426, reading ديباج تسر عن ديباج تصتر. Though a badly edited text, this contains some interesting variants from the author’s Lautif al-Ma‘ārif, ed. P. de Jong (Leyden, 1867).
⁴ Kazwini, el-Cazwini’s Kosmographie, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1846-48), II, 102.
stan was exported to Basra. It grew flax and exported it to the surrounding countries, according to Ibn al-Balkhī.  

A few general remarks are made about the province by the anonymous author of the *Hudūd al-Ālam*  who said that it produces “manifold textiles, curtains (parda-hā), suzan-djird (textiles), trousercords (shalvārband).” Maḵḍišī  added that “its cloth (bazz) is brocade (dībādji), ḫazz-silk, fine cotton, and ḫazz-silk.”

**TUSTAR**

Thaʿalīb stated that “Shapur Dhu  fell on the inhabitants of Sindjār, Buṣrā, Ṭuwāna, and Āmid, and took a great many prisoners, some of whom he established at Tustar, some at Sūs, making them become weavers of brocade and ḫazz-silk there.” Yāḵūt differed slightly:

They say that Sābūr Dhu  raided Jazira and Āmid and other Roman towns and transported some of the inhabitants and settled them in the districts of Khuzistan. They multiplied and lived in those places so that, from that time, the Tustar brocade and other kinds of silk (ḥarīr) came to Tustar, and ḫazz-silk was brought to Sūs, and curtains, and drapery (farsh) to Baṣinna and Mattūṣ, up to the present day. God alone knows whether this be true.

Kazwini also quoted this passage, adding that “the crafts (ṣanāʿi) of Rum appeared in Tustar.”

Abu  talked of Tustar seats (maḵāʿid), the material apparently being used as upholstery. Ibn al-Faḵīh said that “the inhabitants of Sūs in particular, and Djundaishāpur, are skilled in the manufacture of various kinds of silken and brocade garments, as are the inhabitants of Tustar.” Miskawaihi noted that “Muḵtādīr’s mother (ca. 300 H. [912 A.D.]) has boxes containing embroideries (wāshi) and brocade of Rum and Tustar, heavily adorned

---


8 Maḵḍišī, op. cit., p. 402.

9 Henceforth the word “brocade” will represent dībādji unless stated to the contrary. Al-Muṭarrīzī (Nāṣir b. ʿAbd al-Salāyīd) defined it thus: “Dībādji—the cloth (ṭjawb), the warp (ṣadā), and wool (lūhma) of which are ibrism-silk . . . . on the authority of al-Nākhaʿī it is related that he possessed a brocaded head scarf (ṭailasān mudābbadji), i.e., with its edges ornamented (munaḵḵash), decorated (muṣāyiyan) with brocade.” Al-


14 Abu  al-Muṭahrār al-Azdī, Ḥikāyat Aḥi  (Leyden, 1885), p. 36.

The Descriptio It. It. The sultan a of had been translated and had 300 2,000 "fine Egyptian regent came in memory. The Sacred House, or 'Abd Al-Muwaffak. The Kaaba covering can only have been made here for a very short time, however, for Ibn Hawkal (367 h. [978 a.d.]) said:

In Tustar the brocade is made which is taken to the whole world. The cover of the Kaaba, the Sacred House, used to be made there until the Sultan became poverty-stricken and was prevented from doing. The obligation on his part thus fell into desuetude. Every king of Iraq used to have a 'tiraz-factory there, and a representative (sahib).

The manuacture of the Kaaba covering at Shustar must have been introduced before the memory of I斯塔khri, or he would surely have described how and when it first came to be made there. I have suggested elsewhere that the coverings were first made in Tustar by the regent al-Muwaffak. Doubtless in the age of the decline of the Abbasid caliphate, the Egyptian Fatimids sent their own coverings.

Tanukhi often mentioned these Tustar stuffs, telling that Mu'izz al-Dawla sat on a "fine new seat (dast) of brocade which he had had made in Tustar, and which had cost him 2,000 dinars." Again, Tanukhi recorded that garments and fine turbans ('imama) used to

17 Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, Al-Iṯd al-Farid (Cairo, 1331 h. [1913 a.d.]), IV, 267. Malābīf is perhaps better translated "blankets" or "quilts."
18 Ibn Taghribirdi, al-Nudjim al-Zahir, ed. T. W. J. Juynholl and B. F. Mattes (Leyden, 1555-61), II, 192. Cf. 'Arīf, Ṭabarī continuatus, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1897), pp. 44-45, which adds, "in which garments of khazz-silk, etc., were woven."
19 Yākūt, op. cit., II, 616.
be made there and that one day al-Ṣāḥib ibn ‘Abbād put on a turban with a broad ṭīrāz border of the manufacture of Tustar. He said that a Dabiḵī robe of Shūstar cost two hundred dinars (ḵamīš Dabiḵī Shūstārī). Whether this type of cloth is a copy of the Egyptian kind of Tinnīs-Damietta, or whether it is just a linen cloth of a similar variety, is impossible to say.

Maḵḍisī called these garments "Marvian," a term used very loosely by Arab writers: "From Tustar beautiful brocade is brought, carpets (anmāṭ), and beautiful Marvian garments." 24 He added: "Tustar is a mine for every skilled workman in the art of manufacturing brocade and cotton. Opposites come together here... Many special products (of various countries) come to it from both East and West." It had two sets of cloth markets in his time. 25

The Laṭṭīf al-Maṭārīf 26 (430 H. [1037 A.D.]) has heard of no decline in its production: "It has a ṭīrāz-factory of splendid brocades. It is specially renowned for Rūmī (Byzantine) brocades." Idrīsī showed where the manufacture of Kaaba coverings was transferred: "At Tustar they make beautiful silk stuffs. It was from the workshops of this town that the covering of the Kaaba used to come. In our days they make this stuff in Iraq whence it is sent to Mecca every year." 27 Mustawfī, 28 after the Mongol conquest, mentioned its cotton growing. In the early nineteenth century cloth was still made there and was remarked on by the English traveler Buckingham.

One of the fullest descriptions of the style of the textiles made in Shustar is given in a work written at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Tadhkira-i-Shūstāriya, which, of course, draws on early sources:

Moreover the weaving of brocade is carried on, from that goat-hair (kargī 29) which comes to Djawzak Kalblab in autumn, of a higher quality than silk (ḥarīr) and finer. They adorn it with gold and silver ṭīrāz designs (nuḵūsh) of various colors. In former times the robes (albīsa) and turbans (‘imāma) of kings were all made of this. Shūstārī brocade (dībā) was proverbial among contemporary poets and men of taste. ‘Abd al-Wāsī’ Djabalī, who was a silver-tongued orator, in panegyrics of the Sultan Sandjar and others, compared every flowering plant of spring, the dewy freshness on the cheek of his mistress, and the furnishings of the mighty monarch’s audience chamber to Shūstārī brocade. In a panegyric on Sultan ‘Abd al-Šamad he says:

"Each day he composes in thine honour a poem of praise, adorned with the colors of Shūstārī brocade."

In another place he has said:

24 Maḵḍisī, op. cit., p. 416.
25 Ibid., p. 409.
The coverings ban separated prisoners of persan jât, green d. and bers II. Elsewhere the stuffs (279-89) er ivory. Reading Dabîkî "Der ('imäma), 32 in Akad. This the stuffs stated: "Sometimes Sus! and iième menoutchehri, 34 sometimes Sus, and ladies are mentioned wearing "silk of Sus (khazz), and red silks (iðrîdi), separated by strips of white silk (saraḳ)." Sulaimân, the Umayyad caliph, too, called for green Susî garments which seem to have consisted of a green cloak (hulla), and a green turban (imâma), all this about the year 99 H. (717 A.D.). The Kitâb al-Muwashshā 34 numbers Sus mitraï cloaks as one of the stuffs worn by the elegant, while Djâhiz 35 found that coverings (djilâl) and saddle cloths (or cushions barâdhi) came from that city. Ibn al-Fâkîh and Masûdî have already been quoted, but the latter further added that the Caliph Mu'taïdîd (279-89 H. [892-902 A.D.]) told the keepers of the wardrobe (khuzzān) to reserve the Susî and Dabiḳî stuffs for his own personal use.36

İstakhrî stated: "In Sus are made silks (khuzûz) which are despatched to all lands from it... In Sus, the Sultan (Mu'izz al-Dawla) has a tîrāz-factory." 37 Ibn Hawkal and Maḳdisî

35 DJâhiz, op. cit., p. 347.
36 Masûdî, op. cit., VIII, 115.
37 İstakhrî, op. cit., p. 93.
added little: "In Sūs heavy silks (khuzzūz thākīla) are made and taken to all parts." 38 The latter said: "From Sūs come cloth (bazz) and silk (khazz) . . . . One of their special products is the khazz-silk of Sūs with the exception of the turbans, because the soft cloth (sakb) of Kūfā has no peer." 39 The contemporary of Maḳdīsī who wrote the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam called it "the emporium of Khuzistan. It produces textiles and turbans of precious silk stuff (djāma va 'amāma-yi khazz)." 40 The Laṭā'īf al-Maʿārij says: "In Sūs is a tirāz factory of precious kingly silks" (khazz mulūkī—a name which is applied to other stuffs bearing the tirāz inscription). 41 Finally, Idrīsī 42 remarked that "in the town they make all kinds of silk stuffs which are exported into foreign countries and as far as the extremities of Khurasan."

The city gradually became deserted in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the remains have been examined by a French expedition.

KURKÜB

The following notices on the manufactures in Kurkūb have been found. Ṭabarī 43 under the annals for the year 144 H. (761 A.D.) spoke of a coarse shirt (ḵamīṣ) and a cloak (rida) of twisted Kurkūbī. Iṣṭakhri 44 said: "In Kurkūb is the sūsanjīrī stuff which is carried to all regions. There, and in Sūs are tirāz-factories belonging to the Sultan (Muʿizz al-Dawla)." Idrīsī remarked:

It is here that they make the painted and rayed stuff known under the name of rakm al-Kurkūbī, as well as rich brocades known as kharād 45 of so rare a beauty that they have no parallels in the universe. It is in Kurkūb, as in Sūs, that they make the various stuffs designed for the clothing of princes, which are sold at so high a price. 46

Minūčīrī often mentioned Kurkūbī stuffs, usually along with those of Rum (Byzantium). They seem to have been flower-embroidered fabrics, perhaps with a green base like sundus brocade: "They have thrown down cushions (bālish) of Kurkūbī in the desert and mattresses (bīstar) of Būḵalamūn have been spread in the valleys." 47

FACTORIES IN 'ASKAR, DJUNĐAISHĀPŪR, AND LÜR

The references to 'Askar are to be found in Maḳdīsī who said: "In the villages there are many tirāz-factories, especially in Maṣḥruḵān." 48 The latter was a canal running from the Great Weir at Tustar, then back again into the Duḍjail at 'Askar Mukram, and one might infer that these factories were dotted all along the course of the canal. Of 'Askar itself, he

38 Ibn Ḥawkāl, op. cit., p. 175.
40 Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 131. Cf. Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīhī, op. cit., IV, 267, where Sūs stuffs are also mentioned.
42 Idrīsī, op. cit., I, 381.
43 Ṭabarī, Annales, III, I, 168.
45 For kharād, which does not appear in the dictionaries, read khazz.
46 Idrīsī, op. cit., I, 383. This translation is full of wide inaccuracies and must be accepted with reservations.
47 Minūčīrī, op. cit., p. 5.
48 Maḳdīsī, op. cit., p. 410.
said: “From ‘Askar veils (maḳānī)’ of kazz-silk are brought to Baghdad and excellent cloth (bazz) with durable qualities, garments of flax (ḳunnab), napkins (mandil), and other things that are abundant in Ahwāz.” 49 The earlier Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi 50 said that ‘Askar has ‘Askarī garments.

Maḳdisī 51 noted that the people of Djundaishāpur have many tīrāz factories. This city also was founded by Shapur with Greek prisoners.

The same author 52 added that in the whole district of Lūr there were many tīrāz factories, although none of them seems to have had so high a repute as those above. The Hudūd al-‘Ālam 53 makes the surprising statement that “Īdhā (the capital of Lūr) produces great quantities of brocades. There also the brocade for the cover of Mecca (parda-yi-Makka) is made.” Minorsky proposed to read Tustar here for Īdhā, but Idrīṣī 54 said that “there are at Idhādij various other manufactures; the cleverness and application of the workers in this town is beyond comparison.”

THE BAṢĪNNĀ GROUP

There was another cluster of small towns or large villages in Khuzistan where inscribed garments were made, though there is no evidence to show that they were connected with the royal tīrāz system. This group was centered round Baṣīnna, in the same part of the province as Sūs and Tustar, on the Karkheh River. These Baṣīnna stuffs, however, always seem to be mentioned in connection with the royal palaces; for instance, Muḳṭadīr at the close of the third century A.H. had Baṣīnna curtains 55 displayed for the visit of the Byzantine ambassador. Iṣṭakhrī 56 said:

In Baṣīnna there are made the curtains which are taken to all regions with “‘amal Baṣīnna” (manufacture of Baṣīnna) written upon them. There are sometimes made in Birāhīmān and Kaliwān and other such towns, curtains with “Baṣīnna” written on them sold as Baṣīnna curtains, but the origin is from Baṣīnna.

As in the case of Bukhara, where Zandajī cloths took their name from the village of Zandana, though manufactured in other villages, the name was thus extended to similar weaves. Ibn Hawḳal 57 added: “Baṣīnna is one of the celebrated towns famed throughout the

49 Ibid., p. 416.
50 Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, op. cit., IV, 267.
51 Maḳdisī, op. cit., p. 408.
52 Ibid., p. 409.
53 Hudūd al-‘Ālam, p. 130.
54 Idrīṣī, op. cit., p. 384.
55 See Chapter II.
56 Iṣṭakhrī, op cit., p. 93. The practice of faking the name of the country of origin on textiles seems to have been not uncommon, for there is a special injunction against this type of fraud in the Madkhal of Ibn al-Ḥāḍḍī (Cairo, 1348 h. [1929 A.D.], IV, 29), to be dated about 732 h. (1331-2 A.D.). Speaking of the cloth merchant, he said: “It is incumbent on him when he has pieces of cloth (ṭhirḵa) derived from a district the cloth (ḳumāsh) of which is much sought after by the public, not to sell the cloth of another district as the manufacture of the first, even though the two districts are close to one another . . . . Analogous to this is the case of a craftsman who is good at weaving (nasad), the public competing to put up the price of cloth (ṭawb) attributed to him, So let him (the merchant) not sell anything manufactured by someone else as his work, even if it be like it, or better.”
57 Ibn Hawḳal, op. cit., p. 171.
whole world, renowned for the curtains (sutûr) which are imported to every clime." The Hudūd 58 merely states that it "produces good curtains exported everywhere." Maḳdīsî 59 had fresh information: "The curtains (sutûr) of Baśinnâ, and the carpets (anmāt) of Kūrḵāb are well known. In the environs of Wāsīt, curtains are made on which there is written 'minmâ 'umila bi-Baśinnâ'; these are exported as coming from that place, but they are not like them" and 60 "the men and women weave carpets and spin wool." He spoke of Baśinnâ, the curtains of which are found as far as the heavenly lote tree. Idrîṣî 61 and Yāḳūt 62 copied these accounts.

OTHER TEXTILE CITIES

Though Khuzistan contained a great many cities with tirāz factories, there were other villages in which no tirāz is mentioned. One may suspect that Dawrak had one of these factories, for carpets (busūṭ) and strips (ankhākh) of Dawrak are named as some of the fineries displayed for the Byzantine ambassador. 63 Maḳdīsî 64 merely noted that it was a source of khaish, a kind of coarse cloth which was often used in tents.

Of Rāmhurμuz, Iṣṭakhrî (followed by Ibn Ḥawḵal) said: "In Rāmhurμuz are garments of ibrīm-silk which are taken to many places." 65 Idrīṣî stated that "they make various articles of merchandise here and silk destined for export." 66 The Sharaf-nāmah 67 mentions its fine stuffs (ḵumāsh). Rabbi Petachia noted that "at Shushan there are two (families of) Jews who are dyers." 68 This place has been identified as Sūsan on the Karun. Nahr Tirā has several notices devoted to it; Iṣṭakhrî 69 said: "In it there are garments resembling those of Baghdad. They are taken to Baghdad, and exposed for sale as Baghdad cloth. They are bleached in Baghdad." Ibn Ḥawḵal 70 added that they are taken everywhere and that nobody suspects that they are not from Baghdad, for they are lovely. Maḳdīsî 71 mentioned the large izārs (women’s cloaks, men’s trousers, or loin cloth) which are made in Nahr Tirā, and Idrīṣî said that it has "many articles of commerce. They manufacture beautiful stuffs there." 72 The material in question would seem to be some plain white cloth, but further details are lacking.

After the Mongol conquest, Mustawfî 73 remarked that "Ḥawīza grows cotton, as Rāmμuz (Rāmhurμuz)."

58 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 131.
59 Maḳdīsî, op. cit., p. 416.
61 Idrīṣî, op. cit., I, 384.
62 Yāḳūt, op. cit., I, 561 and 656; IV, 303.
63 Sec. Chapter II.
64 Maḳdīsî, op. cit., p. 412.
66 Idrīṣî, op. cit., I, 382.
67 Shāraḳ Khan Bīḍīsī, Scheref Nāmez ou Fastes de la Nation Kourde, trans. by F. B. Charmoy (St. Peters-
burg, 1868–75), I, 107.
69 Iṣṭakhrî, op. cit., p. 93.
70 Ibn Ḥawḵal, op. cit., p. 176.
71 Maḳdīsî, op. cit., p. 416.
CHAPTER V

THE FARS GROUP

Next to the province of Khuzistan, and very closely connected with it was Fars, a land pre-eminent for many kinds of manufactures. Nearly every city made some special kind of cloth, and several possessed royal factories. The central position on the Persian Gulf may have encouraged the flourishing industries there. The țirâz cities, for the most part, lay in the southern district (Map 1).

Map 1—Fars
Djähiz\(^1\) said that “the best robes (aksiya) are of Egyptian wool, then the Fars-Khuzistan kind, and the fine goat-hair (mar’azzā) in Fars, the fine Shiraz goat-hair, then the Işfāhānī and the fine goat-hair in the ibrīsilk of Fasā, then the Ṭabarī kind.”

The Ḥudūd\(^2\) says that “it produces manifold textiles (djāmah) of linen (kattān), wool, cotton, carpets, rugs (bīṣāṭ va furš), zīlū-rugs, and gifīm (tapestry-woven carpets).” Maḵdīsī\(^3\) reported that “in it are made the mantles (abārid), silks (khazz), and art carpets (al-busuṭ al-ṣani‘a),\(^4\) cloth (bazz), wonderful garments (aksiya), curtains (sutūr), linen garments (thiḇāb al-kattān) resembling kaṣāb,\(^5\) brocade, and various kinds of striped robes (ḥulla).”

Though the Džirāb al-Dawla does not mention any textiles in the kharādj (annual tax) of Fars, Ṭha‘ālibī\(^6\) said that every year there used to be brought to the caliphs, according to the custom of carrying the special products of the province along with its tribute, thirty thousand bottles (ḵāṟūra) of Džūrī rose water, five thousand garments of the Tawwazī kind, and two hundred robes (aksiya). The same author also mentioned the robes of Fars in a list of the fine articles de luxe of the time of ‘Adud al-Dawla.\(^7\)

Iṣṭakhri and Ibn Ḥawkal both listed the tirāz cities of Fars, and I have thought it worth while to include the two accounts here, though the differences are but trifling for the most part. The former\(^8\) said:

From Sinīz, Diannābā, Kāzīrūn, and Tawwadji, garments of linen are brought. In each of these places, with the exception of Kāzīrūn, the sultan (‘Adud al-Dawla) has a tirāz factory. These garments are taken to the utmost limits of all the countries of Islam. From Fasā are brought several kinds of garments which are exported to various districts. In it there is a tirāz factory for figured wasḥī-stuff, and goat hair (sha‘r), and sūsandjird, belonging to the sultan. Now concerning the wasḥī-stuff, the gold (mudḥahhab) variety brought thence is better than that which is brought from the other provinces, while, as for the plain (ghair mudḥahhab) variety, that which is produced in DžAhram is better and more plentiful. As for the goat hair, the sultan is brought cloths weighing a mithkāl (mithkāliya),\(^9\) which fetch a high price, and expensive veils (or curtains, kilāl), as well as

---


\(^3\) Maḵdīsī (Muḵaddsī), Descriptio imperii Moslemici, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum (≡ B.G.A.) (Leyden, 1876; 2d ed. 1906), III, 420.


\(^5\) Kaṣāb was not essentially an Egyptian stuff though manufactured extensively there. The Sassanian monarchs used it as a tent cloth as did the Umayyads who followed them. The Abbasid, Manṣūr, was the first to use khaīgh instead. It probably came from this area. See Ṭabarī, Annales, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1879–1901), ser. III, I, 417–18.


\(^7\) Ibid., p. 132.

\(^8\) Iṣṭakhri, Viæ regnor. . . . , ed. M. J. de Goeje, B.G.A. (Leyden, 1870), I, 152.

\(^9\) The Glossary to the Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum suggests the sense of muṭḥakkāla here, meaning perhaps “reinforced with gold,” i.e., brocaded or embroidered with gold, but emendation of the text is not necessary. Niẓām al-Dīn Mahmūd Kārī of Yazd mentioned mithkāl in his Dīwān-i Alīṣa (Constantinople, 1303 H. [1885–6 A.D.]), p. 14.
other kinds of goat hair weaves (šaʿr). For the sultan, ʿazz-silk curtains are made with borders (sutūr muʿlāma); garments of silk and goat hair (šaʿr), exported to many of the provinces of Islam, are sent from here. The sūsandjīr found there is more precious than that of Kurkūb, Tawwadī, and Tārum. In it are to be found silken robes (aksiya) that fetch a very high price. From Djahram are brought expensive garments of wasḥī, carpets (busūt), carpet strips (nakhkh), prayer carpets (muṣallayāt), and large carpets (zullīya), which are known as Djahramī. From Yezd and Abarkūb are brought cotton garments that are exported to all the provinces. From Ghundidjān, capital of Dasht Bārīn, are brought carpets (busūt), curtains (sutūr), and cushions (makʿad), which the Armenian manufacture cannot equal. It is carried to all countries. The sūsandjīr of Fasā is preferable to the sūsandjīr of Kurkūb only because the Kurkūbī variety is ibrīsm-silk, and this wool is better than ibrīsm-silk in manufacture.

Ibn Ḥawkal’s account reads:

From Shīnīz are brought Shīnīzī garments, from Djannābā, Djannābī kerchiefs (mindīl), and from Tawwāzī, Tawwāzī garments, which kind has no similar type in the world, though there are more valuable ones. In every district of it the sultan (ʿAṣud al-Dawla) has a tirāz factory. . . . From Fasā various kinds of garments are brought which are carried to the most distant places. There is a tirāz for the precious wasḥī-robеs the like of which is not to be found in any other district when golden (mudhāhhab); when it is plain it is like that of Djahram and elsewhere. For the sultan and for merchants there are made in wool textiles for upholstery (fursh), which fetch a great price, and valuable curtains (or veils, kišlā) of all kinds of silk (harīr). For the sultan there are also made curtains of a kind marked with round circles and with borders (sutūr muʿayyana muʿlāma) of ʿazz-silk and of wool, which are taken to other provinces; the sūsandjīr to be found there is more valuable than that in Kurkūb and Tawwadī, and Tārum. In it are to be found robes (aksiya) of ʿazz-silk that are sold at the most overwhelming prices, such as a hundred dinars and so on. From Djahram carpets of valuable wasḥī figured stuff are brought, and the carpets (busūt), carpet strips (nakhkh), prayer carpets (muṣallayāt), and large carpets (zullīya) are renowned throughout the world.

From Yezd and Abarkūb are brought cotton garments, which are taken to all districts, and from Ghundidjān, the caital of Dasht Bārīn, are brought carpets (busūt), curtains (sutūr), and cushions (makʿad), which are taken to all regions, and which the manufacture of Armenia cannot equal. There is a tirāz factory of the sultan in it, and much is exported thence to various districts. The sūsandjīr of Fasā is better than the sūsandjīr of Kurkūb, because the base (or material matāʾ) is of wool, and the Kurkūbī is of ibrīsm-silk and wool, wool being stronger (aḥkam) for use in manufacture.10

More passages on this sūsandjīr, a stuff which has already been the subject of a separate work by a well-known orientalist,11 might be quoted. Masʿūdī 12 told a seemingly apocryphal story about a patrician of Constantinople in Muʿāwiya’s time, who asked a Tyrian preparing to return to Damascus to buy for him some “sūsandjīr carpets (bisāṭ) along with cushions

10 Ibn Ḥawkal, Viae et regna . . . . Descriptio ditionis moslemicae, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1873), II, 212.
11 J. von Karabacek, Die persische Nadelmalerei Susandschird. (Leipzig, 1881). This work, however, does not throw much illumination on the subject.
(mikhadda) and pillows (wasīda) of the same material, containing the colors red, blue, etc., and that it should be of such and such a description." The sūsandjīrd carpet of Mustanṣīr’s time has already been discussed in the first chapter. It is quite possible that the stuff sūsandjīrd did exist under that name in Muʿawiyah’s time, though the story itself is unreliable. The Aghānī 13 gives a very early date for the existence of this stuff:

I entered the presence of al-Faḍl ibn al-Rabi’ when he was sitting on a large sūsandjīrd carpet (bisāt) of satin (ṣatinī), embroidered with gold (mudhahhab) and glistening, upon which there was written “mimmā amara bi-ṣanā’atihi Ḥammād ‘Adjrad’ (“What Ḥammād ‘Adjrad ordered to be made”). He (the vizier) said to me: “Do you know who Ḥammād ‘Adjrad was?” I said: “No.” “Ḥammād ‘Adjrad was the governor of that district,” he replied, and fell silent.

This vizier was Harun al-Rashid’s chief minister during the latter half of the second century of the Hijra.

During the Buwaihid period, the decline of the caliphate had become so complete that the sultan had arrogated the use of the tirāz to his own person. As has been seen, in Baghdad, the tirāz became an appanage of the Buwaihid palaces, and later of the Seljuk rulers. The Muslim authors have a great deal to say about the tirāz cities of Fars, which fall into two main groups, the western group situated on, or near the coast, comprising Sinīz, Djannābā, Tawwadj, Kāzirūn, and Ghundidjān, as opposed to the eastern inland group of Djahram, Tārum, and Fasā.

Ibn al-Faḍlī 14 (290 H. [903 A.D.]) numbered Kazeruni garments among the products of Fars, while Iṣṭakhrī 15 took care to mention that it did not have a tirāz, but added: “Now as regards the people of Kazerun and Fasā, etc., they are traders, and I have never known any city, by land or sea where there were people of Fars, but they were the notables of that city.”

Maḳdīṣī 16 considered it so prominent a place that he said: “Kazerun is thickly populated and large. It is the Damietta of the Persians, and that is because the linen garments which are of the same make as kašāb, resembling the Shaṭawī (from Shaṭā, in the Tinnīs-Damietta group), even if they are of cotton (‘uṭb), are made and sold there, with the exception of what is made in Tawwadj.” He further said: “From Kazerun garments of kašāb come, and the same from Tawwaz, Dariz, and those districts, as well as Dabīḵī, and napkins with a velvety surface (manāḍil muḫmala), which are carried to the eight quarters of the world, but there is a great difference between them and the Shaṭawī type.”

---

13 Abu Ḥ-Faradž al-Iṣfahānī, Kitāb al-Aghānī. (Cairo, 1927–36), V, 371. Since the above passage was written I have found in Ṭabarī, (op. cit., III, I, 416) another extract which tells us that the Abbasid, Manṣūr, deposed a governor of a district in Syria, among whose effects a prayer carpet (mussallā) of sūsandjīrd was found in the year 158 H. (774–75 A.D.).


15 Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 136.

16 Maḳdīṣī, op. cit., pp. 433–34 and 442–43. Yellow garments of kašāb are mentioned by Tanūkhī (Nīṣāwār al-Muḥāfara, Table Talk of a Mesopotamian Judge, ed. and trans. by D. S. Margoliouth, text, p. 146), in al-Rādi’s wardrobe.
It is Ibn al-Balkhî, however, who has the fullest account of the manufactures there:

The cloths called Tûzî (Tawwazî), which they make there are woven from the fiber of the flax plant. Of this, first they tie up the fibrous stalks in bundles and throw them into a tank full of water, leaving the fiber being separated out, and the flax is then spun into linen thread. Next, this linen is washed in the water of the Râhbanâ water channel, and though the water is but scanty, it has the property of making white the linen thread that is washed in it, and if it be washed in any other water it never becomes so white. Now this Râhbanâ water channel is the property of the royal treasury, and the custom is now established that the profit thereof belongs to the house of the emir, the treasury having granted the usage thereof to the weavers who weave cloths under the orders of the treasury. There is an inspector who oversees on behalf of the treasury, and there are the brokers who set a just price on the cloth, sealing the bales with a stamp before they are delivered over to the foreign merchants. In times past it was all after this wise. The brokers would make up the bales of the Kâzirûnî cloth, the foreign merchants would come and buy the bales as they stood thus made up, for they placed reliance on the brokers, and in any city to which they were carried the certificate of the Kâzirûnî broker was merely asked for and the bales would then be sold at a profit without being opened (for examination). Thus it would often happen that a load of Kâzirûnî bales would pass from hand to hand ten times over, unopened. But now, in these latter days, fraud has become rife, and the people becoming dishonest, all confidence is gone, for the goods with the treasury stamp are often found deficient, whereby foreign traders have come to avoid the merchandise of Kâzirûnî. The fraud was especially common during the reign of the Emir Abû Sa‘îd, whose bad government and tyranny were manifest to all.17

This latter ruler was in Fars, at the end of the Buwaibîd period from which time the custom of sealing the bales with the treasury stamp may date.

Yâkût 18 used the same source as Maqdisi: “Bâshshârî said ... 'It is the Damietta of the Persians. That is because linen garments of the manufacture of kashâb, resembling the Shaṭawi, even if they are cotton (ḥattûb) are made and sold there, except that which is made in Tawwadj . . . In it are many brokers and broad markets.'” Mustawfi Kâzwînî,19 after the conquest, copying Ibn al-Balkhî stated: “Much cotton is produced here, and muslin stuffs of Kazerun are exported to all parts being of many kinds; some linen too is made. Most of these Kazerun stuffs, unless they be washed in the waters of the Râhbanâ watercourse do not retain their freshness.”

Between Kazerun and the seacoast lay Tawwadj, from which the Kazeruni textiles derived their name, if not indeed their original prototype according to the extract of Ibn al-


Balkh. Djähiz²⁰ said: “From Fars come Sābirī linen garments of Tawwadj.” This curious phrase may perhaps imply that in these places too Sasanian types of cloth were manufactured. The *Hudûd*²¹ says that “all the tavazi (Tawwazi) textiles come from it.”

The contemporary Makdisî²² remarked: “Tawwaz is small of size (rasm), but great in fame by reason of the garments of linen made in it. You must know that they are named Tawwazi, but most of them are made in Kazerun, but those are more skilled and better in workmanship.” The list of precious stuffs of ‘Aṣud al-Dawla’s reign quoted by Tha’alibi²³ includes the Tawwazi garments of Tawwadj.

Yaḵūt gave the fullest account of its manufactures:

There are made in Tawwadj linen garments which are called after it. Now most of this type is manufactured at Kazerun, but the name Tawwadj is generally applied to it because the people of Tawwadj are more skilled in its manufacture. It is a fine cloth of light delicate weave (muhalhal al-nasadj), as if it were fine sieve-cloth (munkhal), but its colors are lovely, and it has golden tirāz borders, a piece being sold for a sum of money. The people of Khurasan used to seek after it, and a large export trade to them was carried on. Sometimes there is made an excellent close-woven kind which sells well. It is a small town but its fame is great.²⁴

After the Mongol conquest Abu’l Fidā’²⁵ mentioned the Tawwazi stuff of Tawwadj, quoting no authorities.

Next to Tawwadj, on the Persian Gulf was the city of Djannābā. The *Kitāb al-Muwashshā*²⁶ mentions “shirts (kamīṣ) of excellent linen, soft and pure of color, such as Dabiḵī and Djannābī.” Ibn al-Fākīh²⁷ cited Djannābī stuffs as one of the most famous products of Fars, and Ibn Ḥawkal²⁸ said: “It is a town in which there are tirāz factories of linen of more than one kind, with abundant merchandise.” The trade seems to have disappeared by the time of Ibn al-Balkh,²⁹ who said: “Nothing that need be mentioned is produced in this place.”

Sulaimān³⁰ the merchant, and Ibn al-Fākīh³¹ had both heard of the Sīnīzī stuffs too, classing them along with those of Djannābā. Masʿūdī³² knew of Sīnīz where the “Sīnīzī tirāz garments were made, and the town of Djannābā after which the Djannābī garments were manufactured.”

---

²¹Hudûd al-ʿĀlam, p. 127.
²³Thaʿalibi, *op. cit.*, p. 132.
²⁴Yaḵūt, *op. cit.*, I, 890.
³²Masʿūdī, *op. cit.*, I, 238.
were named." Miskawaihī 33 mentioned "a shirt (ḵamīș) of Sinīzī manufacture" about the year 324 H. (935 A.D.), and brief notices are to be found in other authors besides those already mentioned. Ibn Ḥawkal 34 said: "From Sinīz comes the Sinīzī which is carried to all lands."

Makdisī suggested an Egyptian influence on this group: "From Sinīz come garments resembling ḳaṣāb; sometimes the flax (kattān) is brought to them from Egypt, but most of what is made nowadays is grown there." Ibn al-Balkhī 35 said: "They weave linen cloths here which are very thick and soft, and those are known as Shīnīzī stuffs. They do not however wear very well." The very incorrect translation of Idrīsī 37 said:

They make tissues of linen here know as Sinīsī cloths and are estimated as much for their solidity as for their fineness; these cloths have the peculiarity that when they are placed in contact with other cloths, they do not adhere to them as is ordinarily the case with tissues of linen.

Mustawfī Ṭazwīnī, 38 after the Mongol conquest, copying Ibn al-Balkhī said: "Linen is produced, but the linen here has no wear in it."

In addition to the notices on Djahram already quoted, Ibn Ḥawkal 39 mentioned: "To it is attributed the Djahramī type of carpet (busūt) manufactured there, and more than one ṭirāz factory belonging to the sultan and merchants is to be found there." This short passage makes it apparent that the ṭirāz factory textiles were not the exclusive property of the sultan. According to the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam: "Zilū-rugs and good prayer-carpets" 40 were produced. Makdisī 41 remarked that "from Djahram come carpets (busūt), curtains (sutūr), and perfectly woven carpets (anmāt muḥkama)." Ibn al-Balkhī 42 wrote that "much cotton is grown which is also exported. Muslin (kirsās), too, comes from here and the Djahramī blankets (zīlū) are woven in this town." Yāḵūt 43 knew of its fame for the manufacture of carpets (busūt), quoting Ruʿbaʿ ibn al-ʿAdjdajdī (who lived from the latter half of the first century of the Hijra into the first half of the second): "Nay many a town the dust of which fills wide roads, whose cotton and Djahram (stuff) are not to be bought." Mustawfī 44 laconically remarked that it grows cotton. Yāḵūt merely quoted ʿĪstakhribī concerning Ghundidjān, and Mustawfī 45 said: "The people here are for the most part shoemakers and weavers."

Djāhīz's note on the value of the Fasā garments has already been quoted, and Ibn al-Fāḵīh 46 spoke of the robes (aksiya) of this town. To the accounts of ʿĪstakhribī and Ibn

35 Makdisi, op. cit., p. 442.  
36 Ibn al-Balkhī, op. cit., p. 63.  
37 Idrīsī, op. cit., I, 399. This translation is unreliable.  
38 Mustawfī Ṭazwīnī, op. cit., p. 130.  
40 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 129.  
41 Makdisi, op. cit., p. 442.  
42 Ibn al-Balkhī, op. cit., p. 34.  
44 Mustawfī Kazwīnī, op. cit., p. 124.  
Hawkal, Makdisi 47 added:

From Fasā garments of khazz-silk, fine and beautiful robes (aksiya), carpets (annāt), carpets (busūt), napkins (fūta), munayyar (stuff with a double woof or weft) like that of Isfahan, washi figured stuff, octagonal patterned curtains (sutūr muthammama), valuable upholstery (furūsh), ibrīsmī-silk curtains (sutūr), 'uşfur-dye (yellow), tables (mā'ida), tents (kharkāhāt), and napkins (mindil) of Sharābiya.48

These latter Sharābi (linen) napkins were of the same type doubtless as those made in Tinnis-Damietta. This is the second textile found manufactured in both groups (the first being kašāb). Many stuffs in the Fatimid treasuries from Fars and Khuzistan are mentioned by Makrīzī.49

Ištakhri’s account of the tirāz factory at Tārum can be supplemented by a short note from Djāhīz who wrote that kirmiz dye is found there, it being one of the few places in Persia proper where this was to be had.50 Makdisi 51 mentioned its large fans (mirwāḥ), and Yākūt 52 said that it produces robes (aksiya) of khazz-silk which fetch a great deal of money.

A curious account of the founding of a city, and the establishment of a tirāz in it, perhaps typical of the same process throughout the Islamic world, is described by Makdisi:

Kurd Fannākhusrū. Fannākhusrū is ‘Aḍud al-Dawla who laid the foundations of a town half a parasang away from Shiraz, and dug a great canal leading to it. . . . and transported to it workers in wool (ṣawwāf), makers of (ṣunnā) khazz-silk and brocade. Every camelot mantle (barракān) as you know, made there today, has its name written on it.53

He mentioned that it is nearly ruined now (375 H. [985 A.D.]).54

CITIES WITHOUT A TIRĀZ

The other manufacturing cities in Fars will be considered briefly. In the north of the province is Yezd, and as seen above, Ištakhri and Ibn Hawkal mention its cotton garments, in passing, only. Perhaps it only came into prominence in the fourth century and later, for there is little information about it before Ibn al-Balkhī (500 H. [1107 A.D.]): “In the districts round, silk is produced, for the mulberry tree here is abundant. Further, they manufacture excellent cloths in brocade also, of the kind named mushṭī, farakāh,55 and the like, for in

---

47 Makdisī, op. cit., p. 442.
48 See Chapter XV.
49 Such as Kurkūbī, Tustāra, Djahramī. See Chapter XV.
50 Djāhīz, op. cit., p. 339.
51 Makdisī, op. cit., p. 442–43.
52 Yākūt, op. cit., I, 811.
54 Yākūt, op. cit., IV, 258., adds that it was founded in 354 H. (965 A.D.). By his day there was no trace of it. Cf. Kazwīnī, op. cit., II.
55 Ibn al-Balkhī, op. cit., p. 20. Le Strange added in a footnote that mushṭī is a stuff made in Nishapur. Mushṭī is a weaver’s instrument apparently, a “comb,” and the name doubtless came to be applied like the term “haʃī” to stuffs made in Nishapur.
Yezd they rear goats only, no sheep, and the hair from these is very strong.” 56 Kazwînî found in it “makers of silk (harîr) of sundus (a kind of green brocade), extremely beautiful and close-woven which is taken from it to all countries.” 57

In Mongol times, Marco Polo 58 noted: “It is a good and noble city, and it has a great amount of trade. They weave there quantities of a certain silk tissue known as Yasdi, which merchants carry into many quarters to dispose of.” Mustawfî Kazwînî 59 is a trifle less laconic than usual: “Cotton is grown . . . also silk is produced . . . The craftsmen of Yezd are excellent and honest workmen.”

Pedro Teixeira during the period of Portuguese influence in south Persia said:

In three parts of Persia are manufactured carpets which in Portuguese we call alcatifas and the Persians call Kalichey (kaliča), the richest, the finest, and most estimated in Yezd, from which place I saw some, each of which, on account of its workmanship and perfection, was valued at more than a thousand ducats; and thus in speaking of the alcatifa (al-Katîfa) of Yezd, which we corruptly call dodiaz, is understood the best, the finest, and the most perfect. The second-best are those from the kingdom of Kermon (Kerman), the third from Karason (Khurasan); they are also made in Agra, Bengal, and Cambaya, 60 but not fine ones. 61

He also mentioned silk and rosewater.

Though it does not really enter the period covered by this work, the early nineteenth-century traveler Buckingham knew “carpets of a blue ground of the manufacture of Yezd in which Arabic inscriptions are wrought round the border in characters of white.” 62

Of Rûdhan, Maḳḍîṣi wrote that “garments resembling the kind made at Bamm come from Rûdhan.” 63 Yâkût added that “it is a mine of fullers and weavers (häka).” It also produced saffron. 64

Arradjân, in western Fars, is said to have been founded by the Sasanian king Kawâdî I (496–531 a.d.), who settled prisoners of war there from Amidt, Diyârzâkîr, and Maiyâfârîkîn. Maḳḍîṣi 65 says that napkins (füta), kundaki (coarse) garments, and Indian goods (barbahâr) were their specialties. Idrîṣi, however, added: “The district of Radjân also bears the name of the founder, who was Sâbûr, and after whom they call the manufactures of the stuffs known as Sâburîya.” 66 This statement increases the difficulty of identifying stuff of this name. I think

---

56 Le Strange suggested faradji for farakh, but I think we should almost certainly read mar’azzî, “goat-hair” with Djâhiz (supra). Kalkashandî, Subh al-‘Aṣḥâ (Cairo, 1331 h. [1913 a.d.]), IV, 347, said of Yezd: “To it is attributed Yazdi cloth (kumâsh).”

57 Kazwînî, op. cit., II, 187.

58 H. Yule, The Book of Ser Marco Polo, the Venetian (London 1871), I, 89. Chapter V.

59 Mustawfî Kazwînî, op. cit., p. 77.

60 See Appendix III.


63 Maḳḍîṣi, op. cit., p. 442–43.

64 Yâkût, op. cit., II, 830.

65 Maḳḍîṣi, op. cit., p. 442.

66 Idrîṣi, op. cit., I, 391.
that Sābirī was the name applied to the materials which came from the tirāz factory at Bishāpūr, a city rarely mentioned in the sources which I have used. Ibn Ḥawkal stated that "Sābūr is renowned for Sābūrī cloth (thīyāb)." 67 Already at the beginning of the sixth (twelfth) century Bishāpūr was a complete ruin, and it may even have been so when Thaʿālibī 68 wrote the Latāʿif al-Maʿārif, because he is uncertain what these Sābirī stuffs are.

The village of Darīz, near Bishāpūr, said Maḵdīsī, 69 had excellent markets and many workers in linen (kattān).

Īṣṭakhrī had begun to decline from its prosperity in Sasanian times, when Shiraz was founded in 64 H. (684 A.D.). Īṣṭakhrī himself had little to say about its products: "In D̄jānāt, one of the villages of Īṣṭakhr, are fine pleasing garments known as al-āba ṭ of fine texture." 70 The earlier Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīhī had heard of "excellent black Īṣṭakhrī robes" 71 exported thence and included it in the list which contains many tirāz cities. It was practically destroyed by Šamsām al-Dawla, toward the end of the Buwaiḥid rule.

Shiraz, according to Īṣṭakhrī, 72 had cloaks (abrād) which were taken to all quarters. Maḵdīsī 73 said that it is famous for its cloaks (abrād) and robes (aksia); and "from Shiraz, come the camelot robes (al-aksia al-barrakānāt) to be found nowhere else, the munaiyar stuffs (with a double woof or weft) unrivaled for wear despite their fineness and loveliness, and the excellent cloaks (abrād), besides which, khazz-silk, brocade, ʿaṣab, and striped cloaks ( ḥulla) are made there." 74 Again, he repeats 75 that the camelots and munaiyar stuffs have no peer.

As the city was only founded after the conquest, all the manufactures of Shiraz must have been introduced there in Muslim times. It seems feasible to suppose that those manufactures were introduced from the various cities in which they originally flourished. Perhaps the munaiyar stuffs were introduced from Rayy, the ʿaṣab stuffs from Fars-Khuzistan, and the brocade from one of the districts planted with Greek prisoners by the Sasanian kings.

Kazwînī wrote (674 H. [1275 A.D.]) that "its people are skilled in the manufacture of garments of silk ( ḥatrī) and fine head-cloths (wikāya 76)." 77 Mustawfī 78 said that in Shiraz all trades may be followed, suggesting its continued prosperity after the Mongols. Cotton is grown around it.

Kavār, according to Ibn al-Balkhī, 79 made muslin (kīrbās).

67 Ibn Ḥawkal, op. cit., p. 179.
68 Thaʿālibī, op. cit., p. 112. Cf. Chapter III.
69 Maḵdīsī, op. cit., p. 433.
70 Īṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 155. Cf. Tabriz in Chapter VI for this stuff.
71 Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīhī, Al-ʿIṣd al-Fārīd (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), IV, 267.
72 Īṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 155.
73 Maḵdīsī, op. cit., p. 430.
74 Ibid., p. 442.
75 Ibid., p. 443.
76 Cf. R. Dozy, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes (2d ed.; Paris, 1927); and idem, Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes (Amsterdam, 1845). He quoted Ibn al-Sikkīt for such a headcloth made of brocade, and also an inscribed one from Kitāb al-Muwaṣṣightha.
77 Kazwînī, op. cit., II, 140.
79 Ibn al-Balkhī, op. cit., p. 38.
Däräbdjird was rather an important city. In the Kitāb al-Muwashshā' long gowns (durrā'a) of Däräbdjird worn by the fashionable are mentioned. Iṣṭakhrī added: “From Däräbdjird is brought stuff similar to the Tabari manufacture which is in Tabaristan.” Ibn Ḥawkal confirmed this: “From Däräbdjird cloth (thiyāb) for upholstery like Tabari is brought which is considered beautiful.” Apparently, the influence of the south Caspian group extended even here to south Persia. Maḵḍisī is more proxí: “From Däräbdjird come all valuable kinds of costly robes, those of middling value, and cheap kinds, as well as the kind which resembles the Tabaristan cloth, and the mats (ḥuşur) like the ‘Abbadānī kind, excellent carpets (busuṭ) and curtains (sutūr) of sūsandjird.” According to Ḥawkal, it was also noted for its “black inks and dyes (ṣibgh) which were preferable to all others.”

The little village of Kardabān may have been the source of the coarse blue (kuḥailī) Kardawānī stuff which Miskawaihī mentioned, about the year 326 H. (937 A.D.). Maḵrizī too heard of these cloths in the Fatimid treasuries, mentioning a Kardawānī brocade, and part of a tent made of variegated Kardawānī (manḵūsh). If this is the case, here is yet another material which was imported from Fars to Egypt.

Furdj lay three marches to the southeast of Däräbdjird, and Maḵḍisī recorded that “from Furdj come the garments, carpets (busuṭ), curtains (sutūr), and linen (kattān).” Djuwaim of Abu Ahmed (the modern Djuyūm) according to Ibn al-Balkhī made muslin (kīrbās).

Rīshahr, near the modern Bushire, was one of the ports for Fars. Ibn al-Balkhī said: “The people are almost entirely occupied with the sea trade, but Rīshahrī flax is to be come by in this place.” Mustawfī wrote (probably copying Ibn al-Balkhī) that “the Rīshahrī linen is famous. Most of the inhabitants are engaged in the sea trade but they excel in nothing.”

Sīrāf was another important port, and Maḵḍisī spoke of its napkins (fūta) and linen loin cloths (izārs). It was a very notable city, but for reasons of space its various activities cannot be discussed here. It was the center for the dissemination of Indian wares in Persia. The following list of textile centers is given by Mustawfī under the rule of the Īlkāns:

**Table of Textile Centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abarkūh</td>
<td>grows cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishāvūr</td>
<td>produces silk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarkān</td>
<td>grows cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djuwaim</td>
<td>grows cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghrundidjān</td>
<td>has weavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāzirūn</td>
<td>makes cotton and muslin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lār</td>
<td>grows cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rīshahr</td>
<td>produces linen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinīz</td>
<td>produces linen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


81 Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 154.

82 Ibn Ḥawkal, op. cit., p. 214.

83 Maḵḍisī, op. cit., p. 442-43.

84 Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 155.

85 Miskawaihī, op. cit., text, I, 387, trans., IV, 437.

86 Maḵrizī, Khiṭaf (Bulaq, 1853), I, 418. See Chapter XV.

87 Maḵḍisī, op. cit., p. 442.

88 Ibn al-Balkhī, op. cit., p. 35.

89 Ibid., p. 62.

90 Mustawfī Ḋazwīnī, op. cit., 120.

91 Maḵḍisī, op. cit., pp. 442-43.

92 Mustawfī Ḋazwīnī, op. cit., pp. 120, 126, 137, 138.

Fars stuffs were also made as far away as Transoxiana, for Makdisî said that Sinîzî cloth was made in Samarkand, and Narshâkhî mentioned Yazdî textiles made in the țirâz factory of Bukhara, which might go to show how the state factories aided the spread of cultural influences. Hamadhâni noted a napkin (mandil) of the weave of Djurdjân, and the manufacture of Arradjân.93

93 See Chapters VII and X.
CHAPTER VI
THE ARMENIAN-CASPIAN GROUP

Around the Black Sea and the Caspian there lies a group of provinces of indeterminate area and frontiers, such as Jazira, Armenia, Arrân, Azerbaijan, and Shirvan. These districts are of great importance to us because it was thence that the Sasanian kings brought the prisoners whom they settled in south Persia and Iraq, and perhaps other places as well. These provinces were, in the main, Christian, and Strzygowski has demonstrated the spread of new influences in architecture westward from this very area into the Western world. The same seems to have been true of the fabrics of this Armenian group, as I shall conveniently designate it, though it includes many districts which are, properly speaking, Iranian. This area sent its exports to all Islamic countries, and very likely, too, its weavers, dyers, and embroiderers (Map 2; see also Map 2 of Chapter III).

The earliest sources mention the Armenian and Rûmî (Byzantine) stuffs. In the reign of Rashid (170–93 H. [786–809 A.D.]), the Aghâni speaks of a carpet (zarbiya) or cushion of Armenian material. Djâhiz (ob. 257 H. [869 A.D.]) stated:

The best and most expensive drapery (farsh) is the crimson Armenian goathair kind with a double woof (al-mar'azzâ al-kirmizî al-Ārmanî al-munaiyar), then the striped silk (al-khazz al-raḵm), then the brocade of the Khusrawânî (Sasanian or royal) Byzantine (Rûmî) manufacture, then the khazz-silk brocaded like Maisânî, then buzyün-silk (a kind of brocade); whatsoever of those varieties is woven with gold is finer and fetches a higher price. All those kinds are sometimes woven with gold, except the Armenian and Maisânî, and buzyün-silk.

Again, he said: "From Armenia and Azerbaijan come felts (lubûd), lacuna, cushions (or horse-cloths barâdhi'), upholstery (farsh), fine carpets (busût), trouserbands (tikka), and wool (šûf)." It might be worth mentioning that Djâhiz paid more attention to Armenia and the areas under its cultural influence, Tabaristan and Fars-Khuzistan, than to any other group. In later times less attention was paid by writers to the Armenian group, and it seems to have become less important.

In the account of the revenues of the reign of Ma’mûn, which Ibn Khaldûn has extracted from the Diṯrâb al-Dawla, the following items are attributed to the Armenian group:

| Tabaristan, Ruyân, and Nehavend | 600 pieces (kit’a) of Tabari carpets (fursh) |
| Gilan | 200 robes (aksiya) |
| Armenia | 500 garments (thiyyâb) |
| | 300 napkins (mandîl) |
| | 300 cups (diṯmât) |
| | 20 robes |
| | 20 large carpets in relief (busût maḥfûra) |

4 Ibid., p. 348.
Again, we can compare this with the items which Tha‘ālibi enumerated as being sent to the (Buwayhid) sultans. To the court of the sultan there were taken every year, with the land-tax (kharāḍj), thirteen million dirhams, and thirty large carpets (bisāṭ) “in relief” (mahfūra), and five hundred pieces (kiṭ‘a) of striped silk (al-raḵm), as well as thirty falcons.

Mas‘ūdī related that Khaizurān, the wife of al-Mahdī (158–69 H. [775–85 A.D.]) had large Armenian carpets (bisāṭ) and cushions (numruk). The historian Tabarī, in the year 170 H. [786 A.D.], mentioned an Arminiya, some kind of carpet. The Caliph Amin too had Armenian cushions (mirfāḵa).

The precise value of the famous Armenian trouserbands is given by Tanūkhî: “When Abū Yusuf died, he left in his wardrobe two hundred pairs of khazz-silk pantaloons (sarāwil) at the court in the reign of al-Ma‘mun. A marginal note to this edition adds: “Mahfur is the name of a town on the coast of the Mediterranean where felts (anmāt), carpets (busūt), and good upholstery (farsh) are woven.”
of different sorts, each with its own band (tikka) of Armani worth a dinar.’’ These trouser-bands figure frequently in contemporary authors, and the Kitāb al-Muwashshāhā9 makes an allusion to Armenian fabrics embroidered in colors (al-mankūshā al-Arməniyā). The earlier Hikāyat Abī ’l-Ḵāsim10 speaks of Armenian carpets (mīṯrāḥ) as one of the things totally lacking in Isfahan.

These Armenian stuffs do not seem to have been so highly esteemed as were the products of the Egyptian tirāz factories; however, to judge from the following passage in the continuation of the Annals of Tabarī, which discusses the fraudulent purchase of effects from the estate of al-Muwaṣṣal in the year 311 H. (923 A.D.):

The vizier al-Muhassim deceived the caliph therein, and took most for himself. The pieces of red Dabīḵī stuff (al-shikāḵ al-Dabīḵīya al-shuḵairīyāt), the lowest price of each of which was seventy dinars, were stuffed into Armenian cushions (makhādd Arməniyā) and pillows (miswar) and sold, being bought by al-Muḥassīn, just as if the stuffing were of wool. He did the same with the precious kašāb, and the Rashīdī11 and the muḥām (a stuff with a warp of silk, but a woof of some other material) called Shu’aibī, and the Nishapur muḥām.12

Iṣṭakhrī,13 with a bias for Persia, claimed that the carpets (busūṭ), curtains (sutūr), and cushions of Ghundidjān surpassed those of Armenia. Ibn Ḥawkal14 stated that a certain governor of Armenia sent, along with the annual tax, a hundred garments of Ṭūmī (Byzantine)

9 Al-Washšāhī, Kitāb al-Muwashshāhā, ed. R. E. Brünnow (Leyden, 1886), p. 125. As the editor was only able to avail himself of a single MS the text is very dubious in places. For the reading here:

النكد المخزنة والمطارف الفخمة والمنفوشة الأرمنية

I suggest we read as on p. 127:

...النكد المخزنة والمطاط الفخمة الأرمنية

This makes the passage refer to Armenian trouser cords.


11 It seems likely that this name refers to the stuffs after the fashion invented by Caliph Rashīd, or possibly, containing a tirāz border with his name. This was the case with Mutawakkilī stuffs. It might refer to the measure for cloth invented by Rashīd, mentioned in Chapter II. Another possibility suggested by M. J. de Goeje (glossary to Taḥārī), is that these materials came from the town of Rashīd (Rosetta) in the Delta. The objection to the first suggestion is that the date of this incident is much later, and that the name occurs in several different authors. Taḥārī (op. cit., III, II, 753) wrote that Rashīd had an “izār Rashīdī” wide of borders (ʿalam), of a deep red dye (shadīd al-taḏrīḏ) circa 153 H. (770 A.D.). In the same place he mentioned that seven cloaks (ghilāʿ) of Rashīdī kašāb of women’s cut were brought in. They seem in fact to have been particularly popular among women, for al-Washšāhī (op. cit., p. 94) discussing the singing girls who seek to extract money from the jeunesse dorée of Baghdad, said: “When she knows that he is drowned in the pangs of love, she begins to seek costly presents, and desires Aden garments, izārs of Nishapur, pieces of Andjāḏjī cloth, Rashīdī cloaks, Sūšī turbans, ibrīm-silk trousecords,” etc. See Appendix I.


brocade. Maqdisi 15 added: "From it were brought curtains (sutu-r), valuable carpets (zulliya) with many properties" and 16 "their trouserbands (tikk), carpets in relief (ma'ah-furiyât), crimson (kirmiz), carpets (anma't), and dyes (siugh) have no equal."

The Laṭâ'if al-Ma'ârîf 17 includes Armenian trouserbands (tikk), carpets (busut), and large carpets (zulliya) of Kaślikalâ in a list of luxurious stuffs in the time of 'Aqûd al-Dawla. Minûcîhirî, 18 the poet of the Seljuk period said: "Nawrûz (New Year) is the time of joy and happiness. The (rain) cloud clothes the plain with Armenian brocade." By this we must understand the poet to refer to the brilliant color of the fabric, and the flower embroideries thereon.

Armenia was in close touch with Byzantium, and successive writers, each one amplifying the account of the previous one, have noted these textiles imported from the Greeks. Mas'ûdî 19 remarked of Trebizond: "It has various markets in the year to which Muslims, Byzantines (Rûm), Armenians, etc., as well as people from the Caucuses, come to trade." İşıkîhirî 20 said: "They have a place of entry into Byzantium, known as Tarâba-zunda (Trebizond), where merchants assemble to enter the land of Rûm for the purpose of trading. All the brocade, buzyûn brocade, and garments of Rûm which come to these parts, are from Tarâba-zunda." To this, Ibn Ḥawkâl 21 added: "Most of the brocade, buzyûn-brocade, garments of Rûmî linen (kattân), woollen (sûf) garments, and Rûmî robes (aksiya) come from Tarâba-zunda . . . and the cloth (kumâsh) going to it and coming from it is liable to a customs-duty of 10 per cent." 22 This shows that the traffic by no means merely went the one way.

The Ḥudûd al-ʿĀlam 23 lists Rûmî textiles: "It (Byzantium) produces in great quantities brocades, sundus-textiles (silk of a green color), Maisâni-textiles, carpets (tinîsa), stockings, and valuable trouser cords." Minûcîhirî often referred to Rûmî sundus brocade along with Kûrkûbî stuffs. The articles which the Ḥudûd details are very curious and seem to correspond to the wares known as Armanî. One must, of course, remember again, in regard to the Maisâni stuffs, that Maisân falls within the area colonized with eastern Byzantine prisoners during the Sasanian era; though foreigners are not precisely mentioned as being planted there, yet the Maisâni wares resemble Armenian types. Doubtless the Muslims were vague as to the difference between the stuffs of Armenia proper and those imported from Byzantium. A further complication is that the name Rûmî was applied to the Kûrkûbî stuffs from south Persia.

16 Ibid., p. 380.
17 Ḥaṭṭâlibî, Laṭâ'if al-Ma'ârîf, ed. P. de Jong (Leyden, 1867), p. 132.
18 A. de Biberstein Kazimirsky, Menoutchehirî, poète persan du 11ème siècle de notre ère (Paris, 1886), text, p. 139.
19 Mas'ûdî, op. cit., II, 3.
20 İşıkîhirî, op. cit., p. 188.
21 Ibn Ḥawkâl, op. cit., p. 245.
ISLAMIC TEXTILES

ARMENIA

Of this province, Ibn Ḥawkāl said:

In this country and the surrounding districts there are many articles of merchandise for export, as well as various things much sought after, such as riding animals, sheep, and cloth (thiyyāb), which is imported, into every country and province being well known and renowned, and consisting of such articles as Armenian trouserbands (tikka), which are made at Salmās, a single one of which is sold at prices varying from one dinar to ten dinars, having no equal in the world, besides the above-mentioned Armani (fabrics) made in Dabil. There are made in Marand, Tabriz, Dabil, and the districts of Armenia, Armenian cushions (mākā'id) and carpets (ankhākh) known as Armani mahfūr (Armenian carpets with a raised pattern), with scarcely an equal in any place which possesses manufactures resembling these. Of a like nature are sabāniya (pieces of stuff for veils or handkerchiefs),24 the cloths of red wool (mikram), and the handkerchiefs manufactured in Maiyāfārīkūn and in certain places in Armenia.25

Idrīsī26 copied this passage and also mentioned the Armenian felts, which, however, Djāhiz27 in the second century of the Hijra, did not esteem so highly as the Chinese, Maghribī (African), or Tālīkānī (from Khurāsān) felts.

In the Seljuk period the country was terribly devastated by that destructive Turkish race in the process of conquering the land, but many of the inhabitants migrated to Little Armenia and Cilicia about the latter half of the eleventh century of the Christian era. This may have been the great blow to the Armenian textile trade, and, in part, the cause of the rise to fame of the Turkish carpets of Asia Minor in the following centuries.

The capital of Armenia was Dabil (Dovin).28 Ištakhri wrote:

There come from it cloths (thiyyāb) of wool, consisting of carpets (busūt), pillows (wasīda), cushions (mākā'id), trouserbands (tikka), and other kinds of Armenian (fabrics). They have a dye called kirmiz (qermes, "crimson") with which wool is dyed, and I have heard that it is a worm which spins round itself like the silk worm (duḍa al-ḫazz). I have heard also that much buzūn comes from it.

The corresponding passage in Ibn Ḥawkāl has:

24 R. Dozy (Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes [Amsterdam, 1854]) said that these stuffs come from a little village near Baghdad, but later, in the Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes (2d ed.; Paris, 1927), he was less certain about their origin and thought that the word might be derived from the Greek ouβaros, which, in view of their being manufactured in this part of the world, is not unlikely. Yākūt (Mu'tam al-Bulān, Geographisches Wörterbuch, ed. F. Wüstefeld [Leipzig, 1866-73], III, 35) said: "Saban. Al-Ḥāzinī said: 'It is a place to which are ascribed the Sabāniya, a kind of garment which is made with linen (kattān) of the coarsest there is.' He gave no indication of the whereabouts of this place. The word was also used later, in the Mameluke period.
26 Idrīsī, Géographie, trans. by P. A. Jaubert (Paris, 1836-40), II, 326. He said that the Sabāni veils are dyed black, but the translation here is most unreliable.
27 Djāhiz, op. cit., p. 338.
28 Duwin and also Tovin.
29 Ištakhri, op. cit., p. 188.
From it come cloths (thiyāb) of goathair (mar'azz) and wool, consisting of carpets, pillows, cushions, trouserbands, and other kinds of Armani-fabric, dyed with kırmız. It is a red dye with which goat hair materials (mar'azz) are dyed, and wool. It originates from a worm which spins round itself like the silk worm when it spins silk round itself. From it much buzūyn-brocade is brought; there are many varieties similar to it in Byzantium, though it is itself exported. As for their famous green mantles for women (batt), cushions (makā'id), carpets (busuṭ), curtains (suthūr), strips of carpet (ankhākh), leather pillows (miswar), and couches (misnad), they have no peer in all the world in any way at all.  

The Hudūd al-Ālam 31 says: "In it live numerous Christians. . . . It produces worms from which crimson dye is made, and good trouser cords." Maḳḍisī 33 added: "From Dabil come garments of wool, carpets, (busuṭ), pillows (wasīda), carpets (anmāt), and precious trouserbands. . . . Its wool is important." He noted that it was a fine place, though most of the population was Christian. Idrīsī 35 had little new to tell: "They make stuffs of cloth called mar'azz (goathair), carpets, felts, cushions, and various other objects which are superior to all that one can obtain of this most perfect kind."

Bidlišī said: "It is a flourishing town of Armenia. The inhabitants make unparalleled carpets and the kırmız there is of a very fine shade." 38

So famous was this part of the world for its kırmız dye that Balādhurī 37 mentioned a place, Azdisāṭ, near Dabil which was called "karya al-kırmız" or the kırmız-village. In the second century Djāhib 38 discussed this dye:

They claim that kırmız is a grass in the root of which there is a red worm. It grows in three places in the earth—in the Maghrib district, the land of Andalus, and in a district called Tārum (in Fars), and in the land of Fars. Nobody knows this grass and where it is to be found, except a sect of the Jews who have charge of collecting it every year in Māh Isfandārmūdh (the twelfth month of the solar year). That worm is dried, and ibrīsm-silk and wool, etc., are dyed with it. The best-dyed is in certain places in the land of Wāsīṭ. 39

This may throw some light on the curious statement of Ibn Rusta: "In Nahrawān are made the draperies (farsh) of which the Armenian stuff is manufactured, and then they are taken to Armenia and spun and woven there." 40 Perhaps the author referred to the thread which was dyed and then taken to Armenia to be made into the celebrated cloth. He may only be referring to the base upon which these carpets were woven. Of the kırmız Ibn al-Faḳīh 41 said: "It is a red worm which appears in certain days of Rabī' (spring). It is collected and prepared (ṭabakha), and wool is dyed with it."

---

30 Dozy, op. cit., idem, Dictionnaire. . . . des vêtements, after Ibn al-Sikht.
31 Ibn Hawkal, op. cit., p. 244.
32 Hudūd al-Ālam, p. 142.
33 Maḳḍisī, op. cit., p. 380.
34 Ibid., p. 377.
36 Sharaf Khan Bidlišī, Scheref Nameh ou Fastes de la Nation Kourde, trans by F. Charmoy (St. Petersburg, 1868–75), I, 171.
38 Djāhib, op. cit., p. 339.
39 See Chapter III.
40 See Chapter III.
41 Ibn al-Faḳīh, op. cit., p. 297.
It is particularly interesting to notice that the Jews are credited with the monopoly of the manufacture of this dye, as I shall later discuss the prominence of Jews as dyers throughout the East during the Middle Ages. Perhaps they took the kirmiz to Spain, but this is speculation.

Yāḥūṭ 42 said of Lake Van (Wān): “At it carpets (busuṭ) are made.” The Muslims had settled in this area by the ninth century.

Quite as famous in ancient times as Dabil, was Kālikalā, the modern Erzerum. Though it was conquered in the first fifty years of Islamic dominion there is only a very meager fund of information concerning the manufactures of this city until Seljuk times. The silence of authors in regard to the manufactures of the city until the Hudūd al-‘Ālam might seem to imply that little was made there during the early Muslim period, but this work does know of kāli-carpets in other Armenian centers and from where else could they derive their name but Kālikalā? Perhaps it first came into prominence during the Buwaihid supremacy at Baghdad, for these monarchs came from the Caspian provinces. Even Ištākhri merely included it among a number of small places of Armenia of trifling importance. However, Yāḥūṭ 43 said: “In Kālikalā there are made those carpets (busuṭ) named Kāli, the name (nisba) of which has been shortened to only part of it in speech, on account of euphony.” Kazwini 44 also confined himself to generalities: “From it are exported the carpets (busuṭ), and the rugs (zulliya) which are called kāli. Its people have a skillful hand in manufacturing them. From Kālikalā they are taken to other countries. There are many Christians there.”

An Armenian, Matthew of Edessa, 45 mentioned gold brocade stuffs taken at Ardzan by the Turks who conquered it in 498 H. (1049–50 A.D.), and that they were many because it was the capital of the Armenian kings. After the Seljuks conquered it, the few inhabitants left, migrated to the neighboring town of Kālikalā, which they called Arzan al-Rūm (Arzan of the Romans, i.e., Byzantines).

To the west of Erzerum is Arzindjān, and here too, there is little information until Seljuk times. Marco Polo 46 spoke of Arzindjān “at which they weave the best buckrams in the world.” Ibn Baṭūta 47 said: “Arzindjān has well arranged markets. They make beautiful garments called after the town there.” Yāḥūṭ 48 remarked that most of the inhabitants were Christian Armenians, but there were some Muslims.

It is perhaps here that Āmid (Diyārbakr) and Maīyāfārikīn should be considered. Djāḥīz 49 noted that there come from Āmid, “cloths of watered silk (thiyāb muwashshā),

42 Yāḥūṭ, op. cit., IV, 805.
43 Ibid., IV, 20.
44 Kazwini, El-Cazwini’s Kosmographie, ed. F. Wulstenfeld (Göttingen, 1846–48), II, 370.
45 M. E. Dulong, Récit de la première croisade, extrait de la Chronique de Matthieu d’Édesse (Paris, 1850), p. 84.
46 Yule, op. cit., I, 47–48. Yule made a very learned attempt to identify buckram, which was not the coarse stiff cloth we know, but a fine stuff of silk or linen. Cf. barrakān, footnote to Chapter III.
48 Yāḥūṭ, op. cit., I, 205.
49 Djāḥīz, op. cit., p. 344.
kerchiefs (mandil), and woollen hoods (tailasân).” Maḳdīṣī 50 has a brief but important note: “From Āmid come woollen garments (thīyāb al-ṣūf), and Rūmī (Roman) linen after the Sicilian manufacture (‘alā ‘amal al-Ṣaḥāli).” Supposing the text to be correct, one finds here a material of a Byzantine kind similar to that made in Sicily, itself once in Byzantine hands.

In Maiyāfārikīn, according to Idrīṣī 51 “they make cords which equal, if not surpass, in quality, those of Salmās, and further, napkins, goathair stuffs (mirʿizz 52), and woollen veils (lin) called sabānīyāt (pieces for veils or handkerchiefs.).”

Marco Polo 53 added: “Near this province (Mosul) is another called Mus (Mūsh) and Mardin, producing an immense quantity of cotton from which they make a great deal of buckram and other cloth. The people are craftsmen and traders and are all subject to the Tartar king.”

Though, properly speaking, Āmid Maiyāfārikīn, and Mardin lie in Jazira, yet culturally they form part of the Armenian unit. As discussed in a previous chapter, it was from those cities that the weavers were transported to south Persia by the Sasanians.

Just over the border, into Armenia again, is Bidlis, of which the native Bidliṣī 54 related that during the caliphate of Omar II (in 98 H. [716 A.D.]) the prince of Bidlis was forced to pay a hundred thousand dinars to the Muslims and to furnish a thousand pieces of stuff (aḵmīsha), and European brocade (dībā-yī Ifrandj).

In Kháwi, Bargrī Ardjiḏiḏ, Aklāṯ, Nakhchuvan, and Bidlis, according to the Hudūd, 55 “large quantities of zilū-carpets (zilū-hā-yi-kālī), and trouser cords” are made. Some of these towns are in Azerbaijan, of which the Hudūd 56 reports: “It produces crimson (ḵīrmīz), trouser cords (shalvārband), woollen stuffs, madder (rūdīna).”

Ardebil (Ardavil) was the Muslim capital of Azerbaijan. It is said to have been founded by the Sasanian monarch Firūz (457–84 A.D.). Iṣṭakhrī wrote: “From it are brought cloths (thīyāb) of wool, such as carpets (busūṯ), cushions (wasīda), pillows (maḵāʾid), trouser-bands (tikka) and other kinds of Armenian wares. They have a dye called kirmīz with which wool is dyed and I have heard that the worm of it weaves round itself like the silk worm (düd al-ḵazz). I have heard too, that much buzūḏ-brocade is brought from it.” 57 The Hudūd al-ʿĀlam 58 remarks: “It produces striped stuffs (djāma-yi-burd) and stuffs of various colors (djāma-yi-rangīn).”

Kūrsara near Ardebil, according to Ibn Ḥawḵal, 59 had a trade in cloth (buzz) and rarities (barbahār).

Marand’s eminence as a manufacturing center has been traced as far back as Ibn Ḥawḵal, but the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam 60 confines itself to the remark that “it produces various woollen

50 Maḳdīṣī, op. cit., p. 145.
51 Idrīṣī, op. cit., II, 152.
52 Reading عض الحاصل for Jaubert’s عض الحاصل
53 Yule, op. cit., I, 62.
54 Sharaf Khan Bidliṣī, op. cit., II, I, 207.
55 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 143.
56 Ibid., p. 142.
57 Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 188.
58 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 142.
59 Ibn Ḥawḵal, op. cit., p. 252.
60 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 143.
stuffs.” Mustawfi 61 said that it produces cotton: “In the plains to the south of Marand the kızmiz insect is found; this can only be obtained during a single week during the summer season, and if the insect be not taken then, it makes a hole (in the cocoon) and flies away.”

According to LeStrange, Tabriz was a mere village in the third century H. (ninth century A.D.) when, in Mutawakkil’s reign, a certain Ibn Rawâd settled there, and he and his descendants built themselves palaces. There are no very early sources, but Yakût 62 said: “There are made there abâ’i garments, sîklâfûn (scarlet), Khaṭâfî (Chinese stuffs?), satin (atlas), and nasâdî (woven stuff), which are carried to all countries, east and west.” I suspect that one ought to read ’Attâbî 63 for this Chinese stuff with Kazwînî: “From it are brought ’Attābî garments, those of sîklâfûn, atlas-satin, and nasâdî (woven stuff), to all quarters.” 64

Tabriz was one of the few towns to escape being destroyed in the Mongol cataclysm, and perhaps because of this it became the largest city in these parts under their rule. To judge from several passages which will be quoted, it must have been a center of state enterprise during the Il-Khanid period.

Bar Hebraeus 65 reported that an ambassador from Ahmed the son of Hûlûgû (in the latter half of the thirteenth century), called Abd al-Rahman, was sent to Syria. He was liberally supplied with money from the Treasury, precious stones and apparel, and bales of stuff wherein much gold was woven: “He came to Tabriz and he sat there for about a month of days. He gathered together handicraftsmen of all kinds, jewellers, and sewers (weavers), and others and made everything to a royal pattern.”

Bidlîsi 66 described how, in 693 H. (1293 A.D.), the (Mongol) emperor tried to introduce paper notes for money after the fashion of the Chinese. It was forbidden to place “the writing of inscriptions (râkm-i-nûsakh) in the weaving of stuffs of gold-brocades (zarbaft) except in the king’s court (sarkar-i-pâdshâh), and thus similarly the goldsmiths (zarkar) gold-wire-drawers (zarkash), and other sewers with gold thread (zardûz) had to give obedience to his command.”

This ordinance must have sorely affected the Tabrizîs as Marco Polo 67 found, a little before this:

The men of Tauris (Tabriz) get their living by trade and handicrafts, for they weave many kinds of beautiful and valuable stuffs of silk and gold. The city has such a good position that merchandise

62 Yakût, op. cit., I, 822.
63 Kazwînî, op. cit., II, 227.
64 According to ’Umarî, Masâlik al-Absâr, E. M. Quatremère, Notes et extraits de la Bibl. Nat., XIII (1838), 283, at Tabriz, “Hulagû étant mort, et son fils Abuqa étant monté sur le trône, les soldats du Kipchak... demandèrent et obtinrent la permission d’ élever une manufacture (karkhâma) dans laquelle ils fabri-quaient des étoffes pour leur usage et celui du Sultan Bérêchek.” War broke out and the širâz was destroyed though probably rebuilt later. “La paix s’étant rétablie... la manufacture fut remise sur pied et l’on régla que les sujets de Bérêchek tirent de l’ argent de leur pays, et fabriqueraient d’ étoffes qu’ ils jugeraient à propos.”
67 Yule, op. cit., I, 75.
is brought thither from India, Baudas (Baghdad), Cremesor (Garmsir, the area round the Persian Gulf), and many other regions; and that attracts many Latin merchants, especially Genoese, to buy goods and transact other business there; the more as it is also a great market for precious stones.

He found a great mixture of peoples there, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Georgians, and Persians.

The last notice is from the pen of Ibn Baṭūta, who said the Kamkhan was a silk stuff made at Baghdad, Tabriz, and Nishapur. This stuff though known before the conquest was never attributed to any of those towns and was perhaps a genuine Chinese stuff. One may surmise that the Mongols introduced the manufacture of this textile into those places. The textiles of Tabriz are also noted in the Mameluke court in a work entitled Zubda Kashf al-Mamālik, where a Tabrizī cloak (ḵabā) is mentioned.

ARRĀN

Bardha'a, the capital of Arrān, was captured as early as the reign of Othman and was rebuilt in the time of ʿAbd al-Malik. The passages quoted below will show that it was never a great manufacturing center, though Makhdisi called it the “Baghdad of the country.” It seems, rather, to have produced raw materials, exported to countries farther south.

Iṣṭakhrī, repeated by Ibn Ḥawkal, said: “A great deal of ibrīsm-silk, raised on the mulberry trees which are common, is exported from it. A large supply is dispatched thence to Fars and Khuzistan.” Concisely, the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam adds: “Bardha'a produces silk and madder (rūnās).” Makhdisi repeated the earlier authors: “From Bardha'a much ibrīsm-silk is brought,” and “from Bardha'a come curtains (sutūr),” and “there is set up on the Sunday a market called al-Kurkī to which the inhabitants of the district and the neighboring country assemble, so that a man says ‘Sunday’ and Kurkī-day, ‘Monday.’ Ibrīsm-silk and garments are sold there.” This market existed as early as the time of Iṣṭakhrī. Yāḵūt commented that a large amount of ibrīsm-silk is brought from it which originates from free mulberry-trees without any owner, dispatched thence to Fars and Khuzistan, in large quantities.”

After the decline of Bardha'a, Bāilaḵān became the capital. According to the Hudūd it produced “striped textiles (burd-hā), horse-rugs (djull), and veils (burḵā).” Moses of Khoren, an Armenian writer, mentions cotton there, and so does Mustawfi.

---

68 Ibn Baṭūta, op. cit., II, 311. ‘Attābī was made in these three cities, but kamkhan is rarely noted before the Mongol conquest by any author. The name is to be found in Thaʿalibi’s Latāfīf al-Maʿārif, and in Ṭabarī (op. cit., III, II, 1169), where in the year 220 H. (835 A.D.), a poet speaks of the Zutūs wearing kamkhan of China. Makhdī (Khitât [Bulaq, 1853], I, 473) in 518 H. (1124 A.D.) spoke of barques ornamented with Dabīḵī awnings and kawāmīḵ (plural of kamkhan?).


70 Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 183.
72 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 143.
73 Makhdī, op. cit., p. 380.
74 Yāḵūt, op. cit., I, 559.
75 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 144.
77 Mustawfi Kazwīnī, op. cit., p. 92.
Little is known of Gandja (Elizabetpol) and Shamkūr, but again, according to the Hudūd: "Both produce woollen stuffs of all kinds." The Samanids used to present their Turkish slaves, when they had reached the rank of withāk-bāshi with Gandjī clothing, so presumably it was no cheap material. Қabān, near Urūdbād, according to the Hudūd "had much cotton of good quality."

SHIRVAN PROVINCE

In Shirvan province, the most important city was Bāb al-Abwāb (Derbent). It had been held at various times by both Romans and Sasanians, though the latter held it previous to the Muslim conquest. Iṣṭakhrī said: "Linen (kattān) cloth is found there. In all Arrān, Armenia, and Azerbaijan there is no linen except here." Ibn Ḥawkal noted "linen garments such as (the kind which are called) Abān." The Hudūd too, mentions linen and saffron like the others. Yākūt wrote of "business" (shughl) in linen there, and Abu 'l-Fīdā', quoted Ibn Ḥawkal as saying that all the linen garments in Dījurdān, Daiyal, and Taβaristān are imported through Derbent. Perhaps these came from Byzantium, though Usāma ibn Munkīdth told how his father sent Egyptian apparel (kiswa al-Mīšr) to the Armenian lords in Lesser Armenia in exchange for the famous Armenian falcons. This Egyptian apparel was most likely linen, though it might have been wool.

Khursān, which, according to the Hudūd lay between Derbent and Shirvan, "produced woollen stuffs, and all the different kinds of carpets with a relief pattern (maḥfūrī) which are found in the world are from Shirvan, Khursān, and Derbent."

This part of the Armenian group was famous for another dye, the madder dye, which is mentioned by all the geographers with more or less detail. Iṣṭakhrī said: "From Bardhā'a is brought this madder (fuwwa), which is imported into the land of India and all places." Ibn Ḥawkal repeated:

In the districts of Wartḥān, Bardhā'a, and Bāb al-Abwāb, and the island which is in the middle of the Caspian Sea (Buḥaira al-Khāzar) there is madder which is carried by the Caspian Sea to Dījurdān and taken to the land of India by land. This madder is found in all the land of Arrān from the extremities of Bāb al-Abwāb to Tīflis, and from near Nahr al-Īs (the Volga) to the districts of Dījurdān.

---

79 *Hudūd al-Ālam*, p. 143.
86 *Hudūd al-Ālam*, p. 145.
87 Iṣṭakhrī, *op. cit.*, p. 190.
He also noted 89 "an island opposite the (river) Kurr known as Djazira al-Bāb . . . madder (fuwwa) is brought from it." The Hudūd 90 says that this island of Djazira al-Bāb "produces madder exported to all the world and used by dyers."

GILAN

Another tiny province of this region was Gilan. The Hudūd gives a general list of its products: "The province of Gilan is prosperous, favored by nature, and wealthy. . . . From Gilan come brooms, reed mats (ḫaṣīr), prayer-mats (muṣalla-namāz), and mahā-fish which are exported everywhere." 91 Kazwīnī 92 related: "They rear the silk-worm (dūd al-ibrīṣm). The work of the men is riziculture, and the work of the women, the raising of the silk worm (dūd al-ḵazz). . . . Their women weave waist cloths (or shirts, miʿzar 93) and strange fine women's belts (mīshaddāt) which are taken to all countries." Marco Polo 94 said that it is from the country of the Sea of Ghelān that the silk called Ghelān is brought.

Resht was the capital of the province, but there is no information as to any manufactures there other than a verse of Minūłḫihrī 95 who said: "From the tulips and violets, all the mountain-tops and desert-plains have become red and white like the brocades of Resht." Barthold thought that industry in this region belonged to a period later than the tenth century, and there is a remarkable paucity of evidence from literary sources of this time, but this must not be too severely stressed.

Of Lāḥīḍjī, Yākūṭ remarked: "From it is imported the Lāḥīḍjī ibrīṣm-silk, but it is not of the first rank." 96 Abu 'l-Fīḍā 97 noted that "Lāḥīḍjān exports a celebrated silk (ḥarīr) to other countries."

For Dailamān province, the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam 98 gives the following list: "This province produces silk textiles (djāma-yi-ibrīṣhum), of one color, or of (several) colors (yak-rang va bā rang), e.g., mubram (twisted silk), silk (ḥarīr), and the like as well as great quantities of linen cloths." As described by Maḵḍīsī: "This is the province of khazz-silk and wool. There are many skilled craftsmen in it." 99 The Hudūd al-ʿĀlam intends a larger district than Dailam proper, including Ṭabaristān, Gilan, Dūrdjān, and Kümis. After the conquest, Mustawfī 100 gave the following list of products of the country: "Ṭūlim, cotton, Resht, cotton and silk, Fūmin, cotton and silk."

---

89 Ibid., p. 277.
91 Tīhrānī (Teheran, 1352 ii. [1933 a.d.]), p. 8. 293
92 Kazwīnī, op. cit., II, 237.
93 Dozy, Dictionnaire . . . des vêteements, and idem, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes, gives the meanings also of "drawers" and "a piece of stuff rolled round the turban," etc.
94 Yule, op. cit., I, 54.
95 Kazimirsky, op. cit., p. 285. I understand Resht in Gilan, not the district in Khurāsan.
96 Yākūṭ, op. cit., IV, 344.
98 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 133.
MÜKÂN

Concerning Mükân province, north of Gilan, the Hudūd 101 says: “From Mükân come madder (rūdhīna), sacks (djuvāl), and palas rugs in great numbers.” The capital, Barzand, was, according to Ibn Ḥawkal, a large town, and Maḏdisī mentioned its bazaars, but again the Hudūd alone is able to tell us that it produced “kaṭifa-textiles.” 102 It had fallen to ruin and was rebuilt by Afšīn, a page of Muṭaṣīm, in the first half of the third century of the Hijra. These kaṭīfa (velvet) cloths were probably introduced there after that date. In Mustawfī’s time it was again an unimportant village. The Hudūd 103 further remarks that Wartān (Vartān) exports “zīlū, and prayer-carpets (muṣallā-namāz).”

THE ĪL-KHĀNĪD PERIOD

Mustawfī 104 does little more than list the names of textile centers. In addition to those already cited above, there are the following:

Khiyāv. Its people for the most part are boot-makers and cloth-workers. Ḋabala produces excellent silk. Darāvard, Ḍal’a, Kahrān, Kīlān, Faślūn, Miyaṇidj, Marāqha, Dih Khwārkan, Marand, Dīzmār, Karkar, Nakhichevan, Urdūbād, Āzad, Ardjīsh, all produce cotton.

AN APPENDIX ON CAUCASIA

Before proceeding to examine the products of the other Caspian provinces, it might be profitable to add a few notes on Caucasia.

Maṣ‘ūdī gave a short but detailed note on a Caucasian people and their manufactures:

In the neighbourhood of the kingdom of the Allāns, between the Caucasus and the Sea of Rūm (the Black Sea) are the Katchaks (Kashak) . . . . the women wear white garments, Rūmī brocade, and siklātūn-scarlet, and various kinds of gold-embroidered brocade. In their country there are various kinds of cloth made of linen of a kind called Ṭalā, finer than Dabīḵī, and more lasting in wear. A garment of this stuff fetches as much as ten dinars. They are carried to the adjoining Islamic countries. These cloths are brought from the near-by countries, but cannot be compared with those of the Katchaks. 105

Some information is also available about Georgia (Gurjljistān), which country only became Muslim after the invasions of Tamerlane. Marco Polo commented that “silk is produced in great abundance. They also weave cloths of gold and all kinds of very fine silk stuffs.” 106

The capital was Tiflis of which Marco Polo said:

Round it are many towns and cities dependent on it. It is inhabited by Christians, that is by Armenians and Georgians; there are also some Saracens and Jews, but not many. Cloths of silk and

101 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 142.
102 Ṭabarī, op. cit., II, I, 366 spoke of trousers of khaza-silk called kaṭīfa, and (op. cit., I, III, 1485) he mentioned a kaṭīfa of brocade (dībdīj). Thus, all we can understand by this term is some rich embroidered stuff, sometimes a velvet.
103 Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 142.
104 See the index to Mustawfī Ḋazwini, op. cit.
105 Maṣ‘ūdī, op. cit., II, 45-46.
106 Yule, op. cit., I, 52.
many other kinds are manufactured there. The people live by their handicraft and are subject to the Great King of the Tartars.\(^{107}\)

Of \(\text{Кars near Tiflis, \text{Y}äkût}\) said: “Ibrîsm-silk is imported from it. One of its inhabitants told me this.” Of \(\text{Dumânis, he also added: “Ibrîsm-silk is imported from it.”}\(^{109}\) Mustawfi described the kirîmiz:

It is a worm resembling the silk-worm. It weaves (a cocoon) round itself and dies within it, but some fly out and lay eggs, and from the material they have woven, the grains of kirîmiz are made. They are plentiful in Georgia (Gurđjistân).\(^{110}\)

It might be added that the Georgians bought off the Mongols in \(618\) H. (1221 A.D.) before Gandja with cloth (thiyâb) and money.\(^{111}\)

\* \* \*

The arrangement of this chapter has been particularly difficult, because of the constantly changing frontiers, the vague way in which the geographers group these cities, and the confusion which existed about the remoter parts of this region.

\(^{108}\) Yäkût, op. cit., IV, 57.  
\(^{111}\) Ibn al-\text{A}thîr, Chronicon, ed. C. J. Tomberg (Leiden, 1851–76), XII, 351.

Supplementary notes:
Raphael de Mars, in his Estat de la Perse en 1660, ed. C. Schefer (Paris, 1890), made the following statement with reference to Gilan: “Outre ce trafic, il y a des soyes abrichon (ibrîsm) qui se produisent et se recueillent dans le pays de Guilan . . . . Les Arméniens d’ordinaire font ce trafic et les transportent par la Turquie à Smyrne et à Alep.” He claimed that Shah Abbas started the Armenians in this trade.

NOTES

THE SYMBOLISM OF ARCHERY

Homage to you, bearers of arrows, and to you bowmen, homage!
Homage to you, fletchers, and to you, makers of bows!

—TS. IV.5.3.2 and 4.2

The symbolic content of an art is originally bound up with its practical function, but is not necessarily lost when under changed conditions the art is no longer practiced of necessity but as a game or sport; and even when such a sport has been completely secularized and has become for the profane a mere recreation or amusement it is still possible for whoever possesses the requisite knowledge of traditional symbolism to complete this physical participation in the sport, or enjoyment of it as a spectacle, by an understanding of its forgotten significance, and so restore, for himself at least, the "polar balance of physical and metaphysical" that is characteristic of all traditional cultures.¹

The position of archery in Turkey, long after the introduction of firearms had robbed the bow and arrow of their military value, provides us an excellent example of the ritual values that may still inhere in what to a modern observer might appear to be a "mere sport." Here archery had become already in the fifteenth century a "sport" under royal patronage, the sultans themselves competing with others in the "field" meidan). In the sixteenth century, at the circumcision festivals of the sons of Muhammad II, competing archers shot their arrows through iron plates and metal mirrors, or shot at valuable prizes set up on high posts: the symbolisms involved are evidently those of "penetration," and that of the attainment of solar goods not within the archer's direct reach; we may assume that, as in India, the "doctrine" implied an identification of the archer himself with the arrow that reached its mark.

Mahmud II in the first quarter of the nineteenth century was one of the greatest patrons of the archers' gilds, and it was for him and "in order to revive the Tradition" (ihjä' al sunna) —that is to say, in renewed "imitation of the Way of Muhammad," the standard of human conduct—that Mustafa Kâni compiled his great treatise on archery, the Telkâhis Resâil er-Rümat,² in which the contents of a long series of older works on the subject is resumed and a detailed account is given of the whole art of manufacturing and using the bow and arrow.

Kâni began by establishing the canonical justification and legitimate transmission of the archer's art. He cited forty Hadith, or traditional sayings of Muhammad, the first of these

¹ First article, in its original form, was to have appeared in the special number of Études traditionelles, to be devoted to "Sport," in the year 1940. Of this journal nothing has been heard since the occupation of Paris.

² First printed at Constantinople in 1847 a.d. A detailed account of this work and of Turkish archery has been published by Joachim Hein ("Bogenhandwerk und Bogensport bei den Osmanen," Der Islam, XIV [1925], 289-360, and XV [1926], 1-78); my account is based on Hein's work.
referring to the Koran (VIII, 60): “Prepare against them whatsoever thou canst of force,”
where he takes “force” to mean “archers”; another Hadith attributes to Muhammad the
saying that “there are three whom Allah leads into Paradise by means of one and the same
arrow, viz. its maker, the archer, and he who retrieves and returns it,” the commentator
understanding that the reference is to the use of the bow and arrow in the Holy War; other
Hadith glorify the space between the two targets as a “Paradise.”³ Kânî went on to “derive”
the bow and arrow from those that were given by the angel Gabriel to Adam, who had prayed to
God for assistance against the birds that devoured his crops; in coming to his assistance, Gabriel said to Adam: “This bow is the power of God; this string is his majesty; these arrows
the wrath and punishment of God inflicted upon his enemies.” From Adam the tradition was
handed on through the “chain” of Prophets (it was to Abraham that the compound bow was revealed) up to Muhammad, whose follower Sa’d b. Abî Waqqâs, “the Paladin of Islam” (fâris al-islâm) was the first to shoot against the
enemies of Allah under the new dispensation and is accordingly the “Pir” or patron saint of
the Turkish archers’ gild, in which the initiatory transmission has never (unless, perhaps, quite
recently) been interrupted.⁵

At the head of the archers’ gild is the “sheikh of the field” (sheikh-il-meldân). The
gild itself is a definitely secret society, into which there is admission only by qualification
and initiation. Qualification is chiefly a matter of training under a master (usta), whose
acceptance of a pupil, or rather disciple, is accompanied by a rite in which prayers are said on
behalf of the souls of the Pir Sa’d b. Abî Waqqâs, the archer imams of all generations and
all believing archers. The master hands the pupil a bow, with the words: “In accordance
with the behest of Allah and the Way (sunna) of his chosen messenger . . .” The disciple
receives the bow, kisses its grip, and strings it. This prescribed procedure, preparatory to any
practical instruction, is analogous to the rites by which a disciple is accepted as such by any
dervish order. The actual training is long and arduous; the pupil’s purpose is to excel, and to
this end he must literally devote himself.

When the disciple has passed through the whole course of instruction and is proficient,
there follows the formal acceptance of the candidate by the sheikh. The candidate must
show that he can hit the mark and that he can shoot to a distance of not less than nine hundred

³ In either direction the “Path” leading directly from the archer’s place to the (solar) target is obviously an
“equivalent,” in horizontal projection, of the Axis Mundî: and in walking on this Path the archer is therefore
always in a “central” and “paradisiacal” position with respect to the rest of the “Field” as a whole. It will be
further observed that in the alternate use of the two targets there is a shooting in two opposite directions, one
from and one toward the archer’s original stand; the shooting from a stand beside the second target involves
a return of the arrow to its first place, and it is clear that the two motions are those of “ascent” and “descent” and
that the “Path” is a sort of Jacob’s Ladder.

⁴ “Compound bows first appear in Mesopotamia in the dynasty of Accad (ca. twenty-fourth century B.C.),”
Near Eastern Studies, I (1942), 227-29, citing H. Bonnet, Die Waffen der Völker des alten Orient (Leipzig,
1926), pp. 135-45.

⁵ A. N. Poliak, “The Influence of Chingiz-Khân’s Yâsâ Upon the General Organization of the Mamlûk
State,” Bull. School Oriental Studies, X (1942), 872, n. 5, refers to Arabian lanceors who formed an hereditary
corporation and concealed “the secrets of their professional education” from the lay public, pointing out that
the art of these rammâhs “was a conservative one, claiming descent from Sasanian and early Islamic warriors”;
these data are derived from a work cited as Kitâb fi ‘Ilm al-Furûsiya, MS, Aleppo (Aßmadiya).
strides: he brings forward witnesses to his mastery. When the sheik is satisfied the disciple kneels before him and takes up a bow that is lying near him, strings it, and fits an arrow to a string, and having done this three times he replaces it, all with extreme formality and in accordance with fixed rules. The sheik then instructs the master of ceremonies to take the disciple to his master, from whom he will receive the “grip” (kaža). He kneels before the master and kisses his hand: the master takes him by the right hand in token of a mutual covenant patterned on that of the Koran (XLVIII, 10-18), and whispers the “secret” in his ear. The candidate is now a member of the archers’ gild and a link in the “chain” that reaches back to Adam. Henceforth he will never use the bow unless he is in a condition of ritual purity; before and after using the bow he will always kiss its grip.\(^5a\) He may now take part freely in the formal contests, and in case he becomes a great master of long distance shooting he may establish a record which will be marked with a stone.

The reception of the “grip” is the outward sign of the disciple’s initiation. He has, of course, long been accustomed to the bow, but what is meant by the “grip” is more than a mere handling of the bow: the grip itself implies the “secret.” The actual grip, in the case of the compound bow used by the Turks and most Orientals, is the middle part of the bow, which connects its two other parts, upper and lower. It is by this middle piece that the bow is made one. It is only when one tries to understand this that the metaphysical significance of the bow, which Gabriel had described as the “power” of God, appears: the grip is the union of Allah with Muhammad. But to say this is to formulate the “secret” only in its barest form: a fuller explanation, based on the teachings of Ibn al-‘Arabī is communicated to the pupil. Here it is only indicated that what links the Deity above to the Prophet below is the Kutb as Axis Mundi, and that this is a form of the spirit (al-Rūḥ).

II

The Indian literature contains an almost embarrassing wealth of matter in which the symbolic values of archery are conspicuous. RV.VI.75.4 as understood by Sāyāpa says that when the bow tips consort (that is, when the bow is bent), they bear then the child (the arrow) as a mother bears a son, and when with common understanding they start apart (releasing the arrow), then they smite the foe; and it is evident that the arrow is assimilated to Agni, the child of Sky and Earth, whose birth coincides with the separation of his parents.\(^6\)

In BD.I.113, where all the instruments of the sacrifice are regarded as properties of Agni, the two ends of the bow are again correlated with Sky and Earth and other sexually contrasted pairs, such as the pestle and mortar; and we are reminded not only of the Islamic interpretation cited above, but also of Heraclitus (Fr. LVI): “The harmony of the ordered-world is

\(^{5a}\) Cf. “Anu shouted aloud and spake in the assembly, kissing the bow,” in Babylonian Legends of Creation (London, 1931), p. 67, sixth tablet, 13. 64, 65.

\(^{6}\) Agni Anikavat, being its point (anika), is the essential part of the divine arrow that does not swerve and with which the gods struck the dragon in the beginning; and so virtually the whole of the arrow, since “where the point goes, there the arrow goes” (ŚB.II.3.10, II. 5.3.3, II.5.4.3.8; AR.I.25, etc.). It comes to the same thing that he is also the point of the bolt (vajra) with which the dragon was smitten (ŚB.III.4.4.14); for it is from the point of this bolt as their eiconym that arrows are “derived” (TS.VI.1.5.5; ŚB.I.2.4.1); and vajra meaning also “adamant”; we often find that a solar hero’s arrows are described as “tipped with adamant.” From the concept of love (Kāma) as a fire, and Agni having “five missiles,” comes the iconography of Kāmadeva, the god of love, as an archer.
one of contrary tensions, like that of the harp or bow.”7 The arrow being the offspring of the bow, the identification of the bow ends with the celestial and terrestrial worlds is clearly indicated in AV.I.2 and 3, where the “father” of the arrow is referred to as Parjanya, Mitra, Varuna, etc., and its “mother is the Earth (prthivī)”; this is even literally true in the sense that the reed of which the arrow is made is produced by the earth fertilized by the rains from above and affords a good illustration of the exegetical principle that the allegorical meaning is contained in the literal. In these two hymns the bowstring and the arrow are employed with spells to cure diarrhoea and strangury; the bowstring because it constricts, the arrow because it is let fly: “As the arrow flew off, let loose from the bow, so be thy urine released” (yath-esukā parāpatala avasrśādhi dhanvanah, evā te mūtram mucyatām); here the relation of the flight of the arrow is to a physical release, but it will presently be seen how this flight, as of birds, is an image equally of the delivery of the spirit from the body.

In AV.I.1 the archer is the Lord of the Voice (Vācaspati) with the divine mind; recalling RV.VI.75.3, where “she is fain to speak” and, drawn to the ear, “whispers like a woman,” it is clear that the bowstring corresponds to the voice (vāc) as organ of expression, and the arrow to audible concept expressed. So in AV.V.18.8 the Brahmans, the human representatives of the Lord of the Voice, are said to have sharp arrows that are not sped in vain, the tongue being their bowstring and their terrible words their arrows; while in BU.III.8.2, pene-

7 Cf. Plato, Symposium 187 A, and Republic 439 B. That for any efficacy there must be a co-operation of contrasted forces is a basic principle of Indian and all traditional philosophy.

trating questions are described as “fie-piercing arrows.” This conception underlies the use of Ish (to “shoot”), compare iśu, iṣukā (“arrow”) and our own vernacular “shoot” meaning “speak out”; in AB.II.5, “impelled by the Mind, the Voice speaks” (manasā va iṣitā vag vadati); the voice indeed acts, but it is the mind that activates (JUB.I.33.4).

Thus an “arrow” may be either literally a winged shaft or metaphorically a “winged word”: Skr. patatrin, “winged,” denoting either “bird” or “arrow” covers both values; for the swift and unhindered flight of thought is often compared to that of birds and the symbolism of birds and wings is closely connected with that of arrows. The language of archery can, indeed, be applied to all problems of thought and conduct. Thus sādh, whence sādhu as “holy man” and as an exclamation of approval, is to “go straight to the mark”; sādhu may qualify either the archer (RV.I.70.6) or the arrow (RV.II.24.8), and “it is not for the King to do anything or everything, but only what is straight” (sādhu, ŚB.V.4.4.5); that is to say, he may no more speak at random than shoot at random. Rju-ga, “that which goes straight,” is an “arrow”; and “as the fletcher straightens (ujuṁ karoti) the shaft, so the wise man rectifies his will” (Dh.33, cf. 86, 145 and M.II.105); in the Mahājanaka Jātaka (J.VI.66) a fletcher at work straightening (ujuṁ karoti) an arrow is looking along it with one eye closed, and from this the moral is drawn of single vision.

Since the bow is the royal weapon par excellence and such great stress is laid upon the king’s rectitude it will not be irrelevant to point out that the Sanskrit and Pali words ṭju and uju, cited above and meaning “straight,” pertain to a common root that underlies “right,” “rectify,” “regal” (Lat. regere and rex and Skr. rājā). From the traditional point of view, a king is not an “absolute” ruler, but the administrator of a transcendental law, to which human laws are
conformed. More than once Śankara makes the case of the fletcher profoundly absorbed in his task, an exemplum of contemplative concentration (on BU.III.9.28.7 and on Bādarāyana, Śārīraka Mimāṃsā Śūtra VII.11, p. 800 Bib.Ind. ed.); and as St. Bonaventura remarked: “Ecce, quomodo illuminatione artis mechanicae via est ad illuminationem sacrae Scripturae, et nihil est in ea, quod non praedictum veram sapientiam (De red. artium ad theologiam), 14.

Aparādh, the opposite of sādh, is to “miss the mark,” hence “go astray,” “deviate,” “fail,” “sin”; the two values can hardly be distinguished in TS.VI.5.5.2, where Indra, having loosed an arrow at Vṛtra, thinks “I have missed the mark” (aparādhām); compare II.5.5.6, where one who misses his mark (avāvidhyā) grows the more evil (pāpiyān), while he who does not fail of it is as he should be. The phrase is common, too, in Plato, where as in India and Persia it pertains to the metaphor of stalking or tracking (ἰχνεύει), the origin of which must be referred to a hunting culture, of which the idiom survives in our own expression to “hit (or miss) the mark,” frapper le but. From vyadh (to “pierce”) derive vedha and vedhin (“archer”) and probably vedhas (“wise” in the sense of “penetrating”). This last word some derive from vid (to “know” or “find”), but there are forms common to vyadh and vid, notably the imperative viddhi, which can mean either or both “know” and “penetrate”; the ambiguity is conspicuous in JUB.IV.18.6, Munḍ. Up. II.2.2 (discussed below) and BG.VII.6. A Brahman’s verbal arrows “pierce” his detractors (AV.V.18.15). Compari-

son of an expert monk to an “unfailing shot” (akkhaṇa-vedhin) is very common in the Pali Buddhist literature, often in combination with other terms such as durepatī (“far-shooting”), Sadda-vedhin (“shooting at a sound”) and vāla-vedhin (“hair-splitting”) (A.I.284 II.170, IV.423, 494; M.I.82, etc.). Mil.418 describes the four “limbs” of an archer that a true monk should possess:

Just, O king, as the archer, when discharging his arrows, plants both his feet firmly on the ground, keeps his knees straight, hangs his quiver against the narrow part of his waist, keeps his whole body steady, sets up his bow with both hands,10 clenches his fists, leaving no opening between the fingers, stretches out his neck, shuts his mouth and eye, takes aim (nimittam ujjuh karoti), and smiles at the thought “I shall pierce”, just so, 9

The Pali Text Society’s Pali dictionary explanations of akkaṇa are admittedly unsatisfactory. The real equivalent is Skr. ákṣaṇa (“target”), as in JUB.I.60.7.8 and CU.I.2.7.8. Cf. ákha in TS.VI.4.11.3, Keith’s note, and Pāṇini III.3.125, vartt.1.

With sadda-vedhin (śabdā-) cf. Mbk. (Poona, 1933), I.123.12-18 where Ekalavya, the Naiśādha, who has acquired his skill (laghutva) in archery (jīvastra) by making a clay image of Drona and practicing before it as his master, shoots seven arrows into the mouth of a dog whom he hears barking, but does not see.

10Dve hatte sandhiḥṭham āropeti (misunderstood by Rhys Davids) can only mean “setting up the bow,” i.e., putting its two parts together, sandhiḥṭham being the junction and “grip”; cf. J.III.274 and IV.258 dhanum adevījaḥ katvāna, lit. “making the bow to be not-twofold,” Mkb.VII.19 dhanuḥ sandhāya, and Mil.352 cāpāropana, “breaking down and setting up the bow” (as one “breaks down” a gun). Āropeti is to “make fit together,” and can also be used of stringing the bow, as in J.IV.129 dhanuḥhi, . . . jīyam āropetvā; while sandahati (saṁdhā) to “join” can also be used of setting the arrow to the string, as in J.IV.258 usum sandhāya.

A glossary of archer’s terms, Skr. and Pali, would require a separate article, and I have mentioned only some that have a bearing on the significance of archery.

11 Cf. J.IV.258: “Thinking, ‘I shall pierce him, and when he is weakened, seize him.’” Nimittam ujjuh karoti could also be rendered “makes a right resolve.”
O king, should the Yogin (monk) . . . . thinking, “With the shaft of gnosis I shall pierce through every defect . . . .” And again, O king, just as an archer has an arrow-straightener for straightening out bent and crooked and uneven arrows . . . . And again, O king, just as an archer practices 12 at a target . . . . early and late . . . .

Just as an archer practices early and late,
And by never neglecting his practice earns his wages,
So too the Sons of the Buddha exercise the body,
And never neglecting that exercise, become adept (arhat).

The bow is the royal weapon par excellence; skill in archery is for the king, what the splendid of divinity is for the priest (ŚB.XIII.1.1.1–2). It is in their capacity as Kṣatriyas that Rāma and the Bodhisattva can perform their feats of archery. Like the king’s own arms, the two “arms” of the bow are assimilated to Mitrā-varuṇau, mixta persona of sacerdotium and regnum; in the coronation rite the priest hands over the bow to the king, calling it “Indra’s dragon-slayer,” for the king is the earthly representative of Indra, both as warrior and as sacrificer, and has dragons of his own to be overcome; he gives him also three arrows, with

reference to the terrestrial, aerial, and celestial worlds (ŚB.V.3.5.27 f., V.4.3.7).

The bow as symbol of power corresponds to the conception of the power of God, bestowed by Gabriel on Adam, for his protection, as cited above from Turkish sources. It is from this point of view, that of dominion, that we can best understand the widely disseminated rites of the shooting of arrows to the Four Quarters; cf. RV.VI.75.2: “With the bow let us conquer the regions.” In the Kurudhamma Jātaka (J.II.372) we learn that kings at a triennial festival “used to deck themselves out in great magnificence, and dress up like Gods . . . . standing in the presence of the Yakkha Cittarāja, they would shoot to the four points of the compass arrows painted with flowers.” In Egypt the shooting of arrows toward the four quarters was a part of the Pharaonic enthronement rite.13

12 Upāsati (Skr. upās) is ordinarily to “sit near,” “sit under,” “wait upon,” “honor,” “worship”; Mīl.352 speaks of a hall, upāsana-sūlā (= saṃthāgāra, S.V.453), in which a skilled archer teaches his disciples (antevāsika, resident pupils, cf. A.IV.423). In other words, the practice of archery is literally a “devotion.” In J.V.127 f. Jotipāla is sent to a Master in Takkasūlā to learn the whole art (sippam). A fee of “a thousand” is paid. When the boy has become an expert, the master gives him a sword, and “a bow of ram’s-horn and a quiver, both of them deftly joined together” (sandhīvyutta-), and his corselet and turban (thus establishing the pupil as a master in due succession).

“Early and late” may mean by day and night. In Mbh. (Poona) I.125.7, Arjuna resolves to practice by ahyāya, of which the primary sense is “shooting at” (cf. “intend,” “intention,” self-direction) and the derived meaning “exercise,” “practice,” or “study” of any kind.

13 A. Moret, Du caractère religieux de la royauté pharaonique (Paris, 1902), pp. 105–6 (p. 106, n. 3: “Il semble que cette cérémonie ait pour but de définir le pouvoir qu’a Pharaon-Horus de lancer, comme le soleil, ses rayons dans les quatre parties du monde”). In the relief from Karnak (E. Lepsius, Denkmäler [Leipsig, 1850–59], III, Pl. 36b) Thothmes III is represented thus shooting, guided by Horus and Seth; in the late relief of the twenty-fifth dynasty (E. Prisse d’Avennes, Monuments égyptiens [Paris, 1847], Pl. XXXIII; H. Schäfer, Ägyptischer und heutiger Kunst und Weltgebäude der alten Ägypter [Berlin, 1928], Abb.54, and idem, “König Amenophis II als Meister-Schütz,” Or. Literat. Zeitschr., [1929], col.240–43) the queen is shooting at circular loaves, which are evidently symbols of the Four Quarters; the inscription states that she receives the bows of the North and South and that she shoots toward the Four Quarters; this is in the sed rite which, later in a reign, repeats the rites of enthronement and deification, apparently renewing the king’s royal power. This rite is accompanied by, or may perhaps replace another in which the four birds are released to fly to the Four Quarters; bird and arrow are equivalent symbols.

In ŚB.I.2.4.15 f. and TB.III.2.9.5 f., where the priest brandishes the wooden sword four times, however, this is done to repel the Asuras from the Three Worlds and “whatever Fourth World there may or may not be be-
China, at the birth of a royal heir, the master of the archers "with a bow of mulberry wood and six arrows of the wild Rubus shoots toward Heaven, Earth, and the Four Quarters" (Li Chi X.2.17);14 the same was done in Japan.15

The archetypal rite of the type thus implies dominion is evidently solar; that the king releases four separate arrows reflects a supernatural archery in which the Four Quarters are penetrated and virtually grasped by the disc-

yond these three." But in the Hungarian coronation rite the sword is brandished, as the arrows are shot, toward the Four Quarters of this world.

SB.V.1.5.13 f. and V.3.5.29,30 describe the ritual use of seventeen arrows and that of three arrows. The seventeen arrows correspond to the "seventeenfold Prajāpatī," the seventeenth marking the place for the goal post about which the chariots are to turn in the ritual race (we know from other sources that this post represents the sun); and it is explicit that the shooting symbolizes and implies "the rule of one over many." The three arrows, one that penetrates, one that wounds, and one that misses, correspond to the Three Worlds.

14 This was regarded by B. Karlgren ("Some Fecundity Symbols in Ancient China," Bull. Mus. Far. Eastern Antiquities, II [Stockholm, 1930], 51) as a fecundity ritual performed for the sake of male children, represented by the arrows: C. G. Seligman ("Bow and Arrow Symbolism," Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua, IX [1934], 35) criticizing Karlgren, rightly pointed out that the primary significance of the rite is that of "a supreme assertion of power." Neither author, however, seems to realize that the erotic significance of shooting (still quite familiar) and that of shooting as a symbol of dominion are by no means mutually exclusive meanings. Thus, the sun's rays, which he shoots forth (cf. Phoebus Apollo) are at the same time dominant and progenitive (cf. T.S.VII.1.1, SB.VIII.7.1.16–17, and A. K. Coomaraswamy, "The Sun-Kiss," Journ. Amer. Oriental Soc., LX [1940], 50, n. 13, 14). In the same way Skr. srj, to "let fly," can apply either to the release of an arrow or to the act of procreation, and it is in fact thus that Prajāpatī "projects" (srjāti) his offspring, thought of as "rays."


charge of a single shaft. This feat, known as the "Penetration of the Sphere" (cakka-viddham, where cakka implies the "round of the world") is described in the Sarabhanga Jātaka (J.V.125 f), where it is attributed to the Bodhisatta Jotipāla, the "Keeper of the Light" and an "unfalling shot" (akkhana-vedhin). Jotipāla is the king's Brahman minister's son, and although the bow, as we have seen, is typically the weapon of the Kṣatriya, it is quite in order that it should be wielded by a Brahman, human representative of the brahma (sacerdotium) in divinis, "who is both the sacerdotium and the regnum" (SB.X.4.1.9), and like any avatāra, "both priest and king." Jotipāla is required by the king to compete with the royal archers, some of whom are likewise "unfalling shots," able to split a hair or a falling arrow. Jotipāla appeared in disguise, hiding his bow, coat of mail, and turban under an outer garment; he had a pavilion erected, and standing within it, removed his outer garment, assumed the regalia, and strung his bow; and so, fully armed, and holding an arrow "tipped with adamant" (vajiragga— the significance of this has already been pointed out), "he threw open the screen (sānīṃ viva-rītvā) and came forth (nīkhamitvā) like a prince of serpents (nāga-kumāro) bursting from the earth. He drew a circle in the middle of the four-cornered royal courtyard (which here represents the world), and shooting thence, de-

16 The printed text has maṇḍapa, "pavilion," but the v.l. maṇḍala is to be preferred. That the archer stands within a circle and shoots thence to the four corners of a square field has a meaning related to that of a dome on a square structure, heaven and earth being typically "circular" and square; it is true that the earth can also be regarded as a circle, and the domed structure may be circular also in plan, still the earth is square in the sense that there are four "Quarters." The archer's position relative to the four targets is quintessential, and virtually "elevated"; the "field" corresponds to all that is "under the Sun," the ruler of all he surveys.
fended himself against innumerable arrows shot at him by archers stationed in the four corners; he then offered to wound all these archers with a single arrow, which challenge they dared not accept. Then having set up four banana trunks in the four corners of the courtyard, the Bodhisattva “fastening a thin scarlet thread (ratta-suttakam) to the feathered end of the arrow, aimed at and struck one of the trees; the arrow penetrated it, and then the second, third, and fourth in succession and finally the first again, which had already been pierced, and so returned to his hand, while the trees stood encircled by the thread.”

This is, clearly, an exposition of the doctrine of the “thread spirit” (sūtrātman), in accordance with which the sun, as point of attachment, connects these worlds to himself by means of the Four Quarters, with the thread of the spirit, like gems upon a thread. The arrow is the equivalent of the “needle,” and one might say that in the case described above the quarters are “sewn” together and to their common center; the feathered end, or nock of the arrow to which the thread is attached corresponding to the eye of the needle. In ordinary practice an arrow leaves no visible trace of its passage. It may be observed, however, that an arrow with a slender thread attached to it can be shot across an otherwise impassable gulf; by means of this thread a heavier line can be pulled across, and so on until the gulf is spanned by a rope; in this way the symbolism of archery can be combined with that of the “bridge.” The principle is the same in the case of modern life-saving apparatus, in which a line is shot, in this case from a gun, from the shore to a sinking ship, and by means of this line a heavier “life-line” can be drawn across.

The Chinese, moreover, actually employed an arrow with an attached line in fowling, as can be clearly seen on an inlaid bronze of the Chou dynasty now in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore. The Eskimo, too, made use of arrows with demountable heads and an attached cord in hunting sea otter. In the same way in the case of a cast net with attached line, and in the case of the lasso; and likewise in fishing, where the rod corresponds to the bow and the

---

17 The Bodhisatta’s invulnerability corresponds to that of the solar Breath (prāṇa) of JUB.I.60.7-8 and CI.I.2.7-8.

18 This mention of a second penetration of the first target should be noted; without this the circle would have been left “open.” One could not ask for better proof of the metaphysical content of what many would think of as mere story-telling. The serious student will soon learn that all true folk and fairy tale motifs have such a content; and that it would be idle to pretend that the most primitive peoples lacked adequate idioms for the expression of the most abstract ideas, whether in verbal or visual arts. It is our language that would be impoverished if their idioms were forgotten.

19 SB.VI.7.1.17, VIII.7.3.10 (the Sun is the fastening to which the Quarters are linked by a pneumatic thread); BU.III.6.2; BG.VII.7; Iliad VIII.18 f; Plato, Theatetus 153 C, D; Laws 644 E, “One Golden Cord”; Dante, Paradise, I.116 questi la terra in se stringe; W. Blake, “I give you the end of a golden string”; etc.

“At a place in Gilgit there is said to be a golden chain hanging down to earth from the sky. Any persons suspected of wrong-doing or falsehood were taken to the place and forced to hold the chain [as in Plato Laws, 644f] while they swore that they were innocent or that their statements were true. This suggests the Homeric reference (Iliad VIII.18 et seq.), and the Catena Aurea Homerica, which was handed down through the Neo-Platonists to the alchemists of the Middle Ages” (W. Crooke, Folklore, XXV [1914], 397).

20 “Tis the thread that is connected with the needle: the eye of the needle is not suitable for the camel,” i.e., soul-and-body (Rümë, ed. by R. L. Nicholson, Mathnawi, I.3065: cf. I.849, cords of causation; II.1176, rope and well).

eyed fishhook to the arrow of needle. In all these cases the hunter, analogous to the deity, attaches the prey to himself by means of a thread, which he draws in. In this sense Shams-i-Tabriz:

He gave me the end of a thread—a thread full of mischief and guile—"Pull," he said, "that I may pull; and break it not in the pulling" 22

A famous passage in the Mahābhārata (I.123.46 f. in the new Poona edition) describes the testing of Droṇa’s pupils in archery. An artificial eagle (bhāsa) has been prepared by the craftsmen, and set up at the top of a tree to be a mark. Three pupils are asked: "What do you see?" and each answers: "I see yourself, the tree and the eagle." Droṇa exclaims: "Away with you; these three will not be able to hit the mark"; and turning to Arjuna, "the mark is for you to hit." Arjuna stands stretching his bow (vitayma kārmukam), and Droṇa continues: "Do you also see the tree, myself and the bird?" Arjuna replies: "I see only the bird." "And how do you see the bird?" "I see its head, but not its body." Droṇa, delighted, says: "Let fly" (muṇcavasana). Arjuna shoots, cuts off the head and brings it down. Droṇa then gives him the irresistible weapon, "Brahma’s head," which may not be used against any human foe; and there can be little doubt that this implies the communication of an initiatory mantra, and the "secret" of archery. 23 The evident “moral” is one of single-minded concentration.

In public competition 24 Arjuna performs a number of magical feats using appropriate weapons to create and destroy all sorts of appearances, and then from a moving chariot shoots five arrows into the mouth of a moving iron boar, and twenty-one into the opening of a cow’s horn suspended and swinging in the air. 25 In the great competition for the hand of Draupadi 26 her father has made a very stout bow which no one but Arjuna will be able to bend, and has made also "an artificial device suspended in the air and together with it a golden target" (yantram vaihayasam . . . krīṭinām,

22 In R. A. Nicholson, Divān-i-Shams-i-Tabrīz (Cambridge, 1898), Ode 28. "Keep thy end of the thread, that he may keep his end" (Hafiz, I.386.2); "Fish-like in a sea behold me swimming, Till he with his hook my rescue maketh" (W. Leaf, Versions from Hafiz [London, 1898], XII.2). Any full discussion of the Islamic symbols of the spirit would require a separate article. For Eastern parallels also could be cited, e.g., the story of "The Spider’s Thread" in Tales Grotesque and Curious, by R. Akutagawa, trans. by G. Shaw (Tokyo, n.d.), the thread is broken by the climbers’ egotism.

23 In Mbh. I.121.21,22 we are told that Droṇa himself had received from (Paraśu-) Rāma his "weapons, together with the secrets of their use" (astrāni . . . saprayogarahasyāni) and the "Book of the Bow" (dhanurveda).

A Dhanurveda, dealing with the whole art of war and arms "auch über geheime Waffen, Zaubersprüche, Königsweihe und Omina" is attributed to the Rṣi Viśvāmitra; and there are other Dhanurvedas extant in manuscript (M. Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Literatur [Leipzig, 1920], III,532).

MW. cites the word kārmukopaniṣat ("secret of the art of shooting") from the Bālarāmāyaṇa.

24 Mbh. I.125.

25 In the Mahāvarta rite (a winter solstice festival) three arrows are shot by a king or prince, or the best archer available, at a circular skin target suspended between two posts; the archer stands in a moving chariot that is driven round the altar; the arrows are not to pass through, but to remain sticking in the target. That is done to "break down" (avabhīd) the sacrificer’s evil (pāpman), as the target is "broken down" by the arrows (TS.VII.15.10). A skin is often the symbol of darkness (for RV. see H. G. Grassmann, Wörterbuch, zum Rig-Veda [Leipzig, 1873], s. v. tvac, sense 9), and darkness, death, and sin or evil (pāpman) are one and the same thing (Brāhmaṇas, passim). So it is to free the sun from darkness, and by analogy the sacrificer from his own darkness, that the rite is performed.

26 Mbh. I.176-79.
yantrenā sahitam . . . lakṣayāṁ kāñcanam), announcing that "whoever strings this bow and with it and these arrows pass it and pierce the target (atītya lakṣayāṁ yo veddhā) shall have my daughter." When the competing princes are assembled, Draupadi’s brother addresses the assembly:

Hear me, all ye children of the Earth: This is the bow, this the mark and these the arrows; hit the mark with these five arrows, making them pass through the opening in the device (yaustrichidreyāḥ bhyaṭikramya lakṣayāṁ samoppayadhvān bhagamār duṣārdhaḥ).27

Whoever, being of a good family, strong and handsome, performs this difficult feat shall have my sister to wife this day; I tell no lie.

This only Arjuna is able to do; his arrows penetrate the target itself, with such force as to stick in the ground beyond it.

The language itself of all these texts expresses their symbolic significance. The feat itself is essentially Indra’s, of whom Arjuna is a descent, while Draupadi, the prize, is explicitly Šrī (Fortuna, Tyche, Basileia). With hardly any change of wording the narrative could be referred to the winning of a more eminent victory than can be won by concrete weapons alone. This will appear more clearly in the citation from the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, below. In the meantime it may be observed that muñčasva ("fly") is from muc (to "release"), the root in mokṣa and mukti ("spiritual liberation," man’s last "aim"). Kārmuka ("bow") is literally "made of krmuka wood," a tree that ŚB.VI.6.2.11 derives from "the point of Agni’s flame that took root on earth"; thus the bow, like the point of the arrow 28 participates in the nature of fire. The primary meaning of yantra is "barrier"; the suspended perforated yantra through which the arrows are to be shot can hardly be thought of but as a sun symbol, that is, a representation of the Sun door, through which the way leads on to Brahma: "Thereby within. To this sun bird corresponds the "suspended device" of Mbh.

In S. (loc. cit.) the Buddha proceeds to ask the archers whether their performance, "to shoot like that, or to pierce one strand of a hair, a hundred times divided, with another strand is the more difficult?" The answer is obvious. He continues: "That is just what they do, who penetrate the real meaning of the words, ‘This is grief’ (atha ko . . . patijijhanti ye IDAM DUKKhAM ti yathabhūtam patijijhanti).

[With atipātente above, cf. M.I.8.2 tiryāṁ tāla-chidda atipātente "pierces an unbragious palm"; but in J.V.130.1.1, pātesi is "knocks down." The more usual word for "piercing" is vijjhati, as in the expression vāvedhī, "splitting a hair." It may be remarked here that in J.V.130 kot(h)kalam parikhipunā viya is misunderstood by the translator (H. T. Francis); the Bodhisatta knocks down (pātesi) his opponents’ 120,000 arrows and "throws round himself a sort of house" of which the walls are the fallen arrows, neatly stacked; it is from within this "arrow-enceinte" (sara-gabbha) that he afterwards rises into the air "without damaging the ‘house’"].

27 In S.V. 453 the Buddha finds some Lichavi youths exercising in a gymnasia (santhāgāre upāsanaṁ karone) shooting “from afar through a very small ‘keyhole’” (durato va sukhumena tāla-chiggalena) and splitting an arrow, flight after flight without missing (asanan atipatente ponkhaṁu poṁkham avirādhitam). Tāla-chiggal (= tāla-chidha) is here evidently not an actual keyhole but the equivalent of the yantra-chidra of Mbh., an aperture that may very well have been called in archer’s slang a “keyhole,” just as we speak of any strait gate as a "needle's eye"; in this sense one might have rendered yantra-chidra in Mbh. by "keyhole." The term is, furthermore, most appropriate inasmuch as the sun door, passing which one is altogether liberated (atimucya), is a "hole in the sky" (dīvaṁ chidra, JUB.I.3.5; chidra ivādiyo dṛṣyaṁ, AA. III.2.4), while the arrow equated with the Atman or with Oṁ (Muṇḍaka U. II.2.4, MU.VI.24) could well have been thought of as the pass "key." In the same connection it may be observed that in traditional art actual keyholes are commonly ornamented with the device of the sun bird (often the bicephalous Garuḍa or Hanūsa), through which the key must be passed before there can be access to whatever is
men reach the highest place.” 39 That the mark, whatever its form may have been, is “golden” reflects the regular meanings of “gold,” viz., light and immortality; and that it is to be reached through a perforated disk, such as I take the “device” to have been, corresponds to such expressions as “beyond the sky” (uttaram divah 30) or “beyond the sun” (parenā ādit- yam 31), of which the reference is to the “farther half of heaven” (divi parārtha 32), Plato’s ἐπεριφερόντος τόπον, of which no true report has ever been made33 and is nameless,34 like those who reach it. Kha-ga, “arrow,” is also “bird,” and literally, “farer through empty-space”; but kha is also “void,”35 and as such a symbol of Brahma —“Brahma is the Void, the Ancient Void of the pneuma . . . whereby I know what should be known” (kham brahma, kham purāṇāṃ vāyuram . . . vedainā veditavyam 36).

It is, in fact, in the notion of the penetration of a distant and even unseen target that the symbolism of archery culminates in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣat (II.2.1–4). In the first two verses Brahma is described as the unity of contraries, summum bonum, truth immortal: “That is what should be penetrated, penetrate it, my dear” (tad vedhavyan, somya viddhi). The third

39 MU.VI.30. The “path” is that of the sun’s “rays” that pierces through his disk, utevham ekāb sthitas teṣām yo bhūtvā sūrya-mandalam brahma-lokam atikramya in MU., like yantrachidreṇābhāyatikramya in Mbh. cited above; cf. Hermes Trismegistus, Lib. XVI.16.38 evīṃ dhīmavī na dīl tāv ḥūlo. For a more detailed account of the sun door and its form and significance see my “Śvayamātpśa: Janua Coeli,” Zalmoisios, II (1939), 3–51.

30 AV. X.7.3.
31 JUB. 1.6.4.
32 RV. I.164.12; SB.XI.2.3.3, etc.
33 Phaedrus 247C.
34 Nyāśa Upr. 2.
36 BU. V.1.

and fourth verses continue:

Taking as bow the mighty weapon (Om) of the Upaniṣat,
Lay thereunto an arrow sharpened by devotions
(ṣaṇana-niśitam) 37
Draw with a mind of the same nature as That
(tadbhāva-gatae cetasā): The mark (laksyam) is That Imperishable; penetrate it (viddhi), my dear!

37 In RV.VI.75.15 arrows are “sharpened by incantations” (brahmasāṁśita), just as in SB.I.2.4 the wooden ritual sword is sharpened by and held to participate in the nature of the cutting Gale. Upaṇāna has been remarked above (Note 12) as “exercise”; in the present context the “exercise” is contemplative, as in BU.I.4.7 ātmety evopāśita, “Worship Him as Spirit,” or “thy Self.”

38 Viddhi, as noted above, is the common imperative of vyadh or vidh to pierce or penetrate, and vid to know or find. Cf. BG.VII.7 prakṛtīn viddhi me parām, “penetrate (or know) my higher nature,” i.e., the “that-nature” of the Muṇḍaka verse. In the same way JUB.IV.18.6 (Kenb Up.) “tad eva brahma tvānā viddhi ne’dam yad idam upāsate,” “Know (or penetrate) only Brahma, not what men worship here.” The ambivalence recurs in Pali; thus, in Udāna 9, attanā vedi is rendered by Woodward as “of his own self hath pierced (unto the truth)” [“in,” or “with the spirit” would be equally legitimate], the commentary reading: sayam eva ahātā, pativijñātī, “knows or penetrates.” In S. I.4 paṭivijñātī (v.l. vidhītā) is interpreted by ānena paṭivijñā “those who have by gnosis penetrated,” and this can hardly be called with Mrs. Rhys Davids an “exegetical pun,” for we do not call the double entendre in our word “penetrating” a “pun.” The fact is that the “pursuit” of truth is an art of hunting; one tracks it down (merg, igheru), aims at it, hits the mark, and penetrates it. Cf. J.340, 341, pacceka-bodhi-nānām paṭivijñā, “he penetrated the gnosis of a Pacceka Buddha,” and Vis. 288 lahkhaa-paṭivijñāvedhena, li “by penetration of the mark” but here “by penetration of the characteristics” (of a state of contemplation). In KB.XI.5 mānasā prave vidhyet is “with his mind, as it were, let him pierce”; cf. MU. VI.24, where the mind is the arrow point.

An analogous symbolism is employed in Vis. I.284, where sūcī-paṭavijñanam is a “needle’s eye borers” used by the needle maker; the needle stands for recollection (sati = smṛti) and the bore for the prescience (paññā) = prajñā) connected with it.
On is the bow, the Spirit (ātman, Self) the arrow, Brahma the mark:
It is penetrable by the sober man; do thou become of one substance therewith (tanmayo bhavet), like the arrow.

Here the familiar equation, Ātman = Brahman, is made. The penetration is of like by like; the spiritual self represented by the arrow is by no means the empirical ego, but the immanent Deity, self-same self in all beings: "Him one should extract from one's own body, like the arrow from the reed" (KU.VI.17); or, in terms of MU.VI.28, should "release" and "let fly" from the body like an arrow from the bow.

In MU. the phrasing differs slightly but the meanings remain essentially the same: there are obstacles to be pierced before the target can be reached. In MU.VI.24: "The body is the bow, the arrow Om, the mind its point, darkness the mark (laksyam); and piercing (bhivā) the darkness, one reaches that which is not wrapped in darkness, Brahma beyond the darkness, of the hue of the Sun (i.e., 'golden'), that which shines in yonder Sun, in Fire and Lightning." In VI.28 one passes by, or overcomes (ati-kramya) the objects of the senses (sensibilīa, rā aśoṣṭa), and with the bow of steadfastness strung with the way of the wandering monk and with the arrow of freedom-from-self-opinion (anabhimānamayena caivesuṇa) knocks down (nihatya) the janitor of Brahma’s door —whose bow is greed, bowstring anger, and arrow desire—and reaches Brahma.

The penetration of obstacles is a common feat; it has been noted above in Turkish practice, and in J.V.131 Jotipāla pierces a hundred planks bound together as one (ekābaddham phalakasatām vinijjhitvā). In Vis. 674 an archer performs the difficult feat of piercing a hundred planks (phalakasatām-nibbijjanam) at a distance of some fifty yards; the archer is blindfolded and mounted on a moving wheel (cakka-yante atṭhāsi); when it comes round so that he faces the target, the cue (saṇā) is given by the sound of a blow struck on the

43 Three forms of Agni. Brahma is "that in the lighting which flashes forth" (Kena Up. 29).
44 Abhimāna, arrogance, is the ego delusion, the notion "I am" and "I do." To overcome the janitor is to open the way in, and is an equivalent of the "keyhole" symbolism. In JUB.I.5 the sun (disk) is the janitor, and he bars the way to those who expect to enter in by means of their good works; but cannot hinder one who invokes the truth, which is that his deeds are not "his own," but those of the sun himself, one who disclaims the notion "I do," or as in JUB.III.14.9 that he is another than the sun himself; cf. Rūmī, Mathnawī, I.3056-65. The world door is a way in for the wise, and a barrier to the foolish (CU.VIII.6.5; cf. RV.IX.113.8).
45 Saṇā (saṇjā) is also "awareness"; A.II.167 defines four levels of consciousness, of which the first and lowest is renunciation (hāna, repudiation, repentance), the second the taking up of a stand (ṣṭhitī), the third the transcending of dialectic (vitatka), while the highest involves indifference (nibbida) and revulsion (virāga) and
target with a stick; and guided by the sound, he lets fly and pierces all the planks. The archer represents the “Gnosis of the Way” (maggañāna), while the given cue is that of “Adoptive Gnosis” (gotrabhūñāna) and can be regarded as a “reminder” of the end to be reached; the bundle of planks signifies the “trunks or aggregates of greed, ill-will and delusion” (lobhadosa-moha- kkhandhā); the “intention” or “aim” (ārammaṇa) is Nibbāna (Nirvāṇa). 46

is of the nature of penetration (nibbāda = nirvedha). The stand (tiṭṭha) corresponds to the skilled stance of the archer; like the archer with his skill, the monk is a “man of skilled stance” (thāna-ku[salo]) by his conduct (sīla), a “far-shooter” in that in all phenomenal things he recognizes “that is not mine, I am not that, that is not my Self,” one who “hits the mark” in that he understands the meaning of “grief” (dukkham) as it really is, and the “cleaver of a great mass” in that he pierces the trunk of ignorance avijjā-khandhām (A.II.171; cf. II.202). M.I.82 compares the perfected disciple to an instructed, practiced, devoted archer (dhanūgahā sikkhito kathatho katūpāsano), who can easily, even with a light shaft, pierce an unembarrassed palm (tiirtyān tālacakchāyam atipāteyya). The Bodhisattva’s great feats of archery (by which, like Arjuna and Rāma, he wins a bride) are described in J.I.58 (where it is to be understood that he performed all those feats that were performed by Jotipāla in the Sarabhanga Jātaka) and the Lalita Vistara (Ch. XII), where he pierces five iron drums, seven palm-trees, and “an iron figure of a boar, provided with a (perforated) device” (yantra-yukta, cf. yantra-sahitam cited and explained above) with a single arrow which passes through all these and buries itself in the earth beyond them, and when the assembly marvels, the Gods explain (S. Leffmann, Lalita Vistara [Halle, 1902], p. 156, verse omitted in P. E. Foucault’s translation [Paris, 1884], from another edition of the text) that “former Buddhas have likewise, with the arrows of ‘emptiness’ and ‘impersonality’ (śūnya-nairatmā-bāyālay) smitted the enemy, depravity, and pierced the net of (heretical) ‘views,’ with intent to attain to the supreme Enlightenment”; cf. M.VI.28. The Buddha is, indeed, “of superlative penetration” (ativijjha) by his prescence (paññā, S.I.193, V.226).

46 It was unnecessary for the purposes of the text to explain the symbolism of the turning wheel, which must have been quite apparent to an Indian audience. This is evidently the “wheel of becoming” (bhava-cakka), “the turning wheel of the vortex of becoming” (āvṛttapa-cakramiva saṁsāra-cakram, MU.VI.29), and, like “chariot” and “horse,” the physical vehicle on which the spirit rides; the blindfolded archer is the incarnate and unseeing elemental self (bhūtātman, i.e., sarira atman, bodily self), caught in the net, overcome by karma, filled with many things and “carted about” (rathita) MU.III.1-IV.4; the bodily self (kāyo = attā, cf. D.I.34 añño attā = D.I.17 añño kāyo), unseeing, overspread by the net, filled up and “carried about on karma-car” (karma-yantita), Th.I.567 f.

The stance upon a moving wheel corresponds to Arjuna’s, who shoots from a moving car, as mentioned above. For the equivalent of a turning wheel and a car may be cited TS.I.2.8 and ŚB.V.1.5.1 f., where the high priest (brahmā) “mounts a car-wheel” (rathacakram, . . . rohati, TB.I.3.6.1) and there enacts a chariot race. This charrowheel is mounted on the point of a post and made to revolve, and is thus just what Viś, refers to as a cakka-yanta; and because a car is essentially the “bolt” (vajra), as are also arrows (see TS.V.4.11.2, VI.1.4.5; ŚB.I.2.4.1-6), the operation implies a “victory over all the Quarters” (Sāyana on TS.I.7.8), as in the case of shooting toward the Quarters, mentioned above. For the equation, car = flesh or bodily self, KU.III.3-9, J.IVI.252 will suffice; cf. Plato, Phaedrus, 247. In the same way the body can be compared in the same context to a chariot and to a potter’s wheel (cakra), MU.II.6 (mark the contrast of cakra-vṛtta, “spun on the wheel” and Cakravartin, the “spinner of the wheel”). All these things, like the body itself, are “engines” (yantra): well for him who, from such a merry-go-round, can hit the unseen mark!

On the general symbolism of wings cf. RV.VI.9.5 “Mind is the swiftest of flying things”; JUB.III.13.10 where the sound of Om serves the sacrificer as wings with which to reach the world of heaven; PB.XIX.11.8, XXV.3.4; Plato, Phaedrus 246-56; Dante, Paradiso, XXV, 49-51.
the bow, it strikes its mark." 47 In what means the same he exclaims: "Fly, fly, O bird, to thy native home, for thou hast escaped from the cage, and thy pinions are outspread . . . . Fly forth from this enclosure, since thou art a bird of the spiritual world"; 48 and indeed: "It is as a bird that the sacrificer reaches heaven." 49 His great disciple Râmî said: "Only the straight arrow is put on the bow, but this bow (of the self) has its arrows bent back and crooked. Be straight, like an arrow, and escape from the bow, for without doubt every straight arrow will fly from the bow (to its mark)." 50

In the same way Dante: 51 "And thither now (i.e., to the Eternal Worth as goal), 52 as to the appointed site, the power of that bowstring beareth us which directeth to a happy mark whatso it doth discharge." 53 With "Oîn is the arrow" may be compared the Cloud of Unknowning (Chap. 38): "Why pierceth it heaven, this little short prayer of one syllable?" to which the same unknown author replies in the Epistle of Discretion: "Such a blind shot with the sharp dart of longing love may never fail of the prick, which is God." 54

In conclusion, I shall allude to the practice of archery as a "sport" in Japan at the present day, making use of a valuable book compiled by Mr. William Acker, the American pupil of Mr. Toshisuke Nasu, whose own master, Ichikawa Kojurô Kiyomitsu, "had actually seen the bow used in war, and who died in the bow-house while drawing his bow at eighty years of age." The book 55 is a translation of Toshisuke Nasu's instructions, with an added commentary. The extracts show how little this "sport" has the character of mere recreation that the notion of sport implies in secular cultures:

The stance is the basis of all else in archery. When you take your place at the butts to shoot, you must banish all thought of other people from your mind, and feel then that the business of archery concerns you alone . . . . When you thus turn your face to the mark you do not merely look at it, but also concentrate upon it. . . . you must not do so with the eyes alone, mechanically, as it were—you must learn to do all this from the belly.

Again:

By dôzokuri is meant the placing of the body squarely on the support afforded by the legs. One should think of oneself as being like Vairocana Buddha (i.e., the sun), calm and without fear, and feel as though one were standing, like him, in the centre of the universe. 56

In the preparation for shooting, the greatest stress is laid on muscular relaxation, and on a state of calm to be attained by regular breathing; just as in contemplative exercises, where likewise the preparation is for a "release." In taking aim (mikomo, from miru, to see, and komu, to press) the archer does not simply look at the target, but "presses into" or "forces into"

47 *Dirâz*, T.1624 a, cited by R. A. Nicholson, *Dirâz of Shams-i-Tabriz* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 336. Cf. "the mark of truth, that they may aim aright" (*Homilies of Narsai*, XXII), and "should he miss, the worse for him, but if he hits becomes like as (the mark)," TS. II.4.5.6.
48 *Ibid*, Odes XXIX, XLIV.
49 *PB.V.* 5.5; cf. TS.V.4.I.I.
50 Mathnawi I.1384-1385, Nicholson's translation.
51 The following is cited, in *Voile d'Isis*, 1935, p. 203, from an Ilâhî of Yunîs Emre (fl. thirteenth-fourteenth century): "Ta vie est comme une flèche sur un arc tendu à fond, puisque l'arc est tendu, pourquoi rester sans mouvement? Suppose donc que tu as lancé cette flèche."
52 *Paradiso*, I.107.
54 "Blind shot" is not, of course, a shot at random, but at an unseen mark.
56 All this implies an identification of one's (real) Self with the mark, as in the *Miyûkô Uô*, cited above (tadbhāva-gatena cetasā . . . tannayo bhavet). "If you do not make yourself equal to God, you cannot know God; for like is known by like" (Hermes Trismegistus, XI.II.20b).
it his vision, as it were anticipating the end to be reached by the arrow itself. The archer's breathing must be regulated, in order to "concentrate one's strength in the pit of the abdomen—then one may be said to have come to a real understanding of archery." 57 In this emphasis on deep breathing the "Zen" (Skr. dhyāna) factor is included, and on the stress that is laid on the "spirit" (āti, Chinese chi, Skr. ātmā, prāṇa) in the same connection, the Taoist factor. Mr. Acker remarked that all Japanese arts and exercises are referred to as "ways" (mīchi, Chinese tao), that is, spiritual disciplines:

... one may even say that this is especially so in archery and fencing for there are archers who will tell you that whether or not you succeed in hitting the mark does not matter in the slightest—that the real question is what you get out of archery spiritually.58

The consummation of shooting is in the release ... the Stance, Preparation, Posture, Raising the Bow, Drawing, and Holding, all these are but preparatory activities. Everything depends upon an unintentional involuntary release, effected by gathering into one the whole shooting posture ... the state in which the release takes place of itself, when the archer's breathing seems to have the mystic power of the syllable Oṃ. ... At that moment the posture of the archer is in perfect order—as though he were unconscious of the arrow's having departed ... such a shot is said to leave a lingering resonance behind—the arrow moving as quietly as a breath, and indeed almost seeming to be a living thing ... Up to the last moment one must falter neither in body nor in mind. ... (Thus) Japanese archery is more than a "sport" in the Western sense; it belongs to Bushido, the Way of the Warrior. Further, the Seven Ways are based upon spontaneous principles, and not upon mere reasoning—

Having drawn sufficiently,
No longer "pull," but "drive" it
"Still without holding."
The bow should never know
When the arrow is to go.

The actual release of the arrow, like that of the contemplative, whose passage from dhyāna to samādhi, contemplatio to raptus, takes place suddenly indeed, but almost unawares, is spontaneous, and as it were uncaused. If all the preparations have been made correctly, the arrow, like a homing bird, will find its own goal; just as the man who, when he departs from this world "all in act" (kṛtaṃ, kataṃ karanyam), having done what there was to be done, need not wonder what will become of him nor where he is going, but will inevitably find the bull's eye, and passing through that sun door, enter into the empyrean beyond the "murity" of the sky.

Thus one sees how in a traditional society every necessary activity can be also the Way, and that in such a society there is nothing profane; a condition the reverse of that to be seen in secular societies, where there is nothing sacred. We see that even a "sport" may also be a yoga, and how the active and contemplative lives, outer and inner man can be unified in a single act of being in which both selves cooperate.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY

AN EARLY COPTO-ARABIC MINIATURE IN LENINGRAD

I

From his second voyage to the Orient in 1853, Constantin Tischendorf brought back seventy-five leaves of an early Arabic manu-

57 Cf. CU.I.4.5 where, as in chanting, "so in other virile acts such as the production of fire by friction, running a race, or bending a stiff bow, one does these things without breathing in and out," i.e. without panting, getting out of breath or excitement.

58 That is to say that hitting the mark in fact should be a result of one's state of mind; an evidence, rather than the cause of his spiritual condition. "Thy concern is only with the action (that it be 'correct'), never with its results: neither let the results of action be thy motive, nor refrain from acting" (BG. II.47).
script containing the epistles of Paul. He showed this fragment to the orientalist Fleischer in Leipzig, who, on palaeographical evidence, dated it in the eighth or ninth century. Then Delitzsch examined the fragment and, on the basis of several passages concerning the nature of Christ, proved the Nestorian character of the Pauline epistles. Tischendorf, shrouding his find in the same secrecy with which he had tried to hide the provenance of the famous codex Sinaiticus, did not tell where he acquired the seventy-five Arabic leaves. Delitzsch stated explicitly, however, that Tischendorf had brought them from a monastery in Egypt and, since it is known not only that the two theologians were in close personal contact with each other but that Delitzsch had seen the leaves in Tischendorf’s house, it may rightly be assumed that the latter had, at least to some extent, given away the secret, though he did not reveal the name of the Egyptian monastery.

On his third voyage in 1859, Tischendorf acquired the remainder of the same manuscript, that is, 151 more leaves. Both parts, then, were given to the Russian czar, who deposited them in the Public Library in Leningrad, where the combined 226 folios became united again in one volume under the signature Arab. N. F. No. 327. At the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews there is a colophon, which was published by Fleischer in facsimile and translated: “Finished is his epistle to the Hebrews which was written and sent from Rome. Completed are the fourteen epistles of Paul, thanks be to Christ. They are written as it is worthy of Him. Written in Sha‘bān of the year two hundred and seventy-nine (i.e., October-November 892 A.D.).” Fleischer could now proudly state that his former dating on the merely palaeographical basis into the eighth or ninth century had turned out to be correct. Opposite the page with the colophon, there is, on fol. 226, a full-page miniature (Fig. 1), which Tischendorf described by a short sentence: “Ceterum folium ultimum pictura insigne est, qua Paulus cum amico repre- sentari videtur.” The very fact that this miniature is at the end of the Arabic text instead of at the beginning, where one would normally expect a frontispiece miniature to be, reveals at once that the model must have been either a Greek or a Coptic manuscript in which the miniature, in the same position, would face the first page of the text instead of the last.

Shortly after the manuscript was acquired by the Public Library of Leningrad, the miniature attracted the attention of the art historian Prochorov. He considered it an important document for a projected history on Eastern ecclesiastical costumes, a book which to our knowledge was never written. He knew, of course, that one of the two saints must be Paul, but he hesitated, as Tischendorf before him, to name the second. Moreover, with regard to the style of the miniature, he stated simply that the two figures reflected national types, which he believed to be either Coptic or Ethiopic. This

1 C. Tischendorf, Anecdota Sacra et Profana (2d ed.; Leipzig, 1861), pp. 13-14, No. XVI.
3 F. Delitzsch, Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer (Leipzig, 1857), pp. 764-69.
5 The measurements are 27, 8 by 19, 8 cm.

7 B. Prochorov, Christianshija drevnosti (St. Petersburg, 1862), p. 12 and Pl. 2 (the miniature is published here in a line drawing).
statement, the correctness of which we shall try to show in the following, was not supported by any further documentary evidence on the part of Prochorov, and this is probably the reason why Kondakoff, though quoting Prochorov, does not enter a discussion of the proposed Egyptian localization. Kondakoff’s short remarks concern only the monumentality of the composition, which he compares with miniatures like those of the Cosmas Indicopleustes MS in the Vatican Library, cod. gr. 699, and the decadence of the color scheme. Moreover, he was the first to give a name to the younger saint, who, according to his description, wears a stole over the chasuble. He called him the youthful Stephen. Since then, the miniature has only occasionally been mentioned, but nowhere has Prochorov’s first attempt of an Egyptian localization either been accepted or refuted.

While working on Greek manuscripts in the Public Library at Leningrad, I was permitted to take the two photographs here published (Figs. 1 and 11), which allow an analysis of the style of this unique miniature. Before discussing the various iconographical and stylistic problems involved, I should like to make a few remarks about the coloring. The younger saint, who holds a codex in his left arm, wears a crimson-brown alb, a blue chasuble, and a pallium with crimson crosses. The face and hands are chestnut brown, the eyes and hair are black, and the nimbus, like that of Paul, is golden and has a broad red outline. Paul, who holds a scroll, wears a vermilion tunic, decorated with a pattern of golden rosettes made up from little squares. His himation is dirty yellow and, like the garments of Stephen, strongly highlighted. The color of his skin—the face is nearly completely rubbed—is chestnut brown. Both figures are outlined in black. The lower half of the background, to the height of the elbow, is dark green; the upper half is dark blue. The miniature is framed by a border in vermilion, which nearly reaches the edges of the folio. This clearly indicates that the miniature has been cut, probably at the same time the codex was rebound and cut.

II

There can be no doubt that the bearded figure holding the scroll is Paul himself, the writer of the epistles. But who is his companion? It has been mentioned that Tischendorf and Prochorov hesitated to give him a name, and that Kondakoff considered him to be Stephen, the deacon and protomartyr. This identification, however, must be questioned for two reasons. An association of Paul and Stephen would, to some extent, be understandable in a frontispiece to the Acts of the Apostles, where the martyrdom of Stephen is related, but he is nowhere mentioned in the epistles. Yet even in the case of the Acts one wonders whether the idea of associating the martyring and the martyred as equals in a double portrait would have been likely, and furthermore the existence of any such picture is unknown.

10 I am greatly indebted for valuable support of my studies to the director of the Public Library, Mr. Banck, and to Professor Pitschko in the same place.

11 It is noteworthy that on occasion Paul, instead of Luke, does occur in front of the Acts either alone, as
Secondly, the costume of Paul’s companion is not that of a deacon but of a bishop, and what Kondakoff considered to be a stole is actually an omophorion. The stole, it is true, is worn in earlier times as a single stripe over the left shoulder, instead of with the more usual double stripe, as can be seen in miniatures of the Gregory manuscript in Paris, cod. gr. 510, and the menologion in the Vatican, cod. gr. 1673,12 but here it is not slung around the neck, and, furthermore, it is worn directly over the alb, and only for this reason is fully visible. If worn by a bishop, only the ends of the stole are visible under the chasuble. The omophorion of the Leningrad miniature is of an early type,13 later superseded by the Y-shaped omophorion. Two of Paul’s close companions are known to have been bishops: Timothy, who as Eusebius 14 and others recorded, was ordained by Paul as the first bishop of Ephesus, and Titus, who according to Paul’s own testimony (Titus I, 5) became bishop of the churches of Crete. Of the two Timothy is more intimately associated with Paul, and since he is mentioned in the first Pauline epistle (Rom. XVI, 21), to which the composition must have been attached in the Greek or Coptic model before it was placed in the Arabic copy at the end of the letter to the Hebrews, it seems preferable to call the companion of Paul Timothy rather than Titus. The youthfulness of the bishop is well in accordance with Paul’s own testimony when he wrote to Timothy: “Let no man despise thy youth” (I Tim. IV, 12).

In East Christian miniatures which precede the Pauline epistles, Timothy is more often associated with Paul than is any other of his companions. In a Greek praxisapostolos in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore, cod. 533 from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,15 Timothy is represented no less than five times at the head of various Pauline epistles:

1. fol. 239v (Epistle to the Philippians): Timothy and Paul in dispute with each other (Fig. 2).
2. fol. 247v (Epistle to the Colossians): Timothy and Paul in dispute as in the preceding miniature.
3. fol. 255v (First Epistle to the Thessalonians): Three medallions with bust of Silvanos, Paul, and Timothy.
4. fol. 262v (Second Epistle to the Thessalonians): Timothy, Silvanos, and Paul standing in frontal position (Fig. 3).
5. fol. 287v (Epistle to Philemon): Paul addressing Timothy (Fig. 4).

In all five miniatures Timothy is clad as a bishop, but, in contradistinction to the Leningrad miniature, he wears the later, forked omophorion and a beard which adds to his dignity as bishop, although it is kept very short so as to let him appear still youthful and to emphasize a great difference between his age and that of Paul. But in spite of these small divergences, which are due to the fact that the

12 J. Braun, Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient (Freiburg, 1907), Figs. 287–88.
13 Braun (op. cit.) illustrated in an instructive sketch (Fig. 297) the development of this priestly costume. Cf. the triptych of Harbaville (ibid., Fig. 299), which shows both forms of the omophorion side by side.
14 H. E. III, IV, 5.

Fig. 1—Leningrad, Public Library, Cod. Arab. N.F. 327 Fol. 226v
two manuscripts belong to different periods and different cultural areas, the assumption seems well justified that both belong ultimately to the same iconographical tradition.

It must be made clear, however, that Timothy as bishop of Ephesus is not the only type in East Christian book illumination; perhaps not even the most common one, if the few documents we possess allow any judgment at all. A second tradition represents him as an apostle, draped in the usual apostle’s garments, not unlike Paul himself, though also in this case he is represented as younger and with a shorter beard. A collection of Pauline epistles with catenae in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, cod. Coislin 30, which belongs to the eleventh or rather twelfth century, has this saint as a frontispiece to the Second Epistle to Timothy, where he stands in frontal position blessing with the right hand in the sling of his mantle and with the left holding a scroll (Fig. 5). 15a Around three sides of the figure runs an inscription which leaves no doubt as to his identity and which reads as follows:

ο ἄγιος τιμόθεως ὁ πράσινος(λος), παῖλον συναγαγοῦ(ς) (=και) θεογόρος μέγας, μάρτυς τι τιμόθεως (=και) μνεύτρι[πόλ.-
(ne)ο(ς)].

Save for the shorter beard, this type is very much like that of Paul in the Copto-Arabic miniature, and there is every reason to assume that this Timothy type is merely an adaptation of the Paul type.

As apostle also, Timothy may be associated with Paul. In the Athos-codex Pantokratoros 49, a psalter and New Testament which is to be dated between the years 1084 and 1101, 16 both apostles either form the hastae of the initial letter II or they are arranged on both margins of a writing column wherever they jointly precede Pauline epistles. 17 There are still other compositional arrangements of Timothy and Paul as apostles. In a praxapostolos of the thirteenth or fourteenth century in the Athos monastery Esphigmenou, cod. 63, 18 Timothy stands in front of Paul, who is seated and writing in a codex, and in a manuscript of the Pauline epistles with catenae in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, cod. gr. 223, 19 Paul and Timothy are seated opposite each other, Paul holding an open scroll over his lap and Timothy holding his chin with the right hand in a gesture of meditation.

There is even a third type of Timothy which characterizes him as the scribe of Paul, and as such treats him as subordinate to Paul. In a thirteenth-century New Testament in the Athos monastery Lavra, cod. B. 26 (Fig 6), 20 he sits

---

15a I wish to thank Mr. Friend for his kind permission to publish this miniature. Besides the miniature with Timothy, the manuscript contains two more pictures: Paul seated and writing on fol. 1r, and Philemon standing on fol. 151r.

16 G. Millet, "Quelques représentations byzantines de

17 On fols. 31rv, 315v, 318v, 321v, and 330r. Photographs in Princeton. Department of Art and Archaeology.

18 Lambros, op. cit., I, 177, No. 2076 (resp. 63).

19 The MS is dated 1045 A.D., but its two miniatures which are painted on free spaces on partly written pages are obviously additions of a considerably later period. H. Bordier, Description des peintures... (Paris, 1885), p. 125.

modestly on a low bench and writes down the
dictation of Paul, who stands in front of him.
The identification as Timothy is assured by the
contemporary inscription:

\[ \text{ἐκδίδου τὸν ἀγ̄ου και γρά(φυντα) τ(ης) πρὸ (ς) ἱωμαίον ἐκστολῆς.} \]

The biblical text does not anywhere mention
Timothy's activity as a scribe, but the
two passages in which Paul calls him his
συνεργός ("workfellow") (Rom. XVI, 21, and
Philem. I, 1) may well have stimulated the
painter who first conceived this picture. In
analog to the Lavra miniature, a corresponding
dictation scene in the above mentioned manuscrip
in Paris, cod. gr. 223, can likewise be
identified as Paul dictating to Timothy, though in this case no inscription is added.
Thus, within the same manuscript Timothy is
represented once as a bearded apostle and once
as a youthful scribe. There is every indication
that the dictation scene was not invented for
Paul and Timothy, but that it is an adaptation
of a nearly identical composition which repres-
ents John dictating the Apocalypse to the youth-
ful Prochoros. This compositional scheme was
very popular in Byzantine art after the eleventh
century, but seems not to have been used before
the tenth century. This means that at the
time the Leningrad miniature was painted, the
tradition knew only of Timothy the bishop and
Timothy the apostle, but not yet of Timothy
the scribe.

III

In the miniature both Paul and Timothy
stand in strict frontality and face the beholder
with staring eyes, a position which combines
austerity with monumentality. Friend, in the
first of his two basic articles upon the portraits
of the evangelists in Greek and Latin manuscrip
scripts, set forth with good reasons that the
frontally standing figures of authors originated
in the book illustration of Alexandria. Though
they must have spread very soon not only to
Syria and Palestine but also to the more distant
provinces where book illumination flourished in
the early Christian period, there can hardly be
any doubt that this type was indeed used more
exclusively in Egypt than anywhere else. It
must have appealed very strongly to the peculiar
sense of form of the Egyptians.

There are indications that in the earliest
illustrated complete Bible of Alexandria each
book was preceded by its author or title figure
in a standing position. Very early, however,
several authors were grouped before larger units
of the Bible. In a Gospel book, for example, the
evangelists were united at the beginning of the
whole text. In the case of seated types, this
resulted in an antithetic arrangement in which
Matthew and Mark face each other on opposite
pages as one pair and Luke and John as a second
pair. Standing evangelists, however, could be
placed side by side two to a page, so that in
opening the book all four could be seen at once.
Besides creating a more comprehensive view, the
grouping of two evangelists on a page eliminated
the empty space which previously had sur-
rrounded the isolated standing figure. This sys-
tem of condensation must have developed early,
since in the seventh century it was already
adapted for the covers from the interior decor-
Gallery at Washington (Fig. 7), which Morey
had made known and placed in the history of

21 Lake, op. cit., IV, Pl. 268.
22 K. Weitzmann, Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des
XXXIX, No. 215.
23 A. M. Friend, Jr., "Portraits of the Evangelists in
the Greek and Latin Manuscripts," Art Studies, V
(1927), 115 ff., VII (1929), 3 ff. Cf. particularly V,
124 ff.
NOTES


28 E. S. Takaishvili, "Adyshskoe Evangelie," Materiali po archeologi Kavkaza, XIV (Moscow, 1916), facsimile, Pls. I and II.

29 M. J. Clédat, "Le Monastère et la nécropole de Baout," Mém. de l'inst. jr. d'arch. orientale du Caire, XII (1904), Pl. XXXV. Friend, op. cit., V, Pl. V, Fig. 65.

Coptic art,25 has Matthew and John painted standing side by side on its front cover, and on its rear cover Luke and Mark. The double portrait arrangement soon appeared in other centers of Christian book illumination, where, however, it seldom occurred in its original completeness: in Syria in the Rabula Gospels, cod. Laurent. Phut. I, 56, from the year 586, where at least two standing evangelists, Luke and Mark, join each other on one page;26 in Armenia in the Etchmiadzin Gospels27 from the year 989; and in Georgia in the Adysh Gospels from the year 897, where Luke and John stand side by side.28

This system, then, was applied also to the illustrations of other books of the Bible, as, for instance, the Prophets. Among the frescoes of chapel XII in Bawit, the prophets Obadiah and Jonah (Fig. 8)29 stand side by side united by a common frame. It seems more than likely that they were copied from a prophet book in which all prophets, two on a page, were combined in front of the whole text in a separate gathering. In a similar fashion also the epistle writers were grouped two by two in front of the full text of the epistles. Although there is no example known in the scarce material of Coptic art, this type of book has survived in Byzantine art, as can be seen in a praxapostelos in the Vatican Library, cod. gr. 1208, in which the Acts and the epistles are combined in one volume.30 On fol. 4v Luke, as writer of the Acts, faces James, the first of the epistle writers; on the opposite page, fol. 5v, are Peter and John, and on the verso of the same folio, Jude and Paul.

Once the type of frontispiece with double portrait had become an established scheme, it was used not only for the sake of economizing, but also for the opposite purpose, namely, to enlarge the cycle of author portraits. Now a Gospel book may be illustrated in such a way that each Gospel is preceded by a double portrait, one figure being the author of the Gospel and the other a companion of the evangelist. No complete set of such standing evangelists with companions has come down to us, but a few single miniatures are either preserved in deficient Gospel books or are mixed with evangelist portraits of another tradition. A twelfth-century Gospel in the Athos monastery Lavra, cod. A. 104, adds Paul to Luke and Peter to John.31 In another manuscript, likewise in Lavra, cod. A. 7, belonging to the eleventh or twelfth century, Luke and Paul once more stand side by side.

A similar expansion of author portraits took place also in the illustration of the epistles. Instead of combining Paul with Jude (whose epistles precede those of Paul) as in the case in the above mentioned codex Vatic. gr. 1208, the writer is associated with a companion in front of

30 Ibid., Pl. VII, Figs. 92–94. Though usually dated in the eleventh century, the manuscript, including the miniatures, is, in my opinion, not earlier than the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century.

31 J. Weitzmann-Fiedler, "Ein Evangelientyp mit Aposteln als Begleitfiguren," Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Adolph Goldschmidt (Berlin, 1935), p. 31, and Pl. XI, Figs. 5–6. The other two pictures of this manuscript are lost.

32 Ibid., p. 31, and Pl. X, Figs. 1–2. In this manuscript the only other miniature, which depicts Matthew seated and Philip standing in front of him, is from another set of evangelists with accompanying figures.
each single letter. A remnant of such a cycle is the Leningrad miniature, in which Timothy, the “beloved son,” as Paul calls him, is the added companion of Paul. The Leningrad manuscript, which contains all fourteen Pauline epistles, apparently never had more than this one double portrait, but on the basis of two Greek manuscripts already mentioned, Baltimore cod. 533 and Mount Athos, Pantokratoros 49, it seems certain that an edition of the epistles had existed which had a frontispiece to each letter. Although the pictures in the Baltimore manuscript occupy only a small area of the whole page, they make very much the impression of reduced full-page miniatures. In a complete set, Timothy, who obviously was associated more than once with Paul, was, of course, not his only companion. In the title picture to the first epistle to the Corinthians of the Baltimore manuscript, Sosthenes stands alongside of Paul; in front of the second epistle to the Thessalonians of the same manuscript Paul and Timothy are joined by Silvanos; Paul and Silvanos occur also in several initials of the Pantokrator codex. It can reasonably be surmised that in other instances also Philemon and Titus were chosen to form, together with Paul, a double portrait. However, neither the Baltimore nor the Pantokrator codex possesses a complete set of double portraits. In both the set is mixed with other title miniatures from different traditions, such as single figures of Paul and larger compositions in which Paul teaches a crowd. Thus, for the time being, it is not possible to reconstruct the full set of fourteen double portraits for the Pauline letters and to determine accurately Paul’s companion in each single case.

The great popularity of frontispieces with two standing figures in Egyptian book illumination is indicated by its adaptation for all kinds of writing besides the Bible. Sometimes two people who are not even contemporaries become associated with each other in this manner. The Coptic Museum in Cairo, for example, possesses a very damaged sheet of parchment depicting two bearded men under a double arch (Fig. 9), a sheet, which, according to Munier, originally was a cover of a book and not a miniature in the text. As in the case of the covers of the Freer collection (Fig. 7) this is a transference of a miniature from the inside to the outside of the codex. The left figure is draped in a richly patterned chiton and a himation, that is, the garments of an apostle or evangelist. Since standing evangelists, as Friend has shown, never appear with a scroll in book illumination, but only with a codex, and since this figure has a scroll, it seems clear that it represents an apostle. With his full and slightly pointed beard, he is not unlike the Paul of the Leningrad miniature, and, although it cannot be proved, it seems at least very possible that Paul was intended. The apostle’s companion is somewhat smaller in size and is draped in a kind of dalmatic with a stole over it and in his left hand he holds a staff, which characterizes him as an abbot. Munier in his catalogue gave Akhmîm as the provenance of the parchment fragment, but A. L. Schmitz asserted that Munier gave him the information that it came from the White Monastery, not far from Akhmîm. If this is true, there would be every reason to believe that the abbot in the


34 Friend, op. cit., V, 133.
NOTES
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miniature is none other than the great and powerful Shenüte himself, the most popular of all the Egyptian abbots.  

The Morgan Library in New York possesses a synaxary, cod. M. 604, of the ninth century, with a title picture which, not unlike the Cairo fragment, is likewise composed of two figures standing under a double arch (Fig. 10). The right one is an abbot with a pointed white beard, who holds a staff of abbatial dignity. His identity is secured by the inscription "Apa Shenüte" and by the fact that this picture heads Shenüte's discourse against spiritual lethargy. This time, however, he is not associated with an apostle, but with Christ. According to Egyptian synaxaries, Christ came many times to speak with Shenüte, and this might well justify their association in a miniature. The parallel between the Morgan and the Cairo miniatures makes it quite likely that the latter served as the decoration of a book cover which formerly enclosed another of Shenüte's discourses. If the identification of the apostle as Paul is right, it might have been a discourse on some theme from the letters of Paul, though this, of course, is merely a conjecture. The Egyptians called Shenüte the fourteenth apostle, and this concept might well have stum-

uated the painter's imagination to place him as an equal alongside Paul.

IV

Even without Delitzsch's assurance that Tischendorf brought the Leningrad manuscript from an Egyptian monastery, the style of its miniature would have revealed the provenance. Timothy's huge, staring eyes, greatly emphasized by dark shadows between the lids and the brows and underneath the lower lids (Fig. 11), the strongly marked straight lines of the nose, the mouth terminating in two crossbars, the black hair which falls deeply into the forehead, the strong shadow around the chin, which encloses the face proper in a frame, so to speak, are all features that have their closest parallels in the frescoes of the monastery of St. Jere-mias in Saqqāra as, for example, the head of archangel Michael (Fig. 12), who stands alongside the Madonna lactans in a decorated niche of chapel A. The hands with their doughy fingers, which seem to be deprived of bones, may be compared in miniature and fresco. In the latter, the brush strokes are broader and rougher than they are in the somewhat more refined miniature, but otherwise the stylistic connection seems to be close enough to justify a localization of the miniature to Lower Egypt rather than to Upper Egypt. The frescoes of Saqqāra, not homogeneous in their style and seemingly stretching over a considerable length of time, are not datable by any documentary evidence, and Quibell, their excavator, leaves the date between the end of the fifth century and about 960 A.D., when a Muslim scored a memento of his visit on a pillar in the ruins. Dated and datable miniatures eventually will play their part in building up a more

35 A somewhat similar suggestion was orally made by Munier (Schmitz, op. cit., p. 346), who considered the larger figure to be Shenüte and the smaller to be Besa, his successor and biographer. The larger figure, however, because of its drapery, can hardly represent an abbot.


37 J. Leipoldt, Schenute von Atribe, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, XXV (1902), 56, n. 1 and p. 57.

38 Ibid., p. 162.

39 J. E. Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara, 1906-1907 (Le Caire, 1908), II, Pl. XLIII.

40 J. E. Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara, 1908-09, 1909-10 (Le Caire, 1912), Vol. IV, Introduction.
precise chronology of the fresco material. The comparison made above between the archangel Michael and the Timothy of the miniature, for instance, makes one wonder whether this particular style of chapel A in Saqqâra belongs to about the seventh century, as many scholars believe, or to a time rather later and closer to that of our dated miniature. The present concern, however, is not to date the frescoes, but merely to define with their help the Coptic features of the Leningrad miniature. Coptic also are the square built proportions of Paul and Timothy, their large feet, placed somewhat clumsily apart. In this respect, they may very well be compared with the figure of Saint Makarios of the same chapel A in Saqqâra (Fig. 13). Moreover, a detail should not be left unnoticed, namely, the square rosettes that in the Saqqâra frescoes are strewn over all garments, tunic and himation alike, and which occur in a slightly varied form also on the undergarments of Timothy and Paul. Here they are made up from four golden squares and used not only as a pattern of the garment but even as a decoration of the background.

Nevertheless, the comparison between the Leningrad miniature and the Saqqâra frescoes is not like an equation which leaves no remainder. In spite of the close connection with Coptic monuments, our miniature contains at the same time features which cannot be explained by the Coptic tradition. The figure of Paul has a comparatively greater three-dimensionality than any of the saints on the walls of Saqqâra. This effect is caused by the treatment of the himation, the energetic folds of which, designed either as parallels, as curves, or as lines fanning out, create the impression of greater plasticity compared with the garments of Makarios, where every fold line and highlight is flattened out to a two dimensional pattern. The manner in which the right arm of Paul is wrapped in a sling, makes it clear that the painter tried to achieve greater plasticity by means of classical formulae, although he succeeded only to a limited extent in giving his figures the desired volume. There is nothing in the style of the frescoes of Saqqâra or anywhere in Egypt after the sixth century which could be regarded as a preliminary step to the revival of a more plastic style, and one has to look for an influence from the outside.

There is much evidence that throughout the early medieval ages the classical tradition had survived in Constantinople more strongly than in any other place and that there the classical heritage was at no time lost completely. If the Leningrad miniature is compared with Constantinopolitan works which are contemporary and which reflect most strongly the classical tradition, that is, the Gregory manuscript in Paris, cod. gr. 510, executed between 880 and 886, and the Cosmas manuscript in the Vatican, cod. gr. 690, from the end of the ninth century, one soon realizes that Constantinople is not the source for the painter of the Leningrad picture. The modeling of the Constantinopolitan figures is done by lights and shades in a picturesque technique which still knows how to make use of the formulae of antique illusionism, while in the Leningrad miniature the plasticity is achieved by a more linear method.

Contemporary Greek manuscripts made in other provinces of the Byzantine empire show a style distinctly different from that of the capital. A Greek Gospel book from the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century, which

41 Quibell, Excavations at Saqqara, 1906-1907, II, Pl. XLIV.


Fig. 19—Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Gr. 68 Fol. 141r

Fig. 20—Berlin, Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Arab. 10173 Fol. 90v

Fig. 21—Berlin, Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Arab. 10173 Fol. 108v
formerly belonged to Andreaskiti on Mount Athos and now is in the possession of Princeton University, contains standing evangelists (Fig. 14) whose classical descent is no less conspicuous than is that of the Constantinopolitan manuscripts but whose greater plasticity and freedom of motion are gained by more linear means, similar to those employed in the Leningrad miniature. Broad outlines and energetic folds, modeling the body and the limbs of St. Mark with curved lines, combine a decorative sense with a strong feeling for structure and articulated posture. Here one sees in perfection what the painter of the Leningrad miniature tried to imitate, but with less success. Paul's right arm in the sling, for example, is spatially not so convincingly related to the upper part of the body as is the case in the figure of Mark. Wherever the Princeton manuscript may have been made, the very same artistic province must also have produced the model for the painter of the Leningrad miniature. In a treatment of Byzantine miniature painting of this period, I tried to show evidence for a localization of the Princeton Gospels and some other manuscripts which belong to the same stylistic group as, for example, the marginal psalters in Moscow and the Athos monastery Pantokratoros, to Syria or Palestine. From this situation, one may conclude that the particular Byzantine influence reflected in the Leningrad miniature came to Egypt from the Syrian-Palestine province of the East-Roman empire.

This corresponds to what one would expect also on the basis of historical considerations. As mentioned, Delitzsch proved the Nestorian character of the Leningrad text. The centers of Nestorianism were, of course, in Persia and Syria. Its chief missionary activity spread to the East, to India and China, while Nestorianism became at no time very strong in Egypt, where it met the opposition of the monophysitism of the Coptic Church. In Assemani's long list of the seats of metropolitans and bishops who were subject to the Nestorian patriarch, the only mention of a Nestorian community in the country of the Nile is under Aegyptus. Egypt most likely never had more than one Nestorian bishop, and he was ordained by and subject to the metropolitan of Damascus. This makes it more than likely that the religious, cultural, and artistic needs of the Nestorian community in Egypt were satisfied from Damascus and Syria in general.

The Leningrad miniature does not stand alone as a manifestation of Byzantine influence in Egypt during the ninth and tenth centuries. A Pentateuch in the Vatican Library, cod. copt. I, dated by Hyvernat on palaeographical grounds in the ninth century, contains at the end of the book of Genesis a very monumental miniature of the Hodegetria (Fig. 15). She is surrounded by a green outline from which small branches sprout off, thus creating the impression that the

Virgin is standing in front of a bush. The figure is painted over the text of a colophon, which follows the end of the book of Genesis; where the paint has flaked off, particularly at the head of the Virgin, the underlying text is visible again. This makes it clear that the miniature must be later than the text. On stylistic grounds, the miniature may very well still belong in the ninth century, and apparently it is not later than the tenth. Not only is the type of the Hodegetria of Byzantine origin, but the style of the miniature, in particular the treatment of the garments, points to a Byzantine influence. The painter is more concerned about the natural fall of the folds than about their ornamental effect, which is strongly emphasized in the pure Coptic style. The color scheme conforms more to Byzantine than to Coptic taste. The blue of the undergarment and particularly the dark violet of the paenula are in contrast to the usually lighter colors in Coptic art, in which yellows, reds, and lighter browns are preferred. But the Virgin was not painted by a Byzantine artist either. The work is a product of a mixture of two styles similar to that in the Leningrad miniature. The yellow of the Christ child’s garment and the yellow of the nimbi are Coptic substitutes of the Byzantine gold. Furthermore, the somewhat thickset proportions of the Virgin, her heavy stance, the squaring of her outline, which almost completely eliminates the distinction between the leg supporting her weight and the “free” leg, and other elements reveal the very basic qualities of Coptic art. Typically Coptic also are the rosettes of four petals; they are strewn over both the Virgin’s garments, just as in the figures of Makarios in Saḵḵāra (Fig. 13) and of Paul and Timothy (Fig. 1), where, however, they are only on the undergarments. The painter of the Virgin displays the same ability to follow a Byzantine model as does the painter of the Leningrad miniature, and the similarities between these two miniatures are close enough to justify the assumption that both are products of the same artistic province. The colophon of the Vatican manuscript, on fol. 166', states that it was written by Solomon from Babylon, and then adds common formulae of prayer without mentioning the date of origin. Babylon is the old Greek name of the capital on the site of Cairo. Thus, as it is known for a certainty that the text of the Vatican Pentateuch was written in the new capital of the Arab rulers of Egypt, it seems at least very likely that the Vatican codex remained for some time in this city and that it was there the miniature of the Virgin was added. The Muslim capital, which under the Tulunids and later under the Fatimids had developed a rather cosmopolitan culture with tolerance toward the Christians, is also, from the historical point of view, very probably the center of the Christian-Syrian influence in Egypt during the ninth century. From what was said above about the connection between the Vatican and the Leningrad miniatures, it, thus, becomes at least a reasonable probability that the latter also was painted in Cairo.

Not all Egyptian painters succeeded so well in the amalgamation of the Byzantine models. The very same Vatican Pentateuch possesses, besides the Hodegetria, another full-page miniature of a standing Moses in frontal position, who raises his right arm in a blessing gesture while in the lowered right hand he holds an open scroll with an inscription in Coptic, which says: “This is the bush in which the fire burns” (Fig. 16). On the one side Moses is framed by the inscription: “ΜΩΥΧΗΣ Ο ΦΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ,” and by the pair of sandals he had put off, and on the other by the red-brown “burning bush” with dirty green leaves. Again, this figure, which is of about the same monumental size as is that of the Virgin, is most likely a later addition, but whether

48 Facsimile of the colophon reproduced by Hyvernat, op. cit., Pl. XVIII.
it is earlier or later than the Virgin is difficult to decide. It is clear, however, that it is quite different in style and that it undoubtedly was made by a different hand. The nearly equal angle from which the feet are seen from above eliminates completely the distinction between the “bearing” and the “free” leg; both knees are marked by hooked lines the original function of which, now lost, was to indicate the free leg; the crude broad folds have no life but serve only to partition the surface into small, stripe-like areas. The red used for the chlamys-like mantle, the reddish brown undergarment, and the vermilion face display a color taste quite different from that of the painter of the Virgin. All these features are distinctly Coptic, and one might even doubt whether a Byzantine model must be assumed at all as standing behind the figure of Moses. The complete absence, however, of any ornamental pattern on the garments, much liked by the Copts in this period, the drawing of the eyes, which do not stare as they usually do in Coptic art, but have a mild expression caused by a smaller and partly covered pupil, and some other features distinguish the Moses from pure Coptic miniatures of this period. Thus, the Moses is likewise a product of a mixed culture, but one in which the native elements are more preponderant than in the figure of the Hodegetria.

The full extent of the Byzantine influence in the Leningrad miniature and in the miniatures of the Vatican Pentateuch becomes clear by contrasting them with other contemporary manuscripts which are devoid of any foreign influence. Fortunately, there are a number of dated examples in the great collection of manuscripts found in the monastery of the archangel Michael at el-Hamuli in the southern Fayyum and now mostly in the possession of the Morgan Library in New York. Some of them are only a few years distant in date from the Leningrad manuscript. Dated in the year 895, that is, only three years after the codex in Leningrad, is a synaxary, cod. M. 577, which starts with a life of St. Stephen the Protomartyr and contains at the beginning a miniature with Stephen standing between two angels (Fig. 17). The decline in the organic rendering of the human body becomes very apparent in these figures if one tries, for example, to analyze the structure of the angel at the left, especially the arms and the almond-shaped thigh, or if one follows the lines of the folds with regard to their natural fall. In the figure of Stephen even the last trace of three dimensionality is eliminated, and no indication of the body’s structure and its proportioning is left. The whole surface is filled with an ornamental pattern which in the archetype adorned only the stole, but now has grown exuberantly all over the deacon’s garments. The tendency to square the figures affects also the wings of the angels, which are fitted into compartments, so to speak. These two chief elements, the distortion of the body for the sake of a decorative filling of the surface and the rich application of ornamental patterns not only over garments but even over furniture, predominate equally in other miniatures of the Morgan Library, such as the two representations of the Virgin enthroned between two angels, one in the cod. M. 612, which

49 The miniature is in the middle of the book of Exodus preceding Chapter XXV which starts on a new page with an ornamental title (“De aedificacione tabernaculi”) equal in size and importance to those heading each of the five books of the pentateuch.

50 Miss copies de la Bibl. du Convent de el-Hamouly, Pl. XIV. Hyvernat, Checklist, p. 18, No. XLVI. van Lantschoot, op. cit., No. 21. E. Denison Ross, The Art of Egypt Throughout the Ages (London, 1931), p. 255, Fig. 2.
is dated 893 A.D.,\textsuperscript{51} and the other, in the cod. M. 574, written either in the year 895 or 898 A.D.,\textsuperscript{52} and the annunciation in the cod. 597 from the year 913 A.D.\textsuperscript{53}

Coptic miniature painting is, of course, not always so negligent of the organic structure of the human figure as are the examples mentioned. A synaxary from the year 903, cod. M. 603, which contains a discourse of Severus of Antioch about the archangel Michael, is headed by a picture of the archangel (Fig. 18)\textsuperscript{54} in which similar decorative and ornamental elements are used with a much greater artistic skill. The lines marking the folds are just as abstract as in the preceding examples, but they are much better organized and are painted with firmer brush strokes. The red brown mantle with its yellow circular patches serves as an effective foil. The yellow wings with their reddish brown scales add greatly to the decorative impression, and, in order to fill what is left of the background, the artist used a pattern adapted from the pattern of the wings. There is a horror vacui in all Coptic art comparable to that in the early phase of pre-classic Greek art.

This comparison between the Leningrad and the two Vatican miniatures on the one side and the Morgan miniatures on the other brings out the two streams of Egyptian art, one more classical, fed by a Byzantine influx, and the other springing from native Egyptian sources. It can be shown that the Byzantine influence is not confined to the short phase in which the Leningrad miniature and the two miniatures of the Vatican Pentateuch were made. It goes on, and for many centuries the dualism continues between a pure Coptic style on the one hand and a mixed style on the other in which now the Byzantine and now the Coptic components are predominant. Two examples may suffice to demonstrate the interplay of Byzantine and Coptic forms in the later centuries.

A Greek Gospel book in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, cod. gr. 68, which, on the basis of its ornaments can be dated at the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century,\textsuperscript{55} contains a figure of St. John standing frontally, blessing, and holding a codex, thus conforming to Friend's “Alexandrian type” (Fig. 19).\textsuperscript{56} Certain stylistic elements relate this miniature closely to the frescoes of Sakkâra (Fig. 13) and, therefore, justify a localization of the Gospel miniature to Egypt. Fresco and miniature have in common the treatment of inorganic highlights painted with thick short strokes that lack any quality of modeling and cover the surface quite densely. In the slightly thicket proportions, the huge head, and the comparatively straight outlines the miniature reveals a strong Egyptian influence. On the other hand, the marking of the free leg is comparatively stronger than in most Egyptian works of art, the small feet stand closer together, the eyes are not quite as staring. In these features the Byzantine heritage can be measured.

Basically, the same interplay of two artistic traditions can also be seen in a series of standing prophets that adorns an Arabic prophet book in

\textsuperscript{51} MSS Coptes, Pl. XXIII. Hyvernat, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 7, No. XV and Pl. IV. van Lantschoot, \emph{op. cit.} No. 15. B. da C. Greene and M. P. Harrsen, \textit{The P. Morgan Library, Exhibition of Illuminated Mss} (New York, 1934), No. 1 and Pl. 1.

\textsuperscript{52} MSS Coptes, Pl. IX. Hyvernat, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 5, No. IX. van Lantschoot, \emph{op. cit.}, No. 23. Greene and Harrsen, \emph{op. cit.}, No. 3 and Pl. 2.

\textsuperscript{53} Mss Coptes, Pl. XX; Hyvernat, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 12, No. XXIX and Pl. I. van Lantschoot, \emph{op. cit.}, No. 50. Ross, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 255. Fig. 3. Greene and Harrsen, \emph{op. cit.}, No. 8 and Pl. 7.

\textsuperscript{54} Mss Coptes, Pl. XXI; Hyvernat, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 9, No. XXI; van Lantschoot, \emph{op. cit.}, No. 38.

\textsuperscript{55} Weitzmann, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 72 (here the older bibliography) and Pl. LXXIX.

\textsuperscript{56} The other two miniatures of this manuscript represent Mark and Luke as seated scribes of the common Byzantine tradition.
the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, cod. ar. 10173 (Figs. 20–21). According to the colophon it was written in the year 1041 of the era of the martyrs, that is, the year 1325 A.D., and the text was translated from the Coptic. From this statement it can be concluded that the manuscript was made in Egypt. All the figures of prophets, of whom only Hosea is lost, are accompanied by Greek inscriptions; these, however, are faulty and betray a hand unskilled in writing Greek. Nevertheless, they indicate that a Byzantine model is involved, and one comes to the same conclusion from a consideration of the style. In his attempt to copy classical poses and a three-dimensional effect and by his avoidance of ornamental patterns beloved of Coptic art, the painter of the Berlin prophets comes close to his Byzantine model. In the figure of Zephaniah (Fig. 20) the painter tried to preserve the impression of movement by turning the body slightly toward the left, by differentiating between the bearing leg and the free leg, and by letting the lowered head follow the direction of the pointing right hand. These motions, however, are not nearly as free as in works of Byzantine art. The tendency to flatten out the figure in broad frontality gains the upper hand and in other figures of the same manuscript, as, for example, in that of Jeremiah (Fig. 21), the Coptic tradition of squaring the body is still more apparent. The means by which the painter tried to achieve considerable plasticity are similar to those employed more than three hundred years earlier in the Leningrad miniature, namely, by strongly marked double and triple lines of folds that model the parts of the body by energetic curves. In contradistinction to Constantinopolitan painting, where plasticity is achieved primarily by the pictorial means of distribution of light and shadow, the more linear way of modeling by curved lines was, as noted, especially developed in the Byzantine art of Syria and Palestine, as demonstrated by the evangelists of the Princeton Gospels from Andreaskiti (Fig. 14). Consequently, one likes to think that the painter of the Berlin Prophet book also used a model from Syria or Palestine rather than one from Constantinople. This, to some extent, coincides with the idea of Baumstark, who has claimed a Syrian or Mesopotamian model for the Prophet book.

This is not the place to deal more explicitly with the relations between the Byzantine and Coptic styles after the ninth century, and the few remarks on this have already overstepped the limits of the problem, which is to find a proper place for the Copto-Arabic miniature in Leningrad in the history of book illumination. Moreover, it must be made clear that the Byzantine stream is not the only one that in medieval times penetrated into Egypt; other influences at least as important as the Byzantine may have left perhaps an even more lasting impression. For example, the style of the Syrian hinterland has found its way into Egypt as shown by such a sumptuous manuscript as the Gospel book in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cplt. 13, which was written and illustrated between 1170–80 in Damietta. Furthermore, a specific Arabic style which had developed in the Near East penetrated into Egypt and left deep traces in manuscripts like the Gospel book in the Institute Catholique in Paris, cod. I, from the year 1250. The native Coptic style persisted with great tenacity alongside these various foreign influences until practically modern times. Egyptian book illumination displays a great complexity of problems to which a satisfactory solution will be given only if they are treated from a wide

angle of the Christian art of the whole eastern Mediterranean.

KURT WEITZMANN

THE ANGEL WITH THE RAM IN ABRAHAM'S SACRIFICE: A PARALLEL IN WESTERN AND ISLAMIC ART*

I

In the sacrifice of Abraham, the ram appears miraculously, "caught in a thicket by his horns," and is taken by Abraham and "offered up for a burnt offering instead of his son" (Genesis 22:13). How did the ram come to this place of sacrifice? The Bible does not say, and both the Jewish and the Christian artists of the early period and the Middle Ages, who represented this incident, were satisfied to show the ram beside or in the bush.

In several works, however, an angel is represented bringing the ram. The late Arthur Kingsley Porter¹ was the first to observe this peculiarity to which he called attention in examples on the Irish crosses of the tenth century in Durrow, Arboe, and Monasterboice (Figs. 1 and 2). Although he was deeply interested in the relations between Irish, continental, and eastern art, the significance of this detail escaped him; he compared the Irish versions of the Sacrifice with Byzantine miniatures in which the angel is lacking.

The same unusual conception appears also in a few continental works of the eleventh and twelfth centuries: a drawing in the Catalonian Farfa Bible,² and Romanesque sculptures in León,³ Bordeaux,⁴ Souillac (Fig. 3),⁵ Parthenay,⁶ Autun,⁷ Parma,⁸ and Capua.⁹ On two capi-

¹ W. Neuss, Die katalanische Bibelillustration (Bonn and Leipzig, 1922), Fig. 5.
² On the tympanum of the south aisle portal of San Isidoro; M. Gómez-Moreno. El Arte románico español (Madrid, 1934), Pl. LXVII, CXVIII.
³ A capital of the porch of St Seurin: J. A. Brutails, Les Vieilles églises de la Gironde (Paris, 1912), Fig. 265.
⁴ There is another example in this region on a Romanesque capital in the abbey of Larreule: X. de Cardaillac, Les Sculptures de l'abbaye de Larreule en Bigorre (Tarbes, 1892), p. 30.
⁵ On the left, that is, north, side of the trumeau. For views of the whole and further details, see J. Baum, Romanesque Architecture in France (New York, 1928), Pl. 241; A. K. Porter. Romanesque Sculpture of the Pilgrimage Roads (Boston, 1923), illus. 349–52; M. Schapiro, "The Sculptures of Souillac," in Mediaeval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), p. 374, Fig. 13.
⁶ A capital from N.D.-de-la-Coudre: Porter, op. cit., illus. 1046.
⁷ A capital in St. Lazare.
⁸ A capital in the nave of the cathedral; it is just barely visible in Pl. 9 of C. Martin, L'Art roman en Italie (Paris, 1912).
⁹ On the portal of S. Marcello: E. Bertaux, L'Art dans l'Italie meridionale (Paris, 1904), Fig. 205. The same motif appears in later Italian art in a Genoese painting of the seventeenth century in the Dresden Gallery (No. 755), called to my attention by Professor Walter Friedlaender, and possibly in a painting of the vault of the Vatican Stanza of Heliodorus by Guglielmo de Marsillac, to judge from the poor reproduction in A. Venturi, Storia dell'arte italiana (Milan, 1901), IX, 2, Fig. 105, p. 237.

* For the seventieth birthday of Professor Louis Ginzberg.

¹ See his Crosses and Culture of Ireland (New Haven, 1931), pp. 114, 115, and Figs. 202, 205, 207. Other examples cited on the crosses of Kells and Donoughmore are unclear, and it is impossible to verify them on the photographs because of the weathered or mutilated condition of the relief. See also the illustrations in F. Henry, La Sculpture irlandaise (Paris, 1933), Fig. 124, Pl. 85, and also Pls. 62, 63 (of the cross at Armagh). But Mlle Henry in her detailed study of the iconography of the Irish crosses is unaware of this peculiar type of the Sacrifice.

² I am able to reproduce Figs. 1 and 2 through the kindness of Mrs. Arthur Kingsley Porter.
tals in León 10 and Jaca 11 the ram is held by a wingless figure, perhaps a misunderstanding of a model in which an angel had been rendered.

These examples of the angel carrying the ram are so concentrated geographically and so few in number beside the usual types that one is inclined to suppose a direct connection between the Irish and the continental versions. Since the Irish examples are at least a century older than the others, it is conceivable that this type was diffused in France, Spain, and Italy from Ireland. Porter had already argued that various elements in continental art were brought from Ireland, and he attempted to trace an Irish current in the theme of the wrestling men on the same trumeau of Souillac, where the angel holds the ram in the Sacrifice. 12

But there is another series of examples that must be taken into account. The angel is shown bringing the ram to Abraham in several Muslim paintings executed since the sixteenth century (Figs. 4-6). 13 Although they are much later than the Irish and the continental Romanesque versions, and although the illustration of the Old Testament would seem to be an exotic element in Muslim art, 14 it is unlikely that the Persian, Arabic, and Turkish examples are derived from the West. In the story of the Sacrifice in the Koran (Chap. XXXVII), no angel is mentioned; but there is a literary tradition in Islam that accounts sufficiently for the pictorial conception. The Arab chronicler of the ninth century, Tabari, in describing the Sacrifice, tells how “God had Gabriel descend from heaven with a ram. . . . When Gabriel arrived on the mountain, holding the ram by the ear, he stationed himself behind Abraham.” 15 This whole incident was of the greatest significance to Islamic imagination. It was argued that not Isaac, but Ishmael, the ancestor of the Arabs, was the son prepared for the sacrifice by Abraham; 16 and according to Tabari, the exclamations and words of Gabriel, Abraham, and Ishmael on this occa-

11 On the south door of the cathedral: ibid., Pl. LXXIX. It was not intended as an angel apparently, since another figure, who arrests the sword of Abraham, is winged.
12 See his Crosses and Culture of Ireland, pp. 126, 127.
13 Paris, Bibl. nat. Suppl. persan ms. 1313, f. 40: a history of the prophets by Ishâk ibn İhrahim al-Nişâpûrî, sixteenth century: Indé Office Library, Está MS 1342—Djâmi’s Yusuf u Zulaikhâ: dated 1599, reproduced by T. Arnold, Painting in Islam (Oxford, 1920), Pl. XXXI; a recent chromolithograph from Aleppo: Du Mesnil du Buisson, Les Peintures de la Synagogue de Doura-Europos (Rome, 1939), Fig. 21; a painting on wood, dated 1603, part of a paneling of a room in Aleppo, now in the Berlin Museum: F. Sarre, “Bemalte Wandbekleidung aus Aleppo,” Berliner Museen, Be. aus dem preuss. Kunstsamm., LLI, 4 (1920), 144-57 and Fig. 50 (Fig. 5); a miniature in a Koran of 1816: R. Gottheil, “An Illustrated Copy of the Koran,” Revue des études islamiques 1935, pp 21-24, Pl. V. For the last two references, I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Eitingerhausen.
14 See T. W. Arnold, The Old and New Testaments in Muslim Religious Art (London, 1932), who ignores the representations of this theme.
15 See Chronique de Tabari, traduite par M. H. Zotenberg (Paris, 1867), I, Pt. I, Chap. LIII, 186. The same detail is reported by the commentator Al-Zamâkshâri (1075-1144), a Persian-bom. Arabic scholar, according to M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sagenkunde (Leyden, 1893), pp. 112, 113, and also in an unspecified Arabic version of the sacrifice recounted by G. Weil, The Bible, the Koran and the Talmud (New York, 1863), p. 88, “Gabriel stood before him with a fine horned ram.”
sion form the takbīr or prayers recited on the great feast of the Sacrifices. Islam was regarded as the faith of Abraham, the builder of the Kaaba in Mecca and the ancestor of Muhammad. According to Muslim belief, Gabriel was the messenger of God in delivering the sacred black stone to Abraham and the Koran to Muhammad. Hence it was possible for Muslim artists to illustrate the Sacrifice at a period when miniature painting was an established art in spite of the prohibition of images.

These illustrations are rather infrequent, but the fact that in almost all that I have been able to discover the angel carries the ram, shows that this detail is essential to the Muslim type, in contrast to the exceptional character of the motif in western art.

In the earliest of all the Muslim images of the Sacrifice, a miniature of the fourteenth century in the Walters Gallery in Baltimore (Fig. 7), the angel stands behind the ram, without holding him. But even here there is reason to believe that the artist, in placing Gabriel directly behind the ram, had in mind the traditional account. For the painting illustrates a manuscript of the World History of Rashīd al-Dīn, who tells how God sent Gabriel to bring a ram from Paradise, and how the angel, taking the sheep by the ear, came up to the mountain and stood before Abraham. 17

II

What is the relation of the Muslim and the western Christian versions of this peculiar detail? If we had only the continental examples, one could infer more readily that they depended on Muslim oral or literary tradition. They are concentrated chiefly in Spain and southern France and belong to a period rich in Muslim-Christian contacts which have left other traces in art. The text of Ṭabarī and the Islamic miniatures come from the eastern Muslim world, but there is also evidence that the motif was known in the Moorish region. The story of Gabriel bringing the ram, which had been browsing in Paradise, is told in a Morisco work of 1603, written in a Spanish dialect in Arabic script. The oldest examples come from Ireland, however, and precede the first continental ones by a century or more. That an Arabic legend determined the conception of a Biblical scene in Ireland in the tenth century is unlikely, although not impossible. There is an abundant Near Eastern material in the insular art of the early Middle Ages, derived apparently from East Christian art. 18 But the angel bringing the ram seems to be wholly foreign to East Christian painting and sculpture. 19

17 Ṭabarī. loc. cit.
18 The text reads: “The Majesty of Glory (i.e., God) sent Ḥihrā’īl to bring a ram from Paradise. Ḥihrā’īl took a white sheep, with black eyes, four legs, black feet and tall horns (?) by the ear; he came up to the mountain and stood there. . . .” The passage has been translated for me by Dr. Ettinghausen.
19 See Grünbaum, _op. cit._, pp. 245 ff., 250, after an English translation by Joseph Morgan, _Mahometism Fully Explained_ (London, n.d. [ca. 1720]).
21 The early Christian representations of the angel in the Sacrifice of Abraham have been carefully studied by G. Stuhlfauch, _Die Engel in der altchristlichen Kunst_ (Freiburg i.Br., 1897), pp. 95 ff. There appears to be an exception in the Cabinet de Médaillles of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, a gem
It is not excluded, of course, that such an Arabic tale might have reached England and Ireland in the ninth or tenth century by other routes than the common connections with the East Christian world. In the Viking period, the commercial relations between the Muslim regions and Scandinavia were especially close, and the British Isles were among the chief objects of the Viking expeditions. Tens of thousands of Arabic and English coins have been found in Scandinavian burial places of the ninth and tenth centuries, a time when Irish and Anglo-Saxon works of art were imported to Norway which has been catalogued as a Christian Sasanian work prior to 340 A.D. It is described as follows by J. M. A. Chabouillet (Catalogue général et raisonné des canées et pierres gravées de la Bibliothèque impériale [Paris, n.d., 1868?], p. 191, No. 1330): "Le patriarche est représenté le couteau à la main et s'apprêtant à immoler son fils couche sur un autel en forme de pyrée. Abraham se retourne et aperçoit l'ange qui lui montre le bœuf qu'il retient par une de ses cornes." The description and attribution are repeated by Ernest Babelon in the latest edition of his guide to the Cabinet de Médailles (Le Cabinet de médailles et antiquités de la Bibliothèque nationale. Notice historique et guide du visiteur: 1. Les antiques et les objets d'art [Paris, 1924], p. 57, No. 1330), although the last sentence of Chabouillet is changed to read: "Abraham se retourne et aperçoit l'ange qui lui amène un bœuf." If the description and attribution are correct, this work would have a considerable bearing on this problem, as well as on the history of early Christian art. But the only reproduction I have been able to find of this gem, on Pl. 479 (No. 9) of Garrucci's Storia dell' arte cristiana (see also his text, VI [Rome, 1881], p. 123), shows no angel at all; Chabouillet and Babelon have apparently mistaken for an angel the bush, which is placed vertically across and above the body of the ram and is surmounted by the hand of God. One branch touches the horns of the ram, and it is not difficult to see the bush as a human figure presenting the ram. The early date assigned to the gem has been questioned by C. W. King, Antique Gems and Rings (London, 1872), I, 84.

Another work that seems to indicate the existence of the motif of the angel with the ram in early Christian art is an ivory pyxis from Nocera Umbra in the Terme Museum (A. Venturi, Storia dell' arte Italiana [Milan, 1901], I, Fig. 406 and p. 534). It is described as follows by Alison Moore Smith "The Iconography of the Sacrifice of Isaac in Early Christian Art," Amer. Journ. Archaeol., Ser. 2, XXVI [1922], 165: "The ram which is below a tree at Abraham's right appears again, with an angel added to the scene." This suggests that the artist, of the Alexandrian-Coptic school, according to this writer, wished to show as a distinct episode the angel bringing the ram. But the angel to the left of the sacrifice is really the angel who brings Habba'ak in the adjoining scene of Daniel in the Lions' Den, and the second "ram" at his feet is a lion. This is clear from the description and the two illustrations in the study by A. Pasqui, Necropoli Barbarica di Nocera Umbra, monumenti antichi (Milan, 1919), XXV, 209-214, Figs. 61, 62.

22 See H. Schedlig and H. Falk, Scandinavian Archaeology (Oxford, 1937), pp. 271 ff.; T. J. Arne, La Suède et l'Orient, Archives d'études orientales, 8 (Uppsala, 1914); G. Jacob, Der nordisch-baltische Händel der Araber im Mittelalter (Leipzig, 1887); and the works of Brandsdorpf and Paulsen cited in note 20 above.

to Arabic literature. But much that he attributes to the latter existed already before Islam in early Christian writings or in medieval Latin literature prior to the ninth century.

I may be permitted to adduce here a parallel situation in the history of the familiar epitaph: “What you are now, we were; what we are, you shall be” (quod fuimus, estis; quod sumus, vos eritis). It is the idea that underlies the macabre story of The Three Living and The Three Dead. Now this verse, so common in Western epitaphs of the Middle Ages, has been traced literally to Arabic poems of the third and sixth centuries A.D. To connect the latter with inscriptions in Italy and France in the eleventh and twelfth centuries does no violence to our knowledge of the historical relations of Islam and southwestern Europe in this period. But there is an older example in an Anglo-Saxon sermon which is dated in 971 and no doubt goes back to a Latin source. In the Blickling Homily, “The End of This World is Near,” the author tells the story of a man who returns to the tomb of his rich friend and hears from his bones: “O my friend and kinsman, be mindful of this, and convince thyself that thou art now what I was formerly, and after a time thou shalt be what I now am.” The same sentiment is expressed in the Latin epitaph that the Anglo-Saxon Alcuin (ca. 730–804) wrote for himself:

Quod nunc es fueram, jamosus in orbe, viator,
Et quod nunc ego sum, tuque futurus eris.

If the theory of the Arabic origin of the motif is correct, we would have a parallel to the history of the angel with the ram in Western and Moslem art: a transmission from the Arabic East to the far Northwest, and thence to France and Italy. But the macabre verse exists also in substance in ancient literature—the same thought has been found in the book of Jesus Sirach (38:22) and later in Ausonius—and probably both the Arabic and the medieval European examples in the North and South are derived from the older Hebrew and classical sources, although it must be admitted that neither the Hebrew nor the Roman versions are as close to those of the Middle Ages as the Arabic form of the third century A.D.

The same possibility of a common source

24 See his La Escatología musulmana en la Divina Comedia (Madrid, 1919) and Dante y el Islam (Madrid, 1927).
27 See K. Künstle, Die Legende der drei Lebenden und die drei Toten und der Totentanz (Freiburg i.Br., 1908), pp. 29, 30; Storck, op. cit., and his book, Die Legende von den drei Lebenden und den drei Toten und das Problem des Totentanzes (Tübingen, 1910); and W. Stammer, Die Totentänze des Mittelalters (Munich, 1922), p. 14 ff. The Arabic parallels are verses by ‘Adi b. Zaid (sixth century A.D.) and Mużād b. ‘Amr (third century A.D.), which have been kindly verified for me by G. E. Grünbaum: “As you are, so we have been—As we are, so you will be,” and “We were people as you are now, but—Time has changed us; and you will be what we are now.”

32 The Latin examples have been collected by B. Lier, “Topica carminum sepulcrallum latinorum,” Philologus, 62, N.F. 16 (1903), 591, 592.
may be posed for the Western and Muslim conception of the Sacrifice of Abraham.

It is well known that Koranic and traditional Muslim stories about the figures of the Old Testament are often based on Jewish legends. In a Haggadic writing, the Nevech Shalom ("Dwellings of Peace"), Gabriel is described bringing the ram to the altar, a characteristically Semitic theme of angelic mediation. The manuscript is a Spanish Hebrew writing of the fifteenth century; but like other Haggadic tales, this one is probably of much more ancient origin.

Its antiquity is established by another account of Abraham's sacrifice as early as the first century B.C. A Greek writer of that time, Alexander Polyhistor, in his work Concerning the Jews, tells the story as follows: "But when he (Abraham) was about to slay him, he was forbidden by an angel who provided him with a ram for the offering." This text is preserved by Eusebius in his Preparation for the Gospel, an invaluable collection of Oriental history and traditions.

34 Cited by L. Ginberg, The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia, 1925), p. 255, n. 245; another example from the Midrash Yalkut is cited by Weil, op. cit., p. 38 note (it is a compilation made in Frankfurt in the thirteenth century).
35 Munich, Staatsbibliothek cod. hebr. 222 (Seperor Ha-masvim); see M. Steinschneider, Die hebraischen Handschriften der k. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in Muenchen (2d ed.; Munich, 1895).
36 See Eusebii Praeparatio evangelica, ed. E. H. Gifford (Oxford, 1903), I, 531, for the Greek text (IX, 9, 421 b) and III, pars I, p. 452 for the translation. According to J. Freundenthal (Hellenistische Studien [Breslau 1875], p. 36 n.) the passage in question could not have been written by Alexander, since the language and style are closer to those of the Septuagint than are other passages about the Jews quoted by Eusebius from his treatise; but it was perhaps excerpted by Alexander from the writings of the chronographer Demetrius, who was more directly acquainted with Jewish literature and tradition.

How the Jewish legend reached Ireland is obscure. Insular literature is amazingly rich in Jewish apocryphal elements and folklore. The elaboration of the stories of Adam and Eve, of Cain and Abel, of Lamech, of Nimrod, and of Solomon, in the literature of England and Ireland owes a great deal to Jewish tales. In some instances this foreign matter may be traced to patristic writings; but the passage in Eusebius does not seem to have interested the early commentators on Genesis or to have influenced the Christian paraphrases of the story of the sacrifice. The writers who recount the incident in chronicles or world histories, in which they draw sometimes on other works of Eusebius, are faithful to the Biblical text. That is true of Sulpicius Severus, of Gregory of Tours, of Caedmon, and Peter Comestor. The Jewish Antiquities of Josephus, which was widely read in the Middle Ages, also adheres to the original story (I, 13, 4).

It is unlikely, moreover, that Jewish images suggested this exceptional type to western ar-
tists, although one must observe that the Jewish pictorial remains of the fifth to the thirteenth century are too scant to allow a reliable judgment. But the fact that the surviving Jewish examples of Abraham’s sacrifice generally correspond in iconographic type to the common Christian representations would exclude or weaken this possibility.\textsuperscript{38}

The assumption remains that the legend was transmitted in the West by the Jews themselves, as in Islam. And of this there is interesting evidence in a text of the early Carolingian period.

In his \textit{Interrogationes et Responsiones in Genesen}, the Englishman Alcuin asks:

Whence came that ram, who was sacrificed instead of Isaac? Was he suddenly created there out of the earth, or was he brought from elsewhere by the angel? Response: That ram is not to be considered imaginary, but a true ram. It is therefore supposed by the learned that an angel brought him from some other place rather than that God created him then and there from the earth, after the works of the six days.\textsuperscript{39}

The two alternatives posed here are derived from the ones which appear in rabbinical tradition. Some Jewish writers say that a ram, created on the evening of the sixth day, had been browsing in Paradise, waiting for the occasion of Abraham’s Sacrifice; others, that the angel brought the bellwether of Abraham’s flock.\textsuperscript{40} This last detail is actually rendered in the Persian miniature of the Sacrifice in the Walters Gallery (Fig. 7).

The connection with extra-Biblical Jewish tradition is strengthened by Alcuin’s answer to the question that follows: “Why did Abraham call that place: \textit{The Lord saw}, when there is nothing that the Lord does not see?” The reply alludes to “the saying of the Jews that when they are in difficulty and wish to be helped by the Lord, they declare: God will see on the mountain, that is, will have mercy on us as on Abraham. Whence they are wont to give the sign of the ram by blowing on a horn.”\textsuperscript{41}

The explanation of the blowing on the shofar or ram’s horn as a rite connected with Abraham’s sacrifice follows Jewish literature. The rabbis say that when Israel has turned to sinful-

\textsuperscript{38} In the early images in the synagogues of Dura and Beth Alpha (illustrated in R. Wischnitzer-Bernstein, \textit{Symbole und Gestalten der jüdischen Kunst} [Berlin-Schöneberg, 1935], Figs. 9, 15), as in some of the oldest Christian versions, the angel does not appear at all. This agrees with Philo’s account of the sacrifice in his work “On Abraham” (176), and with a Coptic retelling, published by O. von Lemm, “Kleine koptische Studien,” \textit{Mem. Imperial Acad. Sci. of St. Petersburg, Hist.-Philol. Class}, VIII (1908), No. 12, 17 ff.

A more developed early Christian type with the angel appears on an ironstone amulet of the fourth or fifth century with a Hebrew inscription in the collection of the late Edward Newell. It will be published in a book on Greco-Egyptian and Levantine amulets by Professor Campbell Bonner of the University of Michigan, who has very generously put at my disposal some of his unpublished material.

For medieval and later Jewish images of the sacrifice similar to the contemporary Christian types, see Wischnitzer-Bernstein, \textit{op. cit.}, Figs. 16, 17; F. Landsberger, \textit{Einführung in die jüdische Kunst} (Berlin, 1935), Pl. 13, Figs. 33 and 38; \textit{Encyclopaedia Judaica} (Berlin, 1931), VIII, s. v. Isak, pp. 481, 482. Alexander Marx has shown me an especially fine example in a manuscript of about 1300 from Steiermark in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York.

\textsuperscript{39} J. Migne, \textit{Pat. lat.}, C, col. 545. Inter. 206: “Unde aries iste, qui pro Isac immolatus est, venerator, solet quare: an (de) terra ibi subito creatus esset, vel aliquando ab angelo alatus?—Resp. Aries iste non putativus, sed verus esse credendus est. Ideo magis a doctoribus aestimatur, aliquando eum angelum atulisse, quam ibi de terra, post sex diem opera, Dominum proceresse.”

\textsuperscript{40} See Ginzberg, \textit{Legends of the Jews}, I, 282, V, 257, n. 245; Weill, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 88 n. The same alternatives occur in the Muslim literature: Grünbaum, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 112, and Tañari, \textit{loc. cit.}, p. 188.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Pat. lat.}, C, col. 545.
ness, it will be redeemed through the horns of the ram.42

But this second reference to Jewish legend comes directly from patristic question books. Alcuin simply reproduces here almost word for word corresponding passages of Jerome43 and Augustine.44 As several writers have observed, Alcuin's work is a compilation based on similar productions of the early Christian period.45 But the question (No. 206) about the origin of the ram is not to be found in these older works, nor among the questions of Alcuin's medieval predecessors, Isidore46 and Bede.47 If we compare the questions of Alcuin with the corresponding series in Augustine's Quaestionum in Heptateuchum, the patristic book that corresponds most closely to this part of Alcuin's questions, we find the following: Augustine's qu. LVI is like Alcuin's qu. 200; qu. LVII is like Alcuin's qu. 201; qu. LVIII is like Alcuin's qu. 207; qu. LIX is like Alcuin's qu. 208.48

On the other hand, Alcuin's question (and answer) No. 206 is reproduced word for word in a later Carolingian question book by Angelo-

42 Ginzberg, _op. cit._, I, 285, V, 252, n. 248; and Bereshith Rabba, LVI.
43 _Liber Hebraicorum Quaestionum in Genesim_, Pat. lat., XXIII, 1021. The same passage is also found in Bede, _Quaestiones super Genesim_, Pat. lat., XCIII, col. 319, and in Rabanus Maurus, _Pat. lat._, CV, col. 358; cf. also Remigius of Auxerre, _Pat. lat._, CXXI, col. 96.
44 _Quaestiones in Heptateuchum_, Pat. lat., XXXIV, col. 563.
46 _Pat. lat._, LXXXIII, cols. 249-51.
47 _Ibid._, XCIII, cols. 318-20; he follows Jerome closely.
48 _Loc. cit._ Alcuin's qu. 207 is only in part like Augustine's LVIII; it repeats also part of Jerome's comment on Genesis 22:14 (_op. cit._, col. 1021 A).

mus of Luxeuil,49 who copies other passages of Alcuin as well; and in the _Glossa Ordinaria_ on the Bible, in the comment on "arietem" (Genesis 22:13), the author repeats Alcuin's answer.50 That Alcuin himself had not merely copied some older Christian text is supported by the fact that in the _Glossa Ordinaria_, which names the patristic authors excerpted by Strabo, Alcuin is given as the source of this passage.

If this analysis is correct, one may suppose that Alcuin owed the particular question and answer to fresh information derived from contemporary Jewish sources. In the Carolingian empire the personal relations of Jews and Christians were often close; Agobard, the bishop of Lyons, writing around 822, could attempt to summarize Jewish Midrashic and Cabalistic doctrines and complained of the growing influence of the synagogue in the Christian community.51 The Haggadic conception of the angel and the ram in Ireland in the tenth century depends on the renewed intimacy with Jewish traditions during the Carolingian period, when trade and

49 _Pat. lat._, CXV, col. 195.
50 _Ibid._, CXIII, 139. Augustine and Jerome are cited by name in the following passage.

The _Glossa Ordinaria_ is traditionally attributed to Walfrid Strabo (ca. 808-49), but the latter's authorship of this compilation has been questioned by S. Berger, _Histoire de la Vulgate_ (Paris, 1803), pp. 133-36, who concludes, however, that the _Glossa Ordinaria_ is at least in part a work by Walfrid (e.g., the Prophets); and by H. H. Glunz, _History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon_ (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 103-5. Glunz believed that the _Glossa Ordinaria_ in its present form is a work of the twelfth century built (especially in the Pentateuch glosses) on compilations of Rabanus and Walfrid.

travel were revived and Jews became for a moment more important in economic and political life, serving also as interpreters and envoys on missions to the East. Alcuin himself, as a kind of minister of education to Charlemagne, and as a scholar occupied with the revision of the Latin text of the Bible, was undoubtedly aware of the value of Jewish learning; in his own writings there is occasional reference to the Hebrew original of the Bible, although his own knowledge of Hebrew was probably very limited. His most able pupil, Rabanus Maurus, in preparing a commentary on books of the Old Testament, inserted into this work the opinions of a learned Jew whom he consulted.

From all this one may conclude that the Jewish legend of the angel and the ram, which is common to Persian and Western medieval art, was introduced into the Latin question literature at the end of the eighth century, and through the copies of Alcuin’s text became known on the continent and was thus available to Western artists. How it reached Ireland and why it was especially favored there, I cannot venture to say. I have found no illustrations of the motif in England, although it turns up in the fourteenth century in miracle plays of the Sacrifice of Abraham.

III

Let us consider finally the possibility that in western art the angel carrying the ram is a native variation independent of an Arabic or Jewish source. Such an abnormal departure is sometimes described as “accidental” and it is supposed that allowance must be made for chance in the production of iconographic varieties. But exceptional forms, no less than the common ones, presuppose determining interests and processes, even though they are more difficult to discover. A foreign model or text may underlie an isolated variant as well as a widespread type. To establish the independence of the motif of the angel with the ram one would have to show that it results from conditions in the West independent of the Muslim or Jewish examples. Of such conditions, the following may be entertained as possible: (1) a psychological process of condensation of existing images into a more compact form; (2) the imitation of a classic work with a similar motif; (3) the assimilation to other religious subjects in which an angel carries an object or instrument of salvation; (4) a desire to present the scene more rationally and naturally, in accord with new cultural standards. I shall take up these possibilities in turn.

1. Among the different ways in which an artist can imagine the scene, this type might sug-

---

52 On Alcuin's knowledge of Hebrew, see S. A. Hirsch, A Book of Essays (London, 1905), pp. 8-10. On the relations of Christian and Jewish scholars in Alcuin’s time there is an interesting passage in a letter of Alcuin’s: “When I visited Rome as a youth and spent several days in Pavia, a certain Jew by the name of Lullus had a discussion with master Peter. This was the same Peter who taught grammar so brilliantly in your palace” (Ep. 271 quoted by M. Manitius, Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters [Munich, 1911], I, 275).

53 For the texts, see Manitius, op. cit., pp. 296, 294; and on the knowledge of Hebrew in the Carolingian schools, C. Singer, “Hebrew Scholarship in the Middle Ages,” in The Legacy of Israel, ed. by E. R. Bevan and C. Singer (Oxford, 1927), pp. 287 ff.

54 In the Chester Play, lines 433, 434 (“Therfore God had me sent by me, in fayle! A lambe, . . . .”) and the Brome Play, line 323 (“A fayr Ram yvynder I gan brynge”); A. W. Pollard, English Miracle Plays, Moralties and Interludes (Oxford, 1890), pp. 28, 29, 175.

Alcuin’s Interrogaciones was translated into Anglo-Saxon by Aelfric, but his version does not go beyond question 201. See G. E. MacLean, Aelfric’s Anglo-Saxon Version of Alcuini Interrogaciones Sigewulﬁ Presbiteri in Genesin (Halle, 1883).
gest itself to a naïve mind, unfettered by the Biblical text and acquainted with the story mainly through other images. The angel is already mentioned in the Bible as calling to Abraham not to sacrifice Isaac, and in certain representations he points to the ram below or above him. In placing the heaven-sent ram in the arms of the angel as the heavenly messenger, the artist unites more firmly and clearly two constant elements of the action, and gives them an obvious functional connection. In medieval art, one may observe often how an attribute or accessory of a saint, at first set beside him, is later brought into direct contact with his body or even placed in his hands. The lamb of God is set in the arms of John the Baptist, the symbols of the evangelists become seats of the writing figures, the apostles carry the instruments of their martyrdom. But the idea that the angel with the ram arose spontaneously from a process of imaginative condensation underestimates the compulsive force of traditional types in the Middle Ages and the theological importance of the text itself, which was too familiar to be disregarded, unless it could be replaced by another text or viewpoint, equally or more significant for the emotional, religious weight of the scene. The appearance of the ram ex nihilo in the thicket was an essential ingredient of the story for the Middle Ages. Not only did the ram turn up miraculously, but his entanglement in the bush, which the Hebrew writer perhaps derived from an old Sumero-Babylonian rite, was interpreted by the Church as a prefigurement of the suspension of Christ on the Cross, an analogy that is implied in the suspension of the ram by the horn from the branches of the bush in images of the twelfth and later centuries (Fig. 8). The symbolic Christian sense of this detail would not operate in Islam; the account of the sacrifice in the Koran ignores completely the ram in the thicket.

A second objection may be brought against this explanation of the variant by an inherent process or tendency of the imagination: in some Western examples two angels are shown, one who arrests the sword of Abraham, another who brings the ram. The second angel is only an addition to the usual form of the scene and implies that the artist has isolated the bringing of the ram as a distinct moment in the story.

2. Classical art offers a parallel in the related theme of the sacrifice of Iphigenia. In some examples of the Roman period, Artemis or a nymph is shown in the sky bringing a hind as a

56 As suggested by C. L. Woolley, Abraham, Recent Discoveries and Hebrew Origins (London, 1936), p. 162.
57 Cf. Rabanus Maurus: "Cornibus ergo haerentem arietem cruciisum Christum significat," Commentarium in Genesis, Pat. lat., CVII, col. 569; the same interpretation appears also in Isidore, Pat. lat., LXXXIII, col. 251, Bede, Pat. lat., XCVI, col. 320, Remigius of Auxerre, Pat. lat., CXXXI, col. 96, and other writers. The thorns or brambles are sometimes likened to Christ's crown of thorns.
58 Cf. the miniatures in the English Bible in Lambeth Palace (O. Saunders, English Illumination [Florence, 1928], I, Pl. 39) and in a Regensburg manuscript of ca. 1170-85 in the Munich Library (Cln 14159, A. Boeckler, Die Regensburg-Prüzeninger Buchmalerei des XII. und XIII. Jahrhunderts [Munich, 1924], Pl. XXVII). There is an interesting example of 1455 in an Armenian gospel (Fig. 8) in the Walters Gallery (MS 543, fol. 4).
59 As on the capital in Jaca cited on page 155 and n. 11, and in a carving of the choir stall of Cologne cathedral (B. von Tischowitz, Das Chorgestühl des Kölner Domis [Marburg, 1930], Pl. 22a.
substitute for Agamemnon's daughter (Fig. 9). Is the medieval angel with the ram a distant reflection of the classical image? This is improbable for several reasons: the medieval examples are all very late and exceptional and appear first in Ireland, a region least affected by classical art; and in the early Christian versions of the Sacrifice of Abraham, including the one on the Berlin ivory pyxis, which is closest to the style of classical art and in which the form of Abraham has recalled to some scholars the figure of Calchas in Timanthes' celebrated painting of the Sacrifice of Iphigenia, the ram is never carried by an angel.  

3. In the most impressive example of the motif, on the great pillar of Souillac (Fig. 3), one observes that the mediating angel appears also in the relief above, which represents the story of Theophilus. It is in his arms that the Virgin descends from heaven to the repentant sinner in order to save him from the devil. On the portal of Beaulieu, another work of the same school, the angel appears again in this manner: on the tympanum, angels carry the instruments of the passion of Christ; below, an angel carries Habbakuk to Daniel. On the stylistically related portal of Moissac, an angel bears the soul of the dying Lazarus to Abraham's bosom. It may therefore be asked whether the artist who placed the ram in the arms of the angel in Souillac was not simply extending to a new theme a conception of angelic mediation already established in his school. On the south aisle portal of San Isidoro de León, the scene of the Sacrifice is surmounted by the holy lamb in a medallion held by two angels. But in Souillac there is a deeper connection with the ideas underlying the main subject of the sculptures, the possibility of redemption through mediating persons like the Virgin, rather than through God, as in the story of Theophilus. By multiplying sacred figures between God and man, by introducing directly the lower agents of the work of salvation, the religion becomes more popular and human.

Since this pattern of mediation is unknown or less marked on the Irish crosses, it would not account for the oldest examples of the angel with the ram. The priority of the Irish versions reduces the importance of the third explanation; yet it is possible that in Souillac, the already existing, but highly exceptional, motif was adopted in spite of its inconsistency with the text of the Bible, because in this region the concept of mediation had a special value for religious thought at the moment. And this judgment would be supported by other aspects of the same sculpture.

The artist's independence of the text is more far-reaching than appears from the detail of the angel and the ram. For the bush in which the ram was caught, an element crucial for Christian exegesis, this has been omitted, although the

---

63 Cf. the painting in Naples (M. H. Swindler, Ancient Painting [New Haven, 1929], Fig. 384), and for an example near the region of my Abraham type, a pavement mosaic from Ampurias, Spain (J. R. Méjida, Arqueología española [Barcelona, 1929], Fig. 197, p. 368). Reproduced in Figure 9.

61 For the Berlin pyxis, see O. Dalton, Byzantine Art and Archaeology (Oxford, 1911), Fig. 115; on the early Christian types of the angel in this subject, see Stuhlfaith, op. cit.; and on the relation of Abraham to Timanthes' Calchas, see D. Ainaloff, The Hellenistic Foundations of Byzantine Art (St. Petersburg, 1900) (in Russian), summarized by O. Wulff in a review in Repertorium f. Kunstwissensck., XXVI (1903), 45—the observation is Graeven's.

62 Porter, Romanesque Sculpture of the Pilgrimage Roads, ill. 348; Schapiro, "The Sculptures of Souillac," p. 361, Fig. 2.

63 Porter, op. cit., ill. 412, 419.
64 Ibid., ill. 365, 366.
65 Ibid., ill. 699, and Gómez-Moreno, op. cit., Pl. LXVII, CXXVIII.
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Walters Art Gallery, MS 343
sculptor has taken pains to represent Isaac carrying the faggots and has shown this detail, not symbolically, across Isaac’s shoulder or in the form of the beams of the cross, in analogy to Christ carrying the cross, but realistically, as a compact mass that a grotesque little Isaac, entangled in the twisted colonnettes framing the scene, holds before him like a torch. Instead of the familiar pairing of the Old Testament scene with the Crucifixion or with Christ carrying the Cross, there is carved on the other side of the trumeau the combat of an old man and a youth, in profane contrast to, or even parody of, the Sacrifice of Abraham in which the son submits to the father, as the latter to God. The motif of the angel and the ram in Souillac is part of a conception of the story which breaks with its traditional religious sense and thereby conveys a new secular striving and consciousness of the individual. The main sculpture of the complex at Souillac, no longer centralized or hierarchically composed like most of the great Romanesque reliefs of the period, confirms and illuminates this tendency; for it represents the salvation of a particular sinner, not by Christ, but by the Virgin, who is carried by an angel and herself brings to the penitent Theophilus the concrete material means of his rescue, the document of his pact with the devil.

4. In deviating from the text, the sculptors who set the ram in the angel’s arms replaced the spiritual significance of the ram in the bush by an image of the efficient cause of the miracle. The means of transportation becomes as interesting as the purpose of the event. This attitude is hardly unique in Romanesque art. In the church of San Isidoro of Léon, where there are two examples of this peculiarity, the Christ of the Ascension on the south transept portal is shown being lifted bodily by two angels, a most unusual variation of the normal types. It contradicts the teaching of the commentators who distinguished the ascensions of Elijah and Christ by pointing out that whereas Elijah rose with the help of a chariot, Christ ascended by his own force. The same type occurs also in southern France on the south aisle portal of St. Sernin in Toulouse. This parallel to our own motif, so far as I know independent of any theological text, flows from an empirical trend in early Romanesque art to represent actions in a more consequential, episodically rich and natural manner, and would seem to support the conclusion that the European examples of the angel with the ram are a native invention, inspired by a new artistic viewpoint and unconnected with Jewish-Muslim tradition. The strength of this tendency in the West is much greater in the Romanesque period than is commonly realized—at least to judge from the books and articles which stress rather the theological and abstract character of Romanesque imagery; one could easily cite examples of a similar change toward concreteness and reality in many other themes. In the cloister of Moissac, on many capitals, the familiar Biblical actions are preceded or followed by episodes of a purely preparatory or concluding character: Abraham and Isaac on the way to the sacrifice, Samuel seeking David in Bethlehem for the anointing, David conversing with Saul before the battle with Goliath, the descent of Christ and the apostles from Mount Tabor after the Transfiguration.

Yet this general trend is not enough to account for the invention of the angel with the

---

66 Porter, op. cit., ill. 352.
67 Ibid., ill. 349-51; cf. my observations, op. cit., p. 377.
ram. Most of the episodes I have mentioned existed already in pre-Romanesque art; what is distinctive in the eleventh and twelfth centuries is the unusual fullness of such episodic additions and the connection with a progressively naturalistic style, especially in stone sculpture. As in the previous explanation, the objection is at hand that the oldest examples belong to Irish art of the tenth century, a style which is not at all empirical in tendency and, on the contrary, reduces the traditional subjects to extremely brief, emblematic images. And this holds also for one of the oldest continental examples, the miniature in the Catalonian Farfa Bible, although not to the same extent.

A second difficulty lies in the distribution of the detail. It is found mainly in the southwest French and Spanish region, which shows in a pronounced way the iconographic realism in question. But the latter is a broader tendency that governs also large groups of Romanesque and Gothic works in which the traditional types of the Sacrifice are preserved. On the other hand, the angel with the ram appears in Romanesque art mainly in a part of Europe geographically close to Muslim (and Jewish) culture. Émile Mâle and others have brought together an impressive number of evidences of contact with Muslim art in southern France, especially in the region of Auvergne and Aquitaine; they include ornamental Kufic writing reproduced with an astonishing fidelity on capitals in Moissac and Le Puy and on the wood doors of the cathedral of the latter. The communication between Muslim, Jewish, and Christian groups in Spain and southern France during the eleventh and twelfth centuries is too well known to require restatement. But I should like to add one fact that has a special interest for the present problem. The chronicler, Rodulphus Glaber, writing in the first half of the eleventh century, in a story about the capture of the abbot of Cluny, Maiol, by Saracens while crossing the French Alps around 970, quoted the opinion of these Saracens that Christ descended from Abraham through Ishmael rather than Isaac. It is possible that the divergent Jewish-Muslim account of the sacrifice also circulated in southern France and Spain.

In four of the examples a little detail seems to support the connection with an Arabic source. In the versions in Souillac, Parthenay, Capua, and the Farfa Bible, the angel holds the ram by the head at the ear or the horn. According to Tabari and Rashid al-Din, Gabriel carried the ram by the ear. The significance of this detail is not clear. It occurs in Ireland, too (Fig. 2), and among the Irish works there are other examples (Fig. 1) in which the ram is held by the hind parts. The method of carrying the sacrificial beast varies also in the pagan images of Iphigenia. In the painting in Naples and in a pavement in Ampurias in Spain (Fig. 9), the hind is held by the horns, as in the statues of Artemis and the hind. But in most of the southern examples of the Sacrifice of Abraham with this particular motif, the ram is carried in the angel’s arms, as in the Muslim images. The method of holding the beast does not help one, therefore, to trace a more precise stemma of relationships. Whether the story of Gabriel bringing the ram reached the South directly from Jewish or Muslim sources or by way of


72 “They said that their Ismael begot Nabaiot; descending thence to their erroneous fiction which is, of course, as far from the truth as it is remote from holy and catholic authority”—Rodulph Glabri, Historiarum, lib. I, cap. IV, 9 (ed. Prou, pp. 11, 12).

73 Cited in note 60 above.
Alcuin's text or insular art remains an open question.

Yet even if the motif came to southern France and Spain from the North, it is worth considering the resemblance of the Muslim works and the examples in the Christian South as a kind of spiritual convergence. As the reception of Arabic science and philosophy by the Western world in the twelfth century presupposed a newly awakened native interest in secular knowledge and rational speculation, so the adoption of this little iconographic variant required a new attitude toward the basic text and its theological meaning, a readiness to disregard the crucial symbolism and the weight of exegesis in favor of a more human, folkloristic and in some respects more rational view, which approximates the Muslim and Jewish unsymbolic reading of this episode. The larger context of southern French and Spanish Romanesque art and especially of the sculptures of Souillac, permits one, I think, to interpret the new type of the Sacrifice in this way. But I would not venture to propose this explanation for the older Irish examples of which the spiritual milieu is much more obscure. It is worth noting, however, that the first literary record of the motif in the West belongs to the Carolingian period and to one of its leading humanists, Alcuin; this is the decisive moment when classical forms are re-introduced in the Northwest after the prevalence of the abstract, unnaturalistic styles of the northern peoples with their heritage of old tribal cultures. In Alcuin's answer to the question about the ram one observes already a naturalistic tendency, for he rejects the idea that God could have created the ram on the occasion of sacrifice, after his original labors of the six days—an idea that implies a perpetual creative action of God in nature—and prefers the less marvelous explanation that the ram was simply brought from another place.74

The survey and analysis of the available evidence yields the following results:

1. What appears to be an "accidental" variant in the West, unmotivated by the Bible text, occurs in Muslim art regularly as a direct illustration of a well-known legendary account of the sacrifice.

2. If this variant in Ireland is not inspired by Muslim oral, literary, or pictorial tradition, it may still be of eastern origin, since the same idea appears earlier in Jewish folklore, although not in Jewish art, and since there is a considerable evidence of elements of Jewish folklore and apocryphal literature in England and Ireland.

3. The Jewish legend had reached England by 800. It was interpolated by Alcuin in a series of questions about Genesis that otherwise corresponds closely to patristic writings.

4. On the continent the variant is concentrated in a region rich in contacts with Jewish-Muslim culture. In several examples it includes a minor detail, the grasping of the ram by the head at the ear or horn, that agrees broadly with Muslim literary accounts, but of which the significance is unclear.

5. The adoption of the Semitic variant in southern France and Spain, whether directly from Jewish or Muslim sources, or indirectly by way of Alcuin's text or Irish art, was possibly affected by native religious and artistic attitudes most evident in the sculpture in Souillac.

Meyer Schapiro

74 Dr. Ettinghausen has found another early example of the sacrifice of Abraham in Muslim art, a miniature in a manuscript of 1410-11 in the collection of Mr. Gulbenkian, formerly in the H. Yates Thompson collection. Here, as in the older example in the Walters Art Gallery, the angel does not carry the ram; but, considering the absence of the bush, the importance given to Gabriel and the other angels, and the difference from both the Biblical and the Koranic accounts, it is possible that the artist had in mind the traditional Jewish and Islamic legend discussed in this paper.
NOTES ON THE MINIATURES ON A THIRTEENTH-CENTURY BEAKER

A few years ago, Diakonov, a member of the staff of the Hermitage Museum, called attention for the first time to the subject matter in the decoration of a small goblet first published as "belonging to Tabbagh Frères," but now in the possession of the Freer Gallery of Art (Fig. 1). From reproductions showing different sides of the goblet, the author identified the scenes as illustrations of a story in the Shah Namah of Firdaousi, the story of Bizhan and Manizha, finding the key in two scenes, one portraying a boar hunt and the other a man lifting a stone from the top of a wall in which another man is imprisoned. In the latter the author recognized one of the heroic deeds of Rustam, a favorite subject with illustrators from the fourteenth century on. In book paintings the compositions were expanded to include many figures, but the four in the scene on the beaker are inevitable—the rescuer, the rescued, the soldier, and the woman of the story. By examining the series as best he could from the published reproductions,

Diakonov then worked out the story in pictures as follows:

1. Figure 5. The Prelude to the story of Bizhan and Manizha contains a description of a stormy night when the narrator Firdausi, himself frightened by storm and darkness, calls his beloved to share his loneliness:

   Amid the woes
   Of that long vigil strait at heart I rose.
   I had one in the house, a loving wight . . .

Immediately, one recognizes a method employed in early frescos, when in order to give more movement to the story in one composition, different stages of the action are represented. Thus, in the first picture there are three stages (reading left to right):

   a. The beloved at home.
   b. She goes out and brings the poet fruit:
      My darling idol fetched me lamps a-shine
      Fetched quinces, oranges, pomegranates, wine
      And one bright goblet fit for King of Kings.
   c. And finally, the beloved relates the tale that follows to calm and cheer him:
      Quaff thou the wine while from this volume's store
      I will read out to thee a tale of yore
      The theme is love, spell, war, and stratagem.

Most curious is it that here is the first representation of Firdausi.

2. Figure 2. In this picture, Kai-Khusrau feasts the heroic Bizhan before the latter starts upon a boar hunt in the country of the Armenians. On the left is Bizhan's horse and his perfidious guide and fellow traveler, Gurgin. The picture undoubtedly illustrates the words of Kai-Khusrau:

   He then
   Said to Gurgin son of Milâd, 'Bizhan
   Is ignorant of the road toward Irmân
   So bear him company with mule and steed
   To show the way and be his help in need.'

3. Figure 3. The third picture represents the boar hunt. Strangely, here is the presence of a third rider (according to the poem only two—Bizhan and Gurgin). Behind the mountains is a man's figure; this

4 A. G. Warner and E. Warner, The Shahnama of Firdausi (London, 1908), III, 287. Passages from this well-known English rendition were used as translations for the verses in the Russian original.

5 Ibid., p. 288.

6 Ibid., p. 292.

1 M. M. Diakonov, "Un Vase en faïence avec des illustrations de Shah-Nameh," Travaux de Département Oriental, Musée de l'Hermite, I (1939), 317–26. An English translation of the Russian article, from which the present notes were taken, was made by Stanley M. Frye. My thanks are due Dr. Richard Ettinghausen for first calling attention to the Russian article and for providing the translation.

2 F. R. Martin, Miniature Painting and Painters of Persia, India, and Turkey (London, 1912), I, Fig. 3; H. Rivière, La Céramique dans l'art musulman (Paris, 1913), I, Pl. 45.

is the forerunner of the multitude of onlookers that fill sixteenth-century Iranian miniatures, introduced by the artist for compositional and decorative purposes and making it much more difficult to understand the fundamental subject of the miniature. The decisive moment of a battle with a terrible beast is represented:

Then came one boar, a very Ahiman,
Whose tusks cut through trees like files
through stone.
And rent his hauberk while the reek of flight
Rose o'er the mead. Bizhan's sword smote
the boar.
And clave its elephantine form.7

4. Figure 4. In this miniature, two scenes are combined. On the left side, Bizhan, after the victorious battle with the boars, rests under a tree in a field near the camp of Manizha, daughter of the ruler of Turan, hoping to attract her attention, while Gurgin watches:

He was a youth and followed youthful fashion
Somewhiles pursuing fame and somewhiles
passion.8

At the right is a pavilion in which sit the princess and her nurse:

When the fair one saw
The visage of the chieftain from her tent
.......................... the maiden yearned
For love of him who came in quest of love
And sent her nurse as envoy.9

5. Figure 9. The contents of this picture are somewhat dubious. Most probably represented is the scene showing Manizha, in love with Bizhan, leading him to the palanquin in the courtyard in the capital of the kingdom, after she had caused him to be drugged asleep. At the right, is an elephant, which supports the palanquin. I believe it illustrates these lines:

She made a litter to transport the sleeper
A couch for him on one side; on the other
An easy seat for her.10

The only deviation from the poem is that Bizhan is represented keeping vigil, while Firdausi has it that he was kidnapped during sleep.

6. Figure 6. This picture represents the scene where the wrathful King of Turan, Afrasiyab, finding the

Iranian hero with his daughter decides to execute him; but the excellent knight Piran dissuades him, dreading the vengeance of Kai-Khusrau. Piran says:

If thou shalt shed
Bizhan's blood in this matter, from Turan
There will go up a dust-cloud of revenge.11

In the miniature, Afrasiyab is seated on the throne; beside him Piran, further on Bizhan, and to the left Piran's horse.

7. Figure 7. The sentence of Bizhan having been commuted to imprisonment in a pit, and Manizha's to banishment from her father's house, this scene represents both punishments. To the left, Garsiwaz leads Bizhan to the well; behind is Manizha, tearing her hair in despair. At the right, is the door of the courtyard:

Manizha was reduced to naked feet
Bare head and single wrap. He hustled her
Forth to the pit. Her eyes wept tears of blood.12

8. Figure 8. King Afrasiyab curses his daughter:

Thou wretched and accursed
Who art unworthy of the throne and crown
Thou hast abused my head among the kings...13

They take Bizhan away to throw him in the dungeon.

Before the illustrations in the lowest register take up the story, there is an interlude of events in Iran. The monarch Kai-Khusrau learns by crystal gazing of the fate which has befallen his young paladin and dispatches the greatest hero of Iran, Rustam, to his rescue. Rustam refuses the army which the king offers him and goes to Turan in the guise of a merchant leading a great caravan loaded with gems, garments, and rugs for gifts and for merchandise. Diakonov identifies the episodes as follows:

9. Figure 10. Rustam's caravan on the march.
10. Figure 11. Rustam's merchant camp in Turan.
11. Figure 12. Rustam's horse, Rakhsh.
12. Figure 13. The liberation of Bizhan from the pit, when Rustam alone among his companions had the power to lift the stone:

He grasped, raised and hurled the boulder
Back to the forest of the land of Chin.
Earth shook thereat.14

7 Ibid., p. 293.
8 Ibid., p. 295.
9 Ibid., p. 297.
10 Ibid., p. 299.
11 Ibid., p. 307.
12 Ibid., p. 310.
13 Ibid., p. 309.
14 Ibid., p. 345.
The captive released from the pit is met by Manżha and repentant Gurgin, who seeks to excuse his evil deeds and is finally forgiven.

A further examination of these small pictures reveals that the twelve are arranged in three zones of four, each corresponding to the beginning, the middle, and the end of the tale. Also, another interpretation for several scenes would remove the difficulties noted by Diakonov, and at the same time make for a gain in sequence and in direction, that is, in an unvarying movement from right to left. The illustrator kept so close to the narrative that he used no unnecessary figures and, as is common in the early stages of any folk painting, made every figure tell in the unfolding action. I would, therefore, abandon the attractive idea of an illustration of the poet Firdausi, and arrange the pictures as follows:

1. Figure 2. Kai-Khusrau feasting the youthfui Bizhan (as above).

2. Figure 3. A single composition which includes two scenes:
   a. Bizhan, falcon on wrist, on his way, followed by the knight Gurgin, his guide to Armenia.
   b. Bizhan slaying a boar, while Gurgin is stationed at a distance under orders to watch for others that might escape, a duty which he sullenly refuses. Far from being an onlooker placed in a scene in which he had no part, his figure represents the very crux of the action, since it was at this moment that he was moved to do Bizhan a mischief. It was then that he conceived the plan to tempt Bizhan into danger by suggesting that he go to the summer camp of the Princess Manžha:

   Malevolent Gurgin, the insensate one
   Apart drew near the forest sullenly
   And all the wood gloomed in his eyes albeit

   He praised Bizhan and made a show of joy.
   That matter grieved his heart, he feared disgrace
   And Ahriman seduced him.

   Gurgin for his own profit and renown
   Spread out his nets upon the young man's path.15

3. Figure 4. Bizhan reclining under a tree in the meadow near the pavilion of Manžha, while Gurgin watches (as above).

4. Figure 5. In successive scenes, the progress of the love affair is pictured:
   a. Forth from beneath the shadow of the cypress Bizhan proceeded hastily afoot
   Toward Manžha's tent and entered it.16
   b. Bizhan is feasted by Manžha.
   c. The castle of Afrasiyab, here represented by wall and closed gate.
   d. Garsiwaz is sent by the king to investigate the rumor that a stranger from Iran is being entertained in his daughter's apartments:

   As Garsiwaz approached the gate the sound
   Of feast and revelry was heard within.17

5. Figure 6. Garsiwaz undertakes the seizure of Bizhan:

   When Garsiwaz found that the palace portal
   Was fastened and heard revels going on within,
   He broke down all obstructions, rushed within
   And sought the chamber where the stranger was.18

   The impetuous rush of the figure at the left is almost enough in itself to identify Garsiwaz.

6. Figure 7. The capture of Bizhan, who is shown twice, first tearing his hair with dismay and then being led into the courtyard holding one leaf of a wooden door as shield, is an arresting detail, since it corresponds

15 Ibíd., p. 294.
16 Ibid., p. 298.
17 Ibid., p. 301.
18 Ibid., p. 32.
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Fig. 15—The Women of Afrasiyab's Family Pleading Before Kai-Khusrau
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Fig. 19—Rescue of Bizhan by Rustam
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Fig. 20—Manizha Dropping the Bread to Bizhan
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Fig. 21—Rescue of Bizhan by Rustam
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perhaps too literally to the text that reads in translation:
He always carried in his boot
A blue-steel dagger; this he drew and holding
The door exclaimed "Bizhan am I!". 19

7. Figure 8. At the right, Bizhan, pinioned, is led into the presence of the king for sentence; at the left, he is led off to his punishment.

8. The sentence of death having been commuted to imprisonment in a pit, this picture follows: It shows the captive, still bound, within a cell identifiable as his prison by the great boulder of Akwan on the top. This, by the king's order, had been brought by an elephant from afar. Outside the cell stands Manizha, condemned by her father's bitter words to banishment and poverty:
Drag her naked to the pit and say:
Behold whom thou sawest on the throne
Here in this pit! Thou art his Spring,
console him
And wait upon him in his gloomy cell. 20

9. Figure 10. The caravan of Rustam (as above).

10. Figure 11. Since it would serve better the action of the story than the interpretation first proposed, this scene may be said to picture that critical moment in which Manizha receives from Rustam the roll of bread in which his signet ring is hidden and all unknowingly passes in to the prisoner this symbol of coming deliverance. 21

11. Figure 12. The horse Rakhsh (as above).

12. Figure 13. The liberation of Bizhan (as above). An interesting detail in this final scene is the action of Manizha, who lifts a cup in what is perhaps a symbolic gesture.

In first presenting the subject matter of the decoration upon this goblet, Diakonov emphasized what was to him the far more important matter of its relationship to the history of Persian painting. He pointed out the fact that while there are other examples in pottery decoration of single incidents drawn from the Shah Namah, from the poems of Nizami, 22 or from still earlier sources, this is the only case known of the illustration in successive episodes of an entire story. Its relation to book painting is unmistakable, and the author inclined to think that these small compositions, unrelated genetically to contemporary painting of the "Baghdad school," are representative of the lost book illustration of the twelfth to thirteenth century in Persia proper. Certainly, they appear to be in a direct ancestral line with the Shah Namah illustrations from the beginning of the fourteenth century (Figs. 14-17). 23 The delicate frames with inturning corners which separate the scenes also indicate derivation from book originals. The use of the frame either to separate pictures from text, or, when arranged in rows at the top or bottom of a page, from each other, was in common use from the early days of the illustrated bound book. 24


Although the Persian phrase "dar-i-khanah bi-girifita" ("holding the door") may be taken in a literal sense, it is idiomatically used to mean taking the way to the door of the house; or, in a military sense, defending the entrance. Mr. M. B. Smith kindly checked the Persian phrase for me.


21 Ibid., pp. 339-40. Cf. Figure 20.

22 Cf. brown lustre plate: Khusrau and Shirin, Freer Gallery of Art 41.11.


and continued always to be employed in Persia, even when reduced to a single line.

These gay little paintings, then, become invested with an unexpected significance when they are removed for the moment from the field of pottery decoration and are examined on their own merits as miniatures of the early thirteenth century. At first glance, they appear to be almost childlike in their simplicity, but a closer inspection reveals a mature skill in drawing all the essentials of action with swift and practiced strokes. Hands, for example, are correctly drawn—right or left, open or shut. Gestures express emotion. The sullen Gurgin glowers with folded arms (Fig. 3); Bızhān, facing capture, tears his hair with both hands (Fig. 7); while in the scene which I take to be that of Manīzha passing the roll of bread to Bızhān through a crevice in his cell, the captive lifts his open right hand to receive it (Fig. 11). The literal fact that his arms were pinioned (Fig. 9) is less important to the mind’s eye than that he should receive the token of Rustam with a thankful gesture.

The rescue of Bızhān, a favorite subject with painters from the fourteenth through the seventeenth centuries, emphasizes this liveliness of action to a remarkable degree. In later miniatures, the “pit scene” invariably shows the hero, Rustam, who has already removed the boulder from the mouth of the pit, in the act of letting down a rope to the captive below (Figs. 18, 19, and 21). Spectators stand motionless—Manīzha, Gurgin, sometimes other soldiers, sometimes demons watching from behind a hill. In our miniature, the true dramatic moment is chosen, and the hero, clad in his tiger-skin coat, is shown in the act of lifting and heaving away the stone, his legs spread, his body balanced for the throw. The captive emerges, Gurgin rushes forward, and Manīzha lifts a cup. It is an illustration of verbs throughout and, tiny as they are, these little springtime pictures manage to convey something of the ardor of the deeds they celebrate.

The coloring is quiet and harmonious, confined to light greenish blue, dark red, flesh color, and touches of black, on the cream ground. The bands painted above and below are of grayish blue.

Grace Dunham Guest

Ali Ibn Abi Talib’s Horoscope

Among the Harvard College Library Persian manuscripts there is a leaf, 15 by 12 cm., MS Persian 26, originally described thus: “Mss page of a small History of Early Kings of Persia representing a ‘Seljuk King,’ 13th c.” (Figs. 1 and 2). The leaf formerly belonged to H. Kevorkian, New York, and was taken from an incomplete manuscript, still in his possession, containing brief histories and illustrations of the kings of Persia, some of them legendary. It was listed in Kevorkian’s 1914 catalogue, compiled by the late Professor Hester Jenkins of Columbia University.

When examined more closely it was found to be the horoscope of the fourth caliph, the Prophet’s son-in-law, husband of Fatima and father of Hasan and Husain, who later became the martyrs venerated by the Shiites. Ali was assassinated by the Kharijite Abd al-Rahman b. Muldjam al-Šārīm on the 17 Ramadan 40 H. (January 24, 661 A.D.), at Kufa, in revenge for the slaughter of the Kharijite’s relatives in the battle of Nahrawān in 38 H. (659 A.D.). His age was fifty-eight or sixty-three. His son Hasan, a profligate, died of consumption at Medina; the other son, Husain, perished in the skirmish of Karbala on the 10 Muharram 61 H. (October 10, 680 A.D.)

The miniature which Eric Schroeder dated as of the first half of the fourteenth century and placed in central or southern Persia, shows Ali sitting against a cushion, with his two sons at the right and at the left, respectively. He is dressed in a red cloak with gold sleeves; the
cushion is light green. The figure on the right (Hasan?) has a pink coat with red spots; the one on the left wears a gray coat with gold sleeves. The background is gold.

The horoscope on the reverse is drawn in red ink; the djidwals are likewise in red.

The text accompanying the miniature reads:

And every opponent who will see him will flee, and his sword will abound all over the world, and he will always be victorious. All the kings from the east to the west upon the whole earth will flee before him, and in all this his bravery will be shown; and he will never have any wealth or treasury, because his ascendant (tālif) was in the ḥaḍid (the lower apsis of an eccentric orbit); and he will perish at the hands of his ghulām (servant soldier), and his children will be killed, [because] his constellation was Scorpio.

The horoscope states in the center: “Horoscope of Ali, peace be upon him.” Above, the conjunction of the moon and Venus is shown; the right-hand top corner shows the sun and Mercury; the left-hand bottom corner shows Saturn and Mars. Whether the twelve houses are to be counted from the alif, through bā, dām to lām, or in another manner, would be a matter for specialists in Arabian and Persian astrology to ascertain. Also the “aw zumurrud” in the Mercury khamā.

The text reads:

And Moon with Zuhārīn (Venus) in the ascendant, and Mīrīkh (Mars) with Zuhāl (Saturn) in the house of children: this was the cause of his sons having perished. The conjunction of sun with Ṣūṭārīd (Mercury), and his birth in the eleventh [house] was the reason why he was one of the prophets and occupied the rank of a king among the ancient kings, and that he vanquished fourteen kings. He was a king of the seed of Kayān, and of the seed of Sukānīn, and of the seed of Mīlān, and of the seed of Zardāshāg, and of the seed of Hat-lān, and of the seed of Hābsān, and in Kes Khan and in Hūdīn and Isfahan. . . .”

A. R. Nykl

NOTES

DAGHESTAN SCULPTURES

The name Daghestan, meaning “mountain land,” appears rather late in history. Today, it applies to an autonomous Soviet republic situated on the western shore of the Caspian Sea and reaching from the Kuma River in the north and beyond the “Iron Gate” of Derbent in the south. The Caucasus mountains cover its hinterland. As part of the land bridge between Europe and Asia, since prehistoric times Daghestan has been crossed by migrations, some of which left permanent settlers behind.

Until recently, the rare finds from Daghestan were classified according to the well-established chronological groups prevailing for the Caucasus region. There was little information concerning premetal and early metal sites, except for the barrows containing pottery of the Fatjano type, characteristic for central and

a small undated manuscript the bulk of which, including eleven or twelve miniatures, is still in the possession of Mr. Kevorkian, who kindly supplied the information about it. Two miniatures from this manuscript are now in the Garrett collection in the Princeton University Library (M. E. Moghadam and Y. Armajani, Descriptive Catalog of the Garrett Collection of Persian, Turkish and Indian Manuscripts Including Some Miniatures in the Princeton University Library [Princeton, 1939], p. 87, Nos. 195 and 196) and a third is said to be in the Metropolitan Museum. One of the Garrett miniatures was exhibited in the Persian Exhibition of 1940 in New York (P. Ackerman, Guide to the Exhibition of Persian Art [New York, 1940], p. 194, Case 76-C). The place of these miniatures in art historical development was shortly described by me in my review of the catalogue of the Garrett collection and of the New York exhibition (R. Ettinghausen, “Review of ‘Descriptive Catalog of the Garrett Collection. . . , ’ Ars Islamica VII [1946], 121, and idem, “Six Thousand Years of Persian Art. . . .” ibid., p. 111). A systematic treatment of this manuscript and its miniatures would be desirable.—ED.

1 A. S. Bashkiroff, Iskusstvo Dagestan ("The Art of Daghestan") (Moscow, 1931), p. 5.
The complete absence of monuments belonging to the so-called "Cimmerian" culture has been attributed to the fact that "among the regions of the Caucasus that of Daghestan is less explored than others from an archeological point of view." From the seventh to the third century B.C., the western shores of the Caspian Sea were probably part of the Scythian realm. When the Sarmatians succeeded their kinsfolk in this region, they left at least one characteristic token of their art in the form of a small bronze plaque representing a stag.

For the migrations from the third to the eighth century A.D., finds are more frequent in Daghestan. Zakhkaroff noted Roman fibulae, Gothic buckles, Hunnic burial customs, and bronze mirrors, cast after Chinese models, the unmistakable sign of Asiatic Turks. This variety of archaeological data resulted from the geographical position of the country; Europeans could reach it over the Grusinian and Ossetian "military roads"; the "Iron Gate" admitted conquerors from Armenia and Iran, while the backwash of migrations from Siberia and East Asia lingered around the northern shores of the Caspian Sea. When Derbent fell to the Sasanians in the sixth century, Iran became the leading political factor in Daghestan. Around 800 A.D. the Turkish Khazars created a powerful empire in South Russia, which reached the northern and western shores of the Caspian. For some time Daghestan was included in this empire, which undoubtedly drew its population from the mixed peoples surrounding it.

With the arrival of the Seljuks at the end of the eleventh century, a Turkish overlordship was definitely established. For three hundred years Daghestan was a link in the chain of the vast Turkish possessions between Crimea and the highlands of Luristan. Like their predecessors and contemporaries of Turkish stock, the Seljuks ruled as an aristocracy over a mixed population. The religion of Muhammad had already come to Daghestan with the conquest by the Arabs of the Sasanian empire at the end of the seventh century. During the Seljuk period, however, masters and subjects were equally reluctant to adhere to the strict rules of Islam concerning artistic production. Consequently, local traditions of figural representation lived on until Tamerlane and his destructive armies swept over the country and annihilated the Seljuks at the end of the fourteenth century.

Daghestan of the Seljuk period assumed specific identity in art history when monuments of a limited range of distribution and of individual character were discovered there. In 1924 the Soviet authorities entrusted A. S. Bashkiroff, a native scholar, with the artistic investigation of his homeland. It was he who coined the term "Daghestan art" and gave it its generally accepted meaning. Finally, Bashkiroff's activity culminated in a profusely illustrated monograph entitled The Art of Daghestan. It had a lengthy resumé in English, but, unfortunately, the plates were badly printed. In this book the author reviewed the long forgotten reports of his predecessors who had investigated the region

---

2 A. M. Tallgren, "La Pontide préscythique," Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua (Helsinki), II (1926), 28 and 81. Hereinafter this periodical will be cited as E.S.A.


4 Ibid., Fig. 29.

5 Ibid., p. 216.

6 T. J. Arne, La Suède et l'Orient (Upsala, 1914), p. 117.

7 A. M. Tallgren ("Besprechende Archaeologische Bibliographie von Osteuropa," E.S.A., I [1927], 148) stated that he gave a first report in the Trudy Sekcii Archeologi, Institute for Archaeology and Art in Moscow, I (1926) (not accessible to the writer). This was followed by another article incorporated into volume IV (1928) of the same publication, "Sculptures monumen-tales de l'aoul Kubañ, Daghestan."

8 See footnote 1.
during the second half of the nineteenth century, and who had left descriptions, drawings, and photographs of this region. Without this material the origin and dates of the sculptures under discussion would remain uncertain. Bashkiroff's list of Russian publications should be completed by John Abercromby's *A Trip Through the Eastern Caucasus*,\(^9\) where reference is made to the monuments reproduced here.\(^{10}\)

As soon as the Soviet scholar brought this unobtrusive corner of the ancient world to general attention, it was discovered that Europe and America owned some of the newly appreciated relics. These had been acquired by a well-known art dealer, Dikran G. Kelekian, as early as 1912. From his galleries in Paris and New York these Daghestan sculptures entered exhibitions and museums. The seven specimens acquired by Mr. Kelekian are the subject of this study. Mr. Kelekian vaguely recalls an eighth piece which could not be traced.

The first public showing of Daghestan sculpture was at the Exhibition of Persian Art, held in London in 1931. It included the hunting scene.\(^{11}\) In 1935 the Soviet Union honored the Third International Congress of Iranian Art by an exhibition. The first part of the *Catalogue*, seemingly the only one ever published,\(^{12}\) lists forty-four numbers, covering about fifty items of Daghestan sculpture, all borrowed from Russian museums.

The memorable art show, "The Dark Ages," organized in 1937 by the Worcester Art Mu-

13 *Catalogue of the Exhibition*, Nos. 53 and 54; Figs. 1 and 5 in this text.

14 *Catalogue*, Gallery XIV, p. 452, No. 6, and p. 471, No. 52; Figs. 5 and 3 in this text.

15 F. Sarre, *Der Kiosk von Konia* (Berlin, 1936), Fig. 36 and Pl. 17a, b; Figs. 1, 2, and 7 in this text.

16 M. S. Dimand, "A Stone Relief from Kubachi in the Province of Daghestan in the Caucasus," *Metropolitan Mus. Art*, XXXIII (1938), 260–62; Fig. 1 in this text.

17 Bashkiroff, *op. cit.*, Pl. 8.
NOTES

visitors. It shows six of the seven reliefs discussed here in their actual state of conservation; they are recognizable even in the poor reproduction. They were inserted at random into the façade of a relatively modern house, as follows: One relief in the center between two windows (Fig. 1), one directly above it (Fig. 2), followed by one toward the right (Fig. 5), one above the tympanum of the right window (Fig. 3), one above the left window (Fig. 7), and one adjoining at the left (Fig. 4). It is most likely that Figure 8 comes from the same wall. When the Kūbachi house was torn down, all these reliefs were sold, so that Bashkiroff could only report their disappearance. By arriving in the West, they confirm Orbeli's statement that the mountain strongholds of Daghestan with their wealth of ancient objects in nearly every house supplied many collections and museums.18

Concerning the medium employed for the Kūbachi sculptures, one can only repeat Bashkiroff's statement that the stone is always a "soft argillite with ferruginous layers."19 No traces of the buildings once decorated by these reliefs have been reported. It is possible that they were destroyed by the local inhabitants, who used them as quarries. Fortunately, Sarre's investigations at Konia prove that Seljuk architecture of secular character made extensive use of just such stone reliefs. In addition, architectural fragments, mainly with geometric floral decorations of the same period, have come to light in Armenia.20

Clues as to the character of the subjects represented in the Daghestan reliefs are given by comparison of the seven specimens now in the West with those still in the country of origin and made known by Bashkiroff. The repertory of the Kelekian collection covers nearly the whole range of that of the group. The most representative example is the well-preserved tympanum in the Metropolitan Museum (Fig. 1). In the main field is a man on horseback in low relief—a common motif of all Daghestan sculptures. The rider holds the bridle in his left hand; with his right hand he extends a whip which touches the back of the horse. He is depicted as if moving at a moderate stride. Although this subject is not represented among Bashkiroff's material, with one possible exception,21 it dominates Daghestan art, particularly among the bronzes.22

Two medallions, one in the Louvre (Fig. 2) and the other in the Kelekian collection (Fig. 3), also bear single figures. On each one a man sits or squats within a multilobed frame, his hands resting comfortably on his thighs. This position suggests complete relaxation, as if the man were enjoying a scene from a balcony or window. No stool is visible. Holding bridle and a whip, a man on horseback also appears on the fragment of a tympanum owned by the Louvre (Fig. 4). Since an approximate symmetry prevails in all Daghestan compositions of more than one figure, it may be presumed that the lost part showed a similar person, probably depicted as moving in the opposite direction from the other. On the upper border, above the representation, a man walks along followed by a dog and preceded by a lion, which can be easily identified by numerous Daghestan examples. Each of the animals has a long tail, pulled down between the hind legs and extending upward across the stomach into a tuft upon the back (Fig. 7).23 With

19 Bashkiroff, op. cit., p. 83.
22 The presentation of these bronzes is planned by the present writer for a later issue.
23 See also Bashkiroff, op. cit., PIs. 25, 28, 33, 49, 57, 69, and 71.
its lost mate, the lion illustrated once crowned the border without taking a part in the action, represented by the other figures of the relief. The pedestrian carries a circular shield and a standard topped by a pick. Another slab from the destroyed house at Kūbachī, and still preserved there, shows the same pole (Fig. 6) with a trilobed flag, evidently made of some stiff material and probably serving as a target for the archer on horseback, who aims backward at it. At the foot of the target, is a shield, with a quiver leaning against it. Since the servant on the Louvre fragment carries one of these implements, it may be supposed that his lost companion had charge of the other. Obviously, the tympanum represents the departure for a shooting contest of the type shown in Figure 8.

An incomplete rectangular panel in the Kuleikian collection introduces a hunting scene, so far without parallel in Dagestan sculpture (Fig. 5). Two men and a dog follow boars, which are identified without a doubt by their proportions and by their parted hoofs. The animals are arranged in two rows, one above the other, and six of them are wholly or partly preserved. In the lower row the animal in front of the hunter is falling down, its mouth wide open and its shoulder pierced by an arrow. The archer at the left prepares to hit another animal while his companion startles the game by shaking a sack, presumably filled with rattling objects, in his raised left hand. At the same time, he protects himself against sudden attack by a club advanced in his right hand. On another relief a boar falls victim to a lion. Orbeli took exception to this obvious representation of a wild pig. He suggested that its image could not have been acceptable to followers of the Prophet. The Seljuks, however, permitted themselves so many liberties with Muhammadan laws and customs that another exception is not unlikely.

On another rectangular slab of the Kuleikian collection, two men are coming to grips in preparation for a wrestling match (Fig. 8). This subject enjoyed great popularity among the sculptors of Dagestan; other examples bring the participants into a clinch (Fig. 6).

Of this group only the tympanum owned by the Freer Gallery (Fig. 7) excludes the human element. Two addorsed lions occupy the main field, against a dotted ground. Their heads are turned back to an almost frontal view. The mane consists of rows of schematic scales. The border contains five agitated animals marching against a background of scrolling plant tendrils. In the center a lion is biting its back; to the left follows a winged griffon and at the right a winged sphinx, its human head adorned with a five-lobed crown and a scalloped collar. The other two animals are naturalistic representations; the one on the left is of an antelope; the other at the right is of a stag.

The subjects of the seven reliefs reveal a preponderance of human themes. The man seated in full front view (Fig. 2 and 3) occurs commonly in all branches of Seljuk art. He seems to delight merely in relaxation and has no additional significance. Four times actions occur that have to do with sports. Their importance in Turkish art was noticed by Bashkiroff. The horse-riding knight (Fig. 1) carries no supernatural attribute or any weapon. Consequently, he has nothing to do with the "fighter against evil," so frequently found in neighboring civili-

24 See also ibid., Pl. 7.
25 I am indebted to Mr. Millard Rogers, of Chicago, for the observation that the sculptor gives a right hand to the left arm of this man.
26 Bashkiroff, op. cit., Pl. 71.
27 Orbeli, op. cit., p. 305.
28 See also Bashkiroff, op. cit., Pls. 5 and 12.
29 Sarre, op. cit., p. 34.
30 Bashkiroff, op. cit., p. 87.
izations. The hunt (Fig. 5), always a noble reminiscence of man’s primordial endeavor, needs no comment. Archery (Fig. 4) is a symbolic manifestation elsewhere, but not in Seljuk art. Wrestling (Fig. 8) has been called “ritual,” especially in connection with early steppe people. Recent discoveries, however, suggest a different parentage for the Daghestan version. One of the burial mounds of southern Manchuria, dating from the end of the fifth century A.D., is called “The Tomb of the Wrestling Scene,” after the match depicted on the right wall. As is the custom in Korea, the main walls illustrate the life and entertainment of the nobleman honored by such an elaborate grave monument. The supernatural world finds a place only on the corbels of the ceiling; even these are not without intrusion of worldly subjects. Another wrestling scene has actually been found in this subordinate position. In both cases the participants are distinctly characterized as non-Chinese, probably as Tungus, or some other racial relatives of the Turks. The Wei-chih, a Chinese Sung text, based on a lost source, contemporaneous with the frescoes, gives welcome clues to their meaning. It describes customs of the Kao Chü li tribe, who built and painted the T'ung Kou graves. One statement reads: “In Han times, the court bestowed on the king of the Kao Chü li an entertainment by a musical band (also to be found on the main walls of these monuments) and athletic performances.” Speaking of the way an ambassador of these people was treated by the Chinese, the text goes even further by reporting that “the emperor caused the board of court affairs to give musical and wrestling performances in his honor and then sent him away.” Thus, a purely mundane explanation of the wrestling match in Daghestan is entirely within the Turkish tradition.

The decorative animal composition (Fig. 7) combines Near Eastern remnants with steppe conceptions. The lion descends in an unbroken succession from prehistoric Mesopotamia throughout all ancient Mediterranean civilizations until it becomes a mere ornament, as in the departure for the archery contest in the Daghestan relief. The griffon belongs to the common repertory of early Assyria, Babylonia, and Iran. The Scythians introduced it into the art of the steppes, where it became common property without retaining any significance. A similar origin and ancestry pertains to the sphinx. The Seljuks made this fantastic creature one of their leading motifs, as illustrated by many paterae and mirrors. Only the simple and naturalistic rendering of the stag and of the antelope keeps faith with the tradition of nomadic hunters, inherited by the Daghestan Seljuks from their forefathers.

For a more detailed analysis of the forces behind Daghestan sculptures one has to turn to an analysis of their details. The human beings represented reveal little by their facial aspect, since the heads have been badly mutilated without exception, evidently by later Muhammadan inhabitants whose faith found such figural representation objectionable. Occasionally, hair and beard are still recognizable as such. The man on the Metropolitan Museum relief has a heavy moustache and a short goatee, framing the jaws.

31 J. Strzygowski, Baukunst der Armenier (Vienna, 1918), II, 632.
33 H. Ikehchi and S. Umehara, T'ung Kou (Tokyo, 1940), II, Pl. XLII.
34 Ibid., Pl. XXV.
36 Ibid., p. 28.
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Fig. 4—Stone Relief, Dagestan. Paris, Musée du Louvre
Fig. 5—New York, D. K. Kieckhan Collection
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Fig. 7—Stone Relief, Dagestan, Washington, Freer Gallery of Art.
Fig. 8—Stone Relief, Daghestan. Paris, D. K. Kelekian Collection

Fig. 9—Pottery Statuette, China, Tang Period. New York
C. T. Loo Collection
Whiskers of this type, common in all branches of Seljuk representation of personages, characterize every race that originated in the Eurasian steppes, from the Scythians, embossed on the silver vases of South Russia, down to the Uigur donors, painted on the walls of Buddhist caves in Turkestan.38 These Uigur latecomers, protectors of Buddhism, constitute the most civilized branch of the Turkish race in the Far East. After 750, they provided the ruling class of Chinese Turkestan, much in the same way as their blood brothers did in the Seljuk empire. Not every figure of Daghestan is shown heavily bearded; the lighter moustache and the small tuft of hair at the chin on the Louvre medallion probably characterize a younger man. The servant of the Louvre tympanum and the wrestlers lack even these modest indications of mature manhood, thus reducing them either to adolescence or to inferior social rank.

Only the wrestlers are bareheaded, and they have shortly cropped hair above crudely shaped ears. All others wear some kind of headgear. The mounted man of the Metropolitan plaque has a hood reaching down to his neck of a type commonly represented in the ancient art of Iran,39 and still worn as the bashlik by parts of the present Caucasian population. The knight and servant of the Louvre fragment have a shorter type of headgear. Over the hood on the knight is a cap with cell-like decoration and a spike at its apex. The medallion of the Kelekian collection shows a front view of the combined hood and cap, whereas the figure on the Louvre relief lacks the bashlik. Both caps have earflaps turned upward. One meets with a similar fashion in Turkestan frescoes dating around 750.40

The dress varies according to rank and occupation. All men wear a tightly fitting tunic ending below the knees. Narrow sleeves may be short (Fig. 1), or may extend to the elbow (Figs. 2, 3, and 8) or to the wrist (Figs. 4 and 5). The short sleeves reveal the sleeves of the undergarment, which extends the length of the arm. The tunic has a simple round neckline. In most cases, the undergarment extends beyond the outer coat in length (Figs. 3-5, and 8). Belts gird all Daghestan men. Tightly fitting trousers disappear under the tunics and into the footwear, covering the legs, except on the wrestlers. The boots are of soft leather and reach high in front and back so that the calves are completely protected. The Uigurs of Turkestan are similarly equipped.41 Only the wrestlers use low shoes, which, however, are of the same general shape (Fig. 8). So far, the Daghestan apparel is the same as that used by horse-riding nomads ever since the Scythians invaded South Russia. Some additions, however, can be observed. To make them more elaborate, some tunics are provided with hems, ornamented by a band of half palmettes (Fig. 1) or by freely running spirals with blunt endings (Fig. 2). The men of distinction also sport large trilobed and scalloped collars, covering the chest and shoulders (Figs. 1, 2, and 3). One of them is made assymetrical by means of a rather short chestlobe, suggesting a bow or knot (Fig. 3). Elaborate collars are also worn by the Uigur donors of Turkestan.42 Their association with Buddhism leads to a large distribution of their fashion. Even some of the holy figures of Japan adopt the Turkish collar.43

38 A. von Le Coq, Bilderatlas zur Kunst und Kulturgeschichte Mittel-Asiens (Berlin, 1925), Fig. 179.
40 Le Coq, op. cit., Fig. 72, 77.
41 A. von Le Coq, Atlas der Wandmalereien, Die Buddhistische Späantike in Mittelasien (Berlin, 1924), III, Pl. 17.
42 A. von Le Coq, Chotcho (Berlin, 1923), Pl. 28, and others.
43 For example the wood sculpture of the Bodhisattva Monju riding a lion, ca. twelfth century, owned by the Yakuoji monastery, Fukushima-Ken, reproduced in the Bijutsu肯華 (Tokyo), LV (July, 1936).
material possessions of the Daghستان men make further conclusions possible. The Metropolitan horseman and one of the wrestlers carry a bell-shaped object, which is suspended from the girdle.\textsuperscript{44} Fettich has shown that this is a leather pouch, covered by a metal sheet, usually the only part preserved in the ground.\textsuperscript{45} All known specimens come from graves in Hungary, dating after 896; that is, after the time the Magyars occupied their future homeland. Before entering it, they had lived between the Don and Dnieper,\textsuperscript{46} neighboring the realm of the Turkish Khazars.

Strzygowski was the first to recognize that the Magyars must have adopted their metal covered pouches before entering Hungary from "some horse riding people."\textsuperscript{47} Since Daghستانians share this object of material culture with the Hungarians, its invention and spread falls to the ethnical group they both borrowed from, namely, to the Turks.

The only weapon on the reliefs under discussion is to be found on the boar hunt, where one man shoots a bow. The pronounced arch of the bow identifies it as a composite reflex bow, probably made of horn or wood. J. Werner and A. Alföldi have proved\textsuperscript{48} that this was the much dreaded weapon of the Huns, Alans, and Avars, who developed it in their Eastern homeland before invading Russia and the Balkans. It became the common attribute of the Sasanian rulers, well known from numerous silver plates. The Daghستان bow differs from the earlier examples of Iranian origin by its asymmetrical construction. The lower part is larger than the upper, so that the arrow departs from a point above the middle of the "belly." A post-Sasanian silver plate in the Hermitage, Leningrad, bought in western Siberia, also depicts the same variation.\textsuperscript{49} One finds it again in the famous gold treasure of Nagy-Szent-Miklos from the end of the ninth century.\textsuperscript{50} Its Turkish character has been repeatedly emphasized. Additional examples of the composite reflex bow, shaped asymmetricaly, can be seen in the rock engravings and metal objects from Siberia. But most of these monuments lack the careful workmanship of the gold vase from Nagy-Szent-Miklos and of the relief from Daghستان, so that the proportions of details could be considered accidental.

A quiver constitutes the most important accessory of archery. Each horseman wears it suspended at the right side of his belt, while in the archery contest it leans against the shield with the girdle attached to it (Fig. 6). Whenever quivers appear in the art of Near Eastern and European antiquity, they are shaped either as cylinders of even width or as inverted funnels, tapering toward the base. All Daghستان types differ from these time-honored forms conspicuously by tapering toward the top. They are closed by a convex capsule with a knob in the center. An appliqué repeating the outline covers the case; this is done rather simply on the Louvre fragment and is split on the Metropolitan relief.

A wooden quiver of this peculiar shape has been found in a Turkish grave near Maikop in the Kuban region, not far from Daghستان. Circumstantial evidence dates it as of the eighth or

44 Cf. also Bachikrofī, op. cit., Pl. 17.
45 N. Fettich, "Zur Archaeologie der Ungarischen Landnahmezeit," Archaeologiae Értesítő (Budapest), XLV (1931), 306, Fig. 37.
46 Ibid., p. 309.
50 G. Fehér, Les Monuments de la culture protobulgare (Budapest, 1931), p. 107, Fig. 62.
nineth century. Its top also has the rather scarce capsule shape. A glance at the silver plates, found in, or east of, the Ural mountains, reveals two more funnel-shaped quivers; they have cover flaps instead of capsules. In the relief on the cauldron from the Kodski Gorodok, Tobolsk district, the quiver and girdle are placed on the ground, close to a wrestling match. For this representation a date earlier than the eighth century is prohibited by the floral decoration. Another example also of post-Sasanian origin is on a plaque with warriors besieging a fortress from Anikovskaya, near Perm. Across the steppes, one meets the same quiver on two bronze plaques from the Yenisei Valley, Siberia, representing hunters shooting at a rearing lion and surrounded by game. Gold and bronze objects in this find resemble the treasure of Nagy-Szent-Miklos so closely that the bulk of Kopeny objects can be safely attributed to the eighth and ninth century. Horsemens on the rock carvings at the upper Yenisei are also equipped with the funnel-shaped quiver. The specimens pertaining to the subject under discussion belong to the Sulek group, and they were assigned to a period from 200 to 600. Tallgren, however, mentioned their Turkish inscriptions, which automatically involve a dating after the seventh century. An example from the Argra Mountains in the same region has the unique distinction of showing the position of arrows in such a case, with their heads downward. In Chinese Turkestan the same quiver dominates, but not to the exclusion of other shapes, such as the inverted funnel. Examples from Chotcho and Tun Huang belong distinctly to the Uigurs. So far, only the usage by Turkish people has been traced. The disturbing fact remains that on the Tocharian frescoes of pre-Uigur origin at Qyzil, the funnel-shaped quiver is shown being worn by the predecessors of the Turks. In the first publication of this painting, Le Coq suggested a Sasanian origin for this type of quiver. Later, he decided that it "can also be Turkish"; however, he quoted two Western examples, favoring a Sasanian origin; one is on the horseman on the silver plate from Nijne Shakharowka, Perm district, the other on a rock relief at Tāḵ-i-Buṣṭān, representing King Chosroes II, who ruled from 590 to 628. These three pre-Turkish appearances of the object stand out as exceptions. Instead of pointing to an Iranian origin, they rather suggest that people of the West and East admired the superior shooting technique of the Turks, even before they became a world power. As a result, it is natural they occasionally copied this type of quiver.

As Le Coq pointed out long ago China also knew the funnel-shaped quiver. A relief from the grave monument of Emperor T'ai Tsung (died in 649) represents one of his favorite

51 A. Zakhareff and W. Arendt, Studia Levantica (Budapest, 1934), p. 61, Fig. 25.
52 Smirnov, op. cit., Pl. XVIII, No. 92.
54 Cf. A. Salmon, "The Find from Kopeny," Gazette des beaux arts, ser. 6, XXIII (1943), Figs. 6 and 8.
55 H. Appelgren-Kivalo, Alt-Altische Kunstdenkmäler (Helsinki, 1931), Figs. 78, 79, 93.
57 Appelgren-Kivalo, op. cit., Fig. 307.
59 Ibid., Fig. 94.
60 Ibid., Fig. 98.
61 Ibid., Fig. 33.
63 Le Coq, Bilderausz, p. 21.
64 Smirnov, op. cit., Pl. XX, No. 46.
65 F. Sarre, Die Kunst des alten Persien (Berlin, 1923), Pl. 85.
66 Le Coq, op. cit., p. 21.
changers and a general wearing such a quiver.\textsuperscript{67} How popular this peculiar quiver became during the Tang period can be seen from the fact that even ordinary guardsmen, represented in the common sets of pottery figurines, are provided with it.\textsuperscript{68} A rather peaceful looking servant in the Loo collection (Fig. 9) is shown with a simple version, which has a row of studs at the base, evidently to reinforce the bottom, but without the surface embellishments that befit the property of a Daghestan knight, a Turkestan warrior, or a Chinese general. Together with the quiver, Tang China borrowed much from her northern neighbors; it acquired their horses, copied their trappings, and hired Turkish servants to take care of the foreign steeds; this can be seen in the funerary statuettes, where they are represented.

One minor item of the Daghestan outfit requires comment, namely, the stirrup; the one used by the Metropolitan rider may be of the perfected metal variety. But the same figure on the Louvre fragment has the feet supported by a sling, as do all the other figures engaged in shooting contests (Fig. 6).\textsuperscript{69} The evolution of the metal triangle can be traced back to a more primitive form, "the simplest stirrup is a knot at the end of a rope."\textsuperscript{70} Iranians and Sasanians have no stirrup, therefore, one has to turn to the steppes to trace this development in riding. Arendt credited it to the Scythians.\textsuperscript{71} His only proof is the famous silver vase from Tcher- tomylyk with a saddled horse, showing a hanging band that could not be explained unless it ended in a loop.\textsuperscript{72} The Daghestan reliefs prove that this primitive form of stirrup survived for more than fifteen hundred years.

The study of the saddle, leather strips, and fittings requires a more detailed rendering than that provided by the reliefs under discussion, but ornamental details can easily be investigated. A set of standardized patterns decorates most animals. One finds three curved lines, closely set, on the belly and on the hind leg of the dog behind the standard bearer (Fig. 4), and in the same place on the three lions of the animal tympanum (Fig. 7). The boars of the hunting scene display it on one or both of these body parts, and the staggering animal does so on its front leg. Most likely, this is a conventionalized rendering of fur, although the central position on the thigh suggests another influence. The front legs of the tigers on the animal tympanum give the clue. There, a circle is added to the lines, thus clearly suggesting the inlay, with which late Scythian and Sarmatian animals are decorated.\textsuperscript{73} In the Minusinsk region and elsewhere, the socket is used as an ornament without any inlay, so that the circle with lines incised into stone constitutes the last link in a long chain of thigh decorations. A less organic or traditional form of decoration is on the forelegs of the dog and lion on the Louvre fragment; it consists of a bomb-shaped pattern with a pit near the base. It is repeated on three boars of the hunt, two in the upper row, the other tilted forward in the lower row near the broken edge. The shape suggests not a socket, but rather an owner's mark, called "tamgha" in Siberia, although this particular one cannot be exactly duplicated among those collected from

\textsuperscript{67} Now in the University Museum, Philadelphia, illustrated in O. Siren, \textit{A History of Early Chinese Art} (London, 1935), III, Pl. 93 A.

\textsuperscript{68} \textit{Ibid.}, Pl. 99 B.

\textsuperscript{69} Bashkiroff, \textit{op. cit.}, Pls. 5, 7, and 15.


\textsuperscript{72} N. Kondakoff, J. Tolstoi, and S. Reinach, \textit{Antiquités de la Russie meridionale} (Paris, 1891), p. 298, Fig. 258.

\textsuperscript{73} G. Borovka, \textit{Scythian Art} (London, 1928), Pl. 46.
stone carvings in northwestern Mongolia. It is conceivable that such a "tamgha" entered the repertory of the Seljuks as a reminiscence from their nomadic past. The last of the thigh figures to be mentioned is purely decorative and occupies more space than those listed before. It is a half palmette, given to the dog and three boars of the hunt. This represents a Seljuk custom the frequency of which will become evident through a forthcoming discussion on Daghestan bronzes.

Actually, these half palmettes are identical with those on the saddle and tunic borders of the Metropolitan horseman. They lead to the consideration of similar but more elaborate filling ornaments at the base of the two tympana (Figs. 1 and 7). On the first one, two lunettes predominate; they are filled with stylized half palmettes, the lobes of which enclose framed disks and which meet in an apex in the center. The only decoration of the border along the upper edge consists of a continuous and the geometrical concepts. As and through the "geometrical to the plant tendrils of classical tradition the geometrical ones originated in the Eurasian steppes and were transmitted by its inhabitants, especially by the Turks. Actually, their greatest gold treasure, the Nagy-Szent-Miklos find, provides the closest parallel to the Daghestan tendrils.

The investigation of the seven Daghestan reliefs reveals sources of inspiration of a definite character. In the subject matter, symbolism and religion are conspicuous by their absence. Instead the themes express "the Iranian joy of living and contemplation." The destroyed building at Kūbachi, from where these reliefs hall, must have been of a secular nature like the Kiosk at Konia and the castle at Anberd; perhaps it was the country house of a Seljuk prince, but certainly not a mosque, as suggested before. The use of the term "Iranian," however, remains questionable. Fashions of beard and dress, outfit and arms, and accessory decorations and filling ornaments are entirely Turkish. Traditions of a remote past were traced only where they had been invented or adopted by earlier steppe inhabitants. The Seljuks of Daghestan appear as heirs of many nomadic ideas and objects of material culture, either in their own right or by adoption from subjected people still living in the region. They stripped their heritage of all meaningful connotations, because they had outgrown the primitive shamanism of nomads. At the same time, their Muhammadan faith was not rooted deep enough to make them give up the pleasure derived from the pictures of enjoyable subjects or of heraldic decorations. This ambiguous position between subjects of two cults tinges every Daghestan image. In their secular language, they record the last words of the many artistic dialects spoken in the steppes.

Alfred Salmony

NOTES

75 Strzygowski, op. cit., pp. 122 ff.
THE EVOLUTION OF INSCRIPTIONS ON FATIMID TEXTILES

In his last article dealing with decorative inscriptions on Fatimid monuments, the late Samuel Flury pointed out that it is only in Egypt that one can easily study in a systematic way the evolution of Kufic inscriptions on stone, stucco, wood, and pottery.1 He did not say a word about textiles. This is not strange, for the textiles excavated in Egypt had not been fully published. If this had been done, he would have known that Egypt could supply the student with many series of dated examples which clearly reveal the evolution of that branch of Islamic art.

In the following pages an attempt is made to indicate the different phases through which Kufic and Neskhi on textiles passed during the reign of the Fatimid dynasty in Egypt.

THE FIRST PERIOD

The Reign of al-Mu'izz, al-'Aziz, and al-Hakim (969-1021 A.D.)

The epigraphic style on textiles belonging to the late Ikhshidid dynasty (934-69 A.D.) is characterized by its boldness. Some of the short letters, such as the ba’ in the middle and similar letters, were elongated to the same level as the lam or the alif. The head of the dal was also elongated to that level, and thus it is likely to be confused with the kas. The heads of the upright letters were sometimes decorated with floral motifs or with a circle above which is a simple floral motif. The heads of some letters such as the ta’, dal, or kaf were rounded, then curved in a rising, sloping line and ended in the form of a swan’s neck. The tails of some letters such as the ra’, mim, nun, and waw are rounded then curved in a mounting slope and ended in the form of a swan’s neck.2

This Ikhshidid style was followed almost through the first Fatimid period in Egypt, as artistic changes do not necessarily coincide with political changes, and the divisions which mark off political periods are not those which separate artistic periods. The fragment represented in Figure 1, which bears the name of al-'Aziz, reveals this style very clearly.3

The Fatimid weaver, however, had his own contribution to make: by developing the style which he had inherited and by evolving a new style. His development lies in avoiding boldness of form and in trying to make the letters more elegant and slender4 (Figs. 2 and 3).

The new style, which may be considered as the first stage of Kufic inscription on Fatimid textiles, is characterized by its small size. Sloping lines in the shape of a swan’s neck were replaced by perpendicular ones springing from the heads of some letters or the tails of others. These perpendicular lines were sometimes decorated by a small triangle (Figs. 4-6).5

This new epigraphic style made the empty

2 For an example of this style of inscription see N.

P. Britton, A Study of Some Early Islamic Textiles in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Boston, 1938), Figs. 29-32 and 34.


4 For Figure 2 (Arab Museum No. 9814) see also E. Combe, J. Sauvaget, and G. Wiet, Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe (Cairo, 1935), VI, 23 (hereinafter referred to as Répertoire); Marzouk, op. cit., p. 113. For Figure 3 (Arab Museum, No. 13015) see Répertoire, VI, 226; Wiet, op. cit., p. 38, No. 144; G. Wiet, “Les Tissus et tapisseries de l’Égypte musulman,” Revue de l’art ancien et moderne, LXVIII (1935), 13; Marzouk, op. cit., p. 103.

5 For Figure 4 (Arab Museum, No. 12644) see Wiet, Exposition, . . ., p. 33, No. 121; Marzouk, op. cit., p. 109. For Figure 6 (Arab Museum, No. 12376) see Répertoire, VI, 142; Marzouk, op. cit., p. 120.
Figs. 1-5—Fatimid Textiles. Cairo, Arab Museum
Figs. 6-9—Fatimid Textiles, Cairo, Arab Museum
Figs. 10-12—Fatimid Textiles. Cairo, Arab Museum
Fig. 13—Cairo, Arab Museum

Fig. 14—Athens, Benaki Museum
Figs. 13-14—Fatimid Textiles
spaces between the shafts of the letters so noticeable that the Muslim artist, who always had a horror vacui, tried to fill the interspaces with different motifs. Such an endeavor appears in Figure 7, which represents a fragment of al-Hākim. The artist at first filled only some spaces with floral motifs, but gradually overcame his hesitation and the result was that no empty spaces in the lettering were left undecorated.

**THE SECOND PERIOD**

*The Reigns of al-Zāhir and al-Mustanṣir*  
(1021–94 A.D.)

In this period, Kufic inscriptions began to take their place as a definite decorative motif. The Muslim artist created ornamental calligraphy from the different letters with various elegant designs. He drew thick lines under the horizontal lines of some letters and stopped at the curves of others so as to bring the whole line of inscription to one level. He sometimes replaced these lines with curves or added such curves to those letters which originally had none, as to form a row of attached curves (Fig. 8). It seems probable that he had been influenced in this by the Iraqi type of Kufic inscriptions on textiles.

Because he disliked the sight of empty spaces, he continued to fill the inner spaces between the stems of the letters by simple flourishes (Fig. 9). These flourishes, at first unadorned, evolved gradually into scrolls ending in one or two rosettes (Fig. 10). The artist made a new step forward by filling the empty spaces with medallions containing floral motifs (Fig. 8).

The perpendicular lines of the letters drew his attention. Enticed by their elegance and slenderness, he drew them symmetrically and observed special rules of proportion in their drawing. To realize the comparative relation of the letters to one another, and to satisfy his artistic taste, he elongated the heads and tails of some letters. Fearing that this succession of vertical lines might become too tiresome to the eye, he tried to lighten them sometimes by twisting the stems of the *alif* and *lam* together.

Inscriptions now began to lose their meaning and became only a decorative element. One finds, for instance, rows of words following one another and symmetrically woven. In trying to read them, however, one faces a riddle very difficult to solve. One guesses every possible meaning, but in vain, and at last one comes to the conclusion that either these words were mere decoration, or that they had had a real meaning, but the artist or the weaver sacrificed many of the rules of writing for the sake of art. Thus, the words were wrongly written, and one is at a loss to know their real meaning.

At the end of this period a new style of inscription appeared on textiles. It is the Neskhi. In the Benaki Museum in Athens there is a fragment of linen, brown in color, with two

---

6 For Figure 7 (Arab Museum, No. 8264) see Répertoire, VI, 119; Wiet, op. cit., p. 41, No. 155; Zaky M. Hassan, *Al-Kunūz al-Fāṭimiyyīn* (Cairo, 1937), pp. 124–25; Marzouk, op. cit., pp. 197, 194.
7 For Figure 8 (Arab Museum, No. 12395) see Répertoire, VII, 132; Wiet, op. cit., p. 51, No. 21; Hassan, op. cit., p. 127; Marzouk, op. cit., pp. 131, 196.
9 For Figure 9 (Arab Museum, No. 8175) see Répertoire, VII, 1; Hassan, op. cit., p. 125; Marzouk, op cit., pp. 124, 195.
10 For Figure 10 (Arab Museum, No. 9028) see Répertoire, VIII, 8; Wiet, op. cit., p. 58, No. 227; Hassan, op. cit., p. 126; Marzouk, op cit., pp. 125, 195.
stripes tapestry-woven in yellow silk. Each contains five lines of Neskh inscription giving the name of the Caliph al-Mustansir, the place of weaving as Damietta, and the date as 478 H. This is the only example known to me with this type of inscription that belongs to this period.

**THE THIRD PERIOD**

*The Reigns of al-Musta‘īl and al-Āmir (1094–1101 A.D.)*

The artist’s hesitation between the use of Neskh and that of Kufic is apparent in this period. The fragment represented in Figure 11 exemplifies this clearly. The weaver, after having used Neskh in the rest of the inscription, returned to the Kufic. It seems as if the artist or the weaver hesitated to replace Kufic by Neskh, but his hesitation soon vanished, and Neskh was so freely used that it almost supplanted it.

Kufic inscriptions used in this period followed, in general, the same lines as those of the previous period and were considered mainly as a decorative element. The artist followed his rules of proportion and symmetry in shaping the stems of the letters without thinking of the laws of penmanship. He omitted the stems of some letters and added stems to others, and from the point of view of decoration he certainly went too far in this deformation, or rather development (Fig. 12). A tendency toward angular Kufic is also apparent in this period (Fig. 13).

### THE FOURTH PERIOD

*The Reigns of al-Hāfiz, al-Zājur, al-Fā‘iz, and al-‘Ādid (1101–71 A.D.)*

The Neskh type of inscription was freely used in this period, but a new style also appeared. It is really hard to describe it as Kufic or Neskh. Generally speaking, it is dependent on Neskh, but does not follow its rules accurately. It is formed of lines of different shapes—horizontal, oblique, perpendicular, and curved. These lines are attached to one another without restriction as to their length, dimension, or curves. When attached to one another, they produce ornamental designs in the form of lettering, which are sometimes easy to read, but sometimes are very difficult to decipher (Fig. 14). This type of inscription is well defined as “debased Neskh” by Mrs. Britton.

**MOHAMMAD ABDIL AZIZ MARZOUK**

These are the titles attributed to al-Ma‘mūn, vizier of the Fatimid Caliph al-Āmir. This brings the date of the piece between 515 and 522 H.

14 Figure 13 (Arab Museum, No. 8046) is published here for the first time. It does not contain any historical inscription. The inscription in the first line is a repetition of the formula نصر من الله وفتح قرب.

The lower line reads:

ننصر من الله وفتح قرب

It is similar to Berlin Museum, No. 871375 (E. Kühnel, Islamische Stücke aus ägyptischen Gräbern [Berlin, 1927], p. 26, Pl. 16). It may be attributed to the twelfth century, but I think that its style may bring the date to the first half of this century.

15 Figure 14 (Benaki Museum) is published for the first time in Marzouk, op. cit., pp. 158, 198, Pl. 22.

16 See Britton, op. cit., p. 53.
"2000 YEARS OF SILK WEAVING"

Textiles, in spite of the important part they have played in the economic life of many peoples and the personal quality in their manufacture and use, usually are not given the prominent place on the exhibition calendars of museums which they would seem to merit. For three cities "2000 Years of Silk Weaving" went a considerable distance in remedying this neglect. The exhibition, sponsored by the Los Angeles County Museum, in collaboration with the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Detroit Institute of Arts, was shown in these three museums during the spring months of 1944.

The material, 484 items, selected by Mr. Adolph Loewi from public and private collections in the United States, is limited exclusively to woven silk fabrics in order to keep the exhibition within the bounds of practicality. Chronologically, the earliest items are Chinese fabrics of the Han period and early textiles from Egypt, Persia, and Asia Minor. Examples are included from Islamic countries, from the looms of the medieval weavers of Italy and Spain, and from western Asia, India, and the Far East. Weaves of various European countries date to the middle of the nineteenth century. Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, Turkey, Armenia, India, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Germany, France, Poland, Russia, England, China, and Japan were represented.

The effect of the exhibition was an impressive fantasy of pattern and color, stimulating to specialist and layman alike. For students of Near Eastern art and its influences the material offered much of interest. Noteworthy to epigraphers as well as to students of art were two textiles attributed to the fifth century. One has a white design on a blue ground and is decorated with the figure of a horseman; it bears the inscription "ZAXARIOY." The other, decorated with a pattern of floral and animal motifs, is inscribed "XEPE MAPIA." Also in the early Near Eastern group is a very effective textile from the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection. It is in roundel form with two confronted stags in white on red ground, is attributed to Egypt, and is dated to the sixth or seventh century. From the same collection came the so-called "Elephant Tamer" textile fragment, which was labeled "Byzantine, tenth century." To this group the Cleveland Museum of Art lent the fine textile with four griffons arranged about a medallion "with cross in center." It should be quickly pointed out that the cross most likely is not of Christian connotation. This piece was labeled "Byzantine, tenth century."

While the individual textiles in the Seljuk group were familiar to anyone interested in the period, it was a welcome opportunity to see them together as much to notice their interesting differences as to compare their similarities. This was also true of the Palermo and Hispano-Moresque textiles, which brought together an unusually large number of examples of these two classifications and offered the opportunity for valuable comparisons.

Among the later textiles are Persian velvets, silks, and brocades of the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries. These include several fragments of the tent executed during the reign of Shah Abbas I, and long in the possession of the Prince Sanguszko family of Poland, and textiles of the same period with scenic ornamentation ranging from small motifs, such as the fragment of the textile decorated with ships and aquatic life lent by the Wadsworth Athenaeum, to the figure with the bottle lent by the Detroit Institute of Arts, which is a miniature painting in silk. Several Turkish velvets and velvet brocades of the seventeenth century were exhibited, as well as Indian textiles of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries.

The variety of mountings and frames in a loan exhibition of such a large number of textiles makes the installation a difficult problem.
The result is at best a makeshift and produces an uneven effect. Possibly the only way in which this could be avoided would be to mat the smaller textiles in a uniform neutral color, do away with cases entirely, and have the larger textiles hung, as most of them were, preferably against a suitable background.

A well-illustrated catalogue of the exhibition was published. The Foreword is by Roland McKinney, Director of the Los Angeles County Museum, and William M. Milliken, Director of the Cleveland Museum of Art. The Introduction is by Adèle Coulin Weibel. Her abilities are such that one wishes she had been given more space for her section. The catalogue contains reproductions of 196 textiles on 88 plates, one plate being in color. The whole forms a welcome addition to materials for the study of textiles. To me it seems unfortunate that the type in which the title and the initial letters of the catalogue are set is not particularly suitable to the subject matter, and the cover will strike some as a misuse of modern facilities for reproduction. The arrangement of the textiles on the plates is uneven, and the variations in the scale of the reproductions are such as to mislead the unwary. There are glaring errors in editing, and the arrangers of the exhibition would not subscribe to some of the dates and statements of provenance of the textiles, since, for obvious reasons, the attributions of the owners were accepted.

Mr. Loewi and the organizers of the exhibition have done nobly in the face of many obstacles to provide a valuable contribution to the field of textiles both in the exhibition and in the catalogue.

Peter Ruthven
BOOK REVIEWS


"Iranian and Islamic Art," by Richard Ettinghausen and Eric Schroeder. Newton, Mass.: The University Prints, 1941. 200 pls. $3.00.

The short version of Philip K. Hitti's monumental History of the Arabs is a praiseworthy undertaking. By elimination of the footnotes and judicious condensation of the text Byron Dexter has succeeded in presenting one not overlong volume that will delight readers of all ages. Dexter has retained all the sparkling passages, such as the description of the camel’s manifold usefulness, the “lawful magic” of the spoken word, Hasan “the great divorcer.” In collaboration with the author he gives the best compact biography of Muhammad, with an excellent exposition of The Book and the Faith. The first hundred years of conquest are treated with loving admiration; the conquest of Spain and Sicily and the attempted conquest of Gaul place before the reader the problem of the indebtedness of western Europe to Muslim learning and art. The chapter dealing with art is all too short, and that on the Crusades is somewhat superficial, permissible perhaps because information can be found elsewhere. But where has the author found the “brocade from Arabia” to which he refers on page 96?

The author’s sympathy is manifest for the Arabic-speaking people in their decline, and the final conquest by the Ottoman Turks—the contest of mere personal valor against superior mechanical equipment—is told in a few words of epic grandeur. The last chapter, “A Forward Look,” deals with the Arab national movements from the Napoleonic invasion of Egypt to the present World War. It ends with the hope that “the Arab may once more be afforded a favorable opportunity for making further contributions to the progress of mankind.” This volume with its eight fine maps deserves a place among the textbooks of cultural history, where it will be both profitable and delectable to students as well as to their teachers. The general reader will appreciate the book also for the excellency of the text and the beauty of printing. The title page and chapter heads deserve special praise.

The reader of Hitti’s Short History will turn to Iranian and Islamic Art with gratitude, for here he will find welcome illustrations of many of the Arab contributions to Islamic art. The selection of 221 specimens, presented together with a useful map in a workman-like folder, is a noteworthy contribution to the library of the student and the lover of things beautiful. About one-third of the pictures deal with architecture, from the tomb of Cyrus to the Turkish rococo mosque of Nūr-i-‘Uthmāniyya. Many unexpected monuments are presented, new views lend enchantment to old favorites. To cavil at two vistas of the Taj Mahal and the absence of the minaret of the great mosque of Kairouan seems ungrateful. Especially welcome are the many excellent photographs from the Iranian Institute, by Gabriel, Herzfeld, Schroeder, and Smith, of architectural details with their wealth of ornament and of monuments with a glimpse of landscape. Unforgettable is Smith’s view of the minarets of a hospice at Isfahan, set against banks of clouds and windblown poplars.

Painting in its diverse forms is very well represented. Would it be possible to enlarge this section to an entire separate folder? Even as it is now it gives the student plenty of working material, including good reproductions of frescoes from Samarra and Palermo, mosaics from
Jerusalem and Damascus, Koran pages, even curiosities, such as the Shah Namah illustrations on a Rayy goblet in the Freer Gallery. The reproductions are good, even large miniatures such as the wonderful bedroom scene of the Fogg Museum do not lose too much by the reduction in size. Admirers of surrealist art will welcome the illustration from the Story of Emir Hamza. I should have preferred one of the views of the sea, with a mighty vessel or a sea monster. It would have been instructive to have both the Boston sketch of the dying Inayat Khan and the finished picture in the Bodleian Library.

The wood and ivory carvings are well chosen as a contribution to representational art. One misses the Hispanic Museum's ivory box, because in other instances the editors have wisely selected objects in American collections, easily available for study. The remainder of applied art—glass, metal, ceramic, and textiles—suffers from lack of space. The importance of textiles as part of Islamic art is sadly neglected. I look forward to the publication of a second folder completing the series presented now.

Adele Coulin Weibel
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