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WHEN DESCRIBING THE MADRASA AL-NÜRĪYA, I MENTIONED THE CURIOUS VAULT OVER ITS PORTAL. It consists of a pair of cross vaults, appearing in the elevation as a pair of windows over the flat-pointed arch that bridges the bay and supports their middle. Without this arch, the outer springing point common to both would hang in the air. The construction is a conscious attempt to produce a "suspended" vault.

What the master of the Nūrīya attempted, the master of the 'Ādiliya has achieved (Figs. 1, 88-90, and 93). The outer springing point of the pair of vaults in the vertical axis of the façade is, indeed, suspended from above, as the design shows. The building was begun immediately after the completion of the Nūrīya in 567, but was finished only in 619, after two interruptions.2 Apparently, this vault belongs to the phase of the completion, but since the plan of the two madrasas is identical, the second architect may simply have carried out what the first planned.

MADRASA AL-KILIDJĪYA
(Figs. 2–3, 91–92, 93–95)

A third specimen of the suspended vault at Damascus is the porch of the Madrasa al-Kilidjīya:

Hanafite Madrasa al-Kilidjīya, built by Saif al-Dīn Kilidj al-Nāširī, who charged in his will the cadi al-kuḍāt Ṣadr al-Dīn b. Sāmī al-Dawla to constitute it as waqf; the cadi executed it, after the death of the testator, in 643. It contains the turba of the founder who died in 643 ... (al-Shihāb al-Kūsī writes:) "The great-emir Ali b. Kilidj ... died in Ṣa'bān 643 (Christmas, 1245–January, 1246) in his house, which had been that of Khālid b. al-Walid. He had built, to the north of this house, a madrasa for the Hanafītes and a kubba [vaulted mausoleum] where he was buried. Madrasa and turba were ruined during the Timurid catastrophe (803) and could not be rebuilt, since the town house, waqf of the madrasa, had been burned down."3 (Nu'aimī)

'Abd al-Bāsīṭ reports a reconstruction during 924 and 970.

I read on the lintel of a window of the building which I believe to be the Turba al-Kilidjīya: "The great emir, fighter of the Holy War, warrior, isfahsalār, of blessed memory, martyr, Saif al-Dīn Abu 'l-Hasan Ali b. Abdallah—Allah the Exalted have mercy upon him!—said these verses and willed that they should be written on his tomb after his death: 'This, our house in which we live, is the true house, and yet it shall perish. So build while you can a house into which you will be transferred before long, and practice the good that it may accompany you as a friend keeps company to his friend!'"4 (Nu'aimī)

The verses are, indeed, written on the lintel of the two windows, in three lines:

---

2 Ibid., pp. 46ff.
3 H. Sauvarel, "Description de Damas," Journ. asiatique, IX sér., III (1894), 278. The article is continued vol. VII (1896). References to it are hereinafter quoted as J.A.
4 J.A., IV (1894), 315-16, n. 140.
Fig. 1—Ädiliya, Plan
Inscription 28

On the lintel of the main door (Figs. 94–95), the middle covered by a modern partition wall, tabula ansata, five lines and border, left half, 100 by 64 cm.; right, 120 by 64 cm., nearly complete, unpublished:

The great emir ... Saif al-Dīn Ali b. Kīlidī ... has ordered to build this ... madrasa ... for the jurisconsults ... of the rite of the imām ... Abū Ḥanīfa ... at the discretion of our lord ... the imām ... cadi al-kūdāt ... Shams al-Dīn ... Yahyā b. Hibbat Allah ... the Shafite ... and it was completed during ... the year 651.

Translation of material contents:

The inscription confirms every detail of the literary tradition.

Of the old building, the entrance, the turba, and part of the prayer hall of the madrasa are all that remain after the destruction by the Tatars; of the restoration carried out in the tenth century, scarcely anything is left. The interior of the tomb chamber (Fig. 3) follows the pattern partly of older Syrian domes, such as the one of the Mukaddamiya and those at Hama, partly of the normal turbas of Damascus: pyramidal pendentives over the square room, drum with windows, and dome. The drum has twelve windows, but every side is slightly broken; little brackets, imitating the large pendentives, produce a twenty-four-sided figure under the springing line of the dome.

The entrance bay is a full square, not, as normal, half of it, and was originally covered by four small corbeled domes. Two of their springing points were suspended: that in the center and that in the middle of the front. This last one is preserved, and also the corresponding bracket-shaped impost on the back wall. The central one has collapsed. The exact shape of the four covering elements—most probably monolith slabs—is unknown: fragments might well be still hidden in the poor houses that occupy the premises today.
In these three instances of suspended impostes the term stalactites would be justified, although it cannot be properly applied to the muqarnas vaults. An ornamental pendant can be fixed to any vault (cf. Fig. 102, Tengiziya) and is insignificant and entirely different from such a tour de force, by which the architect wants to dazzle the inexpert observer.  

Bourgoin gives another example from a Jerusalem madrasa, which seems no longer to exist, since van Berchem in his Jérusalem ignores it. The idea seems to have had no imitation elsewhere. That it turns up again in Tudor Gothic is well known, but one must not connect the two groups; on the contrary, they are a warning: identical forms may appear anywhere as the result of similar conditions.

Figs. 2-3—KILIDJIVA, PLAN AND TAMBOUR

There are a few vaults that create the erroneous impression of being suspended. Their section is a trifoliate arch, its lower part in muqarnas, the upper a nar-row, high-crowned semidome with purely ornamental cones suspended from its lower rim.

J. Bourgoin, Précis de l'art arabe . . . . (Paris, 1892), I, Pl. 20.
MADRASA ABU’L-FAWÄRIS, MA’ARRAT AL-NU’MÂN
(Figs. 4 and 96–97) 7

South of the Great Mosque.

Inscription 29

At back of entrance, sculptured into the masonry of the lowest course of the vault and the highest of the wall, four lines, 8 220 by 80 cm.:

1. بسيلة مَنْتَشِأهُ هِذَا الکِتَابِ الْمَبْرَكَةُ والاسْمُ الْمَسْنُوى فِي هَذَا الْمَسْجِدِ عَلَى مَذْعَبِ الْاِمَامَتِ الأَعْظَمِ 2. وَاِلْبِيتُ الْمَكْرُومُ إِمَامُ اِلْأَسْمَى أُبِي عِبَادُ اللَّهِ مُحَمَّدٌ بْنِ إِدْرِيسِ الشَّافِعِيُّ الْيَسَمِّيُّ الْمُطْلَبِيُّ رَضَيُّ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ فِي أَيَامِ مَوْلَانَا 3. الْبَلَقُ الْمَنْصُورُ نَافِرُ الْدُّنِيَا وَلَيْدُ عَبَادِ الرَّسُولِ الْعَلِيمِ اللَّهُ يَغْفِرُ لِلْعَالِمِ أَبِي الْمَعَالَ ئٍ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ عُمَرِ بْنِ شَاهِرٍ شَاهِبٌ أَبِي أَبُو بُنْبَ عَلَيْهِ رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ فِيَّةُ مَعَانَا رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ F... the humble Abu’l-Fawâris Nadja b. ‘Abd al-Karîm b. Ali Mu‘âfâ . . . has built this blessed madrasa and the mimbar . . . and has founded them as waqf for the rite of the imâm . . . the imâm of imâms . . . Muhammad b. Idrîs al-Shâﬁ‘î, . . . at the epoch of our lord malik al-manṣûr Nâṣîr al-Dunyâ wa’l-Dîn . . . Abu’l-Ma‘âlî Muhammad b. ‘Umar b. Shâhân Shâh b. Ayyûb, the protector, źâhir, of the Commander of the Faithful . . . in the year 595.

Below, in a shawla of the interlaced ornament, above the lintel, very small letters:

وَتَوَلَّى عِبَارَتَها بِوَسْفِ الْخَسَلَى رَحْمَةُ اللَّه

And Yusuf(?) al-Hasanî, Allah have mercy on him! administered its building.

Below, in another shawla:

صِنَاعَةُ تَأْهِرَ بِنْ عَلَى بْنِ قَانِثِ رَحْمَةُ اللَّه

Work of Kâhir b. Ali b. Kânît, Allah have mercy on him!

The same signature is in a small, oblong field above the mihrab, on the springing line of the dome over the prayer hall (Fig. 4).

The ruler is malik al-manṣûr Muhammad (I) of Hama, 587–617, grandson of a brother of Saladin and father of muqaffar Maḥmûd, who added the columns to the mihrab in the Djâmi‘ Nûrî at Hama. The style is semiofficial, but I did not search the chronicles to establish the identity of the founder. The name of the mutawalli, Yusuf, is doubtful. The architect is the same one who has twice signed the minaret of the Great Mosque of Ma‘arra.

The madrasa has an oblong court. The īwân of the entrance is covered by a dome on


8 The following text corrects Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe, ed. É. Combe, J. Sauvaget, and G. Wiet (Cairo, 1937), IX, No. 3518, taken from van Berchem’s notebook. (This work is hereinafter cited as Répertoire.)
pyramidal pendentives. In its axis on the opposite side of the court is a very wide Īwân, unexplored, now wholly invaded by modern houses. On the south is a prayer hall of normal shape: oblong, with three doors, and covered by a dome between two barrels. The mihrab is a deep niche in a broad, oblong field, framed by a molding, the innermost fillet of which is a common feature in Byzantine moldings.

Figure 4 shows the pendentive, very simple mukarnas, and two of the small windows in the cupola. The smooth dome springs from a hexadecagon. On the north side, living rooms are arranged, somewhat irregularly, because the premises are not straight. North of the entrance is a tomb chamber with a dome like that over the Īwân of the entrance. On the south a much later madrasa has replaced the original room.

The elevation of the portal (Fig. 97) is sober and well proportioned. Its vault is a cloister of trifoliate section, the whole similar to the portal of the Sultānīya, Aleppo, tomb and madrasa of Zāhir Ghāzī, built before 613 H., the inscriptions having been added in 621. There, the vault is a simple cloister.

The large lintel of the door is discharged in a peculiar way: the blocks on which a square field of interlaced geometric ornament and two rosettes are sculptured form a true horizontal arch whose joints are cut to follow the main lines of that ornament, on the whole seven blocks. In later buildings ornamented slabs are used to hide the discharging arches behind them.

**Maḵām Nabī Allāh Yūsha‘, Ma‘arrat al-Nu‘mān**

(Figs. 5–9)  

At the southern outskirts of the town.

Next to the wall, in the south, outside of the town, is the tomb of Yūsha‘ b. Nūn [Joshua] as they say, but the truth is that Yūsha‘ is in the land Nābulus.10 (Yākūṭ)

At Ma‘arrat al-Nu‘mān is, as they believe, the tomb of Yūsha‘ b. Nūn—peace upon him!—in a

---


mashhad there, which malik al-zāhir Ghāzī had built anew, and to which he had given a waqf at Ma‘arra; it is a place of pilgrimage. When malik al-mu‘azzam Fakhr al-Dīn Tūrānshāh came out of prison, in Cairo, he bought himself land at Ma‘arra and gave it as waqf to that shrine; that was in the year [blank].11 (Ibn Shaddād)

Our sheikh al-islâm Sirādí al-Dīn al-Bulkīnī, on his way from Cairo to Aleppo, alighted at Ma’arra in this shrine, maḵām, and was told that it was the tomb of Yūsha', which he ridiculed. After having passed the night there, rising early in the morning, he was heard saying: “It is Yūsha’, it is Yūsha’!” For he had had a dream revealing it to him. But I myself went many times in pilgrimage to this shrine and stayed many nights in it, firmly believing in its barakāt. (Ibn Shihna)

My father gave as waqf to the maḵām Ibrāhīm al-Khalīl [Aleppo, Citadel] certain lands of the village of Ürim al-kubrā', a district in the Diabal Simān, . . . . the maḵām is much visited by pilgrims, I myself spent there a certain time, which did me much good. (Ibn Shihna)

When Yākūt saw it, the building must have been rather new. But so many antique stones are used in it, e.g., the four columns of basalt, with rustic capitals of Doric and Ionic order, on the top of the minaret, another capital (Fig. 7) serving as a seat at the door of the tomb chamber, that there was evidently a pre-Muhammedan shrine on the same spot, whose memory lingers in the old name: Yūsha’!

![Fig. 7](image1)
![Fig. 8](image2)
![Fig. 9](image3)

Figs. 7–9—Ma’arra, Nabi Yūsha’, Three Antique Capitals

The Muhammedan authors of this time, especially the three quoted, had some distorted notion of the Assyrian kings through a translation or excerpt of Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, or similar chroniclers, made by Abū Naṣr Yahyā b. Djarīr, a Christian physician of Takrit, in the first half of the fifth century H. The list of Assyrian kings begins for them with Bālūs (Bēl), the founder, Ninūs, the eponym of Nineveh, and Samīram (Semiramis). Among the later kings is bīlvīrs (many variants), sometimes identified as Sardanapal. In the Iranian legend, Nūn e Yūshīhān (i.e., Nūn son of Joshua for Joshua son of Nūn) is called the founder of Nineveh (Nūn). This is the town of Yūnah “abūl-nūn,” father of the fish—an epithet responsible for the transposition “Nūn son of Yūnah”—whose maḵām stands on the temple hill of Nineveh, called nabi Yūnis. Thus, Joshua and Jonah were confused. Sanctuaries bearing such names, though attributed to prophets of the Old Testament, seem to perpetuate aboriginal cults, in this special case that of a fish god, Nūn, which one can trace from northern Syria over northern Mesopotamia to Mosul and Armenia.

Inscription 30

On the tympan of the vault, above the lintel of the door, badly whitewashed, ten lines, middle-sized letters, see sketch of arrangement:

---

12 E. Herzfeld, “Mythos und Geschichte,” Archäol. Mitteil. aus Iran, VI (1933), 95.
The reading between the asterisks is uncertain.

Our lord the sultan malik al-zāhir ... Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa'l-Dīn ... al-Ghāzī, son of malik al-nāṣir Ṣālah al-Dīn Yūsuf b. Ayyūb, nāṣir amir al-mu'minīn ... has ordered to build it ... in the year 604, by the administration of ... Murshid b. Sālim b. al-Muhaddhab.

The plan of this maqām repeats, on a smaller scale, that of the mashhads al-Muḥassin and al-Ḥusain of Aleppo; they are not essentially different from a madrasa, because there is no special architectural type of a maqām. The sanctuary has a rectangular court; opposite the entrance a deep Iwān, not in the axis, but with a front divided in such a way that the small door to the left corresponds to a door to the right, leading to a corridor, and that the main opening is shifted into the axis. The northern and southern sides are occupied by the tomb chamber and a prayer hall, both in a situation due, in the original plan, to an Iwān.

The tomb chamber is square and has two deep recesses like the turba of Ṣafwat al-Mulūk, Damascus. Here, the pendentives, cut from an octagonal pyramid, touch each other in the four axial points, and from this octagon, inscribed into the square, springs the dome. In the larger prayer hall there is the normal dodecagon between two barrels. Old wood carvings are preserved at the doors of the tomb chamber and of the prayer hall, and at the door leading to the stairs.

An octagonal minaret rises over the barrel vault of the entrance, just as does the octagonal minaret over the cloister vault of the Sulṭāniya, Aleppo, which is only a few years later. The four columns supporting the little kūbba on the top of the minaret show good taste in the use of antique material.

**Madrasa al-Ṣāhibīya (Madrasat al-Ṣaḥība), Ṣāliḥīya, Damascus**

(Figs. 10, 11, 13, 98, 99, and 135)³

Madrasa al-Ṣāhibīya, on the slope of the Kāṣīyûn, to the east. Built on the Djabal of Ṣāliḥīya by Rabīʿa Khāṭūn, daughter of Nadīm al-Dīn Ayyūb, sister of Saladin, Safadin, and Sitt al-Shaʿm; she died at Damascus in 643, more than eighty years old [hence born about 560], and was buried in

---

this madrasa. She was the wife of Sa’d al-Dîn Mas’ûd b. Mu‘în al-Dîn Önör, to whom her brother Saladin had married her [not before 576], having himself married, after Nur al-Dîn’s death [569], the sister of Mas’ûd, ‘Îsmat al-Dîn. After the death of Sa’d al-Dîn [in 581], Saladin married her to malik al-mu‘azzafîr Gökbüri, lord of Irbil [born in 549, one of the greatest and most excellent figures of that time], with whom she lived for more than forty years. After his death [Ramadan 630, eighty-one years old] she retired to Damascus, living in the house of al-‘Aïkî, which had belonged to her father Ayyûb, until she died. In her service was the erudite, the just Amat al-latîf, daughter of al-Nâṣîh, the Hanbalite. It was she who advised Rabî‘a Khâtûn to build this madrasa and to make it a waqf for the Hanbalites.15 (Nu’aimî)

Fig. 10—Damascus, Sâlihiya, al-Sâhiba, Plan

Rabî‘a Khâtûn died at Damascus in Sha‘bân 643 (January, 1245), when nearly eighty years old, and was buried in her madrasa, made a waqf for the Hanbalites, on the slope of the Kâsiyûn. More than fifty ruling princes were so closely related to her that she could not marry them.16 (Ibn Khalilikân) (The drawback of being too august!)

To the waqf of the Madrasa al-Šâhibiya belong the larger part of the village Djubbat ‘Assal, the garden below the madrasa, the mill, and the rents of the greater part of the quarter adjoining the madrasa.17

Mu‘in al-Dîn Önör, lord of Kuşair, in the Ghôr, was a client of Toghtekin and military atabek of the last Burid Muğjir al-Dîn Abâk.18 He founded a madrasa at Damascus in 524, continually fought the crusaders of the kingdom of Jerusalem, and died in 544 h. His daughter ‘Ismat al-Dîn died in 581 and was buried in her turba on the Kâsiyûn, south of the madrasa al-Châhârkasîya, which later became the Djami’ al-Djadid of al-Šâlihiya. Both buildings exist.

It is doubtful that she was the mother of Malik al-šâlih Isma‘il and had built (Ibn Shaddâd) at Aleppo a khanqâh with a tomb for her son Isma‘il, in 577; he died when only eighteen years old. But she may well have been the wife of Nûr al-Dîn of whom Ibn al-Áthîr tells:

Nûr al-Dîn paid all the expenses for kitchen and wardrobe of the household from his modest private budget. His wife complained about this penury, and he gave her three shops at Hims, which he owned personally, and which brought in twenty dinars (gold) a year. One day, the princess reproached him, saying that the amount was too small, and he answered: "It is all I have. For all the rest of what is between my hands, I am only the banker of the Muslims. I shall not cheat them, and I shall not go to hell for your sake!" 19

Saladin was equally strict. Ibn Khallikân tells—from Bahâ al-Dîn Ibn Shaddâd—that he left only forty-seven dirham silver and one gold piece, no real estate, no houses, premises, gardens, villages, or fields.20

It is improbable that Rabî‘a Khâtûn had founded her madrasa before her return to Damascus in 630, as a septuagenarian, and that the fact for the inscriptions over the doors and windows are prepared, but not inscribed, shows that the building was not entirely finished when she died in 643. The little madrasa is in a perfect condition and serves today as a girls’ school.

The court (Fig. 10) is almost square, 11 m. to a side, with a slight variation of the regular cruciform plan: the entrance is flanked by a pair of small iwâns—compare the entrance of the Dâr al-Áhâdîl al-Nûrîya, the Zâhirîya, Aleppo, and, on a much larger scale, the Mustansûrîya, Baghdad—and the two lateral iwâns are shifted back, as in the Karamanoglu madrasa of Karaman,21 like large alae of an atrium. The square room in the northwest corner is a turba, but the tomb is in the adjoining iwan. The building uses no cupolas, but only barrel vaults, cloisters, and cross vaults. It is built in the very best Ayyubid style, with conscious simplicity, displaying perfect mastery over stone.

17 J.A., IV (1894), 469.
19 Ibn al-Áthîr, Chronicon . . . , ed. C. J. Thornberg (Leyden, 1851–76), XI, 266f.
21 See Pt. I, Fig. 40.
The portal (Fig. 11) is covered by a semidome in mukarnas work, three corbeled zones under a vaulted conch. The plan is determined by the radii of a halved dodecagon. In the middle zone every mukarnas is decorated with a small conch. The vault springs from a horizontal line. A squinch is formed by a group of two brackets and one cell, supporting a conch, deeper than the others, in the second zone. By the third zone a perfect half-circle has been established. The interior enveloping surface is simply a Sasanian dome with squinches; it belongs to the Iranian type.

**Madrasa al-Atābekīya**

In order to understand really the peculiar character of these vaults, one must compare a similar, contemporary example, the portal of the Madrasa al-Atābekīya, not far west of the
Şâhiba, called also Bâb al-Sük, because it is situated where the old bazaar of Şâlihiya began (Fig. 12).

No inscriptions.

Madrasa al-Atâbekiya, west of the Murshidiya [= Khadidja Khâtûn] and the Dâr al-Ḥadîth al-Ashrafiya.23 (Nu‘aimî)

Both exist, the Dâr al-Ḥadîth, dated 634,24 and the Murshidiya, dated 650.25


Hence she was a grandniece of Nûr al-Dîn.

She died in Rabî‘I 640 (September, 1242) and was buried in the madrasa which she had built on the Kâsiyûn. The night of her death, turba and madrasa became waqf. (al-Ṣafadî)

The building has not been thoroughly explored, being occupied by modern houses, but it looks as if the portal is all that remains of the original structure.

The joints of the arch stones over the small door produce an ornamental design. A very simple form of this peculiar feature appears first in buildings as old as the tomb of Şafwat al-Mulûk and the Dâr al-Ḥadîth al-Nūriya, in which the middle of three stones that form a discharging arch is of basalt, cut in an ornamental shape. This is the rule for all windows of Ayyubid madrasas and turbas (Fig. 13). A more developed form, over a door, appears on the

---

23 J.A., III (1894), 385f.
flat arch over the entrance of a small shrine called Biläl, in the southern cemetery of Damascus (Fig. 16). The shrine contains some old tombs which are beyond the scope of our subject. The arch bears the short inscription: "This place has been built anew in the year 625."

The fully developed phase is reached in the main entrance to the Māristān al-Ḳaimari, 646–56 (Fig. 17). It is a good beginning, but soon degenerates into the two-colored arches of the Mameluke period, which nobody can believe to be, and which are not, genuine arches.

The simple round molding with a loop at the summit and at the springing points of the arch is a form of Syrian origin, used in contemporary monuments, e.g., the mihrab of the Zāhiriya, Aleppo, 613–16 h., and a small mihrab, built into the outer wall of the Darwīshīya of Ḥims (Fig. 19).

From the very top of the wall, four large pointed brackets project, resembling the large muqarnas over the entrance of the Sharafīya, Aleppo (left unfinished in 631); they cannot have carried a vault in front of the entrance and must have formed a strongly salient cornice only.

The detail of the muqarnas work of the semidome (Fig. 12) is very much like that of the Şahibīya, and yet in structure it is deeply different. Both plans are dominated by the radii of their upper conchs, here half a sixteen-sided figure; both have three zones of muqarnas, one of which is decorated with small conchs. But while the vault of the Şahibīya springs from a horizontal line and forms squinches, here two pendentives, themselves formed by three zones
of mukarnas, support it from below. There is no squinch, and all the zones are perfect concentric half-circles; all units of one zone are identical. The enveloping surface of the whole is a semidome on spherical pendentives, the Mediterranean type.

In contrast to the mukarnas vaults of the Nūr al-Dīn buildings, in these examples concave alveoli and convex brackets alternate regularly in each zone. The brackets project less than the points of the alveoli, except under the main conch. The greater projection brings about a turn in the axes: whereas below concave and convex elements alternate above each other, at the top the equal elements are above each other.

Both vaults are models of the Ayyubid mukarnas vault, classical examples of one and the same style. And yet, the structure of the one is Iranian, of the other Mediterranean. At Aleppo, the following belong to the western group: Mašhad al-Muḥassin, portal of Abū Ṭarīfa, 585 H.; Shādhbakiyya, 589; Mašhad al-Ḥusain, Ḥaram, 596; annex, 613–34; Kārīmiyya, probably 595. To the eastern group belong: Mašhad al-Ḥusain, portal of Zāhir Ghāzī, 596 H.; Zāhīriyya, 613; Shārafiyya, 631; Firdaws, 634; Khānḳūh ʾil Farāfra, 635; and Kāmilīyya, in Makāmāt, between 624 and 636 H. (Fig. 101), at Damascus, e.g., the mausoleum of Zāhir Baibars (Fig. 100); enough to show that there is no distinction, local or temporal, between the two. They are no longer two species, but one. In lands with so long a past as the Near East one must expect such hybrids.

**Palace of malik al-ʿazīz Muhammad, Citadel**

(Fig. 104)

A representative example of the almost unknown Aleppo material is the palace of malik al-ʿazīz Muhammad, citadel, 628 H. The inscription at the base of the mukarnas vault speaks of a repair of the water conduits on the citadel in 769 H.—one of the many misleading examples of an inscription which refers to a comprehensive work but which is put on a prominent, pre-existing building. The palace has no inscription of its own.
In 628, malik al-‘azīz Muhammad [son of Zāhir Ghāżī and Daifa Khātūn] built at the side of the arsenal (zardkhāna) a palace (dār) too beautiful for words, on an area of thirty by thirty cubits. On 9 Rabi‘ I 658 (February, 1260), the Tatars [Hulagu] demolished the walls and plundered the treasures therein . . . , the second destruction came when they returned in Muḥarram 659 (December, 1260). The whole citadel was destroyed beyond repair.26 (Ibn Shaddād)

The façade of the palace, less than 15 m. (thirty cubits) long—dār means here as elsewhere a large hall only—touches the arsenal, whose situation is determined by an unpublished inscription. It is, indeed, a fine and unusually rich building.

Only the most solid material is used: dark gray basalt and yellowish limestone, no paint or plaster, but inlay of costly variegated material. The lintel over the door is strengthened by an invisible iron beam of square section.

I spoke of magic knots, ‘uḳḍa, in connection with the marble marquetry of the Aleppo school, and when describing the portal of the Ma'arra madrasa, I mentioned ornamented slabs concealing discharging arches. Here, slabs of basalt, decorated with a large knot once inlaid with light marble (Figs. 20-22), hide the discharging arches over the windows. The two other knots in this figure are from the portal of Zāhir Ghāžī, Mashḥad al-Ḥusain, 596 H., and from the Masjdīd Abīl-Riḍā, Aleppo, about 630 H.

The vault follows the Iranian variety and is richer in plan and detail than the Damascus vaults. Well-projecting groups of brackets are used to accentuate the squinches in the diagonals. The original small window in the middle of the back wall is clearly marked by a little niche. As at Damascus, the four muḳarnas zones are corbeled, the conch above is vaulted.

26 Durr, p. 54.
The oldest example of a muṣkarnas vault known at present is Imām Dūr. Next come the three domes of Nūr al-Dīn at Damascus. Their derivation from the type of Imām Dūr is evident. One must take these oldest Syrian examples as representative of the changes that took place: the origin of the muṣkarnas is not the subject, but its adoption by the Syrian architects and its adaptation to their style.

As exceptions and without significant function, brackets appear in the vaults of Nūr al-Dīn’s buildings. These vaults are made of brick (original Baghdad style) or of plaster (substitute). The succeeding Syrian vaults like the Shādbakhtīya of Aleppo, the Muḥaddamiya of Damascus, employ exclusively the regular alternation of cells and brackets in each zone—that is the fundamental distinction. This expedient increases the margin of the projection, and, by lowering the angle, reduces the number of zones and the height of the vault. This clearly was the intention and the reason for choosing that expedient. Moreover, the brackets, when not projecting over the cells, are the lower part of the cells of the zone above, which do not retreat to the full depth of the lower zone. Thus, by regular insertion of brackets, the cells no longer grow, as scales do, out of the lower into the upper zone, but are confined to one zone. A clean horizontal separation of the zones is produced throughout.

Now, all the Syrian vaults are executed in the best masonry. Numerous elements of each zone are sculptured out of one block, the size and shape of which is determined by considerations of stability. By inserting regular brackets one gains the necessary horizontal stratification, saves carving, and avoids weakening the blocks. Hence, the driving force was the transposition of original Iraqi brickwork into Syrian stone masonry, which had never ceased to be the living inheritance from antiquity in Syria. That antique tradition transformed the imported thought into something different and new, something Syrian. “Are there thoughts but in Persian books? Ours are the rhetorics and the classical language, but the thoughts are theirs!”

The difference between Syrian and Iraqi muṣkarnas is the same as between Syrian and
Iranian madrasas: they have been entirely naturalized in their new land. It is irrelevant to discuss here, how large a part the northern Jazira played in this transformation.

The alveoli function as, and are derived from, the older niches, conchs, kundj, an element of vaults, originally truly vaulted. Without entering into their earlier history, one may regard them as a rampant growth of a simpler structure. In describing the minaret of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mân, I have mentioned the capital of a column in the axis of the lower story.\footnote{Pt. II, Fig. 56.} The same kind of capital is found at the corresponding place on the fourth story of the Great Minaret,\footnote{Ibid., Fig. 52.} a simpler variety of it on the mihrab in the Ma'āram Ibrāhīm, Šālihīn,\footnote{Ibid., Fig. 57.} both at Aleppo. The number of these typical specimens could be increased ab libitum. Now, everywhere in Syria one finds a type of late antique capitals (\textit{Figs. 23–28}) decorated with one or two rows of utterly simplified acanthi. The medieval capitals are evidently the continuation of these antiques. Again, Figures 29–31 show some wooden capitals of columns, representative of the modern style of Mosul and Iraq. To the capital from Assur, made in 1903 by a Mosul carpenter, I have added the names of its parts: from below first the torus, mabrûm, “twisted rope”; then two rows of alternating leaves, the upper ones larger, called chingāl, “claw,” because of their curved, overhanging ends; four volutes at the corners, malfūf, “volute,” and lastly an abacus, māsṭarāsh, a loan word, referring to the diamond cut that usually decorates them, hence evidently Persian almās tarāsh. One is amazed to see so late a survival of a purely antique, Corinthian capital. Thus, there are acanthi everywhere.

But the other examples from Mosul and Baghdad prove as cogently the contrary: there...
are mukarnas everywhere. As in Gothic architecture, the elements of vaulting have invaded the sphere of decoration, such as capitals and moldings. Figure 32 adds an equally typical capital from the huge piers that support the vaults in the Djami' Utrush at Aleppo, 801–11 H. As in older Ayyubid specimens, the alveoli are decorated with a conch, here with its Mameluke variety. Both contradicting conclusions are true. Two elements of totally different origin and meaning have been assimilated so as to fuse. It is aesthetics only, the preference given to certain lines, curves, shapes, that causes the transition of one thing into another. The treatment of the antique tabula ansata in Muhammedan art, as frame and as center of ornamental compositions, is another good example of such fusions.30

Madrasa al-Māridānīya, Šāliḥiya, Damascus

Beyond the Dîjsr Thawrâ, the White Bridge, where three roads branch off leading to the northern suburbs of al-Muhādjrīn (west), Šālihiya, and Ḥārat al-Akrād (east), on the slope of the Kāsiyūn (Figs. 33–35).31

31 v. B., “Plan” without sign; W. W., No. DN, I, b; Sauvaget, No. 96.
No inscription

Madrasa al-Māridāniya, on the edge of the Nahr Thawrā, next to the White Bridge, built, according to the cadi 'Izz al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī, in 610, and founded as waqf in 624 H., by 'Azīzat al-Dīn Ikhshāwira 32 Khāṭūn, daughter of Kuṭb al-Dīn, lord of Mārđīn, wife of malik al-Mu'azzam['Īsā]; I believe her father was Kuṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd b. Zengī, brother of Nūr al-Dīn. The foundress was not buried there, for, after the death of al-Mu'azzam [in 624], she went back to Mārđīn, according to Ibn Shuṭba. But another author says, she made the pilgrimage and stayed in Mecca. There she fell into direst poverty, without any means, and became a water carrier. Someone who had known her at Damascus and saw her in this condition told the administrator of the waqfs of the princess about it, and he took a certain sum and sent it to her. She asked: “What money is that?” They said: “It comes from your waqfs!” She answered: “What I have handed over to Allah I shall not take back!” And remitted the money, adding: “Give this part to every one that has a claim!” Allah reward her amply in His mercy! 33 (Nu'aimī)

Khādidja Khāṭūn, daughter of malik al-Mu'azzam 'Īsā [first wedded by proxy to the Khwārizm-shāh], died in Djamādā II 650 [read 654] in the garden of the Māridāniya and was buried in her turba on the Kāsiyūn. 34 (Ibn al-'Asākir)

The garden belonged to her, since she gave it as waqf to her madrasa turba. It seems that she was the daughter of 'Adīza and had inherited the garden from her mother. Kuṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd of Mosul (544–65) had married a bride of his deceased brother Ghāzi, daughter of Ḥusām al-Dīn Timurtash (516–47) of Mārđīn, hence an aunt of Kuṭb al-Dīn of Mārđīn. It is much more probable that 'Adīza was the daughter of this latter. Māridāniya means “princess of the house of the lords of Mārđīn.”

The little building has suffered by recent additions to its exterior, but remains unchanged inside. The regularity of the plan (Fig. 34) is caused by the bifurcation of three roads. The entrance is from the north. The court has its fine old pavement; other examples of the same period are Aleppo, Great Mosque (seen in 581 by Ibn Djubair); Zahirīya, 620; Firdaws, 634; Hama, Djam'i Nūrī, 558; Damascus, Djamī al-Aḵsāb, 634. The prayer hall lies opposite the entrance iwān, as usual. The east iwān is fully developed; the western was smaller and is reduced to almost nothing by the minaret. The entrance has still a soffit with good wood carving, and in the prayer hall several such panels are preserved on the doors (Fig. 35). The archaic ornament is certainly not later than 610.

Madrasa al-Ruknīya, Şāliḥīya

(Figs. 36–40, 43, 145) 35

Madrasa al-Ruknīya extra muros, built in 621 by the emir Rukn al-Dīn Menguverish al-Falaki, ghulām (“white slave”) of Falak al-Dīn, the full brother of malik al-'Ādil (Safadīn); he was one of the most virtuous emirs, who talked little and gave alms plentifully. 36 (Nu'aimī)

Menguverish al-Falaki, great emir, Rukn al-Dīn al-'Ādilī, lieutenant of Egypt for al-'Ādil, once also of Damascus, built, on the Kāsiyūn, a turba and a madrasa and endowed it with a great

32 'khšwrh' is a strange name, perhaps Iranian.
33 J.A., IV (1894), 282f.
34 Ibid., p. 279.
36 J.A., IV (1894), 258.
number of waqfs. He had built another madrasa in the quarter north of the Great Mosque, inside the Báb al-Farādis. He died in 631 at Dārūd and was buried in his turba. (al-Dhahabi)

**Inscription 31**

Over the windows on the south façade of the turba, inscription in seven lines, Neskhi, small letters:

1. بسمه... هذا ما اتفت الله العبد الفقير إلى رحمة رَبِّه الغازي الجاهد 2 ربع الدين مكروش الفلكي العادل المعظم يرسم دفنه بها ورد رقف على مصالحها وزيد رفع وحص وحار 3. وجماعية قيل سر وقزات ين في الدار التي داخل باب الفراديس من قبَّل المدرسة الفلكية تعرب 4. تذكرياً بالله 5. يت وقف السدس من حانوتين بالخواصين وجميع الجنينة التي قبَّل نهر اليريد بالصالحية وثلاث ونصف التسع من الدار العادلة للجنينة من غربها وسدس من جميع البستان الذي من اراضي النورِ 6. يعرف بالواتف والسدس من البستان والجسر والطاحون الذي من اراضي النور يعرف تذكرياً بالفاضي المكبّدة كل ذلك على ما يصرف وشرح في كتاب الوئف لا يجعل لأحد يمّوس بالله العظيم يغبر ذاك ربدله في سنة أربعة وعشرين وستمائة

In the name of Allah... this is what the humble... the warrior, the fighter of the Holy War,

---

37 Sauvage and Sauvaget (in his translation in *op. cit.*, p. 98) read: “al-malaki al-‘ādili al-mu‘azzami,” indefensible even if al-faliki were not clear. The place of al-malaki in such adjectives of clientele relations is before the name of the ruling king, hence al-‘ādili, al-malaki al-mu‘azzami. Here we have three persons: Falak al-Din, malik al-‘Ādil, and malik al-Mu‘azzam, the malaki before the name, as in other cases, omitted to avoid encumbering the phrase.

38 *wa-dhālika...?*

39 *بما هذه.*
ERNST HERZFELD

Rukn al-Din Menguverish, client of Falak al-Din, malik al-'Adil and malik al-Mu'azzam, has founded as waqf (and) to be buried in it. He has established as waqf for its maintenance, for the oil, the candles, the mats, the salary of a guardian and of reciters of the Koran (what follows): the entire house inside the Bâb al-Farâdis, south of the Madrasa al-Falakiya, formerly called . . . : furthermore a sixth of the two shops in the basket-makers' bazaar; the entire garden (djumaina) south of the Nahr Yazid at Şâlihiya; a third and a half of the ninth of the house bordering upon the west side of the garden; a sixth of the entire garden (bustân) belonging to the fields of Nairab, formerly known under the name of the founder; a sixth of the garden (bustân) and mansion (djaw sak) and mill belonging to the fields of Nairab, formerly called cadi al-Bahdia; all this under the detailed stipulations of the act of the waqf (usual threats and curses), and that in the year 624.

The inscription does not allude to, and the remains of the building show no trace of, a madrasa, hence, the designation "madrasa" seems to be vaguely used in the chronicles instead of turba.

The building consists of two square parts, both of the same period (Figs. 36–39). The smaller square is a turba, the larger a mosque, though a small one, 15 by 18 m. in exterior measurements. 41

On the south side lies a broad haram with mihrab; its roof is a barrel vault with the ends of the barrels slanted off, and with a cross vault in the middle instead of the usual dome. This hall opens on the court through the normal group of three doors, here arranged exactly as in the Dâr al-Ḥadîth al-Nûrîya. The north side of the court repeats this motif, whereas the eastern and western sides have a pair of arches on a middle column. A narrow, vaulted hall runs behind the three fronts. As a whole, this small mosque belongs to the type represented in Aleppo by the mosque of Zâhir Ghâzî, the "upper makâm" on the citadel, built in 610.

But, exceptional in Syria and normal in Anatolia, the little court, only 6.8 m. square, was covered by a dome. Enough of it remains to show that it was shaped like the dome over the tomb chamber.

40 The feminine bihâ presupposes turba. 41 Detailed architectural description in W. W., pp. 135–37.
In this mosque the Koran reciters prayed in continuous relay. A peculiar religious conception, real reason for burial in madrasas, finds a clear expression in this building. In his inscription on the Sultānīyā, madrasa turba of Zāhir Ghāzī (620 H.), Ṭoghrul, the faithful client of Saladin and Ghāzī, the regent for the latter's minor children, says:

قَدْسَ اللَّهُ رَوْحًا وَنَبْرِهُ مَسَاءً لِسَاكِنِهِ ثِيَابَ قُرْآنَ الْعَلَمِ وَدُرْسَةً وَحَبْرَةً وَقُرْآنٍ وتَلْویتَه

That he who rests in this tomb may receive the award for the learning and instruction of knowledge, and the benediction of the Koran and its recitation...

And on his own mausoleum, the madrasa al-Atābekiya, same date, he says:

عَدَّا ما تَعْمَلُ بِإنْشَاءِهِ... مَحْجُودًا لِلَّهِ تَعَالَ يَتَكَلَّمُ فِيهِ الصَّلَاةُ الخَمسُ فِي أَوْفَاتَهَا... وَإِنَّ تَقَدْرَ اللَّهِ

Has proceeded to found this... as a mosque for Allah, where the five prayers will be celebrated at their appointed time...—and if Allah wills that he should die outside of Aleppo, he shall be buried here at the place prepared for him—and where the reading of the Koran never ceases...

To appreciate the spirit fully, one may compare the Greek adespoton:

This is the tomb of Achilles the man-breaker, which the Achaeans built to be a terror to the Trojans even in after generations, and it sloped to the beach, that the son of Thetis the sea goddess may be saluted by the moan of the waves.

The pair of columns in the court of the mosque have capitals in the shape of a truncated pyramid reversed, the edges being beveled in a peculiar way (Fig. 40). As in Greek "orders," a modulus, one-eighth of the upper edge, determines the length of every part. This shows that the architects learned their handicraft and made exact designs from which the masons worked. The truncated pyramid occurs at a slightly earlier date, e.g., as the shape of a well head, on the citadel of Aleppo and in the Maṣḥhad al-Muḥassin, but I know of no capitals of that
shape in Syria. In 805 the same shape appears in the mausoleum of Sultan Bayazid I at Brussa (Fig. 42). Hence, one might classify them under Byzantine impost capitals, used on columns under vaults. But the same type appears also in Persia, in the capital from a bath at Isfahan, in the Russian consulate, about 1800 (Fig. 41). Imitations of Anatolian forms in Isfahan are improbable, and the late Sasanian capitals—some rustic examples beside the well-known pieces that bear busts of Khusrau II—are all impost capitals, i.e., such that gradually transform the circle below into the square above. The problem of origin, thus, offers the same alternative as that of the conch: the original geometric form existed in the West as well as in the East long before Islam.

Over the lintel of the pair of windows, north façade of the turba, is an ornament, rather unusual at this period in Syria, at any rate at Damascus: the name Muhammad, written four times in the turning movement of a swastika (Fig. 43). In Persia it is usually the name Ali that is written in that way, whence the name "chār Ali" for that type of script. An almost identical chār Muhammad in Figure 44, sketched in 1907, comes from the Khātūniya
Madrasa at Karaman. Thus, there are various little observations pointing toward some unexplainable connection of this building with Asia Minor.

On the four corners of the cenotaph are decorative knobs, a trait common to all the tombs of this period in Sâlihiya. The best specimens are on the four tombs in the turba al-Chahârkasîya dated 608, 615, and 635. Sauvaget remarks: "Les aspects divers (des bobéchons) se ramènent en définitive à un type unique, réduction pleine d'esprit d'une grande forme

42 No photograph or drawings available.
architecturale: la coupole côtelée sur tambour octagonal ou sur double tambour"—the typical dome of that period of Damascus. To confirm this view one could adduce a related specimen, from the Khâtünïya at Muhädjirîn, not much later, where the knobs look like the picture of a small pavilion on eight columns.

It is quite probable that the masons who made these knobs thought of the cupolas they saw every day. But as "réduction d'une forme architecturale" they would be a creation produced under very specific local and temporal conditions, while they are a general feature, not confined to any epoch or to any region. The special shape can be nothing but a different interpretation, never the original signification of the object.

Figures 45 to 48 give an example from the Dja'fariya at Isfahan, dated 72 (x) H., and one from Shiraz, a tomb of the Sa'dî period. The knobs on the four corners of those sarcophagi are slightly different, but essentially the same. On the cenotaph of Murad II at Brussa (855 H.) the knob has become a headdress, and the hundreds of turbans on the Turkish tombs of Eiyub and Scutari are well known. That is a totally different interpretation of the same thing.

Farîd al-Dîn 'Aṭṭâr at Nishapur

The original meaning, long since forgotten, sometimes breaks through the disguise of the altered shapes. Figures 49 to 51 give the tombstone of the great mystic Farîd al-Dîn 'Aṭṭâr at Nishapur. The fine marble was erected, under a dome, by Shah Husain (1105-35). In the inscription in Persian verses, twenty-four lines, appear the words:

1. 10 1. 11 1. 16

Whatever their changing interpretation, these stones come down in straight line from the phallic symbols that crowned the tumuli of western Asia Minor and Etruria in high antiquity, symbols of life on the tomb. In Iran they were the metae of hippodromes, maidān < "maitāna. Therefore, the polo gates on the maidān of Isfahan and all polo gates pictured in miniatures have this shape. They appear also on all old bridges, for reasons unknown to me.

The turba of Rukn al-Dīn, the perfect type of Damascus turbas, is included in the discussion of the whole group, which will follow comments on a last specimen of the Syrian madrasa, a mūristān like the first monument studied.

Fig. 43—Damascus, Ruknīya

Fig. 44—Karaman, Khāṭūnīya

Figs. 43-44—Two Chār Alis

Mūristān al-Ḵaimārī, Sāliḥīya

(Figs. 17, 52-55, 103, and 110-113) 43

Saïf al-Dīn al-Kaimarī,46 founder of the hospital on the Dijabal (Ḵāsiyūn) was one of the emirs most famous for their bravery .... he died in battle at Nābulus and was buried in his kūbba opposite the hospital. al-Dhahābī mentions his death under the year 653.47 (Nūʿāmī)

Ibn al-Kathīr notes under year 654: In this year died the founder of the mūristān at Sāliḥīya, the great emir Saïf al-Dīn Abūl-Ḥasan Yūṣuf b. Abūl Fawāris b. Mūšhīk al-Kaimarī, the Kurd. The greatest emirs of the Ḵaimārī tribe stood erect in front of him, as is the custom in the presence of kings. Among his greatest charities was the foundation of the hospital on the slope of Kāsiyūn.48

Abū Shāma in his Kitāb al-Rawdatāin, speaks of the ancestor, the emir 'Izz al-Dīn Mūšhīk, son of a maternal uncle of Saladin, who died in 585 and was buried on the Kāsiyūn. Ibn Khallikān says: “His father was ḥādjīb, ‘chamberlain,’ of the emir ‘Izz al-Dīn Mūšhīk al-

43 v. B., “Plan,” w; W. W., No. DN, VII, 6; Sauvageot, No. 100.
46 J.A., III (1894), 438.
48 J.A., VI (1895), 297.
şalâhi.” 49 Nu'aimi 50 mentions him as owner of the house, later Madrasa al-\'Ādilīya al-ṣuğhrā’, opposite the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nūriya. Like Saladin, the Ḳaimarīs were Kurds. 51

Inscription 32

Around the three sides of the bay, at the height of the lintel over the door, in three lines; continued above, in two lines (details of waqf), on the three sides under the springing line of the vault; the date below, on the middle stone of the discharging arch over the lintel, in five lines, very small and partly illegible. A translation of this long text has been given by Sauvire, with van Berchem’s corrections. 51 I confine myself to the date:

1. Ḵunastū al-wizarah 2. 4584. Rūm 3. 494 ṭamātī nasta’sūt ṭamātī su’sūt ṭamātī pusamātī 3. ṭamātī pusamātī

The building was begun in . . . Rabi‘ II 646, and finished in . . . Muḥarram 65 (x).

Inscription 33

Turba al-Ḵaimariya, opposite the madrasa; 56 on the lintel of a window (Fig. 52), in tabula ansata, 105 by 33 cm., four lines:


. . . every living thing must taste death! This is the tomb of the humble . . . great emir, the fighter of the Holy War, the soldier, the pillar of Islam . . . of the community, the arm of the wars and the fighters of the war, Saif al-Dīn Abūl-Ḥasan, son of the emir Asad al-Dīn Yūṣuf b. Abīl-Fawāris b. Mūshik. He passed away to Allah’s mercy on the eve of Monday, third of Sha’bān 654 (August 25, 1256), Allah have mercy on him!

51 The name Mūshik is Kurdish, Iranian mūšikān, Armenian mēškān (H. Hübschmann, Armenische Grammatik [Leipzig, 1895–97], p. 54), appears as mūšyāk in the Pahlavi inscriptions of Darband, Caucasus, dated “year 700”—404 A.D. Possibly to be connected with Mvšk’s ẓāḥār of the Paikuli inscription, unless these be Indian Mousikānī of the Alexander campaigns.
53 Something like “in the first third.”
54 Not “in the month” but a qualification similar to that given in the preceding footnote.
55 The units are doubtful. The mēm “and” before the “50” seems to be there and requires a unit before, e.g., ṣitt, “six”; but then the necessary “in the year,” sanāt, would be missing.
56 v. B. “Plan,” v; W. W., No. DN, VV, a; Sauvaget, p. 103.
In another Kaimariya turba in Salihiya-West, near al-Muhadjirin; on the cenotaph:

This is the tomb of the great emir Izz al-Din Yusuf b. al-amir Diyâ al-Din Abu'l-Fawâris al-Kaimarî . . . he died the eve of Wednesday, 9 Safar 674 H.

At last the turba al-Kumâriya (?).

On the slope of the Kâsiyûn . . . . .that of Kumâri (?) Khâtûn, daughter of Hûsâm al-Dîn al-Hasan b. Diyâ al-Dîn Abu'l-Fawâris al-Kaimarî. She endowed it in 694 with the khan next to the Masджid al-Akşâb. (Nu'amî)

A late Turkish author, Rif'at Bey, calls her Kaimari Khâtûn, mother of Hûsâm al-Dîn.

These inscriptive data are not enough to reconstruct the genealogical tree of the Kaimaris. On his tomb the proper name of the founder of the hospital is omitted, on the mûristân it is unclear: Saif al-Dîn Abu'l-Hasan . . . . b. al-amir Asad al-Dîn Yusuf b. al-amir Diyâ al-Dîn Abu'l-Fawâris. But this shows that Ibn al-Kathir either omits the name and title of the father, or the proper name of the son and the title of the father. They bear the highest titles just below the rank of a ruling prince. The founder of the madrasa was malik al-unmarâ', grand vizier, and nâsir amir al-mu'minîn. He appointed the malik al-unmarâ' and cadi Nâsir al-Dîn protector, nâzir, of his foundations, together with an acting inspector. The nâzir is probably a cousin of his, Nâsir al-Dîn Abu'l-Ma'âlî al-Hasain b. 'Azîz(?) b. Abu'l-Fawâris, founder of the “great Kaimariya” in town, to which he gave a clock worth 40,000 dirham. He died in 665, and it is he that wrote the posthumous inscription of Abu'l-Hasan:

At the reign of our lord the sultan malik al-naşir Salâh al-Dîn Yusuf (II) b. malik al-'azîz Muhammad—may Allah perpetuate the greatness of his empire! [two years before it was wiped out by Hulagu]—through the beneficence of our lord the sultan malik al-Sâlih Nadîm al-Dîn Ayyûb b. malik al-kâmîl Muhammad, Allah sanctify their souls!

It is unusual to speak of a deceased ruler as “our lord,” the more so as in this instance the kingdom (Damascus) had been taken from the former by his hostile neighbor (Aleppo) and successor. Only a man very loyal and, more, very powerful could do that. The Kaimaris had come from Kurdistan with Saladin, and they surrendered Damascus to the army of the Egyptian Mamelukes after the sudden and unforeseen collapse of the Ayyubid glory under the attack of the Mongols.

The plan (Fig. 53) of the mûristân is evidently modeled after that of the Mûristân

al-Nūrī. It is the perfect cruciform plan of a madrasa, with the lateral īwāns reduced in size. At the same time it shares with the Madrasa al-Ṣāḥibiya the strict symmetry of the plan (one single axis), the avoidance of domes, the exclusive use of barrel, cloister, and cross vaults, apparently a fashion of that late period.

Over the entrance is a Syrian muṣṭānas vault, Iranian subtype. In detail it goes beyond the norm of the older buildings and leans visibly toward the early Mameluke style, as represented in Damascus by the turba library of Baibars and Kalāʿūn. A two-colored frontal arch frames the vault (*Fig. 17*), a feature that stands on the line dividing Ayyubid and Mameluke architecture.

The main īwān on the south of the court, which offers a beautiful view of Damascus through its three windows, is highly decorated. The material is colored plaster (cf. *Figs. 112–13*). An inscription in an advanced style of Neskhi runs around its three sides at the springing line of the barrel. It repeats over and over again the confession of faith: “Lā ilāha illā 'Ilāha, Muḥammad rasūlu 'Ilāhi.” Before that time one would have done better. The floral elements between these letters (*Fig. 54*) are strikingly “late,” but the inscription belongs to the first and only building period. The ornament forming the border of the big arch looks, on the contrary, like the survival of a third-century form. Other styles of ornament are contrasted with these two; all together they look as if they had been taken from a sample card the maker owned by chance, disproportionate and heterogeneous.

The two surfaces of the large barrel vault are ornamented like a carpet with border and
center. The border is a kind of astragal, the center a huge roundel; the Arabs call them mirror, mirāya, or dish, šiniya (Fig. 55). The roundel has twenty-four appendages resembling the sixteen on the great Ardebil carpet of the Victoria and Albert Museum, dated 946 H. These appendages and the circle from which they radiate are higher in relief than the middle, and their elements are late Byzantine acanthi. Two inadequate elements are contrasted for no other reason but increased effect. Figure 56 reproduces a roundel in stucco from the little Turba al-Izzīya in West Damascus, tomb of the emir ʿIzz al-Dīn Aibek, lord of Shākhd, who founded the madrasa to which the turba belonged in 621. The roundel is representative of the compositions from which the one in the Kaimarī Mūristān was derived only some thirty years later. There is simplicity in it and contrast, melody and counterpoint, unity and style. It is infinitely better.
One sees the pitiful process that must repeat itself always and everywhere: every artist must surpass what has been done before him. The superlative replaces the positive, but wears out quicker, and needs again augmentation. Old music forbade the septime accord; at a later phase it became the dominant, the next must surpass it, and the last is forced to use discord; this cannot be surpassed and is the end, death. The lapse of time an art can keep its high level is short. These roundels, typical for many other observations, give a scale to measure the step downward which this art made in the course of one generation. The apogee of Ayyubid art is in Damascus at the time of malik al-ʿĀdil (582–615), in Aleppo at that of malik al-Ẓāhir Ghāzi (583–613), of the brother and the son of Saladin. During the last thirty years of the Ayyubid period, the art is decidedly on the decline.

![Fig. 52—Turba al-Kaimariya, Window](image)

The study of the Syrian madrasa, not only of the examples published here, leads to the following conclusions:

As an institution the madrasa was the thought of Nizām al-Mulk, the ruler of the Seljuk empire at the height of its power; as an architectural type it was an adaptation by Persian architects of the Iranian plan used for large houses and most public buildings: the cruciform plan. In the eastern Muhammadan world, as far as Iranian architecture dominates, that plan went on to be used without essential changes.

Baghdad was the first step on its way west. At that time, just before 500 H., the architectural style in Iraq was Seljuk, but adapted to brickwork native to that old land, a relation analogous to that of North German brick Gothic to French Gothic. This style causes slight
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changes in appearance and affects the vaults used in the madrasa; the Mustanṣirīya, built in the center of Baghdad, shows also alterations in plan under the coercion of the available space, in a big town.

The farther west one goes, the more effective becomes this force. It is deep rooted and explains deep differences between Iranian and more western styles. In Syria and Iraq many "mounds of many cities" mark the sites of ancient towns. Towns rarely change their very first place. In Iran most cities move after a certain period, usually after a short time. There are climatic reasons for these displacements; often the towns recede from the plains, which become too salty, nearer to the mountains from which their water supply comes. Other reasons are historical: foreign invaders, Arabs, Turks, Mongols, Tatars, all build—like Euro-

peans in Asia—their quarters outside the existing towns. When the Safawids chose Isfahan as their residence, they took neither Gay nor Shahrīstān, the two existing towns, but built a third. Thus, the main towns continuously shift, and limited space never restricts the architects.

The Persian traveler Naṣir-i-Khusraw, when visiting Aleppo in 438 H. (1047 A.D.), significantly says: "Aleppo seemed to me to be a good town...about as large as Balkh, entirely flourishing. Its houses touch each other." Certainly, in the bazaar quarters of the Iranian towns the houses, too, touched each other; hamsāya, "shadow-sharer," is the old word for neighbor, and Zoroaster, in gāthā (Y.33,4), calls nazdīstam drujam "proximity of infidels," the shady side of life in town. Elsewhere, the houses are not contiguous. When Ecbatana and Pasargadæ were founded, houses in gardens spread over a wide plain, protected only by a citadel on a hill. Something of that spirit prevails to the present day. Larger houses with their gardens occupy the entire area between two main and two side streets. This is the rule in Samarra and may partly result from the institution of iḵtā‘: the ground is property of the

---

Fig. 54—Damascus, Şālihya, Mūristān al-Kaimarī, Ornamental Frame D-185
state and given as fief to the owner. Even when building within, not as usual at the outskirts of a town, sufficient space is always available for a public building.

Almost all Iranian buildings are royal ones, a term that here includes the works of grand viziers and other high officials. So it was in Iran since the Achaemenian epoch: the king or the government initiates monumental architecture. Of course, there are tombs, and there always were houses and even palaces of great people. But the distance between the groups is great and truly reflects the social order: the vast gap between the ruler and the mass of the population.
In the West, where towns keep for thousands of years to their first place, the narrow space inside their walls is crowded to the utmost; the tiniest piece of ground is fully utilized. Working unrestricted by limitations of space entailed disregard for purpose and utility. Waste characterizes Iranian works: the mosques and madrasas were never filled with the number of people they were designed to contain. They are materializations of the abstract idea and freely display purely aesthetic principles.

![Ornamental Roundel](Fig. 56—Damascus, Turbat al-Izziya, Ornamental Roundel)

The main postulate is strict symmetry. This is the reason why, even when Persepolis was built, the older oblong plan was replaced by a square, and large parts of buildings were purposely repeated in mirror reflection, even when the special location made them unfit for any practical use and actually invisible. Symmetry also ruled supreme in sculpture, and there it caused every subject to be produced in pairs, leading to repetitions unparalleled in the history of art. In the course of time, simple symmetry must be surpassed, double and quadruple symmetry is required.

Disregard of practical considerations is accompanied by neglect of technique, inferior material, weak foundations and structure, and, as uselessness is compensated by symmetry, so are these defects by rampant, dazzling decoration. Those are conditions favoring hypertrophies, which, with other phenomena of degeneration, one can observe again and again in the long
history of that art. Seen as organisms, the Iranian buildings remain primitive in comparison with others, for it is the overcoming of obstacles that produces higher organisms.

In coming to Syria, at the very beginning of the sixth century, the Iranian madrasa was transplanted from a world of unrestricted almost licentious imagination into one of the soberest rationalism, that is the opposition of the Iranian and the Arab spirit.

Syria is a world of totally different social structure, and this is reflected in its buildings, just as the other social structure is reflected in Iranian architecture. Of course, to build fortifications, citadels, castles, the great mosques, is the affair of kings and governments; the madrasa is a state institution, and princes built madrasas. But a high class of the population without equivalent in Iran, participated to such an extent that it equals the public and royal activity of building not only madrasas but all sorts of institutions for public welfare. For several centuries old families at Damascus and Aleppo appear as builders again and again in the inscriptions: the Banu ʿIṣkāfī, Banu ʿIṣhāb, Banu ʿIṣkāfī, b. Abū Djarrāda, al-Muḥammad, Shaddād, Shaibānī, ʿAdjamī and others; all these from the fifth to the seventh centuries. It reminds one of Venice and Florence in the following centuries. And that is why, in coming from Persia to Syria, one feels one is in Europe, not in Asia. One could speak of the contrast between a royal and a civil art.

In Syria the general restriction by space dominates, aggravated by that of lawful ownership. There is the restriction imposed by costs, the greatest thriftiness; the postulate of solidity, based on a magnificent tradition of craftsmanship; that of usefulness, complemented by dislike of the unnecessary, of mere decoration. All these forces were especially powerful at that peculiar moment of the “Sunnite reaction,” of which the great personality of ʿNūr al-Dīn was the exponent. One can, with justice, speak of the influence of his personal taste.

The architects had to overcome all these restrictions, and in doing so, they created a much higher organism than that from which they started, and one that, though Iranian of origin, is no longer Iranian in essence. The double symmetry of the cruciform plan, meaning everything to the Iranian architects, had no meaning to them. The number four of the iwāns may be preserved—as in the two māristāns and some madrasas—when all four fulfill a proper function. There is no reason to give them equal size when their purpose does not demand it, nor to keep them in the main axes when the secondary rooms around them would better function by a different arrangement. The open iwān is unsuitable, in Syria, for a prayer hall, hence it is replaced, from the beginning, by a hall of the usual type. Some inferior techniques, e.g., the faked vaults in plaster, which had been brought over with the foreign type (Māristān Nūrī), are at once eliminated, and the great Syrian art of vaulting soon finds an answer to the question posed by this foreign plan.

The aesthetic principles that dominate the Iranian model never influence the Syrian architects, whose aim was solid masonry, good proportions instead of decoration, an equilibrium of functional parts, carefully weighed, emphasizing the important, subordinating the accessory, with enough contrast not to become monotonous, but no strict symmetry, simple, double, or quadruple. Simple symmetry appears only at the period of decline, when the attempt must be made to surpass the older and better works and when one yields to ostentation.
Al-Faḍl b. Marwān, first vizier of al-Muʿtaṣim, tells in Tabarî: “al-Muʿtaṣim had no liking for the decoration, tazīn, of the buildings; his mind aimed entirely at their solidity, ikkām.” 59 It would require a dissertation on epigraphy, protocol, religious acts, and institutions, altogether a biography of Nūr al-Dīn, to prove the assertion, but it is so; just as Nīẓām al-Mulk had created the madrasa as an institution, so Nūr al-Dīn is the creator of the Syrian madrasa and, far beyond that, of the fine and sober style characteristic of Ayyubid art.

The works of his very first years, best represented by the Kaṣṭal al-Shuʿaibīya, Aleppo, are the unaltered continuation of the style of the preceding, the Seljuk period, just as the protocol is the old atabekian, and the script Kufic. At a point almost exactly definable by the year 548, all suddenly changes. The new style appears, lasts, and reaches its highest point under al-ʿĀdil and Zāhir Ghāzī. It is the deep movement of the Sunnite reaction that produced these changes, and it was Nūr al-Dīn who impressed that spirit into the people of his time.

**THE TURBA**

![Image](https://example.com/image.png)

**FIG. 57—DAMASCUS, KUBBAT AL 'ASAFĪR**

**MADRASA AL-ŠHA’MIYA AL-ḤUSAMIYA EXTRA MUROS**

In the quarter (modern) Sārūdja, old ‘Awnīya, north of the walls 60 (Figs. II4–19). 61 Sitt al-Shaʾm Zumurrud Khāṭūn is for Damascus what Sitt Zubaida is for Baghdad. Zubaida is famous the world over through the Thousand and One Nights; Sitt al-Shaʾm is known through Lessing’s Nathan der Weise, but unknown to the Encyclopaedia of Islām. 62 The high rank and political importance that the women of the Ayyubid family had—Daifa Khāṭūn, daughter of malik al-ʿĀdil, e.g., was a very successful regent of Aleppo—is peculiarly Kurdish. I have met and enjoyed the hospitality of two such ladies, ruling their wild tribes with more authority than a man, “the greatest emirs stood erect in front of them as is the custom in the presence of kings.”

The inscription on the house of Zumurrud Khāṭūn gives her the title:

الخاتون الكبيرة الجزيلة عمة الدين سُبُب الشام أم حسام الدين إبنت أبَب ب شاذِ

The great princess, the very mighty, ʿIsmat al-Dīn, lady of Damascus, mother of Ḥusām al-Dīn, daughter of Ayyūb b. Shādī.


60 W. W., No. C, I, 3 (p. 47) and No. E, 4, 9 (p. 79), extra and intra muros confounded; cf. p. 122, n. 1:

“We did not enter it.” Sauvaget, No. 26, 17 lines text and Fig. 17, drawing of an ornament.

61 Cf. Interior, Pt. I, Fig. 73 and Pt. II, Fig. 78.

62 Her personal name Zumurrud appears only in Ibn Khallikān; op. cit., No. 422 of Ibn al-Šalāḥ, p. 128.
Titles such as “lady of Damascus,” which do not designate actual rulership, probably come down from Sasanian Persia, type shahrbānok, “lady of the empire.” Zumurrud, daughter of Nadim al-Dīn Ayyūb, was full sister of Tūrānshāh and Saladin, half sister of Rabī’a Khatūn. She married first ʿUmar b. Lāḏjīn, and Ḥūsām al-Dīn Muhammad was their son.53 Her second husband was her first cousin Abū Saʿīd Nāṣir al-Dīn Muhammad b. Shīrkūh b. Shādīhī. Thirty-five kings were so closely related to her that she could not marry them. She died 16 Dhuʾl-ʾKaʿda 616 (January 23, 1220) 64 in her house, which she had instituted as madrasa (Shaʿmiya intra muros), south of the Māristān Nūrī, and was buried in her turba extra muros.

Her house, at present a school, is marked by the inscription of her waqf. Inside, I saw an iwān that seemed to belong to the original building. One of her admirers, Abū Bakr Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, an Anṣārī, descendant of the companions of the Prophet, made a great waqf “in favor of the Khatūn Sitt al-Shaʾm . . . to pass after her death to Zumurrud Khatūn, daughter of her son Ḥūsām al-Dīn Muhammad b. ʿUmar b. Lāḏjīn . . . till the extinction of the line, and, in case the house would have been transformed into a madrasa, to the scholars of this madrasa.” 65

Madrasa al-Shaʿmiya extra muros, in the quarter, maḥalla, ʿAiniya [Abū Shāma, better ʿAwniyya], built by Sitt al-Shaʾm; also called al-Ḥūsāmiyya, because Ḥūsām al-Dīn was buried there at the side of his mother, in the third tomb that follows the place taken by the professor (?). In the following tomb lies her husband and first-cousin, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muhammad b. Shīrkūh, whom she married after the death of the father of Ḥūsām al-Dīn. In the adjacent tomb, to the south, rests Malik al-muʿaẓẓam Tūrānshāh b. Ayyūb, lord of Yemen,66 (Nuʿāmī)

**Inscription 35**

On the headstone of the middle cenotaph, six lines, 67 80 by 95 cm:

1. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

2. ها هي جزيرة عمة السيدة خاتمة

3. السيدة شعبان بنت الشام

4. الجليل الكبر الشام弯曲 السعيد الجعفري

5. عبد الله ناصر الدين صلاح الدين

6. خاتم السادة الأمم

7. شريف الدولة بهاء النحلة محمد جمل

8. السليمان بن أحمد بن سعد بن محمد بن شرقي ناصير دين

[end]

Basmala and Koran, LV, 26–27; the enmir, the mighty great isfahsālār, the assisted (by Allah), of blessed memory, the fighter of the Holy War, Nāṣir al-Dīn Ṣalāḥ al-īslām, the intimate, ‘uddat, of the imām, the honor of the government, the splendor of the community, the leader of the armies of the faithful, Alp Ḥutluğ Beg Abū Saʿīd Muhammad b. Shīrkūh has passed away to Allah’s mercy on the 29th . . . (rest missing).

---

53 Most chroniclers call the son wrongly Ḥūsām al-Dīn ʿUmar and the father Lāḏjīn, and know nothing about ʿUmar, the first husband. Among them is Ibn Khallīkān who mentions Sitt al-Shaʾm (op. cit., No. 126: Tūrānshāh, No. 297: Shīrkūh, and No. 422: Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ), but has no biography of Ḥūsām al-Dīn, nor of ʿUmar b. Lāḏjīn.

54 Ibn Khallīkān, op. cit., No. 422, p. 129.

55 See the remarks concerning her eunuch Shīb al-Dawla under “Shībīya.”


67 Cf. Répertoire, IX, No. 3408.
According to Ibn Khallikân’s biography of Shîrkûh, his son Nâsîr al-Dîn died 9 Dhu’l-Hijjah 581, and was transferred from Hîms to Damascus, to be buried in the turba built to receive the body of Tûrânshâh. The only mistake in this notice seems to be the day: 9 for 29, i.e., March 23, 1186.

Inscription 36

On the headstone of the northern cenotaph, seven lines, 80 by 95 cm.:

Inscription 37

On the headstone of the southern cenotaph, nine lines, 80 by 100 cm.:

This is the tomb of the master, the emir, the very mighty isfahânî, the martyred warrior, of blessed memory, Hûsâm al-Dîn Abu Abdallah Muhammad b. ’Umar b. Lâdjîn.... he died at the eve of Saturday, 20 Shâ’bân 587 (October 11, 1191), the praise is Allah’s alone. 

The young prince had built a madrasa at Aleppo; Ibn Shaddâd says that one of the four churches, converted into mosques in 518 by the cadi Ibn al-Khashshâb, the Masdjîd al-Hâddâdîn (“of the smiths”) was converted into a Hanafta madrasa at the time of Salâdîn by his nephew Hûsâm al-Dîn b. ’Umar b. Lâdjîn. Ibn Shihîn adds: “He demolished the old

68 Ibn Khallikân, op. cit., No. 297, p. 120.
69 Cf. Répertoire, IX, No. 3407.
70 A curious MS in the British Museum (C. Rieu, Supplement to the Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the British Museum [London, 1894], No. 557): “The Evident Advantages of the Incomparable Qualities of the Nâşirîya, i.e., the Ayyubids, written by a son of malik al-nâşir Dâ‘ûd b. ’Irá b. Abî Bakr b. Ayyûb to prove the descent of the family from Adam, gives a protocol of sixty titles of his four ancestors; but of the twelve attributed to Ayyûb not one is historical.
71 Cf. Répertoire, IX, No. 3448.
72 Durr, p. 83.
building and erected a solid new one; the instruction there went on continuously till I became director, and later handed it over to my two sons who have it still.” 73 In the tenth century it was abandoned.

According to the inscriptions, Sitt al-Sha’m had begun to build the mausoleum at the death of her brother Tūrānshāh, and it was not yet ready to receive the body in 580. Her second husband, Nāṣir al-Dīn, died suddenly in 581 and was the first to be interred there, then Tūrānshāh. Only five years later the son by her first husband was buried beside them. The tomb of Sitt al-Sha’m herself is not made known. All are cenotaphs, the tombs themselves are undisturbed below, whether in the earth or in a vault.

Of the original building a simple entrance, the tank in the court, and the turba itself remain, perhaps also the portico between turba and tank (Fig. 115). All are of the greatest simplicity, today disfigured by whitewash and paint.

The tomb chamber is a square of 9.6 m., with recesses 11.4 by 12.7 m., covered by a slightly pointed cross vault, about 7.6 m. high at the summit. It springs from a low dado only 1.2 m. from the floor. The low beginning of the vault gives the room, though it is wide and not low, the appearance of a crypt. I do not remember another mausoleum of the period where the problem of space has been treated in this way.

The walls and the vaults are divided into panels (Figs. 116–19) in stucco work. All the framing lines are flat moldings and are accompanied, including the groins of the vault, by capricious lines, variations of a broken arch on brackets, which may be classed among “cuspided moldings.” After having studied Imām Dūr, one can simply state that they are derived from the special style dominating the Jazira during the two preceding centuries.

The arch of the mihrab 74 and a few roundels now badly whitewashed, also the fragment of a frieze on the north wall, of which a drawing is given in Monuments historiques, show a more elaborate arabesque in stucco, the peculiar forms being evidently derived from the terracotta arabesques of late Abbasid buildings in Baghdad. 75

The Ša’miya is not the normal type of a mausoleum at Damascus. The norm is represented by a very large number of small buildings, most of them at Šāliḥiya, on the slope of Kāsiyūn. We saw one of them, the so-called Madrasa al-Rukniya. Some of them are remains of larger constructions, of madrasas; some are in almost perfect condition, some have lost their domes, many are now occupied by public offices or used as private houses and therefore difficult of access. Van Berchem had, in 1893–94, compiled a list of most of them; we added a few in 1914, as did Watzinger and Wulzinger and the Monuments historiques. None of the lists is complete. The main interest in these standardized buildings, most of them with inscriptions, lies in the field of local history. For purposes of the history of architecture, one could choose the very best specimen. But the commonness of a certain local type may open an insight missed when choosing one representative example only. The following are speci-
mens of which I have more than a short note or an inscription only, and I shall describe them in the shortest way, leaving the classification of the type for the end.

Figs. 58-60—Damascus, TURBAT 'ALâ AL-DİN (SİTTA ŞA’M AL-ŞUGHRA’)

TURBAT SİTT AL-SHA’M AL-ŞUGHRA’

(Figs. 58–60, and 120)

Turbat Sitt al-Sha’m al-şughra’ ("Lesser Sitt al-Sha’m") is in the quarter Sük Sărûdja, a short distance west of the "Greater Sitt al-Sha’m."  

Inscription 38

A slab, 53 by 65 cm., set into the wall over the pointed arch of the small door, seven lines of old Neskhi:

This is what the mother of the emir, the young bachelor, killed in the Holy War, ‘Alâ al-Dîn b. al amir Zain al-Dîn—Allah’s mercy upon both!—has built. In Dhu’ l-Hijждja 568 (July–August, 1173).

Zain al-Dîn was the honorific of Ali Kûchik b. Begtekin, governor of Mosul under Zengî, later lord of Sindjâr, Harrân, Takrit, and Irbil. At his death in 653 his sons succeeded, Nûr al-Dîn Yûsuf at Irbil, Muzaffar al-Dîn Gökbüri first at Harrân, after 586 at Irbil. Gökbüri

76 Sauvaget, No. 23.  77 Cf. Répertoire, IX, No. 3209, taken from van Berchem's note book.
married Rabī‘a Khâṭûn, sister of Saladin and Sitt al-Sha‘m. He founded the “Great Mosque of the mountain,” Djâmi‘ al-Ḥanâbila in Śâliḥiya. The Zain al-Dīn of this inscription is probably the father of Gökňûri, the Begtekinid Ali (who died only five years before his son, hence: “Allah’s mercy upon both!”), and the turba was built by his wife for a young son killed in the war.

The tomb chamber contains two secondary tombs, both uninscribed. It is a little more than 5 m. square. Four large niches over the corners form an octagon from which the smooth dome springs. The arch over the door inside is a pointed horseshoe, a variety more common at Damascus at that time than elsewhere.

**Turba al-Nadjmiya**

(Figs. 61, 121, and 123)

In the same narrow lane, opposite the “Lesser Sitt al-Sha‘m.” 78

---

**Fig. 61—Damascus, Turbat al Nadjmiya, Plan**

Turba al-Nadjmiya, in the neighborhood of the Sha‘miya-Ḥusâmiya, contains the tomb of Shâhânšâh [brother of Saladin and Sitt al-Sha‘m], father of Farrukhshâh; of [his son] Taḵī al-Dīn ‘Umar [founder of the Ma‘arra madrasa]; and of the lady ‘Udrâ’, and also the tomb of malik al-Mansûr, son of Sultan Saladin, and that of Fatḥ al-Dīn b. Asad al-Dīn Shîrkûh.79 (Nu‘aimî)

Year 561: death of Fatḥ al-Dīn b. Asad al-Dīn Shîrkûh, brother of Nāṣîr al-Dīn [Muḥammad, husband of Sitt al-Sha‘m]; his tomb is at the Nadjmiya cemetery at the side of that of his paternal uncle Shâhânšâh b. Ayyûb, in a kubba which contains four tombs; those are the two in the middle.

Year 575: death of malik al-mansûr Hasan, son of Sultan Saladin; his tomb is the southernmost of the four under the kubba that contains the body of Shâhânšâh b. Ayyûb, on the Nadjmiya cemetery at the ‘Awniya outside Damascus. (Abû Shâma, in Kitâb al-Raydatâin)

78 Sauvaget, No. 25.

79 J.A., VI (1895), 268.
Apparently, the name Nadjmiya of the cemetery is derived from the honorific of Ayyūb, Nadjm al-Dīn, because his family was buried there.

*Inscription 39*

On the outside, above the small door, 46 by 49 cm., seven lines of old Neskhi in small letters:

> بسيلة ... هذا قبر الملك. منصور حسن بن الملك الناصر صلاح الدين يوسف 6. ابن أبوب ترقى مستشهد جملي الآخر سنة خمس وخمسون وخمسمئة رحمه الله

This is the tomb of malik al-mansūr Hasan b. malik al-Nāṣir Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf b. Ayyūb; he died the first of Djumlah 1575 (October 4, 1179), Allah be merciful to him!

Saladin, here, in 575, is still called Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, not Ṣalāḥ al-Dunya wa l-Dīn. Al-Mansūr, who died twenty years before his father did, must have been very young, and therefore does not appear in the chronicles.

The building is larger than the foregoing, 6.5 m. square, and the folded dome rises above two zones of transition, an octagon and a hexadecagon (*Fig. 121*). Traces of a frieze in plaster (muqarnas) and of interlaced geometric ornament in blue paint are preserved in the interior.

**MADRASA AL-FARRUKHSHĀHIYA**

(*Figs. 62–65*)

In the quarter Sharaf al-a'lä or al-shamālī, “upper” or “northern Sharaf,” west of the town.

Madrasa al-Farrukhshāhiya, called after ‘Izz al-Dīn Farrukhshāh [b. Shāhānshāh b. Ayyūb], founded as waqf by his mother, Khutlukhaīr Khātn, daughter of Ibrāhīm b. Abdallah; he died in 578 and was buried in his madrasa at the upper Sharaf, in his kubba. At its side is the Amdjadiya.31 (Nu‘aimī)

The biography of Farrukhshāh by Ibn Khallikān confirms this notice.

Madrasa al-Amdjadiya, at the upper Sharaf, built by malik al-muẓaffar Nūr al-Dīn ‘Umar at the time when his father malik al-amdjad Bahramshāh b. Farrukhshāh b. Shāhānshāh b. Ayyūb was murdered in the dār al-sā‘āda (“house of felicity”).32 (Nu‘aimī)

Malik al-Amdjad . . . was buried in the madrasa of his father, at the Sharaf, Damascus.33 (Ibn Shihna)

Farrukhshāh Dā’ūd had received Baalbek—before a fief of Shams al-Dīn ibn al-Muṣkaddam—from Saladin in 575. Abū Shāmā states that his honorific was as well ‘Izz as Mu‘izz al-Dīn; the inscriptions use Mu‘izz only.

Saladin confirmed the son, malik al-Amdjad, who ruled with the sovereign title madjd al-dunyā wa'l-dīn, from 578 to 627 (1182–1230). Two of the large towers of Baalbek bear his inscriptions, and his lieutenant Khutlukh built the Amdjadiya near Baalbek. In 627, after

30 W. W., No. W 4; Sauvaget, No. 24; *idem, Monuments ayyoubides*, I, 3.
31 *J.A.*, IV (1894), 272.
32 *J.A.*, III (1894), 392.
having taken Damascus, malik al-ashraf Mūsā of Jazira laid siege to Baalbek and forced the aged Amdjad to resign and to retire to Damascus, where he was murdered in 628 by one of his own mamelukes.

Inscription 40

On the lintel over the window on the northern side, four lines, 84 by 30 cm., in small letters:

1. بسيلة - أمر بانشأ هذه الثورة المباركة. القوي إلى رحمة الله تعالى برسم ولدها الملك المنصور.
2. معر الدين والدنيا (!) فرح خنشاشان بن أبي بكر الملكي. الناصري توتي مستهل جبادي.
3. الآخر سنة سبع وسبعين وخمسينة.

84 Cf. Répertoire, IX, No. 3381.
The humble lady has ordered to found this blessed turba for her son malik al-manṣūr Mu'izz al-Dīn wa'll-Dunyā (sic) Farrukhshāh b. Shāhānsāh b. Ayyūb (officer), the “Nāṣirid”; he died 1 Dju- mādā II 579 (September 21, 1183).

The larger turba, to the north, is the older one, Farrukhshāhīya; the smaller one to the south is the later, Amdjadīya. Our surveys were made in 1914. In 1926–27, as Sauvaget says, the monument was “gravement mutilé” by being transformed into a mosque. Figures 64 and 65 give details of stucco decorations; an ornament like that over the summit of the arches is called, when in a hanging position, “ear-pendant,” by al-Djazarī. The Monu- ments ayyoubides reproduces parts of ornamental compositions once painted in lapis blue on the niches under the dome. The dome itself has fallen, but was certainly the normal one, as the smaller turba of Amdjad shows. The Farrukhshāhīya is the fully developed type of the Damascus turba, which prevails from now on.

On the Sheikh Abdallah mountain near Baalbek stands the domed building, erected in 596 by the emir Sārim al-Dīn Khūṭlūkh, al-muʿizzī al-malikī al-amdjadī, client of Farrukhshāh and Amdjad. It is significant for Baalbek that it is built entirely in the largest free stone masonry without mortar. Four deep, semicircular niches span the corners of the square room, and corresponding flat niches with one window lie in the normal axes. This octagon is crowned by a frieze of large muḵarnas, four to each side, having a cornice on the outside, and forming a sixteen-sided figure from which springs the smooth dome of huge dressed stones, whose back is the outer face of the cupola.

85 Publication: Baalbek, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen, in 1898–1905, ed. T. Wiegand (Berlin, 1925), III, Inscr. III (M. Sobernheim) and pp. 108f and Fig. 121, Pl. 16 (by H. Kohl and D. M. Krencker). Since the monument had not been measured by the expedition, I did so in 1914, but the notebook leaf has disappeared.
Tomb of Saladin  
(Figs. 131 and 132)  

Outside the northern arcade of the Great Mosque.  

Saladin died 27 Safar (March 5, 1193) in the citadel of Damascus, and his body was transferred on the 'Ashūra day, 10 Muharram 592 (December 15, 1195), to his turba, which his son malik al-'azīz 'Uthmān (of Egypt, 589-95) had founded as Madrasa al-'Azīziya, in the Kallāsa quarter, adjacent to the exterior north wall of the Great Mosque. The turba was “in an īwān in the western part” of that madrasa, the foundation of which had been laid by malik al-afdāl Nūr al-Dīn Ali b. Saladin (at Damascus, 582-92). The door of the old Madrasa al-'Azīziya existed at the time of Bourgoin (Fig. 66). On the cenotaph of Saladin was an inscription in verses, composed by his cadi al-Fādil and read by Ibn Khallikān in Ramadan 680:

After the date of his death:

اللهُمَّ فَأْفَرَضَ عِنْ تَلَكَ الْرُّوحِ وَأَفْتَحِ لَهُ أَبْوَابَ الْجَنَّةِ فَنَهُّ أَخْرَجَ مَا كَانَ يُرْجُوُ مِنَ الْفَتْحِ

O Allah, be satisfied with this soul and open (iftah) to him the gates of paradise! That is the last conquest (fatḥ) for which he hoped!

86 Sauvaget, No. 27.  
87 Kallāsa, from kiln "chalk," called thus because mortar was made there when building the Great Mosque.  
88 See his drawing (op. cit., I, 19).  
The tomb was restored by Kaiser Wilhelm II after his visit to Damascus. The photograph, Figure 132, the right side, was taken before that restoration. The body of the monument has not been considerably altered, but the decoration is new. The cenotaph that now stands in the middle is new; the old wooden cenotaph of 592 is preserved and stands at the side. *Monuments historiques* gives two drawings of its ḫarbaṣī work; 90 the cenotaph deserves a complete and good publication.

**Turba al-Naṭīfīya, Şāliḥīya**

![Fig. 67—Damascus, Şāliḥīya, al-Naṭīfīya](image)

Popular name, Bait al-Şāṭir; near the Ḥanābila mosque.

**Inscription 41**

In three parts, above the pair of windows of the façade, under the cornice (decipherment unfinished):

In three parts, above the pair of windows of the façade, under the cornice (decipherment unfinished):

A: date of death, 8 Djamāḍā II 602 (January 20, 1206); B: founder, Muhammad b. Ali b. Naṭīf, seemingly not the deceased.

Simple front of a house, in good masonry, with a pair of windows, the door, a cornice, and some of the original crenelations. The interior was inaccessible in 1914.

90 Sauvaget, Fig. 18.

91 v. B., "Plan" 1; W. W., No. DN, VIII, a; not in Sauvaget.
The khâtûn, mother of the sultan malik al-Mu'azzam, wife of al-'Ädil, died 20 Rabî' I 602 (November 4, 1205), and was buried in her kübba in the Madrasa al-Mu'azzamiya on the Kâsiyûn. (Ibn al-Kathîr)

In 606, malik al-mughîth Fath al-Dîn 'Umar b. al-'Ädil was buried in the turba of his brother al-Mu'azzam.

Madrasa al-Mu'azzamiya, Hanafite, at Şâlihiya, on the slope of the Kâsiyûn, in the neighborhood of the 'Azîziya [of al-'azîz Muhammad b. al-Ädil, brother of al-Mu'azzam, 630], founded by malik al-mu'azzam 'Isâ b. 'Ädil, who was a strict Hanafite; he died in 624, the tenth year of his reign [as sultan] at Damascus, and was buried, first, against the provisions of his will, in the citadel, then transferred to the Kâsiyûn, and buried beside his mother, 1 Muharram 627 (November 20, 1229). Ibn Khallikân says: “In his madrasa in which were the tombs of many of his brothers and relatives.” 93 (Nu'aimî)

The inscription on the left window of the façade is written by a wife of al-Mu'azzam, in 631. Malik al-djawâd Yûnis in 637, malik al-nâsîr Dâ'ûd, who died of the plague in 656,

and other descendants down to the beginning of the eighth century, were all buried in this madrasa. Before his sultanate, al-Mu'azzām had been governor of Damascus for al-'Ādil, 597-615. Seemingly, his mother, who died in 602, was the actual foundress of the turba, which became a family mausoleum.

The building, which was not accessible, seems to be an agglomeration around a first structure. The street front (Fig. 68) is preserved up to the crenelations. Watzinger and Wulzinger give the picture of another turba in the next neighborhood, with only one window and more ornate crenelations (Fig. 69).

Fig. 70—Damascus, Śāhīf, al-Čhārēkāśīyā

**Madrasa al-Čhārēkāśīyā**

(Figs. 70-73) *5*

Chahārkas, čhārkas, Persian, means Circassian, popularly disfigured into Saraksī or similar.

Madrasa al-Chārkāsīya or chārkāsīya, Hanafite and Shafite, founded as waqf by Chārkas fakhr al-dīn al-ṣalāḥī, containing his tomb. *6* (Nuʿāmī)

Ibn Khallikān, *7* calls him one of the great emirs of the Ayyubid period and mentions especially the great kāšāriya al-Chārkāsīya he had built in Cairo. Nuʿāmī quotes Ibn Khallikān as author of a passage that is not in the texts we have today: “Chahārkas left a young son whom malik al-ʿĀdil confirmed in the offices held by his father, appointing a guardian for him; but he survived his father only a short time and died, as they say, in 607.” The date is faulty. The guardian was Sārim al-Dīn Khutlubā who, according to Ibn al-Kathīr, died in 635

---

*5* W. W., Pl. 8b.

*6* J. A., IV (1894), 249f.

and was buried in the ֿkūbāb chahārkas ("the domes of Ch"), which he had built for his master, opposite the turba al-Ḳhāṭūniya on the Ḳāsiyūn.

**Inscription 42**

On lintel of door, four lines, 115 by 33 cm.; twice repeated with slight variants over the windows on the street:

 inser pīlāt. 1. Bismillah... 2. تحمّل الامام الإستحسان الكبير 2. الغازى الجياعد خضر الدين حانين ثغور المسلمين قائل الكفرة 3. والمشركين اياز جهازكس العادلى الناصري توفي في عقب عود الغزاة 4. في العشرين من رجب سنة ثمان وستمئة ورقم الله عليه وعلى جميع الأمم المسلمين أمين.

This blessed turba belongs to the emir, the great isfahsalār, the warrior, the fighter of the Holy War, fakhr al-din, the guardian of the frontiers of the faithful, the killer of the infidels and polytheists, Ayāz Chahārkas, officer of malik al-ʿĀdil and of malik al-Nāṣir; he died of the effects of his having been in war, 20 Radjab 608 (December 28, 1211).

---

**Inscription 43**

Over the door in the court, five lines, 52 by 35 cm.:

 inser pīlāt. 1. Bismillah... 2. تحمّل الإمبراط المباشر خضر الدين حانين 3. ولد الإمبراط الأجل خضر الدين جهازكس 4. يوم السيد خامس عشر جمادى 5. الآخر سنة خمس عشر وسنينه بسأم الحروس.

The emir, the warrior, the fighter of the Holy War, the soldier, the guardian of the frontiers, fakhr al-din Muhammad, son of the very mighty emir fakhr al-din Chahārkas passed away on Saturday, 5 Dījūmādā II 615 (August 29, 1218) at Damascus the well guarded.
This is the very young son who, with the succession, also received the honorific of his father, “fakhr al-din.” Thus, Nāṣir al-Dīn Shah, in about 1880, gave the office of minister of finances to the son, only fifteen years old, of the deceased mustawfī al-mamālik with his father’s title. The date in the chronicle must be corrected to 615.

Of the building (Fig. 70) a prayer hall and two domed chambers are preserved. Each tomb chamber contains two cenotaphs, without inscription, one of them being that of Khutlubā. I mentioned the knobs of these cenotaphs above (p. 25). Traces of a courtyard indicate that there may have been more buildings.

**Turbat Abi Abdallah al-Ḥasan b. Salāma**

(Figs. 74, 75, and 122) 98

A. von Kremer called the eastern part of the main street of Ṣālihiya, at a corner of which the turba stands, Sūk Abī Djarrās; 99 I noted, in 1930, Abī Djarsh or Djarash. This is the popular lākab of the owner of this tomb, and may mean either “the man with the bell” or “who keeps vigil.” Since Nu‘aimī ignores this tomb, Sauvaire makes no remarks about it.

*Inscription 44*

On the lintel of the window, street side, tabula ansata, five lines, small letters:

لا هو النسيم

This is the turba of the humble slave, the exiled, the one that longs for the mercy of his Lord, Abu Abdallah al-Ḥasan b. Salāma al Ṣakkī; he passed away in Muḥarram 610—Allah be merciful to him!—and after him his two sons—Allah’s mercy upon both!—The humble slave who desires the mercy from the Lord the Beloved, the pilgrim Ahmed Mas’ūd has built it anew.

The last line rhymes: mawdūd—mas‘ūd, but the term mawdūd is chosen not only for rhyme’s sake, but to indicate the Sufism of the writer, who took care of the construction when death took away the two sons with their father. Sufism flourished under Nūr al-Dīn and the Ayyubids in Syria. The names al-Ṣālihiya at Damascus and al-Ṣālihīn at Aleppo mean settlements of Sufis. Ibn Dijubair in 286 says: “This sect of Sufis, they are the kings in that country!” The Sheikh Ḥasan seems to have gone around with a bell at his begging bowl, kashkūl. van Berchem transcribed his nisba “al-Zikīṭ”; not knowing such a place name, I refer al-Ṣakkī from Ṣakkā. He was a gharīb: Sheikh Muhammad al-Fārisī in Cairo, Ali al-Harawi

at Aleppo, and other Sufis, all call themselves gharîb, Ali al-Harawî with the pathetic words: "This is the tomb of the exiled . . . he lived far from his land and died in loneliness, without a friend near him . . . without a family to visit him . . . ."

The building is a perfect example of its type, built just after 610.

**MADRASA AL-SHIBLÎYA**

(*Figs. 76-79*)

Madrasa al-Shibliya, on the slope of the Käsiyün, over the Thawrä bridge; built, according to Ibn Shaddād, in 626, by Shibîl al-Dawla Kâfür al-Ḥusâmî, the Greek, eunuch of Ḥusâm al-Dīn 'Umar (sic) b. Lâdjîn, son of Sitt al-Sha’m. It was he that stimulated Sitt al-Sha’m to build the Sha’mīya extra muros, and who built the Hanafite Shibliya at the side of the khânkâh for the Sufis, which had been his house, the turba, the sâbât ("vaulted passage"), the sabil ("public fountain"), and the large roof has fallen, the traces of its walls have disappeared, one has taken away its materials, it has become a ruin among ruins, its waqf has been adjudicated to the 'Great Mosque of al-Djabal,' i.e., the Ǧāmî al-Ḥanâbila of muṣaffar Gökbüri. Any building, at present in a good state of preservation, can scarcely be the Badriya.

---

100 V. B., “Plan” r; W. W., No. DN, XVIII, a; Sauvaget, No. 89, designates it as “madrasa al-Badriya.” ‘Abd al-Bâsiṭ adds to Nu'aimî's description of the Badriya: “In 740 h., the madrasa was converted into a masjid djamî, with waqf. Thus I saw it written on the lintel.” And in about 1000 h. Sheikh Mahmûd al-'Adawi adds: “The condition of the Badriya has changed, its
He also opened a road from the Sha’miya to the street ‘Ain al-Kirsh; before, one could not go from there to the Kāsiyūn, but had to take the road by the Masjid al-Ṣafi and the ‘Ukāiba. He died in 623.\footnote{J.A., IV (1894), 263.}
The date is confirmed by al-Dhahabî.

These particulars fit the plan of Damascus and seem to be authentic. Shibl al-Dawla must have entered the service of Sitt al-Shâ’în after the death of Ḥusâm al-Dîn, in 587. Ibn al-Kathîr calls him “great eunuch,” and al-Ḳaṣrî, i.e., from the ḳaṣr, palace of Cairo, and a Negro. Certainly, he was that and not a Greek. Ibn al-Ṭhillî 101 and Mas’ûdi 102 say: “al-Mutawakkil had called the mother of al-Mu’tazz al-Kâbiha ‘the ugly one,’ because of her perfect beauty, as one calls a black one kâfûr (‘camphor,’)” by antiphrasis.

Ḥusâm al-Dîn, son of Sitt al-Shâ’în, was the master of Shibl al-Dawla Kâfûr al-ḥusâmî, the eunuch, owner of the madrasa and the khânkâh al-Shiblîya, situated outside Damascus on the road to the Ḍjami’ Kâsiyûn, with a rich waqf, a good deed meritorious in this and the other world. He died in 623 and was buried in his turba next to the madrasa. 104 (Ibn Khallikân)

The date 626, given by Ibn Shaddâd for the foundation of the madrasa, must be a mistake; the easiest correction would be 616, date of the death of Sitt al-Shâ’în. 105

The building, once more, is entirely typical. Parts of its original decorations in plaster and paint are preserved. I am not sure whether the octagon and the dome are built of bricks or of brick-shaped stones.

**MADRASA AL-‘IZZIYA AL-BARRÂNIYA**

Damascus west, near the Farrukhshâhiya (cf. Fig. 56). 106

Madrasa al-‘Izzîya extra muros, below the Wirâka [quarter called after a paper factory?] at the upper Sharaf . . . built in 626 by the emir ‘Izz al-Dîn Aibek, ustâd al-dâr, major-domo of malik al-Mu’aẓzam, and his lieutenant at Şarkhâd. Later he was accused of treacherous correspondence, thrown into prison, and his properties were confiscated. He became ill, and said, fainting: “This is the end of my life!” [meaning “must this be . . .?”] and never talked till he died. He was buried in Cairo, near the Bâb al-Naşr, in 646. 107 (Nu’aimî)

Ibn Khallikân 108 says: “Aibek, mameluke of al-Mu’aẓzam, received Şarkhâd in 611 and held it till 644, when he was imprisoned in Cairo by malik al-ṣâliḥ Naǧîm al-Dîn Ayyûb (II).” He adds that he personally attended Aibek’s funeral in 646. In 654 the remains were transported to Damascus to be buried in the Turba al-Izzîya.

**Inscription 45**

Over the door to the garden, hexagon on discharging arch with one line right, two lines

---

103 Ibn Khallikân, *op. cit.*, No. 126 (Tûrânschâh), p. 25.
104 See below under “Turbat Raihân.”
105 W. W., No. W, 5; Sauvaget, No. 33.
106 J.A., IV (1894), 269.
left, and tabula ansata with four lines on the lintel (Fig. 80); for the irregular disposition of the text:

... the great emir, the warrior, fighter of the Holy War, Abu'l-Faḍā'il 'Izz al-Dīn Aibek b. Ali, Allah cover him with His mercy! ... has instituted as waqf this blessed madrasa for the jurisconsults and students, followers of the august imām Sirādj al-Dīn Abū Ḥanīfa ... for the readers of the Koran, the scholars of the Hadith and the hearers, ... and that in the year 621 (1224).

The date rectifies the 626 of Nu'aimi. The door with the inscription is the only remnant of the madrasa. The turba, without inscriptions, is in good condition. The fine ornamental roundel of Figure 56 comes from the turba.

Zāwiyat Sheikh Ali al-Fārīthī
(Figs. 81 and 133–134)

The name is differently spelled in the chronicles; Sauvaire and Sauvaget render it al-Faranthī. Van Berchem left the reading open. I thought at first al-Ḵarnābī, and asked Nabih

---

109 Sauvaget, Fig. 24; W. W., Taf. 9.

110 v. B., "Plan" 1; W. W., No. DN, V. b; Sauvaget, No. 94.
Faris, who found the name, expressly spelled in al-Yāfi’, *Mirāt al-Djanān*: “Abu’l-Hasan Ali, known as al-Farīthī.” This Farīth is mentioned by Yākūt as a village belonging to Wāṣīṭ, Iraq.

Ali al-Farīthī, virtuous man, gifted with great power, miracle worker, addicted to spiritual exercises, and living as hermit. He had disciples and murīd, novices, and owned a zāwiya on the slope of the Kāsiyūn. He died in Djamādā II 621, and was buried on the Kāsiyūn. They have built a turba over his tomb. (al-Dhahabi)

Khadidja Khātūn, daughter of malik al-Mu'azzam..., who died in 650, was buried in her turba which she had built next to that of Sheikh al-Farīthī, on the Djabal. (Ibn al-'Asākir)

The madrasa of Khadidja Khåtun, al-Murshidiya, is contiguous, to the east, to the tomb of al-Farīthī. Ali al-Farīthī, with his muridin, was a murshid, one who has the right to initiate novices into the order; thus, his turba has more claim to be called al-Murshidiya than has that of Khadidja Khåtun.

**Fig. 81—Damascus, Šalihiya, Ali al-Farīthī, Window with Inscription**

*Inscription 46*

On the lintel of a grilled window (*Fig. 81*), tabula ansata, 95 by 37 cm., five lines; a second inscription with slight variants:

> 1-3 بسملة إن الذي 32-33 هذه تربة الفقيه إلى رحمة الله الشيخ على الفرثلاء
> 4 Kor. LXI 30-32 5 الله رحمة تربى في العشر الآخر من جمادى الآخر سنة أحد عشرين وستمائة
> 6 العرفة لله 2 لا الله إلا الله 3 صلى الله عليه وسلم

This is the tomb of the humble... the Sheikh Ali al-Farīthī b. Shahriyār—Allah sanctify his soul—he passed away in the second decade of Djamādā II 621 (July 1-10, 1224).

The dome, with the usual inner arrangement and decoration, is still surmounted by its original globe and crescent of copper.

111 Hyderabad, 1339, IV, 48f.
112 Yākūt, *op. cit.*, IV, 889.
113 J.A., IV (1894), 279.
Contiguous, to the east, of the Murshidiya (Khadijdja) and separated by a narrow lane from the Atâbekiya to the east.

Dâr al-Hadîth al-Ashrafïya al-Mukaddasïya, on the slope of the Käsivün, at the bank of the Nahr Yazîd, opposite the turba of the vizier Taği al-Dîn al-Takritî, east of the Murshidiya, and west of the Atâbekiya, built by malik al-ashraf Muzaффar al-Dîn Mûsâ b. al-Ädil for the hafiz Djamâl al-Dîn Abdallah b. Surûr al-Mukaddasî, who died before the school was finished.115 (Nu'aimî)

The locality is exactly indicated. There was another dâr al-hadîth of the same name in town, mentioned by Ibn Khallikân, built for Sheikh 'Uthmân b. al-Salâh.116

Inscription 47

On the lintel of the door, street side, 125 by 38 cm., four lines:

JolaJ! JLaJ!^liuLJi .2 JlaJ!

...the lord, the sultan, erudite, just, victorious, assisted (by Allah) the victor, malik al-ashraf Muzaффar al-Dîn Abu'l-Fath Mûsâ, son of the lord, the sultan malik al-Ädil Saïf al-Dîn Abî Bakr b. Ayyûb has founded as a waqf this blessed madrasa... for the Hanbalites that are guests there, and he has given as waqf to it the half of Dair Arâ in the Bikî’a al-Äzîzî, and a quarter (?) and its field, in the year 634.

Turba al-Takritiyya

(Figs. 82, 83, 107, 136–38) 119

At a street corner, northwest, exactly opposite the Dâr al-Hadîth al-Ashrafîya, southwest; the southeast corner is the Atâbekiya, called Bâb al-Sûk, “bazaar gate.”

No Inscriptions

115 J.A., III (1894), 273.

118 Dair Arâ, not Bîlâ‘a (Sauvare); Sauvare translates the following words by “et tous les points culminants”; but mažârîhâ is clear; rb”, ry” might be a name, but rather wa-rub‘ûn, “and a quarter,” in parallel with nușî, “half.”
119 v. B., “Plan” o; W. W., No. DN, V, d; Sauvage, No. 105.

This location proves, as the Monuments historiques accepts, the anepigraph building to be the Takritiya, but not at all that it ought to be dated according to the first paragraph of Nuʿāmī: "Taḵī al-Dīn . . . buried there in 698, at the age of about seventy-eight years." For Nuʿāmī goes on, quoting first Naḍjīm al-Dīn b. Sābīk [unknown to me]:

Ibn Muhādji īr [would in this context be Ali] came to Damascus [from Takrit, like Saladin] and settled in a house at the ‘Aḵabat al-Kattān ['aḵaba is a road with high gradient] . . . he gave many alms and began buying estates for waqfs . . . he had agreed with my father to pave that street, and said: Come tomorrow and get the money for it! In the evening, al-Asḥāfī sent him a bunch of violets; he took it and smelled it—that was his death. The next morning he was dead. With a thousand dirham, to the account of the estate, they bought a turba for him at the Sūk of al-Šālihiya.

Then, "Sheikh Šams al-Dīn"¹¹² says: 'A certain time after [what?], the vizier Taḵī al-Dīn b. Ali ibn Muhādji īr al-Takriti built five shops in the walls of the turba; he pretended to be his [whose?] cousin-german.' " Apparently, the passage is taken out of the original context and ought to follow the next passage: "According to Abū'l-Muẓaffar ibn al-Djawzī the estate of the šāhib Kamāl al-Dīn was evaluated at 300,000 dinars (gold). Al-Asḥāf showed me a chaplet of a hundred pearls, each the size of a pigeon's egg, from his estate. He died 1 Ǧumādā II 634" (January 30, 1237).

The vizier Kamāl al-Dīn, son of the šarīf Muʿīn al-Dīn, was one of the illustrious saiyids of his time; his great wealth permitted him not to seek pecuniary rewards from the government . . . He died on a Friday, while prostrating himself at the morning prayer. (al-Ḵūṣī)

¹¹⁰ J.A., VI (1895), 230f.
¹¹¹ J.A., III (1894), 273.
¹¹² The same, quoted in the next passage as Abū l-Muẓaffar al-Djawzī, viz. Shams al-Dīn Abū l-Muẓaffar Yūṣūf Sibīʿ ibn al-Djawzī, author of the Mirʿāt al-Zamān, born in Baghdad 582, died at Damascus in 654 H. Sibīʿ ibn al-Djawāzī was the grandson, by his mother, of the still more famous Abīl-Raḥmān ibn al-Djawāzī al-Bakrī, of Baghdad, descendant of the Caliph Abu-Bekr; hence his intimacy with malik al-Asḥāfī (cf. Ibn Khalīlān, op. cit., No. 378).
Evidently, the Ibn Muhādjir of Nadjm al-Dīn is the Kamāl al-Dīn of ibn al-Djawzī, his proper name was not Ali, else Taḵī al-Dīn would be his son and could not pretend to be his cousin. Evidently, too, there are two Ibn Muhādjirs, Kamāl and Taḵī al-Dīn, the second a shady figure, whose biography Sauvaire quotes from al-Dhahabī, Saḵkāʾī, and Taghriberdī. He was born in 620 and died in 698, his long life being a continued change between premiership and prison, typical for the Mameluke period. But since Sibt ibn al-Djawzī died in 654, the date 634 of the death of Kamāl al-Dīn is right, and the malik al-Ashraf cannot be—as Sauvaire has it—the Mameluke Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl (689–93), but the Ayyubid Mūsā, 626–35. It would have been unnecessary for al-Ashraf to poison a man seventy-eight years old. And the turba was bought, not built, for Kamāl al-Dīn. The fact that the building has no inscription again confirms the story. “To the account of the estate” seems to imply that he had no direct heirs, and, combined, the notes seem to impute legacy hunting to Taḵī al-Dīn.

Thus, the building must have existed before 634 without being used, for reasons unknown; in 698 Taḵī al-Dīn, the vizier, was also buried in it. But the name al-Takritiya refers to Kamāl al-Dīn. The construction permits two periods to be distinguished, demanding
these dates: first third and very end of the seventh century. Al-Sağ̣ıḳā'ī adds that the turba was burned during the occupation of Damascus by the Tatars in 699.

The entrance is a fine example of Ayyubid muqarnas vaulting (my photograph was lost); over the windows on the street are decorative discharging arches in good Ayyubid style; the windows themselves, those to the left, show the typical early Ayyubid arrangement for shutters receding, when opened, into the thickness of the wall. The entrance leads into a hall covered with two cross vaults, and this to a larger, square room, the tomb chamber to the right, and to a smaller oblong room to the left. Figure 82 shows the rather exceptional detail of the transition zone over the tomb chamber: realistic conchs with varying little ornaments at the summit, an idea as archaic as the detail; its archaism precludes the date 698 and is not easy to explain even in 634.

The south side of the prayer hall shows the fine masonry of its walls without coating; it includes a mihrab with a round window over it (Fig. 83). The double quatrefoil around that window is closely connected with the marquetry works of the Aleppo school all dated between 569 and 650 (at the latest). This side of the room belongs to the first period of the building, not later but rather before 634.

The three other sides are plastered and richly ornamented (Figs. 136–38). Watzinger and Wulzinger and Sauvaget stress, with reason, the maghrebine character of these ornaments. Replicas of the great bands of inscription, with their chain frames and the roundels that separate the parts, occur in Cairo in the mausoleum of Shadjjar al-Durr, 648 H., of Zain al-Din Yūsuf, 697, and of Salār and Sandjar al-Djawīlī, 703. The decoration was certainly added when Taḵī al-Dīn was buried in the turba, which had been bought, an existing building, for Kamāl al-Dīn in 634. One cannot expect to find literary evidence connecting Taḵī al-Dīn with the Maghreb. But Ibn Djugair says that there were many Maghrebines living in the Zāwiyat al-Maghāriba, an institution richly endowed, and there must have been many of them a hundred years later. The decoration has found no imitation at Damascus and remains an isolated, spontaneous transplantation. The style does not agree with the spirit of Ayyubid architecture and decoration.

**Turbat Dā'ūd b. Aidekin**

(Figs. 84–85) 124

I checked van Berchem's exact copy of the inscription, on a tabula on the lintel over the door, 100 by 40 cm., seven lines, dated 634, without taking a new copy, and I did not search for Dā'ūd b. Aidekin in the chronicles. He cannot be 'Alā al-Dīn Aidekin al-bunduḵdār al-šāliḥī, called after malik al-šāliḥ Nadīm al-Dīn Ayyūb of Egypt (637–47), and owner of the mameluke Baibars, later Sultan Baibars al-bunduḵdār al-šāliḥī.

Figure 84 shows the façade, built in good masonry, with the tabula over the door and with four antique windows, perforated slabs of basalt—imperishable objects which are often reused in Muhammadan buildings.

---

Masjīd al-Ṭašt-dār al-Ṣāliḥī
(Fig. 130) 125

Only part of the wall of the façade and the inscribed slab on it seem to remain. An octagonal slab decorated with a circular dish, 72 cm. in diameter, having a border in the shape of a knotted fillet, 9 cm. broad; inscription 126 in seven lines:

1. بسمله ... 2. جَدَّ هذَا الْحَجَّاجُ الْعَبْدُ الْفَقيرُ 3. إِلَى رَحَمةِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بِنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ 4. ابن عبد الله الطاشتدار الملكي الصالحي. 5. في شهر رمضان المبارك سنة سبع. 6. ثم تلتين وستمائة

تقبَّل اللَّهُ منه وغفر له ولوالديته وجميع المسلمين

.... the humble .... Abdallah the ṭašt-dār of malik al-ṣāliḥ has built anew this masjīd, in the month ... Ramadan 637 (April, 1240).

Littman follows Quatremère's explanation in translating ṭašt-dār by "Verwalter der Kleider- und Waffenmagazine." But that office comprised different things and, originally, ṭašt = Avestic tašta, qualified by "of gold, silver, bronze," or "for drinking," is a dish or flat bowl, and the unusual shape of the inscription represents such a dish. Hence, ṭašt-dār is almost a synonym of the more common ḏjāmdār, "cup-bearer."

Turbat Raiḥān
(Figs. 86 and 106) 127

Inscription 48

On the lintel of a grilled window, on the façade, tabula ansata, 150 by 40 cm., five lines, in strikingly bad style:

Lines 1-3 basmala and Koran or Hadith, then

3. عَلَى تَرْبَةِ الْعَبْدِ الْفَقِيرِ إِلَى رَحَمةِ اللَّهِ 4. رَحْمَةٌ بِنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ عَنْيِّنَهِ الْمَلَكِ الْمَعْتَمِّ إِنَّ الْمَلَكِ الْعَادِلِ 5. رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ لِيَقُولَ لَهُمْ رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ وَرَحْمَةُ جَمَعِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ

This is the turba of the humble ... Raiḥān b. Abdallah, freedman of malik al-Muʿāẓzam b. malik al-ʿĀdil, ... known as Lālā (tutor) of malik al-ʿAzīz b. malik al-ʿĀdil ... he built it in 641 ... (1243-44).

Malik al-ʿAzīz ʿUthmān did not reign; his elder brother al-Muʿāẓzam ascended the throne in 615.

Year 615: malik al-muʿāẓzam ʿIsā charged Badr al-Dīn Hasan b. al-Dāya with the inspection, nizāra, of the turba al-Badriya, called after him, situated opposite the Shibliya at the bridge over the Thawrā, now called the Kuḥail bridge.123 (Ibn al-Kāthīr)

Madrasa al-Badriya, opposite the Shibliya, at the Djabal, near the Kuḥail bridge; was built in

125 Next to v. B., "Plan" i; W. W., No. DN, IX, d; not in Sauvaget nor in Nuʿaimī.
126 Published by E. Littmann in W. W., p. 134. Correct ṭašt-dār written in two words instead of one, and taḥabbala instead of fa-ṭaḥabala.
127 F. B., "Plan" g; W. W., No. DN, II, c; not in Sauvaget.
128 J.A., IV (1894), 293, n. 5.
638 by Badr al-Dīn Lālā b. al-Dāya [tutor, son of the wet nurse], one of the emirs of Nūr al-Dīn.\textsuperscript{19} (Nuʿaimī)

The foster brother of malik al-ʿĀdil Nūr al-Dīn—I am convinced one cannot have more than one—was Madjd al-Dīn Abū Bakr Muhammad, well known in the history of Aleppo, who died in 565 h. There is a double mistake in the statement: a building existing in 615 cannot have been built in 638 by a man who died in 565, and the mistake must be caused by the rare attributes “tutor and foster brother.” The lālā of the inscription bears no honorific in dīn, but in view of the coincidence of the dates, 615, the assumption imposes itself that the founder of the tomb got the title “badr al-dīn” with the appointment as tutor, lālā, to the sultan’s minor brother, and that both are the same person. As freedman of malik al-Muʿazzam he had certainly been mameluke of al-ʿĀdil, hence an ʿādili like the ibn al-dāya of Nūr al-Dīn, and even may have been an ibn al-dāya, foster brother of al-muʿazzam ʿĪsā.

**Turba al-Ḥāfiẓiya**

*(Figs. 146–49)*\textsuperscript{130}

No Inscriptions

The turba al-Ḥāfiẓiya with the masjd it contains [we should say: the masjd and the turba...], south of the Kuḥali bridge and north of the turba al-Kaimariya on the Shiblī road to Şālihiya, was a garden belonging to Yākūt, black slave of Taḵī al-Dīn al-Kindī, bought (from him) by Arghun al-ḥāfiẓiya, freedwoman of malik al-ʿĀdil. She was very rich. Her surname refers to malik al-Ḥāfiẓ, lord of Ḳalʿat Dja'bar [on the Euphrates, above Rakka], whom she had brought up. Malik al-ṣāliḥ Ismaʿīl hated her implacably and took away from her, among other valuables, four

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., p. 244.

\textsuperscript{130} v. B., “Plan” s'; W. W., No. DN, XIX; Sauvaget, No. 101.
hundred cases with money. She died in 648 and was buried in her turba. She gave large waqfs to that turba and to the masjid she had founded.131 (Nu‘aimî)

The building clearly has had two periods of construction and a repair of its northeastern wall. The turba came first and then the masjid, but both belong to the same epoch. Without knowing the story, I should separate them in time.

The turba is of the canonical type. The masjid follows in principle, on a very small scale and reduced in detail, the cruciform plan, a prayer hall replacing the main iwân. The court, under 5 m. square, was vaulted over as in the Ruknîya.

The main feature of the small building is its entrance (Figs. 146–48). A bay, deeper than broad, about three to two, is covered by a cloister vault, decorated with a large conch in the background. The ribs of this conch stretch over the whole vault and form a lobed arch at the front. This motif occurs again from that time onward. It clearly demonstrates the original connection between conch and lobed arch.

Madrasa al-Mursheidîya, or Khadîja Khâtûn
(Figs. 87, 109, 133-34) 132

Madrasa al-Mursheidîya, on the Nahr Yazîd at al-Ṣâlihiya, next to the Dâr al-Ḥadîth al-Ashrafîya, built by the daughter of Malik al-mu‘azzam Isâ b. Malik al-‘Adîl, in 654 (error for 650).133 (Nu‘aimî)

The proper name of the princess, full sister of Malik al-nâṣîr Dâ‘ûd, was Khâdîja. (Ibn Shu‘bâ)

Al-Nâṣîr succeeded his father in 624, but was deposed in 626 by his uncle al-ashraf Mûsâ; he died in 656.

She was married by proxy to the Khwârizmshâh; she died in the garden of the Mâridâniya in Dju‘mâdâ II 650 (March–April 1252), and was buried in the turba she had built near that of Sheikh Ali al-Farîthî. (Ibn al-‘Asâkir)

Inscription 49

On the lintel of the door, tabula ansata, 162 by 41 cm., four lines:

1. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

2. عبد النبي بن الصحابي

3. من عامه المماليك بالله

4. سنة 654

132 v. B., “Plan” m.; W. W., No. DN, V. c; Sauvaget, No. 102.

133 J.A., IV (1894), 278-79.
...this is what the majestic lady ʻIṣmat al-Dīn Khādīja Khātūn, daughter of the Sultan Malik al-
uṣṭūm Shārīf al-Dīn Ṭāsī, son of the Sultan Malik al-ʻĀdīl Saḥn al-Dīn Abū Bakr d. Ayyūb, has constituted as waqf, namely: of the bath al-Kās (so and so much), of the Ṭarāb mill (so much), a house at Sāliḥiyā, part of the Kašr Taḵī al-Dīn, part of the village Ṭaza, part of the Khan al-ʻĀtika, part of al-Karnābiya, the garden of the Māridāniya in toto, and that (was executed) in Dhu[‘]l-
Kaʿda or Ḥīdīḍja] 650... (January–February, 1253).

Khādīja Khātūn was probably the daughter of ʻAzīza, foundress of the Māridāniya. There is no apparent reason for the name Murshidiya of her madrasa (cf. pp. 56–57 under al-Farīthi), unless she herself entered the Sufi order.

The plan is irregular because it lies on the hooked street. Beside the entrance a prayer hall and a tomb chamber remain, with a square minaret raised on a block of masonry between these two adjacent rooms. The door from the entrance to the prayer hall has an unusual bracket (Fig. 87), and both the mihrabs preserve remains of their original plaster decoration.

Not counting the tombs in larger madrasas, these are twenty examples of small Ayyubid turbas—actually there may be twice as many—dated between 548 and 654 H. With the exception of the Ṣaḥmiya-Ḥūsāmiya, they not only belong to one type, but are stereotyped.

At Aleppo there are many tombs in madrasas larger than those at Damascus, but only one that is merely a turba, popular name Sheik Sāliḥ, tomb of a wife of Saladin and of her son, Malik al-afdal Nūr al-Dīn Ali, built in 621 H. as an addition to an already existing, slightly larger turba; together, they are a family mausoleum of that branch of the Ayyubids. From Ibn Shīhna’s list of turbas in his description of Aleppo it seems that the single turba became general after the Ayyubid period only, and that the present condition is not due merely to the chance of survival, but to a difference in fashion between Aleppo and Damascus, natural and of no great importance. The turba of Saladin’s wife and, with very few exceptions, all turbas in Aleppo use the kind of dome normal for prayer halls: a smooth cupola with or without small windows at the springing line, over pyramidal pendentives. This type,
as discussed above, is of western origin. The use of a different vault indicates another difference in fashion, not a deep one, between the two towns.

The Damascus type is soon described: a square room with flat, arched recesses in the four walls; four niches, semicircular in plan, over the corners, corresponding flat niches with a pair of small windows over the normal axes, together forming an octagonal zone of transition; above it, a drum of sixteen smaller niches, equal in size, alternatingly open with a little window or closed, segment-shaped, and decorated with a conch, the former over the axes, the latter over the corners of the octagon; at last the dome, smooth or with sixteen ribs over this sixteen-sided figure.

Either the dome alone, or the transition zone and drum too, are built in brick or brick-shaped stones; only at Baalbek the dome is made of huge ashlar blocks. The structure below is always of stone, the quality of the masonry in relation to the sum which could be spent on it. The exterior is sometimes, the interior always, plastered and simply decorated; rectangular frames surround all niches; rather baroque curved moldings accompany the arches of the niches of the octagon—an import from Jazira—and, probably to be generalized, some rosettes and arabesque friezes in plaster decorate the walls below, some richer floral compositions, in blue paint on whitewash, the large niches of the octagon; both decorations are an import from Baghdad.

The two oldest turbas, the Muṣaddamiya and that of ‘Alā al-Dīn (568 H.), are the only ones to which this description does not apply (for the Muṣaddamiya see Pt. I, 14). In the turba of ‘Alā al-Dīn the octagon has no windows, and its proportions are visibly higher than elsewhere; there is no drum of sixteen niches over the octagon, instead of that four small windows are at the springing line of the dome, over the diagonal axes; there is no plaster decoration at all.

This is certainly a more archaic type and shows from what the peculiar Ayyubid type was derived; but it does not date its “invention.” For it is a mere chance that this tomb of 568 still exists, and its simple type continues, e.g., in the shrine of Ṣuḥaib Rūmī, Damascus-Ma’dān, and in the madrasa-turba of malik al-żāhir Baibars, dated 678 H., and it existed long before: the Seljuk repair of the Ḥabbat al-Nāṣr in the Greek mosque of the Umayyads, which is a large specimen of this type, is certainly a very close imitation of the original structure of al-Walīd, and that was the prototype imitated in Egypt, Kairouan, and Tunis.

It belonged to pre-Islamic Syria and had spread into Egypt. In the Archäologische Reise I compared some pre-Islamic examples: basilica of Ruṣāfa, northern Syria, in the towers of the pastophoria; Alahan Monastyr, Isauria, over the center of the nave; Dair al-Aḥmar, the “Red Monastery,” Zohāg, Egypt. In these examples full columns are put on brackets against the walls; with their arch they frame a small niche, semicircular in plan.

---

134 But compare the Muṣaddamiya at Damascus.
135 F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet (Berlin, 1911–20), Pl. XXII.
136 Headlam calls it Koja Kalesı; my unpublished, detailed measurements and photographs are, inaccessible to me, with Samuel Guyer in Switzerland.
137 Further example: Ḥāh in the Tür ‘Abdīn (Sarre and Herzfeld, op. cit., II, 10 and 345).
A fine specimen of this variety was in the northwest room of Mašḥad al-Ḥusain,\(^{138}\) Aleppo, built under malik al-‘azīz Muhammad in 613–34,\(^{139}\) now blown up along with the rest of the building.

S. Guyer remarks: “Solche Nischen dürfen wir niemals mit Trompen oder ähnlichen Konstruktionen verwechseln, wie solche z.B. in den persischen Palästen vorkommen.”\(^{140}\) He calls them “vielmehr eine Konstruktion, deren Motive ganz in den Rahmen der syrischen Architektur des scl.VI (p.Chr.) passen … in ihrer statischen Funktion nicht mit den mit primitivem Kuppelbau innig zusammenhängenden Trompen verwandt, sondern mit hölzernen Dachstuhlsäulen.” Indeed, all these examples, including the Umayyad ones, were not destined to carry vaulted domes, but wooden roofs, whether pyramidal or spherical.

Aside from the peculiar condition of the Syrian hinterland, in Syria wood was throughout antiquity the specific material for ceilings. There the famous cedars of the Lebanon grew so numerous that they not only satisfied all local needs, but were exported to Assur and Babylon, Syria and Persepolis. Antique Syria had no use for vaults. The slow transition to vaulting marks the progress of deforestation, the gradual disappearance of the forests.

The cedars of the Lebanon were also the material that enabled the Phoenicians to develop their shipbuilding, and the great Syrian domes of Būṣra, Jerusalem,\(^{141}\) Damascus, all of wood, constructed as double cupolas with an elaborate system of girders and ribs, are the result of experience acquired in shipbuilding and transposed into architecture. They are typically Syrian. This origin, the ribs of a ship, is still reflected in the preference of fluted domes in Syria; for taste is inherited habit. When in the early Middle Ages the forests were completely exhausted, masons educated in antique tradition had mastered the problems of vaulting in stone. It does not mean much, whether a vault in medieval Syria is carried out in ashlar, rough stone, or brick; the ideal, the original conception is in stone masonry, as a confrontation of the Kubbat al-Amdjad at Baalbek or the Mūkaddamīya at Damascus, and of the other Damascus domes reveals.

Thus, the Damascene octagonal transition zone under the fluted dome belongs to aboriginal wood structure and in its origin has nothing to do with the Iranian squinch, however similar they look, and whatever other qualities they may share.

For instance, the niches over the corners are actually arches, bridges; they could all be open. The niche is only a thin filling without structural value. And since the octagon is inscribed into the square below, the thin wall of the niches does not completely cover the diagonal distance; a small hole remains over the corner, and that is why all domes have a tiny cell, differently shaped, under the corner niches. This detail looks meaningless, but is indispensable.

When describing the Sasanian fire temple near Baza‘ūr, I mentioned the same defect

---

\(^{138}\) See Pt. II, Fig. 59.

\(^{139}\) Photographs, sections, plan in MS, “Alep,” Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum; a photograph in K. A. Creswell, Early Muslim Architecture (Oxford, 1940), II, 110, Fig. 100; Dussaud, Deschamps, and Seyrig, op. cit., Pl. 103.

\(^{140}\) Sarre and Herzfeld, op. cit., II, 10.

there. And when speaking of the Sasanian dome in general, I explained how its entire weight always rests on eight points, angles of a virtual octagon inscribed into the square. Thus, the four corner niches of the Damascus domes transmit the whole weight of the dome on the same eight points. Yet there is no filiation between the two. The fundamental difference is that the Iranian dome knows no corner support beneath the springing line. The niche of the octagon is more closely related to the dissimilar pendentif than to the squinch that it resembles.

Behind these researches in provenance and essence of vaults stands a greater problem, greater because its effect reaches farther: the pointed arch which is, of course, the norm of all these vaults and which, in Europe, became an essential feature of Gothic, distinguishing it externally from Romanesque. This change coincides temporally with the period of the oriental monuments studied here.

Detail may catch the interest of a research scholar to a degree that he seems to have, and may have, lost his way. But there is a scale for interest: the relation of the study to the understanding of ourselves and our time and, since every present is the effect of the forces of its past, of our past. There is also a scale for importance: neither is every object of antiquity important, nor anything good because it is old. On the contrary, like new things, most old things are unimportant and bad. Important are only those the effectiveness of which does not end with themselves, but goes on producing effect, just as the significant historical events are not those that impressed the contemporaries, but those of which the consequences appear later. The effectiveness may be expansive, but its intensity may be the greater quality.

These are historical problems, and the historical forces themselves and the way they work are the same whether they deal with man or with his product, art. There has been for a long time a manifest interest in the discovery of the ogive, this pithecanthropus of medieval art, and "the missing link"; specimens older than any in Europe had been discovered in Persia. Their mere existence, however, is of no importance.

The pointed arch existed during the earliest period of Islam though its predominance was not yet decided in the middle of the third century H. For instance, the Great Mosque of al-Dja'fariya, Samarra North (al-Mutawakkil, 246 H. [860 A.D.]), has roundhead, semicircular arches throughout, but the Djawsak al-Khâkânî, 221 H. (836 A.D.), has pointed arches. When we opened, in 1911, the huge vaults under the Kasr al-Áshîk (or Masûk), built between 260 and 265 H. (873-78 A.D.), the foreman pointed out to me the scarcely visible groin saying: "You can see the suture of the skull!" These pointed arches in brick are clearly derived from, and a variety of, the Iranian elliptic arch in pebble and mortar. When a high elliptic arch is built over a narrow span, the pointed shape is almost inevitable, e.g., Gertrude Bell called "pointed" some arches in the long corridors of the basement of Kasr-i-Shirîn (Khusrau II) that I should call elliptic.

Panta rhei, or with Plato: "The objects of this world, which our senses perceive, have no real being: they always become, they never are." And for historical studies we must train
our eyes to see the objects not as individuals, but as passing phases of their type, as a momentary stop in a continuous movement, or as the effect of past causes and as causes of future effects. Like geometry and history, objective description belongs to the trivium, as preliminary work. One is free to choose from what point to give a thing a new name. A pointed arch is high crowned. All Iranian arches are high crowned. The difference is one of mere form and, in the beginning, almost imperceptible. It is a matter of terminology: shall we name the objects by reasons of form or of function?

Everything exists before it is invented—once one neglects certain highly individual qualities and includes it into a wider notion: pointed under high-crowned. Such variations may and do appear in art as in nature, everywhere and at any time. But they remain unimportant, unhistorical, as long as they are ineffective. Their existence means nothing, their effectiveness everything. Evidently, the new name should be given only at the moment they become functional and effective.

In the introduction to his Geschichte des Altertums 142 Eduard Meyer says:

Für das Verständnis eines geschichtlichen Prozesses ist es von wesentlicher Bedeutung, neben den positiven Tatsachen auch diejenigen zu erkennen und zu beurteilen, die man als negative Erscheinungen bezeichnen kann, d.h. die Tatsache dass ein Ereignis oder eine Wirkung, die innerhalb der allgemeinen Bedingungen der Analogien liegt, in dem gegebenen Falle nicht eingetreten ist.... Die Gründe .... führen vielfach in die tiefsten Probleme des geschichtlichen Lebens überhaupt, und lehren 143 uns den Charakter einer Kultur, einer Epoche, eines Volks erfassen, wenn eine politische, soziale, literarische, künstlerische Entwicklung, die man nach allen Analogien erwarten würde, nicht eingetreten ist.

When discussing the dome on spherical pendentives, 144 I have drawn its theoretical counterpart in Sasanian high-crowned arches. Such a vault would comprise in itself the whole Gothic art of vaulting. With insignificant modifications, it is applicable to every shape of room, without ever losing its statical advantages. There is no solution of a problem by the Gothic masterbuilders that is not latent in this design. Not that the arch is ogive, but that its height is independent of its span, that it is high crowned, is the essential point, neglecting for the moment the question of material, and assuming brick or pebble.

That design is purely theoretical. The Iranian builders did not comprehend the advantage of their high-crowned arch over the semicircular, did not understand the hidden qualities of the tool they had in hand. They went on, for many hundreds of years, building their ellipsoids in pebble and mud and that was the reason why the great chance was not taken. Nothing good can come from bad material. The incentive immanent to stone was lacking, and none of the frail germs came to maturity.

In the Mediterranean world a corbeled dome of ellipsoid shape existed in remote antiquity. At a very early period the principle of true vaulting with centripetal stones was dis-

---

142 2d ed., I, 1, 204.
143 Difficult phrase: Not: die Gründe.... lehren uns .... erfassen, wenn ...." but: "wenn .... nicht eingetreten sind, lehrt das uns erfassen."
144 Pt. II, Fig. 24.
covered and, together with primitive corbeling, the high-crowned arch was forgotten. Later, aesthetic postulates, result of centuries of habit, demanded the circular arch, and, the high-crowned arch being unknown, its advantages unimaginable, the pointed arch could never have been invented in the West. Invention is application in a new way of a thing one has. Negative facts, indeed, give a deep insight.

The coexistence of, and the hesitation between, round and pointed arches at Samarra, beside the ellipsoid, the horseshoe, the stilted, and other forms of arches at Ukhaidir, Cairo, and North Africa, show that there was no coercion, no necessity to choose the one or the other. There may have been technical advantages or customs—some scholars stress methods of centering—that made people in different regions prefer one to the other. Such technical reasons have been much discredited since the time of Alois Riegler, indeed, the great works are mostly produced by overcoming them. All that is not a real necessity.

Only two centuries later, the pointed arch—especially the one called 'adjamâna, whose summit is the intersection of tangents to its lower parts—is the only one used in Persia and wherever Persian influence dominates. All buildings are of sun-dried or baked bricks, very rarely of undressed stone. There, too, one does not see a real necessity, and it would be easy to transpose most Persian buildings from minor into major key, from ogive into ellipsoid. Purely aesthetic principles dominate the planning of Persian buildings to the neglect of practical considerations, so that taste alone may have caused the general acceptance of the pointed arch; or the Persian architects followed a movement victorious in another region of the Muslim world.

Only under very special conditions is the adoption of the pointed arch full of purport, import, and effect: in a land where other means of roofing fail and vaulting is enforced, where stone masonry and its complement, the semicircular arch, are traditional, where the limitations of that arch disenable it to fulfill the required tasks, and where the high-crowned arch could be seen.

The semicircle of equal, centripetal stones is the form natural—the ellipsoid arch absolutely contrary—to stone masonry, because one cannot cut in different shape every single stone, or, if the architects would be content with an approximation, many small groups of stones. The pointed is the only high-crowned arch that can be cut into equal stones. Variations at the summit, effecting a more flowing curve, are easy to achieve. Therefore, as long as it is made in bricks and pebble, the pointed arch remains a variety only of the elliptic, and only when made in stone does it become a necessary form, only then is it functional and important.

The land where that happened can only have been Syria of all provinces of Islam. Every single historical phenomenon originates from the intersection of chains of causes, action of infinite forces at one moment. Intersection alone may happen many times without producing a lasting effect. The purposeful will of man must be ready for the coincidence, the time must be ripe. Such conditions were only given, in the third and fourth centuries of the Muslim period, in Syria, including northwestern Jazira; and it must have been there that the pointed stone arch resulted from such an intersection of causes, the principal ones being the spread of the Iranian elliptic arch to the West and the continuance of stone masonry in the country.
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Again, only two hundred years later, it was in Syria that the architects among the crusaders saw that arch at a moment when they were in the same situation as that in which the Syrians had been before them. They understood its advantage over the Romanesque arch and its far-reaching possibilities and applied it to the problems with which they labored. Thus, by the contact between East and West during the crusades, an oriental thought expanded over the West in an intensity it never reached in the East itself.
NOTES SUR L'ARCHITECTURE DES CHATEAUX OMEYYADES *
PAR HENRI STERN

Les notes qui vont suivre sont destinées à relever quelques caractères particuliers d'un groupe de monuments omeyyades. Nous sommes en effet convaincus que ces monuments, des châteaux princiers, ont plus d'originalité, qu'ils ont donné plus d'impulsions nouvelles à l'architecture musulmane naissante qu'on n'a voulu admettre jusqu'ici, qu'ils marquent, pour tout dire, le véritable début d'une architecture musulmane civile. C'est sur cet aspect de la question que nous insisterons dans la mesure où des circonstances difficiles nous ont permis de réunir les documents.

Nous nous excusons du caractère fragmentaire et tout préliminaire de cette étude. Les fouilles en Syrie et en Palestine ne sont point encore terminées, ou ne l'étaient pas au début de la guerre. Quelques rapports en ont donné sommairement les résultats. De nombreux sites attendent l'exploration ou, du moins, un relevé et une étude. Peu de monuments sont publiés avec le soin suffisant. Aussi peut-on dire que nous ne nous trouvons qu'aux débuts des recherches sur l'art omeyyade.

L'idée même de considérer ces châteaux comme un groupe homogène d'œuvres d'art n'a pu naître que depuis peu de temps. Ce n'est, en effet que depuis les fouilles entreprises par les soins de l'Ecole de Damas à Kašr al-Ḥair al-Gharbi, par le Service des Antiquités de la Palestine à Khirbat al-Mafdjär et enfin par une mission allemande à Khirbat al-Minya que cette idée a pu prendre corps. Elle nous est acquise aujourd'hui par des monuments dont l'origine est assurée soit par des inscriptions soit par des analogies du plan, de la construction et du style. Mšattā et toute une série d'autres châteaux se classent ainsi avec certitude parmi les œuvres omeyyades.

LES CARACTÈRES DU GROUPE

C'est le plan de ces châteaux que nous voudrions considérer en premier lieu. Quant à la construction et au décor, peu connus encore, nous n'en parlerons qu'incidemment et en tant qu'ils relèvent les caractères particuliers de l'architecture.

Trois monuments que nous avons nommés, Kašr al-Ḥair al-Gharbi (Fig. 1), Khirbat al-Minya (Figs. 3-4) et Khirbat al-Mafdjär (Fig. 2) doivent former le point de départ de cette étude. Les dates de construction en sont assurées par des inscriptions qui se rapporttent, pour

* The manuscript for this article reached Ann Arbor in the fall of 1942, but publication was unfortunately delayed by the war.—ED.

1 D. Schlumberger, "Les Fouilles de Qasr el-Ḥeir el-Gharbi," Syria, XX (1939), 195-238 et 324-73.
les deux premiers, au Khalife Hishâm (724–743) et pour le troisième à Walîd, Khalife omeyyade également.

Voici les caractères distinctifs du plan de ces trois monuments dont M. J. Sauvaget a déjà relevé quelques traits essentiels: enceinte rectangulaire d’environ 70 m. x 70 m., aux angles, des tours-contreforts rondes, sur les côtés, des tours-contreforts semi-circulaires. À l’intérieur, des pièces, appuyées contre le mur d’enceinte, se placent autour d’une cour également rectangulaire, entourée d’un portique. Parmi ces pièces un groupe se détache par son caractère particulier: une salle oblongue est accompagnée des deux côtés de deux ou de plusieurs pièces de moitié plus petites. Ces cinq, neuf ou onze pièces forment un appartement rigoureusement clos qui ne communique qu’avec la cour. Ces appartements, que K. A. C. Creswell appelle des “baits” (des maisons) se retrouvent dans les trois châteaux. À Kasr al-Ḥair, ils se répètent six fois autour de la cour, couvrant toute la surface bâtie à l’intérieur, à Khirbat al-Mafdjar un bait seulement (No. 1 du plan) est placé dans l’aile ouest, face à l’entrée. C’est la salle de réception. À Khirbat al-Minya nous retrouvons deux baits dans la partie relevée de l’aile ouest, également face à l’entrée, et un autre dans l’aile sud à côté d’une grande salle. Les autres parties de ces deux châteaux, dans la mesure où elles sont relevées, comprennent une mosquée et des salles de dimensions considérables. À Khirbat al-Mafdjar, p.e., l’aile nord est occupée tout entière par une grande salle à sept voûtes en berceau barlongues que M. Baramki considère comme une salle de fête.

Deux variantes se dégagent dans ce premier groupe: l’une celle de Kasr al-Ḥair, comprend des baits tout autour de la cour, l’autre, celle des deux châteaux de Palestine, réduit le rôle des baits: des salles spacieuses et une mosquée occupent une grande partie de la surface bâtie à l’intérieur.

La technique se ressemble dans les trois cas, bien qu’elle ne soit pas tout à fait la même. Ce sont des constructions mixtes où la pierre et la brique sont également employées. Murs d’enceinte à Khirbat al-Minya et à Khirbat al-Mafdjar: parement en pierre de taille renfermant un noyau de blocage; à Kasr al-Ḥair, le socle du mur d’enceinte exécuté selon cette technique, le haut des murs en briques crues qui ont disparu. Les couvertures des pièces sont,


5 Schneider et Püttrich-Reignard, op. cit., p. 12; l’inscription n’est pas encore publiée et les auteurs ne disent pas de quel Khalife Walîd il s’agit.


7 Parfois la tour ronde ou semi-circulaire est remplacée par une tour carrée: tours flanquant l’entrée et minaret de la mosquée à Khirbat al-Mafdjar. La tour byzantine qui, à Kasr al-Ḥair, se trouve à la place d’une tour d’angle peut être laissée de côté ici.

8 K. A. C. Creswell, Early Muslim Architecture (Oxford, 1932), I.

9 Il faut évidemment tenir compte du fait que ces châteaux comportaient un deuxième étage. Nous n’en connaissons pas toujours la disposition. À Kasr al-Kharāna (cf. ci-dessous p. 74) où les deux étages sont conservés, le plan du premier ne se répète que sur trois ailes au deuxième étage. La quatrième, celle de l’entrée comporte deux grandes salles, sans doute des écuries, au rez-de-chaussée, mais deux baits et une salle de réception à l’étage supérieur.
aux deux Khirbat, des voûtes en brique cuite, à Kasr al-Ḥair des poutres de bois posées à plat et reposant sur des arcs transversaux en pierre.

Le plan de Kasr al-Ḥair représente le modèle-type dont les architectes de Kasr al-Tūba\textsuperscript{10} et de Kasr al-Kharāna,\textsuperscript{11} tous les deux situés en Transjordanie, se sont inspirés. Ils le reproduisent avec quelques changements insignifiants.

Kasr al-Tūba est considéré aujourd'hui assez généralement, si nous ne nous trompons pas, comme œuvre omeyyade:\textsuperscript{12} le schéma du plan de Kasr al-Ḥair al-Gharbī y est tout simplement dédoublé (Fig. 5). Deux carrés de 70 m x 70 m sont juxtaposés. Les tours-contreforts sont ronds aux angles, semi-circulaires sur les côtés, sauf celles qui flanquent les entrées: elles sont carrées comme à Khirbat al-Mafdjar. L'intérieur comprend quatre baits au lieu de six, chacun de cinq pièces et pourvu, en outre, d'une cour particulière. Ces quatre logements se groupent autour d'une cour centrale. Trois petites pièces de service, cuisine, office et latrine probablement, ces dernières placées dans des pièces pourvues de petites niches, complètent le dispositif comme à Kasr al-Ḥair et donnent une indépendance entière à chacun des appartements.

Technique mixte comme dans les autres cas: la partie inférieure du mur d'enceinte blocage avec parements en pierre de taille, le haut des murs en brique cuite. Pièces couvertes de voûtes en berceau, construites en briques cuites.

Kasr al-Kharāna qui répète encore ce plan-type, a été retranché, à tort, pensons-nous, par M. Creswell de la liste des œuvres omeyyades (Fig. 6). Les dimensions en sont, il est vrai, de moitié plus petites que celles de Kasr al-Ḥair: 35 m x 35 m. Mais dans les deux cas, elles se ramènent à une unité fixe qui semble être le pied romain: 35 m = 100 pieds romains, 70 m = 200 pieds romains. L'enceinte comporte, comme à Kasr al-Ḥair, quatre tours rondes aux angles et quatre tours semi-circulaires sur les côtés. À l'intérieur au premier étage, cinq baits se groupent autour d'une cour carrée qui est entourée d'un portique à colonnes. Mêmes les petites pièces de service, bien qu'en nombre réduit, ne manquent pas dans ce pavillon. Emplacement et agencement des escaliers sont les mêmes qu'à Kasr al-Ḥair et à Khirbat al-Mafdjar: ils se situent dans les espaces laissés libres entre les quatre corps de bâtiment.

À côté de ces analogies étroites des plans, les différences dans la technique de construction qui ont amené M. Creswell à éliminer ce monument d'entre les œuvres omeyyades ne peuvent jouer. Voici comment les P. P. Jaussen et Savignac\textsuperscript{13} la décrivent: "Grosses pierres mal équarriées, appareillées le plus souvent par leur petit côté. Lits d'assises . . . régularisés . . . avec des pierres de dimension moindre posées à plat, et avec mortier, employé à profusion. Le tout couvert d'une épaisse couche de mortier."

\textsuperscript{10} Relevés et étude détaillée, avec de nombreuses photographies dans l'ouvrage des Pères Jaussen et Savignac, Les Châteaux arabes de Qeṣer 'Amra et Tūba (Paris, 1922), Pls. IV–XVIII.

\textsuperscript{11} Relevés, photographies et étude,\textit{ibid.}, Pls., XIX–XXXV, pp. 51–77.

\textsuperscript{12} Kasr al-Ṭūba, introduit dans l'archéologie par A. Musil lors de sa publication de \textit{Kuṣīr 'Amra} (Wien, 1907) a toujours été mis en rapport avec le château de Mshāṭṭā. La date d'origine qu'on lui attribuait variait selon l'opinion des auteurs sur Mshāṭṭā; cf. à ce sujet la bibliographie dans Creswell, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{13} Jaussen et Savignac, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 52.
Mshattā,14 tout en sortant de la série, est issu, c'est l'évidence même, du plan-type que nous avons défini (Fig. 7). C'est le château d'habitation amplifié pour les besoins de la représentation: une enceinte carrée, pourvue de tours-contreforts arrondies, une cour carrée à l'intérieur, entourée de constructions qui s'adossent au mur d'enceinte. Les dimensions en sont, il est vrai, le double de la norme: 140 m x 140 m; 140 m x 140 m; mais elles sont établies sur l'unité que nous connaissons: 35 m = 100 pieds environ.

Les détails caractéristiques des châteaux omeyyades se retrouvent, les baït15: les latrines aménagées dans les tours, comme à al-Ťuba, à côté d'elles, projetées sans doute, mais non exécutées, les pièces de service. Le hall d'entrée, avec ses trois paires de pilastres, ayant supporté des arcs transversaux, est tout à fait le même qu'à Kasr al-Hair, à Khirbat al-Mafджar et à Khirbat al-Minya, à la seule différence près que dans ces édifices de moindre dimension une ou deux paires de pilastres suffisent pour soutenir des arcs transversaux, supports des voûtes. Enfin, la mosquée à l'intérieur complète ces analogies avec les autres châteaux omeyyades (Khirbat al-Mafджar, Khirbat al-Minya).

Technique mixte comme à al-Ťuba, à al-Ŷair al-Gharbī et ailleurs: le mur d'enceinte, blocage avec parement en pierre de taille (jusqu'à quelle hauteur?); les murs à l'intérieur, à part les portes et les socles, ainsi que toutes les voûtes, en brique cuite. Mshattā, s'il eût été achevé nous aurait montré le génie des architectes omeyyades à son apogée. Ce qui en est conservé, n'est qu'un faible reste de ce qu'on a voulu faire.

D'autres édifices, Kasr al-Ŷair al-Sharkī et Kasr al-Abyād dans la Rubba se classent pour les mêmes raisons de style parmi les œuvres omeyyades. Kasr al-Ŷair al-Sharkī près de Palmyre, découvert et décrit par M. A. Gabriel,16 est considéré aujourd'hui, sans conteste, pensons-nous, comme œuvre omeyyade (Fig. 8). Les dimensions de l'enceinte, compte tenu des irrégularités considérables de l'implantage, les tours arrondies, la technique de construction, socles en pierre, le haut des murs en brique, le décor, concentré sur la porte d'entrée comme à Kasr al-Ŷair al-Gharbī et à Mshattā, en font une œuvre de notre école. Les pièces à l'intérieur, s'appuyant à l'enceinte, ne seraient pas contemporaines. D'ailleurs, les plans de M. Gabriel,17 de A. Musil18 et de Creswell diffèrent sur ce point.

La date de l'édifice est, pour nous, donnée par une inscription trouvée autrefois dans


15 Nous rejetons avec M. Creswell la reconstitution de B. Schulz (op. cit., reconstitution de la salle à coupole, coupe nord-sud) qui voit dans la pièce centrale des baït, non pas une cour, mais une salle couverte d'une voûte en berceau.

16 A. Gabriel, "Qasr el-Ŷair," Syria, VIII (1927), 302-29, avec plans, relevés et photographies; H. Seyrig, "Retour aux jardins de Qasr-el-Ŷair," Syria, XV (1934), 24-32 complète et corrige l'étude de M. Gabriel pour ce qui est des installations d'irrigation et des jardins. Creswell, op. cit., présente des observations intéressantes sur la grande enceinte et sur la mosquée.

17 Gabriel, op. cit., Pl. XXXIX.

18 A. Musil, Palmyra, Amer. Geogr. Soc. Oriental Explorations and Studies, No. 4 (1928), 73, Fig. 16.
la grande enceinte. La grande et la petite enceinte étant selon toute evidence les oeuvres d’un seul architecte et d’une seule époque, cette inscription fixe l’origine des deux ouvrages: elle nomme comme fondateur de la grande enceinte le Khalife omeyyade Hishâm et comme année de fondation l’an 728–29.

Nos connaissances sur le château al-Abyâd dans la Ruḥba sont bien réduites. Seuls deux plans, très sommaires, levés par Wetzstein et par le Marquis de Vogüé, une photographie aérienne publiée par le R. P. Poidebard, quelques dessins et photographies du décor et les descriptions des voyageurs permettent de nous en faire une idée. Quant aux plans, celui de M. de Vogüé, plus détaillé que celui de Wetzstein, et le croquis du R. P. Poidebard d’après la photographie aérienne, ils se correspondent: enceinte rectangulaire dont Vogüé donne les dimensions, 60 m x 60 m (mais qui ne sont, certes, qu’approximatives), avec des tours arrondies, celles des angles creuses, les tours intermédiaires massives. Poidebard en note cinq, Vogüé six. Point de tours à l’entrée. Quant aux constructions à l’intérieur, Vogüé donne une série de pièces isolées, juxtaposées le long des murs d’enceinte, Poidebard semble indiquer deux groupes de pièces qui rappellent nos baits. Les descriptions des voyageurs ne permettent pas de compléter les données du plan. Riche décor autour de la porte d’entrée. Technique de construction de l’enceinte: parement en pierre de taille avec blocage; les pierres de taille ont la coupe caractéristique en queue d’aronde.

En attendant une exploration de ce site important nous le classerons avec M. E. Herzfeld et M. J. Sauvaget parmi les oeuvres omeyyades. Plan, technique de construction et style du décor nous y autorisent.

Enfin, tout récemment, M. J. Sauvaget a relevé un site que déjà M. E. Herzfeld et Miss Bell ont attribué aux Omeyyades: le Djabal Sais (Fig. 9). L’étude succincte, mais précise de M. Sauvaget en fait ressortir les caractères nettement omeyyades. L’édifice principal est un château du type des nôtres: carré de 66 m 70 x 66 m 70 hors œuvre, huit tours arrondies, dont l’une, sur le côté nord, coupée en deux parties pour encadrer la salle d’entrée (comme à al-Minya et à al-Kharâna). À l’intérieur, adossées au mur d’enceinte, des constructions que M. Sauvaget signale sans en avoir pu lever le plan à cause du mauvais état de conservation. Technique mixte: socle en blocage entre parements en pierre de taille, le haut des murs en briques crues qui ont disparues. La porte d’entrée seule était entièrement construite en pierre (cf. Kaṣr al-Ḥair al-Gharbi). La salle attenante à la pièce semi-circulaire au premier étage de la

19 Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe, I, 23, No. 28.
20 J. G. Wetzstein, Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen (Berlin, 1860), pp. 63–64.
23 Dans Vogüé, op. cit., Pl. 24; Brünnow et Domaszewski, op. cit., II, Figs. 858 et 859; E. Herzfeld, “Mshattâ, Ḥira und Bâdiya,” JPK, XLII (1921), PIs. 2b, 6b.
28 Ibid.
tour d'entrée était couverte d’une voûte en berceau en briques cuites. Une mosquée, un bain, de très nombreuses maisons d’habitation dont l’une, le bâtiment D, pourvue de tours contreforts aux angles, et des greniers, des magasins, des écuries, datent tous de la même époque.


Résémons nous: neuf monuments aux particularités nettement tranchées forment un groupe d’édifices homogène; elles sont l’œuvre de l’époque omeyyade et certaines d’entre elles, selon les inscriptions, sont commandées par les Khalifes mêmes.

**AL-ΚΑΣΤΑΛ**

A ce groupe de châteaux omeyyades, nous ajouterons un monument qui prend une importance particulière dans l’étude de la génèse du style: le camp al-Κασταλ, situé à 5 km. ouest-nord-ouest de Mshattā. Ce monument a été invoqué par J. Strzygowski ainsi que par E. Herzfeld, par Miss Bell 39 et par K. A. C. Creswell pour prouver que l’architecture des châteaux omeyyades provient des constructions syriennes. Toutôt considéré comme camp romain 30 tantôt comme forteresse des Phylarques ghassânides d’époque justiniennne, al-Κασταλ semblait prouver que le plan de nos châteaux n’était point apporté par les Omeyyades, qu’il était déjà formé en Syrie au plus tard au VIe siècle, que les Arabes musulmans ne faisaient que copier ce qu’ils avaient trouvé dans l’architecture de la région.

Or il nous semble 31 qu’al-Κασταλ ne peut être qu’une création omeyyade.

Le site al-Κασταλ est un important champ de ruines exploré pour la première fois méthodiquement par Brünnow et Domaszewski (Fig. 10). Les savants allemands ont relevé et publié le plan d’un “camp romain” 32 et celui d’un “prétoire” 33 situé à quelques pas au nord du “camp.” Mais le champ des ruines comporte d’autres restes encore. Tristram 34 parle d’un barrage de 600 yards de long et de 18 yards de large, en partie ruiné, situé à quelques minutes du camp, traversant du nord au sud un ouadi qui prend son cours d’ouest en est. Au nord-ouest du camp se trouvent les restes d’une ancienne ville. Grey Hill 35 enfin signale une grande

---

30 Brünnow et Domaszewski, op. cit., pp. 95–102.
31 Nous sommes heureux de nous trouver d’accord sur ce point avec M. J. Sauvaget.
32 Brünnow et Domaszewski, op. cit., Pl. XLIV.
33 Ibid.
citerne et suppose qu’il y en a bien d’autres. Il s’agit donc d’un ensemble de ruines assez important qui, à première vue déjà, montre des ressemblances avec les deux Kasr al-Hair et le Djabal Sais. Un bâtiment principal, “le camp,” se situe à proximité d’une exploitation agricole qui compte d’autres bâtiments et une installation pour l’irrigation.

Mais voyons le plan du bâtiment principal, du “camp,” levé par Domaszewski. La parenté étroite avec le plan-type des châteaux omeyyades saute aux yeux. C’est la variante de Kasr al-Hair al-Gharbi qui se trouve répétée ici: rectangle de 70 m x 70 m (d’après Domaszewski 70,5 m x 68,75 m) pourvu de tours arrondies aux angles, semi-circulaires sur les côtés.

À l’intérieur six appartements rigoureusement clos, les uns contre les autres, s’adossent au mur d’enceinte et renferment une cour carrée. Chacun de ces appartements comporte une pièce principale oblongue, accompagnée des deux côtés de deux pièces de moitié plus petites. Ces pièces étaient couvertes de voûtes en berceau, exécutées en pierre de taille. C’est donc le plan et la construction des baits omeyyades. Il est vrai que deux de ces appartements seulement, C4 et C5, présentent ce plan idéal. Comme à Kasr al-Hair les autres ne le montrent que déformé.


Quant aux escaliers, leur emplacement à al-Kaštal, je ne comprend pas par le plan de Domaszewski. L’hypothèse de cet auteur qui les place dans les petites pièces situées devant les tours d’angle est à rejeter. L’unique argument en faveur de cette thèse est la présence d’un renforcement dans le mur d’enceinte de l’angle sud-est, renforcement qui a la même largeur que les portes des escaliers dans les camps romains d’al-Ladjdjin et d’Odhrōh. Ils y mènent aux étages supérieurs des tours. Mais ici, l’épaisseur bien moindre du mur d’enceinte (1 m 50) ne permet pas de placer un escalier à l’intérieur. Aussi Domaszewski a-t-il essayé de se tirer de la difficulté en reconstituant cet escalier à l’extérieur du mur, le long des parois de la pièce p 1.

36 Ce mode de construction, inhabituel dans la région pour les pièces d’habitation, ne s’explique, pour nous, que par l’intention des architectes d’imiter les voûtes en brique des autres châteaux omeyyades.

37 A Kasr al-Hair la nature des lieux a imposé à l’architecte une irrégularité que ne se retrouve pas à al-Kaštal. Au lieu de séparer les deux appartements en face de l’entrée par un mur seulement, il a été obligé, pour laisser la place de la citerne, d’intercaler un couloir ouvert sur la cour. L’appartement de droite s’en trouve amputé de deux petites pièces.

ARCHITECTURE DES CHATEAUX OMEYYADES

Aucune trace ne s’est conservée de cet escalier qui, par sa disposition même, s’écarterait de tout ce que nous savons de l’architecture de la région.

Quant à l’entrée, elle est du type de celles de Kāsh-al-Ḥair, de Mshattā ou de Kharāna. Une sorte de salle oblongue est partagée par trois paires de pilastres en deux compartiments de dimensions égales. Domaszewski suppose comme couverture de ces compartiments des voûtes d’arête. Nous préféririons y reconstituer des voûtes en berceau barlongues par analogie avec les voûtes de la pièce r l, p.e. 39

Enfin un élément de l’architecture de ce château mérite notre attention particulière et nous sommes obligés de nous y appesantir: les tours.

Les châteaux omeyyades ont des tours-contreforts arrondies, massives, et au dernier étage, des petites pièces pourvues de meurtrières ou une plateforme. Ces pièces sont restées intactes dans la petite et dans la grande enceinte de Kāsh-al-Ḥair al-Sharkī 40 et au château abasside d’Ukḥaiddir, mieux conservé qu’aucun château omeyyade. (IIe moitié du VIIIe siècle). 41 Il est vrai que certaines de ces tours comportent au rez-de-chaussée des réduits (Mshattā, al-Ṭūba, Djabal Ṣais) mais il n’y a pas d’étage au-dessus d’elles. L’emplacement même de ces tours par rapport aux appartements diminue singulièrement leur rôle défensif. Elles butent contre une cloison ou ne sont accessibles que d’une seule pièce. 42

Les tours des camps romains ou byzantins, par contre, sont de véritables tours de défense avec des pièces à tous les étages, destinées à abriter les troupes au cas même où l’ennemi pénétrerait dans le camp. L’ancien type de ces tours, 43 celui du IIe siècle, comporte trois étages et un escalier à l’intérieur. Al-Ladjdjūn et Odhroh présentent ce type classique. Domaszewski insiste sur l’importance des tours dans l’ensemble de la construction. 44 Le camp diocélien, signalé par le R. P. Poidebard 45 et le fort byzantin gardent cette tour de défense, avec quelques différences: la communication entre les pièces se fait en général par des escaliers extérieurs par des échelles et par le chemin de ronde. Le plan est plus varié; la tour de l’époque de Trajan est ronde aux angles, rectangulaire et terminée par une absidiole sur les côtés de l’enceinte, celle d’époque justinienne est tantôt carrée, tantôt ronde, tantôt polygonale. Seules les tours semi-circulaires sont absolument inconnues dans les fortifications romaines et byzantines. Ces tours sont accessibles de tous les points du camp. À l’époque de Trajan, aucune construction adossée à l’enceinte n’en gênait l’entrée. Dans les forteresses byzantines les pièces placées devant les portes des tours communiquent avec les autres et permettent l’accès de la tour de toutes parts.

39 Ibid., Figs. 679 et 680.
40 Creswell, op. cit., p. 335.
41 O. Reuther, "Ocheïdir," Wissenschaft. Veröffentlichungen d. deutschen Orient-Gesellsch., XX (1912), pl. VI.
42 Ce qui ne veut point dire que ces tours ne servaient pas à l’occasion à la défense. Le rôle défensif en pouvait être le même que celui des tours contreforts des fortifications sassanides qui comportent une seule petite pièce ou une plate-forme au dernier étage accessible par le chemin de ronde, d’où les parties avoisinantes des murs sont surveillées (cf. ci-dessous p. 85 sq).
43 Domaszewski, op. cit., définit avec précision le caractère des tours d’al-Ladjdjūn et d’Odhroh.
45 Poidebard, op. cit., LXXV, XV, XVI, XIX, XXVII, XXIII-XXV, XXXVIII et ailleurs.
De toute évidence, les tours d'al-Kaṣṭal sont du type omeyyade, non point du type romain. Plan: les trois quarts d'un cercle aux angles, outrepassant légèrement le demi-cercle sur les côtés, comme à Mshattā. Dimensions également comme à Mshattā. Quant à l'intérieur de ces tours, Domaszewski ne l'a effectivement relevé que pour deux d'entre elles, celle de l'angle sud-ouest (No. V) et la tour intermédiaire avoisinante (No. IV), le plan des autres est dessiné par analogie avec celles-ci. Selon ce plan, elles comportent toutes des pièces à l'intérieur. Mais Domaszewski 46 dit "la tour V ne possédait certainement pas d'entrée au rez-de-chaussée. De même, nulle part ailleurs n'existe une entrée au rez-de-chaussée des tours. Il s'ensuit que l'espace intérieur du rez-de-chaussée n'a pu être accessible que du premier étage." Solution peu satisfaisante nous semble-t-il. Nous pensons que la difficulté se résoudra plus aisément si l'on considère ces tours comme des contreforts dont les espaces intérieurs, à part certains cas particuliers (latrines?) n'étaient pas destinés à l'usage. En effet, une partie d'entre elles seulement sont accessibles à travers un appartement, les autres butent contre des cloisons.

Mais est-il même certain que ces tours soient creuses? Domaszewski ne se serait-il pas laissé séduire par l'idée de relever un camp romain et de voir ces tours par analogie avec les tours de ceux-ci? Ce qu'il considère comme le mur pourrait bien être, pour quelques tours du moins, un parement de pierre de taille renfermant un blocage caché sous les débris, tombés du haut des murs. Mais quoi qu'il en soit, le caractère de contrefort reste acquis aux tours d'al-Kaṣṭal. La nature particulière des matériaux employés (dont nous aurons à parler) en expliquerait la divergence avec ceux des autres châteaux omeyyades.

C'est à ce point de notre étude que M. J. Sauvaget a donné encore un argument, définitif, nous semble-t-il, en faveur de l'origine omeyyade de ce château.

L'édifice qui se trouve à quelques pas à l'ouest de l'angle nord-ouest du château est considéré par Domaszewski comme le prêtoire, par Tristram comme un petit château. Les dimensions en sont hors oeuvre 18 m 25 x 23 m 15, calculées sur le relevé de Domaszewski. À l'angle nord-ouest se trouve une tour ronde avec un escalier tournant à l'intérieur. 47 Elle se termine par une loggia ouverte, formée de colonnes du type corinthien de la basse époque. Il est évident que cet édifice ne peut être le prêtoire. L'emplacement en dehors du camp, la présence de la tour le distinguent des prêtoires que nous connaissons dans la région. Or, Tristram signale une niche semi-circulaire, creusée dans le mur sud, niche que Domaszewski a omise dans son relevé. Elle donne la solution du problème: cet édifice est une mosquée, la niche en est le mihrab, la tour le minaret et les deux chapiteaux de marbre que Tristram a vus disposés dans la cour sont des restes de colonnes qui supportaient, soit l'arc du mihrab, soit des arcades transversales.

Cette mosquée se place dans la série assez considérable des mosquées omeyyades faisant partie de l'habitation princière. Elles sont construites sur un plan rectangulaire, à nef transversale, sans cour; M. Sauvaget en a relevé une au Djabal Sais. 48 Une autre se trouve

48 Op. cit., Fig. 6, p. 245.
près de Kusair al-Ḥallābāt. Les châteaux de Khirbat al-Minya, de Khirbat al-Maṣfdjar et de Mshattā renferment des mosquées de ce type. Nous signalons ceux de Kāhan al-Zabīb et de Umm al-Walīd que nous attribuons avec M. Sauvaget aux Omeyyades. Elles se situent comme à al-Ḳastāl en dehors du château. En nommant celle d'al-Ramlā, nous croyons avoir mentionné toutes celles qui, pour le moment, présentent ce type en Syrie et en Palestine. La seule différence d'avec celle d'al-Ḳastāl est le fait qu'elles n'ont pas de minaret ou que ces minarets sont des tours carrées. Le nôtre est le premier exemple d'un minaret rond d'époque omeyyade. La date n'en saurait pourtant pas être contestée: mosquée et minaret sont de la même époque que le château. La construction, en matériaux employés, des restes de décor qui se trouvent dispersés dans les débris sont, paraît-il, d'une parfaite identité avec ce qu'on trouve dans le château voisin.

Ajoutons une dernière observation de M. Sauvaget qui rend plus étroite encore la parenté d'al-Ḳastāl avec les châteaux omeyyades. Les débris de colonnes que Brūnnow et Domaszewski ont trouvés dans la cour du château (Tristram en a vu deux encore debout) seraient les dernières traces d'un portique entourant la cour.

Ainsi, al-Ḳastāl présente les caractères les plus marquants des châteaux omeyyades: une enceinte rectangulaire à tours-contreforts arrondies, avec des baïses à l'intérieur et une mosquée se trouvent être le centre d'une exploitation agricole, irriguée à l'aide d'un grand barrage. Ce que Tristram appelle la ville étaient sans doute les habitations du personnel, de la suite du prince et des ouvriers agricoles.

Après cette analyse il nous semble inutile d'insister sur les nombreuses erreurs de M. Domaszewski qui voit dans ce château le camp d'une cohorte à six siècles. Qu'une seule de ces invraisemblances soit mise en relief: les grandes pièces seraient des cours de rassemblement, chacune de cent hommes qui couchaient dans les pièces avoisinantes. La surface de ces "cours," 100 m², est à peine suffisante pour contenir cent hommes, les portes, larges de 1 m 25 seulement, ne laissent passer que deux hommes à la fois. Jamais lieu de rassemblement militaire n'eût été conçu de façon plus maladroite.

Une seule objection serait à faire contre cette attribution d'al-Ḳastāl aux Omeyyades: technique et matériaux de construction, l'emploi exclusif de la pierre de taille, posée sans joint et dont les dimensions dépassent souvent tout ce que nous savons de l'architecture du VIe et du VIIe siècle.

Le fait s'explique cependant sans difficulté. Nous savons que les premiers architectes musulmans se servaient couramment de matériaux de remploi. Les colonnes provenant d'édifices antiques ou chrétiens ont été appelées l'un des caractères du premier art musulman. Au Dôme

50 Brūnnow et Domaszewski, op. cit., Figs. 665, 666, p. 82.
51 Ibid., Fig. 671, p. 89.
du Rocher, à la mosquée al-Akṣā on ne s’est pas toujours donné la peine de marteler les croix sur les chapiteaux, souvenirs de l’origine chrétienne.

Il en a sans doute été de même à al-Kaṣṭal; les inscriptions nabatéennes signalées par Tristram sur des pierres dans l’enceinte du château sont, pour nous, l’indice certain qu’il s’agit de matériaux de remploi. Nous nous trouvons sur un site qui était habité au moins depuis l’époque nabatéenne. Les Omeiyyades firent ici ce qu’ils ont fait souvent ailleurs: ils se servirent des restes trouvés sur les lieux pour construire leurs propres habitations. L’indifférence envers les matériaux paraît être l’un des traits marquants de cette école.

Dans l’architecture on se sert de tous les matériaux, partant de toutes les techniques, dans le décor aucun motif n’est réservé à une matière déterminée. Les mêmes formes apparaissent également dans les stucs, dans les mosaïques et dans les ornements sculptés. Sur la façade de Kaṣr al-Ḥair p.e., on applique pêle-mêle des motifs provenant du décor des parois sassanides, des pavements du pays et des ornements architecturaux anciens. La façade de Mshattà traduit dans le style monumental de la pierre des formes qu’on n’avait vues jusque là que dans les mosaïques ou dans des œuvres d’art mineur. À al-Kaṣṭal, la voûte en briques a été traduite en pierre de taille.

Voici donc résolue, nous semble-t-il, l’énigme qui a entouré jusqu’ici l’histoire d’al-Kaṣṭal. Aussi, se justifie le récit de Tabari selon lequel “Walīd, fils de Yazīd, se fixa à al-Kaṣṭal et son oncle ‘Abbās après lui.” Ce prince malheureux dont le règne ne dura qu’un an (743-44) a-t-il fait construire le château al-Kaṣṭal? Nous ne saurions le dire, mais une observation tirée du plan de l’œuvre nous en fait douter. La façon maladroite dont les deux tours de l’entrée et avec elles l’entrée même sont placées, à côté du point médian de la muraille, accuse un tâtonnement de débutant. Serait-ce un indice pour placer ce château au début de notre série et non pas à la fin, ce qu’il faudrait faire s’il était une création de Walīd II? Nous laissons la question sans réponse, nos connaissances ne nous permettant pas encore d’établir une chronologie rigoureuse des œuvres omeiyyades. Pour le moment, contentons nous de ranger al-Kaṣṭal dans cette série.

LES ORIGINES

Ce plan-type des châteaux omeiyyades est-il une création de toute pièce des architectes omeiyyades?

La question a fait couler beaucoup d’encre lorsque, il y a quarante ans, J. Strzygowski a publié son ouvrage sur Mshattà. D’après lui, le plan de Mshattà dérive du camp romain oriental à cour intérieure. Ce camp d’Orient proviendrait d’un type architectural mésopotamien, de l’habitation à cour intérieure (“Hofhaus”). M. Herzfeld qui s’est prononcé sur cette question à plusieurs reprises est, jusqu’à un certain point, du même avis que M. Strzygowski: le plan de

Mshattā proviendrait de celui du camp romain tel qu’il a été développé à Hīra (Mésopotamie), dans la résidence des princes lakhmides.

Nous ne tenterons point d’intervenir dans cette discussion qui dépasse singulièrement le cadre de notre étude. Nous nous proposons simplement de chercher les modèles immédiats du plan des châteaux omeyyades. D’ailleurs le plan de Mshattā ne sera pris en considération qu’en tant qu’apparenté au plan courant. Nous ne nous arrêterons pas à ses multiples particularités, sauf à la salle du trône.


Voyons cependant le texte dont M. Herzfeld fait état.56 Ce texte parle d’un château-fort du Ve siècle qui serait le modèle-type des châteaux de Sāmarrā. Il y est dit que le Khalife abbasside al-Mutawakkil avait fait construire son palais à Sāmarrā, la Balkuwārā actuelle, d’après le modèle du château d’un roi lakhmide de Hīra, de la famille des Nu’mānides (des Banū Naṣr). Ce palais aurait été construit “dans la forme de la guerre” (d’un “camp de guerre” selon E. Herzfeld). Le roi aurait choisi cette forme “à cause de sa passion pour la guerre.” Suit une description de la disposition de l’intérieur: une salle de réception est accompagnée de deux pièces, d’une salle d’attente et d’une autre destinée à la préparation des mets qu’on offrait aux hôtes. La salle principale est comparée à la poitrine, les deux salles latérales à deux manches. Ces trois pièces se seraient situées autour d’une cour. “Et ce plan devint célèbre et fut imité par tout le monde.”

Si ce récit est exact, il y a tout lieu de croire à l’existence de notre plan-type, sous la forme particulière de Mshattā, en Mésopotamie au Ve siècle. La description est un peu vague, il est vrai. Mais un château avec une enceinte fortifiée (d’où, d’après M. Herzfeld, le terme “camp de guerre”) et, à l’intérieur, une salle de réception avec des pièces latérales se compare aisément à Mshattā, à Kašr-al-‘Āšik et même à Balkuwārā Mshattā, au lieu d’être le point de départ de la série des châteaux arabes n’en serait donc qu’un chaînon; ils proviendraient tous du château de Hīra.

Du reste bien des textes nous disent qu’à l’époque et avant même l’époque de Moham-med, peu de temps après la chute de la dynastie lakhmide, de nombreuses tribus arabes habi-taient dans des châteaux-forts situés autour de la Mecque et de Médine. L’architecture de ces châteaux-forts n’aurait-elle pas été inspirée par les constructions des lakhmides, ces princes liés aux tribus d’Arabie par le sang et par la tradition? Les Banū Umayya de leur côté,

n’auraient-ils pas apporté d’Arabie en Syrie le plan-type de ces châteaux qu’ils auraient adapté alors aux conditions de leur vie nouvelle?

Mais tout ceci est du domaine de l’hypothèse. Aucun monument n’est venu confirmer les dires de notre texte. Les fouilles entreprises à Hîra et résumées dans cette revue même 57 n’ont donné aucun résultat quant à ces constructions lakhlmides. Nulle part ailleurs non plus un édifice de ce type, antérieur au groupe omeyyade, n’a été trouvé. Ukhâidir est généralement placé à la deuxième moitié du VIIIe siècle, à la suite immédiate de notre groupe, les châteaux de Sâmarrâviennent à une distance de cent ans environ.

Voyons donc ce que les monuments eux-mêmes nous disent:

Les Murs d’Enceinte.—La Syrie et la Palestine aussi bien que la région mésopotamienne et l’Iran connaissent le plan-type du camp rectangulaire fortifié, à cour intérieure, entourée de pièces qui s’appuient aux murs d’enceinte.

Le schéma semble apparaître dans la région soumise à la domination romaine et byzantine depuis le IIIe siècle, si nous nous rapportons aux indications du R. P. Poidebard. Khân al-ıBaṣīrī, p.e., 58 Khân al-Shamāt, 59 Kaṣr Bshair, 60 toutes attribuées à l’époque de Dioclétien ou à l’époque immédiatement suivante, sont de ce type; mais dans aucun de ces cas, l’attribution des pièces de l’intérieur à l’époque de construction des murs d’enceinte n’est assurée. Même au IVe siècle le fait n’est pas certain: Dair al-Khāf 61 se place d’après une inscription (No. 229) entre les années 367 et 375; mais cette inscription est-elle en place ou le Dair n’a-t-il pas plutôt été reconstruit à une date postérieure?

Quant aux nombreux “camps romains” que M. Alt et M. Franck 62 ont relevé dans l’Arabie Pétrée, des doutes sont permis tant aux dates fixées par les auteurs. Nous pensons qu’il s’agit dans bien des cas ou de fortifications byzantines remaniées à l’époque musulmane ou simplement de constructions musulmanes. Les nombreux relevés publiés par A. Musil dans Palmyrena et dans Edom demanderaient une vérification sur place.

En fait, les monuments de ce type, datés de façon sûre, n’apparaissent qu’au VIe siècle. Nous voulons parler des camps d’al-Andarîn (Fig. 11) 63 et de Stable ‘Antâr 64 datés respectivement de 558 et de 577–78 (Inscriptions). Ils montrent le type pleinement développé: rectangle de 70 m x 70 m environ, des tours d’angle carrées ou hexagonales et des constructions à l’intérieur, adossées au mur d’enceinte. Mais se sont des pièces isolées ou des portiques, jamais des appartements.

57 D. Talbot Rice, “The Oxford Excavations at Hîra,” 
58 Poidebard, _op. cit._, pp. 37, 39, 40, 47, 49, 52, 102, 187.
59 Ibid., PIs. XV, XVI, pp. 37, 43, 50, 53, 54, 56.
60 Brünnow et Domaszewski, _op. cit._, II, 49–59.
61 Butler, _op. cit._, Div. II A, Fig. 127.
64 Ibid., Pl. IX.
ARCHITECTURE DES CHATEAUX OMEYYADES

En ce qui concerne Kūṣair al-Ḥallābāt 65 que M. E. Herzfeld classe 66 avec al-Κaṣṭal parmi les antécédents directs de Mshattā et qui, en effet, seul parmi les forts byzantins, montre de véritables appartements à l'intérieur, nous sommes convaincus que c'est un fort byzantin, remanié à l'époque omeyyade. Les quatre appartements à l'intérieur ne seraient pas l'oeuvre des architectes du VIIe siècle; nous les attribuons à la même époque que la mosquée qui se trouve à proximité et qui, sans aucun doute possible, est d'origine omeyyade. 67

De l'autre côté de l'Euphrate, en Mésopotamie et en Iran, les exemples de camps fortifiés sur plan rectangulaire, existent bien qu'ils soient plus rares. M. de Morgan 68 a relevé, à proximité de Ḍaṣr-i-Shirin dans les monts Zagros un camp sasanide fortifié de 180 m x 180 m à tours arrondies qui semble avoir eu des constructions à l'intérieur, une grande bâtière indépendante et des pièces adossées aux murs d'enceinte (Fig. 12). Comme les autres ruines du site, ce fort appartiendrait à l'époque de Chosroès II (590-627). Le "Khān" de Kaḥr-i-Kūna 69 situé également dans les monts Zagros est du même type: enceinte rectangulaire de 32 m x 103 m, des tours arrondies, des pièces voûtées le long de l'intérieur, adossées aux murs d'enceinte. Date et origine en sont incertaines, mais sans doute antérieures à l'époque musulmane.

Quant aux traits généraux du plan, les antécédents des châteaux omeyyades se trouvent donc également en pays byzantin et en territoire sasanide. Avec des nuances cependant: les dimensions de nos châteaux sont celles de certaines forteresses byzantines. Les tours par contre s'apparentent bien plus étroitement à celles des forteresses sasanides.

Les fortifications sasanides sont en effet pourvues de tours-contreforts arrondies comme
les châteaux omeyyades. La tour-contrefort arrondie est d'ailleurs la construction-type des fortifications du proche Orient depuis au moins deux millénaires. M. E. Herzfeld en a relevé de beaux exemples à Dastādjiird (Zindān). La liste peut en être allongée sans difficulté ; la plupart des fortifications prémusulmanes, situées sur le Tigre et relevées par M. E. Herzfeld ont des tours-contreforts rondes. M. Reuther, dans le premier rapport sur les fouilles de Ctésiphon, décrit les tours des murailles de cette ville comme des contreforts massifs sur plan semi-circulaire. Sir Aurel Stein dans son voyage à travers la Perse méridionale n'a rencontré que des fortifications sassanides ou plus anciennes à tours-contreforts, pour la plupart rondes. Ces tours massives sont à tel point caractéristiques de l'architecture sassanide qu'il faut se demander si le plan que J. de Morgan a levé du fort de Kašr-i-Šīrīn est exact sur ce point. Ne serait-ce pas seulement les tours des deux côtés de l'entrée et dont il donne une coupe qui comporteraient des pièces à l'intérieur? Quoiqu'il en soit la tour-contrefort arrondie est l'un des caractères de l'architecture militaire persane et c'est par là même qu'elle se distingue de l'architecture militaire romaine.

Sur ce point donc, les rapports entre les châteaux omeyyades et l'architecture sassanide se révèlent étroits. Ces rapports se manifestent jusque dans le décor qui est appliqué aux tours et aux murs. L'extérieur des forts romains et byzantins reste sans décor, le mur se présente sous un aspect sévère : appareil de pierre de taille, parfois en alternance avec des assises de briques. Par contre, dans les architectures sassanides et omeyyade une arcature aveugle est souvent appliquée aux murailles. O. Reuther décrit le mur d'enceinte de Ctésiphon ainsi : "les murailles et les tours étaient décorées d'arcades de 2 m 25 de large qui couvraient les murs et les tours." À la façade de Fīrūz-Ābād, au palais de Ctésiphon, à l'intérieur du palais de Shāpūr l'arcade aveugle en frise, aux colonnettes engagées, fait les frais exclusifs de la décoration. De même, les enceintes des deux Kašr al-Ḥaïr et de Kašr al-Kharānā, seuls conservés ou restitués jusqu'au faîte des murs, en sont décorés. L'arcature aveugle, aux colonnettes engagées, se trouve partout dans l'architecture omeyyade (extérieur du Dôme du Rocher, porte d'entrée de l'Acropole d' Ammān). Avant l'époque omeyyade elle était inconnue dans l'architecture syrienne.

Résumons-nous : l'enceinte carrée aux pièces adossées à l'intérieur des murs se trouve également dans les fortifications byzantines et sassanides. Les dimensions de l'enceinte des châteaux omeyyades sont celles de certains forts byzantins, mais plan et construction des tours, application du décor sont empruntés aux modèles sassanides.

70 Cf. l'enceinte de Sendjirli ; fouilles de Jacoby et Luschan.
71 Sarre et Herzfeld, op. cit., II, 89-93 ; IV, PI. CXXVII.
72 Ibid.
74 A. Stein, "An Archaeological Tour in the Ancient Persia," Iraq, III (1936), Pt. 2, 123 ff.
75 Ces tours, comme celles des châteaux omeyyades, étaient accessibles du chemin de ronde (cf. Reuther, op. cit.) et elles ont dû être pourvues pour la défense, soit d'une plateforme protégée par des créneaux, soit comme à Ukhaidir et à Kašr al-Ḥaïr d'une petite pièce couverte au dernier étage.
76 Nous nous abstenons d'une étude des autres formes du décor, ce serait-que dans le cadre architectural, nos renseignements sur Khirbat al-Minya et sur Khirbat al-Mafджar étant trop fragmentaires encore. Il semble

Cette imitation des modèles persans peut s’expliquer par un fait dont nous aurons à parler: le cérémonial de la cour omeyyade est calqué sur celui des Sassanides. Dans les demeures comme dans les mœurs, les Khalifes veulent paraître comme les Rois des Rois.

Voyons ce que les constructions à l’intérieur des enceintes nous apprennent sur ce point.


Ce noyau, ce logement clos se retrouve dans les appartements, les “baits” de certains palais sassanides. À Ḵaṣr-i-Shīrīn (Fig. 13) et à Ḥawsh Kūrī (Fig. 14), tous deux des palais de la fin du VIe siècle, des logements à trois pièces, oblongues et parallèles, perpendiculaires à une cour, se groupent derrière les salles de réception. Ces pièces étaient couvertes de voûtes en berceau oblongues, celle du milieu grande ouverte sur la cour. Elles n’ont pas de fenêtres. Les différences d’avec le bait omeyyade ne portent que sur les pièces latérales; elles ne sont pas subdivisées par une paroi, le plan est toujours oblong et l’entrée se fait, non pas par la salle du milieu, mais par la cour directement.

C’est le type du Ḣwān persan dont nous pouvons suivre l’évolution depuis le début de notre ère. À Assour,78 à Ḥatras,79 à Čtēsiphon, les Ḥwāns à trois pièces, oblongues, perpendiculaires à une cour, couvertes de voûtes en berceau oblongues sont le type unique de l’appartement d’apparat et d’habitation. Ḥatras montre que le morcellement des pièces latérales n’est pas seulement un fait de l’époque omeyyade. Le rétrécissement des portes d’entrée des châ-
teaux omeyyades s'expliquerait par les conditions climatériques de la Syrie qui exigent, paraît-il, une fermeture plus étanche.

Les habitations pré-Arabo-Byzantines de Syrie et de Palestine sont essentiellement différentes. Certes, le plan tripartite leur appartient aussi. Dans l'ouvrage de Butler, on trouvera de nombreux plans de logements à trois pièces. M. Sauvaget insiste sur l'importance de ce plan pour la genèse de l'habitation omeyyade. Elle nous paraît être assez mince. Les pièces sont, dans la plupart des cas, de plan carré. Ni par la forme, ni par la couverture la direction perpendiculaire à la cour, ce mouvement vers une cour, essentiel au ïwan persan et au bâti omeyyade, n'est marqué. Les trois pièces sont d'habitude de dimensions égales, celle du milieu ne se détache aucunement. Elles sont éclairées et aérées par de grandes fenêtres et couvertures de plafonds plans en pierre de taille. Ces dalles reposent, au mur sur des consoles, au milieu de la pièce sur un grand arc transversal. C'est le plan et la construction classiques des logements syriens des Ve, VIe et VIIe siècles.

D'ailleurs la répétition de ce plan-type de trois pièces dans une même maison, les appartements clos, juxtaposés, n'existent pas en Syrie avant l'arrivée des Arabes.

Sans doute, les architectes omeyyades ont-il continué de construire à la manière syrienne aussi. Au Djabal Sais (bâtiments D, E, F), à Kušair al-Ḫallâbat nous en trouvons la preuve. Mais cette manière de bâtir semble réservée aux habitations de caractère simple. Le trait nouveau des châteaux omeyyades est précisément l'apparition du ïwan.

Remarquons cependant que les appartements de notre groupe, à part Mshattâ, ne présentent que la moitié d'un véritable bâti iranien. En Perse et en Mésopotamie (Ḵašr-i-Shīrin, Ḫākhāḏir) le bâti comporte deux logements à trois pièces, placés sur les côtés opposés d'une cour particulière: l'un composé de pièces spacieuses, l'autre de pièces exigües (Ḵašr-i-Shīrin, Sāmarra). (Appartements d'hiver et d'été). Parfois les deux logements comportent des pièces de dimensions égales: par exemple les "Harem" au nord de la partie est du palais Shīrin (cf. plan de Bell et Reuther) et au palais d'Ŭkhaḏir. Alors, le plan s'en identifie avec celui des baits de Mshattâ.

Ainsi le bâti de Mshattâ devient le véritable trait d'union entre le bâti iranien proprement dit et celui des Omeyyades. Il conserve du premier la disposition exacte des pièces: les deux logements tripartites, placés des deux côtés d'une cour, le tout hermétiquement clos. Les proportions du plan cependant, l'aménagement des portes, la subdivision des pièces latérales sont omeyyades. À Kašr al-Ṭūba, on conserve encore la cour particulière, mais le deuxième logement est supprimé. Dans les autres châteaux (Ḵašr al-Ḫair al-Gharbī, al-Kharāna, al-Ḵašṭal, Khīrbat al-Minya, Khīrbat al-Mafjdjar) on se contente d'un seul logement qui est répété quatre ou six fois autour de la cour commune.

Cette simplification du bâti sassanide paraît être une adaptation du plan irano-mésopotamien aux conditions de vie syriennes. L'accès direct de l'appartement à travers une cour

80 Butler, op. cit., Div. II, B, p. 93, Fig. 106, p. 136, Fig. 156 et ailleurs.
commune, entourée d'un portique, se trouve partout dans les maisons de la région. Les plans des habitations syriennes du VIe siècle, de la maison de Flavios Séos, d'une maison à al-Túba, montrent cette cour entourée de pièces diverses.

La technique des constructions persanes n'est pas conservée non plus au même degré dans tous les bâtis omeyyades. À Mshattá et à al-Túba, au Djabal Sais, aux deux Khirbat et à al-Kharâna, il n'a subi que peu de changement. Dans ce dernier les plafonds, pour n'être pas des voûtes oblongues n'en sont pas moins d'un caractère purement mésopotamien: chaque pièce est divisée par deux arcs transversaux en quatre compartiments, chacun couvert d'une voûte en berceau barlongue. L'un des plus anciens exemples de ce mode de construction s'est trouvé à Assour, dans la salle à piliers (No. 18). À Kaṣr al-Ḥair al-Gharbî les pièces sont couvertes de poutres en bois, à al-Kaṣṭal de larges voûtes barlongues. Nulle part dans notre groupe nous n'avons retrouvé des plafonds du type syro-palestinien.

Ainsi donc, dans ses traits essentiels, le bâti omeyyade est persan: plan et construction des pièces, répétition du groupe autour d'une cour, séparation rigoureuse des appartements proviennent de la tradition sassanide. La suppression de la cour particulière et, partant, d'une moitié du logement, l'accès direct de l'appartement à travers la cour commune sont des concessions faites à la tradition syrienne.

Ce plan des habitations omeyyades est le résultat d'une réunion d'éléments persans et syriens, il signifie la création d'un type nouveau de logement oriental.

La Salle du Trône de Mshattá.—La salle du trône de Mshattá est l'exemple le plus frappant et à la fois le plus brillant de ce mélange des styles, de ce "synchronisme" dans l'art omeyyade (Fig. 15). C'est à ce titre que nous en abordons l'étude, car il n'est point dans notre intention d'en reprendre l'analyse d'ensemble. Elle a été tentée à plusieurs reprises depuis que Strzygowski a mis tout sa science au service de cette question. Ce n'est que sur cet aspect du problème que nous nous appesantirons.

La salle "triconque" ou la salle à trois absides a toujours été comparée, depuis Strzygowski, aux sanctuaires d'éguges chrétiennes, aux baptistères, à des salles d'hypogées, et encore à des salles d'architecture impériale romaine. Dans tous ces cas, sans exception, nous nous trouvons devant des monuments à plan carré, élargi par trois ou quatre absides, dont le diamètre égale la longueur des côtés du carré central. Il y a bien des variantes du type. Tantôt les absides se joignent directement au carré central; par exemple aux couvents blanc et rouge de Sohâg (Fig. 16), au baptistère de Tébessa, à l'église de Dair Dôsî en Syrie (à part l'abside orientale). Dans d'autres cas, les absides terminent les bras d'une croix: église de

Butler, op. cit., Div. II, A, pp. 36 ff., Fig. 322.
Ibid., Div. II, B, p. 22, Fig. 20.
Andrae-Lenzen, "Die Partnerstadt Assur."
Voyez à Ukhaidir ce mode de construction employé dans les salles No. 32, 33, 40 du plan d'O. Reuther.
S. Clarke, The Christian Antiquities in the Nile Valley (Oxford, 1912), Pls. XLVIII et XLIX.
S. Gsell, Monuments antiques de l'Algérie (Paris, 1901), II.
Vincent, op. cit., p. 29, Fig. 4.
Ruḥaiba au Nadjaf,\(^{90}\) église de la Nativité à Bethléem pour ne mentionner que des exemples syro-palestiniens. En Afrique du Nord, en Italie, le type est largement répandu.

Ce sont là les monuments qui ont été invoqués pour démontrer l'origine du plan de la salle du trône de Mshattā. Strzygowski, champion de la thèse “orientale,” aussi bien que ses adversaires étaient d'accord sur ce point.

Nous pensons que la salle à triconque de Mshattā se distingue par un détail assez significatif de ces églises. Dans celles-ci, le diamètre des absides et la longueur des côtés du carré central se correspondent, le plan est nettement trilobé. Par contre, à Mshattā, le diamètre des absides (5 m 25) étant à peine plus long que la moitié des côtés du carré central (9 m 80 à 9 m 90), la pièce centrale reste avant tout une salle carrée pourvue de niches. Les angles de ce carré rentrent dans le mur. Une différence essentielle en résulte d'avec les édifices à forme trilobée: dans le plan c'est le carré qui domine, dans la construction c'est la coupole.

Deux groupes des monuments s'offrent comme modèles-types de ce plan. Les uns appartiennent à la tradition syro-palestiniennne, les autres à l'art persan.

Le premier groupe ne comprend que des monuments de dimensions réduites, des petites salles carrées, qui se trouvent en Syrie, dans les bains (Fig. 17)\(^{91}\) ou dans certaines maisons d'Antioche dégagées récemment.\(^{92}\) La salle carrée est pourvue de niches ou de petites pièces voûtées. Les coupoles ont sans doute été dans la plupart des cas construites sur pendentifs. Les petites dimensions, l'absence d'une nef oblongue nous les font éliminer comme modèles de notre salle du trône.

Bien plus étroits nous semblent être les rapports de la salle de Mshattā avec les salles du trône sassanides.\(^{92a}\)

Celles-ci se composent, pour la plupart, d'une énorme salle carrée à coupole sur trompes, précédée d'une nef oblongue.

En voici les exemples les plus importants: les salles du palais de Firūz-Ābād (Fig. 18) et de Ḵal'a-i-Dukhtar près de cette ville\(^{93}\) toutes deux du début du règne sassanide (223), du palais de Dāmghān\(^{94}\) attribué au VIe siècle (Fig. 19), de Ḵāṣr-i-Šīrīn, de l'époque de Chos-

\(^{90}\) Ibid., Fig. 6.


\(^{92a}\) M. Sauvaget a déjà signalé cette ressemblance entre les plans de la salle du Trône de Mshattā et de certaines salles des châteaux sassanides, cf. ci-dessus note 81, p. 88. Mais il semble rejeter toute influence sasanide pour Mshattā.


\(^{94}\) Découvert par les missions du Musée d'Art et du Musée de l'Université de Pennsylvania. Cf. A. U. Pope,
roès II (590–627) (Fig. 13) et enfin du palais de Kish (Fig. 20) où, il est vrai, la salle carrée est réduite à une petite pièce avec une niche.95 Dans ces monuments, l'évolution du plan de la salle du trône se présente de façon très claire.

À Firûz-Âbâd et à Kal'a-i-Dukhtar, le type n'est pas encore formé: d'autres coupoles se placent de chaque côté de la coupole centrale, la nef oblongue et la salle carrée sont séparées par des parois comme toutes les autres pièces du palais. Mais à Kašr-i-Shîrîn et surtout à Dâmghân, le plan de Mshattâ paraît réalisé: une seule salle carrée à coupole est précédée d'une salle oblongue qui, par deux rangées de colonnes, est divisée en trois nefs. À Dâmghân, pièce oblongue et salle carrée communiquant par une porte qui est aussi large que la nef principale. Comme à Mshattâ donc, ces deux pièces ne sont plus séparées l'une de l'autre, elles forment un ensemble bien uni, le centre du palais, entourées de pièces d'habitation.

D'ailleurs, les quatre portes des salles carrées qui, communiquant avec les pièces adjacentes, se comparent aux ouvertures cintrées des niches de Mshattâ. Elles sont de largeur variable: Firûz-Âbâd 1 : 7 (ouverture: côté du carré), Kal'a-i-Dukhtar 1 : 3; Dâmghân 3 : 5 (Mshattâ 1 : 2). C'est à Shâpûr, où la pièce oblongue manque, que la ressemblance du plan de ce palais à coupole avec notre salle carrée est la plus frappante: aux quatre côtés du carré s'ajoutent quatre petites pièces, creusées dans l'épaisseur du mur et vouées en berceau.96 Le côté en est le tiers du côté de la pièce centrale. En remplaçant ces pièces par nos nicher, le plan de la salle carrée de Mshattâ est réalisé.

Étant donné cette parenté étroite avec l'architecture persane, nous voudrions remplacer la coupole sur pendentifs, reconstituée à Mshattâ par Brunnow et par Schultz, par une coupole sur trompes. Nous savons bien que les coupoles d'al-Minya, d'al-Amra et du Hammâm al-Šarakh reposent sur pendentifs. Mais dans les trois cas les dimensions sont petites et, surtout, la technique de construction des murs est syrienne. À Mshattâ, les murs en briques de la salle du trône ainsi que les voûtes et les murs des pièces adjacentes sont exécutés, on l'a constaté à maintes reprises, dans une technique purement iraquienne. II nous semble donc parfaitement légitime de reconstituer sur cette salle carrée une coupole sur trompes persane plutôt qu'une coupole en brique sur pendentifs dont nous n'avons aucun exemple dans la région.97


97 La coupole en brique de l'église de Kašr Ibn Wardân peut être laissée de côté ici. La construction, à la manière byzantine en est absolument différente de tout ce que nous savons de l'architecture de la région.
Ainsi donc, le caractère essentiellement persan de cette salle du trône nous paraît démontré. Il paraît clair que l’architecture en a été empruntée par les Khalifes omeyyades à la cour sassanide, en même temps que le cérémonial. M. E. Herzfeld 98 rattache les salles du trône des Abbassides à celles des rois persans. Comme ceux-ci les Khalifes disposaient d’une salle de réception publique (Madjlis al-‘āmm جلس العام), c’est la grande nef oblongue, et d’une salle de réception privée (Madjlis al-khāṣṣ جلس الخاص), la salle carrée. Il aurait fallu placer dans cette série la salle du trône de Mshattâ. Nombreux sont en effet les indices qui prouvent une imitation du cérémonial sassanide par la cour des omeyyades. L’image du prince à Kaṣr al-Ḥair al-Gharbî rend celui-ci dans l’attitude, dans les vêtements et avec les insignes des rois sassanides. 99 À Kuṣair ‘Amra, comme à Kaṣr al-Ḥair, le prince omeyyade porte une couronne qui est le souvenir du diadème aillé des shâhs persans. A. Musil, 100 s’appuyant sur les textes de l’époque, décrit une réception de Walid II ; comme les rois persans, le Khalife est caché aux yeux des profanes par un rideau qui, sans doute, était suspendu à l’entrée de la salle à coupole. Ainsi la salle du trône de Mshattâ devient le chaînon d’une série qui va des salles du trône sassanides à celles des Abbassides: la salle à coupole est la salle privée, la nef la salle publique.


Les rapports de proportion entre l’espace libre et la masse des murs sont syriens. Les murs et les supports à Mshattâ sont bien plus minces que dans les édifices persans où d’énormes piliers renforcent d’épaisses murailles. Il s’en trouve dans notre monument une élégance, un affinement des proportions, une largeur des espaces intérieurs qui sont bien loin de la lourde majesté des constructions sassanides.

C’est, pensons-nous, cette interpenetration des caractères de deux styles qui fait la valeur particulière de cette œuvre.

Un modèle persan est adapté à la tradition antique du pays, la lourde grandeur de l’Orient est assouplie par l’élégance du goût grec. Mais retournons après cette diversion à l’étude du plan courant.

Les Portes d’Entrée.—Les mêmes tendances ont présidé à la création du plan des portes d’entrée. On en distingue deux types dans les châteaux omeyyades. Le plus simple que nous avons signalé à Mshattâ, à al-Ḥair, à al-Ḳastal et à al-Kharāna, est une pièce oblongue, divisée par des arcs transversaux en plusieurs compartiments couverts de voûtes. L’autre qui se trouve à al-

98 E. Herzfeld, Samarra, Aufnahmen und Untersuchungen zur islamischen Archäologie (Berlin, 1907), p. 8.
100 A. Musil, Kuṣeṣr ‘Amra (Wien, 1907), p. 159.

"Den Empfang bei Walid schildern uns viele von seinen Besuchern. Fast alle erwähnen einen Saal mit einem Vorhange gegenüber dem Eingange; der Vorhang war bald auseinandergeschoben, bald zusammengezogen...."
Türba, à Khirbat al-Mafdjar, à Khirbat al-Minya et au Djabal Sais se caractérise par l'adjonction à la salle oblongue d'une pièce carrée qui est, soit comprise dans l'épaisseur d'une tour semi-circulaire (Khirbat al-Minya, Djabal Sais), soit placée entre deux tours qui flanquent l'entrée (al-Tüba et Khirbat al-Maφdjar). Cette pièce était couverte, à Khirbat al-Minya d'une coupole, à Khirbat al-Maφdjar d'une voûte en berceau. À Kasr al-Tüba et au Djabal Sais les plafonds n'en sont pas conservés.

Des pièces carrées ou barlongues en guise de salles d'entrée, construites isolément, se trouvent encore aux jardins des deux Kasr al-Hair. Tantôt une tour ronde couppée en deux parties renferme une salle rectangulaire, tantôt un petit édifice carré à quatre contreforts comprend deux pièces, ou encore la pièce carrée forme un petit pavillon isolé (Figs. 21–23).

La salle oblongue servant d'entrée est courante dans l'architecture du pays. À al-Andarîn, (Fig. 11) aux casernes de Kasr Ibn Wardân et dans bien d’autres constructions militaires d’époque byzantine elle est en usage. Les relevés ne permettent pas d’en reconnaître le détail architectural ni la couverture. Le plan cependant est celui des entrées simples des châteaux omeyyades.

L'emploi de la pièce carrée à voûte ou à coupole comme entrée, par contre, est d'origine sassanide. À Kasr-i-Shîrîn, à l'angle sud-ouest du palais, se trouve une porte d'entrée dont le plan est tout à fait semblable à celui de la porte d'entrée de Khirbat al-Minya: pièce carrée à coupole avec des niches, semi-circulaires dans le monument omeyyade, rectangulaires dans le palais sassanide (Fig. 13). N'est-ce d'ailleurs pas la même transformation que la salle du trône des palais sassanides a subie dans l'art omeyyade? Toujours la niche rectangulaire est remplacée par la niche semi-circulaire.

Voici d'autres exemples de ces portes d'entrée sassanides: Hawsh Kuri (Fig. 24), porte d'entrée de Takrit, sur laquelle M. Herzfeld reconstitue une voûte d'arêtes. Elle est pourvue de deux contreforts qui rappellent les tours en quart de cercle de Khirbat al-Minya, d'al-Kharâna, du Djabal Sais. Un bel exemple d'époque omeyyade, mais de pur style sassanide est la porte d'entrée de l'acropole d'Amînân. À Raḳḳa, au début du IXe siècle, une porte d'entrée toute analogue, à voûte d'arêtes, a été construite pour la citadelle.

L'entrée typiquement omeyyade à deux salles successives, carrée et oblongue, est reproduite à Ukhaïdir, sous l'influence directe des monuments de Syrie, pensons-nous.

101 A Kasr al-Ḫair al ʿSharqi, cf. Seyrig, op. cit., Fig. 1.
102 Ibid., Fig. 2.
103 A Kasr al-Ḫair al-Gharbi; Schlumberger, op. cit., Pl. XXX.
104 Butler, op. cit., Div. II, Sec. B, Pl. VIII.
105 Ibid., Div. II, Sec. B, Fig. 39.
106 Miss Bell (plan dans Ukhaïdir) reconstitue une coupole sur le carré.
107 Herzfeld, Samarra, relève la parenté entre les portes d'entrée et les salles de réception en pays oriental. (Importance de la "porte" dans le cérémonial des su-
Quant à la tour sur quart de cercle, elle provient sans doute aussi de la Perse sassanide. M. A. Godard a publié le plan d’un autel de feu à Čahār-ṭāk dont la façade comporte aux angles des piliers-contreforts en quart de cercle. Le monument serait d’origine sassanide.

Comme la salle du trône de Mshattā, les doubles salles d’entrée des châteaux omeyyades sont un curieux mélange d’éléments sassanides et syriens. Dans le premier cas, le plan est persan, mais altéré par la tradition locale, dans l’autre cas un plan courant, banal de la région est amplifié par l’adjonction d’une pièce d’architecture sassanide. Cette combinaison d’éléments hétérogènes est parfaitement réussie. De toute évidence, les architectes cherchent à enrichir et à varier des plans traditionnels, à rehausser l’éclat d’une cour qui veut frapper l’imagination par le faste de ses demeures.

**La Technique.**—Avant de conclure, un mot sur la technique qui confirmera ce qui précède. Des éléments purement syro-palestiniens, les murs d’enceinte en pierre de taille avec blocage, la porte tripartite de la salle du trône de Mshattā, l’entrée de Kašr al-Ḥair al-Gharbī, sont combinés avec des parties mésopotamiennes: baits en brique de Mshattā ou d’al-Ṭūba, le haut des murs d’enceinte de Kašr al-Ḥair al-Gharbī. Parfois (al-Kharāna) le caractère mésopotamien de la construction est sans mélange, parfois le caractère syrien domine (al-Ḳastāl).

Avant l’arrivée des Omeyyades dans le pays peu d’éléments mésopotamiens s’étaient glissés dans l’architecture de la région. La construction en pierre de taille, pratiquée depuis longtemps dans le pays domine. À côté d’elle, la manière byzantine de bâtir avec des briques et des pierres de taille par assises alternantes s’était introduite. Mais on a constaté à maintes reprises que la construction en brique des Byzants est essentiellement différente de celle de la région mésopotamienne. La dimension des briques, l’épaisseur des couches de mortier, le mode de construction des voûtes (en tranches verticales en Mésopotamie, en tranches horizontales à Byzance, arcs ovoïdes ou même brisés en Mésopotamie, cintrés à Byzance), tout différe.

C’est cette manière mésopotamienne que les Omeyyades introduisent dans le pays. Ce nouveau langage architectural provoque une véritable révolution du style qui engendrera l’architecture musulmane proprement dite.

**Conclusion.**—Quelles conclusions tirerons-nous de cette étude des origines? Les châteaux omeyyades sont le produit d’un mélange des styles. L’apport mésopotamien est très important, plus important, nous semble-t-il, qu’on n’a voulu admettre jusqu’ici. Nous avons rencontré les tours-contreforts, les baits, le plan de la salle du trône, les salles d’entrée carrées dans l’art sassanide.

Mais le problème ne paraît point résolu ainsi. Le trait marquant de ces châteaux, présence

---

112 Godard, op. cit., pp. 32 ff., Figs. 14–22.
114 Cf. surtout Strzygowski, op. cit.; et Herzfeld dans les articles sur Mshattā que nous avons mentionnés.
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des appartements dans une enceinte fortifiée, ne s’est retrouvé ni dans l’art sassanide ni dans l’art syro-palestinien.

Nous savons bien qu’au palais de Dioclétien à Split, cette combinaison avait été réalisée quatre cents ans avant les Omeyyades et de façon bien plus grandiose que dans aucune des œuvres que nous avons étudiées. Mais la distance dans le temps, les différences de style excluent une influence de l’une sur les autres. Les monuments intermédiaires manquent. Parmi les nombreux restes de maisons d’habitation et de camps qu’a livrés le sol de la Syrie et de la Palestine aucune habitation fortifiée pourvue de tours de défense ne s’est trouvée qui soit comparable à nos châteaux.

Certes, des fouilles futures peuvent réserver des surprises. Mais jusqu’à nouvel ordre, nous considérons le plan des châteaux que nous avons étudiés comme une création des architectes omeyyades. L’originalité en restera pour nous un fait acquis dans tous les cas: sa valeur propre réside dans cette réunion d’éléments sassanides et syriens. Le fait et la magnificence des palais persans s’associent à la précision et à l’équilibre de plans puisés dans la tradition antique.

Cet art est comme un point de cristallisation des écoles d’architecture de l’immense empire omeyyade. Placés à la croisée des chemins d’Orient et d’Occident, et au point de rencontre de deux époques, de l’antiquité qui disparaît et du moyen-âge qui s’annonce, les artistes omeyyades ont trouvé les formules qui vont déterminer l’aspect de l’art autour de la Méditerranée orientale pendant les siècles à venir.

**INFLUENCES**

L’influence qu’a exercée cette architecture omeyyade sur l’art musulman nous paraît en effet très importante. Les éléments nous manquent cependant pour en apprécier toute l’étendue. Les régions de l’Est, la Mésopotamie, l’Iran sont presqu’inexplorées à cet égard. Aussi revenons-nous aux châteaux d’Ukhaidir et de Sâmarra et aux quelques khâns ou forts arabes que Miss G. L. Bell mentionne pour montrer l’action de cet art à l’Est.115

Ukhaidir et Kašr-al-‘Âshik de Sâmarra 116 nous paraissent dériver, à nous, en ligne droite du plan de Mshattâ. Le schéma, enceinte rectangulaire fortifiée à tours-contreforts arrondies, court également rectangulaire, entourée de constructions qui s’adossent au mur d’enceinte, et plus particulièrement la division du plan en trois bandes oblongues dont celle du milieu comporte, en enfilade, la salle du trône, la cour et le corps du bâtiment d’entrée, sont les mêmes à Mshattâ et aux châteaux mésopotamiens. Ceux-ci, il est vrai, suivent plus étroitement sur certains points, la tradition persane. Les proportions de l’enceinte, rectangulaire, non carrée, la construction et le plan de la salle du trône, l’emplacement de cette dernière, séparée de l’enceinte par un appartement privé du prince, semblent marquer un retour à la tradition purement sassanide (comparez Kašr-i-Shîrîn, Fîrûz-Abâd). Décor et technique enfin sont
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115 G. L. Bell, *Amurath to Amurath* (London, 1924) et dans *Ukhaidir*.
mésopotamiens. Toutefois, les caractéristiques essentielles du schéma de Mshattā restent conservées.

Nous l’avons dit: aussi longtemps que l’existence du château-fort d’al-Hira restera une hypothèse, Mshattā sera le point de départ de cette série de châteaux.

Quant aux petits forts, “Atshânh, Khubbâz et d’autres que Miss Bell a relevés en Mésopotamie 117 et qui sont les antécédents des innombrables khâns musulmans des siècles suivants, le “khan” de Kāla’ī-Kuhna les préfigure à l’époque sassanide. Si toutefois le plan carré devient de rigueur dans la région, c’est sous l’action sans doute de l’architecture omeyyade. De même, maints détails, la forme des portes d’entrées, les dimensions et la disposition des tours-contreforts ne s’expliquent, pensons-nous, que par l’influence de cette architecture. Ces forts sont comme des schémas sassanides, trempés dans l’art omeyyade. Cet art leur a imposé certains caractères qui leur resteront acquis pour les siècles à venir.

En Afrique du Nord aucun monument apparenté à nos châteaux n’avait été signalé jusqu’ici. Il en est cependant qui en reproduisent le plan-type assez fidèlement. M. G. Marçais, en passant devant le ribât de Sousse (couvent-château-fort), 118 daté du IXe siècle, 119 dit que la disposition générale en est tout à fait celle d’un fort byzantin. “Elle comporte une enceinte rectangulaire dont les angles et le milieu des côtés sont flanqués de tours. Muraille et saillants sont ornés vers le sommet d’une suite d’arcatures formant corniche. Six des tours sont arrondies.” 120


117 Bell, Ukhaidir, Pl. 46; et idem, Amurath to Amurath, p. 120 ff., Figs. 164–68; p. 86, Fig. 69 et Fig. 129; p. 139, Fig. 76.
119 La date de construction ne ressort pas avec précision du texte: pour le mur d’enceinte, deux dates (821 et 859), de construction et de reconstruction, sont indiquées.
120 Ibid., pp. 47 ff.
122 Nous tirons certaines de nos observations du croquis, Fig. 20, p. 48, que M. Marçais ajoute au texte.
Il y a là, nous semble-t-il, assez d'éléments pour considérer ce ribâṭ comme provenant de l'architecture omeyyade.

L'architecture civile de la région, ainsi que celle de la Mésopotamie, n'étant pas encore assez connue, il faut nous contenter, pour le moment, de ces quelques remarques sur l'action de l'architecture omeyyade. Elles nous paraissent suffire pour en indiquer le rayon d'influence. De la Mésopotamie jusqu'en Afrique du Nord, l'art musulman du IXe siècle porte son empreinte; certes pour en connaître toute la portée notre vue sommaire est trop fragmentaire. Mais notre but n'était que d'insister sur le tourment que signifie l'avènement des Omeyyades dans l'histoire de l'architecture du proche Orient.  

**SUMMARY**

The author defines the special features of the Umayyad castles, viz., a square enclosure with round buttressed towers and dimensions based on a unit of 35 m. equal to 100 ft.; in the interior, around a square court with portico, are apartments, or “baits,” backed up against the enclosure wall in a repeat arrangement and hermetically closed from each other.

The camp of al-Kastal, which has so far been attributed to the Romans or the Ghassānids, should be added to the series of the Umayyad castles. It has the same plan, the same dimensions, and the same interior arrangement. The presence of a mosque, which dates from the same period, confirms this attribution, which allows one to study the genesis of the style from a new point of view.

The origins of this type of plan were then investigated. It does not represent the imitation of a fixed prototype, but it is the result of a combination of various elements, viz., the proportions of the Syrian square and the manner of building Sasanian enclosure walls and buttressed towers. The “baits,” the throne hall of Mshattā, the double entrance halls of al-Ṭūba, Khirbat al-Minya, Khirbat al-Mafdjār, and Djabal Sais derive from Sasanian art, but are altered by elements of Syrian architecture.

**Conclusion.**—As long as the castles of the Lakhmids of al-Ḥira are known to us only from the accounts of Arab authors and are not a historical reality the Umayyad castles should be considered as the starting point of Muslim civil architecture.

**Influences.**—The castles of Ukhaifūr and of Samarra derive from Mshattā, and the ribâṭ of Susa (Sousse) derives from the simple plan of the Umayyad castles. These have exercised an influence reaching from Mesopotamia to North Africa.

---

123 Communication de 16 juin 1946:
Par une série de circonstances défavorables, il m'a été impossible de prendre connaissance de l'article de M. J. Sauvaget, “Remarques sur les monuments omyyades,” Jour. asiatique, CCXXXI (Janvier–Mars, 1939), 1–59. Cet article n'a effectivement paru qu'en 1940 ou 1941, mais je n'ai pu en prendre connaissance que ces jours-ci.

124 Translated from the French text of the author.
—ED.
MATERIAL FOR A HISTORY OF ISLAMIC TEXTILES UP TO THE MONGOL CONQUEST

BY R. B. SERJEANT

CHAPTER VII *

TABARISTÂN, KÜMIS, DJURDJÂN

TABARISTÂN

W E ARE FORTUNATE IN POSSESSING FROM EARLY SOURCES A FAIRLY COMPLETE RECORD OF the textiles in the province of Tabaristan (Map 1). Ibn Isfandiyār (613 H. [1216-17 A.D.]), who wrote a history of this district, had access to authors, both Arabic and Persian, whose works have now perished. The most interesting piece of information which he has preserved is that the Ispahbad, or semi-independent ruler of that country, sent the Abbasid Mansūr exactly the same tax as had gone to the Sasanians. Mansūr had previously sent him a crown and a robe of honor presumably of the tirāzī kind. This seems also to have been a custom handed down from the Sasanians. The tax consisted of three hundred bales of green silk carpets and quilts, the same amount of good colored cotton, the same amount of gold-embroidered garments of the kind called Rūyānī and Lāfüradj (from Lapūr, south of Mamātīr on the river Bābul), and the same amount of saffron of a kind unequaled in all the world.1

This records the unbroken continuity of the Sasanian system into Muslim times, probably with a similar type of indirect government. Other instances of this type of tax in kind have been previously discussed. It was a Sasanian custom to take the textiles peculiar to the province as part of the tax.

In the reign of Sulaimān ibn ʿAbd al-Malik, the general Yazīd ibn Muhallab invaded the country and forced the Ispahbad to make peace on condition that an annual tribute of 4,700,000 dirhams, four hundred ass loads of saffron, and four hundred men each bearing a shield (turs), a silver cup (djām ḥaḍa), a head scarf (ṭailasān), and a silk saddle cushion (numruḵ ḥarīr) was sent.2

The introduction of Tabarī stuffs to the caliphs, of which the historian Tabarī gave an account, seems to coincide with the payment of the tribute to Mansūr (136-58 H. [753-74 A.D.]) in Tabarī carpets:

Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Sulaimān said: “I heard my father say that the first person to use Tabarī as upholstery was al-Mahdī. That was because his father ordered him to stay in Rayy. Tabarī carpets were brought to him from Tabaristan, and he used to use them as furnishings. Then snow and willow twigs (khilāf) were placed round it. Heavy cloth (khaish) was procured for them, and Tabarī stuff found favor with them.” 3

---


Djähiz in the second century, knew that the "best ṭailasāns are the Ṭabarārī Rūyānī kind, then those of Amul, then the Egyptian kind (Miṣrī), then the Kūmīs kind." He, however, placed "Ṭabarārī robes (aksiya), then wool (lined?) with wool" after the Egyptian woolen robes (aksiya) and those of Fars, Khuzistan, Shiraz, and Isfahan. In another work of his he said: "I bought a white Ṭabarārī robe (kisā') for four hundred dirhams, and from the evidence of their eyes, the people thought it was Kūmīsí worth a hundred dirhams." Djähiz lived into the reign of al-Mu'tasim in the early third century, and there is a very pretty story in the Aghānī the subject of which is just those very Ṭabarārī carpets. The singer Ishāk ibn Ibrahim related:

One day Abdallah ibn Ṭahir brought forth to me two verses on a scrap of paper, and said: "These are two verses which I found on an Isbahbūdī Ṭabarārī carpet (bisāt), which was brought to me from Ṭabaristān. I should like you to set them to music for me." I read them over, and they went as follows:

Fast close that weeping eye, refrain
From unavailing passion's strain.
Alas, my tears scarce cease to fall,
But plaintive flute doth grief recall.

So I set them to music, and on the morrow I took them to him. He admired the song and presented me with a magnificent gift. He became very much enamored of the lines and often used to ask for them to be sung. I taught them to all his slave girls, and his fondness for the song became widely known.

Now, one day al-Mu'tasim was in the audience room and the spring furnishings (furṣḥ al-Rabi') were being displayed in front of him, when a carpet of brocade (bisāt al-dibādī), extremely beautiful, passed in front of him, with the above couplet upon it, and in addition, the following:

Death I know can be none other
Than to be without thy lover.
Two loves lie there within thy heart.
Both old and new can claim their part.

So he ordered the carpet to be taken to Abdallah ibn Ṭahir, saying to the messenger: "Tell him, I know of your fondness for having this verse sung. So when this carpet fell into my hands, I thought I should like to make your pleasure in it complete."

Abdallah was very pleased at being sent this message, made much of it, and said to me: "By Allah, Abu Muhammad, in truth, my pleasure at the completion of this verse is greater than my pleasure in anything else. So set them to music along with the first two verses." I did so.

The note of the editor of the Aghānī suggests that these carpets were named after the
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6 Djähiz, Kitāb al-Ḥayawān (Cairo, 1905-7), III, 8.
7 Abu l-Farādż al-Isfahānī, Kitāb al-Aghānī (Cairo, 1927-36), V, 428-29.
little town of Isfahbad\(^8\) in Džilân (Gilan). This, however, was a little-known place, and I venture to suggest that these garments were named after the Isphahbads themselves and were a part of the tribute which came to Baghdad. They ruled there both before and after the Muslim conquest as a semi-independent dynasty, and according to a later passage they controlled at least a part of the industry.

Ya'qūbī\(^9\) (278 H. [391 A.D.]) knew that “in it are made Ṭabarī carpets (fursh), and Ṭabarī robes (aksiya).” Ibn al-Faḵīr\(^10\) reported that “the people of Ṭabaristān, Dailam, and Kazvin share in the manufacture of Rūyānī, and Āmulī robes, and also in the manufacture of the garment shustaka, napkins (mandil), and many kinds of cloth.”\(^11\) The Kitāb al-Muwashshāh\(^12\) mentions that fashionable ladies wore Ṭabarī cloaks (ardiya).

Iṣṭakhrī said of the products of Ṭabaristān:

From Ṭabaristān there is brought ibrīsm silk, which supplies all countries, there being no town in Islam which has more ibrīsm than it has. . . . In Ṭabaristān many garments of silk (ẖaṛrīr) are made which are transported everywhere. The same is true of wool, carpets (fursh), and robes (aksiya).\(^13\)

Other manuscripts mention in addition “various kinds of ibrīsm silk garments, robes, wool, linen shirts (mīḍra’), napkins (mandil), Ṭabarī carpets (fursh), cloaks for women (mī’zar), silk (ẖaṛrīr) garments.” He further noted that the eggs of the silkworm (bīzr dūd al-ibrīsm) always came from Džurdžān.

Ibn Ḥawkal gave an amplified and modified version:

In the whole of Ṭabaristān ibrīsm silk is manufactured and taken to all countries. In the whole world there is no country, in Islamic or heathen territory, which can come anywhere near Ṭabaristān for abundance of ibrīsm silk. . . . From Ṭabaristān various kinds of ibrīsm silk garments, and precious robes of wool (aksiya al-ṣūf), admirable camelots (barrakānāt) come. In all the world

---


\(^{9}\) Ya’qūbī, *Kitāb al-Boldān, Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum (= B.G.A.)* (Leyden, 1892), VII, 277.


\(^{11}\) See the “Glossary” to Tabari, *Annales*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1879–1901), p. ccxxi, “shustaka.” I suggest here a reading “shasāṭik” as a plural of “shustaka,” instead of “sh s tan k” of the text. Brünnow, *Kitāb al-Djamākīr*, ed. F. Krenkow (Hyderabad, 1938), p. 202, mentions sh stakāt garments which are made from asbestos called by the Persian emperor Adhar-shust. It was so named because, as related in many passages in the geographers, when they wished to clean this material they placed it in the fire. He mentioned, referring to the year 390 H. (1000 A.D.), one of these cloths which was tested in the fire. The asbestos was made into threads mixed with cotton flakes. Generally, however, the name seems simply to mean a napkin of some kind. Cf. Ibn Abī ‘Uṣāībī, *‘Uyūn al-Anbāʾ fi Ṭabḥāt al-Aṭībāʾ*, ed. A. Müller (Cairo, 1299 H. [1882 A.D.], Preface, Königsberg, 1884), I, 217, where a sh staka is used to contain a drug. See also Thaʿalibī, *Yatimat al-Dahr* (Damascus, 1866–67), III, 178, where a word “sustadja” is mentioned.


MAP 1—TABARISTAN, KUMIS, DJURDJAN, AND DIBAL
there are no robes which fetch the price that their robes, camelots, and miṭṭaf cloaks do. When they contain gold they are like those of Fars in price or even a little more expensive. In Ṭabaristān too, are made napkins of cotton (mandīl) and Sharābiya (a type of linen garment), plain and gold-embroidered cushions (dāsātīk sādīdja wa mudḥahhaba), there being no equal to their gold (woven garments) for wear known among their clothes. Their cotton is like the cotton of Ṣaʿda with a yellowish tint, a fine kind of it being made which is much liked by the people of Iraq.\textsuperscript{14}

Maḳdisī\textsuperscript{15} remarked fields of flax (kattān), and of hemp (ḳunnab) in it and said:

From Ṭabaristān come the robes (aksiya) which are preferable to those of Fars, ṭailasāns, and garments of coarse cloth (khaish) which are borne to various lands. A great quantity is sold in Mecca, worth a few dirhams, or a great many, which are called “Meccan” in the west, as well as bands (or girdles, lafāfa).\textsuperscript{16}

On the authority of al-Yazdādī (who wrote between 366 and 403 H. [976 and 1012 A.D.]), Ibn Isfandiyār gave an account of the cloth trade in Ṭabaristān:

In early times there used to come to Ṭabaristān and thence to be exported to the most distant countries in the earth, satin (aṭlaš), woven stuff (nasād), priceless 'Attābī, and different kinds of precious brocade, valuable sīkāṭān . . . . ibrāshīm curtains (parda) and those of wool, women's fine cloaks (mī'zar), felts (anmād) better than Djiḥramī, carpets “in relief” (kālī-hā-yi-maḥfūrī).\textsuperscript{17}

From here these cloths must have been spread among the tribes of Central Asia, for he also said that Amul was a market for goods for the Saḵšin and Bulghār up to his own time, and that traders from Iraq, Syria, Khurasan, and the borders of Hindustan used to come to Amul for trading.

The Lāṭā́if al-Maʿārif has little to add to the other authors:

Among its own special products are the orange robes (aksiya), napkins of coarse cloth (manādīl khaish), womens' dresses (ghilāla, usually yellow, and often transparent), and cotton caps worn under the turban (ʻaraḵyāt\textsuperscript{18}). One of the strange things about Ṭabaristān is that dirhams are taken to it for the purchase of napkins (mandīl) from all countries, but they are not taken from it.\textsuperscript{19}

With regard to the custom of sending Ṭabarī textiles to Mecca it is relevant to quote the following passage from Ibn Isfandiyār:

The Ispahbad Husām al-Dawla wa’l-Dīn Ardashīr ibn Husain, the ruler of Ṭabaristān (about 579 H. [1183-4 A.D.]) used to set aside five bales of silk for the poor of Mecca, and five bales

\textsuperscript{14} Ibn Hawḵal, Viae et regna. . . . Descriptio ditionis moslemicae, B.G.A., ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1873), II, 272.

\textsuperscript{15} Maḳdisī (Muḳaddasi), Descriptio imperii Moslemici, B.G.A. (Leyden, 1875; 2d ed., 1906), III, 354.


\textsuperscript{17} Ibn Isfandiyār, op. cit., p. 33.


\textsuperscript{19} Thaʻālibī, Lāṭā́if al-Maʿārif, ed. P. de Jong (Leyden, 1867), p. 112.
The same author, also, 21 in a list of taxes which Saladin prescribed on conquering Egypt, included an impost of two hundred forty dinars on the Tabari manufacture levied at Miṣr and Cairo.

The author, 22 stated, too, that the Fatimid caliphs had their audience chamber "hung with Dabīḵī curtains (ṣutūr) and carpeted with splendid Ṭabarī of Ṭabaristān worked with gold (mudḥahhab) . . . the throne (ṣarīr) was covered with Kūrkūbī."

After the Mongol conquest, Abu 'I-Fidā' merely quoted Ibn Hāwkāl and Muhallābī for Ṭabaristān's richness in silk. 23 Gaston Wiet 24 has described a silken stuff which he deduces to have come from Ṭabaristān, and which has human figures represented upon it. The date lies about the middle of the fifth century Ḥ. (eleventh century A.D.).

The stuffs which we have been discussing were for the most part made in Amul, the capital of the province. Djāhiṣ placed the ṭalāsāns made in Rūyān before those made in Amul, but these two are the best kinds. Ibn Rusta 25 and Ibn al-Faqīḥ 26 both remarked that the Ṭabarī carpets were made there, but the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam 27 has a fairly long list:

Amul produces linen cloth, kerchiefs of linen and cotton (dastār-i-khīsh), Ṭabarī rugs (farsh), Ṭabarī mats (ḥāṣir) . . . white ʿĀlīsh giiks with gold thread (zarbāft), and Dailami giiks of zarbaft, various kerchiefs shot with gold thread (dastārcha-yi-zarbāft), shagreen (kimūkhtā).

Maḵdisī 28 said that Amul had "wonderfully lovely carpets, and pillows (mirfaḵ) . . . it has a profitable trading center and skilled weavers." Yāḵūt remarked: "In Amul are made the Ṭabarī prayer carpets (ṣadīḍjāda) and the lovely carpets (busūt)." 29

To the east of Amul lie Māmāṭīr and Sari; the former according to the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam 30 produced thick reed mats (ḥāṣir-i-sītabr) of very good quality; the latter which was once capital of the province was noted for silk tissues (dji-a-yi-ḥāṣir va-parniyān). Mustawfī 31 mentioned cotton as grown at Sari in plenty, but not silk, except in the dependencies of the near-by Kābūd Djiāma.

The Rūyānī stuffs have been remarked upon several times in the course of this chapter. The Ḥudūd 32 adds that it exports "the red woolen cloth from which raincoats (bārānī) are

20 Ibn Isfandiyār, op. cit., p. 71.
21 Makrizī, Ḥitiṣ, Description topographique et historique de l'Égypte, trans. by U. Bouriant and P. Casa-
23 Ḫalkashandi, Ṣubḥ al-ʿAšā (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), III, 499.
26 Ibn al-Faqīḥ, op. cit., p. 150.
28 Maḵdisī, op. cit., p. 359.
29 Yāḵūt, op. cit., I, 68.
made as well as blue gilims which they use in Ćabaristan itself.” Balādhuri 33 noted that Rūyān and Damāvand paid their tax to the early Arabs in money, garments (thiyāb), and vessels (āniya). 34

KŪMIS

Most of our authors have commented on the stuffs of Kūmis, and in a list of exports, Djāhiz 35 gave “garments of goat hair or camel hair (amsāḥ), umbrellas (djitr), and taşla-sāns of wool (ṣūf),” but he added that those taşla-sāns manufactured in Egypt, were of a superior quality. Ya’kübī 36 said: “Its inhabitants are Persians, and the most skilled of people, making the valuable Kūmis garments of wool.” Ibn Rusta 37 found that “most of what is sold there consists of white robes (aksiya) for taşla-sāns.” Ištakhrī 38 and Ibn Ḥawkāl 39 agreed that “well-known robes (aksiya) are taken from Kūmis to the provinces.” The Ḫudūd 40 differs little: “Kūmis produces Kūmis textiles and fruit of which there is no like in the world. They are exported to Djurdjān and Ćabaristan.”

Maḳdisī was rather more explicit:

Now, concerning Kūmis, they have white napkins (mandil) of cotton with a border (mu’lama), both great and small, plain (sāḥḥījī) and with a selvage (muḥashshāt), the kerchiefs of which may fetch two thousand dirhams. They have also robes (aksiya), taşla-sāns, and fine woolen cloth (thiyāb). 41

Damghan in particular produces “dessert napkins with fine borders (dastār-hā-yi-shārāb bā ‘alam-hā-yi-nīkū)” according to the Ḫudūd. 42 Yākūt 43 noted that excellent napkins (mandil) were made in Simnān.

DJURDIJĀN

The province of Djurdjān manufactured silks, mainly at the capital, a town of the same name which was finally taken by Yazīd ibn Muhallab about (98 H. [716 A.D.]). The Djirāb al-Dawla of Ma’mūn’s reign gives a thousand pieces of ibrīsm silk as being part of the tribute of the caliphs. Among its exports, Djāhiz 44 numbers soft yarmāḵ 45 and excellent ibrīsm silk.

The geographers bear a monotonous similarity to one another. Ya’kübī 46 said that various garments of silk (ḥarīr) are made there, and Ibn al-Faḵīh: “The people of Djurdjān have ibrīsm silk not to be found in other countries, and it is exported everywhere. They are

33 Balādhuri, op. cit., text, p. 338, trans., II, 44.
36 Ya’kübī, op. cit., p. 276.
38 Ištakhrī, op. cit., p. 211.
40 Ḫudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 135.
41 Maḳdisī, op. cit., p. 367.
42 Ḫudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 135. Or is this “napkins of sharāb,” a kind of linen cloth, and not “dessert napkins?”
43 Yākūt, op. cit., III, 141.
44 Djāhiz, op. cit., p. 344.
45 This word is uncertain and the editor suggests narmāḵ (Persian narmah), which was a kind of soft cloth. Cf. Ṭabarī, op. cit., Glossary, and Djawālīḵī, Kitāb al-Muʿarrab, ed. E. Sachau (Leipzig, 1867), p. 146.
46 Ya’kübī, op. cit., p. 277.
skilled in the manufacture of brocade, veils (or headcloths, maḵānī'), garments, curtains (ṣūṭūr).

Iṣṭaḵrī said: "A great deal of ibrīsīm silk is produced there. The eggs of the silkworm for the ibrīsīm silk of Ṭabaristān are brought from Djurdjān, but no ibrīsīm is produced from the eggs of the silkworm of Ṭabaristān." Ibn Ḥawḵāl noted: "The Khazars have no clothing (malbūs), which is only brought to them from the districts of Djurdjān, Ṭabaristān, Azerbaijan, Rūm (Byzantium), and the neighboring lands." This is an important indication of the large trade with Central Asia. The famous textile found by Stein in Turkestan may have come from this region. Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi noted that it had Djurdjānī figured washī stuff.

The Ḥudūd says: "Djurdjān produces black silk textiles, long veils (vikāya), brocade (dībā), and raw silk textiles (ḵāzin)." Makḍisī added: "The people of Djurdjān have silken veils (maḵānī ḵazziyāt) which are taken to Yemen... and brocade of a poor kind." The Latāʿīf al-Maʿārif 54 says: "Some of the products special to Djurdjān are the black garments, stuffs of twisted (silk?) (mābārim), poppy colored garments (?) (ṭhayāb Ḵaškhāshīya) which excel in fineness and softness the Ḥaffī garments of Nishapur." Yakūt quoted the earlier authorities for the exports of ibrīsīm silk. Like so many other cities, Djurdjān was ruined at the Mongol conquest.

The second city in Djurdjān province was Astarābād, a place of remote antiquity, the refounding of which is, however, ascribed to the Arabs at the end of the first century of the Hijra. Iṣṭaḵrī 56 informed us that "much ibrīsīm silk is derived from it. They have a seaport (Ābaskūn) and sail thence to the Khazars, Derbent, Džīl, and Dailam." The Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam 57 says: "From it come many silk textiles such as mubram and zaʿfūrī." Makḍisī knew that "most of them are weavers of Ḿazz silk, and skilled in its manufacture."

The port of Djurdjān and Astarābād was Ābaskūn of which the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam says: "It is a haunt for merchants from the whole world trading on the Khazar (Caspian) Sea... From it come shagreen and woolen cloth (ḵīmūḵta va-paḵṣmīn)."

After the conquest by the Mongols, Mustawfī noted that cotton and silk were found in Djurdjān and silk in Astarābād.

48 Iṣṭaḵrī, op. cit., p. 213.
49 Ibn Ḥawḵāl, op. cit., p. 283.
50 A. Stein, On Ancient Central Asian Tracks (London, 1933), which contains an illustration in color of a textile with the Sasanian pearl pattern.
51 Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, Al-ʾĪḥād al-Farīd (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), IV, 268.
52 Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 133.
53 Makḍisī, op. cit., p. 367.
54 Thaʿlabī, op. cit., p. 114.
55 Yakūt, op. cit., II, 49.
56 Iṣṭaḵrī, op. cit., p. 213.
57 Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 134.
58 Makḍisī, p. 358.
59 Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 134.
60 Mustawfī Ḵawṣīnī, op. cit., p. 156.

Supplementary note.—Hamadhānī (Maḵāmāt [Beirut, 1924], pp. 119 f.), in the fourth century of the Hijra, describes a napkin (mīnīl): "It is the weave of Djurdjān, and the manufacture of Arradjān. I came across it and bought it; my wife made part into trousers (ṣarāwīl), and part into a napkin. Twenty dirārā were used for the trousers, but I took this length out of her hands and gave it to the embroiderer (muṭṭārīz) so that he made it as you see and gave it a tirāz (or embroidered it, ṭarrazahā)."
CHAPTER VIII

DJIBÄL

The great ceramic center Rayy or Rhages, in DJIBÄL, besides being famed for a kind of lustered pottery and the ware painted with human figures, was also a noted textile center. From several indications in the passages quoted below, this city must have been the possessor of a tiräz factory.

Baihaqi 1 related that the wife of Khâlid ibn Barmak sent her husband a robe (kiswa) from Rayy, a folded (or shrunk) tâlásan (tâlásan mutabbâk). Though no textiles are mentioned in the Djirâb al-Dawla as being sent with the tribute to Baghdad, another early source, Djâhiz, 2 gave a list of exports which includes "yarmak 3 weapons, fine cloth, combs (amshât), royal kalânisuwa caps (al-kâlânis al-malikîya), Kassî stuffs (al-Ḳassiyât), and linen." Ibn al-Fâkîh 4 (290 H. [903 A.D.]) added that, besides silk (ṭarîr) and glazed (mudählt) pottery, they had white tiräz robes (aksiya), and splendid white tâlásans, as well as the munaiyar garments (a stuff with a double warp).

Iṣṭahkri remarked: "There are brought from Rayy and exported to other places, cotton which is taken to Baghdad and Azerbaijan, munaiyar garments, striped cloaks (abrdâd), and robes (aksiya)." 5 The Ḥudûd mentions: "It produces cotton stuffs (kirbâs), cloaks (burd), cotton. From its districts come woolen tâlásans (scarves worn on the head)." 6 Maḳdisî, too, hardly varied, noting that their cloth (bazz) is renowned, and that "there are brought from Rayy the cloaks (burd), the munaiyar, cotton, and needles (masâll)." 7

The Laṭā'if al-Ma'ârif states:

The specialties of Rayy are the cloaks (burd) of Rayy of the same description as the Yemen cloaks called 'Adanîyât because of their resemblance to the cloaks of Aden in Yemen. 8 Al-Murâdî said in describing a falcon (shâhîn): "You would think, when he alights on the swampy ground, that he had scattered the pearls above a robe of Rayy (burd Râzî)." Another of the specialties of Rayy consists of the munaiyar garments. 9

This note on the resemblance of these garments to the Aden type is most interesting;

---

1 Al-Baihaqi (Ibrâhim ibn Muhammad), Kitâb al-Mahâsin wa l-Masâwi, ed. P. Schwally (Giessen 1902), p. 211.
3 For yarmak see the note in Chapter VII, n. 45. Kassî stuffs are more fully discussed in Chapter XVI, but the reading here is probably incorrect.
7 Maḳdisî (Mukaddasî), Descriptio imperii Moslemici, B.G.A. (Leyden, 1876; 2d ed.; 1906), III, 395-96.
8 These may have been made by the "ikat" process, and this may be what the author means when he compares the two types, though burd are made of wool. See N. P. Britton, A Study of Some Early Islamic Textiles (Boston, 1938).
9 Tha'âlibî, Laṭā'if al-Ma'ârif, ed. P. de Jong (Leyden, 1876), p. 111.
perhaps one might infer that the original design went from Aden to Persia, and that this might have taken place in the time of the Persian domination of South Arabia. There was a considerable import of textiles of the Sasanian kind into Arabia as we know from a number of sources.

After the conquest, Mustawfi⁴⁰ found that cotton and corn grew well in Rayy. Ghāzān Khān brought back some people to it and tried to bring back its former prosperity. As a cloth manufacturing center, however, it seems to have lost all its importance at the time of its destruction.

All the geographers unite to praise the products of Isfahan, the sole dissentient voice being that of Abu l-Kāsim, whose aim was to satirize the inhabitants of that city.

Ibn Rusta (290 H. [903 A.D.]) knew the products of the districts to the southeast of Isfahan very well, for he said:

In it (Ruwardaštā) are made the carpets (busūt) which chiefs and nobles are not too proud to use as furnishings (farsh), and which are not often found in the possession of the middle and lower classes, their beauty, the excellence of their manufacture, and their durable qualities being renowned throughout all countries. If they are used with the splendid Armenian type of carpeting (farsh), they go very well with it, and the result is very satisfactory. Precious curtains (sutūr) used to be made there, which surpassed those of Mosul and Wāsiṭ in beauty and excellent lasting qualities.¹¹

Djähiz¹² knew of their saffron and fine cloth (thawb) which came from Isfahan, though he placed their robes (aksiya) in an inferior position to the robes of Miṣrī wool, and those from Fars and from Khuzistan.

Ibn al-Faḳīh¹³ remarked that it had been said that there were more Jews, weavers, and adulterers in Isfahan than elsewhere. Benjamin of Tudela¹⁴ also spoke of the many Jews in Isfahan, but the tradition that the Jews were planted there in the time of Nebuchadnezzar seems unreliable.

Ibn al-Faḳīh further mentioned the Iṣfahānī 'Attābī, which was in all likelihood an imitation of the famous Baghdad stuff. He wrote:

..... the second Baghdad, I mean Isfahan and the excellent climate and sweet water with which they have been endowed, and the skill in the various arts which has been given them. They have Merv stuffs and 'Attābī and wonderful mulham stuffs (which had a warp of silk, but a woof of some other material), and cloaks (ḥulla) of ibrīṃ silk, woven and unwoven (understand “with gold”), and Saʿīdī garments.¹⁵

These latter garments were also made in Sana. The common types of material made in many provinces of Islam emphasize the cosmopolitan nature of the city’s industries.


¹² Djähiz, op. cit., pp. 345 and 337.


¹⁵ Ibn al-Faḳīh, op. cit., pp. 50 and 254.
According to Išṭakhrī 16 Isfahan exported also: "From it 'Attābī, washī figured stuffs, and all kinds of silk cloth (thīyāb) and cotton were brought, and sent to Iraq, Pars, Khurasan and the other provinces." This account was expanded by Ibn Ḣawkāl:

It is the emporium of Fars, Djibāl, Khurasan, and Khuzistan. . . . From it are brought the 'Attābī, washī, and other garments of ibrīsm silk and cotton with which Iraq is supplied, and Fars, Djibāl, Khurasan, and Khuzistan. There is nothing like the 'Attābī of Isfahan in excellence, and luster (or quality, djawhariya). Its saffron is exported to Iraq and other places.17

The Hudād18 only gives "silk textiles of different kinds, as cloaks (ḥulla), tabby (Attābī, coarse watered silk), and siklāṭūn."

Of Yahūdīya, the citadel of Isfahan, Makdisī said: "In it there are many great merchants and skilled artisans as well as cloth which is taken to all regions."19 Again he remarked that "it has a cloth market (sūk al-bazzāzīn) after the manufacture of Sidjistān," and that it is famous for its "elegant cloaks (ḥulla) and earthenware (fakhkhār)." These cloaks are included in the list of luxurious stuffs mentioned in the Laṭā'īf al-Ma'ārif10 by a courtier of 'Aḍud al-Dawla.

Idrīsī21 informed us that "at Isfahan there are factories (métiers) where they make rich silken stuffs such as 'Attābī, washī, and others, and cotton stuffs. Fine saffron is also found. After Rayy there is no greater town than Isfahan (in Djibāl)."

Kaẓwīnī was unusually communicative about Isfahan:

It is proverbial for the skill of its artisans and these artisans have a skilled hand for the fine crafts. You cannot see calligraphy (khūṭāt) like that of the people of Isfahan, nor any ornament (tāzwik) like theirs. This applies to their craftsmen in every art—they surpass other craftsmen to such an extent, that their weavers will weave a veil (khimār) of cotton of a length of four dhīrā', the weight of which is four mithkāls.22

Of Nahr Zarīn Rūdī23 in Isfahan, he said: "Coarse thread is washed in this water, becoming soft and easy to the touch as silk."

Abu 'l-Ḳasīm's satire24 has preserved some notes on the costume of Isfahan:

There are spread out therein (i.e., in the houses) Ruwaidasht carpets (zulfiya), Iraq velvets (kuṭuf Sawādīya), Kurdish cloth (muṣūḥ), and Djibrawānī cushions (makhādd). Both in sum-

---

16 Išṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 199.
18 Hudād al-ʿĀlam, p. 131.
20 Thaʿalibī, op. cit., p. 132.
23 G. Le Strange calls this locality Zarīnrūdī, and Ruwaidasht Rūdasht.
25 Tabarī, Annales, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden 1879–1901), II, 785, noted that in the year 68 h. (687–88 A.D.), Damascus was decorated with musūḥ which must have been some kind of hanging. Again (ibid., II, 1170) he mentioned trousers of muṣūḥ, in the year 85 h. (704 A.D.).
When your employer sent you out in the early winter you sit upon carpets (zulliya) and coverlets (‘abâ’). On your bodies you wear garments of rough Mervian weave homespun. . . . Your shirts are of a like nature, and also your turbans. . . . When you wish to appear fine you put on shawls, and your children put on striped cloaks (abrâ’d), and turbans of cotton of dark-blue (kuňlı) color, in the fringes of which hang threads of green and red color.

While Isfahan is under our notice it might be interesting to compare the account of its industries by a certain Raphael de Mans, a European author of the early seventeenth century. This of course, properly speaking, falls outside the scope of our work:

Un autre trafic est celui des toiles d’or, et d’argent faictes à Hispan, zerbaft, faictes par figures de soye, comme à haute lice, en quoy l’on travaille icy en Hispan à merveille avec peu d’instruments; quatre picquets emmânchées l’un dans l’autre suffisent, car icy tous les ouvriers travaillent avec peu de frais. Toutes ces estoiffes avoient cy devant un grand cours et se vendoient bien aux Indes. A présent qu’il y a deffense d’orner de ces estoiffes les pelenquis ordinairement aux Indes, ce trafic est fort anéanti. Tel Charbafe (sha’râf), ouvrier, qui avoit vingt et trente destega (dastgâh), (ouvroi-hit) n’en peut garder deux ou trois, et avec cela ils n’ont pas de l’eau à boire. La plus part de ces ouvriers se sont mis à tisser de la toile joula (ĉûla or ğûlâr), ou des tafetâs.

L’on traﬁque encore de tapis de Turquie, qui se fait icy fort beaux et qui se transportent hors de le pais. Mais ceci ne donne pas un grand denier.27

Other passages describe how golden thread was made there:

Les ouvriers principaux icy sont les Charbaifes (sha’râf), ouvriers en toile d’or, et d’argent et de soye à haute lice, en quoy ils surpassent l’Occident pour de peu faire quelque chose. Il est vray que les zerbaifes, ou estoiffes de l’or de Venise, sont ici plus chères et plus estimées à cause qu’ils sont plus chargées d’or et de l’argent, celles d’ici estant plus à la légère. Mesme dans Yezde, l’on tire si deliâ le fil de talon que l’on le met en estoiff comme or, que durant six mois, l’on auroit de la peine à le discernir d’avec le vrai filet d’or.

Zerkesh (zarkash) sont ceux qui tirent l’or et l’argent en fîlières par fîlières si délicats que à peine l’on le voit.

Makkekou (mâkü-kûb) sont ceux qui, sur des enclumes très polies et marteaux de mesme, aplatisent cet argent et cet or traictes et les femmes des ouvriers les rouvent sur la soye pour les employer.

Ces trois sortes d’ouvriers n’en doivent rien aux nostres pour l’habileté, vu le peu d’instruments dont ils se servent.28

OTHER TEXTILE CITIES IN DJIBÂL

Though Hamadan is so large and famous a town, Makdîsî 29 is the only person who mentioned textiles there: “From Hamadan and its districts come cloth (bazz), fox and sable

28 Ibid., p. 195. There are of course many travelers who have left accounts of manufactures in Isfahan such as Tavernier and others.
The Kazvin robes are mentioned by Ibn al-Faḳīh, and Iṣṭakhrī also added: "Goat hair robes (mar'izzā) and stockings are made there as is well known." Tha'ālibī included these stockings (djawārib) in the list of precious articles of Buwaihid times. Ibn 'ʿAbd Rabbihi mentioned the garments of Dastuwā'ī, and Yākūt added that Dastuwā'ī robes are ascribed to it. Idrīsī reported that these stuffs were manufactured at Antioch and stuff very like them in Damascus.

Kum. Makdisī said: "From Kum come cloth (bazz) and a great deal of saffron." Ibn 'ʿAbd Rabbihi also knew of its saffron.

Ardistan (modern Arūsūn). Yākūt said: "There are brought thence the beautiful garments which are exported everywhere."

Shahrazūr. Abu 'I-Fidā' from earlier sources noted that it had an active commerce in cotton.

In the Īl-Khānīd period, Mustawfī Kazwīnī gave a list of manufacturing cities. Sultānīya, the Mongol capital with its tirāz, has been mentioned previously. The other cities are: Varāmīn, which grew up after the destruction of Rayy, cotton; Farāhān, Asadābād, Nehavand, Rūdbār, cotton; Sāva, Firūzān, Āva, cotton. In the mountainous regions between Iraq (Aḏjamī) and Gilān, Dailamān and Ashḵūr also produce cotton.

Nevertheless, perhaps a better emendation would be Tustarī. See Chap. XIV, n. 25. al-Suyūṭī, Lubb al-Albāb, ed. P. J. Veth, Specimen e litteris orientalibus... (Leiden, 1840–51), p. 105, said, however, that Dastuwā'ī is a place near Ahwāz which exports cloth.
CHAPTER IX

KHURASAN

Much early information on the textile exports of this area is available (Map 2). The širāz system was established there at an early date, for the Aḥānī 1 mentions a certain al-Muʿallā ibn Ṭarīf, a slave given to al-Mahdī by Manṣūr and liberated by his new master: "He was made governor of the širāz factories and post offices (barid) in Khurasan" (ca. 150 H. [767 A.D.]). He was later made governor of Ahwāz. The Ḏirāb al-Dawla cited by Ibn Khaldūn 2 notes that a thousand ingots of silver, and 27,000 garments (thawb) were sent with the tribute from Khurasan to Baghdad. Ibn Khurādābih 3 reported that 1,187 pieces of coarse Kundadjī muslin (kārābis kundadjīya) and striped cloaks (burūd) came from Khurasan as part of the tribute. In the early third century, the Aḥānī 4 mentions Khurāsānī cloaks (kabāʾ) and chests of Khurāsānī cloth presented to a singer by the governor of that province.

Iṣṭakhri, 5 followed by Ibn Ḥawkāl, 6 said: "In Khurasan are the best stuffs of cotton and ibrīsī silk which come from Nishapur and Merv, and the finest cloth (bazz) from Merv." It is worth noting that Iṣṭakhri mentioned these two širāz cities together. The migration of workmen from the širāz of Bokhara to Khurasan about the end of the third or early fourth century was remarked by Nāshākhī, who, however, added that they did not succeed well there.

With regard to Merv, we have more references than to almost any other city. A passage from Ibn Ḥawkāl may help to show its importance to the Abbasids: "From Merv emerged the dynasty of the Banū ʿAbbās, and it was in the house (dār) of the family of Abū ʿAdījm al-Muʿājji that the first black (the color of the Abbasids) ever dyed was dyed, and the Musawwida (their followers) arrayed themselves in it." 7 Now, we know from discoveries of actual examples of Mervian cloth, the type of material made there, and furthermore, that a širāz factory existed though there are no literary allusions to it. It is very reasonable to suppose that the Abbasids established a širāz in the city which must have supplied them with much equipment for their attack on Umayyad power, and it was almost certainly one of the

---

1 Abu ʿl-Faradj al-Iṣfahānī, Kitāb al-Aḥānī (Cairo, 1927–36), VI, 240.
The Merv stuffs resembled those of the Tinnis-Damietta group and bore silk inscriptions. An example will be found in the Répertoire chronologique, dated 293 H. (906 A.D.), the reign of al-Mu'tasfi.

Djähiz knew it as exporting Mervian carpets (ṭīnīsā) and Mervian cloth, and Ya'kübi said: "In it are the excellent garments (ṭīyāb) numbered among the Khurasan garments." Ibn al-Fa'īh added that "the people of Merv have Mervian garments and outstanding mulḥam cloth (with a double warp) which are the finest of their kind." It is probably to those mulḥam stuffs that the Kitāb al-Muwashšā refers when it speaks of mulḥam of ḥazz silk and Khurasan as being worn by elegant ladies and gentlemen in Baghdad.

Iṣṭakhrī gave the following curious notes on the industry:

It produces ibrīṣm silk and much ḵazz silk. I have heard that the origin of ibrīṣm in Djurdjān and Tabaristān was by transference in olden times from Merv. Perhaps the silkworm was brought from it to Tabaristān. From it is brought the cotton which is called after it, soft cotton, and the garments despatched to all regions.

This compares with Ibn Ḥawkal's account:

There is brought from Merv, ibrīṣm silk, and much ḵazz silk. It is said that the origin of ḵazz silk in Djurdjān and Tabaristān in former times was from Merv. From it is brought the cotton which is named after it in other countries. It is of the utmost softness. There are brought from it the garments despatched to all countries.

By "former times" the author is probably referring to some time in the Sasanian era, as silk stuffs were sent from Tabaristān to Iraq before the Muslim conquest. Even Africa and Spain imported or imitated those Mervian stuffs, for "une belle housses d'étoffe mérvienne" is mentioned in Africa in the latter half of the ninth century in Bakri's account of the province's history under Idrīsid rule.

Brief notes occur in the Ḥudud: "Merv produces good cotton textiles of raw silk
(kažin) and of mulhäm silk.” 18 Maḳdisi 19 added: “From Merv come mulhäm stuffs, and head veils (maḳāni) of kaẓz silk, ibrīṣm silk, and cotton.” The Spanish Arab Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi 20 knew that Merv was famous for its garments, mentioning it among other ṭirāz cities, and Tha’alibi 21 reported that al-Mustakfi left the number of 63,000 Khurasan Merv and Shu’alibi 22 garments, and 13,000 Merv turbans (‘imāmā). Miskawaihi 23 called these Merv turbans “Shahidjān” (ca. 372 H. [982 A.D.]), and they were one of the most famous products of the city.

The loose sense in which the term Mervi was applied was commented upon by Tha’alibi (350–429 H. [961–1073 A.D.]):

The Arabs used to call every close woven garment brought from Khurasan “Marawi” and every fine garment exported from it “Shahidjān,” because Merv in their eyes was the chief city of Khurasan and was called Merv Shahidjān. The name Shahidjān has persisted for the fine robes to this day. The particular article for which Merv is noted is the mulhäm cloth. One day Abu ʾl-Faṭḥ al-Bustāl al-Kātib said to me: “Do you know a town, the first letter of which is a mīm, whence four things are brought by way of gifts, the name of each beginning with a mīm?” I replied, “If you ask me to say offhand, I do not know, but I could think it over, and perhaps I might discover it.” He answered: “It is Merv, whence come mulhäm, pastry (mulabban), cake (murri), and brooms (makānis).” 24

Idrīsī said: “From this country is derived much silk and ‘boure de soie’ as well as cotton of a superior quality under the name of Merv cotton, which is extremely soft. It is with this cotton that they make the various stuffs designed for export.” 25 Yākūt was more precise and mentioned Shāwaskān, a village of Merv: “To it is ascribed extremely good ibrīṣm silk which I have actually seen.” 26

In the Tāhirid period Merv ceased to be the capital, which was transferred to Nishapur, but this did not affect its fame. In the Mongol invasion it was completely destroyed and all the inhabitants but four hundred artisans murdered. The city never recovered, and though Abu ʾl-Fida ʾi mentioned large exports of ibrīṣm silk and cotton this must refer to the Abbasid period. 27

19 Maḳdisi, op. cit., p. 324.
20 Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi, al-Iḥd al-Parīd (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), IV, 267–68.
22 See R. Dozy, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes, (2d ed.; Paris, 1917), for this as yet uncertain name.
26 Yākūt, op. cit., III, 245.
27 Géographie d’Aboulfeda, text, p. 446, trans., II, 186. Other texts where Mervian stuffs are mentioned are Tanakhī, Nishwār al-Mukāṣara, Table Talk of a Mesopotamian Judge, ed. and trans. by D. S. Margoliouth, Or. Trans. Fund, text, p. 218, trans., p. 229; Mutanabbī, Diwān (Beirut, 1882), p. 17, who calls it “ape’s dress,” and The Arabian Nights, trans. by E. W. Lane (New York, 1927), p. 326. As an epithet, the adjective “soft” is usually applied to it. Al-Muṣṭarrazī (Nāṣir
Nishapur, too, was early famed for its textile manufactures. The name of the city is derived from the Sasanian Shapur, either the first or second monarch of that name. Possibly after the fashion of Persian rulers, prisoners of war and deportees were settled there. Its prosperity, however, dates from the time when Abdallah ibn Tahir made it his capital in the third (ninth) century. It is curious that so many cities founded by the Sasanian monarchs should have possessed a ṣīrāz.

Ibn al-Faḳīh (290 H. [903 A.D.]) stated: “The people of Nishapur have the mulḥam and Tahirid cloths, and also tākhtandj and rākhtandj which no other people have.” This Tahir cloth figures in no other geographer, though tākhtandj and rākhtandj are not uncommon. The name would seem to refer to the cloth which was made for the Tahirid governors in Nishapur, possibly with a tīrāz border, the style of which may have persisted after they lost their power. The ‘Arib²⁸ stated that the Caliph al-Muṣṭadīr used to ride in a cloak (ḵabār) of this tākhtandj (twisted material, twisted silk?); al-Hilāl al-Ṣābi’ talked of trousers (ṣarāwīlāt) of Dabīkī, turbans (‘imāmā), shirts (durrā’a), and linings of tākhtandj.³⁰

Iṣṭakhrī³¹ was very brief: “Various kinds of cotton and ibrism silk are made there which are taken to all the countries of Islam and all the heathen countries on account of their abundance and excellence.” Ibn Ḥawkāl was more prolix:

There are many khans and depots (fundūk) where merchants stay with merchandise for the purpose of doing business there. . . . Those who are not wealthy have a market in another place and depots (fundūk) where those skilled in their crafts stay in constructed booths and among working people. The factories (hānūt) filled with craftsmen such as the makers of kalansuwa caps have in the middle of their market a depot (fundūk) in which are many booths. The shoemakers (asākīfa), coppers (khrārz), ropemakers (ḥabbāl), . . . . are after this style. As for the fundūk of the cloth-makers (bazzāz) and their storehouses (ḵānbārāt) therein, and trade, most countries have a part in that and are not to be found missing. . . . From it are brought various kinds of cloth (bazz) and splendid garments of cotton and ḵazz silk taken to Islamic and some heathen countries on account of their abundance, excellence, and the fondness of kings and nobles for wearing them, because the like of them does not come from any land and could not be made in any other district.³²

The Ḥudūd³³ summarily says: “It produces various textiles (djāma), silk, and cotton.” Maḳdīṣi³⁴ was the first author to notice its tīrāz factory: “There is no equal to the

²⁸ Ibn al-Faḳīh, op. cit., p. 254. It is, however, just possible that this Tahir cloth is named after Tāhirīya in Khoresm where it may have originated, though Tāhirīya is not specifically mentioned as a textile center.
³¹ Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 255.
³² Ibn Ḥawkāl, op. cit., p. 311.
³³ Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 102.
³⁴ Maḳdīṣi, op. cit., pp. 325 and 323.
brocade (diwādj), ẓirāz, clay (ṭīn), Shāhīdjanī (stuff), needles, knives, and white currants (rībās) of Nishapur." Of its products he said:

There are brought from Nishapur white ḥaffī garments, and the baibāf, the ḥaffī Shāhīdjanī turbans ('īmāma), rāḵhtandī and tākhtandī, veils called "between garments" and the mulḥam stuff (with a double warp) with ḵazz silk, the cloth of one color (muṣmat), 'Attābī, Saʿīdī, zarāʾīfī, mushti, striped cloaks (ḥulla), and garments of goat hair (thiyāb al-šaʿr) as well as expensive thread (ghazl). . . . From the districts of Nishapur come many coarse cloths.

The Shāhīdjanī stuffs may have been imitated from those of Merv. The Lāṭāij al-Maʿārifī gives an account which varies considerably from that of Maḵdisī, though the two texts are similar enough for corruptions to be suspected:

Among the specialties of Nishapur are the ḥaffī garments, and Aṣīrī kerchiefs (mandīl), tākhtandī and rāḵhtandī, and cloth of one color (muṣmat). As regards striped cloaks (ḥulla), 'Attābī, and sīḵlāṭūn stuffs, Baghdad and Nishapur share in them. Sābīrī is the fine soft kind of any garment but the origin of it is the attribution to Nishapur which is arabicized to Sābīrī.

Nāṣir-i Khusraw compared its thread with that of Miṣr:

From a trustworthy cloth merchant I have heard that they buy one dirham-weight of thread (rīsmān) for three Maghribī dinars, i.e. three and a half Nīshāpūrī dinars. So I asked in Nishapur at how much they bought the best thread and they said that the best variety sold at one dirham for five dirham weights.41

Idrīṣī mentioned, en passant, the ẓirāz factories of the city.

These cloths were popular among the fashionable in Baghdad for the Kitāb al-Muwashshā talks of ʿtašlašāns of Nīshāpūrī mulḥam stuff among the clothes of a gentleman, while ladies wore Nishapur veils (maḵānī').

During the Mongol conquest, the hordes from Central Asia, completely sacked the city, and it never recovered completely, and as we can see from Ibn Baṭūṭā the very type of manufacture changed: "At Nishapur are made silken garments (ḥarīr) of nakhkh and velvet (kamkhā) . . . , which are taken to India." These stuffs were also made in Baghdad and Tabriz.45

35 A kind of cloth made with the instrument known as ḥaff. See Chap. V, n. 55.
36 M. J. de Goeje in "Indices," Glossarium et Addenda . . . B.G.A. (Leyden, 1879), IV, suggests that this kind of garment is derived from the Persian pai-bāf, a weaver.
37 This stuff was made in the Yemen at Sana, according to al-Bakrī. See de Goeje, op. cit. Saʿīdī is a material as yet unidentified.
38 Another unidentified stuff.
43 Al-Washshā, op. cit., pp. 124 and 126.
Nuwairî 46 (d. 732 H. [1332 A.D.]) noted the fine Nishapur garments as being the specialty of the town, but he was probably following pre-Mongol sources.47

OTHER TEXTILE CENTERS

In the Nishapur quarter of the province lay a group of industrial towns. One manuscript of Iştâkhrî,48 remarking that Tib trouser cords are unsurpassed, adds: "...except for what has been introduced in Tûs, and they make in it a kind finer than those of Tîb." The Hudûd al-ʿÂlam 49 says that: "It produces trouser cords (shalvâr-band) and stockings." Maḵdîšî 50 added: "From Tûs come beautiful trouser cords (tîkka) and fine striped cloaks (abrâd)."

"From Ustuwâ, said Maḵdîšî,51 "much cloth is brought." East again of this is Nisâ, of which he remarked: "From Nisâ and Abiward are brought ẓâzz silk and garments of it . . . and zanbait (garments of women's weaving ?)52, and from Nisâ, banbûzī 53 garments and fox furs." The Mongol leader Tâdžîn Nuwîn demanded 10,000 ḏîrâ‘ of stuff (ḵām) from the city at the time of the conquest, so it must have had considerable manufactures.54 On the borders of the desert between Khoresm (Khwârizm) and Nishapur was Shahrastân, three days away from Nisâ. Yâḵût 55 said: "There are made in it the long turbans (ʿimâma) of high price. I can find nothing to approve of in them." Ḥâzînî 56 said: "From it are exported the long turbans of high price and its people are skilled in manufacturing them."

Of Sarakhs, Yâḵût 57 noted: "Its inhabitants have a skilful hand for the manufacture of veils (maḵâni), and turbans embroidered in colors and gold (ʿašâ‘ib manḵûsha wa-mudhâh-haba)." Ḥâzînî 58 repeated this: "Its inhabitants have a skilled hand for the manufacture of turbans and veils embroidered with gold (manḵûsha) which are taken thence to other countries and named after it."

From Dandanḵân, Merv probably drew cotton for its manufactures, but only Abu ʿl-Fidâ 59 has deigned to notice its products, following an earlier authority: "This district is one of the most plentiful countries for silk (ḥârîr). Its cotton is proverbial for excellence. These two products are exported."

Herat was famed for its materials in the early Umayyad period, and a Herat loose shirt

46 Nuwairî, Nihâyat al-Arab fi Funûn al-Adâb (Cairo, 1927–37), I, 363.
47 Ištâkhrî, op. cit., p. 94.
49 Maḵdîšî, op. cit., p. 325.
50 Ibid., p. 319.
51 Ibid., p. 324. Perhaps "zarbâf" should be read here.
52 In Indices, Glossarium et Addenda, de Goeje suggests that this word is derived from the Persian panba, "cotton."
54 Ḫâzînî, op. cit., III, 343. See also Map. 4.
55 Ḫâzînî, El-Cazwîns Kosmographie, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1846–48), II, 266.
56 Ḫâzînî, op. cit., III, 72.
57 Ḫâzînî, op. cit., II, 261.
58 Géographie d'Aboulféda, text, p. 459, trans., II, 197.
without sleeves (ḵarkar Harawī 60) is mentioned in the Aghānī, 61 and precious Herat robes are noted at Mecca in the time of ‘Umar ibn Abī Rabī‘a. They were probably yellow for Ṭabarî 62 mentioned in the annals for the year 77 H. (696 A.D.) that Kutaiba wore a yellow Herat cloak (ḵabā’ Harawī așfar). As early as the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik, Muṣjīr al-Dīn 63 said that the servants in the Dome of the Rock wore striped stuffs of Merv and Herat called aśb, thus they must have been exported even then. Ṭabarî 64 heard that Manṣūr once wore a patched Herat djubba, a fact in keeping with his character.

Maḳdisī 65 gave as its products: “...much cloth (baẓz), cheap brocade, and taffeta (Khulṣī).” Stuffs of this name were sent by one of the Marīnīd sultans to the Mameluke al-Malik al-Nāṣir, but whether they came from Herat or were made in Spain, it is impossible to say. 66 Tha‘alībī 67 noted that “from Herat muslins (kirbās), twisted stuffs (mubram), and brocades are exported.”

Mustawfī 68 reported that at the time of the kings of Ghūr, there were 12,000 shops in Herat, which would argue great prosperity.

In the region east of Herat known as Gharḍj al-Śār (later called Ghardjīstān), Maḳdisī 69 remarked the special products “felts (lubūd), beautiful carpets (busūt), and saddle trappings with all that implies (ḫaḵālīb, saddle-cushions, etc.).”

Balkh does not seem to have been particularly famous for its textiles. According to Maḳdisī: “Belts (wiḵāya) after the manufacture of Djurdjān, and striped cloaks” 70 were made. The Faḏā’il al-Balkh 71 only mentions the ibrīshm silk of Fergana as being produced there (610 H. [1214 A.D.]). The sequence of its history was broken by the Mongol conquest, and Ibn Batūṭa found it a complete ruin.

Of Djuzdžānān, the western quarter of the Balkh district of Khurāsan, the Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam 72 says: “It produces felts, saddle bags (ḫaḵība), saddle girths (tang-i-asf), zilū, and palas” (the last a woolen garment worn by the poor). It includes the city of Ṭālikān, which is well documented. Djāḥīz 73 found that “the best felts are the Chinese (Sinī)

60 See the “Glossary” to Ṭabarī, Annales, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1879-1901), under karkar.
62 Ṭabarī, op. cit., II, 963.
63 H. Sauvare, Histoire de Jérusalem et d’Hebron . . . par Moudjir ed-dyn (Paris, 1876), pp. 52-53. In southwest Arabia ašb was an ikat cloth.
64 Ṭabarī, op. cit., III, I, 415. See Chap. II, Pt. I. Ṭabarī, op. cit., III, I, 569, said that when al-Hādī’s mother, Khayürān, died, she left 18,000 of the garments called karkar.
65 Maḳdisī, op. cit., p. 324.
66 Maḳṣārī, Analectes sur l’histoire et la littérature des arabes en Espagne, ed. R. Dozy and others (Leyden, 1855-61), II, 711. The plural Khulṣī is given here which might perhaps be derived from the Khulud Palace or the near-by districts of Baghdad.
69 Maḳdisī, op. cit., p. 324.
72 Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam, p. 106.
73 Djāḥīz, op. cit., p. 338.
variety, then the red Maghrībi kind, then the white Tālikānī variety, then the Armenian, then those of Khurasan.” Ya’kūbī 74 said: “In it are made the Tālikān felts.” Mas‘ūdī 75 (219 H. [834 A.D.]) mentioned them too. Idrīsī 76 said: “They make felts of cloth renowned everywhere. There are none so solid and compact as those.”

KUHISTAN

Kuhistan was one of the dependencies of Khurasan, from quite early times noted for a cloth which went by the name of Kūhī. In the Aghānī there is a pleasant little story of the poet ‘Umar ibn Abī Rabī’ā (d. 101 H. [719 A.D.]). The poet was in love with a lady but her people disapproved of the most eloquent and seductive versifier of the time, and they married her to another man. ‘Umar, carried away by his passion for the lady, wrote a verse upon a piece of Kūhī cloth and . . . ornamented it and sent it to her—a fashion among lovers.77 Ibn Suraḥī 78 spoke of girls in Kūhī and wasḥī figured stuff who looked like dinars of Heraclius—probably because of their golden color, or because of the gold embroideries.

Ṭabarī 79 mentioned a shirt (ḵāmīs) of Kūhī at the court of al-Manṣūr (144 H. [761 A.D.]) in Baghdad. In the year 160 H. (776–77 A.D.) 80 he told how the emirs and diḵḵāns brought the governor of Balkh presents, the governor of Herat and Khurasan bringing, besides gold and silver plates, “Mervian brocade, and Kūhī and Herati brocade (al-dībāḏj al-Marawī wa ‘l-Kūhī wa ‘l-Harawī).” Again a poem in the Annals 81 for the year 198 H. (813–14 A.D.) says: “More splendid and cleaner than new Kūhī.” And again, Tha‘ālibī 82 wrote that al-‘Abbās ibn al-Ḥasan, the vizier of al-Muktasfī (289–95 H. [902–7 A.D.]) used to say: “The likeness of a wise man is like the way of a tailor (khāiyāt) who one day cuts out brocade (buzyūn) worth a thousand, and the next, Kūhī, worth ten.” The Kitāb al-Muwashshā 83 mentions soft Kūhī linings (mubaṭṭanāt).

Īštakhṛī 84 stated that “muslin (kīrbās), cloth (muṣūḥ), and carpet strips (nikhākh), are taken to various regions, but there are no expensive materials there.” Maḵdisī 85 knew that “from Kuhistan come the garments resembling the white Nishapur variety and carpets (busūt) and prayer carpets (muṣallayāt).” Speaking of Sind, he said: “In all the province, carpets (busūt) and the like, of the kind made in Kuhistan and Khurasan are manufactured . . . From it are brought beautiful garments.” 86

74 Ya’kūbī, op. cit., p. 287.
76 Idrīsī, op. cit., I, 468.
77 Abu ‘l-Faradj al-Īṣfahānī, op. cit., I, 236. The word omitted here is uncertain. It seems probable that the verses (not given here) were embroidered on the stuff.
78 Ibid., I, 310 and 363. The latter mentioned a shirt (ḵāmīs) of this material.
79 Tabarī, op. cit., III, 1, 188.
80 Ibid., II, III, 1635–36.
81 Ibid., III, II, 949.
82 Tha‘ālibī, Syntagma dictorum brevium et acutorum, ed. J. P. Valetton (Leyden, 1844), p. 34.
83 Al-Washshā’ī, op. cit., p. 124.
84 Īštakhṛī, op. cit., p. 275.
85 Maḵdisī, op. cit., p. 374.
86 Ibid., 481. Cf. Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihī, al-Iḥād al-Farīd (Caire, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), IV, 268. Līẖīz, Kitāb al-
Kâyin, the capital of the province, is scantily documented. Maḳdisî 87 merely remarked that much cloth (bazz) is brought from it. Yâḳût 88 said: “Much cloth (bazz) is brought to it and it is the trading center of Khurasan, and the treasury (khizâna—or store) of Kerman.” Mustawfi 89 remarked on its production of saffron.

Tûn, according to Maḳdisî, 90 had many weavers (ḥâka) and workers in wool (ṣunna al-şûf).” Nâṣir-i-Khusraw 91 said: “In this town there were four hundred factories (kârgâh) which wove zïlû.”

Ibn Baṭūṭa, 92 talking of Djâm (the modern Shaikh Djâm), said: “Most of its trees are mulberry trees and there is much silk there.” In the time of Maḳdisî, 93 Züzan “had many weavers and makers of felts (lubûd).” Khawâr, said Kazwînî, 94 produced much cotton which was taken to other lands.

The Hudûd 95 gives a list of places producing muslin (kirbâs), some of which are identifiable, others of which are not to be found on the map (372 H. [978 A. D.]): Kurî, Khây-mand, Salûmidh, Herat, Bûzagân, Sandjân, and Züzan.

For the record of Il-Khânîd times, one must again turn to Mustawfi: “Turshîz, Tûn, Zîrkh, and Djûnâbûd produce silk; Zâva, silk and cotton; Khwâf, silk and madder; and Tabas Gilâkî, cotton.” 96

Abu 'l-Fidâ 97 quoting the Lubâb, 98 said of Tabasain: “They export a celebrated silk (ḥârir) under the name of Tabas silk.” 99

Bayân wa 'l-Tabyîn (Cairo, 1332 H. [1913–4 A.D.]), I, 79, quotes a verse of Abû Nuwâs mentioning kühîya. The Egyptian editor who found difficulty in explaining the text, noted that kühî is white cloth.

87 Maḳdisî, op. cit., p. 321.
88 Yâḳût, op. cit., IV, 23.
89 Mustawfi Kazwînî, op. cit., p. 144.
90 Maḳdisî, op. cit., p. 321.
91 Nâṣir-i-Khusraw, op. cit., text, p. 95, trans., p. 259.
92 Ibn Baṭūṭa, op. cit., III, 75.
93 Maḳdisî, op. cit., p. 321, n.
94 Kazwînî, op. cit., II, 243.
95 Hudûd al-'Ālam, p. 103.
96 Mustawfi Kazwînî, op. cit., pp. 141–43, 152.
97 Géographie d' Abouljéda, text, p. 449, trans., II, 189.
98 There are two towns called Tabas in Kuhistan sometimes known collectively as Tabasain.
99 Hamadîhâni, Maḥâmût (Beirut, 1924), p. 189, in the fourth century, wrote of stuff called Kûhi mumassâr which, he said, meant Kûhi cloth dyed with reddish-yellow clay. See Nakâ'id of Jarîr and al-Farazdâb, ed. A. A. Bevan (Leyden, 1905–12), II, 546.
CHAPTER X

TRANSOXIANA

IN BOKHARA, THE CAPITAL OF SUGHD, THE ANCIENT SOGDIANA, AND ONE OF THE MOST EAST-ERLY PROVINCES OF THE CALIPHATE (MAP 3), THERE SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN A ĞIRĂZ FACTORY IN THE AB-BASID PERIOD. IT IS TEMPTING TO THINK THAT THE MUSLIMS MERELY TOOK OVER THE PREVIOUSLY EXISTING SCHEME OF TAXATION IN KIND, CONSISTING IN THIS CASE OF CLOTH, AS THEY DID IN TABARISTĀN AND ELSEWHERE. BALĀDHURĪ 1 MENTIONED THAT TRANSOXIANA SENT A TRIBUTE TO THE EARLY ARABS WHICH INCLUDED SILK (ḤARĪR) AND GARMENTS (THIYĀB), AND THIS WOULD PROBABLY BE THE SAME TAX THAT WENT TO THE SASANIANS. VARIOUS TEXTILES ALSO FIGURE IN THE PRESENTS WHICH THE LAST INDEPENDENT KINGS OF BOKHARA SENT TO THE CHINESE, 2 AND IT MUST BE KEPT IN MIND THAT THE PROVINCE WAS ALWAYS OPEN TO INFLUENCES FROM THAT QUARTER, THOUGH THE SASANIANS IN THEIR TURN EXERTED A STRONG INFLUENCE ON CHINESE WARES.

CONCERNING THE PROVINCE IN GENERAL, ISTĀKHĪRĪ SAID: "AS REGARDS CLOTHING (MALBŪS), THERE ARE TO BE FOUND COTTON GARMENTS WHICH ARE SO ESTEEMED AS TO BE EXPORTED THENCE TO ALL LANDS. THEY HAVE FURS (ĦIR), WOOL (ṢŪF), AND FUR (WABAR)." 3 IBN ḤAWKĀL 4 REPEATED THAT "THEY HAVE WOOL, ČAKZ SILK, AND FINE MATERIALS (ṬARĀ‘ĪF) OF MUΣLIN (KHĪBĀS), AND CLOTH (BĀZZ)." YĀḴŪT DIFFERED BUT LITTLE: "AS REGARDS CLOTHING, THERE ARE UNEQUALLED COTTON GARMENTS WHICH ARE EXPORTED TO ALL REGIONS. THEY HAVE ČAKZ SILK, WOOL, AND FUR IN ABUNDANCE, AS WELL AS IBRIΣ SILK OF KHUDJAND, THERE BEING NO BETTER IBRIΣ TO BE FOUND." 5 HE ALSO MENTIONED FURS OF VARIOUS KINDS.

IT WAS NOT, HOWEVER, UNTIL ABŪ MUSLIM SENT ZIYĀD IBN ṢĂLIH TO QUELL THE REvolt AGAINST THE Abbasides THAT TRANSOXIANA CAME THOROUGHLY UNDER MUSLIM CONTROL. THOUGH THEY MAY HAVE ESTABLISHED THE ĞIRĂZ THERE PREVIOUSLY, THE MOST LIKELY DATE FOR ITS INSTITUTION IS THE PERIOD OF MA‘MŪN’S RESIDENCE AT MERV; THE EARLIEST, AND SO FAR AS I KNOW, THE ONLY ACCOUNT OF THE FACTORY IS TO BE FOUND IN NARSHAKHĪ’S TA’RĪKH-I-BUKHĀRĀ, WRITTEN IN 332 H. (943-44 A.D.) FOR HIS SAMANID PATRON, THE AUTHOR THEN BEING FORTY-SIX YEARS OF AGE:

AN ACCOUNT OF THE ĞIRĂZ FACTORY (BĀT AL-ĞIRĂZ) WHICH WAS IN BOKHARA AND WHICH IS STILL STANDING.

NOW, IN BOKHARA, THERE WAS A FACTORY (KHĀRAKH) BETWEEN THE CITADEL AND THE SHARISTĀN (WHICH BARTHOLD SAYS WAS THE ORIGINAL TOWN), 6 NEAR THE FRIDAY MOSQUE, WHERE THEY USED TO WEAVE CARPETS (BISĀT), TAPESTRY (ḤĀDURVĀN), YAẒĪ (CLOTH), CUSHIONS (BĀLĪSH), PRAYER CARPETS (MUΣALLĀ), STRIPED FUNDĀKH (EITHER "OF A NUT COLOR" OR "INN, HOTEL") COATS (BURD). THEY USED TO WEAVE FOR THE CALIPH, FOR THE KHAṔDĪ TAX OF BOKHARA WAS SPENT ON LARGE CARPETS (ḤĀDURVĀN). EVERY YEAR AN OVERSEER

1 BALĀDHURĪ, PUTŪH AL-BULDĀN, ED. M. J. DE GOEJE (LEYDEN, 1886), P. 408, TRANS. BY P. HITTI (NEW YORK, 1916), P. 167.
2 SEE APPENDIX III.
3 ISTĀKHĪRĪ, VIAE REGNORUM . . . , ED. M. J. GOEJE, BIBLIOTHECA GEOGRAPHORUM ARABICORUM (= B.G.A.) (LEYDEN, 1870), I, 288.
5 YĀḴŪT, MUḌJAM AL-BULDĀN, GEOGRAPHISCHES WÖRTERBUCH, ED. F. WÜSTENFELD (LEIPZIG, 1866-73), IV, 401.
(‘āmil) used to come from Baghdad specially, and he used to take the equivalent of the tax of Bokhara in this cloth (djāma).

Nowadays it so happens that this factory has become dismantled and the men who used to exercise that craft have been scattered. In Bokhara there used to be master craftsmen specially noted for this craft. Merchants used to come from the provinces and, just as people take away zandanîdji, they used to take those garments to Syria, Egypt, and the cities of Byzantium (Rūm). They did not weave them in any other city in Khurasan. The surprising thing is that some of the men who practiced this craft went to Khurasan and made the tools necessary for this manufacture and wove those garments, but they did not attain the former luster or splendor (āb ū rawânak). There was no monarch, emir, or commander who did not possess such robes. There were red, white, and green varieties, but today zandanîdji is better known than these garments in all the provinces.7

It is interesting to note how this indirect control of the factory differs from the system obtaining in Egypt, and perhaps in other factories in Persia. Some of the stuffs may have been made on commission, as in Egypt. Narshâkhī gave no indication as to how and why the tirâz industry declined. It may have disappeared with the fall of the Tâhirids in 259 ir. (873 A.D.), but it probably continued under Saffarid rule, and Minorsky suggested that this account of its ruined state may be the addition of the Persian translator of the Samanid period. The indirect control suggests Sasanid methods.

The Samanid dynasty seems to have favored these zandanîdji cloths of which Narshâkhī said, speaking of Zandana, one of the villages of Bokhara:

That which comes from it is called zandanîdji, which is to say muslin (kîrbäs) from the village of Zandana, which is both good and plentiful, but many of the villages of Bokhara weave better cloth, and they call it zandanîdji because it first made its appearance in that town. This cloth is exported to all the provinces such as Iraq, Fars, Kerman, and Hindustan. All the nobles and kings make robes (djāma) of it and buy its brocade at a high price.8

The popularity of this garment may have been partly due to the fact that it was a uniform for the Samanid soldiers of the household. Nîzâm al-Mulk9 remarked (485 H. [1092-93 A.D.] ) that the Samanids used to clothe the newly bought slave in zandanîdji. The second year he got a horse with a snaffle, headstall, and bridle. In the third year he received a special belt (kârâčûr). In the fifth year he got a better saddle and bridle ornamented with stars (bi-kawkab), a tunic of silk stuff of various colors (kâbâ-yi-dârâ‘î10), and a mace (dabbûs), which he hung from a ring at his saddle bow; in the sixth year, a parade dress (djâma-unvân); and in the seventh he became a Withâk-bâshî, when he was given a Grandja

---


8 Narshâkhī, op. cit., p. 35.


robe (ḵĀbā) and a black felt hat embroidered with silver (kulāh-i-namad-i-siyāh-i-sīm-ka-
shīda).

This cloth was also exported to Central Asia, for Djuwainī described the cloth with
which the merchants tried to defraud Genghiz Khan as being “gold-embroidered garments
(thīyāb mudāhahhab), muslin (kīrbās), and zandāpīčī.” This variant of the name is also
given by Vullers who described it as a wide robe of white cotton, very coarsely woven and
quilted. Bokhara prospered greatly under the Samanids, but in the Mongol invasions it was
almost entirely destroyed.

Other information is supplied by the geographers. Ištakhrī reported that “from
Bokhara and its environs are brought cotton garments which are taken to all countries, as
also carpets (busūt), prayer carpets (muṣallāyāt), and choice woolen garments.” Ibn Ḥawkāl said: “Most of their dress consists of cloaks (ḵĀbā’) and hats (kalansuwa) like the
dress of Transoxiana.” He noted the cloth markets there, and added: “There are
brought from Bokhara and its environs garments known as Bukhārī which are taken to Iraq,
and other countries; such also is the case with carpets (busūt), and garments of wool (ṣūf).”

The Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam merely mentions woolen goods and saltpeter, but Maḳdīsī was better
informed: “There are brought from Bokhara soft garments, prayer carpets (muṣallāyāt),
carpets (busūt), and cloth of Fundūḵī carpeting (farsh). . . . Ṭabarī cloth. Girths (ḥāzm
al-khāli) are woven in the prisons (maḥābīs), and Ashmūnī garments (of the type made in
Ashmūnain in Egypt?).”

Yāḵūt was also acquainted with the Zandanjī garments with the addition of the letter dījīm. They are well known.”

The earlier western writer Idrīṣī, however, did not know them. Another village which manu-
factured these stuffs was Iskadjkat, the people of which were merchants, and from which
muslin (kīrbās) came, according to Naršakhi who further remarked: “In olden times
there used to be a bazaar in the season of Tirmāh for secondhand cloth, such as curtains
(parda) and hangings (sutūr), or cloth with some defect, and all kinds of secondhand goods
at Bokhara, where merchants came from Fergana, Dājādī, and other places, and used to buy
it.”


12 Ištakhrī, op. cit., p. 314.


15 Maḳdīsī (Muṣaddaṣ), Descriptio imperii Moslem-

16 Yāḵūt, op. cit., II, 952.

17 Naršakhi, op. cit., p. 31 ff.
The largest of the villages in the Bokhara area was Tawāwiṣ, of which Iṣṭakhrī 18 said: "There are brought from it cotton garments which are taken to all places." Ibn Ḥawḵal 19 added: "It has a market and a great time of reunion when people from all quarters of Khurasan go to it at a certain time of the year, and from it are brought garments of cotton, which on account of their abundance are taken to Iraq." Idrīsī 20 repeated this account, but Abu'l-Fidā' 21 stated that the city was ruined in his time, probably by the Mongol invaders.

Proceeding along the Sughd river to Samarkand we come to Karminiya to which Maḵḍīsī 22 ascribed kerchiefs (mandil). Then comes Dabūsiya, of which he 23 said: "From Dabūsiya and Widḥār come Widḥārī garments of one color (muṣmat), and I have heard a sultan in Baghdad call them the brocade of Khurasan." Of Rabinḏjān he said: "From Rabinḏjān come izārs of red felt (lubūd) for winter, prayer carpets (muṣallayāt), and rope (marīr) of hemp (ḵunnab)." 24

The great city of Samarkand has numerous notices devoted to it from which we can build a fairly complete history until the Mongol invasion, and even after that. Ibn al-Faḵīḥ 25 mentioned its Samarkandī garments, and Iṣṭakhrī 26 reported that "Samarkand is a meeting place of merchants and the emporium of Transoxiana. Most of the supplies of Transoxiana come to Samarkand and are then distributed to the provinces." Ibn 'Abd Rabbiḥī, 27 the Spanish author, also mentioned the Samarkandī garments, and Benjamin of Tudela 28 talked of Jews in Samarkand.

Maḵḍīsī gave the following list:

There are brought from Samarkand silver-colored garments (ṭhiyāb sīmḵūn), Samarkandī (stuff), . . . and tents (akhbiya) . . . From Samarkand too come brocade, which is carried to the Turks, and red garments called mumardjal, and Sinīzī, as well as much ḵazz silk and garments of that material. 29

The Laṭāʾif al-Maʿārif 30 said: "Among the special products of Samarkand are the Widḥārī garments." These are obviously derived from the village of Widḥār, and Idrīsī gave a long account of them, so that they were known in the West, by repute, at least:

They make there (in Widḥār) stuffs called Widḥārī, woven of cotton on cotton, and made with

18 Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 313.
19 Ibn Ḥawḵal, op. cit., p. 362.
22 Maḵḍīsī, op. cit., p. 324.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
26 Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 318.
27 Ibn 'Abd Rabbiḥī, al-ʾIḏā al-Farīḍ (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), IV, 268.
29 Maḵḍīsī, op. cit., p. 325. Mārdjīl is a kind of striped Yemen stuff, and this may be what is intended by the term mumardjal here. See Chap. XV.
an astonishing art; they are employed raw and without being cut. There is not a prince, minister, or cadi in the whole of Khurasan who does not wear one in winter over his clothes. The beauty of these stuffs is evident and their splendor is famous. They are of a color approaching yellow saffron, soft and light to the touch, but nevertheless very thick, excellent in their wearing qualities, and durable. The price of a robe varies from three to twenty dinars according to the quality. In short, it is impossible to find anything better, whether as regards beauty, whether as regards solidity.\(^31\)

Yākūt\(^32\) said that the town in which Widhārī garments were made was six miles from Samarkand.

Vâmbéry\(^33\) noted that Samarkand silk and cotton weavers were distributed by Ghenghiz Khan among his relations as useful servants, or else taken to Khurasan. The conquest completely changed local conditions and led to a great infiltration of Chinese craftsmen. This has been remarked by a certain Ch'ang Ch'un\(^34\) who said that they are to be found everywhere at Samarkand. They seem to have been mainly agriculturists. The people were quite unable to manage their fields and orchards for themselves and were obliged to call in Chinese, Kitai, and Tanguts. He recorded also a drop in population after the defeat of the Khwārizmshāh, from one hundred thousand households (say over a half million people) to a quarter of that number in Samarkand. This was doubtless due to the Mongol massacres and deportations which denuded the country of labor. Some of these workmen may have been cloth workers, for he\(^35\) spoke of a place Chieu-chieu-chau (Rashīd al-Dīn's Kem-kemdiyyuta) in the southeast Kirghiz country where Chinese workmen were settled and wove “fine silks, gauze, brocade, and damask.”

Of Dizak (Džizak) in the same group, Mādīṣī\(^36\) said: “From Dizak excellent felts and cloaks (kābā)’ of felt are brought.”

In the neighborhood of Balkh (properly in Khurasan) there was another group of cloth-manufacturing cities, briefly noted by the geographers.

Čagâniyān, according to the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam\(^37\) produces “woolen cloths, palas rugs, and much saffron.”

Tirmidh\(^38\) “produces green matting (būriyā) and fans (bādhl-bizan).”

Dārzandji\(^39\) “produces puttees (pāy-tāba), different sorts of tapestry-woven carpets (gīlimīna), and woolen carpets (bīsāt-i-pašmīn).” Mādīṣī\(^40\) found that most of its inhabitants were workers in wool (ṣuwwāf), manufacturing robes (aksiya).

Kuwādhiyān. Ištakhri\(^41\) said: “From al-Kuwādhiyān comes madder (fuwwa).”

\(^31\) Idrīsī, op. cit., II, 201. I read Wīdhār here for Jaubert’s Wābelhār. The text here is suspect.

\(^32\) Yākūt, op. cit., IV, 944.

\(^33\) A. Vâmbéry, History of Bukhara (London, 1873), p. 132.

\(^34\) Li Chih Ch’ang, Travels of an Alchemist, trans. by A. Waley (London, 1931), p. 93.

\(^35\) Ibid., p. 124.

\(^36\) Mādīṣī, op. cit., p. 325.

\(^37\) Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 114.

\(^38\) Ibid.

\(^39\) Ibid.

\(^40\) Mādīṣī, op. cit., p. 283.

\(^41\) Ištakhri, op. cit., p. 298.
Idriši \(^{42}\) added: “From Kuwādhiyān they bring to Wāshdjīrīd much cotton and madder (?) with which they make the red color which is largely exported to India. The sultan puts a tax on these various productions.”

Shūmān and Wāshdjīrīd were also famous for their saffron, according to Idrīši.\(^{43}\)

Khuṭlān was noted by Mustawfī \(^{44}\) as producing cotton.

In the north of Transoxiana, there was yet another group, the largest city of which was Shāsh (Tashkent). Makḍīsī \(^{45}\) found that “tents (akhbiya), saddles of shagreen (kimkht) of value, izārs . . . prayer carpets (muṣalliyāt), capes ornamented at the neck (bānīkāt) . . . and cotton which is taken to the Turks.”

From Banākath, said Makḍīsī,\(^{47}\) come garments of Turkestan. He \(^{48}\) again noted that Iṣbīdʒāb has a muslin market (Sūk al-Kārābis), and from there and from Fergana, Turkish slaves and white garments were exported. This cloth trade seems to have been established early, for Abu 'l-Kāsim \(^{49}\) of Baghdad talked with familiarity of Kharshānī carpets (ṭīnīsā) from the district watered by the Kharsṭān tributary of the Saiḥūn.

From Sikāshim, says the Hūdūd al-Ālam,\(^{50}\) “come covers for saddle cloths (rūy-i-namad-zīn).”\(^{51}\)

\(^{42}\) Idrīši, op. cit., I, 482. The word madder has been inserted by analogy with other texts to fill the lacuna in the translation.

\(^{43}\) Ibid.


\(^{45}\) Makḍīsī, op. cit., p. 325.

\(^{46}\) See Indices, Glossarium et Addenda . . . , ed. M. J. de Goeje, B.G.A. (Leyden, 1879), IV. R. Dozy, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes (2d ed.; Paris, 1927), and idem, Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes (Amsterdam, 1845), contain further references to various sources including Makḵārī.

\(^{47}\) Makḍīsī, op. cit., p. 325.

\(^{48}\) Ibid., pp. 272 and 325.

\(^{49}\) Abu 'l-Muṭahhar al-Azdī, Ḥikāyat Abī 'l-Kāsim, ed. A. Mez (Heidelberg, 1902), p. 36. For Kharṣān see the index to G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (Cambridge, 1930).


\(^{51}\) Additional note.—Ghenghiz Khan settled Arab and Chinese craftsmen at Karakorum (Bar Hebraeus, op. cit., I, 298).
CHAPTER XI

KHORESM (KHWÄRIZM)

A GENERAL DESCRIPTION 1 OF THE PRODUCTS OF THE COUNTRY OF KHORESM IS GIVEN IN Maḳḍiṣī:

From Khoresm come sable skins (sammūr), squirrel fur (sindjāb), weasel skins (ḳūn), desert fox furs (fanak), weasel furs (dalah), fox furs (ṭha'lab), beaver skins (khazbūst), and goat skin (buzbūst) . . . and ḫalansuwa caps and shagreen (kīmkūght) . . . all the above from Bulghār. From Khoresm are brought striped cloaks (burūd), carpets (fursh), cloth for blankets (ṭhiyāb al-luḥuf), brocade for presents (dībādī bīshkāsh), veils of cloth with a warp of silk and a woof of some other material (maḳānī mūḥam) . . . . and garments of Arandj (colored stuff). 2

Iḥrīṣī 3 said: “From this country cotton and linen stuffs and various articles of merchandise for export are derived.” He, too, mentioned its furs. According to Yāḳūṭ: “It has many trees. Most of all there are the mulberry (tūṭ) and the willow (ḥilāf), because of their need for them in their buildings and for feeding the silkworm (dūd al-ibrīṣm).” 4

The Arab geographers generally called the capital, Kāth, after the name of the province, and thereby some confusion arises. Iṣṭākhrī and Ibn Ḥawkāl referred to the town: “From it comes a large supply of garments of cotton and wool which are taken to all regions,” 5 and “their dress consists of tunics (ḵūrṭāḵ).” 6 Ibn Ḥawkāl 7 called them “twisted ḫalansuwa caps” and commended their beauty.

According to the Ḥudūḏ: “Kāth is a resort of merchants . . . . It produces covers for cushions (rūy-i-mikhadda), quilted garments (ḵazāgand), cotton stuffs (karbās), felt.” 8

The Laṭāʿif al-Maʿārīf, 9 however, is probably referring to Urgandj in the passage which will be quoted below, because it was toward the end of the fourth (tenth) century that Kāth was supplanted by Urgandj as the capital city of Khoresm: “The muslins (kīrbās) called Arandj are among its specialties. They say that the Amīrī kind of them does not fall short of the ḥaṭṭī of Nishapur, the muniyar of Rayy, the poppy-colored kind (ḵhāshkhāshī) of Džurdjān, and the Dabīkī of Egypt.” It notes that the merchandise and the special products of Khoresm are similar to those of Turkish lands.

There was an emir of Gurgandj who succeeded in conquering south Khoresm in the year

2 See Indices, Glossarium et Addenda . . . ., ed. M. J. de Goeje, B.G.A. (Leyden, 1879), IV; also see Djawāliḵī, Kitāb al-Muʿarrāb, ed. E. Sachau (Leipzig, 1867), p. 156 where Arandjād is a black skin.
4 Yāḳūṭ, Muʿḏjam al-Buldān, Geographisches Wörterbuch, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Leipzig, 1866–73), II, 482.
6 See R. Dozy, Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes (Amsterdam, 1845).
and who arrogated the title of Khwārizmshāh to himself. It seems likely that these Amīrī garments mean ṭirāz-inscribed garments containing the title “amīr,” and the factory would be in Urgandj because it was in that same year that the emir destroyed Kāth. Previously this northern part of the province with its capital Urgandj had been separate from the kingdom of the Khwārizmshāhs.

South of Kāth was Hazārasp, and Yākūt\(^{10}\) wrote that “in it are many markets and cloth merchants (bazzāzūn).”

\(^{10}\) Yākūt, \textit{op. cit.}, IV, 971.
CHAPTER XII
Kerman and Seistan

Although not the capital of the province, Bam in Kerman was the chief manufacturing center, and at one time possessed a ṭirāz factory. Ibn Khaldūn\(^1\) stated that five hundred pieces of Yemen stuff were sent with the tribute from the province of Kerman (Map 5).

Iṣṭakhrī was very brief indeed: “From Bam garments of cotton, which are taken to all districts, are exported.”\(^2\) Ibn Ḥawkāl, however, was far more informative:

Bam is larger than Dīrūfī, and splendid robes of great value and durability are made there from the cotton, and taken to many quarters of the earth. Among its choice articles which are made there are the ṭailasāns which are made with hollows (ṭayālīsa muḵawwara, i.e., possibly with some kind of raised pile or embroidery which gave the appearances of hollows?), woven into festoons (rafraf), and a single one of which, when of fine ẓharb linen fetches thirty dinars, more or less when sold in Iraq, Miṣr, and Khurāsān. They have also famous turbans (‘imāma) which are much sought after by the people of Iraq, Miṣr, and Khurāsān. Their garments have a lastingness like the cloths of Aden and Sana, the least of which lasts from five to twenty years. Their robes are the kind that kings store and acquire. They had a ṭirāz factory of the sultan, but it perished when he did.\(^3\)

Presumably, the Buwaihirid Sultan Ruḵ al-Dawla is intended here, or else his father, but owing to the disturbed state of the country at that time it is impossible to be certain. The origin of the ṭirāz factory was probably before the time of Ma’mūn, if we assume that the Yemen stuffs were made in a ṭirāz factory.

A list of products is given in the Ḥudūd,\(^4\) which notes that “from it come cotton stuffs (‘imāma), Bam turbans (or kerchiefs, dastār-i-bamī).” Māḵḍīši\(^5\) found that the Bammi manufactures were not confined to Bam alone: “In Awārīk and Mihrakīrd are made many garments after the Bammi manufacture which are exported as they are. Bam has many skilled and dexterous craftsmen and famous markets, the cloth of which is sought everywhere... most of them are weavers.... Most of the garments which are manufactured are made in Djaḥal Kūd (a parasang away from it).... From Bam are brought turbans and kerchiefs (mandil), ṭailasāns, and precious garments preferred above all the Merv weaves.”

Even Idrīšī in the West had heard of Bam manufactures:

Its inhabitants are engaged in trade and industry. They make here a quantity of beautiful cotton stuffs which are the object of considerable export, and mantles of goat hair which equal in

---


\(^3\) Ibn Ḥawkāl, Viae et regna ..., Descriptio ditionis mostemicae, ed M. J. de Goeje (B.G.A.), II, 223. The rendering of ṭayālīsa muḵawwara is uncertain. The new edition of Ibn Ḥawkāl may resolve this difficulty.


fineness the most beautiful it is possible to see. There are some, the price of which equals thirty dinars. Finally, they make, too, very fine stuffs for turbans. All these stuffs are of fine workmanship and solidity so that they do not wear out and only perish at the end of a very long lapse of time. Kings are proud to wear them, and consider them precious and keep them with care in their treasuries.6

Yaḵūt7 quoted earlier sources such as the above.

Apart from one or two large towns, Kerman was never an industrial province, because it was largely desert, but it was celebrated for its commerce, lying straddled as it does across the land route to India. In the eastern quarter of the province, according to Maḵdisī8 "there is made in Sīrdjān a great deal of this (Bammi) cloth." The Īl-Khānid author Mustawfī9 talked of its cotton production. From Zarand, said Iṣṭakhrī,10 "famous linings (biṭāna) are brought which are taken to Fars and Iraq."

Kerman became the capital of the province in the fourth (tenth) century under the Buwaihids, and it is likely that the governor would have had a ṭīrāz factory there. The only source for the manufactures there which I have been able to discover is Marco Polo:

The ladies of that country and their daughters also produce exquisite needlework in the embroidery of silk stuffs in different colors, with figures of beasts and birds, trees, and flowers, and a variety of other patterns. They work hangings for the use of noblemen so deftly that they are a marvel to see, as well as cushions, pillows, quilts, and all sorts of things.11

Rather similar to this is the following passage from the early nineteenth-century traveler Buckingham:

Printed cloths and handkerchiefs are manufactured also in great abundance, and carpets are wrought which are thought to be equal to any produced in the whole empire. These are chiefly the work of females of distinction; since to spin, to sew, and to embroider are the chief accomplishments of their education. These carpets are mostly made by the needle, with colored Worsted on a woven substance, in the way young ladies in England of the middle ranks work mats for tea urns. These, from their size and quality, sometimes cost fifty tumsans, equal to as many pounds sterling each, though there are others at all prices below this. Others again of an inferior quality are altogether woven in colors and sold at a cheaper rate, these being the work of men. There are no large manufactories of either, however, as both are wrought in private dwellings and, when finished, brought into the bazaar for sale.12

Of textile manufactures at Dījruf we have no information, but Iṣṭakhrī, Idrīsī, and

7 Yaḵūt, Muǧżjam al-Buldān, Geographisches Wörterbuch, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Leipzig, 1866–73), I, 737.
8 Maḵdisī, op. cit., p. 470.
11 H. Yule, The Book of Ser Marco Polo, the Venetian (London, 1871), I, 92.
Abū 'l-Fidāʾ 13 all wrote that it was the emporium of Khurāsān and Seistan. The only exports from Kerman mentioned by Djayhīj 14 are indigo and cumin, the former of which seems always to have been an important article of merchandise. Ibn Ḥawkal 15 said: "From the territories of Māghūn and Walashdjīrī to the district of Ḥurmuz, indigo and cumin are planted and taken everywhere." Makhḍīsī 16 too, said: "From the districts of Ḫīrūft, much indigo (nīl) is brought." Idrīsī 17 also remarked on the indigo of Ḥurmuz.

SEISTAN

The semidesert country of Seistan (Sīstān, or Sīdjištān) was never a cloth manufacturing center, nor even an important administrative center, except for a brief period under the Saffarid dynasty. It did, however, send three hundred pieces of stuff marked with circles (muʿaiyan) along with the tribute to Maʿmūn. Abū Dulaf 18 has left us one short sentence to show that the Saffarid dynasty had royal factories there, presumably at the capital Zārandj, for he does not mention any particular place. Abū Dulaf visited the ruler Khalaf ibn Ahmed, and noted: "He has in the country a tirāz factory in which garments are made. Every day he confers a robe of honor on one of his visitors, five thousand dirhams being spent on it in the tirāz."

General descriptions of the products of this reign are given in the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam and by Thaʿālibī. The former 19 says: "The province produces stuffs used as carpets (djāmāhā-yi-farsh) similar to those of Ţabaristān, zilū rugs similar to the Djahram kind." Thaʿālibī numbered among the specialties of the country "ceremonial drums" (al-tubūl al-mawkibīya), and the brocaded carpets (dabābidj al-farsh). 20 Some of these must have been made in Zārandj. It is significant that the province had no characteristic fabric of its own, but showed a tendency to derive from Fars, Ţabaristān, and almost certainly from India.

Bust was the second largest city in Seistan, and Iṣṭakhri 21 said: "There is commerce in it with India and Sind." According to the Hudūd: "Bust is the gate of Hindustan, and the resort of merchants . . . it produces cotton stuffs (karbās)." 22 The city was ultimately destroyed by Timur.

One march from Bust, in a direction unspecified, lay Zālikān, of which Iṣṭakhri 23 said:

---

13 Iṣṭakhri, op. cit., p. 166. Idrīsī, op. cit., I, 422. Abū 'l-Fidāʾ, op. cit., trans., II, 103. The Seljuk histories edited by T. Houtsma might yield some chance information about tirāz factories in this province, but time has not permitted me to examine them.


15 Ibn Ḥawkal, op. cit., p. 223.

16 Makhḍīsī, op. cit., p. 470.

17 Idrīsī, op. cit., I, 424.

18 Kurd de Schloëzer, Abu Dolaf Misaris ben Mahalhal de itineres suo asiatico (Berlin, 1845), p. 28, an extract from Kazwini. He actually mentioned Abū Dja'far Muhammad b. Ahmed b. al-Lāith who, said Brockelmann, is the same as Khalaf b. Ahmed taken prisoner by Mahmud of Ghazni in the year 1002-3 A.D. See the article "Miṣar ibn Muhāhil" in Encycl. Islam, III, 519.—Abū Dulaf's journey has been republished from a new manuscript by Messrs. Brill of Leyden.

19 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 110.


21 Iṣṭakhri, op. cit., p. 245.

22 Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, p. 110.

“Most of the inhabitants are weavers.” Ibn Ḥawḵal and Yāḵūt repeated this statement, and Idrīsī remarked: “Most of its inhabitants are weavers and their principal commerce consists in stuffs which are sold and exported in considerable quantities.”

Perhaps here the city of Kabul should be included. Ibn Ḥawḵal said: “Indigo (nīl) is sold in Kabul every year, which is made in its gardens and cultivated land... From Kabul beautiful garments of cotton are brought of which wrappers (sabniya) are made, which go to China, and go forth to Khurasan and are distributed throughout Sind and its districts.” This text must suffice to represent the fame of the indigo of Kabul, mentioned by many authors.

CHAPTER XIII
THE TIRAZ IN INDIA

The ramifications of the Abbasid Tiraz system may even have extended to India, but I have found no other reference to any such institution before the Tughluqid period. India really falls outside the scope of this work, but an appendix on Indian and Chinese influences will be found later in this survey.

The Ta'rikh-i-Firuz Shahi 1 of Diya' al-Din Barani tells us that the Sultan Muhammad (who reigned from 720-52 H. [1320-51 A.D.]) decided, for various reasons of policy, to recognize the Abbasid caliphate. He paid allegiance to the representatives of the family who were in Egypt, in the year 744 H. (1343-44 A.D.), and in return he received a robe of honor (khil'a): "He ordered that on the tiraz inscription of gold-embroidered robes of value, they should inscribe the name of the caliph and nothing else (dar tiraz-i-djamah-yi-zarbaft-û kümati)." A robe of honor which probably came from this Delhi tiraz factory is mentioned by Ibn Battuta; 2 it was presented by the king of India, Muhammad Shah, and was made "of blue silk embroidered with gold and spangled with jewels (khil'a al-ňarir al-azraq, muzarkashah bi l-dhahab wa muraşsa'ab bi l-djawâhir)."

Kalkashandi described the state factories of the Tughluqid:

Therein, of those who are master craftsmen, are the makers of swords, bows, spears, armor (zarad) and other kinds of weapons, jewelers (ṣuwwâgh), makers of embroideries (zarâkîsha), and masters of other crafts. . . . The Sultan of Delhi has a tiraz factory (dâr al-tiraz) in which there are four thousand manufacturers of silk (ṣazzâz), making all kinds of textiles for robes of honor (khil'a), robes (kasâwâ), and presents (iţlâkât), besides the cloth of China, Iraq, and Alexandria which is brought there. 3

The Tughluqid dynasty was overthrown four years before Kalkashandi's death; the intricate court organization of the Mogul period is well known and several accounts of its manufactures are available.

The passage from Kalkashandi is founded on a much fuller account in the earlier Masâlik al-Abşar of 'Umari. 4 The latter author is describing contemporary events. Speaking of the dress of the notables of Delhi, he said:

The linen garments which are imported from Alexandria and the land of the Russians are worn only by those whom the sultan honors with them. The others wear tunics and robes of fine cotton. They make garments with this material which resemble the robes (maţâfi) of Baghdad. But these latter, as also those called Naşâfi, differ very much from those of India as regards fineness, beauty of color, and delicacy.

---

3 Kalkashandi, Subh al-A'şâ (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), V, 83 and 84.
Again, he said: "No Indian but the Sultan and those whom he permits to do so may have gold-embroidered saddles. The rest usually have silver embroideries." He also described the costume of the Indians, and wrote that "most of their Tartar (Tatarî) robes are embroidered with gold (muzarkaşha bi-dhâhab). Some wear garments with both sleeves having a тîrâz border of gold embroidery (zarkâš)." Others, for example the Mongols, place the тîrâz inscription between the shoulders.

Besides the account of the robe, Ibn Baṭūta had an interesting anecdote:

In the year 743 H. (1342 A.D.) the king of China sent to the sultan of India at Delhi a present containing, among other things, five hundred pieces of kamkhâ (Chinese silk), of which a hundred were of those made in the town of Thsiouen-tcheou-fou (Zaitûn), and of which another hundred were made in Hang-tcheou-fou (Khansâ). There were, beside, five garments studded with jewels, and five gold-embroidered quivers (tarâkish muzarkašha). In return the sultan sent five Bâirâm garments, which are of cotton, each worth a hundred dinars, a hundred pieces of djuzz stuff which consists of silk, a single piece of which is dyed with five colors, a hundred pieces of stuff called Şâlâhi, and a hundred garments of Şhîrîn-bâf, and a hundred of Şhân-bâf, and five hundred of goat hair (marîz), of which a hundred were black, another white, another red, another green, and another blue. There were also a hundred pieces of Rûmi (Greek) linen (kattân)."
CHAPTER XIV
SYRIAN TEXTILES

THOUGH SYRIA WAS A COUNTRY WITH SEVERAL VERY IMPORTANT MANUFACTURING CITIES (Map 6), there is a lack of documentation concerning them. The ports and inland cities of this province have always been great commercial centers; the Hudūd tells us: “Whatever is produced in the Maghrib, Egypt, Rūm (Byzantium), and Andalus, is brought there.” Ḥaḍīṣī listed garments of cotton, mulḥām stuffs, and wrappers (füța), as the articles of trade there.

The carpets (ānāṭ) of Antioch are known as early as al-Asma’ī, who cited a verse of Zuhair of the pre-Islamic era, speaking of a stuff called Anṭākiya of a red color. At a much earlier date (260 A.D.), Shāpūr transported some of its inhabitants to Džundšērpūr; while, in the year 42 H. (662 A.D.) Balādhūrī noted that Muʿāwiya transplanted some Persians to Antioch and others to Baalbek, Ḥimṣ, Basra, and Kufa.

Idrīṣī stated: “In Antioch excellent garments of a single color (ṭīyāb μuṣmāṭa), ‘Attābī, and Dastuwā’ī (of the type manufactured in Dastuwā in Djibāl), and Iṣfahānī (from Isfahān), and the like, are made.”

The sister city of Aleppo is better documented than Antioch. Ḥaḍīṣī only mentioned its garments and its cotton, but Muḥrīzī, quoting an earlier source for the Fatimid period and discussing the tents in their treasuries, said:

There was brought out the large tent (füșṭāt) known as al-mudawwara al-kabīra (“the Large Round One”), with the manufacture of which, at Aleppo, Abu l-Ḥasan Ali ibn Ahmed, known as Ibn al-Aysar (“the left-handed”) had been entrusted some time after the year 440 H. (1047 A.D.). Thirty thousand dinars had been spent upon its cloth (kuhrūk), decoration (nakṣḥ, probably such as embroidery), fabrication, and appurtenances.

This might imply that there was a Fatimid tirāz factory in Aleppo, though Ibn al-Aysar may have been a private individual, not a state employee.

5 J. Gildemeister, Idrīṣī, Palaestina et Syria (Bonn, 1885), p. 23. For “Dastuwā’ī,” perhaps the reading “Tustari” would be better. See Chap. VIII, n. 36.
7 Ḥaḍīṣī, op. cit., p. 181.
8 Muḥrīzī, Khiṭṭat (Bulaq, 1270 H. [1853 A.D.]), I, 419, line 30.
Yākūt ⁹ has preserved part of the journey of Ibn Buṭlān, who traveled through this part of the world about the same date. This traveler remarked: “One of the marvels of Aleppo is that, in the cloth market (Ḳašariya-al-Bazz), there are twenty shops owned by agents in which, each day, they sell goods to the value of twenty thousand dirhams. That has continued for twenty years and up to this very day.”

In the year 515 H. (1116-17 A.D.), Makrīzī ¹⁰ said that the new vizier, Ma'mūn of Egypt, remitted, among other taxes, “three garments of Aleppo.”

A list of taxes on the city is given by Ibn al-Shiḥna for the year 609 H. (1212-13 A.D.), which includes the following among many other items of all kinds: the tax on dyeing factories, 80,000 dirhams; the tax on indigo (reading doubtful) 20,000 dirhams; the tax on silk, 80,000 dirhams.

He added:

One of the specialties of the town is also the traffic in imported merchandise, silk, linen, Yazdī (cloth), Persian stuffs, furs, (martens, washīk, fanak, squirrel, fox, etc.), Indian merchandise, Circassian, Turkish, and Byzantine articles of luxury. Sales of a single day at Aleppo are often greater than those of a month in other cities. ... Ten loads of silk, for instance, brought to Aleppo, are sold that very day for ready money, whereas ten loads taken to Cairo, though the largest of cities, are not sold there till the end of the month.¹¹

He mentioned a khan of the goat hair sellers inside the walls.¹² Bīḍāšī ¹² said: “Aleppo is so much a trading city that it is called Kūčūk Hind (‘Little India’).”

To the southwest of Aleppo was Aʻzāz of which one manuscript of Abu ʻl-Fidāʼ mentions: “In particular, cotton is cultivated there, which is then laden in ships and taken to Ceuta whence it is distributed throughout the west.” ¹³

Concerning al-Bāb, between Aleppo and Manbij, Yākūt said: “It possesses markets in which muslin (kīrbās) is made that is taken to Egypt (Mīṣr) and Damascus and called after it.” ¹⁴ Of the town of Ḥaffa, he said: “It is said that the Ḥaffi garments are named after it, but all I know is that Ḥaff is an instrument used by weavers with which these garments are made, but it is not used in all garments.” ¹⁵ This explanation of the name is probably correct, and it seems unlikely that these garments derived their name from this obscure village.

According to Balādhrī,¹⁷ Ḥishām founded Ruṣāfa in Syria (105 H. [723-24 A.D.]),

---

¹² Ibid.
¹³ Sharaf Khan Bīḍāšī, Scheref Nameh ou Fastes de la nation Kourde, trans. by F. Charmoy (St. Peters-
burg, 1868-75), I, 266.
¹⁴ For its cotton see P. Belon, Les Observations de plusieurs singularités (Paris, 1585), fol. 57.
¹⁶ Yākūt, op. cit., I, 437.
but though he may have instituted some palace factories, there is no evidence of manufacture there before al-Âşmâ‘î, quoted by Yâkût: "They have skill in manufacturing robes (aksiya), and every man there, rich or poor, spins wool while their women weave it." 18 Қаз-вînî 19 noted: "The craft of its inhabitants is the manufacture of robes (aksiya), sacks, and bags which are taken thence to all lands."

Sarmîn, according to Ibn Baštûṭa, 20 made a beautiful cotton cloth named Sarmînî after it. Baalbek (Ba‘labakk) stuffs were very famous in later times, but I have not found any references to them before the Mameluke period. The Thousand and One Nights mentions them in several places, and Ibn Baštûṭa 21 remarked that "there are made in Baalbek the garments named after it, consisting of ijrâms (a cloth wrapper used in the pilgrimage), . . . " Under the events of the year 922 H. (1516 A.D.) Ibn Iyâs 22 recorded that the puppet caliph in Egypt wore the Baghdad turban which has two ends, and a Baalbek robe (kabâ‘) with Tirâz borders of black silk (hârîr). The sultan himself wore a white Baalbek robe (kabâ‘) with gold Tirâz borders on broad black silk. Again, white Baalbek banners with the inscription "God make the Sultan victorious" are mentioned. Thus, in the Mameluke period there was probably a Tirâz factory there.

Damascus (Dimashq), too, is but poorly documented. Maḵdîsî enumerated among its special products "mašûr and ba‘lîsî cloth and brocade." 23 Idrîsî, however, had rather a surprising fund of information:

The city of Damascus contains many excellent qualities and many types of manufactures and various kinds of garments of silk (hârîr) such as khazz silk, precious and costly brocade of wonderful manufacture, with no equal; this is taken thence to every country and province adjoining it, and to those at a distance from it. The factories (mašânî), for all of those are marvelous, and their brocade resembles the finest brocade of Rûm (Byzantium), approximating to the garments of Dastuwâ‘î 24 and vying with the manufactures of Isfahan, surpassing the manufactures of the Tirâz factories of Nishapur consisting of silken garments of one color (thiyāb al-hârîr al-mušmata) and the wonderful garments of Tinnîs. Its (Damascus) Tirâz factories contain all kinds of manufactures of precious cloth. 25

In Mameluke times, too, the city had a Tirâz factory. Maḵrîzî 26 stated that in the days
of al-Nāṣir Muhammad ibn Ḥalālūn, one of the great emirs, was given a robe of honor (khiła):

... a kind called Tardwāš[27] made in the dār al-tīrāz which was in Alexandria, Cairo (Miṣr), and Damascus. It was embroidered with bands (madawwakha dhākhāt) which were inscribed with the titles of the sultan. It had bands dhākhāt of Tardwāš and bands of different colors intermingled with gold-spangled linen (kašāb muḏḏahhab), these bands being separated by embroideries in color (nuḳūš) and a tīrāz border. This was made of kašāb, but sometimes an important personage (among the officials) would have a tīrāz border embroidered with gold (muẓar-kasha bi-dḥahhab) with squirrel (ṣindjāb) and beaver (ḵundus) fur upon it as mentioned above. Under the cloak (kabā') of Tardwāš there was a cloak of muḵṭāriḥ[28] with hoods (ṭarha) of Alexandrine stuff, and a headdress (kallawta) of gold embroidery (zarkāš) with spurs, a turban (šāsh) as mentioned, and a waistbelt (hiyāṣa) of gold, sometimes with plaques (baḵkāriya) and sometimes without them.

Tardwāš[29] seems to be a Persian compound name and is thought to be a cloth embroidered with animals or scenes from the chase, of which there are numerous examples extant today.

In the Hauran (Ḥawrān) district of Damascus lay A’nāk, and Yāḵūt[31] said: “Carpets (busūṭ) and fine robes (aksiyya) are made in it which are named after it.”

Maḵdīṣi[32] found that Ḥūla was a source of cotton, and “from Kadas come munaiyar (garments with a double warp).”[33] Tiberias had, as specialties, “pieces of carpeting (shikāḵ al-maṭāriḥ), paper (kāḡhīd), and cloth (bazz).”[34] According to Idrīṣī: “In Tyre (Ṣūr) white garments of great beauty, of fine qualities and workmanship, expensive in price, are manufactured, and occasionally similar ones are manufactured in other parts of the surrounding country.”[35]

Nāṣir-i-Khusraw[36] said that artisans were numerous in Jerusalem, each trade having a separate quarter, as at the present time. The Jewish travelers had also some matters of interest to relate: “He (Rabbi Petachia) went to Jerusalem. The only Jew there is Rabbi Abraham the dyer and he pays a heavy tax to the king to be permitted to remain.”[37] Benjamin of Tudela[38] found that “it contains a dyehouse for which the Jews pay a small rent annually to the king (Baldwin III) on condition that, besides the Jews, no other dyers be allowed in Jerusalem.”[39]

---

[27] Reading “Tardwāš” for “Trzwāš.”
[28] The sense of this word is unknown to me.
[29] Cf. R. Dozy, Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements ches les Arabes (Amsterdam, 1845), where this passage is cited and this garment described.
[31] Yāḵūt, op. cit., I, 316. The exact locality of A’nāk is uncertain, so it could not be inserted in the map.
[33] Ibid., p. 180.
[34] Ibid.
The city of Ramle, later the Muslim capital of Palestine, was founded by the Umayyad Sulaimān: "The first place he built was his palace, and then the house known as Dār al-Šabbāghin (‘the house of the dyers’) in which he placed a cistern." This building later passed into the hands of the Abbassids. It seems to have been some kind of royal factory, and the word ūrirūz itself could equally well apply to a dyehouse. No more information, however, is forthcoming about this curious site though it is frequently mentioned by the historians. Maḵḍīṣī reported that "Ramle is the storehouse (khizāna) of Miṣr, and the meeting place of the two seas." Its unequaled veils are also mentioned. Isaac Chelo who journeyed through Palestine in the year 1334 A.D. said that in Ramle they had cotton factories.

The same Jewish traveler also remarked: "There is only one Jew living in this city (Sarafand near Ramla); he is a dyer and has fine works." In Jaffā he noted cotton thread and dyed stuffs.

The kāzz silk of Ascalon (‘Askalān), according to Maḵḍīṣī was surpassingly good. The textiles of Gaza (Ghazza) will be described in the chapter on Egypt, but, according to M. Murray, there was silk in this area from pre-Muslim times.

The Jewish dyers of Palestine have been noticed in several cities, and Palestine was famous for the growing of the indigo plant. Of the town of Zughar, Ibn Ḥawkāl said: "There is some manufacture of indigo (nil) there, and there are workers who do not fall short of those in Kabul, though the dye does not come up to the standard of Kabul." Makdisi mentioned indigo as an export of Jericho, Baisān, and Zughar (Ṣughar). Idrīṣī said: "The principal crop of the Ghor (Gawr [the Jordan valley]) is indigo," and he specially mentioned the indigo of Jericho.

CYPRUS (KUBRUS)

This island exported cloth to the Muslims, for Abu 'l-Ḵāsim of Baghdad spoke of a square carpet to sit upon, from Cyprus (ṭarāha Ḳubrūsīya). Ibn Ĥawkāl noted that there is abundant silk (ḥarīr) and linen (kattān) in Cyprus, while Maḵḍīṣī said that "the Muslims derive advantages and profit from the large amount of goods, cloth (ṭiyāb), and

40 Balādhurī, op. cit., text, p. 143, trans., I, 220.
42 Maḵḍīṣī, op. cit., p. 36.
43 Maḵḍīṣī, Aḥsanu-t-taqāsim fi Maʿrīfāt-l-Aqālim Known as al-Muqaddasi, trans. by G. S. A. Ranking and R. F. Azoo (Calcutta, 1897-1910, incomplete). This does not exist in De Goeje’s text.
46 Ibid., p. 139.
48 Personal information.
51 Idrīṣī, op. cit., pp. 3 and 4.
52 Abu 'l-Muṭṭahhar al-Azdi, Ḥikāyat Abī 'l-Ḵāsim, ed. A. Mez (Heidelberg, 1902), p. 35. See also the passage in Die persische Nadelmalerei Susanschilder (Leipzig, 1881), by J. von Karabacek, pp. 71-73, quoting many European sources. For Ṭarrāba, see R. Dozy, Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes.
54 Maḵḍīṣī, op. cit., p. 184.
articles which are brought from it.” Cyprus madder was used for dyeing reed mats about the end of the thirteenth century. 55 Pedro de Teixeira 56 mentioned various dye stuffs of earth which he saw there, but such brief notices as these cannot do justice to the immense importance of Cyprus in the commercial world of the Near East during the Muslim era.

(To be continued)

56 The Travels of P. Teixeira with His “King of Harmuz” and Extracts from His “Kings of Persia,” trans. and annotated by W. F. Sinclair and D. Ferguson (London, 1902), p. 137. He also mentioned exports of cotton and silk (p. 134).

Supplementary Notes

Of Tripoli anterior to the Mongol invasion, Bur- chard of Mount Sion (trans. by A. Stewart, Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Soc. [London, 1897], XII, 16) said: “It is full of people, for therein dwell Greeks and Latins, Armenians, Maronites, Nestorians, and many others. Much work is done there in silk. I have heard for certain that therein there are weavers of silk and camlet and other like stuffs.” Burchard went to the East in 1232 A.D., and his Description of the Holy Land is based on his experiences there.

M. Minovi has drawn my attention to an important article by D. N. Wilber and M. Minovi, “Notes on the Rab'i Rashid,” Bull. Amer. Inst. Iranian Art and Archaeol., V (1938), III, especially pp. 249-52.

The authors of this article quote from the letters of Rashid al-Din the famous vizier of Ghazan Khan, a collection known as the Mubâttabât-i-Rashidi in a manuscript which belonged to the late E. G. Browne and is now in the Cambridge University Library. Letter 51 refers to the Rashidâ foundation or estate in Tabriz and mentions that it included “factories for cloth-weaving and paper-making, a dye-house, a mint,” which had been constructed at the orders of the vizier. People from every city and border have been removed to this quarter. The craftsmen and inhabitants transferred from other countries were established in separate streets. In this letter, which was written to his son the governor of the district of Kinnârin, the vizier said: “The object in writing this letter in short, is that you should send forth fifty camlet (ṣūf) weavers from Añâjiya (An- tioch) and Sûs and Tarsus, not by force and compulsion, but by kindness and persuasion so that they may come with carefree minds and voluntarily. Twenty more camlet weavers you must ask the King Theophilus, son of Michael from Kubrus (Cyprus) to send to Tabriz.” The authors note that the kings of Cyprus at this time (before 718 H. [1318 A.D.]) were not Byzantines but the Lusignan dynasty, and Rashid al-Din’s information seems anachronistic referring to a much earlier period. The authors add that the wools (ṣūf) of Kubrus are mentioned in a book attributed to Nişâm al-Mulk known as Kitâb-i-Wâṣlâyih in which Nişâm al-Mulk related that Kubrus wool is sent to one of the Seljuk kings, his masters, among presents from Rûm (Byzantium).

M. Minovi has also given me a reference—al-Sam‘ānî, Kitâb al-Ansâb facsimile ed., Intro. by D. S. Margoliouth, Gibb Mem. Ser. (London, 1913), XX, 441: “Kubrusî, This is the adjective from Kubrus which is an island in the Mediterranean to which are attributed Kubrusî cloths (tibâyâb) which are linen.” (It is necessary to read kattân for k bān).

In the latter half of the fifteenth century, Mahmûd Kârî of Yazd (Diwân-i-Albîsa [Constantinople, 1303 H.J] mentioned in several places Kubrusî wool (ṣūf), and once “Cyprus sixteen wool” (ṣūf-i-sittata ‘as̱ârî), the name presumably being derived from some technical process of manufacture, (pp. 61, 119, 15). A reference to “sypres for neckerchiefs,” in Scotland in 1502 A.D. is to be found in J. Bain, Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland 1337-1509 (Edinburgh, 1888), IV, Addenda.

In Rotuli Scacciorii Regum Scotorum, Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, 1264-1359 (Edinburgh, 1878), I, 380 under the “Accounts of the Clerk of the Kitchen & Clerks of the Wardrobe rendered at Scone 10th to 12th December 1331,” is mention of the following items “una magna pecia panni cerici de Antocheia (Antioch) viij £. Et in nouem parvis pecias panni de Antocheia vt supra, xvij £ ij s . . . Et in novemdecim pecias cindonis de Tripo (Tripoli) xij £ xiiij s, iiiij d.” Cf. also p. 384 for a similar entry. In the same volume under the “Accounts of the Stewards of the House of the Earl of Carrick” for 1329 is the item: “Et per quandam peciam, panni de tarse (Tarsus) ruberi coloris.”

Another interesting source of information on the Syrian trade in textiles, also of the post-Abassid period, is Ludolf von Suchem’s Description of the Holy Land, Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Soc. (London, 1895) written about 1350 A.D. Of Alexandria and its district he said (p. 46): “Not far from Alexandria there is a village, all
of whose inhabitants are Saracen work people, who weave mats wondrous well in divers fashions with most curious skill." Of Acre he said (pp. 60–61): "At this day about sixty Saracen mercenaries dwell in Acre as a garrison for the city and port and make a living out of silk and birds." Since the fall of Acre Christian women there dressed in black. Of Damascus he said (p. 129), that it is "rich in all manner of merchandise...abounding in foods, spices, precious stones, silk, pearls, cloth-of-gold, perfumes from India, Tartary, Egypt, Syria, and places our side of the Mediterranean...and is incredibly populous, being inhabited by divers trades of most cunning and noble workmen, mechanics and merchants...Each trade dwells by itself in a particular street, and each workman according to his craft and power, makes in front of his house a wondrous show of his work, as cunningly, nobly and peculiarly wrought as he can...But they sell everything very dear."

IN THIS STUDY ONLY FLOOR COVERINGS WILL BE CONSIDERED. CANOPIES AND TENT COVERS OFFER RICH MATERIAL BUT THOUGH MANY CANOPIES SHOW DESIGNS COMPARABLE TO THOSE OF FLOOR CARPETS, THE DEVELOPMENT SEEMS TO BE NOT ENTIRELY ANALOGOUS. FURTHER STUDY AND SEPARATE TREATMENT SEEM ADVISABLE.

2 "TIM. CARP.," I, 40-41. MIGHT THIS PHENOMENON PERHAPS BE SOMEWHAT ANALOGOUS TO THE PLOUGH OF DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE TODAY, WHERE THE GRIP OF THE SO-CALLED "TRADITIONAL" PATTERNS PREVENTS ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN FROM KEEPING PACE WITH ADVANCES IN OTHER FIELDS.
There are, however, carry-overs from the old geometric manner into the new cursive, more naturalistic one, with its fluidity, lively arabesques, and joyous flowers. Though the primary importance of the knot, so indispensable to the early Timurid designer, be lost forever, it is still employed sometimes for borders and occasionally as a decorative motif in the arabesque design, as in Figure 15. Two of the most imposing arabesque rugs have Kufic borders, though their intricate knot forms are vastly different from those of the conventional Kufic carpet border (Figs. 10, 11). One arabesque carpet (Fig. 8) uses the old Kufic as the main border with a secondary border between field and main border showing a flowery undulating stem. Several Timurid and even a few early sixteenth-century carpets represented have cursive designs in the field and a very simple old-style Kufic border. It never seems quite harmonious, and though it is used on a fine flower carpet illustrated in the exquisite Nizâmi manuscript dated 1524-25 in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, most such carpets are in miniatures less distinguished or possibly of provincial origin. A very elaborate flower carpet by Bihzâd has a border of knots like those in Figures 10 and 11, alternating with arabesques.

The greatest gift of the old style to the new is a respect for, or perhaps an unconscious practice of, adherence to geometry as the basis of design and the controlling force governing both space divisions and surface decoration. This practice goes deep into the roots of Persian design, and its importance cannot be exaggerated. In a style so delicate and rich, the danger

---

4 Ibid., Figs. 23, 41.
5 Ibid., Fig. 63.
6 Ibid., Appendix 41b.
of overprettness is always close. This becomes very apparent in Safawid art, the period from which date the earliest and most cherished Persian carpets. It is my opinion that, as fine as these masterpieces of carpet weaving are, their designs are less virile and slightly decadent when compared with the best of the Timurid period. The unchallenged beauty of the Safawid carpets is due to the mastery of their weavers in handling designs perfected during the period of Bihzād.

In Bihzād's cursive rug designs appears a sound and clear relationship to a basic geometric plan and often to an actual repeating pattern. Something of the method and skill employed becomes evident in the process of reconstructing the carpets depicted in his miniatures. The task is somewhat different and more complicated than that involved in the reconstruction of a repeating pattern where only the unit and its relation to edges and corner of the field must be determined. Yet in the finest of Timurid carpets, there is an astonishing accuracy in the indication of the whole design, interrupted though it be by objects and figures. In computing the center of the leftmost horizontal ellipse in Figure 13, a measurement taken on the photograph from the left end of the carpet was off less than one sixty-fourth of an inch when compared with one taken from the right end. Yet it seems likely that this precision is due to accuracy of eye and hand combined with perfect knowledge of the pattern rather than to minute measuring, because the distortion of the pattern to suit the requirements of the new designs is frequent. The most interesting example is in Figure 10, in which the whole pattern in certain areas is distorted to make possible the small complete circles at the edges, rather than the half circles that would be there if the geometric plan of the repeat had been followed exactly (Fig. 7). The resulting lack of symmetry is scarcely perceptible. The departure from strict geometry in this instance, unlike that found in poor, weak designing, only emphasizes the debt to geometry of these skillful Timurid designers. In fact, lack of consistency or accuracy in this respect is an indication that the painter of the miniature was not entirely cognizant of carpet designs and that, therefore, the authenticity of the carpet represented in his miniature is open to question.7

Certain trends distinguish all types of these arabesque and flower carpets from those with geometric repeating patterns. On the whole, the space divisions are larger than those in the geometric rugs, where the effect was most often that of a rather small allover repeat. With this enlargement of the unit, is found the inclination to emphasize the central motif, thus removing the design still further from the appearance of a repeating pattern. It should be emphasized, however, that the preference of Islamic art for endless repetition is never entirely abandoned. The relation of the design to an infinitely repeating system is still fundamental, though the tendency is to make the relationship less and less obvious, until, in the plans of some Timurid and many later carpets, it seems finally to have disappeared.

A very important difference is one of rhythm and movement. Though a livelier tempo is introduced into several fine carpets of the geometric group,8 the effect, for the most part, is

---

7 This seems to apply to a multiple medallion carpet in a very beautiful miniature formerly attributed to Bihzād, ibid., Appendix 37b.
8 Ibid., Figs. 49, 54, 58, 61.
Figs. 2–6—Line Schemes of Designs Found in Early Islamic Book Illumination
static and sometimes monotonous. The arabesque and flower carpets are all characterized by a movement full of life and freedom. The balance is contained and firm, but is one of rhythms rather than of exact symmetry of forms. The treatment of the corners of the field in Figure 11 is an example, and several instances occur in the arabesques of Figure 13. The curves are ample and rounding, never squeezed nor pinched like the spiral stems of some later floral carpets.

A quality in Timurid geometric carpets contributing to both richness and strength of design in the arabesque and flower carpets is the multiple functioning of the forms—a practice of Islamic artists of making one line serve several purposes at the same time. As in the Samarra stucco designs, the line that limits one area defines another adjoining one. This often explains the very shapes of motifs distinguishing Persian carpets: cartouches for example, are interstices between other forms. This is more evident in Timurid carpets (Figs. 8, 11–13) than in later ones in which the cartouches thus evolved seem to function as independent motifs. This quality applies not only to the delineation of space divisions but also to the decoration itself. One never has the feeling, frequently inspired by less distinguished carpets, that into empty spaces forms have been hopefully placed until the spaces are filled. In Timurid carpets arabesque leaves and flower stems, when not emphasizing contours already established, create pleasing spaces or new compartments.

Perhaps the greatest contrast between the old and new styles is seen in the surface decoration. With the exception of the few knot forms mentioned above, arabesque and flower forms, which were rarities in the decoration of the geometric carpets, are used exclusively in the new cursive designs. The earliest are entirely arabesque (Fig. 10); then flowers are introduced into the arabesque designs (Fig. 13) and finally the arabesques are subordinated to the flowers (Fig. 16).

These flowers are spoken of as naturalistic, as indeed they are when compared with the very conventional flower forms of the geometric carpets. Yet they too are stylized, and their growth is controlled by laws as rigid as those which govern the arabesques. The motifs themselves are few in number and seem to be the result of a fusion of Chinese, Iranian, and Islamic forms. Often the same flowers which ornament the carpet are found elsewhere in the miniature, growing on ground or trees, or as motifs of the architectural decoration. That the vocabulary was already complete in the Mongol period is suggested by the illumination of a Koran page dated 728 H. (1327 A.D.). Half a very ruglike composite medallion is ornamented with several of the forms repeated again and again in the the late Timurid carpets, two-lobed bud, trifoliate leaf, pointed leaflet, and more rare in the carpets, a fine Chinese peony. An excellent representation of these exquisite flower and leaf forms is seen on the border of a camel cover illustrated in Bihzâd’s painting of the “Dromedary and his Keeper,” in the Freer Gallery, Washington, D.C. (Fig. 1). At the center of the top border, is a flower formed by four

9 E. Herzfeld, Der Wandschmuck der Bauten von Samarra und seine Ornamentik (Berlin, 1923).
pointed petals with dainty lobed petals between them. Almost exactly the same flower occurs in one of Bihzād’s geometric carpets, as well as in the interstices of many other geometric carpets. This form is related to that of the full-blown little blossoms used in the corner and alternating with the five-petaled flowers in this and in many other floral borders.

In Timurid carpets, the decoration is contained in one area or compartment. Though the rhythmic movement of a stem may be picked up and continued in another space, as in Figure 8, the practice of running a stem from one compartment into another, or from ground into medallion, seems not to have developed till the sixteenth century. Also the two systems of decoration, arabesque and flower, are always kept distinct. In earlier types, when flowers are introduced, they are restricted to certain compartments. In later types, where flowers and arabesques intertwine in the same area, the two species are never mixed nor confused.

The classification of arabesque and flower carpets is complicated by the ingenuity and fresh invention used by these artists in combining design forms. It is possible to divide them roughly into four groups: (1) carpets which have fields divided into compartments, usually interpenetrating, (2) carpets which have fields decorated with scroll stems, (3) medallion carpets, and (4) prayer carpets. The compartment group which tends to be rather definitely related to repeating patterns, will be analyzed here.

I. COMPARTMENT CARPETS

Unlike the more or less stereotype geometric carpets in many Timurid miniatures, the cursive rugs, far fewer, show designs rich with invention. The impact of a fresh new style full of vitality, richness, and grace, was very clearly felt in a few splendid carpets which, though using the old geometric plans, had arabesque and floral motifs. The new mode was more adequately expressed, however, in the creation of new types, some of which are naturally not represented in Timurid miniatures in the form familiarized in later carpets because they had not yet been repeated often enough to have become crystallized. Such a design is the compartment pattern based on overlapping and interpenetrating areas. More than all other Timurid types of carpets it seems to have been especially peculiar to the later Timurid period and to the influence of Bihzād. Though it has descendants among extant carpets, as will be noted below, the forms have changed considerably and show the influences of other patterns, too. Actual carpets such as are illustrated in Figures 8, 11–13 must have been very handsome, and one regrets that the design was not carried over more directly into the period that produced carpets which have survived.

The type of compartment design used in Figures 8, 10–13, reached the peak

---

12 Ibid., Fig. 24.
13 In book illumination, however, an example occurs as early as 1313, in a Koran dated 713 h. An arabesque stem continues through two areas of the compartment design (Ettinghausen, op. cit., Pl. 934).
14 “Tim. Carp.,” I, Figs. 24, 25, 49, 53, 54, 61. It seems incredible that Figure 53, a large carpet, or the other ornament represented in the miniature of a “Court Scene” in the Shah Namah of Sultan Ali Mizra in the Turkish and Islamic Museum, Istanbul, could have been done as early as 1400, the date suggested by E. Schroeder on the basis of the costumes represented (“Ahmed Musa and Shams al-Din: A Review of Fourteenth-Century Painting,” Ars Islamica, VI [1939], 113–42).
Fig. 7—Diagram of Repeating Scheme for Fig. 10
of its development in Timurid and Safawid book illumination and in Timurid carpet designs. These rather complicated schemes are evolved by laying out a geometric plan of overlapping circular forms of many sizes around certain pivotal points within a rectangle. The arrangement within the rectangle is usually abstracted or adapted from an allover repeating pattern, but is never more than one unit wide. The forms join each other and the edges by means of small circles or semicircles. The substructure completed, certain lines are erased, thus creating new forms, such as quatrefoils and cartouches.\(^{15}\) When the space has been divided into compartments by these compass-made curves, the plan is then developed by choosing certain areas to be filled in with solid tones. This sort of play with curves is seen in several early Islamic illuminated designs (Figs. 2–4).\(^{16}\) Figures 2 and 3 are so simple that the process of construction is easily followed. Figure 4 is much more complicated, but is closer in effect to the Timurid carpets. All show the compartments bound by interlacing bands, a practice maintained for centuries. The important step of eradicating some of the structural lines to form new areas of unusual shape is illustrated in two thirteenth-century examples of book illumination, Figure 5 from a Mameluuke Koran page,\(^{17}\) and Figure 6 from a beautiful page in the Freer Gallery, which is far more ruglike in character.\(^ {18}\) Several tricks of composition in Timurid compartment carpets are featured in the latter, as for example, the half circles coming from the edge of the field and overlapping at the center, where a new shape is created, in this instance, a large four-pointed star. A construction similar to the center of this design is found in Figure 12 in the straight-sided areas at the edges of the field.

Two very noteworthy carpets with overlapping or interpenetrating compartments are represented in Figures 10 and 11 from the Būstān illustrated by Bihzād, in the collection of the National Egyptian Library at Cairo.\(^ {19}\) In spite of the similarities in the construction of the fields and the use of all but identical borders, Figure 11 is far more advanced in style than is Figure 10. Except for the distortion described above and the slight adjustments at the ends of the field, Figure 10 is a section of Figure 7, an allover repeating pattern. Figure 11 is also capable of repetition, but in adapting the pattern to a carpet design many more changes have been made, with the result that it gives a definite impression of having been created as a unit terminating within the rectangle rather than for infinite repetition. Almost three entire units of the repeat have been used in Figure 10, whereas in Figure 11, one unit fills almost the entire center field, with less than half of adjoining units at the ends.\(^ {20}\) Thus, the center of this carpet is different from, and more important than, the ends. Other new features are the use of elliptical forms and the introduction of flowers into the arabesque design. Both carpets are

---

15 E. H. Hankin has shown how this principle was used in the creation of very complicated arabesque ornament: "The Drawing of Geometric Patterns in Saracenic Art," Arch. Surv. India, XV (1925).

16 Fig. 2, F. R. Martin, The Miniature Painting and Painters of Persia, India, and Turkey (London, 1912), II, Pl. 235; Fig. 3, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., No. 34.26; Fig. 4, B. Moritz, Arabic Palaeography (Cairo, 1905), Pl. XII.

17 Martin, op. cit., Pl. 237.

18 Freer Gallery, No. 29.70. Interest is heightened in Figures 5 and 6 by the doubling of the basic circles. The Mongol design mentioned in note 13 shows this same feature.

19 "Tim. Carp.," I, Appendix 42a and c.

20 The division between the units is vertically through the small circles in the centers of the two ellipses.
splendid examples of Islamic design. In Figure 10, the stability achieved at the centers of the three large quatrefoils by placing the knots and the straight arabesque leaves along the solid structural square, as well as the balanced symmetry of the crossed arabesque, gives the effect of three quiet islands in a sea of swirling movement. In Figure 11, the spiral arabesque, an endless stem which ornaments the circles at the centers of the ellipses, is a constant source of surprise and delight. Unlike the quasi-elliptical forms of some of these compartment designs (Figs. 12, 13), the ellipses of Figure 11 are true ellipses with the arabesque decoration functionally related to the foci (indicated by dots on the right side of the drawing).

Somewhere between these two carpets would come, in line of development, Figure 8 from a miniature attributed to Kāsim Ali, in a Mīr Ṭabī‘ al-Shīr Nawā‘ī manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Because of the simple Kufic border, Pope has referred to this design as illustrative of the struggle between the old and new styles.21 An attempt at harmonizing the border and field is seen in the knot placed at the center of the arabesque design in the field. Simpler than Figure 11, it is composed of two complete units of the repeat, finishing at each end with half a vertical ellipse, the only whole one being reserved for the center. Some of the arabesques seem to carry from one compartment into another, suggestive of a future development already noted.

A very strong arabesque carpet of compartment type (Fig. 12) is illustrated in a miniature of “Iśkandar with the Seven Sages,” in the famed Niẓāmī manuscript dated 1494–95 in the British Museum.22 Unfortunately, so much of the center and ends are covered that the reconstruction must remain far from complete. All the peculiarities of construction are explained, however, by two designs found in Safawid book illumination. Except for the small circles at the edges of the field, the suggested plan indicated at the left top of Figure 12 is precisely that of the later of these two designs.23 The differentiation of the center is attained by contracting the circular motif and substituting the slightly pointed arch. The predominant colors are dark lapis, vermilion, and ivory—strong colors for the sturdy arabesque design.24

The climax of this group is reached in Figure 13, a rug represented in Figure 14, a miniature from a Niẓāmī manuscript in the British Museum, which, though dated 846 H. (1442 A.D.), contains miniatures from the school of Bihzād, probably painted about 1493.25 The reconstruction of the very ends of the field may be open to question, since they are not actually visible. But as at least their approximate nature is indicated, it is hoped that the ad-

22 Ibid., Appendix 44b.
23 (1) Opening pages of an Anthology dated 929 H. (1523 A.D.), Freer Gall., No. 32:46–47; published by Ettinghausen, op. cit., Pl. 948. (2) Niẓāmī MS, 1539–43, British Museum, ibid., Pl. 949. Where the carpet has circles at the edges, the illuminated examples have semi-circles protruding from the ellipses, a second instance of Bihzād’s preference for terminating his carpet fields with whole rather than half circles. If the central panel of
24 The list of colors is based on British Museum post card, C. 94.
Fig. 8—Plan of a Carpet in a Miniature Attributed to Kasim Ali
vantage of seeing the strength and beauty of this splendid design in its entirety may compensate for the possible lack of complete authenticity.

An entirely different tendency is illustrated in Figures 15 and 16, two small carpets from late Timurid miniatures both attributed to Bihzād. Much less formal, these rugs aim at charm and grace rather than at sumptuous strength. It is unfortunate that so little is discernible of their plans, which are apparently very simple. It is evident that the designer in dividing his field has used shapes and forms developed in the compartment style of patterning. In Figure 16, there is no overlapping or interpenetration unless one assumes a substructure which has been completely eradicated leaving only the central panel and its attached quatrefoils. Though these shapes, defined and joined by interlacing bands, are obviously borrowed from larger compartment carpets, the effect is rather that of a medallion carpet.

The lobed tabular panel and attached quatrefoils of Figure 16 comprise the border motif of a rather sketchily indicated rug in a Shah Namah manuscript, dated 902 H. (1496 A.D.), in the State Library at Munich.27 Here, at the end of the fifteenth century, there is evidence of the use of this motif for a carpet border, and it is as border decoration that this Timurid design type is most directly seen in extant carpets. The rows of tabular compartments and rondels or quatrefoils are especially familiar in many types of carpets, but interpenetrating cartouches with intermediary small circles, very close to the field designs of Timurid compartment carpets, are seen in the border of a sixteenth-century tree carpet from northwest Persia, in the possession of D. K. Kelekian.28

Compartments somewhat similar to those of this Timurid group decorate the fields of several well-known Safawid carpets which seem at first glance more closely related than they actually are. A silk carpet in the Rockefeller collection is fairly close in feeling and proportions to Timurid compartment rugs and has a stressed center, a small lobed roundel. Two others, the Clam-Gallas woolen carpet and the Havemeyer carpet in the Metropolitan Museum, are repeating patterns with no emphasis given to the center.

Some of the differences between these carpets and their Timurid predecessors were already indicated in designs used in early Safawid manuscripts. The elaboration of forms by substituting lobed forms matching the quatrefoils for simple curves is seen in a compartment rug represented in a miniature in the Niżāmi manuscript, dated 1524–25, in the Metropolitan

26 Figure 15, “Tim. Carp.” I, Appendix 51; Figure 16, R. Ettinghausen, “Six Thousand Years of Persian Art, 1940,” Ars Islamica, VII (1940), 106–18, Fig. 6.
27 “Tim. Carp.” I, Appendix 46a. A carpet illustrated in a miniature of ca. 1500, Freer Gallery No. 23.6, shows a compartment border of tabular rectangles with semicircles protruding from the centers of ends and sides.
28 Ettinghausen, op. cit., Fig. 2. As Pope pointed out (op. cit., p. 2317), Bihzād designed very beautiful borders of the tabula ansata type. He does not, however, appear to have favored them for carpets. Several fine examples occur in the architectural decoration represented in the Cairo Bāstān (E. Kühnle, “History of Miniature Painting and Drawing,” A Survey of Persian Art [London and New York, 1938–39], V, Pls. 886–87). Aga-Oglu said that the pattern had a long history and was well established in book covers by 840 H. (1436 A.D.) (Persian Bookbindings of the Fifteenth Century [Ann Arbor, 1935], Pl. XV).
29 Sarre and Trenkwald, Alt-Orientalische Teppiche (Vienna, 1926–29), II, Pl. 44.
30 Pope, op. cit., Pl. 1143.
31 Ibid., Pl. 1223.
Museum, and in a midsixteenth-century illuminated design reproduced by Martin. Another design from the first quarter of the sixteenth century, in a manuscript in the Freer Gallery, shows these elaborated forms and is another instance of the mingling of the compartment and medallion patterns. A second difference, the elongation or stiffening of the ample curves of the Timurid designs, is illustrated in the illumination of a manuscript dated 1524 and also in the midsixteenth-century example just mentioned.

A feature of the repeat in the Havemeyer carpet and in a small Turkish velvet carpet in the Corcoran Gallery (Fig. 9) is a lobed tablet-like compartment. Though somewhat similar shapes were sometimes used for the centers of Timurid compartment carpets (Fig. 16), they were not part of the allover scheme. Similar motifs occur in two designs only very slightly later than the Timurid rugs, an inscribed silk in the collection of Mrs. William H. Moore, and in a late fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century book binding in the National Museum at

![Figure 9: Plan of Field, Turkish Velvet Carpet, Late Sixteenth Century](image)

**Fig. 9—Plan of Field, Turkish Velvet Carpet, Late Sixteenth Century**  
Washington, Corcoran Gallery

---

32 Kühnel, op. cit., Pl. 893A.  
33 Martin, op. cit., Pl. 245.  
34 No. 37-35.  
35 Martin, op. cit., Pl. 244.  
36 No. 2290.  
Teheran. Both are allover repeating patterns resembling the Safawid far more than the Timurid carpets. One is, therefore, tempted to suppose that these extant carpets represent compartment types different from those featured in the carpets painted in Timurid miniatures. This supposition is strengthened by another very important quality of the later designs which is not characteristic of the Timurid group, namely, the reciprocal nature of the repeat, which, in the Rockefeller, Clam-Gallas, Corcoran, and other examples, consists of lobed forms pointing alternately up and down. Though this is not seen in any of the Timurid carpets with interpenetrating compartments, it is related to a design form with a long history, as is shown by the use of such a reciprocal pattern among the thirteenth-century Seljuk stone reliefs analyzed extensively by Riefstahl. It seems to be true then that the elaborate and beautiful compartment carpets represented in late Timurid miniatures belong to a style of carpet designing limited definitely to the period of Bihzâd, though distant echoes permeate the borders and field of later rug designs.

(To be continued)

39 “Primitive Rugs of the ‘Konya’ Type,” Art. Bull., XIII (1939), 177–220. He pointed out a relation between one relief (Fig. 19) and the Clam-Gallas rug (p. 201). Another design related to this carpet is mentioned by Pope (op. cit., p. 2318, n. 1), a carpet represented in a miniature dated 946 H. (1539 A.D.), a very helpful hint as to the dating of this compartment type.
Fig. 11—Reconstruction of Carpet in a Miniature by Bihzad
Partial Reconstruction of Carpet in a Miniature Attributed to Bihzâd
Fig. 13—Reconstruction of Carpet in a Miniature by Bihzād
FIG. 14—MINIATURE FROM A NIZAMI MS, CA. 1493. LONDON, BRITISH MUSEUM
Figs. 15-16—Partial Reconstructions of Carpets
THE LAWFULNESS OF PAINTING IN EARLY ISLAM *
BY K. A. C. CRESWELL

The paintings of Ķüşair āmra raise, in an imperative fashion, the question of the lawfulness or otherwise of painting in Islam. Even at the present day the belief is very widely held that all forms of painting are forbidden by explicit passages in the Koran, but

this is a popular error for no such passages exist, as orientalists have frequently pointed out.\(^1\)

Azraḵī (d. 858 A.D.), author of the earliest extant history of Mecca, tells that Muhammad, after his triumphal entry into that city in Ramadan 8 (December, 629—January, 630) went inside the Kaaba and ordered the pictures in it to be obliterated, but put his hand over a picture of Mary with Jesus seated on her lap, and said: “Rub out all the pictures except these under my hands”; and Azraḵī goes on to say that this picture remained until the Kaaba was destroyed in 63 H.\(^2\)

Sa’d ibn Abī Waḵkās and his Arabs at the capture of al-Madā’in, or Ctesiphon, used the great Iwān for the Friday prayer and were not disturbed by the paintings decorating it, one of which represented the siege of Antioch by Khusrau Anūshirwān (538 A.D.).\(^3\) Zakī Hasan tries to explain away this fact partly by the lack of time, the troops being so anxious to give thanks for their great victory that they did not stop to obliterate them, and partly by saying that “victorious armies do not always act according to religious principles.”\(^4\) But he has to admit that these paintings were allowed to remain for two and a half centuries at least, for they were seen by al-Buḥtūrī, who died in 897 A.D.\(^5\) An early example of Muslim painting may be mentioned; Yākūt says that the palace of al-Baidā’ at Basra, built by ‘Ubayd Allah the son of Ziyād ibn Abīhi, was decorated with wall paintings.\(^6\) Then, again, the rigid Caliph Omar used a censer with human figures on it, which he had brought from Syria, to perfume the mosque of Medina, and it was only in 785 A.D. that a governor of Medina had these figures erased.\(^7\) This hardening of opinion toward the end of the eighth century is in perfect keeping with the evidence given below.

It is also well known that Mu’āwiya and ‘Abd al-Malik struck coins with their own effigies.\(^8\) Recently, Zakī Hasan\(^9\) has sought to explain the undisputed existence of painting under the Umayyad caliphs by saying that “they did not keep the straight and narrow way in

---


\(^2\) Professor Creswell's article is a revised and supplemented version of his essay first published in his *Early Muslim Architecture* (Oxford, 1932), I, 269-71. ED.

\(^3\) The first to point out that the prohibition against painting comes not from the Koran but from the Hadīth, was Lavoix, in *“Les Peintures musulmans,”* pp. 353-54. He was followed by Pharaon, *op. cit.,* pp. 443-44; Lavoix, *“Les Arts musulmans,”* pp. 98-99; Karabaček, “Über das angebliche Bilderverbot des Islām,” p. 201; De Nahuy, *op. cit.,* pp. 229 and 233; Chauvin, *op. cit.,* pp. 406-6; Lammens, *op. cit.,* pp. 242-43; E. Kühnel, *Kunst des Orients* (Wildpark-Potsdam, 1929), p. 1; Migeon, *op. cit.,* I, 101-2; Arnold, *op. cit.,* pp. 4 ff.; Ahmed Mousa, *op. cit.,* p. 16.


\(^5\) *Ibid.,* p. 15.


\(^7\) Creswell, *op. cit.,* p. 15, n. 10.


\(^1\) Creswell, *op. cit.,* p. 96.

\(^2\) Creswell, *op. cit.,* p. 127.
matters of religion,” except Omar ibn Abd al-Aziz, who, on one occasion, actually is recorded to have objected to a picture in a bath. He had it obliterated and exclaimed: “If only I could find out who painted it, I would have him severely beaten.” I suggest that this painting was most probably pornographic, as was often the case in hammams 11 and that this was the real cause of Omar’s anger, for it has just been seen that he had no objection to a censer with human figures on it which was used to perfume the mosque of Medina.

Yet in spite of the silence of the Koran, the Traditions (Hadith) 17 are uniformly hostile to all representations of living forms. 13 Arnold, the latest scholar to discuss this question, believed that this hostility dates almost from the time of Muhammad, and held that the paintings of Kuṣair Amra were executed in defiance of it. 14 Now although later caliphs and sultans certainly did defy the prohibition on many occasions, there appears to be good reason for believing that this prohibition had not yet been formulated at the time when the frescoes of Kuṣair Amra were executed. When did the change take place? A valuable clue is provided, curiously enough, by the Patrology. Our first witness is John, Patriarch of Damascus 15 and the great opponent of the Iconoclasts, who in the words of Becker, “represents the whole world of thought of the Eastern church at that time.” He did not live secluded in some distant monastery, but occupied a prominent place in the court life of the later Umayyad period, although he retired to a monastery shortly before his death. He belonged to an old Damascus family, the Banu Sarṣūd, which had played an important part in the state administration under Abū al-Malik and even earlier. His active life must be placed roughly between 700 and 750 a.d., 16 so that he was a contemporary of Kuṣair Amra.}

11 al-Ghusūlī, Matār al-Bidūr (Cairo, 1300 h.), II, 8; and Ibn al-Ḥādjī, Madīkah (Cairo, 1348 h.), II, 178-79.
12 The Hadith are traditions concerning the actions and sayings of Muhammad, which circulated orally until they were collected, sifted, accepted or rejected, systematized, and written down for the first time in the ninth century by Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dā'ūd, Malik ibn Anas, Ibn Sā'd, Ahmed ibn Ḥanbal, and Ibn Ḥishām, each tradition being accompanied by its isnād, or chain of oral descent (e.g., so-and-so heard it from his father, who heard it from so-and-so, who knew the blessed Prophet). As early as the middle of the ninth century the number of Hadith in circulation was enormous, the majority false or suspect, for Bukhārī, who died in 870 a.d., only accepted seven thousand out of six hundred thousand which he had heard; see R. A. Nicholson, Literary History of the Arabs (Cambridge, 1930), p. 746.

For a complete list of references to this question in the early collections of Hadith, see A. J. Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition (Leiden, 1927), p. 108. Snouck Hurgronje has shown that Karabaček's contention, that paintings are permissible in the entrance hall of a building ("Kuṣair Amra," p. 223 and n. 69 on p. 237), is due to a misunderstanding of the text of al-'Aṣkālānī. See also C. H. Becker, "Das Wiener Kuṣair Amra-Werk," Zeitschr. f. Assyriol., XX (1906), 373-75; reprinted in his Islamstudien, I, 300-304.
14 Arnold, op. cit., pp. 4-9 and 19.
15 He died ca. 750 a.d. For his life and works see F. A. Perrier, Jean Damascène: sa vie et ses écrits (Strasbourg, 1863); J. Langen, Johannes von Damaskus (Gotha, 1879); J. H. Lupton, Saint John of Damascus (London, 1882); V. Ermoni, Saint Jean Damascène (Paris, 1904); and Becker, "Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung," pp. 177-87; reprinted in his Islamstudien, I, 434-43. His three treatises “against those who depreciate the holy images” were written between 726 and 737 a.d.
16 Becker, "Christliche Polemik . . .", pp. 177-78; reprinted in his Islamstudien, p. 434.
As Becker has pointed out, John knew the doctrines of Islam well, his quotations from the Koran in Greek are sometimes almost literal translations of the original, and he even gives the actual names of the suras cited.\(^\text{17}\)

But although he was a violent opponent of the Iconoclastic movement and wrote his treatises "against those who depreciate the holy images"\(^\text{18}\) under the strong emotion caused by the edict of 726, and although he wrote against Islam, he never refers to the Muslims as being guilty in this respect, but only to the Christians and Jews, whereas Theodore Abū Kurra, bishop of Ḥarrān,\(^\text{19}\) who was a contemporary of Harun-al-Rashid and al-Ma'mūn and the first Father of the Church to write in Arabic, although he took most of his ideas from the writings of John, differs from him in this respect, for he includes the Muslims among the people opposed to painting. He does not actually refer to them as Muslims, but merely says: "Those who assert that he who paints anything living, will be compelled on the Day of Resurrection, to breathe into it a soul."\(^\text{20}\) Although the Muslims are not actually named, the almost literal citation of the Muslim Hadith\(^\text{21}\) proves that they are meant and, in addition, that the Hadith in question was already in circulation among the Muslims in the time of Abū Kurra. Thus the movement may be placed toward the end of the eighth century.

This fact is of considerable importance to students of Byzantine art, for it renders untenable the theory, put forward by Diehl\(^\text{22}\) and Dalton,\(^\text{23}\) that the Iconoclastic movement,\(^\text{24}\) which took definite form in the edict of the Emperor Leo the Isaurian\(^\text{25}\) in 726, was partly due to defeats inflicted on the image-worshipping Byzantine army by an army of men hos-

\(^\text{17}\)“Christliche Polemik . . .” pp. 179–80; Islamstudien, p. 436. This suffices to show that Zaki Hasan's remark that Abū Kurra "could judge the Muslims by what he read in their books and not only by what they practiced" (op. cit., p. 180), applies equally to John.


\(^\text{19}\)For his life, see C. Bacha, Un Traité des œuvres arabes de Théodore Abou-Kurra (Tripoli, 1905), pp. 3–7. His works have been published at Beirut in 1904, and by G. Graf, Die arabischen Schriften des Theodor Abū Qurra (Paderborn, 1910); and the part that concerns us by J. P. Arendzen, Theodori Abu Kurra de cultu imaginum libellus e codice arabico (Bohn, 1897).

\(^\text{20}\)Ibid., pp. 18–19; and Graf, op. cit., pp. 297–98.

\(^\text{21}\)From Bukhārī, Le Recueil des traditions mahometans, ed. L. Kreil and T. W. Juynboll (Leiden, 1862–1908), II, 41, and IV, 106: "On the Day of Judgment the punishment of hell will be meted out to the painter, and he will be called upon to breathe life into the forms that he has fashioned; but he cannot breathe life into anything"; see Arnold, op. cit., p. 5.


\(^\text{25}\)As a result of recent research, it now seems probable that Leo was of North Syrian and not of Issaurian origin; see Vasiliev, op. cit., I, 311–12.
tile to all forms of human representation. This theory has been accepted by Wiet, who, after citing the decree of the Caliph Yazid (see below), quotes Michael the Syrian to the effect that “l'empereur des Grecs, Léon, ordonna lui aussi, à l'exemple du roi des arabes, d'arracher les images des parois, et il fit abattre les images qui étaient dans les églises et les maisons, celles des saints aussi bien que celles des empereurs ou d'autres.”

“Michel le Syrien,” adds Wiet, “est logique avec la tradition de l'Église. On sait qu'a deuxièmes concile de Nicée, tenu en 787, les évêques qui condamnèrent les iconoclastes estimèrent que les mesures prises contre les images l'avaient été à l'imitation des musulmans.”

What was this decree of Yazid? According to Theophanes (d. 818) “a Jew of Latakia, coming in haste to Yazid, promised him a reign of forty years over the Arabs if he destroyed the holy ikons which were adored in the churches of the Christians in all his empire. But in this same year Yazid died before most of the people had even had time to hear about his Satanic order.”

The execution of this order had already begun in Egypt when Yazid died (January 26, 724), and his successor Hishâm revoked it on his accession.

As for the famous Council of Nicaea of 787, Michael the Syrian, who wrote in the second half of the twelfth century, does not tell the whole story. The true facts may be learned

---


27 Theophanes Chronographia, ed. G. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883-85), p. 401. He places this event in the Year of the World 6215 (724 A.D.). Dionysius of Tell Mâhrê (d. 845 A.D.) places it in the year of the Greeks 1035 (723-24 A.D.): J. B. Chabot, ed., “Chronique de Denys de Tell-Mâhrê,” Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études, fasc. 112 (Paris, 1895), p. 19, and trans., p. 17. Michael the Syrian (Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarque jacobite d'Antioche, J. B. Chabot, ed. [Paris, 1899-1904], II, 457; trans., II, 489) and Bar Hebraeus (Chronography, ed. P. Bedjan, Mâkhkhânâ Zahhân [Paris, 1893], p. 118; The Chronography of Gregory Abu 'l Faraj, trans. E. A. W. Budge [London, 1932], I, 109) also mention it but without giving a date. Maṭrânî (Khāqān Bulaq, 1853), I, 302, line 31; trans. by P. Casanova, Mêm. inst. franç. d'arch. orient. du Caire, III [1893-1920], 185) said that it took place in 1044 H. (June, 725-3 June, 724 A.D.). I must add, however, that doubts have been expressed regarding the authenticity of this story, e.g., by J. Wellhausen (Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz [Berlin, 1902], pp. 202-3) and A. Musil (Kušejir 'Amra [Wien, 1907], p. 155). It is true that Tabari, as Wellhausen points out, merely stated that a Jew had prophesied that Yazid would reign forty years, and that Eutychius and Butrus ibn Râhîb knew nothing of the matter. But the silence is not complete, for other writers, equally early, speak of it, e.g., the Arabic historian al-Kindi (d. 961 A.D.), and three ecclesiastical historians, Dionysius of Tell Mâhrê, quoted above, the anonymous Syriac chronicle of the year 846 A.D., published and translated by E. W. Brooks, “A Syriac Chronicle of the Year 846,” Z.D.M.G., LI (1897), p. 584, and Severus ibn al-Muḵafâ’a, bishop of Ashmûnîn in the tenth century; see al-Kindî, The Governors and Judges of Egypt; or Kitâb el-'Umarâ’ (el-Wulâh) wa Kitâb el-Quḏâh, ed. R. Guest, E. J. W. Gibb Mem. Ser., XIX (Leiden-London, 1912), 71-72; and Severus ibn al-Muḵafâ’a, ed. B. T. A. Evetts, trans., Patrologia Orientalis (History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria) (Paris, 1904-10), V, 72-73 (or ed. C. F. Seybold, Alexandrinische Patriarchen—Geschichte [Hamburg, 1912], p. 153, line 7), quoted by Lammens, op. cit., p. 278. The objections of Wellhausen and Musil are therefore invalid. Moreover, on reading the proceedings of the Council of Nicaea, I have come across a contemporary witness, the bishop of Messina who, at the fifth session, stated that he was a boy in Syria when the caliph (sērōdôlosoi) of the Saracens threw down the images: G. D. Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio (Florentia, 1769), XII, col. 200.

28 It is to this order that J. E. Quibell attributed the mutilation of the paintings and sculptures found during his excavations at the Monastery of Apa Jeremias at Saḥkār; see his Excavations at Saqqara (1908-9, 1909-10) (Cairo, 1912), p. iv. J. W. Crowfoot found that the subject subjects in the floor mosaics of the churches at Jerash had been mutilated before the final destruction of the city by an earthquake, probably that of 747; see his Churches of Jerash (British School Archaeol. at Jerusalem, Suppl. Papers, 3) (London, 1932), p. 4; there can be little doubt that this was done in compliance with the same decree.
by referring to an original document, viz., the actual proceedings of the Council in question, which may be consulted by turning to the great work of Mansi. There we read that at the reopening of the fifth session (October 4, 787), Tarasius remarked that the accusers of the Christians had in their destruction of images "imitated the Jews, Pagans, Samaritans, Manichaans, and Phantisasiasts (or Theopaschites)."

Whereupon the monk John, representative of the Eastern Patriarchate, asked permission to correct these erroneous ideas and to clear up the real origin of the attack on images, apparently speaking, like the bishop of Messina from first-hand knowledge of the facts. This is what he said:

After Omar's death [February 9, 720] Yazid (Yazid II), a frivolous and unstable man, succeeded him. There lived at Tiberias a leader of the lawless Jews, a magician and a fortuneteller and a tool of soul-destroying demons, named Tessarakontapechys (= 40 cubits high) . . . On learning of the frivolity of the ruler Yazid, he approached him and began to utter prophecies . . . saying: "You will live long and reign for thirty years if you follow my advice . . . Give order immediately without any delay or postponement, that an encyclical letter be issued throughout your empire to the effect that every representational (εἰκωνείρ) painting, whether on tablets or in wall-mosaics or on sacred vessels and altar coverings, and all such objects as are found in all Christian churches, be destroyed and finally abolished, and so also all representations of any kind whatever that adorn and embellish the market places of cities. . . ." The impious tyrant, yielding to his advice, sent [officials] and most frivolously destroyed the holy ikons and all other representations in the whole province under his rule and, thanks to the Jewish magician, thus ruthlessly robbed the churches of God under his sway of all ornaments, before the evil came into this land. As the Christians fled lest they should [have to] overthrow the holy images with their own hands, the emirs who were sent for this purpose pressed into service abominable Jews and wretched Arabs; and thus they burnt the venerable ikons, and either smeared or scraped the ecclesiastical buildings.

On hearing this the pseudo-bishop of Nicolia and his followers imitated the lawless Jews and impious Arabs and outraged the churches of God. . . . When after doing this, the Caliph (Σέλων) Yazid died no more than two and one-half years later [25 Sha'ban 105 = January 27, 724] the images were restored to their pristine position and honor. His son Othlakos (= al-Walid—should be Hisham), filled with indignation, ordered the magician to be ignominiously put to a parricide's death as a due reward for his false prophecy.

Thus, this act of Yazid was in no way inspired by the doctrine of Islam at that period; on the contrary it would never have taken place had it not been for the vain promises of a fortuneteller, and it was promptly revoked by his successor.

How did the feeling arise? It has been suggested that it arose through the inherent

---

29 Mansi, op. cit., XIII, col. 196.
30 See end of footnote 27.
31 The importance of this cannot be overrated, for all the works of the Iconoclasts, the imperial decrees, and the acts of the iconoclastic councils of 753-54 A.D. and 815 A.D. were destroyed when their adversaries triumphed.
32 This gives the end of July, 721 A.D., for the date of Yazid's act.
33 Mansi, op. cit., XIII, cols. 198 and 206.
34 Let us remember that this was a period when "individuals" as Diehl says "put faith in the prophecies of wizards, and Leo III himself, like Leontius or Philippicus, had been met in the way by one who had said to him: 'Thou shalt be King'; op. cit., IV, 6.
temperamental dislike of the Semite for human representations in sculpture and painting, an antinaturalistic reaction in fact. This undoubtedly helped, but the internal evidence points to a direct Jewish influence. Lammens points out that the Hadith bearing on the question in many cases shows Jewish inspiration, for example, the sayings: "The angels will not enter a house containing a bell, a picture or a dog," and "at the end of the world when 'Isā appears he will break the cross and kill the pigs." Bells were unknown in the time of Muhammad, and the semantron did not inspire the Arabs with any antipathy. Nor did they before Islam experience any special repugnance for pigs. The name khinzīr is met with, and the flesh of the wild boar appeared at feasts. The sayings cited above can only be explained as due to Talmudic influence. Again it is remarkable that the earliest recorded instance of hostility to images and painting appears to have been inspired by Jewish influence, viz., the iconoclasm of Yazïd II, cited above. A Christian influence, springing from the iconoclastic movement which broke out in 726 A.D., is therefore unlikely, likewise a spontaneous Muslim impulse.

This Jewish influence was doubtless due to the internal effect of Jews who had been converted to Islam, like the famous Yemenite Jew Ka'b al-Aḥbār, who was called Rabbi Ka'b on account of his wealth of theological and especially Biblical knowledge. Ka'b entered Jerusalem with Omar, was converted to Islam in 638 A.D., and died in 652 or 654. He is frequently cited as an authority for Hadith, and Abd Allah ibn Abbas, one of the earliest expositors of the Koran, was a pupil of his, likewise Abû Hurairā. Another famous Jewish convert was Wahb ibn Munabbih. These two men were the great authorities among the early Muslims on all points of ancient history.

Finally, as a predisposing psychological basis for the hostility to painting, there was the feeling, so common among primitive peoples, that the maker of an image or a painting in some way transfers part of the personality of the subject to the image or painting, and in so doing acquires magical powers over the person reproduced. This feeling, which is still prevalent in some parts of the world, was once very widely spread. The practice of making wax images of the person to be bewitched, and thrusting pins through them, was known to the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, and was widely spread in medieval Europe, e.g., John of

35 Viardot, op. cit., I, 556-59; Barbier de Meynard, op. cit., I, 333-35.
36 Lammens, op. cit., pp. 276-77.
37 Ibid., pp. 276-79.
40 A small model of a man made of wax, papyrus, and hair, which was intended to be burned slowly in a fire while incantations were recited, in order to produce some evil effect upon the person whom it represented, was obtained in Egypt by Budge in 1895. It is now in the British Museum, No. 37, 932; see E. A. W. Budge, By Nile and Tigris (London, 1920), II, 347; idem, Guide to the Third and Fourth Egyptian Rooms (London, 1904), p. 20.
Nottingham’s attempt to bring about the death of Edward II in 1324, and the similar attempt of Agnes Sampson on the life of James VI of Scotland in 1589; also the League’s attempt to kill Henry III of France. A similar attempt on the life of Muhammad is related by Djannâbî and Ali al-Ḥalabî.

My conclusion, therefore, is that the prohibition against painting did not exist in early Islam, but that it grew up gradually, partly as a result of the inherent temperamental dislike of Semitic races for representational art, partly because of the influence of important Jewish converts, and partly because of the fear of magic. It also follows that Muslim influence on the Edict of Milan is excluded.

41 See M. Summers’ introduction to his translation of [Insititoris, Henricus], Malleus Maleficarum (London, 1928), pp. xix-xx and xxii. The wax dolls were called “Mommets.”


ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS IN PORTUGAL

BY A. R. NYKL

THE FOLLOWING IS A FIRST ATTEMPT AT PRESENTING A COMPLETE ACCOUNT OF THE COMPARATIVELY FEW ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS IN PORTUGAL, STARTING FROM THE NORTH.\footnote{The Arabic inscriptions in Spain are available in E. Lévi-Provençal's \textit{Inscriptions arabes de l'Espagne} (Leiden, 1931); the Arabic inscriptions in the collection of the Hispanic Society of America have been published by W. Caskel. \textit{(Arabic Inscriptions in the Collection of the Hispanic Society of America} [New York, 1936]).}

I. BRAGA

(Early eleventh century)

Around the upper part of a small ivory casket (Figs. 2-5), similar to that found in the Cathedral of Pamplona (Navarra, Spain):

\begin{quote}

\begin{small}

\begin{center}

\textit{ya allah dîn mâ ba amr bî}
\end{center}
\end{small}

\end{quote}

First described in Rodrigo Amador de los Ríos.\footnote{Memoria acerca de algunas inscripciones árabigas de España y Portugal (Madrid, 1883), pp. 281-82.} My good friend, the late Professor David Lopes, wrote concerning it.\footnote{3 "A inscrição arabe do cofre da Sé de Braga," \textit{O Arqueol. port.}, I (1895), 273, and II (1896), 204. See also J. Ferrandis, \textit{Marã‡es árabes de Occidente} (Madrid, 1935-40), I, 81-82 (with bibliography) and Pls. 37-38 (after which Figs. 2-5 were made).} His final reading is the one given above, with the following translation:

\begin{quote}


\end{quote}

II. COIMBRA

(First half of the twelfth century)

Engraved, most likely by a Mozarab mason, in the upper part of a stone, 60 cm. wide by 40 cm. high, which is placed in the sixth row above the zôcalo, on the northern wall of the Sé-Velha (Old Cathedral). A first description of it, as far as I could find, was given by Gustavo Filipe Simões \footnote{Reliquias da arquitectura romano-bizantina em Portugal e particularmente na cidade de Coimbra (Lisbon, 1870).} and a more detailed one by António de Vasconcelos,\footnote{\textit{A Sé-Velha de Coimbra} (Coimbra, 1939-35), I, 29.} in his splendid two-volume work which deserves being quoted in extenso:

Não cito como vestígio do antigo edifício mourisco a lápide com inscrição em caracteres árabes, que se encontra na fachada setentrional da Sé-Velha, próximo da axila do transepto. Essa pedra foi evidentemente aparelhada no século XII para este edifício, ao mesmo tempo que as outras: pedra extraída do mesmo jazigo, donde saíram as restantes, cortada nas mesmas medidas, preparada com o mesmíssimo aparelho, assente na fiada exactamente como as que a cercam, etc. Na construção da Sé
devem ter trabalhado canteiros muçulmanos cativos e canteiros cristãos mozárabes, e êstes usavam também a escrita árabe, mesmo quando escreviam palavras de romance. Algum daqueles ou destes gravou ali aquela inscrição.—O que diz? Até hoje, considero-a indecifrada. O primeiro que disse té-la lido foi o olissiponense António Caetano Pereira, que traduziu: —Honra e glória em especial foi dada a êste lugar pela nossa assistência nêle. Exaltado seja aquele que o tornou em lugar de asilo para os que vieram guardá-lo e defendê-lo.—A seguir D. Pascual de Gayangos interpretou, mas com hesitações:—...édificou-o com solidez Ahmed Ben Ismael por mandado de ... , declarando-a incompleta.

—Depois um mouro marroquino, de nome Hage Mohammed Ben Omar Acalae, a pedido do sr. Jorge Colaço, por solicitação de A. Augusto Gonçalves, decifrou-a desta maneira: —Princiapada a fa

bricar na medida de seis, segundo o ofício da própria mão do autor, com grande cansaço dos mestres em cada hora no mês de noa ... (parecendo que deve ser Novembro).—Também a estudou o dr. Kayserling, consultado pelo dr. Mendes dos Remédios, que lhe enviou um decalco muito nítido; mas sinceramente respondeu: —“Budapest, le 16 janvier 1902.—Cher et honoré Monsieur.—... Vous m’avez fait une grande joie par votre lettre honorée; et vous prie d’excuser le retardement de ma réponse; mais le cliché de l’inscription arabe, hélas! ni moi, ni plusieurs arabistes renommés consultés pori, comme Mr. Nöldke, nous sommes hors d’état de la déchiffrer, ou plutôt découvrir le sens.” —Note-se que Kayserling, assim como Nöldke, o diretor da Porta linguaraum, são autoridades de primeira ordem. —Ultimamente um perito de Alexandria, muito sabedor do arabe marroquino, estudou a pedido do meu prezadíssimo amigo dr. Manuel Monteiro, juiz do Tribunal Mixto daquela cidade, um decalco da inscrição, que lhe foi enviado por A. Augusto Gonçalves; disse ter lido, e traduziu assim: —J’ai attiré son attention sur mes doléances et il m’a comblé de ses bienfaits.— O sr. Dr. David Lopes, cuja competência é por todos reconhecida, também estudou a inscrição, mas confessa, em carta que teve a amabilidade de me dirigir em 13 de Maio de 1929, nada ter conseguido ler, mesmo depois de ver tantas e tão variadas interpretações.—Conclusão: A inscrição arabe da Sé-Velha ainda está por decifrar; não se podendo prestar fé às supostas leituras até hoje feitas. Venha porém, ou não venha, um dia a descobrir-se o verdadeiro significado do que nela está esculpido, nunca aquela pedra poderá ser apontada como resto dum anterior edifício mourisco, pela razão já exposta: —ela foi aparelhada no século XII, e por isso a inscrição não pode ser anterior.

I was able to locate the stone with the help of my friend Dr. Vergílio Correia, director of the Museu Machado de Castro and of the excavations in the old city of Coimbriga, in August, 1940. After being duly washed and freed of the dark layer of dust covering it, the inscription could be examined at close quarters. Figure 1 represents what I could establish beyond any reasonable doubt:

![Stone Inscription, Coimbra](image)

It became quite evident that Pereira’s reading was mere fantasy. Pascual de Gayangos’ error was due to his having assumed that it was a commemorative inscription, very common in Spanish-Arabic epigraphy. The Moroccan’s interpretation was as fanciful as some of those which Antonio Almagro Cárdenas incorporated in his Estudio sobre las inscripciones árabes de Granada (Granada, 1879). The one who came closest to the meaning of the inscription was the Alexandrian expert.

— Figure 1

7 Cf. my study, “Inscripciones árabes de la Alhambra y del Generalife,” Al-Andalus, IV (1936), 174–94.
With but slight corrections: ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل. my reading is the following: ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل.

I wrote (this) as a permanent record of my suffering; my hand will perish one day, but greatness will remain.

It would be tempting to correct the last word to ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل (my writing), thus obtaining a complete verse in ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل.

On another stone I found engraved the word ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل ɪل, which might be the proper name “Péreç” or “Pires,” possibly that of the Mozarab mason.

III. SANTARÉM

In the Museu de S. João de Alporã£o there are four small capitals, listed under Nos. 4 and 5 in the manuscript catalogue. Pascual de Gayangos read them correctly:

1. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم صلى الله على مهدنا.hm
2. و الله و سلم تسليماً
3. اعون بامر امس من الشيطان الحجيم.
4. 

Zeferino Brandão, author of Monumentos e lendas de Santarém, published an article wherein he gave the picture of the two capitals with Pascual de Gayangos' translation:

1. En el nombre de Allah el clemente, el misericordioso, bendiga
2. Allah nuestro señor Mahoma
3. Y a su familia y conceda (a ellos) paz perfecta.
4. Me acojo a Allah (huyendo) de Satan el apedreado.

This was later included in his above-mentioned book (pp. 650 and 631). In line 4 after “acojo” read: “al decreto de Allah, ...” A plaster cast of these capitals is also in the Museu do Carmo in Lisbon.

In the hall of a house in the Rua 12 de Dezembro, No. 46 (belonging to Ing. António Branco Cabral), my friend and guide in Santarém, Sr. Manuel Granado Vidal, librarian of the Biblioteca Municipal Braamcamp Freire, showed me on April 25, 1939, a totally forgotten tombstone on which I found Arabic inscriptions on the top and Persian inscriptions on three sides; the fourth line, which may have contained the name of the deceased, was missing. The inscriptions, beautifully carved in marble against a background which originally

---

8 A. R. Nykl, Diário de Coimbra, August 23, 1940; “A Inscrição da Sé-Velha,” Al-Andalus, V (1940), 408–11.
9 “Vestígios de construção arabe em Santarém,” Ocidente, revista ilustrada de Portugal e do estrangeiro (Lisbon).
was painted light blue, were badly mutilated in places, and consequently I urged Sr. Vidal to persuade the owner to donate the stone to the Museu de S. João de Alporão, where it would not be in danger of suffering further damage. With this in view my brief and hasty description of the stone was published in the Correio da Extremadura on April 29, but despite my having expressly stated that in consideration of its date and of the Shi'ite inscriptions it must have been brought from India by a curio-hunting navigator,\(^\text{11}\) the newspapers spread the erroneous statements: “Trata-se dum notável documento da dominação sarracena,” and: “Precioso elemento para a história da passagem dos árabes em Portugal.” The stone was sent by its owner to Lisbon and Professor David Lopes expressed the following opinion concerning it:

Dada a incerteza da data, o monumento seria, possivelmente, do século XIV e trazido a Portugal de longes terras, o que mostraria também a inscrição persa déle, pois não há notícia de inscrição persa encontrada na nossa Península. Sendo assim, a pedra perde bastante do seu valor, por não ser da nossa época mussulmana. Só o nome do Califá, lá mencionado, poderia esclarecer o caso, mas a sua identificação é tão difícil que bem se pode considerar impossível.

This shows that Professor Lopes has paid but scant attention to the matter, because of his lack of interest in epigraphy. In May, 1939, I obtained, through Sr. Vidal, a set of four photographs from a Santarém photographer, Jacinto Cardoso da Silva, who copied them from old clichés which I was told had been made for “um inglês” about fifteen years before. No further information was available. Professor Joaquim Figanier of Lisbon requested the well-known authority, Professor Henri Massé, of the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes, in Paris to give him a translation of the Persian inscription and published it.\(^\text{12}\) He made use of the same above-mentioned set of photographs and mentioned Professor A. Yahuda as one of those who had seen the stone before me; however it may be, I can lay claim to having made the stone more widely known and saved it from further mutilation in the hall where anyone could sit or step on it.

The top or cover of the tomb shows the Islamic confession of faith: “Lā īlāha illā-llāh, Muḥammad al-rasūlu-llāh.” Above it, and then following to the left: “Allāhumma ṣallī ‘alā Muḥammadin al-Muṣṭafā, wa ‘alā l-Murtādā . . . [probably two names obliterated] . . . wa ‘alā Zain al-‘Abidīn”; then to the right: Wa ‘alā l-Nakī, w'al-Ḥasan al-'Askārī, wa l-ḥudjdjat al-kāʿima Muḥammad al-Mahdī, ṣalawāt Allāhī ‘alaihim adjaʿāfin.”\(^\text{13}\)

The obliterated name of the deceased is followed by a legible inscription. I give Massé’s reading and translation with slight additions.

\(^{11}\) This curio-hunting habit is also attested by the two Sanskrit inscriptions brought from India by the famous João de Castro and placed in the beautiful garden of the quinta near Sintra which once belonged to him and now belongs to a wholesale coal dealer. James Murphy (cf. infra, under Evora) described them with the aid of the Sanskrit scholar Wilson. A more accurate study and description of them were made in 1927 by the contemporary German ambassador.


\(^{13}\) The Shi'ite imams, cf. Encycl. Islām, s.v. Shi'a, Ismā‘īliya, al-Za'idiya. Al-'Askārī died in 878 A.D., at Samarra.
ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS IN PORTUGAL

1. 

2. 

3. 

1. A great rider of his time, a rider king, courageous pâدshâh, lord of the battlefield, he who on the day of battle on the battlefield [was a wise, great lord by ancestry, he who] was the honor and strength of his soldiers,

2. The lord of the earth dwellers was wounded on the twentieth day of the month of Safar; he went on his journey toward his perpetual abode; 803 years had passed and 90, without doubt, since the great Prophet's Hijra [i.e., February 5, 1488 A.D.]

3. May, oh Lord, the soul of this martyr be near God's messenger on the Day of Judgment!

A more detailed study of the stone and of the inscription might possibly yield more accurate information.

IV. LISBON

A. Museu Militar

A cannon captured at the Portuguese colony of Diu in India bears an inscription which was first copied and translated by P. João de Sousa in his hitherto unpublished autograph manuscript, "Numismalogia ou breve recopilação de algumas medalhas de ouro e de prata dos Califas e dos Reis Arabes da Asia, Africa e de Hespanha,... Às quaes se ajunta huma Inscripção Arabica, que está gravada na Peça, vulgarmente chamada de Dio, que ao presente se acha no pateo da Caza da Fundição, sita no Campo de Santa Clara desta Cidade." The manuscript is dated 1782. When the English architect James Murphy traveled in Portugal in the years 1789–90, P. de Sousa gave him a copy of this inscription together with a translation (Fig. 6), which was published in Murphy's Travels in Portugal (London, 1795). Silvestre de Sacy read the French translation of the work, published in Paris in 1797, and wrote to P. de Sousa: "In majori Inscriptione Arabica... errores plures deprehendisset mihi videor"; then he gave a corrected text with a brief commentary. To this letter P. de Sousa replied, as evidenced by a note I found among his papers: "A este Professor de Paris se lhe respondeo a tudo quanto elle dezijava saber e às duvidas em que estava sobre a obra do Inglez Morfei. ..." Prior to that P. João de Sousa 14 had published the inscription with three other inscriptions.

14 "Memoria de quattro inscripções arabicas com suas traduçoes," Mem. litt. port. acad. r. sci. Lisboa, V (1793), 363–76. In the same article he published the Mertola inscription described infra, Evora

No. 5. P. de Sousa's papers are kept in the Biblioteca Municipal of Evora MS CXII/1–5. An interesting detail might be noted here. John Pickering, United States consul at Lisbon in 1799, studied Arabic with P. de
Silvestre de Sacy submitted to the Institut National de France, on the third of Thermidor, year XI, a "Mémoire" which was later printed,\(^{15}\) wherein he said that he proposed to "rétablir la véritable lecture, et l'interprétation de celle-ci, qui n'a été jusqu'à présent ni bien lue, ni bien expliquée."

P. de Sousa's pupil and successor in the chair of Arabic, Fr. José de Santo-Antonio Moura, thought that De Sacy's remarks were disrespectful to the memory of his master and presented in the session of the Academia Real das Sciencias de Lisboa, on November 11, 1818, a "Memoria Apologetica sobre o verdadeiro sentido da inscrição, que se acha na peça chamada de Dío." This was printed \(^{16}\) with a whole page reproduction of the inscription in its correct form and a translation which is likewise correct:

A nosso Amo, Rei dos Reis do presente Seculo, Vivificador da Lei do profeta do Misericordioso, Esforçado guerreiro na exaltação dos preceitos do Alcorão, humilhador do fundamento dos Sectarios do erro, destruidor das habitações dos adoradores dos ídolos, Vencedor no dia do encontro dos dous Exercitos, Herdeiro do Reino de Salomão, confiado em Deos Bemfeitor, e possuidor das Virtudes, o Soberano Bahadur Xah, esta peça, fundida a 5 de Dul-Kaada do anno 939, se dedica.

This corresponds to May 30, 1533 A.D.

While it is true that P. de Sousa misread two phrases and made far-fetched guesses in explaining them, the gist of his rendering and especially the Hijra date were correct:

1. لبولا بسلطان السلاطين الرسول، الحكيم لستة نبي الرحمن،
2. الجاهد في عمل أرام القرآن، القاعم آس أس عالم العلماء،
3. الفالح ديار ورقة الأرثان، الغالب في يوم التقى الجمعان،
4. الوراث لملك سليباني الوليد بالله المثنان،
5. مالك الغضائل بほう جاهي رضوان،
6. هذا المدنع المصنوع في الخامس من شهر
7. ذي القعدة سنة تسعم وثلاثين وتسعمائة
8. يسّني

Sousa, who said about him: "Este sujeito aqui frequentou os seus estudos da lingua arábica de que já tinha seus principios."

\(^{15}\) "Mémoire sur quelques inscriptions arabes existant en Portugal, et rapportées dans le voyage de J. Murphy, et dans les Mémoires de littérature portugaise publiées par l'Académie royale de sciences de Lisbonne," Mém. de litt., II (1815), 566–616.

\(^{16}\) História e memorias da academia real das sciencias de Lisboa, X (1827), Pt. I, 1–8. A further discussion of the subject by David Lopes and Esteves Pereira is mentioned by Sousa Viterbo, Noticia de alguns arabistas e interpretes de linguas africanas e orientaes (Coimbra, 1906), p. 12. Two other interesting details: Antonio Caetano Pereira's "espolio litterario foi vendido a monte para uso de uma tenda," and Fray José de Santo-Antonio Moura was appointed to the chair of Arabic on August 27, 1798, was confirmed as the holder of the chair on June 5, 1808, and began to draw salary on November 4, 1810!
B. Museu Etnológico do Dr. José Leite de Vasconcelos

In August, 1940, when the Monastery dos Jerónimos and the Museum were a part of the wonderful Exposição do Duplo Centenário, I found among the vast number of valuable relics brought together by the untiring zeal of the late Dr. José Leite de Vasconcelos a group of stones with Arabic inscriptions, not properly catalogued. Dr. Manuel Heleno, the present director of the Museum, accepted my offer to make drawings and translations of the material which were to be published in an archaeological review. Thus far I have received no definite information on the subject and feel at liberty to give here a brief summary of my findings.

I

A small ablution fountain, in marble, presumably from Sintra. It resembles, as to form, the one preserved in the Museo Arqueológico in Granada, and the one in the Alhambra. Only the basmala can be read easily; the rest of the inscription is obliterated by water.

This inscription was found in Frielas, a suburb of Lisbon, in the country house of Sr. Castanheira das Neves (Fig. 7). Described by David Lopes:

1. الدائم الله
2. ترحـم
3. بفضلك يا
4. وأتفرج وانظر
5. مكانا دفعة
6. الله سبـد

His translation: “Deus é eterno. Sê compassivo com o teu [bem] superfluo, ó tu que me estás vendo, e contempla um logar que é um dom do proprio Deus. . . .” 17 needs correction: “The Eternal is God only. Say 'may God have mercy on him,' you who are stopping [in front of the stone] and contemplate the place for a while. Allah . . . Muhammad.”

3

Found in the church of the freguesia (parish) of S. Thomé de Aguiâ, concelho (district) de Arcos de Valdevez, in the province of Alto Minho. It was used as a support of the pyx in the tabernacle (sacramento). It measures 51 cm. in circumference and is 4 cm. thick. First described by F. Alves Pereira, 18 who said:

A sua leitura não foi ainda feita. É um fragmento muito reduzido para poder abranger um numero suficiente de caracteres. O Sr. Asin Palacios, do corpo redactorial da Cultura española, só pode assegurar que a lapide é do tipo granadino e da epoca ultima. Vem pois a ser do sec. XV este monumento. O illustre professor David Lopes, a quem tambem tive a honra de consultar, nenhuma interpretação conseguiра.

17 “Inscrição de Friellas (arrabalde de Lisboa),” O Archeol. port., II (1896), 207.
If these lamented friends of mine were asked to express an opinion on the basis of the photograph published in the article (Fig. 8) there is little wonder that they could not read it. When examined in situ the following could be read:

1. [بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم]
2. الحياة الدنيا
3. [هذا تبر الشيخ الوزير الجليل]
4. رضي الله

Basmala... the life of this world... al-shaikh al-wazîr al-dja... rastî al-M...

Sr. Alves Pereira surmised that the stone was sent to Alto Minho from Lisbon and believed that in the archdiocese of Braga a goodly number ("bastantes mais") of such stones ought to exist. Thus far none has come to light.

Concerning this fragment one reads: "O Sr. Antonio da Silva Fernandes, de Mertola, offereceu uma lapide com o fragmento de uma inscripçâo arabe em caracteres cuficos. Foi achada naquella villa. Já está no Museu. Inedita." 19 David Lopes 20 writes: "Só pudemos ler algumas palavras; outrem mais perito conseguirá ler mais." He only read:

1. [بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم]
2. 

to which could be added:

2. 
3. علیكم
4. خالص
5. 

5

A fragment:

1. [بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم]
2. صلى الله على محمد و آل
3. م خلفين [؟]

6

A plaster cast of a tombstone of unknown provenance, probably from Mertola:

---

19 J. L. de V[asconcelos], "Acquisições do Museu Ethnographico Português," O Archeol. port., I (1895), 221.
In the name of God, Compassionate, Merciful. Oh people, verily, the promise of God is truthful, hence let not the life of this world deceive you, and let not the deceiver deceive you concerning God. This is the grave of Abdallah b. Abdallah; he died on Saturday of the month Djumâda II, of the year 498.

This corresponds to February 18, 1105 A.D.

A tombstone from Mertola (Fig. 9). Described by Rodrigo Amador de los Ríos and by Sebastião Philippes Martins Estacio da Veiga, in his excellent book, Memoria das antiguidades de Mertola observadas em 1877, with several errors. Corrected text:

1. بسِم الله الرَّحْمَن الرَّحِيم
2. صلى الله على محمد و آله
3. هذا قبر الشيخ ابني بكر
4. يحيى بن عبد الله ابن
5. الخواري توفي رحمة
6. الله و نصر وجهه
7. يوم الأربعا من
8. ذي الجُمَّة ثمان و
9. تسعين و خمس مائة
10. إلى هذا كان مملوك
11. الإنباء، والصالحين
12. و حرس قومه الله
13. على الاسم اجعين

This is the grave of the sheikh abu-Bekr—Yahyâ b. Abdallah b.—al-Ḥuwâri; he died, may God have mercy upon him—and brighten his face,—on Wednesday of Dhū'l-Hiḍâja, 598.—Such was also the journey—of the prophets and of the righteous—and may God protect his people against all nations.

The corresponding Christian date, August 22, 1202, falls really on Thursday, in case the

21 Koran, XXXV, 5.
22 “Lápidas arábigas del Museo Provincial de Córdoba,” Museo Español de Antigüedades, IX (1878), 333.
23 Lisbon, 1880. Figure 9, from this book, is, unfortunately, a poor reproduction and is given to show the kind of Neskhi used.
24 إِلَى اَلْحَمَيس [?]
first of the month was intended. If it was not, there would be four Wednesdays to choose from: August 28, September 4, 11, and 18.

8
A granite slab (Fig. 10), which contains, as Rodrigo Amador de los Ríos correctly stated, a quotation from the Koran (XXXVI, 27):

[بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم]
[ترني]
ارحمة الله علیة و
على الإسلام ليلة القدر
في النصف من ذي القعدة
[بسمة ست و ثمانين و اربع مائة]

And we have not sent [any hosts] upon his people after him.

9
A fragment of what appears to be an apprentice's trial work, similar to No. 3 in the Faro Museum.

C. **Museu do Carmo**

A tombstone (Fig. 11) standing in the grass-covered open space, near the entrance door:

1. [بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم]
2. [ترني]
3. ارحمة الله علیة و
4. على الإسلام ليلة القدر
5. في النصف من ذي القعدة
6. [بسمة ست و ثمانين و اربع مائة]

[Basmala.] [Name of the deceased.] . . . [Died], God's mercy be upon him—and upon Islam, on the night of the full moon—in the middle of Dhu'l-Ka'da—of the year 486.

Corresponds to Wednesday, December 7, 1093 A.D. 26

V. **ALCACER DO SAL**

José Leite de Vasconcelos in his article "Excursão arqueologica a Alcacer-do-Sal," 27 mentions "uma inscripção lapidar da epocha arabe," with no further information. I had no opportunity to verify the statement.

VI. **EVORA**

Four stones with Arabic inscriptions are preserved in the Museu Regional, the remnant of a larger collection 28 made by Fr. Manoel do Cenaculo Vilas Bôas, the scholarly bishop of

---

26 A. R. Nykl, "Inscrições árabes existentes no Museu Arqueológico do Carmo," pp. 7-8, Pl. 2.
27 O Archeol. part., I (1895), 86.
28 The original collection consisted of 122 items according to drawings preserved in the Biblioteca Municipal of Evora. Augusto Filippe Simões in his Relatorio de cerca da renovação do Museu Cenaculo (Evora, 1869), said (p. 19): "Deduz-se porem da 'Viagem de Murphy' que havia no fim do seculo passado outras pedras na colleção que não chegaram a ser desenhadas, talvez por serem adquiridas posteriormente ao tempo em que se fizeram os desenhos." No. 90 in the above-mentioned book of drawings is a tombstone with five lines in Kufic;
Beja and later archbishop of Evora, whose wisdom saved Evora from destruction during the Peninsular War. It was he who started P. João de Sousa, a Christian native of Damascus, who arrived in Lisbon in August, 1749, on his religious and scholarly career, sometime between 1768 and 1773.

The stone was found in a hole of the wall of the church of S. Pedro in Evora, which was later rebuilt into a school. The Spanish scholar Eduardo Saavedra published a translation of the inscription. The stone itself, marble, measures 51 cm. high by 30 cm. wide on the top and 25 cm. at the bottom, by 3 cm. thick. The inscription is 43 cm. high by 26 cm. wide and consists of seven lines in Kufic characters:

1. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم و صلى
2. الله على محمد هذا فتر أحمد
3. ابن الوزير أبي بكر محمد بن الرحا
4. نة توفي رحمه الله ليلة الخميس
5. خمس خلون ممن صفر سنة
6. خمسة و عشرين و خمس
7. مائة

Saavedra translated:

En el nombre de Dios clemente y piadoso. La bendición de Dios sea sobre Mahoma. Este es el sepulcro de Áhamed, hijo del visir Abubéquer Mohámmed, hijo de Reijana; murió (apiádese Dios del) en la noche del jueves, pasadas cinco de safar, año 525. (1130 de Cristo).—According to Mahler-Wüstenfeld’s tables: January 8, 1131.

In the wall of a house which originally belonged to the noble family of the Lobos de Montemor-o-Novo, in the Rua do Diogo Cão in Evora, there was a huge granite slab, now split into two fragments, inscribed with Arabic phrases. A well-known Spanish Arabist, the late D. Francisco Codera y Zaidín, described the two fragments and gave the following reading: “Lo que quiere Alá, pues no hay poder sino en Alá, mi suficiencia es Alá, que es el misericordioso.”

The larger piece is 1.21 m. long, 34 cm. wide, 22 cm. high. The smaller one 45 cm. long, 20.5 cm. wide, and 34 cm. high.

The inscription is in Kufic characters, 10 cm. high, and badly mutilated.

the first two read: Bismillähi al-raḥmân al-raḥīm; abella llähu ‘alä Muḥammadin wa ‘alä lläh; the three following are very fragmentary.

30 “Inscripción árabe del Museo de Évora,” Boletín acad. hist., XXXIX (1901), 411-12.
This is what can be read with a fair degree of certainty:

Ба шаий хулули ла илэ ас балл: Хусэйн иллэ; Уүрү рихим

Oh thou who curest illness—there is no power except in God—God is He on whom I rely—He is compassionate.

Codera’s readings, мă шă Ӏљăh at the beginning and al-raћmăן at the end, are inexact, due to the poor quality of the calcos sent him by Sr. Antonio Francisco Barata from Evora.

It could be surmised that the inscription was placed above the entrance to a hospital. One-half of the larger slab is occupied by capital Roman letters which could be read “Introibo” or “Prohibido.”

The date seems to be about 500 H. (1106 A.D.).

3

Fixed on the wall of the old City Hall building on the Praça de Geraldo there was an inscription in two parts preserved in a drawing made by P. de Sousa. The original seems to have disappeared, and all my diligent search for it proved in vain.31 Sr. Barata included it in his catalogue, evidently confounding it with the one described under 4.

P. de Sousa gave the following translation of the upper section:

Confessae e credo que нăо ha Deus senао Deus, e que Mahomed é o seu legado. Possuimos a terra com o socorro de Deus e nos senhoreamos della. Vencidos foram os Rumes (christаos) nas terras remotas e tornaram a vencer depois de terem sido vencidos, passados alguns annos; porque a disposиção do passado e do futuro só a Deus pertence. De Ben Axафă Mahomed Haranaqui.

And of the lower section:

Prometteu Deus aos Crentes e aos que fazem boas obras a victoria contra os infeis, a possessаo da terra e a continua successаo, assim como elles succederam aos seus antepassados. Confirmar-lhes-ha cada vez mais a sua lei e lhes trocará o medo por uma firme segurаnса.

4

James Murphy made a very imperfect drawing of the tombstone mentioned under 3, and published it in his Travels in Portugal (Fig. 13). Silvestre de Sacy spoke of it in his afore-mentioned letter to P. de Sousa:

Inter inscriptiones Arabicas quae a Jacobo Murphi in itineris sui Lusitanici narratione prolatae sunt, una est paucis vocibus constans, sed intricatissimis Litterarum ductibus scripta, quam Tab. 23а exhibit hujusce inscriptionis superiorem partem legi. Sententia est ex Alcorano desumpta quae sepul-

31 To judge from Simões (op. cit., p. 36) the stone was still extant in 1869 on the wall of the “Paços do Concelho do lado da praça.” It must have disappeared at the time when the old building was torn down. The passage “Vencidos . . . pertence” is from the Koran (XXX, 1-3); the copy contains three errors: يغلاطى, instead of: پعى, سیغلاطى, instead of: بغيى, and a superfluous 3 after سيدنى. The name in modern transcription: Ibn Ashfa’ Muḥammad al-Ḥaranki.
Chris haud raro inscribitur: Inferiorem ejusdem Tabulae partem quae de-functi nomina, tempus quo obit, servare videtur, frustra legere hactenus tentavi.32

No one could have hoped to decipher Murphy's conundrum without examining the tombstone in situ, as I have done. Such as it appears today, after more than one hundred and fifty years, the stone does not seem to have suffered further damage (Fig. 14). It is of marble, split in two parts; 35 cm. wide, 49 cm. high, and 4 cm. thick. The upper part contains the phrase read by De Sacy. Of the three lines in the lower section only the first one offers no ambiguities whatever; in the second and third there are a few letters which have been almost obliterated by rains. The date must be rather late, about 600 H., as the style of the writing reminds one of the commemorative stone of Faro:

1. يا رأئيين استغفرنا لأيكم و رحموا و تذكروا هذا المصبر
2. لها الله عزك حل غداً [؟] ليس لها رسم تكرب في العمر القديم
3. من حور و ليلة لنا معيد ي وجود و الله تعالى للرحمة و الكرم الكبير

Every soul will taste death. 1. Oh you who visit [this cemetery] pray to God that he may pardon and have mercy on your brother, and remember this journey [toward the Day of Judgment]. 2. [The soul] will be taken away from you by God; no vestige of its pride appears in the humble grave. 3. From the injustice [of this world] we have to return to the Lord; say: to God, and to the mercy, and great generosity.

A badly mutilated, marble tombstone, which was found near Mertola. In its present condition it measures 38 cm. high, 35 cm. wide, and 3 cm. thick. To judge from its Kufic character it dates probably from 500 H. P. João de Sousa gave a complete drawing of the stone, with text and translation, but it seems that he tried to reconstruct the original appearance from the fragment (Fig. 12). It seems improbable that the stone would have been so thoroughly mutilated since 1793.

This is what can be read now:

1. [حق] فلا تفرتكم الحياة
2. الدنيا ولا يغفرون
3. [بالله الغفران] إن الله عزده
4. علم الساعة و إنزل الغيب
5. و علم ما في الارجام و ما تدر
6. نفس ما ذا تكسب غداً
7. و ما تدري نفس بالي ارض
8. [تموت] ان الله [علم خبير]

On the left border: سنة ولا نوم له ما في السموات ....

In P. de Sousa’s translation:

Portanto, não vos engane a vida mundana, nem vos entregueis aos enganos do tentador (que pretende apartar-vos da lei de Deus). Só Deus é que conhece a hora do dia do juízo. Ele é o que faz cair a chuva e sabe o mais oculto das entranhas. O homem não sabe o que poderá adquirir no dia de amanhã, nem em que terra será a sua sepultura, pois Deus é sabio e noticioso.” 33 And: “Não dormita, nem dorme. D’elle é o que está no ceu.34

VII. BEJA
(Twelfth century)

In the Museu Distrital there is a tombstone which was first mentioned by José Leite de Vasconcelos.35 Professor David Lopes 36 described it as follows: “A pedra tem os bordos bastante damnificados, e no angulo da direita soffreu uma pequena quebra. A inscripçâo é em cuíco e bem gravada.” Then he gave a transcription with an error in the name of the deceased, and especially in the date, reading sittin instead of thaláthin, which caused him to assume that it corresponded to “quarta-feira, 5 de Janeiro de 1166 de J.C.” and, consequently, that “esta inscripçâo é, pois, em vista da data, já do tempo do dominio português, porque foi em 1162 que os christãos se assenhorearam de Beja.” 37

33 Koran, XXXI, 33-34.
34 Koran, II, 256. In the article referred to in footnote 14, pp. 373-75, P. de Sousa said: “Esta inscripçâo foi achada junto ao Convento dos Religiosos Franciscanos perto da Villa de Mertola” and his translations are slightly different: “Não vos engane a vida mundana, nem vos entregueis às persuasões do tentador (Satanâs); pois pretende separar-vos da Lei de vosso Deos, o qual só conhece a hora do dia (do Juízo). Ele he que faz cahir a chuva, e o que penetra o mais oculto das entranhas. O homem ignora o que poderá lucrar no dia de à manha, nem sabe em que terra será sepultado; pois só Deos he sabio, e plenamente instruido.” And: “Não dormita nem o acomette a somnolencia. Delle he tudo o que ha no Ceo.”
35 “Inscripçâo da epocha wisigothica,” O Archeol. port., II (1896), 175.
36 “Inscripçâo lapidar arabe existente no Museu Distrital de Beja,” O Archeol. port., II (1896), 175.
37 Cf. A. Herculano, Historia de Portugal (Lisbon, 1846), I, 399.
38 The reading is not very sure.
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If the first day of the month is meant, the corresponding Christian date would be Friday, November 27, 1136; if the first Sunday of the month is meant, the date would be November 29, 1136, nearly three years before the battle of Ourique. 39

VIII. MOURA
(Eleventh century)

In his Travels in Portugal Murphy published an inscription in Kufic letters which he said was given to him by P. João de Sousa, with two additions in the first two lines, but without any translation. P. de Sousa seems to have understood only the first line, but could not furnish any data concerning the other two, made probably from a very imperfect rubbing. Such as they were, the two lines presented an undecipherable enigma (Fig. 15). My dear friend, the late Dr. José Leite de Vasconcelos, had seen the inscription when he passed through Moura on his last philological voyage to Barrancos, but could not give me any details. It was necessary to go to Moura and locate the inscription, after considerable research and adventure, in an old tower of the alcaçova, now used as a well for drinking water. The adventurous Gascon photographer, former officer in the French Colonial army, married to a Portuguese lady and father of seventeen children, was able to take a picture of it (Figs. 16–17). The marble slab is 32 cm. high by 50 cm. wide, and when complete seems to have consisted of four lines, 44 cm. by 56 cm. It refers to the conquest of Moura by Al-Mu'tađid bi 'Ilâh (1012–69 A.D.), father of the poet king of Seville, Al-Mu'tamid 'alâ 'Ilâh (1040–95 A.D.). The date which doubtless appeared on the last line was probably 444 H. (1052 A.D.):

\[\text{بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم امر نبيان}
\text{[[هذة الصومعة المعتضد بالله}}
\text{[المصرور بفضل الله أبو عمر}}

1. In the name of God, Compassionate, Merciful! 2. This tower was ordered to be built by Al-Mu'tađid bi 'Ilâh 3. [Al-Manş]ûr bi-faḍli 'Ilâhi Abû 'Amrin.

IX. FARO

In the Museu Archeologico Infante D. Henrique I found three stones with Arabic inscriptions. My friend Dr. Mario Lyster Franco, one of the curators of the museum, kindly placed at my disposal an extremely interesting work. 40 On pages 117 ff. the author spoke about the "litteratura aladjamiada," 41 and described the large marble stone which was the only important one then stored in the museum. It was found at Silves in 1874, when a road was being

39 Cf. A. R. Nykl, Cronica del Rey Dom Afonso Henrique por Duarte Galvão (Cambridge, 1942).
40 Glossario critico dos principaes monumentos do Museu Archeologico Infante D. Henrique, pelo conservador Monsenhor Conego Botto (Faro, 1899), 2 pts., I, 79 pp.; the second part, pp. 80–120, was a reprint from O Archeol. port., IV (1808), Nos. 1 to 6.
built to the new cemetery. He mentioned the three famous natives of the region, Ibn Badrūn, Ibn 'Ammār, and Al-'Alām; he then tried to give a reading of the inscription on what he called “incontestavelmente um cippro tumular,” but with little success.

As a matter of fact, the stone is a commemorative one, 96.5 cm. high by 34 cm. wide above, and 32 cm. below; thickness: 16 cm. above, 14 cm. on the sides. The inscription itself is 79 cm. high by 28 cm wide, in Neskhi, the most beautiful of all I have thus far found in Portugal. The name of the builder of the burdį (lines 2–3) was scratched out, possibly as a result of popular hatred (Fig. 18):

1. Bism Allah al-Rahim al-Rahim wa-sallâa wa-'alî

2. [Son?]

3. [Abū-’lam']

4. ibn al-Mansûr

5. [?

6. ibn Abī Abdullâh al-Mansûr

7. ibn al-Mansûr

8. ibn Abī Abdullâh al-Mansûr

9. [Son?]

10. In the name of God, Compassionate, Merciful! May God bless Muhammad and his family!

This corresponds to August, 1227 A.D., fifteen years before the final conquest of Silves by Alfonso III of Portugal. The Almohade ruler Abū Ya’kūb died in 580 H. (1184 A.D.); his successor, Abû Yûsuf Ya’kūb al-Manṣūr, in 585 H. (1199 A.D.). The first conquest of Silves is of 1188–89 A.D.; the second, definitive one, of 1242 A.D.

---


45 Allusion to Koran, LXXXIII, 23, 35; LXXVI, 13.
The two other stones are of much less importance. They seem to belong to an older period, 400 to 500 h. One is in black schist and is badly mutilated (Fig. 19). The workmanship is rather primitive. The text reads:

1. In the name of God, Compassionate, Merciful.
3. may God have mercy on him and brighten (نٌضَر) 5. his face, in the year sixty and [probably 400, i.e., 1067–68 A.D.].

The second, a thin slab made of the red stone of Silves, seems to have been an apprentice’s trial work, since no name or date is mentioned (Fig. 20). The first five lines contain the well-known fifth verse of sura XXXV. Between lines 1 and 2 there is an interpolation (کتبها) “written by.” The end of line 5 and the following two lines could possibly be read:

5. كَانِ
6. وَفَدَا تَتَبَيَّنَلا وَكَفَا بِاللهِ سَبِيلَ
7. وَبِذَيِّقَهَا وَ

All of this has the appearance of a mere exercise without any definite aim in view.

46 Dr. Mario Lyster Franco told me that this stone was brought to the Museum in June, 1896; it was found near the banks of the river Odeleite, concelho de Castro Marim. Cf. A. R. Nykl, “Algunas inscripciones árabes de Portugal,” Al-Andalus, V (1940), 408, n. 1.
NOTES

A TOMBSTONE OF THE TIMURID PERIOD IN THE GARDNER MUSEUM OF BOSTON *

The Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum of Boston possesses a tombstone (Fig. 1) which is little known to students of Islamic art and which has not appeared in any publication on Islamic art or epigraphy. I shall describe the tombstone, suggest a reconstruction, discuss its date and provenance as far as the present state of our knowledge allows, and suggest a possible owner of the tomb.

The dark gray stone (limestone or marble?) is 1.173 m. long and 0.36 m. wide. The top end has the following inscription in Neskhi (Fig. 2):

ءيضا تريصت نعر الامله بعزة الشهادة بعد غرارة في الدنيا بالرئاسة والخلافة وهو السلطان

This is the tomb of him whom God has exalted by the glory of martyrdom after a life of abundance in the world through leadership and the caliphate; and he is the sultan... The rest has been erased.

The front side bears a Kufic inscription (Fig. 3):

الحكم لله

Wisdom (or Judgment?) is to God. (Cf. sura XII, 66.)

* I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Morris Carter, director of the Gardner Museum, for his permission to publish the stone, and to each person mentioned in this article for his friendly assistance.

† It was acquired from Mihram Sirvadjian of Paris through Mr. Ralph Curtis in 1901. How the stone found its way to Paris is not disclosed by its former owner. In a letter dated August 8, 1901, to Mrs. Gardner, Mr. Sirvadjian stated: "I possess a truly remarkable work of sculpture of the best Arab art, in gray stone, dating from the beginning of the fifteenth century and proceeding from a mosque in Boccara. The sculpture is belonging to Sultan Behadin, grandfather of Tamerlane." That this information is contradictory will be shown later.

This is repeated on both sides where "He is exalted" is added to the Kufic inscription (Fig. 4).4

The main side is decorated with two panels, the smaller of which bears the Kufic inscription, set against a background of rather realistic flowers cut on a lower plane. The design of the main panel (Fig. 1) is based on the tree of life and is set within a horseshoe arch which is formed by a cloud band. The central stem of the tree of life is broken up into a succession of composite palmettes from which stem most of the branches. These branches wind clockwise and counterclockwise alternatingly and end in full and half palmettes. This design is also set against a flowery background cut on a lower plane. Both pan-

2 Before the stone was removed from its site, it was deeper and longer. The approximate depth can be estimated from the crown of the horseshoe arch of one of the large side panels (Fig. 5). A vertical line drawn from this point to the edge measures 16.1 cm. If a symmetrical design be assumed, the full depth of the stone would be 32.2 cm. If this is checked against the top and it is assumed that there are four lines to the inscription and that the border once framed four sides in equal width, the following figures are obtained: border, top, and bottom, 12.8 cm.; inscription, 20.0 cm.; total, 32.8 cm. Compared with the figures gathered from the side panels, there is a possible margin of error of 6 mm.

If it is assumed that there are three small and two large side panels in alternating order, the stone would be approximately the size of a man. Then the following measurements are obtained: outer border, 7.00 cm.; small panel, 11.25 cm.; border, 6.2 cm.; large panel, 49.3 cm.; border, 6.00 cm.; small panel, 11.2 cm.; border, 6.1 cm.; total, 19.00 cm.; total, 117.35 cm.

To this should be added: lost part of panel (8), 30.3 cm.; small panel, 11.25 cm.; outer border, 7.00 cm.; total, 54.50 cm.; grand total, 171.85 cm.

I am indebted to Miss Edith M. Spellman of the Gardner Museum staff for checking the measurements.

3 Read by N. A. Faris and the author.

4 Read by H. W. Glidden and G. Miles.
els are framed by a border of rather realistic flowers, resembling peonies and lotus. On the surfaces of the two sides are panels of different sizes of which the larger one is filled by an inscription; the smaller ones contain floral ornament within a multifoil arch. Most of these are badly damaged. The border of these panels forms a most intricate design of three intermittent undulating vines formed by freely abstracted palmettes (Fig. 4). Similar palmettes appear on the top side of the stone.

One cannot help being impressed by the rare beauty of technical execution of this work of art. All parts are so well spaced that they form an all-over, lacelike pattern. Realistic flowers with their origin in the Far East and abstract Iranian patterns are welded into a harmonious whole by a most subtle carving technique, precise, crisp, yet rich in forms. It is a technique which seems to derive from wood carving.

Upon looking at the decoration of the stone, anyone familiar with Islamic art will be reminded of the famous carved wooden door from Kokand, now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York (Fig. 7). The same space filling, flat carving is prevalent in both pieces; many motifs are similar, and the same fusion of realistic and abstract styles is present in both pieces. Martin's fifteenth-century date for the door is generally accepted, and Deniké in the article quoted below has shown how well it fits into the work of the school of woodcarving of eastern Turkestan. A closer comparison, however, is with a tombstone from Afghanistan, published by Donald N. Wilber (Fig. 8). It is in the shrine of Khwādja Abd Allah Ansāri near Herat. The comparison is so close that there can be no doubt that both tombstones came from the same workshop. Owing to difficult working conditions the inscriptions were not completely copied. They were read by Gildiken and Miles and contain neither a date nor a personal name. Thus can be established the important fact that the tomb must have come out of the famous Herat workshop, which, under the Timurids and Safavids, brought forth carved tombstones much admired by travelers.

Archeol., II (1937), 126. Photograph courtesy of the Institute of Iranian Art and Archeology.

There is, however, another possibility: the stone might have been executed in Herat and then sent to some locality other than Herat to decorate a sanctuary; the Timurids built numerous sanctuaries.

A good description without illustrations in J. P. Ferrier, Caravan Journeys (London, 1857), p. 177. See also O. von Niedermeyer and E. Diez, Afganistan (Leipzig, 1924), and R. Byron, “Timurid Monuments in Afghanistan,” Mem. 3e Congrès internationale d’art et d’archéol. iranien (Moscow, 1939), pp. 36 ff. C. E. Yate, Northern Afghanistan (Edinburgh, 1888), pp. 30 ff. As to the epigraphy of these monuments, the most exhaustive study has been made by C. E. Yate in his “Notes on the City of Herat,” Journ. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, LVI (1887), 84-106. He published the texts and translations of some twenty inscriptions, but none of them seems to be complete. N. Khankoff in “Lettre à M. Reinaud.” Journ. asiatique, XV (1886), 537-43, merely gives the names and death dates recorded on nine tombs in the musalla and five at Gazirgah, not the full text or translation. An inscription, not read by Yate, was published by M. Mohun Lal, a brief description of Herat in the Journ. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, III (1834), 12, corrected by J. Horovitz, “A List of the Published Muhammadan Inscriptions in India,” Epigraphia Indo-Musulmica (Calcutta, 1909-10), p. 94. As to photographed monuments: Outside of the tomb photographed by Wilber, there are only three others known to me, all of them unpublished. Two of them were kindly shown to me by A. U. Pope. They were taken on one of his expeditions for the architectural survey of Iran. Inscriptions on these stones were not recorded. Of considerable importance is the tombstone of Bākār, son of Omar Sheikh, son of Timur. Its inscription was partly read by Yate in his “Notes on the City of Herat,” mentioned


These stones give an idea of the original size of the Gardner Museum stone. They rest on very low flat slabs and are about six feet long, or about the same size the Gardner stone must have been before it was broken in two. Ferrier gave the size of Gawhar Shâd’s tomb as six and one-half feet long, one and one-half feet wide, and two feet high.

While these stones give the provenance of the Gardner stone, the date must be found outside of Herat.

In the Masjd-i-Djum’a at Isfahan are several alabaster colonettes which decorate the entrance to the four iwâns (Fig. 6). The stylistic proximity to the Herat tomb photographed by Wilber and to the Gardner tombstone is startling. All three agree closely in the structure of ornament and in the crisp, minute carving to such an extent that it must be assumed that there is a proximity in time as well.

The colonette can be dated, for it must be above. It bears the date 843 h. (1439 a.d.). Byron photographed it and sent a copy to Mr. Carter, of the Gardner Museum, who kindly lent it to me. The design of this tomb lacks the restraint of our stone; its carving is deeper. The date 1439 on the tomb is, according to Yate, the date of Bäikârâ’s death. The stone could have been executed later. Bäikârâ was a rebel against Shah Ruhr and died in exile. It is not impossible that the tomb was made at the request of Bäikârâ’s famous grandson, Abu l-Ghâzi Husain Bäikârâ, who died in 1506. Under these conditions it would seem imprudent to use the date of this tomb in connection with the Gardner stone. A fair illustration of the Bäikârâ tomb appears in K. Ziemke, _Als deutscher Gesandter in Afghanistan_ (Stuttgart, 1939), p. 209. I owe this reference to R. Frye. It might not be amiss to mention here a tombstone from Merv, dated 907 h. (1501 a.d.) and mentioned briefly by A. V. Zhukovski, “Ruins of Old Merv,” _Materials for the Archeology of Russia_ (St. Petersburg, 1894), Pl. VIII. It is a poor, provincial copy of the Herat style.

The photograph of one of them (Neg. Nos. L151.10) has been kindly loaned to me by Myron B. Smith.

part of the restoration of 1475–76, executed by Uzun Hasan soon after his great victory over the combined forces of Abû Sa’îd the Timurid and Hasan Ali of the Black Sheep Turkmans. The inscription was published by Godard. It does not refer to any specific parts of the mosque, but Godard proved convincingly that the tile revetments of the southwest façade are part of this restoration. The colonette must certainly be of fifteenth-century date. The only other restoration undertaken in the fifteenth century (851 H. [1447 A.D.]) was confined to the “salle d’hiver.” Myron B. Smith wrote me on this question:

I am under the impression that this alabaster dado (of which the colonette is a part) is pre-Safavid, for no other reason than because Shah Abbas the Great wanted to remove these stones and use them in his Masjd-i-Shâh. Just how long before the Safavids would be hard to establish, but it will be perfectly safe to assume that the dado dates with the tile revetments above it.

Mr. Smith referred to the title revetments of the southwest façade dated 1475–76 by Godard.

How can an explanation be made of the sudden appearance of colonettes in the Herat style in Isfahan, which was then enemy territory? It seems that Uzun Hasan, who was much less cultured than were the Timurids, did everything in his power to draw experienced artisans to his court. Furthermore, Khwândâmîr recorded a specific instance when the artisans left Herat en masse at the time of the occupation of Herat by Yâdkâr, son of Mrânshâh, a great-grandson of Shah Ruhr, while the legitimate ruler, Abu l-Ghâzi Husain Bäikârâ, was busy fighting Uzun Hasan (in 1469).
Fig. 1—Main Side of Tombstone. Boston Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum
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Photograph by and © M. B. Smith from Archive for Islamic Culture and Art
Fig. 7—Wooden Door from Kokand, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art

Fig. 8—Tombstone from the Shrine of Khwādja Abd Allah Ansārī Near Herat
Thus a possible date has been established, *ca. 1470–75*, and a probable \(^{15}\) locality, Herat. The name of the deceased remains to be established. It is carefully erased on the inscription. Only the title, sultan, remains. In a supplement it has been pointed out that the inscription may seem at first glance to refer to a secular ruler, since he is called sultan and caliph. One might easily think of Abū Sa‘īd, who was killed by Uzun Hasan in 1469 A.D., or close to the conjectured date of the stone. In the fifteenth century, heads of religious orders were also called sultan and caliph. How difficult it is to decide between the two possibilities is pointed out in the supplement. The term ri‘āsa, “headship,” however, decides the issue definitely in favor of a religious leader. It is never, to my knowledge, used as an epithet for a secular ruler.

Perhaps it would not be amiss to offer a possible hypothesis which would have to be checked later. The dealer’s letter claimed that the tombstone came from a mosque in Bokhara and belonged to “Behadin,” the grandfather of Timur. Timur’s grandfather is called Burkel in the inscription of Timur’s tomb in Samarkand. Nevertheless, the dealer’s letter sounds more like a garbled version of facts than it does like a fragment of his imagination. Could this possibly be a reference to Muhammad ibn Muhammad Bahā’ al-Dīn al-Bukhārī Nakshbandī (1317–89), the founder of the Nakshbandī order? According to Vámbéry \(^{16}\) he was buried near Bokhara and a sanctuary was erected in his honor by Abd al-Azīz Khan in 1490. Abd al-Azīz Khan reigned, however, from 1645 to 1680.\(^{17}\)

Could it not be assumed that at some time under Husain Bāikhārā a sanctuary was erected for Bahā’ al-Dīn? When Abd al-Azīz Khan erected or restored the tomb, the old Timurid stone, broken in two, might have been stored in one of the mosques of Bokhara and later sold in the nineteenth century.

To sum up: a stylistic comparison with an anonymous tombstone in the shrine of Khwādja Abd Allah Anṣārī establishes the fact that the Gardner Museum tombstone comes from the famous workshop of the Herat school of stone carvers. The colonnettes of the southwestern iwān of the Masjd-i-Djum‘a give a date of *ca. 1475* A.D. or a period when poetry and the arts were flourishing and Herat was a center of culture.\(^{18}\)

It is to be hoped that it will be possible in the not too distant future to study the numerous tombstones in sanctuaries near Herat and in other parts of Iran, Afghanistan, and Turkestan. In a study of these works of art this stone will certainly take a prominent place as the first one that has been studied in its entirety.

**Appendix**

As the tombstone does not bear a name it seems necessary to investigate the meaning of certain technical terms used in the fifteenth century, in order to find out whether such terms as sultan, caliph, and rawdat apply to secular rulers or to religious leaders. By means of such an investigation it can be decided at least to which of these two categories the owner of the tombstone belonged. Only after the category is established is it possible to make further deductions about the person buried under the tombstone.

\(^{15}\) Probable, not because there is any doubt about the tomb’s Herat style, but because of the possible spread of the Herat style to other centers.

\(^{16}\) *Travels in Central Asia* (New York, 1865), p. 211, note.


1. Rawda. Among the words most frequently used for tomb on tombstones in Iran and its eastern border countries are: કબ્ર,¹⁹ марқад,²⁰ мад¬
фân,²¹ дарîkh,²² маддия,²³ and бûрхân.²⁴ Raw-
dâ is less frequent and means, to quote Rehatsek:
“Literally a garden, but usage has in all Muham-
dan countries, as well as in India, assigned to
it the signification of a mausoleum surrounded by
a garden or park.”²⁵

Rawda was first applied to the prophet’s
tomb, after Walîd had built a pentagonal wall
around it and some other holy tombs.²⁶ The
term became later applied to other sanctuariess.²⁷
Many travelers have reported that throughout
Iran and Afghanistan the tombs of holy men
were surrounded by gardens.²⁸ Among the in-
scriptions of tombstones near Herat read by
Yate, rawda appears only once, i.e., on the tomb
of the saint Khwādžia Abd Allah Anšârī:

طربی لروده جمّة

.... welcome to the shrine on the ground....²⁹

While rawda ordinarily refers to a sanctuary
or shrine, it sometimes seems to signify, at least
in the fifteenth century, a tombstone. The Per-
sian inscription on the tombstone of Ulugh Beg in
the Gûr-i-Mîr at Samarkand begins:

این مرقد مزار وابن مشهده رفع واین روده معمتر

Blochet translates: “Ce sepulcre illuminé, ce
mausolée eminent, ce tombeau parfumé....”³⁰
Ulugh Beg’s tombstone, as well as seven other
tombstones, is in a subterranean vault. There is
no reference any longer to a garden. It is also
important to note that Ulugh Beg was not a holy
person but a secular ruler. The word rawda
thus will not help to decide whether the tomb
was that of a ruler or of a holy man.³¹
den.” See also, A. Vâmbréy, Travels in Central Asia
(New York, 1865), pp. 233.

²⁹ “Notes on the City of Herat,” under note 6, p. 89.
Rawda occurs also on the following: a tombstone near
Isfahan reads:

هذَا الروعه المقدسه الشيخ عبید بن بكران

“This is the holy rawda of Sheikh Muhammad Pîr
Bakrân.” It is dated 703 H. (1303 A.D.). I am indebted to
E. Herzfeld for this reference. A long inscription in
the sanctuary of Ridâ Ali in Meshed, written by Báš-
songhor in 820 H. (1417 A.D.), runs around the inner
walls of the saint’s tomb chamber and begins: “Hâdâ
rawda:“ (Sykes, op. cit., p. 1146).

³⁰ E. Blochet, “Les Inscriptions de Samarkand,”
Revue archeol., XXX (1897), 204.

³¹ Dozy, op. cit. Article “rawdât” refers to a Spanish
author who applies rawdat to a royal mausoleum at the
Alhambra: “A las espolas del quarto de los leones,
hacia mediodía, estaba una rawdà, a capilla real, donde
tenien sus enterramientos.” L. del Marmol Carvajal,
Historia del rebelión y castigo de los moriscos (2d ed.;
Malaga, 1797), I, 27. See also the plan of the Alhambra
published by E. Kühnel in Springers Kunstgeschichte
(Leipzig, 1929), VI, 479.
2. Shahāda. According to E. W. Lane\[32\] shahīd not only means that a man died fighting the infidels but also is applied to one who “dies of colic, is drowned, burned to death, killed by a building falling on him,...” to anyone dying a violent death.\[33\] This is the meaning given to shahīd and its derivatives in all Timurid tombstones. The tombstone of Ulugh Beg who was killed by his son is called mashhad,\[34\] and later on in the inscription it is stated that he died a martyr: فَقَدْ أَسْتَشْهَدَ.\[35\] Gawhar Shād who was executed by Abū Sa‘īd in 861 H. (1456 A.D.) became a martyr inasmuch as her tomb is called mashhad in the inscription.\[36\] Thus, the term shahāda by itself would not exclude Abū Sa‘īd as a possible candidate for the tomb, since he was executed by Uzun Hasan in 1469 A.D., which is closer to the established date of the tomb than is the date of any other Timurid ruler.\[37\]

3. Sultan. All great Timurid rulers with the exception of Timur\[38\] called themselves sultan, but this title is also applied to religious leaders.\[39\] It is on the tomb of Abū Shaibān Mu‘āwiyā, a descendant of Zainab, daughter of the prophet; this tombstone was erected by Sheikh Bāyazīd in 1461 A.D.\[40\]

4. Caliph. From Barthold’s masterful exposition of the legal history of the term “caliph” it has been found that Timurid as well as other rulers of this late period assumed the right to call themselves caliph.\[41\] Epigraphers, however, are well aware of the fact that the evidence of coins, tombstones, and seals in manuscripts does not always coincide. Shah Rukh, according to Barthold, who quotes Hāfiz-i-Abūrī, demanded that an Indian ruler, Khiḍr Khan, mention him in the khitba: May God make his realm and sultanate in the caliphate an eternal one.\[42\] Yet Shah Rukh did but rarely insist on this title on his coins,\[43\] and it does not appear among his

\[40\] Yate, “Notes on the City of Herat,” pp. 95 ff. and 104. رحم سلطان systemd


\[42\] Ibid., p. 381.

\[43\] L. A. Sédillot, “Observations sur un sceau de Shah Rukh et sur quelques monnaies des Timurides.” Journ. asiatique, V (1840), 295-319. A distinction should be made between khitba and khilāfa. The former is never used on coins by the Timurids. Even of the Shāhbnām only Muhammad uses it. S. Lane-Poole, The Coing of Bokhara in the British Museum from the Time of Timur to the Present Day, ed. by R. S. Poole (London, 1888), XXXVII. Khilāfa is occasionally used in the beneficent formula which follows the names of the Timurid princes on the reverse of silver coins:

\[66\]

The more usual formula is:

\[66\] Out of twenty-eight silver coins of Shah Rukh on which the beneficent formula can still be read, only two include the term khitba. Lane-Poole, op. cit., p. 23, No. 59, dated 821 H.; and p. 30, No. 82, dated 815 H.
Hypothetically have found, Mor which still Khanikoff's our "Ausflüge on Sağd's titles religuous steht in the Kahle 190 occur Sağd 44 reads: Samarkand! This is the Blochet, Der Blochet, when "Inscriptions The few ibn al-DIn Mashhad the Nakhichevan. however, however, on the tomb of Khwädja Yüsuf ibn Kabîr, published by Khanikoff, and reads: 

١٠۰۰

This is the Mašhad of the Khwädja, the great ra's, pure

45 Blochet, op. cit., pp. 204 ff.

وهو السلطان المبرور والمتنفخ المسرور

Only a few coins of this prince were in the British Museum when the catalogue and this supplement were written (1882 and 1890). None of them contained the benedictory formula.
46 Lane-Poole, op. cit., p. 40.

50 E. Bocthor, Dictionnaire (Paris), I, 493 ff.
51 Bouvat, op. cit., p. 272.

2 MFO, III, 422; note lack of apparatus and the failure of his attempt to give us a photograph of the inscription, as he tells it in n. 1 to this page.
century of Islam. Jaussen and Savignac, who visited the castle in the spring of 1911, were the next to devote their attention to it. But they too made only slight headway with the text. They were, however, more successful in securing a photograph and in making a tracing of the inscription. Finally, this inscription and a second one of three lines placed across the arch from the first, with which it clearly belongs, took their places as Nos. 20 and 21 in the Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe, published under the direction of Combe, Sauvaget, and Wiet, with the collaboration of some twelve or more outstanding Arabists, some unspecified one or more of whom, perhaps again Jaussen and Savignac, attempted the third reading. But the text continued to defy efforts to arrive at anything near a complete or satisfactory reading.

In view of the great difficulties experienced thus far in the reading of so early an Islamic inscription, and because it has the added distinction of being one of few early inscriptions known to have been painted rather than engraved, it, if for no other than epigraphic and paleographic interest, challenges and deserves a new reading, even if that reading is as yet not 100 per cent perfect or complete. An attempt to secure a new photograph of the inscription, through the kind services of Dr. Nelson Glueck, came to naught because of world war conditions. Having nothing more to work with than the extremely poor photograph and tracing given by Jaussen and Savignac I have had to leave the reading of a few words uncertain. The present reading is offered in the hope that someone, with its aid, and perhaps with the opportunity to work from the inscription itself, may be able to clear away the few uncertainties still remaining (Fig. 1).

4 Mission, III, 8, 300 f., and Pls. LVII and LVIII.
5 Vol. I (Cairo, 1931), 18 f.; hereinafter referred to as Répertoire.

NOTES

.Translation

1. Oh my God have mercy on 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Umar and forgive him
2. his faults, those that are passed and those to come, those that are hidden and those that are manifest.
3. No one of himself draws nigh unto thee but that thou forgivest him and hast mercy upon him
4. if he believes. I believe in my Lord. Therefore bestow thou on me thy benefits for thou art the Benefactor, and have mercy
5. upon me for thou art the Merciful. Oh my God, I beg of thee to
6. accept from him his prayer and his veneration. Amen, oh Lord of the worlds! Lord of
7. Moses and Aaron! May God have mercy on him who reads it then says, Amen! Amen! Oh Lord of
8. the worlds, the Mighty, the Wise! 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar wrote (it) on
Three lines across from the main inscription:

1. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
2. اللهم اغفر لعبد الملك بن عمر
3. لا شيء ذهاب الذاتيا وانص عن قيض

1. In the name of God the Merciful, the Compassionate.
2. Oh my God, grant forgiveness to 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Umar.
3. Nothing molested him in the world and he is safe even though seized (by death).

The inscription, as one might expect from a pious invocation of this sort, is rich in Koranic flavor. Short verbatim quotations alternate with longer ones somewhat adapted in text and context. That an inscription so rich in such phrases should have defied decipherment for so long is due largely to one peculiarity, sometimes more apparent than real, of its more or less poorly executed script. This peculiarity is the use of some unorthodox, and therefore unexpected, ligatures, especially the ligature of an initial alif to the last letter of the preceding word. In several instances it is clear that the ligature is unintentional and that its formation is due to the use of the alif with the bend to the right at its lower end, together with the use of a somewhat extended preceding horizontal stroke to which this alif appears to be joined. Doubtless, careful examination of the inscription itself would throw more light on these irregular ligatures.

It is not always possible to tell if some of the dots visible in the tracing are meant for diacritical points. Moritz stated that the kāf in line 9 has two strokes below it. Jaussen and Savignac said nothing about either dots or strokes as diacritical points, but their tracing shows what seems to be several dotted nūn's in lines 4 and 5 and also a possible dotted bā' in line 10.

Line 1. 'Abd al-Malik's last name is to be read as عمر عبد, and not as عمر عبد. The second letter of the name is a medial mīm of a type seen repeatedly in the inscription, for example, in the words الحرم and الجم. That is, it is a mīm written above rather than on or below the main line of writing. It should also be noticed that several of the initial mīm's are so written above the line. Again, the last letter in the name is a rā' and not a dāl; it is similar to many a rā' in the inscription and is unlike any dāl that the piece offers.

Line 2. Here there is an unexpected ligature between the wāw and mīm of . For the forgiveness of faults, past and to come, cf. Koran XLVIII, 2. The phrase, "the hidden and the manifest," see ibid., II, 77; this, with modifications, is frequently found in literary sources.

Line 3. The reading of اتحد كان is given with some reservation. There is a remote possibility of the word إنسان. In this and the following line 'Abd al-Malik is availing himself of the Koranic provision in sura VI, 12 and 54.

Line 4. For the Koranic flavor of this passage, cf. suras II, 127 ff.; III, 8 and 35. One should note the twice repeated ligature of an alif already explained. The reading of قبل البلاذ is offered as the most likely possibility. The jā' and mīm of the first are almost certain, and the little visible stroke could well be that of a final nūn. In the second word, the alif seems joined to the tā' of ابن; the lām needs no comment; the mīm here approximates a triangular form more than the common circular one; the next alif is clear enough, but the final

7 Cairo, 1928.
8 Cf., for instance, Baladhuri, Ansāb al-Aṣkrāf (Jerusalem, 1936–), IV B, 40, 52, 55; V, 24ff., 216, 364.
Fig. 1—The Kasr Kharâna Inscription of 92 H. (710 A.D.)
letter offers some difficulties, since it looks more like a reversed and dotted 'a' than like a final nun. Is there an accidental horizontal stroke and traces only of a final nun? Another, though less likely suggestion is that the alif.

Line 5. One should note again the apparent ligature of an initial alif to the last letter of the preceding word, occurring twice in this line. The seems to have suffered some damage in addition to being somewhat involved with the word above it. The rā' is, in reality, like most of the rā's in the inscription; the hā' is of the form known as the ḥā' with a beam, met again in lines 7 and 10. These letters, however, rā'-hā' have formed another of these unexpected ligatures that characterize the script of the piece.

Line 6. For petitions that Allah accept what is being offered cf. suras II, 127; III, 34 and 37. 'Abd al-Malik is here slipping back from the first person of lines 4 and 5 to the third person form with which he started his petition. It is possible that a word, such as دعاء or دعاء or كرسية, is lost here. The tracing gives a very peculiar nun in the stèles; the photograph, however, shows some damage to the stone at this point.

Line 7. For the phrase cf. suras VII, 121 f. and XXVI, 47 f., where it and are found, as here, together, and sura XX, 70, where it stands alone but with the order of the names reversed. The hā'-rā' of Hārūn look deceptive. Note the irregular ligature between the mim of and the alif of الله.

Line 8. The medial 'ain of the first two words, like that of line 6, is an open one, differing in that respect from the closed 'ain of lines 9 and 10. Though the yā-zāy of the looks questionable, the reading given is most likely, since the phrase is very common in and out of the Koran, and other combinations offer even more paleographic difficulties. The mim of خبر is evidently broken; see note to line 1 above.

Line 9. Jaussen and Savignac and the Répertoire (evidently following them) read the month as the first instead of the second. It is difficult to agree with the former, since their tracing appears to confirm Moritz's reading. The mim is similar to that of the kingdom; see note to line 1. The hā' in the tracing gives some evidence of being a hā' with a beam, but with its lower part lost. This is confirmed from the photographic reproduction which actually shows a slight downward extension of the oblique stroke, bringing the mim and hā' even closer together than the tracing shows them to be. Again, the rā', studied from both the tracing and the photograph, is similar to the rest of the rā's and is unlike any dāl in the entire inscription, cf. note to line 1 above. Finally, the last letter is more easily read as a final mim than as a hā' or tā' marbūta, since it has a small final stroke like other final mim's in the piece. This epigraphic evidence is further reinforced by the fact that the reading of Muharram gives a perfect coincidence of the day, Monday, and the date of the month. The method of dating by the number of the remaining nights of a given month was a common practice among the Arabs. The exact date of the inscription works out to Monday, November 24, 710 A.D.

Line 10. The photograph is of no help for the first half of the line, and the tracing is only slightly better. It is to be noticed that with the end of line 9 the inscription is complete and that anything added by the original writer would be


11 Ibid.

of the nature of an afterthought. Next, lines 10 and 11 start out considerably farther to the right than do the lines above them. The same writer would tend to keep the vertical alignment. Again, the phrase "نَبِيُّ وَرَبِّيُّ" readily allows, if it does not actually call for, a second person. Finally, inscriptions involving more than one person are not uncommon. With so much in favor of a second person, the first three short vertical strokes of the line persist in suggesting the šīn of "شَهِيد". A hāʾ and a good sized dāl would account for the rest of the lacuna leaving no more than average spacing between it and the next word. The latter is clearly the proper name لَم. The reading of جِم might, at first, be questioned because of the diminutive size of the second letter, which could be read as rāʾ or ẓāʾ. But the piece has other small nūn's, e.g., in أَمَس of line 6 or in مِن of line 9. The reading of the last name as عُروُن is encouraged by the looks of عُروُن in line 7. There is clearly some corruption or perhaps scribal confusion at this point of the text. It seems likely that the scribe, having written the wāw following, took stock of his space and, deciding to finish his sentence in one line, started back in the interlinear space, yet failed to make it in one line.

For سَرْح, compare Lane's Arabic-English Lexicon ... An alternative reading is أَسْرُح لِنَا, that is, open for us (our bosoms or minds for the acceptance of the truth). There is a bare possibility that the last letter of the word is an 'aín, giving the likely reading أَسْرُح لِنَا, that is, make apparent to us (the truth or the right), usually used in a religious sense. Whichever of the three possible readings is preferred the essential idea is the same, namely, a request for divine guidance so as to assure the meeting with the prophet. Still another possibility is أَسْرُح فَانا though this need not mean that the petitioners are in haste to leave this world, since pious Moslems always hoped to meet the prophet in visions and dreams.

Now comes the consideration of the three lines across from the main inscription. The first two lines offer no difficulties, but the third line has several of these. On the principle of reading the line as much as possible on its actual face value, it would seem to read:

لا يَشِبُّ فِنَادًا وهوُ أمِينٌ لو قِيَت

which is, from the content point of view, not satisfactory at all. The reading offered, though calling for more reconstruction of the visible text, is more in keeping with the general trend of this type of inscription. An alternative for لَجُج is لَجَج, to stick together closely, to approach or to be near a person. In either event, the main idea would seem to be that the cares or the evils of this world did not get the better of the man. The substitution of a zāʾ for a dād in the last word is a scribal error easily enough understood.

It is difficult to determine the identity of this 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Umar. General indices to literary and historical works covering the Umayyad period list no such name, though the field has by no means been exhausted. For the historical background of the inscription one must, for the time being, be content with the likely suggestion made by Moritz, namely, that Walid I, on his return from the pilgrimage of 91 H., reached and stopped at Ḳharga in Muharram of 92, and that 'Abd al-Malik was some (minor?) official in that caliph's retinue. Ḳharga itself is of pre-Islamic origin. It was first visited and

14 E. Lane, An Arabic-English Lexicon (London, 1863-93), Book I.
described by Gray Hill in 1895. Several other interested visitors followed, including, more recently, Nelson Glueck. These have dealt with the origin, discovery, history, and architecture of the castle, features with which the present article is not concerned.

The epigraphy of the inscription is of special interest and importance. It is neither like that of the common graffiti nor is it typical of the script of the few well-executed specimens of the first century of Islam. The difference is probably due, in part at least, to the fact that the writing was not engraved or incised but “painted,” that is, written either with the reed pen or with a brush. The inscription shares this peculiarity of being painted with two others definitely dated from the Umayyad period. The first of these is that of Kuṣair ‘Amra, listed in the Répertoire under 100 H. (718 A.D.), and the second is that of Madīna in Upper Egypt, dated 117 H. (735 A.D.). The first of these two, of which now only four words are preserved, is in well-executed Kufic script. The second is likewise in a carefully executed script, but one that I hesitate to designate as Kufic, simple or otherwise. It is delicate and graceful in general appearance. It follows early Koranic practice in the use of short strokes for diacritical marks. Van Berchem has already remarked on the resemblance of several features of its script to those of Korans and of papyri documents. The script of the Kharāna piece, poor as it is in execution, bears marked resemblance to the script of the earliest dated Arabic papyrus, that of 22 H., and is probably closer to the script of some papyri contemporary with or nearer to its own period. It is, therefore, interesting to note that both this and the Kharāna inscriptions, different as they are in individual script style, do nevertheless reflect some then current manuscript practice rather than some purely monumental style. Other painted but undated early inscriptions from Kuṣair ‘Amra point in the same direction.

The script of the Madīna inscription may hold a clue to the identification of a script, Koranic or otherwise, that was perhaps even then in the process of development—one of the many scripts listed in the Fihrist but as yet unidentified. Hitherto, no attempt has been made at a complete publication of this inscription. This may be because van Berchem dismissed much of the text as of no particular interest or significance. The inscription is greatly damaged and difficult to decipher. So far it has not yielded sufficient consecutive text, except for Koranic passages and some rhymed phrases, to justify an attempt at publication.

NABIA ABBOTT

A NOTE ON ISLAMIC ENAMELED METALWORK AND ITS INFLUENCE IN THE LATIN WEST

Many instances are known of the influence of East Christian art on the Latin West in the period of the Crusades, during the twelfth century and after the sack of Constantinople early in the thirteenth century. Specimens of the minor religious and secular arts of Byzantium reached Western Europe in ever-increasing quan-

17 See his The Other Side of the Jordan (New Haven, 1949), pp. 38 f.
18 Cf. Répertoire, I, 18 f. for bibliographical references for these.
20 Cf. Répertoire, I, 20 f. and 25 (Nos. 23 and 30).
21 For reproductions, see B. Moritz, Arabic Paleography (Cairo, 1905), Pls. 107-10. See also, M. van Berchem, Matériaux pour un Corpus inscriptorum arabicorum, Egypt (Paris, 1903), I, 693 and Creswell, op. cit., p. 62, n. 2.
22 Van Berchem, op. cit., pp. 695 f.
23 See Abbott, op. cit., Pl. IV.
24 Cf. Mission, III, 96-98 and Pls. LV-LVI.
tity and became the inspiration of local craftsmen. Many textiles and objects in precious metal and glass preserved in western cathedral treasures bear witness to the crusaders’ admiration for the superior arts and crafts of the Christian East. One knows, too, of the respect and reverence occasionally paid by them to Islamic monuments and institutions. But there are practically no records of Islamic works of art being brought from Syria to the Latin West; and, except for Near Eastern textiles, the surviving examples which can be attributed to the zeal of the crusaders are not very numerous. The purpose of this short note is to draw attention to a distinctive group of western objects which owes its origin to the influence of Islamic metalwork. The conclusions which can be drawn from this are of far-reaching importance for the history of Islamic art.

It is now generally recognized that Limoges was a most important center for the production of enamels during the Middle Ages; and it seems that the fabrication of enameled gemelliions was the prerogative of the ateliers of that town during the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Gemelliions were copper basins for the washing of the hands, used for liturgical as well as for secular purposes, and were so called because they were used in pairs. Some forty or fifty specimens are preserved in European and American collections. Except for their figural decoration, they vary little, each having a flat base from which the sides curve up to a narrow edge. The decoration of the interior of the basins is set against a background of symmetrical spiraling vine ornaments which are practically identical in character throughout the group, except for some slight development in the forms of the vine leaves that makes the later pieces easily recognizable as works of the fourteenth century. A typical example which should be attributed to the second half of the thirteenth century has recently been acquired by the Detroit Institute of Arts (Fig. 2). The central medallion shows a falconer on a prancing steed, carrying his bird on his right hand. The upward curving wall is covered with six interlocking circles cut off by the central medallion to form six interlaced lobes. Mr. Robinson, in his publication of the piece, has rightly pointed out the Gothic character of the design as a whole and of the figure decoration; students of Islamic art, however, will in addition observe the great similarity existing between the gemellion and the only example of Islamic enameled metalwork known to me, e.g., the magnificent copper dish made for the Ortokid prince of Amida and Hisn Kaifā, Dā‘ūd ibn Suḵmān (died 1144 A.D.), in the Museum Ferdinandeum at Innsbruck (Fig. 2).

The Ortokid dish, of a shape nearly identical

1 Cf. J. Ebersolt, Orient and Occident, Recherches sur les influences byzantines et orientales en France pendant les croisades (Paris-Bruxelles, 1929).
2 Cf., e.g., R. Grousset, Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jerusalem (Paris, 1936), III, 278 f., 315 f.
3 There is no concern here with Islamic influences reaching Europe from Sicily or Spain. On this subject cf. W. L. Hilkburgh, Medieval Spanish Enamels (London, 1936), Chap. IV.
7 A catalogue of all the gemelliions known to him has been compiled by E. Rupin, L’Oeuvre de Limoges (Paris, 1890), p. 549. Since then about a dozen more specimens have become available for study.
10 The bibliography of the Ortokid dish is quoted in L. A. Mayer, “A Glass Bottle of the Atābāk Zangī,” Iraq, VI (1939), 101. And the color plate in A. Rieg, Die spätromanische Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Oesterreich-Ungarn, Teil 2, Kunstwerke des frühen Mittelalters (Wien, 1923), Pl. XLVIII.
Fig. 1—Gemellion, from Limoges. Detroit Institute of Arts

Fig. 2—Dish. Northern Mesopotamia(?). Innsbruck Museum Ferdinandeum
Fig. 3—Bronze Mirror from Persia. London, Victoria and Albert Museum

Fig. 4—Gemellion, from Limoges(?). London, British Museum

Fig. 5—Handwarmer. Islamic work, from Egypt(?). Florence, Museo Nazionale

Fig. 6—Gemellion, from Limoges. London, Victoria and Albert Museum
with that of the gemellions, shows the ascension of Alexander in the interior central medallion. Around it are grouped six circles with eagles, griffins, and lions; between them alternate palm trees and dancing girls.\textsuperscript{11} Except for the central medallion, a corresponding decoration is on the exterior of the dish: six medallions with the same animals, palm trees, and dancing girls between them. The whole body of the dish is covered inside and outside with spiraling vine ornament.

The similarity between the general layout and the decoration of the two pieces is obvious: the central medallion surrounded by six circles all decorated with figural motifs, the vine ornaments of an almost identical character against which the figures are set, the narrow rim which carries the inscription on the Islamic piece, and a saw-tooth pattern which has replaced the inscription on the gemellion. Even the dancing girls, "one of the most popular subjects in the figural art of Arabic-speaking countries,"\textsuperscript{12} appear on both objects, though in one instance between the outer medallions, in the other filling the outer circles themselves. The falconer, too, though not on the Ortokid dish, is a well-known motif in the Islamic East, where it occurs on innumerable pieces of pottery and on examples of other minor arts. On a Persian bronze mirror of the thirteenth century, for instance, it occupies the central medallion, as on the gemellion (Fig. 3).\textsuperscript{13} Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the artist of the Detroit piece worked in a place where he was able to study an Islamic enameled copper dish very similar to the Innstrbruck specimen.

It may be mentioned that the influence of Islamic metalwork is quite as obvious in the small group of Limoges gemellions whose decoration is mainly heraldic. They show a shield with a blazon in the central medallion and six medallions around the body, containing either blazons or human figures (Fig. 4). These gemellions repeat a type of Islamic object as represented, for instance, by a handwarmer of the late thirteenth century, preserved in Florence, with an escutcheon in the center and figured motifs in six medallions around the body (Fig. 5).\textsuperscript{14}

The earliest known Limoges gemellion is mentioned in an inventory of Rochester Cathedral as having been given in the time of Bishop Gilbert de Glanville, who died in 1214 A.D.\textsuperscript{15} But no such early works are preserved. Most gemellions of which reproductions are available date from the second half of the century. With very few exceptions the character of the decoration is so similar that it is quite possible that all, or most of them, were made in one single atelier, though the examples known cover a period of at least two generations. The Detroit gemellion should be classed among the earlier works of the group. In course of time, the developed Gothic style transforms the details of the decoration: the interlocking circles are reduced from six to four—the Gothic quatrefoil—and the figures become more expressive in their curved outlines, the vine scrolls more irregular, and the leaves more pointed and schematic. The gemellion of the Victoria and Albert Museum, for instance, is certainly one of the later products of this atelier (Fig. 6).

The connections here traced throw a new light on the importance of the Ortokid dish in the history of Islamic craftsmanship. It happens to be the only work of its kind which has been preserved; but the influence of Islamic enamel on the artists of Limoges proves beyond doubt that in

\textsuperscript{11} The decorative scheme of the dish seems to be Sasanian in origin, cf. J. Orbeli and C. Trever, \textit{Orfèvrerie sasanide} (Moscou-Leningrad, 1935), Pl. 29.


\textsuperscript{14} L. A. Mayer, \textit{Saracenic Heraldry} (Oxford, 1933), Pl. XVII.

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Ross, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 11, and idem, "De opere Limoviceno," p. 453.
its time it cannot have been an isolated piece.\textsuperscript{16} It is only one representative example of the products of a school of craftsmen which must have worked in Islamic countries, probably in northern Mesopotamia, and of whose work several pieces must have been brought to France by the crusaders. They gave the idea of enameled gemelons to the craftsmen of Limoges, who adhered rather closely to their models in the general organization and subject matter of their works.

The art of enameling must have reached Mesopotamia from Constantinople. The Byzantine sources of the subject matter and the technique of the Ortoşîd dish are well established.\textsuperscript{17} It is a strange coincidence that in this instance the Byzantine influence which dominates in the western minor arts of the early Gothic period should have reached France through the intermediary of Islam. It is to be hoped that one day some lucky chance will lead to the discovery of more objects of this particular Islamic school and thus extend our knowledge of enamel in Muhammadan countries.

\textbf{Hugo Buchthal}

\section*{EGYPTO-ARABIC TEXTILES IN THE MONTREAL MUSEUM}

In the Museum of Fine Arts in Montreal there are six fragments of textiles from Islamic Egypt before the Mameluke period. The first of these (Fig. 1) probably dates to the late eighth or early ninth century, in the transitional period which took place in Egypt between its conquest by the Arabs in 641 A.D. and the beginning of the Tulinid period in 868 A.D. It is a fine bold piece of tapestry weaving, in wool on a linen ground,\textsuperscript{1} and it is made up of two horizontal rectangular medallions from a tunic, which have been cut out and sewn together in recent years. The base of each medallion is a band of brown wool, spiked with vivid green and yellow lozenges, from which grow tidily spaced lotus flowers, miniature trees, and trefoils. The drawing is clear and intelligible, though rather coarse, and the bright colors, dark blue, red, yellow, green, and warm brown, have a deep stained-glass quality.

The design, though Graeco-Roman in inspiration, is in keeping with other early Islamic decoration from Egypt. In the Arab Museum in Cairo,\textsuperscript{2} the Louvre and the collection of Pfister in Paris,\textsuperscript{3} and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston,\textsuperscript{4} there are other pieces of Graeco-Roman inspiration with the same simple and neat treatment of brilliant color. It is on the basis of their dye that Pfister, of the Musée Guimet in Paris, has dated them to the century or two after the Arab conquest, when lac dye (an extraction from the secretions of the shield louse),\textsuperscript{5} which was imported from India, had largely supplanted madder, indigenous to Egypt, as red dyestuff, because of its splendid strong color.

\textsuperscript{1} Measurements: 36 by 1 (as mounted). All measurements are given in meters.


\textsuperscript{4} Particularly, Figs. 13 and 14 in: N. P. Britton, \textit{A Study of Some Early Islamic Textiles in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston} (Boston, 1938), Figs. 22 and 23, from Upper Egypt, are also related.

\textsuperscript{5} Cf. Pfister, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 5. Cf. also A. Leix, "Early Islamic Textiles," Ciba Review (Soc. Chem. Industry in Basle, Switzerland), 1942, pp. 1573–78, Figs. p. 1575. The Montreal pieces have not been analyzed for dye content, and it is only my opinion that Fig. 1 contains lac dye.

\textsuperscript{16} On Islamic works in the same technique, though of later date and of a different character, cf. M. C. Ross, "Égypto-Arabic Cloisonné Enamel," \textit{Ars Islamica}, VII (1940), 165–67.

Fig. 1—Eighth to Ninth Century

Fig. 2—The Fayoum, Ninth to Tenth Century

Fig. 3—Middle of the Tenth Century

Figs. 1-3—Egypto-Arabic Textiles. Montreal, Museum
From this group it can be seen that the use of varicolored lozenges or squares, and of lotus flower and trefoil motifs is not uncommon. The same type of motif on austerely decorated bands also appears in a few eighth- or ninth-century Egyptian wood carvings. One eighth-century panel in the Metropolitan Museum has been published by Dimand. It is embossed with a line of palmettes and pine cones, without the intricate background decoration of the traditional Islamic wood carving. Another interesting analogy is to a severely carved wooden wall pier in the Mosque of ‘Amr at Fustat, published by Creswell. This panel is important, since it is also Hellenistic in style, and definitely pre-Tulunid in date; yet its date must be put later than 827 A.D., since before that time the Mosque of ‘Amr did not extend to this part of the site. The radiating lines of the Fustat panel superficially suggest the unusual treatment of the tree branches in this first Montreal textile.

Mrs. George D. Pratt has given the Montreal Museum a pair of well-preserved tapestry bands (Fig. 2) of the Faiyum class, made in the ninth or tenth century. These are good examples of the peculiar archaic Faiyum calligraphy with its triangles and barbed hooks. The inscriptions probably contain pious formulæ. The design consists of narrow black or dark blue lines enclosing letters of uncolored linen filled with splashes of dark blue and green wool. The field is rich red wool, and the background material is coarse uncolored linen. These pieces present no problem and are part of a considerable group.

From the middle of the tenth century comes a fine linen-gauze textile (Fig. 3) with delicate silk tapestry bands in fresh pastel colors: apple green, pale yellow, and white, accented with dark blue. The design, which is rather weak, is of alternating floral patterns and rabbits, circled with the pearl motif. There is no inscription. Pieces of this type are not of great archeological or artistic significance; but they are pleasing because of their delicate texture and coloring, and their spaced bands are a link between the single bands of the earlier garments and the intricate multiple horizontal patterns of the eleventh- and twelfth-century textiles.

The first half of the eleventh century is often considered to be the finest in Egypto-Arabic textile decoration, and there are two extremely well-drawn fragments in the Montreal Museum (Fig. 4), woven with bands of affronted birds, which may be attributed to the reign of the Fatimid Caliph al-Hākim (996–1020 A.D.). They are closely related to another small-scale tapestry band depicting birds, in the Boston Museum, which is accompanied by an inscription containing a pious formula in a style of writing consistent with the reign of al-Hākim. There is another piece of tapestry weaving in the Arab Museum, Cairo, where such a band of affronted birds is accompanied by a bold inscription bearing al-Hākim’s name. The Montreal piece is on

---


7 Cf. K. A. C. Creswell, Early Muslim Architecture (Oxford, 1932–40), II, No. 184, Fig. 162, and Pl. 42b.

8 The other Montreal textiles mentioned were purchased by the Museum, with the exception of Fig. 1, which was a gift of the Canadian Handicrafts Guild.

9 R. Ettinghausen suggested that one word in the upper inscription may be “Muhammad” in mirror writing. C. J. Lamm has published a textile from the Faiyum with an inscription in mirror writing (cf. C. J. Lamm, “Some Woolen Tapestry Weavings from Egypt in Swedish Museums,” Le Monde Oriental, XXX [1936], 76, No. 59 and Pl. 15).

10 Measurements: .245 by .035; .255 by .03. For other pieces in this group cf. Britton, op. cit., Figs. 18 and 19, pp. 40–41 and footnotes 16–22.

11 Measurements: .4 by .245. Rondels are .025 high. Cf. Britton, op. cit., Fig. 36 for a single band of similar decoration.

12 Cf. Britton, op. cit., Fig. 45, whose style of writing resembles that of Figs. 43 and 44, the former bearing the name of al-Hākim. See also Fig. 47 for another design of clearly-drawn affronted birds.

13 Cf. Gobelins exposition catalogue (see footnote 2), No. 145, Pl. 9.
a fine greenish blue linen ground with the design in silk. Single outer bands, in yellow with black chasing, enclose a central band of small irregular floral motifs and white birds with yellow or light blue wings. The field is red.\textsuperscript{14}

The next piece to be considered (\textit{Fig. 5}) is an intricate and precise little border, typical of the second half of the eleventh century. It is fine and well drawn, with clear primary colors, on a linen ground, perhaps glazed, with the decoration in silk. The central motif is a broad band of white rabbits in rondels on a red field; each rondel is enclosed by a yellow square chased in black; the squares infringe on the first of three narrow borders: the inner border of simulated Kufic in black on yellow, the middle border of black chased in white, and the outer band of simulated Kufic in red and white on yellow.\textsuperscript{15} A simpler version of the same design is in a textile in the Berlin Museum, published by Kühnel,\textsuperscript{16} and a more complicated version is in the Boston Museum.\textsuperscript{17}

Pieces of this class presage the last period of Fatimid decoration, in the twelfth century, when decoration had grown rampant in a luxuriance of interlaced lines. A fine example of this late Fatimid work (\textit{Fig. 6}) is woven in tapestry in the usual brilliant yellow and red silk of the period, on a linen ground.\textsuperscript{18} The formerly central motifs of rabbits and ducks have now become entirely subsidiary to their framework and are hardly recognizable. The Neskhi calligraphy is also very debased, though it is legible, and reads:

\begin{flushright}
الوز والاقبال
\end{flushright}

Good fortune and prosperity. (repeated)

Similar pieces are in the Boston Museum: one with an inscription bearing the name of the Fatimid Caliph al-Ḥāfiz (1130–49 A.D.), which helps to fix the date of the group, and another with the same inscription as that on the Montreal piece.\textsuperscript{19} Other pieces of the type are in the Berlin Museum.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{flushright}
Nancy Pence Britton
\end{flushright}

\textbf{NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE IN AFGHANISTAN}

The history of Oriental art and architecture is only beginning to be enriched with discoveries made in the eastern part of the Moslem world, and Afghanistan represents one of the most important and little-known areas, lying on the trade routes between Central Asia and India. These few notes are concerned with the architectural monuments the Muslims encountered when they conquered the Kabul region. Afghanistan may be roughly divided in three sections after the dominating cultural influences. In the north, the plains of Afghan Turkestan, with the ancient center of Balkh, have always been exposed to invasions from Central Asia. Hence it may truly be called a part of Turkestan. The west of Afghanistan, centered on the city of Herat, and including the mountainous central part of the country, has adopted Iranian culture and manner of speech. Kandahar, Ghazni, Jalalabad, and the frontier territory are strongly influenced by Indian manners and customs. The Kabul region is the meeting place of the three cultures.

It has been assumed that Buddhism did not extend west of a line roughly drawn from Balkh, through the mountainous area today known as the Hazaradžat, to Kandahar, for no Buddhist re-

\textsuperscript{14} There is evidence of a second scroll band below the present one, this time in black with yellow chasing. Measurements of the pieces are: .24 by .03; .24 by .03.
\textsuperscript{15} Measurements: .25 by .08.
\textsuperscript{16} Cf. Kühnel, \textit{Islamische Stoffe aus ägyptischen Gräbern} (Berlin, 1927), No. 3137, p. 25, Pl. 11.
\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Britton, \textit{op. cit.}, Fig. 64.
\textsuperscript{18} Measurements: .355 by .14.
\textsuperscript{19} Cf. Britton, \textit{op. cit.}, Figs. 83 and 87.
\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Kühnel, \textit{op. cit.}, No. 3139, p. 29, Pl. 12; and No. 3138, p. 29, Pl. 15.
mains have been found west of this line. From Arabic and Persian sources it would seem that Buddhism had been fairly well displaced by the Zoroastrian religion in Central Asia. The conquests of the Sasanians in Bactria, as well as the imitation of the Sasanians by the Ephthalites, would have given a stimulus to the propagation of Zoroastrianism. Hsüan Tsang, a Chinese pilgrim of the seventh century A.D., does not mention Buddhist monks or monasteries existing in present Russian Turkestan, except at Termez on the Oxus River. Hence it is probable that the Muslim invaders first encountered Buddhism and Buddhist remains in the area of present-day eastern Afghanistan. Buddhism persisted in the mountain fastnesses of Afghanistan long after it had disappeared in the lowlands, as is evidenced by the objects recovered from Funduğistan, a ruined town of the eighth century A.D., in the mountains north of Kabul. Kabul itself has been an important center from ancient times, but the city is open to invasion because of its position on the road to India. On account of this, as well as the severe climate, few monuments have survived. Pre-Muslim relics are, however, more numerous than early Muslim remains.

Although the Muslims RAIDed the district of Kabul many times, the real conquest and conversion to Islam dates only from the time of Ya'kūb ibn Laith about 870 A.D. Information about these early raids, mainly derived from the historians Balādhurī and Tabari, is exceedingly meager. Balādhurī made the following statement: "Abd-al-Rahman took with him to Basra slaves captured at Kabul, and they built him a mosque in his castle there after the Kabal style of building." This observation is interesting for the mosque of Abd-al-Rahman was erected in one of the early centers of Islam. Unfortunately, the mosques of Basra have long since vanished, and the victory columns of Sultan Mahmud at Ghazni are the oldest standing Islamic monuments in Afghanistan; hence it is impossible to ascertain the type of building referred to by the historian. Furthermore, it seems that the victory towers erected by the Ghaznevids were not local inspirations, but in imitation of manārs and columns erected by Indian potentates. Thus, although nothing remains from early Islamic times, pre-Muslim remains are very much in evidence.

The city of Kabul in pre-Islamic times was situated southeast of the present town, near the juncture of the Kabul and Loghur rivers. Buddhist Kabul was not such a great center as was Kapisa (Begrâm), for the former is not even mentioned in the itinerary of Hsüan Tsang. At the present time vestiges of monasteries can be found near the villages of Shevaki and Kamar in the Loghur Valley, about five miles from Kabal.

In good state of preservation are two columns (manārs) and a stupa; another stupa, in bad

1 In conversations with M. Ghirshman, head of the Délégation Archéologique Française in Afghanistan, and M. Ahmed Ali Kozâd, director of the Kabul Museum.
2 This is a vexing question, for there are no accounts of Muslims meeting Buddhists in Khurasan or Central Asia. At the same time there existed in many towns gates or quarters called "Nawbahār." The existence of gates with this name, in Samarkand and Bukhara, indicates the presence of Buddhists. Cf. W. Barthold, Istoriya Kulturnoi zhizni Turkestana (Leningrad, 1927), pp. 41-43. Nawbahār is said to be another form of the Buddhist term "vilhara," or temple. This name is also applied to a gate in Tūs, near the present city of Meshed. Does this indicate a Buddhist colony in Tūs? Cf. Aṣrār al-Tawhid fī Maḵmāt Abū Saʿīd (Persian text), ed. by V. A. Zhukovskii (St. Petersburg, 1899), p. 278.
state of repair, is near by (Fig. 1). One of the manârs, the best preserved, is on the crest of a hill and can be seen from the city of Kabul (Fig. 2). It marks a route to the southern province of modern Afghanistan (Khōst and Gardīz). The local inhabitants know the site of Čār manâr well, but any attempt to ascertain the history of these monuments will evoke a score of conflicting replies. These manârs were noted by Charles Mas- son (pseudonym for James Lewis), intrepid British traveler of the last century, but he did not examine them. It remained for a certain M. Hönigberger to report them fully.7

The stupas and manârs are said to date from the epoch of the Kushan empire (first to third centuries A.D.), although it has been suggested that they were erected in the time of Asoka.8 The former suggestion is probably nearer the truth, for the manner of building the walls, with large rocks placed perpendicular to stone slabs (Fig. 3) is also found in the buildings of Sîrkap, Parthian city of Taxila.9 This style, however, seems to have persisted for a long time in northwestern India and Afghanistan, for the same style is to be observed in Fundukistân and Shahr-i-Zohak, in the Bâmiyân Valley. Fundukistân is an ancient town situated on a plateau high above the Ghûrband River. It marks the junction with a caravan route to the Kabul Valley. More impressive, and easier of access, is the site of Zohak. It really consists of two cities, or a walled town, with a citadel above it. Its defensive qualities are excellent. Some parts of the town may date from the Islamic period, for some of the houses resemble those in Shahr-i-Gholghola, the town of Bâmiyân destroyed by Genghiz Khan in 1221 (Figs. 4 and 5). Other buildings in the city may be much later in date (Fig. 6).

It is only natural that easily defended sites such as Fundukistân and Shahr-i-Zohak, on top of mountains, should have survived, while traces of habitation in the valleys disappeared. Now buildings are erected in the valleys and plains, not on hills or mountains. Afghanistan is covered with kalâs, or square forts and caravanserais, which are also typical of eastern Iran and Turkestan. These structures provided adequate protection for the local population against the marauding Turkomans and Uzbeks.

The history of monuments in Afghanistan is too little known to trace the changes and developments in art and architecture. Certainly, in the future, excavations in Afghan Seistan, as well as in the north, will yield interesting results.

Richard N. Frye

Fig. 1—Stupa in the Valley Below Manār

Fig. 2—Manār on Top of Ridge

Fig. 3—Close-up of Manār

Figs. 1-3—Monuments in the Loghar Valley near Kabul
BOOK REVIEWS


Volume 1. As Herzfeld had not published a final volume of ground plans and descriptions of the buildings which he excavated at Samarra,1 the Department of Antiquities of the Iraq government resolved to devote part of its grant to carry out further work there and make good the deficiency in our knowledge. This may be regarded as the most important part of their report. The Iraqi excavators examined the ruins of the palace at al-Ḥuwaiṣilāt, which they identify with Ibn Serapion’s ʻAṣr al-Djaṣṣ (inconsistently transliterated as “al-Jass” or “al-Jas”). The ground plan of the palace is compared with that said by Masʻūdī 2 to have been evolved by the Lakhmid monarchs of Ḥira, and introduced into Islamic architecture by the Caliph al-Mutawakkil in imitation of them. The plan described by Masʻūdī evidently approximates very closely to the layout of ʻAṣr al-Djaṣṣ. Ground plans, besides those of the palace, shown in the report include plans of some of the “houses” excavated—in size and number of rooms almost palaces themselves. These houses were selected from various parts of the area, and the report gives a brief outline of their general features and the special points of interest in each building. Fresh material on Islamic domestic architecture has been made available by the examination of sīrāb basement rooms of a type still in use in Iraq, bathrooms, latrines, columbaria, fermentation vats, foundations, and paved, tiled, or marble floors, though the latter do not show well in the half-tone plates.

Volume 2. Though also well-documented by photographs, the second half of this report does not contain enough precise description of the objects under consideration; in each case a scale is shown, but no proper measurements are given. This practice detracts considerably from its usefulness, since it is devoted to the small antiquities found at Samarra, mostly glazed and unglazed pottery; it also contains inscribed objects of several categories which, however, yield little new information apart from names of potters and metalworkers. No beads or gems are shown, though the excavators must surely have come upon them during the course of their work. As is to be expected the small antiquities merely amplify the number of examples of Samarra types already known.

There are sherds stamped with devices, generally abstract designs or animals, and sometimes with inscriptions; these are probably the trademarks of individuals or firms of potters. Some glazed and unglazed pieces are incised or inscribed with names. Most important of the inscribed class is an unglazed pottery grenade of a type familiar to archaeologists and noted by Hobson as being of uncertain function; this grenade bears a Kufic inscription implying that it was used as

1 Professor Herzfeld was kind enough to supply the following information about the last Samarra volumes in a letter dated Princeton, June 24, 1945: “The plates for Samarra, Vol. VI, were printed early in 1941, and the manuscript for the text was sent over before Germany declared war, so shortly before—about twenty days—that I never heard whether it arrived or not. This volume dealt with the town as a whole, its prehistory, its topography, its history (phases of building), and the people living there. Many single buildings were published in it, especially isolated buildings, also bridges, such as the Band-i-ʻAdaim and ʻHarba; but not the architecture of the palaces, mosques, and private houses, which would have become volumes VII and VIII. There is a complete air survey in it, besides the maps made on the ground.”—ED.

2 Murūdū al-Ḍahab, VII, 192–93.
a container for wine. I cannot, however, concur with the author's conclusion that all these grenades were used for wine, and indeed they might have been used to contain perfumes, which were an article of export from several Islamic provinces, though perfumes seem in the main to have been exported in glass bottles. It would be interesting to discover a reference to such a grenade in one of the literary sources, such as the *Khamriyyāt* of Abū Nuwās and similar writers.

The first volume, mostly a collection of plates, contains a great series of stucco mural decoration, dados, arches, or separate fragments of stucco ornament—a veritable dictionary of early Abbasid pattern and design. These patterns vary from flower motifs to abstract ornament not unlike linen paneling; they include the Sasanian pearl pattern, floral designs resembling the *Mshattā* carvings, designs of a Byzantine type, sometimes containing crosses, and rectangular-linear patterns. In many can be discerned early forms of that distinctive style known as Islamic, despite the many sources from which al-Mu'taṣim drew his artificers and craftsmen. If, however, these finds be compared with the already known material published by Herzfeld it will at once be perceived that there is little not already known.

This last statement also applies to the fragments of mural paintings, a slight, though never to be despised addition to the knowledge of early Muslim painting. "Mural paintings," says the report, "also seem to have needed continual renewal. The walls of one house, for instance, bore signs of repeated replastering, each layer of plaster showing a different painted design consisting of flowers and animals, or purely geometrical patterns." It must be noted that the painted all-over repeat patterns are much inferior to the high standard of the stucco work. The most interesting painting shows a griffin's head, resembling the bronze griffin of the Campo Santo at Pisa, evidently not recognized as such by the authors of the report. There are more examples of faces of the familiar types already published by Herzfeld, a moon-shaped female face, an animal drinking, and the head of a gazelle or buffalo.

Two inscriptions are shown, a Kufic inscription in gypsum, and another on a stone mihrab. There are photographs of short, stumpy columns with a curious bulbous base. Classified groups of sherds and individual pieces are shown, some entire examples being also drawn in section. As is to be expected, much of the unglazed and some of the glazed wares have affinities with Parthian and Sasanian pottery. These unglazed wares, incised, stamped, or decorated in relief, form the largest class of ceramics, but a few pieces of Barbotino of an elaborate type are illustrated, with formalized human and animal forms applied to the surface.

The commonest type of glazed ware seems to be ordinary blue and green glazed pottery, though, in general, descriptions of color and indeed everything but the barest details are lacking. Already familiar to us from the Sarre and Herzfeld excavations are wares with polychrome glaze decoration and with incised underglaze ornament, pottery lamps, lusters, crimson, brown, gold, and silver, Chinese celadon plates, and bowls. Some graffito fragments have been produced in line drawing.

The glassware consists of familiar Muslim types, including some examples with molded ridged patterns, which I could match with identical pieces from the Tihāma coast. Plate cxxi (b) shows a small decorated glass bottle which may be identical with No. 183, Tafel vii of C. J. Lamm's report on the Samarra glass.

Other small antiquities comprise glazed tiles, mosaic, marble, wood, and metal objects, including a pair of copper chair legs, weights, ornaments, and nails, a motley but instructive débris.

This report must be regarded as a preliminary record of the 1936–39 excavations, still lacking that detailed analysis and description which will enable scholars in other countries to profit from the discoveries made by the Iraqi investigators. The two volumes are well turned out, but the plates are of too fine a screen for the paper, and
good though the blocks are they would have printed much better had a little more care been taken in the make-ready. The English is not well proofread; in the second volume it is occasionally unintelligible, and recourse has to be had to the Arabic text. Though these faults cannot be overlooked, the report is a creditable production, all the more so because archaeology in Iraq is a science in its infancy, a government care only since the country became independent of Turkey.

R. B. SERJEANT


In a foreword the director, Dr. Naji al-Asil, states the policy of his department:

The great world of the past in the pre-Islamic field must be continued, but at the same time, suitable emphasis must be laid on the cultural heritage bequeathed to us by our Arab ancestors. All vestiges that remain to us of the glorious floruit of Iraq under the 'Abbasid caliphs must be our especial care, more particularly those aspects of Islamic archaeology which in the past have understandably received less attention from western scholars.

Seton Lloyd’s summary of wartime archaeological activity in Iraq is reprinted from the Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society (London), and two articles already published elsewhere in English, Fu'ad Safar’s report on the Tall al-'Ukair excavations, and Taha Bakir’s report on those at Akarjuf, now appear in Arabic form. A new article (in Arabic) has been written on Sumerian Sculpture by Akram Shukri, but the main article of importance to readers of Ars Islamica will be Gurgis ‘Awad’s “The Mustan-

siriyah College.” This article is given both in Arabic and English, but the latter version is much abbreviated; it is based on Arabic historical sources and the accounts of European travelers, including those of Herzfeld, with observations by the author. The organization of the college, historical events in which it figures, and architectural descriptions given in early Arabic literature have been collected and woven into a well-documented narrative. An account of the Mustanṣiriya clock from an Arabic source is compared with the well-known clock in the Treatise on Automata of al-Jazari, published by Coomaraswamy.

The list of contents concludes with notes and statistics. The Iraq government’s “Three Years’ Plan” for antiquities includes the completion of the National Museum at Baghdad, already commenced at the outbreak of the war, the construction of a regional museum at Mosul, the restoration of the Mustanṣiriya College, the completion of work on the Abbasid palace at Baghdad, the construction of a museum at Kerbela, and a new building for the Costumes Museum and King Faisal I Memorial Exhibition.

While the printing of this journal is not yet perfect, it is technically a great advance on anything previously produced by the Iraq Government Press. There is still room for improvement in the illustrations, though many are very good, and in the proofreading of the English text, but Sumer is an ambitious piece of work which merits the attention of the learned world, and its contents display scholarship and competence in the contributors.

R. B. SERJEANT


This pamphlet gives a very brief account of the Abbasid palace at Baghdad, so-called for lack of other information as to its foundation or purpose. It is thought to belong to the late Abbasid

\[1\] Journ. Near Eastern Studies, II, No. 2 (1943), and Iraq, 1944, respectively.
The building has now been partly restored, and the bulk of the Arab antiquities from the Khan Marjan Museum have been transferred there. Photographs of the work of restoration have appeared in “Wartime Restoration of Two Famous Buildings in Iraq—The Abbasid Palace, Baghdad, and the Arch of Ctesiphon,” and elsewhere. It is a pity that these notes do not include even a rough ground plan of the palace showing the layout of the various rooms.

1 Mustafa Jawad, in *Sumer*, I, No. 2 (1945), just received by the reviewer, identifies the palace with Dār al-Musannāt, for which building see G. Le Strange, “The Abbasid Palace,” *Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 61-104.

2 Illus. London News, CCIV (1944), No. 5478, 444-45.

The vestibule and court and the fifteen display rooms of the palace now contain a number of cases of exhibits. A catalogue, arranged according to the showcases, of these exhibits appears in this pamphlet. It should serve also as a general guide to the contents. More detailed studies with photographs will no doubt be issued later by the Directorate of Antiquities once the work of restoration and renovation is complete.

IN MEMORIAM

LAURENCE BINYON

The study and appreciation of Oriental art in the West is, after all, a new thing. Oriental learning found its admirers and interpreters in Europe in the twelfth century and the seventeenth; during the hundred years from 1775 to 1875 Eastern poetry and philosophy had a considerable influence on Western thought, especially in Germany, and, a little later, in France. In England they formed a considerable tributary to the main stream of the romantic movement. But it was not until after this period was over that Oriental art found any deep appreciation. This is, of course, not to forget the earlier vogue for chinoiserie, which was a borrowing of motifs from an art whose technical accomplishments in porcelain and lacquer won a salute from that age of taste, without any further significance for the West than the dilution of the hitherto purely classical repertory of ornament. But after the way had been paved by the translation of Eastern poetry, especially Persian and Sanskrit, by the last quarter of the nineteenth century the West was ready to approach the art of the East with respect. And so, the breaking down of the narrow limits to the range of what good taste would accept in the visual arts fell in with a development which was also widening the range of taste in letters and philosophy until the schools of Eastern painting and sculpture could find consideration alongside the medieval, the classical, and the Egyptian; and very soon came the recognition in them of an even greater interest for an age which was in its own way sophisticated, humanistic, and intellectual; or sensuous, romantic, and visionary, just as the arts of the Far and Near East seemed to be.

During a period like this when Eastern art was being approached and studied from a completely new angle, for the first time on the level, there are only two ways of approach, in default of any established criteria: either to accept the East's own standards of values to be found in its critical writing and tradition, or to achieve a widening of taste and judgment until a degree of universality could be reached. Both ways were tried; but it was natural and fortunate that the latter had the greater influence. For human nature is seldom found to knit outstanding scholarship with superlative taste; and it might well have taken generations for the work of scholars to make its way into the general circulation of Western thought, whereas, by the alternative method it was possible to go immediately to the heart of the matter.

There is no space here to consider the development from the japonaiserie of the Goncourts to the present admiration for the strength of form of archaic Chinese bronzes and jades. We must limit ourselves here to the appreciation of Islamic art. Just because it was nearer in space, and never since the Crusades completely strange to Europe, Muhammadan art could not strike with the same freshness as that of China or Japan. It is therefore all the more remarkable that the eye of the West, so long closed to the excellencies of what it had had under its notice, should have been opened. For, although Mogul drawings or Mosul bronzes had been found in connoisseurs' collections, they had been regarded as mere tours de force of technical
skill. A glance through the entries describing the miniatures in the catalogues published during the nineteenth century by the principal oriental libraries of the West will show at once how patronizing and estranged were these same oriental scholars in art matters. With the turn of the century all that began to change, and public exhibitions of Islamic art found enthusiastic if not always discriminating critics. Such éblouissement could not last, and the love of sheer color characteristic of art nouveau passed. After 1914 the romanticism of Pierre Loti no longer colored the general view of the Near East. It was time for serious appraisal.

Even in the first edition of his Painting in the Far East, published in 1908, Laurence Binyon included a short chapter on Persia. He had long shared the enthusiasm of the collectors of Paris, especially of his friends Victor Goloubew, Raymond Koechlin, and Gaston Migeon, for Persian miniatures; and in London his older and closer friends Charles Ricketts and Shannon did not neglect this field in framing their remarkable collection. It was therefore in a circle of appreciation that Binyon was writing. And his friendship with Sir Thomas Arnold, professor of Persian at the London School of Oriental Studies, also keenly interested in Italian painting and Christian iconography, gave him an introduction to Persian literary studies. From 1920 Binyon was able to make available to students in the British Museum Print Room a selection from the Museum’s old collections of Indian and Persian miniatures, and in the summer of 1922 he staged in the exhibition gallery of his department a show of these paintings for which he wrote a catalogue. About the same time he published with Arnold his Court Painters of the Grand Mogul, which drew also for its illustrations upon the collections at the Bodleian Library and the India Office, then practically unknown to the public; it contained an appreciation of the unique vision of this school, with purity of line and powers of observation of all forms of life, men, animals, and flowers. At a later date he was to return to this period in a tribute to the greatness of spirit of the Emperor Akbar, that strange mixture of action and mysticism, of illiteracy and love of scholarship and art, whose efforts to rise above the racial and religious differences of his empire he viewed so sympathetically in a short but vivid biography.

While the painting of the Far East stirred deeper emotions, Binyon got no keener enjoyment than from some Indian and Persian drawings, in whose lyric qualities of line and color he found delight which he was able to communicate in his writings and lectures. The introductions to his publications of the miniatures of the royal Nizami manuscript of 1539–43 in the British Museum (1929) and of the Royal Asiatic Society’s Timurid Shahnameh, which he edited with J. V. S. Wilkinson in 1931, and finally to the volume commemorating the Persian Exhibition of 1931 (published in 1934), could not have been better as descriptions of the pleasures of Persian painting. His lectures too at this time undoubtedly won much appreciation for an art then very little known, even to art lovers and critics. In his lectures on the art of Asia at Harvard in 1933–34 he made his final assessment of the place of the arts of Persia and India in Asia and the world.

A remarkable quality of Binyon’s appreciation was the judgment with which he discriminated the superlative from the ordinary, the forced from the true. And his clear insight qualified his first view of an art form hitherto unknown to him. His imaginative sympathy and
sensibility seemed indeed of universal range. It was this which gave sureness of touch to his criticism, and its force was inmeasurably enhanced by the rich and expressive language which marked his prose writing no less than his poetry. His was an integrated spirit, and it is therefore true to think of his contribution to Islamic studies as the work of a poet, a vision illuminating and revealing the essence of what he saw and reaching behind it to the spiritual springs of the civilization that produced it. He may in perspective appear the central figure in the period of appreciation of oriental art that has been characteristic of the last fifty years. At the present stage of the expansion of civilization in range and universality, no work is more important than this of interpretation, and upon its quality depends the quality of the civilization which will be handed on.

Laurence Binyon was born on August 10, 1869, and educated at St. Paul's School, London, then still under the shadow of the Cathedral, and at Trinity College, Oxford, of which he was scholar in classics, and later honorary fellow. He entered the British Museum in 1893, and became the first head of the Sub-Department of Oriental Prints and Drawings in 1913; during the last year of his service, before his retirement in 1933, he was also Keeper of Prints and Drawings. He visited the United States as a lecturer in 1912, 1914, and 1926, and for a longer stay, after his retirement, in 1933–34; and he made many friendships during these visits which he greatly enjoyed. In 1929 he was invited to visit Japan, where he delivered a series of lectures in English on "Landscape in English Art and Poetry," which were afterwards printed; his Norton lectures were published under the title of The Spirit of Man in Asian Art. As a museum man he was outstanding in hanging and arrangement, and the periodic exhibitions in his department, each of which was planned with great care, were among the most popular in the Museum. He was always ready with encouragement and sympathy for the young artist and student, and his reserve covered a sociable nature that had a keen enjoyment of wit as well as of beauty. He traveled with zest, and he had a special affection for France and Italy, where his friends were many. His last journey was to Greece, where in the early months of 1940 he occupied the Byron Chair of English Letters in the University of Athens. He died on March 10, 1943, and is buried at Aldworth near his Berkshire home.

Basil Gray
FRIEDRICH SARRE

Friedrich Sarre was born on June 22, 1865, and died on June 1, 1945. As the name shows, the family had come from the Sarre region; it was one of those Huguenot families which, persecuted under Catarina de' Medici, had left France after the night of St. Bartholomew, August 24, 1572. Some of them, like the van Berchems who had fled from Brussels to southern Germany and Switzerland, stayed there. Others accepted the refuge offered to them by the Great Elector of Brandenburg after the Thirty Years War. Those who had found peace in Berlin flourished and, by one of those roundabout ways history takes, became the almost only “Old Berliners.” That is a closed period, and though the end is not yet a year old, it is as far away as the Middle Ages. In a medieval chronicle of Aleppo there is a remark on one of the oldest families of that town, one of whose great monuments, the minaret of Aleppo, erected before the crusades, is still standing: “They were Ukaili Arabs, their ancestor had immigrated three hundred years earlier, the family enjoyed always the greatest respect with the rulers, but never did one of them aspire to political power, they were much too proud and too honorable to lend themselves to such a thing.” Characters to whom noblesse oblige is the dominant principle of life grow in the soil of a society in which to make a living is not the primal necessity and the scale for moral conduct. Wilamowitz once said to me: “A van Berchem will never do what is not right!” The same could have been said of Sarre: loyalty, honesty, and decency absolute, and with these a modesty that never allowed him to assume an attitude of superiority.

He remained in the background, for he did not sell and advertise and never loved compromises. He once told me an anecdote, an amusing equivocal remark of his captain at a riding lesson: “Sarre, you must ‘sich kompromittieren’ with your horse,” meaning literally “expose yourself,” but meant as “compromise.” With truth and history one cannot compromise, the consequences of defaults are inescapable.

Sarre was very young when his parents died, and his aunt, Elise Wetzel-Heckmann (1832–1913), the only lady ever to be a member of the Berlin Academy, took his mother’s place. Archeological studies attracted his interest, and he started traveling early. In Smyrna he met Carl Humann, who then was excavating Pergamon, and it was Humann, as Sarre told me, who recommended to him the study of the great monuments of medieval Anatolia, which at that time had received hardly any attention. In 1895 he organized a journey through Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Pisidia, followed in 1896 by a longer journey into central Asia Minor. Seeing that the monuments needed exact and meticulous surveying, he prepared himself to be the photographer, to a degree rare at that time. It may be forgotten that till 1880 one had to prepare the emulsions of the glass negatives oneself while traveling. And he always took a trained and competent architect with him. As a result, the great works based on his journeys in Asia Minor, Persia, and Turkestan are models of a beauty difficult to equal. The journeys in Persia and Turkestan were made in 1897–98 and 1899–1900. The epigraphic material col-
lected was given to Arabists like B. Moritz of Cairo, Eugen Mittwoch of Berlin, and later Max van Berchem of Geneva.

Back from these great explorations, he married Maria Humann in 1900, after Humann's death, and above the lake of Babelsberg built a house which looked like a reminiscence of Florence transferred to the sands and firs of Brandenburg, a house to which it was a distinction to be admitted and which, under Maria Sarre's guidance, became a center of hospitality, known and admired by many people from Europe, America, and Asia.

In 1905 Eduard Meyer introduced me, a student just back from a journey from Assur to Persepolis, to Sarre, who proposed to me to publish the Old Persian material he had collected; he wished to take charge only of the Middle Iranian monuments. These *Iranische Felsreliefs* were published in 1910 in a first edition of a hundred copies only, the value of which is entirely in Sarre's fifty imperial folio-size photographs. Before the book appeared, we started together in 1907–8, on a new journey, which led from Constantinople to Aleppo, Baghdad, and the Persian Gulf. An incident of that journey is vividly impressed in my mind: somewhere in the desert between Mosul and Samarra a messenger on horseback met us, saying that he had looked for us for more than a week to deliver a telegram. Sarre, who had been without news from his family for a month, became so gray under his tan that I thought he was fainting: it was an invitation to some reception at Baghdad.

The purpose of the journey was to choose an early Muhammadan site for excavation, and the choice fell, as foreseen, on Samarra. Excavating ruins of such a comparatively late period was Sarre's idea. Hamdi and Halil Bey Edhem in Constantinople favored the plan, and Elise Wetzel-Heckmann made the execution possible by a foundation for studies in the field of Muhammadan archaeology. The report of the *Archaeologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet* appeared in four volumes of the *Forschungen zur islamischen Kunst*, edited by Sarre between 1911 and 1920. The excavations of Samarra took place in 1911–13, but World War I delayed the beginning of their publication till 1923; the fifth volume appeared in 1930, a sixth has been in preparation since 1940, and the remaining two volumes will probably never appear.

In 1935, on Sarre's seventieth birthday, a book, *Friedrich Sarre's Schriften*, was brought out (by the publisher D. Reimer–E. Vohsen) which shows the wide scope of Sarre's more than two hundred publications and gives a vivid picture of the far-reaching influence his literary activity had in promoting our knowledge of the eastern countries and the relation and contact of their civilization with ours.

Sarre was one of the first to collect works of Oriental art, and his private collection, of which he gave the greater part to the Kaiser Friedrich-Museum, and the collection which he started together with Wilhelm Bode for the Museum were known the world over. When I once asked him, how, as a first collector and from the start, he could pick out the very best things, he answered: "It was not so, only, I have eliminated my earlier mistakes." He also said that he had discovered far more in Paris than in the East. His collection was not one of treasures measured in financial value, though there were priceless objects in it and he never
was afraid of paying high prices, nor was it a collection of the most beautiful things as were some of the collections of the older Russian amateurs. It was guided by knowledge and research, the collection of a scholar and connoisseur of art, and hence was one intrinsic unit. With his exploring and collecting he had opened a new way, which has been followed since by public museums and institutions of learning.

The famous “Façade of Mshatta” in the Kaiser Friedrich-Museum, from Transjordania, one of the earliest and most important monuments of Muhammadan antiquity, which was Sarre’s pride, received a direct bomb hit. The most important of the antique carpets, collected with infinite pains in long years, were burned in the cellars in which they had been put for safekeeping. Sarre’s private collection, though some pieces were saved before the war, exists no longer. His house, too, was looted, when, the morning after his burial, June 4, 1945, his family was ordered to leave the house at an hour’s notice. After that hour, works of art, an irreplaceable library, studies, notes, photographs, letters, the whole scientific heritage was destroyed and burned, and thus has gone with him. Individuals may survive, but a living tradition of three hundred years, which started before there was a Saint Petersburg–Leningrad and even a New Amsterdam–New York, is dead. The generation of scholars to whom Sarre belonged, and who were his friends, such as Melchior de Vogüé, Wilhelm Bode, Max van Berchem, Halil Edhem, and Leone Caetani, is gone. They were privileged, a thing unpopular today. Not that they had usurped privileges, they owned them as gift of forces far beyond men and felt them as deep obligation. One cannot even regret or complain. Van Berchem wrote me, shortly after World War I, “Why should one wish to live in a world that wants to revert to barbarism?” and died. Caetani died in self-imposed exile. Sarre, too, saw the doom coming, but had to drink the bitter cup to the dregs. The only thing spared to him was to see the looting of his house.

*Requiescat in pace, or, as his Oriental friends may say, Rahimahullah!*

**Ernst Herzfeld**