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THE STAFF OF THE SCRIBES

AND IMPLEMENTS OF THE

DISCERNING: AN EXCERPT

By GULNAR K. BOSCH

Islamic bookbindings, long recognized by scholars and critics to have special historic and artistic value, are generally accepted as most worthy of merit in any collection of the binder’s craft. Yet desired detailed information concerning the technical aspects of these Near Eastern bookbindings is not easily accessible to the lay English reader, since the scattered references are usually in Arabic, Persian, or Turkish.

It is difficult to realize in this do-it-yourself age how scarce any book in Arabic on method was during the Middle Ages. But when we recall that the handing down of knowledge was by word of mouth and personal example of master to apprentice we are not surprised to find that the references to bookbinding materials and methods are not only infrequent but casual and fragmentary. In Islamic literature, descriptions of libraries, personalities of authors and collectors, and curious or outstanding works are more commonly found.

With these obstacles in mind I offer a translation of a portion of a rare chapter on bookbinding found in an unpublished eleventh-century propaedeutic manuscript. The manuscript, currently at the Oriental Institute in Chicago, is an Arabic work, ‘Umdah al-kuttab wa ‘uddah dhawī al-albāb, or Staff of the Scribes and Implements of the Discerning,¹ written in part by Tamin ibn al-Mu‘izz ibn Bādis (b. 422/1031, d. 501/1108), known to have been a royal patron of the arts from the North African dynasty of Zirides.²

A second source in Arabic which clarified some terms and processes of the earlier manuscript was Ṣinā‘ah tasfīr al-kutūb wa ḥall al-dhahab, or The Craft of Bookbinding and the Dissolving of Gold, by Abū al-‘Ubbas Almīm Al-Muḥammad al-Sufyānī, completed in 1029/1619. The text has been published with a vocabulary correlated with modern terms and usages in the bookbinding craft by P. Ricard.³ Sufyānī, in his introduction, bears testimony to the rarity of propaedeutic works in his time, explaining that it was only his disillusioning experience with ungrateful apprentices that led him at last to commit trade secrets to paper.⁴

Qalqashandi (d. 821/1418), among others, helps to bridge the gap of approximately five hundred years between these two works on bookbinding. He touches on the subject of materials and tools briefly in his book, which was intended to serve as a guide to the artistic composition of essays and reports, written especially for the use of Egyptian Government officials.⁵


³ Abon el-abbas ahmed ben Moḥamed es-Sufiānī (Sufyānī), Art de la Reliure et de la Dorure, ed. P. Ricard, Fez, 1919 (hereafter referred to as Sufyānī).

⁴ Ibid., pp. 3–5.

IBN BĀDĪS: 'Umdah al-kuttāb wa 'addah dhawāwī al-albāb

'Al-bāb ġī ṣinā'at al-tajlīd, or chapter on the craft of bookbinding and the use of all its tools so that one may dispense with those who bind. It consists of: (1) The knowledge of the slab, al-balāṣah; (2) the whetstone, al-misann; (3) the scraper, al-shifrat; (4) the awl, al-shafā; (5) the scissors, al-miṣṣah; (6) the mallet, al-kāzan; (7) the needles, al-ibar; (8) the sword, al-sayf; (9) the press, al-miṣṣarah; (10) the screw press, al-malāzim; (11) the rulers, al-μaṣāīr; (12) and the compasses, al-bayākīr.

Now as to the slab, it must be of white, black, or another marble, and of good quality, perfect of surface, able to be spanned by a single ruler in order to be used for the scraping and binding (processes). Then the whetstone should be symmetrical, the surface perfect, and it should not be too soft so that the iron will dig into it, or too hard so that the sharp iron is blunted by its hardness. The craftsman customarily prepares his own whetstone by aligning, perfecting, and leveling it for his own requirements. It should be kept overnight in a grease pot to allow it to absorb the grease,

6 Ibn Bādis, chap. 12, p. 65.
7 Sufyānī designates this slab as laḥw al-rūḵām or board of marble. Sufyānī, p. 6. L. M. Brunot, Vocabulaire de la tannerie indigène à Rabat, Hesperis, vol. 3 (1923), p. 114 (illustration p. 134, figs. 8, 10), says that for the larger skins in the tanneries the scraping is done on a furdāh or a plank of wood, convex on one side with a concave-shaped scraper.

8 The text adds "or it may be given to the rawwās"; Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon (hereafter Lane), London, 1863-93, vol. 1, p. 996, col. 2, calls rawwās "a seller of heads." Also cf. I. Jawhari, Tāj al-lughāh, vol. 1, p. 454. (Dr. Muḥammad Lotfī, a modern Egyptian, has told me the term is applied to "sharpened" or "grinder" in colloquial conversation.) Perhaps Ibn Bādis here contrasts the professional grinder and seller of stones to the workman who makes and prepares his tools and materials, which is the best thing for it. The scraper should be of good iron, neither too hard nor too soft, and its weight should be in proportion to the size of the artisan's hand. The mallet is used in pasting, and the awl should be very fine. The scissors should be well balanced and sharp in order to cut leather and other things. The needles are of two types, those suitable for gathering, habak (sewing the pages), and those used for binding, ḥazam (weaving the headband). The needle for sewing should be perfect, slight and delicate of build; and the one for binding should be shorter and heavier. It is necessary that the sword's length be twenty or less, of medium width, and its blade should be well tempered. Its hilt should fill the palm. And I am told

9 Qalqashandi, II, p. 471, No. 17. The misann is of two kinds—dark gray known as the Rūmī and green known as Ḥijāzī and Qāṣ. The Rūmī is the better (of the two types); but the Ḥijāzī is the best of the green varieties.
10 Sufyānī, p. 13; index, p. 12. Here the term is used as "paring knife." It is given both as "scraper" and paring knife by R. Dozy, Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes, Leiden, 1881, vol. 1, p. 769.
11 Küzan, a wooden mallet. Steingass, Persian-English Dictionary, London, 1947, p. 1061. The usual term for a wooden mallet, described as heavy—weighing four to six raṭīl—was minjamah or minjam. Sufyānī, p. 8; index, p. 21.
12 Qalqashandi notes that the minfadh as a tool resembles the mikhrāz, or awl, and that it is used to pierce paper; Qalqashandi, II, p. 470. Sufyānī uses isḥāf derived from the same root as shafā. Under kharaz, he explains that it means to sew with an awl; Sufyānī, p. 10; index, p. 16.
13 The author used the term "ḥazama" for "sewing the pages." Lane, vol. 1, p. 561, defines "ḥazama" as to bind, tie, collect, and uses the term habak for "bind." Cf. Dozy, Supplément, vol. 1, p. 246, which gives habaka "to edge a robe" and habakaka "to interlace, twist the thread of a cord."
14 Ibn Bādis, p. 66.
15 The measurement to which "twenty" refers is not stated. The "finger width" is frequently used as a measurement which is close to an inch; therefore, the sword would be approximately 20 inches.
that some craftsmen do not know how to use the sword at all. That is because they have a long sharp blade with which they cut according to their habit and custom.\textsuperscript{16} As to the press, there are two kinds, one has a rope, and this type is used by the people of Iraq, Egypt, and Khurasan;\textsuperscript{17} and the other is the screw type.\textsuperscript{18} It is named by the binders \textit{al mujallidün}, and the carpenters \textit{al najjārūn}, "Solomon's binder," \textit{lahm Sulaimān}; by the Byzantines \textit{Kahlībūn},\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Ibid.} The description of Ibn Bādis corresponds with Brunot's \textit{janwi daqlah}, or knife to remove hairs. It is a long, straight blade with a hilt of two pieces of wood fixed at the end, having an overall length of 30 cm.; Brunot, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 98–99; illustration on p. 124, fig. 2. \textit{Junui} is known all over Morocco in the sense of knife; Doxy, \textit{Supplément}, I, p. 225.

\textsuperscript{17} A reconstruction of this rope press is given in fig. 1.

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. fig. 2.

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ko\v{a}lias}, anything twisted spirally; \textit{Liddell-Scott Lexicon}, Oxford, 1925, vol. 1, p. 988. Cochlea vise of a press employed in the fabrication of oil, wine, and the pressing of materials; Daremberg and Saglio,
and all the people of Iraq use it. The length of the rope press should be according to the section of the book\(^{20}\) to be fastened in it. If the book were half-\(\text{Mansûrî}^{21}\) size, the press should be longer. The book should be placed in the middle of the press because this is easier and safer for the craftsman when squeezing it. The rope press should have fairly thick, perfectly true boards so that when they are closed they would hold even a piece of paper firmly. The rope should be twisted of new black hair, finer than flax, and it should be sufficiently long to go four times around the press from every side. There are fewer twists of the stick necessary in tightening the rope if it goes four times around each side rather than two times. The stick should be about the length of a finger, thin, smooth, and tapered. The boards of the press should be grooved or beveled where the rope goes around the edges.

\(\text{Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques, vol. 1, p. 1265a;} \) vol. 3, p. 1461a; vol. 4, p. 664a.

\(^{20}\) Ibn Bâdis, p. 66, uses here the word \(\text{hazz}\) which may be a scribal error in copying for \(\text{juž}\), “section” or “quire,” according to Ibn Bâdis’ own use of the word; see on p. 69, line 5ff., where \(\text{juž}\) and \(\text{kurrâsâh}\) or “quire,” “section,” are used interchangeably; or in place of \(\text{hazz}\) it may be \(\text{ hazm}\); cf. Sufyânî, p. 8, lines 11–12 for the use of the word \(\text{ hazm}\) in connection with quires.

\(^{21}\) Paper \(\text{sizes}\) determined book \(\text{sizes}\) and we have the description of al-Jawhari, at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, including the \(\text{Mansûrî}\) as one of the Egyptian papers. He describes it as of large size having polished surfaces; Qalqashandi, II, p. 476ff. Qalqashandi also lists the nine types of paper in use in his day. Among them is the Egyptian half-\(\text{Mansûrî}\), IV, p. 190. Björkman, \(\text{Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskanslei in islamischen Ägypten,}\) Hamburg, 1928, p. 114, gives the cut of the half-\(\text{Mansûrî}\) as equal to one-half an ell. Karabacek explains the name \(\text{Mansûrî}\) as honoring the Fâtimid Caliph Abû ‘Ali al-Mansûr (reigned 459–524 A.H./A.D. 1101–30) and gives us the size of the half-\(\text{Mansûrî}\) as 23.443 cm. in width by 36.6645 cm. in length, with an area of 893 sq. cm. (\(\text{Das arabische Papier,}\) Wien, 1887, pp. 68, 69, 71.) so that the sword may be used along the press and not cut into the rope.

The rulers, \(\text{masâtîr}\) (singular \(\text{mísárâh}\)), of ebony, \(\text{ahuqûs}\), or boxwood, \(\text{baqs}\), are best for designing, inking, and coloring. The work ruler, \(\text{mísárât al-shughl}\), should be of willow, \(\text{shâtâf}\), because its edges might be scorched; and if that should happen to the ebony ruler, it would leave nicks that would show as imperfections when lines are ruled. The ruler for designing should be long, firm bodied, and neither thick nor thin; while that for inking should be very thin bodied because it is manipulated by two fingers. The coloring ruler (perhaps for rubrication) should also be thin bodied and light in weight.\(^ {22}\) The \(\text{mísárât al-rîh}\) is the “folder” with which the leather is worked, forcing out the air, stretching, evening, and straightening it. This folder should be very thick, its length a span, and its material of oakwood, \(\text{sindiyyân}\). It should be a piece of wood with thin edges in comparison to its breadth and length, so that when it passes over the leather it smooths it, and its handle, \(\text{nişâb}\), should also be of oakwood because ebony and boxwood dull their edges if they knock against the press.\(^ {23}\)

The compass, \(\text{bikâr}\), to be good, should be light, should have two thin legs in order to make fine lines, and should be firmly riveted at the joint so that it opens and closes gradually. Even if it is hard to open, it must be so, for the compass is for the drawing of the “suns,” which are the tooled circles in the

\(^{22}\) Ibn Bâdis promises to discuss coloring in the chapter on tooling (p. 68), but our manuscript does not include such a section.

\(^{23}\) The \(\text{nişâb}\) is again mentioned, in preparing the quires for sewing, as an instrument which is passed over the center of the open quires and later used to hammer the sewn place. (Ibid., p. 69.) The folder in bookbinding is used for many purposes and is shaped like a letter opener. Sufyânî uses \(\text{qalâb}\) for folder; Sufyânî, p. 9; index p. 19.
middle of the book. We will mention them and describe the making of them in the proper place.

Then the irons which are for tooling, hadid alladhi lil-naqsh, are (1) almond, lawzah, (2) the breast, sadr, called “breast of the falcon,” sadr al-bāz, (3) the ornament, or khālid, (4) the dot, or nuqātah,

24 Ibn Bādis, p. 68. Bīkār is the same as bīrkār; Persian, pirgār. Dozy, Supplément, I, p. 136. Sufyānī calls the compass ḍabī and uses it to make the design; but he includes a second tool of this type, the tāhnish, or divider, used to make the central pattern (pp. 13, 14; index, pp. 16, 17). Tracing tāhnish in Tāj al-ʿArūs (Cairo, 1888, IV, p. 301) brought the meaning “anything whose head is like the head of a snake.” Here perhaps the oval pattern familiar in later Islamic bookbinding.

25 Unfortunately this promise is not fulfilled in our manuscript; Ibn Bādis, p. 68.

26 Ibid. The names suggested both composite stamp motifs and individual elements to be combined in varied patterns.

27 Dozy gives ṣadr al-bāzī as black wheat or Saracen wheat, following a description of Ibn Luyūn (cf. Brockleman, GAL, I, p. 495: Dozy, Supplément, I, p. 598; II, p. 380) who died in A.D. 1346. Dozy continues; “On semble avoir donné le nom de ‘poitrine du faucon’ à cette polygonèe, parce que ces fleurs blanches faisaient penser à la poitrine blanche de l’oiseau de proie noble, et même, jusqu’à un certain point, à des plumes” (Dozy, Supplément, I, pp. 822–823). It is more likely since the buckwheat of the black variety (Eragopyrum talarium Gartn.) has heartlike arrow-shaped leaves and small greenish flowers that it refers to the heart of palmette shape. Levi-Provençal has another proposal under ṣadr al-būsah, translating it as grenensis or milling punch in his glossary to al-Himyari: La péninsule Ibérique au Moyen-Age, Leiden, 1938, p. 271. Although in the Arabic text proper of al-Himyari the term does not occur on page 155, it is introduced by M. Levi-Provençal in his translations (on p. 186) as a clarification of the Arabic text which mentions only “various designs and well known motifs.” Ibid., p. 155.

28 Lane defines the root kh-l-d, in the second form, kh-l-l-d, as adorning with bracelets, earrings, or ornaments; Lane, Vol. 1, p. 2, p. 784.

and (5) the rounded space, or mudawwarah.

The polisher, saqqāl, is called “the cushion,” dast, and there is a finer polisher, saqqāl raqī. The burins, cutters, tweezers, and points, minqāsh (plural munqīsh), are varied. [There will be] then more about them later on when we mention the points of illumination in its place, God willing. This is the complete list of instruments, and success is with the help of God. He who seeks [to acquire] this craft, requires [first] quick understanding, a good eye, a sweet [dexterous] hand, and the avoidance of haste; [second] to be sociable, winning, and of good character.

You first begin in this craft by putting the portion, juz′ [to be sewed], on a slab to the left: taking a quire, kurrāsah (plural kurrās, kurrās), at a time in the left hand and opening it with fingers of the right hand, place it open on the slab and pass over its center with the niṣāb or folder, where the sewing of the thread will be done. Then you close it and cut the bata′in, or end papers, consisting of a double sheet, one page to be pasted against the leather and the other remaining upon the quires to protect the book from harm and dirt. Then

29 The second form of davara means “to turn, to fashion round” (Dozy, Supplément, I, p. 471).

30 Qalqashandi uses mīqalāh as the name of an instrument used to polish gold writing, and saqalāh for polisher, which he suggests should be of copper; (II, pp. 470–471). Sufyānī employs a maharāh, or shell, for this purpose; Sufyānī, p. 19.

31 These are mentioned as a group by Ibn Bādis, p. 68. Sufyānī specifies the engraving point, mīrāt, and two varieties of sharp cutting points: hadidat qādah and the mīgrād. For engraving or tracing the design he uses the mībraq, or a knife resembling a blood lancet (correctly mibzaq), and for putting lines on leather, the mihālt, or tracer; Sufyānī, pp. 12, 13, 14, 26; index pp. 19, 10, 18, 8.

32 The use of the niṣāb to spread the folded section makes the sewing easier because in oriental books the thread runs in and out along the center of the section (cf. fig. 2); if the section is sharply folded it is difficult to get the needle through.
do the same with the rest of the quires [opening and going over the centers] until you come to the last. When you have finished that you prepare the thread for sewing. It should be fine and well twisted, of about three strands depending on the gauge, since, if it is coarse thread, the sewed part becomes bulky and when the book is tightened in the press, the string bears the weight and a ridged impression is left; it is as if you took a string and

wrapped it tightly around your finger to the end.

Sewing may be done by several methods: one which the artisan employs for swiftness and speed, in which the needle pierces the section in only two places, and another done with two or three stitches. Still another type

If the center of the section, or fold at the spine of the book, is pierced in two places only, it divides the length of the spine into three parts; see P. Adam, Der Bucheinband: seine Technik und seine Geschichte, Leipzig, 1890, p. 32, for an illustration of this scheme of sewing.

of sewing is current with the Byzantines, but I am unable to describe it.

After the section is sewn, the thread is pulled and the sewn press placed with the folder, niṣāb. Then hold it [the book] between your knees. Take one side of the press resting it against your left knee and the other side against your right knee with the book in the middle. Take the end of the rope in your left hand and bind it about the press until it ends, and tie the ends. Take the book (now in the press) from between your knees. The projecting sewn spine protrudes. Place the spine upon the slab and beat the edges of the sewn paper sections with the niṣāb, folder, until it is equal in thickness to the rest of the book. The press is then gently tightened by the two sticks called "marāwin." Too much pressure would turn the back of the book and spoil it. [In preparation for the next step] ashrās, asphodelus paste, is melted by taking a small pot, placing a little water in it and bits

Probably it is the sewing frame of which he speaks; on this, cf. P. Adam, Die Griechische Einbandkunst und das früchristliche Buch, Archiv für Buchbinderei, vol. 24 (April 1924), p. 32. Willoughby, in discussing Greek bookbinding, ignores Adam’s works and surprisingly states: “For the history of Greek monastic craftsmanship in bookbinding, about which nothing is published and little is known, they (the manuscripts) are primary sources of first importance”; H. R. Willoughby, A unique miniaturized Greek apocalypse, Byzantium, vol. 14 (1939), p. 164.

Sewn through the center of each section, the thread winds its way zigzag through the entire book. Each section, its pages sewn together, is also secured to the others by this method (cf. fig. 3).

Cf. fig. 1.

Dozy, Supplément, I, p. 25, gives “asphodèle” for ashrās. Asphodelus, Pauly-Wissowa, Real Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, vol. 4, 1730-34, describes asphodelus (Latin-albutium) bulbs as used in the Orient, when pulverized and mixed with water, as an extraordinarily strong, dextrin-rich paste. The powdered form was exported by the Orient as an article of trade even at the time the Encyclopädie was being compiled.
of ashrās. Mix it by stirring with the middle finger of your right hand. The paste should be runny, not too thick if it is summer time, while in winter it should be thicker in order to dry quickly. Then take a thin paper (for the hinges), fold it, and cut it in half. Each half should be two fingers wide—wider than the spine. Taking the paste with your middle finger, suspending the other fingers, smear the back of the volume lightly with paste, being careful that none runs between the sections. One paper is placed and pasted on top of the other so that the excess width projects on either side of the spine. Another sheet of paper is placed on top before pressing the two strips down with the folder because the folder would pull up the paper damp with paste and spoil it. This is one of the secrets of the craft. Then the papers are left to dry in the air either in the sun or near a low fire. Do not take it away until it dries evenly, otherwise it will warp—so be careful of that!

You must previously have taken the measurements of the book before you left it in the press. Smear a piece of paper with paste and cover it with another. Then, protected by another paper, press smooth and rub them with a rag, then even them with the folder. The Iraqis paste the book (cover) to its pages without these linings, baṭā'īn, or end papers. They are called “strengthenings,” taqāwāt, and people think that by using them they strengthen [protect] the book. Their strength is like that of cloth, ṭanūb, or board, takht. Thus as the volume dries the strengthening dries also.

Then the volume is taken out of the press carefully. Place it upon the slab, then fold over the excess of the two papers (hinges). Press it [the excess] to the strengthening and smooth it well. Place a ruler along its side and make a mark. Paste along the mark in order to stick the hinge which you have pasted on the volume. Now place the strengthening on the book, mounting it between the hinge and the core. Thereupon you paste it [the strengthening]. When you paste it, put paste on both sides, and take a long, narrow strip of paper about two fingers wide, and paste it upon the other side (of the strengthening) to prevent it from opening wide. When you reach this point the leather is put upon it.

The leather should be tanned in the Yemenite fashion or like that of Ṭa‘īf. One should

In Egypt the early Islamic boards were generally not made of wood but of papyrus pasted together. Ibscher, *Ägyptische Abteilung, Amtliche Berichte aus den Königl. Kunstsammlung, vol. 33* (November 1911), p. 46. In about the middle of the tenth century the manufacture of papyrus practically ceased and the transition was made from boards of papyrus to boards of paper. Karabacek, *Das arabische Papier*, p. 12.

40 Cf. fig. 5.

41 Cf. fig. 6.
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choose leather which is clear, beautiful of color, and well tanned. The tanning is tested by kneading the leather with the hand. If it is soft, it is good, and on the contrary (if hard) it is not good. This (i.e., hard) skin must be washed in a warm bath because warm water opens it up and softens it. If the leather was tanned in Tā'if, it should be washed in salt water because they tan it in salt water. Touched by sweet water the Tā'if leather discolors and fades, but washing it in warm salt water brings out the oil and beautifies. Wash in sweet water the leather tanned in Egypt by the Yemenite (method) with gall-

nuts, ‘afṣ.” This type is washed in sweet water because it is tanned with it.

If the leather is to be tooled, manqūsh, then choose well-tanned (leather) smooth, light weight, weighing less than a mann,44 or two pounds. If it is to be plain, sādhā‘a,45 it should weigh a mann and have a grained, maḥabbāb, surface.

In washing the leather in sweet or salt water according to the tanning, care should be taken that nothing like a nail or piece of iron touches it, as it would blacken it. While washing the leather tanned with gallnuts, ‘afṣ, the back46 should be thoroughly rubbed with a piece of earthenware to remove the gall and other acids which, if allowed to remain, would eat the material. The leather should then be squeezed, well folded face to face, and then opened until it dries.

The extremities should be cut away, and the remainder of the skin spread upon the slab should be massaged with a heavy work ruler.

44 “afṣ,” galls—with which one tans; the produce of a tree called oak; Lane, I, pt. 5, p. 2991, col. 3. As rules for the police inspector, muhtasib, developed in relation to correctly tanned leather, we find Ibn al-Ukhuvwa objecting to the use of oak galls as harming the skins and causing them to turn black in the sun. He prefers qaraẓ, or fruit of the mimosa, as a tanning agent. Ibn al-Ukhuvwa, Ma’ālim al-qurba fi āthām al-hisba, ed. R. Levy, 1938, p. 229. This may be because mimosa had 38 percent to 49 percent tannin, while oak galls have 50 percent to 60 percent tannin. “Leather,” Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. 13, p. 847. Ibn al-Ukhuvwa also cites the use of qaraẓ as one of Yemenite origin.

45 “Mann”—two ṭalīs. “Rāṭl”—approximately 1 pound or 12 ʿaqiyah or ounces, 144 dirhams, or 249.28 grams: A. Mousa, Zur Geschichte der islamischen Buchmalerei in Ägypten, Cairo, 1931, p. 27.

46 “Ṣādāq”—is arabicized from the Persian meaning “plain, i.e., without variegation, decoration, embellishment—or, without any hair upon it, or of one unmixed colour”; Lane, I, p. 1282.

By the “back” here is probably meant the epidermis side of the derma. The part of the skin which is tanned is the derma.

The best time to pare leather is when it is nearly dry because then the scraper will not tear it as it would if it [the leather] were dry. Pare the leather, taking care not to cut into the epidermis. Again the leather should be washed until the water remains clean and pure.

If you see the water separate on the surface of the leather in drops, you know that it has a surplus of oil which impairs the brilliance and luster of the finished product. To remove this oil, ʿūqiyātān, two ounces of powdered gallnuts should be spread on each layer of leather which is laid out flat. The gallnuts should be sprinkled over every section while it is still wet. Then the leather should be folded over, tied together and put into a vessel containing enough water to cover it.47 The leather should be left to soak for a night and a day, weighted with something so it will remain covered by the water. It should be well scraped when removed from the water. The addition of some bran, mukhālat, in the tanning is helpful.48

Should the leather still be imperfectly

47 The use of a vessel suggests limited production as the tanneries used pits and reservoirs, bilatān, like those built under ‘Abd al-Rahmān III (reigned 300-350 A.H./A.D. 912-961) in the hollow bed of the great river at the place known as the “gate of the tanners” in Toledo and the tanning pits of Seville in the days of the Banū ‘Abbād especially Mu’tamid ibn ʿ Abbād (ruled 461-484 A.H./A.D. 1068-91). Al-Makkazi, Analectes sur l’histoire et la littérature des arabes d’Espagne, Leyden, 1855-61, I. pp. 100, 126. An interesting bit of archaeological evidence is the remains of a tannery, found in the Alhambra, which existed in the fourteenth century. Its small dimensions suggest that perhaps it was utilized for the needs of the Nasrid court only; L. Torres Balbas, Tenería en el-Scano de la Alhambra de Granada, Al-Andalus, vol. 3 (1935), pp. 437, 442.

48 It is of interest to note that bran baths are still a part of modern tanning methods at Constantine, Rabat, and Fez in North Africa; Joly, La Tannerie indigène à Constantine, Revue du Monde Musulman, vol. 7 (1909), p. 226; L. M. Brunot, op. cit., p. 91.
tanned, too dark in color and too soft to the touch (because of too much oil), the process is repeated. As to the effect of the gallnuts, 'afṣ, on leather—if it is too pliant they harden it, if too hard they soften it, if too oily they remove the oil, and if the leather lacks fat they supply the fatty substance. Understand this well!

Then you dye according to the manner of dyeing leather and paper. Red dye may be made in various ways. One way is to take an ounce, 'ūqiyah, of the best powdered baqqam, sappanwood (Caesalpinia sappan), get obtainable. There are two kinds—one called "the little kind," the other "the princely." Soak the ounce of powdered baqqam in water for a night or day. Then put it in a clean copper kettle with ten rats [about eight pints] of water and a dirham's, or one-eight of an ounce, weight of qīlū ṭūrā or crude potassium carbonate, powdered and sieved. Boil it until half the liquid evaporates and half remains. Remove the mixture from the fire when the mixture becomes thick enough not to drip when a stick is dipped into it. The mixture should be strained and left to cool. You can try the other kind of red dye but it is not as good.

In order to dye paper with this mixture, it is dipped gently in this solution and dried in the shade; but if leather is to be dyed, the baqqam is diluted, one to one thousand, with water. Take a brush, miswāk sh'arān, or a piece of felt wrapped on the end of a stick, and dip its tip in the red dye water, passing it two or three times over the leather. The leather is wrung, spread out again, and the application is repeated; then take the brush and dip it in the shabb, alum, which has been dissolved an hour beforehand. There are several kinds of alum, you test it by tasting with your tongue. The best is acid tasting but not salty. If it is too acid you dilute it further.

In connection with the use of baqqam for dyeing it is interesting to find that the police inspector demanded that the dyers discontinue its use for cloth as it was not permanent when washed; Saqaṭī, Fi adab al-hisbah, Paris, 1931, p. 63. A later anonymous addition to Sufyānī's work is a chapter on the "Craft of Dyeing Leather Violet" which describes the use of baqqam and alum. However, in it the leather is soaked in alum solution and then in liquid in which good dark baqqam has been cooled; Sufyānī, p. 25.

Alum is one of the most important tanning ingredients, which by the twelfth century was listed, next to cotton and flax, as the most important export from Egypt to go through the Italian markets to the tanneries at Mengen; A. Schaube, Handelsgeschichte der Romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge, Munich, 1906, p. 105. There was a royal monopoly on alum for the mines at Sāid by river to Akhūn, Sūr, or Bahmasa; it could not be sold directly at a lower price. Although Saladin abolished, in 564/1168, taxes which included those dealing with tanning such as the slaughter of sheep at Gizeh, the dock tax for acacia wood, the tax on the banks where the tanners washed the hides, and the tax on taqāṭṭu‘ādīn, leather cut in pieces, the retail leather, his son restored them, al-Maqrizī, Mawā‘iz al-tībār, trans. M. V. Bouriant, Mémoires de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, vol. 17 (1900), pp. 298, 301, 315.
with water. So dip the felt applicator or brush in the alum, then in the red dye, and the combination of alum and dye is rubbed into the leather until it reaches the degree of redness desired.

The leather is left awhile, then rinsed and smoothed out on the slab with the edge of the ruler for pressing out air bubbles, *mišṭarāt al riḥī*; or with some other rough cloth or wiper and then hung up to dry.

Should you wish to dye it black, then do not dry it [the leather] but dye it while it is wet. To make black dye—take a baked clay vessel, glazed inside and out, which is filled with vinegar into which nailheads, cleansed from rust, are thrown and left for two or three days until ready. To intensify the blackness of the dye, throw into it the rind of the pomegranate. When the dye is ready, take a stick and wrap a piece of wool or felt about it, tying it on. Dip it in the solution and dye [the leather] with it. Care should be taken in application for if the black dye touches your hand, it will stain it. If this occurs, lemon juice will remove the black stain, as it does the red stain of the *baqqam* dye. Repeat the dyeing operation again, then rub it [the leather] and wash it immediately so that the dye will not eat into the body of the leather and spoil it. Then you rinse it and spread it out and rinse it again until it is dyed as you desire. Should you care to improve its blackness use the juice of the yellow myrobalan, *ma‘īlhiliṣ asfar*, or pomegranate juice from macerating it in water until the water absorbs the color of the pomegranate. Then you soak it [the leather] with the dye and leave it to dry.

Should you wish to dye it yellow, *asfar*, it is of two colors: *asfar*, and *nāranjī* or orange. The yellow dye is made of *za‘faran*, while *za‘faran* and ‘*akkar* together make the reddish-yellow dye. To dye leather with the *nāranjī* dye, it should be completely wet or completely dry, otherwise it will be streaked. Both the yellow dyes are diluted with yellow myrobalan juice as this softens the leather. You may soak the leather or apply the dye with a brush if the leather is to be tooled, or a *līf* sponge if it is to be plain.

Lane explains that *ihlilīṣ* is a well-known fruit of the myrobalan—one kind of which is yellow and another kind black, the latter being in the highest state of ripeness; Lane, Book I, pt. 8, p. 2899.

*Za‘faran* is saffron (*Crocus sativus*). For this use of *za‘faran* as a yellow dye of the finest type see the story of Mutawakkil (reigned 232–247 A.H./A.D. 847–861) who desired to be surrounded by yellow at a drinking party, even yellow water in the fountains. First *za‘faran* was used until the supply was exhausted; then, ‘*usfur* or safflower (*Carthamus tinctorius*), was substituted; finally, fabrics dyed yellow with *qasab* (*Calamus aromaticus*) were a last resort. The yellow dyes are graded according to their cost at the time; Abū ‘Ali al-Tanūkhī, *Nishwār al muhādārāh*, Oriental Translation Fund, n.s., vol. 27, London (Royal Asiatic Society, 1921), p. 146.

‘*Akkar* is made from ‘*usfur* or safflower.

In Persia they employ the pomegranate when green and full of sap for dyeing yellow; Chardin, *Travels in Persia*, p. 273. In Fez the rinds of the green pomegranates mixed with alum are used to dye goatskins yellow. The mature fruit, less esteemed, produces a reddish, i.e., orange, color; Le Tourneau and Paye, Hesperis, vol. 21 (1935), pp. 190, 214.

*Līf* is the reticulated tissue which envelopes the foot of the branches of date trees to protect them against the action of the winds; it is used to make cords, and a tuft of it is used as a branch in the bath; Dozy, *Supplément*, II, p. 562.
There are two kinds of \textit{litf}—one of Raqqah,\textsuperscript{62} of clear color and of delicate fiber, the other of Antioch, of thick fiber and of brown color.

If it [the leather] is to be green you make it of \textit{ Burräq} or \textit{Parietaria},\textsuperscript{63} the flower of which is to be found among the cucumber plants, its blossom green like the plants. The flowers are rubbed on pine needles, which are hung on a rack over old urine. When dye is needed the needles are dipped into the urine which turns a beautiful blue. If the color is too pale, more \textit{ Burräq} is added, and if too deep, more water. It should be applied to leather as yellow dye is applied, and it yields a “wonderful” blue.\textsuperscript{64}

A scarlet dye, \textit{'akkar}, is begun by taking some \textit{'usfur}, or safflower, of good quality. You dry it, pound it in a mortar, sift it in a hair sieve, and put it in a glazed pot. You add water to the \textit{'usfur}, stir the mixture thoroughly with your hand, then strain it through a woollen cloth stretched on a wooden frame. More water is poured over the \textit{'usfur}, which remains on the woollen cloth, until the liquid which drains through is clear. The cloth with the \textit{'usfur} in it is removed from the frame, tied, and pressed between two slabs, or heavy stones until all the water is pressed out. Then the cloth is untied and the mass of \textit{'usfur} is opened, a little at a time, by hand, until all of it has been gone over. Thirteen \textit{dirhams} of seedlike potash\textsuperscript{65} is obtained. Five \textit{dirham}'s weight is added at a time to the \textit{'usfur}, kneaded and mixed by hand until the hands become stained. When they become red, the \textit{'usfur} has reached its saturation point of potash. Then the woollen cloth with the \textit{'usfur}-potash mixture in it is restretched on the frame. Water is poured over the mixture and allowed to drain through the sieve into a glazed pot.\textsuperscript{66} When the liquid that drains through is clear, all the dye properties of the mixture have been exhausted.

The \textit{'akkar} can also be made with wine vinegar using \textit{'usfur} without the potash. Two \textit{fûqiyyah} of wine vinegar is stirred into the \textit{'usfur} with a stick and water is sprinkled, by hand or mouth, on the mixture. It is left standing overnight and by the next day the liquid separates from the sediment. This is poured off and used as a dye. Pomegranate juice may be used in place of wine vinegar. It is obtained by macerating four \textit{fûqiyyats} of pomegranate seed in two \textit{rai}ls of water and letting the mixture stand an hour.\textsuperscript{67} Then knead it

\textsuperscript{62} A Syrian town on the left bank of the Euphrates.
\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Burräq} is a variety of \textit{Hortiga verna}, or \textit{Parietaria}; Dozy, \textit{Supplément}, I, p. 274; \textit{Parietaria} is a small genus of widely distributed stingless herbs of the nettle family with alternate entire leaves and small greenish flowers in the leaf axis.
\textsuperscript{64} This use of urine may have been one of the main factors involved in the low status of the dyers as a group in the Middle Ages. That the prince, Ibn Bâdis, recommends its use as an ingredient is probably due to his scientific attitude toward it as a chemical.
\textsuperscript{65} Cf. \textit{supra}.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibd.
\textsuperscript{67} Other red coloring materials are \textit{zinjafar}, cinabar or mercuric sulphide, the best being from the Maghrib, “crushed in water.” This is an error as the red dye is obtained by grinding, digesting it in a solution of caustic potash, and warming it. Cf. “Vermilion,” Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., vol. 23, pp. 82–83; it is mentioned as a writing material by Qalqashandi, \textit{Ṣubḥ al-dīn} II, p. 467f. The “rounat” or “appoponas” are common dyeing ingredients of Persia. The “rounat” is probably \textit{runnās}, or madder, the red dyeing root of \textit{Rubia tinctorum}; Chardin, \textit{Travels in Persia}, p. 273; Dozy, \textit{Supplément}, I, p. 561. Rabat uses in modern times \textit{qushinīyāh}, or cochineal; Brunot, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 114. This cochineal was used as early as 1751 by a Moroccan Jew, Moussa ibn Yahya, in an inventory, as applied to leather “\textit{al jild al-qushina}”; Dozy, \textit{Supplément}, II, p. 351. The same dye is used at Fez, where the amount necessary to dye 10 skins is 750 grams. With the cochineal they mix a small quantity of alum, the proportion being 30 grams for 10 skins. In the case of the present tanning industry we must keep in mind that if buyers of skins, bookbinders or saddlemakers, desire a particular shade or color, they can indicate it to the tanners who then buy

and stir it (with the ‘uṣfur) as you did the wine vinegar. You should have the ‘akkär prepared; every day strain off the liquid in it and add fresh liquid; this keeps it ready for designing.\textsuperscript{68}

The ingredients in the ṣūq al-‘attārin, or the market of the druggists; Le Tourseau and Paye, Hesperis, vol. 21 (1935), p. 199. This seems to indicate that special formulæ are still used in dyeing particular orders.

\textsuperscript{68} The dyes are mentioned above: red, black, yellow, green, and scarlet were the general range of colors in medieval Islamic bookbindings. Other colors were probably in use, for Ibn Khallikān tells us the Abū Bakr al-Ṣūlī (d. 335 A.H./A.D. 946) had a room filled with works composed by himself and all bound in different colors, which Ṣūlī used to call “the fruits of his studies.” Ibn Khallikān, \textit{Wafâyāt al‘āyān}, vol. 3 (Paris, 1843-71), p. 72. Adam considers a tan color warming with age to a rich brown as the general coloring of Islamic bookbindings; P. Adam, \textit{Archiv für Buchbinderei}, vol. 4 (1905), p. 152. Joly gives the usual colors for leather as red-violet, yellow, red, and black. White is achieved by a tanning rather than a dyeing process. It is produced by leaving the skins in brine five or six days, then sprinkling them with alum and soaking them in water five or six to eight days; Joly, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 229.

When the leather is dry, it is trimmed [cut] to the size of the book with the sword, \textit{sayf}. That is done by placing the book before you (among the craftsmen are those who do not work as I have described). You take a ruler and place it at the edge of the book, and mark its center, then you turn the ruler the other way, and treat it in the same manner. It [the mark] will come in the center of the book, making a cross.

You place the foot of the compass in the mark of the cross, then you open its other foot to the base of the book.\textsuperscript{69} This is the craft of binding with leather, and we have none of the tools of binding left except that I have explained and mentioned it. And God is the giver of success.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{69} Here, in the midst of cutting the leather to fit the book, Ibn Bādis breaks off and concludes the chapter.

\textsuperscript{70} Five more pages are devoted to the making of glue and inks. It seems to be a mistake of the copyist. It would be necessary to consult the manuscript now in Cairo. Although I have requested a microfilm or photostats of this chapter from the Cairene copy, they are not yet forthcoming.
SIGNIFICANT USES OF ARABIC WRITING *

By FRANZ ROSENTHAL

On the fifteenth day of October of the year 1351, the well-known Shafi‘ite jurist and author, Taqi-ad-din as-Subkî, released a legal opinion in reply to the following question addressed to him:

What is your opinion concerning a man’s placing his foot upon a carpet into which there are woven some letters of the alphabet arranged in meaningful words such as “blessing,” “bliss,” “enduring strength”? Is it permissible for a man to step on the portions of the carpet where these words are found? ¹

In his reply, as-Subkî is inclined to consider it forbidden for a man to step on such a carpet, although he says he is unable to offer sufficiently strong proof for his opinion. Decisive proof would be necessary because an express prohibition by the Lawgiver, or reasoning based on sound analogy, is required in order to declare something forbidden. He has no doubt, however, that he is dealing with something that is to be classified as disapproved. There are people who do consider it forbidden on the strength of the argument that every letter of the alphabet is indicative of one of God’s most beautiful names. However, this argument is not specific enough. Then, there are those speculations of “the science of letters,” attributing magical and physical properties to individual letters. Some of those speculations are clearly sinful and classified as disapproved; others he has found through his own experience to be untrue.

Since these arguments cannot be used to decide the question, as-Subkî bases his opinion on an argument which runs somewhat as follows. The Qur’an refers to God repeatedly as the “Creator of everything.” The letters of the alphabet are to be included in the expression “everything.” They are sections of the sound complexes that are accidents of the bodies created by the Lord; thus, they are created together with them in the second or third place. Everything created by God has its specific purpose. This purpose must be taken into consideration by man whenever he uses something. It is inherent in the thing by virtue of the act of creation, or it is fixed by the religious law. Any improper use of something is permissible only if sanctioned by the Lawgiver. The Prophetic traditions include the story of the cow that spoke up and protested against being used for riding purposes. Anyone who argues that a cow can be used for riding must bring special proof for his contention, or he may use the argument that riding on them was one of the secondary purposes for which cows were created, even if their primary and obvious purpose, which is always stressed, is that they be used for plowing. Hence, the letters—and here we can observe the almost universal failure of mediaeval scholars to make a clear-cut distinction between sound and letter—were created in order to produce, by means of their proper arrangement, the word of God and Muhammad and of the other prophets and the angels as well as other necessary, desirable, or permissible utter-

¹ Fatâwî (Cairo, 1355–56), vol. 2, pp. 563–565.
ances. There can be no doubt as to the correctness of the assumption that the fact that the letters are used for the production of something necessary or desirable makes it obligatory upon human beings to honor and reverence them. In the opinion of lawyers, a piece of paper containing the name of God cannot be used for writing on it secular stories or the like. In this case, of course, the situation is clear since the name of God is involved. But what if it is a case of ordinary letters that could be used for producing any word in the world? In this case, it is still possible to make a case for a similar prohibition, since it is not necessary to prove the complete identity of two cases but merely to prove the fact that they share certain legal characteristics (causa legis).

An objection may be raised, his argument continues, to the effect that the same letters that are used to indicate good and holy words may be used to indicate evil words and words of unbelief. While this is true, it must be stated that the letters were created for the former purpose. Like anything else, they may be employed by human beings to serve either their proper purpose or a contrary purpose. In the latter case, however, we are dealing with an unjust and improper action which as such is to be classified as forbidden. In this sense, some scholars have gone so far as to wash each time before touching a piece of paper. Paper can be used for writing down either good words or evil words. However, the true purpose for which it was created and for which it must be revered is for writing on it the Qur'an, the Prophetic traditions, and all other useful kinds of knowledge. Were a man to step upon a piece of paper upon which nothing had as yet been written, intentionally

and in full knowledge of the fact that all paper must be reverenced, his action could be classified as a forbidden one. The same applies to the letters of the alphabet. Those who know the purpose for which the letters were created are not permitted to step on them. This admits making an exception for persons ignorant of the purpose of writing, in conformity with the widely accepted legal view that only knowledge of the fact that an action is forbidden makes its commission a crime.

Therefore, as-Subki concludes, only those who are aware of the facts concerning the true purpose of writing as stated here commit a crime when they step on such letters as are found on the carpet. However, though it may not always be a crime, it could in any case be considered as forbidden, and the person ignorant of the situation should be taught to know better.

This summary of as-Subki's legal opinion may serve, I believe, as a competent guide through the vast field of writing in Islam. The practical uses of the Arabic script have never been subject to any limitation. Arabic writing was used to perpetuate the word of God and all conceivable forms of literary and scientific endeavor, from the loftiest thought down to the strictly utilitarian notations of the merchant and the idle scribblings of vulgar hands on the walls of houses and rooms. It proved no less able than other types of writing to denote a great variety of languages and to furnish transliteration signs sufficient for the occasional fixation in writing of foreign sounds. Against the full weight of a powerful literary tradition, it has also been able, when called upon, to express widely divergent forms of Arabic speech, with as much or as little success as similar efforts undertaken, for instance, within the English system of writing. What, we may ask, is peculiar to, or remarkable in, the use of writing in Islam?

---

2 Some examples of the reverence shown by pious men for pieces of paper that may contain the name of God, in H. Ritter, *Das Meer der Seele*, Leiden, 1955, pp. 295, 270.
One aspect, in particular, is suggested and strongly emphasized by as-Subki’s reflections. That is, the sacred character of writing in Islam. At the same time, as-Subki makes it clear—and he is certainly right in making this distinction—that the sacredness of writing should be considered as something different from the magical power that was widely believed to be possessed by writing. It is true that both sacredness and magical power were early and inseparable properties of writing. It is also true that letter magic was widely practiced throughout Muslim history and the theory of specific properties inherent in the letters was accepted as a possibly valid explanation of the mysteries of nature even by some of the best minds produced by Muslim civilization. However, the sacredness of writing in Islam was something more historically effective and more basically and profoundly Islamic. It had its origin in the importance that the Qur’ān attributed to the possession of written books by a religious community, and it was intimately connected with the early Islamic discussion of the meaning of the concept “word of God” as it affected the recitation and written reproduction of the Qur’ān. From the very beginning all this revolved, specifically, around the Arabic language and Arabic writing and made both integral components of the Muslim religion, a role which naturally assumed ever larger proportions when Muslim civilization came to favor more and more its religious aspects and institutions. Arabic writing, even more so than the language, became a sacred symbol of Islam.

The reason why writing outdistanced language as a religious symbol is easily explained from historical circumstances. In the first powerful burst of energy, the Arab Muslims succeeded in displacing the languages of quite a few territories and eventually supplanting them with their own. This was an astonishing feat, considering the comparatively small number of speakers of Arabic and the fact that they were originally no bearers of a higher civilization. The main resistance to Arabic, in fact, came from long-established administrative institutions closely connected with the civilizations of the subject peoples, and it took about half a century to overcome that resistance. Soon, time, space, and numbers did their job of weakening the original impetus so that it was no longer possible to influence additional masses of speakers of foreign tongues in ever more remote territories and to require of them the tremendous sacrifice of giving up their own languages. On the other hand, the sacrifice of changing scripts was much more easily accomplished. It has been alleged that the Arabic script is not particularly suited to express the sounds of the languages that came to adopt it. However, at the time the change to Arabic writing was made, the native scripts were often greatly inferior to Arabic in most technical aspects. The switch to Arabic writing meant a break with the past, of course, but it did not entail any great practical loss and actually made literacy easier.

In Muslim civilization, writing thus became a sacred religious symbol of the first order. In consequence, the various religious groups other than Muslim which lived within the boundaries of Islam adhered zealously to their particular scripts while willingly changing languages. There is no real evidence from the pre-Islamic Orient to indicate the prevalence of writing over language as a religious symbol, even though sacredness attached to writing from the earliest times, and religious groups naturally tended to develop their own type of writing to be used for their original languages. In Islam, sacredness became a characteristic element in writing. Its presence and effect were not only felt but also discussed and analyzed. To this day, radical reforms of writing are widely felt to constitute a break
with a tradition that possesses the aura of religious sanctity.\footnote{A bitter denunciation of those who wish to replace Persian with Roman characters for the writing of Urdu from a Pakistani newspaper (al-Islam, vol. 6, No. 5 [Karachi, March 1, 1959]), is a timely illustration and corroboration of the above statement.}

The feelings aroused by religious awe are not basically different from the emotions stimulated by man's artistic instincts. As-Subki's legal opinion centers around the fact that writing was used in Islam as a form of artistic expression. The extraordinary interest in calligraphy we encounter in Muslim civilization is indeed as well known as it is remarkable. Writing was widely used as a decorative element in architecture and in connection with small objects including carpets, textiles, and a wide range of different utensils. The calligraphic execution of manuscripts and documents was a highly esteemed form of art. Numerous varieties of the Arabic script were created, among them some using leaf and flower motifs for embellishment, and again others of a zoomorphical character, using letters in the form of animals, mainly birds. A rather extensive literature on calligraphy was produced, of which a large part has been preserved.

This literature makes no effort to gloss over the fact that its primary purpose was practical. Books on writing were meant to serve utilitarian ends. They were published in order to help government officials whose main equipment was a thorough command of the written word, and they prepared those officials for success in an often highly lucrative profession. Therefore, this literature stresses the full range of technical know-how required by an accomplished penman, to the virtual exclusion of anything else. It also displays an understandable tendency to link up calligraphy with intellectual pursuits rather than esthetic and artistic-emotional notions. However, there can be no doubt whatever that calligraphy also served to satisfy the artistic needs of human nature in Islam. One of the writers on calligraphy, Ibn Durustawayh (d. 958), said that in addition to the technical and utilitarian aspects to which he restricted his book, there also existed, as another important but different aspect, ornamental writing on paper and stone (\textit{taṣwīr, naqsh})\textsuperscript{4}.

Overwhelming evidence for the emotional-artistic element in Muslim calligraphy is furnished by its very character. The infinite pains that were taken in order to develop new and more beautiful forms of writing point in the same direction. Then there are occasional remarks that express esthetic appreciation of writing in deeply felt emotional terms.\footnote{Kuttāb, 2d ed, Beirut, 1927, p. 6.} We find comparisons of writing with objects of recognized beauty and emotional appeal, such as jewelry, flowers, gardens, and textiles. The sphere of more intimate emotions is touched when a beautiful handwriting is described as giving joy to the heart and pleasure to the eye,\footnote{Since the sources contain little on esthetic appreciation, the secondary literature also has little on it. An exception we may mention here is \textit{A Survey of Persian Art}, edited by A. U. Pope. The second volume of the Survey deals with calligraphy. It would seem wrong, though, to claim every expression of admiration for particular specimens of handwriting as indicative of an appreciation of handwriting as a form of art in the sense we have in mind.} or when the sense of smell, so highly refined in the East, is invoked and ink is compared to perfume,\footnote{Cf. al-Tawhidi's short treatise on calligraphy, published in Ars Islamica, vols. 13-14 (1948), No. 93, p. 19.} and a poet could say that

\begin{quote}
Saffron is the perfume of maidens,  
And ink is the perfume of men.\footnote{Al-Tawhidi, \textit{op. cit.}, No. 71, p. 17.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{4}Al-Māwardî, \textit{Adab ad-dunyā wa-d-din}, Cairo, 1315, p. 37.
Here we also have an example of the significant connection of calligraphy with erotic emotions which had become firmly established at the very latest in early 'Abbasid times. "Tears upon the cheeks of chaste young women are no more beautiful than tears of the pen in a manuscript," was a saying attributed to a secretary of the caliph, al-Ma'mūn. Especially in love poetry, the comparison of bodily features with letters of the alphabet became a standard ingredient of the poetic imagery. The beloved's hair curling about the temples was compared to a qāf at each end of a line, or to the graceful curve of the tail of the letter rā. Or it might suggest to the poet the shape of the letter nūn, and a mole on the cheek of the beloved would then naturally be compared to the dot on top of the nūn. The mourning moustache might be likened to half of the letter sād as penned by a skilled writer. All such beauty attributed to the majesty of the divine scribe.

Even love union could be symbolized by the shape of a letter, in this case the ligature of the letters alif and lām, written, as they are, closely entwined:

I saw you in my dream embracing me
Like as the lām of the scribe embraces the alif.

This verse was often quoted, and the simile underwent numerous variations at the hands of successive poets. The same letters lām-
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*alif*, read as a word, mean "no," and thus we find a poet complaining about his sad fate as a rejected lover:

The *lām*-shaped cheek and the *alif*-like straight figure of the beloved

Make definite reply to the question of the lover: *lām-alif no*! 

Fortunately, it was not always an unhappy message that the alphabetomorph features of the beloved conveyed to the persistent lover:

The *nin* of the eyebrow and the *'ayn* of the eyelids, Together with the *mim* of the mouth, give the answer: *na'am yes!* 

---


In a prose context the metaphor of *alif-lām* is used to illustrate extraordinary promptness in fulfilling one's promises; cf. al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārikh Baghīdād*, Cairo, 1349–1931, vol. 12, p. 479. As the title of a book, we find it in an early work on love, ad-Ṭaylāmî's *Āf al-alif al-ma'lūf 'alā l-lām al-ma'tūf*; cf. *GAL*, Suppl., vol. 1, p. 359, and R. Walzer, in JRAS, 1939, p. 407f. I had no opportunity to check grammatical monographs on *alif-lām*.

The locks of the beloved are compared to *alif* and *lām* by Abū Tammām, *Divān*, Beirut, n.d., p. 462. Cf. also Dīk al-jinn, in Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 247.


17 'Imād-ad-dīn ad-Dunayṣirī, as quoted by Ibn All these and similar comparisons, which are extremely frequent in Arabic poetry, seem tiresome and contrived to us because we do not attach any emotional significance to the shape of letters. Conversely, their popularity in Islam is a strong confirmation of the hold exercised by calligraphy over Muslim emotions.

How did writing happen to occupy this particular place in Muslim civilization? It is hardly a satisfactory answer to say that since all forms of pictorial representation were greatly curbed in Islam, art took refuge in calligraphy.18 There must have been something to suggest that writing was a suitable outlet for artistic creativity; thus, we are back where we started. It also would not do, in my opinion, to derive Muslim calligraphy from the wonderment and admiration with which little-educated pre-Islamic Arabs considered the mystery of writing.19 The truth is that Arabic writing originally showed extremely little promise of developing into a form of art.

Nabataean writing, the predecessor of Arabic writing, even in the period when the Nabataean state was flourishing and prosperous, could hardly be called beautiful. Admittedly, judgments of this sort are wide open to subjective criticism, and there may be some who would see a certain subtle elegance and beauty in the elongated shapes of Nabataean letters. However, in its transition to Arabic writing, Nabataean lost all the elegance and artistic refinement it may have possessed. The earliest Arabic documents of writing exhibit, to say the least, a most ungnaily type of script.20 As a matter of fact, the history of Abī Usaybi‘ah, *Uṣūn al-anbā‘*, ed. by A. Müller, Cairo-Königsberg, 1882–84, vol. 2, p. 271.


the Semitic alphabetic writing gives little evidence of artistic tendencies. As a utilitarian and economic product, the Semitic alphabet shunned luxury features and was much less of a natural starting point for artistic development than, for instance, Egyptian or Chinese writing.

In Semitic epigraphy, Palmyrenian in its later stages shows a tendency toward developing artistic forms, possibly under the influence of Greek epigraphic refinement. South Arabia was closer in time and culture to the beginnings and later history of Muslim civilization. Epigraphic monuments in the South Arabian alphabet show the highest development of a true feeling for form and symmetry, coupled with graceful simplicity, ever achieved in connection with a Semitic language, including, I believe, later Arabic writing.

As far as writing on soft material is concerned, we have at our disposal comparatively few documents from the pre-Islamic period on which to base our judgment. Many outstanding specimens of unusual calligraphic skill may have been lost. We have, for instance, the Aramaic documents from the Achaemenid period, the rich finds from the Dead Sea, or the old Syric manuscripts, to mention the most promising material for comparison. They all reveal a certain neatness and loving care in their execution, but whatever true artistic-emotional elements they may contain—and, in my opinion, they contain hardly any—would seem to be unintentional. The Arabs' cultural heritage did not make calligraphy the natural choice for artistic expression among Muslims.

Whether or not outside models influenced the rapid rise of Muslim calligraphy is an open question. Non-Semitic influences are, of course, not excluded. But Greek writing in

10ff., and Ars Islamica, vol. 8 (1941), p. 65ff. It is the extremely rapid development of Arabic calligraphy which obscures the fact of the original ungainliness of the writing.

Syria, as it must have appeared to the Muslims, was presumably not very impressive. The famous Manichaean predilection for fine books may have influenced Muslim calligraphy somewhere along the line but hardly at its early beginnings. On the other hand, in the environment of Semitic speech, South Arabian epigraphy could easily have served as a major source of inspiration, but the fact that the Muslims knew and admired South Arabian writing is the only, and insufficient, evidence we have.

The most likely starting point for the phenomenal development of calligraphy in Islam would again seem to be the sacred character of writing. It not only demanded the careful and exact execution of religious documents, but also led Muslims to see in writing an outlet for religious emotions and to discover in it the beauty of the divine and of the divine creation. From this starting point, writing could have gained easily its position as an artistic medium on every level of Muslim civilization. It maintained this position, favored by the increasing religious intensity of later Muslim history. It was stimulated, perhaps, by non-Arab artistic impulses unduly repressed by Islam; however, the rise of calligraphy was so early and rapid in Islam that the earliest generations of Muslims must have participated in it. This also makes it unlikely that the requirements of a powerful bureaucracy created Muslim calligraphy even if they greatly contributed to its development and growth. At any rate, the fusion of religion and art in Muslim calligraphy became a reality. To this day, the tablets with the names of the Prophet and the four caliphs high up in the interior of Aya Sofya will not fail to impress everyone who looks at them intently as religious emotion frozen by art and as being no less effective as a religious and artistic experience than Western religious painting was in a different if related medium.
A further noteworthy aspect of writing in Islam, which is also illustrated by as-Subki’s *fatwá*, is the fact already alluded to that writing as such, and Arabic writing in particular, formed the subject of much theoretical discussion and analysis among all kinds of scholars and writers. Like the other aspects of the use of writing in Islam mentioned here, this is not something peculiar to Islam. However, the practice of writing, even where it is extensive, must not necessarily be accompanied by elaborate speculations as to the meaning and purpose of writing, its peculiar characteristics, or its limitations. This we find in Muslim literature. Some of the points raised certainly deserve a few words in this context, as indicative of the role played by writing in Muslim civilization.

The limitation of the effectiveness of writing most commonly deplored by Muslim scholars was peculiar to the Arabic script. As al-Birūnī, writing around the middle of the eleventh century near the end of his long and fruitful life, phrased it:

> Arabic writing has a great drawback. It contains letters identical in their forms. They are easily confused, and there results the need for diacritical marks to distinguish those letters from each other, as well as the need for ways and means to express the grammatical terminations at the ends of words. Where these marks are omitted, the meaning becomes obscured. In addition, it is a widespread custom among scribes to neglect the collation and checking of the correctness of the text of a manuscript. In view of this situation, it often makes no difference whether a book on a certain subject does exist or does not, and reading such a book makes nobody the wiser with respect to the subject matter it deals with.

This and similar complaints confirm the fact that Muslim civilization depended on writing for the preservation and augmentation of its intellectual heritage. This is a point that needs stressing inasmuch as the apparatus of Muslim scholarship gives the impression that the oral transmission of information was valued very highly. The religious sciences, in particular, emphasized the necessity of receiving information *viva voce* and considered the process of oral transmission an indispensable guarantee for the correctness of the information received. The question whether instruction by a teacher or self-instruction with the help of books made the better scholar was often discussed and usually decided in favor of the first alternative. However, writing was always used, even in the disciplines that made a fetish of oral transmission and of astonishing—and no doubt true—feats of memorizing. In fact, insistence upon the paraphernalia of oral transmission became for wide circles a mere pretense. Muslim scholarship always placed reliance upon the written word, and it was this very circumstance that made it great. It was recognized that there existed some technical limitations to writing which made it less accurate in certain respects than oral transmission, but these were outweighed by the durability and definiteness of written fixation. Muslim civilization was dominated by the written word as modern Western civilization was, and still is, by its printed counterpart.

One of the special features of writing which we find discussed in Muslim literature as being of practical importance is the individual character of a person’s handwriting. The possibility of identifying individuals by their handwriting was of particular importance in legal matters. The question was raised whether a handwritten will that was not wit-
nessed by other witnesses was valid. According to Ibn Hanbal, it was, provided the handwriting was known and could be identified as that of the testator. A later Hanbalite added the comment that definite identification of the handwriting was a reliable source of knowledge as to the intention of the testator:

Handwriting indicates the spoken word, and the spoken word indicates a person's will and intention. The most that could be said against assuming validity of a handwritten will is that similar handwritings may be confused with each other. This would fall into the same category as the possible confusion of figures and voices. God put something into the handwriting of each individual by which his particular handwriting can be distinguished from the handwriting of any other individual, in the same way in which the figures and voices of individuals can be distinguished. People do not have the slightest hesitation to testify that this is the handwriting of a particular individual. . . . There is much evidence, almost amounting to absolute certainty, in favor of the acceptability of the testimony of a blind person under suitable circumstances when he is able to identify the voice of someone involved. The possibility of the confusion of voices, if not greater than that of handwritings, is certainly not smaller. . . .

In this and other respects, handwriting came into its own as part of legal procedure, at least, according to the opinion of certain lawyers. Considering the importance of the legal sphere in Islam, this gave it added status.

Not only its individual character but also the innate meaning and purpose of writing gave it evidential character. According to the firmly held world view of philosophers and jurists, writing occupies the third place in the scheme of things. First, there are the ideas in the mind and the intellect. Then ideas become expressible through the spoken word. Finally, the spoken word gains permanence and ubiquity through writing. It could be argued that writing was the least original of the three stages, an image (mithâl) of an image of an image. However, it was natural to assume that all of these stages were equally necessary for civilization. The last one, as the least natural one, was then the final achievement in terms of human cultural endeavor and deserved the highest praise.

Echoing a sentiment also often expressed in Muslim literature, Abraham Lincoln once had occasion to observe that the invention of writing was "great, very great in enabling us to converse with the dead, the absent, and the unborn, at all distances of time and space." In Islam, this great invention reached the pinnacle of its effectiveness. In addition to its elementary uses, it was the greatly refined and indispensable tool of culture in all its aspects. It was the highly adaptable vehicle for the expression of artistic emotion. And it shared and represented the sacredness of the central fact of Muslim existence, the religion of Islam.

23 Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah (d. 1350), at-Turuq al-hukmiyah, Cairo, 1372/1953, p. 206f.
24 For handwriting and the science of jurisprudence, cf., for instance, as-Sarakhshî, Usûl, Cairo, 1372–73, vol. 1, pp. 357–359.
25 Schacht-Meyerhof, op. cit., p. 84.
THE ICONOGRAPHY OF A KĀSHĀN LUSTER PLATE *
BY GRACE D. GUEST AND RICHARD ETTINGHAUSEN

To A. G. Wenley
In Appreciation of His Outstanding Leadership in Oriental Art.

The plate illustrated in figure 1, for many years one of the treasures of the George Eumorfopoulos Collection and since 1941 in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington (No. 41.11), has been known for a considerable length of time. It was first published by

* The results published in this paper represent the fruit of research done in connection with this and other objects in the Freer Gallery of Art and preserved in the records of the museum. The first of the two authors came to the conclusion in 1944 that the usual interpretation of the scene as being that of Khosrow and Shirin could not for various reasons be maintained. Further research, especially the quest for a possible solution, was then taken up by the second author. The main points of these investigations were established in 1945.

The authors have benefited a great deal from the kind assistance given by their colleagues. They wish to thank in particular the following for photographs or other illustrative material: the late Professor Hugo Eberhardt for figures 58 and 59, Professor K. Erdmann for figure 51, the late Dr. Emil Gratzl for figures 45, 55, 56, and 65, Professor Paul Kahle for figure 30, Professor Ernst Kühnel for figures 48, 57, 70, and 73, Mr. Arthur Lane for figure 5, Miss Dorothy E. Miner for figures 10-20, 37, 71, and 72, Mr. F. Cleveland Morgan for figure 60, Dr. Mohammad Mostafa for figures 26, 27, and 33, Professor D. S. Rice for figures A, B, 8, and 43, Mr. E. Safani for figures 31 and 32, Mr. Jack V. Sewell for figure 50, Mr. Jerome Strauss for figure 41, and the Kevorkian Foundation for figure 35. They would like also to acknowledge their indebtedness to the Archæological Museum in Teheran, the Art Institute of Chicago, H. Rivière, La céramique dans l'art musulman, Paris, 1913, vol. 1, pl. 35.

1 H. Rivière, La céramique dans l'art musulman, Paris, 1913, vol. 1, pl. 35.
when the plate was shown at the International Exhibition of 1931, in London, was some doubt thrown upon Kühnel’s identification. The catalogue of the exhibition pointed out that the “general presentation is entirely different from Shirin’s bathing scene as described in Nižâmi’s poem.” 4 Kühnel, however, reaffirmed his opinion in 1931. 5 He saw in the luster plate not only “the oldest preserved representation of a scene from the poem of Nižâmi completed in 1186,” 6 but stated also that such a reason for doubt as expressed in the London exhibition catalogue is “hardly one to be advanced in a ceramic discussion.” 6

THE “KHOSROW AND SHİRĪN” THEORY

There is, of course, a certain ground for identifying the design as that of the Khosrow and Shirin story, since that well-known and frequently pictured scene must inevitably come to mind. On the other hand, after a new survey of the problem the doubt ex-


4 Catalogue of the International Exhibition of Persian art, London, 1931, 3d ed., No. 159 Q. The quoted opinion is apparently that of Professor V. Minorsky, who was Oriental Secretary of the Exhibition and General Editor of the Catalogue.


6 There is no difference of opinion as to the Kashân origin of this plate; for this see Ettinghausen, Kashân pottery, pp. 44–62.

pressed by the London catalogue can be sustained for several reasons. First, since the incident is not included in the Khosrow story of the Shâh-nâmeh, the design would be based only on the episode in Nižâmi’s Khosrow and Shirin. As this poem had been written only 36 years earlier, in 571 H./1175–76, it seems to be too soon for liberties to be taken with the text, even under the exigencies of ceramic design. After a tale has become common property, any of its elements, like parts of a familiar quotation, are enough to evoke the whole, but nearer to the source a designer, one may assume, is apt to follow his subject matter rather closely. In the case of the Khosrow-Shirin story, no matter how formalized, the general mise en scène in an illustration demands two persons, and no spectators. Khosrow is said to have wept at the sight of Shirin, but in this rendition he appears more like a person asleep, with his knees drawn up and his head bent down. 7 There is nothing in his attire which indicates his princely rank, he wears no crown or other distinguishing headgear (if one at all 8), and his riding boots are unadorned.

7 In pl. 708 of vol. 5 of A Survey of Persian Art, the right pupil of “Khosrow” is visible, so that it looks as if he were watching “Shirin.” A careful examination of the original shows that there is no luster spot to indicate a pupil. There apparently never was one, as it is not noticeable on the plate in Rivière’s publication. What looks like a pupil in A Survey of Persian Art must have been a speck on the photographic print from which the plate was made.

8 In this respect he differs from the five figures behind the horse, who wear some form of cap. One of the servitors on the outside of the “Baptistère de Saint Louis” (the one holding a kid in his hands) shows a somewhat similar, diamond-shaped ornament over his hair or possibly affixed to some form of a cap of soft material (D. S. Rice says of him: “Le serviteur est, semble-t-il, nu-tête” [Le Baptistère de Saint Louis, Paris, 1951, p. 20, pls. 5 and 22]); hence whether this figure is shown bareheaded or not, he is not distinguished as a royal personage, but rather as a figure of low rank.

In the elaborate throne scene (text figs. A and B)
He and Shirin are small marginal figures, while the horse (according to this interpretation it would be Shabdiz, Shirin's mount) looms all too large in the middle of the stage. This is at odds with the usual portrayal of the heroic figures in medieval scenes, where they appear larger than the secondary figures (including horses) and are usually placed in the focal center, if not right in the actual center of the composition.

Second, and more specifically, the representation on the plate contradicts the Persian text in one important point, and in doing so runs contrary also to the general concept of propriety. The poem stresses the chaste behavior of Shirin, a feature which is quite natural for a person of her social station. Further, the poem states specifically that while bathing in the well the princess had a blue silk wound around the middle of her body:

\[
\text{در آب نیلکون جون گل نشته}
\]
\[
\text{بردن نیلکون تا ناف بسته}
\]

In cerulean water she sat like a rose
A cerulean silk bound up to the navel.

This is the way she invariably appears in Persian paintings from about 1400 on. She dropped this garment only momentarily in her embarrassment when she saw a strange horseman, but then she instantly hid behind the veil of her hair, which she let slide down. The completely nude figure which seems to be gsei

inlaid on the shoulder of a ewer made by Ibráhīm b. Mawāliyā (which is probably slightly earlier than the Freer plate) the ruler wears a headdress, while all the guards, hunters, and attendants "are bare-headed as far as can be made out" (D. S. Rice, Studies in Islamic metal work—II, Bull. School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. 15 [1953], p. 75).

9 See MS. of Niẓāmī, Khosrow o Shirin, written in Tabriz about A.D. 1400 (Freer Gallery of Art, No. 31.32); the text published in Teheran, Armaghan Press, 1313 (Solar Era, A.D. 1934), p. 80, line 20 has فرخیان (instead of فرخیان); see also Herbert W. Duda, Ferhād und Schīrin, Praha, 1933, p. 20.

Ituring, perhaps even beckoning, to the youth at the shore does not fit the concept of propriety as applied to Shirin, be it either before or after she saw the strange man nearby.

Third, it seems that the ceramic exigencies referred to by Kühnel are perhaps overstressed. It is true that the ceramic decorator can or may have to make certain concessions for lack of space or to fit his painting into the peculiar frame available. It may be that various elements would have to be rearranged or their number reduced. However, all known versions of the Bahrām Gūr—Azādeh story painted on pottery can be easily and unmistakably recognized, as their main features are carefully rendered.10 In this connection it is

10 Pope, op. cit., vol. 5, pls. 664, 672, 679, and 727.

We have to admit, however, that the iconography of the triumphal procession of Faridūn as found on a number of polychrome enameled bowls and tiles of the late 12th and 13th centuries (fig. 47) does not quite tally with the account in the Shāh-nāmeh. This source states, for instance, that Zaḥhāk was flung on a camel before being fettered to Mount Demavend, a secondary feature which, as far as we can see, is absent in the ceramic medium, though it is to be found in the Demotte Shāh-nāmeh, which seems to be, so far, the oldest published representation of the scene in a manuscript known to the authors. Furthermore, the ceramic representations and this oldest miniature place Faridūn on a cow, apparently in memory of Birmāyeh, the animal which nursed him and was for this reason slain by Zaḥhāk. Ferdowsi's text does not support this iconographic feature, which possibly reflects another, popular version; it is, however, in keeping with the story as a whole, especially with Faridūn's devotion to the cow, as expressed in his cow-headed mace. The general character of the scene (the smith Kāveh with the flag, the victorious young prince Faridūn with his animal-head mace, and Zaḥhāk, the bound prisoner, often showing the snakes on his shoulders) leave, however, no doubt as to which episode is illustrated. L. T. Guizalian in an article on A fragment of the Shāh-nāmeh on pottery tiles of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries, published in Russian in Epigr. Vostoka, vol. 4 (1951), pp. 40-55 and vol. 5 (1951), pp. 35-50, has come, independ-
also important to keep in mind that when various textile weavers rendered the Khosrow-and-Shirin story in the 16th century, they were always true to the original version of the poem, although they, too, at times had to cope with space problems. In some instances they had to divide the scene into two parts, but the subject was never in doubt. As to a group of heads which appear above (that is, behind) the horse, their inclusion—which contradicts Nizâmi's account and its whole spirit—seems also hardly conditioned by ceramic necessities. Since the scene takes place in a landscape setting, a multibranched tree would have been the normal choice of a Kashan potter, with flying birds in spaces still to be filled, just as we see them in other pieces from that pottery center.

In view of these facts it seems unlikely that the scene on the Freer plate represents Khosrow discovering the bathing Shirin. This leaves us with the task of finding a better solution of the problem. In solving this question two approaches suggest themselves, which we shall take up one after the other, the one being epigraphic, which tries to find a clue from the rather numerous inscriptions found on the plate, the other iconographic, based on a close analysis of the various elements and the composition of the unusual subject matter on this vessel.

ently, to the same conclusion about the existence of literary and popular versions of the Shâh-nâme. (See the digest by Oleg Grabar in Ars Orientalis, vol. 2 [1957], p. 551.)


12 Ackerman, op. cit., pls. 1022B and 1042.

THE INSCRIPTIONS

The main inscription, reversed in white from the ground of golden luster, is placed along the edge of the platter. It was first read and published by Gaston Wiet, and since we can suggest a few minor improvements we give here a transcription of the inscription (without the faked-in modern replacements of missing parts) together with a translation.

\[\text{[sic] ... [sic] ... [sic]} \]

Everlasting glory... happiness, health, generosity, favor and (one word) to the emir, the great marshal (isfahsalâr), the wise, the just, the one assisted by God, the victorious, the vanquisher, the warrior, the wager of the holy war, the sword of kings and religion, (the) aid to Islam and the Muslims (the lord?), of kings and sultans, the lord of princes... the sword of the Commander of the Faithful, may God render mighty his victories and double his power. Work of the Sayyid Shams al-Din al-Hasani in the month of Jumâdâ II of the year 607 of the Hijra.

This inscription is much more explicit than is usual on pottery vessels and in the elaborate use of titles of the princely owner reminds one—among movable objects—of the inscriptions on metal objects. As it is, it is very valuable in giving us the name of the potter, and the month and year when it was made, although in its present fragmentary state it

12 G. Wiet, L'exposition persane de 1931, Le Caire, 1933, pp. 33–35, pl. 29; Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe, ed. Ét. Combe, J. Sauvaget, and G. Wiet, Le Caire, 1939, vol. 10, No. 3672. (This publication will henceforth be referred to as RCEA.)
can no longer inform us for which particular ruler the vessel was originally made. Professor Wiet has, however, pointed out that the various titles led him to conclude that the plate was originally made for a prince of the Atabegs of Ardebil, Shiraz or Yazd.

The rather fragmentary inscriptions on the scalloped side wall of the vessel and on the outside have been studied by Mojtaba Minovi, to whom the writers are greatly obliged for having given permission to use his readings and comments. Both the inside and the outside inscriptions are a combination of various odes, a quatrain and expression of good wishes.

*Inscriptions on the inside (fig. 2)*

**A**

1. ای ظریف جهان
2. 
3. 
4. نما الروج والضواء لدیک
5. داروی درد به جمعی بگو
6. قیلتا چو رزقت من شفتیک
7. کریم یک روز صد جهان گفت
8. گم صحیح هنگام دشک عیک
9. از تو آم بر تو هم بنظان
10. آه وواستنا ت منک الیک

**B**

1. ۱۴<sup>th</sup> Century [Semaraj[دنیا می نوشم
2. I am weeping and quaffing wine [from a bowl] with the capacity of two *mans*.

**C**

1. همواره ترا دولت وعزر افزون باد
2. اقبال تو پکشته زند بیرتون باد
3. نا هره ازین طبق بکام [تو] رسد
4. ای صدر جهان ترا پاچان افزون باد

Quatrain (in a new meter).

1. May thy fortune be always increasing;
2. Your good luck be out of all bounds.
3. So that whatever reaches thy palate from this plate,
4. O master of the world, be an addition to thy soul.

**D**

عَرَةُۡ وَالْآمَالَ وَمُحَمَّرَ وَسِرُورَ از خداآنِد این میادا دوُر

Power, good luck, greatness, and generosity may never be far from the owner of this (plate).

**E**

فی الجمادی الآخرة سنة سبع

In (the month of) Jumādā II of the year seven (and six hundred).

*Inscriptions on the outside (fig. 3)*

**A**

1. گنتم از دست عشق جان بردم
2. خوید
3. 

**B**

1. ۱۶<sup>th</sup> Century

Professor Minovi commented that this Persian quatrain is very doggerelish and stupid.

<sup>14</sup>In this ode each first hemistich is in Persian (P) and the second in Arabic (A). The end of the first hemistich and the two following ones have been replaced by nonsensical scribbles on modern plaster restorations.

<sup>15</sup>After this ending of the hemistich, suggested by Professor Minovi, follow a series of modern imitations and repetitions.

<sup>16</sup>The date is here incomplete and only the month and the digits are given.
On the other hand there is, at least today, on the Freer plate no trace of poetry referring to a vision of the beloved in a dream, or something similar, although such verses exist on a fragmentary tile of about 1263 and they would have fitted the scene with a sleeping youth.\textsuperscript{21} Yet one has to remember that there is often no connection between the scenes on 13th-century ceramics and the applied verses.\textsuperscript{22} All this seems to imply that these inscriptions containing what was probably stock-in-trade poetry do not help toward a solution of the iconographic problem.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE PLATE

In evaluating the iconographic content of the Freer plate one should first consider its general composition. The piece consists of two parts of uneven size, an upper one representing a scene on land, and a lower one with water. An even cursory survey of the Iranian pottery and tile production of the late 12th and 13th centuries will make it clear that a lower area with water, usually filled with one or more fishes, but occasionally also with snakes, ducks, crabs, or humanlike beings, is a usual feature of this art, whether the subject is a throne scene, a legendary event, a meeting of lovers, an animal, or a floral arrangement. In certain cases, it seems to reflect a cosmological order because we find a tripartite arrangement with the central band populated with the inhabitants of the earth, i.e., human beings or terrestrial

\textsuperscript{18} This line in the incomplete and partly faked inscription has been read by Professor Minovi as خالق پادشاه زرتشت (1) What seems to be the same kind of a good wish occurs also elsewhere in the contemporary ceramic production, where it is better written and completely preserved (see next footnote) so that the text has been rendered as given above to reproduce the general tenor of the inscription. The expression \textit{kodavand-e in} occurs also on the inside inscription D.

\textsuperscript{19} M. Bahrami, \textit{Gurgan faïences}, Cairo, 1949, p. 121, No. 13.


\textsuperscript{21} Idem, \textit{Recherches}, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{22} Bahrami, \textit{Gurgan faïences}, p. 119, poem No. 6 and fig. 162 (the reference to figure 24 is apparently a misprint); p. 120, poem No. 10, and pl. 52; p. 121, poem No. 14, and pl. 64, etc.
animals, with water and aquatic creatures in the lower segment, and birds, angels, a spreading treetop or a canopy representing the sky or heavens in the upper segment (figs. 4 and 5). In view of the basic importance of water for the fertility, even the very existence, of a country as barren in parts as Iran, it can also be assumed that the symbols for, or representations of, water on pottery from prehistoric times on had also a mythological or magic significance. In other cases the reason for a pool of water is rather topographical, suggested by the landscape setting, because in a hot, dust-ridden and bare country like Iran it is usual for people to rest and refresh themselves near a pleasant body of water (cf. figs. 4, 6, 28, and 35) or to follow a path along a stream during one’s travel. Being connected with primary cosmological concepts and, possibly, with earlier mythological ideas, and also tied up with the country’s way of living, this insistence on the representation of water naturally persisted a long time in Iran, though on various levels of consciousness and, in later times, with the various notions partly fused with each other. Still, when it comes to many scenes painted on 13th-century pottery, it can be stated that here the inclusion of a pool of water has become a conventional motif mainly to fill in the lower segment of a roundel or the tiny lower corner of a tile. Naturally this compositional solution was particularly suggestive on account of the sensuous associations which are, in the Near East, always connected with water. How far conventionalization had already progressed in that century is shown, for instance, by a luster plate with a throne scene painted in 624 H./1227, that is, only 17 years after the Freer piece, where the pool of water with a pair of fish appears not only as a space-filling motif in the lower segment, but again, like a curtain, in the equally shaped upper part (fig. 6). This secondary use of a body of water, that is, to fill the lower segment of a roundel, antedates the Islamic period; we find it, for instance, on a Sasanian silver bowl which shows the common motif of a lion attacking a bull (fig. 7). If the representation of the lower section were a necessary part of the scene, we would encounter it also on the staircases of Persepolis, where we find the main subject frequently represented. This, however, is not the case there, nor is it to be found on Sasanian seals with such representations, thus clearly indicating that the segment with the water is, on the Sasanian silver plate, a mere space-filling unit.

Our illustration was made after J. Orbéli and C. Trever, Sasanian metal, Leningrad-Moscow, 1935, pl. 30. The late Professor Ernst Herzfeld, in a letter dated March 24, 1945, was kind enough to offer the following comments on the date of this plate: “The lion and bull dish has not a single detail which is not truly Sasanian; it is certainly not an imitation of a later period. I divide Sasanian art into three phases: the first is the third century, the second the period from approximately 300 to 450, and the third from 450 to the end. This is a good specimen of the third phase: the water with duck and fishes, the earth with flowers, the tree with foliage only at the end of the branches, the fur of the animals with the characteristic little whirls of hair, the big curls of the mane, etc., everything fits. . . .”

Erich F. Schmidt, Persepolis, I, Chicago, 1953, pls. 19, 20, 61, 62, etc.

A. Mordtmann, Studien über geschnittene Steine mit Pehlevi-Inschriften, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, vol. 18 (1864), pl. 3, No. 20; P. Horn, Sasanidische Gemmen aus dem British Museum, ibid., vol. 44 (1890), pl. 1a, No. 727a; pl. 2a, No. 702; P. Ackerman, Sasanian seals, A Survey of Persian Art, vol. 4, pl. 256Q; K. Erdmann, Die Kunst Iran zur Zeit der Sasaniden, Berlin, 1943, fig. 926, third row, right.
THE WAITING GROOM WITH HIS
MASTER’S HORSE

Before we go any further into an analysis of this lower section, it seems better to deal first with the main subject above it, which fills the major part of the plate. In surveying it, it becomes clear that the largest and most prominent part of this design is the saddled and harnessed horse in the center. In comparison to it the human figures have more peripheral positions. As has already been pointed out above, the seated youth on the left—the one formerly thought to represent Khosrow—is the only one of those represented on the plate who seems to be bareheaded, and he is wearing plain riding boots so that he hardly appears to be a person of social prominence. In the same way the five figures behind the horse, though they are wearing caps, are, by their very position in the rear and their stereotyped arrangement, marked as attendants. If, with this in mind, we now look at the iconographic repertoire of the late 12th and 13th centuries, we will find that such a scene is not an uncommon one. It represents the royal or princely horse richly caparisoned, attended by a groom; both are awaiting the return of the master, who, in other examples, is usually shown enthroned nearby. While awaiting his return, the groom just stands or sits while the time away, and quite often one or more attendants stand near or behind the horse. The only more unusual feature of the Freer plate is the fact that the groom is shown as having fallen asleep while waiting. Since this iconographic theme with its variations has not, to our knowledge, been treated elsewhere, we think it justifiable that we depart here from the direct line of investigation of the whole problem to present a select group of parallel cases of the “horse and groom” motif dating from the late 12th to the early 14th century. Since several of these scenes are so far unpublished or little known, we shall at this time also give a fuller description of them:

1. The earliest representation on a Muslim object seems to be on a piece which has been recognized as showing “the oldest Islamic adaptation of the age-old theme of courtly pageants.” It is to be found on the shoulder of the silver-inlaid ewer by Ibrāhīm ibn Mawāliyā of the late 12th or from the very beginning of the 13th century, and now in the Musée du Louvre (text figs. A and B; fig. 8). The center of that composition shows an enthroned frontally seen king surrounded by courtiers, attendants, and hunters. In this entourage is a waiting saddled horse with a groom standing behind it, a scene (marked “14” in fig. B) that is paralleled by a standing groom behind a saddled mule in the corresponding place on the other side of the composition (marked “6”). In front of the horse one notices a man seated on the ground with knees pulled up and beckoning to a hunting dog (marked “13”), a scene which is again paralleled on the other side by a man leading a hunting dog in front of the mule (marked “15”). It will be noticed that the groom stands behind the richly caparisoned horse so that he is partly hidden by it, while the seated figure, although very close, actually belongs to the adjoining scene.

2. Not far in time from this scene, and, incidentally, from the Freer plate, is another “horse with an attending groom,” which is painted on a polychrome pottery beaker showing scenes of the life of Bizhan, his love for Manizheh and his rescue from a pit by Rostam. This piece, from about 1200 or the


[31] M. M. Diakonov, Un vase en faïence avec des
early 13th century, is now in the Freer Gallery of Art. The scene is to be found on the lowest of the three registers (fig. 9) and it shows a groom seated cross-legged on the ground holding the saddled horse of Rostam, who, in the imprisoned. This little scene and that on the Freer plate are the earliest occurrences of the seated groom and the earliest examples of unquestionably medieval Persian origin.


Figs. A and B.—Design on the Shoulder of a Silver-and-Copper-Inlaid Brass Ewer Made by Ibrāhīm b. Mawāliya. Musée du Louvre. (Drawn by D. S. Rice; from his Studies in Islamic metal work—II, figs. 10 and 11.)

groom holding a horse by its bridle on the shoulder of an inlaid ewer said to be made by Ahmad al-Dhaki al-Mawsili in 640 H./1242–43, once in the Homberg Collection and now in that of Mr. Ernst Kölker of Lucerne. It appears here in a continued throne scene to the left of the central group of the seated ruler.
and his standing attendant. The horse is seen facing the throne. Unfortunately, the ewer has been restored in modern times by receiving new inlay work, but it can be assumed that the motif as such is authentic.\(^{33}\)

4. The various polylobed medallions placed on the body of the ewer by Yûnûs b. Yûsuf al-Mawsûli, of 644 H./1246-47, in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore (fig. 10), contains three scenes of the horse with his groom (figs. 12, 18, and 19).\(^{34}\) In the main version (fig. 12) the latter is again seated on the ground in front of the horse; in this instance he is sitting with his knees pulled up in the same way as the sleeping figure on the Freer plate, although he is now shown wide awake, looking out, his right hand lifted. In this case the usual saddle is overlaid with a special cover, on the top of which we notice a knob. This is obviously the ghâshiyah, the ceremonial saddle cover, which is an insignie of royal rank and sovereignty.\(^{35}\) Behind the horse is another attendant holding a long polo staff, while a falcon and duck are placed above the horse.


\(^{34}\) First published by D. M(iner), *Near Eastern Art*, in Handbook of the Collection, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, Md., 1936, fig. on p. 49. See RCEA, vol. 11, No. 4267.

\(^{35}\) The first known use of the ghâshiyah occurred in the Seljuk period when, in 1066, Alp Arslân carried it before Malikshâh, the heir apparent, the earliest example of this public announcement of an investiture, a custom then followed by the Ayyûbiids and Mamlûks. The ghâshiyah has been explained by Maqrizi as being of leather which is embroidered with gold in such a way that it looked like a piece of goldsmith work. The saddle cover of the Walters piece, with its pronounced knob on top, has indeed a rather rigid appearance, which tallies with the foregoing description. E. Quatremère, *Histoire des sultans mamlouks de l’Egypte*, Paris, 1845, vol. 1, pp. 5–7; C. H. Becker, *Le “ghâshiyah” comme emblème de royauté*, Centenario della nascita di Michele and a small quadruped below it, obviously to fill the space. To the right of this medallion and therefore in the direction of both the horse and groom is another medallion showing an enthroned king in three-quarter view “in action,” his hand being kissed by a bearded per-


ان لم اكن راكب الجوام - اسم بيت حامل الجوام

“If I may not be a rider of beasts
I shall strive to carry the saddle covering” (meaning, to serve).

In the early 19th century it was still customary, when their masters were riding out, for the Persian grooms to carry on their shoulders a cloth (called *zin-pûsh*) with which they covered the saddle when the master dismounted (A. Chodzko, *Le Ghilan, ou les marais caspiens*, Paris, 1850, p. 97; quoted in C. H. Defrémery, *Histoire des Khans mongols du Turkestan et de la Transoxiane. . . .*, Journal Asiatique, vol. 19 (1852), p. 287, No. 1). The *zin-pûsh* is clearly shown in the miniatures of an *Asafi* MS. of 908 H./1502-3 (K. V. Zetterstéen and C. J. Lamm, *Mohammed Asaﬁ, the story of Jamâl and Jalâl, an illuminated manuscript in the library of Upsala University*, Upsala, 1948, especially pls. 14, 16, 23, 25, and 33; by comparison pl. 22 shows more of the outline of the saddle, usually covered by the *zin-pûsh*, although in this case Jalâl sits in the saddle and partially covers it).
sonage, while a sword-bearer stands behind (fig. 13). To the left of the scene with a horse is another throne scene with a king “in majesty,” seated frontally, with an attendant on either side (fig. 11). The polylobed medallion which is placed opposite the medallion with the horse on the body of the ewer (that is, just below the spout) shows a raised dais of turned woodwork on which a female lute player and flutist are seated, with a large branching tree behind them, indicating that the scene is taking place outdoors (fig. 15). The series is completed by two more medallions to the left and right of the musicians, each containing a hunter on horseback (figs. 14 and 16).

On the shoulder of the ewer are eight smaller polylobed scenes which correspond to, or enlarge, the scope of four of the large roundels on the body, with only the two hunting motifs deleted. They thus form a more restricted courtly sequence which is presented in two variations of four scenes, one for each side, namely: (1) A scene in which a figure is paying homage to either an enthroned bearded ruler or a youthful prince, each of whom is attended by a sword-bearing page; (2) two standing courtiers facing this act; in one instance the attendants shoulder staffs with a bottle and beaker placed in front to fill the space; in the parallel scene the first attendant is holding a beaker with two other beakers placed in the background, while the second officer shoulders what looks like a long-handled axe; (3) a dais with two female musicians, in each instance a tambourine player being present, accompanied either by a harpist or a lutist; and finally (4) a youthful or bearded groom standing behind a horse in which the sequence of the bearded ruler carries a ghâshiyah (figs. 17-20). The “horse and groom” motif thus belongs to the basic courtly series.

5. A groom seated on the ground in front of a caparisoned horse (whose saddle is apparently also covered with a ghâshiyah) is found also in the wide central band of the stand formerly in the collection of M. Arthur Sambon, which dates probably from the middle of the 13th century (figs. 21 and 22). Behind the horse stands another attendant with a polearm in his right hand and an axe in his left, and the space above the horse is filled by a falcon in pursuit of two birds. All these figures face the next tableau to the left which contains an enthroned ruler “in majesty,” with two attendants on either side, and which is placed beyond a polylobed medallion filled with arabesques. The two other scenes in this band represent four standing court attendants and two lion hunters on horseback. The two small bands above this central frieze contain musicians, revelers, and dancers.

6. The scene of the waiting groom and the musicians which were in juxtaposition on the Baltimore ewer are combined on a basin in the Archaeological Museum in Teheran (fig. 23), a vessel made by ‘Ali ibn Ḥamūd al-Mawṣilī, who worked in the third quarter of the 13th century. Here the standing groom is holding the reins of the horse, which carries, again, a rounded ghâshiyah; in the upper half of the same polylobed medallion is a dais with two musicians—a flutist and a tambourine player—and a person holding a cup (fig. 25). Horse and groom stand toward the

26 Catalogue des objets d’art . . . formant la collection de M. Arthur Sambon, vente à Paris, Gallerie Georges Petit, 25-28 Mai, 1914, Illustration to No. 186, after which figs. 21 and 22 have been made.
27 G. Wiet, Un nouvel artiste de Mossoul, Syria, vol. 12 (1931), pp. 161-162, pl. 28; idem, L’exposition persane de 1931, Le Caire, 1933, pp. 40-41, pl. VIII B; the same artist made a vase dated 657/1259, in the Museo Nazionale, Florence, and an ewer, dated 673/1274, probably belonging to the undated basin and now also in the Archaeological Museum in Teheran (see op. cit., pp. 36-37, No. 36, and pp. 39-40, No. 40 and pl. VI). The Teheran basin is listed (with bibliography) in the RCEA, vol. 12, No. 4698.
next roundel, to the left, with a frontally seen ruler with two attendants at right and left (fig. 24), while the elaborately figured band in between these two medallions reveals another throne scene with a drinking ruler before whom a kneeling figure does obeisance, a combination with two types of throne scenes which is also found in the Walters ewer (figs. 11 and 23).

7. The candlestick by 'Ali ibn Ḥusain ibn Muḥammad al-Mawsili, made in Cairo in 681 H./1282, which came with the Harari Collection into the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (No. 15127) shows the same combination of scenes in polylobed medallions in the upper register (fig. 26). The photograph shows on the right a seated ruler, in three-quarter view, with his swordbearer in front of him; on the left follows another medallion with a standing groom holding a horse (directed away from the previous royal scene) on which there is a round excrescence which seems to indicate that this piece also had a ghāshiyah (fig. 27). Here again we have a space-filling motif above the horse, in this instance, a flying bird. The next polylobed medallion, to the left, shows a tambourine player and a dancer. The other roundels of this register are filled with the usual scenes of royal entertainment, i.e., drinking persons, hunters, and musicians. It will also be noted that the medallion below the groom and the horse, in the lowest register, is that of an enthroned ruler frontally seen with two attendants, so that we have here again the combination of the two different throne scenes with the two aspects of royalty, as in the Walters ewer and the Teheran basin. The two closest medallions in the intermediary register show, on the left, two musicians and, on the right, a mounted falconer, which are both again appropriate subjects in this iconographic scheme.

8. The horse with the waiting groom occurs also as the right part of the double frontispiece of the Tarikh-e Tahān-gosha ("History of the World Conqueror"), by 'Alā'ī-l-Din 'Aṭā Malek-e Joveyni, in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Suppl. pers. 205), written by Rashid al-Khwāfī in Dhū 'l-Hijja 689/Dec. 1290 (figs. 28 and 29). The main scene (fig. 28) shows Joveyni acting as scribe for his Mongol master who is seen dictating or giving orders. This master could be either Amīr Arghān, the Governor of the Western Lands, under whom the historian first served as secretary, or Ḥūlāgū, the Il-khānīd ruler who later on appointed him Governor of Iraq and Khuzistan. On the right side of the double composition (fig. 29) one sees the squatting groom holding the reins of the dignitary's horse, over the saddle of which a ceremonial cover has been placed. This is the only other scene of the 13th century in which a body of water with fishes is in proximity to the groom and horse, though even here it is placed between Joveyni and his royal master.

9. Horse and groom occur also on what is now a detached double frontispiece of a manuscript from about 1300, in the University

This double frontispiece (folios 1 verso and 2 recto) has suffered greatly in the course of time: the faces have been rubbed out (even that of the horse), the verdigris green used for leaves, grass, and the garment of the groom has partly destroyed the painted areas through its acidity, and finally the lower part of the main miniature of folio 2 recto had been covered by unsightly paper at a more recent period. On the authors' suggestion the authorities of the Bibliothèque Nationale have kindly agreed to detach this paper, so that at least this blemish is now removed and the newly taken photograph presents the miniature in a condition somewhat closer to its original state.

The double miniature has rarely been referred to. It has recently formed the subject of a special investigation, in which the earlier literature was quoted: R. Ettinghausen, On some Mongol paintings, Kunst des Orients, vol. 3 (1959), pp. 44–52, figs. 1–5.

36 GUEST AND ETTINGHAUSEN

38 RCEA, vol. 13, No. 4807 with bibliography up to 1944.
Library in Istanbul. Here the right part represents an enthroned king, seen frontally, surrounded by many attendants. In the upper part of the right section are exotic and fabulous animals, with Indian and Persian attendants, while the lower part is filled by the horse turned away from the throne scene and held by a groom seated on a folding stool facing the horse; behind the horse are three falconers and there are also other attendants. This miniature has a Turco-Mongol flavor, but the motif of horse and groom persists in the established manner, and here even—as on the Freer plate—with other attendants standing behind the horse.

10. While the examples so far cited came from Iran or Iraq, the next shows the use of the motif in Mamluk Egypt. It occurs about ten times among the medieval shadow figures made of partly colored leather, which Professor Paul Kahle discovered in the village of Menzaleh in the Nile Delta. They all show a saddled and richly caparisoned horse with a small bearded groom in front of the horse, though the latter seems to be walking rather than standing while holding the animal by its reins, possibly because shadow plays suggest figures "in action" (fig. 30). The horse is not only adorned with the big shield and sword of its master, but the rounded excrecence on its saddle seems to indicate that we have here again a representation of the ghâshiyah. All these shadow figures form part of a royal ceremony. They can be dated, thanks to the heraldic research of L. A. Mayer, since several of the sets contain the coat of arms of a napkin (buqjah), which is the blazon of the master of the robes (jamdâr) and occurs only between 1290 and 1370.

11 and 12. There are, furthermore, shortened Persian versions of the motif, in which it has probably lost its original significance and turned into a mere decoration. In these cases the horse is still shown saddled, but without groom and other attendants. An early example signed by Bâ Naṣr (?) from the 12th or early 13th century is chased on a bronze footstand (zîr-pâ) used in the ẖâmmâm for the application of henna (fig. 31); here the horse, shown even with stirrups (fig. 32), is one of the motifs on the side panels, others containing a lion, confronted birds, a Kûfic inscription (al-mulk îllâh) and palmettes. Another such saddled horse, painted at least a hundred years later than the first, is found on a luster tile in the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo (fig. 33); as this piece has been taken out of its ancient context, we do not know with which other designs it was originally associated. Stylistically it belongs, however, to a well-known group of "Sultânâbâd" tiles, one of which, with a spotted (unsaddled) horse, in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, is dated 710 H./1310.

The motif of the waiting horse and its at-

41 F. Sarre and F. R. Martin, Meisterwerke mohammedanischer Kunst in München, 1910, Munich, 1912, vol. 1, pl. 8.
42 P. Kahle, Das islamische Schattentheater in Ägypten, Orientalisches Archiv, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1912), pl. XIX; idem, Das arabische Schattentheater im mittelalterlichen Ägypten, Wissenschaftliche Annalen, vol. 3, No. 12 (Dresden, 1954), p. 770, fig. 7, which assumes that there was originally a rider on the horse. However the high ghâshiyah and the two streamers in front of and behind the saddle make this not likely.

43 Loc. cit., p. 759. All the Mamlûk amirs listed by L. A. Mayer in his Saracenic heraldry (Oxford, 1933), who had a napkin in the center of a three-partite field, died between 744 and 772 H./1343 and 1371 (op. cit., pp. 55, 67, 73, 74, 104, and 208).
44 Another "Sultânâbâd" tile, a small one, with a saddled horse on floral ground and framed by a blue edge (without writing), of ca. 1300, is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (No. 08.110.8).
tending groom appears nearly always in conjunction with a scene of a king (or prince) who is shown enthroned, and if there is only one such throne scene it depicts the ruler frontally, “in majesty.” Only occasionally, and then for specific reasons or in later examples, the waiting groom and his horse are found in “isolated form,” as a motif by itself. The subject becomes fairly common from the 15th century on, so that it seems sufficient to select only a few additional examples which are of interest in connection with the Freer luster plate.

A specific reason why the motif was used in an “isolated” form (i.e., without the master of the horse) was, for instance, provided when in 821 H./1418 the Amir Sa‘id Tarkhan sent a horse as a present to the Emperor of China; at that time he also sent a portrait of the horse with two grooms who led it by its bridle. On the other hand, the miniature, attributed to Heydar ‘Ali, of a groom and horse (whose saddle is covered by a zin-pūsh) dates from the second quarter of the 16th century and then from a time when individual motifs were, so to say, picked out by the painter from larger figural subjects and rendered by themselves on a larger scale (fig. 34). The complete setting, however, does not go out of fashion. Thus, for instance, the later Indian copy of a Persian miniature of the second quarter of the 16th century shows a prince at a picnic in the country, during which he is resting on a platform erected on a chanâr tree in sight of a watercourse (fig. 35). Among the figures which form his entourage is the groom who, much like his earlier colleagues on the Freer plate and on the Safavid drawing, has fallen asleep while seated in front of the prince’s horse. It will be noticed that the saddle is again covered with the zin-pūsh. A fourth example is the left (and only known) part from a double miniature of the early 17th century, the right part of which must have shown the enthroned king Soleymân with Queen Bilqîs, also possibly his chief minister and, around the throne, animals, demons, and angels. This miniature in the Freer Gallery of Art (No. 07.623) depicts many animals, Suleymân’s attendants; present among these is the richly harnessed and saddled horse with its groom, who, however, in this case is not a human being but a monkey (fig. 36). This example demonstrates again how essential the groom was in connection with the state horse. Finally, there is another Mughal miniature of the early 17th century in which a physician attends a sick ruler (fig. 37). According to the usual Mughal custom, the miniature shows both the


47 See n. 35.

48 The copy goes back to the delicate line drawing allegedly showing “Shâh Ţahmâsp seated in a tree,” falsely attributed to Behzâd, in the Musée du Louvre (or a similar design). For the Persian prototype, which is too delicate to reproduce well, see A. B. Sakiyan, La miniature persane du XIIe au XVIIe siècle, Paris-Bruxelles, 1929, fig. 133; I. Schoukine, Les miniatures persanes, Musée National du Louvre, Paris, 1932, pp. 41-42, No. 9, pl. 9. Figure 35 has been previously published by Clive Bell in Persian miniatures, Burlington Magazine, vol. 25 (1914), pp. 111-117, pl. III D.

49 For another example of an ape-groom in such a double miniature of Suleymân, see A. K. Coomaraswamy, Les miniatures orientales de la collection Goloubèw au Museum of Fine Arts de Boston, Paris-Bruxelles, 1929, pl. XI: left miniature, lower right.

50 There are other miniatures from the same manuscript of ca. 1610 in the Walters Art Gallery of Baltimore (The art of India and Pakistan, ed. Sir Leigh Ashton, London, 1950, p. 155, No. 695 and pl. 133), while two are in a private collection (Stuart C. Welch, Jr., Early Mughal miniatures from two private collections shown at the Fogg Art Museum, Ars Orientalis, vol. 3 [1959], pp. 142-153, fig. 18).
inside and outside of the house in which the action takes place. This means that in the courtyard in front of the door, guarded by the doorkeeper, we find the waiting horse with its groom seated on the ground, with his knees pulled up under his chin; as the noble patient is too sick to be in need of a horse, the groom is probably waiting for the return of the doctor.

The question arises where we would have to look for the origin, or rather the immediate prototype, of this particular custom. The answer to this question will also decide whether the motif represents a traditional theme or is the result of borrowing from another civilization. Since the luster plate is an object made in Iran, we naturally look first among the monuments and objects of the Sasanian period, in which so much of this courtly iconography found a form which was then taken over by the Muslim artists of later periods. Indeed, we find two parallel scenes among the rock reliefs in the Gorge of Shāpūr, and in both the royal horse and groom are close to a representation of the king himself and other members of his court. The first is in a complex relief showing the victory of Shāpūr I over the Roman Emperor Valerian in A.D. 260; here, to the right of the triumphant Shāh (representing the “active” royal type) “a file of men lead a saddled horse” (as Professor Herzfeld expressed it), two men standing in front of the horse and others behind it (fig. 38). In the other relief our motif is even more evident; it shows a frontally seen Sasanian king “in majesty,” surrounded in two registers by many figures, on the left by officers and members of his court and on the right by Iranian soldiers bringing in the prizes and prisoners of an Eastern campaign (fig. 39). Among the figures of the lower left register is a standing groom seen from the back, holding the royal horse (fig. 40). The crown of this particular king is unfortunately not identifiable. Until recently it has been assumed that the triumphant king was Shāpūr I, who is shown in several other reliefs of that gorge, but recently a good case has been made out by R. Ghirshman that the monument celebrates a victory of Shāpūr II (309–79). So far there is no direct link known between the fourth-century representation and those from about 1200 on, and though it is possible that the Ghaznavid or early Seljuq period may have known this motif, such an intermediary link need not necessarily have existed, as other cases are known where artists of the 12th to 13th cen-

52 About A.D. 273; see E. Herzfeld, La sculpture rupestre de la Perse sasanide, Revue des Arts Asiatiques, vol. 5 (1928), p. 135 and fig. 11; idem, Iran in the ancient east, caption to pl. 120 B; K. Erdmann, Die Kunst Iran zu Zeit der Sasaniden, Berlin, 1943, p. 56. Previously F. Sarre had attributed this relief tentatively to Khosrow II (F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, Iranische Felsreliefs, Berlin, 1910, p. 214).


54 The Coptic Museum in Cairo owns a wood carving from the Coptic convent Dayr al-Banāt in Fatimid style from the middle of the eleventh century A.D. which shows a saddled horse led by a groom. As the latter is apparently holding a whip in his right hand and the horse is seen ambling, this must be regarded as a different motif. There is also no direct royal context, as the neighboring scenes represent other animals (R. Ettinghausen, Early Realism in Islamic art, Studi orientalistici in onore di G. Levi Della Vida, Rome, 1956, vol. 1, pp. 264–265 and fig. 9).
tury copied directly from Sasanian prototypes. 55

Whatever the immediate iconographic prototype of the motif of the horse and groom for the Seljuq art may have been, this much is certain: that the iconography reflects a general custom. This is demonstrated by many literary references. Indeed, the horse and groom waiting outside the palace gate become, so to speak, institutionalized in early Abbasid times. When the Caliph al-Manṣūr was in danger of his life from attacks by the heretic Rāwandīs, the institution of the faras al-nawbāh (or, in Persian, asp-e nowbāti, or kheng-e nowbāti), that is, of a “sentry horse,” was inaugurated. From this time on, a good horse, saddled and bridled, was always kept ready in the caliph’s palace, to be used in an emergency. 56 This custom was taken over by other

55 F. Sarre, Die Tradition in der iranischen Kunst, Mémoires, IIIe Congrès International d’Art et d’Archéologie Iraniens, Leningrad, Septembre 1935, Moscou-Leningrad, 1939, p. 228, pl. 104 b and c; compare also the dark-blue glazed ewer in R. Riefstahl, The Parish-Watson collection of Mohammadan potteries, New York, 1922, fig. 66, with a gold ewer in the treasure of Nagyszentmiklós, which goes back to a Sasanian prototype which in turn must also have been the model of the above-mentioned Seljuq piece (N. Mavrodinov, Le trésor proto-bulgarie de Nagyszentmiklós, Archaeologia Hungarica, vol. 29 [1943] pp. 14, 26ff., 35, and pl. 10). Mavrodinov attributes the plant motifs of this gold ewer to the “end of the ninth or early tenth century,” while A. Alfoldi (in a letter) dates it “earliest eighth century.”


This display of saddle horses was different from the richly caparisoned lead horses which were held in front of the drawn-up cavalrymen who lined the passageways from the gates on to the passages, courts, and palaces (loc. cit., p. 37).
among which were richly equipped mules (taking the place of horses) which were then ceremoniously led through the cities, and the prince to be invested kissed the foot of this animal in public. Or one might refer to the custom observed by Ibn Baṭṭūṭah when he visited the city of Ḥillah in Iraq. There every evening before sunset 100 armed townsmen went to the governor of the city and received from him a saddled and bridled horse or mule which was then led in formal procession to the sanctuary of the Imām Muḥammad al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskārī. There they implored the Imām to come forth from the shrine in which he had disappeared and from which he was supposed to emerge again. It was for this special occasion that the bridled and saddled horse was kept in readiness, just as was the sentry horse installed in the royal palace. Hence in early times, before the motif had degenerated into a mere decoration (see above, p. 37) the saddled horse with or without the ghāshiyah, but without the groom, was apparently used as a symbol of sovereignty or of princely status. As such it appears in 482 H./1090–91, in connection with an inscription naming the Great Seljuq Malik Shah, on the city walls of Amida (text fig. C) and, later on, on Mamlūk coins. An early example of an applied design of a saddled horse (and therefore possibly still imbued with its specific connotations) is to be found three times on a cut-glass beaker of the ninth to tenth century in the collection of Mr. Jerome Strauss of State College, Pa. (fig. 41). Finally, to complete the picture, it should be mentioned that owing to the special significance of the horse, the various Muslim sumptuary laws as applied to dhimmis or non-Muslim subjects contained special restrictions with regard to horses, be it that they forbade them outright for riding, or at least the use of riding saddles, or, again, that the latter had to have two large distinguishing balls on the back together with wooden stirrups, etc.

Fig. C.—Saddled horse on the walls of Amida (Diyar Bakr). 482 H./1090–91. (After van Berchem-Strzygowski, Amida, fig. 21.)

In view of the persistent custom, which is demonstrated both by the literary and historical documents and by the contemporary art objects, it does not seem necessary to look for immediate prototypes in Indian Buddhist, etc.


63 The saddled horse with (or without) groom is a pertinent feature of early Buddhist iconography as it is one of the motifs which represent the Buddha, for instance, on the Great Stupa of Sānchi (early first century A.D.) or in the sculpture of Amarāvati (about second century). See Heinrich Zimmer, The art of Indian Asia, New York, 1955, vol. 2, pls. 18, 86, 89, and 91. In the art of Gandhāra, this motif no longer
Chinese or Byzantine art, as the motif of the royal horse and groom existed there also. Although it is not impossible that a foreign model could have given added inspiration for the formation or, rather, the revitalization of the subject, its use seems to be traditionally established so that direct, full-scale borrowing from an outside source seems not very likely.

After this discussion of the “horse and groom” motif, a few comments may be devoted to the additional feature above it: the five heads and torsos behind the animal.

occurs, as Buddha is now represented, but there we find the scene of the returning groom Chandaka holding the horse Kanykaka (A. Foucher, L’art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhára, Paris, 1905–22, vol. 1, pp. 367–368; vol. 2, fig. 301).


63 K. Weitzmann, Greek mythology in Byzantine art, Princeton, 1951, p. 103 and pl. 30, fig. 108; the same miniature also illustrated in the same author’s Das klassische Erbe in der Kunst Konstantinopels, Alte und Neue Kunst, Wiener Kunsthistorische Blätter, vol. 3 (1954), p. 55, fig. 17, lowest miniature. This painting shows a groom bringing the untamed (and thus unriddled and unsaddled) Bucephalus before Philip of Macedonia (from Pseudo-Opian’s Kynegiteia, Marciana Library, cod. gr. 479, 11th century, but going back to a 10th-century prototype).

In a letter Professor Weitzmann kindly pointed also to the Skylitzes Chronicle of the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (No. 5–3N–2), where a much closer motif of a groom holding a horse by its bridle, awaiting a king, who is shown nearby, occurs several times (fol. 20v, Millet 879; 45v, Millet 934: 172v, Millet 1191; fol. 200r, Millet 1225; fol. 230v, Millet 1272); this manuscript is of the 14th century, but goes back to an earlier prototype. For a Coptic hanging of the fifth to sixth century of the Textile Museum in Washington with a succession of the “horse and groom” motif, see J. D. Cooney and E. Rieflastahl, Pagan and Christian Egypt . . . exhibited at the Brooklyn Museum, 1941, No. 242 (illustrated).

When these are compared with the designs on contemporary luster pottery and tiles, they seem to be like the courtiers so frequently used in the upper segments of throne scenes, and, like these, add pomp and circumstance to the subject. They appear also to serve as space fillers within the composition and as such the lower parts of their bodies are not shown, especially since it would have been difficult for the painter to combine their legs and those of the horse. One is also tempted to think that their seriate arrangement might have been chosen, because the rhythm of the heads fitted best into the frame of the scalloped cavetto wall. Yet these figures are actually more than just secondary features applied to the plate in analogy to other Seljuq scenes and for compositional reasons. They go back to much earlier scenes, as similar figures behind a saddled horse appear already on the Sasanian representations (figs. 38 and 40). Although we have here the ultimate models for this part of the design, they differ in another respect from the Freer plate, inasmuch as on these rock reliefs the groom is found to be standing in front of the horse. Thus, taking everything into consideration, the Freer design follows iconographically rather the scene on the ewer of Ibrâhim b. Mawâliya (fig. 8; text fig. B), where we find the groom behind the mount and, in front of it, a seated man handling a dog, a figure which in the luster plate becomes detached from its animal and is then turned to the horse. As the Freer plate is dated 1210, the iconographic type represented by the piece in the Louvre would seem to be slightly earlier. This corresponds also with the date of the ewer as assumed by D. S. Rice. The Freer
piece follows metalwork also in other respects as the shape with a scalloped cavetto wall is typical for bronze plates, as is the scalloped frame for silver-inlaid scenes in medallions (figs. 10–20 and 23–27).

THE LOWER SEGMENT

The last undisputed portion of the Freer plate, the lower segment, shows a body of water with nine fish and a female figure floating on her back and gesticulating with one raised hand. As has been pointed out above, this aquatic section often represents a conventional way to fill the lower segment of a circular interior quite irrespective of the design, although it was at first probably of cosmological and, possibly, mythological significance. In our case there is, however, a cogent reason for the inclusion of this, as the palace, picnic place, or way station of a king or prince was usually near a body of water, so that it would be natural to have his horse with its groom and other attendants placed in such surroundings. The one surprising element within this pool is the figure of a nude woman. To understand its significance we have to pursue two inquiries, first with regard to the use of nudity in Muslim art and then as to the possible meaning of this particular figure floating on the water.

THE PLACE OF NUDITY IN MEDIEVAL ART

Nude figures were found in the palaces, particularly in the harem’s quarters, and in bathhouses, as we can gather from a few monuments and from literary sources. When

Nudes and seminudes were rather common in Umayyad caliphal art: R. W. Hamilton, Khirbat al Mafjar, an Arabian mansion in the Jordan Valley, Oxford, 1959, fig. 50, pls. XLIV, 4 and 5, and LV, 5–9 (in the bath), pls. XXXV, 3, XXXVIII, 8, and LV, 2 (in the palace entrance hall); D. Schlumberger, Les fouilles de Qasr el-Heir Gharbi, Syria, vol. 20 (1939), p. 349, fig. 21, p. 354, fig. 25; A. Musil et al., Kusej 'Amra, Wien, 1907, vol. 2, pls. XXI, XXIII, XXVI, XXXII, and XXXV–XXXVIII.

They occur also, however, in later palace art. E. Herzfeld, Die Malereien von Samarra, Berlin, 1927, pls. 12–14, 16, 20, and 21; Ugo Monneret de Villard, Le pitture musulmane al soffitto della Cappella Palatina in Palermo, Roma, 1950, fig. 221 (two nude figures); D. S. Rice, Inlaid brasses from the workshop of Ahmad al-Dhakal al-Mawsili, Ars Orientalis, vol. 2 (1957), p. 308, fig. 33a, and pl. 8a (two nude wrestlers).


Of a different order apparently is another category of nudity or seminudity which Oleg Grabar has also kindly pointed out to me. Naked or half-clad figures occur, for instance, along the edges of the large polychrome painted plate showing the assault of a fortress by an army of horsemen, now in the Freer Gallery of Art (Pope, Survey of Persian Art, pl. 675). However, inasmuch as the exact place, date, and circumstances of this battle are still unknown, it is difficult and perhaps premature to draw conclusions about the extent of nudity in such circumstances, especially as mainly marginal figures are shown in this manner. Still, nudity in battle is also otherwise known in the Near East, vide the war engagements of Bedouin Arabs during which the unveiled daughter or sister of the shaykh sat in the 'uffah litter with her bosom
it comes to movable objects with nude figures, especially those of female figures, be it on paper or on objects, one can usually attribute them to one of two categories: they are either dancers, wrestlers, or other entertainers of a low moral and social standing, characteristic examples of this being a Fatimid drawing of the late 11th or early 12th century in a private collection (fig. 43), and, to a lesser degree, a relief figure of the 13th century from Raqqah in the Freer Gallery of Art (fig. 44); or such representations follow specifically the indications of a text. An instructive example in this latter category is the earliest bared (the pertinent passages from various travelers are collected in Julian Morgenstern. *The ark, the ephod and the “tent of meeting,”* Cincinnati, 1945, pp. 8–9, 13, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25 etc.).


72 Freer Gallery of Art, No. 08.154. This curious rather large object (height 337 mm., maximum width 187 mm.) is nearly a figure in the round, though rather flat and in the back not sculptured as a human body. Its originally pale-green glaze, now discolored to a yellowish tone, is partly covered by iridescence. The figure is not completely nude but covered with a sheer shirt which was originally decorated with a crosshatched pattern and circles on the brassard; this shirt ends above the knees. During the excavations of Wâsît flat figurines of dancing girls were found in large numbers; they are all dressed, but they share the elaborate headdress and necklace with the Freer figurine; also several of them raise their arms from the elbows, though not quite as high and marked as the piece in Washington (Fuad Safar, *Wâsît. The sixth season’s excavations,* Le Caire, 1945, p. 36 and pl. 20). In view of this (at least partial) parallel, it seems most likely that the Freer figurine is not some kind of cult image or magic object (hung up by means of a string going through the two holes at the side of the headdress).

For nude or half-nude male wrestlers, see the late 13th-century luster tile in the Walters Art Gallery (fig. 71) and the references given in footnote 70.

miniature showing the Queen of the Island of Wâqwâq who, according to Qazwini, sat on her throne entirely in the nude, attended by 4,000 girl slaves, who were likewise nude; in this painting, executed in Wâsît during the author’s lifetime, in 678 H./1280 (fig. 45), the Queen and her four attendants are indeed shown without any clothing. However, about 100 years later, in the “Sarre Manuscript,” now in the Freer Gallery of Art, the painter very characteristically put a loincloth around the body of the Queen and her attendants (fig. 46), and this way of presentation was usually preferred later on, so that nude figures as indicated by the text occur very rarely. This change corroborates two points which we have made earlier, in connection with the “Khosrow and Shirin” theory (see p. 26), namely, that close to the literary source figure representation still follows the text more or less implicitly and only in later times does the artist allow himself some liberties in his interpretation; and secondly, the sense of propriety was so strong that it was thought inappropriate to show a queen and her court in an unbecoming way. Another group of figures which can be shown in the nude are not, in spite of their appearance, human beings. For instance, Nizâmi-ye ‘Arûdî, in his *Chahâr Maqâleh,* speaks about a creature called *nasnsâs,* which appeared in the midday heat on a sandhill when a Turkish caravan was traveling toward Tamghâj in Turkestan. It had the shape of “a woman, bareheaded and quite naked, extremely beautiful in form, with a figure like a cypress, a face like the moon, and long hair. She was standing and looking at the members of the caravan. . . . When they approached her, she fled run-


74 Arnold, *op. cit.*, pl. 37a.
ning so swiftly in her flight that probably no horse could have overtaken her.” Niẓāmī-ye ‘Arūḍī called the nasnās the highest and noblest of animals inasmuch as in several respects it resembles man, first in its erect stature, secondly in the breadth of its nails, and thirdly in the hair of its head. It is therefore obvious that when this humanlike animal was illustrated (as it was, for instance, in a manuscript written for Bā‘isunghur Mirzā, now in the Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi in Istanbul, of 833 H./1431, written in Herat), it shows the nasnās as a completely nude, long-haired figure.

While this code of behavior seems to have been followed throughout the Middle Ages, nude or seminude subjects were treated more widely and conspicuously from the late 16th century on, both on the walls and on paper.76

76 Chahār Maqālo, ed. Mīrzā Muḥammad of Qazwin, p. 9; revised tr. by E. G. Browne, London 1921, p. 9.


77 A. Sakisian, La miniature persane du XIIe au XVIIe siècle, Paris-Bruxelles, 1920, fig. 56. About this MS, see now Kemal Çığ, Türk ve İslâm Eserleri Müzesi’ndeki Minyatürlü Kitapların Kataloğu, Şarkiyat Mecmuası, vol. 3 (1959), pp. 74-75, No. 15, and figs. 2, 7-9, 11, and 12.

78 L. Binyon, J. V. S. Wilkinson, and Basil Gray, Persian miniature painting, London, 1933, pl. CVIII, B; Eric Schroeder, Iranien book painting, New York, 1940, figs. 7 and 8; Sarkis Katchadourian, Exposition des fresques persanes, Paris, 1934, figs. on pp. 13, 21, 24. Besides nude and half-nude female figures or amatory scenes on the walls of the royal palaces or in the paintings made for the Saʿādī Shahs (all of which were beyond the reach and censure of the religious authorities), one finds in the first half of the 17th century also representations of the sex act on a well-known type of green glazed bottle. Such vessels were made with a mold, which indicates a production in larger numbers and for a bourgeois clientele which bought in the bazaars.


THE ICONOGRAPHY OF A KĀSHĀN LUSTER PLATE

However, to come back here once more to the question whether the nude female figure on the Freer plate might be Khosrow’s beloved, even in that late period when Shirin is shown, she appears partially clad in the pool and is observed by the prince on horseback from a distance, that is, entirely in the traditional manner. The same propriety is observed on 17th-century tilework, as, for instance, on a fragment in the Chicago Art Institute which shows a bathing lady partially clad, obviously Shirin (fig. 42).

A HUMANLIKE FIGURE IN THE WATER

In evaluating the small female figure on the Freer plate, it should be remembered that this aquatic being is not a unique feature because similar creatures occur also on other objects from the late 12th to the early 14th century. There is, first, approximately contemporary with the Freer plate, a polychrome enameled bowl in the Detroit Institute of Arts which shows the triumphant ride of Farīdūn with the vanquished Zahhâk behind him, and in the foreground a pool showing two fish, a duck, a snake, and a small half-submerged humanlike figure (fig. 47). Then there is the bottom of a bowl in the same technique which came from the Oskar Skaller Collection into the Berlin Museum. In its present state it reveals a seascape with two human figures disposing themselves among many fish and a large crab, in a
circular body of water which is surrounded by land with flowers, hills, and birds (fig. 48). Several decades later, and this time not from Iran but from the Mamlük sultanate, is a large basin of the second half of the 13th century in the Victoria and Albert Museum, which shows on the bottom of its interior a seascape with a large sailboat (fig. 49 and text fig. D). Here we find again a good many animals in the water and among them another small nude humanlike figure (now, like all the other elements of the design, only reserved in outline,

**Fig. D.—Bottom of a Mamlük Basin, Second Half of 13th Century. Victoria and Albert Museum. (Drawn by M. E. Morsell.)**
as the silver inlay with the more detailed interior drawing has fallen out); but this time it is definitely a bearded man. While this is a miniature-like scene, Persian bowls of the 14th century show, at times, water sprites among the fishes, turtles, crabs, and water birds, all of which are organized in a formal, circular arrangement of semisymbolical significance (figs. 50 and 51). In all these cases there was no obvious necessity to place humanlike figures in the water; this applies particularly to the Faridun illustration, where we have the possibility of checking whether or not there was a textual necessity for including such a creature. This not being the case, we must conclude that such figures belong to the folkloristic imagery of the period. There is no doubt that they represent water creatures such as occur in Persian and Arabic literature from the early Middle Ages on. These form such a rich folkloristic motif that a survey of it would go well beyond this study. We shall therefore restrict ourselves in the following to giving some occurrences which seem significant, either in regard to the date or the importance of the literary source.

One would, of course, look for such tales in the accounts of sailors, and so it is not astonishing that they occur in the 10th-century Wonders of India, by the Persian sea captain Bozorg b. Shahrevar of Ramhormoz, who already distinguishes between two different types of such creatures: one with many human features but with scales and fishlike movements, the other a beautiful human being, but with some flukes (jinâb) like those of sea turtles added at their sides. The motif of the waterman occurs in the Shâh-nâmeh when Key Khosrow encounters in the China Sea such humanlike beings with long hair and covered with wool like sheep. Very close in time to the Freer plate we have two important testimonies from Iran, the first in the Kitâb-e Samak 'Iyâr by Šâdaqeh b. Abi 'I-Qâsim Shirazî, written in 585 H./1189 by the collector of the story Farâmorz b. Khodhdâd b. 'Abd Allâh al-Kâtib al-Arrajâni. The other occurs in two places in Nizâmi's Iskandar-nâmeh of 587 H./1191, where it describes how Alexander met

83 This unique Persian text is preserved in an early 14th-century manuscript in the Bodleian Library, Ouuseley 379, 380, 381 (E. Sachau-H. Erbâ, Catalogue of the Persian, Turkish, Hindustâni, and Pushtu manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Pt. 1, Oxford, 1889, pp. 422–423, No. 442; Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray, op. cit., p. 41; B. W. Robinson, A descriptive catalogue of the Persian paintings in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1958, pp. 2–7); the story with the water spirits which occurs in the last volume has, to our knowledge, never been edited or translated, although the miniature which illustrates it has been published, first by E. Kühnel (History of miniature painting and drawing, Survey of Persian Art, vol. 5, pl. 815A) and then in color by Douglas Barrett (Persian painting in the fourteenth century, London, n.d., p. 12 and pl. 5 on p. 3), who follows the dating of B. W. Robinson, Catalogue of a loan exhibition of Persian miniature paintings from British collections, London, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1951, p. 4, No. 6 (ca. 1330–40); cf. idem, A descriptive catalogue of the Persian paintings in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1958, p. 6, No. 61.
such creatures in his Eastern campaigns. Detailed accounts are furthermore to be found in the Arabian Nights, especially in the originally Persian story of "Jullanār, the Mermaid, and her Son, King Badr Bāsim of Persia" and in the even more elaborate tale of "Abd Allāh of the Land and 'Abd Allāh of the Sea," which E. Littmann regards as an Egyptian version of an early tale from Baghdad. The motif is, however, not only a feature of what might be thought of as more fanciful accounts in the belles lettres; it is found as well in the scientific literature. In his Geographical Dictionary, written in Merv and Mosul between 1212 and 1229, Yāqūt mentions, in connection with the history of Alexandria, the story of a shepherd who had watched a most beautiful girl coming out of the sea. There are at least seven passages of various length referring to water creatures with a human aspect in Qazwini's two-part Cosmography, thus representing the state of this lore about 50 years after the Freer plate was made, but all probably going back to older sources, one of these (Abū Ḥāmid al-Gharnāṭi) being specifically mentioned. Some of these are only part human, such as the human-faced fish of the Indian Ocean (fig. 52) or the white-bearded frog-like man called the "Old Jew" (al-shaykh al-yahūdi) who leaves the Western Sea, i.e., the Mediterranean, for a quiet period on land during the full length of the Sabbath (figs. 53 and 55). Then there are those creatures that

---

85 The story has a Persian setting and the main figures have Persian names. We find here the Persian king Shahrimān, whose capital was in Khorasan; then there are Jawhareh and Samandal (though these can also be Persian loan words in Arabic), the Arabized name Jullanār (from Golānār or Golnār) and, finally, there is the Persian form, Badr Bāsim, deleting the articles which would have been found in the Arabic name. In view of all this, E. Littmann assumes it to be an Arab version of a Persian story as retold in Baghdad (see his comments in Die Erzählungen aus den Teusand und ein Nächten, Leipzig, 1928, vol. 6, pp. 722–723; his translation of the story is to be found in vol. 5, pp. 88–158).
86 Loc. cit., vol. 6, pp. 725–726; the translation of the story is in the same volume, pp. 191–223.
are like human beings but have an additional distinguishing feature, like the tailed waterman \((\text{insān} \text{ al-mā') from the Caspian (\text{figs.} 54 and 56)\), and the (apparently similar) tailed Old Man of the Sea who lives in Syrian waters (\text{shaykh} \text{ al-bahr}), or the beautiful, long-haired girl found in the car of a giant fish of the Caspian, who, according to the text, has, strangely enough, a naturally grown loincloth reaching from navel to knee (\text{fig.} 57). Finally, there are the creatures who from all appearances look like a certain type of human being: the small-sized, black-skinned beings looking like Ethiopian children who live in the China Sea and appear when the sea is high, creatures who swim to ships during a storm to exchange ambergris for iron and carry it away in their mouths, and, finally, the humanlike animals which live in a big lake in India; they appear at nighttime in large groups—and among them beautiful girls—to play, dance, and eat, and are then watched by human spectators. Lastly, they are, of course, not missing.

available. If our assumption should prove to be correct, it would be one more example showing the influence of folklore on the iconography of the decorative arts.

\text{99} \text{Qazw.} \text{ ed. Wüstenfeld, p.} 130, \text{line} 27, \text{to p.} 131, \text{line} 4; \text{Qazw.} \text{ tr. Ethé, p.} 267; 
\text{Hamd Allah al-Mustawfi, op. cit., p.} 73, \text{tr. p.} 51.

Our two illustrations of the \text{insān} \text{ al-mā'}, probably the oldest in existence, are after the Munich MS. of 1280 (Arab. 464, fol. 72 verso) and the "\text{Sarre MS.}," now in the Freer Gallery (\text{No.} 54.68 verso).

\text{100} \text{Qazw.} \text{ ed. Wüstenfeld, p.} 128, \text{line} 26, \text{to p.} 129, \text{line} 6, \text{again freely quoting Abū Hāmid al-Gharnāṭī;}
\text{Qazw.} \text{ tr. Ethé, pp.} 262–263; the original text in the 
\text{Tuhfat} \text{al-albāb, lines} 4ff. \text{Figure} 57 \text{comes from a}
\text{Qazwini fragment in the Ehemalige Staatliche}
\text{Museen, Berlin (see E. Kühnel, \text{Das Qazwini-Fragment}
\text{der Islamschen Abteilung}, Jahrbuch der Preussi-
\text{schen Kunstsammlungen, vol.} 64 [1943], pp.} 59–72,\text{ where this miniature is described on p.} 63, \text{fol.} 91 v,\text{ but not illustrated). About this miniature see also}
\text{p.} 51.

\text{101} \text{Qazw.} \text{ ed. Wüstenfeld, p.} 108, \text{lines} 2–4, \text{p.}
\text{109, lines} 8–12; \text{Qazw.} \text{ tr. Ethé, pp.} 220 and 223.

\text{102} \text{Qazwini, \text{Āthār} \text{al-bilād, p.} 86, lines} 14–22,
\text{ing in al-Damiri's (d. 1405) codification of}
\text{zoological knowledge and folklore.}\text{94}

The accounts of such humanlike creatures living in the sea had such fascination for the minds of the people throughout the centuries that they continued to live in the popular literature, such as in the shadow plays, as the two Turkish shadow figures in the Ledermuseum in Offenbach a.M. testify (\text{figs.} 58 and 59). They are still alive today: the motif occurs among the stories collected by E. Littmann in Cairo between 1910 and 1939 and it is also to be found in H. Massé's account of Persian beliefs, in which he tells that the wells are believed to be haunted by jinn and that one is not supposed to urinate into water, especially stagnant water, as one risks killing thereby the jinn who live there.

In comparing these various texts it becomes clear that some of them do not speak specifically of the sex of these aquatic creatures, as, for instance, Ferdowsi, who just speaks of \text{mardum}. Others stress the male sex, and others, again (and they are perhaps in the majority) speak of the female species, which they refer to as \text{javārī} (damsels), \text{banāt} \text{al-mā'} (daughter of the water), \text{arūsān-e ābī} (brides of the water), and so on. In this respect it seems perhaps symptomatic that, though the submarine world of the story of "\text{Abd Allāh} of the Land and \text{Abd Allāh of the Sea}" contains both sexes, there is also to be found in it a whole city populated by nothing but daughters of the sea (\text{banāt} \text{al-bahr}).

quoting Abū Hāmid al-Gharnāṭī's \text{Tuhfat} \text{al-albāb;}
\text{Bacher, op. cit., p.} 108; see also below, \text{p.} 57.

\text{95} \text{Hayāt} \text{al-hayawān} \text{al-kubrā, Cairo, 1319, vol.}
\text{1, p.} 43, \text{lines} 16–22, \text{p.} 157, \text{lines} 7–8.

\text{96} \text{Arabische Märchen und Schwänze aus Ägypten}
(Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Klasse d. Literatur, Jahrg. 1955, No. 2),

\text{97} \text{H. Massé, \text{Croyances et coutumes persanes,}
Paris, 1938, vol.} 1, \text{pp.} 225 and 228, \text{vol.} 2, \text{p.} 414.

\text{98} \text{See above, footnote} 82.
The accounts stress the gay, frolicsome nature of these female creatures and their eagerness to sing enchanting songs which often lead to the bewitching of the listener. It is even variously recorded that their sexual organs were quite marked, which then leads to accounts of miscegenation with sailors. Perhaps the most detailed descriptions of such female creatures are to be found in the stories of the Arabian Nights, where the mermaid Jullanār is described in the following manner:

She resembled a lance of Rudaynah (which was specially fine and straight) . . . the place was illuminated by her beauty and there hung down from her forehead seven locks of hair reaching to her ankles, like the tail of horses. She had eyes bordered with kohl and heavy hips and a slender waist. He saw her to be a person surpassing in beauty and loveliness, and in stature and justness of form; her face was like the disc of the moon at the full or the shining sun in the clear sky . . . and when he looked at her body it resembled a bar of silver . . . "98

While this may be regarded as a mere stereotyped description of female beauty,99 it nevertheless stresses the eminently human aspect of the mermaid. Jullanār is, of course, clothed in human fashion while she is on land—the story tells how King Shahrimān saw her face first when he lifted her veil at the time when she was brought to him as a slave; and how he later disrobed her in the marital chamber. But the story of "‘Abd Allāh of the Land and ‘Abd Allāh of the Sea," which partly plays in submarine regions, leaves no doubt that the male and female figures live there in the nude, though here they have tails100 like Qazwini’s insān al-mā’. Indeed, a good many accounts mention this and other animal characteristics, such as fins, scales, and fishlike movements. Altogether, there seems to be no doubt that these variously shaped creatures101 are animals, as is even specifically stated by Qazwini,102 while Bozorg b. Shahreyār calls these maritime creatures fishes (samak) in spite of all their human aspects.103

All these details of the textual sources are reflected in the illustrations. First, the very fact that they are animals makes it possible (as we have shown in our inquiry about the place of nudity in Muslim art) that they are shown naked. The representations themselves fall into various categories. The paintings which illustrate scientific books such as the Qazwini manuscripts usually follow the text closely, thus depicting the various described features. This is shown, for instance, in the miniature illustrating the insān al-mā’ in the Munich Qazwini manuscript of 1280 (fol. 72 v) who appears as a nude red-tailed creature (fig. 56). However, even here there are certain crosscurrents, so that sometimes illustrations (especially those in manuscripts from the late 13th century on) do not tally with the


99 Many features occur already in the accounts of the beloved’s charms in the nasīb of the old-Arabic qasīdah (cf. I. Lichtenstädtter, Das Nasīb in der altarabischen Qasīde, Islamica, vol. 5 [1931], pp. 37–48); and in Ṭabarī’s elaborate catalogue of the outstanding attractions of an Arab girl as allegedly preserved in the royal Sasanian archives (see T. Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden, Leyden, 1879, pp. 326–327).

100 See the detailed description of ‘Abd Allāh of the Sea’s daughter in Night 945 (Littmann, op. cit., vol. 6, p. 218; Lane, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 221).

101 Their variety recalls Jullanār’s statement: in the sea are many peoples and various forms of all the kinds that are on the land; Night 740 (Littmann, op. cit., vol. 5, p. 96; Lane, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 276).

102 Qazwini, Āṭār al-bilād, p. 86, line 16: animals of human shape (ṭaywānāt al-ālā ẓārat al-insān).

103 Kitāb ‘ajā’ib al-Hind, pp. 39 and 40; see also the same identification with fishes in Damiri, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 157, line 7 (banāt al-mā’ hiya samak bi-bahr al-Rūm shahība bi ‘l-nītā’).
text which they illustrate because the iconographic type has been influenced in the meantime by other texts. Thus, for instance, the same \textit{insān al-mā} shows in the “Sarre manuscript” (fig. 54) besides his tail, two fins, which the illustrator apparently got from some other source, for instance, the \textit{Marvels of India}, while the callosity on the buttocks seems to derive from pictures or accounts of apes (leaving those below his chest still unexplained). The Berlin Qazwini in its miniature of the girl coming out of the big fish which had been caught in the Caspian is shown without the covering in the middle of its body, which, according to the text, was supposed to have covered her from navel to knee like a fabric (fig. 57). On the other hand, this feature is possibly reflected in the illustrations of the scene showing Alexander watching the water maidens, who now have also (nonspecified) fins on their arms, which are, however, possibly due to the account in the \textit{Wonders of India} (fig. 60).

A greater leeway was given to the artist when he dealt with a literary text or art-ob-

\footnote{It is, however, also possible that the loincloths on these figures are artificially made from leaves and applied to the figures out of the same sense of propriety which partially clothed the queen of the island of Wāqqāw and her servants in a similar manner (see above p. 44 and fig. 46).}

For mermaids of this varied aspect see Kühnel, \textit{History of Persian miniature painting and drawing}, pl. 858 B (dated 1410–11); Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray, \textit{Persian miniature painting}, pl. 32 B, No. 42 (a), ca. 1410–20; a now-dispersed Nizāmī, \textit{Khamsheh}, dated (according to B. W. Robinson) ca. 1445, of which the unpublished miniature in the collection of Mr. F. Cleveland Morgan in Montreal is published here as fig. 60; I. Stchoukine, \textit{Les peintures des manuscrits timurides}, Paris, 1954, pl. 46 (1474); B. W. Robinson, \textit{The Metropolitan Museum of Art miniatures: Persian painting}. . . , New York, 1953, fig. 9 (ca. 1475), and Grace Dunham Guest, \textit{Shiraz painting in the sixteenth century}, Washington, 1949, pp. 54–56, pls. 26 and 34A.

jects, because then he was much less bound by the text passage. The same applies to scientific manuscripts which are at this particular point rather vague about the aquatic creatures to which they were referring, or they are not even called for by the text. In all these cases the illustrations reflect more truly the general concept of the motif. We would like to mention three examples. Qazwini tells, in one place, the story of an apparition emanating from the Caspian Sea and appearing to Khosrow Anūshervān and his court; the passage mentions only an enormous monster without further details. When it first appears in the figural arts, in the Munich manuscript (fol. 71 v), it is depicted, apparently because it was coming from the sea, as a black \textit{man} with red wings and golden horns, looking very much like a Western representation of the Devil (fig. 65).\footnote{For the passage on this sea monster (\textit{bahimah min bahd'īm al-bahr}) in Qazwini, see op. cit., ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 129, lines 22ff. The later “Sarre MS.” reduces the human aspect to limbs and hands and shows the apparition as a real monster before the enthroned Khosrow Anūshervān (fig. 66).} Or we find such a water spirit quite unexpectedly in a Persian geographic manuscript of 1018 H. (?)/1609 in the Kabul Museum, where such humanlike aquatic figures populate the seas together with fish and ducks within schematically rendered maps (figs. 61 and 62).\footnote{The Kabul manuscript is an abridged translation of Ḫāsākhī's \textit{Masālīk wa-l-mamālīk} entitled \textit{Aškāl al-ālam} and (falsely) attributed to Jayhānī. V. Minorsky, in an article on this MS., states that only the digits of its date—218—appear in the colophon (\textit{A false Jayhānī}, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. 13 [1949], p. 90, No. 4, a publication kindly pointed out to us by Professor Daniel Schlumberger), while Ahmad ‘Ali Kohzād kindly informed us that the colophon is dated 1018 H./1609–10. Professor Minorsky has established that the maps of this work (or at least one of them) go back to the 10th-century original version of the \textit{Shah-nāma} of F. Wāqfānī, widely attributed to the 10th-century.} Finally, when the \textit{Shāh-nāme} of
1010 H./1612 in the Freer Gallery illustrates the scene of Key Khosrow’s crossing of the Sea of Zereh, it displays such humanlike creatures and these alone, although the text speaks of various other strange water monsters and states that these watermen are wool covered (fig. 63).\(^{107}\) This demonstrates once more that the concept of these creatures was so varied that the painter could use a specific visual form even when it did not conform to the text.

We conclude this survey by pointing to yet another medium where such a humanlike aquatic creature appears rather unexpectedly, viz, in the six so-called Portuguese rugs, mostly of the 17th century, whose spandrels in the field show a maritime scene with ships manned by Europeans and sailing in a sea in which one can see some fish, a wide-mouthed, many-toothed sea monster, and a small nude human figure half submerged in the water. The latter probably represents, again, nothing else but an insān al-mād,\(^{108}\) giving once more

\[\text{(now lost)}\] of Abū Zayd Balkhi, \textit{Suwar al-qālīm} (loc. cit., p. 94). Figure 61, representing “The Indian Ocean,” is No. 3 in Minorsky’s list and figure 62, “the Maghrib,” is his No. 4 (loc. cit., p. 95).

\(^{107}\) No. 07,279, fol. 238r.

\(^{108}\) The attribution of these carpets to Goa, last advocated by A. U. Pope (\textit{The art of carpet making}, Survey of Persian Art, vol. 3, p. 2371), has been found unacceptable by K. Erdmann in his review of this publication (\textit{Ars Islamica}, vol. 8 [1941], p. 174, n. 182). In his latest publication on carpets, E. Kühnel suggested a South Persian origin and interpreted the spandrel scenes as the arrival of a Portuguese embassy in the Persian Gulf, or as owing to the fact that they had been made for Goa (W. von Bode and E. Kühnel, \textit{Vorderasiatische Knüpftepiche aus alter Zeit}, Braunschweig, 1955, pp. 105–106, fig. 78). A manufacture in Khuzistan has been suggested by R. Ettinghausen in his review of K. Erdmann, \textit{Der orientalische Knüpftepich, Versuch einer Darstellung seiner Geschichte}, Tübingen, 1955, in Orients, vol. 11 (1958), pp. 263–264. An earlier explanation has it that these carpets copied a European print of Jonah and the whale (F. Sarre, \textit{Die orientalischen proof of the ubiquity of this folkloristic motif which, as we have now abundantly shown, remained more or less unchanged through the centuries.

Our interpretation of the lower part of the Freer plate has so far been based on a folkloristic belief which was, as we have seen, widespread in the Islamic world. There is, however, a peculiar Persian aspect of this scene which somehow runs parallel to what we have said so far. The starting point for this interpretation is the common Persian expression \textit{az māh tā māh},\(^{109}\) “from moon to the fish,” that is, the whole sublunar region down to the leviathan on which stands the bull that carries the earth (fig. 64 for the lower cosmological aspect).\(^{110}\) This term is based on the

\textit{Teppiche aus dem Wiener Hofbesitz, Der Kunstwanderer, Berlin, 1920, p. 446; idem, A “Portugese” carpet from Knole, Burlington Magazine, vol. 58 [1931], pp. 214–219, and Pope, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 2370). Even if this should be correct, Persians undoubtedly would still have looked at this scene as one which included an insān al-mād.

Sarre regarded the carpet belonging to Lord Sackville at Knole as the oldest and finest of the group and he thought that it should be dated to the end of the 16th century.

\(^{109}\) This expression has also invaded English literature, as it occurs in FitzGerald’s \textit{Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam}:

\begin{quote}
“A Hair perhaps divides the False and True; 
Yes; and a Single Alif were the clue—
Could you but find it—to the Treasure-house, 
And peradventure to THE MASTER too; 

“Whose secret Presence, through Creation’s veins 
Running Quicksilver-like eludes your pains; 
Taking all shapes from Māh to Māh; and 
They change and perish all—but He remains;”
\end{quote}

\textit{L and LII, from the 4th ed.}

\(^{110}\) Our \textit{figure 64} is one of the oldest (if not the oldest) illustration of the underlying Muslim cosmological concept of the bearers of the earth, the bull (Behemoth) and the fish (Leviathan) lying in water; it is from the \textit{A’jā’ib-e makhā'iqat} of Ahmad-e Tūsī (and not of Qazwīnī, as has been assumed by H.
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identity, but for one letter, of the two nouns māh and māhi and owing to its frequent use creates for the two a close mental association. Inasmuch as the word māh is in poetic language also commonly used as a metaphor for a moon-faced female beauty, the representation on the pottery plate also, to a literary mind, brings these two concepts physically together. That such an interpretation is no mere flight of imagination is shown by a passage in Nizāmi’s Haft Peykar, which deals with a scene in which nude ladies disport themselves in the water basin of a garden. In this case the poet describes briefly but suggestively this situation and, playing with words, he uses the common figure of speech referred to above, first in the metaphorical, then in the ordinary cosmological meaning, and in doing so he demonstrates the unusualness of the situation:

Moon and fish both in the water sitting,
(from) moon to fish (māh tā māhī) all agitated.111

The next two lines, again by the interplay of

Massé and I. Stchoukine, according to the kind information of Professor H. Ritter), Bibliothèque Nationale, Suppl. pers. 332, fol. 249r, written for the library of Sultān Ahmad Jalā’īr in 790 H./1388.


The passage in Qazwini dealing with these ideas is on p. 145 of Wüstefeld’s edition (where the names of the two animals are confused with each other and where also the Leviathan appears in a corrupt Arabic form; see also tr. Ethé, p. 298). The mountain at the top of the painting represents the world, more particularly the Qāf Mountain.


112 For the phallic meaning of māhi, see also Haft Peykar, ed. Ritter and Rypka, p. 262, line 316; tr. and commentary by Wilson, vol. 1, p. 250, line 12, and vol. 2, p. 183, No. 1, 860.)
sis of the metaphorical language of Nižāmī has pointed to the occasional mythological content and way of presentation in his poetry. In the same manner it seems clear that a water spirit, a harmless feature of folklore and tales, is actually the survival of an earlier stage of man’s religious beliefs and his attitude to nature. Indeed there is in Iran a mythological concept which clearly lies behind such aquatic creatures. It is the female deity, Ardvi Sûrâ Anâhîtâ, the “moist, strong and immaculate” Goddess of the Avesta, to whom the long Ábân Yasht (“the Yasht of the waters”) is devoted. She is there described as follows:

a maid, fair of body, most strong, tall-formed, high-girded, nobly born of a glorious race her feet covered by gold-laced, shining shoes. . . . (verses 64 and 78), dressed in a precious, richly embroidered golden cloak . . . holding sacrificial twigs in her hand, resplendent with four-sided golden earrings, a rich jewelry on . . . her beautiful neck; she had girded the middle of her body so that her breasts would be finely shaped and enticing, she had bound above a golden headdress with a hundred stars . . . she wore a dress made of the fur of three hundred beavers. . . . (verses 126–129).

As goddess of the river Jaxartes, she is the goddess of water, and thus, as all life is based on this element, also of fertility; she is outstanding in the Iranian pantheon as the protectress of the creative organs and functions and is much appealed to by men and women. As Anâhítâ she played an important role in Achaemenid times, especially under Artaxerxes II Mnemon (404–359). But the devotion to her was also strong in Sasanian times. Sásân, the grandfather of Ardashîr I, the founder of the new dynasty, was the head of a temple dedicated to her at Ístákhr; she appears in rock reliefs of royal investitures at Naqsh-e Rostam near Ístákhr and at Tâq-e Bostân, where she is shown with a water jug; as to the last-named place, it is also assumed that there was a sanctuary dedicated to her; and there are finally seals with what is thought to be her representations. On the ceramic plate she has, of course, changed her character: she is no longer richly garbed and adorned with golden headgear and jewels as described in the Ábân Yasht, and the connotation of beauty has changed to a mere eroticism; but the close connection with water persists.


The Zend-Avesta, pt. 2, tr. James Darmesteter

113 Ritter, op. cit., passim (see especially pp. 54, 56, 58, 60); see also J. Rypka, Neue Streiflichter auf die persische Metapher, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung, vol. 31 (1928), cols. 942–952, especially cols. 944–945.

114 The details of this goddess are still rather controversial and various interpretations have been given. The main features, in which we are interested here are, however, clear. H. S. Nyberg, Die Religionen des alten Iran, Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen-aegyptischen Gesellschaft, Bd. 43 (Leipzig, 1938), pp. 260–262, 272, 284–285, 291, 301, 368, 370, 407, 405, 468. L. Ringbom, Zur Ikonographie der Göttin Ardiei Sura Anahita (Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora xxiii, 2), Abo, 1957, came to our knowledge too late to be considered here.

115 The Zend-Avesta, pt. 2, tr. James Darmesteter


117 It would, however, probably stretch a point too far to see in the various tall plants growing at the bank of the water a memory of the white hûm, the healing, death-expelling, and world-renovating plant, which, according to the Bundahîshn, grows near the source of the water of Anâhítâ. Pahlavi texts, pt. 1, tr. E. W. West (“The sacred books of the East,” ed. F. Max Müller, vol. 5), Oxford, 1880, p. 100.
such an old religious tradition should be reflected here—and our earlier reference to modern Persian beliefs in jinn in wells seems to suggest this (see p. 49)—we would have an interesting illustration of what Sir Hamilton Gibb has called the “animistic substrate” of Islam.\(^{111}\) A belief of this character could very well be crossed or reinforced by the vivid tales of humanlike water creatures allegedly encountered by sailors, which kindled the imagination of poets and at last were safely categorized by cosmographers.

**INTERPRETATIONS OF THE SCENE AS A WHOLE**

After our investigation of the two parts of the plate’s composition and its various details and aspects, it is now time to consider the scene as a whole. The obvious conclusion to be drawn is that the scene represents a youth, apparently a groom, who, while waiting next to his horse with five other attendants, has fallen asleep and sees in his dream, a water creature that tries to entice him. However, on further thought such a mise en scène admits additional interpretations, according to the significance of the constituent elements. It may be that the inclusion of the water spirit was merely an incidental feature to the main subject, which was the sleeping groom next to the horse. Or it may be that the water creature is an intrinsic part of the composition, so that the scene represents a particular episode in which both of the major participants are essential.

Should the aquatic scene in the lower segment be only incidental, the plate would either belong to the series of “the royal horse and groom,” of which we enumerated a good many examples from the late 12th century to the early 14th century; or it might be a mere genre scene. In the case of the first hypothesis we would have to assume that the plate had at least one companion piece showing the enthroned ruler, if it did not belong to a larger set which included, besides the throne scene, other plates of identical shapes showing hunters, dancing girls, revelers, and musicians. We know that pieces of metalwork were made in sets in the 13th or 14th centuries,\(^{119}\) and in later times we know that fine carpets were made in pairs, or even sets.\(^ {120}\) There is also known at least one case of an early-13th-century pottery set of two, i.e., two black-painted bowls in the collection of M. Jacques O. Mottossian in Paris, one with an enthroned ruler and the other with an enthroned queen (figs. 67 and 68).\(^ {121}\) Both have the same shape and size, having been made with a mold showing, according to Bahrami, the unusual feature of 29 indentations on the rim. They are executed in the same technique of black painting under


\(^{119}\) For instance, the three plates of various sizes from a find in Hamadan in the Archaeological Museum in Teheran (Catalogue of the International Exhibition of Persian Art, 1931, Nos. 198–200; R. Harari, *Metalwork after the early Islamic period*, Survey of Persian Art, vol. 6, pl. 1334); an earlier case of the 10th century is the silver set of the Amir Abū 'l-'Abbās Vakil b. Hārān (Catalogue, Nos. 139A-L; Harari, *loc. cit.*, pls. 1345–46).

\(^{120}\) See for instance the set of carpets made by Ni‘mat Allāh Jawshaqānī in 1082 H./1671–72 for the Mausoleum of Shāh ‘Abbās II at Qum (Survey of Persian Art, vol. 6, pls. 1258–59).

\(^{121}\) First published by Bahrami, *Gurjran faiences*, pp. 54–57, fig. 11, and pls. 16 and 17, after which figures 67 and 68 were made.

There are, especially among the Gurjran potteries, many pieces which have very similar designs (cf. e.g., *loc. cit.*, pls. 50, 53, and 56; or pls. 13 and 36; or see pls. 19, 25, 26a, 28b, 34, 40, 42–44, 59, 61, 65 etc., which have close parallels in various public or private collections); but they are more the result of (non-mechanical) mass production of workshops and can therefore not be called sets. The bowls with the ruler and his consort supplement each other and they are also more individually and more carefully made.
a bluish-green glaze. The style and the composition in both cases is identical and there is also the same garment pattern and the same floral space fillers. (That in the second bowl each figure is slightly larger than in the other piece can be explained by the fact that there was more space to be filled by each person, since the queen had a smaller number of attendants.) It is known that the mold used for the Freer plate served for several other pieces still in existence, and the potter most certainly used it for many other pieces, now unfortunately lost. There are, however, a few pieces of a different shape but in the same general Kashan style as the Freer plate, which give us some inkling at least of what the corresponding throne scene might have been like. Being part of a royal set with courtly subjects, it would also make us understand why this singular pottery piece has a long official inscription with the name of the princely owner.

If this interpretation is correct, the achievement of Sayyid Shams al-Din al-Hasani would consist not only in the composition, so unusual for pottery, and yet very successful, and in the fine draftsmanship of its execution, but, more particularly, in the manner in which the artist has overcome the rather awkward existence of the lower aquatic segment. While in practically all other cases this part of the composition led a static coexistence at the bottom of the main subject with which it had a very tenuous connection, if one at all, the artist has here achieved a new interrelation which infuses a more poetic feeling into the scene. The groom is no longer just waiting around next to the horse, whiling away the idle hours, nor is he lazily sleeping as in some other, related scenes—his sleep has passed beyond the stage of an unimportant everyday occurrence and takes on a special meaning and intensity. This treatment is akin in spirit to the use of the metaphor in Nizami’s poetry, as there inert spacial coexistence has likewise been turned into an inner relationship by means of a humanlike animation of the world, which has suddenly received a fantastic and often mythologically animated aspect reflecting the mood of the main actors. There is possibly even one more parallel between contemporary poetry and this plate: just as in Nizami’s poetry the mythological or astrological world is overcome by a manifestation of true religion, so is the folkloristic or mythological aspect of the pottery plate paired with certain verses, so that no less than three lines, on the exterior, invoke the help of the Creator of the World.

The other alternative for this group (in which, as stated above, the female figure in the water is regarded as more or less incidental) would be to consider the whole as a genre scene. In this case no companion piece or pieces would be necessary to supplement the Freer plate.

If the water creature, however, is not a poetical embellishment added by the artist and thus of secondary nature, but a basic part of the story, we would have here an illustration of a particular episode. Which particular scene is meant will still have to be established.
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although certain ones come readily to one's mind. One is the encounter of Alexander the Great with the water maidens in Far Eastern waters, as described in the *Iskandar-nāmeh*. There is first a general description of the legend giving the mise en scène:

Of these deep waters there was a legend
That the coast rises there full of wonders:
The water maidens, sparkling like sun and moon,
Climb every night onto the shore;
They choose the beach to rest
And there they sing songs accompanied with games;
And whose ear ever catches their song
His mind is lost through the beauty of their voices.
They give voice to a melody
Never before sung by anyone.
Thus, every night on the high quiet shore
The song of the noble company is sung.
Only when the fragrance of Aurora appears
They disappear again into the dark waves.

Later follows a more specific account of Alexander's encounter with the water maiden, after the poet has told how the army was ordered to camp and when the king, accompanied by only one soldier, witnesses the dispersing of these creatures:

He saw the beauties who from the waves
Did sparkle, glittering like so many suns.
Their hair dissolved in curls flowed down their bodies
Like musk poured onto pure silver.
Each one of them sang another melody,
And every melody contained new tunes.
When his ear caught the sweet song
His body became heated, and his blood boiled.
Soon he complained with mournful words,
But soon he says with laughter: "What good is mourning?"  

It seems, however, unlikely that this is the scene meant by the potter, though it has been often illustrated in manuscripts from the early 15th century on (fig. 60). The sleeping figure does not show any royal emblem, especially not in his headgear, and in analogy to other representations, even on pottery, one would have expected more than just one female water spirit. Also the sleep of the seated figure does not quite fit Nizāmi's story.

Turning to another account, that of Qazwīnī (after the *Tuḥfat al-albāb*), we come possibly closer to a plausible model:

There is in India a lake 10 farsaks long and 10 farsaks wide; the water of which comes out of the ground without being fed by rivers. In this lake are animals of human shape which appear at nighttime in large numbers. They play on the coast, dance, and clap their hands. There are also beautiful maidens among them. When the moon is clear, the people sit in the distance and watch them; the more spectators there are, the more creatures come to the shore.  

Again we have here a somewhat similar scene, but in this case, too, the literary source and the painted scene do not completely match each other, as we do not find on the plate "large numbers of water maidens." However, it is not impossible that the clue might lie in the last sentence quoted from Qazwīnī: there was only one person who came to watch and so only one mermaid appeared to bewitch the man ashore, who now seems bemused, if not asleep.

Qazwīnī's account obviously goes back to a yarn of mirabilia ('ajā'ib) brought back by sailors or merchants, and though it has been here incorporated in a scholarly work, such stories must also have been current in more popular books. For instance, in the story of "The Generosity of Ḥātim Ta'lī," as translated from the Persian by Professor Reuben Levy, we find twice the motif of "beauteous maiden emerging from the water of a lake to come straight to the weary traveler, to take him by the hand and to plunge with him rapidly


128 See n. 104.

129 See n. 93.

below the surface.” It could be very well imagined that among such popular accounts of ‘ajā‘ib one might come across a version which will match the scene on the plate. The only drawback is that it is difficult to fix such a story in time and place so that there is no doubt as to its being the inspiration for the Freer plate.

Before our final evaluation of the evidence it is still necessary to investigate whether these three possible interpretations fit into the iconographic range of pottery decorations as found in the early 13th century. This repertory of figure subjects comprises first and foremost the usual courtly scenes with the king enthroned with attendants, dancers, musicians, and revelers, or cavaliers engaged in the hunt. In this group will also have to be included the courtly “love scenes,” although such a designation is actually misleading, as all we see is a noble pair seated sedately together for conversation or music, sometimes even in the company of courtiers. The various aspects of the courtly life may be split up and placed on the various parts of the vessel. For instance, we find the enthroned king with attending courtiers in the center, and galloping horsemen or musicians on the cavetto wall of the inside (fig. 69). Thus while the various aspects of the royal repertory are not physically separated on different pieces (as we would have to assume for a set with various scenes), they are nevertheless not part of a single scene, but divided up and set apart from each other.

As a second, much more limited group we find a number of realistic genre-like scenes. In considering these it must be remembered that the late 12th and early 13th century is a period of pronounced realistic tendency which, especially in Iraqi miniature painting, led to manifold renditions of daily life. This tendency is also reflected in the decorative arts, even outside Iraq.\footnote{See R. Ettinghausen, \textit{Interaction and integration in Islamic art}, Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization, ed. Gustave E. von Grunebaum, Chicago, 1955, p. 124. See also \textit{text figure D}.}

stance, to the representation on the ewer in the Louvre (\textit{text figs. A and B}), where many of the court attendants showed surprisingly realistic traits, for instance in the stance of the falconer (near No. 12) or in the manner in which two huntsmen are busy with a frontally seen squatting dog (No. 8), which, in a somewhat sly fashion, is juxtaposed to the enthroned ruler (No. X), who is likewise frontally seen and attended by two courtiers; or we can refer to a luster plate, made in the same mold as the Freer vessel under discussion, which shows three youthful horsemen riding across the picture plane, thus indicating that the pottery decorations of about 1210 were not absolutely bound to representations of a formal, heraldic, and static nature, but could also depict subjects which, though stylized in many ways, nevertheless showed the free movement of a cavalcade (fig. 70). The realistic approach of the period is especially noticeable in the polychrome pottery called “mīnā‘i,” which is painted with realistic genre scenes, as well as with more formal royal subjects. A good example is a fragment in the Berlin Museum, which shows a very professional-looking physician in a bloodletting operation during which his patient, a noble lady, turns her head away as she does not wish to witness the procedure, in contrast to the little servant girl who is seriously watching (fig. 73). The tendency became even more pronounced as the 13th century wore on and turned into the 14th. This is demonstrated by a number of early 14th-century luster tiles, for instance by one showing two pahlavāns in their leather trunks wrestling with each other (fig. 71) or by another scene in which two men are fighting each other with clubs while grabbing each other’s hair or beard (fig. 72). With such a realistic tendency in the air it would not have been ob-
jectionable to depict the stately horse of the prince with a sleeping groom.

Finally there are a small number of illustrations of stories. These are those pertaining to Bahram Gur and Azadeh, the victory of Faridun, and lastly, the tale of Bizhan and Manizheh. All these go back to the Shâh-nâmeh, just as there are verses from the Shâh-nâmeh (besides quatrains) inscribed on the rims of tiles. In all these illustrated scenes the emphasis is mainly on the heroic character and the prowess of the leading figure. Even in the story of Bizhan and Manizheh it is not so much its amatory aspect as the imprisonment of Bizhan and his final rescue by Rostam that is stressed on the goblet and the two tiles on which this subject is treated.

Compared to this, the story of a young man dreaming of a beckoning water spirit would appear to belong more to the romantic genre. Although love scenes are in this century an acceptable subject, they are, as we have stated, of a formal nature, and more specifically romantic scenes with a more open show of the human relationship seem so far not to have been published in the literature. Actually, a renewed search for a scene belonging to this general category has so far yielded only one example, a fragment of polychrome pottery which shows a hero on horseback talking to a lady who is looking down from a balcony of a pavilion (fig. 74), somewhat similar to the scene of Zal's arrival before Rudabeh's palace, but even more akin to scenes presented in the romantic style of the 14th century. It is also precisely the paintings from the late 14th century onward that contain scenes of dreams, which would be the closest parallel to the envisaged representation.

This survey shows that theoretically all three suggested interpretations of the Freer plate would fit into the iconographic schemes of the 13th century. There are, however, grades of probability. Thus the last-quoted solution—the illustration of a specific episode according to a literary source—is rather unlikely, as the "romantic" range of illustrative painting was then, as far as we know, little developed. It is true, a "romantic" aspect...
might be the singular achievement of Sayyid Shams al-Din al-Hasani, although one would like to see several more pieces belonging to this category to be convinced that such “avant-garde” work was then possible. On the other hand, the possibility of a genre scene readily acceptable, as it seems to be by analogy from other paintings, becomes somewhat questionable for other reasons. The long official inscription fits better a courtly piece than one which represents the dream of a very lowly member of a princely household. The well-established iconographic combination, “ruler” plus “horse and groom,” speaks also against an “isolated” genre scene. This leaves only our first explanation, which presupposes a pair (or a set) of plates, showing, at least, the enthroned ruler with attendants besides the sentry horse. This is, however, not just a solution by default. The long history in Iran of this iconographic theme, the many parallels in other contemporary media, the official inscription, so unusual in a pottery piece, and even such a minor detail as the luster scene’s scalloped edge found also around the same motif on metal objects—all this points to such an assumption. Although for a final proof we will have to wait until one day the treasure-laden soil of Iran will yield a pair of plates showing the enthroned ruler and his waiting horse, all details on Sayyid Shams al-Din al-Hasani’s plate find an easy explanation if we accept the hypothesis of a set which includes the sentry horse and its groom.

THE SECONDARY OR MYSTIC INTERPRETATION OF THE SCENE

While discussing the iconography of the lower segment it became obvious that, besides an interpretation based on the universal Islamic folklore for which we could quote both Arabic and Persian sources, there existed also a specifically Persian explanation for which the clue was the metaphorical language used in secular Persian poetry, especially in the romantic poems of Nizâmi. There is, however, also the mystic metaphor used by the Sûfis, which applies a meaning quite different from the one given by the mundane poets. An interpretation of the subject matter on the Freer plate according to this mystical parlance opens up an entirely different vista.

Such an approach is entirely within the Persian perspective as it is expressively suggested in the mystic literature, for instance, by the following line of Jalâl al-Din Rûmî:

The one saw in the mud (only) figured clay; while the others saw clay replete with knowledge and works.133

Or in another place he states:

The external form is for the sake of the unseen form and that took the place of another unseen (form). Count up the deductions of the third, fourth and tenth in proportion to (your) insight. (IV, 2887–88.)

Indeed this reinterpretation is the method used in his Mathnavi, where we have a long series of stories of different origin and different kind—secular and religious, from the court and everyday life—and to all of them an allegorical sense is given which transfigures them. In a way this method seems particularly appropriate when applied to a vessel executed in luster which imubes the piece with a phantom unreality and leads thus easily to mystic speculations about the impermanent phenomena and the permanent Absolute which are so vital to the mind of the Sûfis. The unreal appearance of the disembodied figures within a nontactile glitter could seem like a reflection of divine beauty, parallel to the Mawlânâ’s symbolic picture:

The sunbeam shone upon the wall:
The wall received a borrowed splendor. (II, 708.)


Hereafter the references are given directly after each quotation.
and make it appear to the viewer like a mirror which reflects not outward passing forms, but Reality.

It should, however, be understood that this is, for all we know, only a secondary interpretation, as we have no proof that it was either in the mind of the atābeg for whom the luster plate was made, or of the artist. There is also, however, no doubt that there must have been men who saw it after its creation and who interpreted it in the Šūfi manner. This will allow us to quote from the Mathnavī, a source which is about 600 years later than the Freer plate, although many of its symbolic metaphors were used before that.126

We shall cite passages to identify the various motifs of which the plate is composed and delineate furthermore the associations connected with them by paraphrasing some of Professor R. A. Nicholson’s comments to the verses. We start with the lower segment, the various elements of which lend themselves more readily to interpretation.

The fish is the symbol of the gnostic, the mystic or prophet, and the water, in which he lives and for which his thirst can never be quenched, stands for infinite Divine Grace. The fish in water is thus the symbol of the mystic union with God. On the other hand, a mystic still bound to the phenomenal world, varied and colorful as it is, is like a fish out of water. This is shown by such verses as the following:

If thou hast forgotten that glorification (rendered to God) by the Spirit, hearken to the glorifications of those Fishes.

Whosoever hath seen God is of God: whosoever hath seen that Sea is that Fish. (II, 3138–39.)

126 Professor H. Ritter has, for instance, stressed that Jalāl al-Din’s Mathnavī resembles ‘Attār’s Asrār-nāme and that he should be regarded as an imitator of the earlier poet (Das Meer der Seele, Leiden, 1955, pp. 430, 342 etc; see index, p. 690). Rūmi’s poetic images and metaphors can therefore be regarded as not too novel and as having, on the whole, been current around 600 H. Unfortunately this most

(This) is not the unicolority from which weariness ensues; nay it is (a case) like (that of) fishes and clear water:

Although there are thousands of colors on dry land, (yet) fishes are at war with dryness. (I, 502–503.)

Whoever is not a fish becomes Sated with His Water, whoever is without daily bread finds the day long. (I, 17.)

I have neither home nor any companion; when has a fish made its home on earth. (V, 1136.)

Since the bounty of the Sea is (poured) through our jar, what wonder (that) the Sea (that is, Divine Grace) should be (contained) in a fish. (VI, 817.)

The dervish that wants bread is a land fish. (He has) the form of a fish, but he is fleeing from the sea.

He is a domestic fowl, not the Simurgh of the air; he swallows sweet morsels (of food), he does not eat from God.

He loves God for the sake of gain: his soul is not in love with God’s excellence and beauty. (I, 2754–56.)

Water has a particularly rich allegorical use, and we can allude to only a few aspects here.127 Being the element with which Allah made every living thing (Koran 21, 30), “the water of the water” (i.e., the source of the water), the infinite sea, or the timeless river become a metaphor for the all-pervading Godhead. Then again “the water of life” which sustains the animal spirit in the world of forms is contrasted with the essential “water of divine love which bestows immortality on the Elect after they have drunk the cup of dying-to-self”:

None (ever) died in the presence of the Water of Life: compared with thy water the Water of Life is (mere) dregs.

The Water of Life is the goal of those to whom life is dear: . . .

(But) those who quaff the cup of death are living valuable book on ‘Attār, who died probably in 617 H./1200 and was therefore a contemporary of the master of the Freer luster plate, became available to us only after this study was concluded.

127 Nicholson in his commentary (op. cit., vol. 7, p. 49 to I, 502–505) points out that the allegory of the infinite ocean standing for God occurs already in the oldest Persian mystical poetry, in the Diwan of Bābā Kūhī.
through His love: they have torn their hearts away from life and the Water of Life. When the water of Thy love gave us its hand, the Water of Life became worthless in our sight. Every soul derives freshness from the Water of Life, but Thou art the "Water" of the Water of Life. (V, 4218–22.) But water stands also for the saintly spirit which, when it is soiled through contact with human sin, renews its purity by union with God:

When the water had done battle (in its task of ablation) and had been made dirty and had become such that the senses rejected it, God brought it back into the sea of Goodness, that 'The water of the water' might generously wash it (clean). . . .

. . . water is the spirit of the saints, which washes away your dark stains. When it is stained dark by the reason of the inhabitants of the earth, it returns to Him who endows Heaven with purity. (V, 200–201, 221–222.)

In reflecting on the figure of the woman in the water, to which the fish are drawn, and to which the dreaming mind of the youth seems to be directed, it appears that it is based on the concept that all phenomenal beauty is a reflection of Divine beauty. Of all earthly beauty, "woman is the highest type, but it is nothing except insofar as it is a manifestation and reflection of Divine attributes." 138 The Mathnawi contains several variations of that theme:

The woman is a ray of God; she is not that earthly beloved. (I, 2437.) That which is the object of love is not the (outward) form. (II, 703.) 'Tis the draught of Divine beauty mingled in the lovely earth that you are kissing with a hundred hearts day and night. (V, 374.)

When Iblis desired God to give a means of temptation that should be irresistible, he was shown the beauty of woman and was amazed by the revelation of Divine glory:

'Twas as though God shone forth through a thin veil. (V, 956–961.)

The poet beholds in woman the eternal Beauty which is the inspirer and object of all love, and regards her, in her essential nature, as the medium par excellence through which that uncreated Beauty reveals itself and exercises creative activity. From this point of view she is a focus for the mystic's Divine illumination and may be identified with the life-giving power of its rays. (Nicholson's Commentary, I, p. 155 to line 2437 of text.)

In now moving to the upper segment of the plate, its central feature, the horse—though occasionally standing for Reason and Spirit, the Divine element in man—is usually the symbol of the body or carnal soul, which goes astray as a horse does without a rider. This symbolism is well expressed in the following passage:

The sensuous eye is the horse, and the Light of God is the rider: without the rider the horse itself is useless. Therefore train the horse of bad habits; else the horse will be rejected before the king. The horse's eye finds the way from the king's eye: without the king's eye its eye is in desperate plight. The eye of horses, withersoever you call it except to grass and pasture, says, 'Nay, why (should we go)?' The Light of God mounts (as a rider) on the sensuous eye, and then the soul years after God. How should the riderless horse know the marks of the road? The king is needed (to ride it) in order that it may know the king's road. (II, 1289–91.)

The seated youth on the left side has two major aspects: his sleeping and his association with the horse. As to the first, the Mathnawi distinguishes between "the sleep of ignorance, when people think that they lose consciousness of reality but when, in truth, they pass only from one plane of phantasy to another," and, by contrast, the sleep wherein the saint and the mystic have passed beyond the range of phantasy into a "higher form of consciousness and their visions are real":

At times my state resembles sleep: a misguided person may think it is sleep;
Know that my eyes are asleep, (but) my heart is awake: know that my (seemingly) inactive form is (really) in action. (II, 3547–3549.)

Your eyes are awake and your heart is sunk in slumber, my eyes are asleep, (but) my heart is in (con-

138 Two examples for the appearance of God in the form of a woman, in Ritter, op. cit., p. 448.
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Temple of (I, 3550.)
The sleep of the Elect is the root of their privilege and election. (IV, 3067.)

In their dreams they perceive the attributes of absolute beauty in the form of visions, or as the Mathnawi expresses it:

Those phantasies which ensnare the saints are the reflections of the moon-faced ones of the Garden of God. (I, 72.)

And this is as the relation of the sleeping youth and the woman in the water must have been understood. But this juxtaposition also conjures up the whole context of “lover and beloved” and with it the theme of mystic union.

In now turning to the relationship between the youth and the horse, it is clear that the two belong together and yet the youth is not riding on the horse. Perhaps, in view of what we have said above about the mystic meaning of the horse, the interpretation lies in the concept that the mystic “does not need a ‘horse,’ i.e., phenomenal forms . . . to reach his goal” as expressed in the following line of the Mathnawi:

How should there be an affinity between a man and a horse? His love for the horse is (only) for the purpose of getting in front (of others). (V, 4063.)

Taken as a whole, the different elements of the scene take on a unified aspect as a mystical allegory: the dream of the youth next to a big horse standing idly by, the apparition of a beauteous woman in a body of water teeming with fish—they all seem to point toward a mystic’s breaking away from the phenomenal world and his carnal soul and to his visions of Divine beauty and his striving to a union with God.

SUMMARY

Our starting point was a reexamination of the usual explanation of the scene on the Freer plate as the first meeting of Khosrow and Shirin, as told by Nizāmī. Representation and text did not fit each other properly and with regard to the explanation so far offered by Western scholars vital points in the scene seemed inappropriate. It was, however, possible to show that the courtly imagery of the period and folktales could explain the various unusual aspects of the scene in what seems a more natural manner and even at various levels of interpretation. What might have been regarded as a mere decoration with an esthetic appeal becomes a rich fabric reflecting the traditional royal iconography, the stories of sailors and the imagery of the most famous poet of the time. Painting and yet pottery decoration, the piece also shows in various ways borrowings from metalwork. The sum total of all these aspects is a unique creation. It thus becomes clear why the patron had his name with all his titles applied to the plate (as it was hardly ever done on pottery) and why this was followed by the potter’s signature. Prince and artist must have been aware that this was a masterpiece.

APPENDIX

The design of the plate in the Freer Gallery shows one more feature which deserves attention. As in so many other luster pieces, the plate has a small turquoise-colored spot in the white disk around the head of the sleeping groom. Two explanations have been so far offered for this phenomenon. Because the turquoise (greenish to bluish) color is a protection against the evil eye in the Near East, Hobson thought that “the splash was intended to bring good luck to the owner.” As S. Beck, K. Erdmann, and B. Rackham noticed blemishes of other colors they found it necessary to find a different and more inclusive explanation.

As expressed by Rackham, “the

159 Hobson, A guide to the Islamic pottery of the Near East, p. 43.
160 K. Erdmann, An open question in Islamic
idea in the mind of the maker seems to have been that it would have been presumptuous to produce anything absolutely perfect and for this reason he has cancelled part of his design," or, to use the words of Erdmann: "the spots were made in order that the object should exhibit that imperfection which is the attribute of human work, since perfection can be attained only by Allah." Both the apotropaic explanation and the theory of "artistic humility" have this in common, that the spots are thought of as deliberate acts of the decorator and thus part of the design. These spots are therefore included in this iconographic investigation, though they are not representational.

The clue to an explanation of this phenomenon, at least as far as turquoise spots are concerned, lies in some modern luster pieces made in Western countries, which show these same uncalled-for color marks as the Iranian ceramics. They were first observed by the second author in a small copper-red luster plate manufactured by Royal Delft and also among the products of the Pewabic Pottery of Detroit, an old and well-known ceramic firm in the United States. Some of these modern ceramics, Bulletin of the American Institute for Persian Art and Archaeology, vol. 4, No. 2 (December 1935), pp. 80-82. According to this article the solution proposed in it was first suggested to K. Erdmann by Sebastian Beck; it was also accepted by Bernard Rackham.

The article of 1935 makes an unnecessary distinction between turquoise blue and cobalt blue and assumes that cobalt-blue spots do not have an apotropaic effect. In this connection see the following remark by H. Massé:

"On prête à la couleur bleue des vertus particulières: ainsi le morceau d'étoffe qu'on coud au bonnet ou à la manche de l'enfant, les verroteries bleues qu'on suspend au cou des humains ou des animaux. On sait que l'Orient confond souvent le vert et le bleu, nuances que la turquoise réunit en elle: 'elle a la vertu de conjurer le mauvais œil et empêche d'avoir peur en songe.'" (Croyances et coutumes persanes, vol. 2, p. 326.)

Pieces have the turquoise spots in the foot, others in the lower parts, or on one side. As long as the turquoise is just a touch of color these commercial firms seem to regard it as a "beauty spot" which brings out the brilliance of the luster without interfering with the intrinsic value of the piece. If the spot covers larger areas, especially on all-over luster tiles, it turns them into wasters. Such losses in the production and the nonexistence of metaphysical concepts about artistic blemishes in the Western world make it definite that the turquoise spots on Persian luster pottery are purely accidental. The turquoise spots are apparently those areas in which by some accident in the firing the copper in the glaze has been oxidized instead of having been reduced. Similar observations have not yet been made for other color spots, but the facts just enumerated make it likely that they too may be the result of some accident in the manufacture.

This assumption has been corroborated and more fully explained by Dr. Frederick R. Matson, who for many years has studied ancient pottery from the point of view of the ceramic engineer. In a letter dated March 19th, 1945, written to the second author, he has kindly supplied the following information about the green spots on the little plate of Royal Delft and on the Persian piece under discussion:

"When copper is in solution in a lead glaze as a copper silicate, under oxidizing conditions, a green color is formed. In alkaline glazes the color is blue instead of green. The green spots in which you are interested might be areas which were exposed to an oxidizing atmosphere—cracks in the kiln causing leaks where air could enter, for instance (for a reducing atmosphere necessary for the manufacture of metallic lusters the kiln is usually sealed so that fresh air which would contain oxygen cannot enter). You mention that the green spots also occur away from the red luster areas. Copper salts tend to volatilize readily in the kiln. In fact it is not well to fire colorless glazes in a kiln in which copper glazes have been used as copper spots may show up unless the wares were fired in saggers and adequately protected. The volatilization of copper salts could readily account for your green spots in luster free areas."
NEUERE UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUR FRAGE DER KAIRENER TEPPICHE

VON KURT ERDMANN


A. Anm. 2 a. O.
K. Erdmann, Kairener Teppiche Teil II: Mam-
Wenn ich bei diesem Referat, was sinnvoll erscheint, chronologisch vorgehen will, muss ich, zu meinem Bedauern, mit einer Fehlange
zeige beginnen: Das 1945 erschienehe Buch
von P. M. Campana9 ist mir nicht zugänglich.

1946 werden im Katalog der Stockholmer Teppichausstellung10 zwei fragmentarische Mamlukenteppiche in Museum von Malmö
als "Syrien oder Ägypten, um 1500" bezeichnet. Im Katalog der im gleichen Jahre veran-
stalteten Ausstellung im Rykemuseum in Amsterdam11 werden der Teppich des Mu-
seums und ein kleiner Mamlukenteppich im Gemeente Museum, 's Gravenhage,12 als
"Kleinasiern? 16. Jahrhundert" benannt. 1947 finden sich im Katalog der Chicagoer Ausstel-
lung13 die Rubrizierungen "Probably Egy-
ptian, Cairo XV–XVI Century"14 und "Turkish, Constantinople or Brussa, XVI Century."15

Die erste wissenschaftliche Stellungnahme
erfolgte 1944 durch M. S. Dimand,16 der meine
aufsätze zitiert und die Mamlukenteppiche
als "probably Egyptian, XVI century" be-
zeichnet, während er von den Osmanenteppi-
chen schreibt, dass sie "were doubtless made

9 P. M. Campana, Il tappeto orientale, Milano,
1945. (Dieser Aufsatz wurde 1957 in Istanbul
erschienen, wo ich ganz auf meine eigene Bibliothek
angewiesen war. Um die Korrekturen nicht zu sehr
durehen, habe ich nur in einzelnen Fällen Nach-
träge eingefügt.)

10 Nationalmuseum Utstillnings Katalog Nr. 124:
Orientaliska Mattor, 1946, No. 37/38 (Fragmente
von "Compartent" Teppichen).

11 Catalogus van de Tentoonstelling van Ooster-
sche Tapijten in het Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam,
1946, Nos. 42, 43. (Die gleiche Zuschreibung hat auch der
Katalog der Deiter Ausstellung, 1949, No. 71.)

12 Ehemals Sammlung H. Wulff, Kopenhagen.

13 An exhibition of antique oriental rugs, The Art
Institute of Chicago, 1947.

14 Nos. 25–28.

15 Nos. 18, 32.

16 M. S. Dimand, A handbook of Muhammadan
art, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York,
1944, S. 307ff.

den engen Zusammenhang der beiden Grup-
pen, der immer beobachtet worden war, den
aber erst S. Troll durch seine technischen
Untersuchungen bewiesen hatte, dadurch zu
unterstreichen, dass ich 7 Teppiche publizie-
in denen Muster sich Elemente der beiden
Gruppen vermischen. Ich schlug damals vor,
den den venezianischen Inventaren entlehnten
Namen "Damaskesteppiche" zu ersetzen durch
"Mamlukenteppiche" und die spätere Gruppe,
da ihre Muster den osmanischen Stil des sech-
zehnten Jahrhunderts zeigen, als "Osmanen-
teppiche" zu bezeichnen. Beide Gruppen seien
nach Kairo zu lokalisieren, wobei allerdings
die Urkunde von 1385, in der Sultan Murad
III. 11 Kaiener Teppichmeister für Istanbul
anfordert,6 es nahelegt, dass man, jedenfalls
vorübergehend, mit einer Filiation der Ka-
irener Werkstatt (oder Werkstätten) in Istan-
bul (oder seiner Umgebung) rechnen müsse.7
Die darbete Abart der Mamlukenteppiche mit
kleinteiliger Quadrirung glaubte ich unter-
geordneten Werkstätten in Kairo zuweisen zu
können.

Zu einer Diskussion dieser Thesen ist es
eigenartigerweise nie gekommen, aber seit
1940 ist so viel neues Material zu dieser Frage
beigebraucht worden, davon manches an ver-
steckten Stellen, dass es mir gerade jetzt, wo
E. Kühnel einen entscheidenden Beitrag gele-
dert hat,8 geraten erscheint, kurz zu referieren,
um dann den gegenwärtigen Stand der För-
schung auf den verschiedenen Gebieten, die
dieser Fragenkomplex umfasst, zu resumieren.

luken- und Osmanenteppiche, Ars Islamica, vol. 7
(1940), S. 55ff.
6 A. Anm. 3 a. O., S. 187, No. 5.
7 A. Anm. 3 a. O., S. 205f. und a. Anm. 5 a. O.,
S. 80f.
8 E. Kühnel, Cairene rugs and others technically
related, 15th century–17th century. Catalogue of the
Washington Textile Museum, with a technical anal-
ysis by L. Bellinger, Washington, 1957. (Vergl. meine
Besprechung in Orients, 1959.)
in either Constantinople or Asia Minor.” Die besseren “may be regarded as the work of Turkish court looms established by Suleiman in Constantinople or not far from there at Brusa in Asia Minor,” während “the coarser ones . . . must have been made in private manufacturies.” “The earliest ones may be dated at the end of the sixteenth century.”

1949 erkennt H. Jacoby7 die Lokalisierung beider Gruppen nach Ägypten an, wobei er die Osmanenteppiche eine “etwa um 1600 entstandene Art” nennt.

Mein Katalog der Hamburger Ausstellung von 1950,8 die 4 Mamluken- und 7 Osmanenteppiche, sowie 4 Beispiele der kleinteilig quadrierten Gruppe enthielt, bleibt bei den Benennungen und Datierungen meiner oben genannten Aufsätze, hält auch an der These fest, dass die Werkstätten der Mamluken- und Osmanenteppiche längere Zeit nebeneinander gearbeitet haben. Die kleinteilig quadrierten Teppiche werden als “Kairo, 17. Jahrhundert” verzeichnet.9 1951 unterscheidet S. Troll10 schärfer als Dimand innerhalb der Osmanenteppiche, die er als “Teppiche aus einer türkischen Hofmanufaktur” bezeichnet und in das sechzehnte Jahrhundert datiert, zwischen einer auf seidinem Grundgewebe gearbeiteten Gruppe, die er als die eigentlichen Erzeugnisse der Hofmanufaktur betrachtet, und der in Wolle und ohne Baumwoll-Intarsien gearbeiteten Gruppe, die er als “blumige Abart der Mamlukenteppiche” bezeichnet. Bei beiden Gruppen ist seine Lokalisierung “wahrscheinlich Kleinasien.” Bei den Mamlukenteppichen behält er die alte Bezeichnung “sogen. Damskusteppiche” bei und ordnet sie als “wahrscheinlich Kleinasien oder Ägypten” ein, wobei seine Datierung “um 1600” überrascht.21

Das im gleichen Jahre erschienene Résumé A. U. Pope’s22 geht auf keine Einzelfragen ein.


7 H. Jacoby, ABC des echten Teppichs, Tübingen, 1949, S. 18f.
21 Auch bei den Osmanenteppichen setzt er mit No. 38 einen sicher dem siebzehnten Jahrhundert angehörenden Typus in das siebzehnte Jahrhundert, die aus der Zeit um und nach 1600 stammenden Stücke Taf. 33–37 dagegen in das sechzehnte Jahrhundert.
23 Darunter fünf bisher nicht veröffentlichte Stücke.
25 Ibid., S. 209–221.
Hälfte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts,²⁷ die zweiten in die zweite Hälfte, die kleinteilig quadrierten in das siebzehnte Jahrhundert, wobei er auch bei diesen eine Entstehung in Ägypten annimmt, obwohl er ihre geringere künstlerische Qualität gegenüber den eigentlichen Mamlukenteppichen klar herausarbeitet.²⁸


²⁷ Bis auf das Fragment eines grossen Mamlukenteppichs in der Sammlung Campana, Mailand, das er sehr richtig als eines der spätesten Stücke der Gruppe bezeichnet und ohne engere Fixierung in das sechzehnte Jahrhundert setzt.

²⁸ M. und V. Viale, op. cit., S. 213.


³¹ A. Anm. 20 z. O.

Die auf Seide gearbeiteten Teppiche werden erwähnt, aber nicht mit der Urkunde von 1585 und Istanbul in Verbindung gebracht. Die kleinteilig quadrierten Stücke werden als spätere, derrbare Gruppe betrachtet, die vielleicht nicht in Kairo gefertigt ist und bis in das hohe siebzehnte Jahrhundert reicht.


Diese Übersicht zeigt, dass sich die Wissenschaft in den letzten Jahren mehrfach mit dem Problem dieser Teppichgattung beschäftigt hat.7 Viel neues Material ist dabei zum Vorschein gekommen, ohne dass damit der Bestand erschöpfend erfasst wäre. Da sich die Kairener Teppiche, wie die zahlreichen Inventarnotizen beweisen, zu ihrer Zeit in Europa grosser Beliebtheit erfreuten, haben sich noch verhältnismässig viele Exemplare erhalten. Wenn irgendwo, besteht bei dieser Gattung die Chance, eine Monographie zu schreiben, die gewiss nicht lückenlos wäre, die aber doch ein einigermassen abgerundetes Bild ergäbe. Dazu ist hier natürlich nicht der Platz. Der hier gegebene “Lagebericht” möchte der Vorbereitung einer solchen Monographie dienen, indem er den gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung untersucht.

I. DIE SCHRIFTLICHE UND BILDLICHE ÜBERLIEFERUNG 89

In meiner Zusammenstellung 1938 (E.I) klaßte zwischen den ersten beiden Belegen,


89 Von nun an werden folgende Abkürzungen benutzt:

E. Ot.: K. Erdmann, Der orientalische Knüpf-


In seiner Reisebeschreibung sagt Evliya Çelebi von der Çoban Mustafa Moschee in Gebze (auf dem Wege von Üsküdar nach İzmit) “auf dem Boden wetteiferten ägyptische Teppiche mit solchen aus Isfahan.” Die Moschee, ein grosser Einkuppelbau, wurde 1522 gebaut, wobei trotz ihrer osmanischen Form alle Innenwände und die Rückwand der Vorhalle mit farbigen Steininkrustationen rein mamlukischen Stils ausgeschmückt wurden, für die der Bauherr, der erster Pascha von Ägypten war, das Material (und vermutlich auch die Handwerker) aus Kairo kommen liess oder mitbrachte.89 Sollte man unter diesen Umständen nicht annehmen dürfen, dass er auch
die Teppichausstattung der Moschee von dort kommen liess? Dann waren die ägyptischen Teppiche, die Evliya Çelebi sah, wahrscheinlich schon 1522 gestiftet worden. Sie waren also Mamakuenteppiche.

1544 heisst es in den "Novelle" des Matheo Bandello "Nel mezzo v' era una condecente tavola coperta d'un Tapeto di seta, ed era Alessandrino" (V., S. 209, Anm. 3).

1555 erwähnt Pierre Belon Kairener Teppiche.40


1677 werden im Inventar des Castello del Valentino in Turin "due tappeti del Cairo tutti setta" genannt (V., S. 212, Anm. 1).


40 Siehe R. B. Serjeant, Islamic textiles, Ars Islamica, vol. 15/16 (1951), S. 59.


1700 spätestens hat diese aufgehört, denn die letzten 3 Belege betreffen die gleichen Teppiche im Besitz des spanischen Hofes. Auffallend ist die Lücke zwischen 1520 und 1554. Die mehr als 90 in den Belegen bis 1520 genannten Stücke müssen natürlich Mamlukenteppiche gewesen sein. Die nach 1554 genannten werden im allgemeinen wohl Osmanenteppiche sein. Die Zeit von 1520–1554 ist die Periode des Übergangs von der einen zur anderen Gruppe, aber es wäre wohl gewagt, das Aussetzen der Belege gerade in diesen Jahren damit in Verbindung zu bringen, wenn man auch damit wird rechnen dürfen, dass die Osmanenteppiche zunächst in erster Linie, wenn nicht ausschließlich, für den Bedarf der Sultane gefertigt wurden, was einen Rückgang des Kaiener Exportes nach Europa bedeuten musste.


Interessant ist die Wiedergabe eines grossen Mamlukenteppichs auf einem Bild der Bellini Schule im Louvre, das den Empfang eines venezianischen Gesandten in einer orientalischen, den Wappen nach zweifellos mamlukischen Stadt darstellt.\(^{47}\) Nach Ch. Schéfer\(^{48}\) soll es sich um die Gesandtschaft des Domenico Trevisani an den Sultan Qānsūh al Ghauri in Kairo im Jahre 1512 handeln, über die uns ein Bericht erhalten ist, der auch Teppiche erwähnt (E. I, S. 185). Nach J. Sauvaget\(^{49}\)


\(^{43}\) Abb. Pantheon, vol. 17 (1936), S. 203.

\(^{44}\) J. Gabriels, *De Francken's*, Antwerpen, 1930, Taf. 2.

II. DIE MAMLUKISCHE HOFMANUFAKTUR

Die Mamlukenteppiche sind typische Erzeugnisse städtischer Manufakturen und als solche nach Kartons gefertigt, die vermutlich nicht, oder nur hier und da, originalgross waren. Im allgemeinen wird man nach Kompositionsskizzen gearbeitet und für die Einzelformen „Patronen“ verwendet haben. Die Fülle der Variationen ist erstaunlich. Dubletten scheinen nicht vorzukommen, doch muss es sie gegeben haben, da sie nicht gut denkbar ist, dass jeder Teppich Einzelstück ist. Vermutlich—man erinnere sich der 60 Teppiche, die der Kardinal Wolsey 1520 erhielt—war die Produktion so umfangreich, dass die heute erhaltenen knapp hundert Exemplare einen verschwindend kleinen Teil des einmal Vorhandenen darstellen. Dabei ist die Zahl der zur Verwendung kommenden Musteranordnungen nicht sehr gross. Drei Hauptgruppen lassen sich, von gelegentlichen Varianten abgesehen, unterscheiden: (Fig. a) Typ I mit einheitlichem Feld und kleinen Eck-quadrate; Typ II mit einem mittleren Feld, dem an den Schmalseiten kleinere Felder symmetrisch vorgelagert sind. Dieser Typ, der die Mehrzahl der erhaltenen Stücke umfasst, kommt in 4 Varianten vor: Typ II a) Mittelfeld mit je 2 vorgelagerten Feldern; II b) Mittelfeld mit je 3 vorgelagerten Feldern; II c) Mittelfeld mit je 5 vorgelagerten Feldern; II d) Mittelfeld mit vorgelagerten ungeteilten Streifen. Endlich Typ III mit in der Längsrichtung gereihten Feldern von annähernd gleicher Grösse. Der normale Typ III hat 3 Felder, einmal kommen 5,51 einmal 2 Felder52 vor. Bei einer Abart mit 3 Feldern (Typ III a), sind die beiden äusseren Felder ihrerseits dreigeteilt, wobei die seitlichen Teile nach dem Schema II a gegliedert sind.53 Bemerkenswert ist, dass innerhalb aller Typen verschiedene Grösse und Proportionen vorkommen. Ich gebe dafür als Beispiele:

**Typ I:**  
131 x 188 cm. (Berlin, E. Ot., Abb. 46).  
213 x 237 cm. (New York, Metropolitan Museum, 41.190.262, Abb. 1).  
252 x 316 cm. (Wien, S.-T. I, Taf. 48).

**Typ II a:**  
(is mir nur in einem Exemplar bekannt).  
334 x 470 cm. (Wien, S.-T. I, Taf. 50).


51 Der bekannte Teppich der Galleria Simonetti, Rom (B.—K. 4, Abb. 46), der später in der Sammlung Pisa war (F., S. 211). Seine Masse sind 224 x 878 cm.  
52 American Art Association Sale, 7—8. XI. 1930, No. 400. Seine Masse sind 132 x 190 cm.  
53 Man könnte dieses Musterschema auch als Abart von II b lesen, doch sprechen die meisten Züge dafür, es als Sonderform von III zu betrachten.
Fig. A.

Typ II b: 133 x 177 cm. (Washington, K.C.R., pl. 5).
212 x 350 cm. (Slg. Pogliaghi, V, Taf. 146).
230 x 315 cm. (Berlin, E. II, Abb. 10).

Typ II c: 170 x 205 cm. (Graf Moy, unsere Abb. 11).
206 x 283 cm. (Washington, K.C.R., pl. 6).

Typ II d: 134 x 188 cm. (Washington, K.C.R., pl. 7).
181 x 209 cm. (Washington, K.C.R., pl. 33).
217 x 252 cm. (Benguiat, Sale April, 1930, No. 590).

KAIRENER TEPPICHE

235 x 480 cm. (Amsterdam, E. II, Abb. 6).
277 x 630 cm. (Washington, K.C.R., pl. 20, ursprüngliche Grösse).

213 x 340 cm. (Fürst Fugger, unsere Abb. 10).
290 x 540 cm. (Wien, Seide, S.-T. I, Taf. 44).


Ein so freies Schalten mit der Grösse und Proportion 54 der an sich doch eng untereinander verbundenen Muster, wie es die Mamlukenteppiche zeigen, findet sich sonst nicht. Schon darin wird die Sonderstellung dieser Gattung deutlich. Sie wird es noch mehr, wenn man ihre Teppiche mit der vorangehenden und gleichzeitigen Produktion anderer Gebiete vergleicht. Alle Teppiche des dreizehnten, vierzehnten und fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts, sei es in Anatolien, sei es in Persien, sind nach dem Prinzip der koordinierenden Reihung gemustert.55 Das Musterprinzip der Mamlukenteppiche ist das der subordinierenden Gruppierung, also das gleiche, das sich einige Jahrzehnte später beim persischen Teppich mit der Einführung der Medaillongliederung ergibt. Zusammenhänge können, schon aus zeitlichen Gründen, nicht bestehen. Dass ein Musterungsprinzip sich aus sich selbst in sein Gegenprinzip verwandelt, ist ausgeschlossen. Anstoss von aussen allein kann den Wandel erklären. In Persien ist das deutlich: die Überwindung der koordinierenden Reihung gelingt durch die Einschaltung der Buchkunst.56 Geschah etwas Ähnliches in Kairo? Sarre hat auf Ähnlichkeiten mit mamlukischen Bucheinbänden und Zierseiten verwiesen, aber diese ist nicht so gross (was er n. b. selber sieht), dass man die Teppichmuster aus dieser Richtung erklären könnte. Überzeugender ist die von E. Kühnel vorgeschlagene Verbindung mit koptischen Stoffen.57 "Une ressemblance extraordinaire se

54 Vergl. dazu meine immer noch nicht abgeschlossene Arbeit Die Formenwelt des Orientteppichs.
55 Die Proportionen der gegebenen Beispiele sind:
Typ I 1:1,43; 1:1,41; 1:1,25
Typ II a 1:1,40
Typ II b 1:1,36; 1:1,65; 1:1,36
Typ II c 1:1,20; 1:1,37; 1:1,53
 Typ II d 1:1,40; 1:1,16; 1:1,16
Typ III 1:1,63; 1:2,04; 1:2,27
Typ III a 1:1,55; 1:1,59; 1:1,86
56 Dazu ausführlich E. Öt., S. 14–25.
57 A. Anm. 30 a. O.
manifeste, à première vue, dans l'emploi d'un octogone ou d'une étoile à huit pointes comme motif central, et dans l'encadrement par une bordure composée de cartouches serrées ou allongées, également à base octogonale avec une tendance arrondissante plus ou moins prononcée. Une étude comparative embrassant tous les spécimens accessibles montrerait des coïncidences surprenantes jusque dans les moindres détails."

Wen man sich der Sonderstellung bewusst ist, die die Mamlukenteppiche mustermäßig gegenüber der Produktion aller anderen Zentren ihrer Zeit einnehmen, wird diese Ableitung, so verblüffend sie ist, einleuchtend. Leider hat Kühnel seine Entdeckung in einem Vortrag gebracht, über den er nur ein kurzes Referat gab, und ist darauf später nie eingehender zurückgekommen.58 "Comment s'expliquer" so fährt er 1938 fort "cette singulière parenté entre deux groupes de produits de l'art textile par un espace presque millénaire? Il y a lieu de supposer qu'après l'établissement de métiers destinés à produire des tapis noués à la turque, l'attention des maîtres dirigeants, à la recherche d'un système décoratif de caractère régional, ait été frappée par certains tissus copiés parvenus à leur connaissance par n'importe quel hasard et correspondant si parfaitement à leurs intentions artistiques qu'ils n'hésitèrent pas à les prendre pour modèles. Il va sans dire qu'on ne se contentait pas de les copier, on y ajoutait des motifs géométriques et végétaux et enrichissait savamment la composition surtout dans les pièces de grandes dimensions, mais nous reconnaissions facilement dans tous les cas le même point de départ." Er erkennt also sehr richtig die Tragweite und Schwierigkeiten seines Vor schlages, aber er deutet auch eine Lösung an. Tatsächlich ist eine solche Ableitung nur möglich, wenn diese Muster ad hoc und eklektisch entworfen sind, was ihre Entstehung in einer Hofmanufaktur impliziert. Ausgesprochen wird das noch nicht, aber die Annahme von "maîtres dirigeants" weist in diese Richtung. "L'influence indiquée" so schliesst er, "ne s'étendait d'ailleurs pas au choix des couleurs; en rencontre toujours les mêmes trois ou quatre tonalités produisant un effet très harmonieux dont la source d'inspiration est encore à établir." Unter dem seitdem in Fustat gefundenenen teppichähnlichen Noppenstoffen zeigen einzelne in Berlin (Abb. 4)59 und im Benaki Museum zu Athen eine den Mamlukenteppichen so ähnliche Farbstellung, dass man an einen Zusammenhang glauben möchte, wenn auch ihre Muster, so weit sie sich erkennen lassen, andere Formen haben.60 Vielleicht lässt sich die Lücke von rund 1000 Jahren, die zwischen koptischen Purpurstoffen und Mamlukenteppichen klaft, doch noch schliessen.61 Rückgriffe über einen derartigen Zeitraum sind unbehaglich,62 und einen Satz wie "parvenus à leur connaissance par n'importe quel hazard" hat Kühnel 1938 gewiss nicht ohne Zögern niedergeschrieben.63 Trotzdem scheint er berechtigt zu sein, nachdem B. Scheunemann nachgewiesen hat, dass die charakteristische Schirmblattdolde der Mamlukenteppiche, eine

60 Vergl. dagegen Fig. 4 bei C. J. Lamm, The Marby rug and some fragments of carpets found in Egypt, Orientaliska Sällskapets Årsk., 1937, S. 68. Lamm ordnet das Stück unter "Konya type, chiefly seljuk" ein, was vielleicht zu überprüfen wäre.
61 Für das Vorkommen der Kandelaber-artigen Motive, die bei den Mamlukenteppichen allerdings erst auf späteren Stücken aufzutreten scheinen, in koptischen und mamlikischen Stoffen vergl. E. II, Anm. 7 und 16.
63 A. Anm. 30 a. O., S. 89.
Form, die nur bei ihnen vorkommt, aus der altägyptischen Kunst stammt und die Papyrus-
staude wiedergibt. Ihre Schlussfolgerung “Mamlukische Musterzeichner werden auf die 
in reichem Masse auf Ruinen aus altägyptischer 
Zeit überlieferten Darstellungen des Papyrus —einer Pflanze, die ihnen noch in der Natur 
vertraut war—zurückgegriffen haben. Der 
zum Vorschlag gebrachte Dekor fand Anklang 
und setzte sich derart durch, dass er fast 
Alleinornament wurde” deckt sich ziemlich 
genau mit der, die Kühnel achtzehn Jahre 
früher zog. Die Sache wird immer kompli- 
zierter, aber die Deduktion, die B. Scheu-
emann gibt, ist so überzeugend, dass man sich 
fragen muss, ob dann nicht auch ein zweites 
für diese und nur für diese Teppiche charakte-
teristisches pflanzliches Motiv, das Sichelblatt, 
aus der gleichen Quelle stammen kann. Die 
ein Schilblatt wiedergebende Hieroglyphe ist 
zwar im allgemeinen naturnäher gezeichnet, 
hat aber, wenn bei stärkerer Stilisierung die 
Angabe der einzelnen Blätter unterdrückt 
will, unverkennbare Ähnlichkeit mit dem Mo-
tiv der Teppiche. Dass das Motiv schon 
früher auf Teppichen oder Stoffen vorkommt, 
ist mir nicht erinnerlich. Schliesslich, wenn 
man schon eine Form aus der altägyptischen 
Kunst entlehnte, warum denn nicht auch eine 
zweite, wobei man darauf verweisen könnte, 
dass diese beiden Formen auf den Mamluk-
teppichen in recht ähnlicher Art verwendet 
werden. Im allgemeinen tritt das Sichelblatt
Die Fragment-Funde aus Fustät beweisen, dass Ägypten im dreizehnten und vierzehnten Jahrhundert Teppichimportland war, wobei Anatolien und Spanien als Lieferanten dominierten. Persische oder turkestanische Teppiche scheinen nicht oder kaum nach Ägypten gekommen zu sein, was überrascht, da die Mamluken den Kontakt mit ihrer turkestanischen Heimat pflegten, wo, wenn uns auch Belege fehlen, die Teppichproduktion in diesen Jahrhunderten kaum erloschen sein kann. Im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert ging man dann zu eigener Produktion über. Wann das geschah, wissen wir nicht, aber da 1474 Kairener Teppiche ein fester Begriff sind, wird man auf die Mitte, wenn nicht in die erste Hälfte des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts zurückgreifen müssen. Der Anstoss ging offenbar vom Hof aus. Die mamlukischen Sultane beschlossen, eine Teppichproduktion ins Leben zu rufen, wobei, wie Kühnel (K.C.R., S. 2f.) gezeigt hat, bis zu einem gewissen Grade, wirtschaftliche Gründe eine Rolle spielten. Die Erzeugnisse


dieser Manufaktur waren nicht nur für den Hof, sondern auch von vornherein für den Export nach Europa gedacht. Um die Konkurrenz mit dem damals, den Markt beherrschenden türkischen Teppich aufnehmen zu können, mussten sie sich von ihm unterscheiden, sozusagen “national ägyptischen Charakter” haben. Das führte zu einer Anleihe bei kopfischen Stoffen für die Musterkomposition und zur Einführung von einem (wenn nicht zwei) altägyptischen Motiven für die Details, die man mit geläufigen mamlukischen Formen kombinierte. Das Ergebnis war entsprechend: der neue Mamlukenteppich unterschied sich grundsätzlich von allen anderen Gattungen. In dieser Eigenart setzte er sich rasch durch und erzielte offenbar beachtliche Exporterfolge. Diese Erfolge werden nicht zuletzt auch darauf beruhen, dass er nicht im türkischen, sondern in dem für die vorgehenden neuen Muster zweifellos besser geeigneten persischen Knoten geknüpft war, der damals in Europa kaum bekannt gewesen sein dürfte. Damit ergibt sich ein neues Problem: die Teppichfragmente aus Fustät sind vorwiegend im türkischen Knoten geknüpft. Gelegentlich kommt spanische Knüpfung vor, persische fast nie. Also liess man bei Einrichtung der Manufaktur Knüpfen aus Persien kommen? Nach allem, was uns die Musterentstehung gezeigt hat, erscheint das nicht unmöglich.

Nach den Angaben der Inventare wurden Teppiche in Europa nicht nur am Boden (tapedi da terra), sondern gerne auch als Tischdecken (tapedi da desco oder da tavola) und auf Truhen, die ja auch als Bänke dienten (tapedi da cassa), verwendet. Von “tischthe-

bichten" und "teppich auf rundtaffeln gehörig" sprechen die deutschen Quellen. Von den 31 auf Bildern dargestellten Stücken dienen 15 als Tisch-, 2 als Altardecken, 7 hängen über Brüstungen, einer liegt auf einer Bank, einer auf den Stufen vor dem Altar, nur 5, und zwar durchweg grosse Teppiche, dienen als Bodenbelag. Die Verwendung als Tischdecke war also offensichtlich bevorzugt, wobei den Erzeugnissen der Kairener Manufaktur die feinere Textur, die der persische Knoten gegenüber dem türkischen ermöglichte, natürlich zustanden kam. Gewiss war es auch Rücksicht auf die europäischen Abnehmer, wenn man den Teppichen vielfach ein bei anderen Gattungen nicht übliches, gedrungenes, oft beinahe quadratisches Format gab.69 In der Gruppe, bei der

69 Z.B. 255 x 256 cm. (Dresden, Kunstdgewerbe-
museum, unveröffentlicht); 263 x 277 cm. (Budapest, Baron Hatvany, unveröffentlicht); 240 x 260 cm. (Wien, S. T., Taf. 47); Graf Baillet-Latour (O.T., Taf. XXXVIII); 195 x 220 cm. (München, L. Bernheimer K.G.); 255 x 270 cm. (Sale Benguia 23. IV. 1932); 255 x 270 cm. (Sale Benguia 1–3. XII. 1927).


Venedig, 8. September 1506: "Item allen fleis hab ich an kertt mit den tewichen, kan aber kein preiten an kumen. Sy sind al schmamm vnd lang, Aber noch hab ich altg forschung dornoch, aweh der Antholi Kolb."


Venedig, ungefähr 13. Oktober 1506: "Jch hab awch zwen dewich bestelt, dy würd jch morgen tzalen.

Elemente von Mamluken- und Osmanenteppichen nebeneinander auftreten, kommen ein runder und zwei kreuzförmige Teppiche vor, die sicher als Tischdecken dienten, Formen, die bei anderen Teppichgattungen selten sind.70

III. MISCH- UND ÜBERGANGSFORMEN VON MAMLUKEN- ZU OSMANENTEPPICHERN

1937 publiziert S. Troll71 einen Mamlukenteppich aus Wiener Museumsbesitz, der bei normaler Musterung in den Ecken des Innenfeldes kleine Zwickel in der Form von Viertelkreisen mit osmanischer Blütenfussing zeigt. Das Hauptmuster macht keinen späten Eindruck, die Eckzwischen sind im Verhältnis zum Feld klein und die Zeichnung der osmanischen Blüten ist ungelenk. Auf jeden Fall kann dieser Mamlukenteppich erst entstanden sein, als die Muster der Osmanenteppiche in Kairo bekannt waren.

1940 konnte ich72 7 weitere Beispiele solcher Formmischung beibringen. Damals

Aber ich hab sy nit wolfeil kunen kawffen. Dy will jch ein schlachen mit meinem dinglich.")


71 Damaskusteppiche, Ars Islamica, vol. 4 (1937), S. 222, Abb. 3.

72 E. II, S. 71ff.
ging es noch um die Frage, ob die Osmanenteppiche am gleichen Ort—also auch in Kairo—entstanden sind wie die Mamlukenteppiche, wofür diese Formmischungen natürlich ein guter Beleg waren. „Mamlukenteppiche und Osmanenteppiche haben offenbar geraume Zeit nebeneinander existiert, einander beeinflussend, nehmend und gebend miteinander verbunden, bis im Laufe einer Entwicklung, die gewiss Jahrzehnte umfasste, der eine Typ sich endgültig durchsetzte.” Obwohl es mir schon damals klar war, dass man die Osmanenteppiche nicht aus den Mamlukenteppichen ableiten kann, brauchte ich für diese Mischformen das missverständliche Wort „Übergangsscheinungen.“ Auch Kühnel spricht von „details of transitory character in carpets of the earlier as well as in the later group," aber er betont auf der anderen Seite richtig, dass es sich bei dem „Übergang“ von den Mamlukent- zu den Osmanenteppichen um „a sudden breach instead of a slow evolution" handele, der sich nur „in an officially controlled establishment, never in a popular industry“ ereignet habe könne.

Da ich heute 22 (statt der bisher 8) Beispiele solcher Formmischung kenne, scheint es geraten, das Problem auf breiterer Basis noch einmal kurz zu behandeln, wobei am besten eine tabellarische Zusammenstellung den Ausgangspunkt bildet.

A. Osmanenteppiche mit Elementen der Mamlukenteppiche.

1. Florenz, Kunsthandel (Kern des Mittelmedaillons).\textsuperscript{74}
2. Versteigerung de Stuers (dgl.).\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{74} E. II, S. 76.
\textsuperscript{75} E. II, Abb. 13.

Abb. im Versteigerungskatalog Mensing, Amsterdam, 1932, No. 447; das Stück, das sich heute im Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam befindet, ist interessant, weil der Zeichner oder Knüpfer den Musteraufbau missverstanden hat.

3. Berlin, Museen (dgl.).\textsuperscript{76}
4. Versteigerung Guidi de Faenza (Borte, äusserer Begleitstreifen).\textsuperscript{77}
5. Versteigerung Tucher von Simmelsdorf (dgl.).\textsuperscript{78}
6. New York, Metropolitan Museum (dgl.)\textsuperscript{79} (Abb. 3).
7. Washington, Corcoran Art Gallery, Clark Collection (dgl.).\textsuperscript{80}
8. San Gimignano, Museo Civico (Borte und Innenfeld).\textsuperscript{81}
9. Berlin, Museen, Gebetsteppich.\textsuperscript{82}


10. Unveröffentlicher Teppich in den Berliner Museen (1883, 546) (Abb. 2).\textsuperscript{82a}

11. Gebetsteppich der Sammlung Fletcher im Metropolitan Museum (17, 120, 137) (Abb. 6).\textsuperscript{82b}

\textsuperscript{76} E. Ot., Abb. 129.
\textsuperscript{77} Vente 21.-27. IV. 1902, No. 256, Taf. 25.
\textsuperscript{79} Acc. No. 41. 190, 207.
\textsuperscript{81} E. II, Abb. 14. Ein anderer kreuzförmiger Teppich, der aber nicht zur Mischstilgruppe gehört, befindet sich im Victoria and Albert Museum. In meinem Anm. 37 zitierten Aufsatz habe ich nachgewiesen, dass das zum Mischstil gehörende Fragment in Berlin (D 2, Abb. 8) ebenfalls von einem kreuzförmigen Teppich stammt.
\textsuperscript{82} E. II, Abb. 21.
\textsuperscript{82a} Bei dem auch das Mittelmotiv des Medaillons an Formen der Mamlukenteppiche erinnert.
\textsuperscript{82b} Eine spätere Kopie dieses Teppichs hat Troll,
B. Osmanenteppiche in den 3 Farben der Mamlukenteppiche.

1. London, Victoria and Albert Museum.83
2. München, L. Bernheimer K. G.84 (Abb. 8).
3. New York, Kunsthandel, 1956.85

C. Mamlukenteppiche mit Elementen der Osmanenteppiche.

1. Wien, Museum für Angewandte Kunst (Eckzwickel).86
2. München, L. Bernheimer K. G. (Borte) (Abb. 9).87
3. New York, Metropolitan Museum (Vorstreifen).88
4. Berlin, Museen (Borte, innerer Begleitstreifen).89
5. St. Louis, City Art Museum, Ballard Collection (Rosetten in den Begleitstreifen der Borte).90
6. Mailand, Slg. Michele Campana (Borte, Hauptstreifen).91

Ars Islamica, vol. 4 (1937), S. 222, Abb. 9 abgebildet.

83 E. II, Abb. 20.
84 Fragment 107 x 170 cm., reicher gezeichnet als das vorhergenannte Stück.
85 Das etwa 120 x 200 cm. grosse Stück, von dem ich keine Photo bekommen konnte, gehört zur Musterguppe A (s. u. S. 92).
86 E. II, Abb. 12.
87 Das schlecht erhaltene Fragment (132 x 92 cm.) kombiniert ein Innenfeld vom Kompositionschema II b (s.o. S. 74) mit einer rein osmanisch gezeichneten Borte. Es hat nur 3 Farben, wobei ein ziemlich dunkles Blau dominiert.
88 B.-M., No. 18.
89 E. II, Abb. 10, 11.
90 Exhibition Indianapolis 1924, Catalogue No. 100.

D. Mischformen aus Mamluken- und Osmanenteppichen.

1. Fragment, von D. Kelekian 1910 in München ausgestellt.92
2. Fragment in den Berliner Museen (Abb. 5).93

Die Gruppen A und B sind ohne Weiteres verständlich. Im Kairo der Zeit der Osmanenteppiche hatten sich gewiss Erinnerungen an die Mamlukenteppiche erhalten, die zur Übernahme einzelner Motive oder zur Anpassung der neuen Muster an die Farbskala der älteren Teppiche veranlassten, wobei es naheliegt, diese Arbeiten in die frühe Zeit der Osmanenteppiche zu setzen. Das ist bei A 1–6 und B 1 möglich, A 7–11 und B 2 und 3 dagegen machen keinen frühen Eindruck. C 1–6 weisen andererseits, dass die Mamlukenteppiche noch gefertigt wurden, als der Kanon der Osmanenteppiche bereits bekannt war. D 1 und 2 zeigen dabei eine so starke Vermischung, dass man zögert, welcher der beiden Gattungen man sie zuweisen soll. In allen Fällen handelt es sich nicht um Übergangsonder um Mischformen, die sich nur erklären lassen, wenn die beiden Typen eine zeitlang nebeneinander existierten. Dass eine solche Koexistenz in einer und derselben Werkstatt stattfand, ist schwer vorstellbar. Nähe liegt die Annahme von anderen Werkstätten neben der eigentlichen Hofmanufaktur.94 Diese hat zu einem noch nicht sicher bestimmmbaren Zeit-
punkt die Produktion der neuen Osmanenteppiche übernommen, die vielleicht nur, oder doch zunächst nur, für den Sultanhof gefertigt wurden. Neben ihr arbeiteten die anderen Werkstätten im alten Stil weiter, wobei sie gelegentlich Musteranleihen bei den Erzeugnissen der Hofmanufaktur machten, bis sie im Laufe der Zeit ebenfalls zu den neuen Mustern übergingen, was den umfangreichen Export von Teppichen dieser Art nach Europa erklären würde. Wann dieser Prozess der Ableitung abgeschlossen war, ist schwer zu sagen. Er kann Jahrzehnte gedauert haben.

Ein Blick auf die ausgezeichnete “Technical Chart” Louisa Belleingers scheint das Vorhandensein mehrerer Werkstätten zu bestätigen. Verglichen mit der Einheitlichkeit der “Brassa Gruppe” und auch der “Compartment” rugs, sind, besonders bei den Mamlukenteppichen, die technischen Unterschiede erheblich, wobei sich aber keine Veränderung im Sinne einer Entwicklung ablesen lässt. Die Knotenzahl auf 1 square inch schwankt zwischen 81 und 168, die Zahl der Farben zwischen 3 und 8, die Vliesshöhe zwischen 1 und 4 mm, die Zahl der Schussfäden zwischen 2 und 3. Dabei fällt auf, dass manche der fein gezeichneten Muster (z. B. 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, und 7.7) grob geknüpft, manche der grob gezeichneten Muster (z. B. 7.3, 7.10, 7.22) fein geknüpft sind. Ob man, wenn man die Ausgangsbasis noch verbreiterte, auf diesem Wege nicht doch zu einer genaueren Feststellung und vielleicht sogar Trennung der Werkstätten gelangen könnte?


96 Fragment eines Teppichs in den Berliner Museen (E. II, Abb. 17); Washington, R. 7.16 (K.C.R., pl. XVIII); R. 7.4 (das pl. XX) u.a.m.
98 E. II, Abb. 18.
99 K.C.R., pl. XXII.
100 Diese ungewöhnliche Bortenform hat—vielleicht nicht zufällig—Verwandtschaft mit den Ranken mit Flachwerkknöten auf den Schrägen (s. o. Anm. 68).
101 E. II, Abb. 19.
102 Offenbar ist diese Borte eine verbesserte Fassung der wenig befriedigenden Borte von Abb. 7.
blattranke in den Begleitstreifen sind alle Elemente dieses Teppichs osmanisch, ja es ist wohl berechtigt, ihn als Osmanenteppich zu bezeichnen. Hier könnte also der Fall vorliegen, dass ein Mamlukenmuster ins Osma-
nische übersetzt wird, aber er ist der einzige und scheint keine Fortsetzung gefunden zu haben, jedenfalls sind keine weiteren Bei-
spiele von Teppichen dieses Musters bisher bekannt. Nur die Artischollenblüten-Zypres-
senborte kommt noch bei einigen rein osma-
nischen Teppichen vor und zwar besonders bei solchen, die noch Reminiszenzen an die Mamlukenteppiche haben, also zur frühen Gruppe ihrer Gattung gehören.

IV. DIE CHRONOLOGIE DER MAMLUKENTEPPICHE

1938 versuchte ich zu einer chronologischen Anordnung des erhaltenen Materials zu kom-
men, indem ich die mir bekannten Stücke zwischen einem Teppich von deutlich früher Zeichnung in Berlin und einem ausserordent-
lich reich gezeichnetem Fragment im Museo Bardini in Florenz einordnete (E. I). Das Ergebnis war wenig befriedigend, da die Grup-
pierung in der Hauptsache an Hand von Ab-
bildungen und Notizen erfolgen musste.

Kühnle (K.C.R.) kommt für die 16 Tepp-
iche des Museums in Washington zu einer klareren und detaillierteren Ordnung, da ihm Originale zur Verfügung standen. Er unter-
zehntes Jahrhundert"; 4. "erstes Viertel des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts." Das Übergangs-
stück (K.C.R., pl. XXII) setzt er "um 1500" an. Von den Fig. A gegebenen Komposi-

103a Dass das Muster in den Osmanenmustern vom Typ A (Fig. B.) nachlebt, (K.C.R., pl. 43), kann ich nicht sehen.

103b S. o. S. 80. Sie findet sich aber auch bei einem sicher späten osmanischen Gebetsteppich in Ber-

formen kommen I und IIa unter den Tepp-
denken gekommen, und auch Kühnle (K.C.R., S. 7) bezeichnet seine "classification" als eine "merely provisional one." Unter den Tepp-
iche in Washington hat das am feinsten ge-
künftige Stück (R. 7.22) nur 3 Farben und eine Zeichnung, die einen frühen Eindruck macht und daher von Kühnle auch "Ende fünf-
zehntes Jahrhundert" datiert wird. Das am grössten gekünftete Stück (R. 7.11) dagegen hat 4 Farben und eine reichere Zeichnung, was ihn zu einem Ansatz "um 1500" veranlasst. Der seiner Zeichnung nach ausgesprochen späte Teppich R. 7.16 hat nur 4 Farben und eine relativ niedrige Knotenzahl. Gleiches gilt von R. 7.7, der seiner Zeichnung nach gewiss an das Ende der Reihe gehört.

Wir haben also zunächst nur die Möglichkeit einer relativen Chronologie. Dass ent-
vwicklungsgeschichtlich die weniger reich ge-
zeichneten Muster die früheren sind, wird niemand bestreiten. Auch die Steigerung der Farbskala von 3 auf 8 dürfte eine allmähliche Bereicherung sein. Die technischen Unter-
schiede brauchen nicht unbedingt in dieser Ent-
vicklungsreihe zu liegen. Aber deckt sich dieser Entwicklungsablauf mit der absoluten Chrono-
logie der überkommenen Stücke? Das ist das
Problem, das auch Kühnel (*K.C.R.*, S. 7) beschäftigt.

Mir scheint, so wie die Dinge heute liegen, kann man dieser Frage nur von der Seite derjenigen Mamlukenteppiche, die osmanische Elemente haben, näher kommen, da diese einigermassen datierbar sind. Dass osmanische Formen vor 1517 von dem Mamlukenteppichen aufgenommen werden, entbehrt jeder Wahrscheinlichkeit, ganz abgesehen davon, dass die auf Mamlukenteppichen auftretenden Elemente auch im osmanischen Kreis so früh kaum entwickelt gewesen zu sein scheinen. Der *terminus post quem* wäre also 1517. Aber auch dieser ist nicht zu eng zu fassen. Im Grunde spricht vieles dafür, dass osmanische Formen bei Mamlukenteppichen erst auftreten, nachdem die Kairener Hofmanufaktur vom Sultan in Konstantinopel übernommen worden war und die neuen osmanischen Muster fertigte. Das kann kaum viel vor 1530 der Fall gewesen sein. Mamlukenteppiche mit osmanischen Motiven wären also 1540/50 datierbar. Von den S. 81 aufgezählten Beispielen hat No. 1 (Wien) Ähnlichkeit mit Washington R. 7,5, den Kühnel "um 1500" ansetzt. Auch No. 2 (Bernheimer) gehört klar zu seiner Frühgruppe, während No. 3 (New York) die feinen Ranken zeigt, die nach ihm für Teppiche des ersten Viertels des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts charakteristisch sind. No. 4 (Berlin) würde man nach Kühnels Ansätzen "um 1500" datieren; No. 5 (New York) geht eng mit Washington R. 7,22 zusammen, wäre also "Ende fünfzehntes Jahrhundert." No. 6 (Mailand) wird man besser beiseite lassen, einmal weil die Borte nicht osmanisch, sondern anatolisch ist, und auch weil dieser Teppich, was Kühnel mit Recht betont, eng mit dem Fragment Washington R. 7,21 zusammengeht, das eine Sonderstellung zwischen den Mamlukenteppichen und den "Compartment rugs" einnimmt und in seiner Datierung ungewiss ist. Von den Mamlukenteppichen mit osmanischen Elementen, die man um 1540/50 ansetzen muss, gehört also nur einer (No. 3) stilistisch zur Spätgruppe. Die 4 anderen vertreten frühere Stilstufen. Das könnte gegen die von Kühnel aufgestellte Gruppierung und Datierung nach stilistischen Merkmalen sprechen. Es könnte aber auch, und das scheint mir die bessere Lösung, dafür sprechen, dass diese Teppiche in verschiedenen Werkstätten hergestellt wurden, von denen eine (oder einige) an den älteren Mustern festhielten, während eine andere (oder andere) zu verfeinerten Mustern übergingen, wobei natürlich die Hofmanufaktur, so lange sie im alten Stil arbeitete, tonangebend gewesen sein wird. Mit der Annahme solcher verschiedener Werkstätten würden sich auch die starken technischen Unterschiede zwischen den einzelnen Stücken (s.o. S. 82) erklären. Trifft diese Annahme zu, würde eine absolute Chronologie der Mamlukenteppiche erst möglich sein, wenn die Verteilung der erhaltenen Stücke auf diese Werkstätten geklärt wäre.

Ich möchte diese Gelegenheit benutzen, um 2 erst kürzlich aufgetauchte, bedeutende Mamlukenteppiche vorzulegen, deren Kenntnis ich der Güte Konsul O. Bernheimers in München verdanke. Der in Abbildung 10 wiedergegebene Teppich befindet sich im Besitz des Fürsten Fugger von Glött auf Schloss Kirchheim bei Dillingen (Bayern). Er ist in 3 Farben geknüpft, ausgezeichnet erhalten und wird im Inventar des Schlosses seit dem sechzehnten Jahrhundert geführt. Mit 340 zu 213 cm ist er eines der kleineren unter den in mehreren Feldern gemusterten Stücken.\(^{103}\)\(^{104}\)

\(^{103}\) Ihm und den beiden Besitzern danke ich aufrichtig für die Erlaubnis, diese Teppiche hier zu veröffentlichen.

\(^{104}\) Zum Vergleich einige Masse grosser Mamlukenteppiche:

- 878 x 224 ehemals Galleria Simonetti, Rom.
- 780 x 440 München, Lenbachhaus.
- 630 x 277 Washington, R. 7.4 (rekonstr.).
Seiner Komposition nach gehört er zum Typ III a, dessen bekanntester Vertreter der seidene Teppich aus Habsburger Besitz in Wien ist, ja er entspricht diesem genau, nur ist seine Detaillierung weniger reich und die Zeichnung der Einzelformen spröder. Er macht stilistisch einen frühen Eindruck, was durch das Vorkommen von nur 3 Farbtönen unterstrichen wird. Die Borte kommt in gleicher Form bei dem Teppich R. 7.4 in Washington vor, der aber in der Zeichnung des Innenfeldes „jünger" wirkt. Interessant sind die 8 Vasen mit Schilfsblattdolden am Mittelmedaillon, die eine überraschende Parallele zu den Kelchen mit Dolden bei R. 7.2 bilden. Sie sind das einzige Motiv, das für eine spätere Entstehung spricht. Nach allem anderen würde man in dem Teppich ein frühes Stück der mamlukischen Hofmanufaktur vermuten, das in seinem Muster eine Vorstufe des Wiener Seidenteppichs bildet.


540 x 290 Wien, Seide.
535 x 230 Wien, das von Troll zusammengesetzte Stück.
498 x 234 München, L. Bernheimer K. G.
480 x 235 Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum.
470 x 334 Wien (S.-T., I. 50).
465 x 275 Versteigerung Castellani 1884.
420 x 273 Washington, R. 7.5.
359 x 220 Washington, R. 7.3.
340 x 213 Fürst Fugger (Abb. 10).
315 x 230 Berlin, Museen 83, 571.

---

105 S. o. Anm. 68.
106 E. II., Abb. 21.
106a Mit diesem geht ein Teppich zusammen, der mir nur aus einer Photographie des Rheinischen Bildarchivs bekannt ist, die nach liebenswürdiger Auskunft des Kunstgewerbemuseums in Köln um 1930 aufgenommen wurde (Abb. 12a).


Ich habe die beiden Stücke 1959 gesehen, hatte allerdings keine Gelegenheit, sie näher zu untersuchen, was bei ihrem schlechten Erhaltungszustand mit erheblichen Schwierigkeiten verbunden gewesen wäre. Nach meinem also nur oberflächlichen Eindruck stimmte ich G. M. Mehrez (gegen J. F. Torres) zu, dass es sich um die Reste von zwei Teppichen handelt. Die beiden Stücke sind etwa gleich gross. Bei 4.50 x 3.13 m, die J. F. Torres (a. a. O.) für das eine angibt, ergäbe sich ein Teppich von mindestens 10m Länge. Ausserdem lässt sich das Muster, soweit es zu erkennen ist, schlecht aneinanderfügen. Gewiss bestehen Verbindungen zwischen der Musterung der beiden
V. DIE ENTSTEHUNG DER OSMANENTEPPICHE

1517 wird Ägypten von den Osmanen erobert. Als Folge davon tritt in Kairo ein neuer


Teppichtyp auf, den man wegen seiner ganz anderen, charakteristisch osmanischen Musterrung früher als “türkische Hofmanufaktur” bezeichnete. Da diese Benennung den Sachverhalt zu sehr einengt, habe ich den Namen Osmanenteppiche vorgeschlagen. Kühnhat ihn übernommen und, weil sich inzwischen herausgestellt hat, dass vorübergehend Teppiche dieses Typs auch in der Türkei selber gefertigt worden sind, durch die Erweiterung “ägyptische Osmanenteppiche” präzisiert.107

Die Frage ist, wann, wo und wie dieser neue Teppichtyp entstanden ist.

Die schriftlichen Quellen und bildlichen Wiedergaben geben keine sicheren Anhaltspunkte. Die Teppiche, die der venezianische Gesandte Trevisani 1512 in Kairo sah108 und die Teppiche, die der erste osmanische Pascha von Ägypten, Mustafa Çoban, 1522 in seine Moschee in Gebze stiftete,109 waren zweifellos noch Mamlukenteppiche. Der 1554 bei Bandello erwähnte Teppich110 wird als “Alessandrino” bezeichnet und 1573 erwähnt Dufresne “tapis d’Alexandrie,”111 womit wohl nur der Exportort gemeint ist. 1584 tritt zum erstenmal in einem venezianischen Inventar die Bezeichnung “cagiarino,”112 die offenbar die Stelle des früheren “damaschino” tritt. Darin könnte sich der Wechsel von Mamlukenteppichen zu Osmanenteppichen spiegeln, aber ein brauchbarer zeitlicher Anhaltspunkt ergibt sich daraus nicht. 1585 muss die Produktion von Osmanenteppichen bereits bedeutend gewesen sein, denn in diesem Jahr lässt Sultan Murad III. 11 Teppichmeister aus Kairo nach Istanbul kommen. Wir hätten also 1517 als terminus post quem, 1585 als terminus ante quem. Nachdem es kürzlich E. Kühnel ge-

107 B.-K. 4, S. 70.
108 E. I, S. 185.
109 S. o. S. 70.
110 S. o. S. 71.
111 K.C.R., S. 41, Anm. 3.
112 E. I, S. 186.
lungen ist, Teppiche nachzuweisen, die wahrscheinlich von diesen Kairener Meistern in Istanbul (oder Brussa) am Ende des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts geknüpft wurden, lässt sich der Zeitraum weiter einengen. Diese Teppiche zeigen nämlich innerhalb der Osmanenteppiche eine keineswegs frühe Form, müssen also auf eine längere Entwicklung zurücksehen. Damit können wir mindestens auf 1530/40 für die Entstehung des neuen osmanischen Teppichtyps. Wo er entstand, ist heute kein Problem mehr: aus technischen Gründen können diese frühen Osmanenteppiche, ja können, von der technisch abweichenden Gruppe, die man nach Istanbul (oder Brussa) lokalsieren muss, abgesehen, alle Osmanenteppiche nur in Kairo gefertigt sein.


Die Zeichnung der Einzelformen entspricht dabei so sehr dem osmanischen Hofstil des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts, dass man sich die Entstehung dieser Muster nur in einem reiner türkischen Milieu vorstellen kann als es das erst vor kurzem eroberte Ägypten bot, dessen Werkstätten ja z. T. noch geraume Zeit an den alten Mustern, nicht nur äusserlich, d. h. im Formenkanon, sondern auch innerlich, d. h. im Kompositionsprinzip, festhielten. Istanbul kommt kaum in Frage, da dort eine Teppichtradition fehlte, eher Brussa, dessen Teppiche schon 1474 erwähnt werden. Aber

114 S. u. S. 88ff.
115 S. O. S. 82 Kühnel (K.C.R., S. 43) möchte von dieser Gruppe der neuen Osmanenmuster ableiten, was ich nicht für möglich halte.
116 Vergl. Tahsin Öz, Turkish textiles and velvets, Ankara, 1959, pl. 20.
117 Hier sind sie charakteristisch für die "Damaskus-Ware," die A. Lane, Later Islamic pottery, London, ohne Jahr, S. 49ff. um 1525-1555 datiert.
118 Z. B. E. Ot., Abb. 129.
119 S. O. S. 81.

VI. DIE FILIATION VON 1585


120 S. dazu aber den Abschnitt IX dieses Berichtes.
Abb. 3.—Osmanenteppich. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
(Courtesy of the Museum.)

Abb. 4.—Fragment eines Noppengewebes in den Farben der Mamlukenteppiche aus Fostat. Berlin, Museen.

Abb. 5.—Teppichfragment mit einer Mischung von mamlukischen und osmanischen Formen. Berlin, Museen.
ABB. 6.—Osmanenteppich. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. (Courtesy of the Museum.)

ABB. 7.—Teppich mit einer Mischung von mamlukischen und osmanischen Formen. Washington, Textile Museum. (Courtesy of the Museum.)
Abb. 8.—Fragment eines Osmanenteppichs in den drei Farben der Mamlukenteppiche.
München, L. Bernheimer K. G.

Abb. 9.—Fragment eines Mamlukenteppichs mit der Borte eines Osmanenteppichs.
München, L. Bernheimer, K. G.
Abb. 10.—Mamlukenteppich. Fürst Fugger von Glött, Schloss Kirchheim (Oberbayer).
Abb. 11.—Mamlukenteppich. Graf Moy, Schloss Stepperg (Oberbayern).
Abb. 13.—Fragment eines Osmanenteppichs mit silbernem Grundgewebe. Washington, Textile Museum. (Courtesy of the Museum.)

Abb. 14.—Osmanenteppich. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. (Courtesy of the Museum.)
Abb. 15.—Osmanischer Gebetsteppich. Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery.
(Courtesy of the Gallery.)
Abb. 16.—Fragment eines Osmanenteppichs mit seidenem Grundgewebe. Washington, Textile Museum. (Courtesy of the Museum.)

Abb. 17.—Fragment eines Osmanenteppichs. Berlin, Museen.

Abb. 18. Osmanenteppich. Frankfurt am Main, Kunstgewerbemuseum.
Abb. 20.—Osmanenteppich. Ehemals Berliner Privatbesitz.

Abb. 23—Osmanischer Gebetsteppich. Sammlung Fürst Liechtenstein.

Abb. 25.—Fragment einer Kopie eines Mamlukentapets. Ehemals Berliner Kunsthandel.
Abb. 26.—Osmanenteppich mit seidenem Grundgewebe. Washington, Textile Museum. (Courtesy of the Museum.)

Abb. 27.—Osmanenteppich. Venedig, Ca d’oro.

Abb. 28.—Osmanenteppich. Ehemals Berliner Privatbesitz.
Abb. 31.—Mamlukenteppich. Mailand, Stg. Michele Campana.
Abb. 32—Mamelukenteppich, Fragment, Washington, Textile Museum. (Courtesy of the Museum.)

Abb. 33—Westanatolischer Teppich mit Einflüssen der Mamelukenteppiche, Philadelphia, Museum of Art. (Courtesy of the Museum.)

Abb. 36. — Spanische Kupfer eines Mamlukenteppichs. Granada, Museum. (Courtesy of the Museum.)
tanboul oder seiner Umgebung hergestellt sind. Das hat man auch getan, aber sich mit der Frage, ob sich diese in der ja keineswegs kleinen Zahl von Originalen, die wir besitzen, aussondern lassen, nicht ernsthaft beschäftigt.


Die Stücke in Washington geben allerdings nur eine schmale Basis, aber diese dürfte sich verbreitern lassen. Zwei Fragmente R. 1.133 und 1.135, die vielleicht von demselben Teppich stammen, aber zu klein sind, um den Musteraufbau erkennen zu lassen, zeigen als besonders ins Auge fallende Motive Zweige mit kleinen weissen Rosettenblüten und stark geschwungene, gefiederte Lanzetblätter (Abb. 13). Die gleichen Motive in verwandter Zeichnung kommen bei folgenden Teppichen vor:

1. Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs.\textsuperscript{121}
2. New York, Metropolitan Museum, Slg. Blumenthal.\textsuperscript{122}
3. dgl. (Abb. 14).\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{121} F. Sarre, Altorientalische Teppiche, Leipzig, 1908, No. 28, Taf. 25.
\textsuperscript{122} 41.190.257. M. S. Dimand, Oriental rugs and textiles, New York, 1935, Abb. 12.
\textsuperscript{123} 41.100.115.

4. New York, Metropolitan Museum, Ballard Collection.\textsuperscript{124}
5. Wien, Museum für Angewandte Kunst.\textsuperscript{125}
6. dgl.\textsuperscript{126}
7. London, Victoria and Albert Museum.\textsuperscript{127}
8. Florenz, Museo Bardini.\textsuperscript{128}
9. Kairo, Museum of Islamic Art.\textsuperscript{129}
10. New York, Slg. S. Kent Costyklan.\textsuperscript{130}
11. Versteigerung Benguiat 18.–22. XI. 1930.\textsuperscript{131}
12. Versteigerung Elverson and Stein.\textsuperscript{132}
13. Versteigerung Hofrat Dr. G. J. von R.\textsuperscript{133}
14. Gebetsteppich, Wien, Museum für Angewandte Kunst.\textsuperscript{124}
16. dgl. Versteigerung A. Kann.\textsuperscript{136}

Zwei andere Fragmente in Washington (R. 1.74 und 1.134), ebenfalls vielleicht vom gleichen Teppich (Abb. 16), zeigen als charakteristische Motive Vierpässe aus weissen, stark verknorpelten Arabeskblattpaaren, offenbar im Wechsel mit Kartuschen mit seitlichen Schild-

\textsuperscript{124} B.-M. No. 21.
\textsuperscript{125} S.-T., I, Taf. 57.
\textsuperscript{126} S.-T., I, Taf. 60.
\textsuperscript{127} Sarre, a. Anm. 121 a. O., Taf. 20.
\textsuperscript{128} Unveröffentlicht.
\textsuperscript{129} Unveröffentlicht.
\textsuperscript{130} Ausstellung, Chicago, 1926, No. 37.
\textsuperscript{131} No. 605.
\textsuperscript{132} Sale American Art Association 12.–15. III. 1930, No. 810.
\textsuperscript{133} Versteigerung Helbing, München, 1902, Kat. No. 405.
\textsuperscript{134} S.-T., I, Taf. 56.
\textsuperscript{135} 81.4.
ansätzen. Auch diese Motive kommen in gleicher Zeichnung auch sonst vor, nämlich:

17. Wien, Museum für Angewandte Kunst.\textsuperscript{137}
18. Berlin, Museen.\textsuperscript{138}
19. dgl.\textsuperscript{139}
20. dgl.\textsuperscript{140} (Abb. 17).
21. London, Victoria and Albert Museum.\textsuperscript{141}
22. Istanbul, Türk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi.\textsuperscript{142}
23. Hannover, Kestner Museum.\textsuperscript{143}
24. Madrid, Slg. Livinio Struyck.\textsuperscript{144}

Das Wolkenband muster des fünften Stückes in Washington (R. 1.114) kommt bei den genannten 24 verwandten Stücken mehrfach in sehr ähnlicher Zeichnung als Bortenmotiv vor.\textsuperscript{145}

Wenn Kühnels These richtig ist, würden von diesen 24 Teppichen diejenigen, die seines Grundgewebe haben, zur im engeren Sinne türkischen Gruppe der Osmanenteppiche gehören. Leider liegen mir nur für wenige der genannten Stücks technische Angaben vor. Kette und Schuss in Seide zeigen No. 4, 7, 14, 17. Ob man die Stücke, bei denen im Grundge webe neben Seide Baumwolle verwendet wird (No. 10), zurechnen darf, bleibt zu untersuchen. No. 1, 4, 6 haben willenloses Grund- gewebe, würden also nicht zugehören. Grundgewebe in Seide oder Seide und Baumwolle kommen nach den dürftigen mir zu Verfügung stehenden Angaben noch bei folgenden Teppichen anderer Musterung vor:

25. Teppich mit Medaillonreihung in Berlin.\textsuperscript{146}
26. Teppich mit Medaillongliederung, New York, Metropolitan Museum, Ballard Collection.\textsuperscript{147}
27. Gebetsteppich, Berlin, Museen.\textsuperscript{148}
28./29. dgl. New York, Metropolitan Museum, Ballard Collection.\textsuperscript{149}
30. dgl., Budapest, Museum.\textsuperscript{150}
31. dgl. Istanbul, Türk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi.\textsuperscript{151}

Es wäre nötig, diese 31 Teppiche und vermutlich noch eine Anzahl anderer technisch zu untersuchen. Erst dann könnte man übersehen, ob sich auf diesem Wege eine homogene Gruppe herauslösen lässt, welchen Umfang diese hat, ob auch die Stücke, die neben Seide Baumwolle im Grundgewebe verwenden, ihr zuzurechnen sind und wie sich die Muster der türkischen Osmanenteppiche zu denen der ägyptischen Osmanenteppiche verhalten. Brachten die abberufenen Teppichmeister die Muster aus Kairo mit, oder sind diese neue Entwürfe, die dann vielleicht auf die Käirer Produktion zurückgewirkt haben? Die Bedeutung dieser Untersuchung liegt dabei weniger in der Feststellung dieser Filiation—obwohl natürlich auch diese wichtig ist—as in der Tatsache, dass wir mit der so gewonnenen

\textsuperscript{137} S.-T., I. Taf. 58/9.
\textsuperscript{138} 89. J. Lessing, Orientalische Teppiche, Berlin, 1891, Taf. 10.
\textsuperscript{139} K.G.M. 97, 58 (nach K.C.R., S. 63), unveröffentlicht.
\textsuperscript{140} J. 6931. Dazu K. Erdmann, Teppicherwer bungen der Islamischen Abteilung, Berliner Museen, 64 (1943), S. 11, Abb. 6.
\textsuperscript{141} 796, 1899.
\textsuperscript{142} Alte No. 768, etwa 5 x 8 m grosses, sehr abgenutztes Stück, unveröffentlicht.
\textsuperscript{143} Kleines Fragment, Inv. III, 716, unveröffentlicht.
\textsuperscript{144} Sehr reich gezeichnetes Fragment, unveröffentlicht. (?)
\textsuperscript{145} Nämlich bei 4, 12, 17, 19.
Gruppe Teppiche hätten, die wir mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit in die Zeit von 1585 bis 1610 setzen könnten, was für die chronologische Anordnung der Osmanenteppiche, die immer noch recht unklar ist, wichtig wäre.  

VII. SEIDENE TEPPICHE
OSMANISCHER ZEIT


Bei den im Inventar des Istanbuler Schatzhauses vom Jahre 1504 erwähnten "twisted silk rugs of a new device" 152 wird es sich allerdings kaum um Knüpsteppiche gehandelt haben. Die 1524 im Inventar der Erzherzogin Margarethe von Österreich genannten "tappis de soie violette, bien ouvri à la mode de Turquie" oder "fait de plusieur couleurs à la mode de Turquie, ouvré de soie et de fil d'or" 153 waren offenbar abendländische Arbeiten. Bei den "four grete pecce of tapis of Turque off the quhilks ane is of silk" im Inventar der Wardrobe des schottischen Königs James V. von 1539 154 ist nicht sicher, ob es sich um türkische Arbeiten handelte, denn der terminus "Tapis de Turquie" wird vielfach auch in der allgemeinen Bedeutung "Orienteppiche" benutzt. Wird doch sogar der Tep-

152a Vergl. aber den nachträglich eingeschobenen Abschnitt IX und meinen Anm. 37 genannten Aufsatz.

152 Talsin Öz, Turkish textiles and velvets, Ankara, 1950, S. 37.
153 Jahrbuch des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses, vol. 3 (1884), No. 2979.

pich mit dem Wappen der Londoner Gürtler-Zunft im Victoria and Albert Museum, 155 den Robert Bell in Lahore anfertigen liess und 1634 der Zunft schenkte in der Eintragung als "a very faire long Turkey Carpitt" 156 bezeichnet.

Anders ist die Lage, wenn Kaiser Karl V. 1549 den Marx Sinkmoser, der dem kaiserlichen Agenten in Konstantinopel, Manetius, Gelder zu überbringen hatte, beauftragt, ihm "zehen der gueten und schönsten Turkischen tischthebichen ... darunter aber zwei oder drei seiden sein sollen," zu kaufen. 157

155 1555 heisst es Inventar der Dña Juana La Loca "una alombrada grande turquesa ... el campo de seda," 158 1622 im Inventar des Kardinals Duque de Lerma "... seys alfonbras Turcas, usadas, de siete." 159 Von den "Fünf gleiche Alkherische teppich von roth, plau und gelb farb auch gelb seiden fransen" im Inventar Erzherzogs Ferdinands von Österreich aus dem Jahre 1596 160 wird zwar nicht gesagt, dass sie in Seide geknüpft waren, aber die "gelb seiden fransen" legen eine seidene Kette nahe. Sie gehörten vielleicht, was dem Datum nach denkbar wäre, zur Filiationssuppe von 1585, wobei nur erstaunlich wäre, dass diese für den Export arbeitete, was aber nicht unbedingt daraus hervorginge, denn die Stücke könnten ja auch als Geschenke des türkischen Hofes in den Besitz des Erzherzogs gekommen sein.

1677 werden im Inventar des Castello del Valentino in Turin "due tappeti del Cairo tutti sete" erwähnt 161 und ein Inventar des  

155 K.-T., Taf. 33.
156 A. Anm. 154 a. O., S. 49.
158 José Ferrandis Torres, Exposición de alfombras antiguas españolas, Madrid, 1933, S. 64.
159 Ibid., S. 69, No. 200.
160 E. I., S. 189.
161 V., S. 212, Anm. 1.
Serais in Istanbul vom Jahre 1680 nennt zwanzig seidene Teppiche aus Ägypten. Aus diesen beiden letzten Quellen ergibt sich eindeutig, dass im siebzehnten Jahrhundert in Kairo ganzseidene Teppiche hergestellt wurden. Kühnel erwähnt erhaltene Originale dieser Art, die ich nach den mir zur Verfügung stehenden Notizen leider nicht identifizieren kann.

VIII. ZUR TYPOLOGIE DER OSMANENTTEPPICHE

Die Osmanenteppiche kennen Grundmuster, zu denen im Laufe der Entwicklung einige Varianten und ad hoc entworfene, meist nur in wenigen Exemplaren erhaltene Muster treten. Wenn im Folgenden versucht werden soll, eine Übersicht zu geben, kann diese selbstverständlich keinen Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit erheben und auch die chronologische Anordnung ist nur summarisch.

Das Grundmuster A (Fig. B) besteht aus einer versetzten Reihung Vierpass-förmiger, aus gegiebelten Arabeskenblättern gebildeter Figuren, die untereinander durch S-förmige Ranken verbunden sind, die in einem gefiederten Lanzettblatt enden und vor ihrer Einrollung eine Nebenranke mit einem zween, kleineren Lanzettblatt aussenden. Das Muster kommt mit und ohne Medaillongliederung vor und reicht, wie Beispiele mit Formmischung beweisen, in die frühe Zeit zurück. Offenbar stellt es einen vorzügliches dat. Als Beispiele nenne ich:

A2, Florenz, Kunsthandel, mit Mittelmedaillon, mit Reminiszenzen an Mamlukenteppiche (Schirmblattstaupe, Artischockenborte) (E. II, Abb. 13).
A4, München, L. Bernheimer K.G., ohne Medaillongliederung wie A1, in den Farben der Mamlukenteppiche, aber reicher gezeichnet (Abb. 8).
A6, Versteigerung E. Zerner, ohne Medaillongliederung, ähnlich A5.
A7, Versteigerung Lepke 6. VI. 1917, ohne Medaillongliederung (ähnlich A5/6, Ausschnitt abnorm).
A8, New York, Hispanic Society, mit Medaillongliederung (Abb. 19).
A9, Düsseldorf, Städtische Kunstsammlungen, mit Medaillongliederung.
A11, dgl. (K.C.R., pl. 33).

Das Grundmuster B (Fig. C) besteht in einer versetzten Reihung von Figuren aus einer mittleren Rosettenblütte mit 8 radial gestellten Palmettenblüten. Die S-förmigen geschwungenen Ranken mit gefiederten Lanzett-

164 Teppichausstellung, Hamburg, 1950, Kat. No. 6, Abb. 5.
165 Verst. Kat. 15./16. XII, 1925, No. 105.
166 A. Anm. 164 a. O., No. 7.
blättern füllen hier den Grund zwischen den Figuren. Als Beispiele nenne ich:

B1, Versteigerung Guidi da Faenza, ohne Medaillongliederung, mit Reminiszenzen an Mamlukenteppiche (äusserer Begleitsstreifen der Borte, Artischockenblüten). 167

B2, New York, Metropolitan Museum, mit Medaillongliederung, Reminiszenzen an Mamlukenteppiche (Schirmblattranke, Artischockenblütenborte). 168

B3, New York, Metropolitan Museum, Gebetstehppich der Sammlung Fletcher (Artischockenblütenborte) (Abb. 6).

B4, Berlin, Museen, mit Medaillongliederung (Artischockenblütenborte) (Abb. 2).

B5, München, L. Bernheimer K. G., ohne Medaillongliederung, Reminiszenzen an Mamlukenteppiche (äusserer Borstenreifen, Artischockenblüten). 170

B6, San Gimignano, Museo Civico, kreuzförmige Tisdecke (E. II, Abb. 14).

B7, Ehemals Sammlung Figdor, ohne Medaillongliederung und ohne Reminiszenzen an Mamlukenteppiche, in der Zeichnung ähnlich B5. 171

B8, New York, Metropolitan Museum, die Füllung der Medaillongliederung ähnlich B2. 172

B9, Düsseldorf, Städtische Kunstsammlungen, ohne Medaillongliederung, Musterausschnitt wie B1. 173

B10, New York, Metropolitan Museum, B-.

167 21.–27. IV. 1902, No. 256, mit farbiger Abb.
168 Acc. No. 41.190.267.
169 Inv. Nr. 1883, 564.
170 Meisterwerke mubamadaniicher Kunst auf der Ausstellung München 1910, München, 1912, Taf. 76.
172 Acc. No. 41.190.273.
173 A. Anm. 164 a. O., No. 8, Abb. 6.

lard Collection, mit Medaillongliederung (B.-M., No. 21).

B11, München, L. Bernheimer K. G., wie B9. 174

B12, Wien, Museum für Angewandte Kunst, ähnlich B10/11. 175


B14, Washington, Textile Museum (K.C.R., pl. 27), Muster verzeichnet.

B15, Versteigerung Sangiorgi 1910, grosser Teppich mit kleiner Medaillongliederung. 176


B17, Ehemals Slg. A. Cassirer, Berlin, Medaillongliederung ähnlich gefüllt wie B16 177 (Abb. 20).

B18, Ehemals bei Loewy, Venedig, wie B17. 178


Von diesem Grundmuster B gehen die Kartons aus, die durch die beiden Fragmente in Washington (K.C.R., pl. 35/36) mit der Filiation von 1585 in Verbindung gebracht

174 Unveröffentlicht.
175 Ars Islamica, vol. 4 (1937), S. 204, Abb. 4.
177 Unveröffentlicht.
178 Unveröffentlicht.
werden können, wobei die S-förmigen Ranken durch die geschwungenen Lanzettblätter und Rosettblütenspiegel ersetzt werden, die in ihrer reichen Zeichnung die Figuren aus mittlerer Rosettblüte mit 8 radial gestellten Palmetten, die ursprünglich die wichtigste Form des Musters bildeten, immer mehr verdrängen. Bei 2 Teppichen im Museum für Angewandte Kunst in Wien,\footnote{170} dem Teppich bei S. Kent Costykian,\footnote{170} einem Teppich der Blumenthal Collection im Metropolitan Museum\footnote{181} und dem Medaillon-losen Teppich im Victoria and Albert Museum\footnote{182} kommen sie in untergeordneter Stellung und ihrerseits zum Füllmotive geworden noch vor, der Teppich in Paris,\footnote{183} offenbar auch die beiden Fragmente in Washington und ein Stück der Ballard Collection in Metropolitan Museum,\footnote{184} zeigen sie nicht mehr.

Bei den zur gleichen Gruppe gehörenden Teppichen mit Kartuschenreihung könnten die Arabesklatt-Vierpässe als Erinnerung an die entsprechende Form des Grundmusters A enthalten. Leider ist auch bei dem intakten Stück in Wien\footnote{185} die Führung der sie begleitenden Ranken nicht klar. Deutlicher ist das bei dem nur in 2 intakten Exemplaren und einigen Fragmenten erhaltenen Muster mit spitzovaler Medaillongliederung,\footnote{186} bei der die Arabesklatt-Vierpässe als Medaillonfüllung dienen und die den Grund füllenden S-förmigen Lanzettblattranken ähnlich, nur etwas reicher als beim Grundmuster A gezeichnet sind. Ein paralleler Vorgang findet sich bei dem Teppich mit versetzter Reihung kreisförmiger Medaillons beim Fürsten Paar\footnote{187} und im Metropolitan Museum,\footnote{188} wo die Figur des Grundmusters B als Medaillonfüllung verwendet wird.

Dass die Kartuschenmusterung auch noch in anderer Form vorkommt, beweist ein Fragment im Grassi Museum in Leipzig.\footnote{189} Bei ihm sind die Figuren durch sonst nicht belegte Rautenbänder verbunden. Die in das Muster eingestreuten "Blitze" finden sich auch bei einem Teppich mit Medaillongliederung auf der Versteigerung Frenkel,\footnote{190} während der ähnlich komponierte Teppich der Blumenthal Collection in Metropolitan Museum\footnote{191} musteräquivalent zur Gruppe von 1585 gehört, zu der man auch das einzigartige Stück in Berlin\footnote{192} rechnen muss.

Für eine Spezialanfertigung hielt ich früher\footnote{193} die 4 gleichen Teppiche aus dem Palazzo Corsi in Florenz, die sich heute in Berlin,\footnote{194} London,\footnote{195} Paris,\footnote{196} und Budapest\footnote{197} befinden, doch ist inzwischen ein fünftes Ex-

\footnote{170} S. o. S. 89, No. 5 und S.-T., I, Taf. 60.  
\footnote{180} S. o. S. 89, No. 10.  
\footnote{181} S. o. S. 89, No. 2.  
\footnote{182} S. o. S. 89, No. 7.  
\footnote{183} S. o. S. 89, No. 1. Die Borte dieses Teppiche wird in wenig geschickter Form auf dem Teppich bei S. Kent Costykian wiederholt.  
\footnote{184} S. o. S. 89, No. 4.  
\footnote{185} S. o. S. 90, No. 17.  

IX. OSMANISCHE GEBETSTEPPICHE

Die Zahl der Gebetsteppiche, die zur Gruppe der Osmanenteppiche gehören, ist nicht gross. Etwas mehr als ein Dutzend scheinen erhalten zu sein, bei denen sich zwei Typen unterscheiden lassen:

I. Teppiche mit ungemusterter Nische.

II. Teppiche mit gemusterter Nische.

(a) mit unteren Eckfüllungen in der Form von Vierteln kreisförmiger Medaillons.

(b) mit unteren Eckfüllungen in der Form von Vierteln kreisförmiger Medaillons.

Die Gruppe I umfasst nach meinen Notizen 6 (bezw. 7) Beispiele, die Gruppe IIa 4, die Gruppe IIb, 3 Exemplare.

Gruppe I

Nr. 1. Teppich im Besitz der Berliner Mus


Nr. 3. Fragmentarischer Teppich im Kunstgewerbe-Museum in Budapest. 206 Braunrote Nische, gelbe Zwickel mit blauen Ranken, Grund der Borte grün. Zeichnung wie bei Nr. 1 und 2, doch um Säulen mit Kelchkapitälen, perspektivisch gezeichneten Basen und gerauften Schäften be-

203 Inv. Nr. 15.64. Masse: 122 x 183 cm., 1915 in Rom erworben.

204 S. 248, 249, 250, 251.


207 Z. M. Hasan, Moslem Art in the Found I. University Museum, Cairo, 1950, pl. 95.


208 Vergl. dazu meinen Anm. 37 genannten Aufsatz, auf Grund dessen dieser Abschnitt nachträglich eingeschoben wurde.
reichert. Technische Unterlagen unzureichend, vermutlich zur Filiation von 1585 gehörend.


Nr. 5. Teppich im Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.\textsuperscript{208} Grüne Nische, Grund der Borte hellblau. Zeichnung wie bei Nr. 3–4, doch die Zahl der Säulen auf 6 erhöht, so dass sich eine dreiteilige Gliederung der Nische ergibt. Nach den nicht ganz ausreichenden Unterlagen kann das Stück zur Filiation von 1585 gehören.


Nr. 7. Teppich in der Moore Collection.\textsuperscript{210}

\textsuperscript{207} Inv. Nr. 89,156. Masse: 127 x 172 cm, 1889 in Istanbul erworben. Vielfach abgebildet, z. B. E. Ot., Abb. 138.


\textsuperscript{209} Inv. Nr. R. 1,62. Masse: 155 x 186 cm. Abb. bei K.C.R., pl. XXXIII.


Gruppe IIa

Nr. 1. Teppich ehemals im Tschinilli Kiosk in Istanbul, heute im Depot des Türk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi dasein\textsuperscript{211} (Abb. 22). Nische olivgrün, Farbe der Zickzack bei Kühnel \textsuperscript{212} nicht angegeben. Grund der Borte rot. In der Mitte der nicht gemusterten Nische ovales Medaillon in Kirschrot mit Blütenfüllung. Technische Angaben bisher nicht vorhanden.\textsuperscript{213}

Nr. 2. Teppich im Besitz des Fürsten von und zu Liechtenstein \textsuperscript{214} (Abb. 23)\textsuperscript{215} Grund der Nische rot, Zickzack und untere Eckfüllungen ähnlich wie bei Nr. IIa, 1. Farbe nicht angegeben, jedenfalls hell, vermutlich cremefarben. Das ovale Medaillon natu-


\textsuperscript{211} Inv. Nr. 40. Aus der Türbe Sultans Selim. Masse: 140 x 190 cm.


\textsuperscript{214} Masse. 137 x 210 cm.

ralistischer gezeichnet. Der Grund der Nische mit Blütenranken im Schema B (Fig. C) (s. o. S. 94) gefüllt. Grund der Borte rot. Technische Angaben nicht vorhanden.


Gruppe IIb


Nr. 3. Teppich, ehemals auf der Versteigerung Alphonse Kann.222 Nische rot. Zeichnung des Innenfeldes ähnlich IIb Nr. 1 u. 2. Technische Angaben fehlen.


218 Inv. Nr. 77,321. Masse: 120 x 173 cm., unveröffentlicht.
219 Nach Troll a. Anm. 217 a. O.
220 Inv. Nr. 81.4. Masse: 135 x 180 cm.
222 A. Anm. 37 a. O.
Die Bortenform A zeigen unter den Gebetsteppichen: IIA Nr. 1 (Abb. 22), IIA Nr. 2 (Abb. 23), IIA Nr. 4, IIb Nr. 3, I Nr. 6. Die Bortenform B zeigen: I Nr. 2, I Nr. 3, I Nr. 4, I Nr. 5, I Nr. 7, IIb Nr. 1-I Nr. 1 (Abb. 21) bringt das Schema B mit Reminiszenzen an das Schema A. Abweichende Bortenform zeigen IIa Nr. 3 (Abb. 24) und IIb Nr. 2. Für das entwicklungsge-schichtlich spätere Datum der Form B spricht die Tatsache, dass sie die Endform darstellt, die von den anatolischen Gebetsteppichen des 18. Jahrhunderts aufgenommen und weitergeführt wird. Für eine chronologische Gliederung des Materials reichen diese Beobachtungen natürlich nicht aus. Dazu bedarf es eingehender Untersuchungen auf breiterer Basis. Jedenfalls legt das Datum 1610/11 bei I Nr. 1 nahe, dass man für alle Teppiche dieser Gruppe—mit Ausnahme vielleicht von IIa Nr. 1—dieses Jahr als terminus post quem annehmen muss, was in der späteren anatolischen Entwicklung eine gute Stütze fände. Das würde bedeuten, dass die Filiation von 1585, zu der mehrere dieser Gebetsteppiche ihrer Technik nach gehören, nicht, wie Kühnel annahm, nur bis zum Ende des ersten Jahrzehnts des 17. Jahrhunderts reichte, sondern mindestens noch einige Jahrzehnte weiter, was für die Beurteilung dieser Sondergruppe, darüber hinaus aber auch für die Datierung der Osmanenteppiche überhaupt, wichtig ist.

X. ABNORME MUSTER


224 Kat. No. 23 (s.a. Anm. 263).
226 Das. 23. IV. 1932. No. 5.
XI. DAS NACHLEBEN DER OSMANEN-MUSTER

Dass die osmanischen Gebetsteppiche auf die Gebetsteppiche von Gördes, Ladik und Kula anregend wirkten, ist bekannt. Die Wege im einzelnen zu verfolgen, wäre interessant, würde hier aber zu weit führen.

Die im letzten Abschnitt genannten späteren Osmanenteppiche (Abb. 28/29) legen nun eine ähnliche Ableitung für eine andere Gattung jüngerer anatolischer Erzeugnisse nahe, die sogenannten Smyrnateppiche, oder richtiger für eine Gruppe dieser sogenannten Smyrnateppiche. 26a

Kühnel schreibt 237 "Da... die Muster keine eigenartigen sind, sondern verschieden älteren Typen nachgebildet, so liegt die Vermutung nahe, dass die Industrie in oder bei Smyrna von der dort blühenden europäischen, vorwiegend holländischen Kolonie ins Leben gerufen und mit asiatischen Arbeitern auf europäische Bestellung betrieben wurde." Troll schreibt 238 "Komposition und Dekor ist meist persischen Vorbildern entlehnt, aber auch europäische und heimische Motive sind häufig." Auch Jacoby 239 denkt an persische Vorbilder und wundert sich, dass sich "gerade in Smyrna eine so bedeutende Knüpfinde ausbreitete."

26a Teppiche dieses Typs sind in türkischen Moscheen, vor allem im Nordwesten Anatoliens und natürlich in Istanbul und Thrakien noch in Massen zu finden, allerdings meist neueren Datums, ohne das leuchtenden Gelb der älteren Smyrnateppiche und in ihrer auf Blau und Rot abgestimmten Farbigkeit mehr an Ushaks erinnernd, denen sie auch vielfach ihre Muster entlehnen. Medaillon-Anordnungen sind bei diesen späten, wenig erfreulichen Ausläufern häufig, aber auch das Muster der alten Smyrnateppiche kommt verwildert noch vor.

237 B.-K. 4, S. 34.
Zunächst zur Frage der Lokalisierung: In der Mitte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts schreibt der Engländer Pococke240 von Afyon Karahissar "In the country . . . between this and Smyrna, they make most of the Turkey carpets, particularly the largest at Oushak, three days journey from Carahissar, and at Goula, two days journey further, and about a place called Goirdas twenty miles to the south west of Goula, and towards Akhissar, the old Thyatira, but farther east they make mostly that sort, which are called Turkoman carpets, without nap, and in broad stripes and figures." Noch aufschlussreicher ist eine Stelle bei E. Oberhummer aus dem Jahre 1892 241 "Es mag hier bemerkt werden, dass die sogenannten Smyrnateppiche . . . sämtlich nicht in Smyrna, sondern an verschiedenen Plätzen des inneren Kleinasien gefertigt werden und nur von Smyrna aus in den Handel kommen, wo stets kolossale Vorräte aufgestapelt sind. Zu den Hauptplätzen der Teppichfabrikation, deren jeder durch einen besonderen Typus des Fabrikates ausgezeichnet ist, gehören Kiutahia, Uschak, Kula, Göröz, Karaman u. a." Smyrna ist also damals wie heute nur der Exportplatz, was ja auch von anderer Seite bereits vermutet worden ist und sich mühelos durch weitere Belege älterer und jüngerer Zeit erhärten lässt.


XII. "COMPARTMENT" RUGS

Die kleinteilig quadrierten Teppiche, auch "Schachbrett-Teppiche" genannt und von Kühnel jetzt als "Compartment" rugs bezeichnet, sind in den letzten Jahren mehrfach diskutiert worden. Während man früher in ihnen eine geringere Abart der Mamlukenteppiche sah, die trotz ihrer antikologischen Elemente in Kairo gefertigt wurde, hat sich neuerlich die Meinung durchgesetzt, dass sie nicht in Ägypten entstanden sind. Besonders Kühnel ist für eine ausser-ägyptische Provenienz eingetreten, für die dann die technischen Untersuchungen

241 E. Oberhummer, Reise in West-Kleinasiien, S. 401.
242 133 x 350 cm.
243 S. o. S. 93.
244 Vergl. auch den Osmanenteppich der Sammlung Rolič, Triest (Abb. V., Taf. 149, und Ars Orientalis, vol. 2 [1957], S. 576, Abb. 15).
Louisa Bellingers den Beweis erbracht haben.245 Das verwendete Material und die Art seiner Verarbeitung ist typisch anatolisch, aber sie sind im persischen Knoten, der dort sonst nicht vorkommt, geknüpft. So stellen sie eine Art Zwitter zwischen Ägyptischem und Anatolischem dar. Ägyptisch sind die Verwendung des persischen Knotens, die Farbstellung, alle Details der Innenfeldmusterung und der Versuch von Ecklösungen bei den Borten, der gelegentlich auf Kosten der mittleren Figur der Schmalseiten geht. Anatolisch sind das verwendete Wollmaterial, die Anordnung der Muster in koordinierender Reihung, die Überschneidung der Reihen durch die Borten,246 das starke Kleiner-werden der Innenfelder bei gleichbleibender Grösse der Mustereinheit bis zu störenden Disproportionen zwischen Feld und Borte,247 endlich alle Bortenmuster.248 Für

246 Z. B. bei Washington, R. 1,87 und 7,10, aber auch sonst häufig.
247 Die Zahl der im Innenfeld erscheinenden Quadrate schwankt zwischen 35 und 3.

anatolische Entstehung spricht auch, dass wir im Lande Kopien dieser Muster kennen.249

Das entscheidende Stück ist, wie Kühnel richtig gesehen hat, das erst kürzlich bekannt gewordene grosse Fragment in der Sammlung Campana in Mailand 250 (Abb. 31) mit dem er überzeugend ein kleines Fragment in Washington (Abb. 32) in Verbindung bringt.251 Diesen beiden steht ein Teppich im Museum für Angewandte Kunst in Wien 252 nahe.

Das Stück der Sammlung Campana steht in der Tat in seinem Muster auf halbem Weg zwischen den Mamlukenteppichen und den "Compartment" rugs. Die Kombination eines grossen Mittelfeldes mit je 2 Reihen aus 3 kleineren, unter sich gleichen Feldern kommt allein hier vor. Der das Innenfeld auf allen 4 Seiten abschliessende Fries aus kleinen Zypressen im Wechsel mit Kandelabern findet sich nur noch auf dem Wiener Teppich und bei einem "Compartment" rug, der um 1930 im deutschen Handel war. Das Muster seiner Borte ist nicht mamlukisch, aber es ist auch nicht osmanisch, sondern es ist anatolisch. Die gleiche Arabeskeblattgliederung zeigen die "Compartment" rugs in Berlin,253 Budapest,254

250 V, Taf. 147.
253 E. Ot., Abb. 47.
254 Sammlung Kalmán Giergl (Magyar Iparmúesetet 10 [1907], S. 104, Abb. 63). Der Teppich — ein Fragment von 3 x 2 Feldern aus einem Stück grossen Formates — ist vermutlich identisch mit einem am 8.—13. XI. 1935 in Wien versteigerten Stück.
Kohn,220 und im deutschen Handel.


227 E. Ot., S. 26.
228 E. Ot., Abb. 33.
dergabe auf dem Bild von Marco d'Angelo, detto il Moro in der Accademia in Venedig, das in der zweite Hälfte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts entstand, ist also für die Mitte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts belegt. Andrererseits kommen "Compartment" rugs noch auf Bildern des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts vor, was natürlich ein Zufall sein kann, der sich mangels anderer Wiedergaben nicht kontrollieren lässt. Auch das "Vogel" Motiv in den Begleitstreifen von 3 der besten Stücke der Gruppe, das mich zu meiner Spätdatierung veranlasste, wiegt nicht mehr viel, nachdem Kühnel mit guten Gründen diese Gruppe in die Zeit von 1550–1650 datiert hat. Trotzdem muss ich gestehen, Teppiche, wie das Stück der Ballard Collection in St. Louis (Abb. 34),

oder Borten, wie die von R. 7.8 in Washington (Abb. 31), in das sechzehnte Jahrhundert zu datieren, macht mir Schwierigkeiten. In diesem Abschnitt bleiben also noch Fragen offen.


E. II, Abb. 23.
ZUR ENTWICKLUNGSGESCHICHTE DER OSMANISCHEN MOSCHEE

VON GÜNTER MARTINY

Um die Entwicklungsgeschichte der osmanischen Moschee des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts klar aufzeigen zu können, scheint es nötig zu sein, alle Moscheen in gleichem Maßstab zu betrachten. Es lässt sich sehr bald erkennen, dass es möglich ist, die Grundrisse von beinahe hundert zur Verfügung stehenden Moscheen nach Alter und Stil so zu ordnen, dass mit nahezu einem einzigen Blick die Geschichte der türkischen Moschee erkannt werden kann.

Für diese Untersuchung wurde ein Plan angefertigt, der in seiner horizontalen Achse die Jahre und die Sultane anzeigt; unter die Namen der Sultane wurden die der wenigen bekannten Architekten geschrieben. In der senkrechten Achse war es möglich die Moscheen in Typen zu ordnen:

Die erste Reihe gibt die Vielstützenmoschee, die sich aus der arabisch-seldschukischen Moschee entwickelt.

Die zweite ist ein Abzweig der ersten; die breiträumige Moschee mit der Zentralkuppel.

Die dritte Reihe bringt neue Formen von der Sophienkirche her.

Die vierte Reihe zeigt die Entwicklung aus der Medrese.

Die fünfte Reihe enthält die einfache Moschee mit der Kuppel über dem Quadrat.

Diese Reihen verquicken sich, überschneiden sich, und lösen sich zum Teil auf.

Die grosse Blütezeit ist die Bauepochе unter Sinan und seinen Schülern im sechzehnten Jahrhundert, was auch zahlenmässig im Plan gut sichtbar wird. Sie verebnt und verklingt dann im siebzehnten und achtzehnten Jahrhundert in drei Linien.

Dass die Seldschuken-Moscheen die türkische Baukunst einleiten, ist unzweifelhaft.


Eine wichtige Abwendung von der Breitärmaigen Vielstützenmoschee tritt bei der Isa Cami in Seldschuk ein (1375), wo man nur die zwei Kuppeln der Mihrabachse überwölbt und vor die Moschee einen Hof anlegt, der durch Mauern in Höhe der Moschee—hier bedingt durch den steilen Berghang—zu einem


Als selbstantändige Moschee tritt der quadratische Kuppelraum schon um 1400 in Milet auf und ist ein beliebter Moscheetyp durch alle Zeiten. Er erreicht in der Nur-i Osmâniye (1748) die grösste Kuppelspannweite in Istanbul neben Süleymaniye und Sophienkirche.


(1616)—aber der Mihrāb wird wieder wie vorher in Marmor ausgeführt.


Note:

Die Grundrisse sind folgenden Werken entnommen worden, soweit sie nicht durch mich neu aufgenommen wurden:

W. Bachmann, Kirchen und Moscheen in Armenien und Kurdistan, Leipzig, 1913.

R. Riefstahl, Turkish architecture in Southwestern Anatolia, Cambridge, 1931.
F. Sarre, Konia, Seldschukische Baudenkmäler, Berlin, 1921.
H. Wilde, Brussa, Berlin, 1909.

Tabellen 1–4.—Grundrisse

Die nachstehende Liste enthält in der neuen türkischen Orthographie (in Übereinstimmung mit der im Text verwendeten Umschrift) die Ortsnamen, welche in den vorher angefertigten Tafeln in alter Orthographie erscheinen.

Namen am oberen Rand

Tabelle 1

Muhammad ibn Khawlan
Muhammad ibn Muhammad of Tūs
Yūsuf Ramadān
Seljuk
Othmān I.
Orkhan

Murād I.
Bayazid I.
Süleymān I.
Mūsā
Mehmed I.
Ya’qūb
Musīl al-Dīn
Ṣihāb al-Dīn
**Tabelle 3**

Selim I.
Sinan
Yetim Baba Ali
Ilyas Abd Allah
Daud Agha
Suleyman II.
Selim II.
Murad III.
Ahmed Agha
Mehmed III.

Ahmed I.
Daud Agha
Orhman II.
Mustafa I.
Murad IV.
Mehmed Agha
Ibrahim I.
Kasim Agha
Mustafa Agha
Mehmed IV.

**Tabelle 4**

Suleyman II.
Ahmed II.
Adjem Isä
Mustafa II.
Ahmed III.
Mahmud I.

Sarim Ibrahim
Izzet Mehmed
Othman III.
Mustafa III.
Abd al-Hamid
Selim III.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Namen innerhalb der Tabellen</th>
<th>CIFTE MINARELI, ERZERUM</th>
<th>KREUZKUPPELCHRCHEN</th>
<th>ATRIUM</th>
<th>SOPHIENKIRCHE 537</th>
<th>ERSTE HALBKUPPEL</th>
<th>ERSTE GEOMETISCHEN IN FLIESEN</th>
<th>ERSTE APSIS</th>
<th>ERSTMALS BOLUS-ROT AUF FLIESEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Cami, Kayseri</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yeni Valide Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaaddin, Konya</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hekimoğlu, Ali Paşa Cami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havan Cami, Kayseri</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imaret Cami, Ankara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haçi Kılıç Cami, Kayseri</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muradiye, Edirne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gök Medrese, Amasya</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hamza Bey, Bursa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Cami, Birgi</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Murat Paşa Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yivli Cami, Antalya</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beylerbey Cami, Edirne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Cami, Bergama</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atik Ali Paşa Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Cami, Bursa</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nişancı Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eski Muradiye, Edirne</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muradiye, Manisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanım Cami, Niğde</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>İnce Minarelî, Konya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zincirli Köyü, Istanbul</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muradiye, Bursa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piyale Paşa Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baba Sultan, Yenişehir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gölkük Cami, Kayseri</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yıldırım Cami, Bursa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaaddin, Niğde</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fırüz Cami, Mîlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunkur Bey, Niğde</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nilüfer İmaret, Iznik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İsa Cami, Selçuk</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beyazıt Sami, Amasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Cami, Manisa</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yeşil Cami, Bursa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Üç Şerefeli Cami, Edirne</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yürgü Paşa Cami, Amasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebul-Vefa Cami</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muradiye, Bursa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatuniye Cami, Manisa</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imaret Cami, Mihalic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmet Paşa Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mahmud Paşa Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinan Paşa</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beyazıt Cami, Amasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustem Paşa, Istanbul</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kademe Ali Paşa Cami, Edirne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokollu Paşa, Istanbul</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mehmed Ağâ Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eski Valide Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Davut Paşa Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinan Paşa</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beyazıt Cami, Edirne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çami al-Khassaki, Baghdad</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selimiye, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeni Valide, Ösküdâr</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haseki Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Cami, Van</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>İbrâhim Paşa Cami, İstanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Cami, Divriği</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuruşulu, Konya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma Minareli, Amasya</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zâl Paşa, Istanbul</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuruşulu Cami, Bergama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihrimâh, Istanbul</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hatuniye, Tokat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azap Kapisi Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fırûz Ağâ Cami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eski Ali Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cadırvan Cami, Bergama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Büyük Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Süleymaniye, Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fâtih, Istanbul</td>
<td>1462, 1771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahlat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyazıt Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ali Paşa Cami, Tokat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selimiye, Konya</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahlat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şahzade Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinili Cami, Ösküdâr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Süleymaniye, Istanbul</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kara MUSTAFA Paşa Cami, Amasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selimiye, Edirne</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuri Osmanîye, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kılıç Ali Paşa Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laleli Cami, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerrah Paşa Cami, Istanbul</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zeynek S. Cami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIE KERAMIK VON PATERNA UND DIE HISPANO-MAURESKEN FAYENCEN DES VIERZEHNten JAHRHUNDERTS

By MARÇAL OLIVAR

Research on the history of the late medieval earthenware of Aragon, Valencia, and Catalonia has advanced during these last years more than that on the history of the Islamic pottery of Andalusia. This may be due largely to the extensive work of Señor González Marti, Cerámica del Levante Español (Barcelona, 1947-52), which is widely known among Spanish connoisseurs and whose publication awakened, indeed, in more than one scholar, a new interest in the question. However, a further explanation is that investigators have at their disposal a rich store of documentation kept in the archives of these eastern Spanish regions, the ancient dominions of the House of Aragon, while contemporary written evidence concerning the ceramic productions of Moorish South Spain in the Middle Ages comes principally from hints contained in Arabic works of travelers and geographers. Señor Guillermo J. de Osma was the first to rely methodically on previous documentary research concerning Valencian wares of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Hence the soundness of his Apuntes sobre la Cerámica Morisca, particularly Los Maestros Alfareros de Manises, Paterna y Valencia and Adiciones a los Textos y Documentos Valencianos (Madrid, 1911). In my study La Vajilla de Madera y la Cerámica de Úso en Valencia y en Cataluña durante el siglo XIV (Valencia, 1950), and in the book La Cerámica Trecentista en los Países de la Corona de Aragon (Barcelona, 1952), I myself tried to investigate on a large documentary basis the first phases of Aragonese, Valencian, and Catalan pottery after the reconquest of Valencia (1238). I had previously undertaken research in the archives of Barcelona, Valencia, and Palma de Mallorca, paying special attention to the inventories of the epoch, and I could study about 400 inventories still unpublished. The mention of recent discoveries by González Marti, by Mrs. Alice W. Frothingham in her masterly Lustreware of Spain (New York, 1951), by Llubià and Batllori in Cerámica Catalana Decorada (Barcelona, 1949), and by J. Caruana and J. Galiay in studies on Aragonese pottery helped me considerably on that occasion.

As a prefatory comment to the following pages written by my friend Rudolf Schnyder, I believe it will be useful now, five years after the publication of my book, to reconsider the results attained in 1952.

Perhaps from the thirteenth century on, in any case after the Almohade domination over Islamic Spain had ceased, two places, Teruel and Paterna—the former in Aragon, the latter in Valencia—were producing abundantly not only unglazed pottery of a strictly utilitarian character, but also pieces for table service or decorative purposes covered by a tin glaze and painted in purple and green or only in blue. In the wares of both, original
glazing and painting usually cover one surface (the exterior of pitchers or jugs and the inside of bowls, plates, and the like), though some of the older-looking vessels found at Teruel have both sides glazed, a feature that later became rather frequent in that Aragonese pottery.

Alfons II of Aragon (the son of Queen Petronila of Aragon and Count Ramon Berenguer IV of Barcelona) founded Teruel in the year 1171, after he had taken from the Moors the mountainous region where it is situated. In the charter granted shortly thereafter to the town, mention is already made of brick-makers, tilers, and potters. Teruel had on its outskirts, perhaps immediately after its founding, a Moorish quarter or morería, and from the thirteenth century on it was one of the more active centers of mudéjar Aragonese architecture, one of whose principal features is the building of brick church towers adorned with glazed tiles and monochrome disks. The oldest known mention of this Aragonese earthenware is given in a Valencian inventory of 1319. Nearly a century later, in 1402–3, a tilemaker of Teruel named García Gonzàlvez (probably a Christian-born artisan) filled for King Martin a large order for glazed floor tiles painted in different colors, according to specified designs.

Paterna was no more than an alqueria (i.e., a farmhouse surrounded perhaps by a hamlet) when, in the course of James I’s final campaign against the neighboring capital of Valencia, it was occupied on April 10, 1237, and granted by the King (as well as Manises) to the Aragonese nobleman Artal de Luna. We know through documents published by Oswa and myself the names of two Moorish canterers or jarmakers working at Paterna in 1317 and 1320. These are the oldest documentary references concerning artisans settled in this ceramic center. Allusions dating from the fourteenth century to Paterna’s potters or to the wares they produced are very rare. In the prologue of his treatise Regimen de la Cosa Pública (written in 1383) the Franciscan friar Francesc Eiximenis mentions Paterna and Càrce (now Carcér, a locality some 50 km. distant from Valencia and as yet unexplored by archaeologists) as producers of an earthenware of common type (Obra de terra comuna): “not easily found elsewhere,” and consisting of “jars, pitchers, pots—i.e. albarelli—flower pots, bowls, oil lamps, kitchen tubs and roof tiles.” Vessels of this origin are cited only in a Valencian inventory of 1414; while in Catalan inventories they are apparently referred to under the vague designation of “Valencian painted earthenware” (obra de terra pintada de Valencia). But thanks to agreements regarding some important purchases, we can be certain that during the fourteenth century Paterna pottery had a high reputation. Thus tilers from there are among the artisans who in 1364 were paid for large quantities of glazed tiles diversorum colorum made for Cardinal Audoin Aubert, then at the Papal Court in Avignon; since 1358 this cardinal had ordered such wares from tilers of Valencia or Manises. During the years 1391–92 several jar and tilemakers of Paterna (perhaps converts) worked at Morella, in the north of the Valencian country, summoned there by the municipal authorities of the town. Finally, in 1402, King Martin ordered some big tiles to be made at Paterna. Two of them, painted in blue and carrying the royal coat of arms, are now in the Museum of Barcelona.

Most of these wares, made either at Teruel or Paterna during the fourteenth century, were of the green-and-purple painted kind. This is the sort of decorated ware which has appeared more abundantly since the excavation of a field situated on the outskirts of Paterna was begun in 1908. (An illustrated account of it is given by J. Folch i Torres in
Noticia sobre la Cerámica de Paterna, Barcelona, 1921.) As for Teruel, the most fruitful excavation was carried out at an uneven and proclive site on the border of the town. Several large fragments were then brought to light. The soil offered no traces of stratification, as it had been repeatedly turned.

A very similar style is used at Teruel and Paterna, a style of obvious Hispano-Moresque conception, with all its elements inherited from eastern Islamic art. But both technique and style have a striking individuality in the pieces from Teruel, owing perhaps to the powerful treatment of the ornamental schemes, and also to the brilliance of the glaze, which surely results from the quality of the minerals employed. For these reasons Teruel vessels have sometimes the appearance of being older than they really are.

There is also great similarity in the themes used for Teruel and Paterna earthenwares: monsters, fishes, birds, interlaced work and arabesques, ornamental Arabic lettering, tendrils and flowering branches, human figures, especially young women with stiff postures and clad in long garments, Moorish female jugglers, also Christian warriors and horsemen, towers and castles, etc. Sometimes the decorative schemes contain a mixture of Christian symbols and Moorish elements. It is when the elaboration of the bicolor wares ceased in Paterna, probably sometime before the beginning of the fifteenth century, that the production of ceramics painted in blue was much increased, but at Teruel the making of green-and-purple painted vessels went on with a marked evolution in their style, though always with an undeniable tendency to archaism.

The bicolor pottery made in Catalonia during the fourteenth century, although related technically to the wares hitherto examined, reflects a quite different approach. It is the work of Christian artisans, alien to the Islamic ways of living, whose methods of labor, based on the principles of apprenticeship, required a corporative organization within the standard of urban life in western Europe. Its main (if not unique) center was the capital of the country, Barcelona, whose municipal council (the Consell de Cent) issued between 1314 and 1327 several documents urging jar makers to stamp their marks visibly on their wares and compelling them to watch over the quality of their products. Since before 1350 potters and jar makers had had their own quarter outside the city walls “de Tallers” and “d’En Xuclà,” situated near the beginning of the present Ramblas. In December 1402, potters, jar makers, and tilers presented to King Martin (then at Valencia) the ordinances of a guild or brotherhood under the patronage of Saint Hyppolite, which was finally given a constitution in 1404.

Before the fourteenth century, the use of wooden utensils for table and even kitchen service had probably been traditional. These wooden vessels were the work of turners, not of escudellers whose speciality was the making of earthenware escudelles (or bowls) and plates. Previous to the period here considered, the technique of making earthenware jars, as containers of liquids or grain, had been based, in Catalonia, on the use of lead glaze, sometimes tinged with intense green by oxide of copper, as was the case in the making of certain vessels such as mortars, round jars with spout and handles, etc.

The tin glaze which covers purple-and-green Catalan wares of the fourteenth century is the result of imitating the glaze used in the wares made in Paterna. This bicolor pottery is also an earthenware of common kind, whose shapes and decorations remind us of the wares made at the same epoch in northern and central Italy, or of the less known wares which were made in the southeast of France. The purple is in most cases very dark, almost black, while the green appears very often smudged
or grayish. Pots, i.e., albarello-shaped jars, are cylindrical, sometimes with a conical neck. Some pear-shaped pitchers have roughly depicted on their spouts, with a sense of humor, the features of a smiling human face. Borders of plates are simple dark circles, or have elaborate designs, particularly cross-hatched lozenges separated by twofold or threefold lines. The central drawings are rosettes of various structures, geometric combinations of lines and dots, or naturalistic figurations such as foliated boughs, fish, starfish, palmipeds, hoopoes, goats, rabbits, cats, also harpies and human figures. Castles are drawn in the fashion of those of Paterna plates. All this means an undeniable originality; still, in more than one of these Catalan pieces the use of designs and motifs taken from Paterna is quite discernible, and this is a fact worthy of notice.

Decorated fourteenth-century Catalan pottery first became really well known when in 1936/37, during the disturbances which accompanied our Civil War, the old church of the Carmelites at Manresa was demolished, and a large number of bicolor pieces was found filling up the space between the church’s nave and the roof. The place in the church’s nave where these were found was covered between 1335 and 1350. About 60 of these pieces could be preserved and are now in the Museum of Manresa or belong to private owners. Then some fragments—which years before had been stored in cases in the Museum of Barcelona—were identified as coming from excavations carried out in the soil of the town. A good number of bits was found afterward, most of them in a place where they had probably been discarded by the medieval Barcelonese potters. Finally, in 1953, a new discovery brought to light some 20 more vessels, found during the resetting of the keystone in the presbytery (covered between 1332 and 1356) of the vast church of Santa María del Pi, in Barcelona. We can point out other places where vestiges of this pottery have been found: Elne (Rousillon), Palma de Mallorca, Murcia, Gerona, Tarragona, Tarrasa, Vich, etc.

Little need be said here about the products of Manises, which was reputed principally for its lusterware. This village, bordering on Paterna, was also given to Artal de Luna by James I in 1237. In December 1304, a grandson of this nobleman sold his rights over the territory to Peter Boil, a gentleman of Catalan or Aragonese descent who, under James II, performed several important missions in connection with political relations between Granada and the king of Aragon.

The technique of luster painting over tin-glazed wares was rather imperfectly practiced at Paterna on a small scale, and in this case an influence of Malaguan lusterware is probable. But it is quite certain that this technique was brought from Malaga to Manises. Although the expression opus de Malica in inventories of the fourteenth century may refer to other characteristics, e.g., green painting, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it certainly meant that the items so described were gilt-looking. In documents from the middle of the fourteenth century on, potters settled in Manises are frequently designated as magistri operis de Malica.

We do not know when or why lusterware was introduced there. The transfer of this technique from Malaga may perhaps be related to a sojourn of Peter Boil at the court of Granada during the winter of 1309–10. But we do not even know if Peter Boil patronized the introduction of ceramic production in his Valencian property. If this were so, he must certainly have taken the greatest possible profit from this activity; and we can prove that in 1372 a grandson of his, Philip Boil, asked Peter IV for permission to buy or take as vassals’ tribute the whole of Manises’ earthenware production, or at least to arrive at an agreement with the buyers. In any case, the
benefit attained by the Boils from this labor was not greater in 1395 than the current rate fixed for other seigniories' rights: a tenth of the gains.

The first known potters established at Manises were two Moorish jarmakers, brothers, who lived there in 1317. A document of 1325 mentions two other sarraceni habitantes Manises, whose capacities were more in conformity with the later fame attained by this center, since they made not only terra alba, i.e., unglazed pottery, but also terra picta, or pottery covered by tin glaze and painted. In the same year there were living in Manises members of a family of potters who became very famous during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and were still active in this craft as late as 1530: the Almureci or Almorci.

A large part of this locality's earthenware production was tilemaking. From Manises came Johan Albalat, magister de opera de Malica, and Paschasius Marté (or Martínes?), who signed in 1362 a contract obliging the tilemakers to go to Avignon in order to make tiles for Cardinal Audoin Aubert. When this cardinal died in 1364, 10 other potters of Manises (Moors and Christians) were paid for tiles which he had ordered. In 1385 three Moorish potters were sent by Prince John, Duke of Berry, at the request of the latter; it is very probable that they came from Manises. The activity in France, during the years 1384–85, of one of these Moors, named then Jehan de Valence, has been minutely studied. At Manises were certainly made a large number of the tiles which, since 1352, Peter IV repeatedly ordered through the governor of Valencia. One of these orders, in 1372, included a thousand gilt tiles: rafoles deaurades. (The document, still unpublished, can be read in the Archive of the Aragonese Crown, Barcelona: A.R. reg. 1230, fol. 50–.) It is the oldest known document where the word "gilt" is applied to a ware of Valencian origin.

Tilemaking, especially the making of glazed and painted tiles for paving, was therefore one of the most solicited activities of the potters of Manises during the fourteenth century, and production did not diminish in importance later on. This must not imply that the making of wares other than tiles was not then appreciated. Some fourteenth-century inventories mention items fabricated at Manises (1342, 1348, and 1398 in Valencian inventories, 1403 in one of Aragon). In such documents written in Catalonia, vessels of this origin are indicated under a more general denomination: "painted Valencian ware" or operis de Malica.

It is indeed undeniable that, according to our present knowledge, Manises' reputation for earthenware reached a very high point at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Information concerning important sales to native and foreign buyers occurs more and more frequently from this epoch on. These, it seems, were the years when the royal house appeared for the first time to be interested in buying a number of vessels at high prices, e.g., the purchases made in 1403 and 1404 by King Martin and his consort, Mary de Luna, from Sanxo Almorci, magister operis de Maleque, and from Mahomat Abdulasí, both of Manises.

But that this fame came from more ancient days is attested in the same text we adduced when we discussed the earthenware of Paterna. In the prologue of the Regiminent de la Cosa
Pública, Francesc Eiximenis in 1383 praised the obra de Manises as “gilt and masterly painted” and as a ware “with which everybody is so pleased that the Pope and the cardinals and the princes of the world ask for it as a special favor and are astonished that ware of such excellence and fineness could be made from clay.”


Der Reichtum des hier zu Tage geförderten ist so gross, dass der Name Paterna seither geradezu zum Begriff für den Typus der hispano-mauresken Keramik des genannten Zeitabschnitts wurde.1a


Dass Paterna auch im Zentrum dieser Untersuchung stehen soll, hat einen andern Grund, der in früheren Arbeiten wohl schon erwähnt wurde, nie aber Anlass gab zu weiteren Gedanken und Ausführungen. Es ist uns nämlich durch verschiedene Urkunden des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts bekannt, zu welchen Bedingungen die Landbesitzer den Töpfern in der Nachbarschaft von Valencia die Felder verpachteten, die zur Gewinnung des Tonens ausgegraben werden mussten. Neben einer normalen Bezahlung verlangten die Boden-

1a Über die Ausgrabungen in Paterna orientiert: J. Folch i Torres, Noticias sobre la cerámica de Paterna, Barcelona, 1921; An weiterer Literatur über Paterna ist zu nennen: Gomez Moreno, Cerámica de Paterna, Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia, Abril-Junio, 1928; Gonzalez Marti, Cerámica medie-val de Paterna, Revista “Cerámica Industrial y Artística,” Barcelona, Octubre 1933; Marcario Golferichs, La cerámica de Paterna, Las Provincias, Valencia, 21 IV, 8 VI, 5 IX; Ernst Kühnel, Keramik von Paterna, Berliner Museen, 1925, fasc. 3; Juan Ainaud de Lasarte, Cerámica y vidrio, Ars Hispaniae, vol. 10 (1952), pp. 13-32.


Dennoch erscheint es gerade hier verlockend, das wahlslos durcheinandergewürfelte Material nach neuen Gesichtspunkten stilistisch und chronologisch zu ordnen. Erst durch eine zuverlässige Scheidung früher und späterer Stücke werden wir in der Lage sein, Paterna nicht nur als ein gewiss be deutendes Phänomen der hispano-mauresken Kultur zu sehen, sondern wir werden im reichen Ausgrabungsmaterial von Paterna auch eine lebendige Folge verschiedenster sich ablösender, Mode und Zeitgeschmack nachgebender Stile entdecken, eine Entwicklung, die endlich jene schönste Blüte der hispano-mauresken Welt hervortreiben wird: die goldene Keramik von Manises.

Wohl wissen wir, dass in Paterna noch im Laufe des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts die früher das Feld vollständig beherrschenden Farben grün und purpur durch Blau malerei verdrängt werden. Wie aber der Zeitpunkt dieser Ablösung völlig im Dunkel liegt, so können wir kein Bild machen von den Jahren der Produktion grün-purpur dekoriert Ware. Hier warten viele Fragen einer Lösung und der Versuch, sich auf diesem Feld orientieren zu wollen, ist aussichtslos, ausser es würde gelingen, technisch und stilistisch einwandfrei zusammengehörige Stücke aus dem grossen Material auszuscheiden und in Gruppen zusammenzufassen, die sich als einheitliche Stilgruppen beschreiben und datieren lassen. Wenn allen bis heute in dieser Richtung unter nommenen Vorstossen wenig Erfolg beschieden war, dann sind uns doch einige Daten überliefert, die einen Massstab geben sowohl für die Entwicklung des Zeitgeschmacks als auch für die Lokalisierung wichtiger auswär tiger Einflüsse und einem verfeinerten, nach zuverlässigen Kriterien suchenden Vorgehen gewissen Erfolg verheissen können.

Ausser den Daten katalanischer Keramik von Manresa (1335–50) und Sta. Maria del Pi in Barcelona (1332–56), die allerdings nur in sekundärem Bezug für Paterna sehr wichtig sind, ist uns Folgendes bekannt:

Im Jahr 1369 liess Don Jaime II die Fundamente des Schlosses Bellver bei Palma
auf Mallorca legen. In einem der Gräben, die dazu ausgehoben und nach beendigter Arbeit wieder zugeschüttet wurden, fand man bei neueren Grabungen ein grün und purpurn bemaltes Schälchen (Abb. 2), das während der Zeit, da der Grafen offenstand, hineingeworfen worden sein muss. So haben wir mit der Jahrzahl 1309 wenn auch kein fixes, so doch ein ungefähres Datum, denn wir wissen nicht, wie lange der Grafen offenlag, noch wissen wir, wie lange das Schälchen in Gebrauch war, ehe es weggeworfen wurde.


Wie im Jahre 1896 in Pula auf Sardinien die alte Kirche abgebaut wurde, fand man versteckt in einem zugemauerten Wandloch eine ganze Reihe mittelalterlicher Keramik aus Manises und Paterna, die ins Museum von Cagliari überführt wurde. In der Hauptsache handelt es sich um lüstrierte Schalen, doch findet sich darunter auch ein blaues sowie ein grün-purpurernes Stück. Möglicherweise wurden diese Schalen im Jahre 1354 nach Pula gebracht, als die katalanische Armee in dieses Gebiet der Insel vordrängt.²

Die Fliesen, die König Martin 1402 in Paterna anfertigen liess, sind schon Zeugen einer hochentwickelten Blaumalerei, und die Funde von den um 1405 konstruierten Gewölben des Hospitals Sta. Cruz in Barcelona zeigen nicht weniger deutlich, dass man damals auch in Katalonien Gefässe und Teller fast nur noch blau dekorierte. Diese drei mehr oder minder datierten Exemplare grün-purpurner Keramik: das Schälchen von Mallorca, der Wappenteller und das in Pula, Sardinien, gefundene Stück, lassen, was eine stilistische Entwicklung der Formen anbelangt könnte, noch kaum Schlüsse zu, zeigen aber eine merkliche Verschiedenheit in der Auffassung des Dekors. Die Bemalung des zuerst genannten Schälchens ist auf dessen breiten, flachen Rand beschränkt, eine fast schwarze, präzise Strichzeichnung mit doppelten, parallelgeführten Konturen, deren rein abstrakte Funktion als übergeordnetes, gotisches Rahmenwerk noch deutlicher in Erscheinung tritt durch die nach-

Abb. 1A — Fussfig. 5, Rückseite von Abb. 9.

Abb. 1B — Fussfig. 5, Rückseite von Abb. 20.
Abb. 2.—Fundort: Schloss Beller, Mallorca. Standort: Daselbst. (Photograph: M. Llubia, Barcelona.)

Abb. 3.—Fundort: Valencia. Standort: Palacio Nacional, Barcelona, Nr. 49103. (Photograph: M. Llubia, Barcelona.)

Abb. 4.—Fundort: Valencia. Standort: Palacio Nacional, Barcelona, Nr. 49104. (Photograph: M. Llubia, Barcelona.)


Abb. 12.—Nr. 18776.

Abb. 13.—Nr. 20090.

Abb. 14.—Nr. 20027.

Abb. 15.—Nr. 20034.

Abb. 16.—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 17.—Nr. 20066.

Abb. 18.—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 19.—Nr. 18775.


Abb. 21.—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 22.—Nr. 19632.

Abb. 23.—Nr. 21248

Abb. 24.—Nr. 19275.

Abb. 25.—Nr. 19622.

Abb. 26.—Nr. 20045.

Abb. 27.—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 28.—Nr. 19794.

Abb. 29.—Nr. 5348.

Abb. 30.—Nr. 44780.

Abb. 30A.—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 31.—Nr. 19701.

Abb. 32.—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 33.—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 34.—Nr. 44727.

Abb. 31-34.—Fundort: Paterna. Standort: Palacio Nacional, Barcelona.
Abb. 35—Nr. 19834.

Abb. 35A—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 36—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)

Abb. 37—(Keine Nummer ist angegeben.)


Abb. 44.—Nr. 49632.

Abb. 45.—Nr. 49638.


Diese gewiss nicht unbedeutenden Unterschiede können nicht mit dem Einwand bagnetellisier werden, dass sie sich bei einem so vielfältigen Material von selbst erklären. Vielmehr dürfen wir in ihnen sichere Wegweiser erblicken, die uns bei der Gruppierung und Datierung des Ausgrabungsmaterials von Paterna Ort und Richtung geben können.

Der Weg dieser Untersuchung scheint nun vorgezeichnet zu sein, denn leicht sollte es im Folgenden glücken, die Massen des Materials zu durchstöbern und Stücke auszuspähen, die den drei im voraus erwähnten Exemplaren mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit zugeordnet und also datiert werden könnten. Bei einem solchen Vorgehen würde aber die Sache selbst, nämlich die in Paterna ausgegrabene und für Paterna ausschlaggebend gewordene Keramik von einer allzu schmalen Ausgangsbasis her angegriffen, und die Folge davon wäre, dass wir uns auch diesmal mit dem Spiel der Möglichkeiten begnügen müssten, ohne in der Lage zu sein, sichere Merkzeichen aufzuziehen, die genügen könnten, Beweise zu führen bei der Bildung von Stilgruppen, beim Festsetzen der Zeit. So wenden wir uns zuerst dem eigentlichen Fundmaterial von Paterna zu, nicht mit dem Ziel, eine breitangelegte Beschreibung der zahlreichen Dekorationsmotive und ihrer Darstellungsweisen zu geben, sondern sorgfältig die Spuren aufsuchend, die durch den Entstehungsprozess der Keramik bedingt sind. Wir versuchen dem Gang der Herstellung zu folgen, beobachten, wie das Rohmaterial gewonnen und aufbereitet wird, sehen zu, wie der Töpfer den nassen, geschmeidigen Ton auf der Drehscheibe zu Tellern und Gefäßen formt, bemerken, dass diese in halbgetrocknetem Zustand ein zweites Mal überarbeitet werden mit einem spitzen Holzmesser, das zum Ausschneiden der schmalen Füße dient, und können nebenbei feststellen, dass sich die Finger des Drehers bei dieser Arbeit im weichen Lehm abdrücken. Erst wenn die Stücke getrocknet sind, gehen sie in die Hände des Malers oder der Malerin über und kommen endlich in den Ofen. Wie in jeder Arbeitsvorgang zum Werden eines Stückes beitrug, lässt sich noch heute an Merkmalen wie diesen deutlich erkennen: Qualität und Farbe des Scherbens, aufgedrehte Formen, abgedrehte Formen, Fingerabdrücke, Glasur und Bemalung.

*Qualität und Farbe des Scherbens* variieren in Paterna sehr stark. Neben fein geschlemmter Erde wird grober, von Quarz und Kalksteinen wenig gesäufter Ton verwendet, der tiefrot, rosa, gelblich, grau getönt oder weiss sein kann. Diese Unterschiede erklären sich leicht durch Schwankungen der Tonqualität, womit bei jeder, geschweige denn bei verschiedenen Lettgruben immer zu rechnen ist. Doch wird der Ton während seiner Aufbereitung zerstossen, mit viel Wasser geschlemmt,
in grossen Bassins getrocknet, durchgeknäult und bei alledem so stark vermengt, dass wohl Stücke von gleichem Scherben (d.h. gleicher Tonqualität) erzeugt wurden, solange der einmal angelegte Tonvorrat in einer Werkstatt ausreichte. Dies mag immerhin von Mal zu Mal einige Monate gedauert haben, sodass die Tonqualität und -farbe als ein Kriterium für Stücke, die unter Umständen sehr nahe zusammengehören könnten, durchaus beachtet sein muss.


**Abgedrehte Formen**, sprich Formen, die in halbgetrocknetem oder, wie der Hafner sagt, lederharten Zustand mit dem Holzmesser ein zweites Mal überarbeitet wurden, haben ihre definitive Gestalt erhalten. Nun erst zeigen sie die schmalen, scharfgeschnittenen Füsse, die für Paterna so bezeichnend sind. Gewiss, hier wurde nur gerade die Fusspartie vom Prozess des Abdrehens betroffen. Doch weisen die so ausgeschnittenen Formen bemerkenswerte Unterschiede auf, die teils durch ein spitzes oder stumpfes Werkzeug erzeugt sein können, teils aber Folge des wechselnden Formgefühls der Handwerker sein müssen. Zwar werden die Töpfer von Paterna wenig auf die Formgebung ihrer Schalen- und Tellerfüße geachtet haben. Dies aber erhöht den Reiz der Sache nur. Damit erklären wir nämlich, dass der Prozess des Abdrehens eine mehr mechanische Angelegenheit war, die mit einem lange eingebütt Handgriff fast unbewusst ausgeführt wurde. Wenngleich aber die Formen mit wenig Vorbedacht mehr in automatischer Wiederholung hervorgebracht wurden, zeigen sie doch durch ihre reichen Variationen nicht nur die individuelle Verschiedenheit der sie hervorbringenden Hände, sondern auch das Spiel eines selbständigen wirkenden Formtriebs, der durchaus dem höheren Gebot der Zeit und des Zeitstils gehorchte. Vorerst ist es erstaunlich, wie viele Möglichkeiten freier Gestaltung der an sich sehr spröde scheinende Gegenstand eines Schalen-oder Tellerfüsses bietet (*Tafel I*). Vereinzelte Stücke stehen auf einem hohen,
durch eine schmale, scharf gezogene Rille vom Schalenkörper getrennten Fuss, der eine leicht gerundete, plastische (I)—oder eine streng gerade geschnittene, kantige Form zeigt (II). Bei mehreren Tellern ist der im Profil vier-eckige Fusskörper gegen die Rille hin deutlich gefast (d.i. abgeschärft), wodurch diese mehr ausgeweitet, der Fuss weniger hart abgesetzt erscheint (III), (Abb. 1 A). Andere Stücke weisen allseits durch Fasen abgestumpfte Kanten auf und lassen noch deutlicher die Tendenz erkennen, Härten der Form auszumerzen (IV). Bei einer grossen Gruppe sind die Fasen von Rillen- und Grundkante so breit, dass sie seitlich aufeinanderstossen und einen schmalen, den ganzen Fuss umkreisenden Kamm bilden (V, Abb. 1 B). Einen solchen Kamm zeigen viele der im vorangehenden Abschnitt letzte-nannten Randteller und Schalen nur sehr verschwommen, andere überhaupt nicht (VI). Bei alledem bleibt zu bemerken, dass damit nur Grundformen aufgezeichnet wurden, die im Detail vielfach variieren können. Individuelle Züge kann man bei der weichen oder härteren Behandlung der Kanten sehen. Oft wurde die Form des Fusses nachträglich mit dem nassen Finger geglättet. Es gab Dreher, die den Fuss von oben nach unten bearbeiteteten. Andere schnitten die Form aus, indem sie das Werkzeug unten ansetzten und nach oben führten. Wenn das Holzmesser nicht sehr scharf war, wurde bei dieser Arbeit gern ein kleiner Tonwulst über die Kanten hinaus aufgeworfen, der leicht erkennen lässt, in welcher Richtung die Bewegung erfolgte. Solche feinen Unterschiede treten vor allem an den Fuss-typhen IV—VI auf, sodass wir in ihnen das Werk einer grösseren Zahl verschiedener Arbeiter vermuten dürfen. Die Typen V und VI finden sich zudem nicht nur an den für die spätere Zeit vermutlich bezeichnenden Tellerformen; wir treffen sie auch häufig an blau-dekorierter Keramik und sind deshalb gezwungen, in ihnen Endformen der Produktion grün-purpurner Keramik zu sehen.


3 Dank der freundlichen Hilfe der Kantons- und Stadtpolizei Zürich war es mir möglich, diese Arbeitsmethode anzuwenden. Insbesondere danke ich Herrn Wepfer vom Erkennungsdienst der Stadtpolizei Zürich, der sich mit grosser Erfahrung der heiklen


klamiert werden kann. Immerhin wird Paterna als eines der frühesten Zentren für die Fabrikation von Majolika auf abendländisch-christlichem Boden die unschätzbar wichtige Rolle des Vermittlers gespielt haben, der die bis dahin nur dem muselmanischen Kreis zugehörigen Werkstattgeheimnisse der christlichen Welt mitteilte und damit Anstoss gab zum sternhaften Aufstieg der europäischen Keramik.

Paterna zeigt auch in anderer Hinsicht das Gesicht eines Ablegers und lokalen Vermittlers der grossen maurischen Produktionszentren Andalusiens. Es muss nämlich auffallen, wie sehr man in der Verwendung der Farben grün und purpur einem Schema folgt, wonach das Grün hauptsächlich dazu dient, die rein abstrakte Anlage der in Mangan ausgeführten Zeichnungen mit breit angelegtem Strich zu betonen. Dadurch deckt sich seine Funktion weitgehend mit derjenigen des Blau auf lüsterierter Ware. Doch bleibt als wesentlicher Unterschied zu bedenken, dass man Keramik, die blau und golden dekoriert werden sollte, zuerst blau bemalen und brennen musste, ehe sie das Gold empfangen konnte, wie es die Technik des Lusters verlangt. Dies erklärt auch, weshalb das Blau mehr nur die abstrakte Anlage der geplanten Dekoration vorzeichnet. Was aber die grün-purpurne Malerei betrifft, kann kein solcher "technischer" Grund ins Feld geführt werden, der dieser oder jener Farbe ihre bestimmte Aufgabe zum vornherein zuweisen würde. Hier stellt sich von selbst die Frage, inwiefern auswärtige Einflüsse stilbildend einwirken konnten, eine Frage, die im Folgenden auf Grund einer stilistischen Ana-


Erst im Hinblick auf den so ungewöhnlich komplex sich darbietenden Dekor zeigen die mehr technischen Erörterungen des vorangehenden Abschnitts ihren praktischen Wert, indem sie uns ermöglichen, das Material zum vornherein in sicher unterschiedenen Gruppen

---

zu sehen. Damit ist auch unser weiteres Vorgehen dahin bestimmt, das Charakteristische der Malereien jeder Gruppe zu definieren, wobei sich erweisen wird, inwiefern die vorgenommene Gruppierung überhaupt gerechtfertigt ist. Wenn aber eine solch profilierende Beschreibung immer besondere Vorsicht erheischt, dann wird sie hier noch dadurch erschwert, dass das gesamte Fundmaterial aus zerbrochenen und oft mangelhaft restaurierten Stücken besteht.


falt gewahrt ist. Daraus lässt sich erschließen, dass der Maler symmetrisch konzipierte: er legte die gegenseitig sich entsprechenden, grünen Konturen der Vögel, zeichnete sodann mit breitem, purpurnem Strich den Baum, die Symmetrieachse, und erkannte zu spät, dass damit zu wenig Raum blieb für eine schöne, symmetrische Anordnung der Schnäbel. So drehte er nach einigem Zögern dem Vogel rechts den Kopf um und opferte das abstrakte, konstruktive Prinzip, indem er sich einfach den Gegebenheiten der weissen Felder des Grundes anpasste. Als Ansatz des geplanten Schnabels blieb nur der Kamm.

Dass das Prinzip strenger Konstruktion einem mehr passiven "sich nach den Gegebenheiten der Grundfläche richten" weicht, lässt sich in der Folge an Tellern mit Fuss Nr. III deutlich erkennen (Abb. 9–11). Schon der weisse Schmelz wirkt hier weicher; oft ist er leicht grün getönt und wird noch gebrochen durch eingestreute Punkte, Blätter und Blüten. Das an sich schon bleiche Grün fliesst oft aus. Doch bleibt ein struktives Element erhalten in den kräftigen Mangankonturen, die ähnlich wie bei der besprochenen Vogelschale erst in zweiter Linie eingezeichnet wurden. Während aber dort—wie auch bei der Sardana—Figur und Rahmung weitgehend zusammenwirken und ein fest verknottetes Netzwerk bilden, dessen leere Maschen das Weiss in mehr oder weniger scharf umrissenen Ausschnitten durchscheinen lassen, vermeidet man hier gefissentlich alles, was die Dekoration als eine fixierte Konstruktion erscheinen lassen könnte, und beschränkt sich darauf, die Gegenstände nebeneinander in der Fläche auszulegen. Einem ursprünglichen Bedürfnis gehorchend, verfährt man dabei meist nach dem Gesetz der Symmetrie. So pflanzte der Maler in Abbildung 9 eine purpurne Rute zwischen den auffallend verschieden charakterisierten Figuren auf und betonte nachträglich schematisch vermittelst eines nebensächlichen Füllmotivs die ornamentale Anlage des Bildes. Ähnlich verfährt er mit dem alten Motiv der gekrönten Melusine, Abbildung 10; die gewiss zur Reihe der Darstellungen schanker, weiblicher Figuren gehört, hier aber einen gleckenförmig geschwollenen Leib zeigt, dessen geschwungener Form die breit konturierten Fische symmetrisch einge passt sind. Und gleich schmieg sich der Drache in Abbildung 11 ornamental der Kreisform des Tellerrandes ein.

Der an den eben besprochenen Tellern beobachtete Hang zu mehr nur dekorat ornamental gemeinter Belebung der weissen Grundfläche eignet auch Stücke mit Fuss Nr. IV und lässt bei Übereinstimmung des oft leicht grün getrübten Schmelzes und der etwas blassen Farben die Dekorationen beider Gruppen sehr ähnlich erscheinen. Immerhin zeichnen sich die Tendenzen im einzelnen besser ab. So demonstriert die Schale Abbildung 12 geradezu das Vorgehen, Gegenstände in der Flache nebeneinander auszulegen. Ohne sich gegenseitig zu berühren, werden die drei mit Grünzeug geschmückten Fische dem Betrachter in der Form serviert, wie es die valencianische Gesellschaft des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts liebte und pflegte. Jeder Fisch ist von einer breiten Mangankontur etwas steif umschrieben und als ein in sich geschlossenes, begrenztes Feld begriffen. In welchem Masse diese Art der Umschreibung rein dekorative Bedeutung hat und weit abführt von der Darstellung des Gegenständlichen an sich, das hier so sehr im Zentrum zu stehen scheint, zeigen


In mehr als einer Hinsicht sind Stücke mit Fuss Nr. VI etwas ärmlisch, uneinheitlich und ohne viel Erfindung dekoriert. Die Glasure ist oft von minderer Qualität und lässt den rohen Scherben röthlich durchschimmern. Wohl zufolge eines Brandfehlers erscheint der weisse Schmelz häufig schwarz eingestäubt (Abb. 27, 28, 31). Die Farben haben meist wenig Leuchtkraft; sie sind bleich oder stumpf und flüchtig aufgemalt. In seltenen Fällen zeigen sie leicht metallischen Glanz (Abb. 32). Die Dekorationen zeugen von einem grossen Arbeitstempo. Schematisch wiederholen sie in oft abgekürztem Verfahren altes Formgut,
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das häufig zur Formel, zuweilen zum Zeichen reduziert erscheint. Diese Reduktion der Formen vollzieht sich im Rahmen einer allgemein dynamischen Konzeption. An Abbildung 29 wird deutlich, was wir darunter zu verstehen haben. Nach bekanntem Schema ist die Bemalung in drei Streifen angelegt, wobei die Seiten die Mitte symmetrisch einrahmen. Aufteilung und Schmuck des Mittelfeldes richten sich aber nicht nach der durch die Randstreifen gegebenen Symmetrieachse und passen sich auch keineswegs der Kreisform der Schale ein, die infolge der durch die uneinheitliche Ordnung entstehenden Spannungen zum Oval deformiert erscheint. Hier schaffen die verschieden­nen, nicht koordinierten Spannungsfelder eine 


Unter den früher erwähnten Exemplaren grün-purpurner Keramik, die zeitlich ungefähr fixiert werden konnten, steht das erste Stück: das um 1309 datierte Schälchen von Mallorca den Fragmenten der ersten Gruppe eindeutig am nächsten. Der scharf profilierte, runde Fuss, die Anlage der Bemalung, Intensität der Farben und Präzision der Zeichnung lassen sich nur mit diesen vergleichen. Dabei muss uns allerdings die Tatsache zu denken geben, dass sich im eigentlichen Ausgrabungsschutt von Paterna fast keine solchen Stücke fanden, sodass Paterna als Herkunftsort dieser wenig Fragmenten anzusehen sei. Da die in Frage kommenden Scherben zudem in

Der im Sodd des alten Herrschaftshauses


7 Es scheint mir wahrscheinlich, dass diese Fragmente bei den Ausgrabungen in Valencia vom Jahre 1919 gefunden wurden. (Cf. M. Olivar, La cerámica trecentista ... p. 56). Beide Stücke tragen auf der Rückseite den Vermerk, F. Tachard, 1921.)


ZUSAMMENFASSUNG


Wir wissen nicht, wie weit die Herstellung bemalter Majolika in Paterna zurückreicht.


Die zwiefache Wurzel dieser Kunst ist hier noch so unverwachsen sichtbar, dass ihre Anfänge wohl kaum weit ins dreizehnte Jahrhundert zurückreichen. Damals mögen Handwerker das technische Rüstzeug aus dem Süden mitgebracht haben, als das aufblühende Valencia seit der christlichen Eroberung eine gotische Stadt geworden war. 

Gewiss gibt es in den Ländern Valencia und Aragon eine eigene keramische Tradition, so dass man verschiedentlich versucht war, das Auftreten der Majolika in Valencia und Teruel als eine aus dieser Tradition hervorgegangene Erfindung zu werten. Hier hätte die Frage abgeklärt werden sollen, welcher der beiden Städte der Vorrang und damit die Palme gebüre, wobei sich Teruel nicht zuletzt auf das nördlich gelegene Calatayud berufen konnte, das um 1154, zu einer Zeit, da Teruel noch nicht gegründet war, ein Zentrum für lüstrierte Keramik gewesen sein soll. Wir haben aber keinerlei Daten, die solche Mutmassungen rechtfertigen würden.  

Andersseits gilt es zu bedenken, dass in der zweiten Hälfte des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts, zu einer Zeit also, da wir die Anfänge der valencianischen Majolika vermuten dürfen, das Auge der Welt auf die keramische Produktion der berühmten Zentren Andalusiens schaute. Malaga sandte damals seine lüstrier-


Die konsequente Abwendung vom gotischen Ding muss sich in den Dreissigerjahren vollzogen haben. Sie lässt sich fortschreitend an Gruppe 4 und 5 beobachten. Gleichzeitig


11 Osma, Los maestros alfareros... Adiciones, pp. 19, 31, 32; Alice W. Frothingham, Lustreware of Spain, p. 80. Da uns zu sagen keine valencianische Urkunde des 13. Jahrhunderts erhalten ist, mag dies allerdings der Hauptgrund sein, weshalb wir hier keine früheren, die Töpferei betreffenden Nachrichten haben.

Die Lebendigkeit und Frische der Produktion dieser Jahre muss nicht ohne nachhaltige Wirkung auf den fremden Betrachter gewesen sein. Davon spricht die weite Verbreitung der Keramik von Paterna in der alten Welt. Ausser auf Sardinien und Mallorca fanden sich Stücke in Barcelona, Murcia, Narbonne (Frankreich) und Kairo. Als zeitgenössische Würdigung dieser Produktion darf aber der für das Herrschafts- und Königshaus angefertigte Hochzeitsteller gelten.

Schon kurz vor 1350 scheint die Qualität der grün-purpurnen Ware auf der ganzen Linie nachzulassen. Der Umsatz muss zwar weiterhin gewaltig gewesen sein, doch wird auf die Formgebung und Verzierung der Keramik weniger Sorgfalt und Zeit verwendet. Dabei tauchen nun auch Stücke auf, deren Grund schwarze Spuren zeigt. An früheren Exemplaren liess sich nichts dergleichen bemerken. Da die Sache nicht nur vereinzelte Fragmente, sondern ein stattliches Gröppchen betrifft, dem auch eine ganze Reihe von blau bemalten Tellern angehört, können wir nicht unbedacht einfach von Brandfehlern sprechen. Eher handelt es sich hier um Effekte, die im Zusammenhang mit einem neuen Verfahren, Keramik zu brennen, gesehen werden müssen.

Dafür spricht auch, dass Kupfer und Mangan bei diesen Stücken gern einen leicht metallischen Glanz annehmen.

Es ist wenig wahrscheinlich, dass der Rückgang der Qualität auf eine anspruchsvolle Kundschaft zurückzuführen ist. Eher ist anzunehmen, dass diese eine neue, ihren Wünschen entsprechendere Ware fand. Hier liegt die Vermutung nahe, dass die zugezogene Konkurrenz Töpfer waren, die sich auf die Herstellung von goldener Keramik verstanden.

Dem würde die Einführung einer neuen Brenntechnik aufs beste entsprechen, denn die lüstrierierte Ware muss nach einem Verfahren gebacken werden, das bis zu der Zeit weder in Paterna noch in Manises bekannt war. Wie aus der Einführung von Marçal Olivar hervorgeht, lässt sich aber auch ab 1342 ein reiches Urkundenmaterial anführen, wonach alles darauf hinweist, dass man in Manises anfangs der Vierzigerjahre lüstrierete Faïences hervorzubringen begann.


Auf kurze Zeit müssen nun die verschiedenen Dekorationsarten nebeneinanderhergelassen sein. Ein Beispiel dafür ist der Fund von Pula auf Sardinien, wo goldene, blaue und

13 M. Olivar, La cerámica trecentista, p. 81.

Schon gegen 1360 muss die Lüsterfabrikation von Manises so berühmt gewesen sein, dass hier nicht nur der Landesfürst Peter IV seine Bestellungen aufgab. Nun beginnen sich auch prominente ausländische Interessenten als Käufer zu melden (cf. S. 117). Und 1383, als Eiximenis seinen Lobspruch schrieb auf die goldene, meisterhaft bemalte Keramik von Manises und nur beiläufig die “obra comuna” von Paterna erwähnt, mag diese (so können wir nach den auf S. 120 erwähnten Stücken der Zeit um 1400 schliessen), so gut wie nur noch blau dekoriert worden sein.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE STAIRCASE MINARET

By J. SCHACHT

More than 20 years ago, I had occasion to point out that the earliest type of minaret in Islam, consisting of a flight of steps leading straight up to the roof of the building at one of its corners, with a small sentry box or lanternlike structure on top of the corner itself, has survived, together with some closely related variants, in the countryside of Egypt and in central and western Anatolia. Then, in 1930, I noticed that the staircase minaret, as a rule reduced to a simple flight of steps along one of the walls of the mosque from outside, is de rigueur in the mosques of the Fulânîs in northern Nigeria, and I traced the transmission of this architectural feature to that remote region from Tunisia (Sousse and the island of Djerba) by way of the oasis of Ouargla. A derived form of the staircase minaret, where instead of the small lantern we find a massive bastion, but still with the essential element of an independent flight of steps leading up to it, occurs in Sousse, in Djerba, in Ouargla, and, in a rudimentary form, also in northern Nigeria.

Since then, I have noticed staircase minarets in a number of other places, and the purpose of this note is, without aiming at completeness in any way, to give some idea of their wide distribution.

For the Maghrib, I will mention the mosque of the village of Beni-Achir, in the territory of the Beni Snoûs (west-southwest of Tlemcen), where a flight of steps along the inside of the east wall leads to a little cell (1 m. by 1.30 m.) at roof level, with a narrow rectangular opening or loophole on each side; from outside, this cell has the appearance of a small bell turret with a pyramidal roof. The building is probably old, dating perhaps from the seventh or eighth century A.H.3

For Syria, we have the Great Mosque of Boşrâ, constructed in 102 A.H. This mosque has a tower minaret, of the well-known square Umayyad type, at its northeast corner, but there is also a flight of steps, outside and along its western wall, rising toward, though not quite reaching, its northwestern corner. It does not seem to have been noticed so far that this is a staircase minaret. There are numerous mosques in Djerba provided both with a tower and with a staircase minaret; the mosques of Arkou and of El May give particularly close parallels.6

For the Sudan, I will refer to the house of the Khalîfa 'Abdallâh in Omdurman, which has a staircase minaret, although there is no special room set apart as a place for prayer there (fig. 1).

For East Africa, I will set out my evidence in more detail, having discussed the survival

3 Ein archaischer Minaret-Typ in Agypten und Anatolien, Ars Islamica, vol. 5 (1938), pp. 52-54.


5 Howard C. Butler, Syrie, Division II, Section A, Leyden, 1919, pp. 289 (photograph), 291 (plan). The greater part, if not the whole, of this staircase is fixed in the original, not the reconstructed, portion of the wall.

6 Sur la diffusion, etc., p. 20 and figs. 25, 27-29.
of another archaic feature in Islamic religious architecture there in a previous paper. I have distinguished there two styles of mosque architecture, one proper to the vanished Islamic civilizations mainly of the Middle Ages, and the other represented by more recent buildings but continuing a very old popular tradition which must have coexisted with the first one. It deserves to be pointed out that the staircase minaret occurs with equal frequency in mosques of both styles. In the great majority of cases, the minaret consists of a flight of steps only, without a lantern.

MOSQUES OF MEDIEVAL STYLE

Kaole (lower site, properly called Pumbuji), northwestern mosque: See Plan A, where the cross-hatched portion denotes a steeply rising mass of stone masonry, presumably the remains of a collapsed turning staircase minaret. Where the length of the wall is not sufficient for the flight of steps to gain roof level, it is carried around a corner; I know at least one example from Egypt, and many more from East Africa (see below).

Kaole (Pumbuji), southeastern mosque: See Plan B, where the cross-hatched portion denotes similar remains of what was probably a staircase minaret outside and along the western wall, leading to the northwestern corner of the building.

Shamiani on Kirweni Island, off Pemba (Mkoani District): The relevant feature has been described as follows: "The mass of the ruins jut out in front of the kibla, on its east side where there seems to have been a tower for the mu’ezzin and stairs leading up to it."}

\[10\] Laurence A. C. Buchanan, The ancient monuments of Pemba, The Zanzibar Museum, Zanzibar (Government Printer), 1932, p. 5. It should be
Kichokochwe, Pemba (Chake Chake District, northern portion): I quote again: "Outside [the western part of the qibla wall] in the [northwest] corner is a tower [sic] for the mu‘ezzin, with steps giving access to it from the raised masonry foundation on which the mosque is built."

Gedi, Great Mosque: The excavator of the site, Mr. Kirkman, says: "From this court [the well court, between the well and the veranda, which is built onto the east side of the mosque proper] steps led up to the veranda and on to the roof of the mosque, from which the call to prayer was given." This would date, according to Mr. Kirkman’s provisional chronology, from about the first half of the tenth century A.H. From my own observation I can say that we have here the remains of a turning staircase minaret, the upper part of which has disappeared; there is nothing to warrant the assumption that the call to prayer was made from the roof of the mosque and not from the top of the minaret.

Ishikani, on the coast of northern Kenya, near the frontier of Somalia: A staircase minaret is clearly visible on a photograph of this ruined mosque which Mr. Kirkman allowed me to see.

I have not noticed minarets in the other mosques of medieval style of which I have knowledge, except for the ruined mosque at Ras Mkumbuu, Pemba, on which the evidence available to me is conflicting.

realized that the author is unaware of the existence of the staircase minaret.

14 F. B. Pearce, *Zanzibar*, London, 1920, p. 370; a sketch plan which Mr. Kirkman allowed me to see in 1953; a letter from Mr. Kirkman of April 27, 1958.

MOSQUES OF MODERN STYLE

Bagamoyo, Great Mosque: The ground plan of this mosque is typical of that of the majority of mosques in East Africa: a prayer hall, preceded by an open forecourt, which in its turn is preceded by a hall with a basin for ablutions. In this particular case, the east part of the forecourt is taken up by an outbuilding containing storerooms, etc., and built onto the south wall of it is a staircase minaret, rising up to roof level (fig. 2).

Bagamoyo, Baluchi Mosque (Hanafi): This mosque has a staircase minaret in the forecourt, rising up to a high terrace.

Kilomo (six miles south-southeast of Bagamoyo): The minaret of this mosque consists of a short wooden ladder leaning against a palm trunk in front of the mosque (fig. 3); the underlying idea is the same as that of the staircase minaret.

Zanzibar Town (Ngambo quarter), Masjid Bi Zrêlî: The same tripartite ground plan as in the Great Mosque of Bagamoyo; staircase minaret in the forecourt, built against the eastern part of the south wall of the prayer hall; it ends at roof level in a balcony that juts out over the street.

Zanzibar Town (Malindi quarter), Masjid Muzähim (with a building inscription of 1235 A.H.): Staircase minaret in the forecourt, built against its eastern wall and leading to the southeast corner of the prayer hall; the last step and the final platform, a few inches above roof level, describe a left turn. I mention this in order to emphasize the difference between a staircase minaret and a utilitarian staircase giving access to the roof.

Zanzibar Town (Malindi quarter), Masjid Ḥalwâ: Tripartite ground plan, staircase minaret occupying the whole length of the

15 Cf. *Ars Orientalis*, vol. 2, p. 159, plan G.
16 The mosque of the Maymans in Bagamoyo has a tower minaret.
east wall of the forecourt and rising away from the prayer hall, so that it reaches roof level above the partition between forecourt and ablution hall.

**Zanzibar Town, Masjid Sayyidi Ḥamūd (Ibāḍi):** Staircase minaret in the forecourt, built against its eastern wall and leading to the southeast corner of the prayer hall; the same staircase gives access to visitors' quarters, a common feature of Ibāḍi mosques in East Africa, on the upper floor of an adjoining building, but that it is indeed a minaret is shown by a small dome covering its upper platform.

**Zanzibar Town, Laghbari Mosque (Jāmi‘ al-aghbari, Ibāḍi):** Turning staircase minaret built against part of the southern wall of the prayer hall and the west wall of the forecourt, rising away from the prayer hall. This minaret is now disused.

I do not count as staircase minarets the flights of steps that lead from the forecourt to the roof from which the call to prayer is made, in the Furdani mosque, the Masjid Kokoni (Malindi quarter), and elsewhere; and in numerous other mosques the call to prayer is made from a slightly raised terrace or from the doorway. But in the whole of Zanzibar Town there are only three mosques provided with minaret towers, as far as I have been able to find out. One of these is the Great Mosque, which has a low, octagonal minaret tower built onto its southeast corner; formerly, the call to prayer was made from the roof, and the minaret was built in 1950 when the original roof was converted into a covered terrace to accommodate the overflow. Of the two other mosques with minaret towers, one, built in 1250 A.H., as a building inscription informs us, is generally called Masjid al-Manāra, after that unusual feature.

**Chake Chake, Pemba, Ibāḍi Mosque:**

Turning staircase minaret built against part of the south wall and the east wall of the forecourt, culminating in a small lantern on the southeast corner of the prayer hall, with openings facing north.

**Pangani, Masjid Mwana Sukali:** Short staircase minaret, not reaching roof level, in the southeast corner of the forecourt, which for reasons of space is situated to the east of the prayer hall (fig. 4).

**Pangani, former Mosque of the Maymans, now Shāfi‘i:** Short staircase minaret outside, built in 1951; formerly, the call to prayer was made from the doorway.

**Bweini** (opposite Pangani on the south bank of Pangani River), Masjid Diwání Wambosasa: Staircase minaret built against the west wall of the forecourt; as this wall is very short, there are two flights of steps running in opposite directions, the second, higher one, leading to the southwest corner of the prayer hall.

**Mombasa:** I have not noticed any staircase minaret proper here; the Great Mosque (Jāmi‘ Bā Shaykh) and the Mandri Mosque (formerly Ibāḍi, now Shāfi‘i, the oldest mosque of Mombasa) have minaret towers, and the Makadara Mosque (Baluchi, Ḥanafi) has a staircase which leads from the forecourt to the roof from where the call to prayer is made.

**Malindi, Masjid Sālim b. Khalfān (Ibāḍi):** (reconstructed about the middle of the nineteenth century on the ruins of an earlier mosque): In the forecourt there are, against the western wall, a minaret staircase which does not give access to the roof, and against the east wall, a utilitarian staircase which leads to the roof.

---

17 The present Great Mosque, built about 1895, has a minaret tower; the site of the former Great Mosque is now an open space, with no trace of the previous building.

18 A second Ibāḍi mosque which I could not enter, called Masjid ‘Ali b. Nūr after a grocer in the neigh-
Fig. 1.—Omdurman, House of the Khalifa 'Abdallah, Staircase Minaret.

Fig. 2.—Bagamoyo, Great Mosque, Staircase Minaret.

Fig. 3.—Kilomo, Wooden Ladder Serving as a Minaret.

Fig. 4.—Pangani, Masjid Mwana Sukali, Staircase Minaret.
Faza, in the Lamu archipelago: A photograph, which Mr. Kirkman allowed me to see, shows that this mosque, apparently of modern construction, has a flight of steps leading to its roof at the southeast corner from outside; the entrance to this flight of steps is through a small locked gatehouse, which shows that it has a flight of steps that leads from the forecourt to the roof from which the call to prayer is made.—The Shela Mosque (Shāfī'i) has a flight of steps leading up to the roof, from which the call to prayer is made. The Great Mosque of Mambrūi, eight miles north-north-east of Malindi (dated 1297 A.H.), has along the outside of its qibla wall a flight of steps leading up to the roof, from which the call to prayer is made.

is meant as a staircase minaret and not as a utilitarian staircase.20

This wide distribution of the staircase minaret obviates the necessity of looking for a special reason for its survival in any given region (excepting special cases such as that of northern Nigeria); it is an archaic feature of Islamic religious architecture which has survived, especially in remote and isolated districts, the demands of urban and metropolitan fashion which have succeeded in identifying, in the minds of most observers, the idea of minaret with that of a tower.

20 For another example of controlling access to an outside staircase minaret, see Ars Islamica, vol. 5, p. 53 and fig. 5.
UN VIEUX POÈME ROMANESQUE Persan: RÉCIT DE WARQAH ET GULSHAH

PAR AHMED ATEŞ

Le récit de Warqah et Gulshah qui commence dans le désert auprès de la Mecque et qui s'achève, après de longues aventures, dans le bonheur, n'est à l'origine, comme nous avons tâché de le montrer dans un article antérieur, que la vie du poète malheureux 'Urwah b. Hizâm al-‘Udhri qui avait vécu aux temps du calife 'Othman (644–656) et du premier calife Umayyade Mu‘awiyyah (661–680), tout au moins ses aventures que les plus anciens savants de la langue et de la littérature arabes nous ont racontées d'après les sources authentiques ou considérées par eux comme telles. Ce récit, après être resté, à ce qu'il paraît, assez longtemps oublié, surgit d'un part avec "Floire et Blanche-fleur" dans la littérature française du Moyen Âge, d'autre part, avec Warqah va Gulshah de Yüsuf-i Maddah, écrit en 770/1371, dans la littérature turque. Aussi, comme nous avons montré brièvement dans l'article mentionné, Mostarli Diyâ‘î, mort en 992/1584, a mis en vers l'histoire de Warqah et Gulshah, mais il semble que cette version ne nous est pas parvenue. Le poète "Azerî" Masîhi (onzième/dix-septième siècle) avait lui aussi mis le même sujet en vers dans le mètre de Laylâ ve Majnûn de Nizâmî. En dehors de ces versions dans la langue turque classique il y en a des version populaires dans la langue vulgaire, qui ont été éditées. Il faut y ajouter une version en prose en turc classique oriental. On voit qu'à mesure que l'on s'approche des temps modernes, les ouvrages dont les sujets sont pris du récit de Warqah et Gulshah deviennent plus nombreux. Mais avant l'ouvrage de Yüsuf-i Maddah on sait très peu de chose sur ce récit. On rencontre seulement dans quelques dictionnaires persans des indications, qui, étant puissées dans des sources anciennes, remontent à des temps plus reculés. Par exemple Burhân-i Tabrizi (mort en 1062/1621) dans son dictionnaire Burhân-i Qâfi' cite les noms de Warqah et de Gulshah. Shu‘ûrî, dans son Farhang-i Shu‘ûrî (complété en 1075/1664–1665) donne quelques détails. À l'article "Gulshah", après avoir dit qu'elle est l'amie de Warqah, il cite un vers de Mawlânâ Jalâladdîn Rûmî (mort en 672/1273) avec un autre de Sûzânî (mort en 569/1173–1174).

Ces indications montrent que le récit de Warqah et Gulshah est bien connu dans la littérature persane, mais elles ne peuvent donner aucune idée sur son ensemble. Il faut donc

4 Ch. Rieu, op. cit., p. 209.
5 Voyez A. Ateş, l'article cité, p. 1.
6 Hikâye-i acibe ez ahvâl-i Gulshâh u Varca, trad. Molla Abdullah Hacîj b. Mir Kerim, Tashkent, 1324, Lithographie. Le traducteur dit dans sa préface qu'il traduit d'un ouvrage en vers persan, mais il ne mentionne pas le nom de son auteur. Une comparaison superficielle montre que ce n'est pas une traduction de 'Ayyûqi. Cet ouvrage est divisé en séances (meclîs), ce qui montre qu'il était destiné à être lu à des petites ou grandes réunions. Il faut dire encore qu'il contient plusieurs morceaux en vers priés à ses héroïs.
7 Lithographie de Newal Kishor, 1305, vol. 2, pp. 331 and 375.
d'autres indications pour bien déterminer les sources du récit et des motifs qui le composent, pour expliquer les différences qu'on rencontre dans ses versions pour éclaircir son histoire et enfin, pour bien tracer son expansion. Car le long délai, qui sépare la forme originale du récit de sa première version qui existe, rend toujours suspectes toutes les théories avancées concernant ces problèmes.

Or le manuscrit de la Bibliothèque de Topkapı Sarayi (section Hazine, No. 841) contenant un poème romanesque persan est très important pour éclaircir quelques-uns des problèmes posés plus haut, étant donné qu'il fut écrit au commencement du cinquième/ontzième siècle. Avant d'expliquer son importance, il serait bon de donner un peu de détails sur le manuscrit. Ceux exemplaire est inscrit dans l'inventaire sous le titre "Sitâyish-i Sultan Mahmûd," titre qui vient du nom de deuxième chapitre de l'ouvrage: Dar sitâyish-i Sultan Mahmûd, rahinahu'lllah, "louange du Sultan Mahmûd, que Dieu lui accorde son miséricorde." Il se compose de 70 feuillets; la reliure en cuir estampé est très simple; son papier est de couleur jaune-brun clair, épais, et peu poli. La dimension du manuscrit est 28,8 cm. sur 21,6 cm.; la dimension de la partie écrite est 23 cm. sur 11,7 cm. Il y a 19 lignes à chaque page. L'écriture est "naskh" circulaire lisible, qui doit dater des septième/treizième/ huitième-quatorzième siècles.

Dans les mots persans les d qui suivent une voyelle sont toujours écrits en dh; on voit quelquefois trois points sur la lettre g, pour la différencier du k. L'encre est de couleur brun-jaunâtre et le texte se trouve dans un cadre de deux lignes rouges qui furent faites après que le texte ait été écrit et les miniatures exécutées.

Dans l'exemplaire, presque à chaque feuillet, il y a une miniature, soixante et onze en tout. Ces miniatures, comme on verra d'après les exemples reproduits, appartiennent à l'époque pré-mongole, dont les exemples sont très peu nombreux. Sans prétendre les décrire ou les analyser, on peut dire qu'elles paraissent un peu primitives; la couleur rouge y est dominante. Dans les représentations des personnages les têtes ont des auréoles qui rappellent à première vue le style des miniatures pré-mongoles. On peut les comparer avec des images de cette époque dont des exemples sont données par E. Kühnel dans son Miniaturmalerei im islamischen Orient (Berlin, 1923). Dans sa conception et sa composition la plante de notre No. 30 (fig. 16) est identique aux plantes des figures 3 et 4 de Kühnel appartenant au treizième siècle. La selle du cheval au premier plan de notre No. 15 (fig. 7) est très semblable à celle du cheval de la figure 7 de Kühnel. L'exemple donné par Kühnel porte la date de 1230. De ces caractéristiques on peut déduire avec certitude que le manuscrit date du septième/treizième siècle. Il faut ajouter qu'à la suite de l'humidité, la plupart des couleurs sont fanées, dispersées et effacées, et quelquefois l'humidité a rendu illisible l'écriture de la page en face des miniatures.

Dans le manuscrit il n'y a pas de colophon; le dernier folio a disparu; celui qui remplace a été réparé, ses bords ont été coupés et un papier plus moderne a été collé sur la place de l'ancien colophon. Mais il est certain qu'il y en avait un sur le feuillet tombé, car la dernière ligne se lit ainsi: "O Dieu miséricordieux au copiste ..." vraisemblablement le premier hémistiche d'un vers

10 Manuscrit en question, fol. 2a.

11 On peut se référer maintenant à la traduction turque que nous devons à S. Kemal Yetkin et Melâhat Özgü, Doğulu İslam Memleketlerinde minyatür, Ankara, 1952 (A. U. İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, No. 2). Pour les auréoles qu'on voit sur la tête des personnes dans les miniatures anciennes on peut voir p. 11.

12 E. Kühnel, op. cit., p. 22.
écrit par le copiste. Quoi qu’il en soit, en tenant compte des caractéristiques de l’écriture et des miniatures, on peut dire avec une probabilité assez forte que le manuscrit provient du septième/treizième siècle.13

L’ouvrage commence par ces vers :

بِنام خُناوَندٍ بَالا وَ يَت
كَهْ آزِ هَشِت دُهُدَهْ هَت
فِروُنَتْ خَالِيْرٍ
بِرِ إِنَاءٍ طَاقٍ نُفُورِي

Par le nom du Maître de ceux qui sont hauts ou bas, que tout ce qui existe est existant par son existence; c’est lui qui fait briller le soleil venant de l’orient et qui éleve l’arc à couleur de nénufar.

Après ces vers sur l’unité de Dieu, il vient un passage de 12 vers d’éloge du Prophète. Ce passage n’a pas de titre et débute par ces vers :

كَرْ اَلْخَاكِرُ الرَّسِّلِ نَكْرِي سِرْم
رُومُ مُنْطَقِيْرَا شِنْعَيْ عَامُ ومِنْ
شُيُعُ اَمْ خَاتِمٍ إِنْيَا
سِهْرُ رَسَالَةٍ مِّهَ إِنْفَأ

Si Tu n’enlèves pas ma tête de la poussière des routes, j’irai emmener comme intercesseur Le Prophète, Mustafâ. Il est intercesseur des peuples, le dernier des prophètes, le ciel de la prophétie, la lune des gens purs. . .

Après cela on passe tout de suite à la louange du Sultan Mahmûd, souverain auquel l’ouvrage est dédié.14 Ce passage commence par ces vers :

دل بَشاَهَان شَه خُروان
كَهْ رَائِشَ بَنْدِسْت وَ بِجَشْ جْوَان
بِرْكَيْرِيْ كَهْ سَادِرْ هُمِ رَائِأٌ اوَي

13 Pour les écritures ressemblantes à celle de notre manuscrit on peut voir A. J. Arberry, Specimens of Arabic and Persian paleography, London, 1939, pls. No. 26 (daté de 637/1240), No. 27 (daté de 697/1298), et No. 28 (daté de 714/1314); A. Ates, Sindbadhnam, Istanbul, 1948, p. 91 et suiv. (Une page d’un manuscrit daté de 656/1252.)
14 Manuscrit Hazine, No. 841, fol. 2a.

Il est le coeur des rois, roi des rois dont les idées sont hautes et le bonheur jeune, le pas de la grandeur que sa pensée produit est sur la cime de la septième sphère. Que toujours son bonheur lui soit ainsi propice et que le Dieu du monde le garde . . .

continue avec ces vers, qui contiennent le nom du roi et de l’auteur: 15

همي تا بمحكر ميبن ذق
زورندن ومال وز تكتب
تويعونا كرن هوش است وذ يرن
بختست يبوند بشت كأرن
بدر بدر مكان غنزي بجوي
بجاه محل مكان محمود كوي
إب القاسم آتى دين ودول
هناءه عالم ابر مال
بيند جهان وتاير سهر
جنو رائذ وفزئان وخوب جهر
در اقفال ودر فضل ودر هر في
چه نست در زير براهن

Qu’il ne voie pas, jusqu’au jour de la résurrection, de la peine (provenant) de (son) fils, de (sa) fortune, de (son) royaume et de (son) trésor. O, toi, ‘Ayyûqî, si tu as l’intelligence et le jugement, attaches-toi à son service et engage-toi dans l’éloge. Cherches avec sincérité l’amour du sultan conquérant, dis avec toute ton âme le louange du Sultan Mahmoud, Abîl-Qâsim, ce roi des états et de la religion, l’empereur du monde, le commandant des nations. Le monde ne verra pas et le ciel n’engendrera pas quelqu’un qui soit aussi généreux, sage et au beau visage que lui. Au point de vue du bonheur, de la vertu et de chaque branche de la science il est un monde sous une chemise.

Abîl-Qâsim Mahmoud dont il s’agit ici, doit être certainement le Sultan Mahmoud le Ghaznévide (les années de son règne sont 387-421/997-1030). Car ce souverain doit être un personnage ayant vécu avant le septième/treizième siècle et auquel on puisse dédier un poème romanesque en persan. On peut mon-
trier à cette époque plusieurs souverains portant le nom d’Abu’l-Qâsim Maḥmûd, par exemple, Abu’l-Qâsim Maḥmûd b. Muḥammad (511–525/1117–1133) qui est considéré comme le premier roi des Seljûqs d’Iraq et Abu’l-Qâsim Maḥmûd b. Il-Arslan (monté sur le trône en 586/1172 et mort en 589/1193).16 Mais le style de Wârqâh wa Gulsâh ne convient qu’à la période des Ghaznèvides. Car, comme on le sait très bien, dans la littérature persane un grand changement de style se produit après la période ghaznévide, ce qui permet de discerner très facilement les œuvres littéraires de cette période de celles de la période postérieure. D’après les caractéristiques de style de cet ouvrage que l’on tâchera d’analyser brièvement plus tard, il est impossible de lui assigner une période plus tardive et rien que les vers cités plus haut suffisent à montrer clairement que nous sommes en face d’un ouvrage du temps des Ghaznèvides. Et parmi les membres de cette dynastie il n’y a pas d’autre Abu’l-Qâsim Maḥmûd. Le poète dont le nom ou le surnom littéraire était ‘Ayyûqi, comme le montre les vers cités plus haut, parle aussi de ses relations avec Sultân Maḥmûd et lui dédie son ouvrage avec une sorte d’orgeuil.17

17 Même manuscrit, fol. 2b–3a.

Que le Dieu du monde lui prête de l’aide et que son Dieu le garde de tous les maux. Cette plante que tu avais plantée au commencement du printemps, à la fête, t’a donnée à toi des fruits. Dans le jardin de réjouissance, avec une fortune heureuse, personne n’a planté un arbre plus rare et plus joli. C’est un arbre dont la racine est la science; c’est un arbre dont toutes les branches donnent de repos. . . A chacune de ses feuilles il y a mille beautés, à son odeur il y a mille douceurs. Maintenant que cette plante de rose a donné ses fruits, emmènes-en au souverain un souvenir. Et dis que ce bouquet de roses appartient à ton règne, et sur chaque feuille de rose ton nom est inscrit . . .

On comprend que ‘Ayyûqi s’était assuré la protection du Sultân Maḥmûd à un printemps quelconque et il avait mis ce récit en vers pour le lui présenter à la première fête, peut-être à la fête de Mîhrâgân au commencement de l’automne. ‘Ayyûqi commence après cela le récit. Dans le premier chapitre qui porte le titre de āghâz-i gisâh (“le début du récit”),18 après avoir démontré la valeur et l’importance de la parole il dit que jusque-là, personne n’avait raconté cette histoire, c’est-à-dire ne l’avait mis en vers. Peu après il ajoute qu’il a pris son sujet, le récit de Wârqâh et Gulsâh des relations et livres arabes. Il ressort de soi-même que ce récit est entré dans la poésie persane pour la première fois par cet ouvrage de ‘Ayyûqi. Enfin commence le récit par ces vers:

18 Même manuscrit, fol. 2b–3a.

J’ai ainsi lu ce récit ravisant dans les anecdotes arabes et les livres de Jarîr: Quand le Prophète de Ābâh—c’est-à-dire Muḥammad-alla de la Mecque à Yathrib (Médine) et que la religion devint forte . . .
Il raconte que parmi les tribus arabes il y avait une qui s’appelait Banû Shaybah dont les chefs étaient deux frères, Hilâl et Humâm. Le passage où 'Ayyûqî présente ses héros est le suivant:

Merci de ne pas vouloir
L’autre... (suite de la citation)

Les noms de ces deux chefs étaient l’un Hilâl et l’autre Humâm... Celui dont le nom était Hilâl avait une fille comme les houris... Son père l’avait appelée Gulshâh, car elle avait une joue comme le soleil et était de la famille des houris... L’autre avait un fils à beau visage, avec cent beautés et éclat, et son nom était Warqah.

Le récit finit par ces vers:

جِنَّةٌ دُوَّانٌ فَتَىٰ الرَّحْمَةِ
رَجُلٌ نَهْدَاءٌ كَأَنَّهُ يَحَقُّ
أَنْ يَعْرَفَ دَاوُرَاهُ بَايِنَاءَ وَعَامِ
تُنَّ أَيْضَّ بِعَلَيْهِ الْوَلَادَةِ

C’était ainsi cette histoire étonnante (prise) des histoires en langue arabe et des livres arabes. L’éloge sur Muhammad, que la paix soit lui, de la part de 'Ayyûqî et de ses fidèles, les nobles et les vulgaires!

Je n’ai pu trouver aucun renseignement sur ce poète 'Ayyûqî qui, pour la première fois dans la littérature persane, a mis en vers le récit de Warqah et Gulshâh. Seul 'Awfî, dans son Lubâb al-albâb, dans le dixième chapitre consacré aux poètes qui ont vécu après les règnes de Malikshâh et de Sanjâr (465–552/1072–1157) mentionne un poète nommé Majd al-dîn 'Ayyûq et cite un “gazal” à lui en cinq distiques dont le premier est celui-ci:

جُنْدنْ صَحِيدُ مَايْدَ بايَايْ يَبْتَ سَوْح
كَمْ ذِي بَيْلَةٍ رَاحَ كَأَنَّ هَيَتَهْ آنُ غَيَّاءٍ رَوح

Si ce poète a vraiment vécu à l’époque que lui assigne 'Awfî, il ne peut pas être l’auteur de ce Warqah wa Gulshâh, parce que son époque est trop tardive et son surnom 'Ayyûq n’est pas identique à 'Ayyûqî. Il n’est pas étonnant qu’un poète comme 'Ayyûqî ne soit pas cité dans les sources de la littérature persane. Car, par exemple, des 400 poètes de la cour de Mahmoud le Ghâznûvidj, dont Dâlûtishâh parle, peut-être avec un peu d’exagération, nous ne connaissons que les noms de quelques uns.

Cependant nous avons une preuve assez certaine qui montre que 'Ayyûqî a vécu au cinquième/onzième siècle ou un peu avant. C’est qu’il est cité dans le dictionnaire très connu d’Abû Manşûr ‘Alî b. Aḥmâd Asâdî-i Tûsî, le K. Lughat-i Furs. En effet 'Ayyûqî est cité deux fois dans ce dictionnaire des mots rares persans. Puisque l’ouvrage de Asâdî-i Tûsî a été écrit vers le milieu de cinquième/onzième siècle, il en va de soi que 'Ayyûqî a vécu à ce temps-là ou un peu avant. L’auteur des vers cité comme exemple par Asâdî-i Tûsî et le 'Ayyûqî qui a écrit ce Warqah wa Gulshâh et l’a dédié au Sultân Mahmoud, doivent être sans doute le même personnage, parce qu’il est impossible que deux poètes contemporains et du même milieu littéraire portent le même nom ou surnom poétique.

Cet ouvrage de 'Ayyûqî est assez important soit pour le littérature persane, soit pour...

Le mètre employé dans ce Warqah wa Gulshâh est comme celui de Wâmiq wa ‘Adhrâ de Unṣuri, celui du Şâhnâmeh, c'est-a-dire: fa’ülun fa’ülun fa’ülun fa’ül, ce qui est une preuve de plus de l’ancienneté de cet ouvrage. En effet il est bien connu qu’après la période Ghaznévide ce mètre ne fut plus employé pour des sujets d’amour.

Enfin cet ouvrage est assez précieux au point de vue littéraire. On peut dire que ‘Ayyûqî ne réussit pas dans le genre du ghasal dont il donne quelques exemples dans ce récit, mais il est très habile à raconter les événements sans combler les vers avec des mots et des particules insignifiants. Surtout dans les descriptions des scènes de guerre et de la situation morale et matérielle de ses héros pendant la guerre ou dans l’excitation de ses héros pour le combat, il montre une maîtrise vraiment remarquable. Avec ces particularités de style dont malheureusement il n’est pas possible d’entrer ici dans les détails, on peut considérer le Warqah wa Gulshâh de ‘Ayyûqî comme une oeuvre littéraire vraiment réussie et précieuse.

Quant à l’importance de cet ouvrage pour l’histoire de la littérature turque, elle est encore plus évidente. En effet, comme on l’a exposé au début de cette article, il sert à élucider plusieurs difficultés de l’histoire d’un récit qui après avoir été un sujet chanté plusieurs fois dans la littérature classique turque, finit par devenir un roman populaire. On ne peut pas étudier tous les changements et les thèmes et motifs du récit avec détail; on n’exposera que les changements et les différences entre l’ouvrage de ‘Ayyûqî et celui de Yûsuf-i Meddâh qui a mis en vers le même sujet, pour la première fois dans la littérature turque. Et pour cela on donnera ici un résumé assez court de ce récit de Warqah wa Gulshâh tel qu’il est raconté par ‘Ayyûqî.24


24 Pour montrer assez clairement ce que signifient les figures et la place où elles se trouvent, j’ai indiqué, entre deux parenthèses, en premier lieu le numéro d’ordre des figures et en deuxième lieu celui des feuillets.
ne le refuse pas, mais demande un délai d'une semaine.

Le matin, les Banû Shaybah qui ont passé une nuit affreuse (6, 9a) voient que Gulshâh n'est pas là. Warqah, plus souffrant que les autres, s'adresse à son père pour demander son aide pour sauver Gulshâh (7, 9b). Les Banû Shaybah s'arment et vont à la recherche des Banû Dabyah (8, 10a). Rabi', entendant la venue des Banû Shaybah, se prépare et les deux tribus engagent une lutte sanglante (9, 11a; 10, 12a; 11, 13a; 12, 13b). Rabi' tue le père de Warqah dans le combat (13, 15a; 14, 15b). Alors Warqah entre dans le champ de bataille (15, 16b) et engage une lutte longue et acharnée avec son rival (16, 17b; 17, 18a; 18, 18b). Warqah fut blessé au bras et Rabi' à la hanche. Cependant Gulshâh s'habille comme un homme et s'échappe de la maison de Rabi' (19, 19b). Elle accourt au champ de bataille, le visage couvert, et regarde la lutte (20, 20a). Warqah fait une charge, mais son cheval bronche et il tombe à terre. Rabi' le rejoint tout de suite et au lieu de le tuer, sur sa prière, le fait captif (21, 20b). Gulshâh découvre son visage (22, 21b). Rabi', croyant qu'elle est venue le contempler, est très heureux. Mais elle le tue d'un coup de lance (23, 22a) et sauve Warqah.

Rabi' avait deux fils qui voulurent venger leur père. Gulshâh remplaça Warqah, blessé et très fatigué de la lutte, entra dans le champ de combat et tua le fils aîné de Rabi' d'un coup de lance (24, 23b). Puis vint l'autre fils, Ghâlib (25, 24b). Pendant la lutte, en voyant le visage de Gulshâh, il devint amoureux d'elle et ne voulant pas la tuer, l'attrapa (25, 25b) et l'emporta au campement de sa tribu. Pendant la nuit Warqah alla au campement et entra dans la tente de Ghâlib où il le vit avec Gulshâh (27, 26b; 28, 27a). Il le tue d'un coup de sabre (29, 28a) et s'enfuit avec Gulshâh, sans que personne ne s'en aperçût. Le lendemain l'armée des Banû Shaybah arriva et vit que la tribu des Banû Dabyah s'était dispersée.

Warqah, devenu pauvre à la suite de ce désastre, ne pouvait demander la main de Gulshâh. Il avait un esclave (30, 29b). Il l'envoya auprès de ses parents pour lui apporter de l'argent suffisant pour ses noces, mais il ne revint pas. Pendant ce temps, l'amour de Warqah et Gulshâh fut divulgué et devint sujet de conversations. Plusieurs personnes demandèrent la main de Gulshâh, ce qui attisa les souffrances de Warqah. Il s'adressa à la mère de Gulshâh (31, 30b) et la supplia de lui donner la main de Gulshâh. Elle alla trouver son mari, oncle de Warqah, pour obtenir son consentement à marier sa fille avec Warqah (32, 31a), mais il refusa à cause de sa pauvreté. Warqah insista, sur quoi son oncle lui conseilla d'aller auprès du roi de Yémen, nommé Mundhir, qui était son oncle maternel. Warqah, joyeux de trouver un moyen, se mit à faire les préparatifs pour ce long voyage, fit ses adieux à Gulshâh (33, 32a; 34, 33a; 35, 33b) et lui donna une bague; les parents de Gulshâh lui promirent de ne pas la marier à une autre personne.

Warqah, continuant son chemin vers le Yémen, plein de souffrance et d'espoir, fit la rencontre d'une caravane et apprit que les rois de Bahrayn et de 'Adan avaient fait une expédition contre le Yémen et assiégeaient la ville et que la guerre continuait encore. Il entra dans la ville pendant une nuit et trouva le vizir (36, 34b), qui lui apprit que le roi, son oncle maternel, était tombé captif aux mains des ennemis. Avec mille hommes que le vizir lui procura, il sortit des murailles de la ville de Yémen pour le combat (37, 35b; 38, 36a) et tua 63 personnes (39, 37b; 40, 38b).

Dans cette partie du récit il y a une lacune qui provient, il paraît, de la faute du copiste qui a omis quelques pages. Le lendemain, de bon matin il sortit de nouveau de la ville pour la guerre; mais les deux armées de Bahrayn et
de 'Adan voyant leur rois tués, s’étaient mis en fuite (41, 39b) et Warqah revint avec un grand butin auprès du roi de Yémen, qui le combla d’argent et de richesses.

D’autre part, il y avait un roi dans les confins de Shâm (Damas) qui était tombé amoureux de Gulshâh par oui-dire. Il sortit de sa ville déguisé en riche marchand. Il visita les tribus en distribuant de l’argent. Enfin il arriva dans la tribu de Gulshâh (42, 40a). Il donne un grand festin et invite tout le monde. Une fois il vit Gulshâh sortant de sa tente et son amour en devint plus fort (43, 41a). Alors il demanda sa main à son père qui le refusa. Il envoie une vieille femme avec des cadeaux très précieux à sa mère (44, 42a). Elle consentit à donner sa fille en mariage et persuada son mari aussi. Après un festin (45, 43a), le roi de Shâm se marie avec Gulshâh et tout le monde jure de cacher ce mariage. Gulshâh en entendant que son père la mariait avec ce marchand n’accepta pas ce mariage et tombe évanouie de souffrance (46, 43b; 47, 44b). Mais son père insiste et elle doit suivre son mari à Shâm. Avant son départ elle donne la bague à un esclave et lui demande de la remettre à Warqah (48, 45a). Elle ne se soumet pas aux désirs et droits de son mari, veut se tuer, mais son mari se contente de sa présence et de sa vue. Après le départ de Gulshâh, une nuit ses parents prennent un mouton, l’égorgent (49, 46a) et le matin feignent de pleurer; son père fait une cérémonie funèbre à laquelle toute la tribu participe avec tristesse et enterrer le mouton comme si c’était le corps de Gulshâh.

Warqah revient de Yémen fort riche. On lui dit que Gulshâh était morte. Il s’évanouit, frappé par un douleur insupportable (50, 47b). Après avoir repris connaissance, il va visiter le tombeau (51, 48a) sur lequel il passe tout son temps. Cependant arrive la fortune du Yémen avec une armée. Warqah renvoie l’armée ne gardant qu’un esclave, un cheval et une série d’armes. Son oncle et son épouse, répents de ce qu’ils avaient fait, voulurent le marier (52, 49a). Mais il refusa. Une jeune fille de la tribu qui savait le secret vint chez Warqah et lui raconta tout. Il ouvrit la tombe et, ne trouvant que les os de mouton (53, 50a) comprit la vérité. Il alla auprès de son oncle et l’insulta. Après quoi, sans rien dire à aucune personne, il s’arma, monta sur son cheval, et se mit en marche sur la route de Shâm (54, 51a). Alors qu’il était assez près de la ville, il fut attaqué par près de quarante voleurs. Quoiqu’il les ait tous tués, il fut blessé en plusieurs endroits. Il tomba de son cheval près d’une fontaine à la porte de la ville.

Le roi de Shâm, l’époux de Gulshâh, qui passait par là au retour d’une chasse, le vit et, ayant pris pitié de lui, l’emmena à son palais (55, 52a). Quand il reprit ses sens, on lui demanda qui il était. Pour ne pas se faire connaître il répondit qu’il s’appelait Naṣr b. ʿAḥmad, qu’il était de la tribu de Khuzâ’a et qu’il s’occupait de commerce; puis il raconte l’assaut des voleurs. Le roi rapporta tout ce qu’il avait entendu à Gulshâh et lui demanda de la faire son hôte. Gulshâh, qui avait déjà l’habitude de donner l’hospitalité à tous les étrangers, dans l’espoir de prendre des nouvelles de Warqah, accepta cette proposition bien volontiers (56, 53b). Après quelques jours, Warqah demanda à la servante qui était destinée à son service où était Gulshâh. Apprenant que le palais dans lequel il se trouvait lui appartenait, il pria la servante d’apporter à Gulshâh la bague que celle-ci lui avait fait rendu. La servante refusa, mais un autre jour Warqah demanda une coupe de lait; il y jeta la bague et demanda à la servante d’emmener du lait dans cette coupe quand Gulshâh en demandera, et de dire, si elle se met en colère, qu’elle n’avait pas aperçu la bague et qu’il était possible que la bague vienne du blessé. Quand Gulshâh eut bu du lait (57, 55a) et vu
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la bague (58, 55b), elle demanda d’où venait la bague et la servante lui dit qu’elle avait pu être tombé du visiteur. Gulshâh se réjouit; pour être sûr de son identité, elle voulut le voir de loin, mais en se revoyant, tous deux s’évanouirent (59, 56a). Après quoi Gulshâh appela le roi et lui fit connaître Warqah. Ils causèrent ensemble (60, 57b). Puis le roi les laissa seuls, mais les observa d’une cachette. Ils ne firent que se plaindre mutuellement de leurs souffrances (61, 58b). Le roi ne vit rien de blâmable dans leur conduite et fut convaincu de leur amour.

Warqah, qui sur les insistances de Gulshâh, avait consenti à rester encore quelques jours après s’être complètement rétabli, voulut partir. Il dit qu’il était tout-à-fait confus par les bienfaits et la bienveillance du roi de Shâm, mari de Gulshâh. Gulshâh lui explique qu’elle ne pourra pas supporter cette séparation. Le roi venant auprès d’eux insista lui aussi pour que Warqah ne les quitte pas (62, 59b; 63, 61a). Warqah répond qu’il doit visiter le tombeau de son père et le faire réparer, s’il le faut. Alors le roi lui donna un cheval, des armes et d’autres choses, et il partit après avoir fait ses adieux (64, 62a). En route il chantait ses souffrances dans des poèmes. Une fois, épuisé de douleur, il tomba de son cheval. Il perdit de temps en temps connaissance. Enfin il expira en chantant son amour. Après midi il arriva deux cavaliers, avec l’aide desquels son esclave enterra le malheureux amant et qu’il prit d’informer Gulshâh de la mort de Warqah.

Les cavaliers, arrivés à la ville, passèrent devant le palais du roi et récitaient à haute voix un poème sur la mort de Warqah. Questionnés par Gulshâh, ils l’informent de son sort. Elle commença à chanter son malheur (66, 65a) et demanda au roi de l’emmener auprès de la tombe de Warqah. Quand ils y arrivèrent (67, 65b), elle se jeta par terre, et, dans la violence de ses mouvements, elle se déchira le visage et le corps (68, 66b); finalement elle aussi expira de douleur. Le roi leur fit construire un Tombeau (69, 68a) que tout le monde nomma "le tombeau des Amants" et que l’on vint visiter.


On voit clairement par ce résumé que bien qu’il y ait de petites différences de détail, le récit, dans son ensemble, est le même que celui que raconte Yûsuf-i Maddâh. Seulement Yûsuf-i Maddâh remplace les combats des tribus et les pillages par des guerres des musulmans contre les infidèles. Le seul motif que j’avais cru devoir avoir été ajouté par Yûsuf-i Maddâh, le motif du prolongement de la vie des amants, existe dans le récit de ‘Ayyûqi, avec cette différence que dans le récit de Yûsuf-i Maddâh, ce sont quatre amis du Prophète qui prêtent dix ans chacun de leur vie; dans le récit de ‘Ayyûqi c’est le roi de Shâm qui prêta quarante ans de sa vie. Dans ce cas ce motif aussi se trouvait peut-être dans le récit arabe.

Pour montrer l’identité, dans les lignes les plus générales, du récit de Warqah et Gulshâh avec celui de Floire et Blanchefleur, roman francois du Moyen-Age, nous ne ferons ici que répéter son résumé (d’après Ch. M. des Granges):

Floire, fils d’un roi païen aime Blanchefleur, fille
d’une captive chrétienne. Le roi veut faire croire à son fils que Blanchefleur est morte, et il lui montre un tombeau qu’il a fait construire pour le jeune fille. Mais Floire ouvre le tombeau et le trouvant vide, part à la recherche de Blanchefleur, qu’il finit, après de romanesques aventures, par rejoindre chez le sultan de Babylone et qu’il épouse.

Après la découverte de Warqah wa Gulshâh de ‘Ayyüqi nous pouvons répéter avec plus de sureté ce que nous avions énoncé sur l’histoire de ce récit. On voit que le récit de Warqah et Gulshâh est à son origine la vie d’un poète arabe du premier/septième siècle ‘Urwa b. Hizâm al-‘Udhrî, qui a pris la forme d’un roman populaire d’amour dans le milieu parlant l’arabe. Mais il semblerait que les noms de ses héros étaient déjà changés. Il est allé d’un part par l’Espagne en France où il a prêté son sujet à Floire et Blanchefleur; d’autre part dans les pays orientaux de l’empire Abbaside et au cinquième/onzième siècle il fut mis en vers, certainement pour la première fois, par ‘Ayyüqi. Il est très probable que cet ouvrage même de ‘Ayyüqi, ou bien un autre qui était presque identique à celui-ci, a donné naissance au quatorzième siècle à l’ouvrage de Yûsuf-i Maddâh, ouvrage turc en vers. Depuis ce siècle, le récit fut plusieurs fois mis en vers, ou raconté en prose, mais dans un style très recherché, par des poètes Turcs d’Anatolie ou du domaine Turc Oriental et enfin il est devenu un roman populaire turc d’amour et d’aventures.
EXPLICATION DES FIGURES

(Le premier chiffre est le numéro d'ordre des figures, le deuxième celui du folio sur lequel elles se trouvent.)
Fig. 1.—1, 3b: Une scène de bazar montrant quatre boutiques; la première (de gauche à droite) peut-être une bijouterie, la deuxième une herboristerie—droguerie, le troisième une boucherie et la dernière une boulangerie avec un personnage qui prend le pain du four; fond bleu; inscription: "Représentation du campement des Banü Shayba."

2, 4a: Warqah et Gulshâh devant leur précepteur assis sur un trône; fond doré; inscription: "Représentation des cousins et du précepteur."

3, 6a: Scène de guerre; fond sans couleur, c'est-à-dire, couleur du papier du manuscrit; inscription: "Attaque nocturne de Rabî' b. 'Adnân."

Fig. 2.—4, 7b: Scène de guerre; inscription: "Représentation de l'attaque nocturne de Daby (!) b. 'Adnân."

Fig. 3.—5, 8b: Gulshâh dans la tente de Rabî', assis sur un trône, auprès duquel il y a une servante; à gauche et à droite quatre serviteurs apportant des cadeaux à Gulshâh; fond sans couleur.

6, 9a: Champ de bataille après la guerre; fond rouge; inscription: "Description de l'état des Banü Shayba, tués ou blessés, pendant (lisez: après) l'attaque nocturne."

7, 9b: Intérieur de la maison (ou de la tente) du vieux père de Gulshâh, assis sur un trône; devant lui Warqah debout; à l'extérieur de la porte, le portier et deux hommes avec un cheval; fond sans couleur; miniature très endommagée.

8, 10a: Départ des Banü Shaybah pour la guerre de vengeance; tous les chevaux sont de couleurs différentes; fond doré.
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(Voyez Explication des Figures.)
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Fig. 4.—9, 11a: Scène de guerre contenant quatre cavaliers et quatre personnages dont deux sont morts et tombés à terre; fond vert; miniature très endommagée.

Fig. 5.—10, 12a: Une autre scène de la même guerre; fond rouge; inscription: "La guerre des Banû Shaybah avec les Banû Dâbya."

11, 13a: Une autre scène de guerre. Rabî' coupe la tête de son adversaire; au milieu de l'image un renard.

Fig. 6.—12, 13b: Une autre scène de la même guerre; parmi les cavaliers il y a un renard et un autre animal ressemblant un dragon; fond bleu, avec nuages de type chinois.

13, 15a: Scène de la lutte du père de Warqah et de Rabî'; derrière eux leurs écuyers et un lapin entre eux; fond rouge.

14, 15b: Rabî' tue le père de Warqah; à droite et à gauche, des fleurs pour remplir l'espace; fond sans couleur.
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Fig. 7.—15, 16b: Warqah prend dans ses bras son père Humâm, tué; à droite deux chevaux sur lesquels il y a trois oiseaux; dans le coin gauche nuages; fond sans couleur.

16, 17b: La lutte entre Warqah et Rabî'; à coté de Warqah il y a un cyprès et un oiseau, à coté de Rabî' une plante à fleurs et trois oiseaux.

Fig. 8.—17, 18a: Une autre scène de lutte entre Warqah et Rabî'; au milieu un cyprès, et des plantes; à droite et à gauche, des oiseaux; le cheval de Warqah porte une cottes de maille; fond rouge.

18, 18b: Une autre scène de la même lutte; le cheval de Warqah est blessé; fond rouge.

Fig. 9.—19, 19b: Gulshâh fuyant du palais de Rabî'; un lapin au milieu des pieds du cheval; à droite la porte et les murs d'un palais; fond sans couleur.

20, 20a: La contemplation de Gulshâh, la lutte entre Warqah et Rabî'; un lapin entre les pieds du cheval de Rabî'; derrière lui, un oiseau; derrière Gulshâh trois oiseaux aux positions diverses; fond sans couleur.

21, 20b: Warqah est pris par Rabî'; on voit un autre cavalier qui doit être Gulshâh déguisée; fond sans couleur.
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Fig. 10,—22, 21b: Gulshâh découvre son visage; en face Rabî’ sur le cheval, derrière lui Warqah, mi-nu et lié; fond de couleur violette contenant des figures et ornements de la même couleur, mais plus claire.

Fig. 11.—23, 22a: Gulshâh tue Rabî’ en enfonçant la lance dans sa poitrine; quatre cavaliers et Warqah lié; fond bleu foncé; inscription: “Gulgshâh tue Ibn ’Adnân, sauve Warqah.”

Fig. 12.—24, 23b: Gulshâh tue le fils de Rabî’; à droite un oiseau ressemblant à une grue et une plante décorative; de l’autre côté des plantes à fleurs; fond rouge foncé.

25, 24b: La lutte de Gulshâh avec Ghâlib, autre fils de Rabî’; sous le ventre du cheval de Gulshâh un chien; fond sans couleur.
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Fig. 13.—26, 25b: Lutte de Gulshâh avec Ghâlib, à pied; d’un côté, le cheval de Gulshâh, la gorge coupée, et de l’autre, celui de Ghâlib, les deux pieds coupés; dans les coins, des armes; fond sans couleur.

Fig. 14.—27, 26b: L’entrée de Warqah dans le campement d’ennemi pour sauver Gulshâh; au milieu une tente, à côté une porte, à droite Warqah, à gauche un cheval; fond sans couleur.

Fig. 15.—29, 28a: Warqah coupe la tête de Ghâlib; Gulshâh est debout; à droite une porte et des plantes à fleurs.

Fig. 28, 27a: Intérieur de la même scène; Ghâlib assis sur un trône, un sabre dans une main, une coupe de vin dans l’autre; devant lui Gulshâh; auprès de la tente une porte avec un portier, dehors Warqah; fond sans couleur.
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Fig. 16.—30, 29b: Warqah sur un trône avec son esclave; des oiseaux et des plantes remplissent l’espace.
31, 30b: Warqah parle avec la mère de Gulshâh; un trône vide sur lequel il y a deux coussins et des étoffes, trois oiseaux et une plante à fleurs dans les parties vides; fond sans couleur.
Fig. 17.—32, 31a: Entretien de la mère de Gulshâh avec son mari assis sur un trône; à droite une table à trois pieds sur laquelle il y a des fruits, et une porte; fond bleu, nuage de grechinois.

33, 32a: Visite d’adieux de Warqah à Gulshâh, avant son départ pour le Yémen; intérieur d’une tente, à droite une porte, à gauche une plante à fleurs et des oiseaux; devant eux un chat; inscription: “Warqah et sa Gulshâh.”
Fig. 18.—34, 33a: Même scène; intérieur d’une tente (ou d’une maison), à gauche une porte et un portier; fond rouge; inscription: “Serment de fidélité de Warqah et de Gulshâh.”
Planche 7

Fig. 19.—35, 33b: Même scène sous un cyprès avec un oiseau; à gauche et à droite, des plantes; à gauche un coq et un corbeau en position de combat.

Fig. 20.—36, 34b: Entrée de Warqah dans la ville de Yémen et Warqah parlant avec le vizir (deux tableaux unis); à droite un cheval en repos, et une personne qui entre (Warqah); à gauche deux tentes, dans l'une se trouve le vizir et dans l'autre Warqah avec une chandelle; derrière les tentes deux chevaux avec un sac à nourriture et un garde.

37, 35b: La sortie de Warqah armé des murs de Yémen, entouré de deux cavaliers.
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Fig. 21.—38, 36b: Warqah au combat ; près de lui, un porte-étandard, derrière lui, deux personnages sur chameaux battant de grands tambours ; devant lui, deux cavaliers et piétons ; fond rouge ; inscription : "L’armée de Warqah disperse celle de Bahrayn et de ‘Adan."

Fig. 22.—39, 37b: Lutte de Warqah avec un guerrier de ‘Adan ; fond rouge foncé.

Fig. 23.—42, 40a: Roi de Shām déguisé en marchand ; deux tentes, dans la plus grande desquelles il est assis sur un trône ; fond sans couleur.
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Fig. 24.—41, 39b: Scène de guerre; Warqah met en défaite l’armée de Bahrayn et de ‘Adan et les pursuit.

Fig. 25.—43, 41a: Deux tentes; dans l’une, le roi de Shâm assis sur le trône; l’autre est vide, Gulshāh étant à l’extérieur; fonds sans couleur; inscription: “Gulshāh sort de la tente.”

Fig. 26.—44, 42a: Intérieur d’une tente, à gauche et à droite deux plantes; fond sans couleur; inscription: “La vieille femme vient et apporte de l’or à la femme de Hilāl.”
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Planche 10

Fig. 27.—45, 43a: Une réception chez le roi de Shām assis sur son trône; le premier des quatre personnes assises est Hilāl, père de Gulshāh; fond rouge; inscription: "Le roi de Shām s’assoit."

Fig. 28.—46, 43b: Évanouissement de Gulshāh en entendant que son père l’a donnée comme épouse au roi; intérieur d’une tente, à droite un lapin et un canard, à gauche deux oiseaux (peut-être des faucons) et des fleurs; fond sans couleur; inscription: "Et elle perd connaissance."

Fig. 29.—47, 44b: Gulshāh souffrante dans sa tente; à droite sa mère assise; à gauche, deux chats mordant la queue l’un de l’autre; inscription: "La mère de Gulshāh."

48, 45a: Gulshāh avec un esclave auquel elle donne une bague à remettre à Warqah; derrière elle un guépard (?) et des plantes; fond sans couleur.
Planche II

Fig. 30.—49, 46a: Intérieur d'une tente où on se prépare à cacher un mouton égorgé à la place du corps de Gulshâh ; à droite Hilâl, père de Gulshâh et à gauche sa mère en deuil; tous deux en deuil; fond bleu, avec des figures; inscription: "Ils cachent le mouton."

50, 47b: Évanouissement de Warqah apprenant la soi-disant mort de Gulshâh; derrière lui, Hilâl pleurant, et son épouse en deuil; fond rouge, avec des décorations en bleu, parmi lesquelles des têtes d'animaux et d'un homme.

Fig. 31.—51, 48a: On amène Warqah à la tombe du mouton; deux personnes aident Warqah; au milieu la tombe, à gauche Hilâl pleurant et, derrière lui, sa femme dans la même attitude; fond sans couleur.

Fig. 32.—52, 49a: Visite de Hilâl à Warqah; derrière lui une souris dont la queue a été attrapé par un chat, et une plante dans laquelle on distèrme une main, une pomme et une tête de singe; fond sans couleur.
(Voyez Explication des Figures.)
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Fig. 33—53, 50a: Warqah ouvre la tombe et ne trouve que le cadavre du mouton; au milieu la jeune fille; fond sans couleur.

Fig. 34—54, 51a: Warqah quitte sa tribu après avoir appris la vérité; mur d’une ville, une porte, à l’extérieur Warqah armé, à cheval.

Fig. 35—55, 52b: Le roi de Shâm à cheval, emmène Warqah blessé; au milieu une plante sur laquelle il y a des oiseaux, à gauche un serviteur, qui porte Warqah sur le dos; fond sans couleur.

56, 53b: Warqah blessé au lit; une plante sur laquelle il y a deux faucons (?), à droite une servante et, derrière elle, un chien; fond sans couleur.

57, 55a: Warqah sur un trône; à sa gauche une table à trois pieds, sur laquelle il ya des fruits; à gauche une crèche d’eau; au milieu une servante; à droite une plante sous laquelle un lapin; deux oiseaux, volent au-dessus de la tête de Warqah.

58, 55b: Gulshâh à demi-couchée sur un trône, trouve la bague dans le lait; au milieu une écuelle sur laquelle il y a coupe avec le lait; devant elle une servante; fond rouge; inscription: “Elle boit le lait, trouve la bague, et [perd] connaissance.”

59, 56a: Évanouissement de Warqah et de Gulshâh se voyant de loin; une porte de ville; à droite Warqah tombé évanoui de son cheval, à gauche Gulshâh évanouie; fond sans couleur; inscription que je n’ai pas pu lire.
Fig. 36.—60, 57b: Le roi de Shām entre Warqah et Gulshāh; intérieur d’une tente(?); sur le fond violette on voit des figures des animaux et des oiseaux; aux coins, deux éperviers.


62, 59b: Causerie des trois amis assis: roi de Shām, Warqah et Gulshāh; fond brun jaunâtre, avec des figures en couleur plus claire.

63, 61a: Scène des adieux; le roi endormi sur son trône, au milieu Gulshāh, plus à gauche Warqah; inscription effacée.
(Voyez Explication des Figures.)
(Voyez Explication des Figures.)
**Planche 14**

Fig. 39.—64, 62a: Le roi assiste au départ de Warqah à cheval, quittant Shâm, derrière lui son serviteur, au devant Gulshâh, plus à droite un animal étrange.

Fig. 40.—65, 64a: Warqah mort (il est sur un lit), son serviteur et deux cavaliers; fond rouge avec des figures en noir.

Fig. 41.—66, 65a: Intérieur de la maison où se trouve Gulshâh; une porte fermée, à gauche une plante avec un lapin; inscription: “Gulshâh récite un poème pendant la séparation.”
Fig. 42.—67, 65b: Gulshâh va à la tombe de Warqah et se jette sur la tombe (deux scènes réunies); de droite à gauche: la tombe, Gulshâh, une litière de femme et deux chevaux; Gulshâh se jettant par terre, un cheval; inscription (sur la litière): "Gulshâh se jette de la litière."

Fig. 43.—68, 66b: Gulshâh sur la tombe de Warqah et cinq personnages parmi lesquelles le roi pluant; fond sans couleur.

69, 68a: Le tombeau de Warqah et de Gulshâh; à droite le roi, derrière lui une autre personne, à gauche deux hommes visitant le tombeau; inscription: "Le tombeau de Warqah et Gulshâh." Au coin droit une inscription que je n'ai pas pu lire.

70, 69b: La visite du Prophète au tombeau; il est assis sur un trône, à droite Abû Bakr et 'Othmân, ses amis et caliphs futurs, à gauche le roi de Shâm debout, derrière lui un serviteur (?); fond rouge.

Fig. 44.—71, 70a: Résurrection de Warqah et Gulshâh, par la prière du Prophète, en attitude de la prière, derrière lui ses quatre amis et futurs caliphs, et le roi de Shâm, Warqah et Gulshâh sortant de la tombe; fond bleu; inscription: "Le Prophète fait la prière; Warqah et Gulshâh sortent de la tombe."
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(Voyez Explication des Figures.)
TARGHYN—THE HERO, AQ-ZHUNUS—THE BEAUTIFUL, AND PETER’S SIBERIAN GOLD *

By JOHN F. HASKINS

The magnificent collection of gold from Scytho-Sarmatian tombs, long of great interest to scholars, has recently become a focal point of interest in popular publications as well. This is all to the good. The many examples housed in the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad represent nearly three centuries of archaeological research, and are among the most beautiful of the world's art treasures. The whole collection has never been completely published, but a number of pieces have received attention at various times. Among the most interesting and perhaps least understood objects in the "gold-treasure galleries" are a well-known series of gold plaques of unknown provenance that are often called the "Siberian gold collection of Peter the Great." In this group are two pairs of cast, openwork gold pieces that may portray the people who made them, or for whom they were made (pl. 1, figs. 1 and 2). They are usually listed as "belt buckles" or "girdle plaques"; actually, however, the use to which they were put is as enigmatic as their provenance and date. The two gold objects mentioned above belong to a group, all having the same general shape, that were found spread over a large area in Siberia, the Ordos and (according to Rostovtzeff) North China. The gold plaques (there are many of bronze as well) consist of two large plates cast in the form of the Greek letter rho (P). The pieces are usually "mirrored," each half showing the reverse of the same scene, but cast in different molds. The scenes are in bas-relief openwork and are frequently set with semiprecious stones. Garnets, red jasper, malachite, and turquoise are employed frequently if inlay is present at all. The two pairs of plaques with human representations both show scenes in a landscape setting. As many have noted, they are quite dissimilar.

* I should like to take this opportunity to thank the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for having awarded me a fellowship, thus making it possible for me to visit the museums in the Soviet Union, including those in Siberia and Central Asia. I should also like to thank Dr. Mikhail Illarionovich Artamonov, Director of the State Hermitage Museum in Leningrad, and his staff for permission to see and handle many of the monuments from the Gold Treasure of Peter the Great and the monuments from the Pazyryk finds. Most of the photographs used in this article are by courtesy of the Institute for the History of Material Culture, Soviet Academy of Science, to the members of which I owe a great debt.


2 Sir Ellis H. Minns, Scythians and Greeks, Cambridge, 1913; M. I. Rostovtzeff, Iranians and Greeks, Oxford, 1922; A. L. Mongait, Arkeologiya v S.S.S.R., Moscow-Leningrad, 1953. These three books have most of the story of the excavations in Russia from 1702 until 1953.

3 Much of the treasure was published by I. Tolstoi and N. Kondakov, Russkiaia Drevnosti v Pamiatnikh’ Iskusstva, 6 vols., St. Petersburg, 1889-93, condensed, translated into French, and published in Paris as the most interesting and perhaps least understood objects in the "gold-treasure galleries" are a well-known series of gold plaques of unknown provenance that are often called the "Siberian gold collection of Peter the Great." In this group are two pairs of cast, openwork gold pieces that may portray the people who made them, or for whom they were made (pl. 1, figs. 1 and 2). They are usually listed as "belt buckles" or "girdle plaques"; actually, however, the use to which they were put is as enigmatic as their provenance and date. The two gold objects mentioned above belong to a group, all having the same general shape, that were found spread over a large area in Siberia, the Ordos and (according to Rostovtzeff) North China. The gold plaques (there are many in bronze as well) consist of two large plates cast in the form of the Greek letter rho (P). The pieces are usually "mirrored," each half showing the reverse of the same scene, but cast in different molds. The scenes are in bas-relief openwork and are frequently set with semiprecious stones. Garnets, red jasper, malachite, and turquoise are employed frequently if inlay is present at all. The two pairs of plaques with human representations both show scenes in a landscape setting. As many have noted, they are quite dissimilar.


6 Tolstoi and Kondakov, op. cit., vol. 3 (1890), pp. 60-62, figs. 69-71; Minns, op. cit., pp. 278-279, figs. 201-202; Rostovtzeff, op. cit., vol. 4/2-3, pp. 100-101; Carl Hentze, Beiträge zu den Problemen des eurasischen Tierstyles, Ostasiatische Zeitschrift,
Hentze called these scenes a "naturalistic-anecdotal style." Rostovtzeff believed that they were illustrations from the life of the hero-hunter of Central Asian epic.

The first pair of plaques (pl. 1, fig. 1; only one is shown: the right, as worn) is in openwork *rho* forms of cast gold with isolated inlays of colored stones, of which some have dropped out. The stones that remain are for the most part red jasper and malachite. The scenes in this case depict a virile hunt, seen from the left and right. The plaques, however, were not cast from the same mold, for one side depicts a three-quarter front view of the hunter with a bow case and the other shows a three-quarter rear view and a sword; otherwise they are identical although reversed. A mounted hunter rides his horse at full gallop pursuing a fleeing boar with a bow and arrow. Both running animals are depicted in the "flying gallop." While the frightened boar and excited hunter thunder past a wooded grove, the bowman's timid comrade has sought safety in the branches of one of the trees. The man has climbed fully armed—bow, arrows, bow case, quiver, sword and all—out of harm's way onto a high branch, accompanied by his terrified horse (on the larger end) and his equally alarmed dog (on the smaller end). Some authors have tried in the past to prove that this pair of plaques illustrates a passage from Herodotus, in which he describes the hunting habits of the Irycae who were supposed to support themselves by the chase. The Irycae lay in ambush along the

... limb of a tree while their horses and dogs were trained to lie quietly in the tall grass until the quarry approached. Rostovtzeff, however, stated that he could see no comparison between the scene on the gold plaque and the story related by Herodotus. Whatever the intention of the artist may have been, the pair of gold plaques presents a vivid portrayal of the excitement of a hunt in the life of a nomad. One scholar has recently called attention to the fact that these plaques, more than any of the others, are composed as paintings rather than sculptures. This pair is one of the largest in the series; each half measures 8 inches (20.32 cm.) long, and 4\( \frac{3}{2} \) inches (10.72 cm.) high.

The second pair of gold plaques (pl. 1, fig. 2), has been termed "idyllic," or a depiction of "pastoral realism." It is neither as tense nor as pleasing in composition and has a much less "painterly" quality than the hunting scene just discussed. They are again a pair of *rho* (P)-formed open-cast gold plates, each 6\( \frac{3}{4} \) inches (16.19 cm.) long and 4\( \frac{3}{2} \) inches (11.83 cm.) high. As was the case with the first pair, the scene is reversed and cast in different molds. The scene is most unlike anything else in the series. Rostovtzeff believed that it represented an episode in the life of the hero hunter, perhaps a love scene, or even the death of the hero.


13 Rostovtzeff, Artibus Asiae, vol. 4/1-2, pp. 100 and 107.
flanking a single tree sit a man and a woman who support the recumbent figure of a second man across their laps. The seated man holds the reins of one of a pair of saddled horses, and the reins of the second horse are tied to the tree. The lady gently strokes the hair of the reclining man while he affectionately pats her knee. A strung bow with notched arrow and a bow case (gorytos?) are seen hanging from a branch.

Costume, facial features, and harness may clearly be seen on both pairs of plaques. The sliding cheek snaffle bit, bridle, stirrupless saddle with overgirth and crupperless breeching are nearly photographic in the accuracy with which they are depicted. These details will provide clues to the date and possible provenance of both pairs of gold plaques. There is a record of when the pieces just described entered the Siberian collection. They are mentioned specifically and are briefly described in one of the early inventories of the so-called Siberian Kunstkammer.14

The name for Siberia comes from Sibir, the Russian term for the chief settlement of the Tatar khan, Kuchum, captured by Yermak, the Cossack, in 1581 (modern Isker on the Irtysh River). Yermak was drowned in the Irtysh in 1584, but by the turn of the seventeenth century, Siberia was beginning to fill up with Russians, many of whom had fled to escape the rigors of the reign of Ivan IV. By the middle of the century, the Russians had reached the Pacific Ocean.15 The first mention of gold from the new territories, however, occurred in 1669.16 In 1688, news of discoveries along the Irtysh River reached the capital from Samarov. The first excavation took place in 1702, when Captain Matigorov opened a kurgan on the upper Irtysh.17 At least as early as 1692, the Netherlands merchant and diplomat, Nicolas Cornelius Witsen, collected numerous examples of Siberian gold that disappeared without a trace in Holland after his death in 1717. A few objects from the Witsen collection were published posthumously in the third edition of his book.18 Most of the Witsen material was supposed to have come from the Irtysh and Ob Rivers, between Tobol’sk and Samarov. In 1715, the nobleman Demidov made a gift of Siberian gold, then valued at 100,000 rubles, to the Tsarina in honor of the birth of the Tsarevich, Peter Petrovich.19 No inventory would seem to have accompanied the gift, however. In 1716, Prince Gagarin, the governor of Siberia, sent 55 “sets” of gold, containing 80 pieces, and weighing 60 pounds.20 Many of the pieces in the Gagarin collection have been identified from the inventory which accompanied it and which was published (in Latin) in 1741.21 Peter I proclaimed one of his many famous ukases in 1718, which stated in effect that all treasure discovered beneath the soil was the property of the Crown and that all objects of artistic worth or scientific merit were to be


15 In 1648, KHabarov explored the Amur and in the same year Deinev, the Cossack, explored the strait which was rediscovered and named in 1728 by Bering.

16 Spitsyn, op. cit., p. 227.

17 Idem, p. 228.


19 Spitsyn, op. cit., p. 230. See also M. Griaiznov and A. Bulgakov, Drevenoe iskusstvo Altaia (also in French as L’art ancien de l’Altaï), Leningrad, 1958, pp. 5 and 15.


sent to St. Petersburg forthwith. In 1720, the Manufaktur i Berg Collegium was made responsible for the collection, preservation, and cataloguing of antiquities, and Messerschmidt reached Krasnoyarsk in 1723. A few pieces entered the collection between 1721 and 1724 when an inventory was prepared. The Academy of Science was founded just prior to the death of Peter I, in 1725, and the following year another inventory was made, listing 124 pieces, many as "sets" or "pairs." Catherine II began her reign in 1762, during which the Siberian collection of Peter's Kunstkammer was moved across the Neva River and installed in the Hermitage where it is still kept. General Melgunov excavated Litoikurgan, near Elizavetgrad, between the Bug and Dneiper Rivers, in 1763, and the new Empress added Scythian material from South Russia to the Hermitage collection of gold treasure. Gerhard Miller explored Siberia in 1733–43; and the discoveries of Radlov in 1865, when the first of the "frozen tombs" at Berel and Katanda were opened, were but a prelude to the magnificent finds of Koslov at Noin-ula in 1925 and those of Michael GriaZnov and Sergei Rudenko at Pazyryk, four years later. The Pazyryk discoveries were

22 Spitsyn, op. cit., p. 231. This particular ukase was to have interesting legal complications, particularly in mining, but it is doubtful if it had much effect on the illegal "treasure-hunting" activities in Siberia.

23 An inventory accompanied the objects sent in 1716 by Prince Matthew Gagarin and is reproduced in Spitsyn, op. cit., pp. 235–240. A few of the pieces have been identified and numbered according to the plates in Tolstoi and Kondakov, op. cit. For the inventory of 1724 see Andrei Lopatin, Dela kabineta Petra velikago, vols. 57 and 72, St. Petersburg, 1725.

24 E. M. Pridik, Mel'gonovskii klad, 1763 g, Materialy po arkheologii Rossi, vol. 31 (St. Petersburg, 1911), pp. 1–24.

25 V. V. Radlov, et al., Sibir'skiiia drevnosti, Materialy po arkheologii Rossi, vols. 3, 5, and 15 (St. Petersburg, 1894), pp. 120–126; Wilhelm Radlov, continued after World War II, and culminated in Rudenko's excavations of 1948–49. Since then two more sites—those at Bashadar and Tukeht—have been uncovered.

The past century has seen a number of excavations in Siberia, all of which have been scientifically investigated and well dated, and have become equally well known. None of them, however, has contained anything as brilliant in workmanship or as valuable in precious metal as the objects in Peter's Siberian collection. Nor are any of the earlier inventories helpful, at least in connection with the provenance of the two sets of plaques described in an earlier paragraph (pl. 1, figs. 1 and 2). Since the inventories are rather sketchy and the descriptions a bit vague, it is not even possible to state precisely to what extent the collection has suffered losses.

The inventory of 1716 may be of some aid. The two sets of plaques are described in the shipping list that accompanied the Garin collection. There is no word about the Aus Sibirien, 2 vols. Leipzeg, 1884; Camilla Trever, Excavations in Northern Mongolia 1924–25, Leningrad, 1932; and S. I. Rudenko, Kul'tura naseleniia gornogo Altaia v Skifskoe vremia, Moscow-Leningrad, 1952.

26 Bashadar and Tukeht are not yet fully reported. See S. I. Rudenko, Bashadarskii kurgany, Kratie sobshcheniia instituta istorii materialnoi kul'tury, vol. 45 (Moscow, 1952).

27 S. P. Kiselev, Drevniiaia istoriia Iuzhnoi Sibiri, Moscow-Leningrad, 1951, contains a summary of most of the finds although not all his dates may be fully underwritten. For an English summary see Karl Jettmar, The Altai before the Turks, Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, No. 23 (Stockholm, 1951), pp. 135–223.


29 Ibid., p. 235, numbers 1 and 2, and notes 4 and 5. Tolstoi and Kondakov, op. cit., vol. 3 (1890), pp. 60–62, figs. 69–71; Musei imperialis Petropolitani, vol. 2 (1745), p. 185, numbers 29 and 30. The description of the hunting scene reads, "Two pieces, mounted rider firing an arrow at a boar, gold, weight 2.34 pounds"; that for the idyllic plaque, "Two pieces,
circumstances of discovery; nor did Prince Gagarin state how he had acquired them. It is to be presumed that they were bought, or preempted, from some Shastlivich who had uncovered them. Considering the variety of the objects in the Gagarin collection, it is hardly likely that all the material was found together. But since most of the gold that had been found in Siberia was melted down for its value in metal we might again assume that the Prince acquired the treasures soon after they were found. We may be certain only that the two sets of plaques were a part of the treasure in 1716.

The date of the two plaques has been as much of a puzzle as their provenance. Neither Tolstoi and Kondakov nor Minns, who were among the first to publish them, attempted to date the pieces. Rostovtzeff believed that they represented "a Scythian renaissance, which lasted in the East until the III. or even the IV. centuries of our era." Later Salmony began a survey which was cut short by his untimely death in 1958. He assigned two men, a woman and two horses, gold, weight 2.24 pounds." The Latin catalogue lists the pieces as 2.331/2 pounds and 2.251/2 pounds respectively. The examples in the Gagarin collection were purchased at the order of Peter the Great by Prince Matthew Gagarin, the governor of Siberia and despatched to the capital 10 January 1716. No provenance is given for any of the objects.

Most of the collection was published by Tolstoi and Kondakov, op. cit., vol. 3 (1890), with some of the pieces in the first and second volumes. The whole collection, however, has never been illustrated; nor did Tolstoi-Kondakov or, later, Reinach, the earlier inventories. Fortunately, the genuine nature of the collection has never been doubted.
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Alfred Salmony, Sarmatian gold collected by Peter the Great. 1: Introduction, and II: The group with all-over cloisonné, Gazette des Beaux Arts, ser. 6, the collection to the last half millennium before Christ. Recent publications by Griaznov, Maenchen-Helfen, and Rudenko would seem to prove that the earlier dates proposed by Salmony were the more nearly correct.

Tolstoi-Kondakov reproduced a tiny gold plaque (pl. 2, fig. 1), which Gerhard Miller found at Kolyvano-Vosnesensk, a site that Maenchen believes to be the modern "Kolyvan, 29 miles north of Novosibirsk, on the river Chaus, a left tributary of the Ob." The gold piece is cast, nearly flat and quite small: 1 11/22 inches (3.75 cm.) long and 1 1/2 inches (3.81 cm.) high. It is, however, fully modeled, although not full round. The object represents a mounted Bowman firing an arrow. Tolstoi-Kondakov mentioned it in connection with vol. 31/1 (New York, January–June 1947), pp. 5–14; III: The early group with winged circle sockets, ser. 6, vol. 33/1 (New York, January–June 1948), pp. 321–326; IV: The early Sarmatian group with embossed relief, ser. 6, vol. 35/1 (New York and Paris, January–June 1949), pp. 5–10; French translation, pp. 63–64; V: The middle Sarmatian group with isolated inlay cells, ser. 6, vol. 40 (New York and Paris, 1952), pp. 85–92; French translation, pp. 133–134. Salmony did not publish the group with human representations, and the series is incomplete.


Griaznov and Bulgakov, op. cit., pl. 1.

Maenchen-Helfen, op. cit., pp. 135–136, believes that parts of the treasure belong to different dates but seems to feel that the hunting scene and the idyllic plaque are close to Pazyryk in time.


Tolstoi and Kondakov, op. cit., vol. 3, fig. 49, p. 47; Radlov, Siberiiskia drevnosti, p. 123; Maenchen-Helfen, op. cit., vol. 5/2, fig. 42.

Idem, p. 136, note 194.

Tolstoi and Kondakov, op. cit., vol. 3, pp. 47
the pair of gold plaques from the Siberian
treasure described above (pl. 1, fig. 1). Ru-
denko,\textsuperscript{42} and later Maenchen-Helfen \textsuperscript{43} quite
rightly compared Miller's find to the huge felt,
discovered by Rudenko\textsuperscript{44} during the 1948–49
excavations in Kurgan No. 5 (K-5) at Pazyryk
(pl. 3; pl. 4, figs. 1 and 2). While the costume
and facial features of the rider on the Miller
plaque differ from those on the hunting plaques
from the Siberian treasure (even the hairdo
is different in each case), there is one interest-
ing point of similarity. Both riders wear a
heart-shaped scarf or short cape (text fig. 1,
A and B). This is probably a neckerchief, like
the ones worn by cattlemen of the American
Southwest as protection against the dust. The
scarf or neckpiece could be pulled around over
the shoulder and up over the mouth and chin,
muffling the face to the eyes and acting as a
dust respirator. This is not the first time the
writer has remarked the similarities in costume
and habits of the cowboys of the “Wild West”
and the northern nomads of the Eurasian
Steppe, nor is he the only one to do so.\textsuperscript{45} The
scarf on the Miller piece is dotted in the same
manner as the fluttering scarf on the Pazyryk
felt (which probably served the same pur-
pose), while that on the hunting plaque from
the Siberian treasure is without pattern; other-
wise they are the same.

The excavators at Pazyryk discovered an
unusual felt of truly heroic proportions (pls.
3 and 4). The felt measures 21.33 feet
(6.5 m.) long and 14.92 feet (4.55 m.) high,
and is composed of a repeated scene of a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{42} Rudenko, KSIIMK (1952), pl. 131, fig. 59.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Maenchen-Helfen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 136.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Rudenko, \textit{Kultura naseleniia gornogo Altaia},
pls. 88 and 95.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Haskins, \textit{Artibus Asiae}, vol. 15/3–4 (1952),
p. 327, note 104; Minns, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 279, also men-
tions this scarf effect.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}

mounted horseman appearing before a seated
figure who is depicted as being enthroned be-
neath a tree. Each end of the huge felt had a
representation, repeated on two levels as is
the rider and enthroned personage, which
showed a combat between a sphinx and a
wyvern(?). First listed as a “felt hanging” for the wall of a yurt, or tent, the felt, the excavators now inform me, was a windbreak intended to screen the opening of a yurt. In an earlier publication, the writer of the present article believed that the scene might represent a story from Herodotus relating to the “Bald-headed People,” the Argippaeans, who dwelt beneath trees which they covered in winter with white felt, possessed no weapons, and acted as judges for their quarrelsome neighbors. The excavators, however, believe that the manytimes repeated scene on the huge felt windbreak represents a mounted horseman approaching a seated goddess. Maenchen thought that the reins held by the rider were a “rhynon seen upside down.” A close examination of a detail of the felt shows that the rider is really holding the reins of the horse, and that the second line, which Maenchen took to be the side of a rhynon, is actually another saber-shaped projection from the crest of the animal’s mane (pl. 4, fig. 2). In view of the combat scene between the fantastic animals on the side of the screen, it is quite likely that the identification of horseman and goddess is the correct one, although it is remarkable that the lady (if it be a lady) should be bald.

Everyone who has discussed the Pazyryk felt has mentioned the startling similarity that exists between the costume of the horseman from the felt windscreen and that of the people seen on the “pastoral” plaque from the Siberian treasure. Both Rudenko and Maenchen-Helfen have noted that the costume of the horseman, as well as the horses on the Miller plaque and the Pazyryk windscreen, are nearly identical. The horses are the same for both and agree perfectly with the mounts on the “pastoral plaques” from the Siberian treasure. There seem to be slight differences in harness; otherwise the bridles and saddles on both plaques from the Siberian treasure, the Miller plaque, and the one represented on the felt windscreen from K-5 might all have been drawn from the ones actually found in K-1, K-2, K-4, and K-5 in the Pazyryk complex (see text fig. 2, A). The bridles brought to light from six of the eight kurgans at Pazyryk are all of the same type. The bits are usually of iron, and belong to the “late” or fifth–fourth centuries B.C. group in Liberov’s chronology. The typical Pazyryk bridle con-

---

60 The women in K-2 and K-5 at Pazyryk were both bald; that is, their heads were shaved. It is not known whether or not this barbering was done in connection with trepanning. The ladies’ tresses were preserved in both cases.

61 Rudenko, Kultura, p. 338 and note 1.
A. Bridle, Typical of Those Found at Pazyryk. Ca. 5th–3d century B.C. (After Griaznov.)

Sliding cheek snaffle bit assembly

1. Bit.
2. Psalia (cheek bars).
4. Cheek pieces.
5. Crownpiece.
6. Throat latch.
7. Nose band.
8. Concha (rosette, frontlet or facepiece).
10. Tie rein or halter.

Crown assembly

B. Saddle, Typical of Those from K–1, Pazyryk. (After Griaznov.)

1. Seat (cushion).
2. Surcingle or overgirth.
3. Breastplate or pectoral.
5. Straps for seat at fork and cantle.
6. Tie straps ("triad").
7. Collar.
8. Head or fork (swell).
**Fig. 1.**—*Gold Plaque, One of a Pair, Hunting Scene, "Siberian Gold Collection of Peter the Great."*


Provenance unknown, Siberia. Probably ca. fourth century B.C. L., 8.0" (20.32 cm.); H., 4-7/32" (10.72 cm.), each one half.
Weight of pair, 2.33-1/2 lbs.

**Fig. 2.**—*Gold Plaque, One of a Pair, Illustration from an Epos (?), "Siberian Gold Collection of Peter the Great."*


Provenance unknown, Siberia. Probably ca. fourth century B.C. L., 6-3/8" (16.19 cm.); H., 4-21/32" (11.83 cm.), each one-half. Weight of pair, 2.25-1/2 lbs.

(Both photographs courtesy of the Institute for the History of Material Culture, Soviet Academy of Science, Leningrad Branch, Photo Section. Scale: 1/1.)
Fig. 1.—Gold Plaque from Kolyvan, Siberia. Leningrad, The Hermitage.
Miller find, 1734. Probably ca. fourth century B.C. L., 1-15/32" (3.7 cm.); H., 1-1/2" (3.8 cm.). Scale: 2/1.

Fig. 2.—Woman's Hat, Wood, Linen, and Braided Hair, Pazyryk, the Altai, Siberia. Leningrad, The Hermitage.

Fig. 3.—Detail of Plate 1, Figure 2.
Scale: about 2/1.
Giant Felt Windbreak for a Yurt, from K-5, Pazyryk, the Altai, Siberia.

Leningrad, The Hermitage.

Rudenko find, 1948-49. Probably ca. mid-fourth century B.C. Repeated scene of mounted horseman and seated figure (a goddess?), floral border, and fantastic animal combat. (Photograph courtesy of the staff of the State Hermitage.)
sists of a sliding cheek snaffle bit assembly which comprises a bridoon or Pelham bit, a psalia or cheek bar, and a split cheekpiece, one of each to the right and left. A crown assembly, consisting of a right and left cheekpiece and a crownpiece is tied to the bit assembly. A throat latch, nose band, and facepiece complete the bridle. One of the reins had a loop at one end through which the free end of the second rein was slid, to form a tie rein or halter. It is interesting to note how clearly this may be seen on the “pastoral” plaque in the Siberian collection (pl. 2, fig. 3). The whole harness, except for the psalia and bit, could be made of leather; hence it was very light and strong. No buckles of any sort were found on any of the harness at Pazyryk, except in K-3 and K-4, where bone and wood cinch rings were found; otherwise all of the harness was tied together. In some instances the leather was split and another end slid through the opening. The bronze or iron bits consisted of two straight bars with a small ring at one end and a large ring at the other. One of the smaller rings was offset 90 degrees from the horizontal so that it would swivel freely about the other small ring. The bits were probably cast in two molds with one finished half set into the mold of the other; the rings do not seem to have been hammered closed. The psalia, either of wood or metal, were slid through the large rings, and the thongs from the split cheekpieces were tied to the center section of the psalia on either side of the outer ring of the bit. In this manner the bridles could be adorned with the fantastic amounts of carved wooden decoration with which all of them were covered, without losing strength and without having any of the “gee” and “haw” stress of heavy riding being brought to bear on the fragile wood. Each of the horses on the hunting plaques has a slightly different bridle, although they (as well as the bridles on the “pastoral” plaque and the Miller piece) are substantially the same as those just described from the Pazyryk complex. The horse being ridden has a bridle which is nearly a duplicate of the one from the second horse in K-5 at Pazyryk. It has a straight bar psalia capped at each end by rosettes, conchas or disks, represented on the plaque by inset stones. These rosettes or conchas are repeated at the junction of the nose band and throat latch. The decorations on the Pazyryk bridle are of carved and gilded wood. A large teardrop-shaped decoration hangs from the crownpiece assembly. The horse that is being pulled into the tree has another type of bridle that is also to be seen at Pazyryk. The straight bars of the psalia are capped by small knobs that are repeated at the throat latch and nose band. A similar bridle was found on the first horse from K-5 at Pazyryk. The horses on the pastoral or idyllic plaque have a bridle and harness that is duplicated in the plain wooden and bone fittings from K-3 and K-4 at Pazyryk. Even the method of splitting the leather to permit ties may be seen. The Miller plaque is so small that not too much detail is evident on a photograph, even an enlarged one, but the essentials—crown assembly, cheekpieces, and nose band—are visible. All these features are represented on the bridle of the horse on the Pazyryk felt windscreen, although in the latter case the clumsier technique of applique makes for a less accurate arrangement.

The similarity between the representation of bridles on the plaques, the felt screen, and the actual objects from the Pazyryk graves holds for the saddles as well. One saddle on

56 Rudenko, *Kul'tura*, pl. 66.
57 Ibid., pl. 65.
58 Ibid., pls. 58–61.
the hunting plaque, the saddle seen on the Pazyryk felt, and that on the Miller gold piece, are partly obscured by the rider. Enough is visible in each case, however, to permit the statement that all the representations of the saddles are very much alike, and that all of them agree with the actual saddles excavated from the kurgans in the Pazyryk complex. As Jettmar stated, "The saddles from Pazyryk are amazingly primitive." He was, of course, describing the saddles from K-1, which would be earlier than those from K-5. The latter are more highly developed. The standard Pazyryk saddle would seem to have consisted of the following pieces, varying slightly in different tombs. There was first a saddle blanket, usually of felt. The saddle itself comprised a seat, made of a quilted-felt cushion, stuffed with deer's hair, stitched in parallel lines to give a ribbed effect; wooden ribs or "saddlebows" were thrust through the seat to stiffen it (in the later saddles at K-5, side bars were added to form a primitive saddle tree) at the head and cantle. The ribs were kept in place by felt or leather tie bands at the fork and cantle. The saddle was fastened to the animal by an overgirth or surcingle (similar to some models of the modern racing saddle). The girth was fixed in place by a breastband (or pectoral), and a collar (text fig. 2, B). In most cases there was a breeching, but no crupper. As was the case with the bridle, there were no buckles used. Wooden and bone compression rings and fixed-prong cinch rings were found; in the main, however, the harness was tied together. Most of the saddles from K-5 had additional caparison (chaparak) in the ensemble. Nearly all the Pazyryk saddles were trimmed with a variety of tie straps, some taking grotesque or fantastic shapes—human heads and animals, among others.

Practically all the saddles shared one feature, one that seems, oddly enough, to be particularly Russian, for the author of the present paper knows of no term in another language that would serve to describe it. This consisted of a double set of tie straps, three on each side all the same length, that depended from the cantle rib tie strap. There was often a fourth, longer strap with a disk weight at the free end. The Russian term for the arrangement is troitchatka, "triad," and it seems to have become a typical feature of Cossack saddle harness. The general purpose of such additions was to tie extra equipment onto the saddle, or, in rare instances, to serve as "spare parts" to mend broken harness in the field. But why three?

Nearly all the details of the typical Pazyryk saddle just described may be seen on the two pairs of plaques from the Siberian collection, on the Miller plaque, and on the Pazyryk felt screen. The clearest illustration, of course, is that on the idyllic plaque with the riderless horses. Even the parallel ribs formed by the stitching of the quilted seat, as well as the wooden ribs at the head and cantle, and the method of tying rather than buckling the girth are nearly photographic. In the light of similar finds of wood and bone in K-3 and K-4 at Pazyryk, the paddle-shaped cinch rings at the head of the saddle, on both the idyllic and hunting plaques, is extremely important.

One more element may shed light on the

68 Griaznov (1950), op. cit., pp. 25–39, figs. 6–17. Griaznov and Rudenko both excavated K-1 at Pazyryk in 1929, and have never been able to agree about anything relating to the dig. The two scholars assigned different numbers to the 10 horses found in the tomb with changes in the combinations of harness parts.
64 Rudenko, Kul’tura, pl. 59, figs. 12–14, and pl. 60, fig. 13.
origin and date of the plaques in the gold treasure. Maenchen has written a valuable study on the treatment of the horse's mane that shows parallels in the treatment of the gold plaques and the finds at Pazyryk. It should be noted that the horse's tail was also a decorative feature. This motif continues on into T'ang times in China and into Sasanian times in the Persian Empire. The tail of each horse found at Pazyryk would seem to have been treated in a different fashion from the next. Some were knotted, some were braided, and some were provided with a decorated leather sheath. This last method gave an unfortunate "rat-tailed" appearance to the horse and should have turned a decent fly-switch into a near-lethal weapon. The horse on the Miller plaque has no tail; it is either meant to be between the animal's legs, cropped, or, as is most likely, has broken off. The tail of the running horse on the hunting plaque is knotted. Precisely such knots may be seen on the tails of the sixth and tenth horses from K-1 at Pazyryk. The tails of the horses on the idyllic plaques from the Siberian collection, and that on the felt screen from K-5 at Pazyryk, are either braided or encased in leather sheaths simulating a braid. Parallels for both types were found on the tails of horses excavated from the Pazyryk tombs in K-1, K-2, K-3, and K-5.

Before turning to one last Altaic feature on the Siberian plaques, it might be of interest to note that the gorytos (quiver and bow case) on each of the monuments in which it occurs is of the same type. That on the felt screen and the one hanging from the tree on the idyllic plaque appear to be slightly different from those on the hunting plaque only because the latter are empty while the former contain the bow.

One of the most striking features on the idyllic plaque is the lady's costume, particularly her hat. Other authors have been interested by this high fezlike cap and have sought to connect it with the shaman headgear of the Yüeh-chih and T'u-huo-lo mentioned in the Wei-shu. The hat is drum shaped, with a projection on top with a long queue pendant from it (pl. 2, fig. 3). While this may call to mind the many queue-wearing tribes that populated Central Asia in the Chinese Histories.

67 The tails of the horses on the reliefs of the Wu tombs of Later Han at Wu Liang Ts'ü, the horses on the reliefs of T'ang T'ai-tsung, and the tails on the horses seen on the so-called Sasanian "hunting dishes" are all tied in knots.
68 Rudenko, Kul'tura, p. 149, fig. 87, and p. 150, fig. 88. This may have been a method of branding and it should be noted as well that the ears of the steeds were notched; idem, p. 147, fig. 86.
69 These numbers are those assigned by Rudenko. See Griaznov (1950), op. cit., pp. 36-37, figs. 144 and 152, horses numbered 8 and 9.

69 For tail sheaths see Griaznov (1950), op. cit., p. 69, fig. 27, and Rudenko, Kul'tura, p. 149, fig. 87, p. 170, fig. 107, and p. 227, fig. 140. For the felt screen, see detail in Griaznov and Bulgakov (1958), op. cit., pl. 56.
70 Minns, op. cit., p. 110, note 2, was the first to notice this; however, the cap referred to in the Wei-shu, 102: 8a, was "one of many horns." This would seem to have been the shaman's cap, one of the "five conceits" of shamanism; see Martha Boyer, Mongol jewellery, Copenhagen, 1952, pp. 17-92. The Hsin T'ang-shu, 221 B, 4b-5a, describes T'ı-hua-lo (Takharistan?), and states that it was populated by the remnants of the I-ta (Hephthalites) who were in turn descendants from the Ta Yüeh-chih (Massagetae?), and that T'ı-hua-lo was formerly Ta-hsia (Bactria), the modern Afghanistan. Hsin T'ang-shu, loc. cit., goes on to state that the habits, customs, and mores of the people of Afghanistan were the same as those of the Turks. The passage in the Wei-shu, loc. cit., about the sexual habits of the T'ı-hua-lo seems to indicate a form of polyandry still practiced in Tibet, and may explain the passage in Strabo, XI, 8, 6 (old form C, 513), about the Massagetae.
there is an even more interesting parallel. During the 1948 excavations of K-5 at Pazyryk, the excavators discovered a double burial in this kurgan that matched that of Kurgan 2, the tomb of the famous “Tattooed Man.”74 One of the occupants of K-5 was the consort (wife, concubine, or mistress) of the chieftain buried there. The lady’s head had been shaved, probably in connection with trepanning.75 The man and the woman shared the same sarcophagus, and while the bodies had been shifted by the grave robbers, some of the original tomb furnishings remained in the coffin.76 One of the objects found in the casket was an ornamented headdress. It consisted of a wooden drum with an aerofoil cross section (pl. 2, fig. 2). A wooden beak projected from the upper rim in the front, and a smaller circular drum was placed on the crown. A long plume of hair, surely the lady’s own, was fastened to the smaller drum. There were two sockets on the crown, also drum shaped and higher but of smaller diameter than the central one. These were presumably for additional ornaments or plumes. The ends of the tresses were wrapped in a kerchief of fine white linen. There was a row of additional holes punched along the frontlet, indicating that there might have been a covering, possibly of gold leaf or other valuable material, since it had been stripped away. The covering had probably been nailed or pegged to the wooden drum. With the exception of the vaguely bird-shaped projection on the brim of the hat from K-5, it is an almost exact copy of that worn by the seated woman on the idyllic plaque from the Siberian treasure. These curious headpieces may explain the very clumsy headdress seen on the seated figure on the giant felt screen from K-5 at Pazyryk. The use of the lady’s tresses as an ornament on the headdress found in the coffin at K-5 might also explain the bald appearance of the seated figure on the felt windscreen. There may have been a ritual reason for the shorn locks of the mistress of the frozen grave at Pazyryk. This may also explain Herodotus’ comment about the Argippaeans: “They were all, both men and women, bald from birth.”77 There is in fact little indication of a “woman’s glory” on the lady of the idyllic plaque, although the rather fuzzy topknots of her two gentlemen friends are clear enough. The hairdo of the reclining man, that of his seated comrade, the brushy locks of the man on the Miller piece, and those of the rider of the Pazyryk felt are all very much alike.78 Only the hairdo of the men on the hunting plaque differs from the others. Maenchen-Helfen would see two or three ethnic groups on these various pieces.79

Allowing for differences in materials involved, the differences in facial type are not as great as they seem. The men on the hunting plaque do, as Rostovtzeff once remarked, resemble the Kushan figures seen at Gandhāra.80 The figures on the idyllic plaque, the Miller piece, and the Pazyryk felt could all easily be the same, or at least closely related people—cousins perhaps, if not brothers. The figures on the idyllic plaque do resemble rightly enough (Maenchen, Martynov, and others have mentioned this as well) the kneeling man on the bronze “altar” from the “treasure of the Issyk.”81 The latter piece belongs to a

74 Herodotus, Histories, IV, 23.
75 Rudenko, Kul’tura, pp. 62–67, quoting G. F. Debets on the physical characteristics of the population in the Pazyryk kurgans, records a mixed population. The men would seem to be part Mongoloid and the women Europoid.
76 Maenchen-Helfen, op. cit., p. 137.
78 Maenchen-Helfen, op. cit., p. 137 and notes.
G. S. Martynov, Issykština nakhdka, Kratkie Soob-
group of bronze altars or lamps which were dated by Bernshtam in the fifth–third centuries B.C.\textsuperscript{79} These are the dates usually assigned to Pazyryk.

The tumuli at Pazyryk have been dated by the excavators circa the fifth–third centuries B.C.\textsuperscript{80} The most important in the complex is the Fifth Pazyryk Kurgan (K-5). This tomb may, in all probability, be dated circa the second half of the fourth pre-Christian century.\textsuperscript{81} It would seem, then, that the date for the two Siberian plaques from the Treasure of Peter I would fit very nicely into this chronological framework. There is no reason to suppose that they are the “lost gold” from the

shcheniiia Instituta Istorii Material’noi Kul’tury, vol. 59 (Moscow, 1955), pp. 150–156, figs. 65–66, a and b, pp. 153–154: “Treasure of the Issyk; bronze altar with man and horse . . . analogous to the two figures on a gold plaque from the Siberian Treasure of Peter I.” The object is now in the Historical Museum at Alma Alta. Lighting conditions in the museum were too bad for me to photograph it, and the illustration in Martynov’s article is not clear enough to permit reproduction.


\textsuperscript{80} Rudenko, \textit{Kul’tura}, p. 356, dates Pazyryk in the last half of the 5th and the first half of the 4th century; Griznov and Bulgakov, however (1958), op. cit., pp. 5 and 15, date the finds as 4th–3rd centuries B.C.

\textsuperscript{81} The author of the present paper has, in another context, given his reasons for this dating (Doc. Diss., Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, 1957, as yet unpublished). The reasons are too many to be dealt with here, but a mid-fourth-century date seems to be the most reasonable for K-5. S. I. Rudenko, in \textit{The mythological eagle, the gryphon, the winged lion and the wolf in the art of the northern Nomads}, Artibus Asiae, vol. 21/2 (Ascona, 1958), pp. 101–122, stated that there were only 48 years represented in the Pazyryk complex. See p. 104, n. 15, tree-ring analysis.

Pazyryk tombs. This would be too optimistic. A culture such as that suggested by the finds of Bashadar, Berel, Katanka, Pazyryk, and Tuckht, and of which Noin-Ula is a late and logical finale, could easily support the “makers of the gold plaques.”\textsuperscript{82} They fit. There is no need to wander far and wide to seek a source. It does remain, however, to interpret them.

Rostovtzeff has given an interesting interpretation of a series of “story-telling” plaques, which he believed to be illustrations of the Central-Asian Epos.\textsuperscript{83} He placed the hunting plaque and the idyllic plaque from the Siberian Collection of Peter the Great in this group.\textsuperscript{84} Of the idyllic plaque he had to say, “Under a tree a man is resting or lying dead on the lap of a woman, while a servant is holding two saddled horses.”\textsuperscript{85} And again, “The idyllic scene may be interpreted . . . Romance and love found early access into the life of the great heroes . . . not all the heroes jealously kept their chastity like Mithras. Some of them had their love affairs, their wives, their mistresses . . . the hero is resting (or dead) after his exploits.”\textsuperscript{86}

It is quite likely that Rostovtzeff was correct and that the scene on the pair of plaques is a part of the epos. There are, however, indications that this is not a scene at the end of the tale, but that the story is still in progress. The plaques may have been meant to give an illustration of an action, like the more powerfully composed hunt.

\textsuperscript{82} Maenchen-Helfen, op. cit., p. 137: “There was no ‘people of the gold plaques’”; no doubt meant to include the entire “Siberian Gold Treasure of Peter the Great.” The ethnological differences noted on the plaques are no greater than the mixed ethnos recorded in the eight kurgans at Pazyryk itself.


\textsuperscript{84} Idem, figs. 3–4.

\textsuperscript{85} Idem, p. 100.

\textsuperscript{86} Idem, p. 107.
Radlov recorded an interesting Kasakh variant of the Hero epos: Er-Targhyn. The story, which tells of internal strife within the Crimean khanate is, in its present form, not earlier than the fifteenth century and takes place in the region of western Kazakhstan between the Volga and Ural Rivers. The story of the baiq Targhyn has long been available in German and Russian translations and an English summary with a few fragments was recently published by Winner. Briefly and shorn of its epic grandeur, the story of the epos Er-Targhyn is as follows:

The hero Targhyn, having slain a prince or noble of his own race, takes refuge in the Crimea. At this time there were 40 khans in the Crimea, the most powerful of which was Aqsha-khan. Targhyn, the refugee, lived with Aqsha-khan’s horde for a period of many months and managed all the while to conceal his identity and his status as a hero. During this period, Targhyn’s hosts were beset by the armies of two warlike neighbors, the Torgut and Oimat. The allies are besieged in a fortress but the forces of Aqsha-khan are powerless to dislodge them until:

As a thousand heroes before him, Targhyn, Knowing his friends longed for their homes, Prayed to his God, Shortened the breeching, Tightened both cinches, Mounted the saddle.

“Make my death a good death, too, oh my God!” was his prayer. Nine hordes of the Torgut, Ten hordes of the Oimat, Thrummed their drums and clashed their cymbals, And paraded before him. In the name of God, the hero stormed onward, “Remember Thy promise, oh God,” he said, “Only Thou can help,” he said. The hero galloped, spurring his horse Swift as a golden camel Riding like a vampire. Not heeding the forces defending the gate, The hero sped onward, Entered the fortress.

Reestablished as a hero, Targhyn is honored by Aqsha-khan and elevated to command of the khan’s squadrons. But triumph and

These seem to be mixed tribes of Turco-Mongols or Mongol-Tatar groups that date at least back to Genghis-Khan; they eventually settled in the western Volga region. All elements of the western Mongols, the Eleut, Kalmucks, and Urat; distant kin of the later Manchu.

The word used is zalmaus or dzhalmaus, the many-headed dragonlike monster of much later Russian folklore, which sucked blood, ate men’s remains and new-born babes, and ravished men’s wives and daughters; it could also take human form. See Winner, op. cit., pp. 51-53, and Radlov, Proben, III, p. 154, note.

Translation adapted from Radlov, ibid., and Winner, idem, p. 62.
fame were short lived, for it seems the khan had a daughter of exquisite beauty who

... combed her hair with a comb
and like a rich man’s filly,
was slender in body;
When one looked at her face,
The spring sun shone
On white wheaten flour,
Freed from its husk;
Her eyebrows curved like yellow bows,
Her glance was like a piercing arrow;
Her waist was pliant;
Whoever saw her, could not turn away.
Her hair was like that of a wild horse.96
Her eyes like the sheep’s,
Her speech, superior,
Her name?
Aq-Zhunus! 96

It was, of course, inevitable that the new cavalry commander and the khan’s beautiful daughter should meet. Unfortunately, the beautiful Aq-Zhunus had already been promised to another khan.97 There is the usual elopement and pursuit. Aqsha-khan promises his daughter to the man who brought her back, but the only fighter who has a horse capable of overtaking the fleeing couple is the aged Qart-Qozhaq.98 Qart-Qozhaq, by a skillful combination of insults and threats, drives Targhyn away and captures Aq-Zhunus with the avowed intention of taking her to Bokhara.99 The girl defends her love for Targhyn, in a poem of nearly boring length, in which she refers to the age of Qart-Qozhaq in most uncomplimentary terms.100 The aged warrior

95 The word used is qulan. Radlov, idem, p. 155, and Winner, idem, p. 63.
96 Translation adapted from Radlov, ibid., and Winner, ibid.
97 Radlov, idem, pp. 158–159.
98 The horse of Qart-Qozhaq was named Qasqa-Azban. The horses and frequently the wives of the heroes were equally capable of great feats.
100 Idem, p. 165: “Oh you old Qozhaq, old Qozhaq, pull hard on the head of your horse, Qozhaq, releases his prize and she rejoins her lover, Targhyn. After many adventures and several fights, the couple join forces with the Nogai khan, Khanzada, who asks their aid in his struggle against the Kalmucks.101 Targhyn agrees to help, and with three Nogai chieftains, and apparently Aq-Zhunus as well, he prepares to meet the Kalmucks. The latter, however, fear the strength of the hero Targhyn and flee without battle.102 Targhyn climbs a nearby tree to spy out the enemy’s path of retreat. As he nears the top of the tree a branch breaks under his weight and he crashes to the ground dislocating his spine, and is therefore unable to move.103 Despite the great care of Khanzada and the loving ministrations of Aq-Zhunus, Targhyn does not recover. In the end, Khanzada finds that he must leave for summer pasture, and departs, leaving Aq-Zhunus, Targhyn, and the latter’s hero horse, Tarlan, behind with food for one week.104 At the end of this time, Khanzada does not return and the pair begin to starve. Targhyn sings a long emotional love song to Aq-Zhunus, and another to his horse.105 Aq-Zhunus, in her turn, sings of her love to Targhyn and the hero prepares to die, cursing the Nogai “dogs” what would you with me?” The lady goes on to imply that desire in the case of one so old is stronger than the flesh.

101 Idem, pp. 168–171. The Nogai appeared about the 13th century and were mixed Turco-Mongols.
102 Idem, p. 170. The frank mixture of heroism and cowardice in these epic poems is remarkable. One man may defeat nine hordes of Torguts and ten hordes of Oimat and then flee from one much older hero.
104 Idem, p. 171. In Radlov’s summary, Targhyn is carried by Khanzada’s troops back to the camp on a litter made of lance hafts. This seems to have taken place near Bulgar-Sary. At this time Edil was the name of the Volga. See Winner, op. cit., p. 62.
105 Idem, Proben, III, pp. 171–175, and the song to Tarlan, the horse, pp. 175–180.
who have proved faithless.\textsuperscript{106} Fearing that he will be remembered not as a hero who dies a hero's death in battle, but as one who fell from a tree, Targhyn seizes his back, and with a mighty tug slips the injured joint miraculously into place, and the hero recovers.\textsuperscript{107}

The remainder of the story of Targhyn need not concern us here. The important part of the epos is the scene by the tree. The Siberian plaque which depicts the pair of horses, the two men and the maid beneath the tree could easily have been an illustration from the story of Targhyn. The injured hero is supported by the beautiful maiden, Aq-Zhunus, who affectionately pats his head, and by the saddened khan of the Nogai horde, Khanzada. The hero's steed, Tarlan, is tied to the tree in which we see the broken branch and the hero's weapons.\textsuperscript{108} The scene takes place at the moment when Khanzada, holding the reins of his own horse, prepares to make his spring migration. The broken spine would easily explain the stiff and awkward position of the reclining man which caused Rostovtzeff to believe him dead.

In its present form, the epic tale of Targhyn is very late. It describes conditions in the Crimea about the turn of the fifteenth century, and some of the tribal conflicts in the tale may be even later.\textsuperscript{109} The fact that Radlov was able to record the tale in the last quarter of the nineteenth century is indicative of the persistence of the epic story in a nomadic environment.

Granting a connection between the Siberian plaques and the epos \textit{Er-Targhyn}, one might ask at this point why the gold objects need to be dated so early. In the first place, horse harness in Siberia changed shortly after the turn of the Christian era. The curb bit seen so often in the so-called Parthian and Sasanian art made its appearance.\textsuperscript{110} We have already had occasion to mention the fidelity with which weapons and working tools were reproduced by artists in antiquity.\textsuperscript{111} In the second place, the parallels noted between the whole series of plaques and the discoveries at Pazyryk are too close and too numerous to be denied. Finally, as Rostovtzeff mentioned so long ago, “All of these episodes are repeated again and again in the tribal epics of Central Asia. They probably represent the remnants of the ancient nomad epos, which may be pre-Tibetan or pre-Mongol in its origin.”\textsuperscript{112}

\textbf{SUMMARY}

An attempt has been made to provide a possible date for the enigmatic plaques in the treasure of Peter the Great, at least for the best known of those with human representa-

\textsuperscript{106} \textit{Idem}, pp. 180–182.

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Idem}, p. 183; Winner, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 65.

\textsuperscript{108} The plaque is most unusual. At first glance the lady's hat and her tresses seem to rise right into the branches of the tree; however, one branch cuts across the top of the hat so that the addition on the tree is probably the broken branch.

\textsuperscript{109} The people concerned, however, were all of mixed Turco-Mongol or Tatar extraction, and the tale may have had an earlier form with another people. There is a vague similarity to Robin Hood and Maid Marian and to the death of Robin (in at least one version); Robin Hood requested to be buried “'neath the greenwood tree with the bow at his feet” after the false Abbess had opened a vein in his wrist. There is no reason to suppose that the plaque represents this story, but it does illustrate a persistent type of story. Winner, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 66–68, gives a \textit{Romeo and Juliet} variant. See also Radlov, \textit{Proben, III}, pp. 261–297, \textit{Qozy Kürpöş and Bayan Sulu}, a Kazakh story of “ill-starred lovers,” who through misunderstanding end their lives.


\textsuperscript{111} Haskins, \textit{Artibus Asiae}, vol. 15/3–4 (1952), pp. 255–256.

\textsuperscript{112} Rostovtzeff, \textit{Artibus Asiae}, vol. 4/1 (1930–32), p. 114.
tions. The suggestion is made that they are close in time to the "princely tombs" of the Pazyryk Valley, that is, somewhere between the fifth and third centuries before Christ. The closest affinities exist between the plaques and the Fifth Kurgan (K-5). Another attempt has been made to provide the so-called "idyllic" plaque with its proper setting in the nomadic epos, and to show that it is part of a story still in progress. The people, even one of the horses, are named and their exploits known. Targhyn became a khan and "thus living, Targhyn became old, and when death took him, he left the world. By

Aq-Zhunus he begat a son Arda-Bi, who was also a great hero and noble ruler. Arda-Bi had two sons: Asy Keräi and Aj-Qosha." The story continues.

113 The Fifth Kurgan at Pazyryk is also the tomb with the most foreign material, Chinese, Central Asian, and Iranian.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE ANIMAL DEITY: LURISTAN, TIBET, AND ITALY *

By BERNARD GOLDMAN

Small, decorated bronzes, unlike large works of art, are so easily carried from place to place that it is not surprising to find identifiable motifs common to them turning up far from their supposed point of origin. These travel souvenirs, therefore, have special significance. They help provide an estimate of the international flavor of ancient trade and travel; they are a measure, in the absence of written documents, of foreign contacts stretching over long distances; they once again remind us of man’s delight in exotic goods and ideas. But perhaps their most important function in the study of ancient society is to provide physical evidence of cultural cross-fertilization. The so-called “animal master” and “animal mistress” have this distinguished property.

The first place to look for these cultural souvenirs, of course, is along the great highways of the ancient world: the amber routes of Europe, the sea lanes of the Mediterranean, the caravan trails of the Palestinian littoral, the Syrian Desert, and the Twin Rivers. More recently we have come to recognize the importance of the skyline set of highways that linked Europe and Western Asia with the lands of the East. Professor Vernadsky properly described the Eurasian Steppe as an open “sea” carrying commerce between the settled lands of East and West. ¹ For example, a mixed collection of small bronzes gathered in Tibet by Giuseppe Tucci, and described by Mario Bussagli, speak as clearly of the extent of early travel as the étiquettes on a well-used suitcase.² Two “talismans” from this group are particularly interesting (figs. 1 and 2).³ They belong to a type of bronze design found as far west as ancient Etruria, but the motifs they carry are native to neither Tibet nor Italy. The design belongs within the sphere of highly skilled metalsmiths south of the Caucasus, one of whose extensions is represented in the splendid series of small bronzes from Luristan.

The Tucci collection is composed of small bronzes of different styles, dates, and origins. Such bronzes uncovered by modern Tibetans were considered to have divine origin and were worn as protective amulets. Their apotropaic power is responsible, fortunately, for their preservation, but it also accounts for their mutilation by constant wear. A glance at the published portions of the Tucci collection tells that not much can be served by treating the group as a whole, for it has little internal unity, being a chance assemblage of ancient survivals.

The bronze of figure 1 is composed of two concentric rings joined by small “bridges” surmounted by an animal head en face and two birds in heraldic pose; lugs on the outer ring complete the design. The bronze is worn smooth, eliminating any surface detail. The second Tucci bronze (fig. 2) is a complex variation of the first: three concentric rings (the innermost is partly broken away) carry some quadruped animals, floral-like motifs, beading and twisted rope patterns, and the

* This paper was completed with the aid of a research grant from the Graduate School, Wayne State University; it is a pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to that faculty.


³ A third bronze, similar in type to the two illustrated, is mentioned but not figured by Prof. Bussagli.
radiating lugs. This bronze is also worn smooth, making it difficult to decipher. The animal head on the first ring appears to be ovine; its broad, down-curling horns may identify it as a wild goat. It is not, however, related to the popular Chinese animal mask, the t'ao-t'ieh. The Chinese t'ao-t'ieh is based on the tiger; the ring mask is definitely that of a horned animal. A clear comparison can be made with the mask-decorated rings from Luristan (fig. 3). Animals, as here illustrated,

or birds are arranged on either side of the ibex mask. The Tucci bronze of figure 2 uses the flanking animals. The bird most common to the Luristan rings is the waterfowl; the birds on the Tucci ring, worn as they are, are more suggestive of the cock. The ring of figure 2 has bird heads rising from the topmost


5 André Godard, Bronzes du Luristan, Ars Asiatica, vol. 17 (1931), pl. xxxi, 111.

---

Fig. 1.—Tibetan Bronze. Tucci Collection. (After Bussagli, Artibus Asiae, XII [1949], No. 12.)

Fig. 2.—Tibetan Bronze. Tucci Collection. (After Bussagli, Artibus Asiae, XII [1949], No. 6.)

Fig. 3.—Luristan Pin. Bronze. (After Ancient Art in American Private Collections, No. 81.)
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lug on either side; they have the short, curved beak of the cock also. A third Tucci bronze ring is described as having cocks on it.⁶ Luristan rings make use of the concentric circles but not radiating lugs as such. Another apparent dissimilarity may be noted; whereas the Luristan rings are complete circles (fig. 4), the Tucci inner ring is interrupted at the top, turning upward to meet the outer ring. Examination of the genesis of the motif explains these seeming discrepancies.

The Tucci bronze with three concentric rings has, instead of the flanking birds, two animals with arched necks mounted on the backs of two other animals. The latter two beasts appear to emerge from the rings. The worn state of the bronze makes identification uncertain, but flexed forelegs and massive horned heads may be distinguished. The center mask is missing, replaced by a trilobed flowerlike arrangement. Luristan bronze pins and "standards" commonly use the device of rings terminating in animals and in feline or ibex heads (fig. 5). One animal standing on, or springing out of, the back of another is also a common Luristan motif. That which seems to be represented in the ring of figure 2 is two affronted animals (perhaps rams, whose horns would account for the large masses above the "eye" sockets) with felines on their backs, as

Fig. 4.—Luristan Pendant. Bronze. (After Godard, Bronzes du Luristan, pl. XXXII, 118.)

The design is schematically presented on Luristan "standards."⁷ It should be noted that both Tucci rings have a fragmentary stem at the bottom, different in size and shape from the radiating lugs. These stems appear on the Luristan "pin" rings as well (pl. 1, A). The double-braided rope pattern on the inner ring of figure 2 is similarly used in Luristan; the beading on the outside ring appears in Luristan on the necks of animals that arch in a circular form.⁸ The lugs on the Tucci bronzes may be

⁶ Bussagli, op. cit., p. 337.


⁸ Godard, op. cit., pls. xxvi, 156; lii, 195.
the vestigial remains of the small animals that perch on the rim of the Luristan circles, or they may be imitations of the stylized curls on the necks and wings of the Luristan animals. Either way, the outer ring of the figure 2 bronze may be interpreted as the elongated bodies of the two opposing animals, corresponding to the manner in which the Luristan animals are treated (fig. 6). Still another origin of the lugs may be the cock's head that springs from the back of the Luristan animals, and is also found on the Tucci ring. A Luristan bronze in the Museum of Art and History of Geneva shows yet another possible prototype for the lugs. This pin (fig. 7) shows the two affronted rams with elongated necks from which spring little floral-like clusters that frequently appear on the bodies of Luristan animals and which the Tibetan lugs may well echo. Perhaps no one of these Luristan motifs can be held directly accountable for the radiating lugs; rather, the lugs are a reflection of the Luristan style of decorating circles, wings, and necks with small series of finials. In the same manner, the decorative element at the top of the Tucci bronze reflects the floral decoration at the top of Luristan pin heads (fig. 7).

The points of similarity between the Tucci bronze rings and those of Luristan are sufficiently numerous and important to permit labeling the Tucci pieces as belonging to the Luristan style. Unfortunately, their worn condition does not permit one even to guess whether these are actual importations from Luristan or local productions; but at least they indicate some physical connection between Luristan and the East. The transformation of the semirealistic animal style of the Luristan bronzes into more abstract patterns probably indicates that the Tucci bronzes

---

9 I am indebted to Dr. Edmond Sollberger for his kind permission to examine this and other pieces in the Luristan collection of the Museum of Art and History.

Fig. 6.—Luristan Standard. Bronze. (After Legrain, *Luristan Bronzes in the University Museum, No. 2.*)
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postdate the Luristan. It would be interesting to find other bronzes in the Tucci collection that reflect the Luristan genre, and the search is not unrewarding. Two pieces are sufficiently distinctive to be noted. One bronze illustrated by Bussagli is composed of a small figure

postdate the Luristan. It would be interesting to find other bronzes in the Tucci collection that reflect the Luristan genre, and the search is not unrewarding. Two pieces are sufficiently distinctive to be noted. One bronze illustrated by Bussagli is composed of a small figure

Luristan character (fig. 8). This decorative piece with a ring for suspension was found “in Shipki, viz, on the very boundary between Western Tibet and Kunavar,” and was called by Tucci unmistakably Tibetan. But it is only necessary to point out a few Luristan bronzes to show the possibility of a non-Tibetan ancestry. The double bird, the cock specifically, is a much-used Luristan motif, and also Luristan are the manner in which the eye and triple crest are formed, the way in which the striations are placed over the back, and the fixing of the ring on top.

Fig. 8.—TIBETAN ROOSTER PENDANT. BRONZE. (After Tucci, Artibus Asiae, V [1935], No. 16.)

The Mediterranean extension of the Western Asiatic style is strikingly close to its appearance in the Tucci bronzes. Bronze rings come from different locations in Etruscan Italy, but they are particularly numerous at Vetulonia (viz, Tomba Belvedere, Tomba del Tridente, Val di Franchetta, Val di Campo). A representative example from Romagna (fig. 9) is composed of the double concentric rings, the inner one “broken” at the top, thickened

\[ \text{Fig. 7.—LURISTAN PIN. BRONZE. (Museum of Art and History, Geneva, No. 14203.)} \]

\( \text{monkey, man, or grotesque?}) \) grasping with his hands the ring inside which he stands. This is a familiar Luristan motif. A double-headed cock illustrated by Tucci is also of

\[ \text{10 Bussagli, op. cit., p. 338, object No. 19.} \]

\[ \text{11 A. U. Pope, Survey of Persian Art, vol. 4 (New York, 1938), fig. 41c.} \]

\[ \text{12 Tucci, op. cit., pp. 113-114, object No. 16.} \]

\[ \text{13 Cf. Godard, op. cit., pl. xlv, 175.} \]

\[ \text{14 Ibid., pl. li, 190.} \]
stem at the bottom, and lugs and small animals on the outer circumference. Not present in the Tucci bronzes is the interior figure with arms raised, hands grasping the sides of the ring, and with duck heads rising from its thighs. The rooster does not come into Italian art at this early date; instead, the so-called "Hallstatt duck" takes its place. Thus the cock head on the Tucci bronze is replaced by the duck head on the Italian rings (fig. 9). With the exception of the important central figure, the rings found in Tibet and Italy follow the same basic pattern.

The Italian rings were used in various ways. Some were fastened by a horizontal plate at the bottom of the stem to deep bowls; they resemble handles, but, more probably, they were decorative accessories on the vessels. An Etruscan ring in the British Museum (90.9–21.16), carrying the same motif as that from Romagna, resembles modern horse brasses for martingales and bridles. The Luristan pieces have always been called "pins" because of their long, tapering stems. The fragmentary stems on the Tucci bronzes may indicate that they, too, were pins. The pierced lugs on the Etruscan bronzes still carry some small bangles, chains of wire links, and by analogy we may assume that the pierced lugs on the Tucci piece were similarly embellished.

The comparative descriptions of the three groups of bronzes—Tibetan, Etruscan, Luristan—can be summarized as follows. The bronzes share sufficient critical elements of design to group them in a single style: concentric rings mounted on a stem, circles terminating in animal or bird heads, animals and pierced finials on the circumference. There are several indications that the Luristan examples are closest to the prototype. Primary is the fact that the Luristan bronzes embody all the features contained in the Tibetan and Italian pieces, but the latter two groups do not necessarily share them. The cock of the Luristan bronzes appears on the Tucci pieces, but in Italy it is replaced by the waterbird. The waterbird decoration is too strongly entrenched in Italy to suggest that the Italian rings are other than local products, even though they are of Western Asiatic derivation. It is true that the duck appears frequently in the small bronzes of Luristan, but in the West it is certainly a European trademark. An important distinction between the Luristan and Etruscan bronzes on the one hand and the Tibetan pieces on the other is in the use of the human figure inside the ring. However, rings with birds and animals on the circumference but with no central figure do appear in both Luristan and Etruria, and the Tucci ring with the grotesque inside, mentioned above, makes the appearance or nonappearance of the figure something less than a critical factor in identifying the relatedness of the several pieces. Stylistically the Italian and Tibetan examples seem later than those of Luristan. The seminaturalistic forms of the Luristan bronzes are simplified and formalized in the other two groups: animals turn into lugs, elongated bodies become abstract rings. More difficult to pin down, but certainly clear, are the vital animal spirit, the rhythmical tensions and sense of awareness of the Luristan bronzes which in the Italian and Tibetan pieces have been reduced to a formal, hieratic composition.

I would suggest, then, that the open-ended ring of the Italian and Tibetan bronzes is a geometric representation of the double animal in the popular "animal master" motif of Western Asia. The figure of the "master" may drop out of the design, but the idea of the center


Fig. 9.—Etruscan Disk Handle. Bronze. (After Notizie degli scavi antichita, IV [1928], p. 439.)
mask, the affronted animals, and the smaller accessory animals and heads remains. It is the persistence of specific elements in the three groups, rather than their differences, that is striking. For example, the birds springing from the thighs of the center figure in the Italian bronzes reflect the same motif in the Luristan pin of figure 5. The Luristan artist was working with a traditional idea—the hero mounted on the backs of animals—which he frequently abbreviated by omitting the lower part of the figure. The Etruscan craftsman, with his love for the waterbird motif, substituted it for the ram. The Tibetan bronzes show a schematic memory of the archetype: an inner circle is substituted for the hero; the connecting “bridges” are all that remain of the hands, feet, and animals. We can observe this process of simplification and abstraction in operation in the more abundant finds of Italy. There the figure appears with its flanking birds, but sometimes the human figure drops out of the composition, leaving only the birds with joined bodies. The double birds in the ring from the Tomb of Franchetta (Vetulonia) begin to assume the abstract properties of the open-end ring in the Tucci collection (fig. 10). The Luristan pin from Geneva (fig. 7) shows too many points of similarity with those from Italy to see it as other than the basic pattern from which the Italian pieces were cut. The motifs in the Geneva pin are difficult to decipher, but certain elements are clear. The outer “ring” is formed of affronted rams who face either snake or lion heads springing from the center stem. The middle of the pinhead is occupied not by the customary human figure, but by its abstract representation, a bar with a line of six circles; instead of the human arms, there are curved wings that fasten onto the rams’ muzzles. Small animals stand on the wings. Beneath the wings are the prototypes for the Italian ducks, long-tailed, curved-beaked birds whose flowing tails join the center stem. The radiating lugs, as noted above, are the tufts on the rams’ neck and back.

The iconography of the human figure in a ring of animals and birds cannot be fully unraveled. The precise meaning of a visual symbol must depend on exact descriptive reference in contemporary literature; in ancient art such keys are more often lacking than present. In their absence we must, when attempting to reconstruct definitive iconographical identifications, abide by the pessimistic conclusion of Voltaire when he sought the “first people” in his History of Philosophy (XII): revelation is absolutely necessary. In general terms the disks are latent with meaning: the “animal master” and his implications, the solar significance of disk, ibex, cock, and duck, the fertility
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 associations of the beasts, etc. The Luristan compositions are almost always labeled as the “animal master,” that is, the human figure between antithetically posed animals which he dominates. This is a challenging design if only because of its amazingly long history, from most ancient times through the Middle Ages. Professor Deonna traced the motif and its transformations in style and meaning in his essay on “Daniel, le ‘Mâitre des Fauves.’” In Western Asia the “master of animals” has been associated with the epic hero Gilgamesh and his brother in adventure, the famed Enkidu. Dussaud has suggested that these companions were in later times coalesced into one figure, one beneficent hero, as he may be represented in the Luristan bronzes.

In the ancient legends, Enkidu begins as a companion of animals: “With the gazelles he feeds on grass, / With the wild beasts he jostles at the watering-place.” His appearance is animal-like, for his whole body is covered with shaggy hair. Later, Enkidu becomes like a man, puts on clothing and is a hunter of wolves and lions; he and Gilgamesh slay a celestial bull sent down to destroy men. Gilgamesh, as animal slayer, tells how he destroyed the bear, hyena, lion, panther, tiger, stag, and ibex. A simile for him is the bull. On cylinder seals the bull-man is portrayed in the ritualistic gesture of slaying the celestial bull while his hairy companion destroys lions. Thus is the representation of the “animal master,” victorious over the beasts he grasps, with his long bull ears, curved horns, and coiled plaits of hair (Enkidu is “endowed with head-hair like a woman”).

However, connections between the literary adventures of Gilgamesh and Enkidu on the one hand and the highly stylized hero between two animals in the Luristan bronzes on the other are extremely tenuous. The motif is centuries old before it appears so abundantly in Luristan. Even if we were sure, which we are not, of its exact significance in most ancient times, we may well be skeptical that it retained much, if any, of its original denotation while still maintaining a general aura of power, be it the eternal struggle between opposing moral forces or the spiritual victory over nature’s relentless regime. Contenau is less concerned over the hero’s identification with Gilgamesh than with the motif’s “general religious value.” Or, one may be led to follow Frankfort’s observation that the hero between animals is “a theme used so frequently and in such varying contexts that one is tempted to suppose its meaning to be less important than its decorative effect.” The designation of “master of animals,” while ambiguous, is perhaps the best name for the composition. We may accept, it would seem, without question that the Luristan motif follows the old Gilgamesh design prototype—the pose, the animals and bull ears appear in traditional fashion. But it is quite possible that by the time of the Luristan bronzes

ancient orient, Harmondsworth, 1954, pls. 39, 40B, 45C. However, on the question of separating the personalities of the two heroes, see L. Speeers, Gilgamesh ou Enkidu—dompteurs des fauves, Bulletin des Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire (Bruxelles), vol. 21 (1949), pp. 65–76.

22 The Epic of Gilgamesh, tablet I, ii, line 36.
24 Frankfort, op cit., p. 35.
we no longer have the Gilgamesh-Enkidu denotation.

In Luristan we are dealing with at least two deities in the “animal master” pose. One follows the Gilgamesh description of the bull-man with large bovine ears, but without the bull horns; usually he wears a high polos. The other figure wears crescentlike horns, has long “Hathor” curls, and female sex characteristics. With the exception of those figures which are clothed or portrayed only as masks, the greater number of Luristan figures dominating animals show this clear distinction: the male hero is characterized with the bull ears, continuing the Gilgamesh pattern; the female has the crescent horns and curling locks. The “animal master” has historical priority over the so-called “mistress” in the East, and retains his greater popularity even in the later Luristan phases when the “mistress” is firmly established. In the Mediterranean the contrary is true, for there the “animal mistress” holds numerical superiority over the male figure. It is significant, although the evidence is meager, that the only Luristan figure yet found outside of Asia is the “animal mistress” wearing her crescent horns as she stands inside a ring.

The suggestion has been made by Nilsson that the sex of the animal deity is not of peculiar importance in the Mediterranean.

It is a very notable fact that either a male or a female deity may appear as the central figure in the anthropic group exerting its power over animals and monsters. There is both a Mistress of Animals and a Master of Animals. This duality is not difficult to understand when we remember how the monuments show these deities as still in the stage of evolution and transition from Nature daemons to gods. The Nature daemons, which roam the mountains and forests, foster the animals and bring good luck in hunting, are both male and female, their sex being a matter of slight importance. This fluid stage of symbolization in the Minoan-Mycenaean world does not apply to that of Luristan. There we are far removed from primitive formulations; the male and female deities are separate and distinct in the light of their attributes.

Because the so-called “mistress of animals” is so popular in the West, she may, perhaps, provide some insight into the identification of her Eastern sister. In the West she is sometimes connected with Artemis in her role of mistress of the animal kingdom, and she is represented with bird, hare, lion, panther, boar, stag, etc. She is the potnia theron of the Greeks. Athena assumes the role of an “animal mistress” when she appears with her two horses. But it should be recalled that Ishtar also, as in the Gilgamesh epics, takes on the character of goddess of horses. Perhaps we may better call this deity simply the “Lady” of the animals when she is not represented in a clearly “mastering” attitude. An Attic seal shows the Lady with raised arms, wearing a knee-length skirt, and with her upper torso bare (fig. 11). Two lions (?) face outward from her thighs in the same manner and position as the flanking birds in the Etruscan disks. Some lines are engraved over her head, and others are outward from her waist, suggesting to Sir Arthur Evans “a swing or skipping

25 Type examples in Godard, op. cit., pls. i, 187, 188; li, 193; lii, 196; lviii, 214.
26 Ibid., pls. xxxii, 116; xxxv, 151; lviii, 215.
29 Ibid., pp. 503–507.
31 Perhaps identifying her as Artemis, T. B. L. Webster, From Mycenae to Homer, London, 1958, p. 46.
rope.” The curving lines above her have been seen as hunting bows, thereby fulfilling the identification of a hunting goddess, a “mistress of animals,” an early form of Diana; but they may well be the serpents of the fertility goddess. The Eastern nude goddess, sometimes depicted with lions or bulls, stands in the same pose holding up her garment to expose her sex. The fringed border of her raised skirt is depicted on the sealings as if it, too, were a skipping rope. When completely naked, she may hold up in either hand flowering branches, animals, birds, and serpents. On a small plaque from Alalakh she is shown holding fluttering birds and stands within a mandorla-like ring. It is well worth comparing her with the Lady of the fluttering birds on the gold ornament from the shaft graves of Mycenae, and with the “god” (Lady?) presenting two serpents from the Aegina treasure. The figures in the Etruscan disks are associated with waterbirds, but the Lady with the more dovelike birds of Mycenae and Alalakh is popular in small Italian trinkets.

It is most likely that the Lady with flanking animals and serpents originates in the old Near Eastern iconography of the nude, frontally presented Lady who holds up the fringes of her garment, or flowering plant stalks or serpents in either hand. She, and the goddess holding or supporting her breasts with either hand, are the two figures who persistently violate the rigid profile mode of representation in the East. This Lady of the animals does not appear as dominant over her beasts, but instead they stand as her attributes. This lack of dominance, as it appears in the old Gilgamesh representations, seems quite clear. In Luristan, Crete, and Mycenae the Lady’s hands usually do not touch the flanking animals. When she does touch them, she does so in a ritual gesture, as a “laying on” of hands, or she holds them forth as if in a presentation

35 Ibid., fig. 9.
36 G. Karo, Die Schachtgräber von Mykenai, Munich, 1930–32, pl. 27; H. Schliemann, Mycenae, New York, 1878, Nos. 267, 268.
38 O. Montelius, La civilisation primitive en Italie, Italie centrale, Series B, Stockholm, 1904, pl. 309, No. 11.
39 These two deities should be added to the evidence for Near Eastern sources of frontality. For a recent summary of the arguments on the origins of frontality see D. Schlumberger, review of E. Will, Le relief cultuel gréco-romain (1955), Syria, vol. 35 (1958), pp. 384–386.
scene. Thus, the deity of the Late Minoan gold seal from the Thisbe Treasure presents the two long-necked birds that she holds by the neck in either hand, just as the Minoan snake goddess presents her snake attributes. Frequently the animals reach up and touch the Lady with their paws, establishing the reciprocity of their relationship. Miss Roes in her Greek geometric art had quite rightly questioned the "mistress" attribution of the Etruscan figures on the basis that they did not "master" the animals at all. Hence, it becomes reasonable to suggest that the Lady of the animals is not simply a consort of the "animal master" with his old Gilgamesh-Enkidu heritage, but rather she is a distinct and distinctive mythological concretion.

Who is this Lady? In her earliest appearance in the Old Orient she is a fertility goddess, the early Ishtar: she displays her nudity in the frontal pose, she deliberately exposes her sex in the act of lifting her garment, and she is associated with such fertility symbols as the flowering stalks and serpents. Over the years she becomes an archetypal figure reinterpreted and modified as she moves among different people.

For the appeal of religious symbols is not dependent upon a correct understanding of their original meaning. Once created, their lasting forms challenge the imagination; they may be charged with a new significance which they themselves called forth, and may stimulate a new integration in alien surroundings.41

She eventually assumes many identities: Hathor, Qadesh, Astarte, Ishtar, Rhea, Kybele,44 Anahit, and perhaps, when she appears in Boeotian geometric vase painting with a fish drawn on her skirt, she is related to the Eastern Derceto.45

An excellent example of the process by which these old deities are transformed and reidentified is provided by a later syncretism. Herzfeld described a late Persian temple at Persepolis (ca. the time of Alexander) with Greek rather than Persian inscriptions. The names of the ancient Eastern gods in this votive inscription are also Hellenized: "Zeus Megistos instead of Hormizd, Apollo and Helios for Mithra, Artemis and Queen Athena for Anahit bānok-nām 'whose name is Lady.'"46

The Lady of the Luristan bronzes still proudly displays her sexual attributes (pl. 1, B) and must belong with the Ishtar myth. It may be suggested that in Luristan, however, the astral identification of the fertility goddess is made manifest; that is, she becomes the Lady under the sign of the moon. She not only frequently stands within a crescent (formed by her attendant animals), but wears on her head the crescent horns. In this respect it is important that her horns do not spring separately from the sides of her head; rather, they are shaped by one continuous line, sitting over her brow (fig. 5; pl. 1, B), strongly suggesting that the horns are a slightly distorted lunar crescent. The goddess Qadesh wears on her head the lunar crescent with the solar disk resting on it.47 Her hair, like that of the Luristan Lady, falls in long "Hathor" locks. As-

40 Ashmolean Museum, A summary guide to the department of antiquities, pl. 15, B.
42 Barrelet, op. cit., pp. 43–44.
43 Contenau, La déesse nue babyloniennne, op. cit., pp. 7–8.
45 Lucian, De Deo Syria, 14.
46 Ernst Herzfeld, Archaeological history of Iran, London, 1935, p. 44; date of the temple, p. 46.
47 A. Parrot, Le Musée du Louvre et la Bible, Neuchâtel, 1957, p. 68, fig. 40.
tarte also wears the crescent and disk. Corroborating evidence of the human bust enclosed in the lunar disk comes in the form of some later representations, lead ex voto figures from near Baalbek, that combine astral attributes of moon, sun, and planets (fig. 12). Ronzevalle presented convincing evidence of the Astarte figure combined with the lunar crescent and serpents. And, of course, in Western art of

![Figure 12 - Ex-voto Figure. Lead. (Seyrig, Syria, X [1920], pl. lxxxvi.)](image)

our era Venus has often appeared with the crescent as a tiara in her hair.

The doves associated with Astarte may be those that appear with the Mycenaean nude Lady. In the Luristan disks and in those from the Tucci collection the cock replaces the dove; in the Etruscan disks the waterbird is the Lady’s familiar. Miss Roes weights the Etruscan birds with a solar significance, thereby making the figure in the ring a solar deity, the birds his attributes, and the circle the sun wheel—a cosmology that she sees as originating in Iran. But we may still treat as suggestive, rather than as definitive, the attribution of the circle, particularly the broken circle that assumes the crescent form, as being solar and its birds as reflecting the sun god.

The cock, who sometimes serves as the solar bird, has had so many meanings that there is little reason to suspect that the specific attributes of the bird in one country or time need carry over to the next. The cock has traditionally been considered as originating in Southwest Asia and India. In India, the earliest literary reference to it is from about the beginning of the first millennium B.C., but to the Greeks and Jews it was known as the Persian bird. It is interesting that there is no mention of the bird (alektor) in early Greek literature. Homer mentions only “the daughter of Alektor out of Sparta,” and the “son of great-hearted Alektryon,” a surname that also appears in Mycenaean documents. Nor is there any sure reference to the cock in the Old Testament. The cock (shechev) is thought sometimes to appear in Job 38:36, but appar-


50 Both astral signs, disk and crescent, were sometimes used together as attributes of a single deity (for example, Qadesh). The Virgin Mary, as Queen of Heaven, carries both signs, continuing this ancient tradition.


53 Odyssey, vi, 10.

54 Iliad, xvii, 602.

55 Webster, op. cit., p. 71, “the lord Alektryon, the Eteoklan.”
ently this is a misreading: the word refers to a celestial phenomenon at that point. In the Avesta the cock is an attribute of the god Srauša in his role of rouser of the faithful, calling them to their religious duties. In the New Testament the cock appears in the Gospels not only as a teller of time (Matthew 26:34; Mark 13:35), but also his crow becomes the symbol of the betrayal, sounding at the first and second denial of Christ (Mark 14:68, 72). This sinister aspect of the cock crowing is carried in classical literature. Philostratus marks cock-crowing time as the time for conjuring up the dead. As a herald of the coming day, it was associated with Apollo; in India it was a symbol of the “sun of men”; in China the sun may be represented by a cock in a circle. But these are samples; the multiple aspects of the cock in folklore and its use in divination, medicine, augury, and sacrifice are almost limitless.

The Lady of the animals appears too late in Luristan to have had any influence on her appearance in the Minoan-Mycenaean world. The group of bronzes to which she belongs does not predate 1000 B.C. The early Mediterranean examples, rather, are related to the second millennium B.C. context of Western Asia. But the Luristan motif is representative of a later Oriental influence in the West, when the Lady is introduced into Crete, Etruria, and probably Greece. In the Old Oriental and Mediterranean representations the artists attempt only a partial frontality. The legs and feet are in the profile view while the rest of the body and sometimes the head are frontal. The Lady assumes her completely frontal pose in Luristan, and hence in Etruria also. By circa 600 the Lady with her frame of animals, as she appears on the lovely Graeco-Italian “handles” (pl. 1, C), has been completely assimilated into Western iconography without losing the Oriental flavor of the composition and its elements. The addition of wings to the Lady may be a Western contribution to this motif. The motifs of the “animal master” and the Lady of the animals in her ring are a small part of the total picture of East-West relationships that continues to assume greater clarity. Two “animal master” bronzes from Arabia stylistically do not seem close to Luristan workmanship, but they show, at the least, the extension of the motif into Arabia. Luristan in character as well as workmanship are a Lady of the animals and a socketed axhead from Crete. Several years ago Miss Segall asserted the real possibility of artistic and iconographical relationships between Luristan and Greek geometric art, and there are many suggestive items that would corroborate her specific examples. We may note the open-

---

60 Hastings, Selbie, Lambert, Mathews, Dictionary of the Bible (1909).
62 The Treatise of Eusebius, xxv.
63 Coomaraswamy, op. cit., p. 402.
64 R. P. Knight, The symbolic language of ancient art and mythology, New York, 1876, pp. 70–71.


work bronze jingles, or pendants, with bird decoration that occur in Greece and Luristan. A small iconographical feature that presents fruitful prospects, for example, is the motif of the bird with a wavy serpent in its beak. The motif appears in the orientalizing period in Crete and at Tepe Giyan (Iran) with its Luristan burials. The elbow-type spring fibula found in Luristan appears to have a European or Mediterranean origin. Not only do we find Iranian elements in early Etruscan material, but we may well look for the oriental traits in Etruscan bronzes moving up into Northern Europe. A Hallstatt horse-decorated socketed axhead, a horse-decorated socket from Vetulonia, and Luristan animal-decorated axes show pertinent relationships.

On the other side, geographically, there is no lack of references to possible connections between the Far East and Western Asia; a few may be mentioned to suggest the milieu of foreign relations of which the disks are a part.

69 Brock, op. cit., p. 98, pl. 76, fig. 17f.
72 Viz, P. Jacobsthal, Greek pins and their connections with Europe and Asia, Oxford, 1956, pp. 19, 85, 86.

The “animal master” motif, present in the Minoan-Mycenaean context as well as in Egypt, had currency in the Far East. On some Shang bronzes the hero will hold the animal by his muzzle, or animals will be dorsally placed, antithetical to him. A third animal is sometimes placed under the hero as if it were his vehicle. Li Chi argues against an independent origin for these Chinese “animal masters,” regarding them as variations of the original Mesopotamian motif. Sometimes, in the place of the human figure, “the character wang, meaning king, might appear; and the lions on both sides were replaced at first by tigers, and later by a pair of boars or even dogs.” The cock appears later in Chinese art in the antithetical position, bracing a winged and horned human figure. The Chinese use of the “hero” between animals and the cock may be a motif arrived at independently of the West, but the relatively late appearance of the “animal master” in Shang times perhaps indicates a connection. For example, Li Chi notes that, along with the heraldic composition, the design of intertwined animals comes so much later than its Western counterpart that he would insist on a Western origin. Leroi-Gourhan places the appearance of the cock at the end of the Chou period; Miss Waterbury found frequent mention of the cock sacrifice beginning at the same time.

77 W. S. Smith, History of Egyptian sculpture and painting in the Old Kingdom, Boston, 1949, 2d ed., fig. 33.
79 Ibid., p. 28.
80 A. Leroi-Gourhan, L’art animalier dans les bronzes chinois, Revue des Arts Asiatiques, vol. 9 (1935), p. 189, fig. 12, No. 75.
81 Li Chi, op. cit., pp. 25–27.
82 Leroi-Gourhan, loc. cit.
83 F. Waterbury, Bird-deities in China, Ascona, 1952, p. 84.
One particular type of socketed ax from China, studied by Max Loehr, raises the possibility of

... some Iranian strain which, passing first through Turkestan and Southern Siberia, then farther east between the Altai and Tien-shan ranges to Kansu and Suiyian, finally—though distorted and disguised—no longer applicable to whole shapes, reached the Yellow River, where perhaps a still essentially Neolithic culture obtained.\(^{84}\)

The relationship between certain artifacts from China and the Hallstatt culture is not clearly defined, but the weight of evidence is impressive.\(^{85}\) The connections between Europe, Western Asia, and China in later periods, particularly just before and after the beginning of the Christian era, have been discussed in terms of trade and invasions—Hunnish and Avar—by Zoltán de Takács.\(^{86}\) Sueji Umehara has suggested that traces of Western culture in Han China may be revealed in the fantastic animals found on some wooden plaques from Korea.\(^{87}\) This beast, a long-necked, winged quadruped with reindeer horns (or does he wear, perhaps, a reindeer mask in Nomadic style?) has a long-necked bird head coming from his chest.\(^{88}\) As Umehara notes, it reflects the nomad patterns of Pazyryk and Noin-Ula. And the rich finds of Pazyryk, in turn, demonstrate strong affinities with Achaemenian Persia, while the classical aspect of the Noin-Ula fabrics was pointed out immediately after their recovery by Kozlov’s expedition.\(^{89}\) The ceramic evidence for most ancient contacts between the Near and Far East has been discussed in several places.\(^{90}\)

The bronze rings must take their place as part of the corroborative evidence of the interchange of designs and motifs over great distances in the ancient world, and of the importance of Western Asiatic metalworking in this trade. It is tempting to envisage an equally free diffusion of religious concepts, as typified by the “animal master” and the Lady of the animals with her lunar and fertility symbolism.

\(^{84}\) M. Loehr, *Chinese bronze age weapons*, Ann Arbor, 1956, p. 32; but for reservations see p. 29.


\(^{88}\) *Ibid.*, fig. 17.

\(^{89}\) G. Boroffka (Borovka), *Griechische Stickereien aus der Mongolei*, Die Antike, vol. 3 (1927), pp. 64–69, pls. 7, 8.

DIE AUSGRABUNGEN IN NÄLANDÄ UND DIE BAUKUNST DES SPÄTEN BUDDHISMUS IN INDIEN
VON HEINRICH GERHARD FRANZ


I. DIE AUSGRABUNGEN IN NÄLANDÄ UND DER BERICHT DES HSÜAN-TSANG

Die eindruckvollsten Reste kamen in Nālandā zutage, wo die seit 1915 durchgeführten Freilegungsarbeiten ein lebendiges Bild vom Aussehen einer buddhistischen Klosteranlage der zweiten Hälfte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. ergaben. Die zahlreichen Funde figürlicher Plastik, besonders von Kleinbronzen, zeigen Nālandā als blühendes Kunstzentrum, dessen Erzeugnisse den Weg in die buddhistischen Länder fanden und dort, in Tibet, Burma, Indonesien die heimische Entwicklung


befruchteten und beeinflussten. Sind die Klein- 
bronzen Zeugen eines lebhaften geistigen und 
künstlerischen Austausches mit diesen aus-
serindischen Ländern—ihre Wanderung lässt 
sich vor allem im Falle Javas verfolgen—so 
zehen auch die ausgegrabenen Bauten Typen, 
die das Vorbild abgaben für die Kunst Hinter-
und Inselindiens. Sie lassen im allgemeinen 
drei Bauepochen erkennen, von denen die 
spätere—häufig auf Wiederherstellungsarbei-
ten beschränkt—durch Inschriften in die Zeit 
des Königs Mahendrapâla (um 890–910) 
datiert. An dem mit Nr. 3 bezeichneten Kult-
bau unterscheidet man allerdings wesentlich 
mehr Umbauten. Er enthält sieben Bauphasen, 
deren jede eine neue Schale um den vorherge-
henden Bau legte.

Das als bedeutendes Zentrum buddhis-
tischer Theologie bekannte Kloster von Ná-
lândâ hinterliess bereits bei dem chinesischen 
Pilgermönch Hsüan-tsang einen unauslösch-
lichen Eindruck, als er im frühen siebten Jahr-
hundert zur Zeit der Herrschaft des Har-
vardhana von Kanauj (606–647) dort mit 
hohen Ehren empfangen wurde. In seinem 
Reisebericht hat er eine farbenreiche und 
gebieterre, wenn auch knappe Schilderung der 
Klosteranlage gegeben:  

Die ganze Anlage ist von einer Ziegelmauer 
umgeben, die den gesamten Klosterbezirk nach aussen

4 A. J. Bernet Kempers, Die Begebenheit der griech-
sisch-römischen Kunst mit den indischen Kulturkreis, 
Handbuch der Archäologie, Band 6, München, 1954.
5 Die Verbindung mit Java zeigt der Fund einer 
ineine Bronzeplatte eingravierten Urkunde des Königs 
Balaputra von Sumatra, in der dieser durch König 
Dvarapâla von Bengalien (um 815–854) dem Kloster 
Nâlandâ 5 Dörfer zum Unterhalt stifte: Epigraphia Indica, 
vol. 17, S. 310ff.
6 J. Legge, A record of Buddhist kingdoms, Ox-
ford, 1886, S. 81; T. Watters, On Yuan Chwang's 
travels in India, London, 1904, Bd. 2, S. 164ff.; H. 
Sasti, Nâlandâ and its epigraphical material, Memoirs 
of the Archaeological Survey of India (Mem. ASI), 
No. 66, Delhi, 1942 (Berichte des Hsüan-tsang auf
abschliesst. Ein Tor öffnet sich in das grosse Kloster-
gebäude, von dem acht andere Hallen abgetrennt 
sind, welche den Mittelpunkt des Klosters bilden. Die 
reich geschmückten grossen Türme und die märchen-
haften Türmen scharen sich zusammen. Die hohen 
Beobachtungstürme scheinen sich im Dunst des Mor-
gens zu verlieren und die obersten Räume türmen sich 
über die Wolken auf. Die äusseren Höfe mit den 
Räumen der Geistlichen sind vier Stock hoch. Die 
Geschosse haben drachenförmige Vorsprünge 
und farbige Voluten; die perlroten Pfeiler, geschnitzt 
und ornamentiert, die reich geschmückten Balustraden 
die mit Ziegeln gedeckten Dächer, die das Licht in 
tausend Schatten zurückwerfen, alles das vermehrt 
Die Schönheit des Anblicks.

Dieser enthusiastische Bericht fand durch 

DIE KLOSTERBAU

Streng voneinander geschieden grenzen 
sich in Nâlandâ die in einer langen Flucht 
aneinander gereihten Klosterkomplexe von den 
Kultbauten ab, deren grosse Schutthügel und 
freigelegte Terrassen ebenfalls eine lange 
Reihe bilden (Abb. A). Diese für Nâlandâ 
typische Anlage besitzt keine Parallelen in den 
anderen buddhistischen Klöstern Indiens, so-
weit sie ausgegraben sind (Sânci, Saheth-
Maheth, Nagârjunakônda). 7 Wohl aber folgt 
die Trennung von Kult- und Wohnbauten einer 
S. 15); J. Takakusu, A record of the Buddhist re-

7 Vgl. A. Foucher, L'art gréco-bouddhique du 
Foucher, The monuments of Sânci, Calcutta, 1946; 
A. H. Longhurst, The Buddhist antiquities of Nagar-
juvnakônda, Madras Presidency, Mem. ASI, Delhi, 
1938; T. N. Ramachandran, Nagârjunakônda, Mem. 
ASI, No. 71, Delhi, 1953; P. Ram. Rao, The art of 
Nagârjunakônda, Madras, 1956; Indian Archaeology 


Eine Hervorhebung einzelner Kapellen durch erhöhten Oberbau fand im buddhistischen Klosterbau offenbar schon im zweiten-dritten Jahrhundert n. Chr. im Zusammenhang mit dem Aufkommen des monumentalen Kultbildes und der Streckung und Längung des Kultstūpa statt, den diese Kapellen umschlossen. Die Tendenz zu vertikaler Entwicklung bestimmte anscheinend in gleicher Weise die sakrale Plastik wie die Baukunst dieser Zeit.12

III. KULTBAU NR. 3 IN NĀLANDĀ: STŪPA UND TURM

Die Frage nach der Existenz von Turmbauten erhebt sich in Nālandā noch entscheidender angesichts der gewaltigen Terrassen der Kultbauten. Die grösste Anlage war der mit

8 Vgl. Anmerkung 1.
10 Marshall-Foucher, Sānci, loc. cit.
11 F. A. Khan, Mainamati, Karachi, 1956 (Pakistan publications.)
SURVEY PLAN
OF THE EXCAVATED REMAINS
AT NALANDA

Abb. A—Nālandā; Kloster, Grundriß der Ausgrabungen. (Nach ASIAR.)
(Nach Burgess, pl. 44.)

(Nach Burgess, pl. 32.)

(Nach Burgess, pl. 27.)
Abb. E—ELÜRÄ: HöHLE No. 4. (Nach Burgess, pl. 57.)

Abb. G—Sāncī: Kloster No. 31. (Nach Marshall-Foucher.)

Abb. H—Maināmati: Großer Tempel, Kloster. (Nach Pakistan Publications No. 183.)
Nr. 3 bezeichnete Backsteinbau, ein Stūpa, um dessen innersten Kern nicht weniger als sechs Erweiterungsbauten liegen, wobei sich jeweils der neue Bau als Schale um den Vorgänger Kammer allein von grösserem Umfange ist als die vorangehenden Stūpas (Abb. Ą). Mit diesem Umbau nahm die Anlage grosse Dimensionen an. Der eigentliche Stūpa stand auf


*einer von vier Eckstūpas flankierten Terrasse von etwa 15 m Seitenlänge, von der eine Ecke bei den Freilegungsarbeiten aus der Umhüllung des fünften Baues—ebenfalls eine Terrassenanlage mit Eckkapellen—zum Vorschein kam.*

13 ASIAR, 1927–28, Tafel 41–43.
NALANDA EXCAVATIONS
STUPA SITE NR 3
EAST ELEVATION

ABB. K—NALANDA: BAU NO. 3, GRUNDRISSE. (Nach ASIAR.)
NALANDA EXCAVATIONS
STUPA SITE No. 3
PLAN SHOWING POSITION OF EARLIEST STUPAS INSIDE MOUND

ABB. 1—NALANDA: BAU No. 3, SCHNITT. (Nach ASIAR.)

IV. BAU NR. 3 IN NĀLANDĀ UND DIE ÄLTESTEN KULTBAUTEN IN BURMA


Die ältesten erhaltenen Kultbauten von Burma stammen aus dem elften Jahrhundert (Abb. M-P, Abb. 18a). Sie bestehen fast durchwegs aus einem hohen massiven Mauerwerk, der als Träger eines Tempel turmes oder


Abb. N—Pagân: Anandā-Tempel, Grundriss. (Nach Mem. ASI, No. 56 (1937), pl. 6.)


V. DER TERRASSENSTŪPA IN INDIEN


Auf solchen Stufenterrassen erbaute Stūpas sind als Bronzemodelle—das Museum in Peshāwar besitzt einige—erhalten, die wahrscheinlich aus indo-tibetischen Gebieten stammen, wie die Überkreisform der Stūpakuppel und die vor Kuppel und Harmikā gestellten Bildnischen mit Bodhisattvias nahelegen (Abb. 8, 9). Die quadratischen Terrassen bauen sich auf mehreren Stufen auf, die auf allen vier Seiten durch Freitreppe verbunden sind.


Auch auf Terrakottaplatten und Tonsiegeln finden sich Darstellungen solcher Stūpas, die die gleiche Umrissform aufweisen. Diese weit verbreiteten Platten sind ebenso wie die Tonmodelle vor allem in Tibet und Zentralasien gefunden worden, wo sie wohl die Pilger hinbrachten, die aus Indien kamen und dort die grossen Gedenkstätten des Buddhismus aufgesucht hatten (Abb. 12).¹⁹

Eine besonders reiche Form des Stūpa Hügels zeigt ein anderes Tonmodell (Abb. 13). Die Terrassen sind hier in unzählige kleine Vorsprünge aufgelöst, die offenbar selbst

¹⁹ Vgl. Anmerkung 17.
wieder Kleinstûpas nachbilden, so dass regelrechte Stûpaberge entstanden. In Lauriyâ-
Nandangârû ist ein riesiger Stûpahügel freigelegt, dessen allein erhaltener Sockel die gleiche
prismatische Zergliederung zeigt.20 Vermut-
lich stand hier einer der in den Modellen abgebildeten Großstûpas und wahrscheinlich ist in
dem fünften Bau des Stûpa Nr. 3 in Nâlandâ
ein anderer zu suchen.

Dass die Tonmodelle im einzelnen dif-
ferieren, lässt darauf schließen, dass mehrere
den bedeutende Stûpaberge dieser Art existierten.
In dem um 850 erbauten Borobûdûr auf Java
erlebte dieser Typus des Stûpa auf Terrassen-
stufen seine grossartigste Weiterbildung.21 Die
indischen Vorbilder dazu müssen spätestens um 800 entstanden sein.

VI. DIE TURMTEMPEL IN NÂLANDÂ

Als Hsüan-tsang um 630 Nâlandâ be-
suchte, fielen ihm, wie schon gesagt, die zahl-
reichen Türme auf, ebenso wie ein sechs-
geschossiger Tempel mit einer 30 m hohen
Kultstatue.22 Von Bau Nr. 3 stand damals
wahrscheinlich der 5. Erweiterungsbau, von
dem ungewiss ist, ob er einen Turm oder Stûpa
als Oberbau besass. Ein in Nâlandâ gefundener
Inscriptionsstein von Yaßovarmâdeva berichtet
u.a.: "Hier in Nâlandâ . . . errichtete Bal-
lâdiya (um 530 n. Chr.), der grosse König . . . einen grossen und aussergewöhnlichen

20 J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, South-East Asian
architecture and the stûpa of Nâlandârû, Artibus
21 T. Van Erp-N. J. Krom, Beschrijving van
Barabudur, Archaeologisch Onderzoek in Neder-
landsch-Indie, vol. 1, Den Haag, 1920; vol. 2, Den
Haag, 1931; N. J. Krom: Barabudur, Archaeological
description, 2 vols., Den Haag, 1927; P. Mus, Bara-
budur, Bull. École Francaise d'Extrême-Orient
(Hanoi) [BEFEO], vol. 33 (1928), S. 699ff.; M.
Parmentier, L'architecture interprétée dans les bas-
reliefs anciens de Java, BEFEO, vol. 7 (1907), S.
1–60.

Prasada (Turmtempel) des Buddha als ob
man den Kailâsaberg (d.h. den Götterberg)
dabei sähe."23 Auch Hsüan-tsang erzählt von
einem Tempel des Balâdiya.24 Vielleicht ist
dieser mit den Ruinen des Tempels Nr. 2
gleichzusetzen.

Auf die Existenz von Turmtempeln weisen
in Nâlandâ auch die Funde kleiner Tempel-
modelle in Turmform.25 Diese zahlreichen
Kleinmodelle aus Bronze und Stein, die teils
als Votivgaben, teils als Erinnerungen der
Pilger dienten, geben über das einstige Aus-
sehen der nur in Ruinen erhaltenen Kultbauten
überhaupt wertvolle Auskünfte. Sowohl für
den Terrassenstûpa wie für den Tempelturm,
den einfachen Stûpa und den mit Kultnische
oder Kapelle kombinierten finden sich Beispiele
(ABB. 14, 15).26 Mit der Entdeckung dieser
Turmmodelle steht der Tempelturm in Bodh-
gayâ nicht mehr isoliert im buddhistischen
Sakralbau. Er war vielmehr im fünften und
sechsten Jahrhundert eine vor allem in Nor-
dostindien geläufige Form des buddhistischen
Kultbaues.

Auch Wiedergaben auf Terrakottaplatten
und auf steineren Stelen bieten zahlreiche
Anhaltspunkte zur Rekonstruktion der ver-
lornen Turmtempel.27 Von ersteren fanden
sich in Nâlandâ selbst Beispiele (ABB. 12,
10).28 Im Bengalen erscheinen steinerne Stelen
mit Turmtempeln und Kultbildern mehrfach
in abgekürzter Darstellung.29 Auf einer Stele

23 Sasti, loc. cit. (Anmerkung 6), S. 73, 78ff.;
24 Sasti, loc. cit., S. 24, 81.
25 H. G. Franz, Der indische Turmtempel und
seine Vorstufen, Forschungen und Fortschritte, vol. 32
(1958), S. 241ff.; ders., Pagode, Stûpa, Turmtempel,
26 Franz, Der indische Turmtempel, S. 268ff.
27 R. D. Banerjea, Eastern Indian school of medi-
ival sculpture, ASI, New Imperial Series, vol. 47,
Delhi, 1933, Taf. 78 (b).
28 Franz, Pagode, Abb. 10.
29 Banerjea, loc. cit., pl. 19 (b), im Indian
aus Dacca ist der Unterbau des Tempels über der Statuennische zunächst als gestufte Pyramide gestaltet und erst darüber wächst der sikhara auf (Abb. 17).

Derartige Darstellungen gehen zurück auf Turmtempel, die ähnlich ausgesehen haben müssen, wie die Miniaturtempel im Berliner Völkerkundemuseum (Abb. 18) oder im Rajban-Garten in Dinajpur (Ostpakistan). Der Unterbau mit den Statuennischen ist in letzterem durch drei kräftig profilierte wulstige Gesimse vom eigentlichen kurvilinearer sikhara getrennt, der aus gleichmässigen Zwerggeschossen im Form von Gesimsen besteht, mit vier Risaliten, die mit Kudu-Ornamenten verziert sind. Nach den in Nalendā gefundenen Turmmodellen sind sicher die auf grossen Terrassen errichteten Tempel Nr. 2 und 12 sowie Nr. 13 und 14 (Abb. A) zu rekonstruieren. Die starken Mauern der quadratischen Cellae von Nr. 12, deren Kultbild in Resten erhalten ist, und der ähnlichen Anlagen Nr. 13 und 14, deuten auf einen hohen, also wohl turmförmigen Oberbau (Abb. 20a-e; Abb. A). Ebenso wird man sich die kleineren quadratischen Tempelbauten mit Vorhalle, die neben Bau 12 stehen, mit einem Turm vorstellen müssen (Abb. 19, 19a).


Der Oberbau ist als gestufte Pyramide geformt. In den vier Nischen mit dreilappigem Bogen sassen früher Buddhafiguren, von denen eine bei der Auffindung noch vorhanden war.

VII. DER FünFTürMIGE TERRASSENTEMPEL

Auf den ausspringenden Ecken der Terrasse von Nr. 12 stehen kleine Tempel mit Vorhalle und auch diese trugen vielleicht Turmbauten über der Cellae, so dass der grosse Turm in der Mitte wie am Mahabodhi-Tempel von Bodhgaya (Abb. 20b, c) von vier kleineren an den Ecken umrahmt war. Dieser Typus

36 M. S. Vats, The Gupta-temple at Deogarh, Mem. ASI, No. 70, New Delhi, 1952, Tafel 32 (a); Coomaraswamy, op. cit., Tafel 54; Rowland, op. cit., S. 127, Abb. 19.
38 Sir A. Cunningham, Mahabodhi, or the great Buddhist temple under the Bodhi tree at Bodhagaya, London, 1892. Erst nach Abschluss des vor-
Abb. Q—Borobudur: Grundriss. (Nach Krom.)

Abb. R—Borobudur: Schnitt. (Nach Krom.)
AUSGRABUNGEN IN NALANDĀ

ABB. S—DEOGARH: VIŚṆU-TEMPEL. (Nach Vats.)

ABB. T—DEOGARH: VIŚṆU-TEMPEL,
REKONSTRUCTION. (Nach Vats.)

Ein derartiger Terrassentempel mit 5 von turmförmigen Oberbauten bekrönten Kapellen, einer grossen in der Mitte, vier kleinen an den Ecken, ist auch der Viṣṇu-Tempel in Deogarh, der wahrscheinlich im sechsten Jahrhundert entstand (Abb. S, T; Inschrift mit datum ante quem um 600).38


Von derartigen Anlagen leiten sich die Tempelpyramiden und Tempelberge in Cambodia ab. Die frühesten (im 7. Jhdt. entstandenen) zeigen Terrassen und eine Gruppe von fünf Turmkapellen, im Schachbrett angeordnet, der mittlere Turm überragt die vier an den Ecken stehenden: Pré Rup, Ta Kéo,

**VIII. DIE STÜPAFORM DER NACHGUPTA-ZEIT**


Dem reich mit kräftigen Wulst und tiefen Einkehllungen profilierten Zylinder sind Kapellenmischern vorgesetzt (meist vier), bekrönt von einem Kudu-Fenster, in dessen Öffnung ein sitzender Buddha erscheint. Ein bronzener Kleinstūpa im Museum von Nālandā, der als bewegliches Kultobjekt diente, wiederholt diese Form des feststehenden Stūpa (*Abb. 23*).\(^{41}\) Derartige Stūpas mit vier in den


\(^{41}\) ASIAR, 1930–34, Taf. 136 (C); vorher Museum Nālandā 32 2924, 0,29 m hoch, Bronze, ur-
Zylinder eingesetzten Bildnischen sassen auch an den Ecken der grossen Terrasse des fünften Baues von Stūpa Nr. 3 in Nālandā, zwei der Stümpfe ohne die Kuppel sind noch erhalten und machen ihrerseits deutlich, dass hier keine fünf Türme, sondern eine Fünf-Stūpa-Gruppe auf der Terrasse standen mit einem grossen Stūpa in der Mitte und vier kleineren an den Ecken, ähnlich dem schon herangezogenen Bronzemodell (Abb. 7). 42


Dieser schuf im nordöstlichen Indien in der Spätzeit seiner Entwicklung eine Vielzahl von Bautypen und -formen, die bisher nur in der Nachbildung der Sakralbauten der von Indien missionierten Reiche Hinter- und Inselindiens bekannt waren. Die Ausgrabungen bringen die indischen Vorbilder ans Licht, die zugleich zeigen, dass der Buddhismus ganz entscheidend an der Schöpfung und Durchbildung der verschiedenen Typen des Turmtempels beteiligt war, der bisher als eine Schöpfung des Hinduismus galt.

42 Es stammt von Bau Nr. 11 in Nālandā.

43 Museum Nālandā 32 4959, 0.18 m hoch und Nr. 32 2959, 0.21 m hoch, ASIAR, 1930—34, Taf. 15.

44 Ebd., Taf. 16, Museum Nālandā S. 1 420 A 29; 0.17 m hoch.
Abb. 1.—Nālandā: Blick über das Grabungsfeld des Klosters von der Spitze von Bau Nr. 3. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 2.

Abb. 3.

Abb. 4.

Abb. 2, 3, 4.—Nālandā, Bau Nr. 3; Reste der Fassade des 5. Baues. (Aufn. Verfasser.)
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Abb. 5.—Nālandā, Kultbau Nr. 3; Gesamtansicht mit den Resten der Treppenanlage. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 6.—Nālandā, Kultbau Nr. 3; Reste des Eckstūpa. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 7.—Modell eines Terrassenstūpa. Bronze. New Delhi, National Museum.

Abb. 8.—Kleinststūpa aus Bronze, Museum, Peshāwar. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 9.—Kleinststūpa aus Bronze, Museum, Peshāwar. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 10.—Terrakottamodell eines Stūpa aus Chotscho. (Nach Le Coq.)
Abb. 11.—Terrakottamodell eines Stūpa, Berlin, Völkerkunde-Museum. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 12.—Terrakottaplatte aus Chotscho. (Nach Le Coq.)

Abb. 13.—Terrakottamodell eines Stūpa, aus Chotscho. (Nach Le Coq.)

Abb. 14.—Modell eines Turmtempels, Nālandā, Museum. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 15.—Fragment eines Modelles, Oberbau eines Turmtempels. Nālandā, Museum. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 16.—Terrakottaplatte, Nālandā, Museum. (Aufn. Verfasser.)
Abb. 17.—Stele mit Maṣjuśrī, Dacca, Museum (Aufn. Verfasser.)


Abb. 19.—Nālandā: Kleinerer Tempel neben Nr. 12. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 20.—Nālandā: Tempel Nr. 12, Reste der Stuckverzierung. (Aufn. Verfasser.)
Abb. 19a.—Nālandā: Tempel neben Nr. 12. (Aufn. ASI.)

Abb. 20a.—Nālandā: Bau Nr. 12, Stucknischen unter dem Erweiterungsbau. (Aufn. ASI.)
Abb. 20b.—Nālandā: Bau Nr. 12, Fassade der Terrasse. (Aufn. ASI.)

Abb. 20c.—Nālandā: Bau Nr. 12, Ecktempel, nach Konservierung. (Aufn. ASI.)
Abb. 20d.—Nalanda: Bau Nr. 13. (Aufn. ASI.)

Abb. 20e.—Nalanda: Bau Nr. 13, von SW, nach der Konservierung 1937/38. (Aufn. ASI.)
Abb. 22.—Nālandā: Votivstūpa neben Bau Nr. 3. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 23.—Stūpamodell aus Bronze, Nālandā, Museum. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 24.—Votivstūpa, Calcutta, Museum. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 25.—Votivstūpa, Sārnāth, Museum. (Aufn. Verfasser.)

Abb. 21.—Modell eines Tempels aus Bronze aus Nālandā. New Delhi, National Museum.
SOME TIBETAN T'ANKAS AT OXFORD

BY HERBERT J. STOOKE

It is a great pity that so many of the world's art treasures can be seen and enjoyed by so few. Many are hidden away in libraries and museums, and this is the case in connection with so many treasures of Tibetan art, particularly the paintings which go by the name of "t'anka." Even the literature about them is available only to the few, since the masterpieces of one of the greatest authorities on them are far too expensive for the private individual and indeed for most libraries. I refer to Tucci's great works, Indo-Tibetica and Tibetan Painted Scrolls; the former written in Italian and rarely to be found outside the largest libraries, and the latter, a most admirable work in English, magnificently printed with a volume of color and halftone plates, but at the cost of £90 per set of three volumes, far out of the reach of individuals and most institutions.

It is bearing this in mind that prompts me to write this brief essay in connection with some t'ankas which are hidden away in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

What are t'ankas? They are the most characteristic production of Tibetan pictorial art. European travelers who have seen them, either on the walls of religious buildings or carried by priests in processions at religious festivals, have always referred to them as banners or flags, which name really bears no relation to the Tibetan name of t'anka or t'an shu or shu-t'an which means "something rolled up," "volumen."

T'anka has replaced the name ras bis, design on cotton, which corresponds in translation of Tantric works to the Sanskrit Paṭa. Ras bis stresses the material on which the picture is painted but t'anka emphasizes its formal aspect, "a rolled up image." When putting a t'anka away, or taking it on a journey, one always rolls it up, taking care to begin at the bottom, since it would be entirely irreverent and tantamount to sacrilege to fold it up from the top.

T'ankas, which are usually paintings of specific deities, are not merely painted according to a painter's whim, but according to procedure laid down and codified in such Tantric works as the Āryamañjuśrīmūlataṇḍra. The paintings are nearly always rectangular and of definite measurements when they are used for a magical purpose, to acquire spiritual merit, or to evoke deities. In the case of the painting of maṇḍalas or symbolic representations of the universe, the rules differ. Maṇḍalas are square and vary in size depending upon whether they are of high, middle, or low rank.

The rules of measurement are not observed strictly in t'ankas; the most recent are rectangular, but the oldest, whether from Guje or Central Tibet or India, are square, i.e., the difference between length and breadth is much smaller than in modern t'ankas. In this connection another distinguishing mark between ancient and modern t'ankas is the border or frame. Modern t'ankas are framed on all four sides by woven material, while on the older t'ankas one finds only a wide border on the lower edge and a narrow one at the top; the sides are without border. The edge of the lower border is pasted onto a rod of bamboo, the ends of which are red or gold or sometimes wrought in the form of a flower. We find that in time the painted surface becomes rectangular, that the frame encloses all sides and that the material of the frame changes from cotton to silk.
In the center of the lower border a square piece of silk of another color or more prized is often found attached. It is referred to by the Tibetans as the door of the t’anka. Often it is wrought with figures of dragons representing, in contrast to the planes of spiritual purity represented in the paintings, the sphere of cosmic waters, of the inexhaustible possibilities latent in the world of Māyā, “the becoming”: a contrast of intellect and nature or matter.

The painting is stretched between two rods; the upper one is thin and the lower thick, and the ends are knobs of wood, silver, or brass. Attached to the upper rod is a length of thin silk (Zal k’ab) as large as the t’anka, which protects the painting when it is rolled up and from smoke of ritual lamps when it is hanging in temples. There are also two ribbons attached to tie it up when it is rolled.

T’ankas are mostly on linen cloth and in general the older the pictures, the coarser the cloth; sometimes they are found on silk or leather.

The silk is thickly covered with a mixture of glue and chalk and then polished. On this smooth surface the outlines are drawn, even minute details of ornamentation being completed before coloration takes place. It would be a sin to make a mistake in measurements of a body given in iconographical manuals. Usually a draughtsman makes the outline and a painter does the coloration since in Tibet, as elsewhere, a draughtsman is rarely a good painter and vice versa.

ORIGIN OF T’ANKAS

We find that India is largely responsible for the culture of Tibet. The Tibetans had little or no civilization when they first came in contact with India. They lived in tents, roaming on the highlands with flocks and herds, subjected to a shamanic and magical religion without even an alphabet or art. The Chinese who first made mention of Tibetans called them loathsome barbarians.

On becoming converted to Buddhism the Tibetans showed great zeal in the assimilation of the lofty which brought them to light from darkness. Because of their lack of cultured traditions and because of reverence for their masters, Tibetan converts were very careful not to change any teachings received from India and China. In fact, since they were issuing for the first time from an uncouth condition by virtue of the new religion, they were unable to make any contribution. There was a great difference between the transplanting of Buddhism into China and into Tibet. In China Buddhism had to conform to the country’s culture and undergo its influence, compromising with native traditions and adapting itself to Chinese psychology. On being transplanted into Tibet, however, Buddhism was rather preserved and protected than lived over again, since there were no traditions or culture in Tibet to which it should conform. Tibet had to assimilate Indian and Chinese suggestions for many centuries before it could follow paths and inspirations of its own.

T’ankas therefore are not a spontaneous creation of Tibetan talent, but rather a type of art borrowed from India together with other ideas which in course of time received the impact of the Tibetan genius.

Tibetan t’ankas were based on the Indian paintings called Paṭa: tissues painted with images and symbols of divinities or lives of saints. They came into general use with the development of Indian gnosis which had found its literary expression in the Tantra, a class of works outlining religious and magical ritual with the chief peculiarity being the prominence given to the female energy of the deity, his active nature being personified in his sakti or wife. Their uses are for the purpose of magic or as a work producing merit profitable for
spiritual welfare by looking on them and forming a pious thought. A further use is to evoke the deity they represent by meditation.

Paintings called Patas and those called mandalas became confused, but originally Patas reproduced figures of divinities while mandalas contained figures of deities and symbols according to a geometrical pattern of concentric squares and circles representing the projection of a cosmos, i.e., a psychocosmogram, representation of a scheme of the world in the liturgical drama. The mandala is an aid to meditation. In the ritual it functions as the abode of the deities themselves and as such must conform to the precepts; each deviation would detract from its usefulness.

The mandala was originally used for the initiation ceremonies when religious rites were performed and was drawn on the ground and afterward washed away. In time, however, the mandala became painted on paper just as the Pata was, and is now used by itinerant lamas who unroll large t’ankas to illustrate the stories and teachings of Buddhism to spellbound audiences.

ORIGIN OF TIBETAN PAINTINGS

Although the t’anka was more extensively developed and more successful in Tibet than in India, it derived from the magical and religious tradition of India. Since originally the Tibetans were ignorant of any art, Tibetan art was born out of contrast with India and China and so continued to live on its past.

By Indian tradition t’ankas are bound by exact and inviolable rules since they are representations of religious subjects and not free creations of the artist’s fancy. Just as it was an act of sacrilege for translators of texts to alter even a syllable of a text, so artists, once educated with a given style, handed down its technique, forbidden to make any arbitrary change. As the subject matter of these paintings, namely the visual symbol of Tantric experience, was unalterable and fixed, so their form was transmitted as inviolably as the religious tradition. Tibetan painting was therefore without any individual stamp until with the passing of centuries Tibet’s artistic spirit outgrew this subject.

Two schools supplied the first inspiration to Tibetan painting: a Bengali-Nepalese school and a West Tibet-Kashmiri school. The pictorial conception is the same in each school, but particular shades show the distinction between the two trends. Indian painting penetrated into Tibet by means of the miniatures in Bengali and Nepalese manuscripts, as well as through the Pata and mandala.

In the seventh century we find a double current penetrating Tibet from Nepal and from China caused by the marriage of the ruler of Tibet, sRong-btsan-sgam-po, to the daughter of the king of Nepal and also to a Chinese princess of the T’ang dynasty. Nepalese influence remained constant because of the frequency of trade and the exchange of persons and things, and finally because Nepal remained for a long time the country where Tibetans went to study Sanskrit and collect manuscripts. Thus for centuries Nepal greatly influenced Tibetan art. The Chinese influence, however, followed political events. When the Mongol dynasty fell, the Chinese influences died and were not rekindled until the eighteenth century, when Tibet linked its fortunes with China.

In the evolution of Tibetan painting we find two styles: Central Tibet and Guje. That of Central Tibet was dominated by Nepal. Nepalese manner tends to isolate figures of deities, perhaps through influences of miniature painters, and we find no trace of a sense of composition, but merely a series of divinities. In the style of Guje or West Tibet, paintings represent historical legends unfolded by subdivisions and squares, or biographies.
The artists were laymen, sometimes assisted by lamas, but the priest, though able to paint, did not as a general rule paint t'ankas. Painters as laymen did not allow priests to paint, so the latter did not consider painting as part of their priesthood.

The figures in the early paintings were without smiles, but later figures show smiles. Man had no place in the early t'ankas; he was put in the corners and background, but gradually we see additions develop such as processions of monks, white houses with thatched roofs, religious ceremonies, donors in festive apparel, armed horses, in fact scenes of human life instead of just a series of deities in files. Thus the t'ankas, rather than remaining static as in early examples, became projections of the earth with man entering as the actor, the saint taking his fellow men along with him.

With the Chinese invasion of Tibet in the eighteenth century, painting showed Chinese influence of space and landscape. This was the first great shock which stirred Tibetan painting; the use of a landscape not their own as seen about their barren wilderness, but one borrowed from Chinese landscape painters. The central figures remain cold and motionless, but scenes around them are free.

Tibetan painting therefore should not be regarded as of no artistic value, just because Tibetan artists endeavor to express on canvas the phantoms of their faith. It is exclusively religious insofar as it draws its inspirations from religious subjects.

The ultimate aim of a Buddhist devotee is to attain, by degrees, complete dissolution of the mirage of existence, and to become re-absorbed into the colorless light from which all things are born. The figures of deities express as a symbolical projection each mystical plane. The initiate’s palingenesis is produced by his reading into the secret instructions. Alternatively the gods are a conventional image of the forces with which the adept must identify himself in order to be in a miraculous condition which will enable him to conquer the abysmal world, whence evil germinates for cosmos and for men. This is the atmosphere which inspires Tibetan paintings, and, but for lives of saints, it mostly places before us symbols of mystical planes necessitating the preservation of the stiffness of geometrical patterns.

The patterns of the mandala rule the development of Tibetan paintings. The central figure is the symbol of a mystical sphere, or moment of cosmic evolution. Emanations unfold all around through which the spiritual force is gradually transformed into physical energies and material reality is evolved. Likewise in the older t'ankas, from the central figure of a deity, disciples shine forth expressing the irradiation of truth and the spiritual link uniting those who have been initiated into the same mystery. Hence these paintings are sometimes called Zin k'ams, Sanskrit Kṣetra, i.e., Buddhakṣetra, “the realm of Buddha,” ideal spheres where spirits of the elect partake of the vision of Buddha.

The planes of Buddhahood can be reached by means of these paintings, which can liberate by sight, if the beholder looks upon them with pure eyes and a penetrating mind. But they must not be regarded as magical since they are no mere artist’s fancies but founded on literary texts.

Every Tibetan t'anka is an evocation. No Tibetan painter copies from nature, but reaching ecstatic state by means of yoga, images of the deities are observed by him with eyes of the spirit and not of the flesh. Just as an officiating priest accomplishes a liturgical act, so must the artist be at one with the spiritual planes which he wishes to reproduce. Hence the deification of the artist precedes the art of painting. Just as the t'ankas are consecrated, so must the artist become identified with the supreme immaterial eternal principle of things,
indiscriminate consciousness from which all things come.

PLAN OF THE T’ANKAS

Although there may be some differences in t’ankas, a general plan of construction is followed. The manḍala is the pattern. Hence the tone of the t’anka is given by a dominant central figure, which represents a transcendent plane of reality, be it a historical character, a supreme Buddha, or a horrific deity. It carries us into the sphere in which that being is revealed to those who have succeeded in provoking its epiphany through the forces of meditation and evocation.

It is because of this that the lotus figures so prominently as the support of these central figures, since it has the double symbology (a) exoteric and (b) esoteric: (a) denoting creation as a whole in its general sense, and (b) in a spiritual sense being a sign of the other “plane” revealing itself in the center of the inner space of the heart. As in the figure of a lotus, the two symbologies penetrate each other rather than exclude each other. So is created a “Heaven” centered around a deity with an assembly of listeners surrounding him.

CONSECRATION

A t’anka has no liturgical value and in order that it shall become a holy thing it must be consecrated. After the artist has finished the t’anka according to a definite and inviolable plan of lines and proportion, it is brought to a priest in a state of perfect fitness, so that through him it might receive the divine spirit. Before drawing the t’anka the artist should have evoked its aspects and forms by visualizing them, causing a first epiphany in his work, and the god’s active spirit descends into it by means of a long and intricate ceremony of the priest’s consecrating ritual.

Hence when one looks at t’ankas portraying deities, especially those of the manḍala type, one feels that the unknown artist has actually seen these creatures, however horrific and unreal they may appear. They seem near to life, and although the mysterious life which they have and represent is sometimes repellent, it is irresistibly fascinating. This is undoubtedly brought about by the spiritual acquaintance of the artist with the subject of his visionary painting.

I will now endeavor to give details of the seven Bodleian t’ankas, identifying as many as possible of the figures. They are by no means all of the same age or importance.

AVALOKITEŚVARA

(Figure 1)

MS. Tib. 17 (R).
Size 16" x 23".
Ca. nineteenth century.

On the back, the center figure of this t’anka is incorrectly described as “Nam-gyal tsug ter ma” which is the Tibetan name for “Uṣṇiṣavijaya,” the victorious goddess of the Uṣṇiṣa, which is, however, found and described in MS. Tib. 20 (R). Uṣṇiṣavijaya is rarely represented without the small figure of a Buddha in her hand. I only know of one reference to a two-armed Uṣṇiṣavijaya without the Buddha image (vide Journal Royal Asiatic Soc. Bengal, vol. 9 (1943), The Rin Hbyu, by the Rev. R. A. Peter).

The central figure is really that of Avalokiteśvara. He is supposed to have been incarnate in the Tibetan king sRong-btsan-sgam-po, as well as in every successive Dalai Lama. Here we see him as Šādakṣari-Avalokiteśvara incarnate in the Dalai Lamas. In this form he has one head and four arms, dhyānāsana (meditative pose), on a pink lotus throne. He has a high “uṣṇiṣa” (protuberance on the skull) with flaming pearl: two
original hands in namaskāra mudrā (mudrā of prayer or adoration), two other hands hold mālā (rosary) and padma (pink lotus) at shoulder levels. The color is white, and he has Bodhisattva ornaments and garments.

The figure in the center immediately above Avalokiteśvara is Amitāyus (the Buddha of eternal life)—the Buddha invoked for the obtaining of longevity. He is a bright red color, seated on a lotus throne with hands in his lap in dhyāna mudrā (meditation) and holding a kalaśa or ambrosia vase, elixir of immortality, containing consecrated wine, giving eternal life, from which sprouts a tiny Aśoka tree (tree of consolation). His hair falls to his elbows (seen here very thin). Amitāyus never has a consort. Amitāyus is flanked by two other Buddhas. On his right may be Bhaṭṭācāryaguru, the medicine Buddha, red in color and in dhyāna mudrā. Śākyamuni is on his left, gold in color and in bhūmisparśa mudrā.

In the center immediately below Avalokiteśvara is a figure of Padmasambhava, a deified historical person who came to Tibet in A.D. 747 and taught Tantric doctrines. He is seated on a lotus throne in meditative pose (dhyānāsana) holding in his right hand a vajra (thunderbolt), or in Tibetan “dorje,” which is applied to anything of exalted religious character which is lasting, immune from destruction, occultly powerful and irresistible.

The dorje, in his right hand, is held in the posture (or mudrā) called in Tibetan the Dorje Dik-dzup (Rdo-rje-sdigs-mdzub), i.e., the Indomitable (or Vajra) Finger-pointing Mudrā, to guard against all evils which might affect the Dharma, and to place the Three Realms of Existence under his dominion. The human-skull cup in his left hand is filled with the nectar of immortality (Skt. amṛta): The skull cup symbolizes renunciation of the world. The trident pointed staff (Skt. trisūla) which he holds in the folds of his left arm is highly symbolical. The trident at the top symbolizes the Three Realms of Existence (in Sanskrit, the Trailokyā), and suggests his dominion over them and over the three chief evils, lust, anger (or ill will), and sloth (or stupidity). In this is also symbolized the Three Times, the past, present, and future. Emanating from the middle point of the trident are the Flames of Divine Wisdom which consume Ignorance (Skt. avidyā). Beneath the trident the skull symbolizes the Dharma-Kāya; the first human head below the skull symbolizes the Sambhoga-Kāya, and the second the Nirmanā-Kāya. The three Kāyas are the three forms in which the Buddha essence is mystically personified, i.e., (1) Dharma-Kāya—Body of the Buddha, (2) Sambhoga-Kāya—the Mind, (3) Nirmanā-Kāya—the Speech. Below the heads is a golden urn filled with the essence of transcendent blessings and perfections. The lamas describe thus the golden double-dorje below the urn: the southern (or lower) point represents Peace; the western point Multiplicity; the northern (or upper) point hidden by the urn Initiatory Power; the eastern point Fearfulness; and the center the “at-one-ment” of all spiritual endowments and perfections. The white silk ribbonlike banner below the double-dorje, resembling a Banner of Victory, of which it is an abbreviated form, symbolizes Padmasambhava’s victory over the Sansāra (phenomenal Universe of Appearances). The staff itself symbolizes the Divine Śakti.

He wears as his headdress what Tāntriks call the lotus cap. The crescent moon and the sun on the front of it signify, as does the lotus cap itself, that he is crowned with all initiatory powers. The feather surmounting the lotus cap, being that of a vulture, regarded as the highest and mightiest of fliers among birds, symbolizes that his doctrine of the Great Perfection is the noblest of spiritual doctrines. His red flowing garment and blue and priestly yellow inner dress is the dress of a Tibetan
Nyag-pa (Snags-pa), or one who is a Master of Tantric occultism. He is particularly worshiped by the sect of Red Caps. Padmasambhava is believed to have been born from a red lotus flower.

At the foot of Avalokiteśvara on his left is his consort Tārā (the green Tārā) or Śyāmatārā. Tārā is the principal feminine deity in Buddhism of later days and takes the forms of white, green, yellow, blue, and red Tārā. Here we have the Green Tārā alleged to be the original Tārā. She is seated on a lotus throne in Khadiravani form, i.e., one head and two arms with no lotus supporting the right foot. Her right leg is pendent, slender and graceful in pose, more animated however than the White Tārā. She is dressed like a Bodhisattva. Her right hand is in vara mudrā (charity) and the left in vitarka mudrā (argument), and holds a blue lotus at shoulder level. The utpala is represented with central petals closed and the outside ones turned back.

Below, on Avalokiteśvara’s right, is Vaijraśānti, soul of the thunderbolt (Buddha of supreme intelligence, or “Divine heroic-minded being”), the form of Ādi Buddha or Primordial Buddha worshiped by the reformed Red Capped sect founded by Atiśa in the eleventh century. He is white and represented seated on a lotus, legs locked. He wears a crown and Bodhisattva garments and ornaments. In his right hand he holds balanced a vajra (thunderbolt), the symbol of his immutability, and in his left the ghānta, or bell, in his lap, the symbol of his divine transcendent heroism.

At the bottom of the painting, on Avalokiteśvara’s left, is a blue figure of Vajrapāni or the “thunderbolt bearer,” in a particular form known as Acalāryavajrapāni and also Dharmanāla, or ferocious form to combat various demons. He is represented in human form and his complexion is blue. His hair is disheveled and he wears a skull crown. His expression is angry and he has the urṇā, or third eye. A serpent necklace is around his neck and a waist belt of heads can be seen, underneath which is a leopard skin. He steps to the right and in his uplifted hand is the vajra. He is surrounded by flames in which sometimes are garuḍas.

At the bottom, on the right of Avalokiteśvara, is Mañjuśrī, the Bodhisattva of Transcendent Wisdom. He is seated on a lotus, holds a sword (khadga) in the right hand and on his left the pustaka (book). He has the uṣṇīsa, or protuberance of the head. The sword symbolizes the dissipating of the clouds of ignorance, and the book, which is the Prajnāpāramitā (treatise of Transcendent Wisdom), is the usual form of palm-leaf manuscript between two pieces of wood. Mañjuśrī has several variations with book and sword of which this is called Arapacana (with one head and two arms). Like Vaijraśānti above, he has not the urṇā, or third eye, since the paintings are by the Padmasambhava sect.

BHAISAJYAGURU

(Figure 3)

MS. Tib. a 18 (R).
Size 25” x 30”.
Eighteenth century.

The central and main figure here is Bhaiaṣajyaguru, one of the 16 Medicine Buddhas, seated on a red lotus and lion throne (lions can be seen on the left and right at the bottom of the throne) under the Bodhi tree. His hands are in bhūmisparsa mudrā, or earth-witnessing mudrā (hands turned inward, as opposed to varada mudrā, or “giving” in the T’anka 21 (R) of Abhijñārāja, another Medicine Buddha) with begging bowl in his left hand symbolical of his being a religious mendicant. With a gold or deep orange-colored body he has monastic garments of red draped over his left shoulder. The urṇā can be seen on his forehead.

The next important figure is Uṣṇīsavijayā,
seen at the foot of the throne on Bhaiṣajyaguru’s left. Uṣṇiṣavijayā is the victorious goddess of the Uṣṇīṣa (ie., the protuberance from Buddha’s head which is the mark of a Buddha). Uṣṇiṣavijayā is one of the earliest feminine deities “having the intelligence of the most splendid Perfect One.” Seated with legs closely locked, she has three heads, yellow, white, and black (in our t’anka dark blue) in sweet expression with the urning, or third eye. She has eight arms: the two normal ones hold the double vajra or are in dharmacakra mudrā; the underneath arms are in meditation mudrā, holding an ambrosia vase. The right hand of the two upper arms holds an image of Buddha, a distinctive feature of Uṣṇiṣavijayā. Other symbols are the bow and arrow. Her hair is drawn up in a high chignon (usniṣa) behind the crown.

On Bhaiṣajyaguru’s right is a figure in blue with usniṣa (protuberance) and urning, and on the left a further image in orange. These may be Bodhisattvas Suryavairocana and Candravairocana, respectively.

At the top can be seen two further Buddhas in the gesture of preaching the dharma, with begging bowls, red monastic garments, and bare right shoulders. These may be Maitreyā and Dipankara. They are each flanked by monks or teachers in the top corners.

Below these are also two arhats or elders, the one holding the pustaka, or book, and the other, which could be Atiśa or Abheda, the stūpa.

AMITĀYUS
(Tshe-dpag-med, Buddha of Eternal Life)
(Figure 2)

MS. Tib. a 16 (R).
Size 17" x 11".
Nineteenth century.

Amitāyus is the Buddha of eternal life and spiritual father of Avalokiteśvara (see Tib. a 17 [R]). His color is bright red, and he is seated with his hands in his lap in dhyāna mudrā (meditation) and holding a kālaṇḍa, or ambrosia vase, elixir of immortality, containing consecrated wine. From this sprouts a tiny Aśoka tree, the tree of consolation. His hair falls to his elbows and he is never seen with a consort.

There is a female figure above Amitāyus and two figures on either side on rose-colored clouds. These figures I am unable to identify at present. The t’anka is inferior, being of thin texture and with a broad silk border all around in red, yellow, and blue. It is probably of the nineteenth century.

The rose-colored clouds and figures on them are definitely of Chinese derivation. The figures on the clouds are probably Milaraspa and Naropa. Top right is Milaraspa, the twelfth-century saint and disciple of Marpa, a founder of the Kar-gyū-pa sect. Milaraspa was a hermit, monk, and great poet who wrote “The Hundred Thousand Songs.” He wears monastic robes and holds his right hand with fingers extended and palm behind his right ear as if listening “to the echoes of nature.” His left hand holds the begging bowl. Top left is Naropa (ca. A.D. 900), one of the 84 great sorcerers, seated on a tiger skin. He has long hair and a bowl in his right hand.

The landscape consists of pale green trees on hillocks and, below the throne, pale green water. Beneath the most elaborate lotus throne is set out an array of precious things, fruits and ivory tusks.

TSONG-KHA-PA
(Figure 5)

MS. Tib. a 19 (R).
Size 25" x 17".
Ca. eighteenth century.

Tsong-kha-pa, literally “the man from Ts’on-kha,” was born in Tibet in the valley of
Ts'ön-kha in 1357 and died in 1419. He is a defined historical personage. It is said that the tree near the house in which he was born bears the imprint of a Buddha on its leaves. He was a Northern Buddhist reformer and a follower of Atiśa, the Indian pandit who was invited by the Tibetan king in the eleventh century A.D. to reform the Buddhist faith in Tibet. Through his reforms and teachings the Kadam-pa sect became the Ge-lug-pa sect or Yellow Cap sect which became very popular despite its hard rules including celibacy, and is the most important sect up to the present day. He wrote books on Buddhism and was deified as an incarnation of Manjusri the God of Transcendent Wisdom. The members of the sect were called Yellow Bonnets from the pointed yellow caps which they wore; in opposition to the Red Bonnets, a sect founded over three centuries before, which, among other things, allowed priests to marry.

Ts'ön-kha-pa is represented seated on a lotus throne or cushion (kolbock). His hands are usually in dharmacakra mudrā (preaching), and he wears a yellow pointed cap with long ear lapels and his garments are red. He also holds the stems of lotus flowers which support at each shoulder the sword and book (khadga and pustaka), Manjusri's symbols.

The remainder of the t'anka portrays scenes from the legend of Ts'ön-kha-pa's life, all of which are fully described by G. Tucci in his work Tibetan painted scrolls (Rome, 1949, vol. 2, p. 417 and pls. 88 to 94), and is an example of the way in which t'ankas form pictorial biographies, mentioned in the introductory notes, designed to commemorate the master's life and also unfold his life story around the central figure.

The inscriptions on the back of this t'anka are unusual and worthy of note. There is first one mantra or invocation to all deities as follows: Om ah hum, repeated 14 times at various spots, possibly intended to be on each incident of his life depicted.

In addition each syllable of this mantra has a sub-mantra apparently addressed to female deities, viz:

1. Om has Om sarva-vidya svāhā.
2. ah has Om vajra āyuṣhe svāhā.
3. hum has Om supratiṣṭhaye svāhā vajra.

Such mantras are merely magical syllables and are not translatable.

This is followed by the well-known Buddhist Credo:

Om. Ye dharmā hetuprabhāvā betum teṣāṃ Tathāgato hyavada, teṣām ca yo nirodha; evamvādi Mahāśramanaye. Svāhā.

Translated, this means “The Tathāgatha has proclaimed the cause and also the cessation of all the things that proceed from a cause. This is the Great Recluse's doctrine.”

This famous Credo is taken from the conversion of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana when Śāriputra says to Maudgalyāyana, “What does the Master teach” (about the Immortal and the way that leads to the Immortal)? Śāriputra replies as above. (See Mahāvastu, ed. E. Senart, t. 3, Paris, 1897, p. 62, and also Mahāvastu, transl. J. J. Jones, vol. 3, London, 1956, p. 63.)

This Credo is made into a mantra or invocation. The whole is followed by cursive Tibetan writing as yet undeciphered.

Uṣṇiṣavijayā

(Figure 4)

MS. Tib. a 20 (R).
Size 25” x 21”.
Ca. fourteenth century.

This t'anka is a portrayal of Uṣṇiṣvijayā as the central figure, the same as that described in MS. Tib. 18 (R), where she appears as a secondary figure but nevertheless complete in detail.
Uṣṇiṣavijayarāja is one of the earliest feminine divinities and very popular in Tibet. She is seated within a pagoda with legs crossed and soles of the feet apparent. Her color is white (although in this t'anka, owing to age and smoke from temples, it appears deep cream). Of her three heads the center one is white, the right yellow, and the left black, all of which have a sweet expression and the third eye, or uryā, in the center of the forehead. She has eight arms, the two normal ones holding a double vajra, or thunderbolt, and being in dharmacakra mudrā. The arms underneath are right in vara, or charity, or mudrā, while the left holds the ambrosia vase. The left hand of the two upper arms is in abhaya mudrā (protection) and the right holds a small figure of a Buddha supported by a lotus flower. This small figure is the most distinctive feature in identifying Uṣṇiṣavijayarāja. The two horizontal arms hold a bow and arrow.

Her hair is drawn up in a high chignon (uṣṇiṣa) behind the crown (in which is sometimes a small figure of Vairocana). Uṣṇiṣavijayarāja is sometimes accompanied by Avalokiteśvara on her right and Vajrapāni on her left, but the two figures here seen cannot yet be identified as such. Four figures of Hayagrīva can be seen above and below Uṣṇiṣavijayarāja.

The whole t'anka is badly discolored by temple smoke, making it very difficult to identify the numerous figures around the edge. To identify them with certainty will require the cleaning of the t'anka and considerable research to find which of the 1,000 Sanskrit texts this maṇḍala is based upon. Until this can be done, I would not attempt identification but hope to make a separate article of this t'anka alone at some future date.

As far as I can trace, there is only one other t'anka such as this, and as old, in England. This is in the British Museum and it has been estimated that the date may be as early as the fourteenth century.

Apart from the above information, very little is known about Uṣṇiṣavijayarāja who seems to be one of the oldest goddesses of the Mahāyāna; but she often appears in paintings in the center of a maṇḍala, which leads me to believe that this t'anka is a complete maṇḍala.

ABHIJÑĀRĀJA

(Figure 6)

MS. Tib. a 21 (R).
Size 30" x 24".
Nepalese, ca. eighteenth century.

This t'anka is the same subject as 18 (R) previously described but with different accompanying figures, being another of the Medicine Buddhas.

The central and main figure is one of the 16 Medicine Buddhas, Abhijñārāja, in gold or deep orange with monastic garments over the left shoulder. He has elongated ear lobes and his hand is in varada mudrā (generosity, giving) with the hand turned outward, as opposed to Bhaiṣajyaguru in 18 (R), whose hand is in bhūmispāra mudrā with hand turned inward. The left hand is holding the symbolic begging bowl. He is seated on a lion throne and red lotus. In the center of his forehead is the uryā.

The two other important figures are on either side of the central one and are probably Avalokiteśvara and Padmapāni. Avalokiteśvara, “the Lord who looks in every direction,” is described in full in MS. Tib. a 17 (R) but is here seen in a different form, probably his earliest form which represents him with two arms, one head, and all white, wearing a rosary and carrying the lotus. He is seen on the Medicine Buddha’s right. On the left is the non-Tantric form of Avalokiteśvara known as Padmapāni. He is also white and carries a
Fig. 1.—Avalokitesvara (MS. Tib. 17 [R].)

Fig. 2.—Amitāyus (MS. Tib. a 16 [R].)
Fig. 3.—Buddha (MS. Tib. a 18 [R.])

Fig. 4.—Kṣitigarbha (MS. Tib. a 20 [R.])
Fig. 5.—TSONG-KHA-PA (MS. Tib. a 19 [R.]).

Fig. 6.—ABHIJÑĀĀJA (MS. Tib. a 21 [R.]).
Fig. 7.—White Tārā (MS. Tib. a 22 [R].)
lotus and rosary, but is in *vitarka*, or argument, *mudrā*.

The two figures to the left and right of the throne are Dharmapāla, or defenders of the law of Buddhism, and are forms of Kuvera and Jambhala, the wealth gods. Kuvera on the left of the throne is red with right foot pendent, carrying a mongoose vomiting jewels in his left hand. He is also a Lokapāla, or one of the guardians of the four cardinal points, namely the North. Jambhala on the right is blue and holds the *triśūla*, or trident, and carries also a mongoose vomiting jewels.

The two figures below them are two more Lokapāla, or guardians of the four cardinal points. On the left of the throne is Virūdhaka, King of the Khumbhanda, giant demons; he is green. The symbol in his right hand is the sword. On the right is Dīrtarāṣṭra, King of the Gandharvas, demons feeding on incense. He is white and his symbol is a stringed instrument. He has a tall helmet with plumes and ribbons.

There appear to be four priests at the top of the t’anka, the two center ones being in orange garments and the outside ones in red, while the one on the right has the Yellow Cap. Three of them are in dharmacakrā *mudrā*.

Below these are two beautifully drawn arhats (those members of the Buddhist order who have advanced so far along the path to Nirvāṇa that they are subject to no more rebirths) accompanied by attendants. Their duty is to preserve and teach the law of the Buddha. The one on the left is in yellow and red garments and is seated on a rock and green leaves under a tree. The one on the right is in golden garments, seated under a tree pointing to a Tibetan text which is quite legible.

This t’anka and the t’anka shown in 18 (R) can easily be mistaken for Sākyamuni.

### THE WHITE TĀRĀ OF SEVEN EYES
(Sitatārā, the White Saviouress)

(Figure 7)

MS. Tib. a 22 (R).
Size 22” x 14”.
Ca. sixteenth-seventeenth centuries.

Tārā is a feminine divinity sometimes understood as consort or Śakti of Avalokiteśvara, the spiritual son of Amitābha (when her color is green). (See description of Tib. 17 [R].) Tārā is also said to be the female manifestation of Avalokiteśvara himself (for Avalokiteśvara, see Tib. 17 [R]). She takes the forms of white, green, yellow, blue, and red Tārā.

The goddess seems to have entered Buddhism about A.D. 150 and to have become popular in Northern Buddhism in the sixth century. There are infinite legends with regard to her origin, but it is generally regarded that a tear fell from the eye of Avalokiteśvara when looking down on the earth, into the valley beneath, and formed a lake from which arose a lotus flower, which, opening up its petals, disclosed the pure dark-colored goddess Tārā (Green Tārā). From his right eye came the White Tārā in like manner. The two queens of the famous Tibetan Buddhist King sRon-btsan sgam-po were considered as incarnations of Tārā. Since the Tārās were born from the tears of Avalokiteśvara they may represent his never-ceasing grief at the miseries of mankind.

It is the form of White Tārā or Sitatārā, the White Saviouress, which is seen in this t’anka. She is known as the White Tārā of the Seven Eyes. She symbolizes perfect purity and is believed to represent Transcendent Wisdom which secures everlasting bliss to its possessor. She is the consort of Avalokiteśvara and when seen with him is usually stand-
ing at his right hand. When depicted alone she is always seated with legs locked and soles of the feet turned upward. She wears Bodhisattva garments and ornaments. Her right hand is in charity (vara) mudrā and her left, generally holding the padma (full-blown lotus), is in vitarka (argument) mudrā. She has the third eye of foreknowledge, and has also six more eyes, on the palms of her hands, on the soles of her feet, and two normal eyes. She is here surrounded by her own manifestations as is quite often the case, in addition to the three figures at the top center which are clearly three lamas of the Gelugspa sect, probably Tsong-kha-pa and two chief pupils.

The whole t’anka is of gold background with outlines of each figure in red and the hair black.
CHINESE PAINTINGS WITH SUNG DATED INSCRIPTIONS *

By MAX LOEHR

INTRODUCTION

One of the difficulties facing the student of Sung painting is the relative scarcity of dated works. They are scarce, not perhaps primarily because of what was lost but because the Sung masters, unlike their successors of Yüan and later periods, were sparing with inscriptions, as has been observed by Chinese writers long ago. Fang Hsün (1736-1799) quite simply states that 置爲題畫始自蘇米, 至元明人而備。道以題語位置靈境。

Signatures and superscriptions on paintings began with Su Shih (1036-1101) and Mi Fei (1051-1107), but only from Yüan and Ming men onward were the inscription texts made part of the compositions.¹

More explicit with regard to the custom of adding dates, Ch’ien Tu (1763-1844), writing in 1830, says 畫之款識唐人只小字藏於右石罅。大約書不工者 多落紙背。至宋時有年紀之。然猶是細楷一紙。無書南行者。惟東坡款書大行楷。或有跋語三五行。

In signing their pictures, the T’ang artists only used small characters hidden in tree roots and rock fissures, while those unskilled in writing put (their signatures) on the back of the paintings. Years and months were first recorded since Sung, but still in fine k’ai-shu in one column, never in two columns. Only Tung-p’o (Su Shih) signed in large hsing-k’ai, or added a colophon of three to five columns.²

A similar restraint can be observed with regard to seals. However, Ch’ien Tu’s assertion that T’ang and Sung painters used no seals at all (唐宋背無印章)³ is too sweeping and is contradicted by actual occurrences of Sung painter’s seals as well as by some occasional reference to Sung seals in coeval sources, such as the Tung-t’ien ch’ing-lu-chi which, for instance, mentions a small seal “Hsi” used by Kuo Hsi.⁴

Whether that tendency to unobtrusiveness or even “a frequent omission of the signature in pre-Yüan painting” (元以前多不用款識)⁵ was founded on modesty or aesthetic considerations or, simply, tradition, it does in part account for the sparsity of dated Sung paintings. Yet it is these exactly dated or datable monuments on which our understanding of the history of Sung painting largely depends. They are the archaeological guides for our interpretations and concepts.

The primary purpose of this article, therefore, is to assemble the material which claims to be dated by, or to antedate, inscriptions of the Sung period.

To assure practical applicability, only extant paintings are considered. Most of these have been published, but some unpublished ones which form part of Chinese public collections and thus can be expected to become ac-

¹ Shan-ching-chú hua-lun, 20b, in Mei-shu ts’ung-shu (Abbr. MSTS), 3:3.3.
² Sung-hu hua-i, shang, 8b, in MSTS, 3:4.2.
³ Ibid., 9a.
⁴ Chao Hsi-ku, Tung-t’ien ch’ing-lu-chi, fol. 27, in MSTS, 1:9.4. The painting “Early Spring” of 1072, by Kuo Hsi (listed below), shows a seal reading “Kuo Hsi pi.”
⁵ Shen Hao, Hua-chu, 4b, in MSTS, 1:6.1.
cessible in the future are included as well.\textsuperscript{6} In addition, a few specimens of prints or stone engravings after lost paintings are also listed. Omitted are the paintings from Tun-huang, whether frescoes or scrolls, because these must not be separated from the context of the Tun-huang complex at large and, moreover, have little bearing on the questions posed by the material here dealt with.\textsuperscript{7}

The dates here assembled, by the way, seem to represent virtually the entire store of inscriptionally dated Sung as well as pre-Sung paintings. To the writer's knowledge, there are—aside from Tun-huang paintings—no more than two instances of T'ang dates.\textsuperscript{8}

If the present survey thus attempts to

\textsuperscript{6} There are a number of unpublished paintings catalogued in 1925 in the\textsuperscript{\emph{Nei-wu-pu Ku-wu-ch'en-\textsuperscript{li}h-so shu-hua mu-lu}} (abbr.\textsuperscript{\emph{K\textsuperscript{\textsc{w}}CLS}) and as recently as 1956 in the\textsuperscript{\emph{Ku-kung shu-hua-lu}} (abbr.\textsuperscript{\emph{K\textsuperscript{\textsc{kJSHL}) of the Palace Museum collection in Formosa.}

\textsuperscript{7} Tun-huang scroll paintings bearing Sung dates corresponding to A.D. 966, 968, 971, 980, 981, 983, 989; cf. E. Matsumoto,\textsuperscript{\emph{Tōkō-ga no kenkyū}}, pls. 106b, 224, 222b, 223a, 157b, 174, 108, 223b. A fresco representing the Wu-t'ai-shan in Cave 117 is datable between 980-1001; cf. Pelliot,\textsuperscript{\emph{Les grottes de Touen-houang}}, pls. 203-231; L. Bachhofer,\textsuperscript{\emph{Die Raumdarstellung in der chinesischen Malerei des ersten Jahrhundertes n. Chr.}}, figs. 21, 22.

\textsuperscript{8} The first, on a "Kuan-yin with a Thousand Arms" signed with the name of Fan Ch'iung,\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textcyr{f}}} corresponds to A.D. 850; see\textsuperscript{\emph{K\textsuperscript{\textsc{kJSHL)), ch. 5:8; Sirèn, Chinese painting}, vol. 2, List (abbr.\textsuperscript{\emph{CP II List}) p. 17 (A?), Iconographically this image with two hands holding a Buddha figure raised above the head appears to be later than T'ang.—The second date, between 880 and 894, appears on one of the "Sixteen Arhats" of the Imperial Household collection in Tokyo, according to Sirèn,\textsuperscript{\emph{CP II List}, p. 29. Reproductions in Tōsō Gemmō meiga taisen (abbr. Tōsō), pls. 6-11. Three of the paintings bear the signature of Kuan-hsiu f\textsuperscript{\textcyr{u}} (832-912). The writer, who is deeply obliged to Dr. Tokugawa Yoshihiro for the opportunity of studying this fascinating series in the morning hours of November 9, 1957, is convinced of the T'ang date of the "Arhats.

cover the earliest chronologically fixed paintings now extant, there should be no question as to the importance of these guideposts as such. They require our attention because they are given; they cannot be ignored. But we have to ask another question, which is less easily answered, viz, the question of the reliability of the dates themselves. To answer this question by a scrutiny of the epigraphic evidence is the second purpose of this article.

The appraisal of an inscription is a judgment in matters of authenticity, and it might be desirable to say a few words about the various aspects of the authenticity problem and the limitations of any particular method of approaching it.

To what degree can the documentation supplied by inscriptions and seals on the painting itself and supplemented, sometimes, by existing literary records be relied on? It is in the nature of the epigraphic\textsuperscript{\emph{additamenta}} such as the signatures (\textsuperscript{\emph{k\textsuperscript{\textsc{k}}\textsuperscript{\textcyr{a}}}), inscriptions or superscriptions (\textsuperscript{\emph{t\textsuperscript{'u}}} and colophons (\textsuperscript{\emph{pa}}} that they can be judged not only by formal criteria but also by their content, and that thereby they offer clues as to their reliability on objective, philological grounds. However, these objective clues, of course, never can give proof of authenticity of the inscriptions; all that can be expected from their scrutiny is an absence of contradictory findings, apparent reliability. A correct copy, even if imperfect, has to be taken as "apparently reliable" when judged by content alone. It is in the case of contradictions or discrepancies found in the inscriptions and colophons that we may arrive at a clear-cut verdict of spuriousness. Thus limited to actual results only on the darker side, the scrutiny of the tenor and dates of the inscriptions will at least lead to an elimination of suspicious and spurious material which else might appear acceptable. Though limited, this method can yield results which not only are final and incontrovertible, but also are un-
obtainable by other ways of investigation. It must be remembered, however, that a decision against an inscription need not under all circumstances condemn the painting with which it is connected. A good painting may be accompanied by bad colophons, and vice versa. What conclusions to draw depends on the ever varying individual conditions of a scroll.

The seals which, affixed by generations of collectors, ideally bear testimony to a painting’s pedigree, form a substantial part of the documentation. The commonest Sung seals were those of the Imperial collections, beginning apparently no earlier than the reign of Hui-tsung, but they were preceded in time by a seal used by Li hou-chu (961–975) of Nan-T’ang, reading Chien-yeh Wen-fang chih yin 建業文房之印. The seals of Emperor Hui-tsung are chiefly nien-hao seals, such as

Ta-kuan 大觀 (1107–1110),
Cheng-ho 正和 (1111–1117),
Hsüan-ho 宣和 (1119–1125);

In addition, there are dubious instances of seals reading
Hsüan-ho shu-pao 宣和書寶,
Hsüan-yüan-ko pao 宜元閣寶,
and one example of
Hsüan-ho chung-pi 宜和中秘,
in one single column. Another of the emperor’s seals,

Nei-fu t’u-shu chih yin 内府圖書之印.

9 R. H. van Gulik, Chinese pictorial art as viewed by the connoisseur, pp. 377–384, gives a most informative discussion of the categories of fakes encountered among the colophons of hand scrolls.

10 Mentioned as a seal of Nan-T’ang by Chao Hsi-ku, op. cit., n. 4 above, fol. 28a.—In addition to the instances observed in the following survey (see “Index of Seals” at the end of the article), this rare seal occurs on a landscape attributed to Kuan T’ung in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (No. 57.194).

11 On the painting attributed to Wang Wei, “Fu Sheng,” listed under 1133, but not visible in the detail is not represented on any of the paintings here discussed, but it is printed across Hui-tsung’s inscription on the beautiful scroll of a “Monkey with Kittens” by I Yüan-chi in the Palace Museum collection. I mention this because the Nei-fu seals do not by themselves reveal with which reign they are connected.

The seal

Nei-fu chih pao 内府之寶
is said to have been used under Kao-tsung (1127–1162), while

Nei-fu shu-hua 内府書畫
occurs on a painting by Liu Sung-nien of 1207 together with a seal suggesting the reign of Ning-tsung (1195–1224), and probably belongs in that reign.

Similarly difficult to place are Sung court seals with symbols, such as

shuang lung 雙龍 “Two Dragons,”
Ch’ien kua 乾卦 “Trigram of Heaven,”
K’un kua 坤卦 “Trigram of the Earth,”
which may have been in use during more than one reign, “Dragons” and “Heaven” by the emperor, and “Earth,” no doubt, by the empress.

A palace name familiar from Hui-tsung’s signatures, Hsüan-ho-tien, appears in the em-
The name apparently was current before the Hsüan-ho reign (1119-1125), as it occurs on a painting by the emperor which, according to a colophon, dates from the last year of the Ta-kuan reign (1107-1110).\(^{16}\) In fact we learn from the Sung Annals that in the second month of the first year Hsüan-ho (1119) the name Hsüan-ho-tien was changed to Pao-ho-tien 保和殿,\(^{17}\) and that the title of Hsüan-ho-tien hsüeh-shih 宣和殿學士, "Hsüan-ho-tien scholar," had been established as early as the fifth year Cheng-ho (1115).\(^{18}\) We should be mistaken, therefore, in applying the time span of the Hsüan-ho reign to the signatures containing the term Hsüan-ho-tien, but rather may have to envisage the years between 1115 and 1119.

No precise time limits seem yet to have been established for several seals with Sung palace names either. The seal

Ju-i-ssu Tung-ko 聚思東閣

appears to refer to the collection of Kao-tsung (1127-1162),\(^{19}\) as may also the seals

16 E.g., KKSHEL, 4:3, s.v. Yen Li-pen. The seal is not represented in our survey.

16a See the entry of 1110—Hui-tsung, below.


18 Ibid., ch. 21, pen-chi 21; loc. cit., p. 4533-3.

The fact that the Hsüan-ho po-ku-t'u was planned in the first year of the era Ta-kuan (1107) may suggest an even earlier date of the Hsüan-ho-tien.

19 It is mentioned in Ssu-ling shu-hua-chi (or, Shao-hsing ting-shih), a text transmitted by Chou Mi (1232-1308), as a seal of the Imperial collection in the Shao-hsing period (1131-1162); tr. R. H. van Gulik, op. cit., (p. 9 above), p. 208. Osvald Sirén, on the other hand, mentions the Ju-i-ssu Hall in connection with Hui-tsung (1101-1125), CP II, p. 77, while John C. Ferguson, Chinese painting, p. 83, only indicates "Sung."

As for a seal reading

Ch'i-hsi-tien pao 紹興殿寶

of his long era so named. After that era, the nien-hao seals seem to disappear.

Two seals testify to the collecting activity of the Chin Tartars under Chang-tsung (1190-1208):

Ming-ch'ang 明昌 (1190-1195),
Ming-ch'ang yü-lan 明昌御覽.

Likely to belong in the same reign, according to Na Chih-liang,\(^{20}\) is a rare and formerly unidentified seal

Ch'in-yü chung-pi 羣玉中秘

affixed to a magnificent landscape attributed to Kuan T'ung, "Waiting for the Ferry."\(^{21}\)

Of private Sung seals encountered in this


21 As quoted in Shih-ch'ü pao-chi, san-pien, apud KKSHEL, 5:71.

22 The writer expresses his gratitude to Mr. Na, curator of the Palace Museum at Taichung, for his generously given time, his frankly given views in matters of appraisal, and for the many days of stimulating conversations during five weeks of studies at the Museum in November and December 1957.
When Wen-tsung (1330–1332) established the K'uei-chang-ko (in the second year of the era T'ien-li, A.D. 1330), T'ao Tsung-i relates, 22 "he had two seals made, namely, T'ien-li chih pao and K'uei-chang-ko pao 奎章閣寶."

which Yü Chi 23 was ordered to design in seal-script." This seal was in use only till 1341, when the last Yüan emperor, Shun-ti (1333–1367), changed the name to Hsüan-wen-ko, which remained probably till the end of the dynasty. The seal

Hsüan-wen-ko pao 袭文閣寶 occurs on several Sung paintings, but is not represented among the paintings listed below. Finally, the Mongols had their Chi-hsien-yüan 集賢院 Palace Library, a time-honored name, current as early as T'ang, and revived under Kublai Khan. A seal assumed to represent an interesting scroll "First Snow along the River" attributed to Chao Kan, KKSIL, ch. 4:16; KKCK', vol. 8, Nos. 157–164. If the seals can be trusted, this scroll passed from the N. Sung Imperial collection to the Chin rulers, then to the Yüan Palace; it was registered again in the Ming Palace collection, later was owned by An Ch'i, and finally by Ch'ien-lung.—A large and clear reproduction of this seal appears in Lan-t'ing pa chu 郎亭八佳, Taipei, 1957, p. 4 (upper left).

1 T'ao Tsung-i, Cho-keng-lu 諸耕錄 (preface dated 1366), ch. 2:10b (of a modern facsimile edition).
2 The name occurs—written on the sail of a barge—in a scroll listed below: 1121—Chang Tse-tuan. I do not recall seal impressions.
3 See indices of seals and colophons, below.
4 T'ao Tsung-i, op. cit., ch. 2:12; cf. KKSIL, 5:23, col. 4.
6 A Chi-hsien-yüan existed as early as the eighth century (Tz'u-yüan, s.v., p. 1588; cf. O. Franke, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 431, 534, vol. 3, p. 385, vol. 4, p. 557), continued through Nan T'ang (see entry 1107—Han Kan, below) and Sung (as attested by a colophon text of A.D. 1011, KKSIL, 1:29, col. 4 from

survey I mention only those of two notorious ministers, Ts'ai Ching 蔡京 (1046–1126), "Chief of the Six Traitors," 24 and Chia Ssu-tao 資道, whose violent death in 1275 ended a career that is not usually remembered as a collector's. 25 These seals are Ts'ai Ching chen-pan 蔡京珍玩 on a scroll attributed to Yang Sheng, 26 and the following of Chia's: Ch'ang 賄, a conspicuous example of the "nine-fold script," 27 Ch'i-ho 秋壑, Ssu-tao 似道, and Yuéh-sheng 悅生. 28

Of wider application as potential clues for a Sung origin of the items carrying them are the Yüan Dynasty official seals. When Hang-chou was taken by Bayan in 1276, the archives, libraries, and art collections of the Sung court were confiscated by the Mongol government. 29 Yüan seals, therefore, ought to be found on many of the paintings bearing Sung Imperial seals. Yet, instances of such official Yüan seals appear to be more limited than might be expected. To what extent the absence of a Yüan seal (on items purporting to have passed through the Southern Sung Imperial collection) should be regarded as a suspicious feature is difficult to say. The question cannot be answered without some knowledge of how the confiscated scrolls were processed. And it is possible that Yüan seal impressions were removed by Ming chauvinists.

One Yüan nien-hao seal that is sometimes seen (but is not represented on the paintings here discussed) is

T'ien-li chih pao 天聖之寶 (1320/30). 20

23 See 1191—Yang Sheng, below.
24 Cf. van Gulik, Chinese pictorial art, p. 423.
25 See "Index of Seals" at the end of the article.
26 The orderly mode of transfer of the Hang-chou Palace treasures to the Mongol conquerors is a striking feature in O. Franke's description, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 342.
27 For instance, on the impressively documented
that institution occurs on a copy of Wang Wei’s Wang-ch’uan scroll attributed to Kuo Chung-shu in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.57

Finally, one Ming official seal bearing on matters of authenticity and dating must be mentioned. It is a seal of which we know only the left half (or, possibly, third) comprising the two characters

ssu yin 司印

printed at the right edge of hanging rolls or, horizontally, at the lower edge of hand scrolls. Its significance was recognized only recently by Ch’en Jen-t’ao 58 who restituted the full wording as 續察司印 Chi-ch’a-ssu yin.

The clues to be taken into account in this identification are the large size and the broad border of the seal, indicating an imperial collection; the absence of this seal on paintings later than Yüan, suggesting late Yüan or very early Ming periods as its likely date; and the designation ssu “office.” There are several ssu recorded in the Shih-lu of T’ai-tsu, the first Ming emperor (1368-1398), for the years 1373 and 1374: Nei-cheng-ssu 內正司, established on November 9, 1373, but renamed Tien-li-ssu 典禮司 on November 28, 1373, and again changed to Tien-li-chi-ch’a-ssu 典禮 續察司 on December 7, 1373. This name remained until December 24, 1374, when it was shortened to Chi-ch’a-ssu 續察司. Ten years later, in 1384, this office was replaced by the Ssu-li-chien 司禮監, mentioned in the Ming Annals 59 as charged with the care and control of the collections of calligraphy and paintings.

The seal in question shows—in a few instances where the leftmost part of the ordinarily invisible characters preceding ssu yin is discernible 40—that the character corresponding to chi actually was written with radical “silk,” which makes the identification with either Tien-li Chi-ch’a-ssu or Chi-ch’a-ssu practically certain. Since the seal impressions do not tell whether the complete legend consisted of six or four characters, both names, the longer one, current from December 7, 1373, to December 24, 1374, and the shorter one, current from the end of 1374 till 1383 or 1384, must be taken into consideration, although it would seem more probable that the impression derives from the four-character seal, Chi-ch’a-ssu yin, the right half of which would have appeared on the catalogue or checking list pages of the Palace collection.

A list of 57 paintings of Sung or earlier date (which includes also unpublished and perhaps lost items) provided with the Chi-ch’a-ssu seal is appended to Ch’en’s discussion.41 From the list of dated works below another three instances can be added,42 as well as one case of a forged ssu yin that may be of recent date.43

That a seal reveals its spuriousness through its design or its legend is, however, exceptional. As a rule it will be very difficult to tell a genuine seal from an imitation, and a single seal taken by itself will be of little value in establishing the authenticity of a painting. Seals

40 For instance, on a painting by Ma Lin, KKSHTC, vol. 11, and on an album leaf by Chia Shih-ku in an album named Ming-hui chi-chen, KKCK, No. 57.

41 Ch’en Jen-t’ao, op. cit., pp. 55-60.

42 See 1174—Li Ti; 1197—Li Ti; 1265—Mu-ch’i. Dubious is the seal on 1424—Hui-tsun.

43 See 1078—Mi Fei, below. In this case, the seal is placed at the lower left edge of the painting and it is framed all around as though the two characters were the complete legend.
are easily copied. Even so, the seals must not be neglected; a single seal that is out of place on a given painting may warn us against accepting it as genuine. Conversely, a genuine seal can appear on a false scroll to deceive the expert. In larger assemblages of seals on a scroll, the arrangement and relationship of the seals, their varying shades of red (or black) may offer criteria of reliability which single seals do not.

On the whole it seems that we have to resign ourselves to the fact that "seals alone, although doubtless supplying valuable additional criteria for the authenticity of antique scrolls, can not be considered as conclusive evidence," as R. H. van Gulik states, in agreement with many Chinese critics. As a part of the epigraphic documentation, the seals, devoid of literary content, are accordingly more limited and less weighty criteria than the inscriptions or colophons to which they are largely tied, and will stand or fall with the latter. Often they will have to be judged from the quality and condition of the very paintings they supposedly authenticate. Simply stated: "If the painting is good, the seals are likely to be genuine." Still, like the inscriptions, the seals may occasionally decide

44 From tracings after genuine impressions on paintings or in yin-p'u, collections of seal impressions, begun in the time of Emperor Hui-tsung; cf. van Gulik, op. cit., pp. 384ff., 428.
45 Cf. van Gulik, op. cit., p. 386.
46 Seals impressed with black ink do occur (e.g., the Chi-hsien-yuan seal, 1107—Han Kan, below), as distinguished from red seals blackened through chemical change, mentioned by van Gulik for Shen Chou’s seals, op. cit., p. 387.
47 As in the case of the two pictures attributed to Shih K'o, listed under A.D. 963, below.
49 So far from being ironical, the sentence merely sums up the experience of years of observations by an expert in ancient seals, Mr. Na Chih-liang, curator of the Palace Museum collection.

or at least strengthen the case against a painting, but on the positive side their testimony is hardly more than neutral.

The type of evidence considered so far can lead to the elimination of dubious or forged paintings but cannot furnish proof of authenticity beyond the vague finding of "possibly genuine." The same is true of the likewise objective criteria of the material and condition of a painting. If we are certain of the Sung age of a particular variety of silk or paper used, we may conclude only that the painting is "possibly of Sung," for it may very well be much later, Sung material having been used by post-Sung artists as well. A final decision against a Sung date is possible, theoretically, if a cloth or paper is known to have been made no earlier than by Yuan or Ming times. Actually too little is known of the likely dates of plain silks and papers as yet to warrant such decisions. If the testimony of the concrete materials is indecisive, that of the condition or apparent antiquity is elusive in the extreme. Not that signs of age and wear would ever be absent in a Sung painting, but aging can be artificially achieved, and actually was, in the archaeologically minded Southern Sung period. The following passage in the Ssu-lung shu-hua-chi leaves no doubt about the practice:

All old paintings acquired which are so badly dam-

50 R. H. van Gulik, Chinese pictorial art, p. 389ff., has collected relevant notes on silk and paper from Ming and recent sources. Stressing the vagueness of the available information and the rather individual criteria applied, he concludes: "... even if it is proved ... by a chemical analysis that the silk or paper of a given picture or autograph dates from the Sung or Yuan dynasty, this does not mean that the painting or calligraphy done on this material actually dates from the same period. ... Ming scholars often wrote or painted on Sung material, Ch'ing artists were proud to use Ming silk ... this habit ... was all the more eagerly cultivated by professional forgers."
51 See n. 19, p. 222.
aged as precluding the possibility of their being repaired, must be traced and copied by the Secretariat. Having been laid before the Emperor (Kao-tsung), Chuang Tsung-ku is charged with mounting them, having given the silk or paper the same antique colour of the original.  

If such was the practice in the Sung Imperial collection, we may assume that it was sanctioned by the commoners alike. But the practice was much older. In a memorial on calligraphy submitted to emperor Ming of the Liu Sung dynasty in A.D. 470 the following is said:

Marquis Hui of Hsin-yü always loved (calligraphy). He offered rewards and summoned people in order to buy (from them), taking no account of the price. But base fellows carefully made copies and imitations: they changed the colour of the paper by soaking it in the dirty water which drips from thatched roofs, and made it at the same time worn and stained, so that it looked like the (paper of) ancient writings. Genuine works and fakes were mingled, and nobody could distinguish between them.

In any case we become aware of the peculiar fact that the seemingly objective criteria (material, physical condition) can even less be relied on than the epigraphic evidence. However, these evidently barren criteria might yet be meaningful when appraised "subjectively" by a connoisseur with his personal experience and insight. We are here touching upon a frequently encountered question, that which expresses doubt as to the validity of subjective judgments in matters of authenticity. The question presupposes, of course, that objective standards are preferable. But if these standards fail or remain virtually fictitious, are we not then compelled to turn toward the informed criticism of the expert even though he offers no proof? Subjective judgments are valuable in accordance with the experience of the critic; his pronouncements cannot be had from another person.

Copying was the way of preserving what otherwise would surely have been lost. A faithful copy was a replacement, made to transmit artistic ideas of the past. From the historian's point of view the copies are a boon; with him, the idea or the style that may be embodied in a copy unimpaired counts most. To the collector, who values the uniqueness of the original work, they may mean little more than imitations or the nightmare of forgeries.

If a painting is designated as a copy, we naturally tend to believe in its accuracy, regarding the admission of its being a copy as a guarantee of its reliability. Nor can we take a critical stand unless we happen to know the supposed original or other copies of the same picture. But a copy made as a mere replacement may not be so designated; it may be a perfect duplication posing as an original of a certain master. If an oeuvre of this master is at all known, the merits of the would-be original will soon be revealed. But, if an attribution has to be judged without knowledge of a man's individual style, in the light of what we know of his period at large, our verdict remains immaterial as to the specific artist's name.

What is nearly generally relied on as the unfailing touchstone of genuineness is the "quality" of a painting. Its high quality will tell whether it is a copy or an original, we expect, thinking of artistic greatness in terms of unity and pictorial logic, sustained power

---

52 The translation is van Gulik's, *op. cit.*, p. 211.
54 The term "bildnerische Logik" was coined by
CHINESE PAINTINGS WITH SUNG DATED INSCRIPTIONS

and liveliness of the brushwork, a flawless technique, inspiredness, and the vibrant life in a painting. Surely the quality of a work has to be taken into account when an appraisal of its authenticity is made, and surely it is sound practice to regard with suspicion inferior works ascribed to a famous master. Yet, quality testifies only to artistic value, not to the historical position or date. "Quality" has no historical significance. Conversely, absence of quality cannot be historically interpreted either. A painting need not be of a more recent date only because it may show weaknesses.

Quality, or the artistic rank which determines the intrinsic value of a picture, can be appreciated, however, without attention to style, age, name, and documentation. In other words, the true value of a painting is a matter entirely independent of (its never fully ascertainable) authenticity. It can even lend credibility to a documentation which in itself may be inconclusive.

Style, by contrast, is a criterion of historical significance, and the foremost in questions of authenticity. The Chinese, recognizing style as the supreme realization of personality, nearly always made their attributions on stylistic grounds. And, referring to the visual structure of a painting, style is unmistakable. There is no other factor that would enable us to come to an understanding of the processes of art history. This should be maintained in particular if some, or many, of the traditional attributions prove to be inconsistent, contradictory, or arbitrary, for with all the clues afforded by "objective" research we are still at the mercy of those attributions, and it is

Emil Preetroius, Von Wesen ostasiatischer Malerei, p. 18.

53 Attributes made on the basis of subject matter (the White Eagle of Hui-tsong, Bamboo of Wen T'ung, Horses of Chao Meng-fu, etc.) are not infrequent but appear to be reserved for paintings of reproduction level.

through stylistic investigations alone that we may hope to come to some conclusion at all. The dilemma resulting from such arbitrary attributions will be illustrated by a few examples.

1) In the Ogawa collection in Kyoto is a painting of "Cliff Roads in Shu" ascribed to Li T'ang. A lesser copy with a different title but likewise attributed to Li T'ang was in the Ti P'ing-tzu collection. A third version of the same composition in the Palace Museum collection in Formosa goes under the name of Kuan T'ung.64

2) In the collection of J. D. Chen, Hongkong, is a large landscape painting attributed to Chü-jan. A slightly smaller and inferior, later version of the same picture, attributed to Tung Yüan, is in the Freer Gallery.65

3) There exist three replicas of a majestic landscape of "Winter Mountains," two of them (Palace Museum collection, Formosa, and Freer Gallery) being considered as anonymous Sung paintings while the third is attributed to Li Ch'eng.66

4) An archaic mountain landscape attributed to Kuan T'ung in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, recurs in a nearly identical version attributed to "Liu the Taoist" in the Chen Collection, Hongkong.67

64 The Ogawa picture is reproduced in Naito Torajirou, Shina kaiga-shi, pl. 52; the Ti P'ing-tzu picture (P'ing-teng-ko collection), in Chung-kuo ming-hua-chi, vol. 1, pl. 25. The Palace Museum version, listed in KKSRL, 8:57, is unpublished.


67 Boston Museum of Fine Arts, No. 57.194, unpublished. The "Liu" version in Hongkong was published by the collector, Ch'en Jen-t'ao in his Chin-k'uei ts'ang-hua-chi, vol. 1:4, also in his article on
No discussion of these paintings is here intended. They are to demonstrate in the flesh the problems posed by contradictory attributions. Except for the quality of execution or the "hands," the several compositions are identical in design and style; yet they are assigned to different artists. What are the consequences of this seemingly hopeless state of affairs? It is possible to single out the superior work in each group, but this will not solve the problem. Should we dismiss one name and cling to the other? Our knowledge of the tenth- and eleventh-century masters permits no such decision; moreover, both attributions might be wrong. We are compelled, therefore, to disregard the names altogether and try to understand those pictures on their own terms, their styles, as though they were nameless. Our first attempt must be to recognize their styles as such, see them in their historical relation to earlier and later ones, and to date the styles as such. By-and-by we may advance toward recognizing derivatives of a style, and eventually may be able to date an individual painting. It is only then that the names of painters become meaningful—historically meaningful in regard to actual, extant paintings. Until we reach that point pronouncements on authenticity made on stylistic grounds carry no weight. This is not a denial but an affirmation of the importance of the criterion of style. Style is a visual fact; authenticity is a matter of conclusions, an opinion based on that fact.

An art history without names, such as would result from a rigorous dismissal of all the dubious attributions in Sung and pre-Sung painting, will not be deprived of the human element, but the masters would be known only by the oeuvres we are able to reconstruct. Master NN may eventually be identifiable as Kuan T'ung, or Li Ch'eng, or another of the great. That interpretations of the same stylistic evidence may occasionally vary—in accordance with the critic's varying concepts of what happened—is natural and perhaps unavoidable. Without concepts formed, without a coherent system, the interpretations would remain haphazard.

Ordinarily, when our apprehension is not aroused by diversely attributed replicas (such as noted above), we would set greater store on a given attribution. If consistent, the attributions, which are but interpretations of the stylistic evidence as handed down by Chinese experts and dealers and forgers, are welcome guides. However, for the periods as early as Sung and pre-Sung which are known only through ever fragmentary and often non-authentic oeuvres, we might perhaps generally proceed on the assumption that the names are but venturesome hints. Were not even Sung collectors wary of false attributions? Chou Mi (1232–1308) notes several cases in his Yün-yen kuo-yen-lu:

A landscape designated as Li Ch'eng which, though not by Li, is enjoyable for its beautiful moistness.—A landscape on paper with an extremely small signature, Fan K'uan, yet designated also as Yen Wen-kuei.—A picture, Clear Morning Light over the Hills of Ch'u, in color, (allegedly) by Wang Shen, not seen before by the author who suspects it to be a forgery.⁶⁰

But copying was not an innovation of Sung times. R. H. van Gulik informs us that the scrolls of the governmental collections of the Liang (502–557) and Sui (590–618) dynasties "contained a large number of copies," that "also in the T'ang period Palace officials had copies made on a large scale, artificially ageing them," and that "an enormous number of forgeries" was current in the later T'ang pe-

⁶⁰ Yün-yen kuo-yen-lu, as reprinted in P'ei-wen-chai, ch. 97: 6b, 10b, 11a.
Certainly the Sung collector had reason to be worried, though not so much by the copies as such as by irresponsible attributions defiling and falsifying the memories of the great masters.

Each wrong attribution aids in the destruction of an artist's identity. It is their anxiety to guard that endangered identity which motivates the critic's and the historian's obsession with brush strokes and styles. And it is through the "indefinable truth, the special form of truth which we call style" (Oscar Wilde, 1882) that a re-identification of the nearly obliterated and dissolved images of some of the ancient masters can at least be attempted.

Concluding this brief critique of the validity of various authenticity criteria applying to Sung or earlier paintings, we should be under no illusion as to the exceedingly unpromising conditions. There is every reason for considering genuine works as exceptional, and that we have no means of verifying their authenticity if we should encounter them.

Nothing can be gained from an investigation of silk, paper, and pigments because antique material was available at all times.

Quality, not readily definable and not always unanimously recognized, determines the artistic value but does not by itself vouch for authenticity.

Style, the historically decisive category of the criteria, supplies, when understood, the "historical date" of a painting. Attributions cannot be judged except on the basis of style. But it does not supply the "actual date" of execution (because a style remains essentially unchanged in a replica or reproduction) and thus cannot determine authenticity. Pronouncements based on style and quality, therefore, cannot go beyond either "convincing" or "unconvincing."

By contrast, the documentary evidence, inscriptions and seals, can sometimes furnish proof, objective and incontrovertible proof of non-authenticity. If the documentation is faultless (or correctly duplicated), however, it proves nothing, but has to be accepted on faith. In the survey of dated works which follows, the question of reliability of the dates themselves will be the writer's foremost concern.

Abbreviations.—Except for book titles, abbreviations used are no more than two: H., for Handscroll, and K., for Kakemono. The book titles are listed under their abbreviated form in the bibliography.

SURVEY

919 or 963—SHIH K'O 石恪: Erh Tsu Tiao Hsin 二祖謁心 "Two Patriarchs with Their Minds in Harmony." Tokyo, National Museum, Commission for Protection of Cultural Properties. Two handscroll sections (?) mounted as kakemonos; ink on paper. A seventeenth-century gift to the Shōhōji 正法寺, Kyoto. One of the paintings is signed and dated: Ch'ien-te k'ai-yüan pa yüeh pa jih, Hsi-Shu Shih K'o hsieh Erh Tsu Tiao Hsin T'u 乾徳改元八月八日石恪寫二祖謁心圖. The date appears to correspond to A.D. 919 (rather than 963, as has been considered). On the "left" picture (with the tiger) appear seals of Emperor Kao-tsung's collection: Te-shou-tien pao 德壽圖寳, pi-wan 禮玩 in gourd shape, and Shao-hsing 紹興 in two squares; the round seal with two dragons, shuang lung 雙龍, is a seal of Hui-tsung. On the "right" picture are the following seals: A large square with a corrupt bird script which, according to Tanaka, reads Shou ming yü T'ien, chi shou yung ch'ang 受命于天御永昌, and unquestionably is painted; Hui-tsung's small Cheng-ho 政和 and Hsuan-ho 宣和 seals; and, lowermost, a seal reading Chien-yeh wen-fang chih yin 建業文房之印 (not Wen-hu chai yin

---

(984)—KAO WEN-CHIN 高文進： “Maitrey” ( ? ). Kyoto, Seiryöji. Woodblock print made by the monk Chih-li 知禮 after Kao’s design. The print is dated: Chia-shen sui (984) shih yüeh ting-ch’ou suh shih-wu jih hsin-mao 甲申歲十月丁丑朔十五日辛卯， “ch’ia-shen year, tenth month beginning with the day ting-ch’ou, fifteenth day hsin-mao.” Found in the interior of the famous wooden Buddha statue of Seiryöji 清涼寺 together with a copy of the Vajracchedikā printed in 985, the year the statue was sealed. G. Henderson and L. Hurvitz, The Buddha of Seiryöji, Artibus Asiae, vol. 19 (1956), pp. 5–55, fig. 9.

987—Anonymous painter: “Sixteen Arhats.” Kyoto, Seiryöji. This series was brought back from China by the priest Chōnen 齋然 of Tōdaiji, Nara, in the year Ei-en 1 (987). Kokka, 154.—In all probability the paintings were new when acquired by Chōnen during the six years of his sojourn in China, between 982 and 987.

1022—CHIEN I 錢易: “A Cabbage Plant.” Unknown collection. K., ink on paper (? ). Signed and dated: Ch’ien-hsing yüan nien (1022) wu yüeh 乾興元年五月. Kwen Catalogue, No. 15; CP II List, p. 46 (C ? ).—To judge from the reproduction, the painting, which is of respectable quality, may date from the Yüan dynasty at the earliest. The dated signature evidently is a later addition.

1032—HUANG CHʻUAN 黃荃: Liu Tʻang Chʻu Ch‘in 柳塘聚禽 “Fowl and Birds by a Willow Pool.” New Haven, Yale University, Ada Small Moore collection. H., heavy colors on paper. The earliest colophon, purporting to have been written by some official of the Sung Imperial collection under Jen-tsung (1023–1063), is dated Ming-tao yüan nien (1032) shih yieh san jih 明道元年十月三日. Of early seals, there are two of
Hsüeh Hsüeh (1119–1125) and three of Chang-tsung, Emperor of the Chin dynasty (r. 1190–1208). Hackney and Yau, No. 6; *CP III*, pl. 136; *CP II List*, p. 28: “The picture may be a little later” (than 1032).—The painting, which is attributed to Huang Ch'üan (ca. 900–965), may well go back as far as the tenth century (B. Rowland, in *Archives*, vol. 5 [1951], p. 17f.). Compared with Northern Sung still-lifes, its archaic character is unmistakable, but measured by the scroll of sketches of birds and insects in Peking (*CP III*, pl. 134) which is regarded as an authentic work of Huang Ch'üan, the present painting takes its place on a humbler level.

1032——SUN CHI-H-WEI 罕知微: Bodhidharma. New York, Joseph U. Seo, K., ink on silk. In the lower left corner is an inscription in gold, reading, according to J. Cahill (letter of Dec. 31, 1959): Huang Sung Ming-tao yüan nien (1031) ch'un, Wang cheng yueh, Shu-jen Sun Chih-wei tso yu Ch'ing-ch'eng Ch'ing-ch'ai 皇宋明道元年春王正月蜀人罕知微作於青城靜唘“... in Spring, in the King's first month, Sun Chih-wei from Shu (Ssu-ch'uan) fecit at Ch'ing-ch'eng (Ssu-ch'uan) in the Ch'un Studio.” Another inscription at the left edge is signed with the name of Chang Chu 張翥 (1287–1368; Giles, *B. D.*, No. 40; *JMTT*, 969.1). A colophon of large characters above the painting bears the signature of Lu Yu 龙游 (1125–1209; Giles, *B. D.*, No. 1439). *Chung-kuo ming-hua*, vol. 4.—The painting, which is executed in broad washes, shows no features reminiscent of Sung works and may be no earlier than late Ming, to judge from the reproduction.

1035——KAO K'O-MING 高克明: Chi Shan Hsüeh I T'u 溪山雪意圖 “Winterly River Scene.” New York, Crawford Coll. H., ink and color on silk. Inscribed with the painter's name at the beginning of the scroll; signature and date, partly cut off but still legible, at the end: Ching-yu erh nien (1035) Shao-chien-pu [ch'en?] Kao K'o-ming shang chin 景祐二年少簡簿[臣]高克明上進 “... presented by the Lesser Inspector of Accounting [servant?] Kao K'o-ming.” Recorded in Ch'ing-ho shu-hua-fang, 7:46: Shih-ch'ü, san-pien (Yen-ch'un-ko); *Hsieh Chih-liu*, pls. 13–14; *CP II List*, p. 56 (A).—Regarded as the only extant work of this master who was active in the first half of the eleventh century, this painting can be traced back in literature to the early seventeenth century (Ch'ing-ho shu-hua-fang, 7:46). It is not listed in the *Hsüan-ho shu-hua-p'ü*. The brushwork (especially in the rocks) does not readily point to a date as early as 1035. The signature, however, appears to be genuine.

1044——HSÜ TAO-NING 許道寧: Hsieh Ch'i Yu Fu T'ü 雪溪漁父圖. Taichung, Palace Museum collection. K., ochre-brown glossy old silk with many repairs. Ink and very little color; some brown in the trunks of trees and a bluish gray in the fisherman's garment. The dated signature is a forgery: Ching-yu chi-shen meng-tung shih yueh Tao-ning tso Hsieh Ch'i Yu Fu T'ü 景祐甲申孟冬十月道寧作雪溪漁父圖. The era Ching-yu (1034–1037) comprises no chi-shen year; the one nearest to the era corresponds to A.D. 1044. A seal reading Nan-T'ang Hou-yüan Fu-shih yin-hsin 南唐後苑副使印信 “Attested by seal of the Vice-Commissioner for the North-Park of the Nan-T'ang Dynasty,” alluding presumably to Tung Yüan (middle tenth century) who held that position, is another spurious and anachronistic addition. Not recorded, except in *Ta-kuan-lu* (13:25). *KKSHL*, 5:43; *KK*, vol. 12; *CP II List*, p. 53: “Appears to be of a later period.”—Certainly a Sung original work, as the editors of *KKSHL* hold, this exquisite painting has all the appearances of
an eleventh-century landscape by an outstanding master.

1057—CHAO TSUNG-HAN 趙宗瀚：
Yen Shan Hsü Pich 居山碧剔 "Parting at Yenshan." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. K., ink and color on waxed paper (la chien 费軸). Long inscription with the following date and signature: Chia-yu erh nien wu yüeh er-shh-chiu jih (July 3, 1057) Ting-yüan Chiang-chün Chao Tsung-han chi 嘉禎二年五月二十九日完造將軍趙宗瀚記 "... recorded by Chao Tsung-han, General of Ting-yüan." Recorded in Shih-ch'i, hsü-pien, 28 (Chung-hua-kung). KKS, vol. 8:58 (merely listed); KK, vol. 5 (rather blurred reproduction); CP II List, p. 43.—A large composition of a mountainous landscape executed with meticulous care in an old-fashioned manner. The painter was the youngest brother of Ying-tsun (r. 1064-1067); having risen to the rank of T'ai-wei 大尉 "Grand Marshal," he died during Hui-tsung's reign (1101-1125).

1061—TS'UI PO 祁自: Shuang Hsi T'u 雙喜圖 "Two Magpies (Scolding a Hare)." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. K., ink and color on silk. Signed and dated on the upright trunk of a small oak tree: Chia-yu hsin-ch'ou nien (1061), Ts'ui Po p'i 嘉祐辛丑年 祁自筆. The signature was overlooked by the cataloguers of Shih-ch'i, ch'ü-pien, 18:3, where the painting is listed as an anonymous Sung work. Early seals: Ch'i-hsi-tien pao 紫燕殿寶 (ca. 1233-1264); Ssu-yin 司印 (ca. 1374-1384). KKS, vol. 5:54; KSHC, vol. 7; CP III, pl. 214; Sickman and Soper, pl. 98A. CP II List, p. 83 (A?).—The painting appears to be a genuine work of the master.

1070—WEN T'UNG 文同: Hua Chu 畫竹 "Windswept Bamboos by a Rock." Formerly Shanghai, Ti P'ing-tzu collection. K., ink on paper (?). In the upper left corner, a beautifully written poem of 40 characters with the following date and signature: Hsi-ning keng-hsü ch'ü ch'i yüeh (1070) Wen T'ung hua ping t'i 畫屏庚戌秋七月文同畫幀. A second poem by another hand underneath the first; a third one, mounted in the shih-t'ang 審堂 above the painting, dates from Chia-ch'ing kuei-hai (1803). Famous Chinese paintings, vol. 22, pl. 2; CP II List, p. 87 (B?).—The combination of a moist atmospheric effect with such features as the shape and slightly flashy contour of the rock rendered in a very wet technique speak against the attribution of this handsome and vibrant painting to Wen T'ung.

1072—KUO HSI 郭熙: Tsao Ch'un 早春 "Early Spring." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. K., yellowish-brown silk in surprisingly good condition; ink in light and dark washes. Signed and dated at the left margin: Tsao Ch'un; jen-tzu nien (1072) Kuo Hsi hua 早春,壬子年郭熙畫; with an oblong seal in faint red: Kuo Hsi p' 郭熙篆. The earliest collectors’ seals are those of Chin Chang-tsun, "Ming-ch'ang" 明昌 (1190–1195), and Ming T'ai-tsu, "Ssu-yin" 司印 (ca. 1374–1384). There are several seals of Keng Chao-chung 艸昭忠 (1640–1686). KKS, vol. 5:47; KK, vol. 10; CP III, pl. 175; CP II List, p. 57 (A?).—There appears to be no reason to doubt the authenticity of the signature or the painting itself. Inspired and grandiose in design and executed with care and accuracy, the painting, surprisingly, shows a few dull passages in its brushwork.

1072—KUO HSI 郭熙: Kuan Shan Ch'un 開山春雲 "Spring Snow on Pass and Mountains." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. K., very dark brown silk in fair condition but with some extensive repairs. Ink and ink washes; no color. The dated inscription purporting to be the painter's is placed
rather conspicuously: Hsi-ning jen-tzu (1072) erh yüeh, feng Wang chih hua Kuan Shan Ch'un Huang chih tsu, ch'en Hsi chin 熙寧壬子二月奉王旨畫闌山春雪之圖臣熙進 “the picture of Spring Snow on Pass and Mountains, painted by Royal order, servant Hsi submits.” The only two seals earlier than those of Ch'ien-lung are illegible. The painting is recorded only in Shih-ch'ü, san-pien (Yen-ch'un-ko). KKSRL, 5:49; KKSNC, vol. 18; CP II List, p. 57 (A?).—That this painting should be regarded as a post-Sung work (London Exhibition, No. 901) is debatable. Combining a masterful brushwork with a powerful dynamic composition, it shows no weaknesses except, perhaps, in the drawing of the architecture. The design does not suggest a later date than Northern Sung.

1077—LI KUNG-LIN 李公麟 李公麟: Ch'ü Ko 九歌 “The Nine Songs” (of Ch'ü Yuän, 332–295 B.C.). Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., pai-miao on silk. Attributed to Li Kung-lin in a colophon purporting to have been written by Mi Fei (1051–1107), who supposedly also wrote the seal characters of the text accompanying the illustrations; the colophon is dated Hsi-ning ting-su (1077) chung-hsia 熙寧丁巳仲夏 “in the second month of summer” and signed Hsi-jiang-yang Mi Fei ch'i 襄陽米芾記. Described in Shih-ch'ü, I, ch. 36:35b. Unpublished.—The scroll, which is not identical with the version illustrated in Sirén's CP III, pl. 198, and in KK'CH', Nos. 357–377, is rated a second-class work in Shih-ch'ü and hence unlikely to be genuine; it may be a Ming copy, according to J. Cahill, who saw the scroll in 1959.

1078—KUO HSI 郭熙: K'o Shih P'ing Yüan Tu 寇熙平遠圖. “Hollowed Rocks in a Plain.” Peking Palace Museum. K., ink and light color on silk. An inscription at the left margin gives the title, followed by the date and signature: Yüan-feng mou-wu sui (1078), Kuo Hsi hua 元豐戊午郭熙畫. Unrecorded? Reproduced in Chung-kuo hua, 1959/11. Not in Sirén's List.—The picture shows a misty, rolling plain, dominated by a group of rounded boulders and leafless, gnarly trees which contrast with shrubs in foliage. It is a work of excellent quality and in agreement with Kuo Hsi's style.

1078—MI FEI 米芾: Ch'ien Chang Ming Meng 千嶂溟濛 “Thousand Peaks in Drizzling Rain.” Hongkong, S. M. Siu (Hsiao Shou-min) 蕭壽民 collection. K., ink on paper (?). Signed and dated: Hsi-ning mou-wu (1078) ssu yüeh, Hsi-jiang-yang Mi Fei 熙寧戊午四月襄陽米芾; in the upper right corner is an inscription purporting to be by Ch'ien-lung, dated 1769, beginning with the four characters used in the title of the picture. Ferguson's Index has no entry of this title. Reproduced in S. M. Siu, Chung-kuo ku-hua-chi, vol. 1, No. 3; not in Sirén's List.—A vista across a river flowing through a hilly terrain with groves and hamlets silhouetted against the whitish mist that drifts around dark, towering mountains in the distance. The surfaces of hills and mountains are uniformly rendered in gray and dark gray washes and horizontal blobs with a whitish effect, in a design that lacks harmony and coherence. In the lower left corner faintly shows an oblong seal that reads “ssu yin” 斯岳; it is an imitation of the left half of the early Ming seal reading “Chi-ch'a-ssu yin,” framed all around as though it were complete. If the seal were genuine, it would have to show the missing two characters “Chi-ch'a” on the right side of “ssu yin” and without a border in the middle. The forger, of course, had no model for the missing characters, because only the left half of the seal is known, always placed at the right edge of the paintings on which it occurs. The presence of
the forged seal makes it inevitable to reject the attribution which in itself is unconvincing.

1079—MI FEI 李芾: “Landscape with Returning Boat.” New Haven, Yale University, Ada Small Moore collection. K., ink on silk. The inscription signed with the painter’s name gives the date Yüan-feng erh nien (1079) hsia wu yüeh 元豐二年夏五月. Another inscription is signed with the cipher of Kaotsung (r. 1127–1162). Hackney and Yau, No. 9; not included in Sirén’s List.—An undistinguished work in the Mi style, possibly of the Ming period.


1081—MI FEI 李芾: Album with Eight Landscapes. Colmberg, Mittelfranken, Dr. E. A. Voretzsch. Ink on paper. One leaf inscribed in large, flashy characters: Yüan-feng suu nien (1081) ch’u ch’un, Hsiang-yang Mi Fei 元豐四年初春襄陽米芾. Kristiania Catalogue, Nos. 19–26, pls. 9–10; not in Sirén’s List.—Though not of recent date, these broadly brushed, summarily suggestive landscapes seem unlikely to antedate Ming.

1083—LI KUNG-LIN 李公麟: Wu Pai Ying-chén 五百應真 “Five Hundred Arhats.” Peking, John C. Ferguson collection in the Wen-hua-tien, Peking Palace. Long handscroll, ink on paper, figures in pai-miao. Inscribed with the date Yüan-feng liu nien (1083) 元豐六年 and the painter’s name. According to Ferguson, the scroll is identical with the one described in Ching-ho shu-hua-fang (8:2) and Shih-ku-t’ang (12:47). Ferguson, Chinese painting, p. 110, with illustration of a short section; Giles, Introduction, p. 124. Not in Sirén’s List.—The date given by Ferguson, a.d. 1085, is erroneous. A remarkable painting that may be closely modeled on the original.

1084—LI T’ANG 李唐: “A Man with a Water Buffalo.” Tokyo, Japan Art Institute (formerly Akaboshi collection). K., ink and color on silk. The inscription reads: Chia-tzu (taken to correspond to A.D. 1084) meng-tung shih jih hsieh, Li T’ang 甲子孟冬十日寫李唐 “painted in (the year) chia-tzu, first month of winter (=tenth month), tenth day, Li T’ang.” Illegible seal under the name; a seal
Ta-kuan 大觀 above it, as though it formed part of the two columns of the signature. Published by T. Akiyama, in Artibus Asiae, vol. 14 (1951), pp. 209–212. Not in Sirén's List.—If Li T'ang lived till ca. 1130 or in any case not till 1144, the chia-tzu year would have to correspond to A.D. 1084, as assumed by Akiyama. It would fall into the reign period named Yüan-feng (1078–1085), so that the Ta-kuan seal, referring to the reign years 1107–1110, seems out of place. The inscription itself is rather conspicuously placed, and the strangely bleak composition of two parallel terrain curves under a high nocturnal sky shows no resemblance to any of the paintings connected with Li T'ang. Nor does the drawing of the buffalo and the peasant speak in favor of the attribution, as pointed out by L. B. Nerio (in a seminar, University of Michigan, 1958). Even if the style of the painting were more convincing, the signature, by its placement and odd combination with the Ta-kuan seal, must be regarded with apprehension.

1085—LI KUNG-LIN 李公麟: Hsiao Ching T'u Chüan 孝經圖卷 "Pictures to the Classic of Filial Piety." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H. Attributed to Li Kung-lin whose name occurs in an inscription at the end, with the date Yüan-feng pa nien (1085) liu yüeh 元豐八年六月. Recorded in Shih-ch'i, II (Chung-hua-kung), fol. 110a. KKSHL, 8:34 (without description). Not in Sirén's List. Unpublished.—The scroll was seen by James Cahill in 1959; he believes it to be a Ming work.

1088—TS'UI PO 崔白: The Monk Pu-tai 布袋. Rubbing from a stone engraving after an unrecorded (?) lost painting by Ts'ui Po. Princeton, Prof. George Rowley's collection. The engraving reproduces an inscription by Su Shih (1036–1101) who, writing in Yüan-yu san nien 元祐三年 (1088), states that he was shown the painting in the Hsi-ning era (1068–1077). Alexander C. Soper, Kuo Jo-shih's experiences in painting, 1951, frontispiece.—This delightful engraving deserves attention not only as a specimen of the painter's unknown figure paintings in a brilliant calligraphic manner, "surpassing Wu Tao-tzu" as Su Tung-p'o says in his inscription, but also as the earliest depiction of Pu-tai ho-shang now in existence. A more painterly effect is produced by a rubbing in gray to black values against a light background (from the same engraving) in Richard Wilhelm: Die chinesische Literatur, Wildpark-Potsdam, 1930, pl. 4.

1091—WANG CH'I-HAN 王齊翰: K'an Shu T'u 勘書圖 "Revising Books" (or "Examining Books"). Peking, Ferguson collection (in the Palace Museum)? H., ink and color on silk. The scroll is attributed to Wang Ch'i-han in inscriptions purporting to have been written by Hui-tsung (title at the beginning of the scroll; Wang Ch'i-han miao pi 王齊翰妙筆 "the wonderful brush of Wang Ch'i-han" at the end), but a colophon by Su Shih (1036–1101) provides an earlier terminus ante quem: Yüan-yu liu nien (1091) liu yüeh erh jih 元祐六年六月二日 (testa Ferguson). Further colophons are by Su Che (1039–1112), Su Tung-p'o's brother, by Wang Shen, Su's friend, by Tung Ch'i-ch'ang (1555–1636), by two sons of Ch'ien-lung, and others. Seals of Southern T'ang (Chien-yeh Wen-fang chih yin), and Sung (Cheng-ho; Hsüan-ho; Jui-ssu Tung-ko), as described by Ferguson, Chinese painting, p. 82ff. Reproduction in Chung-ko ming-hua-chi, 2:6; CP II List, p. 33.—Of this often recorded scroll (v. Ferguson's Index, fol. 60ff.) a clear description is given in Ta-kuan-li (ch. II.15b), which was completed in 1712. This source mentions the same seals (Chien-yeh Wen-fang, Jui-ssu
Tung-ko, Hsüan-ho, Cheng-ho, yü-shu) and colophons (Su Shih, Su Che, Shih Kung-i, Tung Ch'i-ch'ang), and thus would seem to be identical with Ferguson's scroll; however, the inscription of the title by Hui-tsung here consists of only six characters, "Wang Ch'i-han, K'an Shu T'u," whereas Ferguson's scroll has eight. "K'an Shu T'u" and "Wang Ch'i-han miao pi," as mentioned above. We have to conclude that either Ferguson's scroll is altogether a different item from the scroll described in the Ta-kuan-lu, or that its Hui-tsung inscription is spurious. The most charitable view to take would be to assume that the silk of the scroll in the K'ang-hsi collection (the Ta-kuan-lu item) was completely worn so that the precious traces of Hui-tsung's hand could not be saved except by copying them on the new mounting—a view not easy to defend as it does not account for the two additional characters, "miao pi," in Ferguson's scroll. In fact, a glance at the reproduction shows that the Hui-tsung inscription is a poor imitation.

Another difficulty concerns the attribution. Ch'en Chi-ju (1558–1639) in his Ni-ku-lu (ch. 1:3b) mentions a painting of the same subject matter by Li Kung-lin (ca. 1040–1106), a scroll with the same title, "K'an Shu T'u," written by Emperor Hui-tsung, and provided with inscriptions by Li's friends, Su Shih, Su Che, and Wang Shen (none as yet by Tung Ch'i-ch'ang). Was this scroll of Li Kung-lin's (which after the Ni-ku-lu is also inserted in Ch'ing-ho Shu-hua-fang, ch. 5, last entry) identical with the original version of the Wang Ch'i-han scroll, the latter's name having been attached to it later on? Or was the Li Kung-lin scroll modeled on Wang Ch'i-han's and the entire assemblage of title and colophons repeated? The Ni-ku-lu does not indicate what seals there were on the Li Kung-lin scroll; the question of the relationship between the Wang and Li scrolls must therefore remain open.

Whether the title "K'an Shu" was rightly applied to the present subject by Hui-tsung, an issue raised in the Ni-ku-lu with respect to a painting with the same title by Ku K'ai-chih discussed in the early twelfth-century Kuang-ch'iu hua-pa (ch. 3:11), has no bearing on the question of the reliability of the painting. But the existence of more than one version of the Wang Ch'i-han in addition to a more or less identical version under the name of Li Kung-lin does not speak in favor of the authenticity of the scroll under discussion.

1094—SU SHIH 穗軒: "A Branch of Bamboo." New York, Crawford collection (formerly in the Tuan Fang collection). Album leaf, mounted as a handscroll. Ink on paper. Inscribed and dated: Tung-p'o ch'i-shih, Shao-sheng yüan nien (1094) san yüeh tso 東坡居士紹聖元年三月作. There are no earlier seals than those of Hsiang Yüan-pien (1525–1590), including his T'ien-lai-ko seal in the upper right corner. Chung-kuo ming-hua, vol. 37.—That this impressive, broad and freely brushed ink study with its interesting contrasts of clear and blurred forms goes back to Sung is possible, even though the inscription may, according to James Cahill, be a later addition.

1095—MA FEN 马贊: Mu Niu T'uch'üan 牧牛圖卷 "Herding the Buffaloes." Peking, Ku-wu Ch'en-lich-so. H., ink and color on silk. Signed and dated: Shao-sheng erh nien (1095) ch'un-yüeh, Ho-chung Ma Fen 紹聖二年春月河中馬贊, with a seal of the painter. Seals of K'o Chiu-ssu (1312–1365) and later collectors. KWCLS, 5:12a; CP II List, p. 71.—Unpublished?

1100—CHAO TA-NIEN 趙大年: Chiang Hsiang Ch'ing Hsia 江鄉秋夏 "River Village in Early Summer." Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. H., color on silk. Signed and dated:
Yüan-fu keng-ch’ên (1100) Ta-nien pi 元符 鞠大年筆. Colophons by Tung Ch’i-ch’ang (1555–1636) and others. Recorded in Shu-hua chien-wen piao by Chang Ch’ou (1577–1643); P’ei-wen-chai, 83: 26, 100:2, 100:4; Kokka, 494; Sōgen, pl. 7; W. Cohn, figs. 60, 61; CP III, pl. 226; CP II List, p. 40 (A).—An important and convincing work.

1102—MI FEI 米芾: Yün Shan T’u 雲山圖 “Clouded Mountains.” Tokyo, Nakamura Fusetsu 中村不折. Album leaf, ink on paper. Inscription with date and artist’s name: Ch’ung-ning yün nien (1102) erh yüeh pa jih hua yü Hai-t’ai-lou chung, Mi Fei 崇寧元年二月十八日于海岱樓中，米芾 “... painted in the Hai-t’ai-lou.” Seal printed over the character Fei: Ch’u-kuo Mi Fei 楚國米芾. Tōsō, pl. 47; London Exhibition, No. 918; W. Cohn, fig. 56; Sickman and Soper, pl. 91A; CP II List, p. 77 (C).—Nothing in this painting points to Northern Sung. The bizarre and flat mountains, the strangely shapeless sheets of clouds, and the forced uniformity of the brushwork make it difficult to accept this painting as a work of the period in question. Sirén’s "C" which stands for “a doubtful, arbitrary attribution” seems entirely justified to the writer.

1102—WANG WEI 王維: Shan Yin T’u-chüan 山陰圖卷 “The Shan-yin Picture.” Tai-chung, Palace Museum collection. H., silk of a greenish hue with many repairs. Ink used for thin outlines; colors, no washes. The painting is not signed; it is attributed to Wang Wei (699–759) in the third colophon. The first colophon, on a blush-gray silk, purports to have been written by Mi Fei 米芾 in the year Ch’ung-ning jen-wu 崇寧壬午 (1102). The second colophon, on paper, opens with the date Cheng-ho san nien 政和三年 (1113) and is signed by Li Hsiao-yen 李孝僑 and Wu Chi 吳樵. The third, written on the same paper as the preceding one, is dated Chêng-ho ping-shen 丙申 (1116) and is signed by Chia Hsün 賈汛; in contrast to the preceding texts, it refers specifically to the present scroll as “Shan-yin picture by Wang Yu-ch’êng’s brush” and mentions the names of the persons portrayed in it. The fourth colophon is dated kuei-mao 章 1123 and is signed by the following men: Lu Hsiang 盧襄 (T. Tsän-yüan 贊元), Mr. Chao 超 (T. Chung-ts’ang 仲藏), Li Mi-ta 李彌大 (T. Su-chü 似偁), who together examined [this (?) picture] at the home of Ts’ai Chü-hou 蔡厚 (T. K’uan-fu 宽夫). Their names and known dates (identified in KKSRL, 4:11) warrant the cyclical year to be equated with A.D. 1123. The following, fifth colophon, was written by Tung Ch’i-ch’ang (1555–1636), who apparently accepts the attribution and also has a word of praise for the writing of Mi Fei. Recorded in Shih-ch’ü, san-pien (Yen-ch’un-ko); KKSRL, 4:9–12. Not in Sirén’s List.—Unpublished?

The Shih-ch’ü compilers admit the painting to be a later imitation. As to the colophons, the KKSRL, adding Hu Ching’s Hsi-ch’ing cha-chi (4:2), rejects Mi Fei’s by showing that its text is plainly copied from Su Tung-p’o’s inscription on a landscape by Yen Su 袁肅 (first half eleventh century), “Autumn Morning at the Ch’u River” (see, for instance, Shih-ku-t’ang, 11:76). The second and fourth colophons are considered old but transferred from some other scroll; the third is regarded as a collector’s interpolation. The title of this painting refers to a meeting at Shan-yan (Kuei-chi District, Chekiang)—the locality of the famous Lan-t’ing Chi 蘭亭集 “Gathering at the Orchid Pavilion” in A.D. 353—in which Wang Hsi-chih (321–379), Hsieh An 謝安 (320–385) (Giles, B.D., No. 724), and the Taoist and calligrapher Chih Tun 支遁 (T. Tao-lin 道林; JMTTT, 54:3) participated. No painting of this title by Wang Wei is re-
corded before the Ming dynasty, and the then existing versions appear to have been based on paintings by Ku Hung-chung 龔鳴中 and Lu Chin 陸璽 of the Five Dynasties period.

1103—WU YUAN-YU 吳元瑜: Ti Hua Pai O 蒼花白鷄 “Geese among Reeds and Flowers.” St. Paul, Minnesota, Miss A. O'Brien. A pair of K., silk, color. Inscribed by, or in the manner of, Hui-tsung: Wu Yuan-yü, Chia O T'u “House Goose Picture by Wu Yuan-yü.” A label mounted on the framing silk says: Sung Wu Kung-ch'i 宋呉公器, Ti Hua Pai O “Reeds, Flowers, White Geese, by Wu Kung-ch'i (the painter's tsu) of the Sung dynasty”; this is followed by a cyclical date, “Kuei-wei, tenth month, first day” and the name of the writer of this label. Sirén, Histoire, vol. 2, p. 47, pls. 15–16; CP III, pl. 216; CP II List, p. 88 (B?).—The date on the label does not apply to the painting itself. Nor can it correspond to A.D. 1103 (considered as probable by Sirén) because the use of the term “Sung” in combination with the artist's tsu clearly suggests a post-Sung date. Two large seals on the painting with the goose and goslings are not distinctly recognizable, but a seal in the center seems to read “Hsian-ho 宣和 . . . ” If Sirén's evaluation of these paintings is correct, as I believe it is, the seals cannot be of the period.

1104—MI FEI 米芾: “Mountains and Water.” New Haven, Yale University, Ada Small Moore collection. H., ink on paper. An inscription in prosa, dated Ch'ung-ning san nien (1104) liu yüeh chiu jih 崇寧三年六月朔日, is signed Hsiang-yang Fei 襄陽芾 and sealed “Mi Fei chih yin 米芾之印.” Colophons: (1) Poem written by I-shan 遺山 (Yüan Hao-wen 元好問, 1190–1257; JM-TTT, 26:3) in Cheng-ta erh nien (1225) sui-tzu i-yu shang-ssu chih chi 正大二年歲次乙酉上巳之吉 “in the year of the cycle, i-yu, on the auspicious third day of the third month”; (2) poem by Yang Wei-chen (fourteenth century; Giles, B.D., No. 2415), undated; (3) a short note by Li Shih-feng 李士鳳, dated in accordance with A.D. 1381; etc. Kven Catalogue, No. 52; Hackney and Yau, No. 10; CP II List, p. 77 (B?).—In his CP II, text, p. 31, n. 1, Sirén mentions “a better version of a similar composition” he had seen once in New York.

1105—1107—HUI-TSUNG 徽宗: Lin Ku Chüan 臨古卷 “Scroll after Ancient Masters.” Mukden, Northeastern Museum; former Manchu Imperial collection. H., containing 17 landscape pictures of album-leaf size alluding to models of hoary age, as well as a postscript which says that the scroll was begun in Ch'ung-ning ssu nien 崇寧四年 (1105) and was completed in Ta-kuan yüan nien 大觀元年 (1107); the signature reads Hsian-ho-tien yü pi 宣和殿御筆 “Hsüan-ho Hall Imperial brush.” Ōmura, Chigoku meiga-shū, vol. 1, pls. 53–67; several pictures also in Ferguson, Chinese painting; CP II List, p. 55 (B?).—Covering such early names as Mao Yen-shou, Ts'ao Fu-hsing, Wei Hsieh, Ku K'ai-chih, and others, these small landscapes obviously do not represent true copies. Rather they are documents of Sung connoisseurship and antiquarian nostalgia; they are, in the main, a kind of archaeological exercise and uncharacteristic of contemporary styles. To understand such designs in terms of then current styles or of Hui-tsung's own little-known oeuvre is hardly possible. The writing is of a somewhat impersonal character when compared with a typical specimen of Hui-tsung's sou-chin 瘦金 calligraphy; it does not give the impression of having been done in imitation of the emperor's hand, much less by himself.

1107—HUI-TSUNG 徽宗: T'ao Chiu 桃鶯 “A Dove on a Peach Tree.” Tokyo,
Inouye collection. Album leaf, color on silk. Signed and dated: Ta-kuan ting-hai (1107) yü pi 大觀丁亥御筆, with the emperor's cipher and a square seal, Yü shu 御書 "Imperial writing," placed over the signature. A small oblong seal in the lower left corner reading Tenzan 天任 indicates that the painting was owned by Ashikaga Yoshimitsu 足利義満 (1358–1408) who adopted the monastic name Tenzan when he joined the Zen order in 1395. Kokka, 25; B.K., vol. 38; Sōgen meiga-shū, vol. 2; CP III, pl. 237 (seals not recognizable); CP II List, p. 55 (A?)—No full agreement is found in the views of recent critics: "An Academy picture" (Sirén's List); "probably genuine" (Lippe, J.A.S., vol. 16, p. 140); "unconditionally accepted as genuine" (Rowland, Archives, vol. 5, p. 8); "authentic" (Shimada and Yonezawa, Painting of Sung and Yuan Dynasties, p. 10). Sirén's reservation implies no adverse criticism of the quality of this painting. In his view, Hui-tsung's oeuvre is a problem so entangled that any attribution must remain tentative (CP II, p. 74f.). In fact, only the scroll of "Ladies Preparing Silk" in the Boston and the Palace Museum picture of "Birds on a Wax-Tree" (KK-SHC, vol. 45; CP III, pl. 234) are marked "A" in Sirén's List. In Rowland's investigation, "The Problem of Hui-tsung" (loc. cit.), the present picture and the "Five-colored Parakeet" of the Boston Museum (CP III, pls. 238, 239) are taken as the safest point of departure—without prejudice to the stylistically unrevealing "Ladies Preparing Silk."

It may be pointed out that Hui-tsung's calligraphy of the year 1107 can be studied in several specimens, the present one and the following three. These inscriptions (cf. CP III, pls. 101, 102, 237) are so similar in character that it requires no boldness to believe them to be by the same hand and of the same time. Compared with several other inscriptions of Hui-tsung which appear to be genuine, namely, on the "Birds on a Wax-Tree," the "Five-colored Parakeet" and the "Pheasant on a Hibiscus Branch" in Peking (cf. CP III, pls. 234, 238 below, 230), the three inscriptions of 1107 definitely form a coherent group, a group that shows a slightly less assured, less fluent, less buoyant script than do the other inscriptions, especially the one on the "Wax-Tree" picture. The wording, too, in the emperor's signatures of the last-mentioned series is different from that of the 1107 signatures in that he used the name Hsüan-ho-tien 宣和殿. Finally, the monogram attached to all those signatures also changes slightly; in the "Hsüan-ho" signatures it is larger, bolder, and in the upper two strokes more widely spaced than in the "Ta-kuan" signatures. The monograms on the paintings reproduced in CP III, pls. 232 and 236, are imitations.) It is my impression that the buoyant script (as in CP III, pl. 234) reveals a maturer hand than the Ta-kuan hand of 1107, when the emperor was only 25 or 26 years old. My conclusion from the preceding observations is that the "Wax-Tree," the "Parakeet" and the "Pheasant" are quite a few years later than the "Dove" of 1107, and that the "Dove," on the basis of the script type (minor variations, as in the monogram, notwithstanding), should be accepted as a genuine work.

1107—HAN KAN 韓幹: "A Central Asian Groom with Two Imperial Horses."

Album leaf in an album named Ming Hui Chi Chen 名繪集珍, Taichung, Palace Museum collection. Very fine brown silk in good condition; ink, except in the black horse's saddle cover and tassel which are in vermilion red. Inscribed by Hui-tsung: Han Kan chen chī 韓幹真跡 "Genuine work of Han Kan," ting-hai (1107) yü pi 丁亥御筆, followed by his monogram and a large seal reading Yü shu 御書 "Imperial writing." A gourd-shaped
seal with the same two characters is stamped over the date and repeated in the upper right corner. A black seal in the lower right corner, Chi-hsien-yüan yü-shu yin 章賢院御書印, probably dates from the time of Kublai Khan (Chih-yüan era, 1264–1294). The large seal in the upper left corner reads Jui-ssu Tung-ko 容思東閣 “East Hall of Jui-ssu [Palace]”; it is a Sung Imperial seal probably of the era of Kao-tsung. (Later seals omitted.) KKSHL, 6:165; CP III, pl. 101; CP II List, p. 17 (A?).—A painting of very high quality but hardly older than Early Northern Sung (it cannot well have been new at the time when Hui-tsung wrote his attribution). The profusion of Sung Imperial seals is a slightly perturbing feature. Why should the “yü shu” appear three times on a small album leaf bearing Hui-tsung’s signature? Yet this signature does not look suspicious and the form of the characters is compatible with the inscription of the same year on the Inouye “Dove.” If unconvincing as to the attribution to Han Kan, the inscription provides what would seem a reliable terminus ante quem.

1107—HAN HUANG 韓滉: Wen Yüan T’u 文苑圖 “The Scholars’ Garden.” Peking, Hui-hua-kuan. H., silk, ink and color. Inscribed by Hui-tsung: Han Huang Wen-yüan t’u, ting-hai 丁亥 (1107) yü cha 御札 “Imperially set down,” followed by the emperor’s cipher. Two Imperial seals, “Jui-ssu Tung-ko” and “Yü shu.” Overlapping the margin, small seals “Hsüan-ho 宣和” (top) and “Cheng-ho 政和” (below). Wei-ta-ti i-shu, vol. 1, pt. 5, pl. 3; CP III, pl. 102; CP II List, p. 17 (A?).—The painting apparently is not recorded before T’ao Liang’s Hung-tou-shu-kuan (1836), i:11. Hui-tsung’s inscription closely resembles the preceding one (1107—Han Kan). Again, the inscription appears to provide a safe terminus ante quem, while the attribution to Han Huang (723–787) rests on an opinion which “we have no means of either confirming or correcting” (Sirén, CP I, pl. 141). The antiquity of the design, however, is vouched for by its recurrence, observed by Sirén, in a composition of Chou Wen-chü 周文矩 (3d quarter, tenth century).

1107—HO CH'ENG 郭澄: “A Man Trying to Catch a Horse.” Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Album leaf, silk. Attributed to Ho Ch'eng (later tenth century) in an inscription by Hui-tsung: Ho Ch'eng pi 赫澄筆 ting-hai (1107) yü cha 丁亥御札, with the Emperor’s cipher. The seals are unrecognizable in the reproduction. Tomita’s Portfolio, pl. 44; CP II List, p. 49 (A?).—The Hui-tsung inscription appears to be genuine and to warrant a date no later than Northern Sung.

1108—HSÜ TAO-NING 許道寧: Hsüeh Shan Lou Kuan 雪山樓觀. “Monastery in Snowy Mountains.” Osaka, City Art Museum, Abe collection. K., ink and color on silk. Attributed to the master in an inscription in the manner of Hui-tsung: Hsü Tai-ning, Hsüeh Shan Lou Kuan T'u, Ta-kuan mou-tzu sui (1108) yü pi 大觀戊子歲御筆. Sōraikan Kinshō II/1:9; London Exhibition, No. 1114; W. Cohn, Chinese painting, pl. 39; CP II List, p. 53 (C).—The title occurs among the 138 landscapes by Hsü Tai-ning listed in the Hsüan-ho Hua-p’u (ch. 11:9; cf. P’ei-wen-chai, ch. 96:3a), but it may have been attached to the present painting at a later date. The painting has nothing whatever in common with Hsü’s style as evidenced in the several works that go under his name; Sirén’s denial of the attribution seems entirely justified.

The scenes are represented by a text written, according to a note inscribed after the last scene, by Li P'eng 李彭. This note reads: "The painting is restored with a colophon dated Ta-kuan ssu-nien (1110) san yüeh wu jih 大観四年三月五日. Sirén, *Chinese paintings in American collections*, pls. 50–52; *CP II List*, p. 93, second entry ("the picture was probably not executed before the Yüan period").—Li P'eng *(JMTTT, 424:2; Ssu-k'un t'i-yao, p. 3264, s.v. Jih-she-yüan, dates unknown),* was a contemporary of Huang T'ing-chien (1050–1110; Giles, *B.D.*, No. 873); in his colophon he says that at the latter's home he once saw a small screen on which Po-shih (Li Kung-lin) had painted a picture of "Returning Home," similar in spirit to the present scroll. While this colophon may indeed date from Sung, it does not warrant an accordingly early date of the paintings themselves. The handwriting differs from that of the text between the pictures; nor is the silk the same, according to James Cahill, who is inclined to think that the colophon was removed from a different picture (communicated by letter of August 29, 1958).

**III—HUI-TSUNG 徽宗** Hsiieh Chiang Kuei Chao 雪江歸棹 "Rowing Home on a Snowy River," Shanghai (?), Chang Po-chü 張伯驹 collection. Exhibited at Tsinghua University, October 1948. H., ink on silk. Signed: Hsiüan-ho-tien painter with text signature, Ta-kuan 1110, dated Ta-kuan keng-yin (1110) chi-ch'un suo 大観庚寅季春朔 "first day of the last month of Spring (= third month) of the keng-yin year of the era Ta-kuan" and signed, T'ai-shih Ch'ü-kuo Kung . . . -shih, ch'en Ching chin chi 太師楚國公士臣京謹記 "The Grand Preceptor, Duke of Ch'ü-kuo and [retired] official, servant Ching, respectfully records." Seals: Square seal with a pair of dragons (Sung) printed over the title at the beginning; "Yu shu" (Imperial writing) in gourd shape printed over the signature. Hakubundō scroll reproduction: five sections (poorly reproduced) in "Chao Chi 趙佶 "(*Chung-kuo hua-chia ts'ung-shu, Shanghai, 1958*); *CP II List*, p. 55 (B). A fine copy is in the Ada Small Moore collection, Yale University; see Hackney and Yau, No. 14, with a reproduction also of the Ts'ai Ching colophon.—The scroll of the Chang collection is recorded in Ming texts (*Ferguson's Index*, fol. 112ff.). It is distinguished by a very fine and careful execution as well as by a design reminiscent of Kuo Hsi but deprived of his dynamic qualities, and more gentle than forceful. Closely modeled, no doubt, on eleventh-century compositional modes, this lovely work is difficult to assess as a work of Hui-tsung, of whom there is only one other landscape with a claim to authenticity left (*KKSHC, 1; KKCK*, No. 505; *CP III*, pl. 240).

**III—KUAN T'UNG 闕同** Tai Tu T'u 待渡圖 "Waiting for the Ferry." Osaka, Saitō collection. K., ink and light color on silk. The painting is restored and made up of three pieces, according to Sirén. At the left margin is a signature, Kuan T'ung, which is a later addition. Attributed to Kuan T'ung in an inscription in large characters across the top part, with the date Cheng-ho hsin-mao (1111) ch'un 政和辛卯春. This inscription is signed only with a monogram, believed to be of K'ai, Prince of Yun 雲王楷. Hui-tsung's third son (*Sung Shih*, ch. 246) and himself a painter (cf. *Hua chi*, ch. 2 = *Wang-shih hua-yüan*, ch. 719, a text which mistakenly speaks of him as the emperor's second son). Under the monogram, two small one-character seals which resemble the Shao-hsing 紇興 seals but cannot safely be read in the reproductions and are not mentioned in the catalogue of the Saitō collection (*Tōan-zō* or in B. Harada, *Nippon*
One page of a document with text in Chinese and English. The text discusses the work of artists and their contributions, focusing on a scroll by Ts'ai Ch'ing. The scroll was likely made to commemorate the young emperor and was given as a gift from the emperor Hui-tsung, who was an admirer of the arts. The text describes the painting style and the significance of the inscription in the colophon. It also mentions the participation of several artists in the production of this piece, including Wang Hsi-Meng and Yü Ping T'u. The text notes the rich and turquoise pigments used in the painting, which are characteristic of Northern Sung period art. The scroll is attributed to Ts'ai Ch'ing, a renowned painter of the time. The text also discusses the authenticity and the reproduction of the painting, mentioning the Nanking Exhibition and the Hsiao-ho hua-p'u, a collection of important Chinese paintings. The text concludes by noting the importance of such artworks in understanding the cultural and artistic trends of the Northern Sung period.
to the same year (1114) and signed with the title T'ai-shih Lu-kuo-kung ch'en 太師魯國 公臣 “Grand Preceptor, Duke of the Lu Country, servant”; the name, which is not clearly recognizable, possibly reads Ts'ai Ching 鄭京 (1046–1126; Giles, B.D., 1971). If so, the painting would appear to be identical with that recorded under the same title in An Chi's Mo-yüan hui-kuan (ming-hua hsü-lu, 71a). Reproduction in Hsich Chih-lu, T'ang W'u-t'ai Sung Yüan ming-chi, (No. 12, pl. 34). Not in Sirén's List.—This is a painting of great artistic qualities, stylistically close to Huitsung's manner, and convincing as a Sung work. Concerning the identification of the writer of the long inscription as Ts'ai Ching it may be pointed out that the latter was enfeoffed as Lu-kuo-kung in the year Cheng-ho 2 (A.D. 1112), according to Sung Shih (ch. 472; K'ai-ming ed., vol. 7:56783, col. 4).

1117—LI AN-CHUNG 李安忠: “Cottage in a Misty Grove.” New York, W. Hochstader. Album leaf, ink on silk. Signed and dated: Ting-yu (1117), Li An-chung pi丁酉 李安忠筆. CP III, pl. 228; CP II List, p. 58 (A), with the remark: “posterior inscription.”—The present album leaf is the only extant landscape connected with Li An-chung who specialized in birds, particularly quails. If the signature cannot be relied on, there is no way of verifying the attribution on stylistic grounds. Yet in his text (CP II, p. 74) Sirén describes this small landscape as an original work of Li-chung, in accordance with his “A” rating in the List. What argues in favor of the signature are the following considerations: (1) It is in every way similar to that of A.D. 1129 (see below) and therefore was not added (if added it was) by an igno-

rant hand; (2) applied to a landscape, An-

chung's name is rather unexpected; and (3) in addition would have little value as a recommendation because his landscapes, unlike his

bird pictures, were judged “ordinary,” p'ing p'ing 平平 (Sun, p. 194). Whatever conclusion may be drawn from the foregoing, the painting itself offers no reason to question its being a genuine Sung painting which reflects something of Chao Ta-nien's and possibly Mi Fei's manner.

1118—Anonymous painter: “Vimalakirti Surrounded by a Heavenly Host.” Frontispiece of a manuscript containing chapters 5–9 of the Vimalakirti Sûtra. New York, Metropolitan Museum. H., gold and silver on purple silk. Dedication inscription dated Wenchih chiu nien 文治九年 (1116) mou-hsü 戊戌 (1118), the latter date being probably correct, according to Sirén. Sirén, Early Chinese paintings from A. W. Bahr collection, p. 33, pls. 7A, B.: CP III, pl. 212.—The scroll is characterized by Sirén (CP II, p. 60) as “a unique specimen of the finest calligraphy and illumination made in Buddhist monasteries in South China... of the Sung period.”

1121—CHANG TSE-TUAN 張澤端: Ch'ing-Ming I Chien T'u 清明易簡圖 “The Ch'ing-ming Festival's Ease (?)” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., ink and color on silk of a brown tone with considerable damages. Inscribed at the left edge of the scroll: Han-lin hua-shih ch'en Chang Tse-tuan chin ch'eng 翰林畫史臣張澤端進呈 “Presented by the Han-lin painter, servant Chang Tse-tuan.” At the beginning of the painting there are a number of seals, most of which are patched in on a silk of less fine texture. The first now extant colophon is a poem by Su Shun-chü 蘇舜舉, dated Yüan-chien yüan nien (1295)

元貞元年. According to Shih-ch'u, however, there was an earlier inscription at the end of the painting which, when the scroll was remounted, had to be cut off because the Emperor (Ch'ien-lung) regarded it as an absurd and offensive forgery. It ran: T'ien-fu wu
In application to man it is said, in conclusion:

易简而天下之理得矣

It is with the attainment of such ease and simplicity that all the principles under Heaven will be grasped.

Shen quotes here from the I hsí-ts’u 易繫辭, one of the I Ching commentaries which together form the Ten Wings. (Cf. Chou I chu-sū 周易注疏, ch. 7:2a, 3a, in Shih-san Ching chu-su, ts’è 3; James Legge, The Yi King, S.B.E., vol. 16, Oxford, 1899, p. 349; R. Wilhelm, I Ging, Das Buch der Wandlungen, Jena, 1924, p. 216f.)

1122—HU SHUN-CH’EN 胡舜臣: Sung Ho Hsüan-ming Shih Ch’in 送蘇玄明使秦

"Farewell to Ho Hsüan-ming, Envoy to Ch’in." Osaka, City Art Museum, Abe collection. H., brown double-warp silk; ink. Despite damage, the design is intact. The artist’s inscription, a poem of 20 characters, is followed by the date Hsüan-ho ssu nien (1122) chiu yüeh erh jih 宜和四年九月二十日 and the dedication: Hsüan-ming ta-ts’ăn you shih Ch’in chih ming, tso tz’u chi p’ieh 玄明大參有使秦之命, 作此紀別, 胡舜臣 “For Hsüan-ming, the Great Councillor (?) ordered to go as envoy to Ch’in, I made this to commemorate the parting, Hu Shun-ch’en.” A colophon by Ts’ai Ching 祁京 (1046–1126) is mounted after the painting; it has no recognizable relationship with the painting. Colophons: (1) By three men who examined the painting in Chih-cheng 4 (1344); (2) by Shen Chou 沈周 (1427–1509), dated chia-ch’en (1494); (3) by Ch’ien Yüeh 錘鈑, dated Chia-ch’ing chia-tzu (1804); and later ones. Recorded in W’un-i you-i chai, shang, 13; Hsin-ch’ou hsiao-hsia chi, 1:21. Sōraikan II, pl. 16; B.K., No. 104; CP II List, p. 53 (A).

—There is no reason for doubting the authenticity of either painting or signature.

1123—CH’IAO CHUNG-CH’ANG 喬仲常: Hou Ch’ih Pi Fu T’u 周赤壁賦圖 "Pic-
ture of the Later Red Cliff Poem.” New York, Crawford Coll. Long H., ink on paper. Not signed. The date is supplied by the earliest colophon, by Te-lin 德麟 (i.e., Chao Ling-chih 趙令畤) dated Hsuan-ho wu nien (1123) pa yüeh chi jih 宜和五年八月吉日. Shih-ch’ü, ch’u-pien, 32:48. Hsieh Chih-liu, pls. 23–33; CP II List, p. 46 (A).—In his text, Sirén notes that this scroll is “fully signed and documented as a work by Chi’iao Chung-ch’ang” (CP II, p. 50). I failed to detect a signature in the large reproductions in Hsieh Chih-liu’s book; Shih-ch’ü also states “wu k’uan 無款, no signature.” However, the colophon date, 1123, seems reliable. Ch’en Jên-t’ao observed that the representation of shadows thrown by figures is a unique feature of this scroll (Ku-kung i-i, fol. 6b).

1124—WANG SHEN 王縉: Ying Shan T’u 游山圖 “The Land of the Immortals.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., very fine, not quite regularly woven silk of a brown tone; the rocks and mountains in blue and green color. The painter’s signature, almost invisible, is placed on a mountain near the end of the scroll: Pao-ning tz’u-ti Wang Ch’in-ch’ing 王沁清 “Ying Shan” ch’i chüeh yin t’u meng-chung so chien; chia-ch’en (1124) ch’un ssu yüeh, Meng-yu-che 本亭北第王沁清游山吹徹因圈夢中所見; 甲辰秋四月夢遊者 (translated as literally as possible) “Pao-ning graduate Wang Ch’in-ch’ing’s ‘Ying Shan,’ after awakening therefore depicted what seen in a dream; 1124, Spring, fourth month, Dream-wanderer.” Colophons: (1) By T’ien Hsüan 田晉 (T. Yuàn-mo 元邈), dated Chien-yen ch’u-yüan 建炎初元 (1127); (2) Ch’en Chang 章 (T. Han-ch’ing 漢卿) who saw the scroll in 1137 and 1138; (3) Yuán Li-ju 袁立儒, not dated; (4) by Tung Ch’i-ch’ang 鄧其昌 (1555–1636), not dated; (5) Hu Shih-an 胡世安; (6) Shen Te-ch’ien 沈德潛 (1673–1767). In addition, several inscriptions by Ch’ien-lung and one by Chia-ch’ing. There is a seal “Ch’ang 長” of Chia Ssu-tao 賈似道 (died 1276; Giles, B.D., No. 326). Shih-ch’ü, ch’u-pien, ch. 43:20; s.v. Ying Hai T’u 雲海圖. KKS, 4:28; CP II List, p. 85; description ibid., text, pp. 70–71.—Unpublished.

The oddly worded signature apparently did not disturb Tung Ch’i-ch’ang, who assumed this very attractive painting to be identical with Wang Shen’s picture K’o Pan Kua Ying Hai 客帆掛瀟海 (Hsiüan-ho hua-p’u, 12:6), an opinion not shared by Ch’ien-lung, and for want of Hui-tsung’s seals unlikely at the outset. Indeed, the signature appears to be a fraud made up of the contents of another signature of Wang Shen, which is recorded with his painting titled Meng Yu Ying Shan T’u 夢遊瀟山圖 “Dream Travel to the Land of the Immortals” in Chang Ch’ou’s Ch’ing-ho shu-hua-fang of 1616 (ts’e 9:5b): Yüan-yu mou-ch’en (1088) ch’un chüeh yüeh meng yu Ying Shan; chi chüeh yin tu meng-chung so chien; Pao-ning tz’u-ti Chin-ch’ing t’i 元祐時春正月夢遊瀟山; 鬥覺因圖夢中所見; 客帆掛瀟海題 “In the first month of Spring, 1088, I dreamed that I traveled to Ying Shan; after awakening I depicted what I had seen in my dream; Pao-ning graduate Chin-ch’ing inscribed.” Here, the wording is natural, and normal in that the artist’s name is placed at the end. The scroll of 1088, moreover, had the same colophons as appear on the scroll of 1124 as the first three (by T’ien, Ch’en, and Yüan). Tung Ch’i-ch’ang’s colophon is not mentioned in Ch’ing-ho shu-hua-fang; it must have been composed for the present scroll which was unknown to Chang Ch’ou. The recurrence of the three older colophons on the scroll of 1124 unfortunately makes it certain that this scroll cannot be authentic, no matter how skillfully it is painted.

1124—LI T’ANG 李唐: Wan Ho Sung Feng 萬壑松風 “Pine Wind in the Gorges.”
Taihong, Palace Museum collection. Large K., yellowish silk, ink and color. Signature on a slender pinnacle to the left of the central cliff: Huang Sung Hsüan-ho-chia-chên (1124) ch'un, Ho-yang Li T'ang pi 皇宋宣和甲辰春河陽李唐筆 "... brush of Li T'ang from Ho-yang," written in li script. Early seals: Ch'ien kua 乾卦 in a circle (Kao-tsung, 1127–1162); Yüeh-sheng 悅生 in gourd shape (Chia Tsu-tao, died 1276); half-seal Su-yin 司印 (1374–1384). Shih-chü, san-pien (Yen-ch'un-k'o). KKSML, 5:66; KKCK', vol. 27; Burlington Magazine, No. 435; B.K., No. 165; CP III, pl. 247; CP II List, p. 62 (A).—The dense, vigorous, and disciplined design of this outstanding work is difficult to reconcile with a series of paintings likewise attributed to Li T'ang but showing a style close to the broad graded washes of the Ma-Hsia school. To bridge the gap, Sirén defines the style of the present picture as marking a "middle stage" in Li T'ang's art. This invites the objection that in 1124 Li T'ang was already 75 years old and thus unlikely to change greatly, and the earliest sources are agreed on the point of his age. The Hua chi (A.D. 1167) says that Li T'ang was 80 years old when arriving at Lin-an in 1127, while T'ua-hui pao-chien (A.D. 1365) speaks of him as having been nearly 80 when he joined the Lin-an Academy in the era Chien-yen (1127–1130). In anticipation of some objection of this kind, Sirén (CP II, p. 92) advances the concept of Li Tang's "faculty of self-renewal" that would account for his creating a "late style" during the few remaining years between 1124 and his death soon after 1130. Sirén relies here in part on the testimony of the "Shan-shui hua-chüeh, a treatise which was written while Li T'ang was still alive" (op. cit., p. 92). However, this treatise is a fraud, according to Yu Shao-sung (Chüeh-t'i, 9:13b) and the Ssu-k'u t'i-yao (vol. 3, p. 2373, s.v. Hua shan-shui chüeh, which is the correct form of the title), and in any case does not pretend to be earlier than A.D. 1221, which is the fictitious date of the preface signed with the name of an obscure Yüan painter, Li Ch'êng-sou.

Shimada, facing the same problem when he discovered an obliterated signature, "Li [T'ang?] hua," on one of the two Kötoin landscapes (see CP III, pls. 249 and 250), disposed of it in a different way. Rather than endowing Li T'ang with singular powers, Shimada rejected the painting of 1124 and built a Li T'ang image around the Kötoin landscapes, leaving room for a more leisurely pace in the artist's development (B.K., No. 165, pp. 12–25; cf. Willetts, Chinese art, vol. 2, p. 634f.).

The writer, having examined the picture in Taihong in 1957, finds it impossible to discard it and agrees with Sirén as to its being an authentic work, even though this acceptance entails a lack of confidence in the supposed "late style" works connected with Li T'ang, not excluding the beautiful Kötoin landscapes.

1124—TUNG YÜAN 蘇源: Yün Ho Sung Fung 雲鴻松風 “Pine Wind in a Cloudy Valley.” Osaka, City Art Museum, Abe collection. Very large K., ink on silk of a brown tone with many stains, not resembling Sung silk. At the upper edge an inscription in characters vaguely resembling Hui-tsung's sou-chin hand and signed with a scrawl fashioned after his monogram. This inscription gives the title (as above) and the date chia-chên 甲辰 (1124), followed by yü t'i "Imperial epigraph." In a column at the right edge, the same writer continues: Chen yüeh Tung Yüan hua, tang i tz'u wei ti i 聲源善元元 (1) 蘇當以此為第一 "Of the paintings by Tung Yüan we have examined, this we deem to be the finest," as though said by the emperor. Seals purporting to be of Hui-tsung's time: Hsüan-ho shu-pao 宣和書寶; Hsüan-yüan-ko pao 宣元閣寶; Yü-fu pao-hui 御府寶繪; Jui-wen t'u-
shu 瑞文图书. Among the Ch'ien-lung period seals, there are two Shih-ch'ü seals which as a rule would indicate that the painting was recorded in Shih-ch'ü pao-chi; the fact that the picture is not listed in this catalogue is ominous. Written on the silk mounting, one colophon by Tung Chi-č'ang (1555—1636), another by Wang Shih-ch'en 王世貞 (1526—1593). Sōaikan, II, 6; Nanshū ehatsu, I; Tōsō, pl. 32; Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 15; CP II List, p. 33(C). —The painting, which is not listed in the Hsüan-ho hua-p'yu either, is executed in a somewhat rude technique and dates perhaps from the Ming period. It is devoid of any remedying feature and may be considered as an example of a secondary Tung Yüan tradition.


1130—MI YU-JEN 米友仁: Yün Shan T'u-ch'üan 雲山圖卷 “Clouded Mountains.” Cleveland, The Cleveland Museum of Art, J. H. Wade collection. H., ink and a little color on silk; the clouds in opaque white. The painter’s inscription consists of a poem of 28 words (including a dedication to an unnamed person) and the following dated signature: Keng-hsü sui (1130) pi-ti Hsin-ch'ang tso, Yüan-hui 庾戌藝術地新昌作元暉 “made in the year keng-hsü when taking refuge at Hsin-ch'ang, Yuan-hui.” His tsu also appears in the seal, Yuan-hui his tso 元暉洪字作 Yuan-hui fully played made.” The colophons attached are of a much later time: Wang To 王霆 (1592—1652) and Ch'en Kuang 陳暘. Chōkaidō (Yamamoto collection), 1:98; Pageant, pl. 102; W. Cohn, pl. 26; S. E. Lee, Chinese landscape painting, No. 15; CP III, pl. 189; CP II List, p. 78 (“The old attribution not convincing, though the picture may be of the period”). —The greatly involved problem of the younger Mi’s (1686—1665) style scarcely permits a more definite judgment than Sirén’s, just quoted. In utter contrast to the present scroll (which is not actually playfully executed), a series of paintings done in transparent, silhouetted, and boldly abbreviated forms likewise ascribed to Mi Yu-jen, shows no concern for careful modeling, structure, and spatial coherence, and it is among the latter series that Sirén found the only example he was ready to accept as authentic (a scroll in the Hui-hua-kuan).

The conspicuous expression, “pi-ti Hsin-ch'ang,” used in Mi’s inscription, may well be adduced in support of its authenticity. Left untranslated in the catalogue attached to Lee’s Chinese landscape painting (p. 145, No. 15), the term is paralleled in a colophon to a scroll by Mi Yu-jen, “Mist and Rain at Wu-chou” (referred to by Ta Chung-kuan in his colophon of A.D. 1684 to the painter’s “Crown of Clouded Mountains”; see 1135—Mi Yu-jen, below). The passage in question runs: 此元暉紹興辛亥避江淮兵時所作 “This was made by [Mi] Yuan-hui in the hsin-hai year (1131) of the Shao-hsing period he took refuge from military troubles at Yangtse and Huai.” (Cf. KKSHE, ch. 4, p. 35.) While this passage clarifies the meaning of “pi-ti” in the Cleveland scroll of 1130, it also testifies to the reliability of the hinted escape and the time when it occurred. The place whither Mi Yu-jen had fled, Hsin-ch'ang (Chekiang), is mentioned again in the scroll inscription of A.D. 1134 attached to the “Distant Peaks and Bright Clouds” in the Abe collection (see below, under 1134). Thus, the terse allusion in the present inscription is substantiated by two apparently reliable documents which uphold fact and time and place.
1131 — LIEN PU 廖布: “Autumn Landscape.” Stockholm, National Museum. “Inscribed with the name of the painter and the date 1131,” according to CP II List, p. 66 (B?). — Unpublished? Not executed before the Ming period, according to Sirén, op. cit.

1132 — HUI-TSUNG 徽宗: Ch'i'h T'ang Ch'i'u Wan 池塘秋晚 “Autumn Evening by a Pond.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., ink in thin washes on a crinkled yellowish paper; seen from a certain angle, the paper proves to be finely patterned with a floral scroll design. The ink surfaces are much worn off. Signed with Hui-tsung’s monogram, over which a seal yî shu “Imperial writing” in gourd shape is printed. At the beginning of the painting, two seals Hsüan-ho 宣和 in very thin, rubbed dark red. Colophons: (1) By Fan Yü 范遇 from Shu-tu (Ch'eng-tu) who in his text mentions the year Shao-hsing jen-tzu 鳥與壬子 (1132); (2) by Teng I-ts'ung 鄧易從, dated Shun-hsi 諧和 (1177). Recorded in Shih-ch'i, ch'un-pien (Yü-shu-fang), 32:24. KKSHL, 4:26; London Exhibition, No. 858; CP III, pls. 232–233; CP II List, p. 54 (A?). — Judged by its physical appearance and the testimony of the apparently genuine colophons, this puzzling work seems to belong in the period before 1132. The Emperor’s cipher, on the other hand, does not look convincing. Nor does the painting itself: the monumentalized plants, the slightly awkward juxtaposition of the heron and the lotus leaf, the blunted silhouettes of the birds, as well as a lack of posefulness in these birds are traits which seem deeply foreign to Hui-tsung’s taste. Rowland (Archives, vol. 5, p. 12) holds that the painting may be as late as Yüan or early Ming.

1132 — CH'AO YÜEH-CHI H Hsi-t'ou Ch'i Chi’ Ch’in 鳥渚聚禽 “Fowl Gathering on a Riverbank in Autumn.” Peking, Kuwu Ch'en-lich-so. H., colors on silk. Without signature or seal of the artist. Colophons: (1) By Chao Ling-chih 趙令畤 (T. Te-lin 德麟; JMTTT, 1392.2; Su-k'u t'i-yao, vol. 3, p. 2912), dated Shao-hsing erh nien (1132) wu yüeh shih jih 紹興二年五月十日; (2) by Ch'i'ai Kuei-ch'eng 糉黃成 (T. Chung-shan 仲山), dated Huang-ch'ing erh nien (1313); (3) by Ch'en Chi 陳, dated Chih-cheng erh nien (1342). Recorded in Sheng-ch'ing Ku Kung, 2:26; KWCLS, 5:10. A poor reproduction in Li-t'ai ming-jen, pt. 5, pl. 1; CP II List, p. 43, s.v. Ch'ao Shuo-chih (“attributed”).

1133 — WANG WEI 王維: Portrait of Fu Sheng 伏生. Osaka, City Art Museum, Abe collection. H., light creamy brown silk; ink and color. The attribution was made in an inscription by Kao-tsung (r. 1127–1162); Wang Wei hsieh Chi-nan Fu Sheng 王維寫濟南伏生. Seals: Hsüan-ho chung pi 宣和中秘; Shao-hsing (1131–1162). The earliest colophon is dated Shao-hsing kuei-ch'ou (1133); the second was written more than 500 years later by Chu I-tsun 朱彝尊 (1629–1709). The painting has passed through the hands of many Ming and Ch'ing collectors, as testified by their seals: Li T'ing-hsiang 李廷相 (15th–16th c.; JMTTT, 394.2), Huang Lin 黃琳 (unidentified), Sun Ch'eng-tse 孫承澤 (1592–1676), Hsiang Sheng-mo 项聖謀 (1597–1658), Liang Ch'ing-piao 梁清標 (1620–1661) Sung Lo 宋祿 (1634–1713), Ch'en Chieh-ch'i 陳介祺 (1813–1884), Ching Hsien 景賢 (from whom the painting was acquired by Mr. Abe). Sōrakō, 1, pl. 1; Omura, Chū-goku meiga-shū, vol. 1, pls. 4–7; B.K., No. 100; Nippon genzai, p. 3; CP III, pl. 90; CP II List, p. 21 (B). — The seals and the early colophon seem reliable and thus would secure a date before 1133; the painting itself may go back to early Northern Sung.
1134—HSIAO CHAO 亀照: Shan Chü T'U-chüan 山居圖卷 “Dwelling in the Mountains.” China, Fang Jo 方若 collection. Short H., ink on silk. At the end of the scroll, a signature in small and somewhat nondescript k'ai-shu: Shao-hsing ssu nien (1134) pa yüeh, Shang-wan Hsiao Chao hsiieh 紹興四年八月上浣蕭照寫 ... drawn by Hsiao Chao from Shang-wan.” At the beginning, a half-obiterated seal which no doubt reads Cheng-ho 政和 (1111–1117). Not mentioned in Ferguson's Index, the scroll apparently is unrecorded. Tōsō, pl. 60; CP III, pl. 260; CP II List, p. 52 (A?). —In this scroll, which shows an open misty valley contrasted with a crammed rocky scenery, there are features reminiscent of Li T'ang (rocks, pine trees) and, possibly, Ma Ho-chih (contours of distant mountains, design of swirling water); the architecture is poorly rendered (compare the architecture of the Tiger Hill scroll attributed to the same artist; CP III, pl. 261). The script certainly is a far cry from the Stone Drum characters Hsiao Chao is reputed to have used in his signatures “hidden on trees or rocks” (Sun, p. 699). And there is something obvious and a little vulgar about the human figures in this painting, hardly in keeping with the standards of the Shao-hsing Academy. However that may be, on a painting dated 1134 no Cheng-ho seal (of 1111–1117) can appear. Three conclusions are possible: (1) The signature was added to an unsigned work dating from Cheng-ho or earlier; (2) the seal is false; (3) the whole picture may be a later imitation. Considering that it is most improbable for a collector or dealer to lower a certified date, and almost equally unlikely to spoil a genuine work of known age by adding an impossible seal, we must assume that both seal and signature are false. Therefore, the painting, whatever its actual date, cannot be accepted as an authentic work by Hsiao Chao (which is all to the best for his reputation).

1134—MI YU-JEN 米友仁: Yüan Hsiu Ching Yün 遠岫晴雲 “Distant Peaks and Bright Clouds.” Osaka, City Art Museum, Abe collection. Album leaf, ink on paper; in rather worn condition. The painting is signed: Yüan-hui hsi tso 元暉軸作 “playfully made by Yüan-hui.” Mounted above the painting is a colophon in fairly large characters purporting to have been written by Mi: 紹興甲寅元夕前一日，白新昌汎舟來赴書院臨安七賢山巖作小卷付與廬彌

Shao-hsing chiia-yin (1134), the day before the first full moon, having come from Hsin-ch'ang 信昌 by boat to go to court and staying at the Chi-pao-shan in Lin-an, I playfully made this small scroll in payment of victuals received.

A painting of this title by the younger Mi is listed without description in Ch'ing-ho shu-hua fang (1116b); Sōraikan, II, 17; CP II List, p. 78 (B). —It may be noted that the title given this painting does not appear on the painting or on the colophon; it seems to have been appropriated for it. Contrary to the text of the colophon, the picture is not a scroll but an album leaf which is provided with a separate signature. Since it is larger in height than the colophon, it cannot be identical with the painting that preceded the colophon. The latter, therefore, has nothing to do with the present picture, and the date, 1134, does not apply. It is doubtful, moreover, whether the colophon, genuine or not, was written by the same hand as seen in the signature; the character “yüan” in the name differs much from the same character in the colophon. The signature also differs greatly from that on the Cleveland scroll of 1130 (supra), much as the two paintings themselves exemplify extreme opposites of motifs and techniques within the Mi tradition. Although it may not be beyond imagination to think of these two works as originating from the same artist, it would be methodically unsound not to keep these two paintings as widely apart as justified by their styles.
1135—MI YU-JEN 米友仁：Yün Shan Te I T'u 雲山得意圖 "The Crown of Cloudy Mountains." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., paper of a reddish gray; very light ink outlines and washes; dry ink for darker accents. The painting, which bears no signature or seal of the painter's, is a cloudscape rather than landscape. Except for an occasional outlook on some roofs and treetops or a soaring pagoda between clouds covering the land and floating in the sky with peculiar curly outlines, there is little to fill the wide surface of the scroll. The whole gives a light, airy, and unsubstantial effect. The earliest seals are those of Li Ch'i 李珂 (addressed Chen-shu 振叔 in Mi's colophon) who was the first owner of the painting, and a seal reading Hsiu-t'ang t'u-shu chih yin 休堂圖書之印, used by Yen Chen-chih 潛雪直 (T. Tzu-min 子敏), President of the Board of Works in the Hung-wu era (1368-1398; cf. JMTT, 1796.4); it is a large seal in a deeper red than the Ch'ien-lung seals. There are 13 colophons attached to this scroll. (1) An unsigned inscription on a paper different from that of the painting, opening with the following account: 紹興乙卯初夏十九日自潤陽來遊吾山.忽見此卷於李振叔家.賞玩驚異.時作也.

Shao-hsing i-mao (1135), first month of Summer, nineteenth day. Traveling from Li-yang (Kiangsu; between Nanking and T'ai-hu) to T'iao-ch'uan (N. Chekiang; Eastern and Western T'iao unite in Wuhsiing), I unexpectedly saw this scroll at Li Chun-shu's. In fact, it was done by me, as a boy's play that succeeded . . .

What follows is translated by Sirén in his passage, "The people of the world know that I am skilful in painting . . ." (CP II, p. 36). The writing is very like Mi Yu-jen's. (2) Colophon by Tseng Ti 曾覲, dated Shao-hsing jen-wu (1162); Tseng refers to the painting as an early work—about the beginning of the Yüan-yu era (1086—1093)—by Mi Fei! (Tseng's biography is found in the Sung Annals, ch. 470, Lieh-chuan 229). (3) Wu K'uan 吳寬 (T. Yüan-po 原博, 1435—1504; JMTT, 328.3) saw the painting in the hands of a grandson of Yen Chen-chih in the year Hung-chih kuei-hai (1503), believing it was by the Older Mi. (4) Writing on the same paper as Wu K'uan, a paper which differs from the preceding sheet, Tung Ch'i-ch'ang (1555—1636) recognizes the painting as a work of Mi Yu-jen, who, as he puts it, "in his later years, by following only his creative genius, washed out the Sung Academy style" 繼其晚年墨戲.某日與棨時院體而以造化為師. (5) Lou Meng-Chien 娄孟堅, writing in the year mou-hsü (1658, according to the sequence of the inscriptions), makes several critical observations. The Tseng colophon (2), he holds, must have been composed for a painting by Mi Fei and arbitrarily attached to the present scroll. He takes Wu K'uan (3) to task for having paid no attention to chronology when speaking of the Older Mi who is known to have died long before 1135. Presumably in reply to some suggestion that that colophon may not actually be from Wu's hand he defends its authenticity. (6) Next comes a poem of 36 words by Kao Shih-ch'i 高士奇 (1645—1704), dated K'ang-hsi keng-wu (1690). It is inserted before a long series of colophons written by Ta Chung-kuang 竹重光 (1623—1692) between 1681 and 1684, when the scroll was in his possession. Ta is worried about the Tseng colophon's being an interpolation but accepts Lou's verdict, consoling himself with the fine qualities of the writing (colophons 11, 12). In his last entry (13) he ventures to suggest that Mi Yu-jen's painting goes back to Northern Sung days. The painting is recorded in Shih-ch'i, hsii-pien (Ch'ien-ch'ing-kung). KKSHL, 4:31—36. Not in Sirén's List. Unpublished.

As early as the seventeenth century, at least three versions of the same scroll were in existence. One is described in the Ch'ing-ho
shu-hua-fang of 1616 (ch. 10:17b). It is properly listed under Mi Yu-jen; his name appears at the end of his own colophon; the dubious Tseng colophon is lacking; and the Wu colophon is worded slightly differently after the poem. Another version is listed under the name of Mi Fei in the Shan-hu-wang of 1643 (ch. 4:1); it bears the colophons of Mi, Tseng, and Wu, and is considered as identical with the present scroll by the compilers of Shih-ch’ü. A third version is listed in the Shih-ku-t’ang of 1682 (ch. 13:28b). The colophons in this case are those of (1) Mi, (2) Tseng, (3) Wu-yen Su-ch’ing 元顏思敏, dated 1372, (4) Wu K’uan, and (5) Hsiang Yüan-pien 謝元汴 (1525–1590); neither Tung Ch’i-ch’ang nor Lou Meng-chien are mentioned. This item is adjudged a forgery by the Shih-ch’ü commentators. They pass over in silence the version recorded in Ch’ing-ho shu-hua-fang. Yet, of the three versions, it is the latter that would seem to be the least suspicious because it is not burdened with the obviously wrong Tseng colophon of 1162, and because the Mi colophon is signed. That the painter, identifying the scroll as his own work of bygone years, should have omitted his signature is fairly unlikely. The absence of a signature on both painting and colophon in the present scroll is in itself a disquieting feature. The painting as such is unconvincing.

1138—MI YU-JEN 米友仁: "Rainy Landscape." Formerly Shanghai, E. A. Strehneck. K., ink on silk. Inscribed: Shao-hsing pa nien (1138) san yüeh erh jih, Mi Yu-jen hsieh (exactly as in the preceding entry). Auction Catalogue, Collection E. A. Strehneck, No. 183, Tokyo Fine Arts Club, Tokyo (s.a.); Ars Orientalis, vol. 3, Not in Sirén’s List.—Very close to the preceding painting, a landscape dominated by an isolated dark peak with a narrow band of vapor trailing across its foot. Again, the inscription is not likely to be genuine but interesting as an attribution. The possible import of the two last-mentioned works on the question of the Mi style was discussed by the writer in Ars Orientalis, vol. 3, 1959.

1138—HAN KAN 韓幹: Chao Yeh Pai 照夜白 “The Shining Light of Night” (one of Emperor Ming-huang’s horses). London, Sir Percival David collection. Short H., ink on paper. Attributed to the painter in an inscription signed with a cipher, written by the last ruler of Nan-T’ang, Li Yü 李煥 (r. 961–975, d. 978), according to the short commentary placed at the right side of the attribution. The commentary says: 南唐押署所識物多異, 吳人吳說 “The things inscribed with the cipher of [the Lord of] Nan-T’ang mostly are genuine. Wu Yüeh from Wu.” His testimony seems to be supported also by the large, partly obliterated seal impressed over the “Nan-T’ang” signature. (The Ta-kuan-Lu, however, describes the attribution as a Sung inscription.)
There seem to be no seals of the Northern Sung period on the painting itself. Two Southern Sung seals are Ch’iu-ho ch’en wan autumn treasure and Ssu-tao 似道, both of Chia Ssu-tao (d. 1275). The earliest colophon was written by Hsiang Tzu-yan 向子諧 in the year 1138. Of the several Yüan colophons, two are dated in correspondence with 1320 and 1340. Recorded in Shan-hu-wang, 24:23; Mo-yüan hui-kuan, 6, hsii, 1; Ta-kuan-lu, 11:36; Shih-ch’ii, ch’ung-pien (Shun-hua-hsiulin). Sirén, ECP, vol. 1, pls. 61, 62; CP II List, p. 17 (A?); CP III, pls. 99, 100.—With its convincing documentation as far back as Sung and Southern T’ang, this painting may indeed be a T’ang original work, and the astonishing head of the horse fortunately was spared any retouches such as are apparent in the legs and hooves. The tail is faintly visible as it touches the lower and upper edges of the two large seals of Prince Kung (Kung Ch’iin-wang, 1833–1898), to correct a petty mistake in Sirén’s masterly description (CP II, p. 138f.). Wu Yüeh, a Sung writer, is represented with a set of nine letters in KKSIL, 3:22 (not in JMTTT).

1140—CHOU WEN-CHYU 周文矩: Kung Chung T’u 宫中图 “In the Palace” (also named “Ladies of the Court”). Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum. H., ink (pai-miao) on silk. No signature or seals. According to a colophon, the picture is the fragment of a copy after a scroll by Chou Wen-chü which then was in the possession of Chu Ts’ai, former Lord of the Imperial Treasury 前太府卿朱载. The colophon is dated Shao-hsing hsin-yü (1140) wu yüeh i-yu 褡興庚申五月乙酉 and is signed by Tan-yen chü-shih 潘岳居士, whose name, Chang Ch’eng 张澄, appears in a seal affixed to his signature. He refers to the scroll as Kung Chung T’u, but on the label on the outside of the scroll a variant title is given, namely, T’ang Kung Ch’un Hsiao 唐宮春曉 “Spring Morning in the T’ang Palace.” Under this name the picture is recorded in Yu Feng-ch’ing’s Shu-hua t’i-pa-chi (apud Pei-wen-chai, 82:2b), in Shan-hu-wang (1:23) and Shih-hu-t’ang (11:16). Y. Yashiro, in B.K. 25 (1934); idem, Töyö bijutsu ronkō, pp. 85–97, pls. 24, 25; CP II List, p. 26 (B?). —Yashiro has identified the writer of the colophon as the author of a treatise on painting, Hua-lu kung-i 叙錄廣遠 of 1139. Together with the present copy, Yashiro discussed a pertinent fragment in the Berenson collection, Florence, and subsequently published other fragments in the Sir Percival David collection, London (B.K., No. 56, 1936) and the Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University (B.K., No. 169, 1952).

1141—KU HUNG-CHUNG 顧閏中: Han Hsi-tsai Yen T’u 報熙裁夜宴圖 “Han Hsi-tsai’s Night Revels,” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H. (an incomplete version, corresponding to the last part of the famous scroll in Peking). The scroll bears a colophon by one Chang Ch’eng 張澄, dated Shao-hsing hsin-yü (1141) 紹興幸酉. Listed without description in KKSIL, 8:32. Not in Sirén’s List. Unpublished.—Though incomplete and inferior to the scroll in Peking (cf. Ta-feng-t’ang, vol. 1, pl. 5; Sirén, CP III, pls. 120–123; CP II List, p. 29; Shih-ch’ii, I, ch. 32:17b ff.), the earliest colophon of which dates from T’ai-ting 3 (A.D. 1326), the present version may, on account of the date of the Chang Ch’eng colophon, go as far back in time as the Peking scroll (which bears a Shao-hsing seal that ought to warrant a date no later than 1131–1162). The present item was brought to my attention by James Cahill, who saw it during his visit at Taichung in 1959. The writer of the colophon of 1141 appears to be identical with the Chang Ch’eng of the preceding entry.
MA YUAN 马远: Shui Erh-shih Ching 水二十景: “Twenty Views of Water.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., containing a set of 20 views of “billoowing waters in rivers and lakes.” The last picture shows an inscription, dated Shao-hsing shih-i nien (1141) 紹興十一年. KKCK', Special Number, Oct. 10, 1930; KKSHL, 8:3 (without description); CP II List, p. 75 (C). — The scroll is “traditionally attributed” to Ma Yüan, according to Sirén, who points out that the date is far too early to apply to this master.


HU KEI 胡闕: Fan Ma T'u 番馬圖 “Barbarians' Horses.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., color on silk. The scroll is not signed but attributed to the 10th-century artist in a colophon by Kuo Yung 郭雍 (cf. JMTTT, 1055:3) which is dated Shao-hsing i-ch'ou (1145) chung-tung tan-jih 紹興乙卯仲冬貳日 “on the first day of the eleventh month” (probably to be equated with November 16, 1145, rather than December 16, which corresponds to the first day of the following—intercalary—eleventh month of that year). The scroll was in the collection of the writer's uncle at that time, but later must have passed into the Sung Imperial collection as an inscription of eight characters at the end of the painting would suggest: Ch'i-hsi-tien shang-p'in tz'u Wang. . . 紹興樓上品鳯王 “High class painting of the Ch'i-hsi Hall, bestowed upon Prince . . .”; the Ch'i-hsi-tien was a hall erected in 1233 under Li-tsung (1225–1264). A second colophon is dated Hung-wu 6 (1373). Recorded in Shih-ch'ü, I, ch. 14: 13ff.; KKSHL, 8:32 (without description). Not in Sirén's List. Unpublished.—The scroll was seen in 1959 by James Cahill who considers it a lesser work possibly of Sung date and believes it to be the one described in Shih-ch'ü, I, 14:13 (which supplies the above data), another scroll of the same title, listed in Shih-ch'ü, III (Yu-shu-fang; cf. Ferguson's Index, 194b), causing some uncertainty.

SU HAN-CH'EN 阮漢臣: “Ami-tâbha Receiving Souls in the Western Paradise.” Washington, Freer Gallery of Art, (16.64). K., ink and color on silk. In a garden setting with drifting clouds, the Buddha appears awkwardly placed in the corner of a lotus tank, a reborn soul on a lotus leaf before him. The lack of symmetry and frontality deprives the motif of its sacral character and makes for a folkloristic, anecdotal touch. An inscription in white (perhaps the remaining traces of a gold writing, according to James Cahill) says: Lung-hsing erh nien (1164) san yüeh, ch'en Su Han-ch'en hui-ts'ao shang chin 隆興三年五月,臣蘇漢臣翰草上進 “... sketch submitted by servant Su Han-ch'en.” Of three colophons originally on the mounting (now attached to the back), the oldest appears to be dated Ming-tao jen-shen (A.D. 1032) and signed Pao Ch'eng 包拯 (died in 1062; cf. Giles, B.D., No. 1621): a condemning anachronism. CP II List, p. 81 (B?). Unpublished. —Though primarily known for his pictures of children, Su Han-ch'en painted also Buddhist subjects (see Ferguson's Index, 462). That the present, undistinguished work has anything to do with the master is most unlikely.

MR. LI 李生: Hsiao Hsiang Wo Yu T'u 晚湘臥游圖: “Home Traveler's Vista of Hsiao and Hsiang.” Tokyo, Commission for the Protection of Cultural Properties; Na-
national Museum; formerly K. Kikuchi collection. H., ink washes on yellowish-brown paper. Ch‘ien-lung inscription of 1746), the title, At the end of the painting (preceded by a long supposed painter’s name, and a dedication are inscribed: Hsiao Hsiang Wo Yu, Po-shih wei Yün-ku lao ch‘an-yin t‘u” pictured by Po-shih for Yün-ku, the old Ch‘an hermit.” Under this inscription, which is a later addition resembling a signature, two seals are discernible: Wu-hsing 呉興 (town in Chekiang), Wang Chai shang-chien-kuo wu 王齊賢寮過物 “Object appraised in the Wang Studio.” The latter seal also appears at the right edge of the painting, lowermost. Before the attached Sung colophons there is inserted a narrow sheet showing a bamboo sprig with a short inscription by Ch‘ien-lung, dated 1746.

There are 10 colophons by the following writers: (1) Ko T‘an 柯 européen (JMTTT, 1309.1), dated Ch‘ien-tao keng-yin (1170). (2) Chang Kuei-mou 張貴藻 (JMTTT, pu-i, 15.1), dated hsin-mao (1171). (3) Chang Shen 章深, dated 1170. (4) Ko Fu 柯鷹, dated 1170. (5) Yen-chang fu 殷常甫 (unidentified), without a date, mentioning one Mr. Li 李生 as the painter of the short Hsiao and Hsiang roll (tuan chu 短軸) made for master Yün-ku (as above). (6) Chang Ch‘üan-fu 張泉甫, dated 1171. (7) Ko Pi 柯騲 (held the positions of Left Grand Councilor and of Lesser Protector; JMTTT, 1308.1), dated 1171. (8) Ch‘un-chai Si-hsi 鈍齋旖喜, without a date, mentioning one Li K‘u 理窟 (unidentified), without a date. (9) Chuang-sou 嶽叟 (unidentified), without a date. Immediately preceding the painting, there is an inscription by Tung Ch‘i-ch‘ang (1555–1636), saying that this scroll by Li Po-shih from the collection of Secretary Ku 顧中含 (Ku Ts‘ung-i 顧從義, an official during the Chia-ching and Lung-ch‘ing periods; JMTTT, 1792.4) was now in the possession of Ch‘en Tzu-yu 蔡子有; both these collectors’ seals appear in the lower right corner at the beginning of the painting. Recorded in Ta-kuan-lu (12:39), Shih-ch‘ü, ch‘u-pien (44:43), etc. Kokka, 561; Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 25; CP II List, p. 94 (Anonymous). —The painter, Mr. Li from Shu-ch‘eng 舒城 (Anhui), mentioned in the colophons (3, 5), made the painting for a priest named Yün-ku 安谷 雲谷圖照 (unidentified). The various colophons of 1170–1171 were written at the request of the priest, who therefore was a contemporary of the writers. It was the name, Li, in combination with the city of Shu-ch‘eng, birthplace of Li Kung-lin, which has led to the attribution to the latter. But Li Kung-lin died in 1168 and thus cannot have authored this landscape scroll which apparently was finished shortly before 1170 or in that year, as warranted by the inscriptions. The painting is executed in softly blended gray tones, transparent washes, small blobs, and without sharp contours. Reminiscent of the Mi style, the technique is “different from conventional methods that may be seen in so-called Mi Fei paintings” (Shimada and Yonezawa, Painting of Sung and Yuan Dynasties, p. 30).

1174—LI TI 李迪: Feng Yu Kuei Mu 風雨歸牧 “Cowherds Returning Home in a Rain Storm.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. K., ink and light color on a yellow-grayish silk in very good condition. The foliage of the willow tree is done in ink over a pale green underpaint. Touches of brown and yellow in the straw hats of the two boys. In the lower right corner, some distance from the edge, there is a signature: Chia-wu sui (1174) Li Ti pi 甲午歲李迪筆. Above the painting, mounted in a shih-t‘ang 詩塘, there is a poem of 28 words written by Emperor Li-tsung (r. 1225–1264), who signed Ch‘i-hsi-tien shu 輝照殿書, using the name of a palace completed in 1233. The seal impressed on this signature, Yü ch‘ien chih yin 御奉之印, appears also in the upper left corner of the painting.
Early Ming seals worth mentioning are the half-seal Su-yin 司印 of the Ming Imperial collection (used between 1374 and 1384) and two seals of the Chin principality, viz., Chin-kuo k’uei-chang 賢國璽章 and Chìn-fu shu-hua 券府書畫之印 (the third son of T’ai-ts’u was enfeoffed as Chin wang in 1370; cf. Ming shih, ch. 116, K’M ed., vol. 9, p. 7373-4). Recorded in Shih-ch’ü, san-pien (Yen-ch’un-ko). KKSFL, 5:70; KK, vol. 15; London Exhibition, No. 999; CP II List, p. 64(A?).

—That the accompanying poem was written by Kao-tsung (r. 1127-1162, d. 1187), as indicated in the catalogue of the London Exhibition, is improbable because the seal points to some time after 1233. Most striking in this painting is the precisely and tenderly rendered leafage of the two willows in furry small dabs, subtly graded in tone and perfectly suggestive of movement, mass, and atmosphere. Whether this masterly work came from the same hand as the two album leaves in the Yamato Bunkakan, Osaka (CP III, pls. 253, 254), which bear undated signatures of Li Ti, is not absolutely certain; it may be noted, though, that the buffalo at the right hand in the present picture is a true counterpart of the buffalo with the rider carrying a pheasant in the second of the Osaka leaves, without being identical in execution. If any reservation as to the authorship of Li Ti should have to be made, it would not be founded on the evidence in the painting itself.


1174—1189—LIU SUNG-NIEN 劉松年: Yü T’ang Chü Ying 玉堂集英 “Assembled Eminence in the Jade Hall” (The Eighteen Scholars of T’ang). Peking, former National Museum (Ku-wu Ch’en-lich-so). H., ink and color on silk. Signed and dated: Shun-hsi Hua-yüan Liu Sung-nien hui 淳熙書院劉崧年繪 “Painted by Liu Sung-nien of the Shun-hsi (r. 1174-1189) Academy of Painting.” Colophons of Pao-ch’ing yüan nien (1225) and Chih-cheng hsin-ch’ou (1361), written by Chen Te-hsiu 真德秀 (JMTTT, 821.4) and Yü Chi 虞集 (JMTTT, 1322.3), respectively, are followed by a series of later entries. Sheng-ching KKSFL, ch. 2:30b ff.; KIVCLS, 5:1s b; CP II List, p. 68.—The Ku Kung collection in Taichung contains a scroll of the same subject under the title “The Eighteen Scholars,” the description of which (in KKSFL, ch. 4:50 ff.) shows that it is not identical with the present item. The scroll in Formosa is neither signed by the painter nor does it bear the colophon of A.D. 1225 (as erroneously indicated on p. 67 of Sirén’s List). Sirén’s “A” for the scroll in Formosa (p. 67) may be based on a consideration of the painter’s signature and the early colophons of the present scroll (p. 68 of his List). Neither painting has been reproduced so far. Judging from the descriptions alone, the Peking scroll appears to be more fully documented than the Formosa scroll which was attributed to Liu Sung-nien only by Wang Lai 王來 (JMTTT, 97.3) in the fifteenth century.

1175—WU TUNG-CH’ING 武洞清: An Hsien Hsiang 安仙像 “Fairy with an Attendant.” Osaka, City Art Museum, Abe collection. K., color on silk. Inscribed with the following date: Shun-hsi erh nien sui-tz’u i-wei (1175) erh yüeh shih-erh jih 淳熙二年歲次乙未二月十二日. The signature is effaced. In the opposite corner, lower right, an early Ming date (1376). Sōraikan, 2:11; Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 23; CP II List, p. 88: “A late imitation.”—No painting of this title seems to be recorded (cf. Ferguson’s Index, p. 180).
The date, 1175, cannot have been set down by the painter himself, who was active in the eleventh century; it is a spurious date on a painting which, as pointed out by Sirén, has no claim to be as early as Sung.


1178—CHOU CHI-CH'ANG 周季常: Shih Wang Hsiang 十王像 “Images of the Ten Kings” (of Hell). Kyoto, Daitokuji 大德寺. Series of 10 K., ink and color on silk. One of the paintings is inscribed by the priest I-shao, with date and the artist's name: ... mou-hsü Shun-hsi wu nien (1178), kan-seng I-shao t'i, Chou Chi-ch'ang pi 戊戌淳熙五年幹僧儀紹題周季常筆 “... (in the year) mou-hsü, Shun-hsi fifth year, written by executive priest I-shao, brush of Chou Chi-ch'ang.” Kokka, 175; Daitokuji meihōshū (Kyoto, 1933), pl. 73; Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 41. Not in Sirén's List.

1178–1188—CHOU CHI-CH'ANG 周季常 and LIN T'ING-KUEI 林廷珪: Wu Pai Lo-han 五百羅漢 “The Five Hundred Arhats.” Of the original set of 100 scrolls, 88 (?) are in the Daitokuji, Kyoto; 10 are in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and 2 in the Freer Gallery of Art in Washington, K., ink and color on silk. Dates inscribed on six of the Boston pictures correspond to A.D. 1178, 1180, 1184, 1188; the two Freer pictures are dated 1178. The inscriptions, written in gold characters, were added by the priest I-shao (cf. the preceding entry) of Ning-po. The painters themselves only signed their names, according to Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 41. A few of the Daitokuji pictures were reproduced in the Kokka (238, 273) and Tōyō, vol. 8; those in Boston were published in Tomita's Portfolio, pls. 75–84. The Freer pictures are described in detail by Wen Fong, The Lohans and a bridge to heaven. CP II List, p. 46f.—The relatively early date at which this monumental set came to Japan is confirmed by a series of the Five Hundred Arhats in 50 pictures closely modeled on the present set, painted in 1308 by the Japanese priest Minchō (1352–1431) and kept in the Tōfukuji (cf. Kokka, 30, 104, 187; Seizansō Seishō, vol. 10, pls. 46, 47; Cat. Exhibition of Japanese painting and sculpture sponsored by the Government of Japan, 1953, No. 17). As a safely dated and large series of Sung Buddhist paintings, the Daitokuji pictures are of exceptional importance for the study of Southern Sung artistic conventions, iconography, religious lore, and popular beliefs. Besides the figures of the saints, there appear here depictions of lay people, Chinese and foreign, and possibly contemporary portraits. In the case of Tomita’s plate 83, for instance, it is tempting to think of the two gentlemen (standing in front of the likewise individual portrayal of the priest) as self-portraits of the two painters, Chou and Lin.

1180—CHANG SHENG-WEN 張勝溫: Fan Hsiang 煉像 “Buddhist Images.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., color and gold on paper. The scroll consists of three sections which represent (1) the king of Ta-li (Yünnan) with his sons and daughters and their retinues; (2) a vast number of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, Arhats, patriarchs of the Ch'an sect, Devas, various forms of Kuan-yin, etc.;
and (3) the kings of the 16 great kingdoms (sec. of ancient India; cf. Soothill and Hodous, A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist terms, p. 46, s.v. “sixteen”). The paintings were attributed to an otherwise unknown master, Chang Sheng-wen from Ta-li-kuo, in a note written by the Buddhist priest Miao-kuang (妙光), quoted in the colophon by the late Yuan/early Ming Han-lin scholar Sung Lien 李謙 (1310–1381; Giles, B.D., No. 1836; JMTTT, 357.4; cf. also KKSHL, 1.36). According to Sung, that note was dated Sheng-te wu nien keng-tzu sui (十二) cheng yüeh shih-i jih 盛德五年庚子歲正月十一日 and it said that the paintings were made for Li-chen Huang-ti Liao-hsien 利貞皇 帝陛下. Helen B. Chapin has shown, however, that that year must be equated with A.D. 1180, as Li-chen’s reign began in A.D. 1172, according to the History of the Nan-Chao Kingdom. Subsequent colophons were written by the priest Tsung-lo 宗濤, 1378; by the priest Lai-fu 來飡, 1379; by Tseng Ying 曾英, 1413 (cf. JMTTT, 1164.2); of the fifth, dated 1459, the name is lost. The sixth and last colophon was written by Emperor Ch’ien-lung in 1763; after a learned discussion of the scroll and the inscriptions the emperor mentions that he had Ting Kuan-sheng-pei make a painting of “Barbarian Kings worshiping the Buddha” in the manner of the Sixteen Great Kings (section 3), as well as a copy of the Buddhist images (of section 2), under the respective titles of Man Wang Li Po 萬王禮佛 and Fa Chieh Yüan Liu 伏懸流 “Origin and History of the Realm of Law” (or, “Dharmadhātu”). Recorded in Pi-ten chu-lin, hsü-pien. KKSHL, 4.78; KK 300, 3.124–126; CP II lists, p. 37. Discussed in detail by Helen B. Chapin, A long roll of Buddhist images, in Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art, vol. 4 (1936), pp. 1–24, 116–125; vol. 6 (1938), pp. 26–67. —The date 1180 is the year of Miao-kuang’s note of attribution, not of the painting itself, which must be slightly earlier. As pointed out by the compilers of the Pi-ten chu-lin (apud KKSHL, 4.85), the painting, having been made for Li-chen Huang-ti, would fall to the years with the nien-hao Li-chen which ended in 1175.

1185—HSÜ TAO-NING 詢道寧: Sung Shan Hsing Lü 杉山行旅 “Travellers in Pine Forest Mountains.” Formerly Peking, Wang Heng-yung 王衡永 collection. K., ink on silk. Across the top part of the high and narrow picture runs an inscription which is partly obliterated and, in the reproduction, all but illegible. The first eight columns of seven characters each are a poem. The ninth column reads: Hsü Tao-ning Sung-shan Ch’iu-se T’u 詢道寧嵩山秋色圖 “Autumn colors at the Sungshan picture by Hsü Tao-ning,” giving the attribution to this master. What follows is undecipherable save for bits of a date in the twelfth and last column, which Sirén tentatively equates with A.D. 1185 (=Shun-hsi 12). That this inscription was written by Emperor Hsiao-tsung (r. 1163–1189), as stated in Sirén’s List, cannot be verified by the available reproduction. The large seal under the imperial inscription, Ming-ch’ang yü-lan 明昌御览, would point to the collection of Chang-tsung of the Chin dynasty and his first nien-hao, Ming-ch’ang (1190–1195). The painting is not listed under either title in Ferguson’s Index (287th). Tōsō, pl. 34; ECP, vol. 1, pl. 92; CP II lists, p. 53 (B7).—The conjunction of Hsiao-tsung’s inscription with Chang-tsung’s seal would imply that the painting reached Chin as a personal gift of the Sung emperor some time between 1185 and 1195, something which, in view of the relations between the two powers, seems rather improbable. That seal, therefore, must be viewed with suspicion, a fortiori if the Hsiao-tsung colophon can be trusted. As for the painting itself, which in its crammed, dynamic composition of rounded boulders and diagonal thrusts of slopes and
ridges does reflect the Hsü Tao-ning and Kuo Hsi traditions, there seems to be no reason why it should not be accepted as a work possibly of Sung age by some follower of those masters.

1185—WANG SHEN 王顥: Hsi Sai Yu She 西塞漁社 “Fishermen’s Community near the Hsi Sai (Mountain).” New York, Crawford coll. H., section; color (?) on silk. As far as the reproduction tells, the painting is not signed; the attribution, therefore, is based on the colophons, 10 in number. The first four of these colophons were written by (1) Fan Ch’eng-ta 范大 (JMTTT, 708.3; Giles, B.D., No. 530; 1126—1193) in the year Shun-hsi i-suu (1185); (2) Hung Ching-lu 洪景祿 (unidentified), Shun-hsi mou-shen (1188); (3) Chou Pi-ta 周必大 (1126—1204; JMTTT, 526.3; Giles, B.D., No. 420) in the first year of Shao-hsi (1190); (4) Wang Lin 王蘭 (JMTTTT, 159.3) in the second year of Shao-hsi (1191). A scroll of this title is recorded in Chang Ch’ou’s Chen-chí jih-lu (pt. 2, 44b; see below). Ta-feng-i’ang, vol. 4; CP II List, p. 86 (listed without comment).—The painting appears to be the remnant of a larger scroll. It is reduced not only in length but also must have been cut along the upper edge, so that the hills rising beyond a long stretch of water filled with lotus leaves in the foreground are deprived of their crests. Whether this scroll is identical with the one listed (but not described) in the Chen-chí jih-lu is a difficult question to answer. A once-present signature and dedication to Li Tz’u-shan 李次山 (a painter; Sun, p. 196; JMTTTT, 389.4) mentioned in that source is missing. The same is true of a frontispiece (yin-shou-hua 引首畫) done by an Academy painter to embellish the scroll seen by Chang Ch’ou. Most important, there was another colophon, written by Wu Jen-ch’ieh 吳仁傑 (JMTTTT, 307.3), which must have preceded the series of colophons in Chang Ta-ch’ien’s scroll, all of which are listed in the same order (though without text) and thus apparently are identical with those of the Chen-chí jih-lu. All that can safely be concluded from this is that the present scroll, painting and colophons, is no longer complete; the loss of the Wu Jen-ch’ieh colophon does not argue decisively against the authenticity of what now remains.

1185—Anonymous painter: Ta T’ang Hsiang-hsiang 高常香象大士像 “Portrait of the T’ang Priest Hsiang-hsiang.” Nara, Tôdaiji. K., color on silk. The priest is shown lecturing, seated before a small table covered with sūtra scrolls. In the upper left corner is a cartouche with an inscription, dated Ta-ting i-suu (1185) ch’i yüeh chung san jih 大定乙巳秋七月三日. Tôyô, 8; Harada, Nippo gensai, p. 68; Kümmel, Handbuch, p. 72 (“Japanese copy?”); CP II List, p. 91 (“Southern Sung”).

1186—YÜ CHUNG-WEN 胡仲文: Fei Ch’ü T’u 飛驒圖 “A Flying Horse.” Formerly Shanghai, Ti P’ing-tzu collection. Short H., ink on silk. Signed by the artist, whose small-seal inscription is dated (Chin) Ta-ting ping-wu (1186) 大定丙午. Chung-kuo ming-hua-chi, vol. 1, No. 65; CP II List, p. 91 (A?).

1187—LI TI 李迪: Hsüeh Shu Han Ch’in 無極寒禽 “Winter Bird on a Snowy Tree.” Shanghai, P’ang Hsi-ch’ai collection. K., ink and some color on dark silk. Signed in the lower left corner: Shun-hsi ting-wei sui (1187) Li Ti hua 澄熙丁未歲李迪畫. No earlier seals than those of Ch’ien-lung. Hsi-ch’ai ming-hua-lu, ch. 7; Ming-pi chi-sheng, vol. 1, pl. 2; CP II List, p. 64 (without comment).—Judged from the reproduction, the painting displays no features opposed to a Sung date. It is distinguished by a certain purism and a deep stillness; the design is precise without being aus-
tere or dry. The more boldly drawn contour of the slope is a clever and sensitively rendered detail contrasting with the sharp lancets of bamboo leaves and the thin spikes of the jujube (?) branches. That a painting of the high quality of the present one should have escaped the attention of the Shih-ch’ü cataloguers is puzzling; perhaps the painting was not actually in the Ch’ien-lung collection and the imperial seals were added later.

1191—YANG SHENG 杨昇: Shan Shui “Mountains and Water.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., silk of a rough texture. Extraordinary coloring with strong opaque pigments such as white, light blue, dark green, turquoise green, reddish-brown, red, yellow, violet, and lilac tones. For the contours of mountains, gold is used. No signature. Yang Sheng (active in the K’ai-yüan era, 714–741) is mentioned—as the only later follower of Chang Seng-yu’s inkless manner—in a colophon dated Pao-ch’ing ting-hai (1227) of yüeh 顾慶丁亥四月 and signed, Ch’ien-t’ang Lou Kuan chih 顾塘楼觀, with a round seal, Kuan 觀 (to be identified, no doubt, with the painter of the same name and origin who was an Academy member in the Hsien-shun era, 1265–1274; Sun, p. 625). The second colophon, on the same paper, bears an earlier date: Shao-hsi hsin-hai (1191) ch’u-hsi ch’ien i jih 程熙辛亥除夕前一日 “... the day before New Year’s eve”; it was written by Yang Wan-li from Lu-ling 庾陵萬里 (1124–1206; JMTTT, 1279.3; Giles, B.D., No. 2414). Early seals on the painting: Te-shou-ten shu 德壽殿書 and Yü-shu chih pao 御書之寶 purport to be of Kao-tsun’s time, and Ts’ai ching chen-wan 聖京珍玩, of Hui-tsung’s minister Ts’ai Ching (JMTTT, 1529.2; Giles, B.D., No. 1971). Among later seals worth mentioning are these: Huang shih Tzu-chiu 黃氏子久 of Huang Kung-wang (1260–1354); an early Ming seal, Chin-fu shu-hua chih yin 监府書靈之印; seals of Liang Ch’ing-piao (1620–1691). Recorded in Shih-ch’ü, san-pien (Yench’un-ko). KKSHL, 4:8; CP III, pl. 85 (reproduction of a section); CP II List, p. 23 (B3).—Although this painting echoes something of T’ang traditions in sundry details of design and its naively rich color, it is far too well preserved to be of T’ang age, and the composition as a whole rather points to Sung experiences. That the colophons appear in a chronologically reversed order is conspicuous. The same may be said of the date of Lou Kuan’s inscription, 1227, almost 40 years before the period of his recorded activity. In fact, both colophons are regarded as probably spurious by the curators at Taichung. Another apparently irregular feature may be recognized in the Sung Imperial seals which, awkwardly placed side by side (see CP III, p. 85 below, upper left corner), seem to be out of place because they do not accompany any Imperial writing such as their wording would imply. Sirén’s reproduction (op. cit.), without color and reduced in scale, makes for a surprisingly unified and refined appearance of this curious work that might be characterized as a travesty of an archaic style in a far less archaic composition.

1192—MA YÜAN 马远: Chiang Shan Chūan 江山卷 “Scroll of Rivers and Mountains.” Washington, Freer Gallery of Art (11.169). H., ink and light color on silk. Signed and dated: Shao-hsi san nien (1192) ch’un erh yüeh ... jih, tz’u chin-tai ch’en 马远. Chiang Shan ch’ang-chüan 程熙三年三月〇日赐金帶臣馬遠. 江山重巒 “servant Ma Yüan, awarded with the golden girdle, painted this long scroll of Rivers and Mountains.” Toward the end of the painting there are two inscriptions by Ming officials, a long one, dated Yung-lo hsin-ch’ou (1421), and a short one, dated Hsüan-te san nien (1428). Laurence
Binyon, Ma Yüan’s landscape roll in the Freer collection (New York, 1916); Sirén, Chinese paintings in American collections, pls. 134–136; CP II List, p. 76 (B?).—From the earlier of the two colophons, which was written by Chin Yu-tzu 金幼孜 (1368–1431; chronicler of Yung-lo’s Northern Campaign; JMTT, 607.4; cf. W. Franke, Yung-lo’s Mongolei-Feldzüge, Sinolog. Arbeiten, vol. 3, 1945, p. 14 n. 47), we learn that this scroll was given by an unnamed inspector of the former Yüan palace as a congratulatory present to the Prince of Yen, the future Emperor Yung-lo (1403–1424) in 1380, when he first took residence in Peking, his future capital; that the prince, taking no pride in the prognostications of his imperial career, even denied himself the enjoyment of examining the painting; and that it was not until 27 years after his accession to power that, for the first time, he showed the scroll to his entourage at a banquet, when Chin Yu-tzu was ordered to compose the colophon (of 1421). Since the colophon was not written to express an expert’s opinion about authorship and authenticity but refers to Ma Yüan in general terms, it is hardly doubtful that the painting carried the signature as early as 1380. Hence it should antedate that year by a time span long enough to exclude an outright fraud on the part of the unknown giver who certainly did not dare to present a freshly fabricated forgery. Thus, if the inscription of 1421 is trustworthy, the painting ought to be earlier than Ming. Of course, the scroll may be a copy from first to last, including Ma’s signature and the inscriptions, but there is no internal proof that this is so.

The question of Ma Yüan’s authorship is a different matter, complicated by the existence of a similar scroll in the collection of the National Central Museum in Taichung (KWCLS, 5:17; KKSFL, 4:60; CP III, pls. 305–307), a scroll attributed to (and not signed by) Hsia Kuei in a colophon of 1378. Executed in ink on a yellowish-gray paper with stains, that scroll is a far superior work, free, sketchy, and inspired, convincing as a work of Southern Sung. It shows many of the motifs which recur in the Freer scroll. The latter appears to be based on a prototype close to the Hsia Kuei scroll (of which there must have existed several replicas; e.g., a fragment in the collection of Marquis Asano, Asano Koshaku kahō eju, No. 9, which repeats the motif of the bridge, CP III, pl. 305 below), rather than that scroll itself. There may have existed a Ma Yüan version of the same composition that was signed and dated in accordance with A.D. 1192, and would account for the signature of the Freer scroll.

1193—LI TI 李迪: Li Nu Ch'ing-t'ing《A Cat Angered by a Dragon Fly》
Osaka, City Art Museum, Abe collection. Album leaf, color on silk. Signed and dated: Shao-hsi kuei-ch’ou sui (1193), Li Ti hua 紹熙癸丑歲李迪畫. The name is somewhat obscured by a seal, reading Li Ti yin-chang 李迪印章. Soraikan, vol. 2, pl. 20 (6); CP II List, p. 64 (“probably later”).—Sirén’s verdict appears convincing, although the painting may be based on a Sung design.

1196 (?)—LI TI 李迪: An album of eight pictures, studies of whirling waters, cliffs, clouds, and trees. Unknown collection. Published under the title Sung Li Ti shan-shui-ts’ei 巘海畫（Shanghai, 1915); CP II List, p. 64 (A?).
—The item is noted from Sirén’s List, which indicates that the last of the leaves is signed and dated in accordance with “1196(?)”.

1197—LI TI 李迪: Chi Ch’u T’u 雞雏圖《Young Chicken》
(color plate); CP II List, p. 64 (A). — An appealing but not fully convincing small painting which bears no earlier seals than Hsiang Yüan-pien’s (1525-1590).

1197—LI TI 張迪: Hung Pai Fu-jung 紅白芙蓉 “Red and White Hibiscus Flowers.” Tokyo, National Museum. Two album leaves mounted as kakemonos; color on silk. Identically signed and dated: Ch’ing-yüan tingssu sui (1197), Li Ti hua 康元丁巳歲李迪畫. No seals. Kokka, 26 and 134; Sögen meigashu, 3: 14, 15; Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 36; CP III, pl. 245; CP II List, p. 64 (A). — The authenticity of this magnificent and convincing pair of flower pieces has never been questioned. The only problem posed is how the date relates to the painter’s recorded career. If the biographies are correct, he was an Academy member as early as the Hsüan-ho period (1119-1125), this is, 72 years or more before the present date. This exceedingly long interval has been noted with concern by previous writers (Y. Takahashi, in TRD, vol. 8, 410A; Sérén, CP II, p. 88, where the cyclical year is mistakenly read “ting-ch’i”), but there is no proof that the records are in error.

1197—LI TI 張迪: Ch’üan T’u 犬圖 “A Dog.” Peking, Hui-hua-kuan. Album leaf, color on silk. Signed and dated: Ch’ing-yüan tings-su sui (1197), Li Ti hua (as above). Seals: Ssu-yün 司印 (1374-1384); seals of Keng Chao-chung (1640-1686). Sung-jen hua-ts’e, vol. 2, 10: CP II List, p. 64 (A). — The signature differs in every character from those of the preceding pictures of the same year. If the “Hibiscus” pictures are accepted as works of Li Ti, the “Dog” is unlikely to be by his hand.

1199—Anonymous painter: Tsao Ch’iu Yeh P’o 章秋夜泊 “Moored at Night in Early Autumn.” Tokyo, Suzuki Masao 森木正夫 collection. Oval fan painting in ink and light color on silk; without signature. Mounted as K., together with a square piece of silk inscribed with two five-word verses:

沉寢明方夜, 淡泊早秋天.

Deeply silent is the moon-lit night,
Pale and vast the early autumn sky.

To the right of the poem is a gourd-shaped date seal, chi-wei 已未 (taken to correspond to A.D. 1199); to the left, a square seal, yü shu chih pao 御書之寶. Kokka, 537; Tōsō, pl. 66; Pageant, pl. 116; CP II List, p. 72, s.v. Ma Ho-chih (B). — The former attribution to Ma Ho-chih rested on the assumptions that the calligraphy was Emperor Kao-tsung’s (1127-1162) and that the painting was done by his favorite painter. But the latter’s illustrations of the Odes in the handwriting of the emperor (e.g., CP III, pl. 275) show both hands, painter’s as well as calligrapher’s, to be quite different. In the Kokka (537), the attribution to Ma Ho-chih is discarded and the calligraphy is considered to be Ning-tsung’s (1195-1224), which seems far more convincing. Another solution, admittedly tentative, has been suggested by Werner Speiser; without insisting, and aware of stylistic incompatibilities, he claims the painting for Ma Lin and the calligraphy for Li-tsung (1225-1264), equating the date chi-wei with A.D. 1259 (cf. W. Speiser, Ma Lin; v.d. Heydt Festschrift, 1952). This would imply a closer similarity to Ma Lin’s “Sunset” and “Rainstorm” pictures (of 1254 and 1255, respectively; v. infra) than actually exists. The date of 1199, therefore, which fits both calligraphy and painting, is here upheld.

Two oval album leaves, color on silk. Identically dated and signed: Chi-wei (1199) Wu Ping hua 己未吳炳畫. No seals on either painting. Recorded under the album named Sung-jen chi-hui 宋人集繪 in Shih-ch'ü, san-pien (Yen-ch'un-ko). KKSHL, 6:212: not in Sirén's List.—Most of the paintings assembled in this album do not attain to Sung standards; with the exception of two anonymous leaves (Nos. 3 and 9) they seem to be post-Sung works.

1205—Anonymous painter: Ch'i Shan Wu Chin 溪山無畫 “Streams and Mountains without End.” Cleveland, The Cleveland Museum of Art. H., ink and touches of light color on silk. No signature or inscription. Nine extant colophons of the Chin, Yüan, and Ming dynasties form a convincing sequence as far back as A.D. 1205. The writers are unidentified, except the fifth and ninth, viz, Ts'ao Yüan-yung 曹元用, a Yüan dynasty scholar (JMTTT, 984.3), and Wang To 王鐸, a well-known late Ming collector (1592–1652; Contag and Wang, p. 76). The dates of the colophons are as follows: (1, 2) T'ai-ho i-ch'ou (1205) 泰和乙丑; (3) undated; (4) 1214; (5) 1326; (6) 1332; (7) 1336; (8) 1380; (9) undated. There are no seals earlier than Ming. The scroll was in the Ch'ien-lung collection and is recorded in Shih-ch'ü, san-pien (Yen-ch'un-ko). Sherman E. Lee, Chinese landscape painting, No. 14; Lee and Wen Fong, Streams and Mountains without End; CP II List, p. 94.—While providing a dependable terminus ante quem (A.D. 1205), the colophons give no hint at when and where the painting originated. An allusion to Kuo Hsi made in the third colophon was ignored by the later writers. However, from the commentaries of 1332 and 1380 we learn that one or more Sung colophons—lost since—were attached to the painting, opening the possibility that it antedates the sack of Pien-liang and final establishment of Chin sovereignty in North China (1126). “Late Northern Sung” is the date considered on stylistic grounds by Lee and Fong (op. cit.). A later copy of the Cleveland scroll is in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (A. Priest, in Metropolitan Museum Bulletin, vol. 8, 1950, pp. 198–208; Lee and Fong, pl. 13).

1207—LIU SUNG-NIEN 劉松年: Lo-Han 罹漢 “An Arhat.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. K., ink and color on silk. On a rock at the left is a barely visible signature with the following date: K'ai-hsi ting-mao (1207), Liu Sung-nien hua 劉松年畫. In the upper left corner are two seals which appear to be reliable Southern Sung Palace seals: Huang Tzu t'u-shu 黃叔圖書 “Library of the Imperial Elder Sister” (referring presumably to the elder sister of the first Empress of Ning-tsung, r. 1195–1224, née Han 韓; cf. Sung-shih, ch. 243, K'ai-ming ed., vol. 6, p. 5163.3); Nei-fu shu-hua 私門書畫. Recorded in Pi-tien chu-lin, hsü-pien (Ch'ien-ch'ing-kung). KKSHL, 5:80; KKSHC, vol. 45; CP II List, p. 67 (A.).—The painting is one of a set of three, identically signed and dated. Though possibly genuine, it is a somewhat cold and overly elaborate picture, devoid of feeling.

1207—T'ANG CHENG-CHUNG 湯正仲: Mei Chi'iao T'ü 梅鶚圖 “Magpies on a Plum-Tree.” Shanghai, Wu Hu-fan collection. K., ink on silk. The inscription purporting to be the painter's is dated with an illegible nien-hao (corresponding to K'ai-hsi) and the year ting-mao (1207) 丁卯. The seals likewise are undecipherable in the reproduction. Colophons by Han Hsing 韓 (Yüan dynasty) and Ch'ien-lung. Nanking Exhibition, No. 36; CP II List, p. 83.—As the painter is recorded to have been active around 1200 (Sun, p. 525), the equation of the cyclical year with A.D. 1207 poses no problem. Unfortunately,
the reproduction does not permit one to adequately judge this interesting painting. Its design is suggestive of a Ōan rather than Sung date.

1209 or 1229—CH'EN CHÜ-CHUNG

M. Hua Ma Chüan 處馬卷 "A Red Horse." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. Short H., ink and color on paper. Signature in seal script with a partly obliterated date: Chia (?) or Shao (?)-ting erh nien (1209 or 1229) ch'un, Ch'en Chü-chung hua 金定二年春陳居中畫. A seal of the painter: Chü-chung 居中. Collectors' seals: Sung-hsieh-chai t'u-shu-yin 蘇雪嶽館印 of Chao Meng-fu (1254–1322); Po-yan Pu-hua 鄭顏不花 (perhaps identical with Po-yan Pu-hua Ti-chin 唐顔不花的斤, a mid-fourteenth-century Mongol scholar and patriot; JMTTT, 284.1). Colophon by Wen Cheng-ming (1470–1559), a poem in which he refers to Chao Meng-fu as a previous owner of the scroll. Recorded in Shih-ch'ii, Hsü-pien (Chung-hua-kung). KKSRL, 4:63; not in Sirén's List.—Unpublished?

1210—LIU SUNG-NIEN

H. Tsui Seng T' u 酒僧圖 "The Drunken Priest." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. K., of small size; ink and light color on dark brown, heavily damaged silk. Signature and date are written, or hidden, on a rock: Chia-ting keng-wu (1210), Liu Sung-nien hua 嘉定庚午劉松年畫. The painting shows a priest writing under a pine tree on which his wine gourd is suspended. A short poem inscribed by an unknown admirer of the painting speaks of the priest as Ts'ai-sho-sheng 草聖, "Saint of Grass [-Writing]." A second poem was inscribed by Ch'ien-lung in 1775. There seem to be no seals of earlier collectors than Keng Chao-chung (1640–1686). Recorded in Mo-yüan 梅友元, ming-hua, hsia:72a; Shih-ch'ii, san-pien (Yen-ch'un-ko). KKSRL, 5:82. Not in Sirén's List. Unpublished?—Convincing as a Southern Sung work and bearing an apparently authentic signature, this painting shows Liu Sung-nien in a more favorable light than does his "Lo-han" of 1207 (supra). As to the subject, a monk practicing calligraphy in a state of inebriation (as suggested by the gourd), we should not be greatly mistaken when thinking of a famous monk-calligrapher such as Hua-su 惠素 (644–704; cf. Giles, B.D., No. 833) who wrote his most powerful ts'ao-shu when inspired by wine, as did Chang Hsi 張旭, another of the T'ang great calligraphers and one of "The Great Immortals of the Wine-Cup" (Giles, B.D., No. 59; JMTTT, 931.2). It is to the latter that the epithet, "Saint of Grass-Writing," in the above-mentioned poem, refers—mistakenly, I believe, because Chang Hsi was an official, not a monk. This poem, by the way, is regarded as the handwriting of one of the Southern Sung emperors by An Ch'i in his Mo-yüan hui-kuan.

1210—LIU SUNG-NIEN

H. Tsui Seng T' u 酒僧圖 "The Drunken Priest." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. Album leaf, round, ink and color (?) on silk. Signed and dated: Chia-ting keng-wu (1210), ...-men Liu Sung-nien 嘉定庚午○門劉松年. No earlier seals than Ch'ing (Shih-ch'ü pao-chi; Pao-chi san-pien; Chia-ch'ing yü-lan chih pao). The picture is included in an album named Sung Yüan Ming-jen ho-pi 宋元明人合璧 which is listed, but not described, in KKSRL, 8:172. KK, vol. 6; CP II List, p. 67 (B7).—On account of both its somewhat plain and dry design and the rather conspicuously placed signature this small painting does not agree well with other works connected with Liu Sung-nien or of the period at large. Although there is no proof of spuriousness, Sirén's negative judgment is acceptable to the writer.
1210—LI SUNG 李嵩: Shih Tan Ying Hsi 市埸賤賤 “Vendor of Toys and Excited Children,” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. Album leaf in fan shape; pai-miao with touches of light blue and gray-brown on silk. At the left edge is a very small and finely written signature and date: Chia-ting keng-wu (1210), Li Sung hua 嘉定庚午李嵩畫. No seals. This leaf is the third item in an album named Ming Hsien Miao Chi 名賢妙跡 which contains 12 paintings of uneven quality attributed to Sung, Yuan, and Ming masters. Recorded in Shih-ch‘ü, hsü-pien (Yang-hsin-tien). KKSHL, 6:221 f.; not in Siren’s List. —The painting shows a mother with five children enraptured by the fantastic display of toys carried by the pedlar on a pole. It is executed with surpassing skill and tenderness, in an incredibly fine yet lively lineament and with great coloristic restraint. Unfortunately this beautiful and doubtless authentic work has not been published so far.

1211—LI SUNG 李嵩: Huo Lang T’u 活郎圖卷 “The Knick-Knack Pedlar.” China, private collection (?). H., ink and probably some color on silk. Rich design, in fine, slightly studied yet nervously outlines. Signature and date at the left edge: Chia-ting hsien-wei (1211), Li Ts’ung-shun nan Sung hua 嘉定辛未李從順男嵩畫 “painted by Li Ts’ung-shun’s (foster-) son Sung.” Seal of the Ming collector Sun Ch’eng-tse 孫承澤 (1592–1676). Inscription by Ch’ien-lung. Recorded in Shih-ch‘ü, ch‘u-pien, 32:69. W’e-i-ta-ii i-shu, pt. 7, pls. 8–9; CP II List, p. 62 (A).—In his signature, the painter has inserted the name of his foster-father, Li Ts’ung-shun (Sun, p. 194, writes Li Ts’ung-hsün 李從訓), an Academy painter from Hang-chou during the Hsüan-ho period. Both the signature and the painting itself appear to be genuine.

1211—Anonymous painter: Series of the Sixteen Arhats. Kyōto, Ködaiji 高臺寺. K., ink and color on silk. Brought to Japan by the priest Shunjö 俊矣 on his return from China in 1211. Kokka, 252; Shimbi Taikan, VI; Tōyō, VIII; T. Naitō, Shina kaigashi, fig. 37; CP II List, p. 29 (B?).—Relying on the temple tradition, we may accept the year A.D. 1211 as a terminus ante quem for this excellent set that may go back to the later twelfth century. The attribution to Kuan Hsiu (832–912) must not be taken seriously, except as a form of recognition of the iconographic sources.

1216—MA LIN 馬麟: Ts’eng T’ieh Ping Shao 層璽永師 “Layer upon Layer of Ivy Tips” (branches of a blossoming plum tree). Peking, Hui-hua-kuan. K., color on silk. Signed: ch’en Ma Lin. Inscribed with a poem of 28 words, to the left of which are two seals, Ping-tzu K’un-ning 丙子坤寧 and Yang-hsing chih yin 杨姓之印 “seal of the Yang family.” The first seal supplies the date, ping-tzu (taken to correspond to A.D. 1216), and the name of the palace of the second empress of Ning-tsung (1195–1224), Yang huang-hou 楊皇后 (1163–1233; became empress in 1200); the second gives the surname of the writer, who no doubt can be identified with Yang Mei-tzu 楊妹子 or Yang Wa 楊娃, the younger sister of the empress. Between the two seals is a short dedicatory note in very small characters. In the lower right corner is the half-seal “ssu-yin 司印” of the Ming imperial collection (used ca. 1374–1384). A long inscription running along the left edge, on the framing silk, was added by Hsiang Yuan-pien (1525–1590). The short inscription in the middle of the picture, consisting of the four characters adopted for the title, were written by Yang Mei-tzu. KKCK’, 158; KK-SHC, vol. 11; Nanking Exhibition, No. 35; W. Speiser, Ma Lin, pl. 1; CP II List, p. 73 (A).—Aside from its appealing qualities, this painting is important as an early work of Ma Lin as well as for the fact that it offers an
indubitable instance of Yang Mei-tzu’s caligraphy. Incidentally it is her inscription that permits one to determine the date, for Ma Lin’s lifetime is not so precisely recorded as to exclude the possibility of equating the year ping-tzu with 1276 instead of 1216. Lady Yang, born a few years after the empress, about 1165/70 or so, was nearing or had passed her fiftieth year in 1216; in 1276, she would have attained the age of well over 100 years. The year, therefore, must be 1216, in Ning-tsung’s reign. (In Sirén’s List, the date is not mentioned; Speiser, who in his article on Ma Lin recognizes the position of the painting correctly, mistakenly gives the equivalent as 1211.)

1216—MA LIN 马麟: Hua Hui Hua Ts’è 花卉畫冊 “Album with Paintings of Flowering Plants.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. Eight leaves, color on silk. The signature, Ma Lin, appears on each leaf. Each of them is inscribed with a line of four characters of appropriate poetic content, the inscription on the first leaf being followed by the signature K’un-ning jui pi 坤寧容筆 “imperial brush of the K’un-ning” (Hall). The third, fifth, and sixth leaves, moreover, bear the signs ping-tzu 丙子 (corresponding to 1216). On all the leaves the round k’un-kua 坤卦 seal is impressed, a seal which presumably was reserved for the empress, in accordance with the meaning of the trigram consisting of three broken lines, namely, “Earth,” “Mother,” or “Female.” The remainder of the seals are of post-Sung periods. KKCK’, Nos. 48–55; KK-SHL, 6:10; CP II List, p. 73 (A?).—As pointed out in Shih-ch’ü, hsü-pien (Yü-shufang), reprinted in KKSFL, the inscriptions are from the brush of the Empress Yang 楊皇后 (1163–1233; imperial consort from 1200). Indeed, the use of the term jui pi presupposes the imperial rank of the writer, and the handwriting does differ from that of the empress’s younger sister, Yang Mei-tzu (seen in the preceding item); and the name K’un-ning is attested for this period as the designation of the Palace quarters occupied by the empress (through the seal of 1216 on Ma Lin’s “Plum Blossoms,” discussed above). The two Ma Lin items of 1216, therefore, offer the opportunity of comparing the caligraphy of the two sisters Yang, whose manner of writing was said to have resembled that of the emperor (Ning-tsung, 1195–1224).

The fact that Ma Lin’s signature is not preceded by the word ch’en, “servant,” is curious; it may mean that the album was not originally executed for the Palace, or was painted before he was appointed to the Academy. If so, the album may well precede in time the “Plum Blossoms” (supra). These eight leaves show a scrupulous execution and unsophisticated designs such as would befit a beginner. A date as late as 1276 (CP II List) cannot be considered if the inscriptions were written by the Empress Yang, who died on January 18, 1233.

1217—CHIANG TS’AN 江參: Ch’ien Li Chiang Shan 千里江山 “Thousand Miles of River and Mountains.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. Long handscroll, gray-brown fine silk with rust-brown stains and damages; ink, and a faint light blue for sky and water. No signature. The artist’s name and the title of the painting were inscribed by K’o Chiu-ssu 柯九思 (1312–1365) close to the end of the scroll. At the lower left edge is an annotation by Tung Ch’i-ch’ang (1555–1636), so placed and worded as to resemble a signature without imitating it: Chiang Ts’an hua, Tung Ch’i-ch’ang ts’ang 江參畫, 汀其昌藏.

A sequence of eight colophons follows.

(1) A poem of 28 words written by one Mi 密 (unidentified), dated Chia-ting ting-ch’ou (1217) liu yüeh ssu jih 嘉定丁丑六月四日.
(2) An inscription of 10 stanzas of 20 words
each, in a five-word metre, with the following note: "These ten stanzas written for Chiang Kuan-tao’s landscape, alas, will never be seen by Shih-lin and Chien-chai" (v. infra). The writer is Liu K’o-chuang 劉克莊, a scholar and poet who held office in the first quarter of the thirteenth century and was awarded the chin-shih degree between 1241 and 1252 (Giles, B.D., No. 1320, “H. Hou-lin 後林, 12th c.” should read Hou-ts’un 後村, 13th c.; JMTTT, 1443.2; Ssu-k’u t’i-yao, vol. 4, pp. 3413, 4373, 4476). (3) A poem in four-word metre, written in Shun-yu chi-yu (1249) 淳祐己酉 by Lin Hsi-i 林希逸 (chin-shih in 1235; JMTTT, 584.2; Ssu-k’u t’i-yao, vol. 1, p. 372, vol. 3, p. 3041; a prolific writer and commentator, whose preface to Liu K’o-chuang’s Hou-ts’un-chi 後村集 happens to be dated to the same year, 1249). (4—8) Five colophons written in 1597 and 1598 by Tung Chi-ch’ang, who had acquired the scroll in 1596. In the last of his five annotations Tung copies a text passage contained in the Chia-ts’ang-chi 家藏集 of Wu Kuan 吳宽 (1435—1504; chin-shih in 1472; JMTTT, 328.3; Ming shih, ch. 184, K’ai-ming ed., p. 7519.2; Ssu-k’u t’i-yao, vol. 4, p. 3639), a passage introduced as “Wu P’ao-an’s colophon to Chiang Kuan-tao’s long scroll of Rivers and Mountains.” It will be discussed below. Before entering the Ch’ien-lung collection, the scroll passed through the hands of Liang Ch’ing-piao (1620—1691) and An Chi’i (1683—after 1742); it is listed in the latter’s Mo-yüan hui-kuan (ming-hua, hsia, fol. 72a). Recorded in Ch’ing-ho shu-hua-fang, 10:32b; Shih-ch’ü, ch’un-pien (Hua-ch’an-shih), 42:43; KSHKL, 4:47; KKCK’, 339—352 (reproduction in 14 parts) and 353—356 (colophons); CP II, p. 99; CP II List, p. 46 (A).

The attribution of this long and impressive scroll to Chiang Ts’an’s “Verdant Mountains” in the Kansas City Museum (S. E. Lee, Chinese landscape painting, No. 16), has been questioned (Lee and Fong, Streams and mountains without end, p. 8, n. 10). The writer, who had an opportunity to examine the scroll in 1957, finds it difficult to argue against the attribution on stylistic grounds and rather shares Sirén’s favorable opinion, gained from the unsatisfactory reproduction in KKCK’. However, the scroll is not signed (“signed,” in Sirén’s List, is a mistake), and the documentation provided in the colophons is incomplete and certainly does not prove the authorship. A small picture of precisely the same style which could be by the same hand, but is hitherto regarded as an anonymous Yüan painting (“‘Autumn Mountains,” KKCK’, 215), may be a fragment of the scroll in Kansas City, as Laurence Sickman assumes.

Some observations concerning the colophons will be added. Chang Ch’ou’s Ch’ing-ho shu-hua-fang (10:32ff.) contains an entry which seems to refer to the present scroll, viz. a scroll by Chiang Ts’an in the possession of Tung Chi-ch’ang, titled Chiang Shan Pu Chin’s Tu 江山不盡圖 and provided with colophons by Chou Mi 周密 and Lin Hsi-i (cf. colophon 3, above); Liu K’o-chuang (colophon 2, above), however, is not mentioned. Is Chang’s entry identical with the scroll under discussion? Is it possible that Chou Mi has to be identified with the unknown Mi 范 of 1217 (of the first colophon)? Chou Mi was born in 1232 (cf. Yü Shao-sung, Chieh-i’, ch. 12:4b); it would be most arbitrary on Chang’s part had he simply equated the unknown Mi with the well-known Chou Mi (author of the Yün-yen kuo-yen lu) and omitted another colophon of importance (Liu’s), not to mention the different title. Chang Ch’ou’s entry may be incomplete, but we have no reason to assume that it was faulty and thus
must allow for his scroll to have been a different item from the present one.

It is puzzling that Wu K’uan’s colophon, rather than appearing in his own hand, should have been copied by Tung Ch’i-ch’ang from Wu’s Chia-ts’ang-chi. The least forced view to take would be that there did exist a Chiang Ts’an scroll with Wu K’uan’s original colophon, and that a scroll without his colophon would be either another work by, or an imitation of, Chiang Ts’an. Furthermore, Wu K’uan says that the importance of the scroll is enhanced by the following Sung colophons: (a) By Yeh Shih-lin 葉石林 (Yeh Meng-te 葉夢得, chin-shih between 1094 and 1097, Han-lin scholar under Hui-tsung and Kao-tsung; JMTTT, 1305.3); (b) by Ch’en Chien-chai 陳簡齋 (Ch’en Yü-i 陳與義, promoted in 1113; Assistant Executive of the Secretariat-Chancellery under Kao-tsung; cf. Ssu-k’u t’i-yao, vol. 3, p. 3288); and (c) by Lin Hsi-i (colophon 3, above). The compilers of Shih-ch’ü (see KKSIL, 4:50) hold that the Yeh and Ch’en colophons have been removed since Tung Ch’i-ch’ang’s time. It should be noted, however, that Tung’s own colophons mention only “three inscriptions of famous Sung men,” leaving open the question whether they were the same as spoken of by Wu K’uan (a, b, c) or the extant three Sung colophons (1, 2, 3). The now missing two colophons (a, b) are not mentioned in the Ch’ing-ho shu-hua-fang entry either. This means—unless we presuppose simply an omission—that the scroll described by Chang Ch’ou indeed was a different item, and that the two colophons were removed in Tung Ch’i-ch’ang’s time or rather even earlier, for Chang’s book was completed about 1616, only 18 years after Tung’s own colophons, well in Tung’s lifetime.

Reverting to Wu K’uan’s eulogy, which is quoted in full also in the Ch’ing-ho shu-hua-fang, it is striking that he not only mentions two Sung colophons now missing, but omits mentioning the two that are present, namely, those of Mi and Liu K’o-chuang (1, 2), while including Lin’s (3). Liu K’o-chuang was not an obscure enough writer to go unnoticed. The absence of his name in both Wu’s colophon and Chang Ch’ou’s book, therefore, once more suggests that either the present Palace Museum scroll is different from Wu’s and Chang’s scrolls or that the Liu K’o-chuang text was added later, after Chang’s time but prior to Ch’ien-lung’s acquisition.

One point remains to be considered. Wu K’uan’s colophon, copied by Tung Ch’i-ch’ang, contains the statement that the painting (he saw) was authenticated as a work of Chiang Ts’an’s by K’o Chiu-ssu. Since the present scroll is not likely to be identical with the scroll seen by Wu and yet bears a K’o Chiu-ssu inscription, we must consider the possibility that the latter was added later to conform to Wu K’uan’s description.

The present title of the scroll, Ch’ien Li Chiang Shan, does not appear before An Ch’i’s Mo-yüan hui-kuan of 1742; the titles used are “Shan Shui” (Liu colophon, 2), “Chiang Shan” (Wu K’uan), and “Chiang Shan Pu Chin” (Chang Ch’ou), although the title of “Thousand Miles of River and Mountains” was given in the Yuan dynasty inscription by K’o Chiu-ssu. Unfortunately, An Ch’i only speaks of “Sung inscriptions,” stating no names or number.

In spite of the unreliable epigraphic documentation, the painting itself gives no reason to suspect the authorship of Chiang Ts’an, but it may be a close copy.

1228—CHU JUI 朱騫: Ch’ih Pi T’u Chüan 赤壁圖卷 “The Red Cliff.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., ink on a cream-colored paper. No inscription or seal of the painter. The attribution was made only by Hsiang Yüan-pien (1525-1590), whose seals abound; there are no older seals than his. A
colophon by Chao Ping-wen 趙乘文 of the Chin dynasty (chin-shih in A.D. 1185; biography in Chin Shih, ch. 110), not referring to Chu Jui at all, is dated: Cheng-ta wu nien (1228) ch'ung ch'i ch'ien i jih 正大五年重九前一日 "the day before the double ninth," the ninth day of the ninth month, corresponding to October 7, 1228. No earlier record than Shih-ch'ü, Hsu-pien, quoted in KSSHKL, ch. 4: 45 ff. Illustrations: KK, vol. 19; KKCK', No. 145 ff. CP III, pls. 262, 263; CP II List, p. 48.—What little is known of Chu Jui's work argues against the attribution. Sirèn, rightly considering the style to be later than that of the Hsüan-ho and Shao-hsing Academies to which Chu Jui was attached, refers to Chuan Yen's suggestion that the picture may have been painted by a contemporary of the Chin state, Wu Yüan-chih 武元直, known to have done an illustration of Su Tung-p'o's Fu of the Red Cliff. However, this reattribution, which would locate the entire scroll in Chin territory, depends on the assumption that the colophon of 1228 was written for the present picture, of which there is no indication, and leaves the question of the style unanswered.

1228 or 1288—WEN JIHKUAN 溫日觀: "Branches of Climbing Vine," Tokyo, Nezu Bijutsukan. K., ink on silk. The painter's inscription, placed in the middle of the painting, resembling the creepers and tendrils over which it runs, is not legible in its entirety but the date is clear: mou-tzu nien (1228 or 1288) pa yüeh 戊子年八月. To the left of the inscription are two of the painter's seals: Chih-kuei-tzu 匠歸子 (a hao) and Fen'to-li-hua 芬陀利華 "Punṣadārika" (lotus flower, as in Saddharmapunṣadārika-Sūtra). Tōsō, pl. 117; Saisānsō seishō, vol. 1, pl. 21; Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 111 ("attribution"); CP II List, p. 86 (B?).—Of the several datated paintings attributed to this master (1228, 1229, 1231, 1243) none is inscribed with a nien-hao. His biographies do not say how long he lived; they vaguely suggest late Southern Sung as the time of his activity. Conceivably the dates have to be advanced by a full cycle of 60 years (to correspond to 1288, 1289, 1291, 1303), making those paintings post-Sung works. However, in one of his inscriptions (recorded in Chiang-ts'un hsiao-hsia-lu, 1:33b) Jih-kuan, quoting a verse of Kuan-hsiu (832-912) of "Ta T'ang," speaks of himself as Wen Jih-kuan of "Huang Sung":

與世只知嗟逝水, 無人欲解悟空花.
此一聯乃大唐貫休詩師之佳句.
皇宋全面認為卷之為後人策勵之端.

All the world only knows to lament over the fleeting waters/ No one seems even so slightly emancipated as to become aware of his vain imaginations.—This couplet is the excellent verse of Ch'an-master Kuan-hsiu of the Great T'ang (dynasty), written down by Wen Jih-kuan of the August Sung (dynasty) to exhort later men to their highest efforts.

This inscription which is recorded also in Shihku-t'ang (hua, 15:71) is dated to the year kuei-ssu, and the latest kuei-ssu year under Sung would fall to A.D. 1233. Yet his "Huang Sung" may not be conclusive; Jih-kuan may have spoken of himself as a Sung man even after the Mongol conquest. The Shan-hu-wang (as quoted in Shih-ku-t'ang, 15:72b) places him "end of Sung, beginning of Yuan," which makes the dates between 1288 and 1303 rather more likely. The question can be settled if the tradition of a friendship between Jih-kuan and Chao Meng-fu (1254-1322) can be relied on. In fact there is a colophon by Chao Meng-fu to a scroll painting by Jih-kuan, in which we find a clear testimony. Writing in the year hsin-mao (1291), Chao remarks that he had "met the master only once or twice" 吾與師輩—再面 (Shih-ch'ü, ch'ü-pien, 32:109a), and the context shows that Jih-kuan was then living in Wu, Chekiang. Unless there are reasons not to accept the set of colophons accompanying the scroll described
in Shih-ch'ü, the wording of which appears perfectly convincing, Chao's casual testimony would seem reliable evidence for the later dates of Wen Jih-kuan's life and works, making them post-Sung.

The present painting is not generally regarded as a genuine work, but there is no proof of its being an imitation.

1228 or 1229—WEN JIH-KUAN 温日觀: “Climbing Vine,” China, Chu Ai-ch'ing collection. H., ink on paper (?). Signed Jihkuan, and dated: chi-ch'ou nien (1229 or 1228) chiu yieh ch'u pa tan 己卯年九月初八旦 “ninth month, first quarter, morning of the eighth day.” To the left of the painter's signature are two seals, the smaller one of which is illegible in the reproduction; the larger one reads Fen-t'o-li-hua “Pundarika” (cf. 1228, supra). Ōmura, Chūgoku meigashū, vol. 1, pl. 84; CP II List, p. 86 (no rating).—A painting with the same inscription of a T'ang poem is recorded in Shih-k'u-t'ang (ch. 15:73), where the cyclical year is read “chi-yu 已酉” instead of chi-ch'ou, and a blank is left in the printed text where the numeral “eight” should appear. “Chi-yu” (which would correspond to 1249) probably is a misreading; the entry appears to refer to the present scroll. The illegible seal mentioned above is read Chih-ku-tzu in the same text; it occurs also on the painting of 1228/88. What little evidence there is does not speak against the possibility of the scroll’s genuineness, and Ōmura’s reproduction barely permits a judgment on stylistic grounds. The cyclical year may have to be equated with 1229.

1229—MA YUAN 馬遠: “Visiting a Friend.” Japan (?), private collection. K., ink on silk (?). Inscribed with a poem of 28 words by Emperor Li-tsung, dated Shao-ting chi-ch'ou (1229) 調定己丑, and given as a present to Kan Sheng 賈昇 (unidentified; perhaps a descendant of the family of Kan Pien 甘?; cf. Sung Shih, ch. 469). Naitō, Shina kaigashī, pl. 57.—The painting may be identical with a Ma Yuan in the collection of Dr. Wang Shih-ch’ieh, "Sung Lu Fang Yu Tu' 松盧訪友," contained in Sirén’s List, p. 75 (λ?). However, Sirén does not mention the important inscription which expressis verbis connects this painting with Ma Yuan and appears to provide a reliable terminus ante quem.

1229—FANG CH’UN-NIEN 方椿年: Nan Chi Ch’eng Hsiang Tien Nü San Hua 南魏聖光天女散華 “Benign Fairies of the South Pole Scattering Flowers,” Peking, Ferguson collection (?). H., color on silk (?). Dated (teste Ferguson) the second year of Shao-ting (1229) 紹定二年. Ferguson, Chinese Painting, p. 134, illustration opp. p. 134.—The painter, who is not mentioned in Sirén’s List, was active under Li-tsung (1225–1264). A painting with the same title is recorded under his name in Sheng-ching KKSIL, 3:55, and KWPCLS, 5:18b, but neither source speaks of a date or any of the seals mentioned by Ferguson, whose scroll evidently is a different item. However, there was another painting by Fang Ch'un-nien in the Ch’ien-lung collection, titled “Longevity Bestowed at the Jade Pool,” which bears exactly the same date as Ferguson’s scroll (cf. Shih-ch’ü, ch’u-pien, ch. 25:6b). Although Ferguson’s reproduction does not permit a definite judgment, it does not appear to represent a Sung work; quite possibly his scroll was dated in imitation of the one and named after the other of the two pictures in the Manchu collection.

1229—CHU JUI 朱黻: Ch’un She Tsui Kuei 杉醉歸 “Drunk Return from the Spring Festival,” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., color on silk. Signed and dated: Shao-ting erh nien (1229) san yieh Chu Jui pi 紹定二年三月朱黻筆. Several Yuan colo-
phons are mentioned, without text and dates, in Shih-ch'iü, I, 34:8b, where the scroll is listed as a second-rate work. KKSHL, 8:36 (without description). Not in Sirén's List. Unpublished.—Having examined this scroll in 1959, James Cahill regards it as a Ming painting.

1231 or 1291—WEN JIH-KUAN 温日観: Pu T'ao 葡萄 “Grapes.” Tokyo, Marquis Inouye collection. K., ink on paper. On top of the picture, an inscription in prose and a poem in the painter’s hand; in the lower left corner, his signature and date: Jih-kuan lao tso, hsin-mao (1231) ch'i yüeh shih-szu wu 日觀老作, 春卯七月十四午 “Jih-kuan, the old, fecit; hsin-mao (year), seventh month, fourteenth noon.” Kokka, 230; Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 111; Sirén, CP III, pl. 368; CP II List, p. 86 (A).—This painting, which is more austere than others that go under the painter’s name, seems generally accepted as a genuine work. The cyclical year may have to be equated with 1291 (see above, under 1228).

1235—MA HO-CHIH 马和之: “Illustrations of the Classic of Filial Piety with Text Written by Sung Emperor Kao-tsung.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. Album, containing 15 paintings and 17 leaves of calligraphy. (A few leaves are missing.) The paintings are in ink and color on dark-brown silk. Five colophons are added, dating from 1235, 1260, 1266, 1299, 1299. None of the paintings is signed. This fact is pointed out in an inscription by Ch’ien-lung on the first text leaf; he concludes that there is no evidence of the calligraphy belonging in the period of Ma Ho-chih. The compilers of Shih-ch'iü, I (Yü-shu-fang; ch. 41:53ff.), moreover, find fault with the colophons which, as they state, contain many erroneous characters. KKSHL, 6:153. Not in Sirén’s List. Unpublished.—The style of the paintings, close to the Ma-Hsia manner, suggests a Southern Sung date but is quite unlike that of Ma Ho-chih’s Illustrations to the Songs. The attributions to both painter and calligrapher are unacceptable, and the colophons appear to be later fabrications.

1237—LI T’ANG 李唐: Ch’ing Ch’i Yü Yin 清溪漁隱 “The Hermit Fishing in a Clear Stream.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., ink on silk which is of an even brown tone and very well preserved. On the trunk of the tree farthest to the left is a small signature, Ho-yang Li T’ang pi 河陽李唐筆. The earliest seals are two halves of the Shao-hsing seals (of the reign period 1131–1162) at the end of the scroll. There are two colophons on paper: (1) By Yeh Fan 耶蕃, dated Chia-hsi ting-yu (1237) meng tung tan 嘉熙丁酉孟冬旦 “the first day of winter (10th month)” ; and (2) by Chao Meng-chien 趙孟堅, dated Ta-te wu nien (1301) 大德五年, signed Wu-hsing Chao Tzu-ku. Among later collectors’ seals are those of Liang Ch’ing-piao (1620–1691), Hsiang Yuan-pien (1525–1590), and Emperor Ch’ien-lung. Recorded only in Shih-ch'iü, ch'upien (ch. 43:23b). KKSHL, 4:44; KKCK', Nos. 184–189; R. Edwards, in Archives, vol. 12 (1958), fig. 11; CP II List, p. 63 (A?).—The remark in Sirén’s List, “A colophon by Chao Meng-chien is dated 1237,” should be corrected in accordance with the accurate statements in KKSHL (Yeh Fan, 1237; Chao Meng-chien, 1301). Unfortunately, the year 1301 does not tally with what is known of Chao Meng-chien’s lifetime. Several sources only mention the year of his doctorate, 1226, and the fact or tradition that he died at the high age of 97 (Sun, p. 612; Giles, B.D., No. 172; JMTTT, 1399; TRD, VI, p. 143). Sirén’s figures are 1199–1295 (CP II, p. 158, List, p. 41), R. H. van Gulik’s, 1200–1265 (Chinese pictorial art, p. 280). Such discrepancies have been noted also by the compilers of the Ssu-k'u t'i-yao (vol. 4, p. 3417, s.v.
I-ch'ai wen-pien). They arrived at the following solution: In one of his poems (Chia-ch'en sui-ch'ao pa-pi 甲辰歲朝把筆, written in 1244) Chao himself says, "forty-five times have I seen the New Year's eve," which indicates 1190 as the year of his birth; in a colophon written by Yeh Lung-li (Giles, B.D., No. 2457) for Chao Tzu-ku's Mei Chu P'u 梅竹譜 we are told that by the year Hsien-shun ting-mao 成淳丁卯 (1267), when Yeh came to call, Tzu-ku was already dead; considering this colophon reliable, the compilers—agreeing with Chou Mi that Chao died before the Yüan period—accept the dates "1195-before 1267" for Chao's lifetime. But even if the tradition of the 97 years were true, Chao Meng-chien would have lived only till 1295 or possibly 1296 (as in Sirén's computation) and not until 1301. The colophon of Chao Meng-chien, therefore, is apocryphal, and it casts a shadow on the scroll as such. When I saw the scroll in 1957, my impression was that it may have been executed by a skillful Ming painter versed in the wet technique of Southern Sung, somewhat exaggerating in such matters as the big axe strokes for the rocks, not avoiding a certain plainness or even rudeness in some spots, and unabashed in his bravura. It is not surprising that Sirén has reservations with regard to this painting, and the fact that one of the colophons turns out to be spurious strongly suggests that Li T'ang must not be held responsible for this smooth and somewhat superficial work.

1238—Anonymous painter: Portrait of the Ch'an priest Wu-chun 無準. Kyoto, Tōfukuji. K., color on silk. Inscription by Wu-chun, dated Chia-hsi mou-hsü (1238) chung hsia 嘉熙戊戌(夏). Kokka, 163; Waley, Introduction, p. 29; T. Kobayashi, Tōsō no jimbut-suga, pl. 10; CP III pl. 210; CP II List, p. 91. —Wu-chun was born about 1175 at Tzu-Tung 竹東 in Szechuan, home town of the bamboo painter Wen T'ung; at the time this portrait was painted, he held the position of abbot of the Ching-shan 禪山 monastery at Hang-chou, where he died in 1249. He was the teacher of Mu-ch'ü. His portrait he presented to an eminent visitor from Japan, Ben-en En-ni 艾尼, better known under his posthumous title, Shōichi Kokushi 聖一國師 (1202-1277), founder of the Tōfukuji, where the painting is still kept. To him Wu-chun's epigraph is dedicated, addressing him as Jih-pen Chiun-neng Erh chaung-lo 日本久能斡長老 "Reverend Erh from Chiun-neng (Kunō-zan, near Shizuoka), Japan."

1240—Mou I 朱益: Tao I T'ü 指衣圖 "Beating Clothes." Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., ink (pai-miao) on paper of an even brownish tone, in rather good condition. According to the painter's long colophon, the scroll was completed after two years' work in the year Chia-hsi keng-tzu (1240), liang yüeh chi wang 嘉熙庚子良月wig "on the 16th day of the 10th month," when he was 63 years of age. The picture illustrates a poem by Hsieh Hui-lien (394-430) describing the mood of women whose husbands are away at war and for whom they are preparing clothes. The text of that poem, which precedes the painter's inscription, was written by his friend Tung Shih 蒐史 (JMTTT, 1311.2), who received the scroll as a present. Following Mou I's colophon, Tung added four verses—paraphrasing certain expressions of the ancient poem in modern (i.e., Sung) language and different metre—quoted from Huang T'ing-chien, Su Tung-p'o, Wang An-shih, and Su-ma Kuang (?). For the remainder of the colophons, the reader is referred to KKSHL, ch. 4:66fl.; for records, cf. Ferguson's Index, fol. 87b. A detail is reproduced in CP III, pl. 312. KKSHL, 4:64-70; KK 300, 3:119; CP II List, p. 78 (no rating). —A short description of the scroll stressing its archaic character is
given by Sirén (CP II, text p. 128). Mou I himself (in the first of his two colophons) relates that he drew the figures of the women in Chou Fang’s manner, adding the setting; and that he, though short in thought, clumsy in brushwork, and inept in depicting the marvels of Hsieh’s poem, still would say that he caught at least a semblance. There seem to be no features to discredit either documentation or painting.

1241—1252—KUO HSI 郭熙: Kuan Shan Hsiao Hsing 關山曉行 “Travellers at Daybreak in the Mountains.” Peking, former National Museum (Ku-wu Ch’en-lich-so). H., ink and color on silk; without signature or seal of the painter. The scroll is ascribed to Kuo Hsi in the colophons, of which there are four: (1) Ch’iu Yüan 仇遠 (H. Shan-ts’un 山村), from the era Shun-yu 淳祐 (1241—1252), with his seal “Ch’ien-t’ang Ch’iu Yüan” (JMTTT, 24.4); (2) Chou Mi 周密 (1232—1308); (3) Ni Tsan (1301—1374); and (4) Wu K’uan 吳寬 (1435—1504; JMTTT, 328.3). A seal of K’o Chiu-ssu (1290—1343) at the end of the painting reads 柯九思鑒定真跡 “Examined and determined by K’o Chiu-ssu as a genuine work.” Sheng-ching KKSHL, 2:29; KWCLS, 5:5; CP II List, p. 58 (no rating). Unpublished.—While the descriptions of the scroll in the two Chinese catalogues contain nothing to discredit inscription and attribution, there is a disturbing datum in Sirén’s List, namely, the year of “Ch’ou Yüan’s” birth: 1261. If this figure is correct, the colophon date (1241—1252) is impossible. However, Ch’iu Yüan was a poet of renown during the Hsien-shun era (1265—1274; cf. Ssu-k’u t’i-yao, vol. 4, p. 3483), and therefore must have been born considerably earlier than 1261. The date of his colophon, omitted in Sirén’s List, need not be discarded as a terminus ante, whether the attribution be valid or not.

1242—HUI-TSUNG 徽宗: Four Bird Pictures. Hongkong, private collection. H., ink on paper. One of the pictures bears the emperor’s cipher with the square seal “yü shu,” the cipher written in a hardly convincing manner. All of them bear large numbers of seals such as Cheng-ho, Hsüan-ho Two Dragons, Shao-hsing, Ch’i-hsi ching-chih 紙熙敬止 (of Li-tsung, 1225—1264?); Ch’ang 長 (of Chia Ssu-tao, d. in 1276); the Ming palace seal, running transversely at the beginning of the scroll, showing the left half of the seal with the two characters Ssu-yin 司印; seals of the prince of Chin 睿, son of Hung-wu, enfeoffed in 1370; seals of Hsiang Yüan-pien (1525—1590); of Ch’ien-lung who, moreover, is represented with four inscriptions; and others. The date indicated above is that of a colophon written by Yü Sung 虞松 (JMTTT, 628.1) in Shun-yu erh nien sui tai jen-yin (1242) san yüeh ch’i jih 淳祐三年歲在壬寅三月七日. Recorded in Shih-ch’ü, ch. 14:17ff. CP III, pls. 235, 236; CP II List, p. 54 (cf. CP II, text, p. 83).—Except for the subject, the paintings have little in common with the polished form of such works as the Dove of 1107 (supra), the “Parakeet” in Boston, or the “Birds on a Wax-Tree” in the Palace Museum collection; they indeed appear to be from the hand of an amateur, as admitted by Sirén, but even so remain rather extraordinary in their want of sensitivity and harmonious design of the branches, which are drawn in a thin, dry, harsh and halting manner, not only unlike any Sung example but almost unlike anything Chinese. In his List, Sirén refers to an exact modern copy “offered for sale in America,” suggesting that the present scroll is the original. Ch’en Jen-t’ao (Ku-kung i-i, 37b) has an entry for the same two items: “There are two scrolls, one genuine, one spurious; one is in America, one in Hongkong,” without defining the case further.
1243 or 1303—WEN JIH-KUAN 温日宽: “Grapes.” Hongkong, S. M. Siu (Hsiao Shou-min 萧寿民) collection. K., ink on paper (?). The painter’s inscription runs: Kuei-mao (1243 or 1303) san yüeh, Jih-kuan lao tso 热卵三月日宽老作. At the right edge is a long inscription, dated T’ien-li erh nien (1330) meng hsia 天历二年孟夏 “fourth month,” and signed, if I read correctly, Kung Su 姜颐, a name that is recorded as a Yuan scholar’s and writer’s (JMTTT, 1804.4; Ssu-k’u t’i-yao, vol. 4: 3488; a colophon of his, dated 1317, in KKSHL, 1:52). The shorter hsing-shu inscription next to the first one is by Emperor Ch’ien-lung, several of whose seals can be recognized in the reproduction accessible to me. A small seal above the imperial inscription probably is “Shih-ch’ü pao-chi,” but there is no corresponding entry in the Shih-ch’ü catalogue (two titles listed in ch. 32:105ff. being handscreens rather than a colophon of his, dated 1317). Unrecorded? Not in the CP II List. S. M. Siu, Chung-kuo ku-hua-chi, vol. 1, pl. 11.—For the probability of the later date, see above (1228-Wen Jih-kuan). On the basis of the available reproduction, this painting would seem to merit consideration among the works attributed to the master, although the absence of a description in the Shih-ch’ü where it ought to be included is a flaw.

1244—CH’EN JUNG 陈容: “The Nine Dragons Scroll.” Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. H., ink on paper, with a few touches of a reddish color. Two inscriptions by the painter: A long one in verse at the end of the scroll, undated, and a short one at the beginning, written several years afterward and stating that the painting was made in the spring of the year chia-ch’en (1244) 甲辰之春. There is no signature proper, but the painter’s hao, So-weng 所翁, is inserted in the longer inscription and his seal “So-weng” is placed after it. A series of six colophons from the Yuan and early Ming period follows, the first, second, and sixth being dated in correspondence with 1306, 1331, and 1380, respectively. In addition, two inscriptions by Emperor Ch’ien-lung, and eight verses by eighteenth-century court officials. Recorded in Shih-ch’ü, ch’u-pien, 32: 82–86. Tomita’s Portfolio, pls. 127–135; CP III, pls. 356–359; Hsien-chi Tseng, in Archives, vol. 11, 1957, p. 168ff. (translations of inscriptions and colophons); CP II List, p. 44 (A).—The assumption that the date, 1244, was written down only some time after the scroll was completed is supported by the wording of the inscription itself, as pointed out by Tseng (loc. cit.).

1246—MA LIN 马麟: Ching T’ing Sung Feng 靜聽松風 “Quietly Listening to the Pine Wind.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. Large K., ink and color on a yellowish-brown silk that shows no signs of age. The painting bears a signature, ch’en Ma Lin hua 臣马麟畫, and the seal Ch’i-hsi-tien pao 素熙殿寳. The title of the picture is inscribed in the upper right corner, followed by two seals: Ping-wu 丙午 (taken to correspond to A.D. 1246) and yü shu 御書 “Imperial writing.” A seal of the early Ch’ing collector Sung Lo 宋荦 (1634–1713). Recorded in Shih-ch’ü, ch’u-pien, 17: 8. KKSHC, vol. 36; KKSHL, 5:92; CP II List, p. 73 (A?).—That the imperial inscription is from the hand of Ning-tsung (1195–1224), as asserted by the compilers of Shih-ch’ü, cannot be correct. If the year ping-wu is equated with 1186, Hsiao-tsung (1163–1189) would be the emperor, but in 1186 Ma Lin probably was not even born or in any case was too young; and, if equated with 1246, Li-tsung (1225–1264) was the emperor (cf. KKSHL). The authenticity of the Ch’i-hsi-tien seal, which fits Li-tsung’s reign, is questionable. My impression of this shallow and effeminate painting was that it dates from the Ming pe-
period. It does not even physically resemble Sung works.

1254—MA LIN 马麟: Hsi Yang T'U 夕陽圖 “Sunset.” Tokyo, Nezu Bijutsukan. K., ink and some color (purplish red in the sky) on silk of an even grayish-brown tone. In the lower right corner is a small signature, ch'en Ma Lin. A poem of 10 words in fairly large, bold, and severe characters is written in the high expanse of the sky:

山舍秋色近, 燕渡夕陽遙.

The mountains hold the colors of autumn nearing, The swallows fly across in the late evening sun.

To the left is a large square seal reading yü shu, “Imperial writing,” and two small seals indicating the cyclical year chia-yin 甲寅 (taken to correspond to A.D. 1254). A note between those seals says: t'zu Kung-chu 趙公主 “presented to the Princess.” Seizanso seishô, vol. 1, pl. 2; Kokka, 677; Sôgen meigashû, 23; CP III, pl. 294; CP II List, p. 73 (A).—Neither the painting, a marvel of terse economy and tidy elegance, nor the epigraphic evidence give any reason for doubting the Southern Sung origin of this work. The latest chia-yin year under the Sung corresponds to A.D. 1254, in Li-tsung’s reign (1225—1264), and the poem is considered to be in Li-tsung’s handwriting. It is the same hand, no doubt, we see in the inscription of 1255 (infra). Who was the unnamed princess mentioned? Presumably she was the emperor’s daughter, his only child, “The Princess” who came of age (15) in 1259 and died very young (at the age of 22). There was no need for another designation than “princess” when she was given the painting while still a child of 10. (Cf. Sung shih, ch. 248, last entry: Chou Han Kuo Kung-chu 周漢國公主.)

We must ask, however, whether the year chia-yin must not perhaps be equated with 1194 rather than 1254. If Ma Lin’s authorship is accepted, 1194 would be too early a date. Of this we can be certain by computing the likely years of his birth on the basis of those of his famous ancestors and their recorded “floruit” under the successive Sung reigns:

Great-great-grandfather Ma Fen b. 1080/90
Great-grandfather Ma Hsing-tsu b. 1105/15
Grandfather Ma Shih-jung b. 1130/40
Father Ma Yuan b. 1155/65
Son Ma Lin b. 1180/90

These years, with intervals of 25 years for each generation, seem the earliest possible, and they preclude such dates as 1186 and 1194 for the paintings here listed under 1246 and 1254. Sirén’s indication, “active about the middle of the thirteenth century,” would rather point to the years around 1200 for Ma Lin’s birth.

1255—MA LIN 马麟: Wan Feng Hsin Yu 晚風新雨 “Pavilion among Willows in a Rainstorm.” Osaka, City Art Museum, Abe collection. Album leaf, ink on silk. Signed: Ma Lin, the second character being contracted to a cipher. On a leaf of identical shape and size belonging with the painting is an inscription of a poem of 10 characters written by Emperor Li-tsung, in a style that agrees closely with his inscription of 1254 (infra). Similarly are affixed a small, gourd-shaped date seal, reading i-mao 乙卯 (1255), and a larger square seal of four characters, yü shu chih pao 御書之寶. Sôraikan, vol. 2:20 (8); W. Speiser, Ma Lin, fig. 4; CP II List, p. 70 (s.v. Ma Chao, as in Sôraikan).—The erroneous attribution of the small painting with its convincing signature to an unknown painter Ma Chao 马超, owing to a misinterpretation of the second character, was corrected by Speiser (loc. cit.). As a consequence, the inscription cannot be Ning-tsung’s (1195—1224) as assumed in Sôraikan and CP II, but must be Li-tsung’s (1225—1264), and this is supported by the signature of the painter (suggesting the
later date) as well as the handwriting of the poem.

1257—Anonymous painter: Ssu-ma Kuang Tu-lo-yüan T'u 司馬光樂園圖 “Ssu-ma Kuang's Garden of Solitary Enjoyment.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., ink on dark gray paper. No signature. A long colophon bears the date Pao-yu ting-su (1257) hsia wu 賓紳丁巳夏五. Recorded in Shi-h'i, his-pien; KKSIL, 4:86. Unpublished.—The painting, more remarkable for its subject matter than its pictorial qualities, represents the garden in Lo-yang where Ssu-ma Kuang (1019–1086) lived after his resignation in 1070, and where he completed his Ts'ao-chih t'ung-chien 賓治通鑑 in 1084. According to Tung Ch'i-ch'ang, quoted in Shi-h'i, a copy of this scroll was made by the sixteenth-century painter Ch'i Yung.

1257—CHAO MENG-CHIEN 趙孟堅: Ssu Hsiang 四維 “Four Fragrances” (Orchid, Daphne, Narcissus, Plum). Unknown collection. H., ink on paper. Dated and signed: Ting-su (1257) chung-tung wang-jih, Tzu-ku hua 丁巳中 (sic) 冬至日子畫 “fifteenth day of the eleventh month.” Under the signature are two seals of the painter, I-ch'ai 玉齋 and Tzu-ku hua yin 子畫印, and a small seal reading Yuan-lung 玉龍 (unidentified). At the beginning of the scroll is the large seal I ch'in-wang pao 怡親王寶 (the first Prince I, whose original name was Yün-hsiang 允祥, 1686–1730, was enfeoffed in 1723) at the upper edge; below, a smaller seal, Ming-shan-t'ang ch'en-ts'ang shu-hua yin-chi 明善堂珍藏 書畫印記 (name of the studio in Peking of the second Prince I, original name Hung-hsiao, d. 1778; cf. Eminent Chinese, p. 923, s.v. Yün-hsiang); lowermost, a still smaller seal, Wang-ch'ai shang-chien-kuo wu 王耆賞鑑過物. Ōmura, Chōgoku meiga-shū, vol. 1, pls. 81–83; CP II List, p. 41 (B).—Two versions of the same title, bearing the same date, signature, and seals of the artist but differing with regard to their colophons are recorded. One is listed in Shi-h'i, vol. 15:18, with a set of seven colophons, the first of which is dated 1316; the fourth, 1313; and the seventh, 1532. What appears to be an incomplete description of this item is listed in An Ch'i’s Ma-yüan hui-kuan (hsia, hsü, 72b). The second version, with the number of colophons swollen to no less than 22, is listed in Ta-kuan-lu (ch. 15:24); among the colophons are the first five of the first version, the fifth taking the fifteenth place after nine additional colophons preceding it, with seven additional ones following it, the last being dated “Hung-wu ting-yu” 洪武丁酉: a fictitious date, ting-yu corresponding to either 1357 or 1417, but to no year in that reign (1368–1398).

No colophons being reproduced or described in Chōgoku meiga-shū, the present version cannot definitely be identified with either of the above items. But a shadow of doubt will fall on it nonetheless, which, as Sirén’s unfavorable verdict also shows, is not removed by the quality of the painting as such. It may be yet another version of the “Fragrances.”

1260—MU-CH'I 牧谿: “Priest Chien-tzu 親子 Playing with a Shrimp.” Tokyo, Masuda collection. K., ink on paper. In addition to a seal, Mu-ch'i 牧谿, the painting bears an inscription said to be dated 1260 (CP II, text p. 139). Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 56; Kokka, 122; Tōyō, 9; CP III, pl. 334; CP II List, p. 79 (A).—The inscription is not dated; the relevant statement must be an error.

1265—LI KUNG-LIN 李公麟: Chi Jang T'u 擘壕圖 “Beating the Ground.” Peking, former National Museum (Ku-wu Ch'en-lien-so). H., ink (pai-miao) on paper. Without signature. At the end of the scroll is an imperial seal of the era Shao-sheng (1094–
1997) that ought to warrant an accordingly early date. The attribution to Li Kung-lin is made in the sixth of 11 colophons attached; signed by one Chang I-chieh 張以節, it is dated Ching-ting i-ch'ou (1265) 景定乙卯. The entire assemblage of 11 colophons existed by the time Ch'ien-lung added an inscription on the painting itself (in 1784), but I was unable to identify any of the writers with certainty. There appear to be no earlier records than those of Sheng-ching KKSHL, 2: 20; KWCLS, 5:7. Reproduction in CP III, pl. 194; CP II List, p. 60 (A).—Whether this painting, which glorifies the happy life of the people under the virtuous Emperor Yao, is by the hand of Li Kung-lin or an exercise in the Wu Tao-tzu style by an unknown painter who may have been a follower of Li Kung-lin, is an open question (CP II, text p. 43f.). It remains somewhat puzzling that the writers seem to be obscure; Chao Ch'ang 趙昌, of the second colophon, cannot well be the same as the famous painter from the beginning of the eleventh century; Yang Ying 楊英, of the fifth, cannot well be the Ming (Chia-ching) painter if the following inscription dates from 1265; and again, should Chü-p'o 菊坡, of the eighth colophon, be identified with the Shao-hsing era scholar, Ch'en Chü-jen 陳居仁, whose hao was Chü-p'o?

1265—MU-CH'I 牧溪: Hsieh Sheng Chüan 詢生眷 “Drawings from Life.” Taichung, Palace Museum collection. H., ink on paper. Represented are 21 kinds of flowers, fruits, and vegetables (peony, lotus, hibiscus, wild tea, pomegranate, pear, p'i-p'a, persimmon, radish, yu-ts'ai, bamboo shoots, lotus root, lotus pod, water chestnut, cockscob, chiao-pai grass, pumpkin, onion, muskmelon, white turnips, and carrots) and four groups of birds. At the end of this long scroll, there is the date Hsien-shun kai yuán (1265) 成淳改元 and the seal of the painter, Mu-ch'i 牧谿.

Three colophons: (1) By Hsiang Yüan-pien (1525–1590); (2) by Yüan-hsin 圓信, a priest of the Ching-shan monastery 徙山寺 where Mu-ch'i lived for some time; and (3) by Ch'a Shih-piao, dated 1693. The earliest seal, after Mu-ch'i’s own, is the half-seal ssu-yin 司印 of the Ming imperial collection, used between 1374 and 1384. Recorded in Shih-ch’ü, ch’iu-pien, 34:9. Nanking Exhibition, No. 31; mentioned by Lippe, in J.A.S., vol. 16, 1936, p. 140 (“1264”); KKSHL, ch. 4:37; KK 300, 3:120–123; CP II List, p. 78 (A).—The seal of Mu-ch‘i used on the present scroll differs from that which appears, e.g., on his “Chien-tzu with the Shrimp” (v. supra, 1260) or his “Arhat” of the Seikadō collection (CP III, pl. 335). A detail worth noticing is the rendition of lotus flower and leaf with grasses as a bouquet with a fillet wound about the stalks, reminiscent of a common motif in early Ming porcelain decoration (e.g., John A. Pope, Chinese porcelains from the Ardebil Shrine, pl. 30); though less ornamental than in porcelain designs, the fillet is quite unknown in older Sung still-lifes. Another feature of interest is the group of persimmons which are not unlike those of the famous picture of the Daitokuji, if smaller in size, more numerous, and less impressive in their arrangement; like the rest, they are executed in broad gray washes, without contours drawn.

Compared with the Mu-ch‘i paintings of similar motifs in Japanese collections, the present scroll shows more restraint, as though it were an earlier, less mature work. However, the date, A.D. 1265, does not permit one to consider this scroll as an early work of the master. Conceivably the scroll reproduces a series of single paintings or sketches, the originals of which are lost.

A shorter scroll with the same title but varying motifs in a Chinese private collection is partly reproduced in the Nanking Exhibition Cat., pl. 32 (not mentioned in CP II List).
1269—MU-CH'I 夏珪: “Tiger” and “Dragon.” Kyoto, Daitokuji. A pair of K., ink on silk. The “Tiger” picture is dated and signed: Hsien-shun chi-ssu (1269), Mu-ch’i 墨渾已手牧溪, while the seal “Mu-ch’i” is impressed on both paintings. Each of them is inscribed with a line of verse:

虎嘯而風烈．龍興而致雲．

The wind is fierce when the tiger screams.

The clouds assemble when the dragon soars.

Kokka, 190; Tōyō, 9; Harada, Nippon genzai, p. 57; CP II List, p. 79 (B).—If it is true that the “signatures and the date 1269 are later additions,” as noted by Sirén who considers an early Yuan date as probable (op. cit.), the pedigree of the collection of Ashikaga Yoshimitsu (1358–1408) warrants the two paintings to be no later than, rather to antedate, the fourteenth century. Thus, if they do not in fact date from A.D. 1269, the possible time interval for the inscriptions to have been added was a very brief one.

1277—HSIA KUEI 夏珪: Yüeh Ling Ch’i-shih-erh Hou 月令七十二候 “The Seventy-two Periods of the Yüeh Ling.” Peking, former National Museum (Ku-wu Ch’en-liehsu). Four albums containing 18 leaves each, ink and color on silk. A colophon written by Chou Mi 周密 (1232–1308) is dated as follows: Ching-yen erh nien (1277) ping-ssu (1276) hsia ssu yüeh 景炎二年丙子夏四月. Next in age is a colophon signed by one Chao Yu-jiang 趙以 السعود, dated Yüan-chen erh nien (1296) 元貞二年. Unpublished. KW/CLS, 4:1; CP II List, p. 51 (“attributed”).—The pictures illustrate the activities proper to the 72 five-day periods of the year as described in the Yüeh Ling, “The Monthly Commands” (Li Chi, Book 4; tr. Legge, S.B.E., vol. 27, 1885, 249–310). That Chou Mi’s colophon is marred by an incongruity between reign year and cyclical year is a disturbing feature; it cannot well be explained as a slip on the part of the learned collector and writer Chou Mi.

1284—Anonymous painter: Portrait of Po Chü-i 白居易. Hyōgo, K. Mutō 武藤金太 collection. K., ink and color on silk. A long eulogy is written in the space above the standing figure; it is signed Wu-hsüeh weng 無學翁 and dated (with a Japanese nengō) Kō-an ch’i nien liu yüeh shih-liu (1284, July 29).

弘安七年六月十六日, at the Tokugetsurō 徳月楼.

Kokka, 572; B.K., No. 138, 1944, p. 236, pls. 5, 6.—This superb, dignified portrait of the T’ang poet in pure Sung style is the oldest of his portraits known. Wu-hsüeh is the hao of Tsu-yüan 祖元 (1226–1286), a Chinese Zen priest who in 1279 (K. Mori, Nichi-Sō böeki no kenkyū, Tokyo, 1948, p. 566), the first year of the Yuan dynasty, came to Japan where he remained till his death, and is remembered as the founder of the Engakuji 圓覺寺 at Kamakura (1282). The Tokugetsurō, mentioned in the inscription, is a structure of the Kenchoji at Kamakura, the monastery where Tsu-yüan apparently still resided in 1284. It would seem most plausible to assume that the priest who, like Mu-ch’i and Shoichi Kokushi, had known the great Zen master Wu-chun (see 1238, supra) at Chingshan-ssu in his earlier years, had brought this painting with him when he left China; to assume that it is a Sung painting likely to have been in his possession for some time prior to the disturbances of the Mongol conquest and his departure for Japan. Rather than the year 1284, therefore, the year of his passage, 1279, ought to be taken as the actual terminus ante quem. The view taken (in Kokka and Bijutsu Kenkyū), viz, that the portrait was done by a Japanese painter who had mastered the Sung style, appears less convincing to me, and no less an expert than Kanō Yasunobu (1613–1685) had so little doubt about the Chinese
origin of this work that he ventured to attribute it to Chao Meng-fu.

INDEX OF DATES ARRANGED UNDER THE PAINTERS’ NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painter's Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chang Sheng-wen</td>
<td>1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Tse-tuan</td>
<td>1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Meng-chien</td>
<td>1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Ta-nien</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Tsung-han</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ao Yüeh-chih</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ên Chü-chung</td>
<td>1206/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ên Jung</td>
<td>1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Ts'ian</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'iao Chung-ch'ang</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien I</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Chi-ch'ang</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idem, and Lin T'ing-kuei</td>
<td>1178-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Wen-chü</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Jui</td>
<td>1228/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang Ch'un-nien</td>
<td>1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Huang</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Kan</td>
<td>1107, 1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Ch'eng</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Kuei</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiao Chao</td>
<td>1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsü Tao-nüng</td>
<td>1044, 1108, 1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu Kuei</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu Shen-ch'en</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang Ch'üan</td>
<td>1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui-tsung</td>
<td>1105-7, 1107, 1110, 1114, 1132, 1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao K'o-ming</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao Wen-chin</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku Hung-chung</td>
<td>1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuan T'ung</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuo Hsi</td>
<td>1079, 1072, 1078, 1241-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li An-chung</td>
<td>1117, 1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Kung-lin</td>
<td>1077, 1080, 1080, 1083, 1085, 1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Sung</td>
<td>1210, 1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li T'ang</td>
<td>1108, 1124, 1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Ti</td>
<td>1174, 1174, 1187, 1193, 1196-97, 1197, 1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lien Pu</td>
<td>1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Ch'ün</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu Sung-nien</td>
<td>1174-89, 1207, 1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Fen</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Ho-chih</td>
<td>1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Lin</td>
<td>1216, 1216, 1246, 1254, 1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Yüan</td>
<td>1141, 1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi Fei</td>
<td>1078, 1079, 1081, 1102, 1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi Yu-juen</td>
<td>1130, 1134, 1135, 1138, 1138, 1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yü I</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-ch'i</td>
<td>1265, 1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shih K'o</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Han-ch'en</td>
<td>1080, 1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Shih</td>
<td>1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Chih-wei</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T'ang Ch'eng-ch'ung</td>
<td>1061, 1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts'ui Po</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tung Yüan</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Ch'i-han</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Hsi-meng</td>
<td>1124, 1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Shen</td>
<td>1102, 1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Wei</td>
<td>1228/88, 1229/89, 1231/91, 1243/1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Jih-kuan</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen T'ung</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Ping</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Tung-ch'ing</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Yüan-yü</td>
<td>1114, 1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang Sheng</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yü Chung-wen</td>
<td>987, 1110, 1118, 1185, 1199, 1205, 1211, 1235, 1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDEX OF SEALS

(Post-Sung seals of importance included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal's Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chang-tsung (Chin)</td>
<td>1032 Huang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ang</td>
<td>1024 Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Meng-fu</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng-ho</td>
<td>1207, 1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-hsien-yüan yü-shu-yin</td>
<td>1107 Han Kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'i-hsi ching-chih</td>
<td>1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'i-hsi-tien pao</td>
<td>1061, 1113, 1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chien-yeh wen-fang</td>
<td>963, 1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien kua (trigram)</td>
<td>1245/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien-t'ang Ch'iu Yüan</td>
<td>1228/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chih-kuei-tzu</td>
<td>1174, 1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin-fu shu-hua chih yin</td>
<td>1174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin-kuo k'uei-chang</td>
<td>1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin-kuo seals</td>
<td>1138 Han Kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'i-ho chen-wan</td>
<td>1209/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chü-chung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'u-kuo Mi Fei</td>
<td>1004, 1138, 1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen-t'o-li-hua</td>
<td>1228/88, 1229/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiang Yuan-pien</td>
<td>1104 Su Shih, 1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiu-t'ang t'ou-shu chih yin</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsüan-ho</td>
<td>963, 1032 Huang, 1091, 1103, 1107 Han Huang, 1132, 1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'o Chiu-su</td>
<td>1095, 1241/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'ung Ch'in-wang</td>
<td>1138 Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuo Hsi pi</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Ch'i</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Ti yin-chang</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang Ch'ing-piao</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Fen</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi Fei chih yin</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-ch'ang</td>
<td>1072 Kuo Hsi 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-ch'ang yü-lan</td>
<td>1185 Hsü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming-shan-t'ang</td>
<td>1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-ch'i</td>
<td>1260, 1265, 1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan T'ang Hou-yüan-fu-shih yin-hsin</td>
<td>1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nei-fu shu-hua</td>
<td>1207 Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi-wan</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ping-tzu K'un-ning</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po-yen Pu-hua</td>
<td>1209/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shao-hsing</td>
<td>963, 1111, 1133, 1237, 1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shao-sheng</td>
<td>1265 Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shou ming-yü T'ien</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuang-lung (two dragons)</td>
<td>963, 1110 Hui-tsung, 1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-weng</td>
<td>1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-tao</td>
<td>1138 Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssu-ying (half seal)</td>
<td>1061, 1072, 1078 Mi Fei, 1124 Li T'ang, 1174 Li Ti 1, 1197 Li Ti 3, 1216 Ma Lin 1, 1242, 1265 Mu-ch'li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Superior figures indicate whether first or second entry of the same painter.

Sun Ch'eng-tse 1211
Sung-hsiueh-chai t'u-shu yin 1209/29
Sung Lo 1246
Ta-kuan 1084
Te-shou-tien pao 963
Te-shou-tien shu 1191
Tenzan 1107 Hui-tsung
T'ien-lai-ko 1094 Su Shih
Ts'ai Ching chen-wan 1191
Tzu-ku hua-yin 1257
Wang-chai shang-chien-kuo wu 1257, 1170
Wen Chia 1080
Yang-hsing chih yin 1216 Ma 1
Yen Chen-chih 1135
Yü Ch'i 1080
Yü-ch'ien chih yin 1174
Yü-fu pao-hui 1124 Tung
Yü-shu chih pao 1191, 1199, 1255
Yü-shu saepe
Yüan-hui hsi-tso 1130
Yüan-lung (unidentified) 1257
Yüeh-sheng 1124 Li

**INDEX OF INSCRIPTIONS AND COLOPHONS**

(Referring to the year under which the painting is listed. Inscriptions later than Sung are considered only when they bear on authenticity questions or when discussed in the text.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painter</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chang Ch'eng</td>
<td>1140, 1141 Ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Chu</td>
<td>1032 Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Ch'iao-fu</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang I-chieh</td>
<td>1265 Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Kuei-mou</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Sheng</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Chung-t'sang</td>
<td>1102 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Ling-chih</td>
<td>1132 Ch'ao, 1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Meng-chien</td>
<td>1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Ping-wen</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao Yu-jeng</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen Te-hsiu</td>
<td>1174/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Chang</td>
<td>1124 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Chi</td>
<td>1132 Ch'ao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'en Kuang</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'i-hsi-tien (Li-tsun)</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chia Hsin</td>
<td>1102 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiao Kuei-ch'eng</td>
<td>1132 Ch'ao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien-lung</td>
<td>1121, 1124 Wang, 1180 Chang, 1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ien Yüeh</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chih-li</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Yu-tzu</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'i Yuán</td>
<td>1241/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chönen</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Mi</td>
<td>1241/52, 1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Pi-ta</td>
<td>1185 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuang-sou</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chün-chai Sui-hsi</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Ch'eng-ta</td>
<td>1185 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Yü</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang Ts'ung-i</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiang Tzu-yen</td>
<td>1138 Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiang Yuan-pien</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiao-tsung</td>
<td>1185 Hsiü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu Shih-an</td>
<td>1124 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang T'ing-chien</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui-tsung</td>
<td>1091, 1103, 1107 Han Huang, 1107 Han Kan, 1107 Ho Ch'eng, 1108 Hsiü, 1114, 1124 Tung, 1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung Ching-lu</td>
<td>1185 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-shao</td>
<td>1178 Chou, 1178/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao Shih-ch'i</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kao-tsung (Sung)</td>
<td>963, 1079, 1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko Fu</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko Pi</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko T'an</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'o Chiu-ssu</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'un-ning jui-pi</td>
<td>See Yang Huang-hou (1216 Ma²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kung Su</td>
<td>1243/1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuo Yung</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lai-fu</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Hsiao-yen</td>
<td>1102 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li K'ü</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Mi-ta</td>
<td>1102 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li P'eng</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Shih-feng</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-tsung</td>
<td>1174, 1229, 1255; cf. 1145 (Ch'i-hsi-tien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Yü (hou-chu)</td>
<td>963, 1138 Han Kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Hsi-i</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu K'o-chuang</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Kuan</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Meng-chien</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Hsiang</td>
<td>1102 Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Yu</td>
<td>1032 Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi (unidentified)</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ARCHITECTURAL LANDSCAPES ATTRIBUTED TO
CHAO PO-CHÜ

THE STUDY OF ARCHITECTURAL PAINTINGS presents an obstacle encountered to a lesser degree in the study of landscapes. This obstacle is contingent neither upon a removal in time from the objects of study nor, necessarily, upon a lack of first-hand knowledge of the works of art. As an obstacle of formidable character it was appreciated by the Sung critic and connoisseur; it was succinctly but impressively defined in the eleventh century by Kuo Jo-hsiü, and no more precise expression of it would be possible today:

How could one paint buildings among trees, again, if he did not understand about "Han halls" and "Wu halls"; beams, columns and brackets; "crossed arms," cushion timbers, shu king-posts, and "camel's humps"; fang-heng, ke-tao, pao-chien, ang-timber ends, lo-hua, lo-man, an-chih, ch'0-mu, hu-sun timber ends, hu-p'o timbers, "tortoise-head" [building forms], hu-tso, "flying" eaves, "water-repelling" boards, po-fu, hua-fei, "hanging fish" and "stirring grass," tang-kou, "in-and-out" ridges, and so on? Few enough are the painters who have been able to give all this any detailed investigation; how much more so [is that true] in the case of the observers! 1

The study of architectural paintings, then, and in this case architectural landscapes (for this more precisely characterizes the nature of the paintings to be examined here), involves a technical consideration less often required by the study of those landscapes in which architecture is represented by nothing more than the thatch of a fisherman or the hut of the recluse tucked into a mountain recess, scarcely visible, and often more philosophically than architecturally suggestive. Architectural analysis, however, cannot be called upon to supersede critical judgment and aesthetic sense, for little enough is known about early building, and contemporary descriptive texts often pose difficult problems in technical interpretation. But Kuo Jo-hsiü reminds us of still another and even greater danger in attaching too much importance upon or faith in the architectural verisimilitude of a painting—that painters themselves, as well as observers, were likely to possess insufficient technical knowledge of the builder's art preceding their own. 2 Hence, while an understanding of the builder's art is requisite to the study of architectural landscapes, its importance must necessarily remain relative to other factors, be considered as an adjunct, as a check on the interpretation of historical and stylistic evidence. Except in rare cases—and these are mostly later paintings belonging to periods architecturally known from a body of existing monuments—the evidence offered by architecture itself is not sufficient to constitute the sole basis for an attribution.

Perhaps because of the additional obstacles attending the study of architectural landscapes they have received relatively small notice in the critical studies of Chinese painting by Westerners. It is a type of painting having less universal appeal than that of figure paint-


2 A statement attributed to the painter Ku K'ai-chih 顧愷之 perhaps reflects the assurance with which some painters approached architecture: "Terraces and pavilions are definite things. They are easier to execute." (Sakanishi Shio, The spirit of the brush, London, 1939, p. 79, from the Li-tai ming-hua chi 历代名畫記 [Records of famous paintings during the various generations], by Chang Yen-yüan 張奕遠.)
ing or purer landscape forms; it is more particularly Chinese in subject matter and accordingly has generally been more admired by Chinese critics and connoisseurs.

Our earliest evidences of monumental Chinese painting, the tomb reliefs and wall paintings of the Han dynasty, furnish abundant examples of architectural structures in painting. Not until the T’ang dynasty, however, does architecture as a particular category become clearly defined, both from the standpoint of subject matter and technique. The wall paintings of T’un-huang 敦煌 amply attest the continued importance of architectural structures in the painting of this period, but there are extant no incontrovertibly genuine architectural landscape compositions by known painters associated with the court at this time and the knowledge we possess of them is derived either from texts or from later copies in which particular archaisms suggest earliness.

The earliest reasonably reliable works in the architecture category belong to the Sung dynasty, and more especially to a briefer period of significant stylistic change in the mode of landscape art as a whole. Since the architectural landscapes of this period, the first half of the twelfth century, reflect the forms and techniques of the T’ang style from which they were derived but at the same time introduce new concepts, it is germane to the broader study of the architectural landscape to investigate with some care the paintings attributed to the most noted exponent of this style in the early Southern Sung period.

The biographical information concerning Chao Po-chü 趙伯駱 is stereotyped and may be passed over quickly. His birth and death dates are not precisely known, his period of greatest activity as a painter probably falling between 1130 and 1160. On the other hand, he is generally considered to have begun painting at the court of the Northern Sung at K’ai-feng 開封, which, if true, requires some adjustment in these figures owing to the fall of this city to the Chìn 金 Tartars in 1126 and Chao’s presumably somewhat earlier removal to the capital of the Southern Sung at Hang-chou 杭州. He was a descendant of the seventh generation in direct line from T’ai Tsu 太祖 (Chao K’uang-ying 趙匡胤), founder of the Sung dynasty. He is reputed to have been a favorite painter of the Emperor Kao Tsung 高宗 (r. 1127–62) and held an official post in the government. His ts’ai was Ch’ien-li 千里, a name he apparently applied to his paintings more sparingly than the later imitations would lead us to believe. He excelled in every branch of the art of painting.  


* Sickman, Art and architecture of China, p. 131.  

* His official title was “Che-tung ping-ma chien-hsia” 津東平馬鍾校 (Commanding Officer of the Army in East Zhiliang), a commission it is doubtful he often actively discharged.

* The significance of this name has been a matter of some speculation. Ferguson, Chinese painting, p. 20, assumes it reflects “the great extent of country depicted in his landscapes.” If such is the case, Chao Po-chü may have selected this name with reference to comparison between his pictures and those of earlier painters, for the “1000 li prospect” is not an uncommon title (Kuo Jo-ful, Experiences, p. 168, n. 475). The name, or in this case term, is also a common epithet signifying “kingdom,” or that which is all-encompassing (Ta hsüeh 大學 The great learning, iii.1, in James Legge, The four books, p. 317). An appealing if equally uncertain conjecture is that it is a pun deriving from the last character of his name, chü, which means “colt” and by inference, ch’ien-li chü thousand li colt, a strong, reliable man.
of painting; 7 architecture, “measured drawings” (chih-hua 界畫, see n. 10), figures, landscapes, flowers, birds, fruit, Taoist figures and fancies, portraits, reputedly having painted the portrait of the poet Su Tung-po 蘇東坡. Very little of this oeuvre remains and today reasonable attributions have been made in only two categories: architecture and landscape.

Most of the extant works attributed to Chao Po-chü are in the style of painting known as ch'ing li p'ai 菲青派, generally referred to by Western writers as the “blue and green” style, but he may have worked more or less extensively in other styles as well.* Tradition unanimously ascribes the introduction of this style to the T'ang dynasty painter Li Ssŭ-hsün 李思訓, and many of its special characteristics certainly were conventionalized during the T'ang, for the paintings of later periods done in this style clearly refer to T'ang styles and this tendency toward archaism is one of their most pronounced and enduring features.

Kuo Jo-hsü lists, besides Li Ssŭ-hsün and his equally renowned son (or nephew?) Li Chao-tao 李昭道, at least three other T'ang artists celebrated for their architectural landscapes and paintings of buildings, 8 and fully thirteen from the Five Dynasties period are known. 9 The colors employed were usually shih-lü 石綠, mineral green prepared from malachite (a carbonate of copper), and shih-ch'ing 石青, mineral blue prepared from azurite (another carbonate of copper), or sometimes from lapis-lazuli. 10 But even more

(p. 38), the monk Chu-an 楚安 (p. 38), Kuo Chung-shu 郭忠恕 (p. 44), Wang Shih-yüan 王士元 (p. 45), Tung Yüan 膳源 (p. 46), Meng Hsien 孟顯 (p. 53), Ch'en Shih-yüan 陳士元 (p. 53), Liang Chung-hsün 梁忠信 (p. 60), Chou Wen-ch'i 周文矩 (p. 101), Li Wen-ts'ai 李文才 (see p. 163, n. 499), Yen Wen-kuei 燕文貴 (see p. 172, n. 504). This list may be increased by the names Li Su-hui 李思訓, Li Lin-fu 李林甫 (Friedrich Hirth, Scraps from a collector’s notebook, Leiden, 1905, p. 75f.). Of the above painters Kuo Chung-shu is most notable for his paintings of architecture. A master of eccentric genius, the Hsüan-ho hua p'ü 宣和畫譜, viii, considered Kuo to be the sole master of this genre in Sung, his death having occurred after the beginning of this period (Kuo Jo-hsü, Experiences, p. 156, n. 421). “He painted pagodas and palaces set among the hills with an accuracy and minuteness that contrasted strangely with the wild lawlessness of his life.” (Shu-hua p'ü 書畫譜 lxxii, 19, in Waley, Introduction, p. 184). He is credited with the invention of chieh-hua, measured drawing or the “boundary style,” in which the straight lines are drawn with a plum-string or ruler. The term chieh-hua is the abbreviated form of chieh-ch'ih hua 界尺畫, boundary foot-rule drawing. This technique was not greatly appreciated by the Chinese critics: “A ruled brush makes a dead drawing.” (Li-tai ming-hua chi, ii.) The same source records Wu Tao-tzu's scorn of the method (Kuo Jo-hsü, Experiences, p. 122, n. 130). Of this technique Kuo Jo-hsü, ubi, p. 12, says: “Painters of the present day usually make use of the straightedge, and lay out the bracketing by ruled lines. The brushwork then becomes complicated, and fails to impart any idea of vigorous beauty or easy elegance.” Unfortunately there are probably no authentic works of Kuo Chung-shu remaining. The Abe Collection possesses an excellent painting attributed to him, but it is probably a later work imitating his style (Sōraikan kinshō 興麟館欣賞 [Collection of Chinese paintings of Abe Fusajirō], vol. 1, pt. 1, Ōsaka, 1930, pl. 9, Summer Palaces of the Emperor Ming Huang of T'ang.)

particularly marked in this style (for color itself does not distinguish it from others) is the use of thin gold lines outlining the shapes of mountains and highlighting textures and clefts in rock forms. It is not known at what date gold was first applied for this purpose, but most authors attribute its introduction to Li Ssü-hsün whose paintings are said to have been inspired by the work of the sixth-century painter Chan Tsü-ch'ien 展子虔. 12

**THE PAINTINGS**

Chao Po-chü was by no means an isolated phenomenon of his time any more than Li Ssü-hsün had been in the T'ang. Texts of the period contribute the names of several other painters who worked in the blue-green-gold style, 13 but the total number of remaining paintings in the architectural style attributed to these painters is hardly equal to the number passing under the name Chao Po-chü. Hence his oeuvre within this style assumes a relatively greater importance and affords ostensibly the broadest scope from which to study the architectural landscape of this period.

The Chao brothers are habitually cited by Southern School writers in warnings against the tiresomeness of minute detail, yet the distinguished Ming painter and critic Tung Ch'i-ch'ang 端其昌 (1555–1636) concedes to Chao a certain liberality of spirit which his successors lacked, 14 remarking that when Ch'iu Ying 仇英 (1522–60) painted processions he surely did not hear the sound of the kettle-drums and the horses' hoofs. 15 And at least one Western critic has considered that Chao’s “style of painting had, perhaps, a greater influence on later painters than that of any other artist of this dynasty.” 16

I am familiar with 34 paintings attributed with varying degrees of plausibility to Chao Po-chü, and do not doubt the existence of as Chou, lived ca. 1125-80. To a lesser degree at least three other painters worked with architectural subject matter: Ma Yuän 馬遠; Hsiao Chao 姚昭, used considerable color and many of the techniques and details of subject matter of the blue-green-gold style, but his work is not wholly within that tradition; Liu Sung-nien 劉松年, a somewhat younger contemporary of Chao Po-chü, he painted numerous pictures illustrating famous historical events, using light shades of color, but probably did little work in the true blue-green-gold style (Waley, *Introduction*, p. 205; Sickman, *Art and architecture of China*, p. 133 and pl. 101B). I do not include Li Lung-mien 李龍眠 in the above list, for though a number of architectural paintings are ascribed to his hand, they are undoubtedly works of a later period and their connection with this painter is somewhat problematical, e.g., see William Cohn, *Chinese painting*, London, 1948, pls. 62–63.


13 Chao Po-su 趙伯塵, brother of Chao Po-chü, noted especially for bird and flower paintings (Giles, *Pictorial art*, p. 140); Sirén, *Chinese painting*, vol. 2 (1956), “Annotated lists,” p. 42, credits him with only two extant paintings. Ferguson, *Chinese painting*, p. 125f., discusses another bearing the artist’s signature but no seals or inscriptions earlier than 1356. Chao Ta-heng 趙大亨, supposedly a servant to Chao Po-chü, reputed to have so closely imitated Chao Po-chü’s works that his paintings were often taken for the master’s work; apparently no surviving works. Wang Shen 王誥, active in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, his “romantic pictures of Fairyland painted in green, blue, and gold [were] hardly distinguishable... from the landscapes of the T’ang painter Li Ssü-hsün.” (Waley, *Introduction*, p. 178.) Chao Kan 趙幹, considerably earlier in the Sung; died in the year 978. Ma Ho-chih 馬和之, an almost exact contemporary of Chao Po-chü, lived ca. 1125-80. To a lesser degree at least three other painters worked with architectural subject matter: Ma Yuän 馬遠; Hsiao Chao 姚昭, used considerable color and many of the techniques and details of subject matter of the blue-green-gold style, but his work is not wholly within that tradition; Liu Sung-nien 劉松年, a somewhat younger contemporary of Chao Po-chü, he painted numerous pictures illustrating famous historical events, using light shades of color, but probably did little work in the true blue-green-gold style (Waley, *Introduction*, p. 205; Sickman, *Art and architecture of China*, p. 133 and pl. 101B). I do not include Li Lung-mien 李龍眠 in the above list, for though a number of architectural paintings are ascribed to his hand, they are undoubtedly works of a later period and their connection with this painter is somewhat problematical, e.g., see William Cohn, *Chinese painting*, London, 1948, pls. 62–63.


many more. It would be unreasonable to attempt to deal with all of them in a thorough manner. Nor would such a labor be in the least rewarding, for the vast majority of the attributions have been made on the basis of the artist's signature attached not only to later paintings carefully executed in what was presumed to have been his manner, but also to many paintings of inferior quality and workmanship, seemingly wholly outside the main body of his œuvre and manifestly of late date. The name Chao Po-chü is included in the list of painters whose works were extensively forged by the enterprising Ch’ın family of Soochow at the beginning of the Ch’ing dynasty, and it should not be surprising if a number of the relatively meritless paintings now thoughtlessly attributed to him are of this date.

The study of the paintings has been presented in the following manner: I have divided those works chosen for study into six basic classifications, primarily on the basis of compositional plan. In groups A through C the painting presented first I believe to be, if not always an authentic work, illustrative at least of a type of architectural landscape painted by Chao. These are followed by other works which exhibit the same general compositional form, but which are either obvious late imitations or works in such poor condition or about which so little is known that a definite conclusion has been deferred. This has seemed to me to be the most practicable form of presentation, for while there is a perceptible stylistic unity in the best of the works to be discussed, the more or less conventional nature of these landscapes so strongly reliant upon an already ancient tradition of architectural painting has by the Sung period produced an inevitable eclecticism so that the work of the best architectural landscapists from the Sung


on contain compositional and stylistic reference to multiple earlier and contemporary modes. In all, 20 pictures will be cited. The remaining ones are either of so little merit as not to warrant discussion, or they are paintings with highly questionable attributions which have not yet been published, or for which the details available would render impossible any but the most hazardous statements.

A. ENTRY OF THE FIRST EMPEROR OF THE HAN DYNASTY INTO KUAN-CHUNG (Pls. 1–3)

Description.—Handscroll, colors on silk, 11 3/4 inches high, 10 feet 3 1/2 inches long; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; signature of the painter and dedicatory inscription at the end of the painting: “ch’en Po-chü shang chin [your] servant, Po-chü, reverently offers”; the colors, now aged to a state of “softened splendor,” were once more brilli

19 A painting in the collection of C. P. Huang in Taipei, Palace Pavilions on a Terrace Rising above a River, has been seen by Osvald Sirén who considers it to be very close to the manner of Chao Po-chü, though perhaps not by his hand (Sirén, Chinese painting, vol. 2 [1956], “Annotated lists,” p. 42, twelfth painting, s.v. Chao Po-chü).
liant shades of azurite blue, malachite green, gold, red, white, yellow. Among the seals are those of the Emperor Kao Tsung and his successors; among the earlier inscriptions are a poem inscribed by the Yuan painter Ni Tsan 倪贛 for the owner of the painting Hsieh Ying-fang 謝應芳 on seeing the painting in the year 1344, and a verse inscribed by the fourteenth-century painter and critic K'o Chiussū 柯九思.21

Subject.—The historical narrative depicted in the scroll is complex and not in the least simplified by the manner in which the artist presented it. Within the scroll there is a polycyclic running together of events happening over a time span of two months, with a curious juncture at the great stone bridge in the center. The earlier events, those of Liu Pang’s 俐郎 entry into the city in 207 B.C., are shown beginning from the center and progressing toward the end of the scroll (pl. 2, fig. 2B), while the subsequent expulsion of Liu Pang by Hsiang Chi 黃籍, commanding the Northern Army of Ch’u, proceeds from the beginning of the scroll toward the center (pl. 2, fig. 2A), where Hsiang Chi encounters the rear guard of Liu Pang’s forces who turn to submit to him.22

Composition and style.—The historical subject matter of the painting and the narrative appear to be little more than a convenience for an extravagant landscape and as such the narrative elements have been spread over the entire expanse of the landscape, establishing vibrant and effective interrelations between the human and natural elements of the composition.23 The landscape itself is a continuous sea of motion, and the progressive interplay of alternate turbulent and quiet formations of foreground and background seems to be related to the narrative action; human activities and their natural setting exist in complementary relation one to the other, and the excited motion or the more subdued activity of the former appears to coalesce with these same qualities in nature. Hence, the scroll opens on grassy slopes where armies are peacefully encamped in a quiet grove of trees. Moving toward the center where the armies of Hsiang Chi pass over a causeway toward the palace walls, the mountains, turbulent, upward-thrusting masses of rock, seem themselves to be marching. Beyond the massive centrally placed bridge soaring towers and walls vie for prominence with slender vertical peaks. Moving into the palace ground we encounter the tranquil order of the royal gardens where nature, ordered to the more peaceable qualities of man’s nature, presents an ironic contrast to the scene of the submission of Tzu Ying 子婴, last representative of the House of Ch’in, to the triumphant Liu Pang entering the gardens at the head of his army. Finally, at the end of the scroll, behind a massive ridge of mountains that extends from top to bottom of the scroll, and encircled by mists which form a protective barrier against the preceding turbulence, is the palace of the emperor, and only in the banners of unseen soldiers which rise above the mists is there a suggestion that this isolated scene, too, is a part of the foregoing drama. The arrangement of these successive quiet and turbulent areas was certainly not a matter of chance, and the formal quietude of the palace garden effectively recalls the idyllic mountain meadows at the beginning of the scroll. Finally, there is a strong wind

tual observations blended into decorative design of bright green, red, white, and gold.” See also Cohn, Chinese painting, p. 72; Priest, Aspects, p. 45.
blowing the flags and banners; it is a wind opposed to the direction of the narrative, and as both mountains and men incline against this headwind, the irresistible surge of the armies is strongly enhanced.

There is no indication of selectivity in the matter of rich and minutely depicted detail. The artist has arranged a series of episodes into a vast panorama and crowded it with as many forms as it seemingly can hold. Realistic effects of depth and spatial relations are apparently of no concern, for middleground ridges surge into the foreground without apparent change in dimension (pl. 3, fig. 3): a soldier reclines in the foreground beside a flag scarcely equal to his height (pl. 1), but to his left and at the limit of the horizon soars a flag of an identical type which, as represented, is fully three times larger. Space and distance are created by device rather than by perceived relations; some of the more distant mountains are treated in the manner of smaller foreground rocks, and their removal in space is determined largely by their positions near the top of the scroll with nothing but sky above them. More effective are the openings in the foreground mountains providing us with broad expanses of more gently rolling mountains in which the precision of detail and modeling has been somewhat suppressed, and by which means their removal in space is realistically achieved.

Several aspects of this scroll deserve more detailed attention:

**Banners:** Completely concealed masses of soldiers, whose presence is revealed only by the banners they carry, here used so effectively as a device for enhancing the sense of depth and "conveying mass and movement by symbols and significant groups," is seemingly wholly of Chinese origin. The use of such banners is amply attested both in the wall paintings at Tun-huang, and in the landscape art of the T'ang, though the banners in these cases seem to be carried by clearly visible persons. This device or formula for representing unseen persons is also to be found in the paintings of Chao's contemporary Hsiao Chao. It remains as a part of the standard repertoire of details in architectural landscape painting throughout the succeeding dynasties, especially when the subject matter is of a historical nature. The banners used by Chao are carefully drawn and the types well differentiated. Much was still known at this time about the banners and flags of the Han dynasty, which were at least in part distinct from those used in T'ang. Whether Chao Po-chü has been authentic to the point of depicting only Han banners is impossible now to say, but it is probable that for the most part they reflect forms of contemporary usage.

**Figures:** The figures, especially those of the soldiers, are done with exceptional care, with minute attention having been directed toward the depiction of the weapons and

---


26 Kuo Jo-hsü, *Experiences*, p. 23, refers to a painting by Chao Te-ch'i of Prince Hsi-p'ing "with his ceremonial cortège of chariots and banners."

27 *T'ang wu-tai sung yüan ming-chi* 唐五代宋元名迹 (Famous remnants of the T'ang, Five Dynasties, Sung and Yuan), Shanghai, 1957, pls. 65–66, details of a long handscroll.

28 John C. Ferguson, *A survey of Chinese art*, Shanghai, 1939, pl. 171, the first Han emperor receiving homage, by the Ming painter Chang Meng-chin 昌夢晝; Alan H. Broderick, *An outline of Chinese painting*, London, 1949, pl. 4, a painting of inferior quality attributed to Ch'ü Ying but surely of Ch'ing date; Waley, *Introduction*, frontispiece, a late work in the supposed architectural landscape style of Li Sou-hsün.

29 On the concern for authenticity in the depiction of banners, see Kuo Jo-hsü, *Experiences*, p. 140, n. 296.
armor. They are marvelously expressive in
gesture; neither are the men suggestive of the
somewhat more stolid, even loggish and vacu-
ous figures associated with paintings in this
style from later periods, nor do the women
here appear in the vapid and wispy attitudes of
later court ladies drifting languidly about on
terraces and in pavilions.

Rock forms and trees: The pronounced
and persistent diagonal in the eruptive, dia-
strophié rock forms which strengthens the di-
rectional force of the narrative and gives a
sense of coordinated movement, suggests a
prototype in a T'ang landscape attributed to
Li Chao-tao, and the diagonally layered
summit of one mountain peak near the palace
wall suggests affinities with paintings attrib-
uted to the Five Dynasties painter Ching Hao
紫毫．The modeling of the undersides of
jutting cliffs is done in gold with a broken
zigzag stroke imparting to them a certain
rigid and architectural quality, while outer
surfaces are modeled in fine straight gold lines
connected to form obtuse angles, with the
addition of dark texture dabs at intervals
along their length.

Special note should be taken of the fan-
tastic water-worn rocks placed before a hall
on the lower margin near the end of the scroll
(pl. 3, fig. 4). From T'ang times on these
rocks are symbolic of the royal garden, and
they appear in nearly all of the paintings
attributed to Chao Po-chü, though both their
form and placement change greatly. As they
appear here, firmly implanted in the earth and
retaining still much of a rocklike nature, they
are well within the style of similar Sung forms.

Trees of several different varieties are
placed in accordance with the terrain: pines
in the mountains, flowering trees and willows in
the palace grounds, and finally a tall,
slender, stately species of cypress set orna-
mentally before the palace. The foliage both
of deciduous and evergreen forms has been
carefully rendered and in their tendency to-
ward more naturalistic grouping into groves
they are in keeping with Sung modes, though
their decorative function and careful distinc-
tive rendering, characteristic of trees in the
blue-green-gold style, tends to isolate each
from the other in a manner reminiscent of
T'ang. Somewhat unusual for Sung are the
tall cypresses of rather slender form with
trunks clearly visible through the foliage.
Though infinitely fuller and more natural than
the similar trees of the Yüan painter Huang
Kung-wang 黃公望, they are related in type
to his dry impressionistic forms. The pine
bough which dips down into the picture from
the upper border above the armies of Hsiang
Chi on the causeway is a device used to ad-
vantage by Ma Yüan and seems not to be
known earlier than late Sung.

Architecture: The excellence of architec-
tural detail in this scroll, and its decided im-
portance in determining the style and character
of Chao Po-chü's oeuvre, is perhaps justifica-
tion enough for entering into a somewhat
detailed discussion of architecture at this point.
Since a statement on architecture here will
pertain equally to the paintings to follow, I
shall endeavor to consolidate my findings on
this subject.

Our knowledge of Sung architecture is

28 Chao Po-chü was noted for his willows; Tung
Ch'i-ch'ang wrote that "Someone has said that each
must form his own school, but that is not right. Thus,
for example, the willow trees should be made after
Chao Po-chü, the pine trees after Ma Ho-chi and
the old trees after Li Ch'eng. These are traditional
and cannot be altered." (Osvald Sirén, The Chinese
on the art of painting, Peiping, 1936, p. 143.)
lamentably poor. Chinese architecture is an "architecture de circonstance, elle ne recherche pas l'éternel." The basic material has always been wood which lacks the permanence of masonry.

Many of the architectural forms of Sung were already in a developed stage by the late Chou dynasty; virtually all were presented by the middle of the T'ang dynasty. What differentiated Sung architecture from that of the immediately preceding periods is chiefly to be noted in the development of and changing emphasis in details of structural and decorative forms. There is no reason to believe, from an examination of the painting, that Chao Po-chü made a conscious effort to paint the architecture of the Han dynasty, but rather that he quite purposefully set his historical themes in an architectural milieu familiar to the court of his time. Nor can it be certain that had he wished he would have been able to paint buildings in the Han style, for to judge from the texts preserved, descriptions are vague and sometimes clouded by what is certainly reference to ideal order and form rather than to actual structures. If we may judge the difficulty a Sung artist would have encountered in recreating Han structures by the experience of Han Wu-ti who wished to reconstruct the Ming T'ang 明堂 of late Chou, or by that of the Wei 畿 Tartars endeavoring to discern from the ruins of Lo-yang 洛陽 the imperial architecture of the Eastern Han, in both cases an architecture closer in point of time, we may probably safely conclude that the task of recreating authentic Han architecture in the Sung would have been impossible. The clothing of earlier periods was certainly better known than the architecture, for detailed descriptions remain and the ceremonial significance of clothing, especially court attire, was enduring and well recorded.

Palaces and halls: The bracketing systems carefully depicted, with multiple cross-arms and delicate bearing blocks and double or triple sharply pointed, projecting ang-timber 昂 ends, and the intercolumnar reduplica-

Among other sources, the Li-tai ming-hua chi contains detailed commentaries on the clothing of early periods (Acker, T'ang and pre-T'ang texts, p. 170ff.). Kuo Jo-hsü also describes early fashions in clothing in some detail, Experiences, p. 13f.

The most important source for the architecture of the Sung is the Ying-tao fa-shih 建造法式 (Method of architecture), by Li Chieh 李誡 (t. Ming-chung 明仲). It was composed in the late eleventh century, presented to the throne in 1100, and published in 1103. This work is available in various reprints, the last being a handsome edition by the Commercial Press, Shanghai, 1925, 8 vols. It is certainly not wholly reliable as to decorative motifs as the plates of this edition often markedly differ from those of older works purporting to derive their material from this twelfth-century publication. The greater divergences from Sung patterns seem to lie with the 1925 edition. For commentaries on this and other Chinese architectural studies see W. Percival Yetts, A Chinese treatise on architecture, Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, vol. 4 (1927), pp. 473–492; idem, A note on the 'Ying-tao fa-shih,' ibid., vol. 5 (1930), pp. 855–860; idem, Writings on Chinese architecture, The Burlington Magazine, vol. 50 (1927), pp. 116–131; P. Demiéville, in Bulletin de l’École Francaise d’Extrême-Orient, vol. 25 (1925), pp. 213–264. The recently discovered Sung tombs at Pai-sha in Honan with their rich painted architectural ornamentation constitute an excellently preserved source for this period (Su Pai 玉, ed. Pai-sha Sung-mu 白沙宋墓 [Sung dynasty tombs at Pai-sha], Peking, Cultural Objects Press, 1957).

Sung ang-timber ends are single, double, or triple (Ying-tao fa-shih, 1925, v. 30.6b). The general Sung mode is to carve the end into an acute angle, a form known as well from T'ang, but the angle is less acute.
tion at equal short intervals of a bracketing complex identical to the column-top systems, are clearly no older than Sung.

As a general rule in T’ang paintings of architecture, the bracketing rests on the column-tops only, and the outer eaves are set in on a straight line. In modern paintings, first of all there are changes in the shape of the roof outline, and the upward curvature is pronounced. In addition, a column-top beam is introduced, and there are supplementary bracketing units (between) the column heads.

The rather sharply upturned eaves suggest the southern development of this form under the Sung, for the eaves of northern buildings, even in the later dynasties, tend to emphasize this feature less strongly. Great breadth of roof, a fashion recorded in the literature of the late Chou, seems to have remained the style through the Sung, judging from the more unequivocally Sung architectural drawings. In a like manner, roof ornaments seem to have enjoyed an earlier vogue in the south while northern buildings even in the later periods had a tendency to be relatively free of décor. But this varies much according to building and intended function. The use of acroteria at the ridge peaks is attested from the Han on, but the form in which they appear here (open-jawed dragon heads) is that of Five Dynasties and Sung. The ornaments along the sloping ridges to the four corners are likewise attested from the Han. In later periods their form tends to become larger and considerably more ornate than those visible in this scroll, which seem altogether in keeping with what is known of the Sung modes. The platform upon

40 Soper, op. cit., p. 262. Increased delicacy and closer spacing point to later Sung (Soper, op. cit., p. 273; Ying-tao fa-shih, v. 30.19a et seq., vi. 31-3a et seq.). The change from the round eaves purlin to a beam of rectangular cross section and the introduction of a column-top beam replacing the structural significance of the ang-timber facilitated the attaching of the less structural bracketing, the heavier weight of the roof bearing on a beam farther up (Alexander Soper, Hsiang-kuo-ssu, an imperial temple of Northern Sung, Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 68 [1948], p. 32; Sirén, Kinbas Konst, vol. 2 [Stockholm, 1943], p. 35, figs. 3-4, illustrating T’ang to Sung purlin and bracketing changes). These changes, more widespread toward the later Sung, become increasingly evident in the decorative development of essentially vestigial structural members.


42 Curved roofs probably appear about A.D. 500 (Yetts, Burlington Magazine, vol. 50, p. 131). They seem to develop first in southern or south-central China during the T’ang dynasty and were probably not apparent in northern buildings earlier than the Sung (Soper, Art and Architecture of China, p. 256).


44 Ibid., p. 220.

45 Acroteria in the shape of fish or dragon heads are applied to the roofs as protection against fire and calamity (Sirén, Architecture, p. 21). The earliest known form is that of a fish with its tail curving upward and angling sharply inward; later, but probably not earlier than the Five Dynasties, the fish may be replaced by an open-jawed dragon swallowing the roof ridge (Soper, op. cit., p. 254, after Liang Ssū-ch’eng). In the Ming and Ch’ing dynasties the acroterion curves outward (Soper, op. cit., p. 253), though this feature is possibly attested under the Liao (Soper, ibid., p. 276).

46 The magical function of these figures is apparently similar to that of the acroterion and carved water grasses placed in the ridge peaks—that of protection against fire. These figures may be observed on the roofs of structures in the Tun-huang wall paintings (Sirén, Chinese paintings, vol. 3 [1956], pl. 61); idem, Kinbas Konst, vol. 2, fig. 242 and pl. 45, on the roof of a small pavilion in a fan painting attributed to Wang Ch’i-han 王齊翰, but it is possibly of Sung date and not Five Dynasties as attributed). In the Ming dynasty these figures appear, somewhat incongruously, together with ornate and complicated roof-ridge decorations, on smaller pavilions and mountain keeps (Sirén, Kinbas Konst, vol. 2, pl. 103, Chou Wen-ch’ing 周文靖). Earlier, at least in painting, such ornamentation is more generally reserved for monumental building, though Marco Polo, ii.76, in speaking of the city of Hang-ch’ou remarks: “Their
which the palace is built, and the short flight
of stairs leading to the main hall complete
the details of this structure, all of which are
apparently in the accepted style of Sung.

Walls and gates: The walls, towers, and
vaulted gates represented in this scroll permit
more indefinite conclusions. The wall towers,
slender and with emphasis, exaggeration even,
on verticality, are conceived with a forceful
awareness of the Sung ideal in gate architec-
ture. The massive outer wall appears to be
constructed of stone masonry to about two-
thirds of its height, with mud, or brick coated
with plaster, painted red, making up the ad-
tional height. Along the crest of the wall
are battlements colored white. Walls of sub-
stantially this type are recorded from the Yuan
and Ming dynasties, and sources, though not
unanimous, tend to deny the possibility of such
fortifications having been built earlier than the Yuan. The masonry of the lower portion,
houses are well built and richly adorned with carved
work. So much do they delight in ornaments of this
kind that the sums they lavish on such objects
are enormous.” The Ying-tao fa-shih, in mentioning
numerous classifications and forms of wood-sculptured
and terracotta architectural ornamentation, describes
those to be employed along roof ridges as dragons,
lions, winged horses, hippocamps, flying fish, and others
(Demiéville, op. cit., p. 257).

47 This type of recessed stair in Ying-tao fa-shih, v.
29-9a.
48 Soper, Journal of the American Oriental So-
ciety, vol. 68 (1948), pp. 28 and 32: “A general
aesthetic impulse of the Sung age is evident in its
exaggeration of gateway and pavilion heights.”
49 Concerning the Mongol city of Taidu built near
Peking, Marco Polo, ii.11, stated that “it is enclosed
by walls of earth . . . In all parts the battlements
are white.” The prevailing color of Chinese walls is
red and it was thus on the Tartar walls of Peking,
though now largely obliterated by weather and age
(Osvárd Sírén, The walls and gates of Peking, Lon-
don, 1924, p. 139).
50 “Most probably bricks were not used in the
city [Peking] until the Ming dynasty” (Sírén, Walls
and gates, p. 40). The Shun-t'ien-fu chih 順天府志
however, may be only a stone facing over a
rammed-earth core and represent no essential
advance over Han dynasty wall construction.

Information concerning the brick tunnel
vaults is far less specific. Such vaults are often
mentioned in connection with the gates in the
Tartar wall at Peking, but statements regarding
the origin of this form are rare and con-
flicting, some authors steadfastly maintaining
that brick vaulting in such structures cannot
be earlier than the Ming, or the Yuan at the
earliest, while others, less certain, leave the
question open. What is certain is that skilled
(Gazetteer of the Prefecture of Peking), first edited
in 1593, in describing the Ming walls of Peking com-
pleted about 1450, states that "the walls are of stone
below and with brick above." (Sirén, op. cit., p. 44.)
Stone construction in city walls serves primarily as
a foundation and seldom rises more than a few
feet above the ground level. Demiéville, op. cit., p. 245,
lists known walls in stone and brick; none in present
form is earlier than Ming. The Ying-tao fa-shih,
under rules for building with stone (shih tso chih tu
石作制度), does not mention its use in wall con-
struction, and under rules for construction of large
walls (ch'eng 城) speaks only of earth (Demiéville,
p. 239). See also, Harada Yoshito, et al., Shang-tu,
the summer capital of the Yuan dynasty in Dolon
2 (Tokyo, 1941), pl. 14, inner city wall preserved
to a height of 10 to 15 feet and retaining a brick
facing to this height.

51 Soper, Art and architecture of China, p. 219.
52 The question, of course, is not that of the first
use of brick in vaulting (for the principle is well
attested in Han tomb construction), but of its use in
gate architecture. In general, tunnel vaults seem not
to have been built before the invasion of the Mongols.
They might, however, if Tartar in origin, have come
with the Liao 陝 in the tenth century, and hence
would not be anachronistic in Lin-an of Southern
Sung times. But though Brestschneider and others
have successfully traced the lines of the walls of the
Liao city of Peking and identified eight gates, their
work being based largely on information contained in
the Shun-t'ien-fu chih, nothing about the shape of the
gates or their construction is reported (Sirén, Walls
and gates, p. 16f.). The same Chinese source is even
more specific regarding the Chin Tartar walls erected
construction in brick was not unknown in Sung times and while the Ying-tsaö fa-shih recommends stone and brick be used for foundations and paving only, the stone and brick pagodas remaining from the Sung and earlier periods amply testify to a more sophisticated structural use.

For want of large detail photographs covering the portion of the scroll in which the walls and gates appear, certain details of their construction must be surmised. While the paucity of positive information concerning such constructions under the Sung would make it risky to deny the existence of constructions of this type as early as Sung, these elements necessarily remain a matter of some concern in the final attribution of this painting.

**Bridges:** The monumentally conceived bridge in the center of the scroll appears to be of the variety constructed of stone pillars across which long beams of cut stone are laid, and presents no particular problems as a type certainly known and employed in the Sung dynasty. As a matter of fact, it represents a type which was probably somewhat archaic in conception, for at a much earlier date exceedingly elegant bridges were laid over broad and gently curved arches of stone, a fact which in itself testifies to the skill with which the Chinese of T'ang and even pre-T'ang times used brick and stone and the principle of the arch.

The small bridge near the beginning of the scroll, quite indistinct behind the boughs of a willow and approached by a soldier carrying wooden containers to be filled with water, is of a type known from countless Sung landscape paintings, the rickety, whopperjawed bridges raised on slim poles all aslant, so seemingly devoid of engineering and so tenaciously durable.

If architecture is taken as a criterion for the date of this painting, then we are obliged to concede that it might as easily be of Yüan as of Sung age. But as I endeavored to point out at the beginning, the emphasis to be placed upon architectural verisimilitude within paint-

64 A bridge of stone beams spans the Chiu-lung River west of Amoy and in its present form dates essentially from the thirteenth century (Sirén, *Architecture*, p. 220 and pl. 99). In form it is clearly related to the bridge, constructed of timbers, depicted on a pottery tile from Cheng-tu, Szechuan, dating from the Later Han (*Chung-kuo chien-chu* 中國建築 [Chinese architecture], Peking, 1957, pl. 8). 65 Masonry bridge in southern Hopei, ca. A.D. 600 (*Chung-kuo chien-chu*, pl. 26; Sirén, *Kinas Konst*, vol. 2, p. 51).
Figs. 2A and 2B—Entry of the First Emperor of the Han Dynasty into Kuan-chung.

(Courtesy of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.)
Figs. 3 and 4.—Detail, Entry of the First Emperor of the Han Dynasty into Kuan-chung.
(Courtesy of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.)
Figs. 5 and 6.—Detail, Palaces of Ch'în.
(Gift of Mrs. Louis Friedlander, 1938. Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.)
Fig. 8.—A Ke. PALACE MUSEUM COLLECTION, FORMOSA.
(After Harada, The pageant of Chinese painting, Tokyo, 1936, pl. 106.)

Fig. 7.—Portions of the Han Palace. PALACE MUSEUM COLLECTION, FORMOSA.
Fig. 9.—Palaces of the Immortals. Yūrinkan, Kyoto.
(After Harada, The pageant of Chinese painting.
Tōkyō, 1936, pl. 107.)

Fig. 10.—Detail, Rocky Mountains along a River in Autumn. Hui-hua-Kuan, Peking.
Fig. 11.—Palaces and Pavilions among the Mountains.
(Courtesy of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.)
Figs. 12 and 13.—Detail, Spring Morning at the Palaces of Han.
(Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1947.)
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Ings must be at all times relative to other factors. The architecture of the palace and halls is not at all in the style of architectural paintings known to be of Yüan date, and a Ming date is completely impossible except for the main wall. The fact that no Sung monumental walls of this type are extant in no way challenges the Sung character of the painting as a whole.

Alexander Soper writes that "the masters of that genre [architectural painting] had reached their greatest successes in early Sung, when their work might pass an architect's inspection." But he illustrates his statement with a Yüan architectural painting! The architectural forms in the Boston scroll have been executed in a rather dry, hard, but swift and precise line hardly comparable to the meticulous, scrupulous line of Yüan architectural painting, and the relatively greater suppression of minor architectural details further separates this scroll from Yüan paintings. Unless one accepts the architectural paintings of Li Lung-mien as genuine Sung works (see n. 13), there are relatively few points of comparison between the more weightless and "easy" forms of Sung and the calculated precision and extravagant detail of Yüan.

There seems to be no compelling reason to doubt the authenticity of this painting. The signature and inscription at the end are of a type known from other Sung paintings and are distinctly different from those which appear on the more obvious late imitations. And we are encouraged to place a higher credence in the seals and inscriptions on the painting,

lacking, as it seems, the impressive display of Ch’ing imperial seals so common on later works attributed to Chao and so often ostentatiously applied by the dealers in copies and forgeries.

The details of the landscape for the most part bespeak a date in the later Sung, and the strong sense of internal unity, the relatively harmonious juxtaposition of architecture with dense and superbly executed natural forms is of a type never encountered in later periods when the emphasis is more self-consciously directed toward the conceptual depiction of a romantic world of pleasure palaces and pavilions.

THE PALACES OF CH’IN (Pl. 4, figs. 5 and 6)

Description.—Badly faded and worn handscroll, in colors on silk, 7 feet 11½ inches long by 11½ inches high, in the Metropolitan Museum of Art; apparently unsigned, source of the attribution to Chao Po-chü is unknown to me.

Inscription.—A long poem by Tu Mu (803–852) entitled "Palaces of Ch’in" admonishing the wasteful expenditures of the Ch’in emperor which contributed strongly to the downfall of the dynasty, and hence the suggestion by Priest that it is perhaps an admonitory painting; poem supposedly written onto the painting by Wang Ts’eng (934–1038), an outstanding Sung statesman.

58 The entire scroll has not, to my knowledge, been published. See details in Dagny Carter, Four thousand years of China’s art, New York, 1948, p. 222; Priest, Aspects, p. 80; idem, Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, vol. 34 (1939), p. 279.

59 Priest, Aspects, p. 81f. Late Chou sources are filled with the theme of “the political unwisdom of extravagant building,” an admonition which evidently had little influence upon the architectural schemes of the Ch’in emperor; hence this painting reflects an ancient theme (Soper, Art and architecture of China, p. 208f.).
Subject.—Presumably a representation of the extraordinary palaces and pavilions erected by the Ch’iin emperor about 212 B.C. and called the A-fang-kung 阿房宮, set in a mountain landscape.

Composition and style.—In one sense the composition of this scroll is analogous to that of the preceding: here it is the seemingly endless architecture of a rambling palace complex which takes the place of the narrative subject, halls and pavilions winding in serpentine manner over a mountainous terrain, emerging in the valleys and disappearing behind low hills. But the dramatic qualities of movement in the Boston scroll are here lacking, and the powerful, almost empathetic relation of the active natural forms with the human and architectural subjects in the Boston scroll is here entirely suppressed in a more consciously formalized compositional scheme. The landscape elements are clearly in some more archaic style, with tall parallel vertical fold lines in the mountains and a poverty of inventiveness in the shapes less commonly encountered in the Sung. The sere trees with simple, dark, manneristically patterned, contorted forms, together with the archaic rock forms, suggest a strong relation to the style associated with the late sixth-century painter Chan Tzü-ch’ien.61

There is no sense of a limitless panorama. The upper border is crowded with cutoff mountain peaks and leafless trees, and the rocks scattered along the lower border and serving as a partial frame to the composition do not suggest a landscape continuing beyond the limits of the picture.

The architectural forms do not at all correspond to what we understand of Sung archi-

60 For a brief description of this palace, see Soper, op. cit., p. 216.

tecture. Roofs are of many colors,62 a single building sometimes having a roof done in two or more shades. Roof ornaments are totally absent, and for the most part the caves are straight, a few roofs only having slight and subtle curves not unlike those believed to have been in fashion in central China during the T’ang. The buildings have little feeling for real form; in general they are simply skimpy and flimsy roofs set on thin poles, or they are blocklike structures of toylike proportions. Here and there among the halls of the palace are gardens in which stiff and slender personages of ghostly demeanor stand motionless, intensifying the already spectral nature of the landscape. But there is little room for doubt that these are imperial gardens, for we see again the fantastic water-worn rocks and the banana (pl. 4, fig. 6), both unmistakable symbols of the royal garden.

It is impossible to suggest a definite chronological position for this picture owing partly to its deteriorated condition and partly to the fact that I have not seen the entire scroll. The landscape suggests a date considerably earlier than Sung; the architectural forms seem to be without parallel. Alan Priest, the only author who has written on this painting, makes no claim of authenticity for it, but believes that it is “surely of the Sung dynasty.”63 Such thoroughgoing archaism of a landscape during the Sung, especially the later Sung to which it is presently ascribed, would bespeak a triumph of antiquarian concern over artistic temperament and aesthetic penchants we have no reason as yet to assume existed at that time. The close agreement of this painting with T’ang landscapes requires that it be placed much earlier, and a date as early as the eighth, possibly even the seventh, century is conceivable.

62 Priest, Aspects, p. 79.
B. Pavilions of the Han Palaces (Pl. 5, fig. 7)\textsuperscript{64}

\textit{Description}.—Fan-shaped painting in colors on silk, diameter 10 inches, Palace Museum Collection, Formosa; unsigned, attribution made by Tung Chi-ch'\-\'ang; possibly cut from a larger scroll (unusual would be such fragmentary architectural elements), but central subject probably preserved. There are 14 seals on, or partly on, the painting itself, some very faded; those legible are of Ch'ien-lung (4 seals) and Keng Chao-chung 耿昭忠, early Ch'ing dynasty collector and official (7 seals). Six other seals of late date are on the mounting.\textsuperscript{65}

\textit{Subject}.—A main pavilion amidst the lush vegetation of the palace gardens before which a procession of court ladies passes; at the left a balcony of another hall towering above the trees; in the distance a landscape of mountains and sheer escarpments.

\textit{Composition and style}.—We are immediately impressed by the enormous quantity of solid matter the artist has been able felicitously to concentrate in so small a surface area: "lofty palace halls, a procession of court beauties, bullock carts and attendants, a luxurious garden, and a background of distant hills."\textsuperscript{66}

The sense of real depth again is rudimentary, conceptual rather than perceived. The flat façade of the main hall and the garden lane, which rises steeply on the left but does not penetrate the distance, both tend rather more strongly to emphasize the focal points of activity in the foreground, and the foreground and background are not clearly connected.

The architecture, particularly that of the principal hall, is loosely done with a soft, free-hand quality of imprecision to the line. It is clearly not the chieh-hua line of Yüan structures. In general aspect it is less studied than the architecture of the Boston scroll, but achieves an analogous relationship with the somewhat less formalistic aspect of the landscape. The form of the buildings appears to be well within the scope of late Sung architectural achievement. Bracketing units so closely set that the edges of each connect, or nearly connect, with those of the brackets at either side is a feature associated with later Sung developments of this form (see n. 40). In this painting a single bracketing style pertains throughout while in the Boston scroll there are also brackets with wider spaces between the units.

The human figures, though less colorfully attired than in the Boston scroll, are none-the-less executed with superb refinement and feeling. The precise but seemingly casual groupings of personages in the immediate foreground suggest the relaxed dignity of the imperial gardens, while the elegant and gliding movement of the procession imparts a stately grandeur to the entire composition.

The background mountains, bold in plan rather than in execution, with straight outlines and obtuse angles and surfaces devoid of modeling, suggest the later Sung development of mountain shapes originating in the T'ang period. The severity of the straight lines is softened by shading so that the somewhat diffuse line of the mountains harmonizes with the drawing of the architecture where a similar soft quality of line is apparent.

Natural forms are here far less active than in the Boston scroll but are in keeping with the less dramatic nature of the subject. Nature appears as a tangled mass only because of the


\textsuperscript{65} Reproduced in \textit{Ku-kung}, vol. 3.

\textsuperscript{66} Sickman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 131. The monk Ch'u-an is reputed to have worked at least three months in executing an architectural landscape on a fan (Kuo Jo-hsü, \textit{Experiences}, p. 152, n. 395).
compression of at least six varieties of trees into so small a space and is actually somewhat better organized than it at first seems. And the distinct character of the various species and foliages is scrupulously maintained and almost fastidiously executed. The banana trees beside the main hall are not significant of either date or locale. The banana tree was known to northern China by the third century after Christ and it is highly possible that the Emperor Hui Tsung had banana plants brought to his menagerie at K’ai-feng. They are known to have existed in the gardens of the Southern Sung capital at Hang-chou. The banana tree appears as a subject for painting studies as early as the T’ang, and is an increasingly common subject during the Sung and later periods. Its chief significance lies in its symbolic value, for it speaks eloquently of the evanescent springtime of the royal garden so often the subject of the architectural landscape.

The painting as a whole is rather more restricted in subject than in suggestive detail; the complexity of design and the detailed and decorative character of the architectural and natural forms do not disrupt or unbalance the deeper concern for the landscape. And this is perhaps more certainly a landscape than an architectural painting, a landscape in which the influence of the Southern Sung painters has not been superficially adopted to a paint-

68 Sickman, op. cit., p. 127f. At the emperor’s order the Prime Minister Ts’ai Ch’ing 蔡京 and the eunuch T’ung Kuan 黃賔 assembled in K’ai-feng a large collection of rare stones, plants, birds, animals, and archaeological objects.
69 Sickman, op. cit., p. 130.

ing of conservative form, but thoroughly absorbed in a new and distinctive mode. Buildings are no longer set upon or among landscape elements, but are themselves a part of the landscape, and if some of the architectural precision has been sacrificed, this is compensated for by the relative simplicity and scrupulous integrity with which they are depicted within a unified composition.

The authenticity of this painting as a work belonging to the later Sung cannot easily be countermanded. The attribution to Chao Po-chü must necessarily remain more tentative, although it was made by the astute connoisseur of painting Tung Ch’i-ch’ang. Sirén accepts this painting as the only unequivocally authentic attribution to Chao Po-chü, and while it is evident that this painting approaches known Sung styles more closely than does the Boston scroll, Sirén has perhaps overemphasized the differences between them. The size and subject matter of the Boston scroll render it more liable to archaic reference (a style in which Chao was certainly proficient), and the somewhat more dry and precise line has perhaps been emphasized for the sake of the archaistic aspects of the painting. The difference in style and technique between the two pictures is perhaps not beyond the abilities of a painter working in the period of full stylistic transition in which Chao Po-chü lived.

There are a great number of paintings with similar subject matter, that of imperial pavilions set in a narrowly defined landscape, but most have not been published or have

71 Sirén, ibid., p. 42.
72 Listening by the Fountain, unsigned, attributed (John C. Ferguson, Special exhibition of Chinese paintings from the collection of the museum, New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1914, p. 49, small album leaf in an album of 16 paintings by several artists); two small paintings (8.7 inches by 9.5 inches and 9.4 inches by 13.4 inches) in the Musée Guimet under the title Landscape, both signed
been published in books now difficult to obtain. Possibly identical with one of the two paintings in the Musée Guimet (n. 72) is a small landscape presented to this museum by the Empress Tz'u-hsi, depicting pavilions of a palace at the foot of a cliff beside a lake. It bears the signature of Chao Po-chü (Ch'ien-li). In compositional plan and in style it relates to a Sung style prominent somewhat later than Chao, but it is clearly a later re-interpretation of this style and, except for its poorer quality, resembles similar paintings by

"Ch'ien-li," album leaves formerly in the collection of Tung Chi-ch'ang. On one of them Tung has written the following commentary: "Po-chü is the most renowned of the three Chao (Po-chü, Ta-nien, Meng-fu). This painting in an archaic mode has much character. It is by that we know the better painters are distinguished. This picture is very well done and Chao Ch'ien-li has the merit of furnishing inspiration to the contemporary painter Chou Shih and others. Examined and written the third month of the year Yi-mao [乙卯 1615]." (Tchang Yitzhou and J. Hackin, La peinture chinoise au Musée Guimet, Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Art, vol. 4 [Paris, 1910], p. 58f.) Others in Sirén, Chinese painting, vol. 2 (1956), "Annotated lists," p. 42.

73 The Orchid Pavilion, 12½ inches by 12 inches, in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, reproduced in Peng Yün-ts'ân 彭純燦 Hua-shih hui-ch'uan 畫史圖傳, xivii.5. The subject is historical representing the meeting of a group of scholars at Lan-t'ing 郎亭 in eastern Chekiang during the reign of Emperor Mu 穆帝 (A.D. 353) at which time Wang Hsi-chih 王羲之 wrote the manuscript ever after known as "The Lan-t'ing Manuscript," one of the most famous specimens of calligraphy. The painting bears the signature of the artist and numerous seals and colophons of Ming and Ch'ing date (Ferguson, Chinese painting, p. 125).

74 George Soulié de Morant, A history of Chinese art from ancient times to the present day, tr. G. C. Wheeler, New York (1931), pl. 19; Ch'i-ch'ang kung-ts'ang sung yüan pao-hui 清宮藏宋元寶繪 (Rare paintings of the Sung and Yuan dynasties belonging to the Ch'ing Imperial Collection), 1 vol., n.d., pl. 46(?).

the Ming dynasty artist Chou Ch'ên 周臣 (fl. ca. 1500). 75

C. A KE 阿閣
(Pl. 5, fig. 5) 76

Description.—Ink and colors on silk, 28½ inches high, 21½ inches broad, Palace Museum Collection, Formosa; also known as the A-fang kung. The painting has possibly been trimmed slightly on the lateral edges, but most likely retains its full height. There are traces of at least nine seals, all of which are seals of Ch'ien-lung and his son and successor, the Chia Ch'ing 嘉慶 emperor.

Subject.—A large palace pavilion set on a high terrace above smaller structures in a garden bordering a river; in the background tall rolling mountains. The subject of the Ch'in emperor's fabled palace was a favorite one of the painters of architectural subjects from at least the T'ang onward.

Composition and style.—"No building of any consequence in China was erected without the support of a terrace, and the more important the building, the larger and finer the terrace." 77 Judging from this statement there can be little doubt that we have here to do with a representation of royal halls and pavilions. But such an outspoken emphasis on the lofty, really monumental terrace seems, as far as painting is concerned, to belong to phases later than Sung, and especially to the elaborate palaces of the Yuan painters. 78 Nor do other features of this painting wholly coin-

75 Cohn, Chinese painting, pl. 197.
77 Sirén, Architecture, p. 10.
78 E.g., Soper, Art and architecture of China, pl. 171, Li Jung-chin.
cide with Sung modes. The composition appears to be overfull of solid matter; though intrinsically it contains very little more of solid matter than the small fan-shaped painting above, the artist in this case working with a much larger space has been less successful in integrating the landscape and architectural elements.

The mountains retain that diagonal orientation and the surging eruptive suggestion so traditional to more acceptably early architectural landscapes, but they lack the intrinsic force of the powerful shapes of the Boston scroll. Their rounded shapes and lack of harsh angular modeling suggest a “boiling” rather than an eruptive turbulence. The somewhat excessive and superficial modeling imparts to the mass a certain unsubstantial, detrital appearance. The dry nervous outlines and washed-in volumes link these forms to aspects of Kuan T'ung 蒨宗 and Fan K'uan 范寬, but here they are a somewhat eccentric reflection of that style and are less integral to the total conception of the composition, failing to create an impression of solidity and depth. The mountains resemble a series of stage flats superimposed one upon the other objectively defining the requirements of space rather than creating a realistic illusion of depth.

The architecture presents a curious contrast to that which we have examined in point of perspective, in that the onlooker peers down upon it from a somewhat greater height and this in itself suggests parallels with Yüan and Ming paintings, though an absolute rule of perspective in this regard should not be formulated.79 Brackets are shown only under the eaves of the lowermost pavilion and a small gate in the lower right foreground, structures upon which, considering the overall perspective, we should least expect to find them visible.80 The pyramidal units are closely set and the individual cross arms appear to be poorly differentiated. Roof ornaments on the polygonal structures almost concealed in the dense mass of trees in the right middle distance are not, I believe, common in paintings until after the Sung, and the more conscious accentuation of the decorative nature of the roofs, with a corresponding reduction in their size and apparent weight, suggests as well developments affecting this architectural feature in later periods.

Figures, here rather wispy and expressionless, stand about on terraces, walk in the gardens. They represent a form of decorative personage prevalent in architectural landscapes from the Yüan dynasty and later, and possibly in a more rigid form also in pictures anterior to the Sung (cf. pl. 4, fig. 6). But for the most part they are replaced in the Sung by more vital beings whose function in the painting is determined by the action of the scene, or its narrative qualities, and who never, in spite of the depiction of pleasure palaces and pavilions, seem intent primarily on languorous, hedonistic pursuits.

The trees are possibly more carefully executed, the several varieties of foliage customary in architectural landscapes more clearly differentiated, than the worn condition of the painting and the blurred and murky available photographs allow us to discern. But the dense wooded area of the middle distance appears flat and does not satisfy the requirements of the lush vegetation it is supposed to represent.

The composition as a whole is curiously balanced, with the preponderance of mass close bracketing may lie in Sung structural changes which obviated their bearing function with the result that, though retained, in post-Sung periods they become increasingly ornamental and are sometimes scarcely visible under the eaves (Soper, Art and architecture of China, p. 284; Sirén, Walls and gates, p. 152; idem, Architecture, pp. 22, 72; Ernst Boerschmann, Chinesische Architektur, Berlin, 1925, vol. 1, pl. 100).

79 Kuo Jo-hsi, Experiences, p. 159, n. 434.
80 A possible explanation for the invisibility of the
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to the left margin, a factor partially offset by the strong and repeated angle of the foreground pavilions directing the eye away from the solid matter toward a relatively open distance at the right. The obtrusiveness of the main structure with its massive terrace is relieved by its location, partially concealed by foreground cliffs and directly below the loftiest mountain.

The attribution of this painting to Chao Po-chü is undoubtedly incorrect but, as Sirén has suggested, it is perhaps acceptable “faute de mieux” as a representative example of his design, for in the complex, almost ponderous, density of the natural and architectural elements, it has perceptible affinities to the Palace Museum fan-shaped painting. In design it is not as close to either Yuan or Ming as it is to Sung paintings, but it is not wholly satisfying as a painting of the Sung period. It lacks the more pronounced devices and distinct mannerisms of Ming architectural paintings and it is not executed with the scrupulous precision of original Yuan compositions, but it may well be a post-Sung work reflecting more strongly than most later attributions an authentic Sung model.

One painting of a related design, *Palaces of the Immortals* (pl. 6, fig. 9), should be mentioned briefly in that it represents a style markedly different from any thus far discussed, and though it is considered to be by Chao Po-chü and bears the signature “Ch’ien-li Po-chü” on the lower left margin of the painting, no attempt to define this painting in terms of Sung style could succeed. The flamboyant extravagance of the palaces, their relative separation from and meaningless juxtaposition among the elements of landscape, and the decline in respect for architectural verisimilitude are in themselves sufficient cause to reject this painting not only as an authentic work of the Sung but also as a painting by one of the capable Ming architectural landscape painters. The mountains have the same diagonal parallel striations that we see in Ch’iu Ying’s *Saying Farewell at Hsin Yang*, in the Nelson Gallery, Kansas City, but the use of this technique here is more timid and lacks the forceful commitment to the representation of the frankly unreal we see in the virtuosity and skilled craft of Ch’iu Ying.

D.

The category of compositional schema to which the greatest number of attributions to Chao Po-chü belongs presents a somewhat perplexing problem in that none of the extant paintings can certainly be considered authentic Sung work. The existence of so strong a tradition of attributions of paintings of this design to Chao suggests, however, the probability of his having executed paintings related to this type.

There would be little profit in discussing many of these paintings in detail, so I have...

p. 42, is certainly correct in viewing this painting as a doubtful picture with an arbitrary attribution.

83 Brackets are rendered simply as inverted pyramids of solid color, with no effort made at depicting the individual arms and blocks. The kiosk structures, though certainly present in Sung, are more particularly a feature of Ming architectural paintings as are also the narrow porches with curved roofs.


---

selected one which, though it offers no clear relation to possible Sung prototypes, is one of the more outstanding paintings of this design: a vertical scroll in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, entitled *Palaces and Pavilions among the Mountains* (pl. 7, fig. 11).  

Outwardly the design of the painting is decidedly archaic, suggesting close affinities to pre-Sung conventions in the form and treatment of the mountains and in the relationships established between open areas and rocky areas, foreground, middleground, and background. The trees also do not resemble those in paintings of acceptable Sung date, but are closer to those in paintings of the late T'ang and Five Dynasties periods, i.e., in small groups of two or three trees placed, with apparent perfunctory concern for realistic effects, here and there over the land and mountain surfaces, in every way seemingly carefully executed but without either the patterning of T'ang or the conscious attempt at the harmonious integration of the natural and rock forms. Archaic also is the fragmentation of the architectural units, with halls, pavilions and palace structures widely scattered throughout the composition and set among the mountains, sometimes partially concealed by cliffs in a way that very strongly links this painting with early architectural landscapes.

But in spite of the numerous ways in which this painting reflects traditions older than Sung, the richness of the brush and pervading romantic character of the scene as a whole suggest stylistic transformations characteristic of Ming landscape painters. Furthermore, though the relationship between the architectural elements and natural forms is clearly archaic, such structures are not found in paintings earlier than Ming. In the contrast of light stone against dark brick, especially in the foreground masonry bridges, we are reminded of the tunnel vaults in the Han Emperor scroll in which a similar contrast occurs. But in the relatively greater emphasis on the decorative, ultimately artificial, quality of the architecture, its obtrusive brilliance and the prevalence of ornate terraces projecting over water, hexagonal pavilions and small figures strolling on terraces, we encounter a concern for the decorative and ornamental qualities which were the preoccupation of Ming architectural landscape painters. Owing to their delicate and accentuated ornamental qualities, the pavilions appear to have been given more detailed attention than is actually the case. Architectural verisimilitude is subordinated to decorative effects not consciously sought in Sung, and interest in color, structural patterning, and the placement of interesting shapes among natural elements is a foremost objective.

The dendritic lines of gold applied to the surfaces of mountains are vastly different from the energetic, broken strokes employed in the modeling of rock surfaces in the Han Emperor scroll, and the rock forms here are smooth, flat, dull, and inactive.

Owing to the presence of the artist's signature (Ch'ien-li Po-chü) at the lower left corner, the painting has been considered a late copy or free imitation of works by Chao Po-chü. Actually this painting is widely separated not only from what we may presume to have been Chao Po-chü's major oeuvre, but also from Sung styles as a whole. The vertical format and the design of the painting are closer to pre-Sung modes, while the execution of the subject matter is clearly Ming. Above all else, the obtrusive extravagance of the architecture and the more decorative and trivial expression of a strong romantic pen-

85 Siren, *Kinas Konst*, vol. 2, p. 318; *Shen-chou kuo-kuang chi* 神州國光集, vol. 16 (1911). A poem supposedly by K'o Chiu-sü appears on the mounting. There is at least one indistinct seal on the painting.

chant so common in Ming architectural landscapes dissuades me from accepting this painting as a work reflecting the style of Chao Po-chü. If we consider that seriousness counts for something, then we cannot readily consider this painting to be on an equal level with either the Han Emperor scroll or the Palace Museum fan painting.

Of the numerous paintings attributed to Chao Po-chü exhibiting a similar compositional schema, little need be said; the majority are of decidedly inferior quality and in no instance can be considered works of Sung date.

E.

The last two categories seemingly bear a more remote relation to the conceivable œuvre of Chao Po-chü, but the existence of long-standing attributions to this artist of paintings in these categories requires our atten-

tion, and an examination of a few of them will furthermore serve to render the distinction between Sung architectural landscapes and those of later periods more clear.

**Spring Morning at the Palaces of Han**

*(Pl. 8, figs. 12 and 13)*

*Description.*—A miniature scroll in colors on silk, 34½ inches long, 6½ inches high; formerly in the A. W. Bahr Collection, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; signature of the artist at extreme left end, “Ch’ien-li Po-chü,” over a seal of the painter reading “Ch’ien-li” (fig. 13).

*Composition and style.*—It is extremely difficult to appraise this picture which is not “scaled to the human eye.” It is possible that the rendering of certain details is more definitely contingent upon the size than the style. The overall plan of the picture, however, is less reflective of a miniature art than that of the grandiose mural. The luxuriant vegetation is missing, and there is much greater attention devoted to the creation of vast areas of open space than in the previously discussed paintings. Integration of landscape and architectural forms is achieved primarily by the device of partially concealing buildings behind mountains, a widespread characteristic of Ming architectural landscapes which largely reject the organic unity achieved by the Sung artists, suggesting a return to T’ang modes; it is a less convincing solution to a problem of compositional unity. The texturing of rock forms which in the Han Emperor scroll

---

87 Cf. Sirén, *Chinese painting*, vol. 6 (1958), pl. 124, landscape in blue-green-gold by the Ming artist Shih Jui 石騫, for a similar compositional plan.

88 *Wei-yang kung* 未央宮, palaces of the first Han emperor (see Soper, *Art and architecture of China*, p. 217, on this palace), signed “Chao Ch’ien-li,” formerly in the E. A. Strehlneck Collection (E. A. Strehlneck, *Chinese pictorial art*, Shanghai Commercial Press, 1914, p. 123); *Chi-i-ch’eng kung* 九成宮, palaces of the emperor T’ai-tsung 太宗 of T’ang, signed by the artist, with poems inscribed by Wen Cheng-ming, Leng Ch’ien, and T’ang Yin 唐寅 (Taotai gemin meiakaikan, vol. 1, pl. 66); *Ch’u Shan* 春山, *Mountain in Spring*, poem and colophons by Ch’ien-lung, 19 seals, the 16 legible all being those of the Emperor Ch’ien-lung (Illustrated Catalogue of Chinese Government Exhibits, vol. 3, p. 70); of a bit higher quality is a hanging painting in blue-green-gold, signed “Ch’ien-li Po-chü” above a seal of the painter (Ch’ien-li), published by George Rowley, *Principles of Chinese painting*, Princeton, 1947, pl. 18. The architectural elements have been executed by a skilled craftsman, but they are drawn from fancy rather than reality, and the situation of such large and lofty pavilions in such precarious setting is wholly contrary to the sober realism of Sung architectural landscapes.


90 Priest, *Aspects*, p. 46.
achieved an active and strong feeling of rapid motion by quick, broken, zigzag gold lines has here been subdued in softer, rounded and unbrok en lines like those of the preceding painting. The foreground rock pile from which several dryly executed trees spring (fig. 12) is a common feature in architectural paintings from the late Sung onward, amounting by the Ming period to an extensively used and outworn formula.

The details which incontrovertibly link this painting with the architectural landscapes of the Ming are numerous and worth noting as they constitute a compendium of criteria to distinguish these landscapes from those of the Sung. The architecture, both figuratively and actually, is not true; lines which should be parallel diverge, and sections of the same building are set at different angles. Architectural details are drastically abbreviated: the bracketing, once executed in splendid detail, is here little more than simple inverted colored triangles under the eaves. Long and unsubstantial bridges like the ones in this scroll, upon which poorly drawn, lifeless, motionless people stand, are unknown in earlier architectural landscapes. Again, the vast expanse of open water with large and ornate boats with dragon-bodied hulls prominently displayed are particularly characteristic of Ming architectural paintings. Ornamental portals, circular or of a type closely resembling the Islamic four-centered arch, are in keeping with the Ming emphasis on the pleasure pavilion and decorative architecture. The exotic rock formation which we have observed in nearly every painting depicting the royal park or garden has here achieved an enormous, wild, extravagant shape (pl. 8, fig. 12); it is no longer an unobtrusive element of a garden firmly implanted in the ground but an isolated fantasy creation springing from the waters of the lake, which position, apart from its shape patterned for its own sake, is to be especially connected with Ming painting. The small, shrublike flowering trees along narrow fingers of land projecting into the expanse of water in the background, both here and in the preceding Boston painting, have no Sung counterpart. Finally, the rendering of broad areas of open space, of sparser, drier, and often more mannered and patterned vegetation, the total dissolution of intimacy and in its stead a somewhat cold and infinitely vast space, is a feature totally outside the twelfth-century concept of landscape and one frequently encountered in the Ming architectural landscapes attributed to Chu'iu Ying.

The attribution of this painting to Chao Po-chü is perhaps only a tribute paid to this great master of the later Sung by a consequently anonymous painter of the Ming whose work in itself is outstanding in quality. The jewel-like, almost iridescent brilliance and the bold display of forms where one might expect, or at least esteem, a less prepossessing, less brazen virtuosity, is perhaps due to the fact that the scroll is a miniature; but it may also herald the more ignominious future of this style moving toward its nadir of preciosity and finally to a style indistinguishable from the

93 This form of rock rising from water is to a lesser degree used in the Yüan, e.g., painting attributed to Sun Ch'ìn-tse 孫君澤 (Tôsô, vol. 1, pl. 187).
94 See also Rowley, Principles, pl. 28.
95 Soraikan kinkô, vol. 1, pt. 3 (Osaka, 1930), No. 32 (4 pls.).
96 A somewhat similar composition of little merit is in the National Gallery, Prague. A handsccroll 9 feet 5 inches long, 20½ inches high, it is signed by the painter (Ch'ien-li Po-chü) and contains his seal (Ch'ien-li) (Lubor Hajeck, Chinese art, London, n.d., p. 64 and pls. 176–177).
decorative landscape compositions figured in
the silk brocades and in the lacquered work of
late Ming and Ch'ing.  

F.

Though as a group these paintings cannot
be considered architectural landscapes,
among the several riverscapes attributed to
Chao Po-chü is one of the most impressive
paintings linked with his name. A much worn
and badly cracked handscroll executed in
shades of blue, white, and brown on silk, it is
in the Hui-hua-ku'an 檜畫館, Peking, and has
been published under the title Rocky Moun-
tains along a River in Autumn (pl. 6, fig. 10).
The attribution to Chao Po-chü is apparently
derived from the artist's signature on the
scroll, though the meager information avail-
able concerning this painting is ambiguous on
this point.

The subject of the scroll is that of chains of
deply folded mountains along a river, with
dry trees and winding streams at their foot.
The general plan of the forcefully twisting and
surging vertical mountain masses is boldly
archaic as are also some of the crystal-shaped
peaks and the folded, layered, and sloped
summits, suggesting the mountains in land-
scapes attributed to Ching Hao and Li Chao-
tao. But the developed sense of roundness, of
volume, and the superb, almost playful,
rhythm in the relation of one shape to another
speaks more strongly of the Sung. The under-
sides of cliffs, modeled by dabs resembling a
variety of the so-called "ax-chip" texturing,
are not at all in agreement with the linear gold
texturing of the architectural landscapes.
Again, the solidity of the mountain chain and
its relative separation from the foreground,
the deep concern for specific detail, and the
relative isolation of the diverse compositional
elements are reminiscent of T'ang models.
The extensive bamboo groves and the con-
genial humble dwellings of the foreground
impart a more serene atmosphere to the
formidable mountain masses than we encoun-
ter in T'ang compositions.  
The dry, almost sere, quality of the pines with black trunks
is not unlike the trees in The Palaces of Ch'iu',
but the sensitive and skillful shading of the
foliage of the bamboo grove and the subdued
movement and soft linear folding of the shore-
line suggest the work of Chao Ta-nien 趙大年,  
lacking perhaps the full depth of
his subjective perception, less "friendly" and
more objectively interpreted, serene but not
warm.

Footpaths upon which numerous scarcely
visible slender and white-robed persons
wander trace their way over the low land of the
foreground and up into the mountains where
architectural structures more elaborate than
those of the foreground are silhouetted in the
mists or emerge from under cliffs. More un-
usual are the bridges which are not the cus-

tomary precarious-looking, dangerously canted
structures laid upon wooden pilings, but are
vaulted masonry structures of substantial pro-
portions, replete with high guard rails.

The relation between the decorative architec-
tural landscape and similar compositions executed in
silk tapestry extends back to the Sung period (Pauline
Simmons, Crosscurrents in Chinese silk history, Met-
ropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, vol. 9 [1950],
p. 93). For the Ch'ing dynasty see A. F. Kendrick,
Textiles, in Roger Fry et al., Chinese art, Burlington
Magazine Monographs, London, 1925, pl. 7. For
Ming and Ch'ing lacquers see Sirén, Kinat Konst,
vol. 2, p. 605, fig. 554; Edward F. Strange, Chinese

Sirén, Chinese painting, vol. 2 (1956), p. 107,
is uncertain as to the existence of the artist's signature,
but in the "Annotated lists," ibid., p. 42, a signature
is indicated.

E.g., Ming Huang Hsing Shu, attributed to Li
Chao-tao (Cohn, Chinese painting, pl. 25).

Cohn, op. cit., pls. 60–61.

These bridges are well within the structural
form of the Sung dynasty; the Lu-kou Ch'iao, or
It is extremely difficult to assess this painting. Of the attribution to Chao Po-chü, Osvold Sirén demurs, with the statement: “if this is the case, it may be said to lift Chao Po-chü to a somewhat higher level as a landscape painter.”102 And certainly one must concur that there is very little similarity in the treatment of rock forms between this painting and other attributions to Chao. But Sirén’s qualitative judgment seems a bit unfair and suggests a standard of criticism more properly to be exacted from the main current of landscape painting than from the necessarily more traditional aspects of architectural landscapes.

In spite of the numerous archaic references, this painting cannot reasonably be ascribed to a time earlier than the twelfth century, and very likely it belongs to this time. But certain aspects of it would be more or less anomalous at any date. Riverscapes in the blue-green-gold style, or in a style as closely related to it as is that of the present painting, constitute a genre intermediate between the architectural landscape and the contemporary monochrome or more delicately shaded landscapes. The scarcity of such landscapes of high quality and their relatively stronger reliance on certain conventional formulae distinct from those of the architectural landscape has made comparative study difficult. Only recently has such a riverscape (in the Freer Gallery, Washington) attributed to Li Ssu-hsün been reassessed and considered a work of the Ch’ing dynasty.103

More conventional and altogether poorer in quality are the riverscapes and seascape attributed to Chao Po-chü.104 Only two of these paintings, one evidently copied from the other, or both from some earlier painting, are interesting, one in the Musée Guimet and the other in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. To both of them the signature and seals of Chao Po-chü have been affixed.105 The scene is that of a vast sea dotted with islands upon which are small clusters of buildings. Both the islands and the waters are peopled with fabulous creatures of animal and human form,106 and the landscape is that of an imaginary world described in a long poem attached to the Musée Guimet scroll.107 It is this very world which has preoccupied the painters of architectural landscapes from the T’ang dynasty until the present day. But the artist’s ability to believe in this world and to endow it with convincing vigor and reality seems to decline from the Ming on; we then find only artists and technicians of facile technique but of eclectic and perfunctory vision.

Of the paintings attributed to Chao Po-chü, now lost and known only from descriptions, few seem to correspond to the architectural landscape style observed in the likely authentic Sung works, but tend rather to corroborate those biographical texts which attribute paintings in every category of subject to

---

103 Munsterberg, Landscape painting of China and Japan, p. 77 and pl. 68.
104 E.g., landscape with imperial palaces, formerly in the E. A. Strehleneck Collection (Strehneck-shôzôhin tenran mokuroku スツラヘルネク氏所蔵品展覧目録 [Catalogue of the E. A. Strehneck Collection], Tôkyô, n.d., No. 207.)
105 Chchang and Hackin, La peinture chinoise, pl. 2, lower, identified simply as Landscape; Priest, Aspects, p. 46 (detail), and Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, vol. 9 (1951), p. 176f. (a somewhat larger and clearer detail), Sea and Sky at Sunrise, formerly in the Havemeyer Collection. The Havemeyer scroll is likely to be the authentic Ming piece, while the painting in the Musée Guimet, of extremely poor quality, suggests of nineteenth-century forgery of Ming work which itself could be nothing more than a free adaptation of older designs.
107 Chchang and Hackin, op. cit., p. 57f.
his hand. A few titles should suffice to indicate the supposed scope of this artist: *Idling away the Summer under the Lotus Arbor,* in *A Lotus Boat under the New Moon, Po Chü-i and his Eight Friends at Huang-shan, Silkworms and Weaving, Bambooos on the Eastern Hills,* *The Fairies of the Lilacs, The Dragon of Immortality, The Visit to the Tai Mountain, The Boats Coming out of the Gorges,* as well as a painting of Ming Huang's 明皇 famed journey to Shu, a portrait of Su Tung-po, an illustration to Tao Yüan-ming’s 陶淵明 famous tale of the enchanted peach garden, a fan painting of juniper trees, and a painting of *The Three Incarnations of Yüan-tse,* supposedly executed in collaboration with Liu Sung-nien.

There is, of course, no way to be certain that any of these attributions were reliable. Certainly these titles do not reflect what is considered to have been his principal subject matter by modern critics, and extant paintings of the type suggested by these titles are almost all of inferior quality and assuredly not of Sung date. But at the same time, it is not justifiable to declare them to be wholly unrepresentative of the artistic propensities of Chao Po-chü.

109 The preceding four paintings recorded in the Ch'ien-lung catalogue.
111 Giles, *Pictorial art,* p. 140; Sirén, loc. cit.

**CHAO PO-CHÜ AND POST-SUNG ARCHITECTURAL LANDSCAPES**

The blue-green-gold style has, at least from Sung times on, been most particularly an official art and courtly style. As such, paintings in this style were doubtless much copied and imitated, and it is consequently harder to distinguish individual personality and hand. Of the 20 paintings here discussed at length or only briefly mentioned, two architectural landscapes only, according to our present knowledge of Sung landscape art, may be considered as belonging to that period: the Han Emperor scroll in the Museum of Fine Arts and the fan-shaped painting of the Palaces of Han in Formosa. It is furthermore likely that both were painted in the twelfth century and hence probably within the lifetime of the artist to whom they are ascribed. There is, of course, no safe means of assigning them to the hand of Chao Po-chü, but the artist’s signature and the dedicatory inscription on the Boston scroll, both of which markedly vary from those appearing on later works attributed to him (but which in reality are merely works in his supposed style), are points of considerable weight in favor of authenticity. The fan-shaped painting, however, is unsigned and nothing concerning its attribution to Chao Po-chü is known until the sixteenth or seventeenth century when Tung Ch’i-ch’ang expressed his opinion in this regard. Hence it is possible to state only that one painting may be attributed with reasonable certainty to Chao Po-chü, and that another, if not directly by his hand, is by a contemporary master working in a closely allied style.

114 "It is a style easily aped in its superficial aspects by skilled craftsmen, and this industrious class has through the centuries produced countless charming and utterly vacuous scrolls in the ‘blue and green’ manner" (Sickman, *Art and architecture of China,* p. 91).
But perhaps of even greater importance than the identification of authentic Chao Po-chü paintings is the evidence these Sung architectural landscapes afford of the development of this painting style, their position within the age in which they were created, and their relation to the works in this style which both preceded and followed them. Since they belong to a class of painting which by its basic tenets relates to older styles, they are less expressive of inventive qualities, participate less in, than they are influenced by, broader landscape developments. Working within the scope of an older style and conventionalized subject matter, Chao Po-chü went far toward relating the architectural style to contemporary currents.

Of the architectural painting which preceded Chao Po-chü, little enough is known, but, more broadly, from a study of the landscapes of the T'ang and Five Dynasties periods, and from a study of the works, after Li Cha-tao especially, mostly executed in the Ming Dynasty, some aspects of this style may be envisioned. A tendency of the T'ang painters to isolate the various compositional forms and to treat them as separate entities, without concern for realistic interrelations of forms, was, in all probability, already changing by the tenth century. Of the painter Ch'u-an, Kuo Jo-hsü wrote: "Whenever he painted a fan and set on it [a scene of] 'Banqueting on the Ku-su Terrace' or 'the Pavilion of the Prince of T'eng,' a thousand mountains and a myriad waterways would be there in full perfection before one's eyes." The change expressed here is probably only slight, but in the implied emphasis on a denser nature we may envision the beginning of a trend toward the development this same author observes on a painting by the late Five Dynasties artist Chou Wen-chü: "The [artist] reproduced with the greatest possible completeness the atmospheric effects of the mountains and streams and the views of kiosks and terraces."

Hence we may infer that while the architectural landscape retained certain archaic formulae, it was in turn influenced by the perceptible course of development which even in the early Sung presaged the seemingly sudden changes of the early twelfth century. The increasing emphasis on careful and studied rendering of atmospheric effects which so characterizes the landscapes of the Northern Sung had influenced the architectural landscape.

The architectural landscapes of the twelfth century were significantly altered by two substantial factors: the sudden breaking away by the landscape painters from the traditions known as the Northern Sung style, and the developments in and increasing prominence of scenes depicting royal parks and gardens. The influence of these two factors produced a corresponding alteration in the architectural landscape, and the historic and artistic prominence of Chao Po-chü must have rested chiefly upon his position as the painter who realized this new form. His achievement is not perhaps to modes, but which is less likely to have been copied from an older work.

\[115\] E.g., see Cohn, *Chinese painting*, p. 47, fig. 11, and *Illustrated Catalogue of Chinese Government Exhibits*, vol. 3, p. 17, the *Lo-yang Mansion*, and cf. Sirén, *Chinese painting*, vol. 2 (1956), "Annotated lists," s.v. Li Cha-tao, who considers this painting to be a rather close reflection of Li’s style. The ornate and complex representation of the building which yet lacks architectural realism in matters of linear perspective, proportions, and detail resembles Ming architectural painting, but in its general compositional plan the picture seems to reflect a design anterior to the Sung. Cf. *T'ien-lai ko-chia-t'ang Sung-jen-hua ts'e* 天籟開畫藏宋人畫冊 (A collection of famous pictures of the Sung dynasty formerly preserved by the T'ien-lai studio), Shanghai, Commercial Press, n.d. (1957?), pl. 3, *Hall of Prince T'eng*, which illustrates a Ming architectural landscape of parallel composition and which exemplifies the Ming reinterpretation of T'ang (as well as Yuan).


\[117\] Ibid., p. 101.
be understood in terms of his personal influence on what was essentially, and was to remain, a decorative style, but rather in terms of the changes unavoidably wrought by the spirit of the Southern Sung landscape painters. For the first time, to a style of conceptual and monumental grandeur a sense of intimate observation is applied. Buildings are placed credibly, harmoniously among the dense elements of nature, and owing to the relative structural simplicity and at times freehand quality of the drawing, the architecture is brought into a more empathetic relationship with the landscape as a whole. In keeping with observable tendencies of twelfth-century landscape painting, the horizontal composition as opposed to supposed T'ang and even Northern Sung verticality is emphasized.

Chao Po-chü was not one of the "free spirits wandering alone in the wilderness" who accomplished the greatest work of the twelfth century. At its best his work is characterized by a pronounced turn from the purely decorative. The sense of depth in his paintings never quite overcomes the device and formulae of his predecessors, but he absorbed as if by osmosis some of the methods and techniques of rendering depth employed by his contemporaries—the distant mountains silhouetted in mists, a unity derived from forms by a repetition in distant shapes of the contours of foreground objects. His achievement was not in terms of invention but in development and adaptation of contemporary trends to a conventional mode of painting, and changes may have been more unavoidable than studied. But surely the dramatic integration of narrative and landscape in the painting most safely ascribed to him, the Han Emperor scroll, is tantamount to invention, for it seems to be wholly without precedent and without con-

temporary equal, a single final expression of the romantic landscape deeply affected by the pervasive sentimental qualities of the archetypal Southern Sung style.

A few concluding generalities on the post-Sung development of the architectural landscape style, in which the achievements of the Sung were in the main neglected, will further elucidate the unique position of Chao Po-chü.

The Yüan masters of this style, in their paintings of palaces and pavilions, appear to have rejected entirely the effective integration of architecture and landscape, and in their concentration upon the former reached a peak of verisimilitude in their meticulous architectural studies. In the disassociation of the landscape and architectural elements and in the return to a conceptual and formalistic order there was perhaps a strong desire to reinterpret compositional forms earlier than Sung; the Sung had developed the relationship between architectural and natural forms while the Yüan suppressed the landscape elements and brought to perfection the representation of buildings.

The conventional nature of the architectural landscape encourages looking back, and in a time of less vitality and invention this may lead to a romantic view of the past. The architectural landscapes of the Ming period represent a greater variety of forms than those of the Yüan, but in the growing romantic illusion and developed sense of the ornamental there is a general decline in quality. In the hands of devoted craftsmen such as Ch'iu Ying a standard of excellence is preserved and a new style, establishing a conceptual integrity in its own right, is achieved. But in the main the architectural landscape is in decline.

The meticulous chieh-hua drawing so brilliantly employed by Yüan painters is continued, but the Ming painter's concern was no


119 E.g., Harada, Pageant, pl. 326, Li Jung-chin.
longer for the reality of a building but for the opulence of which it could be symbolic. Bracketing is abbreviated and made subservient to more extravagant and decorative architectural forms and ornaments (e.g., pl. 6, fig. 9), or it is prominently displayed, with exaggerated proportions and multiplication of arch-timbers and cross arms (see n. 115). The structural form of the roof, essentially shallow and light, is often nearly completely surrendered to the luxuriance of ornamental detail, and new forms of decoration, doubtless introduced by the Yüan, are extensively developed. Finally, in the Ming there is a curious invasion of the rural landscape by the mansion and the luxurious pleasure pavilion, whereas in earlier periods architecture was more appropriately treated in relation to its setting. Many Ming architectural landscapes would have severely tried the credulity of sober observers had realism any longer been a matter of concern.

It is probable that the majority of the extant paintings in the style of Li Ssu-hsün date from this period, for architecturally the buildings have little relation to what is known of T'ang dynasty building but correspond well to Ming forms and styles. This renewed interest in the T'ang painters of architecture is not surprising, whether or not it was based upon any thorough apprehension of that style through extant paintings. We have already noted the complete rejection on the part of the Yüan of Sung achievements, and this rejection, though less violent, is equally perceptible in the main body of architectural landscapes painted during the Ming.

The Sung painter appears to have utterly “exhausted the subtleties” of a landscape art founded on the empathetic perception of the natural world. The romantic illusionism of Ming dynasty architectural landscapes could not be satisfied entirely by the precise architectural painting of the Yüan, and new efforts were made toward the combination of landscape and architecture. The results of this effort produced an architectural landscape style of new dimensions which was in most ways closer both to T'ang and Yüan than to Sung. From the Yüan the great expanses of water, broad open areas, and limitless vistas, and the preoccupation with architectural form were retained, the latter extensively developed as ornament. From the T'ang, perhaps by way of the Yüan painters' commitment to new concepts of nature, landscape and architectural elements were developed separately and no real attempt seems to have been made toward the creation of a realism. But the foremost characteristic of the Ming architectural landscape and the one which raises it to the level of a new and unique style was not its reinterpretation of older forms but its preoccupation with the sumptuous elegance of the imperial world.

At their best Ming architectural paintings avoid the worst excesses of their age, but the artists' greater concern for, and perhaps somewhat nostalgic belief in, the luxury of the past, stimulated by a predilection for decorative frills, for pleasure pavilions above the solidity of palaces, often produced results that would doubtless have been abhorrent to the Sung painter. It is difficult, except in details, to
relate the architecture of Ming paintings to real forms of the day. The artistic and technical deterioration of building techniques appears to have been answered in painting by buildings, the fabulous nature of which existed in no period, and which are significant perhaps of a longing for a less impoverished and monotonous architectural scheme. The more sober forms of Sung reflect a greater sense of fulfillment derived from the achievements of the age, and consequently are less eye-catching, less ornamental, but are intrinsically more honest, solid, dignified, more apt to impress than amuse, a circumstance probably more revealing of Chao Po-chü’s personal seriousness than the more restrained nature of Sung architecture in general after the “heedless extravagance” of T’ang.\(^{123}\)

Architecture remained as an important subject of painting well into Ch’ing times, but the deterioration of the style already advanced by late Ming continued,\(^{124}\) and by the eighteenth century accurate memory even of its former excellence had become clouded, so that the compiler of the *Hua-shih hui-ch’uan* was obliged to praise the hasty ink sketches of English adventurers above the native tradition of architectural painting which had both figuratively and literally descended from Li Ssu-hsün and Chao Po-chü:

When the English sent a commissioner to congratulate the Emperor Ch’ien Lung, some members of his party made drawings of all the districts through which they passed. These maps and sketches they took back with them to England. The figures and houses were drawn in a style which brought out the lights and shadows. This is the measured painting style as known in China but is an improvement upon it. It may be seen in the paintings of palaces by Chao Po-chü.\(^{125}\)

I wish to thank Professor Max Loehr for his many helpful criticisms and suggestions during the preparation of this article.

---

\(^{123}\) Soper, *Art and architecture of China*, p. 255.

\(^{124}\) One must, in part at least, except the architectural paintings of Yuan Chiang (袁江), active as a court painter during the Yung-cheng 雍正 period (1723–35). His large-scale compositions of landscape and architecture were executed with a spectacular, thrilling boldness and calculated precision, but it is difficult to relate most of his work to older architectural landscape traditions. There is a curious combination of realistic detail and active impressionistic forms executed in a highly personal style in which the perceived harmonies of the Sung world are gone. The complex and carefully composed landscapes are grandly magnificent, but no deep purpose seems to motivate them; the conception is vivid and alive, but it is somewhat superficial, no longer capable of the penetrating depths of Sung. See Sickman, *Art and architecture of China*, p. 194 and pl. 140; Sirén, *Chinese paintings in American collections*, pt. 2, pl. 198; *idem, Chinese painting*, vol. 5 (1958), p. 93, vol. 7 (1958), p. 459f., for references to reproductions of his paintings. Other Ch’ing painters of architectural landscapes were Yuan Yao (袁耀), nephew of Yuan Chiang, also active at the court, ca. 1744–55 (see Sirén, *ibid.,* s.v. Yuan Yao for references; Chung-kuo hua 中國畫 [Chinese painting], No. 1 [Nov. 1957], p. 31, color); Kuan Huai (關槐), painter at the court of Ch’ien-lung, executed landscapes in the blue-green-gold manner.

\(^{125}\) Ferguson, *Chinese painting*, p. 183.
A STUDY OF THE MASTERPIECE "T'ANG MING-HUANG'S JOURNEY TO SHU" *

By LI LIN-TS'AN 李霖燦†

A. REDISCOVERY OF THIS MASTERPIECE

The dramatic figure of Hsüan-tsung, or Ming-huang 明皇, sixth emperor of the T'ang dynasty, who reigned from A.D. 713-756, lives in the memories of posterity through many a beautiful poem (such as "The Song of Enduring Regret" 長恨歌, by Po Chü-i, 772-846) and masterpiece of painting telling of episodes in his life.

To my knowledge, at least nine such pictures are still to be seen in various famous collections:


* I am much indebted to Mr. Chuang Yen 莊嚴, Director of the Palace Museum, for his kindness in giving me much valuable material and many helpful suggestions pertinent to this paper. I also express my cordial thanks to Howard S. Levy, Father Richard B. Mengher, James F. Cahill, and Richard Edwards for reading and improving the manuscript.
† National Central Museum, Taichung, Taiwan, China (國立中央博物院).


If, however, we consult the historical records, we find that at least 30 pictures of Ming-huang have been painted by famous artists throughout the centuries. Examples of these are:

1. Ming-huang Shooting Deer 明皇射鹿圖, by Han Kan 韓幹.
2. Ming-huang Travelling at Night for Pleasure 明皇夜遊圖, by Chang Hsiian 張萱.

Unfortunately most of the recorded pictures about Ming-huang have been destroyed by fire or the ravages of war and brigandry.

One of these early masterpieces, Ming Huang's Journey to Shu (Szechwan) 明皇幸蜀圖 (f. s. 1, 2) attributed to Li Sau-hsun 李思訓 or his son, Li Chao-tao 李昭道, or even sometimes to Chao Po-chü 趙伯鈞 of the Southern Sung period, had disappeared for a long time. We have now had the pleasure of rediscovering it in the collection of the National Central Museum (國立中央博物院), formerly in Nanking and now located in Taichung on Taiwan. 2 The dis-

2 Merely as a landscape, the painting has been well known in the West for some time. See Ludwig Bachhofer, Chinese landscape painting in the VIIIth century, Burlington Magazine, vol. 67, Nov. 1935, pp. 189-191, and Laurence Sickman, "Mountain
covery of its title was quite dramatic. In 1951 many scholars came to our museum to examine our collection of paintings. A few of them were surprised by one work listed as a Sung painting and bearing the title *Travellers in a Mountain Pass* (關山行旅圖), particularly because of its T'ang style and technique (*fig. 1*). From then on I paid much attention to this subject. Having discussed the painting with my colleagues, who offered many valuable suggestions, I at last came to the conclusion that this picture was none but *Ming-huang's Journey to Shu* itself. Following are the points on which my argument is based.

First, the gentleman riding on a red horse (*fig. 3*) in front of the little bridge in the lower right corner of this picture could not be a merchant or any ordinary man for three reasons:

(1) The mane dressing on the horse's neck was a special mark which indicated that its rider was an emperor or prince. For this we have some associated material in the stone reliefs of the six steeds which were placed at the front of T'ang T'ai-tsung's tomb (昭陵六駿) (*fig. 8*). It is very easy to find that the three tufts of the horse's mane are very similar to those in the painting. It is the famous "three flower" arrangement of a horse's mane, and the rider, therefore, should be an emperor or a king.

(2) Following this gentleman, there are a guard bearing a bow and arrows, and two servants. These two servants have no beards, and Mr. T'an Tan-chiung (譚旦卿), Director of the Central Museum, has pointed out to me that they are likely to represent eunuchs.


*See Kuo Jo-hsiu's *Tu-hua-chien-wen-chih (Experiences in painting. An eleventh century history of Chinese painting with the Chinese text in facsimile*, tr. and annotated by Alexander Coburn Soper, Washington, American Council of Learned Societies, 1951.)

such as were usually employed as servants at the court.

(3) Behind these two servants, there are seven pretty ladies on horseback joining the traveling procession; their court costumes lead us to think that they are concubines of the emperor.

Thus, the special mane dressing on the horse's neck, the two eunuchs and seven concubines, along with the T'ang style of the painting, make us think that this gentleman is none other than an emperor of the T'ang Dynasty.

But who was this emperor and where did he wish to go? These questions are major points in our research. Continuing our analysis, it is not very difficult to get some clues from the upper left corner of this painting. Here there are many travelers up and down along a wooden passageway which is built on the cliff. Such a passageway is given a special term in Chinese, chan tao (棧道). It was often found on the route from Shensi to Szechwan. Szechwan had the ancient name of "Shu", so linking our ideas about an Emperor of T'ang with the "trademark" of Shu, one quickly thinks of the famous story of T'ang Ming-huang's Journey to Shu.

B. STUDY OF THIS MASTERPIECE IN CHINESE HISTORICAL RECORDS

Why does this masterpiece bear a "wrong title"? Perhaps we can get some answer from a passage in a book by the Sung scholar Yeh Meng-te 耶夢得:

The picture of Ming-huang's Journey to Shu painted by the artist, Li Su-hsin... I once had an opportunity to look at a copy. Less than two feet long (wide), but the mountains, rivers, carriage, persons, animals, plants and birds are included within this small space. With many peaks and hills and a passageway here and there, a perspective view of hundreds of miles. It is a masterpiece! In the Hsüan-ho period (1119–26), the court sought Li's painting with much enthusiasm, but the owner did not have the courage...
to offer this one to the palace for the title was not auspicious. In this picture Ming-huang rides horseback: eunuchs and court ladies accompany him, some in front and some behind. A melon garden is next to the passageway; a few ladies went to the garden and picked melons, so some one gave this masterpiece another title, *The Picture of Melon Picking*, which conceals the facts about the picture. Yet some people have doubts about it.

"T'ang Ming-huang’s Journey to Shu"

In the area of Chia-ling (Szechwan) among the mountains and valleys, the Emperor is mounted on a red horse with a three-tufted mane dressing on its neck and with some princes and concubines—all together more than ten riders at a pass on the Fei-hsien hill. Beginning to see the plain [after travelling in the mountains], all the horses look a little surprised, and the Emperor’s horse by a little bridge on the foreground seems to hesitate in crossing it.

The most important reason for changing the original title was that *Ming-huang’s flight to Shu* was an unlucky event for the monarch himself. Hence, there was a taboo against using the emperor’s name, so that the picture had to be given a new name when it was offered as a gift.

Dealing with this point, we would like to mention another masterpiece, this time in the Palace Museum collection, also at Taichung, which can be found in the catalogue of the London Exhibition. It was known as *Travelers in the Spring Mountains*, 旅山行旅圖 (fig. 5) and was attributed to Li Chao-tao, the son of Li Su-hsün. If we place these two paintings side by side, it is easily recognized that they are based on the same composition or design. So its title has been changed, too.

Some clues to the genuine work, *Ming-huang’s Journey to Shu*, we can find also in the literary works of Su Tung-p'o:

General Li Su-hsün of the T’ang dynasty has painted a masterpiece entitled, *Ming-huang Picks Melons*.

---

it is not by the hand of Li Ssu-hsün or his son Li Chao-tao, at least, they say, it could be an imitation of the latter part of the T'ang dynasty, i.e., the ninth or tenth centuries. At a first glance it seems to be a typical T'ang-style painting, but if it is investigated carefully, some later-period elements appear in many places. This is especially true of the artist's technique. This is a very useful way to judge the period of the picture, because the criteria come from the piece itself, unlike other complementary features such as inscriptions and seals which could be artificially produced. On this point, we may pick out two criteria as examples of proof of our deduction.

They all come from "brushwork," the most important element of a Chinese painting. Here, one of our points of examination rests in a single line's touch, the other in the organization of lines.

Looking at the outline of mountains, cliffs, and rocks in this work, we can point out that almost every single line has a heavy and sharp beginning, like a nail-head, and a slender end. This is technically called "nailhead and mouse-tail" 銚頭鼠尾描 (fig. 4). This phenomenon, I suggest, has two meanings: first, this is an imitation, for it is too technical and formal and not like a genuine work, but, rather like the repetition of a lecture, it is too skillful and smooth for the original reading. Second, it would be a later copy, for the idea of "writing" is evidently far stronger than the "drawing," to use Chinese terms: "full of the taste of calligraphy" (書法意味過重). As we know, such taste or style cannot be as early as the T'ang, or even the Five Dynasties period. It is traditionally attributed to a Sung artist, Wu Tung-ch'ing 武洞清.4

On the organization of lines of this piece, we may first mention the special term in Chinese landscape painting, "wrinkle," or "ts'un" (皴法). This technical term was invented by the Chinese to express the nature of the drawing of stripes or cracks of mountains and rocks, and we already have some idea that such a technique is seen not earlier than the Northern Sung, i.e., about the tenth century. If we look at the mountains and cliffs, and especially the large rock in the lower center part of this painting, it appears clearly that this artist already had the idea of "wrinkle" in mind. One can note particularly the way the lines that compose the outline and the breaks or folds of the rock are arranged in a rather complex and repetitive way. They do not conform to the simpler, rather easy-flowing lines that we usually associate with T'ang technique. There is a kind of self-conscious simplicity which tells of a knowledge of T'ang art performed by an artist trained in the more complex "wrinkle" techniques of the Sung. If one looks at other mountains and cliffs, one finds a continuation of the same technique.

We can conclude that even though the artist who painted this piece, Ming-huang's Journey to Shu, did his best to make a pure T'ang-style painting or imitation, he succeeded only in some parts but not in the whole. It can only give us a first impression of being a T'ang painting, but after a careful examination, we cannot date it as early as T'ang or Five Dynasties. The earliest date that can be accepted for Ming-huang's Journey to Shu is Sung.

It is very interesting that Emperor Ch'ien-lung (reigned 1736–96) has written an inscription on this masterpiece. In his poem he gives us some ideas about the date. Ch'ien-lung, successful in political affairs but less so in art, and in this respect just the opposite of Sung Emperor Hui-tsung, often made incorrect judgments, but he did not do so this time, for he says, "Northern Sung close to T'ang."

4 See Wang K'o-ju's work, Shan Hu Wang (汪珂玉, 琮瑁編, 古今描法).
Of course, Ch'ien-lung did not express the ideas I have outlined above, but this time he may have been correct.

As we have already discussed the date of this work we may add a few words more, for they can solve a problem which has troubled Chinese art historians for a long time. According to historical records, there are three masters to whom is given the honor of having painted this masterpiece: Chan Tzu-ch'ien 展子虔, Li Ssu-hsün and the latter's son, Li Chao-tao. Emperor Ch'ien-lung's statement in his poem, namely, "the artist's name has long been lost," is not true. They were merely robbed of the honor due them when the title of the work was changed. If we make a primary study on this point, it is rather simple. Chan Tzu-ch'ien was a Sui dynasty artist (589-618), and Li Ssu-hsün died in 716, 720, or 722. They did not have a chance to paint this masterpiece, for they lived many years before the events which are depicted in the painting. An Lu-shan 安禄山 rebelled late in 755, and T'ang Ming-huang fled the capital of Ch'ang-an on July 13, 756, in the direction of Shu and ahead of the rebels who were approaching the capital in force. So it is reasonable to say that all the masterpieces of this period could only have been done by Li Chao-tao's hand. Of course, some later period artists, such as Chao Po-chü of the Southern Sung and Ch'iu Ying 仇英 in the Ming period could reasonably have painted works of the same title or made copies after this masterpiece.

D. A STUDY OF THE FORMAT

After studying the Chinese records and getting some information from a modern artist, we conclude that, as far as we know, there are five different shapes, or formats, used for this masterpiece:

1. Short handscroll or wide album leaf, hung fu, 棕幅.—This shape, like plate 1, seems one of the original types. The following records give us some proofs:

   a) "The picture of Ming-huang's Journey to Shu... I once had an opportunity to look at a copy of the genuine masterpiece, less than two feet long (wide)..." Yeh Meng-te (see above).

   b) "Official Wang Po-yü of our district, owns the painting of Ming-huang's Journey to Shu by Chao Po-chü's hand, a short handscroll, fine silk, without signature..." Chan Ch'ing-feng 蔡景嵒, T'ung-ch'i hsien-lan-pien, 東阿玄覽編 (Ming dynasty).

   c) Ko Wei-shan's family of Chiang-yin 江陰 had from old collected Ming-huang's Journey to Shu painted by Chao Po-chü; it is in color on silk, only a small piece, but outstandingly lovely and elegant. It has been mentioned in the book Yü I P'ien by the earlier scholar Tu Mu, and now belongs to the Wang family of T'ai-yüan. It has been remounted as a tall handscroll. It has been classed as an imitation of Li Ssu-hsün's work. Doubtless it was a first-class masterpiece." Chang Ch'ou 張丑, Ch'ing-ho shu-hua-fang 清河書畫舫 (Ming dynasty).

   All these quotations give us the idea that the original was in the form of a short handscroll.

2. Hanging scroll shape or li chou 立軸.—This shape can be seen in figure 5, collection of the Palace Museum. As the composition and detail are all similar to Ming-huang's Journey to Shu in the Central Museum, we suggest that this work may be a transformed imitation of the original. The short handscroll shape has been mentioned in several different records, but no mention can be found of the hanging-scroll shape. It must be admitted that slight differences can be found in these two masterpieces. In the lower center part there are two travelers (like a father with his son). On the No. 1 format they have already passed the wooden bridge, and on the No. 2
format they have not yet crossed the bridge. This could be a slight mistake in making the copy, but it is also very interesting; so I sometimes jokingly tell my friends that I have an ironclad proof that the No. 2 shape should be earlier than No. 1 according to the distance we can measure; I judge the No. 2 is earlier than No. 1 by five minutes.

3. Round fan shape.—We first found this shape in some historical records. According to the Shih-ku-t'ang shu-hua hui-k'ao, section on painting, 式古堂畫考, ch. 2:

The picture of T'ang Ming-huang's Journey to Shu by Li Chao-tao's hand, round fan shape, color on silk, with the palaces, trees and flowers as background. The Emperor Ming-huang in his brown dress drawing in the reins on the horse, with more than ten servants walking in front and two riding servants on the side holding a fan and lantern. Two court ladies or eunuchs. The Precious Consort (Yang Kuei-fei) rides a jade-colored horse. [Kao] Li-shih (高力士) and several servants wait for her and start to leave the palace in a very hurried way . . . On the opposite page, also fan-shaped and of silk, there is an inscription by Su Ling-chih 蘇靈芝 (a T'ang scholar), a poem in seven-character lines:

The court ladies help the Precious Consort mount the horse;
The Emperor still turns back once more to glance at her jade face.
When leaving the palace they are riding side by side; Why did the tragedy of Ma-wei still have to take place?

According to this poem, the picture expresses the event when Emperor Ming-huang started to leave his palace in Ch'ang-an, the capital of the T'ang. The "tragedy of Ma-wei" in the poem refers to the death of the Precious Consort at Ma-wei at the beginning of the journey.

As we have mentioned before, all traces of this masterpiece were lost for a long time, so it is my deduction that it may be somewhat similar to a picture in the Freer Gallery, The Emperor Ming-huang and Yang Kuei-fei Starting on a Riding Tour. The Freer picture is by Ch'ien Hsüan 錢選, and if we compare it with the poem of Su Ling-chih, we see very easily that they are similar to each other. The only thing which was omitted in the picture was the background of palaces and trees, but in the poem on his picture, Ch'ien Hsüan also mentions the Journey to Shu. There is, then, some relation between these two pictures, and it is very likely that Ch'ien Hsüan made a study of Li Chao-tao's work, but concentrated on the figure painting only.

But fortunately at last, on August 26, 1959, with James F. Cahill I came across a very enlightening album leaf in the Palace collection (fig. 6). After a careful investigation, we both agreed that this version must be a copy of Ming-huang's Journey to Shu, attributed to Li Chao-tao, because it corresponded so closely to the records of Shih-ku-t'ang quoted above. However, it bore the wrong title of Enjoying Pleasure in the Palace, by Kuo Chung-shu 郭忠恕, 宮中行樂圖 contained in 宋人合璧畫册; it appears to be an Academy work of the twelfth century.

A round fan in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, may be yet another version of Ming-huang's Journey to Shu.  

4. Screen shape.—This may be mentioned

6 James F. Cahill, in a recent article, gives a new title, Yang Kuei-fei Mounting a Horse, which fits the Chinese title more closely (貴妃上馬圖). James F. Cahill, Ch'ien Hsüan and his figure painting, Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America, vol. 12, 1958, pp. 11–29.

7 See Kojiro Tomita's Portfolio of Chinese painting, Boston, 1933, pl. 73.
Fig. 1—Ming-huang's Journey to Shu. National Central Museum, Taichung.
Fig. 2.—Enlargement from Figure 1.
Fig. 3—Enlargement from Figure 1, Showing Design of Rocks.

Fig. 4—Enlargement from Figure 1, Gentleman Riding on a Red Horse.
FIG. 5.—Travellers in the Spring Mountains. Palace Museum collection.

Fig. 7.—Ming-huang’s Journey to Shu. Copy of Handscroll Owned by Professor Huang Pin-hung.
A, Beginning of Scroll; B, Center; C, Left End of Scroll.
Fig. 8—Stone Relief at Front of T'ang T'ai-tsung's Tomb.
(Courtesy of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Art, Philadelphia.)
only as a piece of guesswork, without proof. In the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, is a well-known painting in screen shape, painted in colors on silk, to which Alan Priest in his Aspects of Chinese Painting gave the title The Tribute Horse. In my opinion it may be still another version of Ming-huang's Journey to Shu. The fact that the handsome white horse lacks a rider may suggest it was the horse of Yang Kuei-fei herself, who at the demand of the rebellious soldiery had just been put to death; and I was very glad to hear that Shimada Shujirō (島田修二郎), a Japanese expert on Chinese painting, has reached the same conclusion. If we can find further evidence to support this opinion, for example, if we had the good fortune to discover a version of the whole screen composition (Aschwin Lippe informed me last year that such a complete version exists in a German museum) this would form a valuable addition to our knowledge about this special subject.

If I am not mistaken, the various scenes suggest a sequence. The fan-shape version shows the emperor setting out on his journey from Ch'ang-an; the screen version, second, depicts His Majesty, after the death of Yang Kuei-fei, going his lonely way to Szechwan; the short handscroll or the hanging scroll, as the third, would indicate that the party had reached the border of Shu.

5. Handscroll shape.—From an article in Free China by Miss Wu Yung-hsiang 吳詠香女史, I learned recently of a handscroll of Ming-huang's Journey to Shu. She told me that she once copied a handscroll of this title owned by her teacher, Professor Huang Pin-hung 黃賓虹. It is a fairly long scroll showing the emperor on a white horse just before a stone bridge. The design differs from that which we described in the previous chapters. In my opinion it could be a much later work. To judge from the copy, the original cannot be earlier than Ming, about the sixteenth century (fig. 7).

E. CONCLUSION

Even a preliminary study such as the present one permits us to reach the following conclusions:

1. The painting, Travellers on a Mountain Pass, in the collection of the Central Museum, because of the special "three-flower" mane dressing, eunuchs, concubines, and chan tao, we think should be retitled Ming-huang's Journey to Shu, as should the Travellers in the Spring Mountains in the Ku Kung collection.

2. Although this painting is entirely in the taste of a T'ang work, from the point of view of technique, I regard it as a copy that was made later than the tenth century.

3. The artist who made the original composition could only have been Li Chao-tao, not Li Ssu-hsün or Chan Tzū-ch'ien, for the latter two had died before Ming-huang's flight to Shu.

4. The extant paintings of this title are of different shapes: short handscroll, hanging scroll, round fan, handscroll. The short handscroll seems to be the format of the original painting.

5. A round-fan version of this subject has been rediscovered in the Palace collection recently, but it bears the incorrect title of Enjoying Pleasure in the Palace, by Kuo Chung-shu. As the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, has another version in the same shape, perhaps it should be considered when dealing with this subject.

The author hopes that the points which he has discussed in the above pages may throw some new light on this subject, concerning which he expects critical suggestions from experts.
THE SHITENNÔJI ALBUMS OF PAINTED FANS

BY KENJI TODA

INTRODUCTION

The importance of this group of paintings on fan-shaped papers, with the texts of the Buddhist sūtra Hokke-kyō written over the pictures, as a rare example of Yamato-e of the Heian period has been fully recognized. However, comparatively few special studies of this work have been made and many problems concerning these small pictures of unusual interest still seem to require a critical survey. The present article dwells specifically on two problems: (1) the representation of the life of common people, and (2) the use of printing blocks for some of the pictures. For a general study of this work, the notes given in the book Kôko gafu¹ should be mentioned as the standard source of information.

Besides the main bulk of 102 sheets belonging to the temple Shitennôji 四天王寺 in Osaka, and a complete album consisting of 12 sheets kept at the Tokyo National Museum, there are several sheets of the same kind scattered in various places, one at Hôryûji, one at Saikyôji, and a few others in private collections. Good photographic reproductions of about 50 of the paintings at Shitennôji were published by the Kyoto Museum in 1930. A complete facsimile of the album at the Tokyo Museum also was published (date and publisher not clear).² This album, with the painting and writing done in the same style as the detached sheets, indicates that these were all originally made into albums, one for each book of the sūtra. The sheets, held together by pasting at the folded edges, will get detached very easily. There is no record which may give us a clue as to the date or the circumstances under which this set of Hokke-kyō was presented to the Shitennôji. Judging by the characteristics of painting and calligraphy, however, the work has generally been considered to be of either late eleventh or early twelfth century date, at least about half a century earlier than the famous Itsukushima scrolls which bear the dates Chôkan 2 (1164), Nin-an 1 (1166), and Nin-an 2 (1167).

I. REPRESENTATIONS OF THE LIFE OF THE COMMON PEOPLE

Many descriptions of paintings on fans are found in old Japanese literary sources, but for a concrete historical record three Chinese books of the Sung period seem to give us even more valuable material than the Japanese sources. Japanese information about fans is rather casual, since the subject is too common in its native land, while in the Chinese books this foreign object of curiosity is treated with special interest. The three Chinese books are Huang-ch'ao lei-yüan 皇朝類苑 by Chiang Shao-yü 江少虞, T'ü-hua chien-weeney chih 圖畫集 of Kurokawa Mayori 墨川真暉, Kôko gafu 柯古畫譜, Tokyo, 1910, vol. 7, pp. 25–27.

¹ The album at the Tokyo Museum gives the complete text of the four chapters of Book VIII of Myōhô-renge-kyô 妙法蓮華経, commonly called Hokke-kyô 法華経 in Japan. The sūtra proper consists of eight books, with two other sūtras, Muryô-kyô 無量義経 as the introduction and Kan-Fugen-kyô 观音寶經 as the conclusion, usually added, thus making 10 books as a complete set. The eight books of Hokke-kyô include 28 chapters in the following order: Book I (chapters 1–2), Book II (3–4), Book III (5–6), Book IV (7–8), Book V (9–10), Book VI (11–12), Book VII (13–14), Book VIII (15–16), Book IX (17–18), Book X (19–20), Book XI (21–22), Book XII (23–24), Book XIII (25–26), Book XIV (27–28). The 102 detached sheets at Shitennôji represent Muryô-kyô, a part of Book I, the complete Book VI and Book VII, and Kan-Fugen-kyô.
cloud and moonlight effect, given in silver, was very pleasing.

The book *Hua Chi*, dated to A.D. 1167, according to its preface, covers a period of 94 years after Kuo Jo-hsu's work. In volume 10, which includes notes on miscellaneous subjects, we find the author's description of Korean and Japanese fans. His main interest was in the Korean folding fans made of paper on which landscapes, figures, pine trees, bamboos, and flowering plants were painted in a delightful form. Many Japanese fans evidently were brought to China through Korea in the Sung period. They were much appreciated by the Chinese, and the distinct form of painting on them attracted the attention of Chinese art critics. It is interesting to note that both Chiang Shao-yü and Kuo Jo-hsu mention a colored paper used in some of the Japanese fans. The making of colored papers by a dyeing process had developed to a highly specialized art in the Japan of the Heian period. The finest examples of dyed papers are found in some of the Itsukushima scrolls and in the album of poems by 36 poets belonging to the temple Nishi Honganji in Kyoto. Some of the fans that were brought to China probably were made of such dyed papers. In chapter 7 of the *Genji Monogatari* we find the description of a fan belonging to a coquettish old lady. This fan was made of red paper so deep in tone that the color seemed almost to stain one's hand. A picture of a cluster of tall trees was painted on one side of the fan, while a verse from an old poem was written on the other side.

The Chinese records show that the paintings on those Japanese fans represented a great variety of subjects. The subject matter in the screen paintings, of which a study was made by the present writer through the rec-

---

3 *Kuo Jo-hsu's experiences in painting* (T'u-hua chien-wen chih), tr. and ann. by Alexander Coburn Soper, Washington (American Council of Learned Societies), 1951.

4 Contained in the *Wang-shih hua-yüan* 王氏畫苑 of Wang Shih-chen 王世貞 (ch. 7 and 8).
ords of old poems, makes it easier for us to understand the development in the works of smaller scale, the fans. Many of the topics of screen paintings recorded in tenth-century Japanese poetry suggest the representation of the life of the common people. This fact is significant since the screens were made for the aristocrats. Their interests apparently were not confined to their own exclusive surroundings. There are many instances of the representation of the life of common people in the scroll works, but most of them are of later periods, the late twelfth or thirteenth centuries; the fan paintings of Shitennōji seem to be the only material illustrating this particular feature of Yamato-e of an earlier period.

Figure works predominate in the paintings on the fans at Shitennōji. The pictures represent the life of all classes of people. In about 50 of the pictures published by the Kyoto Museum one finds about 20 pictures representing the life of commoners. Two similar pictures of a street scene (pl. 2) which the writer was privileged to study at the Nara and Kyoto Museums, or the picture of peasant girls gathering chestnuts (pl. 4) kept also at Kyoto Museum, may be taken as the striking examples of such representations.

The freedom of expression manifest in these paintings is even more striking than some of the ukiyo-e representations which are taken as the art of common people. The fallacy that holds Yamato-e of the Heian period as an art of the aristocrats does not seem to prove true in this case. Owing to the condition of the social order, the main support of culture was in the hands of a certain class of people, but these people were not greatly interested in limiting the function of art to the glorification of their own mode of life. Even if one may admit that some aristocrats were exclusive in their tastes, one should remember that artists have their own interests and tastes. In the Orient as well as in the Western world one finds plenty of cases in which the artists, even under the patronage of aristocrats, demonstrated their own freedom of expression.

II. THE USE OF PRINTING BLOCKS

It has been observed in some of these paintings at Shitennoji that distinct contour lines in light ink are revealed where the heavy coat of pigments painted over the picture had come off. These light contour lines were taken by some students as the printed underdrawings. It was further observed that in a number of cases almost identical figures were used in different compositions. These facts were interpreted as the proof that in order to save time and labor, printing blocks were used by artists in some of their paintings on the fans.

There is no way to prove definitely that these light contour lines are impressions made by the printing blocks, and some students are rather reserved in their views about the matter. The note in Koko gafu or an article by Mr. Eiichi Matsumoto in Kokka No. 419, may represent the reserved views, while an article by Mr. Taichiro Kobayashi in Kokka Nos. 602–603–605–607, may be mentioned as representative of the views that recognize the use of printing blocks in this work. The present writer had opportunities to examine some of the actual works that show either the light contour or double contour lines, and has

6 Some of the fans belonging to Shitennoji are kept at the museums for the benefit of the public, as the temple has no facilities for study or exhibition. There were 12 fans at Nara, and 5 at Kyoto.

7 Eiichi Matsumoto 松本栄一, Tôkyô Teishitsu Hakubutsukan no semmen Hoke-kyô 東京帝国博物館の扇面法華経.
8 T. Kobayashi 小林太郎, Semmen shakyo-ga to mono-gatari-e 扇面写経絵と物語絵.
been inclined to take a more reserved view. Of the five works examined at the Kyoto Museum there were three cases in which double contour lines were noticed. In the fan illustrated in plate 4, faint contour lines were observed at the right upper corner among the branches and leaves of the maple tree. In the street scene similar to plate 2, double contours were evident in the drawing of some of the hands of the women. In the picture representing a court noble and a girl seated at a desk with three leaves of kaji tree (Broussonellia papyrifera) placed on it, light blurred lines were noted under the drawing of the faces. The writer noticed that most of these fan papers are well sized. Brush strokes would not fully penetrate the sized paper. Part of the ink had been absorbed by the pigments which were painted over the strokes, and when the coat of paint had come off, only a part of the first strokes remained on the paper. A similar effect can be obtained by the use of a soft eraser over the contour lines drawn on a hard smooth paper with a heavy black pencil.

The best-known case showing the light contour lines is a picture of a music party on an open veranda by a mountain stream. Four figures are represented in the scene: a lady playing a koto, a court noble with a biwa, a youth playing a flute, and a priest singing (pl. 3, fig. 6). Almost all of the paints had come off, removing with them the writing of the text of sūtra on the left half of the picture. It can be observed that the drawing of the figure of the court noble shows his left arm clearly from the shoulder under the sleeve of his garment. Similar cases of such underdrawing of arms are occasionally found in the old scroll paintings. Traces of preliminary drawings have been observed in some of the old Japanese Buddhist paintings. The most noted cases are in the series of paintings of Juni-ten belonging to the temple Saïdaiji near Nara. The practice of giving first a preliminary drawing of essential contours in ink, then painting over the outlined spaces in color, and finally completing the work with the definite finishing touches of accenting strokes, was common with the painters of the Heian period. The writer was unable to examine the actual painting of the music party, but judging even from photographic reproductions some of the lines of the figure of the singing priest (top figure in the plate of enlarged details) do not look like printed impressions. The double contours mentioned before also seem to indicate traces of underdrawing. It is to be pointed out that those who try to prove the use of printing blocks in this work at Shitennoji must base their opinions on the following assumptions: (1) There was much demand for the fans and some artists specialized in providing pictures for them even by the use of printing blocks. (2) This work is by one of those specializing artists.

(1) A fan was an indispensable accessory to the proper costume of both men and women. It is a feature depicted in many old Japanese paintings, and the custom of carrying fans persisted even down to the last century until the Western costume became universally adopted in the country. There was unquestionably much demand, but we are not sure whether such elaborately prepared works as the fans at Shitennoji were made for general use in the Heian period. The Chinese records of the Sung period quoted before seem to indicate that those Japanese fans were articles of luxury. There are some prints representing Buddhist figures which are considered to be of the twelfth century, but we fail to find mention of the use of printing blocks for popular pictures in the old literary sources. In his article in Kokka, Mr. Kobayashi gave Episode 93 in the Ise Monogatari as a reference concerning the use of printing blocks by some artists in that period.

This story in the Ise Monogatari is about
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a woman who was asked by her former husband to paint a picture for his fan. The text describes the woman merely as a painter (e-kaku hito) and not as a specialist in the painting on fans. The word kata in the text, interpreted by Mr. Kobayashi as the “printing block,” has been read differently by some Japanese scholars as “to the woman who was a painter” (onna no kata ni e-kaku hito nari-kere-ba). To the limited knowledge of the present writer there is no case in the old Japanese literature of the word kata denoting the printing block.

(2) The great number of pictures of this kind at Shitennoji and the characteristic free style of painting manifest in them has led some students to the belief that they are but one example of many similar works produced by popular artists in those days. Since there is no record at the temple in regard to the circumstances under which these albums were presented, we are unable to know definitely the exact significance of the whole set. It seems clear, however, that only a rich man could afford to make such a presentation. A quotation from the old record Gyokuyō 玉葉 about a presentation of the sūtra Nyohō-kyō 如法経 (same as Hokke-kyō), written on fans, to the temple Shitennoji on the sixteenth day of the ninth month of Bunji 4 (1188), is given by Mr. Kobayashi in his article in Kokka. Gyokuyō, also called Gyokkai 玉海, is a personal record written by Fujiwara no Kanezane 藤原兼実 (1148–1207), who was the prime minister under Emperor Gotoba (reign 1184–98). The record shows that the donor of the presentation was Kanezane himself.

In the album kept at the Tokyo Museum we find that the pictures are carefully selected to give a certain effect of unity. The floral design on the first sheet is followed by the pictures with water as the predominating feature. All the other albums in this series probably were arranged with the same care, and it would require a person of some means to be able to have a collection of such material and to employ a calligraphist for the writing of the texts.

The style of painting in most of these pictures is uniform and one may attribute the whole series to a single artist, whereas the style of painting of the cover designs seems to indicate a different artist. There are five cover designs now extant, including one for Book VIII at the Tokyo Museum. The others are for Books VI and VII, and for Muryōgi-kyō and Kan-Fugen-kyō. The figure of a court lady in the attitude of religious obeisance is represented in each one of these cover designs. The style of painting of these figures is different from the style of painting of the picture with the text. It can be surmised that the person who presented this set of albums to the Shitennoji had a collection of the fan paintings, and having arranged them in a certain order for each book of the sūtra, had the texts written and the cover designs made by an artist available to him at the time of the presentation.

It is to be remembered that the representative masters in Yamato-e like Takayoshi (recorded 1154 and 1174), Mitsunaga (recorded 1173), and Takanobu (1140–1204), all belong to the latter half of the twelfth century. To this period also belong the artists who made the series of Itsukushima scrolls (dated 1164–67) for the Taira clan. Including the works attributed to Toba Sōjō (1053–1140), an approximate historical classification of the late Heian period will give one a fairly good idea of all the variations of Yamato-e in its full development.

The artists Takayoshi, Mitsunaga, and Takanobu are all recorded for their work at the imperial court. Even the few extant works attributed to these painters show distinct in-
dividualities. Technical variations in the form of expression suggest the presence of many other unknown artists working according to their own inclinations. It would not be assuming too much to take the paintings on the fan-shaped albums as another case of those individual expressions. Some of these pictures may lack the dignity of the scroll paintings, but they show a refinement and technical dexterity which one would not find in the work of a mere craftsman.

The present writer is inclined to consider these fan-shaped albums as an organized series, but not as a collection of pictures made at random. The choice of paper made specially for the fans as the material on which to write the sacred texts probably was on account of the quality and the decorative shape. To stand the wear as a fan, papers of substantial quality were required, and there is no question about the beauty of the functionally developed shape of the folding fan.

The writer in indebted to Mr. Ryuichi Kaji of Tokyo who generously contributed the photographs for the illustrations in this article and in the article on screen paintings published in Volume III of Ars Orientalis.
Fig. 1.—The First Sheet with the Picture of Autumn-flowering Plants.
All leaves painted in green; flowers of gentian in blue.

Fig. 2.—The Cover Design. Title Written in Gold.

Fig. 3.—Last Picture in the Album.
Traces of vertical lines over the picture probably were made by a stylus to guide the writing of the text.

The Album Kept at the Tokyo National Museum.
Fig. 4.—A Scene by the Well on a Summer Day.
Given on the first sheet of Chapter 20.

Fig. 5.—A Street Scene.
Given on the last sheet of Book VII, Chapter 24.
Fig. 6.—Singing Priest in the Picture of a Music Party.
The contour lines do not seem to indicate the impressions made by a printing block.

Fig. 7.—Enlargement from Figure 5, Plate 2.
Fig. 8.—Enlargement from Figure 4, Plate 2.

Enlarged Details.
Fig. 9.—Detail of the Left Upper Half of the Picture.
Tree trunks painted in dark greenish-gray wash without contour lines and accented with white spots of lichen. This technique was followed particularly by Kōrin in the early 18th century. Flesh tints are used on the faces and limbs of the girls, while the faces of the two ladies at lower right are painted white. The mouths and faces of two girls and the lady drawn in vermilion.

Fig. 10.—Copy of Picture on a Fan Made by Kosori Tomone, a Well-Known Artist in Yamato-e of the Meiji-Taishō Period.
Copies of these pictures on the fans, with all the writings eliminated, have been tried by a number of Japanese painters.
FIG. 11.—A BUDDHIST PRIEST IN SECLUSION.

Detail from the picture given on the 21st roll of the Itsukushima scrolls. The style of painting in this picture shows another variation in Yamato-e of the late Heian period.
Fig. 12.—First Sheet of the Book of Muryöig-kyö.

Fig. 13.—Text from Chapter 16, Book VI of Hokekyö.
NETSUKE CARVERS OF THE IWAMI SCHOOL

By ANNE HULL GRUNDY

Dedication

To my husband, without whose constant care throughout ten years of illness, I should not be here. Nor could this have been written without his assistance.

TABLE OF IWAMI SCHOOL CARVERS

1. Known Blood Relatives of the School:

   Tomiharu, b. 1733, d. 1810.
   The list opposite contains various signatures presumed to be by Tomiharu.

   Bunshojo (elder daughter of Tomiharu)
   b. 1764, d. 1838.

   Yachiyo (second daughter of Tomiharu)

2. General List of the School:

   Bokugiuen Toshiharu
   Fugioku Seiyodo
   Goko Milani
   Ganko
   Gambun (Jikwan, Akuge, Meibun)
   Seiriodo Gyokuyen
   Kwanko Takugiyoku
   Kwanman (Kuni and Tsuramitsu)

   Tomiharu=Seiyodo
   Sekishu Kawaikawa
   Kiyo Tomiharu
   Rito Tomiharu
   Shimidzu Tomiharu
   Namije Tomiharu
   Namije Seiyodo
   Kiyomidzu Tomiharu
   Shunyodo Tomiharu
   Sei Fushan
   Iwa the First

   Makoto
   Tomiaki Kwaishundo
   Seiyodo Yasuhiro
   Seiyodo Yoshimasa
   Nagami Seiyodo
   Shoman Sayeki (?)
   Tsunesato
   Kitai

3. Additional Carvers Considered by the Author Probably to Belong to the Iwami School:

   Riusen or Tatsugawa Tomitane
   Riusen or Tatsugawa Tosai
   Riusui or Ruiji
   Sekiran
   Sadakazu or Tei-ichi
   Sadayoshi or Tei-yu
   Toka
   Sorin

   U-Wa Jo
   Jo Sen (?)
   Basetsu
   Kachoku
   Sekiju (?)
   Sekishu
   Aki Take
   Senjizo
TOMIHARU AND BUNSHOJO SEIYODO, NETSUKE CARVERS OF IWAMI

Preeminent among Japanese netsuke carvers were the members of the small select Iwami School, which was situated in the Western District of Shimane Prefecture. These artists never repeated a model, so each of their netsuke was an original masterpiece, and, in consequence, is now extremely rare.

Ivory was scarce in Iwami, so the netsuke carvers also used a wide range of other materials. These included antelope horn, umoregi, umimatsu, persimmon, and boxwood as well as whale's tooth and boar's tusk.

The founder of the school was Tomiharu Seiyodo, who often signed his work with this name, but also had a number of other signatures. He was born at Izumo, Tamatsukuri, in the province of Oshu, in Kyoho 18 (1733). In Endyo 2 (1745), at the age of 13 (by Japanese computation, though 12 in ours), he was entered as an acolyte at Ishi gun Namatamura, the temple of Choeiji. Finding, however, that he preferred carving to studying for the priesthood, he turned his scholastic abilities to the writing of Haiku verse, for which purpose he used the name of Shunyodo. In order to follow his vocation as a carver he went to Tokyo (Edo) to study art. When proficient he returned to his own province of Iwami, having sojourned for varying lengths of time at Namine, Omori, Ezu, and elsewhere during his travels. Finally, he came to rest at Rakushi Tono-mura nara-gun where he married a daughter of the place, and settled down to live in the valley of the Kaaigawa River. He died in 1810 at the age of 77.

Brockhaus recorded a netsuke by Tomiharu (though he was somewhat confused over the gender of the carver), which had an inscription on it to the effect that the netsuke (depicting a centipede) was made of "wale-bone" (=whale's tooth) from a whale which he had killed when he was 60 years of age while traveling along the Tokaido. As a sperm whale has from 36 to 56 teeth, this supply of Tomiharu's was doubtless the source from which his daughter Bunshojo obtained a whale's tooth for the superb netsuke illustrated in figure 2. Tomiharu had previously carved a fine netsuke of a centipede from a whale's tooth. This was first recorded in the Gilbertson collection, and there formed lot 79 in the catalogue, and was described as "Tooth of Physeter macrocephalus carved with a centipede in relief and minutely engraved with a descriptive inscription and signature Tomiharu of Nagasaki (Kiyo) Seiyodo." Afterward, it was acquired by Mr. Meinertzhagen, who parted with it to Mr. Fairly in 1936. It was subsequently purchased by the late Mrs. Sharpe, whose husband generously presented it to Mr. Hindson, and it is by far the finest Iwami netsuke in his collection. It is illustrated in figure 1. The inscription, according to its present owner, reads "Nippon Northern Circuit sunny Iwami Kaaigawa Seiyo Shimidzu Tomiharu age 55 years old, yet this fish-tiger tusk engraved and carved this centipede thing was."

As this piece is not dated, and is much more worn than other known pieces by Tomiharu, and as there is also a netsuke in the Hindson collection of a vegetable with an inscription, which the owner interpreted as "Iwami Province Kaagawa Sei Tomiharu Shimidzu Kawa, second son of 12 years and carved this was," it at one time occurred to the author that the centipede on the whale's tooth might have been carved by Tomiharu's father. The calligraphy of the inscription, however, is most skillfully done in the minute kebori typical of the Iwami School, and so appeared too sophisticated for a 12-year-old, which raised the possibility that it had been added by Tomiharu later in life.
The author recently acquired a centipede carved from a large boar’s tusk, which is just as fine as the Gilbertson piece. Though not signed, it is an obvious Tomiharu. The patina is as old and equally fine as on the whale’s tooth netsuke, and it is interesting to compare the carving of the two centipedes, and to note the similarity of the undulating bodies and rhythmical pattern of the legs (fig. 3).

The inferences due to presence or absence of patina are well illustrated by comparing these two netsuke with an even more intricately designed and carved centipede on sperm-whale tooth (truncated and veined to simulate a cut bamboo shoot) by Tomiharu’s daughter Bunshojo. This piece, though about 150 years old, is absolutely without wear or patina, and so lacks the deep glow of the other two netsuke (fig. 2).

Bunshojo was the eldest daughter of Tomiharu. She was born in 1764 when her father was 32 years old. Her first name was Onoe. She was also a poet and wrote Haiku verse, as well as being reputed to be very fond of drinking saké, and died a spinster in 1838 at 74 years of age. Her family name too was Seiyodo; and as Tomiharu was also known as Iwa the First, she became Iwa the Second. According to Reikichi Ueda, she passed on her skill in carving to her nephew Gansui, whom she had trained to follow in her footsteps.

It has always puzzled the author how a netsuke could properly be visualized by the reader without photographs taken from different angles, so as to give the correct three-dimensional effect that the carver intended. All sculptors, no matter what size their work, cannot make anything without shaping it from all sides and angles out of a solid mass. Therefore, in any serious study of a netsuke, how can it be deemed sufficient to show only one view, as if the netsuke were a flat surface as is a print or painting? Whereas one view may suffice for recognizing the common well-known models that crop up continually, one photograph only can never hope to do justice to any netsuke carving that is a real work of art.

It is for this reason that the magnificent snake by Bunshojo is photographed from several positions. It will be noticed that the carefully graduated scales are realistically carved, so that they come to their highest prominence at their tips, then slope down sharply on either side of the central ridge or “keel” so that they appear actually to overlap each other. This same “scale technique” is also used by Tomiharu on an ebony turtle in the author’s collection. The pale amber-colored horn-eyes with the black inlaid pupils are also similar to both pieces. The underside of the snake is comparatively flat, but here the beautifully graduated ventral shields or rings actually do overlap slightly, simulating a concertina most realistically at every bend. Each “ring” has fine lines radiating out from its base (they will be seen most clearly in the dark center part of the illustration on figures 4—10). The carving of the “rings” becomes more intricate and divided in the portion reaching from the anus to the tip of the tail, just as on a real snake. This piece has been worn and is especially well patinated on the underside, owing to the constant rubbing of the netsuke against the silken garments of the wearer.

All the members of the Seiyodo family were renowned for their exquisite calligraphy but this inscription on Bunshojo’s snake is the most minute recorded on a netsuke. It consists of 19 characters written in two rows on a narrow raised plaque which measures only \(\frac{3}{2}\) of an inch in length by \(\frac{1}{2}\) inch in width. The characters, which cover \(\frac{3}{2}\) inch in length, are only legible under a powerful lens and read as follows: “Iwami Province Kaigaiga Seiyodo Sei Tomiharu Jo Bunsho carved and cut this.”

The author feels confident that this snake was carved by Bunshojo for her own personal use, because the white serpent is symbolic for
Benten, the only goddess of the Shichi Fuku-Jin (Gods of Good Fortune), and, as the goddess of learning and speech, is curiously appropriate for Bunshojo in her capacity of poetess. Benten is also the goddess of love and there is a well-known legend quoted by Puini (Il sette genie della felecita) in which the daughter of Shimmiyosu daimiojin, whose name was also Bunsho (and this fact adds credence to this theory though the actual "characters" do not correspond), prayed to Benten to grant her male heirs. One day she gave birth to 500 eggs and then becoming afraid of what she had done, as she feared they might contain monsters, she put them into a basket which she floated on the Rinzugawa River. Apparently a fisherman lower down rescued the eggs from the water and placed them in warm sand to hatch. He was immensely astonished to find a crowd of boys hatch out a few days later, instead of the expected chicks. The head man of the community sent him to the charitable "Lady of the Manor" (Bunsho herself), for advice and help, and so it came about that the boys returned to their progenitor (subsequently deified), and were suitably educated to fit their station.

The centipede on the bamboo shoot by Bunshojo, which has been referred to, is a most beautiful and impressive netsuke of rather large size. The whale's tooth from which it is carved is cut slantingly across the tip and shows a fine opalescence, while the outer wall is carved to represent the cut-off leaves of a bamboo shoot (fig. 2). The sides of the netsuke are most exquisitely carved with delicately veined leaves with their frilled and pointed tips turned outward. Up the full length of the shoot crawls a huge centipede which is most realistically carved, with antennae, head, poison jaws, and 44 slender legs, each of which is cut away underneath so that only their sharp tips rest on the shoot. The legs also become much longer toward the tail end of the centipede, as in the real creature, and the base has been cut across in the opposite direction to the top. In the center of this lower cut surface is a large himatoshi (cord hole) which emerges halfway up the side of the shoot. The signature is finely engraved on the base as follows: "Chokoku Bunshojo Seiyodo Kaigawa Iwami did this."

As well as having some affinity to the before-mentioned centipede by Tomiharu, there is in the author's collection a fine boxwood netsuke by Tomiharu of a bunch of three bamboo shoots with a rose beetle crawling over them. This also illustrated the close bond in the work of father and daughter. As may be judged by the illustrations (figs. 11-15), this is a magnificent piece; it came from the collection of Mr. W. W. Winkworth, and was the first record of a raised signature by Tomiharu. This rose beetle clammers naturalistically over the folded cloth which binds the bamboo tips together. The only blemishes on this piece are some toothlike gnawing marks. These cannot be intentional as they also occur on the beetle (figs. 11-14).

A somewhat similar netsuke, which is illustrated here, comes from the Rijksmuseum at Leiden in Holland (whose previous curator Dr. T. Volker wrote The animal in Far Eastern art, Leiden, 1930). This netsuke depicts a rose beetle on a small whale's tooth, which, though it was apparently catalogued as "boar's tusk," still seems far too large to be one, and the fold in the tooth is very typical of whale's tooth. The signature, which is barely legible on figure 15, appears to read "Bunshojo Seiyodo of Iwami Kaigawa carved and cut this."

Tomiharu scarcely ever used boxwood, and indeed the only other one known is the frog-on-leaf illustrated here (figs. 16, 16a, 17),

---

1 See W. Edmunds, Pointers and clues to the subjects of Chinese and Japanese art, London, 1934.
which, though unsigned, is yet undoubtedly by Tomiharu. Compare it with the ebony frog-on-leaf from the Victoria and Albert Museum signed “Sekiyo Nami-ye Tomi-haru Chosei” (figs. 18, 19). Note the widely opened eyes, the raised pimples on the sides, and the long raised ridge streaks on their backs, which are identical in both frogs. The leaves, too, are alike, though the leaf under the author’s frog, being much less worn, still clearly shows the cutting or chisel marks.

If one might digress enough to settle a controversy here, these signatures and carved details in relief are often claimed to be “impressed,” and this could possibly apply to the work of Bazan and the Nagoya School carvers, but it emphatically does not apply to any Iwami School netsuke that the author has seen, and she owns over 30 pieces and has inspected about 40 other specimens. In fact, the unworn hollows on these netsuke show the cutting marks around the raised “pimples” very clearly, especially on some netsuke by Goho, whose superb work is discussed later.

Another kakiwood frog-on-leaf is shown in figures 20 and 21. Though again unsigned, the details shown in this side view will serve to demonstrate that it may safely be attributed to the hand of Tomiharu. Unfortunately the top of the frog and leaf have all the beautifully detailed work worn off. Although collectors—especially on the Continent—value patinated pieces highly, yet the charm of Iwami pieces is largely dependent on their exquisite detail, and the less worn pieces are the most desirable.

Another frog by Tomiharu in the author’s collection is shown in figures 22–24. It is carved out of dark-brown kakiwood and has pale-brown patches on the underside. This frog is unusually large and has somewhat exaggerated circular depressions behind the ears and big skin wrinkles overlapping the limbs. It is curiously carved with a smooth though wavy surface over the back and legs, and with pimply hollows which go down the center of its back. These realistically carved pimples of different sizes, mixed together, give it a fascinating crepe-like texture, very “reptilian” in appearance, and are different from those on other Iwami pieces. They cover the frog’s face and throat, and continue well up its sides, down over its plump posterior to the base of the spine. The feet are tucked underneath and the pads on the hind legs are arranged to look like overlapping blunt-ended feathers. The orbital ridges over the eyes are enormous, and the “whites and pupils” of the eyes are delicately sunk contrasting ovals. The nasal ridge, nostrils, mouth, and jowls are all most realistically rendered. This piece incorporates so many more details than is usual for Tomiharu to put into his frogs, that it has made it possible for the author to visualize him clearly as the teacher of Goho, whose frog netsuke are unsurpassed. Mr. Meinertzhagen still regrets the frog by Tomiharu which he missed at the Huet sale in Paris in 1928 and which went to a Netherlands collection. The author’s frog illustrated here has “Tomiharu” incised upon a raised circular reserve.

The large netsuke of two smooth little tree-frogs crouched on a “rotten tree-log” (fig. 25) comes from the Hindson collection and was illustrated in the Antique Collector. It is signed “Seiyodo” but after years of research the author is convinced that this is one of the signatures used by Tomiharu himself. Even Reikichi Ueda seems unclear about all Tomiharu’s pseudonyms, but states his family name was Kiyomizu Tomiharu, and that in Chinese style he used the art name Sei Fushun. That Tomiharu himself was amused by his numerous signatures is made apparent by this Haiku verse which he wrote under the name of Shunyodo: “Seiyodo! the wall-peach too possesses all sorts of other special names.”

The author has also seen a photograph of
a rather ordinary little frog with nicely chiselled back markings, squatting on a tree log which has realistic ring markings on one cut end, and the inscription “Sekiyō Kaagawa Seiyodo Tomiharu Chokoku.”

Finally, in the Hindson collection, there is a carving of a frog-on-leaf of persimmon wood. It is the usual Iwami-type “tree frog on leaf” and shows affinity with others by Tomiharu, including the examples in the Victoria and Albert Museum and the author’s collection. It is, however, by Bunshojo, though the only really remarkable thing about it is its raised signature, which is the only raised one recorded by this carver, though the author knows of several other raised signatures by other artists of the Iwami School.

The second Tomiharu with a raised signature in the author’s collection is a large ebony piece, in the form of a “piece of driftwood” (a favorite motif of both Gocho and Tomiharu) with wonderful “modern-art” curves which form a dip in the center out of which rises a plateau, the contours of which are exactly similar in size and shape to the minogame (mane-tailed tortoise) poised on it. The relief signature, being on the unprotected base, and close to the cord holes, has become very worn. This minogame is illustrated in figure 26. There was a unique ivory “minogame on driftwood” in the British Museum which was unwisely disposed of at auction among a lot of so-called duplicates at Glendinnings some years ago. It is now in the Hindson collection, and has a minute inscription of less than one inch in length with “Seiyodo of Kaagawa in Iwami” on it, and is very unworn looking.

An American collector recently sent the author a tiny photograph of a whale’s-tooth netsuke two inches long, carved with a minogame, and signed “Bunsho Chokoku Seiyodo” with a kaki-kan.

A much less impressive netsuke by Bunshojo is the Usu-tokine (pestle and mortar) carved in large-grained brown kakiwood shown in figures 27–29. It was, however, the custom for these mortars (which were used for the pounding of the New Year rice cakes) to be coarsely carved, and this little model is no exception, with the knife marks left showing in the traditional style. Nonetheless, Bunshojo’s charm is apparent in the quaint gold lacquer “repair,” which is actually part of the design. An ivory hourglass-shaped pestle will be seen stuck to the side of the Usu-tokine. It is signed on the base “Seiyodo Bunshojo Chokoku.”

The last example of Bunshojo’s work to be described from the author’s collection is not, strictly speaking, a netsuke, though it did serve as one. It is an ink box (Japanese ink comes in a solid black lump or stick which is soluble), and was suspended from a long brush holder made from the thigh bone of a small animal, with a silver push-on lid which has a silver loop through which a slender silk cord passed to prevent its becoming mislaid. Actually, in this instance, it is not easy to surmise whether the brush holder served as the netsuke, by being thrust into the obi as a sash netsuke. It is, however, not nearly as heavy as the ink box and the latter would have pulled it out, owing to its great weight, especially as the brush holder has no hook or other projection whereby to fasten it securely over the edge of the obi. It is therefore probable that the brush holder was suspended from the ink box, which was slung through the sash and served as the netsuke.

That this supposition is probably correct is also confirmed by the worn appearance of the ink box, which indeed is the only example of Bunshojo’s work illustrated here where the age of the piece is apparent. Artistically it has not the merit of either the snake or the centipede, though it is far better than the mortar. But neither Bunshojo nor Tomiharu
produced their really best quality work consistently, though all their products have an irresistible charm.

This ink box (figs. 30–33) is of particular interest from the point of view of research. First, because it has simulated gold lacquer repairs like the mortar (though much more elaborate); and second, because the spider on the lid is very similar to others by Tomiharu and Gansui (Bunshojo’s nephew pupil), and it also resembles the “spider on rolled leaf” by Bunshojo herself which was illustrated by Reikichi Ueda and reproduced here. The most remarkable thing about the ink box, however, is the skillfully drawn fern, which is spontaneously etched across the entire front surface. Another etched Iwami netsuke is the manju by Seiyodo Yoshimasa, illustrated by Jonas in his book on netsuke and reproduced here in figure 34. Reikichi Ueda also mentions that Seiyodo Yoshimasa carved netsuke from tusks.

Another quaint feature about the ink box is that it is carved in the shape of a fan box, which corresponds with the curves of the tusk, utilizing the outer convex wall of the tusk and reaching nearly to the core of the tooth, which is cut away in an equidistant curve and so forms a semicircular fan-shaped box, the inside of which is most carelessly hollowed out. There is a closely fitting lid, which is carved from the same piece of ivory (the age cracks and grazes correspond exactly), and which had the spider placed upon it. The lid is kept on by means of metal rings which correspond to others on the box, and the silk cord which passed through them kept all in place.

The signature on it is as follows: Iwami Shu Kaigawa Seiyodo Bunshojo Chokoku, i.e., “Seiyodo Bunshojo from Kaigawa in Iwami province carved this.” It is followed by two written “seals” which are untranslatable, and can only be said to represent a family kakihan or identification mark. This is confirmed by the fact that the same type of vase-shaped seal which is on the ink box also appears on the large Tomiharu centipede now in the Hindson collection.

The author recently saw a photograph of a boar’s-tusk netsuke, however, carved with a spider, and engraved with fern leaves very similar in execution to this ink box. It also had 36 Haiku verses on it, and was signed thus: “Iwami Kaigawa, Seiyodo, Gansui carved.”

In figure 35 will be seen the “spider on rolled kahone-leaf,” which was carved from the tusk of a wild boar, and it will be noted that this bears a strong family resemblance to the preceding piece. It is signed “Seiyodo Bunshojo Chojoku” and is illustrated in Shumi no Netsuke by Reikichi Ueda (No. 36). This piece is now believed to be somewhere in the United States and the writer would be interested to hear of its whereabouts.

The author had a stroke of luck recently in the form of a unique netsuke which came with a “mixed bag” from a dealer in the United States. It was described merely as “a spider and web” (but even this sounded promisingly rare). Nevertheless, it was an undiluted joy to find that it was indisputably an Iwami School piece, for only they could make a unique design such as this. It is carved from a large piece of boxwood, left perfectly smooth on top so as to show the wood grain, but with one edge carved to look as if it is rotting away. The base has been left undecorated and has two cord holes (one much larger than the other) that are rather blatantly occupying most of the surface, which is typical of Iwami School carvers who never seem to try concealing the himatoshi. All the decoration is placed around the sides on this netsuke as can be seen in the accompanying figure 36. The sides are pitted with a fine all-over stipple, then both ends are stranded vertically, and the back is decorated with bunches of bamboo leaves. The front has a spider which is extremely similar to those on the ink box and
Reikichi’s piece, but it has tiny metal eyes. The most striking feature, however, is the spider’s web which is most painstakingly carved in relief from the wood.

The author has also seen a photograph of an extremely well-carved ivory cicada with delicately veined wings, perched on a twig with realistically depicted bark and leaves. Notwithstanding, the owner had cheerfully described this piece as “pine log with beetle.” Apparently it is signed “Seiyodo Bunshojo.” Another wooden cicada signed by Tomiharu and dated 1789 is illustrated in Gonse’s Art Japonais and reproduced here in figure 37. Cicadas are a favorite motif with the Iwami School carvers and the author owns examples by Masatoyo and by Sadakazu (Tei-ichi).

In figures 38–40 is shown an extremely fine ebony turtle from the author’s collection. The head juts well out and part of the tail is visible from above, although the limbs are hidden from that vantage point. It is somewhat similar to a magnificent tortoise by Goho in the author’s collection, and one by Kwanman illustrated in the Behrens’ catalogue. The carapace has some exquisitely raised circles (not dots or pimplles as in other Iwamis but really minutely carved circles), radiating in “sunburst” patterns on the larger plates of the shell. Unfortunately they are very much worn in places. The usual raised pimplles appear on the head, skin of the neck, skin and pads of the hind legs, as well as on its posterior, above the tail. The tail itself is covered with incredibly clever rows of tapering scales. The scales on the forelegs are more regular, though also graduated in size, and each one is separately carved with a raised edge that appears to overlap the next. This technique is exactly the same as that used by Bunshojo on the ivory snake discussed earlier in this article. The pale amber-colored horn eyes with black pupils are identical in both, and the unsigned Tomiharu ebony “frog-on-leaf” also has this type of eye.

The entire surface of the plastron (underside of shell) is covered with a lengthy inscription, now unfortunately so worn that two characters have been obliterated (text fig. A). It reads: “Iwami Kaigawa Seiyodo old Tomi-

石見可愛河青陽堂富春翁行年

六十一歳而彫刻之寛政癸丑直正

Fiq. A—Iwami Kaigawa Seiyôdô Tomiharu-ô gyônen roku-jû-ichi sai nite
Kore o chôkoku-su, Kansei Mizunoto-ushî [A.D. 1794]. Choku-sei.

haru at 61 years of age engraved and carved this in the Ox year Mizunoto (1794). This is a true statement.” As Tomiharu was born in 1733 it would therefore be correct. The author obtained this piece direct from Iwami about three years ago, which was remarkable after a lapse of some 150 years!

The last Tomiharu in the author’s collection is carved out of rather open-grained kaki-wood and depicts a crab on driftwood which is most realistically carved with all the wood-shake markings appearing tideworn, just like any piece found casually on a beach. There are also in the author’s collection two crabs by Kwanman which are somewhat similar. The “crab on driftwood” in figures 41 and 42 is inscribed underneath as follows: “Tomiharu Seiyodo Iwami province Kaigawa carved and engraved.”
Other recorded pieces by Tomiharu include the following: In the Tomkinson sale, lot 197 was catalogued thus: "A scene by the seashore carved inside a shell and a poem on the shell in relief (relating to Mount Horai) signed Tomiharu aged 62 and dated 1794."

In the Hindson collection there is a somewhat lifeless spider by Tomiharu on boar's tusk inscribed at 55 years of age and dated 1788.

In the Hayashi collection there was a "toad on an old log" signed "Kiyo Tomiharu."

In the sale catalogue of October 24, 1921, at Glendinnings, lot 157 included "A centipede hiding between two rocks, signed Seiyodo Tomiharu" in ebony. At Glendinnings' sale on October 24, 1921, lot 370 included a tusk signed "Seiyodo."

The last netsuke to be reproduced here is taken from Shumi no netsuke (No. 35) by Reikichi Ueda (fig. 43). It shows a magnificent carving of a twig and leaf, with a discarded nymphal case of a cicada attached to the underside of it, and the freshly emerged insect drying out on top of the leaf. It is signed "Iwami Namie Seiyodo Cho." Though Reikichi Ueda stated that this is later than the work of Seiyodo Tomiharu, the apparent pristine condition of this piece probably misled him. The author feels convinced that the carver was Tomiharu, and an examination of the Gonse cicada by Tomiharu and the ivory cicada by Bunshojo strengthens this assumption. The Reikichi piece is reputed to be in the United States and the author would like to hear of its whereabouts.

Mr. Meinertzhagen also recorded these pieces: "Wood Inro of two cases carved into dragon and clouds signed Seiyodo ex Corbin coll." "A small minogame on folded lotus leaf in ivory with Seiyodo Tomiharu of Kaai Iwami and dated 1797 all in small Kebori characters." He also recorded two netsuke in ebony of a reclining ox signed "Tomiharu—one carved at 61 years of age."

This chapter should serve to show the great affinity between the work of Bunshojo and Tomiharu, her father. It will also be a useful foundation from which to examine the work of the other members of the Iwami School.

GOHO OF IWAMI

The wooden netsuke of Goho are outstanding, even beside the carvings of other masters of the Iwami School. In fact, they have never been surpassed by any other carver. That Goho was proud of his own ability is shown by the remarks he added to some of his signatures. An example, written in somewhat recherché characters, is on the base of the tortoise illustrated (figs. 44–49). This reads Tani Goho Tanshi, which may be translated as: "This faultless piece is by Tani (=Mitani) Goho." Goho's estimation of this netsuke was confirmed in an amusing manner; when it was shown to the Keeper in Charge of Tortoises at the "Zoological Gardens," the official insisted that it was a real terrapin and not a carving! This was probably because the astonishingly fine work on the top and sides of the tortoise, which consists of delicately raised ridges and pimplles, not only makes the piece miraculously real, but seems too intricate to be carved by the human hand.

The tortoise is in its semidefensive position, so that only a small part of the face, with the dark inlaid eyes, protrudes from the carapace. Viewed from above, the limbs and tail are practically out of sight, though when looked at from the side they will be found tightly pressed into their respective body niches. The skin of the head and neck is only slightly tuberculate, but the limbs are covered with realistically carved bumps which terminate in hard raised ridges above the clawlike toes. All these details are clearly visible be-
cause this netsuke is carved from boxwood, which is comparatively light in color, and so takes a dark stain in the hollows. This greatly helps the fine raised carving to be seen by means of the contrast. It is a pity that so many of Tomiharu's netsuke is of ebony and dark-colored kakiwood, as the details tend to sink into the background, and can only be viewed clearly with a good light slanting across them.

It is presumed that Goho was a pupil of Tomiharu; for it is indisputable that their work has a great deal in common. This may be seen by comparing the large Tomiharu frog with the frogs by Goho. In any case, the work of Goho certainly surpasses that of his "master."

The author considers the tortoise (figs. 44-49) to be the best netsuke in her collection, and in these days of high prices, it is pleasant to recollect that this superb piece cost a mere 25 shillings about 15 years ago. It is remarkable how far some of these little carvings have traveled. The author's collection of Iwami School netsuke reminds one of the United Nations, for it has been drawn from many parts of the world.

The frog by Goho (figs. 50-53) is in mint condition. It was purchased at an auction sale in Germany, and its reasonable price may be attributed to its unused appearance, for Continentals tend to overestimate the value of wear and patination on their netsuke. For this reason, probably, either the anxious vendor or the auctioneer obliterated much of the exquisitely carved detail by applying a heavy wax coating which became so hard that it was troublesome to remove.

The netsuke is carved from boxwood, and is only partially stained in a grayish-beige color just a shade darker than the wood. This is a very pleasant pale stain for it does not make too great a contrast. (The only other piece similarly treated is the "frog on driftwood," also by Goho, illustrated here.)

For sheer genius and realism this netsuke is unsurpassed. It depicts a plump frog coming out of a lotus pod. Its bumpy, warty skin is so realistic that no frog hater could pick it up! The little raised lumps on its skin are all in graduated sizes; moreover, they are carved and not impressed, as can be seen clearly in the completely unworn crevices. The frog has large orbital ridges, with sunken eyes and inlaid jet pupils beneath. Its huge mouth appears to be just on the point of opening. Its right forefoot is clasping the edge of the pod, while its left foot is spread (with all the delicately ridged webbing between the toes clearly visible) over the end of the stalk which is cut through so as to expose the pores. The right haunch and foot are only partially visible because the frog is squatting half inside the pod. But the pod follows the contours of the amphibian so closely that it appears only to emphasize them, and it is also split and eaten into holes by insects or snails, so that bits of warty skin peep out of the damaged pod. The pod itself radiates out from its stem and each ridged vein and hollow is most delicately carved with minute raised ridges going crosswise.

The underside has large portions of the pod missing, and the belly of the fat frog is pressed forward so realistically that one feels like an intruder in looking at it. Then suddenly and inexplicably this carefully built-up illusion is shattered by two ugly cord holes bored right through the underside of the frog. They are undoubtedly original, but appear most unnecessary, for the stem of the lotus pod could easily have been "lifted" to permit the passage of a cord. The carver, however, has utilized the stem for his signature and has engraved Goho Rojin upon it.

Goho makes similar overlarge holes in the exquisite tortoise netsuke (figs. 44-48), and it really appears as if the Iwami artists were afraid to carry the naturalistic illusion too far,
and so deliberately introduce a jarring feature, or else were insistent on their netsuke’s functionalism being made apparent.

The third wooden netsuke by Goho in the writer’s collection is a brilliant example of virtuoso carving. It came from the United States in the following manner. Some years ago the large book on netsuke by Tollner was published in America, and included a netsuke that the author realized could only have been carved by Goho. Unfortunately the book gave no particulars at all regarding the netsuke. However, after contacting the publishers and the author, and the man who contributed the photograph, the dealer who had originally owned it was found and persuaded to trace the purchaser. Imagine the writer’s gratification when, after sending off a photographic copy of Goho’s signature, and suggesting that an inscription or signature in convex relief should be looked for, and the long shot paid off, the base of the netsuke was found to be covered by a finely carved inscription in relief. Then, after negotiations, the netsuke was finally obtained and brought to this country after a chase lasting four years!

It is probable that those Iwami pieces were so highly esteemed in their native land that they were worn only on special occasions, which treatment preserved them from excessive wear. Also, wealthy people owned a selection of inro and netsuke, and used special ones for certain festivals and at certain seasons. It is, therefore, fortunate that many Iwami pieces were well preserved, for their charm is largely dependent on the minutely detailed surface work which was their creators’ especial interpretation of nature.

The frog itself is completely unstained, but the incredibly realistic driftwood on which it is squatting has been very lightly stained in the hollows, which makes a pleasing contrast. The frog is also rather thin and scraggly looking, and is obviously a different type of frog than the one illustrated (figs. 50–53).

The very “newness” of the “frog on driftwood” demonstrates even more clearly the astonishing technique of the carving, and disposes once and for all of the notion that the pimples are “impressed,” for the meticulous and painstaking carving of each individual tubercle can clearly be seen. Of special interest on this piece are the long raised lines which are carefully interspaced between the raised dots on the frog’s haunches. Similar raised lines appear on some of Tomiharu’s frogs, and may be seen clearly on the photograph of the Victoria and Albert Museum specimen. There is no doubt, however, as to the general superiority of Goho’s work. The “driftwood” under this frog, for instance, is infinitely more convincing than that beneath the crab by Tomiharu. The other important fact is that practically all Goho’s wooden netsuke are superb and do not vary much in quality as do the carvings of the other carvers of the Iwami School.

The design of the “frog on driftwood” (figs. 54–60) is excellent, and the legs and feet are almost gruesome in their stark realism. The delicately carved raised inscription which covers the “tide-lapped” base is a work of art in itself and appears to read: Goho Kotsu Saku Hi, So Gei Yo—“Made by Goho—bright as the day!” An alternative reading would be Goho Kotsu Saku Nisso Gei Yo—“Made in the official manner by Goho of Southern Aki in old Japan.”

The last wooden frog by Goho in the author’s collection consists of a frog squatting on a piece of bamboo. It has raised pimples and longer raised streaks or lines than usual down the back. It was catalogued by Mr. W. W. Winkworth as “unsigned but undoubtedly by Goho,” and it does resemble some Goho frogs which are to be described presently. In certain lights one can also trace the left half of
two characters that appear to have once read “Goho.” It is illustrated in figures 62–64.

In the Hindson collection there is a very large “frog on driftwood.” Though well carved, it is much clumsier than the one in figures 54–60. When it was purchased it had some hideous brass escutcheon pins in the eye sockets, but the eyes have now been restored by the owner. This piece was illustrated in the Connoisseur Year Book of 1955 and has an incised signature (see fig. 6t). There are two more wooden frogs by Goho in this collection, the first being of a frog hiding in a bamboo stem. It came from the Trower collection where it was described as “Frog coming out of a bamboo node, inscribed and signed Mitani Goho Kimmachi made this at Aki Sanjo (do) Dai Nitto (Great Japan).” The second frog is hidden in an old pine-tree stump, and it has a signature carved in relief.

The author was recently offered a large boxwood zodiacal group, but the carving was comparatively crude. This is now in the author’s collection. It may have been carved by Goho in his old age. The signature on this piece was also carved in relief.

In his Card Index Mr. Meinertzhagen records a wooden netsuke of a snake coiled inside a hollow tree which was inscribed “Hiroshima Goho Mi-Tani Kotsu” (Behrens collection No. 5333). As Hiroshima was the chief town of Aki province, which borders the Inland Sea immediately south of Iwami Province, this is of great interest. On other netsuke he is supposed to have described himself as “Lord of Awa” (see map of Japan, fig. B).

Another wooden netsuke by Goho which is rather disappointing came from the Behrens’ collection No. 805: “Wood, a peach, the kernel of which contains the Seven Sages apparently playing Sugoroku. Signed Goho.” It is presumably the same piece that was in the Reiss Sale and described as “People playing go in persimmon fruit, signed Goho.” This is now in the Hindson collection.

It is unfortunate that Goho did not have the same mastery over ivory that he displayed in his wooden netsuke. It appears as if he found it a hard and unsympathetic material to work. It is also curious how he appears to have carved seashell groups only in ivory. This, however, is an eminently sensible arrangement, for light-colored shells look much more realistic in ivory than in wood.

A shell group from the author’s collection is illustrated in figures 65–69. It is probably
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**Fig. B—Western Japan.**

the most interesting piece academically, for it is the first piece to be recorded with a *kakihan*. It came from Dublin and the author’s housekeeper witnessed its arrival, and later Mr. J. Hillier also confirmed that it was indeed a *kakihan*. It is a most intricate group and incorporates 50 marine objects, mostly piled on a large awabi shell. They include a hermit crab, cockles, mussels, whelks, conch shells, clams, limpets, fanshells, barnacles, and a starfish. There is a good deal of stained engraving on the shells and on the foot or “body” of the awabi mollusk.

*Figure 70* is taken from the Behrens collection catalogue No. 1754, described thus:
“Ivory crab inside a haliotis shell, on the outside of which are various other shells and a hermit crab, one clamshell inscribed with a description—“On sea and land are all sorts of things, but those of this shape are specially to be found on the seashore at Geiyo (Aki), and the signature Goho Rojin.” Together with another piece it was described by Herr Brockhaus, who wrote and published the well-known book on netsuke, but his son says he no longer has it.

Figure 71 shows a shell group from the Hindson collection. Unfortunately part of the inscription has been worn away, but what remains appears to read: “Kishu Province, a catcher of fish, retired gentleman Goho.” The characters for Kishu are nearly illegible, but they make sense because the umoregi cicada by Masatoyo in the author’s collection also has Kishu named as the province.

Figure 72 is taken from Mr. Meinertzhagen’s Card Index. He is the author of the book The art of the netsuke carver, and has devoted much of his life to netsuke research. It shows a sketch of an ivory shell group surrounded by over 50 smaller marine shells of numerous kinds, four of these having been inlaid subsequently to conceal a crack in the ivory. Signed (in very small characters in the manner of Tomiharu and Bunshojo, the complete inscription measuring only about 3/8 x 3/8 inch): Nitto (no) Kuni Awa Goho Shū-jin saku, i.e., “By Goho Shujin (Master) of the Province of Awa in Japan.” Mr. Meinertzhagen goes on to describe it as “an extremely clever and masterly piece of realism with a profusion of careful and minute detail, carried out in an inspired and artistic manner. Date early 19th century or possibly late 18th century.” This group came from the Mander Sale held at Sotheby’s on February 12, 1930 (part of lot 52).

Figure 73 is a reproduction of another of Mr. Meinertzhagen’s drawings. The shell group consisted of about 20 various kinds of seashells including haliotis, clam, etc., the smallest specimen measuring scarcely 3/16 inch across. It is signed “Goho.” A similar piece, of finer workmanship, was sold at Glendinings on November 28, 1924, for £3. 10s. (Dr. Gunther). It was inscribed in extremely fine characters Bunkwa Juichii sai nen inu sho-watsu Goho, i.e., “By Goho in the first month of the year of the dog—the 11th of Bunkwa (1814).” This is one of the pieces which serves to establish at which dates Goho was active, and the dates tend to corroborate the supposition that he was indeed a pupil of Tomiharu. It will also be obvious by comparing figures 65–69 with 73 that the design is extremely similar in both.

The shell group in figure 74 was sketched by the late G. G. Davies. The author has seen this intricate carving but feels it has nothing of the finesse of Goho’s wooden netsuke. It is signed “Goho Saki Shi” and dated Bunkwa 6 (1809).

Seventeen examples of Goho’s work have been discussed here. They clearly fall into two groups, the first being wooden netsuke, chiefly of frogs, although one tortoise, one snake, and one fruit are included. The second consists of shell groups in ivory which contain a mass of small marine objects. Goho’s wooden netsuke are much the most attractive carvings the author has ever seen—but we all have addictions!

KWANMAN, KWANKO, AND KISAI

Kwanman.—Kwanman was an excellent carver belonging to the Iwami School. He is believed to have been active between 1800 and 1830. His style is often very similar to that of Tomiharu, Masatoyo, and Kwanko. Tatsugawa (Riusen) Tosai and Tatsugawa (Riusen) Tomitane also did work which has much in common with that of Kwanman.
His netsuke (like that of all the other Iwami School carvers) are extremely rare. Only 11 have been recorded so far: (1) "Shishi," (2) "crab in bamboo," (3) "monkey and eagle," (4) and (5) "tortoises," and (6) "tortoise with minogame," all these being in wood. There are also (7) "Cicada on leaf" in ivory, (8) "crab" in antelope horn, (9) and (10) two netsuke of a cicada in umimatsu, and (11) a tortoise in tortoiseshell. (Nos. 1, 2, and 4 are in the author's collection.)

In order to prove that the author is not alone in her high opinion of Kwanman's netsuke, F. Meinertzhagen may be quoted as follows:

Kwanman, whose work is unfortunately scarce, was a true master of his craft, his simple representations of the lower forms of life, such as tortoises and cicadas, carved in various materials, being perfect gems of their kind, for their feeling and superb craftsmanship. His name ranks high among the masters of "netsuke" carving. Among the examples of his work recorded, all possess the same subtle charm and realism. Signature "Kwanman to, of Iwami" accompanied by kokihan (June 1954).

The following notes examine his recorded works in greater detail: The little kakiwood shishi (fig. 75) is exceptionally charming. It is depicted elongated like a cat and stalking its prey. It has large inlaid eyes with dark pupils, beneath threatening bushy eyebrows, and over its huge snub nose the forehead is creased with worried wrinkles. Its lips, the skin of which is covered in raised pimples, are drawn back in a tooth-revealing grin, and under the chin there is a beguilingly curled beard.

This netsuke also has those delicately raised "dots," for which the Iwami School is renowned, on the top of the head, as well as on the pads of the paws. Its fur markings are astonishing, with their little "starfish-like" curls amid the roughly chiseled hair, and the mane and tail are generously curled. The "elbow joints," too, have long waves sweeping over them. This piece is signed as follows in ordinary incised (i.e., comparatively large) keboshi script "Engraved by Kwanman resident in Iwami," and also has a kokihan.

For many years the author searched for a reliable person to act for her in Japan where she was convinced that netsuke of the little-known Iwami carvers must still be found, and probably at a reasonable cost, in contrast to the absurd prices charged in Japan for the better known and often faked carvers. She was fortunate in finally obtaining the services of a good agent who found her this charming "lion" netsuke by Kwanman (actually in Iwami some 150 years after it was carved there), and for only £4 10s. In spite of the brittle nature of this open-grained wood, it is in excellent condition.

Another vigorously carved kakiwood netsuke depicts an eagle holding a small monkey in its talons. The bird of prey is elongate in shape, with partly closed wings, though with splayed tail feathers. It has apparently snatched the monkey "on the wing" and retains a remarkable hovering quality. The yellow horn eyes of the eagle, with the dark inlaid pupils, are particularly large, and stare with remorseless ferocity at the piteous appealing little monkey, which also has eyes of yellow horn, with black inlaid pupils. The same kind of eyes are present in the kakiwood shishi signed by Kwanman (fig. 75).

The cord passes through a single hole on the back of the eagle, and fastens to a closely fitting movable plug let into the feathers of the breast. This conceals the cord hole from the front. The design is of compact type, but the details are beautifully finished, thus placing the netsuke in the highest class of workmanship. There is much similarity of style to the Tatsugawa "quails and young eating millet." The similarity is especially noticeable in the feather work.
The netsuke is signed "Kwanman of Iwami," with a kakihan, on a vertical rectangular reserve down the front center of the tail. The style of writing is rather like that on the Tatsugawa quails and also on an ox by Tatsugawa Tosai. It was illustrated and briefly described by M. Hindson in the Antiquite Collector, 1951, and his photograph is reproduced here in figure 76. The drawing and signature copy from the Meinertzhagen Card Index is shown in figure 77.

The Kwanman "crab on stem of seaweed" is carved in horn, probably from an antelope, and shows a crab crouched in a recess on a cut section of seaweed. The truncate ends of the stem display the concentric pattern of the horn. The crab is naturalistically carved in full relief and is feeding its mouth with its left front claw. It is of a curious iridescent gray color not unlike modern plastic coat buttons, and is most beautifully carved in the style of the Iwami School. The netsuke is signed Iwa (Mi) Shu No Ju, Kwanman To, i.e., "Carved by Kwanman of Iwami province," with a kakihan.

This netsuke came from the Gordon Smith collection, No. 591, and was sold at Glendinning, January 1937, for £5 to Murakami, who in turn sold it to W. W. Winkworth, who disposed of it to M. Hindson, who illustrated and briefly described it in his article in the Connoisseur Year Book. His photograph is reproduced in figure 78. The sketch from the Meinertzhagen Card Index is reproduced in figure 79, and it will be seen that the crab is facing around the other way on this. A copy of the signature is also given.

In the author's collection there is an unsigned crab, which can be proved to be by Kwanman by its similarity to the piece just described. Two views of this incredibly exquisite crab are shown in figures 80 and 81. The crab is carved in the round out of rhinohorn. In spite of its considerable age, all the delicate legs are undamaged because of their wonderful design, whereby the delicate tips are protected by the four little conch shells that they clutch (one in each corner). With its big front claws the crustacean is clambering onto a large conch shell, which in turn protects the delicate claws. It really is a most ingenious design, the skill of which has enabled the carver to display the crab in all its delicacy. The carving is so lacelike that the whole piece is very light in weight.

Another crab by Kwanman in the author's collection is shown in figure 82 as seen from above. This netsuke is carved out of an open-grained kakiwood (persimmon), which has a high polish on the upper portion. The bottom surface is rather rough and worn looking. Though not visible in figure 83, just above the left cord hole there are distinct traces of the small raised pimples which are a favorite technique of the Iwami School. The Sosho signature incised within the large sunken reserve is also followed by Kwanman's usual kakihan.

The smooth-backed crab (fig. 82) bears a great deal of resemblance to the "crab on seaweed" by Kwanman and to the author's crab by Tomiharu. The carving is not as delicate as on the "rhinohorn crab with shells" but the design is again very fine. The bamboo knot within which the crab is sheltering is hollowed out to protect the crustacean. The joint of the bamboo knot is surrounded by three bands or rows of cleverly carved knobs.

In the Behrens (blue file commemorative) catalogue, No 2909, is the reference: "Umimatsu, a tortoise, signed Iwami Tsuramitsu (Kwanman)." It is illustrated on plate 33, from which this photograph was reproduced (fig. 84). This is extremely similar in style and execution to my own tortoise in ebony by Tomiharu, the faint raised dots on the top of the shells in both being typical of the work of the Iwami School. Much to the author's frustration this must have been in the collec-
tion of the late G. W. Ellis, from whom she purchased about 150 netsuke, but alas not this one, and just to aggravate the disappointment it appears in the Behrens sale catalogue (Part 2, 1914) as part of lot 557, and the second piece in that lot was a fox in clouds by Shojo (also illustrated in the de luxe edition) and this was bought from Ellis, so it was a very near miss indeed!

There is a similar piece illustrated in the Meinertzhagen Card Index and reproduced here in figure 85, because it is difficult to establish whether it is the same one. The following description is also taken from the Index: "Tortoishell model of a tortoise. Signed Kwanman of Iwami and 'Kakihan.' Fine little carving and no doubt quite genuine as regards signature. Its only fault being its small size. Date ca. early 19th cent. Note. This is probably the piece illustrated in the Behrens catalogue."

The only tortoise by Kwanman from the author’s collection is reproduced in figure 86. It is carved out of heavy-weight, dark-brown kakiwood. It has an unusual shape with a peculiar downward-curving bend beginning just above the back legs, which makes it look a little like a wood louse from behind. The decorations on the plates of the shell are very similar to the sunburst markings on the shishi illustrated in figure 75. The leg scales overlap and come to a triangular point, like the scales on the ivory snake by Bunshojo, and also like those on the legs of the tortoise by Tomiharu in the author’s collection.

The tortoise has large inlaid eyes of pale horn with dark pupils, and was recently purchased in Izumo—some 150 years after being carved there! This piece is completely unworn and rather more coarsely carved—probably in old age. The cords pass through a loose plate in the center of the carapace. As can be seen on the photograph of the underside of the tortoise produced in figure 87, the signature reads: Kwanman Kata Iwami Koku, i.e., “Cut and carved by Kwanman resident in Iwami.”

Figure 88 is reproduced from the Card Index of F. Meinertzhagen who described the piece as follows:

Ebony—a tortoise carrying a “minogame” on its back. The eyes of both inlaid in transparent yellow horn. The central plate of the carapace of the larger animal is remarkable for the purpose of attaching the superior cord within. Signed Iwami (no) kuni Kwan-man to and “Kakihan.”

A remarkably fine netsuke of the highest class, showing real originality and a certain eccentricity of design peculiar to the work of this artist. There is immense power in the modeling, and the detail is beautifully carved with perfect definition and clearness of line. The date appears to be about 1820-40.

Apparently from Hayashi sale 1902 (and March 1949, with 2 others for £7, to Hindson). Sold Glen-dinings November 1936 for £3. 3. 0.

In the Behrens (blue file commemorative) catalogue, No. 1721, is the item “Ivory, cicada on a folded leaf, signed Iwami no Kuni Kwanman.” It is illustrated on plate 30 from which figure 89 is reproduced. In the auction sale it was lot 760 and sold for 36/ (for 3 pieces) to Mr. Brockhaus, but unfortunately it is no longer in his collection.

Note the similarity of the leaf to the leaf under the tree frog of the ebony netsuke by Tomiharu in the Victoria and Albert Museum. Also the leaf has an even greater resemblance to the boxwood “leaf with frog” in the author’s collection. The cicada, too, is extremely similar to the one on “log with rough bark” by Masatoyo which is carved from umoregi.

Figure 90 is reproduced from the Card Index of F. Meinertzhagen who describes the piece as follows: “Umimatsu. A cicada in a portion of a tree branch. Sig. ‘Iwami (no) kuni Kwan-man to and ‘Kakihan.’ (i.e., Kwanman of Iwami). Very dainty, finely carved little gem, its only fault being its small size. Signature beautifully engraved. Date difficult to determine, but roughly first half 19th cent.
Fig. 1.—Whale's-tooth Netsuke Carved with Centipede by Tomiharu.
(Hindson collection.)
Figs. 2 and 2A.—Two Views of the Bunshojo Centipede Carved from Whale’s Tooth.

Fig. 2B.—Centipede on Boar’s Tusk. Unsigned Tomiharu.
Fig. 6.—Top of Snake Showing Head.

Fig. 7.—Snake from behind.
(Note scale technique.)

Fig. 8.—Side View Showing Inlaid Horn Eye with Black Pupil.

Fig. 9.—Front View.

Fig. 4.—Fine Kebori Inscription and Signature Enlargement.

Fig. 10.—Snake as Acquired and before Being Slightly Cleaned.
(Photograph from Ryerson, *The Netsuke of Japan*.)

Fig. 5.—Underside of Snake, Well Patinated.

Figs. 4-10.—Ivory Snake by Bunshojo. (Author's collection.)
Figs. 11-14.—Rose Beetle on Bamboo Shoots, Carved in Boxwood.

Fig. 15.—Rose Beetle of Whale’s Tooth. Leiden Museum.
Fig. 16.—Front View.

Fig. 16A.—Top View.

Fig. 17.—Bottom View Showing Space Left Free for Signature, but There Is No Trace of There Ever Having Been One.

Figs. 16 and 17.—Unsigned Frog of Boxwood by Tomiharu. (Author’s collection.)

Fig. 18.

Figs. 18 and 19.—Ebony Frog on Leaf Signed Sekiya Namicye Tomiharu Chosei. Victoria and Albert Museum.
Figs. 20-26.—Figs. 20 and 21, Ebony Frog on Leaf by Tomiharu, Unsigned. Figs. 22-24, Kakiwood Frog by Tomiharu. Fig. 25, Tree Frogs on Log, Signed Seiyodo. Fig. 26, Ebony Minogame on Driftwood, Signed Tomiharu.

(Fig. 25, Hindson collection; all others, author's collection.)
Figs. 27-29.—Brown Kakiwood Usutokine (Pestle and Mortar for New Year Rice Cakes), by Bunshojo. (Note the simulated gold lacquer repair. Author’s collection.)

Fig. 30.—Enlargement of Signature of Bunshojo and Her kakihan.

Fig. 31.—Top View Showing Spider on Lid.

Fig. 32.—Engraved Ferns on the Curved Outer Surface of Box.

Fig. 33.—Curved Inner Surface of Box; Signature on Left.

Figs. 30-33.—Fan-shaped Ink Box. (Author’s collection.)

Fig. 34.—Manju Covered in Calligraphy, by Seiyodo Yoshimasa. (Jonas collection.)
Fig. 35.—Spider on Rolled Kahone Leaf, by Bunshojo. Boar's-tusk Netsuke, Reproduced from Reikichi Ueda.

Fig. 36.—Spider and Web, Carved in Relief from Boxwood and Attributed to Bunshojo. (Author's collection.)

Fig. 37.—Cicada by Tomiharu, Reproduced from Gonse, Art Japonais.

Fig. 38.—Side View.

Fig. 39.—Underside Showing the Finely Incised Inscription.

Fig. 40.—Top View Showing Traces of the Iwami-type Raised Dots and Circles.

Figs. 38-40.—Ebony Tortoise by Tomiharu. (Author’s collection.)
Fig. 41.—Top View of Crab on Driftwood by Tomiharu. (Author’s collection.)

Fig. 42.—Base of Driftwood Showing Inscription.

Fig. 43.—Cicada and Discarded Nymphal Case by Tomiharu. Reproduced from Reikichi Ueda.

Fig. 44.—Side View.

Fig. 45.—Side View.

Fig. 46.—Underside Showing Signature.

Fig. 47.—Top View.

Fig. 48.—Rear View.

Fig. 49.—Front View.

Figs. 44-49.—Boxwood Tortoise Signed Tani Goho Tanshu. (Author’s collection.)
Figs. 50-60.—Figs. 50-53, Frog Hiding in Lotus Pod, Incised Gojo Rojin. Figs. 54-60, Boxwood "Frog on Driftwood" with Inscription Carved in Relief: Niso Geiyo. Gojo. Kozu. Saku. (Author's collection.)
Fig. 61.—Frog on "Driftwood" Incised Goho.
(Hindson collection.)

Fig. 62.—Front View.
Fig. 63.—Side View.
Fig. 64.—Back View.

Figs. 62-64.—Frog on Bamboo Node with Faint Signature Trace: Goho.

Fig. 65.—Side View.
Fig. 66.—Top View.
Fig. 67.—Base Showing Signature.
Fig. 68.—Bottom View.

Figs. 65-69.—Ivory Shell Group Signed Goho and Kakihan. (Author’s collection.)

Fig. 69.—Signature Enlarged.
Fig. 70.—Ivory Crab with Shells, with Inscription and Signature Go ho Ro ji n.
(Behrens collection.)

Fig. 71.—Shell Group Signed "Retired Gentleman Go ho."
(Hindson collection.)

Fig. 72.

Fig. 73.

Fig. 74.

Figs. 72-74.—Three Shell-group Drawings Reproduced from the Meinertzhagen Card Index.
(Compare with Figs. 65-69 above.)
Fig. 75.—Shishi by Kwanman. (Author's collection.)

Fig. 76.

Figs. 76 and 77.—Eagle and Monkey by Kwanman. (Fig. 76, Hindson collection; Fig. 77, Meinertzhagen Card Index.)

Fig. 77.

Fig. 78.

Fig. 79.

Figs. 78 and 79.—Crab on Seaweed in Antelope Horn by Kwanman. (Fig. 78, Hindson collection; Fig. 79, front view and signature from Meinertzhagen Card Index.)

Fig. 80.

Fig. 81.

Figs. 80 and 81.—Two Views of Finely Carved Horn Crab with Shells, Attributed to Kwanman. (Author's collection.)

Fig. 82.—Top View.

Fig. 83.—Bottom View Showing Kwanman's Signature.

Figs. 82 and 83.—Crab in Bamboo Knot. (Author's collection.)
Fig. 84.—Tortoise by Kwanman. (Behrens cat. No. 2099.)

Fig. 85.—Tortoise from Meinertzhagen Card Index.

Fig. 86.—Top View.

Fig. 87.—Underside Showing Signature.

Figs. 86 and 87.—Tortoise by Kwanman. (Author’s collection.)

Fig. 88.—Minogame and Tortoise, Reproduced from Meinertzhagen Card Index.

Fig. 89.—Cicada in Ivory by Kwanman. (Behrens cat., pl. 30.)

Fig. 90.—Umimatsu Cicada by Kwanman, from Meinertzhagen Card Index.
Fig. 92.—Umimatsu Cicada on Branch, Signed Kisai. (Author's collection.)

Fig. 93.—Umimatsu Ape by Ganko, from Meinertzhagen Card Index.

Fig. 94.—Ebony Landscape by Ganko. (Author's collection.)

Fig. 95.—Ebony Ox by Riusen (Tatsugawa) Tosai. (Author's collection.)

Fig. 96.

Figs. 96 and 97.—Quails with Young in Kakiwood by Riusen (Tatsugawa) Tomitane. (Author's collection.)

Fig. 97.

Fig. 98.—Group of Three Wooden Quails Attributed to Tatsugawa (Riusen) Tomitane.
Figs. 99 and 100.—Ebony Tortoise on a Curled Lotus with a Pod beneath it in the Iwami School Style.

Fig. 101.—Large Bamboo Netsuke with a Centipede.

Fig. 102.—Unsigned Iwami School Netsuke, Probably by Goho.

Fig. 103.—Turtle by Jo-sen.

Fig. 104.—Side View.

Fig. 105.—Top View.

Fig. 106.—Underside Showing Inscription.

Figs. 104-106.—Rhino-horn Netsuke with Inscription by Toka.
Fig. 107.—**Full View.**

Fig. 108.—**Signature.**

Fig. 109.—**Enlargement of Inscription.**

**Figs. 107-109.**—Boar's-tusk Netsuke Carved with Spider by Riusui or Ji.

Fig. 111.—**Snail by Tomiaki.** (Drawing from Meinertzhagen Card Index.)

Fig. 110.—**Crab on Driftwood by Tomiaki.** (Compare with Fig. 113.)

Fig. 112.—**Cicada on "Wood" by Sadakazu (Tei-ichi).**

Fig. 113.—**Crab on "Driftwood" by Sadayoshi (Tei-yu).** (Compare with Fig. 110.)
Fig. 114.—Carp in Waves by Masatoyo. (Drawing from Meinertzhagen Card Index.)

Fig. 115.—Top View of Cicada against "Bark."

Fig. 116.—Underside of Netsuke.

Fig. 117.—Smooth End of Branch.

Fig. 118.—"Rotting" End of Branch.

Fig. 119.—Signature Enlarged.

Fig. 120.—Drawing from Meinertzhagen Card Index.

Figs. 115-120.—Cicada on Branch by Masatoyo. (Author's collection.)

Fig. 121.—Bambuku Chagama by Tomaisl. (Meinertzhagen Card Index.)

Fig. 122.—Ivory "Frog on Leaf" by Seiyodo Yasuhiro. (Meinertzhagen Card Index.)

Fig. 123.—Orange by Sekiran. (Author's collection.)
Believed to be from Behrens' No. 1670." This piece has just been purchased by the author who found it to be a most delicate little carving (fig. 91).

In the Behrens (blue file commemorative) catalogue No. 1670 was listed as follows: "Umimatsu cicada on a tree—signed Kwano of Iwami." It was lot 741 in the Glendinnings auction sale catalogue, which contained four pieces in the lot and sold for £2. (Note: Presumably Professor Joly, whose English was sometimes rather quaint, means by his "tree" a portion of a tree trunk or log.)

Also in the Behrens (blue file commemorative) catalogue No. 1629 is recorded thus: "A cicada emerging from its pupa shell on a chestnut twig, signed Iwami no Kuni Kwano." In the Glendinnings auction sale catalogue it was lot 762 in which there were three pieces, which together sold for 36/ (now Hindson No. 816).

In Weber's Kojihoten, part 1, on page 476 are these particulars: "Kwan-man (ou Kwanno) sculpteur de netskés du XIXe siècle, originaire de la provence d'Iwa-Mi, son nom peut-être aussi Tsura-Mitsu. (Sig. Cat. 309 and 396)."

Reikichi Ueda states: "Kwan-man, native of Iwami. Pupil of Tomiharu, skilled in carving ebony and wild boar tusk."

Kwanko.—Kwanko Takugioku's work is very similar to that of Kwanno, and will therefore be discussed in conjunction with it. It will also be obvious that he is undoubtedly a carver of the Iwami School.

In the Hayashi collection there was a wooden tortoise signed "Taku-gioku." The British Museum's collection included a red tsuishu lacquer figure of a child kneeling with a toy duck in his arms, signed "Kwanko." F. Meinertzhagen described this as "somewhat mediocre work, the signature poorly engraved." It is certainly an oddity so far as the general concept of Iwami School netsuke goes.\(^2\)

In the Behrens catalogue (blue file commemorative), No. 5390 is listed thus: "Horn cicada signed Kwanko Takugioku." This is apparently identical with the one in the Hindson collection. The cicada is carved out of a pale grayish-green horn, and is a most exquisitely detailed carving of great charm, and bears a very strong resemblance to the "crab on seaweed" in antelope horn by Kwanno and to the author's "crab and shells" attributed to Kwanno.

Kisai.—Some years ago Mr. Meinertzhagen included Kisai among a list of Iwami School carvers sent to the author, but this carver was not included in the Iwami School table in his book. The author therefore surmised the attribution to be uncertain, and not having seen any of Kisai's carvings, decided to leave the matter in abeyance.

Since then, however, the author has purchased a large "cicada on branch" carved from umimatsu and signed "Kisai at the age of 71 carved this," and as the work undoubtedly resembles that of other Iwami School carvers, a photograph of the cicada is shown on figure 92.

GANSUI AND GANKO

Reikichi Ueda in Netsuke no Kenkyo gives particulars of Bunshojo (daughter of Tomiharu, founder of the Iwami School and known as Iwa the First). He states that "Bunshojo, who was known as Iwa the Second, taught the art of carving to Skikazo, son of her younger sister Yachiyo."

In Netsuke, a miniature art of Japan, which is a brief résumé of the subject made for the Japanese Tourist Library, and chiefly remarkable for its photographs of signatures, the author Okada writes in his Carvers' Index:

\(^2\) Broken netsuke were occasionally lacquered over in order to cover a repair.
“Iwao the third, 1810–48, took the art name of Gansui, son of Ogawa Yachiyo, younger sister of Bunshojo.”

The author has seen a photograph of a fine boar’s-tusk netsuke carved with a spider which bore a striking resemblance to similar pieces by Bunshojo, such as her “ink box” and her “Reikichi spider on leaf.” The boar’s tusk had 36 Haiku verses engraved on it, also the same type of fern leaves as on the “Bunshojo ink box” netsuke, but was signed “Iwami (Province) Kaigawa—Seiyodo Gansui carved,” which confirms the similarity of style between the works of aunt and nephew.

F. Meinertzhagen records another boar’s-tusk netsuke by Gansui in his Card Index as follows: “Tusk of a wild boar—carved on one side in relief with a dragon. Inscribed in minute characters (in ‘Kebori’). On reverse side Iwami Shu Kaaigawa Seiyodo Gansui Chokoku, i.e., ‘Carved by Seiyodo Gansui in Iwami (Province) on the Kaai-river.’ Of simple design, well-carved, dating from early 19th Century or possibly late 18th Century.” It must be confessed, however, that when the author saw this dragon (now in the Hindson collection) it appeared to be a somewhat uninspired carving.

There are two more netsuke by Gansui in the same collection. The first is of a finger-citron or “Buddha’s fingers” (which is a rare subject for netsuke) carved from varicolored kakiwood. The signature Gansui is carved in relief. The second is a rather fat and expressionless puppy, but this netsuke has a handsomely written signature in Kaisho script, placed on a zigzag-shaped cartouche.

From the work of Gansui it seems logical to proceed to the work of Ganko. There are only two specimens recorded, the first being a somewhat unattractive ape in umimatsu (which material, in spite of its wood-shake markings, is much stronger and heavier than umoregi-jet, and is an attractive coralline substance found principally near the island of Oki. Its main color is treacle-toffee brown, often with orange- and cream-colored streaks, and with minute specks which are supposed to be due to the coralline polyps).

A drawing of the monkey by Ganko is reproduced from the Meinertzhagen Card Index (fig. 93). It is described as a long-armed ape of the classical Chinese type, huddled up with its right arm extended at right angles to its body. It came from the Gunther sale and is now in the Hindson collection, though rather a crude carving.

Another netsuke by Ganko from the author’s collection is reproduced in figure 94. It was purchased at Sotheby’s where it was catalogued thus: “Ebony landscape, with partitions containing figures among rocks and a bridge, style of Ho-Kei, but older looking, signed Gan-Ko (the Gan as in Gambun [or Meibun] the Ko as in Minko),” and dated the forty-third year of the cycle on a summer’s day, i.e., 1787 or 1847.” The first character of the signature being the same as for Gambun is significant, for it is believed that the famous Gambun, about whose netsuke and other carvings many people wax lyrical, was himself an Iwami man. However, so many netsuke and other objects by Gambun have been recorded that his work must be dealt with separately.

In style this Ganko landscape closely resembles others by Kagenosho and by Horaku. J. Hillier deciphered the signature on the Ganko landscape as follows: “Hinoe—ne fuyu—hi Ganko. Winter day, 13th year of the sexagenary cycle, Ganko.” Hinoe occurred every 60 years so that the date is presumed to be 1816, as 1756 would be too early and 1876 too late.

On page 200 in part 1 of the Kojihoten, Weber lists: “Gan 2, Nagami Gan, potier qui travaille à l’atelier de San-Kai-zan dans la province d’Iwami, vers 1820.”
RIUSEN (TATSUGAWA) TOSAI, RIUSEN (TATSUGAWA) TOMITANE, AND TSUNESATO

The curious reclining ox in ebony (fig. 95) is very coarsely carved with rough chisel marks for the fur markings. Its execution is similar to Iwami School work, but is very disappointing artistically, as the carver's knowledge of anatomy is rudimentary, the legs and underside being badly designed and carved. It gives one the impression that a mediocre pupil had been carefully taught to ape his master's mannerisms, but was still unable to reproduce his knowledge and artistry.

It is signed "Riusen (Tatsugawa) Tosi*" and the handwriting is similar to that of both Riusen (Tatsugawa) Tomitane and Kwanman. In style it is very much like a reclining ebony humped ox in the Hindson collection which is signed by Tsunesato (of Satsuma) who is also supposed to be an Iwami carver. As F. Meinertzhagen also lists two ebony reclining oxen by Tomiharu, it is obviously an Iwami-type subject.

On the small kakiwood "group of quails" (figs. 96 and 97), the hen is seated with one chick peeping out from under her wing, while the other two chicks are feeding on millet nearby. The cock stands beside her on surprisingly slender legs. This piece is signed underneath on a long plinth "Tatsugawa (or Riusen) Tomitane," in handwriting which is very similar to that of Kwanman and Tatsugawa (or Riusen) Tosai. The feather work on this group of quails also closely resembles that on the eagle (with monkey) by Kwanman in the Hindson collection, and this forges a link with a netsuke which is indisputably by an artist of the Iwami School.

Meinertzhagen considers that these quails were lot 1515C in the Behrens catalogue, and that they were subsequently in his possession. He agrees they are extremely suggestive of the Iwami School. They were also in the Mander Sale at Sotheby's on February 12, 1930 (lot No. 140), and catalogued thus: "A pair of quails with millet stalks signed Ryusen Tomitane." G. W. Ellis was the purchaser on this occasion, and it was from this collector that the author finally acquired them 26 years later (in 1956).

In the author's collection there is also another group of wooden quails which consists of three birds, namely, the parent birds, together with a large-sized, nearly full-grown chick. This piece is likewise carved in kaki-wood (fig. q8). It is quite similar to the foregoing one by Riuse or Tatsugawa Tomitane, to whose hand it may safely be attributed.

These notes are from the Meinertzhagen Card Index:

Wood (ebony). Small recumbent ox, signed Tatsu-kawa "to." An unimportant little carving (Glendinnings, June 1951). Note that Tatsugawa (Riuse) was the family name of several netsuke carvers, viz: Tatsugawa Kogaku; Tatsugawa Kosai; Tatsugawa Takusai; Tatsugawa Tomitane; all of whose work was in wood, representing animals, and of early nineteenth century date. As Tatsugawa Kogaku appended the term "to" (carved by) to his signature as done by the carver of the piece here recorded, perhaps both pieces are the work of the same man.

POSSIBLE IWAMIS (WITHOUT SIGNATURE)

The ebony tortoise on a curled lotus leaf (figs. 99 and 100) resembles an Iwami School carving. Underneath the leaf lies a lotus pod, and the cord hole (himatoshi) passes between them. Most of the intricate markings have been worn off the shell. The legs, too, are rather worn, but the scales are carved in the raised crisscrossed fashion which is typical of the Iwami School. The carving on the leaf is not nearly as fine as usual, but it is a charming composition. The carver has even put an extraordinarily elongate tail on the tortoise,
so as to balance it against the lotus stalk at the other end. The author saw this piece briefly during an auction sale where it formed part of a large lot, but missed buying it at the time, and so was rather pleased to rediscover and purchase it some years later, when she became even more convinced that it is an Iwami piece, though admittedly not a first-class one.

The author also recently obtained a large-sized netsuke consisting of a thick piece of bamboo, with a big centipede which has been carved in such a manner as to make it appear to be crawling through the bamboo (fig. 101). The head of the creature appears to protrude through a hole on one side of the netsuke, and the tail through the other side. The eyes are inlaid in a yellow metal which looks like gold. It could possibly be an early carving by Gambun, who is believed to have originally belonged to the Iwami School and to have worked in both bamboo and metal. A very raw-looking signature purporting to be that of a Masanao must be disregarded as a later addition made in Japan. Unfortunately, some traders or repairers there occasionally scatter signatures of such illustrious carvers as Tomotada, Okatomo, Kagetoshi, Rantei, Masanao, etc., on netsuke under the mistaken impression that it will enhance the value of the piece, whereas, in fact, they are just a nuisance and luckily the experienced collector will not be taken in by them. On the piece under discussion, for instance, the actual shape of the characters Masanao resembles neither the calligraphy of Masanao of Kioto, who in any event worked principally in ivory, nor does it resemble the signature of Masanao of Yamada. Genuine netsuke by the latter can easily be differentiated (by a connoisseur) from the hordes of horrible frogs which are carved by unidentifiable Masanaos to this day.

In any event the centipede and bamboo is typical of Iwami School work in feeling, though slightly crude in execution. Nor does it bear any resemblance to the work of any Masanao which the author has ever studied. Perhaps the example cited will emphasize the advisability of reproducing photographs of signatures, as being infinitely more satisfactory than reproducing printed characters. A signature on a netsuke usually no more resembles the printed characters in appearance than our own signatures do type setting. And, after all, accurate recognition is the important thing.

Unsigned frog in bamboo, probably carved by Goho.—Unlike the netsuke of the centipede just described, which is actually carved out of bamboo, the netsuke in figure 102 is carved from boxwood to simulate a piece of bamboo. This technique was a favorite trick of Goho, and the author feels 80 percent convinced that this piece is by him, for he was also fond of depicting frogs lurking inside bamboos, tree trunks, and so forth. The realism of Iwami School work is also evident in the creepy maggot-eaten galleries that tunnel through the edge of the “bamboo.” The base of the “bamboo,” which has been carved to look as if it were cut off across the node, is also apparently tunneled through by insect trails.

The frog lurking within the bamboo does not have any of the delicate raised pimples for which Goho is famed. It was the lack of these that made the author hesitate to ascribe this piece to Goho, especially as this netsuke comes from her own collection, and prejudice must be guarded against. Nevertheless, though this frog does not resemble any by Goho, it should be kept in mind that among the several frogs by him previously discussed, no two were found to be alike. It is perhaps better, therefore, to be on the side of caution and simply to ascribe

Recently the author and some other experts were shown a netsuke purporting to be of the Iwami School which the author believes not to be genuine.

Unfortunately photographs are also of assistance to the forger.
this netsuke to some member of the Iwami group.

Senjizo.—This artist carved a quaint kaki-wood netsuke of two heart-shaped leaves and the manner in which they have been carved, with the veins realistically depicted, and the gouge marks left visible on the upper surface of the leaves, is similar to the Iwami School style.

Basetsu.—Behrens (blue file commemorative) catalogue No. 1725 is recorded thus: “Boar tusk carved with a spider, seal signature Basetsu.” This piece is not illustrated, and having never handled it, the author could not presume to say whether it is indeed an Iwami piece, though the use of a boar’s tusk and the spider subject does point in that direction.

Kachoku.—The author has seen an extremely finely patinated ivory cicada (on leaf or branch) with a lengthy inscription and a sketch of a wine vessel. It was very worn, and when examined it was attributed to the Iwami School.

Aki Take.—A somewhat gaunt boxwood Shishi crouched over driftwood and reminiscent of the style of Goho has been recorded. This artist is such a rare carver that one must wait until more examples come to light before going any further.

To-sen.—The kakiwood turtle in figure 103 has a cleverly designed though somewhat roughly carved carapace, with powerfully ridged “plate markings.” The center plate opens and has a slot which runs through the block beneath it to allow for the passage and fastening of the cord. The scale work on the legs is rather similar to that on the tortoise by Kwanman in the author’s collection, and the whole style of this piece is reminiscent of Iwami School work. The signature reads “Josen.”

Shoman.—“A warrior in full armor, signed Shoman.” When the author examined this piece it appeared quite different from any other Iwami School netsuke she had ever seen, and therefore she wondered on what evidence this piece from the Hindson collection could be attributed to the Iwami School.

Nagami, Iwa.—Perhaps Shoman could be connected with this carver. The following details are taken from the Meinertzhagen Card Index: “Nagami, Iwa. Native of Nagahama, Nakagun, Iwami. Pupil of Iwa Seiyodo Tomiharu (Iwa Ist). Was the originator of ‘Nagahama—Ningio.’” His grandson Nagami Fusadzo was still living at Nakagun in 1934 (Reikichi).

Sorii.—Behrens (blue commemorative file) catalogue No. 3083 is described at great length as follows:

Wild boar tusk, implement used by artists and lacquers to rub down and smooth their paper, carved on one side with a centipede in relief, the other engraved in Kebori with a spray of Shinobugusa and three poems in hiragana from right to left.

(a) Chi yeda no mokatarawan tomo Hitogusiu, shinoda no mori no hitokoye no gana. “It is needless to ask thousand tree branches, the voice of the Hototogusiu is towards the forest of Shinoda.”

(b) Korézo pé ni hatsu ne nari keri, kiku kito no machiyenuna no Hototogushi kana. “Indeed it is the first song of the cuckoo, the listener thought he might have to wait long but it burst upon him quite suddenly.”

(c) Akuru ozo matsubekari keru yokogu mono minéyori uzuru Hitotogushi. “The stratified clouds wait for the dawn on the mountain heights, amongst them appears a cuckoo.” Signed Sörü.

It will be recollected that both centipedes and verbosity are Iwami School characteristics. Also the “crab on boar’s tusk” from the author’s collection is by Riusui, which gives these two pieces one character of their name in common.

U-wa Jo.—Brockhaus, page 454, No. 491, catalogued as follows: “Lotusblatt mit zwei Taschenkrebsen. Holz, signed (Frau U-Wa) U-Wa Jo” (i.e., lotus leaf with two small crabs. Wood, signed Lady U-Wa). Admittedly, this is a speculation, but the combination
of lotus leaf plus crab and a woman carver is most suggestive of Iwami School work.

*Toka.*—A netsuke of rhinohorn, depicting the poet Li-Tai-Po standing in admiration in front of the waterfall of Lu, is shown in figures 104–106. The horn is carved to represent a mountain, with the waterfall carved out of a piece of mother-of-pearl inlaid in the mountainside, and the figure of the poet is of ivory. It is an odd and nicely worn piece with some inscriptions on the side and on the base.

It is signed *Toka Sanjin* ("Der Einsiedler vom Phirschblütenberg—The hermit of the peachbloom mountain") and catalogued as follows in a German auction-sale catalogue: "Ein alter Mann von 81 Jahren" (this is on the side). Underneath it continues thus (on the base): "Dieses wurde gemacht aus einem Stück Nashorn aus dem Süden, an einem Frühlingsstadj des Affenjahres Mizu-No-E 1752 oder 1812," i.e., "This was fashioned out of a piece of rhinohorn from the south, on a spring day of the monkey year Mizunoe 1752 or 1812." This piece shows great originality, and the odd use of materials, together with the carver's fondness for inscriptions, and the date, all point to its being made by a member of the Iwami School.

*Riusui or Riuji of Iwami.*—The alternative reading for the signature Riusui could be Tatsumitsu, but the character for Tatsu does not resemble those in Tatsugawa Tomitane or Tatsugawa Tosai. The Japanese craftsmen's habit of incorporating one character from their master's name into their own signature is often useful in tracing the members of certain schools. However, the lack of such confirmation need not daunt the dedicated student.

On one occasion the author read of a "crab on boar's tusk," and immediately thought it could be an Iwami School netsuke. When it arrived from America it was found to be absolutely typical of Iwami School work, and at first glance appeared to resemble the style of Gansui most closely. It was a well-worn piece with a magnificent patina, and on removing some excess dirt a rough streak appeared on the surface of the netsuke. Imagine the excitement when, on slanting a light across it, a faint inscription became visible. India ink was then carefully rubbed into the inscription to bring it up, and curiously, the inscription can now be seen more clearly on the photographs reproduced in figures 107–109 than with the naked eye. The signature is unfortunately worn, but must be Riusui or Riuji, plus a kaki-han.

The finely incised inscription is typical of the meticulously engraved characters used by Iwami School carvers, who were renowned for their calligraphy. For the translation of the three Haiku poems (written in Sosho script) the author is indebted to the British Museum. They are transcribed as follows:

Stroking my jet black hair until it glows with sheen.
Endless and futile are the days and months that pass;
Spring comes too seldom with its views of cherry blossoms

On the sacred woods of Mimuro mountain where the stream brings the maple leaves floating down,
a shower is about to fall.

Probably these verses were composed by the carver. Both Tomiharu and his daughter Bunshojo, for instance, were accomplished poets. In passing, it may be realized from the foregoing how interesting it is to discover new members of a school in this manner.

*Tomiaki of Iwami.*—In the Behrens (blue file commemorative) catalogue, No. 2558 illustrated on plate 31 (fig. 110) is entered thus: "Ebony, a crab on a bit of board, inscribed Kwaishundo Tomiaki (of) Sekiyosawaigawa, made this in the winter of the fifth year of Kwansei (1789)." Refer to the inscription on the "Victoria and Albert Museum frog" by Tomiharu which gives a similar type of inscription. Note, too, how this piece resembles the author's "crab on driftwood" by
Tomiharu. The fine ivory crab on driftwood by Sadayoshi (Tei-yu) resembles the Tomiaki crab even more closely.

The second piece by Tomiaki illustrated in figure 111 is from a drawing in the Meinertz-hagen records. The piece is described thus: “Horn—a section of yellow translucent horn on the side of which is carved in full relief a snail. Signed (very minutely at one end) Tomiaki chokoku Kaigawa ( ) Kwaishundo (carved by Tomiaki of Kaigawa). Sold at Glendinings in July 1936 for 23.5.” It was also No. 478 in the Trower collection: “Snail on a section of horn, carved out of a translucent amber-like horn, a beautiful little specimen by Tomiaki.”

Sadakazu (Tei-ichi) and Sadayoshi (Tei-yu).—For several years, while sifting through information on netsuke from all over the world, the author specialized on subjects popular with Iwami School carvers, e.g., frogs, centipedes, tortoises, and so forth. Consequently, on hearing of a “cicada in ivory on wood” she sent for a photograph in spite of the unpromising signature Sadakazu (Tei-ichi).

As may be seen in figure 112 it consisted of a small cicada on a large wedge-shaped piece of wood (all in ivory), not unlike an old flint hand axe in appearance, in spite of its realistically depicted “raised wood grain” markings. The manner in which the delicate legs were left firmly anchored was reminiscent of the Iwami carvers; and the raised plateau, just the right size and shape to support the cicada, is a favorite Iwami School “stylization.” Another brilliant example of this technique is the minogame on driftwood by Tomiharu (fig. 26).

The large, rather roughly hewn cord holes also seem typical of the one Iwami weakness in design. The signature is neatly written in Sosho script on a small flat surface underneath. The netsuke is an old piece with an excellent glossy patina, and the cicada itself has worn brown patches on it where it has been in constant contact with both the wearer’s perspiration and silken garments.

For years this piece remained an isolated example and the subject of speculation. Just recently the author’s faith proved justified when the “missing link” appeared at Sotheby’s on March 2, 1959. It was catalogued thus: “A crab in unstained ivory on a water-worn rack of flat slate-like formation in two layers with undulating edges, the eyes inlaid black, the shell lightly textured with dots, the whole very smooth and of lovely surface, an unusually early crab-model long before the time, for instance, of Kohosai, and signed by the rare artist Tei-yu (Sadayoshi).”

It was obvious from the first glance that this was an Iwami School piece, as it bore a strong resemblance to both the “ivory crab in shell” by Goho from the Behrens collection, and was quite startlingly similar to the “wooden crab on driftwood” by Tomiaki from the same collection. The crab also bears a strong family likeness to various crabs by Kwanman.

The crab (fig. 113) is most realistically carved, with each jointed segment of the leg formed as in nature, and with long “bristle” marks going down toward the claw tip. In spite of considerable wear (which has given this piece an excellent patina) the terrifyingly delicate legs have been protected from harm, first, by being placed close together, and second, by the carver’s adding an almost unnoticeable thickening to the tips of the claws at the four corners. Kwanman solved a similar problem by letting the claws grip clamshells (at each corner) to protect them. This crab not only proved to be the missing link artistically, but the carvers also had the first “character” of their name in common, which makes the connection almost conclusive.

Here are some records of other netsuke by
Sadayoshi taken from the Meinertzhagen Card Index: “Sadayoshi, Osaka, Worked ca. 1840–50. 9 Netsuke recorded, of which 7 ivory, and 2 wood. Subjects, all animals; Monkey (3); Goat; Cockatoo (2); Frog; Catfish; Crab. Original and cleverly carved naturalistic designs. Bold Signature, Wavy-lined torpedo-shaped reserve, (May, 1935).”

These facts do not at first glance appear very encouraging, but the “wavy-lined torpedo-shaped reserve” is unusual, and Iwami School carvers often went in for curiously shaped reserves to surround their signatures.

Also there is a print in the Meinertzhagen Card Index (too indistinct for reproduction) of an elongate frog stretched along a piece of simulated bamboo which is “cut through” lengthwise. It is of ivory, is signed “Sadayoshi,” and was No. 677 in the Bing collection. This piece bears the strongest resemblance to Iwami School work among those recorded, both in style and subject.

There is also a drawing of an ivory netsuke with a small monkey seated on a short section of bamboo holding a peach in his hand. Now, though monkeys with bamboos are a common subject for netsuke, this piece of “bamboo” appears to be unusually realistic. There is a record of a second ivory monkey in the British Museum collections.

A third ivory monkey, this time on a haliotis shell (a favorite Iwami motif) was in the Reiss collection. Sadayoshi also carved a charming wooden cockatoo seated on a tree branch. It resembles those owls that have trick owlets which pop in and out of holes in logs.

The last Sadayoshi netsuke to be recorded is of an ivory “catfish with gourd.”

Masatoyo of Iwami.—The drawing on figure 114 comes from the Meinertzhagen Card Index, but unfortunately it does not do justice to the extremely fine ebony “carp in waterfall.” The subject, of course, is symbolic of “perseverance,” but it is the quality of the carving, and the beautifully inlaid eyes that are exceptional. It is signed “Masatoyo” on one end in relief.

This piece was sold at Sotheby’s in the Mander sale (lot 117), on February 12, 1939, and catalogued thus: “A carp on waves signed in relief Masatoyo.” It was purchased there by G. W. Ellis, who sold it to Harriet Jaffe, and it reappeared at her sale at Glendinnings on September 29, 1955. Unfortunately, in spite of repeated efforts to see it before the sale, the auctioneers did not produce it until the sale was in progress, thus enabling M. Hindson to snap it up for a nominal £4. 10.

The “cicada on part of an oak branch” illustrated in figures 115–120 from the author’s collection is exquisite. It is most delicately carved out of umoregi which is a form of jet (extremely similar to English Whitby jet) and consequently is a very brittle and irksome material to work in. It is probably for this reason that umoregi netsuke are so rare. It must also be pointed out that the Japanese produced vast numbers of cast netsuke, some in manjuu (rice-cake) form with ships on them in relief, or figures cast in the round, of legendary subjects. These appear to have been cast, or impressed onto softened horn, in exactly the same way as in Europe snuffboxes were made from the time of Charles II to the mid-nineteenth century. These cast netsuke are invariably skillfully designed, and have all the details of dress patterns, carefully marked. It is easy to spot these cast netsuke when they are new, as traces of the cast marks or side seams tend to remain visible; but after they have been worn for some time they acquire a smooth and glossy patina, and consequently tend to be mistaken for tortoise-shell or umoregi netsuke.

The umoregi cicada is very true to nature with all the delicate veining on the wings beautifully carved. The photographs cannot do
justice to it, for, as in nature, the cicada is camouflaged against the bark of the branch. The realism of the bark is uncanny, and the quaint “acorn and leaves” at the side also help the design. As may be seen on figure 117 one end of the branch has been smoothed (except for the brilliant carving of the “bark”) and this smooth part has the faintest of “natural wood-shake” markings that are only visible when a light is slanted across them. These lines, however, have been used as guides for the miraculously clever “wood shakes” that go across the bottom of the netsuke (except for the portion left smooth for the signature (fig. 116)). An enlargement of the Sosho signature is shown in figure 119. It reads Tomita (no) ju Masa-toyo Tsukun, i.e., “Made by Masatoyo of Tonda (Province of Kishu).”

The front end of the netsuke shows the head of the insect, and the realistically carved “rotting wood” effect below (fig. 118). The excellent drawing from F. Meinertzhagen’s Card Index is shown in figure 120, as it will probably show up the contrast better than photographs. The author was fortunate to discover this magnificent piece at Christie’s in spite of their poor cataloguing. It is exasperating the way such a big firm is content to catalogue netsuke as “Twelve assorted ivory netsuki mostly figures” just because they are too parsimonious to employ a competent cataloguer!

It is presumed that this cicada on branch is identical with lot 12 in the Gilbertson sale which was described thus: “Black horn—a cicada on an oak trunk signed Fukuda Hidari Masatoyo.” The cicada is typical of the very best type of Iwami School work, and also has much in common with both the Kwanman and the Kwanko cicadas.

Boku-giū-ken Toshi-haru of Iwami.—Details from the Card Index of F. Meinertzhagen: “Toshi-haru. Boku-giū-ken. Iwami School. Late 18th to early 19th century. ?Pupil of Seiyodo Tomiharu. 4 netsuke recorded, of which 2 are carved from wild boar tusk, and two in wood (one ebony). Subjects: dragon, crab, crayfish, Bumbaku Chagama. Fine and attractive work (March 1939).”

The drawing in figure 121 is reproduced from the Meinertzhagen Card Index, and his opinion of it is quoted as follows:

Wood (ebony) “Bumbuku Chagama” or the Magic Tea-kettle; showing the latter in the act of becoming transformed into a badger: The lid is removable. sig. Boku-giū-ken. (Boku-giū-ken Toshiharu, School of Tomiharu, see Brockhaus). Strikingly original design, of strong character and artistic inspiration. Early 19th century. Sold to W. Winkworth, 1936. June 1951—This piece after 15 years since I last saw it, has left a deep impression on my memory. More than ever now I realize its unique qualities its powerful revelation of the soul of its author. Its quality of greatness which must include it among the finest netsuke ever possessed by me. I shall always regret the acute financial need, which haunts those of the artistic temperament, that alone compelled me to part with it.

The author is familiar with this piece but is not equally enthusiastic.

The next example which is not very attractive is of wild boar tusk, carved in relief with a crab, signed “Toshi-haru made as an old man in the second year of Bunkwa, with pot seal and name Boku-Giū-Ken” (i.e., in 1805). Reiss sale, part of lot 311.

The third piece by Toshiharu has a better patina and is carved out of wild boar tusk with a dragon in relief. The signature is Boku-giū-ken Toshi-Haru. Ex Brockhaus collection, now no longer in it.

The last piece to be listed by Meinertzhagen is in “Wood. Crevette sûr une coquille de’ormeau. Sig. Boku-giū-ken. Raymond Huet Sale, Paris, May 1928 lot 214, fine old piece, early 19th century.”

At Glendinnings’ sale of April 11, 1927, lot 249 was catalogued thus: “Shojo with
large vase signed Toshiharu (ivory).” This does not seem a particularly Iwami type of subject but as the artist also did the badger-teakettle, it is possible. Also, there is no certainty of there being another Toshiharu, though Brockhaus did list two.

Sei-yo-do Yashu-hiro.—Figure 122 as reproduced from the Meinertzhagen Card Index. It is of an ivory (whale-tooth) frog on a lotus leaf. Signed “Sei-yo-do Yashu-hiro (A-tan).” A rather worn and well-patinated ivory carving of a rolled leaf in typical Iwami style. The frog crouched on it is rather grotesque and “Breugel like” and has inlaid eyes. It is a fascinatingly ugly piece. (Now in the Hindson collection.)

Sei-yo-do Fugioku or Tomitama.—These particulars came from the Meinertzhagen Card Index:

Wood, snail on a lotus leaf. 17th century. Sig. Sei-Yo-do Fu-Gioku of Sandindo in Japan, the second day of the third month of the second year of Temmei (i.e., 1782, so that this piece does not date from 17th century). Note. The character “Fu” & may also be rendered “Tomi,” suggesting the school of Tomiaki, and Tomi-haru. In which case the name should, assuming the second character to be 植, Tomi-tama in preference to Fu-gioku. Hayashi collection.


In the Kojihoten, Part I, on page 180 Weber states: “Fu-Gyoku (Sei-Yo Do) Sculpteur de netskés que, d’après un netské daté de l’ancienne collection Hayashi, vivait en 1782.”

Sei-yo-do Fumiharu.—In the Reiss Sale Catalogue of February 25, 1918, No. 329 is catalogued as follows: “Ebony. A Centipede hiding between two rocks, signed Sei-yo-do Fumiharu.” As the character for Fumi can also be read as Tomi this will be by Tomiharu and should have been catalogued under his name, but as the same error is likely to recur it was thought advisable to include this instance of it.

MISCELLANEOUS IWAMI SCHOOL NETSUKE

In the Reiss sale of February 25, 1918, No. 328 is catalogued thus: “A piece of Narwhale-tooth carved with a crab with a lengthy descriptive inscription on the truncated tip.” Obviously it is an Iwami subject, and the carver was a chatty type, which is another Iwami characteristic.

No. 311 in the same sale sounds very similar, but the inscription was “Made by Toshiharu an old man, in the second year of Bunkwa” and it is now in Mr. Hindson’s possession.

No. 551 from the Reiss sale is catalogued as follows: “Wild boar’s tusk carved with a big spider and minutely inscribed with the story of its origin.” This, too, is practically certain to be by an Iwami School carver, as the subject and material are typical, and, moreover, Reiss was obviously smitten by the Iwami charm, as his collection was rich in their works.

Sekiran, Sekji, and Sekishu.—In The art of the netsuke carver, Meinertzhagen states that Riuminsai Sekiran came from Mito in the seaboard province of Hitachi. He was active during the early nineteenth century and his style is so like that of the netsuke makers of Iwami that one wonders if he learned to carve under their tuition. He also used whale’s-tooth ivory and ebony, and the subjects he carved are reminiscent of Iwami work.

The orange netsuke (fig. 123) from the author’s collection is somewhat similar to the “fruit” carved by Goho. Both pieces have minutely carved “go” players inside, which are only visible through a small spyhole. It is, however, the realistically carved skin of the
NETSUKE CARVERS OF THE IWAMI SCHOOL

Some years ago the author saw a netsuke of two small ivory tortoises inlaid in a piece of "driftwood" by Sekiju, which was reminiscent of Iwami School work. He also carved an ivory landscape netsuke depicting the visit of Gentoku to Komei, which was signed "Fu-Jen-Sai Seki-ju." (Ex Trower collection lot 801.)

Sekishu carved many tortoise netsuke and lived to a great old age, as on some of them he signs himself as being aged 103 or 104 years.

Note.—Evidence acquired after this article had gone to press leads the author to think that the centipede in bamboo shown in figure 101 and referred to in the text on page 348 should not be attributed to the Iwami's.
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P. 402: “Sculpteur de netskés de Ka'ai-gawaen Iwa-mi (Sig. 326). Il est né en 1733 (d’après l'inscription sur un netské en bois représentant une cigale, et qu’il fit en 1794; v. Gonse, L’Art japonais). Cet artiste s’appelait aussi Sei-yo-dé.

“A en juger par l’inscription sur un autre netské, cet artiste était du sexe féminin.”
NOTES

THE TURBEH OF GUMAŞ HATUN, A SELJÜK MONUMENT

This turbeh, located in the cemetery of Musalla, in the city of Konya, and popularly called Gömeçhane, differs totally from the turbehs exhibiting square, polygonal, or round patterns and covered internally with a cupola and externally (according to their plan) with a conical or pyramidal roof, such as we know from innumerable examples erected in Iran in the Great Seljük Period (1040–1157), and from similar models built in the times of the Anatolian Seljüks (1077–1308) of which a good number may still be seen in cities like Erzurum, Ahlat, Kayseri, Sivas, Tokat, Konya, and Niğde.

The turbeh in question is composed of a subterranean chamber, and an ïvân exhibiting pointed arches and a cradle-shaped vault. The subterranean chamber contains the tomb, as is the case in all Seljük turbehs. The upper floor forms a small mosque, open in front for the performance of the namaz (communal prayer). A stair, now ruined, leads down to the subterranean sepulchral chamber. The ïvân is reached by two flights of six steps, of modern reconstruction, flanking the entrance to the subterranean part. (Fig. A.)

The façade (fig. 1) facing north is about 11.50 m. high and 9.50 m. wide; the width at the back is 7.50 m., and the length of the lateral walls, 9.30 m. The greater width of the façade as compared to the back is caused by the frame of the opening of the ïvân which exceeds the body of the building by 1 m. on each side. Thus the lateral edges of the ïvân framework serve a double purpose in standing out: an ornamental one from the interplay of light and shade on their rugged surfaces made by alternately jutting-out and receding bricks, and a utilitarian one, as they act as abutment piers to prevent the collapse of the arch. (Fig. 2.)

Coated with ashlar stone up to one-third of its height and with bricks for the remaining two-thirds, and with its triangular abutment piers in the middle of the side walls, its upper parapet imitating machicolations, the building suggests a fortress from the sides and back.

Still visible remains show that the soffit of the ïvân arch as well as the moulding above the arch were formerly covered with geometric designs and the Rümi band was composed of turquoise and black porcelain mosaics (fig. 3). Judging from the traces still extant, it may be conjectured that the corner pillars and the 3.20-m.-high interior walls, which are at present roughcast up to the level where the brick rows begin, were also lined with porcelain mosaics.

Because of the distinctive character of this turbeh, setting it apart from all others left by the Seljüks, and to the name Gömeçhane by which it is popularly known, some have been misled into believing that it was a place where beehives were kept. It is impossible to admit for one moment that such a grand building, rising in a deserted place, a cemetery, should have been destined for bees. Rather than entertaining such an idea we prefer to surmise that it was the name Gumaç that in the course of centuries in the mouth of the people was corrupted into Gömeç. Now, we know from written records that Gumaç Hatun was the name

1 Gömeç = a bee; hâne = a house, hence Gömeçhane = a beehive.
2 Šipalsalar, Menakibi Haxret-i Meylânâ Gelalûddîn Rûmî (The virtues of His Lordship Mevlânâ Jalâlûddîn Rûmî), tr. by Mithat Behari Husâni, Istanbul, 1331, p. 90; Eflâkî, Memakibûl Arifîn
Fig. A—Plan of the Turbeh of Gumaç Hatun, Konya.
Fig. 1.—Turbeh of Gumaç Hatun, Konya: Front View.

Fig. 2.—Turbeh of Gumaç Hatun, Konya: View of Front and East Wall.

Fig. 3.—Turbeh of Gumaç Hatun, Konya: Soffit of İvân Arch and Rûmi Band.

Fig. 4.—Turbeh of Yavtaş in the Commune of Reis: Front View.

Fig. 5.—Turbeh of Yavtaş in the Commune of Reis: East Wall.
of the wife of Sultan Rüknü’d-din IV Kilıç Arslan, a ruler of the Anatolian Seljuks. Such examples of popular etymology are by no means rare. However, there is a further problem: how came the word hâne, a house, to be added, forming the strange compound Gömeçhâne? The reason may well be that hâne itself is a corruption of ana. It is a long-established custom of the Turks to give the surname baba, father, to those of their rulers who cared for the well-being of their subjects and treated them mercifully; the corresponding surname bestowed on their wives of a similar character was ana, mother. These are used even now to denote men and women who have won the love and respect of their circle by their unselfish behavior and generosity. We may therefore set up the plausible theory that the lady Gumaç Ana was buried in the turbeh in question, and that her name and surname fell a prey to a double process of popular etymology, which transformed them rather absurdly into Gömeçhane, a beehive or storehouse for beehives. However this may be, some misgivings as to the function of the monument have arisen because there is now no tomb in the subterranean chamber, whereas there is a vague tradition that the ivân in the upper story was a belvedere from which the Seljuk sultans used to watch the tournaments that took place in the adjoining plain. But these doubts can finally be removed by the fact that another turbeh, somewhat smaller, equipped with an ivân of identical shape, and containing a tomb in its subterranean chamber, stands in a garden situated south of the primary school in the Commune of Reis (Akşehir District, Konya Province) (figs. 4 and 5).

True, there is no inscription in the turbeh of Gümaçana or Gümüş Hatun in Konya; however, there is one in that of the Commune of Reis: written in red paint and in the Seljuk thulût style of calligraphy, it is inscribed across the roughest walls of the turbeh. Along with the monument which has been allowed in the course of centuries to fall into ruin through neglect, the inscription has deteriorated and is now partly illegible, although some parts of it remain decipherable. We are now in possession of no less than three different readings of the inscription, by Ibrahim Hakkı Konyali, Ferid Uğur, and Zeki Oral.

Three readings of the inscription on the turbeh in the Commune of Reis

1 - هذا قبر الامير الاستهلاز الأجل الأوحد ذي الدين فخر الإمام جمال الدولة و الدين فخر الإمام  
الجافر نغت باللغة كل آمر المندسي

2 - هذا قبر الامير الاستهلاز الأجل الأوحد الذين خصصهم الذين ذين
الإسلام جمال الدولة [غرب] السلاطين فخر الإمام الدائما. نغت

3 - هذا قبر الامير الاستهلاز الأجل الأوحد الذين خصصهم الذين بدر
الإسلام جمال الدولة السلاطين فخر الإمام (أي الرحالة قتلت يوتش بكر


* Kilıç Arslan reigned alone 1248-49; then jointly with his two brothers 1249-57; and subsequently again alone 1257-64.
* Ferid Uğur, Gömeçhane, Konya Dergisi (K. Review), No. 9 (May 1937).

The three versions of the text begin with the well-known formula, "This is the tomb of

* Ibrahim Hakkı Konyali, Emir Yavuzgel Tür- 
* Ferid Uğur, loc. cit.
... but then divergences occur. The different readings entail differences of interpretation, but these, except for the name and title of the person buried in the turbeh, are of slight importance. The present poor condition of the inscription is responsible for the uncertainty about the name which appears as Yavasgel in the first, as Yavas Beg in the second, and as Yavas Beg in the third text. But since in all three texts he is given the title of isfahsalar and of Amir al-Majlis, there is no doubt whatever that the man with the controversial name was a commander-in-chief of the Konya Seljūks and held an important position at the Seljūk court. Owing to the partial obliteration and illegibility of portions of the inscription on the southeast and east walls, the date of the commander’s death could not be ascertained. However, when we consider that in the main Seljūk records no military commander by the name of Yavasgel or Yavas Beg appears, whereas in those same records mention is made of a commander called Şemsettin Yavas, who earned for himself the grade of an amir-al umara’ and played an important part in the troubled period following the battle of Köse-dağ (1243), we cannot doubt that Zeki Oral’s interpretation is right and we are further able to determine the approximate date of the erection of the monument. Thus, we surmise that the turbeh in the Commune of Reis was built after the middle of the thirteenth century.

We may therefore conclude that the monument in Konya was destined for Gumšt Hatun, wife of Sultan Rükneddin IV Kilğ Arslan, and was probably built toward the end of the thirteenth century.

S. Kemal Yetkin

TWO PIECES OF ISLAMIC METAL-WORK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In 1955 the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology at the University of Michigan acquired two pieces of metalwork formerly belonging to M. Sobernehein. One is a brass basin of the Ayyūbid period, the other a small Mamlük box. From both objects the silver and gold inlay is almost entirely gone and, as a result, these pieces are not as striking or attractive as a number of well-known thirteenth- and fourteenth-century basins, ewers, boxes, trays, plates, and candlesticks. However, the inscriptions and the decorative themes which can be reconstructed are of some interest for the historian of the period.

I. THE AYYŪBID BASIN

(Plates 1–2; figure A)

Both in size (46 cm. in diameter and 20 cm. in height) and in shape (bowl-like with curved-in rims and a rounded bottom) (pl. 1, fig. 1) this object belongs to a common enough type in the Ayyūbid and Mamlük periods. Its surface is only partially decorated. On the outside a wide band, which has lost all its inlay and parts of which have been rubbed beyond recognition, decorates the upper part of the basin. It is divided into four superposed registers of unequal width. Starting at the top there is first a narrow band consisting of three braided lines. In the intervals there occur vegetal motifs and, at times, whole animals or parts of animals, mostly heads. At times one of the lines widens to the shape of an animal. It is practically impossible to distinguish the exact varieties of animals represented, but there are birds, a number of horned beasts, and, probably, a few female-headed monsters. Below this motif appears a wide band with an

Director of the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, for putting at my disposal the facilities of his museum and for providing me with photographs.

inscription. This band is divided into six parts by six medallions. The subject matter of the medallions, largely distinguishable ([pl. 1, fig. 2] in spite of the loss of inlay, belongs to the common iconography of the hunting prince: a rider, accompanied by a dog, about to take his sword out of the sheath; a rider attacking an unidentified beast with his sword, while another beast is artfully fitted into the limited area of the medallion behind the rider; a rider attacking an animal behind him; a rider about to strike an animal going in an opposite direction to his; a rider with a dog (or prey?) between the front legs of his horse shooting from a bow; a rider being attacked from the back. The first three scenes appear to be like a “comic strip” of the same event, while the last three illustrate other possible hunting adventures. The figures are set over a geometric spiral pattern probably derived from similar vegetal motifs, but here almost entirely devoid of any vegetal character, except in a few cases where a flower or a leafy motif is apparent in the center of the spiral. The scenes themselves are represented quite conventionally. The inscription, which is partly vocalized, is in excellent Ayyûbid cursive, and is set over an arabesque motif which, in most places, develops independently from the inscription and not only in the spaces between the letters. Here the arabesque has a much more definitely vegetal character.

Below the inscription is another narrow band, a scroll pattern within which appear animals. These are practically indistinguishable, but most seem to be winged and horned quadrupeds. The last part of the decoration is unframed and consists of an arabesque design comprising interlacing scroll patterns repeating themselves around two axes. One terminates with three leaves, the other with what may be a horned animal head. The rest of the design is much too damaged to permit more than a very schematic interpretation; it may be that there were animals set amidst the scrolls.

The inscription on the basin reads as follows:

عزَّ لمؤلَّانا السّلَّانَ/ الملك الصّالِحِ/ العالم المادِل/ الموظِّف المتفَصَّل المتمور.\n
َّجم الذين/ أبي النَّجّة أبوب بن محمد/ بن أبي بكر بن أبوب عَزَّ نصره.

Glory to our lord the sultan al-Malik al-Salih, the wise, the just, the assisted, the victorious, the defeater, Najm al-Din abū al-Fath Ayyûb ibn Muḥammad ibn abî Bakr ibn Ayyûb, may his victory be glorious.

This personage was the last Ayyûbid prince to maintain a semblance of control over the vast territory ruled by the Kurdish princes and their vassals. A poor general, but an adept manoeuvrer in the complex feudal diplomacy of the time, he is perhaps best known as the husband of Shajar al-Durr, that most extraordinary woman who was, so to speak, the transition between Ayyûbid and Mamlûk rule. His career carried him all over the Ayyûbid realm. From 629/1232 to 635/1238, he was in DiyärBakır and the northern fringes of the Diyär Muṣlàr. In 636/1239 he went to Da­mascus and the following year to Egypt, where he ruled until his death in 647/1249, trying, generally successfully, to control Palestine and most of southern Syria, and having, through his son and successor, Türânshâh, some control

3 For another example of this special motif see the Fano cup in the Bibliothèque Nationale, D. S. Rice, The Wade Cup, Paris, 1955, pl. 15; compare with fig. 37, p. 313, in Rice in Ars Orientalis, vol. 2.

4 The structure of the design is comparable to that of the ewer in the Türk ve İslam Müzesi in Istanbul, Rice, SIMW-III, fig. 2.
over Ayyûbid possessions in the Jazîrah. Throughout his reign he was an active builder, and inscriptions commemorating his construction have come to light in Amîda-Diyarbakîr as well as in Cairo. Three other pieces of metalwork are known to have been made for him. One is the very well-known d’Arenberg basin, now in the Freer Gallery of Art in Washington, which has never been properly published. The other one is an unpublished basin formerly in the Harari collection. The third one, recently published by Gaston Wiet, is now in the Louvre.

On the outside of our basin are also four graffiti of later owners or users, which may tell us something of the further history of the basin. Two of these inscriptions are perfectly clear:

\[ a \text{ (pl. 2, fig. 4 a).} \]

For the house of Mukhtár al-Rashidi.

\[ b \text{ (pl. 2, fig. 4 b).} \]

For the tishtkhânah of Malik Mansûr.

The tishtkhânah is defined by Quatremère as “un lieu où l’on gardait les étoffes destinées pour l’habillement du sultan, les différentes espèces de pierreries, les cachets, les épées, et autres objets du même genre, et où on lavait les habits.” It was, in other words, a vestiary or wardrobe. As to Malik Mansûr, he could have been any one of a large number of Ayyûbid, Rasûlid, or Mamlûk princes of that name, including such important figures as Qalâwûn and Lâjin.

The last two inscriptions (pl. 2, fig. 4 c-d) have been obliterated through the engraving of two horizontal lines and several oblique ones over the original graffiti. The first one begins with بسم دار "for the house." The last word seems to contain the letters عونان, which could be read as عونان. The dâr ‘unwân may have been the office in which titles were made for official documents, an office of considerable importance in the Mamlûk chancery. But, in that case, one would expect the article in front of ‘unwan, and it is perhaps more likely that we deal simply with a proper name (‘Imrân?). The second obliterated inscription has defied my attempts at interpretation. The last word seems to be al-turbah. The first one may be qa’ah. This might possibly mean a specific “hall or pavilion of the grave” if the inscription refers to a locale in a Mamlûk or Ayyûbid palace, or else with the name of some shop. But the reading here is very doubtful and the interpretations of the last two inscriptions cannot be more than suggestions so long as such graffiti are not gathered and studied as a body instead of individually. The only safe conclusion we can draw from the graffiti of the University of Michigan basin is that, at least for a while, this basin was kept in one and perhaps even two “offices” of the Ayyûbid and, more likely, Mamlûk administration. At some


date it passed into the possession of some individual by the name of Mukhtar al-Rashidi.\textsuperscript{11} 

The inside of this basin is much barer than the outside. It is only at the bottom that a very complex design appears (pl. 2, fig. 3). Its complexity is further heightened by the complete loss of inlay. The main part of the decoration consists of a wide medallion. It is surrounded by an unframed arabesque motif, quite similar to, and simpler and clearer than, the one on the outer part of the basin. The intersections of the scrolls are held together by alternating rings and heads. It is the central motif which is the most original feature of the basin and it is most unfortunate that it has been so badly damaged, since it was probably a most striking design. The drawing, figure A, is an attempt to suggest the main lines of the organization of the decoration. The only addition made is that of facial features in order to emphasize the position of the motifs. There is some justification for this addition, beyond the desire for clarity, since complete surviving examples of comparable types clearly show that eyes, nose, and mouth were generally indicated.

It has proved impossible to define a logical system in the web of stems, here and there punctuated by leaves, which occur between the main elements of decoration. It would rather seem that there was no clear independent pattern of scrolls or arabesques, but that scrolls and stems were used as simple fill-ins. In this the system of decoration inside the bowl is less advanced than the pattern found on the outside. The disparity indicates that the object should be considered as a transitional one between the group of metalwork with arabesques as fill-ins and the group with independent arabesques.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} There were many individuals of the name of Mukhtar in Mamluk times (cf. G. Wiet, Biographical), but none is mentioned with the surname al-Rashidi.

\textsuperscript{12} See the rough scheme of development of back-

The subject matter of the medallion is a group of animals and human beings, with animals largely predominating. The center of the composition is occupied by a type of bird-headed (?) monster with two paws and a long tail curving upward, a motif going back to the Sasanian senmure. Roughly two rows of figures surround it. These rows are not clearly separated from each other and many a figure serves rather as a transition from one area to the other. The first row, nearer to the central
between more complete figures. These seem to have been used in two ways: the majority of the figures along the edge of the design are parallel to the edge, while the ones farther from the edge are larger and more or less perpendicular to it. Insofar as they can be made out, these figures, five of which are fairly well outlined, were variations on the karkadann-unicorn motif and two of them are images of human beings. One shows a running man with a knife in one hand and a shield in the other, a fairly common hunting posture. The other personage is seated with outstretched knees and appears to be gesticulating. While the first figure seems to be bareheaded, the second may have worn a cap or a crown, since one end of the top of his head is slightly pointed. I cannot determine the exact type of activity in which he was involved. As to the figures on the near edge of the design, insofar as their outline can be clearly ascertained, they seem to consist almost exclusively of variations on the theme of the walking or lying griffin or of winged bovines.

This design in the center of the basin shows several characteristics which are common enough in Islamic decoration of the period, but which are rarely combined into one pattern. The circular organization of a pattern in the center of an object occurs throughout the Islamic world of the thirteenth century. The use of human and animal forms — either complete or partial — in a decorative way and without prejudice as to possible symbolism (outside of the well-known examples of “animated” writing) occurs, long before Islam, in the Pazyryk finds and, in medieval times, from Khorasan to the Mediterranean, both in works made for Muslims and for Christians. The specific animals found on our pattern are also quite common. Where

18 S. I. Rudenko, Kultura Natselenija Gornoovo Altaia, Moscow, 1953, fig. 60ff.

17 A few Islamic examples bearing directly on our basin: D’Arenberg basin, Ausstellung von Meisterwerken Muhammedanischer Kunst in München, vol. 2, Munich, 1912, pl. 147; there mythical animals like those of our plate occur on the narrow friezes, while patterns with stems and animal or human heads appear on medallions: a Rasûlid tray in the Metropolitan Museum, M. S. Dimand, Unpublished metalwork of the Rasûlid Sultans, Metropolitan Museum Studies, vol. 3 (1931), p. 231ff., fig. 3; drawing by Rice in Ars Orientalis, vol. 2, p. 292, which shows the same animals, but arranged very symmetrically and in more logical relation to the arabesque design; E. Kühnel, Zwei Mosalbronzen, Jahrbuch des preussischen Kunstsammlungen, vol. 60 (1939), fig. 10; A. U. Pope, ed., A Survey of Persian Art, New York, 1939, pl. 1331, which shows also a very large medallion with a motif made up of animals and human beings; little symmetry is shown and there is no coherent arabesque system, but the individual elements are of a very small size and the “whorl” effect is striking. For Christian examples, see especially Armenian works: G. Geian, 2,000 let armianskovo teatra, vol. 2, Moscow, 1952, figs. 23, 66–67, color pl. 2; S. Der Neressian, Armenia and the Byzantine Empire, Cambridge, 1945, pls. 24–25; J. Strzygowski, M. von Berchem, Amida, Heidelberg, 1910, fig. 313. It is interesting to note that the closest parallel to our motif is found on three medallions of the Eumorfopoulos “canteen,” now in the Freer Gallery of Art in Washington, M. S. Dimand, A silver inlaid bronze canteen, Ars Islamica, vol. 1 (1934), p. 171, since, just as the d’Arenberg basin, the canteen shows Christian subjects.

18 Most of them will be found in the objects mentioned above. Since al-Mallik al-Šāliḥ had governed at Amida, it may be worthwhile mentioning that winged monsters and bovines of all types are quite common among the sculptures of Amida and northern Mesopotamia in general. See M. van Berchem-Strzygowski, Amida, figs. 31, 38, 42, and 300ff.
the motif of the Kelsey Museum basin differs from most known examples is in the apparent lack of symmetry, axiality, and repetition of the units of decoration (which is quite different from what appears either on the arabesque design around the medallion or on the outside of the basin) and in the apparent lack of relation between the animals and the vegetal arabesque. The absence of symmetry is pointed up by comparison with the somewhat later Rasûlîd tray in the Metropolitan Museum which uses quite similar animals. In the relationship of the animals to the arabesque, our motif differs from the d'Arenberg basin made for the same prince and from the usual "animated" arabesque. The only work to show a very similar design, although smaller in size and in a less central position, is the "canteen" with Christian subjects in the Freer Gallery of Art; there we meet with the same animals, real and fantastic, the same general organization without symmetry or repetition and without a coherent web of stems.\(^{18a}\)

We can see then that with its "animated" arabesque on the outside and with its medallion inside, the basin in the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, although severely mutilated, is of considerable interest. The question arises whether it is possible to assign it to a specific area and to date it. In the case of Najm for stucco fragments in Istanbul said to have come from Amida; A. Gabriel, *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie Orientale*, Paris, 1940, pls. 68 and 68 bis; Rice, *SIMW-I*, pp. 210–211. Other unpublished fragments remain in the Diyârbakîr Museum and in a room of the madrasah of Sultan 'Isa in Mardin. Some very close monumental motifs appear also farther north, at Sivas, and should perhaps be connected with contemporary or earlier Armenian and Georgian examples; see, for instance, A. Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d’Anatolie*, II, Paris, 1934, pl. 58.

\(^{18a}\) The Louvre piece does not seem to use animal motifs for decorative purposes, and its splendid central design is much more symmetrical than ours, although not perfectly so. I should like to thank Prof. G. Weit and M. Jean David-Weil for providing me with photographs of the object.

al-Din Ayyûb, localization and dating are connected questions, since he ruled first in northern Mesopotamia and then in Syria and Egypt. If by comparison with other objects of his time one can establish a coherent stylistic sequence, the earlier objects may be attributed to Diyârbakîr and the northern part of the Diyâr Muḍar. If, on the other hand, certain objects of his time show affinities with the art of northern Jazirah, then they might be considered as early in his reign.

The formulary of the inscription on the basin does not help, since all the known inscriptions of Ayyûb bear the titles and epithets found on our object. One point, however, is borne out by a comparison of inscriptions: that the d’Arenberg basin belongs to the last years of Ayyûb’s reign, since the basin and late Cairene inscriptions give the Ayyûbid the title of *khalîl amîr al-mu’minîn*, while the other and earlier inscriptions have other titles in *amir al-mu’minîn*. But since our basin does not have any caliphal title, this particular point cannot lead to dating it securely and one would need a complete publication of the Harari, Louvre, and d’Arenberg brasses and a comparison with the undated Freer “canteen” in order to suggest a stylistic development within which the Kelsey Museum basin can be fitted. This is a task which is beyond the scope of the present publication. The following remarks, however, might be made. The shape of our basin is, as we mentioned, typical of Ayyûbid and early Mamlûk works. The organization of the decoration, with only an inscription on the outside and a complex design in a limited area inside, is also more typical of early Mamlûk works\(^{19}\) than of the usual piece of metalwork, especially of the so-called Mosul group, in the first half of the thirteenth century.\(^{20}\) The Freer “canteen” has been generally attributed to a Syrian workshop. If one adds to

\(^{18}\) Rice, *SIMW-I*, pls. 68–8; Wiet, *Cuivres*, pls. 37, 42, 45, etc.

\(^{19}\) There are, of course, exceptions, as Rice,
these points that the subsequent history of the basin seems to have been Egyptian, it could be suggested that the Syro-Egyptian area was the place of manufacture of the object and that it should be dated late rather than early during the rule of Najm al-Din Ayyüb.

On the other hand, the specific elements of the decoration show very clearly the impact of northern Mesopotamia and of the so-called Mosul school. This in itself would not be an argument for assigning the object to that area, as D. S. Rice has pointed out in a recent contribution, inasmuch as our closest parallels have been works which are generally claimed to have been made under the influence of the “Mosul” school, but not in Mosul itself. Some of the animal motifs on the basin could perhaps be related to the region of Diyarbakır. Relationship with Christian subjects need not always point to Syria and Mosul, but may also be the result of contacts made farther north along the Tigris and the Euphrates. Furthermore, the roughness and vigor of the central pattern differentiates it sharply from the organized sophistication of works such as the d’Arenberg basin, other Syro-Egyptian objects, and the later Rasūlid plate in the Metropolitan Museum. The basin could be attributed to a provincial center influenced by Mesopotamia and in contact with Christian currents. The region of Amida could well be such a center.

Allowance must be made, however, for the fact that in as complex a period as the first half of the thirteenth century it may be adventurous even to try to establish a proper sequence of styles. The movements of princes and of artisans from one place to the other could easily have led to the simultaneous ex-

SIMW-III, but the Türk ve Islam Müzei ewer dated in 627/1229 is of an “ordinary,” not royal, type (p. 232), while the Bologna brass bowl was made for a simple officer, not for a ruling prince, and is out of the ordinary in many respects.


istence of several different styles in the same area, while the nouveau riche culture of many a Kurdish or Turkish prince could well have resulted in the revival of older styles and ideas—a revival which is evidenced in other media—or in the experimentation with new motifs or with themes developed outside of the normal metalwork tradition. If at all possible, a more definitive localization and date should await the publication of the d’Arenberg basin and a fuller understanding of the origins of Ayyūbid decorative motifs.

II. THE MAMLŪK BOX

(Plate 3)

The second object acquired by the Kelsey Museum is a rectangular brass box with curved edges, 27 cm. in length, 7.5 cm. in width, and 6 cm. in height. The silver inlay has completely disappeared from the top of the box (pl. 3, fig. 5), where the decoration consisted of a simple narrow scroll pattern along the edge and of an inscription in two parts set between three medallions in the middle. The two side medallions have empty centers—probably a space set aside for a blazon—and a motif of flying birds over an arabesque design around them. The central medallion is similarly organized but bears a decoration of flowers instead of birds. Both birds and flowers were common in the Mamlūk period. More inlay has remained on the decoration around the body of the box. There we have another inscription divided by eight medallions. The medallions have a common six-armed swastika in the middle and alternating bird and flower patterns around the swastika. Some of the swastikas seem to have been inlaid with gold instead of silver. A third inscription is found in a cartouche inside the box. Its inlay has remained almost entirely.

22 Wiet, Cuivres, pls. 4, 6, 15, 37, etc.
a.—Inscription around the box:

القلم الكرم العالي/ المؤلوى الإمبري/ الكبرى الغازى/ المجاهد المراقب
الخاغر/ الموئي/ الدخري المهاني/اللوام الماليكي [١] لخليفة إبر حجاب
المليك الناصري

The noble and high Excellency (maqarr) our Lord, the Great Amir, the Ghāzi, the Warrior for the Faith, the Defender of the Frontiers, the Warden of the Marches, the Helper, the Treasure, the Shelter, the Administrator, the Royal, the Amir Sharaf al-Din, the Chamberlain, (the former slave) of al-Malik al-Nāṣir.

b.—Inscription on top of the box:

القلم العالي المؤلوى الإمبري/الكريم موسى [١] لخليفة الناصري

The high Excellency (maqarr) our Lord the Amir Sharaf al-Din Mūsa, the Chamberlain, of al-Nāṣir.

c.—Inscription inside the cover:

الخليفة المولى الإمبري الكبرى المجاهد المراقب شرف الناصري

The high Excellency (janāb), our Lord, the Great Amir, the Ghāzi, the Warrior for the Faith, the Defender of the Frontiers, Sharaf al-Din, the Amir Chamberlain, of al-Malik al-Nāṣir.

The person for whom this box was made can be identified as Sharaf al-Din Mūsa ibn al-Azkashi. The text of the Manḥal has this to say about him:

Mūsa ibn al-Azkashi, the Amir Sharaf al-Din, was one of the captives of Sultan Hasan. His whole life was spent as an amīr. He fulfilled a number of official functions, among which were that of chamberlain (ḥājib) in Egypt and that of ustādār. He also ruled over a large number of districts. Then he was appointed counsellor of state (mushīr al-dawlāh). He was exalted in offices of state. He used to ride in great majesty and with his household. When he rode, one of his mamluks used to carry behind him an ink-bottle and a sand box. After the death of al-Malik al-Ashraf Sha'bān, his power declined a little and he became one of the group of amīrs of the tablkhānāt (of the drums) until his death in his house at al-ʿUṣayniyyah on the 16th of dhū al-ṣaḥād in 780. He had been respectable, pious, temperate, noble, kindly to the learned and to the righteous. May God have mercy upon him.

Little else is known about his life, except that he was involved a number of times in palace intrigues. It is not possible to give a precise date to the object under discussion. It must have been made before the death of

25 His full name was Malik Nāṣir abī al-Maʿāli Ḥasan ibn Muhammad; hence the maliki Nāṣirī of our inscription.
26 Since I did not have at my disposal a manuscript of the Manḥal, I used a copy made by Sobernheim of the text of fols. 372 a-b of vol. 3 of the Cairo manuscript, inasmuch as the Paris manuscript is incomplete and, in particular, has no reference to one man.
Sha'bān in 778/1377, since after that Mūsā was in partial disgrace. He appears already as Ṽustadār and ḥājib in 762, although he seems to have lost the former office, at least for a short while, in 763. It would be to a period when Mūsā was only ḥājib that we would have to attribute the box, but the texts are insufficient to determine the date. All one can say is that it was made during a period extending from some time before 762 to 778. It is a period from which a great number of objects have remained and the box described here is quite typical of the time. Its main interest is in reviving the memory of one of the thousands of amirs who were at the same time the main support and the source of decay of the Mamlūk state, whose individual historical importance was secondary, but whose processions through the streets of Cairo preceded by drummers and followed by slaves (future amirs) carrying symbols of office, such as perhaps this box, were an everyday occurrence and, next to mosques and mausoleums, one of the most characteristic forms of “conspicuous consumption” in their fast and often precarious lives.

OLEG GRABAR

AN EARLY RĀGAMĀLĀ SERIES

Recently Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, the Museum of Fine Art, Banaras, India, acquired a complete set of Rāgamālā paintings of such unusual character that they throw a new light on the problem of the origin of the Rajasthani painting.

The origin of the Rajasthani school of paintings is a very controversial subject. Although most scholars feel that the school existed in the pre-Akbar period and though recently some definite examples have been found to prove it, Karl J. Khandalavala argues for a much later date (ca. A.D. 1610 or a little later). He bases his argument on the “Akbari elements” found in the early Rajasthani paintings, which, according to him, reached the out-of-the-way centers of Rajasthan not much before the end of the fifteenth century. I have already published a pre-Akbari manuscript of the Rajasthani style in the Marg. The present note is meant to present to the scholarly world other evidence to show the existence of the Rajasthani style as an art movement independent of the Akbari style.

The manuscript is still in the traditional Indian horizontal format; each folio measures 4.5 inches by 9.5 inches. Sanskrit text describing each painting in a couplet appears at the top of each folio. The following is a list of the illustrations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bhairava Rāga</td>
<td>19 Dīpaka Rāga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nāda Bhairavī</td>
<td>20 Dhan̄yāśī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nāṭa</td>
<td>21 Vasanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gaurī</td>
<td>22 Karpara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Patamāndari</td>
<td>23 Dē Có Varāḍī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lalita</td>
<td>24 Varāji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mālavakauśika</td>
<td>25 Mēgha Rāga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Todi</td>
<td>26 Gauḍī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Khambhavatī</td>
<td>27 Vībhāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mālava</td>
<td>28 Mālāśri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kāmakari</td>
<td>29 Śrī Rāga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Gunakari</td>
<td>30 Gurjari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hiṅgola</td>
<td>31 Mālrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Bilāvala</td>
<td>32 Sārangā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Madhumādhabī</td>
<td>33 Kukubhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dēśākha</td>
<td>34 Kāmoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Gandhāra</td>
<td>35 Āsāvari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Andhīrī (sic)</td>
<td>36 Bangalā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, no colophon appears and the task of assigning a date and a provenance

2 Accession No. 9070/1036.
3 Each presiding Rāga is italicized in the list.

---

28 Maqrizi, loc. cit., calls him amir ḥājib, while Taghribirdi uses the title of ustadār.
29 Wiet, Cuivret, p. 195ff., lists over 150 pieces of metalwork datable between 730 and 780; see also Rice, SIMH-J and IV.
is left to us. However, the manuscript shows many early characteristics which help us to set a date for it. The format of the manuscript belongs to the traditional Indian type which was no longer used for Rāgamālā paintings after about A.D. 1605. The horizontal format, on the other hand, afforded the artist side spaces which he usually filled with architectural pieces or trees, scenes originally appearing in some square manuscript illustrations painted during the preceding centuries. Other regional qualities might suggest close affinities with the early Gujarati illustrations.⁴

The human figures, with their hooked noses, double chins, elongated earlobes, and, in the male figures, the curved chest, resemble the earlier types of figures seen in manuscript illustrations. The female breasts, in the same tradition, are full and in the form of complete circles. The male figures are either clean shaven or wear an early type of hooked mustache. The complexion of the human figures is yellow or brown or sometimes, in special cases, lapis lazuli. Big staring eyes vouch for their Rajasthani type, as do the strict profile faces and the absence of the “farther-eye.” There are no delicate hand postures and long sensitive fingers as are shown in the earlier periods; fingers and hands are crudely shown.

Usually the drapery is shown by red outlines. The turbans are flat, resembling an earlier type,⁵ rather than the Akbari atpafi. Similarly, pre-Akbari taste may be seen in the coats with half-sleeves, the tight pyjamas, and the rarely used jāmāhs. The pointed crown may illustrate the Gujarati type, popularly used in the illustrations from the Gujarat region. The dupattā (scarf) is very broad edged and is shown fluttering at the sides. Pre-Akbari motifs, mostly geometrical in form, appear in red lines; e.g., crosses, dots, primitive meanders, hatches, and four-petaled rosettes are commonly used in both the male and female costumes. Some of these motifs are unknown after about A.D. 1580.

The female figures wear a veil (odlunt), following an early tradition, the wimple being placed at the extreme rear of the head, its ends fluttering at the sides, while the chest is left bare. Similarly, the size of the earring (karnaphūla) may indicate a date not later than about A.D. 1560. The nose ring, very common after about A.D. 1600, absolutely does not appear.

The architecture is simple, usually drawn in yellow, with slender pillars covered with several mediaeval Indian diamond motifs; Akbari heavy columns, so popular in subsequent examples, are completely missing. The earlier type of brackets and wide arches appear. Geometrical frieze motifs, e.g., chevrons, diamonds, parallelograms, hatches, or, sometimes, early scrolls, may indicate a pre-Akbari tradition. Similar evidence is provided by the early flattened domes and battlements.⁶ Sometimes elaborate and decadent survivals of the ancient Indian chaitya arch window motif appear.

Usually the background is plain and monochrome, the color of the paper, broken by certain queer and primitive tree types, e.g., (a) a solid oval of green, supported by a crooked

---

⁴ See my above-cited article for an undated illustrated manuscript of Sangrahanī Sūtra; in the same volume of Marg Pramod Chandra published another illustrated manuscript of Sangrahanī Sūtra, dated A.D. 1583; see also K. J. Khandalavala, Marg, vol. 4, No. 3 (1950), pl. 8, for a Gujarati manuscript of Bhāgavata Daśāmaskandha of A.D. 1610 with captions in the Gujarati dialect; and see Majmudar, JISOA, vol. 10, pl. 1, fig. 2, and ibid., pl. 1, fig. 1, for comparison of style.

⁵ Cf. Rai Krishnadasa, Lollit Kala, vol. 1, for comparison with the pre-Akbari illustrations of a Lor Chandā manuscript having exactly the same type of turban.

⁶ They are commonly used in the earlier manuscript illustrations; cf. Dr. Moti Chandra, Jain minia-
ture paintings in western India, figs. 181 (dated A.D. 1433), 193, etc.
and pruned trunk, (b) a tree type with extended, denuded, black branches, or the same type with red branches, having three-petaled blossoms (?) at the end, (c) a tree with swaying, delicate branches and globular red fruits (?), (d) the plantain tree, the only identifiable one in the group, closely resembling similar representations in the A.D. 1439 Kalpa Sūtra manuscript in the collection of the National Museum of India, New Delhi, and in the tile work on Man Tomar's palace, Gwalior, India, datable ca. A.D. 1500, (e) a bold blossomed plant, made up of a floral design showing similarities to those in earlier manuscript illustrations, and so on.

The conventionalized, variegated, and colorful conical rocks, sometimes with curved peaks, may show a relation to the earlier group of Rajasthani examples dated about A.D. 1540.\(^7\) The lotus pond, at the bottom of certain illustrations, shows an extremely primitive treatment, with blue placid water and a few doll-like, darting fish.

Sometimes the sky is represented by a semicircular broad wash of blue; in one example semicircular stripes of different colors appear. Elsewhere a curtainlike object hangs at the top and corners of the painting. Very similar representations of sky appear in a few Shāh-nāmeh pages in the same collection, which Dr. Richard Ettinghausen has attributed to some Indian Sultanate Courts of the fifteenth century (figs. 37–39).

The palette is limited to dull and raw yellow, crimson, lapis lazuli, malachite-green, black, and other such primary colors.

Certain other characteristics may reinforce the claim for an early date for the illustrations, e.g., the broad, straight Indian daggers, the small round shields, the vīna (lute) of an early type, the early form of the bouquet held by Rāgini Kakubha, the decorative and doll-like representations of a tiger (fig. 30) and peacocks (fig. 28), and so on. The treatment of snakes, with their broad, conical, hooded faces and their bodies filled on the inner side shown with a crisscross (mat) pattern connects these examples with the earlier tradition which dies out during the Akbar period; the absence of Akbar influence, on the other hand, may suggest a date before the Grand Mughal re-established the imperial order in Gujarat (A.D. 1572).

Another Rāgamālā series similar to the one under discussion belongs to Shri Sarabhāi Nawab's collection,\(^8\) Ahmadabad (India); however, when Nawab permitted his collection to be studied, this manuscript was not available to me and thus I am confined to the published information. This fragmentary series now consists of its nine folios, viz, folios 6–9, 11, 25, 29, 31, 32, which measure 9.3 inches by 4.1 inches in horizontal size, illustrating Dakhini Gūjari, Mālakausa, Dhanyāsi, Kambhāvati, Rāmakali, Naṭānārāyaṇa, Āśā, Sindhu, Meghamalāra, respectively. This Rāgamālā series has many features in common with the Kala Bhavan set, with strikingly similar angular profile faces, costume, and drapery. Yet the Nawab examples may show a tendency toward simplification in line and color while eliminating details in architecture and landscape; they would therefore represent the more or less popular nature of these miniatures which seem to have been derived from some earlier prototype. The Kala Bhavan examples might belong to this same early style group, assignable to ca. A.D. 1575 in date.

The following group of manuscript illustrations shows similarities to the Kala Bhavan Rāgamālā series and therefore helps us in dating this series:

(a) The undated manuscript of Sangra-

\(^7\) Anand Krishna, op. cit.

\(^8\) Cf. Khandalavala in Marg, vol. 4, No. 3 (1950), fig. 8, and S. M. Nawab, Masterpieces of Kalpasutra paintings, Ahmadabad, 1956, 8ff. and figures.
Fig. 1.—Bhairava Raga.

Fig. 2.—Nāda Bhairavī.

Fig. 3.—Nāța.

Fig. 4.—Gaurī.
Fig. 9.—Kambhāvatī.

Fig. 10.—Mālava.

Fig. 11.—Rāmakāri.

Fig. 12.—Gūnakāri.
Fig. 21.—Vasanta.

Fig. 22.—Karnâta.

Fig. 23.—Dēśî Varādê.

Fig. 24.—Varâṭî.
Fig. 30—Guruji.

Fig. 31—Malliba.

Fig. 32—Sainaja.
Figs. 37-39.—Šah-nāmeh, Sultanate Period.
Figs. 40-43.—Madana Kumāra—Rāti Sundarī Kathā.
Shri Gopi Krishna Kanoria Collection.
haṇi Sūtra, which in many respects resembles the Rāgamālā series and already suggested by me as an example from the pre-Akbar Gujarat.9

(b) The undated Madana Kumāra-Rāti Sundari Kathā illustrated manuscript, a recent acquisition in the collection of Shri Gopi Krishna Kanoria of Calcutta (published here for the first time, figs. 40–43), again yields no trace of the Akbari influence and although it is not as early in date as the above-cited Sangrahaṇi Sūtra manuscript, it cannot be as late as ca. A.D. 1576, the date of another illustrated manuscript (infra, c).

Madana Kumāra-Rāti Sundari Kathā manuscript illustrations, on the other hand, show no traces of Akbari costume or architecture, but on the other hand show definite pre-Akbari motifs.

(c) An illustrated manuscript of Parśvanātha Vivāhālu in the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Massachusetts,10 datable ca. A.D. 1576,11 is another important piece of evidence to help us in dating the Kala Bhavan Rāgamālā series. Although a few illustrations in the Parśvanātha manuscript show faces having the “farther-eye,” yet at least in one case (fol. 1B) two strict profile faces of the Rajasthani type appear. These examples in their facial and eye types are too close to be much removed in date from the Kala Bhavan Rāgamālā examples.

The Sangrahaṇi Sūtra12 illustrations of A.D. 1583 show a great progress in the same style group, by means of balanced and evolved compositions, faces showing less angularity and comparatively smaller eyes, and above all a few jamah types, derived from the Akbari pointed (chakdar) variety or the characteristic flat (atapi) turban. The same inferences can be drawn from an illustrated manuscript of Uttarādhyayana Sūtra dated A.D. 1591.13

(e) The Gitagovinda series in the late N.C. Mehta’s collection14 is another landmark in the history of this provincial art style. Rai Krishnadasa informs me that a dated Bhāgavata Daśamakhandha illustrated manuscript (unfortunately still unpublished) in the palace collection of Jaipur (Rajasthan State, India) dated A.D. 1598, is very similar in style and several other characteristics to the above-mentioned Gitagovinda series and thus a date for ca. A.D. 1600 can be suggested for the latter.

Now a closer comparison between the Mehta Gitagovinda illustrations and the Kala Bhavan Rāgamālā series may suggest an earlier date for the latter.

In the Gitagovinda illustrations the facial types are more sophisticated, the scenes are more tightly composed, showing a compactness and correlation among the figures. Not only do the costumes and the ornaments lose their primitiveness and the earlier types of motifs disappear, but they also show a definite Akbari impact, which is conspicuously absent in the Kala Bhavan Rāgamālā series. Similarly the lack of ornateness in the architectural types of the Gitagovinda illustrations does not fail to impress upon the student the gradual loss of such Hindu traditions which were simplified or given up by the Akbari architects. The tree types, with their elaborate and swaying branches in the Gitagovinda examples are surely an evolution from the primitive and

9 Anand Krishna, op. cit.
11 The book has two MSS. written in the same hand. The first MS. has a few illustrations, but it is undated. However, the second, unillustrated, MS. follows the first and is dated A.D. 1576. Presumably both the MSS. were written at one time.
13 W. N. Brown, Manuscript illustrations of the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra, described as MS. JP and plates.
14 Karl J. Khandalavala, Marg, vol. 4, No. 3 fig. 10.
stunted trees of the Rāgamālā series and this process of evolution easily presupposes a considerable time.

Thus the conspicuous dissimilarity between these two series of illustrations cited above leaves us no doubt about an earlier date than ca. A.D. 1600 for the Kala Bhavan Rāgamālā series. In any case, the Rāgamālā should be earlier than A.D. 1583, the date of the above-mentioned Sangrahaṇi Sūtra. Therefore, a date ca. A.D. 1575 may be justifiable.

Thus the Rāgamālā series presents a true early stage of the Rajasthani paintings, in primitive form, showing some definite characteristics to prove its existence during the sixteenth century. These manuscript illustrations leave no doubt about its pre-Akbari period and its independent origin, and thus help to settle the controversy.

ANAND KRISHNA

"THE SIX LAWS AND HOW TO READ THEM"

Special interest has been aroused by Acker's new rendering of the famous Six Laws of Hsieh Ho. Since acceptance of his interpretation would force us to regard all previous renderings as more or less obsolete, and since this interpretation appears to be receiving such acceptance from many people concerned with Chinese art, it requires some careful consideration. The Six Laws have been translated and discussed by numerous other writers; the first two were treated at length by Alexander Soper. Soper's exposition still seems to me generally the soundest of all that have appeared to date, and I shall depend on it somewhat in the following discussion.

Hsieh Ho, after announcing that "painting has Six Laws," asks: "What are these Six Laws?" and himself provides the answer (necessarily, since they are his own invention), presenting them in order. The form of his presentation, as it has customarily been construed, is as follows (taking the first law as example): \(i, \text{chi}-\text{yin} \text{ sheng}-\text{tung} \text{ shih yeh}\) (一氣韻生動是也). Adapting Soper's translation to the order of the Chinese sentence, this law could be rendered (awkwardly) as: "The first, 'animation through spirit consonance' is this." Chang Yen-yüan, quoting the laws in Li-tai MHC, simplified Hsieh's construction to the form: \(i \text{ yueh chi}-\text{yin} \text{ sheng}-\text{tung}\) (曰氣韻生動), or, "The first is called 'animation through spirit consonance.'" However presented, the Six Laws have been taken as four-character phrases by Chinese, Japanese, and Occidental scholars ever since.

Acker believes that all these scholars, beginning with Chang Yen-yüan, have been in error, and that each of the Six Laws consists, properly speaking, of a single two-character compound, with a second compound or two-character phrase following it and explaining or defining it. He punctuates the first law, for example: "\(i: \text{chi} \text{ yin}; \text{sheng} \text{tung} \text{shih yeh}\)," and translates, "First, Spirit Resonance which means vitality" (pp. XXIII, 4). The other five he renders in similar form. The words shih yeh are thus understood as equating the law and its definition, and the numerals preceding each law as belonging properly only to the law itself, which comprises only the first two characters of the four. Acker quotes the

1 Acker, W. B., Some Tang and Pre-Tang texts on Chinese painting. See p. 4 for text and transl. of the Six Laws, which appear in the introductory remarks to Hsieh's Ku hua-\'in lu (late fifth century); and Introduction, pp. XIV–XLIII, for Acker's discussion of them.


3 I do not find very convincing Acker's suggestion that Hsieh Ho may have been quoting the laws from an earlier source; there is no real reason to suppose that they were other than original with him.
laws at one point in what he holds to be their basic form: “1. Spirit Resonance. 2. Bone Method,” etc. (p. XLI). This interpretation affects not only the relationship between the pair of two-character terms or phrases of which each law is composed, but also the meanings of the individual terms, some of which (especially in the third and fourth laws) must be understood quite differently if obliged to stand alone.

I do not believe, however, that the Six Laws can be construed satisfactorily in this way. In setting forth my objections and in suggesting alternatives to Acker’s renderings, I shall make use of a method employed to good effect by Acker and Soper, a method which offers, I think, potentially the most fruitful means of clarifying the structure and significance of the Six Laws. This is the introducing of pertinent comparative material—passages which are syntactically related, occurrences of identical or similar terms—from approximately contemporary or earlier literature, and especially from texts dealing with painting, calligraphy, and poetry. Writing at a time when the criticism of painting was in an early stage of its development, Hsieh Ho had little choice but to adopt some part of his terminology, as well as of his forms of presentation and modes of discussion, from the literature of the other arts. We should, then, be able to discover in that literature clues to the meaning of some of his terse pronouncements.

Taking up Acker’s arguments in the order in which he advances them, we may begin by considering a passage in Chang Yen-yüan’s text which Acker offers as having suggested to him, through a parallel use of the words shih yeh, the real nature of the Six Laws. Chang writes that “the word t’u (picture, to depict) contains three concepts,” and gives the first as follows: i yiieh t’u-li; kua-hsiang shih yeh 一字図理, 卦象是也. In Acker’s rendering, this is: “The first is the representation of principles; the forms of the hexagrams (of the Book of Changes) are such.” This passage follows what appears to have been a fairly common pattern in the Six Dynasties period. In an essay on calligraphy by the Chin dynasty writer Wei Heng 衛恆, we find the following: “Written characters have in them six kinds of significance (liu i 六義). The first is called indication; [the graphs for] ‘above’ and ‘below’ are such” (i yiieh chih-shih; shang hsia shih yeh 一字指事, 上下是也). The other five, of course, follow. In the Wen-hsin tiao-lung, a treatise on literary theory which is only a little later in date than Hsieh Ho’s book and therefore of value to our investigation, the following appears: “Thus, in the way of composing literature there are three principles. The first is called literature (or patterns) of forms; the Five Colors are such” (i yiieh hsing-wen; wu se shih yeh 一字形文, 五色是也). Other examples constructed on this pattern could be cited.

All these passages, including Chang Yen-yüan’s, enumerate qualities, categories, etc., in two-character terms; an explanatory note, also of two characters, follows each, and the words shih yeh conclude the sentence, equating term and explanation. They all exhibit, that is, exactly the form in which Acker would like to read the Six Laws. But they all differ from Hsieh Ho’s statement of his laws in one essen-

Acker, pp. XXII, 65.

Wei Heng, fourth century a.d.? Ssu-t’i shu-shih 四體書勢. Quoted with his biography in Chin shu, ch. 36. Another pertinent passage occurs later in the same essay, in Wei’s presentation of the six kinds of writing (liu shu).

Wen-hsin tiao-lung 文心雕龍 by Liu Hsieh 劉勰, early sixth century; cited hereafter as WHTL. This passage is in ch. 31; in the Kuang Han Wei ts’ung-shu edition (to which all the following page references are made), VI/11a-b. A play between wen as literature and wen as patterns or markings is involved here; but the exact meaning does not concern us now.
Another objection to Acker's construction of the laws is based upon the nature of the third and fourth, which, as he admits, "look as if they were indivisible four-character grammatical phrases." The third and fourth laws, ying-wu hsiaang-hsing 應物象形 and sui-pei fu-ts'ai 隨物賦彩, are rendered by Soper as "Fidelity to the object in portraying forms" and "Conformity to kind in applying colors." Acker holds that ying-wu and sui-pei are the actual laws, and translates: "Correspondence to the Object which means the depicting of forms" and "Suitability to Type which has to do with the laying on of colours." He supposes that because ying-wu and sui-pei were terms uncommon in painting theory, the explanatory phrases were required to establish their relevance to painting. I should like to consider in some detail the two-character terms which make up these laws, not only in order to dispute the correctness of Acker's interpretation, but also to suggest a broader significance for them than has generally been recognized.

A pervasive theme in Six Dynasties discussions of the arts, having its foundations within the school which Fung Yu-lan calls Neo-Taoism, was an emphasis upon emotive response to the sights and sounds of the physical world. Philosophers might continue to argue over whether, or in what way, the ideal man should be moved by sensual stimuli, but artists and art critics in this period seem to have paid little attention. For them, it was the artist's response to the world, embodied in his pictures of it or poems about it, which gave to pictures or poems their expressive force. The term ying-wu, sometimes used for the ideal man's capacity to adapt to external circumstance, came to be employed in art-theoretical discussions as one of a number of terms for different varieties of response. The short essay on landscape painting by Tsung Ping (A.D. 375–443), for example, begins: "The sage..."
harbors tao and responds to things (ying-wu); the wise man purifies his emotions and savor images [i.e., visual impressions of nature].” Later in his essay, Tsung uses the word ying for “respond” in a different context, saying that if the painter takes “response to his eyes and accord with his heart” (ying-mu hui-hsin 應目會心) for his guiding principle, the eyes and hearts of all other people will respond to, and be in accord with, his paintings.8

The application of an emotional response to the creation of art is stated more explicitly in Wen-hsin tiao-lung: “Man is endowed with seven emotions. Responding to things (ying-wu), he is moved in certain ways. Moved by things, he chants his purpose (i.e., expresses his thought in poetry).”9 I am inclined to believe that Hsieh Ho uses ying-wu in a similar way, and that the proper interpretation of his third law is something like: “Responding to things, to image (depict) their forms.”

The term which forms the latter half of this law, hsiang-hsing, literally “imaging forms,” occurs also in closely related four-character phrases in texts dealing with the evolution of writing. In the preface to the Shuo wen, we find i-lei hsiang-hsing 依類象形, rendered by Acker himself (p. 97) as “depicted shapes according to their kinds.” The Chin dynasty calligrapher So Ching 索靖, in speaking of the creation of the “bird-seal” script, uses a similar phrase: lei-wu hsiang-hsing 類物象形, “Through similitude with things, their forms were depicted.”10 These phrases seem to belong to a fairly large class of four-character phrases, constructed on a common pattern and used to describe various aspects of creative activity: the embodiment of sensual impressions in art, the abstraction of natural form into “images,” etc. The third and fourth of Hsieh Ho’s laws clearly belong to this class, as does the last phrase of the passage quoted above from WHTL, “Affected by things, he chants his purpose” (kan-wu yin-chih 成物吟志). A number of others will be introduced below, and many more could be cited.11

The close similarity of some of these to Hsieh Ho’s third and fourth laws strongly indicates that those two laws, and by extension the others, cannot be anything but four-character phrases as well, and thus serves to counter Acker’s argument that “Fixed terms consisting of four characters are not at all characteristic of the prose style of the period” (p. XXV). The question of whether the similar phrases in other works are properly to be called “fixed terms” is beside the point; all that is required for them to become such is that the author choose to designate them as “laws” or “elements” of literature, painting, or whatever he is discussing.

The use of the word lei, “kind, category,” in the two phrases cited above from the Shuo wen and the essay of So Ching pertains also to the fourth law, sui-lei fu-t’s’ai. Acker, in order to establish sui-lei as “an independent

8 Tsung Ping, Hua shan-shui hsü, contained in ch. 6 of Li-tai MHC. Well translated by Soper, as an excursus to his article Early Chinese landscape painting, Art Bulletin, vol. 23/2 (June, 1941), pp. 141–164. The above renderings, however, are my own.

9 WHTL, ch. 6 (1/o). For another revealing use of ying, see the poem at the end of ch. 26 (VI/3a): “It is through its appearance that one captures the object; but it is to its principle (li) that the mind responds (ying).”

10 In his essay T’sao-shu chuang 萍書狀, quoted with his biography in Chin shu, ch. 60.

11 The earliest example of a phrase on this pattern being applied to painting is probably in the “Rhyme-prose (fu) on the Ling-kuang Palace in Lu” by Wang Yen-shou, second century A.D. Writing of paintings in this palace, he uses the phrase sui-se hsiang-lei 隨色類, “Following (or: according to) colors (appearances), to depict kinds.” See Pei-wen-chai shu-hua p’u, XI/7b.
binom," introduces occurrences of the term in Buddhist texts (without mentioning the dates of these texts), and suggests that the use of the term by Hsieh Ho "does seem to lend some color to the idea that the Six Elements may have an Indian origin, or at least be based on some sort of formula used by artists who made Buddhist icons in the temples and courts of fifth-century China." There is no real need, however, to bring Buddhism into the question at all. The terminology of the Six Laws is in no way out of harmony with non-Buddhist critical and other literature of its time. Sui-lei, for example, is only one of a number of similar, and evidently to some degree interchangeable, compounds which appear in Six Dynasties and earlier writings: i-lei and lei-wu in the passages quoted above, or the ch'u-lei 觸類 used by the third-century philosopher Wang Pi in a sentence which Derk Bodde translates: "Therefore in keeping with the category, the symbol thereof may be made." 12 Sui-lei itself occurs in non-Buddhist texts of the Han and Wei periods (although in contexts which have nothing to do with art), 13 and need not be connected with the adaptation of the Buddha to the categories of beings to be converted.

The above-quoted uses of such similar terms as i-lei, lei-wu, and ch'u-lei, all evidently meaning something like "depending on kind" or "according to kind," leave little room for doubt that Soper's rendering of sui-lei as "conformity to kind" is substantially correct. To venture beyond it is risky indeed; nevertheless, I should like to do so. The appearance of the term in a position parallel to ying-wu suggests that it, too, is basically a verb-object construction, and that the understood subject of both is the artist himself. The artist, that is, takes a more active part than such impersonal English renderings as "according to" and "conformity to" suggest; it is he who responds, accords, adapts, or conforms, depending upon how we choose to render the verbs ying and sui. Sui-lei might have had overtones, for Hsieh Ho's original readers, of such a term as the more common kan-lei 奇類, "responding to kind" (kan, in distinction to ying, usually carries more of a specific sense of emotional response, of "being moved by" something 14) as it is used, for example, in the Tsung Ping essay in a sentence which I would render: "Now, the [human] spirit is basically without bounds; it abides in forms, responding to [its own] kind (i.e., to what is congenial, 'sympathetic' to it)."

I do not mean to suggest that sui-lei and kan-lei are synonymous—they certainly are not—but only that, in the animistic world implied by Tsung Ping's sentence, the line of division between responding to things and corresponding to them, between a subjective accord with and an objective according to, was somewhat indistinct, as we may observe in the overlapping of the modes of expressing these concepts. I imagine that the use of ying-wu and sui-lei in the third and fourth laws evoked, in Hsieh Ho's time, the rich complex of ideas and attitudes surrounding the notion of response. Indeed, it would be surprising if there were no reflection of this pervasive complex to be found in Hsieh Ho's laws. The juxtaposi-

12 Fung Yu-lan, tr. Derk Bodde, A history of Chinese philosophy, II/184. Other uses of i-lei, lei-wu, ch'u-lei, and related binoms are to be found in the literature of the period.
13 See Pei-wen yün-fu under this phrase.
14 The relationship between the terms is a complex question in itself. The phrase ying kan chi hui 應感之會 in Lu Chi's Wen fu, for example, is rendered by Achilles Fang as "The interaction of stimulus and response" (Rhyme prose on literature: the Wen fu of Lu Chi, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, vol. 14 (1951), p. 444). This seems right in this context; but in other usages, such as some of those quoted here, "stimulus" or "stimulated by" could not serve for ying, and we are obliged to fall back again on "respond," leaving the distinction between it and kan somewhat vague.
tion of these two terms may be found in a passage in WHTL, ch. 46 (X/1a), in which two aspects of the poet's response are designated by a similar pair of terms, *kan-wu* 藝物, "to be moved by things," and *lien-lei* 联類, "associate with one's kind":

The year has its [seasonal] objects, and these objects have their aspects. One's feelings are moved by these things, and the words [of one's poem] are produced by these feelings. [The sight of] one leaf may be like welcoming [a friend]; the voices of insects may be enough to pull at one's heart. How much more so, then, when the pure wind and bright moon make the night like broad day, or when one greets the morning in a spring grove. It is for this reason that the poet is moved by the things [of the world] and seeks out his kind (what is congenial to him); he lingers among the myriad images, immerses himself in sights and sounds. He transcribes their spirit, depicts their appearance (*hsieh-ch'i f'u-mao* 寫風圖貌).

To those who would protest that this is all rather farfetched, that the fourth law probably never meant anything more elevated than that the painter should use yellow color in painting yellow things, I have further outrage to offer: the *fu-ts'ai* of this law, I think, denotes something more than simply "applying colors." WHTL, ch. 8 (11/6a), uses a variant of the term in defining *fu* as an expressive device in poetry. "*Fu,*" it says, "is equivalent to *p'u* (to spread out, arrange). [The poet] sets forth colors (appearances, *p'u-ts'ai*), displaying them in literature; he embodies objects, transcribing his purpose (*ts'i-wu hsieh-chih* 體物志)." The character used for *ts'ai* interchanges with that used by Hsieh Ho; the *p'u-ts'ai* of this passage and Hsieh's *fu-ts'ai* are thus virtually identical, since *p'u* is used to define the same *fu* which Hsieh Ho writes. This *fu*, as a poetic device, is elsewhere defined as "lodging in words, transcribing objects" (*yü-yen hsieh-wu* 寓言寫物). *Fu* as a term in literary theory thus denotes the practice of direct descriptive statement as opposed to allusion, metaphor, etc.; it is a straightforward "setting forth of the appearances of things."

*Ts'ai,* literally "color," is commonly used, as it is in the WHTL passage above, in the broader meaning of "external (superficial) appearance," sometimes with the implication of "sensuous charm," as is the other common word for color, *se*. In another passage, for example, the author of WHTL writes: "Painting depicts the colors (outward appearances) of things, whereas literature captures emotion." Examples of the extended sense of these words could be multiplied; *ts'ai* occurs in a number of phrases in which no reference to actual color is possible, and *fu* appears in art theory in such terms as *fu-hsing* 輯形 and *fu-ching* 輯景, in which it cannot mean "applying" forms or scenery, but can only be "setting forth" or "describing" them. I incline to the opinion that Hsieh Ho's *fu-ts'ai* refers not only, perhaps not even primarily, to the physical act of applying pigments, but also to the descriptive representation of the "colors" or appearances of what the artist sees.

This interpretation raises one problem: if the fourth law is not to be confined to the simple coloring of the painting, does it not repeat the third, with both referring in different words to the practice of direct representation, "copying reality"? Against this objection, one may note a definite and important distinction between *hsiang-hsing* and *fu-ts'ai*; the two terms relate, I think, to the dual function of painting as it was conceived by the early theorists. In opposition to such state-

Chung Jung 朱鍾, a work of literary criticism compiled ca. 505.

15 In the introduction to the Shih *p'iu* 詩品 by

18 Cf. the title of ch. 46 of WHTL, *Wu se*, "the colors (appearances) of things."

17 WHTL, ch. 30 (VI/9a). Writers on painting took exception to such statements, but that is beside the point here.
ments as that quoted above from WHTL, that painting merely “depicts appearances,” they maintained that painting also involves interpretation and abstraction of visual reality, and is thus a means of understanding the world as well as of portraying it. Tsung Ping’s contemporary Wang Wei begins his short essay on landscape painting with a statement directed against those who say that painting is “limited to seeking for the appearances and aspects” of material things. Painting should, on the contrary, “be regarded as of the same order with the images of the Changes,” i.e., the hexagrams of the I ching.18 For an understanding of his analogy, we might turn to the theories of the third-century Wang Pi, a leading figure in the school of Neo-Taoism, which, as noted above, provided the philosophical background for much that is found in Six Dynasties discussions of the arts. In Wang Pi’s epistemology, as summarized by Arthur Wright,19 “The successful activity of man depends on the degree to which he has observed reality and reflected upon its essential content . . . Mere observation . . . does not lead to the formation of images.” By “images” Wang means specifically the hexagrams of the Changes. “. . . image is an expression of thought through the selection of a thing or an event from the outer world; it represents in itself a means of expressing thought and of transmitting thought for general use . . .” Wang Wei wanted the same image-creating process to be recognized as a function of paint-

18 Wang Wei 王微, Hsiu hua 虛畫; contained, with the Tsung Ping text, in ch. 6 of Li-tai MHC. He is not to be confused with the more famous Wang Wei of the eighth century.

19 In a review of A. A. Petrov, Wang Pi (226–249: His place in the history of Chinese philosophy, HJAS, vol. 10/1 (June, 1947), p. 86. Wright is summarizing Petrov’s presentation of Wang Pi’s philosophy. See Fung-Bodde, op. cit., II, ch. 5, for a translation of passages from Wang Pi’s Chou-i t’ieh-li, on which the above is based.

ing. I suspect that Hsieh Ho’s use of the term hsiang-hsing (which had also been applied to the abstraction of natural form in the creation of written characters),20 and the juxtaposition of this term with fu-ts’ai, implies the distinction between the processes of abstraction into images (hsiang), a process carried out in the artist’s mind, according to his response to the visual stimulus (ying-wu), and a more objective portrayal of outward appearances (ts’ai), as they are observed, “according to type” (sui-lei). That is to say, it is not only a distinction between simple shape and color, but also between the larger configuration, the perceived Gestalt, on the one hand, and the sensual surface of the world on the other. Hsieh Ho elsewhere makes the same distinction, using the terms fu-ts’ai chih-hsing 畫形製形 (in discussing the painter Ku Chün-chih) and hsing-se 形色 (in his comments on the painting of the Emperor Ming of Chin). Tsung Ping, in his essay, first speaks of “delineating images, spreading forth colors” (hua-hsing fu-se 畫象布色)21 and later of “transcribing forms with forms, portraying colors (appearances) with colors” (i hsing hsiieh hsing, i se mao se 以形寫形，以色貌色); “Form (shape)” and “color (surface appearance)” are two aspects of reality as the artist perceives it, not merely the physical shapes he

20 In the Shuo wen preface and the So Ching essay quoted above. Hsiang-hsing is also one of the “six kinds of significance” in characters; see Acker, p. 66. For the analogy between painting and the evolution of the script, aimed at extending the function of painting beyond simple representation, see also Chang Yen-yüan’s introduction to Li-tai MHC, as translated and discussed excellently by Acker, pp. 61–110. Chang’s argument is, in a sense, an amplification of Wang Wei’s.

21 Tsung Ping here uses a different character for fu; but this other fu also occurs in the broader usage, e.g., in an appearance of fu-ts’ai in WHTL, ch. 46 (X/6a).
delineates and the material pigments he employs.

Whether or not one agrees with the suggestions concerning the interpretation of the third and fourth laws made in the foregoing discussions (and I admit that some of them are tentative and inconclusive), two points should by now be clear: first, that these two laws follow what was in their time a very common pattern for statements of the creative process, and therefore appear to be, like the closely related examples, indivisible four-character phrases; and second, that ying-wu and sui-lei have applications and implications much too broad to allow them to function in themselves as “laws” of painting, but that they can function very well as halves of four-character constructions of this common type. These two points would in themselves cast strong doubt on Acker’s reading of the Six Laws; combined with the syntactical difficulties discussed above, they show it to be quite untenable. As for the more controversial matters relating to the interpretation of the third and fourth laws, I will only add that I am reluctant to believe that Hsieh Ho, in an age when theoretical discussions of poetry, calligraphy, and other subjects were taking place on a high level of complexity and sophistication, would have devoted two of his laws to a simple advocacy of verisimilitude.

It is obvious that the third and fourth laws, however interpreted, exhibit a close syntactical parallelism, a variety of that stylistic symmetry which any reader of later Six Dynasties literature comes to expect. We may wonder, then, whether the other two pairs (first and second, fifth and sixth) may not be parallel as well. The last two seem to be made up of verb compounds which serve as substantives, and are thus to be rendered in gerunds: “dividing and planning,” etc. (see my rendering below, based on Acker’s very good analyses of the terms which form these laws). The difficulty is rather

with the first two: *ch’i-yün sheng-tung* 氣韻生動 and *ku-fa yung-pi* 骨法用筆, rendered by Soper as “Animation through spirit consonance” and “Structural method in use of the brush.” *Yung-pi,* “to use the brush,” is certainly verb and object, while *sheng-tung,* in the parallel position, is usually taken as “life movement,” i.e., as a compound consisting of two nouns. Of the seven renderings of the first law quoted by Soper (op. cit., pp. 414–415), only Petrucci’s “La révolution de l’esprit engendre le mouvement,” takes *sheng* to be a verb. Soper rejects this interpretation, pointing out that in later texts *sheng-tung* is “a phrase capable of independent existence.” A passage in Yao Tsui’s *Hsi hua-pìn,* in his treatment of Hsieh Ho as a painter (Acker, p. 46), indicates that Yao also took *sheng-tung* as an independent binom, so the practice of understanding it as such had evidently begun by the mid-sixth century. This is not positive evidence of Hsieh Ho’s intention, however, and I should like to reopen the question with a suggestion that Petrucci may have been right on this point.

The “movement of life” concept seems to me strangely out of harmony with the attitudes of the age; in other writings, the word *tung,* unless it takes an object (“moving the arm,” “moving [affecting] the mind,” etc.) is more likely to refer to a grander cosmic movement.

Kobayashi Taichirô, however, in his article *Shina-ga no kōzu to sono riron* (The Composition of Chinese Painting and its Theory, Part I, in Shina-gaku, vol. 10/1 [May 1940], p. 57) gives as the Japanese reading of the first law: “Ki-in ni wa dô wo shô-zeyo,” taking *sheng* as a verb. He also gives other readings based on later interpretations of the law, but considers this one the “basic interpretation.”

A verb-object phrase can ordinarily serve as a substantive anyway; *yung-pi,* for example, is commonly used for “brushwork.” The line by Yao Tsui referred to might very well mean, “He did not completely achieve the effect of engendering-of-movement” (未窮主動之役).
not confined to living things—as, of course, movement was not in Taoist cosmology. Tung-pien, “movement and change,” occurs in cosmological discussions, and the Shih p'in (cf. note 16) begins with the words: “The movement (tung) of objects [of nature] by the ch'i, the affecting (kan) of men by these objects. . .” While I do not favor reading too mystical an intent into Hsieh Ho’s first law, one is tempted to see in it an analogy to this cosmological process: as ch'i animates the things of the world, so does the artist, through ch'i-yün, engender a sense of movement in his painting. I certainly do not agree with those who maintain that Hsieh Ho intended his first law to apply only to figure painting; the essays of Tsung Ping and Wang Wei make it very clear that landscape, in the Six Dynasties, was anything but an “inanimate” subject. In fact, while the term sheng-tung as such occurs (so far as I know) nowhere else in the early literature, the inverted form, tung sheng, is applied to landscape painting in Wang Wei’s essay (cf. note 18): “It [painting] has change as its transverse and transmutation as its upright [principle]; therefore, movement is engendered in it” (ku tung sheng yen 故動生焉).

This passage offers another strong argument, also, for the reading I propose for the first law; for in it, sheng cannot be a noun, “life,” but only a verb, “engender.” Moreover, when sheng appears in four-character phrases of the type with which we are by now familiar, it seems to be consistently in the latter meaning. In the So Ching text (cf. note 10) we find: ch'ü-lei sheng-pien 觸類生變, “According to kind, to engender change.” In a short passage on calligraphy by Hsiao Tzu-liang, son of the Southern Ch'i emperor Wu-ti (reigned 482–493): yin-shih sheng-pien 因事生變, “Depending on affairs, to engender change.” 24 In WHTL (ch. 22, V/4α), speakers of the composition of literature in the piao 表 form: ying-cwu ch'e-kung, sui-pien sheng-ch'ü 應物掣功，隨變生趣, “Responding to things, he grasps his result (achieves his end); adapting to change, he engenders his flavor.” I would suppose that Hsieh Ho, following this pattern, uses the word sheng in the same way, as a transitive verb.

Having thus presented the possibility that the Six Laws may consist of three syntactically parallel pairs, I am obliged to attempt a rendering which reproduces this parallelism. I have tried to preserve the character of the six as fa: Laws, Canon, Elements, what you will, but basically methods, ways of doing something—specifically, of painting. “Spirit consonance and life movement” is not a method, but a statement of desirable qualities. One cannot hope to reproduce, in short renderings, the ambiguities and overtones suggested above, and I do not try to do so, beyond inserting alternate translations of a few of the words. I pay no attention, for now, to the question of the meaning of the terms ch'i-yün and ku-fa; both are discussed in detail and very well by Soper and Acker, and I have nothing to add (beyond joining Acker in doubting that “structural” is a good equivalent for ku, “bone”; I follow him in using the literal translation).

“What are the Six Laws? The first is: engender [a sense of] movement [through] spirit consonance. The second is: use the brush [with] the “bone method.” The third is: responding to things, image (depict) their forms. The fourth is: according (adapting?) to kind, set forth (describe) colors (appearances). The fifth is dividing and planning, positioning and arranging. The sixth is transmitting and conveying [earlier models, through] copying and transcribing.” 25

24 Hsiao Tzu-liang 蕭子良, Ku-ch'iu chuan-li

25 There are, of course, problems involved in
These renderings, I admit, and especially those of the third and fourth laws, inject ambiguity into what was simple and straightforward in most previous translations. But a rich ambiguity is of the essence of the Six Laws; if it were not, they could hardly have called forth such a volume of commentary by subsequent writers, or proved so applicable to the new problems which confronted painters and critics in later ages. They are no more susceptible to "definitive interpretation" than is the Tao-te ching, and I trust that they will, along with that enigmatic text, continue to stimulate theories and counter-theories for centuries to come.

JAMES F. CAHILL

POSTSCRIPT TO A YÜAN ARTIST'S DIARY

In an earlier article on the Yüan artist Kuo Pi and his diary, I gave as complete bibliographical information on the diary and these last two laws as well, but I do not wish to consider them now. It may be noted briefly, however, that there is some evidence that the last law was understood in later ages as referring not only to the copying of earlier paintings, but also to the exact copying of appearances of real objects, or to the practice of portraiture. See Chang Yen-yüan's discussion of this law (p. 152 in Acker's translation); note also the use of ch'üan-hsieh 傳寫 near the beginning of his section on Ku K'ai-chih (Li-tai MHC, ch. 5). In the following century Huang Hsiu-fu, consoling a minor painter who complained that the people of his time didn't consider "copying reality" (hsieh-ch'en 寫真, also used for portraiture) to be painting at all, quotes the Six Laws and remarks, "So you see, the 'copying of reality' is one law among the six; how could it not be called painting?" (Mao-t'ing-k'o chi, X/8a). It is obviously the sixth law to which he refers. Whether Hsieh Ho meant the law to cover this other kind of copying is, of course, another question; but if he did, it is all the less likely that the usual interpretations of the third and fourth laws as advocating simple "fidelity to the object" are correct.

its fate as was possible at the time of writing. But in June of 1958 there was published a book bearing the title Kuo T'ien-hsi shou shu jih-chi 郭天錫手書日記, and I saw it only after the first article on Kuo Pi was in press. This new work contains a facsimile reproduction of 52 folios of Kuo's original manuscript diary, a title page in seal characters with three annotations, and a colophon. The work also contains a modern postscript and a collation of the manuscript with the different printed editions. The first page contains a title written in 28 very large seal characters and an inscription by Yü-weng Ch'ung-en 楊翁崇恩. The title reads as follows: "Manuscript Diary of Kuo Jan of the Yüan Dynasty in Four Fascicles, 69 Leaves, and a Total of over 30,000 Words. A Calligraphic Treasure of the Utmost Rarity Preserved in the Hall of Long Life." (元郭錫手書日記四冊六十九葉，計三千餘言，眉壽堂珍藏希世墨寶。) The Mei Shou T'ang 眉壽堂, or Hall of Long Life, was a fancy name used by Chang T'ing-chi (1768–1844) 張廷濟, a prominent scholar, archaeologist, and calligrapher of the Ch'ing period.

The two-line inscription in small characters to the left of the title is signed by (Gioro) Ch'ung-en 崇恩, a Manchu and a scion of the imperial family, and is dated in correspondence to 1869. He was a prominent book collector and is said to have had a rich collection of fine books. To the right of the title in seal characters is one of his seals, Yü-ling 烏生. He used at least four combinations of different characters which produced this same sound. 

1 Ars Orientalis, vol. 3, 1959, pp. 175–188.
2 Shih ming p'ieh hau so yin 室名別號索引, by Ch'en Nai-kan 鍾乃範, Peking, 1957, p. 153. Yeh Ch'ang-ch'i 夏昌禔 does not give this name in his T'ang shu chi shih shih 戒書紀事詩, Ch'ang-sha, 1897 ed., ch. 5, p. 418, but does cite him as a book collector. See also A. W. Hummel, Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing period, Washington, 1943, vol. 1, p. 400.
3 T'ang shu chi shih shih, ch. 6, p. 54a, and Dai kanwa jiten, Tokyo, 1957, vol. 4, p. 260.2.
and in the signature to this inscription he uses the sobriquet "Old Yu." In this inscription Ch'ung-en refers to his traveling for three years in Shansi with his friend, Secretary Lan-p'o, and to the writing of the title in the style of the latter. Lan-p'o 简坡 was used as a fancy name by at least seven prominent persons of the Ch'ing period, but the one who seems to qualify in this particular instance is one Chang Chao-ts'en 张肇岑. He served as Secretary of the Provincial Judge under Juan Yuan when the latter was Governor of Yunnan Province (1826–35). He was thus a contemporary of both Ch'ung-en and Chang T'ing-chi. Moreover, he was known as an expert writer of seal characters.4

A note by Weng Fang-kang (1733–1818) 蕭方綱 covering almost a full page appears on the verso of the title page of the present edition and is dated in correspondence to 1794. This well-known scholar and epigraphist mentions the fact that a number of pages were missing when he saw the diary. Weng also relates the incident about Ni Tsan, the famous Yuăn artist, who said in 1363 that Kuo Pi died more than 20 years earlier.5 At the end of this note is a one-line inscription containing merely the date corresponding to 1854 and the name of one Chou Erh-yung 周爾墉, unidentified.

Following Kuo Pi's diary is a two-page undated colophon by the same Chou Erh-yung. The first page is devoted to the traditional and brief biography of Kuo Pi and the incident of Ni Tsan. In the last part of his note, Chou gives the original starting and ending dates of the diary and states that it now contains 73 leaves and ends in the sixth month, twentieth day of the second year of the Chih Ta period. He commits an error when he gives the starting date as "Chih Ta, eighth year." It should be Chih Ta, first year, eighth month. None

4 Chung kuo jen ming ta te' u tien, Shanghai, 1924, p. 965-3.
5 Cf. Ars Orientalis, loc. cit.

Fig. 1—Page 7b of the Facsimile Copy of Kuo’s Diary.
of these notes gives specific information on Kuo's birth and death dates.

The modern colophon praises the quality of Kuo's calligraphy, and says that the diary was published because so few genuine examples of his writing are still available. The manuscript diary, now consisting of 52 leaves, is in the possession of the Shanghai Municipal Committee for the Preservation of Cultural Objects.

This colophon does not mention the title page of 1809 which says that there are 69 leaves, but does mention Chou Erh-yung's inventory of 73 leaves in 1854. This apparent discrepancy in the number of leaves may be due to the counting by Chou of title pages and covers while the 69 leaves mentioned in the seal character title page counted only the pages in Kuo Pi's writing. The collocation covers ten pages and includes hundreds of errors in the printed copies, but most of them are of minor importance.

*Figure 1* reproduces page 7b of the facsimile copy of Kuo's diary. It is typical of his writing and entries in general, except that it is part of one of the longest entries in his entire diary. It corresponds to September 7, 1308; this was the twenty-third day of the ninth month, the second day of his sojourn in Hangchou. The first part of this entry tells us that the day was clear and that he started out early on a round of official visits. Most of the officials and other people he called on were not available, and after having breakfast with the grandson of one of them, he went for a walk by himself. He went out the northern gate of the city to the Miao Tai Temple. Here again the person he was looking for was not in, so Kuo wandered about the temple examining its furnishings. In the main hall he saw three very fine Buddha images and, as his text continues in *figure 1*—

In the center there was a Vairocana Buddha. In the front hall there was only a set of the Tripitaka. Then I entered the lecture hall where there were some stone tablets with inscriptions on them . . . but I did not have time to copy them down. Next I visited an old image of the Goddess of Mercy which is said to date from T'ang times. On both sides were mural paintings, but because the room was dim I could not examine them minutely. By the door was a Pool for Freeing Life. This is the temple that is popularly called Chieh Tai Su. On the way back my feet were very tired, so I finished the trip in a small boat.

T'ang Chung-wen and Li Shu-i came when I was out. Chao Po-k'e came. The inn where I am lodging is very clean and comfortable. The houses of Hangchou are for the most part adjoining and naturally have a certain air of refinement. K'ung chün-li of Wu-chou came. I have heard that Inspector K'ung has recently been removed from office. This evening I visited Assistant Secretary T'ang Chung-wen; he brought out Mi Fu's picture of Yen Mountain to show to me. On the road I met Commissioner Wang Ch'eng-chih and we stood and talked together for a long time. Next I met Wang Shou-chih.

9th month, 24th day. Clear. In Hangchou . . .

R. C. Rudolph
BOOK REVIEWS


Professor K. A. C. Creswell is preeminent among students of Muslim architecture as being the most dedicated and most productive over a period of 40 years. The present volume is a condensation of his two monumental works, Early Muslim Architecture, which were published in 1932 and 1940, and for less than two dollars the serious reader can have the essential substance, including 72 plates and 64 text figures from the original, of those costly, bulky, and rather hard-to-find folios.

The reader must have a serious interest, for in Creswell’s works the meticulously detailed fabric is not made exciting or appealing by any hints of levity, of local color, or of vanished oriental splendor. The text unfolds chronologically, describing about 30 monuments, erected between A.D. 700 and 870, which still stand, wholly or in ruins. There is no comparable work which covers this same ground.

In an editorial foreword M. E. L. Mallowan states that it is fortunate that the author himself has been able to condense his material and add new comment. This review should indicate what is new and original in the present volume, and it is unfortunate that Professor Creswell himself did not supply a preface or introduction covering this subject. The brief bibliography listing 31 items includes three books published after 1940, but the text appears to reflect direct use of only one of these more recent studies.

The editor feels that this book should be a further stimulus to Islamic art and archaeology. This is a proper wish and a worthy objective, but if one takes a hard look at the results of research on Muslim architecture, it appears that scholarly activity has declined in recent years and no signs of a revival are apparent. Scholarship reflects the times, and if funds for research, eager students, responsive local authorities, and an eager clientele are lacking, the stimulus of even such a fine work as this is not enough. It is, however, to be hoped that this portable volume will become a traveling companion to informed travelers exploring the area from North Africa across to Iraq, to classical archaeologists whose horizons could be broader, to journalists who write fluently and impertinently on Arab nationalism without knowledge in depth, and to foreigners engaged in diplomatic and economic missions. With English now the language familiar to the area, it should be read by many local residents interested in the origins of their own cultural heritage.

Donald N. Wilber


Sir A. Chester Beatty remarked quite rightly in the foreword to this publication that “Turkish fine books and miniatures are not very well known, largely because the European public collections are rather weak in good examples.” Everybody will also agree and rejoice with him that he has been “fortunate in acquiring a varied collection which includes some outstanding works.” And finally, after a repeated study of this work, one can assure
him that the expressed hope "that this catalogue will be a help to scholars and art lovers alike" will be fully borne out, as this publication will be an indispensable tool from now on.

The Chester Beatty Collection of Turkish manuscripts comprises 93 items (Nos. 401 to 493) from ca. A.D. 1400 till 1903, and it includes manuscripts of high artistic quality and of literary or linguistic significance as well. In this respect the catalogue is different from the same library's previously published Catalogue of the Indian miniatures, since these were collected exclusively as works of art. The collection includes works on history, theology, occult sciences, astrology, geography, medicine, and farriery; also collections of poetry, prayers, and specimens of calligraphy, schoolbooks, original documents (such as vaqf-deeds), anthologies, and albums. The majority, that is Nos. 401 to 471, are arranged chronologically; they were ready to be presented in this manner in 1939 when the outbreak of the war made the completion of the catalogue impossible. In the following years, 21 additional manuscripts were acquired which are listed in the order of their acquisition. A chronological table at the beginning of the book, however, lists all the manuscripts according to their dates. The removal of the Chester Beatty Library from London to Dublin brought about a further delay which led to some "Additional Notes" with further data or corrections. The book provides also lists of sultans, of the catalogues of other major collections and reference works, and two indices of personal names, and of places and tribes, while most of the scant literature on Turkish painting is quoted in the "Introduction."

The main burden of the Catalogue fell to Professor Minorsky. He accomplished his task with a masterly thoroughness which has no equal. In each instance, after quoting the beginning lines of the manuscript, he gives all the necessary data about the author, title, and content (including lexicographical data); this is followed by the information about the size, the folios, the binding, script, paper, the scribe and date, the provenance and later history of the manuscript, and finally the pertinent information about the illuminations and miniatures; here he provides in particular captions for every painting, which, in the case of manuscript No. 419, a Life of Muhammad by Darir, number 136.

Of the listed manuscripts, 20 are illustrated in the Catalogue and they can thus be regarded as the most significant artistically. But Mr. Wilkinson, in his "Introduction," refers to a few more, as he finds artistic merit in them, too. One wishes that some of these could have been illustrated (Nos. 402, 404, 413, 425, 472, 481, and 486). This is about the only regret one has, after a study of this volume, but considering the great labor and the expense of producing this splendid and valuable work, such a remark might quite rightly be regarded as too demanding.

Mr. Wilkinson's main contribution to the volume consists of an "Introduction" of 10½ pages. Short as this seems, his comments represent the most judicious and valuable introduction to Turkish painting so far written. They start with an analysis of the general character and artistic qualities of Turkish miniatures. Here the author does not fall victim to the easy temptation to overpraise the subject of one's research. He remains critical throughout; perhaps some modern Turks might regard him even as too critical, since he stresses the deficiencies of Turkish paintings when compared to Persian miniatures, although he concludes this particular paragraph with a statement that those who produced these Turkish paintings are "entitled to a high, if not the very highest, place in this field of art." The next section of this introduction gives a general survey of painting under the Ottomans down to the revival at the beginning
of the eighteenth century. He concludes with specific comments about individual manuscripts of artistic importance in the Library. There is one further significant aspect of Wilkinson's contribution, because in two instances his analysis of the style of the paintings allowed him to date the manuscripts more precisely than it had been possible from general and palaeographic considerations. Thus, No. 440, called "17th century (?)" in the main catalogue, could be pinpointed to about 1625, and an earlier, pre-sixteenth-century date could be assumed for No. 425; and for a similar reason he could state that with the exception of one painting on fol. 30a (which, by the way, seems to belong to the type of "author-picture"), all miniatures in No. 433 are later additions.

Since this review appears in a publication devoted to the arts, nothing need be said here about the manuscripts of historic or literary merits. Only one exception to this restriction might possibly be welcomed; a detail from a Vâqf-nâma of Princess Fâtimâ-Sultân, a daughter of Ahmad III, and Ibrâhîm-pasha of the year 1141 H./A.D. 1729 which, interesting though it is, might possibly be overlooked in the mass of the offered material. It informs us about the organization and functions of the personnel in a medrese and its library, and the social standing of the various employees, as shown by their respective pay. According to this deed,

the books from the library (of the newly endowed, small medrese) are not to be lent outside the building, but readers are to be admitted three times a week. The salaries are as follows: the librarian who is to compile a catalogue of books, 10 aqchas daily; four keepers of whom two must be in service on admittance days, 15 aqchas each; a bookbinder, 4 aqchas; the keeper of the books bequeathed by one Sümûl 'Ali-efendi, 15 aqchas; a door-keeper of the library, 6 aqchas; a farrâsh of the library, 5 aqchas.

It is interesting to compare this with the salaries of the teachers and stipends for students, as mentioned in connection with the same medrese:

A teacher of Qur'ânic sciences received 20 aqchas; a teacher of 'useful Shari'at sciences and of usual divine arts, 100 aqchas; a teacher of calligraphy, 10 aqchas; a teacher of sufism 'free from vices of superficiality,' 20 aqchas; a reader of Jalâl al-dîn Rûmî's Mathnavî, 4 aqchas; a teacher of mathematics to explain the shares of relatives in an inheritance, 10 aqchas; a monitor of religious duties, 5 aqchas; a teacher of prayers to act as the imâm of the school, 30 aqchas; a muezzin, 10 aqchas; other scholars who lived in the 13 chambers of the school, 10 aqchas each; two monitors from among the students, 4 aqchas; 10 other students, 2 aqchas.

And these are the wages of the lower staff of the medrese such as attendants, laborers, and artisans:

A porter of the entrance door, 10 aqchas; a lighter of lamps, 4 aqchas; a door-keeper, 8 aqchas; a burner of incense during lessons, 3 + 5 aqchas; a sweeper, 5 aqchas; a door-keeper of the garden, 4 aqchas; an attendant looking after the fountain, 6 aqchas; a scavenger, 7 aqchas; four men serving (in turn) water to the passers-by, respectively 10, 8, 8, and 8 aqchas; a keeper of the drinking cup (kefche), 2 aqchas; a guardian of the Sulaymânî canal, 4 aqchas; a conduit cleaner, 4 aqchas; a farrâsh of the lavatory, 4 aqchas; a mason, 4 aqchas; a plumber, 4 aqchas; a cleaner of the sewers, 3 aqchas; a stone-cutter, 3 aqchas. [No. 444, p. 75-]

In dealing with the manuscripts, the authors became naturally aware of the peculiar problem of what should be regarded as "Turkish" because there are illuminated Turki manuscripts written outside Turkey, sometimes even for Turkish rulers, whose paintings are Persian in style while, on the other hand, illuminated manuscripts in Turkey were often written in Persian, though their miniatures are rendered in a completely Turkish manner. To

---

1 Persian, by the way, was even the main language used for a Budget of Endowment of Holy Places, located not only in Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, but also in Istanbul, Anatolia, Iraq, and Cyprus; only the conclusion is in Turkish (No. 416, dated 1002/1593).

2 Even more complex is the case of a copy of al-
the first category belongs, for instance, No. 401, a Divân of Hidâyat, which was written about 883/1478 in the Âzarbâyjân Turkish used by the Turkish tribes of Transcaucasia, Persia, Eastern Turkey, and Mesopotamia. The significance of the manuscript lies in the fact that in spite of its Turkish language, its paintings are not distinguishable from those illuminating Persian texts from the same locality (Fârs). Even the fact that the manuscript was written for a Turkoman ruler of the Aq-qoyunlu dynasty—Khalil, the son of Uzun-Hasan—does not give it a Turkish cachet. Only certain details in the two opening pages with central medallions set in emerald green are, according to Wilkinson, "somewhat out of the ordinary," though we are not informed whether they have anything Turkish about them. Similar statements about the purely Persian aspects of Turkish manuscripts written in Persia can be made about two manuscripts of the Divân of Mir ‘Ali-Shir Navâ’î (Nos. 409 and 411), the Divân of the Turkish poet Fu‘ûlî (No. 440), the Anthology, No. 425, containing Persian and Turkish poets, and the Chaghatay Turkish Makhzan al-Âsrâr by Mir Ḥaydar (No. 433), the last two of which are not illustrated in the Catalogue but are commented upon by the authors. On the other hand, the History of Sultân Sulaymân (No. 413), dated 987/1579, is entirely in the Ottoman style of the period of Murâd III, though it is written in Persian; No. 474, a manuscript of 1003/1595 of the Nafaḥât al-Uns by the great Persian poet Jâmi, is also in the Turkish manner, although one can recognize the influence of the styles of Qazvin and Khorasan within the general Ottoman appearance of its

Bûsirî’s Burda (No. 420). This Arabic poem was transcribed, in 1004/1595, by a scribe whom Minorsky tentatively thought to be Kurdish (p. 40). In his “Additional Note” he states that M. Blochet “considered this a Turkish manuscript, though it is in Persian style” (p. xxxiv).

miniatures. By including both types of manuscripts, the catalogue makes us grasp the problem more vividly than before, especially as, thanks to the munificence of Sir Chester, it was possible in most cases to reproduce several miniatures of the same manuscript.

However, the Chester Beatty Library is so extensive and wide ranging that not even the open-minded approach of the authors was able to garner every Turkish item in its vast holdings. For instance, its Divân of Fattâhî, dated 872/1468 (No. 142) was written in Amasiyya and has therefore a good claim to be included among the Turkish manuscripts. It also seems likely that the Divân of ‘Âtiqî of the middle of the fifteenth century (No. 112) was executed for Mehmêd Fâthî, as Professor Minovi has been able to decipher the name of Sultân Muḥammad b. Sultân Murâd in the shamsa on fol. 2b. In addition, there are, of course, the many Turkish Qur’âns which, we assume, will form the subject of another Catalogue in this series.

Another problem of Turkish painting is also brought out by the Catalogue. While there exist a good many dated or datable manuscripts from the period of Bâyazîd II (1481–1572) to Murâd III (1574–95), few dated ones are known of the period of Mehmêd III (1595–1603), Aḥmâd I (1603–17), and ‘Othmân II (1618–22), and next to nothing of the rest of the seventeenth century; only early in the eighteenth century such artists as Levâni and ‘Abdullâh Bokhârî appear, and with them, datable paintings. The Chester Beatty Collection does not alter the situation by providing datable material for the dark, intermediary period. On the other hand, it contains one more manuscript, a Sulaymân-nâma (No. 406) which can, with some assurance, be attributed to Bâyazîd II, after so far only one other manuscript of his reign, a Khusrau and Shirîn by Shaykhi dated 905/1499, had been
discovered by C. J. Lamm in the Uppsala University Library.

The Beatty Library presents us with three names of artists. Of these, Şu‘īl is the most important. He illustrated a Zubdat al-tavārikh by Luqmān-i ‘Ashūrī which was completed in 991/1583 or shortly after (No. 414). The miniatures show maps, Biblical scenes, figures of the early Muslim history, and of Ottoman sultans with their vazīrs. Three figural miniatures of this manuscript are illustrated (pls. 14–16) and while they do not reveal a great master, they present at least an artist of ability who expresses himself in a typically Turkish manner. This manuscript contains also a map of the world in which newly discovered data, scant and faulty as they are, appear curiously mixed together with medieval notions. It shows, for instance, a big island to the southwest of Africa, called Yenidünya, the “New World”; on the other hand, the Northern Hemisphere is divided into seven climes, with the northernmost segment attributed to Gog and Magog. And the world is still surrounded by the Bahr al-muhāf and beyond it by the all-encompassing Qāf mountains (pl. 13). The second artist is Aqā Mir (in the Album, No. 439, fol. 8a) and his work is a black-and-white drawing with some color, showing a lion killing a deer, with trees and birds. This design is unfortunately not illustrated, but from its description it can be assumed that it belongs to the not uncommon black-and-white drawings in chinoiserie style which were made in the second half of the sixteenth century, and of which quite a number have been preserved. The third artist is represented in an Album which contains the tughrā of Sulṭān Mahmūd I (1730–54) and is probably contemporary with it. In it a picture of Aya-Sofya is signed: “gilt by the son of the treasurer (şâdiq-i khazīna) Qayyim-bashi” (No. 447, fol. 9a). The covers of the manuscript No. 409, of 939/1533, carry the name of the bookbinder Mullā Sharif Kāshgārī; they were made in Bokhārā in 1276 n./1859. In contrast to this rather scarce harvest of artists, the list of scribes which can be culled from these manuscripts is quite extensive. Perhaps the most important and interesting among them are the Persian ‘Abdullā b. Mir ‘Ali Tabrizī, who rendered some Turkish poems of his patron Sultan Ḥusayn Bāqqārā (872–911/1468–1506) in the difficult qī‘a technique (No. 404), and Fakhri of Brusa, “the incomparable representative of his art among the Ottoman Turks,” working in the same technique (Nos. 415, 439, [pl. 29], 477). In this découpé work in which the artist cut out the text and mounted it on differently colored paper, another process was added to the calligrapher’s art, which hereby received a tactile value as the writing now appears in slight relief.

Possibly the outstanding manuscript in the collection is No. 413, A History of Sulṭān Sulaymān, with 25 full-page miniatures. This manuscript was written in 987/1579 for the library of Sultan Murād III. In this reviewer’s opinion, it probably surpasses in artistic excellence the celebrated Hüner-nāma of the Topkapu Saray, which was painted by ‘Othmān, zine, vol. 87 (1945), pp. 228–232, pls. 2 B, D, and E, and 3 B; R. Ettinghausen, Studies in Muslim iconography I. The unicorn, Washington, 1950, p. xi and pl. 45; The Chester Beatty Library. A catalogue of the Turkish manuscripts and miniatures, by V. Minor- sky, with an introduction by J. V. S. Wilkinson, Dublin, 1958, p. 70, fol. 7a, 8a, 9b, and pl. 31.

to whom Professor Suut Kemal Yetkin attributed some of its paintings. Another close parallel to it is the Shāhinshāh-nāma (or Shamā‘il-nāma), also written for Murād III, just two years after the Beatty manuscript (in 989/1581), now in the University Library, Istanbul (Yıldız, 2652/260). Also important is the very richly illustrated manuscript No. 419, Life of the Prophet Muhammad, by Šarīr, dated 1003/1594, that is, again, from the period of Murād III. Some of its miniatures are in a style very close to Persian prototypes, but others are early examples of a more popular style, showing ordinary people in the formal court style used for the official histories. A book of Genealogies written by the scribe “Abū Talib Iṣfahānī residing in Baghdād” in 1006/1598 restricts its iconography to portraits of sacred Biblical and Muslim figures, Persian kings, Caliphs, Mongol rulers, and Turkish Sultans, all set in roundels. Each of them is endowed with individual traits and shown in a different costume and pose, so that a type of painting which could be stereotyped and tiresome turns out to be varied and appealing (No. 423). Only Muhammad appears here with a veiled face, though the Biblical figures have flame haloes. An undated but obviously sixteenth-century poetical Anthology is clearly based on Shiraz prototypes; yet it is definitely Turkish, not only on account of its costumes, but also owing to its peculiar stylization and coloring (No. 424). Its miniature of a king on horseback with attendants (fol. 104, pl. 23b) is also fairly close to one showing Sultan Selim I in a manuscript of his Divān of Persian poems, in the University in Istanbul. Another important manuscript, again undated, but in the “Additional Notes” attributed to the third quarter of the sixteenth century, is a Yūsuf-u-Zulaykhā by Ḥamd-Allāh Chelebi (No. 428). It again has a Turkish character which is quite different from contemporary Persian work and it is also more delicate than most other Turkish painting. This comment applies to both styles, recognizable in the three reproduced miniatures of this manuscript (pls. 25 and 26). Finally, a fine individual miniature from about 1600 depicting with a great deal of perception the various activities during a banquet is included in the Album, No. 439 (pl. 32). It is rendered in realistic and popular style and it is related to miniatures in Nos. 419 and 474, already mentioned above. This particular album contains a varied selection of fine paintings, usually of only one or two figures, and a good selection of them appears on plates 29–34.

In contrast to these very original works, the paintings of sacred shrines in Nos. 427, 443, 460, and 463 (pls. 24, 36, 38, and 39) are quite stereotyped and of hardly any artistic interest, especially those of the eighteenth century, which usually show a decided European influence. Only the fact that the Tomb of Muhammad and the Sanctuary in Medina in No. 463 (pl. 39, lower) are crowned with a flame halo (like the faces or figures of Muslim sacred figures) is of some interest. Another curious iconographic feature is the substitution of roses for human faces, or their total omission. When the latter procedure is followed, a headgear rests directly on the shoulders, or the area where a head should be is covered by another figure, as it happens with the head of a horse. In another instance, a “Boat on the Nile” is shown without human figures (as on some ceramic pieces), but there also are none on the banks of the river. This orthodox attitude appears in the otherwise ordinary paintings of a manuscript dated 1160/1747, offering the Turkish version of Alīd occult ideas of Persian origin (No. 444, pl. 37, a and c).

5 Fehmi Edhem et Ivan Stchoukine, Les manuscrits orientaux illustrés de la Bibliothèque de l’Université de Stamboul, Paris, 1933, pp. 3–6, pl. 2, 3.
In the following a few observations are offered with regard to some of the paintings:

No. 406. The two full-page miniatures in this Sulaymān-nāma transcribed for Bāyazīd II are most unusual. Wilkinson thought that they represent Solomon in his youth and again in his later life, in each case attended by angels, birds, and all kinds of other creatures ranged in tiers. It seems, however, that the so-called youthful Solomon is actually Bilqīs, the Queen of Sheba. She alone of all the youthful figures in these paintings has a display of locks on her shoulders. Apart from this there are other instances, especially among double frontispieces, where the miniature of the king is confronted by that of the queen, each with his or her attendants and vassals. The only parallel for the arrangement in tiers with a single dominant figure on top occurs in the manuscript of Nujūni al-Ulüm, dated 978/1570, and made in the Deccan, probably in Bijapur. This also is in the Chester Beatty Collection. Wilkinson has thought that the illuminations in the Sulaymān-nāma "owe something in their style to Mamluk practise," but since they are not illustrated, it is not possible to comment on this point. In any case, the schematic grouping in rows, the rigidity of the figures, and the stark color scheme with its pronounced use of crimson tally with what we usually regard as characteristically Turkish features.

No. 419. Life of Muḥammad, dated 1003/1594. In spite of the realistic aspect of this manuscript, which brings out, for instance, Jewish types by way of their clothing and gestures (pl. 18), not too much can be learned with regard to the Turkish decorative arts of the period. There seem to be no real equivalents for the tiles and carpets rendered in the reproduced paintings. Only the carpet and wall decoration on plate 17 have the arrangement of a "Medallion Ushak" of that period, though they lack the elaborate decorations of the field and multiple borders.

No. 427. The one miniature reproduced from this composite religious manuscript, tentatively attributed to the "16th century," shows the tomb of Muḥammad (pl. 24). This is apparently a fairly early Turkish version of many such designs which became popular also for tiles. Any study of the iconography of this shrine should take this manuscript into consideration, which also has pictures of the Ka'ba and other holy places of Islam.

No. 429. A Book of Prayers, attributed to the sixteenth century A.D. (?). Its very original ornamentation, using designs around decoratively written invocations or religious sayings, has its possibly closest parallel in tiles or ceramics which often show somewhat similar bold features (pl. 27).

No. 439. Album. The dragon of folio 7 (pl. 31) is an example of the black-and-white chinoiserie paintings, also represented in the album of Murād III in the National Library in Vienna, and in other single leaves. The particular example is somewhat harder in manner, but belongs to the same group. Its appearance in a Turkish album supports the now widely held assumption that this group is Turkish. The picture of a chained lion (fol. 11, pl. 33, upper) is a rather common subject.

7 Op. cit., pp. 35–37, pl. 14. As shown by the authors, this is a copy of a second half of the 16th century of a Timurid prototype, which shows that the iconographic type existed in the 15th century, although it was particularly popular in the 16th century.


9 In Turkey, the keeping of lions was an acknowledged profession, with a patron saint, as shown by this account of Evliya Chelebi: "The Keepers of the Lions (Arslânji), are one hundred men. They pass in the procession along with the shepherds' dogs, but the chief, called Arslânji-bâší Kyayassî, according to the Imperial command, passes with the train of
This particular version was also used as a model for copying, as we can see from the fact that it has pricked outlines. Of the painting of a fettered camel with a richly decorated saddlecloth and two attending figures (fol. 8, pl. 33, lower), there is another version in reverse, which, however, contains only the figure of a man with a spindle (now in the Freer Gallery of Art, No. 37.22). The camel of the Freer miniature is much more sensitively drawn and its face is also fully shown; it seems therefore likely that the Beatty version is a Turkish copy. It is curious that in the picture of the “Two Fighting Camels,” attributed to the old Bihzâd, the one attending figure who is not a cameloteer is also a man handling a spindle.

No. 440. The closest parallel to the miniatures in the Divân of Fuğûlî, attributed by Wilkinson to about 1625, are to be found in a Jâmi manuscript written, painted, and illuminated by ‘Ali Rîzâ-ye ‘Abbâsî in Sârî in 1022/1613 (owned by the Kevorkian Foundation). The Kurek-bâshî (Chief of Sheepdog-keepers). Their patron is Ali, called the Lion of God, because all lions and savage animals came to lay down their heads gently before him, and to speak with him in the language of their condition. These keepers of the lions pass completely armed, carrying large cudgels in their hands, and confections of gazelle’s meat, seasoned with opium and other spices, leading each lion with four iron chains plated with gold or silver. If one of these lions is enraged and about to attack the spectators, the keeper holds under his nose the preserved gazelle’s meat, which makes him tame and quiet, and in this way he is governed.” (Evlîya Efendi, Narrative of travels in Europe, Asia, and Africa in the seventeenth century, tr. J. von Hammer, London, 1834-46, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 146.)

11 A. Sakisian, La miniature persane du XIIe au XVIIe siècle, Paris-Bruxelles, 1929, pl. 49, fig. 84. This miniature, which was once part of Sakisian’s collection, seems to have appeared in Istanbul.

12 R. Ettinghausen, Some paintings in four Istanbul albums, Ars Orientalis, vol. 1 (1954), p. 102, fig. 63; see also fig. 3 for the iconographic prototype.

13 Isabel Hubbard, ‘Ali Rîzâ-î ‘Abbâsî, callig-

No. 443. Indicator of the Ka‘ba (pl. 36). An exact duplicate of this box with its picture of the shrine in Mecca painted on the cover is in the Türk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi in Istanbul (No. 157, A and B). It was also made in Constantinople in 1151 H. and has the same formula for the signature.

No. 454. Astronomical Almanac, attributed to the eighteenth century. This book has as an annex a wooden astrolabe which even by itself is a most unusual feature.

No. 474. About this Naṣḥâḥ al-‘Uns manuscript of 1003/1595, one of the finest in the collection, we have already briefly commented earlier in this review. A particularly interesting feature is that it presents the actions in a Turkish milieu. This provides us with an early representation of the dance of the devishes of the Mevlevi order (fol. 248 b, pl. 42) and also places the execution of al-Ḥallâj in a Turkish locale with a Turkish cadi, possibly the Shaykh ul-Islâm and other types, including the very characteristic caricature-like street figures in attendance. With this should be compared a miniature of the same subject painted eight years later in Allâhâbâd in India (in 1011/1602) where this scene is placed in an Indian milieu (R. Ettinghausen: Paintings of the sultans and emperors of India in American collections, Lalît Kala Akademi, India, 1961, pl. 8, and comments on it on facing page). In both cases the martyr is called Maṉûr, although this was actually the name of his father, his own being Ḥusayn.

All these remarks will, it is hoped, make it abundantly clear that the Chester Beatty Collection of Turkish manuscripts and paintings is unique in the Western world, and that in the two authors of its catalogue it has found its perfect interpreters. It remains only to record that this monumental work is dedicated to the rapher and painter, Ars Islamica, vol. 4 (1937), pp. 282-288 and figs. 5-9.
memory of one of the kindest, most knowledgeable and charming scholars of our time, Sir Edward Denison Ross, of whom it is rightly said that "through his remarkable gifts as linguist and orientalist, together with his wide human sympathies, [he] rendered notable services to the promotion of Oriental learning and the understanding of the East by West."

Richard Ettinghausen


Considering the outstanding quality of the various holdings in the Chester Beatty Library, it is difficult to single out a particular area as being preeminent. Yet there were obviously "favorites" for the founder of this remarkable collection. It is, therefore, revealing to read in the "Foreword" to the present volume that Sir Chester "has for many years taken a special interest in fine Persian manuscripts, which seemed [to him] at their best to have no rivals, from the delicacy of their ornament and the beauty of their miniatures." So it is only natural that a *Catalogue* of this group reveals not only a very extensive collection (much larger indeed than the Indian and Turkish parts of the Library), but also a particularly fine and interesting one.

The new publication comprises 50 MSS. from the early 13th to the early 16th centuries, though still excluding various MSS. of the late 15th century, as for instance, those close to Behzād. It represents the first of a planned set of three volumes. The *Catalogue* was started by M. Blochet some years before the Second World War, but before this pioneer in the field of illuminated Persian manuscripts could revise it, he died in 1937; however, through the joint efforts of the three other authors and the editor, much of this work of easy reference has been accomplished, though death intervened again, since the editor, Mr. Wilkinson, did not live to see the final publication, as he died in January 1957. Like the *Catalogue* (whose publication preceded it by a few months), this one is devoted not only to MSS. with fine illuminations and miniatures, but it deals also with those of literary and textual significance. To the latter group belong many important volumes which are analyzed with great care and are now placed in their historical setting; in consideration of the character of this journal, this review will, however, deal only with the art-historical aspect of the new publication.

In the manner followed by the various volumes of this catalogue series, each manuscript is dealt with under a series of subheadings which cover every possible aspect, namely, subject and arrangement; measurements; writing and paper; binding; date and scribe; seals and inscriptions; and—of particular importance to students of Persian art—illumination and illustrations (where the comments reflect apparently the main opinion of J. V. S. Wilkinson). In this last category the precise iconographic identification of the represented scenes is especially valuable. Thanks to the liberal attitude of Sir Chester Beatty, who allowed some of the most important of his MSS. to be included in past exhibitions and publications, many of his treasures are known to the specialist; hence comparatively few unexpected revelations are made by the *Catalogue*. It rather supplements our previous knowledge by presenting further data or by providing illustrations of unpublished miniatures from already known items. Still, a good many times the *Catalogue* acquaints us with volumes ranging just below those of the very top grade, and
they are all of great charm and beauty. Indeed the true proof of the great value of this Catalogue is that one regrets continually that not more plates have been included, so important seem the MSS. described by the authors. But one feels also grateful for the large number of well-produced plates which form such an important part of these splendid Catalogues.

Among the well-known MSS. are parts of several famous Shāh-nāmeh MSS. There are 10 pages with 7 miniatures of the "Demotte Shāh-nāmeh" (Brian, Nos. 4, 5, 6, 11, 29, 45, and 57) in the discussion of which the authors, for not-specified palaeographical reasons, hint the possibility of two original MSS. (No. 111); a second important MS. is represented by 77 folios containing no less than 80 small-scale miniatures with gold ground which are here attributed to about 1300 with a disclaimer with regard to the Lorey's tentative localization at Shiraz (No. 104); a third fragment with 14 miniatures belongs to the 741 H./1341 MS. of the so-called Īnjū School (No. 110); while a fourth of 800 H./1397 (not illustrated) is, like its mate, the Garshāsp-nāmeh in the British Museum, an important document for early Timurid painting (No. 114). An undated Shāh-nāmeh page, probably of the early 15th century, and showing "Gushtāsp Killing a Wolf" in a "rather primitive style" belongs, by contrast to the just-mentioned MSS., to an unpublished volume which makes one regret that it is not illustrated (No. 118).

The eminence of the Chester Beatty Collection is demonstrated by the fact that it includes several MSS. associated with the greatest connoisseur and patron of the early 15th century, Prince Bā'isunghur Mirza (died 837 H./1433). The most important is the Golčestān of 830 H./1427, of whose eight miniatures two are illustrated (No. 119). Its scribe, Ja'far al-Tabrizi, is also responsible for a so far unknown MS. which comprises the Lama'āt of 'Irāqī and an Anthology of Persian lyrical poetry, dated 835 H./1432; this is decorated with a single miniature of "Shirin Discovering Khosrow's Portrait" and some of the earliest examples (if not the earliest) of stenciled designs—none of which is illustrated (No. 122). Then there are the beautifully written and illuminated two opening pages of an undated Collection of Arab proverbs; it contains a longish statement, in thulth characters, about its contents and its famous patron; according to this it originally contained also paintings now apparently lost (No. 120). Finally there is a copy of 'Aṭṭār's Muṣḥab-nāmeh, dated 833 H./1429-30, which was written by Azhar al-Kātib, Ja'far's pupil, who had also written for this prince the Kolliyāt of 'Imād, dated 834 H./1431, now in the Bodleian Library; like the volume in Oxford, this manuscript has no paintings (No. 121).

The fashion of composing anthologies, so marked in the first three quarters of the 15th century, is not only mirrored by the MSS. just mentioned, but by several others as well. One, in the typical small, oblong format, is dated 835 H./1449; it has stenciled marginal designs of human figures, animals, and floral rinceaux all reserved in the tone of the paper within a colored field; they are very close to other such MSS., e.g., the pages which came with the Goloubew Collection into the Boston Museum (No. 127). A two-volume set, dated 834-40 H./1435-36, contains no less than 121 miniatures, which, to judge from the three illustrations given, seem to belong—at least in part—to what one calls the Shiraz School, being related to the Jouveyni MS. of 1438 in the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Nizāmī MS. of 1444-45 in the John Rylands Library. The authors distinguish two hands and they stress that "they are nearly all of an unusual and peculiar, curiously primitive type contrasting in this with the extremely subtle illumina-
An-mentions one Memoirs—pointed more or comed collection painting. inscription quarter grandson the edge executed father real Stchoukine this volume of library Deccan; rather and that I 54°—its the painting of the father, has been entered, this was once owned by P. W. Schulz and has become known through his publication (No. 137). (The two earlier frontispiece miniatures which do not belong to it are now in the Cleveland Museum of Art.) Another MS. probably of the third quarter of the century has so far been unknown. Its 15 miniatures, of which two are illustrated in the Catalogue, are very unusual. Could it be that, in view of two of its most startling features—large expressive eyes and faces rendered in a three-dimensional manner—these paintings are due to Indian workmanship? (No. 141).

There is one illustrated text present in the collection which has so far not been established anywhere else, a Nuzhat-nâme by Shahmardân b. Abîl-Khair probably written about A.D. 1400. The miniatures of this work which deals “with various interesting and amusing phenomena of the world,” are, however, much like the illustrations in MSS. of Qazwini’s Ajâ ’ib al-Makhlûqât, which from the end of the 14th century on became a popular illustrated book (No. 115).

It speaks for the critical acumen of the authors that they were in some instances able to detect later additions and modern forgeries of colophons or paintings which they all candidly announce (No. 102, colophon by the same forger, who, as Professor Minovi points out, also did similarly nefarious work in a Divân of Khâqânî which the British Museum purchased as early as 1913; No. 103, two miniatures; No. 110, miniature painted over the text on fol. 4b; No. 143, painting on fol. 1a [pl. 35], which may even be later than the middle of the 16th century, as, for instance, it would then have been rather unlikely that a
painter would have depicted such a coarse carpet for a prince without adding a border).

In a few cases it seems possible to improve on the data given by the authors of the Catalogue. No. 105 is probably not from a MS. of Rashid al-Din, but from a MS. of the Zubdat al-tavārikh of Ḥāfiz-e Abrū (who, however, used part of Rashid al-Din’s Jāmi’ al-tavārikh), and the MS., most likely from Herat, is to be dated about 829 H./1425 which is the date of a very similar MS. partly written by the author himself for the Library of Shāh Rukh and adorned with miniatures in an identical style (R. Ettinghausen, *An illuminated manuscript of Ḥāfiz-i Abrū in Istanbul. Part I*, Kunst des Orients, vol. 2 [1955], pp. 30–44). The date of No. 107, the Divān of Qumrī is, as can be seen from the excellently reproduced colloplate 16, Jamādā I 712 H./September-October 1312. Finally the scribe (or one of the scribes) of the fragmentary Shāh-nāmeh MS. of 741 H./1341 (No. 110) is known, after all, as it occurs, at least in parts, on a colophon page, which in 1946 was in the possession of the art dealer Dikran Kelekian; it is Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. ‘Āli (?).

It would be a great help for the users of the next volumes of the Catalogue if the authors could provide full bibliographical data for the already published manuscripts. Some such references are given in the first volume, but an up-to-date complete coverage would greatly increase the informative quality of the work, especially in those cases where the paintings and illuminations are not illustrated.

A thoughtful study of this carefully edited and beautifully printed volume makes it clear that it is a mine of information and a continuous source of artistic delight. When the series is completed it will quite obviously represent a major contribution in the field of Oriental scholarship. Lovers of the Persian book and especially of its magnificent decorations are greatly indebted to Sir Chester Beatty for his often audacious, but always discriminating connoisseurship, and, perhaps even more, for his having gone beyond the stage of personal enjoyment of his treasures by sharing them with like-minded people all over the world.

**Richard Ettinghausen**


Within the field of Indian miniature painting, the school which has undoubtedly the greatest aesthetic appeal is that of the Himalayan hill state of Kangra during the long reign of Sansar Chand (1774–1823). Its tender and idyllic charm, sensuous and yet innocent, has no parallel. As Stella Kramrisch happily phrased it in her “Introduction,” the essence of this style is distilled in the series of drawings which form the subject of this monograph. Previous to its publication the majority of these works of art were not unknown to the scholarly world. The great pioneer in the field, Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, who had once owned this set, had described and analyzed the 26 which had entered the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in his *Catalogue of Rajpūt Paintings* of 1926. In view of their beauty and historical significance, Mr. Eastman has now devoted a whole book to them and to 19 others in the United States which had remained unpublished, although they, too, contained many
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outstanding compositions of great aesthetic appeal.¹

While Eastman respectfully quotes the opinions of his teacher, to whom he dedicates his work, his own work is no mere paraphrasing and elaboration of the earlier publication. Through his identification of a figure in Georgian uniform in one of the drawings with a soldier of fortune at the Kangra Court who called himself Colonel William O’Brien, he was able to give a more precise date for the series, 1810–14, that is about 25 years later than Coomaraswamy’s attribution had been. For each of the 48 drawings illustrating the story of the love of Nala for Damayanti and their marriage he was able to provide the exact lines of the 12th-century Sanskrit epic Naïsadhiyacarita on which they are based, though the story as such had already occurred in the Mahâbhârata. He also goes beyond his predecessor by quite reasonably establishing the existence of one or two pupils working with the master draftsman who still remains anonymous, although Eastman suggests a possible identification with a known painter called Purkhu, without, however, forcing the issue (p. 24). Mr. Eastman gives altogether a very thorough introduction and analysis of these pictures, of which only one, now in Boston, was executed in color (though a second fully painted one is said to be in the School of Art in Calcutta where there are also others of the set, none of them here illustrated), while the rest remained partially tinted drawings with color notes occasionally added. Starting with a discussion of the basic text and a historical note he proceeds to deal with the style (in which section he relies, however, more on Coomaraswamy and also on W. G. Archer), he discusses the treatment of the figures and their grouping, the portraits, the bistre drawing technique, and concludes this part of the book with a critical discussion of related material and how far it should be attributed to the Nala-Damayanti Master or to his pupils and followers. A third section of the book deals with such iconographic topics as deities, kingship, and the priesthood; here Eastman analyzes the various types and provides the textual parallels. He also discusses the many types of exquisite palace architecture which form the setting for the multfigured compositions. In the final part of the book he provides a very detailed catalogue and a bibliography. The book ends with 47 collotype illustrations which reproduce all but one of the drawings.

One can only congratulate the Museum of Fine Arts of Boston for having brought out such a scholarly and handsome publication which continues the old tradition of this institution and express one’s regret that Mr. Eastman did not live long enough after the publication of this book to see it warmly received by his colleagues and undoubtedly much appreciated by the interested public.

RICHARD ETTINGHAUSEN


This book is more than just a popular introduction of an attractive subject to a wider audience. It presents a succinct but well-thought-out study of Indian painting in many of its ramifications, and like all the works of W. G. Archer, it is gracefully written and illustrated with carefully chosen, often exquisite examples.

This survey starts with the Buddhist cave temples of Ajanta and comes down to the

¹ Five are in the Freer Gallery of Art, one each in the Metropolitan and Cleveland Museums of Art, the Detroit Institute of Art, and the Art Institute of Chicago, and 10 in private hands.
paintings of the contemporary George Keyt. The main emphasis, however, is on the paintings from the early sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth century, and it is also from this period that the illustrations are chosen.

In one instance the author has even been able to accomplish a major “breakthrough,” i.e., by presenting us with the first definitely pre-Mughal Muslim painting from India, a miniature from the Ni’mat-nâmeh, India Office Library, No. 2775, a book on Indian cookery, preparation of sweetmeats, and spices. Mr. Archer attributes the book to Ghiyâth al-Din Khalji (1469–1500), while Ethé’s Catalogue connects the book with his son Nâsir-shâh (1500–10). In any case, the manuscript is not later than the early sixteenth century and hails from the Central Indian state of Mâlwa. The style used is an Indianized version of what B. W. Robinson has called the “Turcoman style,” with the foliage, hills, and clouds still very close to the Persian prototype. Mr. Archer also indicates that this quaint style exercised a heretofore unsuspected influence on the paintings of Ahmâdnagar in the Western Deccan and on those of Jaunpûr in Eastern India. On the other hand, the style of this early Mâlwa school and of its capital, Mândû, is not continued in Mughal painting. There is no doubt that after this initial presentation of one miniature the publication of more material from the Ni’mat-nâmeh will be eagerly awaited. The importance of this newly discovered manuscript should not induce one, however, to assume that all paintings at the Khalji court were in the “Turcoman” style. There is in the National Museum in New Delhi a Bûstân 2 which likewise comes from the library of Nâsir-shâh. Its many miniatures by Hâjjî Mahmûd (who also did the illuminations) 4 are executed in a different manner, in a simple and rather coarse late Herât style (pls. 1 and 2); were it not for the occasional use of a strong yellow and of some other strident color, one would, from the mere appearance of these paintings, hardly assume that they were made in India. It is quite possible that they were due to the activities of a

2 A miniature from this manuscript was published without further information in J. Strzygowski, Asiatische Miniaturenmalerei, Klagenfurt, 1933, pl. 81, fig. 217. The manuscript is listed in A Guide to the Galleries of the National Museum of India, New Delhi, 1956, p. 31, No. 5. The text was written by Shâhsuvâr al-Kâtib (see colophon, fol. 229 recto) and, according to information kindly supplied by Sayyid Yusuf Kamal Bukhari, the Deputy Keeper of the Museum, contains 44 paintings (not 43, as stated in the Guide).

Since the writing of this review, it has been referred to by Mr. Archer in his Central Indian Painting (London, 1958, p. 3) and has been more extensively discussed by the reviewer in Marg, vol. 12 (1959), pp. 42–43 (The Bustan manuscript of Sultan Nasir-Shah Khalji).

4 This is indicated by the inscription in an ornamental rosette on fol. 1 recto:

بررسی خزانهالسلطانالاعظم || الإعلاء الكريم ملك الرقاب || والام ابوبنفتح عبد انادر || ناصرشاهبن غیاث شاه بن محمود شاه || والخاجي خند ملكه

“For the library of the most great, the most just and the most generous sultan, the sovereign of the necks and of the nations, Abûl-Fath ‘Abd al-Qâdir Nâsir-shâh b. Ghiyâth-shâh b. Mahmûd-shâh al-Khalji, may his rule remain forever!”

4 The signature on paper ground is found in two small roundels to the right and left of the title cartouche on fol. 1b:

تصمیروتزهره(1)سّي(1) || بعل حاجي محمود

“The painting and illumination are due to the work of Hâjjî Mahmûd.”
Fig. 1.—Fol. 48a: Urban Scene with the King of Ghor.

Fig. 2.—Fol. 55b: Battle Scene.

Fig. 3.—Fol. 99b: The Young Bride Complains to a Wise Old Man about Her Unkind Husband.

Fig. 4.—Fol. 115a: The Drunk in a Tavern.

Figs. 1-4.—Būstān Manuscript of Nāṣîr-shāh Khaljī. New Delhi, National Museum, No. 481614.
refugee artist who came to India from Herāt after the city had been conquered by the Uzbeks under Shaybānī Khān in 1507, just as, after the defeat of the Shaybānids by Ismā‘īl I in 1510, Behzād went to Tabrīz while other artists were brought to Bokhāra and founded a new school. In view of such wholesale migrations of artists after a change of dynasty one might even speculate whether a Persian painter might not have come to Mālwa after the disastrous defeat of the White Sheep Turcomans by Ismā‘īl in 1502; however, such an influence could also have been exerted by an imported manuscript. Be that as it may, the Ni‘mat-nāmeh is all the more valuable because, unlike the New Delhi Būstān, it shows a Persian style in a more advanced stage of Indianization; this seems to indicate that the Ni‘mat-nāmeh was illuminated by an Indian artist.

Besides the very important example from the Ni‘mat-nāmeh, the Iris publication contains paintings of the various periods of the Mughal school; others are attributed by Archer to Jaunpūr and Oudh (in the East), to a later Mālwa period, while still others are assigned to Aḥmadnagar and Bījāpūr in the Deccan, Mewar, Bundi, Jodhpur, Kishangarh, and Kotah (in Rajasthan), and Basohli, Chamba, Kangra, Garhwal, and Nurpur (in the Panjāb Hills). Basic data for each of the miniatures and brief descriptions of them are given in a special section of the book.

Everyone who has followed research in this field must be impressed with the tremendous progress which has been made during the last two decades. To the well-established major categories of Mughal, Rajasthani, and Pahari, the Deccani group has been added more recently, owing to the pioneer work of Kramrisch and Gray, and the last three groups have been in turn subdivided according to the many states where the various styles flourished. In view of the wholesale destruction of much of the ma-

terial, especially that dating from the fourteenth to the early sixteenth century, the lack of documentation, the temporary character of many schools, and the frequent migration of artists from one court to the other, the character of some groups of paintings remains doubtful. Still, thanks to a great deal of patient research by a small group of scholars, among whom Mr. Archer has been outstanding, many of the schools are now well established. However, future research will undoubtedly bring even more precise localizations and datings.

Another factor, which comes now more and more to the fore and is therefore apparent in such a survey, is the mutual influence which Islam and Hinduism exercised on each other in the field of painting. In a very sterile moment of Hindu and Jain painting, Muslim styles revitalized the art of certain Hindu courts. This was not only due to influences from the Muslim courts in Delhi, Gujarāt, Mālwa and Jaunpūr, but also to the activities of individual artists who worked for different Hindu rajas, and at times signed their works with their Muslim names. Conversely, most of the artists illuminating the many manuscripts commanded by Akbar were Hindus, and Hindus continued to paint for the emperor's successors. In addition, the subject matter of paintings executed at Muslim courts is sometimes thoroughly Hindu in character.5

Altogether, this is a valuable contribution to the field of Indian painting. In view of its fine text and well-chosen illustrations, this book should gain many new friends for this enchanting, but still not fully appreciated, branch of Asiatic painting.

Richard Ettinghausen

Later Islamic Pottery, Persia, Syria, Egypt, Turkey. By Arthur Lane. London (Faber and Faber). xvi + 133 pp., 100 monochrome pls., 4 pls. in color. 45 shillings.

This is a standard work in the very best sense and such it is likely to remain, as long as a true critical spirit survives in the world toward the works of the past. Perhaps that is not long, but one thing can be said with certainty; there is little documentary evidence still to come concerning the pottery of the later Islamic period. In this book the learned keeper of the Ceramics Department of the Victoria and Albert Museum shows us all that is to be gleaned from records and excavations. It may be that, amid the obsessions of Near Eastern chauvinism, a few trained diggers will yet explore the neglected soil adjacent to such famous pottery centers as Kirman, Tabriz, and Damascus, where so many problems remain unanswered. But it is doubtful whether another Nishapur or Gurgan awaits their spade. The ground has been built over and built over again, ploughed and reploughed. It is ironical that the pottery sites of the earlier middle ages, today remote from population centers, have proved far more fruitful than the sites of the Islamic renaissance, which unhappily correspond with the towns and cities of modern times.

No one before Mr. Lane has attempted to make a thorough study of this subject. It is astonishing how summarily it has been treated by such earlier authorities as Butler, Hobson, Migeon, Rackham, and Sakisian. Even in the enormous Survey of Persian Art, ceramics receive short shrift after the year 1300. We have had to wait long for this gap to be filled. Personally, I have picked Mr. Lane's brains for more than 20 years and it is only with great diffidence that I venture to review his book. If I insist on some points of difference, they will, I hope, show that this is no mere textbook, expounding stuffy hypotheses suitable for diploma students, but a work which plunges boldly, even adventurously into the unknown hazards of historical speculation.

In reviewing the much shorter book, to which this is a sequel, in the Burlington Magazine in October 1947, I commented on the choice of the end of the thirteenth century as the dividing line between earlier and later Islamic pottery. It seemed to me that this date in the middle of the Mongol occupation of the Near East was not a significant one. And in examining the material in Mr. Lane's second volume I get more and more the impression that the true break in the tradition took place at least a hundred years later during the conquests of Timur. Soon after the year 1300 the pottery produced at Kashan and Sultanabad did, it is true, tend already toward a more naturalistic, more fluent, and more ornate style, in which there were Chinese elements. But there was no change in the rules of competition. Even the sacking of Rayy had not produced that. It is only about 1400 or very soon afterward, when blue-and-white painting appears in Fustat fragments, in the Hama and Damascus excavations, and in the so-called Varamin group of marketed Persian pieces, that the new aesthetic can be perceived. Its victory is slow, for the old radial and calligraphic patterns continued, vaguer and less assured, well into the fifteenth century, while toward 1490 there was a vigorous revival on Turkish soil of a purely thirteenth-century form of ceramic decoration. It is only toward 1540 that this style becomes merged at Isnik into one which seems to owe nothing at all to the past.

One reason for Mr. Lane's choice of a dividing line is his refusal to consider the movement which began with Near Eastern blue-and-white as a renaissance. Mr. Lane expresses this point strongly (p. xv) : "There was no Islamic counterpart to the European..."
renaisance; an ageing civilization had not stimulus to reshape its intellectual life or to create a new language in art.” Surely the sixteenth-century miniaturists and the creators of the great hunting carpets used a new language, one that even now dimly persists. One may prefer the creations of the first six centuries of Islam, just as one may prefer the painting that was practiced in Europe before the discoveries of Masaccio and his followers—which one can do without denying that there was a classical renaissance.

The choice of an opening about the year 1300 compels Mr. Lane to take up some of the threads which he left 13 years ago. The significant point of departure is the discovery in Persia toward the year 1150 of a translucent white paste which imitated porcelain (p. 6). Mr. Lane calls it a “white ground quartz composition” or a “vitreous composition of ground quartz and light clay.” It was to be the standard material till well into the eighteenth century, and personally I should have welcomed some analysis. What was this white quartz and how did it compare with Petunse or China stone? Why did not the Persians, who admired porcelain so much, succeed in making it themselves? Whatever the explanation, the ignorance of the Islamic world was immeasurably its gain. If Islamic potters had condemned themselves, like the Chinese, to a material that had to be fired at 1700 degrees, they could never have achieved the brilliance of colors that could be baked under the glaze in a single firing. The Chinese themselves would seem to have been impressed by Near Eastern methods. Mr. Lane throws out the suggestion (p. 26) that the Chinese use of copper-red underglaze, which may be as old as the thirteenth century, was an attempt to imitate Persian luster ware. The red was not, strictly speaking, an underglaze color at all, but painted on the still tacky glaze which absorbed it, sometimes to the point of disappearance, in the high temperature of the kiln. The Chinese potters would therefore have been unaware that the Persians fired their luster onto finished pieces in a muffle kiln, no hotter than a kitchen stove.

This would not have been the only Persian ware emulated in China. Mr. Lane is of the opinion that the Chinese of the Yuan dynasty not only imported from Persia the cobalt for the “Mahomedan blue” of their porcelain, but were led to do this by a desire to use blue as a ceramic decoration, just as the Persians were doing. This, he says, “would be the single potters’ technique of major importance which China learnt from the Near East” (p. 22). The emphasis is on the words, “major importance,” for, having already described an attempt to imitate Persian luster pottery, Mr. Lane finds a Persian origin for yet another Yuan technique, that of painting in black lines on a white slip under a clear turquoise glaze. He suggests that actual Persian vessels reached China and that this class of Tzu-Chow pottery imitated the textile-like effect of Sultanabad ware.

The journeys of three sorts of Persian earthenware of an almost frivolous flimsiness to the land of porcelain sound like the carrying of coals to Newcastle, which passed for centuries as the most futile activity imaginable—till the year 1947 when it actually happened. But some of these Persian wares were such rarities outside Persia that they even found their way back as royal gifts. Mr. Lane mentions (p. 8) that in the year 1308 the vizier Rashid al-Din learned at Tabriz that he was to receive a gift of porcelain from the Sultan of Delhi, a gift which included Lajvard vessels, some of them decorated in gold. In the form Lajvardina this Persian word for lapis lazulae was used for all native pottery decorated on a continuous deep blue ground, and Mr. Lane points out that no contemporary Chinese ware answers this description. The
vizier could hardly have been impressed by such a gift, for in 1930 I excavated fragments of fine Persian pottery decorated in gold luster on blue from the humble fourteenth-century kitchens of an extinct and even anonymous small town east of Hillah on the Euphrates.  

It is easy to see how objects, commonplace in the Near East, could be incredibly exotic in China with its severely limited ceramic techniques, and still more so in India, where ceramic glaze and color were apparently unknown. But the professional sinologist is still reluctant to admit any debit side in the balance sheet between China and the West even in the cosmopolitan Yuan period. If he does so, he shrugs off such things as the taste of barbarian masters, a Quisling taint of the occupation period. But did not the green glaze of the Han period owe something to Romano-Egyptian or Parthian pottery? And what was the origin of the flambé glaze of the T'ang dynasty? Could not this trick of rocking a number of molten colors to form a marbling have derived from such traders' curiosities as Roman glass? At no period have artistic influences across Asia been a one-way traffic, and it is with such precedents in one's mind that one should approach the most difficult of the problems which Mr. Lane examines, that of the Sultanabad style of the fourteenth century.  

In Mr. Lane's view, the Chinese elements in the Sultanabad style derive not from porcelain but from a rare group of Chinese textiles and perhaps also from brush drawings on silk or paper, curiosities in the Near East and preserved in the albums of princes as at Istanbul. He does not believe that Chinese blue-and-white porcelain had anything to do with it, because in the early fourteenth century Chinese blue-and-white "had scarcely begun to develop" (pp. 4-9). Nevertheless, Mr. Lane accepts the year mark, equivalent to A.D. 1351, on the two famous David Foundation vases as the actual date of their manufacture. He accepts as fourteenth century an obviously related group of Chinese blue-and-white pieces. Well over a hundred of them are known from Ardebil (Teheran Museum), the Topkapu Serai and many other collections, both public and private, and the number of recorded examples is still growing. But how far back does this style go? If such elaborate blue-and-white as the two David vases could be produced in the year 1351 for dedication in a mere rural Chinese temple, then the style must have had a tradition behind it of at least one, and possibly more than one, human generation. This at the one end and at the other the dates on the Kashan lustre tiles, which show that the full-blown Sultanabad style was not reached before the second quarter of the fourteenth century. Can we tell what were the limitations of Chinese blue-and-white a bare 20 years before the date on the David vases?  

The truth is that many of the pieces which Dr. John Pope relates to the David vases have an astonishingly Sultanabad look. Take plate 23 of his Ardebil book. This bowl with an inward curving rim, shallow sides, and a high splayed foot is of a shape which is known in Persia already at the end of the thirteenth century. No precedent for this shape can be found among Chinese wares that are presumed to be older. As in Persian bowls of this period, the inside is far more elaborately decorated than the outside. The whole interior is covered with motifs, reserved in white on blue. On  


other examples of this style, parts of the white design are raised in the paste in relief. At Sultanabad a similar effect was obtained more crudely by painting in blobs of white slip on the undressed surface, which shows gray through the colorless glaze against the raised white. To carry the comparison farther, the arrangement of the decor on the Ardebil bowl is typically Sultanabad, four concentric bands enriched with curly leaves and formalized lotuses and two wild geese in flight. One could almost call it a Sultanabad bowl of the gray-and-white group, translated into Chinese porcelain.

Or did this peculiar fusion of Chinese and Islamic take place, not in the obscure pottery villages around the modern Sultanabad, but in Ching-tê Chên? If the “David vases” style is as old as 1300, that is possible. If the style sprang from the ground full-fledged in 1351 or, worse still, if the inscription on the vases is later and purely commemorative, then it is not possible at all. I submit that in the present state of our knowledge, it just is not the time to say categorically that Chinese blue-and-white could have had nothing to do with the evolution of the Sultanabad style.

It is at any rate clear that the Sultanabad decor was evolved before the Near Eastern potters learned to use blue-and-white in the Chinese way, because throughout most, if not all, of the fourteenth century they failed to master their cobalt. It was so volatile that, except for the crudest hatchings, they were incapable of drawing in it. Just as in the previous century, they used it as a space filling, smudgy and overflowing, sometimes slapped on almost haphazardly. The outlines had to be drawn in lampblack and the gray ground had to do the work of the blue, when a neat background color was required. The blue could only be tamed by slow and patient drying before going into the kiln. I agree with Mr. Lane (p. 28) that the latter discovery must have been Chinese, because the lampblack outlines would not have stood up to their high kiln temperatures. The Islamic potter, moreover, did not possess the national phlegma to wait so long before firing. It is also significant that, with the use of blue alone as a color, the Islamic wares began to look much more Chinese. The dish from Hama in Syria (pl. 13b) seems to follow the model of a Chinese dish from Ardebil or the Topkapu Serai in almost every respect, though this is less true of the Fustat blue-and-white fragments from Egypt. Mr. Lane finds the problem of these fragments complicated by the well-known “Ghaiib” signatures. He points out that this name, occurring also in the forms “Ghaiib al Shami” and “Ghaiib al Tawrizi,” is found attached to blue-and-white fragments, which suggest a Chinese opposite number not earlier than the reign of Hsüan-Tê (1426-1435), whereas the names also occur on fragments, showing the native radial blue-and-black patterns “which we should be inclined to date in the middle of the fourteenth century.”

From this Mr. Lane concludes that the name Ghaib was merely the mark of a workshop operating through several generations (p. 19). However, on page 31 he alludes to the fine pottery mosque lamp in the Metropolitan Museum, which bears the signature “Ibn al Ghaib al Tawrizi.” Since the lamp has close affinities both with Miletus ware and the so-called early Kubacha, it can hardly be older than the middle of the fifteenth century. Clearly, therefore, Ghaib al Tawrizi was an individual potter or kilnmaster, and his successor signed himself unequivocally as his son. It is not unlikely that a kilnmaster practiced two styles. The radial patterns, common to Persia, Syria, and Egypt, continued far into the fifteenth century. As to the second Ghaib style, some of the elements that it shares with imperial Hsüan-Tê ware are in fact Islamic and are therefore its prototypes, such as the spiky leaf and the formal flowers depicted in
outline only. It must, I think, be postulated that the exchange of motifs between China and the Near East remained the same two-way traffic under the early Ming emperors as under the Yuan.

Long time lags occurred in both directions. Thus one of the most baffling of Islamic motifs is the wavy seaweedlike decoration that occurs on a well-known series of tiles which have been pillaged from Damascus buildings, associated with the 1420's. This vegetation seems to spring out of nowhere, like the Isnik pinks, hyacinths, and tulips in the next century. But Mr. Lane shrewdly observes a point of contact which escaped Dr. Pope (p. 30). Many of the tiles repeat a combination of eel grass and water ferns, characteristic of the “David vessels” group of Chinese porcelain. If the accepted chronology is to stand, there is a time lag of 70 to 100 years.

I am nevertheless surprised at Mr. Lane’s conclusion that we have no Persian blue-and-white of the late fourteenth century and only isolated examples from the first half of the fifteenth (pp. 42–44). In the Henry Reitlinger Foundation at Maidenhead there is a Persian shallow bowl so strikingly similar to Mr. Lane’s dish from Hama that it must be of the same age, whatever that may be, for I am not wholly convinced by the excavators’ arguments that the dumping of broken crockery on the citadel mound ceased in 1401 when Timur demolished the citadel fortress. Before the war, Persian blue-and-white bowls of this type used to be brought to London by Persian dealers, who called them Sava or Varamin, according to taste. I believe that the only reason for not importing more of them was the fact that no one supposed Persian blue-and-white to be so old and consequently such wares commanded only a low price.

The real gap in Persian pottery is not the fifteenth century but the sixteenth. On page 82 Mr. Lane comments on the shortage of recognizably sixteenth-century examples. I believe that they are even scarcer than his illustrations suggest. He regards the so-called Kubacha group, wares which were found hanging on the walls of a Caucasian hill town but which were certainly not made there, as bridging a gap of some 180 years. “There is no doubt that the black and turquoise, blue and white and two classes of polychrome form a coherent series from a single place, extending over the period from about 1460 or earlier until about 1630” (p. 81).

Now of these four Kubacha groups only the first is documented. Pieces in the Kelekian and Walters collections show the dates 1468 and 1480. As to the third, Mr. Lane’s first polychrome group, it is restricted to one or two excavated pieces of a much softer paste, which he would place shortly before 1550. The typical polychromes, actually found in Kubacha, are even flimsier. They would scarcely seem to predate the year 1600. Tiles of the same ware depict mysterious Europeans, wearing late Elizabethan or early Jacobean ruffs, while the dishes are related to the style of the miniaturists of the court of Shah Abbas. The gap between 1500 and 1600 at Kubacha is therefore filled only by the blue-and-white group which, starting with a style that might be late fifteenth century, degenerates into something quite undatable. Are these dishes, which in any case were found far from their place of manufacture, Persian at all? In my

4 Plate 13b. The tiles remaining in situ were first published by K. Watzinger and C. Wultzinger in Damascus, der islamische Stadt, Berlin, 1924, where the dated inscriptions are given.


6 Dated dishes of 1468 and 1480 are discussed in relation to undated excavated Persian pottery by myself in Ars Islamica, vol. 5, pt. 2 (1938), p. 165.
possession is a more elaborate version of the great dish, illustrated on plate 21a. On the typical blackened base is the word "Damascus" in the writing of Henry Wallis. Of course Victorian collectors used the label "Damascus" for any blue-and-white that did not look particularly Persian, including pieces which we would now regard as Isnik. But in this case why not Damascus? The dish is very thick and as heavy as porcelain, the white slip is singularly clean, the cobalt painting hard and precise, the style virile, all of these being characteristics of the known Damascus polychrome ware of the sixteenth century. Placed beside a typical Kubacha polychrome dish, the latter looks thin, crackled, and butter-stained, the drawing sketchy, and the colors weak and flaky. No two wares could look less alike.

I doubt whether the occasional presence of Persian verses on such blue-and-white pieces militates against Damascus. Mr. Lane has assembled a remarkable number of references to potters from Tabriz, working in Damascus, Jerusalem, Brussa, and even Edirne in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. I might also add that in 1930 I found many fragments at Abu Sudeira in Iraq of a ware, painted on a white ground, closely akin to the very rare turquoise-and-black Kubacha family of the fifteenth century. Here were the typical black bands with incised decoration, the panels of Chinese-looking flowers, and the swimming ducks, but the glaze was thick, forming drops in the Syrian or Fustat manner.

Outside the Kubacha groups, the lack of any positively sixteenth-century Persian material is still more striking. Of Mr. Lane's illustrations only plates 53a and b seem to me convincingly Persian, as well as sixteenth century. The possibility of a Syrian origin applies to the two cut-down pilgrim bottles on plate 64, dated 1523 and 1525, which are surely of the Kubacha blue-and-white family. Mr. Lane, however, considers that they "undoubtedly belong to the same series as the late polychrome and blue-and-white wares that are reasonably attributed to Kirman" (p. 94). Though the older pilgrim bottles display Persian verses, they appear to me to lack the essentially late Persian quality, soft and at the same time florid, of Mr. Lane's Kirman group. To that group undoubtedly belong the pieces illustrated on plates 66–68 which Mr. Lane regards as sixteenth century on account of their obvious derivation from the Isnik polychrome style of 1540–1555. This Isnik group, however, was notoriously imitated at Damascus until a very late date. Some tiles with lotus lilies in this style might be as late as the eighteenth century, to judge from the perfectly hideous specimens that sometimes grace Victorian fireplaces. The Persian imitations are not much better. The decoration is gross and flyblown, not, I think, worthy of Mr. Lane's praises and far removed in time from the most breathtaking of Isnik styles.

In contrast to the unsatisfactory state of Persian pottery, Turkish pottery can be followed in all its stages right through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but there remains the curious anomaly that the earliest pieces, those in the so-called "Abraham of Kutahiya" style, are by far the most refined and elaborate, even though they are executed in a single color. Mr. Lane's important conclusions are given more fully in his long monograph in Ars Orientalis. He now considers that this earliest style owes nothing to the several Persian tile workshops which were installed in Turkey in the fifteenth century. In

---

7 Gerald Reitlinger and Martin Button, Early Ming Blue and White, Burlington Magazine, January 1948, illustrated in fig. 7.
8 Gerald Reitlinger, in Ars Islamica, vol. 5, pt. 2, p. 165 and fig. 7.
fact he finds the shapes somewhat alien to pottery and akin to metalwork. He discounts the fact that at this period Tabriz potters were still being invited to Turkey, two in 1514 and one in 1525, according to contemporary documents. They could not, he thinks, have had any influence at Isnik because the style, as practiced there, bore no resemblance to any known Persian pottery. Its creators were unfamiliar with Chinese porcelain or even with its Syrian imitations. The meticulous painting of the earliest Isnik has, he thinks, most in common with the great illuminated Korans. He suggests that Isnik may have been provided with designs by the Istanbul court miniaturists (pp. 43–47).

To my mind it is a little dangerous to underplay the continuing activity of the Tabriz master potters in Turkey, even if their workmen would appear to have been Armenians. The single characteristic of the whole series is one that cannot be found in contemporary metalwork or miniature painting. It is a formal-looking leaf. Mr. Lane calls it a long pointed leaf which has often a second lobe, branching from its curved side. He could have added that invariably the white reserve of this leaf contains a row of little dots, invariably there are objects like human eyes at the points of juncture. It was not a new invention. Significantly, Mr. Lane regards the group as “easily the best pottery made in the Near East since the Kashan wares of the thirteenth century” (p. 44). It was precisely in Kashan at the beginning of the thirteenth century that this highly developed pattern first occurred. The big Topkapu Serai dish on plate 22 looks like a more polished version of a Kashan dish of the blue-and-black family. How such a Persian renaissance came about on foreign soil after 300 years is anyone’s guess, but a renaissance it certainly was, even if its counterpart cannot be traced in contemporary Persian pottery.

To this earliest group of Ottoman Turkish tableware belongs the long misdated and misplaced Golden Horn ware. On the strength of the date, 1529, which he discovered on a cut-down bottle of this class in the Godman collection, Mr. Lane has pinpointed the time if not the place of manufacture. On the latter question his train of thought puzzles me. A long Armenian inscription on the bottle records that it was ordered for a monastery by one Ter Martirios, Armenian bishop in Ankara. The bottle was sent from Kutahiya (Kotayes) which is mentioned twice. Mr. Lane says (p. 50): “It appears to have been ordered by the Armenian community of Kutahiya for dedication in a Christian monastery in Ankara—a gift like the ewer, made for Abraham of Kutahiya in 1510.”

This does not agree with the text as given in Mr. Lane’s footnote. It was from Ankara that the bottle was ordered and from Kutahiya that it was sent. This is shown even more emphatically in Mr. Lane’s Ars Orientalis article, where Dr. Charles Dowsett gives the original Armenian text and his own critical comments. “There is nothing in the Armenian to suggest that the bottle was made in another place. I do not think that Kotayes is a personal name, since the pronoun and verb connected with it are in the plural.”

10 Ibid., p. 263. I am at some loss to understand why Mr. Lane did not repeat this somewhat relevant discovery in Later Islamic pottery. Omitting all reference to the fact that Selim I brought two faience makers to Istanbul among the artisans whom he deported from Tabriz in 1514, he says only (p. 49) that the tradition that Selim I settled these Tabriz potters in Isnik dates from the work of an eighteenth-century Turkish historian. But if these potters were not put to work in Isnik, where did they make the tiles of the Mosque of Selim I, which Mr. Lane attributed to them? He does not favor the notion of an Istanbul workshop and he also rules out Kutahiya.

11 Ibid., p. 271, n. 30.
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Why, then, does Mr. Lane so emphatically reject the simple probability that both the bottle of 1529 and the ewer, signed in Armenian with the name Abraham of Kutahiya and the date of 1510, were made in Kutahiya? A whole page of Ars Orientalis is occupied with counterarguments. Granted that Isnik ware is clearly described in a palace inventory of 1495, is there any reason why the same ware should not have been made in two places? Such things are not unknown in the history of ceramics and at Kutahiya, only 75 miles from Isnik, a flourishing rival factory is mentioned at any rate in 1608 (p. 63). Nationalism is a dangerous thing in art history, but could there be anything in a statement of the late Dikran Kelekian that Armenian chronicles record an emigration of Armenian potters from Persia to Kutahiya in the thirteenth century? It is certain at least that the region never formed part of the Armenian kingdom and was not conspicuous for Armenian settlements.

Mr. Lane seems to have committed himself in advance to the view that all sixteenth-century Turkish pottery was made at Isnik, the view that was propounded by the late R. L. Hobson but later vigorously disputed by Armenag Sakisian. I suspect that, having

13 Armenag Sakisian, Pages d'art arménien, Paris 1940, pp. 107–108. Hobson's rejection of the attribution "Kutahiya" in the Godman catalogue seems to me so dictatorial that I think the passage should be quoted in full before the question is regarded as settled for all time.

"For the rest it is impossible to agree that this inscription fixes the manufacture of this ware in Kutahiya. All we may legitimately infer is that the ewer in question was made for a dignitary of that place, and as there is apparently no tradition of pottery at Kutahiya before the seventeenth century, we must find some other centre of manufacture for this ware." (A guide to the Islamic pottery of the Near East, London, 1932, p. 81.)

Surely this is mauvaise logique. If the tradition made a disconcerting discovery, Mr. Lane is still reluctant to complicate the case by recognizing any exceptions. He certainly does not apply the same logic to a piece on which not Kutahiya but Isnik is named. On the foot of the wonderful "Dome of the Rock" mosque lamp in the British Museum the invocation begins "Thou holy man that art in Isnik, Esref Zade." "This," says Mr. Lane, "is the only known piece of Isnik pottery that bears the name of the place where it was made, included as an invocation to the local saint" (p. 54).

No one has yet evolved any theory to account for that burst of floral vegetation which heralds the Blütezeit of Turkish pottery in the 1540's and 1550's, surely the most magnificent ceramic decoration that has ever been made at a single firing. I very much admire Mr. Lane's description of the great tile mosaics. "It defies the ordinary canons of taste and arouses a sense of disquiet, of voluptas atque horror to see harmony attained by such ruthless means" (p. 55). The truth is that the style is so profoundly original that one does not know whether to call it an Islamic renaissance (pace Mr. Lane) or the last flowering of the Byzantine Greek genius. The complete flight from accepted decorative canons suggests, sometimes uncannily, the art nouveau of the 1890's. Greeks, Armenians, Persians, Turks—who were they who felt their spirits emancipated in this way? Mr. Lane is too wise to answer.

The Isnik style ends, as it began, in mystery. Apart from tiles, the latest date on an Isnik piece would seem to be the Christian date 1666 on the Greek-inscribed dish shown on plate 47b. With its odd picture of a wooden pavilion, this dish is about as drab in color and muddy in paste as an Isnik dish can be, though regarding Kutahiya was not sound enough according to such sources as reached Hobson, his duty was not to find another center of manufacture for this particular piece, but to keep an open mind.
there are dishes with animals painted in weak blue and slate gray, which may mark a still lower stage of decline. According to Mr. Lane's sources, the few surviving craftsmen at Isnik were transferred to the Tekfur Serai quarter of Istanbul in 1724, where a factory may have survived for 50 years. Only tiles seem to have been made, and by every indication vessels made at Isnik, even the worst of them, came to an end in the last quarter of the seventeenth century.

Mr. Lane, however, would assign to the eighteenth-century Istanbul revival that great tiled fireplace, which is such a popular and dazzling landmark in the Victoria and Albert Museum. He remarks that in the eighteenth century the colors, including the red, were still remarkably good, but I have always been puzzled by the alleged date on the fireplace, A.H. 1143/A.D. 1731. I now find that it is written in figures under the glaze of one tile. It is 11Σω—or is it 1·Σω? For precisely at the second digit there is a fault in the glaze. If it is the latter, we get A.D. 1633–34, than which nothing could be more plausible.

Perhaps the most difficult, the most ambitious task that Mr. Lane has set himself is to classify the Persian wares of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of which the Victoria and Albert Museum has become the storehouse of the world. Eighty years ago these wares were the only Persian pottery known to Western collectors and they were greatly esteemed, whereas today they are neither understood nor appreciated. They were already familiar in Europe at a time when the Persian factories were in active production, but unfortunately the information of early travelers is vague and faulty. We know some of the towns that produced pottery, but we cannot sort out their products. Mr. Lane has assembled all the information that is to hand, but, though his sources seem to establish the primacy of Kirman, other named centers such as Meshed, Yezd, Zerand, and Shiraz are still a blank page. Was there at this time such a thing as a local style? Very likely not, when one considers how slight was the difference between Rayy and Kashan in the thirteenth century, between Kashan, Sultanabad, and Sultania in the fourteenth.

On plates 74–81, however, Mr. Lane isolates a distinct group of seventeenth-century Persian blue-and-white. All these pieces are painted in light blue washes and finely penciled profuse black outlines with an occasional intrusion of olive green. Some follow Chinese originals quite faithfully, others are startlingly original, all have a singular fairy tale charm. To me this quality suggests that they are older than the common run of late Persian blue-and-white. Fidelity to late Ming rather than to Ming-Ching transitional designs suggests that the best of them may be as old as the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Mr. Lane, however, would associate this quality with a particular factory. “With all due reserve” he proposes Meshed, a place mentioned once or twice in late seventeenth-century European documents (pp. 98–99).

Why Meshed? Mr. Lane offers no clue to his choice. Indeed he admits that General Murdoch Smith purchased some of the pieces, here illustrated, in Kashan where he presumed them to have been made. Is it because Meshed is not so far away from China as Kirman? That will hardly do, since porcelain was no longer a caravan trade. As early as 1623 the Dutch had established a factory at Gamron off the coast, only 200 miles from Kirman, where they at once began to import Chinese blue-and-white in prodigious quantities and astonishingly cheap. The Dutch sea-borne trade was surely the origin of the style that Mr. Lane calls Meshed. The nearer to Gamron, the better the Persian product was likely

to be. I feel that, in spite of the recurrence of certain clearly defined imitations of Chinese potters' marks (which Mr. Lane admits were too freely interchanged to mean anything), it is now too late to sort out factories.

Mr. Lane has, I think, put the dainty but feeble Safavid revival of Persian luster pottery in its right place, the late seventeenth or even the eighteenth century, for the "fussy crowding of trivialities well on the downward path to popular art" is quite unworthy of the reign of Shāh Abbas, to which this ware is supposed popularly to belong. I think this is confirmed by a number of pear-shaped luster bottles in the Godman collection which are octagonally facetted, a shape that recalls the Kakiemon factory in Japan. In the strange fluctuations of the Dutch sea trade the influence could have worked either way, but there are so many octagonal trays, saucers, and bowls of JapaneSE shape in the later Persian blue-and-white style that the octagonal shape of the luster bottle must have arrived with the others, that is to say, not before the end of the seventeenth century. There is even a Persian blue-and-white dish in my possession, which imitates the Kakiemon quails pattern.

Mr. Lane does his duty toward the nineteenth century and modern Islamic potters—with the help of a conscience stronger than anything I can claim to possess. It is a depressing picture, but someone has to fill in the details before it is too late. Incidentally, he dispells the myth that no porcelain was ever made in the Near East. There were two factories in Istanbul at the end of the nineteenth century. Bless them!

GERALD REITLINGER


The exploratory excavations carried out by the Délégation Française in 1924–25 and in 1947 on the vast site of Balkh, "Mother of Cities," have been singularly disappointing in material finds, and as M. Schlumberger observes in his introduction to the present work, the practical difficulties that await any future excavators are enormous. Strategically situated on one of the great caravan routes of Asia, Bactra became the capital of its region, Bactriana, seat of an Achaemenid satrap, and, after Alexander, of the Greco-Bactrian kings. But it was exposed to successive waves of invasion from the east, originating among the barbarous peoples of the steppes stretching beyond the Oxus to the confines of China. First the Yueh-chi, whose incursions led to the establishment here of the Scythian Kushan dynasty (first century B.C.—third century A.D.), Dominated once again from the west by the Sasanians and their Arab successors, Balkh subsequently fell into the hands of various Turkish invaders. The Mongols destroyed it completely in 1220, but the finds suggest a revival in the fifteenth century under the Timurids. From all these centuries of its importance as a civilized center, open to influences from east and west, all that has been recovered are fragments of pottery, terra-cotta figurines, and a few uncertainly identifiable bronze coins.

The material now published was found in 1947 in two main areas of the site; Bala Hissar (the Fort), where numerous trial


trenches were sunk, and Tepe Zargaran, where two wider diggings permitted a proper stratigraphic study. M. Gardin’s typological apparatus of classification is objective and exceedingly thorough. Under main headings based on the technical structure of the ware, he enumerates shapes and types of decoration, adding cautious comments on date suggested by the stratification and by comparative material elsewhere. A synoptic table conveniently illustrates the main forms as they appear in the successive periods: Pre-Kushan (fifth-third centuries B.C., “Balkh I”); Kushan (first century B.C.—third century A.D., “Balkh II”); Sasanian (third century surviving till the Islamic conquest in the ninth, “Balkh III”); and Musulman (ninth-twelfth centuries, “Balkh IVa,” and fifteenth century, “Balkh IVb”).

Fine red ware with burnished patterns appears in the pre-Kushan and Kushan periods; unburnished, with incised or stamped patterns, from the Kushan running into the Sasanian.

White wares run right through into the early Sasanian period, and reappear in the Islamic with a wealth of moulded, stamped, and barbotine decoration.

Clumsy gray wares were introduced by the Kushans and survive into the Sasanian period, when they disappear.

Prominent among the Islamic wares of “Balkh IVa” are slip-painted bowls of the East-Persian Samanid type, probably imported. There is a little undistinguished sgraffiato ware, and one white fragment with an animal in black silhouette, probably a twelfth-century import from Rayy. The Timurid level shows wares predominantly painted in blue and black, with designs more or less influenced by Chinese blue-and-white porcelain. There are a few actual Chinese pieces, celadon and sixteenth-century blue-and-white; also Persian seventeenth-century imitations of late Ming export wares.

The unpretentious figurines in a Hellenistic manner appear to date from the Kushan period.

It must be admitted that the finds represent only a minute sample of what still lies buried, and they include imports. But they suggest that the local artisans were never more than unadventurous provincial imitators of themes derived exclusively from western sources.

Arthur Lane


Konstruktion einer mida’ā, die seit längerer Zeit nicht in Gebrauch war.


Die inhaltlich wichtigen Untersuchungen sind durch vorzügliches Bildmaterial in reichlichem Umfange erläutert.

ERNST KÜHNEL

Painting of the Deccan, XVI–XVII Century.

Among the most beautiful and certainly the most tantalizing of Indian miniature paintings are those from the Islamic courts of the Deccan. While we know the history of Mughal painting substantially from beginning to end, and we are underway toward being able to trace the development of Western Indian, Rajasthani, and Pahari styles, we are just starting to unravel the complex strains of non-Mughal Islamic painting in India, much of which is from the Deccan. The reasons for our inadequate knowledge are various. Although, largely through the work of Messrs. Goetz and Gray and Miss Kramrisch, Deccani paintings were recognized in the 1930’s, material is
scarce, and much of it inaccessible; patrons, unlike their Mughal counterparts, deprived future art historians of clues by being more inclined to poetical subjects than portraits or darbar scenes; and stylistically many Deccani paintings are so akin to Persian or Mughal work that they have been wrongly catalogued for years. Especially challenging is the problem of isolating indigenous elements of style; for their origin, apparently in Vijayanagar painting, remains obscure.

Mr. Douglas Barrett in his recent monograph, the first to deal exclusively with the subject, could not be expected to say the final word, although he does add considerably to our understanding. In keeping with the format of the Faber Gallery, he confines his discussion to four generous pages of introduction and ten short notes, which accompany the good color plates we have come to expect of this series. Considering these spatial limitations, the author has achieved a remarkably full and thoughtful documentation. The text is no mere skeleton of Deccani art history; Mr. Barrett lays the scene with a minimum of "scholarly" inscrutability, enlivening his pages with evocative comparisons, a good many new and valuable discoveries, and several controversial opinions.

In the main, Mr. Barrett has advanced cautiously, sifting the work of previous scholars with a fine sieve. His introduction begins with a paragraph differentiating the Mughal and Deccani courts and styles. Possibly, in his enthusiasm for the topic at hand, he judges the Mughal too harshly, saying of the northern painter that "he lacked an integrated style," and "seemed unable to knit his many sources—Persian, Indian, and European—into a personal language." He goes on to describe the atmosphere of the Deccani kingdoms, "where the possession of a fortress or a good-looking eunuch had equal force as a casus belli," suggesting that while Akbar's paintings were simply "the official adjuncts of a great court," here "they were a passion." A brief account of historical and geographical background comes next, demonstrating that the advent of Islam in the fourteenth century engulfed the ancient traditions in painting, which came to life again only in the sixteenth century. The author suggests that Ahmadnagar took the lead in this revival, apparently with the aid of artists and craftsmen captured at the battle of Talikota in 1565, when the Deccani sultans defeated Vijayanagar, the great Hindu kingdom of the south. A lull of 30 years, between Akbar's defeats of Gujarat and Malwa in the sixties and seventies and his concentration on the conquest of the Deccan in the nineties, "saw the first flowering of Islamic painting in North India and the Deccan." A miniature from the Ta'rif-i-Husajn Sháhi in the Bharata Itihasa Samshodhaka Mandala (pl. 1) illustrates this earliest phase. Although to some extent indebted to Persian idioms, as seen in the Nimat Námeh, painted at Malwa in about 1500, now in the India Office Library, this picture seems to contain elements found in wall paintings at Anegundi, as has been shown by Miss Kramrisch. Although these murals may not be equated with Vijayanagar work, they are examples of South Indian painting in the traditional manner and shed light upon the native aspects of the Poona manuscript. Mr. Barrett, with admirable caution, avoids making a definite statement that Vijayanagar influence is apparent in his miniature, which he attributes to Ahmadnagar between 1565 and 1569. He is less reserved with regard to the effect of the manner of the Southern Kingdom in a page (pl. 2) from the well-known Nujum-al-Ulûm in the Chester Beatty Library, representing a two-headed

female figure with flames emerging from her heads and hands. While the author questions the evidence for this being assigned to Bijapur, the date, 1570, is certain, as is a Deccani origin. A Ragini (pl. 3), in the National Museum of India, is also ascribed to Bijapur, where Ibrahim 'Ādil Shâh II was known to have been a great patron of the arts. Mr. Barrett, however, very wisely insists that artists were probably interchanged among the three main Deccani courts, which were related by marriage.

Vasanta Raga (pl. 4) is to the reviewer the most exciting of the paintings reproduced and possibly the most beautiful of all Indian miniatures. One regrets that in this case, probably owing to inadequate color transparencies, the plate is not up to the usual standard. The author attributes this picture, now in the National Museum of India, to an Ahmadnagar artist working between 1591 and 1595, as he finds in Burhân II, whose reign coincides with these dates, "a patron who might have inspired such an artist." We are rather more inclined to agree with Messrs. Gray and Goetz that this picture is earlier, despite the Mughal touches that convey to the author that it was painted after Burhân's visit to the Mughal court prior to 1591. A most interesting discovery was made by Mr. Barrett, who found an inscription, "Burhân Nizâm al-Mûłk," on the back of a portrait (pl. 5) in the Bibliothèque Nationale, thereby demonstrating that it represents the same ruler. Although superficially Mughal in character, he considers this "the first and perhaps the most distinguished of Deccani portraits," and assigns it to the same years as the Raga.

The most controversial painting of those reproduced is the familiar Siesta (pl. 6), in the collection of the Staatliche Museen. In the past, it has been described as a portrait of Ibrahim 'Ādil Shâh II of Bijapur (1580-1627), an identification that Barrett quite rightly rejects. The languorous prince seems to the author, "if it is a portrait," to be Murtaza II of Ahmadnagar, whose "effeminate and slothful" qualities would have made him a "generous patron if not a good king." Happily, Mr. Barrett is fully aware of the dangers of identification on the basis of suitable historical personalities and points out that this subject also appears, with no suggestion of portraiture, on Golconda painted hangings. It can be seen again, only slightly varied, in a Golconda miniature inserted in a manuscript in the British Museum. The reviewer has said elsewhere in this journal that he considers this painting a late copy. The formless tree trunk, resembling an old sock, and curiously saccharine faces, quite out of keeping with originals of the period, preclude an early date.

A Lady with a Myna Bird (pl. 7), formerly known as a Yogini, in the Chester Beatty Library, was once assigned to Bijapur on the basis of its affinity to the Siesta. Mr. Barrett, correctly we think, places it at Golconda, supporting his case by the costume (the girl’s necklaces are of a type known to have been popular there), an admittedly late inscription on a closely related miniature, and an interesting suggestion that the large flowers in the background derive from Chinese porcelains imported particularly to this state. Also attributed to Golconda is a throne scene (pl. 8) in the British Museum. The writer identifies the central figure as Muḥammad Qutb Shâh


4 Mr. Barrett refers to this manuscript (Ad. 16762) in a note under pl. 8. The recumbent prince is on folio 126.

5 Stuart C. Welch, Jr., Early Mughal miniature paintings from two private collections shown at the Fogg Art Museum, Ars Orientalis, vol. 3 (1959), pp. 133-146, footnote 59.
(1611–26), comparing this likeness to a Mughal portrait of the Jahangir period which was probably copied from a Deccani original. Although the costumes are identical, it is difficult to be certain of the man, as his predecessor Muḥammad Quli Qutb Shâh (1580–1611) closely resembled him and dressed in the same way. However, there is little doubt as to the correctness of the provenance; later Golconda historical sets contain a striking number of similarities and a Shirîn-î-Khosraw of Hastî, in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipur shows us an earlier stage in the development of this Deccani school. Written at Golconda in 1568 for Shâh Ibrahim (1550–80), it contains seven miniatures in a cursory variant of the Bukhara idiom. Presumably by an artist trained in the Bukhara manner, these pictures are enlivened by thoroughly Indian monkeys and other non-Persian characteristics. If we examine the British Museum portrait closely, we find evidence still lingering of the Neo-Bukhara mode, including the treatment of the architecture, recalling Persian "carpenter frames," the prettified three-quarter faces of the grooms, as well as regularized folds of their garments, and an almost static symmetry of composition. A miniature in the Freer Gallery of Art, depicting the Madonna and Child, represents a slightly later stage of the Golconda style, probably of about 1650. This suggests that the British Museum portrait should be dated to the second quarter of the century.

Although Mr. Barrett dates the portrait of Muḥammad 'Adîl Shâh of Bijapur (1627–56), plate 9, to about 1640, it is probably later. A portrait of Tânâ Shâh of Golconda (1672–87) in the Worcester Art Museum and another in an American private collection of a son of 'Alî II of Bijapur (1657–72) are certainly by the same hand and cannot have been painted many years after the British Museum example. Characteristics of this artist are a special liking for graceful arcs (even the circles beneath eyes and the fleshy back of a neck are adapted to his ideal form); a predilection for poses so uniform as to be monotonous, the subjects' right arms invariably raised, holding flowers in identically rendered hands; shoulders almost bursting with power (although this is a bit less true of the Golconda ruler, obviously a weakling compared to the painter's own royal family); a singular formula for somewhat watery eyes; delight in representing jewelry and embroidery in heavy impasto; and the use of thick "leather" pigment set off by lavishly tooled gold.

In his introduction, Mr. Barrett laments the collapse of Deccani painting after 1627 despite the unprecedented peace and prosperity of the southern part of the region during the reign of Shâh Jahân (1627–57). He cites the architectural splendors of these years but could not find evidence of brilliant painting. Recently, however, an extraordinary portrait of 'Alî 'Adîl Shâh II of Bijapur (1657–72) has come to light in the collection of Dr. Moti Chandra, a picture that more

---

6 Herman Goetz, The Indian and Persian miniatures paintings in the Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam, 1938, fig. 16.
7 Joseph Strzygowski, Asiatische Miniaturenmalerei, Klagenfurt, 1933, figs. 37, 38.
9 Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Notes on Indian paintings, Artibus Asiae, No. 1 (Dresden, 1927), pp. 5-11, fig. 4. The ruler is shown nimbed but not fully bearded.
10 S. C. Welch, Jr., op. cit., fig. 30.
than justifies one's hopes for later Deccani painting. Such miniatures as plate 9 and a number of unpublished examples in the India Office Library are clearly the later and somewhat enfeebled followers of this masterpiece. Golconda, too, more than held its own until the end of the century, although we are in agreement with Mr. Barrett's low opinion of the *Khawarmānah* of 1645. A book painting in the collection of the Prince of Wales Museum of Western India, a landscape with cranes and other birds, is datable to the last year of the century and is one of the most poetic natural-history paintings in all Indian art.

*A Prince in a Garden* (pl. 10) from the Chester Beatty Library, is by a Deccani painter working at a Mughal court. Signed *Rahim Dākānī*, who would not have used this form had he been working in the Deccan, this picture exudes the somewhat effeminate style associated with Tānā Shāh, the "Dainty King," who was captured by the Mughals in 1686. Another miniature, bearing an attribution to this painter, and referred to by the author, is a girl in thoroughly conventional Mughal style. One wonders why Mr. Barrett does not mention the *papier maché* box in the Victoria and Albert Museum, which is almost certainly by the same hand although unsigned.

**Stuart C. Welch, Jr.**

11 The manuscript, a *Nala Damyan*, has been published by Dr. Moti Chandra. A color postal card of the miniature in question was published by the Prince of Wales Museum of Western India, Bombay.

12 Stella Kramrisch, *op. cit.*, pl. 21. S. I. Tjulayev, *Indian art in Soviet collections*, Moscow, 1955, pl. 22, offers an interesting comparison: a lacquered pen case showing a garden scene with figures in Indian costume and a landscape. This appears to be of the late seventeenth century by a Persian painter close to Paolo Zamān, perhaps working in India.


The first and lasting impression produced by the contemplation and perusal of this volume, which has gathered 26,076 articles dealing with the world of Islam which were published between 1906 and 1955, is one of unbounded admiration and gratitude to the compiler and his assistants for a thankless labor handsomely brought to completion. Some 510 periodicals, 120 *Festschrift* volumes, and 70 volumes of congress proceedings have been combed for articles pertaining to every aspect of the history and culture of Islam. The material is arranged in 43 chapters covering either disciplines and areas of investigation or specific geographical units. Each chapter is subdivided into numerous smaller categories, which should permit a rather rapid consultation of the existing periodical material on any given subject, although, naturally enough, it was not possible to multiply cross references without overloading the volume. At the end of the volume an index of authors is provided, which refers by numbers to the articles listed in the text; however, the preface announces that the School of Oriental and African Studies in London and the Library of Congress in Washington have (or will have) complete authors' indices, which are at the disposal of scholars everywhere. There is little doubt that both the volume itself and the indices deposited in the two libraries will save many hours of tedious labor to investigators of practically any facet of mediaeval and modern Islam.

In a work of this magnitude errors and omissions are bound to creep in. Some are mere misprints and it is certainly an accident that, when the reviewer, egotistically enough, looked himself up, he found his name mis-
spelled on one occasion (No. 6496). Other errors are more misleading. Thus, under A. M. Belenitsky, there is a reference to No. 6350, which lists actually an article by H. Bassett. Unfortunately, in a work of this type it is not very easy for the reader to correct such mistakes. A confusion occurs also between Max van Berchem and his daughter, Marguerite van Berchem, to whom at least Nos. 9263-5, listed under her father's name, should be attributed. Certain omissions occur also in Russian periodicals and, especially, series. These, to be sure, were probably caused by the known difficulty of finding certain issues of the journals involved. But, to keep within the field of art and archaeology, there are important contributions to the field of Islamic art in individual chapters of the *Materialy i Issledovanii po Archeologii SSR*, of which over 40 issues have appeared, and in single volumes such as the *Sogdiskii Sbornik*, where one of the earliest political documents written in Arabic has been preserved (the article by I. Krachkovskii has been reproduced recently in the first volume of his Izbrannye Sochineniia [Selected Works], Moscow, 1955, p. 182ff). Similarly, many archaeological reports, such as the ones on Antioch and Tarsus, contain chapters on discoveries from the Islamic period. The introduction of such series into the *Index Islamicus* would be all the more justified, since a similar series, the *Recueils Jean Bodin*, has been included. Also of interest to the archaeologist and the art historian are materials from excavations or newly discovered works published first in more popular journals such as the invaluable *Illustrated London News*; often many years elapse between the appearance of the materials and their publication in final form, or even in a preliminary report. The compilers cannot be criticized for having missed a few occurrences of Islamic articles in the most unlikely periodicals (significant contributions to contemporary Islam are found in some of the French monthlies, for instance), but it is odd to see missing Herzfeld's *Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, which contain important contributions to Islamic archaeology. Some of these items could perhaps be included in the planned supplements.

These remarks and suggested additions should not be construed as derogatory. A work of this magnitude could not have been free of omissions and typographical or other errors. Its completeness cannot be fully appreciated from a single examination for the purposes of a review. That it will be an indispensable tool for any Islamicist is obvious enough, for in fact it is a tool *par excellence*, a single work which may replace many hours of endless search in the stacks of libraries. For this the compiler and his associates fully deserve our gratitude.

Oleg Grabar

*Rivers in the Desert, a History of the Negev.*


In an eventual history of the Islamic world, an important contribution should be made by archaeologists not only through their explanation of monuments as expressions of their times, but also through the documents they alone can provide for a historical ecology of the Near East. Some attempts in this direction have been made in the past decades, mostly by French archaeologists and geographers in Syria, and the recent volumes of G. Tchalenko on northeastern Syria are splendid examples of the types of evidence and conclusions which can be drawn from archaeological documents.

Among the problems which are posed to the Islamicist, an essential one is that of the historical and cultural part played by deserts in the Islamic world, from the Sahara Desert...
(where the excavations of Sedrata by Marguerite van Berchem should, when they can be resumed, bring further results) to the deserts of Central Asia, in which numerous recent Russian excavations have discovered many new and important documents. Between these two extremes, the Arabian Desert, the Negev, the Syrian Desert, and the Central Iranian Desert all fulfilled positive or negative functions in the development of the Muslim world, and it is a major task for archaeologists and historians alike to define these functions more fully than has been done so far.

But the history of the desert did not begin with the formation of Islam. For millennia deserts have been crossed by caravans and, as excavations and explorations show more and more, used for agricultural and even industrial settlements. The book by Professor Nelson Glueck is an account for the general public of the history of one such desert, the Negev, up to the time of the Muslim conquest. It follows previous studies by the author on the deserts of Transjordan. The Negev, obviously, has a particular significance for Biblical history and much of the book is devoted to identifications of places known through the Bible, to reconstructions of the movements of Abraham and Moses, to attempts to provide the physical setting of Hebrew history either in its early periods of wandering or in the glorious times of David and Solomon. These questions are not, in themselves, of major significance to the Islamicist, nor is the reviewer competent to discuss them, but they all point to the factors which have permitted life in the desert and those which have hampered it. In addition they provide us with a chronology of growth and decadence of settlements in the Negev, which should be compared to the situation in other similar areas. One conclusion suggested by the author should be mentioned, since it is of significance to Islamicists. It is that the decadence and disappearance of settlements are in most cases the result not of natural changes (although such phenomena as successive years of drought may have led to the abandonment of certain areas) but of human action, or inaction. The succession of gaps and cultures summarized on page 11 and discussed in detail throughout the book can almost always be related to known historical events, at least when we have proper written documents. The causes for the reemergence of such cultures in the desert are perhaps less clearly defined, although it could be argued from later times (re-use of the so-called "dead" cities in Ayyūbid times 1 and the Sahara foundations like Sedrata 2) that the general prosperity of permanently settled areas or the existence of large heterodox communities were some of them.

The last two chapters of the book are of even greater importance to Islamicists since they deal with the Nabataeans and with Christian and Jewish monuments in the desert. The author describes briefly some of the major Nabataean sites in the Negev, discusses the admirable manner in which they used every available water supply, and sketches some aspects of their art, which is related to the later sculpture of the Umayyads (p. 120). The final chapter is devoted to the extraordinary development of the whole area under the rule of the Christian empire. Already before the rise of Islam a partial decadence had set in. It is likely, as we know from examples in Syria and Transjordan, that the Umayyads attempted to keep up the irrigating devices of their predecessors, and it is perhaps after 750 that one must date the disappearance of settlements in the Negev, when, just as several cen-

2 Several accounts have been published by Made-moiselle van Berchem on Sedrata; see, for instance, the one in Ars Orientalis, vol. 1 (1954).
turies before, only the coastal route was maintained.\footnote{Some of the sites which Professor Glueck had considered to be Nabataean have been called Umayyad by J. Sauvaget, \textit{Remarques sur les monuments Omeyyades}, Journal Asiatique, vol. 231 (1939), p. 45ff. It seems to me that they can very well be both and that we are dealing with a continuous settled civilization started by the Nabataeans and continued through the Umayyad period. Specific excavations should solve the problem.}

These are only some of the points which are raised by this highly readable book with a large number of illustrations (to which unfortunately there are no references in the text). While not directed to the Islamicist, it is a book which opens important avenues for further work, since without a good understanding of the Near East before Islam, it is not possible to understand the new Muslim world.

\textbf{Oleg Grabar}


This book cannot be considered merely as a catalogue of the 1,304 miniatures in the Bodleian Library. The Oxford collection has been used as a means to introduce to the scholarly world several hundred manuscripts from private and public collections, most of which are still unpublished. At the same time, Mr. Robinson's book is not really a history of Persian painting from the fourteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Although each chapter is preceded by a few paragraphs on the development and characteristics of the style of the time, no attempt has been made to give a complete picture of the development of miniatures in Iran. This book is a tool and an invitation. It is a tool, since it will serve for the later centuries the function fulfilled by Holter's checklist for the period until 1350 (together with the supplement in \textit{Ars Islamica}, vol. 7). And it is an invitation to publish not only manuscripts from other collections, but also studies which would cut across collections, since, thanks to Mr. Robinson, we have now a repertory of most known manuscripts.

The book is divided chronologically and by styles within each period. Each style and each period begins with a general introduction, continues with a list and description of each Bodleian miniature, and ends with a list of comparative material, at times accompanied by new and important comments. The book ends with 61 illustrations and a splendid series of indices. The most important commentaries are those dealing with the early Shiraz schools and with the Turkman school, in which Mr. Robinson makes new and different attributions. For the later periods, in which the major schools are better known, the comments are briefer.

It is likely that the comparative material could easily be enlarged by the addition of other manuscripts and especially single leaves preserved in various albums, which have been consciously avoided by the author. Yet one can hardly escape the feeling that further efforts of scholarship should be directed not so much to finding and dating new manuscripts, but to analyzing those which are already known and, in particular, separating within the long lists provided by the author those manuscripts whose illustrations are truly great and important works of art from school pieces. It is in the publication of illustrations of the same texts and in the improvement of our knowledge of each period through systematic studies of contemporary manuscripts that Mr. Robinson's thorough work will find its deserved fruition.

The book is clearly printed, quite free of errors, and well illustrated. One small correction should be made. The \textit{Zafar-nâmeh} which
was formerly in the Garrett collection is not in the Princeton Library with most of the collection, but at the Johns Hopkins Library in Baltimore.

OLEG GRABAR


The discovery, in August 1951, by M. A. Mariq, of the minaret at Jâm was not only sensational because of its importance, but also heartening in showing how much can still be discovered on the archaeologically rich surface of the Near East. One must also congratulate the discoverer as well as Professor Wiet and the Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan for the speed with which a full publication followed the discovery.

The first chapter, by A. Mariq, describes the discovery of the minaret in the valley of the Heri-rûd. The second chapter, by G. Wiet, deals briefly with the decoration. In the third chapter Professor Wiet publishes the inscriptions, the historical ones as well as the whole of the nineteenth sūrah of the Koran, whose occurrence has not yet been fully explained, but which must be related to some specific event surrounding the building of the minaret. This inscription alone would justify the hypothesis made elsewhere in the volume (for instance, p. 65) that the function of this structure was much wider than that of simply calling people to prayer. The fourth chapter, also by Professor Wiet, bears the modest title of "Commentaire Historique." It is in reality a full history of the Ghoriid dynasty centered on the life and time of Ghiyâth al-Dîn âbû-l Fath Muḥammad (ruled from 1153 to 1203), the builder of the minaret. The final two chapters by A. Mariq identify the site as Firûzkoh, the new Ghoriid capital, and compare the minaret to the well-known Qub-minar of Delhi, to which it bears close resemblance. Four appendices on related topographical and historical problems, an index, and excellent plates and maps complete the volume.

Thus a new site has been discovered and the historical circumstances of its building have been described. It remains now for Islamic archaeologists to undertake a full excavation of the site and to bring to light one of the many temporary capitals of mediaeval dynasts, whose succession serves to illustrate the complex history of the time. In addition, with Jâm after Lashkari Bazar, Afghanistan appears as one of the most promising lands for further excavation.

OLEG GRABAR


In this handsomely printed volume 33 scholars from eight countries have paid their homage to one of the doyens of the study of Islamic art and archaeology. All aspects of this vast field of learning have been examined, but more emphasis has been given to painting, the so-called minor arts, and iconographical problems than to architecture (four articles, of which only two deal truly with architecture). Many more contributions have dealt with the Islamic Orient than with the Islamic West (two articles only), thereby not fully reflecting the remarkable catholicity of the master himself, whose bibliography of 382 items covers quite fully in time and in space the whole of the Islamic world, an achievement which cannot but instill in the reader a sense of humility as well as of gratitude.

It is, of course, impossible to review in detail all the contributions to this volume, which vary in size as well as in significance.
It may suffice here to enumerate them and to point out some of the more important additions to our knowledge of Islamic art.

M. S. Dimand (pp. 11–14) discusses a newly discovered group of Sassanian silver bowls in four American collections. The single busts in medallions which decorate them are interpreted as Anahita and priests or high officials. An early date is proposed for the bowls.

D. G. Shepherd and W. B. Henning (pp. 15–40) have teamed up in one of the most important articles in the volume. Henning succeeded in reading a Soghdian inscription on a well-known ram silk at Huy, Belgium. The inscription gives the name Zandaniji, long known through texts as a textile-producing center in the area of Bukhara and as the name for a type of textile. On stylistic and technical grounds Miss Shepherd succeeds in indentifying 11 textiles as belonging to the same group and datable in the seventh-eighth centuries. Their origin is probably Central Asian, although the author is careful in pointing out that we cannot say yet whether they should be considered as having been made in Zandaniji or merely as being of the type called Zandaniji.

H. G. Franz (pp. 41–47) attempts briefly a long-overdue task, i.e., a reinterpretation of the mosaics of Damascus in the light of the newly discovered palaces at Khirbat al-Mafjar and Qaṣr al-Ḥayr. He points out quite correctly that many themes in the mosaics are relatable to the architectural features of the palaces, but one may still wonder whether the emphasis given on pages 46-47 to Coptic influences on Umayyad architecture is fully justified by the historical circumstances of the time.

K. A. C. Creswell (pp. 48–53) answers the arguments Sauvaget brought out against his identification of the Great Mosque at Hama as a Christian church transformed into a mosque. He concludes that the building was first a pagan building, then a church, finally a mosque.

F. Gabrieli (pp. 54–58) analyzes again a well-known poem by Ibn Ḥamdis describing the ḥammādite palace at Bougie and explains some of its architectural terms.

K. Otto-Dorn (pp. 59–88) publishes a very interesting and important group of Seljūq mosques with wooden columns from Anatolia; these are related to similar Central Asian mosques and, through them, the whole problem of the exact origins of Seljūq architecture in Anatolia is raised again.

M. Mostafa (pp. 89–92) describes a few new acquisitions of the Museum for Islamic Art in Cairo.

R. Ettinghausen (pp. 93–116) brings some new evidence on the problem of the early Animal carpets, for which our knowledge so far has been derived mostly from Western painting. He first describes a group of ninth-century fragments which show the existence of the pile technique for carpets with bird motifs and which can be localized in several different parts of the Islamic world. Then he introduces the evidence of fourteenth-century Persian miniatures for a reconstruction of carpets, but leaves the question of their origin (Caucasus or Anatolia) still unsettled. Finally he pairs a carpet in the Konia Museum with a representation on a fifteenth-century Catalanian painting. While these points do not as yet solve the problem of the origin of the Animal carpet, they introduce new documents and ideas which should lead to further investigations.

L. Bellinger (pp. 117–124) presents the reader with a useful and convenient summary of the manner in which Near Eastern weavers used the various materials they had at their disposal.

A. Grohmann (pp. 125–138) publishes with important epigraphical and artistic commentaries a rather unusual bronze bowl in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The bowl is to
be dated in the twelfth century and to be localized in East Persia. The commentary is particularly valuable for the documentation it adds to various recent studies by D. S. Rice and R. Ettinghausen on the questions of zoomorphic writing and of styles of animals in the industrial arts of the Seljûq period.

R. Pinder-Wilson (pp. 139–143) publishes a splendid complete Fāṭimid bowl.

K. Erdmann (pp. 144–153) discusses the ceramic tiles in the circumcision room of the Top Kapi Seray in Istanbul and attempts to disentangle some of the problems of provenance posed by them.

B. Farès (pp. 154–162) publishes a fascinating group of magical figures and gives a short and tentative bibliography on the subject.

E. J. Grube (pp. 163–194) gives a lengthy and detailed list of known Arabic manuscripts of Dioscorides with exhaustive bibliographical references and attempts to define some of the characteristics of their illustrations, both in themselves and in relation to Greek manuscripts.

S. Walzer (pp. 195–206) discusses six stories from the book of Kalilah and Dimnah as illustrated in four Mamlûk manuscripts (Münich, Paris, Oxford, Cambridge) and suggests the manner in which they are related to each other.

B. W. Robinson (pp. 207–218) publishes a fifteenth-century provincial Shâh-nâmeh and shows the importance of its miniatures in the general picture of Timurid art.

B. Gray (pp. 219–225) discusses in preliminary fashion a seventeenth-century album of designs for Persian textiles, some of which are of European origin. The album may have originated in the workshop of Muḥammad Shafi‘ Abbāsī.

A. Grabar (pp. 226–233) identifies a Christian church among the paintings of the Cappella Palatina in Palermo, compares it to related representations, and explains the apparent opposition between the nature of the building and the type of decoration found in the niches of its ceiling.

W. Hartner (pp. 234–243) makes, after D. S. Rice and R. Ettinghausen, some new and important remarks on the question of astrological symbolism in the "Wade Cup," emphasizing in particular certain anomalies in the representation of dragons.

A. Schimmel (pp. 244–254) brings out a group of interesting texts dealing with the neglected field of symbolism of letters and writing in Islam. (See, however, F. Rosenthal's essay in this issue of *Ars Orientalis*.)

F. Babinger (pp. 255–266) surveys the representations of Sultan Jem in Western painting.

W. Eilers (pp. 267–274) studies a group of tombstones with figural representations from Luristan and shows the maintenance in them of ancient Kassite motifs.

W. Dudzus (pp. 275–282) publishes a group of Umayyad weights and stamps from Egypt found in the Berlin museums.

M. A. Marzouk (pp. 282–289) publishes five jirâz-fabrics in Basel dated from 893 to the third quarter of the tenth century.

F. Taeshner (pp. 290–292) publishes a new inscription, dated 1248, from a bridge south of Kırşehir in Turkey.

L. A. Mayer (pp. 293–296) adds 27 names to his list of astrolabists.

K. Weitzmann (pp. 297–316) discusses a tenth-century Greek manuscript of John Climacus in the St. Catherine monastery on Mount Sinai and shows the close relation of many of its motifs to Constantinopolitan, Palestinian, Coptic, and Arabic models.

E. Meyer (pp. 317–322) points to Islamic models for certain kinds of zoomorphic romanesque bronzes.

A. Geijer (pp. 323–335) brings out an excellent summary of the styles and motifs of Scandinavian rugs and suggests for them Ori-
ental models, perhaps even silks, emphasizing thereby the importance of evidence from northern European countries for the less well-known periods of Near Eastern textile manufacturing.

H. Schmidt (pp. 336–349) discusses the sources of Oriental and ancient motifs in Rembrandt.

A. G. Wenley (pp. 350–356) compares two paintings from the Freer Gallery, one Chinese, the other Persian, and suggests for both a derivation from a “Chinese-influenced Tartar” milieu.

J. A. Pope (pp. 357–375) publishes a fifteenth-century Chinese porcelain flask whose shape is derived from a type well represented in the celebrated “canteen” in the Freer Gallery. But this derivation, a comparatively rare one, has led the author to a most fascinating inquiry into the significance and spread of artistic motifs and symbols throughout the art of Asia.

A. U. Pope (pp. 376–387) discusses the merit and significance of scientific methods in the study of cultures, and more particularly in art and architecture, and pleads for the elaboration of criteria of judgment specifically applicable to the arts rather than for the adaptation of scientific methods.

This important and wonderfully rich volume ends with a complete bibliography of the great scholar to whom it is dedicated.

Oleg Grabar


The change in the editorship of _Ars Orientalis_ led to a number of editorial delays, one of them being that no review of Professor Creswell’s first volume appeared soon after its publication. Having learned that the second volume was soon to appear, the new editor chose to wait until a review of both tomes could be printed. We hope that Professor Creswell will accept our apology for this delay.

It is with an extraordinary sense of humility and of admiration that one beholds these volumes, truly imperial in size, clearly written, well documented, admirably illustrated. They are permanent monuments to the most painstaking and devoted scholarship. They are also a labor of love, for the monuments of Egypt which form their subject have been for over 40 years Professor Creswell’s main concern, and two volumes on _Early Muslim Architecture_ were but prelegomena to the last two works. But, unlike Ibn Khaldūn, Professor Creswell has succeeded in making his main subject an even more permanent contribution to scholarship than was his introduction. For, in the latter case, so much is still unknown and so much has been discovered since that, infinitely valuable as they are, the volumes of _Early Muslim Architecture_ have in part been superseded by more recent monographs.

The two volumes on Egypt cover the period from 939 to 1326, a period from which much has remained and, therefore, in which the author’s admirable talent for precise descriptions and minute analyses can be used for the best results. The manner of presentation in these volumes is the same as in the preceding ones. We are dealing with a series of monographs taking individual monuments one by one, in chronological order, providing first the literary evidence about them, then a minute description and an analysis of original features, and finally a bibliography. At certain intervals and with respect to certain problems the author goes beyond the individual monuments into more general discussions clarifying
the meaning and development of certain architectural forms or of certain technical devices. Volume I, it should be added, is also provided with a magnificent plan of Cairo (available also separately), on which all the known monuments of Cairo are indicated and for which an invaluable Index has been printed, although it is not included in the book.

Volume I deals with the brief period of the Ikhshids, for which Professor Creswell has discovered and reconstructed in pertinent, if ultimately still unexplained, fashion the important mashhad of Sharif Ṭabāṭabā, and especially the Fāṭimid period. After a chapter devoted to Fāṭimid architecture in their pre-Cairene capital of Mahdiyah and a chapter in which an attempt is made to identify the main characteristics of the newly founded city of Cairo, the author proceeds to a systematic study of some 39 identifiable monuments, to which should be added the large group of mausoleums from Aswan treated as an entity rather than one by one. It would be idle to summarize in detail all the information found in the book. It may suffice to point out those chapters in which the contribution of the volume is particularly significant.

First of all the al-Azhar mosque is here for the first time mapped out and described in all of its infinite complexity. The plan of the mosque (fig. 20) in several colors is in itself an achievement of the greatest magnitude. The second major novelty is the discovery of the importance, quality, and historical significance of the fortifications built by Badr al-Jamālī. Two chapters are devoted to these fortifications and their excellency is all the more notable in that it is mostly thanks to Professor Creswell that so much of them has been cleared. Descriptions and analyses are followed by a lengthy discussion of the architectural origins of the walls in which a Syrian-North Mesopotamian background is cogently argued on historical as well as architectural grounds. The third important contribution of this volume is in bringing to light the large number of mausoleums of various types which existed in Fāṭimid times. Some of these were known before, but it is really only now that they are systematically published that their significance can be properly evaluated. While these points are perhaps the most spectacular improvements over our previous knowledge of the architecture of Cairo, the discussion of almost every other monument brings forth a large number of important remarks, all of which, obviously, cannot be mentioned in a review.

In addition to publishing the monuments, Professor Creswell brings up more general problems and attempts to solve some of them. Of these there are three (other than the problem of the origins of the fortifications which has clearly been settled) which are of particular significance and which may deserve some comments.

One such problem is that of the muqarnas, the peculiar transformation of architectonic elements into decorative ones which is one of the most characteristic features of Islamic architecture from Persia to Spain. On pages 231–232 and 251–253 the author enumerates examples known to him of the “stalactite” pendentive or squinch (they are generally called pendentives in the book, and, while this is admittedly a mere matter of definition, the reviewer feels that one should either call these features muqarnas or separate more clearly pendentives from squinches), argues that the Egyptian development is independent of Persian, Iraqi, or Syrian influences, and that the earliest example is in the zone of transition of the dome of the Coptic church of Abū al-Sayfayn, datable in 975–978. These results seem to the reviewer still inconclusive. It should be pointed out, first, that there are examples of muqarnas in Eastern Iran from the tenth century, if not even earlier. One is
in the very interesting mosque at Hazareh, in Central Asia. Other examples of the tenth or eleventh centuries show highly developed forms which would presuppose earlier experiments. The second point to note is that the Coptic examples seem indeed to be the earliest remaining examples of muqarnas in Egypt, but nothing proves that they were the earliest made there or, for that matter, a Coptic invention. On the contrary, the rather clumsy example in the chapel of St. George in particular clearly indicates not a type which would have preceded the Muslim ones, as Professor Creswell suggests (p. 232), but rather one that imitates a new development without fully understanding its meaning; as to the presumably earlier one over the chancel of the church, it is so remarkably thought out that one may have some doubt whether it is as early as the tenth century. But, if the Coptic examples are neither the earliest ones known nor fully original, the question of the source of the motif is indeed reopened. Iran has the earliest remaining examples and it seems to me rather likely that it is in a land with a traditional brick architecture, which would allow for a greater variation in the articulation of the unit of construction, that we may find the source of the motif, or at least the idea of transforming the zone of transition of domical buildings into a complex decorative design using architectural features as its basis. In the latter case especially, the comparative lack of formal relationship between Iranian and Egyptian examples (quite correctly pointed out by Professor Creswell) will no longer be a difficulty, for the Egyptian development could be explained as an adaptation in local terms of a foreign idea.

A second such general problem is actually related to the first one, for the muqarnas in Fāṭimid times developed almost exclusively in mausoleums, rarely in congregational mosques. Now, it is one of the most significant results of Professor Creswell’s book that the Fāṭimids seemed to have introduced the practice of building mausoleums on a large scale in Egypt. On pages 110–113 some general remarks are provided about the origins of such funerary monuments. While the specific relationship between the early canopy tombs and pre-Islamic “Hellenistic” models is clearly established, the more significant problem of why mausoleums were begun at that time is not raised at all. On this problem the reviewer hopes to publish an article in the near future. But, at the same time, even though the wider question has not been asked in this book, the information presented is indispensable for any further elucidation of the matter.

The third general problem on which this volume sheds a new light is that of the influences which were at work in Fāṭimid architecture. As is known, in many older books and studies, a Persian impact was presumed for Fāṭimid art, since Shi’ism was taken to have been a religious movement heavily impregnated with Iranian elements. Quite cogently and convincingly, Professor Creswell demonstrates that, insofar as architectural features are concerned (they are summarized on pp. 289–290), the primary impact on Fāṭimid architecture came from North Africa (especially in the early decades) and from Syria and Mesopotamia (the work of Badr al-Jamālī). No one can any longer dispute these facts, but it should be noted that the point is proved


3 A preliminary paper on the subject was delivered at the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in New Haven, in March 1960.
only as far as specific architectural features are concerned. On certain wider problems things are not so clear. The whole development of the mausoleum and of the zāwiyah finds apparently no parallels in the Muslim West. The great palaces, known better through texts than from actual remains, find, indeed, parallels in Mahdiyah and Sicily, but are they derived from the latter or are they all Egyptian and Western Islamic royal buildings derived from the great imperial constructions of Baghdad, Samarra, Raqqah, and so forth? Our knowledge of Islamic architecture of Iraq and Persia in the tenth and eleventh centuries is so pitifully small that one cannot validly invoke arguments a silentio, inasmuch as in painting, stucco, wood, or metal the art of Fātimid Egypt is much more clearly related to the East than to the West.  

This is not to say that we must necessarily still look to Persia as the model of much of Fātimid architecture; it is, rather, that the question of the background of this architecture is not solved because a certain number of features in it are related to North African developments, when during this most crucial period so little is known about Iranian and Iraqi architecture and when the industrial and decorative arts of Egypt are so clearly related to the East. The world of the Fātimids was not simply an Egyptian development, but one with ramifications throughout the Islamic world. It would be difficult not to believe that their art also was related to the development of the whole Islamic community.

While one may regret that some of these wider implications of the monuments studied in this volume have not been as fully discussed as one might have liked, the point remains that it would have been impossible even to consider them without this magnificent work. The plates are excellent throughout and, in addition to images dealing with individual monuments, Professor Creswell has provided sequences of images of domes, pendentives, mihrābs, and minarets, which are in themselves histories without words of characteristic Islamic forms.

The second volume is equally impressive in size, presentation, clarity, and excellency of photographs and reproductions. In certain ways, however, it appears at first glance less illuminating than the first one. There are three reasons for that. The first is that four of the longest and most important chapters in it (I, VI, VII, IX) are expansions of articles previously published by Professor Creswell. The second is that the volume does not encompass to the same extent a historically defined period. And the third is that, whereas the architecture of the Fātimids was almost unknown in its full implications before Professor Creswell's researches, the 43 monuments discussed here comprise such buildings as the Citadel of Cairo, the mausoleum of al-Shāfi‘i, the Mosque of Sultan Baybars II, all of which are among the best known monuments of Cairo visited by all halfway serious tourists to Egypt.

If the novelty of the monuments is, on the whole, less striking in this volume than in the first one, this is not to say that the book is any less important. For, first of all, the descriptions and analyses of well-known monuments are generally the first complete and clear ones we possess; there are in them many new and significant conclusions: on the later date of the muqarnas decoration in the mausoleum of al-Shāfi‘i, on the plan of the muristan of Qalâ‘ūn and on its relation to the Fātimid palace, and, especially, the two extraordinary chapters on the walls of the Citadel, which are

---

4 See R. Ettinghausen, Fātimid painting, Ars Islamica, vol. IX (1942), and the amazing stuccos discovered at Tirmidh, which appear related to the paintings of the Cappella Palatina; see, among several publications, A. Mongait, Arheologia v SSSR (Moscow, 1955), p. 277.
not easy to read for those who are not as familiar with the monument as the author, but which are quite obviously definitive analyses of what is visible in this striking and complicated building. Then, also, among the lesser known monuments, many are quite important discoveries, as those of the fifth chapter, for instance.

But, in the final analysis, it is not simply in the excellency and novelty of the descriptions or in the importance of some of the monuments that the greatest quality of this book lies. It is rather that in it the most experienced specialist of Islamic architecture in the Near East has developed a series of more general views on the history of Islamic architecture, whose importance transcends the specific monuments which led them. I should like to enumerate the most important of these additional features and to comment on a few of them.

On pages 102-103 a useful list of marble-lined mihrâbs from Syria is given. On page 161 and following there is an important study of the origins of the architectural features of the mosque of Baybars; in order to explain the large dome in front of the mihrâb, the author recalls such domes in the mosques of Persia and emphasizes more specifically the Urtuqid mosque at Mayâfariqin as the immediate prototype of the Cairene monument; this hypothesis is then justified on historical grounds; but, more important than the possible precise relation between the monuments of two cities is the discussion of A. Godard’s theory of the “mosquée-kiosque”; like Sauvaget, Professor Creswell opposes this particular view on the development of the early Iranian mosque (p. 164). On page 168 and following, while examining the more general problem of the relations between Egypt and the rest of the Islamic world in the early Mamlûk period, the question of the migration of craftsmen during and after the Mongol invasion is brought up; a useful list of objects in metalwork made in Mosul or in a Mesopotamian style is given, presumably confirming Lane Poole’s and van Berchem’s theses about the spread of inlaid metalwork to Egypt; this passage is, except for the bibliography, an almost word-for-word transcription of Professor Creswell’s earlier article on the monuments of Baybars, and does not take sufficiently into account the deeper implications of D. S. Rice’s recent studies on the metalwork of that time.\footnote{It is, of course, true that the most important one of these appeared probably too late to be used, \textit{Inlaid Bronzes from the Workshop of Ahmad al-Dhaki}, Ars Orientalis, vol. II (1957).}

On page 198, the well-known façade of the Qala‘ûn complex of buildings is studied in some detail and is convincingly related to Sicilian buildings rather than to Gothic architecture in Palestine. Pages 246-248 are devoted to the Egyptian minaret and here again, in typical fashion, Professor Creswell’s admirable knowledge of the monuments permits him to discard once and for all any precise relation between the Pharos and the minaret and to explain quite simply the manner in which the Mamlûk minaret arose.

I have left to the last the most important of all these general considerations, the discussion of the origin of the cruciform plan of the Cairene madrasah (pp. 104-132). As is well known, it is Professor Creswell who in 1922 first challenged the explanation of the madrasah as a historical phenomenon and as an architectural form, which had been proposed by Max van Berchem. Since 1922 Herzfeld and Godard have either defended Max van Berchem’s thesis or modified it in certain details to accommodate new interpretations or new monuments. Here Professor Creswell answers his critics and restates the problem as well as his solution to it. There are three separate elements in any discussion of the madrasah: the idea of the building, the func-
tion of specific madrasahs, the architectural forms. There is general agreement on the fact that the idea of building schools for the teaching of orthodoxy developed in eastern Iran and from there moved to the rest of the Islamic world under official auspices. On the question of the function of individual madrasahs, the author shows conclusively through literary as well as archaeological documents, that the madrasah for all four rites was an exceptional building (one should note on pp. 125–127 a new plan and excellent discussion of the Mustansiriyyah in Baghdad) and that most madrasahs were for one or two rites only; the cruciform plan is, therefore, not called for by the purpose of the building. On the question of form, the author discusses carefully all the examples known to him in Syria and Palestine, proves that the first cruciform madrasah in Egypt was the Sâlihiyyah built in 1242, and suggests that both the two-îwân and the four-îwân types originate in local house plans. There is little doubt, in the reviewer’s mind, that, as far as our present archaeological evidence is concerned, the main thesis of Professor Creswell to the effect that the architectural forms exhibited by the Syrian and Egyptian madrasahs owe little, if anything, to outside influences, is justified. Furthermore, the private houses discussed in the first volume could easily enough have been adequate prototypes, and evidence has been brought out by the author showing that orthodoxy teaching was done in private houses.

One may still wonder, however, whether an institution established in Iran, whose main objectives were dictated from above and whose creation antedates considerably the earliest known examples in Syria and Egypt, would not show an impact from the east. Professor Creswell’s criticism of Godard’s scheme (pp. 132–133) is justified insofar as the evidence presented by the latter is far from being clear, but, if the monuments he adduces cannot be proved to have been madrasahs, there is nothing to deny that the madrasahs of Khargird and elsewhere were on a cruciform plan. It seems to the reviewer that no definitive solution to the problem will be found until the precise form of Persian and Iraqi madrasahs is known. With our present archaeological documentation Professor Creswell’s thesis is justified, but the unknown of Iranian architecture of the eleventh and twelfth centuries makes it still difficult to accept them as completely definitive, at least on the one specific point of formal origins. For the rest, the author’s presentation appears final.

Without claiming to be exhaustive in reflecting the wealth of information and ideas in these two volumes, the preceding remarks may have shown the difference between them. The first one has brought to light a whole period of architecture formerly inadequately known. The second one deals with more celebrated monuments, but, aside from publishing them more satisfactorily than they had been before, it brings out a number of conclusions and discussions whose importance transcends the specific buildings involved.

The scholarly world owes a tremendous debt to Professor Creswell. While it may be doubted whether ever again the same devotion and knowledge will find such luxurious presentation and wealth of illustration, it may still be hoped that the same type of systematic and thorough analyses of monuments will be accomplished for other areas. Important work has been done already in North Africa and Spain. A beginning was made in Damascus and Aleppo. Much is being accomplished in Russian Central Asia. But Turkey, Iraq, especially Iran, Afghanistan, and India are still almost terrae incognitae when judged by the stand-

---

*A. Godard, L’Origine de la madrasa, Ars Islamica, vols. XV-XVI (1951).*
ards of Professor Creswell’s books. There would not be any more fitting tribute to him than to wish that, in the years to come, as much progress will be made in our knowledge of these areas as was made by him in Egypt.

Oleg Grabar


Although these two contributions of Professor Popper form an integral part of his monumental treatment of Ibn Taghri Birdī’s Chronicles, they are not alike as far as their functional character is concerned. The first of them contains a translation of a section of the annals, covering a period between A.D. 1412–22, whose corresponding Arabic version was edited in 1915–23.1 Through this highly competent presentation Professor Popper made yet another part of the important Egyptian source accessible to historians unfamiliar with the Arabic language. It is obvious that the primary value of Ibn Taghri Birdī’s Chronicles consists in their information pertaining to political developments in the Egypt of the Middle Ages. But they are also rich in data which should interest historians engaged in the study of Islamic art and archaeology. This is also true of the section under review, which contains numerous details referring to architectural activities of al-Mu’ayyad (A.D. 1412–27), and particularly to the famous mosque of the sultan in question. Marble needed for its construction “was sought in every region, being taken even from dwellings, courts, and the places which were (known) as ‘houses of joy.’ From that day marble became scarce in Egyptian houses because of the extent to which it was required by the size and width of this mosque; for it was the most beautiful mosque built in Cairo as regards its ornamentation and its marble, not as regards the roughness (sic!) of its construction and its solidity” (p. 41). Ibn Taghri Birdī attests the story concerning the “borrowings” in that mosque, which were reported by al-Maqrizī2 and confirmed by a number of modern authorities.3 “No fault was found with al-Malik al-Mu’ayyad in any phase of the building of this mosque except that he took the door of the college mosque of Sultan Hasan and the candelabrum which was there” (p. 41). Difficulties arising from the faulty construction of one of the minarets of the same mosque were not only repeated after al-Maqrizī,4 but even independently interpreted: “‘Fault of stone’ is what actually happened in the case of this minaret, for its foundation was built with small stone, then its upper part was built with large stone, and this caused its inclination and destruction after it had been completed” (p. 63).

Quite different is the character of the second volume under review. It contains systematically presented notes pertaining to various aspects of life in the Mamlûk state, and is conceived as a means toward a better understanding of the text of Ibn Taghri Birdī. The present volume, the last in the series of such collectanea,5 begins with a discussion of the ethnic

2 Al-Maqrizī, Kitāb al-Mawā’iz wa-l-I’tibār bi-Dhikr al-Khilāṭ wa-l-Amsār, Cairo, a.d. 1853, ii/329.
4 Al-Maqrizī, loc. cit.
5 The first volume was The Cairo Nilometer,
composition of various social groups referred to by Ibn Taghrî Birdî. It is followed by a few brief chapters devoted to the problem of names and titles, official documents and diplomas, the calendar, measures and weights. By far the most interesting part of the volume consists of a very detailed study of economic matters. It is divided into three main sections: Currency and exchange (domestic); food prices; income: fiefs, salaries. Apart from explaining relevant technical terms occurring in the Chronicles, Professor Popper compiled economic data recorded by Ibn Taghrî Birdî, presenting them also in tabular form. Along with the pioneering study of Sauvaire, and a more recent contribution of Strauss (Ashtor), the materials produced by Professor Popper will prove of great help to historians who like to rely on statistical evidence in considering economic developments of Mamlûk Egypt. These materials were tabulated by Professor Popper according to the following categories: Currency and exchange in Cairo, A.D. 1382-1469; food prices in Cairo, A.D. 1382-1497; income of the military class; endowment stipends


* In discussing the term harjah or muharjah, Professor Popper felt uncertain as to the vocalization, form, and etymology (p. 45). Actually, al-Maqrizî defined the harahaj as being “Islamic gold, free of any admixtures” (Kitâb as-Sulûk, British Mus. MS, Or. 2902, fol. 22b). Further details pertaining to this type of gold may be found in this reviewer’s Extracts from the Technical Manual on the Ayyûbîd Mint in Cairo, BSOAS, vol. 15, pt. 3 (1954), pp. 434-436.

H. Sauvaire, Matériaux pour servir à l’histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie musulmanes, JA, 14 (1879), and other vols.


It seems proper to mention here that this problem has recently been treated by D. Ayalon, The system of payment in Mamlûk military society, Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient, vol. 1 (1957), pp. 37-65.

(monthly) in Mu’ayyad and Qâ’it Bâi Deeds. To facilitate an interpretation of these data, Professor Popper evaluated them also in terms of United States dollars. The adoption of the dollar as a common denominator was resorted to on the ground that the official currency of the Mamlûks as well as that of the United States had gold for its basis. Although the author emphasizes that this procedure “is for purposes of comparison with other currencies, and has no implications with respect to purchasing power” (p. 45), I nevertheless question the validity of the parity in this otherwise convenient device. Truly, the price of gold prevailing in the United States before 1934 could rightly be accepted for the conversion of the dinâr or mithqâl into United States currency. But I am disturbed by Professor Popper’s statement that “The fineness of the gold in the gold coin, the dinâr or mithqâl, issued by the Mameluke sultans of the XVth century remained constant at .979″ (p. 41). Against this unsubstantiated opinion I would venture to state on the basis of my experience in handling Egyptian dinârs that I have serious doubts concerning the alleged high intrinsic value as well as the stability of the gold coinage of the Mamlûks in the fifteenth century. Until we properly examine numismatic evidence with the aim of ascertaining the metallic contents of Mamlûk dinârs, the parity adopted by Professor Popper for his tables must remain open to question.

This shortcoming amounts to a call for an

10 A parallel device was employed by W. Hinz, Lebensmittelpreise im Mittelalterlichen Forderen Orient, Welt des Orients, 1954, pp. 52-70.

investigation of yet another aspect of the history of late medieval Egypt. A very important share in its reconstruction has been contributed by Professor Popper both in the field of the publication of relevant Arabic sources and in its methodology. The two volumes under review constitute not only further evidence of his achievement in this respect, but an additional cause for our indebtedness to and admiration of the great American orientalist.

A. S. Ehrenkreutz


When planning to catalogue a collection, a series of problems must be taken into consideration. What should be included? What may be omitted? These and others are among the basic questions to be asked. The answers depend, to a large extent, on the audience to whom the book is addressed. If the catalogue is to be presented chiefly to specialists as raw material for research, it generally should be quite different than if it were to serve as a handbook for the general public. When planned for the first group, it often contains data that for the second would best be eliminated or presented in quite another way. Furthermore, if the catalogue is intended by the author to be used as a foil for his own particular interests and theories, it would have a still different character. In any case, the purpose should be stated, and, if stated, should be followed; we cannot say this of J. Edward Kidder's catalogue of the early Chinese bronzes in the City Art Museum of St. Louis.

Charles Nagel, Director of the St. Louis museum, surely was aware of the problems confronting the cataloguer of the bronze collection, as in his preface to the volume he writes: "Of the four classic duties of a museum—acquisition, preservation, original research, and public education—it is the third that, for the average institution, is the hardest to perform." Moreover, he points out that "The Museum's collection of ancient Chinese bronzes is . . . of a size, range, and distinction that made original research a duty and publication of that research an obligation not to be deferred." He then pays tribute to Professor Kidder's knowledge, enthusiasm for carrying out this purpose, and success in producing a catalogue that "represents a standard of scholarly treatment we could wish for all our collections."

We, then, are justified in evaluating the catalogue, at least in part, for its achievement in "original research." We should also compare it with others that have been published by different museums in the United States. The other catalogues are A descriptive catalogue of Chinese bronzes in the Freer Gallery of Art; Chinese bronzes in the Buckingham Collection (Art Institute of Chicago); A catalogue of the Chinese bronzes in the Alfred P. Pillsbury Collection (Minneapolis Institute of Arts).

The St. Louis catalogue, the most recent, has one feature lacking in the others: that is, a brief historical introduction placing the bronzes in their cultural setting. In sections ranging from half a page to two or three pages, the author discusses, in order "The Early History," "The Shang Dynasty," "The Chou Dynasty," "The Ch'in Dynasty," "The Han Dynasty," "Writing and Inscriptions," "Religion," "Materials and Techniques," "Sites and Chronology in Styles." A map and a page of drawings depicting the canonical

---

2 By C. F. Kelley and Ch'en Meng-chia, Chicago, 1946.
3 By B. Karlgren, Minneapolis, 1952.
forms of the bronzes supplement the text. Most of the book contains descriptions of the objects (about 59 in all), and for each there is an excellent photograph. Every inscription is analyzed and reproduced by a photograph or drawing.

The general introduction may be described as the kind of summary commonly found in exhibition catalogues and, as such, it has a good deal of worthwhile information compressed within a brief space. Presumably this book, therefore, would be useful to the general reader, should it happen to come to his hand. But it does not seem carping to ask if such a thin volume, priced at $10 and dedicated to a narrow field, is likely to be acquired by the casual seeker of esoteric knowledge, or, for that matter, if it had been seriously intended for museum visitors of that description. We feel free to assume that the catalogue, because of its emphasis on “original research,” was planned for more specialized, perhaps even informed, readers, and for them there will be many points of disagreement.

In his discussion of chronological terminology (p. 7), Dr. Kidder attacks the use of the term “Huai style” because it implies “a unified style in a period that is far from bound by one style.” The same may be said of any stylistic term applied to the period from 600 to 200 B.C. (e.g., “Late Chou”). But “Huai style” is even more objectionable because it implies that a series of local styles coexisted during the Late Chou Period. On the contrary, there was very little stylistic variation at any one time within that period, and whatever changes we have noted have been because of chronology, not locality.

Dr. Kidder states that “The importance of cattle as beasts of burden, providers of meat and leather [italics mine] and for slaughter in the sacrifices is corroborated by the frequent use of bovine representations in the decor of the bronze vessels and in inscriptive references” (p. 9). Undoubtedly cattle were used for food and they may have been beasts of burden, but certainly they were represented on the bronzes because of their religious significance, not because of their material value. Tigers, too, were depicted commonly on bronzes, but I doubt that they were domesticated. On the other hand, the pig, one of the earliest animals associated with man in China, appears rarely, if ever, on bronzes.

In discussing the t’ao-t’ieh, Kidder makes an even more misleading statement: “Ancient texts shed no light on its exact significance, but that it represents a supreme sky god in animal form there can be no question” (p. 15). A positive enough statement, but will it bear examination? Our evidence, meager as it is, denies Kidder’s answer to the question that he does not ask. The so-called t’ao-t’ieh is prominent on bronzes of both the Shang and the Chou. But the chief deity of the Shang, it is believed, was Ti, an earth god, whereas the sky god, T’ien, apparently became supreme, as Kidder himself notes, only after the Chou succession. Obviously we can at least ask if it were at all possible that the t’ao-t’ieh represents both the Ti of the Shang and the T’ien of the Chou.

The analysis of the bronzes in the main section of the volume is, in general, satisfactory. But here, too, there are some dates that are debatable. For example, the chih in plate 4 is attributed to Shang. But the elaborate and partly naturalistic bird constituting the main motif belongs to a type that appears rather late in Early Chou, around 950 B.C. This date, moreover, is corroborated by the jagged flange pattern on the snake form seen on the underside of the vessel; this type of flange has been found only on Early Chou vessels.

The same chih has a very unusual feature, one noted by Kidder as “triangularly sectioned flanges.” These flanges are also decorated with a series of chevron markings. Only one
other bronze with similar flanges has come to my notice: a large tsun formerly in the C. T. Loo collection, and now, I am informed, in the collection of the Freer Gallery of Art. The rarity of this motif surely indicates a connection between the two vessels. It also suggests that, in doing "original research" for a catalogue of Chinese bronzes, one of the researcher's rewarding "duties" might have been the correlation of individual vessels with others of the same or related sets in different collections.

Other bronzes are assigned dates with which this writer cannot concur. For instance, a ho (pl. 6, number 287:55) is assigned to Shang, whereas I would place it in Early Chou because of its cover, which is designed to reverse as a bowl-shaped cup with a circular "foot"—a decisive feature of that later period. The Shang cover has, instead, a pointed finial, which, when reversed, could be thrust into soft ground for support. A mask (pl. 22, number 288:49) assigned by Professor Kidder to Early Chou, I would regard as Middle Chou because of such characteristics as the flaccid curve of the horns, the circular stylization of the eyes, the catlike nose.

One should question statements throughout the text.⁴ For instance, it is said that Karlgren's "methodology is sound, but that fallacies in its application are due to preconceived ideas" (p. 22). Contrarily, this writer and many others believe that Karlgren's error lies in a more basic misuse of statistical evidence. On page 21 the reader should also be wary, as he may obtain the impression that bronzes from Hsün-hsien date from Shang to Early Chou, whereas a large proportion of them are obviously Middle Chou.

The bibliography is voluminous, but it, too, is open to criticism. It is so full that one may be led to believe it is quite comprehensive. But it does not include any of the crucial publications by Jung Kung, Li Chi, or Kuo Mo-jo. Hentze, merciful though oddly, is represented by only one book, and the present writer sadly finds some of his own favorite articles omitted. As the bibliography, then, was obviously neither critically selected nor complete, but a massive job of hayraking, did the omissions, significant or otherwise, result from unawareness?

A final evaluation of this work leaves the reviewer somewhat baffled. For the novice—who is unlikely to use it—this book, despite some errors, is an adequate introduction to the world of ritual bronzes. For the more advanced student, the book offers little beyond the photographs of the vessels. One may ask why this book is so irritating—and to the writer, it is. The answer may be that it fails to reach its own stated goal, that of true "original research." It is pretentious in that a mélangé of material, uncritically assembled, is offered to the public misleadingly as a "standard of scholarly treatment." But the standard, as evidenced, cannot by any stretch of imagination be compared with that of the Freer Gallery catalogue. Karlgren's catalogue of the Pillsbury Collection can be challenged on method of dating, but it is the product of a man who otherwise speaks with authority. The St. Louis catalogue cannot be compared unfavorably with that of the Chicago Art Institute, but the latter was published in 1946. Although much has been learned in the decade between the publication of the two books, the St. Louis catalogue does little to report that growth of knowledge.

J. LeROY DAVIDSON

Bronze Culture of Ancient China. By William Charles White. Toronto (University of

---

⁴ Interpretations of inscriptions on bronzes are often controversial, but some in this book go beyond the range of expected error. For comment and variant readings cf. Max Loehr, Artibus Asiae, vol. 21/1 (1958), pp. 91–94.
Despite its title this book is by no means a study of the Bronze Age in China. Except for a very short introductory resumé of the generally known facts about Shang and Chou bronzes in terms of history, technique, use, typology, design, etc., the text consists largely of notes on 10 groups of bronzes comprising about 212 pieces most of which are in the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto. As Bishop White points out, we often lack two kinds of information about bronzes: (1) on the geographical areas from which they came, and (2) on the association of objects in groups (p. ix). It is this kind of information that the author gives us with respect to the bronzes in this book, and because of his unique experience in China he is better qualified than most Westerners to do so. Still, this book must be used with caution. The careful reader will note that Bishop White did not himself dig these objects from the ground under the controlled conditions we are accustomed to associate with the word “excavation,” and that all the so-called “excavations” were in fact the clandestine diggings of landowners and dealers in the neighborhood who brought the results of their efforts to Bishop White and supplied him with such information as they saw fit in answer to his questions. Obviously this situation was far from ideal. While we can assume that the good Bishop was accurately informed up to a point, that he could pretty well rely on reports that traced certain bronzes to origins in the region of Anyang or of Loyang, or even to the areas of certain villages near one or the other of those towns, we can hardly expect more. Beyond this point we are dealing with hearsay and local rumor.

With this cautionary word on record we may turn to the contents of the book. The opening generalities about the bronzes of ancient China recapitulate the principle known facts stressing the indigenous nature of the vessel types and the facts that the earliest known examples are the finest at the present state of our knowledge, and that the Anyang excavations, once and for all, confirmed the existence of Shang bronzes. Much of this is by no means news, but it provides the uninitiated reader with a useful summary of what specialists have known for the last several decades. The question of casting is by no means settled (p. 4), and at the risk of anticipating the results of studies now in progress it may be said that there is reason to doubt that the cire perdue method was generally used.

The description of types would be even more useful than it is had there been reference to illustrations of all the variant forms as, for instance, in the case of the axes (yüeh) where three varieties are mentioned and none is identifiably illustrated. No mace heads (Li Kuei-t'ou) are shown (p. 6), and it must be added that in this section and throughout the book the text could have been much enriched by the inclusion of Chinese characters for these and other technical terms. As will be seen later the only characters in the whole book are the ceremonial graphs from oracle bones and their modern equivalents given on page 193 in Appendix C.

Introducing the subject of ceremonial vessels, the author suggests that there is a distinction between those vessels made for sacrificial purposes in connection with ancestor worship, weddings, burials, state functions, etc., and those used for domestic functions, but admits it is difficult to single out the latter. On the other hand he finds that a “large group of vessels and objects is similar in form and design to those used successively in the sacrifices and ceremonies, or to the domestic vessels; but their quality of workmanship and material is greatly inferior, and often the clay cores have been allowed to remain in the base
of the handles and legs. This type is known as ming-ch'i, that is, 'bright vessels,' and they are inferior reproductions made only to be used at the funeral ceremonies, and to be buried in the tombs for the use of the dead in the spirit world" (p. 9). This description is worthy of comment for it seems to offer more information than is warranted by our current state of knowledge. The distinction between vessels made for use by the living and those made for burial with the dead has not only never been entirely clear; it has, in fact, been altogether denied; and the assumption has been put forth that all these vessels were made for use in ceremonies by living persons paying their respects to their dead ancestors, and that after one or more generations of use a bronze or set of bronzes eventually went into the tomb of some leading member of a family for reasons which escape us today. On the other hand, the attempt to distinguish between ceremonial and mortuary bronzes has an honorable antiquity. It seems first to have been recorded in the Li Chi which goes back in its present form to the latter Han dynasty although its origins are thought to antedate those of the other ceremonial books of Chou. In Book II (T'an Kung 墓公, pt. I, ch. iii, par. 6) we find what may be the earliest use of the term ming-ch'i 明器 which Bishop White translates literally "bright vessels"; and these are described as vessels for use by the spirits of the dead in contrast to chi-ch'i 祭器, sacrificial vessels for the use of the living. One has become so accustomed to the term ming-ch'i without reference to its literal meaning that the translation "bright vessels" comes as something of a surprise, particularly in view of the fact that all the ancient bronzes we know today, whether they be ceremonial or mortuary or both, are rather somber in tone. As vessels of both categories must have been bright with the metallic sheen of copper and tin when they were new, it seems likely that the term was used in a more poetic sense and that they were considered bright in that they illuminated the shadowy realms of the nether world. Be that as it may, Bishop White's exposition presents a view that merits further investigation. Granted that all sacrificial bronzes were ultimately buried, no matter what great events they were cast to commemorate or what heroic deed their inscriptions recorded, it may well be that other vessels were cast for immediate burial. This passage in the Li Chi could be the explanation for the existence today of so many thin, poorly cast, uninscribed, ill-decorated or even plain bronzes which nevertheless follow the classic repertory of shapes. So far as this reviewer knows, no one has seriously investigated this possibility. If it were found to be true, this would not be the first time modern scholarship has verified an ancient text considered to be of doubtful veracity.

When the author explains that the "beginning in scientific excavations at Anyang recently made by the Academia Sinica has produced much Shang material," he raises a point which is too little understood by the present generation of workers in this field. In the first place we should remember that his use of the word "recently" is relative and that the period in question is now three decades ago. The other and perhaps less well known fact is that modern archaeological endeavor in China was initiated by the late John Ellerton Lodge, then Curator and later first Director of the Freer Gallery of Art. It was Mr. Lodge who in 1923 sent the late Carl Whiting Bishop out in charge of the Freer Gallery Field Expedition to China; and in the course of the next four years Mr. Bishop and his assistants A. G. Wenley (present Director of the Freer Gallery), Li Chi (present Director of the Archaeological Section of the Institute of His-

1 S. Couvrer (tr.) Li Ki (Mémoire sur les bien-séances et les cérémonies). Ho Kien Fu, 1913, p. 169.
tory and Philology of the Academia Sinica), and K. Z. Tung made archaeological surveys of 10 of the Eighteen Provinces of China. Later on, the Chinese portion of the Freer Gallery field staff, Li Chi and K. Z. Tung, in conjunction with the Academia Sinica, began the excavation of the Shang site at Anyang. The discoveries made in 15 seasons of digging at Hsiao-t’un, Hou-chia Chuang, and other sites on the theretofore legendary Waste of Yin will remain milestones on our road to understanding the ancient history of China. It should be added in passing, moreover, that this work has by no means come to a stop, although the direction of the effort is now in other hands. Political and moral judgments aside, it is a simple statement of fact to note that archaeological activity in China has been greatly intensified since the advent of the Communist regime; in the phase under discussion, not only have further discoveries revealed much that is new about the Anyang culture, but a whole Shang site has been brought to light in another area.

One more point in the introduction is worthy of note before we examine the several groups of bronzes that are discussed in the main part of the book. Among other technical questions is that of inlay, and the statement is made that “a filling or inlay of black lacquer in the surface designs and even in the inscriptions deeply cast within the vessels themselves is very general” (p. 10). No supporting reference is given. It is true that many Shang and early Chou bronzes seem to have a black (and sometimes red, though that is not mentioned here) pastelike substance in the fossae of the relief casting, but the reviewer is not aware of any scientific analysis that has identified this material as lacquer. Such tentative tests as have been made are inconclusive, and it may be that more than one substance is involved. But in any case, the question that really needs to be answered is this: Did the makers of these bronzes seek to enhance the designs by inlaying them with black or red pigments, or are the black and red substances later accretions, either natural or artificial? Only to the extent that it helps us to answer this primary question are we interested in the identification of the vehicle for those pigments, be it lacquer, animal glue, or a mixture of lime and pig blood as suggested on page 147.

NOTES ON THE TEN GROUPS

In his prefatory remarks Bishop White warns that “the groups enumerated are not to be taken as complete sets of ceremonial vessels from the respective tombs, but only parts of the original groupings” (p. ix). But more important than the question of whether these groups are fragmentary is the question of whether they are groups at all. The author considers them to be so because of “the fact that many objects sometimes were associated together, were obviously part of the same burial, and were vouched for by persons who had to do with their excavations” (p. ix). This is all very well, and we cannot but be touched by the Bishop’s faith in the integrity of his informants; but in the last analysis it is the objects themselves that are the evidence, and no amount of earnest vouching by third parties, whether interested or disinterested, can alter the visible and tangible features of the bronzes as we see them today. They alone can tell their story; let us see what they say.

What do we mean by “a set of bronzes”? A definition might well begin by saying it is a group of objects made at roughly the same
time and meant to be used together. A set would probably include a good many of the standard shapes, and the vessels would tend to be decorated similarly though we know enough to understand that sometimes bronzes of the same set may vary considerably in style. But above all, to be a "set," a group of bronzes should be held together by the nature of the inscriptions on those pieces which are inscribed; this does not mean that the inscriptions need be identical, but they should have certain features in common, preferably the names or titles of the patrons. On the other hand we must guard against the assumption that similarity or even identity of inscriptions proves membership in a set. This is particularly true for the numerous one- and two-character inscriptions of the Shang dynasty; the longer texts of early Chou provide more solid evidence one way or the other. There are three good examples of proper sets in this book, and we will do well to examine them with care. Group IV, the Ancestor Hsin set (pp. 107–117), consists of 10 pieces of which 6 are inscribed. A tsun, a kuei, two chüeh, and two ku all have on them the two-character inscription tsu-hsin 亙辛, and these and all the rest of the vessels, a ting, a chih, and two more chüeh are strikingly alike in general character (pls. LIV–LIX). In Group V, the Mang Shan Set (pp. 118–136), there is again a general similarity which holds the 14 pieces together (pls. LX–LXX). Of the 12 inscribed pieces, 2 kuei, 2 li, a tsun, a yu, and a ting have in common the name of the Ching 莊 family as patrons; on a huo, a hsi, and a p’au the first part of the inscription which would include the patron’s name is illegible, and 2 chüeh are simply inscribed p’au 父乙.

And lastly there are, in Group VI, seven members of the famous Ch’en-ch’en Set (pp. 137–145), five of them inscribed with the Ch’en-ch’en 陳堇 name: a p’an, a kuei, a huo, a ting (pls. LXXI–LXXIV), and a yu (not illus-

trated); an additional p’au is introduced on the ground of possible association (pl. LXXV). These three groups are perfectly acceptable as sets, or parts of sets, under the definition offered above. The bronzes themselves tell the story; their presence in this book gives us a standard by which to measure the remaining groups.

Group I, the largest and presumably most important in Bishop White’s arrangement of his material, is the Elephant Tomb Set (pp. 15–74) which consists of some scores of objects in the Royal Ontario Museum and again as many scattered in other museums throughout the world. Of the 87 pieces published here 20 are inscribed; and among these 20 are 12 different inscriptions. One graph, the man with the 亇 on his head and holding a stick in his hand, occurs six times (p. 41, Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6): on two ku (pl. XV), a fang-i (pl. XVI), a yüeh (pl. XXII-A, where it is inlaid), and two ling (pl. XI-A and B). Second in frequency is the graph for “child” or “son” which is also the family name of the Shang royal house. It appears thrice: on a ting (pl. XI-C), a ko (pl. VI-A), and a tou (pl. XII-A); in the latter case I question Bishop White’s reading of the triangular forms as part of the inscription and his reading of the mask above the graph referring to the “tiger” family (p. 28). Occurring twice each are, first, the two-character inscription made up of the same tsu 子 graph as before in combination with a second graph which Bishop White interprets as hsi 姍, mat, 4 which appears on two chüeh (pl. II shows one); and second, the graph of the halberd bearer which appears in two different forms on a ko (pl. XX) and a pen (pl. XXI). The other eight inscriptions in this group occur but once each. These vessels and inscriptions raise a number of interest-

4 I find no graph like this under the archaic forms of hsi in the standard dictionaries.
ing questions; but before discussing them in
detail, we must face the main question—the
question that will be repeated again as we
examine further groups: how can such a dis-
parate assemblage of bronzes with such a
variety of inscriptions be considered a "set"?
We have already noted that a set of bronzes
need not be uniform in style and that inscrip-
tions need not be identical; but even in those
cases where internal variety exists, there is
an underlying unity of general character and
of quality far more striking than anything we
can feel in the presence of, say, the boldly de-
dsigned and handsomely executed yu (pl. VIII),
the sleek and highly sophisticated chih (pls.
IX-A and IX-B), and the simple but strongly
formed small lei (pl. X). The attentive reader
will note further examples of this dilemma
within this same "set," and the point need not
be labored further.

Not only has Bishop White attempted to
force this heterogeneous group of bronzes into
a set and assign them to a single tomb (he
keeps on using that term even after admitting
at the start that "there was no evidence of a
tomb-chamber" [p. 16]), he has also sought
to establish a date for the so-called Elephant
Tomb based on the interpretation of a single
inscription. To make his point, he has brought
into consideration the studies of his friend and
colleague the late Rev. Dr. James Mellon
Menzies, who for many years held a mission
post at Anyang and was one of the pioneers
in studying the finds from that area. Among
other things Dr. Menzies made a long and
detailed analysis (still unpublished) of the
weapon type ko; and Bishop White has here
drawn on Menzies' notes on the one known as
ko-70 which is the piece illustrated in this book
on plate XX and described on page 30. This
ko is inscribed on both sides of the tang; on
one side is the halberd-bearer graph, on the
other a tiger. On page 30 Dr. White sum-
marizes the findings of Dr. Menzies and from
this five-point summary comes to the conclu-
sion that the Elephant Tomb can be dated "to
about 1250 B.C.," a degree of precision with-
out precedent in the study of Shang bronzes.
At the end of Appendix D he relaxes this pre-
cision to some extent by referring it to the
whole reign of Wu-ting, a period of 58 years,
or, recognizing the extra latitude provided by
combining the dates of the orthodox and the
revised chronologies, a period of 127 years.
But, chronologies aside, the thing that inter-
ests us is how Dr. Menzies came to assign this
weapon to the reign of Wu-ting, the 23rd
Shang king. His reasons are given in extenso
in Appendix D, and he has presented a very
intricate case; but it is not necessary to review
his arguments in detail to show that they con-
tain two weak points. Recognizing the prob-
able identity of the halberd-bearer graphs in
spite of differences in the detail of the drawing
(a question I refer to below in discussing
Group II), Dr. Menzies immediately jumps
to the conclusion that all halberd bearers on
Shang bones and Shang bronzes refer to the
same man. In view of the fact that this graph
represents an office rather than an individual,
and that this office presumably existed under
several if not all of the Shang kings, has he not
gone too far? Now James Menzies was a very
cautious man and one whom this reviewer was
honored to call a friend; these remarks are by
no means intended to cast discredit on his
memory. In his vast experience with Shang
dynasty texts he may well have had still fur-
ther reasons for identifying this particular
graph with one official of the time of Wu-ting;
if so, it is only a matter of regret that they
were not given here. The second point con-
cerns the graph for "child" or "son" which,
as already noted, was also the name of the
Shang royal family. This fact was quite ob-
viously well known to both Bishop White and
Dr. Menzies. One wonders, then, why they
did not treat it as such instead of attempting
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to use it as a key to the relationship between one generation and another in its meaning as “son” or, by extension in terms of royalty, “prince.”

Group II, the Halberd Bearer Set (pp. 75-93), named from the principal graph, consists of 41 pieces of which 16 are inscribed with a total of 9 different inscriptions. Six of these, on a chia (pl. XLVI), a kuei (pl. XL), a ting (pl. XL), a lei (pl. XXXVIII), a ku (pl. XXXIX), and a chüeh (pl. XXXIX), show a standing man in profile carrying over his shoulder a halberd with the point up. Two other halberd bearers have already been noticed in the Elephant Tomb Set; both are shown full face, but one holds the weapon across his shoulders with the haft in his right hand and the point hanging down at his left (pl. XX), while the other holds it upright in his left hand with the point away from him (pl. XXI). It is in the nature of archaic Chinese epigraphy that these three graphs should all stand for the same thing, probably an official title as Bishop White points out; but if so, should they not all be in the same group? In this case the two pieces in the Elephant Tomb Set are a weapon and a tool, both very simple and lacking any formal or stylistic hints that might be helpful. Evidently it was the locally supplied evidence of provenance that separated them. As for the remaining eight inscribed objects in the Halberd Bearer Set, each carries an inscription of its own except for a pair of ko (pp. 81-82, Nos. 38-39) which have an inscription not considered worth illustrating, and the yang-t'ou (pl. XLII-B) and the ko (p. 82, No. 40) which share the arrowhead graph. How can all these pieces be considered members of a single set? Notice especially the difference in the general character of the two ku, one of which is inscribed with the halberd-bearer glyph (pl. XXXIX-A) while the other is uninscribed (pl. XLI-A); and again between the two chüeh, that with the halberd bearer (pl. XXXIX-B and p. 83, No. 5) and that marked with the halberd plus the cyclical character i (pl. XLI-B and p. 83, No. 7), two bronzes quite unlike in conception and execution even as seen in the somewhat unsatisfactory view of the former.

Much smaller is Group III, the so-called Disk Bearer Set (pp. 94-106), again named after the most frequently occurring graph. Here 12 of the 13 pieces are inscribed, and the disk-bearer graph (p. 99, Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6) appears four times: in a chia (pl. XLVII), a kuei (pl. XLIX-A), a ku (pl. LI-A), and in the cover of a yu (pl. XLVIII), the bottom of which is inscribed with a bird (p. 99, No. 2). Of the other eight pieces, two are inscribed with the graphs shown on page 41, Nos. 3 and 4; and the remaining six have different inscriptions though some of them have elements in common.

In Group VII, the Prince Kung of Sung Set (pp. 146-158), only 2 of the 11 pieces are inscribed, and even these have only the most tenuous connection. A massive ting, over 18 inches high, with a simple band of dragons in bold relief on a plain background around the upper part and masks atop the three legs (pl. LXXVI), has in it the two graphs tsu-kung (p. 150, A) while a very elegant and dainty little ku (pl. LXXVII), decorated on the lower part with fine casting in flat relief, has inside the foot a 14-character inscription beginning with the same name Kung. As is shown on page 150, the two graphs for kung are as unlike as are the vessels themselves; and the very nature of the inscriptions, one a name and the other a record of a donation, tends to indicate that there is no connection between the two bronzes. Without attempting to draw any conclusions it may be of interest to note that a large tsun of exceptionally fine quality in the Freer Gallery of Art (pl. 1) has inside the bottom the two characters tsu-kung (pl. 1, lower right) in a style much like that found in
Bishop White's *ting*, yet the conception of the two vessels could hardly be less alike. In his notes on the folder sheets of this as yet unpublished bronze, Archibald Wenley has brought together a good many references to the use of *tsu* as a name, but for the inscription as a whole he only ventures to suggest that it "seems to represent a name, possibly of someone belonging to the Shang ruling family." To return to the rest of the vessels of this Prince Kung Set, the three shown on plate LXXVIII may very well belong together and may also be the earliest bronzes described in this book. The next four vessels (pls. LXXIX-LXXX) also seem to be related. It is hard to see why the author grouped these pieces in the same set anyway when he says at the outset that "although the bronzes come from the same excavation, they appear to be of three different groups" (p. 147).

The remaining examples may be summarized briefly. Group VIII, the *Sha-wan Set* (pp. 159–163), includes six Middle Chou pieces with no inscriptions; and the six inscriptions of Group IX, the Marquis K'ang of Wei Set (pp. 164–171) are inconclusive beyond the fact that one of the graphs is *hou*, "marquis." But the latter pieces are among those said to have come from diggings which took place at Hsün-hsien, Honan, in 1931; and among a group of 12 weapons in the Freer Gallery of Art that were reported to have come from the same source is a large blade which bears the two graphs K'ang-hou 康侯. As his final group, Bishop White presents six small sets which are of interest for various reasons and which need not be discussed in detail here beyond mentioning the fact that one of them consists of 10 vessels described as made of pewter. None of these is in the Royal Ontario Museum, and the author tells us that their present whereabouts is unknown. Actually two of the vessels from the Yamanaka group he illustrates (the *yu*, No. 2 on pl. XCII, and the *chia*, No. 5 on pl. XCVIII) are now in the Museum of Asiatic Art in Amsterdam and have been published in its bulletin where the metal is shown to be not pewter but 95 per cent lead and 5 per cent antimony. In the same article Dr. Jan Fontein calls attention to a number of similar pieces recently excavated near Loyang and published in *K'ao-ku T'ung-hsien*, 1956, No. 1.

Eight appendices bring the book to a close as follows: A. A list of the kings of the Shang dynasty showing their generations, order of reigns, relationships, and approximate dates. B. A list of the names of 24 classes of early bronze vessels with descriptions. C. A chart showing 80 ceremonial graphs found on the oracle bones together with the modern script equivalents so far as they have been determined, and explanations of the elements of each graph. D. A note on the probable date of the Elephant Tomb, already referred to. E. Line drawings of a selection of 11 ko from Groups I, II, and III. F. Notes on the relationship of the Bronze Age to the Iron Age in China. G. Notes on archaeological work in China. H. Maps of Honan, the Anyang region, the Loyang region.

All through the book are many bits of information of great interest, important items spotted by a sharp eye, and the kind of lore that is reserved for those who had the good fortune to live 40 years in China. Here are some samples. In the description of an unillus-

---


6 *Bulletin*, Vereeniging van vrienden der asiatische kunst, Derde Serie, No. 9, December 1957, pp. 144–148. I remembered having seen these vessels in Amsterdam in 1958 and Dr. Fontein was kind enough to give me these references in his letter of September 16, 1959.
trated ko (p. 81, No. 36) Dr. Menzies notes that "evidently this design has been stamped into the clay mould by a woodblock carving." In all the loose talk that has been bandied about over the method of preparing the clay moulds—i.e., were they built up by repeated applications of slip over a wax model, or over a clay model, or were they carved directly in reverse—no one seems to have taken the trouble to try any of those processes. Those who do so will find it next to impossible to reproduce the fine and precisely rectangular fossae of the best Shang dynasty lei wen, to use but one example, in a material so plastic or ductile as wax or clay. This reviewer has long held the theory that designs of this refinement and precision could only have been carved in fine-grained wood. Here, apparently, is the first published evidence that someone else has thought so too. On page 95 is an account of the possible significance of the disk-bearer graph in terms of Chinese ceremonies of the early 20th century. It is largely assumption but nevertheless provides interesting background if treated as such. The same thing is true of the paragraphs on page 108 in which the author speculates on the uses of that always puzzling form of libation cup, the chüeh. Discussing the photograph reproduced on plate LXXXII, the author tells us (p. 146) that it was given to him in Kaifeng in 1946 and that he never saw the objects which he describes as "bronzes and white jade animal figures." The photograph was evidently published with Group VII because of the inscription in the rectangular ting which begins with the name kung and relates to that in the ku on plate LXXVII. But the thing to be noted here is the group of six animals which are described as of "white jade"; the striking thing is how much they resemble certain animals which have appeared on the market in recent years made of white pottery and purporting to come from Anyang, none of them entirely above suspicion. In discussing the Sha-wan Set on pages 159-161 Bishop White speculates on the changes that took place in the forms of the vessels and the types of decoration toward the middle of the Chou, and links these to possible changes in ceremonial customs as the central power weakened and the feudal states grew stronger.

To sum up, this is an interesting and useful book, a unique book in that it could not have been written by anyone else. In every page it reflects the author's long and rich experience of four decades in the very heartland of ancient Chinese culture. That Bishop White was not a trained archaeologist we can only regret; but if not his profession, archaeology was his love. The reader who will remember three things: (1) that the reported "excavations" were not scientific digs, (2) that the Elephant Tomb was not a tomb, and (3) that not all the sets are proper sets, will find this a useful and rewarding book in which there are many good, interesting, and genuine Chinese bronzes and a wealth of information.

The halftone illustrations are satisfactory on the whole; and the poor quality of the color plates is at least partially explained by the events which the author describes on page xi. As a tool for scholarship this volume would have been improved by the inclusion of Chinese characters, by a much better index than it has, and by the inclusion of a full bibliography of works to which reference is made.

John Alexander Pope


The pre-T'ang texts of the title are Hsieh Ho's Ku hua-p'in lu (late fifth century) and Yao Tsui's Hsü hua-p'in (early or middle sixth century); both are translated in their
entirety, and copiously annotated. The T'ang text is the longest and most important treatise on painting from that period, Chang Yen-yu'an's Li-t'ai ming-hua chi, completed in 847. A translation of the first three chuan, likewise furnished with numerous notes, makes up the main body of the book. The last section of the third chuan has not been translated, nor have the remaining seven chuan, which deal with individual artists. A subsequent volume to complete the work is promised for the future.

The portion which Dr. Acker has rendered into English covers the following subjects: An introduction "On the Origins of Painting"; notes on the vicissitudes of painting collections up to the author's time; a discussion of Hsieh Ho's Six Laws; some general comments on landscape painting; and short chapters on the transmission of styles and schools; on the brushwork of major masters; on painting materials, tracing, and copying; on the relative values of works of different artists and periods; on connoisseurship and collecting; on signatures, colophons, and seals; on mounting and preservation. The last section translated (made disproportionately long, about one-third of the entire book, by what one feels to be an excess of annotation) records the locations, subjects, and artists of wall paintings in the Buddhist and Taoist temples of Ch'ang-an and Loyang. Chang Yen-yu'an gives scarcely any description of the paintings—which, besides, had nearly all been destroyed by the time his book was written; but these bare and unexciting lists are nevertheless of some interest for the information they give on iconography.

The arrangement of the book is ideal, with the Chinese text printed above the corresponding passages of translation, and the footnotes at the bottom of the pages, instead of at the back. Both in these features and in the general excellence of the translation and annotation, the book might well be taken as a model by anyone who plans to prepare and publish such a work in the future. (Whether he will find a publisher as willing to realize his ideal as the admirable E. J. Brill is, of course, another question.) The Chinese writings which Dr. Acker treats are not always easy to understand. In rendering them into English, he has displayed a broad familiarity with their subject matter, a remarkable grasp of the intricacies of literary Chinese, and an untiring perseverance in carrying out the immense labor of research needed to solve the many problems which arise in the course of such a translation. The footnotes alone contain a wealth of information about Chinese art, history, society, and religion, as well as on philological and bibliographical matters. Anecdotes and passages from literature to which the text alludes are often translated in full in the footnotes, sometimes with the sentences printed in Chinese as well.

A long introduction establishes the historical positions of the texts, argues for a new interpretation of the famous Six Laws of Hsieh Ho, and concludes with a discussion of "the attitude toward painting revealed in the early texts." I shall consider Acker's theory about the Six Laws separately in a Note appearing elsewhere in this volume (see p. 372). The section on the attitude toward painting (pp. L–LXII), while there is much of truth in it, seems to me to overstate its case. Admiration for the "swift, firm, calligraphic line" was indeed an important part of the judgment of quality in Chinese painting; but by Chang Yen-yu'an's time, there were several alternatives to the "impetuous" brushwork derived from ts'ao-shu, the cursive form of writing. They ranged from a fine, careful lineament (which had more affinity with the seal than the cursive script) at one extreme, to the rougher manners connected with the i-p' in, "untrammeled" style, in which lineament played a lesser role, at the other. All were recognized to have their proper place
in painting. In later centuries, the range of possibilities was even wider. Acker's statement that the development of *ts'ao-shu*, especially in the fourth century A.D., "fixed the direction of Chinese aesthetics for all time" (p. LIX) is thus extreme and misleading. Containing more of truth, but likewise in need of qualification, is the statement that all other value criteria "counted as nothing compared to the one ultimate desideratum, *linework interesting and aesthetically satisfying in itself." This was more or less true in some schools and kinds of painting, quite untrue in others. The attitude Acker describes would be the subject of a major chapter in any well-balanced history of the aesthetics of Chinese painting, but not the whole book. Even while declining to follow Acker all the way, however, one must grant that what he says is a salutary corrective to some other approaches to Chinese painting; the Chinese critics have certainly paid far more attention to the element of brushwork and quality of lineament than have Western scholars, who are more likely to concern themselves with the rendition of space and plastic form, with the accuracy of the drawing, composition, and such matters.

There are some debatable points, and a few misreadings, in the translation and notes. They do not seriously mar Dr. Acker's excellent work, but it is worthwhile to point them out here, and to add a few other comments:

P. 3.—The insistence on "painters" instead of "painting" for *hua* in these first sentences of Hsieh Ho's text, as well as in the title, seems to me forced; also, it would seem better to understand *t' u-hui* in the usual way, as "pictures," rather than as "all who draw pictures." The use of *mo pu*, "none which does not," in the phrase does not necessitate an animate subject. Acker's paraphrase of this opening passage (n. 2) seems to go beyond what is warranted in the Chinese text, which is a simple statement of the illustrative and evocative value of painting.

P. 11.—The rendering of *ch'i-li* 氣力 as "nervous energy" is a good example of the many felicitous choices which the translator has made in finding meaningful English equivalents for difficult Chinese terms.

Pp. 134—135.—The name of the musical instrument *ch'in* is variously rendered as "lute" and "psaltery." Since the two are different in English, the reader might suppose that two different Chinese instruments are referred to. The choice would be somewhat arbitrary in any case, since neither corresponds exactly with the *ch'in*; but one or the other should be chosen for consistency.

P. 149.—The word *t'an* is used in criticisms of painting to designate a quality of placidity or "blandness"; the rendering of *t'an-i* as "adequate in (their expression of) thought" misses this meaning. I would render the line: "The paintings of High Antiquity were simple in technique (or lineament) and placid in conception, but elegant and orthodox."

P. 153.—*i-shih* is more than "rare scholars"; the generally accepted rendering of *i* as "untrammled" would be better here, referring to scholars who have escaped from the turmoil of the world.

P. 156.—*pu sheng ch'i se* probably does not mean that the painting "is not worth the colors (used to produce it)" but rather that it "did not rise above the outward appearance (of the object represented)." This extended use of "color," which is quite common, is interesting in connection with the fourth law of Hsieh Ho (see under Notes, p. 377).

P. 159.—*Ch'a-shan*, the "tea hills" of Wu-hsing in Acker's rendering, is a proper name, a mountain in the sea near Wu-hsing.

P. 160.—The "north and south" in the title of this chapter does not refer to the period of North and South dynasties, but to
localities; the title means something like “Discussion of the Transmission of Schools in Different Localities (North and South) and Periods.” As early as Chang Yen-yüan’s time, that is, the importance of the regional factor in the determination of painting style was recognized; critics did not make the mistake of treating it as if it developed in a unilinear way, with a single style current throughout China at any given time. The fact that the contents of the chapter do not correspond entirely with its title is explained by Professor S. Shimada of the Kyoto National Museum as indicating some rearrangement of the text by a later hand; he has found other evidences of such tampering, and has made a study of them in which he attempts to reconstitute, insofar as possible, the original form of the text. His study, when published, may clear up some inconsistencies which any reader will note in the book as it stands today; the beginning and end of Chapter II, section 3, for example, seem to belong elsewhere, perhaps with the preceding section. Acker takes no note of these odd features in Chang’s book; nor does he seem to have made use of some excellent Japanese textual studies of the Hsieh Ho and Yao Tsui treatises. Differences between the existing texts of these treatises and Chang Yen-yüan’s quotations from them would appear to be evidence of textual divergence or corruption; Acker, however, explains all such discrepancies by supposing that Chang miscopied or else quoted inaccurately from memory.

P. 179.—Shen chia t’ien tsao probably means “in his spirit he borrowed the creative powers of Heaven” rather than “spirits lent to him the creative powers of Heaven.”

P. 183, par. 2.—The artist’s conception, i, appears to be the subject of these sentences, which I would render: “But if one revolves one’s thoughts and wields one’s brush without consciously applying his conception to the painting, then it will be captured in the paint-

ing; it will not be stopped up in the hand or frozen in the mind.” Mind and hand, in any case, are certainly objects of the preposition yü, “in,” not the subjects, as Acker has them.

P. 184.—The rendering of shu and mi, the “two styles of painting,” as “the free and the detailed” does not seem adequate; I would prefer “sparse” and “dense,” i.e., “thin” as opposed to “thickset” in texture.

P. 187, lines 7–8.—Mo-ts’o, in the phrase rendered “cinnabar finely ground,” seems to be a place name, although I have been unable to identify it.

P. 191.—The use of the word “amateur,” here and elsewhere (e.g., p. 48), in the rather antiquated sense of “connoisseur” or “collector” is confusing; one might easily take it to refer, for example, to amateur painters, who existed already in the T’ang dynasty.

P. 198.—The rendering of chihs as “primitive” and “primitive force” seems to read too much into the word; it is probably used here in its usual meaning of “substance,” “substantial.” Chang’s characterization of the paintings of High Antiquity could be rendered as “summary in their substance,” and of those of Middle Antiquity, “combining (outer) charm with (inner) substance.”

P. 248, next to last line.—“A painting on silk in color.”

P. 256.—The last two characters of the Chinese line, shih Wu, are omitted in the translation; they presumably mean that the picture in question was painted by Wu Tao-tzu.

P. 258.—The “Ts’ao” mentioned as having painted the walls of the relic pagoda of the Hsing-shan-ssu should have been further identified; it is probably Ts’ao Chung-ta. Same page, below: The paintings of Wu Tao-tzu were not damaged by clumsy “mounting” (they were painted on the plaster wall) but by “ornamenting,” i.e., adding color. (Cf. pp. 266, 272, and 286, where similarly unfortunate results of incompetent coloring are re-
corded.) The use of the word *chuang* in this sense occurs also in the term *Wu chuang*, “Wu coloring.” See Kuo Jo-hsu’s chapter “On Master Wu’s Use of Color” in *T’u-hua chien-wen chih*. See also, for this use of the term, Matsumoto Eiichi’s article in *Kokka*, No. 582, “Go Dōshi to Chakushoku” (*Wu Tao-tzu and Coloring*).

P. 261, last line.—“paintings by Yin Lin and Li Chen.”

P. 265, last line.—“a portrait by Han Kan of the Great Master.”

A bibliography and index conclude the work. The last page of the index is missing from every copy I have seen. In the bibliography it might have been useful to give at least approximate dates of completion for the early Chinese books. The two works under the name of T’an Cheng-pi (p. 396) are one and the same. A glossary and appendices (the second evidently to be devoted to pigments), mentioned several times in the notes (e.g., p. 187, n. 7) are presumably to be included with the translation of the remainder of *Li-tai ming-hua chi*.

None of the points mentioned above, with the exception of the uncritical acceptance of the texts, constitutes a major fault; the book as a whole rises well above the standard set by most previous translations of early Chinese texts on painting. All students of Chinese art must feel gratitude to Dr. Acker for the enormous task he has undertaken, and admiration for the success with which he has completed this first part of it. We await the continuation eagerly, and with confidence that the same high level of scholarship will prevail in it.

**JAMES F. CAHILL**


This is the first book of translations into English of the poems of Wang Wei,1 a name surely familiar to all readers of Chinese poetry, whether in translation or in the original. A book such as this one is welcome, with its generous selection of 136 poems (out of some 400) and a 15-page introduction discussing the poet and his poetry.

Read simply as poems, these translations are lively and vivid, easily persuading the reader that, if not themselves important poetry, they may well be a reflection of such. For example, No. 41 (“Traveling along the Frontier”):

With feathered arrows slung across his back, he reaches the border of his district.

Playing his reed flute, he marches across the frontier.

Yellow clouds warn him that the fort is not far now . . .

Withered grasses whisper the arrival of fall.

This is a reasonably faithful version of the poem *龍上行* (*Works*, 15:8a). Its effect comes from two evocative English words, “warn” and “whisper,” for which the Chinese text has the colorless 知 “recognizes” and 見 “sees.” It is almost as though the translators, to make good the inevitable loss of verbal effects between two languages, had deliberately introduced a poetic imagery of their own.

In No. 50, “Rice Fields” (*上平田*, *Works* 13:2a): “Farmers till their rice paddies at break of day/Toiling, tilling late into the night.” The Chinese is more matter-of-fact and less dramatic: *朝耕上平田，暮耕上平田* “Mornings they till the Shang-p’ing fields/Evenings they till the Shang-p’ing fields.”

One more example of what is perhaps the most striking characteristic of these translations, from No. 89 (“In late Spring Official Yin and Other Gentlemen Visit me” 晚春燕小尹與諸公見過, *Works*, 7:14b): “And par-

rots shriek as they fly through falling flowers." The text: “Orioles sing on after the petals have fallen.”

Such a technique of translation raises interesting and fundamental problems. One's training certainly and perhaps also one's instincts are all in favor of "accuracy," and I always respect the unpretentious prose of von Zach, who more often than most translators knew what his text said and was not ashamed to spell out his understanding of it for his reader. At the same time I am under no illusion as to the poetic merits of such translation. On the other hand Ezra Pound's version of the Shihsing poems, though demonstrably incompetent as a work of scholarship, achieves the miracle of making poetry of a good number of them—something at which most other translators dismally failed. I suspect that there is a point where it becomes an irrelevant impertinence to ask "But is there such a word in the Chinese text?" It seems to me that Pound reaches such a point rather frequently, and Mr. Walmsley (who must take the credit and the blame for the English of these translations) seldom, but in any case the attempt has made for better reading on the whole than we are used to in translations from the Chinese.

The weakness lies not so much in the method as in the limited control which the translators have exercised over their text. Given an exact grasp of the Chinese poem, its idiom, nuances, and overtones, the translator is surely justified in many liberties with the bare words of his poem. He may or may not transform an oriole into a parrot, but first of all he must be certain about the function of the bird in Chinese (and English) poetry. Mr. Walmsley has no doubt found support for what to more prosaic-minded readers of Chinese poetry seem to be liberties with his text in the ideographic or etymological theory of Chinese poetry, familiar from the "split-ups" of Florence Ayscough and the fertile imagination of Ezra Pound. Here it is combined with a further naïveté about the nature of vocabulary in literary language generally: "A single Chinese character will often condense the meaning of many words in English. Take the character 閃 hsien, for instance: the ordinary dictionary defines it as 'leisurely, quiet, unoccupied.' Take the symbol apart, and a great deal more is disclosed. It is made up of two parts: two doors opening from the center, 門, and the moon, 月, between. According to an etymological dictionary, moonlight streaming in through the closed doors suggests 'at ease, sauntering, unoccupied, leisure.' Thus the written images induce some such nuances—almost a feeling—to float across the Chinese imagination. Nor is this the end—from there the imagination takes off!"

I have not found the threatened flights of the imagination, at least not those of a strictly etymological character, in the translations proper. "The shivering mountains turn to indigo" (No. 78) looks suspicious, but turns out to be only an overly "poetic" version of 寒山蒼翠 "On the chilly hills [the pine trees] show the greener." The same excessive exuberance falsifies the concluding lines of No. 88 ("A view of the Han River" 汉江臨眺 Works 8: 17a-b): "Hey! You over there in Hsiang-yang! Set aside some fine day/For a venerable old man of the mountains to get happily drunk!" A more exact translation of the text 襄陽好風日, 留醉與山翁 would be "A fine place is Hsiang-yang/I'll stay and get drunk with Old man Shan" (i.e., Shan Chien, whose connection with Hsiang-yang is well known and is explained in Chao Tien-ch'eng's commentary).

Perhaps the most serious weakness of these translations is attributable to the failure

---

2 Take the English word "idle." Webster's College Dictionary defines it as "Without worth or basis; useless, vain; 2. Not occupied; inactive. 3. Lazy; slothful."
of the translators to make use of the commentaries available in either of the editions of Wang Wei's poems which they had at their disposal. Once the allusion behind the line 园葵固足美 ("He found the mallows in his garden enough to esteem," i.e., good to eat) is identified, it is impossible to translate it "And with him no beauty can compare with the golden faces of his own sunflowers" (p. 134).

It is with regret that I must conclude with a judgment of Poems by Wang Wei on the whole unfavorable. What looked to be an interesting experiment in translation technique is vitiated by an unfortunate disregard of professional standards of scholarship.

J. R. HIGHTOWER


As part of the ever-rising tide of interest in Asia and things Asiatic, a veritable flood of large and handsomely illustrated volumes on various phases of Oriental art has been coming off the presses in recent years. The bookshops are full of them, and the presence of a volume or two on the drawing-room table is an absolute must for any proper hostess.

Since there is nothing in the selection made by Fu Tung-hua which is not also to be found in Chao Tien-ch'eng's complete edition, the paragraph (p. 13) on editions is puzzling: "Most of the poems in the present selection have been taken from Wang Yu-ch'eng Chi Chien-chu, . . . This edition . . . was arranged in 28 volumes by Chao Tien-cheng (sic) and published in 1736. The rest of the poems included herein were chosen from Wang Wei Shih (Poems of Wang Wei) edited by T. W. Fu and published by the Commercial Press, Shanghai, 1920."

T'ao Ch'ien's poem, "On Stopping Wine," has the line 好味止园葵 "My preferred taste stops with (i.e., is limited to) the mallows in my garden" (cited by Chao Tien-ch'eng, 5: 4a).

No doubt they serve a purpose in bringing the beauties of Chinese or Japanese or whatever Oriental art to a wider and hitherto uninhibited public; but the fact is that as these books increase in number, they decrease in scholarship to the point where fewer and fewer of them say anything at all. The knowledge of half a century ago digested and regurgitated again and again has been reduced to almost utter sterility, the scholars who write the texts (and there are some respectable names among them) have sold their souls to mammon, the publishers wax fat, and the gullible reading public, lured by sensational advertising in popular magazines, is gullied once more. Pretty as they are, and they will reward hours of agreeable looking, these books are hardly worth reading and certainly not worth reviewing. They are landmarks on the downward path of scholarly integrity, beacons heralding the triumph of publicity over the search for truth.

Mr. Griswold, on the other hand, has written a large and handsomely illustrated book that is very well worth reading and a pleasure to review, a book that achieves the remarkable feat of making a real contribution to knowledge in the subject it treats. Dated Buddha Images of Northern Siam is an extraordinary book in more ways than one, and that adjective is used in the literal sense. The author had no formal schooling as an Orientalist, nor was he trained as an art historian. A sensitive and cultivated man who was thrown into contact with Siam and the Siamese by force of circumstance, he has for a decade and a half made that country his part-time home and the cultural history of its people the subject of his full-time study. Applying himself to some of the problems of the history of Siamese Buddhist art, he has produced a book that not only, in the prefatory words of Coedès, brings order and clarity to a hitherto unsatisfactory system of classification, but a
book which tells us more about the human side of Buddhist sculpture than we are accustomed to expect from a scholarly work. Let us make a brief recapitulation of its contents.

After a few general remarks about the history, purpose, and meaning of Buddhist images and the importance of type and style as factors in their analysis, he comes immediately to the point which is, in more than a decade of searching, he has found only about a hundred dated Siamese Buddha images, that practically all of them either came from the north or are there now, and that none is earlier than the fifteenth century of our era. Then follows a flashback to the origins of Siamese Buddhist sculpture in the Kingdom of Dvāravatī; the arrival in Siam of the animistic Tais drifting gradually down from their homeland in Nan-chao; the formation of a Tai kingdom in the region of Sukhodaya in central Siam; the development of the “high classic” style in the bronze Buddhas of Sukhodaya and the surrender in 1349 of that city to the new Kingdom of Ayudhya to the south. In the meantime an independent residual Mon Kingdom at Lampun was proving to be the northern center of activity in the plastic arts; this was captured in 1292 by Mengrāi, king of a lesser group of Tais known as Tai Yūān, who made his capital four years later at Chiengmai; and this region, known as Lān Nā, quickly dominated northern Siam. Events in the reigns of King Gūnā (who imported the Abbot Sumana from Sukhodaya) and of his brother the Prince of Chiengrai (who got from the king of Gampaengpet an image—or its replica—which had come, via Ayudhya, from Ceylon into the hands of the first king of Sukhodaya) are used to show the influences under which Buddhist sculpture evolved in the north. The historical preface comes to a close with the temporary eclipse of Buddhism in the early decades of the fifteenth century, and the enthronement of Tilokarāja in 1441, an event which marked the beginning of the “Golden Age.”

Tiloka’s reign is treated in some detail; and the production at this time of a “new” type of Buddha image, the Lion Type, is the main theme of the book. Because of close affinities with the Pāla-Sena style of Bengal (eighth–twelfth centuries) and because many of the good examples were found at the town of Chiengsen, these images have been called “Early Chiengsen” and dated roughly twelfth–thirteenth centuries. On the basis of his intensive examination of Lion Type images with dated inscriptions, Mr. Griswold comes to the conclusion that none of these, with dates or without, can be so early; for the earliest date of all equates with A.D. 1470, and the latest of the Lion Type, before the twentieth century, was inscribed in 1565. To explain the appearance in northern Siam of images based on Bengali prototypes almost three centuries earlier, he introduces the fascinating Chronic of the Seven Spires Monastery, a document that tells how King Tiloka was inspired to plant near Chiengmai a young Bo tree, a cutting from an authentic descendant of the most sacred tree in the world, and to erect around it, sometime between 1455 and 1476, a replica of the Mahābodhi Temple at Bodhgaya, and how in connection with the reproduction of that Holy of Holies of Buddhism the sovereign also placed, in precisely the proper positions vis-à-vis the original temple, copies of the Seven Holy Stations. Further, according to the Chronicle, “on the Seat under the Bo tree there is an image of Buddha sitting in the lotus position, his right hand placed on his knee and his left hand lying on his lap. The name of this image is ‘Buddha Victorious Over Evil’” (p. 38). This image which can only have been a replica—at how many removes?—of the great cult image celebrating the moment of the supreme test at Bodhgaya 20 centuries earlier, was, in Mr. Griswold’s
opinion, the original Lion Type image of Lán Nā.

Presently we shall return to a closer scrutiny of this crucial point; for the moment we may continue our résumé. Contemporary with the Lion Type but showing certain differences in detail because of its heritage from a large number of Indian, Sinhalese, and Tai prototypes is the group formerly called “Late Chiengsen” and now designated Lân Nā “Mixed” type. Then the author takes up a wide variety of related subjects in turn: The curious gap in the records of Tiloka’s reign; the adventures of a certain celebrated “Sinhalese” image that went to Lân Chang (now Laos); the ritual attendant upon the casting of Buddha images, shedding much light on what these statutes meant to those who made them; the systems of dating used in the inscriptions; the languages and scripts of the texts; the nature of the analytical method to which the material has been subjected; the social and economic situation in Lân Nā in the Golden Age, and the question of patronage; the importance of the choice of a model in an art that consists entirely of “copying,” and various details of the manifold processes involved in “copying.” And finally the decline of the dynasty founded by Mengrai and the end of the Golden Age inaugurated by Tiloka were followed by the Burmese conquest of Lân Nā, and the period of creative image-making in northern Siam was for all practical purposes at an end.

But it is time to examine more closely the main argument of this book. Both here and in a preliminary article in the Journal of the Siam Society, XLI/2 (January 1954), pp. 95–152, Mr. Griswold has undertaken to rewrite a whole chapter in the history of Siamese Buddhist art. He has, in sum, proposed that we abolish the old terms “Early Chiengsen” and “Late Chiengsen” in favor of the new terms “Lion Type” and “Lân Nā ‘Mixed’ Type” respectively, and that the dates of all the images concerned be retarded by some two centuries. This of course produces a gap, and means that except for a few images that carried on a sort of provincial Mon tradition, there was no Buddhist sculpture in northern Siam until the fourteenth century. Like any man with a new and revolutionary idea, Mr. Griswold had hardly let his ink dry when he was roundly attacked. Two of these criticisms deserve to be noted here. The longer and more recent may be mentioned first as it is by all odds the least important and is, in fact, brought in at all only so the reviewer may not later be charged with having overlooked it. Thai monumental bronzes is a small (6” x 8”) volume of 96 pages with 99 illustrations published in Bangkok in 1957 (given as B. E. 2500 on the title page) by Mom Chao Chand and Khien Yimsiri with a preface by Silp Birasri. The latter describes the former two as “a well known Thai writer” and “a noteworthy Thai sculptor” respectively; and the former describe the latter (who is in fact an elderly Italian, one C. Feroci, with 30 years residence in Siam and a Siamese name) as “dean of the Faculties of Sculpture and Painting in the University of Fine Arts, Bangkok.” This bizarre trio, for the two authors quote Dean Feroci at length all through the book, writing in tasteless English, have devoted themselves to the task of deprecating Mr. Griswold’s work though occasionally and unexpectedly they seem to relent and agree. Certain suggestive points are made, but on the whole these are outweighed by absurdities. For example, the authors hold that the sculptures and bas-reliefs of Borobudur and Angkor were not cut in stone but modeled in some soft pliable material; or so they say it seems to them from looking at the photographs. Evidently they have not troubled to take the hour-long flight from Bangkok to Angkor to see for themselves; and elsewhere in the book they admit to having drawn their
conclusions more from the study of photographs than of the bronzes. The superficiality of the method and the vulgar flippancy of the presentation combine to make a book that will hardly engage the serious attention of anyone.

At the other extreme is the thoughtful article of Dr. Reginald LeMay, one of the few Westerners to have done any worthwhile work on the art of Siam before Mr. Griswold appeared on the scene. The chronology of northern Siamese Buddha images (in Oriental Art, N. S., vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1955, pp. 17–22), referring to the JSS article which first advanced the new theory, takes the view that Mr. Griswold "by inference, seeks to disturb the chronology of the Buddha images found in Northern Siam" which he, Dr. LeMay, had laid down in his Buddhist art in Siam, Cambridge University Press, 1938. In his opinion the main difficulty imposed by Mr. Griswold's chronology is the implication that the Tai who came from an organized state in western Yunnan, where they had lived in close contact with the highly cultured Chinese, should have waited over 500 years after they began to settle in their new land to the south before they had any religion or images of their own. He also finds it very difficult to believe that the Tai immigrants received no religious influence from the Pyu of Central and Upper Burma; that, as Mr. Griswold holds, the only Buddhism in northern Siam before the arrival of the Abbot Sumana from Sukhodaya about 1370 was a watered-down version practiced with a handful of terra-cotta images in the Mon outpost at Lampun. These are good questions, and it is up to Mr. Griswold to answer them.

In the meantime, turning from the problems raised by others, this reviewer would like to raise some of his own. Assuming that Dr. LeMay's questions will be answered in due course and it is satisfactorily established that the casting of major Buddha images in the north began only in the reign of King Tiloka in the middle of the fifteenth century, the most important question remaining is, in Mr. Griswold's words, "how a Pāla-Sena model suddenly appeared in northern Siam 250 years after it went out of production in the land of its origin?" As we have seen, the author finds his answer "in the Chronicle of the Seven Spires Monastery, a work in Tai Yün based on passages from the Pāli Garland of Time but giving a few additional details" (p. 35). Unfortunately Mr. Griswold tells us nothing further about the Chronicle and seems to accept it at face value. Is it, on close inspection, capable of bearing the responsibility he has thrust upon it? Does it provide solid textual support for a theory so revolutionary in character? In the opinion of this reviewer it does not. Let us examine the few available facts. Apparently the only published description of the text is that by E. W. Hutchinson in his article The Seven Spires: A sanctuary of the sacred fig tree at Chiangmai in JSS, XXXIX/1 (1959), pp. 1–68, who refers to it by the proper title Tamnaan Vat Ced-Yet and tells us that it is contained in a palm-leaf manuscript and "is a free translation, often amplified, of the passages in Jinakālamālini which refer to Vat Ced-Yod." The whereabouts of the manuscript is only hinted at, there is no mention of an author, and the only suggestion of a date is, as we shall see, that it must have been written after 1516. For all practical

1 Mr. LeMay has restated the same questions in a "Postscript to the first Edition" which appears on pp. 203–216 of The Culture of South-East Asia, 2d impr., London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1956.

2 Mr. Hutchinson's treatment of this text is far from satisfactory, and some of these difficulties may be the result of his slipshod methods. There is, for example, no indication of the length of the Chronicle. It is not clear whether his analysis in 12 paragraphs (pp. 40–50) is the translation of the whole text, or whether the 12 paragraphs represent the divisions used by the
purposes this text exists in a vacuum with no claim to reliability except in those passages translated from Jinakālamālinī. Turning to the latter (which is Mr. Griswold's Garland of Time) we are on firmer ground in general, though only slightly firmer as related to the problem at hand. It has been studied at length and partially translated by one of the really distinguished scholars in Southeast Asian studies, G. Coedès, in his learned article Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental in BEFEO, XXV (1925), pp. i–201. Coedès tells us it was written at Chiangmai by a monk named Ratanapaṇṇa in A.D. 1516 and was later extended by the same man to include events up to 1527. It is of interest to note further that his age at the time of writing in 1516 was 43 years, which means he was born in 1473. His work is a history of Buddhism from its legendary beginnings up to the lifetime of the author; and quite naturally the pace slows down and a great deal more detail is included as Ratanapaṇṇa gets into what for him was recent and current history. Even so, his account of the events that concern us here is extremely short and occupies only 14 lines in the translation. He tells of the enthusiasm aroused in King Tiloka by the monks from Ceylon, of his consequent determination to plant a sacred Bodhi Tree, and of the choosing of the site. In C. S. 817, the Year of the Pig (A.D. 1455) he founded a monastery and in the same year planted there a cutting from a tree grown from the seed of a direct descendent of the sacred tree in Ceylon; and because of this the monastery was called Mahābodhārāma. “After the tree was planted,” he goes on, “the King had everything...

unknown author of the Chronicle. The only clue to the fact that the English translation is incomplete is that Mr. Griswold's note 50 to the description of the Buddha image at Vat Ced-Yod refers to the Tai translation given by Mr. Hutchinson (pp. 51–64) rather than to any part of his English version.

arranged in the same way as around the fig tree where Mara was conquered, not omitting the bench and the seven places (visited by the Buddha after his enlightenment).” Then without warning the next sentence skips 21 years to the building of a great sanctuary in the monastery in C. S. 838, the Year of the Monkey (1476). This gap, as noted by Mr. Hutchinson (p. 43) and Mr. Griswold (p. 44) seems to indicate that a page from the manuscript has been lost, and consequently there is no account of the building of the Mahābodhārāma (Vat Ced-Yod) which must have occupied some years after the actual founding in 1455. What might have been a decisive argument in favor of Mr. Griswold's theory is therefore missing, and we are left to guess whether King Tiloka modeled his replica of the Mahābodhi Temple on copies in Pagan, as Mr. Hutchinson seems to think (p. 37), or directly on the original temple at Bodhgayā as Mr. Griswold believes (p. 38). One more problem should be raised at this point. Admitting that the Chronicle and the Garland leave us in the dark about how and where Tiloka got his building plans, Mr. Griswold unexpectedly adds “but another chronicle says he sent a mission of thirty architects and craftsmen, headed by his Minister of Works, to Bodhgayā for that specific purpose.” This document which, if properly authenticated, could settle the matter once and for all is only identified in a footnote as “an unpublished manuscript in the possession of the Buddhist

3 It is my impression that the parenthetical phrase is an interpolation by Coedès; but there can hardly have been any other meaning to “the seven places.” Note, however, that the detailed description of the Seven Holy Stations is that of Tamnaan Vat Ced-Yod and does not appear in Jinakālamālinī.

4 Coedès does not seem to have noticed the implications of this gap, though he finds it curious that there is no reference at this point to the council for the revision of texts which was convened in 1475. Op. cit., p. 111, No. 4.
Institute at Chiangmai”; but then the same note informs us further that “another unpublished manuscript says the Minister got the plans from the Mahābodhi at Pagan.”

Obviously the next step is to see that both those unpublished manuscripts are identified, authenticated as far as possible, published, and translated in toto. Until that is done no further progress seems possible along this line; and only when we know whether these mysterious texts are as unsubstantial as the Tamnan Vat Ced-Yod or have at least the minimum credentials of authors and dates as has Jinakālamālini, can we bring any useful literary evidence to bear on this problem.

The introduction of this brief excursion into the quicksands of Siamese literary sources, while germane to a criticism of Mr. Griswold’s book, is not to be taken as derogatory. In setting forth his ideas on the development of Buddhist sculpture in northern Siam he has presented all the kinds of evidence he could muster. Textual support is one kind of evidence, and he has used whatever he could find that relates to the problem at hand. In the opinion of the reviewer he has tended to overemphasize the evidence of the Chronicle which is altogether lacking in credibility. On the other hand, the single sentence quoted above from Jinakālamālini is sufficient evidence of Tiloka’s intention to recreate at Chiangmai the site of the earth-shaking events at Bodhgaya; and even though this sentence was written some six decades after the foundation which preceded the actual laying out and building of the monastery, these events certainly had a solid place in the local lore, and the author, Ratanapañña, at the age of 43 must have heard eye-witness accounts. Possibly the study of the unpublished manuscript will clarify the interesting, though not really crucial, question of the source of the model; but the point to be made here is that from what we have seen of the nature of Siamese literary documents, no argument is likely to stand or fall on the evidence they provide. The subject at hand is, to use current academic terminology, not in the sciences but in the humanities. No matter how much “evidence” is brought forth, no matter how convincing a case is presented, we cannot, as in the mathematical sciences, think in terms of conclusive “proof” that is either right or wrong. It is not in the nature of the humanities that this should be so, nor, perhaps would we wish it so.

Mr. Griswold has written an excellent humanistic book. It contains, for a relatively short text, a great variety of material all bound together by the central matrix that is the diversity of problems related to the making of Buddha images in Lān Nā in the Golden Age from the mid-fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth centuries; and the reader who will take the trouble to dig into the myriad factors of military, political, economic, and social history, of religion both mystical and practical, of geography, style, iconography, and technique, and of human strengths and weaknesses will end up with more insight into the nature and function of Buddhist art than he is likely to have picked up from any other single text. The author has treated his own little bailiwick of a few hundred square miles over the span of a century in terms that are meaningful for a whole continent for a millennium. The reader will find much that is warm and human, and such sentences as “Not all the sculptors of the best period did good work” come as a breath of fresh air in a field where scholarship too often

5 P. 62, No. 31.
6 The translation given by Coedès says “when he was twenty-three during the retreat in the rainy season.” Coedès takes this to mean that he was 23 years in monastic orders and hence actually 43 years old. Without knowing the authority for this assumption it seems to me that he could also have written the book at the actual age of 23. Cf. Coedès, op. cit., pp. 5-6.
seems to dwindle to a search for rules of thumb. Or take these paragraphs near the end of the book,

The image makers were subject to the same vicissitudes as other citizens. Prosperity and a sovereign's favor encouraged them; war and famine threatened their very lives. Yet the prosperity of the golden age did not turn all craftsmen into good artists; the appalling conditions that followed did not completely destroy the tradition of greatness; and the small production that rose later on out of adversity in Lân Nâ was rather better in quality than the huge production that rose from prosperity in Lân Chang.

The craftsman of almost any period, I believe, was capable of doing far finer work than he did when left to his own devices; if the patron was indifferent, the best craftsman was liable to fall into banalities. But a patron who took a personal interest and a craftsman of talent were like two facets of a single artist's nature.

How far this outlook takes us beyond the lesser problems of style, iconography, and chronology that loom so large in most writings on matters of art and history! To get to the bottom of many of the perplexing problems that beset the student who would investigate the making of religious images in Asia, a look at the man himself is essential. That look Mr. Griswold has given us. The theory he advances is beguiling, and it may prove to be sound as well. The fact that certain lacunae remain to be filled, as pointed out by LeMay, and that Siamese literary sources by their very nature leave much to be desired as shown in this review simply mean that there is more work to be done, and Mr. Griswold's book will have served a double purpose if by its exposition of these matters it attracts further interest and more scholars into this little-worked field.

The volume concludes with an appendix showing some 180 line drawings of details (hands, feet, ears, robe flaps, etc.) which form part of the material for his analytical method. The Catalogue of dated images (pp. 79–97) gives all the data on the 108 images used in the study; and 81 of them are illustrated (many in two views) on the 56 halftone plates and the frontispiece. Twelve text figures in halftone illustrate related material. The romanization of names deserves mention because the author has kept to the classical Sanskrit and Pâli names instead of using the Tai reading to which most readers have become accustomed. Thus, for example, he gives Nagara Pathama for the more familiar Nakorn Pathom, Bishnuloka for Pitsanulok, Svaragaloka for the well-known pottery town of Sawankhalok, etc., and minor variants in other names are easily read. The only really serious shortcoming of this book as a tool for scholarship is that it lacks an index.

John Alexander Pope
IN MEMORIAM

ALFRED SALMONY

With the passing of Alfred Salmony a vacuum has been left in the academic world of America which nobody is likely to fill again. I am not speaking of our late colleague as a creative scholar, of his exploratory journeys, of his influence as an inspiring teacher, or his ingenious direction of Artibus Asiae. All that has been adduced in the obituary already dedicated to his memory. It is Alfred Salmony's humanity of which I wish to say a few words, if ever words are competent to evoke the image of a man who had lived so human and so courageous a life.

To understand his personality, cosmopolitan when he knew him last, one has to go back to his early years in the once sovereign city of Cologne, the atmosphere of which may still be sensed in Turner's painting at the Frick collection. He was fond of his city and its folks whose patois he spoke so well, its sound ever imbeded with an overtone of roguish laughter. In Salmony's youth, Cologne was a hotbed of sprouting Dadaism, not far from the Paris of Ubu Roi, the city not only of the visionary Wilhelm Worringer but of various Owlglass characters in the great style. In such surroundings his mind was formed, while the barges of the Rhine, "dont l'humeur est vagabonde," are symbolic of his lifelong odyssey.

After the first World War, for him an absurd adventure in spurred boots, came his escape into the arts of Further Asia. Almost a year with Alfred Salmony in Peking remains an unforgettable experience. The glittering and yet recondite world of the stage, then still restrained in mythic bondage, soon threw its spell on him, while the drama of the Yung-ho Kung and of the crumbling monasteries was to him as fascinating as a spicy dinner with Lama Pai. I still see, a living "collage," the weird old priest in his gorgeous robes arm-in-arm with Alfred before the temple gate.

But it was in the treasure-troves of Liu-li Ch'ang that he found what he wanted, where his bronze and jade adventures were excessive. They usually terminated in the chiaroscurio of the venerable Huang Po-ch'uan's backyard where we would be entertained for hours with the great magician's experiences and tales. Yet never did we find out if he actually was able to sense the authenticity of a carved nephrite through the back of his head.

Twenty years later I saw Alfred Salmony again, at Honolulu, when he was on his way to Korea. The conversation continued exactly where it had been interrupted in Peking two decades earlier, as if nothing had happened. Yes, as a friend he was as faithful as Damon, and as a gentleman as generous as Amphitryon. The talk he gave us at Honolulu was the beginning of his Antler and Tongue, and then, as ever since Cologne, much of his tongue was in his cheek.

It is impossible to characterize him, as he himself would conjure a personality with a bon mot of two words. There were elements in him both of Faust and of Mephistopheles, of Rousseau as well as of Voltaire, while under the cover of the acid jester there throbbed a devoted heart. His love, however, was glowing for pristine art alone. Perhaps Max Ernst had somebody like his old friend Alfred Salmony in mind, when he wrote in his Histoire Naturelle:

Ne craignons pas de tomber dans l'enfance de l'art. Ne dérangeons pas ces aveugles qui la nuit dansent sur les toits de nos villes et campagnes. Plus amoureux de la vie que vivants, ils ne cherchent qu'à vivre, ils ne cherchent pas à voir. Saluons les mers qui se lèvent, les lunes aussi.

Gustav Ecke
LEO A. MAYER

Leo Aryeh Mayer was born in Stanislauw (Galicia) on January 12, 1895, and died at Jerusalem on April 6, 1959. In him, Studies in Islamic Art and Archaeology have lost one of the most universally respected and best known of their exponents. Few—even those who met him frequently and enjoyed his friendship—can claim that they have known him intimately. Gentle and considerate, tolerant and understanding, he was always available to those who sought his advice, but he did not encourage familiarity. Because of his retiring, almost secretive nature only the barest details of biographical interest are known. It is in his work that we must seek the man.

Mayer studied at the Universities of Lausanne, Vienna, and Berlin, and received a Ph.D. degree at Vienna for an unpublished thesis on town planning in Islam in 1917. A convinced and staunch Zionist, he emigrated to Palestine in 1921. His first appointment there was as Inspector in the Department of Antiquities of the Government of Palestine under British Mandate and he was soon promoted to be Librarian of the Department.

When the Hebrew University was founded at Jerusalem in 1929, he was first appointed Lecturer in Islamic Art and Archaeology and became the first Sir David Sassoon Professor of Near Eastern Art and Archaeology in 1932. He took an active part in the administrative work of the University and served terms as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and as Rector (1943–45). While unwavering in his strong Zionist convictions, Mayer had from the start supported all moves for an entente with the Arabs and counted many of them among his friends.

But for a few exceptions, all Mayer's published work is concerned with Islamic subjects. It is, however, for his outstanding contributions in the fields of Islamic heraldry, epigraphy, and numismatics, that he is likely to be best remembered.

His Saracenic heraldry (Oxford, 1933) remains the only authoritative work on the subject. He himself made the most important additions to it in his New material for Mamluk heraldry (Jerusalem, 1937) and in a number of articles in Ars Islamica (1936–37), Syria (1937), and other periodicals.

His longer contributions to Arabic epigraphy appeared in the Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine and in the Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society but many of his first readings are scattered over the 15 volumes of the Répertoire Chronologique d'Epigraphie Arabe which have appeared, and others will be included in future volumes. During the war years, which prevented him from traveling abroad, he worked on a companion volume to his Saracenic heraldry which he intended to call Saracenic costume, and part of this work appeared in an abbreviated form under the title Mamluk costume in 1952. In it he tried to relate the descriptions in texts with miniatures, metal works, and textiles. He had an eye for, and a tender affection for, all realia, a tendency in which we may recognize some of the influence of his teacher, J. von Karabacek.

Apart from several articles on Islamic coins, Mayer also compiled a valuable Bibliography of Islamic numismatics, which was first published by the Royal Asiatic Society in 1939 and later revised and enlarged by him for a second edition, which contains explanatory notes for each item, in 1954.

The last years of Mayer's life were devoted to the compilation of a corpus of Islamic craftsmen. For the sake of this huge undertaking he traveled extensively, and single-mindedly gave the project priority over all his other interests. He first expounded the plan for a series of monographs on this subject at the XXIInd International Congress of Ori-
entalists held at Istanbul in 1951. The first volume on Islamic architects and their works appeared in 1956 and was followed in the same year by a volume on Islamic astrologists. A list of glassmakers, of whom only few names are known, was published as an article in the Israel Exploration Journal, 1954, and the volume on Islamic woodcarvers appeared in 1958. He was able to read the proofs of the volume on Islamic metal workers and their works, but alas, it appeared after his death, as did also a slender volume entitled L'Art juif en terre de l'Islam, 1959, a subject to which he intended to devote more of his time.

All Mayer's publications are provided with extensive and exhaustive bibliographies. He paid the utmost attention to detail and would often undertake a long journey for the express purpose of checking a single inscription. He was always most punctilious in acknowledging any help he might be given, no matter how trifling it might be. His interest in bibliography also found expression in the edition of the, unfortunately, short-lived Annual bibliography of Islamic art and archaeology (1935-37) which was interrupted by the outbreak of World War II. For this work he had enlisted the cooperation of a great number of scholars in many lands and laid the basis for international collaboration in this field.

Despite his frequent visits abroad, Mayer considered Jerusalem his only home and insisted on returning there when he realized that his recovery from his last illness, which overtook him in Switzerland, afforded him only brief relief. In him the Hebrew University has lost an outstanding scholar, and our studies, so thinly represented, an active and devoted exponent. He was primarily concerned with the production of handbooks which others will quote. His is a lasting and solid contribution.

Among Mayer's many distinctions was the award made to him by the British Government of the O.B.E. He was a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London since 1934 and of the Royal Asiatic Society since 1935, as well as Honorary President of the Israel Exploration Society.

Those who have been privileged to count themselves among his friends will remember him also as the perfect guest and the perfect host, which he was. Mayer was a man of method and of firmly established habits. He always stayed at the same hotels; nearly always as near as possible to the national museums and libraries in all the capital cities of the world; frequented the same restaurants; rarely trusted the post offices to deliver mail unless it was registered. The absence from our mail of his concise matter-of-fact letters written in a beautifully calligraphic hand, the courteous and informative comments on our own work, the absence from our museums of his bearded patriarchal figure, which used to appear with such regularity each year, will long be missed by all those who knew him and were devoted to him.

D. S. Rice
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