TOWARD THE ANALYSIS OF THE EARLY MONUMENTAL
QUR‘ANIC SCRIPTS: ATTRIBUTION OF THE QUR‘ANIC FOLIOS
FROM THE ARCHIVE OF E. E. HERZFELD
(DEPARTMENT OF ISLAMIC ART, METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART)*

The two parallel tendencies in the development of early Arabic writing point out impossibility of transformation of the cursive script from the monumental. On the contrary, pre-cursive and pre-monumental had many features in common, including the shapes of certain letters and horizontality. Fragments from Ernst Emil Herzfeld's Archive (Department of Islamic Art, The Metropolitan Museum of Art) represent several types of early Qur‘anic scripts, from cursive archaic (on fol. 7, figs. 13, 14, 21) to a distinctive form of monumental kufi or the proportional kufi (on fol. 5, 6, 17, 11, 12, 20ab). The parchment has no watermarks, but almost all of the folios contain the supporting lines. Pages are in a horizontal format with some pages having the diacritical marks and all of them having vocalization. Special order, proportion of letters and, especially, of words, use of nuqūf (a calligraphic technique which stretched horizontal elements of the letters), number of lines per page (there is usually no such limit for cursive) are the main attributes of a particular style of writing and help distinguish monumental kufi from cursive kufi. A new classification of kufi based on a composite list of terms and interpretations of early Arabic scripts is proposed. Formation of calligraphic, specifically of the Qur‘anic, writing canon can be observed from our study of non-illuminated manuscripts.

Ernst Emil Herzfeld (1879—1948) was among the most famous archaeologists and scholars of Near Eastern and Islamic art in the first half of the 20th century. In 1943, The Metropolitan Museum of Art acquired a collection of notes, sketches and travel diaries which contained watercolours, pencil drawings, architectural plans and photographs of the places Herzfeld had visited and worked at. Significant portion of the archive came from the excavations in Samarra, an interim capital of the ‘Abbāsid caliphs, which excavation Herzfeld supervised from 1911 through 1913.

In summer and fall of 2001, I had an internship with the Metropolitan Museum of Art. During our work with the Samarra portion of Herzfeld’s archive, between the pages of one of his albums, my colleague Francesca Leoni (currently a post-doctoral fellow at Rice University, Department of Art History) discovered seven separate folios from the early Qur‘an. These pages needed attribution and since part of my internship with the MET had been spent attributing non-illuminated manuscripts from the Qur‘anic collection of the Islamic Department, these seven folios drew my attention. All of them are fragments from different manuscripts belonging to the earliest stages in the development of Arabic calligraphy, with a preliminary dating in the 9th century AD.

Each folio is an example of early Arabic script with observable variations in the style of writing and in size. While the fragments contain no illuminations, such possibility cannot be excluded as we do not have access to the complete set. In addition, there are no πaʾs in qur’ān headings (no any fragment starts from the beginning of a chapter) in the fragments which could be filled with ornaments at a later stage. For this reason, information gleaned from the fragments may be important for the study of the kufi script in the context of the Early ‘Abbāsid writing tradition.

The writing material for all seven fragments is parchment. Also a portion of a paper Qur‘ān, an example of later calligraphy from the 10th century AD was discovered in the archive. In this paper I will not touch on these ten unbound pages from a leather container. The seven fragments that are a subject of my current research are all examples of an archaic script. All folios are in a horizontal format, which points to an early stage of production. An immediate problem was how to identify the
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The term kufi, despite the fact that it is widely used by the scholars writing on Arabic calligraphy, is far from being totally clear. There are various theories as to how this script originated. Questions about the first calligraphic script and about where and how the Arabic calligraphy got started have been answered in the opposing ways. Likewise, there exist numerous definitions for the script called “early archaic.” The proposed explanations for this script remain hypothetical. For quite some time scholars argued that kufi was the first Arabic script from which all later styles of calligraphy developed, both monumental and cursive ones, but in reality the two tendencies developed in parallel and independently from one another. It is now an undisputed fact that there could be no transformation from monumental kufi into cursive. There is, however, more than one definition for the “monumental script” as well, and on the basis of my analysis of the manuscripts in the Herzfeld Archive one can argue that cursive and monumental did not differ initially. In other words, “pre-cursive” and “pre-monumental” were similar.

An attempt to get to the origins of the term kufi while staying exclusively within the Arabic sources ends up for a scholar in a complete disorientation. “Monumental,” for example, is often the term to describe a style or a script that was used solely on hard surfaces, like metal and stone, with an important role assigned to size, value, quality and the sacred function of the inscribed object; as a role, these were architectural monuments, mosques, steles, but also coins. In this context, monumental kufi is contrasted with the kufi from the papry (silk material), whereas the script scripts of the Qur’an are claimed to fall somewhere in the middle. Besides, “the cursive” and “the monumental” were often combined in numismatics. One thing is clear, however, namely that the monumental style is supposed to be angular and static in character, whereas cursive, because it was used for continuous handwriting, tends to have ligatures and rounded forms and was better suited for common usage. So, could kufi be both monumental and cursive? Taking kufi as a generic term to describe early archaic scripts, can one speak of an original canon at the time of the codification of the Sacred Text, a canon which served as a guiding tool for the calligraphers in their copying of the Qur’an (if only it), or no such unity of style existed until some later stage? From which point in time can one speak about a tradition forming, and how fixed were the boundaries of that canon?

When studying the history of the Arabic writing and the period of the emergence of calligraphy, one needs to go into both the Islamic and the European sources. Ibn al-Nadim mentions the first four original writing systems: makti, macani, bahr and kufi, with the names taken from geographic locales in Makka, al-Madinah, Baqra and Kufa [1]. One may note the distinctive traits of makti, such as: alif bend to the right at the lower end; extended vertical strokes in the letters alif (l), lam (l) and lamed-alif (v); high verticals in haa (h) and kaf (k); and an overall slight tilting of the script to the right. The makti script exists in three variations, one of which (madani) is characterized by the round loops in the letters waw (w), fa’ (f), qaf (q), mim (m), nun (n), ghain (g) and the final form of haa (h). Confusion begins when one comes to the kufi script. Quoting from their Arabic sources, scholars like Aida S. Arif [2] speak about a synthetic “early monumental script”, the lama-kufi script. Among, its characteristics are the following: heaviness, short bold lines, angular forms and similarities with the square script. One finds here a distinctive feature which helps identify specifically the kufi script (what the Arabs themselves meant by kufi), namely the slant and the extended vertical strokes of the makkhi and the short verticals of the kufi. These were the main features by which the scripts were distinguished from one another.

In his classification of kufi, Grohmann lists eight modifications: (i) plane or primitive kufi; (ii) kufi with elaborated apices; (iii) foliated kufi; (iv) torqued kufi; (v) plated or interlaced kufi; (vi) bordered kufi; (vii) architectural kufi; (viii) rectangular kufi [3]. Such types of kufi were dispersed over time to some degree. For our study of the Qur’anic folios from the Herzfeld’s Archive of prime interest is, of course, the first type, the “plane” or “primitive” kufi, which illustrates the beginning stage in the development of calligraphy. There is no clarification in Grohmann, however, as to whether any modifications of this type existed. With time, the term kufi script narrowed down to refer specifically the script of the Qur’an. But as far as the early stage (the 1st century AH), no parchment with an unambiguous dating to this time period has survived. This is why, in order to fill in the gaps, Naba Abbott refers to two scripts that were used on the papyri texts in the 1st century AH [4]. The first one (for taking the protocols) is similar to the Qur’anic kufi in that it is also heavy and bold, whereas the second script (for documents) exhibits features of the cursive. The protocol style is characterized by short and almost completely straight verticals. Karabauck defines it as “lapidary kufi” [5], while Grohmann speaks about its similarity to the Qur’anic script. It is obvious that “the Qur’anic script” mentioned here is the same as “the monumental”, but how are we to explain that what one finds in such early manuscripts is in fact “cursive”? Abbott argues that during the early stage in the development of the Arabic writing the script for the protocols, inscriptions and the Qur’ans was of “early monumental lama-kufi type”, which is to be distinguished from the slanted Makkian, makkhi — but makkhi was also widely used in the copying of the Qur’an, as Abbott emphasizes, only these two script are, have survived until nowadays. Even so, one finds two more names in
the scholarly literature on the subject. These were not two independent scripts but rather two distinct writing techniques: māʾil and makhāʾ. Both techniques could be employed while copying the Qurʾān in the kāfīf and the makkī scripts, but there is not enough data to argue this with certainty at this point. Nevertheless, Karaback claims that māʾil developed out of makkī script and dates this to the 2nd century AH. As for makhāʾ, it is often perceived as a fast style of writing, basically a short-hand. At the same time, one finds a definition of makhāʾ as a uniquely Qurʾānic style. Since “Qurʾānic” means sacred, combination with short-hand looks improbable. Was such a combination possible for the calligraphers and the copyists of the Qurʾān in the 1st century AH? Another definition of makhāʾ calls it “a technique of letter elongation” which was used to make writing less heavy. It was a hallmark of the monumental script, in other words. This definition once again underscores an idea that technique and style in calligraphy cannot be the same thing. The conclusion is that one could employ makhāʾ also in kāfīf.

Based on the studies just mentioned, one may speak about a gradual evolution of the “monumental script” better known as kāfīf, implying that this label applies not only to the “lapidary kāfīf” Aida S. Arif is so vague about (following in this the tradition started by Karaback), but first and foremost to the examples of the early Qurʾānic calligraphy. The scope of such research is vast, but when narrowed down to specific topics and issues, one can solve the problem of the early calligraphy which over time formed a tradition characterized by a distinctive canon (this process took at least two centuries and was particularly under way by the end of 8th — beginning of 9th century AD). This problem is the problem of classification of early Arabic scripts in the early Arabic/Qurʾānic writing. Calligraphy emerged as an “inner-Qurʾānic” phenomenon which added to the text an outward sacred dimension, so one should include in this discussion not only “the monumental” but also “the curvilinear” script. Early period is represented by the Unayzah and the ‘Abbādīs caliphat; the Arabic calligraphy had formed within this same time-frame as a distinctive artistic phenomenon. The easiest way to go about a list of calligraphy’s distinctive features, its implicit set of rules and a canon of its artistic tradition, will be to study illuminated Qurʾāns with their ornamental stīrā headings. Event so, the formation of such written canon of the “monumental Qurʾāns” one can best observe from non-illuminated manuscripts, because the illuminated ones and their ornaments represent a later reduction. For this very reason the problem of ornaments will remain outside the scope of the present study.

Classification of Early Scripts

Monumental and cursive types of sacred writing

(i) “Archaic” or “profane” type (8th—9th centuries AD).
(ii) “Monumental proto-kāfīf,” script or typical Qurʾānic kāfīf (8th—9th centuries AD). In other words, this is the “proportional” kāfīf whose inclusion into the

Comparison of the definitions used by different scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Nadim</td>
<td>“In makkī and mabdī alifā curve to the right. They have elongated lines, one form is slightly slanted.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Déroche [5]</td>
<td>Makkī and mabdī were used in these cities even before Islam, probably for purely utilitarian purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aida S. Arif</td>
<td>Early monumental script: kāfīf-ṣaḥīḥ (similarity to block script: heavy, short lines) and makkī (slitted lines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grohmann</td>
<td>(1) plane or primitive kāfīf; (2) kāfīf with elaborated spicules; (3) foliated kāfīf; (4) fortesled kāfīf; (5) plated or interlaced kāfīf; (6) bendered kāfīf; (7) architectural kāfīf; (8) rectangular kāfīf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modifications of the “simple” or “primitive” kāfīf

Abbott

- Styles in the 1st century AH:
  1) protocol style (similar to Qurʾānic with monumental features, short vertical lines) — early monumental kāfīf-ṣaḥīḥ, lapidary kāfīf

Karaback

1) cursive for the documents
   also, to copy the Qurʾān was used 2) italic makkī
   Māʾil as a further development of makkī
   Makhāʾ — short-hand technique or a “technique of letter-elongation” used in monumental kāfīf

Abbott, Déroche

Hijāʾ script as an umbrella term for makkī and mabdī scripts used in 1 and 2 centuries AH. Inscriptions on the
Having studied the Qur’anic manuscripts from the Nasser D. Khalili Collection, François Déroche came to several conclusions: in 7th century AD copying of the Qur’an was done in hijā‘ī script which was in use until 8th century because it had acquired a high standing as the script coming out from the earliest period of Islamic history. In other words, sacred quality of this script had to do with history. Letter forms which one finds in some very early examples vary from one fragment to another. It is unclear, however, whether this resulted from variations in the local and regional practices (of Makka and Madina, for instance), or rather from the variations in the individual style of a particular copyist.

The repertory of graphic forms found in this early manuscript material underwent a gradual process of standardization... This process eventually produced the Early Abbasid scripts, but some Qur’anic material after the 7th century combines elements from both the hijā‘ī and from the Early Abbasid traditions. It may be that some calligraphers who were working within the later tradition were influenced by the prestige of the earlier hijā‘ī script and incorporated some of its characteristic features, such as slant, into their work. Orthography of the hijā‘ī manuscripts was also subject to considerable variation [9].

Déroche concludes that the manuscripts which he classifies as hijā‘ī have not been studied with sufficient detail in order to draw a picture of the development of Arabic scripts in 7th — beginning of 8th century AD. Historic significance of the hijā‘ī script or scripts (Déroche’s four styles) was

obscured by the triumph of the Early Abbasid styles to such an extent that none of the Qur’âns attributed to the subsequent centuries to ‘Ali or ‘Uthmân were by their band; its importance is nevertheless demonstrated by the survival into the 8th century of some of its authorities [10].

Exact relationship between the hijā‘ī script and the early ‘Abbasid scripts used in the Qur’âns done in the vertical format remains unclear. Déroche proceeds from his purely geographic considerations and in effect defines hijā‘ī putting aside common characteristics among the scripts, because in his examples of the four styles differences are quite clear. It is therefore quite impossible to talk about a canon during the early stage of Islamic history and even less so about any further development of the monumental script from the hijā‘ī.

Efrîn Rezvân opines:

Up until the middle and perhaps the end of 8th century, there was a parallel development between two types of Qur’anic copy-making that were marked by inner evolution and mutual influence. These were linked genetically to two cultures and two political centres of Arabia that looked respectively to Syria and Mesopotamia (vertical format = the hijā‘ī script; horizontal format = the kîfî script) [11].

Conclusion

a) Archaic sacred type: (i) hijā‘ī, (ii) makkî, and (iii) jasm.

b) Qur’anic kîfî — proto-kîfî or proportional “distinctive” kîfî and “cursive” kîfî.

The main feature of the monumental script is prevailing horizontality. Also, letters often have no ligatures, whereas writing is static in character and can be large in size.

More specifically about the “archaic” type (a). One should distinguish here three scripts which are not monumental in the strict sense of the word, but can still be called so since they were all used in the copying of the Qur’an and were therefore “sacred”. (i) The first script in this group should not be called pre-kîfî because scripts were developing simultaneously; Déroche proposed to call it the hijā‘ī script. (ii) Makkî. (iii) Jasm. Besides these three scripts, there were also their variations. “Archaic” script is often called kîfî because the latter term referred initially to all examples of early Arabic writing and the classification systems were built following the time-line while paying no attention to the artistic qualities and / or the geographic locale. Differences between kîfî and the “archaic” script are nevertheless obvious. To begin with, “archaic” scripts feature more “cursive”, vertical lines in them often slant to the right; such manuscripts often have no illuminations, variations in certain letters follow no distinctive pattern; dominant role in this script belongs to the vertical. Canon is absent, or, following Val. V. Polosin, proportions are not set.

Despite parallel usage of archaic scripts in the Qur’anic manuscripts, it was specifically the proto-kîfî script that acquired the sacred status (see attributions below featuring “the distinctly monumental kîfî”). This script was analogous to the “first system of writing”, which in the ensuing period experienced influence from local traditions and developed new forms. An example of this tradition is calligraphy of the Mughrīb in Africa and the luxuriant Eastern kîfî.

Analysis of the Fragments

In the early kîfî Qur’âns, diacritics is usually represented by slanted strokes. Different ink colours were used to distinguish diacritics from vocalization markings: predominantly black and brown in the case of diacritics, and red, yellow and green in the case of vocalizations. The end of āyâ was marked by slashes or by letter ḥâ’ (‘), because its numerical value, following the ʿālîyâ, was five. Early manuscripts did not include any sūârâ headings or the number of āyâs.

Fragments discovered in the Herzfeld Archive represent several early Qur’anic scripts: from the type of “cursive archaic” to “distinctly monumental kîfî” or the “proportional” kîfî.
Comparative Analysis of the Qur'anic Folios

In all the examples below except fol. 7, monumental character of a letter unit stands out. This makes letters look as self-sufficient as words. Gaps can be observed in almost all of the folios; they are distributed evenly between the letter units and between words; 'majkal' is present. There is no illumination; supporting lines are used; vocalizations and diacritical marks are present in the majority of instances. Parchment has no water-marks.

All evidence points to simultaneous production of folios, although there is also evidence for the classical distinctly monumental kufi already formed. In favour of the hypothesis advanced here (namely, that in the early period of Islamic culture the kufic script could be both monumental and cursive and that the word kufi is an umbrella term for early archaic scripts) speak similar shapes of letters (including the cursive script on fol. 7) and also the "distinctly widely-spaced writing" (in the earliest kufi 'inscriptions') [12].

The cursive and the monumental quality of the kufic script has the following attributes: size, format and the number of lines on a page (this number is more exact for the monumental script, while in the Qur'ans featuring "the distinctly monumental kufic" the number ranged from 4—5 to 6—7 lines per page; no strict limit existed in cursive Qur'ans); the set ratio between the horizontal and the vertical; 'majkal'.

Notes
5. J. von Karabacek, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Magaditen (Leipzig, 1874).
6. Ibid.
9. Ibid., p. 29.
10. Ibid.

Illustrations
All the fragments do not have call numbers, common features: horizontal format, non-illuminated, no water-marks, brown ink.

Fig. 1. Fol. 1r. 41:55—43. 9th century AD. Parchment, 15 x 10.2 cm (text area: 13 x 8.7 cm). No leaing; 16 lines per page; margins from all sides. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Courtesy of the Museum.
Fig. 2. Fol. 1v. 41:27—35.
Fig. 3. Fol. 2r. 43:53—62. 9th century AD. Parchment, original size can not be determined (text area: 10.5 x 16.5 cm). Leaiing; 15 lines per page; margins originally possibly were made, but the page was cut; diacritics is marked with brown ink, vocalization — with red dots. Possibly this folio belongs to the same manuscript as the folio from Nasser D. Khalili Collection KFO 29 (Fr. Deroche, The 'Abbasid Tradition: Qur'ans of the 8th to the 10th Centuries AD, The N. D. Khalili collection of Islamic art, ed. Julian Raby, 1 (London, 1992) (pp. 82—83)). According to the classification of F. Deroche (ibid.), this script belongs to the group A.II or 1.1. — "early-'Abbasid" or proto-kufi. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Courtesy of the Museum.
Fig. 4. Fol. 2v. 41:46—53.
Fig. 5. Fol. 3r. 42:16. 9th century AD. Parchment, 16.8 x 10.4 cm (text area: 15.6 x 9.5 cm). Leaiing; 7 lines per page; margins originally possibly were made, but the page was cut; no diacritics, vocalization is marked with red and green ink. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Courtesy of the Museum.
Fig. 6. Fol. 3v. 42:16—18.
This work is a continuation of an article published by the author in *Manuscripta Orientalia* [1]. In the previous article, the main attention was given to Buddhist bronze sculpture of the Dolnom style held at MAH, and Kalmyk thangkas were only described briefly. Now we will examine the main features of the style and iconography of Kalmyk Buddhist paintings stored at the Kunstkamera museum.

Kalmyks is the name adopted in the first decades of the 17th century by those Orats who migrated from Central Asia to the territory between the Volga and the Don Rivers in the southeast European part of Russia [2]. The wide spread of Buddhism among Orats is connected with the work of the Buddhist monk Zaya Pandit, who came to the Orats in 1639 [3]. Interacting with other peoples and preserving their religion, the Kalmyks created a unique and vivid culture, which is shown in its full force in architecture [4] and painting.

The Western Asian section of the Kunstkamera museum contains several collections on the material and religious culture of the Kalmyks. The present work will present only ten samples of Buddhist art from the Kalmyk collection Nos. 807, 988, 1157 and 5528.

There are few works about the Buddhist art of Kalmyks. Kalmyk exhibits in Petersburg museums are also few in number. For example, there are only two Kalmyk thangkas held at the Hermitage, and none at all at the huge collection of the Russian Ethnographic Museum. This situation can only be explained by the fact that the proximity of Kalmykia, and the theoretical possibility of easy access to the material, inspired researchers and collectors to concentrate on remote regions of Mongolia and Tibet, leaving Kalmykia "for later". So the examples of Kalmyk Buddhist art held at the Kunstkamera make for a very interesting study, both for Kalmyk art and for Buddhist art in general.

Among the works on the Buddhist art of the Kalmyks, we should note the works by S. G. Batyrev on old Kalmyk art, which are the most complete works on Kalmyk art at present [5]. S. G. Batyrev, examining various forms of Kalmyk art (painting, sculpture, architecture), notes the most obvious characteristic features of Kalmyk thangkas, but the Kalmyk style as an original phenomenon in Buddhist art is not clearly defined. This work is an attempt to continue S. G. Batyrev’s work, and outline the characteristic features of the Kalmyk style on the example of the small but interesting collection of MAE RAS. The work also aims to put examples of Kalmyk Buddhist art from the Kunstkamera collections into scholarly circulation.

**History of Collections Received by the Kunstkamera**

A list of Kalmyk collections held at MAE RAS was published by V. N. Ksidakov [6]. Therefore, we will concentrate on information about collections which we believe are sufficiently important and which are absent from V. N. Ksidakov’s article.

(i) Collection No. 807 was received by the Museum in 1904 from M. A. Elachich. The location is given as Astrakhan.
(ii) Collection No. 1157 was received by the museum in 1907 from N. N. Kandib. The location is given as Astrakhan as well.
(iii) Collection No. 988 was received in 1906 from Dzhungortsev through A. D. Rudněv.
(iv) Collection No. 5528 has the most interesting story of origin. The description states that this collection was received in 1937 from D. Naumov from Saratov through Professor Alexy. The location is given as "Kalmyk Oblast!", the people as Kalmyks. Two notes are attached to the description. The contents of these notes are so interesting that we would like to reproduce them in full:

One Saratov artist gave me six Buddhist drawings and said that to understand this style, he was given these "icons" ten years ago by a professor whose name he had forgotten, while the professor soon disappeared and did not return. He was tall, thin, elderly and was connected with the local University. On 9 January 1937, I took these "icons" to be given to the USSR Academy of Sciences through Professor N. M. Talalkov [7].
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