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EDITORIAL

DURING THE LAST FEW YEARS the rising cost of printing made it more and more difficult to bring out *Ars Islamica* in its established form. At the same time, more and more material was offered to the editor, since many learned journals in Europe had been curtailed or altogether suspended. The Department of Fine Arts of the University of Michigan, which is ultimately responsible for the journal, saw before it the alternatives of either reducing *Ars Islamica* drastically in size and quality or changing the present set-up entirely.

After prolonged negotiations, the University of Michigan and the Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, decided to bring out a new series to be entitled *Ars Orientalis*, which would incorporate *Ars Islamica* but enlarge its scope to include the art of the whole of Asia. It was thought that this arrangement reflected more appropriately the intentions of the late Charles L. Freer, who had bequeathed funds to the University of Michigan, from which *Ars Islamica* has so far been published.

*Ars Orientalis* will continue to follow the policies evolved by *Ars Islamica*, but it may be possible in the future to incorporate longer contributions, which in former years had to be split into various sections. Since, owing to the widespread distribution of its contributors and the technical difficulties of production, it became more and more difficult to bring out the journal at specified dates, *Ars Orientalis* will not be bound to fixed deadlines, but will be a serial publication brought out as soon as possible after appropriate material has been accepted. It will be our aim to publish *Ars Orientalis* once every eighteen months, beginning in 1952.

Since *Ars Orientalis* will be sponsored jointly by the University of Michigan and the Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, it will follow the policy established by the will of the founder of the Smithsonian Institution, which stipulated that the bequest was to be used “For the Increase and Diffusion of Knowledge Among Men.” In practice this will mean that about 1000 copies will be sent free of charge to all the main libraries in the world. Compared with the very small edition of *Ars Islamica*—which was entirely incommensurate with the efforts and costs spent on it—this new arrangement will provide a much wider distribution of research papers, a feature which no doubt every scholar in the field of Asiatic art will welcome.

*Ars Orientalis* will have a Far Eastern editor and a Near Eastern editor, and should the need arise, an editor in other fields, such as Indian art, might be appointed for specific cases. The present editor of *Ars Islamica* will continue to handle the Near Eastern articles. The editor for the Far East material has not yet been appointed.

Authors who contemplate publishing in *Ars Orientalis* are invited to communicate with the Editorial Office, Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington 25, D. C. It is strongly suggested that, before
typing their papers, authors write to the Editorial Office for the general editorial directions for the preparation of the manuscript to be submitted. A proper presentation of material will save the editors an endless amount of work and expense and will thus make additional publications possible.

With the close of the Ars Islamica series, the Editor wishes to thank everybody who has made its publication possible. The first Editor of the journal, Mehmet Aga-Oglu, is unfortunately no longer with us, but this does not diminish our gratitude for his foresight, energy, and scholarly interests, which made Ars Islamica a reality.

Alexander G. Ruthven, President of the University of Michigan, and John G. Winter, former Director of the Institute of Fine Arts, were instrumental in getting the journal started and at all times kept an active interest in its affairs.

Walter A. Donnelly, Editor of Museums and official publications of the University of Michigan Press, always gave competent and untiring assistance in typographical and editorial matters, so that the physical aspect of presentation of the scholarly material should be regarded as chiefly his work.

Many problems in connection with the journal were overcome through the friendly advice of Frank E. Robbins, Director of the University of Michigan Press.

In more recent years, Archibald G. Wenley, Director of the Freer Gallery of Art, has been consistently helpful in steering Ars Islamica through difficult situations.

There are many other persons who have been most generous with their assistance; they certainly are not forgotten and their work will continue to live in the sixteen volumes of this series. The Editor wishes to thank all of them and, in particular, the many faithful contributors and correspondents for their constant support, which, more than anything else, made the success of Ars Islamica possible.

With the continued support of the many distinguished contributors to Ars Islamica and their colleagues in other Oriental fields, we feel sure that Ars Orientalis will find equal appreciation among scholars and students.

Richard Ettinghausen
L'ORIGINE DE LA MADRASA, DE LA MOSQUÉE ET DU CARAVANSÉRAIL À QUATRE IWĀNS
PAR ANDRÉ GODARD

"Née dans le Khorāsān vers le début du IVème siècle de l'Hégire, la madrasa ne fut d'abord qu'une école privée de sciences religieuses, c'est à dire de tradition, d'exégèse et de droit, suivant les rites sunnites." 1 Chose curieuse, dit encore van Berchem, la madrasa semble bien s'être constituée au milieu des populations shīites de l'Iran oriental, où brille, dès le second siècle de l'Hégire, un foyer très prospère d'études sunnites rattachées au rite shāhī. Le professeur enseigne alors dans sa propre maison.2 On connaît de ces madrasas primitives à Nishāpūr, à Merv, à Boukhara à Tūs et à Tābarān, jusqu'à Bagdad et en d'autres villes de l'Iran et de la Mésopotamie.

Peu à peu, cependant, la madrasa prend un caractère plus net. Elle n'est encore qu'une simple maison, mais aménagée pour les cours, souvent bâtie par le professeur lui-même, près d'une mosquée ou près de sa demeure. Tandis que les leçons officielles sont, en général, données dans la mosquée, l'enseignement y est indépendant et personnel.

1 M. van Berchem, "Architecture," Encyclopédie de l'Islām (Leiden, 1913–92), 1, 429. Khorāsān, quatrième siècle de l'Hégire, école privée, voilà déjà le problème à peu près résolu. Cependant, un peu plus loin, dans le même article, van Berchem place en Syrie l'origine du plan à cour centrale et à quatre iwāns. "Ce plan, dit-il, semble originaire de la Syrie. On le trouve déjà dans un curieux monument syrien, bien antérieur aux madrasas syro-égyptiennes, le Kāşr de l'Amrān. Comme le plan de la mosquée, il combine des éléments d'origine diverse: les iwāns sont voûtés suivants les méthodes persanes (palais sāsānides); mais leur disposition en croix autour d'une cour centrale rappelle le plan symétrique à deux axes de certaines églises byzantines et syriennes, dont le Kāşr se rapproche encore par maint détail d'architecture."

2 Le mot "madrasa" n'a tout d'abord d'autre sens que celui de lieu d'étude en général.

Vers le milieu du cinquième siècle, la madrasa abandonne son rôle modeste et se développe considérablement. Pour des raisons qui ont été fort bien analysées par van Berchem: décadence du Califat, réaction orthodoxe, avènement des dynasties mongoles,3 l'école de théologie sort alors du domaine privé pour devenir une institution politique sous le contrôle officiel de l'État. Nizām al-Mulk, le vizir des Sultans seldjoukides Alp Arslān et Malik Shāh, fonde à Bagdad une de ces madrasas pour le célèbre juriste Shīrāzī.4 Quelques années plus tard il en crée une à Nishāpūr pour un autre juriste, le fameux Djuwaini, puis d'autres à Baṣra, Iṣfahān, Balkh, Hérat, Mossoul, Khargird, Tūs, ailleurs encore. Ses successeurs imitent son exemple et la madrasa se répand dans tout l'empire des Seldjoukides.

C'est sous cette forme, celle d'un puissant instrument de propagande religieuse et politique, que la madrasa fut introduite en Syrie, au sixième siècle de l'Hégire, par les Atābaks sunnites, notamment par Nūr al-Dīn, puis en Égypte, par Śalāḥ al-Dīn. Quand elle apparaît dans ce dernier pays, son plan est "déjà fixé: une petite cour carrée, à ciel ouvert, bordée de quatre murs élevés, avec quatre salles ouvrant sur la cour par une haute arcade, et, dans les angles de l'édifice, les dépendances pour le personnel et les services de l'établissement."

3 M. van Berchem, Corpus inscriptionum arabicarum. Égypte. (Le Caire, 1894–1903), p. 256 et suivantes.
Cette composition symétrique à quatre branches répondant parfaitement aux besoins de la quadruple madrasa, c'est à dire de l'école destinée aux quatre principaux rites sunnites, ḥanafi, ḥanbalî, ṭalîkî, ḥanbalî, la quadruple madrasa l'adopta, mais il faut bien se garder de lier la question de son origine à celle de la réunion des quatre rites dans un même bâtiment. De ce point de vue, il en est exactement de la quadruple madrasa par rapport à la madrasa à quatre iwâns comme de moi-même par rapport à la maison que j'habite. Elle existait. Je l'ai choisi parce qu'elle convenait à mon genre de vie.

Le plan des premières quadruples madrasas connues, la Mustansiriya de Baghdad et la Salâhiya du Caire, n'est d'ailleurs pas cruciforme. La première comportait six iwâns disposés symétriquement, autour d'une cour oblongue, de 26 sur 63 mètres de côtés. L'autre avait deux paires d'iwâns séparés l'un de l'autre par un couloir. De plus, la réunion des quatre rites sunnites dans un même bâtiment n'apparaît qu'après la madrasa cruciforme, même en Egypte. La Nâširîya, la première quadruple madrasa égyptienne à quatre iwâns, a été achevée de l'année 703 H. (1303-4) alors que la première madrasa égyptienne à quatre iwâns, la Zâhirîya, fut terminée au commencement de l'année 662 H. et inaugurée le 5 Ṣafar de la même année, soit le 9 Décembre 1263. À l'époque, la Madrasas "de Caire, à l'Irân, au Caire, à Bagdad, à Al-Mulk, à Bahrein..." disparaissent à la même époque. Je me suis éloigné de la question de ce qui concerne le développement de la quadruple madrasa, mais je ne peux m'empêcher de faire un grand nombre de bâtiments à cour centrale et à quatre iwâns, antérieurs d'un siècle ou deux, peut-être plus, à cette Zâhirîya du Caire.

Et d'abord la Nizâmîya de Khargird. Parfaitement identifiée par une inscription au nom de son fondateur, Nizâm al-Mulk, qui ornait les murs de l'iwân kibli de cet édifice, elle n'est pas datée, mais Nizâm y est qualifié de Raḍî Amîr al-mu'mînîn, titre que lui fut octroyé que peu de temps avant l'année 480 H. Nous pouvons donc penser qu'elle fut construite vers 480 H. (1087).

Ce n'est même plus une ruine mais un amas de terre où Diez, ni Herzfeld ni moi n'avions jusqu'à présent reconnu autre chose qu'une cour et un iwân au fond duquel se trouve le miḥrâb de l'édifice. Cependant en 1938, intrigué par une certaine disposition du plan d'un monument laïc, dont je parlerai dans un instant, qui me paraissait avoir une origine religieuse, j'ai résolu de savoir décidément si la Nizâmîya de Khargird possédait originaire-

8 C'est en 631 H. (1234) que le calife al-Mustansîr-billâh la fit construire. (Massignon, op. cit., p. 80.)
9 La construction de cette madrasa fut commencée en 640 H. (1242).
11 Creswell, op. cit., p. 43.
ment un, deux ou quatre iwâns, autrement dit si ce monument pouvait être, ou non, considéré comme le plus ancien spécimen actuellement connu d'une madrasa à cour centrale et à quatre iwâns. J'ai donc cherché, dans le chaos de terre crue qui représente aujourd'hui les bâtiments anciens de la madrasa et les ruines des bâtisses qui y ont été ajoutées au cours des siècles, ceux des murs originaux qu'il était possible de situer par rapport à l'iwan encore debout. J'ai pu mesurer quelques cotes importantes et certaines, celles qui figurent sur le plan ci-joint, et d'autres qui confirment les premières (Fig. 2).

De ces constatations il se déduit bien qu'il y avait là, autour d'une cour carrée, un grand iwân, l'iwân kibli, deux autres iwâns, un peu moins larges, au centre des côtés latéraux et, en face de l'iwân kibli, un quatrième iwân, moins large encore, qui avait sans doute été le vestibule d'entrée de la madrasa. La Nižâmiya de Khargird se composait donc d'une cour carrée, de quatre iwâns disposés sur les axes longitudinal et transversal de cette cour et de locaux d'habitation et de service dans les angles de l'édifice ainsi déterminé. Nous avons en ce monument la première en date des madrasas à quatre iwâns actuellement connus.

Du plan des autres Nižâmiya nous ne savons rien, si ce n'est peut-être, par déduction, de celle d'Išfâhân, qui devait être, elle aussi, à quatre iwâns. Nous savons en effet, par Ibn al-Athîr, qu'en 515 h. (1121–2) la Dîjâmâ d'Išfâhân "fut incendiée par les Batiniens." Elle se composait alors d'une vaste cour au Sud de laquelle se dressait le bâtiment à coupoğe qui porte le nom de Nižâm al-Mulk. Rien donc qui pût brûler. Bordant cette cour, il y avait encore à cette époque les couvents, les hôtelleries, la bibliothèque, les dépendances diverses de l'ancienne mosquée, la mosquée abbasside que décrit l'historien al-Mafarrûkhî. Ce sont ces dépendances qui brûleront. C'est alors, devant ce champ de ruines, que furent vraisemblablement décidées les reconstructions partielles que nous remarquons sur place et la transformation de l'édifice, de mosquée-kiosque en mosquée-madrasa. Une inscription en caractères kûfiques, encore partiellement lisible sur l'une des portes du côté nord du monument, nous apprend que "cette construction a été renouvelée après l'incendie, durant les mois de l'année 515," l'année même du sinistre. Il ne s'agit là que de la réfection d'une porte, évidemment, mais nous sommes en droit de penser que la construction de la cour à quatre iwâns fut entreprise à la même époque, d'abord parce que cette cour est entièrement seldjoukide et qu'entre la date de l'incendie, durant le règne du dernier seldjoukide, Sultan Sanâijâr, et la mort de ce souverain il n'y eut guère plus que le temps nécessaire à la construction des bâtiments en question; ensuite parce qu'entre le moment de l'exécution du décor de la porte de 515 h. et celui du décor de l'iwân oriental il a manifestement passé si peu d'eau sous les ponts du Zendê-Rûd que l'on peut bien considérer la porte et les iwâns comme contemporains l'un de l'autre.

Or, à Išfâhân, en 515 ou vers 515 h.,

12 A. Godard, "Khorâsân," Athâr-é Iran, IV (1949), 72.
13 A. Godard, "Historique du Masdjid-é Düm'a d'Išfâhân," Athâr-é Iran, I (1936), 221.

14 La façade de l'iwân oriental, parfaitement seldjoukide, n'a pas été modifiée depuis le temps de sa construction. D'autre part nous savons maintenant, par un piliers de rive seldjoukide retrouvé en 1938 à l'intérieur d'une pile de la salle du mihrâb d'Uldjâitü (A. Godard, "Additions, Masdjid-é Düm'a d'Išfâhân," Athâr-é Iran, II (1938), 315-20), que les façades courantes de la cour étaient également seldjoukides.
15 Voir A. Godard, "Išfâhân," Athâr-é Iran, II (1937), Fig. 2.
16 Voir A. Godard, "Historique du Masdjid-é Düm'a d'Išfâhân," Athâr-é Iran 1936. Fig. 175 et 176.
quand fut décidée puis entreprise la construction de la cour à quatre iwâns de la mosquée, ce type d'édifice déjà si évolué, était nécessairement imité d'un édifice semblable et voisin qui ne pouvait être alors que la toute nouvelle et prestigieuse Nizâmiya. Il est donc probable, sinon tout à fait certain, que la Nizâmiya d'Isfahân était, comme celle de Khargiré, un édifice à cour centrale et à quatre iwâns.

Le succès de la mosquée-madrasa ainsi constituée, par l'adjonction d'une cour de madrasa au kiosque des anciennes mosquées iraniennes, fut vif et si rapide qu'en 530 H. (1135-6), quinze années seulement après l'incendie de la Djum'a d'Isfahân, nous voyons à Zawârè une mosquée à quatre iwâns construite d'une seule venue.17

D'autre part le Service archéologique de l'Irân a découvert à Rayy et dégagé les ruines d'une madrasa à quatre iwâns (Fig. 3) que son décor (Figs. 6 et 7) permet de dater du commencement du sixième siècle de l'Hégire.

Voilà donc certainement deux et probablement trois madrasas seldjoukides à quatre iwâns, ainsi que les mosquées-madrasas, seldjoukides aussi, d'Isfahân et de Zawârè, auxquelles on peut ajouter celle d'Ardistân, composée, comme la Djum'a d'Isfahân, d'un kiosque d'environ le temps de Nizâm al-Mulk en avant duquel, en 555 H. (1160), on achevait de construire la cour à quatre iwâns d'une madrasa.18 Il nous est, en conséquence, difficile de penser qu'entre la date de la construction de la plus ancienne madrasa cruciforme actuellement connue, la Nizâmiya de Khargiré (vers 480 H.) et l'achèvement de la Djâmî de Zawârè (530 H.), le plan cruciforme ait pu non seulement se constituer mais donner naissance à ces deux excellents types de monuments de l'architecture iranienne, la madrasa à quatre iwâns et la mosquée-madrasa. Il nous faut bien supposer qu'à l'époque de la création de la grande madrasa d'Etat par Nizâm al-Mulk, vers le milieu du cinquième siècle de l'Hégire, la cour centrale à quatre iwâns était déjà couramment et habilement utilisée au Khorassan.

Il me faut maintenant parler de Bâmiyân, en Afghanistan. J'ai donné de cette époque impressionnant un croquis rudimentaire dans les Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan.19

La ville musulmane se trouvait en face de la falaise des grands Bouddhas, de l'autre côté de la vallée, sur un plateau ou, plus exactement, sur une sorte de terrasse qui longe, en cet endroit, le bas de la montagne. Deux ravines perpendiculaires à la vallée y laissent entre elles une langue de terre à l'extrémité de laquelle on voit encore les ruines de l'arg, la citadelle.20 Les habitants de cette ville occupaient d'anciennes grottes bouddhiques, ou s'étaient construit des maisons en arrière de la citadelle, au pied des premières hauteurs, et le long de la ravine Ouest.21

Au quatrième siècle de l'Hégire, Ištâkhîrî décrivait Bâmiyân comme la capitale d'un vaste et fertile district, égale en superficie à la moitié de Balkh. C'était donc une assez grande cité. Elle fut détruite par les Mongols en l'année 618 H. (1221). Pendant le siège qu'elle subit, Mâtûgân, petit-fils de Gengiz Khan, fut tué. En représailles, Gengiz fit détruire la ville de fond en comble et massacrer ses habitants. Il interdit que quiconque vive ou construisse désormais sur son emplacement, qui fut appelé Mo-balîk, la ville mauvaise. Quarante ans plus tard, au temps de l'historien Djuwainî, le site de la ville détruite était en-

17 A. Godard, “Ardistân et Zawârè,” ȳtbâr-é Irân, I (1936), 208 et 296-305.
18 Ibid., p. 198 et 285-96.
19 A. Godard, Y. Godard, J. Hackin, “Les Antiquités bouddhiques de Bâmiyân,” Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan, (Paris-Bruxelles, 1928) II, Fig. 1.
20 Ibid., Pl. IV.
21 Ibid., Pl. VII a.
core inhabité. Il l’est toujours. On l’appelle aujourd’hui Shahri-Golgola, la ville des sanglots. Ses ruines sont donc antérieures à l’année 618 H.

Or dans ce champ de décombres on peut encore reconnaître les plans et parfois même une partie des murs de constructions bien caractéristiques. On y trouve un certain nombre de petites mosquées uniquement composées d’un iwân voûté, l’iwân si cher au Khorassan, devant lequel s’étend un espace rectangulaire limité par des murs bas, où les fidèles se rangeaient pour la prière (Fig. 1). Puis une mosquée plus importante, représentée par une salle carrée dont la partie haute a disparu, flanquée de deux iwâns voûtés perpendiculaires à la façade de l’édifice (Fig. 4). Ces deux types de monuments ont joué un rôle très important dans la formation des diverses mosquées de l’Est de l’Iran.22

On y trouve aussi des maisons particulières, d’un type à peu près uniforme. J’ai pu relever avec certitude le plan de l’une d’elles, moins ruinée que les autres.23 C’est celui d’une construction à cour centrale et à quatre iwâns, avec


23 J’en ai même des photographies, mais elles sont à Paris.

quatre pièces d’habitation ou de service dans les angles (Fig. 5).

Ainsi donc, en 618 H., le plan le plus commun des maisons de Bâmiyân est cruciforme. Il y est si généralisé que l’on doit lui reconnaître une ancieneté beaucoup plus grande et penser qu’il était utilisé dans le Khorassan tout entier.24

24 D. Schlumberger vient de découvrir à Lašjkârî Bâzâr en Afghanistan, un palais à cour centrale à quatre iwâns dont l’existence dès le temps de Mahêmûd
C'est vraisemblablement dans un bâtiment de ce genre que les théologiens juristes du Khorassan enseignaient leurs élèves au quatrième siècle de l'Hégire. Lorsqu'ils firent construire, ou que l'on construisit pour eux, des édifices spécialement affectés à leurs cours, c'est à dire quand la madrasa prit une forme plus nette, c'est sans doute encore des maisons à quatre iwâns que l'on exécuta. Lorsque Nizâm al-Mulk fonda la madrasa d'Etat officielle et construisit ses Nizâmîyas, c'est selon le plan de ces madrasas ordinaires du Khorassan qu'elles furent tout naturellement composées, mais agrandies et embellies en proportion de leur nouvelle importance.

Si cependant on s'inquiétait de savoir ce qu'était devenu le plan et l'aspect général, sinon le mode de construction et le décor, de la maison ou de la madrasa du Khorassan vers ce temps-là, je pense, si surprenant que cela puisse paraître, que l'on pourrait s'en assurer à 'Ammân, en Transjordanie. Il y a là un "palais," selon Dieulafoy, qui semble tout à fait étranger à ce pays. Cette construction a fortement intrigué les nombreux écrivains qui en ont parlé, mais chacun d'eux, quelque origine qu'il lui ait trouvée, s'est senti obligé de tourner les yeux vers l'Est.

On a vu dans cet édifice une "construction de Chosroès au cours de son expédition syrienne," mais ses arcs brisés règlent le sort de cette hypothèse. Van Berchem pense qu'il est, comme le palais de Mshattâ, "l'oeuvre des rois de Ghassân. On sait, dit-il, que ces souverains arabes, établis pendant les premiers siècles de notre ère dans la Syrie transjordanane, défendaient la frontière orientale de l'empire byzantin contre les incursions des Perses et des rois arabes de Hira, leurs rivaux, qui protégeaient en Chaldée la frontière occidentale du royaume perse. Ces nomades, en se fixant, avaient sans doute adopté la civilisation byzantine et leurs constructions devaient s'inspirer d'édifices empruntés à la Syrie et à la Perse." 25 Mais on ne voit pas très bien pourquoi ces Arabes byzantinisés, fixés en territoire byzantin, devaient s'inspirer d'édifices empruntés à la Perse, en fait construire un monument si typiquement iranien. Pour Dieulafoy le palais de 'Ammân est une construction de la Perse sâsânide, de la fin de cette époque ou des premiers temps de l'Islam. 26 Il en a publié le plan, dont voici un croquis (Fig. 9). On y reconnaîtra sans peine, en le comparant aux figures qui accompagnent cette étude, le principe de la maison du Khorassan et celui d'une madrasa de l'époque seldjoukide. Cet édifice, de conception toute iranienne, mais en pierre appareillée avec soin, n'a cependant pas été exécuté par des Iraniens, mais par des Syriens (Fig. 10).

Pour moi, je crois qu'il faut le rapprocher de ce qu'al-Mu'âddasî disait des habitants de 'Ammân à la fin du quatrième siècle de l'Hégire. À cette époque 'Ammân était devenue la capitale de la fertile région d'al-Balkâ. "Les habitants étaient en grande majorité shi'ites." Elle était l'une des principales étapes des caravanes qui se dirigeaient "de l'Asie mineure et des pays de l'Euphrate vers l'Arabie et l'Egypte." Or nous savons que l'Iran et, par l'Iran, l'Asie centrale entretenaient alors des relations commerciales très actives avec la Syrie, le Hedjaz et l'Egypte. Quand les scrupules, dit W. Heyd, qui empêchaient les croyants de porter des vêtements de soie se firent effacés, quand les plus puissants et les plus riches d'entre eux se laissèrent aller aux délices terrestres et déployèrent dans l'ornementation de leurs demeures un luxe vraiment oriental, les tisserands persans vinrent

Fig. 2—Khargird. Plan de la Madrasa au nom de Nizām al-Mulk

Fig. 3—Rayy. Plan d'une Madrasa seldjoukide

Fig. 4—Bāmiyān. Plan d'une Mosquée

Fig. 5—Bāmiyān. Plan d'une Maison
Figs. 6 et 7—Rayy. Décors de la Madrasa seldjoukide

Fig. 8—Plan du Robât Sharaf
Fig. 9—Plan du "Palais" d'Ammân
D'après Dieulafoy
leur clientèle s’accroître sur toute l’étendue des pays conquis à l’islamisme. Les villes de Merv et de Nîshâpûr cultivaient avec un succès particulier cette branche de l’industrie. De l’Iran venaient aussi des pierres précieuses, en particulier la turquoise et le lapis-lazuli, des bijoux d’or et d’argent, des perles du Golfe persique, des tapis, la soie grège du Gilân et du Shîr-wân, les tissus de soie et de coton de Chiraz, d’Isfahân, de Yezd, l’indigo du Kerman, etc. . . . Ce sont les Shi’ites, ou les fils des Shi’ites qu’al-Mukaddası vit à ‘Ammân, in-


Son plan (Fig. 8) est celui d’un édifice fortifié, situé dans une région désertique, sur une route peu sûre et destiné à servir de lieu d’étape et d’abri à des personnages importants, dont le souverain lui-même, à en juger

stallés en ce point important d’une route de leur fastueux commerce, qui ont sans doute ordonné, selon les modes de leur pays, la construction du bâtiment en question.

Voici maintenant un magnifique édifice qui, pour n’être ni une madrasa ni une mosquée, n’en intéresse pas moins notre recherche: Robâţ Sharaf, sur l’ancienne route de Nîshâpûr à Merv, non loin de la frontière afghane. On y trouve seize iwâns, appartenant à deux cours à quatre iwâns et à deux appartements qui ne sont autre chose que deux maisons du Khorâsân, à cour centrale et à

de ses dispositions très particulières, de la richesse de son décor, de la hâte avec laquelle il fut réparé en 549 H. et du nom du réparateur. Il comprend une première cour, à l’usage des escorts, peut-être ouverte aussi aux voyageurs ordinaires, par laquelle on accède à une cour plus grande et plus belle ainsi qu’aux appartements dont j’ai parlé. Or cette dernière cour a ceci de curieux qu’elle est celle d’une madrasa. L’iwân du fond est en effet, comme l’iwân kibli d’une madrasa, celui de la Nizâmîya de Khargird, par exemple (Fig. 2), plus large et plus haut que les iwâns de côtés, lesquels sont eux-mêmes, comme dans la plupart


28 A. Godard, “Khorâsân,” pp. 7-68.
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des mosquées et des madrasas anciennes, plus larges que l’iwân septentrional, quand il sert de vestibule d’entrée. Mais ce robâṭ n’est aucunement orienté comme une mosquée ou une madrasa, selon la kibla du lieu. L’axe de son iwân principal, comme en rend compte le plan, fait un angle de 90 degrés avec la kibla, déterminée par les divers mihrâbs, à l’intérieur et à l’extérieur de l’édifice. Il y a là une anomalie que peut seulement expliquer une imitation irraisonnée de la cour de la madrasa telle qu’elle était, avec ses arrangements religieux.

Tenant à la fois de la maison du Khorassan, par ses appartements à cour centrale et à quatre iwâns, et de la madrasa, par le parti de son plan, qui reproduit exactement celui de la madrasa, ce monument nous permet d’achever de déduire de tout ce qui précède que la maison du Khorassan, à quatre iwâns, donna vraisemblablement naissance à la madrasa à quatre iwâns, qui donna elle-même naissance à la mosquée et au caravansérail à quatre iwâns. Ce que figure le petit tableau schématique ci-dessous:

Maison du Khorassan
   | Madrasa
   | Mosquée
   | Caravansérail

29 Loc. cit.
UNGLAZED RELIEF POTTERY FROM NORTHERN MESOPOTAMIA

BY GERALD REITLINGER

THE FIRST STYLE

Before the evacuation of the British Museum collections in 1939, there stood for generations a highly mysterious object in wall case No. 34 of the Babylonian gallery. Numbered 918,950, it is a corpulent gray unglazed jar, more than two feet high and provided with four handles (Fig. 3). It is decorated in a mixture of molded and hand-modeled relief with a frieze of four saucer-eyed female figures in long skirts, and two long-necked bird-headed monsters. The style of these figures is not unworthy of the jar’s long sojourn in the Babylonian gallery, yet as an object the jar is unlike anything Babylonian. There have always been doubts about it. It is not even known where it came from or how it reached the British Museum. Botta or Layard may have discovered it in the eighteen-forties at Khorsabad or Nimrūd, but if so, there is no record. Archaeologists were not concerned with the stratification of pottery for another half century. It may even have come out of Mesopotamia before the days of excavation.1 When Şufûk al-Fâris, sheikh of the Shammar, was besieging the town of Takrit on the Tigris in 1834, the inhabitants unearthed a number of huge jars with figures of men and animals, while digging a defense-work. One jar was acquired by Dr. J. Ross of the Baghdad residency while on his journey to the ruins of Hatra.2 It passed successively into the hands of Commander Felix Jones and Henry Rawlinson, the British Museum’s great benefactor. The present jar may or may not be Dr. Ross’s jar but we know now that the jars unearthed in the seige of Takrit were certainly of this kind.

The strange British Museum jar slumbered in the Babylonian room till the second World War. It was not unique. There were fragments in the same style in the Louvre’s Babylonian deposits,3 but even nineteenth-century savants doubted whether they were Babylonian and tended to call them Parthian. When more fragments with saucer-eyed figures and bird-headed monsters were found at Assur toward 1910, there was already reason to believe that they were more recent still. In 1907 Sarre and Herzfeld had visited Takrit and investigated its historical associa-

---

1 F. Sarre-E. Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet (Berlin, 1911-20), I, 223.
3 G. Migeon, Manuel d’art musulman (Paris, 1907), II, 282.
tions with decorated jars. Several more fragments came into their hands in Takrit, and Herzfeld sketched a whole jar, almost the double of that in the British Museum's Babylonian room. Their most significant discovery, however, was made in the Baghdad bazaar where Sarre bought the large jar which he presented to the Kaiser Friedrich Museum. This jar is clearly a near relation of the one in the British Museum (Fig. 9), but it has an inscription in Arabic characters of the “fifth or sixth centuries of the Hijra.”

Now in 1905 Sarre had written a paper concerning four fragments from large jars in molded and barbotine relief, but of a more elaborate kind. They were said to have come from Mosul, and Sarre dated them in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D. Thus the jar acquired in Baghdad linked the primitive-looking jar from the Babylonian gallery of the British Museum with the magnificent pottery decoration of the high Middle Ages.

The British Museum jar could now be considered Islamic rather than Parthian, but it was still hard to date it. In 1911–13 more fragments, showing the same peculiar frieze of women and monsters, were found in the German Samarra excavations. Buried in the Abbasid city and palaces, they could scarcely be older than the ninth century. The early excavators, who thought these things Babylonian, had been deceived by Mesopotamian conservatism into an error of a millennium and a half.

Though this pottery had once been considered Babylonian, its later development was so surprisingly different that to many students of forty years ago it could not have been native to the Tigris valley at all. It must have been an importation from Central Asia, as announced by Martin Hartmann and Josef Strzygowski. Sarre, however, continued to defend his theory of indigenous development and production. In 1920, when many more specimens were available, he saw no cause to revise his views of 1905. Today the rare pieces of 1905 have become quite common. My list contains more than forty complete or half complete jars and there must be very many unrecorded. A new analysis is therefore not inopportune.

The subjects of this article are the large water cisterns or coolers of porous clay, of a type still used and known as habbs, but the field is restricted to the highly decorated medieval kind on which molded, barbotine, and incised ornament are combined. Medieval unglazed pottery, showing each of these sorts of ornament, is so abundant in Iraq as to require more than a short monograph and to narrow down the scope of the present one to the combined ware alone. This combined ware occasionally embraces not three but four processes. In Figures 2 and 9, for instance, there may be seen a band of ornament, cut in the soft clay in imitation of woodwork. German archeologists call it kerbschnitt, or chip-carving. But undoubtedly the most striking feature of the ware is the ornament, applied to the surface in wet clay either by hand or with a pipette—like the icing on a cake. This is the barbotine process, and the North Mesopotamian habbs are sometimes described as barbotine pottery. I prefer not to use this description because other techniques are involved and because barbotine pottery in the Middle Ages was not restricted to Mesopotamia. It was made throughout the Islamic world, from Central Asia to North Africa. The best definition is: “North Mesopotamian unglazed ware in molded and barbotine relief.” The combined technique may be as old as the ninth century and it lasted as late as the fourteenth. The color and texture of the ware did not
change in five centuries. By contrast, the style changed absolutely. On a large number of the pieces that have survived, the primitive Babylonian figures merge with the "Central Asian" look of the later pieces sufficiently to form a distinct intermediate style which I shall call Style II. This and the fully developed, or Style III, style can be dated by their close relation to other Islamic objects. Already forty-two years ago, Sarre was able to place them where they belong in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But the dating of the earliest style, Style I, presents great difficulties. Little internal evidence is provided, since the art was so humble and traditional as to go its way ignoring the march of fashion.

Interpretation is equally difficult. Take, for instance, Figure 3, the jar or habb in the British Museum. In the 1908 Guide to the Babylonian collection, Budge and King recognized it as "post-Assyrian." "Around the sides in relief are figures of snakes with feet, duck-headed dragons, and figures of snake charmers." But Sarre describes the subject as follows: "Two birds (geese?) which hold a ribbon-like branch in their beaks and four female figures, standing side by side linked together with ribbons which frame the upper part of their bodies. With elbows bent outwardly, the women have their hands folded before their breasts. The origin of these figures is clear. They are imitations of ancient Oriental Goddess-figures representing Nin-mach or Ishtar who were depicted in similar positions." Sarre's theory of origin rests on the attitude of the figures. Yet in a notice dated 1922 he described the attitude quite differently. The women, he said, were pouring the water of life which also issued from the beaks of the birds or dragons. Referring again to Figure 3, it will be seen that, if this is the water of life, it is coming from the women's elbows, for it is plain that their hands are folded under their breasts. Figure 6 shows a similar confusion as if medieval tradition had muddled two distinct attitudes. I am inclined to think that these zigzag wands, Sarre's bandartige Rahmen, are not consciously symbolic of water but merely an easy way of using the pipette, the way it is used in pastry. The zigzag wand is common in all early Islamic barbotine ware. Outstanding examples of it are found on the big blue-glazed oil jars from Samarra, Susa, and Shāpūr. Sarre offered no symbolical explanation for the animals which Budge and King called "snakes with feet" and "duck-headed dragons." He suggests they are geese. But if the figures represent Ishtar, why should not this be Sirrush, the long-necked beast depicted on the Ishtar gate in Babylon? The attitude of the Babylonian Ishtar remained unchanged at least as late as the Palmyrene sculpture of the third century A.D. Moreover the Parthian Ishtar of Babylon was sometimes a draped figure wearing the long and decorous garment suggested in this medieval pottery. But the hands remained below the breasts and the elbows were bent outward even after Hellenism had given the figure grace and dignity.

Moreover the original Babylonian and Assyrian figures were decorated in barbotine like the habbs. The fragment from the Iraq

7 Sarre-Herzfeld, op. cit., IV, 13.
8 F. Sarre, Die Kunst des alten Persien (Berlin, 1922), p. 56.
9 F. Sarre, Die Ausgrabungen von Samarra (Berlin, 1925), II, Pl. VI.
R. Koechlin, Géométries musulmanes de Suse au Musée du Louvre (Paris, 1928), Pl. VIII.
R. Ghirshmann, "Les Fouilles de Chāpour, 1936-1937," Revue des arts asiatiques, XII (1939), 12, Pl. IX.
Government’s Samarra excavations, reproduced in Figure 5, shows the sausage-like rope of hair and the saucer-eyes which the medieval potter owed to that ancient past. This figure is stamped with rosettes or stars which seem to be the emblem of the goddess. Similar renderings of the Ishtar figure occur in other Samarra fragments in the British Museum, reproduced by Sarre.\(^{11}\) These things cannot be the effect of coincidence alone owing to a primitive method of modeling. Either the medieval potter worked in a continuous tradition of thousands of years, or he copied the ancient figurines that littered his native soil. Imitations of local antiques were indeed not unknown in the early Islamic period. Among the early eighth century stuccoes found in 1938 at Kasr al-Hair al-Gharbi, the Syrian desert palace of the Caliph Hishâm, is a female figure holding her breasts in the Ishtar position.\(^{12}\) M. Daniel Schlumberger suggests it is a copy of some third-century Palmyrene figure of Atargatis, dug up in the neighborhood.

There were special reasons for such imitation at Kasr al-Hair al-Gharbi. In Hishâm’s reign, figure sculpture had all but died out in Syria and these were the only available models. In North Mesopotamia there were other reasons. The old gods may have retained some dim magical or astrological significance. Magic and astrology prolonged the life of several Babylonian traditions. The inscribing of clay tablets for this purpose continued in the old Babylonian language and character at least till the first century B.C. In 1931 I acquired in Kufa, south of Baghdad, a crumbling unbaked tablet of Babylonian type. It was inscribed in Kufic characters of the eighth century A.D. with part of the 36th sura of the Koran, nicely stamped. Dr. Rhuvon Guest\(^{13}\) suggests that the tablet was made to be buried for magic purposes. The large jars with mysterious figures of ancient deities, though not made for this purpose, might have been adapted to it.

All over Mesopotamia one finds buried incantation-bowls, inscribed in Aramaic or pseudo-Aramaic characters. The practice continued almost into modern times, though bowls of the same type found by Koldewey at Babylon may be Parthian or Hellenistic.\(^{14}\) Such traditionalism makes it all the more impossible to establish a comparative chronology for the long and vague period covered by Style I, the “goddess and dragon” style. According to Sarre, the Arabic inscription in Figure 9 may be as late as the twelfth century but this is a piece verging on the intermediate style, or Style II. One of Sarre’s fragments from Samarra is a replica of the four goddesses on the British Museum piece,\(^{15}\) but its discovery in the Abbasid perimeter of the palace does not relegate it neatly between the years 836 and 892 A.D. It is just the sort of ware which a humble population, living among abandoned ruins, might use. More of these fragments were found by the Iraq Department of Antiquities in 1938 in the Kasr al-‘Abbâs which was one of the great West-Bank Palaces. In the tenth century, Ibn Hawkal noticed that the population of the town had moved to Karkh, a northern suburb,\(^{16}\) but he also noticed that the gardens on the West Bank of the Tigris were in good order, which suggests that the palaces might have been kept in repair.

Style I may spread vaguely over the ninth, tenth, eleventh and even twelfth centuries, but clearly there was much older pottery with this sort of decoration, filling the gap since Parthian times. At Hira, many small fragments of un-

\(^{11}\) Sarre, op. cit., Fig. 41.
\(^{14}\) Koldewey, op. cit., p. 242.
\(^{15}\) Sarre, op. cit., p. 41.
glazed ware were found in a well, pierced through the floor of a room with stuccoes of the late eighth century. They were mostly molded ware of a peculiarly classical kind which was found also at Samarra and Susa. Three fragments, however, were of very delicate barbotine ware, showing the “zigzag” wand decoration. Two very small fragments of this fine barbotine pottery are illustrated in M. Koechlin’s work on Susa. Both show birds and one is clearly the duck-headed monster of the British Museum jar. Finer in quality than the big ḥabbs, these fragments seem also to be older, since the well deposit at Hira contained material for comparative chronology in the fragments of a cup with a Kufic inscription around the rim. This form of Kufic is found on an unglazed bowl from Susa in the Louvre. M. Koechlin associates its molded decoration of vine sprays with the Syrian artistic revival under the Umayyads. Thus the Hira deposit, which included the barbotine fragments, could be as early as 700 A.D. That the North Mesopotamian ḥabbs should be more primitive in execution than these earlier fragments is explained by the character of the period. Between the Samarra century and the twelfth-century renaissance, the pottery found in Iraqi sites is almost uniformly bad.

The earliest of the North Mesopotamian ḥabbs are already decadent and the quality only begins to improve as the second style evolves, the figures of goddesses and dragons losing their original significance and new motifs taking their place. The process is shown in Figures 7 and 8, a complete ḥabb dug up casually at the police post of Sinn al-Dhibbān between Fallūdja and Ramadi (Baghdad, Arab Museum, No. 26). These animals are decidedly more realistic than the “duck-headed dragons,” but the goddesses have become so stylized that their heads have disappeared and their skirts form a purely abstract design. The technical finish on this ḥabb is rather superior, but the same transformation of human forms into cyphers occurs in Figures 1, 2, and 4, which are rough, unfinished wares, an indication that mere technical finish is no criterion for dating. Following the visit of Sarre and Herzfeld to Takrit in 1907, Herzfeld suggested that the primitive ḥabbs with the goddess and dragon figures were made at Takrit, while the later types, which I shall call Styles II and III, were made at Mosul. Undoubtedly there are several complete ḥabbs which have been associated with Takrit, apart from the significant story of the find which was made during the siege. The excavation sites at Samarra, Assur, Kūyūndjik, and elsewhere have only yielded small surface fragments. In 1946 the Baghdad Arab Museum acquired a characteristic nearly complete specimen in Takrit, No. 36.465 (Fig. 4). Figure 24 shows a ewer, fourteen inches high, of orthodox Sasanian shape with the standard goddess and dragon figures, which I acquired in Baghdad in 1930. It was said to have come from a “Christian cemetery” in Takrit. Writing in the tenth century, Ibn Ḥawkal says that most of the inhabitants of Takrit were Christians and he says the same of most northern Mesopotamian towns. This ware was probably made and used by Christians. One may speculate whether in Figure 4 the Babylonian goddess has not transformed herself into a Nestorian cross.

Yet grave burial seems improbable if only because an average height of thirty inches is too big for grave furniture. Ḥabbs, found in casual places like those from Sinn al-Dhibbān and Wādi Armush, may have been buried as incantation bowls, whereas Takrit itself may

17 D. Talbot Rice, “The Oxford Excavations at Hira,” Ars Islamica, I (1934), 65–66, Fig. 18.
18 Koechlin, op. cit., Pl. I, Figs. 32a, 32b.
19 Koechlin, op. cit., Pl. IV, Figs. 29, 30.
20 Le Strange, op. cit., p. 57.
contain a kiln-site and store which should repay excavation. It is also possible that the habbs are found under the foundations of Takrit houses, for the later decorated habbs are found in this position in Mosul and Sin-djar. A century ago, Layard was presented with one when a Nestorian church was demolished in Mosul. Apparently large habbs were set upright in the ground and the floors laid over them. The porous shell of the habb thus drains the moisture from the surrounding soil. At Hira where habbs were found under eighth-century rooms decorated pieces were used, and it seems that in Mosul even the elaborate thirteenth-century pieces were sacrificed this way.

THE SECOND STYLE

Figures 9 and 10 in the Berlin Museum and Kevorkian (New York) collections show an advance from the primitive style with its "Babylonian" figures toward the finely decorated ware of the twelfth century. Both have six handles in place of four and the handles are richly decorated in barbotine. Between the handles are small suspension loops which are also to be noticed on the British Museum habb (Fig. 3) and the two primitive habbs (Figs. 1 and 2) in the Metropolitan Museum and David collections. Modeled in clay, the suspension loops are useless, and their presence suggests an imitation of metal work. As the second style developed, these loops or excrescences were expanded to link up with the handles. Thus in the second style the handles, now again reduced to four, have been bridged so as to produce the effect of a series of rococo niches under the rim. The massively molded heads of women and lions on the handles still perpetuate the tradition of the goddesses and dragons of the first style, but the execution is in the latest fashion and altogether more lively than that of the goddesses and dragons. All this massive ornament tends to overload the upper part of the habb, since the belly, which has no base to it and only light surface ornament, is potted more finely. Consequently, in most cases the belly of the habb has been smashed while the upper part has stayed intact, preserving the outline of an inverted bucket. Figure 13 was acquired by the Louvre in 1904, and for many years the upper part was mistaken for a stand and placed in this way for exhibition.

Sarre in 1905 compared the Louvre habb with a fragment, belonging to the Comtesse de Béhague, which had been exhibited in the Paris "Arts musulmans" exhibition of 1903 as "Sasanian or early Islamic." In an appendix to Sarre's article, Eugen Mittwoch was able to support the newly proposed dating by reading from the fragment some words of a Neskhi inscription which "could not be earlier than the second half of the twelfth century." Part of the decoration on the Louvre example appears archaic for so late a date. It consists of a little standing figure, executed in barbotine and many times repeated. The figure's structure can best be seen in the fragment, Figure 16. In 1875 George Smith had illustrated a fragment found at Kuyûndjik which showed this figure. He ventured no opinion, but half a century later Gaston Migeon described the figure as "very Hittite in character" though he recognized "Indo-Parthian" elements in the rest of the decor.

The hieratic stiffness of this short-legged erect figure is only approached by some of the Mosul silver inlay on bronze of the same

22 Rice, op. cit., p. 70, Fig. 19.
23 Sarre, "Islamische Tongefässe," p. 69.
Fig. 1—Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

Fig. 2—Possession of A. S. David, Sunnyside, L. I.

Fig. 3—British Museum

Fig. 4—Found in Takrit, Baghdad Museum (No. A.M. 36465.)
Fig. 5—From Samarra. (No. A.M. 2620.)

Fig. 6—Found at Wâdi Armush. (No. A.M. 7230.)

Figs. 7-8—Found at Sinn al-Dhibbân. (No. A.M. 12.)

Figs. 5-8—Baghdad Museum
Fig. 9—Islamic Department, Staatliche Museum, Berlin

Fig. 10—Possession H. Kevorkian, New York

Figs. 11-12—Baghdad Museum. (No. A.M. 26.)
Figs. 17-18—Baghdad Museum. (No. A.M. 5706.)

Figs. 19-20—Baghdad Museum. (No. A.M. 7150.)
period, but even the metal worker was better able to overcome the limitations of his material. Though the style of the figure is the outcome of the barbotine technique, the North Mesopotamian potter became so enamored of it that he copied it even in molded pottery. Herzfeld has sketched and published a characteristic fragment of molded pottery in imitation of barbotine ware of this kind.  

On almost every example of the Style II ḥabb there occurs, molded on one of the expanded false handles, a cross-legged figure drinking from a cup (Fig. 15). This figure is naturalistic and presents an extreme contrast to the barbotine figures. The cross-legged position and the Mongol faces of the female busts, which surround this figure, suggest both India and China. Sarre preferred to see in them a normal West Asian development of Hellenism, though he was prepared to admit a Mongol element in the faces: "It is not difficult to establish that they belong to a period when Mongols were always strongly in the forefront."  

This would not do for the more romantic school of orientalism. According to Professor Martin Hartmann, the cross-legged figure was a Buddha and the female heads, Bodhisattvas. The potters themselves were central Asian, coming from a place Hartmann called Uiguristan. His view was supported in 1917 by Josef Strzygowski in Altai-Iran und Völkerwanderung. The figures were in a "typical Indo-Chinese mixed style" and the original home of the barbotine technique was Transoxiana, Turkestan, and Khotan. The North Mesopotamian relief-ware was "part of an established export trade from central Asia." Strzygowski illustrated his point with photographs of relief-ware found in central Asia, yet none of this relief-ware is strictly barbotine pottery. Moreover, he chose to ignore the native Mesopotamian tradition of barbotine work going back to ancient dynastic times. Sarre had the easy task of replying that these motifs were hardly an argument for the wares being imported since they were employed in the local Mosul architecture. Hartmann himself had noticed the Buddhist attitude, which he called Mudra in the surviving stucco figures of the Kara Salar palace. In Niebuhr's day (1772) there had been eighty to a hundred of them seated in their little niches and "so alike that they must have been pressed from a mold."  

Nowadays the student is more familiar with the characteristics of the Islamic artistic renaissance of the twelfth to thirteenth centuries. One need not believe that these heavy but fragile objects, over two feet high and of little commercial value, had to be carried from the nebulous fastness of "Uiguristan" to the very metropolis of Arab craftsmanship. That the Islamic renaissance contained a central Asian and Buddhist element is hardly to be denied but it was part of a very ancient inheritance. Buddhist attitudes and Mongol faces occur in several pieces of Persian silverwork of somewhat post-Sasanid date, preserved in Russian museums. The probably contemporary ninth-century Samarra frescoes show them too. It is doubtful whether the invasions of Turks and Mongols, innocent of art, into Persia and Mesopotamia had anything to do with these attitudes and faces which certainly do not reflect contemporary Far Eastern or Indian styles. In Figure 17,
for instance, the figure is not strictly speaking cross-legged but has one foot dangling downward, an early Graeco-Buddhist attitude. It is the attitude of the figure drinking from a rhyton on the silver dish from Buddigara in the British Museum, regarded by Herzfeld as the “stammvater” of the drinking figures common throughout Islamic art.

Sarre and Herzfeld noticed that habbs were still being produced in Mosul in 1907 and shipped down the Tigris to Baghdad. Fragments of habbs in Styles II and III are certainly found far downstream and perhaps all over modern Iraq. I have found unmistakable handles and rims in the Kish area near Babylon. But the complete pieces are generally found in the north and only in the north can one pick up fragments in profusion. Styles II and III coincide with the period of the Zangid atabegs who ruled in Mosul from A.D. 1127 to their overthrow by the Mongol Hulagu in 1262. Branches of this Turkish slave family established secession states as far as Syria. The longest-lived was the Zangid kingdom of Sindjär (1170–1220), a city only a hundred miles west of Mosul. About as many habbs in Styles II and III have been found in Sindjär as in Mosul. They are found as far west as the sites along the Khabur river in present-day Syria. Officials of the Iraq Department of Antiquities consider the specimens brought them from Sindjär to be the finest. Although mass-produced, there is great variation of quality, an indication that there were several sorts of factories and not necessarily all in Mosul.

---

**THE THIRD STYLE**

The third style survived the Mongol conquest of the Zangid kingdom in 1262 though I know of only one example which is clearly later than this date. The third style differs from the second style in elaboration and finish rather than in innovation. A fine example was acquired by the Victoria and Albert Museum as early as 1899 (No. 340) as “old Persian.” Here the cross-legged figure is surrounded, as in all characteristic pieces of the third style, with openwork arabesque behind which there is an air space, a most sophisticated development of the barbotine ornament of the second style. The arabesque is of the vegetable kind which Germans call “kreislappen.” Strzygowski in 1917, in search of prototypes in the depths of central Asia, compared the Victoria and Albert’s habb with some silver personal adornments in the Hermitage Museum found in the Kotskar River in south Siberia. But these ornaments, which are undatable, clearly derive from that advanced Islamic art of which Mosul, under the Zangid atabegs, was one of the centers. Strzygowski mistook the rim of the wheel for the hub.

The openwork and the vegetation make Style III easily recognizable, and also the disappearance of the uncouth little barbotine figures. Their place is taken by a whole range of personalities, realistically made from a mold. For instance, in Figure 19 (No. 7150 of the Baghdad Arab Museum) the seated drinking figure is entertained by a maiden playing a harp. On either side stand dignified figures bearing a rose and a cup, symbols of office. In Style III the drinking figure emerges as a Seljuk sultan surrounded not only by his dancers and musicians but by the symbolic bureaucracy of the day whose office is conveyed

---

32 Y. I. Smirnov, Argenterie Orientale (St. Petersburg, 1909), Pl. XVII.
34 S. Lane-Poole, The Mohammedan Dynasties (Westminster, 1894), pp. 162–63.
35 Sarre, “Islamische Tongefässe,” p. 69 and Fig. 3.
36 Strzygowski, op. cit., p. 260, Fig. 180.
by the objects in their hands, a sword, a cup, a rose, or a pen case. In Figure 21 the figures bear a spear and a flaming lamp.

These erect figures or chamberlains wear a standard costume, a long embroidered frock coat with wide, open lapels, riding boots, and a kalansuva, a conical fur-trimmed hat from which dangle two pigtails. A hundred years ago Sir Austen Layard copied such a figure from a habb seen at 'Arabān on the Khābūr and published it as a woodcut in 1853. In calling the costume Persian, Layard was on a true scent but he believed the style to be "later than the Christian era but earlier than the Arabs." 57 It must be added that the open lapels and the pigtails are not Persian fashions but Seljuk Turk. There is no need to associate them with Hūlagū's Mongol host which did not vanquish the Zangids till 1262. What we have is a true rendering of the costume of the many Seljuk courts of the early thirteenth century. This costume is to be found in the "Mini" pottery of Rayy and in Syrian Rakka wares painted in underglaze black, blue, and red. Rakka, which fell to the Mongol Hūlagū in 1259, was part of the Zangid dominions.

The Style III habbs show a not uncommon blend of fashion and ancient tradition. The drinking potentate with musicians, dancers, and chamberlains certainly derives from Sasanian times, though the two famous silver plates depicting this scene in the British Museum and Hermitage collections, are probably copies of the tenth- to eleventh-century Persian revival. 58 In the scene, as depicted in North Mesopotamian pottery, the details have been brought up to date. In Style III the potentate, who is so constantly depicted in the enjoyment of his leisure, may be a real person, the Atabeg Badr al-Din Lu'lu' who ruled the Zangid kingdom from 1233 to 1259 and is famous for the dedications on several pieces of Mosul inlaid metal work and on a number of buildings. The chamberlains carrying emblems may also represent actual persons.

Figure 20 shows the reverse side of the fine Baghdad fragment with the sultan and his musician. A second drinking figure is surmounted by the emblem of a crescent. Professor Mayer has proposed that this common object in Islamic heraldry is really a horseshoe and that the persons who first used it as their device at this period had borne the office of amir akhūr, master of the stable. 59 It is therefore not impossible that Figures 19 and 20 portray Badr al-Din Lu'lu' and his otherwise unknown master of the horse.

At Sindjār, the home of this fine fragment, there was found in 1938 a magnificent carved-stone niche now in the Baghdad Arab Museum. 60 In little ogival panels, quite reminiscent of the decorated habbs, there is a seated sultan, carrying not a cup but a sword, and a number of standing chamberlains or officials; two cup-bearers, two bow-bearers, two mace-bearers, and a sword-bearer. The style is that of Style II rather than Style III and the niche is closely paralleled by the fine mihrab of the Friday Mosque in Mosul, dedicated in 1148 when the Zangid atabeg, who ruled Mosul and Sindjār, was Nūr al-Din Maḥmūd. Such a carved niche would be typical of palaces and houses of the great. Ever since Sasanian times in the desert palaces of the Umayyads or in the town palaces of the Abbasids and Seljuks in Samarra and Rayy, this familiar court scene had been rendered in stucco relief, in fresco

57 Layard, op. cit., pp. 279-80.
58 Smirnov, op. cit., Pls. XXXV, XXXVII; O. M. Dalton, Treasure of the Oxus (London, 1905), Pl. XXVI.
60 G. Reitlinger, "Mediaeval Antiquities West of Mosul," Iraq, V (1938), 151-53, Pl. XXIV.
painting, or in stone. How then did this scene, associated with royal habitations, find its way to the humble mass-produced habb or water cistern standing in the courtyards of the common people?

The answer, provided by quantities of Rayy pottery decorated in this fashion, is that by the beginning of the thirteenth century possession of such objects had become a sort of snobbery. Iraq, I believe, provides a further very curious example of this snob-art in addition to the highly decorated habbs. In 1941 the Iraq Department of Antiquities found a store of clay figurines or toys while excavating Wāsiṭ, the Umayyad metropolis of Southern Iraq. Associated coins suggest that the store is rather later than the Mongol conquest, perhaps as late as the early fourteenth century. Among the clay figurines are types which were clearly intended to form a court series, including chamberlains of various sorts, dancing girls and musicians. These figures, about a foot high, are flat and cannot be made to stand up. From a preview of the Department’s report, which was not published at the time of writing this article, I gather that the excavators hold the opinion that these are simply dolls. But why are they flat? Detached heads of these flat figures in a variety of head-dresses are to be found on any medieval site in Iraq. Occasionally they reach the western market. In 1930 I excavated two such heads in the Kish area which bore traces of bitumen at the back. The flat figures had, therefore, been stuck onto another surface, perhaps onto walls or onto the wooden jambs of doors where they would have made just such an ensemble as on the carved niche from Sindjār.

The figures of birds, animals, and monsters on the Style III habbs are so completely characteristic of the twelfth to thirteenth century Islamic renaissance with its close adherence to the Sasanian repertory as to call for less special notice. Since Sarre’s study of 1905 they have been made familiar in countless published examples of textile and metal work. The anthropomorphic bird, or harpy, in Figure 18 and the archer with the body of a lion in Figure 22 are curious enough, but they are part of the common grammar of thirteenth-century pottery decoration and in their sophisticated form have quite parted company with their remote Babylonian past. Figure 22, a recent acquisition of the Baghdad Arab Museum (No. 5841), is sophisticated in other respects too. With a supreme effort of realism the busts of dancing girls lean out of their niches with a hand over the windowsill and their tiara-like headaddresses protruding above the lintel. Even this attitude recalls Sasanian tradition, in particular, the stucco friezes with female busts from Kish and Ctesiphon.

The Mongol conquest of the Middle East caused only a temporary, if indeed any, break in the output of decorated pottery. The production of the highly decorated North Mesopotamian habbs survived it, but not apparently for long nor in its previous profusion. I have only been able to illustrate one definitely Il-Khānid piece: it is Figure 23 (Baghdad Arab Museum No. 1). The light and rather skimpy style of the undercut ornament suggests the earlier part of the fourteenth century. The habb is in orthodox Sunna taste. There are no human figures and the only animals are the very rudimentary lions heads under the rim. I have not been able to ascertain where this habb was found. Until the opening of the Baghdad Arab Museum, it stood for many years as a landmark for tourists in the courtyard of the Iraq Museum. It is the only one of the decorated habbs to tell its own story, but it is perhaps a pity that this habb should be a poet, interested only in eternal verities and not in the prosaic facts of time and place. Nevertheless, the fine Neskhi inscription has
its own message and a very fitting one to conclude this article:

"I am a habb of water wherein there is healing. I quench the thirst of mankind. This I achieve by virtue of my sufferings on the day I was cast among the fiery flames."

LIST OF VESSELS AND LARGE FRAGMENTS KNOWN TO THE AUTHOR AT THE BEGINNING OF 1947

Baghdad: The Arab Museum

1. A.M.1. Whole habb, Style III; with poem in Arabic (see Fig. 23).
2. A.M.12. Whole habb, Style I; found in 1939 at Sinn al-Dhibbân police post west of Baghdad (see Figs. 7 and 8).
3. A.M.26. Whole habb, Style II; acquired in Mosul (see Figs. 11 and 12).
4. A.M.128. Whole habb, Style I; found in 1941 in soundings at Kista near Zakho, Kurdestan. Rudimentary style. Combines scratched and barbotine decoration. No figures. Normal-shaped habb but has only two handles.
5. A.M.1974-1990; 2611-2637. Unglazed fragments; from the Archaeological Department's soundings in Samarra. Many of them are typical Style I, resembling those excavated by Sarre in 1911-13 (see Fig. 5).
6. A.M.4295. Fragment, Style II; from Sinjâr (see Fig. 15).
7. A.M.4296. Fragment, Style III; from Sinjâr; two doves on Arabesque background, specially high quality.
8. A.M.5704. Fragment, Style II; from Sinjâr (see Fig. 16).
9. A.M.5705. Upper half of habb, Style III; from Sinjâr. Rather rough.
10. A.M.5706. Upper half of habb, Style III; from Sinjâr. Of the very finest quality (see Figs. 17 and 18).
11. A.M.5707. Fragment, Style III; from Sinjâr. With the drinker and two very unusual figures of birds.
12. A.M.5755. Upper half of habb, Style III; from Sinjâr. With drinker, spearman, and sword-bearer. The spearman wears a turban. Rather rough (see Fig. 21).
14. A.M.5840. Upper part of habb, Style II; from Sinjâr. Good example of style.
15. A.M.5841. Neck only of a habb, Style II. Similar to the foregoing.
16. A.M.7149. Complete habb, Style II; purchased in Sinjâr. The barbotine ornament rather simple and rudimentary and without human figures (see Fig. 13).
17. A.M.5841. Part of the neck of a habb, Style III; confiscated in Mosul. Specially fine quality (see Fig. 22).
18. A.M.7150. Upper half of habb, Style III; purchased in Sinjâr. Specially fine quality (see Figs. 19 and 20).
19. A.M.7230. Habb, neck missing, Style I; said to have been found at Wâdi Armush in Samarra region (see Fig. 6).
20. A.M.36465. Habb, without neck, Style I; found in Takrit in 1946 (see Fig. 4).

Paris: Comtesse de Béhague Collection (formerly)

1. Fragment, Style III; with part of inscription. Reproduced in G. Migeon, Album de l'exposition de l'art musulman, II (Paris, 1903), Pl. 31; and in Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, XXVI (1905), 70 and Fig. 2.

London: British Museum

1. Complete habb, Style I. Babylonian Collection, No. 91.950 (see Fig. 3).
2. Neck and shoulder of habb, Style II. Standard style with good barbotine figures. Published in R. L. Hobson, Guide to the Islamic Pottery of the Near East (London, 1932), Fig. 40.
3. Small fragments, Style I. Some in the Babylonian Collection, and some from Samarra in the Islamic Collection.

Chicago: Chicago Museum of Natural History

1. Neck of habb and another fragment, Style II; acquired by Dr. Henry Field in Sinjâr in 1934. Both rather rough.


1. Complete habb, Style I; very rudimentary style (see Fig. 2).
Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Fogg Art Museum (Harvard University)

1. Upper half of a ēbab, Style III. Usual features; drinking figure and two chamberlains; on the reverse, an eagle. Second quality piece. No. 230, acquired in 1929.

New York: H. Kevorkian Collection

1. Complete ēbab, Transition Style I–II. An excellent piece resembling the ēbab in the Islamic Department, State Museums, Berlin (see Fig. 10).

Berlin: Islamic Department, State Museums

1. Almost complete ēbab, Transition Style I–II. Acquired by F. Sarre in Baghdad in 1907 and presented by him. Arabic inscription: “Honor to the possessor” (see Fig. 9).
2. Neck of a ēbab, Style II; acquired by Sarre in Baghdad in 1907. Rather rudimentary. Molded figure of harp-player resembling Figure 19. Reproduced in Sarre-Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet, IV (1920), Pl. CXLIV.
6. Neck of a ēbab, Style III, with masques; see Sarre, Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, XXVI (1905), Fig. 6.

Paris: Musée du Louvre

1. Neck of ēbab, Style III; with masques. Sarre, op. cit. XXVI (1905), Figs. 4 and 5.
2. Neck and base of ēbab, Style II; acquired in 1904. Excellent piece. Sarre, op. cit., p. 169 (see Fig. 14).
3. Some fragments, Style I; in the Babylonian Collection and among the Susa pottery.

New York: Metropolitan Museum

1. Whole ēbab, Style I; acquired at the Tabbagh sale, 1933. Rudimentary style (see Fig. 1).

Beckley, Sussex: Gerald Reitlinger Collection

1. Complete ēwer, Style I; acquired in Baghdad in 1931; said to have come from a Christian cemetery in Takrit. Fourteen inches high. Has one female figure and two bird-dragons with “the water of life.” Shape is extremely Sasanian (see Fig. 24).
2. Upper half of ēbab, Style II; acquired in Baghdad in 1938. Molded figure of drinker, one of the better specimens associated with Sindjär.
3. Part of the neck of a ēbab, Style III; acquired in Baghdad in 1930.
4. Figurine, Style II; acquired during World War II at Rakka on the Euphrates. Apparently a standard in the shape of a fetish figure with hollow stem to fit a tent pole or banner stick (see Fig. 25).

London: Victoria and Albert Museum


Present Whereabouts of the Following List of Vessels Unknown

1. Complete ēbab, Style II. Reproduced in Kühnel, Islamische Kleinkunst (Berlin, 1925), No. 42, under the word “Kunsthandel.”
2. Complete ēbab, Style II. In possession of K. Minassian, New York, 1937. Typical barbotine figures, rather similar to the above-mentioned vessel, but with some variations.
3. Complete ēbab, Style I. Seen by the author in a dealer’s house in Baghdad in 1930. Had an inscription similar to that of the Berlin Museums’ ēbab, which it closely resembled.
4. Complete ēbab, Style II. Very similar to the foregoing and to Baghdad Arab Museum, No. A.M.7149 (see Fig. 13). It was seen by Dr. Henry Field in Sindjär in 1938, and he has kindly communicated a small photograph.
5. Upper half of ēbab, Style II. Seen by Dr. Henry Field in Sindjär in 1938, and he has kindly communicated a small photograph. Although by no means a Style III piece, it is very developed with a quite charming molded panel of two ducks among foliage.
DOCUMENTS RELATIFS À QUELQUES TECHNIQUES IRAQUIENNES AU DÉBUT DU ONZIÈME SIÈCLE

PAR CLAUDE CAHEN

IL EST BIEN CONNU QUE BEAUCOUP D’OUVRAGES DE MATHEMATIQUES ONT ÉTÉ COMPOSÉS POUR RÉPONDRE À DES QUESTIONS CONCRÈTES BIEN RÉCÉLES DE LA VIE COURANTE. ON PEUT DONC A PRIORI S’ATTENDRE À Y TROUVER DES RENSEIGNEMENTS RELATIFS À L’ÉCONOMIE ET AUX TECHNIQUES DES SOCIÉTÉS D’OÙ ILS ÉMANENT. DANS UNE SOCIÉTÉ RÉGIE PAR UNE ADMINISTRATION BUREAUCRATISÉE COMME CELLE DE L’ORIENT MUSULMAN MÉDIÉVAL, IL ÉTAIT NÉCESSAIRE DE FOURNIR AUX COMPTABLES ET GÉOMÈTRES DU FISC DES TRAITÉS DE MATHEMATIQUES OÙ ILS PUISSENT TROUVER LA MANIÈRE DE RÉSoudRE LES PROBLÈMES QUE LEUR POSAIT LEUR PROFESSION. DE TELS TRAÎTES NOUS RENSEIGNENT AVEC UNE PRECIPE PRÉCISION SUR LES TÂCHES DE L’ADMINISTRATION, VOIRE MÊME SON ORGANISATION. IL NE SEMBLE PAS QU’ON AIT JUSQU’ICI ENVISAGÉ SUFFISAMMENT SOUS CETTE ANGLE LES OUVRAGES DE MATHEMATIQUES QUI SONT PARVENUS JUSQU’À NOUS. J’ESPÈRE QUE LES TEXTES CITÉS CI-APRÈS, TIRÉS D’UN OUVRAGE SUR LEQUEL SON TITRE DEVAIT PARTICULIÈREMENT ATTIRER MON ATTENTION À CE POINT DE VUE, CONSTITUERONT UNE INCITATION À ENTREPRENDRE D’AUTRES RECHERCHES DANS LE MEME SENS.

Le Kitâb al-Ḫâwî l’il-a’mâl al-sulṭâniya wa-rusūm al-hisâb al-dirîqâniya (Bibliothèque Nationale ms. ar. 2462) ne nous est malheureusement parvenu que dans les deux dernières de ses trois parties. Peut-être la première, comme dans le traité d’Abu’l-Wafâ al-Bûzâdjiâni dont il sera question plus loin, ne portait-elle que sur les opérations fondamentales de l’arithmétique et nous aurait-elle peu appris; mais de sa perte résulte que le nom de l’auteur nous est inconnu, ainsi que les conditions de composition de l’ouvrage. Il n’y a toutefois aucun doute qu’il émane du milieu des ḥâsib du fisc et leur est destiné, et qu’il a été rédigé à Bagdad.

La date en est moins facile à déterminer, on peut toutefois y parvenir approximativement. Le rédacteur est un disciple du šaikh Abû ‘Abdallâh Ḥmâd b. al-Ḫusâin al-Šâkâk (le diviseur), dont il reproduit peut-être l’enseignement (104v°, 139v°, 144v°). Ce dernier n’est pas personnellement connu, mais nous avons conservé de lui (Serâî 3133) un commentaire du Kitâb al-Kâfî fi’l-hisâb d’Abû Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḫusâin al-Kâradjî; or ce Kitâb al-Kâfî, l’une des deux sources le plus fréquemment mentionnées dans le Kitâb al-Ḫâwî (6r°, 7r°, 34r°, 53v° avec le titre de l’ouvrage et le nom de l’auteur, ce dernier ailleurs seul nommé, 83v°, 86r°, 88v°, 91v°, 155v°, 18or° sq.) nous est connu, ainsi que, du même, le Kitâb al-Fâkhri, traité d’algèbre; nous savons que ce dernier avait été dédié au vizir du Bûyûde Bahâ‘ al-Dawla, donc rédigé à la fin du dixième siècle de notre ère; quant au Kâfî, il fait allusion (III, 22) aux dinars kawàmi, de Kawâm al-Dawla (1013–28). L’autre source couramment citée dans le Kitâb al-Ḫâwî est le Kitâb al-Manâẓil ou Kitâb fi’l-mâ yahtadju ilaḫî ’l-kuttâb wa’l-=ummâl min ’ilm al-hisâb de l’illustre mathématicien et astronome Abû'l-Wafâ’ Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ya’kûb al-Bûzâdjiānî (328–87(8) 11./940–97(8)

1 C. Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Literatur, Supplement (Leiden, 1937–42), I, 834.
A.D.), ouvrage dont le titre dit assez que le but était identique à celui de notre Kitāb al-
Hāwī. Les autres sources citées secondaire-
ment par notre auteur ou ne paraissent pas
identifiables, ou nous reportent également à
la même période que les précédentes: al-Khwā-
rizmī (178r°), un shaikh Abu'l-Faṣıl al-Hama-
dhānī dont al- Shakkāk a été le disciple et
auteur d’un Kitāb al-waṣāyā wa'l-dūr (139r°)
Haithami (Ibn al-Haitham?) (81r°), Samari
ou Sari (Ibn al-Saîmârî ?) (48r°, 147r°), un
juriste Ibn Sharih (167r°) sans parler, en bloc,
des Grecs, des Hindous, et, pour l’Islam, des
hussâb. D’autre part le Kitāb al-Hāwī ne con-
tient aucune allusion sûre, semble-t-il, à des
faits postérieurs à ’Aṣud al-Dawla, considéré
comme mort (40r°), ce qui nous reporterait
en-deçà même d’al-Karaṭjī. Il y est question
(178r°) de mithkāl ruknî, qui, dans ces condi-
tions, me paraissent devoir être rapportés,
plutôt qu’au Seljukide Rukan al-Din Tughril-
Beg, au Bûyide Rukan al-Dawla (milieu du
dixième siècle). Tous ces faits me paraiss-
ent devoir faire conclure, bien que le seul
terminus ante quem absolument certain soit la
date du manuscrit (733–34 H./1332–33 A.D.),
que le Kitāb al-Hāwī a été rédigé vers le se-
cond quart du onzième siècle sous les derniers
Bûyides iraïqîs, à la veille de la conquête
seljukide.

Le seul auteur qui à ma connaissance ait
utilisé le Kitāb al-Hāwī est H. Sauvain dans ses
Matériaux pour servir à l’histoire de la
numismatique et de la métrologie musulmane;5
mais ses emprunts sont dispersés, et il ne s’est
en aucune façon prêtré d’étudier l’ouvrage
dans son ensemble, d’où l’oubli où il est resté.

En dehors de quelques exposés généraux,
le Kitāb al-Hāwī consiste essentiellement en
énoncés de problèmes, que l’auteur ensuite in-
dique comment résoudre. Les procédés de cal-
cul élémentaire qu’il donne ne nous apportant
en général aucune précision nouvelle sur le
problème technique à résoudre, ce sont donc, à
quelques exceptions près, avec les exposés géné-
raux, seulement les énoncés de problèmes qui
présentent un intérêt historique.

Le manuscrit est d’écriture soignée, fré-
quemment voyellée, mais il s’avère constam-
ment que le copiste a travaillé sans bien com-
prendre ce qu’il écrivait: les mots erronés ou
passés sont nombreux. Les nombres sont écrits
tantôt en toutes lettres, tantôt en caractères
diwānî (lettres abrégées), jamais en chiffres;
il ne m’a pas paru nécessaire de compliquer la
tâche de l’imprimeur en les reproduisant tels
quels, leur lecture, lorsqu’elle est délicate, pou-
vant être vérifiée par le calcul. Il semble que
le manuscrit qui a servi de base au nôtre ait
dû être un peu en désordre; il semble mettre
bout à bout des notes prises à des sources dif-
férentes et se répétant en grande partie; en
gros, la deuxième partie de l’ouvrage (la pre-
mière de notre manuscrit) est consacrée aux
problèmes monétaires, commerciaux, fiscaux,
mais il se retrouve encore, dispersés au milieu
de la troisième partie, plusieurs paragraphes
où l’auteur traite de ces problèmes. En dehors
eux, la troisième partie contient des exposés
abstraits de géométrie et d’algèbre, sans in-
térêt à notre point de vue, et deux groupes d’exposés
et problèmes concernant l’un, le plus

4 Inédit. Le manuscrit Leyde Gol. 103 (R. Dozy,
Catalogus codicum orientalium bibliothecae Acade-
mae Lugduno Batavorum [Lugduni Batavorum, 1865],
III, No. 993) en contient les trois premières parties,
les moins intéressantes (opérations arithmétiques en
general), mais avec une table de matières détaillées de
l’ensemble traduite par F. Woepke ("Recherches sur
l’histoire des sciences mathématiques chez les Orien-
taux," Journal asiatique, 5e série, V [1855], 247–50),
montrant que la suite était consacrée aux problèmes
commerciaux et fiscaux, comme notre Kitāb al-Hāwī
dans les sections que nous ne connaissons pas ici. Brockel-
mann signale des manuscrits au Caire et à Rampûr,
et, à tort, à l’Escorial (M. Casiri, Bibliotheca arabico-
hispana escurialensis [Madrid, 1760], I, 433 n’y fait
qu’allusion à l’ouvrage).

5 Recueil d’articles primitivement publiés dans le
Journal asiatique de 1879 à 1888.
Il est évident que ces textes exigeront un sérieux commentaire. Mais à ma connaissance la plupart des renseignements donnés ici n’ont pas de parallèles dans aucun texte analogue publié. D’autre part il est impossible à l’historien général que je suis d’acquérir chaque fois, sans sacrifier d’autres travaux, toutes les compétences techniques qu’exigerait le commentaire de textes de ce genre, lorsqu’il lui en tombe sous la main. On ne trouvera donc ci-après, avec le texte, que peu de remarques. Ce n’en est pas moins un devoir, il me semble, de soumettre, tels quels, les textes de ce genre au travail des spécialistes.

( D’après le texte de L’Or )

Il est curieux de constater que certains textes, même en arabe, mènent à des conclusions similaires. Le texte suivant est un exemple de cela.

Il est nécessaire de mentionner les étapes de travail de ce texte et de ses auteurs. Le texte est écrit en arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que le texte ait été écrit par des auteurs de langue arabe, mais il contient des éléments de français. Il est possible que
Claude Cahen

Le lingot (dast) était autrefois de 330 dirhams d’or et talgham, avec mitkâl prescrit à 10 kîrat moins 1 ou 2 habba; avec ces 10 dirham (sic), 330 dirham font 244 mitkâl; là-dessus il y a 108 mitkâl dont il est permis d’abaisser chaque dinâr d’un kîrat, ce qui produit un kasr total de 108 kîrat; restent 116 mitkâl de talgham faisant en dirham 160 dirham 4/7, avec valeur, à 12 kîrat au dinâr, de 3 mitkâl 4 qîrat; tout le reste constituant cet or primitivement de 108 mitkâl et après la prise du kasr de 5 dinâr.

6 Ce mot ne figure à ma connaissance dans aucun dictionnaire; il designe apparentement le résidu de l’opération de raffinage de l’or, résidu qui lui même doit contenir encore un peu d’or dans l’état des possibilités techniques d’alors. Osman Turan dans un recent article cite un document anatoliien de la fin du treizième siècle où interviennent des dirhams d’argent talgham (“Le Droit terrien sous les Seldjoukides de Turquie,” Revue des études islamiques, 1948, cahier 1, p. 40, n. 4). L’auteur dit expliquer ce mot dans son Histoire économique de la Turquie, en cours de préparation.
8 kirât réduit à 102 mithkâl 12 kirât; si on y rajoute la valeur du talgham, qui est de 13 mithkâl 4 kirât, on obtient un total de 115 mithkâl 16 kirât. C'est là-dessus qu'on affecte l'approvisionnement (mut'an) dont on parlera en détail à propos de la fabrication du lingot.

Aujourd'hui le lingot est de 335 dirham, qui font 234 1/2 mithkâl, dont 111 d'or avec kâr permis, au compte de 1 kirât par dinâr, de 5 dinâr 11 kirât, d'où reste 104 (il faudrait 105 mithkâl 9 kirât en valeur d'or pur. Le talgham qui constitue le reste est donc de 123 1/2 mithkâl, ce qui, au compte de 12 dirham au dinâr, faut 14 mithkâl 2 kirât (il faudrait 8 kirât). La valeur totale du talgham et de l'or résiduel est donc de 118 mithkâl 9 kirât (il faudrait 116 mithkâl 11 kirât). C'est là-dessus que l'on affecte l'impôt (irtifâ) et l'approvisionnement dont on parlera à propos de la description détaillée de la confection du lingot.

De ce lingot, on fait 7 1/2 haqâk de la confection effectuée en vue de l'exportation en Égypte; mais pour les étoffes saqîtûûn et 'attâbî on en fait 8 haqâk ou parfois ½ en moins. Chaque haqâk s'appelle sikhtû.'

Voici maintenant le détail de la fabrication du lingot, avec l'approvisionnement qui lui est affecté. Le lingot est de 335 dirham et on en fait de 336, voire de 340; il en sort 1024 feuilles (waraka) de 4 kirât 1 habba chacune, d'une largeur de 4 doigts bien joints et d'une longueur de 17. Le Salaire de l'artisan (dar-rûb) pour le lingot est de 2 dinâr 15 kirât selon le tarif fixé et l'usage. Quant à l'approvisionnement, c'est-à-dire à ce dont il a besoin pour faire le lingot, il consiste en 150 fagots de bois de réglisse dont le prix, sujet à des fluctuations, est fixé au maximum à 7(9?) kirât 1 habba, puis la valeur de 1 manna d'huile, à 3 ½ kirât, enfin la valeur de ¼ de râf de mass (?) avec lequel on frappe le lingot en feuilles dans lesquelles on fait les feuilles d'or, soit 23 kirât, enfin, une boîte (durâdû) de fer d'une valeur de 2 dârik à 10 kirât, et qui reste quelque temps avant d'être confectionnée, enfin une valeur de papier de Khurasan de 1 kirât pour envelopper les feuilles. Tel est l'approvisionnement que reçoit l'artisan, le reste étant le salaire de sa main.

Ensuite le lieutenant du 'âmîl reçoit livraison du lingot des mains de l'artisan qui marque les divisions en 8 parties, chacune de quelque 30 mithkâl de poids, un peu en plus ou en moins de 30 ou de 60 mithkâl, et on le donne aux découpages. Le salaire pour chaque centaine est de 4 kirât. Chaque section (bâba) fait 16 dinâdû dont la nature tient de la qhidâda. De chaque coupe revient ce qu'on appelle un kâr de 4 à 5 mithkâl au moins; il est d'autant plus petit que la coupe a été mieux faite, puisque ce kâr est constitué par ce qui tombe d'or et va au rebut, qu'on ne peut travailler, et qu'on envoie fondre et travailler une seconde fois. Lorsqu'il est reçu de la coupe, il est "brûlé," c'est-à-dire qu'il est porté au rouge avec un fer aux proportions d'entaille sur lequel on met l'or à couper et qu'on appelle ribâta, divisé en petites cases au nombre de dix ou plus, et qu'on met à rougir pour l'or. Puis on pèle cet or, car lorsqu'il est livré par l'artisan il est noir, à cause de l'huile qui lui est mélangée lors de sa frappe en feuilles; mais, porté au chaud, il rougit et reprend son état premier, cependant que l'huile et la graisse s'envolent. Il est imputé sur cette opération, en raison de la perte à la combustion, sans parler du salaire, 6 kirât.

Puis l'or est remis au polisseur en présence du 'âmîl, du contrôleur (muðhrîf) et de leurs adjoints, qui le placent dans une marmite, avec interdiction à quiconque de passer là la nuit. Le polissage fini, on paye le nettoyage, pour l'onguent absorbé et perdu, par centaine 4 mithkâl, et on donne en outre au polisseur son salaire, qui est d'1 dinâr par lingot. Le salaire du chauffeur est de 10 kirât. C'est là une indulgence presque coupable, car la quantité d'onguent est connue, et si le polisseur la dé passe et que la perte est plus grande il est responsable des défauts. Si le montant habituel ne se trouve pas dans la terre produite par le polissage sous le tamis au sommet des creusets et tout résidu semblable produit par le tamisage, on le paye cependant au taux usuel, la règle étant la même que pour le kâr qui à la coupe consiste dans les surplus de l'opération et les morceaux superflucs qui tombent et dont a dit le poids.

Lorsque l'orfèvre reçoit le morceau poli de l'Hôtel de l'Or, il le répartit entre les fileuses par lots égaux de 4 mithkâl: et, s'il veut une confection parfaite, il leur donne de la soie en quantité inférieure à l'or, d'1 mithkâl environ; sans cela l'usage est de donner de l'or en quantité égale à la soie, ce qui fait, pour les deux réunis, 8 mithkâl. Lorsqu'on désire une facture supérieure, c'est pour l'exportation en Égypte, et pour elle on réduit (la part de soie). Mais pour le saqîûtûûn et le 'attâbî la soie et l'or doivent être de poids égal et au compte choisi par l'orfèvre et l'artisan, en parts dont chacune consiste en fils enroulés autour de canettes, chaque part en comptant plusieurs, 9 ou 10, le surplus étant un impôt pour l'artî-
san(?). La longueur du fil par canette est de 12 coudées kā'im; aujourd'hui elle varie en plus ou moins de 10½ à 12. Le ḥāḳḳ est la quantité formée par 450 canettes; on le livre par pelottes. Le salaire par ḥāḳḳ était autrefois de 1 dānīk et n'est plus aujourd'hui que de 2½ kirāt. Pour l'Iraq même la vente se fait par canettes à la pièce; le ḥāḳḳ est préparé en vue de l'exportation pour l'Égypte. Lorsqu'on vend à la canette, on compte pour chacune ou pour chaque excédent de canette 1 dinār, un peu plus ou un peu moins selon qu'il y a ou non débit. Les ḥāḳḳ qu'on envoie en Égypte sont de 7½ par lingot; pour le saklātūn et le Ῥattābī il y en a 8, chacun de 450 canettes de 12 coudées la canette, et de 28 mithkāl, imāmī et ruknī par moitiés. Si l'orfèvre paye au sultān son prélèvement (irtāz) à 20 mithkāl par lingot, mithkāl imāmī et ruknī par moitiés, cela fait 28 mithkāl imāmī. Autrefois on prenait le prélèvement du lingot à 26 mithkāl, remis au 'amīl à l'Hôtel de l'Or.

Quant à la marchandise pour l'Hôtel de l'Or, mettons que ce qui est fabriqué soit de deux lingots ou plus, il en revient un gros profit et c'est un commerce fructueux: car le marchand, qui vient et voit l'objet prêt, ne peut plus résister, et on lui vend au prix qu'on veut; il a confiance, on obtient de lui l'ordre, il est d'avis de réaliser son désir au plus vite, on lui donne facilement un poids qu'il ne vérifie pas, il emporte l'or promptement avec majoration de prix il n'est pas possible de marchander comme pour des étoffes, de faire des échanges, il n'y a pas de (. . .) ni de diminution comme on en fait, lorsqu'on pèse, sur la valeur, ni de souhait de délai, il n'est pas possible de surcoûter. S'il ne se trouve pas de marchandise, l'occasion du profit échappe au amīl, les marchands et orfèvres opèrent avec leur propre avoir, et il ne touche rien d'autre que le revenu usuel qu'il perçoit sur le lingot selon le tarif ordinaire.

Quant au titre du lingot, pour ceux qui le demandent et le sollicitent avec insistance, on en fait de 14 kirāt, plus ou moins, mais le procédé est irrégulier.

Le texte ci-dessus pourra être ajouté, en ce qui concerne les étoffes, à la documentation, en général moins technique, rassemblée dans cette revue même par Serjeant; je ne connais pas de travail équivalent pour l'or.

En dehors du point de vue technique, il me semble qu'on peut, d'un point de vue économique plus large, tirer de ce texte les indications suivantes, entre autres:

Persistance du commerce de l' 'Iraq vers Égypte malgré le schisme fatimide: exportations d'objets manufacturés d'or et soie, alors que l'Égypte recevait l'or du Soudan et disposait de soie en Syrie, et avait ses organisations de tirāz. Bien que les provinces payant leurs impôts en or aient la plupart fait scission, le commerce approvisionnait donc amplement Bagdad d'or encore, et elle gardait la spécialité technique de fabrications comme le 'attābī évidemment, qui y était né. D'autre part il serait peu vraisemblable que le Calife 'abbāsīde eût accepté de pourvoir son rival d'étoffes qu'il se réservait pour ses cadeaux aux grands; c'est donc que ses ateliers en fabriquaient d'autres (le 'attābī ne figure pas à l'exportation, ni le saklātūn), d'une valeur cependant au moins égale quant à leur proportion d'or. Il n'est pas parlé d'exportation pour ailleurs que l'Égypte; non peut-être qu'il n'y en eût pas, mais parce que pour elle il y avait un titre d'or spécial, peut-être pour concurrencer la fabrication égyptienne?

Existence des deux ateliers distincts de l'or et des étoffes, liés entre eux, et d'une très minutieuse réglementation du travail qui s'y effectuait.

Emploi, pour la filature, d'une main-d'œuvre féminine.

Écoulement de la production de l'Hôtel de l'Or, en dehors des besoins de la puissance publique, à des particuliers, avec gros bénéfice; il arrive que ceux-ci apportent leur or; il y a donc probablement monopole du travail de l'or, mais non de son commerce.
MATERIAL FOR A HISTORY OF ISLAMIC TEXTILES UP TO THE MONGOL CONQUEST *

CHAPTER XVII

TEXTILES AND THE TİRĀZ IN SPAIN

According to Ibn Khaldūn, during the rule of the Umayyads, and that of the minor dynasties which rose on the ruins of their domination, the tıralz-system found its way to Spain. There are two other authors to support this statement. Al-Bayān al-Mughrīb 1 informs us that "Abd al-Rahmān innovated the tıralz-factories, and expanded their manufacture, and stamped coinage in Cordova." (Map I.) While Suyūtī, 2 speaking of the 'Abd al-Rahmān who succeeded in the year 206 H. (821 A.D.), says: "In his reign, the wearing of embroidered garments (lbs muṭarrax) was first introduced, and Spanish dirhams were struck."

Ibn Ḥawkāl 3 is able to assure us (367 H.) that "in Andalus there is more than one tıralz-factory, the products of which go to Egypt (Misr) and sometimes some are taken to the utmost limits of Khurasan and elsewhere." In the preceding chapter, these Spanish textiles have been noticed among the lists of gifts of the Fatimid rulers to their employees. For instance a piece (shīkka) of Andalusian sīklātūn is cited as one of the articles of clothing regularly given away at the Feast of the Breaking of the Fast, 4 and again furnishings of Djahram and Andalusian carpets (busūt) are mentioned at their court (518 H. [1124 A.D.]). Thus in the intervening period between 'Abd al-Rahmān and Ibn Ḥawkāl, the textile industries of Spain must have made progress, for in the earlier works there is little mention of the country.

If we are to judge by the following passage of Maḳkāri, 5 Spain was a somewhat backward country and it was the eastern culture which so influenced an industry which ultimately exported its wares not only to the primitive Europe of the day, but also to the great Muslim capitals of the east. In 206 H. (821 A.D.), the singer Ziryāb came from Iraq to settle in Cordova. He was already a personage of some note in his profession, and being soon taken into favor, he introduced many fashions from the polite world of Baghdad into this remote province of Islam:

The people of Andalus learnt from him to use vessels of fine glass, in preference to those of gold and silver, and to use coverings (farš) of leather mats

[978 A.D.] that "in Andalus there is more than one tıralz-factory, the products of which go to Egypt (Misr) and sometimes some are taken to the utmost limits of Khurasan and elsewhere." In the preceding chapter, these Spanish textiles have been noticed among the lists of gifts of the Fatimid rulers to their employees. For instance a piece (shīkka) of Andalusian sīklātūn is cited as one of the articles of clothing regularly given away at the Feast of the Breaking of the Fast, 4 and again furnishings of Djahram and Andalusian carpets (busūt) are mentioned at their court (518 H. [1124 A.D.]). Thus in the intervening period between 'Abd al-Rahmān and Ibn Ḥawkāl, the textile industries of Spain must have made progress, for in the earlier works there is little mention of the country.

If we are to judge by the following passage of Maḳkāri, 5 Spain was a somewhat backward country and it was the eastern culture which so influenced an industry which ultimately exported its wares not only to the primitive Europe of the day, but also to the great Muslim capitals of the east. In 206 H. (821 A.D.), the singer Ziryāb came from Iraq to settle in Cordova. He was already a personage of some note in his profession, and being soon taken into favor, he introduced many fashions from the polite world of Baghdad into this remote province of Islam:

The people of Andalus learnt from him to use vessels of fine glass, in preference to those of gold and silver, and to use coverings (farš) of leather mats

4 Makrīzī, Khīṭāṭ (Bulaq, 1270 H. [1853 A.D.]), I, 427 and 474.
MAP 1.—MUSLIM TEXTILE CENTERS IN SPAIN. (SPANISH NAMES ARE GIVEN FIRST, ARAB NAMES IN PARENTHESIS)
(antā'), soft and pliable, instead of covers (milhāf) of linen, and his choice of leather for setting food upon, rather than wooden tables, because grease can be removed from leather with the lightest rubbing.

At different times of the year, he introduced certain changes of clothing for the man of fashion:

For he thought that people should begin to wear white clothing and leave off colored garments from the day of Mīhrāḏjān of that country, called by them 'Anṣara, which is on the sixth day before the end of June . . . and that they should wear it until the first of the month of October . . . and for the remainder of the year, they should wear colored garments. He was of the opinion too that, in the season between summer and winter (which they call Rabi’), they should wear dyed clothes, of such kinds as gowns (djubba) of khazz-silk, mulḥam-stuff, and silken cloth (muḥarrar), and shirts (durrā’a) without linings, because they were close to the time when they would be permitted to enjoy clothes of a white exterior. They used to change into these latter on account of their lightness and contrast with the coarse clothes (or padded stuffs miḥṣā) worn by the vulgar. He was of the opinion too that, towards the end of summer and the beginning of autumn, they should wear coarse garments (miḥṣā) of Merv, garments of a single color (musmat), and light colored clothes with padding and thick linings of a similar kind when the cold was very sharp in the mornings, until it grew very cold so that they had to change into thick clothing with the added protection of fur when needed.

These mulḥam garments were especially famous under the Caliph al-Mutawakkil in Baghdad about half a century later. The name Merv as applied to the stuffs here, has probably nothing to do with the city of that name, but is merely used as a description of the kind of cloth in a very loose sense.

Al-Bayān al-Maghrib’ supplies the first details of the spread of the system. In the year 313 H. (925 A.D.), in the time of the Caliph al-Nāṣir, “the page, Khalaf the elder, was put in charge of the ūṭirāz.” Though not directly connected with the history of the ūṭirāz-system in Spain, it might be interesting to set forth a catalogue of textiles in a gift made to al-
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Nāṣir in 327 H. (939 A.D.). Maḳḳari copied out this list from two authors, Ibn Khaldūn, and Ibn al-Farādī, and they vary quite considerably.

See Chapter II.


Maḳḳari, op. cit., I, 229 ff.
Ibn Khaldûn

Thirty pieces (šikka) of silk (harir), checked (muḥkattam) ⁹ inscribed (marḵūm) with gold, for the wearing of caplips, of various colors and manufactures.

Ten furs of the valuable marten (fanak) skins of Khurasan.

Ten ḥīntārs of bundles containing a hundred sable-skins.

Six Iraq royal mitrafa-cloaks for him.

Forty-eight Zahri milḫaf-mantles for his apparel (kiswa).

One hundred Zahri coverlets ¹¹ (milḫa) for his bed.

Ibn al-Faraḍî

Thirty pieces (šikka) of different kinds of garments, and royal Kh n di ¹⁰ stuff for his wear both white and colored, and five royal (khâṣṣî) Shu-aibî tunics (ẓhârâ) for him.

Ten furs of expensive marten, seven being white from Khurasan and three colored.

Six Iraq royal mitrafa-cloaks for him.

Forty-eight Zahri milḫaf-mantles for his apparel (kiswa).

One hundred Zahri coverlets ¹¹ (milḫa) for his bed.

Ten ḥīntārs of bundles containing a hundred sable (sammûr) skins.

Four thousand raṭlîs of spun silk.

A thousand raṭlîs of a kind of pure silk for weaving.

Thirty pieces of buzyûn silk ¹² (a kind of brocade) for saddles, for gifts.

Thirty woollen carpets (bisât) of different manufactures, each being of a length of 20 dhîrâ of various colors.

A hundred pieces (kiṭ’a) of prayer-carpets (muṣallaṭāt) of various different kinds of carpeting.

Fifteen carpet-strips (na-khâb) half of them made of cut (maḵṭû’t) khazz-silk.

Saddles of Ḍja’fârî khazz-silk.

Saddles of Iraq khazz-silk.

This list may serve to show the widespread interchange of goods in the Muslim world at this time. It is surprising to find furs coming all the way from Khurasan, especially as Spain itself was famous as fur-producing country. The Ḍja’fârî stuffs may be called after the Ḍja’fârî gold, i.e., pure gold, which was used in them. ¹³

Concerning the afore-mentioned silk Ibn al-Faraḍî adds that he derived this from the Șâḥîb al-ṭîrâz, and he did not bring it with the present, but merely gave it to the Șâḥîb al-ṭîrâz (controller of the āṭīrāz-factories) who entered it in his accounts.

Idem (ṭarîr maghzûl).

Idem.

Idem.

Idem.

Idem.

Idem.

Idem.

10 Read naḫḥâb or Kandîjî? See Chapter XVI, II, footnote 22.

11 This type of stuff figures elsewhere.

12 Reading thus with the footnote.

13 Ta’rîkh-i-Guzîda of Hamdullâh Mustawfî
Makšari 11 tells us, too, that under the rule of the vigorous and ambitious minister Manšur ibn Abī Āmīr (366–93 H. [976–1002 A.D.]), in whose hands lay the real power, “Hishām the Mu‘āyяд was not left with any more insignia of the caliphate other than the prayer in his name on the mimbars, and the inscription of his name on the coinage, and the ūrāz-strips.” Curiously enough, a piece of cloth with his name has been preserved for us, cited by A. Grohmann in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam.*

The same author 12 also informs us that, after a victorious campaign, Manšur gave away to the Christian princes and the Muslims who had helped him “two thousand two hundred and eighty-five pieces of various kinds of ūrāz silk (ṣiklätün), twenty-one pieces of sea-wool (ṣūf al-bahr), two ‘anbari (perfumed with ambergris) robes, eleven pieces of siklätün, fifteen of striped stuff (mura’iṣāḥ), seven carpets (nāmaṭ) of brocade, two garments of Rūmi brocade, and two marten (fanak) furs (387 H. [997 A.D.]).”

The first ūrāz in Spain must have been that which was attached to the palace of the Umayyad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (206 H. [821 A.D.] in Cordova, but in such works as I have read, I have not been fortunate enough to come across any references to it. This may be due to the fact that Almeria soon outstripped Cordova in its manufactures according to a passage of Yākūt which will be cited in discussing the former city. That it did make cloth is evident for Ibn Ḥawṭal 17 says: “Travellers who have been to Baghdad say that it (Cordova) is like one of the sides of Baghdad,” and “It has excellent garments, and robes of soft linen, excellent khazz-silk and kazz-silk.” We do know too that al-Ḥakam II employed skilled workmen in transcribing books and binding them in his palace which would also imply the existence of further manufactures.

One of the first industrial cities of the Iberian peninsula was Almeria (Al-Mariya) renowned throughout Islam for its textiles. Some brief indication of its exports to the Christian countries may be found in Makšari 18

There was a station for Christian ships there, and a place of assembly for their government (diwan), and from thence, their merchandise use to go to other countries. . . . It was also a factory (nasna‘) for the making of precious cloaks of figured silk (ḥulal muwashshā). . . . There was a manufacture of brocades which no other country could surpass, and an arsenal (dār al-ṣanā‘a). . . . A certain person said: “In Almeria there were 800 looms (nawḥ) for the weaving of ūrāz garments of silk (ṣ̣hāyir), and for precious cloaks (ḥulla), and splendid brocades thousand looms, and the same number for siklätün, and for Djurdjāni garments, Iṣfahāni stuffs, ‘Attābi, and marvellous veils (mi‘dār), and curtains ornamented with precious stones (suttār mu kullāla).” A certain person said: “There was no people in the land of Andalus richer than the inhabitants of Almeria nor with larger places for trading, and stores. The number of baths and hostellies (funduq) there came to about a thousand.” 19

Makšari, in part at least, uses the same sources as al-Ḥimyari: 20

Almeria was at the time of the Almoravids the town of Andalus (which had the widest relations


15 Makšari, *op. cit.,* II, 258.
17 Makšari, *op. cit.,* I, 271.
with the rest of the Muslim world); there were to be found there the most striking productions of craftsmanship. For the weaving of silk, it had 800 ṭirāz-factories. They made cloth there such as cloaks (hulla), brocades, șiklatūn, izzato, Ǧurjānī, curtains with vertical bands (sutūr mukallala),\(^2\) stuffs with patterns of circles (? muʿāyān), the cloth called 'Attābī, and that which is called fākhrī, in short all kinds of silk stuffs.

Al-Dīmāšḵī\(^2\) writes: "It was frequented by merchants who went there to buy silk, and the tissues that were woven there. The inhabitants retired to Granada under the Almoravid dynasty\(^1\) which captured it some time after the year 484 H. (1091 A.D.). Idrîsī's\(^2\) account may be the source on which these previous extracts are founded:

There were to be found there (in the time of the Almoravids) all wonderful kinds of crafts, and they counted among others, eight hundred factories (ṭirāz) for silk (ḥarīr) where they made precious mantles (hulla), brocades, șiklatūn, izzato, Ǧurjānī, curtains ornamented with precious stones (sutūr mukallala), cloth with patterns of circles,\(^3\) small mats (khumrā), 'Attābī, veils (mūḍāj), and various other kinds of silk cloths. . . . Ships used to come to Almeria from Alexandria and Syria. . . . At the time when we are writing the present work (548 H. [1154 A.D.]) Almeria has fallen into the power of the Christians. Its comeliness has disappeared, the inhabitants have been enslaved, the houses and public buildings have been destroyed, and there is nothing left.

Yākūt\(^4\) differs but little, mentioning that

\(^{21}\) I have kept this rendering of the phrase șturt mukallala which varies from the rendering of Makḵari given above.


\(^{24}\) The text has muʿāyāb, but the reading muʿāyān is preferable here.


it is a noted port for ships:

Merchants sail from it, and their ships anchor there. It is a place of call, and a seaport for ships and vessels, against the walls of which the waves dash. Figured washi-stuff and brocade of excellent manufacture are made there. This was first made in Cordova but then Almeria ousted it. In the land of Andalus there is not to be found a people who make more excellent brocade than those of Almeria.

Almeria actually fell into the hands of the Christians for the first time in the year 542 H. (1147 A.D.), but was retaken by the Almoravids in 552 H. (1157 A.D.). The Christians did not recover it again until 1489 A.D. Thus the passage of Idrīsī must refer to contemporary events, as he wrote three years before its reconquest.

Hīmari\(^2\) preserves an early item of information: "There were in the city of Bāḏḏān (Pechina) eleven baths, and factories (ṭirāz) for the manufacture of silk (ḥarīr) as well as prosperous trade." Pechina was later supplanted by its neighbor Almeria to which the inhabitants soon migrated. In the time of Idrīsī it was already in ruins, and as early as Ibn Ḥawkal, Almeria was the capital of the province.

Another town in the system was Finyāna (the modern Fiñana), in which according to Hīmari\(^2\) "there were factories (ṭirāz) for brocade stuffs." Ibn al-Khaṭīb\(^2\) remarks that it is noted for its silk culture.

As might be expected, Seville (Ishbiliya) was also a famous weaving center of Spain.


\(^{27}\) Ibid., text, p. 144, trans., p. 172.

The first hint of the existence of a tiraz-factory there is to be found in al-Bayān al-Mughrib.\(^{29}\) Ibrahim ibn al-Ḥadīdjādī revolted against the Umayyad Caliph ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān in the year 286 H. (899 A.D.). Our author informs us that “there were at Seville, factories (tiraz) where his name was embroidered on the stuffs, just as the sultan used to do at that time.” It is quite likely that these factories were established by the Umayyad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān himself, but of course they may have been introduced by Ibrahim. This monarch built an arsenal there to protect Seville against the attacks of the Normans, and he may have established a factory at the same time.

Ḥimyarī\(^{30}\) tells us that cotton grows well there. Not only does the output suffice for the needs of the whole of Andalus, but the merchants send it as far as Ifriqiya, Sijilmāsa, and the neighboring countries. Makkāri knew it chiefly by its steel, but adds that its manufactures are too many to mention. It was the Ṭābaṭā diplomatic capital from 414 H. (1023 A.D.) until 484 H. (1091 A.D.) but once more became a provincial city and finally passed into the hands of the Christians in 646 H. (1248 A.D.).

Makkāri\(^{31}\) quotes it several times for its famous dye-stuffs:

The best crimson (kirmiz) is the kirmiz of Andalus, and the most of that is in the districts of Seville, Lbala, Shadhūna, and Valencia. From Andalus it is taken to all quarters. . . . In it (Seville) is collected the kirmiz which is of brighter hue than the Indian lac (al-lakk al-Hindī).\(^{32}\) . . . In Andalus one of the dusts which descends from the heavens is the kirmiz which descends upon the oak-tree, and the inhabitants collect it from the time of intense heat,\(^{33}\) and dye with it, and the red color which no red can surpass is produced from it.\(^{34}\)

As early as the second century of the Muslim era, Djāḥīz\(^{35}\) tells us that this crimson is found in a district in the Maghreb in the land of Andalus, and that only a sect of the Jews knew how to find it. It was collected in the season of Māh-Isfandārmūdāh.

R. Pfister,\(^{36}\) examining a number of Egyptian textiles found that this lac-dye was used in about equal quantities with madder, supplies of which had become hard to obtain in Egypt. Though it seems to have been so common, lac-dye is rarely mentioned in Arab authors. An extract from Birūnī (973 H. [1048 A.D.]) on this lakk, is however cited by Pfister:

C’est une gomme qui est générale sur un arbre jusqu’ à couvrir le bois entièrement, et il y a des crevures (kīrīf, ce qui désigne les excrétions sèches du nez). Après l’avoir cuit, et en avoir sorti une matière colorante on l’appelle al-lakk ; avec cela on teint les peaux qu’on appelle al-lakka.

Birūnī cites the words of Ibn Māsawīh (a doctor) at the court of Baghdad who died in 243 H. (857 A.D.) and he knew it as a drug, but does not mention it as a dye.

Another notice of some interest is to be found in the Ḥākī al-Dījāmān of al-ʿAinī (ob. 855 H. [1451 A.D.])\(^{37}\) who tells us that

\(^{29}\) I prefer to understand this word as a season, and not as a kind of fig as R. Dozy suggests. Cf. the passage of Djāḥīz which follows immediately.

\(^{30}\) Makkāri, op. cit., I, 123.


\(^{32}\) R. Pfister, “Matériaux pour servir au classement des textiles égyptiens postérieurs à la conquête arabe,” Revue des arts asiatiques, X (1936), 6. He quotes Dr. Meyerhof in a private communication. This passage is from the Kitāb al-SArdāla fi ʾl-Tīb (see C. Brockelmann, Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur [Weimar-Berlin, 1898-1902], I, 874-5). The article has many other interesting notes on dyes.

\(^{33}\) Homenajé a D. Francisco Codera, con una in-
"they extract from a mine about a parasang away from Seville, a powder which is used instead of indigo and is only found in this part of Spain, whence it is exported for the use of dyers."

Malaga (Målaḳa) too had its ṭiraẓ-factory, though not so famous as that of Almeria or Seville. Yākūṭ 28 knew that the city was famous for its cotton which was exported all over Andalus. Ibn al-Khaṭīb (713-76 H. [1313-74 A.D.]) knew that the "cloaks (ḥullā) of its brocade are the wonderful articles with the ṭiraẓ-borders (taṭriz)." 29 But it is the voluminous Maḳḳārī 30 who fills the gap in our information:

In it are woven the cloaks of figured silk (al-ḥulal al-mawsūḥīya), the prices of which run into thousands. They have marvelous pictures (sūra) of a choice kind, with the names of the Caliphs and others (incribed) upon them. Its coast is a trading-centre for the Muslims and Christians.

As an indication of the commercial importance of Malaga, it might be added that he claims that figs are exported thence to India and China. Though this might be one of those superb pieces of hyperbole in which oriental authors sometimes indulge when they wish to describe the excellence of any particular article, yet it may be fact. Kalkasandi 31 on the authority of the Masālik al-Abṣār says that "in its provinces, much silk is found."

Of Baṣṭa, the modern Baeza in the province of Granada, Ḥimyārī 32 says: "There are on its territory many mulberry-trees (tūṭ) with a production of silk. . . . It is at Baṣṭa that the ṭiraẓ-factories are to be found for Baṣṭa carpets (al-wiṭā' al-Baṣṭī) made of brocade, which has no known equal." Yākūṭ 33 informs us that "to it are attributed the Baṣṭi prayer-carpets (muṣallayāt)." Ibn al-Khaṭīb 34 only knew it as famous for its preparation of saffron which, according to Kalkasandi 35 supplied the whole of Andalus.

Through the Treateise on Hisba ("Police-Regulations") of al-Saḳāṭī of Malaga, a work composed in the eleventh-twelfth century, we can form some notion of how general the custom of wearing ṭiraẓi garments was. A certain man had bought a slave-girl at Cordova, then the capital of Andalus (until the end of the fourth [tenth] century), and "he clothed her in a robe of brocade, and with a robe of ṭiraẓi silk, which the women of the Persians (? Aʿāḏim) used to wear at that time." 36 Besides this he gives an injunction to the Muḥtaṣib or officer of police: 37 "The Muḥtaṣib must prevent the weavers of ṭiraẓ from changing the inscription (rasm) on a robe at the fuller's, on account of the well-known practice of disreputable persons."

This passage is more easily understood in the light of the following extract from the Maʿālim al-Kurba: 38

Repairers (raffāl) may not repair a ḫbazz-silk garment received from a fuller or cloth-beater (daḵḵāk) except in the owner's presence. Embroiderers (mutarrīz) and ornament-stitchers (raḵḵām) must not transfer embroidery (raḵm) from one garment

28 Yākūṭ, op. cit., I, 275.
30 Maḳḳārī, op. cit., II, 148, and I, 95.
31 Kalkasandi, op. cit., V, 219.
to another which fullers or cloth-beaters bring them. . . On each garment, the owner's name must be written.

These passages seem to refer to the pieces of embroidered braid stuck on to the cloth by sewing, though separate in themselves.

A number of very pretty verses used in the ūrāz-bands by girls and lovers were known to the Spanish anthologist Ibn 'Abd Rabbiḥī in the first half of the tenth century of the Christian era.

OTHER CITIES

Besides the imposing list of ūrāz-cities—Cordova, Almeria, Baṣṭa, Finyāna, Seville, Malaga—all situated in the south of Spain, there was a flourishing industry in many other cities, though probably for the most part in private hands.

The passage from Djāhīz, concerning the kirmiz-dye in Spain has been cited supra, and it is interesting to notice that it was during his lifetime that ūrāzi garments were introduced into Spain. Ibn al-Fākīh (290 H./903 A.D.) counts Andalusian cloaks (ḥulla) among the wonderful things that are only to be obtained by the venturesomeness of merchants and Abu 'l-Kāsim speaks of "rooms carpeted with mats (zulliya) of the Maghreb" and "carpet-strips (nakkh) of Andalus and Cordova." Istāḵrī informs us that: "Most of the things which come from it are Maghribi felts, riding-mules, ambergris, gold, honey, olive-oil, ships, silk, Maghribi saddle-cloths (namad) and the sable (sammūr)."

49 Ibn 'Abd Rabbiḥī, *al-'Iḫā al-Farīd* (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), IV, 370 f.

The extent and fame of the manufactures of Andalus in the fourth (tenth) century may be gauged by the details supplied to us by Ibn Ḥawkāl:

In Andalus are to be found mercury, iron, lead (rasās), and with regard to wool, there are pieces (kit'a) which resemble the best kind of Armenian carpets in relief (mahfūr) of high price, ranging to the beautiful sur-carpets (namat) made there. Concerning the wool (ṣūf) and the dyeing of it, and those things which they dye, they have marvelous stuff in the herbs (hashīsh), peculiar to Andalus, with which the Maghribi felts (lubūd) of high quality and price are dyed, as well as silk and whatever colors of khazz-silk, and kazz-silk they desire.

Brocade is exported thence, and no people on the face of the earth can equal them in the manufactures of their felts. Sometimes, "thirty felts" (lubūd thalā-thiniya) are made for their sultan, a single one of which is valued at fifty and sixty dinars, without their breadth being more than five or six spans (ṣibr), for they are the loveliest of cloths (fursh). In their country soft silk and close-woven (al-khazz al-sakh) is made which exceeds that which is made for the Sultan of Iraq. There is a waxed (muṣjamma') variety of it which prevents the rain from wetting the wearer.

He notes too that the prices in the province are very low and then continues:

In the provinces of their country cheap linen for robes is made and exported to many places, much even going to Egypt (Mīr). As for their robes made in Pechina, they are taken to Mīr, Mecca, Yemen, and other places. Linen is made in their country for the people, and the sultan which is in no way inferior to Dabīk of the compact and the fine soft kind of the sharż variety, and it equals the excellent Ṣhaṯā kind.

Maḳdisi remarks: "From Andalus there comes a great deal of cloth (bazz), specialties and rarities."

54 See Chapter III. This is a term applied to Kufan stuffs.
Maκkαrī has extracted a passage from Ibn Sa’id (ob. 673 H./1274 A.D.) which shows Andalus at the height of its industrial activity:

Ibn Sa’id said: “The articles manufactured in Andalus are to be preferred above all others, and local patriots talk at length about them. For Almeria, Murcia, and Malaga are particularly famous for their gold figured silks (was̱̱jī muḍḥahhāb), the beautiful fabric of which is a source of admiration to the people of the East when they see a piece of it. In Tantālā of the district of Murcia the carpets (busūt) which are sold at so high a price in the East, are made. In Granada and Bāṣa the variety of silken garments (al-lībās al-muḥarrar) called mulabbaḍ, muḵḥāṭṭa (checked stuff), with pleasing colors is manufactured. In Murcia too are made inlaid seats (asirās muɾaṣṣā’a), charmingly contrived reed-mats (buṣūr), articles of brass and iron (ṣufr wa-ḥadid), such as knives, gilded scissors (ʾamkāṣ mūḍḥahhaba), and various other articles for the bride and soldier, which astound the senses (by their beauty). These types of articles are despatched thence to the land of Africa and other places.”

The most instructive source for the other cities is Ḥimyārī who wrote al-Rawd al-Mi’ṭār. The book, as it now stands, seems to be the recension of an earlier work of uncertain date, but which, since it does not give any historical details beyond the latter half of the seventh century H., was probably written about that time. The author uses earlier sources and the book contains information not to be found elsewhere. The question of dating has been fully discussed by the editor in the preface.

Of the Sierra Nevada (Shulair), he says: “The little towns which are round about it produce the most excellent silk (ḥarīr), and linen which is superior to that of the Faiyum.” The Wāḍī Āsh (or Ashṣ according to Yāḳūt, the modern Guadix on the north side of this range, was noted for the quantity of the ibrism-silk which was produced, while Ḥimyārī says that cotton grows there in great quantities. Ibn al-Khaṭīb knows it as a place for silk (ḥarīr). To the south of the range, Andarāṣḥ (Andarax), a little town, dependent on Almeria, is noticed by Yāḳūt: “The surpassingly fine linen is named after it.” Ḥimyārī does not seem to have heard of this, but Ibn al-Khaṭīb says that its silk is gold.

A day’s march away from Almeria was Ḥiṣn Shinṣah in the Wāḍī Ṭabarnāṣ. Maḳḳārī says: “Its territory abounds in mulberry-trees and silk and kirmiz (crimson) are to be found there.” Of Elvira (Ibīra) Yāḳūt says: “In all its districts linen and splendid silk are made.” While Ḥimyārī remarks: “The silk coming from the plain of Elvira is that which is spread abroad in the country, and exported everywhere. As for the flax which is cultivated, it is of a superior quality to that of the Nile valley and the harvest is so plentiful that it is exported to the most distant Muslim countries.” It was probably due to the fact that Elvira began to decline about 400 H. (1010 A.D.), as the result of a Berber rebellion, that records of it are so scanty.

Diṃaṣḵī (ob. 727 H. [1327 A.D.]) adds Jaen to our list: “In the eastern part of Andalus is situated the district of Jaen (Djaiyān), called also Kınıșrin, with the capital Madīna al-Ḥaḍīra which produces much silk.” Maḳḳārī, too, informs us that “it is called Djiayān al-Ḥarīr (Djaiyan of

---

56 Maḳḳārī, op. cit., I, 123.
57 Al-Ḥimyārī, op. cit., see the preface.
58 Ibid., text, p. 112, trans., p. 137.
59 Yāḳūt, op. cit., I, 279.
the silk) because of the extensive rearing of the silk-worm (dud al-ḥarir) in the plain of Jaen and the vicinity." He also remarks that Baeza, which lies in the sphere of its control, grew and exported a great deal of saffron.69

In the southwest of Andalus lay the town of Calsena (Kalsāna). "At Kalsāna they make garments called al-Kalsāniya. They are of very remarkable style and workmanship" according to Ḥīmyari.70

In a more northeasterly direction there lies yet another group, Valencia, Chinchilla, For destroyer, Bocayrente, Murcia, and Alsh.

The inhabitants of Valencia were famed for their great skill in dyeing fine linen tissues according to al-Ainī (op. 855 H./1451 A.D.71 while "Balansi woven stuff (nasiḍj) which goes to all quarters of the Maghreb is one of its specialties" says Maḳkari.72 He further confirms that it is famous for dyes, both saffron and kırmız (crimson).73 Perhaps our authors do not know more of it because the city was lost to James I of Aragon in 636 H. (1238, A.D.), after five hundred years of Muslim rule.

For destroyer, says Yākūt,74 is a citadel of the province of Dāniya and For destroyer garments are named after it. Bocayrente (Bakirān) which lies in the triangle formed by Xatīva, Dāniya, and Elche is mentioned by Idrisi:75 "They make white cloth (thiyāb) which sells at a very high price and lasts for many years. It is incomparable for quality and fineness. To such an extent is this so, that for whiteness and softness, it resembles paper."

Both Idrisi and Himvari give the same account of Chinchilla:76 "Djindjâla ... They make coverlets (awtiya) of linen here which cannot be imitated elsewhere, a circumstance which depends on the quality of the air and water"; and 77 "Shantadjâla ... It is after this place that the Djindjâli covers (waṭāʾ) are named because they are made there."

The most important city of the group, Murcia (Mursiya), has quite a long notice devoted to it by Maḳkari:78

With the cities of Almeria and Malaga, it forms a third, engaged in the manufacture of figured washi-stuff. It is particularly famous for Tantāli carpets (busut) which are despatched to the eastern lands, and for mats (ḥusur) with which walls are covered, pleasing to the eye, and other things too many to mention.

Ħīmyari 79 has a like notice: "They used to make fine and valuable carpets (busut) at Murcia. The people of Murcia have unequalled skill in manufacturing and decorating these carpets."

Both Yākūt and Kazwini mention Alsh to the north of Murcia, the former 80 saying: "Splendid carpets (busut fākhira) which have no parallel in the world for beauty, are manufactured there." Kazwini 81 less rhetorically makes them unparalleled in Andalus itself.

Of Bādja in modern Portugal, the Analects 82 say: "In the days of the 'Abbâdites it was specially famous for the tanning of leather and the manufacture of linen." Of Arūn, a district of Bādja, Yākūt 83 says: "Its linen is better than any of the other linen in Andalus."

---

70 Al-Himvari, op. cit., text, p. 163, trans., p. 195.
71 Homemaje a D. F. Codera, p. 464.
72 Maḳkari, op. cit., II, 149.
73 Ibid., I, 90 and 110.
74 Yākūt, op. cit., III, 881.
75 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 193.
76 Ibid., text, p. 195.
78 Maḳkari, op. cit., II, 149.
80 Yākūt, op. cit., I, 350.
81 Kazwini, el-Cazwini’s Kosmographie, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1846-48), II, 338.
82 Maḳkari, op. cit., I, 100.
83 Yākūt, op. cit., I, 227.
Though industry was concentrated in the south of Spain, there are one or two references to more northern centers. Of Lerida (Lérida), Himyarî tells us: 84 “It is specially noted for the abundance and the excellence of its linen. It is exported thence to all the districts of the territory of the Marches.”

It is most disappointing that, though Mâḵḵāri says that Granada is the Damascus of Andalus, he is so devoid of information about its manufactures, apart from those of silken mulabbad stuffs and mukhattam (checked) materials. He does however remark that there is good saffron to be found locally. 85 Some description of the dress of its inhabitants is given by Ibn al-Khaṭīb (ob. 776 H. [1374 A.D.]) : 86

The most usual apparel worn among all classes is the dyed blanket (milaff maṣḥūb) in winter. In summer various kinds of cloth (buzz), linen, silk (harīr), cotton, goathair, 87 African cloaks (ridā'), and Tunisian pieces of cloth (maṣṭa'), and doubled (lined ?) mantles (maʾẓir maṣḥū'a) strive for first place.

Toledo (Ṭulaitula) has also been very briefly treated by the Arab authors. Mâḵḵāri 88 mentions merely that it had saffron and pastel (ṣibgh samâ'i) which is widely exported. Yâkūt 89 had also heard of the fame of its saffron, and indeed it was famous as a Spanish export as early as Mas'ūdī. 90 Examples of the famed Andalusian silks are to be found in von Falke’s Decorative Silks which, on the literary side, this article may help to supplement.

85 Mâḵḵāri, op. cit., I, 94, and II, 147.
87 Reading مورد for مورع.
88 Mâḵḵāri, op. cit., I, 91.
89 Yâkūt, op. cit., III, 545.
CHAPTER XVIII

THE MAGHREB

OF ALL PARTS OF THE CIVILIZED MUSLIM world during the first four centuries, the Maghreb is probably the least producive of textiles of distinction, nor is it very well documented (Map 2).

The list of taxes in the Djiřāb al-Dawlā, however, includes 120 large carpets (busūt) from the province of Ifriqiya as early as the reign of Ma'mūn along with the tribute in money. Guest has found an inscribed textile from the īrāz of Ifriqiya as early as the Caliph Marwān II, and which, in truth, is the earliest known īrāz fragment. This stuff and the carpets probably came from Kairawān (Kairouan) or one of the cities of what I propose to call "the Kairawān group." 7 Abu 'l-Kāsim 8 talks of Magribi gold-embroidered carpets (antā' mudhāhaba) as articles of luxury in Baghdad of his time, but this term Magribi may also apply to Spain, so this evidence is of doubtful value. So also is the passage of Dījāhīz 4 which says: "The best felts are the Chinese (Sini) variety, and the red Magribi kind," etc. Miskawāhihi, curiously enough, informs us that the Byzantine army which besieged Aleppo in the year 351 H. (962 A.D.) had pavilions (khārgāhāt), adorned with Magribi felts (lubūd). 5

Nor do textiles figure very largely in the products of the Maghreb even in the time of Ibn Ḥawkāl: 6 "Exports of the Maghreb . . . ambergris, silk (ḥārīr), robes of valuable and cheap wool of all kinds down to woollen gowns (dījūbbā), and such-like manufactures, carpets (antā' ), iron, lead, mercury, and slaves imported from the blacks (Ṣūdān)." An embassy to Spain in the year 381 H. (991 A.D.), according to Maḳkāri 7 brought to Cordova, among other things, several loads of burnooses and other articles of woollen cloth manufactured in Africa.

Even as late as 'Umarī 8 the state of civilization among the Africans seems to have been on a low level compared with other Muslim countries, for he says: "The inhabitants of Ifriqiya 9 wear clothes of wool and cotton. Those who wear elegant clothing from Alexandria are isolated individuals." This remark is all the more surprising as Alexandrine stuffs were so largely exported to Europe in the Middle Ages.

Ibn Khaldūn, 10 though contemporary with the famous Tamerlane, gives a very competent survey of the arts in North Africa and Spain which cannot afford to be neglected.

3 Abu 'l-Muṭāḥhar al-Azdi, Ḥikāyat Abī 'l-Kāsim, ed. by A. Mez (Heidelberg, 1902), p. 36.

9 Ifriqiya means the northern littoral of the continent and is hardly so extensive a term as our "Africa."
Map 2—Muslim Textile Centers in North Africa and Sicily. (Modern Names Are Given in Parenthesis)
The arts are few and imperfect in the Maghreb always excepting the weaving of wool, sewing and tanning of leather. These arts are brought to a high degree of perfection because they became indispensable when they had settled, and because wool and leather are the most plentiful products of countries occupied by nomads.

The arts of Spain all reached perfection due to the attention which had been devoted to their improvement and their care. Thus those arts imbued Spanish culture with so deep a dye that it would only disappear if that were to disappear also. So it is, if a stuff is well dyed, the dye lasts as long as the cloth.

Tunis resembles the Spanish cities in this respect. Culture made great progress there under the Sanhâdia dynasty (the Zirîdes), and then under that of the Almohades (Hafsides), and every art had attained a high standard of perfection. However this city is inferior if compared to the Spanish towns, but the proximity to Egypt, and the great number of travelers who pass every year between this country and the Maghreb have resulted in the introduction of many practices which have helped to augment the number of arts which were already in this city. Sometimes Tunisians used to live in Cairo for several years, and on their return they brought back from Egypt customs of luxury and perfection of the arts of the east, a knowledge which gave them a high degree of repute. Thus it happens that as regards the arts, Tunis resembles Cairo, but it also resembles the Spanish towns, because most of its inhabitants are descended from natives of east Spain who came there as refugees in the great migration which took place in the seventh century A.D.

Thus the arts have been maintained in Tunis, and though this city is not at the present date in a state of civilisation which is worthy of it, yet once a dye has been thoroughly impregnated in a stuff, it hardly ever disappears unless this stuff is destroyed.

The truth of his statements of the settlements is attested by Bakri who informs us that Oran (Wahrân) was founded by a band of Andalusian sailors. Colonists from Elvira and Murcia colonized Tanas (Tenes) about 262 H. (875–6 A.D.). They used to winter in the port and later made a pact with the head Berbers to have a market and port there. This, in time, grew to quite a large town of four hundred families.

**AL-MAGHİRIB AL-ADNÄ**

It is mainly the coast cities of the Maghreb that are famous for their manufactures, much of the interior of the province being barren and in a low state of civilization.

As we travel from Alexandria westward, the first important town is Tulmaitha (Ptolemais), and Idrisi tells us that ships from Alexandria bring good stuffs of cotton and linen to it which they exchange for honey, pitch, and butter.

Bařka was early occupied by the Arabs and it flourished until the Hilâli invasion of the fifth (eleventh) century after which I have found no information. According to Ibn Hawkal: “It has markets, frequented by merchants and buyers for the sale of wool, pepper, honey, wax, olive-oil, and various articles of merchandise, coming from the east, and going from the west.” Bakri (487 H. [1049 A.D.]) merely mentions that it exports wool (laina), while Idrisi says: “In past times there was grown cotton which was called after it, quite unlike any other kind of cotton. . . . The ships and travellers who come from Alexandria, and Egypt (Miṣr) to Bařka export wool,” etc.

Of Adjâbiya, Ibn Hawkal says: “Ships

---

come to it with supplies, and take away from it various wares, mostly consisting of robes of mediocre quality, and woollen cloths (şīkka) of little value." According to Bakri 18 it had frequented bazaars, and most of the inhabitants are Copts, while Idrisi 19 remarks on the Jewish traders there. Surt, according to Ibn Hawkal is a place from which ships take wool. 20

It might be well to notice the far inland city of Zawila here, which did a considerable trade in cloth with the hinterland; Bakri 21 tells us that at Zawila (or Zuwaila) of Fazzān is a caravan station. Here slaves are sold, the intermediary being red cloth. This is confirmed by Yākūt: 22 "Slaves are exported from Zawila towards Ifrikiyya and those parts. Their purchase is effected by short red garments." This city was the capital of the Fazzān oasis, and apparently an important commercial center. These red garments seem to be the Başrī stuffs of which Birūnī speaks.

THE KAIRAWĀN GROUP

This rather arbitrary division of cities into the Kairawān group is made because Kairawān was the capital city of early Islam in Africa and possessed a šīrāz-factory. All such cities are characterized by a more developed type of manufactures than the other more backward and primitive centers.

The first of these cities is Tarābulus (Tripoli), and Ibn Hawkal 23 says: "There is a large export of precious wool and pieces of splendid blue robes (ṭikān al-aksiya al-fākhira al-zurk)." The Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam 24 tells us that "it is a resort of Byzantine and Spanish merchants. Whatever the Sea of Rūm produces comes there." Bakri 25 remarks on its frequented bazaars.

Of the island of Djarba, al-Tidjānī (706–08 H. [1306–09 A.D.]) says, "This island is famous in other countries for the superior quality of the wool that its numerous flocks produce. In no other part of Africa are finer kinds for the weaving of rich stuffs and garments to be found." 26 Leo Africanus 27 confirms this: "Ceux de l'île vivent de la facture et trafique des draps de laine (au moins, la plus grand' partie), lesquels ils portent vendre, ensemble le raisin sec, dans la cité de Thunes (Tunis) ou d'Alexandrie."

Ibn Hawkal 28 enumerated silks among the exports from Africa, and of Kābīs he says: "It has markets within its walls, and great supplies of wool, besides which a great deal of silk (ḥarrī) is made there." The anonymous geographer 29 of the sixth century in a passage founded on Bakri, says: "There are many mulberry trees there, and silk is raised. This is the best and finest silk, none being made in Ifrikiyya except here." Idrisi, 30 too, knew of

18 Al-Bakri, op. cit., p. 17.
19 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 132.
20 Ibn Hawkal, op. cit., p. 68.
21 Al-Bakri, op. cit., p. 29.
22 Yākūt, Muḍjam al-Buldān, Geographisches Wörterbuch, ed. by F. Wüstefeld (Leipzig, 1866–73), II, 961.
23 Ibn Hawkal, op. cit., p. 69.
28 Ibn Hawkal, op. cit., p. 70.
29 Description de l'Afrique par un géographe anonyme du sixième siècle, ed. by A. v. Kremer (Vienna, 1852), p. 3. This passage is based on al-Bakri. See M. Quatremère, "Notice d'un manuscrit arabe contenant la description de l'Afrique" (by al-Bakri), Notes et extr. de la Bibl. Nat., XII (Paris, 1831), 28. All the references in this chapter to the latter work allude to the off-print.
30 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 106.
its fame: “In former times there were ḥārāf factories there in which beautiful silk (ḥārīr) was made, but nowadays there are tanneries there for leather which is exported.” Yāḥūt also gives it some attention: “There are many mulberry trees there, and from one of those trees there comes a quantity of silk which five trees elsewhere cannot produce. Its silk is the best and finest variety. No silk is to be found in the province of Ifrikiya except at Kābiṣ.” Even the post-Mongol Nuzhat al-Kulūb speaks of “Kābiṣ... a fine large city where excellent stuffs are woven.”

A more inland group of cities lay to the west of Kābiṣ; they are Kāfṣa, Tawzar, Nakṣa, and others, and they also had some textiles.

“In Kāfṣa” says the anonymous geographer “are made cloaks (ridā) of the kind known as ẓālāsān, and turbans of wool, of the utmost fineness, vying with ṣārāb-cloth.” Idrisi knew that they cultivated cotton and henna. Bakrī mentions a place called Tūrak after which Tūraki garments imported into Egypt took their name.

The same anonymous geographer mentions a place Darḏini: “It is an ancient city near Naṭa, and it is a large city where Darḏini robes which resemble the kind manufactured at Sidjilmās, both in cloth (thāwb) and color, though they are of an inferior quality, are manufactured.”

Ibn Saʿīd says of the district called Kastīliya, the exact area of which it is rather hard to determine: “In this region, excellent linen, indigo, and henna are found.” This district lay somewhere near the two large “Shutts,” and a town of that name is mentioned by Ibn Ḥawkal which “had supplies of wool despatched to every quarter, such as pieces (ṣhikka) of cloth, robes, fur (ḥanbal), and other articles manufactured there and exported everywhere.” The capital of this area was Tawzar, which according to Abu ’l-Fidā had flax and henna. Tidjāni describes Bāb al-Manṣūr there: “Those of the inhabitants who exercise the profession of dyers, come there to spread out garments of various colors, and embroidered stuffs. The eye of the visitor seems to see in front of him, a rich flower-bed, where flowers of a thousand colors blossom on the edges of fresh and limpid streams.” (Eighth [fourteenth] century.)

Ṣafākus seems to have been affected by Alexandrine influence, for Bakrī says: “Dans l’art de fouler les draps, et de leur donner le cati, les habitants de Ṣafākus suivent les méthodes employées à Alexandrie, mais ils surpassent les fabricants de cette ville par l’excellence et l’abondance de leurs produits.” However the translation of Quatremère reads: “Les habitants se livrent à l’art du foulon, et à celui du tisserand, avec encore plus d’activité et de succès qu’on ne le fait à Alexandrie.” Our anonymous geographer remarks that Sicily, Italy, and Rūm have connections with it.

North Africa was in all probability the

23 Yāḥūt, op. cit., IV, 1 ff.
26 Reading ṣārāb for ṣārīf.
27 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 104.
28 If this reading is correct. See M. Quatremère’s edition of al-Bakrī, op. cit., p. 69, which has Ṭūrān.
30 Leo Africanus, op. cit., II, 383.
31 Ibn Ḥawkal, op. cit., p. 94.
33 Al-Tidjāni, op. cit., p. 200.
34 Al-Bakrī, Description de l’Afrique, ed. de Slane, p. 46.
least noteworthy country in the tirâz-system. It was not until Abbasid times that the Maghreb began to be divided into petty semi-independent states where the rulers set up their own factories in the palace and elsewhere. Nevertheless Africa probably possessed tirâz-cities before Andalus. The capital of Nearer Africa (al-Maghrib al-Adnâ) was Kairawân, founded upon an old Roman site in 50 H. (670 A.D.). When Bakri 45 wrote (487 H. [1094 A.D.]) the city possessed a Bâb al-Tirâz which was on the side toward RaKkâda. The tirâz cloth made in Ifrikiya has already been mentioned, and it is probable that it came from here. It is worthy of note that the mosque of Kairawân owed its foundation to Hîshâm, so possibly the tirâz-factory was in existence in his day.

Kairawân became a flourishing place under the Aghlabids (184-298 H. [800-909 A.D.]) it was a very mixed city, and after Ya'kûbî, it had a population comprising Arab, Berber, Persian, Kharûsâni, and Rûmi elements. Ibn Hawkal 47 is able to tell us (367 H. [978 A.D.]):

Kairawân was the greatest town in the Maghreb, the largest in property and trade, and possessing the most beautiful buildings and markets. The Diwân of all the West (Maghreb) was there to which the taxes were all taken, and the Sultan's palace was also there. Outside it was the place called RaKkâda which is a town that was the dwelling of the Banû Aghlab.

An incidental note in al-Bayân al-Maghrib 48 tells us that al-Mu'izz ibn Bâdis summoned the dyers and gave them white stuffs coming from the linen-store (fundûk al-kattân), so as to dye them black, and they dyed them the deepest black. He collected the tailors who cut them into garments, and all the jurists and cadis were summoned to the palace, as well as the preachers of Kairawân, and the muezzins, and he invested them with black.

Since the Fatimids had tirâz-factories while they were still in Ifrikiya, we might expect that, when the seat of government was moved from Kairawân to the new city of Mahdiya in the year 308 H. (921 A.D.), new factories would be established there, and they certainly did have an arsenal (dâr al-šanâ'â) from the first. According to Bakri, 50 Mahdiya was frequented by boats from Alexandria, Syria, Sicily, Spain, etc., and Idrißi 51 tells us that:

It has never ceased to be a station for ships of the Hejaz 52 coming to it from the East, the An-

49 Ibid., text, I, 272, trans., I, 387. For a discussion on standards see the introduction to M. Gaudefroy-Demombynnes translation (in part) of 'Umari, op. cit.
50 Al-Bakri, Description de l'Afrique, ed. de Slane, p. 67.
51 Idrißi, op. cit., text, p. 107 ff.
52 There is no necessity to alter the word Ḥidjâz, as “ships” (marâkib) might also be understood as “caravans” which would come by land. In any case
dalus, Rüm, and other countries. Many wares were imported into it and sold for enormous sums in past days, but there is little of that nowadays. Mahdiya was the harbor and port of Kairawan. . . . Fine and excellent cloth called after it used to be made which merchants took to all countries at all times and at the time when it was impossible to make similar cloth for excellence and beauty, in any other country.

Yâkût 55 adds: "To it are attributed Sûsî and Mahdawi cloth (thiyyâb)."

The downfall of the hitherto prosperous Mahdiya took place in 449 H. (1057 A.D.) when Mu‘izz removed the bazaars and factories to al-Manşûriya. We hear that as much as ten dirhams was paid for the location of a booth to sell linen there. But Kairawan had ceased to flourish at the foundation of Mahdiya and was a miserable city with only a few tanners, in the time of Leo Africanus. 54 According to Ibn al-Mudjâwir 55 the inhabitants of the island of Kish wear the stuffs of Mahdiya in the Maghreb.

The city of Sûsî was always renowned for its textiles, though I have been able to find very little early information about them. It was held by the Idrïsîds, the Almoravids, and the Almohads in turn, though the Almoravids never held it very securely.

Tîrâzi stuffs are mentioned here by Bakri: 56 "Many people are employed in weaving at Sûsî, and they make thread, one mithkâl of which is worth two gold mithkâls."

Here it is that the fullers finish off the fine stuffs of Kairawan." This passage is repeated by the anonymous geographer: 57

It is especially noted for abundance of good, excellent fine garments, and for the fulling (kis Kara) of them, as well as all the manufactures of precious stuffs of its embroidery (tara) and bleaching (kamd). Such as the latter are not to be found manufactured in any city but this, and the Sûs cloth is well known, without parallel, and of a startlingly white color and lustre, 58 not to be found in any other cloth. Precious garments such as turbans of close weave 59 are imported from this place, a single one of which is worth a hundred dinars and more, and which merchants take to all countries, east and west. Thread (ghâzî) is sold there, a mithkâl's weight for two mithkâls usually.

Perhaps the turbans mentioned here are the same as those which were made in Kâla Hammâd for the Sahnâdzi monarchs.

Idrîsî 60 tells us that "it has many wares. Travellers come and go from it with cloth, such as various kinds of garments and turbans, called after it, a fine and precious kind of ware. It has frequented markets." Yâkût 61 remarks: "Most of its inhabitants are weavers, weaving Sûsî clothes of high price, and whatever is made elsewhere resembles them, the price of a garment in the country of provenance being ten dinars." He quotes an earlier authority Ibn Sa'd and further mentions that "the weavers there are many, and they spin a thread a mithkâl's weight of which is sold for two mithkâls."

The traveler Tidjâni 62 from his own evidence tells us that "it is there that they make

54 Read başîs with Yâkût, instead of masîs. Cf. infra, footnote 82.
55 Ma’sûr or maţûr?
58 Al-Tidjâni, op. cit., p. 103. (8th century H. [14th century A.D.].)
the fine garments called Sūsî." Ibn Dukmāk even tells us that there was a street in Cairo known as Darb al-Sūsî which would seem to imply that these stuffs were sold if not even made there. The frequent occurrence of Sūsî cloth in the catalogues of the Fatimid treasuries in Makrīzī show that they were exported to Egypt from that period, and it is very likely that this dynasty had a ūrāz there. At the end of the fifteenth century Ibn Iyâs still notes that garments and robes are exported from Sūs and it is doubtful if this evidence is contemporary.

Tunis began to grow about the year 80 H. (608 A.D.), and it has been prosperous ever since. It was about that time that the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik sent a thousand Copts with their families, and at the same time an arsenal was constructed, in which, it appears, these Copts were to build ships with wood provided by the Berbers. Some textile-workers may have come along with them, but it is Ibn Hawkal who is the first to tell us that "one of its crops is cotton which is taken to Kairawan at a profit and thus also hemp (kînnab)."

The same author adds that the merchants of Fars wear robes of Tunisian stuff. While Idriši found that Kairawan was at a very low ebb, Tunis was a fine flourishing city with crops of cotton and a yellow dye (ūsfur). A court of silk-merchants (funduk al-ḥarâ'īriya) was established there, probably as early as the year 332 H. (994 A.D.).

In the mid-thirteenth century the Ḥafṣide, Abū Zakariyā, established industry there and built a Sūk al-Ḳumâsh (cloth-market). 'Umari tells us that "cloth is made there called 'African'. Those are superior stuffs whether of cotton and linen, or linen only. They are more perfect than the Nāṣāfī of Baghdad, and more beautiful; the best garments of the Maghreb are made of them." Kalkashandi too quotes the Masālik al-Abṣār (of Umari) saying:

The Sultan of Tunis... concerning his apparel, the Masālik al-Abṣār says of the Sultan of his time (the first half of the eighth (fourteenth) century) in Irikiya, that he had a turban ('imāma), not excessively large, with a head-robe (ḥanak), and a small trailing end ('adhaba). Ibn Saʿīd said: "He has a large turban of wool (ṣūf) and linen (kattān) with a ūrāz-border of silk (ḥarir). Nobody of the ruling family wears one so large in size." He remarked that the end of his turban comes behind his left ear, which is reserved to him and his relations. He has gowns (dʒubbā) somewhat resembling that... His customary apparel and that of his great sheikhs is made of a cloth (ḵumāš) they have, called safsāri made there of silk and cotton, of silk and very fine wool, as well as cloth known as Tilimsānî which is made in Tilimsān, either of pure wool, or pure silk, checked (māgbattam), or without checks.

Ibn Bannûn said: "The Sultan is distinguished by the wearing of ḥazz-silk. Its color is green and black." He said: "This color is called al-ljâwâzi (nut-color), and al-ghiyār (read al-ghubâr, dust-colored), and al-Naftî (from Nafta, a city in the

63 Ibn Dukmâk, Description de l’Egypte, ed. C. Voller (Cairo, 1893), I, 29.
64 See Chapter XVI. Sūs stuffs are mentioned by Ibn ‘Adhārī, op. cit., text, I, 271, trans., I, 386-7. They were embroidered with gold. Stuff of Sūs are very commonly mentioned in oriental authors, but there is frequently some doubt as to whether they come from the Persian or North African city of that name, or even from some other place altogether.
68 Idem, "Vae et regna... Descrictio ditiosion moslemicae," ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1873), II, 205. The reading may be incorrect as is indeed very likely.
hinterland of Kābis ?).” Ibn Sa’id said: “It is that which comes from the sea at Şafakūs.”72 ‘Umari says in the Masālik al-Abṣār: “It is called ‘fish-down’ (wabar al-samak) in Egypt and Syria, meaning what is expressed by the ‘fish-wool’ afore-mentioned under Şafakūs (ṣūf al-samak)” . . . Ibn Sa’id said: “They are the finest cloths (ṣīyāb) of the Sultan in Tunis.”

In the Masālik al-Abṣār, on the authority of Ibn Sa’id, he related that the Sultan used commonly to wear garments of precious wool, wonderful and of various colors. The most commonly worn is the checked (muḥkattam), gold-embroidered (muṃtażīdī) stuff of silk and wool,73 with two long sleeves, without great length, narrow without being tight (muzannad). His robes are not tied by a belt (niṭāk) unless it should be war-time when they are tied with a girdle. He also wears cloaks (ṣābā) and has a tallasān of wool of very fine material which he wears as a cloak and does not put over his head.

The Cadi Abu l’Kāsim ibn Bannān said: “It is not the custom of the Sultan of Hijriya to invest those whom he appoints to command a province with a robe of honor (kīlah) as it is in Miṣr (Cairo); it is only an investiture (kiswa), and it consists of uncut cloth which he can use as he wills.”

Kalkashandi74 further mentions that “other kinds of clothing such as the choice articles imported from Alexandria and Iraq, are extremely uncommon.”

Strangely enough, Idrisi75 mentions that this safsārī stuff was made at Nūl (a plain now called Wādī Nūn or Nūl) in southwest Morocco, between the west Anti-Atlas and its outliers, twenty miles from the sea. In Tunis Leo Africanus found there was a great number of merchants of only the finest stuffs, as well as “veloutiers, couturiers, sellers, and pellettiers.”76

In the hinterland of Kairawān near the city of Sabība, much flax (kattān) was grown according to Ibn Ḥawkal.77 Still further inland Tabīssa was one of the more civilized cities which belong to the Kairawān group, and Yākūt78 says: “There are fine carpets of perfect weave (busūt ḏjalīla muḥkama al-纳斯ād) there, which last for a long time.”

Proceeding along the coast from Tunis we come to Būna and Ibn Ḥawkal79 notes that it trades in wool. The editor of the sixth century adds that flax is also grown there.

The area examined in the above passages is known as Nearer Africa (al-Maghrib al-Adnā) and the next province which comes to our notice is called Middle Africa (al-Maghrib al-Awsāt).

AL-MAGHRIB AL-AWSĀT

Another branch of the Zirid dynasty, the Ḥammādids, had its capital in Kal’a Ḥammād which they founded in 398 H. (1007-8 A.D.), and which soon became a center of the arts and industry. It is interesting to find that there was even a small community of Christians there.

The anonymous author of the sixth century80 who mainly follows Bakrī, tells us: “In the city of Kal’a Ḥammād are made robes (aksiyya) which have no equal for excellence and fineness, not even the Wadḍjī robes which are made at Wajdja. A festal robe (kisā‘ ‘id) of the manufacture of the Kal’a is worth thirty dinars.” In the same work there is a passage which must either refer to the stuffs made in the ṭīrāz-factory of the Ḥammādids in the

72 See supra. Compare these passages with ‘Umari, trans. (in part) by M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, op. cit., pp. 124-5. For sea-wool see Chapter XXI.
73 The word muṃtażīdī may simply mean here a “compounded, or mixed, stuff,” and not a gold-embroidered stuff. For a somewhat similar term, muṃmażīdī, see Chapter II, I, footnote 17.
74 Kalkashandi, op. cit., V, 143.
75 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 59.
76 Leo Africanus, op. cit., III, 138.
77 Ibn Ḥawkal, ed. J. H. Kramers, op. cit., p. 84.
78 Yākūt, op. cit., I, 823.
79 Ibn Ḥawkal, op. cit., p. 76.
Kaš'a, or else perhaps to the famous turbans of Sús. 81

The Şahādji kings (from the context, the Zirids are intended) had gold-woven turbans ('amā'īm muḏjahhaba), expensive in price, a single one of which was worth five and six hundred dinars and even more. They used to shape them with the most perfect art so that they became like two turbans (ṣāḏī). In their country there were craftsmen especially for this manufacture. For the making of turbans of this kind, a molder (ṣāḏī) took two dinars or more. They used to have moulds (ṣāliḥ) of wood in their factories (ẖänāt) which they called "heads" round which they used to wind the turbans.

In 543 H. (1048 A.D.) Yahyā moved all the valuable material away from it in front of the advance of the Almohades, and Yāḵūt 82 somewhat later, says: "There were made in Kaš'a Ḥammūd, extremely good felts of Tīlaḵān (Tīlīḵān in Khurasan) (labābīd al-Tīlaḵān). The beautiful Kal'i robes (aksiya) of close weave and embroidered with gold (muṯārraẓ) were to be found. Their wool has a softness and luster, 83 so that with gold, they are esteemed as ibrism-silk." In this connection it is interesting to note that the Ḥammūdīs had an arsenal at the Kaš'a (dār al-ṣanā'a) as well as this tīrāz-factory, but the city declined after their time.

The chief port of the Maghreb in this area was the city of Bidjāya (Bougie) of which our anonymous geographer 84 says: "It is a great port where the ships from Rūm, Syria, and others of the most distant countries of Rūm, and ships of the Muslims from Alexandria with the rarities of the land of Egypt, Yemen, India, and China, etc., put in." This town according to Ibn al-Baĭtār 85 produced a dye Ardjikna (from a plant of that name): "The dyers get it from the Maghreb from the country surrounding Bidjāya and the best is that of Sétif. It is also known in Ifrīkiyya."

Seven days south of Bidjāya lay Tūbna where they had cotton, according to Ibn Ḥawkāl. 86 The same author tells us that: "Masīla is a new town founded by Ali ibn al-Andalusi, a servant of the family of 'Ubaid Allāh (the Fatimid). It grows cotton. 87 Mustaghānim according to Bakri 88 had cotton which made some beautiful articles, and Leo Africanus 89 remarks that there were artisans and weavers of stuffs there.

Tilimsān (Tlemcen) really began to flourish under the Almohades, and Bakri 90 remarks on its bazaars. Yāḵūt 91 knew that "the women in it make out of wool horse-cloths (kan-bāš) of various kinds which are not to be found elsewhere." The passage from Ibn Sa'id (ob. 673 H. [1274 A.D.]) mentioning a Tilimsāni cloth of pure wool, or of pure silk, with or without checks (mukḥattam) has already been cited. If the Sultan derived cloth from this city it is extremely likely that he had a tīrāz-factory there. According to the Encyclopaedia of Islam 92 it is still noted for horse-cloths.

AL-MAGHRIB AL- tờŠA

The chief city in this, the most outlying district of Islam in the West, during the period dyers obtain from the Maghreb, from the country surrounding Bougie (Bidjāya) and Sétif.

83 AL-Bakri, Description de l'Afrique, ed. de Slane, p. 143.
84 Leo Africanus, op. cit., III, 47.
85 AL-Bakri, op. cit., p. 156.
86 Yāḵūt, op. cit. I, 871.
of Muslim domination was Fez (Fāṣ) and this city, at one period at least, did possess ʿtirāz-factories, though from the description it is uncertain how far they were under palace control. It is likely that they made materials on commission of the palace officials, or official, but that their factories were independent of the sovereign. A certain amount of Persian influence may have been exerted on the early manufactures of Fez, because Idris, in founding it, established a group of Persians there from Iraq (probably ʿIrāk Aḍjamī) at ʿAin Allou, but the main trends of influence on local art probably came from Andalus with the immigrants of various periods. The Zahra al-ʿĀs remarks that about the year 462 H. (1069–70 A.D.) Yūṣuf ibn Tāshfin brought artisans from Cordova who restored or built numerous buildings at Fez.

Bakrī 93 found that the Jews were more numerous in Fez than in any other city in the Maghreb and it may have been partly due to this that it was such a noted dyeing center; all this part of Africa produced indigo. According to I. Epstein: 95 "The majority of the Jews eked out their living, mostly in huckstering and peddling amongst themselves as well as among their neighbors. The trade chiefly consisted in woollen goods—raw or manufactured, silks, scarlets, and other textile wares, dyers, wax, and ostrich-feathers." In a footnote he mentions blankets (тельня), dyers' woad (isatis tinctoria), and violets, purples. Yāḵūt 96 adds: "In Fez, purple-red (urdjūwān) and crimson (ḵirmizi) garments are dyed." Further, Benjamin of Tudela 97 actually remarks that in Thebes there were 2,000 Jews (that is to say families of Jews), mostly skilled artisans in silk and purple cloth, and throughout Greece. The connection of Jews with the ḵirmizi (crimson dye) has been noted before.

The Rawḍ al-Kirtās 98 tells us that "the dyers established themselves because of the proximity to the water, on the two sides of the tongue of land which divides the Wādī Kabir from its entry into the town as far as Roumelia ... Beyond, the fritter-fryers and makers of haiks established themselves." The Zahra al-Ās further adds that artisans and merchants of all lands come to Fez. 99

Both the Zahra al-Ās 100 and the Rawḍ al-Kirtās 101 have the same account of the factories there in Almohad times. In the light of what Ibn Khaldūn 102 noticed—that the Almohades were the first to drop the ʿtirāz-inscription, but that in later times, they re-adopted it—we might surmise that this took place under the two monarchs who are mentioned in the following passage: "In the time of the Almohad al-Manṣūr, and of his son Muhammad al-Nāṣir (580–610 H. [1184–1213 A.D.]) there were at Fez ... 467 fundūks (inns for merchants) ... 3094 houses of ʿtirāz (aṭrīza) ... and 116 dyehouses ... inside the walls." These ʿtirāz-factories were in the highest part of the town. Our information here is authentic because the author founds it upon a document which came from the archives of Fez itself.

96 Yāḵūt, op. cit., III, 842.
99 Al-Ghaznāʾi, op. cit., trans., p. 72.
100 Ibid., p. 81.
102 See Chapter I.
Considering the position in al-Maghrib al-Akṣā of Sīdjīlmāsā, founded in 140 H. (757–8, A.D.), it was surprisingly famous for its textiles. An unusual passage from Birūnī may help to explain the fame of Sīdjīlmāsā in Islam:

In the lands of the negroes are mines richer in output than any other region, containing pure gold; but the road thither is very toilsome on account of the deserts and sands, and because the inhabitants of those lands shrink from association with our people. For this reason the merchants of Sīdjīlmāsā, on the borders of Tāḥart in al-Maghrib al-Akṣā, provide themselves with sufficient provisions and plenty of water and carry to the negroes who live beyond the desert, Başra garments known as munaḥnahāt, their love of which they know well. These garments have red borders (atrāf) and are colored with various colors, and bordered (muʿallama) with gold. They sell them for gold, and by making signs from a distance, and by displaying them so that both parties agree.

The Başra intended is probably the Başra of the Maghreb. Idrīṣī tells us that “the people of this town have crops of cotton, cumin, caraway, and henna.” Yāḵūṭ seems well acquainted with its products: “ Its women have the hands of craftsmen in spinning wool of which they make all wonderful and strange kinds of lovely izārs surpassing the linen (ḳaṣāb) of Egypt. The price of an izār reaches thirty-five dinars or more, like the most expensive ḵaṣāb which is in Egypt. They make mantles (or hats, ḡafāra) of it, the price of which comes to about the same, and they dye it with various colors.” Leo Africanus of rather later date, adds that there are Jewish traders there.

Bakrī tells us of Yerara: “Leur laine qui est d’une qualité supérieure, s’emploie à Sīdjīlmāsā pour fabriquer des étoffes dont chaque pièce se vend à un prix qui dépasse vingt mithkâls (d’or).” He further mentions that their sheep are of a kind said to be from the island of Kīs in the Persian Gulf. The translation of Quatremère however, calls this place Ḥiṣn Badārā and informs us that these sheep came from Fars.

The other cities in al-Maghrib al-Akṣā, apart from Sīdjīlmāsā and Fez, seem to have been little known to the geographers and not of much interest as regards their textile products.

Of Wadjda (Ujda), the anonymous geographer says: “They say that from one of their sheep two hundred ounces of fat are taken. From their wool they make robes (aksiya) quite unequalled in quality, like the ‘Abidī kind, a single robe being worth fifty dinars or more.”

Sabta (Ceuta), according to Ibn al-Khāṭīb was “a very San’a of beautiful cloaks (ḥullā)" and a station for caravans of olive-oil (‘aṣīr), silk (ḥarīr), and linen (kattān).

 Başra is a place which has long disappeared. It is believed to have been founded toward the end of the ninth century and seems to have had some manufactures of cloth. Ibn Ḥaw-
kal 113 says: "It has much cotton produce which is taken to Ifriqiya and elsewhere." The anonymous geographer 114 adds: "It is also called Baṣra al-Kattān (Baṣra of the Linen) because its people trade in linen." Idrisi 115 also adds that its principal products consist of cotton. Yākūt 116 quotes 'Umari to say: "Baṣra used to be known as Baṣra al-Kattān, for they used, in early times, to perform all transactions with linen." The red Baṣri garments mentioned as being used in trade with the Negroes may have come from here.

At Salā (Salī), ships from Seville and Andalus used frequently to put in, according to Idrisi,117 while Ibn al-Khaṭīb 118 mentions that it "is a mine of cotton and linen." Leo Africanus 119 remarks that much cotton is produced from which the inhabitants of the town make "des toiles fort délicées et belles, qui est la cause qu’ils sont quasi tous tisserans en la cité." Ibn al-Khaṭīb 120 found that clothing (libās) is made at Azazzūr.

Marrāksh (Morocco) is poorly documented, and it is only as late as the Sa’dian dynasty that I have found any information about textiles there at all. The Nuzhat al-Hādī 121 tells of a palace called al-Bādi’ which was built by the monarch al-Manṣūr of that dynasty (986-1002 h. [1578-93 A.D.]): "One of the secretaries said: Curtains embroidered with gold, of perfect workmanship (sutūr muḍḥahhaha muḥkama al-ṣanā’a) were embroidered (ṭarraza) in it, so that the four sides of the Kubba al-Khamsīniya might be covered with them. These curtains were called by the Arabs ‘Ḥā’īti’." This carpet had four directions (djiḥāt), that is, probably, like prayer-carpets with their arched pattern in each of which were inscribed some verses which are given by the author.

South of Marrāksh we have a small group of towns which made some kind of cloth. Chief of these was Aghmāt from which, according to Idrisi: 122 "They send to the black country a large number of camels laden with red copper of various colors, robes (kisā’), woollen cloth, turbans, mantles (mi’zar), necklaces of glass beads, mother-of-pearl, stones, various drugs and perfumes, manufactured iron utensils." Northeast of Aghmāt were Dāi and Tādala. Idrisi 123 tells us that "Dāi is much visited by caravans. In it and the environs much cotton is cultivated, but less so than at Tādala which produces a considerable quantity which is exported in all directions. Nearly all the tissues (of cotton) used in the West Maghreb come from these lands. Because of this cotton they do not need to import any other kinds from other regions." In the territory of al-Sūs al-Akṣā “there are made in Sūs fine robes, and precious garments which cannot be made in any other country. . . . Their women have skill in craftsmanship.” The Safsārī garments of the modern Wādi Nūn in southwest Morocco have already been

115 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 72 ff.
116 Yākūt, op. cit., I, 653.
117 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 75.
118 Ibn al-Khaṭīb, in M. J. Müller, Beiträge zur Geschichte der westlichen Araber (München, 1876), I, 84.
119 Leo Africanus, op. cit., II, 37.
120 Ibn al-Khaṭīb, op. cit., I, 87.
121 Muhammad al-Ṣaghīr b. al-Ḥadīdī Muḥammad al-Wuṭrānī, Nuzhet el-Hādī, Histoire de la Dynastie Saadienne au Maroc (1511-1690), ed. and trans. by O. Houdas, P.E.L.O.V., III, II, 109, and III, 188. In a footnote the editor says, "La tenture dite Ḥā’īti se place derrière les sofas; les dessins qui les ornent représentent généralement des colonnades

avec arceaux et sont formés à l’aide de morceaux d’étoffes rapportés sur un fond uni."
122 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 66.
123 Ibid., text, p. 74 ff.
mentioned, as well as "burnooses a pair of which is worth fifty dinars." 124 Twelve days away from Aghmät and six from Fez was Sük Fansür 125 of which Bakri 126 says: "Black burnooses are made there of so close a weave that they are rain-proof."

Other inland cities which were mostly trading-centers for the Arabs with Africa are mentioned by most of the travelers in those regions, often with details of some considerable sociological and ethnological interest. Some of the more important are noted here.

Speaking of Iwälätan, Ibn Baṭṭūta 127 says: "This place is two complete months away from Sidjilmäsa and the first place in the negro country. . . . The garments of its inhabitants are lovely and imported from Egypt." Idrisi 128 remarks that Takrūr (French Toucoulou in Senegal) is larger and has more trade than Salā. The inhabitants of the west of al-Maghrib al-Åkšā take wool, copper, and glass beads there, and bring back gold and slaves. Gold was the only really important product of this part of Africa, and Maghribi gold is often mentioned in early authors and was used in embroidery.

Another famous city of this type was Awdåghast of which Bakri 129 says: "Garments with large skirts dyed red and blue are sent to this city." Yākūt 130 talks of its markets. It has now disappeared (it was fifty-one days from Sidjilmäsa).

124 Ibid., text, p. 59.
125 Quatremère’s edition of al-Bakri’s Description de l’Afrique has Fikür.
126 Al-Bakri, Description de l’Afrique, ed. de Slane, p. 294.
128 Idrisi, op. cit., text, p. 3.
129 Al-Bakri, op. cit., p. 301.
130 Yākūt, op. cit., I, 399. For this city see ‘Umari, ed. M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, op. cit., pp. 44 and 47, and G. Yver, “Andaglost,” Encycl. Islâm, I, 516. According to Yver this city is probably between long. 10 and 11 degrees west of Greenwich, southwest of the military station of Tidjika in French Mauretania.
CHAPTER XIX

SICILY

The island of Sicily was attacked by the Arabs in 212 H. (827 A.D.) by an expedition despatched from Sūsa by the Aghlabid ruler of Kairawân. A little after this Palermo, the capital, fell into Muslim hands. Only in 354 H. (965 A.D.) were the Muslims, who were composed of various racial elements, Arabs, Berbers, Spaniards, and others, really masters of the island.

In the year 300 H. (912-3 A.D.), the Caliph of Baghdad invested a certain virtually independent governor with the insignia of his approval as his deputy. The work entitled al-Bayân al-Mughrib 4 tells us that “the Caliph sent him the required investiture, and also standards and garments colored black, as well as a collar of gold.” A little over half a century later, Ibn Hawkal 5 speaks of a quarter in Palermo called al-Ḥāra al-Djadida, or The New Quarter, in which there were various markets including a Sūk al-Tirāzīyin, or Market of the Makers of Tirāz-stuffs. This quarter was presumably built some time after the capture of Palermo by the Muslims. Its foundation would then lie between that date and Ibn Hawkal’s notice (367 H. [978 A.D.]). The author remarks that the sultan has an arsenal (dār al-šanā’ā) there, and that there were places called “The Cotton-dealers” (kaṭṭā-nān), and the “Carders” (of cloth, ḥallāḏ-jūn).

Again he 6 says: “Its sole excellencies are wool, and goat-hair (ṣuḥr) . . . along with some linen garments, but it is only right that justice should be done to those, for they have no parallel in excellence and cheapness. The tailored kind, cut into two pieces of fifty to sixty quarters (rubā‘i)—some cloth measure?—is more expensive than the corresponding cloth sold at Mīṣr (Cairo), often at fifty to sixty dinars.” Makdisi 7 confines himself to remarking that “from Sicily come excellent close-woven (maṣṣār) garments;” but he also found that “from Amid there come garments of Rāmi wool and linen after the Sicilian manufacture.”

Nāṣir-i Khusraw 8 informs us that “Sicily belongs to the Sultan of Egypt, and they bring thence linen stuffs of great fineness, and pieces of cloth with borders (tafṣīlāh bā‘alam), each one of which is worth the sum of ten dinars in Mīṣr (Cairo).” The lady Raṭḥīda, the aunt of al-Ḥākim, who died during his reign (386-411 H. [997-1021 A.D.]) left, among other valuables, thirty thousand Sicilian pieces of cloth (ṣhīkka Ṣikiliya). 9

Idrisi 8 who should be in a position to inform us about Sicily as his book was written at the behest of his patron, the Norman Roger II, gives only the short note that at San Marco much silk (ḥarīr) is produced, and Milazzo (Milaṣ) produces linen.

The city of Palermo was taken by the

3 Ibid., p. 131.
5 Ibid., p. 145.
Normans in 464 H. (1071 A.D.) under Roger de Hauteville, and during their rule alone did Sicily have peace in which its people could rest secure. Arab culture continued to flourish, and it was even said that Roger himself was a Muslim. Travelers did not cease to visit the island, notably Ibn Djubair ⁹ (who performed the journey in 580 H. [1184 A.D.]). As an actual eye-witness, he was far better informed than other writers, and alludes to the ūtarz-factory there. Speaking of the castle of William the Good (1166–89), he says: “His above-mentioned servant whose name was Yahyā, one of the lads employed in the ūtarz-factory who used to embroider (ūtarz) with gold in the King's ūtarz, told us that the Frankish women become Muslims in his castle and are visited by the above-mentioned girls, but they keep that concealed from their king.”

Amari ¹⁰ opines that the ūtarz existed be-

¹⁰ Amari, loc. cit., notes: “Il suffit d'avoir lu un peu l'histoire de Sicile pour se rappeler qu'il existait dans le palais royal de Palerme, une manufacture d'étoffes de soie, fondée à ce que l'on dit, par le roi Roger, au moyen des ouvriers que sa flotte avait

fore Norman times, though it is popularly relat-
ed that the silk workers carried off by Rog-
er's (II) admiral from Thebes and Pelepon-
nesus in 441 H. (1149 A.D.) founded the factory. It was in Thebes that Benjamin noticed many Jewish dyers of purple cloth. The Norman-Arab factory is well known to historians, and the Répertoire chronologique cites examples of it products, one of which, composed of silk, is dated as early as 528 H. (1133–4 A.D.). It was made at the “King's Wardrobe” (khizāna al-malik) in the capital of Sicily (Madina al-Šīkiliya).⑪ Grohmann claims that Palermo produced finely woven stuffs up till the thir-
teenth century. The cultural influences seem to have been African rather than Spanish, though a vigorous trade was carried on with that country in Ibn Djubair's time.

fait prisonniers en Morée l'année 1149. Je suis
persuadé que cette manufacture existait longtemps avant, et que les captifs, hommes et femmes ne firent qu'augmenter le nombre des ouvriers.”

CHAPTER XX

ASIA MINOR OF MONGOL TIMES

The Seljuk conquest of Asia Minor in the eleventh century brought territory that had previously been Byzantine into the sphere of Islam (Map 3). Some disconnected fragments of information on the manufactures of those cities which were later to become so famous for their carpets, still remain. Abu '1-Fidä ¹ quotes Ibn Sa'id (ob. 673 H. [1274 A.D.]) concerning the Turkomans: "It is there that the Turcoman carpets (al-busút al-Tur-kumáníya) are made which are exported to all countries," Marco Polo says: ²

The other two classes (in Turconia besides the Turcomans) are the Armenians and Greeks, who live mixed with the former in towns and villages, occupying themselves with trades and handicrafts. They weave the finest and handsomest carpets in the world, and also a great quantity of fine and rich silks of cramoisy (kirmizi) and other colors, and plenty of other stuffs. Their chief cities are Konya (Kûniya), Savast (Slwäs), and Caesarin (Kaşaɾiya).

Mustawfî gives the following cities as producing cotton: Siwäs, Konya, Malatïya, Angora (Ankûra), Irbil, and Arzan.³

It is very probable that the Armenians, driven out of their native land into what is known as Lesser Armenia, brought with them many of their local manufactures which were so famed in the first centuries of Arab rule. Bidlîsî ⁴ tells us that some Armenians estab-

³ H. Yule, The Book of Ser Marco Polo, the Venetian (London, 1871), I, 45 f.
⁴ ʿUmari (700–48 H. [1301–48 A.D.]) ¹¹ tells us of the kingdom of Akîrâ south of
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TEXTILE CENTERS IN ASIA MINOR DURING THE MONGOL PERIOD

MAP 3
Sinoe, a province on the northern border of the dominions of the Urkhân, and with Djabal al-Ḳasis to the south of it. "From this country come inestimable quantities of silk (ḥarîr) and laudanum which are taken to the Christian countries. Its silk is quite equal to Byzantine (Rûmî) brocade and cloth (ḵumâsh) of Constantinople. Most of it is exported."

PIERRE BELON

This Frenchman published a book of travel in Paris in the year 1555 which contains some details of considerable interest about the Turkey carpets of his time: 12

Tous les tapiz coupez qu'on apporte de Turquie sont seulement faits depuis la ville de Cogne (Konía) en Cilicie, jusques à Carachara, ville de Paphlagonie. Nous avons dit que les fins chamelots sont faits de pois de chevres à Angouri, qui est la première ville de Cappadoce: et les tapiz sont aussi faits de pois de chevres: mais ceux qu'on fait au Caire, ne sont guere beaux, car ils sont seulement tissuz en toile bigarée (the latter word may be the equivalent of the Arabic Abû Kâlamûn). Ceux de Adena sont faits en feutres, fort legers et mols, à se coucher dessus. . . . Les femmes Iuifs, qui ont liberté d'allier le visage descouvert, sont communément par les marchez de Turquie, vendents des ouvrages faits à l'aiguille. 13 . . . Elles vendent ordinairement serviettes, mouchoeurs, couurechefs, ceintures blanches, souilles d'orilliers et autres tels ouvrages de plus grande valeur comme pavillons de liens en diverses façons que les Iuifs achetent pour vendre aux estrangres. Les Turcs


13 Though he says that Turkish women do sometimes sell goods despite the law.

prennent plaisir à avoir du linge blanc, et bien ouvré tellement qu'ils ne plairont à y faire despence. L'on voira vendre deux petits mouchiers ouvrez vingt aspés, desquels nous ne presenterions six sols au pays de France. L'on fait divers ouvrages sur le linge en Turquie, mais le plus commun est tel, que quand elles le veulent piquer, il faut premierement qu'elles dessignent la toile de peinture: laquelle puis suyent entre deux fils, tellement que l'ouvrage représente la peinture. Nous n'avons point telle maniere d'ouvrage en usage, ne la maniere de piquer. Car les femmes suyuent l'entredoux des fils avec une aiguille fort delée, en suyant la peinture, elles font leurs ouvrages de diverses colours de soye. A peine pourroit on croire en noz pays que l'ouvrage sur le linge est bien recu et tenu cher en Turquie: et que l'on y en fait grande quantité. La raison est, que puisque les femmes sont ordinairement enfermées et qu'elles n'ont aucun mesnage à faire, aumoins qu'elles emploient à faire quelque chose. Et elles n'ayant le filer en grand usage, passent leur temps à faire ouvrages en linge.

Of the silk manufactures of Turkey, he says: 14

Les Turcs quelques habillements qu'ils facent, ou de drap, de soye, chamelot, ou Moncayar: ils les cou- sent de fine soye, et font cousure qui dure plus que le drap. Nous osons dire que les habillements qui sont cousus en Turquie ne sont nullement cousus que de fil de soye qui principalement est filé à Bourca (Broussa). Les cousuriers de Turquie, si l'on fait comparaison de leurs ouvrages à ceux qui sont cousus en Europe, cousent toutes besognes mieux et plus elegament que ne font ceux du pois des Latins, tellement que l'on diroit que l'ouvrage d'Europe n'est que ravavdage au pris de leur: car quelque chose que ce soit, est si proprement reprises qu'on n'en voit point les coustures, et quelque ouvrage qu'ils faient, est si bien fait qu'on n'en scaurait que redire.

14 Belon, op. cit., fol. 204 a.
CHAPTER XXI

SEA-WOOL

IN SPAIN AND NORTH AFRICA, A CERTAIN kind of cloth was made out of the threads of a large mollusk called Pinna marina, a genus of bivalve mollusks having a silk byssus or beard. This was known to the Arabs under the name of "sea-wool" (ṣūf al-bahr). According to Dozy, this kind of manufacture was as ancient as classical times and, indeed, is still practiced in Italy. Ignorant of the precise nature of this stuff, the Arab authors make some curious mistakes in their allusions to it. The earliest and most correct author who has heard of it is Iṣṭakhrī who says:

In Ṣantantin (Santarem), at a certain time of the year, an animal comes forth from the sea, and rubs itself on the stones of the seashore and a down (wabar) as soft as khazz-silk with a golden color, lacking in nothing, falls off it. It is fine and small, and garments are woven from it which take on different colors during the day. The Umayyad kings (of Spain) used to put restrictions upon it, so that it was only exported secretly. The price of a garment is worth more than a hundred dinars, on account of its fineness and beauty.

This passage is reproduced in Makdisi with some additional details:

The marvels of this province (the Maghreb including Spain) are many, one of them being Abū Kalamān. It is an animal which rubs itself on the banks of the seashore so that its down (wabar) falls from it. It is soft like khazz-silk, of a golden color, lacking nothing of that, and it is fine to the touch. It is collected and garments are woven of it which take on various colors during the day. The sultan prevents the export of it to other countries, apart from that which is hidden from them. Sometimes the value of a garment of it reaches a thousand dinars.

This "sea-wool" has already been mentioned among the gifts which Maḥṣūr gave to the Christian princes in Spain in 387 H. (997 A.D.), but as compared with the 2285 pieces ofṭirāzī silk, there were only 21 pieces of this fabric.

Under the notice on the city of Saragossa, Yāḵūt informs us that the inhabitants were specially skilled in the manufacture of the sable (sammūr) which he seems to think is a woven stuff made in their factories and called Sarāḵūsī stuff after it. The same confusion exists in Maḵkārī who cites al-Ḥīdjarī (of the early twelfth century): "The sammūr (sable) from the down of which the valuable furs are made, is found in the Atlantic (al-Bahr al-Muḥīṭ) in Andalus in the direction of the island of Britain, and imported to Saragossa where it is manufactured." In this passage he seems to be talking of the seal, but he quotes another author: "When Ibn Ghālib mentioned the down of the sable which is manufactured in Cordova, he said: 'As regards this above-mentioned sable, I am uncertain what is meant by the term, whether it is a plant there, or the down of the known animal. If it is the known animal it is in the sea and comes to the land. It has great power of distinction.'" Both Maḵkārī and Yāḵūt quote similar legends about this animal, which, I think, must refer to the Pinna marina.

The other province where this stuff was made was Africa in the town of Ṣafāḵus, which was a noted textile-manufacturing city also.


4 Yāḵūt, Muḍjam al-Buldān, Geographisches Wörterbuch, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Leipzig, 1866-73), III, 78.
5 Maḵkārī, Analactes sur l'histoire et la littérature des arabes en Espagne, ed. R. Dozy and others (Leyden, 1855-61), I, 121.
'Umari, quoting an earlier source shows us the wide area where those garments were used:

The Sultan (of Ifriqiya), according to Ibn Ban-nūn, is distinguished from other people by wearing garments of khazz-silk of a black-green color named nut-colored (Djawzi), dust-colored (ghubā'ī) and Naftī (from the town of Nafta). This silk is extracted from the sea, says Ibn Sa'id, at Ṣafākus in the Maghreb and I have seen how it is gathered. Divers dive into the sea and bring out tubers like onions with a kind of neck which has hairs on the upper part. These tubers like onions, burst, and let forth hairs (threads) which are combed and become like wool. They spin it and make a woof of it so as to pass a warp of silk through it. They make a checked (mukhattam) stuff or stuff without checks. The most magnificent royal garments at Tunis are made of them. The price of a garment sometimes reaches a thousand dinars of Egyptian or Syrian money. I may add that I have seen high secretaries of the offices of Damascus wearing those garments, then I saw them worn at Cairo by the secretaries. It is what the Egyptians call fish-down (wabar al-samak).

The traveler Tīdījānī (703–8 h. [1306–9 A.D.]6) confirms this: "There is found in its (Ṣafākus) seas, the wool of which the fine tissues destined to be worn by the princes are manufactured." It is probable that wherever there were manufactures of this sea-wool, there were also ūirāz-factories belonging to the reigning monarch for it seems to have been a royal monopoly. Perhaps it is that material which Dimashki6 intends when he talks of a fish which is dried and made into cotton and clothes called s m kin are made of it. This fish was found in the Yemen Sea.

6 Cf. Kalkashandi, Subh al-'Aṣwāh (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), V, 142.
CHAPTER XXII
TECHNICAL METHODS

The Arab and Persian authors display little interest in manufacturing processes and the earlier the author the truer this statement is. However the manuals of hisba have preserved some indications of the technical methods of the craftsmen of their time, and this is specially true in regard to silk. We have several accounts of the rearing of the silk-worm in the works of naturalists. The following is Kazwini’s version of the process:

An account of the silk-worm (dûd al-kazz). It is a small animal which, when it has been sufficiently looked after, seeks its natural habitat among trees and thorns. It passes fine threads from its saliva, and weaves a cocoon round itself like a bag so as to obtain protection from heat and cold, wind and rain. It sleeps until a certain time—all that by instinct. The nature of its preservation is one of the wonders of the world. It takes place in this wise, that, at the beginning of Spring (Rabi’), when the mulberry leaf appears, they take the eggs and tie them in a rag, then the women place this under their breasts so that the heat of the body may affect them for a week, then they are spread on some mulberry leaves shredded with the scissors. The thing moves and eats some of this leaf; then it eats no more for three days, and they say that it is in its first sleep. Then it starts eating again, and eats for a week, then leaves off eating for three days, and they say that it is in its second sleep. The same happens once more, and they say that it is in its third sleep.

After that a great deal of fodder is allowed to it so that it may eat largely and begin to form the cocoon (failâj). Thereupon something like the web of the spider appears upon its body. If rain falls at this period, the cocoon becomes soft with the moisture of the dampness so that the worm pierces it and comes forth from it. When the worm has completed the formation of the cocoon it is exposed to the sun so that the worm may die in it, and the ibrism-silk be taken from the cocoon. Some of the cocoons however are left for the worm to pierce them and come forth to lay eggs. These are collected and preserved for the coming year in a clean pot of clay (khazaf) or glass. Ibrîsm-silk garments are useful against itch and rubbing, and do not breed lice.1

Damiri somewhat amplifies this account of which the most important parts are extracted and set forth here:

It comes forth in warmish localities without being hatched if it is tied up in a purse or placed in a casket. Sometimes it is late in coming out, upon which the women tie it up and place it under their breasts. . . . A white rug is placed to catch the eggs of the females. After this both die. That is what is done if it is desired to have the eggs, but if it is desired to have the silk, ten days after its finishing the process of weaving a cocoon, it is left in the sun for a day or part of a day, upon which it dies. . . . Sometimes it is squeezed with the hand until it dies, so that the silk may not be torn and it may come off entire.2

Miskawaih3 hints at a machine for spinning silk, but unfortunately, the text is not really altogether precise.

“Have you ever seen the ibrism-silk spinner winding it (silk ?) on a number of distaffs (mîghzal) attached to hooks on polo-sticks (sawladjân) (as it were) of glass? I said I had—he went on: Do you not know that all the trouble of the worker consists in setting up and arranging the machine; after that he has only to watch the tails of the distaffs and keep on twisting them? Now we have arranged the machines, the distaffs that are revolving, the silk is taut, and the winding is proceeding; but if we leave the place, the force of the revolution will weaken, there being no motor power to renovate it; it will begin to slacken, the velocity of the revolution of the distaff will be reduced, and they will begin to unwind, revolving to the inverse direction. No one will be there

1 Kazwini, el-Cazwini’s Kosmographie, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1846-48), I, 434.
to attend them, so that, one by one, they will fall off, and finally none remain.

 Regulations for the manufacture of spindles are to be found in Ibn 'Abdûn: “The muḥtasib must prevent the weavers (ghazzāl) from nailing the iron of the spindles (mīghzal) for they come out by the loosening effect of what is being spun from them, very soon, and that is a cause of their crookedness.” Other regulations are given by the Maʿālim al-Kurba: “Spindle-makers. They must not use any wood for spindles (mīrdan) other than that of the sīsām, or red mimosa nilotica (sant), free of knots and worm. For if it is hollow and a woman spins with it, it breaks straightaway. The same applies to the copper (naḥās) used therein, which must be hammered brass (naḥās aşfār maḏrūb). They must not make them hollow but solid.”

The same author informs us about further processes in the preparation of silk:

Silk-makers. Raw silk (ḥārir al-ḵazz) must not be dyed before being bleached in order that it may not afterwards deteriorate. But some do it in order to get an increase in weight. Some mix Syrian silk (al-ḥārir al-Ṣaʿāmi) with local (baladi) silk and sell it as Syrian; and they mix dyed ḵazz-silk with dyed ḵāṭārīsh (silk ?). Some weight silk with prepared starch, others with melted butter or olive-oil. Some mingle with the seīn a quantity of some other material for purposes of fraud.

Dyers. Most dyers of red silk (ḥārir) and other thread and materials, dye in their workshops (hānūt) with henna instead of madder (fuwwa) and the dye appears bright; but when the sun strikes it, its color deteriorates and its brightness disappears. Some take money from a customer to dye kuḥli (a dark blue verging on black). They dip the stuff into a substance called djarrāda (locust), remove and treat it with froth from the vat and return it to the owner. It is not long before it reverts to its original color. On each article, the owner’s name must be written in ink lest it be changed for something else. Most dyers pledge their customers’ property or hire it to persons who wear it. This is dishonesty.6

Thus speaks the Egyptian author of the latter half of the thirteenth century, and similar material is to be found in the Spanish manual of ḥisba by al-Saḵṭaṭi of Malaga about the close of the eleventh century.7

“Another fraudulent practice in the manufacture of veils (ḵūnū) of silk, and turbans of twisted silk (‘amāʿim maftūla?) or turbans twisted in a ready-made form,8 is that they make them of raw silk (ḥārir nāy), dye them kuḥli, and pour gum (ṣamgh) on them. That is fraud and trickery, because, when worn a little, the threads give, and the fabric becomes like a net of no use to anybody.” In this connection it might be well to quote Bakri who lived about the same period: “At Awdāghast one sees gum-trees whose products are sent to Spain where they are used to glaze (lustrer) silken stuffs (diḥādj).” 9

Despite the injunctions of the muḥtasibs, this seems to have been a recognized practice of weavers for we find a description of it in the Arabian Nights10 where the scene is set in Khurasan, though the final form of this work took shape in Mameluke Egypt:

On the following morning the dansel took the curtain (she had told her lover to buy “a piece of

6 Ibid., No. 176.
8 Compare the turbans made at Kaṭa’ Ḥammād (Chapter XVIII, note 79), perhaps after this type.
silk as much as will suffice for a curtain, and gold and silver thread [kašab aşfar wa-abyād] and silk thread of seven different colors”) and worked a border to it (tarraza) with colored silk, and embroidered (zarkasha) it with the kašab, and placed a girdle in the world that she omitted to portray upon it. She continued working upon it for eight days and when it was finished she cut it and glazed it 11 and then gave it to her master, saying to him: “Repair with it to the market, and sell it for fifty pieces of gold.”

The passage seems to portray a Persian rather than an Egyptian scene, but whatever the case may be it confirms the supposition that a great many of the finest fabrics were made in private houses by the women.

Again we must turn to the work of Al-Saḫati for information about silk tailoring and marketing: 13

Now the silk-brokers have a kind of trick for raising the price in their selling and buying. It lies in that they sell, and then buy from another, and take both commissions, one from the seller for selling, and one from the buyer for buying. They raise the price of silk when it is being put up for sale, their aim being merely to sell it to others, not to buy it themselves. This is how they act with silk garments (harir), selling them for ready cash, and on credit. They add borders (rasm) of gold for that is a sought-after thing therein, and a piece of silk is valued according to the two borders. All this is profiteering (riba’), which is against the law.

Another of their fraudulent practices is that the first border (rasm) of the garment does not resemble the second in fineness of gold, pleasing workmanship and excellence of manufacture. The garment is lacking in wool (kašiyim) and of little worth for making into garments, and sometimes its length and breadth are too short, and things after this fashion. The usual size is sixteen dhīrā‘ in length and four spans (šabr) in breadth. It used to be made in fifty-two baits (divisions of a weaver’s comb), and weigh from sixteen ounces. Sometimes it is less, but that is fraudulent and criminal. Material which is less than forty-two

11 This term “saḫala” might mean “to iron,” though it is translated thus by Lane as “glaze.”
13 Much of the translation of this author is at present uncertain, owing to the many strange words he uses.
14 Al-Saḫati, op. cit., p. 62.

baits in the loom, and lighter than eleven ounces in weight, is bad, and the manufacture of it must be prohibited, and must be cut if found.

Linen thread differs from silk (harir) thread in the loom (mimsajj). Whatever is fine has many baits and is light in weight, that being because silk thread is all of one kind, but linen thread is of many kinds. The bait consists of forty teeth, and the number of threads is eighty, and the threads of the warp (‘mulaḥa) are one hundred and twenty. 15

Al-Saḫati, Ibn ‘Abdūn and the Ma‘ālim al-Kurba all contain regulations for the tailors. The first tells us:

The muhtasib must watch over the tailors to see that they do not sew with one thread only, nor yet with a whole (length of) thread, because it cannot be strong on account of its length, and the sewing will be loose. He must be on the watch for loose stitching of robes of cloth by the makers of garments “to order.” Moreover there have been cases of persons who have fraudulently put sand in the hollow of the plate of the balance and taken cloth to the amount of that weight.

He must watch the “cutting” (taṣīr), for there are some rascals among them who cut out the whole (correctly) but curtail those parts of the garment which correspond to the hips and the waist. They act in a similar fashion with regard to the rectangular pattern in which the garment is placed, so that it is narrow, and the cloth thus cut is stolen. Similarly they make the sleeves of the cloth of the robe (ṭawwab al-kisā’) too narrow, and tack the sewing in it, wishing to make it (appear) bigger. When the robe is worn a little the threads escape, the various sections of it fall apart, and the purchaser is at a loss. Similarly they make the necks (tawk) of linen garments wide so as to appear complete on inspection. On being worn they hang down the side of the body of the wearer. 16

Ibn ‘Abdūn further says:

He (the muhtasib) must prevent the kamd (action de donner le cati) of the garment of w r gh nāl (an unknown stuff) for it can scarcely be free from defects. He must place the control of that in the
hands of a man skilled in the art of ḥiṣāya (the trade of the maker of padded or thick garments).

He must prevent the workers at this trade (ḥaṣṣhā') and furriers (farā') from making the openings at the neck of robes very wide; for they only do that so that the robe may lie flat on the wearer though it is too short. He must prevent the ḥaṣṣhā' from making the front parts of a furred robe (maḳādim) of the padded garments (mahāšūj), too long.

If they make the cotton equal it is a fraud and a deceitful practice. It is necessary that ordinary silk should be sewn with a very thick thread for it is very fine and breaks easily.  

The Ma'ālim al-Kurba says:

Tailors must be ordered to cut out properly and shape the neck (tawḳ) well, to make the ornamental borders (taẓārīs) wide, the sleeves of equal length, and the skirts even. Raised seams are better than tacking. The needle is to be fine and the thread contained in the eye short—a long one frays and weakens. A valuable piece of stuff must be measured before it is cut out. Valuable stuff like silk or brocade must be accepted by weight only, and when the tailor has sewn it he must return it with the same weight to its owner. . . . Some will impregate a piece of silk or the like with water and salt in order to increase its weight to correspond with what they receive. . . .

If a customer brings a piece of stuff with orders, that if it is sufficient, it is to be made into a shirt, and the tailor cuts it without measuring and then finds it insufficient, the amount payable is the difference in value between the cloth as it was whole, and after it was cut.

Repairers (raffā') must not repair a khazz-silk garment received from a fuller or cloth-beater (daḳ-kḳāk) except in the owner's presence. Embroiderers (muṭṭārīz) and ornament-stitchers (raḳṭām) must not transfer embroidery (raḳm) from one garment to another which fullers or cloth-beaters may bring them. . . . On each garment the owner's name must be written.

During the course of this work various kinds of cloth have been mentioned without any exact specification as to their precise nature. Some of these stuffs are described in the

Maḥāsin al-Tidjāra, but even here the description is vague.  

Of ibrism-silk, the author says: "The best variety is pure and lovely-colored in kind, free of all variations (in color or texture) and stains which confuse some of its threads. The thread should be of one shape, and not some coarse and some fine, nor bulging. Good quality is recognised by the heaviness in weight and whenever I have seen a web (luhma) of a heavy weight, it is better."

It seems to have differed from khazz-silk which he describes as follows:

Indications as to its quality are sought in its fringes (hudb) so as you may ascertain the strength of its warp (sadā). By touching it one seeks to ascertain the quality of the tissue (nasādī). Perception of its color adds to one's knowledge of the warp and the quality (lams). The largest size that it ought to be is fifteen ḍhirā' by a breadth of four spans (ṣibr), but what is lesser is good. The best variety is that which has a close weave, is heavy in weight, and most closely resembles the asmaṭū (?) in its body (dīsm). The worst variety is that which has a weak warp, is light in weight, lax of texture, pale of color, and of bad silk (ḥarīr).

Dibāj (brocade) he describes in the following terms:

There are various kinds. There is a kind used for clothing, another that is required for hangings and carpeting (farṣḥ). The best variety is that which has a lovely dye (ṣibgh), a well-composed design (nuḳūṣ), the silk (ḥarīr) of which is fine, the texture close, the color of which is bright, the weight heavy, and which is free of burns in the process of smoothing. The cheapest variety is that which lacks these qualities. The best variety for tailoring (taṣīl) is 120 spans (ṣibr); the kind used for carpeting (farṣḥ) and for hangings is a cloth (ṭāwīb) of two hundred spans (ṣibr). If it is less than the kind usually used for a garment (kiswa) being less than enough in size, it is the greatest of faults for in that

18 Mughaddād, "swollen with anger."
case it cannot be cut and cannot be used. If a piece of cloth should be found of a similar kind nobody will allow a piece to be cut from that for it. 20

Of sıklätün, "attäbi and "cloth of one color" (muşmat) which seem to be of the same nature, he says: "The best of all those is that which is made with the ḥaff (some kind of weaver’s instrument), and not with the comb. In quality of silk and conditions it follows what has been described under brocade." 21

The stuffs naşäfi (usually made in Baghdad) and striped stuffs (abrâd) are the subject of a long notice:

The best kind of these is that which is free of blemishes and đaşhtaka. The meaning of đaşhtaka is that a robe should be worn unbleached (kjam) with its two selvages (haşbihya) joined, and it is sewn so that it becomes like the cloak (ridî). Or it is used, then split and washed. Thus after profiting by its use, they seek that its coarseness should be lessened and that it should acquire softness, but the person who wears it does not gain any advantage by that at all. The way in which đaşhtaka is recognised is that you look at rough garments and find them cut, and when you look at them to see through them you find places in them which have become so thin that they can almost be opened, and thick places. You look at the selvages and find them unsound because there are marks of the tailor in them. The quality of striped cloaks (burd) and napkins (füta) and ʿattäbi is perceived by the threads of different colors. If some of them run into others and they differ in fineness, thickness, and bulge, then they are bad. If they are correct and properly arranged in stripes (ṭârika) this indicates good thread (ghazl) and excellent weave (nasal), and good laundering. 22

The naşäfi seems to have been a robe of white silk and was used by the Mamelukes, but as far as I know it was not an early type of material. 23

The brocade-stuff known as buzûyn is sometimes mentioned by our authors, but it seems generally to have been a Byzantine (Rümî) fabric and is enumerated by Ibn al-Faḳih among a list of imports obtained by the venturesomeness of merchants. 24 ʿDjähiz describes the various kinds of this brocade:

The best buzûyn-brocade is the miski (muscolored or musk-scented) of fine weave, then the striped (muḥḥattat) variety, then the robe which is embroidered with little circles like copper coins (muפתח), then the plain variety (without gold-ṣāḥib), then the robe embroidered with eyes (like those of wild animals—muʿaṭîyan), then the spotted kind (muṇaḳḳat). The mantle (or head-dress ǧihfârâ) of a musk-color when of fine workmanship and pure, sometimes fetches fifty dinars in price. 25

This buzûyn, like the Armenian stuffs and Maisâni, was never interwoven with gold.

Various kinds of stuffs of this nature can, I think, be seen in the miniatures of the so-called "Mesopotamian School" of painting. In plate IV of Blochet’s Musulman Painting, for instance, the figure on the extreme left may be wearing a checked (muḥḥattam) stuff. In plate VII, the Chinese slave may be wearing a robe of the type named mudannar (ornamented with golden coins), or mufallas (ornamented with copper coins). Again, the youth in plate XXII, and Ibis in plate XXXII may be wearing muḥḥattam (checked) robes. Doubtless a study of the figures in the pottery of Rayy and other districts would yield quite a number of identifications of textiles which we only know at present by name. 26 Some of the textiles in Blochet have ṭirâzi arm-bands.

22 See the plates in E. Blochet, Musulman Painting, trans. by C. M. Binyon (London, 1929).
TIIRAZ INScriptions

A great many garments bore tiraz-inscriptions of an official or sometimes sentimental nature, and a number of verses of this latter kind have been preserved by two authors, Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, and al-Washsha' author of Kitab al-Muwashsha which is unanswerable. While it is impossible to quote more than one or two of those verses here, it would be fruitful to notice the varied selection of articles of apparel on which it was customary to embroider them. This fashion was not confined to Baghdad, or even to Iraq, but was spread all over Islam and imitations of such ornamental borders are even found in Christendom just as well. The 'Ik'd gives the following verse which a lover wrote upon the brow of his mistress, but it is typical of those found in the tiraz-borders and cited there:

Across her brow with musk
Three lines I traced, as stray
Soft moon-entangled clouds;
"God curse those who betray."
Then took her hand and said,
"List what it has to say.
All things but faithlessness
Love can dissolve away." 27

The same author tells us, on the testimony of an eyewitness, that in Harun al-Rashid's court there were girls wearing headdresses ('iṣāba, a kind of turban), decked with pearls and jačint, with verses written upon them. Another of these girls wore a crescent on the front of her dress with verses inscribed in it, and a slave of al-Mutawakkil had a gown (kabā') also inscribed. Other articles which bore such lovers' verses were tunics (kurtuk), kalansuwa-caps, girdles (mintak), and shirts (dir') of raw silk (khām).

The Kitāb al-Muwashsha gives an even more varied selection on all kinds of clothing. We read of a girl who wears a cloak (ridā') embroidered with an all-over pattern with circles like eyes (mu'aiyan) and a tiraz-border; there is another with a blouse (kamiş) of mulham-stuff, girt with an ornamented belt of gold (üşhā), both the belt and the sleeves having a tiraz-inscription. 28 Another girl had a gown (durrā') of mulham-stuff with ornaments of ibrism-silk, and a collar (lubna) of süsandjird upon which there was an inscription as well as on the sleeves. It seems too that Rashidi cloaks (ridā') bore these inscriptions, and also miṭraf-cloaks of khazz-silk.

Al-Washsha' tells us that a slave girl belonging to one of Ma'mūn's sons had a kalansuwa-cap of brocade embroidered after this fashion with verses, while Djāhiṣ saw a girl's headdress (karzan) and iṣāba each bearing couplets in gold. Even the wiḳāya (a band to hold the hair in place) was ornamented.

Again he talks of belts (zunnār), trouser-cords (tikka), and kerchiefs (or napkins, mandil) which latter lovers used to send as presents to one another, all bearing inscriptions. The zunnār was a name applied to the bands used to tie up the hair also (zunnār al-wiḳāya).

The furnishings of the houses of private (and wealthy) individuals also had these amatory verses marked upon them. We read of curtains (sutūr), pillows (washda and mikhadda), carpets (busūt), and cushions marāfiq of this kind, and he further mentions a curtain of azure silk (killa ḥarir asmāndjūni) with a gold inscription. He includes verses which were seen on a curtain belonging to one of the children of Mutawakkil, and upon curtains belonging to al-Hādi ibn al-Mahdi. At this early date there were even prayer-carpets (muṣallā) with such inscriptions. 29

27 Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, al-'Ik'd al-Farid (Cairo, 1331 H. [1913 A.D.]), IV, 370 ff.
29 Ibid., pp. 176, 177, 178.
LINEN

A very complete account of the preparation of the flax is to be found in Ibn ‘Awwâm in his treatise on agriculture, but as it is very long and the process does not materially differ from that in use in most countries, it has not been given here. However a short passage from the Mahâsin al-Tidjâra might be worth quoting: “Many articles have various requirements, as in the case of flax (kattân) which, after wetting and maceration, must have the dust shaken off it, and must be beaten and combed (mašâta), spun and prepared (ta-bâkha) followed by other processes of weaving.”

The Ma’âlim al-Kurba says: “The best Egyptian flax is the white (?) dj nawi variety, and the best variety of that is the smooth-leaved, and the worst the short rough variety which snaps easily. The poor quality must not be mixed with the good nor that from Lower Egypt with that from Upper Egypt, nor that from Upper Egypt with the Kâri variety; all such practices being fraudulent.”

COTTON

The Mahâsin al-Tidjâra says: “Its quality is perceived by weighing through weight, that which is lightest indicating that it contains the least amount of seed, and by inspection through its whiteness and freedom from husks (kushra), by easy falling apart, and touch, by resilience and softness.”

There is a somewhat similar passage in the Ma’âlim al-Kurba:

Cotton-spinners. They must not mingle new cotton with old, nor red with white. The cotton must be carded frequently so that the black husks and broken seeds shall be removed. If the seed is allowed to remain it shows in the weight, and if left in a djubba (mantle) or blanket (lihâf), and washed and beaten, it will cut the article and the people’s clothes will suffer damage. Some card the bad red cotton and place it at the bottom of the pile with clean white cotton on top and this does not appear in the spinning. The carded cotton when finished, must not be placed in cold wet places, for that increases its weight which diminishes when it dries. That is fraud.

FELTS

Al-Sâkaṭî of Malaga says: “He (the muḥtasib) must watch that the makers of felts (lubûd) do not make them of the wool of any thing that has died of itself. That is to be perceived by the difference in smell. Nor must they be made from the wool of the heads. That is to be perceived by its coarseness. They are made to seem good, and gum (ṣamgh), not starch (nashâ), is poured (onto them).”

He gives specifications as to the required length, breadth, and weights of the felts, but unfortunately there is a lacuna here in each of the manuscripts. Ibn ‘Abdûn knows a similar regulation: “The felt-makers (labbâd) must be ordered to perform their work well for they make them (the felts) lax, not close together, with little wool, and quite useless. The wool must be shaken thoroughly free of gypsum.”

The Ma’âlim al-Kurba of Egyptian origin adds:

A trustworthy member of their profession must be placed in charge of them. He must prevent them from using the wool of anything that has died of itself. That is distinguishable by its softness and ill-odor. Further, he must prevent them from using the wool of the heads—this is recognised by its roughness. The weight of a red felt must be four raṭîs, and a blue one and a red saddle-felt (mirṣâhâ) a raṭî and a half. The thread of all felts must be well

---

31 Dja’far ibn Ali al-Dimâšqî, op. cit., p. 4.
34 Ibn al-Ukhûwwa, op. cit., No. 177.
35 Al-Sâkaṭî, op. cit., p. 68.
The *Maḥāsin al-Tidjàra* written by a Damascen, says:

The choicest variety is the kind with a fine weave, strong web, and pleasing color, and which is strong on account of the amount of its rubbing, and the wool of which is soft. The sign of softness is that when looked at from behind it is a uniform piece without any thin or thick place. The worst kinds are these which are contrary to these qualifications. He must be on the look-out for dust in them. They become worm-eaten when they remain some time without being used.”

According to Djāḥiz:

“The best felts are the Chinese (sbin), then the red Maghribi variety, then the white Ṭālīkān felts, then the Armenian variety, and then the Khurasan kind.

**VARIOUS NOTES**

Of the two varieties of large carpets, called bisāt and tinīsa, the *Maḥāsin al-Tidjàra* says: “The best are those, the dye of which (sbin) is good, and which are of close weave, and which from outside are firmer than from inside. For laxness indicates looseness of weave. As regards softness of wool, it is a good quality in all kinds.”


Of Ḳalansuwa-caps, the *Maʿālim al-Ḳurba* tells us: “The makers of ḳalansuwa-caps must use new pieces of stuff, either of silk or linen and not old dyed pieces. For there are some who (fake) that by starch (nashā) and gum (ṣamgh).”

The following general regulations are to be found in the *Maʿālim al-Ḳurba* and seem to apply to all kinds of cloth:

Regulations for Weavers (ḥāka).

The stuff must be well-woven, compact in texture, and of the full length, breadth and workmanship agreed upon, the thread to be made free of black husks (ḳuṣhra) by means of rough black stone. The muḥtasib must prevent them from sprinkling flour and roasted gypsum over it when it is woven to hide its roughness and so that it may appear as if closely woven and of good quality. . . . He must enjoin them, when they weave a new piece of stuff, not to dye the thread until it has been bleached, but no black thread should be bleached for it turns yellow and does not hold any (color), to the loss of the purchaser. There are some who weave the surface of the cloth of good and uniform thread, and the rest of a different kind. . . . When a weaver receives thread from a man for weaving him a garment he must take it by weight. When he has woven it he must return it to its owner by weight so as to ward off suspicion. If the owner of the thread claims that the weaver has changed the thread, and if he has a sample of the thread but the weaver declares it is the same, the muḥtasib must take them before persons of experience. If he has no sample or proof, the weaver shall swear that he has not changed it.

41 Ibn al-Uḳhūwva, ṭp. *cit.*, No. 175.
42 Ibid., No. 171 a ff.
CHAPTER XXIII
DYERS

Throughout the previous chapters incidental notes on dyeing have appeared scattered here and there, but the strange and prominent fact is that in all Muslim countries, the Jews seem to have been the principal workers in this craft though it was not confined to them alone. Djähiz tells us that "the kırmız is a grass in the root of which there is a red worm, which grows in three places in the world—in the Maghreb quarter, in the land of Andalus, and in a district called Tārum (part of Shiraz), and in the province of Fars. Nobody can recognize this grass and where it is likely to be found except a sect of the Jews who have charge of plucking it each year in Māh-İsfandārmūd." ¹ Thus the Jews possessed trade secrets unknown to other peoples, and obtained a certain monopoly in the art. The best of this kırmız, according to Ibn al-Ba‘ītār comes from Asia, Cilicia, but more especially from Spain.² Bar Hebraeus ³ tells us that: "the behavior of the Arabs hath long been manifest in the world, and up to the present day no Jew hath ever been raised to a position of exalted honor amongst them; and except as a tanner or dyer, or tailor (the Arab ⁴) doth not appear among the Jews."

⁴The translation (which in general is admittedly unreliable) is probably incorrect here and the word "Arab" suggested by the translator should be deleted. The sense of the passage is thus altered to convey that the Jews exercise only the three above-named professions. In Southern Arabia to the present day these three professions are exercised by the Jews.

Benjamin of Tudela gives us the exact number of (families of) Jews in the various places he visited.⁵ They were to be found in Brindisi, Bethlehem, Beit Nuba (near Ramle where there was the Umayyad Dār al-Šabāghin, the Dye-house), Jaffa, Zerim (or Jezerel), and Karyatine (a village on the Palmyra-Damascus route). There were no Jewish residents among the Druses, "but a certain number of Jewish handicraftsmen and dyers come among them for the sake of trade." Of Jerusalem, he even says: "It contains a dyeing-house for which the Jews pay a small rent annually to the king (Baldwin II, died 1162, succeeded by his brother Almaric) on condition that besides the Jews no others be allowed in Jerusalem."⁶ Māḳḍīṣī informs us that most of the dyers, bankers, and tanners of Palestine were Jews.⁷ Leo Africanus frequently talks of Jewish dyers in North Africa at a later date.

It seems that some kinds of dyes were taxed in the early period, for Balāḍīrī discusses the question of a tax on wars (a yellow-brown dye), wasma (a blue dye), katam (a variety of henna), and henna.⁸ Dyeing was subject to certain social regulations in the cities, probably owing to the dirt and disturbance which it caused. The Spanish author al-Saḵāṭī of Malaga says: "The muḥtaşob
must prevent the dyers from dyeing red with brazl-wood (baḳḳam) for it does not last, and from dyeing with every color but saḥḥābi (cloud-blue) in cotton and linen, for the dye in those two does not remain permanent, and that which is exposed for sale in the market is fraudulent and deceptive. Colors only shine when they are dyed taking into consideration the technical necessities of the material." In another work of a similar kind by Ibn 'Abdūn (of the eleventh to twelfth centuries), also a Spaniard, we find a like instruction: "The muḥtasib must order the tanners (kuhllāṣ) and those who dye silk (ḥarir) that they dye only outside the town." 

This regulation also applied to potters; but it does not always seem to have been strictly followed, for, during the reign of the Almohad Mansūr and his son al-Naṣir, the dyehouses, 116 of them, were inside the walls of Fez. 

Again Ibn 'Abdūn adds: "The dyers must be forbidden to dye the color green with miṭhnnān (according to Dozy "thymélée, garou, trentonel, etc."), nor yet with brazil-wood (baḳḳam) for azure (lawm samāwī, isatis tinctoria) and the color disappears quickly." Of this miṭhnnān Ibn al-Baʾtār adds: "It is called miṭhnnān in Egypt and on the Syrian coasts. Its husk is used to make halters for riding-animals especially at Gaza and Dāran where it grows abundantly in the sand." The Egyptian Maʾālim al-Kurba enlarges on this subject:

Most dyers of red silk and other thread and materials dye with henna in their workshops instead of madder (al-fuwwa) and the dye appears bright; but when the sun strikes on it, its color deteriorates and its brightness disappears. Some take money from a customer to dye kūhli (bluish black). They dip the stuff into a substance called Ḥarrāda (locust), remove and treat it with froth from the vat and return it to its owner. It is not long before it reverts to its original color. 

The Thousand and One Nights has embodied an anecdote on dyers in a story that is probably of the late Egyptian period. Apparently cloth was not dyed wholesale but the customer brought it to the dyer who colored it according to his specification. One of the dyers says: "I dye red of various hues, as rose-color, and jujube-color; and green of various hues, as plant-green, and pistachio-green and oil-green, and parrot's wing; and black of various hues, as coal-black and kūhli, and yellow of various hues, as orange-color and lemon-color;—and he proceeded to mention to him all the colors." This is obviously a list of trade-names of these dyes. The Sultan later in the story opens a shop under the control of this dyer called "The Sultan's Dyeing Shop." 

11 See Chapter XVIII.

CHAPTER XXIV

FURS

FURS WERE WIDELY USED IN THE COSTUME OF Abbasid times, and the survey hardly shows how generally they were employed by the wealthy and men of fashion. Even the manuals of hisba give regulations for their preparation. Ibn 'Abdūn says: "The furriers must be prevented from using the dung of birds in the preparation of worn-out furs." The Ma'ālim al-Kurba informs us that "a trustworthy person of their craft must be placed in charge of them. They must not sell sheep-skin furs (al-ḥira’ al-kiḥāṣhiya), etc., unless they are properly tanned and sewn, closely stitched. No old material may be mixed with new, nor any patched article. They must not be taken round houses so that some people get a preference over others. Nay, it must be taken to the market and sold there by roup so that both strong and weak may obtain it." ¹

One of the most precious furs was the sable (sammar), and the Aghānī mentions a mantle (dowādji) of khazz-silk lined (mubat-taṇ) with sable, while Mustawfi Kazwini informs us that "the sable is the most expensive of furs." ² Marco Polo adds that "a robe of sable, large enough to line a mantle is worth 2,000 bezants of gold, or 1,000 at least, and this kind of skin is called by the Tartars 'The Kind of Furs.' The beast itself is about the size of a marten. The two furs of which I speak are applied and inlaid so exquisitely that it is something worth seeing." ³ The Mongol emperor used them for lining his tents.

Damiri in the Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, tells us that: "This (the sable, samma'r) species of animal is specially selected in making furred garments out of its skins on account of its softness, lightness, warmth and beauty. Kings and Grandees wear them." ⁴

Various authors give lists of the precious furs used in Baghdad by the wealthy, and Djähiz says:

The best kind of squirrel fur (sindjāb) is the Kākum (ermine), then the backs of it, then the Khazar kind, then that of Khoresm, then the fur of hares which has no defect. The best kind of fox-fur (ṭa'lab) is the black Khazar type with coarse fur which has not been counterfeited with dye. Then comes the white kind, then the red kind which is colored red with clay, then the red Khazar variety, then the poplar-colored kind. The best kind of ermine (kākum) is that which has the longest tail. The best kind of sable is the Chinese (Ṣini) variety, followed by the Khazar kind of a bright white and deep black color with long hair.⁵

The list given in the Laṭā'if al-Ma'ārif in the reign of the Buwaidhī 'Aḍud al-Dawla consists of "the squirrel of Khirkhīz, the sable (sammar) of Bulghār, the foxes (ṭa'lab) of the Khazars, the marten (fanak) of Kashgar, the ermine (kākum) of Tughuzghuz, and the soft skins (ḥawāsil) of Herāt." ⁶ Nuwairī

⁵ H. Yule, The Book of Ser Marco Polo, the Venetian (London, 1871), I, 391, II, 479, 480, 484.
copies this list." Gharnāti 10 says: "We shall mention the special products of various countries in regard to furs, as one says—the squirrel (sindjāb) of Khirkhiz, the sable of Bulghār, the fox-skins of the Khazars, the soft skins (ḥawāṣil) of Herat, and the ḵ māk m 11 of Tughuzghuz." Mustawfi Ḵażwini gives little notes on the squirrel, marten, ermine, hyrax (wabar), the foxlike animal called wasḥk, and the yāmūr. 12

The post-Mongol author Ibn Batūta describes the ḵāḵum in these terms:

The ermine is the finest kind of fur. A fur of this kind is worth a thousand dinars in India, which sum (in the Maghreb) is worth 250 dinars. It is extremely white, and comes from the skin of a small animal a span (ḏibr) long. Its tail is long and they leave it in the fur as it is. The sable (sammūr) is inferior in value to the ḵāḵum. A fur of this kind is worth four hundred dinars or less. One of the qualities of these skins is that they do not enter them, so the kings and nobles of China place one attached to their furs at the neck. The merchants of Persia and Iraq do the same. 13

These furs were derived from several sources, though most of them came from the northeastern areas of the Muslim world, the district of Transoxiana, Central Asia, and from Russia. It was probably through this trade that the Muslim coins found as far as the Baltic reached there, for the geographers say that the Russians had very little else to offer in the way of merchandise.

Ibn Rusta says of the Rūsiya: "Their sole

9 Nuwairī, Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-ʿAdab (Cairo, 1923-37), I, 369.
11 It would seem that the word ḵ māk m is merely another variant of ḵāḵum, and that the translation "camel-hair-fur" given by H. F. Amedroz and D. S. Margoliouth in The Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate (Oxford, 1920-21), has no foundation.
17 Ibid., p. 286.
19 Ibn al-Faḵiḥ, Compendium libri Kitāb al-Bol-
Mas'udi mentions in particular the Khazar tribe of Burtas whence—

the furs of foxes (tha'lab) both red and black are exported, called Burtasiya. There are some of these skins, especially the black ones which are worth a hundred dinars and more. The red ones sell at a lower price. The former are worn by Arab kings and Persian ones who are proud to wear them, and value them more highly than the sable (sammür), the marten (fanak) and so on. They make kalansuwa-caps, caftans, and cloaks (dawawid) of them. There is hardly a king but possesses a caftan or cloak (dawāwād) lined with these Burtāsi furs.20

Ibn Hawkal states that the Khazars imported honey, khazz-silk (or beaver skins), wax, and furs (wabar),21 while the Hudūd mentions that near Issi-kūl, in the mountain of Tūlas, many sable-martens, gray squirrels, and musk-deer are found, as well as in the Khirkhiz country.22 From the Turk country, Tha'ālibi enumerates sable, squirrel, ermine (kākum), marten (fanak), black fox furs (tha'lab), and white hares.23 Yākūt notes a place, Sarsan in Farthest Turkestan, where, he says, “There is a market in which the beaver (kundus), Burtāsi furs, sables, etc., are sold.”24

Khoresm and Transoxiana seem to have been the centers of the fur trade, which incidentally was largely in the hands of Jews, known as the Rahdāniya.25 Discussing the town of Khwārizm, probably Kāth, Ištākhri tells us that “marten, sable, fox-furs and beaver (al-khazz = djulūd al-khazz) and other kinds of furs come there.”26 The long account of

Maḳḍisi has already been quoted under Khoresm.27 Tha'ālibi notes particularly the red and black foxes of Transoxiana.28 Ištākhri says: “From Saghāniyān and Ḵāshdjird came saffron exported to other lands, and furs of the sable, squirrel, foxes, etc. which are taken to the furthest west.”29

Some furs apparently came from Spain and the Maghreb (North Africa). Ibn Khur-dādbih says: “From the Maghreb Sea come beaver skins (djulūd al-khazz) and furs.”30 Both Ištākhri and Maḳḍisi found many sables (sammūr) near Toledo.31 Mustawfī adds that in the Suwar al-Ākālim (a work now lost) it is stated that in this country there are many sable-martens (sammūr).32 Bakrī informs us that in the deserts about Awdāghast and Sidjilmāsa there are martens (fanak) whose fur is exported to every land.33

27 Maḳḍisi (Muḳaddasi), Description imperii Morlemici, B.G.A. (Leyden, 1876; 2d ed. 1906), III, 325.
28 Tha'ālibi, op. cit., p. 120.
31 Ištākhri, op. cit., p. 44. Maḳḍisi, op. cit., p. 239.
APPENDIX 1: COSTUME

In this survey more attention has been paid to the geographical distribution of manufactures than to costume, and several passages of great interest and importance have only been cited in occasional references. These passages give long lists of the famous manufacturers of the day and those selected here are all taken from authors who lived at Baghdad, thus implying that such stuffs were known there. The most interesting of these are to be found in Abu 'l-Kāсим of Baghdad, an author of uncertain date but who probably lived there about the second or third century. Satirizing the Ḥisfahānīs, he says to them: 1

By Allāh, I do not see a single one of you wearing a garment of reddish Dabīḵ (ṣuḵaḵairī), nor Dabīḵ̄wī (from Dabīḵ̄ in the Dēltā), nor of Kīrāţī Zuhaḵairī (perhaps he means a stuff with embroidered all-over patterns in the shape of the coins called kīrāţ, a fraction of a dinar, and manufactured in the Zuhaḵairīya Quarter of Baghdad), nor reddish woven stuff (baft kūshairī), nor Aden cloaks (rīdā'), nor tāḵtandīj, nor rāḵtandīj, nor garments of ḵašab-linen (al-dhahab vi) and Damsīsī (from Damsis in Egypt 4), and Tinnīsī, and Dīmīṭā, nor yet Muḡjalalī (?) stuff, nor figured (wašī) material of brocade (diḇāḏī) with the woven gold (al-dhahab al-mansūḏ) and the intermingled anibergris, with beautiful markings (ḥasan al-tawesht) as if it were woven of the blossoms of Spring (Rābi'), nor yet transparent ḵinīzī stuffs like thin air or the mirage, nor napkins (ṣuhaḵtāḵ 5) which are used for wiping the mouth in polite assemblies, of ḵašab-linen of unbleached material with a border (mu'lam mukhwawwam), nor striped material (muraḵaṣḥ), nor material ornamented (muwašshaḵ) with Maghribī (North African) gold, nor 'attābi Dabīḵ̄ with a border, and embroidered with gold (mu'lam muḥṣaḵšal).

Nor do I see in your houses and dwellings, places, the roofs of which have been covered with ebony (ṣāḏī) and the stairs of which have been adorned with ebony and ivory. . . . Nor do I see your houses with their public rooms furnished with carpets (zul- liya) of the Magḥreb, nor with Kharṣhānī carpets (tinfiša), nor carpet-strips of Andalus (nakhab) and Cordova, and Armenian carpets (mitrabh), and Rūmī (Byzantine) velvets (katīfa), and Tustār cushion (miḵ'ad), nor Maghrībi carpets (anṭā'), nor gold-embroidered pillows (maḵbād mubabbabha) of Dabīḵ, nor square carpets (tarrāḥāt) of Cyprus, nor sūsandjīr, nor Abūkalamūn, and cushions (numruḵ) a house full of which looks like ground covered with flowers.

Nor have you Sāmān or 'Abbadānī mats (huṣr) which fold in two as cloth does, lovelier than carpets (zubriya), and softer than Sūs khażz-silk, of fine workmanship, perfect craftsmanship and fine weave, and cushions (duṣūt) of a reddish color (kuṣhaḵairī) picked out (muʃašaḵ) with gold, and cushions (duṣūt) of mazmāḏ (mixed) with Iraqi gold, and gold-embroidered brocades (diḇāḏī muẖţalḵal), embroidered with pictures of elephant (muʃaвлад) and horses (muẖţaвлад) 6, and carpets (mitrabh) stuffed with feathers of the Indian bullfinch and Tustār brocade embroidered (muḵašaḵ) with gold.

He again mentions a pillow (muḵhaša) of Kūḇāšti stuffed with the feathers of the bullfinch. 7 Bukhārī talks of leather cushions stuffed with palm-fiber. 8

The Nuzhayt al-Kulib mentions several birds whose feathers are used for stuffing and other purposes:

Abū Farāḵ is a fowl of beautiful form with long neck and legs, and red beak like a stork. It is colored red and yellow and green and blue, appearing a diff-

Reading muʃaвлад for muʃah탈, and muẖtaвлад for muẖtaвлад. Cf. the passages from Maḵrifiz, Khiţat, quoted in Chapter XVI (pt. IV), and note 13.


A conjectural emendation for سویت. Mez considers it to be the same as the French samât, the German samât.

A conjectural emendation for Dāsīšī.

ferent color every season. Abūkalamūn garments are prepared from its colors. . . . Hawāṣil, Pelican. On its breast is a skin covered with soft down of which they make articles of apparel and its feathers are used for arrows. . . . Farisa (?). On its body are blue feathers which they use for introducing into embroidery (zardūz). 8

The geographer Ibn al-Faḥīf gives us a list of articles which are only to be obtained by travel in many lands. The following are the textiles which he classes under this category:

Chinese saddles (surūd),  Sāhirī shirts (or breastplates dīr'). Chinese curtains (sutūr), the munaiyar garments of Rayy, Kazvin robes, Sa'īdī cloth, Yemen cloaks (hulla), Egyptian mantles (ridā'), the mulham-stuff of Khurasan,  Tāhirīd garments, Andalusian cloaks (hulla), Chinese silk (harrī), ḫazz-silk of Sus, Tustar brocade, Rūmī buzūn-brocade, Egyptian linen, figured Kufān washi-stuffs, and the ṣattābī of Isfahan. 9

A very similar list is to be found in Tha'ālibī’s Ḥaṭā'īf al-Ma'ārif where a certain wit at the court of the Buwahid ‘Āṣud al-Dawla, called Abū Dulaf, replies to the satirist of an opponent:

May God shower upon me the striped cloaks (burūd) of Yemen, the kasab-linen of Egypt (Miṣr), the brocades of Rūm, the ḫazz-silks of Sus, the silk (harrī) of China, the robes (aksiyā) of Fars, the cloaks (hulla) of Isfahan, the sīkātān of Baghdad, the turbans (ʿimāmā) of Ubulā, the tawwāzi-cloth of Tawwāḏ, the munaiyar stuff of Rayy, the ḥaff of Nishapur, the mulham of Merv, the squirrel-fur of Khorbīz, the sable of Bulghār, the fox-fur of the Khazars, the marten of Kashghar, the fine skins of Herat, the trouser-cords of Armenia, the stockings (djawrab) of Kazvin. May God give me the furnishings of Armenian carpets (busūt), large carpets (zulliya) of Kālīkalā, carpets (mitraḥ) of Maisān, reedmats (ḫuṣūr) of Baghdad. 10

Nuwairi seems to derive largely from Tha'ālibī in a chapter entitled “An Account of the Different Articles for Which Certain Countries are Noted.” 11

With regard to the special products in the way of clothing, one says: ‘The turquoises (fa'irūzād) of Nishapur, the jacinth (yaḵūt) of Ceylon, the pearls of Oman, the topaz (zabārdjad) of Miṣr (Egypt), the chalcedony (a'ık) of Yemen, the onyx (djaz') of Zafār, and the garnet of Balkh (biḍljādī), and the coral (mardjān) of Ifrikiyya.'

With regard to the special products in the way of clothing (malbūs), one says: The striped cloaks (burūd) of Yemen, the figured stuffs of San'a waṣḥi), the Raṭf 12 of Syria (Shā'm), the kasab-linen of Egypt (Miṣr), the brocade of Rūm, the ḫazz-silk of Sus, the silk of China, the robes of Fars, the cloaks (hulla) of Isfahan, the sīkātān of Baghdad, the turbans (ʿimāmā) of Ubulā, the munaiyar of Rayy, the mulham of Merv, the trouser-bands (tikka) of Armenia, the kerchiefs (mandil) of Danghan, and the stockings of Kazvin.

With regard to the special products in the way of clothing, one says: The squirrel of Khorbīz, the sable of Bulghār, the fox-fur of the Khazars, the marten of Kashghar, the fine skins of Herat, and the ermine of Tughuzghuz.

With regard to the special products in the way of furnishing (fursh) one says: The carpets (busūt) of Armenia, the large carpets (zulliya) of Kālīkalā, the carpets (mitraḥ) of Maisān, and the reedmats (ḫuṣūr) of Baghdad.

An earlier author than some of the preceding writers was the writer of belles-lettres known as al-Washšā'i (circa 246–325 h. [860–936 A.D.]) who devotes several chapters to describing the types of clothing worn by his contemporaries. The following extracts

10 Tha'ālibī, Laṭā'īf al-Ma'ārif, ed. P. de Jong (Leyden, 1867), p. 132.
11 Nuwairi, Nihayat al-Arāb fi Funūn al-Adab (Cairo, 1923–37), I, 369. (Nuwairi died in 734 h. [1333 A.D.].)
12 See this word in the glossary to Tabari, Annales, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1879–1901).
have seemed worthy of presentation as a whole:  

Section on the Dress of the Elegant

The costume affected by men of position

You must know that the costume of the elegant, gallant, and cultured man consists of fine shirts (ghilâla), and thick shirts (kâmiš) of excellent kinds of linen, soft and pure of colors, such as Dabiîki and Djjannâbi, and the linings (mubattanât) of tâkhândj and raw stuffs (khâmât), shirts (durrâ'î) of Dârâbdjîrî and Iskandari (Alexandrine stuff), and mulhâm (a stuff with a warp of silk and a woof of some other material), and khazz-silk, and Khurasan material, linings (mubattanât) of soft Kûhi stuff, and izârs of al-kašab al-shârb (some kind of linen stuff), 14). Aden cloaks (ridâ') with borders (muhasshâţ), tailasân-hoods (or cloaks) of Nishapur mulhâm, and Dabiîki of one color (muştama Dabiîya), Nishapur gowns (djubba), and tîrâzî stuff of one color (muştama tîrâzî), Sa'dî figured washi-stuffs, Kufan khazz-silk, mitraf-cloaks of Sûs, robes of Fars, blue Šulû'û Kûmiş tailasâns, and all things after this sort.

However it is not considered correct to wear clothes of ugly colors dyed with scent (tib, or some kind of dye?) and saffron, such as yellow mulhâm, and Dabiîki impregnated with ambergis, because that is women's apparel, and the dress of dancing-girls and serving-girls . . . that is shirts (ghilâla) perfumed with musk and shirts (kâmiš) perfumed with ambergis, cloaks of various colors (ridâ'), and yellow izârs. But, in certain cases, they may use them as coverings (furûd), and may even don them at an occasion of revelry and still be considered elegant in them in the salons; they can also wear shoes of them in their houses, though appearance in public in this style is bad form.

The elegant find favor with the affluent and relatives of the caliph. No elegant person or man of taste will permit himself to wear soiled clothing with that which has been washed, nor clothing which has been washed with new garments, nor linen with Mervian (cotton) stuff, nor bâbiyâf (cotton) with Kûhi stuff either. The best taste in dress is to wear clothes which suit one another, with a graduated range of color, and materials which have something in common and do not clash.

Section on the Trousercords, Shoes, and Boots worn by the Elegant

They wear Zandji (Negro) 16) shoes (ni'âl) and thick Kanbâti shoes (from Cambay), Yemen furred (mušha ara) shoes (suedâ ?), fine shoes (hâdâv), and the light checked (mukhâtatt) type. The black colored kind can be worn with the red, and the yellow with the black. They wear Hâshini boots and the split shoes of officials (? al-maksâra al-kûtâbiyâ), firm leather, and heavy black leather with stockings (dîjwârâb) of khazz-silk, goathair (mir-i'izzi), and kašz-silk. They buy a red style of boot and a black leather kind (dârâsh). 17) They use trouser-bands (tikka) of ibrisim-silk, and khazz-silk, and cotton mitraf-cloaks and figured Armenian stuffs (almankûsha al-Armaniya). 18

Section on Fashionable Ladies, Concerning those Clothes which Differ from those of Fashionable Men

They wear smoke-colored shirts (ghilâla dukhb-khâniyâ), and Rasbiî cloaks (ridâ'), and linen with decorated bands on it (şurûb muznanara 19), Tabari cloaks (ardiya Tabariya), colored kašab-linen, silk embroidered with round circles (harîr mu'aîyan), Nishapur veils (mûkna'), izârs of Khurasan muhlâm-stuff, cords for tying the necks of dresses, open sleeves, white trousers with tails, black veils (mû'djar) perfumed with hyacinth. They must not wear any trouser-cords (tikka) nor any garment sprinkled (marshâb) (with perfume ?), nor perfumed, nor of simple colors, nor any garments of white linen

14) The insertion of the particle "and" would probably give a better sense, i.e., šhart-linen, and kašab-linen.
15) Reading Kûmiș for Tûmiș.
16) Al-Washshâ', op. cit., p. 125. I read Zandjiya for Zidjiya. The text here is dubious being based on a single MS. only. Perhaps the sandals of Git in Tabuk, Nishwâr al-Muhâdara, Table Talk of a Mesopotamian Judge, ed. and trans. by D. S. Margoliouth, Otr. Trans. Fund (London, 1921), trans., p. 125, should be Zandji sandals. The Abyssinians were famous for their leather.
17) Inserting "min."
18) With the emendation to the text noted in Chapter VI, note 9.
except that which is colored by nature, or dyed according to its kind, or altered from being exclusively the garb of men with some kind of musk or sandal species (of perfume), or the byacinth and ambergis species so that the perfume makes them a different kind of garb, seeing that the wearing of white is part of a man’s dress. Nor can they wear yellow, black, green, rose-color (nuwarrad) or red except that which is by nature yellow, green, blue, rose-colored and red, such as the red silk stuff called ládh, silk (harîr), kazz-silk, brocade, figured stuff (washî), and khazz-silk, because the rose-color, red, and green Sinizî are only worn by Nabatean women,21 and singing-girls of the slave class. White is considered as the dress of abandoned women. Blue and mourning garments are the colors worn by the bereaved and those in trouble. We have described the best fashions, and they do not pass beyond the limits which we have demarcated.

Our author goes on to describe those points of women’s dress which differ from men’s in the way of trouserbands, boots and shoes, scents, etc.22

They wear Kabanî furred (mush’ara) painted green-colored shoes, women’s shoes (khîfâf zanâniya23), and the split (maksûr) type, and the Edessa (Rahâwi) kind. They wear trouser cords of ibrisilk as do men, but they do not also wear, as men do, woven trouser cords of brocade, and twisted shârrâb-cloths of ibrisilk (shârâbât al-ibrism al-maftûûla), and broad belts (zunnâr). They never wear white nor stuffs with many colors or with stripes for they consider them colors of bad omen. They sometimes also wear silken trouser bands, and cotton mitraf-cloaks.24

APPENDIX II: KAABA COVERINGS

Wüstenfeld has published an extract from an Arab author on the different monarchs and dynasties that gave the Kaaba its annual covering. The importance of this function, implying the sovereignty of the Muslim world, was very great. The manufacture was made in different royal factories at different periods:

“The Kaaba was covered, according to al-Azra’î with various types of coverings, including white Khurasan brocade, and red Khurasan brocade as the author of the ‘Ikd (Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihî) has recounted. Another kind was the white brocade in the time of al-Ḥâkim the Fatimid (al’Ubaidî), and his grandson al-Mustanṣîr, al-Ṣulâhî the ruler of Yemen and Mecca covering it with that material. In the year 466 h. (1073-74 A.D.) it was covered with yellow brocade—this was the covering which the Sultan Mahmûd ibn Sabuktugîn, the ruler of India made. Then Nizâm al-Mulk, the vizier of Malikshâh the Seljuk took over this right and despatched the covering to Mecca, and it was placed over the covering with which Abu ’l-Naṣr al-Astarabâdî covered it in the same year. It was covered with a green and black covering. It has continued to be covered with black until the present day, with a yellow tirâz in it, previously having been white. On the east side, in the year 310 H. (922-23 A.D.) cups (djâmât) embroidered in white silk (harîr) were introduced into the covering of the Kaaba, but then this was abandoned in the year 815 H. (1412-13 A.D.) and the three following years. Then the white cups were reintroduced in the year 819 H. (1416-17 A.D.) and the five consecutive years. Then that was stopped in the year 865 H. (1460-61 A.D.).

It was covered with cloth of cotton dyed black because it was laid bare by a tempestuous wind which arose in Mecca in the year 643 H. (1245-46 A.D.) and is said to have happened in the year 443 H. (1051-52 A.D.). The Shaikh of the Holy Place (al-Ḥaram),

1 The text of Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihî, al-’Ikd al-Fârid, has instead of djâmât, “cups,” the word dârat, “circles,” which is probably the better reading.
APPENDIX III: INDIAN, CHINESE, AND OTHER INFLUENCES

The textile trade of India with Muslim countries was at all times considerable, but it does not come within the scope of this work to deal with Indo-Muslim relations in any detail.

The export of Indian stuffs to Persia, etc., was so much of a commonplace that the Persian poet Minūčhīrī can talk of "a camel of Multan laden with stuffs for Mecca." ¹ Chau Ju-kua, the Chinese expert on the Arab-China trade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries tells us concerning Gujarāt: "The native products comprise great quantities of indigo, myrolobans, and foreign cotton stuffs of every color. Every year these goods are transported to the Ta-Shi (Arab or Persian) countries for sale." ² Marco Polo, too, describes their "cotton-trees" and embroidered-leather work. ³ Ibn Ḥawkāl, the anonymous Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, and Idrisī, all describe the chief port of the northwest of India, Daibūl, ⁴ a place now no longer in existence, near one of the mouths of the Indus. ⁵ Abū l-Ḥidāy even attributes a Daibulī stuff (matā') to it. ⁶ The same author, on the authority of Birūnī mentions a stuff Tānāšī ⁷ which came from Tānā, near Bombay; both buckram and cotton are noticed by Marco Polo ⁸ there.

Both Nuwairī ⁹ and Marco Polo ¹⁰ talk of the cotton stuffs of Kānbāyā (Cambay). We also read of an embassy to the king of Ceylon, including negotiations about trade in the usual things such as brazili-wood (bak̲k̲am̲), stuffs (kumāš), and cloth (bazz) and jacinth (yākūt). ¹¹ With regard to the Sea of

² Chau Ju-kua, Chu-jen-chik, on the Arab and Chinese Trade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, trans. by F. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill (St. Petersburg, 1911), I, 92.
³ H. Yule, The Book of Ser Marco Polo, the Venetian (London, 1871), II, 383.
⁷ Ibid., text, p. 359, trans., II, 118.
⁸ Yule, op. cit., II, 385.
⁹ Nuwairī, Nihāyat al-ʿArab fī Funūn al-Adab (Cairo, 1923–37), I, 237. A chapter here is devoted to India.
¹⁰ Yule, op. cit., II, 388–89.
Harkand (the Gulf of Bengal), Nuwairi informs us: "There are many islands in it. The inhabitants are the most skilled of people in weaving. They weave a shirt (kamış) with its two sleeves and seams all in one piece." There are several cities mentioned in India by the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam generally for their velvets. Ibn Baṭūṭa tells of the garments which were called Shāliyāt.

More general accounts of the merchandise of India are given by various authors. Ibn Khurdādbih says: "From India are derived the garments made of grass (hashish), and cotton garments with a velvety pile (mukhmal)." The grass-woven stufls were found in other parts of the Islamic world also. Of Sind, Maḥdīsī says: "In the whole province carpets (busut) and that type of article are made, resembling those made in Kuhistan of Khurasan. Many coconuts and lovely garments are brought from it, and from Maššūra the Kanbāti shoes."

The Lāṭāʾif al-Maʿārif adds:

The land of India is the country which possesses most rare products which are found there alone. Among those are the elephant, the hippopotamus, the panther (babr), the peacock, the parrot, the turkey, and the birds called b nā k r k r, and ṣḥarāk (nightingale), the red jacinth, white sandalwood, ivory, aloes, tuffty, cloves, hyacinth, nutmeg, and velvet garments (thīyāb mukhmala), etc. Thus it possesses more special products than Rūm which is only reckoned to have brocade (dibādij), soap, terra sigillata (ṭīn mukhtūm), and sundus-brocade which is called būzūn, and various different kinds of garments."

Mustawfi Ḵazwīnī gives Maššūra, Multan, Lahore, Sultānīya, Peshawar, Malikfūr, Ḵūsdār, Nahrawāla, and Ḵūs as producing great quantities of stuff til clothes. Nuwairi mentions in his list of the products of the country "velvet garments" (thīyāb mukhmala), muslin (lānis), and stuffs (ḵumāsh).

CHINA

The importation of Chinese silks into Islamic countries was continuous and the authors frequently mention "Chinese silk" (ḥarīr Ṣini). While it seems unlikely to me that much chinaware would be brought to Muslim countries by land, owing to the difficulties of transport through Central Asia, the silk certainly did come by that route, as well as by sea, to Baghdad. Many of the stuffs, however, which were called "Chinese silks" came from the neighboring countries and not from China proper. Tibet and Turkestan were sources of such a supply, especially the latter, which was probably less desiccated than today, according to Sir Aurel Stein.

Some records of the Chinese trade with Turkestan and North Persia are to be found in Chavannes' Documents. In 719 A.D. the
king of Bokhara sent an embassy to the king of China asking for help against the invading Arabs sending as presents two mules of Persia, an embroidered cloth of Fu-lin (Byzantium), thirty pounds of perfume etc. His wife sent two large cloths of “Tcho-Pi,” and an embroidered cloth which she gave to the empress. In return he asked for saddles, bridles, tunics, belts, and garments for his wife, the Khätün. According to another passage the king sent his eldest son A-si-lan (Arslan) on this mission, which was another form of trading mission to China.

A few scattered notes—they cannot claim to be more—will be given on the imports of silks from China, for the Arab and Persian writers were usually splendidly vague about the countries east of Transoxiana. Mas'üdi tells us how the Kḥākān of the Turks gave Kirsā Anūshirwān, “a robe of Chinese silk, decorated with gold (ḥarīr ‘āṣjādi) on which there was the picture of a king sitting in his palace (aįvān) with his regalia (ḥulya), and his crown. At his side were slaves with fans in their hands. The picture was woven (mansiįd) with gold. The background (ard) of the robe was lapis-lazuli (lāzward).” From (Turcs) occidentaux,” *Academia Scientiarium Imperialis* (St. Petersbourg, 1903), VI, 203 and 139. For Chinese sources on western cloth, citing material of a philological nature, see B. Lauerf, *Sino-Iranica*, Field Museum of Natural History, Publ. 201 (Chicago, 1919), p. 488 ff., where dibād and sīklātūn are mentioned.

26 For the history of this area see H. A. R. Gibb, *The Arab Conquest in Central Asia* (London, 1923).


28 Mas'üdi, *op. cit.*, II, 201.

this description the silk in question was of a Sasanian pattern rather than Chinese.

In the second century of the Hijra, Djāhīz tells us that there came “from China (Ṣin) figured cloth (firind), silk (ḥarīr), chinaware (ḥaḍā'ir), paper (kāghid) and inks (midād),” peacocks, steeds, mules, saddles and felts.” The felts undoubtedly came from the Turkish lands where they were the product par excellence. Tha'ālībi is probably copying Djāhīz when he tells us that “they have figured cloth (firind), and painted silk (ḥarīr madhūn) on which figures are displayed called kamkhā. They have waxed (muṣẖamma) waterproof garments which do not get wet in spite of much rain. They have also the coarse napkins (manādīl ārīmār) which, when dirty are thrown into the fire, and become clean and do not burn.” He mentions their celebrated felts.

Several cities and islands in the east and in China exporting these silks are mentioned by Idrisi and Ibn Batūta also mentions the stuffs of Thsiuan-tchou-fou (Arabic Zaitūn), stating that: “The kamkhā and satin (atlas) is made there which is better than that of the other towns, and which is called after its name. They are better than the stuffs of Khasā and

29 Tha'ālībi, *op. cit.*, p. 127.
30 Reading madhūn for madfūn, but compare the parallel passage in Tha'ālībi’s *Thimār al-Kulūb* (Cairo, 1326 H. 1908 A.D.).
31 Idrisi, *op. cit.*, I, 69, 84, 193, 194.
Khânbâlik.”  

Marco Polo talks of the nasich and naques of Cathay. 

The Muslim attitude toward China has been ably summed up by Schefer:  

Tous les écrivains orientaux qui se sont occupés de la Chine, sont unanimes à vanter l’habileté des Chinois dans toutes les industries, et surtout dans la peinture, la sculpture, et la fabrication des étoffes les plus riches et les plus fines.  

Les rapports commerciaux ne furent interrompus ni pendant les troubles qui désolerent la Chine, ni pendant les guerres qui ensanglantèrent l’Asie centrale à l’époque de la chute de la dynastie des Sâmânis. On voit, en effet, mentionné dans les anciennes relations les tissus délicats, les ouvrages en ivoire, et les curiosités de la Chine qui étaient importés dans le Khurâsân.  

He quotes the Djâmi‘ al-Hikâyâi to say that “On trouve chez eux toutes sortes d’étoffes dont quelques-unes sont apportés dans le Khurâsân, avec des merveilleuses curiosités.”

**TURKESTAN**

The Arab and Persian authors sometimes talk of the products of this area imported from early times. Ya’kûbi remarks that “the Turks are the most skilled people in the manufacture of felts (lubûd) because that is what they wear.” Speaking of the Khazar country, Ištâkhiри adds: “Nothing is brought to it which is imported to all provinces apart from furs.” As for the quicksilver, honey, wax, silk (khazz) and skins (wabar), they are imported there. The clothes of the Khazars and the neighboring lands consist of tunics (ḵurțaḵ) and cloaks (ḵabâ’), for they possess no clothing (of their own) which is only brought to them from the districts of Djurđân, Tabaristân, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Rûm.” Al-Nasawi enumerates such products of the Turks as ingots of precious metals, rhinoceros horns (khuţû), musk, jasper (yaşhab), stuffs called T rkuwâ made with the wool of white camels, each piece being worth fifty dinars or more.

Of Kashghar, a Chinese traveler of 629 A.D. informs us: “Its manufactures are a fine kind of twill haircloth and carpets of a fine texture, and skilfully woven.” Marco Polo, centuries later, remarks on its cotton, and Khutan had much cotton flax and hemp. The manufactures of the latter city according to our Chinese traveler were “carpets, hair-cloth of a fine quality, and fine woven silk fabrics.” Narshakhi remarks that “there is a great trade in Khutan in ibrism-silk and muslin (kîrbās).”

**TIBET**

According to the Encyclopædia of Islâm, by the term Tibet, the Arab authors usually meant Little Tibet or Báltistân. Occasionally

---


54 This seems to apply here to Mammoth ivory from Siberia, but Muslim authors are indefinite as to the precise nature of this substance.


56 Yule, op. cit., I, 188, 196.

57 Hien Tsiang, op. cit., I, 309.

we hear of articles of merchandise coming from this country in such works as the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, etc., notably musk. Idrīsī states that: “It has relations with Ferghana and But-
tam and the subjects of the Khākān... They make a great number of objects there and export robes, the stuffs of which the tissue is
thick, coarse and lasting. Each of these robes costs a considerable sum, for its silk is of a red color.”

WESTERN INFLUENCES

Byzantine and European stuffs penetrated into Russia, and thus by devious routes to the
more central parts of Asia, and perhaps even to China. Though it is not intended to ex-
amine this trade, the following passage from Gharanīt’s Tuhfat al-Albāb may prove of in-
terest. He talks of the Nāmush (Austrians or Germans) saying:

Linen cloth (thiāb al-kattān), the like of which is
not found in the world is made in their country, a
single piece (ṭawāb) being a hundred dhirā‘ or more.

al-Alāk al-Nafīsa,” ed. M. J. de Goeje, B.G.A. (Ley-
den, 1892), III, 142 ff., and Idrīsī, op. cit., II, 215.

APPENDIX IV: EARLY TRADE ROUTES

The importance of Rayy as a commercial
center was so great that Ibn al-Faḵīh,1 quoting
an earlier author, Muhammad ibn Ishāk, de-
votes a long passage to describing the various
routes of merchants, trading with it:

Rayy has a good climate, spendid buildings; it
is an entry for merchants, and a resort of the opulent.
It is the bride of the world, the highway of their earth,
and the intermediary for Khurasan, Djurdjān, Iraq, and Ṭabaristān. To it come the wares (tāḏārāt) of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Khurasan, the Khazars, and the land of Burdījān, because the sea-traders travel

1 Ibn al-Faḵīh, Compendium libri Kitāb al-Boldān,
ed. M. J. da Goeje, Bibliotheca Geographorum Ara-

The beginning, end and middle (of the cloth) are
the same without a single thread differing. They are
taken to the Slav lands, and called Rūmī linen. The
Russians live in the Slav country. In Rūmīya (Rome ?) colored woollen garments, better than the
Rūmī brocade, are made. A dhirā‘ is worth a dinar
there. In spite of their smoothness and softness, rain
does not penetrate them, and their lovely color of a
blood-red is dyed with kirmiz (qermes). There is a
creature which descends from the sky at a certain
time in Autumn upon the oak-tree like the red evil-
smelling ant which one sees in houses, red and small
like the seed of the Syrian carob, with an unpleasant
odor like the kirmiz. This latter is also red like the
ant, and wool and ibrism-silk are dyed with it, but not
cotton or linen, nor anything of the vegetable kind,
but only what is connected with animals.

This passage seems obscure:

Yākūt 45 tells us that the Russians (Rūs)
covered a dead chieftain with cushions (mu-
darrabāt) of Rūmī brocade and pillows (mīn-
nad) of the same material.

45 “Tuhfat al-Albāb de Abū Ḥāmid al-Andalusi
al-Gharanīt,” ed. and (partially) trans. by G. Ferr-
and, Journ. Asiatique, CCVII (1925), 198.
46 Yākūt, op. cit., II, 837.
47 For the products of Turkestan see W. Barthold,
Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion, Gibb

from East to West, and from West to East, bearing
brocade and fine khazz-silk from Firandža (France
or the Franks) to al-Faramā. They go to sea at
Kulzum (on the Red Sea) and take all this to China
(Ṣīn), bringing cinnamon, swallow-wort (māmirān),
and all Chinese ware to Kulzum, then they make
for al-Faramā. They are Jewish merchants called
Rāhdānīya (Guides, or “those skilled in the ways”),
speaking Persian, Greek (Rūmī), Arabic, and Frank-
ish. They come forth from al-Faramā and sell the
musk, aloes-wood and all the goods of the Franks
they have with them. Then they go to Antioch, thence
to Baghdad, then Ubulla.

As for the traders of the Slavs (Ṣaḵālība), they
take fox and beaver skins from the most distant Slav
territory and come to the Roman Sea and the king
of Byzantium (Rūm) imposes the duty of ten per
cent on them. Then they go by sea to Samkūsh of the Jews. Then they return to the Slavs or else they go from the Slav Sea in the river which is called Nahr al-Saḥāliba (the Don) until they come to Khalīḍī al-Khazar (Read Khāmilīdī) where the king of the Khazars imposes a duty of ten per cent on them. Then they go to the Sea of Khurasan (The Caspian). Sometimes they land at Djurdjān and sell all they have with them, so that all of it comes to Rayy.

A fuller version of this, obviously using the same source even though no acknowledgment is made, in the customary fashion of Arab authors, is to be found in Ibn Khurdādbih:  

**The Route of the Jewish Rāḥānīya Merchants**

They speak Arabic, Persian, Greek (Rūmiya), Frankish, Spanish, and Slav. They journey from East to West, and from West to East by land and sea, importing from the West slaves, girls and boys, brocade, beaver skins, furs, sables (sammūr), and swords. They journey from France (Firandjā) in the Western Sea and come out at al-Faramā, carrying their wares on the backs of animals to Kulzūm, a distance of twenty-five parasangs. Then they travel on the Eastern Sea from Kulzūm to al-Djār and Djudda. Afterwards they proceed to Sind, Hind and China. From China they bring musk, aloeswood, camphor, cinnamon, and other kinds of things brought from those countries, travelling until they return to Kulzūm, then they carry it over to al-Faramā. After this they put to sea in the Western Sea, sometimes turning to Constantinople with their wares so as to sell them in Byzantium (Rūm); sometimes they travel with them to the kingdom of France (Firandjā) and sell them there. If they wish they take their wares from France on the Western Sea and disembark at Antioch, travelling by land for three stages to al-Djābiya. After this they travel on the Euphrates to Baghdad, then on the Tigris to Ubulla, from Ubulla to Oman, Sind, Hind, and China in succession.

**The Route of the Traders of the Rūs**

They are a branch of the Slavs, and they carry beaver and black fox-skins, and swords from the furthest Slav territory to the Roman Sea where the king of Byzantium (Rūm) imposes a duty of ten per cent upon them. If they travel on Tanais (the Don) the river of the Slavs, they pass Khāmilīdī, the town of the Khazars, and their ruler imposes a tax of ten per cent on them. Then they journey to the Sea of Djurdjān (The Caspian), disembarking on whichever part of its coasts they wish, the coast of this sea being five hundred parasangs. Sometimes they take their wares from Djurdjān by camel-transport to Baghdad. The Slav servants interpret for them and pretend to be Christians, and they pay the poll-tax.

**Their Route by Land**

The outward-bound voyager goes from Spain or from France, crossing to al-Sūs al-Akṣā (in the Maghreb), then travels to Tandja (Tangier), then Ḥirkiyya (Ḵairawān), then Egypt, Ramle, Damascus, Kufa, Baghdad, Basra, Ahvāz, Fars, Kerman, Sind, Hind, and then to China.

Sometimes they take the way behind Byzantium (Rūm) into the Slav country, then to Khāmilīdī, the capital of the Khazars. Then they travel to the Sea of Djurdjān, then to Balkh and Transoxiana, and then to Wurut (Yurt) of the Tughuzghuz, then to China.

---

2 de Goeje reads here “Samkaras” (؟), the Hebrew שמראש.

4 A word of uncertain reading.
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1 Das ist ungewöhnlich, da Kronen im allge-

meinen dazu neigen, eine einmal gefundene Form

festzuhalten. Ansätze zu stärkerer Varianz finden

sich schon in arsakidischer Zeit. Ein konkreterer

Wechsel von Herrscher zu Herrscher ist, soweit ich

sehe, sonst nirgends belegt; allenfalls könnte er beim

Diadem der oströmischen Kaiser vorliegen, wo er
dann aber vom Sasanischen abhängig wäre. Zu der

eigenen Krone scheint so streng gewesen zu

sein, dass Herrscher, die vorübergehend den

Thron verloren, nach ihrer Wiedereinsetzung

eine neue Krone annehmen mussten.2 Die Ele-

mente dieser Kronen sind den Kronen der

Götter entlehnt.3 Sie stellen, jedenfalls urs-

prünglich, wohl eine Verbindung zwischen
dem König und der Gottheit her.4 Ihre Zusam-

Frage, wie weit diese Kronen tatsächlich getragen

worden sind, vergl. Exkurs I.

2 So Péroz, nachdem er Alleinherrscher geworden

war, Kavâd I. nach seiner Befreiung aus dem "Schloss

der Vergessenheit," Khusrâu II., als er sich gegen

Varhrân VI. durchgesetzt hatte (A.M.I., IX [1938],

114). Auch bei Ardâshîr I. spiegeln sich offenbar die

verschiedenen Etappen seines Aufstiegs in der Form

seiner Krone (vergl. Anm. 14) Unklar ist, warum

der nur drei Jahre regierende Ardâshîr III. in seinem

zweiten Jahr die Krone gewechselt hat. Zu einem

Wechsel der Kronenform bei Narseh, die unter

Umständen auch mit Kämpfen um den Thron im

Zusammenhang stehen könnte, vergl. Anm. 7.

3 Herzfeld, A. T., S. 90, und A.M.I., IX (1938),

110 und 155 ff.

4 Deutlich ist diese Verbindung von Königs- und

Götterkrone, wenn Varhrân II. die Flügel eines

Namenspatrons Vrāraga aufnimmt. Ebenso erklären

sich wohl die Flügel des Siegesgottes bei der Krone

des Péroz, dessen Name "der Siegreiche" bedeutet,

und, auf diese zurückgehend, bei Khusrâu II.

Parwêz, dem "Siegreichen." Gewiss ist es auch kein Zufall,

wenn sich Narseh, der die "kannelierte Hohlkehle"

seiner Krone offenbar der Krone der Anâhit entlehnt,

in Naksh-i-Rustam darstellen lässt, wie er aus der

Hand dieser Göttin das Diadem empfängt. Am
deutlichsten wird diese—man könnte sagen "ma-

gische"—Beziehung der Formen, wenn (nach Am-
nianus Marcellinus) Shâhpür II. beim Kampf um

Amida an Stelle seiner Krone, die auserhalb des Pa-
lastes wohl überhaupt nicht getragen wurde, einen

goldenen und mit Edelsteinen besetzten Widderkopf

trägt, bei dem man sowohl an die Tierkopfkappen

vieler Säsâni, wie an ihre gelegentlichen Widder-
hornkronen denken könnte. Dabei bleibt allerdings
menstellung erfolgte nach bestimmten Überlegungen, wobei häufige Rückgriffe beweisen, dass die bereits verwendeten Formen gegenwärtig waren und berücksichtigt wurden.8

offen, ob es sich bei diesem Widdershelm Shāhpuruhs II. um eine Beziehung auf Vṛōraga, zu dessen Inkarnation der Widderr gehörte, handelt oder um eine Darstellung des xvarnah, das im Kārnāmak Ardashīr I. in der Gestalt eines Widders erscheint. Vielleicht sind auch beide Vorstellungen miteinander verbunden.


7 Von den früheren Herrschern war bisher nur die Krone des Ādārnarseh (309) unbekannt, der sich gegen Shāhpuruhs II. nicht durchsetzen konnte und vermutlich nicht zum Prätium kam. Neuerdings hat
gesichert aus den Darstellungen der Münzen bekannt. In beschränkten Umfang treten Darstellungen auf anderen Kunstwerken wie Felsreliefs, Stuckplastiken, Silberschalen oder Siegelsteinen ergänzend hinzu. Diese Wieder-


So lange eine ähnlich handliche Veröffentlichung nicht existiert, ist es trotz ihrer bekannten Mängel (dazu neuerdings auch E. Herzfeld, op. cit., S. 112, Anm. 1) am einfachsten, für allgemeine Nachweise F. D. J. Paruck, Sassanian Coins (Bombay, 1921) (zitiert als Paruck) zu benutzen.


Abb. 1, dritte Reihe von oben, zweite Krone von rechts) bei der Krone Varhrâns IV. gibt, meinen doch die Bindenenden der Kugelabknickn. Sie sind auf den Münzen zwar nicht sehr deutlich, aber es liegt keinerlei Anlass vor, die Querrillung als Per lleibung zu lesen. Reichlich phantastisch und durch nichts auf den Münzen belegt ist die Bildung der Scheitellkappe bei z. Nicht gegeben sind die Kronen Pöroș zweite Form, Djämsap, Kavâd 1. erste Form.
Das wesentliche Mittel, einen bestimmten König darzustellen,\textsuperscript{13}  

\footnote{13} Auch heute gilt noch, was Herzfeld 1920 \textit{(A.T., S. 60) schrieb:} “Von dem Gesetz der persönlichen Krone darf nie abgesehen werden, weder von der Kunst, da sie sonst ihr einziges Mittel, eine Einzelperson zu kennzeichnen, aufgeben, noch von uns, da wir sonst in völlige Willkür verfallen würden.”

\footnote{14} Nach den Darstellungen der Münzen lassen sich bei der Krone Ardashirs I. folgende Typen unterscheiden (vergl. auch E. Herzfeld, “The Early Scheitel von einem Tuch verhüllt, das seinen Falten nach aus einem dünnen Stoff, vermutlich Seide, besteht und mit Perlen oder Edelsteinen

\textit{History of the Sasanian Empire},” in \textit{Paikuli} (Berlin, 1924), S. 35 ff.)


besetzt ist. Über der Stirn erhebt sich eine grosse, ins Hochoval verzogene "Kugel," die offenbar mit dem gleichen Stoff bespannt ist.

Mazdâhs die Lockenkugel unverhüllt zwischen den Zinnen. Seltener Typus, nicht sicher fixierbar.


E) Wie D, nur ist die Frisur nicht von einem Tuch verhüllt. Am Kopf sind die Locken in vier, an der Kugel in drei Horizontalreihen angeordnet.


Scheitel- und "Kugel"umhüllung scheinen aus einem Stück zu sein, ebenso der bei manchen Münzen angegebene Nacken- und Backenschutz. Die "Kugel" ist unten nur leicht abgebunden, ruht also in ziemlich breiter Fläche auf dem vorderen Teil des Schädels auf. An der Rückseite ihrer Befestigung erscheinen die quergerippten Enden zweier kleiner Binden. Gelegentliche unverhüllte Darstellungen zeigen, das sie das kugelig


frisierte, gelockte Haupthaar enthält. Die Scheitelumhüllung wird unten von einem breiten, unverzierenem Reif abgeschlossen. Er ist 

Königin Dénak darstellt, und auf einem anepigraphischen Stein früher im Besitz von E. Herzfeld. Dass sich die Darstellung eines Wurkträgers mit unverhülltem Lockenkugel im Gefolge Shâhpûhrs I. auf seinem Reiterreliëf in Naḵš-i-Râdjab auf den Thronfolger bezieht, ist sehr wohl möglich. Auf dem Narseh-Rei-


Schutz; Shâhpûr I. eigene Prägungen: Spitzkappe mit Tierkopf; Varhrân III., auf Münzen Varhrâns II.: Spitzkappe mit Tierkopf; Shâhpûr III. eigene Prägungen (s.o.): offenes Haar mit einfachem Diadem; unbekannter Thronfolger auf Münzen des Džâmâsp: Zinnenkrone mit Globus; Khusrau I. auf Rs. der Münzen Kâvâd I. anno 25: Krone unzutreffend, jedenfalls mit grosser oberer Mondsichel und Kugel. Eine feste Regel scheint es danach für die Kopfbedeckung des Thronfolgers nicht gegeben zu haben, bzw. diese Regel war im Laufe der Zeit starken Schwankungen unterworfen. (so auch Herzfeld, A.M.I., IX [1938], 114). Zur Frage, ob der jagende König in der unteren Zone der Silberscheibe aus Kungur in der Ermitage (Erd-


legt, die Lockenkugel getragen. Das wäre noch kein sehr schwerwiegendes Gegenargument. Auch dass sie bei Königinnen vorkommt, beweist nicht viel, denn einzelne, wie Dénak (457–459) haben regiert und waren dann dem König gleichgestellt, jedenfalls führt Dénak während ihrer Regierungszeit den Titel "Königin der Königinnen." Ob allerdings der anepigraphische Siegelstein des Museo Trivulci in Mail-

land (E. Herzfeld, Paikuli [Berlin, 1924], S. 31, No. 4, Abb. 31), der eine Frau mit verhüllter Lockenkugel zeigt, ebenfalls eine regierende Königin wiedergibt, ist fraglich. Andere Frauendarstellungen mit Lockenkugel tun es bestimmt nicht, so z.B. die weibliche Figur hinter dem König auf der Silber-

schale mit Varhrân V. auf der Jagd im Museum in Kasan (Erdmann, Jb., S. 220), die weibliche Gott-

heit (Anâhît ?) auf der verschollenen Silberkanne der Sammlung Stroganoff (Smirnoff, No. 70), die weibliche Gottheit an einem Fabeltier in der Mitte der Silberscheibe mit Mondkultszenen in der Biblithèque Nationale (Sarre, A.P., Taf. 117) und die Tänzerinnen (Anâhîtpriesterinnen ?) auf der Silbervase aus Paris in der Ermitage (J. Orbeli-C. Trever Orfèverie sassanida [Moscou-Leningrad, 1935], Taf. 46/7). Auch die von Herzfeld (A.M.I., IX [1938], 140 ff.) als xvarâsân xvarrâh gedeutete weibliche Gottheit auf der Rs. der Denkmünzen Khusraus II. (ob. cit., Taf. VI, 3–4) und auf den Kapitellen aus Bistûn, die heute am Tâq-i-Bustân liegen (vergl. dazu K. Erdmann, "Die Kapitelle am Taq i Bostân," Mitteil. d. Deutsch. Orient Gesellschaft., No. 80 [Okt. 1943], 1 ff.) trägt einen Kopfschmuck dieser Form. Danach scheint die Kugel gerade bei weiblichen Figuren (Göttinnen, Königinnen, aber auch Priesterinnen) gebräuchlich gewesen zu sein. (Zum Vorkommen bei arsakidischen Frauendarstel-

20 Vergl. Exkurs II.
22 Relief des Gotarzes in Bistün (Herzfeld, A. T., Taf. XXIII) und auf vielen Münzen.


24 Das Tādīnāneh zeigte die Krone Şâhpuhrs I. "rot auf grün." Andere Darstellungen: Nākš-i-
einfachen Stirnreifen seines Vaters und Vorgängers um die Mauerzinnen der Krone des obersten Gottes Ahura Mazdäh. Die Münz-


bilde sind in reinem Profil nach rechts gezeichnet, nur bei der Lockenkugel könnte eine leichte Verschiebung zur Dreiviertelansicht gemeint sein.26 Die Krone hatte also vier solcher Zinnen, je eine vorn und hinten und je eine seitlich. Sie sind dreistufig, ziemlich hoch, schlank, leicht nach aussen gebogen und mit einer Perlenreihe als Mittelrippe versehen. Sie verdecken die Scheitelumhüllung nahezu ganz. Die grosse Lockenkugel, deren Stoffalten meist deutlich angegeben werden, ist bei manchen Darstellungen mit kleinen Dreieckgruppen von Perlen gemustert. Der Stirnreifen ist glatt. Die an seinem unteren Rande erscheinende Reihe kleiner Perlen dürfte den Saum der unter dem Stirnreifen durchgezogenen Scheitelumhüllung darstellen, da sie auch den Backenschutz abschliesst.27 Die Nacken-


26 Herzfeld, A.M.I., IX (1938), 119.

27 Vergl. Ann. 16.
binden sind neben dem reichen Lockenbäusch des nach hinten flatternden Haares nur klein gebildet. Wenn sie an einem um den Stirnreifen gelegten Diadem befestigt sind, so war dieses offenbar unverziert.

Obhrmizd I. (272–273)28 greift auf die Kronenform Ardashîrs I. zurück,29 wobei er als unterscheidendes Merkmal am oberen Rande des Stirnreifens fünf, in Wirklichkeit also wohl zehn lockenförmige Gebilde an- bringt, wie sie ähnlich auch bei anderen sasânîdischen Kronen verwendet werden30 und bereits am Diadem arsakidischer Grosskönige vorkommen.31 Die Lockenkugel ist, wenn man in solchen Details den Münzbildern Vertrauen schenken will, noch grösser gebildet als bei Ardashîr I. und stark nach vorn gerückt. Ihre Abbindung und die Anordnung der Falten sind schematischer gezeichnet, im Prinzip aber von gleicher Form wie bisher. Kugel und Scheitel- kappe, die hier deutlich zu sehen ist, sind mit unregelmässig verteilten Dreieckgruppen von Perlen verziert. Backenschutz kommt nicht vor. Die von Herzfeld angegebene Reihe kleiner Perlen am unteren Rande des Stirn-

28 Das Tāḏīḏnāmeh zeigte die Krone Obhrmizds I. "grün auf gold," also in der gleichen Farbstellung wie die Ardashîrs I. Andere als numismatiche Darstellungen dieses Königs sind nicht bekannt.


30 Z.B. Shâhpuru II. und Varhrân V. Vergl. auch die Krone Ahura Mazdâhs auf dem Investitur-Relief Ardashîrs II. am Tâk-i-Bustân (A.M.I., IX [1938], 111, Abb. 7) und die Kappe der Königin auf manchen Münzen Varhrân I.

31 Z.B. Phraates (wo sie allerdings auch das Haupthaar meinen könnten), Vardanes I., Gotarzes und Artabân IV. Vergl. auch den Gothaer Hyazinth mit der Inschrift Shâhpuruhs I.


34 Vergl. die Darstellung dieses Gottes auf Kûshân-Münzen (A.M.I., IX [1938], 100), am Nimrud Dagh (Sarre, A.P., Taf. 56) und am Tâk-i-Bustân (Herzfeld, A.T., Taf. XXIX).


Herzfelds Zeichnung rückt sie etwas zu stark nach hinten.

Das ist auf den Felsreliefs gut zu erkennen und wird besonders bei der in Vorderansicht gegebenen Darstellung in Nāḵš-i-Bahrām deutlich, wo man annehmen muss, dass sie eine eventuell vorhandene seitliche Ausladung übertrieben darstellen würde. Vergl. auch die in face Darstellung Varhrāns IV. auf einer Münze der Sammlung Bartholomaei (Paruck, Taf. X, 6).

Während Herzfeld 1920 (A.T., S. 90–91) an die geflügelte Sonnenscheibe des Ahura Mazdāh-Symbols erinnert, weist er 1938 (A.M.I., IX, 110) auf Vṛatragna hin, der auf Küšān-Münzen den ganzen Vogel auf dem Kopf trägt (op. cit., S. 109, Abb. 5) und schreibt (op. cit., S. 101) "Die einzelteile dieser kronen sind göttliche, zugleich talismanische symbole, z.B. die flügel des vāryna-vogels, in dem


Shähpuhr II. (309-379) nimmt die Zin-


47 Einen ganzen Vogel trägt Vrōtragna auf Kūšān-Münzen als Kopfschmuck (A.M.I., IX [1938], 109 f., Abb. 5). Vergl. auch die säsani-

dischen Tierkopfkappen.

48 Im Tāḏīnāmeh war Shähpuhr II. mit einer blauen Krone dargestellt, deren Ränder vergoldet waren und die auf beiden Seiten ein "māzaradj," in der Mitte eine Mondsichel zeigte. Diese Beschrei-

bung entspricht nicht dem eindeutigen Befund der Münzen. Andere Darstellungen dieses Königs: Relief im Tympanon der Rückwand des kleinen Ivân am Tāḵ-i-Bustān (Dreiviertelsicht nach links), Silberschale mit König auf der Löwenjagd in der Ermitage (Erdmann, Jb., S. 202 f., Profil nach rechts mit abweichender Form der Kugel), Silberschale mit König auf der Schwarzwildjagd in der Freer Gallery in Washington (ibid., S. 202 f., Dreiviertelsicht nach rechts mit geriefelter Form der Kugel, die man lieber als Helm-Emblem betrachten möchte, dazu Herzfeld A.M.I., IX [1938], 133 ff.), Silberschale mit König auf der Jagd auf Argaliböcke, aus dem Poltawaschatz, Leningrad, Ermitage (Erdmann, Jb., S. 208 f., Dreiviertelsicht nach rechts, die Kugel weggebrochen. Zur Be-

stimmung auf Shähpuhr II. vergl. K. Erdmann, "Zur Chronologie der sassanidischen Jagdschalen," Z.D.M.G., XCVII [1943], S. 266 ff.), Silberschale

nen Shähpuhrs I. wieder auf, wobei er als unterscheidendes Merkmal am oberen Rand des Stirnreifens eine Reihe grösserer Schmuckstücke anbringen lässt, die zunächst die Lok-

kenform wie bei der Krone Ohrmizds I. zei-

gen, später als Perlen gebildet sind wie bei Ohrmizd II.

Ardashir II. (379-383) greift auf die Krone seines Namensvorgängers Ardashir I. zurück, wobei er sie ebenfalls um eine Reihe grosser Perlen am oberen Rande des Stirn-

reifens bereichert.

Die Krone Shähpuhrs III. (383-388) mit König auf der Panthjerjagd, Leningrad, Ermitage (Erdmann, Jb., S. 220 f., nahezu Vorderansicht, in Einzelheiten entstellt, da die Schale eine nachsäsani-
dische Arbeit ist, Auswahl und Anordnung der Em-

bleme aber richtig). Vergl. auch die Krone des jugendigen Königs in der unteren Zone der Silberschale mit einem thronenden König aus Kungur in der Ermitage (ibid., S. 216 f.).

49 Im Tāḏīnāmeh war Ardashir II. mit einer grünen Krone dargestellt. Eine Darstellung ausser-

halb der Numismatik bringt das Felsrelief mit der Investitur dieses Herrschers in der Nähe des Tāḵ-i-

Bustān (Dreiviertelsicht nach rechts, Haupthaar und Lockenkugel unverhüllt, die Lockenkugel beinahe auf dem höchsten Punkt des Scheitels angebracht und mit zwei kleinen Binden abgebunden, breiter Stirn-

reifen, an dem zwei grosse, nach hinten flatternde Binden mit quer gestreiften Enden befestigt sind).

50 Die Krone Shähpuhrs III. war im Tāḏīnāmeh grün und rot mit einem goldenen "māzaradj" auf jeder Seite. Andere Darstellungen: Relief im Tym-

panon der Rückwand des kleinen Ivân am Tāḵ-i-

Bustān (Dreiviertelsicht nach rechts, das Haupt-

haar unverhüllt, die Lockenkugel mit einem Stoff überzogen, am Stirnreifen vorn eine ziemlich grosse Mondsichel. Vergl. Zeichnung in A.M.I., IX [1938], 113, Abb. 9. Binden an der Abschätzung der Lockenkugel, aber nicht am Stirnreiten). Unver-

hörig beschrieb Herzheld zeigen die Throntolgermünzen Shähpuhrs III., doch fehlt diesen die Lockenkugel. Die Krone auf dem Felsrelief weicht also von beiden aus Münzbildern bekannten Typen ab. Die gross-

 Königliche Krone Shähpuhrs III. ist sie sicher nicht, eher eine Paraphrase über seine Thronfolgernkrone. Man wird Herzheld zustimmen, wenn er es für


Dass die Münzbilder, wie bei den bisher be sprachenen Kronen angenommen wurde, die Hälfte bringen, ist in diesem Fall nicht ganz sicher, es könnten im Original auch acht solcher Bogenstellungen vorhanden gewesen sein.

Darin stimmt die Krone Šâhpuhrs III. mit der Krone Anâhîts im Hauptvän des Täk-i-Bustân genau überein (vergl. A.M.I. IX [1938], 110, Abb. 6).

Herzfeld schreibt, ibid., p. 111, "wie Narseh folgte Šâhpuh III. erst nach einer—illegitimemen—unterbrechung seinem vater," womit er anscheinend die Verwandtschaft der Kronen erklären will.
bis Narseh) die Grundformen entwickeln, während die folgenden fünf (Ohmizid II. bis Shâhpur III.) Variationen über je eine dieser Grundformen bringen. 

Mit der letzten Krone dieser ersten Gruppe vollzieht sich eine weitere Wandlung, die für den Aufbau der Krone zwar ohne Bedeutung ist, in anderem Zusammenhang aber umso mehr Beachtung verdient. Bis zu Ardâshîr II. sind die im Nacken des Königs nach hinten flatternden Binden immer oberhalb des Lockenhauses der Haare gezeichnet. Deutlichere Prägungen lassen erkennen, dass sie an der Rückseite des Stirnreifens befestigt sind, und Herzfeld wird Recht haben, wenn er angibt, dass die bei manchen Krone erscheinenden einfachen oder doppelten Perlenreihen auf einem Diadem angebracht waren, das über den Stirnreifen gelegt und im Nacken mit Hilfe der beiden Binden geschlossen wurde.54 Mit den Münzen Shâhpurs III55 und seitdem bei allen säsänidischen Münzen56 werden diese Binden nicht mehr oberhalb, sondern unterhalb des Lockenhauses im Nacken des Königs gezeichnet. Ihre Anbringung hat also gewechselt. Wo sie von nun an befestigt werden, ist den Münzbildern nicht zu entnehmen. Sicher ist nur, dass es nicht mehr am Stirnreifen, bzw. an einem um diesen geschlungenen Diadem geschieht. Wo der hintere Teil des Stirnreifens auf den Münzen zu erkennen ist, zeigt er von nun an eine kleine Schleife oder ein Schmuckstück mit zwei oder drei Perlen. Die grossen Binden scheiden also mit Shâhpur III. aus dem Aufbau der säsänidischen Krone aus. Ihr bleiben nur die kleinen Binden zwischen Lockenkugel und Scheitelumhüllung des Kernaufbaus.

Erst mit der Krone VarhrânsIV. (388–399)57 wird das bisher streng eingehaltene leren Säsänidenzeit macht). Einmal eingeführt wird das Motiv von fast allen späteren Münzen beibehalten, obwohl die "malerische" Wiedergabe im übrigen bald wieder aufgegeben wird.

54 Vergl. Exkurs II. 
55 In diesem Fall ist die Zeichnung Herzfelds nicht richtig. Die normale Form der Krone Shâhpurs III. zeigt die Binden nicht mehr an der Rückseite des Stirnreifens. Dagegen sind bei seinen Thronfolger-Münzen an dem Diadem, das er im offenen Haar trägt, zwei Binden befestigt. Eine weitere Veränderung in der Anordnung der Binden, um das vorwegzunehmen, tritt mit der zweiten Krone des Përôz ein, dessen Münzen ja überhaupt eine ganze Reihe wichtiger Neuerungen bringen. Während von Shâhpur III. bis zur ersten Krone des Përôz die beiden Binden im Nacken des Königs übereinander gezeichnet erscheinen, also in der Form, in der sie seit Ardâshîr I. üblich sind, nur dass sie seit Shâhpur III. nicht mehr vom Stirnreifen ausgehen, sondern tiefer angebracht werden, werden sie seit der zweiten Krone des Përôz voneinander getrennt und einzeln über der rechten und linken Schulter des Königs dargestellt. Ein nochmaliger Wechsel in ihrer Anbringung braucht damit nicht verbunden zu sein. Diese neue Anordnung dürfte sich vielmehr aus dem Versuch erklären, eine schillermässigere Darstellung zu geben, der die Münzen dieses Königs auch sonst kennzeichnet (und sie zugleich zu den unklarsten und unerfreulichsten Prägungen der mittl.


Vṛṣragna entlehnt. Formal ist der Unterschied, der sich daraus ergibt, zunächst nicht gross. Inhaltlich wird man aber diesen Schritt, zu dem offenbar der Zwang immer neuer Variation führte, nicht unterschätzen dürfen, bedeutet er doch, dass die mehr als anderthalb Jahrhunderte bewahrte Beziehung der einzelnen Königskrone auf eine bestimmte Gottheit aufgegeben wird.


58 Das Tādānjāneh zeigte Yazdegerd I. mit einer blauen Krone. Andere Darstellungen dieses Königs auf seinen Münzen sind nicht bekannt.


60 Bei Münzen Ardashirs I. an der Kappe (Anm. 14, Typ A), gelegentlich an der Umhüllung der Lockenkugel bei Šāhpuhr I. (A.M.I., IX [1938], 102, unsere Abb. 1 obere Reihe) und bei Šāhpuhr III. als Thronfolger (?) im kleinen Ivān des Tāk-i- Bustān (ibid., S. 113, Abb. 9. Die Angabe "Šāhpuhr II." (ibid., S. 110) ist ein Druckfehler).
seit, denn keine der Kronen nach Yazdeg- derd I. verzichtet auf das neue Emblem, das mehr und mehr im Aufbau des Kronenganzen eine führende Rolle übernimmt und auch sonst auf den Münzen immer reichlicher verwendet wird.

Vielleicht käme man in der Beurteilung dieser und ähnlicher Fragen weiter, wenn die Darstellungen auf den Rückseiten der sasanidischen Münzen, deren Wechsel die religiöse, oder besser wohl die "kirchliche" Entwicklung der Sasanidenzeit spiegeln dürfte, bearbeitet wären. Leider sind meine Vorarbeiten dazu wertlos geworden, nachdem die reichen Bestände des Berliner Münzkabinetts, von denen sie ausgingen, nach Osten gebracht worden sind.
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scher eigener Form zu schaffen, zwingt auch weiterhin zu immer neuen Variationen. Em-
bleme stehen nicht mehr zur Verfügung. Der

British Museum. Wichtig ist dabei, dass diese Büsten, die man als zeitgenössische Arbeiten betrachten muss, in manchen Punkten deutlicher sind als die Münz-
bilder. Die Lockenkugel allerdings scheint bei keiner erhalten zu sein, muss aber selbstverständlich—
übrigens unabhängig von der Frage, welcher König gemeint ist—ergänzt werden. Dafür lassen sie erken-
nen, dass am oberen Rande des Stirnreifens eine Reihe lockenförmiger Gebilde angebracht ist, wie sie
ähnlich schon bei den Kronen Ohrmizd I. und Şâhpûhrs II. vorkamen. Das gleiche Motiv ist auf
den Silberschalen des British Museum und der Sammlung Fabriçius angegeben und übrigens auch
zum Teil zu erkennen. (Meine falsche Interpre-
tation dieser "Lockenreihe," Jb., 1936, S. 224 und
1938 S. 211 habe ich Z.D.M.G., [1943], S. 272 korrigiert, vergl. dazu auch die wichtigen Ausführun-
gen M.S. Dimands, op. cit., S. 192 f., die mir leider
erst jetzt bekannt geworden sind.) Endlich zeigen
die Büsten deutlich, dass die seitlichen Mondschäle
am Stirnreifen befestigt sind und zwar mit Hilfe
einer kleinen Stielung, die auf den Münzen als Kugelchen wiedergegeben ist. (Die zinnenförmige
Stufung dieses Zwischenstückes auf der Schale der Sammlung Fabriçius dürfte wohl auf die Rechnung
des nachäsisnädischen Kopisten zu setzen sein.)

66 Diese Entwicklung setzt schon bei früheren
Kronen ein und ist bei Şâhpûr III. bereits zu
einem gewissen Abschluss gelangt.

67 Das einzige noch neu auftretende Emblem ist
der Stern in der Mondschale der Krone Khusras II.

Vorrat der Götterkronen ist erschöpft. In
dieser Richtung ist eine Erweiterung nicht möglic.
So bleibt nur ein Weg: das Grund-
prinzip des Kronenaufbaus zu variieren, mit
anderen Worten, das Gesetz, dass nur der
Stirnreifen Emblemträger sein kann, zu durch-
brechen, ähnlich wie unter Varhrân IV. bereits
das Prinzip der Emblemeinheit von Götter-
krone und Königskrone durchbrochen worden
war.

Leider lassen uns die Monumente gerade an
diesem entscheidenden Punkt der Entwick-
lung für kurze Zeit in Stich. Die Münzbilder
Yazdegerds II. (438–457) reichen nicht aus,
um alle Einzelheiten erkennen zu lassen, und
andere Darstellungen stehen für diesen Herr-
scher nicht zur Verfügung. Die Emblema-

66 Die Krone Yazdegerds II. soll nach dem
Tâdzinmeh himmelblau gewesen sein. Andere Dar-
stellungen ausser den Münzen sind nicht bekannt.

67 Allenfalls könnte die nachäsisnädische Schale
der Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore, die den König
zusammen mit der Königin (?) auf einer Kline
zeigt (Sarre, A.P., Taf. 111) auf eine Darstellung
dieses Herrschers zurückgehen (so Herzfeld, op. cit.,
S. 121). Die gleiche Form zeigt auch die Krone
der Kamelreiterschale in Leningrad (Erdmann, Jb.,
S. 218 ff.) Danach wäre die obere Mondschale
dem höchsten Punkt der Scheitelkappe angebracht.
Aber Kronen dieser Form (geschlossener Zinnen-
krantz, grosse bekrönende Mondschale) haben auch
Valâsh und Ardašîr III. getragen, letztcrer al-
lerdings mit deutlich eckiger Form der Kappe. Dass
die Kugel in der oberen Mondschale birnenförmig
deformiert ist, kommt auch auf den Silberschalen
des Tcherdyne (Anm. 72) und bei Fuèrard vor.
Auf Münzen finden sich derartige Deformationen
erst unter den letzten Herrschern. Ich bin jedoch
nicht ganz sicher, ob man dieses Argument so hoch
einschätzen darf, dass man danach Datierungen vor-
nimmt. (so Herzfeld, op. cit., S. 129). Unter diesen
Zerfallsformen einen eigenen Typus mit "blüten-
förmiger Kugel" auszusondern (ibid., S. 119) scheint
mir nicht berechtigt. Ein Vergleich mit den Münzen
ergibt, dass Herzelfs Zeichnungen (Abb. 1, unter
Reihe) in diesem Punkt etwas übertreiben. In Wirk-
lichkeit bleibt der Zusammenhang mit der ursprüng-
lichen Faltenganbabe bei aller Erstarrung und Ver-
gröberung immer gewahrt.


böcke darstellt, eine zeitgenössische Wiedergabe, die mit ausreichender Deutlichkeit zeigt, was die Münzbilder nur ungenügend erkennen lassen: den mit Perlen besetzten, tief in die Stirn gezogenen Reifen, an dem seitlich und hinten niedrige, dreistufige Zinnen angebracht sind, während über der Stirn eine kleine Mond- sichel erscheint, ferner die Scheitelumhüllung aus einem mit Juwelen geschmückten Stoff, eine grosse Mondsichel, die durch ein mit zwei kleinen Binden versehenes Zwischenstück gestielt ist und die von einem dünnen, Falten werfenden Stoff verhüllte Kugel (Abb. 12). Mit Hilfe dieser Silberschale werden die Darstellungen der Münzbilder, bei denen auf die Angabe der Scheitelumhüllung verzichtet ist, klar, und es dürfte zulässig sein, auch die Münzen Yazdegerds II. von hier aus rück- schliessend zu interpretieren.\(^73\) Das Neue, das diese beiden Kronen bringen, ist die Art der Anordnung der oberen Mondsichel, die so gross gebildet ist, dass sie die Kugel des Kernaufbaus in ihrer unteren Hälfte rahmend umschliesst. Sie ist nicht mehr, wie noch bei Varhrân V., am Stirnreifen, sondern auf dem höchsten Punkt der Scheitelumhüllung befestigt. Das bedeutet einen entscheidenden Schritt in der Entwicklung der säsänidischen Krone, denn damit ist das ihr zugrundeliegende Kompositionsprinzip in einem wichtigen Punkt durchbrochen. Zum erstenmal wird ein Emblem nicht am Stirnreifen angebracht, sondern mit dem Kernaufbau verbunden. Die Folgen dieser Neuerung sind einschneidend, und es ist sicher kein Zufall, dass diese Neuerung, einmal eingeführt, nie wieder aufgegeben wird.


\(^73\) Herzfeld erkennt diese Entwicklung auch, nur nimmt er an, dass sie erst mit der zweiten Regierung Kavâds I. eingetreten sei. Die Kronen des Pêrôz interpretiert er noch im Sinne der bisherigen Form, also als reine Umhüllung der Frisur. Wie er sich dabei vorstellt, dass das Haar des Königs durch das kleine Zwischenstück und die trennende Mondsichel in die Kugel gebracht wurde, ist unverständlich. An- scheinend denkt er an eine Perücke. Aber dann wäre die Trennung ja vollzogen. Mir scheint jeder Zweifel ausgeschlossen, dass die ursprüngliche Form des Kernaufbaus mit der ersten Einführung der Mondsichel zwischen Scheitelumhüllung und Lok- kenkugel zerstört wird. Das geschieht aber nicht erst bei Kavâd I. zweite Regierung, sondern schon bei der frühen Krone des Pêrôz, ja wahrscheinlich be- reits unter Yazdegerd II. Ausserdem übersieht Herz- feld, dass die Krone Typ A des Pêrôz eine stark überhöhte Kappenform zeigt, die nicht mehr Scheitel- verhüllung, sondern ein selbstständiges Gebilde ist.
bau als der Frisurumhüllung und dem Stirnreifen als dem Emblemträger und damit der Krone im engeren Sinne. Erst unter Péroz, bzw. unter Yazdegerd II., wird diese Trennung aufgehoben, werden Kernaufbau und Stirnreifen, indem beide zu Emblemträgern werden, miteinander verschmolzen. Damit ist der Weg frei zu jenen komplizierten Formen, die für die späteren Kronen der Sásánidnen bezeichnend sind.  


Es wäre nicht undenkbar, dass hier auch der Keim liegt für die eigenartige Sitte der "hängenden Krone" (Exkurs I).


77 Profilansicht des Stirnreifens und der an ihm angebrachten Embleme sowie der Scheitelscheibe, soweit diese noch gegeben wird, und Vorderansicht des oberen Abschusses. Allein auch das genügt noch nicht. Die Kugel behält ihre alte Form bei, die als ein leicht zur Dreiviertelansicht verschohenes Profil zu deuten sein dürfte. Die Ansicht wechselt also noch einmal oder einfacher: alle Formen sind nach wie vor im Profil gegeben, nur die obere Mondsichel und die gelegentlich in der folgenden Zeit mit ihr an der Scheitelscheibe auftretenden anderen Embleme sind en face gestellt.  


Nur werden diese Flügel nicht wie bei Varhrān II., Ohrmīz II. und Varhrān IV. am Stirnreifen angebracht, an dem ja auch wegen des Zinnenkrances kein Platz wäre, sondern an der Scheitelscheibe. Leider sind die Münzbilder zu undeutlich, um uns eine einwandfreie Auskunft über die Art dieser Anbringung zu geben. Die mässigen Prägungen sind durch den misslungenen Versuch, den komplizierten Aufbau perspektivisch wiederzugeben, besonders unklar. Glücklicherweise sind wir nicht auf sie allein angewiesen. An der Rückwand

78 Vergl. dazu K. Erdmann "Wie sind die Kronen der sasanidischen Münzen zu lesen?" Z.D.M.G., I ([1945-49], 206-11).

79 Wobei der Name Péroz (der Siegreiche) die Verbindung mit dem Gott des Sieges nahelegt, wenn nicht hergestellt haben mag.
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des grossen Ívás am Tāk-i-Bustān hat sich eine Darstellung dieser Krone erhalten, die uns über alle Einzelheiten ausreichend unterrichtet (Abb. 14).80 Die Flügel sind bei ihr seitlich, etwa auf der Höhe der Schäfen hinter dem Zinnenkranz am unteren Rande der Scheitellkappe befestigt. Dadurch schmiegen sie sich nicht mehr wie früher dem Kopf an, sondern laden, durch nahezu die ganze Breite der Scheitellkappe voneinander getrennt, stehend und leicht gestützt, seitlich kräftig aus und bilden so einen Rahmen um die obere auf dem Kappenscheitel ruhende Gruppe aus Mondsichel und Kugel.81


Die Kronen der auf Pērōz folgenden Herrscher geben diese reiche Form wieder auf. Die Münzbilder bleiben zunächst undeutlich. Erst als sich unter Khusrav I. ein mehr zeichnerischer Stil durchsetzt, werden sie klarer.82 Andere Darstellungen fehlen bisher noch. So können wir noch nicht mit Sicherheit sagen, worin sich die Kronen dieser Herrscher voneinander unterscheiden. Valāš (483–488)83 zeigt die Kronenform Yazdegards II.


82 Zur stilistischen Entwicklung der sasānīdīschen Münzen vergl. Herzfeld, A.M.I., IX (1938), 115–16, wo er eine frühe Stufe mit Prägungen von guter Qualität (Ardašīr I bis Shāhpuhr II. mittlere Zeit), eine mittlere Stufe "traurigen" (Shāhpuhr II. mittlere Zeit bis Kavād I. erste Regierung) und eine späte Stufe linearer Stile (Kavād I. zweite Regierung bis Yazdegard III.) unterscheidet. Zu etwa der gleichen Dreiteilung kommt auch C. Trever (Survey, S. 819 ff.). Diese drei Stufen decken sich grob gesehen, mit den drei Phasen der Kronenentwicklung, sind aber, da die Entwicklung der Kronenformen nach eigenen, nur sekundär aesthetisch bedingten Gesetzen verläuft, kaum mit ihnen in Verbindung zu bringen. Allenfalls könnte man sagen, dass die einfachen Kronenformen der ersten Phase sich bei den Münzen günstig ausgewirkt haben für die Klarheit der Prägungen, während die Auflöcherung der Ausgangsmuster in der zweiten Phase der Kronenentwicklung der "malerischen Tendenz" entgegenkommt, die in der sasānīdīschen Kunst auf allen Gebieten die mittlere Periode kennzeichnet; die komplizierten Formen der dritten Phase dagegen waren nur mit zeichnerischen Mitteln darstellbar, können also ihrerseits dazu beigetragen haben, den "linearen Stil" der Spätzeit zu verstärken.

83 Im Taḏīnāmeh soll die Krone des Valāš himmelblau gewesen sein. Andere Darstellungen dieses Königs sind nicht bekannt, wenn man nicht die Sil-
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bereits der Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore (vergl. Anm. 69) statt auf Yazdegerd II. auf ihn beziehen will.


Dieser König wird bei Ḥamza al-ʿIsfahānī nicht genannt. Seine Münzen sind selten und in der Prüfung nicht sehr klar, doch fällt ihre Deutung nicht schwer, wenn man die Entwicklung übersieht.

bleibt auch sie bei dem geläufigen Schema der mittleren Zeit, deren Kronen überhaupt keinen so starken Akzent mehr auf die Symbolformen zu legen scheinen wie die der frühen Zeit, was ja auch verständlich ist, nachdem einmal die ursprüngliche Beziehung von Königskrone und Götterkrone aufgegeben wurde. Zinnen und Mondssichel am Stirnreifen, Mondssichel und Kugel auf der Scheitelkappe bilden wie bei seiner ersten Krone die Auswahl. Das unterscheidende Merkmal liegt in der Form der Kappe. Solange diese nur die Umhüllung des Haupthaeres war, hatte sie naturgemäß immer halbrunde Form. Aber auch nachdem sie mit der Einführung der oberen Mondssichel zur selbständigen Form geworden war, behielt sie diese Form zunächst bei. Erst mit der zweiten Krone des Kavād I. wird sie höher gebildet und unter Khusrau I. (531–578) nimmt sie einen Umriss an, der fast an die Kappen der Arsakiden erinnert. Bei Ohrmizd IV. (578–590) wird sie noch steiler und dominiert so stark, dass die Zinnen als bestimmendes Element im Aufbau der Krone ganz zurücktreten. Im Wesentlichen scheinen die Kronen dieser Herrschers durch die Form (und vermutlich Farbe) ihrer Kappe unterschieden.

Eine Ausnahme bildet der Typ A der Krone des Pērōz, bei dem die Scheitelkappe hoch ist.

Diese Änderung der Kappehenform nimmt Herzfeld (A.M.I. IX [1938], 121) als den Punkt der Entwicklung, der in Wirklichkeit bereits unter Yazdegerd II. oder Pērōz mit der Einführung der oberen Mondssichel erreicht wird.

Hamza al-ʿIsfahānīs längere Beschreibung der Darstellung Khusraus I. im Ṭāḏjānāmeh enthält keine Angaben über die Krone. Zu den Münzen treten ergänzend der Bergkristall in der Goldschale aus St. Denis in der Bibliothèque Nationale und die obere Szene auf der Silberschale aus Kungur in der Ermitage (Erdmann, Jb., S. 216 f.).

Nach dem Ṭāḏjānāmeh war die Krone Ohrmizds IV. grün. Andere Darstellungen sind nicht bekannt.

worden zu sein. Die Emblemawahl ist jedenfalls bei allen die gleiche.\(^9\)

Eine markante neue Form bringt erst die zweite Krone Khusraus II. Parwöz (590-628).\(^10\) Offensichtlich greift dieser König mit


Wie Khusrau II. der letzte bedeutende Herrscher des Säsänidenhauses ist, so ist seine Krone die letzte von ausgeprägter Eigenart. Die Kronen der fünfzehn Könige nach ihm, die sich in den wenigen Jahren, die das Reich noch besteht (628–633), in rascher Folge ablösen, können, so weit sie uns überhaupt bekannt sind96 und die äusserst mangelhaften Prädigungen eine Vorstellung von ihrem Aussehen geben, kaum Interesse mehr beanspruchen. Sie variieren die von Khusrau II. gewählte Form, wobei der Doppelflügel zum Teil wieder aufgegeben wird und in der oberen Mondsichel, Kugel und Stern wechselnd verwendet sind.97

95 Vergl. Anm. 62.
96 Unbekannt sind die Kronen der folgenden Herrscher: Khusrau III., Djuvandshar, Gughnasbandah, Azarmidukht, Khusrau IV, und Péroz II.

zeigen 5 einen vollen Zinnenkranz, bei 8 ist er über der Stirn unterbrochen, 3 zeigen nur vorn und hinten eine Zinne, 1 zwei seitliche Zinnen, nur eine vordere Zinne. Von anderen Emblemen kommen Strahlen nur bei 1, die Hohlkehle bei 2, Flügel dagegen bei 8 Kronen vor. Von diesen sind sie bei 3 Kronen am Stirnreifen, bei 5 an der Scheitelkappe angebracht. Unikum sind die Kreisscheiben der Börän-Krone. Sehr beliebt ist das Motiv der Mondsichel. Im Kernaufbau zeigen es 15 Kronen, davon 9 am Reifen über der Stirn, 3 seitlich am Reifen, 9 auf dem Kappenscheitel und zwar meist (bei 6 Kronen) in Verbindung mit einer Stirnreifenmondsichel. Nur in 3 Fällen kommt die Mondsichel auf der Kappe allein vor. Von den herangezogenen 27 Kronen zeigen 9 zwei Mondsscheiden, 7 nur eine, 3 einen Stern an Stelle der Kugel. (Dabei sind in dieser Aufstellung allerdings die wenigen ungeklärten Fragen der Emblemverteilung als "vorläufig beantwortet" eingerichtet, da ja nur eine flüchtige Übersicht gegeben werden sollte.)

In schematischer Übersicht (Abb. 18) lässt sich die Entwicklung der sasanidischen Krone danach folgendermassen wiedergeben:


   a) Entwicklung der Grundformen.  
      (Ardašīr I. bis Narseh, 224–302.)  
   b) Einfache Variation der Grundformen. (Ohrmizd II. bis Šāhpuhr III., 302–388.)

II. Mittlere (Übergangs-) Stufe (Varhrān IV. bis Pērōz, 388–483). 

   a) 1. Stufe der Auflösung der Ausgangsform: Aufhebung der Emblemeinheit, sonst wie I.  
      (Varhrān IV. bis Varhrān V., 388–438.)  
      (Yazdegerd II. bis Pērōz, 438–483.)


      (Vālāsh bis Khusrau II. erste Kronenform, [483–590]).  
   b) Endstufe 2: Endgültige Auflösung der Ausgangsform, indem man die Kugel durch einen Stern ersetzt.  
      (Khusrau II. zweite Kronenform bis Yazdegerd III., 591–633).

EXKURS I. DIE HÄNGENDE KRONE

Bei der Erzählung vom Besuch Königs Nu’māns von Hira bei Khusrau I. schreibt Ṭabarī (ed. T. Nödeke [Leyden, 1879], S. 221/2) "Der König pflegte in seinem Thronsaal zu sitzen, worin sich seine Krone befand. Diese war so gross wie ein Scheffelmaass, mit Rubinen, Smaragden, Perlen, Gold und Silber beschlagen und hing an einer goldenen Kette oben vom Gewölbe des Zimmers herab. Sein Nacken wäre nicht stark genug gewesen, die Krone zu tragen. Er verhüllte sich also mit seinen Kleidern, bis er auf dem Thron sass, dann steckte er den Kopf in die Krone, und wenn er nun recht sass, nahm man die Kleiderhülle ab. Wer ihn so zum ersten Mal sah, der sank vor Ehrfurcht in die Knie vor ihm."

Von Khusrau II. schreibt derselbe Autor (op. cit., S. 304) "Sein Throngewölbe war so herrlich gebaut, wie man noch nichts gesehen hatte. Darin war seine Krone aufgehängt, und er sass dort, wenn er den Leuten Audienz gab."

Diese Angaben ergänzt Tha'alibi (ed. H. Zotenberg [Paris, 1900] S. 699 f.) "Sie (die Krone Khusraus II.) war aus 60 mann reinen Goldes, besetzt mit Perlen so gross wie Sperlingsseier und mit granatfarbenen Rubinen, die die Schatten vertrieben".
und in dunklen Nächten wie Lichter leuchten, und mit Smaragden, deren Anblick genügte, um Schlangen in den Schmelzen zu bringen. Eine goldene Kette von 70 cuvits Länge hing vom Gewölbe des Palastes, an der war die Krone befestigt, so dass die Krone des Kaisers nur berührte, aber nicht störte oder belastete."


Nach F. Justi (Geschichte des alten Persien [Berlin, 1879], S. 210) soll der Ring, an dem sie befestigt war, erst im Jahre 1812 entfernt worden sein.


Eng an die genannten Ausserungen arabischer Autoren schliesst 43,38643 an. (Abschnitt "Khusrau Parwâz" Kapitel "Khusrau baut den Palast von Madâ'in") Dort heisst es anlässlich der Thronbesteigung nach Vollendung des Baus:


Er hängte die Krone über dem TeakholzThron auf."

1 Eine Zusammenfassung dieser Stellen bei A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides (Kopenhagen, 1936), S. 392.
2 Bei der Zusammenstellung der folgenden Stellen bin ich Herrn Dr. K. H. Hansen, Hamburg, für seine freundliche Hilfe zu Dank verpflichtet.

3 Zählung nach F. Wolf, Glossar zu Firdōsîs Shahname (Berlin, 1934).
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Er hängte die Krone über dem Elfenbeinthron auf."

42,161 (Abschnitt "Ohrmizd,") Kapitel "Ohrmizd töret Simähburzen und Varhrän A'drmahan") heisst es ähnlich:

"Der Weltenherrscher setzte sich auf den Elfenbeinthron.
Und man hängte jene wertvolle Krone auf.

Entsprechend auch 10,273 (Abschnitt "Gashäsp,"
Kapitel "Rustam bringt Kai Kobad vom Berg El-
hurs"). wo die Inthronisation Kai Kobads als Nach-
folger des Gashäsp mit folgenden Worten beschrie-
ben wird:

"Am achten Tage errichteten sie den elfen-
beinernen Thron.
Sie hängten über dem Thron die Krone auf."

Kleine Varianten bringen 29,6 und 29,12 (Ab-
schnitt "Shahpurchu Duls-Aktät,"
Kapitel "Geburt
und Thronbesteigung Shahpurchurs"). Vers 6 heisst es von der kurz vor der Entbindung stehenden Mutter:

"Über ihrem Kopf hängten sie eine Krone auf.
Über jene Krone streuten sie Gold und Münzen
aus."

und Vers 12 nach der erfolgten Geburt des Kindes:

"Es kamen die Helden mit goldenem Gürtel,
Sie hängten über ihm die goldene Krone auf.

Sie legten den vierzig Tage Alten unter jene
Krone
Und auf den glückhaften Thron seines Vaters."

Endlich zwei Stellen aus dem Abschnitt "Khusraw
Parwëz" und zwar 43,906 (Kapitel "Thronbesteigung
Varhrän Chobins"): 

"Man legte den Palast aus, (bis er) sauber wie
Elfenbein (war).

Über dem Thron hängte man die Krone auf.
und 43,2187 (Kapitel "Gesandtschaft des Kaisar
an Khusraw Parwëz"): 

"Es zog . . . der König das Gewand an
Und hängte jene juwelengeschmückte Krone
auf.

Er befahl, dass man den Vorhang hebe
Und die Grossen einlassen in den Saal."

Vier weitere Stellen nennen die "hängende Krone"
in einem anderen Zusammenhang:

6,1141 (Abschnitt "Feridun,"
Kapitel "Tod des Feridun") wird von Manöchir erzählt, dass er die
Beisetzung des Feridun folgendermaassen vornahm:

"Nach Art der Könige baute er ein Grabmal aus
rotem Gold unf Lapislazuli.
Sie errichteten unter ihm einen elfenbeinernen
Thron.

Sie hängten über dem Elfenbeinthron die Krone auf."

Ähnliches wird 13,1651 (Abschnitt "Kai Khus-
rau,"
Kapitel "Gev tötet Tazhav aus Rache für
Varhran") von dem Leichnam Varhrans erzählt:

"Er (nämlich Gev) füllte sein Gehirn mit
Moschus und Ambra.
Er bedeckte seinen Körper mit chinesischer
Seide.
Nach Art des Königs der Könige legte er ihn
schlafen auf dem elfenbeinernen Thron.
Er hängte über ihm die Krone auf.

In derselben Art wird 15,4402 (Abschnitt "Gush-
tasp,") Kapitel "Tod des Gushtasp,") von der Be-
setzung dieses Königs gesagt:

"Man baute ein Grabmal aus Ebenholz und
Elfenbein.
Man hängte über dem Thron die Krone auf.

Am ausführlichsten sind die Angaben die Nosjîn-
ranvan seinem Sohn für sein Begräbnis gibt (41,4597
Abschnitt "Kisra Nosjînravan,") Kapitel "Nosjîn-
ranvan belehnt seinen Sohn Ohrmizd"): 

"Für mich soll gebaut werden ein schöner Palast,
An einem Ort, an den keiner kommt.

Bekleidet uns nach Kayäner Art,
Nach Art der säsänidischen Könige,
Erbaut hiernach einen Elfenbeinthron,
Aufgehängt über dem Elfenbeinthron die
Krone."

Selbstverständlich enthalten diese Stellen Firdös, von 43, 3804 abgesehen, keine im einzelnen Fall ver-
wertbaren, archäologischen Angaben. Als Ganzes aber beweisen sie, auch wenn man in Rechnung stellt, dass
es sich um eine feststehende dichterische Formel
handelt, doch so viel, dass die "hängende Krone"
zusammen mit dem elfenbeinernen Thron eng mit
der Vorstellung königlicher Macht in Iran verbunden
war. Nach Firdös hing die Krone nicht nur im
Thronsaal des Palmastes von Ktesiphon-Madâ' in
derer Decke herab, sondern überall, wo der König
residierte, wird sie aufgehängt, gewissermaassen als
Zeichen seiner Gegenwart, bei der Thronbesteigung,
wie bei feierlicher Audienz, bei prunkvollen Festen
wie bei kurzem Aufenthalt in einer Stadt auf der
Durchreise. Und nicht nur der lebende König, auch
der tote hat sie als Zeichen seiner einstigen Macht
und Größe in seinem Grabmal, wo er auf dem elfen-
beinernen Thron aufgebahrt ruht, über sich hängen.
Unter diesen Umständen ist wohl die Annahme
berechtigt, dass der Kalif 'Umar säsänidischer Tradi-
SÄSÄNIDISCHEN KRONE

EXKURS II. DAS DIADEM

E. Herzfeld beschreibt ("Khusrau Parwëz und der Tāq i Vastān," A.M.L., IX [1938], 107) den Aufbau der säsänidischen Krone folgendermaßen:

"Über die seide (der Scheitelumhüllung) ist die eigentliche corona gesetzt, ein goldener reif, an dem die anderen symbole befestigt werden. Um den unteren Rand dieses Stirnreifens ist ein meist perlbesetztes diadem, mp. defem, oder eine taenia, griechischer abstammung, geschlungen, mit flatternden enden." Er trennt also zwischen corona gleich Stirnreifen und diadem gleich perlbesetztem Band, das in Bünden endet. Nach seiner Meinung schliesst der 


1 Auf arsakidischen Münzen wird das zunächst im offenen Haar getragene Diadem mit seinen beiden, meist schmalen Nackenbinden bei der Einführung der Kappe offenbar um deren unteren Rand geschlungen.


Ähnlich wie auf der Berliner Jagdschale schwebt der Putto über einem König beim Gelage (besser wohl bei einer Opferhandlung) auf einer Silberschale in Leningrad (Erdmann, K.I., Abb. 68), nur dass bei dem von ihm getragenen Diadem die Binden zu kleinen Schleifen verkürmt sind (was übrigens dem Befund der späteren Münzen entsprechen würde), während vorn eine grosse Mondsichel angebracht ist. Mondsicheln dieser Art kommen über der Stirn des Königs seit Yazdegird I. vielfach vor (auch bei dem auf der Schale dargestellten König), sie scheinen aber immer zu den am oberen Rand des Reifens angebrachten Emblemen zu gehören. Dass sie an einem um den Reifen gelegten Diadem befestigt waren, wäre möglich, aber doch nicht sehr wahrscheinlich. Leider sind die beiden Silberschalen, denen diese Beispiele entnommen sind, so spät, dass es fraglich ist, wie weit ihre Darstellungen als zuverlässige Quelle gelten können.

In diesem Zusammenhang wäre auf die ähnlich als offene Diadem mit flatternden Binden an ihren Enden gebildeten Bogenstirnseiten der sasanidischen Baukunst hinzuweisen. Das bekannteste Beispiel, der
Hauptivän des Tāk-i-Bustān, zeigt oben (= vorn) wieder eine Mondsichel. Entsprechende Archivolten aus Stuck wurden in Ktesiphon und Kish gefunden.


An dieser Stelle wäre zu vermerken, dass auf dem Zonenrelief mit dem Sieg Shahpuhrs I. über Valerian in Bigşąpûr (S.H., Taf. XLIII) einer der persischen Würdenträger hinter dem um Gnade flehenden Valerian dem triumphierenden Grosskönig ein bindenloses Diadem entgegenstreckt, in dem man wohl eine iranisch formulierte Symbolisierung der dem römischen Kaiser abgenommenen Caesarenwürde erkennen darf.7 Ähnliches scheint schon auf Arsamidenmünzen vorkommen.8

7 Auf dem Relief mit der gleichen Darstellung in Naksâh-i-Rustam trägt Valerian den bindenlosen Lorbeerkrantz des römischen Kaisers.
8 Vergl. E. T. Newell "The Coinage of the


Parthians" (Survey, S. 491) zu einer Münze des Pacorus, auf der hinter der Nike, die dem König das Diadem reicht, eine männliche Figur mit einem offenen Diadem in den Händen steht, in der Newell den besiegten Usurpator Artabân IV. annimmt. Auf der Londoner Silberschale (Dalton, No. 208) dürfte sich die Bindenlosigkeit des Diadems vielleicht daraus erklären, dass der Empfänger kein Grosskönig, sondern ein Würdenträger ist.

9 Ähnlich bei Enten auf der gemalten Nachahmung eines säsänischen Stoffes in der "Grossen Höhle" von Ming-Oï bei Qyzyl, Ost-Turkestan (Herzfeld, A.T., Taf. LXIII).
im Nacken des Königs an seinem Halsschmuck befestigt wurden, würde eine Darstellung wie die auf der Silberschale von Tschurinskaja mit einem Maximum an Deutlichkeit diesen Halsschmuck wiedergeben. Diese Fragen müssten näher untersucht werden, vor allem wäre dabei zu klären, ob, wenn dieser Wechsel in der Anbringung der grossen Binden in der hier angenommenen Form stattgefunden hat, damit auch die Bedeutung, die ursprünglich dem Diadem der Krone zukam, auf den neuen Binder träger, den Halsschmuck, übergegangen ist.

Vielfach tragen die Tiere der säsäischen Kunst das "Diadem" nicht in Maul oder Schnabel, sondern um den Hals gelegt, was seinerseits ja auch dafür sprechen könnte, dass nicht mehr das Diadem der Krone, sondern der Hals schmuck des königlichen Ornates gemeint ist. Als Beispiele seien die Stuckplatten mit liegenden Widdern aus Ktesiphon (Erdmann, K. I., Abb. 42), sowie die Stoffe mit Flügel pfedern und Steinböcken in Lyon und in der Moore Collection (Survey, Taf. 202 A/B und S. 715, Abb. 249) genannt. Einmal in dieser Weise mit dem Tier direkt verbunden, degeneriert das Motiv naturgemäss rasch zur schmückenden Ausstattung der Figur, wobei meist die Perlen verkümmern oder verschwinden und die Binden dominierend werden oder allein übrig bleiben. Doch kommen auch unter späten und ausseriranischen Beispielen immer wieder Darstellungen vor, die die Einzelheiten erkennen lassen und zwischen Perlenband und Binden deutlich trennen, ja sogar die vorderen Juwelenanhänger noch zeigen.


(Manuskript abgeschlossen im Juli 1948.)

10 Ähnliche, angeblich aus der Gegend von Susa stammende Platten mit schreitenden Widdern, die ein "Diadem" um den Hals tragen, waren vor dem Kriege im Handel.


Abb. 1—Kronen der säsäntischen Könige (nach Herzfeld)
Abb. 2—Sassanidische Münzen
Anordnung wie in Abb. 1 (Aber Ohne die beiden en Face Darstellungen der unteren Zwei Reihen bei Herzfeld)
Nach Herzfeld

Abb. 3—Varhrān V
Abb. 4—Dījamāsp
Abb. 5—Pērz, Typ A

Abb. 6—Khusrau II., Anno 1
Abb. 7—Khusrau II., Aureus, Anno 21
Abb. 8—Bōrán
Abb. 9—Ohrmīzd V

Abb. 3—9—Sasanische Münzen. Addenda zu Abb. 1 und 2 (Abb. 3, 4, 7—9 im Münzkabinett, Berlin)

Nach Catalogue, Exhibition, New York, 1940

Abb. 10—Stuckbüste Varhrān V. Kish, Palast II
Nach Herzfeld

Abb. 11—Königskopf der Silberschale im British Museum

Abb. 12—Königskopf der Silberschale des Metropolitan Museums

Abb. 13—Silberschale. Sammlung Fabricius
Abb. 14—Tāḵ-i-Bustān, Hauptivān, Rückwand, Königeiche Investitur

Abb. 15—Stuckplatte aus der Gegend von Rayy, Philadelphia Museum of Art

Abb. 16—Kopf des Königs aus Abb. 15, Berlin, Islamische Abteilung

Abb. 17—Königskopf der Silberschale der Bibliothèque Nationale
SASANIDISCHEN KRONE

ABB. 18—KRONEN DER SASANIDISCHEN KÖNIGE
NOTES

NOTE ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF PERSIAN ART

“What does it profit me to have seen these things, if I do not know what they mean?”

(Shepherd of Hermes, Vision, III, 3, 1.)

In the following note, the problem of meaning in Persian art will be discussed only in connection with the representations of living things. The actual existence of such representations makes it needless to refer at any length to the question of the Islamic iconoclasm, which might have accounted for their absence. We shall do well to remember that this was a Semitic inheritance and that even the ancient Hebrews had never refrained from the representation of supernatural beings, for which there is ample evidence in the accounts of the “decorations” of the temple of Solomon, and in the fact of the representation of Cherubim by Sphinxes; what was objected to was what Plato calls the making of copies of copies. The instruction to Moses had been to “make all things in accordance with the pattern that was shown thee on the mount,” 1 “and so it was with the Tabernacle”; 2 hence, as was pointed out by Tertullian, the decorations of the Temple were “not images of the kind to which the prohibition applied.” 3

It is often a supernatural iconography and perhaps always a symbolic iconography that survives in what we have been so apt to think of as a merely “decorative” art. For that matter, all the earlier part of the Shah Namah itself is really mythological; and it seems to me that no one who knew the Mantik al-Tair or Rumi’s question, “How are ye hunters of the simurgh of the heart?” 4 or who was familiar with the Sufi denunciations of the carnal soul as a “dragon” could have seen in the stories of the simurgh only a meaningless vestige of the old Saena Muruk, Verethragna, or in the conflicts of heroes with dragons the implications of a psychomachy.

It will be much the same if we consider other Persian books of poetry, of which the content is rarely secular; in the pictures of Laila and Majnun, or those of an illustrated Haft Paikar, or a Kalila wa-Dimna, it would be unreasonable to suppose that what was presented to the eye had none of the meaning of what was presented to the ear. In fact, the subjects of book illustrations are often referred to by the metaphysical poets in their symbolic senses. Rumi, for example, refers to the Story of the Hare and the Elephants, and calls those blind who do not see its hidden meaning, 5 and elsewhere to the story of the Hare and the Lion, in which the hare has quite a different significance. It is with reference to such well-known themes as that of Siyawush riding the flames that he exclaims, “Blest is the Turkoman whose horse gallops into the midst of the fire! Making his steed so hot that it seeks to mount the zenith of the sky!” 6 the horse in Sufi symbolism generally meaning the body, ridden and controlled by the spirit.

Representations of polo games are common enough, but what they might have suggested to a cultivated Persian mind one should consider ‘Arifi’s Gây u Chawgân. Alexander’s search for the Water of Life in the Land of Darkness, a subject of which there are many pictures, is a Grail Quest. The Seven Sleepers with their dog in the cave are depicted on the


1 Ex. 25, 40.
2 Zohar, IV, 61.
3 Adversus Marcionem, 2, 22.
4 The Mathnawi of Jalâlu’ddin Rumi, ed., tr.
5 Ibid., III, line 2805.
6 Ibid., III, line 3613.
pages of manuscripts, and often referred to in connection with the inverted senses of sleeping and waking—‘this ‘sleep’ is the state of the ḥārif even when he is ‘awake’,” and the dog as well “is a seeker after God” in this mundane cave.  

In all these cases the point is not that the picture can be explained merely by a reference to the literary sources of which they are illustrations, but that both must be understood with reference to a doctrinal meaning that, as Dante said, “eludes the veil of the strange verse.” Neither is it only painted pictures that must be understood in this way; the anagogical values can be read in a work of art of any kind. Sa’dî, for example, exclaims: “How well the brocader’s apprentice said, when he portrayed the ‘ankâ’, the elephant, and the giraffe, ‘From my hand there came not one form (ṣūrat) the pattern (nāḵš) of which the Teacher from above had not first depicted.”

It would be, then, only a pathetic fallacy to assume for the Persians the same kind of esthetic preoccupation that makes ourselves so indifferent to the meaning and utility of the work of art; these are its intelligibility. An axe is unintelligible to a monkey, however fine an axe it may be, because he does not know its intention; and so in the case of the man who does not care what the picture is about and knows only whether or not it pleases his eye. We dare not presume that Persian art was as insignificant as our own; their estate was not yet like ours, a Tom, Dick, and Harryocracy. Rather let us investigate their own conception of the purpose and nature of works of art. “Aesthetics,” so-called, being a branch of philosophy, it is to the metaphysicians that we must turn; we cannot expect to learn much from the Mutakallimûn whose iconoclasm had to do with externals, but may learn something from the Sufis, whose iconoclasm extended to the very concept of “self” and for whom to say “I” amounted to idolatry and polytheism.

As in Indian, Greek, and Christian theology, so the Persian in his references to works of art has always in mind the analogy of the divine and human artists. The divine Artist is thought of now as an architect, now as a painter, or as a writer, or potter, or embroiderer; and just as none of His works is meaningless or useless, so no one makes pictures, even in a bathhouse, without an intention. “Does any painter,” Rûmî asks, “paint a beautiful picture (nāḵš) for the picture’s own sake, or with some good end in view? Does any potter make a pot for the sake of the pot, or with a view to the water? Does any calligrapher (khwattâ) write with such skill for the sake of the writing itself, or to be read? The external form (nāḵš) is for the sake of an unseen form, and that for the sake of yet another . . . in proportion to your maturity”—meaning upon meaning, like the rungs of a ladder. “The picture on the wall is a likeness of Adam, indeed, but see from the form (ṣūrat) what is lacking,—the Spirit”; “the picture’s smiling appearance is for your sake, so that by means of the picture the real theme (ma’nâ) may be established.”

A fourteenth-century text on pictures in bathhouses, cited by Sir Thomas Arnold, explains that representations of gardens and flowers stimulate the vegetative, those of war and the chase the animal, and erotic paintings the spiritual principles of man’s constitution.

---

8 Bustân, V, lines 133-35.
9 Mathnawi, IV, line 3000.
10 Ibid., IV, lines 2881 ff.
11 Ibid., I, lines 1020-21.
12 Ibid., I, line 2769.
This may seem strange to modern ears, but it is precisely one of the things that must be understood if the Persian or, indeed, any other traditional art is to be understood: Rūmī, for example, can both ask, “What is love?” and answer, “Thou shalt know when thou comest me,” and also say that “whether love be from this side or from that (profane or sacred), in the end it leads up yonder.”

All this does not apply only to pictures. “One can use a book as a pillow, but the true end of the book is the science it contains,” “or can you pluck a rose from the letters rose?” Similarly for gardens: “This outward springtime and garden are a reflection of the garden spiritual . . . . that thou mayest with purer vision behold the garden and cypress plot of the world unseen.” Again, there are few, if any, productions of Persian art more beautiful than the mosque lamps; and here we can be sure that every Muslim must have known the interpretation it contains in the Koran: “Almighty is the Light of heaven and earth. The likeness of his Light is a niche in which is a lamp; the lamp is in a glass; and the glass is like a brightly shining star; it is kindled from a blessed tree, neither of the East nor of the West, of which the oil would never burn untouched by fire. Light upon light! Allah guideth unto his Light whomsoever He will; and He speaketh to mankind in allegories (amthäī); for He is the knowers of all things.” Some would have been familiar, also, with the further exegesis according to which, as Dārā Shikūh says, the niche represents the world, the light is the Light of the Essence, the glass through which it shines is the human soul, the tree is the Self of Truth, and the oil is the timeless Spirit.

The artist’s procedure involves the two operations, imaginative and operative, intellectual and manual; the work of art itself being the resultant of the four causes, formal, efficient, material, and final. “Behold in the architect the idea of the house (khayāl-i-khāna), hidden in his heart like a seed in the earth; that idea comes forth from him like a sprout from the ground”; “behold the house and the mansions; once they were spells (af-sân) in the architect [that is, ‘art in the artist’]. It was the occasion (‘arz), and the concept (andīsha) of the architect that adduced the tools and the beams. What but some idea, occasion, and concept is the source of every craft (pisha)? The beginning, which is thought (fikr), finds its end in the work (‘aml); and know that in such wise was the making of the world from eternity. The fruits come first in the thought of the heart, at the last they are actually seen; when you have wrought, and planted the tree, at the end you read the prescription”; “the crafts are all the shadows of conceptual forms” (zilli-i-shūrat-i-andīsha). That all amounts to saying that the actual form reveals the essential form, and that the proportion of one to the other is the measure of the artist’s success.

Again, “the device on the ring (naksh-i-nigen) reveals the goldsmith’s concept.” The whole doctrine is exemplary; the work always the mimesis of an invisible paradigm. “In the time of separation Love (‘ishk) fashions forms (ṣūrat); in the time of union the Formless One emerges saying, ‘I am the source of the source of intoxication and sobriety both; whatever the form, the beauty is mine. . . .’

14 Mathnawi, II, preface.
15 Ibid., I, line 111.
16 Ibid., III, line 2089.
17 Ibid., I, line 3456.
18 Shams-i-Tabriz, Divān, Tabriz ed., 54:10; and Mathnawi, II, line 1944.
19 Koran, XXIV, 35.
20 Dārā Shikūh, Mazāma ‘l-Bahrāin, chapter 9.
21 Mathnawi, V, lines 1790–93.
22 Ibid., II, lines 965–73.
23 Ibid., VI, lines 3728.
24 Ibid., II, lines 1325–26.
The form is the vessel, the beauty the wine." It is precisely this creative Love that Dārā Shikāh equates with the principle "called Māyā in the language of the Indian monotheists"; and it is Plato’s Eros, the master in all makings by art, and Dante’s Amor that inspires his dolce stil nuovo. But though Rūmī would have agreed that "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made," he knows that the Artist himself is also veiled by his works, and would have endorsed the words of his great contemporary, Meister Eckhart: "Wouldst thou have the kernel, break the shell; and likewise, wouldst thou find out Nature undisguised, must thou shatter all her images." For the Sufi, this is what the "burning of idols" means.

Unless for a modern whose interest in works of art begins and ends in their esthetic surfaces, there will be nothing strange in the concept of art and of its place in a humane culture, as briefly outlined above. The primary sources of this Persian outlook may have been largely Platonic and Neo-Platonic, but the position as a whole is quite universal, and could as well be paralleled from Indian or medieval Christian as from Greek sources; it is, in fact, a position on which the whole world has been agreed. I shall only hint at this universality by a citation of two examples, that of St. Thomas Aquinas in comment on Dionysius Areopagiticus, where he says that "the being (esse) of all things derives from the Divine Beauty," and that of the Buddha who, in connection with the art of teaching, said: "The master-painter disposes his colors for the sake of a picture that cannot be seen in the colors themselves." 23

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY

UNE RÉPRÉSENTATION DE LA CITADELLE SELJOUKIDE DE MERV

Dans une étude récemment publiée, jour était attaché à montrer que deux plats de métal habituellement considérés comme sas- sanides étaient en fait des œuvres musul- manes. L’un de ces objets, conservé à Leningrad au Musée de l’Hermitage (Fig. 1), est particulièrement digne d’intérêt, en ce sens qu’on y voit figurée une scène de caractère historique. D’une part, le château qui en oc- cupe le centre est indubitablement "une construc- tion islamique dont le modèle doit se trouver au Turkestan et qui ne doit pas être anté- rieure à la fin du XIème s. de notre ère." D’autre part, divers détails caractéristiques amènent à chercher l’explication de la scène "dans le cadre des États turcs du Moyen-Age: Seldjoukides et dynasties issues d’eux": son- neurs de cor escortant un mahnal, souverain se montrant à la façade du château, étendards déployés surmontés d’un tugh. Sur ce dernier point, je suis être aujourd’hui plus affirmatif encore, car je n'avais alors trouvé à m'appuyer, qu’aux aspects de sandjak, impérial, que sur des documents postérieurs aux Seldjoukides, tandis que je puis maintenant invoquer un texte

26 Dārā Shikāh, op. cit., chapter 1.
27 Symposium, 197, A.
28 Purgatorio, 24, lines 52–54.
29 Romans, I, line 20.
30 Mathnawi, II, lines 759–62; see also Bhagavad Gītā, VII, line 25.
32 Opera Omnia (Parma, 1864), Opusc., VII, C. 4, line 5.
33 Lāḥkāvatārā Śātra, II, lines 112–114.
1 "Remarques sur les monuments omeyyades. II. Argenteries ‘Sassanides,’ Mélanges asiatiques (Journal asiatique), 1940–41, 19–57; j’y renvoie pour le détail de la discussion, me bornant à rappeler ici l’essentiel.
contemporain, auquel sa date et la personnalité de son auteur assurent une autorité irréceusable. Après la prise de Bâniyâs par Nûr al-Dîn b. Zengî, en 1157, on vit arriver à Damas les prisonniers francs: "on avait mis sur chaque chameau deux des plus vaillants de leurs chevaux et, déployé, un de leurs étendards auquel était un certain nombre de peaux de crânes de Francs avec leurs cheveux." Deux châteaux comparables à celui qui est figuré sur le plat se voient encore, avait-il dit, au Turkestan: l’un (Giavur-kal’a) à 150 km environ au Nord-Ouest de Khiva, l’autre (Ribât-i-Malik) à une centaine de kilomètres au Nord-Est de Boukhara. Mais il en existe aussi dans les ruines de Merv que E. Cohn-Wiener décrit ainsi:


Les photographies montrent effectivement une façade composée de gros contreforts semi-cylindriques jointifs, reposant sur un haut soubassement (Fig. 2), parcellé au rez-de-chaussée du château représenté sur le plat. La date qu’avait proposée Cohn-Wiener pour les édifices de ce type est sans le moindre doute


3 P. Pelliot, "Notes sur le Turkestan de M. W. Barthold," T’oung-Pao, XXVII (1930), 32, sur l’étendard "à neuf queues" (i.e. neuf flammes) de Gengis-Khan et ses antécédents.


5 Celle de Cohn-Wiener, op. cit., Fig. 14, est insuffisante pour laisser reconnaître autre chose qu’une silhouette vaguement modelée; j’emprunte ici celle de V. A. Žukovsky, Rasvâlî ni starogo Merva (St. Petersburg, 1894; Materiali po arkeologii Rossii, izdavaemie Arkeologicheskoi komissii, no. 6).
trop basse: elle a certainement été imposée à l’auteur par l’aspect massif des murailles, qui peut sembler en rapport avec une utilisation d’ordre militaire; mais nous savons que les résidences princières du Moyen-Âge étaient fortifiées, sans perdre pour autant leur caractère de palais. Au surplus l’édifice est construit en brique crue: son développement rendait inévitable l’emploi sous de grandes épaisseurs de cette matière, fragile par elle-même, pour obtenir la solidité requise. Disposant aujourd’hui d’un point de repère chronologique—Ribât-i-Malik—nous pouvons les attribuer à coup sûr à une époque antérieure à l’invasion mongole, et plus précisément à la fin du onzième ou au début du douzième siècle, date imposée par le type de l’inscription de Ribât-i-Malik. Au surplus, des quatre édifices de Merv qui sont construits sur ce modèle, trois sont situés dans la partie du champ de ruines qui correspond à la ville seldjoukide; a comme la dénomination sous laquelle est connue cette dernière—Sultan-Kal’a—rappelle clairement le souvenir du souverain seldjoukide qui la fonda, on est en droit de supposer que le nom de shahriyâr-ark loin d’être de pure fantaisie, évoque pareillement la destination première du bâtiment: celui-ci ne serait autre que la résidence fortifiée (ark) d’un souverain (shahriyâr), évidemment le souverain seldjoukide, puisqu’il s’élève dans la partie de la ville qui fut fondée par Malik-shâh et détruite par les Mongols. Et cette interprétation permet d’expliquer d’une manière simple ce foisonnement inattendu d’édifices d’un type si particulier, par l’imitation d’un monument célèbre: le palais des Seldjoukides de Merv serait le modèle dont se seraient inspirés les constructeurs des autres châteaux.

De ces observations il ne découle pas forcément que le bâtiment à contreforts semi-cylindriques figuré sur le plat de l’Hermitage doive être identifié à cette résidence des Seldjoukides; mais la scène représentée sur ce plat répond si bien à un événement survenu à Merv en 538 H./1144 A.D. que je crois impossible d’imaginer qu’il puisse en aller autrement.

“Atsiz séduisit deux vauriens du Khorezm, appartenant à la secte des mécénats hérétiques, acheta leur vie et, leur en ayant payé le prix, les dépecha vers Merv, pour qu’ils fassent périr le sultan à l’improviste et lui ravissent l’existence. Adib-Şâbir, ayant eu connaissance du fait, mit par écrit le signalement des deux individus et le fit passer à Merv, dans la tige de la botte d’une vieille femme. Quand le sultan reçut la lettre il ordonna de rechercher ces hommes: on les trouva (cachés) dans des ruines et on les envoya à l’Enfer.”

Nous trouvons ainsi dans l’histoire de Merv un événement répondant exactement à la scène figurée sur le plat, comme nous retrouvons dans les ruines de la ville un bâtiment dont le type répond exactement à celui du bâtiment figuré sur le plat; comme en outre les caractères de l’architecture représentée paraissent sensiblement à la date de l’événement en question, il est impossible d’admettre que toutes ces correspondances sont fortuites et on peut considérer comme certain que le plat de

7 On pourrait élever contre cette identification une objection que je crois facile à réfuter. Le soubassement du château figuré sur le plat semble fait de pierre de taille, ce qui ne conviendrait pas au bâtiment de Merv. Mais si l’on observe exactement la manière dont sont représentés les joints on hésitera à y reconnaître l’appareil d’une maçonnerie; ne serait-ce pas là plutôt le placage de faïence bleu turquoise dont on a retrouvé (Zukovsky, op. cit., p. 119) des fragments au pied de la façade du Shahrîyâr-ark?

Fig. 1—Le Plat du Musée de l'Hermitage

Fig. 2—Merv, Shahrivar-ark

D'après Zuckovsky

Fig. 3—Aiguière de Bronze. Perse, Douzième-Treizième Siècle. Musée de Louvre
l'Hermitage retrace l'exécution des deux Ismaéliens qui avaient voulu assassiner le sultan Sandjar, à Merv, en 1154. Désormais tous les détails de la scène s'éclairent, et exactement de la manière que nous avions dite: les deux cadavres basculés sur le parapet crénélés sont ceux des deux fida'i mis à mort, et "de la loggia de son palais, le sultan se présente à l'armée," rassemblée "sous la citadelle," cependant que sur la terrasse du château on promène en cérémonie le palanquin royal, au milieu des fanfares, et que les dames du harem contemplant la scène, installées dans des bow-windows grillagés."

Cette exégèse plus précise entraîne un corollaire qui n'est pas négligeable: le personnage qui paraît au-dessus de la porte du château n'est autre que Sandjar lui-même. Je crois distinguer sur les reproductions qu'il porte sur la tête une couronne. En tous cas on voit nettement que son visage est encadré de tresses de cheveux qui lui tombent sur les épaules. C'était là la coiffure normale des Oghuz, comme l'enseignent des documents contemporains, à savoir les nombreuses céramiques et bronzes de Perse d'époque seldjoukide (Figs. 3 et 4), qui mettent en scène des Turcs, reconnaissables à leurs yeux bridés, à leur face ronde et à leur barbe rare: du bonnet bordé de fourrure qui leur couvre la tête s'échappent régulièrement de longues nattes:

9Cf. la tête d'un rebelle suspendue au-dessus de la porte de la citadelle de Damas en 1424 (H. Sauvaire, "Description de Damas," Journal asiatique II (1895), 287, n. 80): on pourrait multiplier les exemples de cette pratique.


11Figure 4 est tiré d'une céramique de Sâve du douzième siècle après A. U. Pope, "The Ceramic Art in Islamic Times; A. The History," A Survey of Persian Art (London-New York, 1938-39), V, Pl. 652; on en trouvera d'autres dans le même recueil. J'ai eu jadis en mains la photo d'une statuette en céramique émaillée, datant sensiblement du douzième siècle et provenant vraisemblablement de Rakka, qui représentait un cavalier turc frappant de son sabre un serpent enroulé autour d'une jambe de son cheval: lui aussi portait de longues tresses de cheveux. Que ce soit là des Turcs et non des Mongols, c'est ce qu'atteste la date des objets considérés, tandis que leur provenance (Iran et régions limitrophes) établit que ce sont des Oghuz.

12W. Eberhard, Lokalkulturen im alten China (Leyden, 1942) (supplément à T'oung-Pao, XXXVII), I, 222. In der T'ang-Zeit trug man gelegentlich Zöpfe, und in einem Bericht wird die Zopfracht mit anderen fremden Sitten zusammen in einer Art erwähnt, dass man annehmen möchte, es sei eine türkische Sitte. Die Juan-juan trugen Zöpfe; sie waren ein jedenfalls mit Türkten untermischtes Volk. Es lässt sich aber leicht an Hand der älteren Texte zeigen, dass der Zopf eine in der Mandschurei heimische Modeform ist, die sich zeitweise auch über
vivre, et dont une lecture attentive décélerait à coup sûr des traces dans la littérature musulmane. C'est ainsi qu'Ibn Djubaïr a assisté en 1184, dans la mosquée de Médine, à une prédication faite par un docteur d'Isphahan à des A'âdîm qui semblent bien être des Turcs puisqu'on croit voir, malgré le peu de précision du texte à cet égard, que ce sont ceux qui escortent et accompagnent une khâtûn zengide de Mossoul : transportés d'émotion religieuse, ils viennent à l'orateur "lui mettre leurs tresses dans les mains"; il les coupe avec des ciseaux, et on leur met un turban sur la tête. Il est évident (cf. le fait cité à la note précédente) que ces deux gestes visaient à retirer à ces étrangers une apparence qui n'était pas conforme aux exigences de la Sunna, à leur donner un air plus musulman. Je crois que l'on peut expliquer de la même façon le fait que les Turcs (reconnaissables à leur kalpak) figurés dans les manuscrits irakiens des Makâmât n'ont généralement pas de tresses : déjà plus familiarisés, par la vie citadine, avec la coutume islamique, ils ont renoncé à l'ancien usage.

Il n'est point indifférent de voir que sur ce point Sandjar était resté fidèle à la coutume ancestrale. Au surplus, il ne faut pas accorder moins d'attention aux indications nouvelles qu'apporte cette représentation sur la résidence impériale de Merv, sur les insignes de souveraineté adoptés par les Seldjoukides d'Orient, et sur l'équipement et l'armement de leurs troupes.

J. Sauvaget

türkische Völker verbreitet hat, nicht eigentlich türkisch.

13 W. Barthold, Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrale (Paris, 1945), 171; Tamerlan et ses guerriers avaient conservé l'usage de la tresse de cheveux; "lorsque l'armée de Timour assiégea Damas, son petit-fils Sulîân Husain le trahit et se rangea du côté des assiégés: avant tout on lui fit couper sa tresse et on le fit changer de vêtements."


SOME PERSIAN DRAWINGS IN THE JOHNSON ALBUMS AT THE INDIA OFFICE, LONDON

Richard Johnson, banker to the great Warren Hastings and at one time Resident at Hyderabad, was a man of some eminence in the India of a century and a half ago, but today his name is chiefly known as the former owner of the sixty-six books and albums of drawings which he collected. Some of these manuscripts, now in the Library of the India Office, may have come into his hands as pledges in the course of his business.

I recently had occasion to look through these albums again after many years. They contain, as is well known, many hundreds of drawings, mostly Indian, good and bad, of every style and period, jumbled together haphazardly, according to the almost invariable, though to us inexplicable, fashion of collectors of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A number of the finest miniatures have been reproduced in various publications, but the albums contain, along with a considerable amount of dross, material of finer metal than I had thought, and it would be interesting if more of the best specimens could be reproduced.

This brief note is confined to a few Persian miniatures of the mid-Safawid period, none of which, I think, has been previously published. All are line drawings, on paper, with slight touches of color, occasionally of a delicate duck's-egg tint. None of them is of ambitious composition. Several are somewhat marred by inappropriate ornament.

Figures 1 and 2 bear similar inscriptions—that on our first example is certainly not by the artist himself—assigning them to Muḥammadī, that most charming of all late sixteenth-century painters. Neither can be accepted unreservedly as from his hand, although Muḥammadī, it is true, was fond of figures holding pikes and spears as in the second drawing.1

1 Cf. the lively composition from Ardebil, repro-
Figs. 1-2—Persian Drawings. London, India Office Library
Persian Drawings. London, India Office Library
The left-hand person in Figure 5 also can be attributed to this master without hesitation. This youth, in fact, bears some resemblance to Muḥammadī’s “Young Dervish” (also in the Johnson Collection). In Figure 5, the artist of the seated man drinking (right) cannot be identified with confidence, but this drawing and the dervish (a little masterpiece) of Figure 3 may well be from the same hand.

Number 4 of this series is a rapid sketch which loses something in reproduction. It is an admirably rhythmic and expressive little drawing.

J. V. S. Wilkinson

**MEMORANDUM ON THE**

**“CORPUS OF ISLAMIC METALWORK”** *

The *Corpus of Islamic Metalwork* embraces all periods within the artistic culture deduced in F. R. Martin, *The Miniature Painting and Painters of Persia, India, and Turkey* . . . (London, 1912), II, Pl. 102 (right), which can be unhesitatingly allotted to Muḥammadī.

2 Uṣṭād Muḥammadī, as he is justly styled in Rīğā-i ‘Abbāsī’s well-known copy (or embellishment) of a drawing by him of a youth (British Museum). It is reproduced in E. Blochet, *Musulman Painting* (London, 1929), Pl. CLIV.


* The memorandum as prepared by M. Aga-Oglo is here slightly condensed. Even this shortened version outlines, however, the wide scope of the work, on which the author was engaged from 1940 to 1947, and shows also how each of the main volumes was planned as a complete account of the history of metalwork in one of the Muslim countries. Fortunately, the manuscript of the first part of the first volume of the *Corpus* was complete at the time of the author’s death, and a great deal of the material for the other volumes had been collected. It is urgently hoped that the great effort put in this work will not be lost for scholarship and that it will be possible to bring out this valuable research in the not too distant future.

ED.

of the Islamic countries, with the additional consideration of Iranian metalwork of the Sasanian period and that of early Turkish origin. The scope of the subject covers geographical, historical, social, economic, metallurgical, technological, terminological, epigraphic, iconographic, and stylistic aspects of metalwork and has been treated in broad relation to other branches of Islamic decorative arts, as well as to Near Eastern art in general.

Islamic art has hitherto been elaborated upon, with minor exceptions, without any consideration of literary sources. To overcome this serious defect, it was necessary to explore the Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Armenian, Chinese, Greek, Latin, and other Western historical, geographical, scientific, and linguistic source material of the fourth to the seventeenth centuries. The result of this investigation, methodically conducted during the past several years, is beyond my own expectations. The material extracted from literary works is of such importance and scope that I am induced to begin the publication of the *Corpus* with an introductory volume (in two parts) in which this material will be presented and discussed. This volume will also contain the medieval Arabic, Persian, and Turkish glossary of metal objects.

In addition to the documentary material, several hundred photographs of metal objects in public and private collections all over the world have been assembled. Each object has been described and classified. Many ornamental motifs, figural subjects, and inscriptions decorating the objects have been singled out to be presented in line drawings for the purpose of comparative and iconographic studies. The *Corpus* will also contain a number of maps. These are designed to illustrate (1) the distribution of metalliferous mines exploited during the medieval centuries, and the centers of metal production; (2) the archaeological sites where metal objects were excavated or incidentally discovered.
The Corpus has been planned in twelve volumes as follows:

Volume I, Part 1: Introduction to the History of Metalwork

Preface.
A. Historical survey of metalliferous mines in Spain, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, the Arabian peninsula, Iraq, Anatolia, the Caucasus, Iran, and Central Asia. Separately considered are the gold, silver, copper, iron, tin, zinc, lead, and antimony mines.
B. Traffic in metals, in Islamic countries and with non-Islamic countries.
C. Precious and base metals:
   1. Mineralogical formation of metals according to Islamic scientists.
   2. Sulphur—mercury theory.
   3. Arabic, Persian, and Turkish terms for metals.
D. Alloys, their terminology and metallurgy. Ten different alloys are enumerated and described.
E. Technical processes and their terminology.
F. Medieval Arabic, Persian, and Turkish glossary of metal objects, also several maps.

Volume I, Part 2: Introduction to the History of Islamic Metalwork

Preface.
A. Metals in Avesta, Koran, Hadith, and Tafsîr.
B. Historical accounts of the fourth to ninth centuries (25 authors from China to Europe).
C. Historical accounts of the tenth and eleventh centuries (41 authors).
D. Historical accounts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (53 authors).
E. Historical accounts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (30 authors).
F. Historical accounts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (31 authors).
G. Dates of the authorities.
H. Bibliography: a list of 1,031 books and articles by medieval authorities and modern students.
I. Indexes.

Volumes II to XI begin each with a preface and a historical introduction, and end with bibliography, index, and from 75 to 150 plates.

Volume II: Metalwork of Sasanian Iran

The chapters treating of the diversity of forms and aspects of Sasanian, Soghdio-Khwârzamian, Indopersian, and post-Sasanian metalwork are followed by excurses on the influence of the Sasanian metalcraft on Chinese and Byzantine metals, and its importance for the development of the early Islamic period.

Volume III: Early Turkish Metalwork

A survey of the historical development, religious and social aspects, art and crafts of the Turkish peoples, from the earliest period to the tenth century. The cultural relations with China, the westward migrations and the relations with Iran and Byzantium.

The accounts of metalwork deal chiefly with Altaic (the treasury of Chaa-Tas and the Tadilla finds); Avarish (Kunagota, Hungary; Malaya Peretchipina, Russia), and Pechenegian (Nagy-Szent Miklos, Hungary).

Volume IV: Early Islamic Metalwork

The place of metalwork in the early Islamic culture. Iranian metalwork of the pre-Seljuk period; Mesopotamian and Syrian; Fatimid metalwork of Egypt.

Volume V: Metalwork of the Seljuk Period in Iran, Anatolia, Mesopotamia, and Syria

The schools of Herat and Nishapur. The school of Mosul, the participation of Christian metalworkers. The influence of Mosul on the craft of Iran, Syria, and Anatolia.

Volume VI: Metalwork of the Mameluke Period in Syria and Egypt and of the Rasûlids of Yemen

Damascus and Cairo, centers of production.

Volume VII: Metalwork of the Golden Horde (Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries)

Metalwork found at Saray Berke; excavations in the Kurgans of Veloretchinsk.

Volume VIII: Iranian Metalwork of the Il-Khâns, Timurid, and Safawid Periods

Relations with China. The role of the petty dynasties. Tabriz and Isfahan, centers of arts and crafts.

Volume IX: Turkish Metalwork of the Fourteenth Through the Seventeenth Centuries

The metalwork of the Ottoman period is divided into three main groups, that done before, and after the conquest of Constantinople, and that showing Western influence.
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Animal shapes
Architectural Metals
Basins
Arms - Armors
Bottles, Pitchers
Bowls, Cups
Boxes
Buckets
Caldrons
Candlesticks
Coins
Dated Materials
Dishes
Ewers
Inkwells
Jewelry
Lamps
Lanterns, Chandeliers
Miscellaneous
Mirrors
Mortars
Vol. XII Examples

Pen Boxes

Plates

Shapes of vessels

Stands

Trays

Vases
VOL. XIII Artists

VOL. XIV Subject Matter

VOL. XV Iconography and Symbolism

VOL. XVI Astronomical

VOL. XVII Paleographical Material

VOL. XVIII Miscellaneous

VOL. XIX Sales Catalogues
Volume X: *Metalwork of Maghrib, Islamic Spain and Sicily*

Volume XI: *Metalwork of Islamic India*

This volume contains an excursus on Venetian metalwork of Islamic style.

Volume XII: *Systematic Catalogue of Metalwork of All Islamic Countries and Centuries*

Mehmet Aga-Oglu

**A FRAGMENT OF AN EARLY CARPET IN STOCKHOLM**

In 1938 I published in *Svenska Orienterållskapets Årsbok* (The Yearbook of the Swedish Oriental Society) an article (pp. 51-130) entitled "The Marby Rug and Some Fragments of Carpets Found in Egypt." In connection with a detailed study of the famous Oriental carpet of the fifteenth century found in the almost abandoned Church of Marby, in the Province of Jämtland (Northern Sweden), I there published, with reference to other material, twenty-eight fragments of carpets excavated in Egypt (probably at al-Fustât) which I had acquired from Arab antique dealers in Cairo. Out of these fragments five are described in the paper as belonging to the Röhss Museum in Gothenburg, eleven to the National Museum in Stockholm, and twelve to the author; in 1939 I handed my own lot over to the last-mentioned museum together with a number of other fragments of textiles of similar provenance, many of which are described in my work, *Cotton in Mediaeval Textiles of the Near East* (Paris and Cairo, 1937). One chapter of that work is devoted to a group of Abbasid pile rugs which, unlike a number of fragments excavated in Eastern Turkestan and the later Oriental carpets, have the pile formed by what I have ventured to call the "U" knot, an open sling which, in the true sense of the word, is not a real knot. In these rugs the pile is either always inserted under the same warps or, as in the Spanish carpets with single-warp knots (or at least in most of them), under alternate warps. It is patent that the "real" Islamic pile carpet is technically derived from types related to these fragments found in Central Asia, but it would be surprising if the Abbasid pile rugs of the two classes just referred to had not exerted an influence on its ornamentation.

If proof of this be needed, it is afforded by the goose-eye pattern and the double row of beads which, together with an intermittent scroll and some geometric designs, form the ornamentation of the border fragment here reproduced. It belongs to the collection of fragments which I presented to the National Museum of Stockholm in 1939; I acquired it in Cairo in 1937, in the spring, unfortunately too late for having it published in my contribution to the Yearbook of the Swedish Oriental Society, where, however (on p. 66) I could refer to a related specimen from al-Fustât in the Metropolitan Museum of New York published by M. S. Dimand. The fragment in New York (which I have not seen) has a border with Kufic ornament, yellow (buff?) on a dark blue ground; the design of the field (never reproduced) is said to consist of hooks, rows of beads and angular figures in blue, green, yellow, and black on a red background. The knots are tied round single warps. Dimand compares this specimen to a fragment from Eastern Turkestan in the same museum, stated to have knots of the same type, and to the Spanish carpets. He assigns it to about the twelfth century and adds that it is not yet

---

1 No. 219/1939 (C.J.L. XI, ld).
2 M. S. Dimand, "Egypto-Arabic Textiles, Recent Acquisitions," *Bull. Metropolitan Museum of Art*, XXII (1927), 279, Fig. 9; *idem, A Handbook of Mohammedan Decorative Arts* (New York, 1930), pp. 232 and 234, Fig. 143.
Il est évident, par exemple, que certains versets du Coran devaient à une date et dans une région déterminées, être utilisés dans certaines circonstances à l’exclusion d’autres. Les catalogues de stèles funéraires du Musée arabe du Caire nous montrent à cet égard une évolution dans la rédaction des épitaphes qu’il importerait d’étudier en détail. De même, en numismatique, à côté des professions de foi sunnites ou alides figurent des fragments ou des paraprases du Coran dont la diversité attire l’attention. Plus récemment, la devise des souverains de Grenade, paraphrase du Coran “la ghâlib illâ Allah” qui depuis 629 H. (1232 A.D.) rappelle aux murs de monuments* et sur les monnaies le nom d’al-Ghâlibillâh prouve l’intérêt qui doit s’attacher à l’étude de ces formules. Mais si le verset du Trône et la sourate al-Ikhlas apparaissent à première vue comme des citations fréquentes dans des cas très divers certains autres passages du Coran sont d’un usage plus rare. C’est pour cette raison que nous avons cru intéressant de signaler l’emplacement d’un texte coranique dans deux régions très éloignées l’une de l’autre mais à une époque sensiblement voisine.

Un petit fragment du stuc provenant des fouilles* exécutées par M. de Mecquenem sur les ruines de l’ancienne cité de Suse en Iran

---

*a Catalogue général du Musée arabe du Caire. Stèles funéraires (Le Caire, 1932 seq.).
b E. Kühnel, Maurische Kunst (Berlin, 1924), Pls. 48–53 entre autres.
d Deux autres objets provenant des mêmes fouilles portent des inscriptions couffiques d’un style analogue: (1) un petit bol en terre cuite justement célèbre (M. Pézard, La Céramique archaïque de l’Islam [Paris, 1920], PL LI, Figs. 5-6 et p. 95) dont l’inscription n’a pu être déchiffrée; (2) et surtout une moitié d’ustensile en plâtre composée d’une caisse parallélipédique évidée en cuvette et reposant sur quatre pieds prismatiques saillants qui porte en coufique à

ENCORE UNE “FORMULE BANALE”

Il est d’usage courant parmi les archéologues et les épigraphistes de l’Islam de grouper sous le nom de “forme banale” toutes les citations coraniques et les eulogies* dont l’historien n’a pu classer la teneur pour la faire servir à la datation des objets qu’elles orment ou à tout autre enseignement. Nous nous sommes maintes fois élevés contre cette négligence et il est hors de doute que l’examen et la publication de ces nombreux épigraphes fournirait de précieuses informations sur les époques où les documents sont rares et où la moindre précision mérite d’être recueillie.

Fig. 1—Taken in Ordinary Light

Fig. 2—Taken with a Red Filter

Figs. 1-2—Fragment of a Pile Carpet. Stockholm, National Museum

Fig. 3—Stuc de Suse
Figs. 1-2—Lacquer-Painted Canteen, Vienna, Neue Hofburg
porte en relief les trois caractères suivants: ﷼. Le fragment mesure 30 x 21 cm; du côté droit, le mot commence l'inscription car on remarque un léger listel formant bordure; comme les mots commençant par ces trois lettres sont assez rares en arabe et que d'autre part il s'agit sans aucun doute du début d'une phrase ou d'une citation coranique, il nous a paru probable pour ne pas dire évident qu'il faut compléter comme suit: \[\text{قُلُبُكُمُ اللَّهُ (Coran, II, 131).}\] Ce mot est d'ailleurs le plus long mot du Coran. Cette restitution est d'autant plus plausible que les caractères d'un type assez archaïque peuvent se comparer avec ceux de deux inscriptions sculptées sur le bois qui ont été trouvées au Vieux-Caire 6 où s'étale autour de quatre têtes dans un quadrilobe formant le centre d'un médaillon rond, précisément la même expression coranique.

En examinant de près la graphie des deux groupes d'inscriptions: celle de Suse et les deux épigraphes sur bois du Caire on peut noter un certain nombre de traits communs malgré la différence des techniques qu'imposait à l'artisan le travail du bois d'une part, du stuc de l'autre. L'épaisseur relative des caractères, la hauteur relative du fâ et du yâ qui montent presque jusqu'au sommet de la bande d'écriture, la forme du sin: trois dents de scie dans les inscriptions sur bois, trois petits losanges formant comme deux dents de scie superposées pour le stuc nous amènent à la même période.7

A quel usage étaient destinées ces frises? Sont-ce des inscriptions funéraires ou ornaient —elles la cimaise d'une habitation? Aucun indice ne nous permet d'en décider.

dents de scie en relief l'inscription "bismi 'llâh bara(ka?)." (Cf. Pézard, op. cit., Pl. LI, Fig. 4 et p. 95).


7 Vers le huitième siècle.

L'emploi de cette phrase coranique est assez rare, aussi peut-on se demander dans quelle intention l'artiste l'a fait figurer dans deux textes à peu près contemporains mais provenant de deux contrées si distantes l'une de l'autre.

JEAN DAVID-WÉILL

A LACQUER-PAINTED CANTEEN *

In the Arms Collection in the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, there is an unpublished canteen painted with figural scenes (Figs. 1 and 2).

The canteen is pear-shaped and made of papier mâché. Its form differs only slightly from that of a Turkish canteen in the same collection, which is decorated with a colored leather mosaic and dates from the middle of the sixteenth century.3 The lids of both have the same shape: a semicircular dome with a small ball on its top and a somewhat broader ring at the bottom. The surface of the painted canteen is slightly damaged, especially on the top of the neck. Its technique is the same as that of the lacquered book covers and other lacquered objects. On a thick layer of gesso the decoration is painted and then covered with a layer of transparent lacquer. The whole surface of the canteen is covered with a finely

* This article was submitted by W. Born shortly before his death in 1949 under the title "A Painted Persian Canteen." Although the author had invited the editor's comments and even asked him to make all necessary changes in the text, it was not possible to call his attention to the fact that the voluminous turban of the figures and certain floral elements, especially the tulips, carnations, and hyacinths, indicate an origin in Ottoman Turkey, though the style was obviously derived from Persian prototypes. The title of the article was therefore changed and the parts dealing with the School of Bokhara shortened. Ed.

speckled gold ground, which produces a rich and at the same time soft effect.

The two fronts of the canteen show different subjects: a hunt and a garden party. The hunt (Fig. 1) consists of two independent representations, one on the top of the other. Each of them shows a young man on horseback. The lower hunter strikes a panther with his broad sword, whilst two young antelopes are fleeing; the upper hunter pierces a bear with his lance. The landscape is suggested by conventionalized trees and shrubs covering the gold background.

The garden party (Fig. 2) is composed of three groups of people. In the center is a fountain, surrounded on its upper three sides by a girl with a harp, a young man and a girl listening to her; on the lower side is another young man offering a wine bottle to a girl who holds a bowl in her hand. Two amorous couples are on each side, a kneeling one on the left and a standing one on the right.

Laquer is said to have been introduced into Persia by way of China when the Mongols under Jenghiz Khan conquered the country in the thirteenth century.\(^2\) There is, however, nothing known about the early development of lacquering in Persia.\(^3\) Only since the epoch of the Timurids certain traces are to be found. Then the Herat Academy seems to have introduced lacquer painting from China. There is a splendid lacquered book cover with floral decoration in Istanbul, made as early as 1483 for the last of the Timurids in Herat.\(^4\) The perfection of this work suggests that it was preceded by a long evolution. Not before the reign of the Shah Tahmāsp (1524–76) did lacquered book covers come into favor on a large scale. They represent landscapes, hunting scenes, gardens, and bouquets of flowers in the style of contemporary miniatures. Specimens of the sixteenth century are rare. There is one in Istanbul, showing flowers and animals,\(^5\) and another in Hamburg.\(^6\) In the album of Sultan Murād III, compiled in 1572 and now in the Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, there are two lacquered plates, the first one showing persons practicing archery, on a golden background, the second one showing lions in various attitudes, on a black background.\(^7\) The archers bear turbans with a high pointed kula. The mannerisms of the figures reveal the taste of the Persian court.

Since the reign of the Shah Abbas I (1587–1629), lacquer decoration was not only applied to book covers, but also to mirror frames, boxes, pen cases, and doors. One of the subjects of the canteen, the garden party, reappears often, i.e., in a very elegant seventeenth-century mirror case in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.\(^8\) Another mirror case, lacquered and painted, in the calligraphic style of Rizā ʻAbbāsī, showing a drinking couple in a garden, is in the Detroit Institute of Arts.\(^9\) A similar subject on a black background is to be seen in the medallions of a pair of painted

\(^{2}\) J. W. Harrington, “Rare Old Laquers from Persia,” International Studio, LXXXIII (1926), 73–76.

\(^{3}\) Attention should be drawn, however, to the fact that there is a Seljuk Koran stand (rahl), dated 678 H. (1279–80 A.D.) in the Museum in Konya, whose inside surfaces are decorated with paintings in exactly the same technique as the canteen described in this article (R. M. Riefstahl, “A Seljuk Koran Stand with Lacquer-painted Decoration in the Museum in Konya,” Art Bulletin, XV (1933), 361–71, Figs. 7 and 9.) Ed.


\(^{5}\) Ibid., Fig. 11.

\(^{6}\) E. Kühnel, Miniaturmalerei im islamischen Orient (Berlin, 1922), Pl. 72.

\(^{7}\) T. W. Arnold and A. Grohmann, The Islamic Book (Leipzig, 1939), Pl. 61.

\(^{8}\) M. S. Dimand, A Handbook of Mohammedan Decorative Arts (New York, 1930), p. 34.

and lacquered palace doors from the throne room of Shah Abbas. A lacquered papier mâché chest, showing a portrait of Shah Abbas himself in its center, and dated in 1609, is in Berlin. It displays a gold ground strewn with minute black ornaments, obviously a deteriorated imitation of the softly speckled gold ground which covers the canteen. As we have noticed in the above-mentioned palace doors, the black ground began to replace the gold ground not later than under Abbas' reign. In the latest stage of the development the background was realistically painted. The Österreichisches Museum für Kunst und Industrie in Vienna owns a book cover executed in this hybrid style; it is dated 1854 and shows, in a medallion, a drinking couple in a garden.

Among all these examples of Persian lacquering there is not a single canteen. As far as the author knows, the Vienna canteen is unique. Therefore, it can only be dated and located by means of analogy with miniature paintings.

If compared with a miniature of Bihzād's time, the paintings of the canteen appear coarse and simple. Obviously, this subject represents a later stage of the development, when the style of the court painters had passed into the workshops of the artisans. The use of a golden background, however, proves that the canteen was made for a nobleman. Shortly after Bihzād's death, some of his pupils followed the Uzbeks to their capital, Bokhara. They are said to have founded the Bokhara school of miniature painting, but as this school already existed in 1520, we may assume that they promoted the rise of the school to its later importance. The school flourished until the middle of the century. Owing to the lack of a favorable atmosphere, it deteriorated after the first generation of artists died out, shortly after 1567.

The painters of the Shaibānīd court provided their figures with a turban wound closely around a high conical cap. Examples of this type are among others in a manuscript of Yāṣuf and Zulaikhā by Jāmī in the Metropolitan Museum (about 1540) and in the Treasury of Secrets by Nizāmī, painted by Maḥmūd Muḥjahhib in 1537, in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

The paintings on the canteen not only show a close resemblance to the style of these and other miniatures of the Bokhara school, but its male figures also wear the typical Bokhara turbans with protruding conical caps. Therefore the canteen must have been made in the latest stage of the development of the Bokhara book illumination. The applied arts usually follow the style of the plastic arts only after a certain time. Thus we may date the canteen about 1570.

WOLFGANG BORN

A SASANIAN VESSEL FROM KUNGR* 

At Bartym, twenty miles from Kungur, in the Berezov region, Molotov district, a plow

* Translated by Mrs. Kathleen Price and edited by Henry Field. The original publication was in Vestnik Drevnej Istorii, No. 25 (1948), 166–69. Since the poor illustrations of the Russian publication.

NOTES

20 Ibid., 90 sqq.
22 In miniature painting the gold ground had disappeared as early as about the middle of the sixteenth century and was used later only in copies of ancient pictures. (E. Blochert, Musliman Painting, Xllth–XVIth Century [London, 1929], p. 90.)
23 Arnold and Grohmann, op. cit., Pl. 103.
24 Blochet, op. cit., p. 98.
26 Blochet, op. cit., Pl. CXV (color).
at a depth of 22 cm.\textsuperscript{1} turned up a boat-shaped silver vessel ($26 \times 9 \times 6$ cm.), which was given to the Molotov Regional Museum. The weight is about 700 grams. The vessel, which is covered with figures in relief, was damaged at one end by the plow; however, both ends appear to have carried symmetrical ornamentation: two confronted peacocks, separated by a small “vessel” on legs (Figs. 1 and 2). Each figure is different in detail. On the back of the peacock, instead of folded wings there is represented a human face in profile, with a rather long, straight nose, a big beard (in one case with a small beard); the head carries a high headdress. On the breast of the bird there is also a human face in profile, which are based on very bad photographs, do not lend themselves to further reproduction, the editor enlisted the skill of Miss Amy Briggs to make drawings after them. This was a nearly impossible task, because the only parts of the design not difficult to see in the original are the head, back, and scarf of the right bird, and the head of the left bird, and also, to a certain extent, the legs and the object between them. The face on the chest of the right bird is so faint that it can be made out only with the help of the description and a good deal of imagination. Not a trace can be discerned of the third face in front of the legs, since the photographs are too indistinct in these spots. In view of the unusual character of the piece, the editor thought it worth while, nevertheless, to reprint the article in this provisional form, because, owing to the rarity of Russian publications in the West, the vessel might otherwise remain unknown outside the U.S.S.R.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{1} The use of deep tractors for plowing has considerably increased the amount of chance for archeological finds in the Kama region, particularly those of oriental silver, as shown, for instance, by the Anik treasure of silver platters from the Cherdy region, published in 1937 by C. V. Trever. During 1946 N. A. Prokoshev listed these objects, now in the Kirov, Gorki, and Cherdy Museums, as well as the Hinkoye silver cup, now in the Hermitage. A. P. Smirnov published an account of a new Sasanian gold vessel delivered in 1943 to a buying center in Molotov; later it became the property of the State Historical Museum, Moscow.

file, without a beard, with a protruding nose and fleshy lips. Below, in front of the legs, there is a third face, although poorly defined. In one case this lower representation is reminiscent of the head of an elephant, owing to the long outline of the nose, more accurately, of a trunk. The femoral part of the leg appears in the form of a fish with a forked tail. The back part of the body looks like the head of a beast of prey with an open mouth and large, sharp teeth. This animal is swallowing a large fish (\textsuperscript{1}) \textsuperscript{2}, replacing the tail of the bird. The fish tails are small engraved circles with eyes, which call to mind in their outline the ornamented feathers on a peacock’s tail and partly a fish’s scale. The feet of the bird have characteristic spurs. Around the neck is tied a kind of scarf, the folded wide ends of which are flying over the back. In the oval space on the bottom of the vessel a fish is depicted. The inside of the vessel is undecorated.

When the Bartym vessel is compared to similar silver objects as published by Smirnov and Orbeli-Trever, it appears to have no direct analogy in shape or iconography. Another silver spoonlike cup, with a fish represented in relief on the base, was found at Kulagyshev, also near Kungur. Representations of fish have been found more than once, although not frequently, on Sasanian pottery. Birds are also a motif occurring on Sasanian metalwork; water birds (goose, duck) are reproduced in relief. In some instances a treatment entirely analogous to the bird on the Kungur vessel has been found, as in the case of a pheasant carrying a necklace in his beak and having a scarf flapping behind his head.

Regarding the dating of the Bartym vessel, a comparison of the profile with the effigies on Sasanian coins shows considerable resemblance to the profiles of Ardashir I, Narseh, and Ohrmizd II. A comparison with figures on silver dishes provides much closer analo-
gies. This can be said especially of Varhrān I, Shāhpuhr II, Shāhpuhr III, and Varhrān Chū-bin. However, such juxtapositions are not sufficiently conclusive, the more so since the faces on the Bartym cup are not necessarily those of rulers. Thus the headdresses and beards of the profiles are very similar to the heads of the military leaders surrounding Khusrau I. In form and detail they resemble strikingly the Bartym detail. Thus, also taking into consideration the resemblance between Varhrān I and the reliefs of the head on the back of the peacock, the Bartym cup may be attributed provisionally to the epoch from Varhrān I to Shāhpuhr III (273–388) and not later than the reign of Varhrān V.

Khusrau I on the silver dish from Strelki. These comparisons merely confirm the Sasanian origin of the Bartym cup.

The peculiar scarf fastened to the neck of the pheasant is the more revealing for the matter of dating. Scarves are often found on Sasanian vessels. They belong to the costume of the ruler and flutter over his back, being fastened to the headdress, belt, behind the shoulders, and sometimes even in miniature size to the ruler’s bow and the harness of his horse.

Such scarves are present in those of Varhrān I, Shāhpuhr II, Shāhpuhr III, Varhrān V, and Khusrau I. In form and detail they resemble strikingly the Bartym detail. Thus, in all probability it was made during the fourth century of our era.

O. N. BADER

Postscript

The shape of the Bartym bowl is not unique, since there is another Sasanian silver vessel with the same boat-shaped form (decorated, in low relief, with a king, apparently Pērōz [457–63], seated on an eagle-leg throne and attended by two standing persons, and with a nude scarf-dancer in each of the pointed ends); it is in the Walters Art Gal-
lery (No. 57,625) and is soon to be published. This Baltimore piece thus provides another clue for the Sasanian date of the Bartym bowl.

The new piece is also significant in connection with the grylli, popular on Roman gems for more than three hundred years. It will be recalled that these decorations are "either a composition of various human and animal heads, sometimes with birds added to them, or they consist of the body of a bird to which heads and masks are attached in different ways." These motifs have usually been called Graeco-Phoenician, for want of a better explanation, but, more recently, Miss Anne Roes has put forward some good reasons for a Persian origin. One of her arguments was based on an unusual Sasanian gem with a grylli-type human head which dated from a period when the grylli were no longer popular in the West, so that the piece seems to represent the survival of a native art form and not one created under Roman influence. The Bartym bowl with its grylli-type birds would represent another example of the persistence of the same type of symbol and thus lends further support to the Roes theory of the Iranian origin of the motif.

R. E.

MUSEUMS AND EXHIBITIONS

THE ISLAMIC DEPARTMENT OF THE BERLIN MUSEUM *

There have been many unreliable rumors about the war losses of the Islamic Department of the Berlin Museum and about its present condition, so that a matter-of-fact account seems urgently needed.

At the beginning of the war, all first-rate objects on exhibition were at once packed in previously prepared boxes and tubes and removed to safety. After that we took continuous care of the remaining movable exhibition pieces and the objects in the storerooms. They were first taken to the well-constructed cellars of the museum; later they were moved to other places in Berlin, and finally, a part was shipped to abandoned salt mines in Western Germany. As far as possible, the built-in objects and those which could only be removed with great difficulty received special protection to make them safe against bombing attacks.

During the first war years no serious damages were reported. It was only in 1945 that several attacks completely destroyed the windows and skylights of the museum, so that from then on the galleries were exposed to the weather; a direct hit demolished entirely the left tower of the Mshattā Façade, tearing a large hole in the floor; and the subterranean vaults in the New Mint Building, reputed to be extremely solid, were burst by a powerful time-bomb. On this occasion eighteen of our oriental carpets were burned, among which were our best-known pieces of large size. This is the only major definite loss of the Department. In most cases, some fragments could be rescued from the debris and are now being restored (in a way that they may, at least, serve for study purposes). 2

The most important and valuable collections of Muslim minor arts—metal, glass, ceramics, and ivory—had been deposited in the salt mine of Grasleben. They were, together with many thousands of objects from nearly all other departments, continuously cared for by our staff. After the occupation by British troops, this stock was brought to

2 Larger portions remain of the well-known animal carpet, of which the Metropolitan Museum owns a companion piece from the C. H. Mackay collection, of the famous Graf carpet with dragon pattern (F. Sarre and H. Trenkwald, Altorientalische Teppiche [Wien-Leipzig, 1926–29], II, Pl. 3), and of the animal carpet with ascending design from the Schlossmuseum (K. Erdmann, Orientteppiche [Berlin, 1935], No. 8); smaller fragments of the beautiful vase carpet (Sarre-Trenkwald, op. cit., II, Pl. 7), of the large garden carpet (F. Sarre, "Ein neuerworberener Garten teppich," Amtliche Berichte, XLII [1920–21], 54–59), and of the vigorously designed medallion piece without animals (K. Erdmann, "Zwei Medaillingeflechte der Islam. Abteilung," Amtliche Berichte, LVIII [1935], 34). Only insignificant shreds recall the so-called Portuguese carpet (F. Sarre, "A Portuguese Carpet from Knole," Burlington Magazine, LIV [1931], 214–19), our two splendid classical Ushaks (W. Bode and E. Kühnel, Antique Rugs from the Near East, third edition translated by R. M. Riefstahl [New York, 1922], Figs. 73 and 74) and our finest specimen of the late Cairene group (so-called "Turkish court manufacture"; Sarre-Trenkwald, op. cit., II, Pl. 53). No trace remains of the rare but less important swastica rug (F. Sarre, "The Hittite Monument of Ivriz and a Carpet Design," Burlington Magazine, XIV [1909], 143–47). The early Holbein carpet with small pattern (Bode- Kühnel, op. cit., Fig. 82) was safe, but has been stolen from our cellars since the conquest.

* Translated by R. Ettinghausen.

1 They had not been evacuated on account of their dimensions, unsuitable for transportation to the mine.
the Castle of Celle in the Province of Hanover, where they are still kept, all packed in boxes. When, in April 1947, a special exhibition of Islamic art was arranged at Celle (without my knowledge), it was reported that many ceramic pieces had been more or less broken and some had been lost entirely. The Zonal Fine Arts Repository of Celle has now passed from the control of the British Military Government to German custody (Land Niedersachsen).

About forty cases of exhibition objects, mostly of secondary importance, such as stucco and pottery pieces, with quantities from our study collection, as well as some carpets, were deposited in another salt mine in Thuringia. After the conquest by the United States Army they were brought to the Landes-Museum in Wiesbaden where a Central Collecting Point had been established. I checked these collections during several visits and found them to be intact. All the other departments of the Berlin Museum collaborated in equally agree-

3 When I personally had the opportunity to check the Islamic objects in October 1949, I found the damages confirmed, but not beyond repair. They were probably due to a hurried unpacking and repacking of some contents in connection with a fire in the mine. Among the pieces missing are a Rakka bowl with extremely fine luster ornamentation (F. Sarre, "Neuerwerbungen syrischer und persischer Keramik," *Amtliche Berichte*, XXXI [1909/10], Fig. 72), an early Gabri bowl with fabulous animal (K. Erdmann, "Islamische Keramik aus Persien im Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin," *Kunstchronik und Kunstillatur, Beilage zur Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst*, LXII, Nos. 11/12 [1929], 128), a Gabri bowl with turquoise glaze (A. U. Pope, "Ceramic Art in Islamic Times. A. History," *A Survey of Persian Art* [London and New York, 1938–39], II, Fig. 540), a Persian bowl with sgraffito sphynx (*Persian Art. An Illustrated Souvenir of the Exhibition... at Burlington House, London, 1931. Second Edition* [London, 1931], p. 55 B), some Turkish vessels from Isnik and a few unpublished pieces of Persian ware.

able manner with the offices of the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section of the United States Military Government. In July and August 1948 the whole property of the Berlin Museum was transferred to the custody of the Hessian Government, and until further arrangements are made will remain in Wiesbaden.

Early in 1946 a Soviet commando took into custody and shipped away, besides many other holdings, several categories of Islamic antiquities such as wood carvings, specimens of calligraphy, book bindings, Turkish tiles, as well as some carpets, textiles, and ceramics. These had been left in the Berlin Museum, primarily for proper safekeeping, and had remained undamaged in the cellars until the end of the war. So far, we have not learned anything about their whereabouts and their state of preservation. We have been assured that these objects would not be regarded as reparations and that the possibility remains that they may be restored. Since May 1946 no further action of this kind has been taken by the Russians.

We do have, however, besides the Façade and other architectural fragments from Mshattā, the Mihrab of Kashan, dated A.D. 1223, the stone niche of Damascus, and the Hispano-Moresque wooden window. The well-known Aleppo Room lacks a good many of the screwed-on decorative boards; otherwise the walls are preserved, but the lacquer painting has suffered, partly due to dampness. In any case, at least half of the room can be put up again. The stucco decorations from Samarra were kept in the cellar; they are nearly perfectly preserved. The stucco finds from Ctesiphon are to a large extent in Berlin; the rest, together with those from Persia, are in Wiesbaden. The carved decorations from Tabgha are available for exhibition, as are the tombstones with Arabic inscriptions.

We have at our disposal, also, a good
many Persian and Indian miniatures, as well as a number of our fine small-size carpets. Only single, outstanding examples of metal work, ceramics, and glass remain in Berlin. Small excavation finds are still packed in boxes, partly in Berlin, partly in Celle. Owing to the destruction of the cupboards, the otherwise systematically organized collections of shards in our department became totally disarranged and partially destroyed. So far, we have not yet finished the sifting, putting in order, repairing and storing of this material.

A new arrangement of the galleries and the return of out-of-town deposits, due to political difficulties, is not yet feasible (fall of 1949). The rebuilding activities, which are progressing slowly because of scarcity of money and materials, have now reached that point where at least the newly glassed, window-lighted rooms can be used again, the walls and ceilings having been cleaned and painted. Only part of the cases, however, are usable. The galleries with skylights are now provisionally protected by a wood roof. Since these galleries are insufficiently lighted, they can be used for storing purposes only. The great hole in the Mshattä Hall caused by a bomb is again completely closed and the destroyed brick wall rebuilt, so that the reconstruction of the shattered tower can soon begin. It will show some lacunae, since we estimate that about 10 percent of the limestone blocks are lost. After extended work the badly damaged steel structure of the whole roof has been completely repaired; as soon as the material is available, the provisional covering of boards and tar paper can be replaced by wire glass. Also, the radiators of the whole wing are again in order and heat can be provided.

In the hope that the work now in progress will not suffer any extended interruption, it is planned to reopen the Department in 1951. We could then show at least the pieces available in Berlin, which will require only about half the former exhibition area. Our special library, the archives of photographic negatives, reproductions and slides, as well as all the other working materials, are safe and waiting to be reinstalled in the former offices of the Department. For the time being they are still kept in the basement of the Museum. Even with the planned reopening of a part of its collections, however, the reorganization of the Islamic Department of the Berlin Museum can on no account be called completed.

Ernst Kühnel

Islamic Art at the Indian Exhibition,
Royal Academy, London, November 1947 to February 1948

There never can have been such an opportunity as has been offered by the Exhibition in the Royal Academy Galleries of the art of India and Pakistan to see the full range of Islamic painting in India. The other arts of Islamic India are represented mainly by exhibits transferred for the occasion from the Victoria and Albert Museum, but among the jades and jewelry there are some very fine pieces lent by Her Majesty Queen Mary, and the carpets from the Palace of the Maharajah of Jaipur are not only of first-class importance but make a magnificent display.

It is possible here only to outline some of the more notable groups among the 262 Islamic paintings which occupy the walls of three of the galleries and are supported by a distinguished collection of fifteen manuscripts and albums. The collections drawn upon are for the most part those in India and the United Kingdom, but some very important examples have been lent from the French National Museums and from three leading collections in the United States. The Exhibition Committee made a special effort to illustrate on this occasion the little-known schools of painting which flourished outside the Mughal Do-
minion, especially in the kingdoms of the Deccan. Among these, the most striking as well as the earliest are three paintings which are, strictly speaking, not Islamic; for they illustrate the Hindu Rāgmalās, but at the same time bear witness to the policy of toleration and patronage of Hindu painters pursued by the ruling houses of Bijapur and Ahmadnagar. One of these has already been reproduced by H. Goetz in The Baroda State Bulletin where he attributes it, apparently with good reason, to about 1570. The other two are from the Bikaner State Collection, which has also been studied by Dr. Goetz and will be fully treated in his forthcoming volume to be published by the Royal India Society. These are assigned to Ahmadnagar, apparently by comparison with a miniature reproduced by Stella Kramrisch.\(^1\) Since Dr. Goetz has not yet stated his case for assigning these paintings to two different centers, we must reserve judgment for the time being, recognizing that after the fall of Vijayanagar, its court painters are likely to have found refuge at both the courts of its two principal Muslim opponents, Husain Niẓām Shah and Ali 'Adil Shah of Bijapur.

In any case Bijapur is represented at the Exhibition by a very distinguished little group of portraits, of which the two elegant miniatures illustrating a cookery book (Nos. 937 and 938) of Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shah II have already been published by G. Yazdani.\(^2\) A portrait of an unknown Courtier from the India Office Library, No. 934 (Fig. 1), can be assigned to the latter part of Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shah II's reign by comparison with two drawings acquired by the British Museum in 1936,\(^3\) as well as some later portraits. The portraits from Golconda are of a better-known type represented in many collections, but there are several other paintings which must be attributed on stylistic grounds to the schools of the Deccan, of which the most striking are Nos. 1171 and 944, also from the India Office Library, and No. 1143 (Fig. 3) from the collection of Mr. Pendarves Lory, C.I.E. The last also is a Hindu subject, but the coloring, rich and delicate, and the architecture connect it clearly with the Deccani school.

It is well known that even after the Mughal conquest of the Deccan some local schools of painting survived there, and retained something of the special quality of the older Deccani schools. Among the criteria for attributing paintings to this school would be the preference for using white, fullness of drapery and richness of coloring, and predominance of blue in the palette. It is interesting to have evidence from Indian collections of the kind of paintings and drawings attributed to the Southern Deccani schools of Kurnool and Sūrāpur which had been mentioned in Stella Kramrisch's A Survey of Painting in the Deccan.\(^4\) Even farther to the south, the nawabs of the Carnatic seem to have been the patrons of a school of miniature painting at Arcot, which is represented at the Exhibition by Nos. 1159 (Fig. 4) and 1166. This school probably survived until the last nawab reigned his dominion to the East India Company in 1781.

There is one other notable Islamic drawing at the Exhibition that cannot be described as Mughal and yet does not seem to be attached to any of the schools so far considered. This is No. 1127 (Fig. 2) and is lent by the Central Museum, Lahore. In the Lahore Museum Catalogue (F. 51) it is described as "Mughal, late 18th century," in the Exhibition Catalogue as "Deccani, early 18th cen-

\(^1\) S. Kramrisch, A Survey of Painting in the Deccan (London, 1937), Pl. XII.

\(^2\) G. Yazdani, "Two Miniatures from Bijapur," Islamic Culture, IX (1935), 211-16, and colored frontispiece.

\(^3\) B. Gray, "Deccani Painting: the School of Bijapur," Burlington Magazine, LXXIII (1938), 75-76, and Figs. B and C.

\(^4\) Kramisch, op. cit., pp. 117, 183.
Fig. 1—Bijapur. First Quarter of Seventeenth Century. London, India Office Library

Fig. 2—Undetermined School, About 1700. Lahore, Central Museum
Fig. 3—Deccan, About 1700. Andover, F.B.P. Lory Collection

Fig. 4—Arcot, Eighteenth Century. Hyderabad, Government Museum
tury," but neither description seems to be exactly correct. The subject—a Dance of Dervishes—and the composition are particularly fine and unusual. It is rather reminiscent of the enigmatic miniature from the Warren Hastings Collection that was reproduced by Laurence Binyon and Thomas Arnold in Court Painters of the Grand Moguls, which is also to be seen in the same Gallery at the Exhibition (No. 1202). One cannot help wondering whether this may also perhaps be from some other center with its strange union in the exquisitely finished predella of Hindu religious teachers, mostly the pupils of Râmâñanda, and its far less competent and sensitive drawing of the Dervishes' Dance, as well as its curiously inappropriate European background. The Lahore drawing is on plain green ground and has smooth factura, which is characteristic of the later Deccani painting, but it is far superior in invention to anything known from that school. It could hardly be much later than 1700, but at present no local attribution can be attempted.

The most interesting new material for the study of the Mughal school at the Exhibition is to be found among the Akbari paintings. In addition to the famous dated manuscripts of 1570 from the School of Oriental Studies (No. 1223) and the Bodleian Library of 1595 (No. 1225), and others less well known from the Chester Beatty Collection, the Royal Asiatic Society and the Royal Collection at Windsor (No. 1220), a manuscript of the Gulistân of Sa'di, dated 990 H. (1581 A.D.) from the Royal Asiatic Society Library, appears to be unknown to literature, yet contains a colophon not only stating that it was copied at Fatehpur Sikri by Husain Zarin Kâlam al-Kâshâni, but also provided with por-

traits of the calligrapher and the young painter who illustrated the book, Manohar, who was to become so well-known an artist in the next reign. Since he appears to be no more than thirteen or fourteen years old, it is quite possible that the date is correct, and that this son of Basâwan may have been born in 1567 or 1568.

An equally precocious work is to be seen in a drawing signed by the even more famous artist Abül-Hasan (No. 820) and expressly stated to be executed in his thirteenth year, 1009 H. (1600 A.D.). This, it is true, is a direct copy of the figure of St. John from Dürer's engraving of the Crucifixion from the Little Passion, dated 1511 A.D. (Campbell Dodgson, No. 53). He too was a son of one of Akbar's court painters, Riza (Ridâ), who was the instructor in painting of the future Emperor Djahângîr, and this miniature bears at the top his name as Prince, Shah Salim; and Abül-Hasan describes himself as "Ibn Ridâ Murid." M. Ivan Stchoukine has already called attention to his being a Khânazâd, that is, born in the Royal Household, and the opportunity has been taken at the Exhibition to hang side by side his famous signed portrait of Djahângîr from the Louvre (No. 917), and the Durbar scene from the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (No. 918) which Stchoukine had attributed both to Abül-'Hasan and to the same year, 1619. The attribution would seem to be confirmed by this confrontation.

Among the detached miniatures a group has been included to illustrate the early work of the school when it was still largely Persian. Among unpublished material is a Portrait (Fig. 5) described in the Catalogue (No. 854) as Turki noblemen. It still retains the

5 L. Binyon and T. Arnold, Court Painters of the Grand Moguls (London, New York, etc., 1921), Pls. XVIII and XIX.

6 E. F. Wellesz, "Mughal Paintings at Burlington House," Burlington Magazine, XC (1948), 46, and Fig. 25.

A combination of bold curvilinear design and delicate handling which characterized Bihzād’s “Turkish page” and other single figure compositions dating from about the year 1500; but the rather heavy coloring, purple and mauve predominating, as well as the rather hard treatment of the carpet, point to the continuation of the Timurid tradition in Transoxiana. The heavy shading of folds and curtains is apparently especially characteristic of the very early Mughal school, and is found in many of the Ḥamza-nāma pages. The identity of this fat young prince remains uncertain, but the features seem to be Turkish rather than Persian.

Two unpublished miniatures from a private collection (No. 883) (Fig. 7) represent the well-known Tārikh-i-Ālīī manuscript, which is in the fully formed Mughal style of the late Akbar period, probably about 1590.8 They have all the dramatic power of well-conceived large-scale compositions, less elaborate and perhaps therefore more effective than the Akbar-nāma of the Victoria and Albert Museum, some miniatures of which, purposely hung alongside (Nos. 879, 882, 886), seemed richer in coloring but less simple in composition.

Although it proved impossible to obtain the loan of the famous Razm-nāma manuscript from Jaipur, miniatures were shown from two other manuscripts which must be assumed to be broken up. Two lent by the museum at Jodhpur cannot be far in date from the original manuscript of 1584: while five pages were shown, out of thirty-two, which were acquired about twenty-five years ago by the Baroda State Museum. A note upon them was published by E. Cohn-Wiener,9 but he was unaware that they had passed through the London sale room in 1921, when 170 miniatures were sold with the greater part of a manuscript, including the colophon, which bore the date 1007 H. (1598 A.D.).10 These are painted on a much smaller page but are by many of the same artists as in the Jaipur book, and so therefore, presumably, illuminated in the Imperial Library. They are in a style transitional from the Akbarī to the Džahāngīrī, more intimate and more unified in color. The example here reproduced (Fig. 8) by Dhanū (No. 821) shows Sahadeva consulting the stars. The deep red screen and the glorious night sky of deepest blue serve as a foil to the group of figures which seems to revolve around the up-raised finger of the Prince.

There is no space here to go through the list of artists whose work was represented in the seventeenth-century section of the Exhibition, but some idea of the opportunity for studying the work of the Mughal masters may be given by recording that there were no less than seventy signed miniatures by forty-two different artists. It was disappointing that it proved impossible to find any good flower drawings by Mansūr, but his animal paintings were represented by a distinguished group, including the now famous chameleon bent by His Majesty the King from Windsor Castle.11

8 In the upper scene the wife of the Caliph Harun al-Rashid awakes from a dream foretelling her death on the morrow, which came to pass. In the lower scene the Caliph is seen praying before the Ka'ba at Mecca.

9 E. Cohn-Wiener, “Miniatures of a Razm Nameh from Akbar’s Time,” Indian Art and Letters, XII (1938), 90–92, and Figs. I–VI.


11 Reproduced in Wellesz, op. cit., Fig. 29; and H. F. E. Visser, “Tentoonstelling der Kunst van India te Londen,” Phoenix, III (February, 1948), 16, and Fig. 10.
and by a very interesting figure painting which actually includes two charming plants. This is a portrait of a musician playing the vina (Fig. 6) (No. 942) which formerly belonged to the Oriental scholar Jonathan Scott, and was recorded on a note on the reverse to have been given in 1790 by him to a certain Panton Plymley. It now belongs to Mr. E. Croft Murray. It has not been possible to identify the subject of this portrait, but he may perhaps be one of the musicians trained in the famous school at Gwalior. It is just possible that he is the same Nawbat Khan Kalâwant as in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts painting, who is mentioned by the Emperor Djahângir who is having been one of his father’s servants. The


13 A. Rogers and H. Beveridge, Tüzuik-i-Jahângîr or Memoirs of Jahângîr (London, 1909-14), I, 111. The vina player formerly in the Goldschmidt Collection in Berlin named Paraśurâm, and also a servant of Djahângîr, is out of the question (see H. Goetz, “Indian Miniatures in German Museums and later paintings did not perhaps present the same surprises, but it should be recorded that the well-known painting of “Prince Muhammad Murâd on an Elephant” (No. 1100) was found to be signed by the famous artist Bichitr, and dated 1030 H. (1620-21 A.D.); which incidentally rules out the possibility of the subject being any of the sons of Shah Jahan. This is certainly one of the finest elephant drawings that has survived from the Mughal school, but it is, unfortunately, very difficult to reproduce since it is mainly drawn in gold paint. The majority of the eighteenth-century paintings were lent from English collections, and among them the most interesting group was that of the hunting scenes, which seem to have been a special feature of the reign of the Emperor Bahadur Shah.

BASIL GRAY

Private Collections,” Eastern Art, II [1930], 151, and Fig. 5).

14 P. Brown, Indian Painting under the Mughals, A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1750 (Oxford, 1924), Pl. 56, “as by Ghulâm.”
LITERATURE ON ISLAMIC ART, 1939 TO 1945, PART II*

Editorial Note

With the following contributions this series will be finished. The most important lacuna is a list of Russian publications brought out during the war years. It seems unnecessary to print this information, however, since Rudolf Loewenthal has compiled a "Bibliography of Russian Literature on the Orient, 1937-1947," which will be published in the Bulletin of the New York Public Library about the middle of 1951.

The Editor wishes that he had been able to include the books and articles of a few other countries in which a more limited number of publications were brought out, but he has been unable to find collaborators for this task.

R. E.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CONTRIBUTIONS ON ISLAMIC ART PUBLISHED IN GERMANY AND AUSTRIA DURING THE WAR YEARS, 1939-1945†

By D. S. Rice

C. Diehm, Asiatische Reiterspiele, Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte der Völker (Berlin, 1942), 292 pp., 120 figs., 8 color pls.

* Part I, with bibliographical data on publications brought out in France, England, India, and Turkey, was published in Vols. XIII-XIV (1949), 150-79.
† This bibliography is part of a larger one which includes all publications of German Islamists during the years 1939-45. The other sections will be published in Der Islam. In the bibliography, the following abbreviations have been used:

BM, Berliner Museen.

JPK, Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen.

W1, Welt des Islam.

ZDMG, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

E. Diez, Glaube und Welt des Islam (Stuttgart, 1941), 197 pp., 6 figs., 6 pls., and a chronological table.

E. Diez, Iranische Kunst (Vienna, 1944), 240 pp., 130 figs., 16 color pls.


Discussion of Iranian elements in these objects, taking for point of departure a bronze ewer in the Bonn Museum.

K. Erdmann, "Ein sasanidisches Stuckrelief," BM, LXI (1940), 47, 1 fig.


First publication of some thirty new samples of rock crystal objects of the Tulunid and Fatimid periods (not listed by Lamm). Attempt at segregation of the Tulunid group.

K. Erdmann, "Neuerwerbungen der islamischen Abteilung: Fragment eines 'Holbeinteppichs,'" BM, LXI (1940), 48-50, 1 fig.

Proves that the fragment (previously in the Düsseldorf Museum) belongs to the fifteenth century.

K. Erdmann, "Neuerwerbungen der islamischen Abteilung: Sasanidische Stuckplatte," BM, LXI (1940), 47, 1 fig.

Stucco panel with senmurv in a circle of pearls probably belonging to the same mural decoration as the pieces in the Philadelphia Museum.
K. ERDMANN, Das iranische Feuerheiligtum [=Sendschrift der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft, II] (Leipzig, 1941), 93 pp., 492 notes, 14 text illus., 8 pls.
K. ERDMANN, “Iranische Silberschalen des Mittelalters,” BM, LXII (1941), 9-16, 6 figs.

Attempt at chronological classification of six Iranian silver plates in the Berlin Museum.
K. ERDMANN, “Neue orientalische Tier teppiche auf abendländischen Bildern des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts,” JPK, LXIII (1941), 121-26, 8 figs.
K. ERDMANN, “Die Bergkristallarbeiten der Islamischen Abteilung,” BM, LXIII (1942), 7-10, 10 figs.
K. ERDMANN, “Eberdarstellung und Ebersymbolik in Iran,” Bonner Jahrbücher, Heft 147 (1942), 345-82, 6 pls., 4 figs.

Description of a high altar on Mount Barmak, near Baku (according to travelers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries), which may have been connected with fire worship.


K. ERDMANN, Die Kunst Iran zur Zeit der Sasaniden (Berlin, 1943), 137 pp., 100 figs., 2 pls.

General survey based on material available in 1939.
K. ERDMANN, “Teppicherwerbungen der Islamischen Abteilung,” BM, LXIV (1943), 5-17, 12 figs.
K. ERDMANN, “Zum Orientteppich,” Asienberichte, V (1943), 3-20, 8 figs.

K. ERDMANN, “ Neue Wege zur Erforschung der sasanidischen Kunst,” Der Orient in deutscher Forschung (Leipzig, 1944) 170-81, 16 figs.
K. ERDMANN, “Feuerglaube und Feuerkult im alten Persien,” Atlantis, XVII (June 1945), 302-4, 4 figs.
E. KÜHNEL, “Bihzad,” Mémoires du IIIe Congrès international d’art et d’archéologie iraniens (Leningrad, 1935: Moscow, 1939), 114-18, 2 figs., Pl. LIII.

E. KüHnEl, “Islamische Brotstempel aus Ägypten,” BM, LX (1939), 50-56, 30 figs.

E. KüHnEl, Eine Stammtafel der Mughulkaiser in Miniaturbildnissen, BM, LXII (1941), 30-33, 3 figs.

The album of Akbar, his son and grandson, in the Islamic Department, Berlin.


E. KüHnEl, Islamische Schriftkunst [=Monographien künstlerischer Schrift, 9] (Berlin, 1942), 86 pp., 89 figs. (including eleven in color).

E. KüHnEl, “Das Qazwini-Fragment der Islamischen Abteilung,” JPK, LXIV (1943), 59-72, 18 figs., 2 pls.

E. KüHnEl, Kunst und Kultur der arabischen Welt [=Arabische Welt, 2] (Heidelberg, 1943), 66 pp., 11 text illus., 90 figs.

E. KüHnEl, “Neuerwerbungen an islamischem Gerät,” BM, LXIV (1943), 27-34, 16 figs.

Minâ’î, Gabri and Rakka ware, Seljuk and Seljukluke objects.


This issue of WI had not appeared in 1947.


a. Historical introduction and description of early Ottoman architecture.

b. Studies on Iznik ceramics and attempts at new classification of uncertainly dated fayence, in the light of new material.


A. M. Schneider, “Brände in Konstantinopel,” Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XLI (1941), 382-403, 2 pls.

Use is made for the first time of diplomatic dispatches in the Viennese Archives.


A. M. Schneider [together with M. I. Nomidis], Galata: Topographisch-archäologischer Plan mit erläuterndem Text (Istanbul, 1944), 60 pp., 1 map.

LITERATURE ON ISLAMIC ART PUBLISHED IN PALESTINE, IRAQ, AND EGYPT DURING THE WAR YEARS

By L. A. Mayer

Introduction

Although all big centers of Islamic studies in these three countries remained mercifully untouched by war activities, archeological studies had to slow down and—with the exception of Iraq—much less progress can be registered and fewer publications noted than during any other six years of the last two decades.*

I. Palestine

Excavations.—The major enterprise of the last decade in the field of Muslim archeology in Palestine, and perhaps in the whole of the Near East, is the excavation of Khirbat al-Mafjar near Jericho. Work on this site was started in 1935 almost accidentally, but the remains were soon recognized as an Umayyad palace, most likely erected by Hishām, and a monument of paramount importance. The Department of Antiquities of the Government of Palestine (the last director of which has, during the war, rendered many signal services to Muslim archeology—most important by saving the Umayyad woodwork of the Aṣṣā Mosque and by carefully recording the various phases of the rebuilding carried out therein by the Supreme Muslim Council) has systematically excavated this site winter after winter for the last thirteen years. During the period under review, the excavator, D. C. Baramki, Inspector in the Department of Antiquities, published the results of the excavations conducted in 1938–1940, as well as the first study of the pottery. This sober presentation, illustrated by a series of well-drawn specimens, will materially contribute to our knowledge of Umayyad ceramics and repay careful examination and comparison with contemporary examples from other Islamic countries.

Of special importance is the stone sculpture of the palace. As was to be expected, it proves both the continuity of local tradition and the formation of the new style from old, partly misunderstood, motifs. Owing to its richness and variety it helps considerably to understand not merely the ornament of the Umayyad period, but the composition of Muslim geometric design in general, more particularly in those cases in which unfinished panels show us the method of work employed by the stone carvers. But there is every reason to believe that the real place in the history of Muslim art will be accorded to Khirbat al-Mafjar on account of its sculpture of human beings and animals. This Umayyad palace is so rich in them, and has revealed such a variety of types, that for a long time to come its series of statutes and statuettes will form the backbone of the history of Muslim sculpture—the very thing that a mere quarter of a century ago would have been considered a contradiction in terms.

* This article was written in 1947 and the early part of 1948 and thus, as far as “Palestine” is concerned, reflects the political situation and organizations as they existed before May 15, 1948.—Ed.

The following abbreviations should be noted:

PEQ, Palestine Exploration Quarterly.
QDAP, Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities, Government of Palestine.

1 D. C. Baramki, “Excavations at Khirbet el-Mejejjer, IV,” QDAP, X (1942), 153-159, 1 plan, Pls. XXX–XXXIV.
The fifth and last season of excavation at Khirbat Minya near Tiberias conducted during the winter and spring of 1939, made the Islamic origin of this site even more probable than was thought before. It revealed various groups of rooms and halls and brought to light a fair quantity of potsherds and small finds, including a dinar of al-Walid I.  

During the period under review, no other excavation was carried out with the main intention of elucidating problems of Muslim archeology in Palestine. But several sites excavated with other aims in view, either during the war or immediately before, yielded Muslim material of some importance.  

The excavations at the Citadel of Jerusalem, conducted by C. N. Johns on behalf of the government during several seasons in the nineteen-thirties, proved, among many other valuable results, the existence of a large residence in Umayyad style.  

With the aim of clearing up a much discussed problem of local topography of the period of the Second Temple, R. W. Hamilton, Director of Antiquities, undertook excavations at the present North Wall of Jerusalem. It yielded material for the Muslim period as well, particularly pottery, including a stamped handle, lamps, and coins.  

Père R. de Vaux, of the Dominican Fathers of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem, cleared the basement vault of the monastery at Abū Ghōsh, probably Crusaders' work of 1141, with Arab additions erected most likely after 1187, when the Muslims constructed the now adjacent mosque.  

In Trans-Jordan, Franciscan Fathers headed by Father S. J. Saller excavated on Mount Nebo. Among the results are Arabic glass weights, graffiti, inscriptions, and pottery.  

A general survey of recent excavations in Palestine (up to 1940) was given by W. A. Heurtley in his "Presidential Address" to the Palestinian Oriental Society.  

Epigraphy.—In the field of epigraphy only two inscriptions were published, the most important of them a text recording some restoration work at the façade of the Aksa Mosque in Jerusalem and a rather difficult Circassian Mameluke inscription from Gaza, dealing with abolition of taxes in 815 H. (1412 A.D.).  

Numismatics.—Coins apart from those described by R. W. Hamilton were published by J. Baramki. They form part of a hoard of Venetian and Ottoman coins.  

Diplomatics.—A document of the sorely neglected Turkish period dealing with a historical monument in the Old City of Jerusa-

---

6 R. W. Hamilton, "Excavations Against the North Wall of Jerusalem, 1937-38," *QDAP*, X (1940), 1-54, 23 figs., PIs. I-XI.  
9 *JPOS*, XIX (1941), 129-135. Byzantine and early Islamic periods discussed on p. 133.  
10 S. A. S. Husseini, "Inscription of the Khalif el-Mustansir billāh 458 A.H. (1065 A.D.)," *QDAP*, IX (1939-41), 77-80, illus.  
11 L. A. Mayer, "A Decree of the Caliph al-Musta‘in billāh," *QDAP*, XI (1944), 17-29; Pl. X.  
13 "Coin Hoards from Palestine," *QDAP*, XI (1944), 30-36.
lem, which has puzzled several scholars before, was published by St. H. Stephan.\textsuperscript{14} It is one of many forming the archives of photos-stats and verified copies of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine built up in the course of the last twenty years, a collection unique in its richness, and a mine of information for the archeological history and topography of Palestine during the Ottoman period.

Texts.—St. H. Stephan continued his annotated translation of Evliyä’s diary of a journey through Palestine, a source of considerable importance, although as a rule, Evliyä was an easy and credulous prey of the dragomans of his time. The portions include the description of the Haram in Jerusalem and its immediate neighborhood.\textsuperscript{15}

Arts and Crafts.—Jews in Yemen, having practically a monopoly of metalwork there, developed a style of their own, although sufficiently under Muslim influence to be included in this survey. Hardly ever has it been competently studied before. The material is housed mainly in the Ethnographical Museum in Hamburg and in the Bezalel-Museum in Jerusalem. The director of the latter examined this little-known province of oriental popular art, to the elucidation of which linguistic and ethnographical studies by D. S. Gortein and the late E. Brauer have contributed so much already.\textsuperscript{16}

Islam and Classical Art.—M. Avi-Yonah endeavored to trace the Oriental undercurrent which traverses the classical centuries and joins the art of the Ancient East to that of Islam. Consequently, the article throws light on the origins of such aspects of Islamic art as the formation of the human figure, representations of buildings and ships which stand revealed as based on the principles of art, current in the east before Hellenism.\textsuperscript{17}

II. Iraq

Archeological publications of Iraq within the scope of this bibliographical sketch were all issued by the Directorate General of Antiquities of the Government of Iraq, and represent almost exclusively the activities of that department. Relevant work of other scholars from Iraq was published outside that country and consequently could not be dealt with in this chapter.

In January 1945 the Directorate of Antiquities of the Government of Iraq started a half-yearly periodical of its own called Sumer, partly in Arabic and partly in English, covering the whole field of Mesopotamian archeology. During the period under review, only one volume was published; it contains several articles dealing with Muslim archeology.

In a survey of activities of the Directorate in general by the Technical Adviser\textsuperscript{1} a chapter was devoted to Arabic antiquities, mentioning the excavations at Samarra\textsuperscript{2} and at

\textsuperscript{14} St. H. Stephan, “An Endowment Deed of Khâsêkî Sultan,” dated the 25th May 1552,” \textit{QDAP}, X (1944), 170-104, Pls. XXXVI-XL.

\textsuperscript{15} St. H. Stephan, “Evliyä Tshelebi’s Travels in Palestine,” \textit{QDAP}, IX (1939-41), 81-104.

\textsuperscript{16} M. Narkiss, \textit{The Artcraft of the Yemenite Jews} (Jerusalem: Central Press, 1941), VII, 40 pp., 42 figs. on 16 pls. Studies of the Jewish National Museum-Bezalel, I (in Hebrew, with English summary.)


Wāsiṭ, as well as the installation of a Museum of Arab antiquities in the Khan Mirджān and a Museum of Costumes at al-Bāb al-Sharkī.

But more important even than the excavations at Samarra are those at Wāsiṭ conducted by the Government of Iraq from 1936 until 1942. Valuable as the results are for our knowledge of early Muslim architecture and town-planning, the most spectacular find is that of 400 terra cotta figurines of men, animals, and birds, the former clearly representing Mongols (another contribution to the chapter of Muslim sculpture).²

The Librarian of the Iraq Museum, best known for his excellent critical bibliographical surveys published in Egyptian periodicals, wrote about the Madrasa of al-Mustansirī in Baghdad, which had served for many years as customshouse and was recently restored.⁴

Dr. Muṣṭafā Jawād, Technical Supervisor, wrote a historical-topographical-antiquarian study of the remains of an Abbāsid building in the citadel of Baghdad, identified by the author with the Dār al-Musannāh erected by the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh in 1180 A.D.⁵

James Kirkman inaugurated a series of articles on the numismatic collection of the Directorate of Antiquities, with a general survey continued later in postwar volumes by Nāṣir al-Nakṣabandī, an Inspector in the Directorate, who contributed also an article on the dinar for this number.⁷

### III. Egypt

**Architecture.**—Generally speaking, books and articles about Muslim architecture, published in Egypt, deal with buildings erected in Cairo; only a few are devoted to other places or to neighboring countries. Among those surveying many monuments in one publication pride of place belongs to the last two fascicles of the Comité de Conservation des Monuments de l’Art Arabe which valiantly continues this tradition of many decades, although its volumes, which used to appear annually, are now published once in several years only.¹ The late Director of the Administration of the Committee for the Conservation of Arab Monuments published a well-illustrated guidebook to Cairo ² in which four churches are mentioned alongside Muslim buildings. The second edition of a history of the Egyptian capital, originally prepared for the planned celebration of a millennium of its existence, by the Director of the Army Museum in Cairo, gives the monuments their due.³ We owe the same author a special monograph of the Muslim house as well.⁴ A former member of the


⁴ 'Abd al-Rahmān Zaki, al-Kāhira (Cairo, 1943), pp. 1–353.

⁵ 'Abd al-Rahmān Zaki, “Al-Dār al-islāmiya fi
of the Museum of Arab Art in Cairo wrote a survey of the mosques of Cairo before the Mamelukes.⁵

Among the detailed studies devoted to single buildings, a book about the Mosque of 'Amr b. al-'Aṣ should be mentioned first. It gives the history of the monument, a technical analysis and copious notes from Arab historians.⁶ Another volume presents the history of the al-Azhar Mosque during the Fatimid period.⁷ For many years Hasan 'Abd al-Wahhāb, an Inspector of Antiquities, used to write short articles for the daily press about various mosques of Cairo, thus systematically spreading the knowledge of Cairene architecture. Although articles of this kind are outside the scope of this survey, one, at least, dealing with a less-known mosque should be mentioned as an example of this work of popularization.⁸ A more technical study presents his article on the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn.⁹

Leaving Cairo we have to register a few publications of a more general nature: an article on the fortress of Sinai,¹⁰ a book about Muslim places of pilgrimage,¹¹ and three longish studies of Syrian and Mesopotamian monuments written by scholars of these countries.

———, al-Muḥtāf, XCIX (1940), 105-12, 217-24, illus., 3 pls.


Muhammad Abdallah 'Anān, Ta'rikh al-Dīmār: al-Ḳahara fīl-ṣurūt al-Fātimi (Cairo, 1942), 175 pp.


Under the general title, "The Ayyubid Monuments of Damascus," As'ad Ṣalas has studied the Kubbat Ṣafwat al-Mulk, dated 504 H., a building no more in existence, the Dar al-ḥadith of Nur al-Dīn and the Madrasa Amīḍādiyya, so-called after Bahramshāh b. Farrukhsāh.¹² The former Director of Antiquities in Iraq wrote a note about Samarra,¹³ and its librarian a long article about a building which once stood in the center of interest.¹⁴

General Fine Arts.—Islam and fine arts was the subject of a series of articles by Muhammad 'Abd al-'Aziz Marzūk,¹⁵ published afterward in book form under the same title.¹⁶ Zaki Muhammad Hasan published two books, one dealing with Persian art during the Muslim period,¹⁷ and one with China and Islamic art.¹⁸

Painting and Book Illumination.—The most important book published on this subject during the war years is Ahmed Pasha Tāmūr's volume on Painting, Sculpture, and the Reproduction of Living Figures among the

¹² As'ad Ṣalas, “Al-Dīmār al-Ayyūbiya fi Dimashq,” al-Muḥtāf, CII (1943), 274-79; CIV (1944), 338-40; CV (1944), 429-33.


¹⁶ (Cairo, 1944), 32 pp., 15 pls.

¹⁷ Zaki M. Hasan, Al-Funūn al-irāniyya fīl-ṣurūt al-islāmī (Cairo: Egyptian Library Press, 1940), 361 pp., 177 figs. on 160 pls., 1 map.

¹⁸ Zaki M. Hasan, Al-Shīn wa-funūn al-Īsām (Cairo, 1941), 148 pp.
Arab, edited by Zakî M. Hasan, who not only saw it through the press after the death of the author, but added copious notes, doubly precious because they give a digest of European and Oriental relative literature, as well as very full additional pictorial material. How much the book stirred its public is best proved by a series of articles, which mostly, starting as reviews (otherwise not listed in this survey), go far beyond it and deal mainly with the problems raised by the editor. The problem of representation of living beings in art has called for two more articles by Zaki M. Hasan, one about statues in pagan Arabia and another about figures on tombs and mosques in Persia. Muhammad Muṣṭafā started a series of articles dealing with the iconography of various themes popular in Persian book illumination, about Bahram Gûr and Hasan. (discussing, of course, all types, not merely the scene with Āzâde), Khusraw and Shîrin.

19 Al-Taswir īnda l-'Arab (Cairo, 1942), 324 pp., illus.


and an unfinished one about Laylâ and Madjinûn. A similar article by ʻUmar Ḥamdî about the Prophet’s steed and his ascension to heaven, called forth an immediate answer pointing out that the article was merely a translation of Arnold’s Painting in Islam, pp. 117–122.

Zaki M. Hasan described as one of the artistic treasures of Egypt a manuscript of Sa’dî’s Bustân with a colophon dated 893 H., in the Egyptian Library in Cairo. It has four miniatures attributed to Bihzâd. In an article devoted to quite different problems, the late Max Meyerhof published several miniature paintings of plants, from manuscripts of Dioscorides (1224 A.D.) and al-Ŷâfî (1256 and 1582 A.D.).

Other Fine Arts.—Two leading Egyptian periodicals, al-Risâla and al-Thakâfa, have established as a permanent feature, articles on various aspects of Islamic art, usually about the same subject, but viewed from a different angle, the former engaging the pen of Dr. Muhammad Muṣṭafâ, Curator in the National Museum of Arab Art in Cairo, the latter that of Dr. Zakî Muhammad Hasan, Professor of Islamic Fine Arts at the University Fuad I in Cairo. They both wrote about the...
perforated and decorated neck stoppers of medieval, mainly Mameluke, clay jugs. Zaki M. Hasan also wrote about a bronze jug in the Cairo Arabic Museum; Gaston Wiet about another in the collection of Ali Pasha Ibrahim.


Costumes.—The Director of the Army Museum, Cairo, has added to his numerous monographs of arms and fortresses one dealing with some late medieval pieces of arms and armor from the Hall of Arms at the Top Kapu Saray Museum, Istanbul, and the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. The problem of headgear seems to have been the main theme of all the rest that was written about costumes during the war, starting with an article by the late Father Anastase Marie de St. Elie about the kufiya and ‘akal, and finishing with articles which deal mainly with bareheaded appearance in public during the Abbasid period. Mikhâ’il ‘Awâd presented also an abstract of his commentary on Hilâl b. al-Šâbi’s Rusûm dâr al-khilâfa, edited by him. Is’âf al-Nâshâshibi dealt mainly with the headgear of women.

Epigraphy.—During the period under review, three volumes of the invaluable Répertoire appeared, covering the years 626–705 H., as well as four additional volumes on Arabic tombstones, in the National Museum of Arab Art, Cairo. S. Reich has published an inscription of Sultan Shaikh and ‘Abd al-Wahhâb ‘Azzâm an article on Arabic script in general, past and present, dealing en passant with other scripts as well. Yusuf Ahmed, a calligrapher by profession, produced a book on the Kufic script, containing to a large extent forms created by the author himself.

Heraldry.—The general principles of

Risâla (Feb. 24, 1941), pp. 221 f.; (Mar. 17, 1941), pp. 332 f.

Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe, . . . publié sous la direction de E. Combe, J. Sauvaget et G. Wiet (Le Caire), XI (1941–1942); XII (1942); XIII (1944).
Mameluke heraldry were presented almost simultaneously in two articles, the second by a newcomer to this field. Finally, this writer could settle a much-debated question, viz, the interpretation of a heraldic emblem originally called by him, with great hesitation, "horns or trousers of nobility," and given by others as many as eight different designations. The solution of the puzzle was due to a communication by Ralph A. Harari to the author in which "powder horns" was suggested. This interpretation fits perfectly and explains in particular why the emblem did not occur before 1438, that is, the time before firearms were introduced into the Mameluke army.

Collections and Exhibitions.—The exhibition of Turkish rugs in the National Museum of Arab Art in Cairo, called for an article by the Curator, besides a catalogue and notices in the daily press. The private collection of Ali Pasha Ibrahim, famous for its rugs and other objects of art, shown on several occasions in Egypt, was described by Zaki M. Hasan.

Varia.—An unexpected find of an incomplete set of Mameluke playing cards, probably of the fifteenth century, in the Top Kapu Saray, was made by the author of this survey and then discussed in a subsequent article. The 47 handsomely painted cards represent the first Saracenic set ever discovered, and four of its five different suits (the cup, the coin, the sword, the staff, and the polo-stick) form the prototypes of the Italian and Spanish cards, as already indicated by a fourteenth-century source, though repeatedly denied in modern times.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WARTIME PUBLICATIONS IN SCANDINAVIA, 1939–1945

By Carl Johan Lamm

General

Ragna Thiss and Leif Östby, Verdens kunsthistorie (Art History of the World) (Oslo, 1940), De tusen hjems bibliothek, VII, 350 pp., illus.

Kai Birket-Smith, Kulturens Veje (The Paths of Civilization) (Copenhagen, 1941–42), I–II, 320 + 368 pp., illus.; Swedish transl. (Stockholm, 1943), I–II, 652 pp., illus.

Nils Åberg, "Bysans och Orienten vid övergången till medeltid" (Byzance and the East at the Dawn of the Medieval Period). Suomen Muinaismuistoydistys Aikakauskirja, XLV (Helsinki, 1945), 147–53.—On Umayyad art.

Architecture

Iran: Erik Lundberg, Arkitekturers formspråk (The Language of Form in Architecture) (Stockholm, 1945), 455 pp., illus.—Pls. 1–2: Persian mosques.

Topography

Historical Geography

George Wasmuth Sejersted, *Det hemmelighetsfulle Arabia* (Mysterious Arabia) (Oslo, 1944), 240 pp., illus.

T. J. Arne, *Europa upptäcker Ryssland* (Europe Discovering Russia) (Stockholm, 1944), 200 pp., 43 figs.

Travel

George Wasmuth Sejersted, *Garib. Over kong Salomos fjell til det urolige Palestina* (Over King Solomon’s Mountains to Unrestful Palestine) (Oslo, 1939), 184 pp., illus.; Swedish transl. (Stockholm, 1939), 204 pp., illus.

C. G. Mannerheim, *Rensa genom Asien* (A Journey Through Asia) (Stockholm, 1940), I (Journey, 1906–07), 414 pp., illus., 1 map; II (Journey, 1907–08), 431 pp., illus., 1 map; Danish transl. (Copenhagen, 1941), 640 pp., illus., 1 map.


Ellen Rydelius, *Pilgri3 i Persien* (Stockholm, 1941), 145 pp., illus.


Henrik Sødal, *Til Saharas grense. Reiseminner fra Marokko* (To the Border of Sahara. Travelling Memories of Morocco) (Oslo, 1943), 187 pp., illus., 1 map.


About Ibn Djuhair.

Fine Arts

Ceramics

Vagn Poulsen, “Middelalderkeramik fra Hama” (Medieval Pottery from Hama), *Nyt Tidsskrift for Kunstindustri*, XVII (Copenhagen, 1944), 3–13, 15 figs.

Glass


Two fragments of an enameled goblet belonging to the “Syro-Frankish group.”

Metal

Holger Arbman, “Einige Orientalische Gegenstände in den Birka-Funden,” *Acta Ar-
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chaeologica, XIII (Copenhagen, 1942), 303–15, 14 figs.


T. J. Arne, “Ett gästrikefynd från Harun-ar-Raschids välde” (A Find from Gästrikland from the Empire of Harun-al-Rashid), Från Gästrikland (Gävle, 1943; printed 1944), 7–24, 17 figs.

A domed fire-pan of post-Sasanian type found at Åbyn in the parish of Hamränge.

Painting


Textiles

Sofus Larsen, Nordisk Guldsniping og Guldbroderi i den tidlige Middelalder (Northern Gold-spinning and Gold Embroidery in the Early Middle Ages) (Copenhagen, 1939), 171 pp., illus.

Carl Johan Lamm, “An Indian Cotton Fabric,” Nationalmusei Årsbok (Stockholm), Ny serie, IX (1939), 27–37, 8 figs.

A reserve-dyed fabric found in Egypt.

Carl Johan Lamm, “En turkish fana” (A Turkish Banner), Malmö Musei Vänner, Årsbok, III (Malmö, 1940), 5–15, 7 figs.

Elisabeth Thorman, “Koptiska vävnader och svenska” (Coptic and Swedish Textiles), Hemslöjden (Stockholm, Oct. 1940), 99–112, illus.

The reproductions comprise some important Islamic textiles.


Indian and Islamic connections discussed.

Agnes Geijer and C. J. Lamm, Orientalische Briefumschläge in schwedischem Besitz, Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, LVIII (Stockholm, 1944), 47 pp., 40 + 4 figs.

Textiles of the seventeenth century from Persia, Turkey, and above all, the Crimean Tartary.

Collections

Museums

Gothenburg (1940): “Nyförvärv” (Recent acquisitions), Röhsska Konstläromuseets Årsbok, 7–11. 5 figs.

Fig. p. 8: Caucasian carpet from the first half of the nineteenth century showing European influence.

Sale Catalogues (Selections)

Stockholm (1939): Sigge Björck, May 9–11: Property of the late G. and Ellen Kihlmark and others. No. 855, kelim; Nos. 656–663, Persian carpets; Nos. 1065–1118, Oriental arms and armor (5 figs.).

Stockholm (1939): H. Bukowski, April 17–18; objects from the collection of the late C. R. Lamm and others. No. 521, Turkish (Mongolian) helmet, 13th century; Nos. 549, 551–54, Oriental arms and
armor; Nos. 591–99, Oriental carpets; No. 601, Turkish kelim; No. 602, Persian shawl; Nos. 638–40, Persian miniatures.


**Script**

Epigraphy

CARL JOHAN LAMM, "Dated or Datable Tiráz in Sweden," *Le Monde Oriental*, XXXII (Uppsala, 1938: printed for the first time as extract in 1939), 104–25, 33 figs. on 12 pls.

Thirty-three specimens described.

H. S. NYBERG, "Tydd ringskrift" (Decyphered inscription on a ring), *Svenska Dagsbladet* (Stockholm, Nov. 28, 1939), 10, 1 fig.

Kufic inscription on a seal stone of carneol.

**Numismatics**


2,673 coins, 708–911 a.d.

**Arms and Armor**

BENGTT THORDEMAN, *Armour from the Battle of Wisby 1361*. Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, XLVI (Stockholm, 1941), 480 pp., 426 figs.; I (Stockholm, 1940), 7 pp., 145 pls.

Contains a general discussion of lamellar and scale armor.

KALERVO HUURI, *Zur Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Geschützwesens aus orientalischen Quellen*. Dissertation (Helsinki, 1941), 261 pp., 19 figs.

**Oriental Influences**


WILHELM HOLMQVIST, "Den romanska djurväxtgrotsekens föregångare," Vorgänger der romanischen Tierpflanzengrotese, *Fornvännen*, XXXVII (Stockholm, 1942), 197–93, 16 figs. (German summary.)

WILHELM HOLMQVIST, *Kunstprobleme der Merowingerzeit*, Dissertation (Stockholm, 1942), 328 pp., 146 figs., 46 pls.

Coptic and other Oriental influences.


**Ethnography**


G. MONTELL, "Mongolian Chess and Chess-
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men," Ethnos, IV (Stockholm, 1939), 81–104, 5 figs.

Fig. 5—Chessman from Afrāsiyāb. Connections with India and the Muslim world.

HENRY HELLESEN, De sorte Teltie (The Black Tents) (Copenhagen, 1943), 158 pp., illus.

KAARLO HILDÉN, "Abdalerna, ett asiatiskt tiggarfolk med tusesåriga traditioner" (The Abdalas, an Asiatic Tribe of Beggars with Traditions from the Remote Past), Jorden Runt, XV (Stockholm, 1943), 53–66, illus.


AAGE JØRGENSEN, Kaukasus (Copenhagen, 1944), 198 pp., illus.

C. G. FEILBERG, La tente noire. Contribution ethnographique à l'histoire culturelle des nomades, Nationalmuseets Skrifter, Ethnografisk Raekke, II (Copenhagen, 1944) xiv + 254 pp., 19 figs., 3 maps (also used as a dissertation).

C. G. FEILBERG, Afrika. En Verdensdel lukker sig op (A Continent Disclosing Itself) (Copenhagen, 1945), 160 pp., 41 figs.

Excavations

HARALD INGHOLT, Rapport préliminaire sur sept campagnes de fouilles à Hama en Syrie (1932–38), Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Archæologisk-kunsthistoriske Meddelelser, III (Copenhagen, 1940), 154 pp., 7 figs. 48 pls.

A preliminary report of the first campaign (1931) was published in 1934 (Ibid., I).


T. J. ARNE, Excavations at Shah Tepé, Iran. Reports from the Scientific Expedition to the North-Western Provinces of China under the Leadership of Dr. Sven Hedin, VII (Stockholm, 1945) (Publication 27), 367 pp., 730 figs., some of which on 92 pls.


Personal


Contains a bibliography of the numismatical works of Richard Vasmer.

Exhibitions


An important display of specimens in Swedish museums.


The exhibition contained chiefly brocades and embroideries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SPANISH MUSLIM ART 1939–1946 *

BY LEOPOLDO TORRES BALBÁS

In the year 1492, with the conquest of Granada by the Catholic Sovereigns, Isabella

* Translated by Stefi Reiss.
and Ferdinand, the Islamic domination of the Iberian Peninsula came to an end; and as the first waves of the Renaissance reached these new shores, Christopher Columbus discovered a new continent and the Jews were expelled from Spain. From this critical moment onward the strong ties, which for many centuries had united Spain with Islam, were severed and the outstanding influence which Muslim civilization had had on Spanish culture during the Middle Ages was completely forgotten.

The African enterprises of the Spaniards at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century were confined to military expeditions and were made only to safeguard navigation in the western Mediterranean and to combat piracy which was a constant menace to the eastern and southern shores of Spain. Spaniards, eager for adventure, riches, or proselytism went to distant America, ignoring and despising nearby Africa. One could say that the Straits of Gibraltar with their maximum width of twenty-one kilometers had turned into a deep gap, separating for centuries two peoples who, until then, had lived in close communion.

The differences in language and religion, as well as the triumph of Renaissance culture, finally effected Spain's complete break with the Muslim past. The most famous men of Spanish genius, including those of international renown such as the great Cervantes, ignored the importance of Muslim influence of the Middle Ages and judged Islamic culture by the coexisting rudimentary and primitive civilization of North Africa which was a nest of pirates at that time. The same Cervantes, fighting at Lepanto against the Turks, and imprisoned at Algiers, carried, branded on his body and soul, the painful marks of five years of captivity in a primitive and half barbaric society. Just as the Spaniards of action, eager for a free life of adventure, ignored neighboring Africa for the more or less treacherous mirage of remote America, so men of outstanding intellect were blind to the Islamic culture of the Occident. This they overlooked completely, and following European trends of thought they turned their eyes with enthusiasm toward remote classical antiquity, trying to revive it. All the Spaniards of the Renaissance, whether they were of adventurous and dynamic character, or of more spiritual bent, aimed at distant goals; geographically to far off lands and historically to antiquity.

There were still a few Moors in Spain in the sixteenth century, since they were expelled only in 1610; however, they were, according to repeated testimonies, almost exclusively rural people, simple peasants, plain, industrious and honest and with a rudimentary culture.

It is hardly necessary to mention that art had suffered the same fate as the rest of Spanish Muslim culture. From the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries its previous manifestations were almost completely forgotten. The traces, however, have continued to live, especially in the most intimate recesses of the popular spirit. They have persisted in the customs and legends of the people, and it is to this tradition that contemporary writers are referring when they speak of "eternal Andalusia."

One of the consequences of the romantic movement in the first half of the nineteenth century was rehabilitation of Spanish Muslim culture and art. The dream palace of the Alhambra at Granada, miraculously preserved in spite of its extreme fragility, provided a most appropriate stage for the revival of an imaginary world of knightly adventures and mysterious legends which had been refined and brought to life again by the literary art of various writers, chiefly Washington Irving. This was also the inception of interest in the culture of Muslim Spain, an interest which has continued to grow through the years.
From the studies of the last few years, it is obvious that the great distinction of the Spanish culture of the Middle Ages lies in the several centuries of close contact between the civilizations of the Orient and the Occident. If there is such a thing as an original Spanish art, it owes its origin to the mixture of those two currents which produced works perplexing to strangers in their radical dissimilarity to the art of the rest of Europe.

Knowledge of Spanish Muslim art as a whole, as well as a more thorough examination of the archeological and cultural remains, has made great progress in recent times, thanks to the publication of a great number of studies. Nevertheless, there is still a wide field for investigation of its many aspects and a need for detailed analysis of the monuments which are still extant.

During the last few years activity in the study of Spanish Muslim art has continued at a normal pace. As a consequence of the Civil War of the years 1936 to 1939 we deplore the loss of two monuments of the "Mudéjar" period; that is to say, buildings constructed on Christian territory but under Muslim influence. The more important of the two, the Infanta Palace at Guadalajara, was an example of this architecture which, from originality, anti-classicism, and pictorial value, is exclusively Spanish and has no parallel outside of this country. The other building, which contained Mudéjar ceilings, plasterwork, and glazed tiles of great artistic value, was the convent of San Juan de la Penitencia of Toledo, founded in 1514 by Cardinal Cisneros. It was also destroyed by fire.

In the following pages, studies of Spanish Muslim art published during the period from 1939 to 1946 will be reviewed. At another time I shall write more extensively as to the present status of these studies, to the blank spots which still persist, and to the problems which continue to arise. A full comprehension of Islamic art in its entirety cannot be fully achieved without a knowledge of the contributions of the Iberian Peninsula, one of the finis terrae of Muslim culture, where artistic movements, born in Syria, Iran, Mesopotamia, or Egypt, were reflected and where an original style was evolved from these elements, a style which forms an integral part of Muslim art.

I. SPANISH MUSLIM ART

Architecture

During the recent restoration of the cloister of the Collegiate Church of Tudela (Navarra), construction of which was started somewhat before 1200, remains were found which undoubtedly belonged to the mosque that preceded the Christian structure on the same site. They are singularly interesting since no previous knowledge existed of any Islamic culture in this frontier province antedating the remains of the Aljafería of Zaragoza which dates from the eleventh century. Manuel Gómez-Moreno, the great master of Spanish archeology, dates the remains of Tudela as of the ninth century, during the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân II. They are: a merlon like those of the Cordoban mosque; a carved stone with a design similar to the one painted on a door of that building, made under the reign of al-Hakam II; a column with a capital derived from the Corinthian, but without any similarity to any other known; as well as several loose pieces. Of special importance, whether of the ninth or tenth century, are a series of brackets and a series of lobes or cylindrical scrolls, beveled, and of a Byzantine type. Some of these are used in the roof cornices, installed in the church after 1200, while others appeared in the walls of the

1 Manuel Gómez-Moreno, "La Mezquita mayor de Tudela," Príncipe de Viana, VI (Pamplona, 1945), 9-27.
cloisters. In the mosque of Tudela, which survived to the end of the twelfth century, the Romanesque artists could, therefore, see these remains and were able to copy them later in certain French churches, thus originating the bracket that Viollet-le-Duc called, inappropriately, à copeaux.

Several studies have been published about buildings of outstanding importance such as the mosque of Córdoba. Some of these texts refer to the event which occurred shortly after the conquest of that city by the Muslims when half of the Christian church was expropriated by the conquerors in order to install an Islamic prayer niche. Somewhat later, under the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmān I, they acquired the rest of the premises, intending to demolish the church and to create a new mosque in its place. Ocaña, after having accumulated all references by Arab authors, states that this partition of the Church is in no way substantiated. The church may have had to establish itself elsewhere in the immediate neighborhood when the building became a mosque. His deductions regarding the decadence of Córdoba after the conquest by the Arabs are also very interesting. The bridge caved in and the city walls were half destroyed.2

Creswell dedicates a large part of a chapter in his monumental work—which is rather a series of monographs than a real history of architecture—to the description, origin of shapes, and analysis of the mosque of Córdoba constructed by 'Abd al-Rahmān I.3 There is little information in Creswell's book on this particular monument that has not been published previously. It is, however, accompanied by excellent plans of the old part, and by draw-

the portal added by Muhammad I to the mosque of Córdoba. The portal is dated by an inscription in the year 241 H./855 A.D. Obsessed by the recently discovered data, Castejón believes that the decorations of the sides, which have greatly deteriorated, date from the same epoch and not from the mosque of the seventh century as has been supposed up to now. He maintains that the portal with its carrying arch, where a beveled decoration is in a state of perfect preservation, was restored during the nineteenth century. Both these hypotheses are inadmissible, which fact I am trying to prove in a work now being printed.

Creswell has not published anything on another architectural remain of the ninth century which still exists in Seville and which I described in Al-Andalus. I am referring to the lower part of the minaret of the main mosque, erected by 'Abd al-Rahmán II in 214 H./829–30 A.D.—according to an inscription carved in the shaft of one of its columns preserved at the Archeological Museum of Seville; this is the most ancient Arabic inscription known in Spain. The minaret of stone, square on the outside and circular inside, contains a winding staircase.

In Creswell, Hernández Jiménez describes the Alcazaba of Mérida (Badajoz) and also publishes several good plans. According to an inscribed flat stone exhibited today at the Archeological Museum of that same city and which originally was over the main portal, 'Abd al-Rahmán II erected it in 220 H./835 A.D. Following this monograph, Hernández adds a note on the walls and the ramparts of Toledo, parts of which, he believes, date from 222 H./837 A.D.7

In Al-Andalus I commented upon the work published by Lambert on the cupolas of the main mosques of Tunísia and Spain of the ninth and tenth centuries. This French Hispanist finds some relation between the cupolas of the mosques of Kairouan and Tunísia and those of the enlargement by al-Ḥakām II of the one at Córdoba. I believe that the two types are independent and that the model for the Spanish ones, together with several other artistic elements, must have come from the eastern Mediterranean during the reign of that ruler.

In some pages, I dealt with the origin of the Cordoban cupolas on crossed arches, a problem which may prove to be very controversial. In doing so I picked out and described samples of Roman vaults, semicircular, barrel, or groined; the French vault in arc-de- cloître; and cupolas, with projecting arches in the soffit of their vaults—all of which have hardly been mentioned by the historians of architecture. It is my belief that from these examples stem the Armenian vaults of the tenth and later centuries, examples of which were published by Baltrusaitis; and perhaps even those of Iran and Mesopotamia, known mainly through Pope, although their forms are very remote from the Roman styles. After they had been brought to Spain from the eastern Mediterranean during the tenth century, it is probable that the French vaults of the eleventh and twelfth centuries described by Lambert, were created under their influence. It is also probable that the Lombardian and

---

Norman vaults of the eleventh century, the real ogive vaults, derive from Roman construction, and they survived in these territories all through the late Middle Ages. For the odd history of these vaults and their possible origin it may be interesting to note that the French word "ogive," used to designate their diagonal arches or ribs, comes, as demonstrated by Colin, from the Spanish Muslim al-djubb and was converted to al-djibb in some Arab dialects of the peninsula, which in turn originated the Castilian word "algibe."  

The royal city of Madinat al-Zahrâ’ near Córdoba founded by ‘Abd al-Rahmân III in 325 H./936 A.D. is famous today and will become more so in the future. The excavations there were begun in 1910. In a recent publication, Rafael Castejón records them from 1926 to 1936 and informs us that the excavations were started again in 1943. During these years halls of some dwellings were excavated, probably belonging to some important persons connected with the court; and a house, which may have belonged to the chief of the guards and which furnishes valuable data about the domestic architecture of the tenth century. However, the most important excavations in this field of ruins, the complete exploration of which will take a long time, was made during the year of 1944. In this period a large hall was discovered which had three naves of arches resting on columns, rich with decorations cut in plates of stone. Parts of them are in situ but many fragments are lying around (Figs. 6–9). Pavement and socles are of marble. Several inscriptions name ‘Abd al-Rahmân III and give the date of 342 H./953–54 A.D. and 345 H./956–57 A.D., during which period this part of the palace seems to have been erected. The capitals, bases, and piers of marble and the stone decorations of the walls reveal great wealth, and once the fallen fragments are put back in their original places and the rest restored, the sumptuous halls of this legendary castle will provide a rich field for the study of the elaborate decorations which bear the traditions of Syria and Byzantium.

Ocaña Jiménez published a series of capitals that have inscriptions alluding to al-Ḥakam II and are dated between the years 362 H./972–73 A.D. and 364 H./974–75 A.D. and which have been distributed to various collections today. No doubt they belonged to the palace of Madinat al-Zahrâ’, and from their examination it may be deduced that during the first ten years of his reign, the work on the caliphal residence was of minor importance and did not get into full swing until after the year 360 H./970–71 A.D. It was continued at somewhat the same pace until 364 H./974–75 A.D.

Gaya Nuño dedicated a monograph to


the castle of Gormaz (Soria), the most important fortress remaining from caliphal Spain. Situated on the banks of the river Duero, it occupied the top of a large ridge, where its still imposing remains lie. According to Maḳḳari, it was rebuilt in 354 H./965–66 A.D. A fragment of an Arab slab, preserved nearby, refers to al-Ḥakam, since apparently it was he who ordered the erection of the fortress.

Bessie H. Weber 16 dedicated a few pages to the Umayyad art of Spain. Compiled from previous publications, they lack interest. Among other errors, there is a wrong date for the end of the reign of the Umayyad dynasty.

After having cleaned off, between 1934 and 1946, the coating of the walls of the minaret which now serves as the bell tower of the church of San José at Granada, I was able to study it in some detail. It is a square tower of hewn stones which are alternately placed facing and sidewise. This arrangement reveals great precision and gives a rusticated effect. The comparison with other, similar constructions of Córdoba and Granada and a few historical references induced me to date this minaret of Granada between the second and fourth decade of the eleventh century. 17 Some archeologists believe it to be older.

I published some notes on three other mosques, dating from before the twelfth century. One of them, rebuilt, later became the church of the castle of St. Mark at the port of Santa María (Cádiz). There remains the mihrab with a square base, covered by a ribbed vault (an arc-de-cloître) and with two diagonal projecting bands. It had three naves. According to the Cantigas written by Alphonse

the Wise, 18 the Muslim oratory was rebuilt under the direction of the Moorish master Ali in order to remake it into a church in the second half of the thirteenth century. Thanks to ancient documents, dating from before its destruction during the eighteenth century, I was able to reconstruct the original layout of another mosque of the eleventh century, the main one of Granada, constructed between 407 H./1016–17 A.D. and 429 H./1038 A.D. It had eleven naves, the center one wider than the rest. 19 Of the mosque of the Alcazaba of Badajoz there remains a plan made before its destruction during the nineteenth century. It had been converted into a church and rebuilt during the thirteenth century. It seems that it had five naves, the middle one wider than the others. 20

The existence of an Arab bridge at Guadalajara, which undoubtedly dates from before 1085, the year in which that city passed under Christian domination, was unknown. When I revealed its existence, I also alluded to other Muslim bridges in Spain. 21

Recent discoveries in the Alcazaba of Málaga augmented our knowledge, which had previously been so meager, of the art under the rule of the “Taifas,” the government formed after the fall of the Caliphate of Córdoba (Figs. 13 and 15). As a military edifice it is the most important of the Muslim Spanish types. It is probable that part of it dates from the ninth or tenth century, but it was rebuilt during the eleventh, and considerably reinforced from the thirteenth to the four-

17 L. Torres Balbás, “El alminar de la iglesia de San José y las construcciones de los ziríes granadinos,” Al-Andalus, VI (1941), 427–46.
18 Idem, “La Mezquita de al-Qanāṭir y el santuario de Alfonso el Sabio en el Puerto de Santa María,” Al-Andalus, VII (1942), 417–37.
19 Idem, “La Mezquita mayor de Granada,” Al-Andalus, X (1945), 409–32.
20 Idem, “La Mezquita de la alcazaba de Badajoz,” Al-Andalus, VIII (1943), 466–70.
teenth centuries. In its last and highest rampart, I found remnants of a palace which had decorations of plaster similar to those at Córdoba and to the ones at the Aljafería of Zaragoza, which was erected in the second half of the eleventh century.\(^{22}\)

In the Alcazaba of Málaga there was discovered a small group of suburban houses, probably dating from the twelfth century; however, only the lower parts of the walls remained. When I first mentioned these excavations, I drew special attention to the excellent city planning and to the perfection of all hygienic services. The drainage of polluted water was a problem admirably solved in Islamic Spain.\(^{23}\)

From an examination of several fragments of inscribed marbles at the Museum of the Alhambra of Granada and the one of the Alcazaba of Málaga, Ocaña was able to conclude that they belonged to socles of palaces of the twelfth century.\(^{24}\)

Knowledge of Spanish Muslim military architecture is almost nonexistent, although a great number of ruins and fortresses of this period are still surviving. I wrote a few pages, accompanied by plans, about the Almohade Alcazaba of Badajoz, which dates from the second half of the twelfth century, and I stressed its importance therein.\(^{25}\)

A note on watch towers, that is to say those towers that are outside the walled enclosures, much used in the Almohade architecture and later on taken up by the Mudéjar, completes these pages. Their name “albaranas” comes from the Arabic **barrānī** which means exterior or outside.\(^{26}\)

We owe to Hernández Díaz, Sancho Corbacho, and Collantes de Terán the publication of a monograph on the castle of Alcalá de Guadaira, the most important one of the district around Seville, reconstructed to a large extent during the Christian era but which preserved previous plans. The same monograph contains plans, photographs, and a description of the Almohade mosque of Cuatrohabitan which was preserved in a clearing of the province of Seville near Bollullos de la Mitación. It may have belonged to a village which disappeared. It still has the minaret as well as three naves separated by horseshoe arches supported by brick piers.\(^{27}\)

With the pretext of publishing an old reproduction of the great minaret of the main Almohade mosque of Seville known since the sixteenth century as the Giralda, I collected all preserved data regarding its construction and compared it to the minarets of the Kutubiya of Marrakesh and the tower of Hasan of Rabat, the three being almost contemporary. The one of Seville was started around 580 H./1184 A.D. and was finished in 594 H./1198 A.D. when the pinnacle balls of the **djāmūr** were placed in position.\(^{28}\)

The grouping of some known names of Andalusian architects of the Almoravide and Almohade periods who worked in Africa proves the influence exercised by the Spanish

\(^{22}\) Idem, “Excavaciones y obras en la alcazaba de Málaga (1934–1943),” *Al-Andalus*, IX (1944), 173–90.


\(^{25}\) L. Torres Balbás, “La alcazaba almorávida de Badařoz,” *Al-Andalus*, VI (1941), 168–203.


\(^{28}\) L. Torres Balbás, “Reproducciones de la Giralda anteriores a su reforma en el siglo XVI,” *Al-Andalus*, VI (1941), 216–29.
architecture on the northern part of that continent.29

I thought it useful to assemble all the data referring to the Alhambra of Granada which existed prior to the thirteenth century when the Naṣrid reign was formed. I also added the information, known for a long time, that figures in the memoirs of ‘Abd Allāh and which was recently published by Lévi-Provençal. From these memoirs it may be deduced that it had a courtyard with a pool in the center, and on one of the smaller sides a portico of three arches facing south. The rooms have painted socles decorated with beautiful interlacings (Figs. 1 and 2). In the same place there are still buried the ruins of a suburb, deserted since the middle of the fourteenth century.30

Don Carlos Sarthou Carreras described briefly the wooden framework that covered a room of the palace of Pino Hermoso at Játiva (Valencia) and the decorations cut in plaster on the entrance door. They seem to be from the first half of the thirteenth century. In 1931 they were moved to the Municipal Museum of that city.31

Of the Alhambra of Granada, the restoration of which I directed from 1923 to 1936, I published information and plans of the Royal mosque (destroyed), as well as of the adjoining bathhouse (Fig. 10).32 a small oratory in

33 L. Torres Balbás, “La Mezquita real de la Alhambra y el baño frontero,” Al-Andalus X (1945), 196–214.
the gardens (Fig. 11) and the dungeons that still exist. J. Bermúdez Pareja, director of the Archeological Museum of the Alhambra, is the author of some notes on the vicissitudes of the most important pieces of the collection under his charge.

In the publications dedicated to gardens, the authenticity of the remaining Arab sections of the celebrated gardens of the Generalife of Granada has not been properly established. I tried to clarify this matter with the help of ancient testimonies.

In short monographs I described other Nasrid monuments of the fourteenth century: the Márístán of Granada demolished during the nineteenth century, but of which there still exist plans and drawings; and a funduk, now called the Corral del Carbón which I restored more than twenty years ago (Figs. 3 and 4), and finally I discussed the edifice called in Spanish "atarazanas" from the Arabic dár al-šanâ‘a (arsenal) and enumerated those that existed in the Middle Ages and described in particular the one of Málaga that collapsed during the last century. The funduk as well as the dár al-šanâ‘a stem from buildings of the Imperial Roman period, the importance of which as a source of medieval architecture is becoming more and more recognized.

The bathhouse is a type of Muslim construction that has survived frequently in Spain. I have already referred to one at Granada, and further on descriptions of the baths at Ronda and Gibraltar are mentioned. The baths at Valencia as well as another one discovered at Córdoba were the subject of recent articles.

In a few pages I catalogued the still preserved minarets of Spanish mosques, describing their characteristics and mentioning proportions of some of them.

At Ronda (Málaga) there are still remains contemporary to the reign of Granada which I discussed in Al-Andalus; that is to say, fortifications, a bathhouse, a minaret, the remains of a mosque, and some dwellings (Fig. 12). In the same journal I also dealt with a bathhouse, walls, and a large tower—all of the fourteenth century—which are still to be found in Gibraltar. In these two articles as well as in the aforementioned study on Badajoz I tried, after a short historical synopsis, to collect all historical mementoes that are still preserved, both documentary and archeological.

Figs. 3 and 4—Granada. "Corral del Carbón,"
Section and Plan
In the pages of a review dedicated to municipal studies, I analyzed the urban organization of a Spanish Islamic city and described its houses and streets as well as the transformation they underwent after having passed under Christian rule, particularly during the sixteenth century when the Renaissance was triumphant.45

Included in this group is a paper about the comparison (frequent in Muslim literature) of the cities of Damascus and Granada and the reason for this comparison.46 There is also an article in which various aspects of Muslim Seville are described, such as bathhouses and dwellings.47

Architectural Decoration: Sculpture in Stone and Marble

Camón Aznar published some short notes on the decorations of the palace of the Aljafería of Zaragoza, erected during the second half of the eleventh century.48

For the study of the Almohade decorations in Spain the sepulchral stele—"mkâbriya"—of Málaga, dated 618 H./1221 A.D., is of importance. It was described by Ocaña.49

I mentioned before the marble socles with inscriptions that decorated the Spanish Muslim palaces of the twelfth century. At the end of that century painted ones of the most ingenious and complicated interlacing designs were beginning to be used, some of the most beautiful examples with floral motifs being in the Alhambra. I listed the preserved examples of painted socles,50 but those that have since appeared at Almería will have to be added.

Besides the Spanish Muslim capitals of Madinat al-Zahrâ' already mentioned, Manuel Gómez-Moreno and Manuel Ocaña Jiménez described some Spanish Muslim capitals, the dates of which were verified.51 The four of the mihrab of the mosque of Córdoba are of 'Abd al-Rahmân II's reign as well as several others from the enlargement of that oratory. The capitals of the ninth century have a molded abacus in contrast to those of the following century which are plain. There is one dated 320 H./932 A.D. at the Alcázar of Seville; another one of the same date was at the Berlin Museum. There are also capitals of the years 340 H./951-52 A.D. (whereabouts unknown); 342 H./953-54 A.D. (at the Alcázar of Seville); and 348 H./959-60 A.D. (whereabouts unknown). They belong to the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III. Of his son al-Ḥakam II's reign, there are two others, dated respectively 353 H./964-65 A.D. (made for the Alcázar of Córdoba) and 363 H./973-74 A.D. (at Granada). At the Archeological Museum of Toledo there is a capital of the eleventh century, carrying the name of the monarch of that city, al-Ma'mûn, and the date 453 H./1061 A.D.

Another capital that belonged to the palace of the Aljafería of Zaragoza and is pre-

46 T. B., "Damasco y Granada," Al-Andalus, VI (1941), 461-69.
47 Idem, "Notas sobre Sevilla en la época musulmana: los baños, las casas, los alcázares de la Buḥraya," Al-Andalus, X (1945), 177-96.
51 M. Ocaña Jiménez, "Capiteles fechados del siglo X,” Al-Andalus, V (1940), 437-49; M. Gómez-Moreno, "Capiteles árabes documentados," Al-Andalus, VI (1941), 422-27.
served at the Archeological Museum of Madrid has an inscription containing the name of king Abu Dja’far who ruled from 441 H./1049 A.D. to 474 H./1061 A.D. Dubler has published a capital, previously unknown, which is now in the Museum of Gerona and which is made of marble with a double row of plain acanthus leaves and with elephant heads at the corners. It is probably of the eleventh century.

The contention that the Muslims did not represent living beings in the decoration of their edifices is slowly disappearing. In some Umayyad palaces of Syria, sculptures in high relief representing human figures have been encountered. With new finds, the use of animals in sculptural decorations becomes more prevalent in Islamic Spain, particularly during the period of Almanzor (the last years of the tenth century and the first of the eleventh), when some of the best-known examples were made. Their importance is great even with regard to the history of origins of Romanesque sculpture, some of which strangely resemble their Islamic prototypes. Rafael Castejón has collected and published some of the most important examples of these sculptures representing living beings of the tenth and eleventh centuries (Fig. 14). 53

On the other hand two marble fonts recently studied are undecorated. One of them serves as a baptismal font at the church of Santo Domingo of Jaca (Huesca), and seems to be a work of the tenth century. 54 Of a some-


53 R. Castejón, “La nueva pila de Alamilia y las representaciones zoomorfas califales,” Boletín de la Real Academia de Ciencias, Bellas Letras y Nobles Artes de Córdoba, XVI, 1945 (Córdoba, 1946), 197–211.


what later date, probably the eleventh century and Almoravide period, is another font which bears an inscription and is now preserved at the Archeological Museum of Córdoba. 55

*Industrial and decorative arts*

José Ferrandis’s publication on the Spanish Muslim ivories is an important work. The first volume, containing ivories of the tenth and eleventh centuries was published in 1935 (Fig. 19); the second deals with those from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries. These later ivories are less known and the classification is more complex because of the difficulty in localizing many of them. The two volumes constitute an excellent catalog. The last chapter of the second one is devoted to ivory intarsia. 56 Ferrandis, in another publication, described Spanish Arab furniture made in this technique, namely of inlaying into the wood pieces of the same material or of ivory, either in the natural color or dyed. The most outstanding work of this art are mimbars. Ferrandis listed and reproduced a series of boxes and chests of marquetry, most of them having been preserved in Spanish churches. 57

An extremely rare piece of great historical and archeological value, previously unknown, was revealed by Gómez-Moreno. It is the sceptre of the Naṣrid kings of Granada (Figs. 20–26). It was later used as a staff by Cardinal Cisneros and is today displayed at a convent of Alcalá de Henares. Its material is ebony with inlays of bone combined with other woods, probably cedar, and is probably the

55 M. Ocaña Jiménez, “La pila de abluciones del museo de Córdoba,” Al-Andalus, VI (1941), 446–511.

56 J. Ferrandis Torres, Marfiles hispanomusulmanes, I (Madrid, 1935); II (Madrid, 1940).

only Muslim ebony work preserved in the Occident.\textsuperscript{68}

The beautiful swords of Granada of the Nasrids or of \textit{Nasrid} tradition called "de la \textit{jineta}" were the subject of a study by Professor Ferrandis. There are eleven samples preserved. He mentions, in addition, three ivory hilts, a bronze pummel, the rapier of Boabdil, and a small dagger.\textsuperscript{59}

Recently a cast bronze stag was found at Córdoba (Fig. 17). On the gilding that covers it, there is, worked with a burin, an engraved decoration representing wide curved stems, forming a series of circles with caliphal flower motifs in their interior. This piece that may have served as spout on the font in some palace, together with the other stag now in the Museum of Córdoba, and the royal section of the inventory of Isabel, the Catholic Queen, that refers to various Arab jewelry.\textsuperscript{62}

The rock crystal chessmen carved in Fatimid style which were at the church of Ager (Lérida) and later in the possession of the

\textsuperscript{68} M. Gómez-Moreno, "El bastón del Cardenal Cisneros," \textit{Al-Andalus}, V (1940), 192–95; E. Varela Hervias, "Más sobre el bastón del Cardenal Cisneros," \textit{loc. cit.}, 467–68.

\textsuperscript{59} J. Ferrandis Torres, "Espadas granadinas de la \textit{jineta}," \textit{Archivo Español de Arte}, n° 57 (Madrid, 1943), 142–66.

\textsuperscript{60} E. Camps Cazorla, "Un 'ciervo' califal de bronce," \textit{Archivo Español de Arte}, n° 58 (Madrid, 1943), 212–22; T. B., "Un nuevo ciervo califal de bronce," \textit{Al-Andalus}, IX (1944), 167–71.

\textsuperscript{61} S. de los Santos Jener, "Nuevos bronces hispanomusulmanes del Museo de Córdoba," \textit{Al-Andalus}, VII (1942), 165–68.

\textsuperscript{62} M. Gómez-Moreno, "Joyas árabes de la Reina Católica," \textit{Al-Andalus}, VIII (1943), 473–75.
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Fig. 13—Malaga, Alcazaba, Arches—Eleventh Century

Fig. 14—Malaga, Alcazaba, Marble Decoration

Fig. 15—Malaga, Alcazaba, Lions in the Meristan
Figs. 16-19—Objects in the Museo Arqueológico Nacional, Madrid
Figs. 27 and 28—Stucco Decorations, Thirteenth Century, Burgos, Convent of Las Huelgas
Countess of Béhague at Paris—with the exception of one that is now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, and those preserved in the monastery of Celanova (Orense)—have been studied by Camón Aznar.63 We owe it to Guerrero Lovillo that he noticed the similarity of the lamps reproduced in the miniatures of the Cantigas of Alphonse the Wise to some Muslim oriental ones of glass of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.64 The caliphal ceramics of the tenth century of which there exist abundant examples, found mostly at Madinat al-Zahrâ', have not yet been the subject of any publication. A brief notice concerning those which came from Elvira (Madinat Ilbira), in the Archeological Museum of Granada, was published by the director, Joaquina Eguaras.65 There has not yet been any publication on those of the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries, which were found at the Alhambra of Granada, at the Alcazaba of Málaga, and at various other places.

The primitive gold luster ware of Málaga has been described by Gómez-Moreno from the few remaining fragments found in this fortress among the ruined dwellings of the twelfth century. The author refers to the Oriental influences which led to the importation of gold luster ware into Spain during the tenth century and to various pieces found in the Iberian peninsula. He also discussed the luster technique and he believes that the fragments found at Málaga were manufactured in that same city. They also have an extraordinary resemblance to the famous bacini inlaid in some church spires of northern Italy, the origin of which is unknown. He further deals with other luster fragments in relief and made in a mold, which he attributes to the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In the thirteenth century we find a second period for this class of luster ware.66

I dealt with the large and exceptionally important "Alhambra vases" in an incidental manner when I published a notice on the vase decorated entirely with gold luster, which turned up unexpectedly in 1927 in Jerez de la Frontera (Cádiz), and which is now in the Archeological Museum of Madrid (Figs. 16 and 18). The Alhambra of Granada acquired through purchase another such vase of which only the gold decoration on the neck is still well preserved. This piece, in addition to the one which is now in the Ermitage of Leningrad, had formerly belonged to the collection of the painter Fortuny. Another of these vases which have returned to Spain and which had been sent by Raoul Heilbronner to the exposition of Muslim art in Munich in 1910, was destroyed in the fire of the custom-house of Irun in July of 1936.67

In the same article I presented information about the discovery of thirty-five Muslim Granadian azulejos of the fourteenth century in the chapel of San Bartolomé of Córdoba. These tiles (now kept in the Archeological Museum of the same city) are molded in relief and decorated in blue and gold; they deserve to be better known. We owe to E.

64 J. Guerrero Lovillo, "Las lámparas de las 'Cantigas,'" Archivo Español de Arte, n° 63 (Madrid, 1944), 148–70.
66 M. Gómez-Moreno, "La loza dorada primitiva de Málaga," Al-Andalus, V (1940), 383–98.
67 L. Torres Balbás, "De cerámica hispanomusulmana," Al-Andalus, IV (1939), 412–32.
Kühnel an interesting paper about the fragments of the Hispano-Moresque luster ware found during excavations in the Near East; they are almost always of the luster type of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. They were exported from Málaga and Manises (Valencia) to Egypt, where they were much appreciated, as well as to Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor, and Turkey.68

For knowledge of Spanish Muslim fabrics of the thirteenth century, the exploration of the royal cemetery of the monastery of Las Huelgas of Burgos was of extraordinary importance. Save for one, all the thirty-five sepulchres had been opened upon previous occasions and despoiled of parts of their funereal apparel. Nevertheless they afford a splendid collection of Arab and Mudéjar fabrics as well as several other objects, which attest to the craftsmanship and perfection of the Spanish looms of the thirteenth century. Among the former, there are beautiful rich brocades and tapestries of silk and gold, some with a design forming large wheels with pairs of lions and Kufic lettering. Their manufacture is doubtlessly Arab-Andalusian and has no similarity to the known Nasrid textiles, though quite like some Oriental ones. They will continue to be exhibited at the same monastery. Gómez-Moreno has studied and published them with his usual competency.69

Another textile of the same period has been found in a sepulchre at Valladolid. It is of colored silk with cursive Arab script. It also belonged to a person of the royal family.70

This, as well as the previous finds, together with older ones, show the esteem in which the Arab textiles of Andalusia were held in Christian Spain; they served not only as garments for persons of high social position but were also used in wrapping the wooden coffins that contain their mortal remains.

In the spring of 1943 the Sociedad Española del Amigos de Arte, which has done so much for the recognition of ancient Spanish art, organized an exhibition of leather craft, an artistic industrial art which, according to early manuscripts, had flourished on the Peninsula since the eighth century and which continued until the end of the seventeenth century. Also exhibited were Arab samples of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The guide book was edited by Ferrandis, who treated the subject in detail in an academic discourse, adding interesting technical notes.71 The various applications of this industry embrace everything from the decoration of walls and floors to small domestic articles. Thanks to these publications it will be easy from now on to formulate a more complete picture of an art that had great importance in Spain for several centuries and which has now become almost entirely forgotten.

II. Mudéjar Art

The Muslim art of Spain originated in the Orient but upon reaching the Iberian Peninsula it developed definite and distinguishing characteristics when it came into intimate contact with Western Christian art on the same soil. While Christian art had very little influence on the art of Islam, the inverse influence of the latter was extraordinarily fecund, manifesting itself in a new mixed art which

69 M. Gómez-Moreno, El Panteón Real de las Huelgas de Burgos (Madrid, 1946).
71 Sociedad Española del Amigos de Arte, Exposición de cordobanes y guadamecies, Catálogo-guía, Madrid, 1943; (Guadamecles) Real Academia de Bellas Artes, Discurso leído por el Ilmo. Sr. Don José Ferrandis Torres (Madrid, 1945).
is characteristic of Spain. From the twelfth century to the seventeenth, influences and repercussions of Muslim culture may be encountered all over the peninsula, touching every field of artistic production from such notable architectural creations as the cathedral of Toledo and the monastery of Las Huelgas of Burgos to crafts of the most humble and common origin. Altogether these various works form the extremely complex Mudéjar art which has no definite style owing to its enormous variety and to the lack of unity of the creations of this period. In the following paragraphs, let us see how the study of this era has progressed.

Architecture and Archeological Decoration

We owe to the French Hispanist Lambert two monographs on several French churches which were near the Pyrenees and on the road followed by the pilgrims during the Middle Ages who were on their way to Santiago de Compostela. One of the monographs dealt with the church of the Hospital of St. Blaise which was erected during the last years of the twelfth century or the first of the thirteenth. The center of the crossing of nave and transept is surmounted by a cupola on crossed arches which leaves an open space in the center. The outline of the opening is the same as another in the mosque Cristo de la Luz of Toledo, erected about 1000 A.D. Other elements of the architecture and decoration of this French church also stem from Spanish Muslim art. An almost identical cupola may be observed near Santa Cruz de Oloron, another of the stations on one of the roads to Compostela.72

The subject of Lambert's other monograph was the church of Saint-Pé de Bigorre, a chapel of the Benedictine monastery. It had a cupola which collapsed in the seventeenth century and which, at the time, was compared to the dome of St. Peter's of Rome for its monumentality. We do not know the interior plan of the church, but it was undoubtedly also derived from the Spanish Muslim type. Drawings executed prior to its destruction permit us to examine its exterior, to which windows with lobed arches added an original touch that gives the church an Oriental aspect.73

The vault of the chapel of Talavera, the ancient chapter hall of the old cathedral of Salamanca, erected in the last years of the twelfth or the first of the thirteenth century, was inspired by a Spanish Muslim prototype. This vault was designed by an artist who, though of Occidental background, had been influenced by Muslim work he had seen. Camón Aznar described it in a few pages.74

The same author studied the church of San Román of Toledo which had been cleaned of its surface whitewash and repaired a few years ago. It was consecrated in 1221. It is a Mudéjar brick building, the interior of which was covered by paintings of religious subjects deriving from Christian art but combined with Muslim decorative elements.75

The recent restoration of Santa Clara of Guadalajara which was stripped of its decorations of the seventeenth century, disfiguring its interior, revealed a Mudéjar church of the beginning of the fourteenth century.76


73 Ib., "L'ancienne église de Saint-Pé de Bigorre," Al-Andalus, VIII (1943), 189-209.

74 J. Camón Aznar and T., "La bóveda gótico-morsica de la capilla de Talavera en la catedral vieja de Salamanca," Al-Andalus, V (1940), 174-78.

75 J. Camón Aznar, "La iglesia de San Román de Toledo," Al-Andalus, VI (1941), 451-59.

76 F. Layna Serrano, "La iglesia trecentista de Santa Clara de Guadalajara," Arte Español, XIII
Some chapels in the cloister of the convent of the Cistercian nuns of Las Huélgas of Burgos have a definite Almohade character and are, therefore, of special importance for the history of Spanish Muslim art. Incidentally, I referred to them in a work on carved stucco decorations discovered in the vaults of the cloister of San Fernando in the same monastery. These carvings of the thirteenth century are extremely beautiful and completely dissimilar to any of the better-known decorations (Figs. 27 and 28). They can probably be attributed to Andalusian Muslim artists; however, nothing else resembling them can be found in this region. The same artists may have worked on the nearby Hospital del Rey, an edifice which has since disappeared. Plans and drawings are preserved, however, and with the help of these I have been able to formulate an idea of its shape.

In the two volumes so far published of the Catálogo arqueológico y artístico de la provincia de Sevilla, an ambitious, richly illustrated work with a great number of drawings and photographs, there are various monographs of Mudéjar churches and castles of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The custom of frequenting bathhouses was not exclusively Muslim in Spain. The Christians bathed too, and buildings destined for this purpose were erected in the reconquered cities. In the sixteenth century, during the Renaissance period, this hygienic custom was discontinued except in some Andalusian towns, as for instance Seville. Recently published articles deal with some aspects of the bathhouses on Christian territory. A publication dealing with this subject as well as the Muslim baths in detail would be of extraordinary interest since it would help to illuminate the heretofore ignored aspects of the intimate life of the Spanish Muslim society of the Middle Ages.

In continuation of the pages previously cited dealing with the funduk, I added a few about Christian graneries (alhondigas), inns (posadas), and lodging houses (mesones) that continued after the reconquest to serve the same function as the Spanish Muslim funduk and also followed its ground plan. In the same way, after studying the atrasanzas, or arsenals, I turned to the same constructions erected on Christian territory but built after Islamic prototypes.

At the beginning of this review I referred to the Infanta Palace at Guadalajara, the burning of which during the Civil War in 1936 was a regrettable loss to Spanish art. It was erected between 1480 and 1495. Layna has published documents on these last years of Moorish rule in which he has pointed out the collaboration of the Moorish and Christian workmen from this region of Guadalajara. These artisans included such skilled labor as
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carpenters, makers of lattices (rejas) and glazed tiles (azulejos).  

G. Marçais, Director of the Museum Stephen Gsell at Algiers, informed us about a decorative fragment in his collection representing a lion. He believes it to be of the eleventh century. I referred to this article when comparing the fragment to some plaster brackets, cut in the form of lion foreparts that prop an arch of the royal chapel of the mosque of Córdoba. These are attributed to the thirteenth century by some archeologists and to the fourteenth by others. In a short commentary I pointed out the existence of analogous brackets at the Hospital del Rey at Burgos and in various sepulchres of Toledo. The similarity of these brackets to the lion figures supporting many tombs of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is unquestionable.

Among the forms that passed from Spanish Muslim prototypes into Christian architecture and whose origin is not known are some Aragonese gables of the sixteenth century and some cornices on brick brackets with the profiles of circular arches that appear in Andalusian churches from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century; they are inspired by similar architectural features occurring in Almohade buildings.

The Marquess of Lozoya commented on the Mudéjar decorations of the halls in the Alcázar of Segovia, which were made during

the fifteenth century by Moorish artists and destroyed during the fire of 1862.

Two notes published in recent years deal with architectural carpentry. In one of them the oldest alfarje (flat roof with dwellings on it—a kind of penthouse) preserved in Spain is described. It is Mudéjar work dating from the end of the twelfth century, doubtlessly derived from Spanish Muslim carpentry, and is found in the monastery of Santa María de Huerta (Soria). The other note is devoted to the framing timbers with important remains of painted decorations used in the cloister of San Juan de Castrojeriz (Burgos). It is also a Mudéjar work of the fourteenth century.

There is a book of Pérez Embid on the Mudéjar architecture of Portugal but it is of small value because of its superficial study of that art and the author's lack of knowledge of the art in Spain.

**Industrial and Decorative Arts**

Almost all Spanish industrial arts of medieval origin stem from Muslim roots. This extensive field is one of the most brilliant chapters of art history in Spain. Marquetry work did not end with the termination of the Islamic reign of the Peninsula. Ferrandis states in the above-mentioned article

86 *Idem*, “La armadura del claustro de San Juan de Castrojeriz (Burgos),” *Al-Andalus*, XI (1946), 230-35.
that its artistic products have continued to be manufactured up to the present day.

In studying the miniatures of the *Cantigas* by Alphonse the Wise, Guerrero proved that in them Mudéjar furniture was reproduced.88

In 1938, when some laborers started the foundations of a building in the immediate neighborhood of the cemetery of Briviesca (Burgos), they found a small casket that contained a silver tray and a copper pot in which there were several small silver objects. Some of them, as well as the tray, have Mudéjar decorations and seem to have been made in the second half of the fourteenth century.89

Samuel de los Santos has described the collection in the Archeological Museum of Córdoba of well curbstones (brocales) made of baked clay. The decorative motifs of some of them are archaic but must have been made during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, probably already within the Christian period.89

The large Mudéjar earthen jars of the Toledo Museum were the object of a paper attempting to place them in their correct chronological order.91

Gonzalez Martí has published a richly illustrated and voluminous work on ceramics from eastern Spain. In it he has studied particularly the products of Paterna, Manises, and Teruel, between the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries.92 It is a pity that this publication was not preceded by another one dealing with Spanish Muslim ceramics from the caliphal to the Naṣrid period, since the Christian pottery, the subject of this work, is based on them. The statements of the author are often controversial; however, the quantity of reproductions in this study increase its importance. Sr. Bofill has published a catalog for the ceramics exhibition held at Barcelona.93

Glazed Catalan ceramics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are just beginning to be fully appreciated, since these products have up to now been considered of Valencian origin. Many of the decorative motifs used on them are Mudéjar. Alice Wilson Frothingham has devoted an article to these ceramics.94 As to the wares of Manises, E. Kühnel, in his aforementioned work, refers to the discovery of fragments from this locality in many of the excavations of the Orient—in Cairo, Syria, Asia Minor, and Istanbul.

Together with the Spanish Muslim textiles found in the royal cemetery of Las Huelgas of Burgos were Mudéjar fabrics which Gómez-Moreno likewise describes in his aforementioned work.

The only Spanish Arab rug in existence is preserved in a very poor condition in the Archeological Museum of Granada. In the Mudéjar rugs, undoubtedly made in imitation of the Spanish Arab prototypes, the Islamic techniques persisted throughout the period from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries and these rugs are a match for any

92 M. Gonzalez Martí, *Cerámica del Levante español, siglos medievales, loza* (Barcelona 1944).
93 F. de P. Bofill, *Cerámica española, Catálogo de la Exposición organizada por los Amigos de los Museos en el Palacio de la Virreina de Barcelona* (Barcelona, 1942).
Oriental types. The two oldest groups of Mudéjar rugs are: the one known under the name of "del Almirante" because three of them show the same coat of arms as the one ascribed to this noble Castilian family; and the others, known as the "Holbein" type because this famous painter reproduced one of them in his pictures. Ferrandis deals with this latter type in the Archivo Español de Arte, while Mrs. Florence Lewis May describes the former group—of which almost all are now in the United States of America—in the publication of The Hispanic Society of America for 1945.

The artistic Mudéjar leathers have been analyzed by Ferrandis right after the Spanish Arab ones in the two publications mentioned above.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE DES PUBLICATIONS DE L'ART ISLAMIQUE PARUS EN SYRIE, 1939–1945

Par Salahud Din Munajjid

Nous donnons dans cet article une bibliographie des plus importants livres et articles parus dans le domaine de l'archéologie et de l'histoire de l'art au cours des années de guerre 1939–1945 et publiés par des établissements syriens, tel que la Direction Générale des Antiquités en Syrie (D.G.A.—Damas) ou étrangers, tel que l'Institut Français de Damas (I.F.D.), et dans des revues ou bulletins de langue arabe, tel que la Revue de l'Académie Arabe (R.A.A.D.), la Revue de Dimashq (Rev. Dimashq), ou de langue française tel que le Bulletin d'Études Orientales (B.E.O.).

95 J. Ferrandis Torres, "Alfombras moriscas 'tipo Holbein,'" Archivo Español de Arte, n° 50 (Madrid, 1942), 103–11.


I. Livres et Brochures


Ce livre comprend une étude de plusieurs madrasas et bains de Damas. M. Sauvaget y a étudié les madrasas suivantes: (a) Raihâniya, constituée waqf par l'Emir Raihân en 575 H. (1180); (b) 'Adhrâwiya, fondée par al-Sitt 'Adhrâ, fille de Shahinshâh, frère de Saladin avant 593 H. (1196); (c) 'Izziya, extra-muros, constituée waqf en 621 H. (1224) par 'Izz al-Dîn Aïbag, Major d'Orient; (d) 'Adilîya, commencée par Nûr al-Dîn, puis continuée par al Malik al-'Adîl et achevée par al-Mu'azzam.

M. Sauvaget, dans l'étude méthodique de ces madrasas, a ajouté aux éléments historiques qui paraissent souvent peu riches, une profonde connaissance architecturale, et donne un modèle type de l'étude d'un monument historique.

Dans la seconde partie du livre, M. Ecochard parle des trois bains ayyoubides suivants: (a) Bain de Sitti 'Adhrâ; (b) Bain de Nûr al-Dîn; Bain de Usâma.

M. Ecochard a repris l'étude de ces bains dans son livre Les Bains de Damas.

Au cours de ces sept années écoulées, certains de ces monuments ont subi quelques modifications; d'autres ont été restaurés. Des parties couvertes alors, ont été mises à jour. Il y aura lieu donc de faire un appendice. Etant sur place, nous espérons pouvoir faire ces "Notes sur les monuments ayyoubides de Damas" nous-mêmes.


La première partie est consacrée à un exposé général sur le bain damasquin. Elle comprend: (a) L'eau de Damas; (b) description du hammam; (c) dispositif de l'eau; (d) technique de la construction; (e) fonctionnement du bain; (f) vie sociale du bain; (g) l'avenir du bain. Dans cette partie manque


Compte rendu: As'ad Talas, R.A.A.D., XVII (1942), 369 (louange).

As'ad Talas, Les Mosqués de Damas d'après Ibn 'Abdul Hadi (Beyrouth, 1943), 332 pp., 2 planches hors texte, 1 carte (I.F.D.).


Etude succinte sur le mur d'enceinte de Damas, au temps des Romans et des Arabes (Omeyyades, Abbassides, Fatimides, Seljoukides, Mamlûks, et Ottomans). L'auteur a utilisé dans son étude des manuscrits du douzième et treizième siècles encore inédits. On y trouve toutes les inscriptions gravées sur les tours et les portes de Damas corrigées et complétées. (Une nouvelle édition augmentée en cours de préparation.)

II. Articles

Cheik Muhammad Duhmân, “Dâr al-ḥadîth al-Asârîfiyya” (Maison d'enseignement de tradition Asârîfiyya), Rev. Dimashk I,10 (1940), 23-32.


Le fondateur de cette madrasa, sa construction, sa description d'après Ibn 'Uthîn, son aspect de nos jours (1940), les lieux constitués wâfîs en sa faveur, les professeurs qui y ont enseigné, sa bibliothèque. Compilation ordonnée.

L'Emir Djâfar 'Abdel-Kader, “Mathâf Dimashk al-djadîd” (Nouveau Musée de Damas), Rev. Dimashk, I,8 (1940), 36-42.


Cheik Ahmad al-Kâsimî, “Al-'Aml al-wâkîfiyya fi Süriyya” (Les Travaux de la Direction des Wakfs en Syrie), Rev. Dimashk I,8 (1940), 52-56.

Une intéressante partie sur les monuments historiques appartenant à la Direction des Wakfs qui ont été restaurés en 1939-1940.


Mausolées où l'on lit le Coran et où l'on enseigne la "science noble."

**L'EMIR Dî'Â'AR 'ABDEL-KADER, "Kuṣur al-Umawiyyin fî'l-Sha'm" (Les Châteaux des Omeyyades en Syrie), R.A.A.D., XVII (1942), 214–31.**


**CHEIK MUHAMMAD DUHMÂN, 'Alâ Hâmîsh al-bimâristânât, fî'l-Islâm (En marge des bimarîstânâns dans l'Islam), R.A.A.D., XVIII (1943), 62–73.**


**L'EMIR Dî'Â'AR ABD EL-KADER, "Kâbr Mu'âwiya ibn Ābî Sûfîyân (Tombeau de Mu'âwiya ibn Ābî Sûfîyân), R.A.A.D., XIX (1944), 434–41.**

Découverte du Tombeau de Mu'âwiya fondateur de la dynastie Omeyyade. Preuves historiques et topographiques. L'auteur détermine le lieu de ce tombeau au cimetière de Bâb Şaghîr (Petite Porte) au sud de Damas. Article intéressant et original.

**CHEIK MUHAMMAD DUHMÂN, "Turbat Ibn al-Musadîdjîf" (Mausolée d'Ibn al-Musadîdjîf), R.A.A.D., XX (1945), 229–33.**

Histoire du Mausolée ayoubide de Abûl-Kâsim ibn Qanâ'am ibn Yusûf, connu sous le nom de "Al-Musadîdjîf." Description du mausolée; biographie du fondateur; les inscriptions qui s'y trouvent; les travaux de restauration faites par l'architecte Robert Amy.

4 Pour ces inscriptions et d'autres voir: Salahud Din Munajjid, Bimarîstân de Nûrûd Dîn (Damas, 1946).


Il s'agit du tableau attribué à Gentile Bellini qui représente le Sultan Kaşšûh al-Qâhûr recevant, dans la Citadelle du Caïre, un envoyé de la République de Venise. M. Sauvaget croit au contraire, que ce tableau représente une audience accordée par le préfet de Damas à des marchands "francs" de la ville. On y distingue la Grande Mosquée avec deux de ses minarets. M. Sauvaget donne ses preuves. Il y a lieu de discuter certains points de l'article.

**A SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS ON ISLAMIC, PARTHIAN, SASANIAN, AND COPTIC ART PUBLISHED FROM 1939–1945**

*By Helmut von Erffa*
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**General**

M. S. Dimand, *Handbook of Muhammedan Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*,

* In the tedious task of finding titles, Miss Helen Ladd has done a major task. I want to thank her very much for her help.
2d ed. (New York, Metropolitan Museum, 1944).

Added to the second edition are chapters on “The Origins of Islamic Art” and on “Calligraphy and Illumination.” The latter replaces a chapter on Ornament. Other additions are the finds of the Nishapur excavations and some new stone and stucco objects, as well as some important jewelry. That in spite of all this new material there are only sixty more pages than were in the first edition was made possible by omitting footnotes and by condensing the text without losing anything of the content. The bibliography is competently brought up to date. Some changes of dates and spelling occur in the bibliography. A useful map complete for the minor arts might have included architectural sites of the Maghreb (Madînat al-Zahrâ’, Tozeur, Sfax), since sites of similar importance are included in Iran.


Popular summary of the more important Iranian art objects in the Museum.


Coptic and Nishapur objects newly displayed.


This excellent summary includes architecture and is based mainly on objects owned by and loaned to the Museum. Of especial importance is the reference to color in miniatures and ceramics.


A most useful collection of loose prints beginning with Pre-Achaemenian art. The majority are after actual photographs, many of them not easily accessible.

Rev.: A. C. Weibel, Ars Islamica, X (1943), 169-170.


In a chapter, “The Character of Islamic Art” (pp. 251-267), R. Ettinghausen lays down the foundation for certain characteristics of Islamic Art and its religious and sociological origin: humble and transitory material, nomadism and foreign origins for most crafts as a consequence. The permanence of Allah, the transitoriness of life, and the importance of the spiritual element expressed in the dematerializing effect of ornament on the solidity of art objects. How these basic laws are affected by the artistic traditions of the various countries is briefly suggested in a concluding paragraph. One might differ with the author in the case of Egypt. Here it was perhaps less “political aspect of the hierarchically organized state” but Egypt’s tradition of massiveness and solidity which is responsible for the appearance of Fatimid and Mameluke architecture.


Sections on Prehistoric Pottery, the Luristan Bronzes, Sasanian silver are by P. Ackerman who also collaborated on the Textile section. E. Schroeder wrote the section of the Arts of the Book, Calligraphy and Miniature Painting. Architecture, not included here, is planned as the subject for a volume in the same series, Masterpieces of Oriental Art. Nearly all objects of this book were shown in the exhibition of 1940.


A. Sakisian, “Thèmes et motifs d’enluminure et de décoration arméniennes et musulmanes,” Ars Islamica, VI (1939), 66-87.

An attempt to establish the “autonomy” of Armenian art and its influence on Islamic art by treating various themes, animal style, geometric ornaments, floral ornament and the stylized palmette, here called “rinçœaux de rûmî.” On the
credit side a wide knowledge of the material and of bibliography, inclusive of little-known objects and of Turkish and Armenian publications. On the debit side, a biased approach which makes the author often overstate his case. Nothing speaks more eloquently against the "autonomy" of Armenian art than the thoroughly Muhammadan character of the twelfth-century wooden door of Erivan.

**Architecture**


The spiral minarets of Samarra and Cairo and their influence on Baroque buildings, clocks, and Gothic miniatures and other works of art. It is suggested that the spiral tower of Borromini's St. Ivo may have been influenced by a book on Automata which had spiral towers. The reiterated suggestion that the Malwiya may have been influential throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance will hardly be accepted by Islamic scholars since it was almost inaccessible after the ninth century. The Mosque of Ibn Tulun is perhaps a more likely prototype.


Accepts the origin of the bulbous dome from the lost wooden Indian architecture. Although B. believes that bulbous domes developed from small wooden structures into monumental architecture in Syria during the eleventh-twelfth centuries he sees the origin of the bulbous dome of Timur in Russia where it existed from the twelfth century on. This is contrary to Creswell's theory that Timur introduced the bulbous dome through artisans transplanted from Damascus after 1400. B. bases his disagreement on the fact that the mausoleum of Shirin Biki Alkā is fifteen years earlier than 1400, the time of Damascus' destruction. B. certainly goes too far in denying any influence from Syria. Timur actually brought all artisans from Damascus to Samarkand. To strengthen his argument of Russian influence B. sees no evidence of native wooden architecture. In view of the rich wooden carving of the Damascus region the absence of wooden architecture would seem surprising.


The mausoleum of Shah Faḍl near Kāsān in the northern part of Farghāna is here republished with photographs in addition to those in the author's *Turan* and dated middle of twelfth century on the evidence of three mausoleums at Uzgand.

H. Field and E. Prostov, "Soviet Archaeology To-day, II," *Asia*, XL (1940), 327-30.

At Urgench (the old Djurdjaniya capital of Khwarazm until its destruction by Timur) several mausoleums are mentioned; at Anau, two of the fifteenth century (pp. 327-8). The rest of the report is devoted to non-Islamic art and archeology.

T. Hamlin, Architecture through the Ages (New York, Putnam, 1940).

The chapter on Islamic architecture has been reviewed by Ettinghausen in this magazine with great fairness. Some minor errors have been pointed out there. To this one might add: Umayyad Mosque of Damascus does not "follow the basilican scheme" and its mosaics are not Byzantine "in design, color and workmanship" but a mixture of East Christian (not Byzantine) and Sasanian motifs.


Original material, architectural and epigraphical. Instead of a catalogue of buildings in the manner of Sauvaget for Aleppo and Damascus and Cres-
well for Cairo, the author assembles building types, the “Mukarnas Dome,” the “Syrian Madrasa,” the “Turba,” and the “Mosque.” Monuments from Iraq and Iran are included but none from Cairo. The analysis of the type is always continued after the description of a building.


The throne of Chosroes and the “Dome of Heaven” at Kusair ‘Amr is included in this important study without, however, adding much new information.

B. Miller, The Palace School of Muhammad the Conqueror (Cambridge, Mass., 1941).

This “history of the training school of government officials, military officers, and court functionaries which was established by Muhammad II” contains a chapter (II, pp. 45–69), “The plan of the buildings,” i.e., the “Grand Seraglio,” which became the Topkapu Museum in 1924. By plan the author means lay-out and function; Tavernier’s and Bobovi’s accounts are among the sources judiciously used.


Information in addition to earlier articles on the orientation of the mihrab (Isis XX, 262–64; XXIV, 199–200). Southerly orientation in Maghrebine mosques is often due to a Hadith which indicates south as the kibla direction.


A careful, but confusing attempt to reconstruct one of the most difficult of all “palimpsest sites” in Cairo, which, although leaving many questions open, is at least the groundwork for further investigations. Valuable plans.


II. Caravansâraïs mamêlouks, ibid., VII (1940), 1–19.

Thirty-three caravansaries or “khâns routiers” in contrast to the “khâns urbans” rating from the twelfth to the fifteenth century are here systematically investigated architecturally and epigraphically. In conclusion the general type which varies little is summarized. Lack of known monuments makes it impossible to relate the Syrian khan to that of Persia or to Byzantine architecture.


The small mosque and minaret are dated 1134–35 and 1132 A.D. respectively, thus adding two more dated Seljuk monuments to those already known. The hypothesis of the isolated sanctuary type of Iranian mosque, suggested once by the author and carried through by Godard is here abandoned for structural and climatic reasons. Of great interest is the hidden and partly conjectural armature of intersecting arches on which the cupola (calotte) rests and which make the mukarnas nonstructural. The cupolas of Córdoba, earlier than known Iranian examples, may be independent of Iran.

“Three Monuments at Yazdi Khwâst,” Ars Islamica, VII (1940), 104–6.

Corrections and additions to the architectural material in H. Field “Contributions to the Anthropology of Iran,” Anthrop. Surv., Field Mus. Nat. Hist., XXIX (1939), Nos. I and 2 passim.

The ruined mosque possibly pre-Seljuk (Saffarid?). The caravanseraï inscription refers to Shah Abbas the Great.


A record of Smith’s scholarly activities during 1933–37: Measuring the Isfahan Djum’â, discovering monuments unrecorded by the Iranian Archeological Service, studying the Seljuk mosque of Demâvend and the “essentially Sasanian” citadel of Takht-i-Sulaimân.
M. Voronets, "The Beauty that was Samarkand," tr. by H. Field and E. Prostov, Asia, XLI (1941), 723–27.

Detailed account of restorations by the Committee for the Preservation of Monuments of Material Culture of Buildings in Samarkand and Bukhara. At the Mausoleum of Isma'il at Bukhara a Kufic inscription on wood was found bearing the name Isma'il.

D. N. Wilber, "Old Persian Brickwork," Pencil Points, XXI (1940), 491–98.

Technical discussion of bricklaying methods in Iran. One page of text and ten excellent illustrations.

_Illumination and Miniature Painting_


Sources, literary content and style of the _Manāfi’ al-Hayawān_ (pp. 11–12), non-Islamic versions of Bidpai (pp. 17–21). Two astrological leaves (Sol in Leo), Indian and Turkish (p. 25; the Indian example illustrated).


Especially mentioned are: a leaf from the _Manāfi’ al-Hayawān_ (2 stags), a leaf from Rashid al-Din’s _History of the World_ ("Black Lighting Chasing Wolves), two miniatures attributed to the Shiraz School and a "King Picnicking" from a Niẓāmi MS., Safavid period.


Necessity of a knowledge of art, historical methods, and "the language, literature and history of Islamic people" stressed by pointing out errors by some great Orientalists (Blochet, Sir Th. Arnold, and Migeon).


Twenty-one Bidpai miniatures, part of the Greek MS. 397 which is attributed by E. Husselman to Southern Italy and ca. 980–1050. The miniatures are considered contemporary with the script and definitely related to other South Italian miniatures. Miss Avery, contrary to Mrs. Husselman, seems to think that no Islamic Bidpai miniature provides a clue to the archetype for the Morgan MS. In fact she "found it impossible to establish the probability of an Arabic prototype for the Bidpai scenes."


The miniatures of this famous Shah-Namah, now widely scattered, are here re-assembled and many are reproduced for the first time. The study is restricted to iconography and a valuable bibliography. Of the fifty-eight miniatures thirty are illustrated.


Four Jaina manuscripts of the late fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries are discussed. Two manuscripts have the dates 1583 and 1591. Interesting to the Islamists is the influence of Persian painting in style and iconography (hunting scenes!) or the giving way of the early Western Indian to the Rajput style which blends native Indian and Persian characteristics.


The style of the school of Baghdad is here analyzed in a scholarly convincing way by relating the Dioscorides and the Schefer Ḥarīrī MSS. to the _Hippiatrica_, the earliest dated manuscript of this
school and the only one with colophon evidence of Baghdad. Important are the author’s references to Byzantine and possible East Christian sources.

"‘Hellenistic’ Miniatures in Early Islamic Manuscripts," Ars Islamica, VII (1940), 125–33.

Two illuminated MSS. usually considered of the Baghdad school, the Ḥariri Bibliothèque Nationale, Arabe 6094, and the Bidpai Bibliothèque Nationale, Arabe 6465, are compared with East Christian miniatures and localized somewhere in Syria (near Aleppo). A third manuscript, a Coptic Gospel, Bibliothèque Nationale, Copte 13, from Damietta dated 1180 A.D., is stylistically related to the two Arabic manuscripts and has Syrian characteristics, although mixed with Islamic elements. The stylistic grouping is thoroughly convincing but the Syrian provenance necessarily tenuous.


A “picture book” with a brief text aimed at the layman and providing an excellent historical summary of Persian miniature painting from the Manāfi al-Hayawàn to Ridā-i-‘Abbāsī. Twenty illustrations, several of them details.


A more intensified study of one of the four MSS. studied by W. Norman Brown in his Uttarādhyayana Sūtra series and its Persian influences. Not illustrated.


The investigation is mainly based on various ornamental patterns as found in pottery, textiles, etc. This study was written before W. N. Brown’s publication of Uttarādhyayana Sūtra.


In this period where pictorial remains are very rare, E. succeeds in distinguishing three main trends: 1, a Perso-Iraqian one with the ceiling of the Capella Palatina as the main example; 2, a Hellenistic style; 3, a popular style with Coptic Art as its base.


Shah-Namah scenes from a goblet in the Freer Gallery. Important since no thirteenth-century Persian miniatures preserved. The author may find them related to the wall paintings of the Torre de las Damas at Granada.


Only four of a planned seven manuscripts are discussed in this first of two studies. Two are assigned to Shiraz and dated 1333 and about 1330; and two to Tabriz, about 1330 and about 1380–90. The incomplete footnote 13, p. 135, should read: Bull. Amer. Inst. Persian Art & Arch., V, 2 (1937), 137–44.

Persian Painting from Miniatures of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries (New York-Toronto, 1940).

Twelve color plates with an introductory essay and catalogue.

Rev.: R. Ettinghausen, Ars Islamica, VII (1940), 121–22; A. P. McMahon, Parnassus, XII (1940), 51; M. A. Simsar, Moslem World, XXXI (1941), 198–99.


A leaf from the Demotte Shah-Namah.

Three miniatures acquired from the Philip Hofer Collection: 1, the unfinished "Gardenscene" is here not attributed to Bihzâd because it lacks the "flick of the lower edge of all robes, as though they had been caught in a draft"; 2, "Camel and Attendant" is cautiously not assigned to any particular artist; 3, "Picnic in the Mountains" is perhaps overcautiously called "style of Muḥammad" because it seems "less vigorous" than a similar one in the Bibliothèque Nationale ascribed to the master.


Spirited, sensitive description of a Pastoral Scene from the period of Akbar and a Hunting Scene from Dīlahāngīr’s time or possibly somewhat earlier. The latter has the signature of Govardhān.


J. is in favor of a native origin of Jain patterns in the Early Western Indian style, especially the Ḥānsa pattern.


Ghāzi, son of ʿAbd al-Rahmān, al-Dimashqī, who signed the Harirī manuscript, Or. 9718, in the British Museum.


Acquisition report of two miniatures, attributed to the school of Tabrīz and compared to related miniatures.


The introduction by P. H. Hitti contains brief descriptions of the most important illuminated MSS., among them the famous Bihzād miniatures. Single leaves and one album, pp. 87-94.


The horoscope and miniature of the fourth caliph at the Harvard College Library is a leaf from a manuscript in the H. Kevorvian collection, dated (by E. Schroeder) first half of the fourteenth century and attributed to Central and Southern Persia.


An attempt to date the Istanbul Bidpai 1320-40 and the Demotte Shah-Namah 1350-75 by a comparison of hats and coat lapels. The outstanding quality of both works tempts the author into assigning the Bidpai to Ahmed Musa and the Shah-Namah to Ahmed Musa and Shams-al-Dīn. The former is mentioned by Dūst Muhammad as the inventor of "the kind of painting which is current at the present time." Especially interesting are the assignments of different hands in the Shah-Namah in which he differs from other scholars. One cannot help worrying a little about the method of dating by hats.


A brief introduction of principles and history. Illustrated.


Acquisition notice of a page from the famous Ḥamza MS., the bulk of which is in the Museum for Art and Industry in Vienna.

Introductory chapter covers the history of Persian miniature painting (p. 10 a discussion of Persian esthetic terms). Each miniature is not only fully catalogued but discussed in relation to other known works by the same painter.


“Persian Painting,” *Parnassus*, XI (1939), No. 7, 28–32.

Warning against “lyrical” praise and finding need for “critical” praise. Schroeder suggests eloquence as the quality of Persian painting on which “we might profitably expend our critical, and not our lyrical, powers.” He defines Persian painting further: “Representation is developed as an exploration of decorative principles, not an exploration of nature.” The very musing, lyrical style of the author seems to defy the purpose of the article, namely, to define the essential quality of Persian painting to the layman.

“Persian Painting,” *Parnassus*, XII (1940), No. 2, 31–33.

Valuable for the interpretation of Persian terms of esthetic criticism, giving us an understanding of what qualities the patrons of Persian painting sought. Three of the terms are illustrated by examples. Cf. other article—*Parnassus*, XI, No. 7, p. 28, by the same author.


** Ceramics**

(Pottery, Tiles, and Mosaic Faience)


Sixteen examples chosen from a newly acquired group of Islamic pottery are discussed here. Samarra, Rakka and Rusâfa types are all included under “Iranian.”

** M. Crane, “A Fourteenth Century Mihrab from Isfahan, *Ars Islamica*, VII (1940), 96–100.**

From the Madrasa Imâmi in Isfahan, now in the Metropolitan Museum. Dated 1354 A.D.


A most useful study of four types of lamps dated on epigraphical evidence Umayyad and Abbasid. One of them, previously published, is dated 746/7 A.D.


Most important is a molded Umayyad pottery type with green lead glaze, found only in Tarsus, and another, found only in Tarsus and Antioch, late Umayyad or early Abbasid, a spotted ware with a translucent lead glaze. The latter type is comparable to a type of Samarra ware. Later pottery types found at Tarsus were either well-known types or their local derivatives; among them, Byzantine sgraffito ware. Part of the article is a lively, well-documented account of the history of Tarsus.


For a fuller treatment see the article by M. Crane in *Ars Islamica*, VII (1940), 96 ff.

“Gift of Islamic Pottery: Persian Tiles of the 13th and 14th Centuries, a Turkish Tile of the 16th Century and a Turkish

Two tiles are dated 1211 A.D. and 1265 A.D.


Acquisition report of eight pieces given by H. McIlhenny, followed by a catalogue of four Turkish pieces of pottery from the McIlhenny bequest.


Hispano-Moresque, Valencian, third quarter fifteenth century. The coat of arms may be related to that of René of Anjou but is not actually identified.


Tentative grouping of material in need of systematic study. The earliest group is attributed to the sixteenth century. The only group with a definite ante quem date is the "blue and white painted ware" which cannot be later than the first half of the seventeenth century. Kiln evidence. Most of the other groups are related to this group.


Excavated kiln evidence from Muel serves as evidence for classifying Aragonese pottery at the Hispanic Society of America and other museums. A bowl dated 1603 and with Muel mentioned in the inscription at the Walters Art Gallery is illustrated on p. 83, text pp. 86–87.


A valuable but too sketchy contribution to our knowledge of late seventeenth-century Hispano-Moresque pottery. Some localization at Reus, Teruel, Muel, and some dated pieces. An inscription on a plate from Madrid is used, not too convincingly, for evidence that some Moorish potters were tardy in leaving Spain. By 1650 luster ware peters out.


Fatimid luster, eleventh century.


A twelfth-century Rusāfa bowl and a thirteenth-century Rayy bowl (Kashan?) both from the V. E. Macy collection.

A. LANE, "Glazed Relief Ware of the Ninth Century A.D.," Ars Islamica, VI (1939), 56–65.

This type of pottery found in two countries, Mesopotamia and Egypt, is here dated early in the Samarra period and its origin sought in Egypt for reasons of a continuous tradition dating back to Hellenistic times.


Jar with turquoise blue glaze; about 1200 A.D.


While "practically a companion piece" of a dish in the Victoria and Albert Museum with the arms of Queen Maria (1416–58), the author assigns a somewhat earlier date to the Detroit piece (first half fifteenth century).

D. N. WILBER, "The Development of Mo- saic Faience in Islamic Architecture in Iran," Ars Islamica, VI (1939), 16–47.

After some preliminary discussion of the three successive stages of Iranian architectural surface decoration of patterned brick, stucco, and mosaic faience, this important article gives a brief summary of pre-Islamic "glassy faience" in order to demonstrate the uninterrupted tradition of this technique. This is followed by a skillful summary of early monuments and of literary evidence up to the end of the Mongol period. The evidence for the imperfectly understood importance of Kashan
for mosaic faience is judiciously weighed. The latter half of the article is devoted to the development of mosaic faience from its timid beginnings at Damghan (1058 A.D.) to the fully developed stage at the mausoleum of Olchaitu at Sultaniya (1310 A.D.) as shown by dated and datable buildings.

Carpets and Rugs


The Vase Carpet, formerly in the collection of Clarence H. Mackay, given by Mrs. Saidie May to the Baltimore Museum. Poor illustration.

“Silver-woven Silk Landscape Rug with Animals and European Figures, ca. 1640,” Art News, XL (Apr. 15, 1941), 22.

Color print of a Persian silk rug, attributed to ca. 1640 and to Yazd by Martin. Mrs. H. Walters Collection.


Timurid miniatures are studied to recapture the designs of lost Timurid carpets. The view is held that “the rugs represented in Timurid miniatures depict, if not actual carpets, designs of the same type, general composition, and character, as those used in the rugs of the period.” Five basic plans are distinguished, squares, stars, octagons, hexagons, and circles. In conclusion, the origin of geometric Timurid carpets is sought in a Turkoman style. An appendix contains “a list of fifteenth-century Persian manuscripts and single miniatures which contain representations of geometric and non-geometric rugs.”


Date: early seventeenth century.


On loan from Mr. J. Paul Getty. The medallion-type rug is compared to one in the Poldi-Pezzoli Museum, dated 1522/3, and to the famous animal carpet from Ardabil dated 1539/40. The inscription here quoted may refer, according to the author, to the commissioner rather than to the maker of the carpet.


Inventory entries date this rug, “the finest and most sumptuous Persian Garden rug in existence,” before 1632 or between 1622 and 1632. It is the earliest garden rug known. Garden rugs may have been made near Isfahan.


A summary description of the most important rugs owned by or lent to the Museum. Iranian rugs are stressed; Indian rugs and those from Asia Minor, the Caucasus and Turkestan (Ballard Collection) are briefly treated. The stylistic difference between Iranian and Indian rugs is here more clearly stated than in the author’s Handbook of Muhammadan Art.


A Russian journalist points with pride to the revival of an ancient craft. “Within the framework of the Turkmenian line the field (in the rug) is filled with portraits of living people, etc.” One page of illustrations.


A brief description of the rugs now in the Philadelphia Museum, followed by a catalogue.

The first part of this study (*Ars Islamica*, V [1938], 179–206) deals with literary sources of Cairene rugs of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries which, he assumes, are the so-called Damascus rugs and the Turkish court rugs ("Osmanenteppiche"). The second part gives convincing arguments that these rugs were made in Cairo. (Stylistic relations with Coptic rugs and the appearance of a Mameluke emblem.) After a valuable chronological development the Turkish court rugs are carefully analyzed.


Several fifteenth-century Spanish rugs are under discussion. The latter part of the article is devoted to literary and pictorial sources for Spanish rugs among which a miniature from the Manfred Bible, thirteenth century, in the Vatican with an armorial rug is the most notable.


A technical study with excellent photographic enlargements to illustrate the technique under discussion.


The rug in question is a Kazak rug with an abstract design of octagons in squares. The author relates it to a rug in Memling's "Madonna and Child" in Vienna, a Seljuk rug, similar to the famous "Dragon and Phoenix" specimen. T. offers two hypotheses: (1) the Turkish peasants passed the motif on to their Kazak neighbors; (2) it originated with the Turkomans and was carried to the Kirghiz-Kazaks who, after migrating to their present home, borrowed the color scheme from their Turkish neighbors. The latter hypothesis seems preferable.


A "Polish" rug, gift of Edsel Ford, without metal threads.

**Textiles**


This hitherto unknown collection consists of rugs, velvet and brocaded silks, tapestry, and embroideries. Several of the velvets and silks are dated.


Some of these pieces, although found in Egypt, may have come from other parts of the Near East. Two mention the place of manufacture: Tinnis, 288 h., and el-Khassa (time of al-Mukhtadir), tenth century.


Although there was no direct cultural contact between the two countries, Persia and Peru used the same dye stuffs (shield louse and murex shellfish) and the same two-barred loom which is most appropriate for cotton weaving. Color and design is not discussed but hinted at.


A straw mat of the first half of the tenth century, from Tiberias, in the Metropolitan Museum and
one in the Benaki Collection are the only complete ones known.


A silk dated 266 H. (879/80 A.D.) allegedly from the Cathedral of Sens. D. follows Stein's attribution of Sogdiana or Western Turkestan for these textiles. The other acquisition is a silk banner dated 1066 H. (1694-95 A.D.). Since the inscription mentions "Isma'il of Kashan, the weaver was either a native or possibly a resident of Kashan."


A most useful "pocket-size encyclopedia" (233 pp.) aimed at the consumer. Items are alphabetically arranged. "Oriental Rugs" includes their trade names and subheadings such as "Judging Oriental Rugs" and "Care of Oriental Rugs."


The loan collection of Burton V. Berry now on view in its entirety at the museum. Most of the Turkish examples date from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.


Valuable. Neskhi appears for the first time at the end of the second period (1021-94 A.D.), not entirely replacing Kufic. Two pieces: Arab Museum, Nos. 9075 and 8040, are here published for the first time.

F. L. May, "Hispano-Moresque Brocades from Villasirga," Notes Hispanic, III (1943), 118-34.

Thirteenth-century (false) gold and silk brocades in Madrid and in several American museums. Well documented. The gold thread is made of thin strips of gilded skin. The stylized "Kufic" inscription here read as "baraka" should be re-examined.


Velvets, satins, and embroideries.


Part of an article to which various members of the museum staff contributed. It deals with Graeco-Roman, Coptic and Egypto-Arabic textiles, recently added to the museum collection. Some of the Islamic textiles are dated ninth and tenth century by the names of caliphs. Another piece attributed eleventh and twelfth century "must have been woven with needle instead of shuttle."

R. B. Serjeant, "Material for a History of Islamic Textiles up to the Mongol Conquest," Ars Islamica, IX (1942), 54-92; X (1943), 71-104.

A much-needed systematic compilation of Oriental source material referring to textiles. The first two chapters deal with tiraz, its origin (the system probably Persian rather than Byzantine), definition, and history. The rest with the various manufacturing centers. To be continued.


Lengthy discussion of some important pieces. The attack on Guest's interpretation of an inscription which would ascribe a whole group of thirteenth-century brocades to Baghdad is not too convincing. Granted that the whole group belongs stylistically together, we should like to know her reasons that make it Spanish and not Iranian.


Two fragments, Safavid, from the scene of Khusraw meeting the bathing Shirin. Silk velvet without metal thread.

The author sees an influence of the Tabriz school.


Brocaded silk fabric, Persia, twelfth to thirteenth centuries, acquired by the Detroit Institute of Arts. The rider on horseback and the black panther beneath is interpreted as Ahura Mazda and Ahriman. No reference to a Kufic inscription, clearly visible in the photograph.


Recent acquisition of textiles, some of which (silk tapestries) correspond closely to representations on Rajput miniatures.


A piece of satin (tomb cover) from Rayy, twelfth century. Pairs of animals and leafy scrolls enclosed by octagons with as yet undeciphered Kufic inscriptions. Weaving technique described.


Acquisition of a Rizâ-i-‘Abbâsi silk gives Mrs. W. the opportunity to publish two dated miniatures by the master, now in Detroit private collections. (Valentinier and Anonymous.)


One of these supposed to come from Egypt, the other from Peru. The former is assigned to the Fatimid or Ayyubid period. Judging from the photograph one might assign it to India if it is Muhammadan at all.


1, a well-known Hispano-Moresque rug described by van de Put, *Burlington Mag.*, IX (1911), 344, with the arms of Maria of Aragon. Early fifteenth century; 2, a silk, Granada, fifteenth century.


Probably saddle girths from the end of the twelfth to the second half of the sixteenth centuries. Lack of evidence makes it difficult to decide on the place of origin which may be Egypt or “the land of the Turkish nomads” (Turkestan?). Most of the pieces have inscriptions, often referring to the horse.


Kashan velvet in the H. M. de Young Memorial Museum.

*Wood, Ivory, Bone, and Glass*


Mainly devoted to fish-shaped ivory priming flasks (for powder to prime the pushpan and touchhole of a musket) decorated with animal carvings from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. The article contains also much valuable information on non-Islamic animal styles.


A Fatimid dish and a Coptic niche of the Fatimid period in the Treasury of San Marco, Venice. Both are attributed to the eleventh century.


“The indispensable basis for all further research in that field” (G. Swarzenski). Careful study of
the stylistic development, fully illustrated. The inscriptions were read by P. K. Hitti.


G. Swarzenski, *Art Bull.*, XXII (1940), 104-05 (reference to some ivories not mentioned by Cott).


Acquisition report of this “masterpiece of Mamluk glassware.” Dated ca. 1320. Made in Syria.


E. discovered the signature (a)1-Baṣri on a fragment of lustered glass. This and another somewhat earlier fragment at the Arab Museum in Cairo, which also bears, in the author’s opinion, a Baṣri signature, would be the first documented confirmation of literary evidence that Basra was a great glass-producing center. E. dates the Princeton fragment late ninth or early tenth century; the Cairo fragment several decades earlier. At least the Cairo piece may have been made at Samarra. Mentioned in passing is an unpublished bronze ewer at the Tiflis Museum, dated 686 A.D. and made by Abi Yazid in Basra. (The artist’s name on the ewer should be read: Ibn Yazid; the date is either 67 or 69 H. [686 or 688 A.D.].—R.E.)


While this is an important contribution to our knowledge of Campanian sculpture between 800 and 1200, it sheds little new light on definite Islamic foci from which the various motifs of phantastic and real animals sprang.


“Was made at the time when the East Roman Empire tottered before the onslaught of the Ottoman Turks.”

**Metalwork**

(Including Arms and Armor)


The type in question is thirteenth-century Syro-Mesopotamian with a possible origin in the southeastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire. “It was introduced to Iran on the one hand and to Mameluke Egypt on the other.” Key piece in the British Museum is dated 1243-44 A.D. The introduction brings valuable literary sources for incense and its use.


A-O. clears up several misconceptions of Western authors regarding Islamic terms for copper and bronze and quotes from original sources to back up his statements.

“Use of Architectural Forms in Seljuk Metal Work,” *Art Quart.*, VI (1943), 92-98.

Thought-provoking relationships between four types of metal ewers from Northeastern Iran (Herat) and towers of the same region. The parallel is striking enough in the first two groups: (1, vertical convex flutings [tori]; and 2, tori and triangular ribs alternating) to give additional weight to the Herat signature on the ewer from the Georgian State Museum in Tiflis. Parallels in the other two groups are less striking, but do not necessarily weaken the argument. The difficult problem of the wanderings of the metalworkers is not touched upon here.


Exhaustive treatment of the epigraphy, figural decorations, and shape of the vessel. E. suggests the term “bucket” or “pail” instead of “kettle” as more appropriate. Stressed is the fact that the bucket was made for a merchant, not a ruler; other objects made for merchants are cited. After
an interesting excursus about the use of titles as applied to the inscription the author turns to stylistic analysis. Emphasized is the use of continuous band in contrast to cartouches of an earlier period. The evolution of the bucket shape is given. Especially important are the concluding parallels between the atomistic character of the decoration of the bucket and the literary style of the Makāmat by Ḥarīrī and the character of Islamic theology. The evanescent form-denying effect of the decoration as typical Islamic art is stressed at the close of the article.


By Saracens M. means “Muslims in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt during the period which began with the First Crusade and ended with the Ottoman conquest.” Actually nothing earlier than Ayyubid (after 1171 A.D.) is discussed because earlier specimens do not exist. “Plate armor proper was never made by the Saracens” (p. 4).

**Stone and Semiprecious Stone**


Dated seventeenth-century fork and spoon of rock crystal, a spoon of heliotrope, archer’s thumb-rings of jade, all of these in the Kunsthistorisches Museum of Vienna, and a rock-crystal elephant in an English private collection, the latter reproduced for the first time.


“A picture book” with twenty-two illustrations and two pages of descriptive text. Included is a rare Parthian gold fibula with cloisonné inlay. Ten pieces of the museum’s rich collection of Indian jewelry are reproduced.


A Fatimid enameled earring attributed to the eleventh century in the Metropolitan Museum is linked with some jewelry in the Walters Art Gal-}

lery which allegedly came from Spain. Thus the Spanish Moors may have learned the art of jewelry from Egypt.


Eight pieces of sculpture in Western collections here under discussion come from a destroyed building in Kubačhi. (About fifty from Russian collections are listed in the catalogue of the Third International Congress of Iranian Art.) By tracing of beards, dresses, arms, and decorative elements to Central Asiatic sources, S. demonstrates the Turkish character of this material which seems un-Muhammadan in many ways. Basic article in English (Bashkiroff being the most important Russian source) with a comprehensive bibliography and a list of exhibitions.

**Epigraphy, Paleography, and Calligraphy**

N. ABBOTT, “Arabic-Persian Koran of the Late Fifteenth or Early Sixteenth Century A.D.,” *Ars Islamica*, VI (1939), 91-94.

The colophon of this Koran in a private collection mentions the calligrapher Muhammad Nūr, active 1494-1514 at the Court of Sultan Husain at Herat. The other two names appearing in the colophon are here identified as Abdallah Marāwīrī of Kerman, the Arabic calligrapher at Sultan Husain’s Court and the famous Saint Naṣir al-Dīn ‘Ubaid Allāh Aḥrārī Naḵšbandī. A terminus ad quem is deduced from the death date of Abdallah, 1516 A.D. A Persian commentary was added 1818-19 A.D. The article does not include a stylistic analysis of the decorated pages.

**The Rise of the North Arabic Script and its Kur’ānic Development, with a Full Description of the Kur’ān Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute.**


Discusses a fragmentary Arabic block print on parchment of the fourteenth century in the University of Pennsylvanian Museum, probably a unique bibliographical treasure in American collections. The text consists of prayers and the whole was probably an amulet.


A large stone slab in the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, commemorating in Arabic verse the building of a canal or reservoir and an inner gate on the grounds of the Palace of Gaur, the old capital of Bengal, by Bârbak Shah, ruler over Bengal 1459-75 A.D. The slab's provenance is traced and other epigraphical material of Bârbak Shah discussed.


Kufic inscriptions dated first half twelfth century.


Marble plaque with a dedicatory inscription on a reservoir (from Cairo?) by Baibars, son of Sunkur al-Asûkâr, dated 707 H. (1307 A.D.). No other monuments of Baibars mentioned, but a brief summary of Sunkur al-Asûkâr's life after Quatremeré's *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks de l'Égypte*.

"Reliques of the Rev. Dr. John G. Lansing; with Annotated List of Arabic Books and Manuscripts in Denver Public Library Collection," *Moslem World*, XXX (1940), 269-79.

The same material is more carefully described in the preceding article.


Five Koran leaves attributed to the eighth-thirteenth centuries. The statement that one of the leaves comes from a Koran "said to be dated 1050 A.D." is tantalizing.


See M. B. Smith's article in section: Architecture.

"Epitaphs from an Isfahan Graveyard," *Ars Islamica*, VI (1939), 151-57.

A scholarly analysis of eleven unpublished inscriptions dating from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries.


A good popular description of the Garret Collection. The illustrations are selected for reasons of calligraphy.

**Iconography**


Symbolism of archery in Turkey based on Hein's research and paralleled with a wealth of archery symbolism in Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Egyptian, and other literatures.


Undocumented misrepresentation of some of the basic facts of Islamic art, a good deal of which seems to go back to J. Dudley's *Naology*.

M. Schapiro, "The Angel with the Ram in Abraham's Sacrifice: A Parallel in Western and Islamic Art," *Ars Islamica*, X (1943), 134-47.

In this important iconographical study Christian and Muhammadan renderings of Abraham's sacri-
face are contrasted: in Christian Art the ram simply appears, while in Muhammadan art it is brought by the Angel. Jewish tradition is behind this Muhammadan version. Wherever the Muslim variant occurs in Christian art (Ireland, Southern France, and Spain) the source may be either Jewish or Muslim.

Non-Islamic Arts

Parthian and Sasanian Art


A plaque showing an ibex with a flying scarf is compared to a similar piece in the Louvre; period of Tâk-i-Bustân.


Decorative stucco, replacing glazed brick, appears for the first time at Seleucia in Mesopotamia at the excavation level of 69-120 A.D. (level II). At the same time the îvân appears in the form of two barrel-vaulted rooms opening on opposite sides of the courtyard. The îvân takes the place of the Hellenistic columnar buildings of the preceding period. The author considers the various possibilities of the origin of both stucco and îvân and decides for their origin in Northwestern Iran as the most probable.


A stylistic and paleographic study of rock reliefs from Jamdat-Näṣr through the Parthian period. Iranian sites are included.


Horse and rider, dated sixth or early seventh century.


Should be read in connection with his *Archaeological History of Iran* (London, 1935). Much of the material suggested there is expanded, some of it is entirely new. Most important Küh-i-Khwâdja with its îvâns and paintings. Additional rock sculpture (Firûzâbâd, etc.).


The relief comparable to one in the Louvre.


According to this valuable survey of the Parthian temple, certain Greek and Babylonian features are added to the Achaemenian square building supported by a flat roof on four columns and surrounded by an ambulatorium; the interior support, omitted in an earlier phase, is finally supplanted by vaults. In the Sasanian temple a cupola is added. Küh-i-Khwâdja is tentatively dated late second or third century A.D. Herzfeld's date is early first century.


Objects to Debevoise's assumption (*Amer. Journ. Archaeol.*, XLV [1941], 54 ff.) that the seven-stepped battlement had changed from a practical to a decorative motif instead of a symbolic one and warns against neglecting symbolic motifs in Near Eastern art in general.


A drinking cup (scyphus) from the W. H. Moore collection from Homs, datable first century B.C. to first century A.D.

Coptic Art

Recent acquisition from Aḥnās, attributed to the sixth century. Motif: birds separated by a flowering shrub.

**Brooklyn Museum. Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, *Egyptian Art from the First to the Tenth Century A.D.* Exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum by the Department of Ancient Art, January 23 to March 9, 1941. Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences.

A general introduction by J. D. Cooney, a chapter on textiles by Mrs. E. Riefstahl with a selected bibliography which does not include works on Islamic textiles. Only four Islamic textiles were included in the show, probably for reasons of comparison, three of them unpublished.


Checklist with bibliographies, which includes besides 224 Coptic manuscripts (pp. 28–62, with 1 illustration), Syriac, Christian Arabic, Nubian, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Georgian manuscripts.


**J. D. Cooney, *Pagan and Christian Egypt* (Brooklyn Institute, 1941).**

**Late Egyptian and Coptic Art; an Introduction to the Collection in the Brooklyn Museum** (Brooklyn Mus., 1943).

Popular but authoritative introduction and a catalogue (with bibliography) of an important collection. Of the fifty-four plates only one shows objects dated seventh to eighth century ("Textiles with Arabic Influence").


**J. D. Cooney (Ed.), *Coptic Egypt: Papers Read at a Symposium Held Under the Joint Auspices of New York University and the Brooklyn Museum, Feb. 15, 1941* (Brooklyn Museum, 1944).**

The first three papers give social and religious background material—documents of Roman oppression (Z. W. Westerman, "On the Background of Copticism") and documents of that strange visionary piety which, together with other more materialistic forms, preceded Coptic Christianity (A. D. Nock, "Later Egyptian Piety"). The third is an interesting summary of the Harvard-Boston excavations in Nubia but hardly integrated into the scheme of the symposium (D. Dunham "Romano-Coptic Egypt and the Culture of Meroe"). The other three lectures are on Coptic Art. While the general summary of Cooney's presents little that is new, S. de Nersessian's "Some Aspects of Coptic Painting" offers contributions to Coptic Iconography (Death of Zacharias, p.e.), and M. Dimand, "Classification of Coptic Textiles," while on the whole conservative, mentions documentary material rarely used in general surveys.


**S. Der Nersessian, "Pagan and Christian Art in Egypt; an Exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum," *Art Bull.*, XXIII (1941), 165–7.**

Important comments on aspects of stylistic development (acanthus scroll), and problems of iconography. Disagreements on the dating of some pieces.

**H. E. McAllister, "Fourteen Coptic Bone Plaques Acquired by Metropolitan," *Metropolitan Mus. Bull.*, XXXIV (1939), 68–70.**

Dated sixth to ninth century.

**D. G. Kelekian, *Additional Documents of Coptic Art in the Collection of Dikran G. Kelekian, Inc.* (New York, 1941).**


"Preconquest Egyptian" textiles dated fifth to sixth century should be dated in view of textile finds at Dura-Europos which has a terminal date of 256 A.D. "At least one" Dura-Europos textile is in the pile technique.


In the Saidie A. May Collection. R. narrows down Strzygowski's vague date (third to seventh century) to late fourth to early fifth century on the basis of data from Egypt.


An unpublished fragment of an incense burner in the shape of a lion attacking a boar. It forms, together with seven others, a new group of incense burners in the shape of animals, adding a fifth to those groups established by Pelka. It is tentatively dated late fifth or early sixth century and may have originated in the Thebaïd.


The point is made that this tapestry from Egypt is really Byzantine, not Coptic in style. Attributed late fifth to early sixth century.


A miniature from the Epistles of Paul (Public Library Leningrad, Arab N.F. No. 327) dated 279 (?872 A.D.) depicts Paul and Timothy, the latter identified for the first time by W. The Coptic character of this miniature is made plausible by its fairly well-authenticated report of origin and the fact that the figures are standing. It is further stressed by a stylistic comparison with some frescoes from Saškšarā; a Byzantine influence via Syria-Palestine (cf. cod. Copt. I Vat. Lib.) is, however, stressed together with a native Coptic trend manifest in Cod. M. 577 in the Morgan Library.


After a judicious compilation of the historical and artistic material relative to St. Menas the much destroyed frescoes of St. Menas at Medinet Habu are analyzed and ascribed to the middle of the eighth century.


Apropos the exhibition of Coptic art at the Brooklyn Museum in 1941 W. attempts to answer fundamental questions about Coptic art, the period and area of the term "Coptic," the sources of the Coptic style, and its characteristics. A well-organized, general survey of Coptic art and suggestive for further research.

Exhibitions?


Two pages of illustrations of Persian art objects from the New York Exhibition of 1940. Least known of the objects is the bust of Shāpūr II, of the Chicago Field Museum.


With an introduction by A. U. Pope. 559 pages of text.


A carefully thought-out summary of the whole field of Islamic Art, including architecture, going beyond the usual generalities. Well illustrated.

R. Ettinghausen, "'Six Thousand Years of Persian Art,' the Exhibition of Iranian Art,

For exhibitions of Coptic art see under *Coptic Art*, page 203.

A critical appraisal of the arrangement and a discussion of “finds” and unpublished works. Illustrated.

*Metal Work from Islamic Countries* (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, Institute of Fine Arts, Research Seminary in Islamic Art, 1943).

Short introduction followed by a catalog of 63 pieces covering a period from the Sasanian period to modern times, with special stress on pieces from the eighth to the fourteenth century. Many pieces were never shown before and a good proportion of them are here illustrated for the first time.


H. HOLLI, *Islamic Art: Selected Examples from the Loan Exhibition of Islamic Art at the Museum* (Cleveland, Museum of Art, 1944).

Representative examples with a page of text. The emphasis is on miniatures.


Excellent introduction to the spirit of Islamic Art apropos the Museum’s loan exhibition.


Additional material to the author’s book, *Cotton in Medieval Textiles*.

G. LOEWY, 2000 Years of Silk Weaving: An Exhibition Sponsored by the Los Angeles County Museum in Collaboration with the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Detroit Institute of Arts (New York, Weyhe, 1944).

In Mrs. Weibel’s introduction, familiar Islamic material is integrated with silks from other civilizations. Special consideration has been given to Hispano-Moresque textiles. Of outstanding beauty, No. 48: a twill cloth with Kufic inscription on floral background, Seljuk, at Yale University (Pl. 12).


Exhibition report of the memorable Persian show at New York with some general “praise” which is “lyrical” as much as it is “critical,” to use the author’s own terms.


A spirited and often critical review of the important exhibition at the Los Angeles County Museum.

*Expeditions and Excavations*


The fragmentary description of such important sites as Samarkand, Merv, Bukhara, and others less known to the West leaves the reader with deep respect for the intrepid explorer, but also with the conviction that we must wait for a more systematic attempt at exploration by Russia to integrate this important material with our present knowledge of Islamic sites.


The author, personal assistant to Sir Aurel Stein during 1931–32, excavated at Surkhavali Ahli and other sites near Bhera in the Punjab. Most of the finds so far have been every-day objects of Mogul times. The author hopes to continue his excavations.


Fortresses, coins, and silver bowls from the Early
Islamic period. Discovery of the ancient Khwarazmian alphabet close to the Sogdian. On the basis of new finds several silver dishes in various museums are now considered Khwarazmian. Bibliography of previous summaries of Russian excavations in Khwarazm and other parts of the Soviet Republics.


Islamic finds at Termez, among them a Kufic inscription of a ruler of either the twelfth or early thirteenth century. Evidence of pottery making, jeweler’s craft, glass and copper work at Termez. Important pre-Islamic finds in the Bukhara oasis. Paikand (Bukhara region) excavated. Timurid (?) potsherds. Kilns dated by tenth-century coins. Coins from the eleventh through the nineteenth century. Sasanian pottery at Tali Barzu.

H. Field and E. Prostov, “Soviet Archaeology To-day, I,” Asia, XL (1940), 272–77.

On p. 277 a brief mention of excavations at Dzhuga, Armenia, and its important architectural and epigraphic finds prior to 1605 when this once important caravan city was destroyed by Shah Abbas.


The importance of this site, founded by Shāpūr I, lies in the monumental statue in the round of the city’s founder, a “Fire Temple” (?), the cruciform-shaped palace, and especially in the fact that during this early phase of the Sasanian period Greek influence was unexpectedly strong. The first Sasanian floor mosaic found in the Iranian plateau seems related to mosaics from Syria (Antioch?).


Pp. 127–130 cover “Palestine: Roman to Arabic Archeology.” Notable facts: 1, a cistern near Ramle has the earliest dated example of the pointed arch, 789 A.D. (should read: “of the Islamic period”); 2, preliminary notes supplied by R. Hamilton on architectural remains of a mosque beneath the Alṣā; 3, report on Khirbat al-Mafjar.


Third-century mosaic found at Shāpūr by the French expedition under Ghirshman. It contains portrait heads, possibly representing members of the royal family of Shāpūr I. Partly illustrated in Asia, XXXIX, 720.


The results of this most important expedition filling many gaps of our knowledge have been summarized in a foreword to this article (Dimand, M. S. “The Iranian Expedition, 1938–40,” Metropolitan Mus. Bull., XXXVII [1942], 82). Tenth-century paintings in a bath, ninth-century paintings in a palace, which are different from Samarra. A ninth-century mosque of the early ivan type comparable to those discussed by A. Godard in Dāhār-e-Irān. Kiln evidence for the production of glass; two native types of pottery of great beauty in addition to those found previously by the Metropolitan Museum expeditions and further dated evidence for the history of ornament. The period of the finds is ninth to twelfth centuries. A Sasanian stratum remains unexcavated.

E. F. Schmidt, Flights over Ancient Cities of Iran (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1940).

Excellent air views of archeological sites, some of which have never been recorded before. Most sites are pre-Islamic, but Rayy, Isfahan, Gunbad-i-Ḵabūs, and other Islamic sites are included. Folio size. 119 plates.


The “other discoveries” include Naḵš-i Rustam, pp. 98–105. No decision on whether Karba-i-Zarduḵt be Achaemenian tomb or Sasanian sanctuary. Iṣṭaḵḏr not fully excavated at time of writ-
ing. Ceramic finds fully discussed in Ettinghausen's review (see below).


M. A. Stein, *Old Routes of Western Iran* (New York, Macmillan, 1940).


Critical discussion of the Parthian finds.


Bibliographies

H. Buchthal, O. Kurz, and R. Ettinghausen, "Supplementary Notes to K. Holter's Check List of Islamic Illuminated Manuscripts before A.D. 1350," *Ars Islamica*, VII (1940), 147-64.


Lists only the more important publications, 494 in all.

G. C. Miles, "The Writings of Ernst Herzfeld," *Ars Islamica*, VII (1940), 82-92.


A bibliography on ancient Egypt covering the years 1925-41. Much of Coptic art is covered under "Christianity in Egypt," pp. 613-16; Coptic inscriptions, p. 636; Coptic literature, pp. 675-84. No special division devoted to art. Islam not included.


Miscellaneous


Additional notes to the author's important "The Crescent and the Rose." Art is not touched upon except p. 398 (mentioning the serpentine column in Constantinople).


A study of cultural history interesting to the art historian for the use of primary sources (footnotes and bibliography pp. 122-4) as well as for specific information.


This purely statistical survey includes illuminated manuscripts but without titles or dates.


Although chiefly concerned with a problem in the history of commerce—whether or not the Arab conquest was responsible for a sudden collapse in international trade—the article is of great importance for early Islamic numismatics and for ḥifāz.


Comparison extends beyond architecture to the mosque as a religious institution.


L. White, "Technology and Invention in the Middle Ages," Speculum, XV (1940), 141-59.

The first part of the article touches rather sketchily on the East-Western flow (and vice versa) of technical inventions in a very stimulating and heavily documented fashion, usually refraining from taking sides (p.e., in the controversy over the Iranian origin of Gothic architecture). The second part deals with the European "Dark Ages."


Early ninth-century chessmen from Nishapur give the author the opportunity to write about chess in the Near East and the Christian Middle Ages.


Subject is extended beyond Nishapur to Iran in general.


Mostly about the thirteenth-century sermon on chess by Cesseli with references to Arabic writers on chess.


Fascinating study of water and ice in the daily life of the Persians, mostly culled from A. Mez, The Renaissance of Islam, but enhanced by W.'s photos of ice houses, ice walls, etc.


A very readable summary of the subject. Pp. 92-4 deals with the contributions of Islamic art to Christendom. Y. uses his sources uncritically. Few will accept the "evident connection" between the minarets of Cairo and Italian Campanil or, if they see "the striking resemblance" between a tower in Marrakesh and that of Westminster Cathedral in London, believe in any direct or indirect stylistic relationship. His source is Mme. R. L. Devonshire.

Obituaries


"George Eumorfopoulos, 1863-1939," by R. Ettinghausen, Ars Islamica, VII (1940), 123.

"John Ellerton Lodge, 1878-1942," by R. Ettinghausen, Ars Islamica, IX (1942), 239-40.


"Josef Strzygowski, 1862-1941," by M. S. Dimand, Ars Islamica, VII (1940), 177.

Reviews of "A Survey of Persian Art"


Review: M. Schapiro, Art Bull., XXIII (1941), 82-86.

Reviews of individual chapters and replies:


The chapters of the Survey reviewed are: "An Outline History" (of calligraphy), by M. Minovi,
P. Ackerman, et al. (pp. 1707-42); "Ornamental Kufic Inscriptions on Pottery," by S. Flury (pp. 1743-69); "Ornamental Naskhi Inscriptions," by V. A. Kratchkovskaya (pp. 1770-84). In addition A. replies to A. Jefferey's review of her *The Rise of the North Arabic Script* and adds new materials to this subject. Errors in Minovi's account are corrected on pp. 67-69. Certain problems of early Arabic script dealt with on pp. 69-73. The rest of the article is devoted to the two other subjects, Jefferey's reviews and addenda to her book. In the latter part the first Koran attributed to Ibn Muḥla is significant.


D. criticizes the editorial policy (quality of plates, lack of a catalogue, etc.) and lack of scholarly accuracy. P. 15 contains a list of typographical errors. Most interesting is D.'s contention that lusterware originated probably in Mesopotamia, not Persia, and "Persian" lusterware was imported. Two other chapters are summaries interspersed with additional information, doubts of insufficiently documented facts and theories.


In spite of many specific objections to Miss Day's review, P. admits that "new information has been brought out and minor errors have been corrected."


Suggestions as to editorial policy. Minor corrections but no disagreement as to dating. Added are: seven dated pieces published by Y. A. Godard but not included by E. and four unpublished dated pieces from the Chicago Art Institute.


Since Orbeli disregarded Herzfeld's key article on Sasanian chronology D. summarizes it briefly. On the basis of it and for other reasons, other dates are put forth for some objects. *Survey*, pl. 241 is Indian, fifteenth century, not Iranian. Pp. 208-9 groups ewers probably made in Khurasan. The Alp Arslān silver salver in the Boston Museum is not accepted as of the Seljuq period, nor are a number of pieces of silver in the Harari collection.


P. leaves to Orbeli a future answer of Dimand's charges but takes it upon himself to defend vigorously the authenticity of several objects D. had questioned.


A reply to Pope's attacks on his review of the *Survey* chapter on Persian metalwork. Deals mostly with the Boston silver salver. D. insists rightly that chemical analysis "must be supported by stylistic evidence."


E. considers Pope's history of Persian carpets of great importance because it breaks with the old classifications of rugs and is instead trying to establish localization of workshops. The review contains much additional research and gives principles of methodical approach (use of sources) and of stylistic analysis (establishment of a basic structure of pattern). While E.'s review of the chapters on medallion carpets, court carpets, etc., is limited to additions and minor corrections, he disagrees altogether with P.'s treatment of vase carpets. E. date: early sixteenth century. Locality Kerman.

A. U. Pope (Ars Islamica, IX (1942), 208) hopes to reply at a later date.


A statement of editorial policy.
LITERATURE ON ISLAMIC ART


Early dates questioned: Bām, Masjīd-i-Rasūl; Kādī (is Mongol, not 80 H.); Tabriz, Congregational Mosque (not second century H. but "several centuries later"). Attacks Schroeder's method of dating (1) by tradition, (2) by brikgs. South Īvān of Isfahan Congregational Mosque not ninth century, but twelfth century. Sixty-eight plate captions are corrected.

A. U. POPE's reply: Ars Islamica, IX (1942), 171-73.

"Many of Godard's comments are correct and informing, others are debatable." Insists on correctness of date of Pl. 259A. Typographical error of Pl. 311B: 1134 A.D. instead of 1554 A.D.


S. accepts G.'s correction of his plan of Kādī but defends himself against all other criticisms, partly by inferring that he has been misquoted. The question of the Abbasid form of the Dāji of Isfahan still remains obscure after reading S. Of the plate corrections S. accepts those for pls. 305, 339, 340, 346 and 359. The "reply" concludes with some self-corrections of a general nature (p. 215) and an attack on M. B. Smith's doubts "cast upon the hypothesis that the pavilion Mosque existed as a type.


K. offers a clear, carefully weighed estimate of P. Ackerman's chapters on Persian textiles, agreeing or disagreeing, and giving reasons in each instance. In a field where so much is conjecture, especially as to localization, this judicious, objective procedure of an expert should be of great value.

A. U. POPE's reply to Kühnel: Ars Islamica, IX (1942), 197-201.

A surprisingly harsh reply to Kühnel's review of Dr. Ackerman's chapters on textiles. P. corrects K. in several instances but in others he seems to misinterpret his approach (pp. 110 and 120).


A statement of modern mineralogical methods of analyzing clay body, slips and glazes, inclusive of experimental data of a microscopic study of Samarra sherds. Quoting three of Hobson's statements gives M. the opportunity to speak of certain basic facts pertaining to slips and glazes, rarely known to the nonspecialist. Pope's reply is brief and commendatory. Ars Islamica, IX (1942), 197.


Not a review but a chronological list of Arabic inscriptions in Persia (exclusive of the Caucasus, Afghanistan, and Turkestan) from the beginning to the end of the sixth century of Islam. Some of these are unpublished. The list is supplementary to material discussed in the Survey.


For the various sections in this reply see the preceding titles.
BOOK REVIEWS


406 pp., inserted illustrations (not numbered), 160 pls., map of Iran.

The publication, which under the Patronat des Arabischen Museums in Cairo appeared in print, is to be regarded as the first attempt to give the complete survey of the Persian-Islamic art in Arabic, with the results of the first edition being made available in a second edition, with a number of illustrations, maps, and a comprehensive index. The work is well-organized, and the text is clear and concise. The illustrations are of high quality, and they provide a good visual representation of the art discussed in the text. The book is a valuable resource for students of Persian art, as well as for the general public interested in the art and culture of the Islamic world.

In conclusion, Al-Funūn al-Irānīya fil-ʿAṣr al-Islāmī is an excellent introduction to the art of the Islamic world, and it is highly recommended for students and the general public alike.

REFERENCES


nisse vermieden werden, und bei den Zeitangaben ist neben der mohammedanischen stets auch die christliche Ära erwähnt. Die beigegebenen Tafeln sind auf gutem Glanzpapier durchaus befriedigend ausgeführt, und auch die Textabbildungen sind klar genug, um von dem betreffenden Objekt eine Vorstellung zu geben.


Man vermisst in einer so umfangreichen Darstellung verschiedene immerhin wichtige Einzelgebiete. Türkische Stoffe und Teppiche fehlen ganz, auch spanische und ägyptische Teppiche, ebenso die arabisch-normannische Kunst Bizierens; sehr ungleich, stellenweise gründlich und dann wieder lückenhaft, ist die Architektur behandelt. Dem Fachmann wird es leicht sein, selbst bei flüchtiger Lektüre eine Anzahl notorischer Irrtümer und Fehlbestimmungen festzustellen, die in manchen Fällen bedenklich erscheinen mögen, da die Publikation sich an breitere Kreise wendet. So ist z.B. eine Naskhi-Inscription aus Ardistan als kufisch bezeichnet (Abb. 332), ein türkischer Betteppich als persisch (Abb. 539), das Mausoleum des Sultan Sandjar als samanidisch, Imám Dür als seldschukisch, die Masjid-i-Shah in Isfahan (Abb. 376) als timuridisch; eine Zwiebelkuppel aus Shiraz (Abb. 386) ist unter die Timuridenbauten Turkestans eingereiht, usw.

Die Devise der Könige von Granada ist in der Transcription "Le Galib ibn Allah" sinnlos entstellt.

Es wäre ungerecht, wollte man nicht andererseits darauf hinweisen, dass der Verfasser wiederholt wenig oder gar nicht bekanntes Material heranzieht, so etwa das altarabische Pferd in Washington, die Bäder von Barcelona und Gerona (zwölftes Jahrhundert), das Grab des Nür al-Din, den Mihrab unter dem Felsendom (Abb. 40), alte Wiedergaben des Minaretts von Córdoba, einen Bagdader Stadtplan von 1533, eine türkische Miniatur der Zitadelle von Aleppo, die Baybarsbrücke von Lydda u.a.m. Unter den beigegebenen Dokumenten ist ein Radialkreis zur Bestimmung der Kibla von Nutzen, und ein sorgfältiges Register erleichtert das Nachschlagen.

Die technische Ausführung des Bandes—ausgezeichnete Reproduktionen auf vorzüglichem Papier, in Zusammenhang mit dem Text, und meist gut gelungene Farbtafeln—ist höchsten Lobes wert, und als Hauptverdienst des Verfassers wird man hervorheben, dass er sich bemüht hat, die islamische Kunst durch ein ausserordentlich reichhaltiges Bildmaterial in allen ihren Phasen vor Augen zu führen. Auch der Text ist als eindringliche und lebendige Darstellung des Themas lesenswert, bedarf aber für eine zweite Auflage gründlicher Durchsicht zur Ausübung der zahlreichen Irrtümer und einer klareren Erfassung der einzelnen Stilbildungen, ehe er als zuverlässig gelten kann.

E. KÜHNEL


This volume contains 433 pages and 56 unnumbered illustrations which include views of the town, pictures of its ancient and modern buildings, and photographs of notable resi-
idents of the present day. The work contains neither a list of its chapter division nor an index.

The author, now in his seventies and a member of a family resident near Yezd for generations, writes that he has consulted some forty books in the preparation of his history. In the early pages he gives incomplete title listings of ten of these Persian and Arabic sources. None of the sources are primarily related to the town, but later on the author refers to a brief *History of Yezd* by Sayyid Djalâl ed-din Djalā'far who seems to be a contemporary of the author.

The history of Yezd is traced back to remote times and a considerable number of pages are devoted to the Sasanian period. These pages contain descriptions of ruins located in villages in the vicinity of Yezd which the author believes to date from Sasanian times.

The second and by far the longest section of the book deals with the running story of Yezd from the opening of the Islamic period to the tenth century of the Hijra. Personal names are used for nearly all of the many subdivision headings, and the text discusses the lives and activities of the notable figures and local rulers of the passing centuries. Of real interest is the detailed account of Yezd during the Mu'izzafarid period since in most accounts dealing with this dynasty attention is centered upon Shiraz and Kerman. Special attention has been given to public works undertaken in Yezd and its vicinity by these individuals, and these pages include lists of structures which have since vanished as well as brief descriptions of all the older monuments of Yezd. The descriptions place no stress upon architectural features but frequently list numerous repairs or additions made to a monument at various periods. The texts of a number of architectural inscriptions are given and in a few cases these records do not agree with observations made by visitors to Yezd.

Another section continues the history of the town down to the present and closes with a description of the modern Yezd: its public improvements, its schools, factories, and its literary society. Some eighty pages are devoted to notices of the contemporary or near-contemporary literary figures of Yezd, including brief specimens of their poetry.

The author has steeped himself in the stories and lore of his ancient town, but his organization of the material is far from perfect. The names of thousands of individuals figure in the text, but the lack of an index makes it very difficult to locate any particular person. Throughout the book very few references to source material are given, and when these are included, usually as direct quotations, the precise title and page of the source is lacking. The book is undoubtedly of high interest to the local residents of Yezd, but it would have commanded the wider attention of scholars and historians if full notes, precise references, and indices had been included.

*Donald N. Wilber*


This book, issued by the Office of the Threshold at Qum, contains 152 pages and 3 indices. It has 64 illustrations, rather clearer than in most books printed at Tehran, and includes a plan of the Threshold.

The introduction contains a reference to an older documentary source, a *History of Qum* (تاريخ قم) composed in Arabic in 387 H. by Hasan ibn Muhammad ibn Hasan Kumi. This work was translated into Persian in 805 H. by Hasan ibn Ali ibn Hasan 'Abd al-Mulk Kumi, and in 1934 the translation was edited and printed at Tehran by Sayyid Djalâl al-Din Tehranî. There is also a less precise
reference to an *Itinerary of Qum* (سفرنامه قم).

The first chapter gives a sketch history of Qum and a brief description of the agriculture and industry, the river, schools, and mosques, as well as of noted men of this town of 55,000 people.

Chapters II through VIII are concerned with the Shrine of Fatima, the sister of the eighth Imam. The Shrine area is always known as the Ástineh or Threshold. The first two of these chapters contain an account of the early establishment of the Threshold and mention of additions and repairs undertaken up to the present day. A chapter of forty-three pages gives a valuable and detailed description of the architectural elements of the extensive area: a plan of the building complex is published at the end of the book.

Another chapter in this same section describes precious objects belonging to the Threshold. They are housed in a museum within the shrine area. The museum, opened in 1934, is directed by Muhammad Ta'ki Sepahbodi. These objects are rather briefly described under a number of headings. There are thirteen rugs and carpets, three of which are illustrated. All were woven by Ustãd Ni'mat Allãh Djawšakãni, and two bear the date 1082 H. They were bequeathed to the Threshold by the Safavid ruler Shah Sulaimãn. Glazed tiles are shown in seven illustrations. Tiles from the Threshold are dated between 605 H. and 613 H. The other tiles include forty-five pieces from the Imãmzãdeh Ali ibn Djãfar and pieces dated 661 H. from the Imãmzãdeh Ismã'il. Six brocades are described and one illustrated. Six Korans are displayed in eleven illustrations: one of them is dated 590 H. Fifteen miscellaneous objects are mentioned and shown in eleven illustrations. These objects include a box, lantern, swords and scabbards, armlets, oil lamps, candlesticks, gilded and silvered doors.

Another chapter gives biographical sketches of famous men who are buried in the Threshold area. This list includes four Safawid and two Údjarí rulers of Iran. The following chapter deals with the past and present organization of the shrine. In 1937 revenues and expenditures of the shrine balanced at a sun equivalent to $13,600. The final chapter in this section deals with the construction of the museum and the celebration held upon its opening.

Chapter IX gives a brief architectural description of sixteen tombs. The majority of these tombs, located on the outskirts of the town, were erected during the fourteenth century.

Chapter X describes new buildings and improvements made in the town in recent years, including the railway station, new avenues, factories, and a hospital. Chapter XI contains a sketch of the educational system of Qum together with an account of the construction of the new high school.

**Donald N. Wilber**


Kitzinger's article is the first of four presented in the third volume of the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. In this study of a textile acquired by the Dumbarton Oaks Collection in 1939 the author has devoted 59 pages of text, 12 additional pages in an Appendix and 123 illustrations to a description of the piece, to a detailed consideration of its relation to other textiles and to works of art in various media, and to his conclusions which assign a sixth-
century A.D. date and an Egyptian provenance to the textile.

The textile, probably made for a wall hanging, is of wool and is executed in a tapestry weave with both warp and weft threads spun to the left—a technical device common to a majority of Egyptian Coptic textiles. In its present incomplete state the piece includes a main field and a wide border along the right edge of the field. The design of the field consists of seven horizontal rows set in a staggered vertical relationship. The repeat element of these rows is made up of addorsed protomes—horses and lions in alternate rows—set on cuplike bases whose stems spring from foliate scrolls. The border strip displays an alternation of mounted horsemen in roundels with lions and panthers. An extensive palette of bright colors characterizes the border.

According to Kitzinger the combination of field and border design of this textile is unique and he studies each element in turn. In his consideration of the main field he first relates the design to other pieces characterized by the use of addorsed protomes and then investigates both the possible origin of the related examples and of the compositional elements of the Dumbarton Oaks textile. He then proceeds to a comparison of the piece with five woolen textiles in American collections which display all-over repeat patterns and elaborate borders, although they do not contain the feature of the addorsed protomes. Finally, the conclusions, already mentioned above, are given.

Kitzinger presents a closely knit argument as he moves toward the goal of establishing the date and place of manufacture of the textile. The general reasoning is not necessarily weakened if some sections seem less convincing than others for, in contrast to more restricted studies of textile patterns, he has considered weaving techniques, palettes, the origin of design elements, precise comparisons with objects in other media—the Appendix gives a List of Early Byzantine Animal and Bird Capitals, supported by many illustrations—artistic style and literary sources. The length of the study is amply justified by the amount of light shed upon the disputed fields of Sasanian, Coptic and Mediterranean art of the early Christian centuries.

A single aspect of the study may be recapitulated in some detail. Kitzinger points out that the busts of animals and birds, addorsed and mounted on pedestals, are to be found on four wool tapestries and six silk twills all of which were, as far as their provenance is known, found in Egypt. These silks have been previously considered by various scholars to be purely Sasanian, to be Egyptian, to be Egyptian under Persian and Byzantine influence, or to be Syrian. Kitzinger gives his reasons for believing that the silks preceded the tapestries and states that the Dumbarton Oaks textile is a local Egyptian version—“a masterly amalgamation of Sasanian and Mediterranean elements”—of an animal protome pattern which could only have come from Persia. He suggests that some time before the sixth century A.D. there must have been, in the Sasanian area, a school of silk weaving which specialized in all-over patterns. He believes that if the representations of textiles shown on the Tāk-i-Bustān reliefs are characteristic of one school of weaving then the school of all-over patterns would represent an entirely different branch of ornamental art, but that this postulation of two such separate schools is acceptable only if it could be demonstrated that the schools were active in separate chronological limits. Kitzinger suggests that the reconciliation of these proposed schools and an examination of the relationship between recognized Sasanian works of art and textiles assumed to have had Sasanian proto-
This reviewer, while making no claims as a historian in this field, will comment upon some of the problems of Sasanian art which are pertinent to the content of the study and will touch upon the second of Kitzinger's suggestions.

A primary difficulty with regard to the study and classification of Sasanian textiles is that the limited number of scholars who have written on the subject have held as many different views, and the number of textiles that all recognize as having been woven in Sasanian Iran is very few indeed. A natural tendency among art historians is to regard their chosen fields of specialization with paternalistic pride and by their writings to swell the number of works of art attributed to the field. Such a tendency does exist in the field of textile studies, but there is also a novel and contradictory trend. Pfister, who has done so much valuable work on the textiles found in Egypt and has clearly demonstrated the local Egyptian origin of certain themes, attributes a very substantial number of textiles to the Sasanian empire, while Ackerman, who has made detailed studies of the sources of Iranian art, lists a minimum number of Sasanian pieces. Kitzinger, a comparative newcomer to the field, strikes a balance between the counter claims, and the reviewer believes that his classification and attribution of the group of Antinoé textiles will find general acceptance. However, the very fact that his reasoning is so closely knit may represent a weakness. Literary material offers a tantalizing suggestion of the enormous volume of weaving carried on at Antioch, at other Mediterranean cities and throughout the wide confines of the Sasanian empire. It is certain that for every fragment that has survived to the present day as many as a thousand or even five thousand fine pieces came from the looms. Thus, scholars in the field should at least be aware of the volume of this vanished material and realize that an arbitrary series, however closely it appears to hang together, may carry conviction only because of our limited knowledge.

Is it possible that a considerably greater volume of pertinent material may be brought to light? Of all the textiles labeled as Sasanian by any of the scholars none have been found in Iran. The fragments come from European church treasures, gifts brought back by pilgrims to the Holy Land; from lands as far to the east as Japan; and in largest numbers from burials of Egypt. Will expanding research within Iran bring such textiles to light? The relative dampness of the soil in contrast to the dry climate of Egypt or of the steppes of Asia is against such a possibility, but much more cognate is the fact that in Sasanian times bodies were exposed rather than dressed or wrapped in precious fabrics and then buried. On the other hand, museums and private collections demand archeological exploration. Les Arts de l'Iran: L'Ancienne Perse et Bagdad lists some seventy textiles related to the subject of the present study which were exhibited at the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1938 and which come from French collections. Probably such pieces will be slowly brought to light in separate studies just as Kitzinger illustrated five textiles in American museums which had a bearing upon the Dumbarton Oaks piece. The reviewer suggests, as a worthy research instrument, a corpus of Near and Middle East textiles executed in the first ten centuries of the Christian era.

If we believe that Sasanian textiles will not be found in Iran we can still be certain that the excavation of Sasanian sites would yield rich treasures of architectural decoration, stucco plaques and friezes, mosaic floors and objects of art and that this material would shed increasing light upon the problem of Sasanian textiles. The recent and current ex-
cavations at Shāpūr illustrate the validity of this statement.

Kitzinger’s search for Sasanian prototype forms led him into an obscure and much debated subject—that of Sasanian art. Students of Western art will realize that, in spite of the mass of material available for early Christian Egypt, no general agreement has been reached with regard to the basic sources and characteristics of Coptic style. Agreement in Iranian studies, where scholarly experience covers a shorter span and where the material is less abundant, can hardly be expected in the immediate future. In general, scholars have claimed to find two strands in Sasanian art: one represents the Iranian heritage of the region and the other Hellenistic influences at work in the area. Certain writers state that the Hellenistic elements present in the art were a result of influences moving from the Mediterranean area, while others believe these influences came from the Graeco-Bactrian region to the east of Iran. Some authors say that the Hellenistic influence was strong during the early Sasanian period, while others assert that it was very important at the later period of the Tāk-i-Bustān reliefs. In the field of history it is certain knowledge that the Sasanian empire lay open to the West under the early rulers of the line, while later on it was deliberately sealed off from external contacts. However, it is not possible to draw a precise parallel between history and art since the movement of craftsmen, of pattern designs and of the actual art objects is not halted by political frontiers.

Sasanian art displays one striking feature which is characteristic not only of that historical period but of Iranian art in general. This is the fact that themes, decorative forms and design elements persist unchanged over long periods of time or are modified at a very slow rate. This fact may lie outside the experience of historians of Western art who are familiar with stages of rapid evolution, high style and decline. To cite a specific example, in his search for Iranian prototypes of the addorsed protomes Kitzinger went back to the well-known Achaemenid capitals. He might also have cited the bull protomes of the third century A.D. fire temple at Shāpūr. Carved in stone, these supporting elements are very like the Persepolis columns capitals although executed seven hundred years later. Throughout the long history of Iranian art continuity of tradition and type prevailed while innovation and change were foreign to the motivating spirit of the art. To demonstrate the high regard for the past another Sasanian example may be cited. Carved architectural elements were transported from Persepolis a distance of some fifty kilometers and rudely re-erected at the Sasanian village of Ḵašr Abū Naṣr.

The official function of Sasanian art was the visual glorification of the ruler. In form and style the art reflects a controlled and refined naturalism which has been endowed with a particular force and vigor. Rock reliefs, silver plates, and architectural stuccoes all display this feature. The reviewer doubts that stylistic development in a number of recognizable stages can be detected in Sasanian art and hence he questions whether works of art may be assigned to the beginning or end of the period on the basis of assumed stylistic differences. The reviewer also doubts whether it is possible to so identify and isolate the Hellenistic and Iranian elements of the art that the one or the other may be said to predominate at any selected moment of the Sasanian period. The material from Shāpūr displays both elements. The mosaic floors may well have been laid by one of the less gifted Antiochene craftsmen. The bull protomes are in the direct Iranian heritage. The architectural stucco at Shāpūr has Hellenistic patterns which are combined in very un-Hellenistic proportion relationships, just as at a later date the facade of
the great hall at Ctesiphon displays unassimilated Hellenistic elements. The stuccoes from Kish and Damghan contain both Hellenistic and Iranian motifs. The possibility that pattern books worked to foster the geographical spread of designs must not be overlooked: such books would bring the exotic but fashionable Sasanian motifs to the Antioch mosaicists. and crowned by grooved vases. Each vase bears two elongated crescents provided with two little hooks. The textile and its companion pieces are woven in a very simple technique which is almost identical with that of textiles of the end of the Han period (first and second centuries A.D.) found at Lou-Lan. Pfister believes this group is composed of early Sasanian

These general speculations do have some bearing upon Kitzinger's study. If we agree that his group, comprising the several Antinoë silks and tapestries and the Dumbarton Oaks tapestry stem from Sasanian models we should like to know more about these models. Kitzinger suggests that Musée Guimet 1108 (Fig. 1), a silk which he calls the most archaic of the group, is such a model. Textile 1108 is one of a group found at Antinoë and published by Pfister. The piece displays the heads or skulls of mountain goats flanked by half-palmettes pieces woven in a technique borrowed from China and that they are prior to the introduction into Iran from the Mediterranean region of the more developed serge technique. Kitzinger seems to accept Musée Guimet 1108 as early Sasanian. Accepting the use of the "Han technique," we must agree that the piece is of early date, but we must also raise certain questions. First, where and when was the piece woven? Second, is it a convincing type model for Kitzinger's group? Pfister calls the piece Sasanian and of the third or fourth century,
but from the evidence presented it might as well be of the second century A.D. and of an area to the east of Iran.

Kitzinger, in using Musée Guimet 1108 as the model for his group, states that the group displays a development from simple and geometric forms to elaborate and organic forms. The vital steps in this development are assumed to have taken place on Sasanian looms. That such a development could have taken place seems open to question. First, the suggestion implies a continuous stylistic development of a type which the reviewer has already stated he does not find in Sasanian art. Second, if we review the certain Sasanian works of art, the possibility of development from geometric and abstract to organic and naturalistic seems completely foreign to the period. When there is good evidence for the breakdown of a pattern form within the general period the deterioration is always from naturalistic toward more stylized, more rigid, and more geometrical forms. The diagonal square pattern common to mosaics and textiles of the Mediterranean and Sasanian regions, may be cited as a single example of this tendency. In its early version the pattern lines are made up of rows of flowers and the diagonal points of intersection are marked by larger, four-petaled flowers, but later on the flowers gradually turn into geometric shapes.

The organization of Musée Guimet 1108 is also in opposition to the controlled naturalism so characteristic of Sasanian art. The so-called head or skulls of mountain goats are only vaguely suggestive of such forms, while the elongated crescents with their hooks bring no comparative object to mind unless it were such a goat as seen from the rear. The reviewer believes that both elements must be abstractions of more naturalistic prototypes rather than geometric forms which suggested organic forms to Sasanian weavers using the piece as a model. All recorded Sasanian works in other media than textiles are characterized by extreme clarity with no element so obscurely represented as to make it uncertain what it is intended to portray. Thus, in the opinion of the reviewer, Musée Guimet 1108 is not the prototype model for Kitzinger’s group; is earlier than the third or fourth century A.D. and pre-Sasanian; and was not woven at a Sasanian center.

However, we may still accept the well-reasoned argument of Kitzinger that the pattern of the main field of the Dumbarton Oaks textile is a reworking of a Sasanian original and may wonder what this original was like. The reviewer believes that it was simpler, more precise and more closely related with Sasanian motifs as they appear on fixed works of art. Figure 2 gives the pattern element of the field of the Dumbarton Oaks piece and Figure 3 the reviewer’s suggestion for a reconstruction of a Sasanian model. The latter sketch, based upon the bull protomes found at Şāpūr and the reliefs at Ṭāk-i-Bustān is intended to be no more than a speculative suggestion. However, even in the Dumbarton Oaks textile the pattern is reminiscent of an architectural motif, and the motif shown in Figure 3 may yet be found in Sasanian architecture. The tree form, in the more elongated version found at Ṭāk-i-Bustān, would cover a pilaster shaft which would be crowned by the protome carrying a frieze and possibly cross members as well. The probability that such a decorated form was used might be argued in more detail from specific examples. However, the sketch is merely intended to raise the possibility of using certain Sasanian works of art as comparative material for the judgment of more question-able pieces.

In the opinion of the reviewer Kitzinger has made a significant contribution toward the unraveling of the tangled strands of the multiple artistic currents and stylistic trends of the early centuries of the Christian era, and
scholarly research will be well rewarded if he goes on to examine other important pieces in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection or elsewhere with the same comprehensive method and sound judgment.

Donald N. Wilber


This reviewer has wandered through the streets, the lanes, and the sooks or bazaars of many of the renowned cities of Islam: Aleppo, Tunis, Cairo, Damascus, Istanbul Baghdad, Isfahan, and Herat. Vivid memories of their sensuous impact serve to brighten the atmosphere of the desk with its burden of dry and sober notes and references. Of all these cities, Aleppo alone proved to be completely satisfying as a place where the Western traveler finds the Orient as he thought it would be and where the multiplicity of the lithic relics stresses the spirit and power of Islam. Its sooks, so extensive, so solidly built, so well maintained—as if the merchants and craftsmen were proud of their collective heritage—so busy and so laden with distinctive local products, are of particular interest. Its larger appeal lies in the uniform character of its architecture in stone and the amazingly rapid—in comparison with others of the cities cited above—rhythm of labor and activity within the city.

Certainly Sauvaget was eminently qualified to make this study. As a scholar, he is an Arabic epigraphist, editor and translator of Arabic texts, conversant with the entire range of Muslim studies and author of _Introduction à l'Histoire de l'Orient Musulman_. As a longtime resident of the Near East he is a practicing archeologist, specialist in architectural history and skilled draftsman. Long interested in Aleppo, in 1931 he published a report, prepared for the Service des Antiquités of Syria, which comprised an inventory of some 121 historical monuments of the city from a total of more than 300 such monuments seen during the course of his investigations and in 1933 he published a translation from the Arabic of those chapters in the work of Ibn Shihna which relate to the history of Aleppo. He has also written several articles dealing with the architectural and epigraphical remains of the city.

This thorough familiarity with his chosen subject is well reflected in the apparatus of the publication which is here dealt with at some length in order to call attention to its value for scholars working in related fields. The bibliography comprises, first, a list of some 170 publications, documents and manuscripts which contain material with direct bearing on the history of Aleppo. Of real value are the author's concise and extremely apt characterizations of the contents and relative merit of each work. And, second, a list of authors cited in the text, which includes some 135 works not included in the first section of the bibliography. Annexes I through X furnish translations of documents on the revenues of the city, on the establishment of pious foundations, on an interesting foundation for providing soup, bread, and rice for certain functionaries, and two genealogical trees. An index of Arabic words and toponyms and an analytical index appear to be unusually comprehensive. The 908 footnotes are of properly sober character but are also enlivened by many interesting details, such as the fact that the Janissaries of the city displayed their hostility toward the
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local Sherifs by parading through the streets a dog turbaned with a green melon.

Sauvaget relates that he began this study by dividing the city into sections, taking in hand his own inventory of the monuments and the sheets of a map of Aleppo at the scale of 1:2,000, and then making a minute investigation of the city, entering all the detailed information on the map. Then this material was classified according to broad chronological periods and the vestiges in enduring stone were sufficiently numerous to enable him to draw a fairly complete plan of the city for several of its historical periods. He emphasizes the fact that, lacking adequate documentation on the fundamental organizations of government and trade and of social life, this work is not the true study of urban history and human agglomerations that he would have chosen to write, but an exposition of the topographical development of Aleppo, in which the archaeological evidence has been used to supplement, check, and correct the historical sources.

The major portion of the text volume consists of seven chapters dealing with as many broad historical periods while the album contains six plans of the city, four of as many of the earlier periods and two of stages within the prolonged Ottoman period. Each of the chapters has identical subdivisions: an outline of the general historical setting; the effect of this historical situation upon the city proper; the aspect of the city as derived from its archaeological remains; and, finally, an examination of the progress or decline of the town in relation to the previous period. Those sections which present the historical background of each period, most of them about five pages in length, might seem to be somewhat beyond the scope of the subject were it not for the fact that Sauvaget deliberately broadened his approach in the hope of attracting the interest of geographers and historians who are not primarily orientalists.

Within each chapter the considerable variety of archeological and architectural material finds its proper place under such headings as the fortifications, the citadel, the mosques and madrasas, water supply, industry, secular structures, and quarters and suburbs of the city. Most of the text figures are small-scale plans or sections relating to these same categories. Each chapter ends with a characterization of the urban development of the period, in which the salient feature is stressed in a single sentence or phrase.

In his conclusion Sauvaget places Aleppo in a definite category of urban centers, that of "towns of contact" whose importance resulted from a location at a point of contact between major geographical units or ethnic groups—in the specific case of Aleppo, at the crossroads of vital arteries of trade. A comparison of the fortunes of Aleppo with Sidon and Damascus demonstrates that these three Syrian towns are of similar type and enjoyed parallel periods of progress and decline. They are also identified as belonging to a more restricted group of towns of contact, that of towns of contact in a region of contact—with the region defined as the Mediterranean littoral. Finally, Aleppo and the other Syrian towns developed through the ages directly above the topographical framework of the Hellenistic and Roman period. The succeeding Muslim centuries, although they adorned the towns with architectural monuments, served only to carry forward the disintegration of urban order and functions and the breakdown of the urban area into a number of topographic, social, ethnic, or religious subdivisions lacking fundamental unity.

The album comprises a series of excellent photographs, well reproduced, and reproductions of a number of drawings. The photographs include general views of the town and its surroundings, and detailed illustrations of the citadel, the walls and gates, types of streets
and houses, the industries, the khans, and the principal architectural monuments. The drawings include the plans of the town at various periods and plans and sections of important monuments at a larger scale than those of the figures of the text.

The title of the work sets the end limit of Sauvaget's study as the middle of the nineteenth century. We may wish that he had included the most recent period in the development of the town—present-day Aleppo. A few of the questions to which answers would be of real interest follow. How has a perennial difficulty of all the earlier periods—an inadequate water supply—been solved? What factors led to the growth of a western type of urban center at the southern end of the Boulevard de France and along the extension of this avenue which now overlays the moat of the western walls of the town? What effect has the modern location of Aleppo upon the line of the railroad from Istanbul to Baghdad had upon the topography of the town and the location of its industries and warehouses? Do the modern motor roads carry the type of goods as formerly and do they join Aleppo and the same regions which it formerly served? Is the present and possible future development of the town channeled along specific lines by a master plan or other means? Sauvaget lists two works which might possibly be considered as a projection of his study into the contemporary scene: Baurain, P., Alep autrefois, aujourd'hui, Aleppo, n.d. (1930), and Godard, Ch., Alep: essai de géographie urbaine et d'economie politique et sociale, Aleppo, 1938. I have been able to examine only the first of these which is a guide and handbook of definite interest but not a documented study.

In this closing paragraph I would like to write of this excellent study as a worthy representative of the cultural activity of France in Syria and the Lebanon during the past twenty-five years by members of the Service Archéologique and the Institut Français at Damascus. Individuals such as Messrs. Seyrig, Sauvaget, Lassus and Schlumberger, with whose publications I happen to be most familiar, as well as a goodly number of others, have displayed indefatigable zeal in the study of all periods of the history of the region and have been prolific in publication. It is not likely that the altered political situation of the region will tend to diminish their accomplishments. In certain cases their larger studies, heralded by published articles, are still in preparation. Other results of French administration will continue to bear fruit: to choose one example, even in such a prosaic field as that of cadastral surveys. Cadastral maps were of real value in the excavations at Antioch and were certainly extremely useful to Sauvaget at Aleppo, while, as far as my knowledge goes, most of the centers of the Muslim world mentioned in the opening paragraph have not been mapped in comparable detail. It is certain that none of the others has been studied with such painstaking and loving care.

DONALD N. WILBER


With the publication of this remarkable volume there comes to a premature end a series—one might almost say an epic—which began with Herzfeld's Der Wandschmuck der Bauten von Samarra und seine Ornamentik in 1923. Two other volumes in the Samarra series were also Herzfeld's, Die Malereien (1927) and Die vorgeschichtlichen Töpferien
(1930); and to Sarre's Die Keramik von Samarra (1925) he contributed the epigraphical section. To mention the name of Samarra is to bring Herzfeld's to mind; indeed one finds oneself thinking of Samarra as his city, at least since the Abbasid Caliphs abandoned it, much as one associates the name of Schlie mann with Troy, of Rawlinson with Behistun, of Evans with Cnossos. When we reflect that Samarra was but one of Herzfeld's domains and that Mshattâ, Paikuli, Pasargadae and Persepolis were his in something of the same sense, we are reminded that his achievements were, to use the words of Samuel Guyer in his fine obituary preface to the present volume, "schon am äusseren Umfang gemessen zu den bedeutendsten archäologischen Unternehmungen aller Zeiten."

Herzfeld's attack on the famous ninth-century capital of the caliphs long outdates the appearance of the first volume in the Samarra series. It was in December 1903 that he first beheld the vast ruins of the city, and one may be sure that the genesis of the Samarra expedition took place at that very moment. In 1907 he wrote his Samarra, Aufnahmen und Untersuchungen zur islamischen Archäologie. There followed his "archäologische Reise" with Sarre in the Tigris-Euphrates valley (which resulted in four great volumes), the excavations of 1911-12, and thereafter a series of publications relating to Samarra which included the Erster vorläufiger Bericht (1912) and the Mitteilung über die Arbeiten der zweiten Kampagne (1914). The present volume is unhappily the last that we shall see, at least from Herzfeld's pen; the material for what surely would have been a great architectural volume was in hand and still exists, but death has intervened. Sarre too has gone. As for the Geschichte, the manuscript was finished in Princeton late in 1941 and started on its way to the printers in Germany before communications were cut. Early in 1946 Herzfeld had the entire page proof in his hands, but he did not live to see the book in its final form. The aftermath of the war further delayed its appearance, and although the volume bears the date 1948 it was not released until 1949, and only in recent months have a few copies arrived in this country.

Geschichte der Stadt Samarra is a truly Herzfeldian monument of erudition. It is not light reading. Here and there are a few of those delightful vignette-like anecdotes in text and footnote, recalled from vivid memory or notebook jotting, that illuminate some ancient obscurity by a personal experience, or that simply, like classic comic relief, are interjected, upon appropriate cue, to interrupt the flow of some scholarly excursus. There are frequent quotations of Arabic verse and in the narrative portions of the city's history there is anecdotal fare. But by and large the book is a compact gloss, an immensely learned footnote to the archeology, topography, philology, ethnology, and history of Samarra and the land in which it lay. Herzfeld's "Vielseitigkeit," richer and more evident in each later work but fortunately without that distracting and almost perverse diffusiveness which characterizes his still later Zoroaster and his World, is present on every page. As usual the linguistic apparatus that he brings to bear is to the ordinary mortal utterly fantastic: Sumerian, Assyro-Babylonian, Elamite, Old Persian, Pahlavi, Avestan, Syriac, Arabic, Persian, Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, Coptic. The work cannot be competently criticized by a single reviewer, at least not by this one. But the contents may be briefly summarized.

The first eighty-six pages deal with the historical geography of Samarra and its neighborhood. The oldest description of the region is in the annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II. And so down through the ages to the founding of

1 E.g., pp. 51, 54, 150, 204.
al-Mu'taṣim's "Surra man rāʾa," Herzfeld examines in the minutest detail the topography and toponymy of the rivers, canals, roads, settlements, and cities that surrounded Samarra; and the entire body of ancient and medieval knowledge, supported by his own personal exploration and inquiry, is brought under contribution. The next fifty pages concern the founding of the Caliphal residences at Samarra and the topography of the great ninth-century city. Then follows the long historical section dominated by the men who occupied the capital or whose careers elsewhere in the empire affected its growth, brilliance, and decline. How long, al-Muhtadi asked, would his reign last? How long, replied a greybeard? As long as it pleases the Turks. So, in the beginning as at the end, it was the Turkish pretorians who dictated the building and the utter abandonment of Samarra, a city of perhaps one million inhabitants in the time of al-Mutawakkil. All this is narrative history, assembled and ordered in greater detail than it has ever been before and drawn directly from all the Arabic sources, above all from Tabari and the Aṛghānī. Finally there is an epigraphical chapter of twenty-odd pages in which the inscriptions on isolated seals, sherds, fragments of wood, stone, and fabric, and some building inscriptions including that of the Ḥarbā bridge of al-Mustansir, are described, illustrated, and annotated.

Herzfeld intended that his books should be read. He did not write reference books and he had little sympathy for the reader who took up his works for that purpose. The reader is on his own; there is in this volume no "apparatus," no bibliography, no index. One must know one’s way about in the literature, for the references are ruthlessly abbreviated, and the search for an op. cit. is a well-nigh hopeless task in the thousand footnotes. Herzfeld’s cherished economy of language demands that the reader contribute his share to comprehension. Perhaps he would have made the concession of an index, had he lived or had not war conditions interfered. Some enterprising person should prepare one, at least of subjects and of particular words from the source languages, for the book contains scores of new etymologies and in the whole wide Iranian-Semitic cultural field countless new and invaluable commentaries on institutions, customs, things, and ideas. One cannot divine, for example, that matriarchy, polyandry, and the ‘Ali Ilahiyya are discussed on pp. 50–51; the racial composition of the troops on p. 99; zoos, parks, and paradise on pp. 113 ff.; numismatics on pp. 121, 136, 195; 2 castles on pp. 116, 132 ff.; racetracks on p. 117; headgear on pp. 142, 150; Sasanian and Arabic seals on pp. 156–57; rugs and tapestries on pp. 221 ff.; precious stones on p. 239; etc., etc.

The excellent plates illustrate the topography, some of the buildings, and the epigraphical material; numerous sketch maps are scattered through the topographical section, and the epigraphical chapter contains some of Herzfeld’s expert drawings. Five extraordinary aerial photographs of the ruins, made by the RAF in 1917, each measuring approximately 45 x 60 cm., are contained in a pocket at the end of the volume. The four plates of Ludliff’s survey map of Samarra were unfortunately destroyed or lost during the war.

GEORGE C. MILES

El Panteón Real de las Huelgas de Burgos.
By Manuel Gómez-Moreno. Consejo

2 Incidentally the list of Samarra strikings can be amplified by at least fifty unmentioned issues, and the earliest date can be put back from 231 to 224 H. It is a frequent error among archeologists and art historians who utilize Samarra material for dating purposes to end the Samarra period with the abandonment of the city by the Caliphs. The numismatic evidence shows that the mint, and therefore to some degree the city itself, continued to flourish as late as 330 H. (942 A.D.).
Superior de Investigaciones Científicas

This book, one of great importance to students in the field of medieval textiles, is a
careful and methodical report on the textile material discovered during the two years pre-
ceding publication when the tombs in the Convent of Las Huelgas were opened and scien-
tifically examined. The convent, belonging to the Cistercian order, was incorporated in
1199. Founded by Alfonso VIII of Castile, it was the repository for the remains of members
of the royal family of Castile from the twelfth century through the sixteenth century. In-
cluded in this publication are the tombs and objects dating from the twelfth to the four-
teenth century.

Thirty-seven tombs were opened, including several belonging to women of the royal fam-
ily who had been members of the Cistercian order and abbesses of this convent. Most un-
fortunately all but one of the tombs had been previously opened and despoiled. The worst
offenders in this respect were soldiers in the Napoleonic army who ripped open tomb after
tomb in a frantic search for jewels and objects of precious metals. Even the bodies were
moved from their original resting places, and the remains, or incomplete remains, of more
than one individual subsequently were put into a single casket. Only one burial was untouched,
that because the tomb was placed behind another and so was not molested. This one
undespoiled tomb was that of Fernando de la Cerda, oldest son of Alfonso X, who died in
1275 before the succession to his father's throne was open.

The book is divided into sections dealing first with the general history of the convent,
description of the burials, and the known previous opening of the tombs, followed by a
detailed description of the burials tomb by tomb, with attributions of each wherever such
exist, then a detailed analysis of the textile finds by technique and type, a brief description
of the few remaining pieces of jewelry and ornament, and finally a sympathetic history of
the personages who were interred in the convent.

Fortunately for the student of textiles the robbers of the tombs of Las Huelgas were
interested primarily in securing ornamental objects so that there remains to us a large group
of woven and embroidered fabrics dating from the thirteenth century, hitherto unparalleled in
Spain. There are a number of complete garments and casket linings which make this col-
collection outstanding for the size of the specimens as well as for their richness of design,
color, and intricacy of technique.

The author states that he believes the study of technique in discussing textiles is of
prime importance: (p. 41) "... valga el prestarse atención ahora al examen técnico de
tejidos y bordados, constituyendo un avance sobre los métodos ordinares de estudio, que
se ciñen casi exclusivamente al aspecto artístico, dibujo y color, cuando lo básico para
indagar procedencia y talleres ha de ser su elaboración,... Por desgracia, este punto
de vista no se obtiene con los libros modernos. ..." This reviewer agrees with the
author that technique is an extremely valuable aid in assigning provenance to textiles, when
used in conjunction with a study of design, color, etc., and that it has been too infrequently
employed by writers on textiles. It is regrettable that the author's technical study does not
fulfill his promise. To be sure, no completely satisfactory classification of textiles by tech-
nique has yet been published. That developed by Nancy Andrews Reath, The Weaves of
Hand-Loom Fabrics (Philadelphia, 1927), although not perfect, is certainly usable and
has been accepted, at least in part, by many scholars in this country. It would probably be
unfair to expect Professor Gómez-Moreno to be familiar with this book, yet one cannot but wish that he had been conversant with the Reath classification system when he was making his technical notes.

To begin with, the author states (p. 42) that there are only two major types of weaving, cloth and twill, and that all elaborations of technique stem from these two. That point might well be argued on the basis of bulkiness of classification units if for no other more fundamental reason. However, when he explains the techniques present in Las Huelgas Gómez-Moreno adds a further qualification to these two fundamental types, that of fiber used in the weaving yarns. This confusion of ideas is one frequently fallen into by writers of preceding generations. One cannot criticize the author for not defining his terms. He does, but his definitions are not sufficiently specific, not always logical, not well enough explained to make his classifications clear. On page 42 he illustrates in diagram two forms of cloth weave, tafetán corto and tafetán largo (literally short cloth and long cloth), distinguishing one from the other by the length of weft float, but failing completely to realize, or at least to mention, the existence of nonfunctional warps lying between face and back of the fabric in tafetán largo. Also on page 32 he illustrates in diagram form tafetán mixto (mixed cloth) as a separate technique, when in reality the apparent mixture of techniques is occasioned only by the demands of the design, i.e., when a vertical line in the design in this weave (compound cloth) occurs between two colors, the float of one or both weft colors often must of necessity be shortened to preserve the vertical emphasis. The detailed explanation of this weave does not explain the weave as it exists. (The reviewer feels herself qualified to criticize this particular technical analysis since the author states it is the same technique found in the Baghdad silk from Burgo de Osma. The Burgo de Osma piece is now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and has been thoroughly studied under a binocular microscope by the reviewer.)

The diagrammatic figures illustrating technique are disappointingly inaccurate. It is not always possible to follow the course of one yarn throughout the illustration. Especially is this true of the diagram of tafetán mixto on page 43.

Throughout the sections on woven textiles, including “Classic Arabic,” “Mudéjar,” “Christian,” “Twills,” “Oriental,” “Striped,” “Plain,” etc., the technical descriptions are confused and nonspecific. The partial list of chapter headings, given above, in itself shows a confusion of terms, where sometimes type of design, sometimes type of weave are used as the basis for grouping. Fabrics with a ground figure formed by weft floats (where only one functional warp and weft are employed) are described as a combination of short and long cloth. All the Mudéjar and Christian textiles are so classified. The twills are grouped according to whether the yarns are all silk, or partly linen or hemp, without an understanding that the technique is fundamentally the same, no matter what fibers are employed in the yarns.

In discussing ribbons and orphreys found at Las Huelgas, Professor Gómez-Moreno does not succeed in explaining in an understandable way a technique which occurs in a number of examples. Although the illustrations in the plates are none too clear, the technique in question would seem to be tablet weaving, but the description given in the text does not make for an intelligible technical analysis.

The inadequacy of the author’s technical descriptions and classification is particularly apparent in the section devoted to the embroideries found at Las Huelgas. It is certainly surprising, to say the least, to find all
the examples of tapestry in the Las Huelgas fabrics classified as embroidery!

Even given the best of photographs it is not always possible to identify the technique of a textile from a photograph. Unfortunately a number of the pieces which are described in this book as being at least rare, or even unique technically, are illustrated by halftone plates, which are not clear enough to warrant basing identifications on them with any degree of certainty. However, it does seem probable that No. 67, Plates CXIX and CXX, a cushion from the tomb of Mafalda, as well as No. 68 (wrongly labeled on the plate as No. 63), Plate CXXI, a cushion from the tomb of Fernando de la Cerda, should be classified as products of the loom, rather than of the embroider's needle.

To cite further examples would be only to carp. Sufficient it is to say again that from the point of view of accurate technical analysis the book is disappointing, doubly so because of the author's expressed intention to classify primarily by technique.

There are other weaknesses in the book which one cannot entirely overlook, but they are on the whole far less serious. A bibliography would have been a welcome addition, since the author makes frequent references to other textiles related in design or technique to those from Las Huelgas, without informing the reader where he may find published material on the subject. As mentioned above, the plates are halftone and not always clear, but it is distressing to find a number of plates, where more than one fragment is shown, in which all the fragments do not face in the same direction, i.e., sometimes the weft is shown horizontally, sometimes vertically. (Cf. Pl. L, where the weft in a and c is shown vertically and in b the weft is shown, as it should be, horizontally. Cf. also Plates LIII, LIV, LVIII, LXXIX.) In no plate where more than one fragment is shown are the designations, a, b, c, etc., given, although they are consistently referred to in the text.

In spite of all its shortcomings this book is one that should be in every textile library. By the mere publication of the fabrics found in the Convent of Las Huelgas in Burgos the field of medieval textiles has been enormously enriched. Never before has a discovery of such vast scope and richness been made in a single site. Some of the textiles are either the same or very similar to others previously known, such as that from the tomb of Leonor de Aragón, illustrated in Pl. LXII, which is the same textile as one found in the tomb of the Infante Don Felipe at Villalcazar de Sirga; or one from the tomb of Enrique I, illustrated in Pl. LVI, which is so strongly reminiscent of the fabric in the Cope of St. Valerius, formerly in Lerida; or the tapestry cover from the tomb of Queen Berenguela, illustrated in Pls. XLIII and CXV, which shows strong relationship to several tapestry fragments in the textile collection of the Cooper Union Museum. Many more examples of textiles giving evidence in their designs and techniques of having been woven in the same workshops as some already in museum collections or church sanctuaries could be listed. The wealth of such material in this Convent of Las Huelgas is almost overwhelming. But there are also textiles not previously known or published. Throughout the entire group the fabrics are of the highest quality.

Certainly the fabrics from Las Huelgas provide an unrivaled array of medieval textiles, remarkable not only for their size and completeness as garments or tomb linings or cushions, but also for their magnificent designs and superlative craftsmanship, and Professor Gómez-Moreno has done a great service in publishing them.

Jean Lopardo
Soieries persanes. By Gaston Wiet. Cairo.
24 pls.

In this very erudite and important volume, M. Wiet, Director of the Arab Museum, Cairo, and one of the editors of the Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe, publishes eighteen new textiles and a gold bottle belonging to an unnamed private collector. The book is dedicated to Henri Massé, M. Wiet’s former master at the École des Langues Orientales, Paris. Acknowledgments are made to Mme. Paul Mallon and to M. R. Ghirshman for many long discussions and suggestions (p. ix); to Mme. Mallon for brief remarks on the technique of the weaving (pp. ix and 213); and to Hussein Rached and Bichr Farès for help in deciphering and identifying the inscriptions (p. ix).

The volume falls into two sections; first, a full catalogue raisonné presenting the new textiles and gold bottle (pp. 11–98); and then a series of chapters on the historical background of Persia and the city of Rayy; on the epigraphy and date of the silks; and, finally, a summary, on the historical and esthetic value of the silks (pp. 99–231). To save time for the reader in studying the second section, M. Wiet has given, in an “Avant-propos” (pp. 1–9) a list of the forty-three textiles said to have the same provenance published in the Survey of Persian Art with the Survey catalogue numbers.

Before coming to the subject matter of the book proper, it may be remarked that two of the textiles here published are actually in the Textile Museum, Washington, D. C. (This will be abbreviated as TM.)¹ No. I, Pl. I is TM No. 3.253, and No. VIII, Pl. VIII is TM No. 3.256. Several more were seen by the reviewer in the spring of 1948 in the possession of Mme. Paul Mallon in New York. Again, there are three textiles in the Textile Museum cut from the same cloth as three in Wiet’s book, i.e.,

No. VII, Pl. VII, from same cloth as TM No. 3.241
No. X, Pl. IX, from same cloth as TM No. 3.242
No. XI, Pl. XII, from same cloth as TM No. 3.240.

Several more pieces from the same cloth as those published by M. Wiet are in the possession of Mr. A. U. Pope, New York, and in the Hobart Moore Memorial Collection at Yale University. Thus the reviewer has been able to see and study a number of the silks in this book, which would not have been possible if they had all been in Cairo. It is unfortunate that M. Wiet seems to have been unaware of the material in the American collections.

Briefly, M. Wiet states that these new textiles (except for the two “Sasanian” ones, pp. 21, 23) were found at Bibi-Šahr Bānū, near Rayy, in 1925, which is the supposed site of the forty-three silks published in the Survey. I quote: “En fait (italics by the reviewer) ces soieries ont toutes été découvertes dans un ensemble de collines situées à quelques deux kilomètres au sud-ouest du sanctuaire de la sainte” (p. 9); and he adds that it was the holiness of the nearby shrine which saved the site from depredation until the twentieth century. M. Wiet quotes (pp. 2–3) the statements made by A. U. Pope, i.e., “in the vicinity of Rayy, at Bibi-Shar-Banu,” and, “at the base of a ruined tombower on the site of

¹ All the statements in this review are the personal opinions of the writer, and are not to be construed as those of Ars Islamica or of the Textile Museum, where the writer was Curator of Islamic Art at the time of writing, or of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where she is at present Assistant Curator of Near Eastern Art.
REVIEWS

Rayy.” Mme. Paul Mallon, in a conversation with the reviewer in February 1948, stated that the actual site was not Bibi Shahri Banû, but Kûh-i-Nakka Khânîch. The differences in the name of the site, perhaps due to the uncertainty of the original finders, are not as important as a statement made by Sir Leigh Ashton: “The site was not dug at one and the same time. . . . I visited the site in 1927, shortly after the excavation had been completed” (italics by the reviewer). M. Wiet did not point out that this directly contradicts Mr. Pope’s words: “In the winter of 1925, suddenly, in a few hours, more than fifty superlative examples were uncovered accidentally”; and M. Wiet gave these two statements side by side (p. 2). In other words, there is no evidence to show that any reputable scholar or archeologist witnessed the actual digging, nor has the reviewer been able to find the publication of the names of the original finders. M. Wiet, however, has accepted the undocumented story of the find as fact, and on it has based part of his argument: “nous émettons l’hypothèse que ces étoffes ont été tissées dans les ateliers de Rayy. On les a trouvées sur place” (p. 213). (M. Wiet’s other reasons for assigning the silks to Rayy will be discussed later.) Again, M. Wiet says, in the chapter on the history of Rayy, that he had searched the ancient writers for information on the sanctuary of Bibi Shahri Banû and the nearby tombs but could find no records of them (p. 165). The reviewer’s opinion is that the story of finding the silks near Rayy is ingenious romance, with the saint’s name used to add an aura of sanctity, as well as to allay a major element of doubt.

Coming to the main body of the book, we may begin with the section devoted to the epigraphy of the Persian textiles described as coming from this site (pp. 179-189). Though brief, this is one of the most valuable parts of the book, for M. Wiet has put together all the inscriptions, those published in the Survey, one published by Pope in the Illustrated London News, and the new ones, has translated them (in some cases an extremely difficult task) and has analyzed them by content. M. Wiet says that out of all these he discusses thirty-nine with inscriptions (p. 180); the reviewer has counted forty. Another should be counted, for M. Wiet lists Survey No. 58 as having no inscription. This is in the Moore Collection at Yale, No. 1937-4620, and it actually has an inscription of two words, repeated upside down and in reverse, on the body of the eagle. This is hard to see, even on the silk itself, but may possibly be read “Soundness and health.” Whatever the reading, this brings the total of these silk inscriptions to forty-one which have been deciphered. Further, M. Wiet says, “Bien entendu, les sept pièces de la trouvaille de Rayy, auxquelles Mme. Phyllis Ackerman dénie une origine persane, sont anépigraPHIQUES” (p. 180, note 2). Are there no Arabic inscriptions except in Persian art? Indeed, one of these “non-Persian” silks is in the Textile Museum, No. 3.117, and it has the single word المملك “Kingdom” in Kufic below the griffon’s body.

M. Wiet set aside, because of incomplete publication, three pieces from the Survey, No. 44 (not illustrated in the Survey) and


4 The reviewer wishes to thank Mrs. Margaret T. J. Rowe, Curator of the Hobart Moore Memorial Collection at Yale, for showing her the pieces said to be from Bibi Shahri Banû in that collection.
Nos. 49 and 53 (listed as “not deciphered” in the Survey). No. 44 is TM No. 3.169, and it has part of the same inscription as on Nos. 45 (TM No. 3.168) and 46 (Moore Collection at Yale, No. 1937.4613). M. Wiet must be thanked for being the first to publish this text (p. 188): in the Survey nothing was given but a translation (with No. 46) and it was not recognized that Nos. 44, 45, and 46, all have the same text. However, there are minor differences in No. 44 (TM 3.169) as follows:

Also on No. 45 (TM 3.168) one word is written clearly and not in the same style of Kufic, and are all repeated in two lines, upside down to each other, with the tops of the lines in the center, and the base lines at the outside. This is quite different from the tirâz inscriptions, where the base line is in the center, and the tops of the letters are outside.

The second, No. 49, is in three pieces: one is in the Detroit Institute of Arts, one in the Moore Collection at Yale (No. 1939.633) and one was in the possession of Loewi in 1947. The reviewer has seen the two latter, and copied their inscriptions, which cannot be made out on a photograph, but admits that at the time of writing (December 1948) she has not arrived at a satisfactory reading. Probably if M. Wiet had been able to see the originals, he could have read the inscription at a glance.

The third, No. 53, is in the Textile Museum only, No. 3.202—there is no second piece of it in the Moore Collection at Yale (Wiet, p. 7). This has two different inscriptions, A, small bands between the roundels, and B, a larger, long band. A is in two lines upside down to each other, with the base lines in the center. The style is archaistic; and the džim looks like a ‘ain, while the ‘ain is drawn more like a džim.

A. “Verily, I believe firmly in Your Uniqueness and in Your justice, and in the breadth of Your benefits and Your grace.” In B, a small section is lacking; the tall letters are partly braided.

B. “And how many lions ... in his body the spirit of a lion.” In these two inscriptions the individual letters, and the methods of joining them, indeed the whole style, are so different that one is astonished to find them both woven into the same fabric.

As to No. 48 M. Wiet says, “deux mots ont résisté à tous mes efforts de déchiffrement” (p. 188). The reason for this is very simple. No. 48 is in three pieces, one in the Textile Museum (No. 3.201) and the two listed in the Survey as being in the Ackerman-Pope collection, which are now in the Moore Collection at Yale. Of these, one is large, with brown letters, the other is small, with blue letters (No. 1937-4619). This small piece has a mistake in the weaving, and a drawing of this piece is shown in the Survey, Figure 653. No wonder that M. Wiet could not decipher it. However, Mr. Pope, as Editor of the Survey, gave the translation of one of the other pieces which was woven correctly. Here is the part of the inscription which is in question:

(Bismilla. Everything is coming to an end) (etc).

This incomplete translation is offered for want of a better; some, at least, of the words are clear. It has not been traced in the literature.
The reviewer does not agree completely with M. Wiet’s reading of the inscription on Survey No. 21 (p. 181):

"Gloire et prospérité au ministre, au chef, Diyâ’ (?) . . . ." Two pieces of it are referred to, one in the Pozzi Collection, and one in the Bliss Collection, now Dumbarton Oaks (p. 5). However, the pieces in these two collections, which the reviewer has seen, are fragments, and neither has this much of the inscription. That is on a third piece, formerly in the possession of Rowland S. Read, present whereabouts not known; of this the reviewer has seen only a photograph.6 On the photograph the first part is as given by M. Wiet, but the last word cannot be read Diyâ’.

The first letter is not like the ﺍل in the Şâhib, it is a ﺛ with a long stem; in fact, the visible letters are طال . After this one might expect ﺻ ﻦ ﺘ, so as to read, “may his life be prolonged.” Further, the text preserved is in less than a quarter circle, repeated in mirror reverse, so we do not know if the text filled a quarter, as often happens, or if it occupied a half-circle (as on Wiet, No. VIII, Pl. VIII, for example). Thus the text is not completely known; if it were, the context might alter the reading of some words. The reading of al-Ra’is is perfectly logical, but if it were pointed differently it might be read al-Zuntush, or al-Zaybâş, or in a number of other ways. The incomplete text seems to be as follows:

عز و إقبال للصاحبه الرئیس طال [عمره] . . .
عز و إقبال للصاحبه الرئیس طال [عمره] . . .

“Glory and prosperity to the Şâhib, the Ra’is, may [his life] be prolonged . . . ” or, “Glory and prosperity to the owner al-Zuntush (etc.), may [his life] be prolonged . . . ” M. Wiet himself has shown, with No. XIV, p. 74, and p. 78a, Note rectificative, how the reading of a fragment may differ from the reading of a complete text. Until the complete text is found, one should not base too many conclusions upon the fragment alone.

Survey No. 23 is described as being in two collections (p. 5) and as having two inscriptions (p. 182). The reader agrees with the reading given by M. Wiet, and is equally baffled by one of the phrases. There is, in addition, a more complete piece, which was in 1947 in the possession of Rowland S. Read; the reviewer has not seen the textile, but only its photograph.7 It shows the double-headed eagle repeated four times, arranged as if in a square; and in the center, between the figures, is a vertical band with an inscription at the right which is repeated in mirror reverse at the left. This inscription has several mistakes:

بركة كافية و غضبة طاهر (sic) لابركة .

"Satisfying blessing and pure (sic) happiness (several letters).” This phrase was evidently repeated indefinitely, from top to bottom of the cloth.

M. Wiet has several times referred to the inscription of a silk published by Mr. Pope in the Illustrated London News, which is in the Textile Museum, No. 3.230 (pp. 38, 46–7,

6 The reviewer wishes to thank Dr. John S. Thacher, Director, and Mrs. E. H. Bland, of the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, for making this photograph available for study. The silk was reproduced in Persian Art, An Illustrated Souvenir of the Exhibition of Persian Art at Burlington House, London, First ed. (London, 1931), p. 68, below, as, “M. Read collection.” This is a small screen print, blurred at the edges, on which the inscription cannot be clearly distinguished. This is the reproduction cited by Wiet, p. 5.

7 Thanks are again due to Dr. Thacher of Dumbarton Oaks for providing a photograph.
The reviewer agrees with everything that he has read from the published photographs. More can be seen, however, on the textile itself; the main inscription is as follows, with two restorations:

"Ordered by] the most noble [Ami]r, our lord Abū Muhammad ['Abd] al Wāhid, son of Muhammad al-Aslami al-Khāzinī (or, al-Ḫārithi) al-Tūsī, may God glorify him and prolong his life." Thus he is quite a different person from the other members of the Ḥārithi family whose names have been read by M. Wiet (pp. 180–181). Like M. Wiet, the reviewer has not been able to trace this individual in the literature, even knowing his personal names.

There are a few of the newly published inscriptions in this book where the reviewer finds minor divergences from the reading given by M. Wiet. No. VIII, Pl. VIII, p. 54 is TM No. 3,256; the reviewer has thus studied it closely at first hand. The word given by M. Wiet as َلَا يَنْبِلَة actually ends in a ُ, which is written in the initial, not the final or isolated form. Also, the word read as َذَا َرَا َلَا َرَا َسِبْحًا is really written َذَا َرَا َسِبْحًا. A third piece of No. XIV, Pls. XV, XVI, and XXIV, pp. 74 ff., was seen by the reviewer in April 1948, at that time in the possession of Mr. A. U. Pope. Here the inscription does not agree with the text given on p. 78a, Note rectificative. First, after the preposition ج the genitive case should have followed—بَا Basmalāh" (p. 188; see, however, p. 89, where another "basmala" is noted, TM No. 3,230). Thus none of the new textile inscriptions begins with the "basmala." This is odd, indeed, for among them are several which are "historical" in form, and in Arabic epigraphy historical inscriptions, from tombstones to ġirāz, do regularly use that beginning. Exceptions occur in inscriptions which express simply good wishes to the owner, such as the elephant silk of St. Josse, in the Louvre.9 Again, the newly

9 As to the use of the "basmala" at the beginning of inscriptions, it is worth noting that two genuine, and therefore very important textile inscriptions, have been published as if there were no "basmala" present. One is Répertoire Chronologique d'épigraphie arabe, ed. E. Combe, J. Sauvaget et G. Wiet (Cairo, 1931–44) VI, No. 2177 (TM 3,116, Fig. 10), the
published silk, Wiet No. XIV has an inscription beginning with the word مبارك mubarak, which M. Wiet has translated first as Béné- diction (p. 74) and later as bénî (Note rectificative, p. 78a). One would expect the usual baraka. Indeed, to begin an Arabic inscription with the word mubarak is quite unheard-of. Continuing about No. XIV (Note rectificative, p. 78a) M. Wiet says, “Cette inscription remet en question l'emploi du surnom en dunya et din que l'on croyait, à cette époque du Ve/IXe siècle, l'apanage exclusif des Seljoukides.” The reviewer cannot agree with this method of approach. One new, peculiar example cannot upset the known, established protocol of formulas in historical Arabic inscriptions; especially when the new example is of unauthentic ed provenance, and names a person who “n'a pas été retrouvé dans les chroniques” (Note rectificative, p. 78a). Indeed, “Aucun des individus ayant commandé ces étoffes n’a pu être retrouvé” (p. 38). These new inscriptions are then, in content, peculiar in benedictory phrases, contrary to protocol, and mentioning unidentifiable “historical” names.

As to the epigraphic style, it is to be greatly regretted that M. Wiet did not present a thorough analysis, with drawings and tables of all the inscriptions discussed, and a point-by-point comparison with known dated Arabic

blue and yellow Bahá al-Dawla silk; since the seams were opened, it can be seen that the inscription begins in the middle of the letter 'ain, of 'izz, that is, the actual beginning is missing. The other is Répertoire, VII, No. 2640 (published in A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of the Muhammadan Textiles of the Medieval Period, Victoria and Albert Museum [London, 1924], Pl. XIII, No. 965, pp. 43–44). On the illustration it is very clear that before the word al-sayyid there is the tail of a previous letter, probably mi' or ra; so again, the actual beginning of the inscription is missing. Both of these should be corrected in the Répertoire; both might have begun with the “bas- mala.”

inscriptions of the tenth to twelfth centuries, or later. As M. Wiet has spent a lifetime on Arabic epigraphy, such a profound study would have been illuminating. M. Wiet, again, himself, provides a clue to the direction of such a study: “Avouons-le sans honte, nous n’aurions jamais attribué à la fin du XIe siècle la pièce publiée par M. Pope (Ill. London News, Jan. 9, 1943; TM No. 3.230) ni les Nos. III et IV, respectivement datés de 994, 998, et 1003” (p. 190). The reviewer agrees entirely with M. Wiet’s first instinctive reaction. Later on, M. Wiet compares the style of the inscription of No. VIII (TM No. 3.256) to the pottery plate of the Alphonse Kann collection in the Louvre (p. 54). Why not compare it to a dated inscription? M. Wiet’s conclusion as to the whole group said to be from Bibi Shahr Bānū is: “Nous classerons donc ces soieries à la période bouyide: nous y sommes autorisé par certaines dates et par les noms de quelques princes bouyides” (p. 213). The reviewer feels that, as a common provenance has not been proved, the Survey textiles and the new textiles cannot be considered as a single group, and the dating and the origin of each one must be taken as a separate problem.

This brings us to a consideration of the artistic style of the textiles. M. Wiet is a master of the Arabic language, of Arabic epigraphy, and of Islamic history. His method in discussing the designs of the silks is to give a detailed (though not always complete) description, and an esthetic evaluation, and then to list parallels for the various motifs. Though this is valuable, in a general way, it does not lead to a clearer appreciation of either Sasanian or Islamic art, or to a precise dating. For this method is based on iconography, and not on style—yet both must be considered in the study of art history. It is not a stylistic analysis to say of the lion, No. I, Pl. I, “On pense au lion crucifié de Salammbô”
reviewer in April 1948 when it was in the possession of Mme. Paul Mallon in New York. This textile shows, repeated six times, a double-headed eagle with a human figure apparently standing in mid-air in front of it, and a small bird on each wing; the eagle's claws grasp small animals. M. Wiet analyzed three elements: the bird grasping its prey, the double-headed eagle, and the eagle carrying off a human being (p. 58). (1) The bird grasping its prey is a world-wide motif. In this case, the small animal, the prey, is unrecognizable; it reminds one somewhat of the catlike creature, the prey of the double-headed eagle on a Spanish silk from the tomb of San Bernardo Calvo, Vich, perhaps of the eleventh-thirteenth century. This animal, however, is not as well or as logically drawn as the Spanish animal, and may very well be later in date. (2) The double-headed eagle, as M. Wiet points out, was known in the Near East in the days of the Hittites and Assyrians; and in the Islamic period, in the art of the twelfth-thirteenth century Seljuds and Ortokids of Mesopotamia, after the Seljuds; and in the Mameluke art of Egypt (pp. 58-59). M. Wiet then lists five textiles with double-headed eagles, "Qu'on pense originaires de Perse et de Mésopotamie" (p. 59). Of these the first three (Pl. X; possession Indjoudjian; Moore Collection at Yale) are all said to be from Bibi Shahr Bâû; it is not permissible to use this still unproven provenance to prove that another silk, of the same alleged provenance, is Persian. The fourth example, form-

(1) Several pieces of this silk exist. For one in Berlin, see O. von Falke, Kunstgeschichte der Seidenweberei (Berlin, 1913), II, Fig. 249, called Byzantine, eleventh to twelfth century. Another is in the Cooper Union Museum for the Arts of Decoration, see D. Shepherd, "The Hispano-Islamic Textiles in the Cooper Union Collection," Chronicle of the Museum for the Arts of Decoration of the Cooper Union, I (December 1943), 360, Fig. 2, "Spain? eleventh to twelfth century."

(p. 17); nor to say of the face of the man holding two falcons, No. XIV, Pls. XV-XVI, "Nous dirons qu'elle respire, outre un air chevaleresque, la noblesse de pensée, l'affabilité, la finesse, la tranquillité sereine, l'âme en repos . . ." (etc., p. 73). If one may compare iconography and style with writing, iconography is like the letters of the alphabet; it is made up of certain motifs or elements which are used over and over again in different contexts, as the letters are. Style, however, is like a person's handwriting. A man's handwriting is consistent, as the style of a civilization or culture is consistent. A handwriting expert can recognize a specific hand whether written on paper or parchment, whether disguised or in imitation of a different hand. So, too, the art historian and art critic can recognize a specific style, whether expressed in metal, wood, or stone, or textiles. Further, if a handwriting expert has only a few authentic examples remaining out of a man's lifetime of writing, he can say of a new example, "This is his hand," or, "This is not his hand." Similarly, the art historian knows the Umayyad style, or the Seljuk style; and if a new object of unknown provenance and history appears, he can say, "This is Umayyad," or, "This is not Seljuk." It is necessary to recognize iconographic motifs; for instance, on No. VII, Pl. VII, is a peculiar butterfly-eagle, which has no known prototype or parallel in Islamic art. But style is not an imponderable, it is a reality, carrying weight. The art historian must always ask the fundamental question: "Is this object consistent with the style of the period and of the civilization to which it is attributed?"

In an attempt to follow this approach to the problem, the reviewer will discuss three examples which she has seen and been able to study; more cannot be done in the space of a review. The first example chosen is No. IX, Pls. X-XI, pp. 55-63, which was seen by the
erly in Berlin\textsuperscript{10} has not been proved to be Persian either. The fifth, a brocade in Siegburg\textsuperscript{11} is strongly Ortokid in style, and so must be assigned to Mesopotamia, and probably to the thirteenth century. Indeed, the double-headed eagle does not appear in Islamic art before the Seljuk period. (3) The “eagle carrying a human being” theme is related by M. Wiet to the Babylonian Etana, Alexander the Great, Ganymede, Garuḍa of India, the Persian stories of Kai Kā’ūs and Zāl, and the Arabic Nimrūd legends (pp. 60–61). It is important to note two points in these myths: first, a definite reason is given for the human being to be associated with the eagle, and, second, the eagle always has a single head, it is never the double-headed eagle. M. Wiet has presented eight examples which he believes illustrate these myths in various works of art: a gold bottle from Nagy-Szent-Miklós; a Sasanian silver plate in the Hermitage; a printed cotton in the Kunstgewerbe Museum, Berlin; a pottery bowl in the Kelekian collection; a Mesopotamian bronze plaque in the Louvre; and a twelfth-century painting in the Cappella Palatina, in Palermo. Finally, two silks are mentioned: Wiet No. X, Pl. IX (another piece of this is TM No. 3242) and one listed as in the Bliss Collection, now Dumbarton Oaks, which is Survey No. 23—for the purpose of attribution to a country these two must be omitted, as they have the same supposed provenance, Bibi Shaḥr Bānū. These two, like the silk under discussion, have a double-headed eagle shown with the human being. Wiet’s first two examples combine the Hellenistic and Sasanian traditions in art; the third, the printed cotton, is Mesopotamian, tenth-eleventh century.\textsuperscript{12} The painting of the Cappella Palatina are definitely outside the sphere of Persian art, and they have a mingling of western (Byzantine) elements with the Islamic style. The Mesopotamian bronze plaque in the Louvre\textsuperscript{13} should not have been mentioned here, because it is an example of heraldry and has nothing to do with any of the myths cited by M. Wiet. It is datable to the thirteenth century, because the seated figure holding a crescent appears on the coins of Badr al-Dīn Lu’lū’, Zangi of Mosul, 1233–1259 A.D.\textsuperscript{14}—indeed, it represents the arms (“Wappen”) of Lu’lū’\textsuperscript{15}. The fourth example, a sgraffito pottery plate in the Kelekian Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum,\textsuperscript{16} is Persian, and is not dated; it may have been made in the eleventh or twelfth century. In other words, M. Wiet has not given any representation of the “eagle carrying a human being” which can be assigned to Persian Islamic art before the Seljuk period; and the examples of a known country and a known date have an eagle with a single head.

\textsuperscript{10} O. von Falke, Decorative Silks (New York, 1922), Figs. 116–117.

\textsuperscript{11} O. von Falke, Kunstgeschichte, I, Fig. 163, pp. 106–107.

\textsuperscript{12} The printed cotton of the Kunstgewerbe Museum, Berlin, was first published by J. Lessing, “Mittelalterliche Zeugdrucke,” Jahrb d. Preuss. Kunsts., I (1880), 119–122, color plate on p. 120. It came from an early medieval grave in the Schlosskirche in Quedlinburg, which was endowed with relics by Heinrich I and Matilde early in the eleventh century. See also E. Herzfeld, “Der Thron des Khorros,” Jahrb. d. Preuss. Kunsts., XLII (1920), 132–33, Fig. 28. Herzfeld, following Karabacek, considered that this cotton represents the Arabic Nimrūd legend, and he attributed it to Baghdad, eleventh to twelfth century. See also article “Namrūd” by B. Keller in the Encyclopedia of Islam (Leiden-London, 1913–38), III, 842–48.

\textsuperscript{13} G. Migeon, L’Orient Musulman (Paris, 1922), I, Pl. 14.

\textsuperscript{14} Coins of Badr al-Dīn Lu’lū’, see S. Lane-Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum (London, 1875–90), III, Nos. 589–592; illust., see No. 568, Nāṣir al-Dīn Mahmūd. The writer is indebted for this reference to George C. Miles.

\textsuperscript{15} For the “Wappen” of Lu’lū’, see Herzfeld, op. cit., pp. 137–39, Fig. 34.

\textsuperscript{16} Survey, VI, Pl. 585 A.
M. Wiet has not explained why the eagle, grasping its prey in its claws, should be accompanied by a human figure unattached and floating in the air. Perhaps the designer was thinking of the twelfth-century painting in the Cappella Palatina[17] where there is a human figure combined with an eagle who grasps his prey in his talons (Fig. 1). If so, the designer did not fully understand this prototype, because in the painting the figure is holding onto straps or cords which support her, while on the silk the figure stands with hands on hips. Thus in the silk there is a confusion of motifs: the bird grasping its prey, the Seljuk double-headed eagle, and a man who is completely detached from the eagle, and who has nothing therefore to do with Ganymede or any other myth. M. Wiet has shown nothing in Buwayhid thought or art to explain this peculiar synthesis. (5) The human figure itself has no parallel in style or in type in the Islamic art of the Near East. The closest parallel for the peculiar lobes of the hair and for the diagonal lines of the garment is the Spanish silk, the so-called “Lion-strangler” from the tomb of San Bernardo Calvo, Vich.[18] The date of this Spanish silk has not been established, but it could be as late as the twelfth-thirteenth century. (6) There is a fringe of palmettes at the end of the eagle’s tail. This is unknown with eagles, and indeed, birds of all types in Islamic art, in metal, pottery, and textiles, and also in the textiles which are attributed variously to Byzantium and to Spain. (7) At the top of the eagle’s wing is applied a small bird. The reviewer knows only one parallel for this among objects attributed to Persia, namely, another silk said to be from Bibi Shahr Banû, Survey No. 23; its origin will not be proved until the whole question of this presumed provenance is settled. The motif of a small creature applied on the wing of a bird does not occur in Islamic art from the other Near Eastern countries. The location of this motif reminds one of the bust-medallions similarly placed on the wing of the Cappella Palatina eagle (Fig. 1); these medallions are certainly Byzantine in type and style. A small creature on an eagle’s wing is found, however, on a Spanish marble basin in the Alhambra, Granada (Fig. 2); its Arabic inscription is dated in the year 704 H. (1305 A.D.).[19] Such a motif does not occur on earlier Spanish eagles carved in marble.[20] (8) On the silk the Arabic inscription has been identified by Bichr Farès as a line from a poem by Buḫṭūrī dedicated to the Abbasid calif Mutawakkil (p. 63). M. Wiet remarks that to find such a verse on a Persian textile “ne manque pas d’une cruelle ironie,” because of the calif’s anti-Alid attitude. But M. Wiet has not shown any connection between that verse and either the Sel-

17 U. Monneret de Villard, Le Piture musulmane al soffito della Cappella Palatina in Palermo (Roma, 1950), Fig. 245. The reviewer is very grateful to M. Monneret de Villard for his permission to reproduce this painting.

18 R. Koechlin and G. Migeon, Oriental Art (New York, no date), Pl. LXIV, Spain, eleventh century; von Falke, op. cit., I, Fig. 187, Spain, eleventh to twelfth century; Shepherd, op. cit., Fig. 5, Spain, twelfth to thirteenth century. The writer wishes to protest against the term “lion-strangler.” The beast has no relation to any member of the cat family, it is more like a dog or a hyena. The term “monstre” used by Koechlin and Migeon is inappropriate.

19 Répertoire, XIII, No. 5175, with bibliography. For an illustration, see von Falke, op. cit., I, Fig. 183 and p. 116. Curiously enough, this basin was cited by Wiet, p. 57, note 5, as a parallel for the feathers of the eagle, but he made no reference to the curious motif of a small creature on the eagle’s wing.

20 Two earlier Spanish eagles without small animals applied are on two marble basins. One, made in Madinat at-Zahrā’, year [3]77 H. (987 A.D.) is Répertoire, V, 1916 (Fig. 3). The other is in Marrakech; it is not dated but is listed under the year 399; this is Répertoire, VI, No. 2125. Figure 3 is reproduced after von Falke, op. cit., Fig. 182.
juk double-headed eagle or the "Ganymede" motive, or with anything in Buwayhid history. Further, artistically the inscription is unrelated to the design of the textile as a whole. To summarize: this textile combines a number of motifs of which one is not found until the Seljuk period, one which is not in Islamic art at all, two which recall the Palermo paintings, and several which are derived from later Spanish art, going down to the fourteenth century A.D. The total effect is not Persian in style, and is not homogeneous, but breaks down into different stylistic elements, as well as different motifs.

Much of the above applies to the human figure with double-headed eagle, Wiet No. X, Pl. IX, pp. 64-65 (another piece is TM No. 3.242). It need only be mentioned that the tail and legs of the eagle seem to have been copied from a well-known Byzantine type, for instance, the silk in Brixen,21 except that the platform for the bird to stand on is missing (Figs. 4 and 5). Again, the Arabic inscription has nothing to do with the scene, and it has not been identified (p. 65).

The second example chosen is No. XIV, PIs. XV, XVI, and XXIV, pp. 72-78a; a third piece of this was studied by the reviewer in April 1948 when it was in the possession of Mr. A. U. Pope. (1) The peculiarities of the inscription, which is pseudo-historical and mentions an unidentifiable individual, have already been pointed out. (2) The seated figure wears a pointed turban, of a type following no known style or period, and long curls. In Islamic art when a man wears a turban he does not have long curls like this hanging down in front of his neck. (3) The man has tīrāz bands on his sleeves, which is normal, but he also has similar decorative bands on the upper part of his trousers, which is contrary to custom.

21 Von Falke, op. cit., II, Fig. 251; Byzantine, eleventh to twelfth century.

(4) The man is seated stiffly, as if the soles of the feet were together; this is not the normal cross-legged position. It recalls somewhat a medallion of Muktadir 22 which in itself is unusual. But why should such a peculiarity be used as a prototype, when in all branches of Islamic art the cross-legged pose in sitting is shown with convincing realism? Compare, for instance, the seated figure on the gold medal in the Freer Gallery of Art (Fig. 11).23 (5) The man holds in each hand the legs of a fantastic bird: "il tient à chaque main un faucon" (p. 72). It is not proper to hold the legs or feet of a falcon in one's bare hands. A falcon occurs on another silk, TM No. 3.213, with the inscription "al-Isfahbad al-djalal," 24 and here the falcon perches on the man's arm, though the arm and hand are drawn so badly that it is impossible to say whether the hand is bare or gloved. On the Acheroff silk with falconer, Wiet, Pl. XXII, the man properly wears a gauntlet on which the bird perches. Other forms of Islamic art show the scene with much greater clarity and reliability. First, the gold medal in the Freer Gallery of Art (Fig. 12), of which Wiet says, "Bahram Gur, nimbé, tenant un aigle d'une main, un faucon de l'autre" (p. 73). 25 Actually the person is not holding the birds: in his right hand he holds the horse's reins, and on his left the falcon perches. The bird above the right hand is simply a space-filler in the background. A

22 Sir Thomas W. Arnold, Painting in Islam (Oxford, 1928), Pl. LIX, and pp. xviii, 125-26. According to George C. Miles, this is not a coin or a medal, but a medallion.
23 An illustration is given in A. U. Pope, Masterpieces of Persian Art (New York, 1945), pp. 47 and 51, where it is called Sasanian.
25 Is it possible that M. Wiet took his attribution of this piece, "d'époque sasanide," from Pope's Masterpieces, loc. cit., which he quotes here, p. 73, note 2?
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similar pose of both man and falcon occurs on a second metal object, a bronze mirror in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.\textsuperscript{28} Here the man wears a good turban, and the falcon perches on his left hand. The worn surface of the metal prevents us from determining whether or not a gauntlet is present. On a third metal work all the details are perfectly clear and precise, the Mameluke bowl, the Baptistère de St. Louis in the Louvre.\textsuperscript{27} Here the attendant, standing, wears a gauntlet on his left hand where the falcon perches. Now the art or science of falconry was much cultivated and was thoroughly understood in the Near East, as well as across Asia, in China, and in the west, Sicily and Spain. It seems to the reviewer incredible that anyone in the Muslim world from China to Spain can have designed such a poor and inadequate representation of a man holding a falcon. It also seems incredible that anyone in any Muslim country can have designed the figure of a man so inaccurate in turban, hair, and dress, not to mention the nontypical seated posture. The Arabic inscription, too, must have been written and designed by someone who was trying to make a historical text, but was unaware of all the rules governing such texts (see above).

The third example chosen is the "Sasanian kings on elephants," No. I, Pl. I, pp. 11-22, which is in the Textile Museum, No. 3.253. According to M. Wiet, it is not counted in the Bibi Shahr Bānū group (p. 21). Again, there are a number of points to be considered. (1) The general composition is familiar from the royal hunting silks, three Byzantine and one Chinese,\textsuperscript{29} but it is not known on any silk or on any other work of art which is proven to be Persian. (2) The frame is an elaborate geometrical interlace of pearl bands. This sort of frame is not known in Sasanian art, and M. Wiet has rightly observed that in textiles there is only one good parallel (or, probably, prototype) for it, on the silk with mounted falconers, TM No. 3.213 (p. 11, and note 3). M. Wiet has attributed this silk to the tenth century, but the reviewer feels that it may be as late as the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{29} (3) The face of the king is much like that on one of the Byzantine silks, the so-called Yazdegird silk in Berlin, but a closer parallel is that of the face of the sphinx on Wiet No. VIII, Pl. VIII, which is in the Textile Museum, No. 3.256 (Figs. 6 and 7). (4) The costume of the kings is not the Sasanian royal dress; the crown, with very short, wide, flying ribbons, is not found in Sasanian art or coins; Sasanian kings are not represented barefoot.\textsuperscript{29} (5) Riders in Sasanian art are not shown using stirrups nor is there in Sasanian art any decorative band where the stirrup should be. (6) Winged elephants are not known to occur in Sasanian art. The drawing of the elephant itself, and of its trappings and saddle, are not Sasanian in style—compare the elephants in the hunting relief at Ṭāk-i-Bustān. This ele-

\textsuperscript{28} These are illustrated in von Falke, \textit{op. cit.}, I, Figs. 105, 107, 110; and II, Fig. 219. They are also briefly discussed by P. Ackerman, "An unpublished Sasanian silk," \textit{Bull. Iranian Institute}, VI/VII (December, 1946), pp. 42-50. This article is quoted at length by M. Wiet, pp. 231-32.

\textsuperscript{29} Wiet, \textit{op. cit.}, attributes it to the tenth century because of the term Isfahād. However, in Ibn Isfandyār, \textit{History of Ṭabaristān}, transl. by E. G. Browne (Leyden, 1905), the term is used constantly up to the Mongol period.

\textsuperscript{30} M. Wiet refers to the barefoot king on the Berlin hunting silk, which he considers Sasanian; it is probably Byzantine. See von Falke, \textit{op. cit.}, Fig. 107.
phant (TM No. 3.253) seems to be not a prototype for, but a much later derivation from, that on the silk of St. Josse in the Louvre. There the under side of the trunk is drawn in scallops, to indicate the folds of the skin when the trunk is curled up. Here, these folds have degenerated into a sort of fringe, which is not only on the trunk, but extends under the animal’s chin and chest. The legs are decorated with a leafy edging, very like that outlining the body of the sphinx, Wiet No. VIII, Pl. VIII, TM No. 3.256, whose Kufic inscription is in a more or less eleventh-century style. (7) The central lion, whose fore-paws are grasped by the two kings, is drawn full-face, with arms and legs spread flat. M. Wiet gives an Assyrian parallel or prototype for an animal spread flat in such a position (p. 17, note 2). But ancient Mesopotamia is not Iran, and this method of representing a beast does not occur in Achaemenian, Parthian, or Sasanian art, nor in Islamic art in any country.  

(8) The deer with a camel’s face, which is being attacked by a winged lion, has stiff and irregularly branching horns. These horns are very different from the horns of Sasanian deer, and from those of the deer on the Byzantine hunting silk with roundels in Berlin.  

The closest parallel the reviewer has been able to find for the drawing of these horns is the bare twigs on a “Safawid” textile (Figs. 8 and 9); the blue boys on rose ground in the Moore Collection at Yale.  

The style of this is not Safavid, but is certainly a modern attempt to make an imitation of the Safavid style.  

To summarize: the composition is not the prototype of the Byzantine hunting silks, but was very likely made up after them; most of the iconographic elements of the design are not known in Sasanian art; the elephant is not a prototype of the St. Josse elephant, but a poor and misunderstood later derivation of it; the designer is probably also the author of the Wiet No. VIII, Pl. VIII, as well as of the “Safawid blue boys” which was probably woven in the nineteenth century or later.

In his conclusion M. Wiet states, “Avec toute la prudence concevable, nous émettons l’hypothèse que ces étoffes ont été tissées dans les ateliers de Rayy” (p. 213). His main reason is, “On les a trouvées sur place” and the reviewer’s disagreement with this point has already been noted. On that basis, M. Wiet suggests that because one of the pieces (Wiet No. IV, pp. 37 and 41; see also Survey No. 21, Wiet, p. 181) uses the word ra’is “s-applicant vraisemblable au premier magistrat d’une cité,” and because the city is not named, therefore that city must have been Rayy. The reviewer cannot accept this argument, dis-  

31 Ackerman, op. cit., p. 49, Fig. 2, states that a stucco relief from Termez shows “almost the identical lion-hide.” There is no similarity. The Termez figure is two lions’ bodies with a single head. The motif of a beast with two bodies and one head is known in Syrian pottery of the twelfth to thirteenth centuries. It will be noticed that the writer disagrees with P. Ackerman on a number of points. K. Erdmann, in a recent review of the Bulletin of the Iranian Institute, VI/VII (1946), disagrees with Ackerman’s analysis of the king’s crown, and with her dating (Deutsche Literaturzeitung, LXIX [November, 1948], 444).

32 Von Falke, op. cit., I, Fig. 107.

33 Survey, VI, Pl. 1058, in color, and III, p. 2118, “the piece is one of the supreme accomplishments of all time.”

34 The reviewer has made a careful study of the style of this “Safawid” silk; in composition, in drawing, in the details of the face, figure, turban, dress, plants and flowers, it is not typical of the Safavid period. Another piece of it is in Detroit, published by A. C. Weibel, “A Riza-i-Abbasí Silk,” Bull. Detroit Institute of Arts, XXII (Oct. 1942) 3-6. The reviewer has discussed this textile with Mrs. Weibel, who considers it to be genuine. The reviewer feels that a large silk, formerly in the possession of Parish-Watson, Survey, VI, Pl. 1029, is probably the work of the same designer.
agreeing as she does with the major premise. That is to say, the reviewer feels that there is no epigraphic reason for assigning the textiles to Rayy. It has already been pointed out that M. Wiet's iconographic reasons for assigning the silks to Persia do not always hold, and that he has not used stylistic analysis at all. Further, M. Wiet did not attempt to correlate this group of textiles with the references to Rayy in the literary sources; he merely noted their existence in passing (p. 213, note 5). Finally, he also omitted, for lack of information, the method of technical analysis. All these methods, history, epigraphy, iconography, style, and technique should be combined in the study and attribution of any new material, whether its provenance is known or unknown.

As to the so-called Bibi Shahr Banu silks, both those published by A. U. Pope and those newly published by M. Wiet, there are three very simple observations, which anyone can note with the naked eye. One is that among the doubtful ones there are many which are in practically perfect condition, except for some very obvious holes which may have been artificially made. Genuine silks show very natural signs of wear, age, and burial. Secondly, some are yards long, as if they had just come off the loom, such as Survey No. 50, Pl. 991, and Wiet No. IX, Pl. X. Thirdly, the color schemes: among the doubtful ones there is a predominance of a non-descriptive color, a sort of pale grayish tan, combined with dull brown; and several examples of a purplish brown, which M. Wiet calls "marron" (No. VII, Pl. VII, p. 48, and No. IX, Pl. X, p. 55) or "aubergine" (No. VI, Pl. VI, p. 44). The genuine Persian silks (among which is notably the silk of St. Josse in the Louvre) have distinct, clear, and contrasting colors: red, several blues, green, yellow, cream, and a true dark brown. The physical characteristics of any art object are basic, and essential to the problem.

Returning to the artistic aspect, the silk of St. Josse in the Louvre is actually a document on which to base our understanding of the Persian textile style in the pre-Seljuk period; the silks in M. Wiet's book show no stylistic relation to it, nor even to any known Seljuk silks. The style of these silks is so strange to Islamic art, as well as Sasanian art, that the reviewer is unable to suggest any country where they may have been made, though their date may be about a thousand years after the Buwayhid period.

The reviewer is obliged to disagree, and to disagree fundamentally, with M. Wiet on the textiles. But, leaving aside the question of the date and origin of textiles, the book is of great value in other sections. M. Wiet shows his usual mastery of the sources in the chapters Le milieu historique (pp. 99–163) and Histoire de Rayy (pp. 165–178). And throughout the book many fascinating points of epigraphy and history are discussed with great penetration: the title ra'is (pp. 39–41, and 181); amir ajall (p. 43); the word isti'māl (pp. 43, 46, 47); titles in dunyā and din (pp. 75–77); titles dawla and din (p. 82); historical events under the Buwayhids (pp. 92–95); Seljuk chronology (pp. 196–198); the madrasa (p. 204); cylindrical minarets (pp. 35–36).

As a matter of fact, there is no thorough technical study of Persian or Near Eastern textiles. The information on technique in the Survey, and also in N. A. Reath and E. B. Sachs, Persian Textiles (New Haven, 1937), is not adequate. It may be some years before the proper information is collected and is available. When such a study is available, it may (or may not) possibly help in making attributions to particular localities, as well as to countries.

35 Here M. Wiet would doubtless have enjoyed referring to the Numismatic History of Rayy (New York, 1938) by George C. Miles; this is not listed in the bibliography, and must be one of the books which were not available in Cairo; see Preface, p. x.
205-206); a list of dated objects of art of the Seljuk period (p. 210);87 historical references to textiles (p. 211); the first use of Naskhi in epigraphy (pp. 212-213); the question of symbolism in Islamic art, where he points out the errors of writers such as P. Ackerman (pp. 218-220). In matters such as these everyone in the field of Islamic studies is gratefully indebted to M. Wiet. These sections are worthy to rank with M. Wiet's work in editing the Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe, his edition of Makrīzī, his translation of Ya'kūbī, and catalogues of the Musée arabe, as solid monuments of his scholarship.

Florence E. Day

Réponse à Miss Florence Day

"Le plus grand dérèglement de l'esprit, c'est de croire les choses parce que l'on veut qu'elles soient" (Bossuet).

Je désire tout d'abord exprimer ma profonde gratitude à la Direction d'Ars Islamica, qui a bien voulu me communiquer le compte rendu de Miss Florence E. Day, pour me permettre d'y répondre.1

Cette notice sur mes Soieries persanes manque de sérénité et je n'en suis pas autrement étonné. Pendant que j'en corrigeais les épreuves, certains milieux américains faisaient déjà courir le bruit que les tissus que j'allais publier étaient de grossières falsifications. L'ouvrage parut et les commérages s'amplifièrent. Il fut de bon ton, lors du Congrès des Orientalistes tenu à Paris en 1948, d'affirmer avec des mines mystérieuses, que ces étoffes étaient de fabrication récente. Ces rumeurs furent répandues grâce au zèle d'experts compétents, qui haïchaient la tête avec d'autant plus de conviction qu'ils n'avaient pas vu les pièces. Nous rejoignions ainsi une boutade de Chateaubriand: "Tout mensonge répété devient vérité." N'ait-on pas annoncé que le faussaire allait être découvert? Heureusement, l'imprudent était un honnête homme, et il convient aujourd'hui que ce faussaire n'existe pas.

Miss F. Day attache maintenant le grelot, mais elle prend ses précautions: "All the statements in this review are the personal opinions of the writer, and are not to be construed as those of Ars Islamica or of the Textile Museum, where the writer was Curator of Islamic Art, at the time of writing. "Il en a toujours été ainsi, sans qu'on ait besoin d'insister. Je m'en voudrais toutefois de ne pas signaler que le Textile Museum possède à ma connaissance treize tissus de la trouvaille de Bibi Shahr Bânu. Nous savons aujourd'hui que Miss F. Day est conservateur au Metropolitan Museum, lequel n'a acquis qu'un seul fragment.

Je viens de citer Bibi Shahr Bânu, et c'est là que le drame commence. Tout lecteur de bonne foi verra que dans mon ouvrage l'appellation de groupe de Bibi Shahr Bânu n'est qu'une commodité. M. Pope est responsable de la dénomination, et il est bien excusable de cette erreur matérielle. Il fut suivi par Sir Leigh Ashton. Tous deux ont vu le site des fouilles et, pour les habitants de la région, l'ensemble des collines se nomme bien Bibi Shahr Bânu. Que M. Pope ait été lyrique, suivant sa tendance, je ne saurais l'en blâmer. Toujours est-il que lors de l'Exposition de Londres en 1930-1931, on parla de la trouvaille de Bibi Shahr Bânu d'une façon toute naturelle et que personne n'y trouva à redire. Des musées et des collectionneurs ont acheté ces pièces, puis de nouveaux documents appa-

87 This list starts with the silver salver of Alp Arslan; in the reviewer's opinion this is as modern as the textiles.

1 Mon ouvrage n'a pas été édité par l'Institut français, mais par l'Institut d'Égypte.

Henri Massé ne fut pas mon maître. Ce n'est qu'un vieux camarade d'études et je serais désolé de lui voir confier la responsabilité d'un élève, ayant si mal tourné qu'il ne sait distinguer le vrai du faux.
"There is no greater aberration of the mind than to give credence to things because one wishes them to be." (Bossuet).

First I wish to express my deep gratitude to Ars Islamica that kindly gave me communication of the review of Miss Florence Day so as to allow me the opportunity of answering it. (1)

This article on my "Soieries persanes" is lacking in serenity, for which I am not over surprised. While I was still correcting the proofs of my book, certain American circles were already spreading the rumour that the textiles I was about to publish were gross falsifications. It was considered good form at the time of the Congress of Orientalists in Paris in 1948, to state mysteriously that those fabrics were recently manufactured. These rumours spread, thanks to the zeal of competent experts who were shaking their head with all the more conviction because they had not seen the pieces. We were thus illustrating one of Chateaubriand's sallies: "Lies repeated become truth." Did not somebody announce that the faker was going to be unmasked? Fortunately, the imprudent one was an honest man and he admits to-day that the faker does not exist.

Miss Day now takes her first step into the open but she takes precautions. "All the statements in this review are the personal opinions of the writer, and are not to be construed as those of Ars Islamica or of the Textile Museum, where the writer was Curator of Islamic Art, at the time of writing." It has always been so, and insistence on this point was unnecessary. Still, I would not forgive myself did I not mention that the Textile Museum, so far as I know, owns thirteen textiles of the Bibi Shahr Banu find. We know, to-day, that Miss F. Day is Curator at the Metropolitan Museum that acquired only one fragment.

I have just mentioned Bibi Shahr Banu, and there the drama starts. Any reader of good faith will see that in my publication the appellation of "group of Bibi Shahr Banu" is only a matter of convenience." Mr. Pope is responsible for the designation and this material error of his is quite excusable. He was followed by Sir Leigh Ashton. Both saw the site of the excavations and for the inhabitants of the region, this group of hills is indeed called Bibi Shahr Banu. Had Mr. Pope been lyrical as is his tendency, I could not blame him. Anyway at the time of the London Exhibition in 1930-1931 the Bibi Shahr Banu find was currently mentioned and nobody objected. Museum and collectors purchased those fabrics, then new documents appeared, published by Mr. Pope, and no protests were offered. It is then that I had the opportunity of seeing and studying the textiles that were the subject of my book: they are called fakes, and Bibi Shahr Banu becomes an ingenious romance built to allay an element of doubt.

I still believe that those textiles were found in the region of Rayy in a tomb situated on a hill called Nakkara-Khanneh pretty near to the shrine of Bibi Shahr Banu, but, once again, this does not in the least contradict the more general designation of Mr. Pope and Sir Leigh Ashton. Miss F. Day does not for all that
give up her point of view and, in the too evident intention of discrediting me, she mutilates one of my remarks; "He adds that the holiness of the nearby shrine saved the site from degradation until the 20th Century." The slightest decency would have demanded that the preceding lines be not left in shadow; "Gobineau says that men could not have access to the shrine and, especially, Pezard emphasizes in 1909 that the proximity of the shrine made the trial-digs of the tepehs impossible." And this plural refers undoubtedly to the nearby hills. I still consider that those textiles were discovered in the above mentioned site: to the statements of Mr. Pope and Sir Leigh Ashton, that I have no right to doubt, are added to-day those of Mr. Read and of another excavator I know.

In any case, the excavations in question were clandestine and I am quite willing to admit that it is sometimes a delicate matter to give complete faith to the information given. Miss F. Day is probably not familiar with Oriental countries, else she would know that, in such cases, our information is reduced to a minimum. The accusation of premeditated mystery is consequently purposeless: hundreds of objects entered thus into museums and private collections and it is a fact about which one can do absolutely nothing.

Now let us suppose that we have been deceived; in that case it would not be my major conclusions that would suffer but only the hypothesis that those textiles, found in Rayy, may have been woven in that town. On this point, Miss F. Day deliberately states that I only referred accidentally in a short foot-note to the texts concerning weaving in Rayy. With those who do not know well the literature on the subject, the damage is done. My foot-note refers the reader to extracts I had already translated, as well as to the works of Schwarz and Sergeant, this last published in Ars Islamica. If Miss F. Day has some additional notes on the subject they will be welcome. This attitude can only impress non-specialists.

The "ingenious romance" does not prevent the textiles from being in existence and, as so, we have to take them as tangible facts and discuss them.

Then, one will fall back on their unusual size and their perfect state of preservation and, without further ado, will declare, sometimes without having seen them, that they have been recently manufactured. It is true, all this is amazing, but I can remember the stupor of Museum curators at the time of the discovery of Tout Ankh Amon; many were those who did not hesitate to say that they would never have purchased from dealers that group of brand new funeral furniture.

The colours do not help sustain the accusation of fake: it was just as easy to use blues and reds to pepper up the colour scheme, to manufacture something similar to the Saint-Joseph textile. This last is for Miss F. Day a document on which to base our understanding of Persian textile style in the pre-Seljuk
period. May I twist the argument around: an isolated document cannot possibly serve as a basis for the understanding of the style of a whole period, it is only an example of a certain style.

Those silks were said to have been found in a chest, it is at least what I was told in the year 1928 when I first saw in Paris the piece with the name of Baha-el-Dawla now in the Textile Museum of Colombia. If so, there is no reason not to compare them to textiles found in church treasures, from the point of view of their state of preservation and their dimensions. As to the dimensions, anyway one should not exaggerate, as Miss F. Day does with the help of one of those sentences of which she has the secret: "Some are yards long." Let us see where truth lies: Among 18 silks, I have forgotten to make notes on No. 18, but eight are under 50 cms., seven do not reach 1 meter and, finally, No. 5 and 9 are respectively 120 cms., and 171 cms. long. Other silk fabrics as long as these are known, the only thing to do is to consult at random the Catalogue de l'Exposition d'Art Byzantin, of Paris in 1931, for instance No. 268, 270, 277, 278, 283, 284.

It is not enough to throw positive statements around and to play with words. In the course of this answer which I do not wish to lengthen, I shall have repeated opportunities to point out as I have just done, the perpetual habit of Miss F. Day of exaggerating a tendency, or even attributing to me ideas that one looks for vainly in my book. This is the true reason for my answer, because I fear that the review of Miss F. Day may be easier of access than my own publication. I was lucky to have the opportunity of publishing magnificent textiles and felt I had to attribute them as a whole to the Bouyid period. Any reader of good faith will easily realize that I made numerous researches to show the diffusion of iconographical themes without undue insistence on the problem of influences for which I have quite a special distrust. In no part of my work did I base my dating on iconographical themes, nor on the localization of the weaving. Any statement to the contrary is a lie. I searched for other documents where the same motives might be found and no-where, I repeat it, did I mention influences.

Miss F. Day, who revels in a rich collection of theories, thinks that she is showing herself an excellent pedagogue when she writes: "The art historian must always ask the fundamental question: is this object consistent with the style of the period or of the civilization to which it is attributed?" Once again, my answer is for the non-specialists, because the historians of Islamic art are well informed. I wish to confront Miss F. Day with a dilemma: either she sins through ignorance and she does not know that Bouyid documents are non-existent, or she acts in bad faith when she attributes to me certain methods of research. Those textiles are what they are, and that is all. Miss Day's theory consists in building up for herself a certain idea of Bouyid style just to give herself the pleasure of stating that those silks differ from it completely.
I do not wish to stop at every objection of Miss Day and will limit myself to the most characteristic. Let us examine the big textile with eagles: "In the silk, she writes, there is a confusion of motives: the bird grasping its prey, the Seljuk double-headed eagle, and a man who is completely detached from the eagle, and who has nothing therefore to do with Ganymede or other myths. Mr. Wiet has shown nothing in Buwayhid thought or art to explain this peculiar synthesis." At the end of her study, Miss F. Day repudiates as I do all symbolism, but this seems hard to believe when one reads the above lines. Still, one has to choose. I consider that we have here a decorative composition, and no more. Nevertheless Miss Day insists: "Mr. W. has not shown any connection between that verse and either the Seljuk double-headed eagle or the Ganymede motive, or with anything in Buwayhid history." Neither have I explained the melancholy verse by Abu'1-Atahiya which accompanies, on textile No. III, the dancing ring of gay rams. On the other hand, Miss F. Day gives her reader to believe that I found in the examples I quoted the proof that this silk is Persian. Nothing is less exact and I have no pretensions of proving anything by these examples. I could not find a double-headed eagle before the Seljukid it is true, but the inscription on No. 9 is a lightly foliated Kufic, and I consider it as anterior to the 12th Century; here is the basis for my dating, it is neither the eagles, nor their two heads, nor their prey, nor the human figure that they hold. This said, I quite willingly admit that this piece might be placed at the end of the IXth Century, hence some will triumph since the Seljukids had then been in existence for 50 years. Well, no! Does Islamic Art start with the first year of the hegira? The analysis of the various elements had to be made: there is in that composition an homogeneity, a sense of balance and a synthesis that force admiration. It is a simple matter of sensibility.

Now, as to No. XIV. Miss F. Day uses arguments out of every day life to criticise the strange position of the seated man. I note them, though one should refrain from exaggerating. In a decorative composition, it is a delicate matter to refer to impossible attitudes: it was said of Michael Angelo's "Night" on the tombs of the Medici, that no human being could sleep in that position. In this case, if the man has not his legs crossed one over the other it is for technical reasons. The apex of the textile is in the middle of the body and it was impossible to weave the figure differently. I owe this remark to Mr. Guicherd, former Director of the School of Weaving in Lyons.

Miss F. Day seems to be especially well documented on the head-dresses of the 4th and 5th centuries, I have no hesitation in declaring that I am much less so. I could say here too, since I think so, that we are dealing with a decorative composition aiming to put into relief the physiognomy of the man. But we can go further. I beg Miss Day to go to the Metropolitan Museum and look at a Rhages plate dated by Mr. Dimand around 1200, where she will
see a man with long hair and a turban. (2) Miss Day mentions a pointed turban. I also spoke of a turban, but I would be less affirmative to-day, it may be another type of head-dress. Anyway, if this one is pointed, it is because it is surmounted by a jewel. Miss F. Day would yell fake if we owned, without knowing the Arabic text, a portrait of the Ziyaride Mardawidj with a tiara. (3)

The epigraphic study of Miss F. Day includes everything: ameliorations, childishness, and also some very curious things. Most of the new readings find their origin in documents that I have not seen or of which I had only mediocre photographs; I am happy to have provoked this increase in information.

I am sorry that Miss F. Day should not always comprehend the subtleties of the French language. Amongst the entire group of the Bibi Shahr Banu find, Mrs. Phyllis Ackerman classified seven pieces as Byzantine and, when I reached the epigraphic study, I used this commonplace sentence: "Of course, those seven pieces are anepigraphic:" Miss F. Day does not understand me since she writes - "Are there no Arabic inscriptions except in Persian art?" That is foolish.

On a textile, Miss Day expresses surprise because two lines of inscription are placed so that the letters are top to top instead of base to base, which is unusual. So much the better, it is an oddity that a faker would not have made on purpose to baffle us (Nos. 44 - 46). These anomalies are not the only ones! No. 19 is woven "à l'envers" ("upside down" or "backwards") and on a new photograph of No. 23, Miss Day saw a band on which one line was woven in the right way and the other in reverse.

I could have been angered by the accusation of not having compared the inscriptions on the textiles with other texts. If I expressed indignation, the Islamic scholars would blame me, but as the non-specialized readers of the Review of Miss F. Day might quite rightly be worried, I owe an answer, which, unless she wishes to be taxed with ignorance, Miss Day herself must have knowledge of beforehand. First, Arabic inscriptions in Persia, of this ancient period, are extremely rare and, as it is risky to compare inscriptions on stone or wood with inscriptions on textiles, it is necessary to press the point: Outside of the famous Saint-Josse textile, no inscription on Persian textiles is known for that period, and the hundreds of Egyptian inscriptions cannot be taken into account. At a certain moment, Miss F. Day reproaches me with having alluded to an inscription on a plate in the Louvre and adds: "Why not compare it to a dated inscription?" This peremptory declaration is extremely easy to make and is included to my prejudice, only to deceive the reader who is not aware of the precarious state of our knowledge in the field.

Referring to the inscription on No. 21 of the Survey, I am not in a position to control the new reading given by Miss F. Day. Why does she add: "Until the complete text is found, one should not
base too many conclusions upon the fragment alone." For many people who do not happen to have my book at hand this sentence is ambiguous at my expense. As matters stand, I gave three half lines to this text without commentary.

Miss F. Day has not often made use of the works of Max Van Berchem, else she would not have been upset by the omission of a "sic" after Abu for Abi which is practically a rule in epigraphy. Is a misprint for , I ask my word to be taken for it. The same applies to instead of : Miss F. Day would have entertained no doubt on the subject had she understood my translation. While I am on this subject, I wish to note another mistake through lack of attention in the Arabic text on No. 6, where, with the help of the translation may be corrected into . In No. V, I unfortunately omitted both in the text and the translation the nisba of the craftsman, al Isfahane. To end the matter of the reading, I feel I must maintain Hammad in No. XIV.

In this last inscription, I honestly pointed out the presence of a title in dunya et din which I do not explain for the very simple reason that I did not identify the titulary. Miss F. Day is ready to triumph. But no, there is no question here of a title in contradiction with protocol, but of something new in our actual stage of knowledge, that we have no right to reject until we know more. On this point, no faker would have taken the risk of innovating; had he wished to use such a title, he would as a matter of course have followed it with the name of a Seljuk Sultan and the trick would have been played. These silks seem to be special orders and might make one think of a pretendent assuming sovereign titles; needless to say I do not give too great importance to this hypothesis. Formerly, I found the title "kasim a-mir al-mu'minin" (associated to the Emir of the Believers) used at a period anterior to the date until then admitted. (4), but there again it was on a textile from the Bibi Shahr Banu find. The maker of those textiles would therefore have been haunted by the intricacies of Seljuk titles. This would sound rather like a wager. This is also the case for mubarak instead of baraka. I regret to be here in complete disagreement with Miss F. Day but the very use of that word is for me a guarantee of authenticity. Furthermore, I seem to remember another example, but I have no leisure to trace it. The absence of the basmala is a fact that I was careful to note; once more no faker would have risked it.

Miss F. Day insists on the 13th Century for the textile with the falconer that I published years ago (No. 51 of the Survey). So this is a textile from Bibi Shahr Banu that she accepts. But Miss Day is kind enough to let me know that the title "Ispahbad" was used in the Mongol period. The fact is widely known and if I did not mention it, it is because this is far from the Kufic period.

Those textiles show dates and, I say it with the greatest firmness, I refuse to doubt them. Of course, I wrote: "Let us
admit it without shame, we would never have attributed these pieces to the end of the 10th Century, but now they give us a starting point that we have to take into consideration." Miss Florence Day had the same reaction, but concluded that the inscriptions were faked. Rather was I reminded of a thought of my friend Henry Focillon in his "Vie Des Formes" - "A monument dated with certainty may be either anterior or posterior to its date, and it is just for that reason that it is important to date it first."

Beside the dated pieces, some give the names of Bouyid Princes. Most of the historical inscriptions mention names of functionaries that have not been identified. A faker would have inserted here known names because, in contradiction to the statements of Miss Day, all specialists agree: fakers strictly avoid innovations and do not mention in their inscriptions personages with whom they are not familiar at the time when they make the objects.

Last, many of these textiles give the text of poems, which until now was infinitely rare; among them verses that are attributed to Calif Ali and the confession of faith of the Chiites 'dum-decimains', which agrees perfectly with bouyid convictions. The reading of those inscriptions was, generally speaking, rather difficult because, in spite of Miss Day's sarcasm, I do not read Kufic inscriptions at a glance. Fakers are not in the habit of making riddles: they do not invent, they interpret and mix things already known. The faker, moved by a spirit of greed, does not wish to scare his public, even a scholarly one, and he turns out for them easy to read inscriptions.

The arguments used against the authenticity of those textiles work on the contrary in their favour. They have no well defined style, and it is for historical reasons and because of the antiquity of the epigraphic characteristics - without mentioning the dated silks - that I attributed the group to be Bouyid period. As, on the other hand, I had no elements of comparison for that period, I limited myself to making the remark that their patterns had style. A gulf separates me from Miss F. Day that I shall not attempt to bridge, since what she would like me to do is to give the characteristics of Bouyid style. Besides, I feel that Miss F. Day is irritated by the fact that, outside the problems of dating and attribution, I tried to take into consideration the artistic qualities. I can only be sorry to have so ruffled her insensitivity. To resume. For that period, elements of comparison are absolutely non-existent. Being accused, I must defend myself: here is another dilemma for Miss F. Day: is it on her part ignorance or bad faith.

I still pretend that those documents are certain and irrefutable, admitting humbly at the same time that the art of that period is a new science. We should not be disconcerted since we are faced with new facts. Dates have been given, and, according to me, they are uncontestable, and, starting from them, I tried to show that the art of those textiles, strictly coherent in its expression, was part of
the general movement of thought in that period and was in agreement with it.

Compositions made a few years ago "about a thousand years after the Buwayhid period," as Miss F. Day puts it, would show mistakes in the design, weaknesses, characteristic borrowing from known publications, a rich epigraphy with the names of famous personages. In these creations, the strain is not felt that so often gives the copyist away when he faithfully tries to follow a model. And, last, the colours are dulled enough so that one may mention a certain patina. We would not find so many varied patterns so harmoniously coherent, such magnificent Kufic characters. If these were fakes we would not be confronted with works so different one from the other from the point of view of quality: some are no more than effete calligraphic productions, whilst the eagle silk is strongly architected. I am also reminded of No. IV where traditional memories tie up so beautifully with the natural tendencies of the animal painter.

I agree readily that a less cursory classification of those silks should be made. I know the precarious quality of our studies and am, of course, ready to have my mistakes pointed out. Those who know me realize that I shall read with the greatest pleasure any serious and constructive criticism.

(1) My book was not published by the Institut Français, but by the Institut d'Egypte. Henri Massé was not my master. He is only an old schoolmate and I would be sorry to see him made responsible for a pupil who did so poorly that he is not even able to see the difference between the genuine and the fake.

(2) M. S. Dimand, "A Handbook of Muhammadan Art." (New York, 1944), p. 183, Fig. 115.

(3) My "Soieries Persanes" (Le Caire, 1948), p. 115; see the strange helmets worn by soldiers on a drawing in the Arab Museum in Cairo, published by me in the Bulletin de l'Institut d'Egypte, XXVI (1944), 109-18 ("Une peinture du XIIe siècle.")

(4) G. Wiet, "L'Exposition persane de 1931" (Le Caire, 1933), pp. 22-23.
rurent, publiés par M. Pope, sans qu'aucune protestation ne s'élève. C'est alors que j'ai eu l'occasion de voir et d'étudier les tissus qui ont fait l'objet de mon livre: ils sont déclarés faux, et Bibi Shahr Bânû devient un ingénieux roman échafaudé pour supprimer un élément de doute.

Je crois encore que ces tissus ont été trouvés dans la région de Rayy, dans une tombe sise sur une colline appelée Nakkâra Khâneh, assez proche du sanctuaire de Bibi Shahr Bânû, mais encore une fois, cela ne contredit nullement la formule plus générale de M. Pope et de Sir Leigh Ashton. Miss F. Day n'abandonne pas pour autant son point de vue et, dans le dessein trop évident de me compromettre, elle tronque une de mes réflexions: "He adds that the holiness of the near-by shrine which saved the site from depredation until the twentieth century. "La moindre déception aurait été de ne pas laisser dans l'ombre les lignes précédentes: Gobineau nous déclare que les hommes ne pouvaient accéder dans le sanctuaire et, surtout, Pézard précise en 1909 que la proximité de ce sanctuaire rend impossible le sondage des tépehs, et ce pluriel vise sans conteste les collines environnantes. J'estime encore que ces étoffes ont été découvertes dans le site indiqué: aux témoignages de M. Pope et de Sir Leigh Ashton, que je n'ai pas le droit de mettre en doute, s'ajoutent aujourd'hui ceux de M. Read et d'un autre fouilleur de ma connaissance.

Il s'agit en tout cas de fouilles clandestines et je conviens bien volontiers qu'il est parfois délicat d'ajouter complètement foi aux renseignements fournis. Miss F. Day n'est probablement pas familiarisée avec les pays d'Orient, sans quoi elle saurait qu'en pariel cas nos informations sont réduites au minimum. Cette accusation de mystère prémédité tombe donc à faux: des centaines d'objets sont ainsi entrés dans les Musées ou dans des collections particulières, c'est un fait contre lequel on ne peut rigoureusement rien.

Supposons donc que nous ayons été trompés, ce ne seraient pas mes conclusions majeures qui seraient atteintes, mais seulement l'hypothèse que ces tissus, trouvés à Rayy, pouvaient avoir été tissés dans cette localité. À ce propos, Miss F. Day affirme délibérément que je ne me suis référé qu'en passant aux textes concernant le tissage à Rayy, dans une courte note en bas de page. Pour ceux qui ne sont pas au courant de la littérature du sujet, le coup est porté. Ma note renvoie aux passages que j'avais déjà traduits, ainsi qu'aux travaux de Schwarz et de Serjeant, ce dernier publié dans Ars Islamica. Si Miss Florence Day possède quelques fiches supplémentaires, elles seront bienvenues. Cette façon de procéder ne peut en imposer qu'aux profanes.

L'"ingénieux roman" n'empêche pas l'existence des étoffes et il faut bien les prendre comme un fait tangible et les discuter.

Alors on va se rabattre sur leurs dimensions insusitées et sur leur parfait état de conservation, et, sans plus, on déclarera, parfois sans les avoir vues, qu'elles ont été récemment fabriquées. C'est entendu, tout cela est prodigieux. Mais je me rappelle l'étonnement des conservateurs de Musées devant la découverte de Tout-Ankh-Amon; nombreux sont qui n'hésitent pas à déclarer qu'ils n'auraient jamais acheté chez des marchands l'ensemble de ce mobilier funéraire tout neuf.

Les coloris ne peuvent être invoqués à l'appui d'un faux: il était tout aussi facile d'introduire des bleus et des rouges pour corser les nuances, de fabriquer quelque chose d'analogue au tissu de Saint-Josse. Ce dernier est pour Miss F. Day "a document on which to base our understanding of the Persian textile style in the pre-Seljuk period." Je me permets de retourner l'argument: un document unique ne saurait donner une base pour établir le
style de toute une époque, il n’est que le représentant d’un certain style.

Ces soieries auraient été trouvées dans un coffre, c’est du moins la version qui m’a été donnée en l’année 1928, lorsque j’ai vu pour la première fois à Paris la pièce au nom de Bahâ’ el-Dawla, maintenant au Textile Museum de Colombie. Dès lors il n’y a plus de raison de ne pas les comparer aux étoffes trouvées dans les trésors d’églises, aux points de vue de leur état de conservation et de leurs dimensions. Sur les dimensions il ne faudrait d’ailleurs pas exagérer, comme le fait Miss F. Day, à l’aide de ces phrases dont elle a le secret: “Some are yards long.” Voyons la réalité: sur dix-huit tissus, j’ai oublié de noter les dimensions du no XVIII, mais huit sont inférieurs à cinquante centimètres, sept n’atteignent pas un mètre, et enfin les nos V et IX mesurent respectivement 120 et 171 centimètres de longueur. Or l’on connait des étoffes en soie aussi longues, il n’y a qu’à consulter au hasard le Catalogue de l’Exposition d’art byzantin de Paris en 1931, par exemple les nos. 268, 270, 277, 278, 283, 284.

Il ne suffit pas de lancer des affirmations et de se payer de mots. Au cours de cette réponse, que je désire ne pas allonger, j’aurai maintes fois l’occasion, comme je viens de le faire, d’insister sur un procédé constant de Miss F. Day, qui consiste à exagérer une tendance ou même à me prêter des idées qu’on chercherait en vain dans mon livre. Telle est la vraie raison de ma riposte, car je crois que le compte rendu de Miss F. Day ne soit plus accessible que mon propre travail. J’ai eu la chance d’avoir à publier des tissus magnifiques et j’ai cru devoir les attribuer en gros à la période bouyide. Tout lecteur de bonne foi se rendra compte aisément que j’ai fait de nombreuses recherches pour montrer la diffusion des thèmes iconographiques, sans trop insister sur le problème des influences, pour lesquelles j’éprouve une particulière défiance. Dans aucun passage de mon ouvrage je n’ai basé ma datation sur les thèmes iconographiques, non plus que la localisation du tissage. C’est mentir que d’affirmer le contraire. J’ai recherché les autres documents où pouvaient se retrouver les mêmes motifs et, nulle part, je le répète, je n’ai indiqué des influences.

Miss F. Day, qui possède une abondante collection de théories, croit être un excellent pédagogue en écrivant: “The art historian must always ask the fundamental question: Is this object consistent with the style of the period and of the civilisation to which it is attributed?” Encore une fois, ma réponse s’adresse aux non-spécialistes, car les historiens de l’art musulman sont bien au courant. Je voudrais enfermer Miss F. Day dans un dilemme: ou bien elle pêche par ignorance et ne sait pas que les documents bouyides sont inexistants, ou elle est de mauvaise foi en me prétendant certaines méthodes de travail. Ces tissus sont ce qu’ils sont, tout simplement. La théorie de Miss F. Day consiste à se faire une idée d’un style bouyide pour se procurer le plaisir d’affirmer que ces étoffes en diffèrent complètement.

Je ne veux pas m’attarder à toutes les objections de Miss F. Day et me bornerai à retenir les plus caractéristiques. Voyons la grande étoffe aux aigles. “In the silk, écrit-elle, there is a confusion of motives: the bird grasping its prey, the Seljuk double-headed eagle, and a man who is completely detached from the eagle, and who has nothing therefore to do with Ganymede or other myth. M. Wiet has shown nothing in Buwayhid thought or art to explain this peculiar synthesis.” À la fin de son étude, Miss F. Day répudie comme moi tout symbolisme, mais on ne le croirait guère à lire les lignes qui précèdent. Il faut pourtant choisir: j’estime que nous avons affaire à une composition décorative, sans plus. Toutefois Miss Day insiste: “M. Wiet has not shown any connection be-
between that verse and either the Seljuk double-headed eagle or the Ganymede motive, or with anything in Buwayhid history." Je n'ai pas davantage expliqué les vers mélancoliques d'Abu 'l-Atâhiya qui accompagnent sur le no III la ronde des gais bouquetins. D'autre part, Miss F. Day laisse croire à son lecteur que j'ai trouvé dans les exemples que j'ai cités la preuve que cette soierie est persane. Rien n'est moins exact, et je ne prétends rien prouver par ces exemples. Je n'ai pas pu trouver d'aigle bicéphale avant les Seldjoukides, soit. Mais l'inscription du no IX est en coufique légèrement fleuri et je la considère comme antérieure au XIe siècle: voilà mon critère de datation, ce ne sont ni les aigles, ni leurs deux têtes, ni leur proie, ni le personnage qu'ils tiennent dans leurs serres. Ceci dit, j'admet bien volontiers que cette pièce puisse être classée à la fin du XIe siècle. Alors on va triompher, puisque les Seldjoukides ont à cette date cinquante années d'existence. Eh bien non! L'art musulman commencerait-il avec la première année de l'hégire?

L'analyse des divers éléments devait être faite: il y a dans cette composition une homogénéité, un équilibre et une synthèse qui soulèvent l'admiration. C'est pure question de sensibilité.

Passons au no XIV. Miss F. Day recourt à des arguments de la vie pratique pour critiquer la position étrange du personnage assis. J'y suis sensible, bien qu'il ne faille pas exagérer. Dans une composition décorative il est délicat de parler d'attitude impossible: on a prétendu, pour la Nuit de Michel-Ange sur les tombeaux des Médicis, qu'un être humain ne saurait dormir dans cette position. Dans le cas présent, si le personnage n'a pas les jambes croisées l'une sur l'autre, c'est pour des raisons techniques. La pointe du tissu passe par le milieu du corps et il était impossible de tisser le personnage autrement qu'on ne l'a fait. Je dois cette remarque à M. Guicherd, l'ancien directeur de l'École de tissage de Lyon.

Miss F. Day paraît être particulièrement documentée sur les coiffures des IVe et Ve siècles de l'hégire, je n'hésite pas à déclarer que le suis beaucoup moins. Je pourrais dire ici aussi, puisqu'il se passe, que nous avons affaire à une composition décorative, destinée à mettre en valeur la physionomie du personnage. Mais nous pouvons poursuivre. Je prie Miss F. Day d'aller voir au Metropolitan Museum sur un plat de Rhagès, que M. Dimand date d'environ 1200, un personnage enturbanné et chevelu. Miss Day parle d'un turban pointu. J'ai également parlé d'un turban, mais je serais moins affirmatif aujourd'hui, c'est peut-être une autre coiffure. En tout cas, si celle-ci est pointue, c'est qu'un bijou la surmonte. Miss F. Day aurait créé au faux si nous possédions, sans connaître le texte arabe, un portrait de ziyâride Mardâwidj avec une tiare.

L'étude épigraphique de Miss F. Day contient de tout, des améliorations, des enfantslages et enfin des choses bien curieuses. La plupart des lectures nouvelles dérivent de documents que je n'avais pas vus ou pour lesquels je n'avais eu à ma disposition que de médiocres reproductions: je suis heureux d'avoir suscité ce surcroît d'informations.

Je regrette que Miss F. Day ne saisisse pas toujours les finesse de la langue française. Sur l'ensemble de la trouvaille de Bibi Shahr Bânû, Mme. Phillips Ackerman classe sept pièces comme byzantines et, lorsque j'arrive à l'étude épigraphique, j'ajoute cette phrase banale: "Bien entendu, ces sept pièces sont

2 M. S. Dimand, A Handbook of Muhammadan Art (New York, 1944), p. 183, Fig. 115.
3 Mes Soieries persanes (Le Caire, 1948), p. 115; voir les casques étranges que portent des soldats sur un dessin du Musée arabe du Caire que j'ai publié dans le Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte, XXVI (1944), 109-18 ("Une Peinture du XIIème siècle").
anépigraphes. "Miss F. Day ne m’a pas compris puisqu’elle ajoute: "Are there no arabic inscriptions except in Persian Art?” “Ce n’est pas sérieux.

Sur un tissu, Miss F. Day s’étonne d’un adossement des lignes par les hampes et non par la base d’écriture, ce qui est inhabituel. Tant mieux, c’est une fantaisie qu’un faussaire n’aurait pas commise exprès pour nous dérouter (nos 44—46). Ces anomalies ne sont pas les seules: le no 19 est tissé à l’envers, et sur une nouvelle photographie du no 23, Miss Day a vu un bandeau sur lequel une ligne est tissée à l’endroit et l’autre à l’envers.

Je pourrais me fâcher du reproche qui m’est fait de n’avoir point comparé les inscriptions de ces étoffes avec d’autres textes. Si je m’indignais, les arabisants me donneraient tort, mais le lecteur non-spécialiste du compte rendu de Miss F. Day pourrait à bon droit être inquiet, je dois une réponse, que, sous peine d’être taxée d’ignorance, Miss Day doit connaître d’avance. Premièrement, les inscriptions arabes de Perse pour cette période ancienne sont infiniment rares et, comme il est délicat de comparer des inscriptions sur pierre ou bois avec l’épigraphie des tissus, il est bon d’insister: en dehors du fameux tissu de Saint-Josse, aucune inscription sur étoffe persane n’est connue pour cette époque, et les centaines d’inscriptions égyptiennes ne peuvent entrer en ligne de compte. Miss F. Day me reproche à un moment donné d’avoir fait allusion à l’inscription d’un plat du Louvre et ajoute: “Why not compare it to a dated inscription?” Cette déclaration péremptoire est bien facile et n’est là que pour tromper à mon détriment le lecteur non averti de l’état précaire de nos connaissances.

Au sujet de l’inscription du no 21 du Survey, je ne suis pas à même de contrôler la lecture nouvelle de Miss F. Day. Pourquoi cette dernière ajoute-t-elle: “Until the complete text is found, one should not base too many conclusions upon the fragment alone.” Pour les nombreuses personnes qui n’auront pas mon livre sous les yeux, cette phrase est amphi-bologique à mon encontre: or j’ai consacré trois demi-lignes à ce texte, sans aucun commentaire.

Miss F. Day n’a pas consulté souvent les travaux de Max van Berchem, sans quoi elle ne se serait pas émue de l’absence d’un sic après Abû pour Abî, qui est presque une règle en épigraphie.

أبو المصبرة, je prie qu’on me croie sur parole. Il en est de même pour 41, au lieu de ان: Miss F. Day n’aurait pas eu de doutes à ce sujet si elle avait compris ma traduction. Puisque je suis sur ce chapitre, je dois noter une autre faute d’inattention dans le texte arabe du no VI, où, grâce à la traduction, l’on peut corriger ضية الإمام ضية السنة. Dans le no V, j’ai malencontreuse-ment omis dans le texte et la traduction la nisba de l’artisan, al-İsfahānî. Pour en termi-ner avec les lectures, je crois devoir maintenir _HANDLE dans le no XIV.

Dans cette dernière inscription j’ai signalé honnêtement la présence d’un titre en dunyâ et din, que je n’explique pas, pour la raison bien simple que je n’en ai pas identifié le titu-laire. Miss F. Day veut triompher. Mais non, il ne s’agit pas ici d’un texte contraire au proto-cole, mais d’une nouveauté en l’état de nos connaissances, que nous n’avons pas le droit de répudier avant d’être mieux au courant. Sur ce point, un faussaire ne se serait pas risqué à innover et, s’il avait voulu utiliser un titre semblable, il l’aurait naturellement fait suivre du nom d’un sultan seldjoukide, et le tour était joué. Ces étoffes paraissent être des com-mandes et l’on pourrait songer à un prétendant s’attribuant des titres souverains; inutile d’ajouter que je ne donne pas à cette hypothèse une importance trop grande. J’ai naguère rencontré le titre kasim amir al-mu’minin, "as-
socié de l'émir des croyants," antérieur à la date que l'on admettait jusqu'altors, mais il s'agit encore d'un tissu de la trouvaille de Bibi Shahr Bânû. Le fabricant de ces étoffes était donc hanté par les nuances des titres seldjoukides, ce serait une gageure.

C'est aussi le cas pour mubârik, remplaçant baraka. Je regrette de me trouver ici en complet désaccord avec Miss F. Day, mais la présence de ce mot est pour moi une garantie d'authenticité. D'ailleurs je crois me souvenir d'un autre exemple, mais je n'ai pas le loisir de le rechercher. L'absence de la basmala est un fait, que je n'ai manqué de faire constater: encore une fois, un faussaire ne s'y serait pas risqué.

Miss F. Day prétend classer au XIIe siècle l'étoffe au faconner que j'ai publié naguère (no 31 du Survey): c'est donc un tissu de Bibi Shahr Bânû qui trouve grâce à ses yeux. Mais Miss Day veut bien me faire savoir que le titre d'ispâhbad a été utilisé à l'époque mongole. Le fait est notoire et si je n'en ai pas parlé, c'est que nous sommes loin de la période coufique.

Ces tissus portent des dates et, je le dis avec la plus grande netteté, je me refuse à les mettre en doute. Evidemment j'ai écrit: "Avouons-le sans honte, nous n'aurions jamais attribué ces pièces à la fin du Xe siècle, mais c'est maintenant un point de départ dont nous devons tenir compte." Miss F. Day a eu les mêmes réactions, mais pour conclure à la fausseté des inscriptions. J'ai plutôt pensé à une réflexion de mon ami Henri Focillon, dans sa Vie des Formes: "Un monument daté avec certitude peut être antérieur ou postérieur à sa date, et c'est précisément la raison pour laquelle il importe de le dater d'abord."

A côté des pièces datées, certaines procurent les noms de princes bouyides. Les textes historiques les plus nombreux donnent des noms de fonctionnaires qui n'ont pas été identifiés. Un faussaire aurait introduit ici des noms connus, car, bien contrairement aux assertions de Miss F. Day, tous les spécialistes sont d'accord: toute innovation est proscrite par les faussaires, lesquels n'insèrent pas dans leurs textes des personnages qui ne leur sont pas familiers au moment où ils fabriquent leurs objets.

Enfin beaucoup de ces tissus offrent des poésies, ce qui jusqu'ici est un cas infiniment rare: notons des vers qu'on attribue au calife Ali et une confession de foi des Chiites duodécimaux, ce qui cadre à merveille avec les convictions des Bouyides. La lecture de ces textes fut en général assez malaisée, car malgré le périssage de Miss F. Day, je n'ai pas les inscriptions coufiques en un clin d'œil. Les faussaires n'ont pas l'habitude de fabriquer des rébus: ils n'inventent rien, ils interprètent et mélangent des choses déjà connues. Le faussaire, animé d'un esprit mercantile, ne veut pas effrayer son public, même savant, et lui procure des textes faciles à lire.

Les arguments invoqués contre l'autenticité de ces étoffes militent au contraire en leur faveur. Elles n'ont pas un style déterminé, et c'est pour des raisons historiques et à l'aide de l'antiquité des caractères épigraphiques—sans compter les tissus datés—que j'ai attribué l'ensemble à l'époque bouyide. Comme d'autre part, je ne disposais pas d'éléments de comparaison pour cette période, je me suis contenté de constater que leurs décors avaient du style. Un fossé se sépare de Miss F. Day, que je n'essairai pas de combler, puisqu'elle voudrait que je caractérise le style bouyide. D'ailleurs, je le sens bien, Miss F. Day s'irrite qu'à côté des problèmes de date et d'attribution, j'aie tenté de m'occuper des valeurs artistiques: je ne puis que regretter d'avoir froissé son insensibilité. Résumons-nous. Pour cette période les points de comparaison sont complètement défaut. Accusé, je dois me dé-

G. Wiet, L'Exposition persane de 1931 (Le Caire, 1933), pp. 22-23.
fendre: encore un dilemme pour Miss F. Day, son ignorance ou sa mauvaise foi.

Je continue à prétendre que ces documents sont certains et irréfutables, en avouant humblement que l'art de cette période est une science neuve. Nous ne saurions être déconcertés, puisqu'il s'agit d'un fait nouveau. Des dates ont été fournies et, à mon sens, elles sont incontestables, et, en les prenant comme point de départ, j'ai essayé de montrer que l'art de ces tissus, rigoureusement cohérent dans son expression, participait du mouvement général de la pensée à cette époque et lui était accordée. Des compositions inventées il y a quelques années, "about a thousand years after the Buwayhid period," comme le déclare Miss F. Day, contiendraient des erreurs de dessin, des gaucheries, des emprunts plus caractéristiques aux publications connues, une riche épigraphie aux noms de personnages célèbres. Dans ces créations, on ne sent pas l'effort qui trahit si souvent le copiste lorsqu'il veut être fidèle à un modèle. Enfin, les tonalités sont assez ternes pour qu'on parle d'une certaine patine. Nous n'y trouverions pas des décorations aussi variées, d'une cohérence aussi harmonieuse, des caractères soufflés aussi magnifiques. S'il s'agissait de faux, on ne se trouverait pas en présence d'œuvres aussi différentes les unes des autres par leur qualité: certaines ne sont guère plus que des mèvgeries calligraphiques, tandis que l'étoffe aux aigles est solidement charpentée. Je pense également au no IV, où des souvenirs traditionnels s'allient si bien avec des sympathies de peinture animalière.

Je conviens bien volontiers qu'un classement moins sommaire de ces étoffes devra intervenir. Je connais la précarité de nos études et suis naturellement préparé à voir relever mes erreurs. Ceux qui me connaissent savent que je lirai avec le plus grand plaisir des critiques sérieuses et constructives.

Gaston Wiet

Miss Day's Reply

M. Wiet, in his Réponse to my review, has pointed out some mistakes on my part; I regret having given the press instead of the publisher of the book, and my reference to the name of M. Henri Massé. I would like to add another error on my part, which M. Wiet did not point out, that is, the omission of the clay mold with a "Ganymede" scene, excavated at Nishapur (Fig. 13); this omission is inexcusable for an American. The excavators, Hauser and Wilkinson, have told me that no new evidence as to date has appeared since their original publication; it remains a work of the pre-Seljuk period. Putting this authentic Persian work side by side with the big silk with eagles (Wiet, No. IX, Pls. X-XI), the silk looks even worse than when compared with eagles and Ganymedes of later dates and other places. The same conclusion results from comparing the turban of the man of No. XIV with the Rayy bowl cited by M. Wiet (Réponse, p. 6 and Note 2).

On one point I agree with M. Wiet: a gulf does indeed separate us ("Un fossé me sépare de Miss F. Day"). The doubtful silks cannot have been found at any site near Rayy, for the following reason. M. Wiet noticed (Réponse, p. 9) that I consider the silk with falconer (Survey No. 31) to be genuine. There are several others in the so-called Bibi Shahr Bânû group which I also consider genuine. It is not possible that genuine and doubtful objects can have been found or excavated at the same spot; thus the account of the finding circulated by Mr. Pope, Mr. Read, and "un autre fouilleur" (Réponse, pp. 2–3) is quite meaningless.

1 W. Hauser and C. K. Wilkinson, "The Museum's Excavations at Nishāpūr," Bull. Metropolitan Museum of Art, XXXVII (1942), 101-102 and Fig. 32; a clay mold excavated in Teppeh Madraseh, "assigned to the early tenth century." It is 5½ inches high.
The heart of the whole question is style. Indeed, it is the very ugliness of these silks, and their peculiar style, completely unrelated to Sasanian art, or to Islamic art either before or after the Buwayhïd period, which first aroused my doubts. And the parallels or prototypes which I suggested for certain details cannot be disregarded. Further, there is a strong family resemblance among the silks, and between them and the doubtful silver salver of Alp Arslan which M. Wiet cited as an example of Seljuk art; they all reveal the hand of one designer. M. Wiet has mentioned "un coffre" (Réponse, p. 4) in which the silks are said to have been found; in the summer of 1947 I saw a wooden coffin, to which this story was attached, in the possession of Mr. Pope; in my opinion it is as recent as the other objects.

M. Wiet mentioned the fact that the silks shown at the London exhibition of 1931 were generally accepted: "Des musées et des collectionneurs ont acheté ces pièces, puis de nouveaux documents apparaissent, publiés par M. Pope, sans qu'aucune protestation ne s'élevât" (Réponse, p. 2). To my knowledge, certain silks were doubted by scholars from the first; and as to later examples, it sometimes becomes necessary to re-examine material even though published in well-known books.

---

One final remark: I cannot follow M. Wiet's argument that fabricators would do this, or would not do that. There is no basis for saying that fabricators will merely copy, or will use only known historical names. We can only state, from the object itself, what the fabricator has done. In this case we have a fabricator of imagination (not too well founded in fact), not a mere copyist but an inventor as well, who has worked out his ideas in silk, in wood, and in metal. Perhaps, indeed, he is an honest man, who simply took pleasure in recreating what he considered to be the past glories of Iran. Perhaps this innocent man, exploited by the dealers, is now suffering the pangs of being an unrecognized artist.

FLORENCE E. DAY


The subject of this book is the study and reconstruction of the luster decoration of a dated mausoleum from the Khânâkâh (Khâ-

---


3 Consider the "Renaissance" carvings of Dossena, or the more recent "Vermeers" painted by van Meegeren. Many other fascinating examples are to be found in O. Kurz, Fakes (New Haven, 1948). Kurz says, after mentioning the technical and archeological aspects of recognizing fakes (p. 318), "Style must always remain the essential criterion."

nagâh) Pir Ḥusain, a former Shiite monastery, situated about 126 km. from Baku, in the Azerbaijan S.S.R., part of which existed in situ in the beginning of the twentieth century.

As the provenance of many luster pieces is still uncertain, the publication of this vast new material, not only dated but precisely localized, is of great value.

The author begins with a review of our knowledge of luster pottery in general. The literature on the subject is followed up to 1939 and critically discussed. The genealogical table of the Kashan family of potters as given by A. U. Pope is slightly modified, assuming that the two names Zain al-Din Ali and Ali al-Ḥusaini Kātibī represent the same person (Zain al-Din being the title of the master), connecting the families IV and V, and linking them, as well as family II, with family I. This modification would have been made clearer by the inclusion of Pope’s table.

The first information about the Khânakâh was given in 1858 by I. A. Bartolomai, who described the remains of what formerly was a complex of several buildings surrounded by a crenelated wall with towers and an arched entrance. It contained a mosque with a mausoleum, a minaret, an assembly hall, and several inner rooms. While the outside of the buildings was greatly damaged, the interior decoration of the mosque, the kibla wall, and the mausoleum were well preserved and most impressive. Several inscriptions were mentioned (without giving any dates), viz, many on the minaret, a stucco inscription in braided Kufic on the kibla wall framing a niche decorated with faience mosaic in brilliant colors and gold, Koranic quotations framing the star

teiles, and a large frieze around the mausoleum. In 1861 B. Dorn established the existence of a series of dated inscriptions (the earliest with the date Radjab 641 H. [1243 A.D.] containing the names of several Shirvânsâhs). The material was published in a report and several clearly marked fragments were sent to the Asiatic Museum.

The next phase of the study of the Khâna-kâh took place in 1907 when, during the Mungan expedition, S. W. Ter-Avetissian photographed the buildings, inscriptions, and tiles, and made sketches of all inscriptions. Several tiles were sent to the former Caucasian Museum in Tiflis. After that the destruction of the buildings progressed rapidly; in 1913 all tiles had disappeared, having been removed and sold by local dealers.

Many of these tiles were found later in the Hermitage Museum at Leningrad. They could be identified with the help of the five fragments marked on the reverse by Dorn and a photograph of Ter-Avetissian, which depicts three tiles of a large frieze and a panel of star and cross tiles placed on an inside wall of the mausoleum. Five of these tiles, set in one row, contained the consecutive dates 682–84 H. (1283–85 A.D.). With the help of this material it was possible to attribute to the Khânakâh 21 large rectangular tiles, 123 luster tiles, and 325 turquoise cross tiles. Gradually, other tiles or fragments scattered in different places could be added to this group, their identification having been made possible by the study of their ornament and particularly of their inscriptions.

The reconstruction of the large frieze, its size, and the distribution of the tiles along the walls of the mausoleum were achieved with the help of several drawings of Ter-Avetissian


The term “faïence mosaic” seems to have been used correctly, since W. M. Sysoyew, in a report on the Khânakâh given during the general meeting of the Azerbaijan Archaeological Committee in October 1923, emphasized the small sizes (1 x 2.5 cm., or 5 x 6 cm.) of the greenish-blue rectangular and colored triangular parts.
and the fact that some of the tiles were cut into parts, apparently to be used at the transition from one plane to another, mostly next to corners. The whole frieze, which is approximately eleven meters long and dated 684 H. (1285 A.D.), consisted of thirty large tiles (twenty tiles and a fragment are now in the Hermitage Museum, five in Baku, one in Tiflis, while four are still missing); they were placed at a height of about three feet, but one tile and three additional sections were set above the entrance to the tomb chamber. The upper protruding border is decorated with a design of a split palmette molded in relief and reserved from a luster background. The middle (receding) part has a large Neski inscription painted in cobalt blue on a luster background, from which spiral scrolls, leaves and dots are reserved. Large amounts of turquoise in the form of spots follow the outline of the design or are used independently, thus forming a characteristic feature of the Khânakâh decoration. Stylistic variations indicate that the tiles must have been made by two masters. A lower protruding narrow rim connects the frieze with the large panel in which octagonal luster star tiles alternate with turquoise crosses. The design on the star tiles shows also cobalt blue and a great deal of turquoise which is applied in little notches to prevent the flow of the pigment. The patterns are composed either centrally or symmetrically along the vertical axis. Dots and scrolls form the filling pattern. According to composition and design, the author defines nine basic types. Floral designs, either stylized or naturalistic, are found on most pieces. The floral motifs usually start from the base or the center of the tile radiating as stems with leaves or palmette flowers toward the points of the stars. Some tiles show the typical cypress-tree pattern. The stylized foliage or the abstract pattern, based on palmette or trefoil leaves, are occasionally enlivened by naturalistic flowers in the form of an iris, fleur-de-lis, or poppy. Very frequent and characteristic are the types in which the floral motifs are set around a central rosette or where the central ornament has the shape of upright or oblique crosses. The geometrical patterns consist of various configurations, often octagons, set within the outer frame of the tile. The fields formed by their intersection are filled with floral designs. Animal motifs, viz, hares, addorsed birds, birds of prey, quadrupeds, fishes within a pool, complete the range.

The reconstruction of the decoration of the tomb was started with one of Dorn’s fragments and a whole tile from the Hermitage collection, both of unusual shape. Twenty-two centimeters from the upper border they are bent at an angle of about twenty-five degrees, between two lines of a blue Neski inscription, set on a luster background, and surrounded on top and sides by a protruding flat border with a Neski inscription in luster. Three other tiles (two of which are now in the State Museum of Georgia) belong to the same set. All inscriptions on these tiles quote different verses of sura 36. With their help it was possible to place the tiles in the proper order and to determine their architectural function. Such a reconstruction reveals three pairs of angularly bent tiles placed opposite each other and two flat tiles, each with two rounded holes, for the narrow sides, the whole forming the revetment of the upper coffin-shaped roof of the quadrangular tomb. Three other fragments quoting sura 36 suggest an additional vertical frieze of oblong tiles.

The same method was applied to the study of the decoration of the base of the tomb. Fourteen rectangular and seven corner tiles from the Hermitage collection, the latter bent in the middle at right angles, all of the same height, and quoting parts of sura 76, suggest two rows of tiles, one on top of the other, each consisting of sixteen flat and four corner tiles.
REVIEWS

Two other similar rectangular plates, with parts of a text preceding that of the upper row, and a decorated lower edge, belonged apparently to a third row placed horizontally on top of the base, the approximate size of which is given as 1.55 x 2.50 meters.

Although the source of none of these tiles could be definitely proved, the fact that they were acquired together with the star and cross tiles in Paris (except one which came from the Caucasus), the evidence of the Koranic texts, the stylistic similarity with some fragments from the Khānakāh and the large amount of turquoise, make this reconstruction very probable.

The author discusses the relations between the Khānakāh revetments and other luster tiles of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The large frieze, as well as the tiles covering the tomb, show the characteristic features of the Kashan style. In composition and design the large frieze conforms with the mihrab tiles from Meshed, Kashan, and Varāmin. Coloristically the Khānakāh pieces can be compared with the best of the period, the deep cobalt blue and turquoise even surpassing these colors on the Varāmin tiles. The palmette and T-form pattern recall the border of the Meshed mihrab of 612 h., but the design has a more sketchy character than the early Kashan tiles. The leaves on the oblique tiles are similar to those used on the mihrab from Kum of 663 h. (1265 a.d.). The intertwined large ovals on the corner tiles recall a similar pattern on the columns in the mihrabs from Kashan of 623 h. (1226 a.d.) and from Varāmin of 663 h. (1265 a.d.).

The star tiles are very close in design to the Varāmin tiles, many of them dated 661 h. (1262 a.d.) and also to the Damghan set of 665 h. (1266 a.d.). The radial floral pattern is common to all of them. In the Khānakāh tiles, however, the foliage in the corners has often lost the connection with the central pattern and shows a disintegration of the design. This is also seen in the floral motifs confined within the fields of the geometrical ornament. Many of these tiles show a very close affinity to another series dated 738 h. (1337 a.d.), the Kashan provenance of which is known.

Animal motifs, as in the Damghan tiles, are very frequently used. To the author, the fact that some of them are to be seen on the tiles in situ on Ter-Avetissian’s photograph is sufficient to disprove the prevalent view that tiles with animal decoration were originally intended for a secular building and only later moved to a mausoleum. This is confirmed by the use of animal motifs on some mihrab tiles, e.g., on one of 707 h. (1308 a.d.) in the Hermitage Museum, used simultaneously with Koranic quotations from sura 76, the latter definitely suggesting a sacral use.

Chinese influence can be observed in many cases, as for instance in the motif of a stork flying among mushroom-like curly clouds, or in the cross design, accentuated by cobalt blue, and reminiscent of bronze amulets in form of crosses made in South China, near the Yellow River. The prolific use of turquoise and Chinese motifs provide some analogies with the so-called “Sultanabad ware,” as in some tiles with the central-rosette pattern, very much like a plate from the Freer Gallery dated 676 h. (1277 a.d.). For chronological considerations, however, a connection with Sultanabad is not possible.

The author points out an interesting feature which demonstrates the development in the technique used to cover up the lines between two adjacent tiles. In the early thirteenth century tiles (e.g., in Meshed), the long letters of the alphabet, and whole flowers in the border, set on especially prepared hollowed-out background, were applied to conceal the seams. In the tiles from the Maidān Mosque at Kashan of 623 h. (1226 a.d.), this technique is still used. Later, in the mihrab
from Varāmin, the long vertical letters do not cover the line, but are placed next to it on the right or left side, sometimes on both, which also provides some masking effect. In the Khānakāh tiles only twenty of the large frieze and a few of the tomb show reminiscences of this architectural application of large letters.

Epigraphy played an outstanding role in the study of the mausoleum. Most inscriptions are in Arabic and consist of Koranic texts. Due to the limited space available, the texts on the tiles consist of the short Meccan suras 94–114. Sura 36 on the tomb is in accordance with its destination as a funeral sura. Sura 76 on the base of the mausoleum is also appropriate, as parts of it describe the fate of the infidels and the rewards expected by the pious. Eight percent of the inscriptions are in Persian and contain quatrains of mystic character. The study of the paleography, as well as the color and style of the tiles, permits distinction between three different scripts in Arabic and four in Persian, works of different masters, some of which display typical errors.

The inscription of the large frieze records the restoration of the mausoleum of Imam al-Husain ibn Ali, known as Pir Husain Rawānān, made by Omar ibn Muhammad al-Shirzādhi al-Ḵazwini in the year 684 H. (1285 A.D.) The latter is probably a descendant of the donor of the mihrab in Buzūn, dated 528 H.

A Neskhi inscription above the East gate records the foundation of the Khānakāh which took place in Radjab 641 H. (1243 A.D.), under the reign of Malik ‘Alā al-Dīn Wāraz Djam Afrīdūn Abūl-Muṣaffār Farīburz ibn Garšāsp ibn Farrukhzād ibn Minūṣīhr, Nāṣir amir al-mu‘minīn by the means of his Vizier Ḥasan ibn Muhammad ibn Ḥasan al-Bawādi, known under the name Ḥazār-wathāḳ. This inscription and some further numismatic information made it possible to establish the full title of this Šīrḵānārāh.

Another inscription in blue Kūfic, dated 665 H. (1266 A.D.), mentioned by Dorn, is now established as having been placed above the kibla wall. This date allows the attribution of part of the decoration of the mosque to a date preceding the restoration of the mausoleum and coinciding with the date of the Damghan tiles. The author raises the question whether the Damghan tiles could possibly have belonged to the Khānakāh, but adds that only a thorough investigation on the spot could solve this problem.

Ceramic workshops in the territory of Shirvan during the thirteenth century are not known. The high quality of the Khānakāh tiles and the characteristic patterns of their decoration justify their attribution to Kashan. The stylistic similarities suggest Ali, the author of mihrams of 663 H. (1265 A.D.) as possible master of at least some of the tiles.

The book contains ample illustrations, a complete bibliography, a list of dated tiles from the mausoleum, and a description of all tiles from the Khānakāh in the Hermitage Museum and in the State Museum of Georgia. Summaries in Georgian and French follow the Russian text. The wealth of the authenticated and dated material, the scholarly methods applied in this painstaking work, which lead to the unique reconstruction of the mausoleum, make this publication a very valuable contribution to our knowledge of luster tiles.

Salomea Fajans

Islamic Metalwork in the British Museum.


Since every archæologist regards the British Museum as one of the world’s main centers of research, the news of the war damage done to its buildings and library was a real shock to students throughout the world. Mr. Barrett’s
book shows that it has again resumed some of its old established activities, and judging from the handsome appearance of this small volume, some of the special difficulties are now being overcome.

In the foreword to this publication Basil Gray points out quite rightly that metalwork provides the most continuous and best-documented material for the history of Islamic decorative arts, especially from the twelfth century to the end of the fourteenth, when pieces with the names of rulers, dates, and even signatures are quite common.

A collection as old and varied as that of the British Museum naturally includes many historically important pieces. Indeed, this new book, which publishes thirty-nine pieces on forty collotype plates, contains no less than twelve dated or datable pieces, while two mention specifically the place of origin and four are signed by the artists. While a good many of the pieces discussed are well known to scholars and are indeed key pieces in the history of Muslim decorative arts, nine of them are here published for the first time. Perhaps the most interesting of these is No. 11, an inlaid bronze mortar, which the author rightly describes as an example of the mixture of styles in the Mongol period. The massive shape, the knobs, the Arabic inscription, and the seven-dot rosette all follow the traditional Persian pattern, but other elements of the inlaid decoration and the use of deeply set thin lines of silver and copper are Far Eastern. Moreover, there is a Chinese inscription on the base whose seal characters read "Use this only (as a) treasure." Other noteworthy pieces among the unpublished ones are a twelfth- to thirteenth-century lamp (No. 4a), and a Persian sixteenth-century gilt copper ewer of unusual shape (No. 38a).

In fifteen pages the author gives a competent general introduction to the history of metalwork in Muslim countries; in this, the illustrated pieces of the British Museum (one of which was acquired as early as 1753, and another as recent as 1949) are skillfully introduced. The author made good use of the literature on this rather neglected subject. Although in the short space available he follows more or less well-known lines, he is able to make a number of new and cogent observations, i.e., that the seven-dot rosette, which is generally regarded as a hallmark of Persian metalwork (see PIs. 9 and 11), occurs also on an inlaid brass box made for Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ of Mosul (Pl. 18), or that the unusual candlestick (No. 35) should be attributed to fourteenth-century Iran. To the list of Khurāsānī craftsmen listed by the author, two others, from Nishapur, have recently been added by Aga-Oglu: ¹ both are to be found on bronze inkwells of the same shape as the newly published one shown on Plate 5b. On the whole, one agrees with the attributions and the dating, although it is only natural that in a field as unexplored as Muslim metalwork one may occasionally have opinions differing somewhat from those of the author. The brass bucket (No. 10), for instance, and the box (No. 37) are, in the opinion of this reviewer, earlier than the dates given, that is, twelfth century and thirteenth century, respectively. On the other hand, one wonders why the fine fifteenth-century helmet of Plate 30 is attributed to Egypt.² Quite ingenious is the attribution to

² The Mameluke helmets published by H. Stöcklein ("Die Waffenschätze im Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi zu Istanbul," Ars Islamica I [1934], 213–14, Fig. 13) and L. A. Mayer ("Saracenic Arms and Armor," ibid., X [1943], 6–8, Figs. 8 and 9) are different from the helmet of Plate 30. The type is traditionally called Turkish (see, e.g., M. Aga-Oglu, Exhibition of Islamic Art, M. H. de Young Memorial Museum [San Francisco, 1937], Figs. of Nos. 180 and 181).
Syria of the salver (No. 23), in spite of its North Mesopotamian style, since this piece displays the double-headed eagle, which was the blazon of Badr al-Din Baysari, as shown on his handwarmer (No. 22). Such an attribution is difficult to prove beyond doubt, since the metalworkers in this period moved from one region to another and thus produced a mixture of styles. The author quite rightly stressed this fluctuating condition, which makes the study of Muslim metalwork so difficult and thus calls for the intense study of the datable and localized pieces.

The introduction is followed by a catalog, which gives all the important information, including the places where the objects were acquired. This latter information serves as corroborative evidence for the labeling of some pieces. Thus the stylistically related Nos. 3 and 4a are attributed to two different countries, viz, Persia and Egypt, since they were acquired in Bokhara and Egypt respectively. The catalog contains also a number of corrections of data found in the earlier publications of Lane-Poole, Migeon, and Wiet.

In one instance this reviewer would have welcomed further information, namely, for what special astronomical use the inlaid brass instrument of 639 H. (1241 A.D.) was made by Muhammad b. Khultukh (Pls. 19 and 20).

One realizes that such a short book could hardly provide enough space to present the full text of the inscriptions, but one misses this important information in the catalog section, and hopes that at a later time a more extensive publication will include these data.

The plates give not only the main view of all the objects but in a good many cases various views and close-ups. There are also five fine line-cuts which reproduce individual designs (though with one exception we are left in doubt as to which piece they belong).

Let us hope that this very handsome and useful book by Mr. Barrett is just the beginning of a new series of publications of the rich London collections which will come out soon and present their material as extensively as possible.

Richard Ettinghausen
IN MEMORIAM

ANANDA KENTISH COOMARASWAMY (1877–1947)

When Ananda K. Coomaraswamy passed away on September 9, 1947, the world of Oriental studies lost one of its great pioneers. Parentage, training, and personal taste imparted to him a predilection for Indian art and for Rajput painting in particular, yet he contributed a great deal to research in Mughal and Persian painting and iconography. His catalogues of the Indian and Persian miniature collections in the Boston Museum are done with great devotion and knowledge and are thus indispensable to the student in the field. As his life work unfolded Dr. Coomaraswamy’s major aim became a search for the meaning of works of art together with a desire to show the inherent unity in the different artistic idioms of traditional civilizations. Through his many contributions he not only increased our knowledge in this respect, but exerted also a decided influence on other scholars whom he lead beyond a purely esthetic appreciation of art objects.

Dr. Coomaraswamy’s contributions to Ars Islamica represent his endeavor to trace the meaning of pictures and symbols in Islamic art and to relate them to other civilizations; they also give witness to his search in ever-widening spiritual regions. This approach is epitomized in a short but significant paper entitled “A Note on the Philosophy of Persian Art” which represented his comments during the art session of the conference on Near Eastern Culture and Society during the Bicentennial celebrations of Princeton University in March 1947. It seems fitting that Dr. Coomaraswamy’s last contribution in the field of Islamic art is published in this journal, on whose Consultive Committee he served since its inception.

To anyone familiar with the departed scholar’s work—and even to one who has only glanced at the bibliography of his writings published in 1942, on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday, in Volume IX of Ars Islamica—it is obvious that his research in Islamic art was but one facet of his many activities. To do fuller justice to his memory the following memorial by one of his close friends is printed.

R. E.

With Dr. Coomaraswamy’s passing it is difficult to say whether the field of Oriental art has lost one of its greatest interpreters or, as his epitaph, to state that the philosophia perennis has been deprived of its most articulate exponent in our generation. For many of us his death is such a personal sorrow in the departure of an old friend, always ready to counsel in matters metaphysical or practical, that we are less aware of the full significance of his loss to the world. From his earliest publications on the mineralogy and geology of Ceylon in the first year of our century up to the appearance of his last major work, Time and Eternity (Ascona: Artibus Asiae, 1947), Dr. Coomaraswamy, to quote Goethe, “became in the different stages of his life a different being.” The first of Dr. Coomaraswamy’s many avatars was as a scientist studying the rocks and precious minerals of his native island of Ceylon. After a short period dedicated to attempted social reforms in India and Ceylon, he turned to writing on Indian and Singhalese art, at first, perhaps, as a surer means of properly interpreting India to the Western world.

There could be no more appropriate description of Dr. Coomaraswamy’s real stature than Goethe’s definition of the creative writer: “When a writer leaves monuments on the different steps of his life, it is important that he
should have an innate foundation and good will; that he should, at each step, have seen and felt clearly, and that, without any secondary aims, he should have said distinctly and truly what has passed through his mind. Then will his writings, if they were right at the step where they originated, remain always right, however the writer may develop or alter himself in after times." Dr. Coomaraswamy's publications, it is instinctively felt, will "remain always right." His *History of Indian and Indonesian Art* (Leipzig, New York, London, 1927) remains the standard work on the subject, just as his later essays on "the traditional or normal view of art" are models of exegesis that belong to quite another phase of his being. The metamorphosis of Coomaraswamy, the art historian, into Coomaraswamy, the quester after the meaning of the metaphysical basis of form in traditional art, is already accomplished as early as 1933 in his *New Approach to the Vedas* (London: Luzac, 1933). Although it might seem that in his last years Dr. Coomaraswamy was less interested in works of art, it is not that he loved art less, but truth more. The whole effort of his intellect in this final decade of his life was dedicated to revealing how "human cultures in all their apparent diversity are but the dialects of one and the same language of the spirit, that there is 'a common universe of discourse' transcending the differences of tongues." 1

Dr. Coomaraswamy was careful to say, "I have never built up a philosophy of my own or wish to establish a new school of thought." The influence of his works dealing with traditional art and tradition has been extraordinary: it has been both extraordinarily good and extraordinarily bad. Nothing could have been clearer than his statement of the meaning of Oriental and Medieval art and that this meaning expressed in inevitable artistic terms was of greater significance than what our art historians describe as "style." His inveighing against art without meaning was healthy and timely, too, at a moment when the cult of unintelligibility in modern art was at its zenith. Although many scholars, including the writer, are grateful to Dr. Coomaraswamy for turning their thoughts to the meaning of meaning in art, the influence of his words in other directions has been anything but fortunate. Although Dr. Coomaraswamy never even remotely suggested the desirability or the possibility of a return to a traditional art in this untraditional age, his late repudiation of post-Renaissance art seemed to offer a kind of escape for anyone who could not adjust himself to modern art as a result of an inability to adjust to modern life. Flight into the past or to exotic corners of the world is nothing new: once upon a time it used to be called Romanticism. Dr. Coomaraswamy did not mean his words to be taken as a kind of emotional, sentimental substitute for reason. He did not recommend a return to primitivism or medievalism in art any more than he advocated our wearing coats of mail. For the ills of our modern world, he prescribed a change of heart and not a change of costume. Although he pointed out the inferiority of art for art's sake to art made to fulfill a need in a traditional society, it would be a mistake to believe that Dr. Coomaraswamy categorically repudiated every aspect of post-Renaissance art. "The artist's function is not simply to please, but to present an ought-to-be-known in such a manner as to please when seen or heard, and so expressed as to be convincing." 2 That Dr. Coomaraswamy discerned this function even in certain
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1 This and other quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the typescript of Dr. Coomaraswamy's farewell address to a group of friends on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, August 22, 1947.

modern painters could be illustrated by objects in his own collection: the last actual work of art that the writer discussed with Dr. Coomaraswamy was a water color in his home by Charles Demuth, in which he could recognize an almost Oriental sensitivity to the growth and articulation of things in nature.

The universality of Dr. Coomaraswamy’s interests has so often been remarked on that there is little need to catalogue his attainments here.\(^3\) The all-embracing nature of his creative intuitive interpretation of related concepts in separate cultures can nowhere be better illustrated than in the magisterial and definitive paragraph—a single footnote to the *Transformation of Nature in Art*—which gives the complete essence of the meaning of the first of Hsieh Ho’s Six Principles of Painting, *ch’i-yin shêng-tung*, in its relation to the Indian concepts of *cetana* and *prâna*.\(^4\) That Dr. Coomaraswamy’s interests included the Islamic field is not surprising in view of the importance of Arabic and Persian scientists, philosophs, and mystics in the preservation of traditional knowledge. Although it cannot be discerned from a perusal of a bibliography of his writings, the reading of books like the *Transformation of Nature in Art* and *Time and Eternity* will reveal that he was as familiar with the ideas of Ibn Ḥazm and Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī as he was with the *Summa Theologiae*.

Although Dr. Coomaraswamy was happily acclimated to his American environment, he always felt a strong link with his homeland. The writer remembers with what happiness and pride Dr. Coomaraswamy on one of the last days of his life displayed the many newspaper clippings with tributes for his seventieth birthday which had just arrived from Ceylon. One of his last official acts was the raising of the Indian flag at a meeting for Indian students marking the Indian declaration of Independence. If on this occasion he seemed, for some, unduly critical, it was because he wished to impress on his countrymen the necessity to “be themselves” in a world of “organized barbarism and political pandemonium.” Over and beyond the satisfaction that he must have felt at the appreciation of his work in India, Dr. Coomaraswamy had come to feel more and more the necessity to seek and know from experience his spiritual home that logically he had come to know so well. With the gradual unraveling of so many threads in the web of traditional learning, Dr. Coomaraswamy’s understanding had come to involve belief, and only a short time before his death he announced his plans for a return to India, a home-going (*āśram gamana*) with the ultimate aim of fulfilling the last stage (*āśrama*) in a pilgrimage to the fabulous mountain-home of the gods, for him the penetration to the heart of the great *mandala* that is the end of his and every pilgrimage, the realization of what he implied in his farewell: “May I know and become what I am, no longer this man So-and-so, but the Self that is also the Being of all beings, my Self and your Self.”

**Benjamin Rowland, Jr.**

**ERNST HERZFELD**

(1879–1948)

Anyone hearing the sad news of Ernst Herzfeld’s death on January 21, 1948, in Basel, Switzerland, must have realized that there would never be another archeologist like him: an original and penetrating scholar whose research had covered the whole field of Near Eastern archeology from prehistoric to

---


Islamic times. Many phases of the history of Oriental nations, religions, and arts had been recreated by him; he had excavated and surveyed many different civilizations and, as historian, architect, epigraphist, and linguist, interpreted their monuments. A list of his main fields of interest reads like the disciplines of a school of Oriental studies with an extensive faculty: historical geography and topography of the Near East; the stone age, copper age, and bronze age of Iraq and Iran; Hittite, Babylonian, and Assyrian civilizations; Achaemenid art, and the glory of Persepolis; the prophet Zarathustra; the problems of Parthian and Sasanian archeology; the genesis of Muslim art; trends in the development of Islamic architecture; the epigraphic and numismatic documents of Achaemenid, Sasanian, and Muslim periods; the many intricacies of Near Eastern iconography—all these and many others were his fields of research and in all of them his keen and resourceful mind made new and vital contributions.

His literary work comprises nearly two hundred books, articles, and critical reviews. They were all immensely enriched by his extensive knowledge of Near Eastern countries, his intimacy with literary and epigraphic documents, his artistic sense and fine draftsmanship and, in particular, by his vast experience in the field gained during sixteen excavations and expeditions. These explorations started in 1903, with his participation in the Assur excavation of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft, and extended until 1931–34, when he directed the archeological work at Persepolis for the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago and made what were perhaps his most spectacular and best-known discoveries. His paramount position becomes clear when one realizes that his younger colleagues, working in much narrower branches of specialization, are continuously taking his research as a basis for their own studies. Even when, at times, scholars disagree with Herzfeld's interpretations, his points of view are always taken into serious account.

Born on July 23, 1879, in Celle, Germany, Ernst Emil Herzfeld received his academic training at the universities of Munich and Berlin and at the Technische Hochschule, Charlottenburg, under such great teachers and scholars as Kekule von Stradanitz, von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Eduard Meyer, Friedrich Delitzsch, von Luschan, von Harnack, and Dilthey. He received his architectural degree in Charlottenburg in 1903, to which was added in 1907, after his first trips to the Near East, that of Doctor of Philosophy, granted by the University of Berlin. His doctoral thesis dealt with Pasargadæ, a subject which remained dear to his heart during his whole life. In the following year he started his association with the Prussian State Museums and in 1909 he became Privatdozent for Historical Geography at the University of Berlin. He advanced academically during the ensuing years until, in 1920, he was made a full professor, a position he held until 1935. He did not return to Nazi Germany from his work at Persepolis, and after a stay in London he came, in 1936, to the United States, where he was appointed professor in the School of Humanistic Studies of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J. He also gave several courses at the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University, and, in 1936, he delivered the Lowell Lectures in Boston. Shortly after he reached retirement age, in 1944, he started out again for travels in the East, but fell ill in Cairo and in spite of all medical care in Switzerland never recovered.

A full evaluation of Ernst Herzfeld's major activities and publications would go well beyond the scope of this journal. It seems fitting, however, to indicate at least some of his achievements in the field of Islamic art, which was one of the main interests of his life. In-
deed, it can be said that the three devoted friends, Max van Berchem, Friedrich Sarre, and Ernst Herzfeld, put the new discipline on the high scholarly level which we now take for granted; they mapped out the working methods and designated the various areas and problems to be studied. His own contributions are landmarks in the field. Thus, in 1910, he brought irrefutable arguments in favor of an Umayyad origin of the Mshattá facade, the date of which had been hotly debated since the 1880’s. This study was followed up by his “Mshattá, Ḥira und Bādiya” (1921), and by several other important investigations of various aspects of early and medieval Islamic art, such as his articles on the Қubbat al-Ŝakhra (1911), the Tabula ansata in Islamic epigraphy and ornamentation (1916), and on the monuments of Khorasan (1921).

In 1911 appeared the first of the four volumes of the *Archaeologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet* brought out jointly by him and Friedrich Sarre (completed in 1920). It was one of the first and still is one of the best archeological inventories of a vital Islamic region. In addition to this work he wrote several other important accounts based on his travels and expeditions. From 1911 to 1913 he directed the excavations at Samarra, the ninth-century Abbasid capital on the Tigris. This very successful campaign put our knowledge of early Abbasid art on a firm basis and since its material originated within a short period, it established a fixed point for dating to be used in all further research and excavations. His final reports of the three styles of wall decorations (1923) and paintings (1927) from this site are indispensable; especially the latter, since the frescoes (lineal descendants from the lost Sasanian art of painting) are now destroyed and live only in Herzfeld’s photographs and water colors. It is gratifying to know that at least one other publication, the sixth in the Samarra series, dealing with the history, topography, and epigraphy of the city, has been posthumously published in Berlin, and this in spite of total war and the political and economic complications of its aftermath. It will, however, always be a case of deep regret that the premature death of its author prevented the bringing out of the all-important volumes on the architecture of Samarra, on which Herzfeld had also been working during his last years. But even so, we have to be grateful since, for Samarra, we have a more extensive and more detailed coverage of excavation results than in the case of any other expedition to a Muslim site.

The rich architectural and epigraphic material gathered during expeditions in Syria in 1908 (with M. Soberheim), 1914, 1916, and 1930 yielded, finally, two major works. The one on Damascus was published in four sections in *Ars Islamica* IX–XIV (1942–1948) and presented an analysis and history of the mukarnas dome, the Syrian madrasa, the turba, and the influence of the Great Mosque of Damascus on the buildings of the following periods, the whole based on about eighty monuments, many of them little known or unpublished. The volumes on Aleppo containing work done by him and his friend Moritz Soberheim represent Herzfeld’s contribution to the great work of Max van Berchem, the *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum*, for which he had originally also planned to write the section on the “inscriptions mobilier” in European collections. It was when reading proofs of this book (which is being published by the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale in Cairo) that the signs of Herzfeld’s mortal affliction showed themselves. Interrupted by the author’s illness and death, the printing of the three volumes has now been resumed and their publication can be envisaged in the near future.

Hardly less important than these major works in the field of Islamic art are Herzfeld’s
contributions to our knowledge of Sasanian archeology. They are mainly contained in his *Iranische Felsreliefs* brought out in collaboration with Friedrich Sarre (1910), *Am Tor von Asien* (1920), *Paikuli* (1924), *Kushansasanian Coins* (1930), *Archaeological History of Iran* (1935), and *Iran in the Ancient East* (1941), and also in such important articles as “Der Thron des Khosró” (1920), “La Sculpture rupestre de la Perse sasanide” (1928), and “Khusrau Parwéz und der Tāq i Vastān” (1938). This research, by presenting and interpreting many monuments for the first time, gave our understanding of Sasanian art its present aspect and likewise threw light on the later development of Sasanian styles and motifs in the Muslim period.

In view of the vast range of Ernst Herzfeld’s writings, we are fortunate that George C. Miles brought out a carefully prepared catalogue of titles which in 1939 was published in *Ars Islamica*, VII (1940), as a tribute on the occasion of Herzfeld’s sixtieth birthday. The later publications will be found listed in a supplementary bibliography, which follows this obituary.

A man like Ernst Herzfeld could perform work of such titanic proportions only with a clear concept of his task steadily before him. Happily we find throughout his publications fragments of his thoughts on historical problems, and they give us a proper insight into his approach and methods. He felt, with Plato, that:

‘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.

The important task of the historian is to find the significant facts and factors in this “continuous movement” and to get them in the right focus. After all,

Everything exists before it is invented. . . . Variations [of certain forms] 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.

He is fully aware that pitfalls may threaten the work of the historian:

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.

Herzfeld’s tremendous range of studies are thus to be regarded as an outgrowth of his historical philosophy. He did not disapprove of specialization as such, but he clearly saw its drawbacks:

An intense study of a limited field is always apt to reveal entirely convincing developments; but self-imposed limitation is also deceiving. For there are no isolated fields in history and the phenomena are the effect of factors without number and of wide range.

For Herzfeld, the archeologist and historian, there was no conflict of interests in the study of history and the study of art, since “historical forces and the way they work are the same, whether they deal with man or with his product, art.” Just as E. G. Browne had abstracted history from literature and written a *Literary History of Persia*, so he felt that “History can be written from archaeological monuments,” a thought which he transformed
into reality in his short *Archaeological History of Iran*, the Schweich lectures before the British Academy (1934), and later again in his more extensive *Iran in the Ancient East* (1941). For these histories he defined "archaeology as something wider than a mere history of ancient art" and he took "as an archaeological document every object from which conclusions as to the political and cultural developments of antiquity may be drawn, whether it be architecture, sculpture, small works of art and industry, inscriptions and other written documents, or otherwise, myths and legends, coins, royal names, titles and protocols. Such an extension of the notion of archaeology and archeological documents" seemed to Herzfeld as justified as "the use of archaeological material for reconstruction of history."

Professor Herzfeld's extraordinary achievement naturally brought him international recognition. He was a Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, of the Académie Arabe de Damas, and of the Mediaeval Academy of America, and likewise an Honorary Correspondent of the Archaeological Department of the Government of India and a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy.

Owing to his great accomplishments and honors, Professor Herzfeld even in his lifetime became something of a legend, but everybody who came in close contact with him, especially those who had the good luck to study under his tutelage, will remember him as a generous, helpful, charming and stimulating man. His boundless energy and untiring zest for scholarly work, his loyalty to ideas, his unselfish actions, and his fine humor inspired great admiration. One felt it a privilege to be regarded as one of his friends. It is only to be regretted that not more people found the way to him, but his long years of travel and life at excavation sites seem to have made a meeting of the minds sometimes difficult. Having been brought up and steeped in the traditions of the Germany before the first World War, he was a firm believer in the aristocratic principle, and it was not easy for him to adjust himself to different conditions. Without committing a cheap compromise, however, he tried to understand the new age and, later on, his new country, but his last years in a rapidly changing world were not too happy. He therefore buried himself even more in his writing and gave it all possible passion and devotion.

This intense work, his anxieties about the war, the premonitions of his end, just like the attack of the mortal illness in Cairo, and death in Switzerland, form a strange parallel to van Berchem's last years. Certain passages in Herzfeld's obituary for his admired friend (published in 1922) read, indeed, like a characterization of the final period of his own life. These sentiments were consciously echoed in one of the last essays he wrote, the obituary for Friedrich Sarre, which, in 1946, appeared in this journal. In it, as always, he did not only portray the person, but the whole historical setting and the meaning of the historical processes in which this life had been involved. Feeling a close kinship with this scholar, he wrote in the dirgelike sentences not only of the end of his friend, but by implication and as if he were fay, also of his own.

On his retirement from the Institute for Advanced Study, Ernst Herzfeld realized that he would not be able to use all his accumulated notes and records collected during his own life. He then generously presented, in 1946, all his scholarly material, such as notebooks, sketchbooks, journals, plans, negatives, photographs, and archeological documents, to the Smithsonian Institution to be kept in the Freer Gallery of Art for the use of his colleagues. He hoped that the harvest of his life would thus continue to be helpful in the many fields in which he had worked.
IN MEMORIAM

This new contribution to scholarship, added to his vast personal accomplishments, leave no doubt that as long as Near Eastern archaeology is a subject of scholarly research, the name and work of Ernst Herzfeld will remain a living force.

RICHARD ETTINGHAUSEN

Supplement to "The Writings of Ernst Herzfeld," by George C. Miles *

1931

ARTICLE

139a. Anhang I: Stilkritische Untersuchung und Datierung der Steinbilder. In Max Freiherr von Oppenheim, Der Tell Halaf, Eine neue Kultur im ältesten Mesopotamien (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 225-33. See also the English version:


1941

BOOKS


* Published in Ars Islamica, VII (1940), 82-92. The numbers before each title tally with those given in the bibliography of 1940. Contributions largely concerned with Islamic matters are again marked with an asterisk (*).
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1948
BOOKS AND ARTICLES

*190. Geschichte der Stadt Samarra. Bd. VI. 
Die Ausgrabungen von Samarra. 
vi + 290 pp., 37 text illus., 33 pls., 
1 map, 5 aerial maps in pocket, inserted obituary by Samuel Guyer (pp. v—vi).

*197. Damascus: Studies in Architecture, 
IV. The Mosque. In Ars Islamica, 
XIII—XIV (1948), 118—36, 14 text 
illus., 16 pls. [For Parts I—III, see 
1942, 1943, 1946.]

IN PRINTING STAGE IN CAIRO

*189. Aleppo. Matériaux pour un Corpus 
Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Deuxième Partie, Syrie. (Institut français d'archéologie orientale, Le Caire, Mémoires, Tomes 76, 77 et 78).

IN MANUSCRIPT, READY TO BE PRINTED

188. The Persian Empire.

MEHMET AGA-OGLU

(1896—1949)

On July 4, 1949, death came to a man whose personal charm was irresistible, whose accomplishments were manifold, the founder of Ars Islamica, Mehmet Aga-Oglu.

Born of Turkish parents on August 24, 1896, at Erivan in Russian Caucasia, he received his pre-university education there at the Classical Russian Gymnasium, 1904 to 1912. Thus he grew up with a knowledge of three languages, Turkish, Persian, and Russian. In 1912 he began his studies of the history, philosoophy, and languages of Islamic countries at the Oriental Department of the University of Moscow; in 1916 he obtained there the degree of Doctor of Letters. But he was not satisfied, for his studies had led him to realize that the greatness of Islam found its finest expression in its art. He spent several years traveling in Turkestan and Iran, Iraq, Syria and Asia Minor, studying everywhere the vast heritage of Islamic art. In 1921 he resumed his studies of the history of Islam, especially the history of the Ottoman Empire, at the University of Istanbul. There he met the late Halil Edhem Eldem, the Director General of the Museums of Istanbul, who must have recognized the young man's latent abilities for museum work. Halil Eldem expressed the desire that Dr. Aga-Oglu should return to Istanbul after the completion of his studies at European universities. Together they drew up a program which Aga-Oglu followed during the coming five years. He started at Berlin, taking the Herzfeld and Becker courses in Near Eastern art and archeology. The years 1923 and 1924 he devoted to studies of classical and early Christian archeology and Western art and esthetics in general, at the University of Jena, under Dörpfeld, von Zahn, Koch and others. After this interlude he spent three years in Vienna; there, studying under the dean of art historians, Joseph Strzygowski, he received, in 1926, the degree of Ph. D.

In 1927 Dr. Aga-Oglu returned to Istanbul, where he was appointed Curator of the Cinili Kōşk, the Islamic Department of the National Museum, and Assistant Professor of the History of Islamic Art at the University of Istanbul. In 1928 came the appointment as Acting Director of the Turk ve Islam Asari Müzesi, the former Evkaf Museum. Besides these activities he made an extensive study of the architectural monuments of Istanbul and Brussa. In 1929 came the call from America, the invitation of the Arts Commis-
sion of the City of Detroit, to build up the Department of Near Eastern Art of the Detroit Institute of Arts. Here Dr. Aga-Oglu started his activities by arranging an unforgettable beautiful exhibition of the decorative arts of Islamic countries. He built up a fine permanent collection; today, twenty years later, the galleries of Islamic art of this Institute retain the spirit which created them. In 1933 he was invited to fill a newly created chair of the History of Islamic Art at the University of Michigan. He remained there till 1938, first as Freer Fellow and Lecturer, then as Professor. Twice, in 1935 and 1938, he was Visiting Professor at the Summer Seminar of Arabic and Islamic Studies at Princeton University. In 1934 he represented the University of Michigan and the Detroit Institute of Arts at the Millennium Celebration of Firdausi and the Congress of Orientalists at Teheran. In 1937 he organized an Exhibition of Islamic Art at the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum at San Francisco. From 1940 to 1947 he was engaged in writing his still unpublished magnum opus, a Corpus of Islamic Metalwork, about which a memorandum in the earlier part of this volume gives an eloquent account. In the years 1948 and 1949 he was active as consultant for the Textile Museum of the District of Columbia. Again he began his activities by arranging a loan exhibition of great interest: the Dragon Rugs of the Caucasus. His plans of following this up with a series of equally specialized exhibitions, while cataloguing the Museum’s important and all too little-known collection of rugs from China to Spain, were cut short by his untimely death.


Mehmet Aga-Oglu was an inspiring teacher and an excellent museum man. His wide knowledge of languages—Turkish, Persian and Arabic, English, German, Russian, French, Latin, and Greek—made him an insatiable reader and a conversationalist of great charm. And so his memory will remain alive with his students and friends as that of a man unique in many aspects.

Ave atque vale.

Adèle Coulin Weibel
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INDICES TO "MATERIAL FOR A HISTORY OF ISLAMIC TEXTILES UP TO THE MONGOL CONQUEST," BY R. B. SERJEANT

1. Arabic and Persian terms not relating to textiles.
2. Place names.
3. Technical terms.
   List of maps.

I. ARABIC AND PERSIAN TERMS NOT RELATING TO TEXTILES

A‘ādjim (Persians), XV–VI, 36.
Abū Farāsh (name of bird), XV–VI, 76.
Adab, IX, 55.
adām (leatherware), XIII–IV, 88.
Ādāmiyün (human beings), embroidered on cloth, XIII–IV, 113.
‘Ādite, of mail-coats (dir’), XIII–IV, 77.
‘adī (ivory), IX, 90.
aḥkam (stronger), X, 81.
aiwān (palace), XV–VI, 82.
al-Akāsirā, IX, 64.
a‘ījīk (chelcedony), XV–VI, 77.
‘alāmāt (signs), IX, 60.
al-‘āmal al-ṣḥārif, X, 71.
‘āmil (overseer), XI–II, 121.
amkās muḏhāhhaba (gilded scissors), XV–VI, 38.
āniya (pl. ‘āwāni) (pottery or vessels), IX, 64, 66; XI–II, 104.
‘Ansāra. See Miḥraḏjān.
Aρandāji (black skin), XI–II, 129.
arbāb al-ṣinā‘āt wa-l-badā‘i’ (craftsmen), XIII–IV, 87.
arzāk (stipends), IX, 61.
asākīfa (shoemakers), IX, 73; XI–II, 115.
asfāṭī (maker of chests), IX, 73.
‘āṣīr (olive oil), XV–VI, 52.
asīrра mutsasa‘a (inlaid seats), XV–VI, 38.
aswad. See dḥārā‘.
‘āṭār (seat), XIII–IV, 112.
‘āṭār (perfumer), IX, 73.
ba‘ba (locker), IX, 76.
ba‘br (panther), XV–VI, 81.
bāḍḥīl-bāzān (furs), XI–II, 126.
bǔlākāriya (plaques), XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 103.
ba‘rī. See farwa (index No. 3).
bǔt al-māl (pl. buyūt al-amwāl), IX, 67; XIII–IV, 79.
barbāhār (Indian goods), X, 87; (rarities), X, 98.
바ргāh (court), XI–II, 137.
바드 (post), IX, 69, 70; XI–II, 111.
barānīya (vase), IX, 70.
baṣīr, read for maṣīr, XV–VI, 47, 50.
bīdājī (garnet), XV–VI, 77.
bīzr dūd al-ibrīsīm (silkworm eggs), XI–II, 100.
ba nak r k r (a bird), XV–VI, 81.
buhār, XIII–IV, 82, 84.
būrī-fish, XIII–IV, 111.
būrīyā (green matting), XI–II, 126.
dabbūs (mace), XI–II, 123.
al-dākākin al-‘āliya, IX, 78.
dāmān (farming), of weaving of gold, IX, 77.
dang (white silver weight), IX, 64.
Dār al-‘āmma (public audience), IX, 72.
Dār al-Šanā‘a (arsenal), XV–VI, 33, 46, 50, 65.
dārāt (circles), XV–VI, 79; (medallions), IX, 62; (rings), XIII–IV, 89.
dast (seat), X, 73.
dastūr (roll), IX, 73.
destega. See dastgāb.
dīhāl, XI–II, 100.
Dīarīfā (applied to gold), XV–VI, 32, 33. See also kḥāṣ, index No. 3.
dīhā‘, XIII–IV, 83.
dīm (pl. dīmāt, cup), IX, 63, 75; X, 91, 111.
dīm fūḍa (silver cup), XI–II, 98; XV–VI, 79.
Dījārāwī (of a kīntār), XIII–IV, 116, 117.
dījarīb, IX, 78.
dījāwštshīn (breastplates), IX, 74.
dījāwhārīya (quality), XI–II, 108.
dījāwhārīyūn (jewelers), IX, 81.
dīj‘ (onyx), XV–VI, 84.
dījūgraṭīya, XIII–IV, 112.
djür (rosewater), IX, 90.
dhira’ aswad, IX, 70.
dhira’ al-Sawâd, IX, 69.
dir’ (pl. durû’, mailcoat or breastplate), IX, 74, 85; XIII–IV, 77; XV–VI, 77.
dirhams (mainly figures quoted for the price of lengths of cloth or garments, or customs, revenues, and taxation), IX, 65, 71, 74, 82; X, 92; XI–II, 98, 99, 102, 104, 134, 139; XIII–IV, 91, 98, 111, 115, 116; XV–VI, 47; dirhams of silver, XIII–IV, 101; dirham-weight, XI–II, 116; dirhams as a weight for gold, IX, 64.
divan, IX, 73.
Dâwân al-Khizânâ (Office of the Wardrobe), XIII–IV, 104.
Dâwân of Natron, XIII–IV, 117.
Dâwân of the Sultan, XIII–IV, 117.
Dâwân of the West, XV–VI, 46.
dur al-ţarîf (mints), IX, 69.
faîladî (cocoon), XV–VI, 62.
fârûzadî (turquoise), XV–VI, 77.
fâkdbhâr (earthenware), XI–II, 108.
Farîsa (a bird ?), XV–VI, 77.
farrâdshes (porters), XIII–IV, 112; royal farrâdshes, XIII–IV, 105.
firâs-khâna, IX, 75.
Fîtra (breaking of the Fast), XIII–IV, 111.
fîtra (food), XIII–IV, 111.
Fûndûk (depot), XI–II, 115; (hostelry), XV–VI, 33; (inn), XV–VI, 51.
Fûndûk al-ţarîfîya, XV–VI, 48.

Fundûk al-šuţîn (warehouse of cotton), XIII–IV, 105.
ghâdâ’ir (chinaware), XV–VI, 82.
gharabî (for 'Arabî), XIII–IV, 83.
al-Ghazzâlâ. See Dîwân al-Ghazzâlâ.

 hàbbâl (ropemakers), XI–II, 115.
 hàddâd, IX, 73.
 hàdid (articles of), XV–VI, 38.
 hàdjib (chambellan), IX, 77.
 hânûn (factories or workshops), XI–II, 115; XV–VI, 60, 63.
 hashib (grass), garments of, XV–VI, 81; (herbs), XV–VI, 37.
 hasîr (pl. ḥûṣ & ḥûṣûr, reed mats), X, 89, 102; XIII–IV, 112; XV–VI, 38, 39, 77; of 'Abbadân, XV–VI, 76.
 hasîr-i-sitâb (thick reed mats), XI–II, 103.
 Ḥâwâsîl (Pelican), XV–VI, 77; (soft skins), see index No. 3.
 hîsba, IX, 54; XV–VI, 62, 63, 73.
 hûlâ (ornaments), XIII–IV, 105.
 hûlûya (regalia), XV–VI, 82.
 ḥûṣûrî (reed-mat makers), XIII–IV, 116.
 hutûkshabîdî (chef des artisans), IX, 63.
 hûyûşî (sandals), XIII–IV, 81.

'îdâda, XIII–IV, 76.
'iḍîd (interlacing work), XIII–IV, 113.
îkîlim (regions), XIII–IV, 112.
al-i-kitâb (muqtattas (feifs), IX, 77.
isba' (finger measurement), IX, 70.
isâtablât (stables), IX, 78.
al-îstâmâlât al-ţâhsâ (royal requisitions), XIII–IV, 105.
îtablât (presents), XI–II, 136.
'îtr, XIII–IV, 87.
iwân, IX, 64.

kâhid (paper), XI–II, 142; XV–VI, 82.
kâshîm (officer), IX, 61.
kârgân (factory, workshop), XI–II, 121; XIII–IV, 95; factory of Shustar, X, 75; of Tibet, X, 75.
kârkha (factory), X, 99.
kârûra (bottle), X, 80.
kâšaba (a measure of length), XIII–IV, 84.
kâshâr (fuller), IX, 73.
kawkab (stars used as bridlè ornament), XI–II, 123.
kawrâja. See kûrâja.
Kawwâri (a kind of alum ?), XIII–IV, 116.
kharādī (annual tax, land tax), X, 80, 92; spent on carpets, XI—II, 121.
kharaz (beads, gems, shells), XIII—IV, 88; but it should probably be translated not so, but as 'leather-ware.'
kharāt (glasscutter), IX, 73, 74.
kharraz (cobblers), XI—II, 115.
khāš(a) (royal), of manufactures, XIII—IV, 110.
See also dāma (index No. 3), ist'mālāt, libās (index No. 3), musta'malāt, tārifūr.
khāṣṣa (royal use), XIII—IV, 108.
khāš (royal), XV—VI, 32.
khātam (pl. kḥutūm), IX, 82; on sharb-linen, XIII—IV, 105. See index No. 3.
khazaf (clay), XV—VI, 62.
khazā'īn. See khāzāna.
Khāzā'īn al-Kiswa, IX, 73, 74.
khlīf (willow, or willow twigs), XI—II, 98, 124.
khīzānā (pl. khīzā'īn, store, storehouse, treasury), IX, 67, 73, 74, 76; X, 71; XI—II, 120, 143.
Khāzānat al-Farsī (pl. Khāzā'īn al-Farsī or al-Fursī), IX, 74, 75; XIII—IV, 112; Khāzā'īn al-Fursī wa 'l-Amtī'a (stores of upholstery and furnishings), XIII—IV, 110, 111, 112; also known as firāsh-khānā, IX, 75.
Khāzānat al-Khāṣ, IX, 74.
Khāzānat al-Khlīla, IX, 75.
Khīzāna al-Kisawāt (wardrobe of robes), XIII—IV, 110.
al-Khīzāna al-Kubrā, IX, 74.
Khīzāna al-Malik (Royal Wardrobe), XV—VI, 56.
Khāzānat al-Rufūf, description of, XIII—IV, 112.
Khāzānat al-Sīlah (arsenal), IX, 73, 74.
Khāzānat al-Surūdī (saddlery stores), IX, 73, 74.
al-Khīzāna al-Zāhira, IX, 74.
khlūsā (tanners), XV—VI, 71.
khuṭā, IX, 72.
khuṭūt (rhinoceros horn), XV—VI, 83.
khuṭūt (calligraphy), XI—II, 108.
khuṭzān (keepers), IX, 73; of wardrobe, X, 75; XIII—IV, 92.
kībī (east), XIII—IV, 98.
kīmuḥt or kīmuḥšt (shagreen), XI—II, 103, 105, 127, 129.
kīntār (a weight of 100 ratīs), XIII—IV, 115, 116, 117; XV—VI, 32; Mīrī kīntār, XIII—IV, 117; Tinnisi kīntār, XIII—IV, 117. See also Djarawī, and Lāihī.
kīṭrāt (fraction of a dinar), XIII—IV, 83, 116; XV—VI, 76.
kīrīf (excréptions du nez), XV—VI, 35.

kirtās (paper), IX, 65; XIII—IV, 89, 93.
kīshr (wrappings for the transport of cloth), XIII—IV, 95.
kīt'ā (piece), XV—VI, 32, 37.
kundur (frankincense), XIII—IV, 85.
kūrdā or kawrādā, XIII—IV, 83.
kūshra (husk of cotton), XV—VI, 68, 69.
lā'ma (breastplate), IX, 67.
lāṭīma (perfumes), XIII—IV, 87.
ma'amīl (factories), XIII—IV, 98.
al-Ma'dan (mine), XIII—IV, 81.
ma'dūn, asbāb al- (makers of glazed ware, or painters), IX, 81.
ma'dīlīs, IX, 69; XIII—IV, 112. See also Diwān. ma'drūb. See naḥās.
maḥā-fish, X, 102.
maḥābis, XI—II, 124; explained, XIII—IV, 83.
maḥalla (quarter), IX, 80; XI—II, 115.
Māh-Isfandārmudh (a season), XV—VI, 35, 70.
mā'ida (table), X, 86.
makānīs (brooms), XI—II, 114.
makhtūm. See ťīn.
makkekou. See mākū-kūb.
malīkī (royal), XIII—IV, 113; of satin, IX, 71. See kalansuwa (index No. 3).
māmīrān (swallowwort), XV—VI, 84.
marākīb (ships, caravans), XV—VI, 46.
mardūn (coral), XV—VI, 77.
marīr (rope), XI—II, 125.
markab (saddle), IX, 77.
marsūgh (sprinkled with perfume), XV—VI, 78.
masāl (needles), XI—II, 106.
mašī. See bašī.
mašā (pl. mašāni, factory), IX, 89; XI—II, 141; XV—VI, 33.
matḏjar (market), XIII—IV, 116.
mādīd (ink), XV—VI, 82.
Miḥraḏjān, IX, 70; or 'Anṣara, XV—VI, 31.
mīn, XI—II, 114.
mimbars, XV—VI, 33.
mīntāk (girdle), XIII—IV, 76.
mīrwaḥ (fan), X, 86.
mīthāra (skins of animals), XIII—IV, 113.
mīthkāl (usually a gold weight), X, 80; XI—II, 108;
XIII—IV, 76, 94, 108; XV—VI, 47, 52.
mīthnān (thymélée, garou, trentonel), XV—VI, 71.
mīṭrad (spear), IX, 74.
mūṣāmala (service), XIII—IV, 104.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mudähhan (glazed, of pottery)</td>
<td>XI—II, 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munādhaba. See amkāš.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muezzins, XV—VI, 46.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muḥkam (glass?)</td>
<td>IX, 81.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muḥtasīb, XV—VI, 36, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 71.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muḥtaṣāṣ. See iktā'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mulabban (pastry)</td>
<td>XI—II, 114.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mulūkī (kingly)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 80. See khazz. muraṣṣa‘a. See asirra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musannā (daim)</td>
<td>IX, 78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muṣṭar (weaver's comb)</td>
<td>X, 86; (pl. amṣṭāt, ordinary combs), XI—II, 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musta’malāt al-khāṣṣ (royal requisitions)</td>
<td>IX, 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutawallī (controller)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nadd (scent)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 98.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāḏḏār (carpenter)</td>
<td>IX, 73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāḥās (copper)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāḥās aṣfar maḏrūb (hammered brass)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahr. See Yawm al-Nahr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairūz, IX, 70.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakš (pictures)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 113; (decoration), XI—II, 138; XIII—IV, 113. See index No. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāṣā (starch)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 68, 69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nať (pl. antā', leather mats)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 81; XV—VI, 31. See index No. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nišā (name)</td>
<td>IX, 97.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nūḥšāb (arrows)</td>
<td>IX, 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parasang, IX, 78; X, 86; XI—II, 131; XIII—IV, 84; XV—VI, 36, 85.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabī' (Spring)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 31, 62, 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raff (shelf)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangīn (colored)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rasama (to inscribe)</td>
<td>IX, 60; XIII—IV, 97.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raṣāś (lead)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rāsūkht (cinhab)</td>
<td>IX, 90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratl, XIII—IV, 115; XV—VI, 32, 68; ratlīs of Baghdad, XIII—IV, 83.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-rawṣāḥan al-badi', IX, 78.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ribā' (profiteering)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ribās (white currants)</td>
<td>XI—II, 116.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-riḥāl, XIII—IV, 85.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rizma (bale)</td>
<td>XI—II, 103; XIII—IV, 112. Rummānī. See yālūf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šahālūf (taxes)</td>
<td>IX, 70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāḏī (ebony)</td>
<td>IX, 90; XV—VI, 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šāgha (goldsmiths)</td>
<td>IX, 73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šāhīb (representative, perhaps š. al-Ṭīrāz)</td>
<td>X, 73; XV—VI, 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāmān (reed mats)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣāna‘a (pl. ṣānā‘ī, manufacture)</td>
<td>IX, 90; (crafts), X, 72; al-ṣānā‘ī al-ṣārifā (fine crafts), X, 71. See šinā‘āt, där.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanṭ (red nilotica mimosa)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarāj (pl. surūḍi, saddles)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 77.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarir (throne), XI—II, 103. See asirra muraṣṣa‘a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sārkar-i-pādshāh (king's court)</td>
<td>X, 99.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāsān (wood)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sawlaḏjān (polo sticks)</td>
<td>XV—VI, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šāḥabb (alum)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 115, 116.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šāḥīd (accountant)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šāḥīn (falcon)</td>
<td>XI—II, 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Šākirīya (Office of Troops)</td>
<td>IX, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šārāb al-‘Āmma (public supply magazine)</td>
<td>IX, 73-74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šārāb al-Khāṣṣa (private supply magazine)</td>
<td>IX, 74-75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šārak (nightingale), XV—VI, 81.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šārif (a term used to describe royal textile factories)</td>
<td>X, 71. See also, ‘amal, šāna‘a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šīḥb (span)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 81, 98; XV—VI, 37, 64, 65, 74; wrongly translated as inch, XIII—IV, 81.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiramala, IX, 83.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šuḥgli (business)</td>
<td>X, 101.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šūkis (a kind of nation), XIII—IV, 116.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šīfa (map of the world), XIII—IV, 93.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šīna‘āt. See arbāb and šanā‘a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šīniya (dish), XIII—IV, 111.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šir-fiš, XIII—IV, 98.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šiwār (bracelet)</td>
<td>IX, 77; XIII—IV, 111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subut (pearls)</td>
<td>IX, 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufr (brass, articles of), XV—VI, 38.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufrīya (dish, of silver)</td>
<td>XIII—IV, 113.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūk, XIII—IV, 87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šundūk (box), XIII—IV, 99.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūra (pl. suwar, images, pictures, portraits), IX, 61, 75; XIII—IV, 112; XV—VI, 36.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šuwwāğaḥ (jewelers), XI—II, 136.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabīḥ (kitchen)</td>
<td>IX, 86.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāḏḏ, IX, 62.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taifūr (bowl), XIII—IV, 111; t. khāṣṣ (royal), XIII—IV, 111.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taḏht (wardrobe), XIII—IV, 99.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras (great pearls), IX, 83.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**: See index No. 3.
2. PLACE NAMES

Abarkūh, X, 81, 89.
Ábaskün, XI—II, 105.
Abiward, XI—II, 117.
‘Abkār (or ‘Abkārī), XIII—IV, 85.
Abswān, XIII—IV, 98.
Abyān, XIII—IV, 77.
Abyār, XIII—IV, 107.
Acre, XI—II, 145.
Aden, IX, 59, 71; X, 93; XI—II, 131; XIII—IV, 77, 79—85, 109; XV—VI, 76, 78.
Aden Protectorate, XIII—IV, 80, 88.
Adena, XV—VI, 59.
Adībahyā, XV—VI, 43.
Aegae. See Laisas.
Africa, IX, 57; XI—II, 113; XIII—IV, 108, 111, 117; XV—VI, 38, 41 seq., 60.
Africa, East, XIII—IV, 84, 101, 111.
Africa of the Negroes, XV—VI, 41, 52, 54.
Africa, North, XIII—IV, 83, 100; XV—VI, 41 seq., 60, 70, 75.
African coast (of the Red Sea), XIII—IV, 75.
Aftakūn (7), XI—II, 137.
Aghmāt, XV—VI, 53, 54.
Agra, X, 87.

Ahnas, XIII—IV, 107.
Ahwāz, X, 71, 77; XI—II, 110—111; XV—VI, 85; called Sūk al-Ahwāz, X, 71.
‘Ain Alloun, XV—VI, 51.
Ağhāt, X, 98.
Akkirā, XV—VI, 57.
Aksarā (Ak-Sarāi), XV—VI, 57.
Ak-Sarāi. See Aksarā.
Alepo. See Aleppo.
Aleppo, XI—II, 104, 138—9; XIII—IV, 113; XV—VI, 41.
Alexandretta, XI—II, 144.
Alexandria, IX, 67, 75; XI—II, 136, 142; XIII—IV, 82, 84, 95, 100—4, 107, 115—6; XV—VI, 34, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50. A., meaning Alexandretta, XI—II, 144.
 Algeria, IX, 57. See Maghreb, North Africa, etc.
Almeria (al-Mariya), XV—VI, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39.
Aleb, XV—VI, 39.
Ámul (Diyārbakr), X, 72, 87, 97—8; XV—VI, 55.
Anak, XI—II, 142.
Anbār, IX, 63, 91.
Andaglost. See Awdāghast.
Andalus, IX, 57; X, 96; XI-II, 138; XV-VI, 29 seq., 41, 43, 46, 51, 53, 60, 70, 74, 75, 76.
Andarāš (Andarax), XV-VI, 38.
Andarax. See Andarāš.
Angora (Ankūra), XV-VI, 57; (Angouri), XV-VI, 59.
Angouri. See Angora.
Ankūra. See Angora.
Antākiya. See Antioch.
Antioch. See Antioch.
Antioch, IX, 56; XI-II, 109-10; 137-8, 144; XIII, 102; XV-VI, 85; (Antākiya), XI-II, 144; (Antioch), XI-II, 144.
'Araween, IX, 92.
Arabia, IX, 85; XI-II, 107; XIII-IV, 75-6, 86.
Arabia, Northern, XIII-IV, 82.
Arabia, Southern, XI-II, 107; XIII-IV, 76; XV-VI, 70; coastal cities of, XIII-IV, 77.
Arabia, South-Western, XI-II, 118.
Arabian coast, XIII-IV, 75.
'Arafa, XIII-IV, 88.
Aragon, XV-VI, 39.
Ardevil. See Ardebil.
Ardebil (Ardevil), Muslim capital of Azerbaijan, X, 98.
Ardistan (modern Arsus), XI-II, 110.
Arḍjdjān, X, 98.
Arḍjīš, X, 103.
Ariaca, XIII-IV, 75.
El-Arish ('Arish), XIII-IV, 114-5.
Armenia, IX, 55, 58, 63, 67, 71, 88-9, 91; X, 91, 93, 95-100, 101; XIII-IV, 96, 109; XV-VI, 57, 77, 83, 84. Lesser Armenia or Little Armenia, X, 95, 101; XV-VI, 57.
Arradājn, X, 87, 90, 111; XI-II, 105; (Radājn), X, 87.
Ar ṭān, X, 91, 100-101.
al-'Arza, IX, 78.
Artā (R. Volga), XV-VI, 74.
Arūn, XV-VI, 39.
Aruszūn. See Arsdan.
Arzan, IX, 92; X, 97; XV-VI, 57; capital of the Armenian kings, X, 97.
Arzan al-Rūm. See Kālikālā.
Arzindānj, X, 97.
Asadābd, XI-II, 110.
Ascalon ('Askalān), XI-II, 143.
Āš (or Ashā), Wadi (modern Guadix), XV-VI, 38.
Ashkūr, XI-II, 110.
Bahr al-Shark, XIII–IV, 117.
Bahrein, XIII–IV, 87.
Bailkân, X, 100.
Baišan, XI–II, 143.
Bait. See also Beit.
Bakrân. See Bokayrente.
Balkh, XI–II, 118–9, 126; XV–VI, 77, 85.
Baltic, XV–VI, 74.
Baltistân (Little Tibet), XV–VI, 83.
Bam. See Bamm.
Bamm, X, 87; XI–II, 131.
Banâ, XIII–IV, 106.
Barâdkâ'a (capital of Arrân), X, 100–1.
Bargri, X, 98.
Barka, XV–VI, 43.
Barštâllâ, IX, 92.
Barzand (capital of Mûkân), X, 103.
Bâsbâda, IX, 92.
Bašâin, IX, 75; X, 72, 77–8.
Bašra of the Maghreb, XV–VI, 52, 53; known as Bašra al-Kattân, XV–VI, 53.
Baštâ (Baeza), XV–VI, 36, 37, 38, 39.
Batîcala, XIII–IV, 86.
Baudas. See Baghdâd.
Bazardjik. See Pazardjik.
B d kli, XIII–IV, 83.
Beit Nuba, XV–VI, 70.
Bengal, Gulf of, XV–VI, 81.
Bengala, X, 87.
Bethlehem, XV–VI, 70.
Bîdişâya (Bougie), XV–VI, 50.
Bîdîlis, X, 98.
Birdhawn, X, 77.
Bisjâpûr, IX, 86; X, 88–9.
Bîjâvûr. See Bîshîpûr.
Biyawranbâra, XIII–IV, 98.
Black Sea (or Sea of Rûm), X, 91, 103.
Bocayrente (Bakrân), XV–VI, 39.
Bokhâra (Bukhârâ), IX, 76, 89; X, 77, 90, 111; XI–II, 121, 124–5; XIII–IV, 83; XV–VI, 82.
Bombay, XV–VI, 80.
Bougie. See Bîdişâya.
Bourca. See Broussa.
Brîndisi, XV–VI, 70.
Britain, XV–VI, 60.
Broussa (Bourca), XV–VI, 59.
Bukhârâ. See Bokhâra.
China-Baghdad trade route, X, 71.
Chinchilla (Dingjāla or Shantajāla), XV-VI, 39.
Christian countries, IX, 84; XV-VI, 59, 67.
Cilicia (Cilicie), X, 95; XV-VI, 59, 70.
Cogne (Konia), XV-VI, 59.
Constantinople, X, 81; XV-VI, 59, 85.
Cordova, XV-VI, 29, 33, 34, 36, 37, 41, 51, 60, 76.
Cremes (Garmsir), X, 100.
Cyprus (Kubrus), XI-II, 137, 143-4; XV-VI, 76.

Dabkū (variant name for Dabțik q.v.), XIII-IV, 97.
Dabțik, XIII-IV, 89, 94, 97-8; XV-VI, 76.
See also Dabchtsi, Dabțūk, Dabțā.
Dabiķiya (Quarter of Bagdad), IX, 83.
Dabiľ (Dovin, or Duwin, or Tovin), capital of Armenia, X, 95-7.
Dabțā (syn. of Dabțik ?), XIII-IV, 89, 97; XV-VI, 76.
Dabțūk (syn. of Dabțik ?), XIII-IV, 89, 96.
Dabțkwā, XIII-IV, 94.
Dabul (syn. of Daibul ?), XIII-IV, 86.
Dabúsija, XI-I, 125.
Dāj, XV-VI, 53.
Daibul, XIII-IV, 83; XV-VI, 80. See also Daibul.
Dailâm, IX, 101-2; X, 101-2; XI-I, 100, 105. See Dailamân.
Dailâmân, XI-I, 110; province of, X, 102.
Daizadj Street, IX, 82.
Dâmânîrî, XIII-IV, 107.
Damascûs, IX, 67; X, 81; XI-I, 108, 110, 139, 141-2, 145; XIII-IV, 103; XV-VI, 60, 61, 85; Damascus-Palmyra route, XV-VI, 70; Granada the Damascus of Andalus, XV-VI, 40.
Damascu Gate (of Bagdad), IX, 82.
Damavân, XI-I, 104.
Damghan, XI-I, 104; XV-VI, 77.
Damietta, IX, 64, 75, 81; X, 71, 74, 82, 83, 86; XI-I, 113; XIII-IV, 88-9, 91-101, 106, 111-6; (called Caphtor), XIII-IV, 95.
Damsis, XIII-IV, 91, 106; XV-VI, 76.
Dandânkan, XI-I, 117.
Dâniya, XV-VI, 39.
Dar Farâdîj, IX, 78.
Dar Şâdî, IX, 78.
Darâbdjird, IX, 75; X, 89; XV-VI, 78.
Darân, XV-VI, 71.
Darârvand, X, 103.
Darb al- Harîrî, XIII-IV, 104.
Darb al-Sâsî, XV-VI, 48.
Darjîn, XV-VI, 45.
Dariz, X, 82, 88.
Darzandîj, XI-I, 126.

Dasht Bârin, X, 81.
Dast Mâşân, IX, 88.
Dastuvar, XI-I, 110, 138, 141.
Dawrâk, IX, 75; X, 78.
D. bâ, XIII-IV, 88.
Deccan, XI-I, 137.
Delhi, XI-I, 102, 136-7.
Delta (of Egypt), IX, 57; XIII-IV, 106-9.
Derbent (Bâb al-Abwâb), X, 101; XI-I, 105.
Dhûha, XIII-IV, 88.
Dîfî, XIII-IV, 89, 99.
Dîh Khwârkân, X, 103.
Dîlâs, XIII-IV, 108.
Dîmasjîk. See Damascus.
Diyârbâkr. See Amid.
Dîzak (or Djizak), XI-I, 126.
Dîzmâr, X, 103.
Djabâl al-Kâsis, XV-VI, 59.
Djabâl Kûd, XI-I, 126.
Djabbul, IX, 86.
Al-Djâbiya (?), XV-VI, 85.
Djabrawânî, XI-I, 108.
Djadjî, XI-I, 124.
Djahram, IX, 75; X, 80-2, 85, 89; XV-VI, 29.
Djâivân (Jaen), XV-VI, 38, 39; called Djiïyân al-Ḥarîr, XV-VI, 38.
Djâm (modern Šaikh Djâm), XI-I, 120.
Al-Djâmîân (Hilla), IX, 86.
Djanad, XIII-IV, 79.
Djânâs, X, 88.
Djannâba, X, 80-2, 84.
Al-Djâr, XV-VI, 85.
Djarba (Is.), XV-VI, 44.
Djawzaq Kalblab, X, 74.
Djazira al-Bâb, X, 102.
Dîjazîra ibn 'Umar (Zabdicena), IX, 92.
Dîjîrâr, XIII-IV, 114-5.
Dîjî, XI-I, 105.
Dîjînâ. See Gilân.
Dîjîndjâla. See Chinchilla.
Dîrîuft, XI-I, 131-2, 134.
Al-Dîjîr, IX, 78.
Dîzak. See Dizak.
Djûddâ, XV-VI, 85. See also Jîdda.
Djunâbâd, XI-I, 120.
Djundajâhpûr, X, 72-3, 76-7; XI-I, 138.
Al-Djûraîb, XIII-IV, 80.
Djûrdjâün, IX, 63; X, 90, 101-2; XI-I, 98, 100, 104-5, 113, 118; XV-VI, 83, 84, 85. Sea of Djûrdjâün (Caspian), XV-VI, 85.
Djuwâism of Abu Ahmed (modern Djuyûm), X, 89.
Djuyum. See Djuwaim.
Djusuljanân, XI-II, 118.
Don. See Nahr al-Sakîiba, Tanais.
Dovin. See Dabîl.
Duqjail, X, 76.
Dumairâ, XIII-IV, 94–100.
Dumânis, X, 104.
Dunbavand, IX, 63.
Dûr, X, 73.
Dûr Shâhîyâ, IX, 78.
Dura, IX, 58.
Duwîn. See Dabîl.

Eastern Sea, XV-VI, 85.
Edessa, XV-VI, 79.
Egypt. See Delta.
Egypt, Lower, XIII-IV, 91–109; XV-VI, 68.
Egypt, Upper, XIII-IV, 106–9; XV-VI, 68.
Elche, XV-VI, 39.
Elisabetpol. See Gandja.
Elvira (Ibîra), XV-VI, 38, 43.
Erzerum. See Kalikâlâ.
Euphrates, IX, 80; XI-II, 115; XV-VI, 85.
Europe, IX, 59; XV-VI, 29, 41.
Faiyum town, XIII-IV, 107.
Fâkanwar, XIII-IV, 84.
Fandarâyina, XIII-IV, 84.
Far East, XIII-IV, 83.
Farâhân, XI-II, 110.
al-Faramâ, XIII-IV, 97, 99, 114–5; XV-VI, 84, 85.
Fars, IX, 63, 69, 90; X, 71, 79–90, 91, 96; XI-II, 99, 102, 107–8, 123, 132, 134; XIII-IV, 80, 95; XV-VI, 48, 52, 70, 77, 78, 85.
Fars-Khuizistan group, X, 88, 91.
Fartak, XIII-IV, 86.
Fas. See Mesh.
Fasâ, X, 80–2, 85–6.
Fašûn, X, 103.
Fazzân, XV-VI, 44.
Fergana (Ferghana), XI-II, 118, 124, 127; XV-VI, 84.
Fez (Fas), XV-VI, 51, 52, 54, 71.
Fiñana. See Finyaña.
Finyaña, XV-VI, 34, 37.
Firandja (France), XV-VI, 84, 85.
Firuzân, XI-II, 110.
France, XV-VI, 59. See Firandja.
Fu-lin, identified as Byzantium or Syria, XV-VI, 82.
Fümin, X, 102.
Furât, X, 89.
Furkûs, XV-VI, 39.
Gândja (Elisabetpol), X, 101, 104; XI-II, 123.
Garmsîr. See Cremesor.
Gaza (Ghazza), XI-II, 143; XIII-IV, 114–5; XV-VI, 71.
Genoa, XV-VI, 57.
Georgia (Gurdjistân), X, 103–4.
Ghardj al-Shâr (Ghardjistân), XI-II, 118.
Ghardjistân. See Ghardj al-Shâr.
Ghaur. See Ghor.
Ghazni (Ki-tez-i), IX, 83.
Ghazza. See Gaza.
Ghelan, Sea of, X, 102.
Ghor (Ghaur, the Jordan valley), XI-II, 147.
Ghulla (a village outside Cairo), XIII-IV, 106.
Ghundidjân, X, 81–2, 85, 89, 93.
Ghûrûr, XI-II, 118.
Gilan (Djîlân), IX, 63; X, 91, 102, 103, 104; XI-II, 100, 110. See Ghelân.
Goa (Sandâbûr), XIII-IV, 84.
Granada, IX, 61; XV-VI, 34, 38, 39; the Damascus of Andalus, XV-VI, 40.
Granada, province of, XV-VI, 36.
Greece, XV-VI, 51.
Greenwich, XV-VI, 54.
Guadix. See Åsh.
Gurdjistân. See Georgia.
Gurgandj, XI-II, 129.
Gujurât, XV-VI, 80.
Habil, XIII-IV, 77.
Hadjjar, XIII-IV, 87.
Hâffa, XI-II, 139.
Hama, XIII-IV, 81.
Hang-tcheou-fou (Khansâ), XI-II, 137.
Hânût, XIII-IV, 106.
al-Hâra al-Djadida (The New Quarter, in Palermo), XV-VI, 55.
Haram Allâh, XIII-IV, 112; XV-VI, 79.
Harbâ, IX, 91.
Harkand, Sea of, XV-VI, 81.
Iran, IX, 92.
Hauran (Hayran), district of, XI-II, 142.
Hawiza, X, 78.
Hawran. See Hauran.
Hazara, XI-II, 130.
Hajira, IX, 91.
Hazza, IX, 92.
el-Heereh. See Hira.
Hejaz (Hijaz), IX, 64; XIII-IV, 82, 88, 106, 109; XV-VI, 46.
Herat, XI-II, 117-20; XV-VI, 73, 74, 77.
Hijaz. See Hejaz.
Hilla. See al-Djami'ân.
Hims, IX, 68; XI-II, 138.
Hinau. See Onor.
Hind, IX, 80; XIII-IV, 80; XV-VI, 85.
Hindustan, XI-II, 102, 123, 134, 137.
Hira, IX, 85, 89; XIII-IV, 77, 82, 85.
This Badara, XV-VI, 52.
This Shinas, XV-VI, 38.
Hispan (Isfahan), XI-II, 109.
Holy Cities, XIII-IV, 88.
Hula, XI-II, 142.
Humuz, XI-II, 134; XIII-IV, 84.
Iberian Peninsula, XV-VI, 33.
Idba (capital of Lur), X, 77.
Idhadj (Idha, q.v.).
Ifrikiya (Africa), IX, 63; XV-VI, 35, 41 seq., 61, 77; defined, XV-VI, 41.
Ifrikiya (Kairawân), XV-VI, 85.
Ibira. See Elvira.
India (Inde, Indes), IX, 57-59, 84; X, 100, 101; XI-II, 109, 116, 127, 134, 136-7, 145; XIII-IV, 75, 82, 84, 87, 100, 101-2, 114, 117; XV-VI, 36, 50, 57, 74, 79, 80, 81; land route to, XI-II, 132; Indian ports, XIII-IV, 84.
Indies, East, XIII-IV, 83.
Indus, XV-VI, 80.
Iran, XIII-IV, 87, 88.
Iran, IX, 57. See Persia.
Iraq 'Ajilani, XI-II, 110; XV-VI, 51.
Irbil, IX, 92; XV-VI, 57.
'Issa canal, IX, 83.
Ishbidjâb, XI-II, 127.
Isfahan, IX, 82, 86; X, 86, 93; XI-II, 99, 107-9, 138, 141; XIII-IV, 77; XV-VI, 77; (or Hispan), XI-II, 109.
Isfahbad or Isfahbadan, XI-II, 100.
Isfahbadan. See Isfahbad.
Isfahiliya. See Seville.
Iskadjkat, XI-II, 124.
'Iskilya plain, XIII-IV, 86.
Iss-Kul, XV-VI, 75.
'Istakhr, X, 88.
Italy, XV-VI, 45, 60.
Ith, XIII-IV, 75.
Itil. See Volga.
Iwâlatan, XV-VI, 54.
Jaen. See Djajân.
Jaffa, XI-II, 143; XV-VI, 70.
Jazira, IX, 85, 91; X, 72, 91, 98.
Jerusalem, XI-II, 142; XV-VI, 70.
Jezreel (Zerin), XV-VI, 70.
Jidda, XIII-IV, 80, 88, 95. See Djudda.
Jordan Valley. See Ghor.
Kabala, X, 103.
Kâbis, XV-VI, 44, 45, 49.
Kabûd Djama, XI-II, 103.
Kabul, XI-II, 135, 143.
Kadas, XI-II, 142.
Kâdisiya, IX, 85, 89.
Kâfsa, XV-VI, 45.
Kahrân, X, 103.
Kairawân (Kairouan), XV-VI, 41, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49. See Ifrikiya.
Kairawân group, XV-VI, 44 seq.
Kâs, XIII-IV, 107, 114-5.
Kâsîariya of Abû Murra, XIII-IV, 105.
Kâsîariya al-Bazz (Cloth market of Aleppo), XI-II, 139.
Kâsîariya of Waraqha al-Zähir, XIII-IV, 105.
Kal'a, X, 103.
Kal'a Hammâd, XV-VI, 47, 49, 50.
Kalâkat (Arzan al-Rûm, Arzan of the Romans, or Erzerum), X, 94, 97; XV-VI, 77.
Kalûwan, X, 77.
Kalûsâna. See Calsena.
Kambaya. See Cambaya.
Kambâyât. See Cambay.
Kandahar, XI-II, 137.
Karakorum, XI-II, 127.
Karason (for Khurasan), X, 87.
Kard Fannâkhûsûrû. See Kurd F.
Kardabân, X, 89.
Karduvân, XIII-IV, 113.
Karkar, X, 103.
Lahoré (Lahawar), XIII-IV, 109; XV-VI, 81.
Lahsa, IX, 90.
Lais, classical Aegae, XV-VI, 57.
Lapür, XI-II, 98.
Lâr, X, 89.
Lârida. See Lerida.
Lerida (Lârida), XV-VI, 40.
Lûr, X, 76, 177.

Mašfîr, XIII-IV, 85.
Ma'dan (in Armenia), IX, 71.
al-Ma'dan (the mine, in Egypt), XIII-IV, 89.
Madina al-Hâdira, XV-VI, 38.
Mafalis, XIII-IV, 84.
Magreb, IX, 55, 57; X, 96; XI-II, 138; XIII-IV, 93, 100; XV-VI, 35, 37, 39, 41 seq., 60, 61, 70, 74, 75, 76, 85.
Magreb Sea, XV-VI, 75.
al-Maghrib al-Adnâ (Nearer Africa), XV-VI, 43 seq.
al-Maghrib al-Aksâ (Further Africa, Morocco), XV-VI, 49.
al-Maghrib al-Awsat (Middle Africa), XV-VI, 50.
Maghun, XI-II, 134.
Mahalla, XIII-IV, 106.
Maḩallat al-Dâkhil, XIII-IV, 97.
al-Maḩdjâra, XIII-IV, 80.
Mahdiya, XV-VI, 46, 47.
Maḩfûr, X, 92.
Mahrûbân, X, 71.
Maisân, IX, 86, 88; X, 94; XV-VI, 77.
Maiyafârikain, IX, 92; X, 87, 95, 97-8.
Maḵdåšaw (Mogadischio), XI-II, 142; XIII-IV, 103.
Makran, XIII-IV, 77.
Malabar, XIII-IV, 83, 86.
Malaga (Małaḵa), XV-VI, 36, 37, 38, 39, 63, 68, 70.
Malaisie. See Malaya.
Malatiya, X, 104; XIII-IV, 102; XV-VI, 57.
Malaya, XIII-IV, 86.
Malikfûr, XV-VI, 81.
Manâdîr, XI-II, 98, 103.
Manbijî, XI-II, 139; XIII-IV, 79.
Manjîrûr. See Mangalore.
Mangalore (Manjîrûr), XIII-IV, 84.
Maṇṣûra (of India), XV-VI, 81.
al-Mansûriya, XV-VI, 47.
Manût, IX, 92; X, 72.
Manzara al-Ghazzâla, XIII-IV, 104, 110.
Marâgha, X, 103.

Marand, X, 95, 98-9, 103.
Mar'ash, X, 104; XV-VI, 57.
Mardin, IX, 92; X, 98.
Marrâkash (Morocco), XV-VI, 53.
Marv (al)-Sâhîhjîdîn, XI-II, 114-5. See also Merv.
Marv al-Rûdî, XI-II, 115.
Mağhîbad al-Husain, XIII-IV, 106.
Mašhûrûn, X, 76.
Maḫtûl, XIII-IV, 103.
Masila, XV-VI, 50.
Mattûth, IX, 92; X, 72.
Mauretanîa (French), XV-VI, 54.
Mawza', XIII-IV, 75. See Muza.
Mecca, IX, 64; X, 74; XI-II, 102, 118; XIII-IV, 84, 88, 91, 106, 112; XV-VI, 37, 79, 80.
Medina, IX, 64; XI-II, 103; XIII-IV, 112.
Mediterranean coast, X, 92.
Mediterranean Sea, XI-II, 144-5.
Merv, IX, 68, 81; XI-II, 111-8, 121; XIII-IV, 89; XV-VI, 31, 77. See Marw, Marv.
Mesopotamia, XIII-IV, 77; Northern M., IX, 91.
See Iraq, Jazîra.
Mibrakird, XI-II, 131.
Milâs. See Milazza.
Milazzo (Milâs), XV-VI, 55.
Minà, XIII-IV, 82.
Mirbât, XIII-IV, 87.
Mişr, meaning various Egypt, and Cairo, XI-II, 103, 116, 131, 143; XIII-IV, 89, 97, 103, 105, 107, 109, 112, 116; XV-VI, 37. See also Cairo, and Egypt.
Miyânidî, X, 103.
Mocha, XIII-IV, 75.
Mogadischio. See Maḵdåšaw.
Morée, XV-VI, 56.
Morocco, XIII-IV, 102; XV-VI, 49, 53. See also Marrâkâš.
Mosul, IX, 91-2; X, 98; XI-II, 107; XIII-IV, 85.
Muḥalâhkûra, XIII-IV, 85.
Mûkân, X, 103.
Multan, XIII-IV, 109; XV-VI, 80, 81.
Murcia (Mursiya), XV-VI, 38, 39, 43.
Mursiya. See Murcia.
Mus (or Muḥ), X, 98.
Mûṣh. See Mus.
Mustaghānim, XV-VI, 50.
Muza, XIII-IV, 75.
al-Muṣtaḥîf, XIII-IV, 84.

Naďrân, IX, 63-4, 85; XIII-IV, 77, 79.
Nafta, XV-VI, 45, 48, 61.
Nahr al-Rûs, XV, 85.
Nahr al-Šakiliba (Don), XV–VI, 85.


Nahrawâl, XV–VI, 81.

Nahrawân, IX, 91; X, 96.

Nakhtûvân, X, 98, 103.


Nars, canal of, IX, 86.

al-Naṣriyâ, IX, 78.


Near East, XI–II, 144.

Nehâvând, IX, 63; X, 91; XI–II, 110.

New Public Gate (at Baghdad), IX, 75.


Nisâ, XI–II, 117.

Nishapûr, capital of Khurasan, IX, 84, 86; X, 86, 93, 100, 111; XI–II, 105, 114–7, 129, 141; XIII–IV, 77; XV–VI, 77, 78.

Nisâbûn, IX, 92; X, 72.

North Africa. See Africa, North.

Nûr or Nûn, Wâdî, XV–VI, 49, 53.

Nu’mâniyâ, IX, 89.

Nun. See Nûl.

Oases (Wâhât), XIII–IV, 115–6.


Oman, XIII–IV, 87; XV–VI, 77, 85.

Onor (Hinawr), XIII–IV, 84.

Oran (Wâhrân), XV–VI, 43.

Palermo or Palerme (also Madina al-Šijûliya), XV–VI, 55–6.


Palmyra, IX, 58; XV–VI, 70.

Palmyra-Damascus route, XV–VI, 70.

Paphlagonia, XV–VI, 59.


Pazâdjik (Bazarjîjk), XV–VI, 57.

Pechina. See Badjîjâna.

Peloponnesus, XV–VI, 56.

Pelusium (Pâlûse), XIII–IV, 115.

Persia, IX, 60, 64, 91; X, 86–88, 91, 93; XI–II, 107, 123, 137; XIII–IV, 76, 92, 96, 110–1, 113; XV–VI, 74, 80; North Persia, XV–VI, 81, 82; South Persia, X, 94; XIII–IV, 109; South-Eastern Persia, XIII–IV, 117. See also vols. X, XI–II where Persia is surveyed province by province.

Persian Gulf, X, 71, 84, 100; XV–VI, 52.

Pesâvar, XV–VI, 81.

Portugal, XV–VI, 39.

Ptolemâis. See Tulmâitha.

Quilon (Kawlâm), XIII–IV, 84.

Rabî', fief of, IX, 80.

al-Rabib, IX, 78.

Râbîndjân, XI–II, 125.

Rabî‘i-Râshîdi, XI–II, 144.


Râdjân. See Arradjân.

Rabha al-Djâsir, IX, 78.

Râhâbnâ water-channel, X, 83.

Raisût, XIII–IV, 85, 87. See also Baghdad.

Râkšâda, XV–VI, 71.

Râmûmuz (Râmûz), X, 78.

Ramle (Ramla), Muslim capital of Palestine, XI–II, 143; XIII–IV, 114; XV–VI, 70, 85.

Râmûz. See Râmûmuz.

Râ’s al-‘Âm, IX, 92.

Râshîd. See Rosetta.


Red Sea, XIII–IV, 75; XV–VI, 84. See African coast of.

Reşht, X, 102.

Rhages. See Rayy.

al-Rîh, XIII–IV, 80.

Rîma‘, XIII–IV, 86.

Rîshahr, X, 89.

Roman Sea, XV–VI, 84, 85.

Roman towns, X, 72.

Rome. See Rûmiya.

Rosetta (Râshîd), X, 93.

Roumelia (of Fez), XV–VI, 51.

Round City (Baghdad), IX, 69, 78.

Rûdâsht. See Ruwaidâsht.

Rûdâr, XI–II, 110.

Rûdhân, X, 87.

Rûm (Byzantium or Asia Minor), X, 75–6, 94; XI–II, 105, 137, 138, 141, 144; XIII–IV, 88, 115–6; XV–VI, 45, 47, 50, 74, 77, 81, 83, 84, 85. See also Asia Minor.

Rûm, Sea of, XV–VI, 44. See Black Sea.

Rûmiya (Rome ?), XV–VI, 84.

Rûs (Russians), countries of, XI–II, 126; XIII–IV, 84, 102; XV–VI, 74. See Nahr al-Rûs, Russia.

Rûşâfâ (district of Baghdad), IX, 84.

Rûşâfâ (of Syria), XI–II, 139.

Russia, XV–VI, 74, 84. See also Rûs.
Ruyan, IX, 63; X, 91, 103–4.
Sabān, X, 95.
Sabība, XV–VI, 49.
Sabta. See Cœuta.
Sābir, X, 88.
Sacred Territory, XIII–IV, 112.
Ṣa’dī, XI–II, 102.
Ṣafākūs, XIII–IV, 101; XV–VI, 45, 49, 60, 61.
al-Ṣafāni, XIII–IV, 114.
Ṣaghāniyān, XV–VI, 75.
Ṣāghār (a town of the Deccan ?), XI–II, 137.
Ṣā’id (Upper Egypt), XIII–IV, 114–7.
Ṣakāḥā, or Ṣakḫā, XIII–IV, 106–7.
Ṣalā, or Sali, XV–VI, 53, 54.
Ṣalī. See Ṣalā.
Ṣalūmīḏ, XI–II, 120.
Ṣāmān, XIII–IV, 112; XV–VI, 76.
Ṣamānヌd, XIII–IV, 91, 106; XV–VI, 76.
Ṣamarkand, X, 90; XI–II, 125–6.
Ṣamarra, IX, 72; XI–II, 108.
Ṣamkuṣh (Samkaras ?), XV–VI, 85.
Ṣan Marco, XV–VI, 55.
Ṣan‘a, IX, 58; XI–II, 107, 117, 131; XIII–IV, 77, 80–2, 88; XV–VI, 52, 77.
Ṣandābūr. See Goa.
Ṣandjān, XI–II, 120.
Ṣanībūr, XIII–IV, 107.
Ṣantarem. See Shantarim.
Ṣarafand, XI–II, 143.
Ṣaragossa, XV–VI, 60.
Ṣarakhṣ, XI–II, 117.
Ṣārī, XI–II, 103.
Ṣarmin, XI–II, 141.
Ṣarsan, XV–VI, 75.
Ṣāva, XI–II, 110.
Ṣavast (Ṣiwa‘), XV–VI, 57.
Ṣawād, IX, 63, 69, 85.
Ṣawād (of Kufa), IX, 86, 88.
al-Ṣawwāda, XIII–IV, 114.
Ṣcoine, XI–II, 144.
Ṣeistan. See Siddjistan.
Ṣenegal, XV–VI, 54.
Ṣétif, XV–VI, 50.
Ṣeville (Ishbiliya), XV–VI, 34, 35, 36, 37, 53.
Ṣhadjūna, XV–VI, 35.
Ṣḥahrāstān, XI–II, 117.
Ṣḥahrazūr, X, 73; XI–II, 110.
Ṣḥahristān (of Bokhara), XI–II, 121.
Ṣḥāliyāt, XIII–IV, 84.
Ṣḥamkūr, X, 101.
Ṣḥantundaija. See Chinchilla.
Ṣḥantarim (Santarim), XV–VI, 60.
Ṣḥar’ab, XIII–IV, 85.
Ṣḥīḵ (Tashkent), XI–II, 127.
Ṣḥaṭ, XIII–IV, 88–9, 93–6, 98–9, 100; XV–VI, 37.
al-Ṣhaṭī, IX, 78.
Ṣḥawāshḵān, XI–II, 114.
al-Ṣḥihārūsūk, IX, 78.
Ṣḥiniz. See Siniz.
Ṣhiraz, X, 80, 86; XI–II, 99; XV–VI, 70.
Ṣḥirīn (district of), XIII–IV, 96.
Ṣḥirīnkūs, XIII–IV, 97.
Ṣḥirvan (province), X, 91, 101–2.
Ṣḥulair. See Sierra Nevada.
Ṣhusan (or Śūsan), X, 78.
Ṣḥustar, Śḥustar, or Tustar. See Tustar.
"Shutts," XV–VI, 43.
Ṣicily, X, 98; XV–VI, 45, 46, 55 seq.
Ṣidjīlmāsà, IX, 88; XV–VI, 35, 45, 52, 54, 75.
Ṣidjīštān (Seistan or Sistān), IX, 63; XI–II, 131, 133–5.
Sierra Nevada (Ṣḥulair), XV–VI, 38.
Ṣihām, XIII–IV, 86.
Ṣīmān, XI–II, 104.
Ṣīn, XV–VI, 84. See Cathay, China, etc.
Ṣīnd, IX, 63, 80; XI–II, 119, 134–5; XIII–IV, 80, 83; XV–VI, 81, 85.
Ṣīndjār, X, 72.
Ṣīnīz (Ṣḥiniz), X, 80–2, 84–5, 89.
Ṣinope, XV–VI, 59.
Ṣirāf, X, 80.
Ṣirdjān, XI–II, 132.
Ṣis (of Armenia), XV–VI, 57.
Ṣistān. See Siddjistan.
Ṣiwās. See Savast.
Slav country, XV–VI, 74, 84, 85.
Slav Sea, XV–VI, 85.
Ṣmynrna (Smyrne), IX, 64; X, 104.
Ṣogdiana. See Ṣughd (province).
Ṣokotra, XIII–IV, 87.
Ṣomaliland (Italian), XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 103.
Ṣpain, IX, 55, 57–59, 61, 81, 91: X, 97; XI–II, 113, 118; XIII–IV, 100, 110; XV–VI, 29 seq., 41, 43, 46, 60, 63, 70, 75, 85. See Andalus.
Ṣūdān (the Blacks), XV–VI, 41.
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Suez (al-Suways), XIII–IV, 80, 83, 101.
Şughar. See Zughar.
Şughd province (Sogdiana), XI–II, 121.
Şughd River, XI–II, 125.
Şuhār, XIII–IV, 79.
Şuhül or Şuhulā, XIII–IV, 80, 85.
Sūk al-Bazzāzin, IX, 83; XI–II, 108.
Sūk Fānsūr, XV–VI, 54.
Sūk Fikrūr, XV–VI, 54.
Sūk al-Khila'iyyin, XIII–IV, 106.
Sūk al-Kumāš (of Tunis), XV–VI, 48.
Sūk al-Tair, IX, 78.
Sūk al-Thalātha, IX, 83.
Sūk al-ʿIrāzīyyin, XV–VI, 55.
Sūk of Yāhūyā, IX, 78.
Sūltānlīya (in India), XV–VI, 81.
Sūltānlīya (Mongol capital of Persia, etc.), IX, 78–
80; XI–II, 110.
Sunbāt, XIII–IV, 106.
Şūr. See Tyre.
Surt, XV–VI, 43.
Sūs (of Khuzistan), X, 71–3, 75–6, 77; XI–II, 144;
XIII–IV, 83, 92, 111; XV–VI, 76, 77, 78; for
note on identification of Sūs of Khuzistan,
and Sūs of the Maghreb, XV–VI, 48.
Sūs (Sūsan, or al-Sūs al-ʿĀṣā, of the Maghreb),
XIII–IV, 83, 111; XV–VI, 47, 48, 50, 53,
55, 85.
al-Sūs al-ʿĀṣā. See Sūs of the Maghreb.
Sūsā. See Sūs.
Sūsan. See Shushan.
al-Ṣūt, XIII–IV, 80.
Al-Suwais. See Suez.
Syria (Ṣhām or Ṣhāʾm), IX, 57, 61, 84, 92; X, 82,
99; XI–II, 102, 123, 138–145; XIII–IV, 79, 87,
93, 107, 113; XV–VI, 34, 46, 49, 50, 57, 77, 82.
See Fu-lin.
Syrian coast, XV–VI, 71.
Syrian Sea, XIII–IV, 114.
Tabaristan, IX, 63–4; X, 88, 91, 101–2; XI–II,
98–104, 105, 113, 121, 134; XV–VI, 83, 84.
Tabar naš (Wadi), XV–VI, 38.
Tabas Gilaki, XI–II, 120.
Tabasain, XI–II, 120.
Tabras, XV–VI, 49.
Tabriz, IX, 84; X, 88, 95, 99; XI–II, 116, 144.
Tādāla, XV–VI, 53.
Tāḥart, XV–VI, 52.
Tāʾizz, XIII–IV, 79, 84; district of, XIII–IV, 85.
Tāḫ-ši Bustān, IX, 58.
Takrūr (Toucoulour), XV–VI, 64.
Tānā. See Tannah.
Tanais (the Don), XV–VI, 85.
Tanais. See Tenes.
Tanđa. See Tangier.
Tangier (Tanđa), XV–VI, 85.
Tannah (Tānā), XIII–IV, 84; XV–VI, 80.
Tāntāla, XV–VI, 38.
Tārābulus. See Tripoli of North Africa.
Tarsus, XI–II, 144.
Tartary, XI–II, 145. See Turks, Turkish lands, etc.
Tārum, X, 81–2, 86, 96; XV–VI, 70.
Ta-Shi countries, XV–VI, 80.
Tashkent. See Šāhāb.
Taurīz. See Tabrīz.
Tawāwīs, XI–II, 125.
Tawwadīj (or Tawwaz), X, 80–4; XV–VI, 77.
Tawwaz. See Tawwadīj.
Tawzar, XV–VI, 45.
Techo-Pi, XV–VI, 82.
Tenes (Tanas), XV–VI, 43.
Thebes, XV–VI, 51, 56.
Thiouen-tcheou-fou (Zaitūn), XI–II, 137; XV–
VI, 82.
Thunes (Tunis), XV–VI, 44.
Tīb, IX, 88–90; XI–II, 117.
Tiberias, XI–II, 142.
Tīb, IX, 80; X, 75; XV–VI, 81; Little Tīb,
XV–VI, 83.
Tīdijika, XV–VI, 54.
Tiifis, X, 101, 103–4.
Tigris, IX, 78, 80, 82–3; XV–VI, 83 seq., 85.
Tigris district (Kūra Didja), IX, 88.
Tihāma, coast of, XIII–IV, 84.
Tīlaḵān. See Tālīḵān.
Tīlimsān (Tlemcen), XV–VI, 48, 50.
Tinnis, IX, 64, 75, 81; X, 71, 74, 82, 86; XI–II,
113, 141; XIII–IV, 88–9, 93, 95–101, 106, 113,
115–6.
Nahr Tirā, X, 78.
Tirāz (a quarter of Merv), XI–II, 115.
Tlemcen. See Tīlimsān.
Toldeo (Tulaitala), XV–VI, 40, 75.
Toucoulour. See Takrūr.
Tovin. See Dabil.
Transoxiana, IX, 55, 63; X, 90; XI–II, 121–7;
XV–VI, 74, 75, 82, 85.
Trebizond (Tarabazunda), X, 94.
Tripo. See Tripoli of Syria.
Tripoli of North Africa (Tarabulus), XV–VI, 44.
Tripoli of Syria, XI–II, 144.
Ţubna, XV–VI, 50.
Tudela, XV–VI, 51, 70.
Tughuzghuz, XV–VI, 73, 74, 77, 85.
Ţulaţala. See Toledo.
Ţulas, XV–VI, 75.
Ţúlim, X, 102.
Tulmaiţha (Ptolemais), XIII–IV, 101; XV–VI, 43.
Tûn, XI–II, 120.
Tûna, XIII–IV, 89, 94, 98–9, 100.
Tûnis (Thunes), IX, 57, 84; XV–VI, 43, 44, 48, 49, 61.
Ţûrak (perhaps Turân), XV–VI, 45.
Turân. See Ţurak.
Turcomania, XV–VI, 57.
Turkestan, XI–II, 105, 127; XV–VI, 81; Farthest T., XV–VI, 75.
Turkish lands, XI–II, 120; XV–VI, 82.
Turks, land of, XV–VI, 59, 75.
Turquie (Turkey), X, 104; XI–II, 109; XV–VI, 57 seq.
Ţurţçiz, XI–II, 120.
Ţûs, IX, 88–9; XI–II, 117.
Tustar, or Šustar, IX, 73, 83; X, 71–5, 77; XI–II, 141; XIII–IV, 92, 110; XV–VI, 76, 77; Great Weir of T., X, 76.
Tustariya Quarter (Baghdad), IX, 83.
Ţuwâna, X, 72.
Tyre (Şûr), XI–II, 142.
Ubulla, IX, 90; XV–VI, 77, 85.
Ujda. See Waţida.
‘Ukâz, XIII–IV, 77, 82, 88.
Upper Egypt. See Egypt, Upper, and Şa’id.
Urûdûbâd, X, 101, 103.
Ustuwe, XI–II, 117.

Van (Wân), Lake, X, 97.
Varâmin, XI–II, 110.
Vartân (Warthân), X, 101, 103.
Volga (Itîl, or Nahr al-Rûs, or Artîhâ, q.v.), X, 101; XV–VI, 74.

Wâbdîhâr, wrong reading for Widhâr (q.v.), XI–II, 126.
Wâdî Kabir (at Fez), XV–VI, 51.
Wadjda, XV–VI, 49, 52.
Waţât. See Oases.
Wahran. See Oran.
Walashjîrd, XI–II, 134.
Wân. See Van Lake.
Wârâ, XIII–IV, 114.
al-Wârida, XIII–IV, 114.
Warthân. See Vartân.
Wâshjîrd, XI–II, 127; XV–VI, 75.
Wâsît, IX, 75, 80; X, 73, 78, 96; XI–II, 107.
Western Sea, XV–VI, 85.
Widhâr, XI–II, 125.
Wisû (the Finns ?), XV–VI, 74.
Wurut (Yurt), XV–VI, 85.

Xatîva, XV–VI, 39.

Yahûdiya (citadel of Isfâhan), X, 108.
Yemen Sea, XV–VI, 61.
Yerara, XV–VI, 52.
Yurt. See Wurut.

Zabdîcena. See Djazira ibn ‘Umar.
Zabîd, XIII–IV, 80, 83–6; Bâb Zabîd, XIII–IV, 95.
Zabîd, Wâdî, XIII–IV, 86.
Zafâr (or Žufâr), XIII–IV, 83, 85, 87; XV–VI, 77.
al-Zâhir (garden of, a place in Baghdad), IX, 78.
Zaitûn. See Thsiouen-tchéou-fou.
Zâlikân, XI–II, 134.
Zaranjî, XI–II, 134.
Zarinröðb (or Nahr Zarin Rûdî), XI–II, 108.
Zârkân, X, 89.
Zâva, XI–II, 120.
Zawila (or Zuwaila), XV–VI, 44.
Zereen. See Jezreel.
Zirkûb, XI–II, 120.
Zughar (or Šuqhar), XI–II, 143.
Zuhairiya Quarter (of Baghdad), XV–VI, 76.
Zuwaila. See Zawila.
Zûzan, XI–II, 120.
3. TECHNICAL TERMS

'abā' (coverlets), XI-II, 109.
'abā'a (cloaks), IX, 63.
al-ābā', X, 88.
abā'ī garments, X, 99.
'Abbadāni mats, X, 89.
Abdān (linen garments), X, 101.
'Abīdī (of robes), XV-VI, 52. See Şa'idī.
abrihon. See ibrism.
abrişim. See ibrism.
Abū Kalamān. See Bu'akalamān.
'Adānī, IX, XIII-IV, 82.
'Adāniyāt (Yemen cloaks), XI-II, 106.
'ādhaba (trailing end of turban), XV-VI, 48.
Ādxār-šust, XI-II, 100.
aghšiya (awnings), XIII-IV, 92.
ahlāk (hand-woven fabrics), XIII-IV, 83.
akfān (shrouds), IX, 71.
akğbîya (tents), XI-II, 125, 127.
akşūn (satin), IX, 71.
'alam (border, ornamented border), IX, 67; X, 93; XIII-IV, 92, 99, 115; (badge), IX, 72; XIII-IV, 99; (standard), IX, 71, 74; black standards with name of Caliph in white, IX, 75; bā 'alam, XV-VI, 55. See dastār.
alcatifas. See al-kaṭīfa.
'amāl Başinnā, X, 77. See mimmā 'umil.
'amāl al-Šakali (Sicilian manufacture), X, 98.
'amāma. See 'imāma.
Amrī cloth (called Arandj), XI-II, 130.
'amma. See tirāz.
amšāh (rendered as camel hair, perhaps pl. of mиш, q.v.), XI-II, 104.
'anbārī (perfumed with ambergris), XV-VI, 33.
Andgājī (cloth), X, 93.
Anteqāya (red stuff), XI-II, 138.
عر. See mar'azz.
عرتقم, XIII-IV, 89.
'araqiyāt (cotton caps), XI-II, 102.
arandj (a colored stuff), XI-II, 129, 130; =Amrī cloth, XI-II, 130.
arde (background), XV-VI, 82.
Arđjākna (a dye), XV-VI, 50.
Armanī (stuff), IX, 58; X, 93, 94, 95, 96; XIII-IV, 109; red Armanī made for al-Mutawakkil, XIII-IV, 112; Armanīya (a kind of carpet), X, 92; al-mankūsha al-Armānīya (fabrics embroidered in colors, figured stuffs), X, 93; XV-VI, 78; Armanī mahfūr (carpets with a raised pattern), X, 95; al-mar'azzā al-kirmizi al-Armānī-al-
banafaşiji (violet), XIII–IV, 96.
banbüzü (stuffs), XI–II, 117.
banikat (capes ornamented at the neck), XI–II, 127. bâ-rang. See ibrisşim.
bârânî (raincoats), XI–II, 103.
bardha', or bardha'a (pl., bârâdhi', cushions, horsecloths, saddlecloths, mattress), IX, 68; X, 75, 91.
barrakân (pl., ât, camelot), IX, 56, 88; X, 97; (black mantles), IX, 80; camelot mantle inscribed with name of Kurd Fannâkhbûrû, X, 86; al-aksiya al-barrakanât (camelot robes), X, 88; with a tirâz-border, IX, 88.
Başî stuffs, XV–VI, 44.
Başî. See muşallâ 'witâ'.
bayâd (white material), XI–II, 137.
bazz (cloth), IX, 90; X, 72, 76, 77, 80; XI–II, 106, 109, 110, 111, 142; XIII–IV, 87, 115, 118, 120, 121; XV–VI, 37, 40, 80; trade in, X, 98.
bazzâz (cloth seller), IX, 80; (cloth makers), XI–II, 115; (cloth merchants), XI–II, 130.
bistâr (mattress), X, 76.
bitâna (pl, baťa'în, linings), XI–II, 132; of fur, IX, 77. See mušâtaan.
boucassins. See Bûghâšî.
Bûghâšî, IX, 92.
Bûkâlamûn, X, 70; XIII–IV, 95, 96, 97, 98, 115; XV–VI, 59, 60, 76, 77; resembles peacock's feathers, XIII–IV, 96. See Kûlamûnî.
bûkduja (packet), XIII–IV, 102.
Bunduqî (white cloth = Venetian cloth), XI–II, 137; XIII–IV, 85.
Bûnî (type of şarb), XIII–IV, 98.
burd (pl. âbîrad or burûd, cloaks, mantles, but usually as striped cloaks, or stuffs), IX, 90; X, 80, 88, 100; XI–II, 106, 109, 111, 117, 129; XIII–IV, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 85, 86, 88, 93; XV–VI, 66, 77; discussed, XIII–IV, 76; XV–VI, 66; black and red striped burd, XIII–IV, 85; Funduqî burd, XI–II, 121; burd mufâwawû, XIII–IV, 79; burd muşhâṭat, XIII–IV, 83; burd Râzî (robes of Rayy), XI–II, 106; burd-i-Yâmání, XIII–IV, 83; dîjâna-yi-burd (striped stuffs), X, 98; burd = şamla, XIII–IV, 76. See hîbra.
burkû' (veil), X, 100.
burnoose. See burnus.
burnus (upper cloak), XIII–IV, 89; XV–VI, 41, 54.
Bursî stuffs, IX, 86.
Bûrtâsiya (fox furs), XV–VI, 75.
busuût (large carpets), XIII–IV, 112.
buzbûst (goat skin), XI–II, 129.
caftans, XV–VI, 75.
çatr (= mizalla), IX, 80.
cherhafe. See şa'râbâf.
çîkàn (cloth), XI–II, 137.
cramoisy. See kirmizi.
çüll (or çüllwâri), XI–II, 109.
çüllwâri. See çüll.
Dabîki, IX, 68, 71, 72, 82; X, 74, 82, 84, 103; XI–II, 129, 137; XIII–IV, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 105, 110, 111, 113; XV–VI, 37, 78; brocade of, XIII–IV, 97; carpeting of, XIII–IV, 93; Dabîki stunts kept for the use of al-Mu'tâdîd, X, 75; tents of, XIII–IV, 96. 'Attâbî D., IX, 81; XIII–IV, 91; XV–VI, 76; D. mudhâbah, XIII–IV, 92; D. muşhmal (for Dabîki wa-muşhmal, ?) XIII–IV, 113; muşhmal (velvet pile) of D., XIII–IV, 112; musmata Dabîkiya, XV–VI, 78; D. mutâraza, XIII–IV, 92; D. Mutawakkil, IX, 72; mûthâla'th (triple) D., XIII–IV, 109; al-şarb al-khâs al-Dabîkî, IX, 74; D. Şustari, X, 73, 74; D. robe of Şustar, XIII–IV, 92; D. şuqârî (red D.), X, 73; XIII–IV, 91; XV–VI, 76; shirt of şuqârî D., XIII–IV, 92; al-şikâk al-Dabîkîya al-şuqârîät (pieces of red D. stuff), X, 93; şütür (awnings) of D., X, 100; al-Dabîkî al-tâmîm al-mudhâbah (gold Dabîki brocade), XIII–IV, 113. See also kôm, mikrama, namat, sarawîl, şütür.
Dabîkiya, XIII–IV, 96.
Dabîzi, XV–VI, 57.
Dabîkawi, XIII–IV, 91; XV–VI, 76.
dâ'îr (border), XIII–IV, 115.
dâklâk (cloth beater), XV–VI, 36, 65.
dâlah (weasel fur), XI–II, 129. See dâlah.
dâlah (stout fur), IX, 70.
djäma (cloth, robes, stuffs, textiles), IX, 71; X, 76, 80; XI–II, 115, 123; XIII–IV, 91; dast djäma-yi-khäs (set of royal robes), XIII–IV, 95; djäma-hä-yi-farsık (carpet stuffs), XI–II, 134; djäma-yi-imäri (covers for litters), XIII–IV, 96; djäma-yi-rangin (stuffs of various colors), X, 98; djäma-unvän (parade dress), XI–II, 123. See busr.

Djannah, X, 84; XV–VI, 78; kerchiefs (mindil), X, 81.
djarkawät (?) military tents), XIII–IV, 113.
Djarrâda (locust, a dyestuff), XV–VI, 63, 71.
djawrab (pl. djawârib, stockings), XI–II, 110; XV–VI, 77, 78.
djawi (nut color), XV–VI, 48, 61.
djihat (directions, on a carpet), XV–VI, 53.

Djindjâli. See waṭâ'.
djism (body), XV–VI, 65.
djîtr (umbrella), XI–II, 104. See čitr, mizâalla.
dî nawi (of flax), XV–VI, 68.
djull (pl. djüll, coverings), X, 75; (horse rugs), X, 100; (saddlecloths for elephants), XIII–IV, 112.
djülsâb al-khass (beaver skins), XV–VI, 74, 75.
Djurdjâni (stuffs), XV–VI, 33, 34.
djuvâl (sacks), X, 103.
djuzz (stuff), XI–II, 137.
dodîaz, X, 87.
dü-chanbari (two-circle cloth ?), XI–II, 137.
dûd al-harîf (silkworm), XV–VI, 39.
dûd or dûd al-każ (silkworm), X, 95, 96, 98; account of, XV–VI, 62; raising of, X, 102.
dukhûnîya (smoke-colored). See ghlâla. 
dûrank (bi-colored), IX, 88. See darânik, dûrnûk.
dûrnûk, IX, 88. See dûrank.
dusût (cushions), XV–VI, 76.
dû-tarâh. See târah.
duwâdi (pl. dwâwâdi, cloak, cover, mantle), IX, 75; XV–VI, 73, 75.
fâshir (name applied to ‘Attâbi), XV–VI, 34.
fanak (desert-fox or marten furs), IX, 70; XI–II, 129, 139; XV–VI, 32, 33, 73, 75.
farađi (for farâbî), X, 87.
faraẖ, X, 86, 87.
faraẖa (to upholster), XIII–IV, 92.
fardjiya (overmantle, loose robe), IX, 77; XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 103.
farrâ (furrier), IX, 73; XV–VI, 65.
See ḍjâma, fursj, Ṭabarî.
Farwā ba-ḥār (hair of camel), IX, 88.
Fāzā (tent with two poles), XIII–IV, 113.
Fîraḏ (furs), XI–II, 121; al-fîraḏ al-kîbâşţî (sheep-skin furs), XV–VI, 73.
Fîraḏ (sleeping mats), XIII–IV, 79; fîraḏ markûm maţmûţ (striped and knotted carpet), IX, 65.
Fîrind (figured cloth), XV–VI, 82.
Fundûk al-kattān (linen store), XV–VI, 46.
Fundûkî. See Burd.
Furş (cloths, coverings, carpets, furnishings, textiles for upholstery, etc.), IX, 64, 67, 68, 86, 88, 91, 92; X, 73, 91; XI–II, 100, 129; XIII–IV, 107, 108; XV–VI, 37, 77, 78; kîtâ fursj, IX, 63; fursj wa-busût (carpets and rugs), IX, 88; bisât va-fursj, X, 80; fursj al-Khîlâfî, IX, 74; furş al-kîrmîzî (upholstery dyed with kîrmîzî), XIII–IV, 109; furş al-Rabî‘ (spring furnishings), XI–II, 99.
Furş (upholstery), X, 86.
Fuvwâ (madhîr), X, 101, 102; XI–II, 126, 127; XIII–IV, 84; XV–VI, 63, 71.

Gandijî cloth, X, 101.
Ghafrā (hat, headdress, or mantle), XV–VI, 52, 66. Ghâmar. See mandîl.
Ghâşţiyâ, IX, 80.
Ghâţ (thread), XIII–IV, 47, 66; of Yemen, XIII–IV, 79.
Ghazl al-dibâbî (gold weaving), IX, 77.
hašb (cotton), X, 83.

havashîl (soft skins), XV–VI, 73, 74. See index No. 3.

hazm al-khâil (girths), XI–II, 124.

hîbara (striped cloths), XV–VI, 80.


hisbahâ (making of padded garments), XV–VI, 65.

hiyâsa (waist belt), XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 103.

hušb (fringes), XV–VI, 65.

hulla (pl. ĥulâl, cloaks, mantles, striped cloaks, striped robes), IX, 63, 64; X, 80, 88; XI–II, 107, 108, 116; XIII–IV, 75, 76, 77, 80, 82, 94, 97, 98, 108; XV–VI, 33, 34, 36, 37, 77; green cloaks, X, 75; of Nadjîrân, IX, 63, 85; price of, XIII–IV, 96; huLLa ‘Adâniya, XIII–IV, 82; huLLa væfât yama니ya muwasbshâ (cloak of cotton embroidered), XIII–IV, 79; huLLa mùdâhâbba (gold-embroidered cloak), XIII–IV, 111; huLLal muwasbshâ (of figured silk), XV–VI, 33; al-huLLal al-mawisbshiyâ (of figured silk), XV–VI, 36.


ibrisñhim (dîama-yî, silk textiles), of two varieties, yak rang (with one color), and bâ-rang (with several colors), X, 102.

ibrism-silk, IX, 60, 63, 81, 85; X, 72, 78, 80, 81, 86, 93, 96, 100, 102, 104, 110; XI–II, 100, 104, 105, 107, 108, 111, 113, 114, 115, 121; XIII–IV, 79, 101; XV–VI, 38, 50, 83, 84; described, XV–VI, 65; exported, X, 100; origin of, XI–II, 113; raised, X, 100; trouserrods of, X, 93; Libâdji ibrisñhim-silk, X, 102. See düd, ibrisñhim, ibrisñhim, parda, sutûr, tikka.

ibrisñhimyät (thîyäb), IX, 82.

îdrîdî (red silk), X, 75. See tâdrîdî. Hrânîdîjî (European, of brocade (diîbâ)), X, 98.

îhlîdî (myroblan), XIII–IV, 84.

ihtn (striped wool), XIII–IV, 114.

îhrâm, XIII–IV, 88.

îhrâms (cloth wrappers), XI–II, 141.

îm mâma (or ‘amâmâ, pl. ‘amâ‘im, turban), IX, 67, 77, 81, 90; X, 73, 74, 76; XI–II, 115, 117, 131, 137; XIII–IV, 79, 89; XV–VI, 48, 77; green t., X, 75; silk t., IX, 75; of haffi Shâhidjânî, XI–II, 116; maftûla (of twisted silk), XV–VI, 63; of Merv. XI–II, 114; mùdâhâbba, XV–VI, 50. See mu’lama.

îmâri. See dijama.

îsâba (kind of turban), XV–VI, 67; ‘asâ ‘ib man-kušha mùdâhâbba (turbans embroidered in colors and gold), XI–II, 117.

îsîbâgh (isatis tinctoria), XV–VI, 51.

îsibâgh, XIII–IV, 93.

îsparhuïn ûrbâri (brisat), XI–II, 99.


istabraq (brocade), XIII–IV, 108.

izâr (variously rendered as loidnths, women’s cloaks, men’s trousers, veils for women, but probably simply lengths of cloth used for such purposes), IX, 81, 92; X, 78, 89, 93; XI–II, 127; XV–VI, 52, 78; izâr Rashidi, X, 93. See lubûd.

joula. See cûlâ.

kabá’ (pl. akbîya, variously rendered as cloak, gown, robe, but might be best rendered as tunic), IX, 71, 76; XI–II, 115, 124, 126, 142; XIII–IV, 103; XV–VI, 49, 67, 83; Baalbak k., XI–II, 141; yellow Herat k. (k. Harawi aśfar), XI–II, 118; Khûrassâni k., XI–II, 111; Khûvarizmian k., XI–II, 137; Tabrizi k., X, 100.

kabá-yi-darâ’î (tunic of silk of various colors), XI–II, 123. See kabâ’.

Kaisî (garments), XIII–IV, 107.

kâyûm (woof), XV–VI, 64.

kâshum (ermine, = k mâk m?), IX, 77; XV–VI, 73, 74, 75; (weasel skins), XI–II, 129.


Kalâmûni (cloth), XIII–IV, 111, 112; (furnishings), XIII–IV, 98.


kâlî (carpets), name discussed, X, 97; kâlî-hâ-yî-malîfûrî (carpets “in relief”), XI–II, 102. See zilû.

Kali’i. See kisâ’.

kâlib (mold), XV–VI, 30.

kaliça, X, 87.

kalechey. See kaliça.

Kalawta. See kalawta.

Kalûsîniya (name of stuff), XV–VI, 39.

kand (action de donner le cati, bleaching), XV–VI, 45, 64.

kâmîs (blouse, shirt), IX, 69; X, 74, 76, 84, 85; XIII–IV, 91; XV–VI, 67, 78; Bukharan k., XI–II, 125; of Khi, XI–II, 119.
kamkẖā (silk stuff, perhaps Chinese silk), IX, 84; discussed, X, 100; XI–II, 137; XIII–IV, 103; described, XV–VI, 82; (velvet), XI–II, 116; (pl. kawāṁikẖ ?), X, 100; (= kamkẖān ?), X, 100. See kamkẖān.

kamkẖān, IX, 84; X, 100; worn by Zuṭṣ, X, 100; =kamkẖā, X, 100. See kamkẖā.

Kanbātì (shoes), XV–VI, 78, 79, 81.

kanbūṣh. See kunbūṣh.

kandjī (stuff of silk and cotton), XIII–IV, 103; read for Ḫn dīj, XV–VI, 32.

karāćur (belt), XI–II, 123.

karbās. See kirbās.

Kardāwānī (a stuff), X, 89. See Kardūwānī.

Kardūwānī, XIII–IV, 113. See Kardāwānī.

kārgāh (factories), of Şōbūst, X, 75.


carzan (headdress), XV–VI, 67.

cāšāb (linen, or a linen stuff decorated with gold or silver), IX, 71, 90, 92; X, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 93; XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 79, 80, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 103, 105, 108; XV–VI, 52, 76, 77, 78; white ƙ., XIII–IV, 95; yellow ƙ., X, 82; cāšāb asfar wałaybād (gold and silver thread), XV–VI, 64; cāšāb muddahhab (gold-spangled linen), XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 103; al-cāšāb al-shārīb, XV–VI, 78; Bahlkī ƙ., XIII–IV, 98; see tirāzi.

Kassī (= Qassīah or Qessīah), XIII–IV, 113, 114, 115; Kassī stuffs (Kassīyāt), XI–II, 106; = al-Kazzī, XIII–IV, 114; disapproved by traditionists, XIII–IV, 115.

kātam (variety of henna), XV–VI, 70.

kāṭāriāf (silk ?), XV–VI, 63.

kāṭīfā (pl. kuṭūf, velvet), IX, 67, 103; XIII–IV, 113; = al-κaτīfās, X, 87; Iraq velvets (kuṭūf al-Sawādī), XI–II, 108; kuṭūf Sawādīya, IX, 86; Byzantine (Rūmī) ƙ., XV–VI, 76.

kattān (linen or flax), IX, 65, 85; X, 80, 85, 88, 89, 90, 94, 95, 101; XI–II, 102, 144; XIII–IV, 83, 84, 94; XV–VI, 48, 49, 52, 68, 84; read for k hān, XI–II, 144; Alexandre ƙ., IX, 85; Crimean linen (kattān-i Kimrī), XV–VI, 137; of Egypt, IX, 65; Rūmī linen, X, 94; Bašra al-Kattān, XV–VI, 53; Dār al-Kattān (linen warehouse), tax on, XIII–IV, 105.

Kattānnīn (cotton dealers), XV–VI, 55.

kawrāḏā (al-Mahābīs, XIII–IV, 87.

kəzāgānd (quilted garments), XI–II, 129.

Kazerunī (cloth) or Kāzīrūnī, X, 82, 83.


Kāzīrūnī. See Kazerunī.

kəzazz (silk), IX, 72, 87, 92; X, 72, 76, 81, 86; XI–II, 105, 113, 114, 115, 116, 121, 125, 143; XIII–IV, 77, 82, 92; XV–VI, 33, 37, 67, 78, 79; Dār al-Kazz (House of Silk), IX, 78, 83; ḥarār al-kazz, XV–VI, 63. See also dūd, miḳnā.

kəzzāz (silk manufacturer), XI–II, 136.

al-Kazzī. See al-Kāsī.

Kḥābīṣ (stuff), XIII–IV, 77.


kḥaṣ (coarse, heavy cloth), IX, 74, 78, 80; XI–II, 98, 102; XIII–IV, 107; used for tents, X, 78; manaḏīl kh. (napkins of coarse cloth), XI–II, 102. See ḥīṣḥ.

khiyāt (tailor), IX, 69, 73; XI–II, 119.

kẖāl, XIII–IV, 85.


kẖanāṣı (shirt), IX, 67.

kẖamīl kāṣīr (short pile), IX, 88; kẖamīl al-maṇādīl (piles of towels), IX, 88.

kẖarād, to be read kẖazz, X, 76.

kẖārgāhāt (pavilions), XV–VI, 41. See below.

kẖarkāḥāt (tents), X, 86. See above.

kẖāṣḥḵẖāṣḥ (poppy colored, of fir ād), XI–II, 129.

kẖās (royal stuff ?), XIII–IV, 111. See Dabiḳī, ḵiswa, tirāzī, tirāzī.

Kẖaṭṭāʾi (Chinese stuff), X, 99; XIII–IV, 103.

kẖāṭām (checks), XV–VI, 32.

kẖatt (pl. kẖuṭtūṭ, stripes), IX, 81; XIII–IV, 76, 79, 96.

kẖaẓẓāʾīn (of dībāḏ), IX, 64.

kẖazbūṣ (beaver skins), XI–II, 129. See below.

kẖazz (beaver skins), XV–VI, 75; (translated silk, but better, beaver skins), XV–VI, 83. See dījūlād al-kẖazz, khazbūṣ.

kẖazz-silk (pl. kẖuzzāz), IX, 68, 72, 75, 78, 85, 86, 90, 91; X, 71, 72, 75, 76, 80, 86, 88, 91, 92, 102; XI–II, 113, 141; XIII–IV, 88, 91, 92, 103; XV–VI, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 48, 60, 61, 65, 67, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79; (red silk), XIII–IV, 79, 94; Dāʾfārī kẖ., IX, 91; Maṭḥrībī kẖ., XIII–IV, 111; maḵṭūṭ (cut) kẖ., XV–VI, 32; Manṣūrī, IX, 70; muḳlūṭi (kingly), X, 76; al-kẖazz al-sakk (close-woven), XV–VI, 37; tākī, IX, 78. See dībāḏī, Dāʾfārī, mabsūṭ, miṭrāf, mulham, sunnā, ṭāḳīla.

kẖazzāzūn (silk makers), IX, 81.

kẖazz-rāḵm, or al-kẖazz-rāḵm (striped silk), IX, 67, 74; X, 73, 91; kẖazz wa-rāḵm, IX, 74. See rāḵm.

kẖīḍr (curtains), XIII–IV, 114.
marquum (inscribed), XIII–IV, 100. See firash.
nartaba (divan), XIII–IV, 111, 112.
masnagh. See milaff.
masnaga (combed flax), XV–VI, 68.
masufi'a. See miszar.
masikh (fringed), XIII–IV, 92. See hâshiya.
maskul (light, applied to naşfi), XIII–IV, 103.
masûr (compressed, close-woven, for maḵšur), XIII–IV, 93; XV–VI, 47, 55.
matâ' (base, material), X, 81; (cloth), XIII–IV, 77, 112; (a Daibuli stuff), XV–VI, 80; (stuff of Yemen), IX, 63.
matmûm. See firash, ūmīm.
mawshiyya. See hulla.
mawzûn (gold-embroidered, of linen), XIII–IV, 94. Merv. See Marv.
mîḏjar (silken veil), XIII–IV, 111; (veils), XV–VI, 33, 34; (black veils), XV–VI, 78.
mifra' (linen shirt), XI–II, 100, 102.
mîḏzal (distaff), XV–VI, 62.
mîḏšâ (pl. maḏash, padded garments, stuffs), XV–VI, 31, 65.
mîḏ, or maḏ (pl. maḏiḏ, cushion, pillow), X, 81, 95, 96, 98; Tustari cushions, XV–VI, 76; Tustar seats (but probably better cushions), X, 72. See Armani.
miḵrâḏi (cut, slashed, shorn ?), IX, 71.
miḵrâm (red wool cloth), X, 95. See miḵrâma.
miḵrâma (Decke), XIII–IV, 83; (striped linen stuff = sitâra), XIII–IV, 112; of Dabîk, XIII–IV, 93; miḵrâma dibâdī hamrâ (mankusha) (embroidered red cloth of brocade), XIII–IV, 93. milâf mašbuah (dyed blanket), XV–VI, 40.
milhaf or milhaç (pl. malâhif, cover, coverlet, mantle, blankets or quilts), IX, 81; X, 73; XV–VI, 31, 32; Baghdad cloths for horses, in Spain, IX, 81.
mîmnâ 'umil bi-Brînînâ (written on Wâṣît curtains), X, 78.
mindil. See Dînâmbî, mandîl.
miṣâdî (pl. manâṣâdî, loom), IX, 82; XIII–IV, 109; XV–VI, 64.
miṣgâfa (towel), XIII–IV, 98.
miṇtaq (girdle), XV–VI, 67.
mîrdân (spindle), XV–VI, 63.
mîrîfâ (pl. marâfîk, pillow), XI–II, 103; XV–VI, 67. See Armani.
mîrîz. See mar'ažz.
mîṣgâna (red saddle felt), XV–VI, 68.
mîṣhaddât (women's belts or pieces of stuff rolled round turban), X, 102.
mîškî (musk-colored, scented), XV–VI, 66.
misnâd (couch, cushion, pillow), IX, 62; X, 96; XIII–IV, 107, 112; XV–VI, 84.
mîswâr (cushion or leather pillow), X, 96; XIII–IV, 83, 112.
mîthkâlî (iya) (cloths weighing a mîthkâl ?), X, 80; XI–II, 117.
mîṭrâf (cloak, robe), IX, 69, 91; X, 75; XI–II, 102; XIII–IV, 94; XV–VI, 32, 67, 78, 79; of khazz, IX, 69.
mîṭrâ (pl. maṭârîh, carpet), IX, 88; XI–II, 142; XV–VI, 76, 77. See Armani, tarrâhâ.
mîzâalla (pl. mazâll, ceremonial umbrella), XIII–IV, 99, 105; (= ۰۹۸٤٢), IX, 80.
mîţâr (pl. maʿāzîr, variously rendered, cloaks for women, mantle, shirt, waist cloths, wrappings, but probably pieces of cloth used for these purposes), X, 102; XI–II, 100, 102; XIII–IV, 114; XV–VI, 53; maʿâzîr masafū'a (lined (?) mantles), XV–VI, 40.
moloχînê, XIII–IV, 76.
mônachê, XIII–IV, 75.
Moncavar, XV–VI, 59.
Mosolins (cloth of gold and silver), IX, 92.
mu'a'iyab (read mu'a'iyan), XV–VI, 34.
mu'a'iyan (stuff marked with circles, with patterns of circles, with an eye pattern), XI–II, 134; XIII–IV, 113; XV–VI, 66, 67; (read for mu'attab), IX, 63; (read for mu'a'iyab), XV–VI, 34; harir m. (silk embroidered with circles), XV–VI, 78; sutür mu'a'iyana mu'lama (curtains with round circles and badges), X, 81.
mu'allama (with borders, badges), XIII–IV, 98; mu'allama (bordered with gold), XV–VI, 52. See mu'lama.
mub'aiyâd (bleacher), XIII–IV, 116.
mubattan (lined with gold), XIII–IV, 113; (lined with fur), XV–VI, 73, 75.
mubattânât (linings), XV–VI, 78; of soft Kühî, VI–II, 119.
mubram (pl. mabârim, twisted, silk, stuff, textile), X, 102; XI–II, 105, 118.
mudabbab (embroidered with lizards ?), XIII–IV, 113.
mudabbadî (brocaded), IX, 86; (of a ta'lasân), X, 72.
mudalla' (striped), XIII–IV, 113.
mudannar (ornamented with gold coins, a pattern?), XIII–IV, 113; XV–VI, 65.
mudârrabât (cushions), of Rûmi brocade, XV–VI, 84.
mudhabbah (embroidered, worked, woven with gold), X, 82; XI–II, 103, 124; XIII–IV, 109, 111, 112; of washy, X, 80, 81; ghair m. (of washy), X, 80. See Dabîkî, dasâtîk, ḫulla, 'imâma, 'isâba, ḵasâb, mânâdîk, mlkhadda, naṭ, sutûr, washy.
mudâjallali (stuff ?), XV–VI, 76.
mudjawwâka diâkhât (embroidered with bands), XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 103.
mufaiyal (with pictures of elephants), XIII–IV, 113; (read for mufattal), XV–VI, 76.
mufallas (with circles like copper coins), XIII–IV, 113; XV–VI, 66.
mufassal (picked out with gold), XV–VI, 76.
mufattal. See mufaiyal.
mufawwaf (with white stripes, applied to burd), XIII–IV, 79.
muhabbara (striped robes), XIII–IV, 108. See hîbra.
muhaiyal. See mukhâiyl.
muhalhal al-nasâdî (light, delicate weave), X, 84.
muharrar (silk, of lifâb), XV–VI, 38, (silkens cloth), XV–VI, 31. See ḥarî-silk.
muhâshâbât (with borders, with a selvage), XI–II, 104; XV–VI, 78.
mukallalâ. See sutûr.
mukhâssab (embroidered with gold), XIII–IV, 100; XV–VI, 76; (embroidered with gold and silver thread), XIII–IV, 107.
mukawwara (made with hollows (?), of ta'lasân), XI–II, 131.
mukhâiyâl (with pictures of horses), XIII–IV, 113; XV–VI, 76.
mukhâiyarat (stuffs), XIII–IV, 107.
mukhâiyâta (of tiyâb, tailored garments), XIII–IV, 106.
mukhâram (embroidered), XIII–IV, 112.
mukbattam (checked), XIII–IV, 113; XV–VI, 32, 38, 40, 48, 49, 50, 61, 66, 78.
mukâhâttâr (striped), IX, 81; XIII–IV, 76; XV–VI, 66; of a kisâ', IX, 111. See burd, ḵhâtât.
mukhâwâwam (unbleached material), XV–VI, 76. See kham.
mukhâml (variously rendered velvety material, velvet pile, velvet texture), IX, 72; X, 92, 93; XIII–IV, 103, 113; manâdîk mukhâmla (napkins with a velvet surface), X, 82; tiyâb mukhâmla (velvet garments), XV–VI, 81. See Dabîkî.
muktârîb, XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 103.
mulâbad (name of a silk), XV–VI, 38, 40.
mu'lâm (with a border), IX, 60, 67; XI–II, 104; XV–VI, 76; (marked), IX, 76; (with borders of gold), XV–VI, 57; durrâ'a min al-mâkâbî al-Mûsirî mu'lâma (tunic of Egyptian linen with a border), XIII–IV, 103; Egyptian (Mûsirî) turban with border ('imâma mu'lâma), XIII–IV, 103; sutûr mu'lâma (curtains with borders), X, 81; sutûr mu'a'iyana mu'lâma (curtains with round circles and badges), X, 81. See mu'allama, muthâkâqîl.
mulawwan (colored, of tiyâb), XIII–IV, 97. See dibâdî, sutûr.
mumardjâl (red garments, cloth), XI–II, 125.
mumaşâr. See Kühî.
mumazzâdî (mingled with gold), IX, 71; XV–VI, 49. See mamzûdî, mumazzâdî.
mumtâzâdî (gold-embroidered), discussed, XV–VI, 49. See mamzûdî, mumazzâdî.
munabbat (quilted), XIII–IV, 115.
munaḥnahāt. See munakhnakḥāt.
munaiyār (stuff with a double warp, or woof, or weft, or striped stuff), IX, 68; X, 86, 88; XI–II, 106, 142; of Rayy, XI–II, 106; XV–VI, 77. See Armani.

munakẖāb (pl. āt), XIII–IV, 75; XV–VI, 52. See nakẖāb.
munakḵsh (ornamented), X, 72.
munakḵāt (spotted), XV–VI, 66.
munammār (striped spotted), XIII–IV, 76.
munẖāl (sieve cloth), X, 84.
murabbā (square, of checks), XV–VI, 32.
muradẖijal, XIII–IV, 85.
murahẖāl, XIII–IV, 85.
muraiyāsh (striped stuff), XIII–IV, 113; XV–VI, 33, 76.
musaba, XIII–IV, 113.
musabbagẖāt (dyed stuffs), XIII–IV, 94, 96.
musaiyār (cloth), XIII–IV, 77. See sīyārā?
musallā (pl. musallayāt, prayer carpet), IX, 62; X, 81; XI–II, 119, 121, 124, 125, 127; XV–VI, 32, 67; Baṣṭī m., XV–VI, 36; m. of sūsāndjīr, X, 82.
musallā-namāz (prayer mats), X, 102, 103.
musandjāb (squirrel-furred material), XIII–IV, 97.
musattaẖ (flat-roofed tent), XIII–IV, 113.
musẖā’āra (furred ?, suēde?), XV–VI, 78, 79.
musẖābāḵ (loose-woven, applied to Sābīrī), IX, 85.
musẖāḥhir (maker of border of robes), IX, 73.
musẖammā (waxed), XV–VI, 82; of silk, XV–VI, 37.


mutaẖbāḵ (folded, shrunk, of a ta’ilasān), XI–II, 106.

mutaiyār, XIII–IV, 113.

mukẖāib (perhaps to be read for mutaḵẖaiyār, XIII–IV, 108.
mukẖaiyār (chosen ?, cloth), XIII–IV, 108. See above.
muṭarrāz (embroidered), IX, 76; in white, XIII– IV, 112; with a white inscription; XIII–IV, 106; in gold; XV–VI, 50; with a tīrāz border, XIII– IV, 98; Dabīḵī m., XIII–IV, 92; liš muṭarrāz (embroidered garment), XV–VI, 29.

muṭarrīz (embroiderer), IX, 73; XI–II, 105; XV– VI, 36, 65.

Mutawakkili, XIII–IV, 92; of Dabīḵī, IX, 72; of mulẖām, IX, 71, 72.

muṭawwīs (better muṭawwās), XIII–IV, 113.
muṭḥāḵkal (rendered embroidered with gold, heavily adorned with gold), X, 73; 80; XIII–IV, 94, 98; dibāḏī m., XV–VI, 76; muḷam m. (borders embroidered with gold), IX, 81; XIII–IV, 92; XV–VI, 76.
muṭḥāmman (octagonal patterned check), XV–VI, 32; of sūṭār (curtains), X, 86.
muṭẖla (warp ?), XV–VI, 64.
muwwarrad (rose color), XV–VI, 79.
muwaṣẖḥā (cloth of watered silk), X, 97; (ornamented), XV–VI, 76. See ḥulla.
muyassar (plain, of linen), XIII–IV, 94.
muṣayyana (decorated), X, 72.
muzannad (tight, of clothing), XV–VI, 49.
muzannara. See ṣhmāb.
muẓarkaš (embroidered with gold), XI–II, 136; muẓarkaša bi-qẖāb, XI–II, 103, 137, 142. See tārāḵīb.

Naq (= nakẖāb, q.v.), IX, 84.
Nachidut (Ar. nasīḏ), IX, 83.
nadḏijād (upholsterer), IX, 73.
Nafti (a stuff), XV–VI, 48, 61.
naiy (raw, of silk), XV–VI, 67.

nakẖāb (pl. nakẖāḥ, nikẖāḥ, anẖāb, carpet strips), IX, 75, 83, 84; X, 78, 81, 95, 96; XI–II, 116, 119; XIII–IV, 112; XV–VI, 32, 37, 76; senses of, in Persian, XIII–IV, 75; read nakẖāb for Kh n ḍ (?), XV–VI, 32. See Nakẖut.

Nakẖut (= Ar. nakẖḥ), IX, 83.

nakẖāsh (pl. nukẖāsh, embroidery), XIII–IV, 100; in color, XIII–IV, 103; (ṭirāz designs), X, 74; (designs), XV–VI, 65.

namad (saddlecloths), XV–VI, 37; (pl. anmāḏ, felts), XI–II, 102; (in sense of felt), see kulāh.


namat (pl. anmāṭ, carpet, mat, sur-carpet), IX, 86; X, 74, 78, 86, 94, 96; XI–II, 138; XIII–IV, 108, 114; XV–VI, 33, 37; (felts), X, 92; anmāṭ muḥkama (perfectly woven carpets), X, 85; Tabari anmāṭ, IX, 75; anmāṭ of Dabīḵī, IX, 75.

naqees, XV–VI, 83.
narmah (= narmāk), XI–II, 104.
narmāk. See narmah.

Narsi stuffs, IX, 86.
nasāḏ (weaving), X, 77; (weave), XV–VI, 66; (woven stuff), X, 99; XI–II, 102; (tissue), XV–VI, 65. See muḥallāh.
Nasäfi (white silk stuff), IX, 84; XI–II, 136; XIII–IV, 103; XV–VI, 48; described, XV–VI, 66.

nasıd (weave), XIII–IV, 79.
nasıbi (a kind of washy stuff), IX, 70.
nashef, XV–VI, 83.
nasıd (woven stuff), IX, 71, 83, 84; Balansı n. (woven stuff), XV–VI, 39. See also Nachidut.
nat' (pl. ant'a, carpets), IX, 86; XV–VI, 41, 76; ant'a mudjāhhaba (gold-embroidered carpets), XV–VI, 41. See index No. 1 for sense of nat' as leather.
nawl (loom), XV–VI, 33.
ni'āl (shoes, Zandji), XV–VI, 78.
nīla (indigo), XIII–IV, 117.
nītāq (belt), XV–VI, 49.

Seeīrāt. Seeīrāt.

nuṣṭa (dots on cloth), XV–VI, 32.
numruḵ (pl. namāriḵ, cushions), X, 92; XV–VI, 76; n. harir (silk saddle cushion), XI–II, 98; (carpets), IX, 86.
nusākẖ (inscriptions on cloth), see rāḵm-i-nusākẖ.

paibāf. See baibāf.
palas-rugs, X, 103; XI–II, 126.
palas (woollen garments worn by the poor), XI–II, 118.
pamba, IX, 81. See paneh.
pandra (curtains), X, 72; XI–II, 124; applied to the Kaaba covering, X, 77. See ibrāšhim, XI–II, 102.
parnīyān (silk), XI–II, 103; Chinese silk, X, 75.
paḵšūn (woollen cloth), XI–II, 105; (carpets) of, XI–II, 126.
pāy-tāba (puttees), XI–II, 126.

Qassiah. See Kassi.

Qeissiah. See Kassi.

rāḏiǰ (heavy, weighted ?), XIII–IV, 113.
raffa' (mender, repairer), IX, 73; XIII–IV, 104; XV–VI, 36, 65.
raťāf (festoons), XI–II, 131; (walls of tent), XIII–IV, 113.
Rahāwī (Edessan, of shoes), XV–VI, 79.
raį (Iraqi stuff), XIII–IV, 114; (Syrian stuff), XV–VI, 77.

raḵaba (covering for Sultan's horse), IX, 80.
raḵama (write on silk), IX, 61.
raḵamāt (embroideries), XIII–IV, 99.
raḵḵām (gold embroiderer, ornament stitcher), XIII–IV, 104; XV–VI, 36, 65; name of, XIII–IV, 106.
raḵm (embroidery, striped silk), IX, 61; X, 92; XV–VI, 36, 65. See ḫazz-ṣaḵm, Kürkūblil, marḵām, rukām.
raḵm-i-nusākẖ (writing of inscriptions on garments), X, 99.

rang. See ibrāšhim.

Rašidī (a stuff), name explained, X, 93; cloaks, X, 93; XV–VI, 67, 78; izār, X, 93.

rasm, inscription, XV–VI, 32, 36; border, XV–VI, 64.
ridā' (pl. ardiya, cloaks, mantles, robes), IX 67; X, 76; XIII–IV, 80, 81, 91, 111; XV–VI, 40, 45, 60, 67, 76, 77, 78; colored cloaks, XIII–IV, 95; Egyptian mantles, XV–VI, 77; Rašidī cloaks, XV–VI, 67; makfūta bi-l-harir (bordered with silk), XIII–IV, 77. See Ṭabārī.

rubā'i (cloth measure ?), XV–VI, 55.
rūḍīnā (madder), X, 98, 103.

rukūn (ornamented embroideries, inscriptions ?), XIII–IV, 93. See raḵm.

Rūmī (Byzantine or Greek), brocade, IX, 72, 74, 75, 76; X, 93, 103; XI–II, 141; XIII–IV, 83, 115; linen (kattān), X, 94, XI–II, 137; stuffs, X, 91, 98; linen after Sicilian manufacture, X, 98; satin, XIII–IV, 103. See Khusrawānī, kisā', miḵrāḏi, sundus.

rūnās (madder), X, 100.
Rūṣī, XIII–IV, 84.
Rūyānī stuffs, IX, 64; XI–II, 98, 99, 103.
rūy-i-miḵbādā (covers for cushions), XI–II, 129.
rūy-i-namad-zin (covers for saddlecloths), XI–II, 127.

Sabāni. See below.

sabāniya (pl. āt, pieces of stuff for handkerchiefs or veils, wrappers), X, 95, 98; XI–II, 135; XIII–IV, 102; black Sabāni veils, X, 95.
sabāḡh (dyer), XIII–IV, 116; Dār al-Sabāḡhīn (House of the Dyers), IX, 68; XI–II, 143; XV–VI, 70.

Sābīrī, IX, 85, 86; XIII–IV, 79, 101; defined, XI–II, 116; linen, X, 84; shirts or breast plates (dir'ī), XV–VI, 77; Sābīrī (= Sābūrī) cloth, X, 88; Sābūriya stuffs, X, 87.
Sābūrī. See Sābūrī.
sādā (warp), X, 72, 88, 93; XV–VI, 65.
sādēdī (plain, sometimes in the sense of without gold), IX, 75; XI–II, 104; XIII–IV, 94, 112, 113; XV–VI, 66.
Ṣa’dī (of washy), XV–VI, 78.
sa’dījāda (of Ṭabbari), XI–II, 103.
Ṣafan (red robes of), XIII–IV, 114.
safsārī, XV–VI, 48, 49.
sagmatogēnē, XIII–IV, 76.
sāhābī (cloud-blue), XV–VI, 71.
Sa’ādi (cloth, garments), XI–II, 107, 116; XIII–IV, 77, 80; XV–VI, 77; perhaps read for ‘Abīdī, XV–VI, 52.
sā’īgh (molder), XV–VI, 50.
sāqala (iron or glaze), XV–VI, 64.
sakk (a Kufan stuff, or soft cloth), IX, 85; X, 76.
sākrwī, XIII–IV, 81.
Ṣalāḥī (stuff), XI–II, 137.
sālū (red and black cloth), XII–I, 137.
samā‘ī. See sīgbh.
Samarkandi (garments), XI–II, 125.
samāt, XV–VI, 76.
samāwi. See lawn.
samēt, XV–VI, 76.
sammūr (sable fur or skins), IX, 70; XI–II, 129; XV–VI, 32, 37, 60, 73, 74, 75, 85.
sarāk (white silk), X, 75.
Ṣarāḵuṣṭi (name of stuff), XV–VI, 60.
sardj (saddle, inscribed in black), XIII–IV, 115.
Sarmīnī, XI–II, 141.
satīni (satin), X, 82.
sawwāf (pl. sawwāf, workers in wool), X, 86; XI–II, 126.
shādurvān (large carpets, tapestry), XI–II, 121.
Shāhīyāt, XV–VI, 81.
Shālvārband (trouser cords), X, 72, 98; XI–II, 117.
Sha’mī (Damascus or Syrian stuff), XIII–IV, 105.
šāmāla (striped blanket, carpet), XIII–IV, 75; (= burda), XIII–IV, 76.
šamāsi (sun-cloth ?), XI–II, 137.
šāmbāf (a stuff), XI–II, 137.
šār’s (goat hair), IX, 72; X, 80; XV–VI, 55; goat-hair garments (ṭiḥāb), XI–II, 116; tax on, XIII–IV, 105; weavers of, X, 81.
šārāb (linen cloth), XI–II, 104; XIII–IV, 98. See dastār.
šārābī (stuffs), X, 86.
šārābiya (type of linen garment), X, 86; XI–II, 102.
ṣharf. See ṣharb.
ṣhārī (goat-wool cloth), XIII–IV, 113.
ṣharrābāt (al-ibrism al-maftūla, twisted sh. cloths of silk), XV–VI, 71.
ṣhāb (turban), XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 103, 105.
ṣhāshāt (muslins), XIII–IV, 103.
ṣhāsīyīn. See khāmāt.
Ṣhātawī (cloth, garments), IX, 68; X, 82, 83; XIII–IV, 93, 94, 95, 98.
ṣhikka (pl. ṣhīkka, piece), IX, 70; XI–II, 142; XIII–IV, 83, 109, 111; XV–VI, 29, 32, 33, 44, 45; sh. ṣīkiliya, XV–VI, 55. See Dabiki.
ṣhīnī (garments, stuffs), X, 81; XV–VI, 76. See Sinīzī.
ṣhīrin-bāf (stuff), XI–II, 137.
ṣhū’aibī (stuff), X, 93; (garments), XI–II, 114; (tunics), XV–VI, 32.
ṣhūkairī. See Dabiki.
ṣhūrūb (probably pl. of ṣhārb), XIII–IV, 80, 82.
ṣḥustāka (pl. āt & ṣḥustāk, garments, napkins), XI–II, 100; discussed, XV–VI, 76. See below.
ṣḥustāka, XI–II, 100. See above.
ṣḥūstār (kālā-i, šb. stuffs), X, 75. See kārgāh, ṭīrāz.
ṣibgh (dye), IX, 71; X, 89, 94; XV–VI, 65, 69; tax on, XIII–IV, 105; š. samā‘ī (pastel), XV–VI, 40.
Ṣikandarī (Alexandrine stuff), XIII–IV, 103.
ṣīklāṭün (rendered scarlet in earlier sections, but it is a term which can apply to cloth not of this color), IX, 74, 76, 77, 82; XI–II, 102, 108, 116; XIII–IV, 97; XV–VI, 29, 33, 34, 66, 77; Alexandria, XIII–IV, 111; references to earlier sources, XV–VI, 82.
silk (ḍaḵḵ al-silk, fine thread), XIII–IV, 92.
sim-kashīa. See kulāh.
simkūn (ṭiyāb s, silver-colored garments), XI–II, 125.
sināḏāb (squirrel fur), IX, 70; XI–II, 120, 142; XIII–IV, 103; XV–VI, 73, 74.
Sinīzī. See Sinīzī.
Siniz (cloths, stuffs), X, 84, 85, 90; XI-II, 125; green S, XV-VI, 79; manufacture of, X, 85.

sitāra (hangings, veils), XII-IV, 108. See musayyar.
sīr, cited in pl., sūrū, q.v.
sīyarā (cloth), XIII-IV, 77. See musayyar.
sīf m kin, XV-VI, 61.
sūfā (explained), XIII-IV, 83.
sūf (wool), IX, 72, 92; X, 91, 94, 98; XI-II, 104, 121, 124, 144; XV-VI, 37, 48; (camel's), XI-II, 144; Kubrusī wool, XI-II, 144; sūf al-Misr (Egyptian wool), XIII-IV, 91; sūf-i-sittata 'asāhari, XI-II, 144. See džubba, sūnna al-sūf.
sūf al-bahr (sea wool), XV-VI, 33, 60.
sūf al-samak (fish wool), XV-VI, 49.
Sūfūliya (stuff), XIII-IV, 80.
Sūfūravīya, XIII-IV, 87.
Sūlūli (of tailašāns), XV-VI, 78.
sundus (brocade), X, 76; XV-VI, 81; (green brocade), X, 87; XV-IV, 111, 112, 113; sundus textiles of green silk, X, 94; Rūmī s. brocade, X, 94.
sūnna (makers of khlāz-silk), X, 86; (al-sūf, workers in wool), XI-II, 120.
surādīk (pl. āt, pavilion, tent), IX, 91; XIII-IV, 79; XV-VI, 32.
sūsandjīrd or suząndjīrd, IX, 62; X, 72, 76, 80, 81, 82, 89; XV-VI, 67, 70; carpets of, IX, 62; prayer carpets of, X, 82.
Sūsī (pl. Sawāsī, cloth), XIII-IV, 83; XV-VI, 48; green Sūsī garments, X, 75; Sūsī turbans, IX, 85; X, 93.
sutūr (sing. sīr, curtains), IX, 66, 88, 89, 91, 92; X, 77, 81, 85, 86, 89, 93, 94, 96, 100; XI-II, 105, 107; (hangings), 124; XIII-IV, 107, 109, 112, 114; XV-VI, 67; length of, XIII-IV, 108; Chinese s., XV-VI, 77; s. of Dābīkī, XI-II, 103; sutūr Dābīkī mukallawa (colored D. awnings), XIII-IV, 110; of Nisibin, IX, 92; ibrismi silk curtains, X, 86; sutūr muḏḥalḥaha muḫkama al-šāna (curtains embroidered in gold of perfect workmanship), XV-VI, 53; sutūr muḫkallala (curtains ornamented with precious stones), XV-VI, 33, 34. See muʿāyiana, muʿlama.
suzandjīrd. See susandjīrd.

Ṭabāḳha (prepare dye), X, 96; (prepare flax), XV-VI, 68.
Ṭabarī (cloth, stuffs), X, 89; XI-II, 98, 99, 103, 124; (carpets), XI-II, 98, 99, 103; (manufacture), X, 89; XI-II, 103; T. rugs (farsā), XI-II, 103; T. carpets (fursḥ), IX, 63; X, 91; XI-II, 100; T. mats (ḥāṣīr), XI-II, 103; T. robes (aksiya), XI-II, 99, 100; white T. robe (kīșā'), XI-II, 99; T. goat-hair robes (mar'azzā), X, 80; T. carpets (anmāt), IX, 75; T. factory (mā mal al-Ṭabarī), XIII-IV, 105; T. cloak (ardiya), XI-II, 100; XV-VI, 76; T prayer carpets (ṣadī-djāda), XI-II, 103. See Isbahbudhī.

Ṭabaristānī (cloth), X, 89.
Ṭabas-silk, XI-II, 120.
tādāris (borders), XV-VI, 65.
tāḏū (turban), XV-VI, 50.
tāḏrīḏ (ṣḥādī al-t., deep red dye), X, 93.
tāfāšīl (garments), XIII-IV, 103.
tāfīl (cutting-out), XV-VI, 64; (tailoring), XV-VI, 65. See below.
tāfīl-hā bī 'alam (pieces of cloth with borders), XV-VI, 55. See above.
Tāhirid (cloth), XI-II, 115; XV-VI, 77.
tailašān (head scarf, hood, mantle), IX, 69, 70; XI-II, 98, 99, 102, 103, 104, 110, 116, 131; XV-VI, 45, 49, 78; white t., XI-II, 106; woolen t., X, 98; XI-II, 106; Egyptian (Miṣrī) t., XI-II, 99. See mudabbdājī, muḫkawwara, muṭṭabakī.
tāḥkītāndīj (twisted material, twisted silk), XI-II, 115, 116; XV-VI, 76, 78; (linings of), XI-II, 115.
taklāwāt, XI-II, 137.
Talā (name of a kind of linen), X, 103.
tāmīm (brocade), IX, 71; (gold brocade), XIII-IV, 112; of Dābīkī, XIII-IV, 113. See maṭmūm.
Tānāṣī (stuff), XV-VI, 80.
tang-i-asp (saddle girths), XI-II, 118.
tārāh (dā-tārah-yi-kari-i-hārgab-i, two-warp manufacture of the court), XI-II, 137.
tārākīshī muzarkaša (gold-embroidered quivers), XI-II, 137.
tāraz (to embroider), XV-VI, 47.
tārdvālāš (stuff embroidered with scenes of the chase), IX, 64, 75, 84; XIII-IV, 103, 107, 142.
tārāha (hood), XI-II, 142; XIII-IV, 103.
tārika (stripe), XV-VI, 66.
tārbāna Kubrusīya (square carpet of Cyprus), XI-II, 143; XV-VI, 76.
tāraz (to stamp), IX, 65; (embroider), XI-II, 105; XV-VI, 53, 56; (work a border), XV-VI, 64.
tāšrīf (present), IX, 75; (robe of honor), IX, 77.
Tātarī (Tatar robes), XI-II, 137.
tāṭriz (embroidery, tīrāz-borders), XV-VI, 36.
tāvīzī. See Tawwāzī.
tāwāla (long hat), IX, 67.
tāwāk (neck of a garment), XV-VI, 64, 65.
tawāshī (markings), XV-VI, 76.
Tawwazi (cloth, garments, textiles), IX, 68; X, 81, 83, 84; XV–VI, 77.

Tarabin read for Tarabin, XV–VI, 67.

thabila (heavy, applied to silks, khusuz), X, 75.
thalab (fox furs), XI–II, 129; XV–VI, 73, 75.
thalatniya. See lubad.
thiyab al-Khilafa, IX, 68.
at-thiyab al-mulukiya, IX, 60.

tikán. See kisá.
tikka (trouser bands or cords), IX, 88, 89, 90; X, 91, 93, 94; XI–II, 117; XV–VI, 67, 77, 78, 117. See Armani.

Tilimsání (a kind of cloth), XV–VI, 48, 50.
thifisa (pl. tañafs, carpet), IX, 88, 89; X, 94; XIII–IV, 85; XV–VI, 69; Khalífiya, IX, 74; Khurshān carpet, XI–II, 127; XV–VI, 76. See Marvian.

Timmisi (cloth), XIII–IV, 100; XV–VI, 76.

thirāz (of cloth, stuffs, textiles), IX, 78, 86; XV–VI, 37, 46, 47; (arm bands), XV–VI, 66; silk, XV–VI, 33, 36, 60; robe, XI–II, 98; white t. robes (aksiya), XI–II, 106; al-kašab al-khâss al-thirāz (royal t. gold-spangled linen), IX, 70; muṣmata thirāz (stuff of one color), XV–VI, 78; thāwīb thirāz, XI–II, 115. See mulhâm.

thirūz to be read as thirūz, XIII–IV, 111.

T rkuwâ, XV–VI, 83.

தொரும் தரியாயùக்கில், (tiray), XI–II, 137.

Tümisi. See Kümisi.

Tûraki stuffs, XV–VI, 45.

Tarkumâniya. See Bâsât.

Tustari (cloth), IX, 83; X, 71, 73, 86; XI–II, 110, 138; XIII–IV, 113; worn by moneyed classes, X, 71; brocade shirt of Tustar, X, 75; lily compared to Tustar stuffs, X, 75; special products of Tustar, X, 74. See Kûrûbi, Shûstar, thirâz.

Tüzi. See Tawwazi.
'ummâl al-ḥarîr (silk manufacturers), XIII–IV, 102.
'urḍa (a length of cloth), XIII–IV, 85.
urdjûwân (purple-red), XV–VI, 51.
'usfur (yellow dye), X, 86; XV–VI, 48.
'ütb (cotton), XIII–IV, 86.

vîkâyâ. See vîkâyâ.

wabar (fur), XI–II, 121; XV–VI, 74, 75; (down), XV–VI, 60; (hyrax), XV–VI, 74; (skins), XV– VI, 83.
wars (yellow dye), XIII–IV, 80, 82; XV–VI, 70; defined, XIII–IV, 85.
waslîk (marten fur), XI–II, 139; XV–VI, 74.
wasîda (pl. wasî'dî, cushions, pillows), IX, 62, 86; X, 95, 96, 98; XIII–IV, 107; XV–VI, 67; colors of a wasîda pillow, X, 82.
wasîla (pl. wasîlî, striped Yemen cloth), IX, 86; discussed, XIII–IV, 86.
wasma (blue dye), XV–VI, 70.
watâ' (pl. awtîya, covers, coverlets), XV–VI, 39; 'Dînjâjîli, XV–VI, 39. See witâ'.
Wîdhârî. See muṣmat.
wiḳâya (belts), of Djurdjâni type made in Balkh, XI–II, 118; (headdress, headcloth), X, 88; XIII– IV, 95; (band to hold hair in place), XV–VI, 67; viḳâya (long veils), XI–II, 105.
wisâh (belt), XV–VI, 67.
al-wiṭâ' al-Baṣṭî (Baṣṭa carpet), XV–VI, 36. See watâ'.
Wizâriya, wrong reading for Wîdhârîya, XI–II, 123.
w r g h nâl (an unknown stuff), XV–VI, 64.
yâgânagi. See yakânaki.
yakânaki (or yâgânagi cloth), IX, 81.
yak-rang. See ibriqîm.
yâmûr fur, XV–VI, 74.
Yasdi, X, 87.
Yazdi cloth, X, 87, 90; XI–II, 121, 139.
yüê-no (white cloth), IX, 83.

Zabiðî stuffs, XIII–IV, 85.
za'fûrî (silk textile), XI–II, 105.
Zahri (applied to milhâf-mantas), XV–VI, 32.
zanbaft (garments of women's weaving ?), XI–II, 117. See zarbaft.
Zandalljî clothes, X, 77.
zandânljî (garments), XI–II, 124.
zandânûlî, XI–II, 123, 124.
zârâ'iî (stuff), XI–II, 116.
zarbiya (carpet), X, 91.
zardûz (embroidery), XV–VI, 77.
zardûz (sewers with gold thread), X, 99.
zarkaš (gold embroidery), IX, 61; XI–II, 137, 142; XIII–IV, 103.
zarkaša (to embroider), XV–VI, 64.
zîhâra (tunics), Shu'âibî, XV–VI, 32.
zîlû (rugs, carpets), X, 80, 85, 103; XI–II, 120, 134; zîlû rugs of Dîjâram kind, XI–II, 134; zîlû carpets (kâli), X, 98; rendered as blankets, X, 85.
Zuhaîri (Kirâti), XV–VI, 76.
zuhûr (silk cloth), XIII–IV, 107.
zu'liya (pl. zalâlî, carpets, large carpets, mats, rugs), X, 81, 94, 97; XI–II, 108, 109; XV–VI, 37, 76, 77. See Khusravâni.
zunnâr (band, belt), IX, 72; XIII–IV, 92; XV–VI, 67, 79; zunnâr al-wiḳâya (band to tie up hair), XV–VI, 67. See muzannar.
zurbiya (carpet), XV–VI, 76.
SERJEANT INDICES

LIST OF MAPS

Volume IX
1. Baghdad, showing the Round City, p. 79
2. Jazira and Iraq, p. 87

Volume X
1. Fars, p. 78
2. Jazira, Armenia, Arràn, Azerbaijan, & Shirvan, p. 92

Volume XI–II
1. Tabaristan, Kümis, Djurdjian, & Djibál, p. 101
2. Khurasan & Kuhistan, p. 112
3. Transoxiana, p. 122
4. Khoresm (Khwârizm), p. 128
5. Kerman & Seistan, p. 133
6. Syria, p. 140

Volume XIII–IV
1. Yemen, p. 78
2. Egypt, with the Sinai peninsula, p. 90
3. The Delta of the Nile, p. 102

Volume XV–XVI
1. Muslim textile centers in Spain, p. 30
2. Muslim textile centers in North Africa & Sicily, p. 42
3. Textile centers in Asia Minor during the Mongol period, p. 58
INDEX TO ARS ISLAMICA, VOLUMES I–XVI (1934–1950)

AUTHOR INDEX

ABBOTT, NABIA
Arabic-Persian Koran of the Late Fifteenth or Early Sixteenth Century A.D., VI, Pt. 1, 91.
The Kaš Kharānā Inscription of 92 H. (710 A.D.), a New Reading, XI–XII, 190.

AGA-OGLU, MEHMET
Articles:
About One of the “Two Questions in Moslem Art,” III, Pt. 1, 116.
Bibliographia, 1933–34, I, Pt. 2, 239.
Fragments of a Thirteenth Century Mihrāb at Nedjef, II, Pt. 1, 128.
The Khusrau wa Širin Manuscript in the Freer Gallery, IV, 479.
The Landscape Miniatures of an Anthology Manuscript of the Year 1398 A.D., III, Pt. 1, 77.
Memorandum on the “Corpus of Islamic Metalwork,” XV–XVI, 133.

Reviews:
Das Islamische Milet, by Karl Wulzinger, Paul Wittek, and Friedrich Sarre, II, Pt. 2, 244.
Fantastic Fauna. Decorative Animals in Moslem Art, by Cleves Stead, II, Pt. 2, 249.

ANGULO, DIEGO
The Mudéjar Style in Mexican Architecture, II, Pt. 2, 225.

ARNE, T. J.
Funde von Gussformen für kufische Münzen und Medaillen, IV, 461.

ASHTON, LEIGH
Literature on Islamic Art Published in England During the War, 1939–1945, XIII–XIV, 161.

BADER, O. N.
A Sasanian Vessel from Kungur, XV–XVI, 139.

BALRÁS, LEOPOLO TORRES (See Torres)

BERIEMER, RICHARD
A Sasanian Monument in Merovingian France, V, Pt. 2, 221.

BERRY, BURTON Y.
The Development of the Bracket Support in Turkish Domestic Architecture, V, Pt. 2, 272.
Turkish Door Furnishings, I, Pt. 2, 223.

BITTINGER, R. T.
Review:
Glass from Iran in the National Museum, Stockholm, by Carl Johan Lamm, III, Pt. 2, 216.

BORN, WOLFGANG
A Lacquer-Painted Canteen, XV–XVI, 137.
Ivory Powder Flasks from the Mughal Period, IX, 93.

BRIAN, DORIS
A Reconstruction of the Miniature Cycle in the Demotte Shah Namah, VI, Pt. 2, 97.

BRIGGS, AMY
Timurid Carpets. I. Geometric Carpets, VII, Pt. 1, 20; II. Arabesque and Flower Carpets, XI–XII, 146.

BRITTON, NANCY PENCE
Buchthal, Hugo

"Hellenistic" Miniatures in Early Islamic Manuscripts, VII, Pt. 2, 125.
A Note on Islamic Enamelled Metalwork and Its Influence in the Latin West, XI–XII, 195.

Cahn, Claude

Documents relatifs à quelques techniques iranienes au début du onzième siècle, XV– XVI, 23.

Christie, A. H.

Two Rock-crystal Carvings of the Fatimid Period, IX, 166.

Cohn-Wiener, Ernst

A Turanic Monument of the Twelfth Century A.D., VI, Pt. 1, 88.

Coomarswamy, Ananda K.

Articles:

Note on the Philosophy of Persian Art, XV–XVI, 125.
Symbolism of Archery, X, 105.

Review:


Cott, Perry B.

Sasanian Stucco Plaque in the Worcester Art Museum, VI, Pt. 2, 167.

Crane, Mary E.

Fourteenth Century Mihrab from Isfahan, VII, Pt. 1, 96.

Creswell, K. A. C.

Lawfulness of Painting in Early Islam, XI–XII, 159.

David-Weill, Jean

Un Bois à épigraphie attribué au dixième siècle, IV, 471.

Day, Florence E.

Article:

Dated Ūthaz in the Collection of the University of Michigan, IV, 421.

Reviews:

Medieval Finds at Al Mina in North Syria, by Arthur Lane, VI, Pt. 2, 186.
Soières persanes, by Gaston Wiet; and Reply, XV–XVI, 231, 250.

Deniké, Boris

Quelques monuments de bois sculpté au Turkestan occidental, II, Pt. 1, 69.

Diez, Ernst

Simultaneity in Islamic Art, IV, 185.
A Stylistic Analysis of Islamic Art—General Part, III, Pt. 2, 201.
A Stylistic Analysis of Islamic Art—Islamic Art, V, Pt. 1, 36.

Dimand, Maurice S.

Articles:

A Silver Inlaid Bronze Canteen with Christian Subjects in the Eumorfopoulos Collection, I, Pt. 1, 17.
Studies in Islamic Ornament. I. Some Aspects of Omaiyyad and Early 'Abbāsid Ornament; IV, 293.
Dimand, Maurice S.—Continued

Obituary:
Joséf Strzygowski, VII, Pt. 2, 177.

Reviews:
Persian Miniature Painting, by Laurence Binyon,
J. V. S. Wilkinson, and Basil Gray, II, Pt. 2,
241.

Sasanian and Islamic Metalwork in A Survey of Persian Art, VIII, 192. Reply to Pope
Criticism of Review, IX, 208.

Donaldson, Dwight M.
Significant Mihrabs in the Haram at Mashhad,
II, Pt. 1, 118.

Erddmann, Kurt

Articles:
Das Datum des Ṭäk-i Bustān, IV, 79.
Die Entwicklung der sasanidischen Krone, XV–
XVI, 87.
Ein wiedergefundener Teppich, I, Pt. 1, 121.

Kaiener Teppiche, Teil I: Europäische und
islamische Quellen des 15.–18. Jahrhunderts,
V, Pt. 2, 179; Teil II: Mamlûken- und
Osmanenteppiche, VII, Pt. 1, 55.

Review:
"The Art of Carpet Making," in A Survey of
Persian Art, VIII, 121.

Ereffa, Helmut von

A Selective Bibliography of American Publica-
tions on Islamic, Parthian, Sasanian, and
Coptic Art Published from 1939–1945, XV–
XVI, 187.

A Tombstone of the Timurid Period in the

Ettinghausen, Richard

Articles:
Evidence for the Identification of Kāshān
Pottery, III, Pt. 1, 44.
The Exhibition of Persian Art at the Toledo
Museum of Art, II, Pt. 1, 137.
Important Pieces of Persian Pottery in London
Collections, II, Pt. 1, 45.
Painting in the Fatimid Period: A Reconstruction, IX, 112.

Six Thousand Years of Persian Art," the Ex-
hibition of Iranian Art, New York, 1940, VII,
Pt. 1, 106.

Ettinghausen, Richard—Continued

Editorials:
Ars Islamica-Ars Orientalis, XV–XVI, vii.
Literature on Islamic Art, 1939–1945, Part I,
XIII–XIV, 150; Part II, XV–XVI, 151.
Reviews of A Survey of Persian Art, VIII, 1.
The Survey of Persian Art and its Critics, IX, 169.

Obituary:
Ernst Cohn-Wiener, IX, 238.
Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy, XV–XVI, 259.
George Eumorfopoulos, VII, Pt. 1, 123.
Ernst Herzfeld (with supplementary bibli-
ography), XV–XVI, 261.
John Ellerton Lodge, IX, 239.

Reviews:
Architecture through the Ages, by Talbot Ham-
lin, IX, 232.
Descriptive Catalog of the Garrett Collection of
Persian, Turkish, and Indic Manuscripts, in-
cluding Some Miniatures in the Princeton
University Library, by Mohamad E. Mogha-
dam and Yahya Armajani, VII, Pt. 1, 120.
Islamic Metalwork in the British Museum, by
D. Barrett, XV–XVI, 255.
Persian Paintings from Miniatures of the XII–
XVI Centuries, by Basil Gray, VII, Pt. 1,
121.

The Treasury of Persepolis and Other Dis-
coveries in the Homeland of the Achaemenians,
by Erich F. Schmidt, VII, Pt. 2, 173.

Ettinghausen, Richard; Buchthal, Hugo; and
Kurz, Otto

Supplementary Notes to K. Holter's Check List
of Islamic Illuminated Manuscripts before
A.D. 1350, VII, Pt. 2, 147.

Fajans, Salomea

Review:
The Tiles of the Mausoleum from Khānākāh
Pir Husain, by Vera A. Kratchkovskaya,
XV–XVI, 251.

Faris, Nabi A., and Miles, George C.
An Inscription of Barbak Shah of Bengal, VII,
Pt. 2, 141.

Field, Henry, and Prostov, Eugene

Archaeological Investigations in Central Asia,
ARSLAMICA

FIELD, HENRY, and PROSTOV, EUGENE—Continued

Excavations at Khwārazm, 1937–38, VI, Pt. 2, 158.
Note on Recent Excavations at Khwārazm, XIII–XIV, 139.

Frye, Richard N.

Gabriel, Albert
Dūnāysir, IV, 352.
Le Masjīd-i Djam's d'Iṣfahan, II, Pt. 1, 7.

Glidden, Harold W.
Articles:
Fatimid Carved-Wood Inscriptions in the Collection of the University of Michigan, VI, Pt. 1, 94.
A Note on the Automata of al-Dżazārî, III, Pt. 1, 115.

Reviews:

Godard, André
Article:
L'Origine de la madrasa, de la mosquée et du caravansérail à quatre iwâns, XV–XVI, 1.

Review:

Godard, Yedda A.
Notes épigraphiques [Manār and Masjīd, Baršān], IV, 40.
Notice épigraphique [Masjīd-i Djam'a, Demāf-wend], II, Pt. 2, 171.

Goetz, H. and A.
Indian Studies in Islamic Art Published during the War, 1939–1945, XIII–XIV, 162.

Goetz, Hermann
The Genesis of Indo-Muslim Civilization—Some Archaeological Notes, I, Pt. 1, 46.
Sher Shah's Mausoleum at Sasaram, V, Pt. 1, 97.

Gray, Basil
Articles:
Fourteenth Century Illustrations of the Kalilah and Dimnah, VII, Pt. 2, 134.
Islamic Art at the Indian Exhibition, Royal Academy, London, November 1947 to February 1948, XV–XVI, 145.

Obituaries:
Laurence Binyon, XI–XII, 207.
R. L. Hobson, IX, 237.
Oscar Raphael, IX, 236.
Sir E. Denison Ross, IX, 235.

Guest, Grace D.
Notes on the Miniatures on a Thirteenth Century Beaker, X, 148.

Hall, Helen B.
Reviews:
Exhibit of Islamic Art in San Francisco, 1937, IV, 484.

Hartner, Willy
The Pseudoplanetary Nodes of the Moon's Orbit in Hindu and Islamic Iconographies, V, Pt. 2, 113.

Herzfeld, Ernst
Articles:
A Bronze Pen-Case, III, Pt. 1, 35.

Obituaries:

Hobson, R. L.
Syria or Cyprus? IV, 467.

Hollis, Howard C.
A Unique Seljūk Bronze, II, Pt. 2, 231.
HOPKINS, CLARK

*Articles:*


*Reviews:*

Archaeological History of Iran, by Ernst E. Herzfeld, III, Pt. 2, 213.
Old Routes of Western Iran, by Sir Aurel Stein, IX, 217.

HUBBARD, ISABEL

*Articles:*

The Celebrations of the Millennium of Firdâwsî, II, Pt. 1, 143.
Exhibition of Oriental Rugs at the Toledo Museum of Art, 1937, IV, 498.

*Reviews:*

Islamic Pottery of the Near East, by Maurice S. Dimand, III, Pt. 2, 217.

KRETSCHMOWSKAYA, VERA A.

*Articles:*

À Propos de l'épigraphie d'un plat à lustre métallique, IV, 468.
Fragments du mihrâb de Verâmin, II, Pt. 1, 132.

*Obituary:*

Samuel Flury, II, Pt. 2, 235.

KÜHNEL, ERNST—Continued

*Reviews:*

Album du Musée Arabe du Caire, by Gaston Wiet, VI, Pt. 2, 175.

Les Bois à épitaphres depuis l'époque mamlouke, by Jean David-Weill, VI, Pt. 2, 177.
Bois sculptés d'églises coptes (Époque fatimite), by Edmond Pauty, VI, Pt. 2, 180.
Les Bois sculptés jusqu'à l'époque ayyoubide, by Edmond Pauty, VI, Pt. 2, 177.

La Céramique musulmane de l'Égypte, by Aly Bey Bahgat and Félix Massoul, VI, Pt. 2, 181.
L'Exposition persane de 1931, by Gaston Wiet, VI, Pt. 2, 183.

Les Filtres de gargoulettes, by Pierre Olmer, VI, Pt. 2, 179.
Gaibi et les grands tayenciers égyptiens d'époque mamlouke, by Armand Abel, VI, Pt. 2, 182.

Guide sommaire du Musée Arabe, by Gaston Wiet, VI, Pt. 2, 175.

Kunûz al-Fâtîmîyîn (Treasures of the Fatimids), by Zaky Mohammed Hassan, VI, Pt. 2, 184.

Lampes et bouteilles en verre émaillé, by Gaston Wiet, VI, Pt. 2, 176.

La Necropoli musulmana di Aswan, by Ugo Monneret de Villard, VI, Pt. 2, 179.

Objects en cuivre, by Gaston Wiet, VI, Pt. 2, 179.

Publikationen des Arabischen Museums in Cairo 1929–1939, VI, Pt. 2, 175.
Stèles funéraires. 5 vols., by Hassan Hawary, Hussein Rached, and Gaston Wiet, VI, Pt. 2, 178.


KURZ, OTTO; BUCHTHAL, HUGO; and ETTINGHAUSEN, RICHARD

Supplementary Notes to K. Holter's Checklist of Islamic Illuminated Manuscripts before A.D. 1350, VII, Pt. 2, 147.
LADD, HELEN E.
The Writings of Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, IX, 125.

LAMM, CARL JOHAN
Five Egyptian Tapestry-Weavings in Swedish Museums, I, Pt. 1, 92.
Some Mamlûk Embroideries, IV, 65.

LANE, ARTHUR
Glazed Relief Ware of the Ninth Century A.D., VI, Pt. 1, 56.

LAUFFER, BERTHOLD
Chinese Muhammedan Bronzes, with a Study of the Arabic Inscriptions by Martin Sprengling, I, Pt. 2, 133.

LECHLER, GEORGE
The Tree of Life in Indo-European and Islamic Cultures, IV, 369.

LOPARDO, JEAN
Review:

LOREY, EUSTACHE DE
Behzâd. Le Gulistân Rothschild, IV, 122.
L’Hellénisme de l’Orient dans les mosaïques de la mosquée des Omniyades, I, Pt. 1, 22.

MAŃKOWSKI, TADEUSZ
Influence of Islamic Art in Poland, II, Pt. 1, 93.
On Persian Rugs of the so-called Polish Type, IV, 456.
A Review of Polish Publications on Islamic Art, III, Pt. 1, 111.

MARÇAIS, GEORGES
Les Broderies turques d’Alger, IV, 145.

MARTINOVITCH, NICHOLAS N.
A Djâmi Manuscript in the Lafayette College Library, I, Pt. 1, 128.

MARTINY, GÜNTER
Die Piyale Pasja Moschee, III, Pt. 2, 131.

MARZOUK, MOHAMMAD ABDIL AZIZ
The Evolution of Inscriptions on Fatimid Textiles, X, 164.

MATSON, FREDERICK R.
Reviews:
The Ceramic Art in Islamic Times. D. Contemporary Techniques, in A Survey of Persian Art, VIII, 64.

MAYER, LEO A.
Articles:
A Hitherto Unknown Damascene Artist, IX, 168.
Literature on Islamic Art Published in Palestine, Iraq, and Egypt during the War Years, XV–XVI, 154.
New Heraldic Emblem of the Mamlûks, IV, 349.
Saracenic Arms and Armor, X, 1.
Three Heraldic Bronzes from Palermo, III, Pt. 2, 180.

Obituary:
Halil Edhem Eldem, VI, Pt. 2, 198.

Reviews:

MILES, GEORGE C.
Articles:
Note on a Die Engraver of Isfahan, V, Pt. 1, 100.
Epigraphical Notice [Two Dated Seljuk Monuments at Sin (Isfahan)], VI, Pt. 1, 11.
Epitaphs from an Isfahan Graveyard, VI, Pt. 2, 151.
The Writings of Ernst Herzfeld, VII, Pt. 1, 82.

Reviews:
Epigraphy in A Survey of Persian Art, VIII, 105.
Geschichte der Stadt Samarra, by Ernst Herzfeld, XV–XVI, 225.
MUNATJID, SALAHUD DIN
Bibliographie des publications de l'art islamique parus en Syrie, 1939-1945, XV-XVI, 185.

MYERS, GEORGE H.
The Dating of Coptic Textiles in the Light of Excavations at Dura-Europos, IX, 156.

NYKL, A. R.
Ali ibn Abi Talib's Horoscope, X, 152.
Arabic Inscriptions in Portugal, XI-XII, 167.

ÖZ, TAHŞIN
Publications on Turkish and Islamic Arts in Turkey, 1939-1945, XIII-XIV, 174.

PARYSKI, MARIE
Review:
Sztuka Islamu w Polsce w XVII i XVIII Wieku, by Tadeusz Maniowski, II, Pt. 2, 248.

PFISTER, R.
Le Rôle de l'Iran dans les textiles d'Antinoé, XIII-XIV, p. 46.

PLUMER, JAMES MARSHALL
Certain Celadon Potsherds from Sâmarrâ Traced to Their Source, IV, 195.

POPE, ARTHUR UPHAM
Some Recently Discovered Seljûk Stucco, I, Pt. 1, 110.
The Survey of Persian Art and its Critics, IX, 169.

PROSTOV, EUGENE, and FIELD, HENRY
Excavations at Khwârazm, 1937-38, VI, Pt. 2, 158.
Note on Recent Excavations at Khwârazm, XIII-XIV, 139.

REITLINGER, GERALD
Islamic Pottery from Kish, II, Pt. 2, 198.
Unglazed Relief Pottery from Northern Mesopotamia, XV-XVI, 11.

RICARD, PROSPER
Note au sujet d'un cartable du Sultân Sidi Muḥammad ben 'Abd Allah (1757-1790), III, Pt. 1, 23.
Sur un type de reliure des temps almohades, I, Pt. 1, 74.

RICE, D. S.
Bibliography of Contributions on Islamic Art Published in Germany and Austria during the War Years, 1939-1945, XV-XVI, 151.

RICE, DAVID TALBOT
The City of Sâpûr. With Historical Note by Gerald Reitlinger, II, Pt. 2, 174.
The Expressionist Style in Early Iranian Art, V, Pt. 2, 216.
The Oxford Excavations at Hîra, I, Pt. 1, 51.

RIESFÄHNL, RUDOLPH M.
Early Turkish Tile Revetments in Edirne, IV, 249.

ROSENTHAL, FRANZ
Abû Haiyân al-Tawhîdi on Penmanship, XIII-XIV, 1.

ROSS, MARVIN C.
An Egypto-Arabic Cloisonné Enamel, VII, Pt. 2, 165.

ROWLAND, BENJAMIN, JR.
Obituary:
Ananda Kentsh Coomaraswamy, XV-XVI, 259.

RUSSELL, DOROTHEA
A Note on the Cemetery of the Abbasid Caliphs of Cairo and the Shrine of Saiyida Nafisa, VI, Pt. 2, 168.

RUTHVEN, PETER
Articles:
Some Egyptian Wood Carvings in the Collection of the University of Michigan, IV, 449.
Two Metal Works of the Mamlûk Period, I, Pt. 2, 230.
**Ruthven, Peter—Continued**

**Reviews:**

- "2,000 Years of Silk Weaving." An Exhibition, X, 167.

**Sakian, Arménag**

Contribution à l’iconographie de la Turquie et de la Perse, XVe–XIXe siècles, III, Pt. 1, 7.
- Mahmoud Mudjhabib—Miniaturiste, enlumineur et calligraphe persan, IV, 338.
- La Reliure dans la Perse occidentale, sous les Mongols, au XIVe et au début du XVe siècle, I, Pt. 1, 80.
- La Question des faïences de la Corne d’Or, V, 1, 99.
- Thèmes et motifs d’enluminure et de décoration arméniennes et musulmanes, VI, Pt. 1, 66.

**Salmony, Alfred**

Daghestan Sculptures, X, 153.

**Sarre, Friedrich**

Die Bronzefunde des Kalifen Marwân II im Arabischen Museum in Kairo, I, Pt. 1, 10.
- Eine seltene Lüsterschale der Rayy-Keramik, IV, 190.

**Sauvaget, Jean**

**Articles:**

- L’Archéologie musulmane en France de 1939 à 1945, XIII–XIV, 150.
- Les Caravansérails du Hadjâdj de Constantinople, IV, 98.
- Notes épigraphiques sur quelques monuments persans, V, Pt. 1, 103.
- Une Representation de la citadelle seljoukide de Merv, XV–XVI, 128.
- Une Signature de potier persan sur un tesson d’al-Fustât, XIII–XIV, 148.
- La Tombe de l’Ortolığıde Balak, V, Pt. 2, 207.

**Obituary:**


**Schacht, Joseph**

Ein archaischer Minaret-Typ in Ägypten und Anatolien, V, Pt. 1, 46.

**Schapiro, Meyer**

The Angel with the Ram in Abraham’s Sacrifice: A Parallel in Western and Islamic Art, X, 134.

**Schmidt, Erich**

Excavations at Rayy, II, Pt. 1, 139.

**Schmidt, J. Heinrich**

- Damaste der Mamlûkenzeit, I, Pt. 1, 99.
- Figürlich sasanidische Stuckdekorationen aus Ktesiphon, IV, 175.

**Schroeder, Eric**

- An Aquamanile and Some Implications, V, Pt. 1, 9.
- M. Godard’s Review of the Architectural Section of A Survey of Persian Art, IX, 211.
- What was the Badi’ Script? IV, 232.

**Serjeant, R. B.**

**Articles:**

Material for a History of Islamic Textiles up to the Mongol Conquest: Abbasids, Tirâz under the, IX, 69; Armenian-Caspian Group, X, 91; Asia Minor of Mongol Times, XV–XVI, 57; Baghdad, Manufactures of, IX, 80; Costume (Appendix I), XV–XVI, 76; Dîjalâl, XI–XII, 106; Djurdjân, XI–XII, 98; Dyers, XV–XVI, 70; Egyptian Textiles, XIII–XIV, 88; Pars Group, X, 79; Furs, XV–XVI, 73; Index, XV–XVI, 273; India, Tirâz in, XI–XII, 136; Indian, Chinese, and other Influences (Appendix III), XV–XVI, 80; Introduction, IX, 54; Iraq, Manufactures of, IX, 85; Kaaba Coverings (Appendix II), XV–XVI, 79; Jazira, Manufactures of, IX, 85; Kerman and Seistan, XI–XII, 131; Khoresm [Khwârizm], XI–XII, 129; Khurasan, XI–XII, 111; Khuzistan, X, 71; Kûmis, XI–XII, 98; Maghreb, XV–XVI, 41; Manufactures of Baghdad, IX, 80; Manufactures of Iraq and Jazira, IX, 85; Sea-wool, XV–XVI, 60; Seistan, XI–XII, 131; Sicily, XV–XVI, 55; Spain, Textiles and the Tirâz in, XV–XVI, 29; Syrian Textiles, XI–XII, 138; Ţabaristân, XI–XII, 98; Technical Methods, XV–XVI, 62; Tirâz under the Abbassids, IX, 69; Tirâz in India, XI–XII, 136; Tirâz Cities in Khuzistan, X, 71; Tirâz in Spain,
SERJEANT, R. B.—Continued
XV–XVI, 29; Tīrāz System, Origin of, IX, 60; Trade Routes, Early (Appendix IV), XV–XVI, 84; Ṭransoxiana, XI–XII, 121; Yemen, Textiles in the, XIII–XIV, 75.

Reviews:

SMITH, M. B.
Articles:
Three Monuments at Yazd-i Khvāšt, VII, Pt. 1, 104.

Review:

SPRENGLING, MARTIN
A Study of the Arabic Inscriptions [Chinese Muhammedan Bronzes], I, Pt. 2, 133.

STERN, HENRI
Notes sur l'architecture des châteaux omeyyades, XI–XII, 72.

STÖCKLEIN, HANS

STRZYGOWSKI, JOSEF
Iran, Asiens Hellas, IV, 42.
Die islamische Kunst als Problem, I, Pt. 1, 7.
Der seelische Gehalt der iranischen Kunst—Feuertempel und Avesta, III, Pt. 2, 189.

SUNDERLAND, A. L.
Excavations at Kāšr-i-Abū Nasr, II, Pt. 1, 141.

TAYLOR, JOAN DU PLAT
Medieval Graves in Cyprus, V, Pt. 1, 55.

TORRES BALBÁS, LEOPOLDO

TROLL, SIGFRIED
Damaskus-Teppiche, Probleme der Teppichforschung, IV, 201.

WEIBEL, ADÉLE COULIN
Article:

Obituary:
Mehmet Aga-Oglu (with bibliography), XV–XVI, 267.

Reviews:
The Arabs, A Short History, by Philip K. Hitti, X, 168.
Iranian and Islamic Art, by Richard Ettinghausen and Eric Schroeder, X, 169.

WEITZMANN, KURT

WETHEY, HAROLD E.
Review:

WİET, GASTON
Deux pièces de céramique égyptienne, III, Pt. 2, 172.
Réponse à Miss Florence E. Day, XV–XVI, 244.
Wiet, Gaston—Continued
Tissus brodés mesopotamiens, IV, 54.
Un Bol en faïence du XIIe siècle, I, Pt. 1, 118.

Wiklund, Signhild, and Lamm, Carl Johan
Some Woolen Girths from Egypt, VI, Pt. 2, 143.

Wilber, Donald N.

Articles:
Development of Mosaic Faïence in Islamic Architecture in Iran, VI, Pt. 1, 16.
“Pagan and Christian Egypt.” An Exhibition, IX, 150.

Reviews:
Famous Cities of Iran, by Laurence Lockhart, VI, Pt. 2, 197.
Guide to Qum, issued by the Office of the Threshold at Qum, XV–XVI, 216.

Announcements
Les amis des églises et l’art coptes, I, Pt. 2, 255.

Editorials:
Ars Islamica, I, Pt. 1, 3.
Ars Islamica-Ars Orientalis, XV–XVI, vii.

Literature on Islamic Art, 1939 to 1945, Part I, XIII–XIV, 150; Part II, XV–XVI, 151.
1934–1944, X, iv.
Professor Friedrich Sarre, II, Pt. 2, 151.
Reviews of A Survey of Persian Art, VIII, 1.
The Survey of Persian Art and its Critics, IX, 169.

Excavations at Nishapūr, II, Pt. 1, 142.

Surfing for vergleichende Kunstsforshung, II, Pt. 1, 144.

International Congress on Persian Art and Archaeology, II, Pt. 1, 144.


Wilber, Donald N.—Continued
Ulugh Beg und seine Zeit, by Wilhelm Harthold, VII, Pt. 1, 118.

Wilkinson, J. V. S.

Article:

Review:

Witteck, Paul


Worrell, William H.


Zaloscer, Hilde

The Exhibition of Eurasian Art at the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, II, Pt. 1, 136.

Subject Index

Architecture
Aga-Oglu, Mehmet
About One of the “Two Questions in Moslem Art,” III, Pt. 1, 116.

Angulo, Diego
The Mudejar Style in Mexican Architecture, II, Pt. 2, 225.

Berry, Burton Y.
The Development of the Bracket Support in Turkish Domestic Architecture, V, Pt. 2, 272.

Cohn-Wiener, Ernst
A Turanian Monument of the Twelfth Century, A.D., VI, Pt. 1, 88.

Crane, Mary E.
A Fourteenth-Century Mihrab from Isfahān, VII, Pt. 1, 96.

Frye, Richard N.
Architecture—Continued

Gabriel, Albert
Dünäysir, IV, 352.
Le Masdjid-i Dżum'a d'İsfahân, II, Pt. 1, 7.
Godard, André
L'Origine de la madrasa, de la mosquée et du caravansérail à quatre iwâns, XV–XVI, 1.
Goetz, Herman
Sher Shah’s Mausoleum at Sásaram, V, Pt. 1, 97.
Herzfeld, Ernst
Martin, Günter
Russell, Dorothea
A Note on the Cemetery of the Abbasid Caliphs of Cairo and the Shrine of Saiyida Nafisa, VI, Pt. 2, 168.
Sauvaget, Jean
Les Caravansérails du Ḥadždži de Constantinople, IV, 98.
Caravansérails syriens du moyen-âge. I. Caravansérails ayyūbides, VI, Pt. 1, 48; II. Caravansérails mamelouks, VII, Pt. 1, 1.
Schacht, Joseph
Ein archaischer Minaret-Typ in Ägypten und Anatolien, V, Pt. 1, 46.
Schroeder, Eric
M. Godard’s Review of the Architectural Section of A Survey of Persian Art, IX, 211.
Smith, Myron B.
Material for a Corpus of Early Iranian Islamic Architecture. I. Masdjid-i Dżum’a, Demâwend. Notice épigraphique par Yedda A. Godard, II, Pt. 2, 153; II. Manâr and Masdjid, Barsân (İsfahân), IV, 7; III. Two Dated Seljuk Monuments at Sin (İsfahân), VI, Pt. 1, 1.
Three Monuments at Yazd-i Khwâšt, VII, Pt. 1, 104.
Stern, Henri
Notes sur l’architecture des châteaux omeyyades, XI–XII, 72.

Architecture—Continued

Wilber, Donald N.
The Development of Mosaic Faience in Islamic Architecture in Iran, VI, Pt. 1, 16.

Arms and Armor

Born, Wolfgang
Ivory Powder Flasks from the Mughal Period, IX, 93.
A Lacquer-Painted Canteen, XV–XVI, 137.
Mayer, Leo A.
A New Heraldic Emblem of the Mamluks, IV, 349.
Saracenic Arms and Armor, X, 1.
Stöcklein, Hans

Bibliography

Aga-Oglo, Mehmet
Bibliographia, 1933–34, I, Pt. 2, 239.
Selected Bibliography (by Adèle Coulin Weibel), XV–XVI, 268.
Ashton, Leigh
Literature on Islamic Art Published in England during the War, XIII–XIV, 161.
Buchthal, Hugo; Kurz, Otto; and Ettinghausen, Richard
Supplementary Notes to K. Holter’s Check List of Islamic Illuminated Manuscripts before A.D. 1350, VII, Pt. 2, 147.
Coomaraswamy, Ananda K.
The Writings of Ananda K. Coomaraswamy (by Helen E. Ladd), IX, 125.
Eldem, Halil Edhem
Selected Bibliography (by Leo A. Mayer), VI, Pt. 2, 198.
Erffa, Helmut von
Goetz, H. and A.
Indian Studies in Islamic Art Published during the War, XIII–XIV, 162.
Herzfeld, Ernst
The Writings of Ernst Herzfeld (by George C. Miles), VII, Pt. 1, 82.
Supplement to “The Writings of Ernst Herzfeld” (by Richard Ettinghausen), XV–XVI, 266.
### Bibliography—Continued

- **Lamm, Carl Johan**

- **Mańkowski, Tadeusz**
  A Review of Polish Publications on Islamic Art, III, Pt. 1, 111.

- **Mayer, L. A.**
  Literature on Islamic Art Published in Palestine, Iraq, and Egypt during the War Years, XV–XVI, 154.

- **Munajjid, Salahud Din**

- **Öz, Tahsin**
  Publications on Turkish and Islamic Arts in Turkey, 1939–1945, XIII–XIV, 174.

- **Rice, D. S.**
  Bibliography of Contributions on Islamic Art Published in Germany and Austria during the War Years, 1939–1945, XV–XVI, 151.

- **Sauvaget, Jean**
  L’Archéologie musulmane en France de 1939 à 1945, XIII–XIV, 150.

- **Smith, M. B.**
  Annotated list of recent publications on Early Muslim Architecture, XIII–XIV, 186.

- **Torres Balbás, Leopoldo**
  Bibliography of Spanish Muslim Art, 1939–1945, XV–XVI, 165.

### Bone
See under Decorative Arts.

### Bookbinding
See under Decorative Arts.

### Book Illumination
See under Decorative Arts.

### Calligraphy
See under Epigraphy, Paleography, and Calligraphy.

### Ceramics
See under Decorative Arts.

### Christian Art
See under Decorative Arts.

### Decorative Arts—Continued

- **Sakissian, Arménag**
  Reliure dans la Perse occidentale, sous les Mongols, au XIVe et au début de XVe siècle, I, Pt. 1, 80.

- **Book Illumination**
  - **Abbott, Nafia**
  - **Hubbard, Isabel**
  - **Sakissian, Arménag**
    Thèmes et motifs d’enluminure et de décoration arméniennes et musulmanes, VI, Pt. 1, 66.

### Ceramics (Pottery, Tiles, and Faïence Mosaic)

- **Aga-Oglu, Mehmet**
  Fragments of a Thirteenth Century Mihrâb at Nedjef, II, Pt. 1, 128.

- **Crane, Mary E.**
  A Fourteenth-Century Mihrâb from Isfahân, VII, Pt. 1, 96.

- **Day, Florence E.**

- **Donaldson, Dwight M.**
  Significant Mihrâbs in the Haram at Mâshhâd, II, Pt. 1, 118.

- **Ettinghausen, Richard**
  Evidence for the Identification of Kâshân Pottery, III, Pt. 1, 44.
  Important Pieces of Persian Pottery in London Collections, II, Pt. 1, 45.

- **Guest, Grace D.**
  Notes on the Miniatures on a Thirteenth Century Beaker, X, 148.

- **Hobson, R. L.**
  Syria or Cyprus? IV, 467.
Decorative Arts—Continued

Kratchkovskaya, Vera A.
Fragments du mihrab de Verāmīn, II, Pt. 1, 132.
À Propos de l'épigraphie d'un plat à lustre métallique, IV, 468.
Kühnel, Ernst
Di 'abbāsidischen Lüsterfayencen, I, Pt. 2, 149.
Lane, Arthur
Glazed Relief Ware of the Ninth Century A.D., VI, Pt. 1, 56.
Matson, Frederick R.
Plumer, James Marshall
Certain Celadon Potsherds from Sāmarrā Traced to Their Source, IV, 195.
Pope, Arthur Upham
The Survey of Persian Art and its Critics, IX, 169.
Reitlinger, Gerald
Islamic Pottery from Kish, II, Pt. 2, 198.
Unglazed Relief Pottery from Northern Mesopotamia, XV–XVI, 11.
Rice, David Talbot
The Oxford Excavations at Ḥira, I, Pt. 1, 51.
Riefstahl, Rudolph M.
Early Turkish Tile Revetments in Edirne, IV, 249.
Sakisian, Arménag
La Question des faïences de la Corne d'Or, V, Pt. 1, 99.
Sarre, Friedrich
Sine seltene Lüsterschale der Rnyy-Keramik, IV, 190.
Sauvaget, Jean
Une Signature de potier persan sur un tesson d'al-Fuṣṭāt, XIII–XIV, 148.
Taylor, Joan du Plat
Medieval Graves in Cyprus, V, Pt. 1, 55.

Metalwork (excluding Numismatics, Arms, and Armor)

Aga-Ogū, Mehmet
Memorandum on the Corpus of Islamic Metalwork, XV–XVI, 133.
Bader, O. N.
A Sasanian Vessel from Kungur, XV–XVI, 139.
Berry, Burton Y.
Turkish Door Furnishings I, Pt. 2, 223.
Buchthal, Hugo
A Note on Islamic Enameled Metalwork and its Influence in the Latin West, XI–XII, 195.
Cahen, Claude
Documents relatifs à quelques techniques iraniennes au début du onzième siècle, XV–XVI, 23.
Dimand, Maurice S.
A Reply, IX, 208.
A Review of Sasanian and Islamic Metalwork in A Survey of Persian Art, VIII, 192.
A Silver Inlaid Bronze Canteen with Christian Subjects in the Eumorfopoulos Collection, I, Pt. 1, 17.
Herzfeld, Ernst
A Bronze Pen-Case, III, Pt. 1, 35.
Hollis, Howard C.
A Unique Seljuk Bronze, II, Pt. 2, 231.
Lauffer, Berthold
Mayer, Leo O.
Three Heraldic Bronzes from Palermo, III Pt. 2, 180.
Pope, Arthur Upham
The Survey of Persian Art and its Critics, IX, 169.
Ross, Marvin C.
An Egypto-Arabic Cloisonné Enamel, VII, Pt. 2, 165.
Decorative Arts—Continued

Ruthven, Peter
Two Metal Works of the Mamlûk Period, I, Pt. 2, 230.

Sarre, Friedrich
Die Bronzekanne des Kalifen Marwân II im Arabischen Museum in Kairo, I, Pt. 1, 10.

Sauvaget, Jean
Une Représentation de la citadelle seljoukide de Merv, XV–XVI, 128.

Schroeder, Eric
An Aquamanile and Some Implications, V, Pt. 1, 9.

Rugs
Briggs, Amy
Timurid Carpets. I. Geometric Carpets, VII, Pt. 1, 20; II. Arabesque and Flower Carpets, XI–XII, 146.

Dimand, Maurice S.

Erdmann, Kurt

Ein wiedergefundener Teppich, I, Pt. 1, 121.


Lamm, Carl Johan

Maïkowski, Tadeusz
On Persian Rugs of the so-called Polish Type, IV, 456.

Troll, Siegfried
Damaskus-Teppiche. Probleme der Teppichforschung, IV, 201.

Worrell, William H.


Stone and Semiprecious Stone
Born, Wolfgang

Christie, A. H.
Two Rock-crystal Carvings of the Fatimid Period, IX, 166.

Decorative Arts—Continued

Erffa, Helmut von

Miles, George C.
Epitaphs from an Isfâhân Graveyard, VI, Pt. 2, 151.

Sakisian, Arménag
Thèmes et motifs d’enluminure et de décoration arménienes et musulmanes, VI, Pt. 1, 56.

Salmony, Alfred
Daghestan Sculptures, X, 153.

Sauvaget, Jean
La Tombe de l’Ortokide Balak, V, Pt. 2, 207.

Stucco
Cohn-Wiener, Ernst
A Turanian Monument of the Twelfth Century A.D., VI, Pt. 1, 88.

Cott, Perry B.

Pope, Arthur Upham
Some Recently Discovered Seldjûk Stucco, I, Pt. 1, 110.

Rice, David Talbot
The Oxford Excavations at Hîra, I, Pt. 1, 51.

Textiles
Britton, Nancy Pence

Pre-Mameluke Tirâz in the Newberry Collection, IX, 158.

Cahen, Claude
Documents relatifs à quelques techniques iraniennes au début du onzième siècle, XV–XVI, 23.

Day, Florence E.
DATED Tirâz in the Collection of the University of Michigan, IV, 421.

Kühnel, Ernst

Lamm, Carl Johan
Five Egyptian Tapestry-Weavings in Swedish Museums, I, Pt. 1, 92.

Some Mameluke Embroideries, IV, 65.


Marçais, Georges
Les Broderies turques d’Alger, IV, 145.
### Decorative Arts—Continued

Marzouk, Mohammad Abdil Aziz
The Evolution of Inscriptions on Fatimid Textiles, X, 164.

Myers, George H.
The Dating of Coptic Textiles in the Light of Excavations at Dura-Europos, IX, 156.

Pfister, R.
Le Rôle de l'Iran dans les textiles d'Antinoé, XIII—XIV, 46.

Pope, Arthur Upham
The Survey of Persian Art and its Critics, IX, 169.

Ruthven, Peter
Note on “2,000 Years of Silk Weaving,” in the Los Angeles Exhibition, X, 167.

Schmidt, J. Heinrich
Damaste der Mamlûkenzeit, I, Pt. i, 99.
Persische Seidenstoffe der Seldûtzenzeit, II, Pt. 1, 84.

Serjeant, R. B.
Material for a History of Islamic Textiles up to the Mongol Conquest: Abbasids, Tirâz under the, IX, 60; Armenian-Caspian Group, X, 91; Asia Minor of Mongol Times, XV—XVI, 57; Baghdad, Manufactures of, IX, 80; Costumes (Appendix I), XV—XVI, 76; Djibal, XI—XII, 106; Djurdjian, XI—XII, 98; Dyers, XV—XVI, 70; Egyptian Textiles, XIII—XIV, 88; Fars Group, X, 79; Furs, XV—XVI, 73; Index, XV—XVI, 273; India, Tirâz in, XI—XII, 136; Indian, Chinese and other influences (Appendix III), XV—XVI, 80; Introduction, IX, 54; Iraq, Manufactures of, IX, 85; Kaaba Coverings (Appendix II), XV—XVI, 79; Jazîra, Manufactures of, IX, 85; Kerman and Seistan, XI—XII, 131; Khoresm (Khwârizm), XI—XII, 129; Khurasan, XI—XII, 111; Khuzistan, X, 71; Kûnis, XI—XII, 98; Maghreb, XV—XVI, 41; Manufactures of Baghdad, IX, 80; Manufactures of Iraq and Jazîra, IX, 85; Seawool, XV—XVI, 60; Seistan, XI—XII, 131; Sicily, XV—XVI, 55; Spain, Textiles and the Tirâz in, XV—XVI, 29; Syrian Textiles, XI—XII, 138; Tabaristan, XI—XII, 98; Technical Methods, XV—XVI, 62; Tirâz under the Abbasids, IX, 69; Tirâz in India, XI—XII, 136; Tirâz Cities in Khuzistan, X, 71; Tirâz in Spain, XV—

### Decorative Arts—Continued

XVI, 29; Tirâz System, Origin of, IX, 60; Trade Routes, Early (Appendix IV), XV—XVI, 84; Transoxiana, XI—XII, 121; Yemen, Textiles in the, XIII—XIV, 75.

Weibel, Adèle C.

Wiet, Gaston
Tissus brodés mesopotamiens, IV, 54.

Wiklund, Signhild, and Lamm, Carl Johan
Some Woolen Girds from Egypt, VI, Pt. 2, 143.

### Wood, Ivory, Bone, and Papier Maché

Born, Wolfgang
Ivory Powder Flasks from the Mughal Period, IX, 93.

A Lacquer-Painted Canteen, XV—XVI, 137.

David-Weill, Jean
Un Bois à épigraphe attribué au dixième siècle, IV, 471.

Denikè, Boris
Quelques monuments de bois sculpté au Turkestân occidental, II, Pt. 1, 69.

Glidden, Harold W.
Fatimid Carved-Wood Inscriptions in the Collection of the University of Michigan, VI, Pt. 1, 94.

Ruthven, Peter
Some Egyptian Wood Carvings in the Collection of the University of Michigan, IV, 449.

Sakisian, Arménag
Thèmes et motifs d’enlumineure et de décoration arménienes et musulmanes, VI, Pt. 1, 66.

Smith, M. B.

### Dictionary of Islamic Artists

Aga-Oglu, Mehmet
Sinân Bey, Suppl., I, iii.

Taeschner, Franz
Christodulos, Suppl., I, iv.
Epigraphy, Paleography, and Calligraphy—Continued

Miles, George C.
Epigraphical Notice [Two Dated Seljuk Monuments at Sin (Isfahan)], VI, Pt. 1, 11.
Epitaphs from an Isfahan Graveyard, VI, Pt. 2, 151.

Nykl, A. R.
Arabic Inscriptions in Portugal, XI–XII, 167.

Rosenthal, Franz
Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī on Penmanship, XIII–XIV, 1.

Sauvaget, Jean
Notes épigraphiques sur quelques monuments persans, V, Pt. 1, 103.
La Tombe de l’Ortokide Balak, V, Pt. 2, 207.

Schoedler, Eric
What was the Badi’ Script? IV, 232.

Sprengling, Martin
A Study of the Arabic Inscriptions [Chinese Muhammedan Bronzes], I, Pt. 2, 133.

Wittek, Paul

Exhibitions. See under Museums and Exhibitions.

Expeditions and Excavations

Aga-Oglu, Mehmet

Field, Henry, and Prostov, Eugene

Excavations at Khwārazm, 1937–38, VI, Pt. 2, 158.


Note on Recent Excavations at Khwārazm, XIII–XIV, 139.

Rice, David Talbot
The City of Shāpur, II, Pt. 2, 174.

The Oxford Excavations at Ḥira, I, Pt. 1, 51.

Schmidt, Erich
Excavations at Rayy, II, Pt. 1, 139.

Sunderland, A. L.
Excavations at Kaṣr-i-Abū Naṣr, II, Pt. 1, 141.

Taylor, Joan du Plat
Medieval Graves in Cyprus, V, Pt. 1, 55.

Far Eastern Art. See under Non-Islamic Arts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>General</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coomaraswamy, Ananda K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note on the Philosophy of Persian Art, XV–XVI, 125.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diez, Ernst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneity in Islamic Art, IV, 185.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic Analysis of Islamic Art: General Part, III, Pt. 2, 201; Islamic Art, V, Pt. 1, 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimand, Maurice S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Islamic Ornament. I. Aspects of Omayyad and Early 'Abbásid Ornament, IV, 293.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goetz, Hermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis of Indo-Muslim Civilization—Some Archaeological Notes, I, Pt. 1, 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins, Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice, David Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressionist Style in Early Iran. Art, V, Pt. 2, 216.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strzygowski, Josef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamische Kunst als Problem, I, Pt. 1, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Asiens Hellas, IV, 42.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Iconography—Continued</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schapiro, Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Angel with the Ram in Abraham's Sacrifice: A Parallel in Western and Islamic Art, X, 134.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder, Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Aquamanile and Some Implications, V, Pt. 1, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indian Art</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See under Non-Islamic Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Islamic Artists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See under Dictionary of Islamic Artists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ivory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See under Decorative Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metalwork</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See under Decorative Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coomaraswamy, Ananda K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Symbolism of Archery, X, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maniowski, Tadeusz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Islamic Art in Poland, II, Pt. 1, 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See under Painting and Mosaics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Museums and Exhibitions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ettinghausen, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Exhibition of Persian Art at the Toledo Museum of Art, II, Pt. 1, 137.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Six Thousand Years of Persian Art,” the Exhibition of Iranian Art, New York, 1940, VII, Pt. 1, 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Basil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Art at the Indian Exhibition, Royal Academy, London, November 1947 to February 1948, XV–XVI, 145.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Helen B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit of Islamic Art, San Francisco, 1937, IV, 484.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins, Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard, Isabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Celebrations of Millennium of Firdawsi, II, Pt. 1, 143.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition of Oriental Rugs at the Toledo Museum of Art, 1937, IV, 498.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kühnel, Ernst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Islamic Department of the Berlin Museum, XV–XVI, 143.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamm, Carl Johan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Iconography</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born, Wolfgang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Powder Flasks from the Mughal Period, IX, 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coomaraswamy, Ananda K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harner, Willy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pseudoplanetary Nodes of the Moon's Orbit in Hindu and Islamic Iconographies, V, Pt. 2, 113.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechler, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tree of Life in Indo-European and Islamic Cultures, IV, 369.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakisian, Arménag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution à l'iconographie de la Turquie et de la Perse, XV–XIXe siècles, III, Pt. 1, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvaget, Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Une Représentation de la citadelle seljoukide de Merv, XV–XVI, 128.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Museums and Exhibitions—Continued

Rice, David Talbot
Ruthven, Peter
Wilber, Donald N.
“Pagan and Christian Egypt.” An Exhibition, IX, 150.
Zaloscer, Hilde
The Exhibition of Eurasian Art at the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, II, Pt. 1, 136.

Non-Islamic Arts

Christian Art
Angulo, Diego
The Mudéjar Style in Mexican Architecture, II, Pt. 2, 225.
Buchthal, Hugo
A Note on Islamic Enameled Metalwork and its Influence in the Latin West, XI–XII, 195.
Myers, George H.
The Dating of Coptic Textiles in the Light of Excavations at Dura-Europos, IX, 156.
Sakisian, Arménag
Thèmes et motifs d'enluminure et de décoration arméniennes et musulmanes, VI, Pt. 1, 66.
Schapiro, Meyer
The Angel with the Ram in Abraham's Sacrifice: A Parallel in Western and Islamic Art, X, 134.
Taylor, Joan du Plat
Medieval Graves in Cyprus, V, Pt. 1, 55.
Weitzmann, Kurt
Wilbur, Donald N.
“Pagan and Christian Egypt.” An Exhibition, IX, 150.

Far Eastern Art

Diez, Ernst

Non-Islamic Arts—Continued

Laufer, Berthold
Chinese Muhammedan Bronzes, with a Study of the Arabic Inscriptions by Martin Sprengling, I, Pt. 2, 133.
Plumer, James Marshall
Certain Celadon Potsherds from Sāmarrā Traced to Their Source, IV, 195.

Indian Art

Born, Wolfgang
Ivory Powder Flasks from the Mughal Period, IX, 93.
Brown, W. Norman
A Jaina Manuscript from Gujarat Illustrated in Early Western Indian and Persian Styles, IV, 154.
Frye, Richard N.
Hartner, Willy
The Pseudoplanetary Nodes of the Moon's Orbit in Hindu and Islamic Iconographies, V, Pt. 2, 113.

Pre-Islamic Arts

Bader, O. N.
A Sasanian Vessel from Kungur, XV–XVI, 139.
Bernheimer, Richard
A Sasanian Monument in Merovingian France, V, Pt. 2, 221.
Cott, Perry B.
Dimand, Maurice S.
A Review of Sasanian and Islamic Metalwork in A Survey of Persian Art, VIII, 192.
Erdmann, Kurt
Das Datum des Tāk-i Bustān, IV, 79.
Die Entwicklung der sasanidischen Krone, XV–XVI, 87.
Hopkins, Clark
Lamm, Carl Johan
Lorey, Eustache de
L'Hellénisme et l'Orient dans les mosaïques de la mosquée des omayyades, I, Pt. 1, 22.
Non-Islamic Arts—Continued

Pfister, R.
Le Rôle de l'Iran dans les textiles d'Antinoé, XIII–XIV, 46.

Rice, David Talbot
City of Shāhrūr, II, Pt. 2, 174.

Schmidt, J. Heinrich
Figürlich sasanidische Stuckdekorationen aus Ktesiphon, IV, 175.

Strzygowski, Josef

Numismatics

Arne, T. J.
Funde von Gussformen für kufische Münzen und Medaillen, IV, 461.

Miles, George C.
Note on a Die Engraver of Isfahan, V, Pt. 1, 100.

Obituaries

Binyon, Laurence, XI–XII, 207.
Cohn-Wiener, IX, 238.
Coomaraswamy, Ananda Kentish, XV–XVI, 259.
Eldem, Halil Edhem, VI, Pt. 2, 198.
Eumorfopoulos, George, VII, Pt. 1, 123.
Flury, Samuel, II, Pt. 2, 235.
Herzfeld, Ernst, XV–XVI, 261.
Hobson, R. L., IX, 237.
Lodge, John Ellerton, IX, 239.
March, Benjamin, II, Pt. 1, 145.
Martin, Frederick Robert, I, Pt. 1, 4.
Raphael, Oscar, IX, 236.
Riefstahl, Rudolph Meyer, IV, 499.
Ross, E. Denison, IX, 235.
Strzygowski, Josef, VII, Pt. 2, 177.

Painting and Mosaics—Continued

Aga-Oglu, Mehmet

The Khusrau wa Shīrīn Manuscript in the Freer Gallery, IV, 479.
The Landscape Miniatures of an Anthology Manuscript of the Year 1398 A.D., III, Pt. 1, 77.

Brian, Doris
A Reconstruction of the Miniature Cycle in the Demotte Shah Namah, VI, Pt. 2, 97.

Brown, W. Norman
A Jaina Manuscript from Gujarat Illustrated in Early Western Indian and Persian Styles, IV, 154.

Buchthal, Hugo
"Hellenistic" Miniatures in Early Islamic Manuscripts, VII, Pt. 2, 125.

Buchthal, Hugo; Kurz, Otto; and Ettinghausen, Richard
Supplementary Notes to K. Holter's Checklist of Islamic Illuminated Manuscripts before A.D. 1350, VII, Pt. 2, 147.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda K.

Creswell, K. A. C.
The Lawfulness of Painting in Early Islam, XI–XII, 159.

Diez, Ernst


Ettinghausen, Richard
Painting in the Fatimid Period: A Reconstruction, IX, 112.

Glidden, Harold W.
A Note on the Automata of al-Djazārī, III, Pt. 1, 115.

Gray, Basil
Fourteenth Century Illustrations of the Kalilah and Dimnah, VII, Pt. 2, 134.

Islamic Art at the Indian Exhibition, Royal Academy, London, November 1947 to February 1948, XV–XVI, 145.

Guest, Grace Dunham
Notes on the Miniatures on a Thirteenth Century Beaker, X, 148.

Hubbard, Isabel

Lorey, Eustache de
Behzād. Le Gulistān Rothschild, IV, 122.

L’Hellénisme et l’Orient dans les mosaïques de la mosquée des Omaiyades, I, Pt. 1, 22.
Painting and Mosaics—Continued

Martinovitch, Nicholas N.
A Djâmi Manuscript in the Lafayette College Library, I, Pt. 1, 128.

Mayer, Leo A.
A Hitherto Unknown Damascene Artist, IX, 168.

Nykl, A. R.
Ali ibn Abi Talib's Horoscope, X, 152.

Sakisian, Arménag
Contribution à l'iconographie de la Turquie et de la Perse, XVe-XIXe siècles, III, Pt. 1, 7.

Mahmûd Mudhahib—Miniaturiste, enlumineur et calligraphe persan, IV, 338.

Thèmes et motifs d'enluminure et de décoration arménienes et musulmanes, VI, Pt. 1, 66.

Schapiro, Meyer
The Angel with the Ram in Abraham's Sacrifice: A Parallel in Western and Islamic Art, X, 134.

Schoeder, Eric

Weitzmann, Kurt

Wilkinson, J. V. S.

Paleography. See under Epigraphy, Paleography, and Calligraphy.

Papier Mâché. See under Decorative Arts.

Pre-Islamic Art. See under Non-Islamic Arts.

Reviews—Continued


Bahgat, Aby Bey, and Massoul, Félix, La Céramique musulmane de l'Égypte. Reviewed by Ernst Kühnel, VI, Pt. 2, 181.


Ulug Beg und seine zeit. Reviewed by Donald N. Wilber, VII, Pt. 1, 118.


David-Weill, Jean, Les Bois à épigraphes jusqu'à l'époque mamlouke. Reviewed by Ernst Kühnel, VI, Pt. 2, 177.


Reviews—Continued

Havary, Hassan; Rached, Hussein, and Wiet, Gaston, Stèles funéraires. (5 vols.) Reviewed by Ernst Kühnel, VI, Pt. 2, 178.
Herzfeld, Ernst E., Archaeological History of Iran. Reviewed by Clark Hopkins, III, Pt. 2, 213.
Geschichte der Stadt Samarra. Reviewed by George C. Miles, XV–XVI, 225.

Reviews—Continued

Lockhart, Laurence, Famous Cities of Iran. Reviewed by Donald N. Wilber, VI, Pt. 2, 197.
Mańkowski, Tadeusz, A Review of Polish Publications on Islamic Art, III, Pt. 1, 111.
Sztuka Islamu w Polsce w XVII i XVIII Wieku. (The Art of Islam in Poland in the XVII and XVIII Centuries.) Reviewed by Marie Parsky, II, Pt. 2, 248.
Miles, George C., Epigraphy in A Survey of Persian Art, VIII, 105.
Pauty, Edmond, Bois sculptés d'églises coptes. (Époque fatimite.) Reviewed by Ernst Kühnel, VI, Pt. 2, 180.


Stein, Sir Aurel, Old Routes of Western Irân. Reviewed by Clark Hopkins, IX, 217.

Villard, Ugo Monneret de, La Necropole musulmane de Aswan. Reviewed by Ernst Kühnel, VI, Pt. 2, 179.


L'Exposition persane de 1931. Reviewed by Ernst Kühnel, VI, Pt. 2, 183.


Objets en cuivre. Reviewed by Ernst Kühnel, VI, Pt. 2, 179.


Réponse à Miss Florence Day, XV–XVI, 244; Miss Day's Reply, XV–XVI, 250.

Wulzinger, Karl; Wittek, Paul; and Sarre, Friedrich, Das Islamische Milet. Reviewed by Aga-Oglu, II, Pt. 2, 244.


Kunûz al-Fâtîmiyin. (Treasures of the Fatimids.) Reviewed by Ernst Kühnel, VI, Pt. 2, 184.

Rugs. See under Decorative Arts.

Stone and Semiprecious Stone. See under Decorative Arts.

Stucco. See under Decorative Arts.

Textiles. See under Decorative Arts.

Wood, Ivory, Bone, and Papier Mâché. See under Decorative Arts.