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*Near Eastern Editor, Richard Ettinghausen*

*Far Eastern Editor, Max Loehr*

**EDITORIAL office:** FREER GALLERY OF ART, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
AN APPRECIATION OF CHARLES LANG FREER
(1856–1919)

The year 1936 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Charles Lang Freer, founder of the Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, at Washington, D. C., and this issue of Ars Orientalis, dedicated to Mr. Freer, gives opportunity to recollect briefly the man himself and the character of his work in fact and in purpose. An earlier memorial event in 1956 was held at the Freer Gallery of Art on February 25, the actual date of Mr. Freer’s birth a century ago. At that celebration the Charles Lang Freer Medal (pl. 1), designed by Paul Manship and to be given “for distinguished contribution to the knowledge and understanding of Oriental civilizations as reflected in their arts,” was presented to Dr. Osvald Sirén, sometime Professor of History of Art in the University of Stockholm and Keeper of Pictures and Sculptures at the National Museum, Stockholm. This number of Ars Orientalis and the February celebration together form a most felicitous and fitting memorial to Mr. Freer. Felicitous and fitting because Mr. Freer was not sympathetic to the idea of having his biography written, preferring to stress the importance of the collections than to limelight the individual who did the collecting. These two memorials, in honoring Mr. Freer, do indeed emphasize and honor the great work in which he was truly a pioneer and out of which so much of significance has come.

An appreciation of Mr. Freer and his work might well begin: “Once upon a time there lived an extraordinary boy,” if such a beginning could serve to intimate those qualities of undaunted faith, high imagination, and will power that carried Charles Lang Freer through a lifetime of hard work, exciting adventure, and terrible illness, and that always sustained his vision and gave joy to him in his work.

Charles Lang Freer was born in Kingston, N.Y., on February 25, 1856, and died on September 25, 1919. He came of good French-Huguenot stock, his first American ancestor having been one of the original patentees of New Paltz, N.Y., and, as a friend remarked, “that fine Huguenot ancestry accounts for Mr. Freer’s natural elegance.” From his midteens to his midforties Charles Freer was of necessity engaged upon earning a livelihood, starting his career at a cement factory in Kingston and in other small businesses in Ulster County. Through his lifelong friend, Col. Frank J. Hecker, his interest presently was turned to the more engrossing subject of transportation—railroads and their equipment—and he left Kingston, going first to Logansport, Ind., and then to Detroit, Mich., where he made his permanent home. Mr. Freer had a kind of genius for organization, an immediate and accurate response to strategic needs before him. This talent stood him in good stead both in the organization of the American Car and Foundry Company at the turn of the century and later in the detailed planning and presentation of his collection to the Government and people of the United States.

It is of interest to note that although Mr. Freer was actively engaged and interested in his business career, he had the insight to retire from it in his midforties in order to devote himself, his strength, time, and wealth, to the study and acquisition of his art collections. Even as a very young man he was attracted to the fine arts, purchasing such few American paintings and other minor objects as he could afford. None of these found an ultimate place in the present collections and none probably were of moment, though they may well have served as steps in his own aesthetic develop-
ment. On he went, in the pursuit of his ideal, one step seeming to lead inevitably to the next step higher, as his experience widened and his judgment matured.

In the 1880’s Mr. Freer bought etchings and lithographs by several artists, most of which he did not keep; however, those by Charles Storme van Gravesande he deeded to the Detroit Institute of Arts, while those by James McNeill Whistler formed the nucleus of the great collection of Whistler’s work—paintings, pastels, drawings, etchings, and lithographs—now dominant in the American section of the Freer Gallery. Mr. Freer’s friendship with Mr. Whistler (see frontispiece for Whistler’s portrait of Freer) lasted until Whistler’s death in 1903 and was no doubt largely responsible for Mr. Freer’s early interest in Japanese prints. Of these he bought many fine ones, but after he had come to know and admire Japanese paintings and drawings he lost interest in the prints and parted with them by 1905. His interest in Japanese art quite naturally led Mr. Freer into the earlier and more extensive fields of the arts of China, and China held him always. He traveled extensively both in the Far and Near East, to China and Japan, as well as to Java, India, Ceylon, Persia, and Egypt. His purchases were not confined to the Far Eastern field but also laid the foundation for the Freer Gallery’s present superb Near Eastern section. His devotion to the arts of China never wavered and he was continually searching out and buying Chinese things which, in his opinion, matched or excelled those already in his possession.

In the early days of Mr. Freer’s collecting little was known in the museums or among collectors here in the United States about the culture and arts of the Far East. At least Mr. Freer found no one until much later who could translate Chinese for him and document manuscripts and dates, no scholars to aid him in his search or to comprehend the purposes he had in mind. It is hard now to realize how much of present-day interest and scholarship in this country, in that whole Far Eastern field is due to Mr. Freer. The movement was then in its infancy; in a sense he was its beginning, quite alone in his collecting, and so it is the more amazing that Mr. Freer sensed the importance of establishing his foundation and of providing means to insure full use of such scholarship as he felt sure would come.

Mr. Freer was not a scholar and he made no pretense of being one. His approach to a work of art was that of an artist—an artist whose highly cultivated taste and discrimination empowered him to recognize and evaluate quality even in this relatively unknown field of inquiry. Often Mr. Freer left unchanged the dealers’ attributions. It did not overly concern him if a Chinese painting was erroneously attributed to one artist or another; the rendition of a noble tradition was there, he believed the quality was good, and he knew that others would come to amend and ascribe anew; his business was to collect and to provide means for the continuance of both collecting and study.

During the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, Mr. Freer offered his collections of American and Oriental art to the Government, to be given in trust to the Smithsonian Institution. The formal Deed of Gift was executed on May 5, 1906. Along with these extraordinary collections, Mr. Freer built the Gallery that was to house them and established a generous endowment with special funds provided for specific purposes, such as “the study of the civilization of the Far East,” and for the continuing acquisition of “objects of art of the very highest quality needed in the collection” in the Oriental fields. Also, in Mr. Freer’s will a bequest was made to the University of Michigan for research and publication in connection with Oriental art objects in the Freer Gallery. From the latter bequest have come no less than ten important publications in the University’s “Humanistic Series” concerning the Washington Manuscripts and other manuscripts and Near Eastern objects in Mr. Freer’s collection. In addition to these, this fund made possible the publication of the 16 vol-
umes of Ars Islamica, as well as the present publication which is sponsored jointly by the University and the Freer Gallery of Art.

Charles A. Platt was architect of the Freer Gallery. Together donor and architect worked out the general plan of the building, and throughout the last years of Mr. Freer's life when because of illness he was unable to get to Washington, he followed closely every step and detail in the construction of the building as reported constantly by Mr. Platt. Mr. Freer died before the building was completed.

In order to give a brief summary of the main collections, I quote from the Freer Gallery pamphlet (Smithsonian Institution Publication No. 4185, 1954):

China: Bronze, jade, sculpture, paintings, pottery, and porcelain.
Japan: Paintings, pottery, lacquer, and sculpture.
Korea: Pottery and bronze.
India: Sculpture, manuscripts, and paintings.
Iran: Manuscripts, metalwork, paintings, pottery, and sculpture.
Egypt and Syria: Sculpture, manuscripts, glass, and metalwork.
Greek, Aramaic, and Armenian Biblical manuscripts, early Christian painting, gold, and crystal. The outstanding objects in this group are the fourth-fifth-century manuscript of the Gospel according to the Four Evangelists, and a third-century Greek (Egypt) papyrus manuscript of The Minor Prophets (in part) known respectively as Washington Manuscripts Nos. III and V.
American: The arts of the West are represented by the collection of works by James McNeill Whistler, which include a great number of oils, watercolors, pastels, drawings, etchings, lithographs, and the Peacock Room; paintings by George de Forest Brush, Thomas Wilmer Dewing, Childe Hassam, Winslow Homer, Gari Melchers, Willard Leroy Metcalf, John Francis Murphy, Charles Adams Platt, Albert Pinkham Ryder, John Singer Sargent, Joseph Lindon Smith, Abbott Handerson Thayer, Dwight William Tryon, and John Henry Twachtman; two sculptures by Augustus St. Gaudens, and a group of Pewabic pottery by Mary Chase Perry Stratton.

A research library of now over 32,000 books.

The Freer gift of art objects, together with a splendid building to house them, was the first great art donation of a private citizen to the American people. This set a precedent, later to be followed by Andrew Mellon, with his foundation of the National Gallery of Art in Washington. In both cases the gifts were made in trust to the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Freer's reason for placing an American section with the Oriental sections in his collection was that he believed works of art, regardless of provenance or medium, if they were of sufficiently fine quality, could profitably and with enrichment to the student be exhibited and studied together. By the terms of his foundation, no works by American artists may be added to the collection; therefore, as the Oriental collections increase both in size and significance, the small American section will become ever relatively smaller. It will remain as Mr. Freer left it, a symbol and token of this personal predilection and as a permanent expression of his confidence in the works represented there.

Since all new acquisitions are purchased from Freer funds and not from outside financial sources, even 30 years after Mr. Freer's death this is still his collection and will continue to be so.

Of course the original collection as Mr. Freer made it, represented the choices of one man, which in the last resort were based upon his liking and thinking, his judgment and decision. He was free as no museum official is free, to choose, to buy, and to discard as he wished. He was an indefatigable and humble student of the fine arts and especially those of the Far and Near East. He had immense enthusiasm for his field of study and a deeply dedicated purpose in his collecting. Mr. Freer's fundamental concern was to establish a fruitful center of Eastern
studies where first-rate exhibition and research would be carried on by experts in their respective fields. What talent or insight did Mr. Freer possess that enabled him to create a foundation of such intrinsic value? Surely it was a creative wisdom, a spiritual insight granting him the power to recognize the greatness of these civilizations and of the arts they produced, to draw into his own experience an understanding of their importance to us in the West, and to make them so available that they have now become the property of our own experience. Once we accept the validity of his vision and purpose, we are impressed by Mr. Freer’s perception and intuitive judgment. Singularly sensitive to high quality of performance, whether it be the construction of a railway refrigerator car or the design and execution of a Chinese ceremonial bronze, his enthusiasm and praise were boundless. At times he seemed able to enter even into the scholar’s realm of authority and there to comprehend values that otherwise he could hardly have glimpsed.

In 1904 Mr. Freer wrote to Dr. Langley, then Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, of his desire to gather together masterpieces “harmonious in spiritual and physical suggestion, having the power to broaden aesthetic culture and the grace to elevate the human mind.” Mr. Freer oftentimes used the expression “high ideals of beauty.” Today such a phrase is not in vogue, it strikes a discordant note, perhaps sounds sentimental or silly. But if we seek to inform ourselves of Mr. Freer’s intention in using it, we may well find that it is part and parcel of the standards and disciplines he imposed upon himself in his work, and of the heritage he passed on to his successors, expressing basic values inherent in the gift and to be maintained. It would be good indeed, could he know with what care and devotion his endowment has been administered at the Freer Gallery over the more than 35 years since his death, by its two Directors, John Ellerton Lodge and Archibald Gibson Wenley.

In his day, Mr. Freer, despite a fervent dislike for publicity, became well known and admired as a connoisseur. Along with other well-known American pioneers in Far Eastern art, such as William Sturgis Bigelow, Edward S. Morse, and Ernest F. Fenollosa, he was much revered by the Japanese. His memory still persists in that country, so much so that on May 9, 1930, a monument was erected to him at a charming little temple called Kōetsu-dera in the countryside near Kyōto (pl. 2).

His other monument, the Freer Gallery of Art, stands today as one of the most distinguished of its kind in the world. It sets a standard of excellence that cannot be ignored. And if it be true that more is learned about a civilization or epoch from the arts it produced than from any other source, then Charles Lang Freer’s Foundation enriches this country in ways still to be measured. It is of the material of history.

Katharine Nash Rhoades
The Charles Lang Freer Medal Designed by Paul Manship in 1955 (Slightly Enlarged).
Monument for Charles L. Freer at the Kötsu-dera near Kyoto.
ANCIENT SYMBOLS IN MODERN AFGHANISTAN

BY SCHUYLER CAMMANN

For centuries the peoples of Afghanistan have greatly depended upon the products and skills of the neighboring peoples beyond the frontiers, so that their own arts and crafts are still relatively undeveloped. However, among the household implements, popular jewelry, and horse trappings displayed in the bazaars, it is still possible to find distinctive and interesting items, some of which show forms and patterns that seem to indicate the persistence of very ancient ideas, preserved there by rigid conservatism after they have faded out elsewhere. Here, we shall consider a small group of such things that were collected there by the writer, in 1953.1

Since these objects, and the probable reasons for their use and persistence, lead us into byways of folklore and culture that have not previously been explored by students of this area, any explanations and interpretations must necessarily be tentative. Those presented here have been chosen as seeming most consistent with other traits in Islamic civilization and in the earlier cultures of this general area, including Old Persia and the neighboring regions of what is now Russian Central Asia. However, some significant clues have also been found in other areas farther west; because, in spite of regional differences which have created separate national cultures like that of Persia, many ideas and cultural patterns were widely spread throughout the Islamic world by the movement of peoples, by trade and military relations, and by a common heritage from earlier civilizations—especially on the folk level.

I

Among the most common articles on sale in the bazaars of modern Afghanistan are small, crudely cast, and roughly finished metal spoons, which are generally used in the inns and teahouses, as well as in private homes, for passing out sugar. The merchants who sell these spoons usually state that they are made in Kandahar, in southern Afghanistan, but as they are simple to make, some may be produced in other centers also. In any case, the style and patterns probably originated elsewhere, as the closest relatives to these spoons in form and design are now found in northern Europe, where they must represent the other periphery of a once widespread complex that has since died out in the intervening area. The antler spoons of the Lapps, in particular, have a close resemblance to these, with their broad, flat handles which often have rounded projections at the sides.2

The oddly pierced and decorated handles of the Afghan spoons at first glance seem much alike, but we can find three principal types with only minor variations, as shown in text figure 1. The first (fig. 1, a) is the commonest, and apparently the basic type; the second (fig. 1, b) is less frequent; while the third (fig. 1, c) is cur-

1 The writer privately purchased these modern objects in Afghanistan while on an archaeological expedition for the University Museum of Philadelphia, searching for antiquities. They were collected because of the apparent interrelationship between these very diverse things, although the full significance of this did not become clear until after much research. The sketch of the sugar spoons (text fig. 1) was kindly drawn by Eric Parkinson of the University Museum, while the drawings of jewelry in text figures 4 and 6 were generously done by Marianne Stoller. The writer also wishes to thank M. Akbar Khan of Kabul, Taher Jan of Kunduz, and other Afghan friends, for their assistance in obtaining objects and for their information on local customs and traditions.

rently quite popular because of the religious and nationalistic appeal of the Muslim star-in-
crescent motif at the top.

The strange openings in the form of the two opposed comma-shaped holes and the figure(s)-of-eight, together with the long central slot, could not be explained from any functional

point of view. Along with the nucleated circles, they seem to have been placed according to some long-established convention—at least on the upper portion of the handles. Being highly stylized end products of a long tradition, the patterns are difficult to identify; but in spite of their extreme conventionalization, the top-most elements can still be deciphered. For example, the upper parts of the first and second spoons, above the base of the long slot, suggest the form of a bird with a hole through its chest (a two-headed bird in the second case); while the third handle shows how a religious emblem has been superimposed on an older form—un-

consciously violating the upper part of the pattern—in order to give it more significance in the modern world, just as a cross was sometimes added to ancient symbolic bird forms on medieval Russian amulets.²

The suggestion that a bird is present at the top of the design on the Afghan sugar-spoon handles seems more plausible when we see the more easily recognized birds on the "sugar axes," which are (or were) generally used for the primary purpose of breaking up and pulverizing the old-fashioned sugar loaves so that the powdered product could be readily dispensed in these spoons. (See pl. I.) Why should a bird figure in the ornamentation on the sugar implements? Old Indo-Iranian legends told that the sweet nectar of the gods (haoma or soma)

² See the medieval amulets from Kiev, illustrated in B. A. Rubakov, Znaki sobstvennosti v knyazheskom khozyniastve Kievnoi Rusi X–XII, Sovetskaya Arkheologiya, vol. 6 (1940), p. 239, figs. 33–36.
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was first brought down to earth from Heaven by a divine bird; and when sugar was introduced into the Iranian culture area (which included Afghanistan) some fifteen hundred years ago, the obvious analogy between the new sweet and the traditional nectar might have led people to associate sugar also with the divine bird.

However, since the bird makes only a part of the total pattern on the sugar-spoon handles, we must consider the design as a whole. The entire handle pattern can probably best be explained by analogy with the close relatives of the Afghan spoons which are found in northern Europe and Asia. The motif of a (perforated) solar symbol, or the mythical Sunbird itself, atop a cosmic tree has previously been identified on the spoon handles of Lapland and Sweden, and as we shall see, on examining some of the other bird symbols in Afghan folk tradition, the Sunbird atop the World Tree is probably what was originally intended on the pattern of the Afghan spoon handles also. In which case, the rounded projections at the sides could be survivals of the fruits, flowers, or blossoms so often shown projecting from conventional representations of the World Tree as far back as the old Assyrian renderings of their world tree.


5 Sugarcane was apparently first raised in India or Southeast Asia, and imported from there into Persia, where it was being produced as early as the Sasanian period (A.D. 226–651). The Arabs, after their conquest of Persia in A.D. 640, passed the sugar industry on to Palestine, Syria, and Egypt. See B. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, Field Museum Anthropological Series, vol. 13, No. 3 (Chicago, 1919), pp. 376–377.

6 See Leroi-Gourhan, op. cit., pp. 29–31, text and figs., and pp. 162–165 of continuation. An Old Swedish example with a distinctly rendered bird is pictured in fig. 25, p. 31.

the Asherah, or they might be remnants of the lesser birds or birds’ heads which replaced the fruits, etc., in some of the later versions elsewhere in Asia.

This explanation of the entire handle pattern as a representation of the World Tree, or Tree of Life, with the Sunbird, does not contradict the previous suggestion regarding the bird, however. For in the Zoroastrian tradition of Old Persia, the Tree of Life, Gaokarena, was also called the White Haoma, and it was the source from which the divine nectar was brought to earth by the divine bird. Furthermore, it served as the perch for a Sunbird, the Sāna, prototype of the later Persian Simurgh. Thus, once again we encounter the possibility of an old association between the sweet nectar and sugar, which could have provided one reason for the original use of this symbol on sugar spoons. However, on examining the sugar axes and other related objects in the Afghan folk tradition, we shall find still other reasons for the symbolism, most of which are more readily demonstrable than the still hypothetical association between *haoma* and sugar.

The sugar axes, locally known as *gandshekan* or “sugar breakers,” are now quite rare in the bazaars, although it was said that they could


still be found in many private homes, where they were often treasured as heirlooms. The writer was able to purchase several examples in some of the remoter bazaars of Kabul, over a four-month period, between trips to other parts of the country. They were difficult to find, and usually turned up in second-hand metal shops. The widespread use of granulated sugar, which has greatly increased since the recent establishment of the beet-sugar plant at Baghlan, has diminished the sale of the old loaf sugar, although it is still displayed in many food shops, and is used for special occasions, such as weddings. Therefore the sugar breakers are rapidly becoming obsolete.

They come in two main types, differing both in appearance and in use. Those of the first type, which might be called the “ceremonial” variety, are generally cast from brass or bronze. They are quite ornamental, in marked contrast to the relatively simple tools of iron or steel which make up the second, more utilitarian type.

The “ceremonial” sugar axes themselves can be further subdivided into two principal forms, while still other variants may occur, as we shall see. The most spectacular of the two main forms is illustrated by the upper example in plate 1, figure 2. A long slender handle terminates in a flat disk, from which juts a small but heavy adze blade flanked by two slender curved bars, obviously intended to represent snakes. On the opposite side from the blade is a thin, flat piece of metal cut into the shape of an eaglelike bird with a hooked beak.

The bird’s eyes are usually marked by a nucleated circle, like those which ornament the handles of the sugar spoons, while short wings of another darker metal are fastened to each side by a prominent rivet made from a third, whiter metal, which gives the effect of extra eyes on the shoulders of the wings. Usually the bird itself is made of brass or bronze, like the disk and the blade, with wings of blued steel. However, another example brought back by the writer has a bird of thin steel with brass wings. The latter bird also differs by having a small hole for the eye, and another through the end of its tail.

This first type of sugar axe characteristically has two hollow brass hemispheres riveted to either side of the circular disk, thus forming a ball at the top of the handle. The heads of the rivets, which secure the two halves of the ball, are concealed by hinged flaps of a darker metal cut into a shape suggesting the fleur-de-lis. Both hemispheres are pierced with three concentric rows of perforations, and filled with shiny red tinsel paper which shows through the holes.

A reddish sphere suggests the solar ball, while the projections below it which resemble snakes suggest the two “bands or streamers” that often hang from the winged sun disk in the early Near Eastern representations of the latter.

On the old Assyrian and later Persian sun disks, the meaning of the so-called “streamers” is not very clear, but they were doubtless the equivalent of the two uraeus serpents on the still older Egyptian representations of the winged sun disk, from which the Assyrians ones seem to have derived. Whatever they may have meant

---

to the Assyrians, it seems evident that these projections from the sun ball on the Afghan sugar axes do represent snakes, as their appearance would indicate.12

This is especially likely since the projecting bars are shown not only with a solar ball, but also with a bird, which, judging from its associations, must be a form of the traditional Sunbird. The theme of a (Sun-) bird in opposition to a snake, fish, or other reptile, is very old and widely spread in art and literature, not only in Asia.13 A very ancient literary source for it can be found in the Old Babylonian myth of Etana, in which a huge eagle which sat at the top of a great tree fought with a serpent at its base; and an evil lizard strove to eat the roots of the Old Persian Gaokerena Tree on which perched the Sāna.14 Even in old Germanic mythology, Odin as an eagle, or another divine bird, nests atop the World Tree, Ygdrasil, while under its roots lurks the malignant dragon-serpent.15

It is not surprising, then, to find that in Asiatic art snakes (or fish) are frequently shown with divine birds, which belligerently oppose them, or grasp them in their claws or beaks.16 The most obvious example is probably the Indo-Tibetan Garuda;17 but the mythical Simurgh fighting the dragon, so often represented in Persian art, especially on rugs and carpets, is a late expression of the same basic tradition.18 On these sugar axes, the theme of conflict is not emphasized, yet the fact that the bird and snakes are shown on opposite sides of the solar ball, with the birds on the top or superior side,

12 Eric Schroeder, in An aquamanile and some implications, Ars Islamica, vol. 5, pt. 1 (1938), p. 10, says that Iranian auspicious decoration in general sedulously avoided the snake, and that its rare occurrence is usually symptomatic of Indian workmanship. Afghanistan falls within the Iranian cultural area, as we have seen, and yet these projecting forms are most certainly snakes—unless they are extremely broken-down dragons with similar symbolical implications—and there is nothing else about these sugar breakers to indicate Indian influence. However, much of the metalwork in Afghanistan has traditionally been done by Persian and Indian artisans residing there, and it is possible, though not too likely, that some of the latter might have introduced a few of their own concepts into "Afghan" manufactures. Lastly, while the snake may not have figured in the fine arts of later Iran, it was used very commonly in decoration in ancient Iran, as it was in India, so it could have survived in folk symbolism. See Herzfeld, op. cit., pp. 61–62.


16 For the cosmic bird associated with fish, see Carl Schuster, "A comparative study of motives in western Chinese folk embroideries, Monumenta Serica, vol. 2, (Peking, 1936–37), pp. 33–40 and fig. 3. A prehistoric example is illustrated in Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 59, fig. 107. The whole composition, centering around a swastika, indicates that this design from Samarra represents a cosmic diagram.

17 For a fine example of the Tibetan form of Garuda clutching a snake, on a piece of jewelry collected by the writer on the Chinese border of Tibet, see The Museum, n.s., vol. 1, No. 2 (Newark, N. J., April 1949), fig. 7.

18 For a discussion of the motif of the Simurgh versus the Dragon on Near Eastern rugs and carpets see Carl Schuster, Some comparative considerations about western Asiatic carpet designs, loc. cit., p. 68 ff. For some examples see Survey of Persian Art, vol. 6, pls. 1127, 1133, 1144, 1145, 1164, 1206, 1207, 1251, 1267, A, etc. For the same motif in other media, see ibid., vol. 5, pls. 945, A, and 971. B. See also pl. 5, fig. 13, of this article and its explanation in the text, below.
and the snakes as inferiors, below, seems to indicate a definite sense of opposition.

It should be emphasized that the curved bars, which apparently represent twin snakes, can have no other purpose than that of completing the symbolism. For they not only lack any obvious practical use, but also they are definitely in the way, checking or limiting the full stroke of the blade, when one wants to use the sugar axe for its intended purpose. In fact, if the blades on our examples did not bear the marks of actual use, one might be tempted to infer that this form of instrument was merely a small ceremonial mace or scepter.

The solar disk between the outspread wings in the old Assyrian representations was frequently perforated, giving the appearance of a ring through which the light of Heaven could shine. From this ring often emerged a god, either Shamash the Sun god, or Assur, the supreme deity. Much later, in Persia, Ahura Mazda, the god of Light, was shown emerging from a similarly perforated sun disk between the spreading wings. Perhaps the numerous small perforations in the solar ball atop the sugar axes preserve some distant memory of the original pierced disk or ball in the more ancient renderings of the sun symbol.

Furthermore, the old Assyrian symbol of the winged sun disk was frequently shown resting on or above a column representing the axis column which was believed to support the sky and to separate the heavens from the earth, or else the World Tree, which was the column's symbolic equivalent. Very likely the solar ball atop the handle of the Afghan sugar axe is a late representation of the same basic idea, even though full memory of the original meaning has long since passed away.

It is true that the upper portion of this type of sugar axe gives the appearance of being tipped, so that the bird does not rest on the vertical axis of the staff, as one might expect to find it in a representation of the World Column or World Tree; but on an earlier form of the same type of sugar axe the bird apparently did stand at the top, directly above the handle. Evidence for this was provided by part of another brass sugar breaker, evidently related to the type just described, which was shown to the writer in an old metal shop in the "Persian Bazaar" at Kandahar. This had a much thicker circular headpiece, an actual disk, opening out at one side into a vertical blade which was flanked by the two snakes on the same plane, so that the complete instrument must have formed a true axe. Both the bird and the handle were missing, but the marks of attachment were clearly visible. One at the top showed that the bird must have been placed at this point, opposite the handle attachment. Perhaps originally the bird was always placed at the top of the sun symbol, until it was discovered that this was not very practical because a clumsy glancing blow on the nearer side of the sugar loaf could easily break off the bird. If so, the earlier sugar axes of this group would once have more clearly represented a cosmic tree or column, and also they would have borne a closer resemblance to those of the second group than they do now.

The second subvariety within the "ceremonial" type of Afghan sugar axes is simpler, but in some ways even more striking to look at (see pl. i, fig. 1). This consists of a larger bird atop a slender handle, with the tail of the bird forming a broad adze blade. The bird is very simply done. For example, on the usual, rather crudely made sugar axes of this type, the eyes are often omitted, or else simply indicated by a punched circle as in the one on the right in
Plate 1, figure 1. And yet, often the birds have details which help to distinguish a distinct species. Even though some modern Afghans tend to refer to all these birds as “doves,” the tuft of feathers atop the head of the one on the left in plate 1, figure 1, is characteristic of representations of the peacock, while the one on the right in the same plate has the recognizable profile of a gander, and still others have the massive hooked beak of an eagle. The peacock and the gander, as well as the eagle (and the dove), have all served as models for the old Asiatic Sunbird, and, as we shall see, the way in which the birds are shown on these axes makes it evident that they were intended to represent the Sunbird here.

In addition to the winged sun disk atop the World Column or the Tree of Life, the motif of a naturalistic bird atop a staff is also very old in the Near East. Usually the bird was an eagle or a diving bird (duck or gander). Standards consisting of an eagle (or gander) go back to Assyrian times in Mesopotamia, and were later used by the Achaemenian rulers of Persia—according to Xenophon—and by the Parthians.

A metaphorical diving bird, represented as a gander, a duck, or a swan, or elaborately conventionalized into the Indian hamsa, is frequently encountered in the Asian arts of the last two thousand years. The gander was a familiar auspicious decoration among the Sasanians, who rendered it in such a fanciful manner that at times it almost suggested a peacock; indeed, the peacock has been interchangeable with it in the later arts of Persia and the Near East in general. In this connection, see Schroeder, Aquamanile, p. 16. This gander and its derivatives were considered as a sunbird in old Persia; but it was not the only one. An eagle, or eagle-griffin (combining in a single creature the sun eagle and the solar lion), was equally venerable, and could be interchanged with the former. See ibid., p. 17.

The general idea of using a bird atop a staff in this way is also rather old in the later Islamic cultures. A similar convention is said to have been employed on the old Persian battle axes, and definite examples can be found among the Saracen ceremonial axes of the mediaeval Near East, notably those of Mamluk Egypt. However, on the large axes the bird’s tail was set vertically, making a true axe blade, and there are other points of difference from the bird-form sugar breakers as well. For instance, the latter generally have a short, hexagonal hammerhead projecting from the bird’s chest, as shown on the left example in Plate 1, figure 1. On the specimens that lack the hammerhead there is usually a roughened area on the front of the breast, where a hammerhead would have projected, suggesting that one had probably originally been present, then had later been broken off.

As a constant special feature of this second type of ceremonial sugar axe, the bird’s body is pierced transversely, leaving a large hole. This obviously is not intended as a practical feature, for it serves no particular use and it tends to lighten and weaken the top portion behind the blade, where, if anything, greater weight would be desired in order to give more power to the sugar-shattering blows. Since this perforation was not dictated by any practical considerations, we must look for some symbolic explanation.

The basic reason for it is easily provided by the old Asiatic convention that when the Sunbird itself represented the sun (instead of merely accompanying it), its body had to have the tra-


27 See L. A. Mayer, Saracenic arms and armor, Ars Islamica, vol. 10 (1943), fig. 17, op. p. 13, illustrating an axe of the 'Tabardariya Corps among the Mamluks. The present location of this example is not cited; however, there are said to be other similar ones on display in the Hall of arms at the Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi in Istanbul.
ditional perforation, like that in the old Mesopotamian and Persian sun disk which indicated the hole through which the light of Heaven streamed down to earth. However, although the concept of a perforated sunbird is common in Asia, here the perforation is so large that the whole figure suggests a combination of the Sunbird with the old winged ring (perforated sun disk) atop the column.

The concept of a solar bird with a hole through it takes us back once more to the modern Afghan sugar spoons, in which the bird-like form at the top of the handle has a hole (the figure-of-eight) through what would be the middle of its body. On considering this, it would seem that the spoon handles must quite definitely represent a highly conventionalized rendering of the old Tree of Life crowned by the Sunbird, although the details of the tree itself have been obliterated by excess conventionalization.

Still another variant of the ceremonial type of sugar axe is known only from one isolated example, acquired by the writer in Herat. (See pl. 1, fig. 2, bottom.) Since Herat is well within the sphere of strong Iranian influence, this may well have been of Persian origin. It has a much larger adze blade than the others, of a more archaic type (judging by its profile). It also has a much longer, more elaborate hammerhead, while the upper handle between hammer and blade has been thickened to provide a greater weight for striking. On a slender curved projection extending out from the top of the handle sits a little bird. Because of its small size, it has been left severely plain with no indication of eyes or body markings. Its diminutive size and remote perch suggest that the maker of this sugar breaker must have been conscious that tradition demanded a bird, and had therefore tried to fit one in, placing it where it would least interfere with the efficient functioning of the instrument.

The apparently deep-felt necessity to fit a bird in somewhere is also evident in the only two antique Persian examples of such hammer-adzes which the writer has been able to locate. Sugar breakers must once have been common in the Iranian cultural area—in fact, they are still being used in Iran on special occasions, as we shall see—although they do not seem to have been depicted in any of the miniature paintings, and are not mentioned in any of the numerous books on life and travel in Persia written by Europeans. Illustrations of two possible ex-

58 L. A. Mayer, *Saracenic heraldry*, Oxford, 1933, p. 9, states that the eagle was shown in two variations on the blazons of the Saracens: one with a single head and the other with two heads, and that both varieties frequently show a lanceolate patch on their breasts, which at times has the appearance of a gash. These are obviously two standard variants of the traditional Sunbird, borrowed for this special use. The particular objects portrayed on the Saracenic blazons were not arbitrarily chosen. Dr. Mayer has shown in this book, and in subsequent articles, that there was usually some good reason for the original selection of any symbol as a blazon. Thus, Sunbird symbols could originally have been used on armor and weapons as a protective charm, then later retained to serve as armorial bearings.

For another example of the perforated bird in Asia, from another area, see U. Holmberg, *Siberian mythology*, Mythology of All Races, vol. 4, p. 520.

59 The metaphysical Sun or Sky Door, which the hole represented, was also thought to be the aperture through which lightning was hurled down on the earth, so the Sunbird and the Thunderbird were the same creature; and, because of the natural association between celestial light, lightning, and earthly fire, the Sunbird-Thunderbird was also the Firebird.

60 A perforated disk or ring on a stick handle has been used as a symbol of the sun by the Lapps into modern times. In certain rites they held the disk against the actual sun, so that its light shone through the hole. See Holmberg, *Finno-Ugrian mythology*, Mythology of All Races, vol. 4, p. 225.

60a Since this article was first written, Alphonse Riesenfeld has published three of my Afghan sugar axes in *Bronze Age influences in the Pacific*, International Archives for Ethnography, vol. 47 (Leiden, 1955), p. 234, figs. 114–116, and text, p. 229. His article also contains some interesting observations on the "axe-bird association," which he traces back to prehistoric times, and a brief discussion of some aspects of its symbolism.
amples of the fancy hammer-adze type only appear fortuitously, along with other tools and utensils, in boxes of surgical instruments and personal effects made for Persian barbersurgeons. Although they are not specifically labeled as such, it would seem that they were probably sugar breakers, related to the types we have been discussing. They look very handsomely made, and in comparison with them, the Afghan ones seem very unsophisticated products.

The first of the two Persian examples is depicted, without comment, in d’Allemagne’s famous book of travels in Persia.13 This shows a delicately rendered bird with its head turned back over its shoulder, atop a highly ornamented handle. The slender wedge-shaped tail apparently served as a narrow adze blade, while a cylindrical hammerhead projects from the forward end, in front of the upcurving neck.

The second example is illustrated in the Survey of Persian Art.14 This one also has a bird device atop a nicely worked handle, with the narrow tail end adapted to serve as an adze blade. On this one, however, instead of having the top of the instrument in the shape of a three-dimensional bird, side views of a bird are figured on either side of the hammer-adze head, with the feathers and other details inlaid in a precious metal.

Even farther west in the Old Persian cultural area, we find some interesting sugar breakers still being made in Eastern Iraq, just over the border from Iran. Figures 3 and 4 on plate 2, illustrate a modern example from Kirkuk, purchased for the writer by Robert Dyson. The head and the handle are separately cast from brass, as are the protruding decorations, which are screwed on. The actual blade is made of steel and inserted in a slot at the end of the head. The pattern of the head portion apparently represents a stylized mountain, from the top of which rises a round column on which rests the Sunbird. The latter is a stylized peacock, complete with the Sunbird’s perforation indicated on its body. On either side of the “mountain” are two attendant birds, while a stag’s head projects from the front. Below the latter is a device consisting of a sunburst with a pierced center (painted red) surrounded by 12 dots, which is probably a shorthand way of representing the metaphysical Sun surrounded by the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac, a motif very popular in the arts of old Asia. (See pl. 3, fig. 6, for a variation on this theme.) Another Sunbird, with the same perforation in its side, is perched on the back of the handle, where it is only visible when the instrument is held sideways, at which time the Sunbird at the top cannot be seen. (All the birds may be unscrewed and removed to leave a purely utilitarian instrument, if desired.)

The association of the stag with the Sunbird and the Tree of Life is very significant. In nearby Anatolia, to the northwest, in Roman times, the local people made small cult bronzes showing a solar eagle perched on a stag or stag’s head, and the cult was then already ancient, having been traced back to the Hittites.15 Furthermore, stags or other horned creatures were often depicted at the sides of the Tree of Life in traditional Near Eastern representations of the latter.16 However, the stag’s head is also shown on an alternative type of Iraqi sugar adze which has a conventionalized lion in place of the Sunbird,17 so it may have been primarily in-

14 Survey of Persian art, vol. 6, pl. 1392.
16 See Ward, Seal cylinders, figs. 949 and 955, p. 304. Examples are numerous on medieval European textiles designed under Islamic influence; cf. Otto von Falke, Decorative silks, New York and London, 1922, pl. 5 and fig. 474, etc.
17 An example of this second type from Iraq was brought back to England by Professor Mallowan, and it figures as the murder weapon in one of his wife’s mysteries; see Agatha Christie, Mrs. McGinty’s dead, London and New York, 1951. (This seems to be the
tended to represent a horned lunar animal in opposition to, or in subjection to, the Sunbird or the solar lion.\(^{35a}\)

The two lesser birds below the base of the column are also significant. The Tree of Life is often flanked by two small birds (as in pl. 5, fig. 12, for example),\(^{36}\) and so is the Sunbird itself. A quite familiar depiction of the latter is shown on Islamic lamps and incense burners, where the Sunbird, apparently serving in his alternate role of Firebird, often has two lesser birds beneath him as attendants.\(^{37}\) In fact, the two metal flaps in fleur-de-lis form on either side of the solar ball atop the first type of Afghan sugar axe may well represent vestigial survivals of two attendant birds which once accompanied the larger one above.

The second primary category of Afghan sugar breakers comprises the far more utilitarian implements of iron or steel. These can also be subdivided into two types. The first is a simple, undecorated workingman’s tool, consisting of a heavy hammerhead and a very broad adze blade. These are still used by Afghan street vendors for breaking lumps of halwa and other types of hard candy. The second type is equally functional in appearance, but is usually more decorated, as these are also used ceremonially by the poor. It has two blades, the front one being a vertical axe blade, while the rear one is horizontal, in the typical adze form. As these are hammered out on the forge and not cast, it would be difficult to make them in bird shape; but on their blades one generally finds an auspicious design crudely indicated by punch marks that suggests a highly stylized Tree of Life motif on which is, perhaps, a bird. Both of these types of iron or steel sugar breakers have a rather long, plain handle of the same metal, separately made and fitted into a hole between the two blades.

A very large modern example of this second kind of sugar breaker, said to have come from Kerend near Kermanshah, was recently brought back from Iran by Richard Ettinghausen. (See pl. 2, fig. 5.) The punched design on the larger (adze) blade seems to represent a stylized tree flanked by two small birds—as the Tree of Life so often is—with the top of the “tree” piercing a band, which may be intended for clouds, to uphold a strange rayed form with a central aperture, above. It looks very much like a primitive attempt to represent the metaphysical Sun supported by the World Tree. A similar, modern Iranian sugar axe, which Dr. Ettinghausen recently obtained for the writer, has a perfectly distinct tree between the birds, but lacks the stylized sun symbol.

It might seem odd that the old concept, which considered the axe handle itself as representing the Tree of Life, should have been so far forgotten in modern times that they felt it necessary to depict the whole of the symbolism on the blade. However, the same tendency is illustrated on the somewhat older Persian processional axe in the University Museum in Philadelphia, which has a Tree of Life pattern on each side of its two large blades. (See the detail of one of these in pl. 5, fig. 12.) This would seem to indicate that the Afghan sugar axes with the bird atop the staff, like the two other Persian ones previously described, were much nearer to the original tradition.

II

After the writer had collected a number of the Afghan sugar axes, and their symbolism of Sunbird on World Tree, or column, was begin-
ning to become apparent, a primary question arose as to whether or not they had some special uses which might provide the clue to this symbolism. Any explanation of the original choice of a Tree of Life motif simply as a lucky emblem was obviously inadequate, in view of the importance given to meaningful symbols in the folk traditions elsewhere. Several Afghani friends, coming from four basic groups (Pathan, Tajik, Uzbek, and Kizilbash), then explained that the breaking of a sugar loaf had once been an important social and ceremonial act, and that on at least one great occasion it still was.

This was a sugar-breaking rite which constituted one of the high points in the traditional Afghan marriage ritual, irrespective of racial, religious, or tribal differences. At this ceremony, called Shīrīburī, the bride and groom formally met to see each other for the first time, at first just regarding each other’s image reflected in a mirror, then looking up face-to-face. Then, one of the parents was expected to distribute broken pieces of loaf sugar, shattered by a sugar axe, to each guest present, in the same way that wedding cake is given to guests and relatives at Occidental marriages. This, the Afghan friends reported, was a highly important event, one of the chief rites in the complicated succession of ceremonies that make up an Afghan marriage, so that the objects used for it—the mirror and the sugar breaker—had very special significance.

The writer’s informants added that among the principal wedding gifts presented by the bride’s parents to the new couple was one of the sugar axes and (until recently) a metal mirror, which then became prized possessions in the new household.

The mirrors formerly used in the Shīrīburī rite were of polished bronze, as looking glasses are a comparatively late innovation in these regions. The backs of the metal mirrors were figured with a great variety of patterns, some of which reflect pre-Islamic Persian elements from the Sasanian period. One of the old Near Eastern mirror patterns is of especial interest for us here, even though it came from the other side of the old Persian cultural area, as it presents one of the best examples of the Sunbird, clearly identified as such, in the Islamic world. This occurs on an old bronze mirror of the mediaeval period from Iraq, illustrated in plate 3, figure 6. The pattern has three concentric zones of design, as well as a bordering band of inscription. The outer zone contains the 12 signs of the Persian Zodiac; the middle one shows 7 figures representing the Seven Planets; and in the central circle, where one would expect to find a symbol of the metaphysical Sun at the center of the cosmos, there is a large hawk or eagle, with his body penetrated by a hole. The hole is for the cord handle, but it was unnecessary to pierce the bird’s body for this, as the body could have been arched outward to leave a loop for the cord. So, the hole here probably had a symbolical as well as a functional purpose, to indicate the perforation in the Sunbird.

While searching for sugar axes in the bazaars of Kandahar and other southern Afghan towns, the writer found in the jewelry shops slender pins topped by the figure of a bird, which were intended for presentation to Pathan brides on the occasion of their wedding. They were used for parting the bride’s hair in the preparation for the marriage, and thereafter throughout her life. The general form of these pins is very old, recalling the bronze pins of the ancient Near East, and the specific patterns would also seem

28 From F. Sarre and F. R. Martin, Meisterwerke muhammadianischer Kunst, Munich, 1912, vol. 2, pl. 140. The border inscription associates this mirror with Ortoq Shāh, an Ortoqid prince of the mid-thirteenth century, thus helping to date it.

29 The accompanying description (ibid.) explains that the bird on this mirror was included in the decoration for heraldic reasons ("als Wappen"). and perhaps it was, secondarily (see note 28 above); but the eagle was still a sun symbol, and it appears here in a place where the metaphysical Sun, or a symbol of it, would naturally be expected, in view of the other cosmic symbols employed.

30 For some typical bronze pins from ancient Luristan, see the Survey of Persian art, vol. 4, pl. 60, bottom.
to have been products of a long tradition. On the most familiar type, as illustrated in text figure 2, the stylized bird recalls the Sunbird figures atop the modern Iraqi sugar axes. It has a punched hole to mark its eye (the limited space on this small-scale bird would hardly permit a complete nucleated circle); more eye circles dot the projections of its tail—evidently intended to represent the "eyes" on a peacock’s train, just as its crest suggests that of a peacock—while another similar circle marks the middle of the body. This last circle doubtless stands for the traditional perforation in the body of the Sunbird, as there is no other good reason for its presence there. Lastly, the shaft of the pin, like the handle of the sugar axe, suggests a post or column, and it seems obvious that the pins and axes are closely related in their symbolism.

With further research it soon became apparent that the bird figure on the ceremonial sugar axes and on the bridal pins (and formerly on some of the bronze mirrors as well) was by no means the only instance of bird symbolism to be found in the Afghan wedding rites. Furthermore, in the other instances (to be described) only the bird itself was shown, without any tree or column. It is common in folk symbolism that a part may be used to represent the whole, and thus a Sunbird alone could conceivably stand for the whole Tree of Life on which it is often perched. However, its frequency, and the emphasis that was placed on it, made it clear that the bird figure had powerful significance in its own right.

On the occasion of the Shīrīburī ceremony, and at other times during the marriage festivities, the bride appears in an elaborate crown (lidj), which is made of gold for the rich and of silver for the poor. There seemed to be two basic types of traditional bridal crowns, not counting the modern, purely ornamental variety. We saw several examples of the first type in the jewelry stalls in the chief towns of northwestern Afghanistan, notably in Ankhoy and Herat. These consisted of a kind of coronet or chaplet made of slender chains, at the center of which was a jeweled metal plaque, rounded at the top and flat on the bottom, with what appeared to be two highly stylized birds’ heads emerging from either side of it. The total effect had a strong resemblance to the upper portion of the horse charm shown in text figure 7, a, except that the places of the nail heads on the latter were taken by flat plaques of glass or onyx on the crown ornament.

The motif of a double-headed bird is much more readily apparent on the second type of Afghan bridal crown, the kind typically worn by Pathan brides of southern Afghanistan. Text figure 3 shows the central part of one which the writer purchased in the silver bazaar at Ghazni.
Fig. 1—Afghan Sugar Axes (Type 2). (Photograph by Reuben Goldberg.)

Fig. 2—Afghan Sugar Axes (Types 1 and 3). (Photograph by Reuben Goldberg.)
Fig. 3—Iraqi Sugar Axe (Front View). (Photograph by Reuben Goldberg.)

Fig. 4—Iraqi Sugar Axe (Side View). (Photograph by Reuben Goldberg.)

Fig. 5—Persian Sugar Axe. Ettinghausen Collection.
Plate 3

Fig. 8—Tumarcha Horse Charms from Afghan Turkistan. (Photograph by Reuben Goldberg.)
Fig. 9—Detail of Persian Miniature: Bahram Gur Hunting. (Courtesy Metropolitan Museum of Art.)

Fig. 10—Detail of Persian Miniature: Khusrau Visiting Shirin. (Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art.)

Fig. 11—Persian Miniature Showing Safavid Horse Trappings. (Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art.)
Fig. 12—Detail of Blade on Persian Processional Axe.
(Courtesy University Museum, Philadelphia.)

Fig. 13—Turcoman Saddle Rug Acquired in Kunduz.

Fig. 14—Pottery Plate, Twelfth Century.
(Courtesy William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art.)
ANCIENT SYMBOLS IN MODERN AFGHANISTAN

(For the complete crown, see pl. 3, fig. 7.) The large plaque clearly represents a round "body" with two arching "heads" flanked by protruding wing tips, composing a greatly conventionalized bird, with a red jewel set in the middle of its breast. The latter point seems highly significant, as a jewel often fills, or substitutes for, the traditional hole in old Asiatic representations of the Sunbird, particularly in its double-headed form, as is illustrated by a number of examples atop the imperial scepters of Old Russia.41

In addition to their crowns, the brides of Kandahar and other southern districts often wear flexible metal bracelets, and sometimes anklets as well, composed of many individual links strung on a cord, each link representing a single- or double-headed bird with a prominent reserve on its chest, and having a small bell hung between each pair of birds. (Text fig. 4 shows a double-headed bird link.) A single bracelet will have all the birds of one kind, either single-headed or double-headed; but it is noteworthy that the single-headed and double-headed birds are both considered as having the same value as talismans. This is an important point, as it clearly shows that the same traditional bird deity can be represented in either form, interchangeably.

One last, even more striking instance of the sacred bird as a marriage symbol among the Pathans came to our attention in the Kandahar district. On an excursion into the country to the northwest of that city, to visit the French excavations at the ancient site of Mundigak, the writer noticed some women of the Ghilzai tribe of Pathans in a small bazaar outside a nearby Muslim tomb, which was a center of pilgrimage in that region. Two of the women had drawn aside their veils while bargaining for some fruit, and each of them had a stylized bird figure tattooed in dark ink above her nose, between

41 For such a scepter see M. V. S. Krivenko, Les solemnités du saint couronnement, tr. M. C. Korsov, St. Petersburg, 1899, illus. facing p. 158. Note that here the large ruby is surrounded by 12 smaller jewels.

Fig. 3—Central Plaque of the Bridal Crown Shown in Plate 3, figure 7.

Fig. 4—Double-headed Bird Link from Bride's Bracelet, Kandahar. Sketch by Marianne Stoller.
her heavy eyebrows. On sighting the presence of a foreigner, they both quickly covered their faces, but there was time to note down one of the patterns as shown in text figure 5. Our

people know nothing about flying fish (the Exocoetidae), and the very idea of such creatures would seem ridiculous to them. However, in certain traditional representations of the

Pathan guide on that occasion, an Educational Officer from Kabul, resident in Kandahar, explained that the Pathan women, especially in the country districts, traditionally had such a bird tattooed on their foreheads at the time of marriage, to symbolize and solemnize the important change in their status.42

Bird symbolism is not confined to the Pathans. In the jewelry bazaar in Kunduz, in northern Afghanistan, the writer acquired two cheap silver earrings of the type worn by Tajik brides at their wedding and thereafter, coming from two separate sets. (See text fig. 6.) One has a fish with wings hanging from a (solar?) disk, and three small pendants; while the other has a similar pattern, except that the winged fish looks more like a roughly executed bird. It would seem that the second one was probably a transition between an original true bird form and the winged fish. Of course, these inland

42 Ganga Sahai, Female tattooing amongst Ghilzais, Indian Antiquary, vol. 33 (Bombay, 1904), pp. 147-148, shows tattoos from one family of the Tarakki Ghilzai coming from the Kandahar district. One figure on p. 147 roughly suggests the sketch in text fig. 5, above, but it is not so clearly a bird. The article says nothing about the connection between tattooing and marriage; however, its author had never actually been to Afghanistan.

Sunbird, a fish may substitute for the opposing snake, as we have noted, and it seems likely that an old representation of the solar bird with a fish in its beak had gradually disintegrated in the process of evolution, until the fish took up most of the pattern, with only the wings of the bird remaining. The far greater emphasis on the fish, rather than on the originally more significant bird, may have arisen because of the association of the fish with fertility because of its countless eggs. This idea of a fish as a symbol of fertility, and hence an appropriate wedding symbol, is particularly strong among the

Fig. 5—Ghilzai Woman’s Tattoo, Sketched in the Kandahar District by the Author.

Fig. 6—Tajik Earrings (from Separate Pairs). Sketch by Marianne Stoller.
Chinese, and the Tajiks could have become familiar with it in their original home in Central Asia, where Chinese influences have penetrated for more than two thousand years. In any case, the vestiges of the bird remain as evidence of the persistence of the old Sunbird symbol.

The numerous examples of bird symbols used in Afghan marriage ceremonies would seem to indicate that a mythical bird, apparently a once-sacred solar bird, had taken (and to some extent still takes) an important part in the traditional wedding rites of the Afghans. In many parts of Asia—and Afghanistan is no exception—marriage customs tend to reflect old coronation rites, with the groom and bride being considered as “King” and “Queen” during the celebrations. Therefore, one might expect to find that bird symbolism had also figured in old Asiatic royal ceremonial.

As one example of the concept of temporary kingship, in that part of the Afghan marriage when the groom receives his male friends and relatives, known as the ceremony of Shāhgekānī, he plays the role of a crowned ruler, presiding over a mock court. He bestows on his guests courtly titles such as Wazīr, Chamberlain, General, etc., and all of them are obliged to present him with gifts of loaf sugar, which sometimes vary in quantity according to the temporary “ranks.” (Note that this custom offers another significant instance of the use of sugar which pervades the Afghan marriage rites.)

The association between marriage and coronation is probably due to the fact that marriage is considered a form of initiation into a new way of life, and hence it has quite naturally come to share some features with the greatest of all initiation rites, the royal investiture. The writer has been unable to find any adequate descriptions of an Afghan or Moghul coronation, and the only available references to later Persian coronations are not sufficiently detailed to enable one to determine how much cosmic symbolism may have survived from more ancient rites. In any case, since the highly conservative Afghan marriage customs seem to reflect a much earlier cultural and historical stratum, it would probably be necessary to refer back to some earlier period, when the concept of royalty had greater symbolic meaning. We might have to go back, for example, to the earlier Persian empires which contributed to the world the concept of emper- orhood and passed on, if they did not actually originate, many of the coronation rites used elsewhere, along with such items of regalia as the ritual axe and the royal umbrella. For it should be noted that coronation ceremonies throughout the continents of Europe and Asia have had remarkably similar basic features in

The very limited material on Persian coronations in Western languages seems to be confined to Guillaume Marlot, *Le théâtre d’honneur*, Paris, 1843, pp. 7–8 and 91–92, and *The travels of Sir John Chardin into Persia*, London, 1686, Suppl., pp. 38–48. In the latter, a typical seventeenth-century European engraving (facing p. 41) purports to show some of the Persian coronation regalia of that time; however, the items depicted obviously represent the imaginings of a European engraver.

For an early example of a ritual axe carried by a king’s attendant, see Erich Schmidt, *Persepolis I*, pl. 121, where the second person behind the Achaemenian prince, who stands behind the throne, is holding one. Note, too, that a duck or gander head forms an integral part of the design on it.

For a very early example of a royal umbrella, see the sketch of an Assyrian relief from Nineveh in A. H. Layard, *Nineveh and its remains*, New York, 1849, vol. 2, facing p. 110. For an Achaemenian example, see Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pl. 194, etc.; for a Sasanian example, see K. Erdmann, *Das Datum des Tāk-i Bustān*, Ars Islamica, vol. 4 (1937), fig. 11, p. 90. The state umbrella was a symbol of royalty in India and in the Buddhist kingdoms of “Further India,” but it seems to have reached India from Iran, later to be passed on to southeast Asia with Buddhist culture. The royal umbrellas used in China may also have been remotely of Iranian inspiration.
common, despite individualistic overtones which arose from differences in local mores or national religions.

If some of the old royal symbolism did indeed carry over into the Afghan wedding rituals, as it certainly seems to have done, it is likely that the Afghan ceremonial sugar axes, and perhaps also the bird-tipped pin of the bride, were descended from the old tradition of bird-tipped royal scepters, or their ceremonial equivalents. The form of scepter surmounted by a bird standing on a ball, used as a sign of royal dominion, dates back at least to Roman times in southern Europe and the Near East. The eagle scepter carried by Roman consuls and provincial rulers was in effect a miniature copy of the eagle standard (\textit{aquila}) which was carried, and even worshiped, by the Roman legions. The use of this scepter has continued into modern times in Europe, although the ancient eagle was sometimes altered to a dove, changed into a fleur-de-lis, or supplanted by a cross. In the Near East, the idea of an actual scepter carried by the ruler seems later to have been lost, but the use of an equivalent device carried for him by a noble attendant persisted into recent times. The equivalent symbol of the ruler's power and dominion usually consisted of a mace, an umbrella, or a ceremonial axe. The latter was first a kind of scepter, then a processional object.

The old German Imperial Military Museum, at the Zeughaus in Berlin, used to have a Saracenic mace or scepter surmounted by a round lump of crystal which was carved on each side to show a large-billed bird with a flamboyant tail, recalling the old Sasanian sacred birds. Its past history is not known, but its form suggests that actual bird-topped scepters must have survived in the Near East into mediaeval times.

Far more common among the Saracens, particularly among the Mamluks of Egypt, was a badge of exalted rank in the form of an umbrella on a tall staff topped by a golden bird. The umbrella staff supporting the golden bird, like the shorter scepter with its bird, was clearly another symbolic representation of the Tree of Life, or World Pillar, on which sat the Sunbird; while the umbrella proper added the concept of the "canopy of the sky" pierced by

\begin{footnotes}
\item[49] See H. Stuart Jones, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 215.
\item[50] See the English scepters illustrated in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed., vol. 23, pl. 2, fig. 1, following p. 36. Note, however, that the use of a double-headed eagle on the Russian scepters was long continued, sometimes having the aperture on its chest indicated by an inset jewel (see text above, and reference in note 41). This convention persisted long after Russian imperial symbolism used the double eagle elsewhere with a heraldic shield in the center of its chest, like the Austrian one and the German (single-headed) one; but in all these cases the shield was a comparatively late addition of mediaeval times.
\item[51] See reference in note 46, above. For the ceremonial axe as a processional object in a wedding procession, see the Survey of Persian art, vol. 5, pl. 906, A.
\item[52] See Gaston Migeon, \textit{Manuel d'art musulman: arts plastiques et industriels}, Paris, 1927, fig. 284, p. 115. The French author, on p. 116, expressed his opinion that this mace was a modern fabrication, put together to support an antique jewel; but this statement may have been due merely to anti-German bias. For evidence of a far more ancient bird scepter in the Near East, see J. de Morgan et al., \textit{Mémoires de la délégation en Perse}, 2d ser., vol. 7, Paris, 1905, p. 47, fig. 69, showing a dove which apparently came from the top of a scepter, found at Susa, believed to date from the 11th century B.C.
\item[53] See Henriette C. Devonshire, \textit{An Egyptian Mameluke feature in a Persian miniature}, Apollo, vol. 14, No. 83 (Nov. 1931), pp. 279–282. The title is somewhat misleading, as the use of a bird-topped umbrella was certainly not an exclusively Mamluk trait, and was probably not Mamluk in origin.
\item[54] For the Tree of Life in Islamic culture (where it is known as the \textit{Sidrah or Ṭibā}), see George Lechler, \textit{The tree of life in Indo-European and Islamic cultures}, vol. 4 (1937), p. 369ff.
\end{footnotes}
the axis mundi, on top of which rested the divine bird.

Although this form of insignia is usually associated with the Mamluk rulers of mediaeval Egypt, it was also used in Persia, and it appears in a number of Persian miniatures. In several of these pictures the sky symbolism of the canopy is reinforced by the presence of actual sky motifs. A few examples show the canopy decorated with dragons among clouds, as shown in plate 4, figures 9 and 10, while one umbrella with the bird (like many without it) has a variation of the "cloud collar" pattern, an ancient symbol of the upper sky around the top of the world axis. This convention was also used on Central Asian tent domes to represent the dome of the sky, where the tent as a whole was thought to symbolize the universe in microcosm.

Another Persian miniature shows the round canopy figured with a variant form of the "cloud collar" pattern and topped by a golden bird, as a covering for the rectangular funeral cart of a twelfth-century Mongol Khan. In the latter case, the whole structure must also have been intended to represent a universe in microcosm, like the chariots and funeral litters of the ancient Chinese.

Since the golden bird also appeared atop the thrones of the Mongol rulers of Persia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as shown in surviving miniatures, it has been suggested that the umbrella canopy with the golden bird, as a royal symbol, may have come into Persia and into Mamluk Egypt through Mongol influences. However, the ancient symbolic connotations of the "cloud collar" are best understood in the context of Persian art, as discussed in the next section.

61 See Devonshire, op. cit., p. 282. For some examples of Persian bird-topped thrones, see ibid., figs. 4 and 5; Survey of Persian art, vol. 5, pls. 850, 851; E. Blochet, Les enluminures des manuscrits orientaux — turcs, arabes, persans — de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 1926, pl. 23, and Musulman painting, pl. 60. The text of Blochet's Enluminures (p. 77) explains that the golden bird was the emblem of sovereign power among the Mongols, while the text accompanying the example in his Musulman painting calls the golden bird the emblem of sovereignty in China; of course it was not an emblem of sovereignty in China, and there is no other evidence known to the writer for its use as an emblem of sovereign power among the Mongols. A much more likely reason for its presence on these thrones is to complete the cosmic symbolism of the throne as a "universe in microcosm" topped by the solar bird.

These pictures all come from the famous manuscript of Rashid al-Din's History of the Mongols in the Bibliothèque Nationale. This was formerly ascribed to the fourteenth century, but Basil Gray has recently pointed out that it must have been painted later, in Timurid times. See Basil Gray, Unknown fragment, p. 67ff.

Blochet, Enluminures, pl. 75, illustrates still another example, showing Bighis, Queen of Sheba, on a bird-topped throne, from an illustration for Nizami’s poems painted in 1561; while the scene is naturally fanciful, other details are characteristic of the time when it was painted. The same picture is reproduced in G.
cept of a golden bird as a divine messenger was represented in the throne rooms of the Persian sovereigns a thousand years before the Mongols came to Iran, according to Philostratus. In his Life of Appolonius of Tyana, Philostratus described the Persian throne as being placed under a vault of sapphire (meaning lapis lazuli), representing the sky with all its stars, and from this hung four birds of gold, which the Magi called “tongues of the gods.” It is quite possible that later these, or similar birds, may have been attached to the throne itself, and in this way the symbol of the bird on the throne top could well have appeared long before the Mongols. It did not pass away entirely with the passing of the Mongols, either. At least one of the thrones of the Mughal Emperor Akbar had a jeweled bird at its summit, and an early

Martau and H. Vever, *Miniatures persanes*, Paris, 1913, vol. 2, pl. 109; and the same feature is depicted on still another throne in *ibid.*, vol. 1, pl. 61. See also the *Survey of Persian art*, vol. 5, pl. 861. A. Another fine example, in a Timurid painting of the early fifteenth century, is illustrated by Richard Ettinghausen in *An illuminated manuscript of Hāfiz-i Abru in Istanbul, Part I*, Kunst des Orients, vol. 2 (Wiesbaden, 1950), fig. 4, p. 55.

62 Charles P. Eells, *The life and times of Apollonius of Tyana, rendered into English from the Greek of Philostratus the Elder*, Stanford University Series: Language and Literature, vol. 2, No. 1 (Stanford, Calif., 1923), pp. 25-26. A Sasanian silver cup in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, also shows a Persian king on a throne supported by eagles. See R. Ghârsîman, *Scènes du banquet sur l’argenterie Sassanide, Artibus Asiea*, vol. 16 (1953), figs. 1 and 2 (frontispiece). Is it possible that some hazy memory of the four golden birds above the ancient Persian throne, or of the later Sasanian one supported by eagles, could have inspired the legend told in the Shâh-nâmeh about the attempt of King Kâ Kâ’ûs to mount to Heaven on a throne upheld by four eagles? For an illustration of this tale, see M. S. Dimand, Notes on Persian miniatures of the Timurid period in the Metropolitan Museum, Eastern Art, vol. 1 (1928), p. 26, fig. 4.

63 See the painting from the *Akbar-nâmeh* (f. 268b) reproduced in Sir Thomas Arnold, *The chronicle of Akbar the Great*, Oxford, 1937, pp. 33a. While bird-topped umbrellas do not seem to have been common in India, they were not unknown. Examples are shown in the nineteenth-century portrait of Fath ‘Ali Shâh of Persia shows him seated on a throne topped by a jewel-studded eagle. Furthermore, royal umbrellas in the form of a Tree of Life and topped by a sun symbol had previously been used in Persia so it seems likely that this was merely an example of that old indigenous tradition, with the bird being used as the solar emblem.

As mentioned above, the tradition of the umbrella with the golden bird surmounting it was particularly well developed among the Mamluks of Egypt, where the “Canopy and Bird” (*al-qubbah wa ʿl-fayr*) figured prominently as a sign of royalty, carried in the sultan’s processions by the emir who ranked second only to him. And, since the ceremonial bird-axes were also primarily intended to be carried in processions before the sultan (or others of highest rank), these doubtless had similar cosmic implications, connoting universal dominion with divine grace, as represented by the Sunbird atop the World Axis.

The Afghan sugar axes could have originally derived from a royal processionary axe or scepter, or from a similar instrument used at court for a symbol of dominion as well as an article of utility; but they could equally well have been developed independently as a token of the bridegroom’s symbolic kingship. From some such beginnings on the ceremonial sugar axes, on the roof of a bridal palanquin and atop a wedding pavilion in two late Rajput paintings from Kangra in the Freer Gallery (Nos. 23.10, 23.11). The association of this symbol with marriage seems significant.


65 The royal umbrella in Achaemenian Persia was sometimes topped by a fruit, as was the conventional Tree of Life; see Schmidt, *Persepolis I*, p. 194, for an example. In Sasanian times this was replaced by an actual solar ball; see Friedrich Sarre, *Die Kunst des alten Persien*, Die Kunst des Ostens, vol. 5, Berlin, 1923, pls. 86-87.


the bird figure could then have later been borrowed to decorate other sugar axes, which were not necessarily made to be used at weddings. The same symbolism carried over to the spoon handles could also explain the now broken-down patterns on them, for, as already stated, the latter seem to reflect an even more elaborate attempt to represent the Tree of Life crowned by the Sunbird.

The above discussion could account for the form of the Afghan sugar axes, but it probably does not fully explain the complete significance of their use at the high point of the marriage ceremony; nor would it explain the various other bird symbols which figure at Afghan weddings. On returning to the correspondence between marriage and coronation ceremonies, however, we find that a symbolic bird has traditionally been used at the highest point of some coronation services to symbolize the conferring of divine grace, and it would seem possible that the bird-decorated sugar axe, the bird-topped hairpin, the bridal crown, etc., may also have originally been used at the high point of the marriage to symbolize the conferring of grace.

We have seen that the throne room of the Persian kings once had golden birds suspended from the ceiling to represent "messengers of the gods."68 The symbolic concept of birds as divine messengers or bearers of grace is very ancient, and it has continued down through the centuries, both in the Orient and in the West. Its very spread indicates a remote antiquity.

In the East, the fullest development of this concept in recent times has been among the shamanists of northern and northeastern Asia,69 while in the West the messenger-bird idea is most strongly developed in the familiar Christian symbol of the Holy Spirit as a white dove.70

And yet, although it is little known, there has been a parallel iconographic tradition in Christianity in which the divine messenger as the conveyer of grace is represented by a hawk or eagle, usually of gold. This seems to have been a strong tradition in the Orient, because in Islamic miniatures depicting Christian religious scenes, the Holy Spirit is almost always indicated by a golden hawk or eagle.71 However, some very significant examples can be cited from western Europe as well; notably the vessel in the form of an eagle which has played such an important part in English coronations, since the later Middle Ages, as the vehicle for the holy oil or chrism in the ritual anointing.

The traditional English rite of anointing is introduced by a hymn invoking the Holy Spirit,72 but, since 1399, instead of a dove which is "the only proper symbol of the Holy Ghost,"73 a large gold eagle has been brought down from the high altar, and from its beak the holy oil is poured into a spoon for the actual imposition.74 Both the spoon and the Golden Eagle are part of the royal regalia of England; but the present Eagle—and perhaps the spoon, as well—are not those originally used, because the earlier ones were apparently destroyed along

68 See text above, and the first reference in note 62.
69 See Holmberg, Siberian mythology, pp. 409, 508 ff., etc.
with the rest of the regalia, by orders of Cromwell, in 1649. The present Eagle, better known as the "Ampulla," is simply a rather naturalistic-looking golden bird with a removable head, which does not answer the descriptions of the original in contemporary accounts.

Several writers of the early fifteenth century described the original Eagle as being of gold, studded with jewels, and containing a stone bottle, which was the Ampulla proper. The latter is usually mentioned as being made of lapis. This word has been translated as "lapis lazuli," but it must have been used in its regular meaning of "stone," as one account uses the word "crystal" to describe it, after having previously referred to it as ampulla lapidea. If it was indeed of crystal, it might have been related to the Fatimid crystal phials which were quite frequently re-used as ampullae in mediaeval Europe. In any case, the English Ampulla probably have been of Eastern origin, since crystal and other hard stones were not being worked in western Europe at that time, and the making of a hollow vessel would require an especially competent artisan.

Moreover, an Eastern origin for the original ampulla, and the Golden Eagle which contained it, was implied by the earliest tradition to account for them, dating from the reign of Edward II, in the early fourteenth century. This claimed that they had been found by two "Oriental Christians" following a prediction of "the last Sultan of the Saracens." It was said that they had first been given to the German Emperor, Henry VII, who had passed them on to the Duke of Brabant, brother-in-law of Edward II, and that he in turn had sent them on to Edward, in the hope that through the virtue to be acquired by being anointed with the balm contained in the Ampulla, he might extend his rule over Asia (presumably through divine help on a crusade).

The legend further claimed that the "Oriental Christians" had found the Eagle and the Ampulla in a place where they had previously been hidden at the request of St. Thomas of Canterbury, nearly two centuries before. In spite of the fact that this part of the story has since been proved completely spurious, by the end of the fourteenth century this was the only part of the legend that remained, and it was greatly stressed to emphasize the supposed connection with England's most popular native saint. However, the later version still promised that whoever was anointed king by means of the Eagle and Ampulla would become "great among kings," build many churches in Palestine, and would chase the pagans from Babylon.

---

53 See Ratcliff, op. cit., p. 71, n. 1. Other writers claim that the present Eagle (which they call the "Ampulla") might still be the original one; cf. Lawrence E. Tanner, The history of the coronation, London (no date), p. 86. However, apart from the fact that the present one does not correspond with the mediaeval descriptions of the vessel, the very naturalistic feathering of the present bird suggests a post-Renaissance design.

54 For a picture of the present Eagle, see the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed., vol. 23, Regalia, pl. 2, fig. 6. No picture of the earlier one is known.


56 Wyntershylly, op. cit., p. 299.


59 Ibid.

60 This latter portion of the original account is the traditional legend that has come down to us through Wyntershylly (op. cit., pp. 297–299), et al. Thouvenin (op. cit., pp. 5–39) deftly demonstrates the spurious character of the whole story regarding St. Thomas à Becket's part in the origin of the Eagle and the Ampulla.

61 Wyntershylly, ibid., p. 298.
ANCIENT SYMBOLS IN MODERN AFGHANISTAN

Whatever the ultimate origin of the English Eagle-Ampulla, the rite of anointing with an eagle-form vessel must have been of alien origin, and the references to the Orient in the old legends about it suggests that the rite may have been one more byproduct of the Oriental contacts made during the period of the Crusades, when the Europeans drew so much from the higher civilization of the Near East. Quite possibly it was derived from some western Asiatic rite of accession, for the concept of anointing was certainly known in the Islamic world, where it was symbolically shown in paintings, and the Harari Collection has the lower part of a Persian “ampulla,” from the mediaeval period, in the form of an ornately decorated metal bird which has lost its detachable head. Conceivably this might have been used for such a rite.

Certainly, anointing with a bird-form vessel would have been symbolically very appropriate in the Near East. For in Persian folklore there was a mythical bird, the Humā, whose shadow falling on a man’s head announced that he would be king, and the Turkish peoples, including the Uzbeks of northern Afghanistan, had a tradition that, in deciding who was to be the new ruler, a lucky bird (dandat qusi) was released in a crowd of people, and when it alighted on a man’s head, that was a sign that he should ascend the throne. The use of a ritual vessel in bird shape at the coronation could be a symbolic reenactment of this; or conversely, the Turkish story might have developed out of a folk memory of a symbolic bird formerly used for anointing a king’s head at his investiture.

Even if such a tradition had not been present in Islamic coronation ceremonies to influence the form of the wedding rites which presumably derived from them, the extreme spread of the concept of a divine bird as the messenger of Heaven and bestower of grace could easily account for the bird symbolism so prevalent in the Afghan wedding rites. For the representations of the bird on so many of the objects used in marriage rituals there, would originally have had the added connotation of a divine messenger who could confer blessings on the newly united pair.

We have seen that the symbol of a divine bird plays an important part in the ceremonies of marriage, and that it apparently once figured in royal coronations, and, as both of these are “passage rites” (considering a coronation as a higher form of initiation), one might expect it to figure also at other rites of passage, such as those accompanying birth and death. Concerning birth customs, we as yet have little information, but it appears that the symbolic bird did indeed play a part in that ultimate passage, the passing of the soul into paradise.

The presence of the golden bird atop the canopy on the royal funeral cart has already been cited, and a similar golden bird is shown on a spire atop the domes of mausolea in some Persian miniatures which apparently reflected the customs of their times. However, these are both apparent instances of cosmic symbolism, in which the Sunbird merely figured as an ultimate element to complete the symbol of the universe which the cart or tomb portrayed. To

85 *Survey of Persian art*, vol. 6, pl. 1312, B. Another, similar bird-ampullas, also from mediaeval Persia (and also headless) is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Acc. No. 24-476.
88 See note 60, above.
89 A good example of the bird atop a mausoleum is shown in the *Survey of Persian art*, vol. 5, pl. 871. Another bird on a dome is shown in *ibid.*, pl. 884. In both these cases the bird is clearly an architectural feature; but in other cases, such as *ibid.*, pls. 864, B, and 883, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether or not living birds are being depicted.
find instances of the bird used as a funeral symbol in its own right, we must turn to some Islamic funerary silks with an apotheosis motif involving a double-headed eagle, which have found their way into Occidental collections in recent years. These silks are said to have been discovered with coffins in a funerary chapel near Rayy in Iran, in 1925. Some doubts have been expressed regarding their place of origin, but there is no question about their having been products of Islamic civilization, to which most of the other examples we are considering also belong.

Three of the patterns show double-headed eagles bearing aloft a crowned youth, who is believed to have represented the soul of the deceased being carried up into Heaven. Such ample evidence has already been advanced to explain the antecedents of this motif, all the way back to the Old Babylonian Etana myth, that nothing more needs to be said on that score, except to point out once again that the old bird deity can appear in both single- and double-headed forms, which are in practice interchangeable. Only by realizing this, can one clearly understand how this motif could be linked to such predecessors as the Ganymede and Etana tales, in which the more natural type of eagle figured.

The ordinary eagle could depict the sun in its supposed flight across the sky, while the double-eagle seems to represent two birds combined into one to represent two aspects of the sun, such as the two forms of power implied in its life-giving and destructive capabilities. The Old Persian Saëna was described as having two aspects (although these were not specified), and there were two Simurghs, a good one and a malignant one, which could have been represented in a combined form.

There was also a three-headed Sunbird. Ancient three-headed Sunbird amulets of metal have been found in the area north of Afghanistan, in western Siberia and in the adjoining districts of European Russia. In fact, a triple-headed eagle survives as late as the sixteenth century on Russian imperial scepters. The three-headed Sunbird could symbolize some triune aspect of the sun, such as the rising sun, the sun at noonday, and the setting sun, considered by primitive peoples as symbolic entities and yet recognized as one; for the sun disk itself is sometimes represented in Persian art with three faces combined into one. How-

82 Picard-Schmitter, op. cit., fig. 2, p. 311, fig. 3, p. 313, fig. 10, p. 319.
83 Picard-Schmitter, op. cit., and Gaston Wiet, Soieries persanes, Cairo, 1947, pp. 58-61. References to the Etana myth are given in note 14, above.
84 Picard-Schmitter, op. cit., fig. 1, p. 307, and fig. 8, p. 318, for examples of the single-headed eagle carrying a human figure. Another is shown in A. A. Spitsyn, Drevnosti Kamskoi Chudi po Kollektistii 'Teploukovskoykh' (Antiquities of Kama Chud in the Teploukov Collection), St. Petersburg, 1902, pl. 5, fig. 18. See also H. P. L'Orange, Studies on the iconography of cosmic kingship in the ancient world, Oslo, London, and Cambridge, Mass., 1953, figs. 44-46, and

86 See Spitsyn, ibid., pl. 4, figs. 6 and 9, and the Report of the Imperial Archaeological Commission for 1911, Petrograd, 1914, fig. 128, p. 80. Note that these three-headed eagles, and some of the single ones as well (see Spitsyn, op. cit., pl. 5, fig. 10), have on their chests a human sun face, the mouth of which forms the traditional perforation on the front of the bird.
87 See Krivenko, Sollenîdz, portrait of Alexei Mikhailovich (1645-1676) facing p. 36. Perhaps partially as a survival of this, later Russian double-headed eagles often had three crowns over their two heads.
88 This threefold sun face is clearly shown in the decoration on the base of a 12th- or 13th-century Persian bronze ever in the Museum of the Gulistan
ever, later Persians were more inclined to represent the multiple Simurgh by separate birds, rather than by combining them in a single form.99

—But with one head, two heads, or three, the divine bird was still the Sunbird.

A particular reason why this bird figure, or any other special charm or symbol, should be used in a passage rite such as marriage, coronation, or a funeral, would be to confer grace and protection at a difficult time. Because all these occasions of crisis and transition, when the individual passes from one major social or physical state to another, have been considered as being fraught with danger for the persons involved. Special efforts were therefore required to avert evil and to invite good influences at these times, and apparently people still feel that the Tree of Life and Sunbird symbols can help to produce the desired effects, although the precise reasons why they should be efficacious may no longer be explained.

III

Afghan Turkestan, north of the Hindu Kush range, provides another set of highly conventionalized bird patterns which are definitely credited with having supernatural powers of a protective nature. These are found on the distinctive horse - protecting charms, so characteristic of that part of Central Asia, which are hung either from the throatlatch of the bridle or from a special neck strap used for this purpose alone.1 (See pl. 3, fig. 8.)

These charms are apparently the humbler, more popular descendants of the elaborate metal horse ornaments decked with yaktail tassels which were similarly used in former times by the high nobles and princes of the Islamic world, as shown in the old Persian, Turkish, and Moghul miniature paintings (pl. 4, fig. 11). If so, it would repay us to trace briefly the development of the latter ornaments before going on to describe modern ones.

The custom of hanging long tassels from the throatlatch of a horse's bridle is very old in Asia. Assyrian reliefs show heavy tassels hanging from the necks of horses to balance upright ones above the bridle.2 The Sasanians generally used metal plaques instead,3 but the older custom lingered on in Turkestan, where large neck tassels are shown on a fresco painted before A.D. 700.4 Possibly they were, from the beginning, apotropaic as well as ornamental. The use of neck tassels seems to have been carried westward again by the Turks or Mongols, and it reappears in Persia about the fourteenth century.5

Apparentlv the mediaeval Persians had already used some kind of horse amulet hung around the animal's neck by a special cord or strap, as illustrated on earlier ceramics from bags. See H. S. Richards, Horse brasses: figure subjects, Wyle Green, Warwickshire, 1937, and More horse brasses, 1938. In addition to crests, lucky emblems, etc., these, too, often displayed half-forgotten cosmic symbolism as expressions of the folk tradition.

99 For an example of the Simurgh represented in Persian art as three separate birds, see Ph. Walter Schulz, Die persisch-islamische Miniaturmalerei, Leipzig, 1914, vol. 2, pl. 32.

1 These may be compared with the European "horse brasses," now obsolete in their original use but currently in vogue as decorations for women's handbags. See A. von le Coq, Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien, Berlin, 1924, vol. 4, pl. 6, described in text, pp. 9–10.

Palace, Teheran; see the Survey of Persian art, vol. 6, pl. 1314, A. The University Museum, Philadelphia, has a late Byzantine carved gem on which the Holy Trinity has been represented by a crowned figure having three faces in one, in the same manner (Somerville collection, No. 323).

97 See James B. Pritchard, The ancient Near East in pictures, Princeton, 1954, figs. 374 and 375, p. 132, for some Assyrian horse trappings. See also Herzfeld, Iran in the ancient Near East, p. 142.

98 See, for example, Herzfeld, ibid., pls. 112 and 113, for the Sassanian horse medallions. Sometimes, but more rarely, the Sasanians also used pendent tassels.

9 See the Survey of Persian art, vol. 5, pls. 839, 840, for two examples in paintings attributed to the fourteenth century.
Rayy which have been ascribed to the thirteenth century.⁶ Miniatures of the Tabriz School, attributed to about 1340, show horses wearing amulet cases which probably contained magic texts hanging from a neck strap, while a larger tassel hung separately from the martingale.⁷ By the fifteenth century only a single ornament was used, a tassel hanging from a golden ornament which was often jewel-studded, suspended from the throat latch.⁸ If written charms were still used, they must have been carried within the metal part.

Miniatures of the following (sixteenth) century show that the custom had spread very widely in the Islamic world, from European Turkey to far-off Delhi,⁹ the tassels even being applied to boats.¹⁰ By this time, the horse tassels were often so grotesquely long that they reached the ground, and had to be looped up when the rider dismounted, lest the horse tread on them while browsing.¹¹ This cannot have been very practical, so it is not surprising to find in the later paintings that they were eventually abandoned.

Sometimes the pendent tassel was balanced by a metal top piece containing a stiff yaktail or feather aigrette, which fastened to the head strap of the bridle, behind the horse’s ears, or to the top of the special neck strap from which hung the lower tassel.¹² This was particularly popular with the early Mughals, to judge from miniature paintings of them, and it is possible that they brought the custom from their old homeland in western Turkestan, in the region of Bokhara, to introduce it into the Persian culture area. In one Mughal miniature the upper ornament is shown to have the form of a small golden peacock, but this seems to have been rather unusual.¹³

A significant fact about the double use of the aigrette above and tassel below is shown in some illustrations of horses in a Persian book on exhibition in the National Museum of Afghanistan, at Kabul. These picture the steeds wearing both aigrettes and tasseled pendants, and, as the detail is more specific than usual, one can easily see that the shape of the aigrette holder was repeated in the metal mountings that secured the tassels below, except that the latter, being pendent, were inverted.¹⁴ This could explain the curious inversion of the patterns on the modern Afghan horse amulets, to which we shall now return.

Whereas the older horse ornaments of the Islamic nobles, shown in the miniatures, had been fashioned of gold with yaktail pendants, the modern Afghan horse amulets consist of a plaque made of two thicknesses of leather, hanging by a looped strap, with three pendent

---

⁶ See Grace Dunham Guest, Notes on the miniatures on a thirteenth-century beaker, Ars Islamica, vol. 10 (1943), fig. 1 (at center), figs. 2, 3, 6, and 12. The beaker in question is in the Freer Gallery.

⁷ Survey of Persian art, vol. 5, pl. 840.

⁸ A particularly elaborate example is pictured in ibid., pl. 884.

⁹ For a Turkish example, see Marteau and Vever, Miniatures persanes, vol. 2, pl. 133, No. 174; for India, see Martin, Miniature painting, pls. 179, 182 (right).

¹⁰ See A. C. Eastman, On three Persian "marine" paintings, Journal of Near Eastern Studies, vol. 9, No. 3 (July 1930), pls. 9–11, following p. 156. This usage may have begun with the horse-head prow; see the Survey of Persian art, vol. 5, pl. 883, A.

¹¹ Martin, Miniature painting, pl. 114. Sometimes the overlong tassels had to be looped up even when the horse was being ridden; see Martin and Vever, Miniatures persanes, vol. 2, pl. 111, and Blochet, Musulman painting, pls. 134 and 173.

¹² See Martin, Miniature painting, vol. 2, pl. 182.

¹³ See I. Stchoukine, Portraits mughuls, IV, Revue des Arts Asiatiques, vol. 9 (1935), fig. 6 (pl. 69), facing p. 203.

¹⁴ The label for this book had slipped down behind another book, and it was impossible to have the case opened to recover it to determine the title and date. However, a similar feature is illustrated by the horse ornaments of King Peroz on a Sasanian silver plate in the Bibliothèque Nationale, in Paris. See Kurt Erdmann, Die Kunst Iran’s zur Zeit der Sassaniden, Berlin, 1943, pl. 64. (This is also illustrated by him in Das Datum des Taq-i Bustan, Ars Islamica, vol. 4 [1937], fig. 13, p. 90.) Note that the palmette (stylized Tree of Life?), which is shown upright above the bridle, is also displayed in inverted form, hanging from a strap behind the saddle.
tassels made from strips of black leather dangling from its lower edge (pl. 3, fig. 8). The Persian-speaking Tajiks call them tawez-e-āsh, meaning “horse charms,” or simply tawez, (from the Arabic word tawiz, denoting charms in general), while the Uzbek Turks of that region refer to them as tumarcha meaning ‘little amulet.’

The term tumarcha comes ultimately from the Greek toumarion which means “book,” and the earliest Islamic horse amulets may actually have consisted of chapters of the Koran, or other written charms, contained in metal or leather cases. However, these North Afghan horse charms have no writing in them, and apparently it is their traditional form alone which renders them magical and causes people to believe them capable of averting evil from both the horse and its rider.

The shape of the plaques which form the essential part of these charms differs somewhat from one area to another, but there is an over-all similarity and a distinct “family resemblance” between them, indicating a single line of development. Two of the more characteristic examples from the Badakhshan and Kataghan districts are illustrated in plate 3, figure 8, and in text figure 7. In the latter they are shown right side up, as is indicated by the position of the central heart pattern in figure 7, a; but for some reason they are inverted when in use, and hang upside down. Perhaps they were originally intended to balance an aigrette above the bridle which has since passed out of fashion. In any case, the true form of the pattern does not become apparent until they have been turned right again. After righting them, it immediately becomes evident that the basic form is related to that of the central plaques on the bridal crowns, and, more remotely, to the designs on the tops of the sugar-spoon handles.

The first example (text fig. 7, a) shows the clearest type, which probably comes closest to the original basic pattern. The writer found it in a harness shop in Khanabad, where these and other horse trappings are made in considerable quantity for the whole Badakhshan district. By analogy with other patterns—notably those in text figure 8, discussed below—this can be seen to represent a highly conventionalized double-headed bird. The main portion of the Khanabad charm is cut out of blue-green Russia leather, sewn to a stiffer leather base. Its two outcurving “heads” are each provided with a silver-headed stud to represent the “eyes,” while a third stud ornaments the projection between them. Four smaller studs decorate the “body,” and one more larger one, at the bottom, ornaments what would be the center of the outspread tail. At the middle of the “body” is the heart-shaped reserve, cut away to reveal an inner layer of red velvet, which apparently represents the traditional perforation in the

---

**Fig. 7—The Tumarcha horse charms shown in Plate 3, fig. 8, Inverted to Show True Pattern. A, from Khanabad; B, from Kunduz.**
body of the Sunbird. (Compare the red jewel at the center of the central plaque on the Pathan bridal crowns, as shown in text fig. 3.)

The central projection at the top, between the birds' heads, is a characteristic feature of all these horse-charm patterns. This might be accounted for in several different ways. It is remotely possible that the form of the original charm might have been derived from some metal prototype, like the crown plaque in text figure 3, which has a functional projection at the top for securing the end of a supporting chain; or that it might have once had some kind of suspension device like that on top of the metal amulet shown in text figure 8b; or the projection might even represent an old attempt to show the third head on a three-headed Sunbird as described above. However, a functional explanation is most unlikely, since the central projection is a characteristic feature often found in variations of the pattern on other things; and furthermore, the variations often show a budlike process atop the projection which would not be appropriate on a bird's head. The repeated pattern on the Persian ceremonial axe in the University Museum, shown in plate 5, figure 12, provides a more probable answer.

This pattern can be seen to be essentially a more elaborate version of that on the Khanabad charm, with some variations. The two birds' heads—here quite recognizable—turn in, instead of out, and the central projection is greatly attenuated before terminating in a flowerlike form. In addition, it has a stemlike base and two bough-form extensions at the sides from which spring leaf-bearing branches, which, with the presence of the two small birds such as usually attend the Tree of Life, suggest that this is also a representation of the latter motif, in which case, the double-headed Sunbird is here superimposed on the Tree of Life, and it is the trunk of the tree of the World Axis which extends up between the two halves of the double bird to form the central projection. The double Sunbird on the Tree of Life is illustrated even more clearly by an older, less conventionalized rendering on a twelfth-century dish from Rayy, now in the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City, shown in plate 5, figure 14. Probably on the horse charms as well, the double Sunbird is also represented on the universal axis, which projects above it.18

The second kind of northern Afghan tumarcha is shown in text figure 7, b. This example was purchased in the leather bazaar at Kunduz—although it is not strictly typical of the horse charms of that area, which tend to show an even greater simplification of the basic form as illustrated by the Khanabad example. (It may have been brought there from some other place, such as Tash Kurgan, the next big market town to the west of Kunduz, famous for its fine horsemen.)

The pattern of this second charm can be easily interpreted on comparing it with the one from Khanabad. The basic designs of each are essentially the same; although the top projection on the second has been thrown into greater prominence because the "beaks" at each side have been brought down to meet the sides of the charm, doubtless to eliminate the awkwardly jutting points which could hook into things. The open spaces between the "beaks" and the "body" are backed, as is the central hole, with the red velvet which forms the middle layer of the amulet. On this charm, and on the even more conventionalized variants from Kunduz and elsewhere in this region, the larger, principal

18 Possibly there may be more than mere coincidence in the similarity between the shape of the Khanabad tumiz (or the first Mamluk bridle charm, shown in text fig. 8a) and the Fatimid crystal ampullae carved in the form of two birds facing outward with protruding beaks, on either side of a stylized Tree of Life, as illustrated by Kurt Erdmann, in The "Sacred Blood" of Weissenau, figs. 15-19. It is not impossible that the horse charms might have been copied from earlier stone or metal reliquaries of that type, in which the three odd tubes could have functioned as plume holders if the object were atop a bridle (or at the head of a standard).
studs always occupy the same relative positions as on the first type. However, the smaller ones may differ slightly in their placing, as well as in number, for they apparently have less symbolic importance.

One peculiarity to be noticed on both of the examples just described, as well as on the even more stylized variants, is that the stitching on the upper layer of green leather is always done in two colors of thread—red and yellow—apparently for some magical reason. (In text fig. 7 an attempt has been made to illustrate this feature, by using broken lines to indicate the yellow threads and solid lines for the red.)

These tumarcha horse amulets are now principally used by the Tajiks and Uzbeks, many of whom are refugees from Soviet Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, across the Oxus River, and presumably this custom, like so many others, also continues in use beyond the river. Although these tumarcha cannot now be found south of the Hindu Kush, engravings of some mounted Duranni dignitaries in the Kabul area, made during the early part of the last century, show a small jeweled pendant hanging from a strap below the horse's neck. Unfortunately, they are drawn on too small a scale to make out any details. More interestingly, however, the same horses wear, on the nose strap in front of the bridle, jeweled amulets in the shape of the Khanabad tawīz, but not inverted (i.e., right side up, as in text fig. 7, a).

The nearest correspondences to the latter are related bridle amulets from Egypt, which, though far away, is still within the limits of Islamic civilization. Among examples of Mamluk horse trappings captured at the Battle of the Pyramids in 1798, recently exhibited in Paris, these were displayed by the Musée de l'Armée in an exhibition entitled, L'Exposition des Armées de la République en Europe et en Égypte (1792–1799), presented in the Salle d'Honneur, Hôtel des Invalides, in the autumn of 1953.

were two bridles having amulets which apparently show the true nature of the symbolic figure on the horse charms from Afghanistan, offering definite proof that they probably derive from double-headed eagles.

The first bridle had attached to its front strap, where it would hang on the horse's brow, the amulet shown in text figure 8, a, which has the general form and outline of the tumarcha from Khanabad, as well as greatly resembling the earlier bridle ornaments from Kabul. It was

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

**Fig. 8—Two Egyptian Mamluk Bridle Ornaments, Taken at the Battle of the Pyramids. Sketched by the Author in the Musée de l'Armée, Paris.**

---


20 Known to the Egyptians as the "Battle of Embabeh," this is briefly described in Haji A. Browne, *Bonaparte in Egypt*, New York, 1907, pp. 89–93.

21 These were displayed by the Musée de l'Armée in
made of gilded metal, studded with corals, having the principal stones arranged in a definite pattern. Two larger corals marked the "eyes," and two long curved ones accented the "beaks," while a small sunburst of little corals around another large one decorated the upper center; and a larger sunburst, formed of concentric rows of eight smaller corals each, occupied the lower center at the place where the Afghan tumarcha have a hole or reserve. From its lower edge hung T2 pendent chains of tiny corals, which have been omitted in the sketch, along with the smaller corals, for greater simplification.

The second bridle had, in the same location, an amulet of silver-gilt in the form of a fairly naturalistic double-headed eagle, which held in its claws deeply pitted nucleated circles. This is shown in text figure 8, b. The similar mode of using it, together with other correspondences, make it clear that the two forms of amulet were merely different ways of representing the same basic idea, and hence were interchangeable.

Although no such happy examples of more naturalistic bird forms have turned up among the Afghan horse charms, they do occasionally occur on saddle rugs and saddle blankets. The latter sometimes have patterns showing the Simurgh in the conventional form derived from the Chinese "phoenix" (fēng-huang) which came into Persian culture through the Mongols.\(^2\)

Even on these saddle trappings the phoenix-type Simurgh rarely is shown in such a recognizable form as the one depicted on the blanket projecting behind the saddle in the Persian miniature in plate 4, figure 11. It is usually far more stylized, like those on the Turcoman saddle rug shown in plate 5, figure 13, which was purchased in the Kunduz bazaar. Here the birds (text fig. 9) are difficult to make out until one notes the four tail plumes, each marked with an "eye" like those on the tail of the bird on the pin from Kandahar shown in text figure 2. (This is a very common convention on the Chinese representations of the "phoenix" which served as the prototype for later renderings of the Simurgh.)\(^2\) Further identifying elements are the long sinuous neck, and the crest which is indicated by a projection behind the head. But most important are the two triangular reserves, because two holes (often triangular) sometimes replace the single perforation in the solar symbols of northern Europe and Asia.\(^2\) This convention takes us back to the Afghan sugar spoons, where the figures-of-eight through the bodies of the birds at the top could easily have evolved from two perforations eventually merged into one double hole for convenience in manufacture.

The total pattern on this saddle rug obviously represents only a segment of a much larger, over-all design, because the tail plumes of two more pairs of birds are just visible at the bot-

\(^{2}\) Typical examples of the phoenix-form Simurgh are shown in illustrations for the Shāh-nāma, depicting scenes from the lives of Zal and Rustam. See the Survey of Persian art, vol. 5, pls. 876 and 925, A.

Fig. 9—Detail of Turcoman Saddle Rug Showing Conventionalized "Phoenix."
tom, where the design has been abruptly terminated. This pattern seems to represent a combination of two basic motifs. The four Sîmurgh figures are separated into two pairs by the median line. Each pair of birds flanks a vertical element with strange projections, which is probably intended to portray the Tree of Life. Yet the latter is itself made up of alternate segments in red and yellow, which seem to represent highly conventionalized, broken-down dragons, each one paired with one of the Sîmurghs to illustrate the ancient theme of the conflict between holy bird and reptile.

It would seem that these saddle cloths and saddle rugs did not have the Sîmurgh motifs on them merely for ornament, but that they were probably also intended to protect both the horse and its rider from harm, like the bird-form charm pendants; since the traditional allprotecting Sîmurgh was not only believed to be a champion of good, as illustrated by its conflict with the evil dragon, but it was also thought to have so much beneficial power that a mere feather from it could ward off harm and heal wounds.25

The phoenix-form Sîmurgh was a late development in Persian court art, and before that there was apparently no established convention for representing the Sîmurgh in the Iranian tradition. Therefore, it is possible that the single-, double- and triple-headed Sunbird types may reflect earlier stages in its depiction, which have survived in the conservative folk tradition. In fact, although modern Afghans can no longer tell the name of the once-divine bird which, in one form or another, still appears on so many of their symbolic utensils, items of jewelry, and horse trappings, when invited to suggest some likely candidate from their folk tradition, they immediately suggest the Sîmurgh.

The Sîmurgh would indeed seem the most likely choice. As we have just seen, this mythical bird enjoyed a reputation for averting harm which would have made it especially suitable as a horse charm. Hence, whether or not the Sîmurgh tradition had incorporated the older legend about the eagle which brought down the sweet substance from Heaven, and whether or not this caused it to be associated with sugar as well, the Sîmurgh could have been appropriately used on sugar utensils in its protective capacity, to guard sugar users against the dangers of such powdered poisons as arsenic, which could so easily be concealed in sugar.26

Moreover, the Sîmurgh, as the later Iranian form of the Sunbird, not only had a dragon adversary, but it also shared most of the other attributes ascribed to the Sunbird elsewhere; even to the extent of having its traditional perch atop a gigantic tree, which appears to have been the old World Tree taken over into later mythology.27 Thus, this particular bird could have been quite suitably represented atop an axe or mace of which the staff was considered to symbolize the Cosmic Tree or the World Pillar (which were interchangeable). Also, at the

Poison detecting and poison averting seem to have been major preoccupations in the Near East until relatively modern times. A recent article by Richard Ettinghausen has brilliantly investigated the old Asiatic belief that the stag (or markhor) was a force to counteract poisons, which concept may provide another reason for the presence of the stag's head on the Iraqi sugar axes, in addition to the cosmic ones. See R. Ettinghausen, The "snake-eating stag" in the East, Late classical and mediaeval studies in honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr., Princeton, 1955, pp. 272-286. It would seem that some idea of averting poison may partially account for the making of post-Sasanian aquamaniles in the form of horned animals (ibid., p. 282). Similarly, a belief in the poison-averting powers of the cosmic bird, in addition to its symbolic association with water, demonstrated by Schroeder, could also help to explain the apparent popularity of bird-form water vessels in mediaeval Iran and Afghanistan. The National Museum in Kabul has a fine example of a bird-form aquamanile from the old capital at Ghazni. For others, see Schroeder, An aquamanile, figs. 1 and 2 (frontispiece), and fig. 3, facing p. 12.


26 Carnoy, Iranian mythology, p. 289.
later stages in the tradition, when various 
strands of legend had become intertwined and 
confused, the Simurgh took over attributes 
from other, more ancient bird deities, such as 
the Varengān (in addition to those of its own 
prototype, the Saēna), and in the process it 
became known as a bird of wisdom, a messenger 
from Heaven, and a conveyor of protective 
grace. This could account for its use as a royal 
symbol and for its presence on the modern 
bridal things.

Saēna, Simurgh, "Celestial Diver," or simply 
"the Sunbird," the actual name of this old bird 
deity is not as important as the mere fact of its 
persistence as a graphic symbol into modern 
times in Islamic civilization, especially among 
such ardent Muslims as the Afghan Pathans and 
the Uzbek Turks. But these sugar utensils,

28 Ibid., pp. 289-291, and Büchner, Simurgh, 
pp. 427-428.
29 The Simurgh was taken over into Islam in another 
way, as a literary symbol for the Deity; see Büchner 
ibid., p. 428.

The enormous spread and long persistence of Sun-
bird symbolism in many civilizations and the striking 
wedding ornaments, and horse charms, all form 
part of the old Persian-Afghan-Uzbek folk 
tradition; and it is characteristic of the folk 
tradition everywhere that potent symbols and 
charms, especially of a protective nature, often 
continue on, even after a radical change in the 
oficial religion.

The very fact that the representations are 
so strongly conventionalized in modern Af-
ghanistan shows that there must have been a 
long period of evolution in these patterns, as 
well as a conservative retaining of old forms 
long after their ancient meanings had begun to 
pass from memory. This is not so strange; the 
real marvel is that some of the traditional 
symbols of this old cult should have survived 
there in such relatively unchanged forms as the 
Sunbird figures on the Afghan sugar axes and 
the Pathan bridal pins from Kandahar.

correspondences of details in its representation in 
widely separated areas will be fully demonstrated in 
Carl Schuster's forthcoming book on the Sunbird. The 
writer is deeply grateful to Dr. Schuster for many 
helpful suggestions.
SCULPTURE FROM ARABIA FELIX: THE EARLIEST PHASE

BY BERTA SEGALL

For W. F. Albright’s 65th Birthday

Pre-Islamic sculpture from South Arabia has been known for some time and is represented in many of the large museums of the West, yet it is still a hardly touched field of the history of art. There are many reasons for this, some of them inherent in the nature of the material. The ancient South Arab’s gift for ornamental design, so evident in the inscriptions on stone, is not matched by a gift for the rendering of animate form; his is one of the most “conceptual”1 of ancient styles, adding detail upon detail of inherited pattern to make up a human body or a face, and the results present the greatest difficulty both of classification and appreciation even to scholars experienced in the analysis of “primitive” art forms. W. W. Tarn once said: “South Arabian statuary is primitive stuff; to say that sculpture had not reached the level one would expect from architecture, is letting it down gently.”2 However, to say this is to misunderstand both its function in Arabian civilization and the circumstances of its rise, which could not be seen clearly as long as the history and chronology of the country were not known. Ever since the regions in which it developed were first opened up to scientific investigation in the nineteenth century, the central problem remained that of synchronizing the information derived from the thousands of native inscriptions that could be recovered and deciphered with the information on the ancient


Arabs contained in sources outside the country. The inscriptions yielded a relative chronology for the main kingdoms Ma’in, Saba’, Qatabān, and Ḥadramawt which followed each other geographically from northwest to southeast. But it was not until controlled excavations began only a few years ago that the framework for an absolute chronology began to emerge. This could be based on two fortunate discoveries during the excavation of Timna’, the capital of ancient Qatabān, by the American Foundation for the Study of Man.3 The first find was that of an Arabian inscription on a pair of Hellenistic bronze groups with names belonging to the reign of the late Qatabānian King Shahr Yagil Yuhargib. Thus the lifetime of this king,

which had been dated by some scholars as early
as the ninth century B.C., was fixed definitely
in the Hellenistic period, and the feud of long
standing between adherents of the high and the
low chronology for South Arabia was decided
once and for all in favor of the latter. The
second discovery was that of a few small frag-
ments of Arretine sherds beneath the deep layer
of ashes which marked the conflagration level of
the city and dated the time of its destruction.
With the accurate determination of the date of
destruction an ante quem date for all material
found inside the city was given. But since the
lower layers of the mound had to be left un-
touched for lack of time no post quem date could
be determined.

The great depth of unexcavated débris in
parts of Timna¹ suggests that the low levels of
the mound go far back in time, but at the present
moment there is nothing that can tell us when
it was founded or when it gained the prosperity
that it enjoyed before its destruction. However,
there is good evidence, which will be dealt with
elsewhere by W. F. Albright, that the region
around Timna¹ was settled at an early period.
The main evidence comes from a settlement in
the immediate neighborhood of Timna¹, Hajar
Bin Humeid, which was excavated down to
bed silt and where a 15-meter sequence of stratified
pottery was obtained. Albright dates
the early layers through comparison with pot-
tery from Palestine and Syria and through the
appearance of inscriptions on sherds. The stra-
tum with the earliest inscribed sherds is not
later than the eighth century B.C., while the
earliest layers go back to the beginning of the
first millennium or possibly to a slightly earlier
date. But no sculpture was associated with the
early stratified material and no inscriptions
outside those on sherds were found. The ques-
tion of the date and the nature of the earliest
South Arabian sculpture can therefore not yet
be answered by archaeological methods, and an
attempt has to be made to approach the prob-
lem through comparative investigation. This
can be done because the organization of the
country centered around foreign trade: com-
merce with native products like incense, and
transit trade with products of other countries,
notably Somaliland and India. The main South
Arabian settlements were apparently from the
beginning caravan posts, and their entire art
seems to have developed under the stimulus of
the various civilizations which, in the course of
the centuries, were successively the most im-
portant trading partners or boasted the most
impressive culture of their own.²

But in the past comparative studies were dif-
ficult because of the feud between adherents of
the high and the low chronology for South
Arabia. Both schools have attempted such in-
vestigations, with, of course, highly divergent
results. Carl Rathjens, a follower of the high
chronology, has recently sketched a picture of
South Arabian civilization and its commerce
which he carries back to the third millennium
B.C.³ A very interesting contribution from an
adherent of the low chronology was presented
in 1954 by Miss J. Pirenne at the Académie des
Inscriptions in Paris⁴ which was summed up by
the newspaper Le Monde of April 28, 1954, as
follows: “(La civilisation sabéenne) ne se serait
pas développée parallèlement au monde as-
yrrien, mais bien au contact des Grecs et à la
faveur de la prospérité économique amenée en
Orient, dès le sixième siècle, par le commerce
avec les Grecs.”⁵

Carl Rathjens bases his picture of the earliest

¹ W. F. Albright, Chronology of ancient South
Arabia, p. 6 f.
² The influences on South Arabian civilization
resulting from trade relations were especially stressed
by Carl Rathjens, Kulturelle Einflüsse in Südwest-
arabien, Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung, vol. 1
(1950), p. 3 ff., and in his Sabaeica II, Mitteilungen aus
dem Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg, vol. XXIV,
³ Sabaeica II, passim.
⁴ Jacqueline Pirenne, La Grèce et Saba, Compt.
Rend. l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,
SCULPTURE FROM ARABIA FELIX

period of South Arabian sculpture on a collection of crude terra-cotta figurines that he acquired in Yemen. Final judgment of their date will have to be postponed till some of them turn up in datable contexts from reliable excavations, but even a cursory examination of the illustrations in Rathjen's *Sabaeica II* (p. 195 ff.) reveals that his dates must be too early. W. F. Albright tells me that he definitely dates the figurines in the Iron Age; the remark on page 60 of *Sabaeica II* that he agrees with a date before 2000 B.C. is the result of a misunderstanding. It is well to remember that South Arabian pottery, too, remained crude even in periods of great prosperity. The American expedition found in late graves of the Timna cemetery, associated with fine Hellenistic imported ware, crude handmade native vases which would be unthinkable in most contemporary civilizations elsewhere.

On the other hand, the view that the earliest South Arabian artistic production was inspired by Greek art in the sixth century B.C. is even less likely. There is a radical basic "structural" difference between Greek and South Arabian art. Superficial similarities between some South Arabian and some Greek archaic sculpture exist because certain features of both styles evolved under similar circumstances and from similar sources.

In the Hellenistic period the background of South Arabian civilization is painted for us quite vividly by several classical authors. But for the early period, to which the chronology of Hajar Bin Humeid points, the only sources outside Arabia are the annals of late Assyrian kings and the Bible. But the historical utility of these two sources has often been doubted; in fact, the main arguments of those scholars who proposed a very late date for the beginning of South Arabian civilization were based on this doubt. "Aucun indice ne corrobore ce synchronisme," says Miss Pirenne. The Assyrian annals deal mainly with the deeds of their own kings and contain little other information, but the stories of the Bible paint a consistent picture that does not differ materially from that sketched later by the Greeks, and for that reason alone it cannot be entirely overlooked. The Biblical testimony begins as early as the middle of the tenth century B.C. with the famous story of the visit of a queen from Saba' at the court of King Solomon; it is worth recalling in its entirety.

Now when the Queen of Sheba heard of the fame of Solomon concerning the name of the Lord, she came to test him with hard questions. She came to Jerusalem with a very great retinue, with camels bearing spices, and very much gold, and precious stones; and when she came to Solomon, she told him all that was on her mind. And Solomon answered all her questions ... And when the Queen of Sheba had seen all the wisdom of Solomon, the house that he had built, the food of his table, the seating of his officials, and the attendance of his servants, their clothing, his cupbearers, and his burnt offerings which he offered at the house of the Lord, there was no more spirit in her. And she said to the king, "The report was true which I heard in my own land of your affairs and of your wisdom, but I did not believe the reports until I came and my own eyes had seen it..." Then she gave the king a hundred and twenty talents of gold, and a very great quantity of spices, and precious stones... And King Solomon gave to the Queen of Sheba all that she desired, whatever she asked besides what was given her by the bounty of King Solomon. So she turned and went back to her own land, with her servants. (I Kings 10.)

Expressed in less poetic terms, this very picturesque story is witness to the existence of an established caravan trade between South Arabia and Palestine. Spices and raw materials, gold and precious stones went north, and tales of a fabulous civilization that knew how to use them came back with the goods received as barter—"King Solomon gave to the Queen of Sheba all that she desired, whatever she asked." In another passage, we hear that King Solomon did

---


not retain all that he imported but sold it to people farther north. Horses and chariots for instance he got from Cilicia and Egypt in transit trade “and so through the king’s traders they were exported to all the kings of the Hittites and the kings of the Aramæans.” We can, then, expect a network of trade relations in the tenth century B.C. stretching from western South Arabia to North Syria.

To round out the picture, there are references in the Bible to another Arabian trading center, Dedan, and this in connection with Saba’. Dedan was identified by the archaeologists Janssen and Savignac as the modern oasis of al-Ula, ca. 320 km. north of Medina; it has furnished remarkable remnants of art which, however, do not seem to be earlier than the fourth century B.C. The passages in the Bible go back to a far earlier phase. “In the Table of Nations, Dedan appears with Sheba as the offspring of Ra’mah, son of Cush and brother of Seba (Genesis 10:7); all we can infer at present from this passage is that Dedan was already bracketed with Sheba as a trading community of great importance in the early first millennium B.C.” The passages of the seventh and especially of the early sixth century are more specific. In Ezekiel’s lamentation over Tyre (Ezekiel 27:15ff.) it is said: “The men of Dedan traded with you ... They brought you in payment ivory tusks and ebony. The traders of Sheba and Ra’mah traded with you; they exchanged for your wares the best of all kinds of spices, and all precious stones and gold.” And later (Ezekiel 38:13): “Sheba and Dedan and the merchants of Tarshish and all its villages will say to you: ‘Have you come to seize spoil? ... To carry off plunder, to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods?’”

According to these testimonies from the Bible, trade between South Arabia and Palestine then existed and systematic arrangements for its protection between the caravan stations seem to have been made at an early period. The gold and precious stones brought by the caravans of the Queen of Saba’ and the ivory and ebony from Africa that passed through Dedan and were destined for Phoenicia would then indicate that in the first half of the first millennium B.C. raw materials for precious works of art passed over the caravan roads of Arabia for destinations in Palestine and Phoenicia and presumably farther north “to the kings of the Hittites and of the Aramæans.” The Arabian traders must, therefore, have come into contact with the artisans who fashioned the goods, as well as with their finished works. Like their queen, they must have seen and been impressed by “the houses they built” and by the magnificence of their furnishings.

But is there a possibility of assigning any piece of South Arabian sculpture definitely to a period before the sixth century B.C. and to connect it with a source of inspiration that is definitely pre-Greek? The first clear answer was found, rather surprisingly, when the small stele shown in figure 1 was studied for the catalogue of sculpture of the Arabian Publication Project of the Johns Hopkins University. The stele, only 22 cm. high, was found by W. F. Albright among débris in an upper layer of Hajar Bin Ḥumайд; no indication of the date can therefore be derived from its context. It can only be surmised that it came from the necropolis of Hajar Bin Ḥumайд, because its shape and size correspond to other reliefs from cemeteries. When the stele was discovered, the representation seemed to be unique—instead of the usual frontal figure of squat proportions with wide staring eyes the stele showed, in a sunken panel, a man in flat relief with profile turned to the left, grasping with both hands a heavy staff which extends to the upper border of the panel. He has a pointed beard and wears what is
either a cap with a flap falling to the shoulder or long hair. He is dressed in a loin cloth secured by a belt; the cloth reaches down to the middle of the calves. A fringe marking the end of the cloth is indicated by a vertical row of short, incised, diagonal lines like the rungs of a ladder. The ear, the large oval eye, and a headband sitting high near the top of the head are also sketchily outlined in incision; details may originally have been added in paint.

It turned out, however, that the type is not unique. W. F. Albright found a similar stele in the Aden Museum (fig. 2), and Dr. Albert Jamme W. F. called my attention to a third example in the Muncherjee Collection in Aden (fig. 3). The differences between the Hajār Bin Ḥumaid stele (fig. 1) and the stele in the Aden Museum (fig. 2), can perhaps be explained as a stylistic development—on the Aden Museum stele spatial recession is handled with greater skill. On the Muncherjee stele however, the differences outweigh the similarities, and these remained for some time a complete enigma. There is even a marked difference in shape—all three steles taper downward, but the tapering of the Muncherjee stele is more pronounced. The man is displayed on the latter without an inner frame or special panel and, though represented in the same pose as the two others, seems to come from a different world. He, too, has a large nose and a pointed beard; the very thin mouth, not more than a line, is almost lost in it. But the enormous circular eye was not outlined in an incised line, but was represented in inlay, which was apparently secured with the help of a nail or prong fitting into a smaller hole in the center of the eye. On his head he wears a tight fringed cap which is bordered by a row of inlaid dots, the holes in which they were set being now empty. The figure, with square shoulders, and straight and flat as a board, is wrapped in a cloak with fringed borders; he wears a wide fringed collar over his shoulders and what is perhaps a fringed muffler around his neck. On his upper arm he wears a bracelet whose square clasp was also once decorated with inlay, and apparently finger rings on the third and fourth fingers of his left hand. Evidently, he was a man of importance.

The relief is unfortunately broken off above the knees, but it is possible to reconstruct it fully since, upon investigation, it turns out that the costume is that worn by men from Palestine and Syria shown on monuments of the New Kingdom in Egypt as well as on Syrian monuments down to the beginning of the first millennium B.C. The most striking parallel is found on a relief plaque discovered in Assur in the débris of the city wall and definitely datable in the thirteenth century B.C. (fig. 4). On this plaque the figure is represented exactly as on the Muncherjee stele in profile looking left, with the right arm raised and the left forearm stretched forward horizontally. His cloak is drawn around the hips, and he wears a large collar around the shoulders. Cloak, shoulder cape, and close-fitting cap or kerchief on his head are decorated with a fringe represented by rows of incised lines forming squares. This relief belongs to a group of objects in colored glazed clay from Assur which were “imported from Canaan or imitated from Canaanite models.” Since they

Both reliefs are mentioned, without illustration, in Albert Jamme, Pièces anépigraphe sud-arabes d’Aden, Le Musée, vol. 64 (1951). The relief in the Aden Museum, museum No. 37, is Jamme No. 8, loc. cit., p. 160. The relief from the Muncherjee Collection is Jamme No. 38, loc. cit., p. 172. I owe both photographs to Dr. Jamme and want to express here my gratitude to him.


16 Walter Andrae, Die jüngeren Ischtartempel in Assur, Leipzig, 1935, p. 81 with fig. 63.

17 W. F. Albright, Canaanites in the history of civilization, Studies in the History of Culture, to Waldo Gifford Leland, Menasha, Wis., 1942, p. 25, n. 45. C. Watzinger, Phoenikien und Palaestina,
were excavated, a number of similar objects have come to light in Palestine, Syria, and Cyprus, and their Syrian origin is today accepted.\textsuperscript{18} We have, then, in the figure of the Muncherjee stele, a man in Syrian costume of the late Late Bronze Age, an adaptation of Syrian art, but certainly not a Syrian export. The figure on the Syrian glazed-clay relief from Assur was modeled by an artist with a better grasp of spatial problems, and its high relief is witness to a competence developed by long tradition. In comparison, the Muncherjee stele is derivative. Its very stiffness and wooden angularity contribute to its peculiar impressiveness. How then can its appearance in South Arabia be explained?

An answer is perhaps suggested by another small Syrian relief (fig. 6), an ivory from Megiddo in Palestine\textsuperscript{19} (not later than about 1140 B.C.) with the profile figure of a woman who wears a costume corresponding to the man’s garb on the glazed-clay relief from Assur. Here the analogies, especially those of technique, are even more convincing. The large eye, whose inlay is preserved, the fashioning of the fringe bordering her long garments, and the decoration of the neckline are carved in a manner resembling closely the carving on the Muncherjee stele, though they are executed with far greater skill. The figure is cut out inside a frame and both front and back are carefully fashioned; it was probably intended to be seen from either side as part of a symmetrical composition.

Such symmetrical compositions, with two figures facing each other across a central motif, most often a tree or an ornamental plant design, were very popular in the minor arts; it is in-

\textit{Kyros}, in Walter Otto, \textit{Handbuch der Arch"{a}ologie}, Munich, vol. 2 (1939), p. 805, n. 2, also agrees that this group is Phoenician and not Cypriote.

\textsuperscript{18} See preceding note and Henry Frankfort, \textit{The art and architecture of the ancient Orient} (Pelican History of Art), London and Baltimore, Md., 1935, pl. 153, p. 161f.

\textsuperscript{19} G. Loud, \textit{Megiddo ivories}, Chicago, 1939, vol. 37, No. 173. The figure is here printed in reverse.

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{20} Heinrich Schaefer und Walter Andrae, \textit{Die Kunst des alten Orients}, Berlin, 1925, pl. 406.
    \item \textsuperscript{21} Walter Andrae, \textit{Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli V}, Berlin, 1943, pl. 47.
    \item Development of the motif in Sparta, Dawkins, \textit{op. cit.}, pl. 64, No. 12, and pl. 168, Nos. 3c and 4.
\end{itemize}
Plate 1

Fig. 1—Relief from Hajar Bin Humeid. (Photograph American Foundation for the Study of man.)

Fig. 2—Relief, Aden Museum. (Photograph Albert Jammie.)
Fig. 6—Ivory From Megiddo, Chicago, Oriental Institute. (After Loud.)

Fig. 7—Egyptian Spoon, Berlin Museum. (After Schaefer-Andrae.)

Fig. 8—Silver Plaque from Sincirli. (After Andrae.)

Fig. 9—Ivory From Sparta. (After Dawkins.)
Fig. 10—Arab Warrior Riding Camel. (After Assyrian Sculpture in the British Museum.)

Fig. 11—Sabaean Grave Stone. (After Corp. Inscr. Sem.)
but both succeeded in expressing the individuality of their respective cultures in independent creations.

What are the conclusions that can be drawn from these comparisons? The costume, which is that of Syrian men of the late Late Bronze and the early Iron Age, and the technique of the carving, which has the closest affinities to Syrian ivory carvings of the same period, give a clear terminus post quem for the Muncherjee stele: it was made sometime after the thirteenth century B.C. A terminus ante quem is given by the Hajar Bin Humeid stele (fig. 1) whose figure already wears a different costume. The stele from Hajar Bin Humeid cannot be dated precisely and is, according to W. F. Albright, probably not earlier than the Achaemenid period, but there must have been links now missing which point to an earlier date for its prototype. The latest representation of the fringed shoulder collar seems to be that on the enigmatic ivory relief from the so-called treasure of Ziyyè in Iran (fig. 5) which is commonly dated in the eighth century B.C. The procession of bearded men holding heavy staffs, some following, some facing each other, is interesting to compare with the Muncherjee relief (fig. 3). Their heavily embroidered fringed costume is also based on that of Syrians of the late Late Bronze Age, but the Muncherjee stele is far closer to the prototype.

The cumbersome fringed cloak seems to have been abandoned in Arabia as early as the second half of the eighth century B.C. Camel-riding Arabs on reliefs of the time of Tiglath-pileser III which depict his wars with Arabs in the thirties of the eighth century (fig. 10) are represented like the Arab from Hajar Bin Humeid with long

24 André Godard, Le trésor de Ziyyè, Haarlem, 1950, fig. 91.
25 Assyrian sculpture in the British Museum from Shalmaneser III to Sennacherib, London, 1938, pl. XIX. An interesting survival of the figure carrying the staff, which has here become a lance, is the foot soldier on the Sabean relief (fig. 11) from the neighborhood of Ma‘rib (Corpus Inscriptionum Semiti-

hair falling to the shoulder held together by a ribbon, and a short loin cloth secured by a belt (fig. 1). They are excellent evidence for the assumption of a prototype of the stele from Hajar Bin Humeid going back to the eighth century B.C.

The group of reliefs associated with the stele from Hajar Bin Humeid, and especially the Muncherjee stele, open up an entirely new avenue of approach to the problem of the earliest phase of South Arabian sculpture. One can now say with some confidence that the Muncherjee stele was fashioned sometime after the thirteenth or twelfth century B.C. and that Syrian ivory carvings of this period were very likely its ultimate source of inspiration. It is also possible to say that it was probably fashioned not later than the middle of the eighth century B.C. It seems, then, that South Arabian sculpture did not develop from the Greek of the sixth century, but goes back to earlier sources, much closer geographically and culturally. Moreover, it is powerful independent evidence for the general reliability of the Biblical tradition about the tenth-century trade relations between Palestine and the land of Saba'. Since the Ahiram sarcophagus shows that the costume with shoulder cape was worn in that period, it may well have been the costume of King Solomon himself or of his servants, whose clothing the queen scrutinized with such interest.

Postscript

Since this article was concluded in June 1955, several papers bearing on the subject have appeared: W. F. Albright’s dates of the Hajar Bin Humeid pottery were confirmed by radiocarbon dating. Compare Gus W. Van Beek, A radiocarbon date for Early South Arabia, Bull. American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 143 (1956), pp. 6–9.

carum, pars quarta, tomus 3, tabulæ fasc. 1, tabula 44, No. 698; see also H. T. Bossert, Altsyrien, No. 1304, pl. 380).

An interesting statue of a seated woman was excavated in Ethiopia: A. Caquot and A. Y. Drewes, *Les monuments recueillis à Magallé (Tigré)*, Annales d’Éthiopie, vol. 1 (1955), p. 18f. and pls. V to VIII. The decoration of the woman’s garment in small holes, evidently meant for inlay in glass (judging from the technique of ivory borders), is a survival of the technique that was used on the Muncherjee stele (*fig. 3*).
ACHAEMENIAN CHAPES

The internationalism of the Persian Empire is reflected not only in deeds and chronicles, but also in the ambitious works of art which the "Great King, king of kings" commanded to be made and which found favor in his eyes. Just as the endless rows of tribute-bearing peoples depicted on the reliefs at Persepolis tell of the rich contributions of many nations to the conquerors,¹ so also does Achaemenian art testify to the contributions of artists and craftsmen from foreign lands who came to Pasargadae, Susa, and Persepolis, either in person or in their work.² Hence, the magnificent reliefs and sculpture in-the-round uncovered on the Persepolis terrace, which seem to have sprung full-born from the workshops of the newly founded empire, had their antecedents in the rich artistic traditions of the ancient world. The particular genius of the Persians lay in their ability to synthesize these diverse art trends into a style that has an integrity of its own. One instance of the synthetic, or "international" nature of Achaemenian art may be traced in a series of scabbard chapes (fig. 1).³

The scene depicted on the chapes is that of the ancient, dramatic combat of two animals. The clearest representation is carved on the ivory chape 1. The chape is roughly trefoil in shape, the broadest side flat for affixing to the end of the dagger scabbard. Chape I was first catalogued as being, apparently, a seal.⁴ Some of the other chapes were thought to come perhaps from the pommels of daggers, but their appearance on the sculptured reliefs at Persepolis not only gives the correct identification of the objects as chapes, but also provides detailed illustration of the type of scabbard to which they

¹ An inscription of Xerxes in the Archaeological Museum in Tehran lists the following lands over which the law of the Achaemenians extended: Media, Elam, Arachosia, Armenia, Drangiana, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Babylonia, Assyria, Sattagydia, Sardis, Egypt, the Ionians of the archipelago and of the continent, Maka, Arabia, Gandhāra, the land of the Indus, Capadocia, Dahae, Amyrgaean Sacae, the land of the Scythians of the "pointed hats," Skudra (Thrace and Macedonia), Akaufaka (Afghanistan), Pun, Caria and the land of the Kushites. Guide du Musée archéologique de Téhéran, 1948, p. 30.

² From the Foundation Tablet of Darius I at Susa: "Those who wrought the stones were Ionians and Sardinians. Those who wrought the gold were Medes and Egyptians. Those who wrought the ivory were Sardinians and Egyptians. Those who wrought the baked bricks were Babylonians and Ionians. Those who decorated the walls were Medes and Egyptians." V. Scheil, Mémoires de la mission archéologique de Perse (Paris, 1933).vol. 24, p. 111; cf. Walther Hinz, The Elamite version of the record of Darius' palace at Susa, Journal of Near Eastern Studies, vol. 9 (1950), p. 1 ff.

³ Figure 1:

Chape 1. Louvre; M. I. Rostovtzeff, The animal style in South Russia and China, Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology (Princeton, 1929), pl. 22.

Chape 2. Louvre; ibid., pl. 24.

Chape 3. Archaeological Museum of Tehran; E. F. Schmidt, The treasury of Persepolis and other discoveries in the homeland of the Achaemenians, Oriental Institute Communications, No. 21 (Chicago, 1939), fig. 15.

Chape 4. Louvre; E. Herzfeld, Iran in the Ancient East (New York, 1941), p. 265, fig. 307.

Chape 5. Persepolis; ibid., pl. 84.


Chape 7. Ashmolean Museum; ibid., pl. 23,2.


Chape 9. Persepolis; A. Godard, Le trésor de Ziwiye, Publications du service archéologique de l'Iran (Haarlem, 1950), fig. 62.

were attached (fig. 2, a). The large dagger (akinakes) and its scabbard (mykes) are shown hanging from a short fastening that is attached to the wearer's belt. The lower end of the scabbard is held secure against the thigh (just as is its modern army counterpart) by a thong that is braided around the scabbard just above the chape and then passed around the leg, ending in a small loop through which is inserted the other end of the thong. A large ribbed bead secures the fastening. The scabbard is elaborately decorated in exquisite detail to match the chape. The hilt of the dagger and its oval pommel are undecorated except for triangular notching. The scabbard itself was probably made of a wooden core over which an embossed metal covering was wrapped. This type of manufacture was employed by the Scyths in scabbards of similar

Schmidt, loc. cit., fig. 15, a good photograph of a magnificently decorated scabbard worn by the Median carrier of the royal battleax and bow in the southern relief of Darius at the Treasury of Persepolis.
type (fig. 2, d, e).

At Persepolis the akinakes is worn on the right leg where it is available for withdrawing by the right hand and the subsequent downward plunging blow. The long sword, as worn by the Assyrians for example, is hung on the left side so that its greater length may be withdrawn from the scabbard by the right hand across the body. However, the position of the weapons, as seen on some Roman reliefs, may be reversed: the dagger is worn on the left side and the short sword on the right.

Chape 1 shows the combat scene in an abbreviated form: a bearded ram’s head attacked by a lion. The hind leg of the lion is drawn up against its body, the forelegs reach for the ram, the long tail is prominently extended. The two smaller lobes of the chape are formed by the rear haunch of the lion and the large, curling horn of the ram; the large bottom foil encloses the powerful forequarters, neck and head of the attacker. This extremely popular motif of the animal combat is here adapted into an excellent composition fitting tidily into the trefoil shape that it defines. A hole is cut through the ivory (similar penetrations occur in chapes 4 and 7), destroying part of the muzzle of the ram. These holes were made without regard for the careful carving of the animals; perhaps they were pierced at a later date. One of the chapes from Deve Hüyük was found with metal fastenings on it, which were additions made when the chape was put to other uses. Chape 1 has an oblong slit in the flat side which, it seems most likely, acted as a mortise to receive the tenon on the end of the scabbard. This would be the neatest way to fasten the chape to the scabbard base without disturbing the beautiful design of the ensemble. The holes in the face of the chape may have served to hold a pin that locked the tenon in place. Such a fastening device was apparently used for two ivory crouching lions from Samaria (first half ninth century B.C.). They show details identical to those of the chapes: rectangular slots pierced transversely by circular borings. The heads of the locking pins probably were carefully disguised with a paste, or otherwise blended into the surface of the chapes, for the chapes on the Persepolis reliefs, though minutely executed, show no trace of the fastening pins.

The design worked out in chape 1 is repeated in the other chapes, but not with the same degree of naturalism. Chape 1 clearly identifies the attacking lion, heavy mane and tufted tail, in the puzzling series of ribs and curls. The origin of chape 1 has been variously ascribed: Chaldean, Assyrian, Egyptian. Chape 4 retains the essential features of the ram’s head; beard, horn, eye and ear are discernible. The muzzle is worn and mutilated by the holes drilled through the ivory. The attacking lion, however, has been schematized into two massings of concentric ribbing, denoting the hindquarters and forequarters of the beast. The legs, also, have been simplified; only the long tail, looped at the tip, gives the clue to the identity of the lion. The conventionalizing of the animal enroulé into a series of concentric flesh folds has been noted by the late Ernst Herzfeld as occurring in Scythian art (fig. 3). Lydian coins, found at Persepolis,

---

6 Cf. G. Borovka, Scythian art, Kai Khosru monographs on eastern art (New York, 1928), pl. 23; O. M. Dalton, The treasure of the Oxus, British Museum, Department of British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography (London, 1905), pl. 8; M. I. Rostovtzeff, op. cit., pl. 9, 23.

7 A. Baumeister, Denkmäler des klassischen Altertums (Munich, 1884–1889), vol. 3, figs. 2269, 2275, etc.

8 J. W. and G. M. Crowfoot, Early ivories from Samaria, Samaria-Sebaste 2 (London, 1938), pl. 9, 1a, 1b.

9 Perrot and Chipiez, loc. cit.; Rostovtzeff, op. cit., p. 11; Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 266.

10 Herzfeld, loc. cit.; Borovka, op. cit., pl. 14, B, cast-bronze ornament from the tumulus of the Seven Brothers.
are engraved with the lion-bull combat and use the series parallel of ridges to depict the twisted neck of the bull as he turns to face his attacker (fig. 4). A more decorative treatment of the skin folds is found on an ivory plaque from the “treasure” of Ziwiyè. Here, too, the animal turns back to face his attacker, but the folds of the twisting neck are abstracted, much as they are on the chapes, into a surface pattern (fig. 5).

![Fig. 4—Lydian Coin (Persepolis).](image)

![Fig. 5—Ivory Plaque (Ziwiyè).](image)

The groupings of the concentric folds on the chapes, then, is a development from the naturalistic folding of the skin when the animal’s body twists. Chape 1 presents the first naturalistic rendering of the lion *enroulé*; the other chapes are derivations, becoming consistently more decorative until, as in chape 9, the carver lost the meaning of the ribbing and stylized the lion out of existence—even the tail has disappeared. Girdle clasps of Scytho-Siberian workmanship show marked grooves on the animals, but in these instances there is no regular patterning, and the working of the material in this fashion developed from an attempt to capture the surface texture and perhaps the coloration of the animal skins.

Chape 2 preserves the hindquarters of the lion with the curling tail, but the forequarters in the bottom lobe of the chape are simplified into the “skin folds.” The ram’s head retains its beard, but the sweeping curve of the horn and the ear it encloses have been transformed into a heart-shaped decoration enclosing a double-petaled flowerlet. This motif continues in the chapes (chapes 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9), changing into enclosed palmettes. In some of the chapes it is doubtful whether the heads so decorated are ram’s heads or whether they even are horned animals. Each chape from the Persepolis reliefs (chapes 3, 5, and 9) presents a different rendering of the enclosed palmette, as do also the poorly preserved chapes from Deve Huyuk (chapes 6 and 7).

The *akinakes* scabbard with its appended trefoil or cinquefoil chape is repeatedly carved on the processional figures of Medes and Scyths at Persepolis, but usually, because of the small scale of the figures, the sculptors left the scabbards undecorated, carving out only their over-all shape. Chapes 3, 5, and 9 are exceptions (and there must be others). These show an increased simplicity in carving and decorative treatment of the lion. Long pendent curls now appear between the hindquarters and forequarters and on the neck of the head, replacing the vestigial remains of legs still present on chape 4. These long curls frequently appear in the Achaemenian artist’s repertoire. For example, the “manes” on the lion-head armlets from Susa and from the “Treasure of the Oxus” are made up of this type of curl, cut into the metal to receive inlays.

André Godard would account for this and other striking similarities between Achaemenian ornaments and the carving on the Persepolis reliefs with the suggestion that “… the sculptors of the bas-reliefs were goldsmiths. Thus is explained the number, the extraordinary fineness and preciousness of the bracelets, vases and weapons represented.”

Deve Huyuk, located near Carchemish, contained two cemeteries, one of late Hittite date,
the other of the fifth century B.C. From the latter cemetery came the bronze chape 6 and the ivory chape 7. Both are in poor condition, but enough detail remains to identify lion haunch, bearded head, enclosed palmette, and concentric ribbing. Unlike the chapes in the Louvre, those from Deve Huyuk were published with the artifacts found with them and, thus, are in a datable and identifiable context. Sir Leonard Woolley mentions parallels to the Deve Huyuk finds in an earring from Kiev, Scythian material, and a Greek rhyton. The snaffle bits from that excavation (fig. 6, a, b) are particularly interesting here because of their similarity to the horse bit found at Persepolis (fig. 6, c). These bits are of the same type of manufacture: the rein ring is cast in one piece with the cheek bar, which is pierced for insertion of the bridle straps. The jointed bit bars (of b and c) are fitted with small pointed knobs that must have been most effective in curbing the horse, though not most humane. The Persepolis reliefs provide a graphic illustration of the bit and bridle arrangement (fig. 7). Horse bits and chapes tie this Scythian burial site to the Achaemenian empire.

The chapes under consideration are not so unusual and unique that their source need remain a complete mystery. Considering the similarity of the dagger scabbards illustrated on the Persepolis reliefs with Scythian models, the appearance of the scabbards on Scyths and Medes, the association of the Deve Huyuk finds with Scythian material, and the animal combat motif which was such a favorite of the nomads, it seems clear that the history of the chapes extends back into a Scythian-Median environment. The scabbard depicted on the relief from the Treasury of Persepolis (fig. 2, a; see note 5) is elaborately decorated with winged beasts, lotus blossoms, and ibexes. Scythian scabbards, of the type represented in figure 2, d and e, also bear just such gorgeous detail work. In style, the Persepolis and Scythian scabbards have much in common: the flap for fastening to the wearer’s belt, the shield-shaped guard, the pronounced chape with highly stylized animal motif. The procession of the nine “prancing” ibexes on the body of the scabbard from the Treasury is paralleled by the “prancing” horses on the hilt of a Scythian dagger from Chertomlyk, which has the typical shield-shaped guard it would involve by putting the ring on top of the cheek piece.

16 Cambridge ancient history (Cambridge, 1927), volume of plates I, pls. 249, 251.
17 Cf. bit on electron and gilt horse’s head, rhyton from the collection of T. L. Jacks. A. U. Pope, Survey of Persian Art (London, 1938), vol. 4, pl. 110, B.
18 The bit in figure 7 would appear to show that the rein ring was cast at a right angle to the bit bar. This, however, is a convention of the carver who avoided the problem of foreshortening and the lack of clarity that it would involve by putting the ring on top of the cheek piece.
19 Iron sword with scabbard overlaid with gold: Sir E. H. Minns, Art of the northern nomads, Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. 28 (London, 1942), pl. 13, B.
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at the hilt.\textsuperscript{20} The Assyrian basis for this type of animal decoration is clear, and it should not be confused with the “animal style” of the steppe belt that reached from Manchuria to central Europe.\textsuperscript{21} Assyrian art was even more irresistible than the Assyrian armies, infecting the cultures with which it came in contact with its mature style, and always leaving behind its “trademark” motifs.

The swords worn by the Persians on the Persepolis reliefs are different from the akinakes worn by the Medes and Scyths. They were larger weapons with a broad symmetrical guard, worn thrust into a knot at the waist of the voluminous chlamys so that only the handle and guard were exposed (fig. 2, b). The trouser-wearing Medes and Scyths carried the dagger low on the thigh, tied to the leg, where it is most convenient for the mounted warrior; the Persians in their flowing gowns, less suited for horseback riding than trousers, carried their weapon high and loosely held. The long, narrow Assyrian sword was worn in a scabbard slung from a baldric that passed across the body and over the right shoulder. The sword hung on the left side, partly concealed under the Assyrian drapery. Some representations of the Assyrian sword show it in an undecorated scabbard, but it also appears in a scabbard with a pronounced “T”-shaped chape (fig. 2, c). The design of this chape is always the same, with minor variations, showing two felines with interlocked forelegs and heads thrown violently back (fig. 8). Small daggers are carried by the Assyrians, either singly or in pairs, thrust into the fold of the garment draped diagonally across the chest.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{20}M. Ebert, Realelexikon der Vorgeschichte (Berlin, 1929), vol. 13, pl. 37, A; vol. 14, pl. 15, akinakes from Usakov similar to the one from the Seven Brothers tumulus; alternate types from Vettesfelle, Sunejko, and Tomakova, pl. 45. A badly preserved hilt of this Scythian design was found in a Scythian tomb in the district of Aind (Nagy Enyed); illustrated in Vasile Pârvan, Dacia (Cambridge, 1928), pl. 9.

\textsuperscript{21}Minna, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

\textsuperscript{22}For late Assyrian daggers (patru) and short, Hittite swords were carried in the waist belt, on the left side. The scabbards show no decorated chape, but they frequently end in a curled tip, though the blade of the weapon is apparently straight (fig. 2, h).\textsuperscript{23} Seleucid times brought the large, broad-bladed sword, as we see represented on a relief from Dura-Europos and on the relief of two armed Palmyrenes from Palmyra.\textsuperscript{24} The dagger is worn by Antiochus I of Commagene on his right side. Its scabbard is decorated with four “rosettes” in pairs on either side and one “rosette” as a chape (fig. 2, f).\textsuperscript{25} A terracotta statuette (Sarre Collection, Kaiser-Friedrich Museum) shows a mounted Parthian wearing on his right side a large dagger, or short sword, that ends in a sharp curve (fig. 2, g).\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{23} Cf. reliefs from Boghazkê‘y, Ras Shamra: A. Götz, Hethiter, Churrirer und Assyrier (Oslo, 1936), pls. 24, 60; from Zinjirî: O. R. Gurney, The Hittites (London, 1952), pl. 28.

\textsuperscript{24}M. I. Rodovtzeff, Dura and the problem of Parthian art, Yale Classical Studies (New Haven, 1935), vol. 5, figs. 50, 51, 51a.

\textsuperscript{25}E. Herzfeld, Am Tor von Asien (Berlin, 1920), pl. 14.

\textsuperscript{26}F. Sarre, Die Kunst des Alten Persien (Berlin, 1923), pl. 54, left.
The early history of the Medes is still shrouded in obscurity, but we may with safety assume that the contacts between Medes and Scyths were many and intimate, so that the similarity of their dress, weapons, and ornamentation is not surprising. The Madai, or Medes, and the peoples of Parsuash (perhaps the northerly home of the southward-moving people calling themselves Parsa, i.e., Persians, 27) along with the Manneans, occupied the land south of Lake Urmia; north of them, to the east of the lake, was the land of peoples called by the Assyrians Ashguzi, the Scythians. The chronicles of Shalmanesar III and those of Sargon tell of Assyrian expeditions into this region, famous for its horse breeding, and of its intermittent vassalage to the Assyrians. The Cimmerians (Gimmirrai) pushed southward through the Caucasus followed by, and perhaps with, the Scyths, who drove the Assyrians out of Mannean land and dominated the surrounding country (ca. 653-625 B.C.). Cyaxares, the Mede, is made responsible for the defeat of the Scythians (625 B.C.) when he subdued Parsuash, the Manneans, and the Lullubi (in Luristan country west of the Madai). 28 Darins I recorded on the Bisutun relief his subjugation of the Scythian rebel Skunkha. 29 On the walls of Persepolis are standing the Scythian tribute bearers, dressed like the Medes, but also wearing their “pointed hats.”

If we know little about the early history of the Medes, we know even less about their art before they were absorbed into the Achaemenid empire, and until we do learn of it we cannot ascribe our chapels to either Medes or Scyths first. One is tempted find authorship in the latter group, but that is because we know what Scythian art looks like and can make favorable comparisons. 28a The chapels come, however, from the north, from that land traveled by Medes, Scyths, Manneans, Assyrians, and so many others. The ornament from the Seven Brothers tumulus (fig. 3) shows the decorative treatment of the flesh folds of the animal enroulé. And from Mannean country came the ivory plaque (fig. 5) that is so very similar to the chapels in detail and rendering.

The so-called “Treasure of Ziwiye,” which yielded this plaque, is a cache of gold, silver, and ivory objects that was uncovered in 1947 at Ziwiye (ancient Zibi or Izibi), located east of Sakkiz, southeast of Lake Urmia in Mannean country (now Kurdistan). André Godard purchased part of the “Treasure” for the Archaeological Museum in Tehran, where it now resides, dated to the eighth century B.C. 30 The “Treasure” was published by M. Godard in 1950, with a subsequent note by him in 1951. 31 The rich contents of the “Treasure” has provoked discussion on its origin, composition, and date. Whereas M. Godard identifies the “Treasure” as entirely a local product (except for some of the ivory work) of pre-Scythian date, Roman Ghirshman lowers the date to the period of Scythian domination (ca. 653-625 B.C.) and discusses the “Treasure” as a mixed assortment: part Assyrian, part Scythian, and part of local manufacture. 32 In either case, the “Treasure”

31 Several items from the “Treasure” have been exhibited in the United States at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1949) and the Fogg Art Museum (1954-55). Part of the “Treasure” has been disbursed into private collections (Catalog items 109-112, Ancient art in American private collections [Cambridge: Fogg Art Museum]).
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presents some idea of the nature of the art of that locale when the powerful Medes were forming. The splendid tradition of ivory carving found in the plaques from the "Treasure," which are reminiscent of the ivory carvings from Nimrud, finds its natural continuance in the ivory chapes described above. The flat modeling of the surface, the handling of the animal motif, the formalizing tendency and the robust, spirited action is reflected in the chapes. True, the chapes are of a later date, and they show their lateness in the higher degree of stylization and greater rigidity of composition. The plaques from the "Treasure" are of Assyrian craftsmanship, "made in Assyria," says M. Godard, "during the second half of the eighth century B.C." Chape I, probably the oldest of the group of chapes, still shows this healthy Assyrian liveliness and is most closely tied to the spirit of the ivorywork from the "Treasure." Thus, the "neo-Assyrian" quality of the chapes, mentioned by Rostovtzeff, comes not directly from Assyrian workshops, but rather from the tradition of Assyrian artistry in ivory carving that left tangible remains in the Macean country.

A clear Scythian link is identifiable in the chapes also. The Scythian chape 8 is composed of two animals of the cat family facing each other in a symmetrical composition. Nose, mouth, and chin are formed by one continuous line, the eyes of concentric circles, and the ears of heart-shaped ridges. These beasts are in the tradition of the nomadic "animal style" rather than of western Asia. The chape is almost trefoil in design, formed by the two ears and the oval mass at the bottom. It requires little imagination to see these heart-shaped ears transformed, by a gifted worker in fine objects, into the enclosed palmate. Chape 9 from Persepolis insists upon continuing the symmetrical composition, even at the expense of the attacking lion. However, this similarity of chapes is not sufficient argument to place the group in the sphere of Scythian art.

As examples of miniature sculpture, the chapes are more within the tradition of ivory carving in the Near East than in that of the Scytho-Siberian "animal style." The classical Scythian style of carving, exemplified in the famous chased-gold stag from Kostromskaya, betrays the wood-carving technique of its antecedents. The body masses are simplified into broad planar areas that meet in sharp arrises. The eye, ear, and lip line of the stag anticipate the linear technique of the Scythian chape 8. The "beveled" style of carving persisted in the East, but it is not a characteristic of our group of chapes. Nor does the carving of the group resemble the linear style of the Scythian chape or the soft, rounded modeling of later Scytho-Siberian ornaments. The abstraction of the attacking lion on the chapes is carried out in a purely decorative manner; the concentric ridges and elegant curls do not personify or typify the feline qualities of the animal. Abstraction in Scythian art, on the contrary, augments the expressiveness of the beasts, although later examples of the "animal style" show an increasing tendency for the decorative at the expense of the expressive.

The motif of animal combat is not in itself, of course, an indication of Scythian influence. The design reaches far back into history; for

32 The Cambridge ancient history (Cambridge, 1927), volume of plates I, pl. 231, b.
33 Godard, Le tresor de Ziwiye, op. cit., p. 102.
34 M. I. Rostovtzeff, The animal style in south Russia and China, op. cit., p. 11.
35 E. g., in 'Abbāsid times at Samarra: "This new technique of carving [bevel or slant-cutting, Schrägschnitt] was probably introduced from Central Asia in the time of Hārūn al-Rashid (A.D. 786–809) by Iranian or Turkish artists employed by the court. It can be traced back to the Scytho-Siberian animal ornament, some of which dates from the Han period (B.C. 206–A.D. 220)." M. S. Dimand, Studies in Islamic ornament. II. The origin of the second style of Samarra decoration, in Archæologica Orientalia in Memoriam Ernst Herzfeld (New York, 1952), p. 64.
36 Borovka, op. cit., pls. 50, 51, 52.
example, it is found on a seashell fragment from ancient Tello (3000 B.C.). The direction of the lion's attack in the chapes seems to be from behind. The lion's hindquarters are curled around in front of its victim's head in order to fit into the composition. The Scyths showed a preference for the face-to-face attack, but the attack from either direction was used. A metal vase from Kul Oba shows one heavily maned lion attacking a stag from behind, while another lion attacks a boar head-on. Two very late ornaments from Perm (ca. fifth to eighth centuries A.D.), in the shape of roundels, show coiled animals attacking disembodied heads. The head of the lion in chap. 1 is in profile. The profile view is common to both Assyrian and Scytho-Siberian art. A carved-ivory mirror handle from Enkomi (Grave 17, dated between the fourteenth and twelfth centuries B.C.) portrays a maned lion with head in profile view, attacking a bull crossways. From Samaria comes a pierced-ivory plaque showing a lion attacking a long-horned bull. The animals stand facing each other; the lion's head faces full front, twisting up and biting the bull's throat. Another fragmentary ivory plaque from Samaria (first half of the ninth century B.C.) shows the animals in the same position, but here the lion's head is in profile as it bites the back of the bull's neck. The report on the ivories from Samaria remarks: "It is significant that in our ivories there is no sign of Assyrian influence . . . The influence of Egypt on the other hand is all-pervasive." The monumental reliefs on the staircases of the Tripylon at Persepolis show the "lion attacking bull" motif, with the lion's head facing front. The Lydian coin found at Persepolis (fig. 4) shows the lion in profile; a lion faces front as he attacks a stag from behind on an Achaemenian coin. There are many Scythian examples of the attacking animal facing to the front. Sasanian art adds the further refinement of the three-quarter view. The head of the animal suffering the attack is depicted in profile without noticeable exceptions. The palmette is not infrequently found in Nomadic art. We need illustrate only a few examples. A bronze ornament from horse trappings, found in the Seven Brothers tumulus in the Kuban, shows the ubiquitous "beak head" terminating in a broad palmette (fig. 9, a). A

\[\text{Fig. 9—Scythian Animal Motifs.}\]

---

38 E. Diez, *Iranische Kunst* (Vienna, 1944), pp. 31–32, observes that in the Pazyryk felt appliques the attack from the back betrays Iranian influence.
40 Borovka, *op. cit.*, pl. 67, B, C.
45 Ghirshman, *op. cit.*, pl. 8, 5.
47 Diez, *op. cit.*, pl. 25.
48 Rostovtzeff, *The animal style in South Russia and China*, loc. cit., pls. 8, 7, p. 28.
fluence.\textsuperscript{49} A small bit of carved bone from Kelermeskaya Stanitsa shows the ram’s head ornamented with circles and squares, imitating inlay work, rather than with the palmette (fig. 9, c). But it is the persistence of just such a love for elaboration that gave birth to the palmette motif on the chapae. Both the palmette and the symmetrical arrangement of animal heads are found on the pommel of the engraved handle from Chertomlyk, mentioned above (fig. 10). The degree of naturalism, style of workmanship, and treatment of the composition relates this pommel to the chapae and differentiates it from the typical Nomadic “animal style.”

The appearance of the Greek palmette in Nomadic art is not surprising; it is only one of the incidental contributions of Greek craftsmen producing for the Scythian market.\textsuperscript{50} Eastern Greek artists were also employed by the Achaemenians, their numbers figuring in the accounts drawn up at Persepolis,\textsuperscript{51} so that the palmettes on the chapae may reflect not just a Greek strain coming from Nomadic art, but also the constant infusion of Greek artistry into the Achaemenid world. The degree of Greek influence at Persepolis has been argued,\textsuperscript{52} but its presence there is unquestionable. Pliny, for example, remarks on the sculptor Telephanes of Phoci, who lived in Thessaly, and who was put on a level with Polycleitus, Myron, and

\textsuperscript{49} Borovka, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 41, pl. 8, A.

\textsuperscript{50} However, “Whether the Scythian artisans imitated Greek palmettes or came to the palmette solution of their own problem by themselves is a question we are not able to solve” (Rostovtzeff, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 33). This author, in speaking of palmettes, referred specifically to the transformation of stag antlers, usually in openwork design, into the palmette. In this instance his lack of decision still seems valid. The type of palmette we are here concerned with is of a much different type than the antler-palmette, and closely resembles the type of palmettes framed by lotus buds or vines that appear on Greek vase painting at the end of the sixth and first half of the fifth centuries B.C. (e.g., E. Phuhl, \textit{Meisterwerke griechischer Zeichnung und Malerei}, Munich, 1924, pls. 38, 52). The same type of palmette used with other Greek motifs, obviously of Greek workmanship, on “Scythian” objects is also found (e.g., gold ornament from a wooden rhyton, Seven Brothers tumulus, shows both palmette and “egg and dart”; Rostovtzeff, \textit{op. cit.}, pl. 13).

\textsuperscript{51} In addition to the appearance of Ionian “stone-workers” at Susa (note 2), there is mention in the accounts found in the Treasury of Ionian workmen occupied in the making of columned halls at Persepolis. However, Charles Picard (review of Richter’s \textit{Archaic Greek Art} in the Art Bulletin, vol. 36 [1954], p. 68, note 11) doubts that the Ionians’ participation in the building of Persepolis was more than that of construction workers. Also recorded are Egyptian and perhaps Syrian stonemasons and inscription cutters (tablets 15,9), Syrian, Egyptian, and Ionian workmen (tablet 15), Carian goldworkers (tablet 37), G. G. Cameron, \textit{Persepolis treasury tablets} (Chicago, 1948). Unfortunately, the majority of the tablets do not give the nationalities of the workers whose wages are recorded. Strangely enough, the pay scale for these artisans of antiquity has a disconcertingly modern ring: animal guards, animal tenders, sheep herders, donkey drivers, and beer preparers and handlers received a higher monthly wage than “woodworkers and stone relief sculpture makers,” artisans, and ornament makers.

\textsuperscript{52} Kurt Erdmann, \textit{Griechische und achaemenidische Plastik: zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Diskussion}, Forschungen und Fortschritte, vol. 26, Nos. 11/12 (June 1950), summarized the discussions that have revolved about the question of Greek or Persian priority as based on the drapery styles and on the appearance of Greek and old-orient elements in Persepolitan reliefs. To his bibliography we may add: G. M. A. Richter, \textit{Archaic Greek Art}, New York, 1949, pp. 178–180, for the reciprocal debt between Greece and Persia; A. K. Coomaraswamy, \textit{A relief from Persepolis}, Bull. of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, vol. 31 (April 1933), recognized Ionian-Greek influence in Persian art, but also that Ionian itself was impregnated with an Asiatic heritage (pp. 24–25); S. Casson, in \textit{Survey of Persian Art}, vol. 1, cites the archaic Kore figure (No. 593) from the Acropolis as an example of Greek priority in drapery style.
Pythagoras. Other writers, says Pliny, were, however, "of opinion that the cause of his lack of celebrity is not the reason mentioned [his works being in concealment in Thessaly] but his having devoted himself entirely to the studios established by King Xerxes and King Darius."^53 Certainly Greek artists must have been made as welcome at the Persian court as were their artworks. We must also take into consideration the system used by the Achaemenids of "transplanting" conquered nationalities, which must have brought East Greeks as well as other foreign stock into Persian cities and workshops. D. M. Robinson has recently published some Greek gold bracelets from his private collection, the Benaki Museum, and the Morley Collection, that are of the type found at Susa, in the Treasure of the Oxus, and represented on the reliefs of Persepolis: open rings that terminate in animal heads.® Robinson’s bracelets, or armlets, contain medallions depicting the animal-combat scene and use the enclosed palmette in elaborate filigree work. Filigree of this style, though not as beautifully handled, is found in south Russia as a noticeable Greek contribution.®

As M. Godard remarked, the preciosity of the Persepolis reliefs reflects the heritage of the decorative rather than the monumental arts. The over-all plan of the reliefs is conceived as if by a goldsmith or ornament maker, for the reliefs are truly "ornaments" on the walls of the terrace, presenting a glittering tapestry of exquisitely fine detail. This desire for ornamentation, rather than for narrative expression, is most clearly seen in the use of endless repetition of figures with only subtle variations. The art of the Persians and the Medes has been criticized because of this repetition and lack of imagination and inventiveness. But the criticism is not warranted if the function of the reliefs—ornamentation—is considered. The scabbard chaplets discussed here are only a minor example of this ornamental art style, but they reflect the same love of ornate detail and the mixed origins that enliven the entire panoply of reliefs at Persepolis.

^53 Pliny, vol. 34, p. 68 (tr. by H. Rackham).
^54 E.g., the shattered Greek "Penelope" figure uncovered at Persepolis, illustrated in Olmstead, op. cit., pl. 70. The editors have called to my attention Henri Seyrig’s examination of Achaemenian seal stones, which reinforces his opinion that Persian artists, who were under the influence of Greek art and who copied Greek motifs directly, were responsible for the mixed art work that resulted (Cachets Achéménides in Archéologica Orientalia in Memoriam Ernst Herzfeld, pp. 195–202). However, Miss Richter, in the same dedicatory volume (Greek subjects on "Graeco-Persian" seal stones, pp. 189–194) analyzes the same type of material, but she reaches the conclusion that Greek artists were at work which was sponsored by Persian patrons. It may be suggested that perhaps these early ateliers did not particularly distinguish between Greek and Persian stoncuters, and copied and recopied those designs that proved to be popular with the customers. Artisans who must cater to popular taste cannot afford the luxury of stylistic purity; adaptability and flexibility are of greater importance.

^55 Herodotus, vol. 6, p. 119 (tr. by J. E. Powell) mentions the taking of Eretrias to Susa and their subsequent transplanting "in the country of Cissia on a domain of his[Darius], the name whereof is Arderica. This place is two hundred and ten stades distant from Susa."
RECENT RUSSIAN LITERATURE ON NEWLY FOUND MIDDLE EASTERN METAL VESSELS

BY SALOMEOA FAJANS*

Since 1947, when K. V. Trever¹ published three new Sasanian plates of the Hermitage Museum, the magnificent collections of Oriental silver in the USSR were enriched by a series of new finds. As previously, they were accidentally recovered during the processes of cultivation, most of them in the region west of the Ural Mountains, one in southern Russia. The penetration into deeper layers of the soil, due to the use of tractors, increased the chances for such discoveries, and the stress on the scientific importance of such vessels alerted the population and prevented their disappearance into private channels. In order to make these new pieces more widely known, nine publications dealing with fifteen new objects will be reviewed in this article. The often rather elaborate descriptions and various interpretation of the authors will be presented in an abbreviated form, sometimes, the interpretation is quoted, or again it may be merely paraphrased. In the case of one preliminary publication, the description was supplemented on the basis of the reviewer's observations, and the rather confused presentation reorganized. The objects will be discussed in the order of the publication dates, rather than in the chronological sequence of the vessels themselves, since the dating and provenance of some pieces is uncertain, while several objects of widely divergent periods are published in one and the same article.

In 1946, a posthumous publication of N. A. Prokoshev² listed a group of objects, not previously described in the literature, from the Molotov and Cherdyn museums.³ Some of these will be briefly described here.

A damaged bronze kettle or big bowl (fig. 1, A-C) with representations of lion protomas around the rim was found in 1933, near the village Bondug in the course of plowing and is preserved in the Cherdyn Regional Museum. The vessel is hammedered, the diameter of the top is 0.4 m., the thickness of the walls varies within the limits of 0.5-1 mm. The surface is covered by a dark patina. The bottom is nearly gone, and some of its fragments are pressed in. Three handles in the shape of lion figures are placed symmetrically on the upper rim. They are cast and fastened to the bowl by two rivets passing through the paws. This object was undoubtedly imported, as were Sasanian silver vessels. The treatment of details on the animal muzzles, par-

* The author wishes to thank the authorities of the Hermitage Museum, Leningrad, the State Historical Museum, Moscow, the Molotov Regional Museum, the Central Ethnographical Museum of Bashkiria in Ufa, the Abkhasian State Museum and the Cherdyn Regional Museum for the photographs which they kindly supplied for this article. She is also much obliged to Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director of the Freer Gallery of Art, the Department of State, in particular Miss Virginia James and Mr. John H. Stutesman, Jr., and the American Embassy at Moscow, in particular Mr. William A. McFadden and Mr. Nathaniel Davis, for invaluable assistance in procuring these illustrations, some of which have not even been published in the Russian literature. Thanks are due also the authorities of Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Harvard University, who have been most helpful in making publications from the USSR available for this survey article.


³ A large treasure of ancient oriental silver vessels, consisting of a bucket, a series of bowls, plates, and cups, found in the Zavdinski district (northeastern part of the Kirov region) came accidentally into the Gorki Ethnographic Museum; two large silver platters, found in the roots of an old tree, in the same region, are preserved in the Kirov Regional Museum. They are unpublished.
particularly of the engraved whiskers, led L. A. Matzulevich to the assumption that the piece might have originated in Asia Minor.

More recently A. A. Jessen has briefly referred to this bronze vessel. Without wanting to commit himself definitely before a special study had been made, he nevertheless thinks that in the treatment of the whiskers, the eyes, the jaw, the neck, and the mane the lion figures are close to prototypes of the seventh to sixth centuries B.C., i.e., the gold lion heads from Kelerme or the stone figure from Assyria and that the vessel might belong to the Achaemenian period.

In 1939, a silver bowl with a Kufic inscription was brought to the museum from the village Malaya Shaksra. This object, together with other precious pieces, was later stolen from the museum. All that remains from this find is a faint photograph which is unfortunately too indistinct in the Russian publication (quoted in footnote 2) to be reproduced here.

In 1941, the Molotov Regional Museum acquired a massive, almost hemispherical bowl with decorations in relief, later transferred to the Hermitage Museum (figs. 3 and 4). It was found in plowing near the village Ilinski, in the Ilinski region, Molotov district, at a nonspecified date. The diameter of the vessel is 0.155 m, the height 0.06 m, the weight 480 gr. The inside of the bowl is plain, the outside covered with applied representations in relief consisting of six medallions around a central seventh medallion. The six circles are connected by decorative ribbons and the corners between each two and the rim are filled with palmettes. Each medallion, bordered by two concentric bands, contains a figure. The central medallion shows the head and bust of a male figure, in profile to the left, probably a dignitary, wearing a helmet or short conical hat decorated with a half palmette and a dotted band along its upper edge. The coiffure at the back of his neck is elaborate, and around the cap there is a row of small curls. The left ear is adorned by an earring. The face shows large features, with a big, slightly hooked nose. The garment is of light fabric and falls over the shoulders in small, light folds.

In the circle above the head, there is represented a barefoot hunter in light garments and without headgear. He turns to the right and holds in his hands a spear directed toward the next medallion. His garment—a tunic with long sleeves—is adorned on the bottom by a band of dots. In the next medallion to his right is an animal whose bifurcated tail, bifurcated hoofs, and tusks indicate that the artist wanted to represent a boar. The following circle shows a hunter with a bow, in garments similar to those of the first figure. The fourth medallion includes a lion or a lioness with its head turned back toward the bowman. The fifth medallion is occupied by a hunter with a spear held against the animal of the sixth circle. The position of the hands and the spear are slightly varied in the hunters of the first and fifth medallions. The animal of the sixth circle looks like a lion with its head turned back, but some details, such as the lack of a tail and the treatment of the head and hind paws, may indicate that the silversmith tried to depict a bear.

The comparison of the bowl with similar vessels in Orbeli-Trever's Sassanian metal and Smirnov's Oriental silver did not disclose any complete analogies. In general style there is a certain resemblance to a bowl from North India ornamented with medallions, framed by concentric circles, and containing human figures with conical caps and earrings. The British Museum has a silver bowl related to the Ilinski bowl, as it also combines an outer arrangement of hunting scenes with a head in profile in the central medallion, and on account of its shape and size (diameter 0.168 m.). The latter is thought by Prokoshev, following Sarre, to be an Indo-Bactrian object and is attributed to the third

4 A. A. Jessen, Ranni soiazi Priuruli's Iranom ('Early ties of the Pre-Ural with Iran'), Sovetskaia Arkheologiia IIMK, Akademia Nauk SSSR, vol. 16 (1952), pp. 206–231. The article deals mainly with published phalara of the Achaemenian period, found in the Pre-Ural. It tries to show that relations between the Ural region and Iran existed in ancient times and discusses the possible commercial routes. The Pre-Ural is the region west of the Ural Mountains.


6 British Museum. A guide to the Babylonian and Assyrian antiquities, London, 1923, p. 188.

7 I. I. Smirnov, Argenterie orientale, St. Petersburg, 1909, pl. CXXV, No. 310.

8 Friedrich Sarre, Die Kunst des alten Persiens, Berlin, 1922, pls. 114, 115.
The vessel, including the foot, is 30.5 cm. The handle is made from an octagonal metal wire which is flattened in its lower part to form a trefoil palmette with engraved volutes. The upper part of the curved wire passes through the hollow figure of a winged horse and is attached to its breast. The legs of the animal, bent forward and cast together with the wings, are soldered to its body. The hoofs are provided with two small projections that fit into two openings at the back part of the neck, where they are attached to the vessel. The surface of the ewer is plain, the whole ornament consisting of the animal figure, the palmette, and the pellet ring on the foot.

Although the shape is typical for the Sasanian and the following periods, there is no material comparable in shape and ornament. Two ewers, one in the Museum of Kazakhs, found in Kirgizia, and an identical one in the Hermitage Museum recovered west of the Ural Mountains, both dated by Trever to the end of the second to the beginning of the first century B.C., are closely related to the gold ewer. They are of similar shape, the bodies are undecorated, and the handles form in the lower part a palmette with engraved volutes. The reviewer would add to this group an early Sasanian ewer of a slightly different shape, reproduced by Sarre. Among post-Sasanian vessels two ewers of similar shape are quoted, one with representations of winged camels, the other with figure subjects within oval medallions. Ewers of the same shape and proportions are represented on a bowl attributed by Trever to Graeco-Bactrian art.*


**Ibid., p. 111. Smirnov, op. cit., pl. LVIII, No. 124.

**Sarre, op. cit., p. 127 (right).

† I. Orbeli and K. Trever, Orfèvrerie sasanide, Moscou-Leningrad, 1935, pl. 49.

12 Smirnov, op. cit., pl. XI, No. 79.

13 Trever, op. cit, pl. 20; Smirnov, op. cit., pl. XXXVIII, No. 67. M. M. D'akonov, Rospisi Piandzh- kenta i Zhivopis' Srednei Azii ("Wallpaintings of Piandzhikent and paintings of Central Asia"), Zhivopis' Drevnego Piandzhikentka, Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moskva, 1954, p. 139, footnote 4, gives the following opinion about the date of this vessel: "It will be necessary to reexamine the vessel with the
and on some post-Sasanian dishes. Smirnov uses some details of the ornaments to define the dating more precisely. The band of metal bosses, consisting of small, slightly flattened pellets, recalls similar ornaments adorning the rims of Graeco-Bactrian bowls, while in the later periods the bosses tend to become larger in size. The winged horse is a favorite motif of Iranian art. Under the ears, on the cheeks, and flanking the big open mouth are short oblique and transverse grooves. The oval ears are pressed to the body. The forehead is set off by large elevated arches, while above it is a slightly bent horn. The characteristic long muzzle and hoofs are related to the same part of a hippocampus on the caparison of an elephant on a phalaracon from the Hermitage Museum, attributed by Trever to the middle of the second century B.C., and still more to the figure of a wolf on a plate from Dagestan, assigned by Orbeli to the Sasanian period.

The mane of the horse is rendered as a wavelike scroll, occurring also on the elephant mentioned above, on rims of Graeco-Bactrian bowls and on Sasanian objects. The wings are decorated by a representation of a wedding scene (Smirnov, op. cit., No. 67), the dating of which as given by K. V. Trever is evidently too early. Several features on the representations of this vessels have very close parallels in the wall-paintings of Piazhdzhik (end of sixth to beginning of the eighth century) and Varakhsha. However, there are some difficulties in the interpretation of this vessel (nude figures!). The inscription engraved on the outer side of the vessel before the gilding, certainly cannot be dated earlier than the sixth century A.D. The reading of the inscription, as suggested by R. Ghirshman, cannot be considered as satisfactory."

17 Orbeli-Trever, op. cit., pls. 16, 18.
18 Trever, op. cit., pls. 15, 18, 22; or Smirnov, op. cit., pls. CXIII, No. 284; XXXVIII, No. 67; XXXIX, No. 68.
19 Trever, ibid., pl. 1; Smirnov, ibid., pl. CXX, No. 47.
21 Trever, op. cit., pls. 7, 8, 9.

scalelike pattern and end in five feathers engraved by oblique short strokes, typical for the Sasanian period, as for instance, on the winged ibex from Berlin, in contrast to Graeco-Bactrian art where the wings consist of short and pointed feathers and terminate in five long ones. The motif of the trefoil palmette on the lower part of the handle, in the shape of a central leaf and two engraved spirals, occurs in the Graeco-Bactrian and Sasanian periods.

On the basis of the above-mentioned analogies to Graeco-Bactrian as well as Sasanian objects, the author dates the piece as not later than the third to fourth century A.D. Comparing the ewer with other objects of Sasanian art, Smirnov considers it to be executed in a rather crude impressionistic manner, suggesting a possible provincial origin, most likely somewhere on the periphery of the Sasanian Empire where the traditions of Graeco-Bactrian art were strong.

A publication by K. V. Trever of 1947 describes an upper part of a goblet preserved in the Hermitage Museum. It was acquired in 1938 by the North Ossetian Museum from a 110-year-old man in whose presence the vessel was found in the village Arv, in the Urdson Gorge, when it was accidentally hit by a sickle. The site, formerly used as a burial ground, was examined at the time of the find and disclosed ashes, beads, a thin chain, and some small human figures, of which nothing is known. The goblet when found had a stemmed foot which later fell off and was lost. The latter was apparently hollow and contained inside a small rolling and sounding ball. On the place where the foot was soldered on, a small piece of a pin is preserved, the rim is broken in two places, and the silver is covered by a dark patina. The height of the piece is 8.3 cm., the diameter of the upper rim 6.3 cm., the weight 80 gr. (figs. 7–9 and text fig. A).

The vessel is decorated by a "stamped" (the reviewer would prefer to call it a repoussé) ornament by

23 Ibid., p. 8, pl. 22 A.
24 Trever, op. cit., pls. 4, 13; Smirnov, op. cit., pl. CXIV, No. 36.
25 K. V. Trever, Sasanidskii serebrianyi kubok iz Urdsonskogo Ushekela v Severnoi Ossetii ("A Sasanian silver goblet from the Urdson Gorge in North Ossetia"), Ermitazh, Leningrad, Trudy Otdeła Vostoka (henceforth referred to as TOVE), vol. 4 (1947), pp. 119–132, 8 pls., 5 figs. (English resumé, pp. 130–132.)
in low relief, consisting of three horizontal bands bordered by plain moldings. A narrow upper band is composed of vertically placed scales. A broad band in the middle has six medallions in a row with an ornament in the shape of hearts and petals between them. The medallions, each containing a goat, a quail, or a “tree,” are placed in a sequence forming two heraldic groups: two goats on either side of a “tree” and two quails on the sides of another tree, placed on a gilded background. A third lower band is decorated by petals which form a rosette on the bottom touching with their broad curved ends a narrow plain band.

The goblet is related to a group of gold goblets from the Pereshechepeino treasure, which are, however, of a slightly different shape with the rim bent outward. Some of these goblets contain small ringing balls in the stem which change sound when the goblet is filled. Some of the goblets have an arrangement of vertically placed narrow leaves, similar to that on the Ursdon goblet, forming a flower or a rosette, an ancient symbol of the sun found on Achaemenian phials or pateras.

The border of scales of the upper band, in the shape of overlapping ovals, does not appear on other Sasanian silver objects, but forms a part of the decoration on Sasanian textiles. The arrangement of the medallions in the central zone also recalls a textile pattern. The motif—two confronted figures flanking a “tree”—goes back to remote antiquity (Babylonian cylinders) and occurs frequently on Sasanian objects in different versions. They are, for instance, two rams on either side of a tree with a snake around it, or two goats, two cranes, or two monsters. The same subject occurs on textiles, wood, and stone. Two birds flanking a tree are incised on wood capitals from the island of Sevan in Armenia. Such bird compositions personify the mythical Senmurv with his companions Kamrosh or Chamrosh, whose beneficial functions are connected with the holy tree. Circles enclosing a pheasant or a tree are found on a textile in the Hermitage Museum; pheasants and ducks within medallions cover the surface of a plate in the same museum, both objects showing additional heart-shaped motifs.

The “tree” depicted on the goblet is set on a base so as to represent a holy tree and it appears in this form also in metal and on textiles. It has the shape of a lotus flower, characteristic of Sasanian art, heavy, succulent, and reminiscent of a palmette. Both trees are slightly different. They recall in shape trees or flowers on stone capitals.

28 Orbeli-Trever, op.cit., pl. 32; Survey, vol. 4, pl. 232, A.
29 Survey, vol. 4, pl. 199, A.
30 T. A. Izmailova, Sevanskie kapiteli, TOVE, vol. 3 (1940), pl. 1.
32 Survey, vol. 4, pl. 199, A.
33 Ibid., pl. 216, A; Orbeli-Trever, op.cit., pl. 29.
34 Orbeli-Trever, op.cit., pls. 72, 48.
35 Survey, vol. 4, pl. 199, A; ibid., vol. 1, p. 703, fig. 247.
36 E. Herzfeld, Am Tor von Asien, Berlin, 1920, p. 117, pl. X, fig. 30, Nos. 8, 9; p. 119, fig. 31, Nos. 9, 14, and p. 120.
found in 1916 in the village Qa‘a-ye Kohneh, near Kermanshah, the design of which, according to Herzfeld, is based on textile prototypes. The quail is shown with the head turned backward, which is not a functional position but meant to fill the space in a circle. It is used similarly on a bowl\textsuperscript{37} from the Pereshchepino treasure, where a crane or a heron is seen on a heart-shaped field. The feathers of the bird are stylized in the form of leaves, rendered in the same manner as the wings of the pheasant on plate 29 of Orbeli-Trever’s book; the legs are engraved. The goats are depicted resting or leaping, and recall a similar representation on the Pereshchepino bowl; as in the latter, the fur of the animals is marked by rows of short strokes, a device typical of the Sasanian period and, according to Herzfeld,\textsuperscript{38} originating in Assyrian and Babylonian art.

In style, the goblet is closely related to a plate\textsuperscript{39} with the representation of a goddess, probably Anahit, seated on the back of a lion griffin and playing the flute. Both pieces show a flat relief, heart-shaped petals, and the same kind of gilding, applied in patches and not as a smooth background, as on most Sasanian objects. Each medallion appears as a separate plate displaying a characteristic color effect. Only every twelfth or thirteenth scale of the upper band is gilded, just above the heart-shaped motifs; in the lower band, every seventh petal, underneath every second egg-shaped leaf. Similarly, the figures of the goddess and the monster are gilded in patches, while the border has a sequence of two gilded and five plain heart-shaped motifs. This manner of gilding gives both objects a unique pictorial character.

Since the main motifs of the goblet, such as scales, medallions, and heart-shaped leaves, occur on textiles and are represented in a low, flat relief, it was concluded that the design reproduces a textile pattern. The author refers to a series of other vessels, the decoration of which can be traced to this origin.\textsuperscript{40} This assumption is in contradiction to that of Herzfeld,\textsuperscript{41} who claims that the design of metal objects is derived from paintings and not from textiles. However, as Miss Trever points out, the paintings to which Herzfeld refers could have been only wall paintings which in their turn imitated the design of rugs or other fabrics.

The animal representations in flat relief recalling those at Ta‘q-e Bostân, iconographic parallels to the capitals at Qa‘a-ye Kohneh dated by Herzfeld to A.D. 600 and motifs similar to those on the plate of Anahit, dated to the sixth to seventh century A.D.,\textsuperscript{42} assign the goblet to the sixth to seventh century A.D. There are not enough data to determine the provenance of the vessel. The capitals from Qa‘a-ye Kohneh suggest as a possible origin the northwestern parts of Iran, where all eight Sasanian objects found in Iran were discovered. From there the goblet could have been brought to the mountains of Ossetia, either as booty taken by the Alans during their raids on Transcaucasia and Iran, or by way of trade along the caravan routes. The examination of the vicinity of the Ursdon Gorge, Alagir region, revealed\textsuperscript{43} that there existed a transit route through the pass of Alagir (the Ursdon Gorge branches off from the Alagir Valley) connecting from most ancient times the Black and the Caspian Seas.

A preliminary short publication by A. N. Melikhov\textsuperscript{44} describes a silver plate (fig. 11) with the representation of a hunting scene in relief. The piece was found in 1947, in the village Krasnaia Poliana, Adler region, Krasnodarski district, and in the same year acquired by the Abkhasian State Museum. The plate is a massive concave disk, set on a ring foot which was broken off at the time the piece was recovered. The whole vessel was cast in silver from a wax mold, thus being unique and differing greatly.

\textsuperscript{37} Orbeli-Trever, \textit{op.cit.}, pls. 37, 38.
\textsuperscript{39} Orbeli-Trever, \textit{op.cit.}, pl. 22; \textit{Survey}, vol. 4, pl. 225, A.
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Survey}, vol. 1, p. 752.
\textsuperscript{41} Herzfeld, \textit{Ant Tor von Asien}, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{42} On the basis of the inscription read by Herzfeld, M. S. Dimand, in his review of the metal sections of the \textit{Survey of Persian art} (\textit{Ars Islamica}, vol. 8 [1944], p. 196) assigns the plate to the first half of the eighth century; I. Orbeli dates it to the ninth century (\textit{Survey}, vol. 4, pl. 225, A).
from most other vessels of this kind which are usually hammered. The diameter is 28 cm., the weight 1835 gr. The concave surface is decorated with a relief of a horseman hunting bears. He is turning backward, facing left, and pulling a lasso just thrown over one of the animals, while the other animal is running away. The whole composition is vivid and expressive and executed in a realistic style. However, the importance of the horseman is symbolically stressed by his enlarged figure. His face is depicted in detail. His nose is straight, he wears a beard and whiskers, and his long hair is falling in tresses. He is richly attired and his head is covered by what is called "a high round crown," which is really a high round cap (kulâh) decorated along the lower edge with palmettes and with streamers flying in the back. The fabric of his long-sleeved tunic is slightly folded and the baggy trousers have fringes and a decoration in the shape of little circles at the bottom. Around his neck is a round collar with an attached pendant ornament. At his right side hangs a long cylindrical quiver decorated with horizontal bands. The horse has a square saddlecloth with two sets of three punch-marked disks attached to it, the tail is knotted, and on his back are two hair tassels in foliated mounts. The skin of the bears is rendered in conventional manner by parallel rows of short, slightly curved strokes. Technically the plate is executed with great perfection, the relief is finely modeled in different heights and chased; the whole body is polished and partially gilded.

The reverse is not finished. Traces of the work processes are clearly visible: all curved surfaces are covered by marks of the mold. The polishing is done superficially, only sharp roughnesses being smoothed out. An inscription executed in dotted lines is applied on the border of the reverse. Its length is 19 cm. and it is in Pahlavi script, as determined by G. W. Tzereteli and, independently from him, by M. M. D’iaconov.

In composition, the attire of the horseman, and the harness, the plate is said to be related to the plate of Shapur II hunting lions, which is in the Hermitage Museum46 and some other vessels47 attributed to the Sasanian period. Besides having some analogous features, the plate differs, however, from similar pieces, owing to several peculiarities: the hunting by lasso, the lack of a pectoral, the mark of royal rank, and the fact that the headgear is not identical with any of the characteristic Sasanian crowns, although it comes nearest to that of Ardashir I. Moreover, as Melikhov points out, this kind of headgear is not typically Sasanian as it had already been worn by the Parthians and, in antiquity, by some peoples inhabiting southern Russia, as can be observed on Scythian objects. Folds of a coat with short sleeves are seen floating behind the hunter’s back; they are, according to Melikhov, usually not found on figures of the Sasanian period, but are characteristic for Scythian and Caucasian, particularly Georgian, objects. With regard to the composition, certain features of the head, and details of the garments and quiver, the plate is said to be related also to objects in a similar style found in the Caucasus, i.e., the plate from Kutais,48 a plate with an engraved male bust from Armazi (eastern Georgia)49 and a plate from Nor-

46 Orbeli and Trever, op. cit., pl. 6.
47 Ibid., pls. 5, 9, 15.
Baiazet (Armenia)\textsuperscript{49} with the representation of a bear climbing a tree. Mountaintops on the plates from Kutaïs and Nor-Baiazet are interpreted as Caucasian landscapes, and the representations of bears, said to be typical for the Caucasian fauna, are considered as further proof of the Caucasian origin of such pieces.

The above-mentioned features lead the author to the conclusion that the plate shows an affinity rather to Parthian or Scytho-Sarmatian than to Sasanian art. As parallels the following are cited: a figure, in relief, of the Scythian king Palak riding on a horse, depicted on a limestone slab found in Crimea;\textsuperscript{50} a relief representation of the horseman Trifon, in marble, found in the northern part of the Black Sea region, assigned to Sarmatian art and dated to the third century A.D.,\textsuperscript{51} and two terracotta figures\textsuperscript{52} of a Parthian and a Parthian or Scythian horseman. The Parthian figure wears garments similar to those depicted on Sasanian plates.

The deviations from typical Sasanian plates with hunting scenes, the peculiarities of the plate, the Pahlavi script, used already in pre-Sasanian times, and mainly a coin from Cappadocian Cæsarea, dated A.D. 121–122 and found together with the plate, lead the author to attribute the plate to the second century, or at the latest to the first decade of the third century A.D., in other words, to the pre-Sasanian period.

In this reviewer’s opinion, the plate is, however, unique neither in the technique nor in the use of a lasso. The plate of Khusrau II in the Bibliothèque Nationale is also cast, and there is another plate in the Hermitage Museum depicting king Shapur III hunting onager by lasso.\textsuperscript{53} A folded mantle is also visible on the plate of Peroz I, in the Metropolitan Museum\textsuperscript{54} and on that of Shapur II (?) hunting ibex, in the Hermitage Museum.\textsuperscript{55}

It is correct that the headgear on the plate is not that of a Sasanian king. Still, there are Sasanian parallels showing persons wearing a high cap (kulâh). There is, first, a Sasanian seal in the British Museum, the inscription of which Paul Horn has interpreted as belonging to a member of the royal family.\textsuperscript{56} Judging from the rather poor illustration, the kulâh seems to be pearl-edged and with an overhang on top. It has no decoration along its lower edge, but three pearls triangularly arranged on its upper part; it also seems to lack the streamers fluttering above the hair. Although there are therefore definite differences in the symbolic or ornamental details, it nevertheless shows that a high kulâh as such was worn by the royal princes. A closer parallel to the plate of Krasnaïa Poliana is the well-known seal in the same museum, showing the bust of Shapur, Keeper of the Storehouses of

\textsuperscript{49} Sarre, \textit{op.cit.}, pl. 54.
\textsuperscript{50} Orbeli-Trever, \textit{op.cit.}, pl. 8; Smirnov, \textit{op.cit.}, pl. XXIV, No. 52.
\textsuperscript{51} A Survey of Persian Art, vol. 4, pl. 213.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., pl. 209; Orbeli-Trever, \textit{op.cit.}, pl. 5.
\textsuperscript{53} Paul Horn, \textit{Sasanidische Gemmen aus dem British Museum}, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, vol. 64 (1890), p. 651, No. 1, pl. 1, a, No. 910.
Fig. B—Inside of Silver Bowl Found in Armazi.
(Drawn by F. M. Haentschke, after Mtshketa, vol. 1, text fig. 21 and pl. XLVII.)

Fig. C—Side View of Armazi Bowl.
(Drawn by F. M. Haentschke, after Mtshketa, vol. 1, pl. XLVIII.)
pointed out, the particular facial presentation which is the privilege of an independent king could not be depic ted. In all other respects however, the plate reveals features typical of the early Sasanian period.

In this connection it should also be pointed out that quite recently a Sasanian hunting plate—this time involving lions being hunted with bow and arrow—has been found in Persia. In spite of the fact that the horseman has all the appearance of royal rank, he nevertheless does not wear one of the established individual crowns, nor can one actually speak of a crown proper in this case. In this instance R. Ghirshman has tentatively identified the main figure as a son of Shâpûr II, possibly even the future Shâpûr III shown at a time when he was heir apparent and governor of a province. It therefore seems obvious that Sasanian silver vessels of outstanding quality were made for other persons than the ruling king, be it members of the royal house or grandees.

The example of related objects from the Parthian or Scytho-Sarmatian period, quoted by Melikhov, are, when compared with the plate from Krasnaia Poliana, entirely different in character and display rather than an Hellenistic influence. In the reviewer's opinion, the plate should be assigned to the early Sasanian period and dated to the third century A.D. There are no clues pointing to the provenance of the piece. The attribution to the Caucasus lacks sufficient basis, as bears also occur elsewhere (see below, pp. 75–76), and the plate could have been brought to the Caucasus from outside.

A publication by A. I. Voshchinnina deals with a treasure found by workmen in 1941 in the center of the town Ufa at a depth of 70 cm. It consisted


63 A. I. Voshchinnina, *O Sviadatkhi Priuralia s Vostokom v VI–VII vv. n.e.* (Ufmskii klad naidennyi v 1941 g.) ("On the relations between the Pre-Ural [the region west of the Ural Mountains] and the Orient in the sixth to seventh centuries of our era. [The Ufa treasure found in 1941]") , Sovetskaia Arkheologiia, Institut Istorii Material’noi Kul’tury, Akademia Nauk SSSR, vol. 17 (1953), pp. 183–196, 9 pls.
Fig. 1, A-C—Bronze Kettle Found near Bodung, Cherdy Regional Museum.

Fig. 2—Bronze Ewer Found in Novgorod.
(After Artzikhovskii.)
Figs. 3 and 4—Bowl found near Ilinskiie, Leningrad, Hermitage Museum.
Figs. 7 and 8—Upper Part of Goblet Found near Arv in the Ursdon Gorge. Hermitage Museum.

Fig. 9—Ursdon Goblet, Bottom View. (After Trever.)

Fig. 10—Detail of Ewer Shown in Figure 5. (After Smirnov.)
Fig. 11—Silver Plate Found in Krasnaia Poliana, Abkhasian State Museum.

Fig. 12—Bowl Found in Ufa, Hermitage Museum.
Fig. 16—Hunting Plate Found in Ufa. Hermitage Museum.

Figs. 17 and 18—Fragment of Copper Vessel with Lid Found in Ufa.
Plate 8

Figs. 19-22—Vessels found near Bartym.

Moscow State Historical Museum.

Fig. 19—Boat-shaped bowl.

Fig. 20—Hemispherical bowl.

(Figs. 19 and 20—After Bader and Snirinov.)
Figs. 23-28—Cup found near Bartym, Moscow State Historical Museum.
(Figs. 24-28 after Bader and Smirnow.)
Figs. 29-31—Bowl Found near Bartym, Molotov Regional Museum.
of two silver vessels, a bowl and a plate, both very well preserved (now in the Hermitage Museum), \textsuperscript{64} and a copper dish with a lid. The latter was hit by the spade and broken to pieces, of which remained a part of the body and a lid; it is preserved in the Central Ethnographical Museum of Bashkiria in Ufa. A detailed examination of the locality of the find, performed by members of the museum, did not disclose any traces of a tomb or remains of a building.

The bowl has a half-spherical shape with a stable, slightly flattened bottom (figs. 12-15). The diameter is 12.6 cm., the height 4 cm. On the exterior, there is, in relief and engraved, the representation of an eagle holding a deer in its claws. The relief shows traces of blacking and the plain background is gilded. The rim is ornamented by a pearl band in relief with a fluted festoon band below it. On the inside, the bowl has a plain gilded border. The bottom is covered by little round knobs in relief, placed at a distance of 0.5 cm. from each other.

The eagle is depicted in the traditional manner of ancient oriental art, in profile, with uplifted open wings, the latter shown frontally. Its claws are driven into the back of the deer, which is running with its head upturned and the body flattened under the weight of the eagle. The figure of the deer is lively and realistic. A twisted band with scallops on the eagle’s chest emphasizes its royal character. The scene is symbolic, the eagle being an ancient emblem of the sky, the light, the sun and sun god, and the deer the personification of nature.

The composition is modeled in low relief and the details are engraved. The outlines are marked by deep, clear incisions, and the details of the design traced with thin, flat lines or dots forming a conventional geometric ornament. The body and the upper part of the eagle’s wings are covered by short feathers rendered as an imbricated pattern composed of overlapping stylized leaves, while the lower part of the wings, set off by a horizontal band, and the tail consist of long pinfeathers engraved by oblique short strokes. The fur of the deer is represented by parallel lines of dots and the roundness of the thighs indicated by spirals.

These features, as well as the principle of the decoration, contrasting the conventional stylized representation of the eagle with the realistic and expressive figure of the deer, are characteristic of Sasanian art. The figure of the deer recalls representations of running animals on the rock reliefs of Tāq-e Bostān and Sasanian silver plates.

There is no complete analogy between this bowl and other vessels in the Hermitage Museum or other collections, but some of them have the same subject matter or composition in common, while some are stylistically close. Two vessels\textsuperscript{65} in the Hermitage Museum have within medallions the representations of an eagle striking a deer treated in a similar manner; two other Iranian vessels,\textsuperscript{66} also in the Hermitage Museum, show animals depicted in the same style.

The subject matter of the bowl, connected with the mythology of Iran, the composition conforming to that on other Iranian objects, and the stylistic affinity to the relief of Tāq-e Bostān allow the attribution of this piece to the Sasanian art of the sixth century A.D., or possibly even to the preceding century according to the date attributed to the just-mentioned rock relief.

The silver plate, set on a ring foot, is gilded and decorated on the inside with a representation of a royal hunt in relief (fig. 16). The diameter is 20 cm., the height 4.6 cm., the height of the foot 1.3 cm., the diameter of the ring foot 7.7 cm. The rim is bordered by a plain gilded band. On the outside, the plate is plain and covered by black patina. There are no traces of an inscription. The ring foot is soldered by copper. The preservation of the plate is good, but for some minor defects in the relief—a part from the bridle and the reins are missing. A minute opening, smaller than a pinhead, is seen where the plate was attached; hardly noticeable traces remain of the thin lines of the reins.

The relief with its fine engraving shows a composition of several figures set within a circle. A Sasanian king in his typical appearance on a galloping horse is shooting with bow and arrow into a herd of ibexes running in the direction opposite to the movement of the horse. A hunting dog is seen among the ibexes. The figure of the horseman is foreshortened; the lower part of the body is turned to the left, the chest is given frontally, and the hands directing the arrow and the head are turned

\textsuperscript{64} State Ermitazh, Inventory No. S. 297-298.
\textsuperscript{65} Orbeli-Trever, \textit{op.cit.}, pls. 39, 40.
\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Ibid.}, pls. 37, 38; \textit{Survey}, vol. 4, pl. 225, B.
to the right. A crescent and a large six-pointed star are seen to the right of the king. His headgear is a crenelated crown and a globe resting on a crescent, with two ribbons flying behind the head. The face has portrait features: large prominent cheekbones, big straight nose, heavy lips. The mustache and a large curled beard are depicted by small scales. An earring decorated by a pearlike pendant is visible. A halo around the head is rendered by little dots. A necklace is placed around the king's neck while the chest is covered by a pectoral, an ornament worn only by kings, with a medallion in the shape of a round gilded knob. The coat is decorated with groups of three dots. Baggy trousers, enlarged at the bottom, cover the legs to the instep; his narrow foot with protruding toes is clad in a soft shoe with a carefully traced clasp. Ends of ribbons, fastened at the ankle, are shown on the gilded background. A long sword, with a cross-hilt in a plain scabbard with a triangular shape, hangs from his belt. The proportions of the king's figure are presented conventionally: big head, short body and narrow waist, short legs. In contrast, the hands are treated realistically with minute details showing the correct and elegant gestures in tightening the bowstring, and the joints and fingernails are marked by fine engravings. The muscles of the arms under narrow sleeves are shown plastically.

In this refined representation of the king, shown in full splendor according to tradition, the artist combines the conventionally solemn posture with the liveliness of the movements. The figure of the mount, although supposed to show it galloping, is completely static and stylized, recalling a wooden horse. Its short mane, the hoofs, and the muscles are treated as ornaments. The splendor of the harness of a royal horse is stressed. On its head is a crest, the straps are decorated with round golden knobs, and the tail is tied into a complicated knot. Tassels in the shape of scales are drawn as ornaments. The saddlecloth is gilded and embellished by a hatched design. The other animals are depicted realistically. The four ibexes are individual and lifelike, in the traditional manner of running animals. They are of two species: some with short-pointed antlers and smooth skin, the others with long curved antlers and spotted chest, the spots shown by engraved hatching. The animals are rendered partly in high relief, partly sculpturally, the forelegs depicted in the round in contrast to the generally flat relief. The thighs are decorated by an engraved fan-shaped rosette. Arrows pierce the backs of the four ibexes, engraved on the gilded relief. Very striking is the lively figure of the dog, watchful and tense, the long ears pressed against the body, the tail drawn in.

The technique of the relief is more varied than that on the bowl with the eagle. The relief is of different height up to the round, the engravings applied partly with hair-thin, as well as deeply incised, lines. A similar technique is seen on many Sasanian dishes.

The plate presents a basic stylistic feature typical of a certain stage of development of Iranian art, the juxtaposition of the conventional solemn figure of the royal hunter, representing the heavenly kingdom, and the lively, rapidly moving animals—the personification of the terrestrial world.

The characteristic marks of the plate are clear and simple composition, moderate ornamentation and stylization. In size it is one of the smallest among similar pieces. For some of its motifs there are no analogies—the representation of a hunting dog among the pursued animals is here found for the first time; also, the crescent and the star as symbols not linked with the headgear of the king.\footnote{The star and the crescent as independent symbols, not linked with the headgear of the king, appear, according to Voshchiniina, on coins only since the time of Khusraw I (F. D. J. Paruck, Sasanian coins, Bombay, 1924, pls. XIX–XX, Nos. 413–433, p. 380).}

The plate, according to Voshchiniina, is related to the lower part of the Kungur plate\footnote{Orbeli-Trever, \textit{op.cit.}, pl. 13: Survey, vol. 4, pl. 239, A.} in the Hermitage Museum, the top of which shows Khusraw I Anushirvan among his courtiers, while below, separated by a line, his son Ohrriziv IV (579–590) is hunting ibex. The figure of the king is depicted in the same manner. The garments and headgear are basically similar, as are the sword and horse trappings, but the globe of Ohrriziv's crown does not have the crescent underneath, and back on his neck is visible a bundle of hair, which is absent on the Ufa plate. However, one can observe common features in the faces of both kings: broad cheek-bones, a long nose, and the shape of the beard and whiskers. The head of the king is also said to recall repre-
sentations on coins of Khusrau I and Ohrmizd IV,²⁹ having the same facial traits and the same shape of the crown. On the other hand, the silver bowls attributed by S. P. Tolstov⁷⁰ to Khwārazm and the representations on Khwārazmian coins are, in spite of some common features in the headgear (crenelated crown with symbols of the moon and sun), thought to be stylistically different from the Ufa plate.

The affinity to the Kungur plate and the identification with the coins of Khusrau I and Ohrmizd IV lead Voshchinina to give the date of the Ufa plate as the end of the sixth century A.D., the same as that of the bowl.

In the reviewer’s opinion, the crown of the king on the plate from Ufa, having three crenelations and, above, a crescent surmounted by a globe, can be only that of Yazdegerd II (438-457)—not of Ohrmizd IV. The latter has a small crescent in the lower part of the crown instead of one of the crenelations.⁷¹

The symbols of a crescent and a star, seen on the plate at the side of the crown proper, do not contradict this earlier dating. From the time of Shapur II, the field on coins between the bust and the legend begins to be filled by a large variety of symbols. On some of his small coins, as well as on a coin of Bahram V, on the obverse, in front of the face, one can see a crescent and a star.⁷² Since the second reign of Kavadh I,⁷³ they appear first on the rim of the coin, and since Khusrau I,⁷⁴ on the robe in front of either shoulder.⁷⁵

The third object of the treasure is a fragment representing the upper part of the body of a small vessel with thin walls and a lid with an attached loop (figs. 17–18 and text fig. D). The dimensions of the fragment are: greatest height 4.6 cm., greatest diameter 6 cm. The thin walls are embossed. The

---

⁷¹ The hunter in the lower part of the Kungur plate is identified by Orbeli and Trever as Ohrmizd IV, in spite of the deviations from his crown, assuming that he is depicted not as a king, but as the heir apparent, next to his father Khusrau I, and as such does not yet possess his characteristic crown.
⁷⁵ A star alone appears to the left of the king’s crown on a silver plate of the Teheran Museum exhibited in Paris in 1948 (*Iran. Pièces du Musée de Téhéran, du Musée du Louvre et de collections particulières*, Musée de Cernuschi, Paris, 1948, p. 46, No. 82, and fig. 5). The king was identified by the late Dr. M. Bahrami as Kavadh, during his first reign (488 to 499), but it seems rather to be identical with Perz’s coin type b (K. Erdmann, *Die Entwicklung der Sasanidischen Krone*, Ars Islamica, vol. 15–16 [1951], fig. 18). The star on the Teheran bowl is more complex as it shows one 6-pointed element superimposed on another with a central dot (the latter missing in Bahrami’s drawing). It is placed very close to the large crescent with its large ‘‘ball’’ and probably in juxtaposition to it, while on the Ufa plate the crescent and the 6-pointed star are separate and without obvious connection with the king’s crown.
metal is white copper or an alloy with small amounts of silver. It is gilded on the outside, and of whitish shade on the inside. The walls are roundish and show, according to Voshchinina, projections of irregular form which suggest the possibility of its being a figural vessel. The whole surface is covered by convex scales with engravings in the form of bird feathers. The lid is conical, molded, and with a loop in the center; on the shoulder of the body is an attached handle in the shape of a little arch, consisting of two crenelated parts with sloping steps, made from sheet metal. In the execution of this piece we do not find the technical processes characteristic of the first two dishes. It is possible that this was a figural vessel of local origin.

A pear-shaped bronze ewer was found in 1951, during excavations conducted at the Nerevski end of the city of Novgorod, on the wooden floor of a cellar, 6.50 m. deep, and is briefly described in a publication by A. V. Artzikhovskii (fig. 2). The preservation of the vessel is excellent; it is made of yellow bronze, not subject to the corrosion usual in the case of bronze objects excavated in this part of the city. The height is 16 cm. A high foot is soldered by lead to the body of the ewer; the latter contracts toward the top forming a narrow, slightly expanding neck. An ornament consisting of parallel circles is incised around the circumference of the widest part of the vessel; the neck is decorated by two fillet moldings in relief. A curved handle is ornamented by three sets of bosses and a small bird figure with a crest and an upturned tail. M. E. Masson and M. M. D’iakonov assigned the piece to Central Asia of the ninth to tenth centuries.

The most interesting find of the years 1947–1952 is a complex of five silver dishes found (together with a silver buckle and 260 Byzantine coins) in the Kama region during the processes of cultivation at the outskirts of the village Bartym (Berezov region, Molotov district). Four of them, all at the State Historical Museum in Moscow, were published by O. N. Bader and A. P. Smirnov. 76

In 1950, after the disclosure of the first three pieces, the whole area of about 100 square kilometers was examined by O. N. Bader. The localities of the finds were rather scattered, which seemed to presuppose the presence of a demolished graveyard or settlement. However, the silver objects were present only in the upper grayish arable layer of about 25–30 cm. in depth. The reddish subsoil did not contain any archaeological material; no cultural stratum with bones or ceramics was found. The scattered locations of the objects, near the surface, seemed to indicate that they could not have represented buried treasures, but more likely a rich sanctuary.

A silver bowl, found in 1952, is cast and gilded, of half-spherical shape with a flat base and a low foot consisting of two concentric circles; the latter are hammered (figs. 19 and 20). The inside of the bowl is plain, the outside decorated by a floral ornament and four medallions containing human faces. The vessel has a pearl border between two flat fillet moldings. The height is 7 cm., the diameter 14 cm., the weight 622.2 gr. The bowl is slightly damaged and deformed.

The floral ornament between the medallions consists of acanthus leaves in the shape of clusters rising from the base. Each cluster is composed of three leaves—two acanthus leaves, with curled tips and flowers on short stems between them, are overlaid at their lower parts by a large trefoil. The medallions are placed above two bent acanthus leaves with a cuplike flower in the middle set in a high vase. Buds or flowers on long stems are on both sides of the medallions. The two decorative arrangements alternate and all of them are separated from each other by small half leaves placed above the lower edge.

The medallions are round, bordered by half-spherical fillet moldings and contain busts of children with long hair coming down to their foreheads.

The bowl differs greatly from those of the Sasanian period. It represents a type common in the last centuries B.C. and the first centuries A.D., khazadnii, (“Silver of the Kama region of the first centuries of our era. The locality of the Bartym finds”), Trudy Gosudarstvennogo Istoricheskogo Muzeia, Pamiatniki Kultury, vyp. XIII. Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel’stvo, Moskva, 1954, 8 pls., 2 figs.


76 Inventory No. 83746.

77 O. N. Bader and A. P. Smirnov, Serebro Zabamskoie pervykh vekev nashei eri [Bartymskoie mestona...
and in shape, composition, and ornament is related to "terra sigillata" vessels and "Megarian bowls"; it also occurs among vessels of the Graeco-Bactrian period.\(^{78}\)

The faces on the bowl are faint and do not lend themselves to stylistic analysis. The floral ornament—acanthus leaves with curled borders—is a very characteristic motif in the first centuries A.D. and occurs frequently in Graeco-Bactrian art.\(^{79}\) The nearest analogy to the bowl is the relief decoration on the Airtam frieze (Central Asia),\(^{80}\) dated to the first century B.C. and consisting of women figures separated by curled acanthus leaves, and of a row of small half leaves set on the lower edge. The technique (casting) leads to a date not earlier than the first century B.C.

The stylistic peculiarities and resemblance to objects of the first centuries A.D. suggest the date of the piece (first century A.D.) as the latest date possible. The ornamentation of the rim, the proportions of the shape, and the Hellenistic motifs indicate a Central Asiatic provenance.

The second find at Bartym, attributed to an early period, is the silver cup or goblet recovered in 1949 with the foot missing at the time, but found a year later in the same place (figs. 23-28). The cup is not very deep and has an expanding upper part, slightly contracted sides covered by an ornament, and a bottom with a shallow concavity set on a foot of medium height; the latter is covered in the middle by a semispherical ring and rests on a wide ornamented base.

The height of the cup is 8.5 cm., the diameter of the rim 10.5 cm., that of the bottom 7.7 cm.; the height without the foot is 5.3 cm., the diameter of the base 5.5 cm., weight 321.9 gr. The cup is cast, the ornament on the surface chased and polished afterward.

The rim bears a band of small globular bosses, underneath which are four oval medallions bordered in the same fashion. The interstices are filled by trees. The four ovals contain figures. In the first is a woman dancer nude to the waist with her head turned backward; her left arm is bent at the elbow and raised to the shoulder while the right rests on the hip. She wears a fur skirt consisting of four separate pieces sewn together at the waist; as jewelry a necklace, bracelets, and anklets. Over her head is thrown a scarf folded into a narrow band with its ends fluttering and extending beyond the border of the medallion.

The opposite medallion contains a similar figure of a half-nude dancer, in the same garment, but with the right arm fully extended in the dance movement. In the medallion to the right of the first is a satyr turned to the left. His goat feet are depicted in a dance movement, while he holds a reed pipe in his hands. Small wings consisting of an imbricated top and three long pinfeathers are fixed to his back. The fourth medallion bears the representation of an Eros playing a flute. He is wearing a skirt similar to that of the dancing women. The lower parts of his wings are like those of the Satyr. Where the wings are attached to the body, a long fluttering scarf is laid, whose ends project beyond the border of the medallion.

The figural representations—the women dancers, the dancing Satyr, and Eros—suggest the connection with some festival of Bacchus. The figure of Eros depicted as an infant is characteristic of the latter part of the post-Hellenistic or the Roman period.

The other figural representations are of approximately the same time. The figures of the dancers are crude and heavy-set, in poor proportions, with uneven legs (the right one being one-third longer than the left). The facial features seem distorted, their rendering sketchy and limited to basic forms without plastic modeling. The smile is depicted by an indentation around the mouth having no connection with the rest of the face. According to the authors, this crude, barbaric treatment suggests a late date.

The floral ornament between the medallions consists of trees widened at the base with three or four branches, ending in clusters of budlike leaves. The base is decorated by a spiral scroll with leaves and grapes. Both motifs date back to classical antiquity and occur in this shape on Graeco-Bactrian objects.\(^{81}\) In later periods they undergo

---

\(^{78}\) Trever, Pamiatniki greko-baktriiskogo iskusstva, pl. 14; Smirnov, op.cit., pl. VII, No. 20.

\(^{79}\) Trever, op.cit., pl. 9, 30; Smirnov, op.cit., pl. VIII, No. 23.


\(^{81}\) Trever, op.cit., pls. 24, 14; Smirnov, op.cit., pls. XXXIX, No. 68; VII, No. 20.
some changes—the trunk and the branches become thinner, and the undulating branch with spirals and fruits more crude and sketchy. The ornament on the foot—acanthus leaves forming a star—recalls a similar motif on the Airtam frieze and also belongs to an early period.

All these parallels lead the authors to attribute the Bartym cup to the first to second century A.D., which is considered by them as the latest date possible.

The next find, a broken silver plate (fig. 21), was recovered in 1951. It is hammered and later chased. The diameter of the plate is 12.5 cm., that of the bottom 7.7 cm., the weight 118.35 gr. The rim is bent, forming a fillet molding, and underneath is a second band of globular bosses. A similar band encircles the bottom, and between them is a broad zone decorated by five lobed arches in relief. The bottom carries a pair of addorsed lions—a heraldic pattern common in Sasanian art. The lions are depicted in a conventional manner typical for this period. The two forelegs and the head are set straight. Their jaws are wide open and lifeless. The oval eyes are marked by engravings with a dot in the center; above them are two lines. The ear is set off by an oval elevation and engraved inside, the mane indicated by rows of scales with dots within them. On the shoulder is an engraved rosette of irregular form; on the sides, the muscles are depicted by archlike incisions. The hindlegs are one and a half times longer than the forelegs and end in three claws. The tails are swung back and indicated by two engraved lines forming wider end parts. The figures of both lions are slightly different.

Above their backs is a small chest, hanging on two rods, with a pyramidal lid surmounted by a composition consisting of a foliated top and a crescent between two globes. The arch between the two rods is ornamented by a row of triangles with their points down. The lid of the chest is covered by little circles with dots; the sides are bordered by frames decorated in a similar manner as the lid and the panel inside has a hatched design with dots within the small cells. The center shows a rosette. On the outside, around the border, there is an inscription in letters corresponding to the ancient Khvârazmian alphabet. The inscription and the composition on the bottom indicate the date of the plate.

The ornament of the upper part of the chest and the rosette recall similar motifs in Tâq-e Bostân; the crescent and the globe are found on crowns of Sasanian rulers. A similar configuration, a crescent surmounted by a globe, occurs on coins of Kavadh I and Khusrau I, while a scarf, resembling the one above the chest, is shown on the reverse side of the same coin. The dates of Kavadh's reign (488 to 531) and that of Khusrau I (531–578) provide the basis on which the authors assign the plate to the sixth century A.D. The plate is of crude workmanship, as can be judged from the rather inept design. There are not enough data for determining the provenance of the piece. The presence of the ancient Khvârazmian inscription suggests a Central Asiatic origin.

The next vessel found at Bartym in 1947 is a boat-shaped silver bowl with relief representations, already republished in a preliminary fashion in Ars Islamica (fig. 22). The size of the vessel is $26 \times 9.2 \times 6$ cm., the height 6 cm., the weight 700 gr. The thickness of the walls is slightly more than 1 mm., that of the rim 3 mm. The base shows traces of having been soldered to a foot, also of oval shape, 9.2 $\times$ 3.6 cm. The spectrographic analysis disclosed that the bowl was made of silver with a considerable addition of copper, some tin and lead, a very small addition of gold, and traces of silicon, manganese, bismuth, and aluminum. The bowl was cast, the contours chased later. On some places, on the base of the relief figures, traces of gilding are visible in the shape of a narrow gilded band.

---

82 Orbeli-Trever, op.cit., pls. 27, 30, 32, 33, 36, 37.
83 Ibid., pls. 28, 65, 67, 68.
84 Ibid., pl. 2, fourth row.
85 In a later publication (Kamskaia arheologicheskaia ekspeditsia, KS IIMK, Akademia Nauk SSSR, vol. 55 (1954), pp. 126–128), O. N. Bader dates the plate as seventh to eighth century A.D.
The inside of the bowl is plain. On the outside, it carries on both sides figures in relief of confronted peacocks flanking an "altar," and on the bottom a fish 2.6 cm. long. On the backs of the peacocks, replacing the folded wings, and on the breasts there are human faces in profile, with long straight noses (in one case heavy at the tip), full cheeks, and long beards, the heads covered by high caps or helmets; or faces without beards, with fleshy lips and short protruding noses. Below, in front of the legs, outlines of a third pair of profiles are visible, in one case reminiscent of an elephantlike animal with a long trunk. The back part of the peacocks' bodies is depicted as the head of a beast (possibly a wild boar?), with an open mouth and protruding teeth, swallowing a large fish (?) which serves as the tail of the peacock and is decorated by small circles with dots recalling scales of a fish or the decorative design on the peacocks' feathers. The upper part of the peacocks' legs is represented in the shape of a small fish with a well-outlined head, marked fins, and a bifurcated tail. The heads of the peacocks carry a crescent and a globe reminiscent of Sasanian royal crowns. Long scarfs with three deep folds are fastened to the birds' necks, flying over their backs.

Another vessel of the same boat-shaped form, in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, has a decoration which has been described as a banquet scene consisting of a seated king flanked by two attendants and two dancers. The king is there identified as Shapur II and the bowl dated to the third century A.D. Other similar bowls (one with the representation of a fish on the base and two set on a foot) have complex lobed shapes with fluted rims and belong to a later period, i.e., the sixth to seventh century A.D.

The altar between the peacocks is represented as a small table with a round pedestal and a flat top recalling altars on coins of Shapur I, Ardashir I, and Shapur III. Composite figures of the peacocks are connected by the authors with objects of Sasanian art only on the basis of their headgear and scarfs. The crescent and the globe are depicted in a rather sketchy manner, but still show a resemblance to crowns on coins of Ardashir I, Narseh, and Orhmizd II, and on dated plates to those of Bahram I, corresponding to the period from the third to the fourth century A.D. Scarfs similar to those seen on the birds are present on coins of Bahram I, Shapur II, Bahram Gur, and Khusrav I, i.e., between the third and fifth centuries, and on stone reliefs of Shapur I and Bahram I of the third century A.D.

On the basis of the above-mentioned analogies, the bowl is attributed by the Russian authors to the third to fourth century A.D. In the interpretation of the peacock figures it is stressed that such compositions, consisting of human and animal heads, did not occur in Sasanian art, but were frequent in ancient Mesopotamia and in the Caucasus and known in all parts of South Russia affected by Scythian culture. For this reason, the bowl is not classified with Sasanian art. Central Asia or the Caucasus is considered as likely to be the place of its origin. The representation of two confronted peacocks on the base of a column from the Mingechaur temple is given in support of this assumption.

The representation of peacocks (symbols of eternal life) and fishes, connected with the early Christian cult, suggested the possibility that the bowl might have been the product of a Christian master from Central Asia. Figures of peacocks occur on mosaics in an early Christian temple at Khersones in Tauria.

88 Ghirshman, Notes iraniennes V: Scènes de banquet sur l'argenterie sassanide, Artibus Asiae, vol. 16 (1953), pl. opposite p. 51; the connection between the shapes of the Kungur and the Baltimore bowl was first pointed out in R. Ettinghausen's postscript to the article by Bader in Ars Islamica (op.cit., pp. 141-142).

89 Orbeli-Trever, op.cit., pls. 57, 58, 63. Two more elongated lobed bowls, reproduced by Smirnov (op.cit., Nos. 70, 77), are not regarded as Sasanian by Orbeli and Trever.

90 It is interesting to note that in the discussion following the first report on the piece at Leningrad in 1948, there was a difference of opinion concerning the dating of the piece. K. V. Trever was in favor of a pre-Sasanian date (Early Kushan ?), while Orbeli and Matzulevich agreed on the pre-Sasanian date, but assumed the Trans-Caucasus as provenance. On account of the long elephantlike faces and the type of altar with volutes common in the first to second centuries A.D., the latter considered the attribution to the Parthian period.

In a postscript to Bader’s article in Ars Islamica, Richard Ettinghausen quotes a publication by A. Roes in which, on the basis of an unusual Sasanian gem with a similar composite figure, the Iranian origin of such motifs is put forward. The characteristic Sasanian features of the bowl, the headdresses, scarfs, and altar provide further support to this theory.

The fifth piece, preserved in the Molotov Regional Museum, is described in a publication by O. N. Bader (figs. 29-31 and text fig. E). It is a silver bowl found in 1952, made of a silver alloy with a low silver content and a leadlike tint. The bottom is covered by gilded figural representations in relief. A low (9 mm.) round foot, of the same diameter as the embossed part, is made from a sheet of silver and soldered to the base. The sides of the bowl and the foot are approximately 1 mm. thick, except for the wreath which has on the inside a half-spherical shape. On the outside, next to the wreath, there is an engraved inscription forming a full circle; the foot carries a similar but shorter inscription. The diameter of the bowl is 12.4 cm.; the height, excluding the foot, is 3.4 cm.

On the bottom, the gilded representation is bordered by a circular ornamental molding with a diameter of 7 cm. The central figure is a four-armed goddess clad in a long folded garment and seated on the back of a lion. Her round face is framed by braided hair and the head carries an elaborate headdress—a crown surmounted by a crescent filled with three small balls. The right hand holds a scepter, the left a long staff with a little ball on top. Behind the back is a second pair of arms raising the symbols of the sun and moon in the shape of a globe and a crescent. In front of the lion’s chest, a female (?) figure is kneeling with some objects (offerings?) in her hands. All figures are embossed, showing on the outside the reversed concave counterparts. The details are chased and engraved; those of the garments are especially well depicted.

Closely related to the piece are two bowls—one (found with pre-Islamic coins which were in circulation up to the end of the sixth century) reproduced by Smirnov and, particularly, a bowl acquired at the Nizhny Novgorod Fair, now in the British Museum. Both show figures of four-armed deities with identical emblems in their hands. The figure of the goddess from the British Museum is also seated on the back of a lion and has a similar crown; around the rim of the bowl runs a long inscription written in similar letters. The common origin of this and the newly found bowl is obvious. Another related piece is a bowl with a poorly preserved figure seated on a leopard; also, related in some features, is a bowl with the recumbent figure of a warrior (a

---

95 Smirnov, op.cit., pl. XVIII, No. 42.
96 Smirnov, op.cit., pl. XVIII, No. 43; Dalton, op.cit., pl. XXXII.
97 Smirnov, op.cit., pl. XVIII, No. 44.
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The first publication deals with the main motif of the silver bowl which was discussed last and the second is an article of more general character.

During the Tadzhik-Sogdian archaeological expedition of 1948-51, two figures of four-armed deities were found on wall paintings in one of the temples of ancient Piandzhikent. A. M. Belenitzki interprets them as representations of the goddess "Oksho" which occur on Kushan coins and are synonymous with the deity "Bag-Ard" or "Ardvakhsh" known from Manichaean literary sources. Belenitzki remarks that many-handedness has analogies in astrological cults of the Sabaeans. Reminiscent of this astral iconography are the later representations of planets in the form of human figures with many arms, i.e., that of Saturn in the early manuscripts of Cosmography by al-Qazwini, or of Mars on astrological icons from Khara-Khoto in Mongolia. Some other features of the deities on these icons are generally considered as going back to astrological representations of Iran and Mesopotamia.

On grounds of close relationship with representations on wall paintings in Piandzhikent, several silver objects are now attributed to Sogdian art and to the seventh century A.D., such as the plate with the horseman hunting lion and boar, with the two warriors fighting on foot, and the plate with the seated king accompanied by attendants.

7 Orbeli-Trever, op. cit., pl. 3; N. N. Zabelina i L. I. Rempel, Sogdiskiy Vsdnik ("the Sogdian horseman"), Tashkent, 1948.
8 Smirnov, op. cit., pl. XX, No. 50.

98 Ibid., pl. CXIV, No. 286.
99 Tolstov, Drevnii Khorezm, p. 193.
100 Dalton, op. cit., pp. 57-58.
101 Tolstov, op. cit., p. 200.
and musicians.\(^9\) The assumption of Borisov,\(^10\) Potapov,\(^11\) and Pugachenkova\(^12\) that some metal vessels with woman figures under arches are of Soghdian origin, is confirmed.

The last article to be considered here was published in 1952 by K. V. Trever and dealt with the concept and terminology of Sasanian art.\(^13\) It was pointed out that the term “Sasanian” was applied (particularly in the West) not only to objects found in Iran proper but also to those found in Central Asia, the Caucasus, the Urals, and other regions. Such a use of the dynastic term was regarded as improper because it rested on the assumption that all so-called Sasanian objects were created by Iranian masters in Iran alone. “Sasanian” art was thus envisaged to be a single and undiversified cultural manifestation, which even preceded the Sasanian period and extended beyond it to include the seventh to ninth centuries. Finally, exception was taken to the fact that “Sasanian” art included objects made in neighboring countries, even though certain pieces show features not found in Iran or in bona fide Sasanian art, let alone at the court of this dynasty.

In view of these considerations Miss Trever wished to have the term “Sasanian” defined more precisely and to use another designation in those cases where the technique, iconography, style, inscriptions, or locality of the finds show that the objects were created by peoples of the Caucasus or Central Asia, all regions which are now part of the Soviet Union.

\(^9\) Smirnov, op.cit., pl. XXXV, No. 64.


\(^11\) A. A. Potapov, Rel'efy drevnei Sogdiy ("Reliefs of ancient Sogd"), Vestnik Drevnej Historii, Nos. 2/3 (1938), pp. 120 ff.

\(^12\) G. A. Pugachenkova, Elementy sogdianskoi arkhitekturny na sredneaziatskikh terrahodakh ("Elements of Soghdian architecture on Central Asiatic terracottas"), V, Trudy Instituta istorii Akademii nauk Uzbekistana, t. 2, Tashkent, 1950, pp. 15–16.


Various stages in the recognition of the “non-Sasanian” character were then listed.

In 1935 Miss Trever separated a group of objects which she designated as Greco-Bactrian art and assigned to the people of Central Asia—that is, not only to Afghanistan but in particular to the ancient people who used to live in what are now the territories of Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenia.

In 1938 Orbeli recognized in his contribution to the Survey of Persian art that stylistic affinities should, in many cases, not be explained by the influence of Sasanian art upon the cultures of neighboring countries but rather by the influence of the art of peoples bordering Iran on Sasanian art, since in some periods certain countries which were within the political orbit of Iran undoubtedly brought their own contributions into the formation of the arts of Sasanian Iran.\(^14\) Certain “Sasanian” art objects were then claimed by this scholar for the Caucasus, Armenia, Georgia, and Dagestan.\(^15\)

In a number of cases new attributions were given to well-known “Sasanian” pieces. Tolstov and Terenozhkin assigned certain objects to Khwārzm, including the famous fortress plate, which was, however, attributed to Soghd by Pugachenkova and Masson. Then the possibility of relating the plate with Bahram I in the Hermitage Museum to ancient Marg (Margiana, Merv) was considered because the reverse of this piece bears a Soghdian inscription, including the words Marg-ḵwetian, “sovereign of Merv.” Finally, three silver vases in the Hermitage Museum with representations of Anahit were connected with ancient Bactria, since one of them has a Soghdian inscription (so far undeciphered).

Miss Trever herself tried to separate yet another group of objects and to assume for them a Caucasian origin. This particular group includes a silver plate from Nor-Baizat (Armenia), a relic in Zvartnoz (Armenia),\(^16\) and a silver plate which Smirnov saw in Tbilisi. All have on them representations of bears,


\(^15\) Ibid., p. 716.

\(^16\) B. N. Arakelian, Sūshtetvye rel'efy Armenii IV–VII vv ("The reliefs with narrative scenes from Armenia of the IV–VII cc"), Erivan, 1949, pl. 47.
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an animal which Miss Trever thought to be lacking on Sasanian plates of undoubtedly Persian origin and which, as far as she knew, was also said to be absent from Persian folklore and the Persian epic. Since these objects were found in the Caucasus, they were attributed to local Caucasian masters. Miss Trever first presented this idea in a report read in 1929 before the Caucasian Archaeological Society.

In the case of two other pieces, the iconography and region of their discovery were thought to be significant. The bowl excavated in a burial mound of the cristas in Armazi near Mtskheta in Georgia was assumed to be of the second to third centuries A.D. (as could be judged from the finds in the sarcophagus) and to represent a local prince or nobleman. 17 In spite of its general “Sasanian” type and the külāh worn by the man in the central medallion, it was regarded as a local product on account of certain details of the representation which were, however, not further specified. The silver plate found in Krasnaia Poliana with the “Sasanian-type” bear hunt (fig. 11) 18 was, like the Armasia bowl, compared with objects from the Caucasus, and dated not later than the first decade of the third century, that is, from a time when the Sasanian style could not yet have exerted an influence on them. On both pieces the figures wear a külāh and the plates have inscriptions (not yet deciphered), and their Aramaic characters are said to be close to Pahlavi as well as Armenian letters. Miss Trever assumes, therefore, that both “Sasanian” objects are Caucasian and that they predate the rule of that dynasty.

In conclusion Miss Trever rejects even the conditional use of the term “Sasanian” for “objects related to each other in iconography and style and created not only in Iran but in the neighboring countries as well, when they were, at times, politically allied with Iran, during the reign of the Sasanian dynasty and also before and after.” According to Miss Trever, the similarities in such objects merely reflect analogous social and economic conditions, while the differences in iconography, technique, and style depend on different national backgrounds. She wishes to apply the term “Sasanian” only “to those objects which were created by Persians and found in the territory of Iran (i.e., in present Persia) or beyond its borders, if they conform in iconography, style, and technique with objects known as Persian-Sasanian.” As “Sasanian” she regards official rock reliefs with representations of ceremonial scenes such as the investitures, court and triumphal scenes, the representations of kings on coins, and of historically known official persons like noblemen and priests on seals.

The other objects of “Sasanian” type, showing features characteristic of objects of art of the peoples of Central Asia or the Caucasus, should be called Central Asiatic or Caucasian, even if found beyond the border of these countries. The chronological attribution could in some cases, but only if necessary, be supplemented by the designation “Sasanian type,” showing by this, however, only stylistic similarities and the chronological range, but not the ethnic background in which the object was created.

In conclusion Miss Trever states that archaeological investigations conducted on a large scale in Central Asia and the Caucasus will enrich our knowledge and enable us in the near future to recognize objects made in the territories of Azerbaijan, Daghestan, and the north Caucasus, just as we are now said to be able to differentiate between objects from Khwārazm, Sogd, Armenia, and Georgia.

In the reviewer’s opinion, every scholar should welcome Miss Trever’s laudable endeavor to achieve more precise attributions, be it through archaeological, iconographic, or stylistic methods. As a matter of fact, the use of the term “Sasanian” has been so far a designation faute de mieux and often only conditional because it seemed to express best the style which exerted such great influence not only on neighboring countries, but on mediaeval Western and Far Eastern art as well. It will be a definite service if proper indices are established which will enable us to attribute known or newly found objects to the Caucasus or Central Asia, let alone to specific regions therein.

It seems necessary, however, to put in a word of caution to avoid attributions based on one or more features which are thought to be restricted to a certain region but which might also be found elsewhere. The bear as the hallmark of Caucasian vessels is a case in point. Contrary to what Miss Trever assumes, representations of bears are also found outside the Caucasus. They occur—according to information ob-

---

17 See above, footnote 48 and text figs. b and c.
18 See above, pp. 60–64.
tained from Dr. Richard Ettinghausen, on the stucco decorations of the Sasanian capital, Ctesiphon; they are to be found, though not very often, on the seals with Pahlavi inscriptions in the national collections of Paris, Copenhagen, and London; it may be assumed that they came originally from Persia or from other regions to the east or south of it. These are Pahlavi and Avesta words for bear. One passage in the Shāh-nāma speaks of bears (khirs) which are hunted with other wild game; bears occur on a Persian hunter tile of the thirteenth century made in Kashan and in Persian miniatures, and finally,

19 E. Kühnel, Die Ausgrabungen der zweiten Ktesiphon-Expedition, Berlin, 1933, fig. 26; or Kurt Erdmann, Die Kunst Iran's zur Zeit der Sasaniden, Berlin, 1943, fig. 39.

20 Mordtmann, Studien über geschchnittene Steine ..., pl. 1, No. 115; pl. 3, No. 62; pl. 5, No. 24; Horn, Sasanidische Gemmen aus dem British Museum, p. 666, No. 618 ("Bär"), pl. 2, a, second row, No. 618; Survey of Persian Art, vol. 4, pl. 256, HH.


reference might be made to the Persian equivalent of "Among the blind the one-eyed is king," (vide "In the mountain the bear is Avicenna"). There is little doubt that, besides these non-Caucasian examples, others could be established by more thorough search.

As to another piece referred to by Miss Trever, it should be pointed out that recently a number of silver plates have been found in Persia, which have in the center the bust of a male figure without the royal crown. In one case this central medallion is surrounded by eight concentric rows of flat knobs, just as in the case of the Armazí piece; and as in this bowl there is at least one seal in the British Museum with a bust of a prince wearing a high kalûh with an overhang. All this indicates that all the "Sasanian" or Sasanian-type material in the various media has not yet been properly coordinated. Such a task is most desirable and should certainly bring good results. In this work the Russian scholars will play an important role, not only because the vast majority of these vessels are in their museums, with new ones appearing all the time, but also because they have their own large collection of Sasanian seals which are as yet hardly known to Western scholars.


26 Only one of these has so far been published (R. N. Frye, A Parthian silver bowl, Artibus Asiae, vol. 17 [1954], pp. 143-440), but it is unfortunately not the one to which we are referring below.

27 Horn, op.cit., pl. 1,a, No. 910; a better picture in Survey of Persian Art, vol. 4, pl. 255, N.
ARGENTERIE D'UN SEIGNEUR SASSANIDE

PAR R. GHIRSHMAN

Nous avons la rare occasion d'étudier un ensemble de cinq pièces d'argenterie sassanide, fortuitement découvertes au Mazandérân. Il s'agit de trois grands bols décorés de scènes de banquet et portant chacun deux lignes d'une inscription en pehlvi, et de deux fourchettes, le tout en argent massif.

No. 1.—Bol en argent massif; diam. 22 cm.; haut. 7 cm.; épaisseur du bord 2 mm; poids 880 gr. (fig. 1).

Le décor, du côté extérieur seulement, comprend un omphalos inscrit dans un cercle de grênetis enfermant un oiseau dont la longue queue décrit un large demi-cercle. La tête de l'animal est surmontée d'un croissant, et son cou est orné d'un ruban auquel sont attachés trois pendants de perles (fig. 2). Le reste du décor, de même que l'inscription, sont centrés sur cet omphalos figuré.

La demi-sphère de la coupe est divisée en quatre parties par une croix dont les quatre bras partent du cercle central de grênetis, en s'élargissant vers les bords. Chacun d'eux est composé de trois surfaces planes arrondies près du bord de la coupe, et séparées les unes des autres par une rainure. L'élément médian est décoré de dix coeurs en pierre noire incrustée; les alvéoles qui ont perdu leur pierre montrent de petites aspérités destinées à fixer l'incrustation, probablement à l'aide d'une mince couche de bitume.

Les quatre secteurs de cercle que forme la croix sont occupés par des danseuses et des musiciennes, se regardant deux à deux. Chacune d'elles est prise sous une arcade, si chère à l'art des orfèvres sassanides, formée d'un cep de vigne partant du cercle de l'omphalos. Après avoir lancé à droite une branche coupée puis une tige qui se termine vers le bas par une grappe de raisin et vers le haut par une feuille trilobée pointue, le cep, rejettant plus haut vers la gauche une autre tige à feuille, vient dessiner une large volute autour de la femme, en projetant des vrilles et des tiges qui se terminent par d'autres feuilles à cinq lobes et par une grande grappe de raisin très en relief.

Les deux femmes qui se regardent, au-dessus de l'oiseau, sont une joueuse d'un instrument à vent et une danseuse à castagnettes. La première (fig. 3), la tête, l'œil et les jambes de profil, le buste de face, a les cheveux serrés d'un bandeau rehaussé sur le front d'un bijou; une natte tombe droit le long de sa joue sur l'épaule, tandis qu'une autre se termine par un enroulement et descend sur le dos. Elle porte au cou un collier de perles à pendante et des bracelets aux poignets. Sa longue robe à manches ajustées, en tissu transparent, est de celles que portent sur l'argenterie sassanide toutes ces femmes qui étaient appelées à divertir les seigneurs pendant leurs banquets. Le tissu est orné d'un semis de fleurs rondes et tombe sur les pieds en lourds plis dessinés en cornets. Sur l'épaule droite est jeté un châle qui, aprés avoir décrit un large mouvement devant la musicienne, vient retomber sur son avant-bras gauche. De ses deux mains, celle-ci tient un instrument à vent du genre cornemuse composé de cinq tuyaux fixés sur un sac de cuir (?). En soufflant dans un tube posé obliquement, elle semble remplir l'outrde d'air qui, par la pression des deux mains, en est chassé dans les tuyaux de ce petit orgue. Un instrument analogue est tenu par une femme représentée sur une aiguërie de l'Ermitage. A en juger d'après la position de ses pieds, elle doit danser tout en jouant.

1 Ces pièces font actuellement partie des collections du Musée de Téhéran.

2 J. Smirnoff, Argenterie orientale, St. Petersburg. 1909, pl. XXXVI.
Faisant face à cette musicienne, et entourée d’une vigne semblable, se tient une autre femme. La tête tournée de profil à gauche, les jambes de profil à droite et le torse de face, elle est coiffée et habillée de la même façon que sa voisine sauf que le tissu de sa robe est orné de motifs carrés divisés en quatre avec un point au centre de chaque carré; l’extrémité de ses manches, comme chez la musicienne, est ornée de larges broderies (?). Elle danse en s’accompagnant de castagnettes — disques fixés sur de longues baguettes entre lesquelles elle passe l’index (fig. 4).

Sur la seconde moitié du bol on voit, également affrontées, deux autres musiciennes qui semblent aussi danser. Elles se regardent, la tête et l’œil de profil à droite et à gauche, les jambes aussi de profil mais tournées vers l’extérieur. Leurs robes et leurs châles sont identiques à ceux déjà décrits. La seule variante est leur coiffure et la forme du bijou qui l’orne au front. Celle de gauche joue du hautbois (fig. 5) que nous retrouvons sur la même aiguëre de l’Ermitage.

Lui faisant vis-à-vis, une musicienne pince avec un petit instrument pointu les quatre cordes d’une mandoline à tête recourbée, comme on en peut voir encore de nos jours en Iran (fig. 6), et qu’on distingue aussi sur l’aiguëre déjà citée, et sur un plat du British Museum.

Une inscription de deux lignes est gravée sur les deux surfaces plates du bras de la croix qui se trouve à droite de l’oiseau, encadrant les incrustations de coeurs (voir plus bas).

Le long de la lèvre du bol court un cercle de perles qui encadre l’ensemble du décor et forme une élégante bordure.

No. 2.—Bol en argent massif; diam. 23 cm., 4; haut. 8 cm., 5; épaisseur du bord 3 mm.; poids 795 gr. (fig. 7).

La composition du décor du second bol est identique à celle du premier. Tous deux semblent être l’œuvre du même artiste qui introduisit, toutefois, quelques variantes afin que les deux objets ne soient pas absolument pareils. C’est ainsi que l’oiseau du centre n’est pas rubanné, et l’omphalos, au lieu d’un cercle de perles est limité par deux cordonnets au mouvement de torsion contraires (fig. 8). Les bras de la croix sont les mêmes sauf que le nombre de coeurs incrustés s’élève pour chacun à douze. Les musiciennes tiennent les mêmes instruments, mais elles ont changé de place et de pose. Elles ne se regardent pas mais tournent la tête en arrière tandis que leurs jambes s’affrontent. La même vigne les encadre; toutefois, sur chaque première tige de gauche est percé un oiseau différent. Il semble qu’on peut y distinguer un paon, un faisan, une perdrix et une huppe (?). Le même cercle de perles borde la lèvre du bol (figs. 9 à 12).

L’inscription est gravée à gauche de l’oiseau central, et, comme elle commence du côté du bord, elle est vue le haut en bas quand on regarde l’oiseau.

La technique des deux bols est la même et semble être du champlévé. Le travail est d’une grande finesse bien que le procédé par lui-même place l’artiste dans des cadres assez étroits et ne donne pas toute liberté dans l’expression des volumes. Là où l’artiste est forcé de le rechercher, comme c’est le cas pour les seins de la danseuse aux castagnettes, il exprime le volume en les soulignant simplement de deux croisants profondément et largement évidés. Pour éviter de les traiter ailleurs de cette façon, n’a-t-il pas cherché à donner aux musiciennes des poses où leurs charmes se trouvent cachés par les bras qui tiennent les instruments?

Le relief peu accusé n’empêche pas l’artiste de réaliser les passages à des plans différents. Ceci se manifeste dans l’exécution des corps et des jambes qui se modèlent sous les plis de la robe transparente et qui se superposent, tout comme dans les ondulations des châles jetés sur les robes. La torsion des corps aux poses élégantes, le mouvement des bras, celui des jambes avec les...
ARGENTERIE D'UN SEIGNEUR SASSANIDE

79

Les pieds pointés vers le sol pour exprimer la danse, dénotent la technique sûre quoiqu'un peu mièvre du ciseleur.

Les seuls éléments rapportés et soudés sont les grandes grappes de raisin. Un champ assez large reste pour la gravure où l'artiste trouve son application: la chevelure, les tissus, les oiseaux, les feuilles et les fruits, les instruments de musique. Mais le burin ne touche que les parties en relief et ne s'applique au fond du bol que dans des cas très rares: sur le premier bol, seul le ruban de l'oiseau central, et sur le second bol, l'une des pattes des quatre oiseaux seulement sont gravés sur le fond même. Nous reviendrons plus loin sur cette dernière façon de traiter l'oiseau sur l'argenterie de l'époque.

No. 3.—Bol en argent massif; diam. 21 cm.; haut. 6 cm., 4; épaisse. de la lèvre 2 mm.; poids 544 gr. (fig. 13).

Dans sa composition d'ensemble ainsi que par sa distribution sur la surface du bol, le décor de ce bol s'inspire du dessin général des deux autres. Son omphalos s'inscrit dans un cercle qui doit figurer un cep qui projette à gauche, vers l'intérieur, une feuille en forme de demi-palmette, et à droite en forme de fleur de lotus, et est occupé par un personnage assis à l'orientale. Ses cheveux sont serrés d'un bandeau dont les extrémités flottent derrière la tête strictement de profil. Sa main gauche s'appuie sur la hanche tandis que de la droite il tient une coupe dans laquelle il boit (fig. 13).

Un motif en croix dont les bras sont formés, comme sur les bols décrits, de trois éléments, divise la demi-sphère. Les bras ne portent pas d'incrustation; leur décor est réduit à des motifs incisés. En haut et en bas du médaillon central, c'est la partie médiane qui présente une suite de fleurs de lotus superposées. Sur les bras de droite et de gauche, ce sont les deux plate-bandes qui sont décorées de motifs en imbrications, celle du milieu étant laissée sans décor.

Les quatre secteurs de cercle entre les bras de la croix sont décorés de quatre musiciennes et danses, disposées aussi par paires. Celles du haut de l'omphalos représentent, à gauche une danseuse, la tête et les jambes à droite, le torse de face. Elle porte une robe transparente serrée d'une ceinture, sur laquelle est jeté un voile qui ondule derrière ses jambes en passant du bras droit au bras gauche. La coiffure est très proche de celle des femmes des bols déjà décrits: un bandeau à bijou au-dessus de la tête et ceinture de trois paquets derrière la tête, tandis qu'une natté descend le long de la joue et qu'une autre tombe sur l'épaule et le bras. Dans sa main droite elle tient un vase à anse et dans la gauche un oiseau. Un cep à branches ornées de feuilles et de grappes dessine une large arcade sous laquelle se tient la femme.

Celle qui lui fait face tourne la tête vers elle, mais ses pieds sont de profil à droite tandis que, comme partout, le buste est de face. Sa coiffure et ses vêtements ne diffèrent guère de ceux de sa voisine. Elle joue de la mandoline.

Les deux odalisques qui ornent le bol en bas de l'omphalos sont habillées et coiffées de façon identique aux précédentes; de même sont pareilles les arcades de vigne qui les entourent. Elles se font vis-à-vis: celle de gauche, la tête et les jambes à droite, le torse de face, les seins formés de deux cercles incisés, tient dans la main droite levée une coupe, tandis que la gauche, abaissée, tient une grappe de raisin que picore un oiseau.

Enfin celle de droite joue d'un instrument à vent qui paraît être aussi un hautbois.

Un cercle de perles termine le décor le long de la lèvre du bol.

L'inscription, finement gravée, toujours en pointillé, occupe l'une des bandes plates du bras inférieur de la croix (voir plus bas).

La technique du décor de ce bol est identique à celle des deux bols, décrits, mais la valeur artistique de l'exécution est certainement inférieure et le travail semble être la réalisation d'un artiste de moindre expérience. Les corps sont lourds et sans grâce, les têtes trop grandes sont sans finesse, les mains et les pieds trop larges. L'état général de conservation est moins
bon que celui des deux autres vases, et la gravure qui ajoutait un grand nombre de détails et qui constituait une part importante dans la production de ce genre de décor a disparu par suite d’usure. L’utilisation constante et prolongée de ce bol est évidente et son inscription semble confirmer ce fait.

Avec ces trois bols placés l’un dans l’autre, se trouvaient deux fourchettes qui, tant du point de vue archéologique et chronologique qu’artistique présentent un intérêt incontestable malgré leur modestie (fig. 14).

No. 4.—Fourchette à deux dents, en argent massif. Long. 24 cm.
Le manche formé de quatorze boules séparées par des cercles, se termine par une tête de mouton très finement modelée et ciselée. A l’extrémité opposée, un motif en triangle décoré de lignes incisées, se soude à un cercle ouvert dont les extrémités donnent naissance à deux longs fourchons.

No. 5.—Fourchette à une dent (?), en argent massif. Long. 17 cm.
Quatre boutons de fleurs sortant l’un de l’autre et se terminant par une pomme de grenade, forment le manche. A l’extrémité opposée, on voit la tête et le cou orné de six boules d’un rapace. Le bout est cassé mais il est à supposer qu’il formait, d’un mouvement arrondi, une longue pointe qui devait permettre de piquer dans la nourriture.

Date.—Nos connaissances de la variation des thèmes et de la technique dans l’orfèvrerie sassanide sont extrêmement pauvres et insuffisantes. Donner une date sûre à notre ensemble est une tâche délicate et sujette à caution. Soulignons, toutefois, qu’une fourchette exactement pareille, ornée d’une tête de cheval au lieu d’une tête de bouquetin, en bronze, a été trouvée par nous à Suse dans la couche datant de la fin de l’époque sassanide et du début de l’Islam.

Je signalerai aussi une particularité dans la technique d’exécution qui semble apporter un témoignage susceptible d’être versé dans ce maigre dossier. Il s’agit de la façon dont sont traités les quatre petits oiseaux du second bol. L’une de leurs pattes est en relief tandis que la seconde, la plus éloignée du spectateur, est simplement gravée sur la surface du bol. Une technique semblable dans le traitement de l’oiseau se retrouve sur une coupe en argent de Zalesie (Hongrie). Nandor Fettich qui lui a consacré une très importante étude arrive à la conclusion, par comparaison avec la coupe de Paternus trouvée en Russie du Sud, à Malayà Pereshtepina, et datée de 518, que cette façon de traiter la perspective devient une technique byzantine depuis le début du VIe siècle de notre ère. Certes, notre bol n’est pas une œuvre byzantine, mais l’échange entre les deux pays dans le domaine de l’art était constant, ce qui peut de supposer, soit que cette technique venait de la Perse, soit qu’elle fut par elle imitée. En acceptant cette hypothèse, nous proposerons donc, sous toute réserve, pour notre argenterie, le début du VIe siècle comme terminus post quem.

Passons maintenant aux inscriptions et voyons si elles sont susceptibles d’apporter quelque témoignage en faveur de ou contre cette attribution.

Inscriptions.—Chacune des trois inscriptions est gravée en pointillé sur deux lignes; celles des deux premiers bols semblent être de la même main, la troisième faite par une personne différente; par son texte aussi, celle-ci diffère légèrement des deux autres (fig. 15, dans le texte).

Inscription i. Zarasp ūn hormizd hazarnēsaē
2ēš haē 300 + 3 (Z)W(Z)W snē
“Propriété de Hormizd (fils de) Zarasp hazarnēsaē. Coupe de 306 drachmes.”

Fig. 1—Bol No. 1. Dessin d'Ensemble.

Fig. 2—Bol No. 1. Vue d'Ensemble.
Fig. 3—Bol No. 1. Joueuse d'un Instrument à Vent.

Fig. 4—Bol No. 1. Danseuse à Castagnettes.
Fig. 5—Bol No. 1. Joueur de Hautbois.

Fig. 6—Bol No. 1. Joueuse de Mandoline.
FIG. 7—BOL NO. 2. DESSIN D’ENSEMBLE.

FIG. 8—BOL NO. 2. VUE D’ENSEMBLE.
Fig. 9—Bol No. 2. Danseuse à Castagnettes.

Fig. 10—Bol No. 2. Joueuse d'Instrument à Vent.
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Fig. 11—Bol No. 2. Joueuse de Mandoline.

Fig. 12—Bol No. 2. Joueuse de Hautbois.
Fig. 13—Bol No. 3, Vue d'Ensemble.

Fig. 14—Deux Fourchettes en Argent.
ARGENTERIE D’UN SEIGNEUR SASSANIDE

Inscription 2. Zaraspán hormizd hazarnēšač χ'εš hač 200 + 70 + 4 Z(W)Z W snē “Propriété de Hormizd (fils de) Zarasp hazarnēšač Coupe de 274 drachmes.”

Inscription 3. Hormizdē hazarnēšač. χ'εš-i hač 200 + 2 ZWZW MAŅE PZ (ou PN) snē “Propriété de Hormizd hazarnēšač Coupe de 202 drachmes pour la maison.” (?)

Pour la première fois dans l’histoire des collections sassanides, on se trouve en présence d’un ensemble qui porte une même attestation prouvant que tout le lot appartenait à une seule personne. Qui pouvait être ce personnage? Le texte dit qu’il est hazarnēšač ou celui “qui est à la tête des cavaliers lourds”, autrement dit qui est à la tête des cavaliers lourds. Le terme, sauf erreur, se rencontre pour la première fois. Serait-ce un qualificatif, et dans ce cas désignerait-il un grand seigneur qui, comme Sourena de la bataille de Carrhae, armait ses propres cavaliers, probablement les nobles ses vassaux? Ou bien était-ce le titre d’une charge, comme celui de hazarāft que portrait le spahbadh d’Iraq,7 ou un autre seigneur qui aurait été le commandant en chef sous Kavadh (?)8.

Quoi qu’il en soit, Hormizd était certainement, soit dans la hiérarchie des dignitaires, soit dans celle de la noblesse persane, un personnage important. Son nom patronymique dit qu’il est fils de Zarasp ou Zariasp (“celui qui monte les chevaux dorés”), nom pas très répandu, semble-t-il. On connaît un Zarasp qui avait la charge des finances sous Khosroès I.9 Les sources ont conservé le souvenir d’un certain nombre de Hormizd de la fin de la période sassanide: l’un qui, défendant Khosroès II, combattit Bahram Chobin;10 d’autres commandants militaires ou grands de l’Empire, tués ou faits prisonniers en combattant les Arabes,11 Rien de certain ne peut être tiré en faveur d’une identi-

Fig.15—Inscriptions sur Trois Pièces d’Argenterie Sassanides.

6 Je crois que la lecture mānē pat sinē n’est pas impossible. Dans ce cas, il faudrait rapprocher ce passage de l’inscription sur le plat de Xerxès, cf. E. Herzfeld, Altpersische Inschriften, Berlin, 1938, p. 43, No. 19 “pour la maison” (?).
7 A. Christensen, L’Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhague, 1936, p. 514.
8 F. Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, Marburg, 1895, p. 128 et 88.
9 Ibid., p. 382.
10 Ibid., p. 8, No. 24.
11 Ibid., p. 9, Nos 27, 29, 31.
fication du propriétaire de notre petit “trésor”, bien que l’époque à laquelle appartenaient le père et le fils pouvait être le VIe et la première moitié du VIIe siècle.

Le troisième bol devait, semble-t-il, servir couramment et quotidiennement, tandis que les deux autres faisaient, probablement, partie de la vaisselle d’apparat, réservée aux banquets et réceptions. Ceci semble se confirmer par l’objet lui-même: son exécution n’est pas l’œuvre d’un grand artiste, et sa qualité est de loin inférieure à celle des deux premiers bols. De plus, son état prouve une grande usure qui a fait disparaître, comme dans le cas du décor de son omphalos, presque complètement le sujet.

Le mot “drachme” ZWZW est transcrit de trois façons différentes, pleinement sur le troisième bol, mais WW sur le premier, et ZZ sur le second. Quant au dernier mot de chacune des inscriptions, sa dernière lettre, à haste horizon-

THE COMPOSITION OF SOME ANCIENT PERSIAN AND OTHER NEAR EASTERN SILVER OBJECTS

BY RUTHERFORD J. GETTENS*
AND CLAUDE L. WARING**

Silver was used by early civilized man for a variety of purposes, but chiefly for the making of ornaments for personal use, vessels for votive offerings, memorial plaques and funerary utensils, tableware, and coinage. Much early history of civilization is reflected in the silver artifacts that have survived in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and ancient Persia. Curators and collectors have often wondered how pure this ancient silver is, what the chief alloying metals are, and what are the minor impurities, and if these impurities in any way reflect the period and place of origin of objects. It is obvious that any answer to these questions must rest on findings on the analytical composition of a large number of items whose provenance and age are known with certainty. This is difficult. Only a small proportion of the silver objects that have survived from antiquity have been found in scientifically conducted archaeological excavations. Most of them are simply the loot from grave robbing; probably only a few have known histories. These objects of unknown provenance can be dated only on stylistic grounds or by inscriptions. The most accurately datable silver pieces are coins that bear the heads of dynastic rulers or the memorial dishes with scenes that show the activities of recognizable royal personages. Not only is the datable silver scarce, but there is the added problem of obtaining from precious and intact museum specimens samples sufficient for quantitative chemical analysis.

There is a dearth of "study material" that can be freely tested for scientific purposes.

In the collection of the Freer Gallery of Art there are, fortunately, several notable early silver objects from Persia and neighboring countries. Perhaps chief among these is the gilded silver plate of the Sasanian period with relief design showing King Shapur II (A.D. 303 to 379) hunting wild boar. There are other objects whose date and provenance must rest entirely on stylistic attributes. In addition to the Freer pieces, it was possible to obtain samples from important early Persian silver objects in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore, in the Dumbarton Oaks collection in Washington, and elsewhere. Analysis of these pieces by the wet methods of classical quantitative chemical analysis was out of the question because of the labor involved and also because of the large sample (0.1 gram minimum) that would be required. Fortunately, because of special circumstances, it has been possible to carry out semiquantitative spectrochemical analysis on a number of objects from samples that weigh 0.01 gram or less. Although this spectrographic method tells us only the order of magnitude of each chemical element present, and not its precise amount, as in the wet method, yet it gives us most of what we want to know and in much less time. In addition, it provides qualitative and quantitative information about trace impurities not obtainable by the wet method.

The samples were obtained in a number of ways. On certain fragmentary objects it was only necessary to break off with pliers tiny specimens from a broken edge; from whole and intact objects sufficient sample material was

* Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
obtained from drillings made into rims or thick areas with a small steel drill. Some of the drill holes were plugged with silver wire and the spot concealed by burnishing over. The samples were carefully inspected under a microscope to see that they contained no foreign material. The analyses were made in the spectrographic laboratories of the U.S. Geological Survey in Washington.

The analytical findings are shown in Table I. The 28 objects listed are divided into historical or stylistic chronological order if possible. Group I is a single pre-Sasanian piece. Main interest centers around the datable Sasanian pieces of Group II. Silver coins of that period are included in this group because they are among the most accurately datable silver objects available. Group III objects are dated Sasanian only on stylistic grounds; those in Group IV are Persian, but post-Sasanian. Group V consists of Byzantine hallmark silver of the sixth and seventh centuries A.D., which is of interest for comparison purposes. Group VI is made up of odd specimens including even one of modern sterling silver; these are also of interest for comparison purposes.

There are no startling or unusual findings. All the specimens of silver analyzed (with the exception of the one of modern sterling silver) seem to contain the normal impurities that would be expected in silver produced by methods of early metallurgy. Lead and copper occur in greatest abundance and they may be considered the chief impurities. Silver, copper, and lead ores are commonly associated in nature. Much of the silver that has been produced since ancient times is derived from argentiferous galena (lead sulfide) which commonly contains admixed silver sulfide minerals in amounts of less than 1 percent. In most of these silver specimens lead and copper are found in the range 1 to 10 percent. The amount of both of these elements left in the silver depends upon the amount in the original ore and the amount removed by any refining process to which the silver was subjected. This process will be treated later. In the bracket 0.1 to 1.0 percent, gold and bismuth are the most commonly found combination. There is a reason for this which also will be seen later. Most other impurities reported in amounts below 0.1 percent can be explained as those that occurred in the lead-silver ore or that were picked up in the smelting and refining process from hearth materials, laddles, ingot molds, or possibly even from the tools and dies used to fashion the silver.

There is no evidence from these few data that the silver produced in one period is different from that made in another. There is nothing that points to any region of origin. There is no suggestion that coin silver differs from the silver of artifacts.

**DISCUSSION**

The objects of Sasanian origin have their provenance in a region that scholars seem to agree was the birthplace of metallurgy. R. J. Forbes, eminent historian of technology,
says that "Archaeology and classical tradition alike point to the region of northeastern Persia and beyond as the homeland of the oldest metallurgy, whence it came at a very early date in prehistory." The metallurgy of gold, copper, silver, lead, and iron all seem to have been developed in that broad region south of the Caspian Sea and between the Taurus Mountains on the west and the Hindu Kush to the east. Silver and lead first appear in the excavations of Mesopotamia about the same time in the early third millennium B.C. The Sumerians were accomplished workers in silver as well as gold. There were abundant galena deposits, rich in silver, in Armenia and northeastern Asia Minor and Forbes says that archaeological evidence points particularly to this region as the place where metallurgy of silver originated.

The metallurgy of silver and the craft of silverworking was at least 3,000 years old at the time of the Sasanian period, but the methods of mining and of winning the metal from its ores had perhaps changed little from the beginning; in fact, primitive methods of silver metallurgy have been used up to the present time and no doubt are still employed in remote regions. To get rid of the sulfur, lumps of the argentiferous lead ore were roasted in a simple hearth furnace or sloping trench. Alternate layers of ore and charcoal made up the charge. After ignition, air was supplied by a natural draft or artificial blast. In the first stages lead monoxide and lead sulfate were formed, which in turn reacted with unoxidized lead sulfide and carbon monoxide to form crude lead-silver alloy; this collected in a pool at the bottom of the hearth or ran down the trench into molds to harden into ingots.

Since time immemorial the silver has been separated from the lead by a process which is called cupellation. A cupel (L. cuppa, cup) was

4 This process of refining silver by burning out the lead has been mentioned or described by many writers on the arts and sciences of the ancients. R. J. Forbes (in History of technology, ed. C. Z. Singer, E. J. Holmyard and A. R. Hall, Oxford, 1954, vol. 1, p. 576) says the process was probably invented in northeast Asia Minor by the first half of the third millennium B.C. and that by 600 B.C. the process was well known. That this is true is clearly indicated by the several metaphorical references to the "drossing" of metals and "trial by fire" in the Old Testament. (Psalms 12:6; Ezekiel 22:17-22; Proverbs 17:13; 25:4; Jeremiah 6:27-30; Zechariah 13:9; and Malachi 3:2-3). J. R. Partington (Origins and development of applied chemistry, London, 1935) mentions cupellation refining of silver many times in his treatment of the beginnings of metallurgy in all the ancient civilizations from Egypt to Persia. He recalls (p. 405) that Herodotus (Bk. IV, 166) tells of Argandes, Persian governor of Egypt, who minted such pure silver that he incurred the jealousy of Darius, who put him to death. Pliny (Historia naturalis, Bk. 33, sect. 31; Bk. 34, sect. 47) describes the cupellation process only briefly. The mining and smelting of argentiferous lead ores and the drossing of the lead to separate it and other impurities from silver was probably carried on with little change in method down through the centuries in the civilized areas between North Africa and eastern Asia. The Arab alchemists of the Middle Ages were familiar with the art of cupellation and the process of parting gold and silver with nitric acid (see E. J. Holmyard, Maslama al-Majriti and the Rutbatu'i Hakim, Isis, vol. 6 (1924), pp. 203-305; also A. S. Ehrenkreutz, Extracts from the technical manual on the Ayyubid Mint in Cairo, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. 15 (1933), pp. 427-447). The method of refining silver in the imperial mint of the Emperor Akbar, which was done by melting the impure metal with lead in cupels of wood ash, is clearly described in the Šīr-i Akbari by the sixteenth-century historian Aḥmad Fazl Ḥallāmī (cf. Aṣāʾir i Akbarī, English tr. from the original Persian by H. Blochmann, Calcutta, 1873, vol. 1, pp. 22-25). Steps in the process of melting and refining both gold and silver are illustrated by line drawings in plates 1 to 3 of this translation.

In Europe the cupellation refining of silver was developed into a large-scale metallurgical operation. The process is described in great detail and with illustrations by those two well-known sixteenth-century writers on metallurgical subjects, the Italian Vannoccio Biringuccio and the German Georgius Agricola (see the Pirotechnia of Vannoccio Biringuccio,
a small shallow vessel or the hearth of a small furnace used especially for the refining of silver and gold. It was made from a mixture of bone ash (also sometimes wood ash), marl, and magnesia, or any material that would remain porous at high temperatures and not fuse with molten lead oxide. After charging with lead rich in silver (or gold) the cupel was heated in a charcoal fire until the lead was melted. A blast of air was introduced with bellows which oxidized the lead and other base metals but not the silver. The molten dross of yellow lead oxide (litharge), together with the other metal oxides (copper, tin, etc.) was absorbed by the cupel to leave a pool of nearly pure silver in the center. Lead oxide fuses at a comparatively low temperature and it assists in the removal of the other higher-melting and more refractory metallic oxides from the silver. Any gold, however, was retained with the silver. Bismuth metal was difficult to oxidize, hence silver refined by cupellation often contained bismuth along with gold as a secondary impurity.6

The presence of gold and bismuth as the major impurities in the bracket just below copper and lead in many of the silver specimens analyzed has already been noted.

Search has produced no other spectrographic analyses of ancient Persian silver, either of the Sasanian or contiguous periods, with one exception, and that is from a Russian source7 where there is reported a single spectrographic analysis made on a boat-shaped cast-silver vessel roughly of the Sasanian period, found at Bartyn in 1947. In this analysis the chief impurity was gold, but there were, in addition, traces of silicon, manganese, bismuth, and aluminum. Again bismuth is a conspicuous heavy-metal impurity in ancient silver.

From the historical period that preceded the Sasanian we have the recent report of Caley8 on the composition of Parthian coins. Caley and coworkers employed the wet methods of classical quantitative chemical analysis, which, of course, allow more precise determination of major and minor components but do not even identify qualitatively the trace-element impurities. These investigators present the analyses of 22 silver drachms and 7 silver tetradrachms issued over a period covering five centuries. The results are reported in percentage composition to hundredths of a percent. The eight elements reported are silver, gold, copper, tin, lead, iron, nickel, and zinc. Copper is the chief impurity and in these coins it had a wide range, from about 5 to about 75 percent. Copper content is so high in the coins of some periods that

7 V. N. Bader, Bartynskolja Chasha, K SII MK, Akademia Nauk SSSR, vol. 22 (1949) p. 85. This information is derived from the report on Recent Russian literature on newly found Middle Eastern metal vessels, by Salomea Fajans, Ars Orientalis, vol. 2 (1957) p. 55.
Fig. 1—Bowl, Attributed to the Sasanian Period (No. 9 of Table).
(Courtesy Walters Art Gallery.)

Fig. 2—Plate, Attributed to the Sasanian Period (No. 10 of Table).
(Courtesy City Art Museum of St. Louis.)
Fig. 3—Fragmentary Plaque (No. 11 of Table).

Fig. 4—Bowl (No. 12 of Table).

Figs. 3 and 4 attributed to the Sasanian Period.
(Courtesy Dumbarton Oaks Collection.)
it is obvious that the silver coinage issued during the reigns of certain kings was debased. Copper, however, probably was not introduced into the silver as a pure metal, but resulted from the smelting of lead ore high in copper as well as silver, and the copper was only partially or very little removed in the refining process. In these silver Parthian coins the average percentage of gold is 0.33, which is much higher than in modern silver coins but is about in line with ancient silver in general. The percentage of tin is not high numerically, ranging from about 0.1 to 3.5 percent, but it is high for ancient silver. Probably most of the tin in Parthian alloys was introduced along with the copper.

Caley points out that a fairly constant small content of lead is almost always present in ancient fine silver, apparently as a residue from the imperfect cupellation of argentiferous lead. In the series of coins analyzed it varies from a trace to a maximum of 2.65 percent. Iron in ancient silver is small, usually less than 0.1 percent. Nickel is normally not associated with ancient silver. If present, it is usually carried in with copper. The same is true with zinc. Caley does not report on the detection or estimation of bismuth.

Caley further calls attention to the fact that the ancient Greek metallurgists were able to produce silver of exceptional fineness. He lists the analyses of six silver Greek coins which range from 99.07 to 99.48 percent silver with lead as the principal impurity.

Eleven analyses of the metal in a twelfth-century silver shrine in Belgium are reported by P. Coremans. The average composition in percent calculated from the 11 specimens analyzed is: Ag 92.83, Cu 4.35, Au 0.79, Pb 0.53, Ca 0.10, Zn 0.69, Sn 0.02, Fe 0.05, S trace. Also, unfortunately, bismuth is not reported.

SUMMARY

In closing it can be said that even though the spectrochemical data presented here are limited, yet they do supply us with some additional and important compositional data on several of the finest and most ancient pieces of Persian and Near Eastern silver in American collections. The conclusions may be summarized as follows:

1. The principal impurities of ancient silver are lead and copper, although in two instances zinc is in greater amount than lead.

2. The intermediate impurities are gold and bismuth. In 13 out of 28 pieces gold and bismuth occur alone in the 0.1- to 1.0-percent bracket. Thus, gold and bismuth occurring in amounts of the same order of magnitude seem, in a way, to characterize ancient silver even more than do the presence of copper and lead.

3. The spectrochemical estimate of composition clearly shows that the hallmarks on Byzantine silver do indicate fairly high-quality silver.

4. Coin silver seems to have the same general composition as silver plate.

5. The minor and trace impurities are abundant, but there is no great variation in minor impurities in specimens that span the time period between the beginning of the Christian era and the Middle Ages, or in objects from widely separated sources; hence, there is nothing to suggest that either the particular historical period or the place of origin of any of the silver objects studied can be inferred from composition.

These few pieces of ancient silver can now better serve as reference objects for comparison with new finds or with unstudied material in other collections. In respect to the ever-recurring problem of authenticity of ancient silver, these analyses furnish some additional criteria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and group</th>
<th>Description of object*</th>
<th>Period, ruler or reign dates**</th>
<th>Owner and accession number†</th>
<th>Over 10 percent</th>
<th>1–10 percent</th>
<th>0.1–1.0 percent</th>
<th>0.01–0.1 percent</th>
<th>0.001–0.01 percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I</td>
<td>Heavy bowl or boss with high relief decoration</td>
<td>Bactrian</td>
<td>F.G.A. 45-33</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>Zn Sn Al Ni Si</td>
<td>Cr Mg</td>
<td>Ti Fe Bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Sasanian Ardashir I A.D. 224–241</td>
<td>F.G.A. Study Coll.</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>Zn Sn Al Ni Si</td>
<td>Cr Mg</td>
<td>Ti Fe Bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Sasanian Shapur I A.D. 241–271</td>
<td>F.G.A. Study Coll.</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi Sn</td>
<td>Si Zn Al Ca Fe Ni</td>
<td>Mg Ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 IIa</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Sasanian Bahram I A.D. 273–276</td>
<td>F.G.A. Study Coll.</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Sn</td>
<td>Ni Si Fe Zn Al Bi</td>
<td>Mg V Ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Sasanian Yazdegerd I A.D. 399–420</td>
<td>F.G.A. Study Coll.</td>
<td>Ag Cu</td>
<td>Au Pb</td>
<td>Bi Al Si Fe Ca Ni</td>
<td>Zn Mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 IIb</td>
<td>Repoussé bowl, double layered</td>
<td>Sasanian, head of Bahram III A.D. 293–?</td>
<td>S. Eilenberg Coll., New York</td>
<td>Ag Cu Zn</td>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Si Ni Al Ca Au</td>
<td>Bi Mg Sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bowl – appliqué figures of hunting scene – gilded</td>
<td>Sasanian Shapur II A.D. 309–379</td>
<td>F.G.A. 31-23</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>Bi Al Sn Si</td>
<td>MgTi Fe Cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Sasanian</td>
<td>W.A.G. 57,709</td>
<td>Ag Cu</td>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi</td>
<td>Fe Sn Al Ca Si</td>
<td>Mg Ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boat-shaped bowl (fig. 1)</td>
<td>Sasanian</td>
<td>W.A.G. 57,625</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Si Sn Al Fe Ni</td>
<td>Mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Plate – bird design (fig. 2)</td>
<td>Sasanian</td>
<td>C.A.M. 134:54</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi</td>
<td>Si Al Fe</td>
<td>Cr Mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 III</td>
<td>Plaque with griffin (fig. 3)</td>
<td>Sasanian 5th century</td>
<td>D.O. 38:13</td>
<td>Ag Cu Zn</td>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Bi Al</td>
<td>Si Au Ni Fe Sn</td>
<td>MgAl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bowl with center boss (fig. 4)</td>
<td>Sasanian (?) 5th–6th century</td>
<td>D.O. 13:3</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi Zn</td>
<td>Fe Ni Si Sn</td>
<td>MgAl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mask</td>
<td>Post-Sasanian</td>
<td>D.O. 52:9</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi Zn</td>
<td>Fe Ni Sn</td>
<td>Mg Al Si</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bowl with spread eagle 11th century</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>F.G.A. 50.6</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Al Ni Fe Zn Au Co</td>
<td>Si Sn Bi Mg Cr Mn Ga</td>
<td>Mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 IV</td>
<td>Rosewater bottle Persia</td>
<td>F.G.A. 50.5</td>
<td>Ag Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi Sn</td>
<td>Fe Si Mg Al Ca Fe Si</td>
<td>Al Mg Sn Ni V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Inlay in brass basin (Arenberg) Syrian 13th century</td>
<td>F.G.A. 55:10</td>
<td>Ag Pb</td>
<td>Au Cu</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and Near Eastern silver objects, and from a few objects of later cultures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and group</th>
<th>Description of object*</th>
<th>Period, ruler or reign dates**</th>
<th>Owner and accession number‡</th>
<th>Over 10 percent</th>
<th>1–10 percent</th>
<th>0.01–0.1 percent</th>
<th>0.001–0.01 percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Flabellum (repoussé) 4 hallmarks</td>
<td>Constantinople 6th century – Justin II A.D. 565–578</td>
<td>D.O. 36.23</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Au Cu</td>
<td>Si Fe Ca Al Ni Bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fragment of a plate with Silenus. 5 hallmarks</td>
<td>Constantinople 6th century – Justinian A.D. 527–565</td>
<td>D.O. 51.20</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi</td>
<td>Fe Si Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Paten – repoussé and gilt traces of hallmarks</td>
<td>Constantinople 6th century – Justin II A.D. 565–578</td>
<td>D.O. 24.5</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>Si Bi Ca Al Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Candlestick or lampstand, hallmarks on base</td>
<td>Constantinople Late 6th century (Found Antioch, Syria)</td>
<td>D.O. 38.83</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>Si Sn Zn Al Bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Paten 5 hallmarks</td>
<td>Constantinople 7th century – Heraclius A.D. 610</td>
<td>D.O. 51.24</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi</td>
<td>Si Al Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Paten 5 hallmarks</td>
<td>Constantinople 7th century – Heraclius A.D. 610</td>
<td>D.O. 51.23</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Paten with hallmark</td>
<td>Constantinople 7th century – Heraclius A.D. 610</td>
<td>D.O. 51.31</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Chalice with hallmark</td>
<td>Constantinople 6th century – Justinian A.D. 527–565</td>
<td>D.O. 55.18</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi</td>
<td>Al Si Ba Ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Shrine (St. Gertrudes) Coin (8 reales)</td>
<td>13th century Nivelles, Belgium 1767 Peru</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Au Bi Pb</td>
<td>Zn Si Sn Al Si Al Bi Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jewel box German hallmark 800</td>
<td>19th century U.S.N.M. 311.639</td>
<td>Ag Cu —</td>
<td>Fe Pb</td>
<td>Au Bi Si Sb Ni Al</td>
<td>Zn Sn Ba Mg V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sterling silver wire</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu —</td>
<td>Si Zn Pb Al</td>
<td>Ti Sn Fe Mg Cr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for comparisons. They show, in general, what the composition of the silver in ancient objects is in respect to major impurities, minor impurities, and trace elements. Unfortunately, they do not, alone, supply us with incontrovertible criteria for determining age and provenance. We still have to base judgment of authenticity on many kinds of criteria which may include, besides style analysis, mode of fabrication, evidence of use and wear, metallographic history, patina, and accretions. It may be remembered that some time ago Dr. H. J. Plenderleith,12 using diversified technical criteria of this kind, concluded that there was no reason to doubt the age or genuineness of a silver object which he had given searching examination.
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All the Byzantine silver objects will be described and illustrated in the Byzantine section of the forthcoming catalogue on Dumbarton Oaks objects being prepared by Marvin C. Ross.
NEW FINDS OF ANCIENT GLASS IN NORTH AFRICA

BY RAY WINFIELD SMITH

There have been many finds of ancient glass in North Africa. For example, numerous specimens of sand-core ware, a type of vessel molded freely around a removable sand or clay core, have been uncovered in the area. Fossing's listed examples of these early objects, ranging from the seventh century B.C. into late Hellenistic times. They were found at (or were reported in the museums of) Constantine, Philippeville, and Carthage.

The frequent glass finds in North Africa from the Roman centuries have included a number of preeminent objects. As early as 1874 Héron de Villefosse was able to build an entire article around a group of three splendid glass cups which had been found separately in Algeria. Two rare painted specimens bore a gladiatorial scene and a composition with birds amid foliage, respectively. The third carried a Greek inscription in mold-blown relief. Other Roman glass finds have been reported from Morocco, Sidi el Hani (Tunisia), Hadrumetum (Tunisia), and elsewhere. In the hinterland of the North African coastal areas, also, ancient glass has been uncovered. It has been asserted, for example, that glass beads imported from Carthage have been found throughout the Sahara and as far as Nigeria. Glassware from the Roman period, stemming from finds in the Fezzan, can be seen in the Museo Coloniale, Rome, as well as in Tripoli. The most important of the Rome group is a painted cup on which the design includes a bird, an animal, and other decoration.

The accomplishments of glass factories in the late Roman period are well represented in North Africa by a bowl with a Christian scene, found at Carthage and now in the Musée Alaoui du Bardo at Tunis. This superior object exhibits certain characteristics which seem to set it apart from cut bowls with Christian scenes found elsewhere.

The mere fact that ancient glassware has been found in North Africa would not justify du Bardo, in Tunis, similar to the specimen from Algeria (Héron de Villefosse, op. cit.).

1. P. Fossing, Glass vessels before glass-blowing, Copenhagen, 1940.
2. Ibid., pp. 106, 108 (from Collo), 111 (from Numidia), 117, 120.
3. Ibid., p. 106 (from Cirta).
4. Ibid., pp. 37, 57, 66-67, 72, 91, 93.
7. D. B. Harden, Syria, vol. 24, fasc. 3-4 (Paris, 1949), pp. 291-292 (addenda and corrigenda to Harden, Two tomb-groups of the first century A.D. from Yehmour, Syria, and a supplement to the list of Roman-Syrian glasses with mould-blown inscriptions, Syria, vol. 24, fasc. 1-2, 1944-45, pp. 81-95). Harden's reference is to an inscribed cup in the Musée Alaoui (Tunisia), and elsewhere. In the hinterland of the North African coastal areas, also, ancient glass has been uncovered. It has been asserted, for example, that glass beads imported from Carthage have been found throughout the Sahara and as far as Nigeria. Glassware from the Roman period, stemming from finds in the Fezzan, can be seen in the Museo Coloniale, Rome, as well as in Tripoli. The most important of the Rome group is a painted cup on which the design includes a bird, an animal, and other decoration.

The accomplishments of glass factories in the late Roman period are well represented in North Africa by a bowl with a Christian scene, found at Carthage and now in the Musée Alaoui du Bardo at Tunis. This superior object exhibits certain characteristics which seem to set it apart from cut bowls with Christian scenes found elsewhere.

The mere fact that ancient glassware has been found in North Africa would not justify du Bardo, in Tunis, similar to the specimen from Algeria (Héron de Villefosse, op. cit.).


the conclusion that it was made there. In fact, most of the finer specimens are of types that are well known from finds in other areas, and at least some of them were probably imported. Most authors on glass history in antiquity have ignored North Africa as a producing area, or at the most they have dismissed the matter summarily as a vague possibility. (The literature is full of references to glass exports from Egypt to North Africa, all based on surmise.) Marquardt, however, postulated a Carthaginian industry, which he asserted to have been transferred to the city from Tyre. Actually, nothing is known of the origins of the glass industry at Tyre. The Carthaginian industry could very well have antedated any glassmaking at Tyre, or possibly an ancient industry at Tyre had ceased to function before the art was introduced at Carthage. Marquardt’s version, therefore, may be nothing more than anachronistic speculation.

The key to research on ancient glass made in North Africa probably lies within the commonplace ware scattered through numerous local museums of which there have been published a number of catalogues, inaccessible for the most part to scholars outside the area. If glass was made at all in a given area during the early centuries of the art, unpretentious objects were almost certainly produced, but not necessarily superior ware. Technological methods can probably now spot the output of any group of factories using a common formula of identical raw materials.

Fortunately, there is a piece of direct evidence of glassmaking activity during classical times in North Africa. A rarely mentioned gravestone of an infant boy, found in Algeria, identifies in a Latin inscription his father, Antas, as a vitrarius. On the basis of architectural details of a temple showing on the stone, as well as features of the inscription, this Mauretanian artisan’s activity has been placed in the late first century, A.D. A more indirect indication of glassmaking, at Carthage, is provided by the celebrated sepulchral stone (pl. 1, fig. 1) of Julius Alexander in Lyon, which is attributed to the third century A.D. This man is described as a glassmaker and a civis carthaginensis, with further details which, taken together, permit speculation that there was a virile glass industry in his home city.

The paucity of finds in North Africa from the immediate post-Roman centuries may be accepted as evidence that the glass industry was retrograde, as it was in the Rhineland, Gaul, Italy, and for that matter, probably in Egypt and Syria. There is no reason to think that it died out, however, and at the end of the eighth century the glass quarter of Kairouan was explicitly mentioned. Although conceivably the reference may have been merely to a section of the city where sales shops were concentrated, it appears that glass factories in current operation were meant.


14 This information was obtained from the Director of the Archaeological Museum of Algiers by U.S. Consul Merritt N. Coates.

15 Trowbridge, op. cit., pp. 114–115. Mr. Donald B. Harden has kindly called attention to a fragment of a crucible which he saw in 1933 in the museum on the site of the Punic sanctuary at Carthage. He was told that the crucible, of which he has a good sketch, was found “on the shore at Carthage.” Fused millefiori glass, still present on the interior, seems a good indication of the object’s antiquity.


17 As Kairouan was founded in the middle of the seventh century, it is possible that the name was a carryover for a quarter where glass had been earlier made.
ANCIENT GLASS IN NORTH AFRICA

93

When Lamm wrote his monumental work on mediaeval glass and cut stones from the Near East, he was able to say very little about glass manufacturing in North Africa. He knew nothing of an industry in Morocco or Tripolitania, and merely surmised that glass was made in Tunisia, because ancient reports had it that certain sockets, in which the pivots of the ponderous city gates at al-Mahdiyah turned, were made of this material. Lamm concluded that such massive objects would have been too heavy to import into Tunisia. He also thought that certain finds of window glass at Qal‘at Banî Hammâd were products of factories in Algeria or Tunisia.

Otherwise, there has been little speculation on glassmaking in North Africa during the early Islamic centuries, except for a few references by primarily local scholars to inscribed dénégros. These medallion-like objects are of great archaeological importance, because they bear inscriptions containing the names of caliphs and other important individuals, frequently well known to permit a close dating. Occasionally such an object carried the explicit date of its manufacture. They do not reveal the place of manufacture epigraphically, however, and speculation in this field will usually remain tenuous until other approaches are explored. Fortunately, it will now be possible to determine the chemical compositions of glass weights and vessel stamps by advanced technological methods. When this has been done for the most numerous group, those of Egyptian provenance, norms can be established against which the less numerous specimens from other areas can be compared, with fair prospect that regional compositional differences will appear.

* * * * *

It is manifest that the early history of glassmaking in North Africa has not yet been more than superficially explored, and as a result no real attempt could have been made to place this branch of the ancient industry in perspective with respect to the world industry during the centuries from the early Islamic period back to glass origins. Against this backdrop of uncertainty, accordingly, the archaeological world will welcome a significant book recently published with important new material: Georges Marçais and Louis Poinssot, Objets kairouanais, IXe au XIIIe siècle, reliures, verrières, cuivres et bronzes, bijoux (Notes & Documents, Direction des Antiquités et Arts, Tunis, 1952, vol. 2, fasc. 2).

The first volume of Objets kairouanais presented an important series of bookbindings found together in disorder and neglect in a storeroom of the Great Mosque of Kairouan. The erudite treatment of this material gave a foretaste of the care to be devoted by the same authors in their analysis of other material covered in the present volume.

It may be expected that the glass now published in Objets kairouanais will generate particularly lively comment, if for no other reason than because there have been recent sensational finds of glass elsewhere, inaccessible to the authors but permitting further conclusions to


20 Drawing from their rich experience in the area’s ancient culture and history, as well as their wide acquaintance with comparable material and bibliographic sources, the authors have fortified their remarks with 370 useful footnotes.
be drawn with regard to their material. Before turning to a discussion of the newly found glass, however, it will be well to point out a certain doubt as to the validity of grouping the published objects of jewelry, bronze, and glass under a common denominator as restricted as the term “kairouanais.”

What the authors have intended to convey with this appellative is not clear. It appears not to be a label attaching to objects manufactured in Kairouan, strictly speaking, for the glass is considered by Marçais and Poinssot to have been made at Šabrah, which they go to some pains to describe as a separate city. But even if their concept of “kairouanais,” in the context of the title, were sufficiently broad to embrace Šabrah as a nearby city, it is difficult to accept this provenance as an established fact with respect to all the material they present.

There are further difficulties with a portion of the glass. We shall see that one of the two glass groups thought to be from Šabrah is made up predominantly of objects which were almost certainly produced long before the ninth century, the upper chronological limit of the book’s title.

The authors have been on solid ground in regard to the bookbindings and bronzes, for all the bindings and most of the bronzes were certainly found in Kairouan, regardless of where they may have been produced. The jewelry, however, was found many miles from that Ifriqian metropolis, under circumstances which prompt the authors themselves to question whether the local police were correctly informed and whether they accurately recorded the information given them when the find was seized. The authors assert that the elements of a necklace included in the jewelry are “sans doute” pre-Islamic. Nevertheless, they accept a connection with Kairouan for the treasure as a whole on the basis of the gold coins, the majority of which were struck at Šabrah-Manṣūrīyah (not Kairouan). This leads them to conjecture that the owner of the treasure was a faithful adherent of the distant Fatimid caliph. They speculate that he lived in the Kairouan “région,” and perhaps at Šabrah, being in precipitate flight and in fear of his life when he interred the coins and jewelry as a result of some sudden emergency. But the authors emphasize the “fragilité” of this hypothesis.

We have referred to the authors’ misgivings in regard to the stone and glass beads. If, as they think, these objects are of earlier date, the closed context of the treasure in the sense of a contemporary group is shattered. The authors advance another circumstance suggesting that the jewelry may be considerably older than the coins. It is emphasized that their condition as found strongly indicated that they were old items when hidden, and no longer in use. One could imagine various causes of confusion in this incident beyond those implied by the authors. For example, when the police descended on the local farmers to whom the young shepherd had turned over his discovery, the former, terrorized by the possible consequences of the event, may have disgorged objects with no internal relationship. If, in fact, there is any possibility that the jewelry and coins were not found together, deductions regarding the dates of the jewelry from the coin evidence are obviously not necessarily valid. In this case the connection of the jewels with Kairouan becomes even more tenuous.

The detailed examination of the Šabrah glass finds will be further deferred until we have made a short excursion to discuss the bronzes and jewelry. In both cases an indirect connection with our theme of ancient glass is involved.

The section on the cuivres et bronzes is the
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longest segment of the new volume. It is perhaps the most competently presented, as well. With the aid of excellent plates and text drawings, the authors cover a series of 15 lamps, all of which are early Islamic. They consist of three types: (a) *lanternes*, which illuminate in part through the interstices of a metal container; (b) *coronae lucis*, large platelike objects, usually made up of an ornamental ajouré pattern in which openings around the periphery are fashioned to receive the shafts of small glass lamps, each with its own supply of oil and a wick; and (c) portable hand lamps.

The four objects pertaining to *lanternes*, all found in the storeroom of the Great Mosque at Kairouan, include one in poor condition, but reasonably restorable, three fragments of another, and minor parts of a third and fourth. The eight *coronae lucis* all belonged to the Great Mosque. Three of them were found in the storeroom; five are still in use in the Mosque. The three hand lamps are property of the Musée du Bardo at Tunis, one of them reportedly found at Sabrah with Islamic cut glass, another said to have been found in the area, and the third from a local private collection. Thus, all three groups have a Kairouan context, although the hand lamps are only so related through the one ascribed to the adjoining city of Sabrah.

One is much impressed by the meticulous, scholarly manner in which the lamps are described and compared with similar objects elsewhere. All three types have a relationship to ancient glass. As the authors point out, the *lanternes* must have had a smaller glass container within them for the oil and wick. The *coronae lucis* were merely frames into which, it seems, glass lamps were usually inserted, and it could have been mentioned that copies of the hand lamps, or at least their Roman prototypes, were occasionally made in glass.25 The authors provide valuable references to glass inset lamps28 found with early *coronae lucis* at North African sites.

The important so-called “treasure of Tarabiyah”27 consisted of 82 gold coins, 2 bracelets, 6 triangular plaques, 3 ear rings, and 82 necklace elements. In addition to the foregoing jewelry, all of gold, there were 8 elements of a necklace in stone and glass.

The most interesting of the Tarabiyah jewels lead us again to glass. They are a group of six triangular gold pendants28 of noteworthy design and construction. The parallels cited as prototypes for these and the other jewels range in time from the seventh century B.C.29 to the Fatimid period,30 and even on into present-day North Africa.31 They embrace find spots as widely separated as southern Russia (Pantikapaion),32 Persia,33 Cyprus,34 Egypt,35 and Algeria.36

The relation of the Tarabiyah jewelry to glass is provided by a glass triangle (pl. 1, fig. 2) in the Damascus museum.37 This object was likewise seized by the authorities, after the group to which it belongs had been uncovered by clandestine diggers in tombs of the first

---

25 Specimens, for example, in the Römisch-Germanisches Museum in Cologne, and in the collection of the author of these lines.

26 Ibid., p. 440, footnote 2 (fig. 97); pp. 451-452. A palpable omission in *Objets kairouanais* is a reference to the most exhaustive and authoritative discussion of post-Roman glass lamps, in Grace M. Crowfoot and D. B. Harden, *Early Byzantine and later glass lamps*, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, vol. 17, pts. 3 and 4 (November, 1931). The development of the inset lamps for *polycandela* (*coronae lucis*) is well treated.

27 Ibid., p. 488.

28 Ibid., p. 481.

29 Ibid., p. 482.

30 Ibid., p. 481.

31 Ibid., p. 477.

32 Ibid., p. 481.

33 Ibid., p. 485.

34 Ibid., p. 488.


36 Ibid., p. 481.

37 Henri Seyrig, *Antiquités syriennes*, 53, *Antiquités de la nécropole d’Émèse (1er partie)*, Syria, vol. 29 (Paris, 1952), fasc. 3-4, pp. 204-250. The glass triangle was discussed at Seyrig’s request by the author of these lines (pp. 247-249) and is illustrated on pl. 27:8.
century A.D. on the site of ancient Emesa at Homs, Syria. The similarity to the Tarabiyah triangles (pl. 1, fig. 3) is unmistakable at a glance. In both cases the dominant feature of the design is the triangle, employed in an object of appreciable thickness. The arrangement of the subsidiary features, consisting of hearts and circles expressed by means of embedded elements and apertures, is almost identical, except that the central and apex positions of the heart and circular elements, respectively, have been reversed in the Islamic objects. The extent of the similarity, however, may be no longer fully apparent, for it is possible that the glass triangle originally had a metal frame with functional appendages for the attachment or suspension of further decorative features as on the Islamic jewels.

The use of gold mountings in connection with ancient glass is exemplified by a magnificent glass cup (pl. 2, fig. 4) in the State Historical Museum, Moscow, of approximately the same date as the Emesa finds. This vessel, found at Siverskaia, has a gold covering around the base, and another garnet-studded and otherwise richly decorated wide band of gold around the rim and over the handles. The numerous long braided gold chains carry at their extremities cornelians above tiny gold spheres. It will be noted that this object has other decorative details reminiscent of the Tarabiyah triangles. The Siverskaia find included evidence of several such sumptuous gold-mounted glass vessels, making it a discovery of unparalleled richness.

The similarity between the Emesa and Tarabiyah triangles inevitably raises the question of whether they may be contemporary. This would necessitate placing the gold triangles in the first century or the glass object in early Islamic times, unless they both occupy an intermediate position. The question cannot be dismissed in a cavalier manner. We have seen that the find circumstances of the Tarabiyah items are not entirely certain. Those surrounding the Emesa objects are no more so. In fact, as Seyrig points out, there are discrepancies concerning the tomb in which the glass triangle was found. Furthermore, the embedded glass spirals in this triangle, while a characteristic detail around the rims of early millefiori bowls, were again taken up at a late date. They appear in Scandinavia and Britain around the ninth century.

These uncertainties will be cleared up in time. A spectrochemical analysis of the Damascus triangle, for example, would almost certainly determine beyond question whether it is Roman or Islamic. Meanwhile, although we should keep an open mind on the question, there appears to be no reason seriously to doubt the first-century dating for the glass triangle and the early Islamic attribution for the jewelry. Despite the doubts regarding the Tarabiyah objects, the gold jewelry as a group makes a strongly coherent impression. All three ear pendants and the six triangles, for example, have flat, unadorned sides of unchanging width, ringlets of identical construction, and rectangular corners defined by twisted threads. That the group must be Islamic is convincingly demonstrated by the peculiar geometric taste with which the crescent elements of the pair of ear pendants are pieced together. The authors have rightly assessed our knowledge of early Islamic jewelry as meager. It now appears likely, as evidenced by the Emesa glass triangle and the Tarabiyah

40 Cf. Holger Arbman, Schweden und das carolingische Reich (Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, Fyrtiotredje Delen-Tredje Följen-Tionde Delen), Stockholm, 1937, p. 52, pl. 8:3. Dr. Holmqvist of the Statens Historiska Museum in Stockholm has kindly informed me that fragments from seven or eight glass beakers with reticelli decoration have now been found in Sweden, thus confirming the popularity of the decorative element as a late survival.
gold triangles, that some Islamic jewelry had a direct lineage approaching, if not reaching, a full millennium.

* * * * *

The largest group of glass⁴¹ presented by Objets kairouanais consists of 14 vessels apparently found at Šabrah-Manṣūriyah, which was founded in 947 by the Fatimid caliphs as their residence. This important city, immediately adjacent to Kairouan, was destroyed in the middle of the eleventh century. In 1922, workmen searching for bricks in the ancient ruins of Šabrah uncovered a ceramic jar in which were 14 glass vessels. The authors state that the inventeurs split the find into three lots, of which two were recovered and are now published. A glass carafe⁴² with cut design, now in the Bardo Museum, is believed to have come from the third lot, and is included with the published glass. The only object mentioned other than glass is a bronze hand lamp³⁴ stemming from one of the two initially recovered lots.

Assuming that the 14 pieces of glass constitute the whole find, they form a most remarkable group in one respect. All but two of them carry cut decoration. If they are not atypical of the period, therefore, they evidence an extraordinary popularity for this technique. Lamm,⁴⁴ commenting on the glass found at Samarra, considered it noteworthy that two-thirds of the specimens showed cut decoration and was certain that similar excavations in Egypt or Syria would not match this result. We do not know under what circumstances these objects had been collected and placed together in the jar. It is to be hoped that Marçais and Poinssot, with their intimate knowledge of the local circumstances, will still give us their best esti-

mate of the events which led up to the original assembling of this group.

It does not seem necessary to emphasize the possible doubts as to whether the 14 objects of glass were actually found at Šabrah under the circumstances described. They exhibit unmistakable characteristics of well-known types from the early Islamic centuries and give every appearance of being a coherent group. In the absence of direct evidence to the contrary, therefore, their Šabrah provenance should be accepted.

On the other hand, the Šabrah group by no means represents a complete cross section of glass-cutting accomplishment in the tenth century. All the work, with one possible minor exception, is hollow cutting, as contrasted with the more difficult and sophisticated pseudo-relief and full relief found in the finest examples of Islamic cut glass. This fact may have great significance, and it should not be overlooked that a group of Islamic cut glass without representatives of the highest order of competence has been found near the western end of the Islamic axis.

It would extend our article unjustifiably to comment on all individual specimens found at Šabrah, but certain observations are sufficiently important to be made at once. One-half of these objects are what the authors describe as carafes. They are representatives of a type which can be appropriately called “wide-angular bottles.” A substantial number of these have been found, and it is possible to distinguish two variants. The best specimens have straight sides and shoulders, with a fairly sharp corner separating the two profile segments.⁴² The weaker examples display convex lines and indeterminate, rounded corners. That all the Šabrah wide-angulars are weak specimens may indicate that the best work was not being turned out in North Africa,

⁴² Ibid., pp. 372, 385, No. 4.
⁴⁴ C. J. Lamm, Das Glas von Samarra (Forschungen zur islamischen Kunst, 2, die Ausgrabungen von Samarra, vol. 4), Berlin, 1928, p. 49.
⁴⁵ For a particularly sharp specimen with a large Kufic inscription cut into the side, cf. G. Faidere-Feytmans, Verres antiques de la collection Ray Winfield Smith (Musée de Mariemont), 1954, No. 323, pl. 7.
or that they were the product of a Śabrah shop not employing top-flight artisans. Perhaps, also, the best specimens are somewhat earlier than the Śabrah bottles.

The most important of the Śabrah wide-angular bottles (text fig. A) was until recently unique in carrying an elaborate design of large quadrupeds. A second specimen (text fig. B), probably found in Iran, has now appeared.\(^{47}\) Objets kairouanais\(^{48}\) identifies the quadrupeds on the Śabrah bottle as lions, although the authors emphasize the purely decorative character of these animals. They adduce numerous occurrences in earlier periods to interpret the scene. The horns and humps on the three animals of the Persian bottle identify them with bovines of an Indian species.

\(^{45}\) Marçais and Poinssot, op. cit., pls. 55, 58.

\(^{47}\) On permanent loan to the Corning Museum of Glass from the collection of the author of these lines, this object (RWS 1237) will be fully described in an article to appear in Ars Orientalis, vol. 3.

\(^{48}\) Marçais and Poinssot, op. cit., p. 380.

At the best, the zoological identity of creatures on Islamic cut glass is usually nebulous. The artist was drawing from animal life only in search of a decorative subject, and attached no importance as a rule to anatomical accuracy. In fact, he frequently added naturally impossible details, such as long scrolls growing out of foreheads, palmettes sprouting from backs, and other equally imaginative embellishments. Doubtless he claimed virtue in his phantasy. On the other hand, a rare group of Islamic cut vessels can be...
assigned to a naturalistic school, with marked attention paid to anatomic realism in some details. The authors point out that Kûfic inscriptions on Islamic cut glass frequently occur in such a highly stylized or decadent form that they have passed unrecognized. We are given their best shape a cut band of decadent Kûfic characters which runs only part way around the body. The Šabrah group provides no hint of the stylized Kûfic inscriptions which were sometimes placed in superb, sophisticated relief cutting on contemporary Islamic glass vessels.

estimates of the meaning carried by such symbols on two of the Šabrah specimens, including one of the wide-angulars. Two direct parallels can be cited to their inscribed wide-angulars. One is in the British Museum; the other was noted in 1935 in the Pelizaeus Museum at Hildesheim, Germany. Though probably not identical in the inscriptions to each other or to the Šabrah bottle, each shows on a wide-angular

\[7^{*}\]

We have indicated (p. 94) that another group of glass published in *Objets kairouanais* seems predominantly earlier than the founding of that city, and almost certainly cannot be wholly attributed to the early Islamic period. This group consists of nine vessels, purchased in Kairouan by the eminent scholar, H. H. Abdul-Wahab, whose contributions to the literature on the ancient history of his native Tunisia have been widely

\[5^{a}\] Some of these will be illustrated in the forthcoming article in *Ars Orientalis*, vol. 3.
appreciated. The *inventeurs* of the objects\(^{51}\) gave him certain information on the manner in which "*certaines de ces verreis*” had been placed in crevices (*anfractuosités*) in the *toub* or brick walls (at Sabrah) apparently contrived for this purpose. It is interesting to note that this information could be correct, strictly speaking, because three of the objects\(^{52}\) are clearly early Islamic. The other six, however, would have been extraordinary in a wall of ancient Sabrah, or even normally in any one spot, for they are much earlier than the tenth century, and almost certainly range considerably in dates.

The authors themselves cite numerous good parallels to the six pre-Islamic Abdul-Wahab vessels\(^{53}\) from periods antedating Islam. Noting\(^{54}\) that the matrices vary, that the appearance of the layers of decay is not constant, and that the decoration represents various techniques, they conclude that the group may have been made in as many as seven different shops at various times, and that some of them may have been importations from Egypt. Notwithstanding these observations, they accept the group as Islamic, apparently on the basis of the group’s discovery at Sabrah.\(^{55}\)

Actually, it is quite conceivable that all nine of the Abdul-Wahab group were found in the immediate vicinity of Kairouan and Sabrah. Kairouan, according to the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, was built in A.D. 670, "on-or very near the site of a small Roman town called Kamūnah or Kamūnia, the materials of which were used by the Arabs. ’’\(^{56}\) If the area remained inhabited between the fifth and seventh centuries, any type of glass from Roman to early Islamic could be encountered there. It is well known that most early Islamic glass is found in ancient refuse heaps or other places where it was discarded. If such a spot in Sabrah happened to be at a point of earlier habitation, the entire Abdul-Wahab group could have been discovered in quick succession, and almost together, with complete good faith on the part of the *inventeurs*.

In any case, the authors would have been justified in extending their observations on the heterogeneity of the Abdul-Wahab objects to a conclusion that six of the vessels are pre-Islamic. As we shall see, this precision is by no means to be regretted, for one of the group may represent an archaeological discovery of the first order.

To the Roman balsamaria\(^{57}\) cited by the authors as parallels to their Nos. 15–17, there is little to add, except that such balsamaria are already known from North African sites.\(^{58}\) While simple balsamaria were still made at later dates, the general shape of the Sabrah examples, and particularly the construction of the folded rim, bespeak a Roman date. Careful visual examination of these balsamaria might lead to a late Roman attribution, but an early Islamic date seems excluded.

The conical beaker (or lamp)\(^{59}\) with blue blobs (*pl. 2, fig. 5*) is correctly equated to a well-known fourth-fifth century type by the authors. It was used in the fourth century, both in the western provinces and in the eastern Mediterranean, but was apparently more popular in Egypt and Syria than in the West. Fragments of the type, for example, were found in great profusion at Karanis.\(^{60}\) It seems to have


The group is published as Nos. 15–23, pp. 374, 396–402, pls. 62 bis–62 quater.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., Nos. 18–20.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., Nos. 15–17, 21–23.

\(^{54}\) Ibid., p. 396.

\(^{55}\) This is the explicit justification for the three balsamaria, *ibid.*, p. 396, Nos. 15–17.


\(^{57}\) Marçais and Poinssot, *op. cit.*, p. 396, footnote 2.

\(^{58}\) For specimens in the National Museum at Tripoli, for example, cf. Gustavus Eisen, *Glass, its origin, history, chronology, technic and classification to the sixteenth century*, New York, 1927, vol. 1, pl. 66.

\(^{59}\) Marçais and Poinssot, *op. cit.*, No. 23, pl. 62.

\(^{60}\) D. B. Harden, *Roman glass from Karanis, found by the University of Michigan archaeological expedition in Egypt, 1924–1929* (University of Michigan studies, humanistic series, vol. 41), Ann Arbor, 1936, pp. 155–166, pls. 5, 16.
disappeared in the West earlier than in the East, and blob decoration (in a changed form) is of the greatest rarity in Frankish glass. After the fifth century the conical blobbed vessel seems not to occur, and nothing resembling it closely is known in Islamic ware. An undecorated conical shape with markedly concave sides became the most common beaker in Scandinavia during the ninth century, but it may not descend from the Roman blobbed conical type.

The Śabrah conical blobbed lamp is noteworthy in several respects. In the first place, it is not typical of the common Egyptian model. Harden reports no specimen from Karanis with blobs but without cut decoration. More important, the elongated tip and resultant profile concavity does not appear to have been reported from Egypt, Syria, or the Rhineland. A specimen with this feature, however, is said to have been found in Gaul. The Śabrah specimen is further exceptional in its mediocrity. The blobs are puny, unoriented, and applied in a casual, ungeometric manner. One blob was daubed on by itself in a meaningless spot. The object bears the earmarks of provincial work, or at least of a second-rate shop. It would be tempting to ascribe a somewhat later date to it were it not for the typical Roman flare at the lip and the rim thinness, reported as 1 mm. The latter detail bespeaks a sprung rim, quite typical of Roman ware.

The second Śabrah vessel with blobs (pl. 2, fig. 6) likewise presents problems. The technique reached its zenith in the West, probably in the Rhineland, where the finest specimens have been found. They are characterized by large blobs, usually occurring in two contrasting colors. Brown and green are a frequent combination, blue clearly being a second choice. A large proportion of the cabochoons are modeled to show an umbiliform relief. Horizontal cut grooves occur. No close parallel to the Śabrah bowl is reported, and indeed such a simple piece would look out of place among the sumptuous Rhenish examples, which include many large and diverse vessels.

Morin-Jean gives an excellent analysis of cabochoon vessels from Gaul. While the group is large, it lacks something of the luxuriousness of the Rhenish types. Nevertheless, we find the same large cabochoons in contrasting colors, frequently umbiliform, but with engraved bands perhaps less usual. The flat ground rim appears, and there are frequently bands of applied zigzag threads. A popular bowl form with cabochoons, found in Gaul, bears slight similarity to the Śabrah bowl, but it is not nearly so inclined, and the maximum diameter of the body usually equals or exceeds that of the rim. It is significant that blobbed bowls have turned up in Egypt only rarely, and then not in the Śabrah shape.

A series of 10 blobbed vessels, said to be from Śaydā' (Sidon), in the Gréau collection, may well give a cross section of Syrian accomplishment in this technique. In any case, the Śaydā'...
group includes two conicals, one round-bottom bowl, and seven intermediate shapes. Three of the vessels\textsuperscript{67} are very similar in shape to the Şabrah bowl. The Syrian specimens are decorated with blue cabochons only, appear to have flat ground rims, possibly inclined, carry incised horizontal bands in some specimens, and show a single horizontal row of blobs on three specimens.

It is clear that the Şabrah blobbed bowl resembles the Syrian specimens more nearly than those from any other area. It may be significant, however, that again we see a mediocre object. The description in \textit{Objets kairouanais} emphasizes that the scratched lines are thin and confused, a well-known index of decadence. This object also carries a single isolated cabochon, placed under the row of blobs. That this unusual, albeit not unknown, feature should occur in both the bowl and the conical lamp at Şabrah suggests that both were made in a local factory which had possibly adopted this eccentricity as a sort of factory mark. If so, the North African shop seems to have been influenced more by Syria than by Egypt in respect to this type.

* * * *

The next object chronologically among the Abdul-Wahab group, and certainly one of the most significant of all the items included in \textit{Objets kairouanais}, is the ribbed bowl (pl. 2, figs. 7 and 8).\textsuperscript{68} The importance of this vessel stems from its apparent identity with a well-known type of Frankish glass found in the Rhineland and Britain. In fact, unless there is some glaring difference in the appearance of the material which is unrevealed by the photograph, the Şabrah cup would probably be purchased unhesitatingly by collectors of such items in the West.

As far as is known, no ribbed bowl of the Şabrah type has been found elsewhere in North Africa or farther to the east. Its western counterparts form a segment of a family of Frankish bowls, called \textit{Tummler} by the German archaeologists, which includes broadly a number of shapes occurring both with and without decorative elements. Their pronounced instability has given rise to the German term, and this characteristic doubtless affords the etymologic basis for the English tumbler as well. We shall largely confine our discussion to the subgroup of \textit{Tummler}, usually with ribs on the sides, which have a cross design underneath.

Until an exhaustive search has been made for these objects, it will be impossible to gauge definitively their frequency or the distribution of their occurrence, but at least 26 specimens have been recorded. Subject to the vague descriptions and poor illustrations in the older publications, the following incomplete table has been tentatively prepared.

\textit{Group I. Cross in relief.}

A. Molded, tooled, or prunted arms. (Definition of prunt: a piece of ornamental glass, laid on a larger glass object.)

(1) With bosses in cross quadrants.

(a) Şabrah bowl (Marçais and Poinssot, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 400–402, No. 22, pl. 62 quater).

(b) Niessen collection (\textit{Beschreibung Römisccher Allertümer}, gesammelt von Carl Anton Niessen, third ed., Cologne, January 1911, vol. 1, p. 66, No. 1120; vol. 2, pl. 54. Introduction to glass by Siegfried Loeschcke). Twelve ribs, "grünlich," 7 cm. h. A boss is clearly visible at the cross intersection and another in one quadrant. Further bosses may be present, but are not recognizable in the illustration.

(c) British Museum, Inv. No. 1315:70, from Faversham. This specimen has four background bosses, a

\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Ibid.}, Nos. 794, 800, 802, particularly 802.

\textsuperscript{68} Marçais and Poinssot, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 400–402, No. 22, pl. 62 quater.
prominent intersection boss and three rather embryonic bosses at or near the extremities of three arms. (d) Henri Baudot, Mémoire sur les sépultures des barbares de l'époque Mérovingienne, découvertes en Bourgogne, et particulièrement a Charnay, Dijon-Paris, 1860, pl. 21:1. Found at Charnay, but no disposition indicated by Baudot. There are clearly four bosses in the interstices, and almost certainly another at the intersection of the arms. At least one cross arm, and very likely all four, end in converging extensions of two ribs. Possibly 16 ribs. Thickened rim. No surface decay. Probably greenish. Diameter probably between 72 and 115 mm.

(e) Baron J. de Baye, Le cimetiè re wisigothique d'Herpes, Charente, off-print from Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société Arch. et Hist. de la Charente, sixième série, vol. 1 (years 1890–1891), Angoulême, 1892, pl. 22:132. Found at Herpes, the author indicates no disposition of this object. Color not stated. The ribs, 12 or 16 in number, appear to be puny, particularly the two which continue across the bottom with a boss at their intersection. Four interstice bosses. Rim certainly thickened. No dimensions given.

(2) Without quadrant bosses. (f) Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Bonn, Inv. No. 35.453c, from Rödingen, Kreis Jülich. Our plate 4, figure 16. "Unverwittert, wie neu und unversehen." Bottle green. Many bubbles, rarely larger than 1 mm. Pontil mark. Rim fire rounded and thickened. Thickness at rim 4 mm., in middle 1.2–1.4 mm., bottom 5 mm. 9.6 cm. h., 6.9 cm. diam. Herr Haberey reports that the ribs of this exceptionally fine object, but not "das Kreuz und die Tropfen" are palpable on the inside. He considers that the cross design is not applied, but rather pressed in a mold, whereas the spherical Tropfen are in his opinion applied.

(g) Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Trier, from Welschbillig, inv. No. 33.1097 (a). Our plate 3, figures 9 and 11. Pontil mark. Cross mold blown and subsequently tooled. Virtually no weathering. "Olivbraun (sonigfarben), feines sehr blächenreiches Glas." Ribs show relief on both exterior and interior, mold blown. Rim fire rounded and thickened. 76 mm. h., 93 mm. diam.

B. Plain arms.

(f) With bosses in cross quadrants. (h) Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Bonn, Inv. No. 35.453, unknown provenance (Franz Rademacher, Fränkische Gläser aus dem Rheinland, Bonner Jahrbücher, vol. 147, 1942, pl. 56:3). Our plate 3, figure 14. Pontil mark. "Blaugrün." Herr Haberey reports that the heavy cross and four Nuppen are not applied, judging by certain surface indications, which he considers strong evidence that at least the lower portion of the vessel was fashioned in a mold. The cross arms are not palpable on the inner surface. Small depressions on the inside correspond to the bosses. Surface indications, he further reports, again indicate that the vertical ribs are not applied. They are palpable on the interior. 67 mm. h., 108 mm. diam.
(i) Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Bonn, Inv. No. 2502a, from Andernach. "Bernsteinfarben bis honigbraun." Cross in weak relief. Surface indications, according to Herr Haberey, show that the bottom was molded. Rim fire rounded and thickened. Pontil mark. Almost all bubbles considerably under 1 mm. 42 mm. h., 63 mm. diam.


(k) British Museum, Inv. No. 1316.70, from Faversham, Kent. "Unpublished, brown, rim folded outwards." 64 mm. h., 95 mm. diam.

(l) British Museum, Inv. No. 1317.70, from Faversham. "Unpublished, brown." Possibly a pair with (k). 64 mm. h., 89 mm. diam.


(n) Not preserved, but assumed to have been a pair to (m), according to the original entry in the Sloane catalogue in the British Museum, which speaks of two found at St. Martin's-in-the-fields.

(2) Without quadrant prunts or bosses.

(o) Worms Museum, from Worms (Mainzer Zeitschrift, vol. 35 (1940), p. 17, fig. 6:17). Possibly 24 ribs, "braun."

(p) Worms Museum, from Worms, ibid., p. 17, fig. 6:27. Possibly 12 ribs.

(q) British Museum, Inv. No. 65.12.14.r, from Coombe, Kent (Akerman, op. cit., p. 53, pl. 26). "Eight vertical loops, four being free and four joined by cross on base. Very bubbly, no weathering, green, thick glass." Rounded rim. 78 mm. h., 88 mm. diam.

Note: For a cup with six arms arranged as a star and with bosses between the arms, cf. Edouard Salin, Le Haut moyen-age en Lorraine, d'après le mobilier funéraire, Paris, 1939, p. 182, pl. 26:3, (a) and (b). Cf. Baudot, op. cit., p. 86, pl. 21:2, for a ribbed bowl which is too poorly illustrated to permit classification. The ribs appear rather strongly expressed, and there is a central boss, but otherwise the design remains doubtful. It is rather flaring at the rim, which is certainly thickened. There are possibly 12 ribs. No dimensions given.

Group II. Cross expressed as flat area between pattern of relief ribs.

(t) Landesmuseum, Trier, Inv. No. 37, 474 (b), from Zemmer. Our plate 3, figures 10 and 12. Matrix nearly identical with (q). "Olivfarbenes, honigbraunes Glas, sehr bläsenreich." Rim turned inward. Molded ribs show relief on both inner and outer surfaces. Pontil mark. Virtually no weathering. 78 mm. h., 88 mm. diam.

(s) Landesmuseum, Bonn, Inv. No. A 1020, from Saarbrücken (Rademacher, op. cit., pl. 55:3). Our plate 4, figure 18. "Blaugrünes Glas mit helleren Streifen." Pontil mark. Four bosses, one at the junction of each of four sets of three ribs. The 12 ribs, in high relief toward the
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bottom, are also in relief on the inner surface. Bosses not palpable on inside. Fire rounded and thickened rim. Virtually no weathering. 70 mm. h., 97 mm. diam.

(t) Liverpool Museum, Inv. No. 6401, from Kingston Down, Kent (Bryan Faussett, Inventorium sepulchrale, London, 1861, p. 69, pl. 18:4). “Greenish yellow, lower part of body blown into a ribbed mould, pontil mark.” 76 mm. h., 89 mm. diam.

(u) Liverpool Museum, Inv. No. 6513, found with (t). (Ibid., p. 69. Greenish yellow with purple streaks, shape as (t), but not same mold. Not certain that design is as in previous item. Six-fold faint opaque white spiral trail at rim, mostly weathered away. Pontil mark.) 83 mm. h., 114 mm. diam.

(v) Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Bonn, Inv. No. 39.1297, from Siersdorf. Our plate 4, figure 17. Published by W. Kersten in Jahresbericht, 1939/1940, Bonner Jahrbücher, vol. 146 (1941), p. 388, pl. 63:1. “Honigbraunes Glas.” Pontil mark. Herr Haberey reports that surface indications suggest the bottom was fashioned in a mold. Rim fire rounded and thickened. This object presents a divergent cross design, somewhat difficult to interpret. While the form of the vessel and other details seem to place it clearly with the other members of our Group II, it does not have the unbroken surface of the cross between an outline of ribs. Perhaps in this case the glassmaker conceived the four expanding arms of his cross as having median lines in relief, terminating in bosses short of the intersection. Liverpool 6401 (“t” above) seems to have median ribs on the cross arms, but a sketch provided by Mr. Harden does not indicate that they terminate in bosses.

There are several specimens69 which either fail to coincide with any of the foregoing groups or cannot be firmly classified in the absence of clear descriptions.

The foregoing classification has been established in some cases from sources which could not be verified, and from older publications in which inaccuracies are endemic.70

69 (w) From Minster, Thanet, now lost (J. Douglas, Nenia Britannica, London, 1793, pl. 17:4).

(x) From Clery (C. Boulanger, Trois cimetières mérovingiens, Bulletin Archéologique, 1907, pl. 6:5).

(y) Metropolitan Museum, Inv. No. 17.191.360. Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, whose collection of Merovingian glass was said to have been found at least predominantly in France. The design, achieved by blowing into a bipartite mold, consists of an undeciphered inscription and geometric ornamental fields, with a cross design of exceptional character on the bottom. Wide rectangular arms, defined in outline relief, are cut by median relief lines intersecting at the center. In the angles of the arms are inaccurate rectangles, from the outer corners of which ribs radiate. (According to a sketch provided by Mr. Harden, the two items described above from St. Martin’s-in-the-fields had a somewhat decadent version of this design.) Bubbly blue-greenish glass. Apparently pontil mark on bottom. 89 mm. h., 99 mm. diam.

(z) De Baye, op. cit., pl. 22:133. Information sketchy. Twelve ribs. Center boss and four others at arm extremities. Rim thickened. There are two ribbed bowls with cross ornaments in the British Museum from Herpes, but it has not been determined whether they are our (e) and (z).

70 In view of these difficulties, particular thanks are due those who have supplied photographs for our illustrations and precise descriptions of a number of the objects. Mr. Donald B. Harden of the Ashmolean Museum has made available his complete notes on the
The general picture shown, however, must be true.

On the basis of our list, the distribution would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhineland and lower Mosel</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaul</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noteworthy that there is scarcely a single good parallel to the Šabarāb bowl from Gaul. All the elements in the bowl appear elsewhere in various combinations, but none, with the possible exception of the Niessen bowl, has the five cross bosses and four in the quadrants. (The illustration of the latter vessel is not clear, and it is by no means certain that nine bosses are present.)

* * * * *

The following possibilities are contained in the appearance of the Šabarāb ribbed cup in Tunisia: (a) Made in antiquity in Gaul or the Rhineland, and excavated there in modern times, it found its way through trade or collector channels to Tunisia; (b) made in the West, it was exported in antiquity to North Africa, where it was excavated in modern times; or (c) it was made in North Africa, Egypt, or Syria in antiquity.

Other possibilities, such as the object’s being a modern forgery, seem remote, though they are not excluded, and will not be further considered at this time. We shall presently see that the evidence justifies serious consideration for both (b) and (c). The arrival in North Africa of this object in the sixth or seventh century from western Europe would have been possible, though quite unusual, as a result of many sets of circumstances. The British Museum, for example, has somewhat earlier Merovingian-type jewelry from a Vandal grave in Algeria. We shall devote considerable attention, however, to the less obvious possibilities of (c). Absolute certainty on this point can no doubt be reached through the technological approach, including chemical analysis of the Šabarāb bowl and a comparable one of unquestionable Western provenance. In any event, the implications in the phenomenon are so important that they must be considered, although it would be the rashest irresponsibility to draw firm conclusions hastily on the basis of one object whose discovery in the Tunisian area is not even certain.

Assuming for the moment that the Abdul-Wahab bowl was actually found at Šabarāb or in that area, and that it was not made in the Rhineland or Gaul, its appearance suggests two provocative possibilities: (a) All the Tummler of this type found in the West were imported from an eastern source in antiquity; or (b) the type was made in both areas, in which case the Šabarāb bowl could be the eastern prototype of the Frankish ribbed Tummler.

To accept (a) would suggest doubting the local origin of any Frankish glass, a proposition so drastic that it cannot be entertained without more cogent indications. Continued relations between the Frankish glass industry and those to the south and east, however, are not only possible, but probable, and as we shall presently see, there is strong evidence that Frankish glass was subject to morphological and stylistic impulses from the East. 71

71 The authors of *Objets howiouanais* report (op. cit., p. 402) that the Šabarāb bowl is without the slightest
It seems advisable to defer our final judgment on these matters until we have investigated certain aspects of Christian symbolism and other considerations raised by the ribbed Tummeler. One could dispense with an examination of symbolism if it were possible to assume that the ornaments are merely decorative, with a purely fortuitous resemblance to a Christian symbol. As a matter of fact, there has been a marked tendency on the part of modern students of Frankish glass to avoid involvement with these matters. Rademacher, who gave us a scholarly study of great merit on Frankish glass,\textsuperscript{72} has only to say of specimens in the Bonn Landesmuseum, one of which has a strong cross and four (?) prunts (pl. 3, fig. 14), that the ribs terminate underneath "in einem meist kräftig vortretenden Ornament aus knopfartigen trace of decay. This is typical of Frankish glass, and may reveal a compositional affinity between Frankish ware and that of a factory in North Africa or beyond.

A thorough technological examination of the Frankish ribbed Tummeler and of the Sabrah bowl, with a view to establishing the differentiation, if any, would begin with a meticulous visual study of the objects. No sketch, not even the best photograph, can reveal the fine points which may be decisive. It is not sufficient to know that a rim is "rounded," or even that it is "fire rounded and thickened." There are wide differences between areas of manufacture in respect to the same general type of rim. If one looks at them with understanding, it is possible to visualize the glassmaker's tools, and the manner in which he manipulated them.

Mere descriptive words do not reveal the distinctions between a free-blown and a mold-blown object, or molded as against trailed decoration. Objects must be weighed, thicknesses measured accurately and at enough points to establish gradients. Pontil marks must be observed and exact bubble patterns noted in order to recognize the way in which an object was fashioned. Colors have to be measured scientifically. And finally, an object should be analyzed spectrochemically, by X-ray fluorescence, or by other advanced methods, if enough for a conventional chemical analysis cannot be spared.

\textsuperscript{72} Fritz Rademacher, \textit{Fränkische Gläser}, p. 393, with reference to pl. 56:3 (our pl. 3, fig. 14) and pl. 55:3 (our pl. 4, fig. 18).

Erhöhungen und gekreuzten Wulsten." His views on any symbolism are accordingly not clear.

The best analysis of Christian symbols such as monograms and crosses on ancient glass is by Fremersdorf,\textsuperscript{73} who devoted no attention to the relief crosses on the Frankish ribbed bowls. Earlier authors, on the other hand, have recognized and discussed Christian symbols on Frankish glass. In an article\textsuperscript{74} devoted to that specific subject, Pilloy discussed mold-blown Frankish bowls with monograms of Christ and other symbols, but did not seem to be aware of the ribbed type with the ornaments presently concerning us.

That the ornaments on the bottom of our ribbed bowls were deliberately placed for an important mission, or at least that they were initially so conceived, should be obvious, if only because they are usually quite distinct from the purely ornamental ribs and sometimes much more strongly expressed. Beyond that, however, a look at contemporary Christian symbolism will remove any lingering doubt on this score. It is not in the West that the clarification is best sought. To be sure, bosses superimposed on a rectilinear cross, as well as in the quadrants, are found in Frankish art elsewhere than in the glass context. But such ornaments are frequent-

\textsuperscript{73} Fritz Fremersdorf, \textit{Christliche Leibwächter auf einem geschliffenen Kölner Glasbecher des 4. Jahrhunderts} (Beiträge zur älteren europäischen Kulturgeschichte, vol. 1, Festschrift für Rudolph Egger), Klagenfurt, 1952, p. 76, fig. 12. Fremersdorf was interested in a Roman glass beaker with a cut scene in which 6-pointed star ornaments appear. He gives numerous references to prove that the monogram of Christ was often simplified into 8- and 6-pointed stars. He mentions (ibid., p. 77, fig. 13) the simple rectilinear cross on fourth-century coins, stating that it sometimes occurs with four points in the quadrants, but asserts that it is questionable whether the cross was actually intended, or merely a $\chi$ for the first letter of $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\chi$. The later Frankish ribbed bowls would have had no immediate relationship to his Roman beaker.

\textsuperscript{74} J. Pilloy, \textit{Études sur d'anciens lieux de sépultures dans l'Aisne}, Saint Quentin-Paris, 1912, vol. 3, pp. 67-97. (Pilloy's chapter, \textit{Les verres Francs à emblèmes Chrétien}s was written in 1896.)
ly no more definitively Christian on internal evidence than they are when found on glass.\textsuperscript{76}

When one observes the indubitably Christian character of these symbols in the East, on the other hand, and the richness with which they are expressed, the realization grows that the use of the symbols in the West is distant, figuratively and literally, from their inspiration-al source. One of the best parallels to the elaborate ornament on the bottom of the Šabrakh bowl is found on a fine Coptic stole or orarion,\textsuperscript{78} earlier in the Simkhovitch collection, but now in the Worcester, Mass., Art Museum (pl. 5, fig. 19). On this object of intense religious feeling, showing the Virgin, Christ, and the Apostles, there are prominent cross symbols between individual figures. Here are the four quadrant dots which have been replaced in one case by forthright Greek letters of unmistakable Christian meaning. The crosses themselves present further embellishment in the form of eight externally attached bosses, grouped in pairs at the corners of the four arm extremities.\textsuperscript{77} It seems possible that these represent the jeweled cross, and that they suggested the simplification to cross arms consisting solely of bosses as on certain decorated Tummler. A further parallel in Coptic textiles with an arrangement of bosses remarkably similar to that on the Šabrakh cup was published by Holmqvist.\textsuperscript{78} Mr. Karl Katz has kindly given details of numerous objects in the Coptic Museum, Old Cairo, with designs similar to that on the Šabrakh bowl.

It will facilitate our examination of these questions to consider the use of glass lamps in the sixth and seventh centuries. The Šabrakh ribbed bowl is so classified in Objets kairounais.\textsuperscript{79} We shall see that there are grounds for agreeing with this attribution. Crowfoot and Harden\textsuperscript{80} demonstrate for a large group of Merovingian cross symbols, cf. Baude, Mémoire, pp. 155, 156, pl. 27:6 (our pl. 4, fig. 13). Found at St. Sabine in 1849, this disc was of staghorn with inset gold medallions, of which the central one had disappeared. Baudot was not able to state the whereabouts of this eminent object, which will be of the greatest significance for any thorough study of Christian symbolism in Frankish art. It is as though the goldsmith decided to present a complete catalogue of decorative cross forms. It is to be noted that despite the use of a precious metal, the symbols are distinctly barbaric, in one case downright distorted (medallion at 0 o'clock position). One recognizes the affinity to the various cross ornaments on Frankish Tummler.

Of particular interest is the medallion in the 3 o'clock position. Were it not for the unmistakable context, one would pass the ornament off as purely geometric. But the design is clearly a cross of bosses, as found on certain Tummler, with four interstice bosses, all arranged in a most primitive fashion. It is essentially a degrading of the elaborate design on the Šabrakh bowl, to the heights of which this Merovingian goldsmith was seemingly incapable of rising.

\textsuperscript{76} John D. Cooney, Pagan and Christian Egypt, Egyptian art from the first to the tenth century A.D. (exhibited at the Brooklyn Museum), Brooklyn, 1941, p. 84, No. 264 (pl.). Also: Marvin Ross, Early Christian and Byzantine art (an exhibition held at the Baltimore Museum of Art, organized by the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, 1947), p. 136, No. 792, pl. 111. It is almost certainly significant that the peculiar cross design on the Morgan bowl in the Metropolitan Museum is also paralleled in a Coptic textile. Cf. our footnote 69.

\textsuperscript{77} For the precise meaning of the quadrant bosses is not clear. Speculation has ranged from the four Evangelists (Marcel Jungfleisch, Les dénoueurs et estampilles Byzantins en verre de la collection Fröchner, Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte, vol. 14, Cairo, 1932, p. 248, fig.) to drops of blood. For the latter, and for a hypothesis that such symbols represent the vision of Constantine, see Eisen, Glass, its origins, etc., pp. 407-408, 473, 536, pl. 145, figs. 191, 197, 241, 248. While the quadrant bosses almost certainly had Christian significance in Coptic art, they may still have had an earlier pagan origin.

\textsuperscript{78} Holmqvist, Kunstprobleme der Merowingerzeit (Kungl. vitterhets historie och antikvitets akademiens handlingar, fyrtiogunde delen, tredje följden fjortonde delen) Stockholm, 1939, pl. 9:7. Holmqvist attributes the fragment to the seventh century.

\textsuperscript{79} Marçais and Poinset, Objets kairounais, p. 490. The authors consider that their ribbed bowl (as well as the blobbed bowl) was suspended singly in a ring, whereas the conical beaker was used as one of the lamps in a corona lucis.

\textsuperscript{80} Grace M. Crowfoot and D. B. Harden, Early Byzantine and later glass lamps, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, vol. 17, pts. 3 and 4 (November 1931).
strate that not only the conical blobbed vessels, but also simple bowls with rounded bottoms, were used as lamps. Their descriptions of the methods by which these lamps were hung, either singly or in the multiple coronae lucis, and the means for arranging the oil and wicks, are lucid and convincing. They see a “possibility, if not a probability that some, at least, of the specimens (i.e., conical vessels and subsequent developments) from the West were used as lamps.”

No opinion, however, is expressed on the use of rounded bowls as lamps in the West, and there is no reference to the possible use of Frankish Tummler as lamps. Christian symbols on lamps are not mentioned, except that early (i.e., Roman) “shallow bowls with Christian scenes cut out on them” are thought possibly to have served as lamps in churches.

There can be no doubt that the cross was profusely associated with Christian lamps in the post-Roman centuries, for a number of the metal coronae lucis have it as the prominent central ornamental element. Two published in Objets kairouanais are from Egypt (used until recently at the ancient convent of St. Anthony) and Palestine (in ruins of St. Peter). They are attributed to the sixth-seventh centuries, precisely the presumed date of the Sabrah ribbed bowl. This bowl would fit very well into a metal frame, and its size would make it suitable for use either as a singly suspended lamp or less probably in a corona lucis. The similarity of its shape to a glass lamppion found in the ruins of a sixth-century church at Asabaa in Tripolitania may not be entirely accidental. Furthermore, the introduction of relief elements on the bottom would have increased instability and would therefore have been disadvantageous for almost any use other than one involving suspension, whereas unstable forms are shown by Crowfoot and Harden to have been popular as lamps. Placed directly between the flickering flame and an observer below, the cross and bosses on the bottom of a lighted lamp would have been particularly effective.

If our Tunisian ribbed bowl was indeed a lamp, used originally at the site of Sabrah, it is interesting to contemplate that quite conceivably it could have been above ground when Kairouan was founded in A.D. 670. For that matter, if there had been continued occupation from the Roman period and a Christian edifice was still there, the lamp could even have been in place in a church.

If the glass lamp with a Christian symbol is entirely logical for North Africa of the sixth-seventh century, it is every bit as logical that the type would have found its way to the Rhine-land, Britain, and Gaul. An important trade in Coptic bronzes of this period has been demonstrated. It brought such articles from Italy directly northward to the Rhineland and on into Britain. Bronze coronae and glass lamps could have come in this way, and it is interesting to note that the find spots of the closest parallels to our Sabrah bowl are apparently predomi

81 Ibid., p. 200. Glass lamps of the fourth-fifth century are reported to have been excavated by Father de la Croix at Poitiers. Cf. Ch. Rohault de Fleury, La messe, études archéologiques sur ses monuments, vol. 6, Paris, 1888, pp. 5, 13, pl. 438, in which the author shows a glass lamp in place in a bronze corona, apparently borrowed as a lamp type from that found at Poitiers. This volume includes other valuable references to illumination equipment and practices in the fifth-sixth centuries.

82 Ibid., p. 203.

83 Marçais and Poinsot, op. cit., pp. 452-454, figs. 106, 107. It is not surprising to observe that ecclesiastic authorities in the sixth-seventh centuries were associating the cross with their church lamps, as the custom was firmly rooted in the earliest Christian traditions.
nantly in the same two destination areas. But there are other possibilities. Holmqvist describes the unzähliche groups of pilgrims which traversed the Mediterranean toward the Holy Land. He emphasizes that the monks and pilgrims often went on from Palestine into Egypt to visit the cloisters, and that they did not return enriched solely by religious experiences, but brought back all manner of oriental Kulturprodukte, relics, textiles, etc., which were of immeasurable significance for the subsequent development of the arts in the Occident.

On the basis of Holmqvist’s portrayal, one could imagine the quiet satisfaction of one of the pioneer monks, who, solicitous for his home church, brought back the first glass bowl with a sacred symbol for installation in the modest Christian edifice of his Frankish community.

Certainly there was a requirement for church lamps in the West. The surprising number of churches at that early period is well documented. Likewise, the use of glass lamps was specifically attested in various ways between the seventh and ninth centuries. The most descriptive contribution, possibly as late as the early ninth century, is the story of a “brother,” who was busy washing the glass lamps in a church at St. Gallen, when another brother brushed some of the lamps with his garment, knocking them to the pavement.

Some information on glass lamps in the seventh century is provided by the Venerable Bede, who reported that S. Benedict Biscop, first abbot of Wearmouth, sent to Gaul for glassmakers in A.D. 675. The text must be read closely. The artisans not only provided and installed the windows, but “caused the English people thereby to learn and understand this manner of handicraft, which was well adapted for enclosing the lanterns of the church, and for the vessels required for various uses.”

Bede seems to have been reporting that the “lanterns” (not necessarily of glass) in the church were “enclosed” by glass containers. This would have been logical, for it is known that the relatively primitive edifices of the period did not always exclude the wind, which caused trouble by blowing out the lamps. The “enclosed” lamps could have been a pair of glass objects, an inner bowl for the oil and wick, protected by a second glass item. In speaking of the vessels required for “various uses,” Bede may have had in mind several uses to which glass vessels were put within the church, as well as secularly.

Moreover, we may be certain that the Venerable Bede was better able than ourselves to observe, although we can still appreciate the phenomenon, that the glass lamps could and indeed did serve other purposes. We have seen that conical and rounded shapes were used as


Our English translation has been provided by Bernard M. Peebles of the Catholic University in Washington, D. C. Dr. Peebles has made a careful study of the text and previous translations, and proposes certain modifications as the most likely interpretation to make the passage more accurate and meaningful in English. He has also given his advice on various difficult points which are raised by this illuminating text.
lamps. It would be absurd to assume that such simple containers were not put to other uses as well, and the exclusion has never been seriously advanced. Early illuminations (pl. 5, fig. 20) portray, likewise, the use of glass lamps with a stemmed foot. This is a beaker form and it possibly did double duty in the church. While unstable forms, as we have seen, were frequently used for lamps, the footed lamp could advantageously be removed from its mounting and set firmly on a table surface for cleaning, refilling with oil, or other manipulations.

In any case, it is clear that the glassmakers of seventh-century Gaul were skilled in the art of making hollow ware (i.e., glass lamp equipment), as well as flat window glass. The passage


84 There is good reason to conclude that wide, rounded Frankish shapes were a standard type of lamp. A century after the Bede story, an illumination (our pl. 5, fig. 21) executed in the South of England (ca. 770) shows a seated figure reading(?) a volume underneath a wide, round-bottomed bowl that is suspended by a three-way chain. Cf. Zimmermann, *op. cit.*, pl. 297. Cf., also, Ernst Kitzinger, *Early medieval art in the British Museum*, London, 1935, pl. 36, for what looks very much like a simple wide Frankish *Tummler* with a portrait of St. Luke in a tenth-century Byzantine gospel. An ingenious cord and pulley arrangement made it possible to raise and lower this lamp by a connection which ran over to the wall.

It may well have been such simple Frankish *Tummler* used as lamps which inspired the seventh-century poet Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, just after the close of the century, to compare the "*lanterna vitrea*" with "*aurata lucerna*" in terms, according to Dr. Peebles, which made it clear that metal lamps were considered superior to those of glass. Cf. *De Virginitate*, 209–213 (ed. R. Elwald, *Monumenta Germaniae historica, auctores antiquissimi*, vol. 15, Berlin, 1919, p. 361f.). Later in the same poem, in telling of a Bishop Narcissus who changed water into oil, urgently needed in the sanctuary, Aldhelm has occasion to refer to pendent glass lamps (*ibid.*, lines 907, 912, 918, p. 392).

sage would make no sense at all unless the "lanterns" at least included glass elements. Before the continentals imparted the art to England, they could have been inspired by imports from the south and east, judging by the evidence we have cited. Glassmakers from the Orient, moreover, may well have been located in seventh-century Gaul.

All this suggests that ribbed bowls with relief crosses on the bottom may have been introduced to the West from the East. If so, possibly some of them were installed in Frankish churches, whereupon the local factories began to copy them, in view of the lively demand. Judging by the number of them found and the vagueness of many specimens, they probably became secularized, even vulgarized, and in the end the original deep Christian symbolism seems to have been dimmed. The foregoing chain seems

85 According to Albert Ilg, writing in L. Lobmeyr, *Die Glashütte, ihre Geschichte, gegenwärige Entwicklungen und Statistik*, Stuttgart, 1874, p. 8, "Greek" glassmakers came to France 12 years after the Bede incident in A.D. 687. Ilg did not give his authority. A conceivable reference to the arrival of eastern glassmakers at Trier in the middle of the sixth century is contained in the well-known report, according to which Bishop Nicetius, unable to recruit locally, brought "artificers" from Italy. Although these men may have been merely workmen for construction projects, it is a fact that a recognizable upswing in the higher arts occurred at this time in the Rhineland.

86 This in no sense implies that the ribbed bowl with Christian ornament was the first type of Frankish glass lamps in churches, or that it was exclusively used at any time.

87 The instability of these vessels for drinking purposes was circumvented, as Rademacher (*op. cit.*, Bonn. Jahrb., vol. 147, p. 303) points out, by the homely expedient of holding the bowls in the hand while being filled and until emptied, after which they were set down bottom side up. He visualizes the deliberate placing of the symbols on the under side as insuring their visibility in this position. It is possible, however, that having been placed underneath for visibility on lamps, the symbols were already there when the lamps were put to use for drinking purposes. In this case, the position of the symbols increased the vessels' instability and encouraged the custom correctly described by Rademacher instead of resulting from it.
to be a theory well suited to explain the probable appearance of the Ṣabrah bowl in North Africa and to dispel perplexity caused by the absence (?) of glass lamps in Frankish finds. If it is correct, we have simply not recognized Frankish glass lamps as such when they have been found. Let us by all means test the hypothesis carefully against all available facts and any forthcoming evidence.

The foregoing suggestions run counter to the prevalent tendency of ancient-glass students to consider post-Roman glass in the West as a retrogression to be studied in the light of its local Roman antecedents and the new Germanic impulses, but isolated by virtue of the changed political circumstances from any continued Eastern influence of consequence. Rademacher, for example, speaking of the possibility of Egyptian, Syrian, and Byzantine influences in Frankish glassmaking, concluded in general terms that such influences were neither confirmed by literary sources nor by the objects themselves.

In the 13 years, however, which have ensued since Rademacher's work was written, indications have appeared that the Frankish glassmakers were still responsive to Eastern initiative. This is not the place to discuss certain Frankish decorative features which can be found in post-Roman glass from the Eastern Mediterranean, or to point out that changes in style which have been attributed to Germanic taste are equally manifest in Eastern ware.

It might be argued that the frequency of the ribbed bowls with Christian symbols in Frankish finds and the absence of them (except possibly for the Ṣabrah bowl) in Coptic finds, for example, makes the Eastern origin unlikely. On the contrary, Frankish glass has been found in relative profusion because the Franks placed objects in their graves. The Copts, on the other hand, eschewed this practice, and almost no Coptic glass of the sixth and seventh centuries has been found. This is a classic example of circumstances which can cause a very spotty representation in the survivals of ancient glass from the various periods in the history of the art.

It does appear, however, that the time has come to reappraise our views on the derivations of Frankish glass. Certainly we can no longer agree with Kisa, who discussed Christian symbols on the immediate predecessors of Frankish glass and concluded that Christian-barbarian art created in these objects a Symbolik which was entirely independent of oriental and Italian influences. It seems probable that a careful sifting of all evidence will demonstrate beyond question that early medieval glass in Western Europe (until after the advent of Venice) was strongly influenced, if not dominated, by oriental impulses throughout.

* * * * *

The last three Ṣabrah vessels here examined show a noteworthy coherence. The conical beaker, as we have seen, is related to the blobbed bowl by a peculiar feature of the blob decoration. The latter, in turn, is not far removed in shape from the ribbed bowl. One can imagine a development in this order: first the conical shape, which became truncated into the blobbed bowl, and later, by steepening the profile, into the ribbed bowl. The rim construction would fit this pattern, the first two pieces having the Roman-type rim and the third a thickened rim which we know on Frankish glass. All three could well have been made within a century, say from the late fifth to the late sixth, and they may well be local production. Two of them seem glass-technically closer to Syrian than Egyptian models. The symbolism of the ribbed bowl, however, reflects Coptic art. Perhaps this group represents, on Tunisian soil, a synthesis of influences coming from both oriental sources.

2 The Islamic ninth-century cup cited as a parallel to the two Ṣabrah bowls (Marçais and Poinsof, *Objets kairenaïs*, vol. 2, p. 401), shows only a vague similarity in form. It is a well-known Islamic type, decorated in an entirely different technique.
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ANCIENT GLASS IN NORTH AFRICA

The final three members of the Abdul-Wahab Šabrah group\(^3\) should occasion no surprise, for they are common types of Islamic ware fully explainable at a tenth-century site.

We have seen that *Objets kairouanais* reveals an important series of glass which appears to range from the Roman period to the tenth or eleventh century. There is no reason to conclude that any of it was necessarily imported, and there are some slight indications which possibly point to local manufacture. The series, therefore, may represent the output of a local industry which operated uninterruptedly through eight centuries or more. All these questions could be, and indeed should be, given further careful study.

*Objets kairouanais* will inevitably focus attention on the role played by North African glass centers at various periods of glass history. The volume expands in a direct way our knowledge of the subject for Islamic times, because we are told\(^4\) of factory wasters found in profusion near the point in Šabrah where the cut glass was found, and of a glass oven still in existence at al-Mahdīyah (Zouila) which was operating in the tenth or eleventh century. Other indications of glass manufacture at this period are cited from literary sources, and the author of these lines is grateful for having been alerted to several references which he has used earlier in the present article.

Perhaps it is also possible without further delay to discuss purposefully the question of glassmaking in North Africa at earlier periods, albeit in a narrow context. There is no reason why Carthage may not have been one of the various centers at which late sand-core glass was turned out in the second half of the first millennium B.C. In any event, the Julius Alexander gravestone (*pl. 1, fig. 1*) makes it most probable that Carthage was a glass center in Roman times. This stone, however, has never been considered in terms of the relationships which it may convey between the Carthaginian industry and that of Gaul. For this it is necessary to examine the inscription\(^5\) carefully.

Julius Alexander is specifically called *opus ex artis vitriae*, a native of Africa and a citizen of Carthage. It is most likely that he learned his trade at Carthage as a young man, and since his children all appear to have been with him at Lugundum (Lyon), he probably lived most of his adult life there. It seems that he was an estimable citizen, for his gravestone is of substantial size and good quality, and the fact that three sons and a daughter married and remained in the vicinity suggests that he may well have had a sufficiently extensive business to accommodate his sons in it.

When he died he was close enough to his Carthaginian background still to claim citizenship and to go out of his way to announce it. His widow, doubtless knowing his feelings, said, in effect, "Julius was not only born in

---


\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 372–373.

\(^5\) According to CIL 13,14,2000 (Wilman, *Ex. Inscr. Lat.* 2, 1873, 2591), the text is: D. M. ET MEMORIAE AETERNE IULII ALEXSADRI NATIONE AFRI CIVI CARTHAGINISI OMNI OPTIMO OPIFICI ARTIS VITRIAE QUI VIX ANOS LXXV MENSEN V DIES XIII SENE ULLA LESIONE ANIMI CUM COIUGE SUA VIRGINIA CUM QVA VIXIT ANNIS XXXVIII EX QUA CREATIV FILIO III ET EILIAM EX QUIBUS HIS OMNIBUS NEPOTES VIDIT ED EOS SUPERITIES SIBI RELIQUIT HUNC TUMULUM PONENDUM CV Raverunt NUMONIA BELLIA UXSOR ET IULIUS ALEXSIUS FILIUS ET IULIUS FELIX FILIUS ET IULIUS GALLONIUS FILIUS ET NUMONIA BELLIOSA FILIA ITEM NEPOTES IULII AUCT(?)US IULIUS-FELIX IULIUS ALEX(?)SANDER IULIUS GALLONIUS(?) IULIUS LEONTIUS IULIUS GALL., IULIUS EONIUS P/P CYRI DEDICAVERUNT. In separating the words, the CIL version has introduced clear errors. These have been corrected in our text, where evident, but it is possible that minor errors remain. (Illegible or missing letters are italicized in the above rendering.) The scholarship of Prof. Glanville Downey at Dumbarton Oaks has been most helpful in respect to this inscription and otherwise in the present article’s preparation.
Africa, but I wish you to know he was still a citizen of Carthage." Perhaps the reason for this is not as obscure as might appear. The glass industry of Gaul was almost certainly not self-sufficient in raw materials, and large quantities probably had to be imported from the south or southeast. While we know almost nothing of the structure of the ancient industry, one may imagine that precious supplies of raw materials were frequently controlled by the largest industry using them, i.e., glass. Thus, Julius Alexander may very well have come to Gaul under arrangements which ensured the necessary supplies for the manufacturing facilities with which he was to be connected. In any case, the development, financing, and exploitation of distant sources of supply in antiquity must have entailed problems which we cannot now fully appreciate. Transportation alone would have been most difficult to guarantee.

Thus, whether Julius Alexander was the owner of a shop at Lugundum, the manager of a branch house of Carthage, or possibly even the head of a locally controlled facility dependent on friendly Carthaginian interests for its raw materials, he could have had good reason to remain in close contact with his home city. Beyond this, it is futile as yet to speculate on the respective roles, if any, of the Alexandrian, Syrian, and Carthaginian industries in Gallic glass manufacture. It would involve an understanding of the relative degree of monopolistic and competitive conditions in the ancient industry, about which we know next to nothing and which still remain to be investigated.

* * * *

The newly published glass affords an opportunity to advance toward the solution of problems which have been raised but left pending by the present article. The opportunity lies largely in the direction of technological research. If, as is to be hoped, the authorities now responsible for these objets kairouanais will be willing to permit small specimens to be removed for spectrochemical or X-ray diffraction analysis, much valuable evidence can be developed. Likewise, if specimens of the wasters mentioned by the authors as being present at Šabrah can be provided, as well as some of the glass which is still present in the interior of an ancient furnace at Zouila, direct evidence of the existence of ancient glass manufacturing at these points may be at hand and peculiarities of the compositions will perhaps be established. Specimens of the objects themselves, which can be removed without damage to the vessels, would possibly identify them with the local factories or with contemporary production elsewhere.

In any case, Messrs. Marcais and Poinssot are to be congratulated on having made a valuable contribution in numerous ways, particularly through announcing and making available by their descriptions and illustrations many significant objects which would otherwise have remained unknown to numerous interested scholars. And meanwhile they have brought us a good step nearer to achievement of the definitive work on the ancient history of glassmaking in North Africa.6

6 Essential assistance in the preparation of this article has been generously granted in many quarters. Other than to those whose help has been acknowledged specifically, grateful recognition is hereby extended to the authors of Objets kairouanais, both of whom have replied to queries, and to the various museums which have permitted reproductions of objects. Numerous forms of assistance were given by Prof. Gerhard Bersu and Dr. W. Schleiermacher of the Römisch-Germanische Kommission, Frankfurt; Dr. Kurt Böhner of the Bonn Museum; Howard W. Calkins of the U. S. Consulate General, Tunis; John D. Cooney and Elizabeth Riefstahl of the Brooklyn Museum; Richard Ettinghausen of the Freer Gallery of Art; Mme. G. Faider-Feytmans of the Mariemont Museum; William H. Forsyth of the Metropolitan Museum; Prof. Fritz Fremersdorf of the Römisch-Germanisches Museum, Cologne; Mme. Madeleine Rocher Jauneau of the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyon; Dr. J. H. C. Kern of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leyden; R. Lantier of the St. Germain Museum; George C. Miles of the American Numismatic Society; Marvin C. Ross; Dr. Henri Seyrig of the French Archaeological In-
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Postscript

After submission of the manuscript of the foregoing article, a trip to North Africa and Europe made it possible to examine the glass vessels published in Objets kairouanais as well as to study Frankish types in the Rhineland, England, and France. Numerous areas in these areas were consulted. The additional light thrown on our problems is sufficiently important to justify presentation in this form.

It can now be reported that in addition to the ribbed bowl (pl. 2, figs. 7–8) two objects closely resembling another Frankish type have turned up in North Africa. Both vessels (pl. 6, figs. 22 and 24) were likewise in the collection of H. H. Abdul-Wahab, one (pl. 6, fig. 22) having been given by him before 1940 to the Musée du Bardo in Tunis. This eminent Tunisian scholar generously provided further information on the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of these objects and the other items of his Kairouan group published in Objets kairouanais. He recalls distinctly that the vessels in question were not obtained together, but at intervals over a period of several years, and specifically remembers that the Frankish types did not turn up at one time. Mr. Abdul-Wahab believes it extremely unlikely that the latter objects came to the holy city in modern times, because they were in the possession of local individuals known to him under conditions lending credence to their assurances regarding discovery at Sabrah. Drawing from his close knowledge for many years of archaeological matters concerning Tunisia, moreover, Abdul-Wahab points out that no private collections containing ancient glass which might have been brought in recently from western Europe are known to have existed in the area.

That the three Frankish-type vessels may well have been excavated at Sabrah is suggested by their present physical condition. Two of the objects (pl. 6, figs. 22 and 24) had a layer of thin, dark metallic-like decomposition which originally covered large portions if not the entire surfaces. Limited patches of this material can still be seen on both the interior and exterior of the vessels. Flakes of the decay show a bright inner surface next to the glass proper, sometimes with brilliant iridescent effects. These occurrences are typical of glass found in various parts of the Orient from the Roman through the early Islamic periods. They are not typical of contemporary glass found in the Rhineland and England, which characteristically shows surfaces relatively unaffected by the ages. In the instances where decay is present in these areas, it is apt to be dull and it is frequently corroded firmly on the surfaces.

In France, however, decomposition with a metallic luster on the outside is not infrequent, although its color tends to be slightly more on the brown side than the dark gray seen on the Abdul-Wahab vessels. The difference, however, is too slight to provide an unmistakable distinction.

In any case, the dark grayish decay of the two Kairouan vessels (shown, for example, in the center at midheight on plate 6, figure 22) looks just like the decomposition occurring on the Islamic cut carafes in the Bardo Museum believed to be from Sabrah-Manṣūriyah. The quality of the glass in the Kairouan Frankish types, however, is quite different and inferior. In contrast to the brilliant, limpid, often nearly entirely colorless glass of the Islamic objects, the Frankish types are strongly tinted and contain many imperfections and striae.

The foregoing facts certainly reduce the possibility, without by any means eliminating it, that the North African Frankish types were imported from western Europe in modern times.

stitute, Beyrouth; and Prof. Joachim Werner of the Munich University. Very valuable assistance was given at Dumbarton Oaks, particularly by Messrs. John S. Thacher and Ernst Kitzinger. Mrs. Bonnie D. Smith assisted in the preparation of the manuscript; and the drawing for text figure B was the work of Suzanne Chapman.

³ Marçais and Poinssot, Objets kairouanais, pp. 374, 396–402, Nos. 15–23.

⁸
The new evidence, likewise, permits further cautious speculation on the possibility of their production in the Orient and on their precise relationship to the Frankish glass industry.

In an effort to pin down the degree of similarity between the three Abdul-Wahab Frankish pieces and their western counterparts, many specimens in museums of the Rhineland, England, and France have been examined. It now appears that there are minor differences in technical details between the products of the western areas, or in any case between the combinations of construction and design features characteristic of the individual regions. Certain types of vessels, moreover, are frequent in one area, but rare in another. The three North African objects, as we shall see, would not be completely typical in any of these areas.

It has been noted that the Abdul-Wahab ribbed bowl finds particularly close relatives in the Rhineland in various details. There are, nevertheless, differences. The color of the Rhenish specimens is almost always more brown, and walls as well as rims tend to be thicker.

The two North African clochettes (pl. 6, figs. 22 and 24), on the other hand, are completely unlike Rhenish specimens, which fall roughly into two groups. Of these, one series, with knobs underneath, is squarish, but occurs mainly in nearly colorless glass. The other is more elongated, like one of the Abdul-Wahab objects (pl. 6, fig. 22). The latter group is numerous in the Rhineland, but usually does not bear thread decoration or knobs. The Rhenish elongated clochettes also tend to brownish tinges, whereas both of the Kairouan specimens are decidedly greenish.

The clochettes were much less popular in Britain than on the continent, for Harden lists only seven with constrictions, three of the squarish type and four elongated specimens.

The Rhenish characteristics of knobs on the squarish examples, with corrugations but no knobs on the elongated type, seem to form the pattern in Britain. In France the clochettes show a different picture. Both types occur, but many of the specimens are an intermediate type similar to one of the North African objects (pl. 6, fig. 24), and difficult to place in either of the distinct groups. In such intermediate specimens the constrictions are pronounced and fall low on the profile, while frequently the rim diameter exceeds that of the lower portion noticeably. The squarish clochettes in France, contrary to those in the Rhineland, usually have thread decoration, but they parallel the Rhenish pieces in the prevalence of knobs. Both the elongated and intermediate clochettes in France, however, frequently have knobs underneath and bear thread decoration, differing in these respects from their Rhenish counterparts. Corrugations, moreover, are often inclined.

The elongated and intermediate clochettes in France are generally yellow-greenish or nearly colorless, in contrast to the pronounced greenish shade of both clochettes from Kairouan. In shape, good parallels are to be found in France. A white chalklike material on the inside of both Abdul-Wahab clochettes, probably the result of chemical crystallization out of the ground moisture, is found in numerous French specimens. It is to be hoped that such deposits, both from the Kairouan and French specimens, can be analyzed.

Although Frankish glass in Belgium was not examined by autopsy in our present context, there are indications that it would form another distinct group. The fact that the three North African vessels do not appear to fit neatly into any of these groups, although one cannot be entirely certain of this, reinforces the hypothesis that there were other groups. If, indeed, the Abdul-Wahab objects were not produced in the Orient, they could have been made in other European areas. Very little is known, for example, of the glass produced in Italy or Spain in the sixth and seventh centuries.

---

8 This fine survey has now appeared (D. B. Harden, Glass vessels in Britain, A.D. 400–1000, in Dark Age Britain: Studies presented to E. T. Leeds, ed. D. B. Harden, London, 1956).
ANCIENT GLASS IN NORTH AFRICA

It is now possible to increase our list of Frankish ribbed bowls with cross symbols by some 29 specimens, although in many cases their precise design is not known. Only the objects in Bonn, London, and St. Germain-en-Laye have been actually examined. Despite the approximate doubling of our sampling, the list is surely still incomplete. The geographic distribution and the relative frequency of types, however, is not likely to change substantially, although the occurrences in Belgium are now seen to be noteworthy.

If it eventually turns out that the Abdul-Wahab trio was made in the Orient, the new discoveries may indicate that several oriental vessel types were borrowed by the Frankish glass industry. This would be by no means unexpected.

9 (1) Neuwied Museum, No. 1031. (2) Neuwied Museum, No. 1047. (3) Andernach Museum, No. 268. (4) Julich Museum, from Rödingen, now lost or destroyed. A photograph in the Bonn Museum, kindly shown by Herr Haberey, reveals that the object had a medallion-like relief element similar, but clearly not from the same mold or with identical design, to that on the Kairouan ribbed bowl (pl. 2, figs. 7 and 8). (5) Bonn Museum, No. 2500, from Andernach. (6) Bonn Museum, No. 3676, from Engers. (7) Bonn Museum, No. 44138, from the Neuwied Becken. This object is actually a jar, rather than a bowl, but otherwise fits into our group. (8) Bonn Museum, No. 50512(b), from Rödingen. (9) British Museum, No. 83.12-13.580, from Chalkwell, Kent. This, and the following identical item, are jars. (10) British Museum, No. 83.12-13.581, ditto. (11) St. Germain-en-Laye Museum, from Caranda collection. A doubtful item, as the cross design is virtually illegible. (12) Cambrai Museum. (13) Leyden Museum, No. h1912/1.65, from Katwijk. (14) Liège Museum, from Tongres-Coninxheim. (15) Liège Museum, specimen similar to foregoing but from another place. (16) Cinquantenaire Museum, Brussels, from Montfort. (17) Namur Museum, from Wancennes. (18) Namur Museum, from Spontin. (19) Namur Museum, from Bioul. (20) Namur Museum, from Florennes. This and the preceding number are doubtful items, as it is not certain that they have cross ornaments. (21) Mainz, similar to footnote 69 (9), said to be from France. (22-24) Cologne (?), group of three found at Junkersdorf, with similar design but rather crude. (25) Klee, Inv. No. 470, destroyed (27). (26) Andernach, from Andernach, Inv. No. 374. (27) Andernach, Inv. No. 950.

Perhaps it is significant that the second type (pl. 6, figs. 22 and 24) appearing in North Africa has likewise a possible morphological connection with lamps. It is well known that lampions of glass frequently had a knob underneath, a detail dating back to pre-Islamic times, but which has been so persistent that modern glass lamps of this shape still hang in mosques throughout the Near East. The peculiar terminal blob characteristic of the Abdul-Wahab clochettes could have developed out of this construction.

The Bardo Museum has another object (pl. 6, fig. 23) which may throw further light on the activity of Tunisian glass factories before the Arab conquest. This mediocre object, displayed in a Roman gallery without an announced provenance, is of interest in our context in view of the undulating decoration of opaque, white, embedded and flattened threads. These occur in Frankish glass. The concave profile of its elongated base, moreover, would be a logical development out of the conical blobbed vessel (pl. 2, fig. 5) in the Kairouan group.

Thanks to arrangements now under discussion with the Tunisian authorities, definitive answers to many of our questions are likely to be forthcoming through technological research. It seems assured that specimens of ancient glass found in Tunisia from various periods can be examined, as well as wasters and other clear indications uncovered at Sabrah of glass manufacture in Islamic times. Several furnaces have recently been excavated there. Specimens of ribbed bowls with cross ornaments from the Rhineland, likewise, have been made available for analysis by W. Haberey of the Bonn Museum.

10 Specimens of ribbed bowls with cross ornaments from the Rhineland, likewise, have been made available for analysis by W. Haberey of the Bonn Museum.


Particular thanks are due to Mr. Mostafa Sliman Zbiss of the Services of Antiquities in Tunis for a personally conducted tour to Kairouan and Sabrah, as well as numerous other courtesies. A careful examination of the objects in the Bardo Museum was generously permitted under difficult circumstances by M. Fréoual and carried out with the enthusiastic collaboration of his assistants.
GRABUNG IM UMAYYADISCHEN RUṢĀFAH
VON KATHARINA OTTO-DORN


BAUBESCHREIBUNG

Die erste Untersuchung der Ruine musste darauf beschränkt bleiben, die Plananlage zu bestimmen, die Innenräume mussten zunächst weitgehend ungeräumt bleiben (Textabb. A). Die Suchstellen an der Süd-, Nord- und Ostseite er schlossen eine annähernd quadratische Anlage von 77 m Seitenlänge im Osten, 71,80 m im Norden, 76,50 m im Westen und 71,90 m im Süden. Die Ecken sind durch massive Rundtürme von 3,80 m Durchmesser betont, die auf etwa 0,80 m
hohen quadratischen Sockeln aufsitzt und 2,60 m vor die Front vorspringen. Wir haben damit eine Form der Eckbetonung vor uns, wie sie uns bisher nur von Qaṣṭal her bekannt ist.6 Die Aussenmauern haben eine durchschnittliche Stärke von 1,50 m. An der Nord-, West- und Ostfront sind die Mauern von je drei Rundpfeilern von etwa 3,10 m im Durchmesser gegliedert.7 Der südlich gelegene Eingang, der von zwei oblongen, ebenfalls auf quadratischen Sockeln aufruhenden Tortürmen flankiert wird, öffnet sich in einer ungewöhnlichen Breite von 13,40 m. Im Aussenwinkel des östlichen Torturmes ist eine Pferdekrippe angebracht. Im Innern wurde ein Hof von etwa 30 m × 48 m festgestellt: Er ist entgegen der im ersten Grabungsbericht geäußerten Vermutung8 aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach von rings umlaufenden Arkaden begrenzt. Eine Schürfung in der Nähe des südwestlichen Eckturmes brachte einen schmalen Durchgang zum Vorschein. Nördlich davon ist zwischen bearbeiteten Gipssteinblöcken, einem Material, das im Gelände von Ruṣāfah ansteht und aus dem auch die antike Stadt erbaut ist, eine Wasserrinne aus Backsteinen eingelassen, die nach Norden umbiegt und die sich noch etwa 3 m weit verfolgen liess. Möglicherweise dürfen wir hier eine Badeanlage vermuten.9 Ein zweiter ebenso schmaler Durchgang befindet sich in der Nähe des nordöstlichen Eckturmes, ein dritter liess sich nördlich des Südostturmes feststellen. Vom Innern wurden während der ersten Campagne im wesentlichen nur der Mittelsaal des Nordtraktes (1) freigelegt. Während der zweiten Grabung im September–Oktober 1954, bei der ebenfalls leider nur wieder sehr beschränkte Arbeitskräfte zur Verfügung standen, wurden im Nord- und Osttrakt weitere Teile der Innenräume geklärt, die Ostfront des Hofes freigelegt und weitere Schürfungen an dem besonders stark gestörten Tortrakt vorgenommen.

Die Verschüttung der Ruine betrug im allgemeinen etwa 1,50 m, am Tortrakt 2 m–2,50 m, im Hof etwa 0,30 m. Anstehendes Mauerwerk war bisher nirgends über 2 m hoch erhalten. Die Hauptmauern der Anlage sind aus ungebrannten quadratischen Lehzmiegeln von 0,38 m × 0,38 m × 0,10 m–0,12 m errichtet. Die Ziegel sind in Lehmmörtel verlegt und haben einen Lehmmörtel-Verputz von 0,04–0,06 mDicke. Darüber setzt eine weisse Kalk- oder Gipsmörtelschicht, die sorgfältig geglättet ist. An manchen Stellen liegt der Verputz in mehreren Schichten über einander, was auf eine längere Benutzung des Raumes hinweist. Verschiedentlich fanden sich neben dem Lehzmiegewerk auch Backsteine vor. So ist ein Teil der Wandmalerei in Raum 1—wovon die Rede sein wird—auf Backsteinen aufgetragen, das heisst also, dass die Lehzmiegewände dort einen Durchschuss von Backsteinen hatten. Auch die Einbauten im Norden und Süden des Hofes, die aber aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach aus einer späteren Epoche stammen, sind aus Backsteinen gemauert. Ebenso weist das Pfaster des nördlichen Innenhofs quadratische, gebrannte Ziegel auf, und endlich fanden sich im Nord- und Osttrakt eine Reihe leicht gewölbter Backsteine vor, die als Dachziegel gedient haben müssen. Der Hof und die bisher aufgedeckten Innenräume hatten einen einfachen Gipsestrich. Der Schutt bestand im wesentlichen aus geflossenen Lehm und Gipsstückresten. Lediglich am Torbau waren im Schutt Backsteine, Gips, Lehmmörtel und zu einem geringen Teil auch Bruchsteinwerk mit einander vermischt. Möglicherweise dürfen wir hier mit eingestürzten Gewölben rechnen. Nur vereinzelt kamen bisher bearbeitete Gipsstein-

6 H. Stern, Notas sur l'architecture des châteaux omeyyades, Ars Islamica, vol. 11–12 (1946), Abb. 10; Ecktürme auf Vierreck-Basen leben in abbasidischer Zeit fort, so in dem neu ausgrabenen Abbasiden-Palast in Raqqah.
7 Vergleiche dazu ebenfalls Qaṣṭal bei Stern, loc. cit.
blöcke vor, so an den Sockeln der Eck-
türme und an der Wasserrinne am Südwest-
turm.

Im Nordtrakt ergab sich eine Raumreihe aus
einem grüsseren Mittelraum—mit einer Recht-
ecknische an der Südsee—und symmetrisch
angelegten schmälern Seitenräumen beste-
rend, die möglicherweise sätzlich wie die
Räume 3 und 4 noch unterteilte sind. Daran
schliesst sich im Osten eine auf einen Nebenhof
mündende aus ungleich grossen Räumen be-
stehende Raumgruppe an. In Raum 5, der
durch zwei Stufen zugänglich ist, befindet sich
wie im Hauptsaal des Nordtraktes im Süden eine
Rechtecknische. Auffällig sind im Nordosten
eine Reihe von kleinen Kammern, von deren
nördlichter ein Durchgang ins Freie führt. Sie
dienten möglicherweise als Küche, Dienerraum
oder aber auch als Latrine. In Raum 6 befindet
sich in der Nordostcke ein späterer kleiner
Einbau mit wiederverwendet Stuckfragmenten.
Von den südlisch des Nebenhofes gelegenen Räu-
men fallen in Raum 17 wie am hofseitigen Ein-
gang zum Nebenhof die zugesetzten Türen auf.
Daraus geht einwandfrei hervor, dass die An-
lage in einer späteren Periode Veränderungen
erfahren hat. In dem bisher noch unberührte ge-
bliebenen Gelände südlisch des Nebenhofs und
ebenso in den entsprechenden Teilen des noch
nicht frei gelegten Westtraktes lassen sich
Niveau-Vertiefungen beobachten, die mit Si-
cherheit auf weitere Nebenhöfe schliessen las-
sen, so dass wir also unseren Plan im West- und
Ostrakt auf je zwei Nebenhöfe, die von ver-
schieden grossen Räumen begrenzt sind, er-
gänzen dürfen. Entlang der Ostseite des Hofs
befinden sich verschiedene, zum Teil aus Back-
steinen gemauerte Einbauten (51, 52, und 54)
mit Liegebänken. Auch an der Südwestecke
des nördlichen Nebenhofs wie an der Südost-
und des Haupthofs ziehen sich derartige Liege-
bänke hin. An allen diesen Stellen ist sehr wahr-
scheinlich der alte Zustand des Hoftes gestört.
Zur ursprünglichen Anlage dürften jedoch die
beiden Säulenbasen und eine dritte Funda-
ment-Grube im Ostteil des Hoftes gehörn, die
auf rings um den Hof laufende Säulenarkaden
schliessen lassen. Auch die Wandmalerei an der
Nordwand des Hoftes—auf die noch zurückzu-
kommen sein wird—machet es wahrscheinlich,
dass hier eine Arkadenreihe schützend vorge-
legt war. Völlig ungeklärt ist bisher der beson-
ders stark zerstörte Tortrakt, auf dessen unge-
wöhnliche Eingangsbreite von 13,40 m bereits
hingewiesen wurde. Während der zweiten Cam-
pagne wurden hier östlich und westlich des
Tores aus Backsteinen gemauerte Fundamente
aufgefunden, die möglicherweise als Auflager
für Pfeiler- oder Säulenstellungen dienten. Jedoch
ist schwer zu entscheiden, welcher Periode
dieses Mauerwerk zugehörte. Dass auch
am Tor der ursprüngliche Zustand gestört
ist, zeigt die unregelmässige Form der Tor-
türme, deren östlicher in den Mauerzug ein-
bindet, während der westliche der Mauer vorgesetzt ist.

Überraschend war wähde der beiden
Campagnen die überraschende Funde an
Stuck und Wandmalerei, die die ehemals
reiche Ausstattung des Baues bezeugen. Am ergeb-
sten war die Ausbeute an Stuckfragmenten im
Hauptsaal des Nordtraktes (1), am Tortrakt und
im Nordostecke des Hoftes. Ausserdem kamen an
nahezu allen Durchgängen Stuckfragmente zu
Tage, die auffällig gleichmässig dekoriert sind.
Es handelt sich in allen Fällen um flache Bogen-
stücke, die in einem Beispiel zu einem Hufeisen-
bogen ergänzt werden konnten (Taf. 1, Abb. 1);
die Dekoration besteht aus zweireihigen gegenläufig
angeordneten Blattmustern, die bisher im umay-
edischen Ornamentenschatz unbekannt sind.
An der Innenseite des Bogens setzt durchbro-
chenes, zweistreifiges Flechtwerk an, von dem
sich eine Fülle einzelner Bruchstücke zusammen
mit den Bögen voranden (Taf. 1, Abb. 2). Es be-
steht kein Zweifel, dass wir hier hufeisenförmige
Stuck-Gitterfenster vor uns haben, die über den
Durchgängen eingelassen waren. Von ihnen sind
uns eine ganze Reihe mit den verschiedensten
Muster-Varianten vom Stuck aus Qasr al-Hayr

Abb. B—Fragment eines Stuckbogens vom Tor.


Ein anderes Bild ergaben die Stuckfunde aus dem Mittelsaal (1). Hier überwog der geschnittene und bemalte Stuck. Zu dem schon vom Tor her bekannten Weinblatt- und Trauben-Ornament treten hier noch bereichernd Fragmente gelb und rot bemalter "sasanischer" Herzblatt-Bordüren (Taf. 1, Abb. 5) und Palmemuster hinzu, unter denen die Spiral-ge-

rollte Halbpalmette auffällt (Taf. 1, Abb. 6), die wir bereits von den Zackenbögen des Tores her kennen, weiterhin mehrstreifiger Mäander, verschlungene Kreise mit Rosettfüllung, Kyma-

Wellen- und Flechtbänder. Jedoch auch Frag-

mente der Zackenbögen mit dazugehörigen Halbsäulchen kamen in der Nähe des Hof-

durchgangs zu Tage. Eine Entsprechung zum Stuck des Mittelsaales bilden die reichen Funde

Abb. C—Stückfragment vom Tor.
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Jedoch nicht nur die Innenräume, auch die Hofwände trugen Wandmalerei. So hat der Sockel der Nordwand Malerei in situ erhalten, die aus schwarz konturierten Rechteckfeldern und aus Bordüren mit schwarzen Spiralranken und grüner Füllung besteht; sie werden von der gleichen, breiten, roten Bordüre begrenzt wie wir sie im Saal 1 vorfinden.


Wie bei allen umayyadischen Ruinenstätten

14 Creswell, op. cit., Taf. 43-45, und R. W. Hamilton, A mosaic carpet of Umayyad date at Khirbet el Mejjar, Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine, vol. 14 (1950), Taf. 46. (Diese Zeitschrift von jetzt an als QDAP zitiert.)

15 D. C. Baramki, Excavations at Khirbet el Mejjar III, QDAP, vol. 8 (1939), Taf. 34,2; Schlumberger, Qasr el-Ḥeir al-Gharbī, Abb. 29.
war die Ausbeute an Kleinfunden verhältnismässig gering. Das mag in der Hauptsache an der Zerstörungswut der Abbasiden liegen, der Nachfolger der Umayyaden, die diese verfolgten, wo immer sie konnten.16 An Keramik kamen an fast allen freigelegten Stellen Gefässfragmente der unglasierten, gerillten Gebrauchsware mit gelbem, aber auch rotem oder grauem Scherben zum Vorschein, die bereits aus römisch-byzantinischer Zeit her bekannt ist, und die sich bis in die unmayyadische Zeit hinein fortsetzt.17 Besonderes Interesse verdienen Fragmente einer dünnwandigen und z. T. dickwandigen, grauen "steinigutartigen" Ware vom Tortrakt mit einem Ritzdekor aus Kreisen und Rauten, deren archaischer Charakter in unmayyadische Zeit weist. Diese Ware ist tatsächlich ein weicher Stein, wie dies jetzt die Funde in Raqqah bestätigt haben. Sie entspricht möglicherweise der als "hard metallic ware" bezeichneten, unmayyadisch angesetzten Keramik von Khirbat al-Mafjar.18 Ebenso stehen zwei Gefäss-Fragmente (Raum 5 und 14) aus fein geschlemmtem, gelbem Scherben — mit einem Reliefs-Dekor aus radial verlaufenden Rippen in dem einen Fall, mit "Noppen"- und Grätenmustern im andern Beispiel — den in unmayyadische Zeit datierten Lampen mit Relief-Schmuck aus Khirbat al-Mafjar nahe.19 Aber auch die an verschiedenen Stellen zu Tage gekommenen Bruchstücke von Barbotin-Ware des frühen Stils mit stilisierten Tierfiguren-Darstellungen eines Vierfüsslers (Nordseite des Nebenhofs), eines Vogels mit Schlangen (nördlich von Raum 33), eines Gazellenkopfes (?) (Nordwestmauer des Hofs), dürfen sehr wahrscheinlich noch in umayyadische Zeit angesetzt werden.20 Eine Reihe mittelalterlicher Scherben der verschiedensten Gattungen — Überlaufware mit Ritzdekor (Tor), türkis glasierte und gerillte Keramik (Südostpartie des Hofs), Ware mit schwarzer Unterglasurmalerei und ein Lästierscherben (Raum 9) — erweisen die Weiterbesiedlung der Anlage bis in mittelalterliche Zeit hinein.21

Münzen fanden sich bisher insgesamt 14 vor und zwar im Nord- und Ostrakt, im Hof und am Süddurchgang der Westmauer. Es handelt sich dabei durchgehend um Kupfermünzen vom gleichen Typ mit Kufi-Schrift, die das Glaubensbekenntnis auf der Vorder- und Rückseite und eine kreisförmig umlaufende Inschrift tragen, die Prägort und Datum vermuten lässt, die jedoch bisher noch nicht entziffert werden konnten. Jedoch entspricht der Münztyp einwandfrei den uns bekannten umayyadischen Kupfermünzen.22

Ein bedeutender Kleinfund (Raum 10) war ein Alabaster-Fragment von 8 × 3 cm und 1,5 cm Höhe, das wohl von einem rechteckigen Schmuckkästchen stammt. Es trägt auf der Vorderseite einen Ritzdekor aus vertieften Scheibenmustern, die von einer schraffierten Rautenbordüre ge rahmt sind. Die Rückwand ist fein gerillt. Allem Anschein nach haben wir hier ein Gerät umayyadischer Zeit vor uns.

18 Auch im Falle von Ruṣafāh ist uns überliefert, dass der Abbaside 'Abd Allah ibn 'Ali Khān, der 749/50 nach Ruṣafāh kam, dort die einbalsamte Leiche Hischāms schänden und verbrennen liess (Honigmann, op. cit., p. 1280).
19 Vergleiche die für die umayyadische Zeit gesicherten Funde aus Khirbat al-Mafjar (D. C. Baramki, The Pottery from Kh. el Mejer, QDAP, vol. 10 (1940 bis 1942), pp. 66 und 71, Ware 1 und 18a.
20 Baramki, loc. cit., p. 68, Ware 10.
21 Baramki, loc. cit., p. 73, Gruppe 1.
23 Das gleiche Bild der vom 8. Jahrhundert in die mittelalterliche Zeit hineinreichenden Keramik-Funde findet sich in Khirbat al Mafjar wieder (Baramki, op. cit., p. 74).
DIE RUŠĀFAH-ANLAGE UND DER UMAYYADISCHE SCHLOSSBAU


24 Schlumberger, Les fouilles de Qasr el-Heir el-Gharbi, p. 345.

Abb. 1—Nordost-Trakt, Stuckhufeisenbogen.

Abb. 2—Detail eines Turbogens.

Abb. 3—Stuckfragment vom Tor.

Abb. 4—Bemalte Stuckfragmente vom Tor.

Abb. 5—Saal 1, Bemalte Stuckfragmente.
Abb. 7—Sockelmalerei (Ergänzt) aus Saal 1.
Abb. 8—Malereifragment vom Hof (Raum 52).

Abb. 9—Nischenmalerei aus Saal 1.
tung des Tores wiederholt sich lediglich in Mschattä, die Mehrzahl der Umayyaden-Schlösser ist östlich orientiert.\textsuperscript{29} Die Gliederung des West- und Ostraktes durch je zwei Nebenhöfe, um die sich verschiedene grosse Räume legen, entspricht dem Plan von Tībah. Die Raumgruppe ("bayt") im Nordtrakt aus einem recht- eckigen Mittelsaal und schmälere z. T. noch unterteilten Seitenräumen bestehend, ist fast allen Umayyaden-Palästen eigen.\textsuperscript{30}


\textsuperscript{29} Ausnahmen machen al-Tubah, das nördlich und das kleine Schloss Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Sharqī, das westlich orientiert ist.

\textsuperscript{30} Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Ghārbi weist 6 dieser Raumgruppen auf, Khirbat al-Mafjar eine einzelne, Khirbat al-Minaya zwei, al-Ḫarāne fünf (Stern, \textit{op. cit.}, Abb. 6).

\textsuperscript{31} Vergleiche Anm. 28; zum Blendarkaden-Motiv siehe auch die steineren Blendnischen an der Archivolte des Tores, an den Schmuckrosetten und am "Kiosk" des Hofes in Khirbat al-Mafjar (Hamilton, \textit{Khirbat Mafjar}, QDAP, vol. 12, Taf. 4 D, 8 A, C und E; in der Kleinkunst ist hierfür ein besonders charakteristisches Beispiel der Dekor der Bronzeflächen des Marwān II. (F. Sarre, \textit{Die Bronzeflächen des Kalifen auch die inneren Hofwände. Die für Ruṣafā charakteristischen Zinnenbögen hingegen sind in den uns bisher bekannten umayyadischen Stück nicht nachweisbar.\textsuperscript{32} Hingegen finden sie sich überreich am Torbau von 'Ammān in Jordani (\textit{Taf. 4, Abb. 12}), ein überraschender Zusammenhang, auf den weiter unten noch einzugehen sein wird. In den Detailformen schliesst sich der Stuck von Ruṣafā besonders eng an den Stuckdekor von Khirbat al-Mafjar an. Motive wie die verschlungenen Kreise, das stark gerippte Weinblatt, die Traube mit tiefen Bohrlochern die spiralförmig eingerollte Halbpalmette, Herzblatt- und Flechtbordüren kehren hier wie dort in gleicher Formensprache wieder.\textsuperscript{33} Das Männeder-Motiv vom Hauptaal hingegen ist bisher nur aus Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Ghārbi bekannt.\textsuperscript{34} Ebenso bieten sich für die Stuckgitterfenster, die wir in Ruṣafā über den Durchgängen innerhalb der Innenräume ergänzen dürfen, reiche Parallelen in Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Ghārbi an.\textsuperscript{35} Aber auch die Wandmalerei von Ruṣafā trägt ausgesprochen umayyadische Züge. Auch hier spielt, wie die Malerei vom Hauptaal (\textit{Taf. 2, Abb. 7}) zeigt, das Arkadenmotiv eine Rolle. Ihm sind die Malereien von Qusayr Amra und Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Ghārbi zu vergleichen, nur stehen dort Figuren unter den Arkaden,\textsuperscript{36} während hier die Felder mit geometrischen Mustern gefüllt sind, die ohne Frage Marmor-Inkrustation nachahmen sollen. Jedoch auch hierfür ergeben sich, wie wir sahen, in den Malereien von Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Ghārbi zahlreiche Pa-

Marwān II im Arabischen Museum in Kairo, Ars Islamica, vol. 1 (1934), Abb. 2 und 5).

\textsuperscript{32} Wir finden lediglich im Steindekor von Khirbat al-Mafjar einen Wulstfries mit Zackenband (Hamilton, \textit{op. cit.}, Taf. 8 B).


\textsuperscript{34} Schlumberger, \textit{Les fouilles de Qaṣr el-Ḥeir el-Ghārbi}, Abb. 20.

\textsuperscript{35} Selim Abdul-Hak, \textit{Réconstitution ...}, Taf. 5–24.

\textsuperscript{36} Diez, \textit{Kunst der islamischen Völker}, Abb. 28; Schlumberger, \textit{Deux fresques omeyyades}, Taf. 25.

Nach alldem ist offenkundig, dass wir in der Rusāfah-Ruine ebenfalls einen Palastbau umayyadischer Zeit vor uns haben. Wir dürfen sogar noch weiter gehen und die Anlage—sowohl auf Grund ihrer nahen Verwandtschaft mit den Hishām-Schlössern, wie im Hinblick auf die Quellen, die in Rusāfah zwei Paläste des Hishām bezeugen,—mit einem dieser Paläste Hishāms identifizieren.

RUSĀFAT-HISHĀM

Wo befand sich aber nun der zweite Palast des Hishām, von dem die Quellen berichten? Wie bereits oben erwähnt wurde, steht unser Bau nicht isoliert, sondern er ist von einem weiten Ruinen-Gelände umgeben, das sich vor allem in Südrichtung der antiken Stadt erstreckt. Unter diesen Ruinen-Hügeln fällt ein grössterer, etwa 1 km von Palast I entfernter Komplex auf, an dem während der zweiten Campagne eine Schirfung vorgenommen wurde. Es handelt sich hier um eine vorerst nur skizzenhaft aufgenommene Ruinengruppe II von etwa 300 × 120 m, die deutlich eine grössere Rechteckanlage von etwa 80 m × 90 m, eine Breiteta


Siehe den Stuck von Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbi (Schlumberger, Eouvilles ..., Taf. 45).
GRABUNG IM UMAYYADISCHEN RUŞAFAH

ABB. E—Planskizze von Anlage II.


41 Bartoccini, Bollettino del Reale Instituto di Archeologia e Storia d’Arte, Ser. 28 (1934–35), p. 275 ff. (Siehe auch 1941.)

Ruṣāfah. Wie in 'Ammān haben wir uns auch hier auf Grund der verschieden gemusterten Bogen-Fragmente einen in mehrere Zonen gegliederten Blendarkaden-Schmuck des Tortraktes vorzustellen.


Das frühere Beispiel des Palast-Moschee-Komplexes ist aus Kufa erhalten (638), es folgen Basra (um 670), Qubbat al-Khadrā in Damaskus (zwischen 644–656), Wāsit im Iraq (Fuad Safar, Wāsit, the six season's excavations, Le Caire, 1945, fig. 1) die Verbindung Palast-Moschee lebt in abbasidischer Zeit fort, vergleiche al-'Askar bei Fustat (um 750) und Ibn Ṭolūn in Kairo. (Siehe Creswell, op. cit., vol.1, pp. 184.)

43 For Jabal Says siehe Sauvaget, Ruines onceyades du Djebel Seis, fig. 2.


47 Ebendorf.
LA MOSQUÉE D’AL-QARAWĪYĪN À FÈS ET L’ART DES ALMORAVIDES

PAR HENRI TERRASSE

L’art des Almoravides était depuis longtemps connu par deux oeuvres de premier plan: le mihrāb de la grande mosquée de Tlemcen et la coupole nervée qui le précède. L’étude de ce riche ensemble décoratif avait permis à M. M. G. et W. Marçais,1 à une époque où l’on ignorait les monuments almohades et les premières oeuvres de la dynastie merinide, de relier l’art du califat de Cordoue à celui de l’Alhambra de Grenade et d’affirmer ainsi la continuité de la tradition andalouse. Mais, alors que le Maroc nous avait révélé bien d’autres aspects de l’art hispano-mauresque, les oeuvres que la première grande dynastie berbère avait laissées dans ce pays nous échappaient encore. Par ailleurs l’art andalou du XIe siècle, avec lequel les Almoravides prirent contact par leur conquête de l’Espagne, se résuma longtemps dans l’Aljaféria de Saragosse. Les recherches faites à Murcie, à Malaga, et quelques découvertes de détail nous permettent aujourd’hui d’en mieux saisir la beauté et d’en soupçonner la profonde unité.

Mais c’était le Maroc, centre et force vive de l’empire des Sanhâjah au voile, qui recelait le plus grand nombre de monuments almoravides. Des fouilles à Marrakech,2 la découverte dans cette ville d’une gubbah élevée sous le règne d’Ali b. Yûsuf,3 l’étude de forteresses encore mal connues, l’attribution du minbar de la Kutubiyah aux émirs sanhâjiens,4 ont grande-


ment précisé, depuis une dizaine d’années, notre connaissance de l’art du premier grand empire hispano-maghribin.

Mais toutes ces découvertes récentes sont dépassées par la révélation que nous apporte l’étude de la grande mosquée d’al-Qarawîyîn à Fès, entreprise pour une restauration d’ensemble du sanctuaire.

La Qarawîyîn, bien que son oratoire fût strictement fermé aux yeux des non-musulmans, n’était pas tout à fait inconnue. Grâce à deux textes, le Rawd al-Qirjâs et la Zahrat al-Âs, nous saisissions jusque dans la seconde moitié du XIVe siècle l’histoire de ce monument mieux que celle d’aucun sanctuaire de l’Islam occidental. Ces chroniques nous précisent que les travaux almoravides se placent entre 1135 et 1143. J. C. M. Pauty avait pu, grâce à un collaborateur musulman qu’il guidait de l’extérieur, faire lever un plan d’ensemble5 de la mosquée, qui fut fort précieux et qui reste valable pour les grandes lignes de l’édifice (fig. 1). La bibliothèque élevée par Abû ‘Inân avait été visitée: une annexe de l’oratoire, la mosquée des morts, avait été relevée et publiée par M. B. Maslow.6 Enfin la claire avait été aperçue dans la chambre où elle était remise après la prière solennelle du Vendredi.

La préparation de la restauration, et les travaux eux-mêmes permirent la découverte de toutes les splendeurs décoratives que renferme l’oratoire: le mihrâb, les coupole qui couvrent la nef qui y conduit, le mobilier liturgique révélèrent la richesse profuse de leur ornement. Lorsqu’on entreprit de débarrasser les dômes

5 Le plan a été précisé pour les parties de la mosquée qui ont pu faire l’objet de relevés de détail, soit pour les trois quarts N.E., N.O. et S.O.
à stalactites de la nef axiale des couches de chaux et des badigeons de couleur qui les recouvraient, il apparaît que, sur les stalactites elles-mêmes, de multiples panneaux sculptés avaient été recouverts d’une couche de plâtre. Cette étrange mutilation décorative était aisée à expliquer: à l’entrée d’ʿAbd al-Muʿmin à Fès, les habitants de la ville craignirent que le miḥrāb de la Qarawīyīn, par sa richesse, n’excitât le courroux de ces puritains ennemis des arts qu’étaient les Almohades. Ils le recouvriraient de papier et le passèrent à la chaux. De ce masque temporaire, il n’est rien resté. Mais les Almohades, dès 1145 ou quelques années plus tard, firent recouvrir de plâtre toutes les fois que cela fut possible, les panneaux qui ornaient les dômes de la mosquée afin que ces coupoles fussent l’allure plus austères de celles qu’on avait, vers le même temps, à la Kutubiyah de Marrakech et à la mosquée funéraire de Tinnel. Ainsi, après huit siècles, toute la luxure et délicate parure dont les artistes andalous s’étaient plu à orner les parties hautes de l’oratoire renait peu à peu avec toute sa fraîcheur de taille et sa polychromie originelle. Dès maintenant une masse considérable de décors sculptés, qui va s’augmentant au fur et à mesure des travaux, nous fournir la meilleure image qui soit de l’art almoravide, désormais aussi bien connu que celui des califes almohades. La semilacune qui subsistait dans l’histoire de l’art hispano-mauresque est enfin comblée.

En attendant que l’achèvement des travaux me permette de publier une monographie détaillée de la Qarawīyīn, je suis heureux de pouvoir donner aux historiens de l’art musulman une vue d’ensemble de ce qu’apporte la grande mosquée de Fès à notre connaissance de l’art andalou du XIIe siècle, en laissant de côté tout ce qui, dans le grand sanctuaire fassi, appartient à des époques plus anciennes ou plus récentes.

LE PLAN ET LA BÂTISSE

Nous n’avons de plans de détail que pour les trois-quarts de la mosquée de la Qarawīyīn.

Sa restauration étant faite par tranches, afin de n’interrompre ni le culte, ni l’enseignement donné dans l’oratoire, nous ne possédons encore que des plans partiels qui seront reliés les uns aux autres lors des derniers travaux. Dès maintenant nous avons des relevés très précis des angles N.O. et N.E. de l’édifice ainsi que de toute sa partie ouest, y compris la nef axiale. Pour l’ensemble, le plan de E. Pauty conserve toute sa valeur: il avait permis, avec l’aide des textes anciens, de fixer les grandes étapes de la construction de la mosquée; les levés de détail permettent de le préciser en bien des points (fig. 1).

La nef axiale (fig. 2) présente de nombreuses irrégularités d’implantation: elle a été en effet allongée et remaniée à deux reprises, réparée maintes fois. Les supports accusent une nette disparité: la plupart sont des piliers cruciformes qui ont entre eux des différences de dimensions assez sensibles. Mais il subsiste quelques piles quadrilobées qui sont des vestiges de l’oratoire zénète. Ces piles étaient faites de tambours de pierre, comme celles—sensiblement contemporaines—que nous avons retrouvées à la mosquée des Andalous.7 Au voisinage du ʿaṣāfīn, un de ces piliers en quatre feuilles supporte encore un arc en pierre de type cordonan. Les Almoravides qui ont fortement remanié l’édifice qu’ils agrandissaient, ont tenu pourtant à garder le souvenir de quelques-unes de ses dispositions. Les piles ainsi conservées ont été ornées de chapiteaux de plâtre, composés d’acanthes et de palmettes assez plates, analogues aux fleurons qui timbrent certains petits écoinçons de la qubah d’ʿAlî b. Yūsuf à Marrakech. Les réfections plus récentes ont d’ailleurs accru dans le détail l’irrégularité des supports de cette nef axiale. Ces dissemblances, très nettes en plan, sont peu sensibles lorsqu’on contemple la perspective de la nef.

Aussi bien l’attention ne se porte point sur les supports mais sur les arcs, sur les coupoles qui

7 H. Terrasse, La grande mosquée des Andalous à Fès, Paris, 1942, p. 19 et pl. IX.
Fig. 1—Mosquée d'al-Qarawiyyin. Plan d'ensemble (D'après P. Pauty, rectifié d'après des relevés de détail sauf pour la partie Sud-Est de la mosquée.)

Fig. 2—Plan de la nef axiale.
les dominent et sur les lustres qui, en grand nombre, y sont suspendus. On savait que les Almoravides avaient conservé dans leur agrandissement le plan en nefs parallèles au mur de la gībūlah qui avait été celui de la mosquée dans ses deux premiers états. Mais ils avaient tenu à manifester la direction de la gībūlah en surmontant leur agrandissement et trois travées de l'oratoire antérieur par une nef surélevée perpendiculaire à toutes les autres bāṭāj et qui domine de ses murs les autres toitures à double pente de la mosquée. Nous saisissons mieux maintenant les raisons qui firent couper l'oratoire par cette haute nef perpendiculaire aux autres vaisseaux de l'édifice. Le premier oratoire était assez bas (pl. 1, fig. 1); les maîtres d'œuvre andalous au service des Almoravides en ont gardé les dispositions générales dans les nefs communes de leur agrandissement (pl. 1), mais ils ont senti le besoin, pour composer de belles et riches ornancements au mīhrāb même et dans les travées qui le précèdent, de disposer d'une hauteur plus grande. Un ressaut brutal leur parut sans doute inélégant: à l'abri de cette nef surélevée ils purent augmenter, à mesure qu'ils s'approchaient du mīhrāb, la hauteur des coupole. Cette transition est si habilement ménagée que ces exhaussements successifs n'apparaissent pas au premier moment. A cet oratoire aux nefs assez basses, ils ont pu donner, grâce à cette ascension progressive des dômes de la nef axiale, un mīhrāb d'un bel élévation, précédé de deux travées de même hauteur et composer ainsi, à l'intérieur de la salle de prières, un imposant et luxueux sanctuaire.

Sur la bâtisse l'analyse de la mosquée apporte de nombreuses précisions de détail, mais ne change rien à ce que nous savons de ses caractères généraux. Les arcs et les piliers de la mosquée (pl. 1) sont faits de brique; tous les arcs des nefs communes, en plein cintre outrepassé, possèdent l'encadrement rectangulaire. L'oratoire et les galeries qui flanquent le saḥn sont couverts de toitures à deux pentes, refaites à des époques diverses mais qui

grading certaines dispositions des charpentes anciennes. Toutefois les parties les mieux conservées ou les plus exactement refaites montrent que, comme à la mosquée de Tlemcen, presque toutes les fermettes possédaient des entraîts. Tous les entrails anciens ou nouveaux reposent sur des blocs. Le type classique de la mosquée andalouse à piliers de briques et à toitures de tuiles était dès lors bien établi: on le trouvait, dès le règne précédent, aux grandes mosquées d'Alger et de Tlemcen.

Répartition et Caractères Généraux du Découpage

La répartition du décor est commandée par l'emplacement du mīhrāb et des coupole. Il en sera de même dans les mosquées almoladies, mais le plan en T adopté alors, permettra de jalonner la nef de la gībūlah de deux ou quatre coupole fermant autant de rappels de la coupole du mīhrāb: les arcs et les nefs donnant accès à ces coupole secondaires sont alors plus ornés que le reste de l'oratoire. Le décor s'ordonnera ainsi suivant une harmonie expressive et subtile à la fois.

A la Qarawiyyīn, la valeur éminente de la nef axiale est seule soulignée par une suite de coupole décorées: ce vaisseau central, couvert dans ses parties hautes de riches ornements, contient en outre presque tout le mobilier liturgique: la chaire, qui, chaque vendredi, est sortie de sa chambre, de multiples lustres de bronze et, à son entrée, une 'anazah de bois sculpté. Le contraste est vif entre toutes ces splendeurs accumulées sur un même alignement et l'austère simplicité de nefs communes. A l'extérieur même la valeur liturgique, de cette nef axiale, surélevée, on l'a vu, dans les six dernières travées de la mosquée, est encore accusée par le riche décor qui, à la gībūlah, couvre son pignon terminal (pl. 3, fig. 6), au-dessus de la niche même du mīhrāb.

L'abondance de l'ornement sculpté de la Qarawiyyīn permet, avant de passer à l'étude de
LA MOSQUÉE D’AL-QARAWIYIN

quelques grands ensembles décoratifs, de dégager les traits généraux de la géométrie, de la flore et de l'épigraphie hispano-mauresque à la fin de la première moitié du XIIe siècle.

Les arcs sont d'une grande richesse de formes. Aux arcades de l'oratoire et du ġaḥn, à la majorité des portes, c'est l'arc en plein cintre outrepassé qui triomphe. Cette fidélité à une forme ancienne apparaît ici comme un archaïsme : c'est pour respecter l'ordonnance de la mosquée zénète et pour ne pas introduire de discordance dans l'oratoire agrandi que les architectes de Yūsuf ont renoncé à employer l'arc outrepassé brisé qui, sous des formes variées et d'une rare élégance, remplacait presque partout à cette époque le vieil arc de l'art omeyyade. Toutefois les arcs de l'agrandissement almohade reposent sur des piliers plus minces (pl. 1, fig. 2) et plus hauts : l'arcade toute entière est ainsi plus élégante et la moulation en cavet qui reçoit la retombée forme une imposte continue autour du pilier. Aux arcades géminées qui, de la travée du fond de l'oratoire, donnent accès à la mosquée des morts, les arcs outrepassés retombent sur de hauts motifs serpentiniformes qui annoncent ceux de la mosquée almohade de Tinmel (pl. 3, fig. 5).

L'arc lobé est riche de formes. Une des arcades qui bordent la nef axiale est d'une magnifique ampleur (pl. 2, fig. 3) : elle se compose de cinq lobes inégaux ; celui du sommet s'achève par une pointe en accolade. L'extrados, fortement excentré, a un large encadrement qui unit deux entrelacs et un cavet à une ligne d'éléments floraux et qui s'achève, au sommet de l'arc, par un luxueux fleuron. De faux claveaux, alternativement déprimés et en relief, décorent l'arc lui-même : cette forme somptueuse et un peu lourde, semble être un héritage de l'art du XIe siècle, tel qu'on peut le saisir à l'Aljaféria de Saragosse. Mais à la première travée de la nef axiale après le mihrāb, les arcs à onze lobes sur motif serpentiforme (pl. 2, fig. 4) sont tout à fait semblables à ceux que l'art almohade emploiera avec prédilection. L'arc à lobes tréflés ne se retrouve que dans le pignon décoré qui achève la nef surélevée almohade ; d'une grande subtilité de détail, il est le thème majeur d'un riche ensemble d'arcatures entrelacées et mouluées qui rappelle l'esprit et les formes de l'Aljaféria (pl. 3, fig. 6). L'extrados de l'arc se compose de lobes simples. Il était mouluré d'entrelacs à deux brins — très proches de ceux de Tinmel — encadrant un vigoureux cavet. Les pointes des trilobes sont faites dans de courtes feuilles enroulées et affrontées : la contamination des formes géométriques et florales est déjà pleinement réalisée. Une dizaine d'années plus tard les maîtres d'œuvre au service de 'Abd al-Mu'min n'auront qu'à puer dans ce riche répertoire pour composer, en décor large cette fois, les mihrābs de Tinmel et de la Kutubiyya.

À l'intérieur des portes qui conduisent à la mosquée des morts se trouvent de curieux arcs sur motifs septentiformes tenant toute la largeur qu’occupe, à l'extérieur, l'arcade géminee signalée plus haut. Ce sont des arcs lobés très surbaissés mais de trace irrégulier, qui ont déjà la souplesse de l'arc floral. Ce dernier apparaît d'ailleurs au-dessus d'une des portes de la mosquée des morts (fig. 3), mais son extrados se dessine encore en ruban comme celui d'un arc lobé. Dans l'art almohade on accusera le dessin de chacune des palmettes qui composeront ces arcs à lobes inégaux.

L'arc à lambrequins apparaît sous une forme trilobée et élémentaire dans une ligne d'arcatures surmontant une des portes de cette mosquée des morts (fig. 3). Au pignon extérieur du mihrāb (pl. 3, fig. 6) il y a trois ou cinq lobes ; mais son tracé est très savant et des découpages floraux se creusent au raccord de chaque courbe. À la double archivolté qui fait face au mihrāb (pl. 4), il a les fines dentelures, les découpages floraux, l'aspect de guirlande qui se retrouveront à Tinmel et à la Kutubiyya. De chaque côté du mihrāb, il adopte un profil surbaissé et se compose avec plus de largeur : mais le traitement des détails est le même.

À la qubbah de la mosquée des morts l'arc à
lambrequins est employé en défoncement pour border des arcs lobés. Il est ici de lignes plus simples, mais son tracé est d’une grande souplesse. Toutefois, au vestibule de cette qubbah, un arc à lambrequins à cinq lobes avait des découpures florales.

Dans le dessin de tous ces arcs ont sent un parti pris de variété et d’une étonnante virtuosité. L’art almohade ne fera que choisir dans ce riche répertoire d’arcs lobés et à lambrequins et dégager, sous des formes plus nettes, l’arc floral qui s’ébauche ici.

Les entrelacs géométriques, tantôt se composent de minces filets faits de deux rubans presque accolés tantôt forment des réseaux plus larges à base de carrés étoilés ou d’étoiles (pl. 2, fig. 3), très proches par leur inspiration et leur technique de ceux qui règnent sous les coupoles des mosquées de ‘Abd al-Mu’min. Toutefois ils sont loin de jouer dans l’ensemble du décor le rôle que l’art almohade, en renonçant par puritanisme aux grands panneaux floraux, sera amené à leur donner.

Les muqarnas almoravides ne nous étaient connues que par les trompes de la coupole nervée qui, à la grande mosquée de Tlemcen, précède le mihrâb. Cinq dômes à stalactites—dont un grand plafond couvrant deux travées—s’étendent au-dessus de la nef axiale de la Qarawiyîn. La coupole nervée ne s’y voit qu’une fois (pl. 7), à l’emplacement du mihrâb de la mosquée zénète. Des coupoles à stalactites couvrent également la niche du mihrâb et la qubbah de la mosquée des morts. Les architectes au service des Almohades n’ont donc fait qu’adopter le procédé de couverture et de décor qui triomphait déjà à la Qarawiyîn. Les dimensions et les formes des divers éléments des muqarnas sont restés les mêmes, mais le puritanisme almohade n’a pas admis les décors épigraphiques et floraux qu’il avait fait plâtrer sous les dômes de la Qarawiyîn. Il a parfois ménagé de plus vives oppositions de lumière, en accusant la saillie des retombées et en plaçant les coupolettes lobées qu’enserre le réseau de stalactites dans des trous d’ombres plus profonds. Mais il n’a pas repris la coupole sur plan circulaire (pl. 15) qui, à la Qarawiyîn, introduit dans la série de ces dômes à muqarnas une si curieuse et riche variante.

L’épigraphie.—Dans l’épigraphie, le koufique (pl. 6, figs. 9 et 10, pl. 9, 10, 12 et 14) domine de loin, avec une incomparable variété de formes. Les hampes sont presque toujours hautes et élégantes. La flore tantôt s’associe à l’écriture sans jamais la masquer, tantôt lui fournit un fond sur laquelle les lettres se détachent en relief. Certaines hampes, simples ou tressées, amorcent des retours en haut du champ épigraphique. L’analyse détaillée de ces koufiques

* Nous ignorons quelle était la forme de la coupole qui a été remplacée par un dôme nervé récent à la seconde travée après l’entrée de l’oratoire.
almoravides doit nous apprendre beaucoup sur l'évolution des écritures hispano-mauresques.

A la Qarawîyîn comme à Tlemcen c'est le début du naskhî dans l'art monumental (pls. 4 et 10, fig. 14). Il apparait dans un carré à huit pointes sous la coupole devant le mihrâb et orne de nombreux panneaux secondaires des muqarnas, en particulier des archivoltes obliques. Il est très varié de mouvements et heureux dans le détail. Mais dans sa vivacité d'allure, il reste quelque peu anarchique. Il ne connait pas encore l'art d'ordonner ses mouvements suivant deux directions principales: celle des hampes et celles des grandes courbes au-dessous de la ligne. Dans cette première expansion il n'a pas encore trouvé sa loi: il reste une écriture nettement cursive qui n'atteint pas encore à la dignité monumentale.

Le décor floral.—Malgré la poussée du décor géométrique, le riche développement de l'écriture koufiq, l'apparition de la cursive, c'est le décor floral qui forme la plus riche parure de la mosquée. Sa variété et sa qualité attestent que les sculpteurs andalous l'ont traité avec prédilection. L'art du XIIe siècle reste fidèle sur ce point à la tradition de l'art du Califat, héritier lui-même de l'art antique.

C'est à la flore qu'on a recours toutes les fois que l'on veut composer un décor courant (pl. 9). On sait également l'employer en remplissages de moindre importance et même en motifs isolés. Elle constitue les thèmes majeurs de la décoration: la géométrie (pls. 10 et 11) et l'écriture (pls. 10 et 12) ne font souvent que l'encadrer ou l'accompagner.

Cette flore de la Qarawîyîn est d'une grande unité: elle se compose de palmettes nérveuses (pls. 9-14) et d'acanthes (pls. 15 et 16). La palme lisse, que l'art almohade développera, reste assez rare: presque partout règne, avec une grande variété de formes et de traitements, la palme à digitations d'acanthe. La tige n'est qu'un minceau rinceau que viennent encore ponctuer des formes secondaires, moins nombreuses toutefois qu'à la chaire d'Alger. Tantôt les feuilles composent un décor serré, presque compact (pl. 9); tantôt au contraire elles s'ordonnent sur un réseau plus large, dans un heureux équilibre des pleins et des vides (pls. 13 et 14).

A côté de la palme qui, comme dans tous les autres arts de l'Islam, se dégage des multiples dérivés de l'acanthe et de la feuille de vigne qui régnaient aux siècles précédents, l'acanthe antique connaît une étonnante expansion. Certains des panneaux de la coupole de Tlemcen nous avaient déjà révélé, ce retour, en plein douzième siècle, à la tradition antique. A la qubbah d'Alt b. Yusuf à Marrakech, les écoinçons entre les panneaux de palmes nérvees sont couverts d'acanthes en décors compacts, d'une grande variété de composition et de mouvements. Un des ateliers andalous qui travaillèrent à la Qarawîyîn a tenu à orner d'acanthes toute la coupole à stalactites sur plan circulaire qui est aussi originale par son décor que par sa forme. Nulle part on ne retrouve un décor d'acanthes aussi riche aussi varié et, en certains de ses panneaux, d'une telle élégance (pls. 15 et 16).

Si les thèmes floraux, depuis le XIe siècle, ont réduit le nombre de leurs types généraux et surtout épuré leurs lignes, la composition est d'une étonnante richesse. Tous les artistes qui ont travaillé à la Qarawîyîn—à la chaire comme au mihrâb et aux coupole—ont tenu à trouver pour chaque panneau une composition originale et à ne se répéter jamais. A l'intérieur d'un même panneau, qu'il s'agisse d'acanthes ou de palmes, les sculpteurs andalous ont souvent prêt soin d'introduire de légères dissymétries: toujours ils savent allier à une étonnante virtuosité décorative une science raffinée de l'équilibre des masses et des mouvements.

Ainsi cet art est-il, dans sa richesse et sa perfection, sans monotonie. Les grands ensembles décoratifs de la mosquée de la Qarawîyîn ont chacun leur personnalité. Un même répertoire ornemental, des tendances semblables,
une même habileté n’ont pas empêché les ateliers andalous amenés par Âl b. Yûsuf d’affirmer leur personnalité. Souvent même une série de panneaux apparaissent comme l’oeuvre d’un même homme. Ces différences d’ateliers et de mains qui donnent tant de délicate variété et de saveur aux œuvres almoravides s’atténuèrent vite aux siècles suivants: le décor merinide et naṣride, sera souvent, malgré sa qualité, monotone et impersonnel.

LES GRANDS ENSEMBLES DECORATIFS

Le mihrāb.—Dans ses parties basses le mihrāb de la Qarawīyīn (pl. 4) a beaucoup souffert tandis que ses parties supérieures ont été, comme sa coupole et comme tous les dômes de la nef axiale, défendues par leur hauteur même. Les sculptures de l’arc du mihrāb et de ses écoinçons ont été refaites dans un style fort médiocre, sans doute au XVIIIème siècle. Mais l’encadrement koufique a subsisté: toutefois les reliefs de l’inscription koufique ont été grattés. Les cinq panneaux carrés qui séparaient les quatre panneaux épigraphiques sont, eux aussi, de basse époque. Tous les claustra géométriques ont été refaits et l’ensemble du mihrāb a été très bariolé.

Sa composition, presque intacte dans les parties hautes (pl. 5), apparaît solidement équilibrée. L’arc même du mihrāb repose sur des colonnes de marbre couronnées de chapiteaux omeyyades: les Almohades ne feront que suivre l’exemple des Almoravides en ornant leursmosquées de marbres ramenés d’Espagne. L’ensemble de la composition s’ordonne en trois étages inégaux. Le mur semble avoir été lisse jusqu’au départ de l’arc. Mais les deux registres supérieurs (pl. 5) étaient traités en décor couvrant. Des bandeaux koufiques sur fond floral formaient les encadrements. Au-dessus trois arcatures renfermaient des claustra; l’arcade centrale, aujourdhui refaite, plus basse et plus étroite que les arcades latérales, était flanquée de deux panneaux floraux au somptueux ornement. On a ainsi évité de donner à cette composition très ferme une trop grande rigidité.

Un cavet couvert d’une inscription koufique supportait la retombée de la coupole à stalactites; entre les retombées de celles-ci s’inséraient des claustra ou des panneaux floraux. Bien plus que celui de Tlemcen, le mihrāb de la Qarawīyīn réalise l’ordonnance classique du mihrāb hispano-mauresque: les mihrābs almohades ne feront qu’en reprendre les grandes lignes en remplaçant les encadrements épigraphiques par des frises géométriques et en bannissant les décors floraux couvrants. Toutes ces sculptures, encore empâtées de chaux et parfois peintes, laissent mal voir sur photographies leur rare qualité. Au moins, peut-on saisir le luxe profus et aussi l’élégance des deux arcs et des deux panneaux qui, au registre supérieur, encadrent les trois claustra (pl. 5).

Les deux arcades latérales sont dessinées par des arcs floraux aux subtils inflexions, largement moulurés et bordés d’un cordon de folioles d’acanthe. Les écoinçons de palmer nervées apparaîtront, après nettoyage, d’un étonnant relief. Les deux grands panneaux verticaux comportent une tige centrale mais, à chaque registre, le décor de palme nervées se renouvelle. Des palme simples à écailles ou pommes de pin apparaissent souvent au plan supérieur du décor et en bonne place. Nous avons là les prototypes d’un grand nombre d’ornements merinides et naṣrides.

Si le mihrāb dont la restauration n’est pas comprise dans la tranche de travaux en cours ne fait que laisser deviner ses richesses, aux dômes de la nef axiale le dégagement de l’ornement est assez avancé. Il est dès maintenant possible de préciser l’ordonnance et la valeur de ces coupoles dans l’oratoire, leur structure, enfin, pour trois d’entre elles, d’étudier les sculptures qui venaient les enrichir.

* Cf. Henri Basset et Henri Terrasse, Sanctuaires et forteresses almohades, Paris, 1932, figs. 70 et 71, pls. V et VI.
LES COUPOLES À STALACTITES

Le mode de construction de ces coupole à muqarnas apparaît nettement. Elles n’avaient aucune valeur structurale: aussi bien elles sont protégées par la toiture de la nef surélevée qui les contient. Ce ne sont que des concrétions légères de plâtre — renforcées en quelques points de briques posées sur la tranche — et parfois reliées aux murs extérieurs de la nef par des tirants de bois. Pour chaque coupole en avait préparé, au moyen de madriers et de planches une creuse en creux de l’intérieur de laquelle les muqarnas étaient modelés. Cette forme se composait d’étages en retrait vers le haut qui correspondaient aux registres de stalactites des coupole. Certaines planches ont subsisté. En d’autres endroits, lorsque l’extra- dos n’a pas été remanié par des réparations de détail, l’empreinte des planches ou des madriers est encore visible dans le plâtre. Ainsi ces cou- pole, simples agglomérats de matériaux légers, renforcés et soutenus par des madriers, n’avaient aucune valeur architecturale: ce n’étaient que de somptueux décors.

Les stalactites sont les prototypes exacts de celles qu’Henri Basset et moi-même avions publiées dans nos études sur la mosquée de Tinnel et de la Kutubiyah10 et dont j’avais repris l’analyse dans un de mes livres.11 Elles se composent des mêmes éléments et s’ordonnent suivant les mêmes principes. Aussi n’appor- tenelles aucun élément nouveau au problème d’origine que nous avions posé il y a trente ans. C’est donc vers 1135 que les dômes à stalactites “apparaissent tout à coup dans l’art de l’Occident musulman, variés, souverainement habiles, d’une beauté qui ne sera plus dépassée, parfaits, semble-t-il, dès leur naissance.”

A l’étude d’origines que nous avions donnée alors, il est permis d’ajouter un fait nouveau et d’une grande importance. Dans des fouilles récentes, à la Qal’ah des Beni Hammâd, M. Lucien Golvin a retrouvé des éléments de stalactites en plâtre, appartenant sans doute à la couverture d’une niche, qui remontent à l’XIe siècle, entre 1007/08, date de la fondation de la Qal’ah et 1090, date de l’émigration des Hammâdides à Bougie. Ainsi l’art ziride, simple suite de l’art fâtîmid, l’art des Normands de Sicile qui s’y rattachait étroitement n’employaient pas seulement les muqarnas pour des organes d’encorbellement mais comme un décor de plafonds.

Toutefois, il est encore difficile de dire où s’élève pour la première fois, un dôme à muqar- nas de grandes dimensions. Le plafond de la Chapelle Palatine avait été jadis daté de 1132. Dans son étude récente, M. Ugo Monneret de Villard12 note seulement que la chapelle a été consacrée en 1140. Les travaux de la Qarawîyîn on l’a vu se placent entre 1135 et 1142-3. Une inscription historique en cours de dégagement nous donnera peut-être la date exacte du grand plafond, si proche dans ses grandes lignes de celui de la Palatine, qui couvre les deux travées précédant celle du mihrâb. Il n’est pas sûr qu’on puisse dater plus exactement ces deux œuvres sensiblement contemporaines et dire si le premier dôme à stalactites de vastes dimen- sions a été élevé en Sicile ou en Espagne. Au moins faut-il noter que la plafond de la Palatine, est en son temps et son pays, le seul de son espèce—celui de Monreale ne fut élevé qu’entre 1175 et 1180—tandis qu’à la Qarawîyîn le procédé, employé dans sept coupole, est pleinement généralisé.

LES PANNEAUX SCULPTÉS DES COUPOLES À MUQARNAS

C’est par le grand dôme couvrant deux travées que le travail de dégagement des panneaux sculptés a commencé. Travail difficile, puisque

10 Basset et Terrasse, op. cit., p. 58, fig. 15, et pp. 197-208, pls. XXII et XXIII, figs. 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82.
11 Henri Terrasse, L’art hispano-mauresque des origines à la fin du XIIIe siècle, Paris, 1932, pp. 335, 339, pls. LXVII, LXVIII, LXIX.
c'est avec du plâtre que ces sculptures sur
plâtre ont été obliterées: il a pu être fait avec
assez de soin pour qu'en mettant à jour ces
sculptures on ait pu retrouver la polychromie
primitive (pl. 6, fig. 10, pls. 9 et 13).

Celles-ci ne s'appliquaient pas à tous les pan-
neaux; elle était savamment répartie et graduée.
Certains motifs étaient entièrement peints;
d'autres ne l'étaient que sur leur tranche, en
particulier des inscriptions qui étaient ainsi
mises en valeur. Plus souvent encore les motifs
sculptés se détachaient en blanc, sur un fond
coloré. Les couleurs employées étaient un rouge
vermillon, un bleu outremer foncé, un ocre
jaune et enfin un violet très sombre, presque noir,
qui est sans doute le résultat d'une oxydation.

La forme des panneaux sculptés de ce dôme
est très variable. Entre les retombées du réseau
de stalactites se placent, dans des arcades à
lambrequins trilobés, de grands panneaux de
palms à nervures d'acanthe (pl. 9), très proches
par leur inspiration et leur répertoire de ceux
de la qubbah d'Ali b. Yûsuf à Marrakech. Ils
ne sont pas comme ces derniers, timbrés de
palmettes mais enserrant parfois des cartouches
contenant des inscriptions koufiques ou des
eulogies coraniques.

Les plus vastes des panneaux ménagés dans
les stalactites elles-mêmes sont des carrés in-
curvés en cavet (pl. 6, fig. 10, et pls. 9–12). Tantôt
rien ne vient s'ajouter à l'inscription; tantôt les
hampes des lettres sont reliées par des arcatures
ou s'entrelacent en formant un carré étoilé: on
saissit là, à ses débuts, un procédé décoratif qui
prendra un développement considérable dans
l'art merinide et naṣrid. Le fond est toujours
tapisse, à un niveau inférieur, par des palms
à nervures d'acanthes. Les plus beaux de ces
panneaux sont peut-être ceux où une simple
arcade lobée issue de deux des hampes extrêmes
se déploie au-dessus de l'inscription (pl. 12). Des
fonds de niche en plein cintre sont timbrés d'une
pomme de pin entourée d'éléments de palms ou
d'acanthe. Parfois le registre inférieur de ces
niches est meublé par un koufique assez trapu
(pl. 6, fig. 10). Des encochements dessinant
une sorte de console à arêtes sont couverts de
feuilles d'acanthes et de courtes palmes (pls. 9 et
10): on voit même un cinq feuilles assez proche
de ceux de Madīnat al-Zahrā': ainsi avec
l'acanthe, d'autres formes de l'art omeyyade
affleurent encore dans l'art du XIIe siècle.

Le cursif est réservé à des archivoltes en
eventail (pl. 10) supportées par des gaînes can-
nelées en spirale d'où s'échappe une ébauche
de console florale. On a dit plus haut l'allure très
libre de ce naskh auquel se mêle un léger décor
floral: des palmes partiellement nervées ac-
crochées à de très minces rinceaux.

La coupole de plan circulaire (pl. 15) posait
avant la découverte des panneaux sculptés des
autres dômes, un problème insoluble. Les trois
etages de son décor d'acanthes étaient, bien
qu'empâtés de chaux, parfaitement visibles. On
ne s'expliquait pas comment cette coupole était
seule à posséder de riches ornements adventices
alors que toutes les autres n'avaient que des
stalactites lisses ou n'étaient ornées que de rares
clavstra géométriques ou floraux. C'est que les
feuilles ou les bouquets d'acanthe qui l'ornent
ont été modelés en avant du plan des muqarnas:
it était impossible d'empâter ces sculptures en
saillie sans défigurer grossièrement tout l'en-
semble. L'étude de l'art almohade nous montre,
que, si 'Abd al-Mu'āmin et les siens tenaient à
apparaître, au moins dans leurs sanctuaires,
comme des puritains, ils étaient aussi des
hommes de goût, saisis à leur tour par le charme
de l'art andalou. Cette coupole, originale entre
toutes, eut la chance de trouver grâce à leurs
yeux. Débarrassées des multiples couches de
chaux qui les empêtaient, ses acanthes retrou-
vent la netteté et la finesse de leur primitif
modèle.

Près du sommet de la coupole et en dispo-
sition rayonnante s'étalent de longues feuilles
symétriques qui toutes diffèrent par quelques
détails. Deux autres registres de décor floral
viennent former des anneaux continus à mi-
hauteur et vers le bas de la coupole. En bas, ce
Fig. 1—Piliers et Arcs de l'Oratoire Zénète.

Fig. 2—Piliers et Arcs de l'Agrandissement Almoravide Fès, Mosquée d'al-Qarawiyin.
Fig. 3—Arc à Cinq Lobes et Frise d'Entrelacs Géométrique.

Fig. 4—Arc à Onze Lobes, Mosquée d'al-Qarawiyin.
Fig. 5—Une Porte de la Mosquée des Morts.

Fig. 6—Décors d'Arcatures au Chevet de la Nef Axiale, Mosquée d'al-Qaraouïyin.
Fig. 7—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyîn. Le Mihrāb.
Fig. 8—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyîn, Parties Hautes du Mihrāb.
Fig. 9—Panneaux Floreux du Haut du Mihrāb.

Fig. 10—Mosquée d'al-Qarawīyīn. Vue Partielle du Dôme à Muqarnas sur Plan Barlong. (Après Dégagement du Décor Sculpté.)
Fig. 11—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyn. Coupole Nervée Almoravide.
Fig. 12—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyn. Dôme à Muqarnas sur Plan Barlong. (Avant Dégagement des Sculptures.)
Fig. 13. A et B—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîn, Panneaux sculptés à la base d'une coupole à Muqarnas.
A—Coupolets Lobés. Éléments de Muqarnas Lobés ou Décorés.

B—Inscriptions Koufiques et Cursives.

Fig. 14, A et B—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyîn. Coupole sur Plan Barlong.
Fig. 15. A et B—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyîn. Courtoisies Lobées.
Fig. 16. A-F—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyïn. Panneaux Sculptés Sous un Dôme à Muqarnas.
Planche 14 - Eulogie Koufique et Fleurons à Digitations d'Acanthes.

B - Panneaux de Fleurons et de Palmes Nervées.

Fig. 18, A et B - Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyîn.
Fig. 19—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyîn. Coupole à Muqarnas sur Plan Circulaire.
Fig. 20, A–C—Mosquée d’al-Qarawîyîn. Décor d’Acanthes Sous la Coupole à Muqarnas de Plan Circulaire.
Fig. 21—Mosquée d'al-Qarawîyîn. Le Minbar.
sont des bouquets d’acanthe et de palmes qui s’échappent, à la manière antique, d’une sorte de gain. Tous sont dissemblables mais leur composition est inégalement heureuse. Certaines se posent sur des colonnes surmontées de petits chapiteaux composés, non d’acanthes, mais de palmes élémentaires, lisses ou faiblement nervées. Ce sont les plus anciens exemples connus des chapiteaux à palmes qui triomphèrent dans l’art almohade. Ceux de la Qaraïyn sont plus curieux que beaux. Était-ce l’ébauche d’une forme nouvelle ou le sculpteur a-t-il été gêné par la petiteessse de la forme qu’il avait à orner? Il est bien difficile de le dire.

Les ornements qui composent le registre moyen (pl. 16), des acanthes parfois mêlées de pommes de pin, sont d’un rare bonheur de composition: les feuilles se déroulent et s’étagent en gestes souples; le modèle, d’une grande délicatesse, retourne presque à la ronde bosse; de subtiles variantes de détail empêchent, à l’intérieur de chaque motif, une symétrie absolue. Ces simples bouquets qui dépassent en souplesse d’élégance, les panneaux de la qubbah de Marrakech, sont le chef-d’œuvre de cette première floraison de l’acanthe antique dans un art musulman. Cette cupole a conservé plusieurs de ses claustra primitifs (pl. 15). Les mailles de deux d’entre eux sont formés par des entrelacs recticurvilignes du type qui deviendra le plus courant dans l’art des XIIIe et XIVe siècles. Nous l’avions retrouvé dans des fragments de plâtre sculpté des palais d’Al b. Yûsuf à Marrakech.13 Le dessin d’une autre claire-voie, plus archaïque, combine un carroyage et des cercles. Enfin apparaît un motif polygonal curviligne issu d’une étoile à huit pointes. Ce traitement par des courbes de motifs étoilés entrelacés qui, aux siècles postérieurs, seront dessinés uniquement par des droites, semble bien être un des traits de l’art almora-vide. On le retrouve aux peintures de la fontaine qui avait été bâtie à l’intérieur de l’enceinte, près de la porte de la qubbah de Yûsuf b. Tâshîm et surtout dans une curieuse rosace de plâtre sculpté du palais d’‘Alî.14

La troisième cupole dont les décor ancients ont pu être dégagés montrait déjà, avant les travaux, de beaux claustra géométriques et floraux. Le décor des panneaux de muqarnas est plus rare que dans les autres cupoles. Sans doute l’ornement de la nef axiale devenait-il moins riche à mesure que l’on s’éloignait du miṣrâb; mais l’exacte hiérarchie de ce décor ne pourra être appréciée qu’à la fin des actuels dégagements. Des panneaux floraux s’insèrent entre les retombées des stalactites et couvrent quatre panneaux carrés des muqarnas (pls. 13 et 14). Ils sont peut-être ces que la flore hispano-mauresque nous a laissé de plus parfaits: le sculpteur inconnu qui les a conçus et exécutés était un grand maître. La composition est d’une souplesse et d’une légèreté incomparables. Au rebours d’autres artistes qui ont travaillé à la Qaraïyn l’auteur de ces panneaux a adopté une composition très acrèe où, dans un heureux équilibre des vides et des pleins, les formes florales prennent toute leur valeur. Ce sont des palmes nervées simples ou doubles et des pommes de pin. Leurs formes rappellent parfois les thèmes floraux de la chaire d’Alger: elles ont la même variété et la même ferméte. Toutes sont d’une beauté parfaite et d’un modèle délicat. Là, comme à la qubbah d’‘Alî b. Yûsuf, l’art andalou atteint aux sommets de l’art décoratif: aucune flore abstraite n’est, je crois, plus belle que celle-là.

**LE MOBILIER**

Le mobilier liturgique de la Qaraïyn est très abondant et souvent de tout premier ordre. Mais la ‘anazah qui clôt sur le sahn l’entrée de la nef axiale, le grand lustre et les autres plus petits qui sont suspendus dans cette nef sont d’époques postérieures. Toutefois la chaire (pls. 17 et 18) est, comme celle de la Kutubîyah

---

13 Meunié et Terrasse, *Recherches archéologiques à Marrakech*, figs. 6, 8, 9.
14 *Ibid.*, pl. 60, fragments 262 et fig. 11 bis.
de Marrakech\textsuperscript{15} une œuvre almoravide. Sans doute, fut-elle, comme cette dernière, sculptée, sinon à Cordoue même, du moins en Andalousie. Cette chaire est de dimensions un peu moindres que celle de Marrakech mais elle est de même style. Son décor, un peu moins riche, a le mérite d’être mieux à l’échelle du meuble qu’il recouvre entièrement.

C’est, lui aussi, un minbar à neuf degrés (pl. 17). Son arcade latérale d’entrée repose sur un double pilier comme à la Kutubiyah. Mais une seconde arcade, également de la largeur d’une marche, précède le dossier placé en avant et non au fond de la plate-forme supérieure. La rampe, en bois sombre—palissandre ou ébène—est soigneusement moulurée: c’est le plus ancien exemple de minbar hispano-mauresque à main courante car la rampe de la chaire de la Kutubiyah a été ajoutée. Ainsi les artistesandalous savaient varier la structure même des chaires qu’ils fabriquaient. Des bobéchons sons doute incrustés d’ivoire marquaient, entre les deux arcades, le haut de chaque marche; ils reposaient sur des socles lisses.

Les faces latérales—les “joues”—de la chaire (pl. 18), sont entièrement tapissées d’entrelacs géométriques dessinés par des baguettes couvertes de marqueteries d’ivoire et de bois précieux et qui enserrent, comme à la Kutubiyyah, des panneaux de bois sculpté. C’est le décor de palmettes nervées sur rinceaux qui a été employé ici et tous les panneaux ont une composition différente. Dans tous ces bois, ciselés comme des bijoux, c’est la même virtuosité décorative, le même modèle incisif et subtil à la fois. Toutefois les palmettes sont ici plus larges qu’au minbar de Marrakech. Ce sont sans doute deux ateliers différents qui ont exécuté, à la même époque, les deux grandes chaires almoravides. Le décor de marqueterie s’apparente par ses formes, surtout dans les baguettes et dans les fonds à semis, à celui qui a été employé à l’autre chaire almoravide. Mais les éléments d’ivoire et de bois précieux qui composent tous ces motifs sont faits, suivant la technique courte, de minces plaquettes au lieu de se composer de petits bâtonnets comme à la Kutubiyah.

Une inscription koufique de marquerie fait, là aussi, le tour des joues (pl. 18 A). Des motifs faits de plus en plus gros éléments ornent les deux arcades. Le dossier est revêtu de marqueries plus larges. Mais il est lui décoré, lui aussi, d’un magnifique arbre de vie fait de palmettes nervées rapportées sur le fond du dossier, dont il ne subsiste malheureusement que de rares vestiges. Les contre-marches sont couvertes de marqueteries. La première avait même, comme les joues de la chaire, des panneaux de bois sculpté.

Dans son ensemble ce minbar est mieux conservé que celui de la Kutubiyah. Comme lui, il constitue tout un monde décoratif et il reste un des plus beaux meubles que le Moyen-Age nous ait légués.

Ainsi, grâce aux révélations que nous apporte la Qarawiyyin, nous connaissons le décor hispano-mauresque du temps des Almoravides sous tous les aspects et dans toutes ses nuances. Le grand sanctuaire fassi nous fournit en abondance des œuvres de premier plan, égales en qualité aux ensembles ornementaux de la grande mosquée de Tlemcen et de la qubbah d’Ali b. Yûsuf à Marrakech. Pour élever les grands sanctuaires dont il dotait les trois grandes villes de son empire africain, le second sultan almohade a fait venir d’Andalousie les meilleurs artistes de son temps.

Aussi est-ce un témoignage d’Espagne que nous apportent ces grandes œuvres maghrébines. L’art du XI° siècle avait fait, dans la Péninsule, un étonnant effort dont l’Aljaféria de Saragosse nous montre le début et dont les fragments retrouvés à Malaga et au Castillejo de Murcie nous faisaient pressentir l’heureux achèvement.

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. pour la description de cette chaire: Basset et Terrasse, Sanctuaires et fortresses almohades, pp. 234-270, pls. XXXI à XXXVI, fig. 90 à 97, et pour sa datation, Sauvaget, Sur le minbar de la Kutubiyya de Marrakech, pp. 313-319.
Des richesses diverses de l’art omeyyade, il tirait de plus en plus un style qui lui était propre. Peu à peu il simplifiait le répertoire de sa flore mais donnait aux formes nouvelles une beauté jamais atteinte. En même temps, il composait avec une rigueur et une élégance croissantes. Dans ce dernier domaine, il n’admettait aucune simplification; les artistes mettaient leur point d’honneur à ne jamais se répeter: en même temps que la qualité de la ligne, la virtuosité décorative leur apparaissait comme une des vertus de l’art. Mais dans ce double effort de renouvellement et de perfection, guidé par un esprit de choix lucide et exigeant, l’art hispano-mauresque n’oubliait pas les traditions qu’il prolongeait: au moment même où il donnait à la flore andalouse ses thèmes classiques il employait dans son décor de revêtement, pour une dernière floraison, l’acanthe antique qu’il abandonnait pour la palme dans ses chapiteaux. L’art hispano-mauresque a connu vers le milieu du XIIe siècle, un moment peut-être unique d’équilibre et de beauté.

Tout ce que nous avions dit, il y a trente ans, des débuts et de l’esprit de l’art almohade se trouve confirmé. Les artistes andalous au service de ‘Abd al-Mu‘min n’ont pas véritablement créé; ils ont choisi dans le riche répertoire de leur temps, les éléments d’un style nouveau: le décor large qui respectait en apparence le puritanisme des nouveaux souverains. Ils ont été ainsi amenés à mettre en valeur certains éléments qui étaient encore au second plan dans l’art almoravide: les réseaux géométriques et la palme lisse. L’art andalou réussit à servir deux maîtres africains avec le même bonheur: sa richesse et sa science lui permettaient de choisir et de se renouveler sans cesser d’être lui-même.

Mais la réforme artistique des Almohades ne paraît pas avoir touché que l’architecture religieuse d’Afrique et pour assez peu de temps. Dans la Péninsule, l’art qui triompha sous les Almoravides semble n’avoir jamais cessé de tenir la première place. Par ses principes décoratifs, en particulier, par l’emploi presque systématique du décor couvrant, par un bon nombre de ses formes de détail, il se prolongera dans l’art des XIIIe et XIVe siècles. Le style almohade, dans sa sobriété classique, ne fut guère qu’un magnifique accident. Dans les monuments almoravides nous retrouvons le cours profond de l’art hispano-mauresque.

AN UNKNOWN TYPE OF MINBAR AND ITS HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

By J. Schacht

K. A. C. Creswell says in his account of the Great Mosque at Sousse: "To the right of the mihrāb is a door. I had opened and, to my amazement, saw a small room ... filled by a pulpit on wheels, light enough for one man just to be able to pull it forth. Although the actual pulpit was not many centuries old, I was at once reminded of the 'silla (chair) del rey Almāçor' at Cordova, of the very old pulpit on wheels in the Great Mosque of Tunis, and of another, dated 490 H. (1096) [read: 1096], in the Great Mosque of Algiers. Evidently we here have something specifically Maghrebin. Can it be that the old throne idea survived longer in conservative Western Islam than elsewhere, and the minbar being regarded as a symbol of royalty and authority, it was considered advisable to keep it safely locked up until required for official use?"¹ The minbar on wheels or rollers is, indeed, the normal type of a minbar all over the Maghreb, including Ifriqiya. Another type of minbar, completely different in conception but answering the same purpose, is common in East Africa, where I had occasion to observe it in 1953, and a comparison of the two types with each other and with the normal Eastern type of fixed minbar will enable us to fix their common origin at a particular point in the development of the Friday ritual of Islam.

I

It seems indicated to start by collecting the available evidence, some of it unpublished, on the occurrence of movable minbars in the Maghreb, in order to show the strength of a tradition, the significance of which does not appear to have been fully appreciated so far. I hope the specialists on Islamic architecture in the Maghreb will forgive me for elaborating on what, to them, is familiar. My aim is not to give an exhaustive list, but I have tried to digest the relevant information, as far as it is available to me, down to and including the time of the Marinids. Only very few old minbars have actually been preserved, but the existence of a recess for the minbar to the right of the mihrāb proves the existence of a movable minbar at the time the qiblah wall was built. We are concerned here only with Friday mosques, which alone have minbars; the absence of a minbar recess in other mosques is irrelevant to the present argument.

It so happens that the earliest extant Friday mosque in the Maghreb, the Great Mosque of Kairouan, has a fixed minbar and forms one of the few exceptions from an otherwise general rule.² The series of movable minbars begins with the Great Mosque of Sfax, which was built in 235 H./849 and thoroughly rebuilt in 378 H./988. The plans of both the original and the reconstructed building show recesses for the minbar.³ Next in order of time comes the Great Mosque of Tunis, reconstructed in 250 H./864; it, too, has a recess for the minbar in the qiblah wall, and its minbar on wheels is said to be "very old".⁴ These mosques belong to the Aghlabid period. There follows, perhaps, another exception from the rule in the Fātimid Great Mosque of Mahdia; it has no minbar recess and therefore possibly had a fixed minbar.⁵ From here on, however, the series of movable minbars is practically uninterrupted. The minbar of the

² See below, section III.
⁵ See below, section III.
Great Mosque of Cordova was on wheels; it has not been preserved, but the wheels were mentioned by an eyewitness, who called it a “carriage.” It was built under the Umayyad al-Ḥakam II between 355 H./966 and 365 H./976. This minbar replaced an earlier one, which presumably dated from a former extension of the mosque under ʿAbd al-Raḥmān II in 234 H./848, and when al-Ḥakam II completed his own extension of the mosque in 355 H./966, he at first had the old minbar placed at the side of the new miḥrāb and the old maqsūrah put up in front of the new qiblah. The fact that this was considered worth mentioning does not imply that the earlier minbar was not movable, too, because the maqsūrah encloses the space in front of the miḥrāb and minbar, and even a minbar on wheels, which could not be pulled forth beyond the maqsūrah, would normally be put in its place “at the side of the miḥrāb” before the maqsūrah was erected. The next example, in order of time, is probably the old minbar in the Mosque of the Andalusians in Fez. This minbar was built in 369 H./980 by the Zirid Buluggin under the Fāṭimids, restored in 375 H./985 under the Umayyads, and later, under the Almohads, incorporated in a minbar on wheels. The qiblah wall, which has a recess for the minbar, belongs to an Almohad reconstruction from 600 H./1203 to 605 H./1207. It is therefore not certain that the old minbar was on wheels, but it is probable. Next come the minbar recesses in the reconstructed Great Mosque of Sfax, to which I have already referred and which, too, belongs to the Zirid period, and in the mosque of the Qaʿah of the Banū Ḥammād, the rivals of the Zirids. This last mosque is obviously contemporaneous with its fortress town, the construction of which was begun in 397 H./1007. Exactly contemporaneous is the Great Mosque of Almeria; it was built under the Umayyads at the end of the fourth (tenth) century and enlarged, but not on the side of the qiblah, between 403 H./1012 and 419 H./1028; it, too, has a recess for the minbar.

To an indeterminate period, but presumably to the second half of the fifth (eleventh) or the first half of the sixth (twelfth) century, belongs the qiblah wall of the Great Mosque at Sousse, with its recess for the minbar.

Our documentation becomes abundant from the Almoravids onward. In the Almoravid period, we have the minbar on wheels of the Great Mosque of Algiers, already mentioned, which is dated 490 H./1096, the minbar recess of the Great Mosque of Tlemcen of 530 H./1136, and the minbar recess in the Almoravid qiblah wall of the Mosque of the Qarawiyyīn at Fez, about the same date, anticipating its strict

---


7 Cf. Creswell, op. cit., p. 140. For the most recent view of the architectural history of the Great Mosque of Cordova, see Marçais, op. cit., p. 135ff.

8 Ibn ʿIdhari, op. cit., p. 238.


10 The wheels which are visible on plates 50 and 51 were put in recently, after Professor Terrasse had disengaged the Zirid-Fāṭimīd minbar from the Almohad shell.

11 Cf. L. de Beylié, La Kalaa des Beni-Hammâd, Paris, 1906, pp. 19 (for the chronology), 78 (plan of the mosque); Marçais, op. cit., p. 75.


14 Cf. Marçais, ibid., p. 191.


chronological place, I will mention here the minbar recess beside the mihrāb of 590 H./1194 in the mosque of Tazm, a work of the Banū Ghānīyāh, a succession dynasty of the Almoravids. There follows the series of the great mosques of the Almohads, all of which have recesses for the minbar: the first and the second Kutubiyya in Marrakech (built between 541 H./1146 and 558 H./1162), the mosque of Tinmel (548 H./1153-54), the mosque of the Kasbah in Marrakech (591 H./1195), the mosque of Hassān in Rabat (593 H./1196-97), and the reconstruction of the mosque of the Andalusians in Fez (600-605 H./1203-07). From the period of the Marinids we have the Great Mosque in Fez Jā'id (674 H./1276), the two mosques in Chella near Rabat (685 H./1286 and 739 H./1339), the Great Mosque of Taza (ca. 700 H./1300), the mosque of Ben Ṣāliḥ in Marrakech (shortly before 731 H./1331), the mosque of Mansoura near Tlemcen (founded 702 H./1303, reconstructed from 736 H./1336 onward), the mosque of Sīdī Bū Madayn at El-Eubbād near Tlemcen, the Madrasah Bū-Īnānīyyah in Fez (completed 756 H./1355), which was built as a Friday mosque from the beginning, and the mosque of Bāb Gīsa in Fez (eight/fourteenth century). To the end of this period belongs the Zayyānid mosque of Sīdī Brāhīm in Tlemcen (ca. 760-790 H./1359-88).

The same tradition was continued in Morocco under the Sa’dians and later, as is shown by the zāwiyāh of Sīdī al-Jażzū (ca. 961 H./1554), the mosque of Bāb Dukkālah (965 H./1557), and the mosque of Mouassine (970 H./1562), all in Marrakech, as well as by examples in Fez, Meknes, and Rabat. As to Algeria, I know of movable minibars in the mosque of Sīdī Ramdān in the Kasbah of Algiers (perhaps contemporary with the Great Mosque of Algiers and certainly earlier than the sixteenth century), in the Great Mālikī Mosque in Ouargla (not later than 1073 H./1666), in the mosque Sīdī Ba ‘Afu in Ouargla (pl. 1, fig. 1), in the zāwiyāh of El Hamel, near Bou Saada (nineteenth century), and others. Tunis in the Haṣṣid and the Turkish periods is represented by the minbar

38 Cf. H. Basset and H. Terrasse, Sanctuaires et forteresses almohades (Coll. Hespéris, 5), Paris, 1932, fig. 26 and pl. 15; Marçais, Architecture, p. 205. The actual (second) Kutubiyya possesses its original minbar; it was originally movable and fits exactly into its recess, but is not at present kept locked away during the week; cf. Basset and Terrasse, ibid., p. 235.
39 Cf. Basset and Terrasse, ibid., fig. 9 and pl. 5(b); Marçais, ibid., p. 201.
40 Cf. Basset and Terrasse, ibid., p. 276 and pl. 40. This mosque, too, possesses its original movable minbar.
42 See above, note 9.
43 Cf. Marçais, op. cit., p. 40; Marçais, op. cit., p. 268.

52 Cf. Marçais, Architecture, p. 386.
53 Cf. ibid., p. 385.
55 Cf. Maslow, op. cit.; Marçais, ibid., p. 388; J. Caillé, La Ville de Rabat, pp. 711, who visited Ouargla at that time, saw the Great Mālikī Mosque in its present condition; cf. A. Berbrügger (tr.), Voyages dans le sud de l’Algérie (Exploration scientifique de l’Algérie, Sciences historiques et géographiques, 9), Paris, 1846, p. 45 f.
recesses in the mosque El-Haliq (777 H./1375),\textsuperscript{38} in the mosque of the quarter Bâb al-Aqwâs (beginning of the ninth/fifteenth century),\textsuperscript{39} and in the mosque of Yûsuf Dey (1025 H./1616).\textsuperscript{40} The island of Djerba provides several further examples.\textsuperscript{41} The Jâmi’ al-Ghurabâ’ (pronounced ghurba), formerly Ibâdî, now Mâliki, and the Jâmi’ al-Turk (pronounced truk), formerly Hanafî, both in Hount Souk, have movable minbars with their recesses.\textsuperscript{42} The mosque of Midoun has two mihrâbs; the original one, to the right, has beside it a now useless recess for the minbar; later the mosque was enlarged and a second mihrâb added in the new center of the qiblah wall; beside this stands a minbar on wheels, but without a recess. In the mosque of Arkou, which I did not enter, a built-out recess for the minbar beside the apsidal mihrâb is visible from outside.

I have already drawn attention in another place\textsuperscript{43} to the Old Mosque in Laghouat, where the minbar consists of two solid wooden drawers which can be pulled forth and pushed back, forming the steps, and higher up a niche in the wall, which forms the seat (\textit{pl. i, fig. 2}), and to the mosque of Sî ‘Abd al-Qâdir, also in Laghouat, where, instead of the drawers, we find a pair of wooden steps, which is placed underneath a niche in the qiblah wall. Wooden steps, without a niche in the qiblah wall, serve as minbars in three of the four Friday mosques of the Beni Snoûs, about 20 miles southwest of Tlemcen, which A. Bel has described.\textsuperscript{44} The minarets of these mosques date probably from the beginning of the eighth (fourteenth) century, and the mosques themselves are either contemporary with them or earlier, perhaps even as early as the time of the Almoravids. Though the mosques may have been, and one of them certainly has been, more or less extensively repaired since, there is nothing to suggest that their essential arrangements have been radically altered. The fourth of these mosques, that of the Beni-Achir, has a minbar built into the qiblah wall, and this is described by Bel as follows: “À droite, une niche étroite et surélevée, creusée dans le mur, dans laquelle on pénètre au moyen de deux hautes marches d’escalier, remplace le minbar des autres mosquées-cathédrales. C’est la chaire.”

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{plan-a.png}
\caption{Plan A—Mihrâb and Minbar of the Mosque in Maiduguri, Bornu.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{plan-b.png}
\caption{Plan B—Mihrâb and Minbar of the Mosque in Bama, Bornu.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{38} Cf. Marçais, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 459.
\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 460.
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 461.
\textsuperscript{41} I am speaking only of mosques that belong to the Sunnis. The Ibâdis have no special Friday ritual and have therefore, in principle, no use for a minbar or a minbar recess. On Djerba, however, the Tunisian Government obliges them to perform a Friday ceremony with a khutbah, and for this they use minbars on wheels. Cf. my paper \textit{Sur la diffusion des formes d’architecture religieuse musulmane à travers le Sahara}, Travaux de l’Institut de Recherches Sahariennes, vol. 11 (1954), p. 16f.
\textsuperscript{42} At least in the Jâmi’ al-Ghurabâ’ the recess for the minbar must have been built on after the Mâliks had taken over the mosque.
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Sur la diffusion} (see above, n. 41), p. 25f.
It appears from the plan⁴⁶ that the two steps of the minbar or, better, the one step and the seat which compose it, are built within the niche, that is to say, within the thickness of the wall. This gives us another of those minibars built as part of the fabric of the mosque and not protruding into the interior of the hall, which I had already observed in the Māliki mosques of the Mzab region (foil. i, fig. 3) and, in a slightly modified form, in the mosques of Kanuri type in Bornu, where the minbar is included in the recess of the mihrāb, plans A and B.⁴⁸ This type of built minbar, which we shall meet again in the East, fulfills the same purpose as the recess of a minbar on wheels, making the pulling forth and pushing back of the minbar itself superfluous, and I propose to show that it is a very old alternative to it.

II

In the qiblah wall of a Friday mosque there is often a door for the imām, be it the prince or governor or the more modest functionary who pronounces the khutbah and leads the service. This arrangement goes back to the time of the Umayyads.⁴⁹ We often find the imām’s door, to the left of the mihrāb, placed symmetrically with the opening of the minbar recess on the right, and the three elements combined into a tripartite architectural unit. This, too, is familiar to the specialists on Islamic architecture in the Maghreb, but the chronology of its occurrence in the Maghreb and in the East, which is part of my argument, has not, to my knowledge, been explicitly established so far.⁵⁰ We shall see that this architectural tradition established itself in the Maghreb only gradually.

The symmetrical arrangement is not yet found in the Great Mosque of Kairouan; its qiblah wall, which dates from 221 H./836, has a door for the imām to the right of the minbar, which is not movable.⁵¹ It is not found, either, in the Great Mosque of Tunis, of 250 H./864, where the imām’s door is, it is true, to the left of the mihrāb, but not placed symmetrically with the opening of the minbar recess.⁵² Even sensibly later, it is found neither in the mosque of the Qal‘ah of the Bani Ḥamād, soon after 397 H./1007, nor in the Ḥammādīd Great Mosque of Bougie, founded 494 H./1099, nor in the mosque of Tozeur, the mihrāb of which is dated 590 H./1194, nor even in the Almohad reconstruction of the Mosque of the Andalusians in Fez, of 600–605 H./1203–07.⁵³ The earliest example of the symmetrical arrangement, however, occurs already in the ancient Great Mosque of Sfax, of 235 H./849, according to the reconstruction of its plan by G. Marçais.⁵⁴ It is found again in the Great Mosque of Cordova, on which I shall have to say a few words later, in the reconstructed Great Mosque of Sfax, of 378 H./988, in the Great Mosque of Almería, of the end of the fourth (tenth) century,⁵⁵ and in the extension of the Great Mosque of Sousse, of the second half of

The decorative scheme may, of course, have fused later with the architectural arrangement, with which alone I am concerned here.

⁴⁶ Cf. Creswell, Early Muslim architecture, vol. 2, p. 218 and fig. 175.
⁴⁷ Cf. Creswell, ibid., p. 322 and pl. 91(c).
⁴⁸ Cf. de Beylié, La Kala‘a des Beni-Hammad, p. 78.
⁵¹ See above, n. 9. As the tripartite arrangement is typical of the other mosques of the Almohads, the asymmetrical arrangement in this particular case seems to go back to an earlier stage of the building.
⁵² Architecture, p. 73.
⁵³ Ibid.
⁵⁴ Architecture, p. 73.
the fifth (eleventh) or the first half of the sixth (twelfth) century. It is the rule in the mosques of the Almoravids, of the Almohads, and later.

The tripartite arrangement, the mihrāb flanked by two doors arranged symmetrically, became an architectural convention for the layout of the qiblah wall, even in other than Friday mosques, where there was no minbar and no minbar recess, for instance in the Madrasat al-Šahrīj in Fīz (Marīnid), in the mosque of the suburb of Mellasine in Tunis (Ḫafṣīd), and in the Madrasah of Ben Yousouf in Marrakech (Saʿdīan).

The arrangement of the qiblah wall in the Great Mosque of Cordova, which is part of the extension of al-Ḥakam II, completed in 355 H./966, calls for a short explanation. It shows the tripartite order with two doors placed symmetrically, one on each side of the mihrāb. Al-Šarīf al-Idrīsī (d. 560 H./1166), in his description of the mosque, makes it clear that the door to the left of the mihrāb gave access to a room in which the valuable utensils of the mosque and a venerable copy of the Koran, associated with the caliph ʿUthmān, were kept, and that the door “to the right of the mihrāb and of the minbar” gave access to a passage leading to the palace. This envisages the position of the minbar after it has been pulled forth and put into its place for the Friday service. That the minbar was pulled forth and pushed back within the space enclosed by the maqṣūraḥ is certain; otherwise there would have been no point in putting it on wheels. Where was the minbar stored? Maqqari (d. 1041 H./1632), quoting the Kitāb majmūʿ al-mustāriq, states that the minbar was put away in the room in which the famous Koran was kept, in other words, in the room to the left of the mihrāb, and whereas this “imām’s room” is often used for storing the implements of a mosque, it is indeed surprising that a minbar should be put away to the left of the mihrāb. Maqqari’s information on the Great Mosque of Cordova is not correct in at least one other detail. I am, nevertheless, inclined to credit the statement of his source precisely because it is so unexpected.

However we may interpret this particular case, the architectural convention of a tripartite order in the qiblah wall presupposes for its development the tradition of a movable minbar recess and therefore of a movable minbar.

III

I must now discuss the few exceptions, more apparent than real, to the general rule of the movable minbar in the Maghreb. First of all, there is the Great Mosque of Kairouan. Its qiblah wall dates from 221 H./830; it has no niche for the minbar but two doors, in the first and the second aisle to the right of the mihrāb. The mihrāb itself and the fixed minbar, immediately to the right of it in the central aisle, date from 248 H./862-63. Now the panels of the minbar, together with the tiles of the

---

68 Cf. Creswell, op. cit., fig. 190, opposite p. 250.
72 Cf. Marçais, Manuel, p. 702.
74 Cf. Dessus Lamare, op. cit., pp. 8-11 (in note 127, read “du palais” instead of “de la mosquée”). This passage was copied by Ibn ʿAbd al-Munʿim (see above, n. 6), text p. 155, tr. p. 185; cf. É. Lambert, Précisions nouvelles sur ... la Grande Mosquée de Cordoue, Annales de l’Institut d’Études Orientales (Faculté des Lettres de l’Université d’Alger), vol. 4 (1938), pp. 77-79.
miḥrāb, were imported from Baghdad, and on grounds of style, the panels of the minbar must have been already carved there. The eastern origin of the material of the minbar accounts sufficiently for its being immovable, in the eastern tradition. We therefore need only consider the arrangements of the qiblah wall. Its two doors lead into an outbuilding, which is now the library, and in its present condition is of a later date; but there is no doubt that it replaces an earlier "imām's room." It is agreed that the door in the first aisle to the right of the miḥrāb dates from the reconstruction of the qiblah wall in 221 H./830; the door to the right of this, in the second aisle, is ascribed by Creswell and by Gómez-Moreno to a later period, but R. Velázquez Bosco and Marçais regard it, with good reasons, as part of the original structure. If this is correct, the second door to the right of the miḥrāb was the door of the imām, and the first door the one through which the movable minbar of the mosque of 221 H./830 was pushed back.

Secondly, there is the Fāṭimid Great Mosque of Mahdia. The outer part of its qiblah wall belongs to the original structure, built in or soon after 303 H./916, and it shows no indication of a built-out recess for the minbar. It is therefore possible that this mosque had a fixed minbar, in common with the later Fāṭimid mosques in Egypt. The inner part of the qiblah wall, however, is later, and it is equally possible that the original mosque had a minbar carved out of the qiblah wall, such as we shall find in the qiblah wall of the Aqsā mosque at Jerusalem, Fāṭimid or earlier, a type of minbar which is essentially a variant of the minbar on wheels. If the Great Mosque of Mahdia had indeed a fixed minbar, it would be one of the oriental features in the architecture of the Fāṭimids in Ifrīqiya.

The mosque of Sīdī 'I-Halwī in Tlemcen, built by a Marinid sultan in 754 H./1353, possesses a fixed wooden minbar which, however, appears to be considerably later than the building. It seems that this small mosque was put into use as a Friday mosque only at a later date, when it was found impracticable or too expensive to add a minbar recess.

The Jāmiʿ al-sunnah in Rabat, of 1199 H./1785, actually the Friday mosque of the sultan, lacks a recess for the minbar. The place where we should expect it, is now taken up by the sultan's annex, which was added in 1907. It is reasonable to suppose that the minbar recess was pulled down when the annex was built.

I need hardly mention that the fixed minbars in the mosques of Turkish style in Algeria and Tunisia, belonging as they do to the eastern architectural tradition, cannot be regarded, properly speaking, as exceptions from the rule of the movable minbar which has prevailed in the Maghreb so far. It is only in the modern Friday mosques of Laghouat, built some 80 years ago, of Bougie, built in 1900, and elsewhere, with their immovable minbars, that we observe a weakening of the old Maghrebin tradition. In any case, this survey of the Friday mosques in the Maghreb, which is as complete as I could make it, shows sufficiently the strength of the tradition of a movable minbar.

IV

As concerns the eastern half of the Islamic world, the tradition of an immovable minbar,
projecting into the mosque, has always been taken for granted. I should like to point out, however, that this tradition is not quite as general as has sometimes been supposed. Fixed indeed was the first minbar of Islam, the minbar or throne of the Prophet in Medina, from the early Umayyad period onward. It had originally been a small piece of furniture, by its nature movable but usually kept in the same place, though its function and use at that time differed essentially from those it was to acquire later. Under the orders of the Umayyad caliph Mu'awiya I (41–60 H./661–680), his kinsman and later successor, Marwan (governor of Medina 41–49 H./661–669 and 56–57 H./676–677, but presumably during his first tenure of office) provided it with a wooden understructure and put it on a built base, which made it immovable. This is obviously a special case. But the minbar at the Kaaba in Mecca was on wheels; it stood normally beside the Masāqim Ibrāhīm and was pushed forth beside the Kaaba only for the Friday sermon. This information refers presumably to the minbar given by the Abbāsid caliph al-Wāthiq (227–232 H./841–847). It was replaced by a fixed minbar only under the Ottoman sultan Sulaymān Qānūnī (926–947 H./1520–66).

Outside the two holy cities of Islam, there is the mosque of Susa (Susa), which dates from the first century of the hegira. The excavator describes it as follows: "Aucune trace ne fut observée d'un mihrāb qui a dû disparaître avec les murs de l'enceinte. Nous n'avons relevé que quelques restes de murs qui furent ajoutés à une époque certainement plus récente que la date de la construction de la mosquée et qui forment une pièce accolée au mur extérieur Sud-Ouest, à l'endroit même où l'on s'attendait à trouver les restes du mihrāb." The existence of a chamber at the back of the mihrāb, the later the better for my argument, suggests the existence of a recess for a movable minbar and an imām's room, in other words, a tripartite arrangement, in this mosque. We shall find more direct evidence in the two following examples.

The Great Mosque of Samarra dates from 234–237 H./848–852. The mihrāb is flanked by two doors, symmetrically placed on each side, which are not direct entrances from outside but open into rooms attached to the back of the qiblah wall. This is identical with the tripartite arrangement familiar from the Maghreb. Moreover, the wall round the mihrāb and the flanking doors was formerly covered by a wooden paneling, fragments of which were found lying on the ground by Herzfeld, and this was attached by means of a wooden grid, the grooves for which are still visible in the wall. Herzfeld's photograph shows clearly that there is no room for a fixed minbar against the wall in the place where we should expect it, between the mihrāb and the door flanking it on the right; the traces of the paneling make this impossible, and we must therefore postulate the existence of a movable minbar which was pushed back through the door on the right (or possibly on the left, as in Cordova). The clear height of the flanking doors seems to have been 3.90 m.; this agrees well with the maximum height that we may expect of a movable minbar of that period; the slightly later fixed minbar of Kairouan is only 3.31 m. high.

The mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn in Cairo was built in 265 H./878–879. Immediately to the right of the mihrāb stands a fixed minbar which was

79 Cf. Sauvaget, La Mosquée omeyyade de Médine, pp. 87 ff., 141 ff.
81 Cf. al-Batanūnī, al-Riḥla al-ḥiṣāziyya, 2d ed., Cairo, 1329, p. 100.
84 Herzfeld, loc. cit., and fig. 2 on p. 2.
given by Sultan Lājīn (696–708 H./1297–1309). But the qiblah wall still preserves two symmetrically placed doors, one on each side of the mihrāb, in other words, the tripartite arrangement, an architectural feature which, we have seen, presupposes the tradition of a movable minbar. The walls of the rooms to which these doors give access, are much later; but the door to the right of the mihrāb is obviously the door, mentioned by Maqrīzī (d. 845 H./1442), which enabled Ibn Tūlūn to enter the mosque directly from the “amīr’s appartement” (dār al-imāra)—not the palace, but waiting, changing and ablution rooms. This arrangement is identical with that of the Great Mosque in Cordova. I am therefore inclined to interpret Maqrīzī’s statement that Ibn Tūlūn went through the door in question “to the maqsūrah adjoining (bi-jiwār) the mihrāb and the minbar,” somewhat differently from Creswell and, rather, in the light of Idrīṣī’s statement on the Great Mosque of Cordova.

There is at least one example of the alternative to the movable minbar, of the nonprotruding minbar carved out of the qiblah wall, in the Aqṣā mosque in Jerusalem. The qiblah wall has been ascribed by Sauvaget to the Umayyad al-Walīd I (86–96 H./705–715), by Creswell to the Fāṭimid al-Zāhib (411–427 H./1021–36); the recessed minbar, which consists of two steps and a seat, could date from any time within these limits.

This is the background for the regular occurrence of a special form of the recessed minbar in East Africa.

V

The great majority of the Muslims in East Africa (Tanganyika, Zanzibar, and Kenya) is Shāfiʿī, and the normal form of the minbar in their Friday mosques is a recess, or often a raised platform in a recess, which is built out behind the qiblah wall and accessible from the mihrāb; the lower part of the opening by which this recess communicates with the interior of the mosque, is divided off by a balustrade or wooden railing, or the balustrade may be part of the qiblah wall, in which case the minbar appears as a window in the qiblah wall to the right of the mihrāb. This arrangement is merely an architectural variant of the recessed minbar carved out of the qiblah wall and of the minbar included in the recess of the mihrāb, to both of which I have already referred. All these forms of minbar fulfilled the same purpose as the minbar on wheels, and this purpose is not to lock the minbar away as something particularly precious, but to let it infringe as little as possible upon the floor space of the mosque proper. In a number of East African mosques, a common recess contains both mihrāb and minbar, often the imām’s room too, where it exists, and the opening of the minbar and the door of the imām are regularly placed symmetrically on both sides of the minbar so as to form, together with it, the tripartite arrangement of which I have already spoken. And exactly as the valuable utensils of the Great Mosque of Cordova were kept in what is normally the imām’s room to the left of the mihrāb, the corresponding room in East Africa often contains the modest implements of the mosque.

---

86 Cf. Creswell, op. cit., p. 342 and fig. 257.
87 See above, p. 154.
89 Cf. Creswell, op. cit., fig. 119.
91 I should like to mention in passing that the tripartite layout of the qiblah wall, which in the Maghreb was transferred as a nonfunctional feature to other than Friday mosques (see above, p. 154), seems to have inspired in a similar way the triple mihrābs in the Fāṭimid mausoleum of Ikhwan Yusuf (ca. 520 H./1125) and a few other buildings; cf. Creswell, The Muslim architecture of Egypt, vol. 1, p. 234f. and pl. 118(a).
92 See plans C–I and pl. 1, fig. 4; pl. 2, figs. 5–8; pl. 3, figs. 9–10; pl. 4, figs. 11 and 12.
93 Above, section I, at the end.
94 Above, sections II and IV.
I have observed this type of minbar in the following mosques:\(^4\)

Dar-es-Salaam, main Shāfi‘ī Friday mosque, a relatively recent stone building. The mihrāb recess is flanked by a larger one for the minbar; a short flight of steps leads from the mihrāb into the minbar (plan C).

Mbwamaji, 10 miles southeast of Dar-es-Salaam. The stone-built mosque shows the date 1017 H./1608-09 on a slab over the door. The minbar recess here is not accessible from the mihrāb, but has a separate narrow entrance in the balustrade which divides it from the interior of the mosque (pl. 2, figs. 5 and 6).

Msasani, 5 miles north of Dar-es-Salaam. The stone-built Friday mosque\(^5\) shows the symmetrical, tripartite arrangement of minbar, mihrāb, and imām’s room in a common, built-out recess (plan D and pl. 1, fig. 4). The floor of the minbar recess, which communicates with the interior of the mosque by a window in the qiblah wall, is not elevated, but a flight of three wooden steps is placed inside it.

The six mosques that follow are situated on or near the road from Dar-es-Salaam to Bagamoyo. All but the first of these village mosques are built of mud and wattles.

Kunduchi. The mosque has a built-out recess for mihrāb and minbar; the minbar, which opens out of the mihrāb through a pointed arch, contains a high seat, built against the back wall.

Bunju, southern mosque. This mosque shows the tripartite arrangement of minbar, mihrāb, and imām’s room in a common, built-out recess; the minbar contains, built against its front, a step and, built against its back, a seat (plan E).

Bunju, northern mosque. We find here the same tripartite arrangement; the minbar contains a wooden step.
Kokoto. This modest mosque has a built-out recess for mihrāb and minbar; the minbar contains a brick of dried mud which serves as a step.

Zinga (formerly called Mzinga). This well-kept mosque shows the tripartite arrangement again; the three elements which compose it take up the whole width of the mosque, and only the mihrāb protrudes slightly from the outer wall.

Kilomo (in the place where the map shows Knopeni). This mosque, too, shows the tripartite arrangement, except that the place of the imām’s room is taken by a recess which is fully open on the side of the mosque.

Kaole village (upper site), 2 miles southeast of Bagamoyo. The Friday mosque, which is built of stone, has a built-out recess for mihrāb and minbar, with a short flight of steps leading from the mihrāb into the minbar (plan F).

Bagamoyo, Great Mosque. There is a built-out recess for mihrāb and minbar, the minbar consisting of built steps and seat. To the left of the mihrāb, corresponding with the position of the minbar opening, is an ornamental panel; beyond this, symmetrically placed with a window to the right of the minbar, is the imām’s door (plan G, and pl. 2, fig. 7 and pl. 3, fig. 9).

Bagamoyo, Myenzini Mosque. This mosque, built of mud and wattles and very recently reconstructed, is not used for the Friday service and has therefore no minbar. It has, nevertheless, an asymmetrical built-out recess which contains the mihrāb and the “office” of the mosque, corresponding to the imām’s room elsewhere.

Zanzibar Town, Great Mosque. There is a built-out recess for mihrāb and minbar, a short flight of steps leads from the mihrāb up to the raised platform of the minbar, and there is a further step at the front of the minbar, sepa-
in one of the back corners of the mosque, and I shall explain its function later.

Zanzibar Town, Furdani Mosque (masjid al-furudah, or al-masjid al-saghîr, so called because it is the smaller of the two Shâ’î Friday mosques). A doorway leads from the mihrâb into the minbar recess, which is not raised above the floor level of the mosque and is fully open toward it. During the week a kursî on wheels, which was given to the mosque in 1315 H./1897–98, is pushed back into the minbar recess (pl. 3, fig. 10).96

On the Island of Pemba, the mud and wattle-built village mosques, which are used for the Friday service, have regularly an eccentric built-out recess for mihrâb and minbar. In the mosque of Wawi (a few miles northeast of Chake Chake, near the airfield), which may be considered typical, there is no partition between mihrâb and minbar, and the minbar consists of two steps and a seat built against the back wall of the recess (plan I). This arrangement is essentially identical with that found in the Mālikî mosques of Kanuri type in Bornu.97

Pangani, Great Mosque. The building is, I was told, about 55 years old; the place of the former Great Mosque is now an open space. The minbar is accessible from the mihrâb by means of wooden steps, and it contains an ordinary wooden armchair as a seat. In this neighborhood and farther to the north, the balustrade which separates the minbar recess from the interior of the mosque, is often slightly bow-shaped without, however, protruding to any considerable degree into the the mosque proper (pl. 4, fig. 11).

Pangani, Mosque of Mwana Sukali. The minbar is accessible from the mihrâb by two steps, and has a small bow-shaped wooden balustrade.

Bweni, opposite Pangani on the south bank of Pangani river. The Mosque of Diwani Wambosasa has a minbar accessible from the mihrâb by high built steps with a bow-shaped wooden balustrade. This mosque, I was told, is a hundred years old, or more.

Tambareni, near Tongoni, 15 miles south of Tanga. The mosque, which is about 50 years old, was the Friday mosque for the neighboring settlement of Marongo and for the village of Tongoni, and is at present being repaired, as Mr. G. Hunter informs me. It has a raised minbar, accessible from the mihrâb, and a wooden balustrade in the form of a shallow balcony (pl. 4, fig. 12).

Tanga, Great Mosque, recently rebuilt. There is the usual minbar accessible from the mihrâb, with a wooden balustrade. In Tanga I saw two small mosques which are not used for the Friday service, but they, too, had the same arrangement of minbar and mihrâb; the minbar is used only on feast days.

Mombasa, Great Mosque (Jâmi’ Bâ Shaykh). This mosque has the same arrangement of minbar and mihrâb.

Mombasa, Mandri Mosque. This mosque is said to be 350 years old, and older than the Great Mosque. There is the same arrangement of minbar and mihrâb, the minbar being acces-

---

96 I did not enter a modern Friday mosque situated about 1 mile south of Kizimkazi on Zanzibar Island; it has an asymmetrical built-out recess in the middle of the qiblah wall, and therefore presumably the usual recessed minbar.

97 See above, n. 46, and plans A and B.
PLATE I

Fig. 1—Ouargla, Mosque Sidi Ba‘Apou, Movable Minbar. (Photograph P. Jacquemin.)

Fig. 2—Laghouat, Old Mosque, Minbar with Steps Pushed Back.

Fig. 3—Metlili, Minbar of the Mosque.

Fig. 4—Msasani, Mihrâb and Minbar of the Mosque. Inside View.
Fig. 5—Mbwamaji, Mihrāb and Minbar of the Mosque. Inside View. (Photograph G. Hunter.)

Fig. 6—Mbwamaji, Mosque. Outside View. (Photograph G. Hunter.)

Fig. 7—Bagamoyo, Great Mosque. Outside View of Imam’s Stairs and Recess for Mihrāb and Minbar.

Fig. 8—Zanzibar Town, Great Mosque. Outside View of Imam’s Stairs and Recess for Mihrāb and Minbar.
Fig. 9—Bagamoyo, Great Mosque. Inside View of Mihrāb and Minbar. (Photograph G. Hunter.)

Fig. 10—Zanzibar Town, Furdani Mosque. (Photograph Zanzibar Museum.)
Fig. 11—Pangani, Mihrāb and Minbar of the Great Mosque.

Fig. 12—Tambareni, Mihrāb and Minbar of the Mosque. (Photograph G. Hunter.)

Fig. 13—Magagoni, Mosque, Minbar for Use on Feast Days.

Fig. 14—Kizimkazi, Mosque, View of Mihrāb and Minbar. (Photograph F. Wilson.)
sible from the mihrāb by high built steps and provided with a bow-shaped wooden balustrade. This mosque was formerly ʿIbāḍi, so the minbar recess must have been built in later; and indeed all the other arches in the hall of the mosque and in the arcades are ogival, including the arches of a subsidiary mihrāb and of a well, now blocked up, in the ablation chamber (both are typically ʿIbāḍi features); the arches of the main mihrāb and of the minbar alone are rounded.

Mombasa, Mosque of Shaykh Mubārak al-Mazrūi. This mosque has the same arrangement of minbar and mihrāb.

Malindi, Friday mosque. The mosque is said to be 60 years old and it has the same arrangement of minbar and mihrāb in an asymmetrical built-out recess.

Mambrū, 8 miles north-northeast of Malindi. The Great Mosque, dated 1297 H./1880, has the same arrangement of minbar and mihrāb.

I mentioned two small mosques in Tanga, where no Friday service is held and the recessed minbar is used only on feast days. The reason for this is that the Shāfiʿīs, in contrast with the other schools of religious law, prefer to hold the special services on feast days in a mosque. Other mosques have a movable wooden minbar, though not on wheels, for this purpose; this minbar is normally put away at the back of the mosque, mostly in a corner, and put into position when needed. I have noticed it in the mosques of Magagoni (pl. 4, fig. 13) and Mjimwena, 4 and 6 miles, respectively, southeast of Dar-es-Salaam, in the Masjid Muzāhim (built 1235 H./1820) and the Masjid al-Manārah (built 1250 H./1834-35) in Zanzibar Town, in a small mosque in Chake Chake on Pemba Island, and in the Shela Mosque in Malindi. The Great Mosque in Zanzibar Town, which has a recessed minbar for the regular Friday service, has in addition a special wooden minbar, for use on feast days, which is kept in one of the back corners.


VI

There is hardly any exception to the rule that the minbar must be recessed in the Shāfiʿī Friday mosques of East Africa which are at present in use. The Khonzi Mosque in Mombasa was recently rebuilt and provided with an elaborate fixed wooden minbar alongside the qiblah wall (plan J); this constitutes an effort of a different kind to make the minbar protrude as little as possible into the interior of the mosque.

PLAN J—MIHRĀB AND MINBAR OF THE KHONZI MOSQUE IN MOMBASA.

The Shāfiʿī Friday mosque in Chake Chake, Pemba Island, was originally ʿIbāḍi, and was gradually abandoned by them when their numbers decreased. It was built by the grandfather of the present ʿIbāḍi scholar Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb b. Mubārak, who remembers worshiping there as a child. When the Shāfiʿīs took it over, they did not go to the expense of building a new minbar recess, but contented themselves with putting in an immovable wooden minbar.

The only other exception to the rule that I know of, occurs in the mosque of Kizimkazi, but this belongs to a different architectural tradition, which I shall discuss later.1

The arrangement of mihrāb and minbar of which I have spoken, was several times described to me as typically Shāfiʿī, and the relatively few Friday mosques of the ʿHanafīs from the Indian region have fixed minbars, either of wood or built against the qiblah wall so as to protrude into the interior of the mosque, such as the ʿHanafī Friday mosque in Dar-es-Salaam, built in a vaguely Indian style, the Makadara

99 I did not enter the Masjid al-ʿNūr, another Friday mosque in Mombasa.

1 Below, section VII.
Mosque in Mombasa, and the mosque of the Maymans (Memons) in Bagamoyo. In this last mosque, the niche of the mihrāb is flanked on the right by a separate niche for the minbar, both being contained in an asymmetrical built-out recess, and on the left by a shelf for books built into the wall; the minbar niche contains a built straight staircase minbar, which was described to me as typically Ḥanafī, and the whole is surrounded by a tripartite decorative unit. This arrangement represents a concession to the local, East African tradition.

The mosques of the Ibadis, of course, lack a minbar on principle, and so do those of the Bohoras and of the Ithnā-‘Ashariyya Khojas, though at least one of them does in fact contain a minbar, which is not used, as a measure of taqiyya.\(^3\)

VII

This concludes my survey of the Shāfi‘i Friday mosques in East Africa which are at present in use. With the exception of the mosque of Kizimkazi, they are all relatively recent or even contemporary buildings; the oldest date, which is attested by an inscription in the mosque of Mbwamaji, is 1017 H./1608-09. Now it is remarkable that none of the ruined mosques belonging to the vanished Islamic civilizations in East Africa, which in accordance with local usage are often indiscriminately and incorrectly called Shirazi, possesses, as far as I have been able to verify by personal inspection and from published records, a recessed minbar of the kind

\(^2\)In the mosque of the Ithnā-‘Ashariyya Khojas in Dar-es-Salaam, I found a wooden minbar standing in the niche of the mihrāb, and I was told that for reasons of taqiyya it was placed to the right of the mihrāb for the Friday service. In Tanga, the ‘āmil of the Bohoras assured me that, again for reasons of taqiyya, they used a minbar for their Friday service, and when I pointed out the absence of a minbar in their main mosque there, he pretended that it was kept during the week in the women’s gallery upstairs and brought down for the Friday service (sic).—I did not enter the mosque of the Ithnā-‘Ashariyya Shi‘ites in Mombasa.

I have described. They have neither a minbar niche nor an imām’s room; some possess a minbar which is built against the qiblah wall and protrudes into the interior of the mosque; and in others the former existence of a wooden minbar of the same type can be inferred. A few of these mosques have been reconstructed, or have been abandoned only recently, or are still in use in their original form; I have indicated this in each case, but it does not, of course, invalidate my distinction between the two groups. I will now give a list of the main monuments of this kind which have come to my notice, again not aiming at completeness.

Kilwa Island (Kilwa Kisiwani), Great Mosque. This mosque was originally built by Sultan Sulaymān b. Ḥasan (ca. A.D. 1302-16), but soon fell into ruin and was restored and enlarged in the following century. Both the old part and the extension have each an apsidal mihrāb only, and the mosque must have had a protruding wooden minbar.\(^3\)

Kilwa Island (Kilwa Kisiwani), smaller or palace mosque. This was presumably not a Friday mosque, and in any case has an apsidal mihrāb only.\(^4\)

Songo Mnara Island, south of Kilwa Island, the so-called Nabhani Mosque, dating from the thirteenth or the early fourteenth century. This was presumably a Friday mosque; it has an


\(^4\) Cf. Dorman, ibid., p. 66 (plan); Moffett and Mathew, ibid., p. 179 (on the date: built between A.D. 1440 and 1490).—The small mosque in the cemetery was certainly not a Friday mosque; cf. Dorman, ibid., p. 66 (plan).
apsidal mihrāb only, and must have had a protruding wooden minbar.\(^5\)

Banderini, 16 miles southeast of Dar-es-Salaam. This mosque was discovered by G. Hunter, who writes: “In this mosque I found the remains of the original (?) Friday chair, altogether fourteen turned wooden legs (arms?), which had been bundled together in the mihrāb. The pottery suggests that this was done in the eighteenth century. The wood is extremely hard, but in some cases it has worn away with age. The mosque is a fourteenth-fifteenth century type with two central pillars and an ogee arched mihrāb. The site has been uninhabited for as long as people can remember.”

Kaole (lower site, properly called Pumbuji), 3 miles southeast of Bagamoyo. There are two mosques, and their spacious dimensions suggest that both were used for the Friday service. They both have apsidal mihrābs only, and their minbars must have been of wood, and must have protruded into the interior.\(^6\)

Kizimkazi, Zanzibar Island. This mosque has a minbar, consisting of two steps and a seat, built against the qiblah wall to the right of the mihrāb, and protruding into the interior of the hall (plan K and pl. 4, fig. 14). The first step is very low; it is called kia po and is used when an oath is taken in the mosque: a person who stands on it, touches the minbar. The mihrāb is adorned by an inscription in decorated kūfī, dated 500 H./1107; this makes it the earliest dated Islamic monument in East Africa.\(^7\) This inscription runs not only round the mihrāb niche, but extends on both sides of the mihrāb along the qiblah wall;\(^8\) this fixes the position of the qiblah wall and proves the absence of a minbar recess in the original mosque. Another inscription close to the mihrāb states that the mosque was restored and repaired in 1186 H./1772-73,\(^9\) to this reconstruction is no doubt due the present appearance of the mosque, which is still in use. We are therefore entitled to attribute the built minbar to the original mosque and not to count it as an exception from the regular occurrence of recessed minbars in the modern Shāfi‘ī Friday mosques of East Africa.

---

\(^5\) Cf. Mathew, op. cit., fig. 11, and Moffett and Mathew, *ibid.*, p. 183.


\(^8\) Cf. the plates in Flury, *ibid*.


\(^10\) The Muslim settlement on Tumbatu was presumably founded about 1200, and by 1500 had already become insignificant (cf. W. H. Ingrams, *Zanzibar*, London, 1931, p. 144f.); this gives approximate limits for the date of the mosque. This mosque is to be published by Mr. J. S. Kirkman.
Shamiani on Kiwani Island, off Pemba (Mkoani District). The mosque has a built minbar "with three steps" (presumably better: two steps and a seat) to the right of the mihrāb.11

Kinyu, Pemba (Wete District, eastern portion). The mosque, situated in the most remote village in the most remote district of Pemba, is still in use, as are other "Shirazi" mosques in the neighborhood, on which I have no information concerning the minbar. Judging from Buchanan's not very clear account,12 this mosque seems to have been more or less thoroughly reconstructed. Its mihrāb and minbar are of carved wood, and though Buchanan does not say so explicitly, I presume that the minbar is of the protruding staircase type.

Chwake, Pemba (Wete District, eastern portion), greater mosque. This must have been the Friday mosque of an important settlement. The published photograph of the middle portion of the qiblah wall13 shows no minbar recess, but a low, built minbar may be hidden under the debris to the right of the mihrāb, or it was of wood. The mosque is now in ruins, but it is still used for votive offerings.14

Msuka (or Msuka Mjini),15 Pemba (Wete District, western portion). This mosque has a built minbar of "two steps" (presumably better: one step and a seat) to the right of the mihrāb.16 An Arabic inscription dated 816 H./1414 is scratched on the plaster inside the mihrāb; Pearce believes this to have been added when the mosque was already a ruin.

Ras Mkumbun, Pemba (Chake Chake District, northern portion), Great Mosque. This mosque, of which Mr. Kirkman allowed me to inspect a plan drawn by him, was certainly a Friday mosque. It has an apsidal mihrāb only, and must have had a protruding wooden minbar.17

Kichokochwe, Pemba (Chake Chake District, northern portion). This mosque has a built minbar "with seven steps" to the right of the mihrāb. It was in use until recently, but its original roof had fallen and had been replaced by a construction of mangrove poles and coconut leaves; the whole building, too, seems to have been repaired from time to time, and the mihrāb, in particular, seems to have been rebuilt.18

Chambani Mjini, Pemba (Chake Chake District, southern portion). This mosque has a protruding minbar with "five steps" to the right of the mihrāb, built against the qiblah wall.19

Tongoni, 15 miles south of Tanga (the place of the ruins itself is called Mtangate). The spacious dimensions of the mosque suggest that it was used for the Friday service. It has an apsidal mihrāb only (the qiblah wall to the right of the mihrāb is still standing), and it must have had a protruding wooden minbar.20 The date 609 H./1214 is said to exist, scratched on the plaster of the East wall.21

Watangana Mosque, Mombasa. According to a communication of Mr. Kirkman, who has cleared the site, this mosque has a built staircase minbar.

12 Ibid., p. 9.
17 The photograph of the middle part of the qiblah wall, in Ingrams, *op. cit.*, pl. opposite p. 138, shows the absence of a minbar recess.
18 Cf. Buchanan, *op. cit.*, p. 27 ff. The top of the minbar, on which a mat has been put, is just visible in Ingrams, *op. cit.*, pl. opposite p. 138.
Gedi (official orthography: Gede), 10 miles southwest of Malindi, Great Mosque. The first mosque on the site dates from about A.D. 1450, the second mosque from about 1500–1550; the mihrāb niche and the minbar probably belong to this period, whereas the mihrāb received its final form in the following period, about 1550–1600. The protruding minbar, built against the qiblah wall, consists of two steps and a seat, counting the low kia'po as the first step. The qiblah wall of the first mosque, including the outer wall of the mihrāb recess, was in the same position as that of the second; the first mosque must therefore have had a similar arrangement, or else a protruding wooden minbar.

Kilepwa, southeast of Gedi. The first mosque dates from about 1400, the second on the same site from about 1450. It has an apsidal mihrāb only, and must have had a protruding wooden minbar.

Malindi, former Friday mosque. It was abandoned and became a ruin, I was told, only some 20 years ago. It has a built, protruding staircase minbar. It is important to note that when the new Friday mosque of Malindi was constructed, it received not a protruding but a recessed minbar in the prevailing local fashion.

Takwa, near Lamu. Mr. Kirkman informs me that he has noticed in the qiblah wall of the ruined mosque to the right of the mihrāb two long, parallel, horizontal slots which presumably served for fixing a wooden minbar; this must have been of the protruding staircase type.

Manawwana wa Mashaa, near Kipini. A photograph of the qiblah wall, made by Mr. Kirkman, shows a high, stone-built minbar protruding into the hall. The side banisters are separate elements, and the whole is obviously copied from a wooden model. According to Mr. Kirkman, the minbar dates from the last reconstruction of the mosque, which is now in ruins, about A.D. 1500.

VIII

The separate existence of the two types of minbar in East Africa calls for a historical explanation. The recessed minbar, we shall see, represents one of the two possible solutions of a problem that posed itself at the beginning of the second century H. (eighth century A.D.), a solution that from the middle of the third (ninth) century on has survived only in the Maghreb and in a few isolated examples in the central eastern provinces of the Islamic world. It is therefore unthinkable that this type of minbar should have come into existence in East Africa independently at the end of the middle ages. There are, indeed, indications that it existed, parallel with the "Shirazi" type of protruding minbar, much earlier. The Moroccan traveler Ibn Batūtah visited East Africa in 731 to 732 H./1330–32, and he says of Mombasa that its inhabitants were Shāfi‘īs, that their mosques were carefully built of wood (khashah), and that adjoining each mosque there was at least one well provided with long-handled, wooden ladles. This is an accurate description of the mosques built of mud and wattles which are common in East Africa today and which, as far as they are used for the Friday service, have invariably a recessed minbar. Of Kilwa, Ibn Batūtah mentions that its inhabitants were Shāfi‘īs, and he says of the town: "It is a very beautiful and well-kept town, all built of wood, and the roofs of its buildings are made of rushes (kulūhā bil-khashah wa-suqīf buyūtihā 'l-dīs)."

\[^{26}\text{Below, section IX.}\]


with coconut leaves (makuti), which is the rule in the houses and mosques built of mud and wattles. Carefully constructed and well-kept buildings of this kind certainly look very neat. Ibn Battūta goes on to relate an anecdote which is meant to show the extent of the generosity of the sultan of Kilwa, Abu 'l-Muzafar Hasan b. Dāwūd, called Abu 'l-Mawāhib. When the sultan left the mosque at the end of the Friday service, a beggar asked him the gift of his clothes, and did not want to wait until the sultan went to his palace to change; the sultan thereupon entered the bayt al-imām, not the "house of the imām" but the imām's room, and divested himself immediately of his garments. The whole point of the anecdote is that at the insistence of the beggar at the door of the mosque the sultan took his clothes off immediately. This gives us for the Friday mosque in Kilwa at the time of Ibn Battūta's visit an imām's room, which is a prominent feature in the contemporary but not in the "Shirazi" tradition of mosque architecture. It was obviously not the Great Mosque, the ruin of which still exists. The Kilwa Chronicle informs us, in

certain, fact, that the Great Mosque collapsed completely, with the exception of its (central) cupola, during the reign of the Sultan Abu'l-Mawāhib, and lay in ruins until it was rebuilt by the Sultan Sulaymān b. al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Muḥammad. In the interval, people were obliged to perform the Friday service under a shelter of patchwork and rushes (taḥt zilāl al-khassa wahlkhiyām). The mosque that Ibn Battūta saw was presumably this temporary or emergency mosque which was thatched with makuti and had an imām's room (and probably a recessed minbar).

At this point, we must glance at the history of Islam in East Africa. The traditional picture of this subject needs a thorough reconsideration. We can distinguish four groups of evidence: (1) Classical or pre-Islamic sources; (2) Arab historians and geographers; (3) local chronicles and traditions; and (4) archaeological evidence.

The Periplus Maris Erythraei, which dates from the second half of the first century A.D., shows that the trading relations between South Arabia and East Africa and South Arabian trading settlements on East African soil are

27), Paris, 1928, p. 239ff. The details concerning the mosque occur in the Arabic version only.

28 This, rather than "in tents," is the exact meaning of the Arabic terms. It is obviously a synonym of Ibn Battūta's dis.


much earlier than the hegira. There can be no doubt that the Arabs from South Arabia who made their temporary and perhaps even permanent homes in East Africa, marrying native women, adopted Islam together with the other members of their tribes, who had remained in Arabia, that is to say, well in the first half of the first century H. The Arab conquest of Iraq and the resultant demand for slaves created a new outlet for East African trade, and we find the Zanj, East Africans, as slaves in Lower Iraq as early as the year 70 H./689-690. They revolted in 75 H./694-695, and their leader bore the Persian surname Shir Zanjî, “Lion of the Zanj.” This Persian term belongs, of course, to the colloquial language of Iraq. All this is prior to the alleged three or four separate waves of emigration of Muslims, because of political or religious persecution, to East Africa, where they are said to have founded city states in the first few centuries of the hegira. These emigrations are purely legendary.

There is, first, the story of the flight of Sulaymân and Sa’îd, the sons of ‘Abbâd b. al-Julandâ, from Oman when Ḥajjâj subdued it for ‘Abd al-Malik. This story occurs only in a modern local chronicle of Oman which is devoid of any authority on the events of the first century. The historian Balâdhuri states explicitly that Oman was quiet from the suppression of the riddâh in the caliphate of Abû Bakr until the caliphate of Hârûn al-Rashîd, and there is no trace of the alleged events in any other historian. There is, secondly, the emigration of the Emozaydîj, the followers of the Shi‘îte pretender Zayd b. ‘Alî, after he was killed in 122 H./739. The only authority for this event is the Portuguese version of the Kilwa Chronicle, and it is not confirmed by any other source. The term Emozaydîj is difficult; it has been explained as ‘umma Zaydiyya, “Zayd’s community,” but this expression would be unprecedented as the name of an Islamic sect. The Portuguese Chronicle adds that the Emozaydîj, on the arrival of the next wave of immigrants, retired to the interior, where they merged into the native population. I am therefore inclined to regard the story as an aetiological legend which purports to explain some African tribal name. The next following emigration, again according to the Portuguese version of the Kilwa Chronicle, was that of seven brothers and their followers, who wanted to escape from the persecution of the king of Lasah, which means presumably al-Ahsâ’ on the Persian Gulf. I consider this story merely a variant of the following one, with which it has several motifs in common. The last of the alleged waves of emigration of Muslims to East Africa in the early Middle Ages is that of people from Shiraz, to which both versions of the Kilwa Chronicle refer.


36 Cf. Pellat, Le Milieu bâприen, p. 41 f. Later references to the Zanj in the empire of the caliphs are common.

37 Sirbân b. Sa’îd b. Sirbân (wrote 1140 H./1728), Annals of Omân (Kashf al-Ghumma), tr. E. C. Ross, Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. 43, part 1 (Calcutta, 1874), p. 119 f. This account is the source of Ḥamad b. Muḥammad b. Razîq (d. 1873), known as Salîb b. Razîq, History of the Imâms and Scyvyids of Omân (al-Fath al-mubîn), tr. C. P. Badger (Hakluyt Society Publications, vol. 44), London, 1871, p. 5. An ambiguous expression of Badger (p. XII) has led some writers on East African history to believe that this information goes back to Balâdhuri, but Badger’s reference to Balâdhuri refers exclusively to the expedition of ‘Uthmân b. Abî ’l-ʾÂş against Sind. There is no evidence whatsoever for the alleged emigration of Ḥajjâjis, who had revolted against Ḥajjâj, to East Africa; the reference to Mas‘ûd, which has been given in this connection, is spurious.

38 Cf. C. van Arendonk, De ophkomst van het zaidie-tische Imanaat in Yemen (De Goeje Stichting, No. 5), Leyden, 1919, p. 30 f.

39 There are seven members of one family in each case; the emigrants in each case find that their predecessors belong to a different sect and therefore do not mix with them; and whereas the emigrants from Ahsâ’ ought to be Arabs, their successors from Shiraz call them “Persians like themselves.”
refer. According to the Arabic text, it happened in the first half of the third (ninth) century, according to the Portuguese text, about the year 400 H./1010, more than 70 years after the emigration of the people from al-Ahsa'. This chronological divergence alone must make us doubt the historical accuracy of the information. According to the Arabic version, the sultan of Shiraz, Ḣasan b. ‘Ali, with his six sons, and, according to the Portuguese version, ‘Ali, one of the seven sons of Sultan Ḣasan of Shiraz, emigrated to East Africa, either on account of a dream, or because of persecution, and founded the dynasty of the sultans of Kilwa. Shiraz at the time belonged to the domain of the Bāyids, and we know enough of their history to regard the story as purely imaginary.\(^{42}\) Legends with similar motifs on the emigration of Muslims from Shiraz (or from Mecca) occur in Madagascar and in the Comoro Islands, too.\(^{43}\)

It is significant that the one well-attested event in East Africa in the early centuries of Islam, the occupation of Zanzibar by the Muslims, has left no trace in these local traditions. The historian and geographer Masʿūdī (d. 345 H./956) relates: ‘‘The island of Qanbalū,\(^{44}\) a well-cultivated island, has Muslim inhabitants, but their language is that of the Zanj; they occupied this island and enslaved the Zanj who lived in it, in the same way in which the Muslims occupied the island of Crete in the Mediterranean; this happened at the beginning of the ‘Abbasid and at the end of the Umayyad dynasty,’’ i.e., about the year 130 H./747.\(^{45}\) In Masʿūdī’s time, there existed a dynasty of Muslim kings in the island, and the East African trade was in the hands of Arabs from Oman, who belonged to the tribe of Aṣd.\(^{36}\)

Contemporary with Masʿūdī is the story of the conversion to Islam of a king of the man-eating Zanj, which is reported by the sea captain Bozorg b. Shahreyār as having occurred in 310 H./922\(^{46}\); though it is located in Sofāla, to the south of the “Land of Zanj” proper, and though it is nothing more than a sailor’s yarn, it is again significant that this relatively old piece of information has left no trace in local East African tradition. The same holds true of the information given by the geographer Yāqūt (d. 626 H./1229). He says of Zanzibar: “Lanjūyah\(^{48}\) is a great island in the land of the Zanj, and in it is the seat of their king,”\(^{49}\) but at present its people have removed themselves to another island, called Tunbātū (Tumbatu), the

\[^{42}\] There is, incidentally, nothing specifically Persian or Shirazian in the Islamic civilizations of East Africa in the Middle Ages (cf. C. H. Becker, Islamstudien, Leipzig, 1924–32, vol. 2, p. 72, n. 4; Mathew, quoted by Sir J. Gray, The Wadebali and the Wadiba, Tanganyika Notes and Records, No. 36, p. 27). A few pieces of Persian pottery and glazed tiles have been found on “Shiraz” sites, and the solar year of 365 days with the Persian New Year’s day (\textit{nawruz = nowroz\textperiodcentered}) is used for agricultural purposes up to the present day (cf. Sir J. Gray, \textit{Memoirs of an Arabian princess}, Tanganyika Notes and Records, No. 37, p. 52). These influences are sporadic. I do not wish to deny, of course, that some of the Muslim immigrants in East Africa came from Persia, or from Shiraz (cf. E. Cerulli, \textit{Iscrizioni e documenti arabi per la storia della Somalia}, Rivista degli Studi Orientali, vol. 11 (1926), p. 2 f.; \textit{idem}, s. v. \textit{Muhdisthū}, Encyclopaedia of Islam, Leiden and London, 1913–38).


\[^{44}\] L. M. Devic (Bozorg b. Shahreyār, \textit{Livre des merveilles de l’Inde}, ed. P. A. van der Lith, tr. L. M. Devic, Leyden 1883–86, p. 288 f.), has decisively proved, with the help of de Goeje, that this is the Island of Zanzibar.


\[^{48}\] Lanjūyah is a variant of Unjūya = Unguja, a local name of Zanzibar. It occurs already in Jāḥīz (d. 255 H./868), \textit{Fakhr al-Sūdān}, ed. G. van Vloten, \textit{Trias Opuscula}, Leiden, 1903, p. 76. Jāḥīz, however, distinguishes the easily accessible shores of Qanbaluh (sic) from Lanjūyah, the homeland of the Zanj.

\[^{49}\] This information is derived from Masʿūdī, see above.
inhabitants of which are Muslims.” According to the local tradition on the history of Tumbatu, however, “the first man to settle in Tumbatu was named Yūsuf b. Sultān b. Ibrāhīm al-ʿAlawī. He was a prince of Shiraz and came from Bushire ... Yūsuf sent his son Ismāʿīl to Kilwa, and there he founded a city.” As Tumbatu is situated at a stone’s throw from Zanzibar Island, the existence of a Shirazi dynasty on the smaller island is obviously incompatible with that of the kings of the Zanzibar on the larger. On Pemba, Yāqūt says: “The Green Island ... There are two cities on it, ... each of which has a sultan, but neither of them claims sovereignty over the other ... Their sultan (sic) claims to be an Arab and to descend from a family of maritime transporters from Kufa (miin nāqilat al-Kifāf ālayhā).” This contradicts the Arabic version of the Kilwa Chronicle, which makes one of the six sons of Sultan Ḥasan b. ‘Alī of Shiraz the founder of the Muslim settlement on Pemba. Ibn ʿAṯīr is the first Arab author to confirm the local tradition on the history of Islam in East Africa.

In other words, this tradition, either oral or contained in written chronicles, is of no historical value for the period earlier than the middle of the seventh (thirteenth) century.

51 Pearce, Zanzíbar, p. 250. Ingrams (Zanzíbar, p. 144) refers to a written chronicle of Tumbatu.
53 See above, at the beginning of this section.
57 Islamic merchant cities of East Africa, The Times, 26 September 1951. An unpublished paper by the
to the twelfth century A.D., is represented by a number of small trading stations, including Kizimkazi with its original mosque. The second civilization is that of the sultanes from the late thirteenth to the end of the fifteenth century; the mosques of Kilwa Kiswani, Songo Mnara, Banderini (presumably), Tumbatu, Muska, Tongoni, Gedi, Kilepwa, and Maungwana wa Mashaa belong to this period. The third civilization developed at the end of the sixteenth century and fell into decay in the late eighteenth century; most of the other “Shirazi” mosques, which I have discussed in this paper, seem to belong to it. The mosques of all three civilizations have invariably a fixed, protruding minbar. In order to explain the survival of the very old recessed type of minbar, so that it could prevail in the modern period, we must postulate the spread of Islam to the islands and coastal regions of East Africa as early as the second century H. (eighth century A.D.). We saw, in fact, that the Muslims made themselves masters of Zanzibar exactly at that period. The East African recessed type of minbar came into being at that time, and it has survived, as part of popular religious architecture, the three “urban” Islamic civilizations of East Africa.

IX

In his masterly work La mosquée omeyyade de Médine, J. Sauvaget, basing himself in part on the conclusions of his predecessors, has definitely established the origins and the early development of mosque, mihrab, and minbar in Islam. Whatever the value of his attempt to find the architectural prototype of the Umayyad mosques and palaces in the basilicas of antiquity, his analysis of the layout and function of the mosque of the Prophet in Medina and of the mosques of the Umayyads are immediately convincing to a student of Islam. Following the example of the mosque of the Prophet, the mosques of the Umayyads were not buildings reserved for worship, but places of assembly for political functions, which were incidentally opened or closed by a short act of common worship. The mosque was the public annex of the palace of the ruler or the governor (p. 137 ff.), and the minbar was his seat or throne (pp. 142 to 144), from which he addressed the Muslims at the salāt al-jum‘ah which, during the greater part of the Umayyad period, remained a political function and could be held on any day and at any time (pp. 134–137). The mihrab in the Umayyad mosques was the place reserved for the ruler or governor; this is why its dimensions in those mosques are roughly the same everywhere, proportionately large in small mosques, and proportionately small in large ones (pp. 147 to 149). Sauvaget explains the traditional arrangement of the qiblah wall, in which the mihrab is normally in the axis of the building and the minbar to the right of it, as the adaptation of the plan of the Umayyad reception hall to the ground plan of the mosque of the Prophet in Medina, which had been piously preserved when the mosque was reconstructed and enlarged by Walid I in 88–91 H./706–710 (pp. 153–155). In the Umayyad reception hall, the throne or minbar of the ruler stood in the
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same author is quoted by Sir J. Gray, The Wadnali and the Wadiba, Tanganyika Notes and Records, No. 36, p. 27.

... The evidence of Mas‘ūdī and Yâqūt shows that there were Muslim sultanes on Zanzibar and Pemba, too.

... Popular architecture, as opposed to urban fashions, has often preserved old styles and forms of construction; cf., e.g., A. Godard, Le masjid-djami` Djam‘a de Nwet, Atlâr-é Iran, vol. 1 (1936), p. 172, and my paper Ein archaischer Minaret-Typ in Ägypten und Anatolien, Ars Islamica, vol. 5 (1938), p. 52 ff.

... Section IV: La mosquée de Médine dans l'architecture omeyyade (pp. 93–121); section V: La mosquée et le palais (pp. 122–157).

... Mainly C. H. Becker, L. Caetani, and H. Lammens.

AN UNKNOWN TYPE OF MINBAR AND ITS HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

central apsis or mihrāb; in the primitive mosque of Medina, the small wooden minbar of the Prophet stood in front of the center of the wall. At the reconstruction, the place of the minbar, which by then had been provided with a wooden understructure and put on a built base, was left unchanged, and a mihrāb was added asymmetrically to the left of it, facing the place where the Prophet had stood when directing the common worship. But this position of the mihrāb remained an exception, and as its natural place was in the center of the qiblah wall, the minbar of the mosques was placed asymmetrically to the right of it. But Sauvaget does not take a further step which the evidence seems to demand: he does not state explicitly that the minbar, not only in the Umayyad reception halls, but in the Umayyad mosques as well, stood in or in front of the mihrāb. The few passages which the literary sources provide as evidence on this point prove decisively that in the Umayyad mosques "le magīs du gouverneur, l'endroit où il prenait place, était devant ou dans l'ouverture de la niche" (p. 148), and this means that the minbar was placed in or in front of the mihrāb, for the ruler or governor to sit on when he addressed his audience. No minbar has actually survived from the Umayyad period, but all indications that can be gleaned from literary sources show that they were low and portable (pp. 139, 143). It is to be presume that the minbar was put into or in front of the mihrāb whenever it was needed, and put away after use. This is how I interpret the often quoted passage in Ibn al-Jawzi,

54 See above, p. 156.

55 Another method of adaptation occurs in the Tārik-Khāneh at Damghan, which dates from the second half of the eighth century A.D. (ca. 130–180 H.). Here the mihrāb, which is a niche in the thickness of the wall, and the protruding, built minbar are both placed symmetrically at the left and at the right extremity of the central aisle respectively. Cf. Creswell, Early Muslim architecture, vol. 2, p. 99 f.

56 The existence of a mosque, in addition to a reception hall, in the Umayyad palaces obviously does not invalidate my conclusion; these mosques were, in the nature of things, destined for private worship in common, and not for public political functions, such as the salāt al-jum’ah in the Umayyad period. I find that my interpretation of the evidence diverges from Sauvaget’s conclusions, as he formulates them, only on one detail: Sauvaget takes it for granted (p. 154 f.) that the mihrāb of the Umayyad mosques was too small to contain the seat of the ruler or the governor, and therefore antedates the introduction of an eccentric minbar to the right of the mihrāb; as I see it, this happened only when the mosque became a purely religious building at the end of the Umayyad period. The smallest Umayyad mihrāb known to us has a width of 1.09 m. (40 in.; Sauvaget, p. 149), and others are considerably broader.

57 Sauvaget says of these texts: “Du moins sont-il précis et au-dessus de tout soupçon, si bien que je les crois décisifs” (p. 147).

58 Italics are mine. J. S.

59 The Umayyad mosque of Bosra, built in 102 H./720–21, has a stone-built, protruding minbar of two steps and a seat (Sauvaget, op. cit., pp. 101 f., 139, n. 6; I have seen it myself); it is most unlikely that this “pauvre maçonnerie rustique, bâtie avec des matériaux de fortune,” should be contemporary with the substantial Umayyad building. The study of this mosque which is expected from its restorer, M. Écochard, has not yet appeared.


61 This detail is confirmed by a provisional issue, under ‘Abd al-Malik, of a dirham with a mihrāb and a lance on the reverse; cf. G. C. Miles, Mihrāb and ansâb: a study in early Islamic iconography, Archæologica Orientalia in memoriam Ernst Herzfeld, New York, 1952, p. 156 f. Dr. Miles informs me that since he wrote this paper, two more copies in private possession in Persia have come to his notice.

62 The further mention of Friday as the day of the salāt al-jum’ah, and of Umar’s choice of sūrah 63 for recitation on that day, is a symptom of the transformation of the salāt al-jum’ah into a purely religious act of worship. This process may well have started by the time of ‘Umar II, though it was certainly not
The use of a lance in order to mark the qiblah acquires its full significance only if the miḥrāb was still the place of the minbar of the ruler and had not yet become exclusively an indication of the direction toward Mecca. In any case, the use of the minbar on wheels, which was normally kept in a recess to the right of the miḥrāb and pulled forth only when it was needed, cannot be attributed yet to the time of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz (99–101 H./717–720). The transformation of the ṣalāt al-jum'ah from a political into a purely religious function, of the mosque from a hall of assembly into a purely religious building, and of the minbar from the throne of the ruler or governor into the pulpit of the preacher took place not at the beginning of the Umayyad period but at its end. This is attested by the fact that the mosques of the provincial cities in Egypt, and presumably elsewhere, were provided with minbars as late as 132 H./750, by order of the last Umayyad caliph Marwān II.\footnote{Cf. J. SCHACHT, *Islamstudien*, Leipzig, 1924, vol. 1, p. 464.} It was, of course, a gradual process, the decision of Marwān II only consecrated the end of a development, and its gradual character appears well from the verses of contemporary poets.\footnote{Cf. R. Mielck, *Zur Geschichte der Kanzel in Islam*, Der Islam, vol. 12 (1922), pp. 109–112.} It was only at that time, at the end and not at the beginning (or in the middle) of the Umayyad period, that the ground plan of the mosque of the Prophet in Medina, the exceptional character of which has more than once been emphasized by Sauvaget, was applied more exactly than before to the other mosques, and this resulted indeed in the asymmetrical placing of the minbar to the right of the miḥrāb.

It was only when this last step was taken, as Marwān II took it with regard to the provincial cities in Egypt (and presumably elsewhere), that the problem of the minbar presented itself. Up to that time, there were the movable minbars in the Umayyad mosques of the provincial capitals, which were put into place (as I think, in or in front of the miḥrāb) whenever they were needed for a political pronouncement of the caliph or governor, and removed when not in use; there was one exception, the venerable minbar of the Prophet in the mosque of Medina, which had been piously preserved, provided with a wooden understructure and put on a built base, well before the mosque of Medina was reconstructed. The mosque of the Prophet in Medina was indeed the paramount, if not the only mosque in Islam with special religious associations (the sanctuary of Mecca and the Aqṣā Mosque in Jerusalem are not relevant in this context), and the problem of the layout of the new, purely religious type of mosque and of the place of the minbar in it was solved, as was only natural, by reference to it. Two possible solutions presented themselves, and both were adopted in different circles. The first solution was simply to accept the minbar of the Prophet, which by that time had become immovable, as the model to be followed. The second solution was less simple and direct: its upholders continued to feel that the minbar of the Prophet was something apart, they were still conscious of the originally political and essentially nonreligious character of the ordinary minbar, they felt that such a minbar had no real place in the mosque, and therefore took it for granted that the minbar in mosques other than that of the Prophet, though it had in fact become indispensable, had to be kept out of the mosque as much as possible. These two possible solutions are typical of the two possible reactions of the ancient schools of Islamic law to Umayyad practice.\footnote{Cf. my *Origins of Muhammadan jurisprudence*, 2d ed., Oxford, 1953, p. 190ff.} This confirms the dating of the
problem and its possible solutions in the early part of the second century H.

The first solution led to the type of fixed, protruding minbar which was to prevail in the central and eastern provinces of the Islamic world, and the second solution led to various arrangements which allowed the minbar to intrude as little as possible into the floor space of the mosque, at least when it was not actually in use. This is the common idea underlying the minbar on wheels, which is pushed back into its recess when not in use, of the nonprotruding minbar carved out of the qiblah wall, and of the minbar built out behind the qiblah wall and accessible from the mihrāb. This last arrangement, by which the minbar is accessible only from the mihrāb has, in my opinion, preserved an echo of the old arrangement of minbar and mihrāb in the Umayyad mosques, when the place of the minbar was in the mihrāb.

The argument that the minbar ought not to intrude upon the floor space of the mosque was still present in the mind of Ibn al-Ḥājj (who wrote in Fez in 732 H/1331), al-Madkhal, Cairo, 1929, vol. 2, p. 212, and it was regularly quoted to me by scholars in East Africa. Ibn al-Ḥājj also disapproves of the minbar on wheels, customary in the Maghreb, which meets this requirement, and he therefore must produce another, formal objection to it.
TAKWA — THE MOSQUE OF THE PILLAR

BY JAMES KIRKMAN

Among the many Arab monuments on the coast of Kenya, one of the best preserved and most individual in its features is the Jamia of Takwa on Manda Island.

The Jamia, or Great Mosque of Takwa, has a rectangular muṣallā with a length two and one-third times its breadth, verandas with three open arches on each side, and chambers at the rear extending the whole breadth of the building. It is surrounded by a boundary wall forming a simple rectangle on the north and west, but an irregular polygon to south and west (plan and elevation, text figs. 1 and 2).

The material, except for the arcade of the west veranda, is coral rag, earth, and lime, and the use of cut coral is confined to the facade of the miḥrāb, the quoins of the south door, and the kerbs of the steps.

The roof was a flat plaster-and-rubble construction, carried on squared 2½-inch rafters at 6-inch centers, as at Gedi, but without coral tiles. The rafters were supported on heavy joists, the sockets of which can be seen above the centers of the arches of the miḥrāb and the doorways in the east and west walls (pl. 1, fig. 2). Running around the long walls, below the rafters, and interrupted by the sockets of the joists, was a 5-inch-wide rounded groove about 2 inches deep, which may have carried a wooden frieze carved with a text from the Koran, as in a building in Fort Jesus at Mombasa. This would have been removed with the minbar when the mosque was dismantled. No signs of masonry support or post holes were found at the points of intersection of lines drawn from the sockets in the side walls to a line drawn from the socket in the qibla wall down the center of the mosque. It would appear, therefore, that the roof was supported by large wooden posts, as in the Great Mosque at Siraf (now Tahiri) on the Persian Gulf and in the mosque at Kilwa, rebuilt in the middle of the fifteenth century.1 The floor of the mosque is covered with slabs of masonry from the roof, so there can be no question of there having been a palm-frond roof.

On the qibla wall immediately above the miḥrāb is a broken square pillar 6 feet high, with “half pediments” on each side of it (pl. 2, fig. 2). At the northeast corner is a low, square pillar, and between the northeast and middle-east doors are the remains of a taller pillar. The roof over the south wall of the mosque is thicker and higher than at the other end. There are no signs of any staircase to the roof. The pillar above the miḥrāb is a peculiar feature. A possible explanation is that this is a tomb mosque and that the miḥrāb was built over the grave of a greatly respected sharīf or sayyid. Since it was customary to raise pillars over such tombs, the traditional mark of honor was not omitted even when the memorial had been enlarged into a mosque.

The roofs of the east veranda and the small room at the south end of the west veranda were similar, but lighter, and without supporting joists. In the east veranda a 9-inch wall was built against the wall of the mosque, to carry the ends of the rafters of the new building. The roof of this room was 2 feet lower than the roof of the mosque; the material was red earth.

The roof of the west veranda (pl. 1, fig. 4) was of a light and temporary character, probably palm fronds. There are no signs of sockets or supporting walls, and one end of the rafters

Fig. 1—Plan of Great Mosque at Takwa.
rested on the roof of the muṣallā and the other on three projections above the centers of the round arches of the arcade, leaving an air space between them.

A similar sloping roof, but steeper, was raised over the east and west ends of the chambers behind the mosque, but in this case the rafters were built into the sloping ends with which the south walls of the east veranda and the room at the south end of the west veranda were finished. These were permanent roofs of plaster and rubble.

There are three doors in the east wall and two in the west wall, opening inward, placed opposite each other. The absence of the third door in the east wall is explained by the small room at the south end of the east veranda. There are cupboards in both walls between the north and middle doors, between the middle and south doors on the east wall, and in the west wall opposite. In the middle of the south wall is a door which has been blocked. Above the doors in the east wall, in pairs on either side of the miḥrāb, and at the east end of the south wall are longitudinal ventilation slits; those in the east wall were blocked when the east veranda was erected.

The miḥrāb (section, text fig. 2) has a pointed arch with three square-edged "orders" broken by a flat capital of three "orders." It is set in a triple frame, consisting of pilaster and architrave, a band of herringbone ornament with the horizontal member laid across the vertical without corners, and a plain inner frame of the width of the outer "order" of the arch (pl. 1, fig. 1). This is the traditional miḥrāb of the Kenya coast, and the only unusual feature is the cursory treatment of the corners of the herringbone frame. On the pilaster to the east of the miḥrāb are horizontal grooves for the

---

HORIZONTAL SECTION OF MIHRAB

VERTICAL SECTION OF MIHRAB FACADE

SECTION ACROSS MOSQUE

SCALE 0 4 FEET OR 1.22 METRES

SCALE 0 8 FEET OR 2.44 METRES

W E

Fig. 2—Sections of Great Mosque at Takwa.
wooden minbar, which has been removed. The upper groove is 11 feet from the ground, so that the minbar must have been of the platform type.

There was no plaster or red earth floor, but a deposit of white sand a foot deep was found above the foundation line of the walls.

The east veranda has an arcade of pointed arches opening onto a step descending to the level of the court. There are two square-headed windows in the north wall and one in the east wall between the north opening of the arcade and the corner. To the south of this opening is a niche for a lamp and in the south wall is a cupboard.

The west veranda is built of small rubble from a calcareous conglomerate of coral and sand found along the coast. It consists of an arcade of three round arches built onto a small room at the southwest corner of the mosque, with a long cupboard in the mosque wall. The north wall of the veranda is of coral masonry similar to the walls of the mosque, and has two trefoil-headed windows. It opens onto a narrow passage, presumably with a small door at the south end leading into the chambers behind the mosque.

The present north wall of the precincts is built onto the older east wall. In it is a doorway with a trefoil-headed arch whose cusping has crumbled away (pl. 1, fig. 2). To the east of the arch are three pictures of dhows, one of which appears to be attached to a sea anchor or buoy, made in the plaster of the wall (pl. 2, figs. 5-7).

The east wall of the precincts is irregular and ruinous and it is uncertain whether the lavatory marked on the plan belonged to the mosque or a neighboring house. To the south is the plastered jamb of a tall doorway, which may be the main entrance to the precincts. At the south end of the court on the east side of the mosque (pl. 1, fig. 3) are the washing facilities, consisting of a square-sided well, set at an angle to the mosque, surrounded by a square plastered step roughly parallel with the line of the mosque.

A conduit with two elbows brought the water around a low wall into a cistern built against the old wall running from the southeast corner of the mosque. At the south end of the cistern is a plaster platform 3 feet wide. In front of the cistern is a step with four coral heads for cleaning the soles of the feet; a similar arrangement is found at the Great Mosque at Gedi. In the cistern are three bowls or dishes: two are of lead-glazed earthenware whose glaze has decayed, one of a dull yellow-green with a narrow rim and the other with a broad rim and the normal rich green color; the third is a blue-and-white maiolica dish with a border pattern of concentric semicircles on a flat rim and at the bottom a cross of St. John (pl. 2, fig.8). Above one of the windows of the east veranda and the door of the room at the end of the west veranda are two shriveled but uncarbonized pieces of wood, parts of the frames of the door and window.

In the limited time spent on the site, all walls could not be investigated, but it is clear that the two verandas, the conduit, cistern, and probably the storerooms are additions, and it is possible that the walls of the musallâ have been rebuilt. The absence of a ventilation slit at the west end of the south wall is an argument for the rebuilding of this corner when the room at the south end of the west veranda was built. The masonry of the south wall is so inferior to the other walls that it is difficult to believe that it could have been built at the same time. The blocking of the door at the rear end of the mosque, which may have led to an older ablution room, can be associated with the rebuilding of the well parapet and the construction of the conduit and cistern. The north perimeter wall has been raised and plastered and it would be natural to connect the trefoil-headed arch of the rebuilt wall with the trefoil-headed windows of the west arcade.

A construction sequence would run as follows:

1. Musalla, chamber behind the mosque, original well, east and south perimeter walls.
2. Room at south end of west veranda, east veranda, north and west perimeter walls.
3. West veranda, raising of north perimeter wall, engravings of dhows, conduit, and cistern.

Two shafts were sunk in the mosque area. The one in the northwest corner of the mosque produced no datable evidence but showed that this part of the mosque has been built on undisturbed ground; the other beside the well was more productive. In the last cutting, two levels were distinguished: an earlier one before the reconstruction of the well parapet, contemporary with structural periods 1 and 2, and a later one contemporary with period 3. Only part of the lower level was sealed by the hard plaster surface of the platform around the well, and the pottery and porcelain from this part of the cutting is the most important dating evidence for Takwa. It included sherds of late Ming blue-and-white, the Near East imitations in soft paste, and a Near East blue-and-white glazed ware on a red body. These are all sixteenth-century wares. In the lowest level on the natural sand in the unsealed part of the cutting were found sherds of water coolers of the type found at Gedi in the last level, and two sherds of celadon, one of which was of a type commonest at Gedi in the late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century levels. This was the oldest sherd found at Takwa. Curiously enough, the commonest single class was a soft gray-bodied earthenware with brown or green lead glaze, which is ascribed to the Far East, as both glaze and body are so unlike the Near East glazes. The forms were small bowls and jars with ring bases after the style of celadon bases. This class was also found in quantity in the last level.

Fig. 3—Map of Lamu Archipelago.
at Gedi, dated to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The local wares consisted mainly of plain, rimmed bowls and jars at present undated. A sherd of a bowl with incised pattern on the side linked this level with the level under the gatehouse. The bowl with the cross of St. John, from the cistern, is Spanish or Portuguese of the middle of the sixteenth century, possibly made at Talavera. A bowl with similar border pattern is in the Museo Nacional de Belas Artes.3

Takwa is on the island of Manda, one of the three principal islands of the Lamu Archipelago—the Pyralaoan Isles of the classical geographers (text fig. 3). Once there were three small walled towns on the island—Manda itself, Takwa, and Kitâo—but today they are all deserted. The fresh water in the shallow wells has disappeared, perhaps owing to the decay of cultivation and the continual burning of the bush for grazing. Only in the southwest corner are there a few houses near the one place where fresh water can still be found. The present inhabitants of Shela, on the island of Lamu, opposite the entrance to Takwa creek, claim to have come from Manda Island. They state that they were driven off the island by the people of Paté, the strongest town of the archipelago, and after taking refuge in Lamu were permitted to build their present home. They belong to the same Arab-African stock as the inhabitants of Lamu, 2 miles away, but speak a different dialect, which substantiates their claim to separate identity. When the evacuation of Manda occurred is unknown, but the present settlement at Shela is not likely to be more than 150 years old.

The walled town of Takwa is roughly rectangular, with long sides north and south, and covers an area of about 12½ acres (text fig. 4). It is built on a sandy hill sloping from northeast to southwest. On the west and north is a muddy flat that may once have been covered by water and navigable by small dhows, but jehazis, oceangoing dhows, would have had to anchor in the main creek. This creek is wide and runs due east from the straits between the islands of Lamu and Manda, nearly bisecting the island of Manda. On the other flank, running from the northeast to the southwest corner of the town, is dry land with the abandoned lands and site of the town of Kitâo, about a mile and a half to the south, and to the east, across sand dunes, the breakers of the Indian Ocean. As a harbor it is in every way less con-
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3 J. Queirases, *Cerámica portuguesa*, Museo Nacional de Belas Artes, Gr. 44, Lisbon, 1948; B. Rackham, personal communication.
and disciples who had gathered round their teacher and master. The state of el-Damer in the Sudan, described by Burkhardt in the eighteenth century, is a typical example of what Takwa may have been in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The three main features of these sacred states were:

1. The provision of hospitality for pilgrims and travelers.
2. The admitted right of intervention with rulers on behalf of the oppressed.
3. The recognition of a right of asylum for men threatened with death.

At Takwa there is the pillar above the mihrāb of the mosque, suggesting that it is also a tomb, and there are extensive outbuildings suitable for the accommodation of strangers. There is also a local tradition of a right of sanctuary once enjoyed by the mosque at Takwa, which seems to be a reminiscence of the original character of the settlement.

The town wall is the normal Swahili town wall, 18 inches of rubble and mortar with a triangular coping on top, standing at least 9 feet high. At one place, to the southeast, the height has been raised to at least 12 feet. Four gates have been identified: one to the north, possibly the gate of Manda; the second to the east, a small postern toward the sea; a third to the south, the gate of Kitāo; and a fourth on the west, the gate of the strand. The first is exceptionally well preserved, owing to its having been used subsequently as a dwelling. It consists of a chamber built up against the outside of the wall, with outer door on the south wall and inner door on the east wall opening into the town. The mud roof, which once was carried on round mangrove poles, belonged to the dwelling, but the plaster-and-gravel floor was of the original gatehouse. The foundations of the north wall of chamber and town wall are contemporar
dy, but the south wall was rebuilt, possibly when the door into the town was blocked.

Under the gravel-and-plaster floor was an earth-and-sand deposit going down to natural soil. In it were found sherds of local earthenware, including one complete section of a small bowl with rounded sides and flat disk base. The commonest forms, which may be taken as the characteristic ware of the earliest period at Takwa, were wide-mouthed bowls with flat lips, straight sides, and disk or ring bases, and bowls with rounded sides, incised patterns, and probably bases. Curiously enough, here, as by the well, there were no sherds of cooking pots. The only imported sherd was the low ring base of a green glazed stoneware dish from the Far East. These sherds connected this subfloor level with the subfloor level by the well, and indicated that the town wall and mosque were contemporary.

Other wall features were towers near the southwest corner and facing the strand, but these were too ruinous for their plan to be seen without excavation.

Other finds amounted to eight beads: one small green glass, one small brown paste, and one red coral ½ inch long, above the surface by the well; one small black glass, two small cobalt glass, below this surface; and one translucent shell disk and one broken coral bead below the floor of the gatehouse.

Besides the mosque there are a number of houses inside the town wall, some with walls standing to their full height. Most of these are to the northeast and northwest of the mosque. None of them was investigated but most appear to be considerably smaller and less elaborate than the houses of Gedi or Kilepwa.

Outside the walls to the northeast of the gatehouse described above is a tomb with a round pillar in the middle of the east wall and cruciform finials on each of the four corners of the stepped enclosure behind the pillar. On the top of the north wall is a coral plaque with an inscription which has been read: 'Abd Allah Muḥammad 'Alī al-mutawaffa sanah 1094.'
(AD. 1682). The tomb, however, is known as “the tomb of Sheikh Ahmad Mansur bin Ahmad” or “Sheikh Fakihi Mansur,” and is a place of pilgrimage for the people of Shela today. Twice a year they visit it to pray for rain. The shape of the pillar is unusual. The untapered cylinder and the semicircular offset like a shelf in front of it have no funereal parallels on the coast of Kenya, but they recall the Vasco da Gama pillar at Malindi, which has the semicircular offset although the stubby pillar tapers toward the top.

The imported wares found at Takwa showed that the settlement commenced in the sixteenth century, flourished during the seventeenth century, but then fell into decay. The few sherds of local ware did not resemble closely the wares found at Gedi, but the general use of wheel-made disk and ring bases would place them at the end of the Gedi sequence. The absence of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century porcelain, such as is found in quantity on the foreshore at Lamu, Siyu, and other sites, is evidence of the termination of occupation at the end of the seventeenth century.

Fig. 1—North Wall and Mihrāb, from Inside.

Fig. 2—North Wall, from Outside.

Fig. 3—East Court.

Fig. 4—West Veranda.

Figs. 1–4—Takwa, Great Mosque.
Figs. 5 and 6—Dhows incised in plaster on outside of North Perimeter Wall.

Fig. 7—Dhow, also from North Perimeter Wall.

Fig. 8—Iberian Maiolica Plate in base of cistern.

Figs. 5-8—Takwa, Great Mosque.
THE ORIGIN AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF
FLORIATED KÜFIC

BY ADOLF GROHMANN

AMONG THE EIGHT VARIETIES OF KÜFIC—(1) Primitive or simple Küfic (coufique primitif); (2) Küfic with elaborate apices; (3) foliated Küfic; (4) floriated Küfic (coufique fleuri); (5) plaited or interlaced Küfic (coufique à entrelacs) (6) bordered Küfic; (7) architectural Küfic (coufique architectural); (8) Küfic rectangles (coufique carré) — the floriated Küfic (No. 4) is the most attractive; it is the most decorative variety of lapidary styles, and marks a culminating point in the development of the Arabic script.

Inscriptions in floriated Küfic are known to Western scholars since the first quarter of the eighteenth century—two, dated 348 and 392 H. respectively and found in Persia, were reproduced by Chardin, but they did not attract any special attention; only their difficult readability was repeatedly stressed. The origin of this script was in complete obscurity, and it was only at the beginning of the twentieth century that theories about its origin were formed.

Before I go into details, it is necessary to make a clear differentiation between (a) foliated Küfic and (b) floriated Küfic, for both have been frequently confused, even by experienced scholars.

Floriated Küfic is characterized by the decoration of the apices of the letters, consisting of half-palmettes and 2- or 3-lobed leaves, the bifurcation of the endings of letters (I, Ï), which might extend even to initial forms, and the terminal letters (fl. 1, figs. 1 and 2).

Floriated Küfic shows the same decoration, but in addition floral motifs, tendrils, and scrolls growing from the terminations or even from the medial forms of the letters (text figs. 1 and 2). These tendrils are of course to be distinguished from those growing from the upper edge of the band of writing, or forming the floral background of the inscription, for the essential characteristic of coufique fleuri is that the tendrils and perfect arabesques form an organic unit with the letters from which they grow.

* Throughout the article the following abbreviations are used:
  CIA, Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptions Arabicas, M. van Berchem, in MMAF, Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française du Caire: I (Égypte), MMAF, vol. 19 (1894-1903); II (Syrie), MMAF, vol. 25 (1909); vol. 43 (1922-23); vol. 52 (1929-30); III (Asie Mineure), MMAF, vol. 29 (1910-17).
  MPER, Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyri Erzherzog Rainer.
  OLZ, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
  PER, Collection of the papyri Erzherzog Rainer, Vienna.

1 According to the description of this variety, given by S. Flury, Ornamental Küfic inscriptions on pottery, in A. U. Pope, A survey of Persian art, vol. 2 (London-New York, 1939), pp. 1743f., 1745 (with fig. 602), that a purely ornamental border is added to the upper part of the band of writing, script and ornament thus forming two horizontal zones clearly separated from each other, it is actually not a question of a new kind of script, but of a distinct accessive decoration of the frame only.


3 E.g., by J. J. Kehr, Monarchiae Asiatico-Saracenicae status, Leipzig, 1724, sect. 4; Chr. Th. von Murr, Inscriptio arabica litteris cuficae auro textili picta in infima fimbria pallii imperialis, Nürnberg, 1790, p. 12; J. J. Marcel, Paléographie arabe, Paris, 1828, p. 10.

4 Flury, op. cit., p. 1758, has included such inscriptions in foliated Küfic, since the visual impression is the same.

Since J. G. Chr. Adler⁶ and Marcel,⁷ this floriated Kūfic is also known by the name Carmatian (Qarmatique, carmatique), which points to the

**Fig. 1—Inscription in the Transept of the Mosque al-Azhar. (After K. A. C. Creswell, The Muslim architecture in Egypt, vol. 1, fig. 17, p. 54.)**

Fāṭimids. Unfortunately no sharp distinction was made between foliated Kūfic and floriated Kūfic, the term “coufique fleuri” being employed for both styles of script. So, e.g., the script of the inscription of the Jāmi’ al-‘Aṭā’īrīn in Alexandria⁸ is called coufique fleuri by van Berchem, although it is obviously foliated Kūfic. The script on the tombstone in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (pl. i, fig. 3), No. 4288, dated 243 H./857, a rich foliated Kūfic, is even described by Wiet⁹ as “coufique simple.” So


⁸ *CIA* 1/4, Égypte, MMAF, vol. 19, 1903, p. 701. The same is the case with the inscription, *ibid.*, No. 48, p. 79; pl. 18, No. 3; and No. 45, p. 74, while the inscription of Badr al-Jamālī of 480 H. (Bāb al-Futūh), showing a tendril with 3-lobed leaf in red, is designated as “coufique fleuri à rinceaux” (*CIA* I, No. 36; pl. 18; No. 2, p. 61).

⁹ *Stèles funéraires*, vol. 2, Cairo, 1936, p. 28, pl. 9.

M. van Berchem has used the expression “coufique fleuri à riches rinceaux” for genuine floriated Kūfic,⁰ e.g., in the inscription of the tympanums of the arches in the sanctuary of the Azhar Mosque, which Flury¹¹ called “a developed phase of coufique fleuri.” To this

¹⁰ *CIA* 1/1, Égypte, No. 31, p. 53; pl. 16, No. 2.

vagueness in terminology comes another handicap due to incompleteness: in the investigations hitherto made, extending to the decorated apices and the development of foliated Kufic, the influence of the manuscript style on the lapidary script has been completely neglected, although J. von Karabacek\(^{12}\) pointed out this important phenomenon as early as 1874.

The problem of the origin of "coufique fleuri" was first discussed by W. and G. Marçais\(^{13}\) in 1903; they said that this angular foliated character, known as Carmatian (qarmatique), appeared for the first time in Tunisia in 341 H.\(^{14}\) and was then transferred to Egypt, perhaps by the Fatimids. M. van Berchem\(^{15}\) at first shared the same view in 1905, but, under the influence of the appearance of the famous stela of Tashkend, dated 230 H./844,\(^{16}\) he changed his opinion\(^{17}\) and considered this epigraphical document as the oldest example known of this type of script, although he expressed serious doubts about the correctness of the date and said that the Tashkend stela undoubtedly was engraved later. Martin Hartmann,\(^{18}\) who had discovered this tombstone on the occasion of his journey to Turkestan, in the Museum of Tashkend, declared this stela to be the pre-eminent example of the new style of writing, which manifests its existence so energetically in the Fatimid inscriptions of 470 H. in Cairo, and arrived at the conclusion that this foliated Kufic ("Blumenstil") has come from the East to Egypt.\(^{19}\) He was followed in this view by J. Strzygowski,\(^{20}\) who took the movement of this ornamental script from Central Asia to the West as a proved fact, and even supposed that the Kufic palmette and the ornamentation of the Arabic tombstones in Cairo also came from the East to Egypt and are related to the patterns of Persian textiles.

Both theories soon met with serious objections. First of all, J. von Karabacek\(^{21}\) proved with strong arguments that the Tashkend stela in question (A), published by M. Hartmann, is only a copy or replica of a stone, originally dated 230 H., and is contemporaneous with a second tombstone (B), also published by Hartmann\(^{22}\) from the same museum and dated 541 H./1146. Karabacek's view was fully approved by Herzfeld.\(^{23}\) So the basic preliminary condition for an early appearance of coufique fleuri in the East was eliminated. Herzfeld,\(^{24}\) in his famous review of Strzygowski's Amida, has further pointed out that the stela of Tashkend (pl. 1, fig. 1), used by Strzygowski as an argument for the spreading of coufique fleuri from Turkestan to the West, offers by no means this style of writing—no tendril, no flower. Indeed, a comparison of plate 1, figures 1 and 2 with real foliated Kufic (text figs. 1 and 2) shows clearly that there is a frequent use of the lobed terminations of letters in both tombstones, but nowhere even a disposition to develop these terminations to a scroll, tendril, or arabesque growing out of the letters. So neither the stela

14 The epitaph from the Qubbah of Sidi Ribāh in Qairawān, O. Houdas and R. Basset, Épigraphe tunisienne, No. 16, Bulletin de Correspondence Africaine, vol. 4 (Algier, 1882), p. 126, pl. 3 (here reproduced on pl. 1, fig. 2).
16 See below, next column and pl. 1, fig. 1.
17 Amida, p. 24.
18 Archäologisches aus Russisch-Turkestan, III, OLZ, vol. 9 (1906), cols. 71–73 (here reproduced on pl. 1, fig. 1).
19 Ibid., col. 34.
24 OLZ, vol. 14 (1911), col. 432 f.
Diagram A.
DIAGRAM A

1—Euting, *Sinaitische Inschriften*, No. 657, pl. 38.
2—Papyrus Khirbat Mird, No. 4.
3—PER Inv. Ar. Pap. No. 1003.
4—Inv. No. 9291, Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.
5—Inscription of Ascalon, Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d’archéologie orientale*, vol. 1, pl. 11.
9—P. Cair. Inv. No. 69, *ibid.*, pl. 5.
14—Moritz, *Arabic paleography*, pl. 18.
16—PER Inv. Ar. Pap. No. 2150 recto.
17—Tirâz No. 61, Benaki Museum, Athens.
19—Plate, Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo, Ars Islamica, vol. 3, fig. 4, opposite p. 177.
21—Mazâr Shâh Fadl, Safid Buland, Ars Islamica, vol. 6, fig. 2, p. 88.
22—Cenotaph of Fâdâ, Hims, Ars Islamica, vol. 10, fig. 86, opposite p. 71.
25—Koran of Sultan Faraj, Moritz, *Arabic paleography*, pl. 72.
26—Tirâz No. 144, Musée Benaki, Athens.
27—Tirâz No. 8164, Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.
30—Koran, Moritz, *Arabic paleography*, pl. 47.
31—PER Inv. Chart. Ar. No. 17631.
35—Inscription on a bronze vessel, Ars Islamica, vol. 5, fig. 1, opposite p. 113.
36—Epitaph in Jerusalem, CIA II/1 (1922), pl. 4, No. 18, dated 395 H./1005.
38—Inscription at Thaḥbād, Niebuhr, *Beschreibung von Arabien*, pl. 9.
39—Koran of Sultan Barqūq, Moritz, *Arabic paleography*, pl. 68.
40—Inscription of the Church of St. Mary, Calatrava (Badajoz), Lanci, *Seconda opera cufica*, vol. 3, pl. 19.
of Tashkend (A) (ca. 540 H./1145) nor that of Qairawân (341 H., pl. I, fig. 2) can be considered as a preliminary step to the developed form of coufique fleuri, and the way from Tunisia to Egypt or from Turkestan to Mesopotamia and Egypt is therefore also out of the question.

But Herzfeld’s negative criticism of the theories of Hartmann and Strzygowski already contained one positive and important statement, i.e., the decoration of the apices by elegant palmettes, beginning on Egyptian tombstones since ca. 240 H./854, might be considered as a preparation for, or first step to, coufique fleuri. So the way was indicated on which further investigations had to start, especially when new material, inscriptions as well as papyri, had come to light. In spite of the statement of Flury 26 that we obtain from Amida just as little information as from Cairo about the sudden appearance of the Kûfîc decorative writing, it is, in the first place, Egypt where the first steps in the development of floriated Kûfîc are clearly demonstrated by papyri and epitaphs. 26

There is no doubt that the decoration of the letters begins with the alîf. The top of the shaft is provided with a barb or hook, turned to the left. Possibly this barbed form of the alîf is connected with the late Nabataean form of aleph (diagram A, 2) in Sinaitic inscriptions, 27 which is preserved in cursive writing in a question-mark form of alîf in papyri of the first to the third centuries of the Hijra 28 (diagram A, 8, 9), and in the lapidary style even as late as the fifth to sixth centuries of the Hijra 29 (diagram A, 10). A variant form of this alîf is to be seen in the copy of the Makki script in the Chester Beatty manuscript of the Kitâb al-Fihrist by Ibn al-Nadîm, fol. 3 verso, last line (diagram A, 6). 30 The hooklike top or barb of the alîf and lâm forms later a transition to the plain loop, shown by an epitaph in Sicily (579 H./1183; diagram A, 32), 31 which developed into a fully looped head in ceramics from Samargand (text fig. 3) 32 and in inscriptions especially of the thirteenth century (diagram A, 33) and finally into tops in the form of human heads, as, e.g.,

26 Islamische Schriftbänder Amida-Diarbekr, Basel, 1920, p. 10.
28 A. Grohmann, Arabic papyri in the Egyptian Library, vol. 1, Cairo, 1934, No. 18; Corpus papyrorum Raineri, III, Series Arabicæ, vol. 1/2, Vienna, 1924, No. 256, pl. 34.
31 Karabacek, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mazjaditen, p. 53. The alîf shown in diagram A, 33, reproduced by Karabacek, ibid., p. 53, is to be found in an inscription of the thirteenth century A.D., not specifically designated.
in an inscription from Sicily\textsuperscript{23} dating from the thirteenth century A.D. (diagram A, 34) and a bronze vessel of the late twelfth century A.D., made in Persia, formerly in the Qolestan Palace and now in the Archaeological Museum in Teherān (diagram A, 35).\textsuperscript{24} The transition to such forms is effected by knoblike apices of the \textit{alif} in the cursive writing of the eleventh to twelfth centuries A.D., e.g., in PER Inv. Chart. Ar. 17631,\textsuperscript{25} and even in a Maghribi-Koran in the Egyptian National Library, Cairo, dated 557 H./1160.\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{24} W. Hartner, \textit{The pseudoplanetary nodes in the moon’s orbit in Hindu and Islamic iconographies}, Ars Islamica, vol. 5 (1938), fig. 1 opposite p. 113.

\textsuperscript{25} Cf. MPFR, vol. 4 (1888), p. 80, eleventh century (diagram A, 31).

\textsuperscript{26} Reproduced in Moritz’s \textit{Arabic paleography}, pl. 47 (diagram A, 30).

Also another decoration of the top of the \textit{alif} is to be traced back to cursive or manuscript writing.\textsuperscript{27} In using a qalam with a nib, cut slightly from upper right to lower left, the top of the \textit{alif} is naturally formed in the same way, when the reed is put on the papyrus; a slight oscillation of the qalam downward from left to right then easily provides the head of the \textit{alif} with a wedge-shaped top on the left side, as it is to be seen in the papyrus found at Khirbat Mird (No. 4, first century of the Hijra, diagram A, 2), and in PER Inv. Ar. Pap. No. 1903 (first century of the Hijra, diagram A, 3). In stone inscriptions it appears already in the epitaph No. 9291 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (diagram A, 4),\textsuperscript{28} dated 71 H./690–691 and occurs further in inscriptions and ceramics of the Umayyad and early ‘Abbāsīd periods, e.g., on a bowl, probably made in Syria but found in Susa,\textsuperscript{29} in the inscription of al-Mahdī at Ascalon (155 H./772; diagram A, 5),\textsuperscript{30} in a _separatoră-inscription from al-Fustāt (168 H./847–85; pl. 2, fig. 4), an epitaph (No. 1506/142, dated 180 H./796; diagram A, 11),\textsuperscript{31} and the inscription of the Nilometer in al-‘Rūdah (247 H./862; diagram A, 12).\textsuperscript{32} We also see the same apex in an outline for a panel or tile, drawn on papyrus (second to third century H.; diagram A, 13).\textsuperscript{33}


\textsuperscript{29} A. Lane, \textit{Early Islamic pottery}, London, 1947, pl. 4, c, and p. 8 (eighth century A.D.).

\textsuperscript{30} Clermont-Ganneau, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 214, pl. XI, left side.

\textsuperscript{31} H. Hawary and H. Rached, \textit{Stèles funéraires}, vol. 1, Cairo, 1932, p. 4, pl. 2, Inv. No. 1906/142 in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.

\textsuperscript{32} K. A. C. Creswell, \textit{Early Muslim architecture}, vol. 2, Oxford, 1940, p. 293, fig. 229.

\textsuperscript{33} A. Grohmann, \textit{Corpus papyrorum Raineri III}, vol. 1/3, pl. 23, b.
and in manuscript writing in the colophon of a Koran manuscript in the Egyptian National Library, dated 268 H./881–882 (diagram A, 14), and of a parchment Gospel-codex, dated 279 H./892 (diagram A, 15) in Leningrad, further on papyrus (diagram A, 16) and on textiles (diagram A, 17, 18) of the second half of the third and the fourth centuries H., made in Persia. It also occurs on pottery, e.g., a plate in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo from the time of the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Ḥākim bi-amr ‘llāh (386–411 H./996–1021; diagram A, 19).

In the lapidary style this form recurs—beside that with the thorn on the right side—400 H./1010, on the epitaph Inv. No. 801 in the Kunsthistorische Museum in Wien (diagram A, 20), and on the stucco cover of the wall of Mazār Shāh Faḍāl at Safid Buland (middle of the twelfth century A.D.) near Kasan in the northern part of Fergānāh-Turkestan (diagram A, 21), which represents a somewhat hybrid form of apices.

42 Moritz, op. cit., pl. 18.
44 PER Inv. Ar. Pap. No. 2150, recto line 8 (third century of the Hijra).
46 G. Wiet, Deux pièces de céramique égyptienne, Ars Islamica, vol. 3 (1936), fig. 4 opposite p. 177, and Lane, Early Islamic pottery, pl. 25, a, p. 22.
48 E. Cohn-Wiener, A Turanic monument of the twelfth century A.D., Ars Islamica, vol. 6 (1939), p. 88, fig. 2.

inasmuch as not only are all letters provided with apices of the described form, but a short shaft with such an apex is furthermore added above the apex of the letter. The wedge-shaped apex on the left side of the alif—which moreover occurs less frequently than that on the right side—is to be found down to the fifteenth century A.D. Some examples are the cenotaph of Faḍāl in Ḫimṣ (diagram A, 22), the title page of the manuscript A.F. 4 of the Burdah of al-Būṣīrī in the National Austrian Library in Vienna (746 H./1345; diagram A, 23), the inscription in the Sультān Ḥasan Mosque in Cairo (ca. 750 H./1349; diagram A, 24), which Flury derives from the East Islamic area, and finally a surah heading in a Koran of Sültān Faraj in the Egyptian National Library, dated 814 H./1411 (diagram A, 25).

An isolated peculiar form of this ornamented apex which somewhat recalls “architectural Kūfic” is shown by two tirāz-inscriptions. One,

50 Islamicische Schriftbänder Amida-Diarbekr, p. 45, fig. 14.
51 Moritz, Arabic paleography, pl. 72.
Musée Benaki No. 144, made in Tinnts in 309 H./912-922, exhibits a rectangular broken top of the alif and lām (diagram A, 26); the other, Inv. No. 8164 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (diagram A, 27, tenth century), shows the heads of the shafts bulging out and intentionally stylized and so recalling simplified dragon heads. An isolated convex variant of this head occurs on a displaced stone of the Kharput gate in Diyār Bakr (diagram A, 28) and in a Spanish Koran in the Egyptian National Library. The development of the wedge to a triangle is shown by an Arabic inscription in the old Bailleul collection in Paris, published by M. Lanci (diagram A, 29).53

At a comparatively early date the decoration of the apex on the left side of the alif also affects other letters, as, e.g., in the inscription of the Maqām 'Alī on the Euphrates of the tenth century A.D.,54 on a carpet fragment from al-Fustāt,55 and in various tirāz inscriptions56 and on a Seljuk incense burner in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (577 H./1181–1182).57

In some rare cases the arrowhead apex of the alif upon the left side is substituted by a half-palmette, already occurring in papyri of the second to third century H./seventh to ninth century (diagram A, 37), as, e.g., in an epitaph in Jerusalem, dated 395 H./1005 (diagram A, 38),58 in a tombstone from the Mosque in

52 van Berchem-Strzygowski, Amida, fig. 292, p. 344 and pl. 3, 2.
54 van Berchem-Strzygowski, op. cit., p. 358, fig. 306.
55 Aly Bahgat and A. Gabriel, Fouilles d'al-Fustāt, Paris, 1921, pl. 31.
56 Inv. No. 13143, 14475 (dated 168 H./784–785) in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo.

Tha'bād (Yaman), dated 540 H./1146 (diagram A, 39),59 in the painted Koran inscription on the stucco mihrāb of the Maydān Mosque in Sāveh (sixteenth century A.D.),60 and in the Sūrah-headings of the Koran of Sulṭān Barqūq (784–801 H./1382–1399, diagram A, 39) in the Egyptian National Library.61 A special form of such a half-palmette is represented in ceramics (text fig. 5).62 In the inscription of the Church of

Fig. 5—Decorated Final Alif in the Inscription on a Piece of Egyptian Pottery in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo. (After La céramique égyptienne de l'époque musulmane, pl. 19.)

St. Mary of Calatrava, Badajoz (437 H./1046) the half-palmette has been developed into a 3-lobed palmette (diagram A, 40).63

60 C. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, Kopenhagen, 1772, p. 96, pl. 9.
62 Moritz, Arabic paleography, pl. 68.
63 La céramique égyptienne de l'époque musulmane, Basel, 1922, pl. 19, right side.
64 Lanci, Seconde opera cufica, vol. 2, p. 34, pl. 19; E. Lévy-Provençal, Inscriptions arabes d’Espagne, Leyden-Paris, 1931, No. 43, p. 54 f. For this inscription,
Diagram B.
Much more variety is shown in the decoration of the apex on the right side of the alif. It begins with a hook or barb, obviously taken over from the late Nabataean form of aleph in Sinai inscriptions (diagram B, 1) but appearing as a thorn or split arrowhead only as early as the second half of the second century of the Hijra in the lapidary style (diagram B, 2–4). The last dated examples of this form of the alif are offered by a tombstone from Tashkend, dated 541 H./1146, and the inscription on the mihrab of the mosque in the Qaṣbah in Mar-

\[ \text{rākṣesh (591 H./1195)} \]

indicating the very wide area in which this decoration was used. It even occurs as late as the eighth century H. in Koran manuscripts of the Mamlūk period in Egypt, e.g., the Koran, dated 776 H./1374–75, in the Egyptian National Library (diagram B, 5) and in the inscription on the door of a mosque in Isfahan, copied by E. Herzfeld, dated 768 H./1366.

It is not possible to give here further details concerning the rich stock of forms offered by the decoration of the alif with a hook, sometimes only discretely indicated, as e.g., in the alif in the inscription of al-Rūdah (diagram B, 4). Some especially characteristic forms may never-

---

64 H. Basset and H. Terrasse, Sanctuaire et forteresses Almohades, Hesperis, vol. 6 (1926), p. 221, fig. 108.

65 Arabische Inschriften (unpublished MS.), fasc. II, p. 73.
theless be designated. Thus, the hook has been developed into a triangle, e.g., in tirāz inscriptions of textiles fabricated in the Yaman, dated 311 H./923 (diagram B, 6) and A.D. 900–920, in an epitaph from Abyssinia, on a seal in the Kunsthistorische Museum in Vienna (Inv. No. 105), and on ceramics found in Samarrā and North Africa (diagram B, 7, a, b). The sketches on paper Inv. Chart. Ar. Nos. 25042, 25043 in the Archduke Rainer Collection in Vienna from about the twelfth century A.D. (pl. 2, figs. 6, 7), showing the same decoration of the hastae of the alif and lām, were possibly destined for the execution of such ceramics. These triangular decorations are very similar to those occurring on the left side of the apices in an inscription in the old Bailleul Collection in Paris, published by M. Lanci. A hook with extended point is seen on a fragment of a mat found in al-Fustāt, in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo (Inv. No. 8244, tenth century A.D.; diagram B, 8), on tombstones dated 432 H./1040 and 462 H./1070, on a wood carving of the ninth century A.D. also found in al-Fustāt and preserved in the same museum, extremely elongated on a plate of the tenth century A.D. made in Mesopotamia and found in al-Fustāt (diagram B, 9), and in a tirāz inscription of a textile in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Inv. No. 8560–1863) of the eleventh-twelfth century A.D. That this evolu-

tion of the decoration of the alif is not confined to Egypt is also shown by a copper plate of the eleventh century A.D. and a silver plate of the tenth century A.D., both made in Persia. But Egypt has developed it in a very artistic way in the Fātimid period, as is demonstrated by ceramics of the eleventh century A.D. (diagram B, 10).

A special form of the apex, projecting in form of an angle to the right, shown in the inscription Amidā No. 14 (diagram B, 11) of 450 H./1067 to 1068, has developed into a 3-lobed palmette on a textile from Spain or Egypt from about A.D. 1000 (diagram B, 12) and into the half-palmette in the inscriptions Amidā Nos. 15, 18, 24 (476, 484, second half of the sixth century H./1083–84, 1091–92, second half of the twelfth A.D. century respectively; diagram B, 13, 14, 15 forming thus the transition to "architectural Kūfic" of the end of the seventh


77 Wiet, Exposition persane de 1931, pl. 4 above and 3 below.

78 Lane, op. cit., p. 22 and pl. 22, b.

79 Flury, Islamische Schriftbänder Amida-Diarbekr, pl. 8, B. This form recurs on a pitcher from Mesopotamia, eleventh-twelfth century A.D. (in Lane, op. cit., pl. 36, a) and in the inscription of the sarcophagus of al-Husain in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (Inv. No. 15025, early Ayyubid period).

80 Real Academia de la Historia de Madrid. The tirāz shows the name of the Caliph Hishām II al-Mu‘ayyad bi ‘llāh (366–400 H./977–1009). This textile came from San Esteban de Gormaz (province of Soria) and is published in M. Gómez-Moreno, El arte árabe español hasta los Almohades, Ars Hispaniae, vol. 3 (Madrid, 1951), pp. 345–346, pl. 504, a, and in Lévi-Provençal, Inscriptions arabes d‘Espagne, No. 211, p. 192. I owe these particulars to the courtesy of Prof. E. García Gómez, Madrid.

81 S. Flury, Islamische Schriftbänder Amida-Diarbekr, p. 19, fig. 3; p. 21, fig. 4; p. 25, fig. 7.

82 Cf. W. and G. Marçais, Les monuments arabes de Tlemcen, p. 179, fig. 30. A decoration, similar to that in diagram B, 18, occurs in the alif and lām in the faience panels of Gūr-e Mīr in Samarrā; see Pope, A survey of Persian art, vol. 5 (1938), pl. 542, and the stucco panel from Rayy (12th century), ibid., pl. 516.


49 Kühnel, Catalogue of dated tirāz fabrics, pp. 87–89, pl. 46, Inv. Nos. 73213, 73675.


51 F. Sarre-E. Herzfeld, Die Ausgrabungen von Samarrā, Teil II, pl. 10; G. Marçais, Les poteries et faïences de la Qaba des Beni Hammūd (XIe siècle), Constantine, 1913, pl. 15, 6.

52 Seconda opera cufica, vol. 3, pl. 16, No. 2.

53 G. Wiet, Stèles funéraires, vol. 6, Cairo, 1939, pls. 20, 28, pp. 122, 164, (Inv. No. 1506/483 and No. 624).


55 Lane, Early Islamic pottery, pl. 13, a.

56 R. Guest, Notice of some Arabic inscriptions on
century of the Hijra (thirteenth century A.D.), well known from mosques in North Africa, e.g., Sidi Bel Hassen (696 H./1296; diagram B, 16). Anyhow, it does not seem probable that this architectural Kufic is a product of Maghribi art, as Flury\(^3\) surmised, and has migrated from the Maghrib to the East, since the building inscription of the Jami' al-'Attar in Alexandria (dated 477 H./1084; diagram B, 17),\(^4\) as well as those of 'Amid and of the Mashhad Imâm Abû'l-Qasim in Moșul\(^5\) (diagram B, 18), and also the inscriptions on the tower of Rayy\(^6\) and on the minaret of Shâh Rustam in Isfahan,\(^7\) all from the fifth-sixth century H., show already the characteristics of this style of writing: angular apices, projecting like consoles, and festoon-like, concentric, round Norman arches or broken ogives (diagram B, 19, 20). An interesting example of this style—showing long angular apices of the alif and lâm—is offered by the stucco border of a window of the mosque of the Ayyûbid Sultan al-Kâmil Muhammad (621 H./1224) in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo\(^8\) and by the inscription of the "Tombau Rouge" at Marâgheh (465 H./1073; text fig. 12). A strange obtuse-angled head of medial yâ is offered by the inscription of a luster vase in the Hermitage Museum of Leningrad (text fig. 6).\(^9\) The barb on the right side, which still occurs in about the same form as in the Sinaic inscriptions (diagram B, 1)

---

\(3\) Die Ornamente der Halim- und Ashar-Moschee, p. 21.
\(4\) CIA I/4 (MMAF, vol. 19/4, 1903), No. 518, p. 701, pl. 43, No. 1, and fig. p. 703; Lancel, Seconda opera eufica, vol. 3, pl. 12. The inscription is preserved in the University Museum in Messina.
\(6\) P. Coste, Monuments modernes de la Perse, Paris, 1867, pl. 64. Cf. also the stucco panel of the fifth/twelfth century in Pope, A survey of Persian art, vol. 5 (1938), pl. 516.
\(7\) Ibid., pl. 54.
\(8\) M. Herz-Bey, Catalogue raisonné des monuments exposés dans le Musée National de l'Art Arabe, Cairo, 1906, p. 60, fig. 16.
\(10\) Littmann, Arabic inscriptions, No. 53, p. 49.
\(11\) Kühl, Catalogue of dated tiraz fabrics, p. 9, pl. 3.
\(12\) Wiet, Exposition perse de 1931, pl. 2, middle, 3, above, No. 5.
\(13\) Herzfeld, Arabische Inschriften (unpublished MS.), fasc. III, p. 36, No. 6; M. B. Smith, Material for a corpus of early Iranian Islamic architecture, I, Ars Islamica, vol. 4 (1937), fig. 33, p. 27. The mihrâb of the sanctuary is dated 528 H./1134, cf. p. 37. The same loop also occurs on a textile in the Ackerman-Pope Collection, Ph. Ackermann, The textile arts, textiles of the Islamic periods, A. U. Pope, A survey of Persian art, vol. 3 (1939), fig. 646, p. 211.
3—PER Inv. Ar. Pap. 1173.
4—Inscription on a Spanish textile (cf. diagram B, No. 12).
6—Inscription of the miḥrāb in the sanctuary of the mosque in Bārsān, Ars Islamica, vol. 4, fig. 33, p. 27.
7—Inscription on a piece of Egyptian pottery, *La céramique égyptienne de l'époque musulmane*, pl. 21, left side above.

But an even stronger impulse for the decoration of the right apex of the *alif* came from another form of this letter, and here again the first steps of the development go back to the second century of the Hijra (eighth century A.D.). They are connected with the forked top of the *alif*, appearing already in 191 H./807 and 196 H./812 on the tombstones Nos. 1103 and 2721/138 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (*diagram D, 1, 2*) where almost all the letters show forked apices. Two further examples are furnished by two tombstones, dated 256 H./870 and 272 H./886, published by G. Salmon (*diagram D, 3, 4*). This forked apex is to be found down to the Fāṭimid period, e.g., on a textile in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Inv. No. 1381–1888) from the time of al-Mustansir bi’llāh (427–487 H./1036–93), a rock crystal seal in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (Inv. No. 14555; *pl. 2, fig. 5*), a leaden seal published

---

94 *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mazjäditen*, p. 53.
95 *Trattato delle sepolcrali iscrizioni in cufica Tamurea e nischia lettera da' maomettani operate*, Lucca, 1840, pl. 21, line 4 (pl. 19).
96 *La céramique égyptienne de l'époque musulmane*, pl. 21, left side above.
97 Hawary and Rached, *Stèles funéraires*, vol. 1, pl. 6, p. 16, pl. 8, p. 211.
98 *Notes d'épigraphie arabe*, Bull. de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, vol. 2 (1902), No. 6, 13 (pp. 8, 13).
99 Guest, *op. cit.*, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (1906), No. 5, pl. 2.
by G. Stickel\(^1\) (diagram D, 5), and even as late as the sixth century H. in Persia in an inscription of the entrance corridor of the Shrine of Bâyazïd in Bistâm, dated 535 H./1140).\(^2\)

In the following third century of the Hijra this simple ornament is transformed into an artistic half-palmette, as, e.g., in two epitaphs in the Musée de Municipalité in Alexandria, published by E. Combe,\(^3\) dated 217 H./832 and 246 H./860 (diagram D, 6). It further occurs in the inscriptions of the marble paneling of the mihrâb of the Great Mosque in Qairawân (248 H./862),\(^4\) in the inscription of the Masjid-e Nâyîn (287 H./900)\(^5\) and especially in the building inscription of al-Muqtadir in Amida\(^6\) (297 H./910), where the heads of the shafts of the letters as well as the terminal forms end in a half-palmette; text fig. 7). Very similar forms occur in a stucco relief in Mashhad-e Misrîyân (about 300 H., end of the tenth and beginning

\(^3\) Inscriptions arabes du Musée d'Alexandrie, Bull. de la Société d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie, No. 30 (1936), Nos. 4, 7–8.

---

**Diagram D.**

1—Inscription of the epitaph No. 1193 in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo, Hawary-Rached, Sôles funéraires, vol. 1, pl. 6.
2—Inscription of the epitaph No. 2721/138 in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo, ibid., pl. 8.
8, 9—Inscriptions on Egyptian pottery, La céramique égyptienne de l'époque musulmane, pls. 21, right side; 90, in the middle.

---

**Notes:**

5 S. Flury, Le décor de la Mosquée de Ndyin, Syria, vol. 2 (1921), pl. 45.
6 M. van Berchem, in M. v. Oppenheim, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien, Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, vol. 7 (Leipzig, 1909), Nos. 114 (fig. 11, p. 72) and 120 (fig. 13, p. 764); van Berchem-Strzygowski Amida, fig. 6, p. 18.
of the eleventh century A.D.), and frequently in the inscriptions of Qairawān. The building decorative adornment of the tops of the shafts and terminations of the letters, so that we encounter here genuine foliated Kūfic; but it still forms an exception: a counterpart to it is seen only in 374 H./984-985, in the inscription of the

FIG. 8—SKETCH OF AN INSCRIPTION ON PAPYRUS, ARCHDUKE RAINER COLLECTION, VIENNA (INV. AR. PAP. NO. 10019).

FIG. 9—ALIF IN THE TIRĀZ NO. 5264 IN THE MUSEUM OF ISLAMIC ART, CAIRO.

FIG. 10—SKETCH OF AN INSCRIPTION ON PAPYRUS, ARCHDUKE RAINER COLLECTION, VIENNA (INV. AR. PAP. NO. 8032).

FIG. 11—INSCRIPTION OF QAL'EH MĀMULĀN IN POL-E KALHOR. (After the copy in E. Herzfeld’s Notebook of his Journey in October, 1928, unpublished MS.)
Qal‘eh Māmulān in Pol-e Kalhor (text fig. 11), in which the shafts generally show thornlike apices, while the letters of medium size and those going below the basic line show half-palmettes as terminations. Apices with half-palmettes are then to be seen in the building genuine floriated Kūfic occurs, and in Amida No. 10 (437 H./1045-46). An artistically flourished half-palmette is shown by an epitaph in the Museum of Alexandria (440-449 H./1048 to 1057). We meet with it again in the “Tombeau Rouge” in Marāgheh (465 H./1073; text fig. 12). Fig. 12—Inscription of the “Tombeau Rouge,” Marāgheh. (After a drawing made by A. Godard, in E. Herzfeld, Arabische Inschriften, fasc. II, p. 77, unpublished MS.)

inscription of the Great Mosque in Cordova (346 H./958), in the tārāz inscription No. 133-1896 (No. 857) in the Victoria and Albert Museum (386-411 H./996-1021) with the 2-lobed terminations of nūn and zā, in the inscription of Qairawān of 414 H./1023, and in the shafts of the alif and lām in the inscription Amida No. 8 (426 H./1034-35), where already and, differing in the execution, in the inscription of Shu‘āb Shahr (northern Mesopotamia, fifth century of the Hijra, eleventh century A.D.; text fig. 13), where not only the shafts of the alif and lām, but also the terminations of hā and mīm, show forms lobed in the same way. Within the same period (fifth century of the Hijra) we meet the same lobed head of the alif in a tārāz inscription from the ‘Irāq (diagram D, 7). The band of writing above the mihrāb in

11 Roy-Poinssot, op. cit., vol. 1, No. 221, p. 350, fig. 16.
12 Flury, Islamische Schriftbänder Amida-Diarbekr, fig. 1, pp. 10, 11.
13 Ibid., pl. 4.
14 Combe, op. cit., No. 16.
15 Herzfeld, Arabische Inschriften, fasc. II, p. 77.
16 M. van Berchem, in M. v. Oppenheim, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien, No. 88, p. 65 and pl. 7.
17 Kühnel, Catalogue of dated tārāz fabrics, No. 7352, p. 98, pl. 51.
the Great Mosque in Tlemcen (finished 530 H./1135–36)\(^{18}\) also contains tops of the alif in the form of half-palmettes beside 3-lobed heads, which recur in \(\text{ذ} \) in an alabaster slab of the mihrab of the tomb of Shekh Fatih in Mosul \(\text{م} \) and \(\text{ر} \) \(\text{ذ} \) are decorated in the same way, similar to the letters—e.g., \(\text{ر} \) and \(\text{kaf} \)—on a glass bottle of the end of the sixth century of the Hijra/twelfth century A.D. \(\text{ط} \).

Shafts, decorated in this way, also occur in textiles, e.g., in a fragment of textile of the twelfth century A.D.,\(^{22}\) in a Persian bowl in the Victoria and Albert Museum (fifth-sixth century H./twelfth-thirteenth century A.D.),\(^{24}\) in a Seljuq water jar in the Metropolitan Museum, New York,\(^{25}\) and on a pottery from Bougie,\(^{26}\) in the Koran inscription on the Kharput gate in Diyar Bakr,\(^{27}\) and on a leaden seal.\(^{28}\) Split palmettes also occur in the terminations of \(\text{ح} \), \(\text{ر} \), \(\text{ز} \), and \(\text{kaf} \) on the tombstone of Tashkend \(\text{ط} \) and in the terminations of medial \(\text{lām} \) and of the medium-sized letters of the stucco mihrab of the Fātimid vezir al-Afdal \(\text{ح} \) (487 H./1094)\(^{29}\) in the mosque of Ibn Tulun.

E. Herzfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Samarra, Hamburg, 1948, fig. 30, p. 280.

2 W. and G. Marçais, Les monuments arabes de Tlemcen, pl. 6.


20 Wiet, Exposition personel de 1931, pl. 10.

21 D. N. Wilber, The development of mosaic faience in Islamic architecture in Iran, Ars Islamica, vol. 6 (1939), fig. 14, p. 37.

22 E. Herzfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Samarra, Hamburg, 1948, fig. 30, p. 280.

23 Wiet, op. cit., pl. 26 above.

24 Lane, Early Islamic pottery, pl. 69, b, p. 42.

25 Ibid., pl. 44, p. 34.

26 G. Marçais, Les poteries et faïences de Bougie, Constantine, 1916, pl. 4, No. 15.

27 van Berchem-Strzygowski, Amida, pl. 5, No. 3.


29 CIA I/4, No. 12, p. 32 ff., pl. 20, No. 1. A plaster reproduction is in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (Inv. No. 3099; pl. 3, fig. 8).
(pl. 3, fig. 8), also in a wooden panel in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (pl. 6, fig. 14, Fātimid Inv. No. 11750). In Persia we meet the same decoration in the inscription on the door of Ūljaitū Muḥammad Khudābandeh (703–716

in the amulet PERF No. 1336 (seventh century H./thirteenth century A.D.; text fig. 16). For the various possibilities of evolution from this 2-lobed palmette two further examples are offered in diagram D, 8, 9, from Egyptian pottery. A

special form of this half-palmette, apparently developed from such a form as in diagram D, 7.

24 La céramique égyptienne, pl. 21, right side (Inv. No. 5292/30 and pl. 90 in the middle.

Bū Medīne, southwest of Tlemcen. This decoration of the alif occurs then in the seventh century H./thirteenth century A.D. in a Spanish

silk textile in the Victoria and Albert Museum, and, as the latest instance, in the lobed rā of a carved stone panel from the minaret of the Musalla in Herāt (fourteenth century A.D.).

H./1304–16) in Bistām in Khorāsān (text fig. 15), in North Africa we find letters of medium size with half-palmettes in the twelfth century A.D. in the portico of the mosque Sidi

Fig. 16—Title heading of PERF No. 1336, Archduke Rainer Collection, Vienna.

Diagram E.
1—Inscription on the minaret of Tabās, Ars Islamica, vol 6 (1939), fig. 15, p. 38.
2—Inscription of the mihrāb of mosque Sidi Bel Hassen in Tlemcen, W. and G. Marçais, Les monuments arabes de Tlemcen, fig. 7, p. 87.
3—Inscription on a luster vase in the Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan, Ettinghausen, Notes on the lusterware of Spain, Ars Orientalis, vol. 1 (1954), fig. 1, p. 146.
may be noticed here, since it is found in two different varieties in two places widely apart in the area of Islamic art: one (diagram E, 1) adorns the tops of the alif, lām, and letters of medium size in the inscription of the Seljuq minaret in Tabās; the other, a very similar form, the same kind of letters in the inscription of the miḥrāb of the Mosque Sidi Bel Hassen (696 H./1296) in Tlemcen (diagram E, 2) and, in an artistically developed form, on a luster vase in the Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan in Madrid (diagram E, 3). It reminds us in its artistic shape of the half-palmettes decorating the kāf in the title page of the Burdah of al-Būṣīrī (MS. A. F., No. 4) in the National Austrian Library in Vienna (text fig. 17), dated A.D. 1345, in the manuscript style, and of the half-palmette in the shaft of the alif in the epitaphs in the Municipality Museum in Alexandria (217 H./832 and 246 H./860; diagram D, 6) in the lapidary style.

An exorbitantly shaped arabesque form of the half-palmette is offered in \( \text{\textit{al}} \) in the inscription of a silk textile in the Schloss-Museum in Berlin (Inv. No. K 6807, twelfth-thirteenth century A.D.; text fig. 18). Perhaps even more important than the half-palmette is the partition of the tops of the alif and lām in form of a 3-lobed palmette, which had a decisive influence on the development of the floriated Kūfīc. We have already met with one example above, page 191 (diagram A, 40).

---

Fig. 18—Part of the Inscription of a Silk Textile in the Former Schloss-Museum in Berlin, Inv. No. K 6807, Twelfth-Thirteenth Century A.D.

---

35 Wilber, op. cit., Ars Islamica, vol. 6 (1939), fig. 15, p. 38.
36 W. and G. Marçais, Les monuments arabes de Tlemcen, fig. 7, p. 87.
37 Cf. Ettinghausen, Notes on the lusterware of Spain, fig. 1, p. 146.
39 Combe, Inscriptions arabes du Musée d’Alexandrie, Nos. 4, 7, 8.
Also this decoration is first to be seen in Egypt in 192 H./808 (diagram F, 1)\(^4\) and yet—and this is the important fact—in an obvious connection with the decoration of the margin and top of epitaphs. Strzygowski\(^4\) has exhaustively dealt with this decoration without perceiving its obvious connection with the script, while Herzfeld immediately noticed that with these palmette-like apices (“mit diesen palmettenhaft den Apices”) the preparation for the coufique fleuri is effected (“die Vorbereitung auf das Coufique fleuri gegeben ist”).\(^2\) He further emphasized\(^4\) that the floral ornament of the apices recurs each time exactly as such in the leaves of the wavy tendril of the marginal frame and of the ornament of the ansa (handle), and that the ornamentation of these tombstones is clearly a function of the script’s development and has come into existence on this spot, viz, in Egypt.

In spite of the opposition of Strzygowski,\(^4\) who supposed that the ornament of the epitaphs from Old Cairo is related to the patterns of Persian textiles and received its individuality through the hand of an (Arabic) calligrapher, it is quite certain that this ornament has been taken over from Coptic tombstones. Even if Strzygowski’s reference to the “Persian textile” No. 355–1887 in the Victoria and Albert Museum could be justified—and it is questionable from the stylistic point of view—we would be led into the Coptic sphere; for this textile of the sixth century A.D. has been found in Antinoë in upper Egypt\(^4\) and is presumably an Egyptian product. If we compare the Coptic tombstone No. 8609 in the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo (pl. 3, fig. 9) with the Arabic epitaph No. 1265 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (pl. 4, fig. 10)\(^4\) the resemblance is quite convincing.\(^7\) So the frame and top ornamentation

---

\(^{4}\) Not at first 240 H., as Herzfeld, in his review of van Berchem-Strzygowski, *Amida*, OLZ, vol. 14 (1911), col. 432, has supposed.


\(^{4}\) G. Wiet, *Stèles funéraires*, vol. 2, Cairo, 1936, No. 1265, p. 67, pl. 22 (211 H./826).

\(^{4}\) Similar Coptic epitaphs are No. 8607 in the Coptic Museum (formerly No. 8587 in the Egyptian Museum) and W. E. Crum, *Coptic monuments*, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Cairo, 1910, Nos. 8457, 8456, pl. 11, a, d, p. 102; further, the
of Arabic epitaphs are clearly to be derived from that of Coptic tombstones of the fifth-sixth century A.D. and later, and since the ornament in writing is connected with this ornamentation, this ornament also goes back to a Coptic source. Let us now follow up the evolution of this ornament.

Fig. 19—Decoration of an Epitaph.
(After Der Islam, vol. 2 [1911], fig. 5, p. 311.)

On the stela Inv. No. 1506/46 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo, dated 192 H./808 (diagram F, i) the division of the tops of alif and lām is clearly discernible in the form of a 3-lobed palmette, but it has not yet any relation to the marginal decoration, since this consists of the "running spirals" and a tendril with a rough palmette tree only (cf. pl. 4, fig. II). Further examples from 193 to 213 H. are given in diagram F, 2-6. But already in the years

stela No. 3337 in the Coptic Museum, dated A.D. 912 and published by Togo Mina, Deux stèles funéraires coptes en dialecte bhâthique, Bull. de la Société d'Archéologie Copte, vol. 5 (1939), pl. 1, No. 1, p. 81 f., where a floral decoration in the form of a delicately ramified palmette occupies the center of the top of the stela, replacing the ansa; this is obviously a later development.

Hawary and Rached, Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, pl. 7, p. 17 f.

48 Hawary and Rached, Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, No. 2, Inv. No. 8136, dated 193 H./809, ibid., pl. 7, p. 19; No. 3, Inv. No. 2054, dated 198 H./813-814, ibid., pl. 9, p. 234; No. 4, Inv. No. 4150, dated 211 H./826, pl. 22, p. 66; No. 5, Inv. No. 1265, dated 211 H./826, pl. 22, p. 67; No. 6, Inv. No. 3003, dated 213 H./828, pl. 24, p. 75; No. 7, Inv. No. 2721/1016, dated 222 H./837, pl. 34, p. 125 f.; No. 8, Inv. No. 2721/115, dated 228 H./842-843, pl. 40, p. 149; 199, 200, 205, 210, 213, 214, 50 and 217 (text fig. 19) the connection between the palmette heads of the letters and the ansa, as well as the acroteria at the corners of the stelae, is definitely established. This is especially significant in the epitaph No. 1506/171 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo 51 dated 210 H./826, where the 3-lobed palmette in alif and lām exactly corresponds to the acroterion on the corner (right and left); and the year 228 H./843 furnishes further examples. 52 From the same year dates another epitaph 53 (cf. pl. 5, fig. 12) which is of some importance insofar as it shows the development of the decoration of the apex in the form of a tree. This decoration is already to be found

No. 9, Inv. No. 1268, dated 229 H./843-844, pl. 45, p. 164; No. 10, Inv. No. 7149, dated 235 H./849-850, pl. 54, p. 197.

50 Hawary and Rached, Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, No. 1506/6, pl. 10, p. 26; No. 3944/11, pl. 11, p. 29; No. 1506/81, pl. 15, p. 44; No. 1506/171, pl. 21, p. 63; No. 3003, pl. 24, p. 75; No. 1506/175, pl. 25, p. 79.

51 Ibid., vol. 2 (1911) fig. 5, p. 311; fig. 12, p. 314; fig. 14, p. 314; Hawary and Rached, op. cit., vol. 1, No. 1267, pl. 28, p. 94 (217 H./832).

52 Ibid., pl. 21, pp. 63-64.

53 Hawary and Rached, Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, No. 2721/117, dated 228 H./843, pl. 41, p. 152. The 3-lobed palmette also occurs on other objects, e.g., on a wooden chest of the eighth-ninth century A.D. in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo, Inv. No. 13117.

54 Ibid., No. 8147, dated 228 H./842, pl. 40, p. 149.
in terminal mim in an epitaph dated 217 H./832 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo,54 but later it fell completely into oblivion. We nevertheless possess a noticeable parallel for it in the decoration of medial lam in a sketch on papyrus in the Archduke Rainer Collection in Vienna of such tree patterns into the letter itself is furnished by an initial in the Greek manuscript No. 438 in the National Library in Paris (text fig. 23),59 dated A.D. 992, which resembles very

![Figure 21](image1.png)

**Figure 21**—The Tree of Life on a Coptic Textile in the Victoria and Albert Museum. (After Kendrick, *Catalogue of Textiles from Burying Grounds in Egypt*, vol. 2, No. 370, pl. 19.)

(Inv. Ar. Pap. No. 10019, pl. 6, fig. 15) and in the medial lam in % in the epitaph Inv. No. 150672, dated 234 H./848, in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo.55 Apparently also this form of floral decoration is borrowed from Coptic patterns of the fifth-sixth and sixth-seventh centuries A.D., occurring on textiles (text figs. 20 and 21),56 representing the tree of life,57 or even from the marginal decoration of Greek manuscripts of the fourth-fifth century A.D. (text fig. 22).58 A later example of the infiltration

54 Ibid., No. 1267, pl. 28.
55 Ibid., p. 52, p. 196.

much the tree motif in lam in the sketch on papyrus Inv. Ar. Pap. No. 10019 (pl. 6, fig. 15) in the Archduke Rainer Collection and in Hebrew manuscripts of the ninth-tenth century A.D. (cf. pl. 6, fig. 17).

![Figure 22](image2.png)

**Figure 22**—Marginal Ornament in a Greek Manuscript of the Fourth-Fifth Century A.D. (After Stassoff, *L'ornement slave et oriental*, pl. 120, No. 15.)

The year 205 H./820 is also of decisive importance in another sense: it is for the first time in 205 H. that the decoration of the 3-lobed palmette, hitherto restricted to alif and lam, is extended to other letters, as e.g., bā, rā, ḥā, nūn,

![Figure 23](image3.png)

**Figure 23**—Greek Initial in MS. Grec 438. (After Bordier, *Description des peintures et autres ornements contenues dans les manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, fig. 38, p. 97.)
khā, dāl, etc., and in the following years the circle of letters decorated with this floral motif is increased more and more. In the year 234 H./848 only the tops of initial bā, kāf, alif, and lām show the palmette decoration in the epitaph No. 1506/72 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (pl. 5, fig. 13), while the medial lām in lines 3 and 8 is decorated with a palmette tree. But in the epitaph No. 2721/82 of the year 234 H./849, in the same collection, the decoration of the letters with a delicate full palmette is to be seen to a larger extent. So the decoration with palmette trees and palmette leaves is used simultaneously, and the latter prevails more and more. Undoubtedly the evolution of this decorative motif, shown by the famous stela A of Tashkend (pl. 1, fig. 1, about 540 H.) is to be indicated as already fully developed in Egypt between 205 and 235 H. It advances progressively in the termination of mīm in line 1, and in dāl in lines 1 and 5. The tops of medial lām and end kāf (lines 4 and 2) are decorated with a half-palmette.

No. 1506/72 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (pl. 5, fig. 13),

40 Hawary and Rached, Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, No. 1506/72, pl. 15, p. 44.
41 Ibid., No. 1201, pl. 49, p. 175 (231 H./845-846). Notice the side acroterion.
42 Ibid., pl. 52, p. 190.
43 Ibid., pl. 53, p. 193. In Inv. No. 3944/47 (234 H./849, ibid., pl. 53) we meet with the full palmette in the termination of mīm in line 1, and in dāl in lines 1 and 5. The tops of medial lām and end kāf (lines 4 and 2) are decorated with a half-palmette.
44 Hawary and Rached, Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, No. 3380/8, pl. 55, p. 199f. Sometimes the lobes are

Fig. 24—Stucco relief in the Masjid-e Jāmi' in Nayin. (After A. U. Pope, A survey of Persian art, vol. 2, fig. 455, p. 1273.)
sively and irresistibly from Egypt, where it also
occurs in a band of writing on papyrus (Inv. Ar.
Pap. 10017, third century H./ninth century
A.D.; pl. 6, fig. 10) in the Archduke Rainer
Collection, and in the third century H. it is to
be found everywhere: 288 H./900 in the stucco
relief of the Masjid-e Nāyīn (text fig. 24),66 in
the Yaman on a textile in the Museum of Fine
Arts in Boston (Inv. No. 31962; text fig. 25);67 in
Egypt on a wooden tablet from al-Fustat in
the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (e.g., in
rā in ʿṣāʿ),67 and on an application work on
paper in the Archduke Rainer Collection (Inv.
Chart. Ar. 27206; text fig. 26). At the beginning
of the fourth century H./tenth century A.D. we find
merely outlined, e.g., in a wooden panel of the third
century H./ninth century A.D. in the Museum of
Islamic Art in Cairo (Inv. No. 35661) published by
J. D. Weill, Les bois à épitaphes jusqu’à l’époque
Mamlouke, Cairo, 1931, pl. 2. In the epitaph, published by
Bergstrasser, op. cit., No. 2, p. 33 (dated 229 H./843
844) both forms occur side by side, the top of the alif
with the split arrow and the 3-lobed head.

66 A. U. Pope, Architectural ornament, A survey of
Persian art, vol. 2, fig. 458, p. 1273; S. Flury, Orna-
mental Kūfic inscriptions on pottery, ibid., fig. 599,
p. 1744.
67 N. P. Britton, A study of some early Islamic
textiles in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1938,
fig. 91.
68 Kühnel, Kunst und Volkstum im Islam, fig. 29,
p. 278.

it in North Africa in inscriptions in Qairawān (303
and 306 H./A.D. 915–916 and 919–920, diagram
G, 1, 2),68 in Spain in the inscription of Almeria
(320 H./932).68 In the fifth century H./eleventh
century A.D. we meet it in a stucco relief from

Sāweh (Persia) in the Collection Rabenou in
Paris (diagram G, 3).70 An especially remarkable
stage of evolution is represented by the form in
diagram G, 4, where a double 3-lobed leaf is
used as decoration of the shaft of alif on a textile
from the Yaman (eleventh century A.D.).71

But its highest and ripest degree of develop-
ment is reserved for the Fatimid period, and
the best examples are again shown by Egypt.
And it is here that the evolution of foliated Kūfic to floriated Kūfic (coufique fleuri) is ac-
accomplished, which S. Flury72 has treated so
impressively.

It has been believed that the floriated Kūfic
first appears in Amida73 or had come from North

64 Roy-Poissot, Inscriptions arabes de Kairouan,
vol. 1, pl. 10, Nos. 14, 18.
65 Lévy-Provençal, op. cit., fig. 25, No. 112.
66 A. U. Pope, Some recently discovered Seldjuk
stucco, Ars Islamica, vol. 1 (1934), figs. 1, 2, p. 110.
67 Kühnel, Catalogue of dated tiraz fabrics, vol. 1,
Inv. No. 73567, pl. 46, p. 91.
68 Die Ormamente der Hakim- und Ashar-Moschee,
p. 9ff.
70 Flury, Islamische Schriftbänder Amida-Diarbehr,
p. 11.
Africa to Egypt with the Fāṭimids. The latter supposition—first put forth by W. and G. Marçais in 1903—is refuted by the fact that the epitaph of Qairawān of 341 H. shows no "coup de fleur" at all, but merely foliated Kūfic. In contrast, an epitaph, dated 243 H./848, in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo

tombstone from the Hijāz (text fig. 27). It not only shows genuine tendrils growing up from the terminations of the letters (tā, mīm, nūn, kāf, wāw) but also floral motifs scattered in the spaces between the letters, which also here—as in plate 8, figure 21—correspond to the palmette tendril in the marginal frame. The

--- Fig. 25 — Inscription on a Yamanite Textile in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston (Inv. No. 31962). (After Britton, A study of some early Islamic textiles in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, fig. 91.)

--- Fig. 26 — Application Work of Paper, Showing a Kūfic Inscription, Archduke Rainer Collection, Vienna, (Inv. Chart. Ar. No. 25636).

Mutual relations are therefore absolutely obvious in both examples and give evidence for the origin and course of development of this style of writing which has already been set forth (cf. above, p. 188). In the middle of the third century of the Hijra the evolution of foliated Kūfic to foliated Kūfic had definitely taken place in Egypt. Further steps in this evolution certainly existed in the neighboring countries, e.g., in Palestine, where an inscription of the time of al-Muqtadir billāh dating between 301 and 304 H./913–917 and situated in the enclosure wall of the Haram in Jerusalem77 shows a rather more

74 Le mémorial arabes de Tlemcen, p. 88.
76 It is noticeable that the mason who dressed the epitaph No. 3904 (pl. 8, fig. 21) is called Mubārak al-Makki.
77 CIA II/f (MMAF, vol. 44, 1925), No. 144, p. 7ff. and fig. 2, p. 7.
Fig. 8—Stucco Mihrab Made for the Vezir al-Afdal in 487 H./1094.
Cairo, Ibn Tulun-Mosque.

Fig. 9—Coptic Epitaph. Old Cairo, Coptic Museum (No. 8609).
Plate 4

Fig. 10—Arabic Epitaph, Cairo, Museum of Islamic Art (No. 1306/40).

Fig. 11—Arabic Epitaph, Cairo, Museum of Islamic Art (No. 1506/40).
Fig. 14—Wooden Panel. Cairo, Museum of Islamic Art (No. 11750).

Fig. 15—Sketch on Papyrus. Vienna, Archduke Rainer Collection (Inv. Ar. Pap. No. 10019).

Fig. 16—Sketch on Papyrus. Vienna, Archduke Rainer Collection (Inv. Ar. Pap. No. 10017).

Fig. 17—Hebrew Manuscript with Letters Decorated with Full Palmettes. (After Günzberg-Stassoff, Miniatures of Hebrew Bibles of the IXth and Xth Centuries, pl. 6.)

Fig. 18—Tirāz Fragment Made for the Caliph al-Muqt‘ lillāh. Cairo, Museum of Islamic Art (No. 12224).
Plate 7

Fig. 20—Inscription from the Mosque of al-Hakim bi-Amri llah, Cairo, Museum of Islamic Art (Nos. 2638; 6739; 9; 2639; 7; 2640).

Fig. 19—Epitaph, Cairo, Museum of Islamic Art (No. 1341). Middle of the Third Century of the Hijra.
Fig. 21—Tombstone Dated 243 H./858. Cairo, Museum of Islamic Art (No. 3904).
Fig. 22—Marble slab in the Great Mosque at Esna. Dated 15th Rabı’ I, 470 H./Oct. 8, 1077. (Photograph in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo [No. 4864]).
Fig. 23—Part of the Inscription of the Seventh Band of the Western Minaret of the Hākim Mosque.
(Photograph No. 7151, Service des Antiquités, Cairo.)

Fig. 24—Stone Inscription, Caro, Museum of Islamic Art (No. 8833).

Fig. 25—Inscription on the Pillar of Bab Tunis in Qairawan.
(Photograph of K. A. C. Creswell.)
developed decorated Kufic than figure 21 on plate 8 as far as the form of the leaves is concerned (cf. text fig. 28). This is all the more important since the inscription of the same caliph in Amida (text fig. 7) represents a modest foliated Kufic only. Anyhow, the high standard attained in Egypt is not yet traceable elsewhere.

For the next period this initial phase of floriated Kufic is not able to impose itself fully, further proved by stone inscriptions in relief made in Egypt in the early Fatimid period, e.g., Inv. No. 5832 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (pl. 10, fig. 24) or a marble tablet in the Great Mosque in Esnâ (dated 470 H./1077; pl. 9, fig. 22), if we compare it with the two fragments of inscriptions, containing the "Throne-verse" (sûra h 2, verse 256), from the northeast wall of the Azhar Mosque (361 H./972; text fig. 29), where the half-palmettes in alif, tâ, râ, dâd, and wâw tend toward the developed phase of coufique fleuri. But most apparently it is demonstrated by a band of writing on stone from the Hakim Mosque (before 393 H./1003; pl. 7, fig. 20) which shows a quite particular connection of writing and floral tendril growing out of the letters and forming with them an organic unit, serving at the same time as an ideal filling in of the space (Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo, Inv. Nos. 2638; 6730; 9; 2639; 7; 2640. It is certainly from here that its development has advanced to Mesopotamia on one side and to North Africa on the other, where we find it, unlike that of Mesopotamia, in its most beautiful evolution in the inscription of Bab Tunis in Qairawân, 437 H./1045 (pl. 10, fig. 23). Here, as well as in the inscription of the sanctuary of the Mosque Sidi 'Oqbah (464–53 H./1055–61) the tendrils are apparently connected with the

---

**Fig. 27—Tombstone from the Hijâz, Dated 250 H./864.** (After a photograph in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.)

---


82 Cf. Flury, Islamische Schriftbänder Amida-Diarbêr, p. 101, fig. 1, pl. 2 (Amida No. 8, 426 H./1034–35; No. 9, 42* H./1029–38, p. 12 and pl. 3; Amida No. 10, 427 H./1045–46, pp. 13–15, pl. 4: Amida No. 11, 444 H./1052–53, pl. 13, pl. 6).

83 I owe the photograph to the courtesy of Prof. K. A. C. Creswell. The tendrils have been omitted in Houdas-Basset, Épigraphie tunisienne, pl. 9 (cf. p. 191).

shafts and terminations of the letters, but so discreetly that the impression of a floriated background is given.

But where has this peculiar decoration come into existence? S. Flury has stated in connection with the discussion of the bands of writing on the minarets of the Mosque of al-Hākim (393 H./1003) that the decoration of the

and supposed that the more developed “coufique fleuri” must have flourished in the fourth century H./tenth century A.D.; otherwise a band of this perfection would be unimaginable.®

It is astonishing that Flury did not risk the further step, so near at hand, of tracing back the ornamentation of this oldest band of writing of the Hākim Mosque to Coptic influence,

as would be expected according to the statement made just above. He refers to the textile of al-Hākim in the South Kensington Museum (Inv. No. 133-189) in connection with the letters decorated with half-palmettes, and with respect to the palmettes and small tendrils in the band of writing in the Azhar

® Ibid., p. 46.

® There is no doubt that the band of writing running around the socle of the northern minaret represents the original and oldest style of decoration of the letters. In comparison with it the frieze of inscription above the aisles of the sanctuary represents another, seemingly more advanced, style, which, nevertheless, in its affected perfection differs considerably from the essential characteristics of the simple older style of the northwest minaret, and even spoils the artistic impression through the application of certain forms of letters—e.g., initial ḫāt—which are incongruent with the original style of the early period of the construction of the mosque and therefore apparently belong to a later reconstruction.

Mosque to Hebrew manuscripts\(^{91}\) containing letters with individual palmettes and small tendrils. Apparently the idea was present in his mind that these Hebrew manuscripts contain materials for comparison which had not survived elsewhere. Certainly these manuscripts rated with a trefoil in the inscription on the west minaret of the Mosque of al-Ḥākim (pl. 10, fig. 25)\(^{92}\) with the initial \(I\) in the Greek manuscript No. 423 in Laon (7th century A.D.; text fig. 32)\(^{93}\) or with the initial \(T\) in the Greek manuscript of Gregory of Nazianz in the National Library in Paris (Ms. Grec 510, 9th century A.D.; text fig. 33)\(^{94}\) the striking resemblance between the ornamentation of the Arabic and Greek letters, based on the connection of a floral element—trefoil and leaf—with the letter, is immediately obvious. If we possessed more manuscripts of the period between A.D. 728

---

\(^{91}\) Flury referred to D. Günzberg-V. Stassoff, *Miniatures of Hebrew bibles of the IXth and Xth centuries.*


\(^{93}\) Ed. Fleury, *Les manuscrits à miniatures de la Bibliothèque de Laon*, vol. 1, Laon, 1863, pl. 1.

\(^{94}\) Bordier, *Description des peintures et autres ornements dans les manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, fig. 26, p. 88.
and 842, characterized by iconoclasm, more and older material would probably be available for comparison, since hesitant attempts to decorate initials with spiral involutions existed very early, e.g., in the Orosius codex in Florence of the sixth century A.D.,96 and a Coptic Gospel codex of the eighth century A.D. (Ms. Borgia No. 64 and Bibliothèque Nationale Copt. No. 129)96 offers examples of the connection of a letter with a split palmette (text fig. 34). Floral decorations and scrolls frequently formed then a decorative element of the letters with which they were connected, in Greek as well as in Coptic97 and Hebrew manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. (pl. 6, fig. 17).98 It is at line 4 (text fig. 35) a 3-lobed palmette leaf growing out of the head of waw, while a similar 3-lobed leaf is connected with initial ba in line 2. The importance of this inscription had already surprised Max van Berchem, who furthermore suggested that these striking ornaments are independent of the letters, which is not correct; but he was right in saying that this ornament forshadows the rise of coufique fleuri called Carmatian, which appears much later.1 Perhaps he was influenced in his tardy recognition of the realities by his inclination to accept Marçais' theory as to the Tunisian origin of coufique fleuri.

---

Fig. 34—Coptic Initials in a Gospel Codex of the Eighth Century A.D., Pi and Alpha. (After Th. Peterson, The paragraph mark in Coptic illuminated ornament, figs. 47, f, and 49, c, p. 308.)

any rate noticeable that the connection of a floral element with the letter occurs in Greek manuscripts as early as the seventh century A.D., i.e., about a hundred years earlier than in the sphere of Arabic epigraphy. For the hitherto oldest instance of such a connection is offered by the inscription of the cistern in Bir el-‘Aneziyih, northwest of al-Ramlah on the road to Jaffa (dated 172 H./789).99 Here we see in

98 Loc. cit., figs. 60, 61, 63-68, pp. 312f., 316-323.
100 van Berchem, Inscriptions arabes de Syrie, pl. 2.

---

Fig. 35—Waw with a Floral Decoration in the Inscription of al-Ramlah, 172 H./789. (After van Berchem, Inscriptions arabes de Syrie, pl. 2.)

Therefore three neighboring countries have participated decisively in the evolution of floriated Kufic: Palestine, with the first traceable connection of a floral element with a letter (the inscription of al-Ramlah, 172 H.); Egypt, where in the middle of the third century of the Hijra the decoration of the letters with palmettes had already reached a high perfection (pl. 8, fig. 21) and where the decoration of the apices had been invented possibly in connection with, or imitation of, Coptic forerunners; and the Hijaz, where the tombstone of 250 H. shows genuine floriated Kufic (as in pl. 8, fig. 21) definitely established. It was in Egypt then that the first steps to the highest perfection of this style were made, represented by the inscriptions in the mosques of al-Azhar and al-Hākim bi-

1 "Les curieux ornements qui les accompagnent sont indépendants du caractères, mais ils font déjà présenter la naissance du coufique fleuri dit carmatique, lequel n'apparaît que beaucoup plus tard."
amri 'Iläh in Cairo. The idea of decorating the script, such as we see it in the inscriptions of Amida (426 H.), obviously reached northern Mesopotamia from Egypt. It was possible to connect this idea of decorating a letter with floral elements with certain initials in Greek, Coptic, and Hebrew manuscripts, all belonging to the same sphere of Hellenistic art which was created in the near East about the third century B.C. We know that the school of painters and book illuminators in Alexandria played a very important role, not only in Egypt, but also in early book illumination and illustration in Rome, and spread with Manichaean book art as far as Mesopotamia, North Africa, and even Turkestan. A direct way leads from this center of art down to early Islamic book art—Tulûnid and Fâtimid—and so it seems very probable that Egypt had also a decisive influence in embellishing the Arabic script, whereby Coptic patterns possibly formed a bridge of transition from the late Hellenistic art. For example, the developed palmette tendril, serving as a marginal frame in the Arabic epitaph No. 3380/12 in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo, dated 204 H./819–820\(^2\) recalls a similar tendril on a textile of the late Roman period (third-fourth century A.D.) from Akhmim, in the Victoria and Albert Museum.\(^3\) So Egypt has contributed much more to the development of Islamic art than has perhaps been hitherto admitted, although it was early recognized that an individual development had taken place here.\(^4\) The evolution of foliated and floriated Kufic in Egypt gives a new example of the activity of this individual creative power which willingly received and developed inspirations from abroad or from previous times.

\(^2\) Hawary and Rached, *Stèles funéraires*, vol. 1, pl. 14.

\(^3\) Kendrick, *Catalogue of textiles from burying grounds in Egypt*, vol. 1, No. 183, pl. 25, p. 99. Even certain forms of the arabesque already existed in the fifth century A.D., e.g., in a tendril frame on the archway in the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo (Inv. No. 6472 A, from Bawit) and in a tendril on a textile from Akhmim (sixth-seventh century A.D.) in Kendrick, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, No. 838, pl. 30, p. 87.

EARLY ISLAMIC TOMBSTONES FROM EGYPT IN THE
MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, BOSTON

BY GEORGE C. MILES

In 1907 the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston acquired, through the agency of the late Joseph Lindon Smith, 14 Egyptian-Arabic marble tombstones. Twelve of these stones are dated between 218 and 291 H. (A.D. 833–904), one is undated, and one with a fragment of several lines missing lacks the date. To the writer's knowledge none of them has been published, either in the Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe or elsewhere. While the historical and philological material contained in these inscriptions is of relatively slight significance, they are not without value in the study of Kufic epigraphy, and it will perhaps be of interest to students of this branch of Islamic archaeology to have this small body of illustrated evidence added to the rich resources already available in the several volumes describing similar epitaphs in the Musée Arabe (now the Museum of Islamic Art) in Cairo. In preparing this brief catalogue,1 the writer has been impressed by the amount of valuable dated evidence these stones—however modest and conventional many of them are—present for the study of the development of ornamental Arabic epigraphy in Egypt, and he hopes in a future article to undertake a systematic study of this development based on the whole body of published material.

The tombstones are here arranged in chronological order, but it will be noticed that in style they fall into two main groups: incised (Nos. 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 14) and carved in relief (Nos. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 12). Of the latter the earliest is No. 2, dated 231 H., less than 30 years later than the first example of this type in the large Cairo collection.


Text

1. يسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
2. شهيد الله انه لا هو ولا عل
3. كتا وأوكر العلم [sic] فاتا بالخط لا
4. ل الا هو العزيز الحليم هذا ما
5. يشهد عليه زبيه ابنت عثمان بن شبيب
6. بن نافع الجهني يشهد الله انه وحد
7. لا شريك له وأن محمد عبده ورسوله صلى الله
8. عليه وسلم وان الجنة حق وثار والBUM حق و
9. ان الله يبعث من في الوضوء تفوت في ربع الآخرسة
10. علم عشرة ومائتين

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful,
2. God has testified that there is no God but he, and the an-
3. gelsandmenendued with knowledge, established
4. in righteousness [proclaim] that there is no G-
5. od but he, the mighty, the wise. This is what
6. has testified Zinah ibnat ‘Uthmân b. Shu’ayb
7. e, there is no partner with him, and that Muham-
8. mad is his servant and his messenger—may
9. God bless
10. him and give him peace—and that paradise is
11. truth, and the fire and resurrection are truth, and
12. that God will raise up those in the graves. She
died in Rabi’ II
13. 218 [April-May, A.D. 833].

1 begun in 1940, but interrupted by the war.
Commentary.—The text presents no unusual features and contains the customary formulas for this period. Two passages are Koranic: 3: 16 (lines 2–4), and part of 22: 7 (first part of line 9). The nisba, al-Juhani, refers either to a tribe of the Yemenite Qudâ'ah or to a village in the Mosul district.  

Ornament and epigraphy.—The text is enclosed within a frame consisting of a plain line and an outer chain border. Such chain borders are common on Egyptian tombstones and occur as early as 191 H. The Kufic characters are open and legible and, aside from the wedge-shaped terminations (common to all these stones), are for the most part unadorned. Scattered through the inscription, however, and especially in the first few lines, there are sporadic ornamented letters, the chief decorative elements being half-palmettes and symmetrical sprigs. The ornamented letters are: the bâ’ and mîm of the first word, a number of alîfs and lâms, râ’ (twice), dâl (twice), hâf (once), and final nun and yâ’ (once each). Half-palmettes such as these first appear in the epigraphy of Egyptian tombstones toward the end of the second century of the Hijrah: cf. for example, Stèles funéraires, 1, No. 1506/46 (pl. 7), dated 192 H. Quite similar sprigs occur on a stone dated in the same year as the present one: ibid., No. 3386/4 (pl. 30). The lâm-alîfs take various forms: three different varieties in line 2 (square, incurving, and multiple-branched), another in line 3 (multiple-branched, outcurving), and still another (plain) in line 7. Such imaginative treatment of lâm-alîf begins early in the third century: cf. ibid., No. 1506/581 (pl. 15) and No. 3003 (pl. 25), dated 205 and 213, respectively. In addition, the word Allâh twice (line 1 and line 2) has an intermediate element between the two lâms, in one case ornamented, in the other a simple hump in the base line. This quirk occurs on a tombstone dated as early as 190 H.: ibid., No. 1506/747 (pl. 5).  


Text

3. Allâh ‘âlâm li-[90]hâm al-mahdim  
   - îlâm ha yaâ a‘ûdhu bî yahdî.  
4. ‘Allâh ‘âlâm li-[91]hâm al-mahdim  
   - îlâm ha yaâ a‘ûdhu bî yahdî.  
5. ‘Allâh ‘âlâm li-[92]hâm al-mahdim  
   - îlâm ha yaâ a‘ûdhu bî yahdî.  
6. ‘Allâh ‘âlâm li-[93]hâm al-mahdim  
   - îlâm ha yaâ a‘ûdhu bî yahdî.  
7. ‘Allâh ‘âlâm li-[94]hâm al-mahdim  
   - îlâm ha yaâ a‘ûdhu bî yahdî.  
8. ‘Allâh ‘âlâm li-[95]hâm al-mahdim  
   - îlâm ha yaâ a‘ûdhu bî yahdî.  
   - îlâm ha yaâ a‘ûdhu bî yahdî.

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful. God has testified that  
2. there is no God but he, and the angels and men ended with knowledge, es-  
3. tablished in righteousness, [proclaim] that there is no God but he, the mighty, the wise.  
4. This is what has testified 'Abdûs b. Sa‘îd; he testifies to what has testified  
5. God on his own account, and to what have testified his angels and men ended  
6. with knowledge among his creatures, that God there is no God but he, the mighty, the wise,  
7. and he testifies that death and resurrection are truth and paradise and the fire are truth,

[

---


---
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8. and that the hour will indeed come—there is no doubt of it—and that God will raise up those in the graves.

9. [He died in Dhūl-Qa'dah of the year 231 (June–July, A.D. 846); may God have mercy upon him.]

Commentary.—The usual formulas. Koranic passages: 3:16 (end of line 1 through line 3, and, adapted, end of line 4 through line 6); 22:7 (line 8).

Ornament and epigraphy.—A vertical rope pattern frames the inscription at right and left. The basmalah is separated from the beginning of the testimonial by a six-lobed rosette. The Kufic is open and very clean, and with the exception of only a very few letters is entirely unadorned. The exceptions are two alifs (one in line 1, one in line 2), one kāf (line 3), and two lām-alifs (one in line 2 and one in line 3); these letters are ornamented with half-palmettes. The type of epigraphy in relief (without ornamental flourishes) which this stone exhibits appears to have been introduced about the beginning of the third century of the Hijrah. The first example in the very large collection of tombstones in the Arab Museum in Cairo is dated 203 H. As for the developed palmette-ornamented letters, this would appear to be an early instance of their use; the first illustrated example in the Arab Museum is on a stone dated six years later than the present one, 237 H.


For a similar rope border, cf. Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, No. 2721/96 (pl. 47), dated 230 H.

Ibid., vol. 1, No. 2721/87. Not only is this the first one of the type illustrated in the catalogue (pl. 12), but the compilers specifically state that this is the "première apparition de ce genre de caractères."

8 Stèles funéraires, vol. 2 (Cairo, 1936), Nos. 2721/70 (pl. 8) and 4288 (pl. 9), both dated 243 H.

Text

1. Bism Allah al-rhaman al-rhamim

2. Allahu 'azza wa jall wa Khafif" (sic) wa la hu al-'amīm

3. Allahamah sabti subsallahu 'ala wa sallam

4. Al-Isra' li-rabbis-salih al-mu'mun wa al-awla 'ala wa sallim al-walid bi-an yari'a anna al-lah al-'âlîm

5. Allahu 'azza wa jall wa la hu al-'amīm

6. Allahus-salih 'al-walid bi-an yari'a anna al-lah al-'âlîm

7. Wa sallim al-walid bi-an yari'a anna al-lah al-'âlîm

8. Al-lâ tair wa al-lâs al-walid bi-an yari'a anna al-lah al-'âlîm

9. 'Ala al-awla 'ala wa sallim al-walid bi-an yari'a anna al-lah al-'âlîm

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful, verily in

2. God there is consolation for every adversity and compensation for all that

3. perishes, and understanding for what has passed. And verily the greatest

4. of adversities is the adversity [of the death] of the Prophet Muhammad—may God bless him and give him peace.

5. Wâjîd b. Râjâ testifies that there is no God but

6. Allah, the One, there is no partner with him, and that Muhammad is his servant

7. and his messenger—may God bless him and
give him peace—and that paradise

8. and the fire and death and resurrection are truth. He died in

9. Dhūl-Qa'dah of the year 237 [April–May, A.D. 852].

Commentary.—Common formulas. The name of the deceased is probably Wâjîd, although it might possibly be Wâjîd.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The inscription, in entirely unadorned Kufic, is crowded, undistinguished, and somewhat clumsy. Because of the irregular shape of the stone the last line slants upward and the final words are squeezed into a very restricted space. The style of constricted letters in the lower lines of this stone (see No. 6, below, for a more typical example) appears to have originated at about this time. The first illustrated example in the Cairo catalogue is dated 242 H.

9 Stèles funéraires, vol. 2, No. 1506/669 (pl. 5, there misnumbered as 1506/699).

Text

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful. Praise be to God who has written mercy for himself and death for his creatures
2. and resurrection at his decision and the final reckoning at his sanction. And verily Jum‘ah [ibn ‘Am‘ār] has never ceased to affirm to God the Unity, and to recognize
3. God [sic] the Seigniory, certain of God’s promise, seeking the pardon of God; and . . . . she testifies to what has testified God on his own account, and
4. to what have testified his angels and men endowed with knowledge among his creatures, that God, [there is no] God but he, established in righteousness [they proclaim] that there is no God
5. but he, the mighty, the wise; and she testifies that Muhammad is his servant and his chosen messenger and his elected Prophet and the best
6. of his creatures, and he selected him for his inspiration and he sent him with his religion which he approved of himself for his creatures, and he accomplished his mission . . .
7. appear the religion of God, and he fought the best of fights in the path of God, until the firm belief came—may God bless him and give him peace—and [she testifies]
8. that death is truth and resurrection is truth, and the way and the balance and the final reckoning in paradise and the fire are truth, and that the hour will indeed come—
9. there is no doubt of it—and that God will raise up those in the graves. In this faith she lived and in it she died and in it she will be raised up,
10. if God pleases. O God, forgive her sin, and illumine for her her grave, and make wide for her her entries [into paradise], and give her existence
11. the sure word, and whiten her face and lighten her sorrow and be compassionate of her solitude, and fortify
12. her eloquence at the time of the interrogation, and make her grave for her a garden among the gardens of paradise, O thou most merciful of the merciful;
13. and make her a companion of Muhammad—may God bless him and give him peace—and of those upon whom he has bestowed his favor from among the prophets and the faithful ones and th-
14. e martyrs and the pious ones, and make her a good companion[?]. She died—may God’s mercy be upon her and his forgiveness—on Thursday [Thursday–Friday night]
15. the 13th of Dhū’l-Ḥijjah of the year 238 [26 May, A.D. 853].

Commentary.—The long inscription is composed of a number of funerary formulas, some of them common, others less so. The phraseology of the first two-and-a-quarter lines is almost identical with that on a tombstone in the Arab Museum in Cairo, dated 247 H. From the end of line 3 to the beginning of line 5 is an adaptation of Koran 3:16. For the name of the deceased woman, Jum‘ah, compare Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, Nos. 2721/6 and 7285. The spelling of al-muṣṭafā (cf. al-muṟṭadā) in line 5 is paralleled in a tombstone dated 248 H. Three fragments (end of lines 6 and 7, and beginning of line 11) are missing; other small bits are lacking but can be reconstructed.

Ornament and epigraphy.—A “seal of Solomon,” with pellets between the points and in the center, separates the basmalah from the beginning of the testimonial. The style of Kufic resembles that of No. 1, above, and is very similar to Nos. 5 and 13, below. Ornamented letters occur in the first line only: half-palmettes on 11 alifs and lâms. The end of the last word of the inscription is drawn out in order to fill space (compare Nos. 7 and 8, below).


Text

Text

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful,
2. has testified Marām ibn ‘Amrū
3. b. Hishām, al-Tujini, to that which has testified
4. God on his own account, and have testified to
5. his angels and men endowed with knowledge
6. [that] God, there is no God but he, established in
7. righteousness [they proclaim] there is no God
8. but he, the mighty,
9. the wise; and she testifies that Muhammad
10. is his servant and his messenger—may God
11. and give him peace; and she testifies that death
12. and paradise and the fire are truth, and that
13. in the graves. She died—may God be well

12 This symbol, with or without dots, occurs quite frequently on Egyptian tombstones: cf. Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, Nos. 1506/687 (185 H.), 4522 (190 H.) 2721/25 (190 H.), 2721/56 (200 H.), 1506/32 (236 H.), etc. An example of an exactly similar symbol used in the identical position is ibid., No. 1506/69 (pl. 55), dated 235 H. See also Strzygowski, op. cit., p. 319, for a discussion of this ornament.
Commentary.—The usual formulas. Koranic passages: 3:16, adapted (line 5 to beginning of line 8), and part of 22:7 (second half of line 11 to beginning of line 12). The nisbah of the deceased’s grandfather appears to be al-Tujinī, the name of a tribe settled in Egypt. 13

Ornament and epigraphy.—The Kufic fairly closely resembles that of No. 4, above, and is almost identical with No. 13, below. Ornamented letters are limited to an alif and a lām in line 1 and the tail of the final mīm in the same line. Above the first line, and quite detached from the letters are three ornaments: a half-palmette, a rosette, and a blossom joined to a half-palmette. The earliest illustrated examples of such independent ornaments on Egyptian tombstones are stones dated in the year before the present one. 14 The lām-alīf's vary in shape, as do several final letters such as the yā’ in the middle of line 12, which sweeps upward to the height of the top of the vertical letters.


Text

1 بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
2 اهْدِنَا الصَّبْحَةَ الْمُطْرَفَةَ
3 عَلِىّ نَفْسِكَ وَالْمُوتِ عَلَى نَفْسِكَ
4 وَلَبِّئْ اللَّهَ الْجَمِيعَ
5 لَنِّيْمَةَ هَذَا مَا يَضِيعُ عَلَيْهِ
6 عَلِيّ الْامَرْضِيَ الْمُحَدَّثَ
7 لَا إِلَّا إِنَّهُ وَحَدٌ لَا شَرِّ
8 يَا لَكَ وَلَوْ تَعَلَّمَ عَلَيْهِ
9 وَرَسُولُ اللَّهِ عِلَيْهِ}

10 وسلم توفي في شهر ر
11 يعني السنة احداث و
12 [sic] خمسين ومائتين

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful,
2. praise be to God who has written mercy
3. for himself and death for his creatures
4. and resurrection at his decision and the final reckoning
5. at his sanction. This is what has testified
6. 'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad; he testifies that
7. there is no God but Allah, the One, there is no part-
8. ner with him, and that Muḥammad is his servant and
9. his messenger—may God bless him
10. and give him peace. He died in the month of Rabi’ II of the year 251 [May, A.D. 865].

Commentary.—The common formulas; no remarkable features.

Ornament and epigraphy.—See No. 3, above, for comment on this crowded style. The Kufic is entirely without ornament.


Text

1 بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم هذا ما
2 شهدت به الملكة ابنت زكير بن محيي
3 إلا الله إلا أنه وهده لا شريك له
4 فإن حمدنا ورسولنا صلى الله عليه وسلم وان اللهجة واللغة
5 والاذان حق وأن الله هو الحق الحين
6 وليه تفضل عليها رضوان و
7 عنصروف وحسن فايبرك يا رحم
8 فيهمها يملك أهل درجات دين
9 وجوه نل يذكر في يوم النفا
10 في لاثي عشر سنة من عصر الأول من سنة
11 اثنين خمسين ومائتين
12
Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful, this is what
2. has testified Malikah ibn Zakayr b. Muhiyy
3. that there is no God but Allah, the One, there is no partner with him,
4. and that Muhammad is his servant and his messenger—may
5. God bless him and give him peace—and that resurrection and paradise
6. and the fire are truth, and that God he is the manifest truth.
7. O God, favor her with thy benediction and
8. thy forgiveness, and thy good pardon, O thou merciful one;
9. and cause her to attain, by thy grace, the highest ranks of thy paradise
10. and the neighborhood of thy Prophet, O thou gracious one. She died on Tuesday [night of
   Monday–Tuesday],
11. 18th of Rabi’ I of the year
12. 252 [April 8, A.D. 866].

Commentary.—The usual formulas with some variations, such as al-haqq al-muhîn in line 6, from Koran 24:25, or 27:81. For the name of the deceased woman's father, Zukayr, compare Stèles funéraires, I, No. 3974/1.

Ornament and epigraphy.—Above the first line is a border of continuous, undulating tendrils. The earliest recorded instance of a somewhat similar border is a stone in the Arab Museum in Cairo, dated 204 H. The Kufic is simple, and being fairly open is more easily legible than Nos. 3 and 6. The only ornamental letter is the final mîn in the last line, which curves upward and ends in a simple tendril. The word mi‘atayn is drawn out to fill space (compare No. 4, above, and No. 8, below).


Text

1. Bismi llâh ar-rhamân ar-rahîm
2. an-nâmi min kullâ musîbî wa kullâ hâlik wa din
3. la illa illa Allâh ‘alâ kullâ al-salâh al-mu’min
4. Allâhu akbar, jâhi Allâh ‘alî wa sallî ‘alî
5. ânma shahid biyâni [sic] 'Imrân abî [sic] al-‘amîd
6. dânu ‘alâ Wallâh bîn ‘Abdullâh wa bi’râdî bîn ‘Alî
7. [âl]‘Alî ‘alâ Allâh wa sallî ‘alî wa shahid an
8. ân la ûa’la bint al-jâlî al-wâlî wa illâ Allâh
9. ân huwallâh biyâni ‘alâ-hu wa illâ Allâh
10. ‘alâhi an dânu ‘alâ wâlihi min kullî wâlihi
11. ‘alâhi ‘alâhi wa illâ Allâh wa illâ-ya’âlimin wa ma’âlimin
12. kawnat wa ‘alâhi ‘alâ Allâh ‘alâhi wa ma’âlimin wa
13. 15 Safar, 254/968, and 255/970.

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful, verily in God there is consol-
2. ation for every adversity and compensation for all that perishes, and understand-
3. ing for what has passed. And verily the greatest of adversities is the adversity
4. [of the death] of the Prophet Muhammad—may God bless him and give him peace—th-
5. is what has testified Bânwârf [?] ibn abû’l-Hadid
6. b. Ishâq; she testifies that there is no God but Allah, the One,
7. there is no partner with him, and that Muham-
8. mad is his servant and his messen-
9. ger—may God bless him and give him peace; and she testifies that
10. death and resurrection and paradise and the fire
11. are truth, and that God
12. he is the manifest truth. In this [belief] she has
13. lived, and in it

15 Stèles funéraires, vol. I, No. 3380/12 (pl. 14). A less graceful example is ibid., No. 2721/98 (pl. 47). Strzygowski analyzes borders of this type at some length (op. cit., pp. 312–318), and divides them into a number of categories. Compare his figure 11 for "Ranken mit Halbpalmetten, einfachste Form" on a stone dated 246 H.; and his figure 30 (p. 320) for a similar example of this relief type.
she has died, and in it she will be raised up living, if God pleases.

And her death took place—God's mercy be upon her—in


Commentary.—The usual formulas. For al-haqq al-mubīn (line 10), cf. No. 7, above. I have only been able to guess at the deceased woman's name, there being a wide range of possible consonants. If Bānwar, could it be related to a Persian name, Shāhbānwar? 

Ornament and epigraphy.—The Kufic is neat and legible, and for the most part relatively simple, but there are a number of ornamented or unusual characters. Twice in line 1 and once in line 11 a hump rises above the base line between the two lāms of Allāh. Most dāls and kāfs have restrained floral upper terminations, and dālī in line 4 has a remarkable form. So also the zā' on line 3. Final yā' several times runs back in a long tail beneath the word (note especially in line 4). Ḥā' frequently has a floral top; and medial and final 'ayn bears a simple cap (lines 9, 11, 13). A final waw (line 7) and an isolated nūn (line 8) sweep upward and bear floral terminations. The word mi'atayn in the last line is drawn out in two places to fill up space (cf. Nos. 4 and 7, above).


Text

14) Bism Allah al-Rahim an fī a
15) wuzūrā man kā min miṣṣā bi wa-lām al-mašāf
16) dārak la messan wa 'an abūm al-salāb

15) Cf. No. 1, above, for this idiosyncrasy.

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful, verily in G-
2. od there is consolation for every adversity and compensation for all that perishes, and
3. understanding for what has passed. And verily the greatest of adversities is the
4. adversity [of the death] of the Prophet Muhammad—may God bless him and give him peace.
5. This is what has testified Nā'ilah ibnat Bishr b. Sayf
6. b. 'Aṭiyyah, al-Ray'ānī; she testifies that there is no God but Allāh,
7. the One, there is no partner with him, and that Muhammad is his servant
8. and his messenger—may God bless him and give him peace—and she testifies
9. that death and resurrection are truth, and that paradise and the fire
10. are truth, and that the hour will indeed come—there is no doubt of it—and that God
11. will raise up those in the graves. In this [belief] she lived, and
12. in it she died, and in it she will be raised up living, if God pleases. She died
13. on Monday the 20th of the month of Ramadān
14. of the year 269 [Monday–Tuesday night, April 2, A.D. 883]. May God bless Muhammad the Prophet and his family,
Commentary.—Aside from several of the common formulas, all of Koran 22:7 is quoted in lines 10–11. The name of the deceased woman, Nā’ilah, is not unusual. The nisbah al-Ray‘anī (line 6), probably for al-Ray‘ānī, would refer to the locality frequently named in the poetry of the Hudhayl.¹⁹ I have been unable to decipher the short last line of the epitaph.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The inscription is framed at the top and at the sides by a chain border somewhat like that of No. 1, above, with the addition of dots.²⁰ The quite graceful epigraphy also is not unlike No. 1, but there are distinctive features. Two letters have sweeping foliate terminals: the first mīm and one of the ḥā’s in line 1. The lām-alifs take several forms: plain (line 6), foliate (line 6), and more elaborate foliate (line 7), plain incurving (lines 10 and 13).²¹ One rā’ (end of line 9) has a long upward-sweeping tail, and the vertical of ẓā’ (line 3) has a similar flourish. Three final yā’s have long retreating tails, the most remarkable being those in line 4, which carry back beneath two words and are curved at one point to dip beneath letters which project beneath the base line.


Text

1. بسم الله الرحمن الرحمن
2. حمّام خر هو ابّه احد
3. ابّه العماد لم يلد
4. ولم يولد ولم يكن
5. له كفوا احد هذا
6. فيه محمد بن أبو بن

²⁰ For this type of border, cf. Strzygowsky, op. cit., p. 311.
²¹ Cf. No. 1, above.

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful.
2. Cifu, say, he is God alone,
3. God the eternal, he begetteth not,
4. and he is not begotten, and there is none
5. like unto him. This is
6. the grave of Muhammad b. Ayyūb b.
7. ’Abdullāh, al-Ṣughdī(?),
8. al-‘Attā[r]?. He died and he
9. testifies that there is no God
10. but Allah, the One,
11. there is no partner with him, and that
12. Muhammad is his servant and his messenger—may God bless him

Commentary.—Lines 1–5 contain Koran 112 in full, the Sūrat al-İkhlās. I have read the nisbah at the end of line 7 as al-Ṣughdī, but as the letters are much cramped and somewhat enigmatic, I offer the reading with diffidence. In the next line the first word appears to be al-‘Attā, and I can only suggest that al-‘Attār (the perfumer) is intended, the final letter having been inadvertently omitted.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The crowded epigraphy, without ornament, closely resembles No. 6, above, and has no interesting or remarkable features.
II. Marble tombstone, dated Safar, 289 H. (Jan.-Feb., A.D. 902). Eleven lines of simple incised Kufic. Fractured (three pieces), rectangular, 36 x 57.5 cm. (No. 07.280). Pl. 5, fig. 11.

Text

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful,
2. this is what has testified al-Hasan b. Sulaymân. He testifies that there is no God but Allah, the One, there is no partner with him, and
3. that Muhammad is his servant and his messenger
4. may God bless him and give him peace—and that
5. death and resurrection and paradise and
6. the fire are truth, and that Allah will raise up those
7. in the graves. And took place his death and resurrection and paradise and
8. in the year 289 [Jan.-Feb., A.D. 902].

Commentary.—The usual formulas, with part of Koran 22:7 (end of line 8 to beginning of line 9).

Ornament and epigraphy.—Except for the wedge-shaped crockets of vertical letters the Kufic is unornamented and lacks any distinctive features. The shapes of the letters are clumsy and the engraving is coarse.


Text

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful,
2. verily in God there is consolation for every adversity and compensation
3. for all that perishes. Th-
4. is the grave of Bakr, mawlā of Muhammad b. Ḥarīsh, al-Sharābhī;
5. he died on the 28th of Jumādā-9.–10. of the year 291 [April 17, A.D. 904].
6. He testifies that there is no God but Allah, the One, there is no partner with him, and that Muhammad is his servant and his messenger—[may]

Commentary.—The usual formulas, brief in extent. The deceased was a freedman or client
Fig. 1—Zinaa bint 'Uthman, 218 H./833.

Fig. 2—'Abdus b. Sa'id, 231 H./846.

Figs. 1 and 2—Tombstones, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Fig. 3—Wājid b. Rajā', 237 H./852.

Fig. 4—Jum'ah ibnät 'Ammār, 238 H./853.

Figs. 3 and 4—Tombstones. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Fig. 5—Mamah Ibnat ‘Abd Allah, 241 H./859.  
Fig. 6—Abdullah b. Muhammad, 251/865.  
Figs. 5 and 6—Tombstones. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Fig. 7—Malikah ibnat Zukayr, 252 H./866.

Fig. 8—Bânwar (?) ibnat Abu'l-Hadîd, 254 H./868.

Figs. 7 and 8—Tombstones. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
Figs. 9-11—Tombstones. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Fig. 10—Muhammad b. Ayyub. 266 H./880.

Fig. 11—Al-Hasan b. Sulayman. 389 H./992.
Fig. 12—Bahr, mawla of Muhammad b. Harish, 201 H./904.

Fig. 13—Hasanah ibn Ibrāhīm. Middle Third Century H.

Fig. 14—Ja'far. Second to Third Century H.

Figs. 12-14—Tombstones. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Text

1. Bism Allah al-Rahim
2. Siham us-Sam'ani
3. La ala ala wa la
4. [sic] makka wa la
5. Qatala sammad ala
6. La ala ala wa la
7. Hisamuhu
8..transforms
9. Bn qibl al-Haras

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful, God has testified that there is no God but He, and the angels and men, and the jinn and what is in the earth, that He is the Lord of the Worlds.
2. He is the Merciful, the Compassionate, who created you from dry clay and made you the first thing. 
3. And the ruin of the worlds is not decreed except by His permission; and the creation is not perverted.
4. The Al.Mustabih, is established on its tombstone. 
5. A man named Muhammad b. Harish, al-Sharahi, a nisba recognized by al-Sam'ani.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The unadorned and compact Kufic resembles that of Nos. 6 and 10, above.


Text

1. Bism Allah al-Rahim
2. Siham us-Sam'ani
3. La ala ala wa la
4. [sic] makka wa
5. Qatala sammad ala
6. La ala ala wa la
7. Hisamuhu
8..transforms
9. Bn qibl al-Haras

Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful, God has testified that there is no God but He, and the angels and men, and the jinn and what is in the earth, that He is the Lord of the Worlds.
2. He is the Merciful, the Compassionate, who created you from dry clay and made you the first thing. 
3. And the ruin of the worlds is not decreed except by His permission; and the creation is not perverted.
4. The Al.Mustabih, is established on its tombstone. 
5. A man named Muhammad b. Harish, al-Sharahi, a nisba recognized by al-Sam'ani.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The style of Kufic very closely resembles that of No. 5, above, dated 244 H.; in fact the two stones might have been carved by the same hand. Not only are the floral ornaments of several alifs and lambs (lines 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9) and of two kafis (lines 4 and 6) similar, but also the independent rossette and the blossom joined to a half-palmette above the first line are identical with the ornaments on No. 5 and are in almost exactly the same positions. No. 4, above, is also related.

Commentary.—The usual formulas, with Koran 3:16 (lines 2-6). Probably at least four lines are missing, containing the customary affirmation about death and resurrection, etc., and the date of the woman's demise. The nisba al-Haras refers to a village in eastern Egypt.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The style of Kufic very closely resembles that of No. 5, above, dated 244 H.; in fact the two stones might have been carved by the same hand. Not only are the floral ornaments of several alifs and lambs (lines 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9) and of two kafis (lines 4 and 6) similar, but also the independent rossette and the blossom joined to a half-palmette above the first line are identical with the ornaments on No. 5 and are in almost exactly the same positions. No. 4, above, is also related.

Commentary.—The usual formulas, with Koran 3:16 (lines 2-6). Probably at least four lines are missing, containing the customary affirmation about death and resurrection, etc., and the date of the woman's demise. The nisba al-Haras refers to a village in eastern Egypt.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The style of Kufic very closely resembles that of No. 5, above, dated 244 H.; in fact the two stones might have been carved by the same hand. Not only are the floral ornaments of several alifs and lambs (lines 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9) and of two kafis (lines 4 and 6) similar, but also the independent rossette and the blossom joined to a half-palmette above the first line are identical with the ornaments on No. 5 and are in almost exactly the same positions. No. 4, above, is also related.

Commentary.—The usual formulas, with Koran 3:16 (lines 2-6). Probably at least four lines are missing, containing the customary affirmation about death and resurrection, etc., and the date of the woman's demise. The nisba al-Haras refers to a village in eastern Egypt.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The style of Kufic very closely resembles that of No. 5, above, dated 244 H.; in fact the two stones might have been carved by the same hand. Not only are the floral ornaments of several alifs and lambs (lines 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9) and of two kafis (lines 4 and 6) similar, but also the independent rossette and the blossom joined to a half-palmette above the first line are identical with the ornaments on No. 5 and are in almost exactly the same positions. No. 4, above, is also related.
Translation

1. In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful,
2. God has testified that there is no God but he, and ver-
3. ily the angels and men endued with knowledge, established
4. in righteousness [proclaim] that there is no God but he, the mighty,
5. the wise. This is what has testified Ja'far,
6. mother of the son of Ḥassān b. Yūsuf b. Ḥassān,
7. n, the apothecary. She testifies that there is no God but Allah, the One, there is no partner with him, and that Muhammad
8. is his servant and his messenger—may God bless him
9. and give him peace. And she testifies that death and
10. resurrection and paradise and the fire are truth, and that
11. the hour will indeed come—there is no doubt of it—and that
12. God will raise up those in the graves. In th-
13. is [belief] she lived, and in it she died, and in it
14. she will be raised up living, if God pleases.

Commentary.—The woman was doubtless a slave; perhaps the name was Umm Ja'far, rather than Ja'far, but the latter, as written, is possible. The word walad in line 6 is obscure, but I cannot suggest any other reading. Al-Saydalānī is a common designation for "apothecary"; but is also is frequently used as a nisbah probably without specific reference to the profession. It is curious that the epitaph, which in other respects follows the usual pattern (including Koran 3:16 in lines 2–5, and 22:7 in lines 12–13), is undated. Possibly the son, who wished his mother to be remembered, had forgotten the date of her death.

Ornament and epigraphy.—The kufic is very simple and unsophisticated, the only attempt at adornment being the splayed crockets in some of the verticals of the first two lines. Crockets such as these appear as early as 191 H. The epigraphy is therefore difficult to date, but in all probability it can be assigned to the late second or early third century of the Hijrah.

25 Cf. al-Sam'ānī, fol. 358b.
26 Cf. Stèles funéraires, vol. 1, No. 1193 (pl. 6).
POTERIES DE BAMIYAN

PAR J. C. GARDIN

Dans une haute vallée de l’Hindu Kush, en Afghanistan, au confluent de deux torrents, se dressent, taillées dans la falaise, les deux célèbres statues géantes du Bouddha; elles regardent, à leur pied, le village moderne de Bamiyan,1 et au delà, sur la rive sud du fleuve, une colline de forme conique, ouverte de vieux murs et de tours en ruines. C’est dans les découpages de cette citadelle, dite “Shahr-e Gholghola”2 qu’ont été recueillies depuis une vingtaine d’années,3 au hasard de recherches commerciales ou de simples visites touristiques, les poteries présentées ici.4 Beaucoup sont entières; et on doit se demander à la suite de quel désastre ces poteries ont été abandonnées intactes par les citadins. La légende locale garde le souvenir d’une époque brillante, brusquement interrompue par une catastrophe: l’incursion de bandes mongoles qui, dans leur marche contre le sultan khwarezmien Jalâl al-Dîn Mangoberti, détruisent de fond en comble la ville.5

Les textes orientaux confirment cette légende. Au dixième siècle tout d’abord, Bamiyan est décrite comme une petite cité non fortifiée, égarée en étendue à la moitié de Bakh,6 et construite sur une colline.7 Son importance grandit au milieu du douzième siècle, lorsqu’après les conquêtes des princes du Ghor dans l’actuel Afghanistan, Bamiyan devient le siège d’une principauté florissante, qui s’étend au nord jusqu’à l’Oxus.8 Quelques décades plus tard, vers 1215, la ville est annexée au puissant empire que le sultan du Khwarezm, Muhammad, se taille alors de Hamadan à Ghazni; et son propre fils, Jalâl al-Dîn Mangoberti, reçoit le gouvernement des régions enlevées aux princes ghordes.9 Cependant, la domination khwarezmienne devait être de courte durée: en 1221, les bandes mongoles de Gengis-Khan campent devant la ville haute, et s’en emparent après un siège dont la légende donne un récit.

2 En persan, la ville de(s) rumeur(s).
4 Les pièces ou tessons dits “de Shahr-i Gholghola” dont l’origine pouvait prêter à quelque doute ont été écartés de cette étude. C’est en particulier le cas de la poterie non-glacée, généralement délaissée par les visiteurs, et dont de ce fait on connaît encore trop peu de fragments pour qu’une étude soit possible. Collections: Musée de Caboul, Nos. 2, 5–7, 11–23, 27–32, 35, 36, 38, 41–45, 54–57, 70; J.-M. Casal, Nos. 33, 51, 52; M. Choukour, No. 69; Melle. A.-M. Fontana, Nos. 37, 48, 58, 59; Freer Gallery of Art, Nos. 49, 50; M. M. Le Berre, Nos. 3, 4, 8, 9, 24–26, 39, 40, 60–67; M. J. Mançeau, No. 53; M. C. Momual, Nos. 1, 68; Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan, Nos. 34, 46, 47.
9 Sur cette période, de 1150 à 1221, cf. ci-dessous, p. 159 s.
épique. Pour venger son petit fils Mütügen, tué pendant le siège, le conquérant fait entièrement rasor la ville; et bien des années plus tard, lorsque Juwainî écrivait son histoire, Bamiyan était toujours une ruine déserte.

Les objets que l'on retire aujourd'hui des décombres ont donc été abandonnés par les assiégés pendant ce triste épilogue, et l'on connaît ainsi le terme de la période de fabrication.
Entre quelques pans de murs, sur la colline, on voit encore l'emplACEMENT d'un four de potiers; c'est peut-être de cet amas de cendres que sont sorties de nos jours maintes poteries intactes, restes d'une cuisson interrompue pendant un épisode du siège. Par ailleurs, ratés de cuisson et pernettes ne manquent pas sur le site, de sorte que le lieu de fabrication des poteries dites de Shahr-i Gholghola n'est pas douteux: ce ne sont pas des importations, mais bien le fruit de l'artisanat indigène à Bamiyan.

**CLASSIFICATION**

Selon que le décor des poteries est gravé, moulé, ou peint, nous les répartissons en trois groupes A, B, et C; à l'intérieur des groupes A et B, les deux ou trois variantes de teinte dominante utilisées permettent une subdivision en séries, que résume le tableau suivant:

Groupe A. Décor Gravé
Série 1—Céramique vert-jaune clair, avec décor peint.
Série 2—Céramique vert-foncé, sans décor peint.
Série 3—Céramique jaune-fauve, sans décor peint.

10 Hackin et Kohzad, _loc. cit._

11 La prise de Bamiyan par les Mongols pose un problème de chronologie: W. Barthold, _Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion_, 2d ed., London, 1938, p. 444 s.; mais l'incertitude porte seulement sur quelques mois, et on peut l'ignorer en ce qui concerne la datation de la céramique.

On appelle ainsi les petits trépieds sur lesquels reposent les poteries encrassées les _unes_ dans les autres lors de la cuisson; la trace des trois pieds à l'intérieur des bols, sur le fond, est bien visible aux Nos. 50 à 62, 67, etc.

Groupe B. Décor Moulé
Série 4—Céramique bleue.
Série 5—Céramique blanche.
Groupe C. Décor Peint

**A. DÉCOR GRAVÉ**

Les poteries des trois séries à décor gravé sont tournées dans une pâte imparfaite épurée, de couleur rose-brique; un engobe blanc recouvre la paroi intérieure, et la face externe sur sa plus grande hauteur.

Sur cet engobe sont pratiquées les incisions du décor gravé, qui se présente sous deux aspects distincts: tantôt les motifs sont simplement tracés à la pointe fine, tantôt l'engobe est en outre enlevé par petites plages autour de ces derniers, qui se détachent ainsi en léger relief, dans la couleur claire de l'engobe, sur le fond rougeâtre de la pâte (décor "champlevé").

Après application d'un colorant uniforme, vert (série 2) ou jaune (série 3), ou d'un décor peint (série 1) sur l'engobe, la poterie reçoit une glaçure transparente, brillante, sous laquelle les sillons incisés prennent une teinte ocre-rouge vif.

**SÉRIE 1, CÉRAMIQUE VERT-JAUNE**
**CLAIR, AVEC DÉCOR PEINT (Nos. 1 à 53)**

La couleur vert-jaune pâle que donne la glaçure à l'engobe originellement blanc constitue la teinte de fond caractéristique de cette série. On y distingue quatre sortes de récipients: les bols, les coupe hautes, les couples plates, et les assiettes.

A. BOLS (Nos. 1 à 33; 34, 37)

Ce sont les plus nombreux; la paroi, assez épaisse (0,7 à 0,8 cm.), fortement incurvée à la base, s'évasant régulièrement jusqu'au bord, souvent recourbé vers l'extérieur (fig. 1, a, b). Les dimensions moyennes sont les suivantes: diamètre au bord 17 à 18 cm., hauteur à 10 cm.

Une caractéristique fréquente de ces bols est le petit ressaut qui, à l'intérieur, marque le
Fig. 1—Poteries de Bamiyan, profils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOLS</th>
<th>COUPES HAUTES</th>
<th>COUPES PLATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a (No. 2)</td>
<td>d (No. 24)</td>
<td>g (No. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (No. 1)</td>
<td>e (No. 54)</td>
<td>h (No. 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (No. 63)</td>
<td>f (No. 26)</td>
<td>i (No. 43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assiettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j (No. 53)</td>
<td>k (No. 68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l (No. 69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
raccord de la paroi au fond (fig. 1, b); ce dernier, plat, repose sur un piédouche d’environ 1 cm. de hauteur, dont la face inférieure est générale-
ment concave.
L’extérieur des pièces est rarement orné; à l’intérieur, le décor est régulièrement réparti en deux zônes indépendantes, la paroi et le fond.

Décor de la paroi.—(1) L’ornementation la plus fréquente consiste en figures géométriques juxtaposées tout autour du fond. Ces figures, circulaires, elliptiques ou piriformes, sont tantôt unies (Nos. 2, 11, 12), tantôt coupées d’un bandeau vertical, tresse (No. 17) ou entrelacs schématisé (Nos. 1, 22). Elles se détachent dans la teinte claire du fond au milieu du réseau foncé que dessinent les motifs rudimentaires gravés dans les intervalles, volutes, rinceaux, entrelacs.

Au lieu de figures curvilignes, on trouve sur deux bols (Nos. 3, 4) des secteurs trapézoïdaux, au nombre de trois, régulièrement espacés sur la paroi unie; chacun d’eux est orné d’un motif formé de deux pseudo-lettres (? (No. 3) ou de deux demi-palmettes (No. 4), symétriques par rapport à l’axe vertical. Au No. 9, trois secteurs trapézoïdaux analogues sont couverts de petites vrilles verticales.

(2) Quelques bols portent une ornementation continue sur toute la paroi; les motifs s’élèvent alors dans la teinte claire de l’engobe, sur un réseau d’incisions qui dessinent, dans la teinte foncée de l’argile, un quadrillage (Nos. 10, 20, 23) ou des écailles (No. 21). Ces motifs sont tantôt des fleurons (Nos. 10, 21), tantôt un thème pseudo-épigraphe (Nos. 5, 20, 23) dont les caractères couvrent parfois toute la hauteur de la paroi; les lettres sont en outre marquées d’un trait peint qui souvent cache la gravure primitive.

Au No. 8 reparaissent les vrilles verticales, sur tout le pourtour du bol (cf. aussi No. 18), tandisqu’au No. 6, le décor, plus simple encore, se réduit à un zigzag encadré de volutes.

Décor du fonds.—Les fonds de ces bols portent des motifs souvent mal individualisés (ex. No. 7), d’autres mieux définis, mais rudimentaires: fleuron trilobé (No. 8), rosette (No. 22), quad-
drillage (Nos. 5, 14, 34), bandeau circulaire chargé de vrilles (Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, g), de “postes” (No. 2) ou d’anneaux (No. 37).

Décor peint.—Le décor peint des bols comporte rarement des motifs individualisés. Sur la teinte claire de l’engobe sont jetées quelques touches, rondes ou filiformes, brunes ou vertes, dont la distribution sur les parois et le fond est généralement régie par le décor gravé ou par la forme du bol. Ainsi, aux motifs gravés se superposent fréquemment des semis de pois ou des trainées allongées.12 De même, les taches sont quelquefois disposées en cercles concentriques autour du fond (Nos. 7, 14). Parfois cependant, ces mouchetures sont sans rapport avec le décor gravé; il en est souvent ainsi sur les petits motifs qui ornent les intervalles entre les figures géométriques (cf. paragr. 1 ci-dessus), et aussi dans le cas des couleurs qui, sur plusieurs bols, descendent du bord en longues trainées, re-
couvrent au hasard différentes parties du décor (ex. Nos. 4, 8, 10, etc. ...).

Enfin, le bord est presque toujours teinté plus foncé que le reste de la pièce, vert, jaune, ou le plus souvent bistre. Cette dernière couleur n’est pas due à un pigment, mais à l’absence d’engobe sur la tranche du bord; c’est la glaçure qui, appliquée directement sur la pâte, lui donne à cet endroit une teinte bistre.

B. COUPE HAUTES (Nos. 13; 24 à 38)

Dans notre classifications les coupes hautes se distinguent des bols par la courbure irrégulière de la paroi. Largement évasée à la base, celle-ci se ferme approximativement à mi-hauteur, soit par un brusque ressaut (Nos. 24a, 25a), soit par une inflexion rapide (No. 28), jusqu’au bord du vase, nettement recourbé vers l’extérieur (fig. 1, d, e). D’autre part, sur toutes ces coupes

12 Lorsque cette superposition est étroite, ainsi aux Nos. 5 et 20, le décor peint acquiert naturellement une certaine individualité: celle-là même du décor gravé, fidèlement suivi par le pinceau du potier.
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hautes (sauf le No. 26), les deux faces de la paroi sont décorées.\textsuperscript{14}

D\textsuperscript{é}cor externe.—Sur la paroi externe, le thème le plus fréquent est, le long du bord, un zigzag gravé, encadré de vrilles (No. 30), que l'on retrouve à l'intérieur d'un des vases (No. 13). Parfois, ce zigzag est aussi peint (Nos. 24a, 25a). D'autres bandeaux horizontaux portent un des motifs en cœur (No. 27), un autre un rinceau (No. 28), d'autres encore des ornements découverts en léger relief, fleurons (No. 29), tresse (No. 33) ou ruban bouclé (No. 31). Sur le No. 32 enfin, court le long du bord un large bandeau simplement couvert d'"écailles".

D\textsuperscript{é}cor interne.—À l'intérieur, le décor se réduit souvent à quelques couleurs peintes, brunes ou vertes, auxquelles s'ajoute parfois un thème gravé simple: zigzag (No. 13) ou entrelacs (No. 28, face non photographiée). Sur deux vases toutefois (Nos. 24 et 25, b, c) apparaît une ornementation plus éloquente: c'est une sorte de large rosette, dont l'anneau central occupe le fond, légèrement déprimé, tandis que les six lobes s'étalent sur la partie inférieure, évasée, du récipient. Ces pétale, unis (No. 25), ou ornés chacun d'un petit poisson gravé et moucheté de vert (No. 24), sont séparés les uns des autres par d'étroits bandeaux verticaux où sont inscrits de schématiques entrelacs (No. 24)

ou rinceaux (No. 25), également mouchetés. Au dessus de cette rosette, la partie presque verticale de la paroi est unie sur un vase (No. 24c), mais ornée sur l'autre (No. 25c) d'un bandeau pseudo-épigraphique (fig. 2) que recouvrent des

trainées peintes issues du bord. Notons enfin, sur ce même vase, au fond, une petite rosette à 5 lobes qu'entoure une vrille.

Il semble que les pétalas de ces grandes rosettes soient à l'origine de l'ordonnance à secteurs arqués qui constitue l'ornementation de deux autres poteries: d'une part une grande coupe (No. 40, cf. p. 232), et de l'autre, un récipient un peu particulier (No. 26), qu'il convient d'étudier maintenant. On voit, à la figure 1, f, l'originalité du profil; quant au décor, limité comme sur les bols à la surface interne, il se compose de huit secteurs arqués, tracés à la pointe et au pinceau, et séparés, comme l'étaient les pétalas sur les vases précédents, par d'étroits bandeaux verticaux ornés chacun d'une vrille gravée et mouchetée. Ces secteurs sont disposés autour d'un fond plat, où se détache, sur un dense réseau de feuilles et de tiges, un oiseau, de facture maladroite.

Les thèmes animaliers sont, sur la céramique de Shahr-e Ghoighola, assez rares. Outre cet oiseau (No. 25) et les petits poissons du No. 24 (cf. plus haut), nous n'en connaissons que deux autres, également dessinés sur des fond de vases: d'une part, un oiseau (No. 35), peut-être un coq, si l'on en juge par le plumage dressé, caractéristique de ces oiseaux dans maintes représentations iraniennes;\textsuperscript{15} d'autre part un quadrupède, probablement un cheval (No. 36), qui se détache en surface unie sur un fond strié.

Enfin, le No. 38, également fond de coupe haute ou bol, mérite d'être cité pour son décor particulier: trois bandeaux rayonnant, ornés de rubans perlés, encadrent sur la paroi des ellipses perlées et mouchetées de vert. C'est en effet le décor même de certaines poteries trouvées à Lashkari-Bazar, près de Bust;\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{14} Le décor peint est de même nature sur les coupes hautes et les bols; nous n'en donnerons pas d'analyse nouvelle, non plus que pour les coupes plates et assiettes de la série 1.

\textsuperscript{15} Sur cette identification, cf. Lashkari-Bazar, Céramique non-glacée, Nos. 45 et 110 (étude à paraître dans la publication prochaine des fouilles de Lashkari-Bazar et de Bust, Mémoires de la délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan. Les références renvoient à la section concernant la céramique.)

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., Céramique glacée, série XI–3, Nos. 492–494.
C. COUPES PLATES (Nos. 39 à 50)

Le type le plus fréquent, tel qu'on peut le reconstituer par certains tessons du Musée de Caboul, est, semble-t-il, une coupe de grandes dimensions (diamètre 25 à 35 cm.), dont la paroi, épaisse (en moyenne 1 cm.) et très évasée à la base, se relève franchement, par un brusque ressaut, à l’approche du bord (fig. 1, g–i). C’est à ce type qu’appartiennent le No. 39; le No. 40 en diffère par la forte courbure convexe du bord, qui à partir du ressaut, s’incurve jusqu’à horizontale (fig. 1, g). Le fond, plat, repose sur un piédouche en forme d’anneau.

Décor.—La décoration de ces coupes rappelle, par l’ordonnance au moins, celle qui apparaît le plus souvent sur les bols (cf. p. 230, paragr. 2): sur la paroi interne, autour du fond, alternent des figures géométriques, cercles ou ellipses, et des ornements variés, tresse (No. 43), formule pseudo-épigraphique (No. 39) (fig. 3), vrilles et rinceaux (Nos. 44, 45). Comme sur les bols, ces figures géométriques sont tantôt unies (Nos. 39, 43, 45) tantôt coupées d’une torsade verticale (No. 44); de même, le long du bord, court invariablement un mince ruban orné de thèmes linéaires: zigzag (Nos. 39, 49); torsade (No. 41), vrille (No. 45), rinceau (No. 42).

La coupe No. 40 cependant s’apparente davantage, par ses neuf secteurs ogivaux, aux vases ornés de rosette (Nos. 24, 25); comme on l’a dit à propos du No. 26, les pétales de ces rosettes, également en forme d’ogive, ont pu se transformer en éléments d’une ornementation géométrique par secteurs arqués, telle qu’on l’observe ici.17

Ces ogives, et les petits triangles placés de part et d’autre de chacune d’elles, se détachent sur surfaces unies sur un quadrillage gravé, à mailles serrées; de même le noeud tressé, savamment découpé au centre de la coupe, et la torsade qui l’entoure.

L’ornementation sévère de cette pièce, où la monotone disposition concentrique se trouve heureusement rompue par les arcades rayonnantes, et où le pinceau s’avère plus discret que de coutume, montre que l’artisanat local, à Bamiyan, pouvait parfois donner une œuvre de qualité, digne au moins des modèles qui de près ou de loin avaient pu l’inspirer (cf. p. 238).

C’est sans doute aussi à des coupes qu’appartiennent les tessons Nos. 46 à 50; nous les avons retenus ici pour certaines particularités de forme—ainsi, un bord à moulure saillante (No. 46), un autre à tranche crénelée (No. 47)—ou d’ornementation—ainsi les thèmes épigraphiques aux Nos. 4918 et 50,19 et au No. 48, l’association curieuse de hampes fleuronnées et de motifs végétaux, sans autres éléments épigraphiques.

D. ASSIETTES (Nos. 51 à 53)

Les petites assiettes de la série 1 (diamètre environ 15 cm.) se composent d’un fond plat, au centre duquel apparaît parfois, sur la face interne, une protubérance arrondie (fig. 1, j); il est relié par un double ressaut au large marli de l’assiette (largeur 4 cm.), voisin de l’horizontal.

C’est sur ce marli que se trouve l’unique décor des pièces, réduit à une guirlande (Nos. 51, 53).

17 Sur cette évolution, cf. plus loin, p. 234.
18 Le long du bord, à l’envers sur la photographie, fragment d’une inscription persane, en écriture cursive: ...ه‌ر تا تک‌کان... (le dernier mot est sans doute ک‌کانار). 19 Fragment d’une inscription en écriture naskhi.
ou à un schématique rinceau (No. 52), que recouvrent, plus ou moins denses, les habituelles trainées et mouchetures peintes.

**SÉRIE 2, CÉRAMIQUE VERT-FONCÉ, SANS DÉCOR PEINT (Nos. 54, 57, 58)**

Hormis quelques tessons, on ne connaît de cette série qu’une seule pièce. C’est un grand vase (No. 54), à panse bombée et haut bord recourbé vers l’extérieur (fig. 1, e), entièrement peint en vert et glacé sur les deux faces (sauf le piedoncule). À l’intérieur, trois bandeaux horizontaux, ornés chacun d’un entrelacs ou d’un rinceau, divisent la paroi en deux zones où s’inscrivent des ellipses; la surface de ces ellipses est tantôt unie, tantôt couverte d’“écailles” gravées (zone supérieure, invisible sur la photo), tantôt enfin ornée d’une sorte de rosette (zone inférieure, cf. fig. 4, a). Entre les ellipses s’enlèvent des rinceaux finement découpés (“champlevé”); le fond du vase n’est pas décoré.

A l’extérieur, sous un entrelacs parallèle au bord, la paroi est couverte de larges figures piriformes, ornées chacune d’un fleuron à pédoncule (fig. 4, b) ou d’une rosette (fig. 4, a), et séparées les unes des autres par des écailles ou des rinceaux.

On retrouve sur les tessons cette ordonnance géométrique: juxtaposition d’ellipses au No. 57, juxtaposition de figures piriformes, tantôt droites, tantôt renversées, au No. 58. Entre ces figures unies, le champ est couvert de vrilles gravées, comme à la série 1.

**SÉRIE 3, CÉRAMIQUE JAUNE-FAUVE, SANS DÉCOR PEINT (Nos. 55, 56, 59)**

Les fragments de cette série sont également rares. Deux d’entre eux appartiennent, semble-t-il, à de grandes coupes, ornées de thèmes épigraphiques (No. 59) ou de fleurons et rinceaux (Nos. 55, 59). Un autre tesson (No. 56) est un fond, sur lequel trois bandeaux ornés d’écailles rayonnent vers le bord, comme au no. 38.

**COMMENTAIRE, GROUPE A**

1. Dans ces trois séries, le répertoire décoratif demeure fort pauvre; et c’est plutôt la *technique ornementale* qui permet d’établir les premiers liens entre la poterie de Bamiyan et l’ensemble de la céramique musulmane.

L’usage du trait gravé pour agrémenter les surfaces apparaît, il est vrai, dès le neuvième siècle, sur des poteries de Samarra par exemple, et n’est en aucune façon un critère convenable de classification, historique ou géographique. En revanche, le procédé de gravure dit “champlevé”, qui seul ici donne à quelques pièces une certaine qualité artisanale, appartient en propre à un groupe relativement homogène de céramiques iraniennes, mieux localisées dans l’espace et le temps.

C’est, semble-t-il, au onzième siècle qu’apparaît dans le nord de la Perse ce mode de gravure, les fouilles de Lushkari-Bazar en ont

---

Fig. 4—a, b, Ornements du no. 54. c, d, Ornements du no. 7.

---

20 A. Lane, *Early Islamic pottery*, London, 1947 (cité plus bas sous l’abréviation *EIP*), p. 25 et pl. 30B.
montré l'extension vers l'Afghanistan, où, à la fin du onzième siècle, la gravure, par incision simple ou par découpage (champlévé) succède à la peinture sur engobe dans la poterie locale. Les séries à décor gravé, avec ou sans mouchetures peintes, subsistent seules à Lashkari-Bazar tout au long du douzième siècle, sous la domination des Ghories; leur présence sur un autre site d'Afghanistan, capitale d'un état ghoride jusqu'au début du treizième siècle, n'est donc pas pour surprendre.

Toutefois, rares sont les pièces de Bamiyan que des analogies ornementales plus précises que cette seule identité des procédés apparentent aux poteries de Lashkari-Bazar. Le No. 38 est, de cette parenté, l'unique mais remarquable exemple: ses rubans et ellipses gravés et mouchetés sont en effet l'ornementation caractéristique de toute une série de céramiques à Lashkari-Bazar. Par ailleurs, l'ordonnance et les ornements diffèrent d'un site à l'autre; dans quelle mesure sont-ils, à Bamiyan, originaux?

2. L'ordonnance la mieux caractérisée est, on l'a dit, une juxtaposition de figures géométriques, souvent coupées chacune, ou séparées l'une de l'autre, par un bandeau vertical, entrelacs, torsade, etc. ... Cet agencement apparaît sur des poteries de Suse, que l'on donne au neuvième siècle, puis sur des céramiques fabriquées dans le nord de l'Iran au cours des deux ou trois siècles suivants.

Dans certains cas, l'ordonnance géométrique semble dériver de représentations florales: ainsi aux Nos. 1, 24, 25, où l'on peut voir une fleur à 4 ou à 6 pétales. Ce passage d'un ornement figuratif à une disposition géométrique, que l'on observe aussi sur les poteries à décor gravé de Lashkari-Bazar, invite à rechercher le moment et le lieu où paraîtraient, sur d'éventuels modèles, les thèmes originaux, non encore décomposés. A Lashkari-Bazar, cette recherche conduit à l'énumération de poteries fort dispersées, de Palestine au Turkestan, du neuvième au onzième siècle, mais dont un caractère commun semble être l'inspiration par des thèmes ornementaux de la céramique chinoise. Cette hypothèse se trouve ici confirmée par l'ordonnance particulière du No. 40. En effet, les 9 figures ogivales disposées autour du centre de ce plat rappellent singulièrement les représentations du lotus, à 6 ou 8 pétales généralement, sur les plats chinois d'époque Tang. A propos de ce décor, on a aussi évoqué des documents scythes, qui pouvaient en effet expliquer la persistance du thème dans l'est de l'Iran à l'époque musulmane.

Il est néanmoins plus plausible de l'attribuer à l'influence de la céramique chinoise, dont la poterie musulmane est alors largement tributaire; dans le cas du plat de Bamiyan cependant, cet emprunt à la Chine est tout à fait indirect, puisque ce genre de décor figure déjà sur des poteries de deux ou trois siècles.

De même, les figures piriformes (Nos. 1, 12, et 22) pourraient être un souvenir du motif oriental composé de deux demi-feuilles incurvées, symétriques par rapport à un axe vertical; celles-ci du moins paraissent bien esquissées sur le bol publié par J. Hackin (supra, note 3).


Ibid., série XI-1, note 1.


plus anciennes\textsuperscript{30} et qu'il apparaît d'ailleurs ici fortement décomposé.\textsuperscript{31}

On trouvera de même dans la poterie musulmane de la Perse des exemples de la plupart des motifs utilisés à Bamiyan; c'est ce qu'il faut maintenant montrer.

3. À l'ornementation épigraphique, il est naturellement malaisé d'attribuer une origine précise, tant l'utilisation de l'écriture est fréquente sur la céramique musulmane antérieure. Elle ne prend cependant toute sa valeur ornementale que sur les grands plats de Samarqand vers le dixième siècle,\textsuperscript{32} et plus tard sur les poteries à décor "champlevé" de l'Iran du nord,\textsuperscript{33} dont elle constitue, comme au No. 5, l'unique décor. Sans doute le caractère très simple de l'écriture, à peine agrémentée ici de quelques boucles (fig. 2, 3), différencie-t-il clairement une poterie de Bamiyan d'une poterie de Yastkand (Iran du nord); la similitude des techniques et des teintes invite pourtant à supposer une certaine relation historique entre ces différentes pièces.

4. Les ornements géométriques confirment cette relation. Ainsi, les poteries iraniennes à décor champlevé offrent maints exemples de torskadés (No. 40),\textsuperscript{34} postes (No. 2),\textsuperscript{35} ruban tressé (Nos. 31, 33),\textsuperscript{36} noeud tressé (No. 40),\textsuperscript{37} zigzag (No. 40),\textsuperscript{38} vrilles et volutes (No. 9),\textsuperscript{39} écailles (No. 32) et quadrillage (No. 5),\textsuperscript{40} motifs qui constituent l'essentiel de l'ornamentation géométrique au groupe A. Mi-géométriques, mi-végétaux, les ornements particuliers au No. 54 (fig. 4a, b), voisins de ceux, plus rudimentaires, du No. 7 (fig. 4c, d), évoquent des motifs usuels sur les bronces du douzième siècle,\textsuperscript{41} ces rapports entre le décor gravé de la céramique et l'art contemporain du métal sont assez bien connus\textsuperscript{42} pour qu'on ne cherche pas à les souligner davantage ici.

5. De même, les motifs végétaux de la série 1 sont semblables à quelques-uns de ceux, plus nombreux, qui ornent les poteries de l'Iran septentrional: fleurons allongés, trilobés (No. 10),\textsuperscript{43} ou polylobés, avec une fente centrale (No. 48),\textsuperscript{44} fleurons et rinceaux finement découpés autour d'une inscription (No. 59).\textsuperscript{45} Toutefois, devant la facture souvent bien schématique de ces motifs (Nos. 15, 29), on ne saurait poursuivre aucun rapprochement particulier. Notons néanmoins le rinceau mieux caractérisé que l'on voit se répétter aux Nos. 20, 21, et 54, en d'étroits rubans. Il est en effet plus facile de reconnaître ailleurs ce même rinceau, composé de demi-acanthes toutes dirigées dans (No. 4806), l'autre dans la collection personnelle de M. Rabenou.

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. note 27, et plus spécialement, le bol de la collection Sir Alan Barlow, Nishapur ou Samarqand, 10 siècle?; Lane, EIP, pl. 19 A; Survey, pl. 561: entre les arcades, au nombre de 8, apparaissent les mêmes petits triangles qu'au No. 40.

\textsuperscript{31} Le nombre impair des arcades (neuf), au No. 40, illustre bien l'oubli du motif original: "a quatrefoil with the calyx revealed in the diagonals" (Pope, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1502).

\textsuperscript{32} Lane, EIP, pl. 14 B et 15 B.


\textsuperscript{34} Survey, pl. 610 B, en marge du bol.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., pl. 586 B, autour du fond.

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., pl. 586 A.

\textsuperscript{37} Ce motif figure au centre de deux grands plats que l'on dit provenir d'Amol, tous deux exposés à Téhéran en octobre 1952, l'un au Musée archéologique
le même sens, de part et d’autre d’une tige sinuose : c’est encore sur les poteries originales du nord de l’Iran qu’on en trouve le plus d’exemples.46

La persistance de cet ornement sur la céramique à décor champlévé, de Bûst47 à Antioche,48 aux environs du douzième siècle, laisse entrevoir la place de la poterie de Bamiyan dans cette vaste catégorie.

6. Quant aux représentations animales, elles sont, on l’a vu (p. 231), trop rares, trop rudimentaires aussi, pour prêter à des comparaisons serrées.49 Sur la céramique des provinces caspiennes au contraire, le décor animalier est l’un des plus caractéristiques50 ; faut-il expliquer cette différence par l’inhabité des potiers de Bamiyan ? La qualité de certaines exécutions la dément, ainsi au No. 40 ; au demeurant, le dessin des animaux, sur les poteries de Yastkand, est souvent d’une extrême simplicité, facilement imitable. Faut-il voir là une possible préférence de l’artisan pour l’ornementation géométrique, conformément à une tendance, ou à une mode propres à ces régions ?51 Le matériel recueilli à Bamiyan est trop peu important, en tout sens du mot, pour que l’on puisse, à son propos, énoncer de telles lois.

7. Conclusion.—Malgré cette différence, les céramiques de Bamiyan, dans le groupe A, apparaissent au terme de cette étude comme des variétés de la poterie à décor gravé, qui se répand, vraisemblablement à partir du onzième siècle (cf. Note 52), autour des régions septentrionales de l’Iran.

A cette conclusion, on peut objecter que la poterie à décor gravé n’est nullement homogène, qu’elle comprend plusieurs genres distincts, différemment localisés dans le temps et l’espace, et qu’il importait de reconnaître les attaches particulières de la céramique de Bamiyan à l’un quelconque de ces genres. Il est deux raisons pourtant de n’en rien faire : c’est que d’une part, la détermination de ces différentes “écoles” repose encore sur des données bien fragiles. Le matériel ainsi classé provient en effet pour une large part des magasins d’antiquaires, où l’on donne comme lieu de trouvaille non pas une ville, mais souvent une province ; quant aux “fouilles commerciales” qui maintenant alimentent les musées, si elles viennent heureusement préciser ce point, elles n’apportent cependant aucune lumière sur les problèmes de chronologie, même relative. En deuxième lieu, il paraît certain que parmi les “écoles” auxquelles nous avons emprunté des éléments de comparaison, aucune n’est postérieure à l’époque où se font les poteries de Bamiyan publiées ici. En effet, ces dernières, on l’a dit (p. 228), ne peuvent être antérieures de plus de quelques décades au raid mongol de 1221 ; tandis que pour les poteries à décor gravé de l’Iran du nord,

46 Ibid., pl. 584 B, 620, et 622 ; Pézard, op. cit., pl. 24, fig. 1. L’histoire de ce rinceau peut offrir ici quelque intérêt. On le rencontre sur des pièces d’argenterie “sassanide” (R. Ghirshman, Notes iraniennes, 5, Artibus Asiae, vol. 16, 1/2 [1953], pp. 53 et 60), et, plus anciennement, sur des miroirs chinois d’époque Han (M. Rostovtzeff, Inlaid bronzes of the Han Dynasty, in the collection of C. T. Loo, Paris, 1927, p. 36, fig. 19, pl. 18, 1 et 2 ; et au Victoria and Albert Museum No. M. 16–1933). Soit que l’art persan et l’art chinois aient tous deux subi, par l’intermédiaire du Turkestan et du Gandhara, l’influence du décor végétal hellénistique (Rostovtzeff, loc. cit., p. 54 s.), soit que l’Iran ait ultérieurement pris à la Chine, par le même chemin, un ornement qu’elle avait inventé, ou seulement modifié au contact de l’Occident, on se trouve réduit aux régions orientales de l’Iran pour placer l’apparition de ce rinceau dans l’art sassanide. C’est ce dont il faut tenir compte lorsqu’on étudie son passage à l’art musulman, et sinugérièremment à la poterie.

47 Lashkari-Bazar, série XI–2, No. 485.


49 On doit cependant noter la similitude de certaines dispositions : animaux sur fond strié (No. 39), ou entourés de rinceaux (No. 26), comme sur des poteries de l’Iran du nord : Survey, pl. 583 et 614 A, respectivement.

50 Ex. : Survey, pl. 614 à 617.

51 Lashkari-Bazar, cf. “Conclusion,” où se trouve proposée une hypothèse analogue.
tout ensemble, la période de fabrication la plus longue que l’on puisse actuellement envisager s’étend, semble-t-il, de la fin du dixième siècle jusqu’aux invasions mongoles de 1220–1230.

L’ensemble des rapprochements précédents se trouve ainsi justifié. On peut cependant se demander s’il n’est pas possible d’y découvrir certaines liaisons plus fortes que d’autres, et de reconnaître par là, dans cette céramique iranienne, une espèce plus particulièrement apparentée au groupe A de Bamiyan.

Certains types, en effet, n’ont fourni que peu ou point de termes de comparaison: ce sont


d’une part les “lakabi” dits d’Aghkand, et de l’autre, les céramiques à décor gravé (mais non champlevé) et peint, attribués à Amol. D’autres au contraire ont été souvent cités: ainsi les poteries monochromes à décor gravé ou champlevé, attribuées à Rayy, parfois aussi à Amol, et d’autre part, les poteries à décor champlevé agrémenté de traits peintes, attribuées à Yastkand, dans la région de Garrûs. Aux premières appartiennent plus particulièrement les ornementations géométriques, aux secondes les décors épigraphiques et végétaux; aux premières, la gravure sur fond strié, aux secondes, le champlevé proprement dit; aux premières enfin la monochromie (vert ou jaune, comme aux séries 2 et 3), aux secondes les traitées peintes, ornements et procédés tous également attestés au groupe A de Bamiyan, mais sans qu’il soit possible de distinguer plus avant des correspondances sérielles.

Ces rapports, si lâches soient-ils parfois, entre certaines poteries de l’Iran du nord (Rayy, Amol, Yastkand) d’une part, et celles de Bamiyan de l’autre, apportent quelque lumière aux problèmes de datation. Il devient en effet difficile d’accepter maintenant, dans quelques

54 Lane, EIP, pp. 25–26; Survey, vol. 2, p. 1326. Le procédé ornemental—décoiffage de larges motifs (champlevé), peints en teintes différentes de celle du fond sur lequel ils se détachent—est inconnu à Bamiyan.

55 Lane, EIP, p. 26; Survey, vol. 2, p. 1327. Les mouchetures caractéristiques de ces poteries, associées à des motifs gravés simples (vrilles, torsades) que l’on trouve aussi sur des pièces de Bamiyan (série 1), suggèrent un certain degré de parenté; de même la superposition de filets peints sur les motifs gravés (Survey, pls. 626 à 629), connus aux Nus. 5, 24. Mais les différences l’emporent: sur les poteries d’Amol, vastes compositions dissymétriques, ornements décomposés, mouchetures par grappes, etc., inconnus à Bamiyan.

56 Lane, EIP, p. 25.


58 Lane, EIP, p. 26; Survey, vol. 2, p. 1330 s.

59 Cf. note 57.
cas précis au moins, de trop grandes écarts chronologiques entre les premières, d'époque encore mal connue, et les seconde, contemporaines de la souveraineté ghoriide ou khwarezmienne à Bamiyan (fin douzième — début treizième siècle).

Nous n'en prendrons pour exemple que le grand plat du Musée de Téhéran, déjà cité, censé provenir d'Amol. Semblable au No. 40 par la forme et la couleur, orné comme ce dernier, en champévé, d'un noeud tressé au centre et d'un zigzag sur le marli, ce plat est sans doute postérieur de deux ou trois siècles à celui qu'on lui assigne, le dixième. De ce parallèle, on serait tenté d'étendre l'inférence à l'ensemble de la poterie dite d'Amol (cf. note 37) dont fait partie ce plat; mais on se heurte à l'objection déjà soulevée: il n'y a pas encore de "céramique d'Amol" bien objective-ment caractérisée. On pourra seulement suggérer que pour certaines autres pièces, qui, comme le plat de Téhéran, présentent quelque analogie avec des poteries de Bamiyan, la date n'est pas non plus aussi haute qu'on l'avance généralement. Tel serait par exemple le cas du plat de la collection MacIlhenny, avec ses vrilles en rubans, son rinceau de demi-akanthes, et celui du compotier de l'Art Institute à Chicago, qu'une inscription, de lecture contestée, fit passer successivement du dixième siècle au quinzième siècle. Aujourd'hui M. Ettinghausen m'assure qu'il "ne pense pas que cette inscription puisse être tenue pour une date" et en vérité, entre les deux années proposées (383 H. et 836 H.), une moyenne plus approximative (le douzième siècle) paraît aussi plus probable. Non pas certes au nom de la logique, mais pour la présence sur ce comptoir d'un décor champévé de même style que sur les poteries précédemment citées. Plus précisément, on n'ose à peine rapprocher les deux larges rubans tressés qui ornent cette pièce, du même motif aux Nos. 33 et 43 à Bamiyan, car ce sont ces tresses même que l'on a invoquées pour confirmer l'attribution du compotier d'abord au dixième siècle, puis au quinzième siècle. Il semble que de tels écarts puissent être mainten-ant évités.

B. DÉCOR MOULÉ (Nos. 60 à 66)

Les poteries à décor en relief, moulé, sont d'une toute autre nature que les précédentes. En premier lieu, les matériaux et techniques de fabrication ne sont pas les mêmes: la pâte, de teinte jaunâtre, est rugueuse, peu homogène; elle reçoit directement, sans interposition d'engobe, un émail bleu (série 4) ou blanc (série 5), qui recouvre non seulement l'intérieur, mais aussi la majeure partie de la paroi externe des pièces. En l'absence d'engobe, l'imparfaite cohésion de la pâte et de l'émail lors de la cuisson est la cause de fréquentes craquelures (No. 64).

En deuxième lieu, toutes les pièces sont ici des bols (diamètre 12 à 17 cm.), dont la paroi, plus mince qu'à la série précédente (0,4 à 0,6 cm.), s'évase régulièrement, à peine incurvée, jusqu'au bord. En outre, le fond, plat ou légèrement concave, repose sur un piédouche évidé en forme d'anneau (fig. 1, e).

Quant au décor, il se réduit à quelques ornements géométriques, qui apparaissent en léger relief, inscrits dans un médaillon circulaire sur le fond et dans un bandeau horizontal sur la

60 Cf. note 37.
61 Le noeud tressé qui orne le fond figure aussi au centre d'un plat en bronze (Musée de Téhéran, No. 3495), attribué à la fin du 12e siècle; c'est cette même date approximative qu'il faudrait selon nous assigner au plat d'Amol.
62 Survey, pl. 622: "Amol, 11e s. (?).
63 Ibid., pl. 586 A, "11e s. (?)."
64 Ibid., vol. 2, p. 1508.
66 Lettre personnelle du 4-2-1953.

67 Néanmoins le rapprochement aurait ici pour lui de ne mettre en balance que des poteries, apparentées déjà par la technique du décor (champévé), au lieu de miniatures dans un cas (Pope, loc. cit.), ou de bronzes dans l'autre (Day, loc. cit.).
paroi. Ce relief des motifs, comme aussi la forme largement ouverte des bols, invitent à penser que ces dernier étaient moulés sur des matrices tronconiques, ornées des mêmes motifs gravés en creux (cf. ci-dessous, note 68).

Sur les bols blancs (série 5), quelques touches brunes ou bleues échelonnées sur le bord complètent l’ornementation.

SÉRIE 4. CÉRAMIQUE BLEUE (Nos. 60 à 63)

Les thèmes ornementaux sont, sur les bols bleus, les suivants: sur le fond, dans un cercle, soit une croix grecque, dont les branches encadrent ou supportent, deux à deux, de petits motifs en forme de cœur (Nos. 60, 61, 62); soit, au No. 63, un sceau de Salomon. Dans ce dernier, l’hexagone central est lui-même orné d’une figure semblable, plus petite, tandis que des chevrons, appuyés sur les branches, entre les sommets, font du motif une sorte d’étoile à 12 pointes (fig. 5). Ces différents ornement sont jalonnés de quelques tout petits points en relief, en tête d’épingle.

Sur la paroi, dans un bandeau horizontal, on trouve soit une sorte de rinceau, aux ramifica-
cations très irrégulières, de part et d’autre d’une ligne ondulée (No. 62); soit des figures piriformes, alternativement droites ou renversées (Nos. 60, 61);68 soit enfin, au No. 63, une suite de lettres arabes souvent bien formées, mais qui ne permettent, semble-t-il, aucune lecture. Cette dernière pièce est la seule des poteries bleues à porter en outre, sur le bord, quelques touches de peinture brune.

SÉRIE 5. CÉRAMIQUE BLANCHE
(Nos. 64 à 66)

Les ornements en relief, dans cette série, ne diffèrent guère des précédents. Ce sont, sur le fond, le sceau de Salomon (No. 64) d’une part, et de l’autre, sinon la croix, du moins les quatre petits motifs en cœur disposés en croix (Nos. 65, 66), comme au fond des bols bleus; sur la paroi, le rinceau schématique (No. 64), les figures piriformes (No. 65), et au No. 66, un thème d’origine épigraphique, où des “S” renversés alternent avec des hampes fourchues aux deux extrémités.

Sur toutes ces poteries, le bord est jalonné de petites touches de peinture brun-manganèse ou bleu-cobalt, parmi lesquelles figurent invariablement trois paires un peu plus longues, placées à égales distances l’une de l’autre. Le fond porte toujours aussi, au centre, une tache peinte, parfois en virgule ou en chevron.

COMMENTAIRE, GROUPE B

1. Ici comme au groupe précédent, les ornement sont pauvres et peu variés, et c’est au premier chef la technique de fabrication qui révèlera l’origine de ce type de poteries.

En effet, pâte sableuse et rugueuse, absence d’engobe, glacure épaisse, vitreuse, souvent craquelée, ce sont là les caractères de la céramique nouvelle qui vers la fin du onzième siècle

68 Ces deux bols présentent un décor identique jusque dans les plus fines configurations du dessin, ce qui confirme l’hypothèse du moulage sur des matrices.
ou le début du douzième siècle apparaît en Iran.

2. Sans doute le décor de cette céramique dite “seljukide”, souvent riche et très habile, n’a-t-il guère en commun avec l’ornementation rudimentaire des bols moulés de Bamiyan. La technique du moulage cependant est elle-même un signe de leur parenté; en effet, maintes de ces poteries iraniennes doivent le relief de leur décor non à l’ébaucher, mais au moule où, encore fraîches, on les engageait.

D’autre part, l’alternance des tons bleus ou blancs, ou, sur ces derniers, l’usage des touches peintes, brun-manganèse ou bleu-cobalt, sont autant de traits communs aux poteries de la Perse et à leurs imitations provinciales de Bamiyan.

Ici cependant s’arrête le parallèle, car on ne décèle pas de thèmes ornementaux communs aux unes et aux autres. A Bamiyan, ce ne sont que de banals motifs, empruntés à la décoration musulmane de tous lieux et de tous âges — scene de Salomon, quatre coeurs disposés en croix — analogues parfois à des motifs du groupe A — ainsi les figures piriformes alternées. D’autre part, avec les ornementes “épigraphiques” des nos. 63 et 66, avec le “rinceau” du no. 62, on est bien loin vraiment des inscriptions et feuillages éminemment décoratifs de la céramique seljukide.

3. Un tel écart stylistique ne fait sans doute que traduire la distance qui sépare cette dernière dans le temps comme dans l’espace, des poteries moulées de Bamiyan. Celles-ci, fabriquées dans les quelques décades qui précèdent l’invasion mongole, viennent en effet environ 100 ou 120 ans après l’époque où l’on s’accorde généralement à placer le début de la production de ce genre de céramique en Iran.

C. DÉCOR PEINT (Nos. 67-70)

On ne peut caractériser cette série d’aucune autre façon que par la technique ornementale: ni gravure, ni moulage, mais peinture du décor, sous glaçure. Selon que la poterie comporte un engobe (No. 69) ou non (Nos. 67, 68, 70), la nature de la pâte varie, de la même façon qu’elle change du groupe A au groupe B. Quant aux formes et décors, ils sont particuliers à chacune des pièces groupées dans cette série.

1. Assiettes. Il existe au Musée de Caboul plusieurs fragments de ces petites assiettes blanches (ex. No. 67), d’un diamètre de 14 à 15 cm, apparentées à la série 5 par la nature de la pâte et de l’email, l’absence d’engobe, la forme annulaire du plédouche, et enfin, le décor peint, réduit à de petites touches de pinceau échelonnées long du bord.

De forme voisine (fig. 1, k), l’assiette No. 68 est remarquable en revanche par l’originalité


78 Cf. ci-dessus, p. 228.

79 Lane, EIP, p. 34; Survey, vol. 2, pp. 1510, 1521. Cette datation est confirmée par l’apparition à Lashkari-Bazar, après 1150, d’une céramique du même type; Lashkari-Bazar, série XIV–2.
Poteries de Bamiyan, Nos. 1 à 6.
Poteries de Bamiyan, Nos. 7 à 23.
Poteries de Bamiyan, Nos. 24a à 32.
Poteries de Bamiyan, Nos. 33 à 50.
Poteries de Bamiyan, Nos. 51 à 62.
Poteries de Bamiyan, Nos. 63 à 70.
relative de son décor peint. Six rubans brun-noirs rayonnant du centre divisent le champ en six secteurs triangulaires, ornés alternativement d’une simple vrille verticale, ou d’un réseau de tigettes mouchetées, au milieu desquelles se détachent, sur de petites surfaces réservées, un ou deux croissants. Les trois secteurs décorés de ces réseaux portent en outre quelques taches diffuses, bleu-vert pâle, également présentes sur le marli, où elles alternent avec des groupes de 2 bâtonnets ou de 3 points de teinte brun-noir; un filet de même couleur court sur la tranche du bord.

2. Vases. Également original, le vase No. 69 est unique parmi les poteries de Bamiyan, tant par la forme — sorte d’albarello en réduction (fig. 1, l) — que par la décoration peinte. Le thème majeur est un ornement composé de deux demi-feuilles verticales, symétriques par rapport au point central du motif, qui dessinent ainsi une sorte de “S”; des incisions pratiquées dans le pigment découvrent l’engobe, et indiquent ainsi, en blanc sur noir, les nervures des feuilles. Cet ornement se répète quatre fois sur la paroi, où, entre deux rubans noirs horizontaux, chargés de quelques “bourgeons”, il alterne avec des surfaces de teinte jaune-brique, parsemées de petites incisions qui font aussi apparaître l’engobe blanc.

Sur l’épaule, dans un bandeau de même teinte, sont peints, entremêlés de chevrons et de virgules, des signes noirs dont l’origine et la signification nous échappent.80

Quant au vase no. 70, c’est aussi un albarello, mais de dimensions moins réduites, monté sur un piédouche annulaire. La paroi cylindrique est légèrement côtelée; dans les sillons verticaux, l’émail bleu-pâle prend des colorations foncées.

80 Il peut s’agir d’un texte pseudo-épigraphique; mais l’écriture arabe, sous la plume du calligraphe le plus ignorant, n’a jamais échappé à de tels signes. Est-ce une réminiscence d’écriture étrangère, de l’Inde ou de la Chine?

COMMENTAIRE, GROUPE C

La relative rareté des pièces, et leur hétérogénéité dans ce groupe, ne permettent pas une étude comparative d’ensemble, et l’on ne peut que suggérer des rapprochements particuliers pour chacune d’elles.

1. L’assiette No. 68.—La forme est ici l’indice le plus clair de son origine. En effet, on reconnaît en ce récipient creux, à marli plat, un type spécifique des poteries de Raqqah.81 Sur ces assiettes mésopotamiennes, à décor noir sous glaçure incolore, le marli est souvent orné, comme ici, de paires de bâtonnets régulièrement espacés,82 et parfois agrémenté en outre de quelques taches bleu-cobalt,83 également présentes, mais diffuses, dans la partie creuse des assiettes.84

De même, les tigettes mouchetées apparaissent sur des assiettes de Raqqah,85 autour de motifs peints sur des surfaces réservées, comme le sont ici les croissants.86

Ces analogies ne laissent aucun doute sur la parenté qui unit l’assiette de Bamiyan aux poteries de Raqqah. On notera cependant que l’ordonnance rayonnante qui caractérise la première est peu fréquente à Raqqah, où dominent les compositions figuratives (animaux, personnages, festivités) qui couvrent tout le champ. En revanche, cet agencement apparaît souvent sur les poteries persanes contemporaines, de Rayy87 ou de Kashan.88

81 Lane, EIP, pl. 57 B, 59 A, 78, 80 B, 81 B; J. Sauvaget, Tesson de Rabha, Ars Islamica, vol. 13-14 (1948), fig. 11, No. 82.
82 Lane, EIP, pl. 57 B, 59 A; vestiges, semble-t-il, des “alif-lâm” d’un thème pseudo-épigraphique plusieurs fois répété sur le marli: ex. EIP, pl. 78Aet B.
83 M. S. Dimand, Handbook of Mohammedan art 2e éd., New York, 1944, p. 192, fig. 123.
84 Lane, EIP, pl. 79 B.
85 Dimand, loc. cit., p. 192, fig. 122; Lane, loc. cit., pl. 57 B.
87 Hobson, Guide, p. 39, fig. 44; Survey, pl. 648.
88 Ibid., pl. 734 A, 735, 736 B, 737 B.
De Rayy à Raqqaqah, et jusqu’en Egypte, la céramique à décor peint sous glaçure, lustrée ou non, remplace vers la fin du douzième siècle les poteries à décor en relief de la période seljoukide. C’est à cette céramique nouvelle qu’appartiennent l’assiette de Bamiyan.  

2. Le vase No. 69.—De même, sans doute, cette pièce; mais les signes de parenté sont ici moins nombreux. La forme d’une part est celle d’un albarelo, moins haut mais de même forme que certains vases lustrés, dans la céramique de la fin du douzième siècle. En second lieu, l’allure des feuilles, longues, courbes, et pointues et surtout leur association par paires, avec le milieu du motif pour centre de symétrie, évoquent certains éléments de feuillage caractéristiques de la même poterie lustrée.  

On a trouvé qu’un seul tesson, à Shahr-e Gholghola, qui puisse témoigner d’un essai d’application de la technique du lustre métallique.  

On pourrait penser que cette pièce, l’unique du genre parmi les poteries de Bamiyan, fut apportée là de l’ouest par quelque marchand. Rien ne s’oppose à cette hypothèse, mais rien non plus ne l’impose; car entre les petites assiettes blanches d’une part, ornées de quelques touches peintes sur le marbre, et de l’autre, cette pièce, avec son décor plus élaboré, mais nullement savant, l’écart n’est pas si grand qu’il peut paraître. Si les premières sont de fabrication locale—et le nombre de fragments que l’on en trouve à Bamiyan invite à le penser—il n’y a guère de raisons pour supposer qu’il en aille différemment de la seconde.  

3. Le vase No. 70.—Cette pièce est aussi apparentée, par la forme, aux albarelos persans de la fin du douzième ou du début du treizième siècle, quant à sa couleur bleu-turquoise, c’est une des teintes les plus communes de la céramique monochrome à la même époque, non seulement dans les grands centres, Rayy ou Kashan, mais aussi dans les ateliers secondaires.  

CONCLUSION

Décor gravé, décor moulé, décor peint, aucun n’offre une originalité véritable: l’atelier de céramique que l’on voit naître au coeur de l’Hindou-Kush, dans, ou après la deuxième moitié du douzième siècle, emprunte la plupart de ses recettes à l’artisanat de l’Iran, plus particulièrement l’Iran septentrional.  

Reste à préciser, si on le peut, le moment où s’ouvre à Bamiyan cet atelier. Si le raid mongol...
de 1221 marque d’une façon sûre le terme de la fabrication, il n’est en revanche aucun évènement particulier que l’on puisse associer à l’établissement de l’artisanat.

Un point pourtant demeure acquis: c’est que cette céramique est postérieure au milieu du douzième siècle. C’est en effet dans la deuxième moitié de ce siècle que Bamiyan reprend l’importance que la conquête musulmane lui avait ravie. Lorsqu’ʿAlā al-Dīn Jahānsūz, prince du pays de Ghor, s’empare vers 1150 de Ghazni, puis de Bust, l’empire ghaznévide échoit à sa famille: son fils Saif al-Dīn lui succède à Firuzkoh, dans le Ghor, tandis que son frère, Fājr al-Dīn Masʿūd reçoit la principauté de Bamiyan. Ce petit état bientôt s’étend au nord jusqu’à l’Oxus, sa prospérité grandit jusqu’à la fin du douzième siècle, lorsque des dissensions entre les princes de Bamiyan et de Ghazni viennent en entraver l’expansion: vers 1215, ces deux villes et leurs dépendances tombent aux mains du sultan du Khwarezm, Muhammad, bientôt maître de l’ensemble des territoires ghoridaux, de Hérat à la frontière de l’Inde.

Il serait ainsi plausible de placer vers 1175, à quelque dix ou vingt ans près, la naissance de l’artisanat despotiers à Bamiyan. À cette époque, Hérat est occupée par les princes de Firuzkoh, 3

1° ...to the boundary of Wakhsh and Badakhshan” ibid. p. 424.
3 Rappelons encore les fondements archéologiques de cette hypothèse, qui interdisent une datation plus haute: à Lashkari-Bazar, les types de poterie apparentés au groupe A de Bamiyan (groupe XI) sont parmi les plus tardifs, postérieurs au 11e siècle; un autre (série XIV–2), analogue à la série 5, apparaît après 1150; enfin, certaines catégories de Bamiyan (série 4 et groupe C) sont absentes à Lashkari-Bazar, dont l’activité semble s’étendre peu à peu dès la fin du 12e siècle, avant même l’arrivée des Mongols (cf. Lashkari-Bazar, Conclusion).
4 Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion, p. 338.

qui s’avancent ainsi jusqu’au terme de la grande route caravanière du Khorassan, de Rayy à Hérat. On peut imaginer que par cette voie, potiers et poteries de l’Iran du nord ont voyagé, pour pénétrer à travers le Ghor, le long de la vallée du Hari Rud, jusqu’à la capitale de l’état vassal, Bamiyan.

Il est pourtant une objection à cette hypothèse: c’est la rareté ailleurs qu’à Bamiyan même des types de poterie fabriqués dans cette ville. En effet, de 1175 à la destruction mongole s’écoulent environ cinquante ans. Cinquante ans, ce serait assez pour que la céramique de la capitale ait été diffusée, ou imitée, dans les régions voisines. Du moins est-il ainsi pour la céramique “samanide,” du Turkestan au Khorassan, pour la céramique “ghaznévide,” sa filleule, dispersée sur tant de sites au Makran, au Seistan, et au Khorassan, pour la céramique “ghoride” même, puisque les poteries à décor gravé et moucheté contemporaines de la domination ghorida à Lashkari-Bazar, parviennent jusqu’à Bamiyan, pour la céramique timuride enfin, dont on suit les traces de Balkh au Seistan. Si la diffusion rapide des différents types de poterie qui se succèdent en Afghanistan semble être ainsi la règle, pourquoi la céramique de Bamiyan est-elle au contraire si étroitement localisée qu’on ne la trouve, semble-t-il, nulle part ailleurs, pas même à Balkh, cité pourtant la plus importante aux approches de Bamiyan? 5

4 Cf. Lashkari-Bazar, Conclusion.
5 Cf. No. 38, note 16.
6 Le matériel recueilli au cours des fouilles de Balkh sera prochainement publié: la poterie timuride y occupe une large place: J. C. Gardin, Céramiques de Bactres, Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan, vol. 15, à paraître.
7 Simon à Sar-Koshak, autre citadelle perchée sur une colline, à une trentaine de kilomètres de Bamiyan sur la route qui, par la gorge de Shikari, conduit à Balkh. On y trouve surtout des tessons de la série 6.
8 Ce fait sera noté dans l’étude annoncée à la note 6: la poterie “bleue et blanche” du 14e siècle succède directement aux imitations tardives de la céramique de type transoxien.
9 Sur l’annexion de Balkh par Bahā al-Dīn Sām,

10 Ibn al-Athir, op. cit., vol. 12, pp. 149-152 (en 602 H./1205); Juwaini, Ta’rikhi-i-Jahân-Gushâ, éd. M. Qazwini (Gibb Memorial Series, vol. 16, 1 et 2, Leyden 1912-1916; seul le volume 2, The Khwârazm-Shah Dynasty, est cité), p. 64, sans date.

11 Juzjâni, Tab. Nâṣî, p. 267 (année 612 H./1215); Ibn al-Athir, op. cit., vol. 12, p. 202 (même date); Juwaini, op. cit., p. 85 (année 611 H./1214); Rashid al-Din, Jami’ al-tavârîkh, British Museum MS. Or. 1684, p. 325 (même date); Nasawi, Histoire du Sultan Djâlal ed-dîn Manjöbiti, trad. O. Houdas (Paris, 1895), pp. 5-6 (sans date). A l’article Bamiyan, Encyclopédie de l’Islam, vol. 1, p. 659, W. Barthold place en 609 H./1212-1213 le début de la suzeraineté khwarezmienne à Bamiyan, mais sans indiquer la source de cette date. On l’obtient par le calcul suivant: lorsque Jalâl al-Din ‘Ali est battu et tué à Bamiyan par Muhammad Khwarezmshah, il a régné 7 ans (Tab. Nâṣî, p. 434); or, il succède à Bahâ al-Din Sâm, dont la mort, selon Râvâyê, se placerait en 602 H. (ibid., 432, n. 2). Le Tabaqàt-e Nâṣîrî est en effet la source principale de Barthold (cf. la bibliographie); mais les données sont, on le voit, insuffisantes pour résoudre ce problème de datation.


13 La campagne de Muhammad contre le calife de chronologique de ces expéditions khwarezmien-nes vers l’est et vers l’ouest, il demeure que lorsque Muhammad s’empare de Bamiyan, il règne déjà sinon sur l’Iraq, du moins sur la Perse, et en particulier sur les provinces caspiennes.

Les quelques faits peuvent éclairer les rapports que l’on observe entre la campagne de l’Iran septentrional et celles de Bamiyan: l’artisanat serait né dans cette ville, moins par l’effet d’un commerce pacifique avec la Perse, à l’époque phasisée, que par suite d’une immigration de potiers, volontaire ou forcée, lors de la conquête khwarezmienne dans l’Hindu-Kush.


15 Cf. ci-dessus, note 111.


17 Cette conquête ne semble pas entraîner un déclin de prospérité dans les régions occupées; celles-ci sont confiées par Muhammad à son propre fils, Jalâl al-Din Mangoberti: Nasawi, op. cit., pp. 44-45; Tab. Nâṣî, p. 267; Juwaini, op. cit., p. 85; Rashid al-Din, op. cit.,
Dans cette hypothèse, la période de fabrication des poteries à Bamiyan ne serait plus que de six ou sept ans,\textsuperscript{18} brièveté nullement incompatible avec l'existence d'un artisanat florissant, et qui expliquerait néanmoins l'absence en Afghanistan d'aucune poterie strictement comparable à celles-ci.

Convenons cependant que la documentation est encore trop pauvre pour que la datation "ghoride" le doive absolument céder à la datation "khwarezmienne"; l'écart au demeurant ne dépasse pas cinquante ans.

\textsuperscript{18} De l'une des dates proposées plus haut, note 110: 609, 611, ou 612 H., à l'année de l'invasion mongols: 618 H.
THE OTTOMAN POTTERY OF ISNIK

BY ARTHUR LANE

For a century past the Ottoman painted pottery has enjoyed among western collectors the same high regard as the finest contemporary Italian majolica. But until some 30 years ago there was such a dearth of evidence regarding its date and origin that largely conjectural attributions were proposed for the well-marked stylistic groups into which it falls. Providing we recognize that these are now only convenient nicknames, we may still use "Abraham of Kutahia type" to describe the early blue-and-white pieces; "Damascus group" for those painted in blue, turquoise, sage green, and purple; "Golden Horn" for the pieces with a form of spiral ornament; and "Rhodian" for the most numerous class, those painted in "sealing-wax red," blue, turquoise, and green.

The first study of major importance devoted to these wares was a series of three articles published by G. Migeon and A. Sakisian in 1923-24—a survey of the whole field of Turkish ceramics from the Seljuk tile revetments of the thirteenth century down to the unpretending peasant pottery made at Kutahia in the eighteenth. The authors quoted documentary sources for the importance of Isnik as a ceramic center, to which they correctly attributed the early "Abraham of Kutahia" class and the later "Rhodian" wares; they accepted the traditional ascription of the "Damascus group" to Syria, and were the first to suggest that the spiral-decorated pieces were made, during the seventeenth century, in the Golden Horn district of Istanbul. In 1931 R. L. Hobson convincingly showed that in style and technique the "Damascus" wares were inseparable from the two classes already attributed to Isnik.2 Bernard Rackham, writing in 1934, developed Hobson's exposition into a reasoned system of chronology. He showed that the "Damascus" group fitted into the Isnik series between "Abraham of Kutahia" and "Rhodian," and that "Golden Horn" must also have been made at Isnik in the same period.3 Rackham also referred to a distinct class of Turkish-style pottery, undoubtedly made during the sixteenth century at Damascus, whose identity had already been pointed out in 1932 by Leigh Ashton.4 Papers by Tahsin Chukru (Tahsin Öz) in 19345 and R. M. Riefstahl, in 1937,6 though mainly concerned with tilework, contained valuable new documentation for the pottery vessels. The most recent study, published by Katharina Otto-Dorn in 1941,7 records the mainly negative results of excavations at Isnik, and has an admirable appendix by R. Anhegger quoting and commenting on a long series of Turkish and European documents referring to the Isnik potteries. Otto-Dorn's discussion of the pottery vessels leaves something to be desired, not only on the

---


ground of its incompleteness and lack of supporting illustrations; she rejects Rackham's chronology for the "Damascus" group, suggesting that this was made at Istanbul in the seventeenth century.

The present study was undertaken with the hope of defining more closely the chronological and stylistic development of Ottoman fine pottery vessels down to the middle of the sixteenth century. Particular attention has therefore been paid to the so-called "Abraham of Kutahia" and "Damascus" groups. But it would in any case have been necessary to refer to the early fifteenth-century tilework at Bursa and Edirne, which Riefstahl considered (erroneously, as I believe) to have been closely connected with the foundation of the Isnik potteries. And recent discoveries have tempted me to range still farther back, to the thirteenth century. It now seems more probable than before that some fine pottery vessels were made in Anatolia in Seljuq times, in addition to tiles. In the later period, the Ottoman pottery made at Damascus claims some attention, and so the study has grown into a random review of a much wider field than was at first intended. In gratefully acknowledging the information and photographs received from many sources, I would like, above all, to thank my friends Professor Kurt Erdmann of Istanbul, who has communicated important observations made on his travels in Anatolia, and Dr. Storm Rice of London, who has translated the inscriptions and given me much help in other ways. Dr. Richard Ettinghausen has gone far beyond the usual good offices of an editor in drawing my attention to material I would otherwise have missed.

I. THE SELJUQ PERIOD

It has hitherto seemed a curious paradox that no fine pottery vessels should have been made in Anatolia before, at earliest, the second half of the fifteenth century. For in one branch of ceramics, that of glazed-tile decoration applied to architecture, Anatolia in the thirteenth century surpassed all other countries of the Near East. The great series of Seljuq tile mosaics begins at the Alâeddin Mosque at Konya (617 H./A.D. 1220), and closes with the mihrab of the mosque at Birge, dated 712 H./A.D. 1312–13—about the time when the Seljuq dynasty of Rum collapsed. On tile mosaics in the Sirçahl Medrese at Konya (640 H./A.D. 1242), appears the inscription "Made by Muḥammad, the son of Muḥammad, the son of 'Othmân, architect of Tûs" (in Khorasan). This has been accepted by Sarre and others as evidence that the tile-mosaic technique was introduced to Anatolia by craftsmen from Persia, where it must have had a long previous history. More recently Wilber has shown that in fact the ceramic decorations on Iranian buildings prior to 1200 had not yet attained the character of true tile mosaic, whose development in Persia was postponed by the Mongol invasions until after about 1270. He offered alternative suggestions: either Anatolia was the region where tile mosaic developed earliest, with or without subsequent influence on Persia; or else experiments begun about the same time in both countries continued in Anatolia without the interruption caused in Persia by the Mongol invasions. He discounted the idea that tile mosaic was introduced to Anatolia from the East, on the not very convincing ground that no one artisan, or group of artisans, could have


10 Donald N. Wilber, The development of mosaic faience in Islamic architecture in Iran, Ars Islamica, vol. 6 (Ann Arbor, 1939), pp. 16–47.
transported the complicated equipment over so great a distance. Nevertheless there is one piece of circumstantial evidence that the technique of tile mosaic, worked out at Konya, had as its precondition the activity of potters from abroad. The material of which the tile mosaics are made is not ordinary clay, but a loose-grained, white composition, evidently containing ground quartz and glass frit. This was the material whose introduction during the twelfth century determined the character of all fine pottery made then and later in Persia, Syria, and Egypt. It is hard to believe that the potters of Anatolia discovered it independently.

Tile mosaic is admittedly a technique suited for architectural ornament alone. But evidence accumulates that other kinds of tilework were made in Anatolia, decorated in techniques equally, if not more, appropriate to pottery vessels. At the Kiosk on the citadel hill at Konya, apparently built by Kılıç Arslan IV (1257–67), there were tiles of various shapes painted in the "mınâ'î" colors used on the fine pottery of Rayy and Kashan (but unknown on that of Raqqah in northern Syria). Riefstahl published in 1930 samples of a series of star and cross tiles found, not in situ, at Antalia. Some were painted in purple or olive luster, others in underglaze black and blue. From their soft white material and style of painting Riefstahl was inclined to regard them as imports from Syria (i.e., Raqqah). That they were more probably made in Anatolia itself is suggested by the recent important discovery of similar tiles in great quantities at Kubadâbâd, on the western shore of Lake Beysêhir. Here were stars and crosses painted with arabesques and human figures in yellow luster, either on a purple glaze or on an opaque white glaze apparently containing tin oxide. Their style recalls the pottery of Rayy rather than Raqqah, where, moreover, the luster pigment was almost invariably purple-brown and the glaze transparent. But other star and cross tiles found on the same site at Kubadâbâd are closely related in style and technique to the Raqqah wares. They are painted with human figures, birds, and animals in underglaze colors—black, blue, and manganese-purple (a substitute for the Raqqah red), or black under transparent turquoise. In material and painting all the Kubadâbâd tiles look inferior to the wares of Raqqah and Rayy; but it is very reasonable to suppose that potters from both those places came to Anatolia to make them. At present there is apparently no definite evidence to link their arrival chronologically with the Mongol attack on Rayy (1220), or the sack of Raqqah (1259). Professor Erdmann informs me that star tiles with underglaze painting, like those from Kubadâbâd, have been found in a Seljuq construction at the Theatre of Aspendos. And Dr. Storm Rice has shown me fragments of similar underglaze tiles which he discovered at Alara (Corachessum) and Alanya. I myself saw, down the end of one of the tombs in the Alaeddin Türbe at Konya, a strip of tiles poorly painted with palmettes in blue under a thick crackled glaze.

Riefstahl commented, in 1937, "The picture


\[13\] Riefstahl, op. cit., pp. 144, 145, figs. 97, 98.


\[15\] At Rayy, underglaze painting seems normally to have been carried out in thick black slip. Freer brushwork in thin black and blue pigments is characteristic of wares made at Raqqah and Kashan. See Lane, op. cit., pls. 48–50, 51,B,C (Rayy types).
of Seljuq wheel-made pottery is not clear."

We should now expect to find some Anatolian pottery in the same techniques as the Kubadābād tiles, though until enough material has been examined it may be difficult to distinguish it from imported Raqqah and Persian wares. Sarre published a number of fragments found on the citadel at Konya; others from the same site are in store at the Konya museum, and a further series was acquired by the Victoria and Albert Museum from F. R. Martin in 1906. On figure 1, the following are certainly imports from Raqqah: K, dish-fragment, painted in underglaze black and blue; F and H, lips of jars, in black under turquoise glaze, and G from a dish with similar coloring; E, rim of a dish with carved decoration under turquoise glaze, iridescent from decay. Other pieces seem to me, from their much softer and coarser material and thinner, inferior glaze, to be of Anatolian make; J, bowl fragment, black under turquoise, and I, similar colors, the rim from a bowl of a shape unknown to me in Raqqah ware; L, lip of a conical bowl with underglaze painting in thin washy black and blue, very like the Kubadābād tiles; and D, lip fragment, one of three from similar bowls with relief rosettes and beaded rim, with dull, transparent crackled monochrome turquoise glaze (certainly a local type). Figures A, B, and C are bowl fragments painted in yellow-brown luster on a white tin glaze; the first two are very soft, and I think Anatolian; C is thin, hard, and compact in composition, and is probably a piece imported from Kashan.

It is possible that either through lack of encouragement or because their soft material proved unsatisfactory, the Anatolian potters were unable to establish the manufacture of vessels on an extensive or permanent basis. By far the commonest pottery found on Seljuq sites in Anatolia are varieties of the lead-glazed sgraffiato earthenware current also in the Byzantine dominions to the north and in the Crusader settlements of Syria to the south. It remains to be proved whether any class of this ware was made in Seljuq territory. Of fragments from the citadel hill at Konya on figure 2, A, B, C, and D, are robustly potted, with strong, deeply incised patterns through white slip under a thick, glassy glaze which also covers the reverse; all came from bowls, and evidently belong to the same class as the "Crusader" pottery found at 'Atlit in Palestine and al-Mīnā near Syrian Antioch, where some of it was certainly made. Figure 2, H, I, K, L, are of a thinner, harder red ware with patterns partly incised in fine lines, partly scooped out of the slip with a broad tool. They belong to a "Byzantine" class found also in Constantinople, al-Mīnā and 'Atlit, Cyprus, Alexandria, and Fustāṭ. Figure 2, G, had painting in thick white slip on the brown ground of the clay; it belongs to a subvariety of the same class. Figure 2, E, F, J, are of a coarser ware with poor green glaze (not continued on the outside of the bowls); these may be of fourteenth- or fifteenth-century date.

II. REVIVAL OF TILE DECORATION IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

After 1312, according to Riefstahl, the great series of Seljuq tile mosaics was followed by "a period of darkness; ceramic wall-deco-


17 F. Sarre, Seltschitische Kleinkunst, Leipzig, 1909, pl. 21. His Nos. 3 and 6 are the best candidates for local manufacture.
rations, with the exception of revetments in tiles of plain colour, disappear." It would be interesting to know at what point knowledge of the white composite material used for the Seljuq tiles was lost.

In the second half of the fourteenth century, and perhaps for a little longer, there was current the robust peasant pottery known as "Miletus ware" since the publication of the finds at that place. There were no kiln wasters at Miletus, and the ware must have been made at some other center in Anatolia, where it has a wide distribution (e.g., Konya, Isnik, and Istanbul). The material is red clay, with a white slip and painted ornament in blue, black, purple, and green under a transparent lead glaze. In decoration, the geometric and radial designs are most closely related to those on the contemporary but technically superior white-bodied Syrian wares, while the plant motifs often suggest the influence of fourteenth-century Chinese blue-and-white porcelain. Showing no trace of Byzantine influence in design, "Miletus ware" is essentially Islamic, a provincial type which has parallels in the so-called "Veramin" and "Kubachi" pottery of Persia. Neither in style nor technique has it anything in common with the later Isnik painted pottery.

But a similar coarse red clay is the material of most of the rich tile decorations that suddenly appear in important Ottoman buildings of the early fifteenth-century—the Yezil Cami (1419–24) and Yezil Törbe (about 1421) at Bursa, and the Muradiye Cami at Edirne (1433). Riefstahl has given good grounds for the belief that this tilework was executed by a band of immigrant artists from Persia, the "Masters of Tabriz" who left their inscription on cuerda seca tiles in the Yezil Cami at Bursa. At both places different parts of the decoration are carried out in four distinct techniques. There are some panels in true tile mosaic; and larger areas in which the patterns are painted in colored glazes over large rectangular or molded red clay slabs, with black outlines in some greasy pigment which has the effect of confining the molten glazes in their prescribed areas. A third series of tiles, the

20 Riefstahl, op. cit., p. 249.
hexagons which cover most of the inner walls, are made of a lighter buff clay with no slip, and glazed in turquoise, blue, or green monochrome with patterns stenciled on in unfired gold. But it is the fourth technique that has the greatest bearing on our inquiry into the origin of Ottoman painted pottery—the tiles with blue painting under a transparent glaze. In the Muradiye Cami at Edirne (1433) numbers of these tiles, specially shaped, are incorporated among the cuerdaseca decorations of the mihrab, and must therefore have been made by the same gang of craftsmen. The fields of blue-and-white hexagonal tiles on the south wall of Muradiye Cami, painted in Chinese style, are clearly contemporary. At Bursa, the only blue-and-white tiles of this type are on the sarcophagus of Sitt Hatun in Yeşil Türbe (about 1421 or later).

Riefstahl was strongly of the opinion that Persian artists from Tabriz were responsible for introducing the fashion for these blue-and-white tiles not only to Turkey, but also to Syria. A series with patterns similar to, but not identical with, those on the Edirne tiles can still be seen in the Turbe of al-Tawrizi at Damascus, built in 825 H./A.D. 1423; and there is a further series, said to have come from the Great Mosque, in the Victoria and Albert Museum. Riefstahl’s attractive theory would be more convincing if we knew of comparable tiles or blue-and-white pottery of this date in Persia, particularly at Tabriz. I have not seen the Edirne blue-and-white tiles, but can confirm that those in Yeşil Türbe at Bursa seem technically very like the Syrian ones, with their thick, widely crackled transparent glaze; though the body is not visible, I suspect it is of the same white composite material without a slip. We have archaeological evidence that white-bodied wares with painting closely imitating Chinese blue-and-white porcelain was made in Syria before the end of the fourteenth century, and a number of tiles in the Victoria and Albert Museum suggest that the fashion continued throughout the fifteenth. It therefore seems quite likely that the blue-and-white tiles at Bursa and Edirne were contributed by Syrian potters working in association with the Persians who supplied the tile mosaic and cuerdaseca decorations.

Riefstahl saw the blue-and-white tiles at Bursa and in the Muradiye Cami at Edirne as the first stage of a movement which continued unbroken through the fifteenth century, and which from about 1420 included also the earliest pottery vessels of the “Abraham of Kutahia”

There are no underglaze painted tiles in the Blue Mosque, completed in 1465. It has been suggested that Tabriz was the home of the so-called “Kubachi” pottery, which includes blue-and-white pieces; but none of the latter can be dated as early as the first half of the fifteenth century. See A. Lane, The so-called Kubachi wares of Persia, Burlington Magazine, vol. 75 (London, 1939), pp. 150–162. Riefstahl, op. cit., p. 281, fig. 29, illustrates a blue-and-white Kubachi plate in the Metropolitan Museum as “fifteenth century”; but its Ming prototype cannot be earlier than the reign of Wan Li (1573–1619).

An imitation Chinese dish, found on the citadel at Hamam in a deposit antedating the sack by Timur in A.D. 1400, is illustrated by H. Ingholt, Rapport préliminaire sur la première campagne des fouilles de Hamam, Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Archaeologisk-kunsthistoriske Meddelelser, vol. 1, No. 3 (Copenhagen 1934), pl. 11, No. 1. An important point concerning the dish was made by Vagn Poulsen in a letter to the Burlington Magazine, vol. 90 (London, 1948), p. 150.
type. I feel that the evidence points to a different conclusion, and that by the middle of the fifteenth century the tilemakers in Turkey had discarded underglaze painting from their repertoire of techniques without attempting to apply it to pottery vessels. There followed a distinct break in tradition; and when the technique was once again employed, toward the end of the fifteenth century, it was in the hands of makers of pottery vessels who at first made very few tiles.\(^{32}\)

In addition to Yeşil Cami (1419–24) and Yeşil Tübe (about 1421) at Bursa, and Muradiye Cami (1433) at Edirne, Riefstahl described underglaze-painted tiles in two other buildings which he attributed to the first half of the fifteenth century.

(1) Bursa, Tübe of Cem Sultan, son of Mehmed II the Conqueror (murdered at Naples in 900 H./A.D. 1405). According to Migeon and Sakisian, this türbe also contains the cenotaph of a prince who died in 1429, and the building should therefore date from then.\(^{33}\) But modern labels state that the four marble cenotaphs are for (a) Cem Sultan; (b) Prince Şehinşah, son of Bayezid II (died before 1512); (c) Prince Mehmed, son of Şehinşah; and (d) Prince Osman, son of Alemşah, son of Bayezid II. The last two were murdered at Bursa in the winter of 1512–13 by their uncle, Sultan Selim I.\(^{34}\) The tilework dado of green hexagons has a border of narrow white rectangular tiles painted under the thick crackled glaze with pairs of notched leaves framing simplified lotus flowers. The colors are dark blue, manganese, and turquoise (the last not mentioned by Riefstahl); they are of poor quality and have run together. In tympana over the windows, surrounded by monochrome hexagons with gilding, are white hexagonal tiles painted in underglaze blue and purple with four different radial designs.\(^{35}\) The latter could be said to resemble some of the designs on blue-and-white tiles in Muradiye Cami at Edirne.\(^{36}\) But in view of the uncertainty of the evidence and the poor quality of the tiles I do not feel convinced that these can be as early as 1429; they are exceptional, and better omitted from the argument.

(2) Edirne, Üç Şerefeli Cami (completed by Murad II between 1437–47. Riefstahl, Ars Islamica, vol. 4, p. 254, fig. 1.) Two pointed tympana over windows in the court have large thulth inscriptions naming Murad II and smaller Kufic inscriptions from the Koran superimposed; spiral stems in the background. The color scheme, different in each panel, includes cobalt blue, turquoise, manganese purple, and black for outlines.\(^{37}\) There is thus evidence for polychrome painting in underglaze

\(^{32}\) The cuvda seca technique may similarly have died out for a while in Turkey, though it lasted a little longer. Two very fine cuvda seca panels in the forecourt of the Mosque of Mehmed II Fatih date from the original building of 1463–71. But there is no cuvda seca work at the Cinili Kôşk (1472), the Mosque of Bayezid II (1500–05), or the Tübe of Bayezid II (probably after 1512). In the sixteenth century a new series of cuvda seca tiles, beginning at the Mosque of Selim I (1523) and ending at the Ahmed Paşa Mosque (1554), may well be ascribed to another generation of immigrant Persians—perhaps brought back from Selim I’s Tabriz campaign in 1514. The sixteenth-century tilework differs technically from that of the fifteenth century in its whiter material and lighter and more radiant colors.

\(^{33}\) Riefstahl, op. cit., p. 271, quotes them in this sense. But I cannot find the reference in their article *La céramique d’Asie-Mineure et de Constantinople au XV\(^{\text{e}}\) et au XVI\(^{\text{e}}\) s\(^{\text{e}}\)cle*, as published in Revue de l’Art Ancien et Moderne, vols. 43, 44 (Paris, 1923).


\(^{35}\) One illustrated by H. Wilde, *Drusso*, Berlin, 1909, pl. 4, No. 1.

\(^{36}\) Compare Riefstahl, op. cit., p. 254, fig. 4; and Aslanapa, *Osmanlilar devrinde Kitabıya çınliler*, fig. 11.

\(^{37}\) Riefstahl was careful to check that the tiles are painted in underglaze colors, not in cuvda seca. The same technique is found at Bursa in Yeşil Tübe (about 1421), in the tympana above the six windows on the inner and outer walls. There the colors are white for the inscriptions, on a cobalt-blue ground, with turquoise and gold spiral stems behind. The glaze is thick and shows crackle (*Ars Islamica*, vol. 4, p. 252, n. 14).
colors on tiles at this early date. If the tile-makers also made pottery vessels, we should not except them to have confined themselves to the blue-and-white palette which is all we find on the early Isnik pottery. These tympana at Edirne, dating from at least 1447, seem to be the last which might be attributed to the "masters of Tabriz" and their associates who worked at Bursa. There are no underglaze-painted tiles in the Çinili Köşk (1472), the only important building of the second half of the fifteenth century to survive in almost its original condition.

III. ISNIK POTTERY OF THE SO-CALLED "ABRAHAM OF KUTAHIA" CLASS

This will here be considered under the headings "dating," "technique," "shapes," and "painting."

DATING

There are eight documents, of varying worth, for dating this first group of pottery vessels considered to have been made in the factories of Isnik.

(1) Bursa, Türbe of Mustafa, son of Sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror, who died in 879 H./A.D. 1474–75\(^{28}\) (fig. 35, C). Narrow frieze tiles, 11 cm. wide and about 37.4 cm. long, painted with typical "Abraham of Kutahia" designs in bright, clear blue-and-white, frame the paneled dado of purple and turquoise hexagons inside the Türbe. Besides the cenotaph of Mustafa, the Türbe contains those of Bulbul Hatun and Handi Hatun, wife and daughter of Sultan Bayezid II, and of three others unidenti-

\(^{28}\) Otto-Dorn, *Das islamische Isnik*, pl. 48, fig. 4. Wilde, *Brussa*, pl. 3, fig. 9, and p. 68, wrongly describes the Türbe as that of Prince Musa. A general view of the tilework is given by Aslanapa, *op. cit.*, fig. 5. He also illustrates in fig. 43 an apparently similar tile said to have been found near Kutahia (Kütahya). Fragments of the blue-and-white tiles are in the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris.

(2) An inventory of the royal treasure in Istanbul for 907 H./A.D. 1495 mentions spouted jugs (*ibriq*), water bowls (*liğen*), and other examples of Isnik faience.\(^{30}\)

(3) A similar inventory for 920 H./A.D. 1505 mentions:

- 1 spouted jug from Isnik (*ibriq-i izniq*)
- 1 water-bowl ".. (*liğen-i izniq*)
- 10 bowls with foot of Isnik faience (*irzîşinden ayâq ısrai*).\(^{40}\)

(4) Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi. Four mosque lamps acquired in 1885 from the Türbe of Sultan Bayezid II (d. 1512) (figs. 16–18).\(^{41}\) The lamps should have been made for the Türbe about the time of its completion, which cannot, apparently, be exactly dated.\(^{42}\) The adjoining mosque of Bayezid II was built between 906 and 911 H./A.D. 1500–1505; the Türbe probably after 1512.

(5) Bursa, Türbe of Prince Mahmud, son of Bayezid II, executed in 913 H./A.D. 1506 (fig. 35, E). Blue-and-white border tiles, about 9.5 cm. by 35 cm. patterns light on dark; traces of unfired gilding in the white scalloped medallions.\(^{43}\) They enclose panels of gold-stenciled


\(^{30}\) R. Anhegger in K. Otto-Dorn, *Das islamische Isnik*, p. 179.

\(^{40}\) C. Gurlitt, *Die Baudenkämmer Constantinopels*, Berlin, 1914, pp. 64, 68, 69, states that the Türbe was built by Sultan Selim I after Bayezid II's death. Celal Esad Arseven, *Les arts décoratifs turcs*, Istanbul, 1932, fig. 256.

\(^{41}\) The fourth lamp is illustrated by Celal Esad Arseven, *Les arts décoratifs turcs*, Istanbul, 1938, p. 150, quotes the date carved over the door of the mosque as 907–911 H.; he also states that the Türbe was built after 1512. E. Kühnel suggests that the Türbe was built after the completion of the mosque in 1505 and before 1512, and dates the lamps about 1506: *Die Sammlung türkischer und islamischer Kunst im Tschinilli Köschh*, Meisterwerke der Archäologischen Museen in Istanbul, vol. 3 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1938), pl. 25 (left).

\(^{42}\) Wilde, *Brussa*, pl. 2, fig. 3. Fragments in the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Musée des Arts Décoratifs. Some missing tiles in the Türbe have been replaced by very poor modern imitations.
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dark-blue and turquoise hexagons. Mahmud was executed by Bayezid II for insubordination and spying.\textsuperscript{44} The three other cenotaphs in the Türbe are for Mahmud’s sons Musa, Orhan, and Emir, murdered by Sultan Selim I in the spring of 1513.\textsuperscript{45} Riefstahl noted the similarity of the stucco decorations in this Türbe and that of Çem Sultan (p. 253), suggesting that both buildings were roughly contemporary; he was, however, mistaken in thinking they could date from early in the fifteenth century.

(6) Godman collection, Horsham, England. Spouted ewer (\textit{ibrik}) inscribed in Armenian under the base: “This mass-cruet commemorates the servant of God Abraham of Kutahia. In the Armenian year 959” (A.D. 1510) (\textit{fgrs. 27} and \textit{28}).\textsuperscript{46}

(7) Gebze, Türbe of the Mustafa Paşa Cami, built A.D. 1520. “Abraham of Kutahia” type frieze tiles like those at Bursa.\textsuperscript{47}

(8) Manisa, Valide Cami, built 929 H./A.D. 1522-23. Over doorways flanking the mihrab two pointed tympana, 85 cm. high and 133 cm. wide, each contains a blue-and-white design spread over 12 long, narrow, rectangular tiles shaped to fit.\textsuperscript{48} Neither composition is successful; the makers were obviously more familiar with narrow friezes and had not mastered the problem of designing for a wider space.\textsuperscript{49}

The designs are all reserved in a blue ground. Each tympanum has a Koranic inscription in a cartouche, carried on the central tile. Each has a border, the width of one tile; in one lunette the border is of arabesque leaves and interlacements, recalling the tiles in the Türbe of Mahmud (No. 5 above); in the other lunette are large florid lotus flowers. The space between border and inscription is filled with arabesque “rumi” leaves. The general effect is very overloaded with complicated detail.

If the tiles in the Türbe of Mustafa (No. 1)\textsuperscript{50} really date from about 1474-75, they precede by 20 years the next earliest evidence for Isnik pottery furnished by the inventories of 1495 (No. 2). But in technique and style they do not look like the earliest surviving examples; they are closer in feeling to the Godman ewer of 1510 (No. 6) and the tiles in the Türbe of Mahmud (No. 5). Sultan Selim’s murder of his brothers and nephews in the winter of 1512-13\textsuperscript{51} greatly increased the population of the royal tombs at Bursa, and perhaps both Türbes were redecorated at this time. We would then be left with the dates 1495 and 1523 as securely documented limits for the first phase of Isnik pottery—say about 1490-1525; by internal comparisons of style, most of the surviving pieces can be dated between 1505 and 1520, with a few earlier and a few more later.\textsuperscript{52}

TECHNIQUE

The body of the “Abraham of Kutahia” and all later Isnik pottery is a fairly loose-grained

Selim I (1523) in Istanbul (Otto-Dorn, \textit{Das islamische Isnik}, pl. 49, fig. 1). There can have been no contact between the makers of these and the potters of Isnik.

Prince Mustafa fought valiantly in the campaign against Uzun Hasan, and his father would have had good reason for erecting a new türbe in his honor. (Hammer-Purgstall, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 291, 292, 296, 300, 301.)

Vestiges of the “Abraham of Kutahia” decoration naturally lingered on in a few easily recognized pieces with very poor painting; a jar of this kind formerly in the Kelekian collection had “sealing-wax red” spots on the flowers, and must have been made after 1550.
white composition, often with a faint buff tinge. It is less white, less compact, and considerably less hard than the twelfth-thirteenth century pottery of Rayy and Kashan, though obviously made after a similar recipe. It probably contains a larger proportion of white clay to glassy matter. There is no attempt to make the walls translucent, as often in the earlier Persian wares, and the potting is fairly robust. A dilute wash of the body material—too thin to be called a slip—was sponged over the leather-hard raw surface as a ground for the painting. The glaze is lustrous, very thin, and close fitting; it does not crackle or form into superfluous drops like that on the early Bursa-Edirne tiles or most Syrian pottery. There are no marks of "cockspurs" or other supports used in firing. For consistent technical brilliance the ware far surpasses any pottery made in the Near East since the thirteenth century, and there are no obvious clues that would suggest its derivation from neighboring countries. The blue on some pieces is somber and blackish; this may well be an indication of early date. Usually the color is warm and brilliant, being skillfully laid in shades of varying strength. The only other color used, apart from unfired gilding, is the very pale turquoise applied in sparing touches on a few pieces which on other grounds must be regarded as the latest of the group.

SHAPES

I believe the makers were men with no traditional experience in potmaking. Many of their shapes betray, by sharp angular articulations and moldings, an immediate derivation from vessels of metal; in a few cases possible metal prototypes have survived. This dependence on the forms proper to another medium is a somewhat rare phenomenon in the Near East, where, outside Turkey, fine pottery had been made for centuries. As experience was gained, the metallic excrescences were gradually smoothed away. Chinese porcelain suggested other forms, particularly the large dishes. It is worth considering the rare examples of this formative phase of Ottoman pottery in some detail, and the pieces may be most conveniently grouped according to shape.

Large bowls.—I know of the 10 examples listed below. They no doubt correspond with the "water bowls" (ligen) mentioned in the Istanbul Palace inventories of 1495 and 1509, but could also be those called "bowls with foot." The pieces are listed in what I believe to be chronological sequence, judging by the prominence or otherwise of metallic moldings on the high foot ring, the character of the drawing, and the color of the blue.


53 The term "hatayi," meaning lotus and foliage of Chinese derivation, is further discussed on p. 262.
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(4) London, Victoria and Albert Museum (Salting Bequest), No. C. 1931-1910. Ht. 23.5 cm., diam. 43 cm. (fig. 11). Slighter torus and step moldings on foot. Good warm blue. Dark plaited knots and dotted ground inside, closely resembling those on the Godman lamps and pen box (figs. 20, 21, 23).

(5) Paris, Musée du Louvre, No. CL 9064. Ht. 23 cm., diam. 46 cm. (fig. 12). No torus at junction of bowl and foot, but step molding lower down. The designs outside and inside almost identical with No. 4.

(6) London, Victoria and Albert Museum, No. 7409-1860. Ht. 24.7 cm., diam. 46 cm. A picture book of Turkish pottery, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1955, fig. 3. Torus and step moldings on foot. Decoration inside rather like Nos. 4 and 5, but fewer plaits and no dotted ground. Outside, the large lotus flowers have disintegrated into bunches of volutes, and there are curious secondary flowers or tendrils in very dark blue.

(7) Sir Alan Barlow collection, Wendover, England. Ht. 23.4 cm., diam. 42.7 cm. Unpublished. Very slight torus and step moldings on foot. Inside, medallion with lotus flower in asymmetrical “contour panel”; around it, ogee panels and ovals containing light on dark “hatayi” designs; the panels bordered by light floral wreaths like that running round the medallion shown on figure 38. Outside, perfunctory “hatayi” designs, dark on light. The bright blue and the light effect of the decoration suggest that this is one of the latest “Abraham of Kutahia” pieces.

(8) Former Sambon collection, Paris. E. Kühnel, Islamische Kleinkunst, Berlin, 1925, fig. 91 (interior). Radial panels with very perfunctory drawing, especially in the rosettes; a late piece.

(9) London, Victoria and Albert Museum, No. C. 257-1921. Ht. 20.3 cm., diam. 38 cm. (fig. 13). The torus molding below the bowl has disappeared, and there is only a faint suggestion of a step molding on the foot, which is painted with a quite meaningless pattern. The light panels inside contain feathery leaves (ṣa‘) of a kind found on wares of the succeeding “Damascus” group, and there are touches of bright turquoise in the center of the flowers. Clearly one of the latest of the “Abraham of Kutahia” class.

(10) New York, Metropolitan Museum. Unpublished. Smaller than the other bowls. Moldings on the foot have almost disappeared. Inside, radiating cypress trees between oval panels; outside, “Hatayi” designs, all slight and rather perfunctory in drawing.

Bowl on high foot.—Possibly the “bowls with foot” (ayaq īst) referred to in the Istanbul inventories of 1305. But the only example I know must be later; it is in the Godman collection (figs. 14 and 15); ht. 29.2 cm., diam. 43 cm. The shape, with no molding between the bowl and foot, is exactly that of bowls painted in the “Golden Horn” and “Damascus” styles, indicating this as a late, almost transitional, piece of its class. A clear, pale turquoise is applied to the contours of the panels inside and to the centers of the flowers. The unframed floral sprays inside have an air of lightness that already suggests the feeling of the “Golden Horn” style.

Small bowls.—Probably once a common shape, though now known only from examples found in excavations. One in the British Museum, found by J. T. Wood at Ephesus, has an outcurved lip, and is painted in blackish blue with “hatayi” ornament and a meander border; it looks early. Later pieces were found at Miletus and in Istanbul. A still later piece from the

85 See p. 254.
86 Sarre, Das islamische Milet, p. 79, figs. 13, 13a. British Academy, preliminary report on excavations in and around the Hippodrome of Constantinople, No. 2, Oxford, 1929, fig. 56.
site of the Post Office in Istanbul has "hatayi" decoration outside and very feeble "Golden Horn" patterns inside. A larger bowl in the Godman collection has an outcurved lip and a central boss containing a rattle; it is a late piece with large nonsense inscriptions.

Mosque lamps.—The shape has a long previous history in the Near East, where it is found in glass, in metal, and in pottery. When made of opaque material the "lamps" can only have been hung as decorative objects. I doubt whether it would be profitable to compare shapes of the Isnik lamps with their predecessors. Among themselves, they fall into clearly defined groups showing an evolution in shape as well as in the painted decoration.

(1) Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi. H. 21 cm. (fig. 16). Acquired from the Türbe of Bayezid II in 1885, together with Nos. 2, 3, 4. The British Museum lamp, No. 5, is so similar that it might well have hung in the same building, whose date is uncertain, but probably falls between 1512-15. The short conical neck has almost straight sides; there are sharp, almost angular curves at the shoulder and lower belly, and the handles are hardly more than pierced bosses. The painting, in rather dark blue, is strongly stylized in the peculiar "Abraham of Kutahia" manner, and looks early. Inscriptions apparently nonsensical.

(2) Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi (fig. 17). Provenance as No. 1. Similar inscription in zone above the foot.

(3) Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi (fig. 18). Provenance as last. No inscription.

(4) Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi. Illustrated by Arseven, Les arts décoratifs turcs, fig. 256. Provenance and inscription as Nos. 1 and 2.


See p. 254.

(5) London, British Museum. Ht. 22.1 cm. (fig. 19). Similar in style and technique to the last four. Inscriptions apparently nonsensical.

(6) Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi. Ht. 27.5 cm. E. Kühnel, Die Sammlung türkischer und islamischer Kunst im Tschinili Köschk, Berlin and Leipzig, 1938, pl. 25 B. Said by Kühnel to have been acquired in 1885 from the Mosque of Mehmed Sokollü Paşa, built in A.D. 1571 (perhaps an error or confusion?). It must form a set with the closely similar lamps in the Godman collection, Nos. 7 and 8. The delicacy of the painting, in rather light blue with some traces of unfired gilding, is exceptional in "Abraham of Kutahia" wares; the style is closely related to that of the Godman pen box (fig. 23). Compared with Nos. 1 to 6 above, the shape is less angular and more elegant; the handles are larger. Inscription on one of the side panels: "Allah, Muḥammad, 'Ali."

(7) Godman collection, Horsham. Ht. 28.5 cm. (fig. 20). Closely similar to No. 6.

(8) Godman collection, Horsham, Ht. 28.9 cm. (fig. 21). Shape and general style of decoration similar to Nos. 6, 7. Some of the slight floral sprays already anticipate the "airiness" of the "Golden Horn" style. Inscription: "Help from God and speedy victory / Give the good news to the Believers / Allah, Muḥammad, 'Ali. We Trust." (Koran, Sura 61, 13).

(9) Berlin, Islamische Abteilung der Staatlichen Museen (fig. 22). This lamp forms a late pair with No. 10 below; tall trumpet neck, and large handles. The blank white panels and surrounding areas obviously call for the unfired gilt decoration which has now disappeared. Inscription: "Allah, Muḥammad."


(11) Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi.
Unpublished. Badly damaged. Shape as Nos. 9 and 10, but with three very large additional handles set between the three smaller ones. Blue inscriptions on neck and lower belly. Inscriptions between them in unfired gold (perhaps repainted).

Pen box.—One example only, Godman collection, Horsham. Length 20.8 cm., ht. 6.6 cm. (fig. 23). Painted in good bright blue; the silver mounts more recent. Under the base, four Chinese cloud scrolls; inside, on the bottom of the box, is a large cell pattern. This beautifully made piece is close in style to the mosque lamps in the same collection and in Istanbul (figs. 20 and 21). Inscription on naskhī on the top, "Help from God and speedy victory." The ornamental Kūfic inscriptions on the sides make no sense. The pen box, a familiar Islamic metal shape, was imitated by the Chinese in blue-and-white porcelain for export to the Near East, but the two known examples have covers. In the Victoria and Albert Museum there is a very large later Iṣnik pen box painted in "Rhodian" colors (No. 263-1885).

Large dish with wavy edge.—There is one only, in the Topkapu Sarayı Müzesi, Istanbul (figs. 6 and 7). The shape derives from Chinese porcelain dishes of the fourteenth or early fifteenth century, as does the undulating floral pattern painted on the reverse. It is a little curious that the wavy edge, regularly adopted in the so-called "Damascns" phase of the second quarter of the sixteenth century, is not commoner in the earlier period. The powerfully stylized plastic "rumi" decoration, and the painted gadroons, recall the mosque lamps from the Tūrbe of Bayezid II (figs. 16-18). But this dish looks earlier than any other Iṣnik piece with the exception of the jar in figure 3, the pilgrim bottle in figure 5, and the two dishes in figures 8 and 9. These are all painted in sombre blackish blue, and probably go back to the last years of the fifteenth century.

Large dishes with flat rim.—The rim is wider than usual on Chinese porcelain dishes, suggesting a possible derivation from a Turkish metal shape. But the floral patterns on the reverse, and the wavy line painted on the back of the rim, are obvious Chinese references. Three examples densely painted in blackish blue look very early, perhaps about 1490-1500:

(1) Sèvres, Musée National de Céramique, No. 4759 (fig. 9).
(2) The Hague, Gemeente Museum. Closely similar to the last. Illustrated, Diez and Aslanpapa, Türk Sanatı, fig. 407.
(3) Paris, Musée du Louvre, No. 6321. Diam. 40 cm. (fig. 8). The nonsense inscription on the latter is in a very artificial, archaistic script which cannot be used as a point of style.

The nine other dishes known to me all appear contemporary, belonging to the same rather late phase as the mosque lamps shown in figure 22 and listed as Nos. 9-11 on p. 258. The decoration, in brilliant light blue, consists mainly of flattened "rumi" ornaments and small oblong cartouches with scalloped ends; the latter are found as a diaper in the Well, ranged along the rim, or along the bulge on the reverse (fig. 24).

Rimless dish with convex sides.—One example, in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (figs. 25


62 Illustrated in color by Celal Esad Arseven, L'art turc, p. 80, pl. 6.
and 26), has the most sophisticated and accomplished painting on any "Abraham of Kutahia" piece. It stands by itself; in date, it might be about 1525–30, overlapping into the "Damascus" phase, when the shape becomes fairly common. The shape comes from Chinese porcelain or from Lung-ch’üan celadon, the probable source also of the cell-pattern diaper in the center. The spirit of fifteenth-century blue-and-white porcelain is quite faithfully echoed by the painting on the back, with the small notched leaves. A late and rather inferior dish in the Islamische Abteilung, Berlin (unpublished), has a very narrow rim with a herringbone pattern, and radiating "rumi" ornaments in panels.

Jar.—The jar acquired by the Victorian and Albert Museum from the Kelekian collection (fig. 3) is probably the earliest known piece of Isnik pottery and must date from the last years of the fifteenth century. The shape is thoroughly metallic—offset lip, two torus moldings at the top and bottom of the neck, and two more around the foot; it may be compared with a silver-gilt Turkish tankard in the Victoria and Albert Museum, with cast relief decoration not unlike that on the "Abraham of Kutahia" pottery (fig. 4). There exist Persian inlaid brass tankards of similar profile, two with dates 866 H./A.D. 1461 and 917 H./A.D. 1511, and Kühnel has illustrated a related brass "azzimina" vase made in Venice by Persian artists, with the date 910 H./A.D. 1505. The painting on the pottery vase is blackish blue which has run in places during firing. Another large jar in the Godman collection is much slacker in shape and has lost the metallic moldings; its color is a very bright blue, and it appears to be a late piece of its class.

Ewers.—The shape (ibrig) is mentioned in the Istanbul inventories of 1495 and 1505, and the first of three surviving examples is dated 1510.

(1) Godman collection, Horsham. Ht. 17.7 cm. (figs. 27 and 28). Armenian inscription under the base containing the date 959 Armenian Era/A.D. 1510. The shape is not Chinese, and its angularity suggests a metal prototype. The missing handles from the Persian brass tankards mentioned above (p. 260) probably took the form of dragons; there is the original dragon handle on the Turkish gold tankard (fig. 4); and four unpublished globular stone tankards in the Treasury at the Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, which may be Turkish or Persian, also have carved dragon handles. The Godman ewer is unfortunately too small to have very elaborate decoration, but the designs, in clear bright blue, may be compared with those on some of the large bowls (p. 256, Nos. 4 and 5) and on the mosque lamps from the Türbe of Bayezid II (p. 258, Nos. 1–4).

(2) London, Victoria and Albert Museum (Salting Bequest), No. C. 2008–1910. Ht. 22.5 cm. (fig. 29). The bright blue decoration has the same flat character as on the large flat-rimmed dishes (p. 259 and fig. 24); under the modern silver restorations of the neck are traces of what look like "Golden Horn" decoration. The piece should be a late one.

(3) London, Victoria and Albert Museum, No. 349–1807. Ht. 24 cm. (fig. 30). Neck and

64 Compare E. Zimmermann, Altmachisches Porzellan im Alten (Salting Bequest), Berlin and Leipzig, 1930, pl. 29 (blue-and-white), and pl. 17 (carved cell pattern on a celadon dish).
66 No. C.57–1952. Ht. 24.5 cm.
67 No. 158–1804, ht. 15.8 cm.; the cover a later addition, but the handle original. The tankard may be later than the jar, but must belong to the first half of the sixteenth century.
70 The Godman collection of oriental and Spanish pottery and glass, London, 1901, pl. 48, No. 283.
71 Translation on p. 255, No. 6.
spout restored in silver. Touches of pale turquoise help to suggest that this is one of the latest pieces.

**Tankard with globular body and tall neck.**—One example only, Sèvres, Musée Nationale de Céramique, No. 4686 (fig. 31). The shape must derive from Turkish metal or stone tankards such as have been mentioned above (p. 260), but on this particular piece only a slight thickening at the base of the neck remains from the moldings usual in metal. The shape becomes common in the ensuing “Damascus” stage. There is a curious tail-like appendage below the handle.

**Cylindrical flower vase with flat, angular handle.**—The shape, found also in “Golden Horn” and very common in the still later “Rhodian” class, is represented by a fragment found in Istanbul. The handle suggests that the prototype was a tankard made of bound wooden slats; such tankards are still made at Andritsaena in the Greek Peloponnesse.

**Albarella.**—One example only, Paris, Musée des Arts Décoratifs. The disintegrated style of the decoration, and the appearance of the cypress-tree motif, suggest that this is a very late survivor of the group.

**Pilgrim flask.**—One example, Sèvres, Musée Nationale de Céramique. Ht. 31 cm. (fig. 5). Found at Damascus. The dense and strongly stylized decoration in blackish blue suggests that this is one of the earliest pieces, about 1500 or earlier.

**Candlestick.**—One example, G. Migeon, Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Exposition de l’art musulman, Paris, 1903, pl. 45. A metal shape, with decoration in a very early style. Two other candlesticks in the British Museum (Henderson Bequest) are palpable forgeries, probably made by Samson of Paris. Their material is very hard and the blue stands up in relief.

---

72 Otto-Dorn, Das islamische Isnik, pl. 48, No. 2.
73 A gilt brass candlestick bearing the name of Sultan Bayezid II is mentioned on p. 261.
74 One illustrated, Diez and Aslanapa, Türk Sanatı, fig. 405.

---

**Mosque ball.**—One example, Victoria and Albert Museum, No. 337–1903. Ht. 13.7 cm. Pierced for suspension at top; nipple at the bottom. In zone around middle, ornate Kâfic pseudo-inscription reserved on blue ground; on lower part, “rumî” ornament and plaits, reserved. Poor painting, fairly late. Similar decorative objects for suspension are found in later Isnik pottery of the “Damascus” and “Rhodian” classes. They were apparently not made in other Islamic countries. The “eggs” with cherubs’ heads painted on them, made by Armenians at Kutahia, continue the idea in the eighteenth century.

---

**PAINTING**

On vessels of the “Abraham of Kutahia” class, the painting is conceived in terms of small, very detailed patterns carefully mapped out in bands, medallions, or panels of ornate contour. It is not a style naturally suited to the decoration of pottery, and stands far removed in spirit from the broad freehand painting on the early fifteenth-century tiles at Bursa and Edirne. Could the designs have been imitated from those on engraved metal vessels of the kind that evidently inspired many of the shapes? A gilt brass candlestick in the Turk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi, inscribed with the name of Sultan Bayezid II, offers points of comparison only in the stylized cable-pattern borders. The other patterns painted on the pottery have a fluency that would be impossible in engraving on metal.

The immediate origin of the individual motifs, and of the dense manner in which they are combined, is rather to be sought in contemporary Ottoman illuminated manuscripts. Nine leaves from a magnificent Koran, former-

---

75 E.g., The Godman collection, pl. 50, No. 466; pl. 63, No. 61.
76 Illustrated in Splendeur de l’art turc, Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Exposition fevrier-avril 1953, Paris, pl. 10, No. 140.
ly in the Mosque of Bayezid II in Istanbul, should be considered in conjunction with the pottery lamps from the Türbe adjoining the same Mosque (figs. 16-18). It is even possible that the potters were supplied with designs by the court miniaturists—a procedure that was certainly followed later in the sixteenth century.78

The motifs themselves mostly fall into the two broad groups traditionally recognized by the Turks as “rumi” and “hatayi.”79 “Rumi” is based on the long pointed half-leaf, which often has a prehensile tip, and may have a second pointed lobe branching from its underside. (The border and central medallion on figure 6 show good examples.) The leaves are carried on intersecting stems with little curved tendrils ultimately derived from the classical vine; they are often associated with plaited knots. “Hatayi” (i.e., “of Cathay”) is, as its name suggests, an adaptation of Chinese design, and especially of the lotus flower which is too apt to be miscalled a “palmette.” (Good examples appear on the bowl, figure 14, and the mosque lamps, figures 16-19.) It would be easy enough to cite purely Islamic prototypes of the “lotus” from Seljuq times and earlier, but

These descend from the Herat school as exemplified by pl. 242 in the same work, a manuscript of 1434 done for Shâh Ružk.

78 A firman of 977 H./A.D. 1569 ordered tiles to be made in conformity with patterns sent to Isnik; similar orders followed in 982 H./1574 and 998 H./1590 (R. Anhegger, in Otto-Dorn, Das islamische Isnik, pp. 161, 162, 169).

79 A. Sakisian, La relire turque du XVe au XIXe siècle, Revue des Arts Anciens et Modernes, vol. 51 (Paris, 1927), p. 278ff., shows that the name “rumi” was current in the seventeenth century, when Evliyâ Çelebi used it of carved decoration on the marble portal of the Yeşil Cami at Bursa. His suggestion that it indicated a “Roman” (i.e., Byzantine) origin is unacceptable; the reference is clearly to the Seljuqs of Rûm, who constantly used this ancient Islamic motif in the thirteenth century. Further discussion of “rumi” and “hatayi” will be found in Celal Esad Arseven, L’art turc, p. 226, and idem, Les arts décoratifs turcs, pp. 52-55.

about A.D. 1300, when Mongol II-Khâns ruled in Persia and the Mongol Yüan Emperors in China, this ornament was given a more Chinese complexion and became frequently associated with the “chi”—the formalized Chinese cloud scroll. (E.g., on the mosque lamp, figure 21, beside the handles.) A softer and more luxuriant phase in the development of pseudo-Chinese design was reached about 1400 in work done for Timur and his successors at Samarqand and Herat. The tile decorations of Yeşîl Cami and Yeşîl Türbe at Bursa represent the transplantation of Timurid art into Turkey, where it became acclimatized in the fifteenth century, and formed the current idiom at the time when the first “Abraham of Kutahia” pottery was made at Isnik. I see no reason to follow the suggestions of Migeon, Sakisian, and Rieflsthal, that because this pottery shows fifteenth-century (i.e., Timurid) characteristics, its beginnings should be placed in the first half of that century. The cuerda seca tile panels in tympana of the Mosque of Selim I and its courtyard in Istanbul, built in 1523, are still thoroughly Timurid in style, and a good deal more orthodox than any Isnik pottery.80

Contemporary sources, Eastern and Western, are unanimous in recording that Sultan Selim I deported skilled artisans from Tabriz to Istanbul after his victorious campaign against Shâh Ismâ’il of Persia in 920 H./A.D. 1514.81 But the tradition that he settled the potters among them at Isnik goes back no farther than the

80 Otto-Dorn, Das islamische Isnik, pp. 154-155, and pl. 49, fig. 1. I fully agree with Otto-Dorn that this and subsequent cuerda seca tilework in Istanbul is likely to have been made by Persian craftsmen brought back by Selim I from Tabriz in 1514. It is significant that there are no tile decorations in the Mosque of Bayezid II, built A.D. 1500, suggesting that the technique had died out in Turkey since its last employment at the Fatih Mosque in 1463-71. At the Çiniî Köşk (1472) the decorations are in tile mosaic and in gold-stenciled tiles, with no cuerda seca.

81 Anhegger, in K. Otto-Dorn, op. cit., pp. 180-184, quotes the sources in detail, noting the absence of references to Isnik.
OTTOMAN POTTERY OF ISNIK

Turkish historian Küçük Çelebişade, who wrote in the eighteenth century, mentions only two faience makers; and in a similar list dated 932 H./A.D. 1525, Habib of Tabriz, faience worker, had seven apprentices from all parts of the Ottoman Empire other than Persia. There is thus little reliable evidence to support Migeon and Sakisian in their suggestion that Persians from Tabriz transformed the style of Isnik pottery after 1514. They would have arrived too late to affect the “Abraham of Kutahia” style, which was already formed; and too early to introduce the “Damascus” style, which took shape only in the second quarter of the sixteenth century.

One would expect the early Isnik “Abraham of Kutahia” pottery to have been strongly influenced by the Chinese blue-and-white porcelain from which it borrowed its color scheme. But in fact this influence was remarkably slight; it can be seen in the shape and in the decoration on the reverse of some of the large dishes (figs. 7 and 26), and in the upper and lower zones of floral ornament on the early jar (fig. 3). It is possible that the Isnik potters at this stage were not very familiar with Chinese porcelain, which may still have been rare in Turkey. The Seray inventory of 901 H./A.D. 1495 mentions only 5 pieces of Chinese porcelain; that of 907 H./A.D. 1501 12 pieces; that of 910 H./A.D. 1505 21 pieces. Many more came in as loot from the campaigns of Sultan Selim I against Persia in 1514, which added 62 pieces, and against Syria and Egypt in 1516–17, the proceeds of which are unfortunately not recorded. Decoration and shapes taken from porcelain are much commoner in the “Damascus” phase of Isnik pottery in the second quarter of the sixteenth century.

In discussing the shapes, I have already mentioned what I believe to be progressive stages in treatment of design. Zones or panels with ornament reserved in a dark ground alternate with those having the ornament painted on a white ground; on bowls, the inside and outside are dark and light or vice versa. The earliest pieces, which may have been made about 1500 or earlier, are the jar (fig. 3), a large bowl (p. 256, No. 1), four large dishes (figs. 6–9, p. 259, Nos. 1–3), and a pilgrim bottle (fig. 5). The blue is dark, almost black, and the sombre effect is increased by the heavy drawing of the details and their dense crowding together. The Godman ewer of 1510 and the mosque lamps from the Türbe of Bayezid II (figs. 16–18, 27) suggest that in the years 1510–15 a brighter blue was used and more of the white ground was allowed to show. This effect of lightness becomes more pronounced in such pieces as the mosque lamps (figs. 20 and 21), the pen box (fig. 23), and some of the large bowls (fig. 15). They already hint at the delicate “airiness” of the “Golden Horn” style. The latest pieces, of about 1520–25, are painted in the brilliant warm blue typical of the “Damascus” and “Rhodian” groups, with sparing touches of turquoise and the first naturalistic serrated leaves (figs. 13–15). A curious provincial idiosyncracy to be observed especially in the Bayezid II mosque lamps (figs. 16–18) is the plastic, almost three-dimensional treatment of the “hatayi” lotuses. It is mainly contrived by skillful shading. The flowers disintegrate into clusters of fleshy volutes or group of Chinese porcelains in the Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi, Istanbul, Freer Gallery of Art Occasional Papers, vol. 2, No. 1 (Washington, 1952), pp. 9–13.
rounded forms, from which tongues protrude through an orifice. In later pieces of the “Abraham of Kutahia” class the designs are much flatter, as the inner shading tends to disappear. The dish in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (figs. 25 and 26), is quite exceptional in its skillfully executed Timurid design, and might conceivably be the work of an experienced miniature painter. The same is true of some extraordinary fragments in the Islamische Abteilung in Berlin, to which Professor Ernst Kühnel has very kindly drawn my attention (fig. 32). They apparently come from a blue-painted tankard, the lower end of whose handle ended in the snakelike appendage seen to the left of the lowest fragment in the illustration. Two bearded men with turbans sit in a garden under cypress trees and a perched parakeet; a youth in an elaborate Mongol hat approaches carrying a bottle and tray; on the third fragment is a cheetah and the tail of another parakeet. Only the shading on the leaves of a tree in the upper right fragment recalls a typical Isnik mannerism. Kühnel has suggested a fifteenth-century date, but to me the period about 1525–30 seems more likely; the Isnik potters were then embarking on other unpredictable experiments such as the dishes shown in figures 38–41. In the collection of Ekrem Hakki Ayverdi in Istanbul is a fragmentary blue-and-white bottle of about this date, painted with very lively figures of animals.

The style of the inscriptions on the early Isnik ware calls for little comment; the ornamental Kufic has no bearing on date. On three mosque lamps (p. 258, Nos. 6, 7, 8), the combination of the three names “Allah, Muhammad, ‘Ali,” without the name of another Caliph, is Shi’ite in character, and suggests that the artist was a Persian. The presence of Armenians among the potters is attested by the inscription on the Godman ewer (fig. 28, and p. 255).

IV. THE SO-CALLED “DAMASCUS” GROUP OF ISNIK POTTERY

This series of vessels and tiles shows a richer vein of invention than any other in the whole history of the Isnik potteries; it introduces almost all the motifs of design exploited in the later “Rhodian” ware, and all the colors except the emerald green and the “sealing-wax red.” Vestiges of “Abraham of Kutahia” type decoration are found on the earliest pieces, and at the other end a transition to the “Rhodian” style is suggested by pieces on which the color schemes characteristic of the “Damascus” and “Rhodian” groups are combined. There is only one secure document for dating—the mosque lamp from the Dome of the Rock made in 956 H./A.D. 1549 (fig. 42); but if the dates proposed above for the “Abraham of Kutahia” group are accepted, we can with some confidence place the chronological range of the “Damascus” group in the period about 1525–55. I am quite unable to follow the argument of K. Otto-Dorn, who claims that this dating could not be upheld “auf Grund des naturalistischen Blüten- und Dekork, der erst in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts nachweisbar ist.” The evidence to which she refers is that provided by dated buildings in which there are tiles with naturalistic decoration, but painted in the “Rhodian” colors. Tiles with the “Damascus” colors are relatively rare, from which we can safely infer that the manufacture of tiles on a large scale did not begin till after these colors had gone out of fashion.

As we have seen, the earliest Isnik productions were vessels with severely stylized, almost abstract miniature ornament painted in blue monochrome, with occasional touches of turquoise on the latest pieces of the group. In the succeeding “Damascus” phase there is a continuous trend away from abstraction toward freer, larger, and eventually quite naturalistic

---


87 Das islamische Iznik, p. 152, n. 3.
designs; while the range of colors is expanded from blue and turquoise to include purple, gray-green or olive green, and black (mainly for outlines). It would be a gross and misleading simplification to suppose that these gradual changes were exclusively due to Persian potters deported from Tabriz in 1514, at least 10 years before they began. No Persian pottery of the sixteenth century remotely resembles the Turkish wares of the “Damascus group,” either in color or design. The color schemes were developed at Isnik itself by what we must assume to have been an artisan community of cosmopolitan origin, including Turks as well as Armenians, Persians, Greeks, and perhaps Syrians. They had Chinese porcelain dishes, already a century or more old, which they imitated with some fidelity; they may also have had vessels of Italian majolica, from which they took suggestions for new shapes. Some of the simpler painted designs show directness and originality, and were doubtless invented by the pot painters. The more complicated naturalistic ornament has parallels on Turkish textiles, but there is no evidence that the weavers or potters directly influenced each other; it is far more likely that they drew on a common source—patterns provided by the court designers in Istanbul. There is in fact documentary evidence for this procedure during the second half of the sixteenth century.

As the leading power in the Islamic world, the Sublime Porte had been, through three

88 The green (containing iron) was evidently much affected by conditions of firing, which gave it alternatively a grayish or brownish cast.

89 References given on p. 262, n. 78. To these should be added the designs supplied for inscriptions on Isnik tilework: the scribe Kara Hisarli Ahmed and his apprentice Hasan, mentioned in a list of craftsmen in 1551, wrote those for the Suleimaniye Mosque in Istanbul (Taksin Chakru, Les Faïences turques, OCST [London 1933–34], p. 52); and in 980 H./A.D. 1572 the scribe Molla Hasan was sent to Edirne to design the inscriptions for tiles to be placed in the Mosque of Selim II (Anhegger, in Otto-Dorn, Das islamische Isnik, p. 166, Nos. 2, 3.)


93 C. J. Lamm, Miniatures from the reign of Bayezid II in a manuscript belonging to Uppsala University Library, Orientalia Suecana, vol. 1 (1953), pp. 95–114. reigns, in a favorable position to engage artists from all the neighboring countries. Matteo de' Pasti, the medallist, was detained by the Venetians while on his way to Istanbul via Crete in 1461; Costanzo da Ferrara worked as a medallist, and perhaps as a painter, for Mehmed II between 1478 and 1481; Gentile Bellini spent a year at Istanbul in 1480–81. Even the services of Michelangelo were unsuccessfully sought by Bayezid II in 1506, to construct a bridge over the Golden Horn, and again by Selim I, as a painter, in 1519. It must have been far easier to attract artists from Persia, by means other than forced deportation following a successful war. The register of guilds working at the Saray in 1525–26 records that Shâh Quli of Tabriz, a pupil of Aqa Mirak, was then the designer (ressam) at the head of 29 painters (naqqâs), of whom one-third had already been appointed under Sultan Bayezid II (1481–1512), and another third under Sultan Selim I (1512–20). A Turkish manuscript dated 905 H./A.D. 1499, recently published by C. J. Lamm, shows in its fifteen miniatures a close dependence on the school of Herat. After Shâh Quli's death, the Saray register for 1557–58 separates the Istanbul court painters into two groups: that of Rûm (Turkey) with 26 painters, and that of the Persians (Ajam) amounting to 9, mostly from Tabriz, but including one Hungarian and one Frank. There is little to choose between the decorative painting done in Persia and in Turkey about the middle of the sixteenth century; dragons,
ch'i-lins, birds, and other Chinese fauna are shown among lotuses and the large, feathery leaves known to the Turkish miniature painters as “saz.” A school of painting in the Persian manner had thus been long established at the Ottoman court, and its resources in design would have been at the disposal of the Isnik potters as soon as the latter had attained sufficient mastery of their technique.

Some idea of development within the “Damascus” group of Isnik pottery is given by the relatively uncommon tiles. These are mostly hexagonal, following a tradition begun at Konya in the thirteenth century and continued at Bursa, Edirne, and Istanbul (Çiniği Köşk, 1472) in the fifteenth. A good selection from Bursa and Istanbul is in the Victoria and Albert Museum; they are characteristically painted in two colors only, a warm light blue with touches of clear turquoise. The small, neat designs are self-contained on each tile; from a central rosette radiate intersecting stems with flat-painted “hatayi” flowers, “ch'i” cloud scrolls, and feathery leaves (saz). Here is something quite different from the tight, introverted “Abraham of Kutahia” style—as if the painters had emerged from their provincial backwater into the main stream of post-Timurid art. In the Circumcision Room (Sunnit Odasi) of the Topkapu Saray is a field of these hexagonal tiles set round with plain green triangles transforming them into stars; the field is framed by oblong rectangular frieze tiles bearing similar patterns. The Circumcision Room was built by Sultan Ibrahim in 1641; but these tiles must be earlier, dating from about 1530–40; the present arrangement on the wall is obviously a patchwork of tiles of various dates brought from elsewhere.

On the same wall are five enormous rectangular tiles, 125 cm. high, superbly painted in blue and turquoise with birds, Chinese ch'i-lins, and flower vases among “hatayi” flowers and long feathery leaves. Professor Erdmann has suggested to me that these superb creations are earlier than the room itself, and I share his opinion; they should date from about the middle of the sixteenth century, and must have been designed by the painters of the very similar miniatures mentioned above. Similar designs spread over several rectangular tiles are seen in the large vertical panels in the Bagdad Kiosk of the Topkapu Saray, built in 1639. Here the beaks of the birds are painted in “sealing-wax red”—a sparing use of that color such as might be expected when it was still an innovation. These tiles, too, may well have been brought from an earlier building, for the decorations of the Bagdad Kiosk also include cuerda seca tiles which are obviously not contemporary.

Of the same style and date as the Circumcision Room tiles is a series of hexagonal tiles painted in blue and turquoise with a pair of ducks among foliage (fig. 36, examples in the Victoria and Albert Museum and elsewhere). The brighter color, the sharper and more careful drawing, and the hexagonal shape distinguish

94 F. R. Martin The miniature painting and painters of Persia, India and Turkey, London, 1912, pls. 252–254, pages of a Nižami painted for Shah Tāhmāp dated A.D. 1530–42. Turkish paintings of similar character are illustrated, loc. cit., pl. 271, and by Sakisian, Turkish miniatures, op. cit., pls. 2, 3, and by 3.B. For the “saz” leaves, see Sakisian, La reliure turque du XVᵉ au XIXᵉ siècle, p. 280.
95 But already hinted at in one or two late “Abraham of Kutahia” pieces, e.g., the blue-and-turquoise bowl in figure 13.
96 Otto-Dorn, Das islamische Iznik, pl. 47, upper right.
98 P. 266, n. 94.
99 Tahsin Chuikru, Les faïences turques, OCST, vol. 11 (London, 1933–34), pl. 25; Celal Esad Arseven, L’art turc, figs. 255, 256. It has previously been assumed that these tiles are of the same date as the building. They are not equal in quality to those in the Circumcision Room.
these tiles from those painted in the blue-and-turquoise color scheme during the seventeenth century (e.g., at the Yeni Valide Mosque, about 1663–82).\(^1\) Hexagonal tiles in eight different patterns adorn the niches of the fountain room in the Yeni Kaplica baths at Bursa, which, according to an inscription on the tilework, were restored by Rustem Pasha, son-in-law of Süleyman the Magnificent and Grand Vizier from 1544–53 and from 1555 till his death in 1561.\(^2\) Here the “Damascus” palette is used in its full range of blue, olive green, turquoise, and purple, with greenish-black outlines. The radiating designs still have something of the formal quality seen in the slightly earlier blue-and-turquoise hexagonal tiles. It is interesting to compare with them a similar “Damascus” style dish in the Godman collection, painted with a hexagonal design obviously more suited for the decoration of a tile (fig. 37).\(^3\) In the second half of the sixteenth century the tiles of the “Rhodian” group were normally rectangular, with designs spreading across several adjacent tiles. This scheme was very rarely adopted for tiles with the “Damascus” coloring, and the few examples must be the very latest of their group, dating perhaps from about 1550–60. There is, or was, an extremely beautiful panel in the Morrisson collection at Alexandria, with very pale blue flowering prunus stems against a darker blue background.\(^4\) Blue, turquoise, and olive green are used for the splendid large saz decoration on some isolated tiles in the Victoria and Albert and the Musée des Arts Décoratifs.\(^5\)

The earliest vessels of the “Damascus group” correspond with the early hexagonal tiles in their blue-and-turquoise color scheme and in a still rather formal treatment of design. It seems that the potters suddenly cast off the shackles imposed by the complicated “Abraham of Kutahia” decoration, and began to select only those simple elements that would look well on pottery. Their work has a consequent freshness and originality that recalls the archaic Italian majolica rather than any pottery made in the Near East. The dish with a snake threatening a bird (fig. 38), others with flower vases surrounded by a similar “contour panel” (fig. 39),\(^6\) and a dish in the Victoria and Albert Museum, with a fleet of lateen-rigged ships (fig. 40), are typical of this very attractive series. There are still reminiscences of the “Abraham of Kutahia” style in the background ornament behind the “contour panels,” and the backs of the dishes carry a continuous floral pattern derived from Chinese porcelain, as on the “Abraham of Kutahia” dishes in figures 7 and 26. Here for the first time appear the tulips and carnations that became favorite subjects on all later Isnik pottery. Stiff, spiky little tulips, often painted in clusters, are almost a hallmark of the “Damascus group,” early and late; they are seen on the foot of the mosque lamp from the Dome of the Rock, dated 956 H./A.D. 1549 (fig. 42).

\(^1\) Celal Esad Arseven, *L’art turc*, fig. 337.


\(^3\) The dimensions of the hexagon on the dish correspond almost exactly with the size of the tile, and the border pattern is the same. The designs repeated on series of Isnik tiles were evidently transferred from a paper cartoon pierced for “pouncing” with charcoal—the usual method used by potters in Europe. This accounts for the almost mechanical certainty of spacing that is such a feature of Isnik work.

\(^4\) G. Migeon, *Les arts décoratifs musulmans* (Ex-


\(^6\) Further examples, Sale Catalogue, Christie’s, London, July 4, 1929, lot 131 (Godfrey Brauer); *The Godman collection of oriental and Spanish pottery and glass*, pl. 55, No. 36.
and on the foot of the large bowl in figure 44. On "Rhodian" dishes they survive as a vestige, painted on the back. A long-necked bottle in the Victoria and Albert Museum has a diaper of spotted tulips or fritillaries combined with closed crescents, on a blue ground. Lively little figures of hounds couring hares and gazelles, akin to those found on Persian carpets, appear on a pilgrim flask formerly in the G. R. Harding collection (the only recorded piece of this shape). A male profile portrait, in the shallow well of a dish, is without parallel in Turkish pottery (fig. 41), and as Rackham has pointed out, was almost certainly suggested by similar subjects on Italian majolica—the undoubted source of the shape. The "tondino," a small dish with a wide, flat rim and a deep or shallow well, was very fashionable in Italy between 1500 and 1530. A series of Isnik dishes in this shape are painted with tulip bunches in scalloped oval panels, sometimes alternating with cloud scrolls; the colors are dark and light blue, with the occasional addition of a peculiar dull gray-blue.

The influence of Chinese porcelain is much more marked in pottery of the "Damascus group" than in the preceding "Abraham of Kutahia" series. A familiar pattern on Chinese dishes of the early fifteenth century was the central lobed medallion containing clusters of grapes. Such dishes were closely imitated at Isnik in the blue-and-turquoise colors; and the wavy-edged rim, with a stylized pattern of waves breaking against rocks, was acclimatized as a standard treatment for Isnik dishes even when the rest of the decoration was completely un-Chinese.

It would appear that the wares of the "blue-and-turquoise family," with their rather prim drawing, were succeeded in the period roughly 1540–55 by those of the fully developed "Damascus" style, with their luxuriant semi-naturalistic plant ornament painted in several colors. I have already stressed the connection of this style with the contemporary court miniature painting; but we may legitimately assume that the Turkish passion for garden flowers encouraged the naturalistic differentiation of species, showing them as if growing from roots at the base of the design. Certainly Turkish is the tendency to inflate the designs to an aggressive size in relation to the space that they fill; the same can be seen on Ottoman textiles. Tahsin Öz has recently published the costumes of the Ottoman Sultans preserved in the Topkapı Saray, and if the evidence he quotes were to be trusted, the large floral designs already appeared on textiles in the reign of Bayezid II (1481–1512), much earlier than on the pottery.

The mosque lamp from the Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem dated 956 H./A.D. 1549 (fig. 42) is a document of cardinal importance, as the only

4 B. Rackham, Catalogue of Italian maiolica, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1940, p. 457, Nos. 9, 10, 11.
5 Koechlin and Alfassa, L'art de l'Islam, la céramique, pl. 21, No. 100; others in the Victoria and Albert British Museums.

13 The degenerate wave pattern on later "Rhodian" dishes has been called "ammonite scrolls" by writers who did not recognize its origin, for which see Pope, Fourteenth-century blue-and-white, pl. B, No. 2; pls. 9, 10, 11, etc.
14 The naturalism is frequently tempered by a purely decorative convention—the rudimentary cloud scroll that binds the stems like a clip.
15 Tahsin Öz, Turkish textiles and velvets, Istanbul, 1950 (pls. 20, 21, kaftans said to have belonged to Bayezid II). Such decoration would previously have been attributed to the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent (1520–66). For the possibility that the wrappers, the contents and their labels may have been changed since the sixteenth century, see Tahsin Öz, op. cit., p. 18.
Isnik pottery vessel bearing the name of the place where it was made. Translations of the invocation to Allah around the middle and the ḥadith passages on lip and lower belly have been published by Fortnum, but he was not in a position to extract the full sense of the small inscription in panels round the foot: "... thou Holy Man who art at Isnik, Eşref Zade. In the year 956 on the first of the month Jamadha. The painter [is] the poor, the humble Musli [or Mustafa]." It is natural that a potter working at Isnik should invoke Eşref Zade, the local saint who died in 874 H./A.D. 1469 and was commemorated there in a famous shrine erected before 1518. The lamp, like its companion in the Godman collection was made without a bottom, so that a light inside would shine downward. They must have formed part of a set commissioned by Suleyman the Magnificent during his restorations at the Dome of the Rock (see p. 273). They lack the large floral decoration, and are painted only in blue, turquoise, and black; nevertheless they carry with them the whole of the "Damascus" class, proving, if proof were still needed, that this was made at Isnik. One detail of the decoration is particularly valuable as an aid to dating other related pieces such as the magnificent polychrome "Damascus" bowl in figure 44—the arabesques, which appear in cusped panels on the lamp and again inside the lip of the bowl, painted in a good black under turquoise. The black used for outlines on wares of the "Damascus" and "Golden Horn" classes is usually of a soft greenish color; only in the wares of the second half of the sixteenth century were outlines deliberately painted in an intense black which contributed an important note in the color scheme. On some pieces painted in the "Damascus" colors the veins of the leaves are indicated by white lines scratched through the green pigment.

The full color range of the "Damascus" group is so beautiful that it is not easy to understand why the potters should apparently have ceased to use it soon after 1550. Evidently the colors were unreliable; on many pieces they have lost their strength because the firing conditions were not favorable. The olive green containing iron was apt to go gray, and the manganese to become very pale. Moreover these soft colors were less ideally suited than the powerful "Rhodian" palette to the tilework which after 1550 became the main preoccupation of the Isnik potters.

The same distinctive black arabesques under turquoise are seen in bands on another large "Damascus" bowl in the Victoria and Albert Museum, on the egg-shaped pendant (Catalogue of the Godman collection, pl. 59, No. 466), and on another ball-shaped pendant in the Benaki Museum, Athens. These arabesques are still present in a band around the lip of the lamp from the Suleymaniye Mosque (fig. 43), made about eight years later.

Lotus flowers strikingly painted in black are seen on the lamp from the Suleymaniye Mosque (fig. 43), one of the earliest pieces in the "Rhodian" colors.
ARTHUR LANE

Apart from those already mentioned here and under the heading of “Golden Horn," the shapes of the “Damascus group” call for little further comment. I know of only five examples of the great bowls on a high foot(fig. 44), a shape found also with “Abraham of Kutahia” and “Golden Horn” decoration. A peculiarity of the large wavy-edged dishes is their surprising thickness at the rim.

V. THE “GOLDEN HORN” STYLE

A list of artisans in Istanbul dated 945 H./A.D. 1547 mentions the shops of the potters on the Golden Horn in the Balat district, and Evliyâ Çelebi gave a fuller account of the potters’ quarter in 1631. Evliyâ also described four places near Istanbul where potters’ clay was dug. From near Eyüp came a soft, perfumed clay used for making jugs; from between Eyüp and Hasköy a black clay; from Sarıyer near Kağıthane a perfumed clay; from Göksu a red clay. Drinking vessels made from these clays were evidently unglazed, and Evliyâ’s comparison with the Isnik ware can only refer to the esteem in which they were held.

Migeon and Sakisian proposed to indentify as the work of the Golden Horn potters a group of wares painted with spiral decoration, fragments having been found in excavations in that district. But they have also been found at Isnik and elsewhere, and technically the ware is indistinguishable from the “Abraham of Kutahia” and “Damascus” groups of Isnik pottery. Some pieces are painted in blue alone, and Rackham’s suggestion that they are the earliest is confirmed by the bottle dated 1529 (figs. 33 and 34). Other pieces have the spiral stems painted in greenish black, and interpolated arabesque roundels in blue and turquoise—colors found in the contemporary wares painted in “Damascus” style. A small jar in the Victoria and Albert Museum has rather poor “Golden Horn” spirals, and rosettes in the thin red of the earliest “Rhodian” pieces. The group should therefore cover the period about 1525–50 or a little later. As Sakisian has observed, the spirals appear on the tughras of Süleyman the Magnificent (1520–66) and Murad III (1595–1603). They are merely a simplified version of the background ornament common in Persian art of Mongol and Seljuk times. It is interesting to observe that Isnik wares of this class found their way to Italy and were imitated in majolica made during the second half of the sixteenth century, apparently at Genoa.

A key piece is the cut-down bottle in the Godman collection (figs. 33 and 34, hitherto unpublished). The painting, in blue, is of excellent quality, and the Armenian inscriptions seem intended to escape superficial notice, being camouflaged as part of the design. That around the molding at the base of the neck reads: “Bishop Ter Martiros sent word to K’ot’ayas: May the Holy Mother of God intercede for you: send one water-bottle (surahi) here: may Ter Martiros receive it in peace. In the year 978 (A.D. 1529) on the 15th of March this water-bottle was inscribed.” In a spiral under the base is: “T(e)r Martiros sent word from Ankara: may this water-bottle (be) an object (of)

20 No. C.158–1900, from excavations on the site of the Post Office in Istanbul.
22 Figure 45, p. 278.
K’ot’a’ys for this Monastery of the Holy Mother of God.”³⁹ It would seem from this that the bottle was made specially for the Armenian community of Kutahia, and by them presented to the famous Monastery at Ankara. But the reading of the name is not without difficulties.

Because of its inscription, “Abraham of Kutahia,” early students believed that the ewer dated A.D. 1510 in the Godman collection (figs. 27 and 28, p. 255) was made at Kutahia, a view apparently still held by Sakiasian even after Hobson had shown that the evidence could not support it.³⁰ The inscriptions on the “Golden Horn” bottle could be misinterpreted in the same way. Undoubtedly both pieces were ordered by Armenians of Kutahia and painted by Armenian artists. But their form and decoration have no Christian reference, though both

³⁹ “Ter Martiros episkopos/ xapar xrkeç i K’ot’a’ys/ s(ur)b a(stua)cin jez barexős / mek surahi xrkeç’ i hos / barov bínä t(ē)r martiros / i τ’v(t)in jha. (978) marti za. (18) grveç ays surahin.” “T(ē)r martiros xapar xrkeç / yankurey ès surahi t’o ban k’ot’a’ys s(ur)b a(stua)cin vank’is.” These inscriptions have kindly been studied for me by Drs. Serge Topalian and Charles Dowsett of London and Mr. H. Kurdian of Wichita, Kansas. The translation is Dr. Dowsett’s. He observes: “It is fairly clear that K’ot’a’ys is a place-name; note parallel constructions xrkeç i K’ot’a’ys ‘sent to K.’ and xrkeç’i hos ‘send to here.’ K’ot’a’ys would normally be taken to refer to Kutais the capital of Imeretia (Arm. K’ut’a’ys, Georgian K’ut’aisi) but I suppose this is out of the question as far as pottery centres are concerned. The usual Armenian forms of Kutahya are K’ut’ahia, K’ot’ahia, K’iwt’ahia and the trouble with a K’ot’a’ys = Kutahia equation is the final –s of the Armenian form. The phrase ban K’ut’a’ys, apparently ‘object of K.,’ suggests that the bottle was presented by K. at least. There is nothing in the Armenian to suggest the bottle was made in another place. I do not think K. is a personal name since the pronoun and verb connected with it are in the plural.”


were destined for a church; and the inscriptions on the bottle are disguised, as though to escape the notice of the artist’s Muslim fellow workmen (they have been overlooked by previous visitors to the Godman collection). If an Armenian-run factory capable of such good work had existed at Kutahia in 1510 and 1529, we should have expected the survival of many contemporary pieces with explicitly Christian subjects and inscriptions. As it is, the earliest document for a pottery industry at Kutahia is a firman of 1668 ordering the local “cupmakers” to surrender some of their raw materials to the Isnik potters, who were charged with an urgent order for tiles for the Sultan; the Kutahia potters were evidently not thought capable of making the tiles themselves.³¹ Evliyâ Çelebi in 1669–70 referred to the plates, cups, drinking vessels, and jugs made by the “infidel potters” of Kutahia as less famous than those made in the declining factories of Isnik.³² The wares sent home by the French traveler Paul Lucas from Istanbul in 1715 consisted of “une douzaine de tasses à café avec leurs soucoupes, une tasse, deux bouteilles pour mettre de l’eau de rose, deux salières et deux escritoires, le tout de porcelaine de Cutajé.”³³ The earliest identified Kutahia vessels that survive are precisely of this trifling character.

Most of the “Golden Horn” shapes correspond with those of the contemporary “Damascus group.” There are large bowls on a high foot,³⁴ large dishes with flat wavy rim.³⁵

³¹ Anhegger, in Otto-Dorn, op. cit., p. 194.
³² Anhegger, op. cit., pp. 173, 194 (large order for tiles in 1709).
³³ Quoted by Sakiasian, Pages d’art arménien, p. 105.
wide-rimmed *toudini* with a shallow well, rimless dishes, long-necked bottles, and a cylindrical flower vase with flat handle. The rather squat form of two mosque lamps stands in development midway between figures 22 and 42. A large vase and a set of rectangular tiles may be mentioned, and a unique covered ewer, formerly in the Kelekian collection, seems from its angular spout to have been adapted from a metal shape.

VI. A MINOR GROUP OF ISNIK POTTERY, ABOUT 1525-60

Certain pieces of Turkish pottery share characteristics that distinguish them from the more typical pieces of the "Damascus group." They are comparatively thin and slight in potting, and most are rather feebly painted in gray or black instead of blue. Many are close imitations of the Chinese porcelain dishes with a wavy edge. A rimless dish in the Victoria and Albert Museum is painted in gray with four very peculiar goggle-eyed fish. The same museum has an interesting small bowl found in excavations in Istanbul, with blackish-blue radiating triangular petals outside (suggested by those on a fifteenth-century Chinese bowl), and Chinese clouds inside surrounding a medallion containing the "Solomon’s seal" pattern of crossed triangles. There are touches of dull olive green in the triangle. Resembling this bowl in its thin potting is a small globular vase in the Godman collection painted with two zones of dull blue tongue pattern outside, and with a monochrome wash of olive green inside. In view of claims put forward for the existence of manufactures at Kutahia and Istanbul, the possibility should be considered that all these pieces were made at some place other than Isnik. I myself believe, however, that they came from an inferior factory at Isnik. A document in this sense is a large mosque lamp in the Godman collection, of typical "Rhodian" shape, with gray-painted roundels containing interlacements. One of the three handles has been broken and clumsily repaired in clay; over the repair is painting in the typical "Rhodian" light blue; and around a circular hole in the base has been painted a rosette in "Rhodian" blue, emerald green, and "sealing-wax red." The vase may have been damaged in the workshop, after painting but before glazing; after a lapse of time someone may have decided to repair, glaze, and fire it, having added some painting in the superior colors that had meanwhile become available.

VII. SYRIAN (DAMASCUS) POTTERY OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

Though the Isnik wares formerly attributed to Damascus have nothing to do with that city,
Fig. 1—Seljuk Fragments from Konya, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 2—Sgraffiato Fragments from Konya, Victoria and Albert Museum
Fig. 3—Jar. About A.D. 1490-1500. Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 4—Cast Silver-Gilt Tankard. About 1500-25 (Cover Later). Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 5—Pilgrim bottle. About 1490-1500. Musée Céramique, Sèvres.

Fig. 6—Dish. About 1490-1500. Topkapu Sarayı Müzesi, Istanbul.
Fig. 7—Reverse of figure 6.

Fig. 8—Dish. About 1490-1500. Musée du Louvre.

Fig. 9—Dish. About 1490-1500. Musée Céramique, Sévres.

Fig. 10—Bowl. About 1510. British Museum.
Fig. 15—Interior of figure 14.

Fig. 16—Mosque lamp. About 1512-15. Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi.

Fig. 17—Mosque lamp. About 1512-15. Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi.

Fig. 18—Mosque lamp. About 1512-15. Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi.
Fig. 19—Mosque lamp. About 1512-15. British Museum.

Fig. 20—Mosque lamp. About 1515-20. Godman Collection.

Fig. 21—Mosque lamp. About 1515-20. Godman Collection.

Fig. 22—Mosque lamp. About 1520-25. Berlin, Islamische Abteilung.
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Fig. 24—Dish. About 1520-25. Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 25—Dish. About 1525. Metropolitan Museum, New York.

Fig. 26—Reverse of figure 25.
Fig. 27—Ewer. Dated 1510. Godman Collection.

Fig. 28—Inscription under base of figure 27.

Fig. 29—Ewer. About 1520-25. Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 30—Ewer. About 1525. Victoria and Albert Museum.
Fig. 31—Tankard. About 1520-25. Musée Céramique Sèvres.

Fig. 32—Fragments of a vessel. About 1525-30. Berlin, Islamische Abteilung.

Fig. 33—Bottle. Dated 1529. Godman Collection.

Fig. 34—Inscription under base of figure 33.
Fig. 38—Dish. About 1525-30. Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 39—Dish. About 1525-30. (Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art.)

Fig. 40—Dish. About 1530. Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 41—Dish. About 1530-40. Victoria and Albert Museum.
Fig. 42—Mosque lamp from the Dome of the Rock. Dated 956 H./1549. British Museum.

Fig. 43—Mosque lamp from the Süleymaniye Mosque, Istanbul. Victoria and Albert Museum.
Fig. 44—Bowl. About 1550. Godman Collection.

Fig. 45—Italian Maiolica Imitating "Golden Horn" Decoration. About 1570-75.
Plate 14

Fig. 46—Plate. Arms of Mocenigo (3). About 1575. British Museum.

Fig. 47—Bowl, Syrian (Damascus). About 1550. Gordan Collection.

Fig. 48—Tiles in Court of the Suleimaniye Mosque, Damascus. About 1547-60.
there nevertheless remains a considerable body of Ottoman vessels and tiles which were certainly made in Syria. It is important to establish their date, since it has been suggested that Sultan Selim I may have brought back Syrian potters and settled them at Isnik after his conquest of Syria in 1516. But this would hardly have been worth while; to judge from the scanty evidence available, the ceramic industry in Mamlûk Syria and Egypt was at that time in a thoroughly decadent state. According to Wulzinger and Watzinger, no painted tiles survive on buildings in Damascus of the period between 1424-26 (Mosque and Tomb of al-Tawrîzî) and 1554 (Mosque of Sûleyman the Magnificent). In Cairo, the tympanum over the door of the Fountain of Qâyt Bây (1495-96) has blue-and-white tiles in a definitely Chinese tyle, as had the now demolished Madrasa of Janbalât, built in 1500-1501. There are, or were,

blue-and-white painted tiles in the Mausoleum of Sultan Qânsûh al-Ghawri (1503-1504) and at the postconquest Mausoleum of Âmir Sulaymân (1544-45). But the scantiness of this evidence indicates that in the first half of the sixteenth century neither Syria nor Egypt had any considerable manufacture of painted tiles.

Far more significant for our present study is the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. The ancient mosaics covering the exterior of the drum and octagon of this venerable shrine were in a ruinous state, and were therefore stripped off and replaced by glazed tilework. Richmond believed that the restoration began in the fifteenth century; but the inscription around the cornice of the drum, the point at which work must have started, has since been read by Max Van Berchem, and found to include the date 952 H./A.D. 1545-46. Tile mosaic is used for this inscription; below it, mostly on the drum, are cuerda seca tiles, and an “intermediate” type in which the glaze overflows the cuerda seca outlines. It appears that in the course of the job the tilemakers worked out for themselves a technique of underglaze painting which is used for the majority of the tiles. A tile on the architrave of the North Porch signed “Abd Allâh of Tabriz” and dated 959 H./A.D. 1552 is painted in blue, turquoise, and black on a white ground, and is technically similar to the Isnik tiles. Megaw has confirmed from the presence of kiln debris that many of the tiles

49 Aly Bey Bahgat and F. Massoul, La céramique musulmane de l’Égypte, Cairo, 1930, p. 80 (finds at Fusât). Syrian pottery of the fourteenth century is well understood, thanks to the excavations at Baalbek, Hamlû, and Damascus (outside the Bâb al-Sharqi); in general style it resembles the Persian pottery of the Mongol period found near Sultanabad. In the fifteenth century this style continued in a feebler form, along with imitations of Chinese blue-and-white. But it would be hard to characterize any Syrian pottery of the early sixteenth century.
51 Prost, op. cit., pp. 11-15, pls. 4, 5.
53 I owe these observations to my friend A. H. Megaw, Director of Antiquities in Cyprus, who kindly allowed me to study the very valuable unpublished report on the Dome of the Rock which he prepared in 1945-46 for the Arab Committee for Restoration.
54 Van Berchem, op. cit., No. 240; the inscription records the restoration by Sultan Sûleyman.
were made locally; he considers that the workmen were Persians brought either from Persia or from an intermediate center such as Damascus, where they had conserved their native traditions. In the later stages tiles were imported from Isnik, and these have the typical “sealing-wax red.” The earlier cuerdaseca tiles are of types peculiar to this building and are not found elsewhere.

The task of tile-facing the Dome of the Rock was of a magnitude far beyond the resources of native potters in Syria or Turkey at that time. Isnik had so far made very few tiles, and in Istanbul the cuerdaseca technique was obsolescent.55 It would be natural for Suleyman to look, for craftsmen, to Persia, where tile mosaic and cuerdaseca were competently practiced on a very large scale; and in particular to Tabriz, which he himself visited in military campaigns of 1534 and 1548–49. It is more surprising that instead of completing the work on the Dome in cuerdaseca, the tile makers changed over to what for them must have been an unfamiliar technique, that of painting in underglaze colors. The idea of using such tiles on a large scale was born; and perhaps indirectly, through Suleyman’s architects, it must have had a decisive effect on the ceramic industry at Isnik. For the Mosque of Suleyman (1550–57), begun while work at Jerusalem was still in progress, was the first of many in Istanbul to receive extensive decoration in Isnik painted tiles.

The example of the Dome of the Rock went further. Sultan Suleyman’s Mosque in Damascus was founded in 962 H./A.D. 1554 and finished six years later. Here too, in the tympana over the windows and doors of the great court, are the first of a notable series of painted tiles.56 The designs (fig. 48) are of the Persian-Chinese character that had become international, and their broad handling, with stiff black outlines, suggests an immediate derivation from cuerdaseca tilework. A series of buildings in Damascus dating between 1554 and 1585 (the Mosque of Sinan) have tiles which show the development of more detailed freehand brushwork;57 there is a preference for such motifs as cypress trees, flower vases, and wavy vine branches. At this time the tilemakers of Damascus and Isnik were apparently pursuing quite distinct, though parallel, courses. But it is just possible that the color scheme of the Damascus tiles had been suggested by earlier imports from Isnik, not of tiles, but of pottery vessels. For there are a few fine bowls, undoubtedly made at Damascus, which seem to be imitated from Isnik wares of the so-called “Damascus group” (fig. 47).58

To these colors—cobalt blue, turquoise, purple, black outlines, and a green ranging from clear, pale, apple green to a muddy olive—the Damascus potters remained faithful in a series of vessels whose shapes and painted designs betray familiarity with the Isnik pottery painted in the “Rhodian” colors of the second half of the sixteenth century. They are technically inferior, with a glassy crackled glaze, a dirty yellowish-white ground, and careless drawing in colors that tend to run.59 Needless to say, the “sealing-wax red” is never used.


56 Victoria and Albert Museum, No. C. 1988–1910; also, The Godman collection, pl. 52, Nos. 9 and 13; pl. 64A, No. 473. The body is softer than that of the Isnik wares, and easily stained; there are three spur marks inside; the glaze is glassy and uneven, though less so than on most of these Syrian wares; the bright, pale, apple green is a typical Damascus color. But it is the looser drawing that gives them away.

57 Examples illustrated by Ashton, Near Eastern pottery, Connoisseur, vol. 90, p. 167, No. 5; also The Godman collection, pl. 65, Nos. 26, 27, 30, 32.

58 Wulzinger and Watzinger, op. cit., pp. 102–111, fig. 27.
VIII. THE "RHODIAN" GROUP OF ISNIK POTTERY

It has been suggested above that Suleyman the Magnificent's restorations at the Dome of the Rock may indirectly have led to an unprecedented demand for painted tiles. In the second half of the sixteenth century tiles rather than pottery vessels became the main product of a greatly enlarged ceramic industry at Isnik. The tilework, which is comparatively well documented, has been so extensively discussed by previous writers that I will add only a few technical observations that have a bearing on the contemporary vessels.

THE TRANSITIONAL PHASE

A complete change in the color scheme of Isnik pottery, and the first use of painted Isnik tiles in a building of major importance, appears precisely in the mosque built by Mimar Sinan for Suleyman the Magnificent between 1550-57, and the associated Turbes of Suleyman (completed 1566) and his consort Hasseki Hurrem (Roxelana), who died in 1558. The tiles, which have been well described by Professor Otto-Dorn, cover a smaller area than in the slightly later mosques of Rustem Paşa (1561) and Mehmed Sokollu Paşa (1571); their color scheme is predominantly blue and turquoise with intense black outlines, the famous "sealing-wax red," or "Armenian bole," being still used rather sparingly.

A damaged mosque lamp in the Victoria and Albert Museum is a valuable in库存 of the new style, since it came from the Mosque of Suleyman and should therefore date from about 1557. Around the lip is a band of arabesques in black under turquoise glaze, similar to those in panels on the "Damascus group" bowl in figure 44, and on the mosque lamp from the Dome of the Rock made some eight years earlier in 1549 (fig. 42). Some of the "hatayi" lotus flowers are also in black, which plays an important part in the color scheme; a very pale turquoise is used for details, cobalt blue for the ground, green is absent, and broad areas are painted in a thin blotty tomato red. In the very rich tile decorations of the Rustem Paşa Mosque (1561) the red is still too thinly applied, except on the qiblah wall, where it is very thick and attains its true scarlet intensity; there is plenty of blue and turquoise, but still no green. In the Mehmed Sokollu Paşa Mosque (1571) a strong emerald green is very prominent, the red is excellent, and the turquoise has dropped out. At both Rustem Paşa and Mehmed Sokollu Paşa are some panels where managnese purple is used alongside the "sealing-wax red," but neither here nor at the Suleymaniye Mosque could I see any of the olive green so characteristic of the Isnik pottery of the "Damascus group." It would therefore seem that the change from the old to the new color scheme was fairly sudden and decisive, and that the rare pottery vessels on which the "sealing-wax red" and intense black outlines are combined with the Damascus olive green and purple, should be dated within a very few years after 1550. A fine dish of this kind in the Musée du Louvre is illustrated in color by Koechlin and Migeon; there are two dishes and a tankard in the Victoria and Albert and a tankard in the British Museum, and one dish in the Godman collection. The red on these pieces is thin and

60 P. 274.
61 Otto-Dorn, Das islamische Isnik, pp. 120-122. Documents concerning payment for the tiles, ibid., p. 186, No. 35.
62 No. 131-1885. Mentioned by C. D. E. Fortnum, Archaeologia, vol. 42 (London, 1869), p. 397, as a lamp of "Persian ware" which occupies the most important place in the Mosque of Suleyman in Istanbul, "much broken and begrimed with filth." Acquired by the Museum for £450 in 1885; a ball-shaped pendant offered with the lamp, but not bought, cannot be traced.
63 Koechlin and Migeon, Cent planches en couleurs d'art musulman, pl. 43.
65 Hobson, A guide to the Islamic pottery of the Near East, fig. 97.
66 The Godman collection, pl. 56, No. 423.
brownish, and strikes a discordant note with the other colors. The potters evidently soon recognized this and made no more.

THE "RHODIAN" RED

Potters have always had difficulty in finding a good red that could be fired at the same temperature as the glaze.67 The natural clay silicates containing a high proportion of iron oxide are infusible, and when applied as a "slip" of sufficient thickness are apt to repel the overlying glaze, standing out with a rough surface. A brownish underglaze red was used by the potters of Raqqah and Cairo in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but often turned olive green under slightly reducing conditions. A more usual practice in the Islamic east was to apply the red as an overglaze color, fired on in a muffle kiln (as in the Persian mināʾi ware and the simpler lājvardīneh wares of about A.D. 1300). In Persian tile mosaic details in red were left in unglazed clay or plaster, perhaps painted with unfired color. Examples are known where the red is an inlay of glass or colored stone.68 In the Yeşil Cami and Yeşil Türbe at Bursa (about 1420) the cuerda seca tilework has in some places matt red outlines laid over the black; in other places the red is painted over the yellow glaze. It is easily scratched off in the form of powder, and appears to be unfired. In the cuerda seca panels of the Mosque of Selim I in Istanbul (1523), the petals of the lotus flowers that should be red are painted in a very dull olive-brown color; comparison with similar Turkish tilework in the Victoria and Albert Museum reveals that in those places the glaze has been scraped off after firing, and painted with an

unfired color (perhaps oil paint) that now looks a dirty brown.

It was therefore a singular achievement of the Iznik potters to discover the means of producing their brilliant underglaze red. The color had to be applied very thick, standing up in perceptible relief; in a broken section it is seen to be unfused and relatively soft. Perhaps the thin Iznik glaze was exceptionally stable and viscous, for it does not retreat from the raised red areas over which it forms a continuous film.

"Armenian bole" or "boliarmény" was valued in medieval and renaissance Europe for its medical properties as an astringent, and did not all come from the east; Bernard Palissy the potter says that the name was also used of similar clay from deposits in France and probably elsewhere.69 Palissy did not regard it as a potter's color; but Cipriano Piccolpasso, writing at the very moment when the "sealing-wax red" was discovered in Turkey, reports the experimental use of red by the Italian makers of maiolica.70 He says that in the March "they put some Armenian bole in the yellow"; that Armenian bole is an ingredient in copper "lustre"; and that he had actually seen, "in the workshop of Vergiliotto of Faenza, a red as beautiful as vermilion, but it is untrustworthy; and this is made as follows: Armenian bole is ground with red vinegar and then it is painted over light yellow, so that if it happens to come about that the fire does not consume it, you will see a red in all perfection."

67 Otto-Dorn, op. cit., p. 110, refers to articles discussing the use of red in ancient and medieval Near Eastern pottery.
68 Red glass in a tile mosaic fragment from Persia, Victoria and Albert Museum No. 444–1906. Professor Erdmann informs me that red stone is used in the Yeşil Türbe at Bursa, in tile mosaic around the windows.
69 Nos. 1675–1892, 496 to B–1900, 528–1900.

70 Les oeuvres de Bernard Palissy, ed. Anatole France, Paris, 1880, pp. 363–364, 426–427. Palissy's Discours admirables was published in Paris in 1580. He implies that the bole originally came from Armenia or Turkey.
71 Cipriano Piccolpasso, Lettere libri dell'arte del vasaio, tr. and ed. B. Rackham and A. van de Put, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 1934, pp. 39, 51, 64. Piccolpasso was writing between 1556–59. He seems unaware that a dull sticky red, imperfectly absorbed by the tin glaze, had been already used for half a century by potters at Faenza, Siena, and Cafaggiolo near Florence.
On tiles in the Mosque of Ahmed I in Istanbul (built 1609–17) the red is still excellent, and if later in the seventeenth century it deteriorated into a muddily brown, that was not through the loss of a “potter’s secret”; the potters were taking less trouble with all their materials. There is excellent red on tiles made at the Tekfur Saray factory started by the Grand Vizier Damad Ibrahim in 1724 with workmen brought from Isnik to Istanbul.72

THE DECLINE OF THE ISNIK POTTERY

Generally speaking, the designs painted on the so-called “Rhodian” pottery are less interesting than those of the earlier “Damascus” group; at their most elaborate they can be regarded as excerpts from the larger designs painted on tiles. Perhaps the most effective designs are those planned simply to show off the marvelous colors—the diapers of stylized clouds, skewed gadroons, etc. Comparison with the tilework in dated buildings justifies us in placing the floruit of the style between about 1555 and 1620, when the colors, especially the red, began to deteriorate. The typical dishes with featherly leaves and flowers almost invariably have the stylized wave and rock border derived from Chinese porcelain, but only in the early “Rhodian” examples does the rim retain the shaped wavy edge. By the end of the sixteenth century the edges are plain circles, the wavy pointed lobes being indicated only by painted lines enclosing the border pattern. On seventeenth-century dishes these lines themselves become plain concentric circles, and the stylized rock disappears from among the now meaningless black spirals which were once waves.

According to Evliyâ Çelebi, in 1648 there were only 9 potters’ workshops at Isnik, compared with 300 in the time of Ahmed I (1603 to 1617).73 The industry was in full decline owing to the falling-off of the demand for tiles,74 and it is small wonder that the potters, who doubtless had many Greeks among them, were glad to find a market for their wares in the poor but house-proud Greek communities such as that at Lindos in the island of Rhodes.75 So far no one has collected all the not very rewarding Greek inscriptions on dishes, whose dates range from 1646 to 1669 or later.76 In the Topkapı Saray Museum is a wall plaque pierced for a tap, probably from a church, as the ogee arch which frames the blue-and-turquoise decoration includes a cross as well as the dedication by “the palsy, the least of the Lord’s servants, the pitiful and sinful (—) scaris, 1667.”77 The date 1678 is inscribed on one of the tiles that survive in situ in the katholikon church of the Megiste

72 Quoted by Anhegger in Otto-Dorn, op. cit., p. 192, No. 44. Another writer mentions 12 workshops in about 1654 (op. cit., p. 193, No. 47).

73 I have expressed above (p. 266) my doubt as to whether the superb tiles in the Circumcision Room and the Bagdad Köşk of the Topkapı Saray could actually have been made at the date of the buildings in 1641 and 1639. That tiles from older buildings were saved and reused is evident all over Istanbul, though the practice is referred to in only one late document—a firman of 1151 H./A.D. 1738 ordering tiles in a decrepit palace at Edirne to be removed, packed, and sent to the capital. (Anhegger, op. cit., p. 178.)

74 E. du Sommerard, Catalogue et description des objets d’art, Musée des Thermes et de l’Hôtel de Cluny, Paris, 1883, pp. 178–193, describes the 532 pieces from Lindos and Rhodes acquired by the Museum between 1865 and 1878; these are now dispersed among various French public collections, and many are illustrated in Clara Rhodes, vols. 6–7, Rhodes, 1932–33, pp. 803–845. Du Sommerard’s attribution of them to a local manufacture was effectively refuted by O. von Falke, Majolika, Berlin, 1907, pp. 44, 45.

75 Some are quoted by Otto-Dorn, op. cit., pp. 142–143.

76 evšέπικς κε ἐκάχιστος δύολος τῆς ἀθετῆς ταπηνάς κέ διαφασμέλλος (break) -σκαρίς, (break) 1667. Professor Romilly Jenkins informs me that ἀθετῆς is surely a misspelling for ἀθετώς. The Patriarch of Constantinople was known as ἀθετώς after A.D. 1453. The donor’s surname was probably Laskarion. In the break before the date was probably the word ξένος, “year.”
Lavra Monastery of Mount Athos, which were given by the Patriarch Dionysos of Constantinople, who ended his days here; similar tiles are in the Ivron Monastery.78

Dr. Richard Ettinghausen informs me that some years ago he saw in the New York market a typical “Rhodian” mosque lamp which had a Hebrew inscription, suggesting that the potters worked for other minorities besides the Greeks.

IX. EXPORT OF ISNIK POTTERY TO WESTERN EUROPE

This subject has been thoroughly investigated by Sarre and others,79 and I have but few points to add. Soon after 1500 exotic oriental influences appeared in the painting on the Italian maiolica of Faenza, Siena, and Caffaggiolo; dishes were decorated, on front and back, with coiled running foliage and flowers in blue-and-white. Such designs were called “porcellana” by Cipriano Piccolpasso, writing about 1556–59,90 in conception and in detail they obviously derive from Chinese blue-and-white porcelain. The Venetian wares made after about 1520 showed a marked preference for the Chinese designs, which in this city were often combined with arabesques of Near Eastern character. Rackham has suggested that the designs were not adopted direct from China; “the half-way stage is to be found in the Near East, particularly in the lovely blue-and-white Turkish earthenware of Isnik, which Venetian potters introduced with them to Italy.”91 Falke saw in the unusually transparent tin glaze used by the Venetian potters

78 I owe thanks to Sir Alan Barlow for a description of these. See also H. Brockhaus, Die Kunst in den Achos-Kloster, Leipzig, 1891, pp. 253–255.
80 Piccolpasso, op. cit., p. 71, pls. 54, 78, 79.

a conscious attempt to imitate the Persian-Turkish glazes.82

There is, however, little Chinese feeling in the “Abraham of Kutahia” style that prevailed at Isnik until about 1525, and the contemporary Italian potters are therefore more likely to have taken their designs directly from true Chinese porcelain. This would naturally enter Italy mainly through Venice, the headquarters of trade with the Levant. Even the Near Eastern motifs on Venetian majolica are unlike those on Isnik pottery,83 they appear to have been taken over from the “azzimina” engraved metalwork made by a colony of Near Eastern craftsmen in Venice itself.84 In fact I can find no convincing evidence that Isnik wares had any influence in Italy before the second half of the sixteenth century.

A distinct group of Italian maiolica vessels, hitherto little noticed, is painted in blue with spiral designs obviously imitated from the “Golden Horn” wares made between about 1525–50.85 Their approximate date is given by an albarello formerly in the Salvadori collection, Florence, inscribed “1572.”86 Morazzoni attributes them, with good reason, to “Genoese manufacture”; but his suggestion that they were made “under influence from Pesaro” appears unjustified.

82 Von Falke, op. cit., p. 141.
86 Morazzoni, op. cit., fig. 13.
Padua in Venetian territory is now recognized as the home of the well-known group of maiolica, formerly attributed to Candiana, which imitates the "Rhodian" wares with feathery leaves and flowers. The dates inscribed on these pieces range from 1601 to 1697, and it would be interesting to know whether genuine Turkish vessels continued to be imported throughout this period.

Italian patrons had long been in the habit of ordering lustre-painted pottery with their own coats of arms from the "Hispano-Moresque" factories near Valencia. But there is hardly any evidence that the Turkish wares imported to Venice, and from there passed on to Germany, came as the result of special orders placed with the factories at Isnik. We learn from Stephan Gerlach, secretary to the Austrian Embassy to the Sublime Porte between 1573 and 1578, that his master, David Ungnad, had bought 100 ducats' worth of Isnik pottery for shipment to Venice; but he probably obtained it from the numerous retailers in Istanbul. Only one Isnik service, of which several plates are in European collections, bears a shield of arms indicating that it was made for a European family (fig. 46). The almond-shaped, pointed shield is set among flowering branches and shows: argent and azure, divided by a bend gules, in each a rose counterchanged. It seems possible that we have here a garbled version of Mocenigo of Venice (per fesse azure and argent, in each a rose of four petals counterchanged boutonneé de or). Alvise Mocenigo was Doge of Venice from 1570 till 1577, and thus presided during the war with Turkey which began in 1570. Cyprus was lost, and in spite of the great victory of Lepanto in 1571, the Venetians were forced, through the defection of their allies, to sue for the unfavorable peace of 1572-73. In 1574 the Turks in turn made overtures for an alliance against Philip II of Spain, and Rabbi Salomon Nathan Eschinas, representing the Grand Vizier Mehmed Sokollu, was sent to Venice to negotiate. Rabbi Salomon had good reason to thank the Doge for the protection accorded to his own sons in Venice, and Sultan Selim II's favorite wife Haseki Safiye happened to be a Venetian lady of the Bafo family. A diplomatic gift of Iznik pottery to the Doge Mocenigo would thus have been timely, and the service we are discussing was indeed of a quality to suit the occasion.

Equally fine, and probably of about the same date, are three flower vases with narrow necks and broad pierced shoulders, all marked under the base in black with a long-stemmed cross intersected by a capital letter "S." This sign


68 Stephan Gerlach des Aderen Tagebuch, Frankfurt am Main, 1674, p. 380; quoted by Otto-Dorn, op. cit., p. 131.

69 One large plate and two small ones in the British Museum; another in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Splendeur de l'art turc, Paris, 1953, No. 300. The very wide, flat rim is exceptional in Turkish plates.


81 Giovanni Mocenigo was Ambassador to Istanbul in 1604, but the service looks earlier (T. Bertelé, Il Palazzo degli Ambasciatori di Venezia a Costantinopoli, Bologna, 1932, p. 415). Mr. Ralph Finder-Wilson has drawn my attention to an object in the British Museum which bears, thrice repeated, what appears to be the same coat of arms on a heater-shaped shield. It is a bowl with pouring-spout, of brass engraved and inlaid with silver, apparently Mamluk; the inscribed titles are: "al-amir al-'âlî al-mawâli al-mâliki al-'adili al-'âmili al-âlimi al- (shield interposes) al-mujâhidî al-murâbiî al-muthâghiri al-mâliki al-'adili al-mâliki al-nâsîri." It is unlikely that the same mistake in rendering a European coat of arms would be made on objects of different provenance, and the tentative identification as Mocenigo may have to be abandoned.

82 One example in the Godman collection (not catalogued), another in the British Museum (mark
resembles those found on Italian maiolica drug pots made for the pharmacies of religious hospitals, and as the shapes of the vases, all different, are exceptional in Turkish pottery, there can be no doubt that they were made specially for some person or institution in Europe. The carnations, feathery leaves, and fruit blossom are painted in the most brilliant colors, the "sealing-wax red" being especially good.

The blue-and-white designs on the so-called "Medici porcelain" made in Florence for the Grand Duke Francesco I of Tuscany between 1575 and 1587 often seem to be adapted from those on Isnik pottery, and a contemporary stated that the material itself was discovered with the help of a "Levantiner." Could it possibly have worked at Isnik? Two later soft-paste bowls, made at Padua in 1627 and 1638, show the influence of Isnik in the designs, and must be attributed to the same workshops that produced the so-called "Candiana" maiolica described above.

Isnik ware must have been more widely known in contemporary Europe than we have hitherto believed. Thomas Platter, a Swiss who visited England in 1599, reports seeing "a Turkish pitcher and dishes" in the curio cabinet of Mr. Cope, "a citizen of London who has spent much time in the Indies"; and according to an inventory dated 1612, the kitchen of the Mouth Tavern without Bishopsgate, London, contained "one earthen Turkey bason, with painted dishes," valued at one shilling and sixpence. All the other utensils in the tavern were of pewter or brass. Soon after this, the new delftware factories in London got into their stride; and a favorite motif on their boldly painted "blue-dash chargers" showed tulips, carnations, and other flowers growing from a single root. It no longer seems farfetched to suppose that these were directly inspired by Isnik pottery. Three "Rhodian" jugs, often published, have metal mounts made by the London silversmith "I.H." between 1586 and 1598; and the undated mounts on a fourth jug in the Victoria and Albert Museum, previously described as Utrecht work of about 1580 through a mistaken interpretation of an accidental casting mark, are now considered by my colleague Charles Oman to be English, and contemporary with the others.

**SUMMARY**

There is no proof that the famous Seljuq tile mosaics in thirteenth-century Anatolian buildings were created by Persians; but technical knowledge of their white body material must have been due to immigrant Persian or Syrian potters. It is now known that these immigrants also made tiles painted in luster and underglaze colors; and probably pottery vessels as well.

The ceramic arts declined in the fourteenth century, and knowledge of the white material was lost. Ordinary potter's clay was used for

---


the so-called “Miletus” ware, and also for most of the tile decorations carried out at Bursa and Edirne by Persians from Tabriz in the first half of the fifteenth century. But these tiles included some made of white material painted in underglaze colors, probably by craftsmen from Syria. In the second half of the fifteenth century knowledge of these techniques again died out in Anatolia.

Between about 1490 and 1525 potters at Isnik made extremely fine vessels and a few tiles of white material painted in underglaze blue. The antecedents of this newly founded industry are still unknown. The shapes were inspired by metalwork; the painted designs by illuminated manuscripts, with some borrowings from Chinese porcelain. Close comparison reveals a slight development in style, but with no significant influence from outside Anatolia.

Between about 1525 and 1555 revolutionary changes took place in the motifs and color schemes of the painting, designs for which may have been supplied by the court designers in Istanbul. A newly published bottle with an Armenian inscription confirms that the so-called “Golden Horn” style had started by 1529; and the discovery of the place name “Isnik” on a mosque lamp dated 1549 establishes the date and origin of the finest pieces painted in the so-called “Damascus” style. Besides pottery vessels, a fair number of tiles were also made in this period.

The restoration of the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem by Suleyman the Magnificent after 1545 led to an enormous demand for painted tilework, which henceforward became the main production of an expanded industry at Isnik. The soft “Damascus” colors were discarded in favor of the so-called “Rhodian” colors, including a brilliant red; these were better for tiles. The change can be closely dated within a few years around 1557. In the seventeenth century the industry declined, and the potters eked out a living by working for Greek customers.

The restorations at the Dome of the Rock stimulated a revival of ceramics in Syria itself, where, from about 1555 onward, tiles and vessels were made at Damascus, similar in design to those of Isnik, but different in color and poorer in quality.

Turkish pottery was hardly exported to the west before the middle of the sixteenth century. But imitations of the “Golden Horn” style were made, probably at Venice, about 1570; and the “Rhodian” style was imitated at Padua throughout the seventeenth century. A few first-class examples of the so-called “Rhodian” ware can be identified as made to special order for Italy about 1575.
INLAID BRASSES FROM THE WORKSHOP
OF AḤMAD AL-DHAKĪ AL-MAWŠİLĪ

By D. S. Rice

I. INTRODUCTION

The publication, more than a century ago, of the famous Blacas ever, made at Mosul, led to the rather indiscriminate attribution of many fine inlaid brasses to workshops in that city. The terms “Mosul Work” and “Mosul School” have suffered from injudicious usage and require clarification. The issue has been further obscured by the tendency to confuse two groups of metalwork which, though overlapping to some extent, are by no means identical: (a) works produced at Mosul, and (b) works signed by artists who use the nisbah al-Mawsili. It is significant that when a modern Iraqi scholar came to compose an article on The crafts and commerce of Mosul in the Middle Ages he found a great many references to the town’s famous textile industry, but had to fall back for information regarding metalwork on the second-hand compilations of European writers, many of whom merely copied each other without adding any substantial evidence.

Reliable (that is to say, contemporary) textual evidence about the existence of an industry of inlaid brasswork at Mosul is indeed remarkably rare. One such text has repeatedly been referred to at second and third hand, but has never been published in extenso in the original Arabic. This relevant passage occurs in the Geography of Ibn Sa’id. It is contained in a brief sentence but the word of its author carries great weight, for he was recording his personal observations. Ibn


2 The collection of material for the present study was greatly facilitated by a grant from the Central Research Fund of the University of London. Unless otherwise stated all the photographs and drawings in this article are my own.

3 E. Kühlm, Zwei Mosulbronen und ihr Meister, Jahrbuch der preussischen Kunstsammlungen, vol. 60 (1939), p. 9 writes: “Die Ausbreitung des Einlegeverfahrens von der Stadt am oberen Tigris auf weite Gebiete der arabischen Welt hat dazu geführt, dass man zeitweilig schlechterdings alle zwischen dem XII. und XIV. Jahrh. entstandene Tschierarbeiten als “Mosulbronen” bezeichnete, während später die in das äusserste Gegenteil verfallende Aufsicht aufkam, die Benennung dürfte nur den nachweislich in Mosul selbst hergestellten Erzeugnissen vorbehalten bleiben. Beide Überreibungen vermeidet man zweckmässig indem man den Ausdruck zunächst einmal auf alle diejenigen Gefässe anwendet, deren Hersteller sich selbst als in Mosul beheimatet bekennen gleichviel ob sie dort geblieben oder anderswo sesshaft geworden waren.” I beg to differ from the last part of this statement and will endeavor to show that Mawsili artists working in Syria and Egypt did not necessarily produce works in a “Mosul” style.


Sa'id, a Spanish Muslim by birth, traveled extensively in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Iraq in 648/1250 and again in Armenia a few years later. According to one account he died at Damascus in 673/1274, according to another at Tunis in 685/1286. The passage, which is reproduced here for the first time, is taken from the precious manuscript of Ibn Sa'id's *Geography* in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris,7 which once belonged to Abû'l-Fidä'. It reads: "... في صنع جبة ولا سيما أوائل الأحرار (sic) التي تنجم بها. "Mosul... there are many craft vessels in the city, especially inlaid brass vessels (awâni al-muḫās al-muḫ'am) which are exported (and presented) to rulers,8 as are the silver-Inlaid garments9 woven there."

Another interesting text, which has been overlooked so far, is to be found in the chronicle of Sibt ibn al-Jawzî who died in 654/1257.11 Describing the defeat of the ruler of Mosul, Badr al-Dîn Lu'lu', by the Khwârazmians at Sinjûr in 635/1237, he supplies the following details: "Lu'lu' escaped all alone, riding a fast horse. The Khwârazmians looted his chattels, his treasures and all the possessions of his army. I have been informed," writes Sibt ibn al-Jawzî, "that a silver-inlaid pen case [lit. "silvered pen case" al-dawât al-muṣfaḍḍaḍah] which was worth 200 dirhams fetched 5 dirhams and a basin (tisht) and ewer (ibrîq) brought 20 dirhams."12

It is curious to note in passing that neither Yâqût (d. 626/1229) in his *Mu'jam al-buldān*, Qâzîmî (d. 682/1283) in his *Athâr al-bilâd*, nor Ḥamdullâh Mustawfî in his *Nuzhat al-qulâb* (compiled in the middle of the fourteenth century) made any mention of a noteworthy metalwork industry at Mosul. The early geographers (edited in the Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum) are equally silent on that score. Some explanation may be offered for that silence.

Although the technique of inlaying brass and bronze with precious metals was known in the Near East in remote antiquity,13 there is so far no evidence to show that it was practiced there in the Islamic period before the twelfth century. The earliest Islamic Inlaid work is an unpretentious pen case dated 542/1148 in the Hermitage14 which, judging by its bilingual (Arabic and Persian) inscriptions, is of Persian workmanship. It seems very likely that Islamic inlaid brasses were first made in Persia and that the fashion spread from there westward. It is not until

---


9 *luḥmān miḥāna ilā ʾ-mulūk* is more than just "is exported." The expression indicates that the vessels were of high quality and fit for kings.


12 Sibt ibn al-Jawzî, *Mīrāʾ at-al-zamān*, facs. ed. of MS. 136 of the Landberg coll. belonging to Yale University, by J. R. Jewett, Chicago, 1907, p. 466. This interesting text also informs us as to the relative values of Inlaid pen cases, ewers, and basins. The normal prices must have been: a pen case, 200 dirhams; an ewer or basin, 800 dirhams.


the time of the Zengids (1122-1233) and their successor Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’ (1233-1259) that Mosul rose from the status of a provincial town to that of capital of a wealthy and well-regulated kingdom. It was endowed with magnificent palaces and public buildings and rapidly became a prosperous center of commerce, industry, and the arts.\(^\text{15}\)

Elaborately silver-inlaid brasses were luxury articles which only the mightiest and wealthiest could afford, and it was not until the thirteenth century that a real demand for large-scale production of such goods arose at Mosul. At the same time, most of Persia had already fallen under the heel of the Mongols and skilled Persian craftsmen had begun to migrate. The nisba\(\text{h}\) used by one Mawṣili artist, al-Tūrabbī, seems to suggest that some were already in Mesopotamia in 627/1229.\(^\text{16}\)

The foregoing remarks explain why there is no mention of the production of inlaid brasses at Mosul in the accounts of the early geographers. It is highly unlikely that such vessels were manufactured there in their time. As for the later writers, both Qazwīnī and Ḥamdullāh Mustawfī were writing after the Mongol conquest of Mosul which brought about, if not the extinction, at least the decay of this luxury craft. The Mongol invasions were also the prime cause for the migration of craftsmen to the flourishing cities of Syria and Egypt, which were under Mamluk domination.

The silence of Yāqūt, however, who for many years lived at Mosul, and who completed a clean copy of his Geographical Dictionary there in 625/1227, is, at first sight, surprising. But it must be remembered that Yāqūt’s aim (as outlined in the introduction to his magnum opus) was to provide the correct spelling of place names, the geographical location of each place, and only incidentally such items of interest as the names of famous people born in each place, and the poetry composed in its praise. The entry under the heading of “Mosul” is disappointingly brief. Though Yāqūt finds space to praise the methods of building practiced there and to deplore the intense summer heat and the severe cold prevailing there, he dismisses the commercial and industrial activities of Mosul with a peremptory statement that “one could buy there all manner of goods produced in any country.”\(^\text{17}\) The enumeration of industries did not fall within the scope of his work. Moreover, his very familiarity with conditions at Mosul may have led him to neglect the—to him—obvious and well known.

We thus possess, at present, only two textual references to a flourishing industry of inlaid brasses at Mosul: the chronicle of Sibt ibn al-Jawzī describing conditions in 635/1237, and the Geography of Ibn Sa’īd probably reflecting conditions during that author’s visit to the city in 648/1250. Both accounts have, however, the advantage of being first-hand and independent evidence. Both relate to conditions during the reign of Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’ and we possess some actual works to confirm the textual evidence. These works are six in number.\(^\text{18}\) Foremost and by far the best in quality is the Blacas ewer, now in the British Museum, which was made (as its inscription indicates) at Mosul in 629/1232, one year after the recognition of Lu’lu’ by the Abbasid caliph as the de jure ruler of Mosul (he had been in sole control de facto since 615/1218). Five other pieces are unsigned and undated but all bear the titles and name of Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’ and there can be little


\(^{17}\) Yāqūt, Mu’jam al-buldān, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen, 1869, vol. 4, p. 684.

doubt that they were produced in his capital, Mosul. These are: (1) a large elaborately decorated tray in Munich, (2) a basin in Kiev, (3) a candlestick in the Hermitage, (4) a tray, and (5) a cylindrical box, both in London. The best-quality piece among Lulu’s brasses is without doubt the Munich tray; the other pieces are of coarser, though very competent, workmanship.

Strictly speaking, the term “Mosul Work” should be confined to these six inlaid brasses. It remains to be shown that this short list can be extended to include other works—signed and unsigned—which on grounds of stylistic and technical features can be classed if not specifically as “Mosul Work,” at least as belonging to Mesopotamian (as distinct from Persian or Syrian) workshops.

In the first place we must consider a number of works signed by artists who use the nisbah al-Mawsili, it being clear from the outset that the use of this nisbah indicates neither the origin of a piece from Mosul nor its being decorated in “Mosulian” style.

The series of works which bear such signatures now runs to 28 items. It comprises

12 ewers, 6 candlesticks, 5 basins, 1 box, 1 vase 1 divination table, 1 celestial globe, and 1 tray.

Lists of works signed by Mawṣili artists were previously published by G. Wiet and E. Kühnel, but as these can be amended and somewhat enlarged, I have thought it advisable to draw up a new list which is reproduced in an appendix to this paper (p. 325). It will appear at a glance that the majority of works were executed in Syria or Egypt and they are (as I shall endeavor to demonstrate) rather more characteristic of the styles current in those countries than in Mesopotamia. Before reaching this conclusion, however, it is necessary to submit each work to a searching examination.

We are fortunate in possessing occasionally more than one work by the same craftsman and his assistants. These works, taken together, constitute useful subdivisions in the ensemble of 28 signed pieces and they should be examined jointly. I have dealt elsewhere with the earliest of these subgroups, which is represented by the surviving works of ʿAbd al-Din al-Dhaḵi and his followers Ismāʿil ibn al-Ward (617/1220) and ʿAlī ibn ‘Abd al-Mawsili (629/1232). While the first two were almost certainly working in Mesopotamia, the last-named was almost certainly in Syria when he made a ewer for a dignitary of a Syrian Ayyūbid.

In the present paper I propose to discuss in some detail the works of another atelier—that of Aḥmad ibn ʿUmar al-Dhaḵi and of his ghlūm ʿAbū Bakr ʿUmar ibn Ḥājjī Jaldak.

We possess three works from the hand of the master craftsman himself (1–3) and two from the hand of his ghlūm (4 and 5):


20 S. M. Viasmitina, Katalog musei mistetsva Vseukrainskoi Akademii Navk, Kiev, 1930, p. 115. Only the inscription of this vessel has so far been competently studied by V. A. Kratchkovskaya, Nadpis’ bronzovovo tasa Badr al-Dina Lulu, Epigráfička Vostoka, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1947), pp. 9–22. The photograph printed in Viasmitina’s catalogue is too blurred to permit a study of the décor.

21 L. T. Gyuzralyan, Nadpis’ imenem Badr al-Dina Lulu na bronzovom podsvetnikhe, Epigráfička Vostoka, vol. 2 (1948), pp. 76–82. Only a partial view of the candlestick is shown in the reproduction.


24 Kühnel, op. cit., pp. 9–11.

BRASSES OF ĀHMAD AL-DHAKĪ AL-MAWSILĪ

II. THE CLEVELAND EWER

This ewer (pls. 1–2) measures 36.5 cm. in height. The bulk of the work is original but there are some later additions: (1) the lid and the uppermost ring of the neck, (2) the lower part of the spout and the plaque by which it is fixed to the body, (3) the base.

The handle is solid and cast in one piece; the rest of the vessel is raised from a sheet of brass. The ewer is signed in two places: (a) on the neck (pl. 15, a), and (b) at the base of the handle (pl. 15, d). These signatures read:

(a) عمل أحمد الدككي الموصلي في سنة عشرين ومائتان والن

This ewer was previously owned by Mr. R. Stora of New York and I am extremely grateful to him for lending it to me for several months. This has enabled me to study it carefully and to check my observations over a period of time.

I am indebted to Mr. Jean David-Weill, Keeper of Islamic Art in the Louvre, for allowing me to photograph this vessel, and to Madame M. Hours, chief of the Louvre's laboratory, for permitting me to use the laboratory for this purpose.

Mr. Kofler very kindly allowed me to photograph this ewer. I shall continue to refer to it in the present paper as the "Homberg ewer" merely because it has become known by that name.

I have already published a detailed paper on this piece entitled The oldest dated 'Mosul' candlestick, A.D. 1225, Burlington Magazine, vol. 91 (Dec. 1949), pp. 334–340. It was then in possession of the late Mr. M. Stora of Paris. It will therefore not be necessary to repeat the details here. I am indebted to Mr. Kojiro Tomita, Curator of Eastern Art in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for permission to publish a general view of the candlestick on plate 14, b (not shown in my Burlington Magazine article).

I regret to state that permission to photograph this ewer in detail was not granted. Permission to reproduce the already known view on plate 14, a, is due to the kindness of Mr. Marshall B. Davidson on behalf of the Metropolitan Museum.

"Work of Ahmad Al-Dhakī, the engraver, Al-Mawsili, in the year 620 (1223) and glory to my owner!" (fig. 1).

FIG. 1—CLEVELAND EWER, SIGNATURE OF ĀHMAD AL-DHAKĪ AL-MAWSILĪ AND DATE (620/1223).

"Work of Ahmad Al-Dhakī, the engraver, Al-Mawsili, in the year 620 (1223) and glory to my owner!" (fig. 1).

FIG. 2—CLEVELAND EWER, SIGNATURE AT BASE OF HANDLE.

31 In this text the ewer itself is made to wish the owner glory (izîz). There are other examples of "speaking" vessels, cf., e.g., F. Sarre, Erzeugnisse islamischer Kunst, I, Metall, Leipzig, 1906, p. 27, No. 57.
"Work of Ahmad al-Dhaki al-Mawsili (fig. 2).

Unfortunately the Cleveland ewer, which is not only the oldest ewer of its kind but doubtless was once one of the finest and most original works, has suffered severely from wear and tear. Most of the silver inlay has vanished and this circumstance makes the interpretation of some of the scenes which decorate it rather difficult.

A. The neck.

This is tubular and tapering toward the lower end. A band (7.5 cm. wide) between two rings in relief is decorated with figures and bordered by narrow bands of Sasanian pearls and inscriptions. Unfortunately the letters of the inscriptions are so badly worn and effaced that, despite continued efforts, I have been unable to make anything of them. An outline of the scene developed in the large band is given in figure 3. In the center, facing the spout (i.e., the front of the vessel), is a throned figure raising a beaker in his right hand. Two flying genii are holding a canopy over his head. On either side of the throne are two rows of attendants. In the upper row are servants who carry a variety of vessels and weapons (one can distinguish a man holding a long-necked bottle and another shouldering a mace). In the lower row are seated figures of musicians. A curious feature is the posture of the two standing attendants nearest the throne. They seem to be directing the orchestra rather than attending their master, as is usual in similar courtly compositions. The arrangement of the figures in two rows is also to be seen on the shoulder of the Metropolitan Museum ewer of 623/1226, on the miniatures of some Aghani MS. frontispieces of 614/1217, and on that of the pseudo-Galen manuscript in Vienna, all of which are considered to be works executed in Mesopotamia.

Two graffiti of later owners are shamelessly scratched into the neck of the ewer (fig. 4). The first reads حسین بن قاسم حسین ابن یحیى, the second, less clear, may stand for اسما الحسینی. Under the second ring on the neck comes the full signature of the artist (fig. 7), then follow 10 raised, scalloped spaces which form a collar. The décor on these is very badly worn but one can make

---

out a pair of dancers over a crouching figure (acrobat?), a man on a camel, two archers, etc. No particular cycle of themes seems to underly the decoration on the scalloped collar.

c. A throned figure wearing a pointed hat, a bird of prey curiously perched on his bent forearm, not (as usual) on a gloved fist; the throne with pine-shaped finials is flanked by two attendants whose attributes are not clear.

d. Two hunters, pouches hanging from their shoulders; one is shooting his bow; the other following the movements of a dog which is chasing a quadruped (gazelle?).

e1–e2. A peacock and a running man; a throned boon companion raising a beaker with the left hand towards—

f. A standing attendant who is filling the beaker with liquid from a large container which is placed on the ground,34 a harpist (jank player), and a tambourine (daff) player.

g. A flute (zamr) player and a figure playing a violin (kamanja).35

h. Hunters and birds; a peacock.

At the joint between the two large compartments of the shoulder décor is a strange crouching figure with wings and a human face under a tall, pointed hat. A similar enigmatic figure is located under the handle of the ewer (fig. 6). In both instances the winged creature seems to be a fanciful, ornamental device performing the function of a knot at the junction of two parts of a composition. For similar figures one may compare details from a fluted, twelfth-century ewer in the British Museum (fig. 7, a)36 and a detail on a thirteenth-century wooden door from Konya (fig. 8).37

34 An excellent example of servants filling beakers from a large basin is to be seen on the shoulder of the Metropolitan ewer.

35 The instrument is not clearly visible but the gesture of the musician leaves no doubt about its identity. For the identification of the musical instruments cf. E. G. Farmer, Arabian musical instruments on a thirteenth century bronze bowl, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1950, pp. 110–112, and 8 figs.

36 For a photograph see Barrett, op. cit., pls. 6–7.

37 Cf. E. Kühnel and Aziz Ogan, Die Sammlung türkischer und islamischer Kunst im Tschinilli Köchh, Berlin, 1938, pl. 11.
Fig. 5, a and b—Cleveland Ewer, Scenes on Shoulder.
is decorated with a zodiac cycle. The handle springs from the sign of Pisces and the seated figure on the handle occupies the place normally filled by the planet figure symbolizing Jupiter seated crosslegged between two fishes (fig. 7, a).

A remote echo of the same arrangement seems to reappear in an ornamental headpiece of a fifteenth-century anthology in the Museum of Fine Arts Boston. This composition renders a favorite theme—a scroll ending in animal heads. In the center is a winged and crowned figure holding two fishes (fig. 7, b). The connection of this figure with the twelfth-century one does not seem to be a figment of

The fantastic, winged, crouching figure appears, further developed and woven into an ingenious repeat-pattern, on a Rasûlid tray (made by another Mawṣili artist) in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 9; Appendix, No. 26). Another explanation of the winged figure may be advanced, however. The twelfth-century fluted ewer in the British Museum, to which reference has been made,

the imagination, for in the same anthology at Boston there is a leaf whose headpiece portrays unmistakably a rendering of the zodiac sign Gemini.\(^{37b}\) Zodiac signs were often used to decorate ewers, especially in the twelfth century. The cycle almost invariably started to the left of the handle with Aries and finished with the sign of Pisces placed exactly where the handle is joined to the body. The Jupiter figure was then placed on the handle itself.\(^{37c}\)

The strange figure on the Cleveland ewer, placed (admittedly) under the handle not on it, seems to follow this tradition. The addition of the wings might be accounted for by the fact that in the absence of the zodiac cycle (of which it originally formed part) the figure was no longer felt to represent the planet Jupiter. The same applied a fortiori to the work of the fifteenth-century illuminator in which the zodiac sign, though still recognizable, has been transformed into an essentially decorative device.

C. The Body.

The shoulder of the ewer is separated from the body proper by a band of interlaced kufic which contains a series of standard blessings and good wishes. The part of the body below this band offers the richest and most remarkable harvest of iconographic material. It is fortunate that the inlay here is also relatively better preserved. The décor consists of a series of medallions set on a ground of boldly executed overall arabesques (fig. 10).

There are five large polylobed medallions (max. width 7 cm.) (Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9) alternating with five medium-size medallions (max. width 4 cm.) (Nos. 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10). In addition to these compositions, which form the central register, there are inserted above and below in the spaces between the large and the medium-size medallions two rows each of ten medallions (Nos. 1a–10a; 1b–10b).

---

\(^{37b}\) Coomaraswamy, \textit{op. cit.}, pl. 10, c, and Survey of Persian Art, vol. 5, pl. 944, D.

\(^{37c}\) F. Saxl has already commented on this arrangement in his fundamental \textit{Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der Planetendarstellungen im Orient und Okzident}, Der Islam, vol. 3 (1913), p. 173 (1–2).
The most interesting scenes are concentrated in the central register. We may now proceed to examine them, beginning with that placed to the left of the handle and continuing in clockwise direction—the direction of the Arabic script.

**Medallion 1** *(pl. 4, a, and fig. 11)*: In the center is a tree which also appears in most of the other medallions. Three birds are perched on the tree and a pouch hangs from one of its branches. To the left, a horseman, his head turned backward, is shooting his bow at one of the birds. To the right, a gardener is digging at the root of the tree with a pointed spade. Both figures are known from early Islamic metalwork, pottery, and painting. Two types of spades are depicted, those with and without crossbars for the foot. The latter type can be seen on the Boston candlestick *(fig. 40, f, h)*, in the Vienna and Paris Pseudo-Galen MSS. and in the Edinburgh MS. of Bûrûnî's *al-Abhâr al-bâqiyyah,* and on the outer walls of a painted pottery dish in the Freer Gallery of Art (previously Kelekian collection), and on glazed relief ware. The second type, without crossbar, can be seen in the Schefer Ḥārîrî MS. of 1237 (NB. arabe 5847, fol. 138).

**Medallion 2** *(fig. 16)*: Two archers are kneeling and shooting at birds perched on the tree which divides the composition.

**Medallion 3** *(pl. 4, b, and fig. 12)*: Two unarmed riders on camels facing one another.


The meaning of their gestures and attributes is not clear. If my impression is correct, the rider to the left is presenting a bouquet to the other. The remainder of the medallion is filled with birds—two of them peacocks—and by a peaceful hare at the bottom. The scene portrayed is not unlike a much later representation in the Turkish *Mi’râj-nâmeh,* of the Bibliothèque Nationale. That miniature shows newly deceased believers, mounted on camels, being welcomed into paradise and presented with bouquets of flowers. If this comparison is valid, the scene on the Cleveland ewer would thus portray terrestrial bliss, just as the miniature in the *Mi’râj-nâmeh* depicts heavenly bliss. Themes whose sole subject seems to be “friendly concord” are not unknown in Islamic metalwork. One may compare a composition with two standing figures in a panel of ɪbriḥîm ibn Mawâlîyâ’s ewer in the Louvre *(fig. 21).* Another possible explanation for the scene on the Cleveland ewer may be that it depicts a sort of “fantasia” performed by two camel riders with veils. A parallel for this exists on a Sasanian seal.

**Medallion 4** *(pl. 5, a, and fig. 17)*: An agricultural scene. A compact composition shows a ploughman holding his plough in the left hand and raising the right hand to urge on his oxen; in the background a tree with two birds. So far as I know, there exists no parallel for this scene in Islamic metalwork. A similar genre scene, depicting the threshing of grain, occurs in the Pseudo-Galen MS. in Paris *(pl. 16, a)*. In this, as in the ploughing scene, no yoke is shown. The model for the plough-
Figs. 11-14—Cleveland Ewer, Medallions on Body.
ing scene could have been a Hellenistic or Roman mosaic, or manuscript illustrations, such as those which illustrate the discourse on the awakening of nature after Easter, in the eleventh-century MS. of the Homilies of St. Gregory Nazianzus in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Medallion 5 (pl. 4, c, and fig. 13): A throned figure holding a mirror in the raised left hand is approached by two attendants. One is carrying a toilet box, the other a fly whisk (?). A lion passant is shown at the bottom and two affronted peacocks at the top. For a similar composition one may refer to a medallion on the Blacas ewer. The curiously emaciated lion in the foreground and the two affronted peacocks occur in exactly the same positions on a luster tile dated 1211–12 in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. On the tile, however, the two peacocks decorate a canopy suspended above the throne. This version seems to be closer to the original composition and makes better sense. In the medallion on the Cleveland ewer, the two birds hover precariously over the throne; the canopy has been omitted.

Medallion 6 (pl. 5, b, and fig. 18) shows a bucolic scene which, to my knowledge, never occurs on Islamic metalwork elsewhere. A shepherd, his right leg bent as if leaning against a rock (not shown), is playing his flute; two goats and a kid represent his flock; a burly sheep dog lies on the ground; a bird is perched on a tree. Another bird fitted in, it seems, in deference to the obligatory horror vacui of the Muslim craftsmen, is shown behind the shepherd’s back. This second bird is drawn clumsily and is alien to the composition, which strongly recalls a classical model.

Medallion 7 (fig. 14): A harpist and a flute player. This is a very common theme in the décor of metalwork. It occurs again on the Cleveland ewer in a small medallion (No. 10b). A close parallel can be seen on the Blacas ewer. Birds and a quadruped (dog?) are used as fillers.

Medallion 8 (pl. 5, c, and fig. 19) shows yet another pastoral scene: a man grazing his donkey; a peacock, and two smaller birds. This scene is also unknown from metalwork.

Medallion 9 (pl. 4, d, and fig. 15): This is probably the most remarkable among the unusual scenes of the Cleveland ewer. The principal figure is a youth nonchalantly reclining on a couch. His right arm is bent behind his head; the left arm, bent in front of him, is resting on the couch. Behind the couch, seated at the feet of the reclining figure is another person (male or female) holding a beaker or a bouquet in the outstretched right hand. A standing figure in the rear is carrying a long-necked bottle. The remaining spaces are filled by a tree and birds. The reclining youth is shown in a complicated perspective, partly from above (showing the position of the outstretched legs), partly from the front (showing the upper part of the
Fig. 15.

Fig. 16.

Fig. 17.
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FIGS. 15-18—CLEVELAND EWER, MEDALLIONS ON BODY.
Fig. 19.
Figs. 19-20—Cleveland Ewer, Medallions on Body.

inspiration came from such scenes as are portrayed on the "Mosaic of the Drinking Contest" in Antioch, or in the bower scene in the Nilotic composition of the Palestrina mosaic. Nor was the theme unknown in the Ancient East. Similar intimate banqueting scenes, but with the prince or king shown in a halfseated posture propped up against a pile of cushions, can be seen on a number of Sasanian and post-Sasanian silver dishes and seals.

50 An extremely close late example may be seen on a fragment from a lead sarcophagus in Berlin. Cf. E. von Mercklin, *Antike Bleisarkophage*, Archäologischer Anziger, Beiblatt zum Jahrbuch des Archäologischen Instituts, Berlin, 1936, p. 264. Here the same "flying posture" and the head resting on the bent arm can be observed. In the majority of classical monuments the deceased is shown in a seated position holding a cup.

54 Cf. P. Ackerman, *Sasanian seals*, Survey of Persian Art, vol. 4, pl. 256, LL, SS.
Parallels can also be quoted for some details in this curious composition. The circular carpet which covers the couch appears in certain Hariri miniatures and in Syriac manuscript illustrations. The couch with heavy short legs is frequently found both in the silver dishes and miniatures.

The garden scene in medallion 9 is part of the repertoire which includes the throne scenes and the entertainment of the prince. This repertoire appears to have come to the Muslim artists as part of their Sasanian legacy, while the agricultural and bucolic scenes are part of their Hellenistic heritage. Such a dichotomy is not unusual and can be observed in many branches of Islamic art.

Medallion 10 (pl. 5, d, and fig. 20): Two men under a tree; one, seated, is raising a beaker while the other is shooting a bird with a blowtube. For the man with the blowtube there exist several parallels. He appears on the Barberini vase made for al-Malik al-Nāṣir, the Ayyūbid of Aleppo (d. 658/1260) (figs. 23–24), and also on another work of al-Dhaki, the Homberg ewer made in 640/1242 (see below, p. 315, pl. 12, e). At present, I am unaware of any representation of this method of fowling with the blowtube in any other medium of Islamic art. Muḥammad ibn Māngli’s manual on venery also omits to mention it although it has a chapter on the guling of birds (tadbīq). Muḥammad Kashghāri’s Turkish-Arabic dictionary, composed at Baghdad (about A.D. 1075), explains tāwēk as “the bark of the willow tree (khilāf). The bark of the wet branch can be slipped off like (the skin of) a fish (shabbūr).” It is used to shoot


at birds with pelets (banâdiq). It is also made of reeds (qanât)."\(^{58}\) The Persian word for the instrument is tefak-e dahan "a tube for shooting clay balls through by force of breath."\(^{59}\) The Mamluk manual of administration of

The meat of small birds (‘asâfir) shot with this instrument was considered a delicacy and an aphrodisiac.\(^{61}\) The Abbasid caliph al-Mustanjid (555–566/1170–80) is reported as saying: "What could be nicer than to be a

Qalqashandi explains the term zabatânah (الزابتانة) (clearly not of Arabic origin) as "a wooden instrument like a spear and hollow inside. The hunter places a small clay pelet (bunduqâl) inside and blows. The pelet is ejected with force and kills the bird. It is a reliable weapon (kathrât al-işâbah)."\(^{60}\)

\(^{60}\) Qalqashandi, Subh al-a’şâr, Cairo, 1913, vol. 2, p. 138. The editors of the Subh found the name of the weapon spelled zebrata in their MSS. and corrected it according to the Qānûn of Fīrûzabâdî who equates al-sabatânah (السابتانة) with al-sabatânah. Hariri, in his work on Linguistic faults (H. Thorbecke [ed.], Al-’Hariri’s Durrat al-gauwâs, Leipzig, 1874, p. 14) lays down that the word zarbatânah should really be sabatânah as man sitting in an orchard eating all the little birds that enter that orchard and this can only be achieved by gluing,"\(^{62}\) i.e., by a silent operation. The scene on the tenth medallion it is derived from subâtâh "to be elongated." The commentator of the Durrat, however, is less convinced (ibid., p. 481.) and points out that only Hariri and Jawâliqi seem to accept this etymology. He also refers to a verse of the poet Ibn al-’Hajjâ (d. A.D. 1000) in which zarbatânah occurs in the sense of blowtube. At any rate it is the form, rejected by the purists, which is preserved in the Spanish zebratana (Alcala, Vocabulista) and also in the French sarbacane (Dozy, Supplément, vol. 1, p. 584b). See also H. Lammens, Remarques sur les mots français dérivés de l’arabe, Beyrouth, 1890, p. 214, and the references given there.

of the Cleveland ever seems to represent such a pastime: one man seated under the tree is waiting for the birds, which another is shooting with the blowtub (a silent weapon), to be prepared and freshly served. The whole setting of this scene and of all the others in the central register on the body of the Cleveland ever recalls the introduction to the twenty-fourth Maqāmah of Ḥarīrī, and the illustration to this Maqāmah\(^\text{66}\) where we find the same rural setting with people enjoying a pleasant “déjeuner sur l’herbe” to the accompaniment of musical instruments, while the peasants in the background continue to perform their daily tasks.

As already mentioned, the décor of the body of the Cleveland ever also includes two rows each of ten small polylobed medallions whose subjects may now be listed briefly. Some can be seen in plates 4 and 5.


---

In the upper row:

Medallion 1a (immediately under the handle) is filled with a crouching, winged figure wearing a tall hat which ends in a pompon. It resembles the winged creature on the shoulder of the ever, placed immediately above it, behind the handle (see above, p. 291 f.).

Medallion 2a, man on foot spearing a lion.

Medallion 3a, rider with falcon.

Medallion 4a, man riding lion (see below, p. 311).

Medallion 5a, man shooting bow at leopard.

Medallion 6a, man riding lion and looking backward.

Medallion 7a, rider killing dragon, different from 4a (very badly damaged).

Medallion 8a, man on foot fighting lion with a stick.

Medallion 9a, rider with (?).

Medallion 10a, rider attacked by lion.

The lower row of medallions is rather better preserved and all depict closely related themes of dancers and seated musicians displayed in pairs.

---

Figs. 25, a–c—Cleveland Ewer, Small Medallions on Body.
Medallion 1b (aligned below 1a), flute and tambourine players.
Medallion 2b, cymbals and lute players.
Medallion 3b, violin and (? players.
Medallion 4b, dancers (fig. 25, a).
Medallion 5b, lute and tambourine players (fig. 25, b).
Medallion 6b, lute and (?) players.
Medallion 7b, flute and darabukkah players (fig. 25, c).
Medallion 8b, two revelers.
Medallion 9b, flute and harp players; a cypress tree.
Medallion 10b, flute and harp players; in the foreground a bottle.

The subjects depicted in the small medallions require no comment; they are all stock-in-trade motifs of the Islamic metalworkers’ repertoire.

III. THE LOUVRE BASIN

This basin (pl. 6, d) in the Musée du Louvre (Inv. No. 5991) previously belonged to the Doiseau Collection. It measures 47.2 cm. at its widest diameter on the top, has a base of 32.6 cm. in diameter, and a height of 19 cm. A long circular inscription covering the whole circumference of the flattened rim contains the name and high-sounding titles of the Ayyūbīd Sultan al-Ādil II, Abū Bakr. It can thus be precisely dated between 636–638/1238–1240. An incised graffito on the base (pl. 15, g) indicates that the vessel had belonged to the vestry (jiškhanah) of this ruler. A second graffito shows that it had passed subsequently into the possession of a Yemenite prince, Ḥusain ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, son of the Commander of the Faithful in the year 1189/1775 (pl. 15, f).

The signature of the artist (fig. 26), Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar al-ma‘rūf bi’l-Dḥakī al-naqqāsh (with omission of the nisbah al-Mawṣili), appears in a cartouche on the outside of the vessel (pl. 15, c). The short text is perfectly balanced with the scrollwork which fills other compartments in the central band (fig. 27). These compartments recall cross-tiles in tile revetments.

The décor on the inside of the basin is badly damaged. Immediately under the flattened rim with the regnal inscription runs a band of blessings in kufic script (1.6 cm. wide). This is followed by a broad band (7.7 cm.) cut by quatrefoil medallions into seven oblong compartments. The quatrefoil medallions have in the center large octagons surrounded by six-armed swastikas and the lobes are filled with arabesques. The oblong compartments are filled with animated hunting scenes, which will be described below. Along the lower border of the wide band runs another narrow one (1.6 cm.) in kufic script containing more of the traditional blessings. The remaining space on the inner flanks of the vessel is covered with an overall interlaced-swastika pattern (so-called T frets) on which are reserved 19 polylobed medallions decorated with hunters and musicians.

The décor on the bottom of the basin has suffered most from wear and tear. The general layout resembles that of the décor on the Munich tray made for Badr al-Dīn Luʾluʾ and is organized in concentric circles. In the center a group of strutting ducks forms a whorl design (which takes place of the

64 Cf. G. Migeon, L’orient musulman, armes sculpture, bois, ivoires, bronzes, cuivres etc., Paris, 1922, pl. 29; idem, Exposition des arts musulmans au Musée des Arts Dénoratifs, 1903, Paris [1903], pl. 13.
65 Cf. RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4104. There are some mistakes in the reading given there. For ملک (?) read ملک the numeral after the “missing” word for the ḥamal al-nisbah, al-Mawṣili.
67 This inscription does not appear in the RCEA.
68 A similar text in the name of the father of this Yemenite prince, dated 1072/1662, appears on a basin in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo. Cf. G. Wiet, Objets en cuivre, Cairo, 1932, pp. 97–98, where further examples of Yemenite owner marks are listed.
more common sun disk) around it, in a circle, are six round medallions with the remaining planet figures. Then follows an outer circle made up of 12 medallions with images of the zodiac in conjunction with the planets. A badly effaced band of naskhi script, cut by 12 small roundels and fringed toward the outside with lanceolate leaves completes the design. The text appears to be taken from a poem but it is too badly damaged to be reproduced.

By contrast the inlays on the outside of the basin are almost perfectly preserved. The outer flanks of the vessel are covered by an overall pattern of interlinked swastikas. Beautifully worked barbed bands filled with vigorous arabesques frame the surface and divide it into two registers. Suspended between these bands—like pendants from a chain—are 30 quadrilobed medallions, 15 to each register. Small rosettes link the medallions with the bands and with each other. The impression evoked by this décor is comparable with a sumptuous chain laid out on rich material. Comparison with a textile pattern would be apt, were it not for the deliberate diversity of the scenes depicted in the medallions. No two are identical and, while some may have been copied from textile models, the creation of a pattern was studiously avoided. Each subject is treated individually and the medallions are matched, like differently shaped and multicolored elements in a necklace, without regard to any programme.

After this summary description, we may now turn to the more detailed examination of each part of the décor on the Louvre basin, beginning with that on the inside.

Despite their dilapidated condition, the seven large compositions of hunting scenes which fill the larger compartments are by far the most remarkable. Two of these panels only are reproduced here, on plate 7, a–b, and it is hoped that the outline drawings given in figures 28 and 29 will help to distinguish the various figures in these badly ruined scenes. Although one can recognize upper and lower registers in all seven panels, these are composed in depth, and animals and human figures detach themselves from the borders to flow toward the center. The compositions are powerful and lively. They would easily stand enlargement to fresco size. The horses, in particular, are treated with consummate skill and daring. Some are shown galloping, others as if descending a slope (pl. 7, b, and fig. 29); others
Fig. 28—Hunting Scene on the Inside of Louvre Basin of 1238–40.

Fig. 29—Hunting Scene on the Inside of Louvre Basin of 1238–40.
still are prancing or docilely following a groom. No posture seems too difficult for Dhakī to attempt. In one instance (pl. 7, a, and fig. 28) a horse is shown frontally in a violent foreshortening, and in the same panel another horse (in the left-hand lower corner) is rendered in three-quarter view. The mounted hunters shoot at birds with their bows, fly hawks, and pierce a wild boar with their lances; here and there are beaters and grooms on foot. There is nothing friezelike or rigidly repetitive about these compositions. The scenes are teeming with life and an illusion of depth is maintained throughout by means of several devices: (a) The horses in the bottom register are depicted somewhat larger than those on top, making the latter appear as if receding in the distance; (b) brilliantly executed foreshortenings (note, e.g., the wild ass at the bottom of fig. 28), and the movement toward the center of the compositions by men and animals help to maintain the illusion of depth; (c) the thick vegetation, unique to my knowledge in Islamic art, has the same effect.

It is interesting to compare in this connection some early Islamic attempts at foreshortening. They occur in the Pseudo-Galen MS. in Paris whose colophon is dated 1199 (but which may be a later copy of a MS. so dated) (pl. 16, b), and in the Schefer Ḥarīrī MS. of 1237 (pl. 16, c). The horses executed by Dhakī in silver inlay, between 1238–40, are at least as lively and convincing as those in the manuscript illustrations. Curious rear and front views of foreshortened horses decorate a silver-inlaid pen case dated 704/1304 in the Louvre (fig. 30, a–b). This is of Syro-Egyptian workmanship and the main effect aimed at, and achieved, is that of decora-

![Fig. 30, a and b—Details on Pen Case, Dated 704/1304, Louvre.](image-url)

---

68 For a photograph of the whole pen case see Migeon, _op. cit._, pl. 28; cf. _RCEA_, vol. 13, No. 5181.

70 For a color reproduction, see Arnold and Grohmann, _op. cit._, pl. 31.
dated 1337 (pl. 16, e). The friezelike arrangement is the same in both miniatures but a slight illusion of depth is obtained in the first by the foreshortening of the horse to the extreme left and by the placing of some of the figures on a second plane (the hawk second from the left; the dog behind the tassels of a saddle; the man behind a rock to the extreme right). In the second, Mamlük, miniature the decorative elements are emphasized, all the horses are shown in profile, the vegetation is regularly spaced and schematic, the illusion of depth is not desired and not achieved.

One of Dhaki's hunting scenes shows the killing of a wild boar (pl. 7, a, and fig. 28). Boar hunts were frequently represented in Sasanian art and examples are available in the rock reliefs, in stucco, and in silverwork. Boar hunts also appear later in Shah-nâmeh illustrations (surely based on old pre-Islamic models) but they are rare in Islamic applied arts.

The remaining five panels not reproduced here show a bear hunt, a gazelle hunt, and fowling parties, and all are set in thick vegetation which covers the whole background. These panels must be numbered among the most original compositions in Islamic metalwork and their dilapidated condition is much to be deplored.

In addition to the oblong panels, there are on the inside of the Louvre basin 19 medallions with figures. These depict in counterclockwise order (following the direction of the script) the following scenes:

1. Lute player and harpist, seated.
2. Falconer on horseback.
3. Tambourine player and violin player, seated.
4. Two persons on a camel.
5. Galloping horseman, shooting bow at bird.
6. Harpist and lute player (slightly different from 1).
7. Horseman shooting bow at bird (different from 5).
8. Woman playing lute, youth with beaker, standing (pl. 6, a).
10. Tambourine player and flute player, seated.
11. Horseman shooting bow at quadruped.
12. Lute player and wann player, seated.
13. Cheetah jumping from horse in pursuit of its prey (pl. 6, b).
14. Two flute players, seated.
15. Horseman with woman on crupper (pl. 6, c).
16. Harpist and lute player, seated.
17. Rider with falcon.
18. Flute player and duff player.
19. Horseman shooting bow at bird.

With the exception of medallions 5 and 8 the arrangement is that of horsemen alternating with pairs of seated musicians. A rare scene is that of medallion 8 (pl. 6, a, and fig. 31, a). The two figures are shown in a lively movement, probably that of a dance. The veil of the female lute player has slipped onto her neck; the youth holding a beaker is swaying forward toward her. A similar scene appears on the enameled Artuqid dish at Innsbruck (fig. 31, b), and, more clumsily, on the Lu'lu' tray at Munich (medallion 0) (fig. 31, c).

In medallion 13 one sees a cheetah jumping from a horse on whose crupper it had sat.

This portion of the miniature is unpublished. The central scene is reproduced in L. A. Mayer, Mamluk costume, Geneva, 1953, pl. 29, a. The lower border, still unpublished, shows a row of seated musicians.
I have pointed elsewhere to the frequency of the motif of the hunter in company of his tamed cheetah seated on the crupper of the horse before going into action. The leap which heralds the pursuit of the prey is portrayed here by Dhaki. It also occurs on a mid-thirteenth-century stem cup in the Bibliothèque Nationale (fig. 32) and in the frontispiece-miniature of the Oxford Ḥarīrā of 1337, mentioned above (pl. 16, e).

Medallion 15 shows a hunter on a galloping horse with another figure on the crupper. The scene belongs to the type of Bahrām Gūr illustrations which are very common in several media of Islamic art and for which good Sasanian prototypes have also survived. A similar explanation may be given for the strange figure on the crupper of a horse in one of the large panels (pl. 7, a, and fig. 28, upper register) of the stem cup. It may be a depiction of a man in a central register: a horseman or perhaps a hunter (to the left) although this figure looks more like a monkey than a singing girl.

The quality of the silver inlays in the 19 medallions on the inside of Dhaki's basin is not of the best. This can be explained by the awkwardness of their position deep inside the vessel, which must have made the task of the craftsman working on them extremely cumbersome.

We may now turn to the excellently executed and perfectly preserved scenes set in the medallions (diam. 5 cm.) which decorate the outer flanks of Dhaki's basin. One of the spaces in the barbed band by which the décor is divided into two registers (pl. 15, d, and fig. 26) bears the artist's signature and this is doubtless the “front” of the vessel. The list of subjects which follows begins with the medallion placed above the word 'amal, opus in the inscription and proceeds clockwise.

**Upper register:**
1. Acrobatic dancers (pl. 8, a).
2. Dancing monkeys (pl. 8, f.)

75 For a similar “front” of a round basin see D. S. Rice, The Baptistère de Saint Louis, Paris, 1953, p. 12.
3. Falconer on foot with two birds (pl. 8, h).
5. Whorl made up of man, two bears, dog and bird (pl. 8, b).
6. Archer on foot shooting at fox.
7. Addorsed, winged, dragon-headed lions.
8. Bearded man with drawn dagger, riding lion (pl. 8, c).
9. Two youngsters playing (?) or dancing (?) (pl. 8, e).
10. Man spearing winged quadruped.
11. Man stabbing hare with dagger, bear (pl. 9, d).
12. Man with shield spearing lion, two birds.
13. Two sword fencers with shields (pl. 8, d).
14. Man viewed frontally between two bears (pl. 9, a).
15. Bearded man killing lion with sword (pl. 8, g).

Lower register:
1a. Bull attacked by winged lion.
2a. Two moufflons affronted (pl. 9, b).
3a. Man spearing winged quadruped.
4a. Man viewed frontally between two hares (pl. 9, c).
5a. Fowler shooting bow at birds.
6a. Falconer on foot, bird on gloved left hand (pl. 8, i).
7a. Crosslegged seated figure between two peacocks.
8a. Birds arranged heraldically.
9a. Winged griffin attacking sphinx.
10a. Addorsed, winged, dragon-headed lions (variant of 7 above).
11a. Man killing winged quadruped with long sword.
12a. Archer on foot shooting at bear, three birds.
13a. Eagle between two foxes (?) (fig. 34).
14a. Man spearing winged quadruped.
15a. Man fighting bear with long sword.

As already stated, there is no preconceived plan in the arrangement of these scenes. They have, however, one feature in common. With a single exception (medallion 8) all the human figures are on foot. There are several variants of one theme (e.g., medallions 3a, 10, 11a) but the treatment is different in each instance. Several themes have parallels in the medallions which decorate the tray at Munich made for Badr al-Din Lu’lu’. This fact seems to point to the existence of a pattern book for metalworkers. In quality of craftsmanship, originality of composition, and finesse of execution Dhaki’s work, however, is by far superior to that of the anonymous craftsman who made Lu’lu’s tray.

Despite the absence of a regulating scheme in the arrangement of the medallions, these can be grouped into certain families in accordance with their subjects:

A. Mythical: (i) lion attacking bull (1a), (ii) lion attacking camel (4), (iii) griffin attacking sphinx (5a), (iv) man riding lion, (v) eagle between foxes (13a).
B. Heroes: (i) with two hares (4a), (ii) with two bears (14), (iii) between two peacocks (7a). It will be noted that all these figures—and only these—are shown frontally.

C. Heraldic: (i) addorsed fantastic creatures (7 and 10a), (ii) affronted moufflons (2a), (iii) birds (8a). This group and the preceding have parallels in textile designs and the scenes may well have been copied from textiles.

D. Hunters: (i) with spears (10, 12, 3a, and 14a), (ii) with swords (15, 11a, and 15a), (iii) with daggers (8 and 11), (iv) with bows (6, 5a, and 12a), (v) with birds of prey (3 and 6a).

Some of the above scenes are stock-in-trade ones and appear fairly frequently in metalwork and ceramics, but some are rare, others unique. In the last category belongs the medallion with acrobats (1, pl. 8, a, and fig. 33, a). A man with naked torso, clad only in short trousers, is seen performing an acrobatic feat with a female partner, who, except for some thin bracelets on the arms and wrists, appears to be completely nude. This, to my knowledge, is the only example of the portrayal of a nude figure on Islamic metalwork. A similar scene, but of inferior execution, exists on Lu'lu's tray (medallion 10, pl. 9, f; cf. figs. 33, a–b). There both dancers are fully clothed. Acrobats were depicted as part of the entertainment of the court. Some can be seen on the enameled Artuqid dish in Innsbruck and on the frontispiece of the Vienna Ḥarīrī dated 1334. It is not surprising to find the somewhat risqué nude figure on Dhaki's basin made for al-ʿĀdil II whose boisterous living and loose morals have been recorded by Muslim historians with unanimous diapproval. The scene belongs to the repertoire from which medallion 8 of the inner décor is taken (see above, p. 305).

Some of the themes depicted in the outer medallions are of very great antiquity. The eagle rising above two antithetically placed quadrupeds which it has seized with its talons (medallion 13a, fig. 34) is a remote echo of the ancient Mesopotamian image of

---

*Strzygowski-van Berchem, Amida, p. 349, fig. 295.*

*Arnold and Grohmann, op. cit., pl. 43 (in color); Holter, op. cit., pl. 3.*
Imdugud which appears as an eagle hovering above two moufflons in Early Dynastic Akkadian art and throughout ancient Mesopotamian art. The motif found its way—probably via Islamic art—into Romanesque art.


Frankfort, op. cit., p. 317 and pl. 47, d.

There certainly is no dearth of parallels for frontally portrayed hero figures between two beasts in the arts of the Ancient Orient, Islam and Medieval Europe.

Less obvious, perhaps, is the whorl-shaped design in medallion 5 (pl. 8, b). Here the arms

and legs of the man form a rough swastika. If one turns the design (fig. 33) the "human-wheel" aspect vanishes and resolves itself into a static image of a man attacked by bears. From the arrangement of the design in the medallion it is obvious that al-Dhakī was aiming at producing a whorl composition. Parallels for this are also found in the ancient cylinder seals and in Islamic and western medieval designs.81

The theme of the two fencers in medallion 13 (pl. 8, d) occurs on Lu'lu's tray in an inferior version (medallion d, pl. 9, h) and also appears in Romanesque art. In the last instance it does not seem to me to represent, as one writer has suggested a "souvenir d'un événement contemporain" or a "symbole de discorde,"82 but originally, like the preceding themes, the adaptation of an Oriental motif, which in all probability shows a sporting display of fencing rather than a serious duel. In Western art, however, the theme does acquire the meaning of "virtue and crime"82a as, e.g., in the mosaic of Vercelli.

The medallion of two dancing (?) youths (pl. 8, e, and fig. 33, c) also occurs on the Lu'lu' tray (medallion h, pl. 9, i, and fig. 33, d) and on the Artuqid dish in Innsbruck (fig. 33, e). It may perhaps be inspired by the zodiac sign of The Twins. I do not recall a close Islamic parallel, but there is a very good one in a Georgian MS. dated 1188 belonging to the Tiflis Museum (fig. 33, f).82b

81 Cf. Frankfort, op. cit., p. 317, pls. 14, h, 42, m, and 47, c; Rice, The brasses of Badr al-Dīn, figs. 1–3; A. S. Bashkirov, Ishusstvo Daghestana, Moscow, 1931, pl. 107; Rice, The Wade Cup, figs. 6, 10, and 11.
82a See P. Toesca, Storia dell'arte italiana. Il medievo, Torino, 1927, p. 1082, fig. 773.

A curious motif is that of the dancing monkeys in medallion 2 (pl. 8, f). A single dancing monkey appears on the ceiling of Qūṣayr 'Amra, where it is accompanied by another monkey playing the zither, and on the Blacas ever one can see a monkey dancing with castanets.83

The motif of animal musicians is also very widespread and of great antiquity. It is found on reliefs from Tell Halaf,84 at Ur,85 on an Indo-Bactrian silver cup in the Hermitage, and in China86 as well as in Europe.87

In preceding comparisons Dhakī's superior craftsmanship and sensitive understanding of his medium has been illustrated and compared with the routine competence of the maker of Lu'lu's tray. Dhakī's outstanding qualities become even more obvious when we compare his treatment of the subject in medallion 15 (pl. 8, g) with that of its parallel on the Munich tray (medallion s, pl. 9, e). In Dhakī's work a bearded man, striding out vigorously, has caught a lion by the scruff of its neck and wields a long sword for the kill. The design is perfectly distributed over the quadrilobed medallion. The movement of man and beast are lively and reveal a flair for the dramatic. In the same scene on Lu'lu's tray the design is unbalanced; the man does not fit into the space allocated to him, his hand is poised dangerously...
near the lion’s snout, his death blow lacks force. The whole composition lacks cohesion.

In medallion 8 another bearded man is riding a lion. This motif seems to have astrological connections. It appears on a small medallion of the Cleveland ewer (above, p. 300, med. 4a) on a ceramic dish in association with the signs of the zodiac.\(^{88}\) and on coins.\(^{89}\)

Dhaki’s designs are never hackneyed or dull. When he chose to represent a subject more than once he introduced variations which make it appear fresh and new; compare the falconers in medallion 3 (pl. 8, h) and medallion 6a (pl. 8, i). The same applies to the more common subjects, such as the hero figures, and to motifs borrowed from textile designs, such as the addorsed moufflons in medallion 2a (pl. 9, b).

At present we possess only two basins which are earlier than that of Dhaki—(1) a basin made for al-Malik al-Amjad Bahrām, the Ayyūbid of Baalbek (578–627/1182–1229) in the Harari collection (No. 15, unpublished), now in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo, and (2) a basin made for the Atābek of the Jazira Mu’izz al-Dīn Mahmūd ibn Sanjarshāh (605–639/1208–1241).\(^{90}\) Both vessels, though relatively large (the first has a diameter of 36 cm. and a height of 15 cm., the second measures 41 cm. in diameter and is 16 cm. high) are shaped like large bowls and are decorated only with narrow bands of inscriptions.

In addition to Dhaki’s basin in the Louvre we possess only two other fully inlaid Ayyūbid basins. Both were made for the successor of al-ʿĀdil II, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb (637–647/1240–1249). The first is in the Harari collection (No. 37) and still unpublished. It has a diameter of 48 cm. on top and a height of 20 cm. Its interior décor consists of six polylobed medallions with mu-

88 Survey of Persian Art, vol. 5, pl. 713.
90 Sarre, Metall, pp. 72–73, No. 19, pl. 6.

88 Survey of Persian Art, vol. 5, pl. 713.
90 Sarre, Metall, pp. 72–73, No. 19, pl. 6.

sicians and hunters, and six oblong panels filled with beautiful naskhi script. The rim is decorated with running animals, the bottom with figures of the seven planets in original designs. The outside of the vessel is blank. The absence of inlaid designs on the outer walls of the basin perhaps indicates that it was never finished.

The second basin made for al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ is the famous d’Arenberg basin (max. diam. 40 cm., h. 23 cm.) now in the Freer Gallery of Art. It is fully decorated both inside and outside. The decorative elements used are knotted kufic and naskhi inscriptions, animal friezes, arabesques in medallions (some ending in human and animal grotesques), panels of polo players, and Christian scenes (the Annunciation, the Virgin and Child, The Flight to Egypt, the Resurrection of Lazarus, the Entry into Jerusalem, and the Holy Supper), for which it has attracted considerable attention.\(^{91}\)

Dhaki’s basin made for al-ʿĀdil II is, thus, the earliest fully decorated vessel of its kind to have survived to our time. It was certainly not made in Mosul, but was in all likelihood executed in Syria or Egypt during the brief and unquiet reign of that Ayyūbid sultan. It is the work of a highly skilled imaginative craftsman who well deserved to be called al-Dhaki—the “Sagacious one.”

**IV. THE HOMBERG EWER**

The third and last surviving work from Dhaki’s hand is a ewer which previously formed part of the Octave Homberg collection and which is now in possession of Mr. Ernst E. Kohler of Lucerne (pls. 10–11). This ewer was exhibited at the Paris exhibition of

91 The best reproductions are to be found in Meisterwerke, vol. 2, pl. 147, vol. 4, No. 3094. See also G. Migeon, L’exposition 1903, pls. 11–12; H. Glück and E. Diez, Die Kunst des Islam, Berlin, 1906, fig. 447; RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4302.
1903 and was reproduced in the catalogue.\textsuperscript{92} It was also illustrated in the catalogue of the Homberg sale of 1908,\textsuperscript{93} and has several times been referred to in print, especially for the interesting Christian motifs depicted on it. But no one seems to have noticed an admittedly badly worn inscription which can be deciphered on the decagonal neck of the vessel. It reads \textit{Work of Ahmad known as al-Dhaki the engraver, al-Mawsili, in the year 640} (fig. 36).

We thus possess yet another ewer from the hand of the great master, executed 20 years after that which belongs to the Cleveland Museum and which has been discussed above (p. 287f.). Unfortunately the Homberg ewer retains only a shadowy semblance of the work as it originally was. It has lost its spout, which was probably straight, and this has been replaced by a weirdly curved one which does not enhance the vessel's appearance. The upper ring of the neck is a later addition (but the inside of the lid has a plaque with a thirteenth-century design), and the base (though also ancient and contemporary) has been added from another piece. These would be but minor blemishes, which the Homberg ewer shares with many fine vessels of the early period, but a worse disaster has befallen it in the total loss of its original inlays. To make things worse still, these have been “restored” throughout. New silver inlays have been inserted into the existing, undercut cavities and chased in a manner which is utterly un-Islamic.

The Homberg ewer is, however, by no means the only important vessel to have suffered from similar restorations and it is curious to note that all the vessels treated in like manner are in French collections. The following have “restored” inlays: (1) The candlestick made by Dâ'úd ibn Salâmah in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, dated 646/1248 (\textit{pl. 13}, a; Appendix, No. 14); (2) a ewer with Christian scenes, undated and unpublished in the same Museum; (3) a ewer made by Husain ibn Mu'hammad al-Mawsili dated Damascus 657/1258, in the Louvre (\textit{pl. 13}, c and d; Appendix, No. 16). This piece has suffered only partial loss and partial restoration of its


\textsuperscript{93} \textit{Collection Homberg} (sale’s catalogue for 11–16 May 1908), Paris, 1908, No. 337.
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silver inlays; (4) a beaker, and (5) a bowl, both previously of the Delort de Gléon collection and now in the Louvre.94

To illustrate the difference between the appearance of original and restored inlays, it is enough to show part of the décor on the Damascus ewer of 657/1258 (pl. 13, d). The

arabesque in the center is original. The animal in the center of the lower frieze has preserved a remnant of the original silver in the head and feet, but the remainder has been restored at a later date. The animals in the upper frieze are all restored. Another example can be seen by comparing the photograph of a medallion representing the Presentation to the Temple from Dā‘ūd ibn Salāmah’s candlestick of 1248 (pl. 13, a) with the line drawing (fig. 37) in which only the original design has been retained. On the other hand a basin made by this artist two years later (Appendix, No. 15) has retained all its original inlay and has escaped mutilation.

In viewing the Homberg ewer, abstraction must, therefore, be made of all the chased designs on the silver plaques. Unfortunately, the background scrolls which fill the spaces round the figures have also suffered severely and it is sometimes not easy to make out the precise contours of the original designs.

The ewer stands 34 cm. high. The base measures 14 cm. in diameter and the neck at the rim measures 9 cm. across. The neck and body are fashioned in 10 facets. In shape, this piece closely resembles the Damascus ewer of 1258 in the Louvre (pl. 13, c) except that its handle is straight and not, as in the later piece, slightly bent inward. The general profile also recalls that of the Blacas ewer, except for the handle which in the latter is hollow.

The décor falls into two major groups: (a) upright panels with subjects borrowed from Christian iconography, and (b) oblong panels with courtly and hunting scenes. The neck shows 10 upright figures, one to each facet, bordered above and below by narrow bands of blessings in kufic script (pl. 13, b). This is followed by a ring under which comes

the artist’s signature in naskhi characters. Then follows a raised polygonal collar (such as is seen on other faceted ewers) as opposed to the scalloped collar which is characteristic of pear-shaped ewers.

The shoulder of the vessel is decorated with a continuous band showing attendants approaching a throned personage from both sides.

94 G. Migeon, L’Exposition 1903, pl. 21; idem, Orient musulman, pl. 23, fig. 73.
The scene is bordered by an interlaced kufic inscription (similar to that of the Cleveland ewer) conveying blessings to the owner. Then follow 10 oblong panels (4.6 cm. high) decorated with pairs of hunters. Farther down are 10 upright panels (7.2 cm. high) with figures standing in niches formed by an arcade whose columns are formed by leaves. The body terminates at the bottom with a narrow frieze of running animals, mutilated for insertion into the base.

The combination of two types of themes, the courtly and the religious, appears forced. This combination may be due to the whim of the client who commissioned the ewer or it may (as seems to me more likely) signify that Dhaki was “moving with the times” and included in his repertoire scenes taken from Christian iconography which enjoyed brief popularity with Islamic metalworkers toward the middle of the thirteenth century. Even bearing in mind that the ewer as it is today bears little resemblance to Dhaki’s work in its pristine condition, it must be admitted that the combination is not a happy one and that the two cycles combine but do not merge. One misses the inspired virtuosity and the unity of Dhaki’s early work. The arrangement of the figures in the courtly scene on the shoulder of the ewer is careless (pl. 3, fig. 38, a and b—Shoulder Decoration on Ewer by Ibrāhīm ibn Mawāliyā, Louvre.)
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The figure on the throne, which should be the center of attraction, has slipped sideways and is placed awkwardly to the right of the handle. Its “natural” position is in the center of one of the flanks as in the ewer of Ibn Mawāliyā (fig. 38, a–b) and in the Cleveland ewer (fig. 5).

It is not easy to make out the contours of the figures which approach the throne in the shoulder scene. One distinguishes advancing from the left (1) a lance or sword bearer, (2) a groom leading a horse, (3) a warrior with a large round shield slung on his back and carrying a javelin. The interpretation of this figure is suggested to me by a figure on a vase in the Bargello made by another Mawṣili artist, ‘Ali ibn Ḥamīd, and dated 659/1260 (Appendix, No. 17; pl. 16, g). Then comes (4) a figure whose attributes are not clear, followed by (5) an attendant raising a conical object in his left hand and stepping over a crouching dog. The figures approaching the throne from the right are also five in number: (6) an attendant carrying a beaker in his right hand and holding a long-necked bottle in his left hand, (7) a servant carrying a bird (peacock?), (8) another carrying a bird by the neck, (9) a man carrying a goose (?), (10) an overseer without special attributes. The two figures immediately to the right of the spout (pl. 3, b) turn toward one another and indicate the cisura in the composition. For a similar, but much more felicitous, marking of the cisura, one may compare the already quoted work of Ibrāhīm ibn Mawāliyā (fig. 38, b).

The oblong panels immediately under the interlaced inscription, which separates the body of the ewer proper from the shoulder, are complementary to the courtly scene. They are devoted to hunting scenes and are (in clockwise order, beginning from the handle):

1. Bowman and man holding stick (?) (pl. 12, a).
2. Bowman and man seizing bird.
3. Man carrying bird by legs, man carrying bird in arms.
5. Bowman with bird, man approaching (pl. 12, b).
6. Similar scene in reversed order.
7. Bowman shaking hands with unarmed man.
8. Bowman and man with crossbow.
9. Man with pouch and blowtube, man with pouch and stick (pl. 12, c).
10. Bowman standing, man kneeling to pick up bird (pl. 12, d).

None of these groups is particularly new. The most interesting is the man with the blowtube whose function has already been discussed above (p. 298 f.). The various gestures of the men and the different ways in which they hold each variety of bird are not due to accident but follow well-established hunting instructions with which I propose to deal in detail elsewhere.

The second category of decorative themes is confined to the upright panels and is exclusively made up of elements borrowed from Christian iconography with, at times, complete disregard for their deeper significance. The most striking example of this can be seen in the figure placed under the handle (pl. 12, a). It is clearly borrowed from a Presentation to the Temple, such as is depicted on the work of another Mawṣili artist in full (pl. 13, a and fig. 37). Torn from the context, the man reverently holding two doves on his covered hands has lost all significance. The figures which fill the remaining niches on the lower part of the ewer seem to be saints. Their attributes, however, are not easily distinguishable as the contours have been effaced by the re-inlaying of the silver. I must leave it to scholars versed in Christian iconography to try and determine their identities. The subjects in the 10 niches formed by the arcade seem to be:

---

943 The same motif also occurs on a bone plaque discovered at Fustāt; cf. Aly Bahgat and A. Gabriel, Fouilles d’al Foustāt, Paris, 1921, pl. 28, center.
1. Man offering two doves on covered hands (pl. 12, a).
2. Saint carrying a book in one hand and an indistinct object in the other.
3 and 4. Two saints turned back to back (pl. 10, b).
5. Woman saint orant (pl. 12, b). This, with the possible exception of 7, is the only female personage.
6. Saint, or apostle, lifting hands in supplication.
7. Male or female saint performing the same gesture in the opposite direction. The feeling here is of two figures torn from a composition from which the central figure has been omitted (pl. 11, a).
8. A saint lifting the right hand in a gesture of blessing (pl. 12, c).
9. Male figure, gesture obscure.
10. A bishop (to judge by the miter-shaped headgear) holding a crosier (pl. 12, d).

This figure is shown frontally and it is probably more than just a coincidence that it is placed in line with the throned personage on the shoulder of the ewer. The female saint orant is also shown frontally and occupies the panel at the other end of the axis which runs from the bishop figure through the center of the vessel; she is placed in line with the cisura in the shoulder composition.

The small upright figures which fill the narrow panels on the neck’s facets are similar to those in the large panels. The most curious is the figure looking up toward the divine hand which reaches from the top left corner (pl. 13, b).

This completes the description of the Homberg ewer. The vessel belongs to a group of Islamic metalworks with Christian scenes to which I hope to devote a special study. The pieces recorded to date are 14 in number and all seem to be of Syrian provenance and made toward the middle of the thirteenth century. Only three are dated: (1) The d’Arenberg basin made for the Ayyûbîd al-Malik al-Šâlîh, Najm al-dîn Ayyûb (637–47/1239–49), now in the Freer Gallery of Art; (2) the Homberg ewer dated 640/1242 made by al-Dhakî; (3) the candlestick of Dâ’ûd ibn Salâmah made in 646/1248 (Appendix, No. 14).

Only 2 of the 14 pieces are signed, both by Mawṣilîs. At first sight, one would surmise that some of these artists were Christians themselves and were working for Christian patrons. This does not seem, however to have been the case in the majority of instances. Christian artists and Christian patrons could not have failed to detect the incongruities of the misunderstood iconography which can be observed in many of the vessels. The most accurate treatment of Christian themes is, ironically, found on the d’Arenberg basin which was definitely made for an Ayyûbîd sultan. So far, no vessels with scenes that depict Christ’s Passion have come to light. It would seem that the artists studiously confined themselves to subjects which could not give offense to prospective Muslim buyers. The Homberg ewer with its lack of programme in the arrangement of Christian motifs torn from their context is the work of al-Dhakî who was called Aḥmad, son of ‘Umar, and who is unlikely to have been a Christian.

V. THE WORKS OF DHAKÎ’S GHULÂM

Before considering some observations which may be made on the basis of the material presented here, it is necessary to examine two

66 For this motif cf. the abundant material collected by H. Stern, Le calendrier de 345 (Institut français d’archéologie de Beyrouth, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, tome 55), Paris, 1953, pp. 150ff.

67 See above, note 91.

68 This view seems to have been held, among others, by M. Aga-Oglu, About a type of Islamic incense burner, The Art Bulletin, vol. 27 (1945), pp. 34–35.
other works not made by Dhaki himself but by his ghulām. Ibn Jaldak.

The earlier of the two is a candlestick in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (pl. 14, b). I have already dealt with this work in detail in 1950 when it belonged to the late Mr. M. Stora of Paris, and there is no need to repeat the argument in detail here. The candlestick stands 36 cm. high and has a base of 34 cm. in diameter. An inscription in naskhi characters round the base of the neck (pl. 15, c) indicates that it is the work of Abū Bakr ibn Ḥājjī Jaldak the ghulām of al-Dhaki, and that it was made in 622/1225. The flanks of the vessel are bordered above and below by interlaced kufic inscriptions containing the usual blessings and there is a finely worked band of running animals and another with an interlaced pattern at the bottom.

The major decorative compositions are distributed over compartments formed by ogee arches. The spandrels are covered by an allover arabesque design (fig. 39) which recalls that on the Cleveland ewer (fig. 10). The scenes in the 11 compartments all belong to one cycle but can be divided into three groups: (1) Hunters on foot and agricultural laborers with mattocks (fig. 40, b, e, g, i); (2) hunters on horseback (fig. 40, e, h, j); (3) throne scenes (fig. 40, a, d, f, k).

The backgrounds of these scenes are left plain, except for some vegetation which recalls the thick-leaved plants on the internal hunting panels of Dhaki's basin (pl. 7 and figs. 28, 29). The dress and tools of the gardeners are the same as those of the gardeners on the Cleveland ewer (pl. 4, a, and fig. 11). All the throned personages have a tall headgear, typical of the Seljuk-Ayyūbid period, about which more will be said below (p. 323, n. 19).

A year after making the Boston candlestick, Ibn Jaldak made an ewer which is now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (pl. 14, c). This ewer came to the museum as part of the Moore bequest in the 1890’s, but only one view has so far been published. Having been unable to photograph this piece in detail (see above, p. 287, note 30) I must confine my remarks to a summary description.

The vessel stands 37 cm. high. The signature runs in a ring above the scalloped collar and reads: دورن المعين المجيد جلديك علین محمدك التناش الموحی في سنة ثلاث وعشرين وسبحان Work of 'Umar ibn al-Ḥājjī Jaldak, ghulām of Aḥmad the engraver, al-Mawsili, in the year 623." A bulbous ring adorns the neck. In profile the neck resembles that of an ewer made by 'Ali ibn Ḥamūd al-Mawsili in

The name of the artist has been wrongly published by M. S. Dimand, Dated specimens of Mohammedan art—1, Metropolitan Museum Studies, I (1928), p. 103; also idem, A handbook of Mohammedan art, 2d ed., New York, 1944, p. 114; RCEA, vol. 10, No. 3960, also needs correction.

99 On the meaning of ghulām see my SIMW-II, p. 67. Ibn Jaldak is unlikely to have been a slave for he could boast a kunyak to his name.

1 See above, p. 287, note 29.

Fig. 39—Arabesque Design in Spandrels of Candlestick Dated 622/1225, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts.
Fig. 40—Scenes on Candlestick of 622/1225, Boston.
VI. CONCLUSION

There is no inlaid inscription on the Boston candlestick to indicate who had owned it originally. On the inside, however, can be seen a brief incised graffito which reads: al-fishkhânah al-mas'ûdiyah "the vestry of (al-Malik) al-Mas'ûd." This unassuming mark affords a valuable che. Such incised marks are found also on pieces which have fully inlaid decorative inscriptions (sometimes difficult to read), which spell out the owner's name and titles. There must have been a need for adding such graffiti, probably for the benefit of the personnel who had charge of the vessels.

For the Ayyûbid period we possess several examples. There are "redundant" graffiti of this kind (1) on the earliest known basin made for al-Malik al-Amjad Bahràn in the Harari Collection in Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo,4 (2) on the basin of Dhaki made for al-'Adîl II (pl. 15, g), (3) on a box made for the same ruler, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum,5 (5) on the Barberini vase made for al-Malik al-Nâšir of Aleppo (634-58/1236-59),6 and (6) on Lu'lu's tray in the Victoria and Albert Museum.7 Mentions of a vestry (fishkhânah) or buttery (sharâbkhânah) are always regal, and the adjectives 'adîliyûh, badriyûh, zâhiriyûh etc., are derived from the laqab of the ruler to whose household they belonged.

The Malik al-Mas'ûd, who was the owner of the Boston candlestick, is almost certainly Mawdûd ibn Maḥmûd the last Artuqid of Âmid and Ḥisn Kaihaft. The Artuqids were descend-}

---

6 Reproduced in Lanci, Trattato, vol. 3, pl. 47.
7 Reproduced in Rice, The brasses of Badr al-din Lu'lu', p. 344, fig. 10.
It implies that the candlestick had become property of a lady (dār)⁹ (in the care of) ‘Afff (a eumuch) of (al-Malik) al-Muṣaffar. This lady almost certainly belonged to the harem of al-Muṣaffar of Ḥamāh who gave shelter to al-Masʿūd after 635/1237. The same graffito of “the lady in ‘Afff’s care” appears on the Metropolitan Museum ewer of 623/1226, but not the first regal graffito.

It is possible to reconstruct the chain of events as follows: In the twenties of the seventh century Ibn Jaldak and probably also his master al-Dhakī worked in a town under the control of the Artuqid al-Malik al-Masʿūd (Āmīd?). It is not likely that they were active at Mosul which was already under the de facto rule of Badr al-Dīn Luḥuʾ with whom the Artuqids were at war. The mere fact that military operations were then in progress does not, of course, prove that the Artuqids were not supplying their needs in inlaid metalwork from Mosul. War in those days was no serious impediment to commerce. The fact, however, that al-Dhakī made a basin for al-ʿĀdil II, son of the Ayyūbīd al-Kāmil who overthrew the Artuqids and imprisoned al-Malik al-Masʿūd, seems significant. It suggests that al-Dhakī (we know nothing of Ibn Jaldak’s whereabouts) moved to Syria or Egypt after the fall of the Artuqids—either in 629/1232 or shortly afterward—in search of new princely patrons. It is permissible to assume that the two works of Ibn Jaldak (the Boston candlestick and the Metropolitan Museum ewer) reached the household of al-Muṣaffar of Ḥamāh either as a gift, or in some other way, from Masʿūd.

The Cleveland ewer and the two works of Ibn Jaldak (620–23/1223–1226) are decorated in the Mesopotamian style and could be classed as Artuqid works. Dhakī’s basin in the Louvre before 638/1240 (is) still very much in the Mesopotamian tradition, but there are some subtle changes and omissions which denote an adaptation to Syro-Egyptian fashions. In the Hombreyber ewer (640/1242) al-Dhakī extended his repertoire to include Christian themes, not to my knowledge found in Mesopotamian works (with the exception of coins), and which are typical of artistic trends in Syria. The chain of events outlined above cannot, of course, be proved at every stage, but it seems to me the only one which accounts for all the facts and which takes satisfactory account of the stylistic changes noted in Dhakī’s work.

Several observations may now be tentatively advanced on the basis of the material presented in this paper.

1. The term “Mosul School” is too specific and too narrow to be useful. It implies the existence at Mosul of a style which was typically Mosulian—a suggestion which is not borne out by the facts.

2. The term “Mosul Work” may be used provided it is applied strictly to the six vessels which were made during the reign of Badr al-Dīn Luḥuʾ and which have been listed above, page .

3. There appears to have existed a “Mesopotamian Style” as distinct from the Persian and Syro-Egyptian styles. The line between Mesopotamian and Persian work is easier to draw than that between Mesopotamian and Syro-Egyptian, where the distinctions are more subtle and the borrowings more wholehearted.

4. The specific character of the Mesopotamian style can only be defined by a systematic study of the available material and must be extended to other media, apart from metalwork, before a valid definition can be attempted. M. Aga-Ogūlu has applied the method of patient analysis to the study of a type of incense burner. He based his observations on typological and decorative characteristics of a group of incense burners and was successful in distinguishing between Persian, Mesopotamian, and Syrian variants. This ⁹⁰ Op. cit., pp. 28–45.

⁹ On the meaning of dār, which is the equivalent of jiha, “lady,” see M. van Berchem, Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Egypte I, Paris 1903, p. 188.
Homberg Ewer Dated 640/1242, Shoulder Decorations. E. Kofler Collection, Lucerne.
CLEVELAND EWER, LARGE MEDALLIONS (Height 7 cm.).
CLEVELAND EWER, MEDIUM-SIZED MEDALLIONS (Height 4 cm.)
Three Interior Medallions, General View. (After Migeon.)
Hunting Panels from Interior of Louvre Basin.
SELECTED MEDALLIONS FROM EXTERIOR OF LOUVRE BASIN.
a-d, Medallions from Louvre Basin. e-i, Medallions from Lu'lu's Tray in Munich.
Homberg Ewer Dated 640/1242, Kofler Collection.
Details from Homberg Ewer, Kofler Collection.
Plate 13

a, Detail from Candlestick Dated 646/1258.
b, Neck of Homburg Ewer.
c, Ewer Dated 657/1258, Louvre.
d, Detail of Same.
Plate 14

Ewer
Dated 623/1226.
Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Candlestick
Dated 622/1225, Boston Museum of Fine Arts.
(Photograph courtesy Metropolitan Museum.)

Ewer Dated 633/1235, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
(Photograph courtesy Metropolitan Museum.)
Plate 15

Inscription on Boston Candlestick.

Graffiti on Louvre Basin.

Signature on Cleveland Ewer.
a–b, Galen Manuscript in Paris. (Courtesy Bibliothèque Nationale.) c, Harîrî Manuscript, Dated 1237, in Paris. (Courtesy Bibliothèque Nationale.) d, Detail from Galen Frontispiece, Vienna. (After Holter.) e, Detail from Oxford Harîrî Frontispiece. (Courtesy Bodleian Library.) f–g, Animals from the Cleveland Ewer. h, Detail from the ‘Alî ibn Ḥamûd Vase, Florence.
method can be even more fruitfully applied to brasses inlaid with pictorial designs, for these have contemporary parallels in book illustrations, ceramics, glass, stucco, etc.

One of the fallacies which is taking a long time to die is the fond belief that there is a telltale sign by which one can recognize a "Mosul bronze." It is still widely held that the presence of a cross-legged figure holding up the crescent of the moon is an infallible hallmark of such works. Some saw it in Lu'lu's coat of arms; others sought to recognize it in the emblem of the city of Mosul, and it is generally believed that it is very common on works by Mawsili artists. None of these suggestions, however, will withstand objective examination:

(a) Lu'lu's honorific title was Badr al-din (full moon of the faith) not crescent moon (hilal).

(b) The seated figure of the man holding the moon crescent appears only twice on brasses of Lu'lu's time, the Munich tray and the Blacas ewer, and in both instances it is one of seven planet figures and occupies its normal place as a representation of luna.

(c) On coins the symbol appears well before Lu'lu's time and only late on his own coinage. Furthermore, it is not the emblem of Lu'lu but that of the planet and used on coins for semimagical purposes. There are examples of other planet and constellation figures on coins.

(d) As for the emblem being that of the city of Mosul, van Berchem has already pointed out that there exists no parallel for such city emblems anywhere in Islam. The relief of the seated figure with the moon crescent sketched by Herzfeld on the Sinar gate of Mosul (now destroyed) was an instance of the use of planet figures as well as other images (dragons, lions, etc.) for prophylactic purposes.

(e) Finally, a careful examination of the 28 works signed by Mawsili artists listed in the appendix to this paper has revealed that 3 include the seated figure with moon crescent (as distinct from a planet figure in a row of seven planets) in their décor. The are the candlesticks made by the pupil of Ibn Man'ah in the Harari Collection in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo (Appendix, No. 9), and the ewer and basin in Berlin (Appendix, Nos. 27-28) which, judging by their eclectic, rather overlaid décor, are late thirteenth-century Syrian works.

A planet figure appears repeatedly on the Blacas ewer made at Mosul in 620/1232, but it is not the seated figure representing the moon, but the radiated disk representing the sun.

These last shattering revelations should suffice in themselves to dismiss once and for all the thought that it is possible to attribute an inlaid brass to Mosul at the mere sight of the "Moon figure" in its ornamentation.

We must therefore broaden our basis of enquiry into the means by which it may be possible to recognize, if not "Mosul work," at least Mesopotamian work, and to distinguish it from Syrian work which comes closest to it.

In the following paragraphs I have grouped some observations to this effect. In time, these

11 Behzad Butak, op. cit., p. 104, No. 114, Saladin (Mayafarqin 587 H.), and other coin catalogues, quoted by Aga-Oghl, op. cit., p. 42.
12 Behzad Butak, op. cit., p. 21, No. 16; p. 39, No. 41; p. 87, No. 100 (Centaurus), pp. 36-37, Nos. 35-38 (Mars). Moreover, the use of planet figures on coins is not confined to Islamic coinage, e.g., Saxl, Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der Planetendarstellungen, fgs. 12, 14; W. Koch, Astrologische Münzen der römischen Republik, Zeitt, Zentralblatt für archäologische Forschung, Düsseldorf, 1938, pp. 3-15.
13 Van Berchem, Amida, p. 86.
15 First small reproductions in Muhammad Mustafa, Mathaf al-fann al-islimi, dalil mihaj, Cairo, 1954, fgs. 12 and 86; see also idem, Mameluk metalwork, Egypt Travel Magazine, No. 7 (February 1955), p. 22 and figs. 4-6.
will doubtless be amplified, modified, and better defined. Some are of a technical, others of a stylistic, and yet others of an iconographic nature.

1. The designs on most Mesopotamian brasses (the Blacas ewer is an exception) are “fluidly” traced, roughly undercut, and deeply hatched with closely applied nervous punches. This work I shall designate as Type A. In Ayyūbid Syrian, and later even more so in Mamlūk brasses, the contours are precise and dry. They are traced more deliberately and perpendicularly and the undercutting is more meticulous. Tightly rolled scrolls and spirals make their appearance in this type of work which we may designate as Type B. These differences are as clearly visible to an experienced eye as are differences in the brushwork of various schools of painting. They go beyond differences due to the idiosyncracies of the individual artists and their relative competence. They constitute a basic difference of approach. This can be illustrated by a comparison of Dhakī’s work on the Cleveland ewer (Type A) and his work on the Louvre basin (Type B). For the purpose it is necessary to choose surfaces of approximately similar size and fulfilling similar decorative functions. A comparison is permissible, for instance, between the medium-sized medallions of the Cleveland ewer (h. 4 cm.; pl. 5) and any of the outer medallions of the Louvre basin (h. 5 cm.; pl. 8). It will show better than any lengthy disquisition where the essential differences lie. The ewer is Mesopotamian in style, iconography, and technique; the basin is still in the stylistic and iconographic tradition of Mesopotamia but no longer technically so in every respect.

The Blacas ewer presents a puzzle. Here is a highly polished work, definitely made at Mosul as its inscription explicitly states, and yet in some ways “Syrian.” Could it be a vessel made for export “to be carried to princes” in the words of Ibn Sa‘īd (see above, p. 284) and was it designed to satisfy “foreign” tastes? I do not think so, but rather that it represents a new development, at Mosul itself, which was later adopted by Mawṣilī craftsmen and others working in Syria and Egypt. So, while it may be right to distinguish between Types A and B, on technical grounds the distinction is probably no more than between earlier and later methods of tracing and inlaying. It is in the iconographic preferences and in some other features that a sharper distinction can be drawn between Mesopotamian and Syrian work, as will be shown below.

2. It is curious to note that only early Mesopotamian pieces and the Louvre basin made by Dhakī have décors made up of uneven numbers of components: (a) the Cleveland ewer has 5 large and 5 medium-sized medallions, (b) the Boston candlestick has 11 ogee-arched compartments, and (c) the Louvre basin has 7 hunting panels, 15 medallions on the inside and 2 registers of 15 medallions on outside. Later pieces have décors divided into components of even number (4, 6, 8, and 10). This observation, however, offers no shortcut to determining the antiquity or provenance of an object. The ewer made by Ibrāhīm ibn Mawāliyyā almost certainly in Mesopotamia (with the exception of some mirrors and the Artuqid dish at Innsbruck, the earliest surviving Islamic metalwork from that area) is decagonal, and so is the Blacas ewer. All that may be said at present, and that with extreme caution, is that the division of décors into components of uneven number went out of fashion before the middle of the thirteenth century.

3. The combination of red copper inlays with silver inlays is known only in Persian and Mesopotamian work. The latest dated example is represented by the Blacas ewer 629/1232. Gold inlays do not appear before the middle of the thirteenth century. The earliest example known to me is to be seen in the unpublished basin made by Da‘ūd ibn Salāmāh in 648/1250, in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs (Appendix, No. 15). Gold inlays do not become really popular before the Mamlūk period.
4. Overall arabesques in unending sinuous lines fill the spandrels on the Cleveland ewer of 620 H. (fig. 10) and the Boston candlestick of 622 H. (fig. 39), and also decorate the small box in the Benaki Museum, Athens, dated as early as 617 H. (Appendix, No. 2). Overall interlaced-swastika patterns are absent from early pieces and appear for the first time on the Blacas ewer (629 H.). These become common in Syrian work. When arabesques are used on Syrian works they are treated in a more formal, rigid manner.\textsuperscript{17}

5. The animals which pursue each other in narrow friezes on early Mesopotamian work are treated in a less stereotyped manner than those on later Syrian work. They are comparatively small and do not fill the whole height of the band. Ample “air” is allowed around them and the scrolls winding in the background are given at least as much importance as the animals themselves (pl. 16, f, g). The animals are set against the scroll or are treading on it but are not, as is done in later work, woven into it and subjected to its curves.

6. Plain backgrounds are used only in the earliest pieces: (1) Ibrāhīm ibn Mawāliyā’s ewer (figs. 21, 22); and (2) the Boston candlestick and (3) the Metropolitan Museum ewer, both works of Ibn Jaldak (pl. 14, a, and fig. 40). It is here that the indebtedness of the metalworkers to the miniature painters is most evident. At a very early date thick winding scrolls make their appearance (fig. 38). The spaces between these are quickly covered with hatching, later with spirals (imitated in turn on the backgrounds of luster ceramics from Raqqah) and then, later still, with ornamental scrolls which have their own independent existence. A similar development from purely pictorial and narrative compositions to ornamental designs, in which figures and ornaments shrink to an equal status, can be watched in luster tile painting.\textsuperscript{18}

7. Vegetation. Here again the development is from plants sprouting out of the bases of panels and medallions, as from the ground, in a “natural” way (shorthand indications of landscapes as in thirteenth-century miniatures), to plant elements dotted about between the figures “unnaturally” wherever there is a space to fill. One may compare figures 21 and 22 from Ibn Mawāliyā’s ewer, figure 40 from the Boston candlestick, and such vegetal elements as there are in the medallions of the Cleveland ewer (pl. 4, a, and fig. 11), all of which I would call “natural,” on the one hand with the “decorative” vegetation in the medallion taken from the Barberini vase (fig. 23) on the other. The thick vegetation which covers the hunting panels in Dhaki’s basin (pl. 7, a–b, figs. 28, 29) is unique, but then we possess no earlier basin with storied inlays which might serve for comparison. It recalls the thickets of the boar hunt on the Tāq-e Bostān rock relief.

8. The repertoire from which metalworkers chose their subjects seems to have been wider in Mesopotamian workshops. Some scenes used in early Mesopotamian works are not found later. Outdoor scenes with gardeners wielding spades and mattocks, shepherds and peasants tending their flock, grazing their beasts of burden, or ploughing their fields (the Cleveland ewer, figs. 17–19, the Boston candlestick, fig. 40) do not appear at all on Syrian work. Hunting scenes are retained but tend to become decorative friezes rather than pictorial panels. Battle scenes, almost completely absent from truly Mesopotamian works (with the exception of the frieze and the upper spandrels on the Metropolitan Museum ewer), become very popular on Syrian Ayyūbid work and even more so in Mamluk work. Throne scenes, often placed outdoors (the Cleveland ewer, etc., fig. 5) and intimately linked with rural and hunting scenes in early Mesopotamian work, become formal and stereotyped. The lyrical, nonchalant mood of the young man reclining on a couch in an orchard, which graces the Cleveland ewer (pl. 4, d, and fig. 15), is inconceivable on Mamluk work from Syria. So is the goodhumored—not to say

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Aga-Oglu, op. cit., fig. 8.

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. Survey of Persian Art, vol. 5, pls. 722 and 723.
humoristic—treatment of the subjects in the assorted medallions of the Lu’lu’ tray in Munich, the Blacas ewer, and Dhaiki’s basin.

9. Differences in costume are also noticeable between the Mesopotamian and Syrian, the earlier and the later pieces. One detail is particularly striking: the tall hat, trimmed with fur and provided with a plaque in front. This characteristic headgear was reserved for members of the military hierarchy and appears very often as part of the costume of governors and rulers. It is peculiar to representations from countries under Seljuk-Zengid domination and seems to have enjoyed particular popularity in Upper Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, and northern Syria. It can be seen in representations on a variety of materials, paintings, metalwork, glass, pottery, stucco, and coins. I am giving in the note below a casually assembled list of examples which is not intended to be complete.

After the Mongol invasion this type of fur-trimmed headgear seems to have gone out of fashion. The Mongols are depicted in a bewildering variety of headgears, in which hats and caps with feathers predominate. The Mamluks in Syria and Egypt favored turbans and it is in turbans that they are depicted on metalwork and miniatures.

The following provisional conclusions may be drawn from what has been said above. We do not possess inlaid brasses from Syria before the Ayyubid period. The earliest appears to be the Kevorkian ewer now in the Freer Gallery (Appendix, No. 7) dated 629 (1232).

---

9 I have hitherto followed L. A. Mayer (Mamlûk costume, Geneva, 1935, p. 28) in identifying this headgear with the sharbush of the Arabic sources; but I am not sure now whether this is justified. Maqrizi (Khitâf, Cairo, 1279 H., vol. 2, p. 99) defines the sharbush as “resembling a triangular diadem (tâj) worn without turban.” There is no mention of the fur trimming and the plaque in front which seem to be most characteristic. The headgear of Mamluks on Mamlûk frontispiece miniatures (the Oxford Hariri of 1337 and the Vienna counterpart of 1334) all wear turbans and so do Mamluks depicted on metalwork. The example quoted by Mayer from a Mamlûk Hariri MS. in the British Museum (his plate 18, i) is taken from a text illustration and was probably copied directly from a Mesopotamian model.

---

20 a. Painting:

(1) The Aghâni frontispieces (Rice, The Aghâni manuscripts, figs. 14–19).
(2) The Dioscorides MS. of 1224 (H. Buchthal, Early Islamic miniatures from Baghdad, Journal of the Walters Art Gallery, vol. 5 [1942], fig. 4), “only princely figure,” only headgear of this type in the MS.
(3) The Vienna Pseudo-Galen MS. (Holtz, op. cit., pl. 1).

b. Metalwork:

(1) Ibn Mawâliyâ’s ewer (fig. 38).
(2) The Cleveland ewer (fig. 5).
(3) The Metropolitan candlestick base (E. Cohn-Wiener, Die Kunstgewerbe des Ostens, Berlin, s.d., p. 117, fig. 90).
(4) The Boston candlestick (fig. 40).
(5) The Blacas ewer (Survey, vol. 6, pl. 1330, D).

c. Glass:

C. J. Lamm, Mittelalterliche Gläser, Berlin, 1920, vol. 2, pls. 96, 6, and 130, 10. Also, Aly Bahgat and Gabriel, Fouilles d’al Fousâfi, pl. 33.

d. Pottery:

(1) Painted Raqqa dish in Berlin (A. Lane, Early Islamic pottery, London, 1942, pl. 78a).
(2) Tiles in Boston and New York (Bahrami, op. cit., figs. 18, 19, 21, 22).
(3) Unglazed wares (G. Reitlinger, Unglazed relief pottery from Upper Mesopotamia, Ars Islamica, vol. 15/16 [1951], figs. 15, 17, and 19; Sarre and Herzfeld, Reise, vol. 3, pl. 114).

e. Stucco:

From Anatolia (Strzygowski, Amida, fig. 303; F. Sarre, SeldschuKische Kleinkunst, Leipzig, 1909, pl. 3; Kühnel and Aziz Ogan, op. cit., pl. 10).

f. Coins:

Artuqid coinage (S. Lane Poole, The coins of the Ortuksid, pl. 2).
Syrian inlaid work is closely related to Mesopotamian work for which dated examples are available from 617/1220 (Appendix, No. 2) onward. There are, however, several clearly defined differences.

The repertoire of the Mesopotamian artists was wider and included scenes from the outdoor life of the court which do not appear on Syrian work. Mesopotamian compositions are closer to their pictorial models and intimately related to miniature painting. Their backgrounds are occasionally blank, as in contemporary miniatures, and their vegetation is "natural." Technically the tracing of the Mesopotamian brasses is more "fluid" and there occurs the occasional use of red copper together with silver inlays. In Syrian work the emphasis is more and more on the decorative aspect of the compositions, to the detriment of their pictorial character. The place of overall arabesques is taken by swastika patterns. This process began in Mesopotamia and spread to Syria. Borrowings from Christian iconography are confined to Syrian work, and I would hazard a guess that they are due to the belated influence of the Crusades.

The planet figure of the moon, represented by a seated man holding up a crescent, is not related to Lu'lu' or to Mosul and is no guide for the recognition of Mesopotamian work.

A full-scale definition of the Mesopotamian style must, of course, await further monographic treatment of other groups of metalwork and the extension of the inquiry to Islamic art in other media.

Footnotes to Appendix, p. 326.

1 See above, p. 286. In the following notes reference is made to the relevant entry in the RCEA where a bibliography will be found. In addition, only reference to the best available reproduction will also be included.


4 RCEA, vol. 10, No. 3903; see above, pp. 287-301.


9 RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4046; Survey of Persian Art, vol. 6, pls. 1329-30.

10 RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4361; Muhammad Mustafa, Mathaf al-Janu al-islâmi, dâ'irat mi'asat, Cairo, 1954, figs. 12 and 86; idem, Manuscript metalwork, Egypt Travel Magazine, No. 7 (February 1955), p. 22, figs. 4-6.

11 RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4164; see above, pp. 301-312, pls. 6-9.

12 RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4202, wrongly described there and in D. Barrett, op. cit., pls. 16-17, as an astronomical table. The contemporary owner’s inscription (see Barrett, pl. 17) is omitted in both places and so far unpublished except for the transcript given above. The nisbah could also be read “al-Bukhârî,” as there are no diacritical works.

13 Not in RCEA. First published above, pp. 312-316, pls. 3, 10-12, 13, b, and 15, b.

14 RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4267, Walters Art Gallery, A handbook of the collection, Baltimore, 1936, fig. on p. 49.


16 RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4345. Unpublished except for inscription. I intend to deal with this basin in a separate article.

17 RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4439, see above, pl. 13, c-d.

18 RCEA, vol. 12, No. 4454, where the owner’s name is wrongly given as Ḥaḍīṯa (7) ibn Tūdhrā: G. Wiet, Un nouvel artiste de Mossoul, Syria, vol. 12 (1931), pl. 30; idem, L’exposition persane de Londres, Cairo, 1933, pl. 6.

19 RCEA, vol. 12, No. 4600; G. Wiet, Objets en cuivre, pl. 27.

20 RCEA, vol. 12, No. 4697; G. Wiet, Un nouvel artiste, pl. 29.

21 RCEA, vol. 12, No. 4698; G. Wiet, Un nouvel artiste, pl. 28.


23 RCEA, vol. 12, No. 4708.

24 RCEA, vol. 13, No. 4807.

25 RCEA, vol. 13, No. 4854; no reproduction available.


27 RCEA, vol. 14, No. 3453; M. S. Dimand, Metalwork, Metropolitan Museum Studies, III, fig. 2.


29 RCEA, vol. 11, 4363; ibid., pl. facing p. 1.
### APPENDIX*: LIST OF CRAFTSMEN WHO USE THE NISBAH AL-MAWSILIH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Made by —</th>
<th>Type of object</th>
<th>Made for —</th>
<th>Made at —</th>
<th>Collection of Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(a) ibrāhīm ibn mawāfiyyā</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Louvre, Paris⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>617/1220</td>
<td>(b) ʾisām ibn ward, pupil (filmand)</td>
<td>Box</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>620/1223</td>
<td>(c) ʾahmad ibn ʿumar al-dhakī</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>622/1225</td>
<td>(d) ʿabd balaʾr ibn al-ḥājjī jaldak ghulām of (c)</td>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>623/1226</td>
<td>(d) ʿumar ibn Ḥājjī jaldak ghulām of (c)</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>627/1229</td>
<td>iyās ghulām of (e), ʾabd al-karīm al-Turābī</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>Amir Shihāb al-Dīn al-ʿAzīz</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>629/1232</td>
<td>(f) ʿuṣām ibn ʿalī ghulām of (a)</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>629/1232</td>
<td>(g) ʿṣūţaʾ ibn manʿāḥ</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ḥājjī ismāʾil and (h) mūhammad ibn Fatūḥ, hired man (aṭīr) of (g)</td>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>636/1238</td>
<td>(c) ʾahmad ibn ʿumar al-dhakī</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>al-Malik al-ʿĀdil II</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>639/1241</td>
<td>(b) mūhammad ibn khutluḵ</td>
<td>Divination table</td>
<td>Muhammad al-Muḥtasib al-Ṭāfār</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>640/1242</td>
<td>(c) ʾahmad al-dhakī</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>644/1246</td>
<td>(i) yūnūs ibn yāṣaf</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>646/1248</td>
<td>(b) dāʿūd ibn salāmah</td>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>650/1252</td>
<td>(c) dāʿūd ibn salāmah</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>Amīr Badrāl-Dīn al-Baysarī</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>(d) ḥusayn ibn muḥammad</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>Ayyūbīd, al-Malik al-Nāṣir Yūsuf</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>(m) `ali ibn ḥāmidd</td>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Qustah ibn Tādirah</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>668/1270</td>
<td>(n) mūhammad ibn ḥāsān</td>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Miṣr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>673/1274</td>
<td>(m) `ali ibn ḥāammad</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>Amīr Atmish al-Saʿdī</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(b) `ali ibn ḥāammad</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>674/1275</td>
<td>(o) `ali ibn husayn ibn muḥammad</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>Rasālīd, al-Muẓaffar Yūsuf</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>674/1275</td>
<td>(p) mūhammad ibn hilāl</td>
<td>Celestial globe</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>681/1282</td>
<td>(q) `ali ibn husayn ibn muḥammad</td>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>684/1285</td>
<td>(q) `ali ibn husayn</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>717/1317</td>
<td>(i) `ali ibn uṣūţaʾ ibn ʿabrāhīm al-saŋkarī</td>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>692/1211</td>
<td>(d) ḥusayn ibn ʾahmad ibn ḥusayn</td>
<td>Tray</td>
<td>Rasālīd, al-Malik al-Muʿayyad Dāʾūd</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(e) `ali ibn ʿabdallāḥ al-ʿalawī</td>
<td>Ewer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(f) `ali ibn ʿabdallāḥ al-ʿalawī</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For footnotes, see preceding page.
THE "WADE CUP" IN THE CLEVELAND MUSEUM OF ART, ITS ORIGIN AND DECORATIONS

BY RICHARD ETTINGHAUSEN*

Owing to the active interest of the Cleveland Museum, students and admirers of Near Eastern metalwork recently welcomed a new publication in this all too rarely investigated field, a monograph by D. S. Rice on an unusual inlaid footed bowl in that institution.¹

* Thanks are due Dr. D. S. Rice for his permission to reproduce here a number of illustrations from his publications and for his comments on an early draft of this paper. Mr. Stuart C. Welch, Jr., kindly allowed me to reproduce his metal tray and his sketch of a motif on it. I would also like to thank the authorities of the Kabul and Teheran Museums, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Walters Art Gallery, and the Freer Gallery of Art, and the officers of the Kevozian Foundation, for granting publication rights for objects in their care. I am also greatly obliged to Prof. Mario Bussagli and the Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente in Rome, the Heeramaneck Galleries in New York, Mr. Wilhelm Henrich, Frankfurt on Main, Mr. Ahmad Ali Kohzad, Director of the Museum of Kabul, Mr. M. T. Mostafavi, Director of Antiquities of Iran, and to Mr. K. Rabenou and Mr. E. Safani of New York, who were good enough to provide photographs or to permit the publication of those taken by me. Finally, I am indebted to my wife for the photographs of figures 10, 14, 23, 32, and 37, to Mr. Rostamy of the Teheran Museum for that of figure 22, to Mr. Raymond A. Schwartz of the Freer Gallery of Art for those of figures 15–17, 21, 24, 29, and 30, and to Miss Eleanor Morsell, who made the drawings used for text figures E, I–L, and S.


The following was originally started as a review of this book, but it soon became apparent that in view of its length, range, and the necessity of introducing so many unknown objects, it would have to go well beyond the normal limits of this type of writing. Inasmuch as this literary genre makes it possible, however, to point out Dr. Rice's new and valuable contributions and in addition to present ideas which are complementary to or different from his, the form of a book review has beautifully illustrated study enriches our knowledge because of the scholarly discussion not only of its main subject but also of other newly discovered or little-known pieces related to it. In including such comparative material this book surpasses in stature and usefulness the same author's Le Baptishe de Saint Louis (published in similar form in 1951) which presented analogous methodological problems yet did not go beyond the discussion of a single object. This new contribution to our knowledge of Islamic metalwork is therefore unusually stimulating. However, in as difficult a subject as this branch of Muslim art, and with so many of its objects, widely dispersed over four continents, there are bound to be points of further discussion. Sometimes they will be based on a somewhat different interpretation of the same sparse material, which resembles the parts of a large jigsaw puzzle of which most of the pieces are missing; quite naturally at times different ideas suggest themselves as to how these pieces should be grouped. But more often there are instances where these pieces appear in a new light, because of other so far unpublished artifacts which should also be considered. In view of the prominent position the inlaid cup in the Cleveland Museum will assume from now on, owing to its intrinsic significance and the new monograph devoted to it, such a discussion will, it is hoped, be helpful in elucidating some of the problems connected with the flowering of Persian metalwork around the year 1200. In any case this new survey will lay special stress on the degree to a certain extent has been adopted for this article. The official designations "cup" and "Wade Cup" have been kept throughout, but the shape will be discussed on p. 366.
development of the pertinent shapes and decorations used in the periods preceding the Wade Cup, thus supplementing Dr. Rice’s publication, which deals mostly with contemporary and later pieces.

I. D. S. RICE’S DISCUSSION OF THE WADE CUP.

To acquaint the reader with the issues involved we will first follow Dr. Rice’s presentation of the Wade Cup and of the pieces related to it and then proceed to analyze the major problems for which another interpretation will be given. At this point it should be stressed that the wide scope of such a discussion is to a not inconsiderable degree due to Dr. Rice, since in past years he has, by his various publications, greatly increased our knowledge of mediaeval Muslim metalwork.

After a short introduction dealing briefly with the rise and development of inlaid metalwork in the Islamic world and pointing to the great significance of mediaeval metalwork for our knowledge of Muslim iconography, Dr. Rice gives in his first chapter a lengthy description of the “Wade Cup,” an unsigned, almost globular stemmed vessel, 10½ inches high, which was first briefly described and illustrated in the catalogue of the metal exhibition in Ann Arbor in 1943 and which since then has entered the Cleveland Museum of Art as a gift from the late J. H. Wade (figs. 1 and 2). The two parts of the vessel, the bowl and the foot, were cast as one unit with only the bottom of the upper part being inserted separately. The piece is very richly decorated with silver inlay (now partly lost) and traced design, especially on the outer surface. The latter shows, below a border with an “animated” inscription expressing a series of good wishes, an elaborate décor of which the organizing element is provided by bands swathed around the body of the vessel. The major triangular and lozenge-shaped interstices between these bands are filled with the signs of the zodiac. The bands themselves show processes of animals, real and imaginary, not mixed and pursuing each other, but in most cases the same animal repeated within the same unit, although, it should be pointed out, we find also, for instance, a bearded sphinx leading a moon-faced female of the same species. The foot has a narrow band of naskhi writing ending in human heads containing a brief formula of good wishes, the whole bordered on top and bottom by tassel-like leaves pointing up and down respectively. The inside of the cup shows on the bottom four sphinxes, whose connected wings are interlaced with a knot-like design; these animals are revolving clockwise around a central point (text fig. A). They are surrounded by a double row of fishes moving counterclockwise, with parts of other fishes visible along the edges. There are small figures of other animals, particularly birds, between the two main rows of fishes, mostly moving in the same direction as the sphinxes. The central design is framed by 12 stalks radiating from the center, each carrying a lemon-shaped motif with a finial. Finally there is a continuous frieze in Kufic along the

![Fig. A—Design of Four Sphinxes in Interior of Wade Cup. (Drawn by D. S. Rice, after The Wade Cup in the Cleveland Museum of Art.)](image-url)
edge of the cup's interior; in the monograph it is said to consist only of a repetition of the single word *wal-barakah*, "and blessing'" but curiously enough, besides one incomplete version, it contains also, once, the word *wal-dawlah*, "and government" (with the letter *lām* missing).

In the second chapter Dr. Rice first presents his ideas about the origin of the cup's peculiar form, which he regards as the rendering of a pottery shape in metal. He then points out that the shape of the Wade Cup is not an isolated example and goes on to discuss briefly another outstanding piece, the "Vaso Vescovati" now in the British Museum, which alone of this group has a lid (fig. 9). Another example illustrated is a footed cup in the Metropolitan Museum, while a vessel in the Victoria and Albert Museum with arabesque designs is only referred to. A fifth vessel, formerly in the Peytel Collection, is much simpler, its only decoration being a historical inscription, whose visible part on the only available photograph was read by Dr. Rice (fig. 5). An interpretation of its text leads him to regard it as "probably mid-fourteenth-century work from Khorasan" (pp. 13, 16). He also discusses a second group of differently made cups whose taller pedestals have annular knops. This group comprises vessels in the Pinacoteca in Naples, in the Museo Nazionale in Florence, and the Walters Art Gallery, all from Persia, and then finally the "Fano Cup" in the Bibliothèque Nationale which now has a base from another piece attached to it. This last-named piece is attributed by Rice to Syria and the Ayyūbid period. Here this writer would like to call attention to two other stem cups which belong to the first group. On the first, of yellowish brass, in the Metropolitan Museum (No. 91.1.542), there is an all-over silver-inlaid leafy design, which surrounds two staggered rows of undecorated roundels on its bowl part. On the second piece, which once belonged to the late Joseph Brummer in New York and whose present whereabouts is unknown to this writer, roundels with seated figures are set against a background with an all-over design of interlocking swastikas which is bordered on top by an inscription band with good wishes in the form of a naskhi inscription placed on arabesques. To judge from its rather dry design this piece, like the one just referred to, in the Metropolitan Museum, could date from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. These tentative dates can, however, only be verified when proper photographs are available; for the time being these pieces are mentioned here mainly to help to establish the full range of this particular group.

In the monograph's second chapter it is emphasized that the revolving sphinxes in the interior of the Wade Cup have close parallels on the large basin in the Völkerkunde Museum in Munich (text fig. B), which was made by order of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' of Mosul (1233–59), and on a tray bearing the title of the same ruler in the Victoria and Albert Museum. To establish a more precise date and provenance Dr. Rice turns, in two succeeding chapters, to an analysis of the two main decorative features of the Wade Cup. In chapter three he analyses the designs of the zodiac, hereby mainly following the investigations of Willy Hartner. These symbols present themselves as the various domicilia of the seven main planets, and of the pseudo-planetary nodes of the moon's orbit, although this "mixed" system shows a few deviations from the norm, which are duly noted. This

---

2 After having been published more than a hundred years ago by M. A. Lanci, this piece has now been made the subject of an article by Ralph Finder-Wilson on the occasion of its recent acquisition by the British Museum (*An Islamic bronze bowl*, British Museum Quarterly, vol. 16 [1951], pp. 85–87).


A third unpublished cup belonging to this first group, but not inlaid with silver (cf. text fig. 1) will be introduced into the discussion below, p. 339.
discussion brings interesting insights into the iconographical concepts of the Muslim Middle Ages, but no precise historical information could be gained, since our present knowledge in this field is still too limited.

More promising appears to be an analysis of the elaborate naskhī inscription expressing good wishes below the rim, since its peculiar amalgamation of the letters with human figures and animals is not only regarded as a clever transformation of the Arabic alphabet but also as a clue to its date and, through it, to its place of origin. Here Dr. Rice’s drawings of details serve a particularly useful purpose, as he was able to assemble the inscriptions from the pieces so far discussed, and in addition those on other objects of different shapes and functions.

Dr. Rice starts his historical survey of these specific examples by differentiating between three varieties of this script, for which Mme. V. Kratchkovskaya’s all-embracing term “figural” is probably the best. The first he designates as the “animated” naskhī, as the upper hastae are formed of human beings engaged in various activities, while some or all of the lower letters are composed of animal parts. The two examples of this group, and both of them are ingenious and most appealing, are on the Bobrinsky Bucket of 1163 (559 H.) in the Hermitage Museum, and the Wade Cup itself (text fig. C). In the second variety the hastae of the letters—and they can be either Kā’fī or naskhī—are “human-headed.” In the third variety animals appear as fillers between the letters of the naskhī writing without being fused with the script itself. In the course of his survey Dr. Rice provides readings of some inscriptions in these various forms of figural writing. They are a testimony to his ability as an epigraphist, because they prove in many instances to be real riddles, especially in the later versions, when the letters are more or less submerged in the heavy growth of figural decoration. The reading of the inscription on the Wade Cup is, by comparison, fairly easy.4

4 Dr. Rice renders this inscription (text fig. C) as follows: “Glory and success, and government, and bliss, and soundness, and peace of mind, and mercy, and well-being, and good health, and duration, and increase, and satisfaction, and care, and continuance to its owner.” This seems fully justified, except that the misspelled (o) “always” is not translated; also the writing of the seventh word (g), said to be wal-rāmah, might allow another reading. In all the other examples the letter mim is either given as a loop (in r, j, and o) or shows (in k) a thickening of the line, neither of which is found in g. Furthermore, the letter which is read as ḥā is higher and steeper and does not show the acute angular form which is found in the words (f) and (p). It seems to this writer more likely, therefore, that the fish held in the duck’s bill does not form part of the letter, so that the word in question should be rendered as rāmah. If we apply diacritical points to it, wal-zinah, “beauty, ornament,” would be a solution, since such a reading was listed by E. Mittwoch, after a piece published by M. Lanci (E. Mittwoch, “Epigraphischer Anhang,” in F. Sarre, Erzeugnisse islamischer Kunst, I. Metall,
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Fig. C—The "Animated" Naskhï Inscription on the Wade Cup. (After drawing by D. S. Rice.)
Based on the analysis of these figural inscriptions, Dr. Rice finally places the Wade Cup after the pen case in the Freer Gallery, dated 1210 (though without giving the reasons why he does so), and before the Blacas Ewer in the British Museum, dated 1232, or, as he also states, into the third decade of the thirteenth century. Since Herat was sacked by the Mongols in 1222, he attributes the cup to the other great center of metalworking, Azerbaijan, or a region near the Caucasus. He does not refer to contemporary examples which would relate the Wade Cup to other pieces from this region. Instead his supporting evidence is (1) two close parallels for the wheel with four sphinxes on the cup’s interior, which occur on the basin and tray of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ made in Mosul, and a less close parallel of four revolting lions on a stone carving from Daghstian, attributed to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century; (2) the style of the text on the cup’s stem, which appears in the same manner on the sockets of northwest Persian candlesticks from the end of the century or the beginning of the next; and (3) the grayish-green tinge of the cup’s alloy, which Rice noticed also on the later candlesticks. When evaluating this evidence, of which the first seems to be the decisive one for Dr. Rice, it should be borne in mind that it is either from a different region or, when referring to the same region, at least 50 years after the making of the Wade Cup. In either case it is from a period when the migration of craftsmen as a result of the Mongol invasion had greatly changed the artistic landscape of the Near East.

II. THE EARLIEST ISLAMIC INLAID METALWORK

After this analysis of Rice’s monograph, which indicates the wealth of information contained in it, we turn now to a discussion of certain issues. We are starting with one of general nature, which is of great significance for the history of Near Eastern metalwork. It seems certain to this writer that the statement in the Introduction, that “all the early vessels produced in the Near East in the first four and a half centuries of Islamic rule are either plain or decorated with traced designs only” (p. 7), can no longer be maintained. There are a few brass vessels usually designated as post-Sasanian which are inlaid with copper. Although their precise date has so far not been established, so much is certain, that they are pre-Seljuk and therefore constitute definite proof that inlay work in bronze or brass was practiced in the early centuries of Islamic Iran. In any case they are much older than the pen case of 1148 in the Hermitage, which is called “the first example of an inlaid Islamic metal work.” To this already published material can now be added another item: Several years ago this writer saw, in the little Museum of Herat, a Persian bronze ewer of a shape derived from a Sasanian prototype (fig. 36). On its body below the spout a short inscription in simple unadorned Kufic

FIG. D—Silver Inlaid Inscription on Bronze Ewer in the Herat Museum (see Plate 36). Silver in Letters Given in Outline Only Has Fallen Out. (Drawn by M. Fikri Seldjouki.)

was inlaid in silver which, with the exception of the first two letters, was well preserved; it gives only a name, "Bakr ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz" (text fig. D). For epigraphic reasons this inlay can be dated from the last two decades of the third to the first half of the fourth century H. (end of the ninth to the middle of the tenth century A.D.).

6 On my visit to Herat in 1951 I got, unfortunately, only a glimpse of this piece one evening, but hoped to come back to it the next day to study it more extensively and photograph it. The conditions of travel, however, made this impossible and two subsequent trips proved unsuccessful. Thanks to the kind help of Père Serge de Beaurecueil, O. P., M. Abdollahfar Rawan Farkadî, and M. Fikri Seldjouki I am now happily able to present two illustrations of this important piece. As to the copy of the inscription, Père de Beaurecueil stated in a letter: "La reproduction est parfaite." M. Fikri Seldjouki indicated by outline drawing those parts of the inscription from which the inlaid silver had fallen out. According to this same Afghan scholar, the thickness of the line is about 1 mm., the height of the inscription about 8 mm., and its length 49 mm. The most revealing epigraphic feature as to the date of the early unadorned Kufic is the descending rounded ligature between two letters found in two places, the rounded swelling of several lower letters and, to a very limited extent, the one 'ayn formed by two slanting lines coming to a point on the writing line, and with the top of the letter open. The earliest use of a connecting loop together with this special form of an 'ayn is on a dirham of al-Mu'ta'did billâh struck in Isfahan in 282 H./895 (H. Lavoix, Catalogue des monnais musulmanes de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 1887-96, vol. 1, No. 1047, pl. 3).

Dr. George C. Miles kindly informed me that he knows such a ligature on another dirham of this Abbasid caliph of 28x (mint effaced) in the collection of the American Numismatic Society, and that this feature occurs on other coins from 303 H./915 to 318 H./930. He also pointed out that it is found in the mid-fourth century H. in stone epigraphy and becomes common toward the end of that century. I have checked this information against inscriptions on tîrâz fabrics made in the East. There it appears also first under al-Mu'ta'did billâh in 283 H./896, again under al-Muqtadîr billâh (286–295 H./902–908), on a tîrâz from Marv, then on various other tîrâz cloths made in Bishâpûr, Baghchad, and other unnamed places, up to a tîrâz of al-Muqta'did billâh, dated 320 H./932. The specific swelling of the lower letters is found on a tîrâz of this last-named caliph dated 316–318 H./928–930 (E. Kühnel-L. Belinger, Catalogue of dated tîrâz fabrics, The Textile Museum, Washington, 1952, p. 14, No. 73-366; p. 19, No. 73-657; p. 20, No. 73-674; p. 26, No. 73-144; p. 28, No. 73-17; p. 31, Nos. 73-557 and 73-197; p. 32, No. 73-368; p. 34, No. 73-369, and pls. VI, VIII, XII and XIII). This evidence shows that while this type of ligature occurred already in the eighties of the third century H., it became more common in the first three decades of the fourth century. In view of the swelling of the lower letters, a date of ca. 320 H./932 suggests itself, but there may be other tîrâz fabrics which show this feature at an earlier date. There is one other approach to the problem of the date, namely, that of considering the name. It seems unlikely that this is the signature of the artisan, as it would most probably have been preceded by one of the usual fictitious formulas.

In view of this, the name probably represents the owner. Since the name "Bakr" is not too common, there is a good chance of identifying such a person. One that fits in time would be the Dâlafî Bakr b. 'Abîl-'Azîz b. Abî Dâlaf al-Qâsim, who died in 285 H./898 (E. de Zambran, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie, Hanovre, 1927, p. 199). However, that family resided in Karaj in Kurdistan and one would still have to explain how this ever came to Herat. Several possible theories suggest themselves, but it seems wiser at this point to leave this question of identification for the time being.

Strictly speaking, our assumed date—end of the third or beginning of the fourth century H.—applies only to the inlaying, because this work could have been done on an earlier piece. To a certain extent this is suggested by the shape of the ewer which, owing to its "Sasanian" shape, one would have been inclined to date earlier than about A.D. 900. This question of whether this inlay work was applied to an old or a new vessel must remain in abeyance because we still do not know enough about the continuation of Sasanian forms in the first six centuries of the Hijrah and it will, furthermore, be necessary to examine the ewer in Herat in a thorough manner. It seems, however, significant that this piece appeared in the same town, Herat, from which we have about two and a half centuries later the first bronze vessel with silver and copper inlays carrying inscriptions which give, besides other information, the name of this very place and the date 559 H.
points out that under the stimulation of Chinese pottery, Near Eastern ceramic craftsmen created a number of new shapes, one of which was a deep bowl “with gentle curved-in rims and a high splayed footring.” The earliest of these pieces with a date so far tracked down is from the year 600 H./1203 (fig. 3). The Wade Cup would, according to Rice, “represent a rendering of the same shape in metal” (p. 12) and “is unlikely to be earlier than this earliest dated pottery vessel of the shape,” i.e., 1203 (p. 16).

As Dr. Rice is quite right in pointing out that the footed bowl seems to have gained a fairly recent popularity in metalwork at the time when the Wade Cup was made, the question of its antecedents is very important, especially since the genesis of this new type can possibly provide a clue for its date and point also to the region of its origin.

Now as to the assumed dependence of the metal shape on the pottery—because it is this that “the rendering of the same shape (i.e., the shape used for pottery vessels) in metal” seems to imply—it can be stated that although there is a general resemblance between the pottery vessels referred to and others made of metal, the two betray also certain differences. This will become clear when we compare the profile of the “earliest” pottery piece, that of 1203, with the Wade Cup (figs. 1 and 3). Not only is the outline of the pottery bowl with its more vertical upper part, which slightly inverts and then everts again to form the lip, different from the more unified outline of the metal vessel, but also the foot differs in both instances. In the ceramic ware we have, so to speak, a simple truncated cone, while the brass object shows a very specific curve, in which the foot flares slightly near its junction with the bow, then contracts to flare out in a more pronounced fashion toward its lower edge. Mr. Arthur Lane has furthermore pointed out that the ceramic type is, for stylistic reasons, most likely to be earlier than 1200, and he referred in particular to a fine vessel in the Victoria and Albert Museum which he dates about 1180 (fig. 4). The profile of this piece evidently differs also from that of the Wade Cup. Another aspect of the problem is the fact that although pottery vessels often imitate metal shapes, it happened only very rarely that a mediaeval Muslim metalworker copied a pottery shape, as he did, for instance, in the case of the cast brass bowl now in the Museo Civico in Bologna, which was made for an officer of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ between 1231 and 1259; but this piece never set a fashion and from all we know seems to have remained a unique creation. On the other hand, the footed metal bowl was a fairly popular type which in the course of time underwent an evolution of its own. It was indeed so popular that it influenced potterywork, since the foot of a ceramic bowl in the Victoria and Albert Museum, dated 672 H./1274, with its flattened-out base (Rice, pl. XIV, a) has a typical metal shape and is in this respect different from the feet on early dated ceramic pieces (see fig. 3). Also, as Dr. Rice himself noted (p. 15), the idea of swathing the body of a globular vessel with decorative bands was imitated by a potter in 1270. The influencing, therefore, if there was any, might very well have gone in the opposite direction—that is, from metalwork to pottery, as seems to have happened in the second half of the thirteenth century. While Dr. Rice’s hypothe-
sis of a pottery model is—in theory—not altogether impossible, the general and specific evidence makes it seem unlikely. This, in turn, naturally raises the question as to what should be regarded as the prototype of the new metal shape.

There is in the Archaeological Museum in Teheran a stemmed cup found in Mazanderan which dates from the Sasanian (or possibly the post-Sasanian) period (fig. 12). Although the globular part is shallower than the Wade Cup and the foot higher, especially in relation to the upper part, there can be no doubt that this vessel is, so to speak, the Iranian ancestor of the piece in Cleveland. This is indicated by the general shape, the “waist” of the foot, and the compartmenting raised bands with interstitial designs. Recently another such early silver cup with a high and rather heavy foot has come to light. Its only decoration consists of narrow animal-on-arabesque frieze in relief on its upper part, has recently entered the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore (No. 48.2075).

Another possible prototype for a hemispherical stem cup, even for the complete type with flutings on the outside of the bowl part, but this feature is important, as it may be the prototype for the arches and gadrooning on the later footless and footed bowls (cf. text figs. H. and I and figs. 6 and 13). This new piece, which belongs to Mr. Rabenou in New York, has a Pahlavi inscription in the foot.

The Wade Cup is, therefore, probably closer than any other pieces to the archetypes of the vessel, and such a result is not surprising. The Japanese pieces, however, are of a later date, and the time gap is a considerable one. Although the Chinese pieces have, however, so many features in common with the Iranian group, especially with the Vaso Vescovali (text fig. E), that a connection cannot be entirely disclaimed. The most important historical pieces are a set of seven bronze reliquaries in the famous Shōsōin in Nara, which as such cannot be later than the first half of the eighth century. The pieces are

---

**Fig. E—Profile of Vaso Vescovali. Height 217 mm.**

**Fig. F—Covered Reliquary. Nara, Shōsōin. Height 290 mm. (After Shōsōin gyomotsu zuroku, vol. 12.)**

**Fig. G—Covered Reliquary. Nara, Shōsōin. Height 123 mm. (After Shōsōin gyomotsu zuroku, vol. 12.)**
all conceived as stupas. Their globular bowls are slightly more or less than hemispherical or about hemispherical; the lids of four pieces are crowned by a three-, five-, or seven-storied finial in pagoda form ending in a cintamani jewel, the whole top set on a base (text fig. F); in a fifth case we find on the lid only a large cintamani above two profiles (text fig. G), while the sixth and seventh carry a small single-tiered stupa with a cintamani. None of the pieces shows any decoration besides gilding and application of silver, or in one case inserts of green glass beads. Three pieces—the largest being 290 mm. high with a diameter of 75 mm.—were cast in two pieces, that is, as lid and bowl-foot units. The foot and the finial of the four others—among them the smallest piece measuring 115 × 73—were made separately and soldered on. In every instance the bowl’s interior is rounded at the bottom and no piece has an insert as found in the Wade Cup and others of its group. Apart from this detail the main differences between the Far Eastern examples and the Vaso Vescovati are that the latter is by comparison broader both in its bowl part and foot, the latter is not set on a base, and the bowl and lid invert toward their juncture, while the curvature of these two parts remains the same in the Chinese pieces. In spite of these differences there is, however, something of a family resemblance between all these covered bowls. Besides the Shōsōin reliquaries there is a similar, partially silvered bronze piece with an 8-tiered finial in the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art in Kansas City. The Freer Gallery of Art also owns a most elaborately engraved silver-gilt reliquary of “stem cup” shape with a small stupa on the lid (No. 31.17, fig. II); the proportions of this piece are more attenuated than the squatter Shōsōin and Iranian examples. Finally, a wooden and painted vessel with a 5-tiered finial was found by von Le Coq at Toyok in the Turfan region.11

In view of the fact that only two Sasanian examples of this general shape (although, at least now, coverless) have become known, while the Far Eastern examples are more common and furthermore have a ritual function, it seems quite likely that the shape is in Iran due to foreign influence, especially as the country bordered on Buddhist territory and had Buddhist inhabitants in its eastern regions. If this was so, it must have been the Far Eastern type with a shallow bowl which was copied in these two examples. What happened to the stem cup between the eighth and the twelfth centuries—that is, whether the Iranian types continued to exist or died out and had to be revived—is not known at present owing to our lack of information about early Islamic metalwork from Iran. The fact that the two Sasanian pieces with their raised bands or flutings foreshadow two later decorative schemes (see below p. 339) seems to suggest that the shape was continually used in Iran, though probably as a rarer type.12 Be that as it may, the renewed interest in stem cups during the Middle Ages seems to have

9 Shōsōin gyomotsu zuroku (Illustrated catalogue of the Imperial treasures in the Shōsōin), Tokyo, Imperial Household Museum, 1929, vol. 12, pls. 46–49; English notes pp. 16–18. Our text figure F was made after the drawing accompanying pl. 49 and text figure G after a drawing of the right piece on pl. 49.

10 Los Angeles County Museum. The arts of the T’ang dynasty, A loan exhibition, January 8–February 17, 1937, p. 62, No. 116 (illustrated). Height 149 mm.; diam. 87 mm.

11 A. von Le Coq, Chotscho, Berlin, 1913, pl. 61, d. This reliquary has a scale pattern with floral design in red, green, yellow, and black on white (height 135 mm.; diam. 73 mm.). This piece demonstrates the westward movement of this shape.

12 In Basil Gray, The influence of Near Eastern metalwork on Chinese ceramics, Transactions of the Oriental Ceramic Society, vol. 18 (1940–41), pp. 52–57, all the Western and Far Eastern examples quoted have a too-high stem to be useful in this discussion; they also do not help to elucidate the question of the origin of the second type of mediaeval Islamic stem cup (with knobs) established by Dr. Rice. The (later) Far Eastern cups with a knob in the high stem are thought to have been influenced by western prototypes.
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been brought about or at least stimulated by another development.

The circumstances under which the stem cup was again made part of the general repertory of shapes can to a certain degree be reconstructed. If we study the Bobrinsky Bucket of 1163 we find, first, that this object has basically a foot which in its general curvature is not too different from that of the Wade Cup, the major difference being that it is wider in proportion to the vessel. One could also point out that it does not flare out as much at the top as the foot of the Wade Cup does, although the difference is minimal. However, the general aspect of the foot in both instances is the same and so is the relation of foot to body. In this connection it should also be recalled that there are other buckets of this period which show varied width of the foot, while others are footless. When we now look at the topmost register of the bucket of 1163 we find above the beginning of the word wał-dawlah (fig. 18) a globular bowl with a rather narrow splayed foot and above the central wał a flat globular bowl without a foot. Similar shapes are found also in other places in this register and in the next. Although we do not know certainly of what material these vessels were made, we can nevertheless draw a few conclusions: First, at this time there existed vessels of the same form, either with a foot or without one; second, the shape of the foot is, in this period, wide, medium-sized, or narrow; and third, the introduction of a foot precedes the year 1203 and can be traced back at least to 1163. Taking this clue, we will have to find globular vessels of a preceding period to which, in certain cases, at a particular moment, a foot was added. Such pieces exist among the little-known and not yet investigated Sâmânid or Ghaznavid pieces of metalwork, or those from later periods, where we find hemispherical bowls of various sizes with a slightly drawn-in rim and slightly flattened at the bottom so as to allow them to be placed on a flat surface or on some kind of a stand. However, even the earliest of these pieces were probably not an original creation of that period, since we have fine pieces of silver and gold of roughly the same globular shape without a foot which are probably Parthian and Bactrian. Nothing of that type has so far appeared among the Sasanian metal pieces, although round-bottomed vases are well known, but the type possibly existed and is probably also to be found among more lowly ceramic wares. There is also an unglazed, more or less globular bowl with a Kūfic inscription below the rim and floral decoration on the lower body, which was found in Susa and dates probably from the Umayyad period; but its rim does not turn in and it has a flat base, so it may be too much of a variant to be a link in the evolution. When the shape appears (or rather reappears) in spun or cast brass in the tenth-eleventh century, the pieces vary in size from very large to medium-sized bowls. Of the largest and best-preserved piece, which was found in Afghanistan and is now owned by the Kevorkian Foundation in New York, so far only the interior has been illustrated before, so that we re-

12 R. Harari, Metalwork after the early Islamic period, in A survey of Persian art, ed. A. U. Pope, London and New York, 1938–39, vol. 6, pls. 1291, B, and 1292, A; for such buckets with a foot, see ibid., pls. 1292, B, 1306, A, and 1307. There are also jugs with or without a foot, cf. ibid., pls. 1309, B, and 1309, A, C, D.

13 For such a stand, see Survey, pl. 1286, and possibly also a piece in the Cleveland Museum of Art (Howard L. Hollis, A unique Seldjuk bronze, Ars Islamica, vol. 2 [1935], pp. 231–32, figs. 1 and 2).


15 R. Koechlin, Les céramiques musulmanes du Sene au Musée du Louvre ( Mémoires de la Mission archéologique de Perse, t. 19), Paris, 1928, pl. 4, No. 29.

16 R. Ettinghausen, Interaction and integration in Islamic art, in Gustave E. von Grunebaum (ed.), Unity and variety in Muslim civilization, Chicago, 1955, pl. 32. The height of this bowl is 165 mm., its diameter
produce here a view of its exterior, of which the large Kufic inscription below the rim is obviously a decorative feature which persists in the Wade Cup (fig. 13). One might even be inclined to see in the geometric all-over design which develops from a 6-pointed star at the bowl’s bottom a prefiguration of the swathing ribbons; be that as it may, we find here already the idea of crisscrossing bands and of placing the main ornamental units in the areas created by these bands. Another big bowl is now in the Kabul Museum and was undoubtedly also found in present-day Afghanistan. Its outside decoration is closely related to the just-mentioned piece, only that its large Kufic inscription below the rim, expressing the usual good wishes, is simpler, 405 mm. The shape was fashioned by spinning and the decoration applied by tracing, engraving, and punching.

Fig. H—Bowl Made by Abû Naṣr Mūhammad ibn Aḥmad al-Sījžī. KEVORKIAN FOUNDATION, NEW YORK.
(After R. Harari, in A Survey of Persian Art.)

However, its much-worn interior shows, among other decorations, the signs of the zodiac. which is yet another feature that a metal bowl of this type has in common with the Wade Cup (fig. 14). Another piece of this series, this time by an artisan hailing from Sîstān (Abû Naṣr Mūhammad ibn Aḥmad al-Sījžī) has the same general shape and, again, a large inscription along the outside rim; this time instead of the

— It will be noticed that in this bowl Sagittarius is shooting at a dragon’s head connected with its tail, an indication that at this time (possibly the first half of the eleventh century and contemporary with al-Bīrūnī) the pseudoplanet Jawzahr was already used in Muslim art (regarding this “planet” see Willy Hartner, The pseudoplanetary nodes of the moon’s orbit in Hindu and Islamic iconographies, Ars Islamica, vol. 5 [1938], pp. 113–154). It will also be noticed that, besides the usual 12 figures of the zodiac, there are three additional figures placed between Aries and Pisces.
geometric design with a Kūfī inscription and arabesques filling the interstices we find a plain gadrooned surface edged on top by a sequence of crescent-shaped arches with a hexagon substituted for the 6-pointed star at the bottom (text fig. H). A fourth, still unpublished piece of the group, in the collection of the writer, is unepigraphic. Its outside shows, below various friezes with circular motifs and moldings, a series of high columned arches, the latter design being related to that found on the bowl of Abū Naṣr Muḥammad (fig. 15). The treatment of the exterior of a fifth bowl in the Teheran Museum is quite different from that of the pieces so far discussed (fig. 22). Here the artist who made the bowl not only created the usual globular shape but also an elaborate dense decoration (in relief), which covers the whole surface of the object. In its horror vacui it resembles the Wade Cup. Other features in which these two pieces are related are the inscriptions containing good wishes below the rim, the delineation of areas to be decorated by bands or lines crossing each other, bands with animals and, finally, the signs of the zodiac. There is also a definite connection between the Teheran piece and the Vaso Vescovali evidenced by the manner in which, in each case, the single row of round figures of the zodiac are framed and connected by thin bands forming loops between the individual units.

The shape of the globular bowl without a foot continued not only into the thirteenth century, but well beyond the Mongol conquest, as shown by two bowls formerly in the Harari Collection and now in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo. The first, still pre-Mongol, has a more accentuated curvature than in earlier examples, with the base part lower and more pointed. Still it continues to have the characteristic inscription below the rim and the lower part is again gadrooned (fig. 6). The second is also of this general shape, but its most characteristic feature is its finial-topped cover which is fixed to the lower part by a hinge (fig. 7). This piece might still be called a version of the species and as such it is particularly related to the Vaso Vescovali, which has a similar cover. The character of the rich decoration and especially the lotus blossom date this covered bowl to the late thirteenth or, more likely, to the early fourteenth century.

It was to this more or less hemispherical bowl that at one point in its evolution (possibly in the middle or third quarter of the twelfth century) a foot or stem was added. The connecting link between the footless and the footed types could very well be pieces on the order of a bowl which was formerly in the collection of the late Professor Herzfeld and whose present whereabouts is unknown; it is obvious from the drawing (text fig. I), which is based on a sketch made by the author many years ago, that this piece is a gadrooned bowl on the order of text figure H and figure 15, to which a foot was added which then became typical for the series. The idea of
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a foot caught on quickly, and so it is only natural that we find it in various types of metalwork.

A late (if not the last) stage in the development of the stem cup is, according to Dr. Rice, represented by the Peytel Cup, which he regards as being probably a mid-fourteenth-century work from Khorasan (p. 16) and as such the final *terminus ante quem* for the Wade Cup (fig. 5). He arrives at the date of this piece by assuming that "the title of *sadr*" borne by both the owner of the vessel and his father "probably indicates that they were religious leaders," and as they were without doubt Shi'ites he assumed "that they would fit into the milieu of Sarbadâr of Sabzevâr, who ruled over a large part of Khorasan from 738-88 H./1337-86" (p. 13). It can, however, be shown that the title of *sadr* was also borne by a purely mundane officeholder, namely a grand vizier, and that early in the thirteenth century. The main inscription on the Freer Gallery's pen case of Majd al-Mulk of 607 H./1210, who was the grand vizier of the Khwârizmshāh 'Alâ al-Dîn Muhammad, starts with *al-sadr al-ajall*; this dignitary was a *sadr* of Khorasan (*sadr wanîzâm Khorâsân*) and his father was likewise a *sadr* and a *shâhid*—all features which have a parallel on the Peytel Cup. This opens up further possibilities for the identification of a political figure in the thirteenth century, or at least prior to the middle of the fourteenth century. Such an earlier date would, in the writer's opinion, fit better the general character of the piece, since its shape is still fairly close to the Wade Cup and the Vaso Vescovali. As a matter of fact, what a post-Mongol cup, possibly of the fourteenth century, looked like is shown by a specimen in the British Museum which indicates that the fine proportions between bowl and foot have been lost owing to the exaggerated increase of the latter and the changed profile of the former (fig. 8).24 In view of all this and before a more

24 Barrett, *op. cit.*, pl. 34, where it is called fourteenth century; Harari (*op. cit.*, pl. 1357, D) calls the piece thirteenth to fourteenth century. This particular shape continued to be popular, as shown by such a stem cup in the Bibliothèque Nationale, which may be of the fourteenth or possibly fifteenth century (*d'Allemagne, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, fig. on p. 99) and another late one formerly in the *d'Allemagne* collection (*ibid.*, fig. on p. 65). R. Pinder-Wilson has called attention to a fourteenth-century parallel to the Vaso Vescovali, an enameled glass vessel belonging to the Kevorkian Foundation, which, on account of its annular knop in the stem, would be akin to Rice's second group (*Pinder-Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 86; the piece is illustrated in R. Ettinghausen, *The unicorn*, Freer Gallery of Art Occasional Papers, vol. 1, No. 3 [Washington, 1950], pl. 20). Its proportions are also quite different from the earlier examples.
specific identification of the two *ṣudūr* mentioned on the Peytel Cup is possible, the early thirteenth-century attribution previously postulated by Max van Berchem,\(^{25}\) which was obviously based on the character of the writing, should not be ruled out, or at least a date within the thirteenth century.

**IV. ANIMAL WHEELS, BIRDS, AND FISHES**

Dr. Rice uses, quite rightly, the three major decorative schemes, i.e., the four sphinxes, the signs of the zodiac, and the figurial script, as clues to the date and the place of production of the Wade Cup. The first of these designs, the four sphinxes in the interior, is of special significance since it has close parallels in Mesopotamian metalwork from the court of Badr al-Din Lūḥī', a fact which weighed heavily in Dr. Rice's final determination of the region where the artist of the Wade Cup worked and, indirectly, of his period. However, the early history of the motif and its possible origin or meaning should also be investigated, as they provide important clues. After what we have said before, we should look for further leads among the decorations of the hemispherical footless bowls which this writer regards as the forerunners of the Wade Cup. It will be our aim to find further examples of revolving sphinxes or other winged animals, especially those which are surrounded by fishes, as this peculiar motif might give additional data for the understanding of the Wade Cup.

Of the various stemless globular vessels to which we referred more specifically in the preceding pages, the fourth is the one which provides us in this instance with a clue (figs. 16 and 17). Here we find in the center a wheel motif consisting of a 6-armed swastika, the vertical bars of which are shaped like the heads and necks of birds, so that it seems as though the radiating spokes were, so to speak, the highly stylized wings or bodies of birds. It should also be noted that the artist inserted certain markings just above the point where these radiating spokes turn horizontally. Each of these little designs looks like the pointed head of a fish. Around this central motif single stylized birds are placed in nine roundels; all these birds are turned in the opposite direction to that in which the central wheel design is rotating. Finally, we have a border with a repetition of what seems to be a broken-down design. Here again the explanation which most readily comes to one's mind is that these are the highly conventionalized renditions of a series of fishes that move in the same direction as the birds in the roundels, that is, in the direction opposite to that of the central wheel motif. Obviously we have here an animal wheel and also various bird and fish designs moving in opposite directions, and if it can be shown that it is earlier than the Wade Cup it would be a forerunner of its design. The clue to its date is provided by the big-eyed, full-chested birds with broad, summarily treated tail feathers and rather thin wings which, like the spandrel design of dotted circles, occur on a certain type of Persian sgraffito pottery (text figs. J and K).\(^{26}\) These ceramic wares have always

\(^{25}\) *Notes d’archéologie arabe. III*, Journal Asiatique, ser. 10, vol. 3 (1904), pp. 28–29 (quoted by Rice on p. 35, note 11). Van Berchem’s dating is corroborated by the very similar shape of the pottery bowl of 600 H./1203 (cf. figs. 3 and 5) and others from the early thirteenth century.


After the completion of this article another characteristic bowl of this ware in the Bensillum collection in Cairo was published (Zaki Muhammad Hasan [Zaky M. Hassan], *Atlas al-funūn al-zukhrūfiyyah wa’l-tajāvur al-islāmiyyah* [English subtitle: *Atlas of Muslim decorative arts*], Cairo, 1956, fig. 96). As its bird is very
been thought to derive from engraved metalwork but they are too humble to have silver vessels as their prototypes, and bowls on the order of, or related to, the type here discussed are much more likely to have exerted this influence. Since the close connection between the designs on the metal bowl and these pottery pieces can hardly be denied, one has to place the former slightly earlier than the generally accepted date for the latter, which is tenth to eleventh century.

To understand the unusual design of the animal wheel on the metal bowl under discussion we will have to look at (slightly earlier) pottery, an ubiquitous and better preserved close to the Chicago example of text figure K, but better preserved, one can assume that originally the edge of the tailfeathers of the latter probably did not have indications of slight curves.

working material than metalwork, or at glass vessels, to find an animal wheel, or birds and fishes, or a combination of the two, i.e., revolving birds and fishes. This proof can be easily supplied and we are selecting a few characteristic examples to demonstrate this. A pottery fragment from Afrasiyāb (Samarqand) in the Museum of Oriental Culture in Moscow has as its central design three highly stylized revolving birds forming a wheel pattern (fig. 19). Two other pieces were found in Nishapur: one is a glass bowl painted with several luster tones, belonging to Mr. Wilhelm Henrich; its decoration consists of a single large bird (not unlike the birds in the roundels of the metal bowl), which is surrounded by a circle of five fishes (fig. 26). The other, in the possession of Mr. E. Safani, is the most significant of these parallels; it is again a pottery bowl with two birds and two fishes, both revolving counterclockwise (fig. 27). There is an obvious iconographic relationship between these rotating birds and fishes and those on the cast bowl illustrated in figures 16 and 17; even a connection between

27 A very fine survival of the motif of revolving birds and fishes is to be found in a chinoiserie drawing, probably of the middle of the fifteenth century, in the Library of the Topkapu Sarayi Mızesi in Istanbul (Hazine 2152, fol. 70a). It will be observed that there are there two circles of birds, moving in opposite directions, and that in two circles the animals are also interlocked (fig. 37), features which are prefigured in the writer's metal bowl (figs. 16 and 17) and the Wade Cup. Drawings of this general type were attributed to Herat by Martin, Schulz, and the writer, and to western Turkestan by Kühnel, which means in any case an east Iranian region. Even in Safavid art the choice of motifs is still governed by the old combination of birds and fishes, although the arrangement and lack of movement indicate that any understanding of the original setting has been lost. For this see, for instance, a tapestry in a private collection which has in its central medallion two pairs of confronted birds and next to them, at each side, a pair of linked fish, in oblong cartouches (Gertrude Robinson, An unknown sixteenth-century Persian carpet, Burlington Magazine, vol. 72 [1938], color pl. opp. p. 103).
this motif and the rotating sphinxes and fishes on the later Wade Cup is suggested, although this still needs further explanation, which will be presently given.

To understand the next step in the development of this motif it should be pointed out that, besides revolving birds, the art of eastern Khorasan knew also other revolving animals, as shown by the early Nishapur pottery (fig. 20). Animal wheels appear also in metalwork of the second half of the twelfth century or possibly of its end. There is, for instance, a metal tray, formerly in the collection of M. d’Allemagne, in which four rabbits walk in a circle around a central point and this (as far as it can be made out from an earlier, poor illustration) in such a way that, owing to overlapping, only two pairs of ears had to be drawn (text fig. I). The same motif appears quite clearly on another Persian metal tray in the collection of Mr. Stuart C. Welch, Jr., of Cambridge, Mass. (fig. 21). Thus we have here not only the main general motif found on the Wade Cup, but also one of its unusual features, the fusing of animals. Nothing is known about where the Welch tray was found, but it includes, on the outer wall, at least one motif which is very characteristic of Khorasan metalwork, the tri-partite vase with flower sprays. It occurs six times alternating with a roundel. The vase has an ovoid as its center section with the neck and foot drawn as triangles, while each of the two hanging sprays carries a leaf and on the tip a budlike flower with two petals at the side (text fig. M). The inclusion of this design makes an East Iranian origin of the tray very likely. Finally and most significantly there exists also a piece with an animal wheel composed of four walking sphinxes whose wing tips interlock just as they do on the Wade Cup and the two Badr al-Dîn Lu’lu’ brasses. It is to be found in the center of a rectangular brass tray whose corner spandrels are decorated with silver-inlaid arabesques and whose framing outlines and central dots in circular designs are inlaid with copper (figs. 31, 33 and 34). In view of the close connection with the Wade Cup and the two metal objects made by order of Badr al-Dîn Lu’lu’, the date and region of origin of this piece, which is in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore, is of great importance.29 There is no specific information available as to a precise date, but pieces of this type are usually attributed to the second half of the twelfth century or shortly after 1200. One can be more precise about the locality. There is first the unusual shape, which has so far not been reported in the literature on bronze and brass vessels, but which is frequently found in Af-
Richard Ettinghausen

Afghanistan, especially in Ghaznah, and of which there are several in the Kabul Museum (fig. 32). Then there is a silver tray of this shape made at an earlier date (end of eleventh or twelfth century), which has a benedictory inscription for a certain Khwārizm-shāh b. Ibrāhīm, a prince who possibly belonged to the family of

![Diagram](image)

Fig. M—*a*, **Design on Outside Wall of Small Tray.** Collection of Mr. Stuart C. Welch, Jr., Cambridge. (Drawn after a sketch of the owner.)

*b*, **Design on Bottle Signed by 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Naysābūrī.** Islamische Abteilung der Staatlichen Museen, Berlin. (After Sarre, Metall.)

the sovereigns of Khwāh—all of which indicates at least that this is an East Islamic shape. Then there are the arabesques in the spandrels (fig. 33), which in their drawing are very much like those on the inkwell signed by Muḥammad b. Abī Sahl al-Haravī, also in the Walters Art Gallery;30 this resemblance extends to such details as the ring bands around the stems (a feature also found on the tails of the sphinxes on the Wade Cup, *text fig. A*), the clasping of the stems by the leaf tips, and the inlaying of narrow lines of silver in the middle of the stems. And finally the sphinx itself in one form or another is well attested in Khorasanian metalwork, although designs with a single animal are probably not found there exclusively; a single winged sphinx is found on a bottle fragment in the Berlin Museum, made by 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Naysābūrī (it is, as we shall see, significant in this connection that the sphinx occurs on this piece together with birds, on the bottom and top plates);31 two sphinxes in relief placed in opposite directions, so as to indicate a circular movement around a central decoration, occur on one of the rectangular trays in the Kabul Museum (fig. 32). In view of the wheel of rabbits which we noticed on two trays (*text fig. L* and *fig. 21*) in the position taken by sphinxes on other examples, it should be pointed out that on this Ghaznah tray the two sphinxes are surrounded by a frieze of walking rabbits, so that here the two animals are combined. It should also be pointed out that the center of this tray is filled with a large disc with four small leaves in the interstices of its four spokes, the whole surrounded by radiating roundish leaves. This has some bearing on the assumed original significance of this design which we shall presently take up. Finally we have the combination of three crouching (or possibly walking) sphinxes in openwork design and relief on the dome of an inlaid inkwell made by Nāsir ibn As'ād Naysābūrī.32 All this seems to indicate that the
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31 Sarre, *Erzeugnisse islamischer Kunst*, p. 9, No. 14, figs. 5 and 6; Harari, *op. cit.*, pl. 1311, E. The combination of sphinx, birds, and radiating stalks occurs on a parcel-gilt silver tray formerly in the Kelekian collection and now in the Cincinnati Museum and attributed to the twelfth or thirteenth century by R. Harari (*op. cit.*, pl. 1354; see also pl. 1290, B).

32 Mehmet Aga-Oglu, *A preliminary note on two artists from Nishapur*, Bulletin of the Iranian Institute, vol. 6–7 (Dec. 1946), pp. 123–124, figs. 3 and 4. The illustrations in this article are unfortunately very poor, so that the sphinxes are hardly visible and no con-
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brass tray in the Walters Art Gallery (fig. 31) is most likely of Khorasanian workmanship, and in any case East Iranian; and this applies then, also, to the motif of the wheel composed of four rotating sphinxes.

In view of this conclusion one would have to assume that the Walters tray was made before the early 1220's, when Khorasan was devastated by the Mongols. Since, owing to the use of the sovereign title "al-Malik al-Raḥim," the Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' basin and tray could only have been made in 1233 at the earliest, it follows that this motif as used in Mosul was possibly borrowed from Khorasanian metalwork or, more likely, brought there by refugee artisans and is therefore hardly a clue for attributing a piece like the Wade Cup to a region bordering Mosul. In this connection it should also be pointed out that the sphinxes on the Munich basin of Lu'lu' (text fig. B) have the same interlocking wing tips and the ends of their tails turn back in the same manner as they do on the Walters object. On Lu'lu' s tray in the Victoria and Albert Museum even the unusual feature of placing the sphinx wheel within an undecorated surface can now be explained by the same feature on the Walters tray and other brasses made in Khorasan. This makes it unnecessary to follow the assumption that the tray in the London museum may have been made by a non-Muslim. On the other hand, the occurrence of the rare sphinx wheel in Khorasan and then in Mosul and the "unusual" way of leaving a great deal of the background free of ornament in works from both regions supports Professor Kühnel's theory that the metalworkers specializing in inlays were transplanted from Herat to Mosul.\textsuperscript{39}

To interpret the motif in the Wade Cup's interior it will not do to assume that the design of revolving birds and that of quadrupeds (cf. fig. 20) were combined to form a wheel composed of another winged animal; and that the result of this amalgamation, the sphinx, would, so to say, form a link between bird and beast, but still keep the traditional complement of the former, i.e., the fishes. An explanation of this sort would be too formal and superficial. The real clue lies in the reason for the persistent interest in animal wheels and in birds and fishes, both of which already occurred, as Miss Anna Roes has shown, in prehistoric times and continued to be used throughout the millennia. It is obvious that they must have had some significance. As a revolving circular motif, they were originally in all likelihood a solar symbol in which "the fish may stand for the nightly phase of the sun, for the sun sunk into the sea, whereas the bird symbolizes the sun in the sky."\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{39} Kühnel, \textit{Zwei Mosulbronzen und ihr Meister}, pp. 8–9, 15; about the same time R. Harari had come to similar conclusions (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 2496); their idea was accepted by Mehmet Ağa-Oğlu (\textit{About a type of Islamic incense burner}, The Art Bulletin, vol. 27 [1945], p. 40). The possibility of a non-Muslim artist for the Victoria and Albert Museum tray was considered by D. S. Rice in \textit{The brasses of Badr al-dīn Lu'lu'}, Bull. of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. 13 (1950), p. 633.


The rabbit and rabbit wheel (\textit{cf. text fig. L and fig. 21}) on the other hand, have been interpreted as lunar symbols (Roes, \textit{Tierwirbel}, p. 94; W. Deonna, \textit{Êtres monstrueux à organes communs}, Revue Archéologique, 5\textsuperscript{e} série, vol. 31 [1930], pp. 32–33). These occur in areas as widely separated in distance and time as Pharaonic Egypt, Buddhist Central Asia, and mediaeval Europe. Miss Roes (\textit{Tierwirbel}, p. 99) has referred in particular to a painting in Qyzil, where a rabbit on a moon disk is matched with a decidedly solar symbol (A. von Le Coq und E. Waldschmidt, \textit{Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien}, Berlin, 1928, vol. 6, fig. on p. 77). A similar parallel use is found on the rectangular tray in the Kabul Museum (fig. 32), just as a combination of lunar and solar symbols occurs on classical ceilings (Karl Lehmann,}
\end{footnotesize}
Let us accept this well-reasoned hypothesis for the moment, or at least the solar nature of the animal wheel (and particularly the bird wheel), since it is more difficult to bring support for the given interpretation of the surrounding fishes. Then, with this explanation in mind, one would, in accordance with generally held beliefs, be inclined to think that the Islamic versions are, as rather late examples in the long development of the symbol, purely decorative, or at best, designs whose original meaning was at the time only dimly felt. An investigation of this question has made it clear, however, that the bird wheel was still regarded as a solar symbol by the Muslims of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This can be shown in at least two ways: we find that a wheel of birds can take the place of the usual sun disk with rays in the common scheme of the seven planets, or a revolving wheel of birds in one case (fig. 39) is paralleled by the usual rendering of the sun in another (fig. 40), with the central motif in both cases surrounded by fishes. There are other such cases but these examples—the first from The dome of heaven, The Art Bulletin, vol. 27 [1945], figs. 8 and 63.

The horned animals which form the center of an animal wheel on the Nishapur bowl in the Musée du Louvre (fig. 20) occur also in the same function (either in twos or fours) in prehistoric pottery (E. Herzfeld, Die vorgeschichtlichen Töpferwerke von Samarra, Berlin, 1930, text figs. 18, 20, 21, 23, 25–27; Roes, Tierwirbel, pp. 85–86). Two heads of such animals are applied to the spikes of a 4-armed swastika on a Sasanian seal (Paul Horn and Georg Stein dorff, Sasanidische Siegel steine, Berlin, 1891, pl. 4, No. 158).  


36 Figure 39 is the inside of a Persian inlaid brass bowl of the third quarter of the fourteenth century, in the Walters Art Gallery (No. 54. 455); for a general view of this piece see Handbook of the collection, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, 1936, fig. on p. 48. center. Figure 40 is the inside of a still unpublished Persian bowl in the Freer Gallery (No. 49. 11) from the early fourteenth century. In this piece the fishes thirteenth-century Syria and the second from fourteenth-century Iran—will suffice to demonstrate the point that at the time when the Wade Cup was made a bird wheel was not just “decoration” but was in diverse quarters considered a symbol of the sun.  

What is likewise astonishing in this connection is how faithfully the Muslim artisans kept certain details of the ancient design. If we look at the earliest example of the motif so far traced, which is to be found on a piece of prehistoric pottery from Samarra, it will be noticed that a circle of four birds holding fishes in their beaks moves around a central swastika, the whole surrounded by a circle of fishes (text fig. N). This is precisely the same concept found in the brass bowl illustrated in figures 16 and 17, only that a 6-armed swastika and the birds with fishes are now all joined in a single motif. The fact that the central design has become more abstract and hardly recognizable may have been the reason that the craftsman was induced to reinforce it again by inserting a second row of birds in roundels, since they are a major aspect of the motif and their existence in a second circle was, moreover, suggested by the “Samarra design.” Finally, we find in both move in each circular row in a different direction and there is another frame of radially grouped fishes. The same arrangement is found on another such bowl in the Metropolitan Museum (No. 91. 1. 581).  

The motif was discovered and first dealt with by E. Herzfeld in his study of prehistoric pottery of Samarra (op. cit., pp. 14 and 15; figs. 7 and 8, pls. 6 and 39; also idem, Iran in the ancient Near East, London—New York, 1941, p. 58 and fig. 107). Its importance as one of the oldest known and most long-lived symbols was pointed out by Miss Roes in Tierwirbel, pp. 85–86 and 94, and Birds and fishes, pp. 461, 468, and 472. As to the date of this earliest occurrence of the motif, Miss Roes states: “Some authorities date it as early as the sixth millennium B.C., and no one seems to put it later than the fifth” (loc cit., p. 461).

38 Such a case of reinforcement may also be present in the tray of the Kabul Museum (fig. 32), where the circular motif in the center and the two sphinxes may express the same idea.
cases the encircling line of fishes. The only basic difference between the two sets of representations, separated though they are by more than five thousand years, is the fact that in the Muslim example the circles of animals revolve in two different directions while they all move counterclockwise in the Samarra example. The idea of a bird holding a fish in its beak is still preserved in vestigial form in the center of the Walters bowl, where the head of each fish is close to the beak of a duck (fig. 39). If it is thought that this identification of the bird-with-fish motif on the two brass bowls is farfetched and not actually warranted, one might point to an earlier and more obvious Islamic version on an object from the fourth/tenth century, made in Iraq, which is precisely the same region from which the prehistoric Samarra bowl came. It occurs on a pottery plate (belonging to Mr. K. Rabenou in New York) whose luster decoration includes two long-tailed birds, each with a fish in its beak and both revolving counterclockwise (text fig. O). Here the meaning of the design is changed, as it is combined with a seated man holding a goblet in his right hand and a flower in his left. In this study we are not concerned with what this particular decoration might represent, yet even so it is clear that here one of the design elements—the revolving birds with captured fishes—still follows an age-old pattern.

In view of the persistence of meaning and details in this symbol, the significance of the wheel of sphinxes should be noted, since it represents a departure from the norm. Even before we go into a discussion of what the sphinxes stand for, it is obvious that the wheel of birds and that of sphinxes served the same decorative function. This is shown not only by the earlier East Iranian examples on metal (fig. 17) and on pottery (fig. 27), where the birds occupy the same position as later on the sphinxes, but also by the use of both designs in the work done for Badr al-Dîn Lu’lu’. This ruler had not only the wheel of sphinxes applied to the center of trays and basins (text fig. B), but
on one of his boxes now in the British Museum we find, in the same central position, a wheel composed of ducks whose necks form the same kind of knot as do the wings of the sphinxes (text fig. P).  

FIG. P.—DESIGN ON TOP OF A BOX MADE FOR BADR AL-DIN LU’LU’. BRITISH MUSEUM. (After drawing by D. S. Rice.)

It is more difficult to reconstruct the connotations of the sphinxes so that we can grasp their meaning. Since they have obviously something to do with a traditional solar symbol whose basic meaning was still understood, their presence cannot be due to the whim of an artist or to a temporary fashion, but must have had some long-established connection with the sun. This would, of course, not preclude that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries this particular animal could also have been interpreted in a new, though related, manner. If we survey the objects of Iranian art of earlier times we have to go back to the Achaemenian period, when there was indeed a close relationship between sphinxes and the sun. This is shown, for instance, by a seal on which two such standing animals support a winged sun disk with a crescent disk enclosing a crowned god between them (fig. 25).  

39 Rice, *The brasses of Badr al-din Lu’lu’*, p. 629, text fig. 1 and pl. 14, B.  

40 E. Porada, *The collection of the Pierpoint Morgan Library, Corpus of ancient Near Eastern seals in North American collections* (no place), 1948, vol. 1, pl. No. 817, description in text vol. p. 103. The very similarly composed seal, No. 818, has, instead of the standing sphinxes adored, regardant birds whose heads nearly touch the winged sun disk above them. This seal in turn is very close to a seal formerly in the E. T. Newell collection in which the birds are replaced by two confronted seated sphinxes, of which at least the cap of the right one touches the sun disk (H. H. von der Osten, *Ancient oriental seals in the collection of Mr. Edward T. Newell*, Chicago, 1934, pl. 31, No. 452). This points not only to an association of the sphinx with the sun, but also to the fact that their place can be taken by birds, or vice versa, a fact which explains their continued association in Muslim art (see above, n. 31). That the two sphinxes and the sun symbol belong together and are not necessarily linked to the divine figure in a crescent circle between them, is shown by a seal in the Brett collection which has only the two confronted sphinxes and the sun symbol above them (H. H. von der Osten, *Ancient seals in the collection of Mrs. Agnes Baldwin Brett*, Chicago, 1936, p. 19, No. 133, pl. 11), or by two seals in the Bibliothèque Nationale where there is either a tree of life or a stand between them, again with the sun symbol on top (Louis Delaporte, *Catalogue des cylindres orientaux et des cachets . . . de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1910, vol. 1, pp. 327–328, Nos. 632 and 633; album, pl. 38). The sphinxes on the two Bibliothèque Nationale seals had been described as “Lions ailés à tête humaine barbu...” but on inquiry Miss Porada was kind enough to inform the writer that the sphinxes on the Morgan seals are probably “bull-bodied like the bull-men of seal No. 793 [of her publication] and the earlier bull-men of the Old Babylonian period which are so frequently the adjuncts of the sun-god (H. Frankfort, *Cylinder seals*, London, 1939, p. 171 ff.). Lion-bodied sphinxes are more likely to occur in Syrian cylinders, but not as supports, just with the winged sun-disk floating above them. The supporters of the winged sun-disk from Yazılıkaya look superficially as if they were lion-men, but also have bulls’ bodies on closer study.”
period, so much is certain, that the sphinx had certain solar aspects that could have made it acceptable later. Moreover, whichever way it was originally interpreted, the leonine body of the sphinx on the Wade Cup led one to associate it with the zodiacal sign which shows the sun's house in Leo (see fig. 1 on the left side of the globular body). Since this combination of sun and lion goes back to the fourth millennium B.C., the lion has, here as always, a strong solar significance. The wings endow the animal, of course, with the quality of a bird, and it is thus linked physiologically and iconographically with the original form of the animal wheel. In addition to these old solar aspects of the sphinx there is a new Islamic concept which admits of a supplementary explanation. When Ibn al-Balkhī visited the province of Fars at the beginning of the twelfth century he carefully described the large monsters built into the still standing gateway of Xerxes at Persepolis; he called them representations of Burāq.42 Since Muḥammad's mount for his ascension has traditionally the body of an ass, mule, or, possibly, a horse,43 but not of a bull, as these large animals of Persepolis have, it was rather their human heads and wings that caused Ibn al-Balkhī to call them Burāq. In view of this, he would certainly have applied the term to sphinxes of the type we find in the Wade Cup because they, too, show a human head and wings with the body of a quadruped. This new interpretation as Burāq brings to the wheel pattern the concepts of swift flight, ascent, sky and heaven,44 all of which make it akin to the original associations of the bird design, whose place the sphinxes have taken.45 Yet in spite of the substitutions there are also many cases where the sphinx and the bird occur in close proximity in decorative schemes, as they were obviously linked together in the minds of the craftsmen.46

While it is now understandable that a mediaeval artist like the Master of the Wade Cup should substitute the sphinx for the bird in a solar symbol, one would still have to explain why such a replacement took place just then, as it is apparently not yet found in the earlier art of Nishapur.47 The reason for this is probably

41 Hartner, The pseudoplanetary nodes of the moon's orbit in Hindu and Islamic iconographies, pp. 115 and 119.
42 Ibn al-Balkhī, The Fārsnāma of Ibn 'l-Balkhī, ed. G. Le Strange and R. A. Nicholson, London, 1921, p. 126, lines 19–21; idem, Description of the province of Fars, in Persia, at the beginning of the twelfth century A.D., Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1912, p. 27. That the ruins of Persepolis were also frequented by other men is shown by the two sgrafitti of the Bāyid Abū al-Dowleh (E. Combe, J. Sauvaget, and G. Wiet, Répertoire chronologique d'égigraphie arabe, Le Caire, 1933, vol. 4, Nos. 1475 and 1476) and the visits of persons who collected there stone fragments, since according to Ibn al-Balkhī and Ḥājjī Khalīfah filed particles from these stones were used as a stiptic for wounds (Farsnāma, p. 126, and E. Blochet, Études sur l'histoire religieuse de l'Iran, Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, vol. 40 [1899], p. 216, quoting the Žahān-nāme, in which Ḥājjī Khalīfah also speaks of the Burāq sculpture at the site).
44 There is even a late twelfth-century association of Burāq and sun; see the description of him by Nizāmī, in the "Introduction to the Ishandar-nāme": "Burāq—the hastener, lightning-like, beneath him His housings, like the sun bathed in light":

45 In certain individual mystical experiences in which the mystic takes Muhammad's Miʿrāj as a theme, his ascending spirit turns symbolically into a bird, thus once more showing the affinity of bird and Burāq (al-Hujwīrī, The Kashf al-mahjūb . . . . tr. R. A. Nicholson, Leyden–London, 1911, p. 238, quoting Abū Yazīd [Bayazīd] of Bistām [died 261 H, 873]).
46 See above, footnotes 31, 40, and 45.
47 For the problem of the exact time when the sphinx makes its appearance in mediaeval Iranian art it would be of great importance to have the question of the authenticity of the Bāyid textiles of Bībī Shahr-
twofold. Although there has always been a strong interest in Muhammad's ascension, the period just prior to the making of the Wade Cup was more preoccupied with this theme, owing to the great fervor of contemporary mystical writing and the mystical implications of the theme. This applied not only to the pure mystic but also to poets. Nişâmi, for instance, prefaces his writing, as Sir Thomas Arnold has already pointed out, with lyrical outbursts on the theme of Muḥammad's mi'rāj. The other condition which contributed to the change in the motif was a new interest in the monuments of the Iranian past. This is noticeable not only in the close observation of ancient monuments and their accurate description by a man like Ibn al-Balkhī, but in many objects of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which imitate particular forms and motifs of the Sasanian period. There are also, to a lesser degree, borrowings from art forms current during the Achaemenian dynasty and apparently not used to any large extent in the following periods. The sphinx, which occurs rather frequently during the Seljuk period, is the outstanding example of such a dependence on art forms of the ancient Orient, as already recognized by E. Blochet, J. Horovitz, and Sir Thomas Arnold. It is a conjunction of these two tendencies which apparently made the substitution of the sphinx in the bird wheel possible.

Our next task is to give an explanation for the number of sphinxes on the Wade Cup. In many Asiatic cosmic representations the number four suggests the four points of the compass;
they can hardly be meant, however, in this instance, as in these other cases we find equally often the number eight referring to the cardinal and intermediate directions, while the early examples of the wheel, if they do not show four animals, have two or very rarely five.\textsuperscript{44} Also a symbol for the directions would seemingly presuppose a permanent, static position, while the animals in the Iranian examples revolve. In view of these facts, the four animals in this solar symbol are more likely to represent the cycle of the Four Seasons, the animals being joined, as together they form the year. Representations of the seasons in a cosmic setting are, of course, very natural and they occur, for instance, in late classical, Jewish, and Christian ceilings and mosaics, and in Mithraic statuary.\textsuperscript{55} This form or symbolism is, however, ever so much older than Roman and Islamic renderings, as it occurs already in the prehistoric pottery of Samarra, where the wheel is also composed of four birds or four other animals whose presence was then certainly meaningful and can be best explained as representing the seasons.\textsuperscript{56} In any case, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D. it is usually four animals that constitute the sun wheel, vide the four sphinxes on the Wade Cup, the Walters tray, the basin in Munich, and the four lions on the stone from Daghestan, while the wheel composed of three sphinxes, as we find it on the tray of Badr al-Din Lu‘lu‘ in the Victoria and Albert Museum, goes together with that form of solar symbolism which shows a 3-faced or tripartite sun.\textsuperscript{57} If our assumption is correct, this “prehistoric” way of symbolically visualizing the seasons would, in an Islamic context, antedate the representation of the seasons due to western inspiration, which are found in a Baghdad manuscript of 80r H./1399.\textsuperscript{58}

The reason for the various movements of the animal wheels or circles in relation to each other remains obscure. Possibly there are only aesthetic considerations, as in some cases, especially the early ones, they all have a parallel course (text fig. N, figs. 20 and 27), while later they run, as in the Wade Cup, in opposite directions (figs. 2, 17, 37 and 40). As to the relationship between the central animal wheel and the accompanying fishes, a general trend in the development can be observed. In the early decorative arts of the Muslim period up to the Wade Cup the two have about equal importance (figs. 26 and 27), although in the writer’s brass bowl (fig. 17) the sun symbol looms large in proportion to the surrounding circle of fishes, which, in the case of the Walters tray, can even be dispensed with (fig. 31). After that the central part of the symbol has a tendency to become less important, so that it appears eventually as a small unit surrounded by a large body of fishes (fig. 39). The section with the fishes starts also to include many other creatures living in or on the water, such as ducks, crabs, turtles, and so on, even to water sprites (fig. 39). This trend is already noticeable in the Wade Cup, as it contains some other water animals besides the fishes (and even some land animals which do not fit into the concept). Finally, the fishes...
and aquatic animals become the main theme, with the sun sometimes represented only by a small whirl or circle. The fishes are then usually combined in radial or circular arrangements, the "Baptistère de Saint Louis" in the Musée du Louvre\textsuperscript{59} and the Walters bowl being typical fourteenth-century examples. As these vessels were often destined to hold water, the realistic aspect of such a decoration comes to the fore, as it suggests a body of water teeming with aquatic life.\textsuperscript{60} On the other hand, simpler pieces show the design reduced to a minimum (\textit{text figs. Q and R}).

\textbf{Fig. Q—Fish Whorl on Bronze Bowl. Fourteenth Century. Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore.}

This leaves only the question of the possible meaning of the so far unexplained design feature of the Wade Cup’s interior, namely, the 12 radiating stalks. Inasmuch as the basic motif is, as we have seen, of solar nature, the most plausible explanation is that they are an adjunct of the main concept and represent the rays of the sun in the same way as we find them, for instance, in a somewhat different form in the central roundel of figure 40. Decorative roundels with radiating strokes at the edge are called \textit{shamsch}, from \textit{shams}—sun, in Iran and the same term is applied in Iraq to starlike configurations with appended medallions, as found in architectural decoration,\textsuperscript{61} so that the solar nature of the design is apparent to the people even when the motif is not realistically rendered. As to their number, it has been observed that in the Buddhist art of the Far East multiples of 4 and 8 in the framework of the central circle have a solar significance.\textsuperscript{62} This seems to apply also to Islamic versions, since not only the Wade Cup but also most of the examples in Iraq follow this principle.

It seems pretty certain that the whole decorative scheme of the Wade Cup’s interior developed from the disk which is placed at the bottom of the bowl where the foot joins it. Its

\textsuperscript{59} Idem, \textit{Le Baptistère de Saint Louis}, Paris, 1951, figs. 22 and 23 and pl. 40.

\textsuperscript{60} The combination of fishes and aquatic animals with what seems to be a solar symbol is already found in the pre-Islamic art of the Near East (see the silver fragment in the Walters Art Gallery of the fourth–fifth century, possibly from Egypt, discussed by Marvin Chauncey Ross, \textit{Notes on Byzantine gold and silversmith’s work}, Journal of the Walters Art Gallery, vol. 18 [1955], p. 60, fig. 3).

\textsuperscript{61} See E. Herzfeld in F. Sarre und E. Herzfeld, \textit{Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet}, Berlin, 1920, vol. 2, pp. 156, 256, 258 and 270. The number of appendices, called \textit{lawzah} or \textit{baddûm} (almond), is usually 12, although 9 and 10 occur, too.

Figs. 1-2—The "Wade Cup," Cleveland Museum of Art. (Photograph courtesy D. S. Rice.)
Fig. 3—Luster Bowl. Kashan, 1203. (Courtesy Kevorkian Foundation, New York.)

Fig. 4—Pottery Bowl. (Courtesy Victoria and Albert Museum, London.)

Fig. 5—The Peytel Cup. (Photograph courtesy D.S. Rice.)

Fig. 6—Brass Bowl. Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo. (After R. Harari, in *A Survey of Persian Art*.)

Fig. 7—Brass Bowl. Cairo Museum of Islamic Art. (After R. Harari, in *A Survey of Persian Art*.)

Fig. 8—Brass Cup. (After D. Barrett, *Islamic Metalwork in the British Museum*.)
Fig. 9—The Vaso Vescovale. British Museum. (Photograph courtesy D. S. Rice.)

Fig. 10—Hemispherical Bowl. Detail of Exterior. Kabul Museum.

Fig. 11—Silver-Gilt Reliquary (Courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution.)
**Fig. 12—Partially Gilt Silver Cup. Archaeological Museum, Teheran.** (Photograph courtesy Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.)

**Fig. 13—Large Brass Bowl. Kevorkian Foundation, New York.** (Photograph courtesy A. F. Mackenzie.)
Fig. 14—Hemispherical Brass Bowl, Interior. Kabul Museum.

Fig. 15—Brass Bowl, Exterior. Author's Collection.
Figs. 16 and 17—Interior of Bowl Illustrated in Figure 15. Author’s Collection.
Fig. 18—Detail of "Bobrinsky Bucket." (After Vesselofski.)

Fig. 19—Pottery Fragment from Afrasiyab. Museum of Oriental Culture, Moscow.

Fig. 20—Pottery Bowl from Nishapur. Musée du Louvre. (Gift of M. J. O. Matossian.)

Fig. 21—Brass Tray. Collection of Stuart C. Welch, Jr., Cambridge, Mass.

Fig. 22—Brass Bowl. Archaeological Museum, Teheran. (Photograph courtesy M. Rostamy.)
Fig. 23—Pottery Bowl with Barakah in Ornithomorphic Script. Heeramanek Galleries, New York.

Fig. 24—Pottery Bowl. Author's Collection.

Fig. 25—Achaemenid Seal. Pierpont Morgan Library. (After Porada.)

Fig. 26—Luster Glass Bowl. Possession of Wilhelm Henrich, Frankfort on Main.

Fig. 27—Pottery Bowl. Possession of E. Safani, New York.

Figs. 23, 24, 26, and 27—Bowls from Nishapur.
Fig. 31—Brass Tray. (Photograph courtesy Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore.)

Fig. 32—Brass Tray from Ghaznah, Kabul Museum.
Fig. 33 and 34—Details of Tray Illustrated in Figure 31. (Photographs courtesy Walters Art Gallery.)

Fig. 35—Pottery Jug with Dark Blue Glaze. Possession of Khalil Rabenou, New York.

Fig. 36—Bronze Ewer, Herat Museum. (Photograph courtesy Abdulghafour Rawan Farhadi.)
Fig. 37—Chinoiserie Drawing. Midfifteenth Century. Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi, Istanbul.

Fig. 38—Bronze Polycandelon with Copper and Silver Inlay. Iran, Second Half of Twelfth Century. (Courtesy Walters Art Gallery.)
Fig. 39—Courtesy Walters Art Gallery.

Fig. 40—Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution.

round shape in a hemisphere suggested the sun in the sky and from this first premise everything developed in the traditional symbolic manner. One may only ask whether this disk was in this form applied deliberately or not. We pose this question because when one compares the Wade Cup with the (undecorated) interior of the Metropolitan Museum stem cup No. 91. r. 542, which belongs to the same group, and even with the much earlier Chinese vessels of a closely related shape, one becomes aware that they show a perfectly rounded bowl without break, although they, too, were cast as one unit (cf. text figs. F and G and fig. 2). By comparison the handling of the problem in the Wade Cup looks technically inept, as the beautiful curve of the bowl’s interior is awkwardly broken by the recessed area in its center. While this criticism is justified when applied to a bowl it would not be so in the case of another hemispherical form, namely, a dome above a building (or tent). All over Asia, as also in the classical world and then again in Christianity, a cosmic symbolism is associated with this roof form which depicts the canopy of the sky with a real opening in the center, or in which a round painting in the apex reproduces a vista into the beyond, or which has a lantern with a visionary scene above the round hole. This is the “Sun Door,” or “Gate of Heaven.” If it is not a hole, it provides, as just stated, a vista or symbol of the Supreme Being in heaven, which can be a celestial dragon; Jupiter, or Helios; or Christ as the Pantocrator, and so on (text fig. S). Should such an architectural setting have given the inspiration for the Wade Cup, we would, by analogy, be confronted with a recessed sun symbol comparable to that in the center of a dome. This idea is perhaps not as farfetched as it sounds when one remembers that celestial bodies have been represented on domes and throne canopies in Achaemenid, Parthian, Sasanian, and even in Muslim times down to fairly recent centuries. Furthermore, certain domes of the Muslim period show a set-off circular area in their apex, although these particular monuments, being mosque structures, would not have obvious cosmological decorations. Finally, the idea of having a reflection of a dome decoration in another medium is not

---

23 Lehmann, op. cit., pp. 2–27; Cammann, Cloud cellar, pp. 2–4. Text figure S is made after Lehmann, loc. cit., fig. 27, and represents the central part of the decorative scheme on the stuccoed dome of Nero’s Golden House, showing the central painting with Jupiter on the clouds and along the periphery the edge of the 8-cornered canopy of the sky. For the theme in Asia, see also A. C. Soper, The “Dome of Heaven” in Asia, The Art Bulletin, vol. 29 (1947), pp. 225–248.


65 This has been very aptly shown by Schuyler Cammann (op. cit., p. 2).
in itself surprising, as it has been recognized, for instance, that certain designs on Roman floor mosaics are reflections of those on domes; and there is a well-known later Islamic example, the Ardebil carpets of 946 H./1539–40, which mirror a dome with colored faience decoration and lamps. In the same way designs on other mediaeval Iranian objects can be best explained as having been inspired by and possibly even copied from such designs on domes. Finally representations of domes and awnings in the Muslim world also seem to support our hypothesis. Still, as we have stated above, we only wish to pose the problem here, this not being the place to follow up intricate clues so as to be able to decide this question. Only a systematic exploration of the place of symbolism in Islamic art, and especially that connected with cosmic forces and their possible relationship to dome decoration, can clarify this aspect.

This survey shows that the figures of the zodiac on the outside of the Wade Cup are not an isolated astrological element. The artist was also concerned with the sun, although its symbol is not of classical but of prehistoric origin. This cosmic aspect of the Wade Cup brings it closer to the Vaso Vescovali, whose strong astrological context seemed to have set it so far apart from the other stem cups.

There is a second conclusion to be drawn. Islamic art, when it is not strictly illustrative, is generally assumed to be merely decorative, so that it is commonly thought to be enough to list the constituent elements and to describe their organization. Pieces like the Wade Cup and the above-quoted examples, which show that the solar nature of the bird and fish motif was still understood and appropriately used, give us pause and make us suspect that other pieces, too, probably contain more than appears on the surface. This does not mean, of course, that all decorative schemes in Muslim art had a meaning. Far from it. Even those decorations which have apparently a significant content were probably not everywhere understood as such; possibly even the artists who made these objects may not have been fully aware of symbolical implications. In many cases they may have regarded these ornaments as traditional patterns which were the proper and efficacious ones for certain pieces or functions; or again certain decorative elements were brought into play by others in the scheme by way of some mental association (such as in the combination of sphinxes and birds). There are many levels of awareness and knowledge, as a society in which Șūism was widespread understood only too well. Actually, even when the symbolical picture was true and clear, thus making a proper understanding possible, the grasp of its meaning could soon be lost. This is demonstrated by the deterioration of the symbols which turn into mere decorations with only vague hints of the original content.

It is therefore to the development of the designs on other stem cups that we are now turning. On the Vaso Vescovali a 6-pointed central star replaces the animal wheel, which means that the motif has lost its circular motion, just as its surrounding circle of fishes has been...
deprived of its movement by having two fishes confront each other three times (text fig. T). This deviation is in tune with its more advanced decoration; it is, for instance, the only object of the series which does not have the usual inscription band around the outside edge. On the other hand the fishes are entirely lacking a-

![Fig. T—Vescovali Cup.](image)

![Fig. U—Florence Cup.](image)

![Fig. V—Fano Cup.](image)

**Figs. T-V—Designs in the Centers of Three Stem Cups** (After drawings by D. S. Rice.)

round the sphinx wheels on the two Mesopotamian brasses of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, as they are on the Walters tray. One can imagine that they were left out because, owing to the substitution of sphinxes for birds, they were only improperly understood by some Khorasanian artists, and even less so in Mosul. A still more advanced transformation of the motif is found on the cup from northwest Persia in the Museo Nazionale in Florence which dates from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century (text fig. U). It has only a central star with neither an animal wheel nor a circle of fishes; this corresponds to the iconographically simplified ornamentation on its outer surface, although it is still good work—decoratively speaking. On the Fano Cup in the Bibliothèque Nationale, which comes from Ayyubid Syria and is thus farthest away from the country of origin of these cups, this particular motif, the star, has taken on minute proportions and is of little significance in the purely decorative medallion scheme (text fig. V). This tallies again with the main ornamentation of the piece, which, as Rice rightly says, “is in a class apart” and is covered with a different iconographic theme on the outside. While in the preceding discussion the emphasis was on the transformations of the combined animal wheel and the bird and fish motif, as we find it on the Wade Cup, and its final dissolution, another aspect of the decorative scheme should not, however, be overlooked. If we consider once more the design of the interior of the Wade Cup, we see that it contains, besides the central wheel motif, a series of 12 radiating elements which form an outer star design around a circle. In the Vaso Vescovali a star design has been substituted for the wheel motif, with the outer radii reduced in size but increased in number (the design is partly obscured through decomposition; in Rice’s reconstruction [see text figure T] the number of these tassel-like rays is 49). In the Florence cup the last vestiges of the bird and fish design have been eliminated and instead the central star design has become richer and more complex; but we still have the radiating strokes and again in large numbers, i.e., there are 50 such radiating elements (text fig. U). Finally, on the last piece of the group, the Fano Cup, there is only a small star in the center and the rays are replaced by a series of
14 scallops (text fig. V). Is this insistence on a central wheel or star design, and especially on the strokes radiating from a circle, a basic iconographic concept to which the artists adhered even when they had given up the bird and fish design? Or is this design rather a “natural” decorative feature for the center of a bowl, possibly due to psychological necessities, and thus very satisfactory to fill a void? A definite answer to these questions can be given only after a much wider survey of this and other material has been made. But it should at least be pointed out that quite similar questions can be raised when we look at the decorations on the outside of the cups. For this our starting point is one of the Teheran bowls, which shows the figures of the zodiac in a single row, each given as a round design (fig. 22). The same single-row arrangements of roundels is found on the Vaso Vescovali (fig. 9). The Metropolitan Museum cup has the figure of the zodiac in two rows with the roundels placed in staggered positions. Staggered rows are also used for the Wade Cup, although here the individual units are no longer round but, owing to the swathing bands which organize the surface, either diamond- or triangular-shaped. However, the curved outlines of at least the lower triangular group make their form not too different in appearance from a roundel. When we now proceed to look over the various other pieces which do not have figures of the zodiac we find that the Brummer Cup shows a sequence of roundels, while on the Fano Cup a series of polylobed medallions alternates with small roundels in the main register. Even the pottery cup, dated 672 H./1274, in the Victoria and Albert Museum, has roundels alternating with a motif of a different sort. While these three pieces show the roundel design in a single row, the second, still unpublished, bowl in the Metropolitan Museum to which we have drawn attention shows a series of undecorated roundels in two staggered rows. Finally, we have a third group consisting of the Baltimore, Naples, and Florence cups; here the roundels are given in three staggered rows with a parallel proliferation of the individual units, which can be of different sizes and at times of slightly varying shape. This suggests clearly that there are certain basic forms to which the artists adhered over a considerable period and even in different countries; on the other hand, content and number could be varied. It seems particularly significant that these shapes are more permanent than the designs within them. However, such a deduction does not imply that these particular shapes and ways of organizing the surface are found exclusively on the cups, but rather that, of various decorative schemes, only particular ones were more or less invariably used in specific places, once they had been adopted for whatever reasons.

V. FIGURAL SCRIPTS

The chapter dealing with the various scripts with anthropomorphic and zoomorphic aspects is possibly the most interesting and significant in Dr. Rice’s book, not only because it brings together to a much larger extent than ever before a great deal of material which is admirably presented in drawings, but because it also finally leads to the author’s dating and indirectly provides another argument for his localization of the Wade Cup. As these various scripts are therefore shown to be important for the historical placing of the object, it seems essential to present additional information which could throw further light on it.

Notwithstanding the fact that the author is justified in stating that the “animated” and “human-headed” scripts do not begin (as far as we are aware at present) before the middle of the twelfth century, that is, with the Bobrinsky bucket of 1163, and are restricted to metalwork, it can now nevertheless be said that the phenomenon of the “figural” script as such (and its zoomorphic aspect in particular) starts at least 150 years earlier, with the first documents so far known being on pieces of pottery of the
late tenth or early eleventh century. Here we find what one might call "ornithomorphic" inscriptions, since figures of birds form integral parts of the Kūfic letters. So far there have become known comparatively few vessels which show this type of script as clearly as it appears on the example here illustrated as figure 23, but there are a good many other specimens, even from the tenth century, on which the lettering seems to be endowed with bird heads (text fig. W and fig. 24), an assumption which is now sup-
ported by the pieces in which the birds are quite obvious. The further history of this particular script has not yet been explored; it continued, however, at least until 1210, as the signature of the Freer pen case is also ornithomorphic Kūfic, with birds' heads on the upended final strokes of the letters yā and sīn. It is hoped that the final report on the Metropolitan Museum's excavations in Nishapur will provide new information about this script.

There is still one other related type of writing, which should be considered in this context. It exists both in Kūfic and naskhī and is found on a silver and copper inlaid brass platter belonging to the Heeramaneck Galleries in New York. Here the letters are fused with the heads of real and fanciful animals, including birds, with the zoomorphic parts fixed to the lower and upper parts of the letters (figs. 28-30). In a few instances we find even human heads (in the case of the naskhī inscription in the interior, they are fixed at right angles to the tops of the hastae). However, these human heads play here only a minor role in comparison with the zoomorphic parts, so that the inscriptions of this piece can hardly be classed with the usual (and relatively later) human-headed variety. The two versions on the Heeramaneck platter stand thus between the ornithomorphic and human-headed varieties. Zoomorphic features are one aspect of what Rice calls the animated script, but they are usually overshadowed by the more spectacular human figures.

As to the animated script on the Wade Cup itself, it should be pointed out that, in spite of its apparently unique character in the realm of Persian art, it shows, nevertheless, certain features which link it with other inscriptions. First, for instance, the initial word, al-‘izz, in its over-all appearance is, if we discount its fanciful elaboration, not too far from the form that we find on the Freer pen case of 1210. In both inscriptions we have an over-long stem for the tā marbūṭah, and finally, the sād in lisāhībīhī is identical in both inscriptions. Even the faulty form dā‘im (instead of dā‘iman70) is peculiar to both, quite apart from the fact that we have in both cases long lists of good wishes which are also found, for instance, on the Bobrinsky Bucket.

The "human-headed" script is important for this discussion insofar as it occurs concurrently with the animated script, and appears, though in a position of minor importance, on the foot of the Wade Cup. It is felt by this writer that in the discussion of this particular script two additional pieces, undated though they are, should be considered. There is, first, the inkwell made by Nāşir ibn As‘ad Naysābūrī, which shows on the top of its cover, around the central decoration, the perhaps most unusual rendition of this type of script.71 In spite of the fact that

70 For the correct spelling see Sarre, Erzeugnisse islamischer Kunst, I. Metall, p. 12 (No. 17); Kühnel, Zwei Mosalbronzen und ihr Meister, p. 6 (fourth inscription).
71 Aga-Oğlu, op. cit., fig. 4.
the published photograph is rather indistinct, it is clear that the human heads are not as stereotyped as they are on other specimens, but represent both profile and three-quarter views, with a special type of coiffure for each position. Such heads appear not only in the usual manner on top of the hastae, but in the case of the alif-lâm combination of the article a single head shown in three-quarter view terminates both letters. The heads appear also as a terminal ending of the low letters and even as an integral part of them, as for instance the rounded part of the 'ayn in wal-sa'âdah. In addition, the craftsman placed a series of three heads on a line above the letter sîn. Although the human elements in the script are of major importance, there seem to be also a few animal heads incorporated in it. Altogether the writing on this object is, in its way, as unique and original as that on the Wade Cup, but here the east Iranian origin can hardly be doubted. The other undated example is to be found in the top register of an inlaid Persian brass vase in the British Museum, which is close to certain of the polygonal ewers, of which the only dated one is from the year 1182 and made by Maḥmûd b. Muḥammad Haravî. This particular inscription—"human-headed" and "inhabited"—is of significance for our discussion inasmuch as here the letter sîn does not consist of the mere heads of birds, as on the Wade Cup and in a more degenerated form on the cup of Khalaf ibn (sic) Jûlakî in Naples and on a tray in Cleveland, but represents three whole birds. In this example the tâ mîrûtâh, with its round part biting its straight stem, and the oblique open forms of the mim, are, however, close to the same letters on the Wade Cup. Finally, in this inscription the dragons on the top of some hastae still threaten birds, as they do on the Bobrinsky Bucket of 1163 and as is proper for this kind of iconography. Here we have, obviously, an inscription close to the Wade Cup and possibly somewhat earlier, although the difference in

22 Barrett, op. cit., pl. 8; Harari, op. cit., pl. 1317, B.

time might be minimal. Both pieces have also this in common, that they are covered with a very dense design which leaves very little undecorated background space, and that they use a "pecking bird" as a space filler. In their horror vacui these two pieces are quite different, for instance, from the Freer pen case of 1210, and more akin to the Bobrinsky Bucket of 1163.

The third variety of writing discussed by Rice is called by him "inhabited naskhî writing." According to his definition, in this script animal figures "are inserted as figures between the letters and take the place of ornamental scrolls. They constitute a background to the lettering and do not form an integral part of the script" (p. 22). They are therefore a somewhat different type of script because in the other examples either human or animal forms were fused with the letters. They are, however, an expression of the same ornamental tendency and, as Dr. Rice has rightly pointed out, the animals of this script are very often combined either with the animated or human-headed script. Since in the background of most of the illustrated examples one can still make out vestigial traces of scrollwork, and it is even sometimes plainly visible (as in Rice's figure 27), it seems, however, too strong an expression to state that the animals take the place of ornamental scrolls. Actually the inscription from Baku (Rice's figure 24) is his only example which fits his definition completely, but this, being a monumental stone inscription in a border region, may well be a special case. This combination of animals with naskhî writing also occurs occasionally on pottery, as for instance, on a dark-blue glazed jar in the possession of Mr. K. Rabenou of New York, in which various birds, a "harpy" and a small deer are placed between the writing (fig. 35). This piece shows that "inhabited" naskhî writing is a type of naskhî in which the scrollwork of the background is inhabited by animals, except that in certain instances the scrollwork appears in a very reduced scale.

At this point one might quite properly ask:
How did this writing come about, especially as it is so unusual and, in a way, contrary to the spirit of Islam? As a tentative answer one could suggest the following: since we know now that its earliest examples occurred in Khorasan in the tenth century, we had best look for further clues in the art of that period and in that region. Here we find within the decorative schemes of Nishapur large human eyes in combination with arabesques or tendrils ending in human hands, in other words, anthropomorphic features applied for whatever reasons to decorative schemes. We also find that certain stucco decorations have intimations of birds' heads, very much in the way in which we found them on one of the hemispherical bronze bowls. Although we have not yet come across other examples of human forms in the arts of Khorasan in the subsequent periods, the application of animal heads to objects or decorative panels is quite common in the eleventh to twelfth centuries. Bird heads appear on the sides of incense burners and lamp fixtures (fig. 38) on the handles of buckets, on the covers of jugs, or we have bottles with caprine or bovine heads, or we find bovine heads on the handles of mortars. It was only natural that in a civil-

75 M. S. Dimand, *Samanid stucco decoration from Nishapur*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 58 (1938), pp. 259-260 and pl. The example described in this article shows two highly stylized bird-wheel patterns (in the outside panels); they are akin to the design in the interior of the metal bowl in this writer's collection (fig. 17), which is therefore more securely fixed in the Šamâniid period.

76 Harari, *op. cit.*, pls. 1277, A; B: 1279–1281; 1291, B; 1296, B; 1299; 1309, B; and 1313, B. The connection of the bird with "light" is well demonstrated by its application to various forms of lamps. I am reproducing here an Iranian polycandelion of the decoration bent on imparting such zoomorphic and even anthropomorphic features to its decorative arts a tendency of this sort should eventually appear on decorative inscriptions of secular nature, primarily applied to private objects. Since from very early times on and still in the Islamic period the bird has auspicious connotations—as the sunbird, simûrgh, or enemy of the chthonic snake or dragon—it was also natural that one of the earliest, if not the first, animal form to be applied to writing should be a bird, and even that it was then applied to the word *barakah*, which in Islamic fashion tries to vouchsafe the same kind of auspicious effect that the bird symbol was thought to have rendered in earlier civilizations.

Seljuq period in the Walters Art Gallery (fig. 38). It shows complete birds and bird heads just as in the types of writing here under discussion. The convention of applying animal parts to vessels is, however, much older than the Seljuq period, although it became quite common then. The Freer Gallery of Art owns, for instance, a "Sasanian type" bronze ewer probably of the early Islamic period (No. 45.13), the handle of which ends in an antelope head at both ends.

77 I read a paper on this subject ("Bird and snake symbolism in Islamic art") at the annual meeting of the College Art Association in Baltimore, on January 27, 1949, which, however, was not published, as I am collecting further data. The topic has now been expertly treated by S. V. R. Cammann in his article in this volume (vol. 2) of Ars Orientalis *Ancient symbols in modern Afghanistan*, where other investigations in this field are also mentioned.

78 There are two interesting variations on this theme: The Metropolitan Museum owns a pottery bowl found during their excavations in Nishapur in which the word *barakah* (minus the final loop of the *fā marbūtah*) is given as a repeat pattern on the rim while a bird in the same style (see particularly its wings shaped like the hastae of the writing above it) is placed in the center, as if it, too, were a form of *barakah* or at least its equivalent (Charles K. Wilkinson, *Fashion and technique in Persian pottery*, Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, n. s., vol. 6 [1947-48], fig. on p. 101). The second variation is to be found on a bowl in the same general style (Freer Gallery of Art, No. 56.1), in which the word *barakah* is inscribed in Kufic in two confronted birds (Ettinghausen, *Interaction and integration in Islamic art*, pl. 16, a).
VI. THE OVER-ALL THEME OF THE WADE CUP'S DECORATION

After this survey of the various motifs applied to the Wade Cup, a more general question should be raised, namely, what should be regarded as their programme or purpose. An examination of the categories of the decorations reveals the fact that they fall into a few groups, which are listed below, together with their probable implications or connotations:

A: THE ISLAMIC ASPECT

(1) In three different places, various expressions of blessing and good wishes for the owner of the vessel are given in Arabic—the language of the Koran and the prayers, of the educated and the central government. There are no other more specifically Islamic elements present, especially none with religious overtones, with the exception of the Burâq aspect of the sphinxes.

B: DECORATIVE FEATURES OF MAGIC ORIGIN

(1) Signs of the zodiac. They have, for all their decorative purpose, still strong magic and apotropaic implications.

(2) Knot forms. These appear six times in interstices of the wide bands on the outside of the vessel and as part of the finials of the 12 radiating elements of the interior. A knot is also formed by the interlaced wings of the four sphinxes. These knots are again a feature which is both decorative and magic and as such they occur in other work from Khorasan of that and preceding periods. Their magic character is, however, clearly established since they occur on magic bowls. The heart-shaped version has also a close connection with the signs of the zodiac in whose proximity it here occurs. It is found in the figures of Sagittarius and Cancer, where it represents a mythological aspect symbolizing a dragon.

(3) The wheel motif with winged sphinxes surrounded by a series of fishes, birds, and other animals and framed by 12 rays. The revolving motif and the combination of a winged animal, usually a bird, with fishes, and finally a wheel or star motif are again age-old. They had originally a magic purpose and are clearly of solar character. These motifs kept their basic meaning through the ages down to the Muslim

---

Fig. X—Knot Design in Center of Large Plate from Nishapur. Tenth or Early Eleventh Century. Freer Gallery of Art (No. 53-70.)

---

79 E.g., on the pen box of 1210 (Herzfeld, op. cit., fig. 1, side view of the pen box between signature and date, and fig. 5), also on the Tiflis ewer of 1182. A big knot in dark-brown slip appears as the single decorative unit on a large round pottery plate from Nishapur, from the tenth or early eleventh century, in the Freer Gallery of Art (No. 53-70, text fig. X). The diameter of this plate is 12 3/4 inches (324 mm.) and that of the central knot 5 7/4 inches (146 mm.).

80 G. Wiet, Objets en cuivre (Catalogue général du Musée arabe du Caire), Le Caire, 1932, pl. 63, No. 3897. Perry Blythe Cott, Siculo-Arabic ivories, Princeton, 1939, pl. 79, c.

81 Hartner, op. cit., p. 138. Here we have one more example of how the choice of certain "decorative" motifs is obviously influenced by the presence of others (see above for bird [or birds] and fishes, sphinx and bird, and sphinx and rosette).
period, even if they may have been only subconsciously understood by some and regarded as a magically efficacious pattern.

(4) Birds as space fillers in the lower and minor interstices of the swathing bands. Although now mainly a decorative element, they too have a submerged symbolical meaning and are of auspicious nature.

C. THE PLEASANT ASPECTS OF LIFE

(1) Merrymaking, such as drinking, playing the harp, tambourine, and flute, and various forms of dancing; one of the latter suggests a sword dance, but there are also other forms of the use of arms, some apparently for shooting birds, or for fighting, as entertainment or in earnest. All these elements are found in mixed fashion in the anthropomorphic parts of the animated inscription.

(2) The animals on the bands, i.e., antelopes and birds, and dogs and cheetahs to chase them. They form, foremost, a decorative pattern but by being connected with the hunt evoke a most pleasant aspect of life, the excitement of tracking down the game and chasing it with dog and cheetah.

(3) Fantastic animals like sphinxes and harpies on the swathing bands and harpies and other fabulous animals as part of the animated inscription. The mediaeval onlooker probably did not regard them as imaginary but rather as strange and fascinating, indicating man's quest of foreign countries in the service of commerce and of his acquisition of unusual knowledge while mastering all the problems of the voyage.82 Khorasan, being the main thoroughfare between the Muslim heartland and central Asia, India and the Far East, was a natural place for the lore of such fabulous animals.

The common denominator of these various themes is the hope for and the auspicious evocation of a pleasant, successful and long-lasting life without sickness and misfortune. This is basically expressed in the words and pictorial aspect of the long inscription on the outside, which is given in the language of the official religion. To assure this desired aim the artist did not, however, make further appeals to Allah, but to cosmic forces whose powers are invoked with the age-old symbols of the pagan substrata. There is no better way to translate this appeal from pictorial to verbal language than to have it voiced by an inscription on an object of the same general period. This is done by a verse within a short poem on a metal basin of about 1400 in Berlin:

لا زالت الأقدار و الملاك لا تدفع الاوراد منك في الجيران
"May destiny and the spheres in the(ir) course(s) affecting you never lead to misfortunes" (Literally: "not cease not to overtake misfortunes," or perhaps, "never bypass any remarkable fortunate happening (?)."


Since this particular passage (the fourth line of the poem) proved to be very difficult, the writer is greatly indebted to Professor Franz Rosenthal of Yale University for help kindly given by him. His translation, based on Mittwoch's reading, is quoted above. He adds that there is a possibility that the word awādīd may be intended in its positive meaning (extraordinary events), and a reading in this sense is given above as a secondary translation. His general comment is that in view of these textual difficulties the last word may not yet have been said concerning the verse, but that whatever the exact translation may be, the meaning must be as indicated. The other four verses of the poem and final sentence were translated by Mittwoch as follows:

While a visual invocation of the spheres appears also in the iconography of other pieces, it is then, as in the poem quoted below, intermixed with other topics, usually those of the various aspects of kingship. These features are lacking in the Wade Cup, which, together with its anonymous character, indicates that it is a nonroyal piece. That an object showing such a wealth of ideas and such fine workmanship fitted the taste and pocket of the Iranian middle class is shown by the even more sumptuous Bobrinsky Bucket in the Hermitage, which was made in Herat for a merchant. 84

It has often been stated that the special quality of oriental literature lies not in its originality but in the skillful manner in which well-known parts are put together and in how, through an unexpected turn or combination, new vistas of thought and imagination are opened up. This applies just as well to the fine arts, and the Wade Cup is an excellent example, with its great wealth of traditional detail composed in an unusual manner. For example,

1. Rahm und Glück mögen dauern und langes Leben
   Dir, o Herr, erhaben an Macht.
2. Wohlergehen und ewig sich erneuerndes Glück,
   um deiner Hoheit willen, der du reich bist an
   Verdiensten und Wohltaten.
3. Du bist derjenige, dessen Befehle die Könige
   gehorchen, bei dessen Herannahen sich frohe
   Botschaft geben die Menschen und Genien.
4. 
5. Und wenn Du befehlst, gehorchen Deinem Befehle
   alle Existierenden im Geheimen und im Offenbaren.
   Und Sieg über die Feinde, Hoheit und reiche
   Wohltaten dem Besitzer.

Mittwoch mentions that the text occurs (with wrong readings) also in M. Lanci, *Trattato delle simboliche rappresentanze arabiche*, Paris, 1845-46, vol. 2, p. 146 (as this work is not available to me, I cannot state to which object Lanci’s inscription is applied; finally, the first three lines are also to be found on a Persian bowl formerly in the Sarre Collection (Sarre, *op. cit.*, p. 34, No. 72, p. 78) which indicates that this is the usual poem reflecting a common attitude.


Dr. Rice has pointed out that the outdoor and indoor activities depicted on the Bobrinsky Bucket of 1163 are juxtaposed with inscriptions which incorporate the same aspects in their imagery (p. 25). In the animated inscription of the Wade Cup everything is now happily combined, and in the master’s tour de force, outdoor and indoor activities and Arabic writing have become one integrated ensemble.

In weighing all enumerated factors, one can conclude as follows: The artist managed in a skillful, spirited manner to combine and, in various places, even to interweave three themes of a Muslim’s attitude to the world around him. In doing so he represented various aspects of Muslim civilization, whose religion also combines lofty ideas with primitive animistic and magic beliefs.

VII. PROVENANCE AND DATE OF THE WADE CUP.

It is now time to make the final deduction as to the place of production and date of the Wade Cup. It will be recalled that Rice’s conclusion was northwest Persia (Azerbaijan or near the Caucasus) and the third decade of the thirteenth century. Throughout this discussion it has, however, become evident that a great deal of evidence points to East Iran and most likely to Khorasan as the place of production. Since these clues were rather dispersed throughout the preceding pages, it might be worthwhile to coordinate them now more systematically.

A. BASIC CONSTRUCTION:

(1) Casting.—At least one of the footless bowls has, on technical examination, been shown to be cast (*fig. 15*), but others of this group were probably also made in this way. One of them was made by an artist hailing from Sīstān. These bowls are here regarded as the forerunners of the Wade Cup, which is also cast. 85

85. The technical examination which established that the writer’s bowl (*figs. 15–17*) was made by
THE WADE CUP

(2) Shape.—Two hemispherical footless bowls have been found in Afghanistan. The Peytel Cup of the same general shape but with a foot was made for a šadr of Khorasan, "almost certainly" in Khorasan. Footed bowls are represented on the Bobrinsky Bucket made in Herat in 1163, and this piece, too, has a foot of the same general character.

H. DECORATION:

(3) The bands.—Exact parallels to the swathing bands of the Wade Cup have so far not been found in metalwork, although they are possibly prefigured by the star designs made up of criss-crossing bands on the Kevorkian and Kabul bowls. The closest parallel so far tracked down is on a fragmentary ewer of the general type of the Tiflis ewer which came with the Sarre collection into the Islamische Abteilung of the Berlin Museum. Simpler interlaced bands as found on the Vaso Vescovali form three roundels on the inkwell of Našir b. As'ad Naysâbûrî, and they appear also on the footless bowl in Teheran (fig. 22).

(4) Inscriptions.—Long lists of good wishes occur on the Bobrinsky Bucket and the Freer pen case, made for a vizier in Merv. On the Freer pen case appears the same grammatical mistake (dâ'im) which occurs also on the Wade Cup. Inscriptions below the rim occur already on some of the earlier globular bowls without stem.

The earliest known type of zoomorphic writing occurs on pottery pieces found in Nishapur.

The earliest animated inscription is found on a bucket made in Herat. The most original form of the human-headed naskhi occurs on the inkwell of Našir b. As'ad Naysâbûrî, and, finally, the inhabited writing is likewise found on the Herat bucket. In view of Khorasan's great, if not unique, inventiveness in the field of Muslim figural epigraphy, it seems very likely that the most original and highly developed animated inscription so far known should have been made in the same area, especially since certain basic forms of its underlying lettering are found on a piece from Khorasan, the Freer pen case, and zoomorphic and even anthropomorphic tendencies are endemic in the art of Khorasan.

The human-headed naskhi found on the foot of the Wade Cup has parallels in similar inscriptions on the shoulder of an ewer generally attributed to Khorasan, on the lower parts of two others, and on the foot of a fourth.

(5) Figures of the zodiac.—They occur on one of the early large hemispherical bowls in the Kabul Museum, obviously of East Iranian origin. These zodiacal figures appear also on a fragmentary ewer in the Metropolitan Museum, which belongs to the same type as the one in Tiflis and whose Khorasanian origin is indicated by the flower vase that seems to be one of the hallmarks of metalwork of that region.

(6) Knots.—They occur on the ewer in Tiflis and on the Freer pen case. They are already a feature of Nishapur pottery.

(7) Birds.—They are a favorite motif in the decorative arts and writing of Khorasan.

(8) Tassel-like frames, pointing up on top of a human-headed inscription and down below it, are found on an ewer of the Tiflis type.

(9) Rotating motif and fish.—This decoration had occurred already on Nishapur pottery and

88 Harari, op. cit., pls. 1325 and 1328.
89 Ibid., pl. 1314.
90 Ibid., pl. 1322.
on a hemispherical bowl of an East Iranian type.

(10) Sphinxes.—A wheel of four sphínxes with their wing tips interlocked occurs on a rectangular tray which for stylistic reasons should be assigned to Khorasan. A combination of three as a circular motif appears on the top of an inkwell made by Nāṣir b. Asʿad Naysābūrī, two in a revolving pattern occur on a tray of a form characteristic of eastern Iran and the single animal is found on the bottom of the fragmentary bottle by ʿAbd al-Razzāq Naysābūrī in the Berlin Museum.

While any single one of these clues probably would not in itself prove an origin in Khorasan, all together (and they comprise about every single aspect of the Wade Cup) they indicate that origin. Expressed in other words, it does not matter that some of the listed motifs occur also elsewhere and are, as for instance the knots, ubiquitous in the Muslim world. What counts is that these shapes and designs in their totality conform with the artistic language of eastern Iran and of Khorasan in particular, as we understand it at this time, and that there is no feature of the Wade Cup that seems foreign to that idiom. On the other hand, no similar large group of northwest Persian parallels dating from prior to the Mongol onslaught are known which would suggest an attribution to that region.

More difficult is the question of the date. In considering it several factors which were brought out on earlier pages should be recalled:

(1) The date of the oldest preserved piece of dated Kashan pottery of a related but not identical shape is not a terminus post quem. The Wade Cup can be older than 1203.

(2) Footed bowls appear already on the Bobrinsky Bucket of 1163, which has also a foot of the same general shape.

(3) The animated inscription of the Blacas Ewer of 1232 is so much advanced and in a way degenerated as an inscription that it seems most unlikely that there should be a difference of only from 3 to 12 years between it and the Wade Cup, as assumed by Rice. The difference between the two seems to me longer.

(4) It is generally agreed that the Wade Cup is older than the Peytel Cup, which was attributed by Max van Berchem to the early thirteenth century.

(5) If our assumption that the piece was made in Khorasan is correct, it must follow that it would be before the early 1220’s, because in 1221 Merv and Nishapur crumbled before the onslaught of the Mongols and in 1222 Herat was destroyed. However, it is difficult to judge how far back from these dates one should go. The Freer pen case is too different in its style to furnish any definite clues. The same can be said about the ewer in Tiflis of 1182, although it presents at least the same idea of braiding around areas with major figural decorations as the Wade Cup. The one-handled jug made for ‘Uthmān ibn Salmān of Nakhchevān in 1190, in the Louvre, shares only the motif of the lemon-shaped figure with an ovoid undecorated center, a triangular base, and a finial which occurs 12 times in the Wade Cup’s interior. In common with the Bobrinsky Bucket of 1163, the Wade Cup has the animated inscription, which is, however, more advanced in the Cleveland piece. In the lower part of the Hermitage piece there are also confrontations of animals which, in their style, are not unlike those applied to the swathing bands on the Wade Cup, although the latter are again more diversified and spirited. What is even more important is the general appearance of the two pieces. Both have not only a dense over-all ornamental scheme but one in which no units have an accentuated position in the manner in which medallions stand out on the Blacas Ewer, the Munich basin of Badr al-Dīn Luʿl, and other Mesopotamian and Syrian metal pieces. This

decorative principle is much less apparent on the Tiflis ewer of 1182 and not at all on the jug of 1190. Even on the Freer pen case, which is also imbued with a certain *horror vacui*, the different sizes of the various themes and the care with which they are clearly set apart from each other reveal an intent to differentiate and grade. There are, however, too few dated pieces in existence to state just how long this dense style of the Bobrinsky Bucket prevailed.

In spite of the enumerated points of inter-relationship, there are still too few compelling arguments to narrow down safely the terminal limits of the date: sometime after 1163 and before 1221. In view of the connections with thirteenth-century derivatives of the Wade Cup, the date eventually established could be closer to 1221 than to 1163. Our tentative conclusion is, therefore, that the piece was made sometime around 1200. A more specific and yet reliable attribution will have to wait until other dated pieces from the second half of the twelfth or the early thirteenth century have been found.

On the other hand, the relative date of production is less difficult to grasp. The Wade Cup as an art object was possible when there existed certain economic and intellectual conditions. There had to be large urban centers with highly accomplished metalworkers supplying the needs of an educated, well-to-do middle class. Such conditions existed in Khorasan, particularly in Herat and Nishapur. There had to be, in addition, a special concern with the heavenly bodies. This existed on two levels. There was a specific concern for astronomy, proof of which is a number of distinguished astronomers living in Khorasan in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, such as al-Khâzînî, Muḥammad al-Khuṭâbî, and al-Muẓaffar al-Ṭûsî. A general interest in astronomy is also implied by a relatively large number of illuminated manuscripts of Ṣûfî's *Kitâb ẓâwâr ʾl-kawâkib* dating from before the Mongol Conquest. The other form of interest in the heavenly bodies was astrological and magical. There was a great vogue for this approach at this period from the highest to the lowest social levels. This is shown by the various signs of the zodiac applied for magic purposes to the coins, to many fine vessels of clay and metal, and also by the simple magic bowls which specifically state that they are made under propitious astrological conditions and depict them with celestial symbols. Earlier in the twelfth century ʿAdnân al-ʿAynzārî (died 548 H./1153) had written a treatise on the application of "the science of the celestial sphere" (*ʿilm al-falâk*) to medicine and in 595 H./1198-99 a whole poem, Nizâmî's *Haft Peykar*, was composed by a contemporary of the Master of the Wade Cup, which had as its basic theme the conforming of life to astrological principles.

The historical setting explains also the aesthetic aspect of the Cleveland vessel, especially of its decoration. The shape is dependant on the function which is here, as in many other cases, not easy to establish. The evidence of Persian


92. See the illustrated examples in Stanley Lane Poole, *Catalog of Oriental coins in the British Museum*, vol. 3: The coins of the Turkmûn houses of Seljûq, Urtûk, Zengee, etc., London, 1877, Nos. 421 (Mars: ca. 596 H.); 420 (Sagittarius: 599 H.); 536 (Moon: 627 H.); 635 (Moon: 616 H.)

93. A survey of Persian art, vol. 5, pls. 656, 712, 713; vol. 6, pls. 1311, C and D, 1314, 1317, D, 1325, and 1328.


miniatures\textsuperscript{4} seems to indicate, however, that objects of this shape were most probably sweetmeat dishes used in groups especially for receptions.\textsuperscript{2} Such an erstwhile use would explain the large opening of the bowl and the rather low height of the vessel. This interpretation immediately raises a question, because if we assume that the Cleveland dish once served a Khorasanian merchant as a nut bowl, how would we account for the rich, dense, and potent decoration which in its fullness seems rather exaggerated for such a purpose. When considering this argument it is best to leave aside modern aesthetic considerations and to rely alone on the contemporary point of view. It is here again that Niẓāmī’s romances give us a clue. The poet’s supercharged style resembles a very rich and dense embroidery in which one unusual image follows the other. As Hellmut Ritter’s masterly analysis has shown, Niẓāmī, moreover, transforms each and every event by means of an endless series of optically decorative metaphors into actions of profound purpose, imbued with new significance and relationships.\textsuperscript{3} Although this poetry far surpasses the figural arts in richness of detail and variety of associations, the all-over impression of the “style” in both media is similar; and, just as in the poetry, everyday events are transfigured into more meaningful happenings by the use of imaginatively worded metaphors, so are an ordinary bucket for the ḡammām\textsuperscript{4} and a bowl for nuts elevated by the imagery of the highest (i.e., royal) form of physical life and of cosmic power, themes which were chosen for very specific reasons. On the other hand, it should also not be forgotten that in poetry the effect of the various metaphors is too powerful, when considered by themselves and especially in a translation, since in Persian many of these verbal pictures had become clichés; in the same manner many of the individual decorative features applied to the vessel are traditional, even stereotyped, hence were probably not as forceful in conveying their message as the motif in “archaeological isolation” implies. As already stated above (p. 362) it is rather in the way in which the different age-old symbols are individually varied and combined in novel fashion that the originality of the work of art appears. Here the Master of the Wade Dish has made a unique contribution, so much so that the various aspects of his work have influenced many other artisans and this not only in Iran, but even in far-away Syria.

\textsuperscript{1} See, e.g., the scene of “Key Khosrow and the Minstrel” in the Shāh-nāmeh MS. of 833 H./1429–30 in the Golestan Library in Teheran. (For the best reproduction, see now B. Gray and André Godard, Iran, Persian miniatures, Imperial Library, UNESCO World Art Series, Paris, 1956, pl. 6). Although this miniature is more than 200 years later than the dish in Cleveland, it can be taken for granted that the traditional use of the vessel remained the same, even though the shape had changed.

\textsuperscript{2} The term “cup” used in the recent monograph in preference to the “bowl” of the Ann Arbor catalogue of 1943 (Metalwork from Islamic countries, p. 13, No. 43) implies a drinking vessel; but neither the miniatures nor the traditional shapes of Iranian drinking vessels seem to indicate such a function which is also contradicted by the covers of the Vaso Vescovali and of the enameled glass vessel of the Kevorkian Foundation (Ettinghausen, The unicorn, pl. 29).

\textsuperscript{3} Ritter, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{4} Ettinghausen, The Bobrinski “kettle,” p. 203.
ABBASID SILKS OF THE NINTH CENTURY

By ERNST KÜHNEL

In several collections are preserved fragments of an interesting group of textiles hitherto not sufficiently studied. Portions of one or more fabrics with identical design in the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Cooper Union Museum, the Textile Museum in Washington, and other collections belong to this group. The pattern is dominated by alternate rows of irregularly drawn octagons, with concentrical outlines, containing the figure of a cock with raised tail and looking toward the left. These octagons are set in squares or lozenges formed by starlike motifs; a second, outer frame consists of the alternation of larger, eight-pointed stars and deformed hexagons, both with inner ornamental detail.

The ground material is a plain cloth of creamy or light-yellowish silk, of a texture very easily confused with fine linen. The decoration—silk embroidery in plain stitch with metal threads and gilt silver stripes—is executed in such a skillful way that at first glance it appears to be mechanical brocade weave. Actually it is needlework done on the loom in a brocading manner, with single threads running from one motif to the other.

In the Textile Museum fragment (No. 31.6; fig. 1), the color red prevails (in three shades: brick, cherry, and rose), besides blue, dark blue, yellow, and green. Gold threads appear in the birds and in some framing motifs. No difference can be noted between this portion and those in the Cooper Union (1948–24–31) and in the Victoria and Albert Museum (T 1188–1934). Another section, formerly owned by M. Guérin and now in the Musée Cluny, is identical in design, but shows, in addition, part of a border, consisting of a cross motif changing in color, alternating with a trilobed-like ornament and accompanied by threefold checkered lines above and beneath; at a distance below a narrow chain design is still embroidered (fig. 2). It is to be supposed that the piece as a whole was originally bordered in the same way, thus indicating that it might have served as a tunic or similar loose outer garment.

A fragment in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Copenhagen (B 19–1934) offers a slight variation, inasmuch as the cocks are turned toward the right and the surface of the otherwise identical design is filled in with broken lines (fig. 3). Here again the ground is yellowish white with gold threads in the embroidery. Another portion of this same fabric is in the Victoria and Albert Museum (T 1188–1934).

A very incomplete pattern, in the Benaki Museum, Athens, also embroidered in silk on silk ground and evidently belonging to this same group, shows the cocks, slightly different in detail, set in eightpoint stars with pearl outline, surrounded by an inner frame of small stars and lozenges, and an outer frame formed by irregular octagons with single small birds oriented partly to the right and partly to the left (fig. 4). The cocks alone, without any frame or other detail, in horizontal rows in endless repetition, all looking toward the left and entirely corresponding to those mentioned above, on a piece of green silk in polychrome embroidery with gold threads, in the Textile Museum (No. 31.5, fig. 5) could possibly signify a somewhat later evolution of the cock motif.

The design of the cocks recalls, in all instances, the Sasanian tradition. It is undoubtedly derived from a prototype like that in the famous silk from the Sancta Sanctorum (fig. 6),

---

1 Cf. e.g., Adèle Weibel, *Two thousand years of textiles*, New York, 1952, describing the Cooper Union fragment (fig. 65) erroneously as of linen cloth.

only without the halo and in very reduced proportions; even the whole framing system, though simplified and different in detail, admits a comparison with that of the Vatican textile. Probably depending on the same model, but more naturalistic in treatment, are the cocks in oval medallions on purple ground within a star pattern in the well-known Byzantine (?) silk existing in many collections, as well as those arranged in vertical columns in a fragment in the Berlin Museum. Slight variations of the same bird motif, usually in circles with pearled contour, may be noted in Sasanian wool tapestries found in Egypt.

If we look around among the early Islamic fabrics we find an interesting parallel used as a detail on the magnificent compound twill with the name of Abū Manṣūr Bukhtātgin (?) in the Louvre (fig. 7). This case is particularly important because, though perhaps intending to represent a peacock, the weaver obtained a more advanced, rather elegant, evolution of the cock dominating the textiles under discussion, and this helps us to assign them a date prior to that of the Louvre piece, i.e., before ca. A.D. 960. Obviously, the entirely different technical execution forbids any supposition of local or regional connection.

The cock motif was not obligatory for the group of brocading embroideries with which we are dealing. Identical in material condition, in stitch guiding, and in ornamental spirit are some portions of a fabric in the Benaki Museum and, in better preservation, in the Textile Museum in Washington (No. 311, fig. 8). As with the birds, the octagons have disappeared, and lozenges with double, graded outline around an inner modest ornament, form a continued pattern all over the surface, surrounded by an outer frame of irregular hexagons. This design could be explained as a simplification of the system first described, but there is no reason to attribute it to a later period, for both types may have been nearly contemporary. The lozenge pattern itself is known to have been very common in all kinds of textile work; as far as silk fabrics are concerned, its tradition goes back to fragments found in Antinoe and Akhmīm, and it occurs in several definitions of Sasanian and Byzantine products.

More concentration inspired another pattern, also preserved in the Textile Museum (No. 312, fig. 9). In this case the continued decoration consists of a grating formed by vertical and horizontal strong lines, with square enlargements at the intersections and a small four-petaled flower in the spaces between. Still more compact, filling the whole ground in a nearly kaleidoscopic way, is the decoration of other fragments in the Benaki Museum (fig. 10). Here we see an extremely dense grating formed by small squares, lozenges, hexagons, diamonds, and other geometrical figures, mostly with concentrical outlines in different shades and without any real "leitmotiv." Ground material, technical performance, and ornamental principle point unmistakably to the conclusion that it must have come from the same workshops as the other variations.

The last-mentioned specimen gives us the clue for the correct interpretation of a fragment
Fig. 1—Washington, Textile Museum, No. 31.6.

Fig. 2—Paris, Musée Cluny.

Fig. 3—Copenhagen, Kunstindustrimuseum.

Fig. 4—Athens, Benaki Museum.
Fig. 10—Athens, Benaki Museum.

Fig. 11a.

Fig. 11b.

Figs. 11a and b—Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Islamische Abteilung.
Fig. 12—Cleveland Museum of Art.

Fig. 13—Sasanian Capital from Qal'ah-ye Kohneh.

Fig. 14—
a and b, Lund, Kulturen Museum. (After Lamm.)
c, Collection R. Pfister. (After Pfister.)
d, Stockholm, Nationalmuseum. (After Lamm.)
in the Berlin Museum, so poorly preserved that it seems impossible to reconstruct its original pattern, though it is of documentary importance for the whole category we are studying here (figs. 11, a and b). It seems that in this case the differently framed lozenges filling the surface were not spread without interruption as in figure 10, but were ordered in some way by lines running in zigzag. The ground silk changes from red to brown, and the lozenges, employing blue, green, and white, are outlined in black (lost in most spots), no gold having been used. Surprising is the fairly preserved embroidered text, in creamy color with contour in gold thread, covering the design and reading, as far as preserved, in kufi script: .... وکررر يکپر ایگه ایگه .... a repeat of the title "al-Muntaşir bi'llâh."

This laqab corresponds to the Abbasid caliph Muhammad ibn Ja'far al-Muntasir bi'llâh who reigned only from 247 to 248 H. (A.D. 861 to 862) and resided in Sâmarra. His short reign would give us a very exact date for this textile but we have to consider that this son of Caliph al-Mutawakkil was granted the throne name of "al-Muntaşir bi'llâh" (the victorious through God) as early as 235 H. (A.D. 850)." Hence, luxurious garments with his title could have been issued from the caliphal workshops years before his accession to the throne. On the other hand, the fact that in the inscription he is not expressly designed as "amîr al-mu'mînin" (Commander of the Faithful) does not necessarily indicate a date preceding his caliphate, for the throne name alone, without adding the caliphal function, was quite usual among the Abbasid rulers, including al-Muntaşir.8

8 E.g., we have coins struck in Sâmarra in 248 H. bearing merely "al-Muntaşir bi'llâh" without any addition (see H. Nützel, Katalog der orientalischen Münzen, Berlin, 1898, vol. I, p. 225), and in the Pfister Collection is a typical Yemenite textile with the short mention of a son of "al-Muntaşir bi'llâh" (cf. R. Pfister, Matériaux pour servir au classement des textiles égyptiens, Revue des Arts Asiatiqques, vol. 10 [1936], p. 79).

There still may be raised the question of whether we really have to deal here with the caliph referred to. It is true that the last Sâmâniid ruler, Abû Ibrahim Ismâ'il ibn Nûh (A.D. 1000 to 1004), had also the laqab of "al-Muntaşir," but it is unlikely that he could ever have been mentioned in a fabric with the title alone, and, moreover, his reign would be much too late to be connected with the kind of textiles under discussion. Zambaur, in his genealogical tables, introduces the Umayyad caliph of Cordoba, Ḥakam I (A.D. 796 to 822) as "al-Muntaşir ibn Hishâm," but there is no evidence that this emir ever used that title, for which, by the way, Zambaur gives no reference. Thus the statement may be allowed that the epigraphy on the Berlin fragment refers undoubtedly to the Abbasid al-Muntaşir and that we are justified in dating the whole series here treated between A.D. 850 and 862.

As to the localization of these textiles, the fact that they were excavated mostly in Egypt proves merely that they were used there, nothing more. They cannot have been made in that country, because in the ṭīrāz workshops weaving in Egypt for the Abbasid court only linen served as ground material, never silk. There is news that in the beginning of the ninth century A.D. weavers from Tuster in Persia and from Lower Egypt were settled in Baghdad and that Egyptian textile methods were introduced there under al-Mu'tasim (A.D. 833 to 842).9 When the same caliph entered his capital in A.D. 833, his army is said to have been wearing "gold brocades" (الديجاج الذهب).10 In any event, silk woven stuffs were made in Baghdad at least since the ninth century,11 and one of the successors of al-Muntaşir, al-Muhtadī (A.D. 869 to 870), found it necessary to restrict the widely

10 Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 138.
spread luxury in garments, when 10,000 dirham were paid for a single silk robe. He dressed himself over his mail shirt (درع) with a mantle of white silk with a lozenge pattern (قرآن) in hundreds. 

There is no doubt that thousands of precious garments were stored in the caliphal residences to be ready for all kinds of purposes. Mas'ūdī tells that in the palace of Balkuwârâ in Sâmarrâ, in the right wing, were the magazines for the honor robes, and, according to Qâlqashandî, “colored brocades” (کبیح ملون) were deposited in the caliphal wardrobe (خزائیلات). It is not impossible that textiles like those studied here were counted among the “colored brocades,” for there is no reason to believe that the term “ dibâj” referred exclusively to shuttle-woven brocades. We do not know what kind of fabrics were understood by “ tamîm”—precious brocades woven in the time of the caliph Ma’mûn—or by “Yakânaki”—valuable soft garments under Persian influence, both a specialty of Baghdad. By no means does the material condition of the category we are discussing correspond to what the Arab authors classified as “khazz,” for there is no doubt that this term never signified pure silk, but a special type of textile, with warp of silk and weft of wool.

Although we possess no document for the exact place of origin of the Abbasid textiles with brocading embroidery herein described, we have to reckon with the possibility that they represented one of the many achievements of the weaving industry in the caliphal capital itself. As to the Sasanian tradition manifested in some of their decorative details, we are able to establish a still earlier phase offering the same material and technical conditions as those in the main group. Fragments of this earlier type, all found in Fuṣṭâṭ, exist in several museums, i.e., Chuny and Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris, Victoria and Albert Museum (No. T 119–1934), and others. A well-preserved specimen that may be studied here is that formerly belonging to Dr. Emil Delmár and now in the Cleveland Museum of Art (fig. 12).

The ground is of yellowish silk with gilt silver stripes around a silk core. The embroidery, very exactly imitating the mechanical weft, is executed in red, green, blue, light blue, tan, and white. As to the design, the surface is completely covered by a pattern of lozenge compartments in endless repetition. The compartments are filled alternately with geometrically stylized lotus palmettes and an arrangement of four lozenges in one. All the compartments are framed by beads or pearls, and the spaces between them with rows of a rosettelike ornament.

The lozenge system itself may be considered an earlier phase of that shown in figure 8; the pearl-lined outline clearly denotes the Sasanian tradition. The palmette motif is to be understood as a textile geometrization of one of the many Iranian floral definitions to be noted in Sasanian art. Without taking into account some less striking parallels in the silverwork of that period, we may point, in the first place to the decoration of some of the capitals in the famous Tâq-e Bûstân, and especially in that from Qâl’ah-ye kohneh (fig. 13). It contains several variations of palmette forms, of which one or the other, misunderstood and translated into a peculiar textile version, could have served as a model to the Baghdad weaver, and the state-

12 Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 260.
13 Ibid., p. 121.
14 Serjeant, op. cit., p. 74.
15 Serjeant, op. cit., pp. 71 and 81–82, quoting Maqrizi (following v. Kremer) and Maqdisi.
16 Serjeant (passim) and other writers translate “ khazz” erroneously simply as “silk,” for which the correct term commonly used was “harîr.” The mistake results clearly from a quotation from Ibn Abî Zaid’s Risâla, published by R. F. A. Dozy in his Dictionnaire des noms des vêtements chez les arabs, Amsterdam, 1845, p. 6, explaining: "لا يزيد... وهو مادة حروفته صوف.

Thus “khazz” is a mixed texture like “mulham,” only that the latter combines silk with cotton.
ment that they are bound in an oval lozenge grating speaks also in favor of such a connection.

However, this deduction may be objected to for the reason that the weaver was hardly interpreting directly a stone carving, but more probably was using a textile prototype. Indeed, Sasanian wool tapestries rather than silk woven stuffs offer some points of comparison. Though less stiff and more "botanical" in design, far from the nearly "architectural" structure of the motif shown in figure 12, they indicate, to a certain degree, the evolution of the palmette flower in this case (figs. 14, a, b, c). On the other hand, there may be noted late Coptic or early Islamic tapestries representing a very simplified and even more "geometrical" variation than that we are discussing here (fig. 14, d). 18

If we are justified, as seen above, in assigning the previous group to the middle of the ninth century, the Cleveland fragment and its companions may be dated some decades earlier or even about A.D. 800. They signify the beginning of a very peculiar kind of silk decoration by means of an extremely skillful brocading embroidery, entirely unknown in other medieval textiles and probably an exclusive achievement of the Baghdad looms in the ninth century A.D.

18 The drawings in figure 14 are copied from reproductions published by R. Pfister, Coqs sasanides (see n. 5), pl. 27, a (fig. 14, c), and by C. J. Lamm, Some woollen tapestry weavings in Swedish museums, Le Monde Oriental, vol. 30 (1936), pl. 11, a, (figs. 14, a, b) and 11, a, (fig. 14, d).
A DATED HISPANO-ISLAMIC SILK

By DOROTHY G. SHEPHERD

The only woven silk yet to have come to light from all the tremendous output of the workshops of medieval Spain with a historic inscription permitting a relatively precise dating constitutes a fragmentary chasuble (pl. 1) known as that of San Juan de Ortega in the tiny parish church of Quintanaortuña some 11 kilometers north of Burgos on the Santander road. Inwoven into the silk of the chasuble are two bands containing a kufic inscription (pls. 2 and 4, A), repeated normally and in reverse, which reads: "Victory from God to the Amir al-Muslimin 'Ali." There can be no doubt that the person referred to in the inscription is the Almoravid 'Ali b. Yusuf b. Tashfin who ruled over Spain and North Africa between 1107 and 1143. The Almoravids were the first of the Western dynasties who, recognizing the spiritual authority of the Caliphs of Baghdad, refused to take the title amir al-mul'min in for themselves but were content to adopt the lesser title amir al-muslimin. The only other 'Ali to use this title was the famous Merinid Abûl-Hasan 'Ali (1331-1348) who obviously is much too late to be considered in connection with this textile. That this most important silk should have so long escaped the attention of Islamic scholars and textile historians alike is quite without explanation. The circumstances surrounding its original discovery are not known, but it was exhibited in Burgos in 1921 at the time of the seventh centenary of the Cathedral and it was published in the catalogue of that exhibition although without reference to the inscription and there ascribed to eleventh- or twelfth-century Persia. Photographs have been available, evidently at least since the time of the exhibition, in three photographic collections in Spain. It was the examination of these photo archives in 1949 that brought the textile to the attention of the writer, who first mentioned it, in connection with another textile, in March 1951. The chasuble in question, together with a white linen alb decorated with bands of another important and unusual Hispano-Islamic silk, is crammed in a small reliquary casket of relatively late date which is zealously guarded in the household of the parish priest who seems to consider that his personal mission in life is to

1 The only other Hispano-Islamic textiles with historic inscriptions are the well-known tapestry-woven tiraz of Hishâm II (976-1013) in the collection of the Real Academia de la Historia in Madrid and an unpublished embroidered tiraz with the name of 'Abd al-Rahmân III (912-61), which the writer hopes to make the subject of a "Note" in a future volume of this journal. The two silk and gold tapestry-woven banners in the cathedral of Toledo made at Fez in 1312 and 1339 for the Merinid rulers, Abû Sa'id 'Uthmân and Abûl-Hasan 'Ali, respectively, certainly must be regarded as products of the great Hispano-Islamic textile tradition and although made in Fez may well have been woven by Andalusians or by weavers trained in that country.

2 For a discussion of the use of these two titles see Max van Berchem, Titres califien d'Occident, Journal Asiatique, 2e ser., vol. 9 (1907), pp. 245-335.


4 Exposición de arte retrospectivo, 1921. Catálogo general de la exposición de arte retrospectivo, Burgos, 1926, No. 685.

5 A twelfth-century Hispano-Islamic silk, Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art, vol. 38 (March 1951) p. 61. In 1951 there also appeared in Madrid volume III of the Ars Hispaniae series: M. Gómez-Moreno, El arte árabe español hasta los Almohades; Arte Mozárabe, in which one detail of the silk was illustrated (fig. 407, a) and reference made to the inscription (p. 351).
guard the sacred relics from all intruders. Neither cajolery, nor bribery, nor a letter from the bishop of Burgos on the occasion of two visits to Quintanaortuña in 1949 and again in 1954 were effective in moving him to open the reliquary and to permit the silks to be examined. Happily, in addition to the relatively good photographs that exist, three small but vitally important fragments were removed at some time in the past and these the writer had the opportunity to examine. Two of the fragments are in a private collection in Madrid and the third is preserved in a silver monstrance in Quintanaortuña. The following analysis and reconstruction of the silk is based on the examination of these small fragments and the photographs which are reproduced in the accompanying plates. Fortunately one of the fragments was judiciously cut through the band with the historic inscription which thus eliminates any possible doubt of its being actually woven into the main textile field and assuring thereby the date of the silk.

The chasuble, of characteristic medieval bell shape, was evidently cut and pieced from a single length of silk. The diagram (fig. 1), based on an examination of the photographs, shows the probable arrangement of the pieces of which

---

**Fig. 1—Diagram of the Chasuble Opened Flat Showing the Probable Arrangement of the Pieces of Which It Is Formed.**

The reconstruction was made on the basis of the photographs in plates 1 and 3.
it is formed. The seams indicated at a and b are clearly visible in the photograph (pl. 1); that the left one continues down the back at least to point a is confirmed by the photograph (pl. 3). It is only logical to assume that these seams continue through the length of the chasuble as shown in the diagram. That there must be another seam, probably down the center back, is assured by the fact that the direction of the design (indicated by arrows in the diagram) of the right-center panel (III) is in the opposite direction to that of the left-center panel (II). The length of the chasuble given in the Burgos catalogue as 1.69 m. permits us to estimate the width of the two front panels (I and IV) as roughly 1.20 m. and 1.25 m. respectively. From this it is possible to reconstruct the probable form of the silk from which the chasuble was cut (fig. 2). Without selvages for confirmation one can only guess whether the width of the panels represents the approximate loom width of the silk. This seems plausible when it is compared with the few other examples of medieval textiles whose full widths have been preserved. The construction of the chasuble, which appears to have been dictated by the width of the silk, supports this supposition. As for the length of the silk we are in the realm of pure conjecture. That the original piece as it came from the loom was twice the length of that shown in the reconstruction (fig. 2), or that a second piece was woven on the same loom is indicated by the reversal of the design either side of the lower inscription border. The weaver, beginning at the lower end of his warps, proceeded to weave one piece to the center point indicated by the lower inscription band shown in figure 2, then simply by reversing the order of his operations he repeated the design in reverse. That he evidently underestimated his warp length is indicated by the curious way the upper

FIG. 2—A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SILK SHOWING THE PROBABLE ORIGINAL RELATIONSHIP OF THE PIECES WHICH WERE CUT FOR THE CHASUBLE. (Ca. 5 m. X 1.25 m.)
inscription cuts through a row of circles at the top which there was not space to complete.

There are no other Spanish silks assignable to the twelfth century which have been preserved sufficiently intact to give an indication of their original form. Two examples, whose relationship to the Quintanaortuña silk are discussed below (p. 378 et seq.), preserving horizontal inscription bands which cut through the main field of ornament, are the much published lion-strangler silk from Vich (pls. 4, B, and 8, A) and the almost equally famous silk from Burgo de Osma (pls. 4, C, and 7). In neither case is there enough of the silk preserved to permit a reconstruction although the several pieces of the lion-strangler silk strongly suggest an arrangement similar to that of the Quintanaortuña silk. From the thirteenth century, however, we have at least two complete loom pieces to serve as a basis for comparison. There is the magnificent, and as yet unpublished, cover recently discovered in the tomb of Sancho IV (King of León and Castile, d. 1205) in the cathedral of Toledo which is preserved just as it came from the loom with both selvages and the beginning and the ending of the piece. It measures 1.475 m. wide by 2.83 m. long and shows the same composition as that of the reconstructed Quintanaortuña silk—a main decorative field cut through near the top and bottom by horizontal inscription bands. The famous mantle of Don Felipe in the Museo Arqueologico Nacional in Madrid, which measures 1.45 m. wide and 2.03 m. long, exhibits the same composition.

Quantities of other thirteenth-century silk fragments closely related to these two important documents show this same composition which dominates all of the thirteenth-century textile designs. A clear line of development both in design and technique can be traced, connecting many of these later silks with the same school which more than a century earlier produced the Quintanaortuña silk. A comparison of these silks from the standpoint of the all-over composition and dimensions with the silk of Quintanaortuña leaves little doubt that the reconstruction is approximately right.

From the given height of the chasuble it is possible to estimate the diameter of the roundels as approximately 35 centimeters. Within the roundels are pairs of addorsed, rampant lions which look backward at one another from either side of a central tree. Under the feet of each lion stands a small quadruped which it has not been possible to identify from the photographs. The wide frame of the roundel is filled with pairs of sphinxes which stand facing each other either side of a little plant motif. The interspaces are filled with four highly stylized palmettes which grow out from a central star device. In two places, cutting horizontally through the pattern, are narrow bands containing the inscription quoted above. The background of the pattern is a dull ivory and the design dark blue-green and bright orange-red. The inscription is woven in dark blue, almost black, against a gold ground. The heads of the lions and the majority of the stars in the center of the interstices are brocaded in gold. The stars in some of the interstice motifs, and possibly other minor details also, are yellow as in other related silks.

The technique of the Quintanaortuña silk is one to which may most conveniently be applied the term "diaper" taken from the medieval

---

7 In the twelfth-century silks the main field contains large-scale circles enclosing animal motives. By the thirteenth century the circles have been reduced to a geometric laceria but the original composition of circles in rows is never lost sight of.


9 The part of the textile with the star design was not seen, but one of the fragments examined preserves a narrow band of yellow wefts on the reverse just as they occur in line with the stars and other yellow details on the reverse of the lion-strangler and Burgo de Osma silks and others. That the stars differ in color, texture, and design can be seen in the photographs (cf. these motifs in pls. 2 and 3).
The chasuble of San Juan de Ortega. The broad band sewn down the center to form an orphrey has been cut from a thirteenth-century Hispano-Islamic silk.
Chasuble of San Juan, Detail showing the Inwoven Band with the Inscription Containing the Name of 'Ali b. Yusuf.
Detail from the Back of the Chasuble

The seam at the left is the one indicated in figure 1 between a and a'.

Plate 3
A—Chasuble of San Juan de Ortega, Detail with the Name of 'Ali b. Yusuf.
The warps can clearly be seen to continue unbroken from the ground through the band.


C—Fragment with Inscription Band from the Burgo de Osma Silk. Formerly in the H. A. Elsberg Collection; present whereabouts unknown.
A and B—Details, Approximately Five and Twenty-five Times Enlarged, Showing the Transition of the Diasper Weave of the Ground to the Compound Weave of the Band.

From the lion-strangler silk in Cleveland.
The "Bamian" Silk from Burgo de Osma. Boston Museum of Fine Arts.
The Eagle Silk from Quedlinburg.

(After Lessing.)
A—The Eagle Silk from Sigüenza. 
Cleveland Museum of Art.

name for such weaves. It has two sets of silk warps and two sets of silk wefts and an additional brocading weft of membrane gold wound on a silk core (cf. figs. 3 and 4 and pl. 6, A, and B). The tightly Z-twisted ivory warp and the untwisted ivory weft are interwoven to form a tabby ground, the wefts passing regularly over and under the warps which are arranged in groups of 2-2-4-2-4-, etc. The red and green wefts used throughout and a third yellow weft used only as required form the pattern and are tied down by a binding warp of the same ivory color as the ground warps. The binding warp is run in with the groups of four ground warps, separating them into pairs as it comes to the surface to bind down the pattern wefts. Thus there are eight pairs of ground warps between each two binding warps so that the pattern weft which is bound in regular tabby weave by these warps passes under one binding warp and, in a long float, over one binding warp and the sixteen adjacent ground warps and again under one binding warp. The pattern wefts not needed on the face of the fabric are bound down in the same fashion on the reverse. In those areas where no pattern wefts appear on the face, the binding warp is completely concealed beneath the groups of four ground warps. The gold brocading weft is also bound down by the binding warp but in a different manner (cf. fig. 4, and pl. 6, B). Each binding warp ties down two brocading wefts at one time; adjacent warps do not bind down the same pair of brocading wefts but rather alternate warps pass over A B, under a ground weft and over C D, under a ground weft and over E A, etc.; and the intervening warps pass over E A, under a ground weft and over B C, under a ground weft and over D E, etc. This peculiar system of binding results in the "honeycomb" effect illustrated in the diagram. In the area occupied by the inscription band the weaving system changes and the diasper weave is replaced, for the width of the band, by compound tabby weave (cf. pl. 4, A). In this area the ivory weft of the ground is dropped and the red and green pattern wefts are replaced by the gold and the dark blue of the inscription. The binding warp continues to bind down these wefts as before but the ground warp, no longer forming a separate ground fabric, lies concealed beneath the pattern wefts in groups of eight between the bindings warps (cf. pl. 5, A and B). After the inscription band is completed the diasper weave is again resumed.

The Quintanaortúa silk may be shown to be closely related to a whole group of silks which for both stylistic and technical reasons must be considered the product of a single school. Its
importance is therefore greatly enhanced because, rather than standing alone as an isolated document, it carries the whole group with it providing them for the first time with concrete evidence for dating and confirming beyond question their Spanish provenance. Among the earliest known and most famous of this group are the two textiles mentioned above, the "Baghdad" silk from Burgo de Osma (pl. 7)\textsuperscript{11} and the lion-strangler silk from the tomb of St. Bernard Calvo at Vich (pl. 8, A), with which must be mentioned the sphinx stuff from the same tomb (pl. 8, B).\textsuperscript{12} Two other important examples are the great eagle silk from Quedlinburg (pl. 9, A)\textsuperscript{13} and the very similar but almost unknown silk at Vich from San Pedro Cercada (pl. 9, B).\textsuperscript{14} Recent discoveries in Spain have added two more important examples from the reliquary of Sta. Librada in the cathedral of Sigüenza (pl. 10, A and B).\textsuperscript{15}


\textsuperscript{13} von Falke, \textit{op. cit.}, fig. 185.

\textsuperscript{14} Josep Gudiol y Cunill, \textit{Nocións d'arqueologia sagrada Catalana}, Barcelona, 1931, fig. p. 293.

\textsuperscript{15} Shepherd, Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art, vol. 42 (January 1955), pp. 6–10. The writer's notes contain 14 examples which she believes are datable, with the Quintanaortuña silk, to the first half of the twelfth century. Others, for example the Salamanca silk and the Gazellenstoff in Berlin (von Falke, \textit{op. cit.}, figs. 190 and 191), probably belong to the second half of the twelfth century and with others help to make the transition between the early group and another large group which continues the tradition of this school up to the end of the thirteenth century.

The technique of all these silks is identical. The designs in their general composition and character, as well as in innumerable details often repeated with only slight variation from one silk to another, can best be explained in terms of a common school if not, indeed, of a common workshop. The writer has discussed the relationship of certain of these pieces in a series of brief articles\textsuperscript{16} and, at the risk of being redundant to those who may have read them but for the sake of those to whom these articles may not be readily available, it may be worthwhile to summarize the evidence here.

There are two technical features present in all these silks that are so unusual as to provide them with an almost absolute guarantee of common origin. They have never been encountered in the examination of literally hundreds of other medieval silks of Byzantine, Persian, Egyptian, Spanish, Italian, and Chinese origin, as well as many of undetermined origin.\textsuperscript{17} One of these features is the arrangement of the ground warps in groups of 2–2–4, etc. with the binding warp run in with the groups of four. While the diapason weave is common among medieval Persian textiles and exists among presumed Byzantine textiles and becomes the most characteristic weave of the early Italian textiles, this 2–2–4 binding system nowhere occurs. Wherever this system has been found, it has been in conjunction with stylistic features which clearly relate the silk to the Spanish school which produced the Quintanaortuña silk. The second unique techni-

In all it has been possible to bring together some 55 examples of silks belonging to, or closely related to, this school and it is hoped to make the entire group the subject of a future publication.

\textsuperscript{16} Cf. references in notes 11, 13, 14.

\textsuperscript{17} During three extended trips in Europe the writer has made a concentrated effort to gather, as far as possible, physical descriptions and microscopic analyses of every known medieval silk and has examined those in most of the great European treasuries and museums, as well as many in out-of-the-way churches and private collections. The majority of American collections have, of course, also been studied.
A DATED HISPANO-ISLAMIC SILK

A dated Hispano-Islamic silk was noted for its distinctive color combination: design in red and green on an ivory ground with some details, especially the heads of the principal animals, in gold and the limited use of yellow for minor details. Occasionally in the late twelfth- and thirteenth-century pieces the red or the green occur alone in combination with the ivory and gold. This color combination is more than a simple preference for red and green; the colors are obviously from the same dyes which have been processed in the same fashion. The red is the beautiful orange-red of the kermes, a product for which Spain—especially Seville—was famous all during the middle ages. The green is composed of indigo with the addition of some yellow coloring matter which could not be identified, but which may well be saffron, another important resource of Spain and one for which Seville was also noted. The green in all the pieces shows the same tendency to become brittle and to disintegrate, a feature which most likely may be traced to the presence of iron which was evidently used for mordanting. In several examples, notably the Sigüenza silks and that of Quintanaortuña, for which the conditions of preservation were particularly unfavorable for the green, that color has almost totally disappeared from the face of the fabric. In most of the preserved pieces the red has faded to a very dull orange-red and the green has faded very unevenly showing considerable variation from yellow to dark cobalt blue from thread to thread and from fiber to fiber within a single thread. In the tiny fragments of the Quintanaortuña silk which it was possible to examine the colors appear extremely fresh and brilliant and give for the first time an indication of the brilliant yet harmonious and subtle color which all these silks must originally have had.

The relationship of this group of silks from a stylistic point of view is readily apparent. The general composition of rows of large-scale circles cut through, at least in some instances, with horizontal inscription bands has been referred to above. The form of the roundel itself is a very significant feature. It is almost invariably slightly elliptical with the longer diameter in the vertical direction and sometimes with more of a point toward the top than the bottom. Except for the two great eagle silks of Quedlinburg and San Pedro Cercada mentioned above, the diameters of whose roundels measure 50 cm. and 48 cm., respectively; the others, which with the Quintanaortuña silk belong to the first half of the twelfth century, all have diameters varying between approximately 30 and 35 cm. The frames of the roundels in all cases are bordered by narrow pearl bands and, except for the Vich sphinx stuff which has an arabesque motif, are ornamented within by friezes of animals generally arranged in confronted pairs. The obvious similarity of the eagles of the Quedlinburg, San Pedro Cercada, and Sigüenza silks requires no comment. The griffons on the second of the Sigüenza silks and the lions of the Quintanaortuña silk are strikingly similar. The repertoire of animals, both real and fantastic, used by the designers of this school comprises lions, both realistic and winged, griffons, sphinxes, harpies, heraldic eagles, peacocks, parrots, and a variety of little animals often difficult to define, some perhaps antelopes, others possibly rabbits, dogs, or lions. There is an obvious relationship in the design and drawing of these animals and one can often recognize the animal of one silk as the

14 The analysis of the dyes was kindly made by W. J. Young of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for the lion-strangler silk in the Cleveland Museum's collection.

19 This measurement is taken from the scale given in J. Lessing, Die Gewebesammlung des Königlichen Kunstgewerbe-Museums zu Berlin, Berlin, 1900, pl. 41.
composite of elements taken from the others. Only in the lion-strangler and the Burgo de Osma silks do human representations occur. Another obviously related feature in all these silks is the palmette device which, growing from a central star, forms the ornament of the inter-spaces. Varied as this motif is from one silk to another, its underlying form is always recognizable. In addition to the horizontal bands discussed above, inscriptions have been used as ornaments in a few examples. In the Sigüenza and San Pedro Cercada eagle silks kūfīc inscriptions are repeated around the outside of the roundels; in the Burgo de Osma silk the inscription is repeated in two segments around the small circles which overlap the tangent points of the main roundels; and the single word barakah appears in a block below the feet of the Sigüenza eagle. In the San Pedro Cercada and Sigüenza silks also occur curious ornaments which the writer has elsewhere\(^20\) called pseudo-Gothic inscriptions for lack of a better explanation. The relationship of these silks is so evident from even the casual comparison made above that it does not seem necessary to make here a more detailed analysis to prove their common origin.

With the silk of the chasuble of San Juan de Ortega thus firmly established as belonging to the school which also produced the lion-strangler silk, the sphinx stuff and the others, we have confirmation that this school had its center in Spain. The Quintanaortuña silk was certainly made in the kingdom of, and very probably by the order of, the Almoravid ruler whose name it bears.\(^21\) Scholars have long been in general agreement as to the Spanish origin of


\(^{21}\) The lack of evidence for any important weaving industry in North Africa at this time and our knowledge of the cultural dependence of that area on Spain and by contrast the tremendous importance of Spain's weaving industry obviates our having to consider the possibility of the silks having been woven in the African part of the Almoravid domain.

the majority of the known silks of this school and have concurred in general on the dating which has been variously placed between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. In 1934 Mr. Elsberg and Mr. Guest first published the silk from Burgo de Osma\(^22\) which they ascribed to the workshops of Baghdad on the basis of the inscription which states that it was made in that city. They saw in it the prototype for the lion-strangler silk and the sphinx stuff which they considered to be Spanish copies of Mesopotamian silks. Based on a study of the technique of these three pieces and a comparison of the designs with the other obviously related ones, this writer pointed out\(^23\) that it is impossible to separate these silks; and that all must have been produced in the same workshop or school, the center of which must be sought in Spain in spite of the Baghdad inscription. Recently Miss Day\(^24\) has added a further important argument for the Spanish origin of the "Baghdad" silk on the basis of epigraphic evidence, pointing out that the spelling مارا (normally مَا) in that inscription is peculiarly Spanish and is not found in the inscriptions from eastern Islam. That the "Baghdad" silk was made in the same Spanish school as the Quintanaortuña silk now appears to be beyond doubt. We have no recourse then but to see in the Burgo de Osma silk either the overconscientious copying of a design—perhaps of a Baghdad textile—or an ancient forgery. That putting false inscriptions on textiles must have been a common practice in Spain during the eleventh and twelfth centuries is proved by a regulation prohibiting this practice which is contained in the Treatise on Hisba of al-Saqaṭī of Malaga.\(^25\) That this regulation was not very effective can be judged by the fact that at

\(^{22}\) Op. cit.

\(^{23}\) Chronicle of the Cooper Union Museum, vol. 1 (December 1943), p. 365 et. seq.


\(^{25}\) R. B. Serjeant, Material for a history of Islamic textiles up to the Mongol conquest (chap. XVII: Textiles and Tiráz in Spain), Ars Islamica, vol. 15–16 (1951), p. 36.
least as late as just before the last war, I am told, the Spanish workshops of Tarassa and Sabadell produced tweeds with "made in England" woven in the borders to enhance their value on the local market!

It has been established that the Quintana-ortuña silk, as one of a very clearly defined technical-stylistic group, carries the entire group with it, offering proof of its Spanish origin and its twelfth-century date. Does this mean that all the silks were woven at the same time? Probably not. Unfortunately, for our purposes, 'Alî b. Yûsuf had an unusually long reign—some 36 years—a period sufficiently long to allow a considerable evolution in the silks produced in a single school. Although we can assign the Quintanaortuña silk and those of the school most closely related to it to a period roughly within the first half of the twelfth century, we have nothing more concrete to go on. Among all the other silks of the group only two provide us with clues as to date and these admittedly are very slender clues. The "Baghdad" silk comes from the tomb of San Pedro de Osma, Bishop of Burgo de Osma, who died in 1109. Presumably the tomb had not been opened before that unrecorded day in the twelfth century when the silks were removed from it. The Sigüenza silks were found enveloping the relics of Sta. Librada which were brought back from Almeria by Alfonso VII on his return from the capture of that city from the Almoravids in 1147. Since the reliquary when opened also contained fragments of late thirteenth-century textiles and one much earlier one, there is no assurance that these two silks were actually brought to Sigüenza with the relics—and yet the date fits incredibly well with the evidence that the textiles themselves provide. A comparison of the various silks of the group reveals a marked difference in quality in both design and workmanship. Standing out among the chefs-d'oeuvre of the school are the two silks from Vich and the Burgo de Osma silk. Definitely inferior in quality of design and showing some deterioration in workmanship and especially in the quality of the gold thread used are the two Sigüenza silks and that of Quintana-ortuña. May we not then, taking as a hint the dates provided by the Burgo de Osma silk (1109) and the Sigüenza silk (1147) regard the one group as the product of the beginning of the twelfth century and assign the other group to the middle of the century? Around and between these dates can then be ranged the other pieces; after which may be placed such pieces as the Salamanca parrot silk and the silk from Berlin whose designs provide the link with the thirteenth-century patterns to follow.

Having established the Spanish provenance and the historical sequence of this group of silks it remains to determine the center where this most important school flourished during at least two centuries. All the contemporary sources point toward Almeria as the logical center. One cannot but be tempted to see in these silks "the stuffs with patterns of circles"26 which Maqqari and Idrïsî describe as being made in Almeria during the Almoravid period. Although there were many other cities in Spain important for their textile weaving, notably Seville and Malaga, Almeria certainly stands out in the contemporary accounts as by far the largest and most important weaving center in Spain and the evidence is that its textile industry ranked among the most important in Islam. Yâqût tells us, for example, that "in the land of Andalus there is not to be found a people who make more excellent brocade than those of Almeria;"27 and Maqqari comments further that "there was a manufacture of brocade there which no other country could surpass."28 It is therefore almost impossible to believe that this magnificent group of silks, which are among the masterpieces of their age, could have come from other than the textile center par excellence of Andalusia. We do not know just when Almeria's

26 Ibid, pp. 33 and 34.
27 Ibid, p. 34.
28 Ibid, p. 33.
ascendancy in the field of textiles began but Yāqūt, writing in the early thirteenth century, tells us that the “figured washi-stuff and brocade made there were first made in Cordova but then Almeria outstripped it.” We know that Cordova declined as a center of the industrial arts as its political importance declined after the fall of the Umayyad dynasty, and it is possible that it was soon after this that Almeria took precedence. Almeria was conquered by the Almoravids in 1091 and remained in their hands until 1147 when Alfonso VII captured it. It was retaken in 1157 by the Almohades and in 1288 passed under the control of the Nasrid rulers of Granada to remain in Muhammadan hands until 1489. These dates coincide remarkably well with the evidence provided by the textiles themselves, which show a long unbroken development from at least the beginning of the twelfth century until the end of the thirteenth century, when Granada evidently succeeded it as the center of Spanish weaving.

However, we must admit that the attribution of this school to Almeria is only hypothesis and it is to be hoped that, just as the silk of ‘Alī b. Yūsuf has provided the long-hoped-for proof of the date and Spanish provenance of this group, some future discovery will provide the evidence to establish the locale of the school that produced it.

The all-over designs of geometric laceria cut through by horizontal inscription bands of the fourteenth-century Granada silks show clearly their dependence on the Almeria tradition and suggest that the newly established Granada industry may have been founded by Almeria weavers who migrated to the new capital.

Ibid, p. 34.
PRINCE BĀYSONGHOR’S NĪZĀMĪ: A SPECULATION

By B.W. Robinson

I

All lovers of Persian Painting must needs have an affectionate regard for that dissolute young prince Bāysonghor Mīrzā b. Shāh Rokh, however much they may deplore or envy the state of almost continuous inebriation in which his short life was passed. For them, his fame rests secure on the foundation at Herat of his well-known academy of book production, with its brilliant staff of artists and craftsmen selected from every part of the Timurid dominion; for from these apparently heterogeneous elements was welded the school that set a standard of Persian painting and the art of the book for all time. There can be little doubt that this was due to the presiding genius and exquisite taste of Prince Bāysonghor himself, ably backed by his supervisor of staff, the talented calligrapher Ja’far of Tabriz. The contemporary style of Shiraz was bolder and freer, the later style of Behzād was more naturalistic and infused with a more individual genius, and the Safavid style of Shāh Ṭahmāsp was more sumptuous and spacious; but in the work of the Herat painters of the years about 1420–1430 all the virtues and beauties of Persian painting are to be found combined, and each in its perfection.

These works of Bāysonghor’s artists glow like jewels, sometimes, as in the Chester Beatty Golestān, with the cool brilliance of the diamond and pearl, and sometimes with the warmer fires of the sapphire and ruby, as in the Tehran Shāh-nāme. The colors are notable for their richness and purity, and “crisp” is perhaps the best single word to describe their drawing and execution; everything is sharp, precise, and exquisite. In the middle years of the century, after the death of Bāysonghor and before the advent of Behzād, these qualities tended to petrify into an academic rigidity; but in the golden age of the Prince’s guiding patronage the miniatures are fresh, spontaneous, and full of grace and vigor. Sometimes epic and monumental, as in the Battle of Rostam and the Khāqān,1 sometimes romantic and magical, as in Hūmāy in the Fairy Palace,2 and sometimes light and gay, as in the girlish sports of figure II, they explore every mood and atmosphere of which Persian painting is capable. But through all this variety of subject and mood they maintain a constant family likeness in their rich and brilliant colors, their impeccable technique, and their broad and masterly composition. In comparison with works of the previous generation, such as the twin volumes of epics of 13973 or the Gulbenkian Anthology of 1410,4 the figures are reduced in scale, giving the miniatures a more spacious appearance. The artists of Bāysonghor thus formed the style that
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Behzād inherited. The great master’s debt to them is obvious from the illustrations to this article, and it is perhaps not to be wondered at that he was so long credited with the miniatures in the New York *Haft Peykar*.

When Martin published his pioneer work in 1912 he paid a just tribute to the memory of Prince Bāysonghor, but was unable consciously to reproduce any work executed under his patronage. Two years later Schulz had discovered the Vienna Khwājū Kermānī, but by following Fhegel’s misreading of the colophon (“Bāsnagārī” for “Bāysonghorī”) he failed to connect it with the Prince. In 1929 Sakisian published three miniatures from a *Chahār Maqālekh* at Istanbul, copied for Bāysonghor in 834/1426. But it was not until the great Persian exhibition at Burlington House in 1931 that the work of Bāysonghor’s artists was revealed in all its splendor in the Chester Beatty *Golestān* of 829/1426 and the Tehran *Shāh-nāmeh* of 833/1430. Since that time other manuscripts produced for Prince Bāysonghor have come to light, and it may be of interest at this point to give a chronological list of those so far known: 814/1412. *Tabāqät-e Nāserī* (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Petermann 386; Pertsch, *Catalogue*, No. 367): 2 miniatures in bad condition, and dedication to Bāysonghor. Copyist, Aḥmad b. Masʿūd. Bāysonghor was no more than 13 years of age at the time, and no doubt, as Schroeder has observed, this little historical work contributed to his education. 823/1420. *Anthology* (Berlin, Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Islamische Kunstabteilung, J. 4628): 29 miniatures. Copyist, Muḥammad b. Ḥusām Shams al-Dīn Bāysonghorī. The use of the epithet “Bāysonghorī” is sufficient indication that the work was done to the Prince’s order.


---

7 Sakisian, op. cit., figs. 52, 56, 57.
10 E. Schroeder, *Persian miniatures*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1942, p. 66f. (This passage contains an error in the reference to Pertsch.)
12 I am indebted to Mr. Basil Gray of the British Museum for the particulars of this manuscript.
13 See above, note 8.
14 See above, notes 2 and 6.
15 See above, note 9.
Fig. 1—Prince and Attendants, Formerly Goloubew Collection. (After Martin.)
Plate 2

Fig. 2—Khosrow at Shirin's Castle, early Shah Tahmasp Period. Manchester, John Rylands Library.

Fig. 3—The Death of Khosrow. Manchester, John Rylands Library.
Fig. 4—Colophon of the John Rylands "Khosrow o Shirin."
Manchester, John Rylands Library.

Fig. 5—The Hermit with Leyla and Majnun in the Grove. About 1420–30.
Plate 4

Fig. 6—Leylâ and Majnûn Faint at Their Last Meeting. CALCUUTA, KANORIA COLLECTION.

Fig. 7—Leylâ and Majnûn Faint at Their Last Meeting. LONDON, BRITISH MUSEUM.
Fig. 8—Bahram Gur Hunting in Arabia. About 1420-30. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Fig. 9—Bahram Gur’s Master Shot. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Fig. 10—Bahrām Gūr and the Indian Princess in the Black Pavilion. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Fig. 11—The Bathing Nymphs Watched by the Master. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Fig. 12—Bashr at the Well. About 1420-30. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Fig. 13—Bashr at the Well. 814/1411. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.


834/1431. Nizāmī al-Arūdī, *Chahār Maqāleh* (Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, 1454): 3 miniatures (at least), and a dedication to Bāysonghor.\(^{17}\)

835/1432. Joweynī, *Tarīkh-e Jahān Goshāy* (San Francisco, Fleishhacker Collection): No miniatures, but a dedication to Bāysonghor.\(^{18}\)

Undated. Amīr Khosrow, *Qaṣīdās* (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Diez Fol. 74; Pertsch, Catalogue, No. 699a (3)). A fragment with an illuminated dedication to Bāysonghor.

Undated. Two illuminated calligraphic pages from a collection of Arabic proverbs, with a note that it was made at Prince Bāysonghor’s direction (Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, P. 120).

The above list does not include manuscripts (such as the *Anthology* of 835/1432, copied by Ja’far al-Tabrizī\(^{19}\)) which, though executed by members of Prince Bāysonghor’s academy, bear no direct evidence of his ownership.

One is immediately aware of something missing. The list contains the Prince’s copies of the *Shāh-nāmeh*, the *Golestan*, and the *Kalila wa-Dimna*, as well as a number of lesser-known works, but what of the *Khamseh* of Nizāmī? It is surely inconceivable that Bāysonghor omitted to commission a copy of this work, which has always run the *Shāh-nāmeh* a close second in popularity among Persian illustrated manuscripts. It is the purpose of this article to suggest that parts of Prince Bāysonghor’s Nizāmī may indeed survive, though in a fragmentary form, as follows:

*Double-page frontispiece*: (formerly) Goloubew Collection.\(^{20}\)

*Khoshn o Shīrīn*: Manchester, John Rylands Library, Pers. MS. 6. Dated 824/1421. Copyist, Azhar al-Sultānī. 5 miniatures in the Tabriz style of about 1530–40. Written surface, \(7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}\) in.\(^{21}\)

*Leylā o Majnūn*: Calcutta, Kanoria Collection. Two detached miniatures only. Written surface, \(7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\) in.\(^{22}\)

*Haft Peykar*: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 13.228.13 (Cochran 10). 5 miniatures. Copyist, Azhar. Written surface, \(7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\) in.\(^{23}\)

*Eshkandar-Nāmeh*: No trace.

Before proceeding to consider these items in detail it must be observed that the differences in measurements, though small, seem to preclude the possibility of their having originally been parts of a single volume. But separate copies were often made of Nizāmī’s poems, and there is no reason why Bāysonghor should not have commissioned them in this way. It is worth


\(^{17}\) Sakisian, *op. cit.*, p. 431, and see above, note 7.


\(^{19}\) Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, P. 122; Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray, *op. cit.*, No. 51, pl. 42, A.

\(^{20}\) Martin, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pl. 54; Schulz, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pl. 51; G. Marteau and H. Vever, *Miniatures persanes*, Paris, 1913, vol. 1, fig. 64 (shows the left-hand half only).

\(^{21}\) Bibliotheca Lindesiana, *Handlist of Oriental manuscripts* (privately printed), 1898, p. 206; B. W. Robinson, *Some illustrated Persian manuscripts in the John Rylands Library*, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol. 34 (Manchester, 1951), p. 76f. At the time that article was written, I had formed the impression that the colophon had been falsified, an opinion I have since revised after a second and more careful examination of the manuscript.

\(^{22}\) I am indebted to the owner, Mr. Gopi Krishna Kanoria, for photographs of these miniatures, one of which has been reproduced by Stchoukine, *op. cit.*, pl. 57.

\(^{23}\) See below, notes 31–35, 38.
noting that in the two cases where the copyist’s name has been preserved it is the same. Mowlânâ Aẓhar was a noted calligrapher of the period, being either a pupil of Ja’far Bâysonghorî or a fellow pupil with him of ‘Abdallâh, whose master was Mîr ‘Ali of Tabriz, the inventor of the nasta’liq script and copyist of the British Museum Khwâjû Kermâni of 1396 (Add. 18113). Aẓhar was a great traveler, and died in Jerusalem as late as 880/1476. Among his pupils was Sultan ‘Ali Mashhâdi.24 At least two manuscripts from his hand have survived in addition to those already mentioned, both of them dated 833/1430; they are an ‘Aṭṭâr in the Chester Beatty Library (P. 131) and a Kazerûnî at Istanbul (Nur i Osmaniye 3342) copied “at Herat.” His son Muhammad followed his profession, and was working at Herat about 1470 to 1490.25

II

To connect the isolated double frontispiece of the Goloubew Collection (fig. 1) with a hypothetical manuscript or series of manuscripts produced for Bâysonghor may at first seem farfetched and fanciful, but is in fact a tenable hypothesis. Its known history is short but varied, covering three years only, during which it was in the hands of three different owners. When Martin first published it in 1912, it was in his own collection; Demotte, however, was its owner when it was exhibited at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs in the same year; and in 1914 Schulz published it as belonging to M. Goloubew. For some reason it did not pass to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, along with the rest of the Goloubew Collection, and its present whereabouts is unknown. It has therefore not been possible to examine the reverses of the two halves, which may have carried, respectively, an illuminated dedication or ex libris and the beginning of the text to which the miniature belonged.

Although this frontispiece is simpler and less sophisticated than the other Bâysonghorî miniatures under consideration, and has, indeed, a comparatively formal and archaic appearance, there can be little doubt that it dates from the Prince’s lifetime. It has, in fact, so far as one may judge from reproductions, a close stylistic resemblance to the miniatures of the Istanbul Chahâr Maqâleh. But the difference in style between this frontispiece on the one hand, and the Kanoria miniatures and those in the New York Haft Peykar on the other, has a parallel in the British Museum Niżâmî of 1495 (Or. 6810), where the execution of the frontispiece was entrusted to one of the older generation, Mîrak of Khorasan, whose style is similarly formal and archaic in comparison with the works of his more progressive junior colleagues.26 It may even have been customary, when a number of artists were engaged on one manuscript, for the senior man to paint the frontispiece.

As to the prince depicted in the Goloubew frontispiece, it is not impossible that he may be the same Bâysonghor portrayed in the frontispieces of the Topkapu Kalila wa-Dimna and the Tehran Shâh-nâmeh,27 but 8 or 10 years younger. We may also compare the figure of Hümâyî in the first miniature of the Vienna Khwâjû Kermâni (note 2), which was recognized by Mrs. Wellesz as a portrait of Bâysonghor. Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray observed that in the Shâh-nâmeh frontispiece he has a “rather weak puffy face”; his systematic indulgence in drink was no doubt beginning to affect his personal appearance by 1430, and it was only three years later that he succumbed to the effects of a fall while intoxicated. But the face of

25 His work includes British Museum Or. 3306, dated 875/1470 “at Herat,” and Chester Beatty Library, P. 163, dated 890/1485.
26 F. R. Martin and Sir Thomas Arnold, The Nizami M.S. (British Museum Or. 6810), Vienna, 1926, pls. 1, 2.
27 Aga-Oglu, op. cit., fig. 10; Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray, op. cit., pl. 44.
the prince in the Goloubew frontispiece, though full, shows as yet no sign of puffiness or ill health, and this may be accounted for either by its earlier date or by the less realistic vein of the painter who executed it. The small mustache is the same in all four miniatures, but Baysonghor was not the only Timurid prince who wore one; that of his cousin Muhammad Juki was very similar if, as seems likely, he is represented as Esfandeyar on fol. 269b of the Royal Asiatic Society Shâh-nâmeh of about 1440.\footnote{Stchoukine, op. cit., pl. 67; B. W. Robinson, Unpublished paintings from a XVth century “Book of Kings,” Apollo Miscellany, 1951, p. 20 and fig. 7.}

We have, then, a detached frontispiece that may be safely dated to the period of Baysonghor's viceroyalty at Herat, that in style and quality could have been produced under his patronage, and that may well represent the Prince himself about 10 years before his death. Its connection with the manuscripts under discussion is admittedly no more than conjectural, but the possibility seems worth noting.

As already indicated, no copy of the Makhzan al-Asrâr has so far come to light that can be connected with Prince Baysonghor. The Berlin copy by Ja'far al-Tabrîzî was made “at Yazd” in 820/1417,\footnote{Diez Fol. 74; Pertsch, Catalogue, No. 699a.} and Ja'far does not appear to have entered the Prince's service until after 1420, for in that year he copied a Khamseh of Nizâmi with miniatures of very mixed quality (some of them extremely crude) which it does not seem possible to connect with Herat.\footnote{London, Victoria and Albert Museum, Persian paintings, 1952, pl. 2; idem, Catalogue of a loan exhibition of Persian miniature paintings, 1951, No. 30.}

The John Rylands Khosrow o Shirîn is something of a mystery. There seems no reason to doubt the authenticity of the colophon or of the text itself, but there can be no question that the miniatures and illuminations—all of the highest quality—belong to the earlier part of Shâh Tahmâsp's reign (figs. 2 and 3). A careful examination of the manuscript fails to reveal any indication that the miniatures have been painted over earlier work, or that any of the original folios have been removed and replaced with later ones. The curious wording of the colophon (fig. 4) may perhaps suggest a solution: The writing of the Book of Khosrow and Shirîn, which is the clear sign and lucid speech of the worthy Khamseh of the Guide of the People of Certainty, Shaykh Nizâmi, reached its limit at a period of disordered days and confused events detrimental to the work of scribes, which occasioned the delay of its completion, on the 24th of Rabî' II, 825 (28th April, 1421), by the slave who needs God's mercy, the poor Azhâr al-Sulûm.

It seems possible that the "disordered days and confused events" may not have immediately ceased with the completion of Azhâr's work, and that his text was laid aside and remained undecorated until it was brought to light over a century later, and the miniatures and illuminations were then added (to judge from their quality) under royal patronage. The binding, of gilt and embossed leather, is of characteristic Safavid type.

Mr. Kanoria's two miniatures from the Leylâ o Majnûn (figs. 5 and 6) represent respectively the interview arranged between the lovers in a grove by an old hermit, and the final meeting at which both fainted from excess of emotion. Mr. Kanoria later heard of a third miniature from the same set being offered for sale in India, but his efforts to trace it have so far been disappointed. These two miniatures speak for themselves, even in monochrome reproduction, and there is little that need be said of them. That they are in the best style of Prince Baysonghor's academy is too obvious to require stressing, and their date may be nearer 1420 than 1430. The fainting scene virtually reproduces, on an expanded scale, the corresponding miniature in the British Museum Miscellany of 1410–11 (fig. 7); indeed, as Sakisian observed, the miniatures in the Miscellany served as models for a number of later works. We shall see that the same rich repertory contains the prototype of
one of the paintings in the New York Haft Peykar.

This latter manuscript has long been known. In 1912, when it was first described and its miniatures reproduced by Martin, it was in the possession of Messrs. Bernard Quaritch of Grafton Street, London, the publishers of Martin’s magnum opus. In the same year it was purchased by Alexander Smith Cochran, and so passed in 1913 to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, as part of his munificent gift of fine Persian manuscripts. Messrs. Quaritch have no record of its previous history.31

The miniatures are as follows:

Fol. 1oa (fig. 8): Bahram transfixing a lion and a wild ass with a single arrow.32 This incident occurred in Yaman, where Bahram was living before he became king, and his Arab companions are depicted with the ends of their turbans looped around their chins. This seems to have been the normal fashion of the Arabs, and they are so represented in many Persian miniatures of the Battle of the Clans in Leyla o Majnun and other scenes from the same poem (compare figs. 5 and 6). It will also be noticed that the Prophet Muhammad, being an Arab, is usually portrayed in the same manner.

Fol. 17b (fig. 9): Bahram’s master shot before the slave girl Fetneh. This is the best-known miniature in the manuscript, and has been reproduced several times.33

Fol. 23b (fig. 10): Bahram and the Indian Princess in the Black Pavilion. The prototype of this composition is to be found in the British Museum Miscellany of 1410–11,34 of which Sakisian calls the New York version “une copie servile au point d’engendrer une confusion”—a rather harsh verdict, for though the composition is followed fairly closely, the miniature is of very high quality, and the treatment of the dome and pavilion, with the designs picked out in gray and white, is original and effective.35 Another version of the same composition is to be found in a Berlin copy of Nizami’s Khamseh of about the middle of the fifteenth century.36

Fol. 33b (fig. 12): Bashr testing the depth of the well in which Malikha drowned (from the story of the Princess in the Green Pavilion). This is an uncommon subject for illustration in manuscripts of Nizami, but there is a version in the British Museum Khamseh of 140537 and a third one is here reproduced for comparison (fig. 13). It comes from an Anthology, also in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (13. 228.19), and seems to be one of the few miniatures in that volume to have escaped the attentions of an assiduous Turkish “restorer.” The original date of the manuscript, 814/1411, is given in a colophon on fol. 127b, together with the copyist’s name, Mahmod b. Murtad al-Husayni.38

31 For a full description of this manuscript see A. V. Williams Jackson and A. Yohannan, Catalogue of Persian manuscripts (Cochran Collection), New York, 1914, No. 10, p. 71f.
32 Also reproduced by Martin, op. cit., vol. 2, pl. 67; Robinson, op. cit., pl. 7 (in color).
33 Bertuch, Catalogue, No. 719, with 14 miniatures; Schulz, op. cit., vol. 2, pl. 66; Arnold and Grohmann, op. cit., pl. 55. It is dated to the sixteenth century by these authorities.
34 Or. 6810, fol. 175a; Martin and Arnold, op. cit., pl. 20.
35 Four other manuscripts are known from the pen of this celebrated Shiraz scribe, dated between 1405 (British Museum Or. 2833 “at Shiraz”) and 1429 (Istanbul, Milli 480 “at Shiraz”); curiously enough, three of them are also anthologies. Jackson and Yohannan (op. cit., p. 81)alinly dismissed Mahmod’s colophon, which occurs in the main text, preferring two others that occur in the marginal text with the date “123,” which they took to be 1230/1815, but which is more likely intended for 1023/1614. However, the paper, most of the script, and the miniatures (discounting the Turkish “restorations”) all point to the early fifteenth century as the original date of the manuscript. But some of the marginal texts must have
Fol. 47a (fig. 11): The bathing nymphs observed by "the Master" from an upper window (from the story of the Princess in the White Pavilion). This is perhaps the most charming miniature of the set. The same composition, but in reverse, is used for the corresponding miniature in the British Museum Nizāmī of 1495, which Stchoukine is inclined to attribute to Behzād.

This superb manuscript has had the misfortune to be a center of controversy and an object of suspicion for some time, so that latterly it has been thrust into the background, ignored, and forgotten. It has not been exhibited at the Metropolitan Museum of Art for a considerable period; it is not even mentioned in the Survey, and scarcely noticed in Stchoukine's Les Peintures des Manuscrits Timurides. This unfortunate state of affairs is largely due to the presence of microscopic 'signatures' of Behzād in the corners of the miniatures, combined with a colophon dated 988/1580, and the fact that the miniatures are in such fine condition as to appear, to a cautious eye, almost too good to be true.

The colophon need not detain us long. As Jackson and Yohannan observed, it is written

been added later (hence the later colophons) as they contain selections from Ḫāmi (1414–1492) and Shaykh Bahāʾī (1546–1622). The miniatures of this most interesting manuscript are possibly the earliest examples of the independent Shiraz-Timurid style which later flourished under Ibrāhīm Sultān and his successors, as opposed to the normal early Timurid court style practiced there (and elsewhere) between about 1397 and 1411. Another miniature from this Anthology is reproduced by B. Pavy, The heroines of ancient Persia, Cambridge, 1930, opposite p. 46.

30 Also reproduced by M. S. Dimand, Dated specimens of Mohammedan art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Metropolitan Museum Studies, vol. 1 (New York, 1928–29), fig. 15; Robinson, op. cit., pl. 5 (detail only, in color).

31 Or. 6810, fol. 190a: Stchoukine, op. cit., p. 78 ff. and pl. 84; Martin and Arnold, op. cit., pl. 21.

32 Since this article was written, however, it has been shown in an exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, dated "c. 1430."


in thinner ink than the text though the handwriting is skillfully imitated, and the gold rulings that enclose it are of poorer quality than elsewhere in the manuscript, and are not so accurately drawn. There can be little doubt, then, that this colophon was added when the manuscript was presented (as recorded in an illuminated medallion on fol. 1a) by Munʿīm Khān, Governor of the Punjab, to his master Akbar, and that the date, 988/1580, is that of the presentation. The illuminated border of the medallion referred to, however, appears to be contemporary with the manuscript, and the central space within it, now occupied by the inscription of Munʿīm Khān, may well have formerly contained the ex libris of Prince Bāysonqor. It is worth noting that the name of the copyist Aẓhar, "a poor miserable sinner that craves God's pardon," is included in this later colophon, from which two alternative inferences are possible: either that Aẓhar's handwriting was recognized by a sixteenth-century connoisseur of calligraphy and that the colophon was composed accordingly, or that this Haft Peykar, before its presentation to Akbar, was attached to or associated with another work or works copied by Aẓhar to which he had written a perfectly genuine colophon. The latter seems the more likely of the two, and in that case the companion work would most probably have been the Eshandar-Nāmeh (which normally follows the Haft Peykar), or perhaps one of the other poems of Nizāmī's Khamseh.

"Signatures" of Behzād, however microscopic, are regarded nowadays with a good deal more scepticism than they excited in Martin's time. Martin himself unfortunately allowed their presence to outweigh the correct judgment of his eye. "In quite the early Timurid style" he writes (p. 44) "are the miniatures in a manuscript of Nizāmī's Haft Peykar belonging to Mr. Quaritch. If they were not signed with the authentic signature of Bīhzhād, I could hardly believe that he had so truly reproduced the style of his masters." Knowing what we do now
of Behzād and his work, we should find it difficult to imagine him at any time merely “reproducing the style of his masters.” Schulz also accepted these miniatures as the work of Behzād, stipulating that they must be among his earliest productions, and this opinion was echoed by Sakiyan. Dimand was the first definitely to impugn their authenticity, pointing out perfectly correctly that both style and color scheme suggest not Behzād or Qāsim ‘Alī but the early fifteenth century. “The Behzād signatures,” he concludes, “thus can hardly be authentic.” So far so good; but he proceeds: “A more detailed examination of the colour-schemes, some details of the landscapes, and the ornament of the costume, indicate that the miniatures are not of the fifteenth century but were copied from works of this period at the time of Akbar the Great. Behzād’s name was famous at the time, and it is probable that a Persian artist who copied Timurid paintings added the signatures of Behzād.” This devastating verdict from the custodian of the manuscript himself had the not unnatural effect of discrediting it altogether, and was accepted by the authors of *Persian Miniature Painting* in their authoritative assessment of the whole subject after the Burlington House exhibition of 1931.

But a very careful examination of the manuscript and its miniatures failed to reveal, to the writer’s eye at least, any feature inconsistent with a date between 1420 and 1430, which the published reproductions had already strongly suggested to him, and Dr. Dimand is now of the same view. Our knowledge of the subject has advanced considerably since 1928, when his article was written, particularly in the matter of Bāysonghor’s school, and an enormous quantity of additional material is available for comparison. Many later copies of Timurid paintings do, of course, exist, but it is unlikely that any of them are today capable of deceiving an appreciative and experienced eye.

In her article on the Vienna Khwājū Kermānī, Mrs. Wellesz discussed its relationship with the New York *Haft Peykar*. She pointed out the very close similarities between the miniatures on fol. 32 of the Vienna manuscript and fol. 17 of the *Haft Peykar* (fig. 9), and agreed with Dimand in rejecting the attribution to Behzād, arguing, however, that the greater naturalism of the New York miniature indicated a later date than that of the Vienna one (1427) which, incidentally, she regarded as aesthetically preferable. But it would not be difficult to find equally naturalistic paintings among the works of Bāysonghor’s artists listed earlier in this article, and with views on aesthetics, as with other personal opinions, one may be permitted to disagree.

Otherwise it seems that for the last quarter-century the New York *Haft Peykar* has been left severely alone by all writers on the subject of Persian painting. But the time has surely come to reinstate it among the select body of material that combines excellent condition and superb quality with prime importance from the historical point of view. As we have seen, the colophon need not be taken seriously in the dating of the manuscript itself, and the Behzād “signatures” can now be regarded as thoroughly discredited; we are therefore left to judge and date the manuscript and its miniatures on their own merits. Let them speak for themselves, and there can be only one verdict: Martin’s eye was, in this instance, unerring, and the New York *Haft Peykar* must be accorded its rightful place among the best produced for one of the world’s most exacting and discriminating connoisseurs.

In conclusion let it be repeated, on the general question of Prince Bāysonghor’s Niżāmī, that

---

46 See above, note 2.
what has been put forward here can in the nature of things be no more than a speculation. To recapitulate briefly:

1. Prince Bāysonghor may be reasonably assumed to have had a copy of Ṣamī’s poems made for him.

2. In view of its popularity, the Khamseh would probably be among the first major works he commissioned. With this suggestion the date (1421) of the John Rylands Khosrow o Shīrīn is in agreement, nor is it contradicted by the style of any of the other miniatures discussed.

3. A detached frontispiece and portions of three out of the five poems exist, the miniatures being in the style practiced under Bāysonghor’s patronage, and well up to the standard of paintings known to have been produced for him (excepting, of course, the Safavid miniatures in the Khosrow o Shīrīn).

4. It is possible that the prince in the detached frontispiece is intended to represent Bāysonghor himself.

5. In the only two places where he is named, the copyist is Azhar, a calligrapher of high repute known to have worked for Bāysonghor.

The evidence is all circumstantial; no proof is possible. But the pursuit of such a speculation can be instructive as well as intriguing, and meanwhile we may be permitted to indulge the hope that future researches at Istanbul or among the princely libraries of India will disclose the Makhzan al-Asrār, the Eskandar-Nāmeh, and perhaps the missing miniatures of the Leylā o Majnūn.
THE MUGHAL ARTIST FARROKH BEG

BY ROBERT SKELTON

The evolution of Mughal painting during the second half of the sixteenth century and the earlier years of Jahāngīr’s reign presents no clear transition from the early Safavid style of Persian painting to the mature Mughal style. We are met with a bewildering assortment of diverse elements emanating from the regional schools of both Persia and India, as well as Europe. Of all these constituent styles, those of the Persian group seem to have been predominant in the early stages, but already by about 1590 a style of manuscript illustration had come into being which was a new development in Asiatic art and may be described as typical of the Akbarī school.1 From then on a norm was established against which any picture exhibiting a greater degree of Persian, indigenous Indian, or European influence can immediately be seen in relief and its distance from the main stream in some measure assessed. My intention in the following pages is to examine the works of one painter who persistently held aloof from the current work of this main school of artists, and to separate his work from theirs with the hope that this will clarify the general picture of Indian painting at that time, not only at the Mughal court, where he is known to have worked, but also in the Deccan, by demonstrating his authorship of several miniatures which have long been attributed to the Bijapur school.

Farrokh Beg first comes to our notice in the Akbar-nāme, where his arrival in India is recorded by Abūl-Fażl at the end of a list of persons who left Kabul for Akbar’s court in 1585, following the death of the Emperor’s half brother Muhammad Ḥakīm. Abūl-Fażl’s list concludes: “... Farrukh Beg Musavvir and others received suitable robes and horses, and trays of muhrs and rupis. Various favours were conferred upon them.”2 Once established in Akbar’s studio, the painter was employed in manuscript illustration and although only a few of his miniatures have come down to us, there are four well-attested published examples that provide us with a key to his style.

Two of these miniatures (pl. 1, fig. 1, and pl. 3, fig. 5), bearing the attribution “Farrokh Beg,” are found in the Akbar-nāme manuscript belonging to the Victoria and Albert Museum.3 The authenticity of the manuscript is beyond question,4 for on the flyleaf there is a note written by the Emperor Jahāngīr, who entered the book in his library in 1605, the year of his accession. There is no colophon giving details of when and where the book was written, but stylistic evidence points to a date of about 1600.5 This is borne out by the fact that the Victoria and Albert Museum manuscript is only part of the whole project. It begins with the account of Akbar’s march to Agra in 1560 and ends with his visit to the Punjab, which took place in 1577. Abūl-Fażl carried his account right up to the year 1601, but there is no reason to suppose that the production of the whole work was delayed until then. In fact just the opposite is to be expected, for if the book was to

1 For miniatures in this typical style see I. Stchoukine, La peinture indienne, Paris, 1929, pls. 7-18.

3 I. S. 2-1896.
4 Doubts expressed by Percy Brown (Indian painting under the Mughals, Oxford, 1924, pp. 117-118) have been answered by I. Stchoukine (op. cit., pp. 173-175).
5 One of the last miniatures in the manuscript, which is attributed to Farrokh Beg, has been dated “late 16th century” (J. V. S. Wilkinson, Indian painting, Indian Art, ed. by Sir Richard Winstedt, London, 1947, p. 199). An early 17th-century date is suggested by I. Stchoukine (op. cit., p. 39).
achieve its aim as a political weapon by magnifying the power and achievements of Akbar in order to discourage aggression, there was good reason for copies to be made as soon as each chapter left the author’s pen. There are in the Victoria and Albert Museum manuscript 116 miniatures, of which 114 are in the characteristic bustling and eclectic style of the period. The two remaining miniatures, however, stand out as being in a much more Persian style and these are the two which bear Farrokh Beg’s name. If we look at the first of these (pl. 1, fig. 1), which depicts the interview between Mo’izz al-Molk and Bahâdîr Khân in 1567 (I.S. 2–1896 96/117), we find that the composition is flat, the color scheme chilly, and the austere figures have impassive Mongoloid features. Throughout the whole picture is a crisp precision which reaches an astonishing degree of technical perfection in the treatment of decorative details such as the tilework. Qualities similar to these are met with in the second miniature (pl. 3, fig. 5), illustrating Akbar’s entry into Surat in the year 1572 (I.S. 2–1896 117/117). In this picture the clattering Mughal army, as it approaches the town, has been transformed by the painter’s brush so that it takes on an exquisite fairylike grace. Parallels with the interview scene, such as the general use of hard, clean lines, a jewel-like brilliance in the glittering tile patterns, and a distinctive treatment of foliage, all support the inscriptions in attributing both pictures to the same artist.

Features of style identical with these are also found when we examine a third miniature (pl. 1, fig. 2), which is in the collection of H. Vever in Paris. The subject is a ruler holding court in front of a typically Persian pavilion. The drawing of the figures is very similar to that found in “Akbar’s Entry into Surat” and again there is an attribution to Farrokh Beg, although this is not visible in the reproduction. It is not known from which manuscript the picture has been detached, but on grounds of style it appears to belong to the period 1590–1600.

The only other miniatures known, which can definitely be ascribed to Farrokh Beg during the years he spent in Akbar’s service, are from a manuscript of Nizāmî’s Khamseh in the possession of A.C. Ardeshir of Bombay. Unfortunately only one of these has been published, but in his article Ardeshir claims that the MS. contains 5 in all signed by Farrokh Beg, as well as 30 others done under his “guidance.” The published example (pl. 2, fig. 3) depicting Khosrow visiting Shîrûn bears an attribution in a scribe’s loose hand čahâh wa ʿamal-e Farrokh Beg (“outline and painting by Farrokh Beg”). It is clearly his work, the treatment of the tilework and male figures being remarkably like the same details in the three other pictures already mentioned. In a note to this plate Karl Khandalavala writes: “This miniature of Farrukh Beg has a brilliant gem-like quality which is characteristic of most of the miniatures of this superb Khamsa,” describing a quality we have already noticed in the two Akbar-nâmeh paintings. From Ardeshir’s account it would appear that the book was written in Persia during the latter part of the fifteenth century, the illustrations being added afterward.

8 Brown (ibid., pp. 64–65 and pl. 14) suggests that this represents the Emperor Bâbur holding court, and was executed either at Kabul or immediately on the artist’s arrival in India. Actually there is little in the style to distinguish it from the two Akbar-nâmeh illustrations, and it may even have survived from the missing portion of the same manuscript. A short account of the Emperor Bâbur does occur in Abâl’Fazl’s work but it is not included in the Victoria and Albert Museum’s portion.

9 A. C. Ardeshir, Moghul miniature painting, Roopa-Lekha, vol. 1, No. 2 (New Delhi, Jan. 1940), pl. 7.

10 Ibid., p. 32. Elsewhere in the article Ardeshir states that the number by Farrokh Beg is four (pp. 25–26).

11 Ibid., p. 37 (footnote).
in places left vacant. The small size of the illustrated miniature (4\(\frac{3}{4}\)" \times 3\(\frac{3}{4}\)"") would confirm this, and in terms of style it could perhaps be dated to the 1590–1595 period.

While these miniatures help us to define Farrokh Beg's work during his first 15 years in India, the problem still arises as to his origin and his activity before 1585 when he arrived there. Abū'l-Fazl, unfortunately, does not tell us what the artist was doing before he worked at Kabul, but in the Ā’in-e Akbarī there is a passage which has been taken to suggest that he was of Mongoloid extraction. In the section on Akbar's principal artists we read:12 "The following artists have likewise attained fame: Kusn, Lal, Mukund, Mushkin, Farrukh the Qalmaq, Madhu, Jagan, Mohesh, Khemkarān, Tara, Sanwah, Haribans, Ram. It would take me too long to describe the excellencies of each. My intention is to pluck a flower from every meadow, an ear from every sheaf." It does not follow that Farrokh Beg is the person referred to here, as there is also a slight discrepancy in the texts at this point.13 On the other hand, Farrokh's Turkish title "Beg" lends support to the suggestion that he had central Asian blood in his veins,14 though this of course would not prove that he actually came from beyond the Oxus. A more certain indication of his origin is provided by the miniatures already discussed. We have seen that the two Akbar-nāmeh miniatures are the most Persian looking of the whole volume. For example, in the interview scene (pl. 1, fig. 1) all the faces are depicted according to a Persian convention in three-quarter view. The scene is flattened onto the page in the Persian manner. Across it leans a huge chanār and below is yet another Persian tree, the slender tabrīzī, a variety of poplar that commonly lines the watercourses of Iran.15 All these features confirm the accepted view that Farrokh Beg's early studies took place in Persia, but I believe it is possible for us to carry our investigation even further and identify the precise regional style in which he was trained.

At first sight, an answer seems to be provided by a hitherto unknown group of seven Persian miniatures that occur in a little manuscript of Amīr Khosrow's Khamseh, housed in the library at King's College, Cambridge.16 There are two colophons. The first, at the close of the second Mathnavī, is dated 978 H. (A.D. 1570) and the second, which ends the manuscript, is of the following year and gives the place name as Herat. The miniatures themselves, though slight in nature, derive considerable charm from elegant figures of the type that one associates with Moḩammadī, and can with certainty be placed at about the same date as the writing of the manuscript (pl. 2, fig. 4).17 All are inscribed "Nādir al-Āṣrī Farrokh Beg"18 and the inscriptions are in the style of sapling, rarely depicted in Mughal painting, is found more than once in Farrokh Beg's work. The only other use of it that I can recall (other than in Persian miniatures) is in a miniature by Mirzā Ghōlam, in the British Museum's Avestā-ē Soheylī MS., Add. 18579, f. 36a (vide J. V. S. Wilkinson, The lights of Canopus, London, 1929, pl. 36).

For other miniatures of this type see A. K. Coomaraswamy, Catalogue of the Indian collections in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Part 4, Mughal painting, Cambridge, Mass., 1930, pls. 21–23. The "youth and girl," (ibid., pl. 22, No. 42) may well be by the same artist who did the Cambridge miniatures.

Some of the miniatures also have a further word, partly deleted, which I am unable to read. This title, "Wonder of the Age," was bestowed by Jahāngir on

13 Not all the MSS. refer to this person as "Farrokh-e Qalmaq." Three (but unfortunately not the best) of those used by Blochmann insert the wā with the two words, thus reading "Mushkin wa-Farrokh wa-Qalmaq wa-Madbā, etc.," i.e., treating them as two separate names on the list. Vide Persian text edited by H. Blochmann (Bibliotheca Indica, No. 58 [Calcutta, 1872], vol. 2, p. 117, line 14 and footnote 12).
15 This type of sapling, rarely depicted in Mughal painting, is found more than once in Farrokh Beg's work. The only other use of it that I can recall (other than in Persian miniatures) is in a miniature by Mirzā Ghōlam, in the British Museum's Avestā-ē Soheylī MS., Add. 18579, f. 36a (vide J. V. S. Wilkinson, The lights of Canopus, London, 1929, pl. 36).
16 Pote Collection, No. 153. I am deeply indebted to Mr. B. W. Robinson for drawing my attention to this book.
17 For other miniatures of this type see A. K. Coomaraswamy, Catalogue of the Indian collections in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Part 4, Mughal painting, Cambridge, Mass., 1930, pls. 21–23. The "youth and girl," (ibid., pl. 22, No. 42) may well be by the same artist who did the Cambridge miniatures.
18 Some of the miniatures also have a further word, partly deleted, which I am unable to read. This title, "Wonder of the Age," was bestowed by Jahāngir on}
scriptions themselves would appear to be of a comparatively early date. Nevertheless, despite their highly convenient provenance, it is difficult to believe that this is a sample of the painter’s early work, for as we have seen from the Akbar-nāmeh illustrations, Farrokh Beg was possessed of an outstanding technical competence, and graceful as these little miniatures are, the summary execution of their backgrounds and vegetation coupled with extreme simplicity of conception entirely precludes the possibility of his authorship.

However, if the Pote manuscript does not seem to help us, it is nonetheless to a Khorasān school that we must turn for the origin of Farrokh Beg’s style. Our evidence is found in a manuscript of Jāmī’s Haft Owrang in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, which was written at Mashhad between 1555 and 1565 for Ibrāhīm Mīrzā, a nephew of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. A comparison between the miniatures of this book and the painting of Akbar’s entry into Surat from the Akbar-nāmeh will at once evoke many similarities. There is the same emergent naturalism, polished technique, frequent characterization of individual faces, and similar delicate treatment of the upward-branching stems of tabrīzī, to mention but a few of the more obvious parallels. The composition of one miniature (pl. 3, fig. 6) in the Jāmī manuscript, “the reception of Zoleykha’s procession,” folio 100a, is identical (in reverse) with that of our Akbar-nāmeh miniature (pl. 3, fig. 5). The upper register in each case consists of lavishly tiled buildings beyond a city wall with rows of heads peeping over turrets, with the gateway half obscured by the rocky ground. The two lower registers, united by diagonals, contain a procession led by dancing figures proceeding from the side opposite the gateway and met by an istiqbāl group that has come out from the city, while a mounted figure ascends at an angle of 45 degrees from the bottom of the picture. Both paintings contain a phenomenal number of figures.

Such similarities can hardly be fortuitous, especially as one can point to no other Persian miniatures that exhibit quite the same resemblance to Farrokh’s work. Taking these facts into consideration it seems likely that Farrokh Beg’s first years as an artist were spent in Khorasan. If this is so, his appearance in Kabul may perhaps be attributed to the murder in 1576 of the Khorasān patron Ibrāhīm Mīrzā, just as his later migration to Lahore in 1585 was certainly due to the death of another patron, Muhammad Ḥakīm.

Having surveyed the material relating to Farrokh Beg up to the close of the sixteenth century, it is now necessary for us to consider his activity after that time. It is known that he was working for Jahāngīr in the year 1609 and was highly regarded at that time, for, according to Jahāngīr’s memoirs, it was on the 22d Ramaḍān of that year that “Two thousand rupees were given to Farrokh Beg, the painter, who is unrivalled in the age.” For actual examples of his work during this reign we can

---

20 The Akbar-nāmeh miniature contains 76 figures, the Freer picture has 103.
21 The murder was arranged by Ibrāhīm’s cousin Ismā‘īl; vide Hasan Beg Rūmlā, Aḥsan al-tavārīkh, tr. by C. N. Seddon, Baroda, 1934, vol. 2, p. 208.
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turn to a royal album that contains many miniatures from Jahānır’s time as well as others added during the reign of Shāh Jahān. The volume in question, brought to England by the first Earl of Minto, was sold at Sotheby’s in 1925 and divided between the Victoria and Albert Museum and Sir Chester Beatty. Among its contents are three miniatures with attributions to Farrokh Beg. Two of these, the “Aged Mollā” (pl. 4, fig. 7) in the Victoria and Albert Museum (I.M. 10–1925) and the “Page Boy” (pl. 4, fig. 8) of the Chester Beatty collection are both inscribed in a spidery hand: “Raqm-e Farrokh Beg dar senn-e hafīd sālagī kashīleh” (drawing of Farrokh Beg at the age of 70 years). The two pictures exhibit some similarities, for each is of a single figure standing on a curving bank with foliage behind the figure and a large plant on either side. The plants themselves are botanically impossible, the one on the right in each case being composed of more than one species and treated in a stylized manner. Several of the linear leaves are bent sharply down as in early Timurid examples of Persian painting, while the blossoms in the “Page Boy,” of poppy type, and the “Aged Mollā,” a modified tulip shape, both have a marked calyx which is not found in petaloid monocotyledons. The mollā leans slightly forward, the crisply folded ends of his long scarf swinging to the rear of his robe. As would be expected, the page’s garb is more suited to the court, his robe richly diaphermed with Chinese cloud pattern. His long scarf and the patka, which is boldly decorated with a geometrical design, hang heavily in precise folds similar to those of the mollā’s scarf. There is again a slight suggestion of a swing in these draperies. The other picture from the Minto album26 (pl. 5, fig. 10) is a tinted drawing of a dervish standing among flowers, in a similar attitude to that of the mollā and again with a long scarf, its backward-swinging ends hanging in neat folds. The flowers are smaller, less robust and more akin to those usually found in Mughal paintings of the time. Written on the mount below the painting, in the familiar hand of Shāh Jahān, is the attribution “’amal-e Farrokh Beg.” No date is to be found on any of these paintings but comparison with others from the album suggests that they were executed about the year 1615.27

While some of the qualities of Farrokh Beg’s earlier work are still to be seen in this group, the intervening years have also wrought certain changes. There is the same Persian quality, crispness of execution and, in the “Aged Mollā,” a return of the austere note seen in the interview scene, but we can also see that two developments have taken place. The first of these is the result of the change of emphasis which led, in the early seventeenth century, to the increased production of portrait albums rather than of illustrated manuscripts. In order to meet the new demand, artists abandoned the complex composition necessary to the anecdote and instead centered attention on the personality and finery of a single individual, with a consequent reduction of detail. All this is to be observed in the three Minto pictures, but there is also something more. The second development is due to a factor of much greater significance—a contact with the Deccan. We find evidence of this in both the “Page Boy” and the

26 In the Victoria and Albert Museum (I. M. 11–1925).

27 See, for example, the Durbar of Jahānır in the Victoria and Albert Museum (I. S. 9–1925), which, although well within the principal Mughal stylistic stream, nevertheless connotes the same stage of artistic development and can be dated between 1610 and 1614, vide I. Stchoukine, Portraits moghols; deux durbar de jahānır, Revue des Arts Asiatiques, vol. 6 (Paris, 1929–30), p. 216 and pl. 34.

25 The “Page Boy” has “’amal-e.” There is apparently in the “Golshân Album” at the Library of the Golestan Palace another painting executed by Farrokh Beg in his 70th year which bears a note to that effect in Jahānır’s handwriting. Vide Y. Godard, Un album de portraits des princes timourides de l’Inde, Āthār-e Irān, vol. 2 (Paris, 1937), p. 214.
“Aged Mollâ” for they contain features that are clearly Deccani in origin. There is the use of unusually large plants, the slight swing of the draperies, and, in the case of the Chester Beatty picture, a rather Deccani color scheme, the background an olive-brown and a coat of purple over the boy’s long yellow robe. These features are repeated in a picture similar to the “Page Boy” which appears in the album of Naṣr al-Dîn Shâh in the Golistân Library. Again the subject is a richly dressed youth, this time holding a parrot (pl. 5, fig. 11). He is standing on a similarly curved bank from which grow large plants, and he has the same type of geometric pattern on his wide *patha*, the sky, as in the Chester Beatty picture, being rendered as a whitish band above his head. At the foot of the picture is seen an inscription “‘amal-e Farrokh Beg” in the same thin handwriting that appears on the two Minto album pictures (pl. 4, figs. 7 and 8) and which may well be suspected as being that of the artist himself. Deccani feeling is here even more apparent in the use of a blue robe against a mauve background and the total impact of slightly barbaric richness, with characteristic unrest in the flamelike treatment of the leaves and flickering pointed ends of the *jâmeh*. Were such a painting left uninscribed, no one would have failed to attribute it to a Deccani school and there is in existence an almost identical Deccani version of this painting, which bears a Hindi inscription describing the subject as a prince of the Qotb Shâhî family, which was the ruling house of the Deccani kingdom of Golconda. Thus it is evident that between 1600 and about 1615 the work of Farrokh Beg had acquired a strong Deccani flavor and, as will be shown, this was almost certainly the result of several years which he had spent at the Deccani court of Bijapur.

Now that we have established a connection between Farrokh’s later work and that of the Deccan, we can closely examine a group of miniatures that have been or can be attributed to the Bijapur school of his day and that bear unmistakable signs of being his handiwork. These are:

(a) Saints in a Landscape. The Hermitage, Leningrad (pl. 7, fig. 15).

(b) Elephant and Rider. Collection of Babu Sitaram Sahu, Banaras (pl. 6, fig. 14).

(c) A Royal Yogi. Collection of Sir Chester Beatty (pl. 8, fig. 16).

(d) A Poet in a Garden. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, No. 14.663 (pl. 8, fig. 17).

The first picture (pl. 7, fig. 15) listed above seems so far to have escaped the attention of writers on Bijapur painting, so it will therefore be necessary to relate it to that school before connecting it with the artist. It was attributed by F. R. Martin to the school of Akbar and dated to circa 1590, but this date is clearly too early, and although the painting derives much from the transitional phase between the Mughal styles of the Akbar and Jahângîr periods, the total rich effect of the crowded landscape, the typical Deccani castles, and the profusion of large plants and flowering shrubs all point to a Bijapur origin. When we come to make a comparison between this painting and the inscribed examples by Farrokh Beg from the

28 Vide Godard, op. cit., p. 240, fig. 95.
29 In the collection of Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Bombay; vide Basil Gray, “Painting” in The Art of India and Pakistan, ed. Sir Leigh Ashton, London, 1950, p. 174, No. 809. The Hindi identification need not be accepted as correct but merely stresses the connection that Farrokh Beg had with the Deccan. In actual fact boys such as those portrayed in these two pictures and the Chester Beatty example should merely be regarded as representations of the “adorable youths” who figure in Persian poetry.

30 Vide Moti Chandra, Portraits of Ibrahim Adil Shah II, Marg, vol. 5, No. 1 (Bombay, 1951) p. 27 and pl. 1. Buildings of this type are also depicted in the two paintings (b) and (c) listed above.
31 In relating this picture to the Bijapur school it is interesting to compare the thin foxtail features of the hunter in the center of the landscape with the courtiers in the picture of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shah II which is at Bikaner (vide H. Goetz, The art and architecture of Bikaner state, Oxford, 1950, pl. 8).
Minto album we immediately become aware of astonishing similarities. The distant grassy banks reflecting light from their smoothly curving rims repeat exactly the motif discovered in the artist’s “Page Boy” and his “Young Prince Holding a Parrot,” while in the foreground the two unusual plants which we saw in the “Page Boy” and the “Aged Mollā” are both found here in company with the large boulders that are found in the latter painting. The treatment of the narcissus plants is also identical in the two pictures, and similarities in garb and stance of the second man from the left and our old mollā are too obvious to bear mention. We could in fact very well attribute this picture to Farrokh Beg on the basis of this figure alone and therefore, taking the other factors into consideration also, there can be no doubt that this painting is Farrokh Beg’s work.

In the magnificent elephant portrait (b, pl. 6, fig. 14), the artist has perhaps departed further from his characteristic manner than in any other picture, yet his signature is written there with countless strokes of the brush. European influence has softened and modeled the rather flat, austere figures found in the interview scene and the “Aged Mollā” so that for a brief instant the ascetic streak in Farrokh’s nature was brushed aside in wonder at the richness of a new experience. This experience can only have been the result of a visit to the court of Ibrāhīm Ḍilāl in Bijapur in January of the year 1604, when the elephant Chanchal was being hurriedly accoutered prior to its departure with the returning mission of Asad Beg, as a present for Akbar. However difficult it may be at first to recognize Farrokh Beg’s hand in the ponderous giant and its two attendants, the vegetation can leave us in no doubt. Every single plant (and they are by no means like those of any other Indian artist) can be paralleled in his other works. The sharply down-bent leaves of the flowers in the foreground and the spriny treatment of the sugarcane carried by the attendant are both typical features of his style, while in the distance the trees with their luminous edges and the wispy palms are identical with those that appear in the picture of “Saints in a Landscape” mentioned above (a). Moreover, our difficulty in relation to the figures will soon be dispelled if we look again at the very rounded and plastic form of the young prince with the parrot (pl. 5, fig. 11) and compare Chanchal with the elephant in “Akbar’s Entry into Surat.”

The third picture to be attributed to the artist has also something of this sumptuous modeled quality. The yogini (c, pl. 8, fig. 16) stands between huge plants, holding a bird in her raised hand, her outward-swinging scarves and pointed jāmeh ends echoed by the inevitable turned-down linear leaves which share their habitat with the giant lotus to her left. Her stance is the same as that in the picture of the prince with the parrot, which is signed by the artist,32 and in the background is a castle-palace, a palm, and other tree details to remind us of similar features in the paintings of the “Elephant and Rider” and “Saints in a Landscape.”

The next picture to be discussed, the “Poet in a Garden” (d, pl. 8, fig. 17), during the past 30 years has been given to several different centers, the most important comments being those of Basil Gray, whose suggestion of a Bijāpūrī origin has been endorsed by Karl Khandalavala.33 The picture is inscribed on the cut-down mount “‘amal-e Muḥammad ‘Alī,”

32 Moti Chandra, op. cit., p. 28. See also P. M. Joshi, Asad Beg’s mission to Bijapur, 1603-04, Prof. D. V. Potdar Sixty-first Birthday Commemoration Volume, ed. by Surendra Nath Sen, Poona, 1950, p. 102.

but suspicion was cast on this inscription by A. K. Coomaraswamy, who attributed the painting to the Mughal school of the first quarter of the seventeenth century. In his contribution to the commemorative catalogue of the 1947-48 Indian Art Exhibition held at London, Mr. Gray carries us a good deal farther: "A difficult problem is the attribution of No. 688, the Poet in a Garden of the Goloubew collection. This is so outstanding as to make an attribution to an unknown master unsatisfactory for a time from which so many signed works remain for comparison. Yet the jewel-like quality of the colour makes Abîl Ḥasan the only possible author among artists of the Mughal school, while there is a sensibility in the character of the face that seems outside the range of his known work. In the relation between figure and setting No. 737 [the “Chanâr tree,” Johnson Collection, vol. i, No. 30] is comparable, but none the less Abîl Ḥasan’s name does not fit this drawing quite satisfactorily, and now that we begin to know more of the school of Bijapur in the early seventeenth century, it becomes quite possible to believe that an artist of this quality was working there." Bearing Mr. Gray’s comments in mind, the way is made very easy for us to attribute the picture to Farrokh Beg’s Bijapur period, for the ubiquitous narcissus with its bent-down leaves, and the old man himself, so exactly like the figures in the “Saints in a Landscape” and “Aged Mollä,” could hardly be by any other artist. In these four pictures, then, we have examples of Deccani painting, which for the reasons given must now be attributed to Farrokh Beg, and which can only have been executed during a residence of some years at the Bijapur court.


36 The art of India and Pakistan, p. 98. See also p. 154, No. 688.

There remains but one further unsigned published miniature containing Deccani idioms that can be identified with any certainty as Farrokh Beg’s work. This is a portrait of a young prince on horseback in the collection of Baron Maurice de Rothschild (pl. 4, fig. 9). In this case it hardly seems necessary to recount the reasons for regarding it as Farrokh Beg’s work, for it is very characteristic of his style. The tree has much in common with the young chanâr in the Leningrad painting (pl. 7, fig. 15); the mauve plain, with the similarly tufted mauve background of the Boston example (pl. 8, fig. 17), and the blank insensitive face of the rider and whitish strip of sky, with those same features in the picture of the “Page Boy” (pl. 4, fig. 8). It is not to be expected that the monocotyledonous plants could have anything but turned-down leaves37 and here we have an interesting insight into the evolution of the impossible poppy-topped monocotyledon seen in the Chester Beatty painting (pl. 4, fig. 8), for to the right of the chanâr are poppy plants with their correct foliage partly obscured by the slender linear leaves of which the artist was so fond. Like the last four pictures, this is also replete with Deccani idioms and was attributed to a Deccani school by Ivan Stchoukine.38 Despite these features, however, the picture clearly belongs to Farrokh Beg’s second Mughal phase. There is great technical assurance, but in its hard uninspired quality it comes very near to the “Page Boy” of the Chester Beatty collection and must therefore be dated to the period following Farrokh Beg’s return to Lahore.

37 I do not mean to suggest that the mere presence of turned-down leaves in a picture amounts to a signature by Farrokh Beg. The idiom is an old one and occurs in many Persian pictures, though it is rarer in Mughal painting, except in the floral borders inogue at the time of Jahângir and Shâh Jahân. A comparison between such examples and the ones cited here will at once make it clear how very different the idiom is in the hands of Farrokh Beg.

Fig. 1—Interview between Mir Mo'izz al-Molk and Bahādor Khān in 1567. Circa A.D. 1600. Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

Fig. 2—A Ruler Holding Court. Circa A.D. 1590–1600. Collection of H. Vever, Paris. (After P. Brown.)
Fig. 3—Khosrow Visiting Shīrīn. Circa A.D. 1590-95. Collection of A.C. Ardestir, Bombay. (After A.C. Ardestir.)

Fig. 4—Girl with a Wine Cup. A.D. 1570-71. King’s College Library, Cambridge.
Fig. 5—Akbah's Entry into Shiraz in 1572. Circa A.D. 1600.

Fig. 6—The Reception of Zuleykuh's Procession. A.D. 555-65.
(Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Washington)
Fig. 7—An Aged Molla. Circa A.D. 1615. Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 8—A Page Boy. Circa A.D. 1615. Collection of Sir Chester Beatty, Dublin. (After T. W. Arnold and J. V. S. Wilkinson.)

Fig. 9—Young Prince on Horseback. Circa A.D. 1610-15. Collection of Baron Maurice de Rothschild, Paris. (After I. Stchoukine.)
Fig. 10—A Dervish. Circa A.D. 1615. Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 11—Young Prince Holding a Parrot. Circa A.D. 1605-68. Library Golestân Palace, Teheran. (After Y. Godard.)
Fig. 12—Court Scene. Circa A.D. 1600. Collection of Otto Sohn-Rethel, Düsseldorf.
Fig. 13—Youth with Wine Cup and Falcon. Golestan Palace, Teheran. (After B. Gray-A. Godard, Iran.)
Fig. 14—Elephant and Rider. Circa A.D. 1604. Collection of Babu Sitaram Sahu, Banaras. (After N. C. Mehta.)
Fig. 15—Saints in a Landscape. Circa A.D. 1601-4. The Hermitage, Leningrad.
**Fig. 16—A Royal Yogini. Circa A.D. 1603. Collection of Sir Chester Beatty.** (Photograph A. C. Cooper, Ltd.)

**Fig. 17—A Poet in a Garden. Circa A.D. 1608. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.**
Fig. 18—Portrait of a Young Prince. Circa A.D. 1625-1627. Library, Golestän Palace. (After Y. Godard.)

Musée Guimet (Louvre Collection). (After F. R. Martin.)
Since it has been postulated on stylistic grounds only that Farrokh Beg spent several years in the Deccan, it is clearly necessary for us to discover whether other evidence also endorses this view. If we search the scanty literary material relating to Bijapur at the time, we find, apart from Ibrâhîm himself, the name of one painter only. Like our artist, he was also highly praised in his own day, a Persian from Shiraz and named Farrokh. He is mentioned by Zahûrî, the celebrated poet whom Ibrâhîm was fortunate in having to adorn his court. The reference appears in the third preface to Ibrâhîm’s Kitâb-e Nowras in a list of six prominent men of learning in ‘Adîl Shâh’s service. Although the passage tells us more of the poet’s ornate style than of the artist, I will quote it in full:30

The fourth [is] Maulânâ Farrukh Husain: than whose painting nothing better can be imagined. The expert painters take pride in being his pupils, and having adopted the outline of his black pen the green-haired (the beautiful) have learnt wiles. The freshness of his painting has put the portrait of the beautiful to shame, and has thrown it into the whirlpool of the jealousy of his painting. He paints the musk-navel and people smell its fragrance; he sows tulip and they reap its colour (i.e., he turns the effect into cause, and allegory into reality).

Poem

With the portraits of the heart-bewitching beauties he washed off the impression of patience (i.e., the sight of his painting makes men lose all patience).

He represents the thorn so exquisitely that the eyes of the critics are pricked. If the waterfowl of his painting shakes its wings, the face of those present becomes wet with the falling of drops. After finishing the decoration of the flower he busied himself in depicting the voice of the nightingale. That magical painter has put in motion the breeze which throws aside the veil from the face of the beautiful.

One cannot read this passage without feeling that the writer is not merely exercising his literary skill but that another motive lies behind the extravagance of his praises. If the subject of the discourse were a sovereign or a powerful patron they would be easily understood, but in this case the only satisfactory explanation can be that the two men were friends. There was, for example, a close friendship between Zahûrî and Malik Qumî, his father-in-law, who was also treated to similar eulogies in the Khvân-e Khalîl. If we go back into the poet’s past we learn that he was a native of Tarshiz in Khorasan and that it was in Khorasan that he first studied.41 Later, as his fame grew he traveled to Yezd where he stayed for a time, after which, as we learn from the Ma‘âtir-e Rahîmî,42 he went to Shiraz: “From Yezd, he repaired to Shirâz, and was there in that home of learning for a period of seven years. They say that he lived with Maulânâ Darwish Hoseyn who was a most versatile man, and had a considerable share from the knowledge of history, enigma, and poetry, and in calligraphy and illumination he was from among the unrivalled of the age, and a good many painters and illuminators of Shirâz are his pupils.” Zahûrî later seems to

30 For references connecting this artist with Shiraz see Moti Chandra, op. cit., p. 26, and M. A. Chughtai, A few Hindu miniature painters of the 15th and 16th centuries, Islamic Culture, vol. 8 (Hyderabad, 1934), p. 397. A drawing attributed to “Farrokh Hoysen ‘Adil Shahi” is in the Salar Jang collection at Hyderabad: vide S. Kramrisch, A survey of painting in the Deccan, Hyderabad, 1937, p. 220, n. 25. An additional indication of the presence of an artist called Farrokh at Bijapur is found in a portrait of “The Son of Ibrâhîm ‘Adil Khân” bearing the inscription “‘amal-e Farrokh” in the Bodleian Library (MS. Done Or. A.1, folio 31 recto). Although this Bodleian picture is an 18th-century copy, it is a good one and follows a type of portrait executed at the Mughal court during the early 17th century. The attribution must therefore have been based on a tradition that associated the name Farrokh with Bijapur. This inscription was pointed out to me by Dr. R. Ettinghausen.


42 Ghani, op. cit., p. 181.
have spent some time at the court of Shāh 'Abbās, but lack of encouragement drove him to India (A.D. 1580), where he at first took service at Ahmadnagar and finally with Ibrāhīm 'Ādīl Shāh at Bijapur.

Now we have seen that several of the very best Bijāpūrī paintings, all with traces of Mughal influence, can be attributed to Farrokh Beg, who was a first-rate Mughal artist. We have seen that a first-rate artist called Farrokh Ḥoseyn is mentioned by Zāhūrī as having worked at that time at Bijapur, and that, like Farrokh Beg, he had come from Persia. In view of the paucity of material left to us from the Bijapur school during Ibrāhīm's time it is impossible to believe that there were more than say two or three painters of the first rank working there, and it would be a remarkable coincidence if two were called Farrokh. If we conclude that the two Farrokhis were the same person, it is possible to explain the difference in the second names by remembering that the title Beg might easily have been applied to a man of Mongol ancestry on his arrival at the busy Mughal court, whereas the use of his full and correct name would certainly be expected of a former friend who knew something of his family. I would therefore suggest that Farrokh Ḥoseyn Shirāzī, alias Farrokh Beg, was probably the son of Mowlānā Darvish Ḥoseyn, the Shiraz illuminator and scholar, that he went in youth from Shiraz to Khorasan to work for Ibrāhīm Mīrāz and there fell into the company of a young poet, Zāhūrī. When the poet later traveled to Shiraz he stayed, naturally enough, with his friend's father and, as we know, went afterward to the Deccan. Five years after the poet had gone to Ahmadnagar, his former friend journeyed to Akbar's court, to which the fame of Zāhūrī spread as a result of his celebrated correspondence with Akbar's poet laureate Faizī. Working in the vast machine of Akbar's book factory Farrokh may not have felt that his talents were being sufficiently appreciated, and news of Zāhūrī's success, his enthusiasm for Bijapur, and Ibrāhīm's zeal for attracting artists could not but interest him. There is, however, another factor that may well account for the painter's leaving the metropolis for a provincial center. As the son of a learned man and himself known as a mowlānā, revealing in his work a rather ascetic and conservative nature, it is not unlikely that, dissatisfied with Akbar's unorthodoxy and conservative nature, the Muslim doctors, he would seize the opportunity to repair to the place where his former friend was so well received and where such liberal patronage was given. This very same repugnance for religious heresy could also account for his subsequent return to northern

45 "What an excellent city!" etc. Vide Ghani, op. cit., p. 445.
46 A clue to the patronage given by Ibrāhīm 'Ādīl Shāh II will be found in the following quotations from the second laudatory preface to his book the Kitāb-e Nowras (vide Sīh Naṣr i Zāhūrī, tr. by Moulovī Abdus Salam, Calcutta, 1881, p. 34): "From the bestowal of gold and silver, the scripts of artists are heavy, and from the present of meanings and senses, the poems of poets are elegant." Vide Ghani, p. 38: "He has let loose his fame in the world, For the capture of every artist." It does not follow from the context of these quotations that the word "artist" necessarily refers to painters, but if this is read in conjunction with passages recounting Ibrāhīm's interest and skill in painting such as are found in the first preface (ibid., pp. 8 and 9) and elsewhere (vide Mīrāz Ibrāhīm Zubayrī, Basāfīn al-Salāfīn, Hyderabad, n.d., p. 275), there is no doubt that he was doing all he could to attract painters as well as musicians and men of letters to his court.

43 Twenty-three examples only are mentioned in a fairly complete list given by Karl Khandalavala (Marg, loc. cit., p. 28). It may be remarked incidentally that it is doubtful whether No. 4 of the list belongs to that school while the additional painting (ibid., p. 25, pl. A) falls to a later period. Among the more interesting Bijapur pictures of the period not mentioned by Khandalavala is the portrait of a youth, wrongly described as Persian in an article by T. Sutton, Some Persian miniatures, Rupam, Nos. 19 and 29 (Calcutta, July-Dec. 1924), facing p. 114.
44 For a painting by Darvish Ḥoseyn see Schulz, op. cit., vol. 2, pl. 156.
India. Whatever may have been the attractions offered by Bijapur and its enlightened ruler, there is no doubt that Ibrâhîm was by no means all that a pious Muslim might desire in a head of state. The influence of Brahmin advisers and his own rather original turn of mind led him into paths similar to those trodden by Akbar, and indeed at one time Ibrâhîm professed to be Akbar's disciple.  

With the accession of Jahângîr in 1605 there was a change of atmosphere at the Mughal court and two of the reasons for Farrokh's absence were removed. Jahângîr was not completely orthodox but at least he was a good deal more so than either his father or Ibrâhîm, and though he did not always respect the olamât there was no persecution of them. Also, as we have noticed, there was a change of taste, with more emphasis being placed on the portrait and portfolio picture than on manuscript illustration. The need for a huge staff with more than one person contributing to each picture was removed, the accent being placed more on the individual artist, stimulated to great heights by the Emperor's personal interest and connoisseurship. It has been seen that, unlike most painters at Akbar's court, Farrokh had not collaborated with others in producing pictures by the factory method. This is surely a sign of his tacit disapproval of the system. With the weeding out of the royal studio and enlarged scope for individual merit under Jahângîr, the way was cleared for Farrokh's return. Thus it will be seen that although we have no direct reference in Bijapuri sources to Farrokh Beg's stay in the Deccan, there are strong indications to support the view that he lived and worked there for several years.

Before we come finally to survey the whole of the artist's life and work, there are two remaining miniatures that must be mentioned. One of these is the drawing of a Turkman prisoner (pl. 9, fig. 18) in the Musée Guimet (Louvre Collection), which is inscribed ‘‘amal-e Farrokh Beg.’’ Doubts have been expressed by Stchou-
When any work is brought before me, either of deceased artists or those of the present day, without the names being told me, I say on the spur of the moment that it is the work of such and such a man. And if there be a picture containing many portraits, and each face be the work of a different master, I can discover which face is the work of each of them. If any other person has put in the eye and eyebrow of a face, I can perceive whose work the original face is, and who has painted the eye and eyebrows.

Even allowing for Jahângîr’s undeniable conceit it would be difficult not to accept his judgment in this case; yet when the picture is compared with the other known examples of Farrokh Beg’s work, one is struck by a total dissimilarity of feeling and idiom. Here the boy is elegant and affected in his pose, the painter having treated his subject in a finicky and effeminate manner. There is none of the crisp and assured drawing that can be associated with Farrokh, and neither the Persian nor Deccani idioms characteristic of his work under Jahângîr are to be found. The date has been partly cut off by the marginator, and in discussing this picture, Madame Godard suggests that it should be read as 1010 Ḥ. (A.D. 1602) and that the subject may be Prince Parwiz at the age of 12. However, the style of the picture, far from being of the Akbar period, is much nearer to that of Shâh Jahân’s time and should be placed near the end of Jahângîr’s reign. It therefore seems likely that the third digit of the inscription should be read as a two, or more probably as three with only the vertical stroke visible. As the fourth digit has been altogether removed, the possible range of dates from the figures as they stand extends from 1010 Ḥ. (A.D. 1602) to 1049 Ḥ. (A.D. 1639), but in view of the style of the picture I would favor a date between 1030 Ḥ. (A.D. 1621) and 1037 Ḥ. (A.D. 1627), when Jahângîr died. A date at the very end of Jahângîr’s reign, when the Emperor’s health was breaking down as a result of excessive use of opium and spirits, would support any conclusion that he was mistaken in attributing the picture to Farrokh Beg.

Having now considered all the known material relating to our artist, I shall attempt a final tentative reconstruction of his life with a rough chronology. His date of birth is deductible from the approximate date of those paintings that he executed at the age of 70. These I have dated to about A.D. 1615; so allowing, therefore, for the fact that his age at that time was 68 years by European reckoning, we get a date near A.D. 1547. The painter no doubt spent his youth at Shiraz under the guidance of his father Mowlânâ Darvïsh Hoseyn, and there received the beginnings of both his education and his training as a painter. Then, probably in his late teens, Farrokh went to Mashhad in Khorasan and may even have helped to illustrate the fine Jâmi manuscript that was completed when he was about 19 years of age. This would have been the real formative period of his style, and in the company of young scholars such as Zâhûrî the poet, we can imagine his education receiving the polish that was to earn him the title “Mowlânâ.” The death of Ibrâhîm Mirzâ in 1576 was perhaps the reason for Farrokh’s going to Kabul, and when Muhammad Ḥâkim died in 1585, the painter, now in his late thirties, went on with others of the Kabul court to try his fortune under Akbar. On arrival he was suitably received, and during the next 15 years he contributed miniatures to several manuscripts. Apart from his work in the studio, he seems during this period to have served in other capacities. In 1590 a rebellion of the Mirzâs against the ruler of Persia provoked Akbar to send a force under the Khân Khânân for the reduction of Qandahâr. Ḥûl-Fâzî’s list of those who went on this expedition terminates as follows: “... Tingri Bardi, Farrakhd Beg, Qul Muḥammad and many other brave and capable men accompanied him.”

62 While on the face of it this would seem an odd occupation for a middle-aged artist, there is no special reason for doubting that he 

is the person referred to here. It is well known that in 1586 Akbar allowed one of his favorites, Birbal, to hold a high command in the Kashmir campaign, although the latter, a poet, jester, and musician, was by no means fitted for such a post, as events were to prove. Furthermore, at the end of Abû'l-Fazî' chapter on the imperial library we read the following:

In the same manner, as painters are encouraged, employment is held out to ornamental artists, gilders, line drawers, and pagers.

Many Mansabdars, Ahdîs, and other soldiers, hold appointments in this department. The pay of foot soldiers varies from 1,200 to 600 dams. It would thus seem that artistic and military appointments were to some extent interchangeable. Farrokh was at this time still in his mid-forties and in view of his Persian origin and his travels through Khorasan and Afghanistan he would have been especially fitted for service on the expedition.

Reasons have already been suggested why Farrokh should have become rather disgruntled with conditions under Akbar’s service. This being the case he must have been greatly interested in news of lavish patronage extended by Ibrâhîm II at Bijapur, where there was also a small group of Persian scholars who would not doubt provide a congenial circle untainted by the unorthodox speculations of the Dîn-e Ilâhî which had gripped many scholars at the Mughal court. An opportunity to go to Bijapur presented itself early in the year 1601, soon after he had executed one of the last miniatures in the Victoria and Albert Museum portion of the Akbar-nâmeh. On the 29th of the month Isfandarmaz, A.H. 1009, Mir Jamâl al-Dîn Hoseyn was sent off to Bijapur in order to make arrangements for the marriage of Ibrâhîm’s daughter, Sultâneh Begam, to Prince Dâniyâl. Mir Jamâl was just the sort of person to whom Farrokh would attach himself, for he was not only a great scholar but also a member of the famous Injû family from the town of Shiraz in which Farrokh was born. The party arrived at Bijapur in March 1601 and Farrokh was then reunited with his old friend, the poet Zahûrî. One of the first pictures he painted at the Deccan court must clearly have been “Saints in a Landscape,” for the crowded composition savors still of his Akbar-period style. Soon, however, he began to absorb more from his new environment, and in 1604, after Asad Beg had arrived with his commission to bring back Mir Jamâl “without giving him time to eat or drink,” the painter was called upon to make a picture of the elephant Chanchal which Asad Beg was to take away as a gift for Akbar. The portrait of a yogini should also be dated to about this time for it exhibits the same richness as the elephant picture, with the impact of European influence still fresh in the treatment of the figure. These exotic qualities are also to be found in the Tehran picture of the young prince holding the parrot, but a slightly later date is indicated by the general setting, which is nearer to that of the Chester Beatty “Page Boy.” In the picture of the poet the European influence is not so apparent, but the painting was certainly done before Farrokh left Bijapur, for it is surely a portrait of none other than Zahûrî himself. If there were no other clue than their friendship, we would be justified in suspecting this, but there exists also another painting reputed to be a portrait of Zahûrî that bears a general resemblance to the version by Farrokh. The poet

51 Joshi, op. cit., p. 185, footnote 13.
52 Ibid., p. 186.
53 Ghani, op. cit., illustration facing p. 181. This version is based on a figure in a miniature drawn by Madhûn in the Timûr-nâmeh MS. at Bankipur (vide Brown, op. cit., pl. 34). The design of this figure was certainly not originated by the Hindu artist and it is quite likely that Farrokh Beg had introduced it to the Mughal atelier and later utilized it on more than one occasion, as in the case of the “Page Boy” motif.

is seated in each case with his right hand holding his beard; the position of the knees is the same and there is a close similarity in the heads and turbans. Despite the strength in the poet's features, the whitish beard indicates that he was quite an old man, and this is what we would expect, for in the Khvān-e Khalīl, just after his description of Mowlānā Farrokh Ḵoseyn, Zahūrī gives his own age as 70 years. It is not known exactly when he wrote the three prefaces, but it was certainly during the first years of the seventeenth century when the painter was at Bijapur. If we assume that Jahāngīr's gift to Farrokh Beg61 marked the painter's return to the Mughal court, it would seem that he left Bijapur in A.D. 1608–1609, making the arduous journey while in his early sixties. The reason for going back was perhaps, as has been suggested, connected with Ibrāhīm's tendency to follow Akbar into apostacy, coupled with changes at the Mughal court which invited Farrokh's return. It is also possible that, learned as he was, Farrokh was a little disappointed in a patron who was so deeply imbued with the foreign culture of the Deccan that his literary medium was Deccani Hindi, and who was unable to speak the Persian language except in a broken manner.62

The final phase of Farrokh's work, as exhibited by his paintings from the Minto album, suggests in general a slackening of that inspiration which he had possessed so abundantly in middle life. This did not matter. His technique was still beyond criticism and, in any case, by 1609 he had won the universal fame that he so richly deserved. In the portrait of the "Aged Mollā," painted in his seventieth year, we see that there is not only the same mastery of drawing, but there is added a penetrating insight into the character of his subject which is lacking in most of his work. One would like to think that in this old scholar we have perhaps a searching self-portrait of Mollā Farrokh Ḵoseyn himself, a painter "unrivalled in the age."

Postscript

The drawing bearing the ascription to "Farrokh Ḵoseyn 'Ādil Shāhī," which is mentioned above (p. 401, footnote 39), has now been published (Nāzīr Ahmad, Farrokh Husain, the royal artist at the court of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh II, Islamic Culture, vol. 30, No. 1 [Hyderabad, 1956], pp. 31–35). Unfortunately it is a late copy of very poor quality and does not justify the encomiums bestowed upon it by the writer of the article who has been misled by what are clearly false inscriptions.

Elsewhere in the same publication it is mentioned that a manuscript of Hilālī, Ṣifāt al-ʿĀshīqīn in the Saʿīdiyā Library, Hyderabad, Deccan, bears a note on the last page to the effect that it was acquired through Mīrzā Farrokh Beg, on the 25th Muḥarram in the 25th year of the reign of Akbar, at a cost of rupees 1, 945 (vide Klaus Fischer, Some illuminated Persian manuscripts in the Saʿdiya Library, Hyderabad-Dn., ibid., p. 38). If, as seems very possible, the person referred to in this note is in fact Farrokh Beg, the artist, we may reasonably suppose that he was either actually in the Emperor Akbar's territory during the 25th regnal year A.H. 987 (A.D. 1579) or at least was acting on behalf of a bibliophile who resided in that territory. This implies that the artist may in fact have visited India six years before the date of arrival given by Abūl-Faẕl in the Akbar-nāmeh. As the Hilālī manuscript in the Saʿīdiyā Library was copied in the year A.H. 986 (A.D. 1578), only one year before the date of acquisition through Farrokh Beg, and, moreover, contains three illustrations, it would be interesting to know whether or not he contributed to its production.

60 Ibid., p. 464.
61 Cf. Supra, p. 396.
62 Joshi, op. cit., p. 191.
APPENDIX A

List of Paintings

BEARING AUTHENTIC ATTRIBUTIONS TO FARROKH BEG:

1. Khosrow visiting Shirin.
   Illustration from a copy of the Khamseh of Niẓāmī.
   Size: 11.0 x 8.0 cm.
   Date: c. 1590–1595.
   Collection of A. C. Ardeshrī, Bombay.

2. A ruler holding court.
   Detached page from a manuscript.
   Size: 30.4 x 20.3 cm.
   Date: c. 1590–1600.
   Collection of H. Vever.

3. Interview between Mir Moʿizz al-Molk and Bahādur Khān in 1567.
   Illustration from a copy of the Akbar-nāmeh of Abūl-Fażl.
   Size: 27.2 x 17.2 cm.
   Date: c. 1600.
   Victoria and Albert Museum, I.S. 2–1896 96/117.

4. Akbar's entry into Surat in 1572.
   Illustration from a copy of the Akbar-nāmeh of Abūl-Fażl.
   Size: 32.0 x 19.2 cm.
   Date: c. 1600.

5. Portrait of a Turkman prisoner (drawing).
   Size: 24.3 x 16.6 cm.
   Date: End of the sixteenth century.
   Musée Guimet (Louvre Collection)
   No. 3.619.1a.

6. Young prince holding a parrot.
   Miniature from an album of Naṣr al-Dīn Shāh.
   Size: 16.7 x 9.2 cm.
   Date: c. 1605–1608.
   Library, Golestān Palace, Tehran.

7. Study of a dervish (tinted drawing).
   From the Minto album.
   Size: 14.7 x 7.6 cm.
   Date: c. 1615.
   Victoria and Albert Museum, I.M. 11–1925.

8. An aged molla.
   From the Minto album.
   Size: 16.6 x 11.2 cm.
   Date: c. 1615.
   Victoria and Albert Museum, I.M. 10–1925.

   From the Minto album.
   Size: 18.2 x 10.8 cm.
   Date: c. 1615.
   Collection of Sir Chester Beatty, Dublin.

HERE ATTRIBUTED TO FARROKH BEG:

10. Saints in a landscape.
    Date: c. 1601–1604.
    The Hermitage, Leningrad.
    Reproduced: Martin, op. cit., vol. 2, pl. 175.
11. Elephant and rider.
   Size: 15.8 x 19.4 cm.
   Date: c. 1604.
   Collection of Babu Sitaram Sahu, Banaras.

   Size: 19.4 x 11.7 cm.
   Date: c. 1605.
   Collection of Sir Chester Beatty, Dublin.

13. A poet in a garden.
   Size: 12.2 x 10.3 cm.
   Date: c. 1608.

14. Young prince on horseback.
   Size: 19.1 x 16.5 cm.
   Date: c. 1610-1615.
   Collection of Baron Maurice de Rothschild, Paris.

**Bearing attributions but not yet published and therefore unsubstantiated:**

15-18. Four miniatures from a manuscript of Nizâmi's *Khamsâh*.
Collection of A. C. Ardeshir, Bombay.
   Mentioned in connection with the published example (see No. 1 above) but not illustrated.

19-22. Four miniatures divided between two albums.
Collection of A. C. Ardeshir, Bombay.
   See A. C. Ardeshir, *Mughal miniature painting: the school of Jahangir*, Roopa-Lekha, vol. 2, No. 3 (New Delhi, 1949), p. 31. One of these is mentioned by Mr. Ardeshir as being an outline drawing of an aged mollâ and there is also a self-portrait among the group; *vide* Karl Khandalavala, *Some paintings from the collection of the late B. N. Treasurywala*, Marg, vol. 1, No. 1 (Bombay, 1949), p. 50.

23. A miniature inscribed by Jahângîr to the effect that it was executed by Farrokh Beg at the age of 70.
   Golshân album.
   Library, Golestân Palace, Tehran.
   *Vide* Godard, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

**Bearing attributions but not accepted here as Farrokh Beg’s work:**

   Size: 15.9 x 9.4 cm.
   Date: Seventeenth century (Stchoukine).
   Musée Guimet (Louvre Collection)
   No. 3.619, N.b.
   As in the case of the Turkman prisoner (No. 5 above), Stchoukine doubts that this is by the master.

25-31. Seven miniatures depicting (1) two youths playing with dice, (2) girl offering wine to a youth, (3) lovers by a stream, (4) youth holding a book, (5) girl with a wine vessel, (6) young dervish, (7) young polo player.
   King’s College, Cambridge, MS. Pote 153.

32. Akbar receiving news of the birth of Murâd while watching an elephant fight.
   Illustration from a copy of the *Akbar-nâme* of Abûl-Fażl.
   Size: 33.1 x 19.8 cm.
   Date: c. 1600.
   Victoria and Albert Museum, I.S. 2-1896 81117.

The outline and painting of this miniature have been attributed to Farrokh Beg by all the above writers and also elsewhere (e.g., B. Gray in The art of India and Pakistan, ed. Sir Leigh Ashton, London, 1950, p. 151, No. 670B) but careful consideration will refute the possibility of this being his work. First, it must be remembered that it was a general rule in Akbar’s worship for the work of book production to be divided between as many different hands as possible, in the manner of modern industrial mass-production techniques. Thus in the Victoria and Albert Museum Akbar-nâmeh manuscript, out of the 109 illustrations that bear attributions, 98 are the work of two, sometimes three, collaborators, while only 11 are the work of single painters. It is in this latter category that the two miniatures already discussed (Nos. 3 and 4 of this list) fall, for the inscription in each case reads “Farrokh Beg” without the name of any other artist. In this respect the inscription on the example under discussion is quite different since it indicates that the portraits were done by Baswan; moreover, the name of the man who executed the rest of the miniature is given as Farrokh without the title Beg. As we have already noticed that more than one of Akbar’s painters bore the name “Farrokh” and that Farrokh Beg was one of the few artists working on this manuscript who produced pictures without the aid of a master to outline the drawing or paint the principal portraits, there seems no reason why it should be given to him. In style the picture is more akin to the main stream of Mughal manuscript illustration than are the Farrokh Beg pictures mentioned, for where we have here some of the extraneous movement and bustle of the typical Akbari school, in Farrokh Beg’s work there is a quality of suspended action inherited from Persia, in which the figures appear to be moved by outside forces, if at all, rather than by the violent muscular exertion animating the majority of Mughal illustrations at that time. If any more confirmation be needed, a glance at the colors (Studio, Feb. 1948, fig. 11) will clinch the matter. With its drab scheme of dull browns, scarcely relieved by any brighter hue, there is no other illustration in the whole manuscript that presents so strong a contrast to the listening brilliance of our painter’s style. We can only conclude that this other painter is perhaps the man who styled himself “Farrokh Chelâ” and whose work appears in several other manuscripts of the time (vide Brown, op. cit. pl. 37 and p. 196; T. H. Hendley, The Razm Nama manuscript, Memorials of the Jaipur Exhibition, London, 1883, vol. 4, pls. 80 and 137). A double page miniature in the Chester Beatty Akbar-nâmeh manuscript (Arnold and Wilkinson, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 7, and vol. 2, pl. 15) is by “Farrokh” with faces by Manohar, Anant, and Mukund. It may be possible to identify Farrokh Chelâ (the slave or disciple) with Farrokh Khord (the younger) whose work appears in the British Museum Dârâb-nâmeh (MS. Or. 4615, folios 60a, 60b, and 114a). Similarly, it is possible that Farrokh Kalân (the elder), who executed the outlines of folios 80a and 99a of the Bankipur Timur-nâmeh, may in fact be Farrokh Beg, though this cannot be verified until the manuscript is fully published (vide Descriptive list of photographic reproductions of illustrations from three Persian manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore, India, prepared by Wali-ud-din Khuda Bakhsh, B. A., Librarian, Oriental Public Library, Patna, no date).

33. Portrait of a young prince.
From the album of Naṣr al-Dīn Shāh.
Size: 17.4 x 9.5 cm.
Date: c. 1625-7.
Library, Golestân Palace, Tehran.
Reproduced: Godard, op. cit., p. 213, fig. 78.

Copies with false attributions:

34. Humâyûn hunting near Kabul.
From the Wantage album.
Size: 19.6 x 17.5 cm.
Date: c. 1800.
Reproduced: C. Stanley Clarke, Indian drawings, London, 1922, pl. 3.

This painting and the one following are from a group of miniatures in the Wantage album which have been described by Dr. Moti Chandra as "fakes" (Moti Chandra, The technique of Mughal painting, Lucknow, 1949, p. 80). While the use of this precise term is questioned by some scholars, it is now generally accepted that these miniatures were executed at the end of the eighteenth or beginning of the nineteenth century in a style based on that of earlier miniatures and that the inscriptions relating to artists of the early seventeenth century are false. The inscription on this example reads "'amal-e fadavī Farrokh Beg."

35. An incident in the life of Khvājeh Jahān. From the Wantage album.
Date: c. 1800.
Victoria and Albert Museum, I.M. 126–1921.
Reproduced: Clarke, op. cit., pl. 4.

See the foregoing remarks. The inscription in this case reads "kār-e Farrokh Beg."

36. Shāh Ṭahmāsp dictating to a scribe.
Date: c. 1800.
Freer Gallery of Art, No. 39.47A.

This miniature exhibits the stippled surfaces and weakness of line characteristic of late copies such as those of the Wantage album (vide Moti Chandra, op. cit., pp. 81–82). The miniature is inscribed: "sanneh-ye 1020 Shāh Ṭahmāsp rasm-e Farrokh Beg."

37. Bird on a flowering tree.
Date: c. 1800.
Freer Gallery of Art, No. 48.21A verso.
Vide Messrs. Sotheby’s sale catalogue of 12th December, 1920, lot 118 reverse.

This picture belongs to the same category as No. 36 of this list.

38. King Kayūmarth and his subjects.
Size: 21.5 × 14.0 cm.

Date: 18th century.

Although following the main Akbar period style, this miniature is clearly a later version (a view also expressed in a letter by Dr. M. S. Dimand). Unlike the last four miniatures, the motive behind the use of an earlier style can be described as emulation rather than deception, and the inscription "'amal-e Farrokh Beg" may be dismissed as the pious hope of some late owner or librarian.

Addendum

In addition to the paintings of Farrokh Beg listed above (Appendix A), another two published paintings have come to my notice, which can confidently be accepted as his work. The first of these, published by Kühnel in 1931, was pointed out to me by Dr. Richard Ettinghausen (vide Ernst Kühnel, Die indischen Miniaturen der Sammlung Otto Sohn-Rethel, Pantheon, vol. 8 (Munich, 1931) p. 387, fig. 4). As Kühnel has shown, the Sohn-Rethel page was formerly in the famous album of miniatures and calligraphy put together for the Emperor Jahāngīr in 1600 and now principally divided between the Berlin Staatsbibliothek (Libr. Pict. fol. A. 117) and the Library of the Golestan Palace, Tehran (Golshān album). The subject of the miniature is an unidentified ruler seated on a canopied throne in a landscape, surrounded by a throng of courtiers and others of many varied types and nationalities, including Indians, Persians, Central Asians, and two European priests (pl. 6, fig. 12). It seems likely that the picture was originally painted for an illustrated manuscript dealing with the history of perhaps the Timurid dynasty and was presumably incorporated within the Jahāngīr album, either because it was not finally utilized in the original manuscript, or else because the manuscript was, for some reason, broken up soon after being copied. There is no doubt that, as Kühnel suggests, the picture dates from about the year A.D. 1600 and was painted by Farrokh Beg. The style is identical with that of the Akbar-nāmeh pages (pl. 1, fig. 1, and pl. 3, fig. 2) and the Vever miniature (pl. 1, fig. 2), which are here dated to about A.D. 1600. One can see, furthermore, in the distant landscape, a
very striking hint of what was to come in the earliest phase of Farrokh’s work in the Deccan as represented by the picture of “Saints in a Landscape” (pl. 7 fig. 15). Apart from the similar treatment of the chanär in each case, there are three other kinds of trees and shrubs painted alike in both pictures as well as the same highly individualistic treatment of the rocks.

The other miniature by Farrokh Beg to be mentioned here is from the same Jahāngīr album, but now forms part of the Golshān album in Tehran. It has recently been published for the first time in the U.N.E.S.C.O. World Art Series (vide, Iran, Persian miniatures-Imperial library, preface by Basil Gray, introduction, by André Godard, Paris, 1956, pl. 20). The subject represented is a richly dressed youth who stands holding a wine cup and a falcon (pl. 6, fig. 13). There is an attribution to Farrokh Beg written discreetly near the left hand margin of the picture, but this is hardly necessary since, as Godard observes, “His unaffected nobility of manner, the splendour of the colour, the drawing of the bird and, above all, the flowers, are particularly characteristic of the very personal art of Farrukh Beg.” The actual design of the figure is closely connected with that of a miniature in the Pozzi collection of a youth in sixteenth-century Safavid dress, who stands with a wine cup held in a similar way, but with his right hand lowered to hold his sword hilt (vide E. Blochet, Les peintures orientales de la collection Pozzi, Paris, 1930, pl. 11). In each case the posture of the youth and position of the outer coat is virtually the same and it is clear that both pictures are developed from a common model. The provenance and dating of the Pozzi picture is rather puzzling but it is clearly not purely Persian and was possibly executed in the Deccan during the early seventeenth century. This might explain its relationship with the painting by Farrokh Beg, since the latter has more in common with the work of his Deccani period than with the paintings done for Jahāngīr at the Mughal court. Stronger support for the supposition that Farrokh painted this picture while at Bijāpur is found by comparing it with his “Saints in a Landscape” where the trees have similar luminous edges to their foliage and there is the same smooth sensitivity in rendering the faces. Most of Farrokh’s later painting tends to lose this exquisitely sensitive quality and it is noticeable too that the later pictures resort to a more simplified rendering of background than in this case. It therefore seems possible that the picture was painted by Farrokh Beg during his early years in the Deccan and then was taken by him to the Mughal court when he presented himself there in about A.D. 1609. In discussing this picture, M. Godard mentions that there are several paintings by Farrokh Beg in the Golshān album. It is to be hoped that these and other virtually unknown paintings of the artist may soon be published and the critical examination of his work carried farther.

APPENDIX B

Table Showing the Suggested Chronology for Farrokh Beg’s Career

It should be borne in mind that Farrokh Beg’s age at different stages, although expressed here in precise figures, can only be regarded as approximate, being based on the probable date of those paintings that he executed at the age of 70.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Approximate age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td>circa 1547</td>
<td>Born in Shiraz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circa 1565</td>
<td>Went to Mashhad</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circa 1576</td>
<td>Went to Kabul</td>
<td>39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Went to Lahore</td>
<td>44 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Took part in Qandahār campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circa 1600</td>
<td>Worked on the Akbar-nāmeh MS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circa 1601</td>
<td>Went to Bijapur</td>
<td>55 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circa 1608–09</td>
<td>Returned to the Mughal Court</td>
<td>63 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circa 1615</td>
<td>Painted the “Aged Mollā” and the “Page Boy”</td>
<td>70 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THREE ILLUSTRATED MANUSCRIPTS OF THE MUGHAL PERIOD

BY R. H. PINDE-WILSON

The art of the book, which depends on the combined efforts of painter, illuminator, scribe, and binder, was the great achievement of Timurid Persia. The advent of the Safavid dynasty had no adverse effect on its development; Tabriz, inheriting the traditions of the Herat academy, and Shiraz, with a still older history of book production, produced a series of masterpieces during the reigns of Ismâ'il and Shâh Ţahmâsp. But after the middle of the sixteenth century the quality of surviving books shows a marked decline and it is rather to India that we must turn for a continuance of this great tradition. Introduced into India by Humâyûn as a result of his asylum at the court of Shâh Ţahmâsp, the art of the book acquired new vitality under the patronage of Akbar. But under his successors the art of book illustration underwent a steady decline. Not that painting itself declined, for the mature Mughal style was to emerge in the last years of Akbar and the early years of Jahângîr. It is rather that narrative illustration was eclipsed by other forms of expression; and, as so often in the Islamic world where the prince leads the way in matters of art, it was deprived of imperial patronage and had to surrender to the new taste.

In the reign of Jahângîr there emerged a new attitude to painting; patrons were no longer satisfied with the reiteration of well-worn themes where the pictures were ancillary to the narrative of romance, epic, or history. The popular forms were now portraiture, genre and nature subjects. No longer were the separate elements of a painting subordinated to a total decorative effect; the completed picture was to be enjoyed for its own sake, independent of narrative and its relevance to a wider decorative scheme. At about this time the album begins to displace the illustrated manuscript in popularity and apparently the earliest surviving moraqa’s date from the reign of Jahângîr and were put together under imperial supervision.¹

No doubt portraiture was stimulated by the great historical manuscripts dating from the last two decades of Akbar’s reign, but considered as the delineation of character it owed far more to the influence of European painting. The mundane incident was not excluded by the Timurid artists; but the simple scenes of everyday life depicted in the margins of the moraqa’s seem to suggest a new approach that depended on Persia, since their counterpart is to be found in the work of Muḥammadî and his contemporaries and was introduced into India by Āqâ Rizâ. At the same time the spirited copies of European paintings and engravings which appear alongside these reveal the receptivity of the Mughal artists.

The paucity of surviving manuscripts as well as the general decline in quality is particularly striking in this period. It is hoped that the three manuscripts described below will illustrate this point. The first of these belongs to the early years of Jahângîr, the second was executed four years after the accession of Shâh Jahân, and the third at the beginning of Awrangzîb’s reign, when the Emperor was still not secure on the throne of Delhi. None was produced under imperial patronage and the last we owe to one of Shâh Jahân’s prominent nobles, himself a patron of poets and men of letters.

I

Among the exhibits of the International Exhibition of the Art of India and Pakistan, held

in London in 1947–48, was a manuscript of Nizāmī’s Leylä and Majnūn belonging to the India Office Library.8

It consists of 50 folios, each measuring 11 by 6½ inches and having four columns in a clear nastalīq. The columns are separated by vertical bands of illumination, and chapter headings in red are set in rectangular panels of flowers on a gold ground. An illuminated sarlowḥ on folio 1 verso consists of floral decoration in gold, red, green, blue, and white. The manuscript was copied by Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Mollā Mīr ‘Alī in Rabī’ā’ 1, 605 H. (equivalent to December 13, 1557, to January 12, 1558) according to the colophon on folio 50 recto.

Five miniatures probably executed by one hand were added in the Mughal period in spaces left vacant by the copyist. The stepping down of the upper and lower edge of the paintings belongs to an earlier tradition of manuscript illustration and serves to unite text and miniature. At a later period this principle was ignored and text and picture were treated as separate and independent entities.

Folio 7 recto (fig. 1): “Leylā and Majnūn at school.”

The grassy slope, flowers, and shady trees contrast with the desert of the background. The sky is rendered by horizontal washes of blue and white, gilded at the horizon to suggest sunrise. The diminutive figures of the children are placed against the blue ground and gold border of the carpet. The colors of the costumes range from yellow and green to red, lilac, and mauve. The schoolmaster wears a vermilion jāmeh.

Folio 23 recto (fig. 2): “Leylā’s father gives her in marriage to Ibn Salām.”

Leylā wears vermilion shalvār and a muslin mantle, and on her head a tall Mughal bonnet of gold brocade, the same headdress as worn by three of her attendants. Ibn Salām wears a brocaded jāmeh with flowered embroidery and green shalvār.

Folio 34 verso (fig. 3): “A hermit brings Leylā to the place appointed for her meeting with Majnūn but she shrinks from the encounter.”

The blue-green ground terminates in the pink tones of the distant rocks. The golden orb of the sun is visible from behind the rocky crag. Particularly striking are the vermillion-hued blossoms, the stems of which are entwined about the two cypress trees. The flowing water of the stream is rendered by wavy white lines on a gray ground. Majnūn’s loin cloth is vermillion, the hermit’s mantle mauve, and Leylā’s costume and headdress of gold brocade.

Folio 42 recto (fig. 4): “The last meeting of Leylā and Majnūn.”

As in folio 7, the background hill is rendered in a dull yellow representing sand. Leylā is dressed in a vermilion mantle and headdress of gold brocade.

Folio 48 recto (fig. 5): “Majnūn languishes on Leylā’s tomb.”

Majnūn kneels on the brick-colored sockle of the marble tomb observed by two youths. A stream with herons runs across the foreground and the horizon is broken by a rocky crag in the center and a domed building and minaret in the left-hand corner.

The style of these miniatures is related to that of a group of manuscript paintings executed in the closing years of the reign of Akbar and in particular to those of the Anvār-e Soheylī in the British Museum9 and of the ‘Īyār-e Dānesh manuscript in the Chester Beatty Library.4 The colophon of the first is dated 1019 H. (equivalent


to A.D. 1610–1611) but 2 of the 36 paintings bear the date 1606 and the remainder were probably executed about the same time. The colophon of the second contains no date but on stylistic grounds the paintings must have been executed about 1606.\(^5\)

Of particular interest for our purposes are the paintings in the Anvār-e Soheylī signed by Āqā Rizā and his son Abū'l-Hasan who introduced into India the fashions current in Persia. Their influence may be detected in the miniature on folio 34 verso (fig. 3) where the placing of the figures in the landscape is Persian rather than Indian and the somewhat mannered curve of the figures of the hermit and Leylā are reminiscent of the full-length portraits of youths and girls of the Shāh ‘Abbās period.

The miniatures of the Leylā and Majnūn manuscript lack the brilliance and depth of tone of those of the Anvār-e Soheylī and ‘Īyār-e Dānesh manuscripts though the palettes are similar. The unevenness of the ground as it slopes toward the horizon is rendered by shaded lines, but in the Anvār-e Soheylī manuscripts hill contours are suggested by subtle washes. The naturalistic treatment of the sky is common in late Akbarī miniatures and the representation of sunrise by a gilded horizon is found in the ‘Īyār-e Dānesh.\(^6\) There is no attempt at this period to introduce atmospheric tones in distant landscape. Distance is suggested by gradations in scale.

The animals in folio 42 recto (fig. 4) are stiff and lifeless compared to the carefully observed beasts depicted in the Anvār-e Soheylī and have, too, a curious “masklike” quality found also in the ‘Īyār-e Dānesh.\(^7\)

The human figures have little of the suggestion of movement which the Akbarī artists achieved by the use of vigorous gestures, suspended attitudes, and wind-tossed or flowing drapery. They anticipate, rather, the frozen and statuesque poses characteristic of Jahāngīr painting. And yet this searching after movement appears in the ‘Īyār-e Dānesh and to a lesser extent in the Anvār-e Soheylī. Unlike these two manuscripts, there is no attempt at modeling in the faces. Our artist, too, on occasions displays a certain “gaucherie,” as in the awkward movement of Ibn Salām on folio 23 recto (fig. 2) as he ascends the steps of the dais, and the clumsy architectural perspective in the drawing of the pavilion. He was clearly no innovator and his work often seems labored for he was content to introduce well-worn clichés such as the camel driver on the same folio which is a stock figure in Akbarī miniatures. Nevertheless in figure 4, his most successful painting, he has achieved a singularly beautiful scene in which landscape and gestures combine in underlining the poignancy of the situation.

The miniatures, therefore, would seem to have been executed after 1606 but probably not later than 1610.

\(^5\) The art of India and Pakistan, commemorative catalogue, p. 97; according to Karl Khandalavala, Five miniatures in the collection of Sir Cowasji Jahangir, Bart., Marg., vol. 5, No. 2 (Bombay, 1952), p. 30, the manuscript is dated A.D. 1606, though no known folio in fact bears a date.

\(^6\) Arnold, op. cit., pl. 46(b).

\(^7\) Ibid., pl. 47(a).

\(^8\) Add. 27, 262; Rieu, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 603; W. Wright, Facsimiles of manuscripts and inscriptions, Palaeographical Society (Oriental Series), London, 1875–1883, plate 50 (reproduces folio 168 verso).
Rokn al-Dīn Mas'ūd, better known as Ḥakīm Roknā. Of Persian origin, he had early secured the patronage of Akbar and became prominent among the poets at the court of Shāh Jahān. A companion volume containing Sa'dī's Golestān and dated Jamādā I, 1038 (equivalent to December 1628 to January 1629), also copied by Ḥakīm Roknā, is in the Chester Beatty Library and is described elsewhere in this volume by J. V. S. Wilkinson.

Each page measuring 15 by 10½ inches contains gold marginal decorations consisting of birds and animals in a landscape of rocks, trees, and flowers against a colored ground, either blue, crimson, scarlet, green, or yellow. There is considerable variety in the drawing and apparently no repetition, so that there is no reason to assume that stencils were used. In folio 19 recto (fig. 6) the marginal decoration is on a purple ground. Each of the 10 miniatures is set in a long, narrow rectangle placed in the middle of the page. The effect of this is to destroy the closely knit relationship between text and miniature. Miniatures of a similar shape are to be found in a double miniature from a manuscript of the Golestān belonging to the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore.9 None of the artists has succeeded in achieving a completely unified composition within this rather awkwardly shaped frame.

Folio 37 recto illustrates the story of “The young man and the lamb.”10

Folio 40 recto (fig. 7), 3.5 by 5.8 inches: “The generosity of Ḥātim Tā'i.”

The Emperor of Rūm sends to Ḥātim Tā'i in order to prove his famed generosity. After being feasted and rested, the messenger demands on his master’s behalf his host’s celebrated horse. Ḥātim Tā'i seized with remorse and regret reveals that the horse has already been slaughtered and served to his guest the previous evening.11

The pale green of the ground is relieved by dark green tufts of grass and the purple rocks of the horizon lie beneath a blue sky. Ḥātim Tā'i wearing a green jāmeh and the messenger a brocaded jāmeh are seated before a vermillion tent.

Folio 52 recto: “A scene of polo players.” Illustration to the story of the beggar’s hopeless love for a king’s daughter.12

Folio 59 verso (fig. 8): “An old Šūfī abandoned on shore by the ferryman is borne across the sea on his prayer carpet.”13

Folio 67 verso: “The humility of Bāyazīd Bistāmī.”14

Folio 129 recto (fig. 9), 3.2 by 6.1 inches: “An old man seeing a girl in the arms of an ugly Negro curses the latter who takes flight; whereupon the girl reproaches the old man for his untimely interference since by his action he has caused her to lose him for whom she had conceived an ardent longing.”15

The colors have the soft and transparent tonality associated with the Shāh Jahān period. Particularly striking is the figure of the old man in an attitude of rebuke. The face is rendered in delicate flesh tints.

Folio 145 recto (fig. 10), 3.0 by 6.2 inches: “A mother rebukes her son for his pride and arrogance reminding him how he once lay helpless in the cradle and so will lie when he is laid in the grave.”16

In the right-hand scene the mother wears a white ʿūrānī and the younger woman one of embroidered muslin. In the left-hand scene the mother wears an orange ʿūrānī over a dress of gold brocade; the youth wears a green turban and a turquoise coat over a mauve jāmeh.

---

9 The art of India and Pakistan, commemorative catalogue, p. 135, No. 695, and pl. 133, where it is dated c. 1610–1615.
10 A. C. Barbier de Meynard, Le boustan ou Verger, poème persan de Sa'di, tr. with notes, Paris, 1880, p. 115.
11 Ibid., pp. 118–120.
12 Ibid., pp. 148–149.
14 Ibid., pp. 183–184.
15 Ibid., pp. 284–286.
16 Ibid., pp. 319–320.
Fig. 1—Folio 1r: Leyla and Majnun at School.

Fig. 2—Folio 2r: Leyla's Father Gains Her in Marriage to Ibn Salam.

Fig. 3—Folio 3v: A Hermit Brings Leyla to Meet Majnun.

Figs. 1-3—Nizami, "Leyla and Majnun." London, India Office Library, No. 381.
Plate 2

Fig. 5—Nizami, India Office Library, Folio 42r: Majnun at Lelya's Tomb.

Fig. 6—"Busan," British Museum, Add. 27705, Folio 19r: The Last Meeting of Lelya and Majnun.
Fig. 7—Folio 40r: The Generosity of Ḥātim Ṭāṭ.

Fig. 8—Folio 59v: Ṣofī Crossing the Water on his Prayer Carpet.

Fig. 9—Folio 129r: The Rebuke of the Old Man.

Figs. 7–9—“Būstān,” British Museum, Add. 27,262.
Fig. 10—Folio 145r: A Mother Chiding Her Son.

Fig. 11—Folio 152r: Sa'dî Visits the Idol of Sōmnāth.

Fig. 12—Folio 162v: A Rich Man Views the Corpse of His Enemy.

Figs. 10-12—"Būstān," British Museum, Add. 27.262.
Figs. 13 and 14—Folios 6r and 5v: Durbar of Shāh Jahān.

Fig. 15—Folio 15v: Shāh Jahān Seated on a Terrace.

Figs. 10 and 11—Zafar Khan, "Mathnawi.": Folio 114 and 114: A Review of Troops.
Figs. 18 and 19—Zafar Khan, "Mathnavi." Folios 20r and 19v: Zafar Khan in the Company of Poets, Dervishes, and a Painter.
Figs. 20 and 21—Folios 27r and 22v: Zafar Khan's Outdoor Pleasure Party

Fig. 22—Folio 31v.

Figs. 20-22—Zafar Khan, "Mathnavi."
Folio 152 recto (fig. 11), 2.9 by 6.0 inches: "Sa'di's visit to Sømmâth in Gujerat where he saw the ivory image which raised its arms in adoration and on this account was a popular object of pilgrimage and veneration. Spending the night in the temple Sa'di discovers that the miraculous movement is due merely to a mechanical contrivance."  

The shrine is mauve, the gabled outlines of the town across the water are rendered in a pale blue wash, and the distant trees by washes of a pale green with darker shadows.  

Folio 162 verso (fig. 12), 3.2 by 6.1 inches: "A rich man regards the decaying corpse of his former enemy and is filled with pity and remorse for the glee with which he had received the news of his death."  

The treatment of the distant landscape resembles that of the last miniature. The graveyard is a pinkish gray. The figure on the extreme right is in yellow and the interesting one seated toward the background wears a red turban and yellow mantle.  

Folio 168 verso: "The story of Yûsuf and Zoleykhâ."  

The miniatures appear to have been executed by four different hands: the first responsible for the miniature on folio 37 recto; the second for those on folios 40 recto (fig. 7), 52 recto, and 59 verso; the third for those on folios 129 recto (fig. 9), 145 recto (fig. 10), and 168 verso; and the fourth for those on folios 152 recto (fig. 11) and 162 verso (fig. 12). They also fall into two distinct styles; on the one hand the first five miniatures and on the other the second five.  

The first style is archaic and is characterized by bright opaque colors; figures are rather stiff and heads are drawn slightly over-large, reminiscent of the figures in Bokhara manuscripts. The treatment is flat and two-dimensional. Folio 40 recto (fig. 7) is a good example of this style. The faces are carefully modeled and the drawing precise. The composition is more successful than in the others, and the animated group on the left contrasts with the tranquil conversation piece on the right. Features of costume such as the large turbans and the jämeh buttoning down the center are unusual at this period.

The style appears in the double miniature of the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, and perhaps on a more ambitious scale in a miniature in the Victoria and Albert Museum of Nûr Jâhân entertaining Prince Khurram in 1617, which, however, should be regarded as very much later in date. Yet this is a true miniaturist style in contrast to that of the other five paintings. In this second style one has the impression that the artists were more accustomed to painting detached portraits and scenes and as a result were less skilled at reducing their compositions to the scale required in manuscript illustration. They are, in fact, more typical of painting in the Shâh Jâhân period. Evidence of this new style is apparent in the treatment of landscape in folios 152 recto (fig. 11) and 162 verso (fig. 12). The attempt to obtain the effect of distance by gradation of tones was unknown in an earlier period and must certainly derive from a knowledge of European painting. Even in the Jahângîrî period, distant features were indicated by difference in scale and plane. Nor is it surprising that these paintings reflect the influence of portraiture initiated under Jahângîr and developed in the reign of Shâh Jâhân. Apart from the modeling of features there is some attempt at delineating facial expression, most successful in the mother rebuking her son, in folio 145 recto (fig. 10), where the gesture of the hands is matched by the stern expression of

---

18 Ibid., pp. 351–352.  
19 Ibid., pp. 361–362; this folio is reproduced in Wright, op. cit., pl. 50.  
20 See note 9.  
rebuke in the face, the wily dissimulation of Sa'di as he venerates the idol of Sōmnāth, folio 152 recto, fig. 11), and the self-righteous indignation of the old man with raised stick, on folio 129 recto (fig. 9).

Finally, the construction of these paintings is much weaker than those of the preceding period, and the facile grouping of the figures is not compensated by the subtle balance of color which is an important feature of earlier painting. There are singularly few illustrated manuscripts of the reign of Jahāngīr and less of the reign of Shāh Jahān. A manuscript of the Khamseh of Amir Khosrow of Delhi (Or. fol. 1278) in the Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, may be regarded in some respects as transitional between the India Office Leylâ and Majnûn and the British Museum Būstān. It was copied before 1617. The flower-entwined cypressess of folio 34 verso (fig. 3) occur in two of its miniatures where there is a similar rendering of trees, distant landscape, and architecture. The arrangement of two other miniatures, in which divān scenes are portrayed, anticipates that of Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahānī durbar scenes and conversation pictures.

III

The manuscript of the Mathnawi of Zafar Khān in his own autograph, exhibited at the International Exhibition of the Art of India and Pakistan, is in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.

Zafar Khān or, to give him his full title, Zafar Khān Khwājah Aḥsan Allāh, was a prominent noble under Shāh Jahān, and himself a poet. His father Khwājah Abū'īl-Hasan Turbatī, of Persian origin, had come to India during the reign of Akbar and risen high in the service of Jahāngīr, eventually attaining the office of Chief Divān. When in 1624 he was appointed governor of Kabul, his son accompanied him as his deputy, receiving the title Zafar Khān. In 1630 father and son were with the imperialist forces in the Deccan, and in 1632 Khwājah Abū'īl-Hasan received the governorship of Kashmir but on account of his years remained at court and Zafar Khān went as his deputy. On his father's death in Ramazān 1042 H. (1633), Zafar Khān succeeded him as governor of Kashmir where he received the Emperor on his visit to the Punjab and Kashmir in the same year. Except from 1638 to 1642, when he was in disgrace and deprived of his jāgīr, he retained the governorship until the close of Shāh Jahān's reign, finally obtaining the rank of three thousand men and three thousand horse. In 1645 he was again honored with a visit from the Emperor at his garden at Zafarābād. During the war of succession, he supported the cause of Dārā Shikōh and held a command in the imperialist forces. He did not long survive the new reign for he died probably soon after his son's death in 1670 or 1672.

He was small in stature and endowed with a keen intelligence and a shrewd political sense which stood him in good stead during the civil strife of the later years of Shāh Jahān. Unlike

his father, who was a Sunni, he was a confirmed Shi‘ite and this may explain his patronage of Persian men of letters. For Zafar Khan’s main claim to fame is the generosity he extended to the Persian poet Shā‘īb of Tabriz, who repaid him by apostrophizing him in more than one of his verses.27 He also patronized painters, and in a significant passage of his notice on Zafar Khan, Shāh Navaz Khan reports how he had his poets write down a selection of their verses and on the reverse of each page he had his painter illustrate a selected subject.28 This is confirmed by our manuscript, for on folio 11 verso (fig. 19) an artist at work is included at just such a gathering of poets and men of letters.

The manuscript was completed by Zafar Khan himself at Lahore on the 28th Dhul-Hijjah, 1073 H. (August 1, 1663) according to the colophon on folio 122 verso.29 It is written in a neat nasta‘liq and consists of 122 folios measuring 9.8 by 5.5 inches arranged in double columns, and five double-page miniatures.30 There are carefully executed sarlōwās on folios 1 verso, 29 verso, and 30 recto, 31 verso and 32 recto. Most of folios 1 to 44 contain gold marginal decoration of regularly disposed flowers and cloud scrolls: the margins of the remaining folios have outline drawings only and have not been filled in with gold. On folios 29 verso and 30 recto, 31 verso and 32 recto the marginal decoration is more sumptuous and the flowers are painted in colors on a thick gold ground. In folio 31 verso (fig. 22), the tiny cloud scrolls at the top of the page are rendered in blue, purple, and white; the flowers in scarlet, gentian blue, purple, and mauve; foliage and the intervening tufts of grass in a single shade of green with shadowed outlines.

Folios 5 verso (fig. 14) and 6 recto (fig. 13): “Durbar of Shāh Jahān.”

Shāh Jahān with graying beard seated on a throne under a šāmâyāneh wears a gold-brocaded orange jāmeh. On his right Dārā Shikōh and on his left, in order of age, Shoja’, Awrangzib, and Morād Bakhsh. Four courtiers stand facing them.

The scene is on a terrace looking over a river on the opposite bank of which extends a walled city. The sky is red and gold with massed clouds.

Shāh Jahān is portrayed in his middle years, about the age of fifty, that is, about 1642.31 Dārā Shikōh who wears a gold-brocaded mauve jāmeh would have been twenty-eight in 1642.32

The three younger princes are seated according to their ages: Shoja’ wears a gold-brocaded russet jāmeh, Awrangzib a brocaded lilac jāmeh, and Morād Bakhsh a gold-brocaded

29 There is also an undated autographed manuscript of Zafar Khan in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore (Maulavi Abdul Muqaddir, Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore, vol. 3, Calcutta, 1912, No. 329, pp. 117–120). This contains the second divān of Zafar Khan composed in 1053 H. (1643). In his preface, the author enumerates some of the poets whom he assembled around him in Kashmir; and among these, was Mowlana Heydar Muhammad Khisâlî from whom he learnt the art of calligraphy. When Zafar Khan was appointed to deputize for his father in Kashmir, this same Heydar Muhammad Khisâlî was made divân of Kashmir (The Badshah-Namah by ‘Abd al-Hamid Lahawri, ed. Mawlawis Kabir al-Din Ahmad and Abd al-Rahim, Bibliotheca Indica, new series, No. 56, Calcutta, 1867, vol. 1, p. 432.
30 The miniatures on folios 22 verso (fig. 21) and 27 recto (fig. 20) form one single composition and at some time have been incorrectly bound in their present state.
31 In most surviving portraits he is shown either older or younger than this. Thus in the portrait of Baron Maurice de Rothschild, he is distinctly older (I. Stchoukine, Portraits moghols IV, Revue des Arts Asiatiques, Paris, vol. 9 (1935), pl. 70, fig. 8).
32 Cf. the portrait by Anüpchatar in the India Office Library (Laurence Binyon and Sir Thomas Arnold, The court painters of the Grand Moguls, Oxford, 1921, pl. 10) and the portraits of Dārā Shikōh, and dervishes in the Golestān moraqqā’ (Y. Godard, Un album de portraits des Princes Timarides de l’Inde, Athar-e-Iran, vol. 2 [1937], figs. 72 and 72bis). In all three portraits he is shown at about the same age.
white jâmeh. Their ages at this date would have been twenty-six, twenty-four, and eighteen respectively.\(^{33}\)

The identification of the four courtiers in folio 6 recto (fig. 13) presents certain difficulties. The figure on the right with graying beard and wearing a yellow jâmeh and a curious scarf of silver brocade which falls from either shoulder like a stole is probably Āsaf Khân. Similar features occur in a Durbar scene of Shâh Jahân sold at Bernard Quaritch's in 1932 and in which the figure in the top left corner is identified as Āsaf Khân.\(^{34}\) The inclusion of Āsaf Khân known as I'timâd al-Dawlah, father-in-law of the Emperor and grandfather of the princes, would certainly not be inappropriate in a scene such as this.

Immediately behind this figure is Khwâjah Abû'l-Hasan wearing a green jâmeh. As mentioned above, he died in 1632–33 and the reason for including him in the group would be his relationship to the author of the book.\(^{35}\)

\(^{33}\) Cf. the portrait of the three younger sons of Shâh Jahân by Bâlgand in the Victoria and Albert Museum (1. Stchoukine, La peinture indienne à l'époque des Grands Moghols, Paris, 1929, pl. 40); the portrait of Shojâ in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (Percy Brown, Indian painting under the Mughals, A.D. 1550–1750, Oxford, 1924, pl. 64); and the portrait of Morâd Bakhsh in the former R. M. Rieffstahl Collection (Ph. Walter Schultz, Die persisch-islamische Miniaturmalerei, Leipzig, 1914, vol. 2, pl. 180).

\(^{34}\) Sale Catalogue No. 462 (1932), Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., London, No. 1198, with photographic reproduction. The known portraits of Āsaf Khân show considerable differences in physiognomy; in several he is portrayed beardless but with mustache. The portrait by Manôhar in the Golistân moraqqa' (Godard, op. cit., fig. 80) is of the youthful Āsaf Khân in which features similar to those of the portrait under discussion may be detected. Similar features occur also in a drawing in the British Museum (G. Marteu et H. Vever, Miniatures persanes, Paris, 1913, vol. 2, pl. 161, No. 229, the figure immediately below the courtier making his obeisance to Shâh Jahân).

\(^{35}\) Cf. the portrait in the Louvre by Hâshim (Stchoukine, op. cit., pl. 31, and Les miniatures indiennes de l'époque des Grands Moghols au Musée du Louvre, Paris, 1929, No. 39, p. 31). There is a copy of this portrait in the British Museum. He also appears in the unfinished durbar scene by Anûpchatar in the British Museum (Binyon and Arnold, op. cit., pl. 20, key No. 7).

The two other figures do not occur, as far as the present writer is aware, in any other paintings of the period. As they appear in each of the five portrait groups of the manuscript it is perhaps permissible to assume that they are the two sons of Khwâjah Abû'l-Hasan, Zâfar Khân in a brocaded jâmeh standing immediately behind his father, and his brother Mirzâ Khoshâd Na'azar in a yellow brocaded jâmeh.

The setting of this scene is doubtless the banks of the Jumna with the distant prospect of the Emperor's new city Shâhjahânâbâd on its western bank.

Folios 11 verso (fig. 17) and 12 recto (fig. 16): “A review of troops.”

In the lower foreground the quarters of a town behind which runs a river crossed by a wooden bridge. On each side of this bridge are two state barges with draped canopies toward the prows and paired oarsmen plying wooden paddles amidships.

On the opposite bank horsemen are drawn up, each attended by a sâ'is and in front and facing these, Zâfar Khân mounted on a dappled charger and spear in hand; by his side Khoshâd Na'azar on a gray mount. Both are preceded by five standard bearers who carry triangular pennons displaying a gold dragon on a green ground and scarlet border. Five others bear yaks' tails. In the train of Zâfar Khân are mounted bandsmen and attendants and drummers mounted on elephants. In the background is a group of musicians and male and female dancers.

Folios 15 verso (fig. 15) and 16 recto:

In folio 15 verso (fig. 15) Shâh Jahân seated on a terrace with Dârâ Shikôh and Āsaf Khân; in folio 16 recto, five standing courtiers including the two who appear in folio 6 recto (fig. 13) behind Khwâjah Abûl-Hasan and three others unidentified. In the background a canal
flanked by parterres and trees flows through a pavilion and cascades into a tank below the terrace. Hills and snow-covered mountains in the distance.

The main interest of this miniature is the representation of a Mughal garden, probably the Shāh-lmār Bāgh on the Dal Lake in Kashmir.

Folios 19 verso (fig. 19) and 20 recto (fig. 18):

Zafar Khān seated in the company of poets, dervishes, and a painter. Zafar Khān converses with a mollā who wears a white and mauve striped jāmeh. Particularly interesting is the figure in the lower left corner of folio 19 verso of a painter engaged in drawing a portrait. The group in folio 20 recto includes a dervish who holds a rosary in his hand; next to him a scribe with qalam and paper in his hand and a qalam-dān on the ground beside him. The figure in the top left wears a crimson scarf and a flat turban. The dark cast of his bearded features suggests a south Indian origin. The instruments of the musicians are recognizable as the qānūn or trapezoidal zither, the mızhar or frame drum cymbal, the vīnā or lute, the kāmāncheh or spiked fiddle, and the nāy or reed pipe.

Folios 25 verso and 26 recto:

Shāh Jahān, Dārā Shīkōh, Āsaf Khān and four nobles on a terrace overlooking a tank surrounded by an arcade. The grouping is the same as in folios 15 verso and 16 recto except that here the right-hand figure of folio 16 is omitted. The landscape is composed of a thickly wooded hill rendered impressionistically.

Folios 22 verso (fig. 21) and 27 recto (fig. 20).

Zafar Khān, wearing a muslin jāmeh and green shalvār and reclining on a brocaded cushion, and Khorshīd Naẓār, in muslin jāmeh and orange shalvār, beside a stream. In front of them sits a bearer with a gold-mounted nargīleh. The group on the left consists of attendants seated round a pot over a fire and a cook kneading dough in a flat dish. Of the three musicians the lute player is repeated from folio 20 recto; in both miniatures he is portrayed with the same distinctive eyebrows. The execution of the landscape is rather summary; grass is rendered by fine shading and the rocky crags in the distance by various shades of brown tending to pink and in some parts green.

The Zafar Khān manuscript is a personal record of the life of a cultured amīr in the reign of Shāh Jahān. There is the slenderest connection between miniature and verse. The durbar scene of folios 5 verso and 6 recto (figs. 14 and 13) stands alongside a panegyric on Shāh Jahān. Other poems describe the beauties of spring in Kashmir and of the author’s garden at Zafarābād. The artist of the durbar scene was evidently an accomplished portraitist and probably acquainted with the features of the Emperor and his sons. Perhaps he is most successful in his vivid portrayal of Zafar Khān and his circle of friends on folios 19 verso and 20 recto (figs. 19 and 18), a portrait group freer and less formal than the durbar scenes of the period but lacking the intimacy of the conversation pieces so popular in the Shāh Jahānī period. As a portraitist he certainly lacks the subtler perception of his contemporaries like Hunhar and Nādīr al-Samargandi. In his landscapes he reveals himself as a careful, if uninspired observer of nature.

The scene of the review of troops in Kashmir on folios 11 verso and 12 recto (figs. 17 and 16) is an attempt to revert to the large-scale treatment of the Akbarī period. A more spectacular example is the illustrated Shāh Jahān-nāmeh in the Royal Collection at Windsor. Nevertheless, there could be no greater difference in style and treatment, especially as regards composition. The rather rigid and symmetrical arrangement of the Shāh Jahānī picture into monotonous verticals and horizontals affords a striking contrast to the easy rhythm of the Akbarī composition.

More interesting is the scene on folios 22 recto and 27 recto (figs. 21 and 20), which, in spite of the rather weak handling of the land-
scape and a stiffness in the drawing of the figures, achieves an atmosphere of intimacy. Similar treatment and subject occurs in a fragment in the Faketinzimmer in the Schönbrunn Palace, where two huntsmen are seated under trees listening to a musician.37

The miniatures described above were produced during a period when the detached picture was gradually displacing the manuscript miniature. With the passing of a genuine miniature style, artists adapted the current style to the requirements of the manuscript by reduction in scale or by attempting to revive an earlier style which often results in an archaistic appearance.

The India Office Leylâ and Majnûn manuscript is still in the main line of tradition; but in the British Museum manuscript of the Bûstân, five of the ten miniatures are the work of artists more accustomed to the medium of the detached painting. And yet the remainder of the miniatures in that manuscript are treated in a true miniaturist style which for that very reason reveals an archaizing tendency. Finally, in the Royal Asiatic Society manuscript of the Mathnâvî of Šâfar Khân, the treatment and sub-


ject matter of the paintings are far more appropriate to the detached picture. There is, in fact, only one genuine miniature, i.e., the "Review of Troops in Kashmir," and in this the artist has had recourse to the earlier tradition of the Akbari historical manuscripts.

It would seem that the better artists were not prepared to produce manuscript miniatures and that for this reason the latter are not the most representative examples of contemporary painting.

It is outside the scope of this article to discuss the stages in the dissolution of Mughal painting which set in under Awrangzib. No doubt the withdrawal of imperial patronage and the increasing disintegration of the Mughal empire with the deteriorating social conditions were decisive factors. Mughal painting of the eighteenth century is for the most part academic and lacking in inspiration. Originality and vitality had already passed to the schools of the Hills and the Plains.38

38 Grateful acknowledgements are due the Trustees of the British Museum; the Librarian, the India Office Library, Commonwealth Relations Office, London; the President and Council of the Royal Asiatic Society for permission to reproduce manuscripts in their charge; and Mr. Basil Gray, Keeper of the Department of Oriental Antiquities in the British Museum, and Mrs. Emmy Wellesz for advice and criticism.
AN INDIAN MANUSCRIPT OF THE GOLESTĀN OF 
THE SHĀH JAHĀN PERIOD

BY J. V. S. WILKINSON*

In the Chester Beatty Library is an illustrated manuscript of Sa’dī’s Golestān dating from the beginning of Shāh Jahān’s reign which is slightly older than the Būstān, now in the British Museum, described elsewhere in this volume by R. Pinder-Wilson.1 Both were written at Agra by the same scribe, and they are separated in time by less than a year, the Golestān being dated Jumādā I, 1038 H. (December 1628–January 1629), and the Būstān, Rabi’ I, 1039 H. (October–November 1629). There are similarities in the shape and arrangement of the miniatures, and in the ornamentation of the text. The two form, in fact, a pair, containing Sa’dī’s two best-known works.

Jahāngīr had died in October 1627, and Shāh Jahān ascended the throne in 1628. The Golestān must, therefore, be one of the earliest illustrated manuscripts of his reign. As a matter of fact, “Shāh Jahān” illustrated manuscripts are extremely rare, as indeed are those of Jahāngīr’s reign, in comparison with the large number which have survived from that of Akbar.

The history of both manuscripts is of unusual interest. That of the Būstān, which was acquired in 1820 by Sir John Malcolm, is noticed by Mr. Pinder-Wilson. There is no evidence of the Golestān having witnessed so tragic a story, as it was sent by the Emperor as a gift to the “King of England” (i.e., Charles I) in 1048 H. (1638), and apparently remained in the Royal collection for nearly 200 years, before being presented by George IV in 1826, freshly bound in a sumptuous manner, to Fath ‘Ali Shāh, King of Persia. Some indication of its later history is afforded by the inscriptions which are described below.

The Golestān measures 35.1×26.5 cm. The written surface varies slightly from 24–25×14.5–15 cm. There are 119 folios, 12 lines to the page. Certain details of the scribe, who signs himself Ḩakīm Rokn al-Dīn Maṣʿūd, known as Ḥakīm Roknā, are available.2 He began his career as a poet at the court of ‘Abbās I, went to India in Akbar’s reign, and became one of Shāh Jahān’s favorite poets. Later he returned to Persia where he died. Shāh Jahān in the inscription in this manuscript refers to him as Nādir al-Zamān, which testifies to the high estimation in which he was held by the Emperor. Ḥakīm Roknā gives a specimen of his poetry just before the colophon (fig. 1) in two stanzas boasting that his fame as a calligrapher will survive his death. His writing is a large clear nasta’līq, and the script throughout is on cloud forms on a gold ground written within blue, red, and gold rules. The light-brown polished paper is firm and thick; the margins are of different paper, polished and of an ivory tone, sprinkled with gold. It is possible, from the analogy of the British Museum Būstān, that the original margins were filled with gold designs. Certainly the manuscript may well have been remargined at some time. At any rate the book was probably regarded as of high quality, worthy of presentation to the King of England, and inscribed by the Emperor himself.

The manuscript contains the following inscriptions:

1 (fig. 2). On folio 118 v., on the back of the colophon page, is a note, apparently in the hand

* The sad news of Mr. Wilkinson’s death in Dublin on January 28, 1957, after a short illness, was received before this volume went to press. An obituary will appear in the next volume. — Ed.

1 Three illustrated manuscripts of the Mughal period, Ars Orientalis, vol. 2 (1957), pp. 413–422.

of the Emperor Shāh Jahān, stating that “on the 17th of the month of Safar of the year 11, corresponding to the year 1048 of the Hijrah, this exquisite Golestân, resembling the Garden of Eden, and in the writing of the Nādir of the time, Mawlānā Ḥakīm Roknā, I have sent as a gift to the glorious and exalted King of England. Written by Shihāb al-Dīn Muhammad Shāh Jahān Padīshāh, son of Nār al-Dīn Jahāngīr Padīshāh, son of Jalāl al-Dīn Akbar Padīshāh."

2 (fig. 3). On folio 1 v., on paper similar to that of the margins, is an inscription stating that “as ordered by his Majesty, Fath 'Ali Shāh, this Golestân, written in India, was brought as a gift by a special envoy from the glorious George, King of England, and has been placed by Muhammad Ḥoseyn Khān Nezām al-Dowleh in the Royal Library among the special royal books. Written in Jumādā II, 1242 A. H. (i.e., January 1827)."

3 (fig. 4). Folio 2 contains a note that “this book of the Golestân has been entered in the year 1259 in the Library of the Nawāb Bahman Mīrzā, elder son of the late Crown Prince 'Abbās Mīrzā.” Above this is a seal reading “the unique gem, the royal pearl Bahman Bāy,” with a date which is apparently 1240 H. (1824–25). The date is presumably that on which the seal was made.

4. On folio 119, on paper similar to that of the margins, is a note that Bahman Mīrzā, son of Nāʾīb al-Saltāneh, governor of Azerbaijan, died in the night of Sunday, 25 Rabīʿ II, 1301, corresponding to the February 11, 1884, at the age of 78. This calculation seems to be incorrect by 12 days.

The binding is a very grandiose affair, as might be expected from the donor. It is of red velvet, thickly incrusted with embroidery. In the center are George IV’s initials and a crown embroidered in gold and colored thread; at the corners are the emblems of the British Isles, and there is a well-constructed border of rose, thistle, and shamrock.

Miniatures, as already noted, are very rare as illustrations of manuscripts of this period, and those of this Golestân are of a fairly simple type, hardly comparable to the illustrations in the much more ambitious and considerably later Shāh Jahān-nāmehe of 1067/1657 belonging to Her Majesty the Queen.3

Shāh Jahān’s attitude to fine manuscripts and miniatures is not quite clear. As noted many years ago by Sir Thomas Arnold, we have it on the evidence of Sir Thomas Roe that the Emperor as a young man was attracted by English miniatures, and he appears to have inscribed some of his father’s fine manuscripts on the actual day of his accession with notes that they had been taken into his library. Moreover, the considerable number of splendid court portraits and durbar scenes of his reign testify to the continuation of his patronage. Sir Thomas Arnold, however, has pointed out that there is at least negative evidence that the Emperor’s painting establishment was considerably diminished in the fact that, though some noted painters continued to work for him, relatively few names survive, while none of the official court chroniclers of the reign gives any account of them. Manohar, one of the greatest, seems to have deserted the court atelier and taken service under Dārā Shikōh.4

There is a well-executed ‘onvān on folio 2 v. mainly notable for the two birds incorporated in the ornamental scheme. The nine miniatures (of which all but two have been separately mounted) are all set in plain rectangles, varying in size, extending right across the text area, with no interplay, such as one finds in certain earlier illustrated manuscripts, between text and miniatures.

The subjects of the illustrations are as follows:

1 (fig. 3). Folio 14. A minister pleading before a King to spare the life of a boy who has been captured among a band of Arab brigands.

---


Fig. 1—Colophon on Folio 118.

Fig. 2—Shāh Jahān’s Entry on Folio 118 v.

Figs. 1 and 2—Golestān, Agra, 1038/1629. Dublin, Chester Beatty Library.
Fig. 3—Fol. 1 v, Entry Pertaining to Fath 'Alî Shâh.

Fig. 4—Fol. 2, Entry Pertaining to Nawâb Bahman Mirzâ.

Figs. 3 and 4—Golestân, 1038/1629. Chester Beatty Library.
Fig. 5—Fol. 14, The Minister's Plea.

Fig. 6—Fol. 17 v. The Cure of the Slave.
Figs. 5 and 6—Golestan, 1038/1629, Chester Beatty Library.
Fig. 7—Fol. 27, The King's Illness and Cure.

Fig. 8—Fol. 30 v, The Defeat of the Boastful Wrestler.

Figs. 7 and 8—Golestan, 1038/1629. Chester Beatty Library.
Fig. 9—Fol. 46, The Devotee's Fall from His Camel.

Fig. 10—Fol. 50, The Depraved Hermit.

Fig. 11—Fol. 85, Sa'dî Refreshed by a Damsel.

Figs. 9-11—Golestan, 1038/1629. Chester Beatty Library.
Fig. 12—Fol. 72, The Stranding of the Unpopular Youth.

Fig. 13—Fol. 90, The King and Drunken Qāzi.

Figs. 12 and 13—Goestān, 1038/1629. Chester Beatty Library.
2 (fig. 6). Folio 17 v. A Persian slave who was terrified of the sea was thrown into the water on the advice of a philosopher and pulled out by the hair to cure him, on the principle that until a misfortune is suffered, the benefit of immunity from danger is not appreciated.

3 (fig. 7). Folio 27. For a King who is sick, there is prescribed, to save his life, the bile of a boy, to obtain which would entail the boy's death. The King, however, spares him. (He subsequently recovers.)

4 (fig. 8). Folio 30 v. A conceited pupil who boasted that he could defeat his wrestling master is overthrown by the master.

5 (fig. 9). Folio 46. On a pilgrimage of dervishes to the Hejaz a camel of a hostile devotee, excited by a boy's ecstatic song, throws his rider.

6 (fig. 10). Folio 50. A hermit, spoiled by luxury, visited by a King, who finds him reclining among young companions.

7 (fig. 11). Folio 85. Sa'di, overcome by the heat, is brought a cup of water by a damsels.

8 (fig. 12). Folio 72. A young man who has made himself unpopular on a journey by water is left standing on a pillar, having been persuaded by a trick to leave the boat.

9 (fig. 13). Folio 90. A King discovers a qāzī in a drunken sleep after a night of debauchery with a farrier's son. The sequel is amusing. The King wakes the qāzī, telling him the sun has risen, whereupon the qāzī asks, "From what quarter?" "Why, the East." "Then the gate of repentance is still open, according to the Tradition that it shall not be shut upon God's servants until it shall rise in the West." The qāzī is eventually pardoned, after another dexterous retort.

The general character of the miniatures is apparent from the reproductions. At first sight they give the impression that they may be later, perhaps by as much as 20 years, than the date of the MS. They are at all events characteristic of a period in which the Persian influence, so obvious in some of the painting of the previous reign, was being more and more discarded, to the disadvantage, on the whole, of compositional quality, but with certain compensations. One would imagine that the artist (or probably there were two artists) was by inclination a portraitist. Many of the faces are beautifully drawn in the best style of Mughal portraiture, as in figures 10, 11, and 13, where different attitudes are also well expressed. The female figures are well delineated. The colors are mellow, varied, and well applied; the palette is a rather sober one except for the orange red, which is a noticeable characteristic of the miniatures. Backgrounds in particular are usually rather somber. Static compositions are dictated by most of the subjects chosen, but when stress and movement are attempted the result is not very successful. Compare, for instance, the method of depicting the incident of figure 6 with the rather earlier parallel in the miniature belonging to the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore. There is some attempt at animation in figures 8, 9, and 10.

The detail is sometimes very well and minutely executed, as in figure 13 with its wall paintings of deer in the landscape and the floral ornament (unfortunately not very clear in the reproduction).

* The art of India and Pakistan, pl. 133.
THE FIRST GOLDEN AGE OFUDAIPUR:
RAJPUT ART IN MEWAR DURING THE PERIOD OF
MUGHAL SUPREMACY*

BY H. GOETZ

Of all Rajputana states, Mewar has had the most checkered history. Successively its rânâs have been the overlords of all Rajputana, or have been hunted through the jungles as outlaws. Rânâ Kumbha (1433-67) and Rânâ Sangrâm (Sângâ, 1508-28) expanded their kingdom from Ajmer and even Bayâna down to central Mâlwa and northern Gujarât and, as champions of the Hindu cause against the Muslims, could claim the loyalty by most other Rajput princes, of Mârâwâr, Amber, Gwâlior, Râisîn, Bûndî, Chanderi, Sirohî, Īdar, etc., and through the latter also of Bîkâner and Jaisâlmer. Later, during the persecutions by the Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb (1659-1707), Râj Singh (1652-81) and Jai Singh (1681-98) became the leaders of Rajput resistance. But other rulers estranged their contemporaries by their boundless arrogance and capriciousness, and the Mughal emperors therefore did not find it difficult to play out the other states against Mewar. During the reigns of Akbar (1556-1604) and Jahângîr (1604-27), when a tolerant policy allied Amber-Ajipur, Bîkâner, Jodhpur, Bûndî, and Bundelkhand to the imperial cause, the situation of Udaí Singh (1537-72), Partâp Singh (1572-97), and Amâr Singh I (1597-1620) grew more and more desperate until submission was the only alternative to extinction.

As a result, the art of Mewâr (see map) has been the most erratic in Rajputana, alternatingly blooming in glory and then being extinguished, only to be revived again with the help of imports from the rest of Rajputana.

For almost a millennia and a half Chitorgarh (Chitrâkûta) had been the capital and the cultural center of Mewâr. It was already well known to the Chinese pilgrim Hui-an-Tsang (seventh century), but scattered earlier vestiges (late “Kushana” and Gupta sculptures) can still be traced in and around Chitorgarh, Arh, and at Nagari, as well as in the post-Gupta substructure of the Kumbhâsâyam (Vrijî) Temple. Lost by the Mauryas early in the eighth century, it became the capital of the Guhîlots (Sisodias), whose rânâs since then have been the rulers of the country. In the Middle Ages Mewâr must have flourished, though its suzerainty was disputed between the Solankîs of Gujarât and the Chaulâns of Ajmer-Sâmbhar. At Chitorgarh many temples rebuilt since the fifteenth century go back to the eighth-twelfth centuries. Other less splendid temples are at Arh, Nâgdâ, Eklîngî, Baroli, Jâhâzpur, Lahari, Dhod-Anwâlda, Begûn, Menâl, Rakâbdev, Râmpura, Murâkuro, Abîsâ, Gadbor, Bhainsorgarh, Bijoli, etc. After the Muslim conquest the Aravalli mountains became a rampart of Hindu resistance and the Guhîlots started the reconstruction of Chitorgarh already in the thirteenth century. The capture of this strong fortress—indeed a whole fortified mountain—by Sultan ‘Alâ-al-Dîn Khîlji in 1303 proved no more than a temporary setback, and in the fifteenth century Chitorgarh developed into the most splendid capital of Râjâsthân, especially under the Rânâs Mokal (1397-1433) and Kumbha (1433-68).

Even today the ruins of the immense palace of Rânâ Kumbha (fig. 1), of the mansions of his principal nobles, of the Kumbha-Meru (“Tower of Victory”), the Kumbhâsâyam, Mrâ Bai’s, the Samîddhîsâvar, Kâlikâ, Ratnesâvar, Khudkudi, and other temples, of the Mahâsâtî,

* All illustrations are made from photographs taken by the author, with the exception of figures 19-21, which are from the Baroda Museum.
and of many tanks impress the visitor by their grand conception and richness of execution. And so do the innumerable fortresses, temples, and palaces erected in that time all over Mewār, and down to Gujarāt and Mount Ābhī (especially Kumbhalner, Ranpur (Ranakpur), the later temples at Dīwārī, etc.). It is a curious art, eclectic and academic, yet most harmonious in the ultimate result. Religious art imitated to perfection the glorious monuments of the pre-Muslim Middle Ages, and only a careful inspection reveals that it had been the product not of an uninterrupted, living tradition, but of a conscious renaissance. Secular architecture made free use of contemporary Muslim concepts, especially of keel arches, vaults, domes, encaustic tiles, and cut stucco decorations; but it blended them with simplified Hindu forms, columns, niches, trabeat lintels, brackets, door and window pediments, balconies, jālīs, etc., and planned them in a very different, asymmetrical system.

Painting and the industrial arts must have flourished no less lavishly, but no vestiges have been discovered. Most of them were probably destroyed in the two conquests of the city, first by Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt in 1533-35, and then by the Mughal Emperor Akbar in 1567-68, when the palaces went up in flames, when the Rajput soldiers perished in a last desperate fight (and their ladies in the “Jauhar”), when the town was looted, and the civil population massacred. The ravages of the subsequent guerilla war over almost half a century must have done the rest. As most of the old aristocratic collections in Rājasthān have not yet been explored, it is quite possible that some day the missing evidence will come to light. From the general character of Chitorgarh art, however, we may surmise that the “Jain” painting style, sometimes mixed with Muslim motifs, which we know from a number of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts, also must have been common there. Probably it developed into the Rajput style proper, not at Chitorgarh, but in northern Rajputana. For this much is at present certain:

(1) that the characteristic features of Rajput painting are already evident in the reliefs of the warrior memorial stones of the twelfth to fifteenth centuries; (2) that already in the palace of Mān Singh Tomār (1486-1516) of Gwālior (a vassal of Rānā Sāṅgā of Mewār) there are figural jālīs and tile mosaics of decidedly Rajput character; (3) that a sort of “Rajput” style apparently was known in Bengal already in 1539 (see the Assamese Chitra-Bhāgavata, Śaka-Samvat 1461-1539, published in 1550 by Harinarayan Dattabaruva); (4) that the famous “Bundela” Rāgmālās (discovered by Coomaraswamy) have been attributed, for strong reasons, to the reign of Madhukar Shāh of Orchhā (1554-92; (5) that Rajput style elements turn up in Mughal painting about 1580; (6) that reliefs in the purest Rajput style have been traced at Amber (ca. 1560 et seq.) and Brindābān (1590), Nūrpur (before 1613), and Dātiā (before 1627); and (7) that extensive murals of the reign of Mān Singh of Amber (1562/89-1611) have been discovered at Bairāt (A.D. 1586/87) and of Bir Singh Deo (1604-27) at Orchhā.

In Mewār the clash with the Mughal Empire brought about a complete collapse of artistic activities. Already after the death of Rānā Sāṅgā (1528) the decline had set in. Dissension and civil strife were not favorable to the erection of new structures, and such buildings as we know, e.g., Ratan Singh’s palace, merely repeat the already established pattern, slightly modified if not even impoverished. But in spite of all

2 A. K. Coomaraswamy, Rajput painting, Oxford, 1916. In the catalogue of the Boston Museum, Coomaraswamy changed his opinion for a later date, but in view of the murals at Orchhā, Bairāt, and Dātiā, as well as of the Rasikapriyā leaves published by him (Catalogue of the Indian Collections, Cambridge, 1930, pt. 6, Mughal paintings, pls. 8-19), such a later date is out of the question.
Mewar and Surrounding Rajputana States.

- Muslim centers.
- Under control of Mahārāna Kumbha.
- Under control of Mahārāna Sāngā.

Present frontiers of Mewār (adjusted on Mālwa side).
Most contracted frontier in Mughal times.
Rajput fiefs created by Shāh Jahān and Awrangzēb in order to keep Mewār in check.

With the exception of Mewār proper, no frontier lines are given because, under the then existing feudal system, control over the vassals was loose and intermittent and the frontiers of all states were very fluid.
these qualifications it still was a fine and impressive art. Then the great disaster followed. The fall of Chitorgarh (1567/8) proved to be also the end of its art; there does not exist any later vestige of its rich architecture, its lavish sculpture, or its beautiful decoration. Rānā Udai Singh had fled into the Girwa, the vast “circular” valley to the west, a natural fortress the access to which could easily be defended. Here a rich Bāñjara merchant had already constructed the present Pichola Lake a century before, in the reign of Rānā Lākha (= Laksha Singh, 1382-97). Udai Singh had loved the valley and laid out another lake, the Udai Sāgar, as early as 1559-60. After the fall of Chitorgarh he started to build a new capital on the Pichola Lake. But this early architecture of Udaipur is miserable enough; indeed it is in the plainest and clumsiest provincial style imaginable. Nevertheless, vestiges of it still exist, i.e., the Rāi Angam Court (1571), the Nauchaukī and the northern substructures of the great palace (fig. 3) on the ridge overlooking the Pichola Lake, the arcades of the adjoining bazar (fig. 2), and the Udaiśyām Temple (fig. 5) on a peninsula opposite Udaipur Town, beyond the northern branch of the Pichola extending to the Sarüp Sāgar. Probably the Ambā Māṭa Temple at Baramati and the Sarneswar north of Udaipur also belong to this same period.

But even that poor art was condemned to sterility, for after Udai Singh’s death in 1572, Rānā Partāp resumed the war against the overwhelming might of the Mughal Empire and the plains were laid waste by a systematic “scorched earth” policy. After the disastrous defeat of Haldighāt in 1576, the Girwa could not be held and Udaipur fell into the hands of the imperialists. After the fall of Kumbhalner, Partāp was no more than an outlaw, hunted from hiding place to hiding place, in rags, and starving. In 1586 he almost submitted, but the Emperor, occupied elsewhere, abandoned the manhunt, and so Partāp Singh could recover. After his death in 1597, his son Amar Singh I began to reorganize the ruins of his rāj; but Emperor Jahāngīr overran Mewār again in 1608 and set up a counter rānā, Sāgār, at Chitorgarh. Amar Singh’s reconquest of Chitorgarh led to another war, and after the battle of Khāmnor, with starvation and death staring at him and his people as the last alternative, the rānā was forced to submit to Prince Khurram in 1614. Emperor Jahāngīr was wise enough to take the sting out of this submission by not demanding Sisodia princesses for his zenāna, or vassal service from the ruling prince. It was merely the heir apparent who, with his troops, had to follow the Mughal banners.

For art this submission meant a renascence. Peace meant reconstruction and prosperity, and also competition with the other Rajput princes in all matters of pomp and representation. All around Mewār the Rajput courts in the service of the Grand Mughal had grown in wealth and splendor, with the booty amassed in the imperial wars. Especially Amber, once a ridiculous little state, under Mān Singh (1589-1614) controlled the whole of eastern India, Bihār, Bengal, Orissā, and after a short eclipse became prominent again under Jai Singh I, the “Mīrzā Rājā” (1625-67). Bīkāner followed under Rāi Singhji (1571-1611); then Jodhpur, under Sur Singh (1595-1620) and Gaj Singh (1620-38), was soon to bring forth the great Jaswant Singh (1638-78); and finally Bundelkhand under Bīr Singh Deo of Orchhā (1605-27) and Būndi under its rāos Sūrjan, Ratan, Chhattarsāl, and Bhāo Singh. All these princes laid out beautiful capitals, constructed fortresses, built palaces, gardens, and temples, employed painters, poets, and scholars, and encouraged art industries. Whereas Mewār had become a desolate desert, all around Rajput art had blossomed into a wonderful flower, indeed had already passed its zenith. For with Mughal rule firmly established, Mughal culture began to dictate the fashion. In those very years when Rānā Amar Singh was forced to submit to what seemed an inescapable destiny, Mughal art started to invade the Rajput
courts and to replace the Rajput style which had developed in the course of the sixteenth century. The rānās of Udaipur who had to revive the art of Mewār from scratch, could, therefore, have recourse to this older art style which then was being discarded by the already established Rajput courts.

Rānā Amar Singh I (1597–1620) could no longer do very much. That early in his reign, before the resumption of the Mughal war, an effort had been made to revive art activities is shown by the stepwell inscription of 1598 at Nādol in Desārī and by some temples in the oldest quarters of Udaipur Town. In his last years he built the Bārī-Pol (Great Gate) of the present vast palace (more or less an imitation of the Chitorgarh gates) and a small palace on the Pichola Lake, the Amar Mahāl, which Tod describes as of “Gothic quaintness” and the Badal Mahāl (now included in the Rāwala, i.e., the ladies’ quarter). But after his submission, which left him broken, he is said to have preferred a life in retirement in the Nauchauki. Whether his portrait in the company of his sons (Udaipur Palace Collection), which was exhibited in the London Exhibition of 1947–48, was actually painted in 1610, seems doubtful to me. It is possible that after the recapture of Chitorgarh some foreign artist was invited to commemorate that event; but the general situation of the time makes it appear unlikely that any such work originated before the surrender to Sultan Khurram in 1614, or that the picture can be interpreted as evidence of a well-established local school.

It was under his successor, Karan Singh (1620–28), that the art renaissance first really set in. Karan Singh had stayed much in the Mughal camp, was a friend of Sultan Khurram and of many of the leading Rajput princes at the Mughal court. He was also well acquainted with Mughal art, and his portrait was made by Mughal painters more than once. Karan Singh further enlarged the Pichola Lake by again raising its dam. He enclosed Udaipur Town with its present ring of fortifications, and its gates surely are among the finest in Rajputana. He enlarged the old palace into a building worthy of his status. Quite a series of representation rooms and halls were laid out, the Ganesh Deori (Inner Gate), the Mānak Mahāl, the Khūsh Mahāl, and the Karan Vilās (fig. 4). For the ladies there arose the gigantic block of the Rāwala (fig. 7) with its many towers and trellis-encased balconies. He also began the beautiful Jag-Mandir palace on an island in the Pichola Lake, named after his son and heir apparent, Jagat Singh I, who probably completed it. This palace has become famous as the residence of Prince Khurram, who stayed there as a refugee before he could ascend the throne of the Grand Mughals only a few months before Karan Singh’s death. The open hall on the northwestern shore of the island still has a most archaic appearance; its pillars resemble those of the Āḍināṭha Jain Temple at Dūhwārā, which by an obscure tradition is attributed to Rānā Pratāp, who had not been in a position to endow such a shrine, whereas Rānā Karan might well have done so. The latter founded also the royal cemetery (Mahāsatī) at Arh (fig. 13) by erecting the fine mausoleum for his father, Amar Singh I (in the northern group; fig. 6), a domed, open hall of cross-shaped ground plan enclosing a four-faced linga (modeled on that of Holy Eklīngjī), and a satī stone.

Of other arts of his time so far we know nothing, but taking all the circumstances into account, it is probable that the style of painting that flourished under his successor may in fact go back to his own reign, especially the group portraits showing Amar Singh or Karan Singh paying their respects to Shāh Jahān. Although the preserved versions are later, he alone could boast of a friendship with the Emperor justifying and excusing such a scene.

Compared with the few remnants of Amar Singh I’s time, the art of Karan Singh repre-
sents enormous progress. It is harmonious and well balanced, elegant and beautifully ornamented; but compared with the rest of contemporary Rajput architecture, it is amazingly archaic and provincial. The same style of architecture was used at Amber and Bikaner in the last decades of the sixteenth century, and at Jodhpur and Bundi early in the seventeenth century. As it was in those very years when Karan Singh started building that the other courts adopted the Mughal style of the earlier reigns of Akbar and Jahangir, it looks as if on this occasion they dismissed the more old-fashioned architects who had been in their employ, and that Karan Singh had re-engaged them for the rebuilding of Udaipur.

Râna Jagat Singh (1628–52) continued his father’s plans. In his reign the original Mahrâmâ Palace must have been completed. Likewise the palace of Jag-Mandir Island (figs. 8, 9, and 12) was brought to completion, and according to Tod, the palace on Jagnivas Island was begun. The upper story (Gol-Mahal) of Jag-Mandir Palace reveals a new “baroque” taste, an ample use of curves, a circular, domed hall, fluted balcony balustrades, etc. In the decoration, tiny animal groups, especially parrots and hansas, were introduced. The domed hall (mentioned above) is decked with intarsia of white marble and costly stones, somewhat in the earlier style characteristic of the Mausoleum of Itimad al-Dawla at Agra. In the court a black serpentine throne was erected, supported by fourfold female caryatids. The northeastern arcades along the shore, with their elephant statues, as well as the palace court to the southwest, may possibly be later, perhaps of the reign of Sangrâm Singh II.

However, the chief monument of Jagat Singh’s activities as a builder is the Jagadîśa (Jagannâth) Temple (consecrated in 1652), towering high above the town on the northern spur of the small ridge on which the palace is erected. Impressive because of its gigantic dimensions, it is merely a faithful repetition of the architecture and sculpture of Râna Kumbha at Chitorgarh, two centuries earlier. That it should be a direct descendant of that earlier local art is out of the question, since not a single monument exists which would link them together. However, both were offshoots of the great school of revivalist temple architecture and sculpture that had flourished in Gujarât and Bârvâr through all these centuries and is alive there even today. As the links between the courts of Mewâr and Bârvâr have always been very close, it seems probable that the architects and masons had come from Bârvâr, like so many other artists and artisans. Under Akbar, and in most of Jahangir’s reign, the Rajput princes had encountered no obstacles in building new temples. But the civil war of 1622–27 had brought into the saddle the orthodox Muslim party, led by Shaikh Aḥmad Sarbindi, the Mujaddid, and Shâh-Jahân. The imperial government now frowned on the construction of new shrines, though tolerating the existing ones. Only some decades later, Awrangzâb started out on a wholesale destruction of Hindu temples. In consequence, temple building was continued mainly in the territories beyond direct Mughal control like Udaipur, Jaisâlmer, Chambâ, Kulû, etc., where the râjâs gave vent to their growing dissatisfaction by ostentatiously defying the imperial ban. The Jagadiâsa Temple must be appreciated in the light of this situation. However, its masons could not ignore the art currents of the time. Though the panels of gods and goddesses (fig. 10) are bound by hieratic rules, the Rajput spirit breaks through in the animal and human friezes (figs. 14 and 15). They depict Rajput horsemen, elephant riders, processions, dancers, and other genre scenes in contemporary costume, Purânic myths in the style of Rajput paintings, etc. This latter manner was taken over from Amber where it can be traced back at least to the middle of the sixteenth century (best example, Jagatśiromani Temple, ca. 1580–90).

For painting flourished. We know at least three dated manuscripts of Jagat Singh’s reign,
all illustrating the Rāmāyana, one of 1648 at Poona, another of December 30, 1649 (some leaves in the Baroda Museum; figs. 19 and 20), the third of 1651-52 in the Saraswati Bhandar Library, Udaipur, and finally some fragments of other manuscripts (e.g., of a Bhāgavata Purāṇa, cp. Kalā-Nidhi, I, No. 2). All of them are executed in the same style, a very late and decadent aspect of the early pure Rājasthānī style, very conventionalized and mannered, overelaborate, rather crude in execution, petty, and neurasthenic. Generally, this style resembles that of the miniatures of the Mārwār school early in the same century. As under Gaj Singh (1620-38) and Jaswant Singh (1638-78), that style went out of fashion at the Jodhpur court in favor of a semi-Mughal taste, it seems probable that these three Rāmāyana manuscripts were the products of a group of painters who immigrated from Mārwār. The process seems to have continued through the seventeenth century, as we shall see later on.

Other miniatures reveal a very different style, on one hand related to the above-mentioned group portrait of Amar Singh I and his sons, on the other more connected with the typology of Mughal painting, especially the variety favored by the Rajput princes visiting the imperial court. One has been exhibited in London, another has been acquired by the Baroda Museum (fig. 27). Both represent Shāh-Jahān receiving the rānā of Udaipur in audience, in the first picture Karan Singh and his son Jagat Singh, and in the second Amar Singh. But they cannot be contemporary and must be as late as the middle of the seventeenth century (e.g., the flower motifs can be compared only with those of Mughal art in Shāh-Jahān’s later reign, and in the Baroda picture Shāh-Jahān is represented already as an old man). Both seem to go back to an identical prototype, probably of Karan Singh’s time, as only Karan Singh had had close relations with the Mughal court and could boast of the personal friendship of Shāh-Jahān.

The reign of Rānā Rāj Singh (1652-81) witnessed the zenith and also the beginning of the decline of the pure Rajput art of Mewār fostered by his predecessors, Karan and Jagat Singh. Rāj Singh was a great patron of art and literature. But the terrible famine of 1662 inflicted immense damage on his country; then, after 1668, the growing political tension with the imperial court, and, finally, the Mughal invasion of 1678-81 wrought irreparable havoc, from which the country did not recover completely until the reign of his grandson, Amar Singh II.

Rāj Singh’s most famous monument is the great irrigation lake near Kankroli, the Rāj Samand. A relief work during the great famine, it is a remarkable work of engineering as well as of art. The gigantic dam closing a gap in a hill range is planned as a long row of ghāts (steps) between platforms projecting into the water, on which open, pillared halls (fig. 11) offer shadow and rest. Long inscriptions (the Rāja-Prāšasti, 1662-72/3) eulogize the achievements of the Sisodia house and especially of Rāj Singh, and the ceilings are covered with charming reliefs. The style of architecture, strictly Hindu, is the same as that of the Khūsh Mahāl, Karan Vilās, and Rāwala at Udaipur, and the older palace of Jag-Mandir Island, though the individual forms have become more elaborate and involved. The ceilings represent the apogee of the revivalist sculpture style, in incomparably better than the Jagadiṣa Temple reliefs. They possess a charm unknown before, a sensitiveness derived from secular Rajput art; and a closer

---

6 The art of India and Pakistan, op. cit., fig. 416, pl. 89.
7 G. Ojha, Bhavnagar Prāchin Sodha-Samgraha, No. 8, Bhavnagar (Bombay), 1885; Annual report, Rajputana Museum, Ajmer, for 1917-18, p. 28.; Annual report, Arch. Survey of India, 1917-18, Calcutta, p. 31.
Fig. 1—Chitorgarh, Palace of Rāṇa Kumbha, Rawala Court.

Fig. 2—Udaipur, Old Temple in the Bazar.

Fig. 3—Udaipur, Mahārāṇa Palace, Substructure of Northern Wing.

Fig. 4—Khūsh Maḥal and Karan Vilās.
Fig. 5—Udaíśvām Temple.

Fig. 6—Chhatri of Amar Singh I, Chaturlinga and Sati Stone.

Fig. 7—Udaipur Palace, Rawala.

Fig. 8—Jag-Mandir Palace, Upper Storey.
Fig. 9—Jag-Mandir Palace, balcony.

Fig. 10—Jagadīśa Temple, Sculpture Frieze.

Fig. 11—Pavilion of the Rāj Samand Dam.
Figs. 14 and 15—Jadadí Temple, Figure Friezes.
Fig. 23—Jai Samand Dam, Temples, Palaces and Ghats.

Fig. 24—Bara-Mahal, Hall and Garden.

Fig. 25—Jag-Mandir Island, Pavilion of Western Palace.

Fig. 26—Mausoleum of Amar Singh II, Arh.
investigation reveals that even many iconographic motifs, especially those of the Krishna-
Līlā, have been adapted from contemporary Gujarātī wood sculpture or Rajput miniature
painting; in fact, certain details, e.g., the winged devatās, go back to Mughal, and, finally,
to Christian prototypes.

In the gardens in southeastern Udaipur Town, irrigated by the Pichola Lake, Rāj Singh built,
not long before the Mughal war, the charming Sabrat Bīlās Palace (fig. 16), a precursor of the
better-known modern Sahelion-kī Bārī. Compared with the palaces erected until then at
Udaipur, Sabrat Bīlās, with its multicusped arches and niches of many shapes, fluted cupo-
las, elegant balconies, richly carved decorations, polished marble-stucco walls and sgraffito
friezes, was ultramodern. However, compared with the architecture of other places, e.g.,
Orchhā, Dātiā, Bāndī, Hindolī, etc., it is, on the whole, again behind the times by at least half
a century, though some of its details already reveal the influence of Shāh-Jahān’s archi-
tecture. Also some of the less-known parts of the great Māhrānā palace and likewise some
aristocratic mansions in the town, as well as some buildings in the forts surrounding it, are
in the same style. Other buildings of the time are the Bedvās-kī-Baori (1608), the Bārī-kā
Talāo, constructed by Rāj Singh’s mother (1677), and finally the rānā’s chhattī at Orā (1681).

Naturally, painting also progressed considerably at Rāj Singh’s court. We know quite a
number of beautiful manuscripts, all preserved in the Saraswati Bhandar Library of Udaipur
Palace, e.g., a Rāgmālā, Mahābhārata, Bhāgavata Daśama-Skandha, Keśavadās’s Rasikpriyā,
Prithvī-Rāj Rāso, Malik Muhammad Jayaśī’s Padumāval, Bānabhattā’s Kādambarī, Śukra-
shetramāhātmya, Dolā-Mārū, etc., the Rasikpriyā at Bīkāner (fig. 22),8 the Pancharatana, the
Bhramara Gītā,9 and several other sets in the

National Museum at Delhi, most of which are
dated merely in his reign (without year) or can
be attributed to it because they are in the same
style and the same type of script. Fundament-
ally their style does not differ so much from that
of the preceding reign, but their mannerism is
less obvious, the overcrowded elaborateness and
nervosity have disappeared. The scenes are
much simpler, but drawn with a sure hand, well
composed and full of a joy of life and a fine
sensitiveness of observation. They are far from
any naturalism, and their individual components
must still be accepted more as symbols than as
exact descriptions of nature. Nevertheless the
pictures reproduce scenes that give a real feel-
ing of living nature, of living persons, of action,
of sentiments. The figures are anatomically cor-
rect and healthy, notwithstanding their con-
tventional poses; there is a delightful wealth of
observation, of details of costume, of animals,
of trees and flowers, a great poetic charm, a real
re-creation of all the more discrete undertones
of a strong life experience. With all that, the
art-historical position of these illustrations is
curious. They represent a natural evolution of
the preceding style, and yet they evidently link
up with contemporary provincial painting in
Mārwār. The Rāgmālā set, finally, was either
the work of new immigrants from Mārwār, or
was brought from there. However, compared
with contemporary court art at Amber and
Jodhpur these manuscripts look strangely ar-
chaic, like the contemporaneous architecture of
Udaipur. On the other hand, for the official
portraits of the ruler and of his court,10 the semi-
Mughal tradition continued to be in fashion,
though slowly adapting itself to the style of the
other miniatures. Finally, in one manuscript,
the Śukrakshetramāhātmyam, dated 1656, a
semi-Mughal style likewise is used, an echo of
that in fashion at the imperial court in Jahāṅgīr’s
time, auguring the artistic revolution to come in
the reign of Rāj Singh’s second successor, Amar
Singh II.

8 H. Goetz, The art and architecture of Bikaner,
Oxford, 1930, pl. 9.
9 See Khandalavala, op. cit., p. 20, fig. 19.
In the meantime the tension with the Mughal court grew worse and worse. Following the policy of using Rajput manpower, yet weakening the Rajput states, Jahângîr had already tried to divide Mewâr into two kingdoms, one under Rânä Amar Sinh at Udaipur, another under Sâgrâ at Chitorgarh. After this attempt had failed, Shâh-Jahân and Awrangzêb contented themselves with encircling the semi-independent râj by a system of smaller states more dependent on the imperial court. Thus Ídâr on the Gujarât side and Ratlâm, Sàilââ, Sîtâmû, etc., on the Mâlwa side, were given as jâgîrs to younger princes of the Jodhpur family, and other small ñefs to Umat-Pramârâ, Chauhâñ, Khîchî, Solankî, Bargûjâr, etc., Rajputs who had distinguished themselves in the army. These new diminutive states, though otherwise culturally sterile, naturally borrowed some artistic idioms, even more archaic than the art of Mewâr, from Jodhpur, Amber, and especially from Bundelkhand, which had completely broken up politically and culturally since the rebellion of Râj Jhûjâr Singh against Shâh-Jahân. Râj Singh countered this encircling policy by close political and marital relations with Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur and with Karan and Anûp Singh of Bûkâner, which developed into a secret Rajput opposition to the encroachments of Awrangzêb. His support of Kishangarh (1660) and his championship of the famous Vallabhâchârya idol of Śrî-Nâthâjî, to which he assigned Nâthdwârâ in 1671, brought relations to the breaking point, and in 1678 Awrangzêb invaded Mewâr from all sides. Backed by the parallel Râthor insurrection in Jodhpur after Jaswant Singh’s death, Râj Singh successfully kept the Mughals at bay, destroying several armies in the gorges of the Aravallis and supporting the rebellion of prince Akbar. But for this purpose a good part of Mewâr had to be evacuated temporarily—even the new capital, Udaipur. Nevertheless, the damage proved to be remarkably little, possibly because the Mughals, harassed from all sides in the evacuated country, needed all their men to keep communications open, and thus had not much time for demolition. Jai Singh later repaired what damage could not have been avoided. Awrangzêb succeeded in extricating himself and his armies from the hills, but difficulties elsewhere—his attack on the kingdoms of Bijâpur and Golconda, and especially the costly and so ineffective war against Shivâji’s Marâthas—forced him at last to leave Mewâr alone.

The war meant another serious setback for cultural life in Mewâr, but this time artistic activities were not completely paralyzed. As a matter of fact, Jai Singh, who had followed Râj Singh on the throne in 1681, undertook the greatest engineering work ever accomplished in Mewâr, namely the Jai Samand (Dhebar) dam. Actually, this gigantic lake was a byproduct of the war, for the retreat into the Aravallis forced the rulers of Udaipur to pay more attention to the undeveloped areas in the west and southwest, hitherto mainly the haunt of primitive Bhil tribes. Like the Râj Samand, the Jai Samand dam (fig. 23) is also embellished with many ghâts, temples and palaces which for some time even served as the permanent residence of the rânâ and his favorite queen, Komâlâ Devî, called the Rûthi Rânî. But the artistic quality of all these buildings stands far below those of the reign of Jai Singh’s father. The same seems to be true of painting—if we may attribute to this period the Murâqqa’-e Zarb al-Imshâl manuscript at Udaipur, a curious collection of Persian proverbs accompanied by a Hindî translation and illustrated in a degenerated variety of the Râj Singh style, intermixed with Persian figures wearing the characteristic costume of the last years of the Safavid dynasty—and the official portraits, two of which were exhibited in London in 1947–48.11

A change set in only during the reigns of Amar Singh II (1698–1710) and Sangrâm Singh II (1710–34). The disintegration of the Mughal empire then became more and more visible. In

11 Ibid., No. 415, pl. 89, and No. 418.
a treaty with the Mughal Emperor Farokhsiyar, Mewār at last regained her independence. Thus relations were completely reverted. The political and economic decline of the Mughal empire released a number of artists trained at Delhi, who now were only too willing to work under the Rajput princes. Mewār emerged from her isolation, and following the example set by Ajīt Singh of Jodhpur (1678/86–1724) and Sāwāj Jai Singh of Amber-Jaipur (1693–1743), the Mahārājās of Udaipur advertised their regained sovereignty by surrounding themselves with all the splendor that so far had been the privilege of the Mughal imperial court, or of a few mahārājās closely allied to it. Thus the reign of Amar Singh II meant a complete revolution in the art history of Mewār. The first Golden Age of Rajput art at Udaipur came to an end, the second was inaugurated, based on all the achievements of Mughal art. Amar Singh II constructed the Bāre Maḥal (Amar Vilās) and the Karan Maḥal (fig. 24) on the top of the Mahārāṇā’s great palace, a wonder of engineering and perfect beauty. Gigantic blocks of spotless white marble were raised to the top of that pile of buildings and shaped it into a fairy palace comparable to Shāh-Jahān’s creations at Agra and the Tāj, simple and restrained, with beautiful ornamental and figurative sculptures, yet most harmonious with its interior surrounding an intimate court of fountains and trees, and outside a marvelous view over the town, the lake and the mountains. Amar Singh II’s mausoleum at Arh (fig. 26) inaugurates the long series of splendid marble chhatri s filling that gigantic royal cemetery. His early portrait is still in the old style. But soon afterward the Mughal-Rajput style invaded Udaipur in all its strength, in all its perfection of line, but also in its undeniable flatness of treatment.

Under his successor, Sangrām Singh II (1710–34), the transition period came to an end. Now we can no longer speak of an imported Mughal style; we are already confronted with a new Rajput style characteristic of Mewār. Its architecture is exemplified by the Tripolia Gate of the palace, the Chīnī-kī-Chitra Maḥal, probably also the western palaces of Jag-Mandir Island (fig. 25), and the Bajjnāth Temple of Sisarma, though Jagniṇās was laid out first by Jagat Singh II (1734–51). Of white marble, it was rich and baroque, yet again strangely conservative when compared with the trends in the rest of Rājasthān. Until well into the eighteenth century manuscript painting conserved the Mughal-Rajput tradition which had flourished in the northern Rajput states at the end of the seventeenth century. Portraiture and official court representation were dependent mainly on the model set by Jodhpur under Mahārājā Ajīt Singh and Abhai Singh. Finally, an industrial art piously preserved the late Mughal tradition, with certain local features, up to the end of the nineteenth, and even into the twentieth century.

It is difficult to account for this extreme conservatism even in those late years of regained independence. But in some respects the situation of Mewār had not changed. The Mughal threat had disappeared, but another had turned up in the form of the Marāṭha and Pindāri depredations which, fostered by the embittering civil war since 1745, brought the country again to the verge of utter ruin. It may be that this conservative pride and exclusiveness permitted the country to maintain its identity in the midst of all these catastrophes and checkered history. For the same reason Udaipur proved to be the most faithful guardian of ancient Rajput civilization until our own days. On the other hand, Mewār cannot be taken as the measure of the progress and achievements of Rajput art, for after its initial leadership from the fourteenth to the early sixteenth centuries the country was always behind the times by at least a half, if not a whole century, though instilling a rare purity and perfect beauty into the later styles.

12 Ibid., fig. 417, pl. 90.
COMMENTS TO ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Râwala (Zenâna) Court of the palace of Rânâ Kumbha (1433–68) at Chitorgarh. Erected on the ruins of an older palace destroyed by ‘Alî al-Dîn Khîlji in 1303, it shows the eclectic Hindu-Muslim architecture of 15th-century Râjputânâ.

2. Old Temple in the bazar of Udaipur, northeast of the palace, built in the early reign of Rânâ Amar Singh I, about 1600, in the interval between the Mughal wars.

3. Substructure of the northern wing of the Mahârânâ Palace at Udaipur, revealing the relapse into a crude provincialism in the last years of Udai Singh (1568–72), after the disaster of Chitorgarh.

4. The Khusâla Mahal and Karan Vilâs of Udaipur Palace, reception rooms in the time of Rânâ Karan Singh (1620–28). Architectural forms completely inspired by medieval Hindu prototypes, but richer and more developed than in the Udaîsîm Temple.

5. The Udaîsîm Temple, on the Pichola Lake opposite Udaipur, a very simple and plain structure of the time when Udaipur was founded.

6. The Chaturlinga and Satî Stone in the Chhattî of Amar Singh I at Mahâsati, Arh, two miles east of Udaipur.

7. The Râwala of Udaipur Palace, erected by Karan Singh. Comparable to the oldest palaces at Amber (ca. 1570) and Bîkânèr (late sixteenth century), and the Taleti-kâ Mahal at Jodhpur (early seventeenth century).

8. The upper story or Jag-Mandir Palace, built by Jagat Singh (1628–52) probably during the last years of Karan Singh. The later “baroque” stage of Karan Singh’s architecture.


10. The great sculpture frieze of the gigantic Jagadiâsa Temple, erected by Rânâ Jagat Singh at Udaipur not far from his palace (1652). Clever, but lifeless imitation of medieval Hindu art.

11. One of the pavilions of the Râj Samand Dam near Kankroli, 1662. It reveals architecture of seventeenth-century Udaipur in its richest stage, fundamentally still medieval Hindu renaissance, but already influenced by contemporary art trends.

12. The domed marble hall in Jag-Mandir Palace, said to have been the residence of Prince Khurram during his exile at Udaipur. The costly marble intarsia is of the same type as that of I’timâd al-Dawlah’s Mausoleum at Agra.

13. Stela from the cemetery of Arh, about 1630–40. It reveals the amazing archaisms of sculpture still sticking to traditions shaken off in northern Rajputana almost a century earlier. It is in the same style as the Bîkânèr stelas of 1505 and 1571 (see Goetz, Art and architecture of Bîkaner, p. 148, figs. 17 and 18).

14. Another figure frieze from the Jagadiâsa Temple. Top: wrestlers, dancers, servants, etc. The style of the latter reminds of certain “old Gujarâtî” bronzes. Bottom: Rajput horsemen.

15. Small figure frieze from the Jagadiâsa Temple. In the lively horses and the primitive but vivid scenes illustrating the Devi Mâhâtmya, the Rajput folk spirit such as evolved at Amber breaks through.

16. The ceiling of one of the pavilions of the Râj Samand Dam. The general outlay and technique imitate medieval temple ceilings, etc., at Dilwâra or Kumbhârâ, but individual figures are inspired either by wood sculpture of seventeenth-century Gujarât and Mârwâr or by Rajput paintings.

17. Another ceiling, in which Mughal influence is also evidenced by the above-mentioned wood sculptures.

18. The garden façade of Sabrât Bîlîs Palace at Udaipur, erected by Rânâ Râj Singh in the seventies of the seventeenth century. The pavilion in right foreground is of much later date.

19. Illustration of a Râmâyana manuscript written and painted at Udaipur in the reign of Rânâ Jagat Singh (1628–52), December 30, 1649 (V.S. 1706). The name of the painter is Manohar. Baroda Museum.

20. Another illustration of the same manuscript, showing the conventional, overcrowded, and rather petty style characteristic of this school.


23. The temples, palaces, and ghâtis of the Jai Samand Dam, constructed by Rânâ Râj Singh III (1680/1-1698).

24. Hall and garden of the Bârë-Mahâl (Amar Vilâs) in the Mûhârânâ's palace at Udaipur, constructed in white marble by Rânâ Amar Singh II (1698-1710/1). In Amber such halls had been built as early as the reign of Jahângîr, in Bikânêr under Anûp Singhji, about 1680.


CHRONOLOGICAL CHART

Rânâ Kshetra (Khet) Singh (1364-82).

Rânâ Lâkha (Laksha Singh) (1382-97): Pichola Lake constructed (where Udaipur 1571 founded); Rânâ Palace at Chitorgarh.

Rânâ Mokal (1397-1433), dictatorship of Raimall Râthor of Jodhpur.

Rânâ Kumâha (karna) (1433-68), Râthors expelled 1537, Chitorgarh Palace completed, Ranakpur Temple 1438, Kumbhalgarh constructed 1443-58, Tower of Victory at Chitorgarh 1448-58, Govindâyam (Kumbhâyam) Temple 1448, 1455 invasion of Mahmûd I of Mâlwa, assassinated 1568.

Rânâ Udâ Singh (1468-72).

Rânâ Raimoll (1472-1508), war between his sons, Eklingji Temple 1488.

Rânâ Sângâ (Samgrâm Singh) (1508-28), 1517 annexation of Central Mâlwa, 1528 defeat by Ibrâhîm Lodi at Ghatoli, 1518 victory of Gagrân, 1520 invasion of Gujarât, 1522 war with Mâlwa and Gujarât, defeat by Mughal emperor Bâbur at Khânua 1527, poisoned 1528.

Rânâ Ratan Singh II (1528-31) civil war, assassinated. Palace at Chitorgarh.

Rânâ Bikramâjit (1531-36), dissolution of Râjput federation, siege of Chitorgarh by Bahâdur Shâh of Gujarât 1533, capture of Chitorgarh 1535, assassinated 1536.

Rânâ Banbîr Singh (1536/7-1540), bastard, usurper.

Rânâ Udat Singh (1540-72), pretender 1537, rânâ 1540/2, 1543-46/7 under Sâr Sultân of Delhi, restoration of state, Udat Sâgar 1559-60, capture and destruction of Chitorgarh by Mughal Emperor Akbar 1567-68, Udaipur founded 1571. Rânâ palace: Rû Angam Court, Nauchauni, Udaïyâm Temple, Ambâ Mâtâm Temple at Baramati.

Rânâ Jagmâl (1572) deposed.

Rânâ Partîb (Pratîb) (1572-97), battle of Haldighât 1576, most of Meâwâr lost, near surrender 1586.

Rânâ Amar Singh I (1597-1620), recovery, Nâdol stepwell inscription 1598, temples in Udaipur town, Mughal invasion 1608, counter-Rânâ Sâgrâ at Chitorgarh, that latter recaptured, Mughal invasion under Prince Khurrâm (Shâhjâhân) 1614, submission, Barî Pol and Amar Mahal built.

Rânâ Karan Singh I (1620-28) at Udaipur: Ganesh Deori, Mânak Mahal, Khûsh Mahal Karan Vilâs, Râwala built, visit of Prince Khurrâm 1626, Jag-Mandir Palace, Àdinâth Temple at Dilwara (?), Arh cemetery (Mahâsatî), first paintings.

Rânâ Jagat Singh I (1628-52), Palace completed, Jagadiâ or Jagannâth Temple at Udaipur 1651-52, Jagat-Nivâs first laid out (?). Râmâyana MSS.

Rânâ Râj Singh (1652-81), Sabrat Vilâs Palace at Udaipur, famine 1662-68, Bedvâs-ki Bâori 1668, Râj Samand (Kankrol) Lake constructed 1662-72/5, Bari-ki-Talao 1677, Mughal invasion under emperor Avrangzâb 1678-81, rebellion of Prince Akbar, chhattîr at Orâ 1681. Many illustrated MSS.

Rânâ Jai Singh (1681-1698), Jai Samand (Dhebar Lake), Muraqqa’e Zârb-al Imshâl.

Rânâ Amar Singh II (1698-1710), revolt against Mughals, alliance with Mârwâr (Jodhpur) and Bikânêr. Barâ Mahal (Amar Vilâs), Karan Mahal, mausoleum at Arn built.

Rânâ Sangrâm Singh II (1710-34), independence regained. Tripolia Gate, Chinî-ki Chitra Mahal, western palaces of Jagmandir Island, Baîjnâth Temple at Sîsarma built.

Rânâ Jagat Singh II (1734-51) Jagnâvîs Island Palace begun.
THE STRATIGRAPHY OF HSIAO-T’UN (ANYANG)  
WITH A CHAPTER ON HSIAO-T’UN FOUNDATION BURIALS  
AND YIN RELIGIOUS CUSTOMS  

BY MAX LOEHR

The reports on the Academia Sinica excavations of Yin-hsü, site of the Shang dynasty capital after its removal to Yin (near Anyang, northern Honan), were discontinued after the seventh campaign in 1932. Little was known, therefore, about the results of eight subsequent campaigns carried out between 1933 and 1937 until, after the War, new information came forth in a substantial article written by Shih Chang-ju in the Chinese Journal of Archaeology. Dealing primarily with the most important discoveries made up to the last prewar excavation (the fifteenth) that was conducted by him, Shih Chang-ju also acquaints us with the stratigraphic conditions encountered in the site of Hsiao-t’un. On his comprehensive description the present paper is based. It is condensed from a full translation and for the sake of clarity and brevity is freed of expendable detail, lesser items of topographical references, and occasional repetitions, but on the whole runs close to the Chinese text; some notes have been added here.

Though further excavations may amplify the archaeological documentation, it does not seem likely that they will greatly change the conclusions arrived at by Shih Chang-ju.

Of the various sites along the Huan River which in their entirety correspond to Yin-hsü, the large and centrally located site of Hsiao-t’un is best explored. Hsiao-t’un is distinguished by an abundance of cultural remains that are by no means all of Yin age but to a large extent are either earlier or later than Yin. The Yin remains themselves are not homogeneous; the houses aboveground were preceded by semi-subterranean dwellings dug into the ground. The traces of earlier man’s activity become visible wherever the surface soil is removed. Conditions are utterly complicated, and unless distinctly separated strata or clearly distributed vestiges are encountered, it would be hard to find a way out.

Concerning a Yang-shao phase at Hsiao-t’un: On November 21, during the fall campaign of 1929, a sherd of Yang-shao type of painted pottery was uncovered, which proves the existence of remains of Yang-shao age at Hsiao-t’un. However, since no corresponding stratum has yet been discovered, the Yang-shao phase will not be discussed under Hsiao-t’un.

The Chung-kuo K’o-hsiêh-yüan (Chinese Academy of Science), Peiping, in 1950; under the direction of Kuo Pao-chiên, who had been in charge of the Anyang excavations in the fall of 1933 and in the spring of 1936, 15 tombs and 2 ash pits were opened at Su-p’an-mo, and 23 sacrificial burials and 1 large tomb at Wu-kuan-ts‘un; cf. the table, ibid., p. xi.


Yang-shao strata have been ascertained in three Yin-hsü sites: Hou Kang, Kao-ching-t’ai-tzu, and T‘ung-lo-chai; see p. 26f below.
HSIAO-T’UN I: LUNG-SHAN STRATUM

As a result of several years’ surveying and excavating in the Huan and Ch’i River areas in Honan and in the Lung-shan and Jih-chao sites of Shantung, the Lung-shan or Black Pottery culture was recognized as an autonomous and independent culture. Pertinent finds have been made in the Huang-ho and Huai-ho basins and as far south as Hang-chou. This culture has a long history of its own and its specific character. Owing to the rather confusing conditions encountered in Hsiao-t’un up to the seventh excavation, the remains of this culture, a few pits under the surface soil, revealed, however, no close and direct relationship with the Yin-Shang stratum. During the eighth excavation, Sector D yielded not only considerable quantities of Lung-shan-stage artifacts but also true stratigraphic proof of the fact that Hsiao-t’un, far from having been an unoccupied wilderness before the arrival of the Yin people, had seen a flourishing village life.

The artifacts of the Lung-shan stage are readily recognized because their shapes, decoration, material, and make show distinctive features. As to ceramics, their main characteristics can be outlined by these five points: Black color, gloss, thinness, angularity, and lugs (serving as handles or, perforated, for cord suspension).

6 Fu Su-nien, Li Chi, Liang Su-yung, et al., Ch’eng Tsu Yai, a report of excavations of the proto-historic site at Ch’eng-tsou-yai, Li-ch’eng Hsien, Shantung, Archaeologia Sinica, vol. 1 (1934). The Jih-chao finds have not been published yet, but several interesting drawings of ceramic shapes are contained in an article by Li Chi, Chi Hsiao-t’un ch’u-t’u chih ch‘ing-t‘ung-ch‘i, (Studies of Hsiao-t’un bronzes, Part I), Chinese Journal of Archaeology, vol. 3 (1948), pp. 1-99.

7 Ho T’ien-shen (— hsing), The prehistorical site and the black earthen-wares in Lian-chu District, Hangchow, Shanghai, 1937. See also S. S. Beath, Black pottery of the Liang Ch‘u site near Hangchow, China Journal (December 1939), pp. 262-266; idem, The Black Pottery culture of Chekiang, Asia (January 1941), pp. 47-56; Sidney M. Kaplan, Early pottery from the Lung Ch‘u site, Chekiang Province, Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America, vol. 3 (1949).

Most of the vessels of this stage have either flat bottoms with footrims or three legs; vessels with rounded bottoms are very rare. Atypical colors such as gray, buff, red, and white occur in smaller number, as do comparatively thick-walled vases of sandy clay. Instead of the typical smooth burnished surface, some pots display grooves, horizontally or vertically incised lines, and circles, while they retain the characteristic sharp-cornered silhouettes and other symptoms of manufacture. It is known that most of the vases were wheel made, and that they underwent such processes as kneading, scraping, and burnishing. In the wares of Lung-shan type found in the Huan and Ch’i River regions, ornamentation by strokes, squares, and fine straight cord patterns are most representative and are easily recognized.

Other artifacts of the Lung-shan phase are: Bone arrowheads with a round stem and triangular points; bone awls made of split animal bones rubbed smooth; shell knives with two perforations, resembling the stone knives of the Yin-Shang stratum; shell saws of similar shape but provided with teeth. (Both kinds of shell implements were made chiefly of large but rather thin shells—apparently of some edible kind of mussel—different from the thick shells used in the shell industry of the Yin.) Very numerous are disks of fired clay. Stone axes occur in varying shapes. Among the stone arrowheads there occur polished ones.

The dwelling pits are approximately round and comparatively shallow and small. Many of them were filled with light-gray earth that possibly points to some fuel and habits different from those of the Yin-Shang phase. It should be noted that no storage pits of the Lung-shan phase have yet been found in Hsiao-t’un.

Distribution of Lung-shan-stage remains in Hsiao-t’un.—According to present knowledge, Lung-shan remains were encountered in these four areas: Southwest corner of Sector B; a small part of Sector C; a large part of Sector D; and one part of Sector E.
The finds from Sector B came not from an ordinary pit but from what appeared to be a ditch. They consisted chiefly of pottery sherds, too fragmentary to permit the recognition of whole shapes but still definable as a ware of the Lung-shan stage. The ditch may have been a water ditch; it was destroyed, partly by Yin excavations (dwelling and storage pits), partly by Sui Dynasty tombs.

In Sector C, there were only two subterranean structures of Lung-shan age: Locality C 155, cut into by Yin-Shang pits, and Locality C 175, a somewhat irregular round pit containing rather few artifacts, underneath a deep Yin-Shang stratum.

Sector D. Except for a certain number of pits and tombs and an expansive layer of gray-brown earth, the lower culture stratum contained, on the whole, only Lung-shan elements. The spots that yielded artifacts were mostly abandoned dwellings, large and small in size. The large dwelling pits were oval, ca. 13.00 m. long (N-S), ca. 6.00 m. wide (E-W), and ca. 4.50 m. deep (measured from the surface); the smaller ones were round, with a diameter of ca. 1.50 m. Their upper edges were lying under the Yin-Shang stratum so that they became visible only after the latter had been cleared.

In Sector E, conditions are more particular. Yin-Shang pits were found mainly easternmost and westernmost while the Lung-shan remains were in the middle, adjoining the Lung-shan localities of Sector D. These remains are chiefly smaller round pits of about 2.0 m. in diameter, most of them close to the surface but some of them overlaid by (Yin-Shang) tamped-earth foundations. The finds were poorer than those of Sector D.

As to the over-all distribution of the Lung-shan remains, it would appear that their density decreases with the distance from the river bank; the farther south, the less.

Relations between Lung-shan and Yin-Shang Strata

The following records of individual trenches show that the relations between the Lung-shan stratum and the Yin-Shang stratum are remarkably clear, especially in Sector D.

D 82. Depth, 1.00 m. Two distinct layers, the upper one of the Yin-Shang stage, the lower one of the Lung-shan stage.

D 83. Depth, 1.00 m. Below this level were found some animal bones and shells, one sherd of thin black pottery, very thin sherds with square patterns, sherds with cord impression, and clay disks; all belong to the Lung-shan stage.

D 84. Depth 1.60-2.80 m. Mussel shells of the thin variety used for knives and pottery fragments, all of Lung-shan age.

D 85. Ancient pit, about 3.00 m. long (N-S), excavated to the bottom, at a depth of 1.05 m.; down to 1.20 m., brown earth, underneath it, gray earth; the bottom of the culture stratum was not reached. In the upper layers, rather varied artifacts of Yin-Shang age; in the lower layer, Black Pottery.

In the following, profiles of several trenches will be discussed.

D 84. In the western wall there appears a clear succession of three major strata below the top soil:

1. Gray-brown earth to a depth of ca. 1.40 m.: Yin-Shang stratum.
2. Gray earth between ca. 1.40 and 3.50 m.: Lung-shan stratum; much Black Pottery and some animal bones.
3. Yellow-gray earth, ca. 3.50 to 4.5 m.: still Lung-shan stratum; disturbed at the southern extremity.

Probably we are faced here by a pit of the Lung-shan stage that was abandoned and afterward twice filled up, so that strata 2 and 3 both contain Black Pottery. Whether what is underlying the gray-brown layer 1 was the Lung-shan surface level or not cannot be decided.
under the given conditions. Later, the Yin people had filled up completely the abandoned pit with this gray-brown earth.

D 47 is the excavation trench that brought the richest finds of the Lung-shan stage. It comprises two smaller pits which in Yin times were disturbed so that the boundaries of their upper edges became obliterated. It is at the east wall of the pit D 47 that, under the surface, two successive strata can be very clearly discerned:

1. The upper one consists of gray-brown earth accumulated during Yin-Shang times.

2. The lower one consists of gray earth accumulated during the Lung-shan stage, and part of it was cut through by a Yin-Shang deposit.

H 024 in the western part of Sector B is a pit of Yin-Shang times. It is a locality of extreme interest and value because it aptly demonstrates the relations between Yin and Lung-shan. Here was originally a band-shaped ditch, which in Lung-shan times may have been a water ditch (such as mentioned above, p. 68, s. v. Sector B). Sometime after this ditch had been refilled, one section of it was destroyed by a Yin-Shang pit (= H 024) the bottom of which, however, did not reach the bottom of the old ditch. A section laid through the axis of the ancient ditch (fig. 1, A–A') makes these relations quite obvious.

Reexamining the terrain conditions in the northern part of the village of Hsiao-t'un, we find that in Sector D, highest up, the Lung-shan stratum always underlies the Yin-Shang stratum, and that similar conditions obtain in Sectors B and C. Only in Sector E, which is lower and where the surface soil seems to have been dug away, the Lung-shan stratum appears to a large extent immediately under the present-day surface.

When the observations described above are summarized, a relatively reliable general picture emerges. The Lung-shan remains in Hsiao-t'un are all located to the north of Sector C and, as a rule, lie below the 1.00 m. level; the stratum above is of Yin-Shang age. There are, of course, exceptions; it occurs that a Lung-shan deposit is not overlaid by a Yin-Shang stratum, but
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HSIAO-T'UN II: YIN-SHANG STRATUM

The fact that Hsiao-t'un was the site of the Yin dynasty capital through most of their reign—there are oracle bones of the fifth reign and ceramics from the end of the dynasty—accounts for the wide expansion, the deep refuse deposits, and the numerous traces of axe and spade work of this site; it accounts also for the fundamental importance of the Hsiao-t'un site and for the fame of the name of Yin-hsü. What, according to present knowledge and experience, forms the essential elements of the Yin-Shang culture stratum will be described below.

_Dwelling Pits_ (Hsieh 𫈽) and _Storage Pits_ (Chiao 𫈼)

Among the ancient dugouts are large and shallow ones—the dwelling pits—and small and deep ones—the storage pits. They have been met with in every excavation and area, and their very number places them at the head of the various remains. It is evident that they were not made all at the same time; in Sectors B and C, chronological differences have been clearly established. A dwelling pit (A) may have been destroyed in part by another one (B), and the latter may in turn have been cut into by a third one (C). A small pit may have been sunk into the refill of a large dwelling pit, or a large dwelling pit may cut through a refilled small pit. Some of the storage pits had foot holes for climbing down; some of the dwellings had steps leading down (e.g., H 134). It appears as though these complexities and diversities speak of rapid developments.

All the refilled pits contained some kitchen refuse or fragments of ordinary objects such as animal bones, shells, and pottery (of Li, Hsien, Tsun, or I type); broken pins, awls, carved bone and shell ornaments; stone knives, stone hatchets, bone arrowheads, bronze arrowheads, _ko_ butts, tips of spearheads, and the like. They also contained waste material of the industries: sawed animal bones, pieces of battered shell, polished ivory, particles of bronze oxide, casting moulds, whetstones, wood ash and charcoal ash, and fragments of inscribed oracle bones. Some of the pits were filled up with a gray-green earth of loose consistence looking very like the withered remains of grain.

Among the _dwelling pits_, those of round shape are commonest; oblong and irregular ones follow in this order. Of storage pits, the rectangular ones outnumber the round ones. Large dens measure up to about 20 m. in length and 10 m. in width, while the smallest pits may have a diameter of only about 1.00 m. The rectangular pits have an average length of over 2.00 m. and a width of over 1.00 m., while the round ones measuring a little over 1.00 m. in diameter are commoner than either larger or smaller ones. The depths of the dwelling pits range from 0.50 to 4.00 m.; they rarely are deeper. In the case of the _storage pits_, the depths vary between 4.00 and 9.00 m., but sometimes the ground water prevented measurements.

Both dwelling and storage pits were simply dug into the ground. Their walls were left rough or were given some finish, either by beating them smooth or by an application of some sort of mud plaster in two or three layers, which peeled off easily. Both kinds of finish still occur today in western Honan and in Hunan.

The excavator's conclusion that part of the large pits served as semisubterranean dwellings and that part of the small pits were storage pits or cellars is supported by modern analogies: subterranean dwellings in western Honan and northern Shensi, and storage pits for grain in Chahar and Suiyuan. However, the cavities uncovered at Hsiao-t'un had all been turned into refuse pits, so that they no longer showed the character of dwellings.  

---

8 As early as the Second and Third Excavations, spring and fall of 1930, Li Chi was aware of three varieties of pits; he tentatively defined them as dwellings, storage holes, and immolation pits. Li Chi, _Yüan k'eng yu fang k'eng_ (Round pits and square pits), Report on Excavations at Anyang, vol. 2 (Peiping,
The Water Ditches

The term “water ditches” was hypothetically applied to a kind of canals and ditches which were first observed during the Thirteenth Excavation (spring, 1936). They are of two distinct varieties. One type, fairly broad and deep, with characteristic recesses in opposite position (.branch position), was dubbed “trunk canal”; the other one, narrower and shallower, with plain walls (branch), was termed “branch canal.” Both are trapezoidal in cross section. Constructed of tamped earth, the walls of the “trunk canals” show a smooth hard surface, while the recesses, semicircular in shape, were filled with a whitish substance which to all appearances was the decay product of wooden posts. The walls of the “branch canals” were less carefully smoothed. Throughout, the gradients are very small; over a course of about 50 m., the descent amounts to no more than about 0.10-0.20 m., which is nearly even. These ditches often lie underneath the tamped-earth floors of buildings.

As to the function of these ditches, two theories can be advanced: 1. they were water courses; 2. they were water levels.

1939), pp. 235-239. The question was discussed again after the Sixth and Seventh Excavations, which afforded substantial new evidence in favor of Li’s view; Kuo Pao-chin, B Ch’ü fa-chüeh chi (Note on the excavation of Sector B), Report on Excavations at Anyang, vol. 4 (Shanghai, 1933), pp. 602-606; Shih Chang-ju, Ti ch’i ts’u Yin-hsü fa-chüeh: E Ch’ü kung-ao pao-hao (The Seventh Excavation at Yinhsii: Report on the work done in Sector E), loc. cit., pp. 716-721.

In a brief paragraph of the first part of Shih Chang-ju’s article it is pointed out, however, that there is a good number of very deep shafts, the function of which remains unexplained; they do not come under any of the three categories mentioned above. Recent discoveries at Yin-hsü, Anyang, Chinese Journal of Archaeology, vol. 2 (1947), p. 13.

9 The following brief description is based on a chapter on “The problem of the water ditches” in Shih Chang-ju’s article, Recent discoveries at Yin-hsü, Anyang, Chinese Journal of Archaeology, vol. 2 (1947), pp. 27-30.

The second theory alone is likely to be correct. Since there is virtually no incline, it seems more natural to think of standing rather than flowing water; and, since the borders are well preserved and smooth, they apparently did not suffer from either long use or the flow of water. The water-level theory, moreover, is well supported by present-day builder’s practice and by a passage in the K’ao Kung Chi of the Chou Li.

The water ditches in Hsiao-t’un run either from north to south or from east to west. Owing to the unevenness of the terrain, their depths vary considerably. The deepest of the “trunk canals” lies about 1.20 to 3.00 m. under the present surface, whereas the shallowest of the “branch canals” is covered by no more than about 0.20 m. of surface soil. However, if the terrain conditions are duly taken into account, the levels of these canals do match.

Tamped-earth Foundations

During the Sixth and Seventh Excavations, two fairly complete foundations (or floors) were

10 Shih Chang-ju refers to a method still in use in rural areas of Western Honan. In the ground that is to be occupied by a house, two ditches are dug that cross diagonally. Wooden posts provided with horizontal level marks are rammed into the ditches, which then are filled with water. The posts are adjusted so that their level marks are perfectly leveled with reference to the zero plane of the water surface. Having thus served their purpose, the ditches are—exactly as in Hsiao-t’un—refilled with pounded earth. Op. cit., p. 30.

11 “Chiang jen chien kuo, shui ti i hsien.” which Biot has rendered thus: “Les constructeurs, lorsque l'on établit une capitale, n'èlèvent par l'eau le terrain, en se servant de la corde pendante.” Edouard Biot, tr., Le Tcheou Li ou rites des Tcheou, vol. 2 (Paris, 1851), p. 553. The commentaries bear out that the tersely worded Chou Li passage refers to an ancient method similar to that described in the preceding note, and probably similar to the Shang builders' method. Cf. Chou Li Chu Su, ed. Sun Fu Pei You, Shanghai (s. a.), ch. 41:13, and the fuller discussion in Sun I-jang’s Chou Li Cheng I (preface dated 1899; printed in 1931), ch. 82:29f.
discovered in Sector E. As a consequence, the excavators' attention was aimed at architectural remains, especially those of the Yin Royal Palace. These floors were constructed in tamped earth, with its characteristic density and hardness, and the coherence of the layers was secured by means of roundish processes and corresponding cavities fitting into each other. The term applied to this kind of construction, pan-chu 築 "board ramming," is of great antiquity, occurring, as it does, in the Shu Ching as well as Mengtse. Even so, the same technique is still practiced today, with wooden boards and a pile or ram as the only tools required, and the old name is still current, pan-chu-t'u, "board-rammed earth." Actually, there is no proof that the pounded-earth foundations of Yin times were made with boards; they may have been made in the ordinary way, without boards, in the technique which in the Anyang patois is called k'ang-t'u 土壙, "pounded earth."

The foundations are not all of the same period. There occur overlaps which often result in rather complicated conditions. Of the upright parts of the buildings, nothing is left, and it is even questionable whether the foundation levels are of Yin age or not. It is not easy, therefore, to discuss Yin architecture, the more so since

13 Shu Ching, chapter Yüeh Ming, "Charge to Yüeh," speaks of the "builder" (chü) Yüeh who was appointed minister to Wu Tung, the fourth Shang king in Yin, in 1271 B.C., according to the Bamboo Annals; however, contrary to expectation, the word pan, "board," does not occur in the Shu Ching. Cf. James Legge, The Chinese Classics, vol. 3, p. 250f., and Prolégomènes, p. 135. It is in Mengtse, Kao Tzu, Pt. 2, ch. 15, that the term pan-chu is used, in connection with the same person, Yüeh: "Fu Yüeh was called to office from the midst of his building frames" (pan-chu), Legge's translation runs. In his notes he adds: "pan-chu, 'planks and building.' Many of the houses in China are built of earth and mortar beaten together within a moveable frame, in which the walls are formed." The Chinese Classics, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1895), p. 446.

the soil has been moved by farming work through the centuries. In some places, the k'ang-t'u floors lie close to the present surface; in others, they are obscured by some additional top layer and therefore hard to recognize. Complete foundations are also very rare. Three things account for most of the destructions of the Yin site and particularly its architectural remains: the diggings of grave robbers; the wells constructed for irrigation; and the tombs of later dynasties.

Varying with the localities, the kind of earth used for the floors was brown, gray, or yellow in color. The thickness of the layers was uniformly about 0.10 m., while the total thickness of the foundations varied from building to building. In places that had first to be leveled, foundations may attain a depth of as much as 3.00 to 4.00 m., depending on the depths of the cavities to be filled. Conversely, when the ground had to be leveled off, the floors may be no thicker than about 1.00 to 2.00 m. The dimensions vary considerably; there are floors of about 40 by 10 m.2 for large buildings, as compared with small ones of no more than about 5.0 by 3.0 m. Orientation differs; the long axis was sometimes in a N-S, sometimes in an E-W direction. These latter apparently were the main houses, the former, side houses. The pillar bases were of two kinds, stone and bronze. They were placed along the edges of the foundations. Through the stratigraphic conditions it became apparent that the houses erected over refilled pits were earlier than those built on leveled-off ground; possibly this latter procedure implied a progress in building methods.

Burials

The exact age of the burials cannot be proved at present. Stratigraphy tells us that they were partly earlier, partly later than the tamped-earth floors and the water ditches, while the style of the objects found in them comes rather close to that of the Hou-chia-chuang Northwest Hill finds. In the burials of Hsiao-t'un, the resplendent royal capital assumes the aspect of
a gloomy necropolis, an aspect strange and daemonic not only to the observer from afar, but most frightening to the excavators themselves. It appears that these burials were not those of an ordinary graveyard but were connected with sacrificial rites. This notion is based on the fact that many burials are inseparably related to the foundations of buildings, as discussed in the chapter on “Hsiao-t’ung Foundation Burials and Yin Religious Customs” below. In the present chapter, the actual conditions are described under eleven categories.

1. Single burial; skeleton lying on its back. Rectangular graves, N-S or E-W. No burial gifts. (Pl. 2, fig. 4.)

2. Single burial; prostrate position. Rectangular pits, N-S or E-W. With or without burial gifts, which consist of pottery (ku, chiēh, etc.). (Pl. 2, fig. 8.)

3. Collective burials; prostrate positions. Rectangular graves, chiefly N-S, rarely E-W, with three or more skeletons, all of them beheaded. The bodies were laid down in an orderly way, most often in alternating directions. (Pl. 2, fig. 5.)

4. Disorderly disposal. Irregularly rectangular pits, chiefly N-S. No fixed number of skeletons, which are lying helter-skelter. Sometimes the skulls are assembled in one spot, showing that interment took place after beheading. In general, no burial gifts, or in any case nothing more valuable than a few shell buttons. (Pl. 2, fig. 1.)

5. Kneeling skeletons in square pits. These pits are about half the size of the rectangular graves, resembling a skull pit at Hou-chia-chuang Northwest Hill. Only one skeleton, kneeling, with a dagger-axe in the right hand and a shield in the left, or without any objects. Sometimes a dog was buried with the man. Oriented toward north or south. (Pl. 2, figs. 7, 10.)

6. Headlong burials. Square pits, containing one skeleton, head down, feet up. No definite orientation. (Pl. 2, fig. 2.)

7. Animal burials. Rectangular pits, oriented both N-S and E-W. As a rule, animals of one species—oxen, sheep, or dogs—are found in these tombs; mixed burials—sheep and dogs, or oxen and sheep—occur. There were also burials of pigs and monkeys. (Pl. 2, figs. 3, 12.)

8. Chariot and horse burials. Rectangular pits of large size, oriented N-S. There are burials with chariot and horses, and with horses only. (Pl. 3, figs. 1 and 2.)

9. Burials with funerary offerings. Rectangular graves, most often in N-S direction, about 2.00m. long and 1.00-1.50m. wide. The furniture comprises bronze vessels such as ku, chiēh, ting, hsien, lei, chia, kuan, and i; dagger-axes and arrowheads. The skeletons, whose numbers vary, lie below the objects. (Pl. 2, fig. 6.)

10. Burials with companions and funerary offerings. Rectangular graves, comparatively large, measuring about 3.00m. by 1.50-2.00m., always oriented N-S. There is a chamber which contains the coffin, the skeletons of retainers, and the burial gifts. If the companions are few, they are placed alongside the coffin; if they are many, they surround it. The body of the master was sprinkled with red pigment and bedded on a layer of red earth. He wears jade ornaments. The objects, which sometimes were placed simply upon the followers’ bodies, comprise bronze vessels such as ku, chiēh, chia, ting, p’an, lei, and ho; dagger-axes and arrowheads; jade pins and bird figures of stone; white pottery; and objects the substance of which has entirely decayed so that they are traceable only through the imprints of their décor. In some of these tombs, dogs were buried below and above the chamber; in others, one dog is buried underneath the chamber. (Pl. 4.)

11. Large tomb. Of this kind of burial, only one example is known. The walls are very regular and measure about 4.00m. in length. This tomb had been plundered in the past; it contained nothing besides stone pebbles and a few potsherds. The farther down, the more pebbles there were, ranging from goose-egg to pigeon-
egg sizes. A tomb of the Sui dynasty (A.D. 589–618) was lying above the shaft driven into the Yin tomb by the plunderers; it seems, therefore, that the Yin tomb had been emptied by Sui times at the latest.

Relations between the Yin Remains

The above-discussed four types of Yin-Shang remains appear in the following stratigraphic order:

Lowermost stratum: dwelling and storage pits.
Middle stratum: ditches and foundations.
Topmost stratum: burials.

Proof of this order is furnished by the conditions found in excavation trench C 85. (Fig. 2.)

In the western part of that trench there appears as the oldest construction an irregular cavity (dwelling pit, H 086). Having been used for a long time, this pit was abandoned; gradually it was filled up until it was level with the surrounding terrain. Again after some time there was dug here a water ditch, which happened to cut through the obsolete dwelling hole from its northern to its southern end. Having fulfilled its purpose, the ditch was refilled; together with the entire old dwelling hole it disappeared under the foundation of a building. Hereafter, a tomb (M 149) was dug into the foundation, without destroying the bottom of the latter, and then refilled with pounded earth, resulting in the conditions shown in figure 2. Thus, starting from the surface, the following sequence obtains: 1. Below the surface, the tomb; 2. below the tomb, the foundation; 3. below the foundation, the water ditch; 4. below the water ditch, the ancient dwelling pit.

There are instances, however, of foundations destroyed by dwelling pits, or of tombs destroyed by foundations. In these cases we have to do with rather late dwelling pits and foundations, respectively, and they are rare exceptions to the above-described order. Interments underlying the foundations form a group of particular significance.14

THE POST-YIN REMAINS OF HSIAO-T'UN

Having been abandoned at the beginning of the Chou dynasty (1027 B.C.), the elegant capital of Yin fell in ruins. From Early Chou down to the Sui dynasty, very few remains—of undetermined absolute age—are left. It was only

14 See the chapter on "Hsiao-t'Un Foundation Burials and Yin Religious Customs," pp. 454–457.
under the Sui (581-618) that the site saw some activity again, as a graveyard. The kind of remains found during the excavations were as follows.

(A) The Yellow Earth Ditch.—In the western part of Sector C (C 93, 97) runs the Yellow Earth (loess) Ditch obliquely from N-E to S-W. Its east wall descends in a slope; it west wall could not be traced, so that the width remains obscure. The bottom of the ditch lies under the ground-water level. This ditch cuts through several dwelling and storage pits as well as tombs. In it were found some Yin-Shang pottery sherds and lumps of red-burnt clay. The ditch is definitively later than Yin-Shang and, in all probability, earlier than Sui.

(B) Urn Burial.—This burial is overlying a foundation of Yin age. Two urns with cord-impression were used as a coffin, containing the skeleton of a boy. Judged from the pottery, this burial may be of Yin-Shang age or slightly later. 15

15 Urn burials occur sparsely in northeastern China, whence they seem to have spread to Korea and Japan. None of those uncovered so far can be dated as early as Yin-Shang, except perhaps a burial of a child from the upper stratum of the Ch'eng-tzu-yai site in western Shantung; Fu Su-nien et al., Ch'eng Tsu Yai, Archaeologia Sinica, vol. 1 (1934), pl. 54:1. A number of urn burials found near I-hsien, Hopei, in the ancient territory of Yan, are of the Warring States period. Three such burials discovered in the Liaotung Peninsula date from Late Chou or Early Han; Y. Harada, K. Komai, et al., Mu-yang-ch'eng, Han and pre-Han sites at the foot of Mt. Lao-t'ieh, South Manchuria, Archaeologia Orientalis, vol. 2 (Tokyo, 1931), pls. 57-60. Hardly earlier and still later are the Korean instances: Kumhae shellmound and Tunglai urn burials (both in Keijō Namdo), and a child's urn burial in a brick tomb of Lo-lang age; cf. K. Kayamoto, A jar-coffin discovered in the shellmound of Kaiguni, Kinshai (= Kumhae), Kōkogaku, vol. 9, No. 1; K. Hamada and S. Umehara, Kin'kai kaizuka chōsa kōkoku (Report on the investigation of the Kumhae shellmound), Koseki Chōsa Hōkoku, vol. 1 (1920); R. Fujita and S. Umehara, Chōsen ko-bunka sōkan (Survey of ancient Korean culture), vol. 1 (Kyoto, 1947), pp. 87-89, pl. 49; the Lo-lang type brick tomb is mentioned by R. Fujita, Chōsen kōkogaku (Korean

(C) Sui Dynasty Tombs.—The tombs of this period are the most numerous of the post-Yin remains. They are of two distinct types: "nail-shaped" and "knife-shaped." 16 Most of these tombs have earthen chambers but some are built of bricks. There are both single and collective burials. Funerary offerings consist of stoneware dishes, bowls, iron mirrors, iron scissors, clay figurines, clay coins, and wu-shu coins. In some of the larger tombs were also found stoneware figurines, tripods, and vessels. Inscriptions occur; in one case, the whole vita of the deceased was engraved on a pottery urn. In a few tombs, charcoal pans with iron handles appeared among the furniture.

(D) T'ang Dynasty Tombs.—Some of the T'ang tombs were shaped like those of the Sui period; others, rectangular, were constructed with brick vaults. Orientation is toward the south. Offerings consisted of pottery urns and vessels, iron mirrors, and coins of the K'ái-yüan period (A.D. 713-741).

(E) Sung Dynasty Tombs.—The ground plan of these tombs resembles a spade; the burial chamber ("blade") lies toward the north, a passage ("handle") leads to it from the south. The heads of the buried point northward. Among the offerings were coins of the Cheng-ho period (A.D. 1111-1117), a black-glazed stoneware urn, and bricks with red-painted marks. The Sung tombs were few in number.

(F) Ming Dynasty Tombs.—The tombs are rectangular like those of the Sung, but oriented to the east, with a passage running from west to
Fig. 1—Map Showing the Yin-hsü Sites along the Huan River Northwest of Anyang. (After Chinese Journal of Archaeology, vol. 2, 1947.)

Fig. 2—Map Showing the Excavation Sectors North of the Village of Hsiao-t'un. (After Chinese Journal of Archaeology, vol. 2, 1947.)
Plate 4

Sketch of a Burial with Companions and Dogs, Hsiao-t’un, Tomb M 232.
east. They contain double burials, heads eastward. The offerings comprise bronze mirrors, bricks with red-painted marks, and coins of these reigns: Wan-li (1573–1619), T'ien-ch'i (1621–1627), and Ch'ung-cheng (1628–1644). No more than two Ming tombs were found.

(G) Ch'ing Dynasty Tombs.—The Ch'ing burials are easily recognized by the earth mounds protecting them. They are located relatively far from the excavated localities.

(H) Modern Tombs.—Still nowadays people are buried in this ground—as was one of the men working for the excavators, Ho Kuo-cheng, whose grave is right in the center of Sector B.

The survey of the stratigraphic conditions at Hsiao-t'un is herewith completed. In the following chapter, the relationship between Hsiao-t'un and the other Huan River sites shall be considered in brief.

RELATIONS BETWEEN HSIAO-T'UN AND OTHER HUAN RIVER SITES

The excavations first centered around Hsiao-t'un but later were expanded to include several sites north and south of the Huan River.

South of the river are Hsiao-t'un 小屯, the Hou-kang 侯岡, Su-p'an-mo 四盤磨, Wang-yü-k'ou 王裕丘, Hsiao-chuang 霞杖, and Fan-chia-chuang 畲家杖; north of the river are Ta-ssu-k'ung-ts'un 大司空村, Wu-kuan Nan-pa-t'ai 武官南坡台, Hou-chia-chuang 北丘杖, Hou-chia-chuang Northwest Hill 北丘杖西北頂, Hou-chia-chuang South Field 北丘杖南頂, Kao-ching-t'ai-tzu 高井臺子, and T'ung-lo-ch'ai 東樂寨. Excavations have been carried out altogether in 11 sites, which are not equally well explored. Their stratigraphic conditions vary, as do the finds, indicating differences in age. The essential points are covered in the following table.

These localities, with T'ung-lo-ch'ai farthest west and Hou-kang farthest east, stretch across five kilometers approximately, and none of them is farther away from the river than about one kilometer. A close survey of the areas beyond did reveal one or two sites—very little to compare with the density of sites along the river.

SUMMARY

The Yang-shao Stratum

According to the material assembled and the observations made during the excavations, the first settlers at the banks of the Huan River were people who used painted pottery, gray coarse tripods (Ting), ground-stone implements, and disks of clay. Whence these people came is a question that must be left open for the present. Similar relics have a wide distribution: Kansu, Shensi, southern Shansi, western and northern Honan; even Liao-ning (Chin-hsi) and Jehol (Ulan Hata) have yielded comparable finds. Since this culture was first discovered at Yang-shao-ts'un (West Honan), it was named "Yang-shao Culture"; however, in view of the frequent occurrence of red and painted wares, it was also called "Red Pottery Culture" or "Painted Pottery Culture." It is the culture of the lowermost stratum of the Huan River sites. The Yang-shao settlers chose hills close to the river for their dwellings. Their villages were very small. What still is left of them are a few shallow and small ash pits and patches of solidified brown earth—an earth of strongly cohesive nature and great density which retains moisture, wherefore the objects found in it often have disintegrated beyond recognition. Objects from the ash pits were in a slightly better state. These villages were scattered sparsely over the area, no more than three having been traced: T'ung-lo-ch'ai, Kao-ching-t'ai-tzu, and the Hou-kang. Their burial places were not found.

The Lung-Shan Stratum

Those who came to the Huan River banks after the Yang-shao settlers were users of the shiny black pottery and chipped- and ground-stone tools; they had a preference for shell knives; and, in addition to clay disks, they had
## Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Important remains</th>
<th>Important finds</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hsiao-t’un</strong></td>
<td>Two clearly superposed culture strata:</td>
<td>Painted pottery, one fragment.</td>
<td>Most important areas in the north and east, close to Huan River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Twelve excavations:</td>
<td>I. Black Pottery Stage; dwelling pits (no cellar pits).</td>
<td>Black pottery, clay rings, stone axes, shell knives, bone awls, etc.</td>
<td>Extraordinary wealth of Yin-age objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st-9th, 13th-15th</td>
<td>II. Gray Pottery Stage; in the beginning, dwelling and storage pits; later,</td>
<td>Gray and white pottery, more than 300 tortoise shells, 3 animal skulls with</td>
<td>Fairly high hill at south bank of Huan River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campaigns)</td>
<td>architecture, canals, tombs. (Yin stratum.)</td>
<td>inscriptions, crude pottery, glazed pottery, Stone axes, knives, ko, animal</td>
<td>Because of sequence of three culture strata, a key site in Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burials of the Sui, T’ang, Sung, Ming, Ch’ing dynasties.</td>
<td>masks, figures.</td>
<td>prehistoric archaeology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bronze vessels, weapons, horse trappings, etc.</td>
<td>West of Hsiao-t’un, close to south bank of the Huan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hou-kang</strong></td>
<td>Three superposed strata:</td>
<td>Painted pottery, bowls, tripods; stone tools.</td>
<td>No large-scale excavations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Four excavations:</td>
<td>I. Painted Pottery Stage.</td>
<td>Black pottery, with furrows, squares, cord-impressions; bone, shell, stone</td>
<td>Loc. south of Ssu-p’an-mo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th, 5th, 8th, 9th</td>
<td>II. Black Pottery Stage; dwelling pits, white lime-plaster circles, earth floors,</td>
<td>tools.</td>
<td>rather far from the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campaigns)</td>
<td>III. Gray Pottery Stage; dwelling and cellar pits, tombs, large and small.</td>
<td>Objects resembling those from Hsiao-t’un; in the tombs, bronze vessels, horse</td>
<td>Important Yin burial ground; many tombs destroyed by grave diggers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trappings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ssu-p’an-mo</strong></td>
<td>Yin dwelling site and cemetery.</td>
<td>Finds from dwelling site resembling those from Hsiao-t’un,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Two excavations:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomb furniture chiefly clay vessels ( Ku, Chüeh).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th and 8th campaigns)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large bronze tripod, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Han dynasty tomb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wang-yü-k’ou and</strong></td>
<td>Yin dwelling site and cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Huo-chia Hsiao-chuang</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( One excavation, 6th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STRATIGRAPHY OF HSIAO-T'UN (ANYANG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Important remains</th>
<th>Important finds</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hou-chia-chuang</td>
<td>Three cultural stages:</td>
<td>Finds comparable to, but much less numerous than, those from the Hou-kang.</td>
<td>Loc. northwest of Hou-chia-chuang, close to east bank of the river. A small site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao-ching-t'ai-tzu</td>
<td>I. Painted Pottery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(One excavation, 6th campaign)</td>
<td>II. Black Pottery.</td>
<td></td>
<td>South of Hou-chia-chuang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III. Gray Pottery; remains scattered in small ash pits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>South and west sectors, close to the river, very rich in finds. Highly diversified and important site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Han tomb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou-chia-chuang</td>
<td>Surface finds of Warring States objects; isolated, no contemporary settlement being known.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southwest of Wu-kuan-ts'un, close to north bank of Huan, opposite of Ssu-p'an-mo. Originally a part of Ssu-p'an-mo site, it became separated when Huan changed its course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Field (One excavation, 9th campaign)</td>
<td>Yin dynasty pits, floors, tombs, and tombs of a later date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu-kuan</td>
<td>Two cultural stages:</td>
<td>Very few artifacts of this stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan-pa-t'ai</td>
<td>I. Black Pottery, dwelling pits.</td>
<td>Many oracle bones and tortoise shells of Yin age.</td>
<td>Southwest of Wu-kuan-ts'un, close to north bank of Huan, opposite of Ssu-p'an-mo. Originally a part of Ssu-p'an-mo site, it became separated when Huan changed its course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(One excavation, 9th campaign)</td>
<td>II. Gray Pottery; dwelling pits and tombs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hou-chia-chuang</td>
<td>Chiefly cemetery; also several small ash pits from older settlement. Very large tombs, measuring from 300 to ca. 1200 sq. m. Burials containing skulls, skeletons of human victims, bronze weapons and vessels. Burials of horses and chariots, elephants, deer, oxen, dogs, sheep, monkeys, other animals, and birds. Except skull burials, the tombs are rectangular. Depth of small tombs, 1.50-5.00 m.; large tombs, about 10.00 m. Large Han dynasty tomb.</td>
<td>White pottery (Lei); glazed pottery; gray pottery urns of 1.00 m. in height. Stone weapons, animal sculpture, vessels, human figures. Very large bronze vessels, many small ones. Bronze weapons, helmets, human masks, and chariot fittings. Bows, arrows. Jade emblems, ornaments, sculpture. Ivory and bone carvings. Turquoise and shell ornaments. Unique finds: marble owl and tiger (pillar decorations); bronze bowl with rotating dragons; bronze Yu with human faces. Han pottery urn, granary, basin, tripod, well; Han lacquer trays, etc.</td>
<td>This site, east of the Huan river, was a Yin royal cemetery. Large-scale excavations, revealing a surpassing wealth of finds. Equal to Hsiao-t'un in matters of Chinese culture; outranking Hsiao-t'un in regard to excavation results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Hill (Three excavations, 10th-12th campaigns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ch'iu-k'ou
T'ung-lo-chai

(One excavation, 10th campaign)

Site Important remains Important finds Remarks
--- --- --- ---
Surface finds of Warring States remains. Painted pottery scarce. Site southwest of Ch'iu-k'ou, close to east bank of the river. Because of exemplary stratigraphic conditions and variety of finds, this site sets an archaeological standard.


II. Black Pottery; dwelling pits, lime-plaster circles, küh. (Black Pottery Stage finds outnumber the rest; many complete vases were found.)

III. Gray Pottery; tombs. Han dynasty tomb. Han bronze tripod fragment.

Yin dwelling pits and storage pits, tombs. Contents of pits similar to those in Hsiao-t'ün. Yin tombs contain mainly pottery (li, tou, wan, p'ên, chüeh, ku), bronze vessels (chüeh, ku), bronze socketed celts, axes, chisels, spearheads, kö, knives, and arrowheads. North of the Huan river, opposite Hou-kang. Rich and varied in finds, this is one of the archaeological key sites.

Yin tombs contained mainly pottery (li, tou, wan, p'ên, chüeh, ku), bronze vessels (chüeh, ku), bronze socketed celts, axes, chisels, spearheads, kö, knives, and arrowheads. Poor in contents.

Tombs of the Warring States period. Later burials.

Since this site has been surveyed only, no finds of importance can be reported as yet. On the south bank of the river, opposite T'ung-lo-chai; a rather large Bronze Age cemetery.

Bronze Age burial ground, where only one previously pillaged tomb was excavated. Since this site has been surveyed only, no finds of importance can be reported as yet. On the south bank of the river, opposite T'ung-lo-chai; a rather large Bronze Age cemetery.

On the basis of stratigraphic and typological evidence, the foregoing 11 sites can — allowing for individual features — be grouped as follows:

1. Hsiao-t'ün
2. Ssu-p'än-mo,
   Wang-yü-k'ou,
   Huo-chia Hsiao-chuang.
3. Hou-kang,
   Kao-ching-t'ai-tzu,
   T'ung-lo-chai.
4. Hou-chia-chuang Northwest Hill
5. Ta-ssu-k'ung-ts'ün,
   Nan-pa-t'ai,
   Hou-chia-chuang South Field.
6. Fan-chia-chuang

Sui generis.
Two adjacent sites of Yin remains and burials.

Three sites, distinguished by superposition of three strata: (I) Yang-shao, (II) Lung-shan, (III) Hsiao-t'ün.

Yin cemetery of unique character.

Three Yin dwelling and burial sites, rather similar in character.

Cemetery, different from (4), little explored so far.
disks of stone. Again it cannot safely be stated whence they came, for again we observe a wide distribution of related cultural remains in Shantung, Honan, Anhui, and Chekiang. Because this culture was first discovered at Lung-shan (Shantung), the name “Lung-shan” has been adopted for it, a name used side by side with the term “Black Pottery Culture,” descriptive of its pottery. Relics of this culture were found in the lower and middle strata of all the Huan River sites.

The dwelling sites were chosen along much the same lines, but, owing to a probable increase in population, new settlements arose and grew in size. The Black Pottery people constructed small dwelling pits, lime-plaster circles (pai-hui-mien 白灰面), and, occasionally, a kiln. Their abandoned pits they refilled with loose gray earth, broken implements, and refuse. Five of the Huan River sites belong to this stage: T’ung-lo-chai, Kao-ch’ing-t’ai-tzu, Nan-pa-t’ai, Hsiao-t’un, and Hou-kang. All these are close to the river; farther away no traces of settlements were found. Nor were any of their burial sites discovered.

The Hsiao-t’un Stratum

The Yin people, removing their capital to this area, were the third to arrive here. According to literary tradition, they came from the south bank of the Yellow River. Whatever the cause—their mentality, or their social organization—their ceramics were coarser and larger; their tools and weapons were made not only of stone but also of bronze; they had bronze vessels; and they had a script they used to note down oracular texts on tortoise shells and animal bones. Since we know with certainty that these things are Yin relics, we refer to them as Yin-Shang Culture or, in view of the site of its discovery, the Hsiao-t’un Culture. Other terms, such as “White Pottery Culture” or “Gray Pottery Culture,” have been proposed in consideration of their exquisite white and ordinary gray wares, respectively.

The Yin people also stuck to the river banks; they occupied the ancient Yang-shao and Lung-shan villages and built new ones on both sides of the river. Compared to the material possessions of the earlier population, theirs were far superior, their food was better, and so were their clothes and furniture. In the beginning, the Yin people still were somewhat unrefined, living as they did in their earth holes, but later they built houses above ground. They elaborately cared for the burials of their dead. The localities chosen as cemeteries were similar in nature to those where they had their dwellings—not too far from the river and on dry hills. Tombs as well as houses were embellished with painted walls.

17 To be added: S. Manchuria, where typical Black Pottery was found in stone cist tombs at Ssu-p’ing-shan and in the Shang-ma-shih shellmound; S. Umehara, Select specimens of the archaeological collection in the Department of Literature, Kyoto University, New acquisitions, Kyoto, 1931, pls. 43–47; and Szechuan, where specimens closely related to eastern Chinese types were unearthed near Han-chou, north of Chengtu; David C. Graham, A preliminary report of the Hankow Excavation, Journal West China Border Research Society, vol. 6 (1934), pp. 114–131.

18 These curious white circles with a black center, which occur also in Ch’eng-tung-yai, Lung-shan (Shantung), were first observed at the Hou-kang, where no less than eight of them were counted in a relatively small area. They possibly had a religious significance, as places for “sacred fire” or as primitive forerunners of the “altar of heaven.” Cf. Liang Ssu-yung, Hou-kang ja-chieh hsiao chi (Brief report on the Hou-kang excavation), Report on Excavations at Anyang, vol. 4 (1933), pp. 617–621.

19 According to the Bamboo Annals, P’an-keng’s new capital, Yin, the seventh capital of his dynasty, was built in 1306 B.C.; James Legge, The Chinese Classics, vol. 3 (1865), Prolegomena, p. 135. Efforts to locate the previous capital south of the Yellow River, undertaken by a team of three Academia Sinica members in the fall of 1936, were without success; Li Ching-tan, Archæological survey of the districts of Shang-ch’iu and Yung-ch’eng in Eastern Honan, Chinese Journal of Archaeology, vol. 2 (1947), pp. 83 to 88, where the relevant literary sources are adduced.
As the sovereigns of their time, they used slaves' sweat and blood to increase their wealth and enjoy life in "gay bustle and debauchery," with music made on sonorous stones and drums. In political affairs and the king's every movement, they never acted without first consulting the oracle. When a prince was interred, men and animals were killed to be buried with him, and they were followed by other victims in the periodical sacrifices. When a house was built, men and animals were immolated as offerings to the spirits and to insure prosperity. To the manes of the ancestors near and far, sacrifices were made every year at fixed intervals, when various ceremonies were performed. The Yin people's mentality and mode of life were such as the more ancient dwellers would not have conceived of in their dreams.

HSIAO-T'UN FOUNDATION BURIALS AND YIN RELIGIOUS CUSTOMS

The discovery during the thirteenth excavation at Hsiao-t'un of several tombs yielding bronze vessels led to the belief that Hsiao-t'un was a large necropolis, comparable in nature and extent to that of Hou-chia-chuang Northwest Hill. However, during the fourteenth campaign, when digging and surveying proceeded on the assumption that Hsiao-t'un was an eastern complex corresponding to that of Hou-chia-chuang, search trenches opened in the western part did not uncover any larger tomb. The fifteenth campaign, therefore, was carried out in a previously explored section, where Shih Chang-ju's careful observations led to a new discovery, namely, that there were burials indissolubly connected with the foundations of buildings, burials which, despite apparent similarities of purpose, proved quite different from those at Hou-chia-chuang. These burials, all of which are of the Yin period, revealed their purpose through their varying relations to the foundations and through their types. They can be classed under three categories:

I. Burials outside foundations.
II. Burials on top of foundations.
III. Burials underneath foundations.

These three categories are closely linked to the corresponding orientations of the buildings.

I. Burials outside Foundations.—It was only during the fifteenth excavation that structurally distinct, coherent, and relatively large foundations were uncovered. Unfortunately, no more than one half of such a foundation was laid free; of the other half, one-fifth remained untouched, while four-fifths had been destroyed by the river. The aspect of the uncovered half was as follows.

Back of the floors running north-south, there were burials laid out chiefly N-S. In front of the floor running E-W, there were burials laid out chiefly E-W. This E-W floor appears to have been that of the main house, and the burials in front of it were few. The N-S foundation was that of a side house, and the burials behind this foundation were numerous. Those buried here were mostly beheaded ones, whereas the tombs in front of the main house contained mainly skeletons of oxen, sheep, or dogs. However, oxen and sheep were also buried behind the side house, and a few human skeletons were interred in front of the main house.

II. Burials on top of Foundations.—The greater part of the burials dug into existing foundations consisted of small squarish pits; oblong pits were less numerous. They were placed close to the edge of the foundation, either at both sides of the door or in front of the door. They contained skeletons of kneeling men who were buried, sometimes without any gift, sometimes with a dagger-axe (ko) or with dagger-axe and shield (kan), and sometimes together with a dog.

III. Burials underneath Foundations.—The burials of this type were comparatively few; they were found only below floors the long axis of which was running E-W. One group of these burials was arranged along the front (i.e., the south edge), cutting under the floor or lying
clear off; they contained skeletons of oxen or sheep. Another group was placed under the middle of the floor; as a rule, one dog was interred here, but there was a pit that held the skeletons of five dogs.

From the above descriptions it becomes apparent that the tombs connected with house floors were those of men and animals. There were single graves of genuflexed men and collective burials of beheaded bodies. As to the animals, we observed single interments of oxen, sheep, and dogs; mixed burials of oxen and sheep, and sheep and dogs. What was the meaning of these burials? A plausible answer to this question is supplied by some of the oracle sentences, such as are adduced below, from oracle bones found at Hsiao-t'un, no matter in which area or stratum.

Oracles concerning the immolation of men or animals relate chiefly to the sacrifices. Referring to the killing of men, the oracle texts speak of “fa jen 伐人,” “fa Ch’iâng 伐羌,” or only “fa 伐.” There are instances of “ten men killed,” of “thirty Ch’iâng,” of “twenty killed.” In these sacrifices, the men or Ch’iâng were beheaded; reverence was shown to the victims; and the receivers of these sacrifices were the male and female ancestors.

Among the oracles concerning sacrifices of animals, there are seven varieties of sacrifices which accord with the archaeological finds: 1, Only oxen; 2, only sheep; 3, only dogs; 4, only pigs; 5, oxen and sheep together; 6, sheep and dogs together; and 7, sundry combinations. However, there occur oracle texts that mention combinations of victims other than these, combinations not archaeologically verified thus far: men and oxen together; pigs and sheep together; oxen, pigs, and sheep together (suovetaurilia); oxen, dogs, and pigs together.

The oracle texts also differentiate between interments (mai 埋) and burnt offerings (liào 祭). Obviously the pits containing animal skeletons answer to the former rite, while remnants of the scarred skeleton of an oxen point to the latter.

Receivers of sacrifices, beside the ancestors, are also the River and the Earth.

No hint is offered by the oracle texts about the meaning of the elaborate burials connected with the ancient buildings. It is with the help of ethnology that this question can be solved.

To the present day, complicated rites accompany the construction of houses in the country around K’un-ming (Yünnan). They comprise: 1, A sacrifice to the Jupiter when the ground is broken; 2, a secret ceremony involving a wooden horse and a cock, performed by two carpenters at a distance of no less than 150 feet from the house to be erected; 3, ceremonies at the occasion of the setting up of the pillars and rafters; and 4, a sacrifice to the Earth for the spirit of the last departed family member and the spirits of the locality. This sacrifice requires also the recitation of sūtras by a Buddhist or Taoist priest, fasting, the libation of a bowl of water, and the killing of a black goat and a white duck, the horns and the head of which are nailed above the main gate of the new house, while the feet of the goat are attached to the four corners of the enclosing wall.

In the light of Yin oracle texts and the superstitious ceremonial of modern house builders, the significance of the Hsiao-t’un foundation burials appears to be: 1, The dog burials below the foundations were sacrifices to the Earth; 2, the genuflexed human skeletons in rectangular pits served as guardians of the house; and 3, the burials of oxen and sheep and those of the beheaded men were sacrifices offered when the building was completed.

Having been connected with the process of the construction, the dogs sacrificed to the Earth and the men slain to be guardians were all buried at the same time. The victims interred outside the foundations, however, were not buried at one time. Evidence afforded by several groups of such burials in the northern part of Sector C suggests that these were laid out at no less than five consecutive occasions. A cluster of eight animal burials (M 94, 105, 106,
Fig. 3—Plan Showing Relations of Foundation and Tombs, Hsiao-t’un Sector C. (After Chinese Journal of Archaeology, vol. 2, 1947.)
adjoining the floor in the south (fig. 3) form one unit. Six tombs (M 42, 43, 52, 53, 54, 55), seven tombs (M 22–28), and another two (M 30, 35) possibly dug at three different times, are counted as a second unit. A third group consists of eleven tombs (M 88, etc., except M 144) and two tombs (M 49, 148). Several chariot burials (M 20, 40, 45, 202, 204) and the grave M 222 form a fourth unit. Finally, there is a group of eight burials (M 188, 191, 205, 208, 235, 238, 239, 242) which form the fifth unit.

Owing to pressure, ancient digging, and recent pillaging, the burials of the former three units yielded no sacrificial furniture whatever, while those of the latter two units did. M 222, for instance, contained bronze vessels such as ku and chuēh as well as three skeletons of imolated boys; they were no doubt connected with the sacrifice of the chariots and were buried simultaneously with the chariots. More sumptuous still were the offerings of the fifth group, comprising 20 human victims distributed in five pits and a set of sacrificial vessels (t'ing, hsien, chia (2), lei, kuei, ku, chuōh) deposited to the north of the central pit together with two victims in a kneeling position and looking southward (M 188). The pit No. M 238, to the east of this group, contained another five human skeletons and bronzes (ku, chuēh, hu, kuan, chia, yu, fang-i, knife, dagger-axe, bow-shaped fitting), which, however, may have been interred at yet another occasion.

**Dog Burials at Neighboring Sites.**—In places such as Houkang and Ta-ssu-k'ung-ts'un, dog burials were uncovered under the coffins of smaller tombs. A large tomb on the Northwest Hill near Hou-chia-chuang was surrounded by smaller tombs in which chariots and warriors were buried; below the coffin chamber of the large tomb and at the four sides and the four corners of the coffin chamber there were nine small pits, each of which contained the skeleton of a man in kneeling position together with a dog and a dagger-axe (ko). The Yin people's superstitious beliefs were strong. In all their affairs they first took to divination; everywhere they arranged for defense against the evil spirits; below their tombs they buried men and dogs to guard them, and below their palaces they also buried men and dogs as guardians. Although it was for the living in one case and for the dead in the other, the ritual was the same and its meaning must have been the same.
"A BREATH OF SPRING," BY TSOU FU-LEI

By A.G. WENLEY

This painting is one of importance both as a work of art and as a document (fig. 9). Remarkable as a display of technique, it also shows the vigor and knowledge of a master who fully understands both his medium and his subject, and as an exhibition of painting to show the relationship to its sister art, calligraphy, it could hardly be bettered. The long, sure brush strokes of which the main branch consists are marvels of strength and brush control, and it is difficult to imagine how the artist's particular technique could be improved. The painting, No. 31.1 in the collection of the Freer Gallery of Art, is executed in ink on a horizontal paper scroll measuring 13-7/16 inches wide by 88 inches long.

Oddly enough the artist Tsou Fu-lei has never been numbered among the great names in Chinese painting, and this, the only work of his recorded, is perhaps unique. Accounts of his life are meager, all that I have seen being taken from two inscriptions that follow the painting under discussion. These are by 杨维桢 Yang Wei-chên (1296–1370), and a certain 時顔曼 Shih-hsien Ku Yen whom I cannot identify. The inscriptions are dated in correspondence with August 27, 1361, and April 22, 1350, respectively. There is a title written before the painting by 杨 pública Yang Yü who lived from 1285–1361, and a poem by Tsou Fu-lei at the end of the painting dated in correspondence with the year 1360. Yang Wei-chên, Ku Yen, and Yang Yü appear to have been friends of the artist and the dates recorded above supply the only clues as to when he lived. The two inscriptions by Yang Wei-chên and Ku Yen afford us just a glimpse of the man himself.

A Taoist "doctor," Tsou Fu-lei dwelt with his elder brother 復元 Fu-yüan. Their house bore the Taoist name 洞玄丹房 Tung Hsüan Tan Fang, referring to the "mysteries," 玄 hsüan, of 丹 tan or "cinnabar," the basic mineral in all magic formulae of the Taoist doctors. The artist bore the title 煉師 lien-shih or "doctor," derived from Taoist practices, both psychological and physical, in the preparation of their magic compounds, and collectively known as 煉丹 lien-tan. He likewise had the literary names 雲東 Yün-tung, and 選居 P'êng-pi-chü or "Dweller in a Grass Hut," the characters 選 居 p'êng-pi forming a figure of speech denoting the abode of a poor scholar. The accounts of him give one the impression of a rather whimsical old gentleman who amused himself by practicing calligraphy, and playing the 琴 ch'ín or Chinese lute. His great interest, however, lay in the plum painting of the Sung dynasty priest 仲仁 Chung-jên, better known by his literary name 華光 Hua-kuang. Tsou Fu-lei assiduously studied and mastered this artist's methods. Now Chung Jên's success as a painter of plums lay in the fact that he made a careful study of these trees, as may be seen from the following quotation taken from the 華光梅譜 Hua Kuang's Mei P'u.

墨梅始自華光仁老之所酷愛其花色種植數本每花放時輒移其下吟詠終日莫知其意偶月夜未眠見窗間梅影橫斜而亦然可愛遂以筆規其狀凌晨視之殊有月下之思

The painting of plum trees in ink was begun by Hua Kuang. Old Jên loved them very much and planted many plum trees at his monastery. Each time the flowers bloomed he hastened to move his cushion beneath them and stayed there all day intoning his prayers. Still he did not grasp their true

1 Sirén in his History of early Chinese painting, p. 107, lines 36, 37, renders this "removed his couch underneath the trees and lay there chanting poems."
meaning. By chance one moonlight night before he went to bed, he watched on the window the lattice-work of their criss-cross shadows, wonderfully beautiful. Then he took his brush and drew their forms, and in the cool of the morning he saw that verily here was a reflection of the moonlight.

From this we see that the Chinese artist, unlike many of his Western brothers, undertook to study his subject under all conditions and in all its moods, and not until he really knew it did he paint it. In other words, the great artists were not only masters of technique but in addition had a thoroughgoing knowledge of the subjects they so successfully portrayed. Tsou Fu-lei was a painter of this stamp. It is interesting to note in passing that his elder brother Fu-yüan specialized in painting bamboo, and we gather that the brothers were considered equally proficient in their respective specialties.

This painting has been recorded in the following works:

铁网珊瑚 *T'ieh Wang Shan Hu*, first published about 1600, but said to have been written by 朱存理 Chu Ts'un-li (1444-1513), an avid collector of notes on calligraphy and painting. The edition used here is undated, the notice of the painting appearing in chapter IV, page 36, of the 畫品 hua-p'ing or section on painting.

式古堂书画彙考 *Shih Ku T'ang Shu Hua Hui K'ao* notes on calligraphy and painting compiled about 1682 by 卜永譽 Pien Yung-yü. The edition used here was published in 1921, chapter XXIII of the section on painting.

石渠寶笈 *Shih Chi'ü Pao Chi* catalogue of the Imperial collection during the reign of Ch'ien Lung, published about 1744. According to Ferguson's *A Complete Catalogue of the Imperial Collection* Li Tai Chu Lu Hua Mu the notice appears in the 三山 Erh Pien supplement to this work in the section 御書房 Yü Shu Fang, or Imperial Study, a very appropriate place for such a calligraphic type of painting.

墨緣彙觀 *Mo Yüan Hui Kuan* by 安岐 An Ch'i, a wealthy Korean collector residing in Tientsin. His preface to this catalogue of his collection, which was confiscated, is dated 1742. The edition used here is a reprint made by Tuan Fang in 1900, volume V, Yüan dynasty section, pages 30-32.

顧齋書畫錄 *Chih Chai Shu Hua Lu*, a catalogue of the collection of 郭葆昌 Kuo Pao-ch'ang, published in 1926.

唐宋元明名畫大觀 *Tō Sō Gen Min meiga taikan* catalogue of an exhibition, held in Tōkyō in 1929, of famous paintings of the T'ang, Sung, Yuan, and Ming dynasties, page 117, a reproduction of the painting.


Kinas konst under tre ärtusenden by Osvald Sirén, Stockholm, 1943, volume II, plate 93 (details).


The brown and white silk brocade wrapper in which the painting came is lined with white silk on which appears an inscription 鄭復雷春消息圖上等 Tsou Fu-lei ch'un hsiao hsi t'ou shang t'eng, or "A Breath of Spring painted by Tsou Fu-lei"; shang t'eng means "first class" in the rating of paintings in the Imperial collections. On the inside of the jade pin used for fastening the scroll when rolled up appears the same inscription very nicely carved, and in addition the characters 乾隆御詠 Ch'ien Lung yü yung, or "With a poem by H.I.M. Ch'ien Lung."

On the painting and its mounting are 97 seals, some of which are repeated, thus reducing the
actual number of different seals used to 56. These represent 14 connoisseurs, including the Emperors Ch'ien Lung and Chia Ch'ing, and cover a period from A.D. 1360, when the painting was executed, to at least 1925. In the following pages the seals are numbered and given in the order in which they occur, and the reproductions of seals bear corresponding numbers, except where a seal is repeated, in which case the first occurrence is noted with its number (figs. 6–8).

On the right end of the scroll are nine seals which read as follows:

1. 浮生山中好處 fou hua shan tsui kao ch' u. Square seal in red characters, .0255 × .0255. (All measurements are metric.)

2. 郭氏書齋秘笈之印 kuo shih chih chai pi chi chih yin, a seal of 郭葆昌 Mr. Kuo Pao-ch'ang, formerly director of the famous porcelain factories at 景德鎮 Ching-ťê Chên during the administration of the late President 袁世凱 Yüan Shih-k'ai. Oblong seal with red characters, .0390 × .0225.

3. 王伯年生真賞 kung po p'ing sheng chên shang, or "Kung-po will truly enjoy it all his life." Seal of the late Mr. Justice 金紹城 Chin Shao-ch'êng, 1876–1926, a patron of the arts in Peking. He was known to foreign residents as Kungpah T. King. Square seal with red characters, .0150 × .0150.

4. 令之 ling chih, seal of 卞永譽 Pien Yung-yü, a Chinese member of the 鐘紅旗 Hsiang-hung-ch'i, or "Bordered Red Banner." His style was Ling-chih and his sobriquet 仙客 Hsien-k'o. Famous as a collector and connoisseur of calligraphy and painting he compiled the Shih Ku T'ang Shu Hwa Hui K'ao. In official life he was junior vice president of the board of punishments. He was born in 1642 and died in 1712. Square seal with red characters, .017 × .0175.

5. 仙客 Hsien-k'o, seal of Pien Yung-yü (see No. 4 above). Square seal with red characters, .0185 × .0185.

6. 式古堂書畫 shih ku t'ang shu hua, or "Calligraphy and painting of the Shih Ku T'ang." Seal of Pien Yung-yü (see No. 4 above). Oblong seal with red characters, .0255 × .0185.

7. 任柏溪萬卷樓書畫印 jên po chi wan ch'ên lou shu hua yin, or "Seal of calligraphy and painting in Jên Po-ch'i's Tower of a Myriad Scrolls." Square seal with red characters, .0250 × .0275.

8. 任氏鈐印 jên shih k'ai yin, or "Seal of K'ai of the Jên Family," a seal of Jên Po-ch'i (see No. 7 above). Square seal with red characters, .0200 × .0195.

9. 黃琳美之 huang lin mei chih. A seal of Huang Lin, a connoisseur and collector of paintings of the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries. His style was Mei-chih and his sobriquet Hsin-po. Square seal with red characters, .0195 × .0205.

Immediately following these seals we again find the characters 春消息 ch'un hsiao hsi (fig. 1) written in large characters of the type known as 隸書 li shu, "official writing," said to have been introduced about 200 B.C. by 程邈 Chêng Miao to replace the more cumbersome "lesser seal" style, and employed in later times for its decorative character. The inscription is signed 山居道人 Shan-chü Tao-jên, a sobriquet of 杨瑀 Yang-yü, the well-known fourteenth-century calligraphist. Immediately below these appear two of his seals as follows:

10. 杨氏元緒 yang shih yüan ch'êng, or "Yüan-ch'êng of the Yang Family," Yüan-ch'êng being his style. Square seal with red ground, .0260 × .0255.

11. 山居道人 shan chü tao jên. Square seal with red characters, .0225 × .0220.

12. 黃琳私印 huang lin ssü yin, or "Private seal of Huang Lin" (see No. 9 above). Square seal with red characters, .0185 × .0240.

13. 任葆昌印 jên pao ch'ang yin, or "Seal of Kuo Pao-ch'ang" (see No. 2 above). Square seal with red ground, .0180 × .0180.

14. 世道延年 shih wu yen nien, or "Shih-wu's advanced years," a seal of Kuo Pao-ch'ang (see No. 2 above). Square seal with red characters, .0185 × .0180.
15. 休伯 hsîn po, a seal of Huang Lin (see No. 9 above). Square seal with red characters, .0215 x .0215.

16. 黃氏惠川書院編 huang shî huai
tung shu yîan t'u chi, or "Record of paintings in the Huai-tung Library of the Huang Family," seal of Huang Lin (see No. 9 above). Oblong seal with red ground, .0295 x .0155.

17. 柏溪子印 po chi tzê yin, a seal of Jên Po-ch'i (see No. 7 above). Square seal with red characters, .0200 x .0200.

18. 安岐之印 an chi chih yin, or "Seal of An Chi." An Chi, whose style was 儀周I-chou and who used the sobriquets 韜村 Lu-ts'un and 松泉老人 Sung-ch'üan Lao-jên, was a Korean collector who lived in T'ien-tsin during the first half of the eighteenth century. The catalogue of his collection, Mo Yu-an Hui Kuan, is referred to above. Square seal with red ground, .0225 x .0235.

19. 朝鮮人 chao hsien jen, "Korean," probably a seal of An Chi (see No. 18 above). Square seal with red ground, .0225 x .0235.

Next comes the paper on which is the painting itself. On the right end of this are 15 seals and a poem. The seals are as follows:

20. 春消息 ch'un hsiao hsi, or "A Breath of Spring," probably a seal of the artist Tsou Fulei. Oblong seal with red characters, .0445 x .0145.

21. 石渠寶笈 shih ch'ü pao chi, a seal of the Emperor Ch'ien Lung who reigned from 1736 to 1795. The catalogue of his collection is entitled Shih Ch'ü Pao Chi. Square seal with red characters, .028 x .0205.

22. (See No. 5 above.)

23. (See No. 6 above.)

24. 午令之鑒定 pien ling chih chien ting, or "Examined by Pien Ling-chih," Seal of Pien Yung-yü (see No. 4 above). Square seal with red characters, .0250 x .0250.

25. 奧興金城鑒定宋元真蹟之印 wu hsíng chin chêng chien ting sung yüan chên chi chih yin, "Seal of examination of genuine Sung and Yuan relics of Ch'in Chêng of Wu-hsing," Square seal with red characters, .0210 x .0145. Seal of Ch'in Shao-ch'êng (see No. 3 above).

26. 世玉寶玩 shih wu pao wan, or "Shih-wu's treasure," seal of Kuo Pao-ch'ang (see No. 2 above). Oblong seal with red characters, .0170 x .0165.

27. 江表黃琉璃 chiang piao huang lin, a seal of Huang Lin (see No. 9 above). Square seal with red characters, .0170 x .0165.

28. 美之 mei chih, seal of Huang Lin (see No. 9 above). Square seal with red characters, .0170 x .0165.

29. (See No. 7 above.)

30. 安儀周家珍藏 an i chou chia chên
ts'ang, "Treasury of An I-chou," seal of An Chi (see No. 18 above). Oblong seal with red characters, .0285 x .0175.

31. 濟南女士愷素鐫珍藏書畫印 tien
nan nü shih miao su yin chên ts'ang shu hua yin, "Seal of the Treasury of Calligraphy and Painting belonging to the Historienne Miao Su-yin of Tien-nan." A seal of 穆嘉惠 Miao Chia-hui whose courtesy title was Su-yin. On account of her proficiency in calligraphy and painting she was called to court in the latter part of the reign of the Kuang Hsü Emperor (1875–1908) to aid the Empress Dowager Tz'u Hsi whose "ghost" calligraphist and painter she became. On account of her ability she was commonly known in the palace as 穆先生 Miao Hsien-shêng, or "Professor Miao," and people spoke of the bird and flower paintings of Miao Lao-t'ai-t'ai, or "Venerable Lady Miao." We gather from an inscription to be mentioned later that this painting was given to Miao Su-yin by the Empress Dowager during this period of service. Oblong seal with red characters, .0285 x .0140.

32. (See No. 15 above.)

33. 三希堂精鑒逞 san hsí t'ang ching chien
hsi, or "Imperial seal of examination of the San-hsi T'ang." San-hsi T'ang was the name of one of the palace apartments and is also the name of a section of the Shih Ch'ü Pao Chi catalogue in which paintings kept in that apartment were listed. Seal of the Emperor
Ch'ien Lung. Oblong seal in red characters, .0395 × .0220.

34. 宜子孫 i tsu sun, or “Fit for my posterity,” seal of the Ch'ien Lung Emperor. Square seal with red characters, .0245 × .0240.

35. 乾隆御览之宝 ch'ien lung yu lan chih pao or “Treasure Imperially inspected by H.M. the Emperor Ch'ien Lung,” Oval seal with red characters, .0415 × .0335.

36. 嘉慶御覽之寶 chia ch'ing yu lan chih pao, “Treasure Imperially inspected by the Chia Ch'ing Emperor,” Chia Ch'ing reigned from 1796-1820. Square seal with red characters, .0370 × .0360.

37. 石渠定鑑 shih chu ting chien, or “Approved by the Shih Ch'i,” referring to the collection of the Emperor Ch'ien Lung. Round seal with red characters, diameter .0270.

38. 寶笈重編 pao chi chung pien, a seal of Ch'ien Lung. Square seal with red ground, .0246 × .0240.

Below this appears a poem by Ch'ien Lung (fig. 9) which runs as follows:

Like breath is spring, it goes but must return.
Who gave the tidings to the winter plum?
A sage from Jui-chu envying Nü-i's art,
Craftily stole a march on the East Wind.

This rather unnecessary poem is something of a literary trick. The rhyming characters, hui, mei, and lai which terminate the first, second, and fourth lines are the same as those used in a poem by Tsou Fu-lei written at the left end of the painting. Ch'ien Lung's poem therefore is merely a not too happy attempt to balance that of the artist, which is quoted farther on. In the second line the characters hsiao hsi, which also appear in the title of the painting, are translated as “breath.” They allude to the inspiration and expiration of breath, and by analogy have taken on the meaning of the ceaseless flux and reflux of the primordial principles of 隱 yin and 陽 yang as seen in the coming and going of the seasons, the waxing and waning of the moon, etc. By extension the term came to mean “tidings.” In the third line Jui-chu is a name for the realms of the immortals. The name might be rendered as “budding pearls.” This line forms an allusion to the white buds of the plum tree and the ability of the “Sage” to reproduce them. In the same line we have “Nü-i” with whom the artist, as the Sage from Jui-chu, is compared. The Taoist philosopher 劉安 Liu An of the second century B.C. describes this goddess thus: “Nü-i drums and sings controlling the harmony of the heavens, raising the hundred grains, the birds, the herbs and the trees, ...”

39. 乾隆宸翰 ch'ien lung chen han, or “Written by Ch'ien Lung,” seal of the Emperor, appears immediately below the signature. Square seal with red characters, .0135 × .0130.

40. 御書房藏寶 yu shu fang chien ts'ang pao, or “Treasured in the cabinet of the Imperial Library,” seal of Ch'ien Lung. Oval seal with red characters, .0450 × .0380.

41. 龍 chih, name of Kuo Pao-ch'ang's studio (see No. 2 above). Square seal with red characters, .0095 × .0090.

42. See No. 16 above.

43. 式古堂 shih ku tang, seal of Pien Yung-yü (see No. 4 above). Oblong seal with red characters, .0215 × .0100.

44. 儀周鑑賞 i chou chien shang, or “Examined by I-chou,” seal of An Ch'i (see No. 18 above). Square seal with red ground, .0165 × .0165.

45. See No. 5 above.

46. See No. 43 above.

47. See No. 24 above.

48. See No. 9 above.

8 (See 淮南子二十一篇 Huai-nan-tehs Erhsih-i-P'ien, ch. 3, folio 10, verso; ed. dated 1788). In regard to the East Wind, mentioned in the last line, it is the rain-bringing wind, which causes the flowers to bloom. (See 詩經 Shih Ching, Legé, vols. II, V, VII.) Further, in China the east wind is the dawn wind, which begins to blow at break of day, so we have here an allusion to the end of the night of winter and the dawning of spring, the plum being the first spring blossom.
49. See No. 8 above.
50. 乾隆鑑賞 ch’ien lung chien shang, a seal of approval of Ch’ien Lung. Round seal with red ground, diameter .0285.

Beneath this seal is a poem by the artist Tsou Fu-lei (fig. 9). It runs as follows:

Where’er my straw-roofed hut may be, I long for the return of Spring. And so I bid the autumn moon to linger on the old plum tree. Though the silken wisps of smoke die out and the empty room be cold, my daubs of ink may keep for me its shadow on the window.

Dated: “In the early autumn of the Keng-tzū year of Chih Chêng.” [A.D. 1360.]

The first two characters of the poem appear to be an abbreviation of 蓬廬居 p’êng pi chü or “Dweller in a straw-roofed hut,” which was a sobriquet of the artist, and thus he modestly refers to himself. In the second line the character ch’än rendered as “moon” literally means “toad.” The reference here is to the legend of 蓬廬居 Ch’ang ê, the wife of Hou I, a famous archer serving the legendary Emperor 興 K’u (B.C. 2436). Ch’ang ê stole the drug of immortality from her husband and fled to the moon where she was changed into a toad. Hence in literature ch’än has come to mean “moon.” The last line seems to imply that inasmuch as the plum blossom is a harbinger of spring, so the artist by his painting may keep spring with him. The poem as a whole refers to Chunjên’s study of plums by moonlight, mentioned above.

Immediately below the date are three seals as follows:

51. 蓬廬居 p’êng pi chü, a seal of Tsou Fu-lei.
52. 復雷 fu lei, a seal of Tsou Fu-lei. Square seal with red ground, .0180 × .0185.
53. See No. 16 above.

To the left of the above seals the following appear:

54. See No. 7 above.
55. 子印 tzù yin, half seal, probably part of the seal po ch’i tzù yin (see No. 17 above).
56. 之印 chih yin, half seal.
57. See No. 26 above.
58. 淋印 lin yin, seal of Huang Lin (see No. 9 above). Oblong seal with red ground, .0145 × .0110.
59. 黃美之氏 huang mei chih shih, a seal of Huang Lin (see No. 9 above). Square seal with red characters, .0170 × .0165.
60. See No. 25 above.
61. 安氏儀周書畫之章 an shih i chou shu hua chih chang, a seal of An Ch’i (see No. 18 above). Oblong seal with red ground, .0250 × .0160.

Beyond this seal comes a poem by Yang Weichên (fig. 3) written in a large and powerful grass hand. It provides a very fitting calligraphic example to compare with the painting. The text of the poem is as follows:

鶴東煉師有兩復
神仙中人殊不俗
小復解畫華光梅
大復解畫文同竹
文同龍去擘破壁
華光留得春消息
大樹仙人夢正甘
翠禽呂夢東方白

The two Fu’s are Hao-tung and Lien-shih.
Even among the immortals such men are not common.
The younger Fu paints plums like Hua-kuang.
The elder Fu paints bamboo like Wên T’ung.
Wên T’ung is like a dragon going and breaking down a wall.
Hua-kuang retains the breath of Spring.
The Sage of the Great Tree dreams tranquilly.
The bluebirds sing dreaming of dawn.

In the first line of the poem, Hao Tung, or “Owner of the Crane,” appears to be the Taoist sobriquet of the artist’s brother Tsou Fu-yüan. The crane is a symbol of longevity. In the same line Lien-shih refers to the artist, being his
Fig. 3, A–B—Yang Wei-chén’s Poem.
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A Taoist title comparable to “Doctor” or “Professor.” The Hua-kuang in the third line is Chung Jen, the famous painter of plums heretofore mentioned. In the fourth line Wen Tung, who is mentioned as Tsou Fu-yuan’s inspirer, was a well-known eleventh-century painter of bamboo. The fifth line refers to Wen Tung’s strength of style and the verisimilitude of his work. There is, for example, a legend about Chang Seng-yu (sixth century A.D.) who painted four dragons on a temple wall but did not put in their eyes for fear they might come to life. Ridiculed for this, the artist painted in the eyes of one of them, when with a crash of thunder and flash of lightning the wall was broken down and away went the dragon. It is to be noted that this story is told about a number of artists. The next line also refers to the verisimilitude of the artist’s work, which seems to catch and hold the feeling of springtime.

The seventh and eighth lines of the poem which run—

The Sage of the Great Tree dreams tranquilly, The bluebirds sing dreaming of dawn, seem to refer to the legend Lo-fu Meng, or “The dream of the Lo-fu Mountains.” It concerns one Chao Shih-hsiung who, during the reign of K’ai Huang (A.D. 581–601), was walking in the Lo-Fu Mountains. The day was cold and the sun was setting when in a pine forest he came across a wineshop tended by a charming young lady. With her Chao Shih-hsiung spent a convivial evening. As dawn began to break he awoke beneath a great flowering plum tree where bluebirds were singing. This again refers to the lifelike quality of the painting. The characters meng cheng in the seventh line have reference to the first of the six classes of dreams enumerated in the Zhou Li. These six classes are:

1. meng cheng meng, regular or peaceful dreams.
2. meng wu meng, terrible dreams.
3. meng ssu meng, dreams of reflection.
4. meng wu meng, dreams causing awakening.
5. meng hsı meng, joyful dreams.
6. meng chu meng, dreams accompanied by fear.

In the center of this inscription where the paper joint occurs are five seals as follows:

62. See No. 43 above.
63. See No. 41 above.
64. See No. 42 above.
65. See No. 39 above.
66. See No. 16 above.

At the end of the poem, also on the paper joint, are five seals:

67. See No. 43 above.
68. See No. 41 above.
69. See No. 44 above.
70. See No. 59 above.
71. See No. 16 above.

Immediately following his poem is written Yang Wei-chen’s account of a call he paid on Tsou Fu-let at which time he saw this painting and wrote the above poem and the following account (fig. 4):

余抵陁沙泊洞玄且房主為復雷師設著供後連出清江樹三番求來翰墨師與其兄復元者能詩畫既見元竹復見兩梅卷中有自居老仙品題春消息字遂不賦詩卷之端時至正辛丑秋七月廿有七日老鐵貞在篤華居試陳有墨尚簡筆

I called at Hao-sha-po’s Tung Hsuan Tan Fang. My host was Doctor Fu-lei. After offering ceremonial tea he brought out Ch’ing-chiang mulberry paper, and thrice begged Tung [refers to Fu-yuan, elder brother of Fu-lei] to bring writing materials. The master and his elder brother Fu-yuan both could write poetry and paint, and having seen Yüan’s bamboos I again looked at Le’s plums. Among the scrolls was one with the heading “A Breath of Spring,” written by Shan-chu Lao Hsien, followed by a poem at the end of the scroll. On this the 27th day of the 7th month in the autumn of the Hsin
Ch'ou year in the reign of Chih Cheng [August 27, 1361 o.s.], at Peng-pi-chê, Lao T'ieh-chê has tried to show that he has ink, still he regrets his deficient penmanship.

In the first line Hao-sha-po appears to be a Taoist sobriquet of Tsou Fu-yuan. Tung Hsiaian Tan Fang is of course the fancy Taoist name of the dwelling place of the brother artists. As mentioned above, "Shan-chü Lao Hsien," or "The Old Sage who dwells in the mountains," is a sobriquet of Yang Yu, while Lao T'ieh-chê is a sobriquet of Yang Wei-chê, the writer of the poem and the inscription.

At the end of this inscription are 14 seals as follows:

72. 楊維桢印 yang wei chên yin, seal of Yang Wei-chê, the writer of the inscription. Square seal with red ground, 0.02 x 0.0185.

73. 廟夫 lien fu, a seal of Yang Wei-chê. Square seal with red ground, 0.019 x 0.0185.

74. 錫笛道人 t'ieh ti tao jên, or the "Taoist of the Iron Flute," a hao of Yang Wei-chê. Square seal in red characters, 0.0205 x 0.02.

75. See No. 2 above.

76. See No. 4 above.

77. See No. 5 above.

78. See No. 24 above.

79. See No. 31 above.

80. See No. 1 above.

81. 高齋 chih chai, or the "Horn Goblet Studio," a seal of Kuo Pao Ch'ang (see No. 2 above). Oval seal in red characters, 0.029 x 0.0155.

82. See No. 43 above.

83. See No. 3 above.

84. See No. 59 above.

85. See No. 16 above.

After the above seals comes an inscription written by 頭曼 Ku Yen in li shu, or "official script" (fig. 5):

This modest reference to himself refers to a remark by the eleventh-century writer or painter Kuo Jo-hsiî 郭讎慈 who wrote "Wu Tao-tzü in painting land-scap es had brush but lacked ink, while Hsiang Jung had ink but lacked brush." See Kuo Jo-hsiî's experiences in painting, by Alexander C. Soper, Washington, 1951, p. 26, under Ching Hao.

陰陽之氣有清有澀人之生其氣之清者則所行亦清而遇者莫不焉得其氣之清者則所行亦清而遇其混焉失清之不能以澀清之不能以清者因自然之理也雲東都君復復齊居京華琴書餘興又以寫意是樂於久之深得花光老不傳之妙殊名怪狀風枝雪蕊或曲盡其妙且梅者至清之物也瀟灑無一毫塵俗氣耳若發越於吟詠詠月之間其可向者不止清而已蓋有歲寒之心也哉若復製者莫可比德於梅之清無愧矣於是乎書此以貽序。

至正十年歲青龍集庚寅秋戊午望天台委羽洞天山人時顯居於華屋居

The vivifying principle (氣 chi) of yin and yang consists of the "impure" (澀 cho) and the "pure" (清 ch'ing). If at his birth a man receives the "pure" part of the vivifying principle, then his taste is "pure" and the "impure" part does not concern it. If he obtains the "impure" part of the vivifying principle then his taste is "impure" and the "pure" does not mix with it. If one is "pure" he cannot be "impure," and the "impure" cannot be "pure." This is a natural law.

Yün-tung Tsou Fu-lei lives in retirement at Peng-pi. He enjoys writing and lute playing. Also he delights in painting plum trees. Thus after a long time (of study and practice) he has acquired the untransmitted skill of old Hua Kuang. Famous are these bizarre forms, wind-tossed branches and snowy buds, revealing his skill in all details. Moreover plums are things of the utmost "purity." They

Hua Kuang is a sobriquet of the priest artist Chung-jên, mentioned before.

This mention of "purity" in connection with plums is again a part of the development of the yin yang theory as applied to botany, and in this case to the plum trees. In 華光梅譜 Hua Kuang's Mei Pu we find a full set of instructions on plum painting coupled with a complicated explanation of the botany of the plant in terms of Chinese cosmogonical theory. Thus we find that:

梅之有象由制氣也

花屬陽而象天

木屬陰而象地

The form of the plum is from the controlling primordial essences. The flower is from the yang and conforms to heaven. The tree is from the yin and conforms to earth...
“A BREATH OF SPRING,” BY TSOU FU-LEI

are cheerful without any touch of vulgarity as if they had been put forth while sighing in the frost and humming in the moonlight. They can be
described thus if we follow the Chinese line of reasoning it required no stretch of the imagination to see that the best of plum trees would naturally be 濛 ch'ing or "pure" in the sense described above.

This seems to refer to a poem by Po Ch'ü-i 白居易, A.D. 772-846. The poem is entitled Hsieh Yang-t'ao ch'i pi li ko 謝陽陶吹簧歌, or "Hsieh Yang-t'ao plays a tune on the pi-li." At the time the poem was written Hsieh Yang-t'ao was a boy of eleven, and apparently the poet thought that he was or would become a genius in playing a type of Tartar pipe known as pi-li. The lines from which the quotation is taken run:

潤州城高霜月明
吟霧思月欲發聲
山頭江底何悄悄
獨聴不嘩魚龍聽

The Jun-chou walls are high and the frosty moon is bright,
Sighing in the frost and thinking of the moon he longs to issue sounds [on his Tartar pipe to express his feelings].
On mountain tops and river bottoms how still, how still!
The apes sound not a breath and fish and dragons listen.

[See 金唐詩, sect. 7, book 5, p. 21 a.]

Thus the writer seems to use this allusion as meaning something very fine. On the other hand he goes to the other extreme in using the allusion "humming in the moonlight," which refers to idle pleasures. Thus Pei wein yin ju 佩文頌月 under 詠月 quotes a story from Shih i chi 詩集記, a fourth-century A.D. work attributed to Wang Chia 王嘉. Therein is recounted a story about one Chêng I 鄭夷 who used to use literary selections for teaching his son. His elder brother reproved him, saying: "Why not teach him to read the Canon of filial piety and the Analects? Avoid teaching him to sport with the wind and hum in the moonlight, which is a characteristic of mean men." The whole expression is distinctly unusual if not unique, and copies of this inscription given in T'ieh wang shan hu 鐵網珊瑚 (ch. 4, p. 36) and Ta kuan lu 大觀錄 (ch. 18, p. 57 b) change it to read "to sing in the wind and hum in the moonlight," which is reminiscent of the remark attributed to

esteemed not only for their purity alone, for they have the very heart of winter. As for Fu-lei, truly we may compare his power (德 tê) to the "purity" of the plum, it is flawless indeed. Therefore I have written this as a preface. (Dated: "The tenth year of Chih-Chêng, the cyclical year keng yin of the Ch'êng Lung Chê, on the chi wang [16th] day of chi ch'un [the 3d moon], Tien-t'ai Wei-yü Tung-t'ien shan-jên Shih-hsien Ku Yen writes for P'êng-pi-chü," [This date corresponds with April 22, A.D. 1359.]

The first paragraph is based on the metaphysical speculation of the school of 朱熹 Chu Hsi, the famous twelfth-century commentator of the Classics. It is a development of the ancient

Ch'êng Hao (A.D. 1032-1085), the famous pupil of the philosopher Chou Tun-i 周敦頑 (A.D. 1017-1073). (See Sung shih 宋史, ch. 427, p. 4 b.) He tells us that after he had first seen the philosopher he was so elated that he 唱風弄月 "sang in the wind and sported in the moonlight" as he returned home. This has now become a common expression for "poetic elation." The editor has pointed out to me that in the Great Preface to the Book of Odes (Legge, J., Chinese Classics, vol. IV, pt. 1, p. 36, par. 9), 喜月 seems to mean simply "poetry" and it may well be that this is all that is meant here. It seems more likely, however, that a contemporary of the artist would make his allusions to an earlier text rather than to the then relatively recent biographical remarks attributed to the famous philosopher. That is to say, he would be much more likely to have recourse to well-known works rather than to the Sung History, which was only completed in A.D. 1345. No doubt, however, the artist and his friends must have been greatly influenced by the philosophy of Chu Hsi 朱熹, (A.D. 1130-1200) whose work in many ways was a culmination of the work of predecessors like Chou Tun-i and Ch'êng Hao, to whom he referred as his masters.

The plum blossom is the first spring flower. In China it is one of the 萬古三友 sui han san yu, or "Three Friends of Winter," a numerical category referring to the pine, the plum, and the bamboo. Indeed a blossom-laden plum tree covered with snow is not an unusual sight. Hence this sentence refers both to the verisimilitude of Hua Kuang's paintings and his practice of observing the plum trees by moonlight.

Ch'êng lung chi a geomantic term for the Ten Celestial Stems and Twelve Horary Branches by use of which a given year in the Chinese 60-year cycle is indicated.

30*
Chinese cosmogonical theory. Briefly there is an Absolute, 太極 T'ai Chi, which evolved two opposite primordial essences. These have been likened to positive and negative, male and female, dark and light, etc., and are technically known as yang and yin. Through the interaction of these essences all things have been and are produced. Now in regard to mankind, the Chu Hsi school explains the action of these elements in the following way. The individual character and intellect are, of course, products of the interaction of yang and yin. These elements are 氣 ch'i or “immaterial,” and 質 chih or “material.” (The meaning of ch'i here is not to be confused with the same term used in a different sense in the first line of the inscription.) The ch'i is received from the father and chih from the mother, and the quality of the individual depends upon the quality of these two factors implanted in him. In their origin ch'i and chih may be identified respectively with yang and yin. In regard to individual character 吳澄 Wu Ch'eng (A.D. 1249–1333), wrote:

氣之極清
質之極美
者為上聖

If the ch'i is absolutely pure, and chih is absolutely fine, there will be a perfect and divinely inspired person.

He goes on to remark that the reverse is true if the ch'i is of the “utmost impurity,” or 至污 chih cho, etc. Between these two extremes lie the various grades of humanity. The fact that this theory, when stripped of its foreign terminology and imagery, snacks very much of our modern theories of heredity and evolution is perhaps not unworthy of comment.

The above inscription is of a great deal of interest. Accounts of Tsou Fu-lei's life are extremely meager, and what we do find seems to be quoted in part from this inscription. From it and the one just preceding it we get a small glimpse of the sort of man the artist was, and as a document it gives some insight into the philosophic background which inspired not only this artist but those of the Sung dynasty who preceded him.

This inscription, a good example of 隸 li writing, is dated some ten years prior to Yang Wei-chên's inscription which precedes it. Further, it is to be noted that Yang Wei-chên does not mention it although he does mention Yang Yü's heading, and a poem, presumably that of Tsun Fu-lei. The paper on which the inscription is written is not so wide as that on which Yang Wei-chên's writing appears, but the same is true of the painting itself which, like the inscription under discussion, seems to have been trimmed. That Yang Wei-chên's inscription was not also trimmed is no doubt due to the fact that his calligraphy covers the whole width of the paper. This paper, however, has been much patched along the upper and lower edges.

Of Shih Hsien Ku Yén, the writer of this inscription, I can find nothing. There is a certain Shih Hsien mentioned in the 萊化縣志 Ch'ang-hua hsien chih as being Director of Education in 平利縣 P'ing-li Hsien, Shansi, during the reign of Hung Wu (1368–98). There seems to be no further account of him, so it is not possible to say whether or not this is the same person. At the end of the inscription Shih Hsien speaks of himself as being from T'ien-tai which is in Chekiang, while Chan-hua is in Shantung. On the other hand, the district gazetteer of T'ien-tai does not list him.

Following the inscription are nine seals:

66. See No. 9 above.

87. 關內侯印 Kuan nei hou yin, or “Seal of the Kuan-nei hou” (title of a general officer). Square seal with red ground, .0230 x .0225.

88. 侃儀周家珍藏 an i chou chia chên ts'ang, or “Treasury of An I-chou” (see No. 18 above). Oblong seal in red characters, .0285 x .0175.

89. 世五 shih wu, a seal of Kuo Pao-ch'ang (see No. 2 above). Square seal in red characters, .0115 x .0115.

---

10 See 性理大全 Hsing Li Tu Ch'üan, chs. 30, 31.
"Spring" by Tsou Fu-lei, Freer Gallery of Art (No. 31.1).
Plate 7
Fig. 9 — “A Breath of Spring” by Tsou Fu-lei, Freer Gallery of Art (No. 31: 1).
90. See No. 4 above.
91. See No. 5 above.
92. See No. 24 above.
93. 蕭國文獻 t'êng kuo wên hsien, a seal of Wên Hsien, fifteenth century, supervising censor of provincial circuits. Square seal with red ground, .0180 x .0175.
94. 易卷圖書 i an t'ung shu, a seal of Hsiang Shêng-mo 項聖謨, 1597-1658, a grandson of Hsiang Yüan-pien. He painted landscapes and flowers. His tsu or “style” was 卓 彰 K‘ung-chang, and he used the sobriquets I-an, and 青山樵 Hsi-shan-ch’iao. Square seal with red ground, .0200 x .0175.

On a separate paper rolled up in the scroll is an inscription by Kuo Pao-ch’ang (fig. 2) (see seal No. 2 above), former owner of the painting. A great deal of this material is contained in his catalogue 觀齋書畫錄 Chih Chai Shu Hua Lu. The inscription mentions measurements of the painting, with seals and inscription. Further, we gather that the painting rated 上等天一 shang têng t’ien i, or of the best quality, in the 石巖畫箋三編 Shih Ch‘ii Pao Chi San Pien, a supplement to the catalogue of Ch‘ien Lung’s collection, Shih Ch‘ii Pao Chi. We are also told that Mr. Kuo was brought the painting while lying ill in Peking in March 1915. Being much taken with it he acquired it. He tells us that it had been presented to Miao Su-yüan (see seal No. 31 above) by the late Empress Dowager Tz’ü Hsi. He says that this painting and another plum painting, also in his possession, by 熊 穎 with Wang Yen-sou (now in the Freer Gallery of Art, No. 31.2), are the only paintings by these artists mentioned in any of the books and catalogues of painting. As far as my own observation goes, this appears to be true. Other information given in this inscription is a repetition of what has already been covered so that it does not appear necessary to translate it. In connection with this inscription are three of Mr. Kuo’s seals:
95. 顧壽堂 i shou t’ang, found at the head of the inscription. Oblong seal in red characters, .0320 x .0140.
96. 鄭振昌印 kuo pao ch‘iang yin, square seal with red characters, .0120 x .0115.
97. See No. 89 above.

In this painting we have a veritable tour de force of brushwork, in which, as Kuo Pao-ch’ang points out in his colophon, the end of the branch is made with one great sweeping stroke. In addition, the documentation which the inscriptions and seals afford is excellent. These writings, furthermore, provide us with a remarkable view of the literary and philosophic background from which was derived the Chinese aesthetic outlook of the time. Here was a deep interest in various manifestations of nature based on the speculations of neo-Confucian and Taoist philosophers which were themselves culminations of the blending of some two thousand years of Chinese thought. Perhaps the fact that the China of that time was an occupied country may have served to heighten this feeling of tradition among her philosopher artist recluses.
SUMITOMO. The question raised could properly be settled by a careful comparison of the originals, since the halftones in the Peking publication are rather inadequate for any conclusive decision. This quandary could be solved in part by adequate photography for reproduction, for this is the tool we have to work with whether we will or no. By adequate photographs we also mean enlarged details of brushwork, so that we can at least approximately read the touch of the artist. How important this can be is revealed, to take an example, by comparing the previously inadequate reproductions of the Cleveland Museum’s Li Shih-cho8 with a good-sized detail of the original (detail, fig. 16). Such a photograph reveals not only the painter’s true signature and his brushwork, but also the chief charm of the original, an extraordinary variety of subtly differentiated textures.

While it is true that one can study a good photograph in detail with optical aids, it is not true of a reproduction made from that photograph. Hence the need for more details in published material. In this respect we are especially unfortunate with regard to the great Chinese collections, the Palace collection in particular. We can see only a tantalizingly short distance into the available reproductions of the great works in that collection. Ultimately, financial circumstances permitting, our greatest need is for a reference library of photographs such as that provided in the European field by the Frick Art Reference Library in New York and its counterparts in Europe.

We, in the United States, cannot complain

\(^3\) Catalog number 114; Museum number 52,588. (Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America, vol. 7 (1953), p. 84, fig. 8; S. Lee, op. cit., p. 140; Fei Sui Lu tu’ang ming-jen shan-shui hua-ch’uan mui-lu (catalog of the “Fei Sui” studio landscapes), Shanghai, 1936.
too much, however. The heartening fact, revealed in part by the exhibition, which was after all limited to landscape subjects, is that American museums have, and are continuing to acquire, a relatively rich variety of Chinese paintings of good quality. These provide us with the aesthetic delight and the historical sources that are the very heart of our study. Further comparisons and more accurate studies are sure to result.

A consideration of some of the problems involved in the Ming and Ch’ing sections of the exhibition follows.

"THE IMMORTAL PEACH GARDEN,"
BY CHOU CH’ÈN

Some of the innocent pleasures and useful studies in the field of European painting have been devoted to the attribution and publication of unsigned and previously unknown pictures. One who follows such a path in the study of Chinese painting does so at his peril; and yet occasionally a "find" is possible and can be backed by stylistic evidence, when there are no signatures, seals, or history available for confirmation.

In 1952, The Cleveland Museum of Art acquired a small album painting (figs. 1, 2) which had been previously described as by "Tung Yüan" (late tenth century). While such attributions may have seemed possible many years ago, they cannot stand even a preliminary test today. Matters of style aside, there is a śarīra stūpa-pagoda in the temple in the mountain notch at the upper left and such pagodas were unknown in the Chinese landscape until the Yüan dynasty. But since the painting is patently not pre-Yüan, we should not discard it. Simply as a matter of quality we cannot do so since it displays a miniature style of great firmness and delicacy in an excellent state of preservation. Rather we should welcome the arrival of a good Ming painting and the disappearance of a spurious Sung one.

The composition is a relatively simple one, slightly asymmetrical, based on an off-center mountain massif with a view to a distant village and mountains on the right, and a shallower, more congested view over a little village, through a narrow pass to a temple complex on the left. These elements are connected by rocks and paths, but with the exception of the distance on the right, the spaces between the rocks and mountains are filled with the reaching limbs and feathery foliage of numerous pine trees. Thus there is little empty space, no romantic mist or great void. The whole effect is crisp, objective, conservative, based upon the kind of transitional Northern to Southern Sung style associated with the name of Li T’ang (active ca. 1100-1130).

These characteristics lead us to such painters, active about 1500, as T’ang Yin (1470-1524), Ch’iu Ying (early sixteenth century), and their teacher (?), Chou Ch’en (active to ca. 1535). The

---


5 It is a good general practice, and a humbling one, to do as the beginning student in art history, and deliberately refrain from looking at the signature or attribution on a given Chinese painting. Surprisingly, even with the most diversified scholarly painters, a homogeneity of style, or touch, is ultimately revealed, and on a visual basis.

6 Catalog No. 45, as *Pines and Towering Mountains*, ink and slight color on silk; height 9-11/16 inches, width 8-11/16 inches; ex. coll.: V. Simkhovitch; No. 52.283, Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance collection.


first is a more individual painter standing between the conservatives and the scholarly school, and the second, the personification of grace and elegance in figure painting, is ruled out as a possible author when we examine a detail (fig. 2) of the Cleveland album painting. There, in the rather ramshackle village we see a numerous gathering of villagers paying their respects to an old traveler dressed in a straw jacket and hat. The drawing of these figures, angular and abrupt, and their social status, poor villagers, speaks not of Ch'iu Ying but of Chou Ch'ên, especially as he appears in such works as The Cock Fight in a Village (ex. Imperial collection). The indication of the figures is confirmed by the treatment of the landscape when we turn to the most characteristic signed examples by Chou Ch'ên. Perhaps the Boston picture is the closest, but all share with the album painting the feathery pines, the cracking branches of the barren trees, the sharp, angular rock forms with a rather precise indication of wrinkles, and the extreme verticality of the mountains relieved by inner thrusts, usually to the left. A careful examination of the Cleveland miniature yielded no trace of an actual signature but it is signed throughout by the staccato prose of Chou Ch'ên's brush.

The subject matter of the picture was not specified in the exhibition catalog, but it can now be given. There are faint traces of pink on the apparently bare branches by the boat in the lower right corner (fig. 1) and on those huts in the detail (fig. 2). The old man is a fisherman, for he holds a paddle as he walks slowly from the boat up the path, and he still holds this attribute as he appears again being welcomed by the villagers. To reach this point the old fisherman must have passed through the cleft at the lower left and so comes from the outer world through the opening into a haven or Shangri-la. This, combined with the blossoms, clearly gives the subject, The Immortal Peach Garden—a popular one in Ming and Ch'ing painting. The specific idea can be traced back as far as T'ao Yüan-ming (365-427), from which source the poem by the famous painter-poet of the eighth century, Wang Wei, was derived. The idea of a retreat, an escape from the "dusty world" was a perennally popular one to the Chinese scholar and painter, and the pictorial possibilities of the poem were exceedingly rich. Of the numerous representations, that by Chou Ch'ên is the most compact and is dominated by a realistic and down-to-earth approach.

VIEWS OF "TIGER HILL"
BY SHên CHOU, HSIÊH SHIH-CH'ÈN, AND CH'IEN KU

Tiger Hill in Su-chou, with its huge brick pagoda and complex of temples, pavilions, bridges, etc., was a popular place of pilgrimage in what must have been an extremely beautiful setting. One painting in the exhibition, a

---

10 Sirén, ibid., pl. 100. See also the poor reproduction in Ku-Kung Chou K'ân, vol. 11, No. 235, p. 417, a fan with figures in a boat.
11 Sirén, HLCP, pl. 98 (M. F. A., Boston); Harada, op. cit., pl. 547 (Kansas City); G. Tanaka, Chôgoku meiga-shû, Tokyo, 1947, pl. 17; Famous Chinese paintings—first series, Yu Cheng Book Co., Shanghai, vol. 36, No. 6.
12 See the Korean version of the fifteenth century in S. Lee and W. Fong, Streams and mountains without end, Ascona, 1955, pl. 27; also, a fan by Hsiao Yün-t's'ung, Lee, Chinese landscape painting, No. 103; there is a scroll of this title attributed to Ch'iu Ying at Chicago. Shên Chou also painted the subject (see A loan exhibition: great Chinese painters of the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties, Wildenstein and Company, New York, 1949, No. 10 [coll. P. Dubosc]).
13 S. Jenyns, Selections from the three hundred poems of the T'ang dynasty, London, 1949, p. 106. The subject is listed by Sirén, HLCP, p. 209, under Ch'iu Ying as "Among the peach trees in the realm of the immortals."
14 Aside from views of the famous pagoda and a general view showing the remains of the covered bridge in O. Sirén, Kinas konst under f. årtusenden, Stock-
handscroll by Hsieh Shih-ch'ên (1487–after 1559) (fig. 3), was followed by a colophon by Wu Hu-fan. The modern scholar-collector identifies the subject as Tiger Hill even though the artist's inscription does not mention the subject.

A second set of paintings (figs. 4–6) in album form, not in the exhibition, signed by Ch'ien Ku (1508–1572), is also so identified in the title written for the cover by the same Wu Hu-fan. In this case certain inscriptions by the artist, holm, 1943, vol. 2, p. 64, the only readily available photographs of other areas at the hill are to be found in the five illustrations in D. Tokiwa and T. Sekino, Buddhist monuments in China, Tokyo, 1930, vol. 2, pls. 13–15. What information is given is from the English text of this edition, part 2, pp. 9–10. Plate 13 is a general view of the hill from the land side toward the pagoda. Plate 14 shows two views of the flat rock terrace area with the Nodding Stone and the rock on which Sheng Kung delivered a discourse. This area includes a small pavilion, a square stone pillar-pagoda of Five Dynasties or T'ang date, and a larger stone octagonal pillar-pagoda. Plate 15 shows two views of the great pagoda and is of little interest to us in the present context.

15 Catalog No. 67, ink and color on paper; length 813/4 inches, height 74 inches. Signed and dated in accordance with 1536. Two artist's seals. Three colophons with four seals, the last colophon by Wu Hu-fan. A smaller section of the scroll than that in fig. 4 was illustrated.

16 Album with 6 paintings, ink and color on paper; height 11 inches, width 11 3/8 inches. Signed on the first leaf “Ch'ien Ku” with one seal of the artist, “Ch'ien Shu-pao shih,” repeated on the succeeding leaves. The seal is not the same one as that shown in V. Contag and C. C. Wang, Maler- und Sammler-Stempel aus der Ming und Ch'ing Zeit, Shanghai, 1940, p. 473, No. 7, but neither is that on the Palace picture in Ku Kung Yüeh K'uan, vol. 23. Each leaf is titled: 1, Ch'ien Ch'ing Yün—Boundless Expanse of Clouds; 2, Pa Pa Ch'üan—Drought Demon Spring; 3, Chien Shih—Sword Stone; 4, Ch'ien Fo Ko—Thousand Buddha Hall; 5, Ti San Ch'üan—Third Spring; 6, Chien Chü—Sword Pool. The title by Wu Hu-fan mentions Hsü-yo (Tiger Peak) and the Fang Hsiu-shing (?) (Precious Storage). The paintings are followed by a colophon written in 1885 by Wu Ko(?)-yüan. I am indebted to Howard C. Hollis, Cleveland, for these readings.

notably the one on the first leaf, Ch'ien Ch'ing Yün (Boundless Expanse of Clouds), refer to Tiger Hill, for the monastery there was known as the Yün-yên Ssü (Cloud Precipice Monastery). The album is of particular importance because of its relationship to a third work we are considering. This is an album by Shên Chou (1427 to 1509) which was shown at the exhibition as “Tiger Hill?” (figs. 7, 8). Some of the scenes by Ch'ien Ku are free variations on the compositions in the album by Shên Chou. The connections of subject matter are reinforced by the fact that both Ch'ien Ku and Hsieh Shih-ch'ên, though immediate followers of Wên Chêng-ming (1470–1559), were heavily influenced by the older founder of the Wu school, Shên Chou. We are confronted, then, with an interesting and instructive pattern involving style, pictorial subject, and the actual appearance of that common subject, Tiger Hill. Further, we are presented with some extra stylistic evidence confirming the attribution of the fragmentary album to Shên Chou.

The two distinguishing features shown in the available photographs of Tiger Hill in recent times (see footnote 14) are the great octagonal brick pagoda situated at the top of the hill and the terraced flat rocks in the area of the “Nodding Stone” with its adjacent pond, pavilion, and the small square stone pagoda. These are to be seen in the Hsieh Shih-ch'ên in parts B and A respectively; and in the Ch'ien Ku album on leaves in figures 4 and 5. Figure 8 of the Shen Chou album is very likely the Nodding Stone Terrace, to judge by the general conformation, square stone pagoda, and the pavilion. The variations inherent in personal handling are increased by the radical changes of prospect at every turn on the actual site. Figure 5 by Ch'ien Ku is very close to the first leaf (not illustrated)

17 Catalog No. 51, four-leaf album, each leaf with the seal Ch'i-nan. No signature. No colophons. There are eight more leaves from the same album in a New York private collection. These have not been seen by the writer.
by Shên Chou and to section A of the Hsieh Shih-ch'ên. All three painted views of this scene show the arched bridge overhead and the flat terrace, but the pavilion seen in the almost aerial views of the handscroll is lost behind the small ridge to the right in the more intimate album views.

Section B of the Hsieh Shih-ch'ên handscroll is comparable to figure 4 of the Ch'ien Ku leaves. In addition to some changes of building positions, the spectator has been shifted slightly to the right in the album leaf and of course brought much closer. Still, one can identify the two-storied hall with round-topped windows and probably the slightly smaller double-roofed structure at the left. In the Ch'ien Ku we are shown both the clouds and the view over the lake that gave the monastery its name, "Cloud Precipice." Part C of the handscroll is paralleled by a third leaf by Ch'ien Ku and one by Shên Chou, a scene with a cliff on the right, part wall, part natural rock, with a flight of steep steps leading to a row of three pavilions perched on the edge of the cliff (not illustrated).

The second leaf in the Ch'ien Ku album (fig. 6) is titled Drought Demon Spring and is a detail not recorded in the more panoramic handscroll by Hsieh Shih-ch'ên. However, it must have been one of the sights of the area, for the same scene is found on the last leaf of the Shên Chou album (fig. 7). There are remarkable similarities—and differences. The well or spring is enclosed with a five-sided wall, while Shên Chou shows it enclosed by a circular structure. The two figures on the right correspond closely in pose, but such a correspondence is totally lacking on the left. The similarities are enough to indicate a degree of borrowing on the part of the younger artist, but the differences are such as to firmly discourage any idea of one being a copy of the other. The circumstance is more likely that Shên Chou, or someone before him, used certain organizations which were current for the given subject, just as in the case of the "illustration" of The Lute Song by such contemporaries as Lu Chih and Wên Po-jên (see page 476).

But in both cases the subject is a thing held in common, and helpful as it may be in establishing our confidence in the authenticity of the two versions, the style in which these subjects are handled is the final test. If we examine some of the works assigned to Ch'ien Ku, we see a talented artist with some of the complicated elegance and refinement of Wên Chêng-ming, but who could paint in a simpler way, as did Shên Chou and Wu Chêng before him. Even when brusque, his most typical characteristic remains, a manner of curvilinear drawing, of defining figures and features with rounded contours. His compositions tend to be somewhat conventional. This style is the one we see in the album leaves illustrated. And the style of the comparable leaf attributed to Shên Chou? It is more daring, more brusque, sharper, with a bold touch which combines the angular with the curved, the thin line with the thick, and always with the feeling of a large-scale art. The visual excitement of Shên's page is the proper contrast to the elegant and quiet mood of Ch'ien Ku's painting.

The relationship is the same with regard to general composition. In the latter painting we find a conventional horizon and repoussoir foreground. In the earlier work the horizon is hidden by a low wall and the foreground is deemphasized to the advantage of the main theme of the picture, the middle ground. All of these latter characteristics seem to me to confirm the suggestions of seals and subject matter, and that in the pages belonging to the Hobart collection we have an excellent example of Shên Chou's mature art, the prototype for the similar compositions by Ch'ien Ku.

While not specifically related to the primary subject, Tiger Hill, there is something to be seen in the handling of the figures on the second leaf of the Shên Chou album (fig. 8). They are

18 See Sirèn, *HLCP*, vol. 1, p. 208, for a preliminary list.
made with short, thick strokes of the brush and simplified to an angular degree that recalls the art of Sesshū, the Japanese master who was almost exactly contemporaneous with Shên Chou. But with all this simplification, the figures exist in space and, as far as possible, in activity.¹⁹ They compare favorably with the figures on the universally admired album mounted as a handscroll in Kansas City (detail, fig. 9).²⁰ Note especially the two figures at the left, and remember that their scale is somewhat larger than that of the figures on the other album leaf.

We are not so rich in excellent works by Shên Chou that we can afford to ignore a fragmentary album with only seals as literary evidence of authorship. The equation we have examined, that of three related painters, a common subject, and three paintings of that subject, is not conclusive. One cannot “prove” the quality of a work of art, or in our present state of knowledge, the absolute authenticity of an attribution. But the equation persuades this writer of the reliability of the attribution, and of the identification of the subject matter. ²¹

¹⁹ In the catalog, p. 150, these figures were identified as “the seven poets?” This is an error. They seem to be six lay visitors, a monk, and four attendants, taking their ease during a ramble through the grounds of Tiger Hill.

²⁰ Catalog No. 53; signed, sealed, and with excellent poems by the artist. The detail is from the first leaf.

²¹ Two hanging scrolls with long inscriptions and the signatures of Shên Chou are described in the inscriptions as literary gatherings at Tiger Hill. One, on silk in a horizontal format, is in the collection of H. C. Weng, Scarsdale, N. Y.; the other, on paper in a vertical format, belongs to Howard C. Hollis and Company, Cleveland. They are not primarily views of Tiger Hill, but of figures in a generalized landscape. Since preparing this paper the writer became aware of an earlier (?) representation of Tiger Hill in a handscroll attributed to Hsiao Chao (active second quarter of twelfth century), dated in accordance with 1134. The viewpoint in this scroll is rather like that of the Hsieh Shih-ch’ên painting, but with the notable addition of two square, stone pagodas on the Nodding Stone Terrace. The figures on the terrace are laid out rather like those of Shên Chou. The painting is reproduced in Tô Sô Gen Min meiga taikan, Tokyo, “THE LUTE SONG: SAYING FAREWELL AT HSÜN-YANG”

If The Immortal Peach Garden was popular, so too was The Lute Song by the famous Tang poet, Po Chü-i.²² The Cleveland exhibition showed two “illustrations” of the poem, one by Wên Po-jên (fig. 10; fig. 11, detail),²³ the other by Ting Yün-p’êng.²⁴ There are two other illustrations of the poem that are of interest here, one by Lu Chih in the Freer Gallery of Art (figs. 15, a, b),²⁵ and the other attributed to Ch’iu 1930 (2 vols.), vol. 1, p. 56, bottom. It is quite impossible to say anything about the attribution or date from the reproduction. See also the hanging scroll of Tiger Hill by Wên Chia reproduced in A special collection of the second national exhibition of Chinese art under the auspices of the Ministry of Education, part 1, No. 156 (1943), where “Nodding Stone Terrace” is shown with two similar stone pagodas and the usual small pavilion.

²² Translated in W. Bynner and Kiang K’ang-hu, The jade mountain, New York, 1929, p. 125, where it is called “The Song of a Guitar.”

²³ Catalog No. 58, handscroll, ink and color on paper; length 23 3/₄ inches, height 8 3/₄ inches. Inscribed with the title and with signature, “Wu Feng Shan Jên Wên Po-jên painted at T’ing Yün Kuan,” and two seals, “Wên Po-jên” and “Wu Feng.” Ten collectors’ seals on painting and colophons. The first colophon is a transcription of The Lute Song; the second is by Wu Hsi-chia (Yung-kuang), a late nineteenth-century Cantonese collector who writes that the painting was in the famous collection of Sung Lo (1634–1713). (I am indebted to Hsien-ch’i Tseng, of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for this latter information.) Formerly in the Yamamoto collection and published in the catalog, Chokaido shoga mokuroku, vol. 3 (1932), p. 94, No. 54.581, Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance collection.

²⁴ Catalog No. 77, illus. p. 101, hanging scroll, ink and color on paper; height 35 ½ inches, width 18 ½ inches. Signature and two seals of the artist, “Ting Yün-p’êng yin” and “Nan-yu.” Dated in accordance with 1585. A transcription of The Lute Song is mounted above the painting. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

²⁵ Dated in accordance with 1554. Handscroll, ink and color on paper; length 39 1/₄ inches, height 8 3/₄ inches. Titled Autumn Colors at Hsüen-yang. Signature and two seals of the artist, “Pao Shan Tsz” and “Lu Shu-p’êng Shih.” Twelve collectors’ seals on painting and mounting.
MING AND CH'ING LANDSCAPE PAINTING

Ying, at Kansas City\(^\text{26}\) (detail, fig. 12). Three of these, the handscrolls, were presumably painted close to the years 1540–1559, and so represent three reactions to exactly the same subject known to all three painters: *The Lute Song*.

Unlike *The Immortal Peach Garden*, Po Chü'i's poem is not escapist from, but nostalgic for, the urban life. It is a poem of exile, of banishment from a cultural center to the provinces, and of memories brought up by hearing the sound of a lute played by a lady also banished and pining for "civilization." All concerned are sad at the realization of their remoteness and the poem ends in tears. One suspects that these poems illustrate the scholar's dilemma—the desire for escape from the "dusty world," countered by the desire for civilization when escape is imposed. At any rate, *The Lute Song*'s gentle sadness had great appeal for the scholarly class and was above all eminently suited to the rather delicate and small-scale art of the sixteenth century.

Since landscape painting was by this time the overwhelmingly primary mode of expression for the scholar-artists, and since *The Lute Song* was primarily a poem of ideas and people, some adjustment had to be made in illustrating it, or rather paraphrasing it. For the idea of the scholar-painter was not to narrate but to express. How, then, could the mood of the poem be conveyed?

The non-narrative landscape elements of the poem are few: "Night on the Hsün-yang river, where maple leaves and full-grown rushes rustled in the autumn ... When the river widened mysteriously toward the full moon ... We moved our boat near hers ... There was quiet in the east boat and quiet in the west, And we saw the white autumnal moon enter the river's heart ..." The mood of the poem is sad, reserved, nostalgic, and hypersensitive.

With this material at hand, the professional artist, Ch'iu Ying (detail, fig. 12), gives us much more. In a sense he uses the poem as a springboard for a panoramic landscape in the archaic style of the period of the poem, the T'ang dynasty. In this profusion of color and shape the narration is begun with preparations for parting (horse and rider) at the right and proceeds through the little narration, interpolating servants carrying lights and, about halfway through the scroll, reaching the culminating scene with the two barges and their occupants, the men and the lute player. This is immediately followed by a climactic mountain mass and then with a fisherman and extensive waters. Villages and even a walled city are indicated in the scroll. In short the setting dominates both narrative and mood. The most romantic passage, visually speaking—"we saw the white autumnal moon enter the river's heart ..."—is treated in an unusual way, the moon, or its reflection, being placed literally in the river. Perhaps the word that best describes this handscroll is "correct." It is correct in style, correct in execution, and correct in following what few narrative elements there are in the poem. Also, in a sense, the setting is correct, that is, in the sense of being archaeologically accurate. The walled town represents the provincial town of Kiu-kiang (Bynner's romanization) where the poet was exiled as second official.

The scroll by Lu Chih (figs. 15, a, b) is quite different. This follower of Wên Chêng-ming has given us the broad river as a setting with landscape elements in complete dominance. The maple leaves, some dozen left in late autumn, are on a tree which stands over the tiny figures of two waiting servants with a horse. At the exact center of the composition are the two minuscule boats, one now empty of its passengers and attended by a boatman, the other, and larger, with the three principals and a servant. The usual tart colors of Lu Chih, orange and an acid green, give a certain clarity to the scene, as do the rather sharp dots on the rocks and islands and the rather crisp outlines of the distant

\(^{26}\) Handscroll, ink and color on paper; length 13 feet 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches, height 13\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches. Signed "Shih-\(\text{h}^{-}\)Yu Ch'iu Ying" with two seals.
islands themselves. Here, too, we are more conscious of the reeds, shown at the right of the scroll—"full-grown rushes rustled in the autumn." The moon is lacking. The effect is that of an autumnal day in subtle color and of a personal and delicate handling of the brush.

The very short scroll (figs. 10 and 11) by Wên Po-jên, the nephew of Wên Chêng-ming, is, at first glance, very slight—as a landscape. But as an evocation of the poem, the picture must stand as a most sensitive and subtle success. Each of the major elements of setting is abstracted and used as a symbolist would have used them: "River," a fragment of a river painted by the fish-scale method;\(^27\) "maple leaves," the top of a maple tree projecting from the tops of others (fig. 11); "the full-grown rushes rustled," making a major motif, representationally and aesthetically; "white ... moon ... river's heart," a motif treated as if the moon were sinking into the river. And above all there is "quiet in the east boat and quiet in the west." By means of understatement and suppression the breathless hush of the poem is transferred to painted paper. The miniature handling reduces the scale of the figures and hence concentrates attention on the mood. Even more, the waiting attendants with the horses are not allowed to appear; only the tops of their banners and a discreet hat and shoulder show over the treetops. We are left with the symbols of nature and the mood provided by The Lute Song. This is the scholar's taste at its most subtle and quite removed from the more professional and prosaic art of Ch'iu Ying, of or of Chou Ch'ên in his illustration of The Immortal Peach Garden.

**WANG CHIEN-CHANG OR LU CHIH?**

As Sirén points out,\(^28\) the work of Wang Chien-chang (active about 1644) is largely represented in Japan, and what there is of it displays a conservative tendency of some strength, but rather coarse, and represents a decline from the art of T'ang Yin and his like. In general effect, his style or styles agree with the often rough-and-ready methods of some of the late Ming individualists. The little handscroll from the Seattle Art Museum\(^29\) (fig. 13), exhibited in Cleveland, has a signature and inscription of Wang Chien-chang and has been so catalogued in Japan\(^30\) and confirmed by Sirén.\(^31\) But when the time came for the decision in placing the scroll on exhibition, it was placed in juxtaposition with three works by the earlier master, Lu Chih.\(^32\) More than one visitor to the exhibition went further and suggested that the Seattle scroll was earlier than the seventeenth-century one and, further, that it was most likely by Lu Chih. With the album painting by Chou Ch'ên one has to attribute an unsigned work, but with the Seattle scroll we are dealing with a presumably signed work of excellent quality. Even so, in this case matters of pictorial style are paramount and a careful comparison is in order.

While the gold paper ground is unusual it is not uncommon. The fan by Lu Chih, exhibited

\(^{27}\) While Wên Po-jên's brother, Wên Chiia, was most famous as a water painter in this style (see Harada, pl. 524), and painted Parting at Hsün-yang at least once (Sirén, *HLCP*, pl. 79, a) in 1569, our artist also tried this water method on a major scale in one of The Four Van, now in the National Museum, Tokyo. The pictures represent ten thousand (wan) aspects of nature: valleys, pines, bamboos, waves, and mountains. Two of the four were shown in the exhibition (catalog No. 130). The scroll of waves, not exhibited, uses the pattern over a large area (Harada, *op. cit.*, pl. 528).

\(^{28}\) Sirén, *HLCP*, vol. 2, pp. 29, 30, pls. 145, 146. See also *Kokka*, Nos. 291, 294, 351, 552.

\(^{29}\) Catalog No. 78, *Spring Comes to a Cliff over the River*, ink and color on gold paper; length 38\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches, height 7\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches. Seattle Art Museum, gift of Mrs. John C. Atwood, Jr.

\(^{30}\) *Kika Inshitsu kanzō garoku* 九華印室鑒藏畫錄. Kyoto, 1920, 2 vols.; vol. 1 (Catalog of the Kuwana Collection).

\(^{31}\) Sirén, *HLCP*, vol. 1, p. 237, *The Island of Immortals on a Spring Morning*, dated 1638. This date, however, cannot be found on the painting.

\(^{32}\) Catalog Nos. 60, 61, and 62.
as No. 62, is painted in color on gold paper, but then gold is more often used as a ground for this particular format. When we examine the pictorial structure we are on firmer ground. The Seattle picture is small in format and in the scale of the landscape within the format. It is complex and detailed in brushwork, if not so in a representational sense. Rocks and mountains are built in a crystalline fashion with the repeated use of acutely angled profiles. Tree trunks and foliage are treated in an extremely flat manner and in the former we see again the nervous, angular touch of the painter. The dots, representing lichens or distant shrubs, are all vertical and sharp. The color of the scroll, while based on the archaic scheme of blue, green, and gold, has occasional wry touches, especially in the foliage. The personality of the artist, even when expressed in this manner, is quite clear; and the closest parallel is the well-known Kansas City handscroll (No. 60), signed and dated in accordance with 1549 (fig. 14). The congruent morphology of the trees and foliage, and of the rock construction, is particularly convincing. We can, with considerable confidence, reattribute the “Wang Chien-chang” to Lu Chih and in so doing provide the beautiful little landscape with an earlier and a higher origin more in keeping with its visual appearance.

As to accounting for the signature and two seals now on the painting, we can only guess that Wang Chien-chang was more respected in Japan than in China, and that the supplier of the signature thought he was upgrading the picture. Also, the fact that the scroll is painted on gold paper may have suggested Wang, since fans on this ground are among the most numerous of the paintings by him in Japan.\(^\text{29}\) The removal of the earlier artist’s signature may have been accomplished by cutting off the extreme left edge of the scroll, for Lu Chih’s signature and seals were usually discreetly placed, as on the Kansas City picture.

\(^{29}\) Sîrîn, \textit{HLCP}, vol. 2, p. 31, mentions 24 of these in the Hashimoto collection.

\(^{24}\) Such as the damaged handscroll formerly in the Heng collection, Sîrîn, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. 1, pl. 2, a; the large album leaf (?) formerly in the Manchurian collection at Mukden, O. Sîrîn, \textit{History of early Chinese painting} (hereafter referred to as \textit{HECP}), London, 1933, vol. 2, pl. 16; or, less likely, the famous Palace scroll shown in \textit{Illustrated catalogue of Chinese Government exhibits for the international exhibition of Chinese art in London}, vol. 3, Painting and calligraphy, pp. 143-147; and the even less likely scroll formerly in the Ch’ien Lung collection, shown in \textit{Kokka}, No. 518, pls. 2, 3, and 4. Interesting hanging scrolls are in the Palace collection (\textit{K’u Kung shu hua chi}, vol. 17) and the P’ang Yüan-ch’i collection (Sîrîn, \textit{HECP}, vol. 2, pl. 117).
and as separators or accents for the larger shapes in the landscape. While his art seems to have possessed something of the measured rationality of the northern Sung landscape style, his relatively unnaturalistic treatment of specific detail and his marked use of the white paper ground as a means of conveying an impression of "purity and loftiness" places him quite properly in the fourteenth century and somewhat close to some of the methods of Ni Tsan.  

While the influence of Huang Kung-wang continued from his own time, the seventeenth century saw a particular revival of his style, both by the orthodox and by the individualist schools. The orthodox Four Wangs painted numerous variations on the themes of the Yuan master. Wang Yüan-ch'i, in particular, made intelligent use of his style and carried its constructive and rational possibilities to a high degree, involving more distortion and daring than was possible for the earlier artist. There was probably less real interest in Huang Kung-wang on the part of the major individualists, perhaps because their art had greater tendencies to emotional expression and to rapid, even anti-traditional, brushwork.

Such was not the case with two of the Anhui individualists, Hsiao Yün-ts'ung (1596–1673) and his pupil, Hung-jén (died 1663?). The former, in particular, made a truly creative use of Huang Kung-wang's style, and greater familiarity with the works of Hsiao Yün-ts'ung may well elevate him to a higher place in the seventeenth-century hierarchy, where he is not even admitted to the secondary circle of the Four Masters of Anhui.  

A long handscroll, Clear Sounds among Hills and Waters, in The Cleveland Museum of Art, published only in two details in the catalog of the exhibition, offers a major statement of his style and contributions (fig. 17, a, b, e, d). A general résumé of the subject matter is given by the artist's poem at the end of the scroll: Planting pine trees to grow elegant colors, The trees show the thoughts of a lofty hermit. Chiseling away the rock to make room for a thatched hut; The hut is covered by greenery, all year round. White clouds emerge casually. My books are opened and I find pleasure in the empty forest. Myriad noises are silenced at once, And only the light breeze drops an occasional musical note. This mood cannot be affected. This scenery cannot be described. Just turn towards the thousand peaks And harmonize (nature) with a five-stringed lute. I see the green waters are lined with pink peach blossoms; Little have I realized that Spring is already here.
Fig. 1—"The Immortal Peach Garden," Attributed to Chou Ch'ên. The Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance Collection.
Fig. 4—"Tiger Hill: Thousand Buddha Hall," by Ch'ien Ku. Frank Caro, Successor to C. T. Loo, New York, N.Y.

Fig. 5—"Tiger Hill: Sword Stream," by Ch'ien Ku. Frank Caro, Successor to C. T. Loo, New York, N.Y.
Fig. 6—"Tiger Hill: Drought Demon Spring," by Ch’ien Ku. Frank Caro, Successor to C. T. Loo, New York, N.Y.

Fig. 7—"Tiger Hill: Drought Demon Spring," by Shên Chou. Richard Hobart, Cambridge, Mass.
Fig. 8—"Tiger Hill: The Nodding Stone Terrace," by Shen Chou. Richard Hobart, Cambridge, Mass.

Fig. 9—Detail from an Album by Shen Chou. The Nelson Gallery of Art and Atkins Museum, Kansas City, Mo.
Fig. 10—"The Lute Song: Saying Farewell at Hsün-yang," by Wên Po-jên. 
The Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance Collection.

Fig. 11—Detail of Figure 10.
Fig. 12, A-B—Detail, "Saying Farewell at Hsün-yang," by Ch'iu Ying. The Nelson Gallery of Art and Atkins Museum, Kansas City, Mo.
Fig. 13—Detail, “Landscape,” Attributed to Lu Chih. The Seattle Art Museum, Gift of Mrs. John C. Atwood, Jr.

Fig. 14—Detail, “Rocky Landscape,” by Lu Chih. The Nelson Gallery of Art and Atkins Museum, Kansas City, Mo.
Fig. 15, A—“Autumn Colors at Hsün-uang,” by Lu Chih. (Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.)
Fig. 15, B—"Autumn Colors at Hsün-Yang," by Lu Chih. (Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.)
Fig. 16—Detail, "Landscape with a Waterfall," by Li Shih-cho. The Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance Collection.
Fig. 18—Detail, "Landscape with Mountains and Rivers," by Hsiao Yun-ts'ung. Los Angeles County Museum: Museum Associates, Balch Fund.

Fig. 19—"Fish and Rocks," by Chu Ta. The Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance Collection.
Fig. 20—"Landscape after Kuo Chung-shu," by Chu Ta. The Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance Collection.
As one unrolls the scroll he sees the “thousand peaks” and many pines following one another in an irregularly rhythmical succession that takes up the first half of the painting. Then a solitary pine on a hummock with pavilion provides the closing note of this long introduction and at the exact center of the scroll we see a low, marshy lake with willows just beginning to green. This prepares us for the dominant mood and themes of the poem: the hut in the cave; the hermit and his books; distant waters; and finally the “white clouds emerge casually.” All this is executed in ink with color, some green, yellow-tan, blue, and pink, but the predominant hue is a delicate mauve, a pale gray-purple used as a general rock and ground color.

Hsiao Yün-ts'ung’s indebtedness to Huang Kung-wang is obvious. The first colophon mentions it but then dilutes that perception by adding the name of Ni Tsan, so that what was a true critical remark becomes a cliché. There is much of Huang—nothing of Ni. The method of interlocking the rocks and mountains is Huang’s, but the interlocking is more extreme and produces a heightened effect of tension and movement. The number of plateaus, ledges, and other flat, receding planes seems increased in the Cleveland scroll when compared with the works attributed to the Yuan painter. Another very interesting device initiated in a conservative way by Huang Kung-wang is the use of different horizon levels in various parts of a handscroll, thus shifting the viewpoint of the spectator and forcing him into a closer and more attentive contact with the painting. This device was revived in a major way by Tung Ch'i-ch'ang in the sixteenth century and then by many of the seventeenth-century painters. The scroll by Hsiao Yün-ts'ung uses it with great effect in the second half, separating the low horizon of the willow marsh from the high, out-of-the-picture horizon of the ending by the climactic rocky cave unit with its sheltered scholar and approaching monk.

There is one other important connection with Huang Kung-wang in the newly published painting. Some Chinese texts mention his use of “thin purple” as a distinctive characteristic of some of his works. We have already mentioned the dominant hue of Hsiao Yün-ts'ung’s scroll and it would seem that a connection is likely. Certainly the color effect is unusual and, if derived from the earlier man, of considerable interest since most of the attributions to Huang appear to be in monochrome.

But with all these elements derived from Huang Kung-wang, Hsiao Yün-ts'ung’s scroll strikes one as an original and individual work. The brushwork is personal, rapid, and very rhythmical, with great variations in relative degrees of wetness and dryness. The trees, too, are distinctive, especially the pines with their

---

39 The scroll published by Taki in *Kokka*, No. 518 (see footnote 1), is colored with ch’ien-chiang, “light purple-red” as defined by B. March, *Some technical terms of Chinese painting*, Baltimore, 1935, No. 112. Another evidence of the dominant influence of Huang on Hsiao Yün-ts'ung is to be found in some of the woodcuts made after the latter’s paintings, notably the *Landscape of T’ai Ping*, reproduced in *The great heritage of Chinese art*, 11th set, the Ch’ing Dynasty, Shanghai, 1951–52, part 1, pl. 8. Something of the archaic nature of the composition and the rather crude technique is due to the woodcutters. In this case we have, in addition to the mountain and rock technique of Huang Kung-wang, the consistent use of horizontal and vertical brush accents like those in the album painting by Huang, formerly in Mukden (see footnote 1). In connection with the last section of the Cleveland scroll by Hsiao Yün-ts'ung, the foreground clouds in the woodcut should be noted. Other woodcuts by Hsiao from the famous T’ao-P’ing landscape book of 1648 were most influential in the formation of the Japanese Nanga school of literary painting. Perhaps the origin of the swinging and exuberant rhythms of Taiga, Buson, and Gyokudō are to be found in the works of Hsiao Yün-ts'ung. See Japanese Southern School paintings (*Nihon Nanga shū*), Tokyo, National Museum, 1951, pl. 116 and text.
thick spines of foliage and the almost darting movement of their trunks. The greatest difference between the old and the new master, however, is in the overall impact of their styles. Huang Kung-wang, even in later copies, seems measured and extremely rational, while Hsiao Yün-ts'ung produces a cheerful tone with rapidly swinging rhythms and sudden darts back and forth, in short a more volatile style and distinctly his own.

Both the derived and personal elements discussed above are heightened in his later works. A major work in handscroll form and dated 1669 has been acquired by the Los Angeles Museum (fig. 18) and clearly shows this tendency when compared with the scroll of 1664. The later picture uses different horizon levels, twisting trees, leaning rocks of unusual shape, and the recurring pattern of pine foliage to an increased degree.

There remains the matter of Hsiao's stylistic relationship to his reputed pupil, Hung-jén, who is supposed to have died almost 10 years before his master. Nearly all of the published works by Hung-jén are in the style of Ni Tsan, with only the use of plateaus and flat ledges to remind one of Hsiao and Huang. However, one very interesting handscroll by Hung-jén, dated in the winter of 1661, has been reproduced. It is apparently in monochrome and with an even more striking resemblance to the work of Huang Kung-wang than to the works of Hsiao Yün-ts'ung. This scroll provides visual evidence for the personal relationship between Hung-jén and Hsiao. One can judge very little from the poor reproduction in the Commercial Press catalog, certainly not in terms of brushwork or detail. But the bending of the tree shapes and the slightly exaggerated interlocking of planes with swelling contours are traits that remind us very much of Hsiao Yün-ts'ung.

Although Hsiao Yün-ts'ung outlived Hung-jén by 9 years, the usual information one finds is that the latter was the follower of the former. While the Ni Tsan style works of Hung-jén would seem to owe little to Hsiao, the scroll of 1661 shows that some such relationship is possible. Both artists are revealed in their paintings as original and definite personalities. And if one cannot yet see the work of Hung-jén in a public collection here, one can now see the work of Hsiao Yün-ts'ung in two important and beautiful handscrolls.

THE TWO STYLES OF CHU TA

The most typical productions of the great monk individualist, Chu Ta (1626-ca. 1705), equally well-known as Pa-ta-shan-jén, are rapidly and economically brushed ink paintings of rocks, fish, birds, or plants. Their extreme and daring simplicity is matched by what appears to most observers as an almost whimsical familiarity with his subject matter. Perhaps more than any other Chinese painter he imputes what a Westerner would describe as human values to both his animate and inanimate subjects. In such works his brush never hesitates, never naps, and never searches. It describes and places with immediate, almost divine, haste. The results are brilliant, but even so, with a frosty, cold brilliancy quite unlike the equally bold, but warm and sensuous art of another contemporary individualist, Tao-chi (before 1645-after 1704).

Chu Ta's other style is found, to my knowledge, only in landscape subjects. It is complex, where the other is simple. The brushwork seems more tentative, even careless, in seeking out and defining the shapes and placements of the landscape elements. Where the first style is

40 See catalog No. 104 for a typical example.
expressive of immediate, intuitive knowledge of the pictorial structure to be, the second is constructive and rational, corresponding to a deliberate and earnest attempt to rebuild the structure of nature on paper with the means available in the seventeenth century; that is, without the interest in detailed representation so characteristic of the much earlier rational approach of the Northern Sung painters, and with the abbreviated and rebellious, and often antitraditional, brush handling of the early Ch'ing individualists. The quality that unites the two styles of Chu Ta is the cold and rational mood common to both and, in addition, occasional lapses from the constructive to the intuitive mode in landscapes of the second style.

A previously unpublished handscroll will serve to illustrate Chu Ta's most common and appealing manner (fig. 19), but with the additional interest of an unusually close integration of pictorial values with literary ones. In this integration one can find, intended or not, a striking example of intellectual organization, and that in a picture of extreme simplicity and apparent spontaneity.

From right to left we see in the scroll: an overhanging rock in rather dry brushwork with chrysanthemums seemingly suspended from it; a poem; an eccentric rock with lichens, two fish, one large, the other almost a minnow, and above them a poem; finally, a broad and wetly brushed area defined as an expanse of lotus by the several characteristic stalks with their dotted surfaces, and a third poem. One's first impression is of a delightfully informal sequence of representationally related objects. We do note a definite progression from right to left in terms of relative wetness of the ink wash, beginning with a dry touch and ending with floating masses of very wet ink. We are also aware of a generally diagonal movement from above on the right, through the rock and fish in the center, to the lotus ink at the far lower left.

The poems are cryptic as is usually the case with Pa-ta-shan-jên.

A foot and a half from Heaven  
Only white clouds are moving.  
Are there yellow (huang) flowers there?  
Behind the clouds is the city of gold.

In the old days there was a river,  
Above which the bright moon used to shine.  
Mr. Huang had two golden carp  
Which have gone, becoming dragons.

Under these thirty-six thousand acres (of lotus)  
Day and night fish are swimming.  
Coming here to the shadow of a yellow (huang) cliff  
All creatures become immortal.

The visual program conforms to the literary one: the traditional heaven, this world, Buddhist salvation (the lotus). Further, the character huang (yellow) runs through all three poems and while it may refer to the color of earth, or the center of the world, it is even more likely to be a reference to the imperial yellow. Chu Ta was of the Ming princely lineage and one of the standard themes of the early Ch'ing individualists was a continued lamentation for the fall of the Ming house and the domination of the foreign Manchus. Is it not possible that the poems refer successively to the remote golden heaven of the past, the scholar's world (carp becoming dragons is one of the most hackneyed symbols of scholarship and officialdom), and to the only path now available to the rebel scholars, the life of a Buddhist hermit? The picture seems to

43 See S. Lee and W. Fong, op. cit.
44 Fish and Rocks, handscroll, ink on paper; length 62 inches, height 11 1/2 inches. Three poems of the artist, each with one seal, I-shan-jên. One unidentified seal of the artist at the far right. Two collectors' seals at lower right. Two collector's seals of Chang Ta-chien, twentieth-century painter and collector, on the mounting. One modern Japanese colophon. No. 53.247, Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance collection.
45 The translations are by Wen Fong, who also untangled the literary meaning as far as possible.
say just this beneath the dashing surface. The viewer progresses from the dry and remote to the wet and immediate, from the more careful construction, or even recollection, of the overhanging rock and flowers to the abstract and intuitive grace of the final passages.

What appears, then, as a simple and spontaneous ink play becomes a rather more complex and organized combination of intellect and emotion. Chu Ta’s most common style can, then, be more than it seems. This fluid and cursive manner in landscape was shown in the exhibition by an extremely handsome large landscape in ink and color with the same direct appeal of the animal, vegetable, and mineral paintings.

The second pictorial method used by Pa-ta-shan-jién is most familiar from the well-known hanging scroll in the Abe collection and was represented in the exhibition by a previously unpublished hanging scroll recently acquired by the Cleveland Museum of Art (fig. 20). In this, as in the Abe painting, we are confronted with a different facet of the same remarkable personality that is Chu Ta. If we ignore for the moment the imposing composition and look only at the brushwork we are surprised to find a complex of strokes, some dry, some wet, some clear, others faint, some repeating the directional significance of other nearby strokes, some strengthening a previously more hesitant stroke, while others seem to be applied for textural purposes. What, then, is the meaning of this apparent mélangé?

46 Catalog No. 99. There is another of this type, but in a lighter and more delicate style, reproduced in Kokka, No. 516, pl. 6 (ex. coll. T. Yamamoto).
47 Sōrai kwan Kinshō, Osaka, 1930, part 1, vol. 3, No. 44.
48 Landscape after Kuo Chung-shu, ink on paper; height 43½ inches, width 22½ inches. Inscription and signature of the artist with three seals: Shan-jén, K’o-tē shén-hsien, and Yao-shu. Three collector’s seals of Mr. Huang (?). Two unidentified collectors’ seals. Three collector’s seals of Chang Ta-ch’ien, the twentieth-century painter and collector. No. 53-30, Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance collection.

The key lies, first, in the large hanging scroll format and, second, in the intention implicit in the inscription. “Imitate (follow, manner of) Kuo Chung-shu” (flourished ca. 934, pupil of Kuan T’ung). We are not dealing with a handscroll or an album meant to be seen close at hand, nor are we seeing his own most individual style, but rather a large-scale construction in his own liberal interpretation of the Northern Sung monumental style. Chu Ta was by no means the only one to re-try this rational method of recreating the natural order on paper. The same painstaking method described by Kuo Hsi (eleventh century) was used by such seventeenth-century orthodox painters as Wang Yüan-ch’i. In this method one built as one went along after indicating the general outline of the work, and correcting and strengthening as the painting progressed. Note all through the Cleveland landscape the light washes and strokes underneath the darker areas. With these, the “layout” was accomplished and on these the fully developed forms were built. The result is full of “pentimenti” and corrections; one does not thrill to the single unerring brush stroke, but to the gradual realization of forms grown from tentative beginnings.

This is not to say that the resulting landscape looks like that of a Northern Sung painter. Far from it. The hand of the individualist is present in every area, in the distorted trees, and especially in the deliberate hiding of the top of the great twisting cliff, so that it may be capped by

49 Ku Kung shu hwa chi, vol. 29, shows a figure painting attributed to this master, while Sōrai kwan Kinshō, op. cit., vol. 1, part 1, No. 9, reproduces an architectural and landscape hanging scroll of imposing size and sound composition. At the least it shows his style and is particularly interesting because of the minor use of the twisting cliff motif used as a starting point by Chu Ta.
50 See S. Lee and W. Fong, op. cit., or the brief summary in Lee, op. cit., pp. 23-27.
the two towering distant peaks and so made to appear not smaller, but larger, even colossal, in scale, and dwarfing the trees, boat, man, and houses below. The suppression of brush virtuosity is as deliberate as that practiced by the first innovator of the late Ming individualists, Tung Ch'i-ch'ang (1555–1636), an artist whose influence was paramount in the seventeenth century and whose methods are found in Chu Ta's landscape, especially in the handling of the foliage in the lower right.

Still, no matter how the virtuoso may try to conceal the obviously astounding technique seen in his first style, it betrays its presence in certain passages, notable in the lightly toned, curving planes of the rising shoreline just below and beyond the figure of the man with staff standing on the shelving ledge about two-thirds down the center of the landscape.

What we are meant to see, however, just as the title implies, is the monumental scale produced by the capping peaks, the tension and force of nature's shapes, and the spaciousness suggested by such a wonderful series of recessions as those from the man to the trees on the flat to the rising ledge, through the air from the cliff edge to the boat and beyond. All this is accomplished with rather cold ink and in a rather dispassionate way. This manner and the one discussed earlier are united by the same emotional tone—cool, brilliant, and objective. In the first style, these qualities are in the parts and united by literary means; in the second style the artist asks us to look at the construction as a whole.

---

83 Ibid., No. 69, p. 94.
NOTES

A SASANIAN SILVER MEDALLION OF VARHRĀN III

The silver medallion illustrated in figure 1 was acquired in the trade in New York and is in the possession of the present writer. It is said to have been brought from Persia around 1930. It is a flat fragment from some larger object whose exact nature can no longer be surmised and measures 130 mm. (maximum diameter). The weight is 290 grams. The medallion is composed of two layers of silver joined together. The lower layer—the lining—bears no decoration and is essentially flat, though irregular. The upper layer is somewhat convex and features a royal personage facing left and wearing a distinctive crown belonging to one of the Sasanian emperors (figs. 3 and 4). The portrait was worked in high repoussé and subsequently chased and gilded. The head of the king is surrounded by an inscription of which 26 letters remain. The medallion is enclosed in a border consisting of two concentric ellipses with a garland of foliage between. A small segment of the lower border is visible at the lower left corner. The border and inscription are in silver applique, chased and gilded.

The inscription contained 40 letters of which 14 were on the missing right edge. It begins at the place indicated by an arrow on figure 1 and reads counterclockwise from the inside (i.e., right to left). The writing is in cursive Pahlavi script and reads as follows:4

YHYW mzdyzn bgy wrhr'n ML
[K'n MLK  yr'n W ]nyr'n

Approximate pronunciation (third century A.D.) is:
ziw mazdesn bai Varhrân šahān-šāh ērān ud anērān.

Translation: Vivat Mazdayasnian Lord Varhrān, King of Kings of the Iranians and Non-Iradians.

The inscription and the crown show that the portrait belongs to Sasanian Emperor Varhrān III (A.D. 293).

We follow Herzfeld4 in a brief sketch of the historical events surrounding the reign of Varhrān III. Shāhpuhr I (241–272) was succeeded by his sons Hormizd I (272–273) and Varhrān I (273–276). The latter was succeeded by his son Varhrān II (276–293). In 283, while he was engaged in war against the Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius Carus, his brother Hormizd rose in rebellion. Hormizd was supported, among others, by the Sakas (occupants of Sakastan, modern Seistan, east of the Great Persian Desert). Varhrān II defeated his brother, conquered Sakastan, and in 284 installed his son Varhrān III as Sakān-šāh. In 293, upon the death of his father, Varhrān III claimed the throne, apparently against his own will but compelled by his dignitaries. He was opposed by Narseh, his great-uncle and the son of Shāhpuhr I. In the resulting civil war, Varhrān III was defeated and probably met with death. He ruled the capital for four months. Narseh ruled from 293 to 302.

1 I am indebted to Dr. A. D. H. Bivar of Christ Church and the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford) for helpful information and valuable criticism. The author is also grateful to Mr. M. Azizbeglou for kindly permitting him to publish the obverse of a fine coin in his possession (fig. 4) and to Dr. R. Göbl for generously supplying Mr. Azizbeglou’s photograph for this study.


3 The reading of the inscription and its authentication are due to Prof. W. B. Henning.

4 Capital letters are used for Pahlavi ideograms, i.e., words of Aramaic origin pronounced in Iranian. Thus, for instance, “MLK” was pronounced “shāh” instead of “malkā.”


6 F. D. J. Parack (Sasanian coins, Bombay, 1924, p. 87) states that Varhrān III was the son of Hormizd I and thus the cousin of Varhrān II. Herzfeld’s arguments (Paikuli, pp. 171–172), however, seem convincing.
The length of the reign of Varhrān III is by no means a certainty. He might have ruled longer in the provinces. According to Tabari, he ruled for four years.

Varhrān III left a small number of coins recognizable by the crown (figs. 3 and 4). The coins of Narseh are quite numerous and his crown has the same simple basic diadem as that of Varhrān III. The characteristic difference is that instead of the two streamers at the base of the globular superstructure of the crown of Varhrān III, the crown of Narseh has four palmettes attached to the diadem at the cardinal points (fig. 5). Another important difference is that the hair falling on the neck of Varhrān III is curly while that of Narseh is straight and appears to be plaited.

The scarcity of the coins of Varhrān III, their poor legibility and the similarity of the two crowns has led several authors to attribute all the coins of Varhrān III (and consequently also his crown) to Narseh.

7 Paikuli, p. 43.
9 The 25 coins of Varhrān III which came to this writer’s attention are distributed as follows: 9 British Museum; 7 Ermitage, Leningrad (as of 1928); 2 Cabinet des Médailles, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; 2 collection M. Azizbeglou, Teheran; 1 Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; 1 American Numismatic Society, New York; 1 Berlin, Museum; 1 Central Museum, New Delhi (ex coll. Paruck); 1 collection of Dr. R. Göbl, Vienna. Of these, two are aurei (British Mus. and Berlin Mus.), five are small coppepers (Ermitage and British Mus. [1]). The remaining 18 are silver drachms.

Very few coins of Narseh show the palmettes and the upper pair of streamers. The tables of Herzfeld, Erdmann, and Göbl picture this crown with both palmettes and upper streamers.

11 R. Vasmer, Sasanian coins in the Ermitage, Numism. Chronicle, ser. 5, vol. 8 (1928), pp. 297-308; Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt. aus Iran, vol. 9 (1938), p. 112; Erdmann, op. cit., p. 98 and 123; Göbl, op. cit., pp. 105-106 and pl. 4. Vasmer, op. cit., p. 304, refers to correspondence with Herzfeld which seems to be the origin of this point of view. It should be noted that as late as 1924, Herzfeld (Paikuli, p. 10, fig. 12) did attribute the crown without palmettes to Varhrān III.

There is an unsigned rock relief at Naqsh-e Rostam representing an investiture scene of a king wearing a crown of the type discussed above (fig. 2). The crown lacks the upper pair of streamers but also shows no sign of the palmettes. The hair is flowing and curly. The attribution of this relief to Narseh should perhaps be reconsidered, particularly if one admits the possibility of a longer reign for Varhrān III.

Narseh is the author of the famous Paikuli inscription in which he refers to Varhrān III as Sakan-shāh. Also found at Paikuli were four stone busts of Narseh. The palmettes in the crown and the straight hair are present. The Berlin Museum (Islamic Section) has a silver bust (height, 4 cm.) attributed to Narseh.

Samuel Eilenberg

BEMERKUNGEN ZU EINIGEN NEUEREN ARBEITEN ÜBER DIE SASANIDISCHE NUMISMATIK


13 In his original reconstruction of the bust (Paikuli, pp. 7-9) Herzfeld did not notice the palmettes. He corrects himself in Arch. Mitt. aus Iran, vol. 9 (1938), pl. 112, fig. 8. Cf. Erdmann, op. cit., p. 98, note 41.
14 Sarre, op. cit., p. 49, fig. 14; Erdmann op. cit., p. 98, note 41.
15 Vol. 15-16 (1951), S. 87-123, im Folgenden zitiert A. I.
Fig. 3—Silver Drachm of Varhrān III. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum.

Fig. 4—Silver Drachm of Varhran III. Teheran, Collection of Azizbeglou.

Fig. 5—Silver Drachm of Narseh. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum.
NOTES
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Zunächst kurz zu den Vorarbeiten. Sasani
dische Münzstudien I. Generelle Vornotizen (Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Numismatischen Gesellschaft)


3 Bombay, 1924.
5 Obwohl ich mir denken könnte, dass die Fachgenossen des Verfassers warten werden, bis er seine Ergebnisse in einer weniger skizzenhaften Form vorlegt.

(See the review by George C. Miles in this issue of Ars Orientalis, pp. 589–591 [Ed.])


7 F. Altheim sei gedankt, dass er ihr Erscheinen ermöglichte.


Sasani
dische Münzstudien II. Römische und sas
dische Büstengruppen, (s. o., vol. 7 [1952], S. 133–135) Die Gegenüberstellung ist überzeugend, nur hätte man für No. 1 lieber ein römisches Beispiel gesehen, das früher ist, als die älteste sasäische Büstengruppe. Die späte Partherzeit hat stärker mit den hellenistischen Tendenzen gebrochen, als die erste Phase der sasäischen Kunst, die ihre eigene Form erst in erneuter Auseinandersetzung mit der westlichen Kunst findet, allerdings, insofern ist die Formulierung „eine Art hellenistischer Renaissance“ nicht glücklich, mit der oströmischen Provinzkunst.

Die Investitur des Djamasp. Ein Beitrag zur sasani
dischen Münzkunde“ (Schweizer Münzblätter, vol. 3 [1952], S. 57 f.). Göbl hat Recht, daß es sich hier nicht um eine Thronfolger- sondern um eine Investiturguppe handelt, bei der an die Stelle des Thronfolgers der Münzen Varhrans II. Ahura Mazdāh getreten ist. Die kompositionelle Ähnlichkeit zwischen diesen beiden, rund 300 Jahre auseinanderliegenden Münzen ist so groß, daß sie kein Zufall sein kann. Wie erklärt sie sich? Und was bedeutet dann die Corona mit Bünden in den Händen des Thronfolgers auf den Münzen Varhrans II. (Göbl Typ 8)?

Sasani
dische Münzstudien III. Die Kronenfolge
des Sasani
den Artaxer I. (s. o., vol. 7 [1952], S. 138,

8 Beides hat er Aufbau, S. 51–52, 76, 82 korrigiert.
9 Büstengruppen nach römischem Vorbild, dies nur am Rande vermerkt, sind bei seldschukischen Münzen nicht selten.
10 Dazu K. Erdmann, Die Kunst Irans zur Zeit der Sasani
den, Berlin, 1943, und Sasani
dische Felsreliefs—römische Histori
Die Krone mit Arsalidenkappe und Adler als Füllung (Göbl No. 3) war mir natürlich bekannt, da C. Trever das Leningrader Exemplar in *A survey of Persian art* veröffentlicht hat. Ich rechnete sie zu meiner Gruppe B, wobei ich allerdings übersah, sie als Variante zu erwähnen. Göbl hat gewiß Recht, sie als eigenen Typ zu betrachten und ihr eine besondere Bedeutung zuzusprechen. Mein Aufsatz beginnt mit der letzten Krone Ardashîrs I. (Göbl No. 6). Darum wurden, was gewiß nicht ganz berechtigt war, ihre Vorformen in eine Anmerkung verwiesen. Wenn ich dabei den Typus mit unverhülltem Haupthaar als E am Ende aufführte, sollte damit nicht gesagt sein, daß ich ihn, was ja sinnlos wäre, als die späteste Form ansah. Daß für mich wie Göbl die Endform D = Göbl, No. 6 ist, geht aus dem Text eindeutig hervor. Die Stellung von E in der Übersicht sollte eine Einordnung offen lassen, was ich hätte vermerken sollen. Göbls Einordnung als No. 4 ist typologisch einleuchtend, aber wenn er die bei mir fehlende Abart von B (seine No. 3) mit Adlerfüllung als kurzfristige Krönungsprägung nach dem Sieg über Artabân ansieht, was richtig sein wird, wäre doch darauf hinzudeuten, daß die Form E (Göbl No. 4) in Firûzâbâd auf dem Felsrelief vorkommt, das Ardashîr im Kampf mit Artabân zeigt. Danach wäre diese Form eher zwischen Göbl Nos. 2 und 3 einzubinden. Oder sollte sie unter Umständen gar keine Krone im repräsentativen Sinne darstellen? So würde die Reihenfolge sein:

Göbl No. 1 = Erdmann A Arsalidenkappe von vorn.
Göbl No. 2 = Erdmann B Arsalidenkappe nach rechts mit Stern.
Göbl No. 4 = Erdmann E Scheitelhaar kugelig, unverhüllt, Stirnreif.
Göbl No. 3 = Erdmann (B) Arsalidenkappe nach rechts, mit Adler.
Göbl No. 5 = Erdmann C Zinnenkrone, unverhülltes Haupthaar.
Göbl No. 6 = Erdmann D Endform, Scheitel u. Lockenkugel verhüllt

In diese Anordnung würde sich No. 4 = E am besten einfügen, wenn sie nicht im engeren Sinne als Krone zu deuten wäre. Schwierig bleibt No. 5 = C, da sie die reine Krone Ahura Mazdâhs wieder gibt, also gewissermaßen König und Gott gleichsetzt. Undenkbar wäre ein solcher Versuch nach No. 3 = (B) nicht. Daß er verworfen wurde, wäre verständlich. Die Endform No. 6 = D wäre dann die durch Umhüllung repräsentativ gewordene Form No. 4 = E.


15 *Aufbau*, S. 101 kommt Göbl, wie ich nachträglich feststellen, zur gleichen Deutung.
16 Das., S. 119 habe ich sie etwas vorsichtiger formuliert.
17 So auch Göbl, *Aufbau*, S. 81, 103.
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Aber das alles sind Anmerkungen und Korrekturen ohne Belang. Einen Einwand habe ich nur an einer Stelle: S. 61/2 wird die Frage aufgeworfen, ob die verschiedene Anbringung der Binden im Rücken des Königs nicht "bloße Darstellungsmanier, die nichts besagt" und die "kleinen Bändchen, die am Stirnreifen erscheinen ... Verzierung, Ausschmückung oder gewohnheitsmäßiges Füllsel" sein können. Das scheint mir eine Frage von prinzipieller Bedeutung. Wie weit kann der Stempelschneider das Münzbild abändern? "Münzen sind öffentliche, amtliche Dokumente. Ihre Bilder mögen technisch und stilistisch mangelhaft, können aber nicht falsch sein" schreibt Herzfeld,\textsuperscript{34} und der Verfasser wird ihm darin gewiß zustimmen, geht er doch sogar so weit, geschichtliche Ereignisse, die nicht überliefert sind, aus den Kronenbildern der Münzen zu rekonstruieren.\textsuperscript{35} Wo liegt die Grenze, an der das Aufsichtspersonal des Münzamtes, das es ja doch in irgendeiner Form gegeben haben muß, gegen eine Abweichung einschritt? Diese Frage sollte geklärt werden, wenn wir nicht in bedenkliche Nähe des Herzfeld'schen "münzstils"\textsuperscript{36} kommen.

\textsuperscript{33} Wie es Mithra auf dem Investitur Relief Ardashirs II. am Tāq-e Bostān in den Händen hält.
\textsuperscript{34} Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, vol. 9, S. 131.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Aufbau}, S. 106, 122.
\textsuperscript{36} Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, vol. 9, S. 128.

KURT ERMANN

AU SUJET DES IMAGES DES MOIS DANS L'ART MUSULMAN

M. Rice, dans son intéressant article sur The Seasons and the Labors of the Months in Islamic Art, paru dans le 1er tome de cette revue (pp. 1–39) a fait connaître un groupe d'objets, quatre chandeliers de bronze à décor incrusté, qu'il date des XIIIe/XIVe siècles et qu'il attribue à l’Azerbaïdjan. Ils sont ornés de personnifications des douze mois de l'année. Que ces images soient inspirées par des modèles venus du monde chrétien nous paraît aussi évident qu'à M. Rice. Nous hésitons davantage à en chercher avec lui les modèles dans l'art latin, plus particulièrement français, du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle.

Les mois sur ces chandeliers ne sont pas faciles à identifier. Les praticiens musulmans, sans doute à cause de leur indifférence envers l'année solaire, ont copié très librement leurs modèles. Ces personnages n'ont pour eux qu'un caractère décoratif. Ils en modifient souvent les attributs et n'en respectent guère la séquence. Quelques uns portent des objets qu'il n'est pas aisé de reconnaître de sorte qu'on ne peut préciser l'identité des personnages. D'autres, cependant, sont mieux caractérisés et c'est à leur examen que nous nous attacherons.

Tous les quatre chandeliers présentent au n° I un homme accroupi qui se chauffe auprès du feu. (pl. I, fig. A, en haut, à droite). Ce personnage illustre décembre ou janvier dans les cycles latins, et février à Byzance où il est de règle à partir du XIe siècle. Le n° 2 des chandeliers I et II, 3 de III, et 5 de IV donne un bébêche qu'on retrouve dans les suites latines et byzantines (pl. 2, fig. 2, en bas, au milieu). De même le moine hors des chandeliers I, III, III, et V, 4 fait partie des séries occidentales et grecques. Aucun de ces sujets ne permet donc de décider si les praticiens musulmans ont copié des modèles latins ou grecs.

Deux autres, au contraire, nous autorisent à nous prononcer sans équivoque, l'homme portant une bête à cornes sur les épaules et l'homme armé d'une épée et d'un bouclier (pl. I, en bas, à droite). Ces deux images imitent les personnifications byzantines des mois d'avril et de mars (pl. 2, fig. 2, Nos. 3 et 4, et pl. 3, fig. 4), que ce M. Rice a parfaitement reconnu. Mais il faut insister sur un point. Elles sont ab-

---
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bem verändert, nur weil es ihm aus dekorativen Gründen besser gefällt, ist eine unmögliche Vorstel-

lung. Ich führe dieses Beispiel, das mit der Arbeit Göbs nichts zu tun hat, nur an, weil mir nach dieser

Erfahrung die Frage prinzipielle Bedeutung zu haben scheint, ob es einen "münzstil" gibt, und wenn, wo

seine Grenzen liegen.

1 Nous mentionnerons ces chandeliers par les n°s d'ordre romains que M. Rice leur a donnés, et les

diverses images des mois par les chiffres arabes qui

4 Nous renvoyons pour les séries byzantines à notre livre Le calendrier de 354, étude sur son texte et son

illustration, Paris, 1953, pp. 227–242; à une autre

étude, A propos des poésies des mois de l’Anthologie palatine, Revue des études grecques, t. 65 (1952),

pp. 374–382; et enfin à un article, Représentations et

poésies des mois carolingiennes et byzantines, dans Revue

archéologique, 6e Série, t. 45 (1955), pp. 141–186.

5 M. Rice, (op. cit., p. 21) a omis de mentionner celui du 

Marcianus Z. DXL, manuscrit byzantin du XIe

siècle (pl. 2, fig. 2, deuxième rangée, à droite).

6 Chandeliers I, 3; III, 5; IV, 3; V, 2.

7 Chandelier 1, 10; IV, 2; V, 8; il manque sur III, 

qui ne possède que neuf images.
NOTES

Fig. A—Représentations des mois d’un manuscrit géorgien du XVIIe siècle. (D’après Rice.)

Fig. B—Représentations des mois du chandelier de Berlin. (D’après Rice.)

sentes des cycles latins sans exception et ne caractérisent que les suites byzantines.

Nous avons relevé ailleurs cette particularité des cycles grecs qui se manifeste depuis le IVe, sinon le IIe siècle. Il est vrai que le père avec le chevreau

8 Celui de Saint-Marc de Venise suit un modèle ou des modèles byzantins.

9 Voir Stern, Le calendrier de 354, p. 224 et suiv.

... figure en Occident au IVe siècle et encore au Ve, au mois de mars, mais il disparaît dès le VIe siècle sans jamais reparaître. Le guerrier en mars y est inconnu dès le début. Les artisans de l’Azerbaïdjan n’ont pu trouver ces personnages que dans des cycles byzantins ou sous influence byzantine.

Or, le hasard nous a conservé en Géorgie, pays chrétien, voisin de l’Azerbaïdjan, deux manuscrits, l’un de la fin du XIIe ou du début du XIIIe siècle (pl. 2, fig. 3), l’autre du XVIIe (fig. B) qui contiennent tous deux des cycles des mois, copiés sur des modèles byzantins. Nous nous contenterons toutefois d’une comparaison sommaire avec les séries musulmanes puisque quatre seulement des douze


Fig. 1—Douze médaillons d'un chandelier musulman du Musée de Berlin, XIIIe-XIVe siècles.
(D'après Rice.)
Fig. 2—Représentations des Mois du Manuscrit Marc. gr. 2. D.XL.
(D'après Rico.)
Figs. 7-9—Icône géorgienne au Musée de Tbilissi, Xe Siècle, Détails. (D’après Amiranachvili.)

Fig. 10—Plaque de reliure d’un Évangile Géorgien au Musée de Tbilissi, XIIe Siècle. (D’après Amiranachvili.)

Fig. 11—Détail d’une Plaque émaillée de Limoges, XIIIe Siècle, Musée Britannique. (D’après Rice.)
mois du manuscrit du XIIe siècle sont publiés et ceux du XVIIe siècle ne sont connus que par des petits dessins.

Les gravures et les renseignements qui nous sont fournis suffisent à montrer que la source d’inspiration des praticiens musulmans se trouve dans l’art géorgien, ou, de façon plus générale, dans l’art d’un pays voisin de leur et soumis à l’influence byzantine. Dans ces deux cycles mars est un guerrier. Et par surcroît, dans le manuscrit du XVIIe siècle, il porte, non pas une lance et un bouclier ovale comme dans les enluminures byzantines, mais une épée et un petit bouclier rond, vu de face, comme sur le chandelier no 1. Avril, dans l’évangile de Vani, a chargé un “cochon” (si ce n’est un agneau ou un mouton) sur les épaulas, dans l’autre manuscrit il porte un mouton sous le bras (deux autres paissent à ses pieds). Ici et là, Juin coupe le bœuf avec une fausse, et dans l’évangile de Vani, novembre bêche la terre. Mai est d’après les éditeurs un “Sarrasin, buvant dans une timbale”, janvier serait un homme au festin.

Quoiqu’il en soit de ces quatre dernières images la présence du guerrier et du porteur d’un animal suffit à prouver que les cycles de l’Azerbaidjan dérivent d’un modèle d’inspiration byzantine, et probablement géorgienne. Et le fait n’est pas seulement suggéré par l’iconographie, mais aussi par une particularité du style que M. Rice attribue également à une influence limousine.

Les personnifications des mois musulmans, placées dans des médaillons, s’enlèvent sur un fond de rinceaux gravés (pl. 1). Or, style et technique de ce décor, sans exemple dans l’art islamique antérieur.

Cette image est sûrement inspirée par celle du même mois dans la série des octaètiques byzantins, voir supra, n. 4. Le plus ancien de ces octaètiques qui contient les images des mois date du XIe siècle, Vat. gr. 747. Mai est un homme coiffé d’un haut chapeau, qui hante une fleur.

Dans le manuscrit du XVIIe siècle il boit dans une timbale; à ses pieds se voit un grand récipient qui pourrait être un tonneau, cf. le ms. de Vatopedi, de 1346, qui donne le même sujet.

Sur les chandeliers IV, 10, et V, 8, un homme porte un lièvre suspendu à un bâton. Dans les octaètiques, c’est octobre, dans le manuscrit géorgien du XVIIe siècle, septembre.

eur,15 ne rencontrerait d’après M. Rice une analogie que dans les fonds dits vermiculés des émaux de Limoges.16

L’art géorgien offre cependant des exemples plus proches de ces fonds “vermiculés” des chandeliers. Nous pensons au fond d’une icône du Xe siècle (pl. 3, fig. 6 et pl. 4, figs. 7-9) et à la reliure d’un évangile du XIIe (pl. 4, fig. 10), tous deux en métal gravé.17 Il est vrai que les fonds de ces objets diffèrent sur un point des œuvres musulmanes de même que des émaux de Limoges (pl. 4, fig. 11). Les rinceaux sont moins serrés et l’espace libre est strié à la molette, d’où un contraste marqué entre le dessin et le fond proprement dit de la plaque, absent des chandeliers de l’Azerbaidjan et des émaux français. Mais à part cette différence, qui ne saurait suffire pour interdire un rapprochement, la parenté entre les objets géorgiens et musulmans est extrêmement étroite. Les motifs sont les mêmes, le style ne diffère que légèrement. Voici ces motifs: une feuille allongée à la pointe recourbée qui est une demi-palmette atrophiée, puis le fleuron “sasanide” très simplifié et enfin, comme terminaison des branches, deux volutes symétriques, entre lesquelles s’élève une feuille lancéolée. Le décor des fonds limousins, qui remonte sans doute, comme les ornements géorgiens, à des modèles byzantins, est plus sec et géométrique que les formes végétales, souples et nerveuses, des œuvres orientales.

C’est donc pour une double raison, de style et d’iconographie, que nous voudrions rattacher le décor des chandeliers azerbaidjanais à l’art géorgien. Les musulmans ont empruntés les images des mois, et les ornements des fonds à leurs voisins chrétiens. Ceux-ci les avaient reçus de Byzance. Ce n’est pas l’Occident latin, mais la capitale du Bosphore qui a été le centre de diffusion de ces motifs vers les pays de l’Islam situés aux confins du Caucase.

H. Stern

NOTES

15 Rice, loc. cit., p. 26 suiv. et aussi notre pl. 3, fig. 5.
16 Idem, loc. cit., fig. 12 et pl. XXIe.
17 Voir Ch. J. Amiranachvili, Istoria Grusinskogo Iskusstva (Histoire de l’art géorgien), t. 1 (Moscou, 1950), pls. 131 et 132, icône du Musée de Tiflis, du Xe siècle, pl. 128, reliure d’un évangile, XIIe siècle, pp. 230 et 223.
THE INSCRIPTIONS
ON THE “FREER VASE”

In Ars Orientalis, volume 1 (1954), pages 154–156, R. Ettinghausen describes this vase in detail, and mentions an undeciphered poetic inscription in naskhi (pl. I, figs. a–d). Having examined it, I find it to consist of four 8-syllable lines, reminding one of the verso de romance, in that three lines appear to have an assonance in a-i and a strophe form aab. They could be scanned as irregular mujlat or ramal (text fig. 1):

Eyuyah n-nâziru iilahî zänahu râ‘iqu d-dâri
Unzur al-yawma šârâ‘a wa ta‘ammal tara‘ khairî
Fa-hu-an-nîn fidâstat wa ilbâsî min az-zahri
Sû‘î bi-yadaya iilahî nâla muqlî bi-miżallah

[O thou onlooker who art adorned with the splendor of the dwelling:
Look at my shape today and contemplate: thou wilt see my excellence:
For I seem to be made of silver and my clothing made of blossoms:
o My happiness lay in the hands of him who is my wner underneath the canopy!]

This description seems to refer to the white glazing and the golden flowers that adorn the vase, standing underneath a canopy which provides a cooling shade for the owner of the dwelling, possibly the Sultan Abû ‘l-Ḥajjâj Yusuf I, or Muḥammad V (d. 1391). Did the scribe make errors? In the third line he certainly put in an extra alif, because neither albāsî nor ilbâsî would be acceptable. In the first line one might be tempted to correct zänahu to râhabu (i.e., puzzled, instead of adorned or allured), and in line 2, thammu (then) for tara, but the first readings seem satisfactory.

For details on flowers, gardens, and similar themes of Hispano-Arabic poetry, the reader is referred to the excellent work of Henri Pérès, La poésie andalouse en arabe classique au XIe siècle, 2d edition, Paris, 1953, especially pages 160–201, 327–330. On page 198 mention is made of zahr (fleur jaune). The subject is also treated, passim, in my Hispano-Arabic poetry and its relations with Old Provençal Troubadours, Baltimore, 1946, pages 123, 130, and 367.

As regards miżallah, cf. Lane Lexicon, book 1, part III, page 1917; Dozy, Supplément, II, page 84.

A closer examination of the inscriptions on the two doe-like quadrupeds leads to the conclusion that the one on the right may well be a corrupt form of al-‘āfiyâh (Ettinghausen, loc. cit., p. 155), but the one on the left side (pl. 2, fig. 2) would lend itself to a
Plate 1

Fig. 1, A–D—"Freer Vase," Poetical Inscription.
(Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution.)
Fig. 2—"Freer Vase," Left Doe with Inscription.
(Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution.)
number of ṭahrīf and ṭasḥīf combinations (Pérès, op. cit., p. 192), such as “min Ibn al-Kutandi” (HAP, p. 320; Pérès, op. cit., p. 192, No. 2). By connecting the two inscriptions one comes to the most natural interpretation: “Wishes of good health from Ibn al-Kutandi,” possibly meaning “a gift from Ibn al-Kutandi” to the owner of the charming dwelling, sitting under the niẓāllah, not necessarily the lord of the Alhambra (text fig. 2a).

They belong to what is known among archaeologists as Egyptian graffito ware—a ware characterized by its red clay which is covered with white slip under yellowish glaze.² It is usually attributed to the Mamlūk period on the grounds of the formulae that appear on it occasionally³ and the armorial bearings which are depicted on many pieces.

The first specimen (fig. 1, 5 by 11.5 cm.) is made up of two small fragments attached together. It represents a part of the side of a vessel with a small part of the base. It is covered, on the inside, with a fine brown glaze with some splotches in dark brown. It may have been glazed also on the outside but the glazing is entirely gone. The rim of the vessel as it appears in this example is marked by three parallel lines running around the whole side. A line of inscription engraved in simple lettering appears upside down near the rim on the inside. It reads: “The work of Sharaf in Abwān”.

The second specimen (figs. 2 and 3, 8 by 4.5 cm.) consists of two potsherds attached together. It is Dikkah in Alexandria to find out the composition of the hill and see whether there is a cone of rock beneath it or whether it is a rubbish dump. The various tests have shown conclusively that the hill consists of debris containing abundant remains of Islamic pottery, and lumps of vitreous slag, pockets of sand, seaweed, and ashes. The report on this excavation with a study of the imported pottery by Mr. A. Lane of the Victoria and Albert Museum and a study of the Egyptian finds (most of which is sgraffito ware) by the writer will be published by the University of Alexandria.

² The first to pay attention to this kind of pottery was Dr. D. Fouquet. More than 50 years ago he lived near the ruins of Fustāt, the first Islamic capital of Egypt, and used to roam about the relics of that deserted city, going up and down the mounds formed by the accumulated deposits of the inhabitants of Cairo. The tremendous quantity of Egyptian and imported pottery that existed in this debris attracted his attention and raised his curiosity. Gradually he began to collect the potsherds and to buy them from the manure diggers (sabbākhin). His interest grew to such an extent that he even dug pits in search of more fragments. He wrote an interesting article on Oriental pottery and consecrated a long chapter on the kind with which we deal here. (Contribution à l’étude de la céramique orientale, Le Caire, 1900, p. 120 ff.)

³ Such as忽然السلطان (glory to our lord the sultan) ... سلم من رؤم الملک ... (of what was ordered to be made for His Excellency ...
represents a part of the side of a vessel with a very small part of the base. It is covered with a yellow glaze on the inside and with a green glaze on the outside. It shows, on the inside, remains of incised ornament near the rim (which is lacking) that may be a "pigeon eye" motif. Below this we observe a drip pattern, under which there is a line of inscription placed upside down. It reads exactly as the text on the previous specimen, and the style of the inscription is similar with a slight difference, namely that the ḥamza here is without teeth. From the outside there are remains of a painted inscription in white slip in which we can read a part of a word:

....Sharaf....

The third specimen (figs. 4 and 5, 16 by 12 cm.) is more significant than the previous ones. It is made up of six fragments attached together. It represents a small part of the rim, a big part of the sides, and the base of a vessel. Both sides and base are glazed from the inside as well as from the outside. The glaze is of various colors and shades—light brown, dark brown, black, and manganese. On the inside, the vessel is decorated with three bands—a narrow one on the rim filled with a simple geometrical motif, a wide one on the sides filled with a pattern made up of acrading under which is seen trelliswork alternating with a motif that may be a cup, and a third plain band with a drip pattern at its head. In the base there are some remains of a pattern which I could not recognize. The outside is also decorated with three bands—a very narrow one at the top, a very wide one in the middle filled with a complicated and artistically treated naskhī inscription on a floriated background, and a third band enclosing a Z pattern. The inscription reads: "The humble poor slave Sharaf al-Abwān". It is quite evident that this vessel was made under the inspiration, more or less direct, of the metalwork of the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk periods. The technique of inlaying in metalwork, which is considered one of the real glories of Islamic art, is perfectly imitated here.

The value of these specimens lies, to a great extent, in the inscription they bear which gives us the name and nationality of a potter and the name of a place where pottery was made. It is regrettable that literary sources do not mention this artisan or throw any light on the manufacture of pottery in that place.

This is, undoubtedly, a good opportunity to show how helpful archaeology is in the reconstruction of the past and how it takes its place as one of the great expansions of thought which have been quite unforeseen.

The inscriptions on the first and second specimens are similar, as said before. The words can be easily read and understood. The first word is ثم, "work of." The second word is فحص "Sharaf." It represents a proper name of a man. The third word is made up of the preposition ب and the word زار, i.e., "Abwān," which is, no doubt, a name of a place.

Now, who is this Sharaf and where is Abwān? In fact we know nothing of this artisan but his name which appears on the three specimens under discussion and on many other fragments of the same kind of pottery which were found in Fustâṭ and most of which are now in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.\(^6\)

\(^6\) It is said that this word is typical of the 'Abbāsid inscription while the word قَسط is typical of the Umayyad inscription (F. Day, The tīrāz silk of Marwān, Archaeologica orientalia in memoriam of Ernst Herzfeld, New York, 1952, p. 41). This may be true in some instances (loc. cit., n. 11), but it should not be taken as a rule and it would be much safer if we exclude this view from consideration.

\(^4\) In fact the mounds of Fustâṭ were the most important source of this kind of ware. These mounds had unfortunately undergone three main catastrophes, namely, the ruthless sack of manure diggers who were only thinking of the benefit to antique dealers, the casual search made by Dr. Fouquet to which we referred before, and the excavation conducted by Aly Bey Bahgat, ex-Director of the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo. This excavation was not carried out under any scientific control. No record was made of the position and level of the huge quantities of the sherds contained in these mounds. Nothing is said about the relation between these sherds and other objects found beside them which may be dated or datable, and it is not said which fragments came from lower and which from higher levels. Thus a unique opportunity for determining the history and sequence
As for Abwân, we find some information in the Arabic Geographers. Following Yâqût, it is the name of three different places: The first was a village on the eastern bank of the Nile in the lower part of Upper Egypt; the second was a town near Damiette whose inhabitants were mostly Christians. Excellent shorb (a kind of cloth) was made there; and the third was a village in the district of Bahnasâ in Upper Egypt.\(^7\)

Ibn Duqmâq referred also to the second place and says that in his days (14th century A.D.) it was destroyed because the water of Lake Manzalah submerged it.\(^8\)

In which of these three places was Sharaf living and working? This I cannot tell simply because I have no evidence for assigning one of the three different places.\(^9\)

From the inscription on the third specimen we can guess his nationality. It contains his name followed by an appellative, "al-Abwânî," which means that he is a native of Abwân, i.e., an Egyptian.

But was he a Copt, i.e., a Christian Egyptian, or a Muslim? M. Hussein Rashed, once a curator of the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo, told me, some years ago, that this artisan was a Copt. M. Armand Abel stated in his book\(^10\) that "M. Hussein Rashed of the medieval pottery of the Near East was lost. The Kôm el-Dikkah excavation conducted by Prof. Wace may be considered as a small compensation for that great loss.


\(^8\) Ibn Duqmâq, Kitâb al-intiṣâr li-wâṣâyât 'iqâ al-amâsâr, Boulaq, 1309 H., vol. 5, p. 78. See also Jean Maspero and G. Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l'Égypte, Memoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, Le Caire, 1919, t. 36, p. 3.

\(^9\) Dr. M. Mustafa believes that this artisan was living in Abwân which is in the district of Bahnasâ in Upper Egypt. He does not give any evidence for this belief. (See his Sharaf al-Abwânî, a paper read in the Congress of Archaeology of the Arab Nations held in Damascus 1947. It is published in the book of this Congress by the Cultural Committee of the Arab League, Cairo, 1947, p. 161.) Perhaps later on, when he publishes his promised book on this potter, he will discuss this point.

\(^10\) Armand Abel, Gaûî et les grands faïenciers égyptiens d'époque mamlouke, Publication du Musée Arabe du Caire, Le Caire, 1930, p. 16.

m'a dit aussi qu'il avait de sérieuses raisons pour considérer comme chrétien le bon potier du XIVe siècle Sharaf al-Abwânî." Dr. M. Mustafa, the present director of the above-mentioned museum, discussed this point and declared that this artisan was a Muslim and not a Copt, and that his full name ought to be, very probably, "Sharaf al-Dîn" which is a name of a Muslim.\(^11\)

These three specimens of Sharaf al-Abwânî here studied do not carry enough weight to form an idea of this potter's art. But Aly Bahgat, who had found in his excavation at Fusṭâṭ many examples bearing the signature of this artisan, was able to give us, with his colleague Félix Massoul, a clear idea of the work of Sharaf which is worth quoting here to make this paper as complete as possible. They say:\(^12\)

"Avec lui l'écriture naskhi devient un élément du décor d'un effet tout à fait heureux. Des tresses, des palmettes, des entrelacs se détachent sur des fonds pointillés, sont très harmonieusement rythmés. Il a employé également la figure animale avec succès. L'usage judicieux de la couleur vient encore ajouter son charme à cet art si attrayant: les noirs violacés de manganèse s'enlèvent vigoureusement sur les fonds de couleur crème, tandis que des tons verts s'opposent aux tons bruns chauds de la terre que l'engobe ne recouvre pas."\(^13\)

"Les oeuvres de Sharaf sont recouvertes d'un vernis remarquablement laissant qui les distingue facilement de celles de ses contemporains. De plus, on peut remarquer souvent sur la face extérieure des pièces de ce fabricant, que la couche composée de l'engobe et du vernis forme une sorte de croûte qui s'enlève sous l'ongle par petits écailles."

"Les signatures (of Sharaf and his contemporary potters) are generally placed at the interior of the pieces and close to the edge of the wafer. They were gravés dans la pâte avant la cuisson, de telle sorte qu'on les voit habituellement se détacher en brun foncé sur le ton crème de l'engobe".\(^14\)


\(^12\) Aly Bahgat et Félix Massoul, La céramique musulman de l'Égypte, Publication du Musée Arabe du Caire, 1930, pp. 84-85.

\(^13\) Ibid. p. 84. This is quite clear in the third specimen here described.

\(^14\) Ibid. p. 85. Just like the signature of figures 1 and 3.
"Sharaf . . . a mis aussi parfois son nom dans le décor même de ces pièces à des endroit très visible . . . ., dans ce cas il a employé les formes de l'écriture naskhi dont la belle élégance lui donnait un motif de décor merveilleux".  

"Sa signature est souvent accompagnée de qualificatifs comportant une certaine bizarrerie, tel que miskin . . . ."  

There is still one more point to be discussed in this connection. We observe that the inscription used by Sharaf on his works has two different aspects in phraseology and in style.  

The text on one group of his works (such as the first two specimens) implies clearly that he worked in Abwân; while on another group (such as the third specimen), it implies that he worked either in or outside Abwân.  

Does this mean that he worked in Abwân and when he became famous he transferred his workshops to other important centers such as Fusṣâṭ, as Dr. M. Mustafa suggests, or to Alexandria? It is rather difficult to give an accurate answer to this question at present and perhaps in the future, when Dr. Mustafa excavates at Abwân, something may appear to throw some light on this point. But at the moment it seems hard to believe that Sharaf was working at Kôm el-Dîkkah in Alexandria, (although the excavation there brought to light lumps of vitreous slag, seaweed, ashes, and pockets of sands, which means that near that place there was a factory for pottery) because no wasters bearing his name appeared, and the three signed specimens found there among thousands of sherds might have served as samplers in that factory.  

In the first group, which is represented here by the first and second specimens, the style of the inscription is very simple and does not show any sign of artistic attitude. In the second group, which is here represented by the third specimen, the style is very elaborate and complicated.  

Does this mean that the first group represents the first step in the career of this artisan when he began his work, while the second group represents, on the other hand, his maturity in his trade?  

Judging only from the style of inscription one is inclined to answer this question in the affirmative, but in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo there are many examples that force one to hesitate a little because, although they bear the simple signature, their glazing, coloring, pattern, and curvature show that they are the work of a mature potter and not a beginner.

The size of the signature and its place on the vessel also differ in both groups. In the first it is small and has its place in the inside near the rim; while in the second group it is much bigger and takes a conspicuous place on the outside of the vessel.  

Does this mean that Sharaf was, at first, not quite sure of his work and so he tried to hide his small signature, and later on, when he became mature and perceived that he could compete with his contemporary potters, he dared to enlarge it and put it in that conspicuous place? This is quite possible.  

To which period can this potter be attributed? It is much to be deplored that he did not care to accompany his signature with a date or a datable phrase to save us the trouble of guessing when he was living.  

Literary sources are silent, and no coins or any dated object were found beside or near any of these three signed specimens.  

The only clue that may be of some help in guessing an approximate date of the works of Sharaf is two motifs: the first is on the inside of figure 5, the cup; and the second is on a potsherd found at Fusṣâṭ and is now in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (No. 5164/1), namely, the napkin. Both motifs are known to be among the most common armorial blazons used in the Mamlûk period. The first was for the office of the cup bearer, and the second for the office of the cup bearer.

15 See Nos. 3854, 5402/11, 5402/12, 5402/14, 5402/15, 6526/1 in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.  

16 Aly Bahgat and Felix Massoull attributed him to the fourteenth century A.D. (op. cit., p. 86). Dr. Mustafa suggested 690–760 H./1291–1328 on the grounds of comparison between the patterns used by this potter and those used on dated monuments (op. cit., pp. 161 and 162). He did not mention these monuments, possibly reserving them for his forthcoming book.  

17 See Nos. 3854, 5402/11, 5402/12, 5402/14, 5402/15, 6526/1 in the Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo.  

Figs. 1-5—Fragments of Sgraffito Pottery by Sharaf al-Abwâni from Excavations at Kôm el-Dikkah, Museum of the Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University.
second was for the office of the jamdar, i.e., the master of the wardrobe.\(^3\)

The earliest known dated examples with these two blazons refer to two princes who were in the court of Sultan Muhãammad al-Nàsir ibn-Qalàûn: the first was Turjî-î, his cup bearer who died in 731 H. (A.D. 1330) and the second was Āqbughà min 'Abd al-Wâhid his jamdar who was executed in 744 H. (A.D. 1343).

Does this mean that Sharaf was living and working during the time of that great Mamlûk sultan whose long reign was the golden age of Islamic art in Egypt and in whose time the decorative arts reached a greater perfection than ever before or since?

In fact, the perfection of the works of this potter, whether in form, glazing, coloring, pattern, or naskhî inscription, speaks of a very civilized taste which undoubtedly prevailed during the time of that Mamlûk sultan. I feel very much inclined, in view of the present data, to attribute Sharaf al-Abwâni to the period of Muhammad al-Nâsir ibn Qalûn, i.e., 693-741 H./A.D. 1293-1341.

M. A. MARZOUK

A NEW VOLUME OF THE ILLUSTRATED AĞHÂNİ MANUSCRIPT

Several volumes of a splendid set of manuscripts of Abû'l-Faraj al-Isfahânî's Kitâb al-Ağhânî, exquisitely written and provided with a miniaturized frontispiece for each volume, have already become known, thanks to the successive efforts of various scholars. The Kitâb al-Ağhânî, "Book of Songs," written in the first half of the tenth century, is one of the most valuable works of Arabic literature. It is a collection of poems that had been set to music, together with biographies of the authors of the poems and the composers of the melodies, and is a veritable storehouse of information concerning literary and cultural history. There is good reason to believe that the set of manuscripts in question, the only illustrated manuscript of the Ağhânî known, was prepared between ca. 1217 and 1219 for the library of Badr al-Dîn Lu'lu', regent of Mosul (who governed, in various capacities, from 1210 to 1259).

Originally it consisted of 20 volumes, of which hitherto 6 had been identified (although as the frontispiece of one of these volumes is lost, we had only had five miniatures). It was my fortune to discover an additional volume of the set, with its frontispiece preserved, in the Royal Library at Copenhagen, thus bringing the total of volumes recovered to 7, and that of miniatures to 6; the purpose of the present article is to describe this volume and publish its frontispiece.

It will be useful to start with a short account of the discovery of the various volumes. Volumes II, IV, XI, and XIII of the set are in the Egyptian Library, Cairo (the miniature of volume XIII is missing); volumes XVII and XIX are in the Feyzullah Library, Istanbul; the volume in Copenhagen is volume XX, the last of the set. The miniatures of volumes II and IV were first published by Ahmed Moussa in his Zur Geschichte der islamischen Buchmalerei in Ägypten, Cairo, 1931, pp. 38-40, pls. xi-xii. K. Holter pointed out in 1937, on the basis of information received from H. Ritter,\(^1\) the existence of the two volumes in Istanbul, without, however, giving illustrations (see Die islamischen Miniaturlxv. schriften vor 1330, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, vol. 54 [1937], p. 15, No. 36; also Die Galen-Handschrift und die Makamens des Hariri der Wiener Nationalbibliothek, Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, vol. 11 [1937], pp. 37-38). B. Farès discovered the miniature in volume XI and devoted a whole book to it: Une miniature religieuse de l'école arabe de Bagdad, Cairo, 1948. Finally, D. S. Rice published the two Feyzullah miniatures (The Aghânî miniatures and religious painting in Islam, The Burlington Magazine, vol. 95 [1953], p. 128 ff.).

The Copenhagen manuscript, bearing the number 168, is adequately described in the catalogue (Codices Orientales Bibliothecae Regiae Hafniensis, vol. 2 [Copenhagen, 1851], pp. 106-107): "Fol. 1r pictura occupat, splendidissima olim, sed nunc contaminata, equitis imaginem sistens, falconem album in sinistra gestantis, quem angeli utrisque comitari videntur. ... 240 foll. Subscriptio finalis, fol. 240v hâdãhâ aẖhir Kitâb al-Ağhânî al-kabûr al-jâmî min taṣnîf Abû'l-Faraj 'All b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muhammad al-Isfahânî. Absoluta est scriptura codicis mense

---

\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 67 and 141.

\(^1\) Ritter published his own notes in Philologika XIII, Oriens, vol. 2 (1949), p. 278.
Ramadhan a. 616 (Chr. 1210); exaravit eum Muhammad b. Abi Talib el-Bedri.2

The calligraphy (the script, the arrangement of the page, etc.) is identical with that of the rest of the volumes. Examples of the writing of volume XI are published by Farès (pls. i-iii), and of volume XIX by Rice (p. 133); these may be compared with the first page of the Copenhagen manuscript reproduced here (fig. 2). The name of the scribe, Muhammad b. Abi Talib al-Badri, also occurs in volume XI, where he signs as the scribe of that volume and of “those preceding it.” Volume XI is dated from 614 H./1217, while volume XX is from 616 H./1219—thus it took the scribe two years to finish volumes XII–XX.

It is, however, the frontispiece miniature that attracts the greatest interest (fig. 2). Not being a historian of art, I do not intend to offer an exhaustive study of it, but shall confine myself to publishing it and making the most necessary comments. It is to be hoped that in due course further observations will be forthcoming from more competent quarters.

It is obvious that the miniature depicts a rider with a falcon perching on his left hand and two genii hovering above him. This at least is not open to controversy; yet the obvious question of why this subject was chosen for the frontispiece takes us into the thick of learned controversy. Students of Islamic art will be familiar with the scholarly dispute waged in these last years concerning the subject matter of the Aghānī miniatures hitherto known. Holter, following Ritter, has assumed that the two Istanbul manuscripts depict courtly scenes. B. Farès, who in his book confined himself to volume XI, assumed that the frontispiece of that volume represented a scene from the life of Muham- mad, viz, the reception by him of the leaders of a deputation from the town of Najran, a bishop and a prefect—the very scene which forms the subject matter of the text that opens the volume. Doubts about the interpretation of the miniature as a scene from the life of the Prophet were raised by E. Kühnel, in a review of Farès’ book in Oriens, vol. 4 (1951), pp. 171–173; the arguments with which Farès (Oriens, vol. 5 [1952], pp. 361–364) tried to rebut those of Kühnel do not, in my view, hold good. Finally, the whole question was reviewed by D. S. Rice in the article quoted above. In my view, Rice has established the true nature of the miniatures, and I cannot do better than reproduce his conclusions in his own words: “It may be assumed that four out of the five surviving frontispiece miniatures of the kitāb al-agḥānī depict the ruler of Mosul (and probable owner of the manuscript), Badr al-dīn Lu’lu’, surrounded by his followers.” After quoting similar frontispieces of other manuscripts, Rice adds: “They all represent various scenes connected with life at court. So do four out of five of the Aghānī frontispieces. The fifth, and so far unique scene (which deserves a detailed examination), may represent female musicians and entertainers attached to the court ... One fact is obvious. There is no specific connexion between the subjects depicted on such frontispiece-miniatures and the narrative matter in the volumes which they adorn.”

Farès is not, however, convinced by Rice’s article and devoted a long study (L’art sacré chez un primitif musulman, Bulletin de l’Institut d’Égypte, vol. 36 [1953-54], pp. 619–677) to its refutation, which contains valuable material but does not, at least as far as I am concerned, carry conviction. (Farès announces moreover the forthcoming publication of a further study in which he proposes to show that all the miniatures are connected with the text of the volumes.) He does make one point, viz, that there is no proof to show that the manuscript is connected with Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’ of Mosul; yet I continue to hold with Rice that it is at least highly probable that it is. Fortunately the restricted scope of the present article releases me from the obligation of examining the evidence, or acting as a judge between the conflicting opinions. It is sufficient for me to state in general that in my view the opinion according to which the miniatures represent courtly scenes is the more acceptable one, and to restrict a more detailed examination to the miniature of the Copenhagen volume.

First, is there a connection between the miniature and the first chapter of the text contained in the volume? That chapter consists of the biography of

---

2 The end flyleaf contains a notarial note in Maghribi handwriting according to which the manuscript was bought by the Ḥasanī ‘Alami Sharīf, the ḥaqīḥ and ‘adī, Shaykh al-Tayyib b. Shaykh Muhammad (?) b. Shaykh Qasim al-Harrâq of Tetuan, from the ālīb Shaykh Ahmad al-Malîh, also of Tetuan. The manuscript is, then, like the greater part of the Copenhagen collection, of Moroccan provenience.
Fig. 1—Copenhagen, Royal Library, Arabic Ms. 168; "Kitāb al-Aghānī," vol. XX.
First Text Page. (Photograph courtesy Royal Library, Copenhagen.)
Fig. 2—"Kitāb al-Aghāni," vol. XX. Frontispiece Miniature. (Photograph courtesy Royal Library, Copenhagen.)
the poet al-Namir b. Tawlab, a contemporary of Muhammad. To be sure, he is described as one famous among the ancient Arabs for his generosity and knightly qualities; but it could hardly be argued that the figure in the miniature is an illustration of this knightly character. There is no mention of falconry, or of hunting in general, in the biography. Thus one must conclude that the figure does not serve as an illustration to the first chapter of the volume, the biography of al-Namir b. Tawlab. It seems to me that we can safely assert that it represents yet another "scene connected with life at court," viz, the prince at the hunt, holding his falcon on his left hand. The two genii, holding a canopy above his head, are fitting accessories in the representation of a prince. Thus the new miniature bears out the conclusion of Rice.

The whole conception of the miniature, as well as the details in its execution, tallies perfectly well with the other miniatures, and more especially with those of volumes XI, XVII, and XIX. (The closest parallel is the riding figure in the miniature of volume XIX.) The figure of the prince is the same and his robe and headgear are represented in the same manner. The sleeve bands contain the inscription: Badr al-Din (left sleeve) Lu’lu’ (right sleeve), as in volumes XVII and XIX. (Volume XVII has Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ b. ‘Abd Allâh; the right sleeve band on our miniature is not preserved well enough to allow us to ascertain whether it contains the words "b. ‘Abd Allâh" after "Lu’lu’.") Fârâ’s asserts that the inscriptions of the sleeve bands are in the script of the fourteenth century and were forged at that time. I cannot help wondering whether our knowledge of Arabic paleography warrants such refined dating of an inscription consisting of a few letters, and the assumption of a fourteenth-century forgery looks to me a bit far-fetched. Thus I think we may safely take the inscription at its face value and, in addition, conclude with great likelihood that the name "Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ b. ‘Abd Allâh" found in a manuscript dated 617-619 refers to Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ of Mosul.

Like the other miniatures, ours, too, has a narrower inner and a broader outer frame. The ornament in these frames is different in each miniature.

I may add that the motif of the falconer on horseback holding his falcon on his left hand is very frequent. It appears, for instance, twice in a bowl made for an officer of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ of Mosul, named Najm al-Din ‘Umar. It seems, however, that our miniature represents not the falconer, but the prince himself.

No doubt there are in the miniature more details that call for comment—but I leave these to more competent hands, satisfied with having contributed to the restoration of that magnificent monument of Islamic art, the set of the Aghâni manuscript.

S. M. STERN

AN ILLUSTRATED LEAF FROM A LOST MAMLÜK KALİLĀH WA-DIMNAH MANUSCRIPT

Among the books which attracted the Muslim artists, Kalilah wa-Dimnah was a particular favorite. The Arabic version of Ibn al-Muqaffa’ (eighth century A.D.) goes back through the first Pahlavi version of Burzqâ (sixth century A.D.) to Indian originals that included, among other fable books, the Panchatantra. The book belongs to that genre of literature known as “Fürstenspiegel” in which moral advice intended for princes is put into the mouth of animals. Ibn al-Muqaffa’s book became one of the most popular books of Arabic literature.

It survives in a considerable number of illustrated manuscripts produced at various times and in various countries of the Islamic world. Among these an interesting group belongs to the Mamlûk


5 A series of illustrated manuscripts of the Persian version belonging to the fourteenth century is described by B. Gray, Fourteenth-century illustrations of the Kalilah wa-Dimnah, Arts Islamica, vol. 7 (1940), pp. 134-140; the author proposed to study illuminated Persian manuscripts of later periods in a second part (which has not yet appeared). For a thirteenth-century illustrated manuscript of the Arabic text, cf. H. Buchthal, Hellenistic miniatures in early Islamic manuscripts, Arts Islamica, vol. 7 (1940), pp. 128 ff.
period.\(^3\) Up to now this group consisted of four manuscripts: (1) MS. Pococke 400 in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, dated 1354;\(^4\) (2) MS. in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, dated 1388;\(^5\) (3) MS. in the Staatsbibliothek, Munich, cod. Arab. 616, undated;\(^6\) (4) MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Arab. 3467, undated.\(^7\) The iconography of the four manuscripts is similar though not every manuscript repeats the same scenes; all reveal a strong stylistic affinity.

To these four manuscripts can now be added a single leaf, hitherto unpublished, from a manuscript of the *Kalllah wa-Dinnah*,\(^8\) found in the Cairo Geniza. This is now preserved in the University Museum of Cambridge (T-S. Box Ar. 51, fol. 60; 9\(\times\)12.5\(\)\(^\prime\)). The Hebrew word Geniza means a lumber chamber attached to a synagogue; a Geniza was used as a dumping ground for disused books and documents to prevent from profanation the name of God which might be contained in them. The dry climate which has preserved the Greek archives and literature written on papyrus has also preserved the contents of the Geniza of the synagogue of Fustat or Old Cairo. Writings of the most varied kind accumulated there from the tenth century onward, and these have enriched every branch of Hebrew and Judaeo-Arabic literature as well as Jewish history. This is not the place to sketch the history of the discovery of the Fustat Geniza and the distribution of its contents to various libraries, and the exploitation of all the material which is still in progress. The principal centers are Cambridge, Leningrad, and Oxford.\(^9\)

The single leaf is all that has survived of the manuscript, and since it depicts a scene which occurs in each of the other four manuscripts\(^10\) an interesting comparison of the five versions can be made.

The scene illustrated is from the first tale of the book, Kallilah and Dimnah are two jackals at the court of the lion, king of the animals. Dimnah, who is presented as a thoroughly malevolent character, intrigues against the bull, whom he himself has introduced to the court but of whose growing influence over the lion he is becoming

\(^3\) The most detailed study of these manuscripts is to be found in K. Holter, *Die frühnamalthische Miniaturmalerei*, Die graphischen Künste, Neue Folge, vol. 2 (Wien, 1937), pp. 1–14; cf. also his *Die islamischen Miniaturhandschriften vor 1350*, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, vol. 54 (1937), Nos. 78, 79, 80, 83. The writer of this note is preparing a detailed study of this group of manuscripts.


\(^8\) The leaf was discovered among the Geniza fragments and identified as a leaf from a *Kalllah wa-Dinnah* manuscript by Dr. S. M. Stern. I wish to thank him for his kindness in drawing my attention to it.
Plate I

Fig. 1—Oxford Manuscript, Dated 1354.

Fig. 2—Geniza Leaf.
Fig. 3—Munich Manuscript.

Fig. 4—Paris Manuscript.

Fig. 5—Cambridge Manuscript. (Dated 1388)
jealous. The lion’s mother sees through these machinations and warns the king, her son, of Dimnah’s treachery. The story illustrates, of course, the moral that a person of evil intentions can destroy the friendship of two people of good character. The incident which the artist chose to depict was the conversation between the lion and his mother, and lends itself particularly well to a type of treatment in which the main concern is with the principal protagonists, while architecture and landscape are of secondary importance. The artist is content to indicate these by the wall of a house or a leafy branch, somewhat in the manner of mediaeval paintings in the West.

In certain respects, the versions appear to differ in style and therefore in date, but these differences may be due rather to quality and state of preservation. The paintings in the Oxford manuscript and the Geniza leaf are markedly superior to the others, both in drawing and in color. The same composition is repeated in all five versions: the lion and his mother are seated opposite one another, with only the briefest suggestion of landscape. Because the Oxford and Munich versions are, as elsewhere, very close, the Munich manuscript must be close in date to the dated Oxford manuscript. In both versions (figs. 1 and 3) the lion is seated on the right, the lioness on the left; the lion looks slightly toward the front of the picture with head bent—a vivid illustration of an attentive listener. On either side are the fleshy plants, with red, blue, and golden fruit typical of the Mesopotamian and Mamlûk styles. The animals are seated on a narrow strip of grass which looks as if composed of tightly compressed leaves and in the middle of which grows a plant.

The painting on the Geniza leaf (fig. 2) is arranged in a slightly different way: the lioness is seated on the right, the lion on the left; the lioness has her mouth slightly open and her left paw raised in an attitude of emphatic advice, both features of the Cambridge manuscript. The plant in the middle of the grass is hardly recognizable as a natural form and seems rather to have a space-filling function, as a sculptor might include an otherwise irrelevant piece of stone in order to add balance to his composition. As in both the Oxford and Munich versions, the hindquarters of the lion and lioness extend beyond the grass verge. There is at the same time a plastic quality which contrasts with the more linear treatment of the animals in the other versions; the vivid and naturalistic treatment puts it more in the Mesopotamian tradition.

The manuscript in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (fig. 3) is dated 1388 and it shows a considerable difference in style. Iconographically it shares some features with the Geniza leaf: the lioness has her mouth open and her paw raised. On the other hand there are marked differences. Quite apart from the inferior quality (especially when compared with the Geniza leaf) and bad state of preservation, the figures are much smaller and especially the drawing of the lioness is so unnatural that it could easily be taken for some other animal. The plants next to the lioness also look more like heads of animals than flowers. The whole effect is much farther removed from the Mesopotamian style.

The addition of the Geniza leaf to the small group of Kalllah wa-Dimnah manuscripts of the Mamlûk style is especially valuable because it allows us to trace a link between the Mesopotamian and the fully developed Mamlûk style.

Sofie Walzer

Paris manuscript. (The lioness has her mouth open, but this is obviously owing to someone’s having tampered with the miniature. The original line for the closed mouth is still there, exactly as in the Oxford and Munich manuscripts; below it an open mouth was added, so that the original lower jaw now serves as the upper jaw. When the secondary lower jaw is covered, the head can still be seen in its original state.)
BĀGH-E FIN NEAR KASHAN

In 1504 a beautiful suburb of Kashan, called Fin, was the site of a reception welcoming the Safavid ruler Shāh Ismā'īl. Identification of Fin as a garden appears in several sources which state that structures were erected there by Shāh 'Abbās, presumably after A.D. 1587, while a contemporary account mentions a visit made to the garden in 1659 by Shāh 'Abbās II. No traces of structures of the Safavid period survive within the high, fortified walls of the spacious enclosure, and the numerous buildings that do remain have been ascribed to Fath 'Ali Shāh, Qājār ruler from 1799 until 1834.

The year 1852 associates the garden with history. Enemies of the honest, capable, far-sighted Prime Minister of the time, Mīrzā Taqi Khân (known as Amir-e Kabîr) destroyed his standing with the young Qājār ruler Nāṣir al-Dîn Shāh, and the Amir-e Kabîr was exiled to Fin. Intrigue continued at the court however and a vicious enemy secured a death warrant from the Shāh. Accompanied by royal executioners, he rode from Teheran to Kashan. Approaching Amir-e Kabîr in the rooms of the bath at Fin (the complex of rooms in the lower left-hand corner of the plan shown in text fig. A), the executioners put him to death by opening his veins.

For some 15 years after this time the garden seems to have remained desolate, while its structures, penetrated by snow and rain, gradually reverted to the earth from which their bricks had come. Then about 1935 this Bāgh-e Fin, or Garden of Fin, was named as a national monument and came under the protection of the Government of Iran. Vitaly needed repairs were carried out and time may see the reconstruction of such noble elements of the complex as the spacious central pavilion.

Aside from its abiding beauty and charm, the Bāgh-e Fin has special reasons for meriting attention and interest. First, it is an admirable example of those earlier, monumental royal gardens which have all but vanished from the Persian scene. Second, because it is the very epitome of the Persian garden, in this single example are the most desired features and elements.

As do all Persian gardens, Fin appears to express a series of deliberately accentuated contrasts between the arid, desolate, inhospitable landscape outside the high walls and the lush surroundings within the walls. Here is overabundant water in a land where a few drops may be precious, and here is a jungle of growth set against a sparse and parched natural foliage. The monotone of the landscape is replaced by the colors of foliage, flowers, blue tiles, fountains, and painted plaster and woodwork. Haphazard nature is brought under the control of axial symmetry.

In addition to these notable contrasts, features of distinction may be noted. Vital is the water axis: most Persian gardens displayed a single great pool and a central water channel stepping down the garden's slope (figs. 1 and 2). This same water axis, the spacious pool, and appropriate flowers and foliage are faithfully reflected in the garden carpets of Iran (fig. 4), some woven as early as the second quarter of the seventeenth century. At Fin a central channel receives principal emphasis, but channels equal in size—sides and bottom all lined with blue faience tiles—convey water to all parts of the huge enclosure. Characteristic is the design of the pools, permitting the water to overflow their edges continually, creating sheets of water without apparent boundaries. Two pavilions display sophisticated design; water, light, and air so penetrate
Fig. 1—Looking Across the Great Pool at Fin.

Fig. 2—The Central Pavilion of the Garden During the Course of Repair.
Fig. 4—Garden Carpet, Northwest Persia, Eighteenth Century.
Formerly Possession of S. Kent Costikyan, New York.
(Alter A. U. Pope.)
these structures that there is no precise line of demarcation between outdoors and indoors.

Practicality plays its role too, for even the gardens are related to the struggle for survival in arid Iran. Ad Fin the water gushes forth from a spring just outside the walls. Leaving the garden, a rushing stream serves to turn a series of mill wheels, grinding wheat and barley for Kashan, then breaks into many rivulets which border the streets and lanes and fill the courtyard pools of Kashan. Finally, the water fans out over the thirsty fields below the town to nourish the growing grain. Practicality is
also displayed in the produce of the garden. While stately lines of cypresses and plane trees line the walks and channels, and beds and borders of flowers accentuate the features of the plan (fig. 3), most of the total area is given over to irrigated plots in which grow fruit trees—oranges, cherries, apricots, peaches, pears, figs, and pomegranates.

Even a cursory examination of the plan reveals features of special interest. Gushing fountains dot all the channels and pools; in two of the pools lead nozzles form a compact pattern of jets. Several entrances pierce the walls. The principal one, on the north, is approached by a ceremonial avenue bordered by great trees. On the west an inconspicuous portal awaited royalty, permitting the shah and his suite to ride directly into the stable area. Source material tells of a separate _anderūn_, or women’s quarters, and the complex adjacent to the stable may have served this function. The bath, already mentioned, contained its separate rooms and pools for hot and cold water. The central pavilion, still in need of extensive reconstruction, offered a variety of delights: on the ground level deep shade and a shimmering pool, on the upper level rooms open to the breeze, with vistas over plain and mountain.

Donald N. Wilber

A RADICOCARBON DATING OF A YÜNNAESE IMAGE OF AVALOKITÉSVARA

Some years ago the late Helen B. Chapin wrote a very convincing article attempting to date this type of image. Her findings were based on (1) a figure in the Fine Arts Gallery, San Diego, Calif., which seemed datable through a cast inscription on the back of it; (2) the _Nan-chao yeh shih_ 南詔野史, an unofficial history of Yünan written in A.D. 1550; (3) a scroll painting called _Nan-chao-lu chı̂n_ 南詔圖錄, a thirteenth-century copy of an original made in A.D. 899; (4) a Yünnaen painting in the Palace Museum painted in the latter part of the twelfth century. This extremely well-documented article showed that in all likelihood figures of this type should be dated as twelfth century, or thereabouts.

In 1946 the Freer Gallery of Art acquired such a gilt-bronze figure from Miss Alice Boney of New York. This figure was one mentioned, but not illustrated, in the above article as belonging to Alice B. Kleykamp. When acquired by the Freer Gallery, the figure had never been opened. This made us curious to know if there was anything inside that might suggest a date. The image was found to be filled with charcoal. This, no doubt, represented the remains of relics and _dhāraṇī_ with which the figure was consecrated, and which must have been reduced to charcoal through the process of fire gilding. The latter performe must have taken place after the apertures left for the insertion of the relics were closed. Herbert Maryon remarks in regard to fire gilding: “This gentle heating may go on for many hours, but the work must be heated at last to low redness to drive off every particle of mercury.”

However, the charcoal became such, it was evident that the contents of the figure had been undisturbed since the apertures were first closed. Thus it seemed a good opportunity for a carbon-14 test. With this in view, a sufficient quantity was sent to Dr. James B. Griffin, Director of the Museum of Anthropology at the University of Michigan; this was submitted by him to the Michigan Memorial Phoenix Project Radiocarbon Laboratory under the direction of Professor H. R. Crane. A letter from Dr. Griffin, dated November 11, 1955, states that tests proved this charcoal to be 1,500 years old ± 250 years. Thus we have a possible dating lying between the years A.D. 205, which is quite unlikely, and A.D. 705, which, before the publication of Miss Chapin’s article, would have been considered a perfectly fair attribution. She herself contended that there was no way of knowing whether or not the figures shown in later paintings resembled the figures of the seventh century. Now, thanks to Professor Crane’s finding, we can safely say that they did.

A. G. Wenley


Gilt Bronze Figure of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara.

(Courtesy of the Smithsonian Institution, Freer Gallery of Art. No. 46.10.)
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BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF K. A. C. CREWS
Compiled by Richard Ettinghausen
In Honor of his seventy-fifth birthday,
September 13, 1954

1912

1913
2. The origin of the Persian double dome, Burlington Mag., vol. 24, No. 128 (Nov.), pp. 94-99, 4 text figs. and 1 pl.; No. 129 (Dec.), pp. 152-156, text figs. 5-8.

1914

1915
5. Persian domes before 1400 A.D., Burlington Mag., vol. 26, No. 142 (Jan.), pp. 146-150, 155, text figs. 1-10, 1 pl.; No. 143 (Feb.), pp. 208-213, text figs. 11-15, 1 pl.

1918

1919
7. A brief chronology of the Muhammadan monuments of Egypt to A.D. 1317, Bull. de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, t. 16 (Le Caire), pp. 39-164, 3 text figs., 18 pls.


1921

1922
10. Ancient gates of Cairo, The Sphinx, Special Tourist Number (Cairo), pp. 17-18, 3 illus.
12. The origin of the cruciform plan of Cairene madrasas, Bull. de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, t. 21 (Le Caire), pp. 1-54, 10 text figs., 12 pls.

1923
15. The great salients of the Mosque of al-Hakim at Cairo, Journ. Royal Asiatic Society, pp. 573-584, 2 text figs., pls. VII-XI.

1924
18. Archaeological researches at the Citadel of Cairo, Bull. de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, t. 23 (Le Caire), pp. 80-167, 13 text figs. (including 9 folding pls.), 30 pls.

The compiler is very grateful to Professor Creswell for information given in connection with this bibliography.
21. The origin of the plan of the Dome of the Rock, British School of Archeology in Jerusalem, Suppl. Papers, No. 2 (Jerusalem), 30 pp., 8 figs.

1925

1926
23. The evolution of the minaret, with special reference to Egypt, Burlington Mag., vol. 48 (March), pp. 134–140; (May), pp. 252–258; (June), pp. 290–298 (including 2 pp. of tables), 4 text figs., 4 pls.

1928
27. The citadel of Cairo, Egypt and the Sudan (Tourist Development Assoc. of Egypt, Cairo), pp. 26–27, 3 illus.

1929

1930

1931

1932

1933

1934

1937

1939
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1940

1946

1947

1949
47. Preface, The Mosques of Egypt from 21 H. (A.D. 641) to 1365 H. (1946) being a series of views in colour and monochrome of the principal mosques of Egypt with a brief note on each monument describing its history and architectural features accompanied by detailed plans and maps. Published by the Ministry of Waqfs, Egyptian Kingdom, and reproduced and printed by the Survey of Egypt, Giza. 2 vols.

48. The Ka'ba in A.D. 608, Archaeologia, vol. 94, (2d s. vol. 44), pp. 97-102, 3 text figs., pl. XXII.

1952


1953


1954

54. A visit to Ukhaidir and Kufa with Dr. Naji al-Asil, Sumer, vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 143-149, and 3 plans.


1955
56. A bibliography of the Muslim architecture of Egypt, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, Art Islamique, t. 3. 64 pp.

1956


59. The legend that al-Walid asked for and obtained help from the Byzantine Emperor, Journ. Royal Asiatic Society, Parts 3 and 4, pp. 142-145.

1957

REVIEWS


THE PUBLICATIONS OF MIKHAIL MIKHAILOVICH D'IAKONOV*

Visitors from western countries to the Third International Congress of Iranian Art and Archaeology, which took place in Leningrad and Moscow in September 1935, will undoubtedly remember a very pleasant young Russian archaeologist who at that time was most helpful to everybody through his general knowledge of the Islamic field and his good command of English. This was Mikhail Mikhailovich Diakonov, who since 1931 had been a member of the staff of the State Hermitage Museum in Leningrad. At the time of this congress visitors also received one of his major publications, brought out together with L. T. Guizalian; it dealt with the rich collection of illuminated *Shâh-nâmeh* manuscripts in Leningrad and actually formed the second part of an earlier volume which contained precise descriptions of these manuscripts and had come out in connection with the Ferdowsi millennial celebration in Teheran. Subsequent research papers showed that Diakonov had developed into a first-rank scholar with many fine publications to his credit. They dealt usually with Islamic and Iranian subjects, mostly based on material in Russian collections, and with the results of archaeological expeditions, but it will also be recalled, for instance, that it was due to his insight that the many scenes painted on a polychrome goblet from about A.D. 1200, now in the Freer Gallery of Art, were first interpreted by him as belonging to the *Shâh-nâmeh* cycle.

After his first experiences in a museum D’iakonov, began, in 1939, his archaeological fieldwork and took part in the excavations of Paikand. After war

* The data for this note and the subsequent bibliographical references are first given in Russian in transliteration and then every part is translated, including the names of journals. "M." and "L." stand for Moscow and Leningrad. The numbering of the publications here given is that of the Russian original.
work in the Army from 1941–44 he was appointed acting dean of the History Department at Moscow State University and held this position from May 1944 to October 1945. From 1945 D’iakonov was again working at the Hermitage and the Leningrad section of the Institute for the History of Material Culture. In 1946 he became a member of the Tajik Archaeological Expedition and close collaborator of A. Iu. Iakubovskii; after the latter’s death he succeeded him as leader of the expedition. In 1953 he was nominated Professor at the Moscow State University, and while holding this position he died on June 8, 1954.

Although the scholarly publications of D’iakonov are comparatively little known in the West, there is no doubt that he was one of the most active and successful younger scholars in the field. His premature death has all too soon cut short a very fruitful and successful career.

R. E.

1932


1934


1936


1938


A Guide to the rooms of the Oriental Section of the State Hermitage. Prepared by the scientific staff of the section, headed by M. M. D’iakonov. L., 1939, 247 pages, ill. pls.


A bronze weight with the name of Ismail Samani, Proceedings of the Oriental Section of the State Hermitage, L., vol. 2 (1940), pp. 165–176, 2 ills. Résumé in French.
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The manuscript Khamseh by Nizami of the year 1431 and its importance for the history of miniature painting in the Orient, Proceedings of the Oriental Section of the State Hermitage, L., vol. 3 (1940), pp. 275-286, 7 ills. Résumé in French.


1941


1944


1945


1946

30. Istoriiia drevnego Iran. (Avtoreferat doktorskoi dissertatsii).—“Voprosy istorii,” M., 1946, No. 1, s. 130-139.
The history of ancient Iran (author’s abstract of his doctoral dissertation), Historical Problems, M., No. 1 (1946), pp. 130-139.
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37. O data Dendenakanskoj mecheti.—“Kratkie soobshcheniia In-ta istorii material’noi kul’tury AN SSSR.” M.—L., 1948, No. 23, s. 108.


1949

41. Keramika Peika.—“Kratkie soobshcheniia In-ta istorii material’noi kul’tury AN SSSR,” M.—L., 1949, vyp. XXVIII, s. 89–93.


1950


1951


49. Obraz Siavusha v sredneaziatskoi mifologii. "Kratkie soobshcheniia o dokladakh i polevykh isledovaniakh In-ta istorii material'noi kul'tury AN SSSR." M., 1951, vyp. 40, s. 34-44, ill.
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1952


1953


55. Iran. Izobrazitelnye i skusstva i arkhitektrya.—V kn.: Bolshaia sovetskaiia entsiklopedia, izd. 2, t. 18, M., 1953, s. 427–430.


1954


1954
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WORKS PREPARED FOR PUBLICATION
60. Drevniaia Baktiia. Ancient Bactria.
63. Tadjikskii Khudozhnik v Azerbaidzhan. V soavtorstve s IU. S. Dashevskim.

This list does not contain articles and notes in newspapers, translations from west-European languages, and small translations of oriental poetry.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE
DER ISLAMISCHEN EINBANDKUNST,
1871 BIS 1956
VON EMIL GRATZL,∗ K. A. C. CRESWELL und RICHARD ETTINGHAUSEN

Vorbemerkung


Die mir bekannte Literatur über koptische Einbände ist vollständig aufgenommen, da ihre Bedeutung für die Entstehung des frühislamischen Einbands, schon lange vermutet, in neuester Zeit völlig beweisbar geworden ist, so daß beide Gebiete als eine Einheit gesehen werden müssen.


Wissenschaftsgeschichtlich ist es vielleicht nicht ganz wertlos anzugeben, wie sich die angeführten Titel zeitlich verteilen; es liegen vor 1890: 17 zwischen 1890 und 1899: 16 „ 1900 „ 1909: 22 „ 1910 „ 1919: 39
between 1920 and 1929: 68
,, 1930 ,, 1939: 69
,, 1940 ,, 1949: 22
,, 1950 ,, 1956: 29
(Rezensionen und die wenigen Bücher, deren Erscheinungsjahr mir unbekannt ist, sind dabei nicht mit gezählt.)


Zum Schlüß noch einige Bemerkungen:

Zum ersten: die Freude an diesem liebenswürdigen Zweig des islamischen Kunsthandwerks darf uns, trotz der verhältnismäßig großen Zahl der hier aufgeführten Arbeiten, nicht vergessen lassen, daß es sich dabei nur um ein relativ kleines Sondergebiet im weiten Bereich der gesamten islamischen Kunst handelt.


Die wichtigsten Publikationen (oder vielmehr diejenigen, die uns als die wichtigsten erscheinen) sind am Anfang des Titels durch ein Sternchen (*) hervorgehoben. Dies wird wohl den Anfängern und den Kollegen aus den Nachbargebieten, Museumsämtern und Bibliotheken willkommen sein. Ein Kreuz (†) kennzeichnet die 28 auf spätantike und koptische Einbände bezüglichen Titel.

Und endlich: Ich habe versucht, alles zu erfassen, was mir erreichbar war, und ich habe ferner versucht, das gesammelte Titelmaterial in möglichst einheitlicher Form vorzulegen. Hierbei werde ich hinter dem Wünschbaren zurückbleiben sein. Aber: "If you are troubled with the pride of accuracy, try to print a bibliography."

Herrn Dr. Theodore C. Petersen bin ich für die Ergänzung meines Materials durch die Titel mir unbekannt gebliebener Publikationen über koptische Einbände zum Dank verpflichtet.

E. G.


Allgemeines über "Binding", anschliessend an Sarre und Grohmann, auf p. 56; Besprechung mamlukischer Bände aus der früheren Sammlung des einstigen Direktors der damaligen Khedivial Library in Kairo, B. Moritz, auf pp. 71-73, 75, 78, 79 und 87, dazu von zwei jüngeren Bänden, pp. 89 und 91


Enthält auch Bucheinbände.

*Adam, Paul, Der orientalishe Bucheinband, Kunstgewerbeblatt, Bd. 4, (1888), pp. 63-73.*

Früheres Versuch einer Zusammenfassung.

———, *Der Bucheinband. Seine Technik und seine Geschichte.* Seemann's Kunsthandbücher, Bd. 6, Leipzig, 1890.

Über islamische Bände, pp. 186-200.

———, *Orientalisches Mittelstück, Monatschrift für Buchbinderei, Bd. 2 (1891) p. 158 und Ill. p. 151.*

———, *Über türkisch-arabisch-perische Manuskripte und deren Einbände, Monatschrift für Buchbinderei, Bd. 3 (1892), pp. 13ff., 20ff., 33ff. und 52ff.*

Im wesentlichen Neudruck des voranstehend genannten Aufsatzes.


†———, Der koptische Einband in Berlin, Archiv für Buchbinderei, Bd. 11 (1912), pp. 177-181.

Hinweis auf die Bedeutung der koptischen Buchbinderkunst, anknüpfend an Ibscher’s Aufsatz im gleichen Band, pp. 113-116.


———, Die griechische Einbandkunst und das frühchristliche Buch, Archiv für Buchbinderei, Bd. 23 (1923), Bd. 24 (1924), passim.


Über Einbände, pp. 15 und 35-37.


Darín t. 2, pp. 180 ff., George Marteau über Einbände in d’Allemagne’s Privatsammlung.


Eine farbige Tafel.


Englische Ausgabe unter Grohmann, Adolf, verzeichneten Werkes. Für Einband-


Darin p. 12, Der orientalische Einband.


Einbände aus dem Besitz des Museums, pp. 26–29 unter Nr. 117–130.

Bachhofer, Ludwig, siehe Grohmann, Adolf.


Auf p. 56 und fig. 3 ein persischer Lackband von circa 1540.


In dieser umfangreichen Arbeit findet sich nur p. 236 eine Notiz über die Blüte der Einband kunst in Fès im 14. Jh.


Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Codex, hauptsächlich auf Grund der Aphroditopapyri im British Museum.


Blochet, E., *Peintures de manuscrits arabes, persans et turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris*, (1911 ?). Einbände auf pl. 1 und 64.
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Verkaufskatalog von Photographien; knapp charakterisierte Einbände unter den Nrn. 624, 628, 640, 846, 848, 891, 881, 904 und 906.


Gibt u. a. 2 Buchbindersignaturen aus Täbriz und Isfahan, a. d. 16. u. 17. Jh.

Burlington Fine Arts Club, Exhibition of bookbindings, London, 1891.


Darin p. 43 über einen mit Gold und Edelsteinen gezierten, nach Mekka geschenkten Koran, dessen Beschreibung nach p. 55 uns durch Ibn Khaldün überliefert ist.

Catálogo guía. Siehe Sociedad Española de Amigos de Arte.


Persische Einbände sind ohne Abb. beschrieben unter Nr. 43-51.
Champeaux, A. de, *Portefeuille des arts décoratifs.*
Publié sous le patronage de l'Union centrale des Arts décoratifs, Paris, 1888-98.
Siehe pl. 21: Plut de reliure en cuir gaufré et doré, orient, XVI. siècle.

P. 103, Verweis auf Verwandtschaft mit den koptischen und den Turfan-Bänden.


———, *Persisk Kunst i London,* Tilskueren, Aargang 48 (1931), Halvb. 1.
Ein persischer Einband auf p. 336, fig. 17.


Persische Einbände auf pls. 35-40.

Mit Abbildungen von Einbänden des British Museum.

Zwei schöne Innendeckel aus dem Palast von Alwar (Ulwar).

Einbände in ganz willkürlicher Kolorierung auf pls. 21-26.

Figs. 114-116, mamhluskne und persische Bände; figs. 123, 124, 135, und 136, italienische Bände persischen Stils.
Siehe VIII, Legatura orientali e inizio della doratura su cuio, pp. 49-55, figs. 45-47 und pl. 6.

Dasgupta, Surendra Nath, *Note upon paintings and manuscripts,* Central Museum, Lahore, Annual Report, 1927-28, 1928, pp. 7-9 and pls. I-V.

Davenport, Cyril, and Tregaskis, J. and L. M., *International Bookbinding Exhibition by the chief craftsmen from all parts of the world,* at the "Caxton Head", 232 High Holborn, London, W. C., from Wednesday, June 27th. to Saturday, July 7th.

Nr. 53: ein schöner moderner indischer Einband aus Alwar (Ulwar) mit Verzierung in flacher Reliefpressung und Handbemalung in Gold und Blau.


———, siehe auch Bibliothèque Nationale, *Arts de l'Iran*.

———, siehe auch G. Marcais, *Objets . . . . . .

———, siehe auch Petersen, Theodore C., *Early Islamic bookbindings* . . .

Über islamische Einbände pp. 744f.

Deutsches Ledermuseum, Offenbach am Main, siehe Eberhardt, Hugo.

Uber venezianische Einbände persischen Stils.


Auf p. 147 eine nichtssagende Notiz über Einbände.

——, siehe Gratzl, Emil, *Bucheinbände* ... 1924.


——, *A handbook of Mohammedan decorative arts*, New York, 1930.

“Bookbinding”, pp. 70–76.


Über Einbände, pp. 51–53.


“Bookbinding,” pp. 79–84.


†Eberhardt, Hugo, *Deutsches Ledermuseum, ange schlossen Deutsches Schuhmuseum, Offenbach am Main. Kunsthandwerk, Volkshunde, Völkerkunde, Fachtechnik, Offenbach am Main, 1955.*


Die Einbände der erwähnten Handschriften sind eingehend beschrieben.


16 Abbildungen im Text, 3 Farbtafeln.


——, siehe auch Aga-Oglu, *Bookbinding*.


Fig. 3: Lackeinband des 19. Jhs. mit Blumen dekor.


“... attached a piece of fine gilt lacquered leather with decorations in the Persian taste and perhaps of Persian origin ...”


P. 37 und Abb. 1,2 über einen persischen Lack einband von 968 H.1567 n. Chr.; auf der Außenseite Wald mit Tiergruppen; auf der Innenseite Blumenranken und Vögel um ein erhaben geprägtes Medaillon und ebensolche Eckfüllungen.
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†Forrer, Robert, Antike Bucheinbänden von Achim-Panopolis, Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde, Bd. 8 (1904-05), Halbbd. 2, pp. 311-315. 4 figs.

†Frauberger, Heinrich, Antike und frühmittelalterliche Fussbeleitungen aus Achim-Panopolis, Düsseldorf, 1896.

Mit reichem Abbildungsmaterial der verschiedenen Ledertechniken, die auch für koptische Bucheinbände verwendet wurden.


Buchleinbände auf pp. 118-120.


Gabrieli, Giuseppe, La Fondazione Caetani per gli Studi Musulmani, Roma, 1926.

Ein persischer Einband auf pl. 3.

——I primi Accademici Lincei e gli studi orientali, La Bibliofilia, t. 28, (1926-27).

Ein persischer Einband erwähnt, pp. 102-104.


Beschreibung persischer Einbände von Gaston Migeon, t. 1, p. 54, und t. 2, pls. 34 und 35.

Gayet, AL, L'art persan, Bibliothèque de l'Enseignement des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1895.


Gianni, Guido, Lagatura, Encyclopìdia Italiana, vol. 20, Roma, 1933, pp. 742-753. pls. 95-102. 2 col. pls. und 18 figs.

Siehe p. 745 und vier Beispiele persischer Einbände in der De Marinis Sammlung in Florenz.


Pp. 91-100: Glück, Buchkunst; ohne Abbildungen.

Goetz, Hermann, siehe Gratzl, Emil, Bucheinbände .... 1924.


Bände islamischer Länder auf Taf. 4-9; das Werk ist aus der eben genannten Ausstellung hervorgegangen.


Erste wissenschaftliche Bearbeitung des seither wiederholt behandelten Gegenstandes.


Im wesentlichen Text des folgenden Tafelwerkes:


———, *Islamische Bucheinbände, Die Kunst. Monatshefte ... Bd. 52 (1924),* pp. 44–50.

Anknüpfend an F. Sarre’s *Islamische Bucheinbände.*

———, *Eine frühe Buchbinderinschrift aus Kleinasiien*, Jahrbuch der Einbandkunst, Bd. 2 (1929), pp. 60–62.

Signatur eines Buchbinders Muhammad al-Karamānī auf einer persischen Hs. d. J. 832 H. Die Hs. kam später in die Berliner Staatsbibliothek.


———, siehe auch Aga Ogil, *Bookbindings.*

———, siehe auch *Bibliothèque Nationale ... 1925.*

———, siehe auch Grohmann, Adolf, *Denkmäler Islamischer Buchkunst.*

———, siehe auch Loubier, Jean, *Bucheinband ... 1926.*


Grohmann, Adolf, siehe auch Arnold, Sir Thomas, *The Islamic Book ... 1929.* (Englische Ausgabe des obligen Werkes.)

———, siehe auch Gratzl, Emil, *Bucheinbände ... 1924.*


Zwei schöne Mudéjar-Einbände auf den III. und J.


Darin pl. 1A: Innenseite der Lackklappe von Freer MS. 08.199, in Shirāz in 955 H./1548 hergestellt.


La maroquinerie, pp. 134–137; la reliure, pp. 137–141.

Habib, Mārza, *Khatt we-Khattātan, Istanbul, 1304 H./1888 n. Chr.*

 Hinweis auf die Bedeutung der timuridischen Buchkunst in Ostpersien.


Siehe pp. 484–493 und fig. 2.

Hannover, E., *Kunstfertige gamle bokbind, Kopenhagen, 1907.*

Islamische Einbände sind auf p. 40 erwähnt.


Harthan, John P., siehe Victoria and Albert Museum.

Hasan Muhammad al-Hawārī, *Risālah ... Dār al-Athār al-'Arabiyah (Booklet ... Museum of Arab Art), Cairo (n. d.).

Siehe pp. 87–89.
Hassan, Zaky M., siehe Zaki Muhammad Hasan.
Kapitel IX: "The Ulwar Library and its contents". Am Ende des Kapitels Bericht über die Einführung der Einbandkunst in Alwar durch einen Muhammedaner namens 'Abd al-Rahmân, sowie über die dort gefertigten Kunsteinbände, mit Abb. auf pls. 77 bis 79 und farbiger Illustration am Anfang.
———, Persian and Indian bookbinding, Journal of Indian Art, vol. 5 (1894), Nr. 43.
Mit 14 farbigen Tafeln durchweg jüngerer Bände.
Herz Bey, Max, A descriptive catalogue of the objects exhibited in the National Museum of Arabic Art, 2d ed., Cairo, 1907.
Über arabisch-persische und türkische Einbände, pp. 257–269 mit pl. 8 und fig. 55. Es ist zu bedauern, dass über die andere grosse Einbandsammlung in Kairo, die der arabischen Nationalbibliothek, welche besonders an Prachtbänden der Mamlukenzeit reich ist, noch keine Veröffentlichung existiert.
P. 9: Islamic bindings.
Mit einer Liste der bis 1938 bekannten koptischen Einbände und dem Hinweis, dass die maghrabinischen Bände "derive ultimately from Coptic work".
P. 27 über die Innenseiten persischer Buchdeckel.
Hofbibliothek, K. K., siehe Gottlieb, Theodor.
———, siehe Katalog der Buchkunst-Ausstellung, 1916.
Hollis, Howard, Islamic art, selected examples from the loan exhibition of Islamic art at the Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, 1944.
Holmes, R. R., Specimens of royal, fine and historical bookbindings, selected from the Royal Library, Windsor Castle, London, 1893.
Persische Einbände auf pls. 146–152.
Enthält keine islamischen, sondern nur Mudéjarbände.
Der islamische Einband ist nicht behandelt, sondern nur seine Auswirkung auf Europa in dem Abschnitt "Die orientalische Einbandart in Italien", pp. 687–690.
Ibn Abi Ya’qûb al-Nadîm, Muhammam ibn Ishaq, siehe Nadîm.
†Ibscher, Hugo, Alle koptischen Einbände, Archiv für Buchbinderei, Bd. 21 (1911), pp. 113–116 mit 3 Abb.
Über koptische Einbände.
†Ibscher, Hugo, Von der Papyrussrolle zum Kodex, Archiv für Buchbinderei, Bd. 20 (1920), passim. t Abb. eines koptischen Prachtbandes in Berlin aus dem 4.–6. Jh.
†—, Koptische Bucheinbände aus Aegypten, Berliner Museen, Bd. 49 (1928), pp. 86ff. 
Über die Wichtigkeit solcher koptischer Lackarbeiten für die Frühgeschichte der Einbandkunst siehe Ettighausen, The covers…, p. 459.
—. Siehe auch Katalog der Buchkunst-Ausstellung, 1916.

Katalog… 1953, siehe auch Nationalbibliothek, Oesterreichische… 1953.
Kirchner, Joachim, Bilderatlas zum Buchwesen, 1 (Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens, 3, 1), Stuttgart, 1955. Zwei persische Einbände auf Taf. 348 und 349 nach Gratzl.
Kohlhausen, Heinrich, Islamische Kleinkunst. (Führer durch das Hamburgische Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, 12.) Hamburg, 1930. Über Einbände, pp. 16–19 mit fig. 1 und pl. 7.


†Kühnel, Ernst, Antikes Schreibgerät (Meisterwerke in Berlin, 4), Berlin, 1923.


Über Einbände, p. 223 mit Abb. 10.


—, Maurische Kunst (Kunst des Ostens, Bd. 9), Berlin, 1924.

Mudejār-Bände abgebildet auf Taf. 142 und 143.

Kühnel, Ernst, Islamische Kleinkunst (Bibliothek für Kunst- und Antiquitätenmämler, Bd. 23), Berlin, 1925.


—, Die Sammlung türkischer und islamischer Kunst im Tschinili Kösch (Meisterwerke der Archäologischen Museen in Istanbul, Bd. 3), Berlin, 1938.


—, siehe auch Ibacher, Hugo, Aller koptische Einbände.

—, siehe auch Katalog ... Berlin, 1920.

—, siehe auch Petersen, Theodore C., Early Islamic bookbindings ...

Kunstindustrimuseet i Oslo, Gamle Bokbind i Norge. Katalog over Utsstillingen Oslo, 1925.


Kyster, Anker, Bookbindings in the public collections of Denmark, vol. 1: The Royal Library, Copenhagen, Copenhagen, 1938.

Der p. 43 abgebildete Band geometrischen Stils gehört nicht ins 18. Jh. sondern zur aegyptisch-syrischen Gruppe der Manlukzeit.


Über einen in einen Prachtband gebundenen, angeblich vom Khalifen 'Ummān geschriebenen Koran, der sich bis mindestens 552 H./1157 n. Chr. in der grossen Moschee zu Cordova befand.

P. 143, fig. 77. Abb. der Innenseite eines persischen Einbandes des 16. Jhs.

Einbände auf pls. 36 und 37.


Mit Hinweis auf die starken islamischen Einflüsse, vgl. besonders pl. 4.

Ledermuseum, Deutsches, zu Offenbach am Main ... 1955, siehe Eberhardt, Hugo.


A loan exhibition of Islamic bookbindings, ... Chicago, 1932 siehe Miehet, Julius.


Hier und bei dem folgenden Werk gebraucht Loubier den Vornamen "Hans."


-----, siehe auch Gratzi, Emil, *Islamische Bucheinbände ...* 1924.


Macaulay, D. I. M. *Catalogue of a small but very choice collection of Persian and Indian miniatures, manuscripts and calligraphy, the property of the late Major D. I. M. Macaulay ... a superb binding of Samargand leather ... which will be sold by auction by Messrs. Sotheby & Co. ... on Tuesday, the 24th. of June, 1941, London, 1941.

Siehe p. 31 und die dazu gehörige Tafel.


Auf pp. 60 und 144 erster Hinweis auf die in *Objets kairouanais* beschriebenen Einbände.

1. Auflage von Saladin, 1908 siehe Saladin.


Das vorzügliche kleine Buch berührt die Einbandkunst nur kurz auf pp. 147 und 192.


Über Einbände, pp. 43-46 und pls. 21 und 180-195.

———, siehe auch d‘Allemagne, Henri-René.

Martell, P., *Der orientalische Bucheinband*, Die Warte, Bd. 27 (1924), Nr. 19.

Unselbständiger kurzer Artikel in einer abgelegenen Zeitschrift.


Bemerkenswert nur als früher Darstellungsversuch.

———, *A history of oriental carpets*, Vienna, 1908.

Abbildungen persischer Einbände auf figs. 66-70, 87, 97, 107 und 128.

———, *Les Miniatures de Békaïd dans un manuscrit persan daté 1485*, Munich, 1912.

Auf pls. 1 und 2 Aussen- und Innenseite eines schönen (Herät?) Bandes.


Reproduktionen von Einbänden auf pl. 13 aus
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEYS

Aegypten, auf pls. 18, 19, 30 and 32 aus Persien, mit Beschreibungen.

Martin F. R., Miniatures from the period of Timur in a manuscript of the poems of Sultan Ahmad Jalair, Vienna, 1926.


——, The Nizāmi ms. from the library of the Shah of Persia, now in the Metropolitan Museum of New York, Vienna, 1927.


Siehe pp. 34–35 und figs. 8–9.


*Migeon, Gaston; Exposition des arts musulmans au Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, 1903.

Tafelwerk zu Migeon, Gaston; van Berchem, Max; Huart, Clément, Exposition ... 1903.

——, Manuel d’art musulman, t. 2: Les arts plastiques et industriels, Paris, 1907.

Kurze Erwähnung der Einbände, p. 59.


——, siehe auch Ganz, Paul.


Persische Einbände pp. 118–120.

Miquel y Planas, R., Restauración del arte hispano-arabe en la decoración exterior de los libros, Barcelona, 1913.


Mirzâ Habib siehe Habib.


Mit 2 Abb. ohne Erläuterung.

Moritz, B., Arabische paläographie. Folio, in portfolio (Nachbildung eines alten Koraneinbandes mit Klappe), Cairo, 1905.

Auf pl. 51 ein Koraneinband von 874 H./1469–70 in der Moschee Sayyidnâ Husayn in Kairo.


Munthe, Gustav, Islams Konst (Bonniers Allmänna Konsthistoria), Stockholm, 1929.


Mustafâ 'Ali, Menâqib-i hânverân [Klassen der Künstler], Istanbul, 1926.

Über Buchbinder, p. 83.

Eine Liste hervorragender Buchbinder bis zum 10. Jh. in Bd. 1, p. 10.


Nr. 171–201 auf pp. 57–60, „Arabische, persische und türkische Einbände“, meist schon in der Ausstellung von 1901 gezeigt und in Gottlieb’s Katalog beschrieben; auf pl. 12 Abbildung eines Lackbandes, der aber — trotz Gottlieb, Katalog, Nr. 29 — nicht dem frühen 15. Jh. angehören kann.


ÖZ, Tahsin, The Topkapı Saray Museum. 50 Masterpieces. (Druckort und -jahr nicht angegeben.)


Auf p. 201. zwei ganzseitige Abb. islamischer Einbände.


Siehe pls. 39–41 und den dazu gehörigen Text.

Parvillée, Couverture de manuscrit persan, Décoration Ancienne et Moderne, (Année 1897).

War uns nicht zugänglich.

Paton, Lucy Allen, Selected bindings from the Gen-nadius Library. American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Cambridge, 1924.

Pls. 9–11, zwei persische Einbände neuerer Zeit, mit Text, p. 18.

Paz y Melia, A., Misal toledano del siglo XV, Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, IIIª. época, tomo 8 (1953), pp. 36–37, with 2 pls.

Pl. II: “Encuadernación mudéjar del Misal toledano”.

Pedersen, Jøhs., Islams Kultur, Stockholm, 1928.

Figs. 111–122, zwei Einbände, beide nach Sarre.

—, Den arabiske bog, Kobenhavn, 1946.

Pp. 100–114, “Bogbind”.


Polak, J. E., Persische Lederindustrie, Oesterreichische Monatschrift für den Orient, 1876, pp. 186–188.

Nur wegen des frühen Datums erwähnenswert.


Figs. 55–56 Wiedergabe von zwei Einbänden.


P. 150, pls. 138–139 über Einbände.

——, siehe auch Aga Oglu, Bookbindings.


Farbige Wiedergaben von Einbänden auf pls. 124, 125, 126(?), und 174.
**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEYS**


Ricard, Prosper, *La reliure d'art de Fez*, France-Maroc (mai-juillet, 1917). Handelt über die moderne einheimische Buchbinderkunst in Fez, um deren Wiederbelebung und Erhaltung sich Ricard grosse Verdienste erworben hat; die Arbeit war uns nicht zugänglich.


—, *Un cartable impérial du XVIIIe siècle*, Réalisation, t. 2 (Casablanca, nov. 1936), pp. 211–214, mit 2 figs.


—, siehe auch Abû 'l-Abbas Ahmed.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEYS

Erwähnung eines Einbands von 1444/45.
Rolland, Francesco Hueso, siehe Hueso Rolland, Francesco.
   Pp. 146-150 und 293-297 über ostpersische Einbände.
Beide Zusammenfassung über türkische Einbände.
   Über Einbände, pp. 48–58 und figs. 50, 51, 54, 55, 63 und 67.
   ———, [La reliure persane sous les Séfévîs.]
Sollte nach *Ars Islamica*, vol. 6 (1939), p. 77.
Anm. 103 in Artibus Asiae, vol. 8 (1940–45) erscheinen, ist aber dort nicht erschienen.
   ———, *Thèmes et motifs d'enluminures*, Ars Islamica, vol. 6 (1939), pp. 66–87 mit figs. 1–32.
Fig. 25 reproduziert eine Klappe "für quinzième siècle" mit "visages lunaires." Text hierzu pp. 80f. Für eine vollständige Zusammenstellung solcher Ranken, die in Gesichter auslaufen, siehe Carl Joh. Lamm, *En Miniature och en Matta*, in Nationalmuseet Årshok, N. S. Årgang 1 (Stockholm, 1930–31), wo alle bekannten Darstellungen des Motifs gesammelt sind.
Sakisian hat sich durch Hinweise auf unbe-kannte Stücke, vor allem in Istanbul, sehr verdient gemacht. Doch sind seine Arbeiten wegen ihrer Zersplitterung und vielfacher Wiederholung ebenso wie wegen der grossen Sicherheit mit der seine oft schwer nachprüfbaren Meinungen vorgetragen werden, nicht so fruchtbar, wie sie sein könnten.
Abb. auf p. 77, "Reliure en papier doré découpé par Si Younès el Nachaichi."
Englische Ausgabe des obigen Werkes.
Sarre, Friedrich, und F. R. Martin, *Die Ausstellung ..., München, 1910, siehe Martin, F. R.
   Pp. 130–133 zwei persische Einbände.

Das grosse, sorgfältig gearbeitete Werk enthält persische Einbände auf pls. 99 und 100.


Dieses Tafelwerk über die Bestände des jetzt zerstörten Leipziger Museums für Buch und Schrift enthält persische Einbände auf pls. 5 und 6.


†— Dr. Hugo Ibscher und die koptischen Manuskripte, Archiv für Buchbinderei, Bd. 34 (1934), pp. 81–82.


Schulz, Ph. Walter, Die persisch-islamische Miniaturnäerei, 2 Bde., Leipzig, 1914.

Das grosse, für die Erschliessung der islamischen Handschriftsnäerei wichtige Werk enthält Einbände auf pls. 195–199.

Serjeant, R. B., A rare Ottoman manuscript with two contemporary portraits of Murad III, Islamic Culture, vol. 17 (1944), pp. 15–18.


Persische Einbände auf pls. 4, 11, 12, 20, 29, 32 und 35.

Smith, R. Murdoch, Persian art (South Kensington Museum Art Handbooks), London, 1879.

Knappe Erwähnung der Einbandkunst, pp. 80f.


Sothen’s, Price Current of Literature, Nr. 82, London, 1924.

Nr. 657–663, “Persian lacquered bookcovers of the 19th century”, mit 6 figs.

Stchoukine, Ivan, Les peintures des manuscrits timourides (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, t. 60), Paris, 1954.

Auf pl. 9 der Kartuschen-Rahmen einer Miniatur “vers 1390”, der wenn die Altersangabe zutrifft, für die frühe Ausbildung der auf den persischen Einbänden des 16. Jhs. so häufigen Rahmenform von Bedeutung ist.


Knappe Zusammenfassung ohne selbständigen Wert.

—, Islamische Bucheinbände, Archiv für Buchbinderei, Bd. 30 (1930), pp. 9–11.


Pl. 59, alte Bände mit geometrischen Stils und modernen Medaillonbänden, letztere aus Fez.


P. xxi s. über Entstehung und Elemente der mudéjaren Einbanddekoration mit Analyse der von ihr verwendeten, großenteils auch in islamischen Ländern verbreiteten Stempeln; p. xxx s. über Anfänge der Vergoldung in Nordafrika. Islamische Bände sind in dem vorziiglichen Buch nicht veröffentlicht, doch finden
sich Stempel mit verbildeter arabischer Schrift auf pls. 53 und 57. Die zahlreichen gut reproduzierten musäjaren Einbände zeigen neben dem arabischen Erbe vielfach Verwandtschaft mit Einbänden hebräischer Handschriften. Da manche Stempel bis nach Südaraabien vorkommen, sind sie möglicherweise von aus Spanien vertriebenen Juden mitgebracht worden.


Studie über die "Miklep"-genannten Klappen der alttürkischen Einbände.

———, *Fatih Devri hattatlarından*, I, *Amasya Hamdullâh Efendi ve tôp tarihimize deki yeri* (The calligraphers of Fatih’s period, I, Hamdullah Efendi from Amasya and his place in our history of medicine). Imnentitel (auf dem Titelblatt): *Hattat Şeyh Hamdullah ve Fatih için iştisası ettiği iki mühim tibbî eser* (The calligrapher Şeyh Hamdullah and two important medical works copied for Fatih). T. C. Istanbul Üniversitesi, Tıp Tarihi Enstitüsü, Sayı 48 (1 Ü. 542) (Turkish Republic, University of Istanbul, Institute of History of Medicine, No. 48 [1 Ü. 542]).


Ünver, A. Süheyil, *Kapılarla Türk tayinatı örnekleri* (Patterns of Turkish decorations on bookbindings), Istanbul, 1943.

12 Seiten mit schwarz-weissen Illustrationen auf 10 Tafeln, die Medaillenformen des 15. bis 17. Jahrhunderts wiedergeben.


P. 99 und pl. 21, persische Einbände früher im Besitz F. R. Martins.


Pt. 1, pl. 13 ein mamlukischer Band; Pt. 2, pls. 18–20 persische Bände.

———, *100 masterpieces Mohammedan and oriental*, London, 1931.

Auf pls. 36 und 37 persische Einbände.


Ein koptischer Einband auf pl. 1; zwei mamulukische auf pls. 2 und 3; vier persische pls. 4–7, z. T. identisch mit den in den vorangehenden Werken veröffentlichten Bänden.


Siehe p. 46 und fig. 5.


P. 293, "ancient book-binding" über einen Einband der Bibliothek zu Alwar mit Abb. auf pl. 43 D.

Weisse, Franz, Der Buchbinder in der Ausstellung von Meisterwerken mohammedanischer Kunst in München, Allgemeiner Anzeiger für Buchbinderei, Bd. 24 (1910), Nr. 42.


Auf pl. 100 gepresster Lederband des 14. Jhs.


Pls. 2 und 3 Wiedergabe eines Einbandes des Shäh Ismā’l.


Ein Einband auf pl. 45.

—, L’Exposition persane de 1931 (Publications du Musée Arabe du Caire), Le Caire, 1933.

Zwei Einbände des 16. und 17. Jhs. auf pls. 41 und 42.

—, Miniatures persanes, turques et indiennes, Le Caire, 1943.

Vergl. pp. 175–176 und pls. 68–70. Zaki Muhammad Hasan, Qunūz al-Fāṭimiyin [Die Schätze der Fāṭimiden], Cairo, 1356/1937.


Über chinesische Einflüsse auf pp. 57 und 72, und pl. 29.

—, Al-Funūn Al-ʿIrāniyya fil-ʿAṣr Al-Islāmī (Persian art in the Moslem period), Cairo, 1946, pp. 141–148, 1 Abb. im Text, pls. 54 und 55.


Vergl. pp. 262–263.

—, Moslem art in the Fouad I University Museum, Cairo, 1950, vol. 1 (all that appeared) (Publication of the Faculty of Arts).


Zaky M. Hassan, (eigene Schreibung des Verfassers) siehe Zaki Muḥammad Ḥasan.

ADDENDA


Bd. 2 ist für die Buchbindetechnik sehr nützlich, aber die Ausführungen über den islamischen Einband in Bd. 1 (p. 82: Eastern bindings, pp. 90ff: Spain) sehr kurz und ohne selbständigen Wert. Pl. 15: persischer Reliefeinband mit Vergoldung, 17 Jh., pls. 14 und 16: Italienische Einbände mit islamischem Einfluß, 15 Jh., pls. 24–26: Spanische Mudéjar Einbände, 16 Jh.
Behandelt die heutige Buchbinderei von Fez von handwerklichen und ökonomischen Gesichtspunkten aus. Die 5 Abb. zeigen die verschiedenen Stadien der Arbeit.


War uns nicht zugänglich.
BOOK REVIEWS


noch einige Miniaturen und Kultgegenstände aufgeführt, bei denen ebenfalls arabische Elemente mit sprechen.

Die auf gewissenhafter Forschung und überragender Beherrschung des Stoffes beruhende Darlegung von Gómez-Moreno ist so wichtig für die Kenntnis der behandelten Epoche, dass ihre Übersetzung in andere europäische Sprachen dringend erwünscht wäre. Denn nur wenige werden des Spanischen genügend mächtig sein, um die gepflegte, sehr prägnante und fachlich präzise, aber nicht ganz geläufige Diktion des Autors in vollem Umfange würdig zu können.

ERNST KÜHNEL


Die Darstellung der Kunst unter den Nasriden nimmt mehr als doppelt soviel Raum ein, bietet aber wenig Neues. Lesenswert ist die allgemeine Betrachtung über die ganz auf sich angewiesene Granadiner Richtung, die Architektur und Landschaft in Harmonie zu bringen wusste, und über die starke Originalität der Alhambra, die allein ihre erstaunliche Expansionskraft erklärt, trotz Mangel an grosszügiger Planung. Der Grundriss erfasst einige Korrekturen; auf eine hypothetische Rekonstruktion der durch den Palast Karls V. weggerissenen Teile wird verzichtet. Dass der Generalife zeitlich etwas früher anzusetzen ist, als der Residenzbau selbst, ist inschriftlich gesichert; die unten in der Stadt im Cuartel de Sto. Domingo festgestellten...


ERNST KÜHNEL

Some principal Muslim religious buildings in Israel.

This trilingual (Hebrew, Arabic, and English) work represents essentially a report, submitted by the authors to Israel’s Minister of Religious Affairs, which was based on a survey of Muslim religious monuments undertaken during the Palestine fighting of 1948-49. It deals, among others, with sites in Yavne (Yubna), Ekron, Ramleh, Lydda, Sarafand al-Ammár, Sarafand al-Kharâb, Jaffa, Haifa, Acre, Safad, and Tiberias.

As might be expected from work done under such circumstances, the treatment of the various sites is uneven. Certain monuments are described in the text in considerable detail and are illustrated by photographs and by excellent plans done by Pinkerfeld. Other sites, however, such as the Maqâm al-Sitt Sukaynah, the earliest Muslim religious edifice in Tiberias, is cursorily treated in a brief paragraph and is accompanied by neither photographs nor plans. Although it is stated (English text, p. 20) that "the common denominator of the sites chosen is the fact that they have suffered, either by additions or by neglect under the mandatory administration, or during that hostilities that followed," this does not seem to be the case with a number of monuments described, if one is to judge from the text.

A number of inscriptions attached to these monuments are illustrated by photographs and have been competently translated by Yigal Yadin. In general, the bibliographies appended to the discussion of the sites in the various localities are quite complete; a handy French translation of most of the Arabic passages contained therein can be found in A. S. Marmardji's Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine (Paris, Librairie Lecoffre, 1951). In many cases, however, the bibliographies seem to be conceived as a complete reference guide for the reader rather than source material for the text. Furthermore, the elaborateness of the architectural drawings and plans often seems out of proportion to the rather summary character of the accompanying text. Finally, it may be noted that the Arabic section of the book does not always correspond exactly with the Hebrew and English portions, the latter two often being more complete than the former.

There are some errors in the text which should be corrected. In the list of figures preceding the English version the captions of figures 57 and 58 have been transposed. On page 20, in the phrase "battles between the Crusaders and the Franks," the word "Muslims" should be substituted for "Franks." The seat of the Abbasid caliphate was not transferred to Cairo in the Fatimid period, as intimated on page 10; the seat of the Abbasid caliphate remained in Baghdad, while a competing Shi’ite caliphate was set up in Cairo and extended its control over Palestine.

H. W. GLIDDEN


Kurt Erdmann


Ever since people have become conscious of the art of Egypt and devoted historical books to it, the heroic scale of her monuments has inspired tomes of royal grandeur. There are, to name a few of the past, such monumental works as Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien, by the German, Richard Lepsius; L'art arabe d'après les monuments du Kaïro, by the Frenchman, A. C. T. E. Prisse d'Avennes; The Muslim architecture of Egypt, by the Englishman, K. A. C. Creswell; and now, to complete the noble series, an Egyptian publication has appeared, The mosques of Egypt, which was printed in two folio volumes in 1949 but has been released only recently by the publisher (the loose preface is signed 4th June, 1954). This new book was brought out by the Reproduction Offices of the Survey of Egypt together with the Department for the Preservation of Arab Monuments and the (then so-called) Museum of Arab Art, all working under the auspices of the Ministry of Waqfs of the Egyptian Government. To understand the significance of this work as a document of cultural consciousness, it is good to point to the remark of Mr. Ahmad Hassan Bâkourî, the then Minister of Waqfs, who quite rightly pointed out in the Introduction that "the history of the Muslim world in general and of Muslim Egypt in particular cannot be properly understood or rightly interpreted unless mosques are thoroughly studied as links in the chain of the past;" and since, as stated in Professor Creswell's Preface, Cairo "possesses a remarkable series of Muslim monuments running unbroken from the ninth to the nineteenth century," the capital city of Egypt offers unique opportunities for such a study. This has been handsomely carried through. Everybody who has an interest in the historical development of Muslim architecture will appreciate the beautifully produced Egyptian publication. Not only do these two volumes reproduce the major architectural aspects of the buildings in 243 plates (photogravures and a good many handsome color plates after western-style paintings by Egyptian artists), but they present also closeups of the wall decorations, cornices, ceilings, doors, and decorative details, the whole covering a range from A.D. 827 to 1946 (the Mosque of al-Fûlî in Minyâ), with a few buildings...
from outside Cairo. At the end there are, furthermore, special series of minarets, domes, columns and capitals, stucco window grilles, marble floors and crestings, and also woodwork, lamps, chandeliers, and even such minor features as door knockers. A good many of the views are different from those given in Professor Creswell’s book or in the earlier Les mosquées du Caire, by L. Hautecoeur and G. Wiet, so that some of these form welcome additions to our visual record of Egyptian architecture. Though the publication is essentially a pictorial survey, one finds in each volume ahead of the plates short accounts of the architectural history of each monument from the original construction to modern restorations, together with a brief survey of the pertinent architectural features, and this nearly always accompanied by drawings of some fine detail and with ground plans and sections for the major monuments. As this textual part was written by Messrs. ʿAbd al-Fattâḥ Ḥîmî and Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Wâlhâb, with Professor K. A. C. Creswell, a member of the general committee for this work, apparently giving a helping hand, the general reader is competently presented with all the information he may want. The first volume contains also two sheets of a map of Cairo drawn to the scale of 1 : 5,000 (issued in 1950), with the buildings of the pre-Fāṭimid and Fāṭimid, Ayyūbid, Bahrite Mamlâk, Circassian Mamlûk, Turkish and post-Turkish periods indicated in different colors and with the official number of each historical structure, which then occurs again in the separate, chronologically arranged Index to Mohammedan monuments in Cairo (Survey of Egypt, 1951). One can, therefore, quite rightly concur in Professor Creswell’s praise as given in the Preface: “The Survey of Egypt is to be congratulated on having carried out the printing and the reproductions of the plates in a manner worthy of the subject. In fact one need have no hesitation in saying that these two volumes constitute the finest piece of book production achieved in Egypt, and there is no doubt that it will be most useful to universities, museums, libraries and similar institutions.”

Richard Ettinghausen


In this small volume the author describes a series of monuments of the early Seljuq period in the southern part of Central Asia, along or not far from the present frontier between Persia and Russia. None of these monuments has an inscription and the author’s dating is based on comparisons with later monuments. The emphasis of the book is on architectural techniques and methods, but numerous conclusions can be drawn—and are drawn by the author—which can be useful to the historian of art in general and to the historian of civilization.

The first chapter deals with two mausoleums. The first one, found just outside the remaining walls of the medieval city of Sarakhs, is presumed to be that of ʿAbū ʿl-Fadl, a Persian mystic who died in 1023.1 Extremely thick walls form a square supporting a gallery and covered by a dome. The dome rests on a circular drum with a 12-sided zone of transition, a feature quite rare in Persian architecture. The interior arrangement is not apparent on the outside. Some time in the fourteenth or fifteenth century the portal was redone; and, according to the author, the _mugarnas_ motif found inside dates from the same period. The second mausoleum is that of ʿAbū Saʿīd in Mehneh.2 It is the only remaining structure on the site of the ancient city. In plan it is very similar to the mausoleum of ʿAbū ʿl-Fadl, but in elevation it shows a significant number of variations. It had a stairway on each side of the facade and a peculiar variation in the level of the gallery which cannot be fully explained (pp. 35–36). This mausoleum was also redone in the Mongol period. The author concludes her chapter by trying to show that these two mausoleums, in architectural type and in the sobriety of decoration, belong to the same group as the mausoleum of Sanjar in Merv, the so-called shrine of al-Ghazzâlî in Tûs (for which Diez’s date is accepted rather than Pope’s), and the mausoleum of Luqman in Persian Sarakhs. All together they form a group of related Central Asian mausoleums which is distinguishable from the group at Uzgend and in other areas of Central Asia. On this score Madame

---

2 Ibid., p. 157.
Pribytkova’s arguments, generally of a technical nature, appear quite convincing. She does not raise
the question of what led to the building of mausoleums to the memory of poets and mystics; or was it
their original purpose? It must be noted that most of these mausoleums were rebuilt under the
Mongols. Was it because of a renewed interest in poets? Or was it at that time that the connection
between certain tombs and poets and mystics was made? A general study of the function of the
mausoleum in the Islamic world, and especially in Persia, would be most welcome, and Madame
Pribytkova has brought a detailed analysis of two of these which were almost totally unknown.

The second chapter is devoted to the caravanserai called “Daia-Hatyn,” which is identified as the
ribâṯ Tâhiriyah of Arabic geographers. The complex comprises a large fortified enclosure, probably
dating to the time of the founder of the Tâhirid dynasty. Within this enclosure is found the
caravanserai proper, which is later. It is also a square structure with a central courtyard, three eyvâns
opening on the courtyard, the entrance eyvân on the fourth side, and rooms of varying sizes along the
walls behind a portico of heavy piers. Some of the rooms are domed, and show interesting transitions
from square or polygonal to dome. On the facade brick was used as a decorative motif in a series of
panels repeating the names of the first caliphs (on p. 52, fig. 59 should be fig. 58, and vice versa), but
these panels should, according to the author, be considered as later. The author compares this
caravanserai to the well-known Ribâṯ-e Malik, but her dating in the eleventh century should perhaps
be questioned, since we meet with a fairly similar plan (with the exception of the large entrance
complex around a first court) in the Ribâṯ Sharaf between Mashhad and Sarakhs, which is dated in
1154–55, that is almost a century after the date proposed by Mrs. Pribytkova for Daia-Hatyn. On
the other hand it may very well be that as common a type of structure as the caravanserai may have
maintained the same or nearly the same form for several centuries. The comparison with the other
monuments of this book is certainly valid, but, since none of them is dated precisely by an in-
scription, the question of the attribution of this caravanserai to the eleventh or to the twelfth
century should perhaps still be left open.

The third chapter deals with another mausoleum, the so-called Mazar 'Alamberdâr, 15 kilometers
north of the city of Kerki. This mausoleum is structurally somewhat different from the first two: it
has thinner walls, a tripartite division of the wall surface both on the inside and on the outside, a
very curious group of cubic st maqarnas on the upper corners of the octagon, not in the squinches,
and a different profile of the dome which begins, on the outside, with two stepilevels of bricks,
probably used as buttresses. The decoration of this monument is interesting, since it uses bricks in
three different ways: “basket weaving” as in the Sâmânid mausoleum at Bokhara, geometric patterns
created by setting the bricks up in different orders, and individual designs on single bricks. This
mausoleum thus shows features that are typical at the same time of older and later monuments and its
datation in the eleventh century seems therefore quite convincing.

In the fourth chapter Madame Pribytkova deals with the mosque called today Talhatan-baba
(equated with the Dalgatan of ancient geographers) in the Merv oasis, which had already been mentioned
by Zhukovskij in 1894. It is a small mosque, whose sanctuary only remains. It consists of a central
domed room, on each side of which there are two small, square, vaulted areas. The sanctuary opens
onto the central courtyard through three high arches, the central one being much wider than the
side ones. The most interesting feature of this mosque is that its outer walls are decorated with a
motif of arches on pillars with engaged columns, a means to decorate the surface of a wall which
should perhaps be connected in a more general way with brick architecture in the Islamic world since
Raqqa and Samarra. Great inventiveness and imagination in the decorative use of bricks is shown
in this mosque, and a series of drawings by the author could give the reader an idea of the range of
decorative patterns in Central Asia in the early Seljuk period. The author compares this mosque to
other structures in Merv and Tirmidh, and shows,

d’Iran*, Cairo, 1949.

³ She mentions (pp. 98–99) excavations made in Tirmidh, which have been published but which were
unavailable to this reviewer.
in opposition to Cohn-Wiener, that, first, this whole group of constructions belongs to a definite architectural type whose methods of construction are sharply different from those of the Sasanian period, and, second, that we are dealing not with an “archaic” architecture, but with a fully developed one.

In conclusion Madame Pribytkova tries to define the characteristics of this architecture: simplicity and clarity in composition; logic in constructional methods; decoration properly subordinated to construction; brick used both for decoration and as material of construction. Then the author enumerates (p. 115) the remaining structures of the eleventh century on the right bank of the Amu-Daria and suggests that, while a similar development and usage of brick architecture took place in Khorasan proper, a number of differences exist between the techniques of the two areas. She points out also that the emphasis on exterior decoration sharply differentiates Central Asian architecture of the eleventh century from the contemporary architecture of Persia proper (Isfahan, Gulpaygân), where the decoration was concentrated on the interior. At the same time she claims that the towers of Ghaznah, although showing the same emphasis on the exterior, should be related to a separate architectural development.

While a complete critical review of this book is difficult, since many of the monuments used as comparisons are not well known to the reviewer, this short volume is certainly a useful addition to our knowledge of architectural forms in the Islamic Middle Ages. The important changes brought to the whole Near East by the Seljuq cannot be fully understood without a thorough knowledge of the developments found in Central Asia and Khorasan under Sâmâni, Ghaznevid, and early Seljuq rules. The book under review is primarily destined for architects and one may argue with certain points in it, in particular the lack of any attempt (except briefly in the introduction and the conclusion) to relate the monuments with the historical and political evolution of the area in the eleventh century. But it must be said that, together with Professor Schlumberger’s excavations at Lashkari Bazar, the excavations at Tirmidh, Mr. Godard’s accounts of the monuments of Khorasan, and various publications in Russian journals such as Epigrafika Vostoka and the Trudy of Russian and Central Asian academies (the latter only too rarely available), in addition to the monuments made known in earlier times by Sarre, Zhukovskij, Diez, Cohn-Wiener, and Pope, the publication of these five buildings must lead the historian of Islamic art to a better understanding of the architecture and civilization of the northeastern part of the Islamic world, which was indeed from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries one of the most important centers of civilization in the whole of the Near East.

Oleg Grabar


Under the aegis of its Central Asian branch, the Academy of Sciences of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics founded, in 1947, the first journal to be devoted exclusively to oriental epigraphy. The journal is under the editorship of Professor V. A. Krachkovskaja, and is entirely in Russian.

At the time of this writing, eight issues have reached the United States. Volume I was published in 1947, volume II in 1948, volume III in 1949, volumes IV and V in 1951, volume VI in 1952, and volumes VII and VIII in 1953. (Volumes IX and X have since appeared, and will be reviewed, together with later volumes, at a future date.)

The journal is illustrated with a great number of photographs and drawings, although the former, especially in the earlier issues, are not always of the first quality. The issues vary in length between 51 pages (Vol. I) and 143 pages (Vol. V), but all comprise a main body of articles and a few pages of general information dealing with bibliography, excavation notes, and technical problems pertaining to epigraphy.

The purpose and scope of the journal were defined by its editor in the first issue (pp. 2–3). It plans, first, to make available to the scholarly world epigraphical material found within the boundaries of the Soviet Union, without linguistic or racial limitations. Central Asia, with its treasures of Soghdian, Turkish, Arabic, Persian, and Mongol monuments, is given primary attention. The Caucasus, a little-known area of Islamic expansion, but rich in Georgian and Armenian material, forms
a second center of investigations. A vast body of material comes from the museums and collections within the Soviet Union, not only the Hermitage, but also the numerous provincial collections, whose treasures are little known to scholars. The second aim of the journal will be equally welcomed by all orientalists. It is to make available again inscriptions that were published many years ago and inadequately so, or that appeared in obscure journals difficult or impossible to obtain. The third purpose is to provide the reader with a survey of discoveries and books dealing with epigraphical problems, the emphasis being here again on Central Asia.

To review adequately all the articles published in Epigraphiа Vostokа would require the efforts of scholars in different fields. The majority of the articles that deal with the Islamic period are treated here in greater detail than the others, which are simply noted. Three large categories have been established: General, Islamic, and non-Islamic. After each title the volume and pages are given in parenthesis.

GENERAL

1. V. A. Krakhkovskaya, On the question of the alphabet (V, 5–9), examines briefly the problem of the origins and formation of the alphabet within the framework of Marxist theory as expounded by Stalin in his 1950 study of linguistics.

ISLAMIC

The great majority of articles deal with medieval Islamic monuments and problems. Either a chronological or a geographical classification was possible, but it was felt that a combination of the two might make it more convenient for readers of varied interests to find the material that concerns them. Seven categories have been established: A, Early or pre-Seljuq (i.e., before the middle of the eleventh century); B, Seljuq (i.e., to the middle of the thirteenth century); C, Mongol (i.e., to about the middle of the fourteenth century); D, Central Asia; E, Caucasus; F, Later than the fifteenth century; G, Others. In the sections on the Caucasus and Central Asia, articles have been included, whatever period is involved, deal with local problems or with problems significant only to the two areas involved.

A. Early or pre-Seljuq (before the middle of the eleventh century)

1. M. M. Diakonov, On an early Arabic inscription (I, 5–8), publishes the inscription found on a ewer described as having an "egg-shaped ribbed body on a foot in the form of a truncated cone, a high neck, and a handle topped by a beautiful palmette" (illustrated), located in the State Museum of Georgia in Tiflis. The inscription dates the object in 69 (or 67) A.H./A.D. 688–689 (or 686–687), places its manufacture in Bašrah, and gives the name of a certain Ibn Yazid. It is thus one of the earliest, if not the earliest, inscription on a manufactured object from the Islamic period.

2. ———, Arabic inscription on a bronze eagle from the collection of the Hermitage (IV, 24–27) deals with the inscription on a remarkable vessel (inadequately photographed) in the shape of an eagle, acquired in 1939 by the Hermitage. It is dated in the year A.H. 105/A.D. 723–724 and gives the name of a certain Sulaymān. The name is preceded by two words which are read مَـتْر by Diakonov, who translates it as: "this [is] what Sulaymān ordered to be made," a most unusual expression. It must be pointed out that in both this object and the one published in the first article, the pious expressions are not common and sometimes are not even grammatically correct. While these errors could be attributed to foreign (Persian?) artisans working in Mesopotamia, Diakonov's suggestion that both objects were made for the same man, Sulaymān Ibn Yazid, who was governor of Bašrah in 95 A.H./A.D. 714, cannot be fully accepted without a more complete study of the activities of this personage before and after the one year during which he was governor. Both Yazid and Sulaymān were quite common names in Umayyad times. The author also suggests that both objects were made at Bašrah. Their inscriptions are paleographically similar and Bašrah was an important center of early Islamic times (especially noted for glass-
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making), but the attribution of the second one to a specific center could only be tested through a stylistic analysis, which is not possible with the available photographs.

3 A. I. Mihailova, New epigraphical data for Central Asian history in the IXth century (V, 10–20), discusses the very interesting inscriptions mentioned by al-Azraqi,3 which were set by al-Ma'mūn on the crown and throne of Kābul-shāh before they were sent to Mekkah. The author dwells in great detail on the political reasons which led to the taking of Kābul by al-Ma'mūn and on the significance of Kābul-shāh’s conversion to Islam. The two inscriptions are seen as a form of political propaganda. On a few points the author corrects the reading of the Répertoire.

4 ————, About the formulaic of state acts under the 'Abbāsids (VII, 3–6), comments on the exact significance of a few terms in the extremely important document in which Hārūn al-Rashīd established his succession.4 She argues that the terms khatama and wadā’ a al-fān (or fāna) indicate two separate activities in the process of sealing a document. While the first one is taken to mean “to apply the seal,” the latter would mean specifically “to put (on the document) the fin (a special clay used as wax by the 'Abbāsids on their documents).” She adds a useful list of the legends found on 'Abbāsid seals.

B. Seljuk (until the middle of the thirteenth century)

1 V. A. Krachkovskaia, Inscription on a bronze basin of Badr al-Dīn Lū‘lū’ (I, 9–22), publishes the inscription on a basin formerly in the Museum of the Ukraine Academy in Kiev, now No. 1036 in the Hermitage. This bowl was already known,5 but Mme. Krachkovskaia gives a new reading of the inscription, which supplements and improves that of the Répertoire. The major part of the article is devoted to a detailed and thorough analysis of the titles used in the inscription. Most of them are quite common. A few, however, are either new or show variations that are significant. Instead of the normal qāhir al-khāwārij wa 'l-mutamarridin, the bowl has only qāhir al-mutamarridin. There is no doubt that the latter term was used essentially for political “rebels,” while khāwārij had a religious connotation. The fact that khāwārij is missing would strengthen Mme. Krachkovskaia’s argument that the mutamarridin may refer to a specific group of people. She suggests the anīrs against whom Lū‘lū’ fought between 1218 and 1220. But the use of the title sultan implies that the basin was made after 631/1234, if not even after 649/1248. It may be wondered whether the wording of an epithet is likely to refer to an event that took place at least 15 years before. The question of how far such expressions should be taken as referring to specific events is not yet very clear, except in a few limited cases such as the use of the title of sultan (at any rate before the middle of the thirteenth century). But the fact that in a funerary chapel of Mosul dated A.H. 649/1248–49,6 we also meet with mutamarridin alone seems to indicate that the two inscriptions, which are probably contemporary, may have referred to a more or less contemporary event.7

Another curious feature of the inscription is the lack of any Turkish or Persian title; in particular the title of atāhekh does not occur. Mme. Krachkovskaia has not been able to find an explanation for this phenomenon. A third title has puzzled the author. It appears to be قابل اللهو, “the killer of barrenness.” A final problem dealing with this basin is that of authorship. Mme. Krachkovskaia points out (pp. 18–19) that on one of the borders appears a badly preserved inscription with, apparently, the signature of an artist, whose name ends in Yūsuf. Mme. Krachkovskaia asserts that no Yūsuf is known with the kunya al-Mawṣili. However, under


7 H. A. R. Gibb, in a private letter to I. Krachkovskij (quoted in Epigrafika Vostoka, vol. 2, p. 4), suggested, à propos of another title in the inscription, that it may refer to Lū‘lū’ as a defector of the Mongols, since there is one literary reference to the effect that the ruler of Mosul had defeated a band of Tartars:“
the number 4267, the Répertoire lists a brass bowl in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore, made in 1246, and signed by Yûnûs Ibn Yûsuf, al-maqqāsh al-Mawṣili. Both the name and the date are quite close to those indicated for the Hermitage basin.

2. In the following issue of the journal, Prof. I. Iu. Krachkovskij (On an epitaph in the inscription of Lūlū’s bronze basin, II, 3–8) proposes a solution to the problem of the title. He points out that the title exists in a poem of Abûl-‘Alâ’ al-Ma’ârî,9 where it is used for a tribal chieftain in northern Syria. This discovery led Prof. Krachkovskij to reinterpret another title of the vessel, containing the phrase بالظن في الغدر. The expression had been transliterated by Mme. Krachkovskaja as hamî al-thughhâr bi ‘l-ʕa’n fi ‘l-thaghhr and translated “defender of frontiers by blows (of the spear) in the face.” G. Wiet had translated the same expression as “le protecteur des marches en frappant à la mâchoire,”10 where the word thughhr is more correctly rendered. On the basis of a line from the same poem by al-Ma’ârî, Prof. Krachkovskij suggests that the word hamî should be read as al-thughhar (plural of al-thughhrâh), which means “the upper part of the breast below the neck.” Horses were trained to meet enemy blows with this part of the body. Hence he proposes that the expression should be understood as meaning “defender of frontiers by striking with the spear at the breasts (of enemy horses or men).” This interpretation is extremely suggestive, and it is also important from a methodological point of view, since it indicates that the explanation for eulogies and titles in Islamic inscriptions should not be sought only in political or ideological developments, but also in what we know of poetical usage and current customs.

3. L. T. Giuzalian, Inscription with the name of Badr al-Dīn Lūlū’ on a bronze chandelier of the Hermitage (II, 76–82; partial photograph), publishes the inscription from another undated object with the name of Lūlū’. The nashîf of the inscription is of rather poor quality, but it seems, on the whole, to have been carelessly written.11 It is unfortunate that the author did not add a photograph of the inscription. His reading of the fifth line of the drawing as the hendecasyllable بحُضُور في الذكر والاسئلة المسالك shows a very unusual title and his translation “famous for his gratitude and for forcing roads,” is both unclear and grammatically unacceptable. If Giuzalian’s drawing is to be trusted, no alternative could be suggested for the first part of the expression. To read the latter part as al-atâbek al-mâlik, while theoretically possible since the title atâbek usually preceded the kunyah abâ ‘l-fadâ’il,12 is difficult, for this reading would make the wâw before al-atâbek meaningless. Furthermore the engraver tended to bend his kāf toward the left, while the last part of this word is perfectly straight.13 However unclear and unelegant, al-asâ’il should stand, but it seems that the reading al-mâlik is more adequate for the last word of the expression. The meaning of the whole inscription is still obscure and there is here an epigraphical problem, which, if it can be solved at all, would require a photograph of the whole inscription.

4. L. T. Giuzalian’s Frieze-like tiles of the thirteenth century with poetical fragments (III, 72–81) can be considered an introduction to the question of the significance of poetical fragments found on tiles. The author first asks what was the purpose of such inscriptions, inasmuch as in many cases the whole poem cannot be read and was probably not meant to be read. He suggests that the answer will most likely be found, not in the polygonal tiles, often with figures in the center, but in the rectangular or square tiles which contained only inscriptions and which formed friezes. He analyzes first a group of sevensuch tiles from Russian and Western collections with Shâh-nâmeh fragments. He suggests that the frieze-like tiles with a specific text precede the polygonal ones—figured or not—and that they created a tradition of copying literary texts on the latter. The frieze-like tiles themselves originated in imitation of the stone and brick frieze-like inscriptions, whose history goes much farther back.

Giuzalian also investigates the origin of the specific custom of writing poems on wall surfaces. He points out that tiles were used inside houses as

11 See also Rice, op. cit., BSAOS, vol. 13.
12 Ibid., pp. 628–629.
13 This has been pointed out to me by D. S. Rice.
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well as in mosques and on exteriors. Hence one possible explanation for the use of poetical texts may be found in a practice that started in private houses and was then taken to the outer walls of buildings. This hypothesis, Giuzalian believes, is only tenable insofar as excerpts from large poems are concerned. Individual *rubāʼiyāt*, which were also common, have a more complex origin, partly to be sought in a study of the texts found on ceramics. Giuzalian does not overlook the fact that many problems, particularly chronological ones, are posed by his interpretation. Yet he has opened up an area so far overlooked by most scholars.14

One of the problems posed by the study of the inscriptions on tiles concerns not the art historian, but the historian of literature. Considering that the thirteenth-century tiles are earlier than any of the manuscripts we possess of the great Persian literary masterpieces, the problem is to know whether the tiles provide us with a different reading of the texts.

5 In two consecutive articles, *A fragment of the Shāh-nāme* on pottery tiles of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries (IV, 49–55, and V, 35–50), Giuzalian compares the texts of the story of Sōhrāb in the known manuscripts15 with a text provided by 13 tiles and other objects, 6 of which are in Russian collections, and also with the Arabic version of the *Shāh-nāme* made in the thirteenth century, i.e., closer in time to the tiles than to the manuscripts. The result of his very careful examination of the evidence is that 17 verses found on tiles correspond to 24 verses common to all manuscripts and to 19 verses in the Arabic version. Of the 24 verses in the manuscripts, several are shown to be later interpolations, and in the others, marked differences appear from the text found on the tiles. Although

14 See, however, M. Bahrami, *Recherches sur les Carreaux de revêlement lustré*, Paris, 1937, a work which was apparently unavailable to Giuzalian. In his *Gurgan faïences*, Cairo, 1949, the same Bahrami published more readings from Persian ceramics and tiles, but never excerpts from long poems.

15 Of the early fourteenth-century *Shāh-nāme* manuscripts Giuzalian mentions only the one in Lenin- 
grad. Many more are found in West European and American collections. See K. Holter, *Die islamische Miniaturhandschriften vor 1350*, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, vol. 54 (1937), and the *Supplement* published by H. Buchtal, O. Kurz, and K. Ettinghausen in Ars Islamica, vol. 7 (1940).

6 The same author, in *Two fragments of Nizāmi on tiles of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries* (VII, 17–25), turns now from the *Shāh-nāme* to Nizāmi, whose earliest manuscript is dated in 1362. Taking as an example two tiles (one in the Hermitage and one in the former Preece collection), he shows that the method used for the *Shāh-nāme* can also be applied to other literary masterpieces. Giuzalian realizes quite well that it is not likely that we shall be able to find and decipher enough fragments to enable us to reconstruct a complete text on any large poem through tiles alone. But he feels that a comparison between the texts found in manuscripts and those deciphered on tiles, even if it is made only in a limited number of cases, will permit a fairly precise definition of the nature of interpolations, and therefore it will be possible to detect interpolations in other parts of a manuscript without the help of tiles.

The specific value of Giuzalian's attempt in the examples from the *Shāh-nāme* and from Nizāmi can be judged only by a literary historian familiar with the complex textual problems posed by these manuscripts. Whatever their value may be, it must be pointed out that Giuzalian is introducing a method of working which is of great importance. By using works of art to solve literary problems, he is breaking down the barrier of compartamentalization in oriental studies, which, as Sauvaget, among others, often remarked,16 leads to a narrow view of Islamic civilization.

7 A. Iu. Jakubovskij, *Two inscriptions on the northern mausoleum (II 52 A.D.) at Uzgend (I, 27–32)*. The northern mausoleum is the best preserved of the two Qarakhānid structures remaining at Uzgend and mentioned by many travelers. It contains two inscriptions, one in Persian, the other in Arabic. The

first one is in naskhi, the other in Kufic. The Persian text gives the date of the beginning of the construction (547/1152) and contains a number of peculiarities such as the word daylłat-khâšeh for mausoleum, the expression āghâz kardâh ānâd, and the spelling pânsâd for pânsâd. Unable to explain the first term, the author claims that the second refers to a typical lajik construction, while the latter is an archaism.

The second inscription, in Arabic, gives the name of the man for whom the mausoleum was built, Alp Kilij Tunga Bilga Turk Tughril Qara-khaqân Hüsây ibn Hasan ibn 'All. The rest of the article is devoted to a study of the Turkish names found on the inscription and to a brief study of the style of the writing. The author points out that at that time and in that area strictly Arabic influences were dwindling and he sees a proof of that in the mixture of Persian and Arabic.

8. M. M. Diakonov, Some inscriptions on Kirghiz tombstones (kayrak) (II, 9–15), deals with seven inscriptions, which have now disappeared, from a place east of Ferghana. Four are dated, two in the twelfth century, two in the thirteenth. All of them were near a masjid where, according to the legend, a group of Companions of the Prophet had perished. One of the tombs is that of a merchant (No. 2) and on it is found the title khwâjâh, which has been thought not to have been used for merchants until after the Mongol period. But the author does not mention the fact that the twelfth-century “Bo-brinsky kettle” in the Hermitage also exhibits the same title for a merchant. Others are tombs of religious leaders and sîfas, the former bearing titles quite similar to those of the Syrian and Egyptian lords. The author draws some interesting social and economic conclusions.

9. M. E. Masson, in New data on the inscriptions of one of the minarets from Mashhad-i Misrian (sic) (VII, 7–16), describes one of the ruined cities of Dihistan, in Jurjân. There remain the ruins of a mosque, which is generally attributed to the thirteenth century and to Muhammad ibn Tekesh, the Khwârezmshâh, as the latter’s name occurs on the portal. The ruins comprise two minarets and, near the southernmost one, what is called a portal by the author, although it is not clear whether it was the eydân of a sanctuary or an actual gateway. The minaret near the arch belongs to the same period. But Masson shows that the other minaret, the northern one, is definitely earlier. It contains three partially legible inscriptions, one of which ends with the date X95. On stylistic grounds the author suggests that it should be understood 495/1103. Both minarets are also interesting in that they give us the names of the builders. On the second minaret a father and a son are named.

10. The same author, in Medieval tombal bricks from the oasis of Maris (VIII, 24–35), publishes a group of bricks (average size 28 × 28 × 5) found near Merv in 1951. The practice of using bricks for funerary inscriptions is otherwise evidenced in literary sources. Their importance is twofold. First, they provide us with a set of inscriptions useful for determining the development of epigraphy. Second, all these inscriptions are fairly simple and refer to common people, giving us thus a counterpart in Central Asia to the stone funerary inscriptions of Egypt.

11. E. A. Davidovich, in A hoard of silver-covered bronze from Termidh in 617/1220 (VIII, 43–53), describes a hoard of 78 coins found in Termidh. As all the coins are of the same date, it is a type of discovery that should bring joy to all numismatists. Two types are represented, one by 3 coins, the other by 75. The author carefully lists all the titles found on the coins and gives a very complete table of measurements. He points out that there were certainly several dies and that some inscriptions were struck over older ones, which cannot, in most cases, be determined. Two problems are discussed in greater detail. First, these coins are called dirhams on the inscription. Yet they are merely copper coins with a thin plate of silver. Economic reasons probably lie behind such inflationary practices. The author analyzes them from a theoretical, Marxist point of view, without entering into an analysis of contemporary historical
documents, a task that is highly complex, given the difficulty of obtaining economic data from a medieval chronicler. The second problem consists of the fact that the name of the Caliph al-Nasir occurs on coins from Bukhara and Samarkan, but not on this specific group of Termehi coins. We probably have here a direct result of the unsuccessful march on Baghdad organized in 616/1219-1220 by Muhammad ibn Tekesh.

C. Mongol (to the middle of the fifteenth century)

1. A. A. Semenov, Epitaph of pseudo-Sayyid Omar in the Gür-e Amîr in Samarkan (I, 23-26). Among the tombs of the Tîmûrids in the Gür-e Amîr, there is a tomb, which, according to a tradition accepted by Barthold and others, was that of a Sayyid Omar, who had occupied the position of muhtasib in some city, perhaps Samarkan, and who died in 803/1400-1. The author publishes the inscription of the tomb, which does not contain any name or date. Then he shows that Sayyid Omar, who did exist, had been muhtasib at Shahr-e Sabz and was buried at Bukhara. There seems to be no information about the identity of the personage who was actually buried in the Samarkan tomb.

2. The same author in Inscriptions on the tombs of Tîmûr and of his descendants in the Gür-e Amîr (II, 49-62), deals with the inscriptions on the tomb of Timur himself. There are two groups of inscriptions. The first is on the plinth over the actual tomb in the vault of the monuments. The second one is found on the top and front of the jade sarcophagus which was set over the place where Timur was buried, on the ground floor of the mausoleum. Aside from the fact that the first one contains a lengthy religious text, the inscription on the tomb itself and that on the top of the jade sarcophagus comprise essentially the titles and genealogy of the great conqueror. This genealogy is of considerable interest, as it has two purposes, both of which appear to be of fundamental importance for understanding Tîmûrid ideology. On the one hand, it attempts to connect Timur with Genghis Khan. On the other, it strives to make Timur a descendant of 'Ali. The latter claim is introduced in most curious fashion, and it is expressed in greatest detail on the jade sarcophagus. After giving the name of the last paternal ancestor, the inscription says: 'And no father was known to this glorious [man], but his mother [was] Alânuqiva. It is said that her character was righteous and chaste, and that she was not an adulteress. She conceived him through a light which came into her from the upper part of a door and it assumed for her the likeness of a perfect man. And it [the light] said that it was one of the sons of the Commander of the Faithful, 'Ali son of Abû Ṭâlib.'

The author discusses the literary evidence for shi'ite influences in Timurid times and shows that Timur, Ulugh Beg, Bâyûnguhur, and others knew and admired the great mystic and shi'ite heterodox Qâsim-e Anvârî. Whether on the basis of this inscription one can say definitely that Timur was shi'ite is not certain, but it seems clear that he was under strong shi'ite influences. An interesting problem of comparative religion, which is not brought up by the author, is that of the manner in which the relation between an unnamed son of 'Ali and Timur’s ancestor is established. The Koranic quotation refers to the story of Mary and it seems to me that a more direct Christian impact (or perhaps a conflation of a Christian theme with a pagan one) should be presumed. We know, for instance, that there existed in eastern Christianity, in the early Middle Ages, a very specific symbolism relating the story of the “closed door” in Ezekiel (Ezekiel 44:1–3) with the virgin birth of Mary.
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20 Koran, XIX, 17.
22 This theme seems already to have been in existence under the Ilkhanids. See B. Vladimirtsov, Genghis Khan, Fr. tr., Paris, 1948, p. xvi.
23 Cf. Theodoret, Bishop of Cyprus in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, Paris, 1864, vol. 81, pp. 1233-1234; see, in general, W. Neuss, Das Buch Ezekiels in Theologie und Kunst, Münster, 1912. For an earlier study of this theme and a comparison with the legends dealing with Alexander, cf. E. Herzfeld, Mongol, Der Islam, vol. 6 (1916), p. 317 ff. Herzfeld’s knowledge of the inscription derives from Blochet’s reading of the “facsimiles” brought from Samarkan by I. Østrup and A. Christensen. Semenov and Masson both show that these writers did not see the whole inscription. For other examples of Christian themes in Mongol times,
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To ascertain whether we are dealing with a direct impact of some Christian idea on the Timūrids or whether the idea was already adopted in Muslim religious thought at an earlier date would require a lengthy study. At any rate the Timūrid inscription poses a very interesting problem of religious syncretism.

3. The jade sarcophagus contains yet another inscription. It is at the foot of the sarcophagus and only about three-quarters of it remains in situ. But, by a most extraordinary coincidence, the missing chunk was discovered in a private house in Samarqand and is published in the this same issue of Epigraphika Vostoka, by M. E. Masson (The third piece of the jade tombstone of Timūr, II, 63–75). It is unfortunate that Semenov and Masson do not appear to have known about each other’s work. Their readings do not always agree and the reader is compelled to flip pages back and forth in order to understand the inscription. I shall give a complete text of the inscription, as it was read by Semenov and Masson, indicating the places where the two authors disagree (Semenov’s article is accompanied by good photographs, while Masson’s has a drawing):

6 — في رحيم رحمت م ما فيه ل ألم به توح على طكاه ل يف م
7 — لو حل فيما خَلِيل اللَّه لا حِرفَة بحجَم . . . و عشرين و خاتم.

Here is a tentative translation of this inscription based on the versions given by Semenov and Masson: “1. Glory to God who was true to His promises, [who] helped His servant, strengthened his (servant’s) army and routed the bands of robbers27. 2. [He is] One and there is nothing after Him. And [may there be] blessings over His Prophet who liberates booty and incites to [fight and over] 3. His (Prophet’s) family, strong against unbelievers and merciful to the just. This [is] the stone 27 . . . . 4. Which was brought by the khāqān Duvā Saṣān kān from Udān (Ayān)7 to the place of his throne called Qarshi26 on the bank of the Qūyāsh; 5. And it was brought back from there by Ulugh Bek Kuregān, when he went to [the land of] the Jītā . . . .26— 6. He subdued them (the akhrāb) and, but even then one would expect a pronoun in the relative clause which would refer to the relative pronoun itself. Should one not suppose that a piece is missing? It would be very useful to have exact measurements of the fragments.

26 As Semenov pointed out, this sentence is not very clear.
27 This is Masson’s reading. The first sign seems to me to be بَيْن rather than ص. Here there is no doubt that a piece is missing.
28 Semenov translates al-akhrāb as “a band of [his] opponents.” He also suggests that there may have been a lá ilāha at the end of this line, but it does not seem to me that there is enough space for the whole expression.
29 Both Semenov and Masson believe that the letters ١١١١ were the beginning of a word meaning “black.”
26 Masson translates: “. . . brought by the khāqān Duvā Saṣān kān Merawdān to the place of his evil throne at Qarshi.”
23 Semenov, whose text stopped at جِدَا, translated “he is very skillful.” Masson, who does not give his reading for the first part of the line, translates: “whose [the Jītā’s] armies he put to flight and overcame.” Neither translation seems fully satisfactory. There are other possibilities but none can be advanced with certitude before we know whether or not a word i missing.


22 Masson has instead مَرَادِون, but neither reading seems to be identifiable.

23 Here, as in line 1, one could perhaps read الإبراح, but the existence of a dot in Masson’s drawing makes it more likely. The sentence as it stands in Masson’s reading does not make much sense. It could perhaps be
with his sword (?). Had Noah come near him (?) on his ark, he would not have been safe unless.... 7-Had the Friend of God (Abraham) alighted there (?), they would have both been burnt with their ancestor (?)²⁷⁶ ....828 (i.e. 1424-1425).

In spite of the numerous epigraphical difficulties presented by this text, it gives us several important indications on the origin and date of the sarcophagus. These have been fully exploited by Masson (p. 69ff.), who has worked out all the details of Ulugh Beg's inconclusive, although victorious, war against the nomads of Mongolia in 1424, and of his finding there and bringing to Samarqand the jade piece that was set over Timūr's tomb in 828/1425. In the last pages of his contribution Masson asks whether there were originally one or several pieces of jade, as there are three at present. He concludes that there was only one and that its present bad condition is the result of its having been moved out of Samarqand by Nādir Shāh.

4. In a third article under the same title (III, 45-54), A. A. Semenov describes the last four tombs in the mausoleum. The first one is that of Shāh Rokh, with an inscription partly in Persian and partly in Arabic. There are no Koranic texts on this tomb, but a description of the tomb as a garden. The inscription also tells us that it was not Ulugh Beg who moved the body of Shāh Rokh to Samarqand, as is generally believed, but Pāndeh, Shāh Rokh's daughter. A curious detail reported by Semenov is that, when the tomb was opened, 144 small stones were found in it, carefully laid in a box.

The second tomb is that of Ulugh Beg (in the crypt). Its inscription is also in both Persian and Arabic. Ulugh Beg is called a khalīfah. The tomb was probably erected by his second son, since the first son is accused in it of having murdered his father. Apparently Ulugh Beg was buried as a shahid, i.e., in the clothes in which he died.

The third tomb is that of Timūr's nephew, Muḥammad Sulṭān, a favorite of the conqueror who designated him as heir to the throne. Muḥammad Sulṭān died, however, before his uncle, and in the inscription he is called wali al-'ahd. The tomb is particularly brilliantly decorated and Semenov suggests that Muḥammad Sulṭān and Timūr were probably the only two Timūrids who were originally intended to be buried in Gūr-e Amir. The fourth tomb is that of Mīrānshāh, son of Timūr, who died in 1407-08. It is very similar to Timūr's.

This group of four articles dealing with the inscriptions of the Gūr-e Amir is certainly one of the most important published in Epigrafika Vostoka. Although one may regret that the authors have not included more numerous photographs of the building and of the tombs themselves, one must acknowledge the extraordinary service performed by A. A. Semenov in reading the often very complicated and tiresome inscriptions found on the six tombs of the Gūr-e Amir. Their historical interest is very great and both Semenov and Masson have dealt with many of the problems posed by them. But their religious significance is equally interesting and should lead to an investigation of the religious beliefs and practices of the Timūrids.

5. M. E. Masson, The date and history of the construction of the Gunbaz Manas (III, 28-44). The Gunbaz Manas is a mausoleum some 12 kilometers east of Talas, in the present-day Kirghiz Republic. An inscription indicates that the mausoleum was made for a certain Kanızak Khatūn, daughter of Abuka (or Abukân), but the inscription stops after telling that Kanızak died on the first of Ramaḍān of a year whose last digit is 4. On stylistic grounds the author dates the mausoleum in the twenties or thirties of the fourteenth century. He then attempts to identify the personage who was buried in it. Choosing the reading Abuka, he believes him to be one of the sons of Dava Khân, and one of the first ones to be converted to Islam. A study of the complex wars and successes in the Mongol empire leads Masson to the conclusion that Kanızak must have died on the first of Ramaḍān 734/May 6, 1334. It may be argued that the author dismisses too readily the reading Abukân, which would make his identification impossible. Even if the identification is not accepted as certain, the commentaries on the epigraphical style and on the history of the period are extremely valuable (see in particular p. 41, a genealogical table of the Mongol branch that ruled the area).

6. The preceding inscription, without thorough commentary, and a few others from the valley of Talas are mentioned also in a short article by A. M.²⁷⁶ This is Semenov's translation. Masson does not even attempt one and simply mentions that the text refers to Noah and Abraham.
Belenitskij, *From Muslim epigraphy in the valley of Talas* (II, 16-18).

7. O. D. Chehovich, *A waqf document from the time of Timur in the collection of the Samarqand Museum* (IV, 56-67). This earliest waqf document from Central Asia is in Persian. Its beginning and end are lost. It was made out for 'Abd al-Malik, who was *shaykh al-Islâm* under Timur. His genealogy is given in the document, together with a long description of the lands whose revenues were to be used for a group of religious structures. It is an interesting document for the historian and the economist.

**D. Central Asia**

1. V. A. Krachkovskaia, *The evolution of Kufic in Central Asia* (III, 3-27), gives a survey of the epigraphical material on stone, textiles, ceramics, parchment, coins, paper, and brick which come from Central Asia, more specifically from Transoxiana, and which are written in Kufic script. Together with monuments and works of art already known to scholars, the author has collected a number of examples found in the Soviet Union, previously unpublished or very little known: Afrasiyab fragments in the Hermitage (figs. 3, 4, 11; pl. II), a Koran in the Uzbek State Museum (pl. IIIa), a minaret inscription from Urganj dated in 401/1010-1011 (fig. 15 and pl. Vb), another minaret inscription from Uzgend (figs. 24-26), and a final one at Mashhad-e Meşroyan dated in 596-617/1200-1220 (fig. 27). A number of late examples show that Kufic was used, if only as a decorative motif, as late as the sixteenth century. In the course of her study, Mme. Krachkovskaia suggests the attribution to Central Asia of a textile in the University of Michigan and of its companion pieces, on the basis of paleographical similarities to a Merv textile dated in 278/891. She also suggests that the name of Ahmad ibn Isma'il, the Smanids, was written in cursive script on his coins, in order to emphasize the "power of the Smanids and their limited dependence on the caliph" (p. 8). The article is full of such small remarks and studies which tend to show that there was a definite Central Asian development of epigraphical style. The question may be asked, however, whether it is justified, at this stage of our knowledge, to assign certain trends and phenomena to one geographical area only. Too little is known about the epigraphy of Persia itself, for instance, in the first centuries of Islam, to enable us to know whether the developments evidenced in Central Asia may not have had a counterpart in neighboring areas. Taking into consideration the extraordinary development of civilization at the time of the Saffarids, Smanids, Ghaznavids, Seljuqs, and Khwârezmshâhs, we know too little about their art, which must have been quite varied, to be able to determine in detail that certain types and epigraphical trends are peculiar to a limited geographical area within a wide unit which comprises Khorasan, Afghanistan, Transoxania, and Khorezm. The term "Central Asia" may not correspond exactly, in the Middle Ages, to a unit of cultural development. The various dynasties, whose capitals were in Merv, Samarqand, Nishâpûr, or Bukhara ruled in fact over a much wider area than what is today understood as Central Asia. Perhaps an analysis in the nature of the one made by Mme. Krachkovskaia, extremely valuable in presenting new monuments and new interpretations, should be widened to include an area extending as far west as Rayy and as far east as Herât and Ghazna.

2. ————, *Monuments of Arabic writing in Central Asia and Transcaucasia before the eleventh century* (VI, 46-100). This article, of great length and touching on a great number of different problems, appears to be essentially a sort of prolegomenon to the complex and very significant problem of the ways in which and purposes for which Arabic was used in lands which were not primarily Arabic-speaking, but which had been conquered by the Arabs and, within the chronological limits of Mme. Krachkovskaia's work, were ruled by them. As an introduction the author sketches in a few pages (pp. 48-68) the development of Semitic alphabets in general and of Arabic in particular, using mainly for the first part the works of Diringer and Liddbarski, and for the second those of Moritz.

28 Cf. above, p. 552.
Grohmann, Littmann, and Cantineau. In a second part (pp. 68–86) Mme. Krachkovskia discusses the history and characteristics of the script (or scripts) used in the first-century A. H. papyri of Egypt and on monumental inscriptions found in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. A detailed analysis of the most significant documents is accompanied by a series of very enlightening plates with drawings of the forms taken by the various letters. Turning then to the area under consideration, Mme. Krachkovskia deals with three monuments: a dirham from Merv (76/695–6), the unique letter of Divâšhtî (99–100/718–9), and a milestone from Tihib (undated; appended photograph of a squeeze). While basically the coin reproduces a type that was common throughout most of the Umayyad empire, Mme. Krachkovskia points out (p. 87) a few differences in epigraphy and suggests that the missing wâw in the word al-mashrikân was the result of a lack of familiarity of the Central Asian mint master with Arabic. The point does not seem very convincing, since, as far as possible, representatives of the central power were controlling the minting of coins and, furthermore, errors occur also on coins minted in a purely Arab city like Basrah. The letter of Divâšhtî to the Arab amir al-Jarîr ibn 'Abdallâh, which was discovered by the Russian expedition to Soghdia, is much more significant, since it is one of the very few documents—other than monumental inscriptions, which are not numerous—we possess from the early Islamic period outside of Egypt. Mme. Krachkovskia shows that the type of script is sufficiently different from the usual first-century script of Egypt to suggest that it was probably from a different calligraphic school, a calligraphic school whose influence does not appear in Egypt until several decades later. The letter is unfortunately not illustrated, although a table is provided with an alphabet. It would be interesting to compare it in detail with the various scripts identified by Miss Abbott. The milestone from Transcaucasia is interesting in another respect. It is quite similar to the milestones found in Syria and serves to indicate the extent to which, already in the Umayyad period, Transcaucasia, actually even the Caucasus itself, was fully fitted into the new empire.

Then (p. 91 ff.) the author goes back to Egypt and studies in great detail the documents of the second century A. H. It will be apparent from this summary of Mme. Krachkovskia’s learned article that its title is somewhat misleading. Only three Central Asian or Transcaucasian documents are mentioned in any detail, only one of which is new. The main point of the article is to establish the trends of early Arabic scripts, presumably as a preface to further studies more specifically devoted to Central Asian problems. It is constantly emphasized that throughout the history of Semitic writing, there was a constant influence of cursive writing on other types. Hence a thorough understanding of early scripts and the influences they underwent is necessary for the study of later monumental and manuscript writing. A complete critical analysis of Mme. Krachkovskia’s thesis and interpretations would require a detailed examination of all the documents mentioned by her. It would appear, however, that her article does not replace Miss Abbott’s studies, which used not only early documents, but also literary sources on calligraphic problems. On a few points it supplements it and suggests that, at a very early date, calligraphic traditions which do not appear in Egypt can be found in Central Asia.

3. The same author’s Central Asian epigraphy (VII, 45–69) is subtitled “pioneer epigraphists: the Turkestan circle of the friends of archaeology.” It is an analysis of the works done by the early Russian travelers and scholars in Central Asia (Lerh, Khanikov, etc.), with particular emphasis on the active and successful society established in Turkestan itself. The article contains a very complete bibliography of works not easily available outside of Russia, but whose importance for the knowledge of
Central Asia, and especially of monuments now disappeared or badly damaged, is invaluable.

E. Caucasus

1. V. A. Krakhkovskaia, Unknown album of Arabic and Persian epigraphy (II, 19-40), publishes extensive parts of a 50-page album from the Archives of the Russian Geographical Society, which contains pictures of 76 inscriptions in Arabic and Persian and 14 watercolors. Almost all the inscriptions are from the Caucasus and Mme. Krakhkovskaia shows that they were taken by Khanikov and various collaborators in the middle of the nineteenth century. Some of them have already been published. Many, mostly tombal, were until now unknown.

2. ————, Tomb inscriptions from Dzuruni (V, 21-32). About 50 Arabic inscriptions were found in 1930-37 in the ancient Georgian capital, about 100 kilometers southwest of Tiflis. The author publishes nine of them, all later than the middle of the thirteenth century, one of them possibly monumental. One inscription is in Kufic, one in thuluth, the rest in naskhi. Although very fragmentary, the documents are interesting for a study of Islamic expansion into the Caucasus.

F. Later than the fifteenth century

1. A. A. Semenov, Two autographs of Khôja ²brâma (V, 51-57). The author describes two autographs from an album of autographs of great men, and not of calligraphists (as was usual with such albums), collected by an unknown personage in the seventeenth century. The album is at present in the collection of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences.

2. ————, A seventeenth century Persian cruets for spices (V, 58-60). Description of a curious object made up of individual “cups” fitted within each other and inscribed with religious poems.


4. E. A. Davidovich, Inscriptions on Central Asian silver coins of the sixteenth century (VII, 39-40), discusses inscriptions of Shaybânid coins. On the whole there is comparatively little variation between the titles of the various rulers of the dynasty (five at the most). Some titles appear only in certain mints. The author has added a convenient table of all known mints from the period and of the dates of known coins from those mints.

5. A. A. Semenov, Inscriptions on the tombstone of the amir of Buhārah Shâh Murâd Ma‘ṣūm, 1200–1215/1785–1800 (VII, 41-44), shows that the tombal inscription of the first Uzbek ruler of Bukhara was different from that of his successors.

G. Others

1. V. A. Krakhkovskaia, From the archives of Khanikh and Dorn (IV, 28-39), outlines, with numerous excerpts, the correspondence between the two orientalists, mostly dealing with Dorn’s trip to Central Asia and with the purchase in Paris of books for the library of St. Petersburg.

2. ————, V. V. Bartold, numismatist and epigraphist (VIII, 10-23), contains, with a summary of the work accomplished by this great Russian scholar, a useful bibliography of some of his less known contributions.

3. A group of five articles dealing with the subject of Islamic epigraphy in Russia itself concerns essentially Tartar and Bulgarian tombstones from the thirteenth century on. Four of these articles merely publish monuments with short commentaries: (a) S. E. Malov, Bulgarian and Tartar epigraphical monuments (I, 38-45) and (b) Bulgarian and Tartar epigraphy (II, 41-48); (c) G. Iusupov and G. Hisamutdinov, Bulgarian epigraphical monuments found in the summer of 1947 (IV, 68-75); and (d) G. V. Iusupov, On some Bulgarian epigraphical monuments (VII, 26-29). The fifth article, (e) G. V. Iusupov, Tartar epigraphical monuments of the fifteenth century (V, 78-94), is more developed and contains, besides a large group of tombs, a map showing the places where the inscriptions from different centuries were found. The map shows how
the Tartars moved toward the northeast and the west in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The large number of inscriptions published here permits a more complete analysis of the textual and stylistic developments in this little-studied area of Islamic expansion.

**NON-ISLAMIC**

**A. Non-Islamic Central Asia**


2. K. K. Yudahin, *Bouz or bu uz* (I, 46–48), is a commentary on a word found on a smaller pitcher from Saraychik.


4. O. I. Smirnova, *Soghdian coins from the collection of the numismatic section of the Hermitage* (IV, 3–23), is a complete description of the coins with technical and historical commentaries.

5. A. N. Bernshtam, *Old Turkish writing in the Lena River region* (IV, 76–86), is a study of recently found runic inscriptions with a map showing the spread of these inscriptions between the sixth and ninth centuries.


8. A. N. Bernshtam, in *Old Turkish documents from Soghd, a preliminary report* (V, 65–75), suggests that a document found by the Soghdian expedition and so far not understood is in fact in Turkish. He also draws a few conclusions of a historical nature on the significance of the close relationship between the Turks of the Semirech'ia and the Soghdians.


11. O. I. Smirnova, in *Materials for a catalogue of Soghdian coins* (VI, 3–45), discusses coins of the seventh and eighth centuries A.D., “a group of copper coins whose inscriptions are in Soghdian and which are written in the official government script (cursive) of Soghd in the same period” (p. 7). Many important problems are touched upon in the course of this lengthy study: the relation to Chinese coins, the means we possess to localize Soghdian coins, and the curious fact that no silver coins are found. The latter point is explained through the practice mentioned by Arab geographers that many Central Asian cities had a coinage valid only within the limits of that city. More problems are posed by the discovery at Varahsha of coins with inscriptions whose script is Aramaic, but whose language is unknown. This general introduction is a remarkably clear presentation of the very complex monetary situation of Central Asia at the time of the Muslim conquest. It is followed by a long catalogue.


**B. Ancient Near East**


2. I. M. Diakonov, *Fragments of cuneiform tablets from the 1946 excavations at Karnin Burun* (II, 86–89), gives a transliteration and transcription of three tablets dealing with judicial and legal problems.

3. G. V. Tzereteli, *Armazi script and the problem of the origin of the Georgian alphabet* (II, 90–101, and III, 59–71). In the first article the author discusses the signs used for numbers. He is led to the conclusion that the "Armazi letters and numbers are genetically tied to Aramaic, to the specific variety of Aramaic appearing in the script of the Egyptian Aramaic papyri of the fifth to second centuries B.C." (p. 95). He shows also the close relationship between Armazi and various types of
Persian scripts. In the second article the author turns to a more general problem. “During the archaeological excavations at Mt'het were found Greek, Hebrew, Persian, and Aramaic inscriptions, but so far no Georgian ones. Does it mean that at that time the Georgian alphabet did not exist as yet and that the supposition is then justified that the Georgian alphabet was formed in the fifth century A.D.? Or perhaps that it [the lack of Georgian inscriptions] can be explained through other reasons and, in spite of the lack of monuments with Georgian inscriptions in Armazi times, we are still justified in supposing the existence there of a Georgian alphabet? The solution to the problem is entirely tied to the question of the relation between Armazi and Georgian scripts. If it will appear that the Georgian script is tied to the Armazi one, and, at the same time, if it can be shown that individual Georgian letters show a more archaic character than the Armazi ones, the suggestion of the existence of a Georgian script in Armazi times becomes more convincing; on the other hand, if it appears that the Georgian script has no genetic relation to Armazi, then the question of the origin of the Georgian script will still remain open.” (P. 59.) The author believes that the first possibility is correct and that, with a number of exceptions, the Georgian alphabet shows many similarities to Armazi.

5. B. B. Piotrovskij, Three Urartian inscriptions on bronze objects from Teishebaini (Karmir Blur) (III, 88–89).
7. I. M. Lurié, Old Egyptian plaque with a donation to the earth (V, 95–109).
8. B. B. Piotrovskij, Cuneiform inscriptions on bronze bowls from the excavations at Karmir-Blur (V, 110–112).
9. I. N. Vinnikov, Newly found Phoenician inscription (V, 121–133), presents an attempt at interpretation of the well-known Kara-tepeh inscription.
10. N. V. Artiunian, The chronicle of Argisht I from Khorkhor (VII, 81–119), is a transcription and translation of a new arrangement of the cuneiform inscriptions formerly published by Schultz, Guyard, and others.

BOOK REVIEWS

II. V. V. Struve, P. K. Kokovtsov as an Assyriologist (VIII, 3–9).

C. Georgian

2. L. M. Melikset-Bekov, The tetralingue of Garešdji from 1352 (VIII, 56–62), presents a graffito found in 1921 and written in Georgian, Armenian, Persian, and Uighur.

SUMMARY

Ranging in time from the second millennium B.C. to the early nineteenth century and in space from Tibet to Egypt and to Asia Minor, the contributions to Epigraphika Vostoka cover a great number of fields and problems. As is to be expected, the contributions vary in importance and value. To limit myself only to the medieval period, such works as those of Semenov on the inscriptions of the Gür-a Amir, of Mme. Krakhkovskaia on the plate of Badr al-Din Lūlî and the exploration of Central Asian and Caucasian epigraphy, of Mme. Smirnova on Soghdian coinage, of Giuzalian on the epigraphical problems of tiles, and many others, are certainly of great significance to all Islamic scholars. A great number of new monuments and new inscriptions have been made available. In many cases the authors have not limited themselves to purely epigraphical problems, but have sought the wider implications of the texts they published. On the whole the presentation is good. Printing mistakes are few and the Arabic and Persian texts are generally correct. A list of corrections is often attached at the end of the issue.

However, the photographs are often unsatisfactory and, although excellent drawings are generally provided, the best drawing can never be trusted in the same way as a photograph. It is to be hoped that the subsequent issues of this journal devoted to an essential area of oriental studies will continue to publish new documents and studies which exemplify the importance of the research done in the Soviet Union and which give us an opportunity to know better the significant discoveries recently made in Central Asia and the works of art in Russian museums, whose access is difficult to scholars outside the Soviet Union.

Oleg Grabar
BOOK REVIEWS

Inscriptions de Tunis et de sa banlieue, 1 partie.

This first part marks an auspicious beginning of the projected corpus of the Arabic inscriptions of Tunisia. The harvest should be a rich one, and it is being gathered from a field that has lain neglected for too long as far as the collection of the material into a single series of volumes is concerned.

The present part includes 100 inscriptions from the city of Tunis and its environs. Certain of these, notably those from the Jamiʿ al-Zaytūnah, are of historical interest. This is particularly true of the inscription mentioning the name of the Abbasid Caliph al-Musta’in bi-Allah (dated 250/864) and of a series from the Jamiʿ al-Zaytūnah and two other religious sites stemming from the Khurāsānī rulers of Tunis in the fifth century H. The majority of the inscriptions, 78 in number, are of a funerary character; several are of more than passing interest as far as the personalities mentioned in them are concerned.

The inscription of al-Musta’in refers to the dome of the Jamiʿ al-Zaytūnah as having been built at the order of this Abbasid caliph. This has caused M. Zbiss a certain amount of perplexity because, as he says, of the “autonome quasi-totale” of the Aghlabids, who at the time were ruling Tunisia. G. Marçais, in his La Berbérie musulmane et l’orient au moyen âge (Paris, 1946), pp. 62–63, has discussed the problem raised by this inscription and has concluded that the caliph’s name was mentioned because he paid for the construction. It is worth recalling also that at this period the Aghlabids continued to pay at least nominal allegiance to Baghdad and that the rising Shi‘ite danger probably acted as a factor tending to preserve this relationship.

M. Zbiss has done an excellent job of reading these inscriptions, a number of which tax even the most experienced epigrapher. There are only five rather minor instances of errors. In the first of these (inscription No. 27, p. 62), the word من should precede سنة and the month should be صفر. The month in No. 32 (p. 66) looks like رمضان, not شعبان, and in No. 63 (p. 81) the word المصلح (al-ʾasbar) should precede the word الأموات (for the الأموات —not الأموات as suggested).

There are a large number of instances in which the Christian dates corresponding to the Hijrah dates have been converted one year short of the correct equivalents. Thus in the nonfunerary inscriptions Nos. 6, 8, 13–20, 27, 28, 31, 32, 38, 40, 48, 50–54, 59, 63, 74, 76, and 77 the dates should be one year later than indicated. In inscription A on plate IX the date almost certainly is 1042 (1632 to 1633), not 142 (759–760). No. 49 (p. 73) contains the date 1113 in error for 1134, and in No. 78 (p. 92) the date 1127 should be deleted.

Very commendably, M. Zbiss has illustrated with photographs all the inscriptions with which he has dealt. It is suggested, however, that in the future the illustrations should be larger and clearer, since as they stand many are too small or indistinct to be read. This would also make for much better utilization of the space on the plates, a large proportion of which is left blank while the undersized photographs are almost lost on the page. An excellent feature is a complete index of all the personal names appearing in the inscriptions.

It is encouraging to see the production of such a praiseworthy undertaking as this on the part of a native Tunisian scholar. It is to be hoped that this task will be completed by the competent hand of him who has initiated it.

H. W. GLIDDEN

Majallat Maḥḍ al-Makhtūtāt al-ʾArabiyah (Revue de l’Institut des Manuscrits Arabes), issued by the Arab League, vol. 1, fascicle 1 (Cairo, May 1955), 160 pp., 3 pls. in text; text in Arabic except for French title on cover.

For some years past the Cultural Office of the Arab League in Cairo has been engaged in taking a census of Arabic manuscripts throughout the Arab world and in photographing the most important specimens. In the course of this undertaking the League has sent missions to various Arab countries, including areas such as Mecca and Medina which are inaccessible to non-Muslim scholars. A valuable by-product of this activity has been the gathering of a considerable fund of information concerning libraries, both public and private, in the Arab world in general. Although the League has published checklists of the MSS., it has photographed, there previously have been no published periodical re-
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ports on the progress of this work. The first issue of this journal marks the beginning of the semiannual publication of the findings of these missions together with reports on Arabic manuscript collections and on libraries contributed by correspondents throughout the Arab world.

This issue of the journal contains brief descriptions of the Arabic MSS. in a number of important collections and libraries and in some cases an account of their history. These include the Zāhiriyah library in Damascus, 13 public libraries in Aleppo (all in mosques, madrasahs, and other religious institutions), the Iraq Museum in Baghdad, the American University of Beirut, the National Library of Lebanon, the Rabat public library, al-Azhar, the Egyptian Library in Cairo, the Alexandria Municipal Library, the mosque of Ahmad al-Badawi in Tanta, as well as that city’s public library, and the Damietta Religious Institute. This section is followed by a history of libraries in Tunisia, a discussion of bibliographies (barāmiṣ) produced by Andalusian scholars, and two articles on calligraphy.

The second section of this issue of the journal contains a statement of the aims and objectives, together with a summary of the activities of the Institute of Arabic Manuscripts. Next comes a listing of Arabic MSS. edited and published during 1954 both in the Arab states and in Europe. There is also a list of catalogues of Arabic MSS. published during the same year. Six pages are devoted to the report of a mission to Saudi Arabia in 1955 which makes clear the neglected state of the collections in Mecca and Medina. The issue concludes with an announcement of those Arabic MSS. which currently are in process of editing and publication.

For historians of Islamic art, it is worth noting that the interest of the Institute of Arabic Manuscripts, as reflected in this journal, is primarily in the subject matter of the manuscripts involved. The only exception to this is the subject of calligraphy, which traditionally has been held in high esteem by the Arabs. Hasan Ḥusnī ’Abd al-Wahhāb’s article on books and libraries in Tunisia from the third to the fifth centuries H. discusses a number of calligraphers who worked in Tunisia during that period. Plate 2 illustrates a colophon by the calligrapher Ḥusayn ibn Yūsuf, who worked at the court of the Spanish Umayyad Caliph al-Ḥakam al-Mustansir bi-Allāh; the colophon is dated Sha‘bān 359 (June-July 970). The same plate reproduces a colophon written by the female calligrapher Durrah “the scribe,” a student of ’Ali ibn Ahmad al-Warrāq, who worked in the period of the Zirid amirs who governed Tunisia under the nominal suzerainty of the Fatimids in Cairo. The author of the article, possibly through a typographical slip, has wrongly dated the manuscript, however. On page 86 he states that it was dedicated as a ḥabs (waqf) in 140 H. (January-February 758), whereas the Zirids only came to power in A.D. 973.

A second article (pp. 121–127) on calligraphy is by Dr. Khalīl Maḥmūd ‘Āsākir. It reproduces the text of a short risālah on that art which Dr. ‘Āsākir copied from MS. No. 7 in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek during the last war. The author of the article believes that this risālah is to be attributed to Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, although it is anonymous and is undated. It appears, however, that the mystery of al-Tawḥīdī’s risālah on calligraphy is still unsolved, for the text reproduced by Dr. ‘Āsākir differs radically from that published by Franz Rosenthal in Ars Islamica (vols. 13–14) in 1948. Furthermore, the sample of Ibn al-Bawwāb’s handwriting illustrated by Dr. ‘Āsākir in plate 3 of his article is clearly a forgery, probably of Mamlūk date.1

The publication of this journal represents a most praiseworthy effort on the part of the Arab League. It provides scholars everywhere with information on the existence and location of Arabic manuscripts which it would cost years of individual effort to acquire, and the Institute’s collaboration can make available to Western scholars material to which the latter could not have access by other means. Finally, and importantly, this undertaking is evidence of fruitful cooperation among the Arabs themselves for the further discovery, organization, publication, and preservation of the rich treasures of Arabic literature which for too long have lain neglected and unexploited. It is thus to be hoped that both the Institute and its journal will have a long and productive career.

H. W. Glidden

1 There are a number of forgeries of ibn al-Bawwāb’s work in existence. See D. S. Rice, The unique ibn al-Bawwāb manuscript in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, 1955, p. 19 ff.
BOOK REVIEWS


In his introduction, the author comments shortly on the early Kūfic Koran manuscripts, the variation of a semi-Kūfic, and finally, in connection with the introduction of paper, the evolution to the cursive naskhī in the tenth century. He declares the Chester Beatty Koran to be the oldest existing manuscript in naskhī.

The first chapter is dedicated to the personality of ‘Ali ibn Hilāl, who got his nickname of Ibn al-Bawwāb from the fact that his father used to be a doorkeeper. He began as a house decorator, later illuminated books, and finally became a calligrapher, as a pupil of Muhammad al-Simsimānī and thus indirectly of the famous Ibn Muqlah. The year and place of Ibn al-Bawwāb’s birth are unknown, but it is sure that he lived nearly always in Baghdad. He preached for some time in the Mosque of al-Mansūr and became one of the intimates of Muḥammad ibn Khalaf, governor of Baghdad under the Būyids since 1010. Ibn al-Bawwāb was also temporarily in charge of the library of Bahā’ al-Dawlah in Shiraz. He died in Baghdad in A.D. 1022 (later sources fix his death in 1031), and was buried near the tomb of Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal. He perfected the style of Ibn Muqlah (d. 939), but did not invent new scripts as is sometimes pretended. His main merit is that he gave an artistic element to the rigidly proportioned script of Ibn Muqlah (the “хишт al-munsūb”). He is said to have copied the Koran 64 times. Many details about his activity are known, and he had several imitators and pupils who followed his line until Yāqūt al-Mustaṣimī eclipsed the fame of his predecessors.

The second chapter gives a description of the Chester Beatty copy, written in regular naskhī, with letters closely set and intervals between lines reduced to a minimum. The colophon says that this Koran was written by ‘Ali ibn Hilāl in Madinat al-Sallām in 391 H. (A.D. 1000/01), and Rice concludes from the pious formula used that the calligrapher shared the Shi‘ite rite. The author is convinced that the illumination, very rich in some parts, is also the work of Ibn al-Bawwāb, and divides it into three categories: full-page decoration, marginal ornament, and ornamental bands.

In the third chapter, Rice discusses the other manuscripts attributed to Ibn al-Bawwāb, all wrongly, in his opinion. Among them is a splendid copy of the dīwān of Salāmāh ibn Jandal in the Topkapu Sarayi Müzesi, with a colophon mentioning ‘Ali ibn Hilāl and the date Ramadān 418 H./A.D. 1017, but containing in a sarlawh the indication that it has been made for Abū Sahl Muḥammad ibn Hibatallāh al-Muwaffaq, who was born in 1031 and died in 1064. This circumstantial evidence indicates that the manuscript cannot be earlier than 1053, thus too late for Ibn al-Bawwāb. Another copy of the same dīwān in the Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi has an identical colophon, but the whole style is so typical of the fourteenth century that the attribution is obviously apocryphal. A Koran in the same museum is dated 401 H./1010 in a colophon mentioning ‘Ali b. Hilāl, but partly scratched and probably forged, though the manuscript itself seems to belong to the early eleventh century. Two other examples with forged attribution to Ibn al-Bawwāb are, according to the author, rather of the fourteenth century. Some of the pages of the just-cited manuscripts are reproduced for comparison.

The fourth chapter deals with the characteristics of the Chester Beatty manuscript, i.e., its disposition, ornamentation, and coloring. The author is convinced that Ibn al-Bawwāb is to be considered also as an innovator in the field of illumination and cites other Korans of the eleventh century with full-page decoration, among them the well-known copy dedicated in 1026 to the Şūlayḥīd ‘Ali ibn Muḥammad with which he tries to establish a special connection. Rice agrees that some winding scrolls and the graduated tinting of certain palmette forms have been hitherto associated with much later developments, but he finds that they are “in line with what little is known of Islamic manuscripts illuminated in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries.” In this case the reviewer confesses that he is not convinced; he would rather stress the entirely unique and completely isolated position of the ornamental style manifested here. For if the decoration is really of the time and even by the hand of Ibn al-Bawwāb, the Chester Beatty Koran alone would constitute the proof that what we used to consider as characteristics of Seljuq or even İlkānī ornamentation had actually been invented already in the Būyid period, and it could be adduced as a solid argument for the authenticity of many of
the so-called Bûyid textiles still under discussion. The change from the preceding decorative principles to the style of the Chester Beatty manuscript would not have been an evolution to be followed step by step, but an act of revolutionary significance.

The particular importance of this splendidly presented publication needs no further comment.

EIERNKH KÜHNEL


While working in the Bibliothèque nationale at Paris during the autumn of 1948, M. Farès had the happy idea to order the manuscript catalogued by de Slane as No. 2964 (Supplément arabe 2433) and found that it was embellished with 11 illustrations and some richly illuminated pages which, for some reason, had escaped the attention of the specialists of Islamic painting including the late M. Blochet. The result of his studies on this manuscript is laid down in the present work, which has a summary in Arabic; it contains, besides 21 plates in collotype, 5 excellent illustrations in color which have also appeared in a paper devoted to the same manuscript that M. Farès has published in La Presse Médicale, No. 44, Paris, 1953.1

This manuscript had been acquired by the Bibliothèque nationale in 1883, but already in 1815 it had been offered to the same library. It is not quite complete, and the right order of the 37 folios that have been preserved has been established by M. Farès. The colophon contains the date Rabî’ al-awwal 595 (January 1100), and the copy was made by a Shi‘ite calligrapher, Muḥammad b. Abûl-Fath ʿAbd al-Wâḥid, for the library of the learned Abûl-Fath Maḥmûd, who must have been the son of his brother, the Imam Jamâl al-Dîn; although the male ancestors of the two brothers, in three generations, are spoken of as imâms, none of these personages has been identified. M. Farès is inclined to believe that the paintings are the work of the calligrapher, who wrote an excellent naskhi and a kûfî characteristic of the Seljuq period. Unfortunately, we have no indication as to where the manuscript was written. The miniatures belong to what has been called the Baghdad School, under which heading M. Farès also places miniatures of Mamlûk origin. He refuses to discuss the geographic distribution of the works belonging to this group, making the following statement before the text: “...il demeure prématuré de vouloir classer avec rigueur les miniatures de cette haute époque selon les pays d’origine ou selon les groupements par écoles, car bien imparfaites encore sont nos connaissances sur la genèse de la peinture arabe-musulmane, son développement et son rayonnement.”

The efforts made by Holter and many others toward a geographical and chronological classification of early Islamic miniatures is thus more or less ignored by the author, who has, however, as is obvious from the excellent bibliography that precedes the text, a very full knowledge of the literature on early Islamic painting, to which he has already before made some valuable contributions.

For reasons that are more obvious M. Farès also refrains from making any comments on the text itself, stating on page 4: “Je me désintéresse totalement de l’objet de ce traité, n’étant point spécialiste de la pharmacopée ni de la thérapeutique. Je suis loin de regretter mon incompétence, car l’histoire de la médecine arabe n’avancerait guère et la science grecque se trouverait amoindrie si l’on s’avisait de prêter une attention spéciale au texte. Je me réfère, en effet, à l’opinion de Max Meyerhof.” Dr. Meyerhof’s analysis of the treaty was based on a manuscript in the National Library, Cairo (Medicine, No. 166), dated 995 H. (A.D. 1586).

The very thorough description given by M. Farès of the various illustrations in the Paris manuscript (that in Cairo is not illustrated) indicates that they contain much subject matter that may be utilized by students of Arabic medicine and its Greek sources; and in a supplement, preceded by a brief bibliography, M. Charles Kuentz writes about the plants represented on two of the pages of the Paris manuscript. All of them are identified, and in one case (al-wajj) the name given on the illustration has settled a lexicographical problem in favor of the opinion held by a minority of specialists on Arabic plant names. The ethnographical value of all the other illustrations is quite obvious. One illustration has good representations of a number of agricultural

implements, and M. Farès has much to say about their names, not only in classical Arabic, but also in the Arabic dialects of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq. Unfortunately, these commentaries do not throw any light on the question of what country the manuscript was written in, and the same may be said about the very full treatment of the iconographic problems connected with the double frontispiece, if not the connections with Sabean beliefs that M. Farès finds in these representations should be taken as an argument against an Egyptian origin (cf. p. 9).

Among the 13 illustrations in the text are 6 drawn from another manuscript of the same work, the famous Galen in the National Library at Vienna (A. F. 10), probably dating from the second half of the thirteenth century. The comparisons M. Farès makes between parallel scenes in the two manuscripts are most valuable, but in his enthusiasm for the manuscript in Paris he goes a little too far in the depreciation of the artistic qualities of the later and more "formalized" paintings in Vienna, which come very close to representations on glass, pottery, and inlaid metalwork. But if it is unfair to criticize M. Farès for being personal in artistic judgments, one might perhaps ask why he has paid so little attention to figural representations outside of book illustration in his comparative analyses of a number of paintings which he persists in speaking of as all belonging to the Baghdad school.

CARL JOHAN LAMM


It is a happy circumstance that the celebration of the five-hundredth anniversary of the conquest of Constantinople by Mehmet the Conqueror has stimulated not only historical research in general, but also several contributions in the field of the fine arts. Two books are particularly to be mentioned in this connection. Students of Turkish architecture are by now probably familiar with Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi's Fâtit Devri Mimarlığ, which was published in Istanbul in 1953. Now there has also appeared the book which is announced here and which was brought out as a publication of the Literary Faculty of the University of Istanbul. Quite apart from its intrinsic interest, this book deserves an announcement in these pages, since the authors have given their ideas not only in Turkish, their mother tongue, but have also published a complete French translation after each of its various parts. Such consideration for western scholars is much appreciated and it is hoped that it will be widely followed by other Turkish writers.

As the authors indicate in the first chapter, they deal with the most haphazardly arranged volumes, Nos. 21.52, 21.53 and 21.60, of the Library of the Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi. These are known as the Album of the Conqueror ("Album de Fatih") because one of the series—No. 21.53—contained two portraits of the Sultan, one attributed to Sinan Bey and the other to Costanzo da Ferrara, both of which, as the book states, have now been detached and placed in the newly founded Fatih Museum. The authors make it clear that there is no document which leads us to attribute the Album to the time of the Conqueror or to the conviction that the artists lived in Istanbul. They even consider the possibility that these paintings, drawings, and calligraphic documents (or, at least, a good many of them) came to Istanbul as war trophies or presents (pp. 13, 20). But since the majority of the works contained in them are from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, they assume that the Album was begun for or by the Conqueror, whose interest in the fine arts, and particularly in painting, is well known. In the course of their investigation they stress, however, that a good many of the paintings are of foreign origin, in particular Far Eastern and Italian, a fact which is also best explained by an attribution to the time of Fatih. From all this it seems clear that for the authors the association with the Conqueror is a point d'appui rather than a historical fact.

Students of Near Eastern painting will be aware that this publication is now the third by Turkish scholars within a very short time dealing with the same material. An article by Dr. Oktay Aslanapa appeared (for technical reasons, rather belatedly) in the first volume of Ars Orientalis in 1954. Its main purpose was to acquaint the scholarly world with this collection of paintings and to demonstrate its wide range. A different approach had been taken by Professor Zeki Velidi Togan in his Topkapı
Sarayndaki dört çöyk, 1 which was a historical examination of the *Album*, especially of the persons named in it, i.e., the rulers and artists, and of the documents contained in it. From the all-too-short two-page English summary of this article, it becomes apparent that Western scholars can learn a great deal from Professor Togan’s findings, but unfortunately the bulk of this information is still inaccessible, owing to the language barrier.

The approach of Professors İpsiroğlu is again different. Viewing the subject as experts in the field of Western art, they deplore the lack of interest shown by scholars in the forms of artistic expression found in Near Eastern painting and regret that publications are usually limited to a mere description of content and technique and to providing the historical documentation. This book is an effort to present their own aesthetic approach, which is based on the examination of the work of two masters and a group of animal pictures dating, as they say, between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries (p. 20). In their efforts to establish these artists the authors are again not dogmatic, recognizing, for instance, that a good many miniatures, though executed in different styles, bear the same signature, while others in the easily identifiable style of a certain artist lack the artist’s name or are attributed to other artists, and finally that there are still others on which the signatures are so gauchely written that they cannot possibly be by the artists themselves or by a connoisseur. However, two masters can be easily isolated as they go beyond the usual “decorative” style of Near Eastern paintings, and taking the attributions found on some of the miniatures, they form convenient labels to designate, at least in the first two cases, well-defined groups of miniatures. It is not the intention of this reviewer to discuss here questions relating to date and provenance of these paintings, since the authors themselves do not make this the issue of their investigation and a great deal could be said about this subject. 2 Instead attention is drawn to their ideas about the artistic means used, especially in the case of Mehmet Siyah Kalem, 3 the master of wizened old men and women and of evil demons, who is discussed in the second and longest chapter of the book. The authors deal with such problems as the treatment of space and movement, plasticity and perspective, the expression of volume and inner force, naturalistic features and schematic conventions, the grouping of figures, the meaning of folds and wrinkles, the iconographic, religious, and anthropological aspects of the scenes, the connection with China, and so on. At times comparisons with non-Muslim arts are made, and, for instance, a juxtaposition of the artistic effects in the use of folds in Gothic art and in the wash drawings of Mehmet Siyah Kalem is very illuminating (p. 82). One welcomes the opening of a discussion along these lines and although one may not always follow the authors in their way of thinking and may have at times other ideas, their approach will certainly help to bring about eventually a fuller appreciation of Islamic miniature painting.

Of the equally important miniatures of the second group discussed in the third chapter, only one has been, to the reviewer’s knowledge, illustrated before and this in a general magazine. 4 They bear what seems to be a sixteenth-century attribution to Ahmed Müsa. The Turkish authors do not believe that he is identical with the founder of the Persian school of painting of the same name, who is mentioned in the account of Dost Mohammad; they see in him rather a successful artist in the palace of Mehmet the Conqueror, a student or admirer of that famous artist, whose name he had taken over (pp. 114–115). However, Dost Mohammad’s statement that Ahmed Müsa lived under the Mongol Abu Sa’id and painted a Mi’râj-nâmeh seems to fit these miniatures, whose number, by the way, is not six but nine, as several of the cutout paintings are

---

1 İslam Tectüleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, vol. 1 (Istanbul, 1953), pp. 73–87; English résumé, pp. 87–89.

2 The reviewer has already expressed certain ideas about these problems in his Some paintings in four Istanbul albums, Ars Orientalis, vol. 1 (1954), pp. 91 to 103.

3 For the benefit of those familiar with the first volume of this series, it should be mentioned that this is the artist represented in O. Aslanapa’s article, Türkische Miniaturmalerei am Hohe Mehmet des Erbäbers in Istanbul, Ars Orientalis, vol. 1 (1954), by figs. 27–30 and 36–38.

4 A rich contribution from Turkey to the Persian art exhibition: Early miniatures, The Illustrated London News, vol. 178, No. 4785 (Jan. 3, 1931), p. 16, fig. in lower left corner (this is fig. 91 in the Turkish publication).
pasted together. The Turkish authors aptly point to the well-known Mi'raj-namâh of 1436 from Herat in the Bibliothèque Nationale and compare in particular the two versions of the adoration of the gigantic cock. There are, however, obvious differences in the iconographies, especially in view of the importance of the guiding angel and the rarity of Burâq in the album, in contrast to their reversed roles in the Herat manuscript. The whole series deserves a special treatment, particularly inasmuch as these miniatures reflect a mid-fourteenth-century Persian version of the still lost Arabic original which has recently been recognized as a possible prototype for at least some elements of the Divina Commedia and of a Chinese journey to the other world. Here the authors discuss again the stylistic aspects of the various miniatures, but in view of the religious subject matter they comment also on the place of such paintings within Islamic art.

The fourth and final chapter deals with animal designs, and though the names of Sheybâ, Maḥmûd Shâh, and Āḥmad ʿUdî are parenthetically mentioned in the caption, these artists are only referred to en passant in the text and their work is not as elaborately analyzed as those of Mehmet Siyah Kalem and Āḥmad Mûsâ. The various paintings and drawings are of very different character, some being even of Chinese origin (figs. 113 and 126), or inspired by Far Eastern models (figs. 101 and 106), while others are Persian (figs. 115, 117, 119, and 125), and one is possibly Italian (fig. 111); they and many others give an idea of the wide interest in animal designs in the Near East in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, of the models which were available and the various styles which were fostered. The two Turkish authors stress especially the naturalistic aspect, which, as always in Near Eastern art, is here more pronounced than in the more schematic drawing of human beings, and they consider this tendency in conjunction with the opposite propensity, i.e., to turn a design based on actual observation into a decorative pattern. Another line of inquiry is dedicated to the reasons for the preference for line drawings or, at least, for a sparse use of color in animal designs; to the explanations given one might add the strong influence of Chinese paintings in black and white or with delicate wash colors, which, like other Chinese artistic creations, had a profound influence on Near Eastern arts and crafts.

Throughout the book one finds observations and thoughts put in well-turned, adroit phrases. This is in itself quite a feat, in view of the difficulty in expressing such ideas. However, there are also many passages which give ground for further discussion.

A most important aspect of the book is, of course, the rich illustrations in it. On the whole the illustrations came out well; in only a few instances the design is perhaps too delicate or there is too much detail to see everything clearly, especially since the screen of the halftone illustrations does not allow the use of a magnifying glass. (This applies especially to the paintings of Āḥmad Mûsâ, with the exception of figs. 86 and 94.) However, the authors have somewhat counteracted this drawback by providing us with a number of skillfully chosen detailed views which bring out the unusual qualities, especially of the work of Mehmet Siyah Kalem. There is no doubt that this publication represents a valuable addition to the existing literature on the painting of the Near East.

Richard Ettinghausen

Şanâye-e Iran, Zohâf-e safâlîn (Les arts de l'Iran, la céramique). Par Mahdi Bahrami. Publications de l'Université de Téhéran, No. 38, Téhéran, 1327 H. (solaire) (1949), 126 pp., 5 figs., 47 pls.

Il n'existait encore sur l'histoire de la céramique iranienne-, écrit l'auteur (p. 21), aucun ouvrage en langue persane. Le petit livre de M. Bahrami comble aujourd'hui cette lacune. A vrai dire il
n'expose qu'un seul cycle de cette histoire, le plus riche assurément, pendant les dix premiers siècles de l'hégire. Les belles poteries à décor point de la Perse antique sont omises du tableau; et la céramique des périodes achéménide, parthe et sassanide est évoquée plus qu'elle n'est vraiment décrite, au cours de considérations préliminaires sur les liens historiques de la Perse avec l'Asie moyenne d'une part (pp. 10–13), et avec le monde grec de l'autre (pp. 14–20).

Pour l'époque musulmane, en revanche, l'étude de M. Bahrami se fait plus ample et plus systématique (p. 21 s.). Elle débute par un rappel des sources littéraires relatives à la céramique de cette période: auteurs orientaux jusque vers le 14e siècle (pp. 21–23), voyageurs européens du 15e au 18e siècle (pp. 23–25), et enfin, à partir de la fin du 19e siècle, amateurs d'art ou savants, gagnés par un goût nouveau pour la céramique de l'Orient musulman (pp. 27–43).

Cette bibliographie n'est pas exhaustive; et sans doute ne prétendait-elle pas l'être. Elle offre en revanche d'utiles observations critiques sur les insuffisances aujourd'hui les plus évidentes des dernières études citées.

Surtout une analyse détaillée de la céramique persane des dix premiers siècles de l'hégire; c'est la partie la plus importante de l'ouvrage (pp. 44–126). Elle se présente sous forme d'une classification visiblement inspirée de celle qu'a dressée A. U. Pope dans le Survey of Persian art. Comme cet auteur, M. Bahrami distingue en effet quatre périodes successives:

I. L'époque archaïque, qui couvre les cinq premiers siècles de l'hégire (8e–12e s.), (pp. 44–57).

II. L'époque intermédiaire, vers la fin du 12e et le début du 13e siècle (pp. 57–92; dates, p. 59).

III. L'époque mongole et timuride (14e–15e s.), (pp. 92–101).

IV. L'époque safavide (16e–17e s.), (pp. 101–105).

A l'intérieur de chaque période, l'auteur examine successivement diverses catégories de céramique, définies selon les critères techniques ou stylistiques généralement admis.

I. ÉPOQUE ARCHAÏQUE

A. Céramique non-glacée, à décor gravé (p. 44), moulé (p. 45), ou appliqué (p. 47), vaisselle d'usage courant pendant les cinq premiers siècles de l'hégire (Suse, Rayy, Nishapur, Isfahan, Saveh). L'auteur note certaines réminiscences de l'iconographie sassanide dans la décoration de ces poteries (p. 46, figs. 3, 4); en fait, toute l'histoire de la céramique non-glacée des premiers siècles de l'Islam reste à faire, et ces quelques pages ne font pas justice à la richesse du répertoire ornemental qui caractérise ces modestes poteries, particulièrement les cruches moulées. L'abondante collection de tessons non-glacés recueillis dans les fouilles scientifiques de Nishapur et de Bust fournira les premiers matériaux de cette étude, toujours un peu défavorisée dans les ouvrages consacrés à la céramique archaïque de l'Islam, en Perse comme ailleurs.

B. Céramique glacée monochrome (p. 48), de teinte bleue, vert-pâle, ou brune, sans décor (parag. 4) ou à décor gravé (parag. 5), et dans ce dernier cas probablement inspirée, écrit l'auteur, de la toleutique sassanide ou des poteries qui les imitent. L'absence d'illustrations rend l'identification de cette catégorie difficile; mais la remarque précé-dente, et la description d'un certain bol du musée de Berlin, suggèrent qu'il s'agit ici de la céramique "graffiato" à décor géométrique ou animal, dite de Rayy. Son origine et sa date ne sont pas aussi sûrement établies que ne l'indique le texte (3e s. H.); les attributions, toutes incertaines, oscillent encore entre le 9e et le 11e siècle.

C. Céramique glacée polychrome (p. 49).—I. Ecole de Nishapur, ici définie non par l'ensemble des poteries à décor polychrome fabriquées dans cette ville, mais seulement par une catégorie "particulière au Khorassan", où les teintes prédominantes seraient les "gris-sombre, vert, bleu, et rouge". D'après l'exemple illustré, la belle coupe au cavalier-chasseur du musée de Téhéran (pl. 3), on reconnaît la "buff and yellow ware" définie par les fouilleurs de Nishapur; la dénomination de cette céramique, la plus originale en effet dans la production locale, manque encore de précision.


2. Etoile du Turkestan (p. 50), définie par les riches poteries à décor géométrique, animal ou épigraphique des régions de Samarkand et Bokhara (plis. 5, 6), vers le 10e et le 11e siècle. L'auteur signale avec raison la vaste diffusion de cette céramique au Khorasan, où de nombreux ateliers s'en inspirent tout au long du 11e siècle.

3. Céramique à décor bleu de cobalt (pp. 50-51), bien datée par les trouvailles de Samarra en Mésopotamie (9e s.), mais abondante aussi en Perse (Rayy, Nishapur, Istakhr, Suse), où M. Bahrami voudrait placer le foyer primitif du genre. Mais le problème des origines demeure entier, et les dates trop précises, entre le 3e et le "5e s." de l'hégire (p. 51, l. 13), sans grands fondements.

4. Céramique à lustre métallique (pp. 51-53), également datée par les trouvailles de Samarra (9e s.), mais d'origine tout aussi incertaine. La thèse "persane" de l'auteur repose sur des observations négatives, ou par trop subjectives, qui n'emportent pas la conviction.

5. Céramique d'Amol (pp. 53-54). Sous ce titre, l'auteur range des poteries de nature, et peut-être d'origine différentes. Les unes, à décor peint sur engobe, s'apparentent dans une certaine mesure à la céramique des provinces orientales du califat, Khorasan ou Turkestan; l'exemple illustré (p. 57, pl. 11) comporte des médaillons, et, sur le corps de l'oiseau, des disques perlés, qui caractérisent diverses séries de la céramique de Bust, au 11e et au début du 12e siècle. On attribue parfois les poteries de ce genre à la région de Sari, dans le Mazandaran.

Les autres poteries "d'Amol" se distinguent au contraire par un décor "champlevé" (pl. 12), qui constitue sous des thèmes variés la marque originale d'une céramique nouvellement répandue dans le nord de l'Iran vers le 11e ou le 12e siècle, et dont s'inspirent jusqu'à la conquête mongole (1220 s.) les lointains ateliers des états ghordes ou khwarezmiens.3

6. Céramique de Yaskan (et Aghkand) (p. 54), tributaire de la même technique ornementale, le "champlevé"; mais la distinction des divers styles et lieux d'origine de la céramique persane à décor gravé ou champlevé (Amol, Yaskan, Aghkand, Rayy, Zendjan) est encore bien incertaine. L'auteur l'a d'ailleurs noté (p. 54, l. 5, 6); et ses propres suggestions, fort succinctes, ne font que souligner l'urgence d'observations archéologiques rigoureuses qui seules permettront de fixer pour ces différentes variétés de la céramique "sgraffiato" des attributions dignes de foi.

7. Céramique d'inspiration chinoise (pp. 55-57), soit d'une part certaines poteries blanches de Rayy ou de Saveh (p. 56) et d'autre part les poteries dites à trois couleurs, imitées de la céramique Tang à décor gravé ou jaspré (pp. 56-57). Les premières, non illustrées, restent mal définies; sans doute s'agit-il des vases à émail blanc-lard ou blanc-ivoire et décor gravé, moulé, ou ajouré, de l'époque seljukide, qui ne sont cités nulle part ailleurs dans l'ouvrage. Quant aux seconde, l'auteur les attribue à une période comprise entre le 2e et le 4e siècle de l'hégire en vertu de l'âge des monnaies qui les accompagnent sur les sites de Nishapur et de Suse (p. 57); mais la référence aux monnaies de Suse est légèrement inexacte.4 En outre, les poteries de Bust à décor jaspré n'apparaissent pas avant la fin du 11e ou le début du 12e siècle et les vases de Nishapur qui leur sont apparentés définissent peut-être aussi une période d'occupation tardive du site, postérieure au 4e s. de l'hégire. La prochaine publication des fouilles de Nishapur viendra sans doute lever cette autre incertitude chronologique.

II. ÉPOQUE INTERMÉDIAIRE

La période archaïque s'achève par un apparent déclin de l'artisanat des potiers, vers le 5e siècle de l'hégire (fin 11e-début 12e s.). M. Bahrami l'explique par un regain de la vaisselle en métal qu'aurait originellement favorisé le goût des princes bouyides pour les formes prélamiques de la civilisation persane (pp. 57-58); hypothèse intéressante, que confirmeraient dans une certaine mesure l'abondance des vases en métal à partir du 11e siècle, et aussi l'apparante inspiration "métallique" de certaines poteries à décor gravé au 12e siècle (supra, parag. 5, 6).

Quoiqu'il en soit, c'est seulement dans la seconde

3 Cf. supra, Poteries de Bamiyan, pp. 228-238.

moitié du 6e siècle de l’hégire (fin 12e s.) qu’apparaissent en effet les premières céramiques distinctives de la période intermédiaire (p. 59). Mais l’auteur n’indique pas les caractères nouveaux que ces différentes poteries ont en commun, tant au point de vue des techniques de fabrication que d’un certain style ornemental jusqu’alors inconnus ; et après avoir évoqué le rôle privilégié de Rayy dans l’histoire de la céramique persane (pp. 59-60) M. Bahrami aborde immédiatement l’examen des poteries attribuées aux ateliers de cette ville.

A. Rayy.—1. Céramique bleu-azur (“lajward”) et turquoise (pp. 61-93 et pl. 14) y compris les figurines animales trouvées à Rayy et à Saveh (p. 63, pl. 15).

2. Céramique polychrome (dite “lu’abi”) (p. 63, pl. 16).

3. Céramique à lustre métallique (pp. 63-66, pl. 17). L’auteur évoque certaines pièces datées bien connues (p. 65) et donne ensuite un petit répertoire de la décoration particulière à cette céramique (p. 66). La technique de fabrication est exposée plus loin sous forme d’une longue citation tirée du célèbre traité d’Abâ’l Qâsim Kâshânî (p. 90-92).

4. Céramique dite “mina’î” (pp. 66-68, pls. 18-20).

B. Suit l’examen des poteries de Kâshân :

1. Céramique non-glacée (pp. 69-70, pl. 21), à décor moulé.

2. Céramique à lustre métallique (pp. 71-72, pls. 22-23).

3. Céramique à décor noir sur fond blanc ou bleu (pp. 72-74, pls. 24, 25) dont les principaux thèmes ornementaux sont énumérés à la p. 73.

4. Céramique “mina’î” de Kâshân (pp. 74-75).

5. Carreaux de faïence (“khashî”) (pp. 75-84, pls. 26-29), leurs antécédents, mais en Perse uniquement (pp. 75-76), les premiers exemples datés (pp. 76-77), les inscriptions (dates, poèmes) (pp. 78-84).

6. Bandeaux ornementaux (p. 84-86, pls. 30, 31).

7. Mihrâbs (pp. 86-88, pls. 32, 33).

C. Vient enfin la production de Saveh (p. 88 s.) ; céramique bleu-turquoise à décor gravé, en creux ou en relief ; céramique lustrée ; mina’î (pls. 34-35).

La typologie de M. Bahrami est claire ; on lui reprochera seulement une assurance qui peut tromper et certaines omissions. Ainsi l’origine et la date de la céramique dite “lu’abi” (ou “lakabi”, dans la transcription erronée mais courante) sont-elles vraiment bien établies ? L’auteur indique Rayy (p. 63), et, pour la poterie qu’il reproduit, le 10e siècle (légende de la pl. 16, “début du 4e s. de l’hégire”) ; mais sur quels indices ? La seule inclusion de cette céramique parmi les œuvres de la “période intermédiaire” lui assignerait d’ailleurs une date plus basse et aussi plus vraisemblable, vers le 12e siècle.

De même, l’énumération des ornements particuliers aux céramiques de Rayy, de Kâshân ou de Saveh dans des catégories analogues (poteries lustrées, mina’î), ne suffit pas à définir chacune de ces “écoles”. En fait, l’origine même des poteries est souvent moins bien connue que ne le laisserait penser l’auteur ; seule une analyse sévère des documents et des conditions de leur trouvaille, à supposer qu’elle pût être fructueuse, permettrait de différencier les styles propres à chaque artisanat dans ces trois villes.

Enfin une catégorie importante de la céramique prémongole semble absente dans la classification de M. Bahrami : les belles poteries dites à silhouettes noires que l’on fabriquait en Perse vers la fin du 12e ou le début du 13e siècle ne sont en effet nulle part évoquées.

III. ÉPOQUE MONGOLE ET TIMURIDE

Les invasions de Gengis-Khan marquent le début d’une nouvelle étape dans l’évolution de la céramique iranienne : dans les villes ravagées, des ateliers ferment leurs portes (Rayy, Saveh, p. 92), mais d’autres subsistent (Kâshân, p. 93) ou se créent (Sultanabad, p. 96), pour adopter bientôt un style nouveau, qu’inspire largement, pensait M. Bahrami, l’art des potiers chinois (pp. 94-96).

Les conquêtes orientales des princes mongols ont en effet pu contribuer à répandre en Iran le goût des matières et des ornements distinctifs de la céramique chinoise (p. 93). L’auteur cite des imitations de porcelaine et de céladon à Kâshân et à Saveh, mais ne donne malheureusement pas d’illustrations qui permettent d’apprécier l’importance de ces emprunts à l’Extrême-Orient.

Cette période est d’ailleurs plus sommairement traitée ; poteries d’une part (Sultanabad 13e-14e s., p. 96 ; Tabriz, Saveh 15e-16e s., p. 97), carreaux de faïence de l’autre (pp. 94-95), bientôt conçus comme

Ainsi, la céramique bleue dite de Rayy (pp. 61 à 63) doit comprendre nombre de grands et beaux vases à décor en relief, dont la provenance n’est pas toujours bien fixée (Kâshân, Sultanabad ?).
autant de fragments d’un décor complexe (mosaïques, pp. 98–99, pls. 37, 38).

Le chapitre s’achève par une évocation de la céramique à décor bleu et blanc: que les potiers persans auraient fabriqués dans les états timurides à l’exemple des maîtres chinois (pp. 100–101). Mais ici encore quels sont les vases antérieurs à l’époque safavide qui attestent ces emprunts? L’auteur n’en cite, ni n’en illustre aucun; et l’abondante poterie “bleue et blanche” que l’on voit surgir dans les provinces orientales de l’Iran après la conquête timuride ne témoigne pas en faveur de ces “influences” chinoises. C’est bien plutôt l’artisanat levantin qui semble alors inspirer les ateliers timurides; et les premières poteries persanes à décor bleu et blanc qui soient directement inspirées de la porcelaine Ming et assurément datées, ne sont pas contemporaines de l’âge d’or timuride (15e s.), mais de la période suivante, par laquelle s’achève l’exposé de M. Bahrami.

IV. ÉPOQUE SAFAVIDE

C’est alors en effet que le goût des riches Persans pour les céramiques de style chinois atteint son apogée (p. 102, pls. 43–44). Mais dans le même temps, certains ateliers cultivent des genres locaux nés vraisemblablement à l’époque timuride (cf. p. 97): céramique dite de “Kubatcha” (pp. 101–102, pls. 40–41), poteries à décor bleu et blanc de Tabriz (p. 102), carreaux de faience “à 7 couleurs” (pp. 103–104 pl. 45), mosaïques (p. 105, pls. 46–47).

L’auteur donne enfin un bref aperçu des rapports qu’offre le décor de la céramique avec l’ornamentation des manuscrits persans (p. 105–108), ainsi qu’une listé des poteries datées les plus importantes, entre le 6e et le 10e s. de l’hégire d’après les travaux de E. Kühl (pp. 109–126).

Compte-tenu des quelques réserves exprimées dans cette recension l’ouvrage de M. Bahrami offre au public de langue persane un bon cadre de référence pour aborder l’étude typologique et chronologique des céramiques iraniennes à l’époque musulmane. On regrettera seulement que l’auteur ait suivi le mauvais usage de bien des auteurs “occidentaux”: trop de descriptions d’objets non reproduits, et pas assez de planches. Celles qui figurent dans ce petit livre ne sont pas toujours bien venues; et pour les descriptions, l’absence d’index réduit encore le profit qu’on en peut tirer.

J. C. Gardin


1 Verzeichnis der Abkürzungen:
Mw., F. Sarre-F.R. Martin, Meisterwerke mohammedanischer Kunst auf der Ausstellung München, 1910, München, 1912.
O.T., Orientalische Teppiche, Wien, 1892–96.
Von den 61 ausgestellten Stücken waren 19 persische Arbeiten (5 nord-, 9 ostpersische, 4 „Polenteppiche,“ 1 Gebetstieppich). Der Kaukasus war mit 5, die Türkei mit 34 Stücken vertreten. 3 Stücke (No. 59–61) fallen aus dem Rahmen.2 Von den türkischen Teppichen gehörten nicht weniger als 9 zur Kairener Gruppe (3 Mamluken-, 4 Osmanenteppiche, und 2 Stücke der späteren Gruppe mit kleinteiliger Quadrierung). Die 23 anderen waren anatolisch. Sie verteilten sich folgendermassen: 8 „Holbeinteppiche,“ 10 Ushaks (5 Medaillon- und Sternenushaks, 3 Ushak-Gebetsteppiche), ferner 2 Gebetstieppiche, 2 Vogelteppiche, 1 Tschintamanteppich3 und 2 Smyrnateppiche.

Unter den öffentlichen Leihgebbern stand das Museo Bardini in Florenz mit 15 Stücken an der Spitze. Es folgten Museo Poldi Pezzoli, Mailand (5); Museo degli Argenti und Bargello in Florenz (je 3); Museo Civico, Turin; Museo Correr, Venedig; Museo Civico, San Gimignano (je 1). Unter den privaten Leihgebbern war die Reihenfolge: Piero Barbieri, Genua (12); Ludovico Pogliaghi, Verona (6); Pietro Accorsi, Turin (3); Simone Lutomirski, Mailand (3); Michele Campana, Mailand (2); Franco Rolich, Triest (2); Principe Doria Pamphily (1); R & A Cittone, Turin (1) und V. V. Vagnoni, Turin (1).


Verst., Versteigerung.


Für Abbildungen, Vorlagen und Reproduktionserlaubnis habe ich zu danken den Herren V. Viale (Abb. 2, 3, 5, 8–10, 12–16, 18, 19), C. Th. Müller (Abb. 4, 17), S. Troll (Abb. 1), H. Jacoby (Abb. 6) und Hadjidakies (Abb. 7).


Einige Stücke aus öffentlichem Besitz (den privaten kenne ich zu wenig, um urteilen zu können)

2 No. 59 Anatolische (?) Kopie des spanischen „Synagogen-Teppichs“ in Berlin; No. 60 Kaschgar-Teppich; No. 61 Savonnerie-Teppich.

3 No. 20 scheint aus der Sammlung des Malers Sohn Rethel in Düsseldorf zu stammen; No. 52 war früher beim Baron Tucher von Simmelsdorf in München (vgl. B.-K., 3, Abb. 77).

fehlten auf der Ausstellung, vermutlich weil sie nicht erreichbar waren. Die Schah 'Abbâs-Teppe des Museo di San Marco\(^5\) wären eine wünschenswerte Ergänzung der vier ausgestellten Stücke dieser Gruppe gewesen. Aus dem Museo Bardini hätte man gern die nordpersischen Fragmente No. 162 und 450 und das rotgrundige Vasenpeppichfragment No. 376\(^6\) gesehen, aus der Ca d'Oro in Venedig den "Holbeinteppich," den kleinen nordpersischen Medaillonsteppich\(^8\) und vor allem den eigenartigen persischen Venedigfragment, allerdings ist es möglich und muss über teilung weissgrundige die "Palazzo aus Simonetti einem Lanzettblättern Blüten Versteigerungen Genua, Italien." wären wohl mir Hauptimporteur Photo Erdmann, erreichbar in Berlin^®. Das weder das Drachen-Phönix-Kampf\(^{12}\) wurde im römischen Kunsthandel erworben und soll aus einer mittelitalienischen Kirche kommen, ein ebenfalls in Berlin befindlicher Baumtierteppich\(^9\) der Sanguszko-Gruppe wurde in Bologna erworben. Auch das Fragment eines nordwestpersisch-kaukasischen Kartuschenteppichs, zu dem sich der restliche Teil in Philadelphia befindet,\(^{14}\) stammt aus Italien.\(^{15}\) Der Jagdteppich der Sammlung M. de Rothschild\(^{16}\) gehörte dem Marchese Torrigiani in Florenz. Von den kleinen Seidentensticken aus Kaschan sind eines der Altman Stücke\(^7\) und der aus dem Berliner Schlossmuseum stammende der Sammlung Gulbenkian\(^{18}\) in Italien erworben, ebenso der Wirkteppich in Kansas City.\(^{19}\) Aus dem Palazzo Capponi in Florenz stammen zwei Tierenteppiche des Metropolitan Museum,\(^20\) aus dem Palazzo Corsi daselbst vier unter sich gleiche Osmanenteppiche.\(^{21}\) Auch auf die drei "Holbeinteppiche" mit gemischem Wappen wäre zu verweisen.\(^{22}\) Diese Liste

\(^5\) Alinari 38628, 38652, 38654, 38656.

\(^6\) Das etwa 180 × 250 cm messende Stück muss von einem sehr grossen Teppich stammen, da die einzelnen Blüten bis zu 80 cm messen. Nach dem Auftreten von Lanzettblättern gehört er in den Beginn der Spätzeit, etwa in das zweite Viertel des 17. Jahrhunderts.

\(^7\) Photo O. Böhm 614.

\(^8\) Photo O. Böhm 637.


\(^10\) Erdmann, Orientteppiche, Abb. 1.

\(^11\) Das., Abb. 23.
liesse sich ohne große Mühe erweitern. Feststeht, dass Italien einen erheblichen, ja wohl den wesentlichen Bestand seines Teppichbesitzen im Laufe der letzten hundert Jahre an das Ausland abgegeben hat, so dass sich heute keine Ausstellung mehr zusammenbringen läßt, die auch nur entfernt den einstigen Reichtum spiegelte.


Der Katalog Viales ist weit bedeutender als es die Ausstellung war. Nicht nur dass jedes Stück ausführlich beschrieben und sorgfältig eingeordnet wird, jeder Gruppe ist ausserdem eine längere historische Einleitung vorausgestellt und das Ganze wird von einer allgemeinen Einführung eröffnet. Dabei ist die Literatur so ausgezeichnet, wenn auch natürlich nicht ganz lückenlos,—wer könnte das?—verarbeitet, dass das Buch trotz der Beschränkung, die ihm die Katalogform auferlegte, einen umfassenden Überblick gibt. Ich hatte daher ursprünglich die Absicht, diese Publikation, die einen so ungewöhnlich sorgfältigen Querschnitt unseres heutigen Wissens bietet, zum Ausgangspunkt einer Untersuchung über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Teppichforschung zu machen. Da eine solche Untersuchung erst geschrieben werden kann, wenn einige Publikationen, die sich z. Zt. noch im Druck befinden, erschienen sind,23 möchte ich es nicht länger hinaus


23 W. Bode-E. Kühnel, Vorderasiatische Knüpftteppiche aus älterer Zeit, 4. Auflage, Braunschweig,
schieben, dem Verfasser meinen Dank für seine mustergültige Arbeit in der Form einer Besprechung abzustatten. Bei der Fülle der von ihm angeschnittenen Fragen muss ich mich dabei auf kurze Notizen, die sich beim Studium ergaben, beschränken.

*Profilo Storico* (S. 161–169) gibt eine kurze, inhaltsreiche, einleitende Übersicht der Entwicklung und der Verteilung der Produktionszentren.


S. 162. Dass Marco Polo Konya besuchte, ist nicht erwiesen. Es wird zwar im dritten Kapitel des ersten Buches zusammen mit Kayseri und Sivas erwähnt, aber da er die Häfen Giazz (das heutige Asans an der Bucht von Alexandrette) und Trebison (Trabzon) benutzte, ist es nicht wahrscheinlich, dass er das viel weiter westlich gelegene Konya berührt hat.


**Persia. (a) Persia Settentrionale (S. 170–184).**


S. 173. Der seidene Teppich der Sammlung Gulbenkian hat keine Jagdscenen, sondern Tierkämpfe. Zu den bisher bekannten zehn Beispielen

26 Eine etwa 400 Titel umfassende Bibliographie habe ich in meinem Anm. 23 genannten Buch gebracht.


28 Metropolitan Museum, Altman Collection and Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, München; Metropolitan Museum, Altman Collection und Musée des Gobelins, Paris; Metropolitan Museum, Altman Collection, and Art Institute, Detroit; Rockefeller Collection; Wiener Collection; Paris, Louvre; London, Sammlung Gulbenkian.


30 Ausstellung Amsterdam, 1946, Katalog, No. 24 (245 × 168 cm).

31 In den Archives Macie im Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris befindet sich die Abbildung einer intakten wollenen Kopie desselben Teppichs mit dem Vermerk „Vente 1909, No. 108, 315 × 200 cm.“

32 Erdmann, Carpet making, S. 170 f.


34 Troll, op. cit., Taf. 25.

Tafel 2


Abb. 7—Fragment eines brochierten wollenen Knüpfteppichs, Ostpersien, Herat, Ende 16. Jahrhundert. Athen, Musée Benaki.

Abb. io—Polnische Kopie eines Teppichs vom Typ Abb. 12.

Genoa, Sammlung Piero Barbari.
Varese, Sammlung Professor Ludovico Pogliaghi.

Abb. 15—Wollener Knüpfteppich, Aegypten, Kairo, 17. Jahrhundert. Triest, Sammlung Franco Rolich.

Abb. 16—WOLLENER KNUPFTEPPICH, ÄGYPTEN (2).

17. JAHRRJEDERT. GENUA. SAMMLUNG PIERO BARBIERI.

Teppich gehört, wie das Fragment in Leipzig.46 In einigem Abstand dieser Gruppe anzuschliessen ist ein Teppich, der sich ehemals in der Yerkes Collection befand.47

S. 186. Broschierung kommt nicht nur bei dem Teppich aus dem Schrein des Imām Ṭabari48, sondern auch sonst gelegentlich vor, besonders häufig49 bei einer Gruppe von Herat-Teppichen, die zwischen den mit Tieren und Tierkämpfen geschmückten frühen Stücken vom Typ Habsburg-Rockefeller Mc Cormik50 und den normalen Teppichen ohne Figuren stehen und in Feld oder Borten, manchmal auch an beiden Stellen, Fasen zeigen, die bei frühen Beispielen in Anordnung und Zeichnung so viel Ähnlichkeit mit den Fasen in den Borten mancher der kleinen Seidentepiche Kaschans51 haben, dass ein Zusammenhang nicht ausge- schlossen scheint.52

(c) Tappeti cosidditi dello Scuti Abbas (o Polacchi) (S. 194-200).

Der Verfasser weiss, da er meinen Aufsatz zu


47 Mumford, Taf. 11. Der Teppich befand sich 1887 bei Bardini in Florenz.

48 Survey, Taf. 1185.

49 Ob regelmässig, konnte ich nicht feststellen.

50 Survey, Taf. 1174.

51 Z. B. Survey, Taf. 1199 und 1200.

52 Die bekanntesten solcher „Fasanen-Isfahans“ sind: ehemals Kulekian (Migeon, La collection Kulekian, Taf. 6); ehemals Spanish Art Gallery (Mus., Taf. 48); Victoria and Albert Museum (No. 721/1884; unveröffentlicht); Kulekian (Ausstellung, Chicago, 1926, Katalog, No. 14; Survey, Taf. 1180); Washington, Corcoran Gallery, Clark Collection (B.-K., 3, Abb. 32); ehemals Sammlung von Dirksen (B.-K., 3, Abb. 31); Duveen (Ausstellung, Chicago, 1926, Katalog, No. 15); Comtesse de Béhague (G. Migeon, Exposition des arts musulmans au Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, 1903, Taf. 80/81); ein schönes Fragment besitzt das Benaki Museum in Athen (Abb. 7). Broschert sind auch die figurenlosen Teppiche in Washington, Corcoran Gallery, Clark Collection (Survey, Taf. 1187) und beim Duke of Buccleugh and Queensberry (Ausstellung, London, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1914, Guide, No. 14).
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Dieser Fragment53 zitiert, dass ich in der Einschätzung dieser Gattung seine Bewunderung nicht teile, ihm dafür in der Ablehnung der Bode’schen Theorie ihrer Anfertigung als Geschenke für Europa zu- stimme.54 Die Wirkteppiche Kaschans zu dieser Gruppe zu rechnen, scheint mir unangebracht, wenn sie auch z. T. gleichzeitig sind, und wenn auch die Schah ’Abbās-Teppiche auf der Basis der älteren Seidentepiche dieses Zentrums entwickelt sein werden, wie das gut der Teppich mit mittlerem Medaillon im Schatz von San Marco in Venedig zeigt.55


54 Für die E. Kühl in B.-K., 4, S. 143 wieder ein- tritt.

S. 194, Anm. 1. Dass die 1878 in Paris gezeigten Teppiche der Familie Czartoryski im Museum der Universität von Krakau waren, ist mir nicht erinnerlich und geht aus meinen Notizen auch nicht hervor; der grosse Teppich mit Wappen ist jedenfalls nicht dort. 27


S. 195, Anm. 1. Teppiche dieser Gruppe in Wolle sind mir nie begegnet. 58

S. 195, Anm. 3. (s. a. S. 197, Anm. 1). Der Teppich mit zwei Phoixenen im Mittelmedaillon im Schloss Rosenberg ist gestickt und nur mit Vorbehalt den Schah 'Abbäs-Teppichen zuzurechnen. 59


59 Die mir bekannten gestickten "Polenleipiche" sind: No. 1, Teppich mit zwei Phoixenen im Mittelmedaillon im Schloss Rosenberg bei Kopenhagen (Martin, Taf. 11); No. 2, Teppich mit drei Fasen im Feld im Residenzimuseum in München (Erdmann, Hamburg, Katalog, No. 86); No. 3, Teppich mit Arabeskatranken im Schloss Rosenberg (Martin, Taf. 12); No. 4, Teppich mit einfacher Medaillenmusterung ohne Figuren in der Universitätssammlung in Krakau (unveröffentlicht); No. 5, ähnlicher Teppich um 1910 bei Bernheimer in München (Abb., A. Gregor, Orientalische Teppiche, Velhagen und Klasing's Monatshefte, vol. 22 [1907–8], S. 719); No. 6, ähnlicher Teppich in Sargis bei Moskau (nach Notizen auf der Leningrader Ausstellung, 1935; vielleicht identisch mit einem Stück, das sich nach der Beschreibung eines Photos in den Archives Maciet des Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris in der Waffenkammer in Moskau befinden soll); No. 7, Teppich mit Medaillenmusterung im Bayerischen Nationalmuseum in München (Erdmann, Hamburg, Katalog, No. 87); No. 8, Teppich mit ähnlicher Zeichnung im Schloss Rosenberg (Martin, Taf. 14); No. 9, Teppich mit Arabeskatmuster im Schloss Rosenberg (Martin, Taf. 13); No. 10, Teppich mit Kartuschenreihung im Bayerischen Nationalmuseum (Erdmann, Hamburg, Katalog, No. 88); No. 11, Teppich im Kunstgewerbemuseum in Prag (unveröffentlicht); No. 12, Teppich im Besitz der persischen Regierung (1931 in London ausgestellt, Katalog, No. 413). Nos. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, und 14 zeigen deutliche Beziehungen zu den geknüpften Schah 'Abbäs-Teppichen, während Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7 und 8 mehr an die Wirksteppiche Kaschans anknüpfen. Von Nos. 6, 11 und 12 habe ich nur Notizen. Danach ge-
S. 196. Die Teppiche aus dem Mausoleum Schah 'Abbās II. im Qum werden nach meiner Meinung zu Unrecht zur Gattung der Schah 'Abbās-Teppiche gerechnet.60

S. 198, Katalog, No. 15. Teppich im Museo degli Argenti in Florenz (Abb. 3). Dasselbe Muster zeigen ein fragmentarischer Teppich im Bayerischen Nationalmuseum in München (Abb. 4)61 und zwei Stücke der Sammlung des Duke of Buccleugh and Queensberry.62 Teppiche dieser Art pflegen in unendlichem Rapport gezeichnet zu sein, wobei man häufig durch die Art des Ausschnittes zwei verschiedene Muster erzielt (Textabb. 1). Der Ausschnitt b findet sich bei Teppichen in der Universitätssammlung der Nationalmuseum zu Florenz63 und in der Sammlung Rockefeller.64


Durch ein Verschen war auf der Hamburger Ausstellung nur die rechte untere Ecke ausgestellt (Erdmann, Hamburg, Katalog, No. 93) und erst bei der anschliessenden Ausstellung in München stellte sich heraus, daß die ganze Mitte des Teppichs vorhanden ist.


tät zu Krakau,68 beim Grafen Potocki,69 ehemals im Bayerischen Nationalmuseum70 und im Residenzmuseum zu München,71 im Museo Nazionale zu Florenz72 und in der Sammlung Rockefeller.73

Ein intaktes Stück und ein Fragment (beide unveröffentlicht).


O.T., Taf. 64, No. 82. 1928 verkauft, Verbleib unbekannt.

Erdmann, Hamburg, Katalog, No. 89.

Unveröffentlicht.

O.T., vol. 2, Taf. 44.

Unveröffentlicht.

Inv. No. 808, unveröffentlicht.

Seray in Istanbul untersuchte, kann mich aber nicht ganz des Gefüls erwehren, dass er vielleicht nicht gerade zu dieser Gruppe gehört, wohl aber zu einer ihr nahestehenden, zu der auch der Teppich des Bayerischen Nationalmuseums, der Teppich aus der Şeyh Sadreddin Cami in Konya und zwei Teppiche im Mevlana Müzesi in Konya zu rechnen sind.


Türk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi, Inv. No. 760, Martin, Abb. 337.

Inv. No. 766/7, Katalog des Museums von Konya 1939, No. 25.

Wir haben also in dieser Gruppe folgende Stücke: No. 1, Teppich des Museo degli Argenti in Florenz; No. 2, Teppich des Bayerischen Nationalmuseums in München; No. 3, Teppich aus Konya im Türk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi in Istanbul; No. 4, Teppich mit Ka'ba-Darstellung im oberen Teil der Nische und Spiralrankenfüllung des Grundes, Konya Museum No. 766; No. 5, Teppich mit drei ovalen Schildern als Füllung des Nischengrundes, Konya-Museum No. 767. Zur Verbindung von No. 2 und No. 3 vergl. Erdmann, Hamburg, *Katalog*, No. 17 (gleicher Haupt- und innerer Begleitstreifen der Borte, dreiteilige Nische, gleiche Basen und Kapitelle der Säulen, Bodenan-

Caucaso (S. 202-208).


B.-K., 4, S. 59, Abb. 41.

Vergl. Anm. 3.

nischer Inschrift, der datiert und Gohar signiert ist. 77
S. 206, Kat. No. 21. Fragment eines nordwest-
persisch-kaukasischen Karatschenteppichs, Museo
Bardini, Florenz. Teppich dieses Typs, der wohl
auf ein nordpersisches Vorbild in der Art des Clam
Gallas Teppichs (heute im Museum für angewandte
Kunst in Wien) 78 zurückgeht, finden sich in Berlin, 79
eben deiner Sammlung Lamm, Naesby House,
Schweden, 80 in den McIlhenny 81 und Williams
Bequests 82 des Pennsylvania Museums in Phila-
delphia und in der Sammlung McMullan, New York. 83
S. 206, Kat. No. 22. Teppich mit Blütenreihung,

77 Martin, S. 118, Abb. 296; B.-K., 3, S. 32; K.-T.,
Taf. 7; A. U. Pope, The myth of the Armenian dragon
carpsels, Jahrbuch der Asiatischen Kunst, vol. 2 (1923),
S. 149; derselbe in seiner Rezension von S.-T., Band 2
in The Art Bulletin, vol. 11 (1920), S. 419; A. Sakisian,
Les tapis arméniens du XVè au XIXè siécle, La Revue
de l'Art Ancien et Moderne, vol. 64 (1933), S. 33,
Abb. 8; R. Ettinghausen, Kälti, Encyclopædia des
Islam, Supplementband S. 112. Martin liest das
Datum S. 118: 1680; Abb. 296: 1684; K.-T. lesen:
1679; Ettinghausen: 1669-1700. Herr Dr. A. Abeghan,
damals Dozent für Armenien an der Berliner Uni-
er, war so freundlich, mir unter dem 27. X., 1942
folgende Lesung zu schicken: "Im Jahre 1679, ich,
Gohar, die Sündener, habe diesen Teppich geknüpft.
Wer dies liest, er möge einmal mir, der geistig Schwaf-
chen, sagen: sie möge gesegnet sein." Auf eine Rück-
frage antwortete Herr Dr. Abeghan unter dem 4. XI.
1942 "Das Datum in der Teppich-Inschrift ist nach
armenischen Aera bezeichnet: 1128, das entspricht
1679 der christlichen Aera. Es ist allerdings nicht aus-
geschrieben, was jedoch aus der Schrift nicht gut
ersichtbar ist, dass die Zahl 100 (~600) aus einer 200
79 Erdmann, Orientteppiche, Abb. 20.
80 Survey, Taf. 1109.
81 R. M. Riefstahl, The McIlhenny bequest and exhi-
bition: rugs and textiles, Bull., Pennsylvania-Museum,
82 Mw., Taf. 67.
83 Nach freundlicher mündlicher Mitteilung von E.
Kühnel, B.-K., 3, S. 33, werden Stücke in der Samm-
lung M. K. W. Vanderlilt in New York [heute Samm-
lung McMullan] und im dortigen Metropolitan-Museum
(*) erwähnt. Martin nennt S. 28 ein schlecht erhaltenes
Stück im Istanburger Handel. Fragment bei Martin,
Abb. 63 [heute Museo Bardini, Florenz] und in der
Sammlung McMullan.

Sammlung Piero Barbieri, Genua. Das Stück ist nur
Fragment und muss wesentlich länger gewesen
sein. Die Ergänzung an der oberen Schmalseite
gibt einen willkürlichen Abschluss. Ein etwas
früheres Exemplar, auf das auch Viale verweist,
findet sich im Museum für angewandte Kunst in
Wien. 84 Ein etwas späteres bei Frau von Wedder-
kop in Oberreisig am Rhein. 85
S. 207, Kat. No. 23. Nordwestpersisch-kaukasischer
Teppich mit Blütenmusterung, Museo Bardini,
Florenz. Der sicher dem späteren 18. Jahrhundert
angehörige Teppich vertritt einen geläufigen Typ,
dessen Ableitung noch unklar ist. Elemente der
ostpersischen Herat-Teppiche werden mit solchen
der südpersischen Vasenmuster und der mittel-
persischen Isfahan- und Kaschan-Teppiche ver-
bunden. Das Muster lebt bei einer der Haupt-
gruppen der Schirvan-Teppiche weiter, zeitigt aber
auch noch andere Ableger. Die ungewöhnlich viel-
fältigen Musterfilialen des nordwestpersisch-
kaukasischen Gebietes im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert,
den die der Turiner Ausstellung und damit auch
der Katalog Viales keine Vorstellung gibt, zu unter-
suchen ist eine ebenso dringende, wie reizvolle Auf-
gabe, 86 da es keine Stelle gibt, an der man dem
Wesen des Orientteppichs so nahe kommen kann
wie hier. Die reichsten Bestände sind im Türk ve
Islam Eserleri Müzesi in Istanbul. 87 Nur mit ihrer
Hilfe wird eine positive Arbeit möglich sein.

Egitto (S. 209–221).
Der Abschnitt bringt interessantes neues Material.
Die lange historische Einleitung referiert muster-
gültig Weg und heutige Situation der Teppich-
I forschung in dieser Frage. Besonders erfreulich ist,
dass Viale zwei neue Quellen bringt. Bei Matheo
Bandello Novelle (Lucca, 1554) S. 33 heisst es "Nel
mezzo v'era una condecente tavola coperta d'un
Tapeto di seta, ed era Alessandrino". Die zweite ist
ein Inventar des Castello del Valentino in Turin aus

84 S.-T., vol. 1, Taf. 41.
85 Unveröffentlicht.
86 Vergl. dazu meine Anm. 23 genannte Arbeit.
87 1937 hatte ich Gelegenheit, die Bestände, auch
de depoierten, durchzusuchen. Rund 300 der über
700 Teppiche konnte ich genauer untersuchen, dar-
Heute soll der Bestand über 1000 Stücke betragen,
von denen aber weniger ausgestellt sind als 1937.
dem Jahre 1677 mit der Notiz "due tappeti del Cairo tutti setta" (circa 2,40 x 1,40). Ich selber kann auch zwei Quellen nachtragen.88 Evliya Celebi sagt bei der Beschreibung der Çoban Mustafa Paşa Cami in Gebze89 (zwischen Üsküdar und Izmit) "auf dem Boden wetteiferten aegyptische Teppiche mit solchen aus Isfahan." Das ist natürlich der Zustand seiner Zeit, aber die Notiz könnte doch ein früheres Datum erhalten. Die Moschee wurde 1522 gebaut und zwar mit rein mamlukischen Steininkrustationen an den Wänden, für die der Bauherr, der vorher Gouverneur von Aegyptien gewesen war, das Material von dort kommen liess. Unter diesen Umständen ist es wahrscheinlich, dass er auch die Teppichausstattung von dort kommen liess, wobei es sich 1552 natürlich um Mamlukenteppiche handelte. 1555 schreibt Pierre Belon86: "Tous les tapiz coupez qu'on apporte de Turquie sont seulement faits depuis la ville de Cogne in Cilicie, iusques à Carachara, ville de Paphlagonie. Nous avons dit que les fins chamelots sont faits de poiles de chèvres à Angouri, qui est la première ville de Cappadoce: et les tapis sont aussi fait de poil de chèvres: mais ceux qu'on fait au Caire, ne sont guère beaux, car ils sont seulement tissus en toile bigarée. Ceux de Adena sont faits en feutres, for legers et moles à se coucher dessus."—Diese vier neuen Belegstellen sind deswegen wichtig, weil die Daten 1522, 1554, 1555 die Lücke füllen, die bisher zwischen unsern Quellen No. 2 (1512) und No. 3 (1583) klaffte.89


90 Les observations de plusieurs singularités, Paris, 1588, fol. 182 b. (Ich zitiere nach R. B. Serjeant, Ars Islamica, vol. 15/16 [1951], S. 59.)
91 Siehe Erdmann, Kairener Teppiche, Teil I, S. 186.
92 Das., S. 183 ff.
93 Inv. No. 174.
die Brüstung hängende Teppich auf dem 1517
datierten Bild "Die Gesamtschacht der Amazonen
bei Theseus" von der Hand des Vittore Carpaccio
im Musée Jaquemart-André in Paris,² so weit die
Museum (Inv. No. 5775). Der Arbeit von B. Scheune-
mann, Anatolische Teppiche auf abendländischen
Gemälden (Dissertation Berlin 1953, nicht im Druck er-
schienen) entnehme ich noch die folgende Wiedergabe
eines Teppichs dieser Gruppe: Brüsseler Wandteppich
aus der Werkstatt des Barend van Orley mit der Al-
legorie des Greisenalters, datiert 1534, im Besitz des
Fürsten von Monaco auf Schloss Marchais (Abb. bei
Th. Demmler, Kunstrwerke aus dem besetzten Nord-
frankreich, ausgestellt im Museum zu Valenciennes,
München, 1918). Zu dem in Ars Islamica, vol. 7 (1940),
S. 74, Abb. 20 abgebildeten Osmanenteppich in den
drei Farben der Mamlukenteppiche im Victoria and
Albert Museum befindet sich ein offenbar etwas spä-
teres, reicher gezeichnetes, fragmentarisches Gegen-
stück im Besitz der L. Bernheimer K.G. in München,
die auch das Fragment eines normalen Mamlukente-
pichs mit rein osmanischer Borte besitzt, beides gute Belege
für meine am oben angegebenen Ort aus-
gesprochene These, dass die Werkstätten der Mamlu-
ken- und der Osmanenteppiche eine Zeitlang am
gleichen Ort nebeneinander gearbeitet haben. [Die
Kenntnis eines großen Mamlukenteppichs, der sich
noch heute im Besitz der Fürsten Fugger befindet,
verdanke ich der Güte des Konsul O. Bernheimer in
München. Ich hoffe das bedeutende Stück bald
publizieren zu können.]
² Inv. No. 1029 Roter Grund mit grünen (?) Okto-
gonen. Die Details flüchtig durch weisse und gelbe
Punkte angedeutet.

Der hier oben in Anm. 1 genannten Arbeit B. Scheune-
manns entnehme ich die folgenden Beispiele von anato-
lischen Teppichen mit Einflüssen der Mamlukente-
piche:
1. Giovanni Martini "Der heilige Markus," datiert
1501, Dom zu Udine. Abb. bei B. Mollajoli, Mostra
del Pordenone e della Pittura Friulana del Rinascimento,
Udine, 1939, S. 23, Abb. 8.
2. Antonello da Saliba "Thronende Madonna," um
1510, Kathedrale von Syrakus. Abb. bei R. van Marle,
The development of the Italian schools of painting,
vol. 15, the Hague, 1934, Abb. 339.
3. Lorenzo Lotto "Herrenbildnis," Abb. bei A.
Banti, Lorenzo Lotto, Florenz, o. J., Abb. 106.
4. Lorenzo Lotto "Thronende Madonna," Pfarr-
kirche Sta. Cristina di Tivarone (Treviso). Abb. im
Katalog der "Mostra di Lorenzo Lotto," Venedig,
1953, No. 11 (eventuell auch auf der "Thronenden
summarische Wiedergabe ein Urteil zulässt, hierher.
Bei ihm handelt es sich nicht um einen Mamlukente-
pich, sondern eher um einen Bergama mit Ein-
flüssen der Mamlukenteppiche, wie sie sich in
einzelnen Originalen erhalten haben.³ Mit diesen
Nachträgen erhöht sich die Zahl der bekannten bild-
dlichen Darstellungen von 23⁴ auf 27, bzw. 28.
S. 214f., Kat. No. 25. Fragment eines Mamlukente-
pichs im Museo Bardini, Florenz. Das besonders
reiche und schöne Stück ist hinreichend bekannt.⁵
Seine Musteralage ist die gleiche wie die von
Katalog No. 26 und kann wohl nach diesem Stück
rekonstruiert werden.
S. 215f., Kat. No. 26. Mamlukenteppich der
Sammlung Ludovico Pogliaghi in Varese (Abb. 12).
Ausser bei dem Teppich im Museo Bardini (Katalog
No. 25 findet sich diese Musteralage bei einem
Stück im Berliner Schlossmuseum⁶ und einem
Stück, das sich 1935 im Pariser Kunsthandel be-
fand.⁷ Aehnliche Komposition zeigen Teppiche
ehemals bei Benguït⁸ und im Völkerkundemuseum
in München.⁹ Der ausgestellte Teppich ist interessant,
weil er in den Eckquadraten je acht Kelche zeigt.¹⁰

Madonna" in Sto. Spirito zu Treviso. Abb. ibid.,
No. 44).
⁵ Kopie des 1537 von Hans Holbein dem Jüngeren
in Whitehall gemalten Wandbildes, 1668 von Remigius
van Leemulp angefertigt. Abb. bei H. A. Schmid,

Vergl. auch die Sumak-Kopie eines Holbein-
teppichs mit Einflüssen der Mamlukenteppiche auf der
Young Memorial Exhibition 1937 (Kat. No. 258).
⁶ Z. B. je ein Teppich in der Williams Collection des
Pennsylvania Museums in Philadelphia (E.O.R., No. 8,
und im Bayerischen Nationalmuseum in München
(Erdmann, Museen, S. 401 f.; Erdmann, Hamburg,
Katalog, No. 17; Erdmann, Der orientalische Knüp-
ftteppich, Abb. 45).
⁷ Erdmann, Kaiyner Teppiche, Teil I, S. 184.
⁸ Idem, Kaiyner Teppiche, Teil II, S. 63, Abb. 4.
⁹ Inv. No. 83, 571.
¹⁰ Erdmann, op. cit., S. 65, No. 8.
¹¹ Verst., American Art Association, 23. IV. 1932,
Katalog, No. 34.
¹² Erdmann, op. cit., S. 65, No. 18; s. a. Erdmann,
Hamburg, Katalog, No. 3.
¹³ In meinem Aufsatz Kaiyner Teppiche, Teil II,
S. 61, habe ich zuerst auf das Vorkommen von solchen
Kelchen auf einem Berliner Teppich (loc. cit., Abb. 3)
hingewiesen. Inzwischen konnte ich feststellen, dass
auch auf dem grossen Fragment des Musée des Arts
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S. 218f., Kat. No. 30. Osmanenteppich der Samm-14 O.T., Taf. 68, No. 86.
15 Unveröffentlicht. Depot III/31. Das in Spanien oder Portugal erworbene, etwa 100 x 100 cm messende Fragment ist verbrannt.
16 Unveröffentlicht.
17 E.O.R., No. 21.
19 Erdmann, Museen, Abb. 6; Erdmann, Hamburg, Katalog, No. 18 (mit Abb.).
20 Verst., Rom, 21.—27. IV., 1902, Katalog, No. 256, Taf. 25.
21 Erdmann, Katalog, No. 10, Abb. 15.
23 Dieses Stück kenne ich nicht.
24 Verst., 15./16. XII., 1924, Katalog, No. 105 (230 x 250 cm).

S. 220, Kat. No. 33. Teppich mit kleinteiliger Quadrierung im Museo Bardini in Florenz. Der Teppich ist mit vier zu acht Quadraten das grösste mir bekannte Stück dieser Gruppe. Ein Teppich im Kunstgewerbemuseum in Köln³² hat 5 × 7, der der Islamischen Abteilung im Berlin³³ 4 × 7 Quadrate, 4 × 6 Quadrate zeigte ein Teppich bei Benguinet³⁴ 4 × 5 ein Stück im Besitz der L. Bernheimer K.G. in München.³⁵ 4 Quadrate in der Breite hat auch der Teppich der Sammlung Kronenburg,³⁶ der aber in der Länge nicht erhalten ist. 3 × 6 Quadrate hatte ein Teppich, der sich vor dem letzten Kriege im westdeutschen Kunsthandel befand.³⁷ 3 × 4 ein Stück im Berliner Schlossmuseum.³⁸

S. 219f., Kat. No. 32. Teppich mit kleinteiliger Quadrierung in der Sammlung Piero Barbiere in Genua (Abb. 16). Bei den Teppichen von kleinem Format finden sich die Anordnungen 3 × 3, 2 × 3 und 1 × 3. 3 × 3 Quadrate zeigen Teppiche bei Hollitscher³⁹, Mounsey,⁴⁰ Pohlmann⁴¹ und im Kunsthistorischen Museum,⁴² die aufmerksam gemacht, der sich früher im Kunstgewerbemuseum in Dresden gemacht.⁴³ Die Anordnung 2 × 3 ist die häufigste. Als Beispiele: Williams Collection,⁴⁴ zwei Stücke auf der Versteigerung Volpi 1910,⁴⁵ Versteigerung G. Hirth 1918,⁴⁶ Tucher 1925,⁴⁷ Dr. Schmidt-Dumont, Berlin⁴⁸ und im Hamburger Kunsthandel 1950.⁴⁹ 1 × 3 Quadrate zeigt ein Teppich der Ballard Collection, St. Louis.⁵⁰ Der Teppich der Sammlung Barbiere ist insofern ein Unikum, als er in der mittleren Reihe nur ein Quadrat zwischen sehr breiten Eckfüllungen zeigt. Hier liegt eine interessante Wechselwirkung zwischen Anatolien und Kairo⁵¹ vor. Dass die Teppiche mit kleinteiliger Quadrierung von Anatolien beeinflusst sind, ist lange erkannt worden. Nicht nur die Formen zeigen das deutlich, vermutlich ist auch die Vereinfachung der komplizierten Gruppierungsmuster der eigentlichen Mamlukenteppiche zur einfachen Quadrierung auf anatolische Einflüsse zurückzuführen. Auf der anderen Seite lässt sich nachweisen, dass die "Holbeinteppiche" mit gruppiender Anordnung der Quadrate auf die Mamlukenteppiche zurückgehen.⁵²

Vielleicht ist der Teppich der Sammlung Barbiere das Ergebnis einer rückläufigen Beeinflussung der späten Kairener-Teppiche durch "Holbeinteppiche" mit gruppierten Quadraten. Bei dieser Gelegenheit sei auf einen einzigartigen Teppich in Düsseldorf bemerkt, der sich früher im Kunstgewerbemuseum in Düsseldorf befand (Abb. 17)⁵³. Es handelt sich bei dem Stück um die westanatolische Kopie eines kleinteilig quadrierten Kairener Teppichs, bei der das Muster auf ein kleineres Format umgezeichnet ist.⁵⁴

²⁹ Siehe Anm. 12 auf Seite 584.
³⁰ Vers., 1910, Katalog, No. 173.
³³ Erdmann, Orientteppiche, Abb. 34.
³⁵ Erdmann, Hamburg, Katalog, No. 13.
³⁶ Abb. Ars Islamica, vol. 4 (1937), S. 204, Abb. 3.
³⁷ Unveröffentlicht.
³⁸ Unveröffentlicht, Inv. No. 76, 1557.
³⁹ Ver., Cassirer, Berlin, 23. V., 1928, Katalog, No. 53.
⁴⁰ K.-T., Taf. 47.
⁴² Unveröffentlicht, Inv. No. 3689.
⁴³ E.O.R., No. 10.
⁴⁴ Katalog, Nos. 96 und 103, Taf. 83 und 84.
⁴⁵ Katalog, No. 872, Taf. 121.
⁴⁶ Ver., Berlin, 8, XII., 1925, Katalog, No. 23, Taf. 6.
⁴⁷ Unveröffentlicht.
⁴⁸ Erdmann, Hamburg, Katalog, No. 16.
⁴⁹ No. 82.
⁵⁰ Wenn die Teppiche dieser Gruppe überhaupt in Kairo gemacht sind, Dazu B.-K., 4, S. 75ff.
⁵¹ Siehe S. 584, Anm. 3.
⁵² Erdmann, Museen, S. 409, Abb. 7.
⁵³ Ein ähnliches Stück befindet sich im Museum islamischer Kunst in Kairo, Dazu B.-K., 4, S. 76, Abb. 55.
Zu und 4, Teppich Ausstattung liner Müzesi leiten.®®

misst. ist sich gesprochen, Wulff, Blütenmustern werbungen 1930, (etwa 586 Quadraten 5 gehören gelber Musterung und Unveröffentlicht. Katalog, Neuerwerbungen Erdmann, Ausstellung, Z.

®® Der Berliner Ushak-Gebetsteppich®® hat dunkelblauen, nicht schwarzen Grund.


®® S. 229ff., Kat. No. 35 bis 41. "Holbeinteppiche" mit gelber Musterverfütterung auf rotem Grund. No. 37 und 38 gehören mit 500×240 und 515×260 cm zu den grössten Stückern dieser Art. Grösser sind die Teppiche No. 700 (etwa 700×300 cm) und 702 (etwa 600×280 cm) im Türk ve İslam Esærleri Müzesi in Istanbul,®® der Teppich der Sammlung Wulf, Kopenhagen (585×262 cm),®® und ein Teppich im Besitz von Kelekian (780×255 cm).®® Zu No. 35 befindet sich ein ähnliches Stück in der

54 Siehe meine Anm. 23 genannte Arbeit.
55 Erdmann, Orientteppiche, Abb. 39.
57 Z. M. Hasson, Moslem art in the Foudj I. University Museum, Cairo, 1950, Taf. 95.
59 Unveröffentlicht.
60 Katalog, Taf. 7.
61 Ausstellung, Chicago, 1926, Katalog, No. 39.


S. 233ff. Von den Ushak-Teppichen im engeren Sinne (Katalog, 42–51) sind No. 43, 46, 47, 48 normale Stücke, wie sie noch häufig vorkommen. No. 44 (Abb. 9) zeigt im mittleren Medaillon eine Füllung aus gereihten Blüten, die mir nur noch einmal bekannt ist bei einem geringer gezeichneten, späteren Teppich im Besitz von Dr. L. D. van Hengel in Arnhem.®® Dass No. 42 aus dem Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts, also der älteste Ushak sein soll, halte ich für ausgeschlossen. Viele beruht sich auf Bode,®® weist aber selber daraufhin, dass die Borte typisch für "Holbeinteppiche" des späteren

®® No. 70.
®® Unveröffentlicht.
®® No. 37.
®® Ausstellung, Delft, 1949, Katalog, No. 79.

Von den Ushak-Gebsteppichen mit gegenständigen Nischen (Katalog, No. 49-51) ist No. 50 ein normales Stück mit der für die späten Beispiele dieser reizvollen Gruppe üblichen Wolkenbandborte, nur dass das Medaillon nicht ganz in der Mitte sitzt. No. 49 (Abb. 18) zeigt, worauf auch 69 Die aber auch gelegentlich bei späten Ushaks (z. B. Ballard, New York, No. 27) vorkommt.
70 Erdmann, Orientteppiche, Abb. 42.
71 Erdmann, Der orientalische Knüpfeppich, Abb. 144.
72 C. Meyer-Pünther, Der Orientteppich in Geschichte, Kunst, Gewerbe und Handel, Zürich, 1917, No. 7279.
73 Verst., Helbing, München, 29. X., 1910.
75 Ausstellung, Chicago, 1926, Katalog, No. 38.
76 E.O.R., No. 18.

S. 240. Der erst kürzlich aus der Sammlung Pisa ins Museo Nazionale del Bargello in Florenz gekommene "Vogelteppich" (Katalog, No. 54) ist mit 490×240 cm eines der grössten und schönsten Stücke dieser Gattung. Er bildet mit den Teppichen ehemals Sammlung Bode, ehemals K. Zander, später A. Cassirer, in der Universität zu Krakau
77 Viale spricht von den "spazi per posare i piedi," womit er die Flächen rechts und links der Aufwölbung meinen will. Damit hat er praktisch Recht, nur glaube ich nicht, dass es der Sinn der Aufwölbung ist, den Standort der Füße des Betenders zu markieren. Solche Markierungen, die häufig sind, haben immer die Form von Fußspuren.
78 B.-K., 4. S. 44. Abb. 27.
80 No. 28.
81 Unveröffentlicht.
82 K. Erdmann, Teppicherwerbungen der Islamischen Abteilung, Berliner Museen, vol. 64 (1943), S. 5-17, Abb. 10 und 11.
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J. Ferrandes Torres² sich über die wahre Größe des Teppichs nicht klar war.

Damit bin ich am Ende angelangt, sowohl des Kataloges, wie auch der Besprechung, die eigentlich keine Besprechung ist, denn dem aufmerksamen Leser wird nicht entgangen sein, dass ich in fast allen Punkten derselben Meinung bin wie der Verfasser.⁷ Ich möchte sie daher lieber als eine Ergänzung bezeichnen, die ich ihm als Dank für seine schöne Arbeit widme.


KURT ERDMANN


Students of Sasanian art, archaeology, and history in general and of Sasanian numismatics in particular will welcome the second chapter of this volume, a contribution by Robert Göbl entitled "Aufbau der Münzprägung" (pp. 51-128, with 23 tables, one plate and a map).¹ It represents the first serious attempt to provide a manageable and systematically planned handbook of Sasanian coinage since the great pioneers were active in this difficult field during the second half of the nineteenth century. The so-called "standard" work on the subject is F. D. J. Paruck's ponderous and, in many respects, unsatisfactory Sasanian coins, published in 1924. W. H. Valentine's Sasanian coins (1921) is elementary and superficial. Within the last 25 years several important contributions have appeared, but none of them is comprehensive in scope. R. Vasmer's notes on Sasanian coins in the Ermitage (Numismatic Chronicle, 1928) deal only with rare

⁶ Siehe Anm. 4.
⁷ Im Gegensatz zu meiner Survey Besprechung in Ars Islamica, vol. 8 (1941), S. 121-191, die zu meinem Bedauern niemals eine Antwort gefunden hat und offenbar von nur sehr wenigen gelesen wurde.
¹ No. 27.
¹ Also issued separately as an offprint for personal use.
specimens down to the time of Shapur II. Ernst Herzfeld’s provocative paper on mint marks (1938) was no more than an assemblage of workshop notes; in other books and articles he made frequent use of the coins chiefly in iconographical contexts. The treatment of Sasanian coinage in the *Survey of Persian art* was inadequate. John Walker’s admirable catalogue of Arab-Sasanian coins in the British Museum (1941) is comprehensive and indispensable, but its relevance is of course limited to the post-Sasanian period. Kurt Erdmann’s thorough study of the development of Sasanian crowns (in *Ars Islamica*, 1951) relates only to that aspect of the iconography.

Goëbl’s “Aufbau” is admittedly a “Versuch, dem Wesen der sasannischen Münzprägung näherrzukommen.” The author recognizes both the limitations of the material at his disposal and the elementary state of our knowledge of many facets of Sasanian numismatics. Numerous problems remain to be solved, problems which are both explicit and implicit in Goëbl’s treatment of the subject; the simple statement of their existence should stimulate investigation of them and lead to their eventual solution. Meanwhile we have here the most serviceable handbook that has yet appeared.

After a brief survey of the existing literature the author discusses the portraiture, reverse types, legends, and symbols (pp. 56–75), and then takes up the thorny question of mints and mint marks (pp. 75–93). He reduces de Morgan’s and Paruck’s excessive lists of mint signatures to 79 and consolidates these into about 55 putative mints. Here and elsewhere he leans heavily on Herzfeld’s often undeveloped intuitions. He is in agreement with Walker in the identification of many of the mints, but the student will notice deviations from some of the latter’s controversial hypotheses: for example, he gives BBA to Ctesiphon, where it probably belongs, and solves the enigmas presented by this mint signature toward the close of the Sasanian political period by considering it “später ambulant”; BH he assigns to Balkh(?), not to Bihqobadh; he eliminates SK, consolidating it with SD, and adopts de Morgan’s (to this reader improbable) identification with Sudd(?) in Khorasan. Some signatures seem to be missing: where, for example, is NAH, unless it has been assimilated to NIH? And the common SHI(?), which Walker tentatively assigned to Shiraz, unless it is included with SB (No. 64), which is certainly a distinct symbol? There are many other dubious points in this section, but only a saint could tackle these problems and emerge unscathed. The author is not without confidence that all problems eventually will be solved. See, for example, p. 92 and the footnote on p. 124, both with reference to the dilemma presented by Bistâm’s (spelled Bistâm in table 11) Rai issues: “doch bin ich überzeugt ... eine annehmbare Lösung finden zu können.”

A few pages (93–100) are devoted to a discussion of denominations, metrology, and hoards, and the rest of the chapter (pp. 101–124) deals in specific detail with the coinage of each of the Sasanian rulers. The final pages are explanatory to the useful tables, 12 of which give in synoptic form the known issues of each ruler, listing mint and regnal year after these details begin to appear on the reverses (the author distinguishes between specimens which he has verified by actual handling and those reported by Paruck and others). Obviously these lists must be considered tentative. The publications of large collections will add new data: as a single example, Burân’s four mints can be increased to at least six. The 11 remaining tables portray the crowns, reverse types, and symbols of each ruler. These will be of special interest to students of Sasanian art. They are much more complete than Herzfeld’s and Erdmann’s and present many more varieties than one might have imagined to exist. Some of the sketches are less faithful than others; for example the drawing of Narsesch’s second type fails notably to bring out the sprigs which are so characteristic and which lend so much charm to his crown. The decision to omit from these drawings any elements of portraiture and coiffure was unfortunate, at least in this reader’s opinion, for it is often difficult to distinguish among some of the crowns without the assistance given by the facial features and hair. The single plate illustrating 26 coins (unlappily reduced from natural size) is scarcely adequate.
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There are few enough workers in this very rich field of archaeology, and one may hope that Göbl will continue his research and eventually produce the authoritative work on the subject. As it is, we are much in his debt for a conscientious beginning.

GEORGE C. MILES


This work is a catalogue of the Arab-Sasanian (and some other) coins in the collection of the Cabinet des Médailles. The text is in mimeographed form. The plates consist of glossy photographic prints of somewhat uneven quality; the majority of the reproductions are gratifyingly legible, but as the photographer appears not to have taken into account the different shades of the individual specimens, many of the photographs are so dark that they can be read only with difficulty. At all events, students of Arab-Sasanian numismatics will welcome this important addition to the illustrated corpus: 96 coins of the Umayyad governors, 68 of ʿTabaristan, 48 ʿAbbāsid and related coins of Bukhāra, and 12 Arab-Sasanian bronzes. The specimens in the collection include: (a) those already published by Lavoix in the first volume of the Catalogue des monnaies musulmanes; (b) those presented by J. de Morgan and (c) by Allotte de la Fuýe; and (d) coins from the Susa excavations.

The text, unfortunately, adds little to our understanding of this difficult branch of numismatics; it is indeed a disappointment “à ceux qui prendront la peine de contrôler les lectures et les classements ici soumis à la critique” (to use the words of M. Jean Babelon’s foreword). In fact the reader is advised to use the text only with great caution. Not only does it fail to make any new contribution, but mistakes in attribution and description abound. This is not the place to record the errors in detail, but a few examples may be cited: No. 1 is a coin of Khosrau II, not an Arab-Sasanian coin at all (hence all the observations on p. 11 are irrelevant); the mint of No. 13 is AP (not “mois de Safar”); No. 70 is not a coin of “Talha ibn ’Abdullāh,” but of al-Qaṭārī b. al-Fujāʾa; numerous dates are misread; the readings of the Arabic legends seem to suggest that the author is not at all at home in this aspect of the subject; ʿrabbaʾ is omitted wherever it occurs; ʿālāʾ illā biʾillāhi is rendered “ʿālāʾ illāʾ illāh”; ʾillāhi al-ḥanīd is “ʿAllāh Mohammed”; ʿal-ʾizāh ʾillāhi is “ʿAl-Azzahu ʾillāh”), etc., etc. The verbose general introduction (pp. 1–7) and the preamble to the sketchily described bronze section (pp. 64–66) are quite without substance. In connection with the issues of Bukhāra no notice is taken (p. 55) of R. N. Frye’s monograph and supplementary notes on the early coinage of Transoxiana.

An “Annexe—Monnaies de cuivre du Khazarism” (pp. 70–76), illustrated by plate XIV, has, as the author admits, nothing to do with the subject and is included only on the basis of a hypothetical and very tenuous connection between the coinages of Bukhāra and Khwārizm.

GEORGE C. MILES


This stimulating and lucidly written book treats of the age-long coexistence of Jews and Arabs from their first contacts down to modern times. It reviews the whole range of this symbiosis, especially during the Muslim Middle Ages, in particular how it affected social and economic conditions and every phase of intellectual activity, including language, religion, and law. The author is well qualified to delve into this complex subject, as he is an expert in both Arabic and Judaic studies and has been for many decades living in Palestine, where he is now Chairman of the School of Oriental Studies in the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. For this work he makes use not only of the researches of earlier scholars but also of his own extensive experience in this field. The book is particularly enriched by his knowledge of the Geniza material, from the vast archives in Arabic and Hebrew which have been discovered in a lumber room next to a synagogue in Fustāṭ and in the nearby cemetery of al-Baṣṭīn, where these papers had been placed in dead storage, following the custom of not destroying any documents in which the name of God may be found. The author’s studies of the Yemenite Jews,

1 Shortened from Beth Geniza, literally “house of concealment.”

2 The author has recently given a general account of the Geniza material in his The Cairo Geniza as a
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a very conservative group which for centuries lived in an Arab milieu of a thoroughly mediaeval character, also provided valuable source material.

Interesting as this book might seem to readers of Ars Orientalis, the question will quite naturally be asked why it should be reviewed here. The answer to this is, of course, that Jews in this region have since antiquity been engaged in many crafts. In the Muslim period they monopolized certain fields such as dyeing, or took a large or active part in others, such as gold- and silver-smithing, weaving, embroidering and glassmaking. In addition Professor Goitein reveals quite a number of facts which were not known, since they have only recently been discovered by him in the Geniza material. They bring further proof that in spite of the general Islamic character of the mediaeval civilization of the Near East, a certain percentage of its artisans did not belong to the religion of the ruling majority. That some of the contributions by non-Muslim craftsmen were made by Christians has often been observed, but the Jewish share is less frequently considered. The data presented by Professor Goitein do not cover every aspect of artistic activity of Jews living in Muslim countries; it is, however, obvious that the author is familiar with all this material but had to restrict himself to a number of characteristic examples to demonstrate certain points in his book.

Although most of his references pertain to the high point of Muslim and Jewish culture, that is, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and in particular to Egypt and nearby areas, other periods and countries are also referred to. In the Umayyad palace of Khirbat al-Mafjar, an artisan, probably a member of the forced-labor contingent, scribbled Hebrew and Arabic letters on a tablet, thus to all appearances indicating that a Jewish craftsman was at that time anxious to learn Arabic (p. 101). If it should ever be possible to single out a feature of Jewish character in this building complex, it could be attributed to this workman. A different documentary aspect is presented by the fact that in Old Cairo one of the synagogues was called “that of the Iraqians,” proving that a large part of the Jewish population was of foreign origin, just as there had been a parallel influx of many Iraqi Muslims into Egypt, because that country had developed from an agricultural province into the commercial center of the Muslim world. This naturally helps to explain the sudden appearance of Iraqi elements in the art of Egypt (p. 113).

Particularly valuable are the data contained in the letters and documents from the Geniza, even though they are referred to only in a general manner. The author points to the many catalogues of private libraries in Egypt and other Arabic-speaking countries which contain details about the quality of paper and bindings (p. 92). Very little is known about these materials, so new documentary information will be valuable, especially as it might be possible to correlate it with surviving examples. Even more intriguing are the lists of dresses, ornaments, and furniture which were brought in by brides (p. 94). They naturally could provide us with new data about the material culture of the eleventh-twelfth century. Surprising also is the information provided by the documents pertaining to the India trade. According to them, silks were exported from Egypt to India (p. 82) and Qashi robes taken along by merchants to pay the customs duties at the various ports on the way to India. Reference is also made to silversmiths, two of them from North Africa, who emigrated to Ceylon; and other documents show that the head of the Jewish community in the Yemen encouraged Jewish goldsmiths to settle there (pp. 22, 115, 209). A Tunisian Jew ran a factory for brass vessels whose beauty was described and which were made by Jews with Arabic names, possibly from the Yemen (p. 209). Some of the copper and brass vessels made in India

source for the history of Muslim civilization, Studia Islamica, fasc. 3 (1955), pp. 75-91.

About the recent discovery of a Mamluk miniature of the mid-fourteenth century in the Fustat Geniza, see the article by Sofie Walzer, An illustrated leaf from a lost Mamluk Kalilah wa-Dimnah manuscript, in the present volume of Ars Orientalis (vol. 2 [1956], pp. 503-505).

---

3 Two such lists have already been published in Richard Gottheil and William H. Worrell, Fragments from the Cairo Genizah in the Freer Collection, New York, 1927, pp. 179-187 (document No. 40) and pp. 219-223 (document No. 45). Goitein has pointed out that this pioneer edition now needs revision (From the Mediterranean to India, Documents on the trade to India, South Arabia, and East Africa from the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Speculum, vol. 29 [1954], p. 184).
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were then shipped to Cairo where they served, for instance, as presents to business partners, who were so pleased to get these objects that often they sent the raw material there for their manufacture. On the other hand, the West exported to the East besides the raw material also old metal vessels.

Since Professor Goitein’s book is of a more popular nature, although written for an educated public, it has unfortunately no footnotes which could direct the more interested reader to the edited documents and a discussion thereof. It is true that there is a selected bibliography but it contains only books of a general nature and does not include articles in which the detailed information can be found. To show just one example of how valuable such a specific investigation can be, we should like to give here a résumé of such an article, inasmuch as it was published in a periodical where students of Muslim art are not likely to look for information.

Here Goitein discusses a letter apparently from the turn of the tenth to the eleventh century, that is, the reign of the Fātimid caliph, al-Ḥakim. The writer was a Karaite Jew living in Damascus. According to him the artisans of his profession (that of weavers) were Jews and because they were all Rabbanites, the religious ill-feeling between the two groups had led to the Karaite being denounced to the “officer for recruiting to forced labor” (mutawallī l‘isti‘māl). This action had resulted in his being forced, for the last two years, to serve in a caliphal ūrah workshop, without being able to move to another place to escape personal hardships. In his tale of woe this weaver does not, however, complain about the wages received, which makes Goitein conclude that the payment must have been adequate, or at least not outrageously low, most probably because each artisan was paid for what he actually produced. The objective of this particular letter was to obtain, by way of two intermediaries, an order from the caliph in Cairo which would have exempted the writer from all forced labor. This letter gives, therefore, proof of the existence of an official ūrah factory in Damascus at the turn of the tenth to the eleventh century. This in itself is interesting, since so far no Damascus ūrah seems to have come to light and we know of such workshops only from the account of Idrīsī, more than 150 years later. In addition, owing to this letter we now have more specific data about the organizational and social aspects of a Damascus industry. In his discussion Goitein gives us some further information on the subject. Thus a member of the family heading the Jewish community of Yemen in the eleventh century had a gold-threaded muslin robe woven for himself in Cairo with his full name embroidered on it. This shows that private persons could have their names applied to their gowns. Goitein even tentatively suggested that a preserved robe made for a certain untitled Abū Naṣr in Baghdad may have been woven for the chief intermediary to whom the Damascus Karaite applied, since this man was called Shaykh Abū Naṣr al-Tustārī—an influential merchant and banker who belonged to a well-known south Persian family which for some time had lived in Baghdad before settling in Cairo. The author also throws some new light on the pre-Islamic history of the ūrah institution. He points out that, according to the Babylonian Talmud, the rabbis of Mesopotamia wore robes which were signed with (or had badges of?) the name of the exilarch, i.e., the secular head of the Jewish community, most probably in imitation of the custom in the Sasanian court, whose practices have long been regarded as the immediate prototype of the Muslim ūrah. There is also a Talmudic reference to the “head of the embroiderers of the king,” a title which in its Aramaic form, rēš ūrahā de-malkā, uses a word with the same root as ūrah.

This résumé of Goitein’s more detailed treatment of a single Geniza document underscores what was already indicated in his Jews and Arabs, namely, that there are certain scarcely tapped documentary sources from which we can expect new light on the history of art in the Muslim world. We are therefore

---

4 For all these details, see also the article quoted in the last footnote.
7 It will be recalled that Mas‘ūdī and Ibn Khaldūn, when speaking of the Sasanian prototype of the Muslim ūrah, mention portraits of the rulers on their garments or carpets (Serjeant, *op.cit.*, vol. 9 [1942], pp. 60–62); the Talmudic reference, however, speaks only of names, very much like the later Muslim version.
looking forward to another specialized investigation by the author, this time dedicated to the archaeological aspect of the Geniza material, a study which we are sure will be very fruitful.

RICHARD ETTINGHAUSEN


This handsome publication is the catalogue of the Budapest Museum. A short introduction relates the history of this museum and its collections, starting with Francis Hopp, an optician, who was born in Moravia in 1833, went around the world five times, and assembled some 4,000 objects which, together with his house, he left to the state in 1919. Since that time many objects have come to the museum by gift and bequest and others were purchased by Zoltán F. Takáts (formerly known as Z. de Takacs), who was director from 1919 until 1948, in Europe and also, in 1936, in the Far East. The present director and author spent the six war years in Japan.

During the siege of Budapest the museum was seriously damaged and lost over 900 objects. However, more gifts and bequests have since been added, purchases have been made out of the five-year-plan budget, and transfers have been received from other museums, so that the collection has now more than doubled. Another building had to be added to the premises of the museum, which now belongs to the Museum of Industrial Arts.

Exhibitions of Three Thousand Years of the Art of China (for Stalin's 70th birthday), Art of Old Korea, Art of India, and Arts of Further India and Indonesia were held in 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1953 respectively.

The "Description of Figures" is carefully done and contains historical data as well as aesthetic appreciation for educational purposes. The 112 objects have their origins in China, Siberia, Korea, Japan, India and Pakistan, Nepal, Tibet, Siam, Java, Turkey, Egypt, and Iran; the majority are Chinese and Japanese.

However, the rather ambitious title, The art of Asia (the subtitle does not appear on the cover), is not borne out by the contents of the book. The collection is not representative of the art of Asia, not even of her decorative arts, which it seems to emphasize, and though it contains a certain number of good pieces, the average quality is not too high. Nearly all the Japanese pieces date from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Most of the Chinese items are products of the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties but do not represent the best that these periods produced, particularly in painting and porcelain.

As far as I can judge from the illustrations, I would like to point out the fine seventeenth-century portrait of a Chinese official's wife (figs. 14-15); a good Chia-ching carved red lacquer box (figs. 29 to 30); the late Ming carved wood official (fig. 38); the painted Koryo vase, a donation from the Academy of Sciences of the Korean People's Democratic Republic (fig. 43); very good Japanese prints from the Vay collection, acquired in 1906 (figs. 55 to 60); the lovely Japanese ivory girl by Hosei (fig. 78); a fine medieval Orissa head, given by I. Schwaiger, who was a dealer in Delhi (fig. 90); a beautiful Pala-Sena Vishnu head, donated in 1864 (figs. 92-94); two very fine early Nepalese gilt-bronze sculptures from Mr. Schwaiger (figs. 99 to 100), and a lovely seventeenth-century Turkish glazed tile (fig. 109).

The Ordos tiger plaque (fig. 5) looks somewhat suspicious and in any case is a clumsy piece. The bronze axe (fig. 6) probably is a late cast, perhaps of the Ming dynasty altogether, especially if the relief inscription is cast, as seems to be the case. The wooden Kuan-yin (fig. 9) could be early Ming. The interesting Ming bear-shaped "arrow holder" (fig. 33) perhaps was used as a target for the game of throwing arrows or darts. The bronze unicorn on drum (fig. 34) probably is as late as the seventeenth century. Also the bronze sage wearing a pigtail (fig. 36) may be from that time. We could do without the carved ivory balls (fig. 37). The dry lacquer figure (fig. 47) should be dated eighth century. It could also represent a Yakushi who displays the same mudrās (abhaya and vara) as Shaka. But if it never had an uṣṇīśa, it probably is Miroku after all, in view of the hairdo, and perhaps once wore a metal crown. Figure 48 could be Shaka or Yakushi. The gray terracottas, figures 82 and 83, are from the Sunga period.
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38*

Though the material published in this book is not too important, the catalogue is well done and a welcome contribution.

Aschwin Lippe


In the summer of 1954 the City of Venice staged an important exhibition of Chinese art to commemorate the 700th anniversary of the birth of her famous son Marco Polo.

The exhibition, held under the patronage of the President of the Italian Republic and with the Mayor of Venice as its president, was an ambitious enterprise, showing 951 objects of Chinese Art, nearly all of which are illustrated in this handsome catalogue, four in full-page reproductions, two more in color plates, another yet in color on the cover. The executive committee of the exhibition consisted of Professor Giuseppe Tucci as President, Professor Guglielmo de Angelis d’Ossat and Dr. Alberto Giuganino as Vice Presidents, and Jean-Pierre Dubosc as Commissioner General. Dr. Pietro Zampetti was director of the exhibition.

The catalogue begins with a preface in Italian by Professor Angelo Spanio, the Mayor of Venice; the rest of the book is done in Italian and English. There follows an introduction, historical and aesthetic, which is brilliantly and perceptively written by A. Giuganino.

After this we come to the catalogue itself, written by Jean-Pierre Dubosc. It begins with an introduction to the exhibition which briefly summarizes the history of Western appreciation of Chinese art and points out the purposes of the show, its highlights and weak points as well as its deliberate omissions. Chronological tables, maps, a note on the rubbings and a short typology of bronze forms and decoration motifs, followed by a bibliography, lead us to the descriptive catalogue, which begins with the bronzes.

In this first group of 163 items the early bronzes are extraordinarily well represented. The splendid pieces from the Lochow collection are particularly outstanding. They are complemented by very fine loans from Ambassador A. J. Argyropoulos, Dr. G., Sir Herbert and Lady Ingram, and others. There are beautiful inlaid belt hooks, etc., from Dr. N. D. T. Wessén, Mr. and Mrs. Desmond Gure, and others, a splendid tiger head from the Cologne Museum, mirrors from H. M. the King of Sweden and Dr. F. Vannotti, and lovely small animals from Mr. and Mrs. F. Mayer.

The section on jades begins with a note on their use and ornamentation, with bibliography; it contains 71 pieces from the Shang through the Ming dynasty. Among the lenders I mention H. M. the King of Sweden, Mr. F. Caro, and Mr. and Mrs. Gure. All 16 of the early glass pieces (Chou through T’ang) are from the Kempe collection.

Sculpture in stone was not one of the strong points of the show. About half a dozen pieces, mainly from Sweden, are listed here; a few more, from Italy, are described in a later section of the catalogue. The Buddhist bronzes are much better represented, by loans from Mr. and Mrs. Mayer, Marquis Lanza d’Ajeta, Professor Sirén, Mrs. Seligman, and anonymous private Italian collectors.

Fine gold and silver work (14 items), mainly from the T’ang dynasty, was lent by Dr. Kempe and various English and American collectors. The large section on ceramics (about 450 pieces) is again preceded by a short historical and technical introduction with bibliography. The selection ranges from prehistoric times through the Ming dynasty. There are fine funerary ceramics from various museums and private collections, T’ang polychrome ware (Bristol Art Gallery, et al.), nearly 20 pieces of T’ang white porcelain and porcelaneous ware from the Kempe collection, about a dozen pieces of Yüeh ware (beginning with the Six Dynasties) from the Ingram collection; all the famous Sung wares with splendid specimens from the Ingram, David, Clark, Kempe, Bristol, and other collections.

I have to point out the famous lung-ch’üan bowl (No. 438) of the Cassel Museum, with a gilt-silver mount made before 1453. This vessel, recorded in inventories since 1594 (perhaps as early as 1515), is, to our knowledge, the first Celadon that ever reached the West. Another famous piece, kept in the treasury of the New College of Oxford, was booty from a Spanish ship destined for Philip II’s court. The English considered it such a rare gem that they had it mounted in gold. The Oxford bowl was not exhibited in Venice, but there were several
other pieces of comparable interest. I mention the little ying-ch'ing vase (No. 565) from the treasury of the Basilica di San Marco, which is said, by tradition, to have been brought to Venice by Marco Polo himself. The Bologna Museum lent a blue-and-white bowl with a silver-gilt mount, the inscription of which relates that it was given by King John III of Portugal to Cardinal Zambecari in 1554. Another blue-and-white bowl, lent by the Museo Duca di Martina of Naples, is decorated with a Portuguese coat-of-arms and inscription; the latter states that it was made in 1541 for Pero da Faria.

The selection of Yüan and early Ming underglaze reds and blue-and-whites, more than 80 pieces, mainly from British collections, is quite extraordinary and one of the highlights of the exhibition.

All the lacquers, Han and Ming dynasties, come from the unique Low-Beer collection; the Ming cloisonnés from England.

Among the textiles I mention a T'ang silk gauze fragment from the W. R. Nelson Gallery, a Sung k'o-ssu (reproduced in color on the cover) from the Textile Museum in Washington, D. C., and the Yüan damask from the Dantzig Marienkirche, now in the Lübeck Lutherkirche.

The description of the paintings (about 120 in number) is again preceded by an introduction. Here, as well as in the descriptive part, the Japanese terms “makemono” (it should be “makimono”) and “kakemono” are used for hand scroll and hanging scroll, which are preferable terms. Owing to circumstances beyond the control of the exhibition organization, the selection of paintings is incomplete and uneven. Especially the Sung and Yüan periods could not be sufficiently well represented: the Chinese Government's national treasures are not available; Japan sent only a few indifferent pictures; the museums in this country either do not have the legal right to lend or are naturally reluctant to let their relatively few early masterpieces, precious and fragile, leave their roof, let alone travel overseas; in Europe, the former Berlin State Museum collection (now Kunstgutlager Celle) is perhaps the only one to possess an appreciable number of good early paintings. More than three-quarters of the pictures exhibited are the works of the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties. And we notice another significant fact: of 94 Ming and Ch'ing paintings, 80 are either in the Dubosc collection or were formerly part of it (now Musée Guimet and Dr. Vannotti). It is encouraging to see how much one man has achieved in the promotion of knowledge and appreciation of Chinese painting. At the same time, however, this provenance makes for a certain narrowness in scope. An individual collection, even the very best, will generally not represent all the wide and long stream of artistic expression. Mr. Dubosc has concentrated, as a collector, on the literary painters of the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties, who indeed represent the main current and are the most important artists of the later centuries. In this he also has followed the example of the Chinese collectors of recent times. This is all the more fortunate, as the so-called later Chinese painters had been and in part still are unduly neglected by Western connoisseurs. However, a selection like this, in the context of the Venice show which, after all, tried to represent all important and great aspects of Chinese art, is not wholly satisfactory.

Among the earlier paintings I would like to draw attention to the banners from Tun-huang (Musée Guimet) and the lovely album leaves attributed to Chung-jen and Han Jo-cho (Celle). There is a Ma Yüan album leaf (Boston) and a fragment of the well-known figure scroll after Chou Wen-chü (Sir Percival David). A K'o Chiu-ssu bamboo painting (C. C. Wang) is representative of this typical Yüan subject, while the Chu Yü scroll (Chicago) illustrates the daily life of the Mongol period. A picture attributed to Ch'en Hsüan (Metropolitan Museum of Art) shows a traditional style. The great landscapists are not represented.

As to the “later” painters, there is the Detroit Shen Chou with Wang Ao calligraphy; the delicate Ch'iu Ying of H. C. Weng; a good Tung Ch'i-ch'ang album (Dubosc) and hanging scroll (Caro); an interesting Ting Yün-p'eng (Dubosc), and a fine Ch'en Hung-shou album (Dubosc).

I also liked Dubosc's Wang Chien and his large Wang Hui of 1692, as well as the small one from the Imperial collection (Vannotti). Wang Yüan-ch'i is particularly well represented, especially by the landscape of 1712 (Guimet). Among the individualists, I want to point out the large Kung Hsien (Caro) and the lovely Tao-chi album (H. C. Weng).

The next section of the catalogue describes some illustrated books of the Ming dynasty; the following section, 30 pieces of glass (T'ang or Sung through
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Ch'ing from Dr. C. Kempe and the Bristol Museum. Seven pieces of sculpture lent through IsMEO (Italian Institute for the Middle and Far East) are described next. The objects sent from Japan—a dozen paintings and nine pieces of ceramics, including a Chin or Yüan bowl with red floral design (aka-e) from the Tokyo National Museum, and a tree-leaf (konoha) temmoku bowl from Mr. Takayoshi Kamei bring us to the end of the exhibition. Incidentally, in the "Albo d'Onore dei Prestatori" (p. VI), the Commission for the Protection of Cultural Properties is by mistake called "Chiyodaku"—the name of the ward of Tokyo where its offices are located.

Indices of painters and calligraphers and of the lenders, and a table of contents round out the catalogue.

In conclusion I would say that this is a good and carefully done catalogue of an important exhibition. Its highlights are the early bronzes, the small bronze sculptures, the T'ang white porcelains, the Yüeh wares, the Kuan and the other famous Sung wares, the early blue-and-whites, the Ming lacquer and the late Ming–early Ch'ing paintings. The richness of the great English collections is in particular evidence, but there are reproduced many other European treasures which we did not know sufficiently well before. Mr. Dubosc deserves our thanks for this splendid contribution.

Aschwin Lippe


This little volume brings together about 1,000 Chinese terms, which the student will encounter when he turns to the Chinese sources in his study of art and archaeology. The general headings are metals, gems and gem stones, sculpture in stone, painting, ceramics, and miscellaneous, and each has several subheadings. Eight pages of outline drawings illustrate types of ancient bronzes, motifs of bronze decoration, ceramic shapes, and types of ritual and other jades; and there is an index of all terms listed in alphabetical order by romanization. In his preface, the author, who has recently been appointed Director of the Percival David Foundation of Chinese Art at the University of London, sets forth the purpose of his work by saying that it "is addressed both to readers of Chinese who require precise definitions of technical and conventional terms met with in current writings on art and archaeology, and also to those, already familiar with Chinese arts, crafts and antiquities, who have embarked on the study of the written language." He then goes on to a brief discussion of his sources and of the limitations he has imposed upon his work in the interest of providing "basic vocabularies to which (the student) will add in the course of his own reading." This last is important because no book of this nature is likely to be perfect or complete, and the problem is to make it useful and still keep it within manageable limits. On the whole this glossary meets those requirements. In many cases variant Chinese terms are given, and the definitions are brief and to the point. Mr. Hansford recognizes that more than a few of these terms involve complex linguistic problems and deserve extensive research, but he has confined himself here to generally accepted definitions as found in the standard works on the subject; and the fact that further study may necessitate the revision of certain interpretations is not so much a criticism of this book as a commentary on the fluid state of the whole knowledge of Chinese art and archaeology at the present time.

Anyone perusing the contents of the volume will be struck by definitions that might, in the light of his own experience, be modified in one way or another; and the specific comments offered here are not intended to constitute an exhaustive criticism of the list as a whole. They are simply suggestions relating to some of the points that caught the attention of the present reviewer. In the hope that they may to some extent enhance the usefulness of the glossary, they are set forth here under the same general headings employed by the author.

Metals

P. 2. While it is true that the precise origin of the term fa-lang or fo-lang is a matter of dispute, it seems worth mentioning that it is most generally accepted as an abbreviation of fa-lang-chi or fo-lang-chi which in turn is a phonetic transcription of the word Frank which was used over a long period of time in the Near East to designate not only natives of France but Europeans in general (cf., e.g., T'oung Pao, vol. 31, p. 69, n. 2).
P. 5. The type hui also occurs without handles.

P. 6. The preferred reading of the character 角 when used for a type of bronze vessel is ch’iu rather than chiao. The type huo also occurs without legs.

P. 7. The statement that the type yu occurs in the First Phase only is open to question. Professor Yetts defines the First Phase as including "those bronzes displaying the standards established in the Shang-Yin period" and lasting "from earliest times to the tenth century B.C." The Second Phase he describes as including "the style distinctive of Chou culture" and lasting "from the tenth century to dates which varied in different parts of the country" (The Call Chinese bronzes, p. V.). Such yu as Jung Keng’s Nos. 660 and 661 (The bronzes of Shang and Chou, vol. 2, p. 344) and an unpublished one of the same type in the Freer Gallery of Art (47.12) may well be later. Jung lists his two as Western Chou (op. cit., vol. 1, p. 421), a general dating that would permit an attribution well into Yett’s Second Phase. In any case they are decorated in a style that seems more Chou than Shang.

P. 8. The low oval cups with horizontal flanges described under pi and shang also occur in jade carving, lacquer, and pottery. Other terms for this shape are erh-pe1 耳杯 "ear cups," and jen-tien-pi1 靓臉杯, "human face cups."

P. 10. Jingles or rattles of the type nao usually have rectangular sockets surmounted by disk-shaped cages enclosing small bronze balls which rattle when the object is moved (e.g., Yetts, Eumorfopoulos Catalogue, vol. 1, pl. 67, Nos. A136–137). Another well-known type of jingle (loc. cit., No. A140) has long been associated with horse trappings and called ch’ti-ling 諂銖 or yich’ti-月題 (cf. Bull. Mus. Far East. Antiquities, vol. 17, 1945, p. 112). Recent excavations have tended to suggest that the type may rather belong to the category of archery tackle. Shih Chang-ju points to finds at Hsiao-t’un (Anyang) where these objects, associated with hand weapons in human burials, seem to have been attached to the grip of the reflex bow and calls them Fu 弩 (Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academic Sinica, vol. 22 (Taiwan, 1950), pp. 39–44; see esp. figs. 1–4, 14–15, and 32, and pls. 1–7.

P. 13. The po-shan-lu is more properly called po-shan-hsiang 薄盧.

GEMS AND GEM STONES

P. 26. The hsi, described as "a short pointed instrument said to have been used for loosening knots," has long been a puzzle. Here again the Hsiao-t’un excavations mentioned above suggest a new and more satisfying solution. Shih Chang-ju calls them mi-f§ and describes them as the nocks for bows (op. cit., pp. 36–39, esp. figs. 10–11, and pl. 5).

SCULPTURE IN STONE

Under this general heading are included, in addition to Stonecraft, Terminology of Buddhism, Bodhisattvas and Arhats, Divine Beings, Buddhist Iconography, and Taoist Gods and Immortals and their Iconography. It is not entirely clear why all these subheadings were used; the four dealing with Buddhism might all have been grouped together, especially as each is rather short; and without criticizing this glossary for a brevity which is one of its virtues, the reviewer feels bound to warn that these Buddhist sections are by far the most abbreviated in the book. The subject is covered in 12 generously spaced small octavo pages, while in the standard reference work, Oda’s Bukkyo Daijiten, the index alone covers 118 large pages of fine print set four columns to the page. Useful as this list is, so far as it goes, it must be admitted that it is hardly anything beyond an introduction to the subject; and it should also be pointed out that in spite of the fact that they are grouped under stone sculpture, these terms apply equally to painting and also to the study of Buddhist images in bronze, lacquer, wood, and other materials.

A few specific comments may be made on some of the terms listed:

P. 33. As common as pi-ch’iu for monk is the term pi-ch’iu-ni 僧 for nun; it is probably more often encountered than ni-seng, the term given. The shaman is, of course, the same as shaman now in good English usage to describe medicine men and conjurers in a number of primitive religions.

P. 37. Kuan-yin has many names, but Kuan-shih (觀) yin is probably even more common than the shorter form given.

P. 39. In the definitions of the disciples Kasyapa and Ananda it might have been useful to add that they are an old man and a youth, respectively.

P. 41. In the case of the "lion throne" the allusion
BOOK REVIEWS

599
go beyond the simple reference to "The Lion of the Śākyas" and involves the whole complex question of the lion as a symbol of kingship, both spiritual and temporal, in Eastern thought.

P. 46. Chung K'uei, rightly described as a God of Literature, is even more prominent in Chinese lore as the Demon Queller.

PAINTING

This section seems largely based on Benjamin March's Some technical terms of Chinese painting and gives about one-third of the terms included in that work which still remains the standard source on the subject. On the whole, Hansford's definitions are abbreviated from those of March. It might be noted that the upper and lower parts of the mounting of hanging scrolls, here called T'ien-ti (p. 56) are also commonly and more simply referred to as shang-hsia.

CERAMICS

This is the longest section in the book, and more than 300 terms have been brought together making a very useful glossary on the ceramic arts. Again, many more terms than these will be encountered in the reading of ceramic texts, and as the author points out in his preface, by no means all these phrases have been uniformly or satisfactorily rendered in English. Much work remains to be done in this field, but the present list makes a very worthwhile start.

P. 53. The definition given for p'ei involves a contradiction as the English word "biscuit" refers to clay that has been fired.

P. 59. An-ni is defined as "to mould, or 'throw' clay on a wheel"; but another very common term, la-p'ei 轮车拉坯, should also be included as should tsao-p'ei 造坯. These are more general terms, and to "throw" on a wheel is more specifically lun-ch'e-la-p'ei 轮车拉坯. Two important omissions under The Potter's Craft are the word mu 模 for a mould and yin 印 in the sense of "to press" or "to mould." The T'ao-shuo provides a useful example where both are used in one sentence 印模有模 (ch. 1, 68-9, 1931 reprint) which Bushell (p. 15) translates "Moulds are employed to press the moulded pieces," but which might be more simply and accurately rendered "to press the clay they have moulds."

The terminology of ceramic shapes is very confusing, and beyond such general designations as plates, dishes, cups, bowls, boxes, and certain types of jars and vases, it is difficult to say exactly what a Chinese writer may have had in mind in using a particular term. For that reason a number of the definitions given in this section (pp. 63-67) may be misleading to the beginner who relies on the illustrations (figs. 75-98) for final decisions in his translation. As the variant terms indicate, there is considerable latitude of choice at the disposal of the Chinese writer even in discussing the general categories mentioned above, but in many instances where a more particular term is used, it is still impossible to say what type of vessel is meant. A few examples from the present list may be cited:

P. 64. Kung-wan, palace bowl, is illustrated (fig. 81) by a bowl with high sides and slightly contracted mouth; but as used today in common parlance "palace bowl" has been accepted, on the authority of Brankston (Early Ming wares of Ching-le Chen, p. 46, pl. 26), to designate a delicately potted Ch'eng-hua bowl with slightly flaring lip. Hansford's figure 81, although not exactly conforming because of the contracted mouth, is closer to the shape commonly known as lioen-tzu 迦子 on account of its similarity to the seed pod of the lotus; the latter term describing a familiar early fifteenth-century type is not included in Hansford's repertory. On the same page is the well-known term ya-shou-pei, "press hand cup," generally associated with the shape of the famous white Yung-lo bowl in the Franks Collection (Brankston, op. cit., pl. 2, shows the type). Hansford equates it with the shape of his figure 84 which shows the general form of the most common type of Ming bowl; but as a matter of fact what the Chinese really meant by ya-shou-pei is not known at all.

P. 65. The term chih-ch'ui p'ing, papermallet vase, describes a type (fig. 89) also well-known by its Japanese name kinuta 金涂, and may or may not have fish handles on the sides and a wide flattened lip.

There is no need to pursue these details further, but one word of warning may be added for the benefit of those who venture for the first time into this corner of Chinese literature in search of information on shapes. Not the least of the difficulties to be encountered is that of distinguishing between
descriptions of form and descriptions of decoration. A simple example is an expression like t'ien-hua-wan 遠花碗, which may mean a bowl moulded in the shape of a lotus flower or a bowl decorated with lotus flowers or both. It is unlikely that any hard and fast rule can be established for the interpretation of such a phrase, and without an illustration to guide him the translator will be at his wits' end to put his text into sensible English.

The section on Glazes and Pigments and that on Decoration provide many useful terms and most of the definitions are good. One always hopes for new light on the difficult word ch'ing 青 (p. 68), but Hansford has not produced any (indeed it would have been in the nature of a miracle if he had), and his caution that the context is all-important in its interpretation cannot be repeated too often. No less than 12 modifications of ch'ing are listed, but they do not include the term ch'ing-pai 青白, used by Chiang Chi in his well-known memoir first published in 1932. He thus describes one of the wares produced at Ching-te Chen, and it seems likely that, in the sense of "bluish white," it refers to the type now commonly known as ying-ch'ing.1

P. 74. yin-hua is defined as "stamped or impressed decoration," but in the T'ao-shuo (ch. 3, 1r 1r, 1931 reprint) it is used to describe the decoration of the Yuan dynasty ware known as shu-fu 榜府 (which is missing from Hansford's list of names of wares). Shu-fu, however, seems often to be decorated by slip painting in relief, and this usage of yin would seem to mean one of two things—either the word is used in a broader sense to include a stamping technique that would in effect produce a relief pattern that looked like slip painting, or else the design of shu-fu was first applied in this manner and then finished with a brush and slip using the stamped design as a guide.

MISCELLANEOUS

This section of five pages gives terms relating to lacquer, ivory, wood, glass, textiles, field archaeology, and collecting. Among the first of these it might have been useful to include the terms chia-chu 夾竹 and t'uan-huan 握換 which were used in early texts to describe the "dry lacquer" technique used in the making of lightweight Buddhist images (cf. Journal Asiat., Apr.-June 1923, pp. 181–207), although the Japanese term kanshitsu 乾漆 is probably better known.

P. 87. In the same category as the word chai for "studio" and ch'en-lieh-so for "exhibition hall" are many other common expressions; among them t'ang 堂 for "hall," t'ing 廟 for "pavilion," hsüan (or hsiens) 軒 for "pavilion" or "porch," shu-fang 書房 or shu-shih 書室 for "a study," t'u-shu-huan 圖書館 for "library," and po-wen-yüan 博物院 for "museum," are frequently encountered.

Only those who have attempted to compile lists or glossaries of this kind, either for their own use or for publication, can appreciate the time and patient research that have gone into the production of this small volume. To point out occasional lacunae or to comment on certain definitions is not to detract from the value of the work done. Mr. Hansford has brought his long experience to bear on a difficult and exacting task and he has placed a very useful tool in the hands of his colleagues.

J O H N A. P O P E


The T'au-hua chien-wen chih 圖畫見聞志, covering the period from A.D. 841 to 1074—a period that saw the rise of great landscape painting—is one of the most important Chinese books about the history of painting. It was written as a sequel to the Li-t'ai ming hua chi 歷代名畫記 by Chang Yen-ying 張應嶽, a work which, completed in A.D. 847, treats of the history of painting from the earliest times to the year 841; and it was followed in turn by Teng Ch'un's 鄧椿 Hua chi 畫槩, which continues the story from A.D. 1074 to 1107.1


Alexander C. Soper's book here under review, pp. xi and 112, n. 12 and 13, supplies further references.
The text which Soper’s admirable translation has made accessible to every art student consists of a Preface (pp. 1-2); a Bibliography and General Discussion (pp. 3-22); three historical chapters relating to the late T’ang and Five Dynasties (pp. 23-49); the Sung Imperial House, figure painters and portraitists (pp. 47-56), landscape and still-life painters (pp. 57-72); and two chapters devoted to stories, anecdotes, and miscellaneous descriptions (pp. 73-109), a true treasure trove of information on cultural history.

In an Appendix (pp. 105-109) the translator offers an erudite and plausible hypothesis on Kuo Jo-hsi’s genealogical affiliations. The footnotes occupy no less than 97 pages (113-207) in small print: a thorough and conscientious documentation that goes far beyond immediate needs and in itself represents a compendium of pertinent reading matter. The Chinese text reproduced is that of the seventeenth-century Chi Ku Ko print, the merits of which, as compared to those of other existing editions, are discussed in the Translator’s Preface (pp. ix-xii). The whole of the English text is an offset reproduction of neatly typewritten pages, which, except for some slips in transcribed names and titles, are remarkably free of misprints.

On examining the “Experiences” in Soper’s close, critical, tasteful, and often superb renderings, the reader will soon become aware of the fact that Kuo Jo-hsi was not only an industrious compiler and delightful storyteller, but an expert and outspoken critic and an eminent historian as well. His short account on The Three Schools of Landscape (p. 19), which refers to Li Ch’eng, Kuan T’ung, and Fan K’uan, is a masterly description offering guidance toward an understanding of that important, obscure period. He supplies the important date of Li Ch’eng’s death, A.D. 967 (p. 46). He mentions that Wu Tao-tzu painted “bygone events in the Ch’an sect” (p. 98). Recognizing Kuo Hsi’s genius (p. 60), he clearly sees the superiority of landscape painting in his time (p. 21). Speaking of the painting of buildings, he shows himself familiar with the principles of perspective, “with a hundred lines converging on a single point” (p. 12). Korean folding fans are recorded (p. 103), and we learn of burial gifts consisting of irreplaceable fine paintings (p. 95).

In another passage of exceptional interest Kuo Jo-hsi ardently expounds the meaning of Hsieh Ho’s (ca. A.D. 500) principle of artistic excellence, ch’i yün sheng t'ung 气韵生动, the terse and vague wording of which invites speculative interpretation. Ch’i “spirit” was most often taken in a pantheistic sense; it is something external to the artist, according to Shio Sakanishi.1 Kuo, however, understands it differently. He states that if a man’s quality (jen p’in 人品) is high, then the ch’i yün will also be high; and if the ch’i yün is high, the sheng t’ung will be attained (Chinese text, ch. 1:12a; cf. p. 15). He further compares the ch’i-yün to the imprint of personality in someone’s signature. While this may not fully explain the relation between the two qualities in question, it does show that both are conditional on personality and thus narrows the range of possible interpretations. Soper’s rendering, “animation through spirit consonance,” which differs from previous writers’ wording,2 retains the inclusive character of the original and at the same time is in keeping with Kuo’s commentary which makes “animation” incidental to “spirit consonance.” Apropos, the expression jen p’in referred to above is circumscribed in the translation (p. 15) by “one’s ranking among men,” which seems hardly necessary.

All in all, Soper’s translation is an outstanding and substantial contribution, which the student of Far Eastern art will gratefully acknowledge. That in this long and difficult text there occur passages permitting or demanding interpretations different from those adopted in the present version is almost a matter of course. Those that this reviewer happened to observe are noted below.

P. 8, line 3. “To him, therefore, [the Emperor] presented in full court audience a picture of the Duke of Chou holding [the infant] King Ch’eng in his arms, which one of the court painters had been


commissioned to execute.” Therefore had one of the court painters paint ‘The Duke of Chou assisting King Ch’eng in receiving the feudal lords in audience’ as a present to Kuang.

P. 8, third paragraph from below. “In setting down such rebukes against wild and dissolute conduct, they meant that their origin lay in wine.”

P. 9, first par. “... in their [very] colors”—“in their countenances.” (色)

P. 19, first par. “In the recent past, [again], there have been men of single-minded strength in study, like...; but it would be hard [to see them as] direct heirs.”


P. 28, second par. “Rich Harvest among the Uighurs.” It seems more likely that the passage refers to two different paintings, “Uighurs” and “Rich Harvest,” in keeping with the immediately preceding titles.

P. 61, third line from below. “... and where he found [himself at home] under the true mandate. His Majesty T’ai Tsung treated him with even greater kindness.”

P. 79, s.v. Wang Wei, last line. “... [and found] that he had not made a single error.”

P. 81, third par. from below. “Before him, Pi Hung had been popularly held up as the first artist of the day.”

MAX LOEHR


When this review is published, Mr. Pope’s work will be four years old. The little book has already changed the whole basis of the study of Ming blue-and-white. All over the world its influence can be seen in the labels on museum exhibits and in the catalogues of auction sales. If there were doubts before 1952 as to whether the Chinese made blue-and-white porcelain in the fourteenth century, Mr. Pope has almost dispelled them.
The interesting thing is that Mr. Pope has done all this in the quietest way possible. He has avoided the least semblance of high aesthetic writing. He has bombarded no one into worshiping the subjects of his study. He has used few cut-and-dried hypotheses and he has produced no cut-and-dried conclusions, except the single one which no one will be able to dispute, namely, that the objects that he illustrates belong to a clearly defined group whose dating must stand or fall with the authenticity of the inscription on the two vases in the David Foundation, London. So impressed is the writer of this review with this simplicity of method and with this gentlemanly way of doing things that he offers his criticism only with reluctance and with a dim sense of sacrilege.

It is, however, this extreme simplicity in Mr. Pope's argument which is its chief drawback. By using this method he makes the whole of his case depend on the single keystone of a potter's inscription, since he uses no other analogies that purport to date from the fourteenth century to back it up. It is unnecessary to remind readers of Ars Orientalis that Chinese potters' inscriptions are open to suspicion. Already in Ming times old reign marks were copied on common mass-produced wares, probably without any intention to deceive. Occasionally a Chinese potter will use a more precise date in the same way. Sometimes he will choose something outside the common run of the classical Ch'eng Hua, Hsüan Té, and Chia Ching marks. There is, for instance, a poor-quality group of greenish tripod dishes decorated in underglaze red, one of them in the Victoria and Albert Museum, with the Yüan dynasty date 1341 and the signature of the potter Chiang Ch'i. They are not considered to be very old.1

So the question is, did the Yüan dynasty inscriptions of the year 1351 on the twin David vases belong to these dubious categories, or do they date the vases, as Mr. Pope says, "precisely and beyond any doubt in the latter part of the Yüan dynasty." The vases came to England shortly before 1920, when the late R. L. Hobson first published them.2

In those days it was often doubted whether anything so overdecorated could be so old. Even in 1945 Mr. Honey in his standard work "The Ceramic Art of China" refused to commit himself on the authenticity of the inscriptions (p. 111). Mr. Pope, it seems to me, devotes less than enough space to the rather peculiar literary nature of these inscriptions. Yet this nature surely has some bearing on the question of authenticity.

In the first place it must be noticed that the two vases are totally different from Mr. Pope's other related material in that they were not made for export. Nor were they made for the Chinese court. They were ordered by a quite obscure person living in a remote country village in Kiangsi and they were dedicated to a quite unknown local god whose name was Hu-ching. It is not certain whether these are the actual "flower vases" mentioned in the inscription or whether they are porcelain copies which record the depositing of the bronze originals in a temple. In either case if the porcelain vases were broken, there would be nothing unusual in replacing them with other vases, not necessarily exact copies, bearing the same inscription. This would be no more than ordinary Chinese practice.

But even if the two vases should be nothing but replacements of something that was dedicated in the Yüan dynasty, they are surely very ancient, as decorated porcelain goes, and their style is quite extraordinary. Mr. Pope observes, "The standard fifteenth-century categories have no place for it, and it is even more out of place among the sixteenth-century vases or those of any later period." The impossibility of assigning the David vases and the pieces that resemble them to any of the recognized Ming groups is, in Mr. Pope's words, "the heart of the argument" (pp. 24 and 50).

The important thing then is to find something at least which these vases can be said to resemble and to discover what bearing this has on the date 1351.

Since Mr. Pope's reexamination of the material from Istanbul and Ardebil, the family of the two vases has become quite large. Including 31 at Istanbul and 30 in Teheran, Mr. Pope estimates that there are more than 80 related pieces in existence (p. 51). I believe that since the time when Mr. Pope wrote this, others have appeared on the market—so many that the problem has come to concern collectors as well as art historians.


It appears to me that in stressing the "isolation" of these pieces Mr. Pope has rather exaggerated their uniqueness. Since he cannot find their abundant decoration in the rigidly stylized pieces, which are generally attributed to the early fifteenth century, he regards the elements of that decoration as having become extinct by that time. If Mr. Pope had turned his attention to humbler and much later products, he would have found that this is by no means the case. For instance, the plant that he accepts as a chrysanthemum (pl. A, 2) is not as rare after the early fifteenth century as he suggests. It is common enough in this form in Late Ming and Ch'ing porcelain. It is curious that Mr. Pope should regard the gourd as a rare motif or that he should accept as grapes, which are foreign to China, except perhaps for Western-inspired T'ang art, what are in fact vine gourds, a standard late Ming decoration when used in conjunction with the tree rat, emblematic of scholarly application. Contrary to Mr. Pope's view, insects are not uncommon in blue-and-white. They are a standard motif on dishes and saucers of the "Kraakporcelain" type, imported into Holland about 1620. They are, moreover, the same insects that are found in Mr. Pope's Istanbul class, the cricket, praying mantis, dragonfly, and moth. Another rarity that is no rarity is a design which he calls "concentric waves." There was a splendid example in the Ezekiel collection which was probably fifteenth century, and in later times it was closely copied in Japanese Kutani pottery and in Isnik ware.

It seems to me that Mr. Pope has overcome much too lightly the greatest stumbling block of all to a fourteenth-century dating, namely, the highly developed nature of the decoration. Very truly he observes (p. 51) that the David Foundation vases stand not only in the middle of a century but in the middle of a style. How is it then that Chinese texts say nothing of blue-and-white in the Yüan dynasty? Mr. Pope suggests that these pieces were ignored in official records because they were not for imperial use (p. 69). Alternatively he thinks that patriotic writers passed them over because they were made under a foreign occupation. I do not think these shots in the dark are good enough. The suspicion remains that the Yüan records ignored blue-and-white because there wasn't any. There are many commonly quoted texts in appreciation of Hsüan-tè blue-and-white and all imply that blue-and-white was something new and rare even in the years 1426–35.

There is another stumbling block to which Mr. Pope pays little attention. How do there come to be fourteenth-century pieces at all in a collection like that of the Saray Palace, which was only begun in the sixteenth century; or in the Chini-Khâneh at Ardebil, which was only bequeathed at the beginning of the seventeenth century? Except in the Far East, the love of "antique" pottery is not older than the nineteenth century. Sultans would scarcely consent to be served at table except from flawless pieces and the newest would have been esteemed the best. This stumbling block however is less difficult. A collection of Timurid heirlooms might easily have been looted in the Persian campaigns and preserved in some forgotten vault of the palace simply because it was already chipped and tarnished. Even so, the survival rate for objects of such antiquity is astonishingly high.

But it is in historical style analysis that Mr. Pope's argument is at its weakest. He notices the "spiky leaf," which is the key to the decoration of this group just as it is the key to the group associated with the early fifteenth century. There is a brief mention in his book of some pieces of T'z'uchou pottery which may date from the Yüan dynasty. These have leaves approaching the shape of the "spiky leaf" but without the spikes. Surely it is the spikes that we are looking for and Mr. Pope might have found them, had he not restricted his field to Chinese ceramics alone, in the hoards of blue-and-white faience fragments found in Egyptian, Syrian, and Iraqi sites. This is the spiky leaf as Mr. Pope has drawn it on plate A, 5, a complicated derivative of the Greek acanthus. At Fustâ'î it is associated with a group of potters' signatures, particularly with those of Ghaibi and Hormozd, and it is a curious fact that these potters possessed two styles, one of them in blue-and-white with Ming affinities and the other a traditional Syrian or Persian style in blue turquoise and black on a white ground. It is the traditional style that makes it possible to date the work of these potters in the
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3 Catalogue of Ezekiel collection sale, Sothebys, May 21, 1946, pl. 8, No. 83.

4 Quoting Fujio Koyama, Sō-ji, Sung pottery, Tokyo, 1943.
second half of the fourteenth century, possibly overlapping into the fifteenth.  

Ghaibí's blue-and-white fragments already look Chinese but it is hard to say who copied whom. The use of plain blue-and-white is a novelty, but the flowers, the birds, and the "spiky leaf" are Islamic in their evolution. A fairly traditional object in the Shiraz Museum, a funerary stele, painted in blue and black on white faience and bearing the date A.H. 809 or A.D. 1406, shows the spiky leaf in a by-no-means Ming decor. We are up against the old problem, which came first, the chicken or the egg.

One thing however is certain. Mr. Pope's group of Chinese porcelains was designed for the taste of Islamic countries. Heavy Pilav dishes and capacious stew bowls predominate. These were intended for Islamic, not Chinese, table manners, while the big double-gourd Kuan and Mei-p'ing jars were meant for oils and conserves, and perhaps they conveyed the actual product from China. Even with a predominance of Chinese dragons, phoenixes and water plants, the decoration is more Islamic than Chinese. The panels are mathematically laid out and the surfaces are evenly and richly covered. In the fine dishes, shown in plates 10 to 12, the layout strongly recalls that of the fourteenth-century Persian dishes made around Sulțânâtâbâd and this resemblance is surely no coincidence. As a positive analogy, contemporary with the date on the David vases, it is astonishing that Mr. Pope should have overlooked this.

It seems as if Mr. Pope went to Istanbul and Teheran as a specialist in Chinese ceramics, little prepared to look for clues in local Near Eastern art. He is surprised that "humble native products" like Isnik pitchers should be inventoried along with Chinese porcelain. His surprise might have been less had he realized that these Isnik pitchers of the year 1505 were in the marvelous style of Abraham of Kutahia, pitchers as exciting as anything he has illustrated in this book and far, far rarer, forerunners of the most truly princely faience ever made. Moreover, when Mr. Pope tells us a little about the local background of the Topkapu Sarayi collection, his information is liable to be ambiguous. What are the "Turkish porcelains made in Istanbul and the nearby Yildiz Palace" which are "installed in adjoining galleries"? In all Islamic art there are no wares that can be classed as porcelain, nor is there any Turkish pottery that can be attributed with certainty to Istanbul.

The work that Mr. Pope has done in isolating his material and in analyzing its characteristics is of great importance, but it leaves an impression that he has not used his evidence fully and that he has underestimated the importance of proof. He should have gone further than the mere establishment of the fact that Zimmermann's wholesale sixteenth-century attribution was wrong-headed. Looking through the moderately good plates in this book one is struck by the appearance of characteristic sixteenth-century motifs in a freer, bolder, and less stylized form, and therefore presumably older than the sixteenth century. But how much older? Is there enough here to make the authenticity of the J357 date self-evident? If it is, then some of the material must be as old as the year 1300, and even thirteenth-century blue-and-white need not be primitive.

GERALD REITLINGER

Archaic Chinese jades from the Edward and Louise B. Sonnenschein Collection. By Alfred Salmony. Chicago (The Art Institute of Chicago), 1952. xiv + 279 pp., 107 of which are plates; frontispiece in color. $25.00.

The large and magnificent collection of more than six hundred ancient Chinese jades and hardstones described in this catalogue was donated to The Art Institute of Chicago by the collectors, whose memory is honored by the Institute through this fine publication.

That jade "has been widely admired and little understood," as C. F. Kelley says in his Foreword (p. v), was no doubt partly due to the fact that collections of comparable scope and character, systematically built up as an "exploring venture," did not previously exist in the West, and Salmony acknowledges this when he states that "some solutions of jade problems . . . could not have been reached without the comparative material amassed in the Sonnenschein collection" (p. xi). Its bigness

---

4 See particularly Ali Bey Bahgat and Felix Massoul, La céramique musulmane de l'Egypte, Cairo, 1930, pls. 40, 1, B; 43, 1, and 45, 1.

5 Yedda A. Godard, Pièces datées de céramique de Kaskâa a décor inscrit, Athâr-é Iran, vol. 2 (1937), p. 336.
means more than quantity or multiplicity; it means a promise of discoveries and new insights not otherwise afforded. For instance, to the philological approach, the elements accounting for individuality and, hence, reality, are all but lost: shapes and forms, textures and colors, the technical treatment, and the always exciting blend of nature and art. It is on these inherent features that Salmóny’s text is founded, a text that reveals his unrivaled familiarity with the subject. Some of the statements read as if they were made by someone who had looked over the shoulders of a Shang lapidary or had spent some time in a Chou workshop.

The objects are presented under five categories of style: Shang (105 pieces), Early Western Chou (202 pieces), Middle Chou (70 pieces), Late Eastern Chou (187 pieces), and Han (72 pieces). In the corresponding chapters, brief outlines of historical and archaeological interest are followed by discussions of technical characteristics, of types, motifs, and style characteristics, which in turn precede the tersely worded individual descriptions—conveniently arranged to face the illustrations.

In contrast with Salmóny’s earlier book, Carved jade of Ancient China (Berkeley, 1938), which included a number of decorated specimens from the Sonnenschein collection, the present one contains many plain objects such as axes, hoes, chisels, blades, disks, handles, and the like. It is in his attempt to determine the chronological place of these plain types that the author made a remarkable step beyond his Carved jade where, to establish the stylistic sequence of the jades, he relied on the ornaments and their correspondence with the décor of the coeval bronzes.

The challenge of the plain jades lies in the scantiness of criteria to go by, to say nothing of the ever wanting archaeological context. Even so, basing his statements on such technical traits as perforations, surface finish, and, secondarily, on the varying kinds of rocks or gemstones used, Salmóny is never evasive in regard to dating. For instance, “many Han attributions . . . are based exclusively on the character of the material” (p. 249). This sounds more hazardous than it actually is. There are natural limitations in the supply of most of the specific varieties of jade, and the exclusive occurrence of one variety within a stylistically definable group of decorated pieces makes it unavoidable to assume that plain pieces cut from the same variety of rock belong to the same “batch” or the same workshop and period. However, this method of attribution requires extraordinary experience and, moreover, depends on the availability of large numbers of actual specimens for comparison. Therefore, if it comes to identifying an object that may have no other lapidary criterion than a drilled hole, the collector or student rather will turn to the many observations of subtle technical and typological points contained in the book.

In his interpretations of the jade emblems, the author stresses their derivation from ancient (Neolithic) types of weapons or working tools, which would seem the most acceptable theory about their origins. That the disk of jade was a reminiscence of the disk-shaped mace—Salmóny speaks only of the throwing disk1 (p. 9)—and later became a symbol of power and authority both secular and divine, thus, a symbol of Heaven, is quite conceivable; a fine mace head may have been a token of chieftainship even in prehistoric times. On the other hand, the various types of long tablets called kui, which likewise are considered to have been symbols of sovereign power,2 are taken by Salmóny as descendants from the primeval agricultural tool, the hoe (pp. 61, 67, 137, pls. 4, 5, 25, 54); and the scepter types known as chang or ya-chang, another badge of rank and authority, according to tradition,3 would in Salmóny’s opinion have an even humbler origin: “the type . . . derives from a blade-shaped fish-scale scraper” (p. 671, pls. 27, 28). However sound these typological or ergological interpretations are, the true significance of the jade symbols is not ipso facto understood; the explanations given in Chou and Han literature are a far cry from what can be inferred on typological grounds.

For two conspicuous and comparatively common disk types, viz, the flanged disk which resembles a wheel and the notched disk or hsian-chi, rather
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1 The same assumption was made by Lauffer in the case of notched disks with cutting edges, comparable to the Sonnenschein specimen, pl. 14:1; cf. Berthold Lauffer, Archaic Chinese jades collected in China by A. W. Bahr, New York, 1927, pp. 15, 26f., pls. 2:2, 13:1.
2 B. Lauffer, Jade, a study in Chinese archaeology and religion, Chicago, 1912, p. 80ff., figs. 21–33.
3 Ibid., pp. 100–102.
prosaic purposes are suggested: the former is explained as a cup stand (p. 9, pls. 12, 13), the latter—since Wu Ta-ch'eng reluctantly regarded as an astronomical instrument that is mentioned in the *Shu Ching*—as a cord holder for silk bales (p. 69 f., pl. 31), a view close to Pelliot's. The cup-stand theory does not seem convincing to this reviewer, partly because of the shape of these disks and partly because we do not know of Shang or early Chou cups suitable to be placed upon these flanged disks; moreover, vases with globular bottoms which would require a ring-shaped stand are atypical of the period in question. It may be worth remembering that large, crude, flanged disks occur also in Somrong Sen (Cambodia), and in the Late Neolithic Black Pottery site of Pu-chao-chai (W. Honan), and in Yang-shao (W. Honan), clay rings of comparable cross section, likely to be earlier still, were common. Structurally, this sort of disk again looks very like a derivative from the mace head of a type represented by a heavy ditorite fragment from Hopei in the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm, and a perfect marble specimen in the Museum für Völkerkunde in Munich.

Concerning the beautiful type of the notched disk, "hsüan-ch'i," which Salmony does not consider as an instrument for stargazing, it would seem significant that small buttons of shell of whorl-star shape and small marble disks with notches occur rather frequently among the Anyang small finds. The design of the "revolving" three-pronged buttons and jade disks is essentially the same and may have the same meaning; it evokes the graph that stands for "sun" in Shang and Early Chou inscriptions of the characters míng 明 "light/bright" and míng 明 "covenant," a graph consisting of a circle with three notches (?) rendered by inward-bent little curls or strokes. Precisely the same graph or ornament—with three and four notches—appears conspicuously in Shang bone carvings and shell spinning whorls. These analogies would, perhaps, merit a fuller discussion, as does another aspect of the subject, namely, the term "I yì 玉 " which occurs in the *Shu Ching* and refers, on the authority of the Han commentators, to jade of the tribes in the Northeast, more exactly, in the Liao-tung region. Wu Ta-ch'eng linked a notched disk in his collection to the *I yì* tradition. Not long ago, Japanese excavations in Liao-tung (Ssu-p'ing-shan 四平山 near Port Arthur) brought to light assemblages of black pottery and jade articles that included five disks with notches. The type, therefore, appears to have been current among the *I* tribes, at a period probably coeval with Shang, and it formed part of their tomb furniture; it does
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9 Paul Pelliot, *Jades archaïques du Chine*, Paris and Brussels, 1925, pl. 16:2, text.


11 *Ibid.*, pl. 68:8, 10— a type Andersson named "rings with thickened inner margin."


---


15 White, *op. cit.*, pl. 19, 4210/B (shield of tortoise); pl. 59, text p. 152 (body of a serpent ?); pl. 109 (three whorls).

16 *Shu Ching (Ku Ming)*; Legge, *op. cit.*, p. 554: "gems from the wild tribes of the East."


18 Illustr. in *Select specimens of the archaeological collection in the Department of Literature*, Kyoto University. *New acquisitions*, compiled by S. Umehara, Kyoto, 1951, pl. 45.
not seem to have served the utilitarian purpose of a cord holder, as conceived by Salmony.

The rather common, small, slit disk, chītēk, which to the author again suggests a connection with cords “forced through the slit” (p. 68), is a type of wide dispersion, occurring as it does in Tongking16 as well as Japan, where it is considered an ear ornament.17

Among the plain jades dated on the basis of technical treatment alone, there is a large group of disks termed pi, which are assigned in toto to the Middle Chou period, i.e., after Early Western Chou and before Late Eastern Chou (pls. 55, 56, 57). Most of these disks are comparatively rude products, such as hitherto were believed to be Neolithic.18 Salmony’s late date comes as a surprise. It is defended by the observation that disks answering the measurements of the “classical pi” (with a perforation no wider than one-fifth of the whole diameter) have not so far been found in clear pre-Chou context, and by the hardly compelling argument that there are no references to yin and yang in Chou bone inscriptions (p. 9). It does not seem likely that disks of that particular proportion should be entirely absent among earlier material, although this cannot be archaeologically substantiated at present.

A few remarks about individual specimens follow, in the order of the plates.

Pl. 1:2, “flat-axe.” As suggested by shape and grooves as well as the absence of a cutting edge, this piece appears to be a reworked butt of a large jade blade of ko type, comparable to plate 9:3.

Pl. 2:2, “flat-axe,” regarded as a “unique deviation” (p. 6), looks very like a copy after Shang and Early Chou metal types with trunnions and splayed edge.

Pl. 6:4, “barbed arrowhead,” tentatively located


17 In a tomb in Kawachi opened in 1917, disks of this kind were found to be in the position of ear ornaments. Nakaya Jōjirō, Nippon sekki-jidai teiyō (Japanese Stone Age manual), rev. ed., Tokyo (Yōto-kusha), 1944, p. 207 and pl. 1; Higuchi Kiyono, in Kōgaku zasshi, vol. 23 (1933), Nos. 1-2.

18 E.g., Soame Jenyns, op. cit., No. 1, pl. 1; S. Howard Hansford, Exhibition of Chinese jades, London (The Oriental Ceramic Society, April 14 to June 9, 1948), No. 22, pl. 2.

in the Hongkong area (p. 7). This type of stemless arrowhead with concave base was current in North China; Chang-te-fu would seem the more likely provenance.

Pl. 30:3, “axe-shaped pendant,” dated Early Western Chou, gives the impression of being considerably older. Salmony points out that it is difficult “to sort out the Chou examples from prehistoric specimens” (of axes) (p. 66). An earlier date than Shang may have to be considered also in the case of the axe pl. 1:3.

Pl. 40:7, “forepart of elephant,” said to be a unique example of the elephant represented in jade (p. 73). While this is true as far as the rendition of the whole figure of the animal is concerned, it must be remembered that there exists a jade animal head of possibly even earlier date; cf. S. C. Nott, op. cit., pl. 71, which in another view is reproduced in the C. T. Loo catalogue of Chinese archaic jades, West Palm Beach, 1950, pl. 17:3.

Pl. 42:1, “arched flat fish,” described as a catfish on account of the strong curve of the body (p. 75). The strong curve rather indicates that the piece was carved from one-half of a narrow ring disk.

The text, like a genuine jade, has its flaw: on p. 3, the terms “jadeite” and “nephrite” should, of course, appear in reversed order.

Max Loehr

Woollen textiles of the Lou-lan people and Investigation of silk from Edsen-gol and Lop-nor.


In these two excellent volumes Vivi Sylwan has presented distinguished studies of the textiles brought back by the expedition from sites in the Lop desert in eastern Turkistan and from Edsen-gol in Inner Mongolia.

The first to appear treats the woollen textiles brought back by Hedin from graves of the autochthonous Lou-lan peoples in the Lop desert. In the introduction Folke Bergman discusses the archaeology of the sites from which the material comes. From the appearance of the well-preserved mum-
mies and from the limited anthropological studies made, it seems that the Lou-lan people were an intermediate type between Mongolid and Caucasian. Linguistic studies based on documents found by Sir Aurel Stein in the same area show that the Lou-lan people in the third century A.D. spoke a Tokharian dialect. The contents of the graves being of a very primitive nature are, as Bergman points out, of a timeless nature that give no clue to their age. From other finds in the area and from historical sources and hydrographic information he concludes that the graves must date from before the middle of the fourth century A.D. when the Tarim River abandoned its ancient course, thus leaving this region uninhabitable. However, one will find in the second of Miss Sylwan’s volumes that other graves nearby have been attributed to the T’ang period on the basis of the textiles found therein. If this is the case, then Bergman’s dating for the graves of the Lou-lan people is cast in doubt. For the terminus ante quem the archaeologist found no clue.

The contents of the graves, with few exceptions, were textiles and textile materials comprising the clothing in which the body had been buried. They include a long mantle, a loin cloth, hat, and boots. The material is of sheep’s wool and, in a very limited degree, coarse hemplike fiber. The woven fabrics, except for one small fragment of tapestry, are in plain cloth weave. There is a quantity of other objects, for the most part made of wool, which, while not technically to be defined as textiles, serves to illustrate the primitive character of the Lou-lan textile industry. Miss Sylwan has classified the material into various categories and with characteristic meticulous care has analyzed and described each, illustrating them with numerous specific examples. Her descriptions of technique are supplemented with carefully drawn diagrams and excellent photographs.

For the most part the material treated in this first book is essentially ethnographic and as such has little interest to the art historian. Among the woven textiles only two have any attempt at pattern, and these are of the simplest sort. The real interest for the textile historian lies in the very fascinating and searching study Miss Sylwan makes of certain technical features found in the textiles and the relationships she draws with similar features found among textiles from the eastern Mediterranean region. Her conclusion that the textiles of the Lou-lan people belong to the great current of textile tradition in the West rather than the East bears out Mr. Bergman’s findings of an anthropological and linguistic nature.

It is the second volume, devoted to the silks from the finds of Edsen-gol and Lop-nor, that is of major interest to the art historian and the Orientalist. The two regions are widely separated but both were important links in the great system of defense and communication which the Han emperors created—the Great Wall and the Silk Route. The silks from these sites are important documents of this most important early industry and trade of China. They take their place beside, and supplement, other Han silks found in sites stretching across Asia from Palmyra to Noin-ula in northern Mongolia.

One reads with a sense of loss that Folke Bergman, who had done so much of the fieldwork and who was to have written the introduction as he had for the earlier volume, had passed away before the completion of the study, and Gösta Montell, Director of the Statens Etnografiska Museum, has in his stead provided the archaeological background against which the work is set.

The Edsen-gol region is most famous for its medieval city Khara-khoto, the Edzine of Marco Polo, first discovered by Kozlov in 1901 and later explored (1914) and published (Innermost Asia, 1928) by Sir Aurel Stein. It was Bergman who located and identified the Han remains in the area during his 1930–31 expedition. In all he examined 43 sites, of which 39 were watch towers or forts concerned with the protection of the Great Outer Wall. In the refuse heaps of 16 of them textile material was found. Evidence for dating was provided by a series of inscribed wooden slats with dates covering the period between 100 B.C. and A.D. 100.

The Lop desert finds are less closely associated and come from four principal sites in the region; and, according to Miss Sylwan’s conclusions on the basis of the textiles themselves, date not only from the Han period, as one would assume, but also from the T’ang period. The Han sites are those studied by Hedin; they comprise the Lou-lan military station (Stein’s L.A.), which Hedin visited in 1901,

1 More correctly, the Lop-nor region or the Lop desert.
BOOK REVIEWS

and three burial places, Graves 34, 35, and 38, nearby in the delta of the Qum-darya, which he excavated in 1934. The sites attributed to the T'ang period are considerably removed from the others—more than a hundred kilometers to the west. They comprise three graves, 4, 6, and 7, on the west bank of The Small River just across from Cemetery 5 from which came the majority of the woollen textiles discussed in the volume reviewed above, and an isolated grave, 10, near the confluence of The Small River and the Qum-darya about 40 kilometers north of the other three.

Miss Sylwan’s discussion of the textiles is divided into two sections. In the first she discusses in a general way the material from each of the finds. She touches upon the pertinent archaeological data; discusses questions of dating; and describes at length the textile objects as such. Almost without exception the silks were fragments of clothing, either those worn out and thrown in the refuse heaps, as at Edsen-gol and Lou-lan station, or those that had served as burial cloths in the graves of the Qum-darya and The Small River. The most important garments, or fragments thereof, are carefully described and often accompanied by drawings showing actual or reconstructed forms. In one instance evidence was found in the form of the garment (not thoroughly convincing to this reviewer) for assigning the grave to the T'ang period.

It is in the second section that the main purpose, and indeed the main interest, of the work lies. There the textiles themselves are discussed. Miss Sylwan devotes her main attention to the question of technique, which she carefully analyzes, describes, and diagrams, and frequently illustrates with macrophotographs. She has classified the material according to weaving technique and described them in groups, although leaving aside until the end those that she considered to be of T'ang date.

Miss Sylwan’s study is the first precise technical analysis to appear for so representative a group of early Chinese textiles and provides us for the first time with a clear picture of the scope of Chinese weaving in the Han period. One cannot praise too highly the contribution she has made. Her tremendous knowledge of weaving and, for that matter, of all of the textile techniques, has made of her work a valuable handbook that every student of the history of textiles will find it necessary to master. Unfortunately, that will not be easy, even for one familiar with the problems of textile techniques. One cannot but regret that the expert analysis has not been accompanied by a more fortunate choice of terminology and a more orderly system of classification. This criticism is less, perhaps, one of Miss Sylwan than of the general level of textile scholarship; her use of terms points up dramatically the need for an internationally accepted system of classification and terminology on which to base the study of the history of textiles.

It is not within the scope or purpose of this review to discuss at length the problems of textile terminology and classification. However, as the terms used by Miss Sylwan for the textiles treated in her book as well as the general terms and definitions given on pages 13 and 14 do not accord with those to which we are accustomed and are for the most part inadequate and extremely confusing, the reviewer feels compelled to comment on them in the hope of clarifying some of them for the reader and, at the same time, of averting their continued use by other writers in the field. In the first place, Miss Sylwan fails to make a clear classification of the textiles based on their weaving techniques, an omission which has contributed greatly to the difficulty of understanding her terms. She has failed to keep clearly before her, and before her reader, the distinction between object and technique. She speaks of plain and patterned silks, for example, and then describes their techniques. Silk is not a technical term; the weave would be the same in any material. What she really wants to describe are silk textiles of plain or patterned weaves. Similarly, she does not make clear the difference between weaving effects and weaving techniques. She discusses taffeta and rep as plain “silks” but crepe, equally a plain weave which is only distinguished by the twist of its
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8 The newly formed International Center for the Study of Ancient Textiles at Lyons has set the formulation of an international textile vocabulary as its first goal. Considerable progress has already been made by the drafting committee and it is hoped that in the relatively near future a new and valid international vocabulary will be prepared and that its ultimate acceptance will do much to simplify the problems of both writer and reader in the field of textile history.
thread, is placed under a separate heading. In devising the names for the silks which she classifies as damasks (warp rep damask, damask with wavy effect, and warp twill damask) she has lost complete sight of the fact that all are the same basic technique with only variations in the pattern effect.

But the greatest handicap from which Miss Sylan's valuable work suffers is her definition and use of the word "rep" and her association with it of the word "warp" as a basis for her terminology for the Chinese weaves. In the case of "rep" she has taken a well-defined word, of long-established usage, and redefined it—giving it exactly the opposite meaning to which we are used! On page 92 she comments that:

"The rep of the Chinese plain silk as of other plain cloth is generally called "weft rep" which implies that the warp covers the weft and that the material is corded in the weft direction. I have here called this "warp rep" as the warp constitutes the surface . . ."

She goes on to explain that because of the predominance of the warp in the Chinese silks she has used a different basis in naming the different kinds of textures than that generally used and has prefixed the word "warp" to the names of textures in which the warp constitutes the surface. In so doing, unfortunately, Miss Sylan has devised terms which, properly speaking, are not technical terms and which therefore confuse rather than clarify what the author wishes to express by them. Both "warp" and "rep" as used in her terminology are simply secondary descriptive terms of weaving effects and have nothing to do with the basic techniques involved. Furthermore, she has not been consistent in her use of the word "rep", for certainly, in spite of her comment (p. 112), that the compound "warp rep" has "a more or less cored surface," there is nothing resembling the clearly defined rib of her original "warp reps", and the extension of this term to describe the surface effect in this instance, as for her "warp rep damasks", is completely unjustifiable. In her preoccupation with these secondary effects of pattern and texture the author has lost sight of the fundamental technical points which should have been made clear to the reader. This is especially regrettable because the skillful analyses and diagrams indicate that Miss Sylan understands thoroughly the techniques of all the textiles discussed. Her error is simply her failure to make a clear statement of these techniques either in her text or by means of classification and terminology. The fundamental points—(a) that all Chinese silks of Han are technically based on a cloth binding, and (b) that patterns are achieved through the manipulation of warps—are not even hinted at in the terms used, and as a matter of fact are nowhere clearly brought out in the text.

One important error has been made in using the term "compound" (compound warp rep) for the polychrome figured silks of Han. Although properly analyzing and describing the weave of these silks, she has misinterpreted the function of the warps, seeing in the different colors two sets of warps, whereas actually there is only a single set of warps of two or more, as the case may be, different colors. Thus the weave is not a compound weave but a simple weave with a single set of warps and one weft. The different color warps are arranged alternately into two series and manipulated so that the binding of one warp is exactly inverse to that of the adjacent warp, forming, in effect, a double-face cloth weave. This weave has long been treated in the literature on Chinese textiles as a very complex technical development of the Chinese and taken to prove their great technical advancement. As a matter of fact, admitting that the Chinese did carry it to a very high degree of perfection, it nevertheless remains a primitive technique; it is well known among both primitive and folk textiles. It was an important technique among the Indians of the Americas in pre-Columbian times. Whether or not the Chinese in the Han period had actually hit upon the drawloom principal to produce the beautiful and complex little repeat patterns is one that still requires much study, as Miss Sylan has pointed out. We know that the pre-Columbian Indians were capable, as are their descendants today, of producing
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39 The use of the word "texture" instead of "weave" is probably a fault of translation.
very complex patterns in this technique on simple backstrap looms with heddles of sticks and strings. The weaves that Miss Sylwan has called "damasks" are in fact only cloth weaves with patterns formed by floats of warp on the face; they might better be termed warp-patterned cloth weaves.

To summarize, Miss Sylwan has classified the Han silks of Edsen-gol and the Lop desert in the following manner: Plain silks, including taffeta and rep; crepe; gauze; patterned silks, which comprise warp rep damask, plain weave damask with wavy effect, warp twill damask, and compound warp rep. For the textiles which she discusses as showing Western influence and therefore belonging to the T'ang period, she has used the terms silk twill and compound weft rep. The following suggested terms and system of classification, together with a concordance of the terms used by Miss Sylwan is presented in the hope that it may help to clarify somewhat the important technical information which the book contains.

THE TEXTILES OF HAN

Cloth weaves
plain cloth plain silks
taffeta taffeta
warp-face warp rep
crepe crepe
patterned cloth patterned silks
warp patterned cloth warp rep damask, etc.
double-face cloth compound warp rep

Gauze weaves
plain gauze gauze

THE TEXTILES OF T'ANG

Twill weaves
plain twill silk twill

Compound cloth weaves compound weft rep

In conjunction with her technical study Miss Sylwan has included a valuable discussion of the designs, accompanied by excellent photographs, some in color, and drawings. She points out the relationship with design in other media and with textiles from other sites. Although most readers will agree that her conclusion regarding the possible influence of Luristan bronzes on the Han silk A.10:1.93 from Edsen-gol is farfetched, there are on the whole many interesting points brought out which are well worth careful study.

There is a rather lengthy discussion of the silks from the Small River sites. The contents of the graves themselves give no clue to their date. As mentioned above, it has generally been considered that this area became uninhabitable by the middle of the fourth century; however, on the basis of her study of the textiles, and in one case the form of the garments, Miss Sylwan considers them to be of T'ang date. She concludes (p. 11) that the original Tocharian population "survived in certain places longer than has been hitherto supposed." She believes that some of the silks are Chinese and that others were probably made in eastern Turkistan. In either case her dating is based on the "western" influence which she sees—largely in the technique—since she considers such influence impossible before T'ang times. The arguments presented are too involved to discuss at length here and it must suffice to say that in this reviewer's opinion the material is too limited and the arguments presented too open to discussion to permit the acceptance of her dating of these finds until much more research has been done on certain of the points offered as evidence. Admittedly many interesting points have been raised which remind us that the history of early Chinese textiles has not yet, by any means, been solved.

This is especially true in the case of the silk coat of twill weave from Grave 10 on the Qum-darya which Miss Sylwan considers must be of late T'ang date, because, she says, plain twill weaves were not known in China until after contact with the West in T'ang times. Her discussion is clouded by the failure to recognize that there are two basically different twill weaves involved. She follows the argument first advanced by Stein that, because there are no twills found among the Han silks and because they do occur among those of T'ang date, twill in China must be the result of Western influence. However, as Miss Sylwan has pointed out
(pp. 19, 77, 109), the Chinese as early as Shang used a 6-hedled warp twill binding to produce patterns on plain cloth grounds and this technique is found among Han textiles. It seems logical that they would have known how to weave plain warp twill before they combined it with another weave to produce patterned textiles. In any case, it is certain that the Chinese did know and use the warp twill principle in Shang and Han times and that by T'ang plain warp twill weaves had come into usage, although judging from the limited number of examples among the quantities of preserved T'ang silks it never was a popular technique. There seems, nevertheless, no reason to go beyond the borders of China in search of the origin of this technique. There is, therefore, no basis for the assumption of "Western" influence in the twill weave of the coat from Grave ro or in a number of plain twills from Ch'ien-fo-tung and Astana since all these twills are warp twills. To Western influence, the result of the importation of Sassanian textiles and possibly weavers, may certainly be ascribed the compound weft twill technique which first appears among Chinese textiles of T'ang date. It appears, then, that both China and the West had their own traditions of twill weaving—warp twill in China and weft twill in the West—and that the Chinese learned the technique of compound weft twill from the West in T'ang times.

As a final section Miss Sylwan includes a number of most interesting notes and appendices comprising discussions of Coloring, Dyes, and Dying; Weaving, Looms and Methods; Ancient Chinese Terms for Textiles; Cleaning of Silks and Articles of Silk. The work is accompanied by an extensive bibliography.

DOROTHY G. SHEPHERD


In a beautiful volume illuminated with numerous excellent color plates Agnes Geijer has presented a catalogue raisonnée with accompanying text and illustrations of the Oriental textiles in Swedish collections. Without attempting to write a history of the subject the author has sought to place the Swedish examples in their proper context among the known classes of Oriental textiles. Some few of the pieces have been previously published and are well known but the majority have hitherto remained quite unknown outside of Sweden. On the whole, although covering a wide range both geographically and chronologically, the material represented does not include many new or unusual examples but for the most part conforms to relatively familiar types. The importance of the Swedish material lies in the fact that so many of the textiles are accompanied by documentation which permits a precise dating or at least a terminius ante quos. Such documentation is almost wholly lacking for similar textiles in other collections and the dates thus provided give valuable confirmation for dating which has hitherto been largely based on stylistic considerations alone.

The material treated comes from three principal sources: (1) Vestments and furnishings preserved in churches throughout Sweden, many of them documented by deeds of gift or inventory entries, or have the names of donors and dates of donation embroidered upon them; (2) royal possessions still preserved in the Royal Armory in Stockholm; and (3) letter sacks containing diplomatic correspondence from Oriental courts which, still containing their valuable documents, are in the Swedish National Archives.

The author prefesses her discussion of the textiles with an introductory section devoted to a survey of Sweden's intercourse with the East. Both in early times, i.e., during the Viking Age, and later during her period of political ascendency in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Sweden's energies were bent on developing trade with the East, Far and Near, over Russia's inland waterways to the Caspian Sea. It was during these periods of greatest commercial activity that the majority of the Oriental textiles reached Sweden. During the later middle ages with the occupation of South Russia by the Mongols and again when Russia's doors were closed to Swedish merchants after the Russo-Swedish wars at the beginning of the eighteenth century, such trade with the Orient as existed came via Western Europe; in the middle ages via the Levant trade which was monopolized by Italy and later by the East India Companies, especially of Holland and England, and finally by Sweden's own Levant Company which was founded in 1732.

The discussion of the textiles themselves is treated under the two main headings: "Silk Woven Fabrics" and "Embroideries." A short chapter of
two and a half pages comments on the existence of important carpets which the author considers are sufficiently published not to warrant further discussion.

The earliest of the Oriental textiles preserved in Sweden is a fragment (No. 1) of Chinese silk which was found at Birka in an early tenth-century Viking grave. It is an extremely important document because its presence here in Scandinavia gives evidence for the even farther westward extension of the early Chinese silk trade than it has hitherto been possible to show. The textile itself is similar to a number of early Chinese silks which have been yielded by archaeological sites stretching across Asia from Mongolia to the Crimea and to Syria. It is a tabby weave with a geometric pattern of lozenges formed by a twill binding. Miss Geijer uses the term “Han damask” to describe this weave. It is unfortunately a misleading term because, of course, the textile is not of Han date and furthermore because the silk in question is not really a damask weave. Followers of the Nancy Reath system will recognize the term “fancy cloth” for this technique but the present writer proposes the term “twill-patterned tabby” as more appropriate and more easily understandable.

Only seven others of the Oriental textiles which Miss Geijer treats are attributed to the medieval period. Of these, six (Nos. 2–7) are given to fourteenth-century China and the seventh (No. 42) to Persia or Central Asia. Among the silks attributed to China, by far the most interesting is the beautiful twill damask (No. 2) which forms the covering of the shrine containing the relics of Sweden’s painted king, Eric (d. 1160). It makes an important contribution to our all too scanty knowledge of medieval Chinese silks. The Chinese character, both stylistically and technically, is undeniable and the arguments presented for its dating are convincing.

Less clear is the case for three of the other silks (Nos. 3, 4, 5) which, totally different in design from the silk of the Eric shrine, are similarly twill damasks. It is this twill damask weave, so characteristic of early Chinese textiles, which provides the principal clue to their Chinese origin. Simple as it is, this technique is not, as far as this reviewer is aware, to be found among silks of other origin. Another reviewer,1 evidently not considering the evidence offered by technique, has denied these silks to China: No. 3 on the basis of style of the palmettes which he describes as pomegranates and considers to be un-Chinese, and Nos. 4 and 5 because of the presence of a rabbit motif which, having a lewd connotation in China, he considers precludes the textile’s being Chinese. In both instances this reviewer feels, as did the author, that the technique is the primary clue to provenance. We have too little material for comparison to be able to state emphatically, in the face of technical evidence to the contrary, that the palmettes could not be Chinese. As for the rabbit’s not existing in Chinese textile designs, one need only refer to the Shōsōin collection for at least one example of a Chinese, or at least Far Eastern, silk with rabbits gayly running in a landscape.2 Examples of rabbits, similarly not native symbols, can be cited in other media. To mention only one, there is the delightful painting in the Palace Museum collection with a rabbit seated under a tree.3 No one familiar with Near Eastern textiles could ever consider the silks Nos. 4 and 5 to be Persian, either stylistically or technically, as Mr. Cammann counterproposes. As for Central Asia, the term is too vague and the area too vast to be meaningful as the provenance of a textile. The fourteenth-century date of the Eskiştuna antependium (No. 3) appears to be justified by the style of the embroidery, but the date of the other two silks which form the lining of the fifteenth-century chasuble is less clear. There is no reason to assume them to be earlier than, or even contemporary with, the rest of the vestment.

This reviewer regrets that she must disagree emphatically with Miss Geijer’s attribution of the silk forming the chasuble in Hed church (No. 42) to thirteenth-century Persia (or Central Asia). Miss Geijer states (p. 37) that this silk definitely cannot be Italian; in the writer’s opinion it cannot be Persian and is most probably Italian. The author considers that the silk must be thirteenth century because of its association with embroideries which she, evidently rightly, considers to be late thirteenth century. She considers that the silk and the en-

2 Jiro Harada, Gomotsu jidai senshokuron, Tokyo, 1929, No. 137.
broideries were made over into the present chasuble in the seventeenth century from an old cope. She believes that they are from the same cope and therefore contemporary and that their association “definitely proves that the Hed fabric dates from the thirteenth century.” She dates the embroidery 1290-1300 but does not specify a late thirteenth-century date for the silk. The strong Far Eastern influence would, if the silk were Persian, indicate that it at least must date from the second half of the thirteenth century—after the Mongol invasion. There is no evidence given, however, to support the contention of the original association of the embroideries and the silk. It would seem possible that the chasuble was made from two older vestments and these not necessarily contemporary; or the thirteenth-century cope might have had its original silk replaced by a later one at some time before the whole was finally remade into the present chasuble. Certainly Miss Geijer is right in saying this silk bears no resemblance to any which are generally considered to be of thirteenth-century Italian origin, but it does bear a very marked resemblance to a well-defined group of textiles generally considered to be of fourteenth-fifteenth century date which have been variously attributed to Spain, Italy, or Persia. All these silks have golden designs showing varying degrees of Far Eastern influence against monochrome-colored silk grounds. In all of them the gold thread is formed around a linen core—a feature which Miss Geijer cites as evidence of Persian origin. On the contrary, however, the presence of a linen core is almost certain evidence of non-Islamic origin. In the microscopic examination of hundreds of medieval textiles this writer has never found a single Near Eastern, or even Hispano-Islamic, silk in which linen was used for the core of the gold thread; silk is invariably the material used by Islamic weavers. When considered as a group one cannot fail to recognize the Italianate character of these gold-on-monochrome silks and it is impossible to attribute them to Persia. There seems little doubt that they represent an expression of the Oriental influence that came into Italy, especially Venice, in the late middle ages. If Miss Geijer could give positive proof of late thirteenth-century date for the Hed silk it would provide interesting evidence for this influence having taken place earlier than is generally considered to have been the case, and would give an important clue to an earlier dating for this group of silks.

The next class of woven fabrics discussed are silks, which the author attributes to eighteenth-century China. The material falls into two groups. One, constituting Russian military banners in the collection of the Army Museum taken at the battle of Narva (1700) and in the war between Peter the Great and Charles XII (1709), and the other, constituting silks of various forms for the most part accompanied by interesting documents giving clues to early eighteenth-century date, are preserved in churches throughout Sweden. The majority of these silks are unquestionably Chinese and conform to known types, but the presence of documentation providing them with relatively precise dates makes them unusually valuable as documents for the history of Chinese textiles. Some among these two groups, however, do not accord with our usual concept of Chinese textile design and these the author has considered to be Chinese export material influenced by foreign designs. These non-Chinese designs fall into two different styles. Some of them (Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 17) are clearly reminiscent of European late-Gothic and Renaissance patterns; the second group (Nos. 20, 23, 24, 27, and 28) are close to the rococo designs of the end of the seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries in France and Italy. It is unfortunate that the author has not always given precise reasons why she considers these silks Chinese and not European. On page 37 she comments on a certain stiff quality in the weft direction which occurs in some of these silks and which she has found to be characteristic of Chinese silks. One must not overlook the fact that in judging textiles there are often certain characteristics which one comes to recognize through

Miss Geijer contradicts herself on this point in the catalogue description of the silk saying there that the core is of silk. However the obvious relationship of the Hed silk to other well-known silks of the type leaves little doubt that it is in the latter instance that she is in error.

Although some writers have thought to give these textiles to Spain, evidence for such Far Eastern influence in Spain at this period is wholly lacking and the fact that such silks do not exist among the Spanish collections may be taken as further evidence that they were not produced in that country.
working with quantities of material that are more easily felt than described, and there is no doubt that the author has been guided to a considerable extent in making her attributions by just this type of feeling for her material. But it is regrettable that certain precise technical data, to which she held the clue, were not exploited more fully in this connection. Had she done this, some of these silks with non-Chinese designs would probably have been excluded and the case for the Chinese origin of the others would have been made stronger. Miss Geijer consistently gives the loom width of these silks in the catalogue descriptions and she comments more than once upon their uniformity; but she failed to take note of two important facts in this regard. All the silks that can without question be considered Chinese have loom widths varying from 60 to 74 centimeters; the majority are about 73 centimeters wide. Among those with non-Chinese designs showing Renaissance patterns, the widths are 52, 53, and 56 centimeters; while among those with the non-Chinese designs showing later European influence the widths are 73, 74, and 78 centimeters (two are not given as they are evidently incomplete). The narrow width (52 to 56 centimeters) corresponds exactly to what appears to be the "standard" European loom width. Without having made an exhaustive study of the loom widths of European textiles (a project which needs to be done), this writer has yet to find a European silk of Renaissance or later date with a width of much more than 52 centimeters. It would seem then that the four Renaissance-inspired silks are not Chinese, as Miss Geijer believes them to be because of their "diffuse forms and the character of their drawing," but merely poor examples from an inferior European workshop. The character of the selvages with an outer twill stripe is different from all the others which the author describes as being plain satin.®

On the other hand, on this basis the silks with non-Chinese designs of later European inspiration are evidently actually Chinese, as it appears that European workshops did not employ looms of such width. Thus, without having quite clearly stated the point herself, Miss Geijer has provided us with an important clue that will be invaluable in the further study of eighteenth-century European silks and their counterparts from the Far East.

The remainder of the chapter on woven fabrics deals with textiles of Near Eastern origin: Seventeenth-century Persian textiles; three Indian sashes; Turkish fabrics from the fifteenth-eighteenth centuries; and an entirely new group of material constituting letter sacks containing correspondence from the court of the Tatar Khan of Crimea and presumably woven in that area; and finally two silks constituting costumes of a Torgod Mongol woman. The Persian and Turkish silks constitute a magnificent group of unusually high quality. None can rival in beauty or interest the Safavid coat of elaborate velvet which was given by the Czar of Russia to Queen Christina of Sweden, probably at the time of her accession to the throne in 1644. The Persian textiles, except for No. 38 which provides us with a new type of design, are all familiar types. Their importance lies in the fact that so many are accompanied by important clues to their dating. For example, Nos. 32 and 33 are chasubles of Safavid silk and velvet, respectively, and are dated 1633; No. 37 is a letter sack brought back by Fabritius (the famous Swedish ambassador) from the Persian court in 1682; No. 30 is another letter sack containing a letter of 1697. The Turkish textiles are likewise, with the exception of No. 47, familiar types and are provided frequently with interesting evidence of date. Nos. 65 and 66 are called "Asia Minor (?), early 17th century" and "Provincial Turkish manufacture (or Venice?), 16th century"; in this reviewers opinion both are Italian and eighteenth and seventeenth century, respectively. It is difficult to really judge No. 56 from the poor photograph, but it appears to be an unusual design for a Turkish fabric although the details of the drawing, as far as they can be seen, do appear to be Turkish. No. 57 is completely un-Turkish in design and the colors and the fine silver wire are further evidence of European origin. Perhaps the most interesting of the entire group of Turkish textiles is No. 47 which provides us with an extremely interesting example of Italian influence among Turkish textiles. That the textile is definitely Turkish is proved by the form of gold thread as noted by the author.

The letter sacks from the Crimea number some 64 examples which are subdivided into two groups:

6 Miss Geijer has used the archaic word "atlas" throughout instead of the more common "satin." The meaning nevertheless remains clear.
those (Group I) which have techniques which were in common usage such as taffeta, satin, damask, etc.; and those (Group II) of a unique technique which is quite unknown outside of this material. Of the entire collection only seven belong to Group I. Four are unpatterned fabrics of simple taffeta, moire (presumably also taffeta), satin, and velvet. The other three are purely Italian in technique and in design as is noted by the author who, however, considers that they cannot have been made in Italy—No. 78 (and No. 79, a duplicate) because of the poor quality of the drawing and the late occurrence of the Quattrocento pattern. Her reasons for excluding No. 80 are not specified. The silks of Group II are entirely unique in weaving technique, quality, and character of the silk threads used, and in their designs which, reflecting in a general way the contemporary Near Eastern—especially Turkish—designs, have a character of their own. Miss Geijer believes that all the silks of both groups are of local manufacture; she explains that, because silk is known to have been produced and manufactured in the Crimea, there is no reason to doubt that all were made there. The silks of Group I she considers to represent work of "professional" workshops and those of Group II to represent "homemaking." This reasoning is difficult to follow on the basis of the evidence given. It would seem much more logical to consider Group I as imports, most likely from Italy, and Group II as the indigenous production. In the reviewer's opinion Miss Geijer does not adequately support her contention that Nos. 78 and 80 cannot be Italian. Poor quality of design in No. 78 is not a guarantee of foreign copying (and certainly not that it was made in the Crimea). As for the late occurrence of the design, there is no assurance that the textile was not already old when made into a letter sack in the seventeenth century. It is possible that the silk in question was made expressly for export and therefore with less care given to quality and with the design perhaps intentionally conservative. There seems to be no reason for doubting the Italian character of No. 80. Miss Geijer points out the unusual character of the silks used for Group II which is not present in Group I; this alone may be taken as evidence of different provenance. Furthermore, even though the technique of Group II is relatively primitive, the carefully repeated patterns, which are not simple, must have been produced on a drawloom; it does not seem possible to this writer that they could be the products of home industries, as Miss Geijer believes them to be. It seems curious, furthermore, that the Khan should have chosen for his letter sacks homemade textiles in overwhelming proportion to those from the professional workshops which are known to have existed in great numbers in his empire and to have supplied his court. It would be a coincidence, indeed, if the few fragments represented by Group I were all that were left of this important industry and all the others should represent domestic crafts. The presence of Italian imports among the Khan's letter sacks is hardly surprising in view of the importance of Italian commerce in that area, of which Miss Geijer makes note.

The section on woven fabrics is concluded by a discussion of two silks which form part of a Torgod Mongol costume brought back to Sweden in 1734 by the famous soldier Renate and his wife Brigitta. The history surrounding the costume is actually more interesting than the silks themselves, which are relatively late and coarse examples of Turkish work. Miss Geijer, evidently at first somewhat uncertain as to the proper attribution for these silks, ascribes them in the catalogue and in the photo captions as Chinese but in the text says that they must have been produced in the "sphere of activity of Persian art." In conversation with this reviewer since the appearance of the book she has expressed her conviction that they are actually Turkish textiles. They were no doubt acquired during the time when, in the first half of the eighteenth century, the Torgod Mongols lived in South Russia in the region of the Volga and were in easy contact with Turkey.

The second section of the book (comprising only about one-third of the text and catalogue entries), which is devoted to the Oriental embroideries, holds far less interest to the Orientalist and to the art historian than the section on woven fabrics. While a number of the examples are undeniably of excellent artistic quality and superb craftsmanship and constitute important documents of an all too little known and appreciated art, the majority are not of great interest. As in the case of the woven fabrics, their principal interest often lies in the accompanying documentation which gives evidence
of date and occasionally also the place of origin. The author divides her material into two subgroups which she defines as "heavy" and "light" embroideries. The former she considers are the products of professional ateliers and largely the work of men, and the latter, domestic work done by women in the home or harem.

Among the "heavy" embroideries are several worthy of mention. These include the beautiful Turkish gold-embroidered saddle-shabrack (No. 104) a gift to Gustavus Adolphus in 1628. Another similar saddle-shabrack (No. 105) was later made over into an antependium and bears an embroidered date, 1701. To the Tatar kingdom of Crimea are assigned, on stylistic as well as documentary evidence, two more saddle-shabracks (Nos. 106 and 107), the former given to the church of Kungslena by count Sven Lagerberg who served as Swedish minister to the Crimean Tatar Khan in 1710 and 1711; the latter a gift to Charles XI (or XII) by the Khan himself. Although also a gift to the Swedish court by an embassy from Tatar Crimea, it is difficult to consider that the quiver for bow and arrow (No. 103) is also Tatar work (and not Turkish) as Miss Geijer has. Two interesting embroideries (Nos. 108 and 109) which are attributed in the text and photo captions to Russia but in the catalogue as "Russia (or Turkish?)" appear, stylistically at least, to be more probably Turkish. The writer has not adequately supported her claim for Russian provenance. Beautiful and well-documented examples of the Turkish applique technique are two tents (No. 113 and 114) of which details only are illustrated.

The heavy embroideries also include several coverlets and other objects variously attributed to Indian, Indo-Portuguese, and Persian origin. The majority are from the seventeenth century. Only three examples are Chinese. The first and most interesting is a large panel (No. 126), ornamented with a series of congratulatory emblems in two registers, which was made into an antependium in 1705, as is attested by a rather clumsy embroidered inscription which has been added to perpetuate the name of the donor. The second, a European woman's dress (No. 127) is an extremely interesting example of Chinese export work made after a European rococo design which nevertheless in numerous details of technique and of drawing betrays the Chinese hand that executed it.

The "light" embroideries, for the most part simple squares described as kerchiefs and towels, comprise the following categories: Veils and sashes of Indian origin; linens with polychrome designs "probably" from Asia Minor; and Turkish veils and peshaours (towels). All conform to known types, but again they are especially interesting because of their accompanying documentation.

The writing of a book of such varied content not only technically but also geographically and chronologically is not an easy task for one person who can scarcely hope to be an expert in so many fields. It is only Miss Geijer's unusually broad experience in the whole field of textiles that made her work possible. Although disagreeing from time to time with certain attributions or points of view which the author has presented, this reviewer is thoroughly aware of the many positive points which the author has made and of the value of the work as a whole. The assemblage in one volume of so many documented examples of Oriental textiles will make this book an indispensable instrument of scholarship for textile historians and Orientalists, both Near and Far Eastern, for years to come.

DOROTHY SHEPHERD


This is a tantalizing book. It is described by the publishers as being "Scholarly and well-illustrated ... vividly interwoven with the record of the dynasties themselves, this account provides not only an authentic interpretation of a major phase of Chinese costume, but also a fuller understanding of subsequent Chinese history and culture." One opens it, therefore, hoping to find at least one color plate to give a hint of the splendor of both robe and history, but, unfortunately, there are no colored illustrations.

Next, of course, one looks for the list of illustrations, expecting to find a long one, but there is no such list. Only by running through the pages does one finally come upon some photographs bound in the middle of the book, and only 20 of them. The reader is hereupon obliged to put a bookmark at the place, lest he spend the rest of his time again turning pages and losing his place in the text. He is obliged also to have a high-powered magnifying
glass at hand, not because the photographs are so
clear as to invite closer inspection, but because he
will be quite unable to follow the author's arguments
and descriptions without some such aid. The plates
are far too small to give the average reader any idea
of the beauty of the robes; nor will they be useful
to curator or collector who may wish to compare
an actual robe with those singled out by the author
as typical of certain styles and periods.

No doubt the author regrets as much as the
reader the omission of clear details that would allow
such comparisons. It must have embarrassed him
to have to refer to publications by Mr. Alan Priest
and Miss Helen Fernald as essential aids in fol-
lowing this text, for he has disagreed with both of
them quite openly, though he neglects to give their
names as authors of the texts when he refers to
them for the first time. We encounter Miss Fernald's
_Chinese court costumes_ on page 37, footnote 4,
without being told the name of the author, or the
place and date of publication. The same omission
occurs when he refers to _Imperial robes and textiles
of the Chinese court_ (p. 39), _Costumes from the for-
bidden city_ (p. 41), _A brief guide to Chinese woven
fabrics_ (p. 47), and even _Eminent Chinese of the
Ch'ing period_ (p. 21). This is a serious oversight on
the part of an author, his editors, and his proof-
readers. It is all the more shocking because there is
no bibliography of titles in European languages to
help the reader. Quite obviously the book is an as-
semblage of articles published before, but that does
not excuse such omissions on the part of a scholar
with the fine reputation of Dr. Cammann, nor does
it give one a feeling of confidence in his editorial
staff.

As a result of painstaking research into Chinese
texts, the author presents a brief early history of
dragon robes. It is to be hoped that some of the
many gaps in our knowledge of the early days may
some day be filled in. This publication gives us a
good start, but in almost every paragraph the author
offers a supposition that something "probably," "apparently," "presumably," etc., may be so.
He may be quite right, but the reader is inclined
to follow one of two courses. He may go along in
complete agreement, realizing that the author is a
remarkably intense scholar who consults many rare
source books in searching for the most reasonable
hypotheses, or he may begin to resist the sweeping
statements offered without adequate proof, wearied
at the thought of seeking out books available only
in specialized libraries to check for himself. The
reader may thus accept all the suppositions as
truths, or, out of impatience and irritation, begin to
suspect that the author cannot be right all the time.

As the book unfolds, direct translations of ancient
records are most welcome, as are the splendid notes
on customs lists, dyes, and techniques. Whenever
such direct information is given, the reader feels
that he is on firm ground, and may wish that the
author had confined himself to this kind of a con-
tribution—say, to the translation of a series of edicts
or historical records, with adequate illustrations. In
a work of the vast scope of the present book, the
happy medium between a definitive reference book
for the specialist and an informative, pleasant ac-
count for the general reader is rarely achieved.

As a matter of fact, the average reader may be
bewildered about the very subject of the book,
dragon robes. They are defined as "A specific
type of semi-formal robe" in the first paragraph, but
before long we read of "dragon garments" (upper
dragon robe), presentation robes with coiled dragons on them, a dragon robe that was a
"carriage-riding costume of a Sung emperor," and,
later on, of court robes, semi-formal robes, robes of
state, ceremonial robes, "sacrificial coats that were
not true dragon robes," etc.

Even the dragon appropriate to each period and
to each type of robe is elusive. On page 4, in discus-
sing the emperors of the T'ang period, the author
speaks of a pair of portraits in which they (the
emperors) are shown wearing robes with large
dragon medallions in them (not illustrated), and
he comments, "However, the dragons themselves
are painted in Yüan or Ming style and have too
many claws—the dragons of the T'ang regularly
had only three—so these paintings are undoubtedly
very late and useless as evidence." Later on, he
regrets that there are no surviving portraits of Sung
emperors wearing robes with dragon patterns, but
says, "However, we do know that they were proba-
bly three-clawed dragons with horns curling upward
at the tops, like those of the T'ang (although the
four-clawed dragon had begun to appear in later
Sung art) ... Furthermore, we cannot tell if the
Sung had yet developed the bold patterns that
characterized the later dragon robes. We can only
assume, in the light of other art productions of the period, that the Sung emperors probably preferred small and subtle patterns” (pp. 5 and 6).

One wonders exactly what the author means by "Yüan and Ming styles of dragon," for surely he is obliged to describe or illustrate them when he uses such a style as the basis for his acceptance or rejection of a painting. He remarks that they have too many claws, but beyond that we know nothing of the general proportions of the body, head, legs, tail, type of horn, beard or lack of beard, kind of scaly surface preferred, eyes, etc. All students of Chinese art know what infinite variations there are on the dragon theme from Shang times through the later ages, and they would expect a stylistic analysis of types used from the thirteenth through the midseventeenth centuries.

As to the number of claws characteristic of each period, we must remember that thousands upon thousands of pieces of fabric, pottery, painting, sculpture, and architectural ornament have perished in China, and such generalizations are a bit dangerous. There is, for instance, a five-clawed dragon on a vase described as Late T'ang in the Eumorfopoulos Catalogue.1 There is another on a Tz'u Chou vase in the Nelson Gallery in Kansas City, of the Sung dynasty, and there is a five-clawed dragon appearing in the sky in a Sung painting by Lu Hsin-chung of the thirteenth century.2 In this same series textile patterns are portrayed with great clarity, and we would not call them “small and subtle” any more than we would so describe designs on Tz'u Chou and other ceramic wares of the time.

In hoping to learn more about the robes themselves, the reader must pay close attention to the text from page 22 through page 34, for the author refers to so many minute changes in edict, fashion, classification, and ornamentation that one may well feel more discouraged than enlightened. Even before that, on page 20, we are told, “Dragon robes had never been an integral part of the Ming costume tradition—they were not even specifically mentioned in the Ming clothing laws.” Yet, on page 17, footnote 32, we were informed that a law of 1459 had mentioned robes with three-clawed dragons and a winged dragon-fish as being forbidden to officials.

Later on (p. 43), in describing Type 5, an eight-dragon medallion robe first known in an early K'ang-hsi portrait, painted sometime in the 1660's, the author concludes that it had been derived from “earlier Ming examples which had eight-dragon medallions and the Twelve Symbols.”

Much of the confusion about Ming robes still holds for early Ch'ing times. As the author reminds us also on page 43, “The problem is to determine what if anything was meant by the differences in the number of facing and profile dragons. There is nothing in the laws to indicate that they conformed to distinctions in rank, and yet they very likely did. Perhaps some contemporary account not yet known will still turn up to tell us about the unrecorded styles and conventions of those times.” This is well worth keeping in mind for the whole early period, where supposition plays so large a role in attempted classification. It should serve as a warning to all who would be arbitrary in their opinions until such contemporary accounts come to light.

When later Ch'ing robes are discussed, we are on firmer ground, but on pages 86 and 87 the information and opinions given on pages 52 and 53 are practically repeated. One clear statement would have been far more helpful. As it stands, the reader (who has already tried to concentrate on so many types of robe and variations within these types) is haunted by the feeling that all of this is familiar, but must go back to check and re-read to be sure.

The several Appendices that give, in résumé form, concise information on types of robe and insignia appropriate to members of the royal family, nobility, and dignitaries, will prove most useful to those who wish to refer quickly to a chart. The lack of adequate illustrations, even line drawings, is, however, a lamentable omission that reduces the value of the book. No doubt the author and publishers would have liked to include more, but were deterred by the cost of publication. For this subject, though, they are of fundamental importance.

1 R. L. Hobson, Chinese, Corean, and Persian pottery and porcelain in the Eumorfopoulos collection, (London, 1925–28), vol. 1, pl. 63, No. 412, “Late T'ang, similar to wares found in a tomb in Szechuan with a slab dated 839.”

BOOK REVIEWS

The section on symbolism and punning symbols is more pleasant reading than the descriptive chapters. Here the reader feels closer to the great past traditions of China. The author has brought together both old and new interpretations, and he seems to have done so with real enjoyment, which is shared by the reader.

Returning to the publishers’ claims for the book, one must note that there are unscholarly practices as well as scholarly, that it is not adequately illustrated, and that it is marred as a reference book by this lack. The glimpses of history and culture are so firmly interwoven with wearisome detail that the average reader will find the whole thing too complex for informative reading, and the expert will not find at hand the criteria he is seeking. One is impressed, nevertheless, by the author’s tireless inquiry into past records, and by his knowledge of robes in various collections. Unfortunately the fruits of his labor are not presented in a sustained narrative.

There is much to be complimented in the book, especially the Appendices, the translations of old texts, the many footnotes containing quantities of facts, and the challenging suppositions of the author, but one leaves the text with a feeling of regret that Dr. Cammann and his publishers were content with a result that does not bear out their claims. A less ambitious project, dealing with materials that could have been more adequately covered, would have been more rewarding on every score.

JANE GASTON MAHLER


A few general introductory remarks may be in order with respect to Western, particularly American, reaction to Japanese sculpture. Despite a half century of study and publication that has revealed an enormous and well-catalogued body of sculptural material, including Langdon Warner’s monumental “Japanese Sculpture of the Suiko Period,” the Occidental has remained strangely unmoved. This nonreaction to the sculpture of Japan—so noticeable when compared to the inordinate love for color prints—is a puzzle to the Japanese. Our failure to react has been taken, mistakenly we believe, to indicate our “inability to appreciate Japanese sculpture.” A possible result of this apparently double misunderstanding may be seen in the curiously small proportion of sculpture in the great Loan Exhibition of Japanese Painting and Sculpture that toured the United States in 1953 and of the arrangement in the official catalogue of the few sculptures as an incongruous sort of appendage. The fact is that the span of history, as far as extant examples are concerned, is far more adequately covered by sculpture than by painting. Compared to either of these the art of the colored block print might be described as a brilliant flash in a somewhat corroded pan. What is to be done for us then with respect to sculpture? The volumes under review are assuredly part of the answer. Their announced release in three separate languages, Japanese, French, and English, indicates the worldwide breadth of their intended public.

Despite long contact, the Western world has seen little of Japan’s great sculpture. It is far less satisfactorily represented in our museums than that of China, and except for the group noted above and the somewhat larger selection sent to Berlin in 1939, few first-rate examples have traveled to the West. The Westerner in Japan, unless on special pilgrimage or research, will miss most of it and even so will probably never lay eyes on such key representations of their respective periods as the Yumedono Kannon, the Shukongoji, and the Kanshinji Nyoirin Kannon, simply because they are normally kept in secret, revered for special sacredness.

Most of Japan’s great sculptures are undoubtedly known and photographed. Many are known through the indefatigable Ogawa of the Asuka-en, Nara, whose camera always caught the sacred image in the correct religious light. Here, however, we have a calculated departure. Each piece, for better or worse, is treated as a museum object rather than as an icon. The several photographers have used light effects with abandon, generally eschewing the dim religious glow, sometimes creeping up sacrilegiously behind an image to portray the back of its neck, sometimes approaching so close to the face of a deity that the cracked surface becomes more important than the face itself. But we mean no
condemnation. There are many approaches to God and art.

The 192 plates are divided among a lesser number of sculptures, several plates frequently being assigned to a single object; and, all in all, present a selective review of Japan's great sculpture.

In the first volume, the quality of the photography raises the lowly prehistoric haniwa from mere clay artifact to primitive sculpture of distinction. The second volume covers splendidly the highlights of the Asuka (or Suiko) period. It includes, for example, a fine study of the face (II, pl. 11) of the Hōrinji standing wooden Bodhisattva, charming details of the gilt bronze Māyā and apsarases on the occasion of Buddha's birth (II, pls. 29-31) and the head of the Kudara Kannon (II, pl. 9) with a spider web from the nose to the jewel in the crown. One wonders, however, that the Kōryūji Miroku, for all its beauty, is allowed six plates to the exclusion of a single glimpse of the Yumedono figure.

The selections for Volume III do not provide the clarity that is so greatly needed for the Hakuho Period, for which the usual dates, A.D. 645-710, are given. Indeed, more than half the plates exhibit peripheral or disputed materials: the Yakushi Triad (A.D. 688 or A.D. 717-728), and the Tōindō Kannon (perhaps archaic), the Hōryūji, pagoda clay figures (A.D. 711), and the much mended Chūmon guardians, Nio, of the same temple and date. However, the Hakuho group begins, fittingly enough, with two fine studies (III, pl. 12) of the nearly complete colossal Buddha head found at the Kofukuji as recently as 1937, and identified almost certainly as that of the original principal image of the Tōkondō, cast in A.D. 678 and consecrated for another temple (the Yamada-dera) in A.D. 685. In terms of gradual stylistic changes, it is difficult to conceive of the Yakushi Trinity being cast within three short years of the dedication of this superb head, so obviously a document of stylistic transition, embodying the naïveté of Suiko faith, yet already swelling with the maturity of Tempyō. This is followed by appropriate examples from the gilt wood so-called “Six Kannon” (III, pls. 3-8) and the bronze “Forty-Eight Buddhist Images,” all originally in the Hōryūji, the latter now in the Tokyo National Museum (III, pls. 9-12). The bronze “Yumetagae Kannon” of the Hōryūji (III, pls. 20 and 21) is very much in keeping. A much stronger Hakuho group might easily have been presented however, by inclusion of the Tachibana Triad, the standing Yakushi Nyorai of the Shin-Yakushi, and the Shaka from the Jindaiji near Tokyo.

There can be no stylistic criticism of the fourth volume, on Tempyō. The selection is of 19 well-known examples of lacquer and clay, ending with one wooden gigaku mask from the Tōdaïji, so well preserved as still to show the painted hirsute lines of eyebrow, lip, and chin. As a group it would have been strengthened by the inclusion of bronze examples, preferably, in our opinion, by the moving up from the previous volume of the colossal Yakushi Triad. The full-length lacquer image of Sariputa (IV, pl. 9), somewhat blurred, is one of the very few reproductions in the set that is not up to standard.

In the selection and reproduction of the Heian Period in Volume V, emphasis is rightly on the early, powerful, solid wooden images of esoteric Jōgan. This chapter of Japan's sculptural attainments, too little known, yet representative of Japan's best, is superbly covered. The Tōshodai-ji torso, seen in San Francisco in 1952 (V, pls. 1 and 2) is followed by several photographs that do full justice to the great standing Jingoji Yakushi (V, pls. 3-6), and similar coverage for the Shin-Yakushiji's huge seated version (V, pls. 7-9), not to mention the sweet but strong, and of course familiar, Eleven-faced Kannon of the Hokkeji Nunnery (V, pls. 10-12). The Tōji Bishamonten, supported by earth spirits, while unfortunately included, is less successfully reproduced—a pity, since we know of no good photographs (V, pls. 13 and 14). An extraordinarily sympathetic lens seems to have been turned on the perfectly preserved hidden image of Nyoirin Kannon of the Kanshinji (V, pls. 15-17), the now paintless Shaka of Murōji (V, pls. 18 and 19), and the Shintō goddess of the Matsunō-ō Jinsha, one of the world's great female images (V, pls. 20-22). The volume concludes with plates of the Tōdaiji Priest Rōben, a bronze phoenix, and interior pictures of the Byōdōin Amidadō (Hō-ōdō), the Jōruri-ji Kichijōten (stylistically in place, in spite of some hint of Kamakura attribution), and the Okura Fugen, affording a briefer view of the better-known Fujiwara.

The Kamakura volume, while beginning with
Unkei's incomparable Dainichi Nyorai, features priests, guardians, and lesser attendants, and ends with the startling likeness of Uesugi Shigefusa. Here are amply demonstrated the humanistic tendencies of the age—an age, however, not untouched by spirituality. From this prolific age, however, only 15 examples are chosen—8 of which are pairs—so, inevitably, favorites and famous pieces will be missed. Nonetheless the photography is striking, and for some who would work their way gradually into Japanese sculpture, it may be best to start with this last volume and work gradually toward the past.

The publication of this work, announced for 1952, has appeared piecemeal, and at the time of review only three of the numbers that have come to hand, III, IV, and V, contained the English text. These each have 15 pages embodying an essay followed by full descriptions giving names with Sanskrit equivalents, sources, measurements, iconography, and historical data. Essays and descriptions alike are admirably informative, terse, and up-to-date, their quality and content quite overshadowing the trivial slips, misspellings, and misusages. “Reared,” for example, is found for “backed”; “spiritualism” for “spirituality.” In the essay on Tempyo by the pen of Takeshi Kuno, the discussion of the “sensuality” of T’ang is as unconvincing to a Westerner as the broad reference to the “delicate, neat or pretty, the traits that always differentiate Japanese art from Chinese.” One indelicate and ugly demon from the Kaidanin (IV, pi. 26) would seem to refute this! In the same article and in the descriptions, “Candra-prabha” and “Sūrya-prabhāsa” are wrongly given as Sanskrit equivalents for “Nikkō” and “Gakkō.” These terms are, of course, to be reversed.

While it is unfortunate that these minor blemishes could not be caught in proof, it behooves us to remember the barriers of language and to conclude that, after all, the splendid array of reproductions will do more than words ever could for an increased understanding of Japanese sculpture.

JAMES MARSHALL PLUMER
IN MEMORIAM

MEHDI BAHRAMI (1905–51)

Mehdi Bahrami was born in Teheran in 1905 as a member of a distinguished Iranian family. After the completion of his training in the highest schools of his native land he worked for some time at the court of Reza Shah Pahlavi. In 1934 he was sent by the Iranian Government for further training in Europe, where he first studied Persian art and archaeology at the University of Paris, and eventually received the degree of Docteur ès-lettres. In 1934 he joined the Islamic Department of the State Museum in Berlin as volunteer assistant and stayed there until the end of 1935. As a member of its staff he participated in the proceedings of the Third International Congress of Persian Art and Archaeology, which took place in Leningrad and Moscow in September 1935. In 1936 he returned to Teheran to join the Archaeological Museum, where he became eventually the Director of its Islamic section. At the same time he taught art and archaeology, especially of the Islamic period, at Teheran University. In 1948 he was one of the organizers of an exhibition of Iranian art which was held in the Musée Cernuschi in Paris. When the present Shah of Iran, Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, visited the United States in the fall of 1949, Dr. Bahrami brought an extensive collection of Iranian art to the United States to honor this occasion; the exhibition of these objects was formally opened by His Majesty at the Metropolitan Museum, and they were also shown later in Boston. Dr. Bahrami also wrote an illustrated catalogue for this American exhibition, just as he had contributed sections to the earlier Paris show. Dr. Bahrami participated in the International Congress of Orientalists in Istanbul in August 1951, where he read a much discussed paper on Persian pottery. He was already ailing at this time but nobody realized how serious his condition was; he himself hoped that a year’s stay in Germany would restore his health. However, he had to be operated on in Hamburg and passed away on October 29, 1951.

Bahrami’s scientific studies were particularly devoted to Persian pottery. His publications of the luster tiles of Damghan and the poetical inscriptions found on these and other tiles were followed by an extensive work on the faience of Gorgan. This book acquainted the scholarly world with a great amount of unknown material which he discussed from the historical, archaeological, ornamental, and palaeographic viewpoints. His other research was devoted to special problems of Iranian archaeology and to the art of his country in general.

Bahrami was a typical representative of the amiable oriental scholar who had been trained according to European methods. If a premature death had not taken him from us we certainly could have expected from him many informative pieces of research. We shall miss him greatly as one of the few specialists in the field of Iranian art. All who appreciated him and his work will regret his much too early passing.

ERNST KÜHNEL

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF MEHDI BAHRAMI


1 The compiler of this bibliography wishes to express his thanks to Madame S. Moghadam, Director of the Library of the Archaeological Service of the National Museum, Teheran, for having brought three titles to his attention, and to Engineer Abbas A. Mazda for kindly providing the information about the popular articles in Persian.


12. *Snatch of an Iran, Gurgan.* The arts of Iran. Pottery vessels (in Persian). (Publication of the University of Teheran No. 38.) Teheran, 1327 (1948), 126 pp. + 4 pp. index and list of errata, 44 text figs. and 47 figs. on plates.


17. *Iranian art. Treasures from the Imperial collection and museums of Iran*. Catalogue, with a foreword by Francis Henry Taylor and Maurice S. Dimand, New York, 1949, 41 pp., 43 figs.


**B. Popular Articles in Persian**

21. *The historical monuments of Tafresh.* سلسله آموزش و تربیت، جلد اول (1322 هـ)

22. *The fine arts of Iran in the Islamic period.* مجله ایران امروز، تیر 1329

23. *Carpet weaving in ancient times.* مجله ایده‌ها، 1327


25. *Painting.* مجله جامعه آمریکایی ایران، سال 1320

26. *The artistic connections of Iran with Europe in ancient periods.* مجله آموزش و تربیت، شماره 1323

27. *Sasanian silver vessels in the National Museum of Teheran.* مجله پژوهشگاه آنان (1323) شماره 1

28. *Portrait of Allah Khân Zand.* مجله پژوهشگاه، سال 1324

29. *Gold lustered pottery bowls.* مجله پژوهشگاه بین‌المللی ایران، شماره 1324 (نامه‌های قزوینی) شماره 1324 (نامه‌های قزوینی)
The most important illus- 
trated Jāmi` al-tawārikh MS. 
جملة ياقارخ. ديوان ماه. 
١٢٣٤, دال دوم شاركا. شتم.

'Ali Reżā-ye 'Abbāsī and 
عباسی مانی. دریمن مانی. 
بةزيه پبکار. نرذاد ماه ١٢٣٤، دال دوم 
شاركا. دهم.

The Mazandaran-Treasure. 
گنجیه مازندران. 
جملة آمرش ووريش. نرذاد ١٢٣٨ شاركا. دهم.

UGO MONNERET DE VILLARD (1881–1954)

Wieder ist einer der wenigen dahingegangen, die in der archäologischen Erforschung des christlichen und islamischen Ortes ihre Lebensaufgabe gefunden hatten, und in die Träner um seinen Verlust mischte sich die Sorge um das wissenschaftliche Erbe, das er hinterlässt. Monneret de Villard war Architekt und Archäologe, Historiker und Epigraphiker in einer Person, und er war das alles und jedes mit grosser Gewissenhaftigkeit. Diese seine Vielseitigkeit hat Giorgio Levi Della Vida mit der Herzfeld’s verglichen, und wer beide gut kannte, wird hinzufügen, dass sie auch den Hang zu völliger Unabhängigkeit miteinander gemein hatten.


Von Oberägypten führte ihn sein Forscherdrang weiter nach Nubien, das er in mancher Hinsicht überhaupt erstmalig in mehreren Expeditionen archäologisch erschloss und dessen politische und kulturelle Rolle seit der Römerzeit er überzeugend klarlegte. Ganz folgerichtig schloss sich dann nach der Besetzung Abessiniens durch Italien die Ausdehnung seiner Studien auf den äthiopischen Bereich an; der Auftrag zu einer Expedition nach Aksum (1937) und die Gelegenheit zu Ausgrabungen in Addis Abeba waren ihm Anlass, sich eingehender mit der abessinischen Kunst zu befassen, in der ihm der asiatische Einschlag stärker erschien als der von Ägypten her.


Seit 1934 lebte Monneret de Villard in Rom. Ein erklärter Gegner des fascistischen Regimes, fand er erst spät die ihm gebührende äußere Anerkennung und starb, stolz und verarmt, am 4. November 1954, den Tod eines einsamen, unbeugsamen Forschers, dem alle, die ihn kannten und verehrten, lange nachtrauern werden.¹

ERNST KÜHNEL

IN MEMORIAM

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF UGO MONNERET DE VILLARD

COMPILED BY GIORGIO LEVI DELLA VIDA


4. La teoria delle proporzioni architettoniche. Milano 1908. 70 pp., figs.


10. Iscrizioni cristiane della Provincia di Como anteriori al secolo XI. Como 1912. 176 pp. (Rivista storica della Provincia e antica diocesi di Como, fasc. 65-66.)


12. L'isola Comacina. Ricerche storiche ed archeologiche. Como 1914. 244 pp., figs. (Rivista archeologica della Provincia e antica diocesi di Como, fasc. 70-71.)


16. Catalogo delle iscrizioni cristiane anteriori al secolo XI. Milano 1915. 96 pp., figs. (Il Castello Sforzesco in Milano: le sue raccolte storiche e artistiche.)


18. L'architettura romana degli ultimi secoli dell'Impero, ibid., Nos. 9-10, 47 pp.


---

1 This bibliography is based on the material prepared by the late author. Items marked with an asterisk deal with Oriental problems. Readers are referred also to an obituary by Professor Levi Della Vida in the Rivista degli Studi Orientali, vol. 30 (1955), pp. 172-188 in connection with which this bibliography was first published. With the compiler's permission it was thought advisable to reprint the bibliography in a journal specifically devoted to problems of Oriental art. The "Additions" were kindly contributed by the Rev. Father Jean Simon, S. J., of the Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Rome.—ED.
32. Sull'origine della doppia cupola persiana, Architettura e Arti decorative, 1 (1921), pp. 315-324.
33. La Chiesa di Santa Barbara al Vecchio Cairo, illustrata da A. Patriccolo e U. M. de V. Firenze 1922, 62 pp., 39 figs. and pls. (also in English edition).
34. Oggetti egiziani in una tomba germanica, Aegyptus, 3 (1922), pp. 315-320.
37. La scultura ad Ahnás. Note sull'origine dell'arte copta. Milano 1923, 97 pp., 105 figs.
41. Arte manichea, Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, 56 (1923), pp. 971-984.
42. La fondazione del Deyr el-Abiad, Aegyptus, 4 pp. 150-162.
44. Ricerche sulla topografia di Qasr esh-Sham, Bull. de la Société Royale de Géographie d'Egypte, Nos. xii-xiii (1924).
45. L'arte di Samarra e il cosiddetto fregio tìlanìIDE, Aegyptus, 5 (1924), pp. 39-44.
46. Sul castrum romano di Babilonia d'Egitto, ibid., pp. 174-182.
47. Gli scavi di Capharnaum, Vita e Pensiero, n.s. 15 (1924), pp. 82-84.
55. Amboni copti e amboni campani, Aegyptus, 8 (1927), pp. 258-252.

*60. Deyr el-Muḥarraqah. Note archeologiche. Milano 1928. 35 pp., 30 figs.


*63. La tomba di San Macario, Aegyptus, 10 (1929), pp. 149–152.


*69. La missione italiana nella Nubia cristiana, Bollettino dell’Associazione internazionale degli Studi Mediterranei, 2 (1931), No. 3, pp. 19–23.


71. Un santuario di Min- Pane in Nubia, ibid., 13 (1933), pp. 42–44.

72. Iscrizioni dal cimitero di Sakinya (Nubia). Le Caire 1933, viii–28 pp., 4 figs., 9 pls. (Service des Antiquités de l’Egypte.)

*73. I vescovi giacobiti della Nubia, Mémoires de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 67 (1934), pp. 57–66. (Mélanges Maspero, II.)


*82. Note sulle influenze asiatiche nell’Africa orientale, Rivista degli Studi Orientali, 17 (1938), pp. 303–349.


*86. Storia della Nubia cristiana. Roma 1938. 250 pp., 10 maps. (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 118.)

*87. Note sulle più antiche miniature abissine, Orientalia, 8 (1939), pp. 1–24.


*90. Per una nuova iscrizione greca ad Aksum, Oriente Moderno, 19 (1939), p. 520.


*92. Le necropoli di Ballalaita e di Qoṭuf, Orientalia, 9 (1940), pp. 61–75.

*93. L’iscrizione ciotica di Ham e l’epigrafia meroticra, Aegyptus, 20 (1940), pp. 61–68.
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*95. La basilica cristiana in Egitto, Atti del IV Congresso internazionale di Archeologia cristiana, vol. 1 (1940), pp. 292–319. (Studi di Antichità cristiane pubblicati per cura del Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia cristiana, 16.)
*96. Le chiese della Mesopotamia. Roma 1940. 177 pp., 93 figs. (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 128.)

*97. Le forze cristiane della Nubia, Miscellanea Gregoriana, raccolta di scritti pubblicati nell'I centenario della fondazione del Museo Egizio (Città del Vaticano 1941), pp. 135–143.
*98. La Nubia Romana. Roma 1941. 53 pp., 49 figs. (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto per l'Oriente.)
*100. La chiesa monolitica di Yakkâh Millai'd, Rassegna di Studi Etiopici, 1 (1941), pp. 226–233.
*107. La Majestas Domini in Abissinia, Rassegna di Studi Etiopici, 3 (1943), pp. 36–45.
*110. La vita, le opere e i viaggi di frate Ricoldo da Montecroce. P., Oriente Christiana Periodica, 10 (1944), pp. 227–274.
*111. Lo studio dell'Islam in Europa nel XII e nel XIII secolo. Città del Vaticano 1944. iv–86 pp. (Studi e Testi, 110.)

*113. La tessitura palermitana sotto i Normanni e i suoi rapporti con l'arte bizantina, Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, 3, pp. 464–489. Città del Vaticano 1946. (Studi e Testi, 123.)
*116. La Madonna di S. Maria Maggiore e l'illustrazione dei Miracoli di Maria in Abissinia, Annali Lateranensi, 11 (1947), pp. 9–90.
*120. 'Aksûm e i quattro re del mondo, Annali Lateranensi, 12 (1948), pp. 125–180.

*122. Articles: Enciclopedia cattolica (Roma 1949–1954): Abu Hennis (I, col. 151); Akhîmîm (I, 615); Baqawât (II, 703–704); Bâwît (II, 1082–1083); Egitto (V, 170–180); Etiopia (V, 702–708); India (VI, 1820–1821); Isauria (VII, 245–249); Messopotamia (VIII, 754–757); Mileto (VIII, 996–997); Nubia (VIII, 1985–1987); Oriente cristiano (IX, 331–335); Osroene (IX, 420–421); Siria (XI, 745–755); Sohâg (XI, 917–918); Yemen (XII, 1739–1740).

*123. Le pitture muri omane al soffitto della Cappella Palatina in Palermo. Roma 1950. 82 pp., 250 pls. Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte.)


*128. La fiera di Bataac e la traslazione di S. Tomaso a Edessa, ibid., serie 8, vol. 6 (1951), pp. 77–104.


*130. Le leggende orientali sui Magi evangelici. Città del Vaticano 1952. 262 pp. (Studi e Testi, 163.)


*135. L’arte ivanica. Milano 1954. 194 pp., 87 figs., 4 pls. (Biblioteca Moderna Mondadori. Serie d’arte.)


**Additions**

139. Edifici del Piemonte, Il Monitore Tecnico, 17 (1911), pp. 112–114, 5 figs.


144. Il più antico documento relativo all’Ospizio del S. Gottardo, ibid., 45 (1918), pp. 578–579.


*146. Il museo degli Evag al Costantinopolis, Rassegna d’Arte, 8 (1921), pp. 123–127, 6 figs.


“Renounced Writings”

Congresso ed esposizione d’Architettura a Vienna, II Monitore Tecnico, 14 (1908), Nos. 15, 17, 19, 21, 22 (title on the offprint: Esposizione d’architettura a Vienna 1908).

Monneret de Villard wrote on the first page of the notebook containing the bibliography of his writings: “These writings have been omitted as they are devoid of interest.” This is, however, not quite so, as these early writings give a better understanding of the scholar’s scientific personality and at the same time show a serious approach and wide range of information, just as they already reveal the nobility of his style. None of these “Scritti Refutati” seem, therefore, unworthy of being recorded and those that could be traced have been assembled here.
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La forma architettonica e la materia, ibid., No. 22.
La libertà nell'architettura, ibid., 15 (1909), No. 14.
Opere di architettura moderna, con note di U. M. de V. Milano, 1909. 22 pp., figs., pls.
Il battistero e le chiese romaniche di Firenze. 28 pp., 64 illustrations, (Italian and French text) [L'Italia monumentale. Collezione di monografie sotto il patronato del Touring Club Italiano e della “Dante Alighieri,” No. 3.]
Le chiese di Roma, I. Milano 1910, 16 pp., 64 illustrations. (Italian and French text; another edition, Florence, 1923, Italian, French, and English text), ibid., No. 4.
Aosta. Milano 1911, 20 pp., 64 illustrations. (Italian and French text; another edition, Florence, 1922, 36 pp., Italian, French, and German text), ibid., No. 19.
I monunentali del Lago di Cono. Milano 1912, 18 pp., 64 illustrations. (Another edition, Florence, n. d., 54 pp., 2 maps, Italian, French, and English text), ibid., No. 27.
Il Battistero di S. Vitale, Il Monitor Tecnico, 17 (1911), No. 1.

REVIEWS


LANGDON WARNER (1881–1955)

With the passing of Langdon Warner on the ninth of June, 1955, the American scene has been deprived of one of its great men. For half a century he was a leading figure in the Far Eastern field and did more than any other person toward giving Far Eastern art a permanent place in our university curricula and in our public and private collections. It seems fitting, therefore, that we record here some of what Mr. Warner always referred to as the “bare and ugly facts” of his life. It was the man behind these facts, of course, that drew forth the respect, the love, and, in the Orient, even the reverence and awe, of his fellow men.

He was born on August 1, 1881, in Cambridge, Mass., and here he had his early schooling and graduated with a B.A. degree from Harvard College in the class of 1903. Stemming from old New England families in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and in Concord, Mass., he was to travel far and wide, yet always were his roots to remain firmly embedded in his native New England. He married Lorraine d’O. Roosevelt, a cousin of President Theodore Roosevelt, at Oyster Bay in 1910. Together they were to rescue a dismantled seventeenth-century house, an important early American relic, in Newburyport, Mass., and re-erect it in nearby Essex as their summer home. Here, as to their Cambridge home, there came with the passing of the years a constant stream of admiring visitors from all over the world.

The first of Mr. Warner’s many explorations was undertaken in 1904, with the Pumpelly-Carnegie Expedition to Russian Turkestan. In 1906, under the auspices of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, he first went to Japan to study Japanese art and to
learn the language. He was lucky in being a pupil of Kakuzo Okakura, and in working and living with Okakura's other pupils, among them the sculptor Chunosuke Niire, the lacquerer Okabe, and the painter Yokoyama Taikan. From 1906 on, he made many long visits to Japan and was and always will be regarded by the Japanese with peculiar affection. Had he not once discovered a long-lost bit of gilt bronze ornament from the crown of the Kudara Kannon and had he not restored it to its rightful place? Had he not once walked, when others rode, to one of those rare openings of the Shoso'in? Had he not been summoned into the Imperial presence while Japan was still under the military occupation of his own countrymen?

In 1913 Mr. Warner was sent by the Smithsonian Institution of Washington and by Charles L. Freer of Detroit to consult with European Orientalists as to the wisdom of founding in Asia an American School of Archaeology on the general lines of those in Athens and Rome. This led him to studying European institutions and methods, and to investigating the archaeological potential of China, Manchuria, and Mongolia, and finally to visiting the École Francaise d'Extrême-Orient in Indo-China. His brilliant and thorough report, privately circulated, recommended founding in Peking an American School of Oriental Studies along the lines of the French school in Indo-China, but the outbreak of the first World War put a stop to the plan. Crossing Siberia the first of many times he reached Russia in 1914 in the early days of the war and assisted the curators of the Hermitage and Alexander III Museums in packing their treasures for safekeeping.

As early as 1912, Mr. Warner was an instructor at Harvard. In 1914-15 he lectured there on Oriental art, and thereby, despite strong pressure from relatives and friends to go into business, determined his life work. Always a man of action as well as a man of words, he was off to China in 1915 on behalf of the Cleveland Museum of Art. In September 1917, he was appointed Director of the Pennsylvania Museum of Art in Philadelphia. Although a diplomatic assignment interrupted the Philadelphia appointment, he was to undertake museum work along with teaching for the rest of his career. Before that year was up, however, he was proceeding to Japan and Siberia as vice-consul on a confidential mission for the State Department. He crossed Siberia four times under chaotic conditions, finally acting as liaison officer between the Czechoslovakian forces and the Allies, before returning to Philadelphia in January 1919.

From 1923 until his retirement in 1950, Mr. Warner was associated with the Fogg Museum of Art of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., under various titles, such as Field Fellow of the Fogg Museum, Fogg Fellow for Research in Asia, Lecturer on Fine Arts, and Curator of Oriental Art. Through all his life, he was in fact archaeologist, teacher, curator, and writer. He led the first and second Fogg Expeditions to China in 1923-24 and in 1925 respectively, both of which entailed overland journeys from Peking to Tun Huang, the major portions of which he covered on foot. The beautiful T'ang clay kneeling Bodhisattva and the fresco fragments now in the Fogg Museum of Art and his stirring travel tale of The Long Old Road in China were among the results of the first expedition, and his monograph on Wan Fo Hsia followed the second.

At the Fogg he built up one of the finest Far Eastern Art collections in the country. With the generous support of C. Adrian Rubel he founded the Rubel Asiatic Research Bureau, whose study collections augmented those of the museum, the two together giving Harvard an enviable position in the field of art research.

Mr. Warner in the early 1930's served in an advisory capacity to the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art in Kansas City at the inception of its Oriental collections, and if we remember correctly went to Peking on their behalf. We recall his infallible eye, whether looking at antique pots and bronzes in the Lie-li-ch'ang shops in Peking or viewing paintings by the dozen in the presence of Mr. Henry P'u Yi, last of the Ch'ing Imperial line in the temporary “palace” in Tientsin. His advice was often sought by and freely given to American museums in the matter of prospective acquisitions.

The most ambitious and far-reaching of Mr. Warner's many splendid exhibitions was certainly that undertaken while on two years' leave, 1938-39, from Harvard College as Director of "Pacific Cultures" for the Golden Gate International Exposition. Preliminary travel took him as far as Siam before setting up his office in San Francisco. Here for the first time Penelosa's Pacific Basin theory was monumentally and tangibly realized in an
enormous exhibition embracing all the continental and insular cultures of the North and South Pacific. The University of California, in recognition, awarded him an LL.D. degree in 1939.

An inspiring teacher, Mr. Warner was also a brilliant public speaker. He delivered two lectures at the great Exhibition of Chinese Art, 1935-36, at Burlington House, London, and lectured at universities all over the United States, tirelessly dispensing his knowledge of Oriental beauty as seen in homely artifacts or sophisticated works of art. In 1952 he gave a series of lectures on the arts of Japan before the Lowell Institute, Boston, and later delivered a number of lectures at the Honolulu Academy of Arts. His final courses, after his retirement from Harvard, were offered at Radcliffe.

During World War II he served as consultant to the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas. It was in this capacity that he was able, despite his modest denials of the fact, to intervene effectively in the matter of the possible bombing of Kyoto. The rumor that he also saved Nara, as many people believe, can hardly have any basis in fact, as that quaint old city was surely never in our day considered a military objective.

Soon after the war, in 1946, he was appointed special consultant to General MacArthur attached to the Civilian Information and Education Section, Division of Arts and Monuments, GHQ, Tokyo. Incidental to the main work of preserving cultural relics, he patiently welcomed the flocks of war-stunned citizens who sought redress for postwar injustices, and broke regulations left and right in order to aid them. The Japanese were not ungrateful. Early every morning during his several months in Tokyo, flowers, sent anonymously, were found outside his office door.

His last trip to Japan took place in 1952 as a member of an American visiting committee sent to aid in the selection of Japanese art treasures which toured the United States the following year. The large number of Sukiyo bronze images, all national treasures, included in the final Japanese selection was patently a gesture of gratitude to Mr. Warner whose Japanese Sculpture of the Sukiyo Period is still the definitive work on the subject.

As an editor Mr. Warner will be remembered for the two following publications:


He was the author of six books on Chinese and Japanese art:


*The Enduring Art of Japan* (Lowell Lectures), Cambridge, 1952.

*Tempyō Sculpture*. (A nearly completed work which, it is understood, is to appear posthumously.)

Among his shorter works and articles were:

*The art of the Japanese gardener*, International Quarterly.


*The Freer gift of Eastern art to America*, Asia (Aug. 1923).

An eighth century statue from Tun Huang with Chinese and Japanese parallels, Art Studies, vol. 4 (1926).
Introduction to Tō-Sō Seikwa, by Sadajirō Yamana, Osaka, Japan, 1928.
Works of art from Japan now shown in Boston, Art News, vol. 34 (Sept. 12, 1936), p. 5.
L'exposition d'art japonais au Musée des Beaux-arts de Boston, Mousseion, vol. 10 (1936), Nos. 3-4, pp. 87-105.

On teaching the fine arts, American Review (March, 1937).

All their desire is in the work of their craft. Commencement address, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, R. I., 1942.
Chinese jades, crystals, pottery and porcelains; The Ernest B. Dane, Class of 1892, and the Helen P. Dane Collection. Cambridge, 1942.
The Winthrop Collection; Chinese sculpture, stone and bronze, Art News (January 1944).
An introduction to the wall paintings in the Main Hall of the Hōryūji Monastery, by Ichimatsu Tanaka and others. Tokyo, 1951. (Preface by Mr. Warner.)

For many periodicals, and notably for the Atlantic Monthly, Mr. Warner also wrote numerous pithy book reviews. He was a great conversationalist and a master of the art of letter writing. Many will miss his calligraphic commentary on world affairs, his humor, and his words of encouragement, all set down boldly in black or in the rich brown ink of the Japanese squid.

He was an authority on such traditional sports as archery and falconry, and in his spare time a proficient amateur at such crafts as whittling,
potting, furnituremaking, and in later years in the carving of wooden eagles. But his chief mastery was with ideas and words, the materials of his chosen craft. Few institutions in America concerned with teaching or collecting Oriental art have been untouched by his great personality. Uncounted followers and friends must be forever in his debt.

To the foregoing sketch of Langdon Warner's life there must be added one further precious item—the Japanese Government's posthumous award in September 1955 of the Order of the Sacred Treasure conferred on him by the Emperor.

James Marshall Plumer
ANNOUNCEMENTS

After having edited *Ars Islamica* from the fall of 1938 until 1951 and having had the editorial responsibility for the Near Eastern section of *Ars Orientalis* from its inception in 1951, the undersigned has asked to be relieved from further editorial duties with the completion of this volume in order to devote himself more extensively to research and to his tasks at the Freer Gallery of Art.

In all these 19 years it has been the editor’s prime concern to bring out important research and discoveries in the field of Islamic and cognate arts, and to do this without interruption in spite of the difficulties of the war and postwar years. He could also assure the publication of articles in these fields when *Ars Islamica* changed into *Ars Orientalis*, even increasing the scope of the Near Eastern material, as this volume happily indicates. He gratefully acknowledges that in these efforts he had the full support of the authorities of the University of Michigan and the Freer Gallery of Art. As to the scholarly merits of the two publications, they are due to the unfailing interest, patience, and understanding of the many contributors from all over the world. To each and all of them he wishes to express his warm appreciation for their help. There is no doubt that with the same scholarly and administrative support the forthcoming volumes will under most competent editors continue to flourish.

Richard Ettinghausen

In regard to Professor Ettinghausen’s request to be relieved of the duties of Near Eastern Editor of *Ars Orientalis*, it may be well to quote from the minutes of the Freer Fund Committee meeting on October 24, 1955:

“The Committee received this information with great regret because it is fully sensible of the high abilities and complete devotion which Professor Ettinghausen has brought to his work as Editor. At the same time, the Committee feels that he fully deserves to be relieved of this onerous burden and that he merits the profound thanks of the Committee.”

Professor Ettinghausen’s place as Editor has been taken by Dr. Oleg Grabar, assisted by Dr. Andrew S. Ehrenkreutz, both of the University of Michigan. Professor Max Loehr remains as Far Eastern Editor. Communications should be addressed to the Editors at the Fine Arts Department, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

A. G. Wenley