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AN EARLY AL-ŠŪFĪ MANUSCRIPT IN THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY IN OXFORD

A STUDY IN ISLAMIC CONSTELLATION IMAGES*

BY EMMY WELLESZ

THE MANUSCRIPT

The Bodleian Library in Oxford contains a manuscript (Marsh 144) of "The Book of the Fixed Stars" (Šuwar al-Kawākib al-Thābitah), by the famous Arab astronomer 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Umar al-Šūfī. It has 419 pages; pages 252–269 have been misplaced and should be inserted between pages 211 and 212. From page 405 onward the manuscript shows more or less drastic repairs: the original upper parts of the last pages are altogether missing and have been rewritten and replaced at a later date. The binding, in red morocco with a flyleaf, was done at a late date and rather carelessly, so that the inner margins of the pages are wider at the bottom than at the top. The edges have been cut to such an extent

that quite a number of drawings are slightly mutilated. A few pages are wider than the others and have had to be folded back to match the average size of 26.3 cm.: 18.2 cm. The figures are drawn in black ink throughout, except for the first three, in which the inside drawing is done with a brownish wash. Most figures show signs of tracing; sometimes, however, the actual contours are at variance with the traced lines. The stars, on the other hand, conform exactly with the more or less punched marks which indicate their position. Those stars that form the constellations are red, their numbers are inscribed in black, and the most important ones have their names added. The stars outside the constellations are black, most of them with red numbers.

The last page includes a fragment of what seems to be the original colophon, with the usual words of praise to God and His Prophet and the statement that the book was written and illustrated by al-Ḥusayn b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Umar b. Muḥammad in the year 400 A.H./A.D. 1009–10 (fig. 35). In the margin and at the bottom we find a Latin inscription written in Constantinople in 1644 by Christianus Ravius, saying that he supplied

* I should like to express my sincerest thanks to the Warburg Institute which allowed me to use their vast photographic material and generously supplied me with most of the photographs published for the first time in the present article; to Dr. D. S. Rice, London University, who furnished much information and who also kindly provided me with photographs as yet unpublished; to the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, Washington, D. C.; to the Bodleian Library and to the History of Science Museum, Oxford; also to Professor A. F. L. Beeston and Dr. Otto Paecht, Oxford University; to Professor Richard Ettinghausen, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C.; to Professor Oleg Grabar, University of Michigan; to Mr. R. H. Pinder-Wilson, British Museum; and to Mr. Marcel Destombes, Paris, all of whom helped me in many ways.


2 An Urjūzah on the fixed stars was attributed to a son of al-Šūfī bearing that name. A different view is taken by C. Brockelmann, Ges. d. Arab. Lit., Supplementsb. 1, p. 863.

3 The Keeper of Oriental Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Mr. Sainsbury, kindly drew my attention to the fact that Ravius (Christianus) is mentioned in the Catalogue of Arabic books in the British Museum, vol. 2, p. 507 (696.g.38).
the missing parts of the text after having compared it with a more recent copy of the same work.4

If the dating on the colophon proves correct, as most scholars agree, the Bodleian manuscript is not only the earliest known copy of al-Šûfî’s work, but with very few exceptions the earliest example of Islamic book illustration. The existence of the manuscript is widely known and its text, together with that of other manuscripts, has recently been used for an edition of al-Šûfî’s work;5 yet none of the drawings have been published. This is the more remarkable since, apart from their historical relevance, they are of considerable artistic merit.

AL-ŠÛFÎ AND THE TRADITION OF CONSTELLATION IMAGES

Al-Šûfî was born in Rayy in A.D. 903 and died in 986. He was one of the greatest Muslim astronomers, the friend and teacher of the Buyid sultan ‘Aḏud al-Dawlah to whom “The Book of the Fixed Stars,” his most important work, was dedicated.6 As he says, it

4 “Haec sunt rudera veteris scripturae quae supra complevimus. Christianus Ravius, Constantinopoli, 8. Januar, 1644. Contuli cum aliquo Exemplari M.S. 100 annorum, id quod singulas figuram saltem semel habuit et minus elegantus. Semperque hoc melius deprehendi recentiore illudque ad diem saltem habere potui die ut supra.” I am grateful to Dr. Hunt, Keeper of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library for having helped me in deciphering the handwriting.

5 Al-Kitāb Šuwār al-Kawākib, ed. Dr. M. Nizam’d-Din, with a contribution by Professor H. J. J. Winter, Hyderabad, Deccan, 1953.

6 A survey of other copies of al-Šûfî’s work, with references, is given by A. Hauber, Zur Verbreitung der Astronomen Sufi, Der Islam, vol. 8 (1918), p. 48 ff. Also J. Upton, A manuscript of the book of fixed stars by Abd Ar-Rahman As-Sufi, Metropolitan Museum Studies, vol. 4, No. 2 (1933), pp. 179–197. K. Holter, Die islamischen Miniaturhandschriften vor 1350, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, vol. 54 was actually the desire of this prince to know the fixed stars, their position within the figures and in relation to the Zodiac, which compelled him to write this book. He had convinced himself that many who pretended to be authorities on the subject could not be trusted, since their knowledge was not founded on personal observation and they blindly accepted the errors of their forerunners, relying on spheres which were worked by artists who were not astronomers and who followed books and tables which were not themselves entirely reliable.7 The works of the astronomers which al-Šûfî criticizes were, like his own, based on Ptolemy’s classical work, the Mathematike Syntaxis, commonly called the Almagest, which had been translated into Arabic as early as in the beginning of the ninth century.8

It was, as is well known, a natural process with primitive man to name certain outstanding groups of stars after familiar forms of human beings, animals, or inanimate objects. A further step consisted in identifying these


8 The earliest translator was the Jew Sahl al-Tabari. Another translation was made a little later (in 829), on the basis of a Syriac version, by al-Hajjâj ibn Yûsuf. Cf. G. Sarton, Introduction to the history of science, vol. 1, Baltimore, 1927, p. 545.
celestial configurations with mythological personages, even in linking them together into heavenly projections of mythological events. Astronomy as a science had begun with the Ionian philosophers. The first to compile a scholarly catalogue of the fixed stars was Hipparchos (active 161–126 B.C.). He also constructed the first celestial globe on record, though it is believed that other globes had existed before. His work was continued and brought into a definite form by Ptolemy about A.D. 138, and his catalogue of the fixed stars forms part VII, 5, and VIII, 1, of the Syntaxis.

It may be useful to give the names of the constellations in their original Greek as well as in the current latinized form, adding an English translation.

THE CONSTELLATIONS OF THE NORTHERN HEMISPHERE

Arktos mikra, Ursa minor, the lesser Bear.
Arktos megale, Ursa maior, the greater Bear.
Drakon, Draco, the Dragon.
Kepheus, Cepheus.
Bootes, Boötes, the Herdsman.
Stephanos boötes, Corona borealis, the Northern Crown.
Engonasin, Hercules.


Lyra, Lyra, the Lyre.
Ornis, Cygnus, the Swan.
Kassiopeia, Cassiopea.
Perseus.
Heniochos, Auriga, the Charioteer.
Ophiuchos, Ophiuchus, Serpentarius, the Bearer of the Serpent, with Ophi, Serpens, the Serpent.
Oistos, Sagitta, the Arrow.
Aetos, Aquila, the Eagle.
Delphis, Delphinus, the Dolphin.
Hippou protome, Equus minor, the lesser Horse.
Hippos, Pegasus.
Andromeda.
Trigono, Triangulum, the Triangle.

THE CONSTELLATIONS OF THE ZODIAC

Krios, Aries, the Ram.
Tauros, Taurus, the Bull.
Didymoi, Gemini, the Twins.
Karkinos, Cancer.
Leon, Leo, the Lion.
Parthenos, Virgo, the Virgin.
Xelai or Zygon.
Libra, the Balance.
Skorpios, Scorpius, the Scorpion.
Toxotes, Sagittarius, the Archer.
Aigokeros, Capricornus, the Kid.
Hydrochoos, Aquarius, the Water Pourer.
Ichthyes, Pisces, the Fishes.

THE CONSTELLATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE

Ketos, Cetus, the Whale.
Orion, Orion.
Potamos, Eridanus, the River.
Lagoos, Lepus, the Hare.
Kyon, Canis maior, the greater Dog.
Prokyon, Canis minor, the lesser Dog.
Argo, Argo navis, the Ship.
Hydros, Hydra.
Krater, Krater, the Cup.
Korax, Corvus, the Raven.
Kentauros, Centaurus, the Centaur, with Therion, Lupus, the Beast.
Thymiater, Ara, the Censer.
Stephanos notios, Corona Australis, the Southern Crown.
Ichthyes notios, Piscis Austrinus, the Southern Fish.

In his catalogue, Ptolemy indicates the position of each single star of a constellation.
according to its longitude and latitude and in its relation to the human figure, the animal or the inanimate object which is regarded as the image of the constellation. Ptolemy’s attitude toward these figures becomes obvious from his directions concerning the construction of a celestial globe. He says that its color should be likened to the darkness of the night, that the contours of the constellation pictures should not be too conspicuous, but that the stars should stand out in their own shining hue, in order to make it obvious to the eye that the figures are merely imaginary formations to act as an aile-mémoire to what exists in the heavens.

In connection with the catalogue he explains that he sometimes disagrees with his predecessors—as his predecessors disagreed with those who came before them—in indicating how the stars should be placed in the image, if by this he can make the contours more characteristic and more pleasing. This passage shows that a certain flexibility existed in regard to the iconography of the constellation images. It is believed that globes of the kind indicated by Ptolemy were in common use in his day, and that his own work was based on their figures. The globes also served to illustrate the Phainomena in which Aratos of Soli (c. 300 B.C.) had described the starry sky in poetic language and which remained of paramount influence throughout antiquity. As mentioned before, it is obvious from al-Süfi’s text that such ancient pictures of constellations, in books as well as on globes, must have been well known in the Arabic world and have been used by Arabs before al-Süfi’s time.

In his criticism of former scholars he makes special mention of a book by ’Uṯārid, written in the latter’s hand and containing the 48 constellation pictures. He also finds fault with a big sphere made by ‘Ali ibn ’Īsa al-Ḥarrānī, since its images reflected certain errors committed by the scribe of a particular manuscript of al-Ḥajjāj’s translation of the Almagest which he himself had consulted. ’Uṯārid is probably identical with the mathematician and astronomer ’Uṯārid ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥasib who flourished in the ninth century; al-Ḥarrānī obviously was the famous maker of astronomical instruments who is known to have worked in Baghdad and Damascus at about A.D. 830. Al-Süfi also speaks about several globes made by the Harranians, on which the names of the stars were inscribed according to Arab fashion.

In fact, in a Latin translation of an Arabic original, a celestial globe, made of silver, was attributed to al-Süfi himself, “ad usum Regis Adadhaldaulat.” It was on show about A.D. 1043 in the Public Library in Cairo, together with another globe, made of brass, which was attributed to Ptolemy, a fact which, as A. Hauber points out, clearly indicates the inti-

12 Book 8, chap. 3.
mate connection between classical and oriental astronomy.\textsuperscript{18}

Concerning the illustrations to his own text, al-Ṣūfī says: “We shall draw the figures which gave their names to the constellations on account of the likeness which was found between both, and we shall assign to the stars their right place within these figures, in order to represent what is seen in the sky.” Each figure appears twice, in symmetrically opposed drawings. For on globes, as al-Ṣūfī explains later on, they appear as seen from above, so that what should be their left side becomes their right side, and vice versa. “But in the sky,” he goes on, “we see the stars in their true position, because we look upwards from the centre of the globe . . . and it is for this reason that we have included both positions; for otherwise the beholder might be confused if he saw the figure on the globe differing from what he sees in the sky. If we want to see the constellations in their true state we must raise the page over our head and look at the second figure from underneath. We shall then see it conforming to what is found in the sky.”\textsuperscript{19}

In the main part of his book al-Ṣūfī treats each single constellation separately, giving a full description in which he adds his own very important observations to what he had learned from Ptolemy, and from the Anwā’, the system which had already been used by the Bedouin Arabs. He quotes and comments upon the Arabs’ stellar nomenclature which was infinitely richer than that of the Greeks;\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{18} Hauber, op. cit., p. 51 (Ibn al-Kifti, p. 440). The Latin translation (Bibl. Arabico-Hispana Escorialensis I, 417) states its weight as 3,000 drachmae. Drachmae with pseudo-Kufic inscriptions weighing 2.6 mm. were coined by the crusaders (Wörterbuch d. Münzkunde, Schröter). We may assume for the globe a weight of roughly 16-17 lbs.

\textsuperscript{19} Schjellerup, pp. 45-46.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. The Encyclopedia of Islam, new ed. (1957), article Anwā’ by Ch. Pellat.

for long before acquiring any knowledge of scientific astronomy the Arabs had become acute observers of the stars which were their only guides when during the hot season they had to travel by night. The description of each constellation is followed by a catalogue of its stars according to Ptolemy; but al-Ṣūfī changes the longitudes by 12° 42’, according to his estimation of the precession at the rate of one degree in the course of 66 solar years, and he gives his own estimate of the sizes of the stars, which is often at variance with that given by Ptolemy.\textsuperscript{21}

Little remains of those ancient constellation pictures which were the ultimate models of al-Ṣūfī’s figures. The most important constellation pictures surviving from antiquity are those on the famous “Atlas Farnese” in the Museum in Naples (fig. 1), a huge celestial globe supported by the kneeling figure of the Giant. The globe is believed to be a Roman copy dating from the Hadrianic Age of a Greek original.\textsuperscript{22} Though the Farnese globe undoubtedly has its scientific aspect, it is not designed primarily for scholarly purposes, as the one described by Ptolemy, but must primarily be regarded as a work of art. The figures stand out in relief, their positions approximately indicated by lines of latitude and longitude; there are no stars, but they may have been applied in paint and become invisible. Generally the figures are seen from the back,


\textsuperscript{22} According to Thiele (pp. 27-45, fig. 5, pls. 2-6) it ultimately was derived from a globe made by Hipparchos, a view accepted by other scholars only in the wider sense that all later work was influenced by Hipparchos. Cf. F. Boll, Beiträge zur Gesch. d. griechischen Astrologie u. Astronomie, Sitzungsber. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss., philol. u. hist. Kl., 1899, vol. 1, p. 120.
as indeed they should be, since they are visualized by the astronomer as being suspended in the air, facing the earth. Nevertheless, the artist aims at showing their faces, so that some of them appear in rather twisted positions.23

Another class of classical constellation pictures was found in manuscripts. They ultimately rest on the Phainomena by Aratos of Soli which were mentioned before, and survive in many medieval copies, containing commentaries and translations by Latin writers. The earliest date only from the ninth century A.D., but some of them are closely connected with their classical or postclassical prototypes. The Codex Vossianus in Leiden, a manuscript illustrated by framed paintings of the constellation figures, which have been fully reproduced by Thiele, seems to be a fairly accurate copy of a fourth-century original.24 Another manuscript showing very marked classical features is the fragmentary Aratos translation by Cicero in the British Museum (Harley 647).25


26 A full description of this important manuscript is given by Boll, op. cit., who dates it 813/20. Cf. also K. Weitzmann, op. cit., p. 158, with references.

pictorial tradition of these manuscripts is related to that of the earliest Islamic constellation images that have come down to us, those in the hemispherical dome in the palace of Qusayr 'Amrah built by an Arabian prince at the beginning of the eighth century. Much has been written about the outstanding importance of the frescoes in Qusayr 'Amrah as demonstrating the close connection between late classical and early Islamic art. This is particularly true of the way in which both elements meet in the paintings of the dome, which therefore provide a fascinating subject for comparative studies (fig. 2).

As a representation of the "Dome of Heaven" the cupola of Qusayr 'Amrah can by no means be regarded as an isolated phenomenon in the classical and postclassical world. It is, however, unique in being utterly devoid of any visionary and symbolical features; though the frescoes cannot be called scientifically correct, they attest a thoroughly scientific approach.

As on a celestial globe, the constellation figures appear within a system of coordinates. The analogy goes even further and leads to illogical consequences: as Saxl points out, the figures do not appear as they are seen in heaven, as one would expect when looking up toward a domed ceiling, but they are transposed from left to right, as on the outer surface of a globe. Another illogical feature derives from the fact that the celestial equator is placed considerably above the base of the cupola, that, in other words, not only the northern but parts of the southern celestial hemisphere are encompassed in the single hemisphere of the globe. The painter takes the constellations down to -40 degrees; had he rendered realistically the heavens as he saw them at Qusayr 'Amrah he would have had to include the southern heavens down to almost 60 degrees. As it is, the discrepancy in size and shape between the figures in the upper and the lower part of the ceiling is a considerable one; the distortion would have been even more accentuated had the painter been bound by the heavens as they really were, and this may well account for his self-imposed restriction. Some of these peculiarities can be explained if we imagine, with Saxl, that the painter proceeded by transferring a plane drawing to the inner surface of a dome—a plane drawing of the kind which was described in these pages as belonging to the fifteenth-century Byzantine manuscript in the Vatican Library. The use of this method and the astronomical errors they have in common seem to demonstrate that both the Islamic paintings and the Greek manuscripts were ultimately derived from the same or from a similar prototype.

The iconography of the figures, however, is not always in accordance with that of the illustrations of the Vatican manuscripts. Some are closer to the Atlas Farnese types, others to those of the Latin Aratea illustrations. A few foreshadow later Islamic constellation pictures. The questions involved will, however, be discussed in the next section. Most important from our point of view is the fact that the paintings in the cupola of Qusayr 'Amrah combine scientific with aesthetic aspir-

30 Saxl-Creswell, p. 290.
31 E.g., both in Qusayr 'Amrah and in Cod. Vat. graec. 1087 Heracles is not placed between, but after, Boötes and Serpentarius. For other examples see Saxl-Creswell, pp. 291–292.
rations in a way unknown to the Western world during the early Middle Ages.

AL-ŞÚFĪ'S ICONOGRAPHY

"The ninth and the tenth centuries"—to quote Sarton's *Introduction to the history of science*—"were essentially Muslim centuries," and their activities were superior to the West in almost every respect. Not only were the Arabic-speaking peoples the chief recipients of Greek knowledge, but they developed a great intellectual activity of their own, particularly in the scientific field; and astronomy was among their main achievements.

It is not surprising, therefore, that when al-Şúfī wrote his major opus some of the constellations had assumed a new nomenclature and, in a few instances, even a changed iconography. It seems a natural process that the Arabs, working from classical representations of the constellation figures, should have altered some names derived from a mythology which had no meaning for them, either owing to a misunderstanding or else in an attempt to find names which could be more easily grasped and remembered. Usually al-Şúfī gives the Arabic transcription, sometimes the translation, of the Greek names, then the names which had been assigned to them by the Arabs.

*Cepheus* (fig. 3), the fourth among the constellations, and the first human figure, has been given the name of "the flamboyant." This name may be derived from the pointed Phrygian cap which in classical representations is characteristic of barbaric kings and which, painted in red, *Cepheus* wears, e.g., in the Cod. Vossianus. Also the possibility has been pointed out that his Arabic name may be due to the fact that his head lies within the radiance of the milky way. In our manuscript his headdress is a mitre, in accordance with Ptolemy's text. Contrary to classical representations, where he is seen standing with outstretched arms, he is here represented with one knee bent and uplifted arms, a position which he had already acquired at Quṣayr 'Amrah.

*Bootes* (fig. 4), the second human figure, is rightly translated the "Herdsmen," but is also called the great "Howler," or "Shouter," probably from an older translation which misread *Boötes* for *Boötes*, or *Boötes*.

*Heracles* (fig. 5) is called "the kneeling man," or "the dancer," the former being the correct translation of Engonasin, the original name given to this constellation figure in antiquity. As a "kneeling man" without any attribute which would characterize him as a mythological figure, he appears on the Atlas Farnese. It is a later stage which shows him standing, with a lion's skin and a shepherd's crook. This crook must have been misunderstood by the illustrator of our manuscript or by one of his Arab predecessors, since in the Şúfī manuscript he is holding a scimitar, an Oriental weapon. Here, as in several other instances, we are aware of a fusion of various earlier traditions.

*Cassiopea* (fig. 6) has become "the woman with a seat" (dhát al-kursi), the seat being described as "having legs like a throne, and a cushion." The legs, ending in lion's paws, may occur wherever classical tradition is kept alive; the palmette-shaped knobs in which the back posts end, on the other hand, are charac-

---

52 Sarton, *op. cit.*, p. 543.
54 Thiele, *op. cit.*, fig. 19; Saxl-Creswell, fig. 348.
56 Saxl-Creswell, fig. 348.
58 E.g., Thiele, fig. 19 (Cod. Vossianus); Panofsky-Saxl, fig. 12 (Vat. Reg. Lat. 309).
teristic of Islamic work. On the Farnese Globe the chair stands in profile and the lady turns away from the beholder; on the analogous picture of the Cod. Vossianus both chair and lady are seen almost en face. Our manuscript combines both aspects, the chair being shown as on the Globe, the lady as in the Codex.

*Perseus* (fig. 7) is called the "Bearer of the Demon’s Head," *al-Ghūl*, which in European usage has become "Algol" and now designates the most important star of that particular constellation, the one in Perseus’ hand. Contrary to classical tradition, the Islamic figure no longer carries Medusa’s head, but that of a male demon, the streams of blood flowing from the Gorgon’s neck having perhaps been misinterpreted as a beard.49

*Auriga* (fig. 8), the Charioteer, also “he who holds the reins” (*mumsik al-a’innah*), or “the goats,” stands with bent knees and a whip in his hand, and follows classical lines on the whole. “The goats”—here not represented—and “the kids” are the ancient names of groups of stars of which the first are usually at his elbow, the second on his wrist, and with which he is actually seen in the Cod. Vossianus.41

*Serpentarius*, or the *Psylle* (fig. 9), the “Serpent-bearer” and the “Serpent,” have not acquired any new iconographic distinction. It might even be said that our illustrator stays closer to the early origin of the figure than some of his classical and postclassical forerunners, for in his drawing the serpent turns its head away from the man, as demanded by Hipparchos and by Aratos and as demonstrated on the Farnese Globe, while in the Vossianus, in other manuscripts, and also in Quṣayr ‘Amrah, its head is turned toward the man.42

*Andromeda* (fig. 10) is called “the Woman in Chains” (*al-masalsilah*), also “the Woman who never had a Husband.” She raises both arms, according to classical tradition; but contrary to it there is no indication of chains. Strangely enough, al-Ṣūfī gives the following comment: “This woman is called ‘the en-chained’ because she stretches out both hands.”48 In al-Ṣūfī’s description as well as in the illustrations of our manuscript she appears in two other variations (figs. 11, 12): in the one, two fishes of different sizes, one drawn inside the other, are laid across her body; in the second, a large fish covers her feet. Here we meet with an entirely new iconography, unknown to the West, which is partly due to the observations and the nomenclature of the Bedouin Arabs.

Al-Ṣūfī says that *Gemini*, the Twins (fig. 22a), appear as if they were embracing each other, since the stars of the one merge into those of the other. From Ptolemy’s catalogue we actually learn that the one is following the other. On the Farnese Globe, in Quṣayr ‘Amrah, and in the Vatican Ptolemy, where they are seen from the back, they have their arms on each other’s shoulder, but are not as closely, and unnaturally, interlaced as they are here.44

*Virgo* (fig. 13), the *Virgin* is also called “the Spike.” The second name as well as the first was derived from classical sources; it arose because the fourteenth star, which is situated in the left hand of the figure, was named “Spica” and the Virgin was often represented as holding one or several ears, e.g.,

49 Thiele, fig. 30, pls. 3, 4.
41 Thiele, fig. 27.
42 Saxl-Creswell, fig. 344; Thiele, fig. 21.
44 Saxl-Creswell, fig. 341.
on the Farnese Globe. These are, however, missing in our manuscript and so are the wings which usually characterize the Virgin.\(^{45}\) There is a curious diatonomy in al-Šūfī's paragraph on this constellation: in the catalogue he follows Ptolemy, who locates a number of stars in the wings; but in the description which preceeds the figure he assigns the fifth star to the left shoulder, adding that it is "the one which Ptolemy locates at the tip of the wing." And about the sixth star he says: "It is found in the left side, it is the one which Ptolemy says is in the left wing." Since the wings were omitted, the left shoulder had to be raised very high in order to comply with al-Šūfī's indication that "the fifth star should form a roughly straight line with the stars which are in the face."\(^{46}\) It seems impossible to decide whether this new iconography of the Virgin which, as far as my knowledge goes, finds no parallel in antiquity, was worked out by al-Šūfī himself or by one of his Arab predecessors, and on what grounds. Could it be that mostly back views of the figure, as it would appear on globes, were known in the Arab world, and that the Arab designer for reasons of his own would have found it preferable to omit the wings in a figure seen frontally? One thing is certain: the solution is a very successful one, the Virgo drawing being one of the finest of the entire manuscript. The survival of both traditions in later al-Šūfī manuscripts is interesting and will have to be discussed later.

Sagittarius (fig. 14), the "Archer," also called the "Bow." There are two classical prototypes for this figure, both of which lived on during the middle ages: the one is a faun who bends his bow in a standing position (e.g., Farnese Globe); the other a centaur, also about to shoot his arrow.\(^{47}\) Both Ptolemy's and al-Šūfī's remarks are based on figures of the second type, but whereas al-Šūfī, in his description and in the catalogue, speaks of certain stars as being located in the "fluttering ribbons of the headband," Ptolemy places them in the "mantle." In fact, classical representations of "Sagittarius," e.g., in Cod. Vossianus, show him with a garment fluttering from his back, and so does the Qusayr 'Amrah fresco. There, however, he is shooting backward, the "mantle" being blown forward, i.e., in the direction into which he is moving. Saxl, in pointing out the illogicality of these proceedings, believes that the painter of the cupola may have mixed up two different prototypes.\(^{48}\) Al-Šūfī resolves this incongruity, but it seems from his text that this peculiar way of representing Sagittarius was in the Islamic world not restricted to Qusayr 'Amrah, for his criticism of 'Utārid includes the following: "He states that the Archer has his face turned towards the East, and this is the way in which he designs him in his book"; and al-Šūfī goes on to explain that this was evidently wrong, since the stars (as the figure rises from the east) followed each other in the opposite order, the point of the arrow rising before the notch, the notch before the hair, the head before the tail of the animal—"so how could the face be turned towards the East?"\(^{49}\) The "Sasanian" origin of the figure in general and of the headdress in particular will be discussed later.

Aquarius (fig. 15), "the Water Pourer," also called "the Bucket," is represented as a young man holding some curious receptacle from which he pours out a schematically drawn flow of water—indeed, it looks as if he

\(^{45}\) E.g., Thiele, fig. 23, pls. 5, 6; Panofsky-Saxl, fig. 8.

\(^{46}\) Schjellerup, p. 159, and also p. 31.

\(^{47}\) E.g., Saxl-Creswell, fig. 350; Saxl, vol. 3, 1, fig. 3 (Harley 2506).

\(^{48}\) Saxl-Creswell, p. 294.

\(^{49}\) Schjellerup, pp. 30–31.
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were squeezing it out of a bag. In Qushayr 'Amrah and even in the Vatican manuscript Aquarius holds the urn upside down in an awkward way, in contrast to the Farnese Globe, where he holds it by the brim, as one naturally would.\(^5^0\) Our manuscript shows a further schematization, or even a misunderstanding, of the Qushayr 'Amrah type.

About Orion (fig. 16), "The Giant" (al-jabbār) (also called "the Spouse," which name seems to be due to a complicated philosophical error),\(^5^1\) it is said in the description that "he resembles very much a human figure . . . he holds a stick in his hand and is girded by a sword." Again there are inconsistencies between the description of the constellation figure with which the illustration conforms, and the catalogue, in which al-Ṣūfī follows Ptolemy. According to the latter, the stars 17–25 are on the skin which covers the left arm—and this is the way in which they appear in classical representations, including Qushayr 'Amrah. But in the description al-Ṣūfī states that these same stars are on "the sleeve of the figure," and in the illustration they are actually placed on a sleeve which is lengthened far beyond the Giant’s hand.\(^5^2\) Also, the lago-bolon or the shepherd’s crook, mentioned by Ptolemy and characteristic of this figure in antiquity, has become a club according to al-Ṣūfī. (The literal translation of the Greek is "staff for flinging at hares," since Orion is supposed to hunt the Hare, the adjoining constellation.)

It is surprising (particularly when compared with Sagittarius) how closely the figure of Centaurus (fig. 17) with Lupus, the wild beast, follows its classical forerunners in its proportions and in the easy, cantering movement of the heavily built horse. And if in the Centaur’s hand the thyrsos has become a bunch of leaves, these are obviously meant to be the vine leaves in which the thyrsos is often wreathed. That this conception of the thyrsos must have been suggested by a classical model is made obvious by the representation of a Maenad in the Pseudo-Oppian of the Bibl. Marciana in Venice (Cod. Gr. 479), who is holding a very similar branch, this time of ivy, "the branch being a deformed thyrsos." Since the Pseudo-Oppian is believed to be based ultimately on classical formulae, it may well be that both the vine in Centaurus’ hand and the ivy in the Maenad’s should go back, not to the same, but to a parallel prototype.\(^5^3\) The way, however, in which Centaurus holds the thyrsos in one hand and the beast’s hind legs in the other has no analogy in ancient art. His gestures are exactly those of Sagittarius spanning his bow, gestures familiar to us from so many works of Sassanian origin.

It is, of course, mainly the human figures which were renamed by the Arabic astronomers, since their classical names were more closely bound up with classical mythology than those of the constellation figures belonging to the two other groups, to the animals and the inanimate objects.

The latter are often reduced to their simplest form in the drawings of our manuscript; a number of them are mere diagrams and no attempt is made to give any perspective or embellishment. The Corona borealis, for example, appears on the Farnese globe and in

\(^5^0\) Saxl-Creswell, fig. 347.

\(^5^1\) Schjellerup, p. 214, n. 1.

\(^5^2\) Exaggeratedly lengthened sleeves are often used in Islamic art to accentuate the movement of a figure, e.g., a lustre bowl in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington; cf. R. Ettinghausen, Early Realism in Islamic Art, Studi Orientalistici Onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida, vol. 1, fig. 5; or the Eumorfopoulos bowl, cf. A Survey of Persian Art, ed. by A. Upham Pope and Ph. Ackerman, vol. 5, London and New York, 1938–39, p. 603. This feature may be due to Chinese influence.

\(^5^3\) K. Weitzmann, Greek mythology in Byzantine art, Studies in Manuscript Illumination, No. 4, Princeton, 1951, pl. 43, fig. 157, p. 130.
the Cod. Vossianus as a highly ornamental wreath; in the al-Šūfī manuscript it is a simple circle. The one object which has been drawn lovingly and with great care is Naonis, the “Ship” (fig. 21), both drawings of which are the only ones that extend over two pages of the book. One fact, however, is worth mentioning: Lyra is called by al-Šūfī “Persian Harp” and “Cymbal” (fig. 22b), and also “Goose” and “Tortoise.” In our manuscript the drawing may be interpreted as a schematized, not even fully adequate, representation of a “Persian Harp”; but on Islamic celestial globes and in later manuscripts the constellation image has often become a Tortoise, because the body of Lyra was, in classical representations, often made of tortoise shell.55

The animal figures also retain, on the whole, the names given to them in classical times, sometimes with other names added to the old ones. Aquila (fig. 24) is also called “flying Vulture”; here a part stands for the whole, for “flying Vulture” is the name given by the Arabs to the first three stars and, in particular, to the third and main star of the constellation,66 a star of such importance that it is indicated by a bird on astrolabes. Cygnus (fig. 23) is called al-Dajajah, which may mean a bird of any description, or else the “Hen.” In classical antiquity this constellation is usually represented as a swan,67 and as such it also appears in Quṣayr ʿAmrah. The bird of our manuscript, however, does not recall any of those prototypes. Hydra, Crater, and Corvus are each represented by a single drawing and are not united into consistent compositions as, on globes and in books, they used to be in antiquity.

One animal figure, which does not appear in Ptolemy’s catalogue and therefore is not numbered, is, as al-Šūfī says, the figure of “another horse, which resembles a horse more closely than does the “Greater Horse” (Pegasus). It is formed by a series of stars which partly belong to the constellation Pegasus. Like the drawings of Andromeda with the fishes, which also are unnumbered, the “Horse” appears only in a single drawing, not in the double aspect of the other figures (fig. 29).

THE TYPES OF THE DRAWINGS AND THEIR STYLE

Let us remember that the Marsh manuscript is supposed to have been copied from al-Šūfī’s original by his son, only a few years after the author’s death. In such an authoritative manuscript the drawings were bound to be of first-class draughtsmanship. Yet the main interest was focused on the scientific contents of the book, of which the illustrations were merely to form the visual counterpart. The artist was therefore limited in his freedom, and the figures had to remain true in their general outline to their classical prototypes. We saw, however, that their iconography underwent some alterations when they were transferred into the Islamic sphere, and even more were the details of their appearance and style affected by a natural process of Islamization.

In a study of the human figures, it immediately becomes apparent that their proportions differ from what they had been in antiquity: here they have comparatively large heads,

55 Thiele, op. cit., pl. 6, fig. 20.
56 Ibíd., pl. 6, fig. 38.
58 According to Ideler, op. cit., p. 76, n. 2, this name was first used by Eratosthenes. Cf. also Thiele, op. cit., fig. 29; Saxl-Creswell, fig. 346; Panofsky-Saxl, fig. 8.
short bodies, and well-developed hands and feet. Their posture, too, is characteristic; whether their faces are seen in three-quarter view or in profile as in Perseus, Sagittarius, Gemini, and Centaurus, the bodies are presented in full frontal view, which often is accentuated by outstretched arms, while the legs are again set either completely or partially in profile.

With the single exception of Cepheus, who according to classical tradition is always represented as a bearded man, suggesting a barbarian king, the male figures are youthful and beardless. Their facial type is hardly distinguishable from that of the women. They all have broad foreheads, full cheeks and rather pointed chins, long drawn eyes with the upper lid visible, and slightly crooked noses. The distance between nose and mouth is unnaturally short, and the line which marks the chin is set immediately under it.

The drawing of hands and feet is careful and sensitive, though, like that of the faces, it follows a standard convention. This is particularly evident from the semicircular line that runs from the thumb down to the wrist when the palms of the hands are visible.

All the youths have their hair falling down to and in front of their ears, sometimes curling over their cheeks (Perseus, Heracles, the Twins). The women have long hair streaming down their backs and the same "temple locks" as some of the men. Sometimes the rendering of the hair stands out against the other parts of the drawings owing to a profuse appliance of black ink, a realistic feature, since it was the fashion to dye one's hair.  

The style that has produced the type to which our figures belong has been called "Post-Sasanian," or "Perso-Iranian"; or, from its most famous representative, the "Samarra style." As Dr. Ettinghausen puts it, it is "a manifestation of East Hellenic art, strongly reflecting Sasanian ideas," and it was widespread in the Islamic world. Before appearing fully developed in the 'Abbāsid residence town of Samarra, built in 836 and abandoned 50 years afterward, it was shadowed in the fresco representing a musician in the Umayyad palace of Qaṣr al-Hāy al-Gharbi. It can be seen in Fatimid wall paintings, on pottery and on the fragment of a painted column in the Ghaznevid palace of Lashkari Bazar in southern Afghanistan, attributed to the tenth or eleventh century. It survives in a modified form in the paintings of the Cappella Palatina in Palermo executed for king Roger II. Very similar types drawn according to the same stylistic convention exist in Manichaean manuscripts in Chotcho, attributed to the ninth or tenth century A.D.

All women, with the sole exception of Virgo (and also Heracles), wear diadems of various shapes, with different kinds of rosettes, large plain earrings, necklaces, and bracelets. The same kind of jewelry was en vogue in Sasanian Persia and can be paralleled in Sasanian art: the Niké of Tāq-i Bustān, for example, wears a diadem with a rosette; the moon

pp. 112–124, deals with the chronology and with the character and diffusion of this type, referring to E. Herzfeld, Die Malereien von Samarra, Berlin, 1927, pp. 47–50.

E. Herzfeld, op. cit., particularly figs. 19, 22, 23.


Cf. the reproductions and references given by R. Ettinghausen, op. cit., particularly figs. 19, 22, 23.
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The crescent of Andromeda’s diadem occurs frequently on the headgear of Sasanian kings and is included in the exuberant jewelry reproduced in the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock. Very similar jewelry is also worn by the Manichaean ladies of Chotcho and it survives in later Islamic works.

Essentially, all the figures wear the same costume: it is a kind of girded, sleeved chiton, crossed right over left, down to the waist, with flaps hanging down at both sides. There is a possibility that the round line at the base of the neck may be meant to indicate that a close fitting garment is worn underneath. There are differences in this basic shape: sometimes the men’s gowns open down from the waist, so that short trousers become visible. Perseus wears long trousers; the women, too, have long trousers which sometimes become wide and baggy. Only Cassiopèa’s are invisible under her long dress, while Andromeda has a second, frilled skirt underneath her first.

The way in which folds and draperies are treated is throughout extremely interesting and original. On the whole the folds follow a fairly regular pattern. They are, of course, at their richest in the skirts, which are gathered together at the waist at regular intervals and form looped draperies. The ends of these are turned up as if windblown, falling back in a swirl, and ending in a scroll pattern at the bottom. This main theme is treated by the artist in many variations: it is most elaborate in the cascades of Andromeda’s skirt, has greater lightness in that of Virgo, and is fuller in Cassiopèa’s. In other parts of the garments, sleeves, lapels, etc., the scrolls are simpler, yet they are derived from the same motif. The unity, and at the same time the variety, in the energetic handling of folds is altogether admirable and matches the quality of the sensitive and unaltering outlines of the drawings.

To some extent the folds comply with the conventions of classical drapery; and it is apparent that in the last instance they derive from the excitedly fluttering garments of late so-called “baroque” antiquity. Their specific stylization, however, was devised in the semi-classical sphere of eastern Hellenism.

In discussing a group of silver vessels (fig. 36) which he attributes to the Bactrian melting pot of styles, Professor Weitzmann mentions as an outstanding feature the falling of the women’s garments over their feet, and their spreading in waves over the ground, where they form scrolls; and he traces the origin of this mannerism back to the coins of the Saka and Kushan kings of northwestern India. There is a close connection between this particular mannerism and that of the “windblown” folds of fluttering scarves and garments which, mainly since Shapur I, appear on the rock sculptures of the Sasanian kings, and which Herzfeld was the first to describe. Similar folds are displayed in great richness and variety on Sasanian and post-Sasanian silver. Looking at the well-known silver bottles in the Hermitage in Leningrad (fig. 37), we shall certainly find that the ends of the dancers’ garments, swinging with the rhythm of

66 Creswell, op. cit., pls. 2, 16, 17, etc.
68 E.g., A lustre-painted bowl from Rayy. Pope, Survey, vol. 5, pl. 646.
69 The young workmen in the frescoes of Qusayr ‘Amrah wear similar chitons. Cf. Kuséir ‘Amra, pls. 18, 20. The painted copies, however, may be misleading.
71 Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 64; also Iran and the ancient East, 1941, p. 314.
their movement, form cascading swirls very similar to those which we see in the al-Šūfi illustrations. Another example is given by the much-discussed silver plate in the Walters Gallery in Baltimore (fig. 38), where the queen’s double skirt is reminiscent of Andromeda’s.

As far as my knowledge goes, the al-Šūfi illustrations are the only surviving works of Islamic pictorial art in which this particular type of fold and drapery has not only been retained, but has been used in a most competent and original way. Nothing similar appears on the few extant examples of Umayyad painting; certainly not in the frescoes of Qaṣr ʿAmrah in spite of the fact that the chiton worn by a number of figures is not unlike the garments of our figures. Even the flying ribbons of the otherwise decidedly “Sasanian” rider of Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbi are drawn in a more illusionistic fashion, which is nearer to a classical conception. In Samarra, on the other hand, folds and draperies are more conventionally drawn than in the al-Šūfi manuscript. The cascading scroll motif is used only occasionally, mainly in the garments of the dancing girls, whose descent from the Sasanian type in the Hermitage silver bottles is obvious (fig. 39). It is outside the

Islamic sphere that a fairly close parallel can be found: we have already turned once to the Manichaean manuscripts of Chotch to find analogies with our drawings, and this time we find an object of comparison in the garments of a High Priest and in the draperies which cover the desks of writing clerics.

The treatment of folds and draperies, whose forms, in spite of being rooted in classical convention are defined by linear rather than by plastic means, may be taken as an indication of the artist’s truly oriental attitude regarding the introduction of depth. In the representation of human figures the third dimension, generally speaking, is admitted to the picture plane only as far as it is suggested by their iconographical type, and is indispensable for their plausibility. Foreshortening and overlapping of limbs occurs, but to a fairly limited extent.

Most figures are shown as if they were on the point of moving, or actually in the process of walking, in a horizontal direction within the limitation of the picture plane; their feet, however, are not on the same level, and one at least is seen in full expansion. There is a curious lack of poise in their appearance, as if they were treading on air.

Cassiopea (fig. 6), the one seated figure, seen mainly en face, with the chair drawn in profile, is precariously perched on the side of the seat, pressed flat against the surface of the page. On the first image, her feet have been left out altogether; on its symmetrically opposed replica, which is artistically less satisfactory, part of the chair is missing. These facts, taken together with al-Šūfi’s remark that she is sitting “with her feet outstretched,” show how unfamiliar this attitude must have been to the Muslim draughtsman.

The kneeling figures, especially Hercules and Orion (figs. 5, 16), convey a certain feel-

74 Cf. note 62, pl. B, fig. 5.
75 The cascading folds are less visible in the costumes of the well-known, symmetrically opposed dancing girls (fig. 39) than on some more fragmentary paintings of dancers (Herzfeld, op. cit., pls. 18, 19).
76 Cf. Le Coq, op. cit., pl. 8, b.
ing for depth in the position of their legs, but this is again counterbalanced by the action of their outstretched arms. Cepheus’ arms and legs (fig. 3), on the other hand, move essentially in parallel planes. It is not made altogether clear whether he is actually kneeling or whether he is performing some extravagant step. The drawing of the Twins (fig. 22a) is the only one in which the artist shows himself unable to transpose what was to him an utterly foreign artistic medium into his own form of expression: no attempt is made to define the natural shapes of the body; and the decorative unity is missing, which would have safeguarded the artistic quality of the drawing. Perseus’ (fig. 7) vigorous action, however, is beautifully convincing, yet it is closely linked with the picture page and, in spite of his vigor and energy, he is standing as if in suspense, like a dancer.

As mentioned above, Sagittarius (fig. 14) recalls Sasanian prototypes. The fluttering bands of his turban, the way he bends his bow with his head turned in profile and his body fully expanded, the “double” or “Asiatic” bow itself, are well-known characteristics of what may be called the most common subject of Iranian art. The figure seems somewhat incongruous, the problem of wielding together horse and rider proving too difficult since the artist had renounced classical guidance (so much more apparent in Centaurus). The incongruity is made even more obvious by the fact that, owing to astrotheric reasons, the horse’s foreleg is unnaturally raised, while the hindlegs seem to belong to a prancing horse. Yet even this odd feature can be somewhat paralleled in a Sasanian hunting plate where the hunter, according to Erdmann, was fused from two models, one a galloping, the other a bucking horse. 77

The figures in their poses and movements as much as in their proportions, are far removed from the poise, the plastic modeling of forms, and the symmetrical structure which surely must have characterized their Mediterranean prototypes. In many ways their artistic conception goes back to Sasanian art, where we find the same reluctance to use the third dimension, intense vigor, and sometimes a certain fluidity of movement. 78 It is especially this latter feature which underwent a peculiar development in Islamic art, and very close analogies can be found between the movements of our figures and those which appear in Fāṭimid works. 79

Oddly enough, it is in the representation of some of the animals that the style is closer to the classical fashion. This, however, seems due to mere chance. The first drawings in the series (figs. 18, 19), the “Bears,” are carried out in a technique which, for reasons unknown to us, was discarded in the bulk of the manuscript. They are modeled in the round by thin brownish wash, a treatment conveying an impression of corporeality which distinguishes them from the other figures. Yet, even these first drawings show a certain tendency (which becomes more obvious in the other animal representations) to “dissect” the bodies by curved lines separating their various parts. 80 In comparing the “lesser” and the “greater Bear” we find that this principle has been applied more forcefully in the second drawing; a curve running from the eye to the ear encircles the cheek, another divides the neck, etc. Draco (fig. 20) is the last drawing to which color is applied, but here its function is no longer to


78 Cf., e.g., the “huntress,” Herzfeld, op. cit., pl. 6, with Perseus.


80 Cf. Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 57 ff.
accentuate modeling, but merely to form a decorative surface pattern all over the body of the reptile.

The other animals are, like the human figures, defined exclusively by strokes of the pen. Some of them are extraordinarily lifelike. This is certainly true of the various birds, in spite of the schematic rendering of feathers in their wings and tails which are drawn after a standard pattern, and of the calligraphical design of their feet (figs. 23, 24, 25). However, the most impressive of them, Cygnus, with its breast in full view and its claws outstretched in an almost symmetrical design, brings to mind those heraldic birds of ancient Oriental lineage which appear so frequently on objects of Islamic art.

The "Smaller Dog" (fig. 26) is partially a new invention, for in this picture the hound of classical origin has been replaced by a Saluki, a typically Eastern dog. The "Bigger Dog" is less convincing with its long hind legs, one of them raised in a curious fashion. The drawing of the "Hare" is much more satisfactory in its vivid characterization. It is surprising to what extent the spiral line of the muzzle is apt to suggest its mobility. As in the bird drawings, a kind of modeling is achieved by linear means: tufts of hair here, of feathers there, are drawn in thin parallel lines and located in the most telling parts of the body.81

The "smaller Horse," "The Horse" and "Pegasus" have identical heads, with long drawn eyes (figs. 29, 30), calligraphically circumscribed cheeks (clearly noticeable already in the "greater Bear"), and nostrils indicated by a bean-shaped mark, idiosyncrasies which also occur in the representation of most of the other animals. With slight variations the characteristic circular line drawn from the eye to the ear appears frequently on Sasanian silver vessels (figs. 40, 42). The persistence of this peculiarity is shown in miniatures of a later date, e.g., the animal drawings in the Manāfī' al-'Hayawan in the Pierpont Morgan Library.82

The Horse is conspicuous by a schematized emphasis on knees and ankles, again by circular lines. This peculiar indication of the joints by circles again goes back to Sasanian and post-Sasanian silverwork (fig. 41). It is also very noticeable in the drawing of a rider in the Vienna Papyrus collection, one of the few Islamic drawings which may be attributed to the ninth-tenth centuries A.D.83

Pegasus, if compared with the same image on the Farnese Globe and in Western manuscripts, has gained by the fact that his wings are no longer those of a bird but of some fabulous, nonexistent creature, a Senmurv, the typically Sasanian dragon found in the stone reliefs of the Tāq-i Bustān, on textiles, silver (fig. 40), and pottery, where it survives into Islamic times.84

Among the imaginary beasts, Aries and Capricornus are faithful translations of the classical prototypes into a different language. Others, Draco (fig. 20) and Cetus (fig. 34), have acquired a new, more fantastic and more sinister appearance. The latter, with upright ears, the beard of a musk deer, and the snout of a snarling dog, brings to mind the heads of

81 Parallels to the Hare occur in Islamic pottery; e.g., the polychrome bowl in the Louvre, signed Abu Talib, eleventh century, Pope, Survey, vol. 5, pl. 608; or, even closer, a charmale jug, Possession Mousa, twelfth century, ibid., pl. 506.

82 Ibid., vol. 4, pls. 219 ff., and vol. 5, pl. 819.

83 On many Sasanian and post-Sasanian hunting plates, e.g., ibid., vol. 4, pls. 211, 213, 229, B; cf. also Th. Arnold, A. Grohmann, Islamische Buchkunst, 1929, fig. 4, a pen drawing, ninth-tenth centuries.

some of the “Senmurvs.” Taurus (fig. 32) is no longer the realistic charging bull whose hindpart happens to be missing; it has been given a new, imaginative shape which in an uncanny way contains all the characteristics of a bull and, at the same time, is of a convincing decorative nature. The “Dolphin,” represented even in Qusayr ‘Amrah as true to nature as it had been in antiquity, has now assumed a purely fantastic appearance. The Fishes, whenever they appear, are seen almost completely from above, their faces determined by a series of symmetrical, calligraphical lines which, beside forming ornaments of an almost geometrical character, contribute to the individuality of the creatures (figs. 11, 12). Curiously enough, these lines are partly identical with those that define the Lion’s head. The Lion (fig. 33) is the only beast that is not seen in profile. Parallels can again be found in Sasanian and post-Sasanian silver, where lions are frequently represented almost en face, with similar spiral-shaped nostrils (fig. 42).

Any further comment on the other animal figures of the Marsh manuscript would merely confirm what we know already: there is great competence in the artist’s way of handling them, whether he keeps fairly close to classical or oriental models or whether he follows more imaginative trends. His mastery shows itself in the skillfully drawn, sensitive contours and in the manner in which lines and shapes of an essentially ornamental kind are made subservient to his intention to depict the individual appearance of his objects and to imbue them with a life of their own.

THE “ORIENTALIZATION” OF THE IMAGES

Summing up what has been gathered from

E.g., fig. 40.
E.g., ibid., vol. 4, pl. 220, Hermitage; according to Dimand, op. cit., it is post-Sasanian.

this short investigation into the type and the style of the al-Ṣūfī drawings, it can be concluded that they have been thoroughly orientalized. They definitely belong to the class of objects called “post-Sasanian.” This term is sometimes used in a wider sense but it particularly applies to objects that were made in Persia during the first centuries of Islam whose derivation from Sasanian art is obvious. Our knowledge of the art of that period is, indeed, so fragmentary, and so little of what survives is securely dated, that this rather vague term was chosen for works in which the Sasanian tradition survives, the age and provenance of which cannot be defined, however, except within a rather wide margin.

No such uncertainty exists where our drawings are concerned. It can safely be assumed that they are of the same date as the manuscript, which assigns them to the year A.D. 1009/10. We are, however, faced with the question as to what extent they were original conceptions of an individual artist, and how far this artist was following existing Islamic prototypes or, in other words, at what time the “orientalization” of the classical constellation pictures took place.

If we believe the colophon, the Bodleian manuscript was copied from al-Ṣūfī’s original; this suggests A.D. 960 as the date of the initial type of the figures. But most likely it will be necessary to go still further back in time, for it can hardly be doubted that some of the books and globes by earlier Islamic astronomers mentioned by al-Ṣūfī were already illustrated in an orientalized fashion.

In this connection it seems interesting to quote from the fi ṭaṣṣīḥ al-ṣuwar wa ṭaḥṣīḥ al kuwar (“about the projections of constellations and of countries”) written by the great scientist al-Birūnī (973–1048). He states

that, owing to the great number of manuscripts and to the frequency of their copying, the original correctness of the illustrations of books by such authors as 'Utard b. Muham-
mad (9.c.), 'Umar b. Farruchen al-Tabari (d. 803), or of Abû al-Hasayan al-Šûfî, from whom his own knowledge was mainly derived, had greatly suffered. And he goes on to say that in books even the best illustrations have the drawback of being separated from each other, so that they do not offer a simultaneous picture (of the sky). Such a simultaneous picture can only be presented on globes, "not on small ones, but on big ones. But these are rare and costly, and too big to be carried and transported and they are difficult to use."

In a later passage, al-Biruni mentions having heard from his friend, the geometer Abû Sa‘id Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Jalîl (al-Šijzi) (c. 951–c. 1024), that al-Šûfî traced the single stars as well as the constellations from a globe by applying very thin paper to its surface. Al-Biruni speaks rather critically of these proceedings before turning to his own, scientific, method of converting a spherical into a planimetrical design.87a

We have, of course, no evidence at all for the validity of al-Biruni's anecdote. Yet, his remarks are of great importance for our subject. In the first place, they confirm the impression we got from al-Šûfî's introduction, namely, that of a wide circulation in the Islamic world of illustrated works by earlier astronomers. Secondly, we learn that big globes, obviously much bigger than any which have come down to us, existed among the Arabs as they had existed in antiquity, and that, as in antiquity, they were objects to be admired rather than used, in contrast to the smaller globes which were designed for scholarly work and for teaching purposes. The big globes were probably made for princely patrons only; it seems that the heavy silver globe in the Cairo Library which belonged to the Buyid sultan 'Adud al-Dawlah and which was attributed to al-Šûfî, was such a major objet d'art. (See note 18 above.)

Thirdly, it seems unlikely that al-Sijzi, a younger contemporary of al-Šûfî, or even al-Biruni himself, who must have known manuscripts of al-Šûfî's work which were very close to the original, if they did not include the original itself, could have reported a story indicative of the most intimate connection between the illustrations of such manuscripts and the constellation images on globes, unless such a connection had existed and been obvious to the eye. This would mean the existence of big globes, obviously made of silver—since al-Biruni mentions their preciousness—containing constellation images in a style akin to that of the earliest Šûfî illustrations, but, in all probability, going back to an earlier period. The frequent analogies between the drawings of Marsh 144 and Sasanian and post-Sasanian silver, particularly that they have in common the fold convention which is so characteristic of our manuscript, would then find a most plausible explanation: the engravings on metalwork, including the "costly globes," and the illustrations of the earliest Islamic manuscripts followed an artistic tradition identical in style.

From all this it seems reasonable to believe that an oriental type of constellation picture on globes as well as in books, came to life when the East was made familiar with Greek astronomy, a time remarkable not only for its scientific studies but also for its artistic activities.

This does not mean that al-Šûfî slavishly copied what he found in the works of his predecessors. This would be impossible in a man who, as modern astronomers agree, competently criticized not only the works of his

87a Ibid., p. 86.
Oriental forerunners, but even asserted his own observations of the stars against Ptolemy's. It is, indeed, much more probable that some divergencies between the iconography of classical images and those found in many copies of his work were his own doing.

It cannot be doubted that this iconography was scrupulously followed by al-Šūfī’s son, when he drew these pictures we know; yet he presumably included a few “modern” trends into his presentation of the figures. But he must have felt, as we do, that the treatment of folds and draperies constituted such an integral part of their aesthetic aspect that in carrying out this particular part of his work, he followed closely in the wake of his predecessors. We shall presently see that many of his own successors took a similar attitude.

In the drawings of other items, however, he showed greater independence. Leaving aside Cepheus’ “mitre” which from antiquity onward had a tradition of its own, all male figures wear large turbans which, though showing slight variations in size as well as in manner, are essentially similar to each other. Headgears not unlike in fashion can be traced in Rayy pottery and in Fāṭimid art, where close, if not identical, parallels occur in wall paintings, on pottery, and also on the fragment of a drawing published by Wiet and dated in the eleventh century. The artist of the Marsh manuscript “modernized” the turbans of the figures, changing the headdresses of their prototypes into those which were fashionable in his own day.

TRENDS IN LATER AL-ŠŪFĪ MANUSCRIPTS

A comprehensive survey of the many al-Šūfī manuscripts still existing in Eastern and Western libraries and of the survival of their iconography in the infinitely more numerous copies of Qāzwnī’s ‘Aṭā’ib would present a most welcome attempt to supplement Professor Saxl’s pioneer work on Western astrological and astronomical manuscripts, and on their relations with the East. It is hoped that such a work might be undertaken in the not too distant future. At present only a sketchy picture of the proceedings of later al-Šūfī illustrators can be attempted by comparing a few drawings of some outstanding manuscripts with their predecessors in the Marsh manuscript in the Bodleian. What emerges most strikingly from this comparison is the faithfulness with which throughout the centuries a number of illustrators clung to an established pictorial tradition.

The likeness between the Virgo of our manuscript and that of the al-Šūfī in the Top Kapi Seray Library in Istanbul (Ahmet III, No. 3493) (fig. 43) dated A.D. 1130/31 goes far beyond what might be due to astrotheric requirements. The iconographical type is identical, since the absence of wings is made up for by the raising of the right shoulder. Also the similarity in the treatment of the folds is astonishing indeed; it is true that some of the inside folds show a schematization unknown to the older draughtsman, but those at the bottom of the skirt are copied with great accuracy. And if the Istanbul Virgo wears no trousers, this applies to a number of figures in the Oxford manuscript as well. The main difference is in the change of proportion. The dress of the younger figure is “modernized” by the insertion of bands with Kūfic inscrip-

---

tions which adorn the sleeves and the ends of the sash.

Not all the figures of Ahmet III 3493 remain as true to type as *Virgo* (fig. 43). The "modernization" has gone a little further in *Orion* (fig. 45). Some figures have obviously been tampered with at some later period. Others seem to have been drawn by a different hand. But in the case of a number of illustrations the connection between the older and the younger manuscript must be regarded as a very close one indeed.

Another important Istanbul manuscript (Aya Sofya 2595) is the autograph of Naṣīr ad-dīn al-Tūsī's
d of Nasir ad-din al-Tusi's
to Persian, which was owned subsequently by the Jalā'īrid Ahmad ibn Unways and by Ulugh Beg, and which dates from A.D. 1249/50. Here, too, a number of figures are intimately related to the corresponding ones in the Bodleian manuscript: *Heracles* (fig. 46), for example, whose attitude and garment conform exactly with the early model, although he now wears a large, extremely ornate turban; *Cassiopea* (fig. 47) whose diadem has been converted into a crown; the *Charioteer* (fig. 48) has bands with Kūfic inscriptions on his sleeves and on his turban, while the cascading folds have been transferred from the bottom of the tunic to his trousers. The same is true of *Andromeda* (fig. 49) who, like *Cassiopea*, wears a crown.

91 The representation of *Pegasus* (fig. 50) shows that the animals as well as the human figures conform to the Bodleian manuscript, though it is more ornate than its model, just

90 Al-Tusi, astrologer to the Ismaili governor Naṣīr al-Dīn, later adviser to Hūlagū, on whose orders he founded the Observatory of Marāgha (1261). Cf. *Encyclopedia of Islam*, p. 980 (Strothmann).

91 Analogies in contemporary and later manuscripts, e.g., Vienna Galen and the Demotte Shāh nāmeh.

as some of the accessories of the figures are richer than in the older manuscript. Also the folds of the garments, in spite of being designed according to the former tradition, have become more schematized. This is perhaps most apparent in the other *Cassiopea* figure (fig. 51), where the artist seems to have allowed free play to his imagination and has invented new variations on the old scheme, with the result that wherever the folds are gathered together they form a regular design which is spread all over the robe like a surface pattern.

But some of the illustrations were obviously added by a later hand, and will be discussed in another context.

A Paris manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Arabe 2489) is undated but is also assigned to the thirteenth century A.D., and its drawings definitely belong to the same group. The similarity of a number of figures to the corresponding ones in the Aya Sofya al-Ṣūfī in particular is quite extraordinary—we only have to compare the two renderings of *Heracles* (figs. 46, 52). There is, however, an increased predilection on the part of the illustrator for profusely ornamented crowns and rich jewelry; *Virgo* (fig. 53) may exemplify this point. Again, it is the wide trousers of some of the figures which form the typical cascades of folds (*Charioteer*, fig. 54), though others have retained their wide tunics (*Andromeda*, fig. 55).

In their proportions the drawings of the Paris manuscript conform more closely to those in the Bodleian manuscript than to those of later manuscripts, and some of the former's idiosyncrasies are faithfully repeated, even in the facial types, though a Turkish element is obvious (fig. 56). Also, the overall pattern of folds, which we found in some of the Aya Sofya drawings, never occurs in the Paris manuscript, where it is replaced by a looser arrangement of an essentially decorative char-
acter, less logical than that in our original manuscript.

The tradition to which these manuscripts belong is by no means confined to an early period. It is widespread in time as well as in place. The manuscript of the Metropolitan Museum in New York (Acc. No. 13.160, 10) is believed to have been written in the late fourteenth century, probably in Samarkand. Though very much debased, the old theme of folds is still recognizable, and there are close analogies in the general conception of the figures (Cepheus).\(^2\) A much later copy, which was used by Schjellerup for his translation of al-Ṣūfī’s work is in the Public Library in Leningrad (Arab 191, New Series). It was written in Nayin, in central Persia, on October 15, 1606 A.D.\(^3\) Its ultimate derivation from the Oxford manuscript is obvious, though, again, it underwent a certain process of modernization. The figures have slender proportions. They wear the turbans that were fashionable during the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās. The folds are true to type, but they are relegated to wide trousers made of thin material, and have acquired a new, more naturalistic aspect.

Another outstanding manuscript which follows the same tradition is in the Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal in Paris (Cod. 1036). It is a Latin translation of al-Ṣūfī’s work, written in Sicily in the thirteenth century. Years ago Professor Saxl drew attention to this remarkable manuscript, and to its dependence on Islamic models.\(^4\) His remarks can now be complemented by our knowledge of the particular type of manuscript from which the Romanesque artist took his inspiration. For the likeness of the Arsenal Ṣūfī to that of the Bodleian is striking indeed.

It is true that, apart from the usual change in headdress, the Western manuscript shows considerable differences in technique and in idiom: the figures are painted in different colors, in a fashion that increases their compactness and plasticity, and the faces have more expression (figs. 57, 58). The animals, in particular, achieve a monumentality which is beyond the scope of the illustrator of Marsh 144 (figs. 59, 60). But the Western manuscript reproduces with remarkable exactitude not only the outlines, but also many details of its drawings; the garments are identical in kind, and the treatment of folds shows obvious relationship.

A manuscript, which is now in the Top Kapi Seray Library (Fatih, No. 3422), was written in Mardin and is dated A.D. 1134–35, approximately at the same time as the Ahmet III one. Yet, it is of a completely different type. The drawings are less elaborate than any so far described in these pages; they are mostly reduced to mere contours, the garments being indicated by a few simple lines. All that remains of the exuberance of folds are a few meaningless arabesques. Not only its style but also its iconography is at variance with that of the other copies: Andromeda wears chains (fig. 61); the cushion is missing from Cassiopea’s seat (fig. 62), her hand reaches backward in order to clutch its pole; and Virgo (fig. 63) has wings as she had in antiquity.

The fact that the Aya Sofya manuscript had a number of illustrations added by a different hand has been mentioned above. One of those illustrations is the image of Virgo (fig. 64); and we notice at once that this figure deviates from the tradition of our Bod-
leian manuscript, which, for the sake of convenience, we shall call that of “Group A,” and that it must have derived from the same prototype as the Virgo image of Fatih 3422. Apart from having the wings in common, both have the same oddly-shaped skirts with parallel divisions from which all folds have disappeared. The Centaurus (figs. 65 and 66) images of both manuscripts confirm our view that the second part of the Aya Sofya manuscript and Fatih 3422 are closely related. Both follow a tradition which we shall call that of “Group B,” as opposed to the “Group A” tradition.

We do not know whether Fatih 3422 is the first of its kind. One thing, however, is certain: in its iconography it follows classical usage more closely than the manuscripts belonging to the “A Group,” and it is intimately connected with the iconography of the celestial globes.

Like Fatih 3422, a number of the B Group manuscripts are fairly simple in design, for example the Paris manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Arabe 2488, which, like Ar. 2489, is believed to date from the thirteenth century. A confrontation of the Cassiopea drawings (figs. 62, 67) of both manuscripts may serve to demonstrate this point, and to show that in both classes of al-Ṣūfī illustrations the once-established types may survive for centuries.

Yet it would be quite wrong to believe that all Group B manuscripts are of the simple kind. One of them, in fact, is the best known and the most elegant of all al-Ṣūfī copies. It is Ar. 5036 in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, which was Ulugh Beg’s personal copy, believed to have been written in Samarkand before A.D. 1437, when this prince had the astrological tables newly revised in his own observatory. The figures are most delicately painted, they are realistic according to contemporary conceptions, and their costumes comply with the fashion of the day. Here, too, we find a winged Virgo (fig. 69) and Andromeda (fig. 70) with chains. Cassiopeia (fig. 68), on her more elaborate, but cushionless seat, has the posture we know from other B manuscripts and—another feature of most manuscripts of this group—Hydra, Crater, and Corvus appear on a single page (fig. 71).

Two illustrations from another Istanbul manuscript, Pertev Paça 375 (figs. 72, 74), may exemplify the survival of the B tradition into the sixteenth century. In fact, most, though not all, later manuscripts belong to the B group, e.g., the second manuscript used by Schjellerup, which was written in Median in 1601 and which is now in the Royal Library in Copenhagen (No. 83).

There are some manuscripts which do not fall entirely into either group. It is impossible to say whether they represent divergent groups, or whether they have to be regarded as isolated specimens. One of those manuscripts is the British Museum Ṣūfī Arab. 5323. Again, different hands have participated in the drawings. It is undated, but the greater, and at the same time the better, part of the illustrations have much in common with Aya Sofya 2595, and can be assigned to the thirteenth century (fig. 75). Some figural types are almost identical, and so are the costumes, and the fold convention, though some Chinese influence may have already come in. There are, however, some remarkable divergences: a number of the youthful male figures have partly by E. Blochet, Musulman painting, pls. 88-93, and in Les peintures des manuscrits orientaux de la Bibl. Nat., vol. 2, Paris, 1914-20, pls. 25-33.

been transformed into bearded men, others into women. Both aspects of most of the human constellation images appear on one and the same page worked into a consistent composition. Nothing decisive can be said about the iconography of the manuscript; the image of Cassiopea is a poor drawing which does not belong to the main set; and a few constellation images are missing, among them Virgo. Yet, the connection with Group A seems obvious.

Another interesting manuscript which fits even less into the general scheme is Cod. Rossi 1033, now in the Vatican Library, which was written in Ceuta in Morocco in A.D. 1229. Here both aspects of almost all constellation images confront each other symmetrically on one page, and quite a few of the animals and of the inanimate objects are reminiscent of the Group A manuscripts. Most of the human figures, however, differ so widely from any others we know that sometimes their identity may be doubted. The Charioteer (fig. 73) has become a bearded man, and so has Hercules, who has lost his scimitar. Orion is without his sword, his elongated sleeve has become meaningless, and he is standing instead of kneeling. Virgo (fig. 76) is the one who most complies with the A Group prototype.

The style of this manuscript, so different from that of any other al-Ṣūfī copies, was obviously influenced by its milieu which was unlike that of the Middle East. We should remember that Ceuta had for a long time belonged to Islamic Spain and that, in Spain, interrelations between Eastern and Western art were not uncommon. Such interrelations may account for some of the unusual features displayed in Cod. Rossi 1033. However, this, like the British Museum manuscript, does not display an iconography of its own; both must be regarded as interesting variations of those manuscripts which follow the A Group tradition.

We are now faced with the problem of explaining the existence of two different iconographies in al-Ṣūfī drawings. The iconographic disparity also has stylistic implications, since the A Group is characterized by that particular mannerism of folds which can be traced back to Marsh 144 but which, according to the hypothesis put forward in these pages, goes back to an older tradition of artistic conventions.

It may be useful, at this point, to recall al-Birūnī’s mention of small globes as opposed to the “big and costly globes” whose style we believe to have survived in Marsh 144 as well as in other manuscripts of the same class.

It is not impossible that some of the countless globes made of cheap material which circulated in the Hellenistic world had come down to Islamic times, and we may certainly assume that the intensive study of the Almagest promoted the construction of wooden globes on which, according to Ptolemy’s instructions, greater stress was put on the stars themselves than on the constellation images, on the real thing instead of the fictitious. Such globes were undoubtedly made by the astronomers themselves, while the finer specimens were presumably constructed in collaboration with professional craftsmen.


98 Another extremely interesting variation is represented by the Bodleian Manuscript Hunt 212, a few illustrations of which contain certain items derived from the nomenclature of the Arabs.


100 In fact, a wooden globe, but gilt, was constructed by Qaysar, the same one who constructed the globe in Naples, Musco Nationale (1225). Cf. L. A. Mayer, Islamic astrolabists and their works, Geneva, 1926.

101 According to Mayer, the astrolabists, some of whom also made globes, were astronomers of some
figures, then, would be drawn on simple lines, rather like diagrams meant to illustrate a scientific text. They would hardly be affected by any implications of style or by artistic imagination, and would, therefore, show only such alterations in iconography as were imposed by the Arabic translations. In fact, the earliest globes which have come down to us, though made of bronze, have a simple, rather crude design. The figures are engraved in outline only, without any indication of clothing, though their attributes, which are essential to their character, are easily recognizable. Their iconography is, as stated before, that found in the B Group of Şüfi manuscripts. Some of the later globes are more sophisticated: it is not impossible that by then the big globes had altogether gone out of fashion and were replaced by those of smaller dimensions.

On the Dresden globe, made at Hulagu Khan’s court at Marāghah, the figures show considerable realism and their headaddresses and garments are clearly defined. But they reflect the fashion of their own day, and are in no way reminiscent of the idealized garments which appear in the A Group of manuscripts. The iconography is that of the B Group manuscripts. As far as I know, the globe in the British Museum, made in Mosul in 1275, is the only one which deviates from this iconography insofar as Virgo has no wings. However, she seems to hold a spike in her hand. Actually, the engraving is somewhat rubbed off at that particular place. Others of the same and of a later period again comply with the B Group manuscripts.

How can we account for the fact that the iconography of the small globes was taken over by some copyists of al-Şüfi’s work while others faithfully followed the tradition which we believe to have been developed by al-Şüfi himself and which, if we follow al-Birüni, was connected with the tradition of the big globes?

Unfortunately, there is no clue which would suggest an authoritative answer. The following possibility may perhaps be suggested: that some early copyist of al-Şüfi’s book, finding the illustrations too elaborate to be followed even by tracing, took refuge in the simpler drawings of some globe which he had in hand. The Istanbul manuscript Faith 3422 could easily be the outcome of such proceedings.

When once established, this second tradition may have been followed and improved upon by other copyists. It is understandable that a patron like Ulugh Beg might have pre-


103 Made by Mohammed ben Movajid Alardhi; published by A. Drechsler, Der Arabische Himmeis-globus im mathematisch-physikalischen Salon in Dresden, 1873.

104 Dept. of Oriental Antiquities No. 71. 3.1.1. (formerly in the Royal Asiatic Society) made in Mosul by Muhammad b. Hilal in 1257. Cf. B. Dorn, Mem. Royal Asiatic Society, vol. 21, No. 2 (1829). This is the largest of all surviving globes, with a diameter of 240 mm.

ferred a prototype which would leave complete freedom to the artist in choosing the garb and attire of his figures to another which would impose its own, more rigid, conventions. Also he might have been partial, and others with him, to an iconography which was closer to that of the classical originals than the one which was followed by al-Ṣūfî himself.

Another possibility ought to be considered: it could well be that some astronomers other than al-Ṣūfî had, in their books, followed an iconography differing from his and analogous to that of the small globes; this might, for the reasons mentioned above, have slipped into a copy of his own work.

If we compare the constellation images of the various al-Ṣūfî manuscripts with other miniatures we shall find that only the later manuscripts of the B Group seem to fit entirely into the general framework of contemporary book illustrations.

Taken as an entity, the images, particularly those of the A Group, represent a tradition which is unique in Islamic miniature painting. They are, of course, subject to the same evolutionary process as other works. To quote one example only, there is a marked difference between the drawings in Marsh 144 on the one hand, and those of Arabe 2489 in the Bibliothèque Nationale on the other. Also, certain parallels can be found between the drawings of al-Ṣūfî manuscripts and other miniatures of the same period. More extensive studies might work such developments and analogies into a more coherent pattern.

Yet, within the limitations mentioned above, the constellation pictures will always hold a place of their own. This is not due altogether to their derivation from classical prototypes. Other miniatures were closely connected with Greek book illustrations, as we know. The most interesting feature of the al-Ṣūfî drawings lies not in their resemblance to, but rather in the degree of their independence of, these prototypes. For, surely, their style is far remote from anything which existed either in the Western or in the Byzantine world. Unlike the paintings of Qusayr ʿAmrah, which represent the very first stage of this evolution, they have been completely orientalized.

It is hard to imagine that this process could have taken place as an isolated phenomenon. We are only able to visualize it against an artistic background where other similar achievements were accomplished. If seen in this light, the drawings attain an importance far beyond their artistic and scientific merit; for they help to throw some light on the beginnings of Islamic book illustration, which up to now have been almost completely obscure.


Fig. 40—Silver Vessel.
Hermitage Museum, Leningrad; Pope, Survey, plate 219 (cf. note 82).

Fig. 41—Hunting Plate.
Metropolitan Museum, New York; Pope, Survey, plate 213 (cf. note 83).

Fig. 42—Silver Plate.
Hermitage Museum, Leningrad; Pope, Survey, plate 220 (cf. note 86).
Fig. 43—Virgo.
Istanbul, Ahmet III Libr., Ms. 3493 (24.5 : 15.8 cm.).

Fig. 44—Cassiopea.
Istanbul, Ahmet III Libr., Ms. 3493 (24.5 : 15.8 cm.).

Fig. 45—Orion.

Fig. 46—Heracles.
Istanbul, Haya Sofya Libr., Ms. 2595 (31 : 20 cm.).
Fig. 52—Heracles.

Fig. 53—Virgo.

Fig. 54—Auriga.

Fig. 57—Serpentarius.

Fig. 58—Virgo.

Fig. 59—Cygnus.

Fig. 60—Pegasus.

Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, Ms. 1036.
Fig. 61—Andromeda.

Istanbul, Top Kapi Seray Libr., Ms. Fatih 3422 (29.7 : 20.6 cm.).

Fig. 62—Cassiopea.

Fig. 63—Virgo.

Istanbul, Top Kapi Seray Libr., Ms. Fatih 3422 (29.7 : 20.6 cm.).

Fig. 64—Virgo.

Istanbul, Haya Sofya Libr., Ms. 2595.
Fig. 69—Virgo.

Fig. 70—Andromeda.

Fig. 71—Hydra with Corvus and Crater.
Fig. 73—Africa.
Rome, Vatican Libr., Rossi 1033 (22.5 : 18.5 cm.).

Fig. 74—Andromeda.
London, British Museum, Ar. 5323 (27.5 : 15.4 cm.).

Fig. 75—Virgo.
Rome, Vatican Libr., Rossi 1033 (22.5 : 18.5 cm.).

Fig. 76—Virgo.
Istanbul, Pertev Pasa Libr. 375.

Fig. 77—Cassiopeia.
Istanbul, Pertev Pasa Libr. 375.
DOCUMENTS D'ARCHITECTURE FATIMITE D' OCCIDENT
PAR SLIMANE-MOSTAFA ZBISS

Dans la première partie de son dernier ouvrage The Muslim Architecture of Egypt (Oxford, 1952), le grand maître de l'archéologie musulmane, M. Creswell, nous donne une documentation aussi exhaustive que sûre sur l'architecture fatimite d'Orient, documentation que nous attendions depuis longtemps et que nous saluons avec joie.

Nous avons pensé qu'il serait utile de donner ici, comme pendant à l'ouvrage magistral de M. Creswell, un premier aperçu de cette même architecture fatimite en Occident en présentant quelques monuments repérés jusqu'ici. Par architecture fatimite d'Occident, nous entendons, non pas celle qui correspond à la période occidentale de la dynastie des Obaidites, c'est à dire jusqu'au transport au Caire du Calife al-Mu'izz li-din Allâh en 362/972, mais la période de 250 ans environ qui va de l'avènement de cette dynastie en 296/908 jusqu'à la prise de Mahdiyah en 555/1060 par 'Abd al-Mu'min ibn 'Ali et l'annexion de la Tunisie à l'empire almohade. Cette division nous semble commode parce qu'elle correspond—au moins en théorie—à l'hégémonie fatimite sur le Maghreb, hégémonie qui ne devient définitivement caduque qu'avec la conquête almohade. La division aussi est commode parce que l'architecture occidentale, malgré une évolution normale, conserve des caractéristiques propres, une unité, une harmonie et une homogénéité qu'elle perdra en majeure partie avec les Almohades qui introduisent sur le site ifriqien une architecture nouvelle et impriment à l'art traditionnel une orientation nouvelle.

Né à Mahdiyah, l'art fatimite, qui prend source aux traditions antiques occidentales, se transporte à un moment donné en Égypte, où son évolution dans ce nouveau milieu revêtira un certain aspect, l'aspect décrit par M. Creswell. C'est de l'aspect qu'a revêtu son évolution sur place, que nous essayons de parler ici, c'est à dire: sous les fatimites proprement dits (avant leur départ pour le Caire); sous leurs lieutenants, les Zirides, jusqu'à l'invasion hilalienne; sous les reyes de taifas, principes issus de la crise hilalienne.


LA COUPOLE DU BAHOU DE LA GRANDE MOSQUÉE DE TUNIS

Au centre de la galerie intermédiaire entre le sanctuaire et la cour, à l'extrémité nord de la nef centrale, se trouve une coupole dite Qubbat al-bahou ou al-bouhour. Cette coupole, insuffisamment connue jusqu'ici, est pourtant un prototype et un fil conducteur. Nous allons essayer d'en dégager les caractéristiques qui nous permettront d'identifier d'autres monuments sur lesquels planait une obscurité complète. En effet, avec la coupole du bahou, nous avons un monument abondamment et diversement ouvragé, mais, ce qui est une grande chance, un monument daté. La date 381/991 qui s'y trouve explicitement exprimée, indique que l'édifice fut construit à
peine vingt ans après le départ des Fatimides pour l'Egypte et en même temps qu'on construisait la mosquée caïroise d'al-Hâkim (380-404/990-1013).

La coupole du Bahou de la grande mosquée de Tunis (fig. 1) est essentiellement une coupole ifriquienne dont les deux principaux types sont les coupoles du mihrâb de la grande mosquée de Kairouan et de Tunis: coupole sur trompes en coquille couvertes d'un dôme côtelé. On y retrouve les mêmes niches, les mêmes arcatures aveugles et la même disposition des zones de construction: support de plan carré surmonté, au dessus de la zone des trompes, d'un dispositif de plan octogonal qui évolue vers le cercle à sa partie supérieure et sur lequel vient s'agglomérer la calotte terminale.

Une nouveauté pourtant dans notre coupole du bahou: c'est la décoration extérieure (fig. 2). Tous les arcs sont circonscrits d'une corniche moulurée. Pour les arcs isolés ces corniches retombent de part et d'autre sur des corbelets. Pour les arcatures, ces corniches se poursuivent sans solution de continuité. Sur la façade principale (façade nord), les écoinçons de l'arc central de support sont meublés par deux niches à fond plat; le fond plat est précédé d'un décrochem. Ce fond, surmonté d'un arc recticurviligne retombant au moyen d'un motif serpentiforme, est meublé par une mosaïque de petits éléments en pierre de sable que nous appelons "birch" en Tunisie. Ces éléments sont bicolorés: la couleur naturelle alterne avec le rouge obtenu par immersion dans une solution d'ocre rouge diluée dans du lait. Les parements extérieurs de ces niches sont constitués, jusqu'à hauteur des arcs, par un appareil alterné et bicole. Les arcs sont appareillés au moyen de claveaux bicolorés. Une corniche, surmontant horizontalement le grand arc de support, à hauteur de la toiture, retombe verticalement, de part et d'autre des niches des écoinçons, sur des corbelets.

Dans la zone supérieure, c'est à dire dans la zone du massif carré, on voit une niche centrale à fond plat, lequel fond est surmonté d'un arc trilobé. Cette niche est flanquée de part et d'autre d'une niche à fond semicylindrique meublé par un damier bicole surmonté d'une coquille rayonnant du fond. Chaque coquille est bordée, à l'extérieur, par un bandeau en forme d'arc qui donne aux concavités terminales des cannelures de coquilles, l'allure d'un chapelet d'alvéoles. Notons pour ces niches deux décrochements, alors que, plus bas, il n'y en a qu'un seul. Notons, par contre, le clavage bicole identique des arcs extérieurs et intérieurs.

Les écoinçons extrêmes sont en appareil alterné et bicolores. Les deux écoinçons intérieurs sont constitués par des chevrons bicolores. Un bandeau de carrés rouges posés sur la pointe, sur fond couleur sable, court immédiatement au-dessous de la corniche qui surmonte cette zone carrée de la coupole sur sa face nord. Sur la face sud, le surhaussement de la nef centrale du sanctuaire n'a permis aucun décor. Par contre, les faces est et ouest (fig. 3) sont identiques à la face nord, sauf que la niche centrale, profondément défoncée, est surmontée d'une coquille rayonnant du fond dont la découpe extérieure adopte la forme d'un arc recticurviligne à motifs serpentiformes. Une autre différence tient dans le fait que les niches flanquantes, à fond creux, ne comportent pas de décor. Les deux cannelures inférieures sont bouchées et portent, en lettres coufiqnes en relief, le mot: Allâh. Une dernière différence vient de ce que les arcs de la face nord sont des plein-cintres tandis que ceux des faces est et ouest sont outrepassés.

Nous voilà maintenant à la zone octogona- nale (fig. 3). Elle comporte huit niches, toutes percées aujourd'hui et munies de chassés vitrés. Il est fort possible qu'à l'origine elles étaient alternativement ouvertes et aveugles. Toutes
sont surmontées de coquilles rayonnant du fond. Les écoinçons sont meublés par un appareil de lits horizontaux jaunes alternant avec les lits rouges. Les trumeaux, rejointoyés de blanc jusqu’à hauteur des arcs voisins, sont décorés d’un réseau mosaïqué blanc, rouge et couleur sable, avant de s’épaneler en console à feuilles d’acanthes, au-dessous d’une épaissie corniche moulurée. Au-dessus de cette corniche, le tambour octogonal s’est déjà transformé en tambour circulaire, prêt, par conséquent, à recevoir la calotte hémisphérique côtelée qui est le couronnement de notre coupole du bahou.

Nous avons dit, plus haut, que cette coupole était une synthèse de l’art fatimite et un fil conducteur qui nous a permis d’identifier une série de monuments jusqu’ici obscurs.

LA MOSQUÉE “EL ISHBILI”

Parmi ces monuments citons l’oratoire dit masjid El-Ishbili qui se trouve à peine à 100 mètres au sud de la grande mosquée de Tunis. La façade (fig. 4) de ce petit sanctuaire est faite entièrement d’un appareil de hirch (pierre de sable). On y distingue trois registres. Le registre inférieur en appareil alterné est percé de trois portes rectangulaires de dimensions égales. Le registre médian, en appareil alterné également, est percé de trois baies surmontées d’arcs en plein-cintre. Circonscivant les claveaux de chaque arc, une corniche enjambant une à une les trois baies, assoit ses retombées sur des modillons. Le registre supérieur est formé par une plate-bande appareillée, surmontée d’un bandeau nu que vient couronner une corniche. Dans cette façade, l’appareil alterné, les corniches circonscivant les arcs des baies—lesquelles n’étaient pas toutes des baies à l’origine mais très probablement des niches à fond plat—la corniche supérieure délimitant, en hauteur, toute la composition, cela ne rappelle-t-il pas assez certains éléments de la coupole du bahou? Sans doute. Mais voici quelque chose de plus probant encore: le mihrâb de la mosquée (fig. 5). On y retrouvera la mosaïque bicolore en hirch, les lits horizontaux de couleur alternée, etc. . . . Une juxtaposition de la coupole du bahou et du mihrâb nous évitera une longue description (figs. 2, 5). Elle démontre leur identité d’une façon évidente. Par conséquent, nous nous croyons fondé à déclarer que ces deux monuments sont contemporains et même, peut-être, qu’ils sont dus au même maître d’oeuvre. La mosquée “El-Ishbili” à Tunis pourrait donc être datée, sans risque d’erreur, des environs de 380/990.

LES PORTES ET PORCHES DE LA GRANDE MOSQUÉE ZAYTŪNĀH DE TUNIS

Sur la façade extérieure orientale de la grande mosquée de Tunis se trouvent deux portes (fig. 6) dont l’une est datée de 457/1064, ce qui correspond à l’une des premières années de l’invasion hilalienne en Tunisie et à l’une des premières années de l’avènement à Tunis d’un gouvernement démocratique autonome ayant pour chef ‘Abd al-Haqq b. Khorassan. La parenté du décor de la façade de ces deux portes avec la coupole du bahou et la façade de la mosquée “El IShbili” est apparente.

Sur la façade ouest qui donne sur le sūq des étoffes, l’enceinte de la grande mosquée Zaytūnah est percée de trois ouvertures en avant-corps qui sont également masquées par des constructions parasites. Nous avons réussi à en dégager partiellement une et à la décaprer (fig. 8). Son identité avec ce qui précède n’est pas contestable. Cela nous autorise à dire que, s’il n’est pas prouvé que les Banū-Khorassan ont refait entièrement l’enceinte de la Zaytūnah, il est cependant assuré qu’ils en ré-aménagèrent toutes les portes, (sauf celle du sud qui semble ne pas avoir bougé depuis le neufième siècle).

LA MOSQUÈE AL-MIHRĀS À TUNIS

De cette mosquée, il ne reste que la partie supérieure de la façade principale qui porte une inscription datée de 485/1092 (fig. 9). Elle procède également, comme on le voit, du même art.

LA COUPOLE DE “SIDI BOU KHRISSAN” À TUNIS

Cette coupole est datée de 486/1093 (fig. 10). Elle fut construite de leur vivant, par deux princes khorassanides pour leur servir de lieu de sépulture, après leur mort. L’inscription de fondation nous signale que l’un de ses constructeurs est aussi celui qui avait construit le porche de la Zaytūnah donnant sur le Sūq al-ʿAttārīn.

Coupole sur piles, à claire-voie à l’origine, cet édifice menaça rapidement de s’écrouler : la portée des arcs était trop grande pour la charge qui leur était confiée. Aussi y eut-il, de bonne heure, un rétrécissement de ces arcs par l’adjonction d’arcs nouveaux reposant sur des colonnes. Ce sont les chapiteaux archaïques de ces colonnes qui nous autorisent à assigner à ce travail une date très proche de la construction de la coupole. Si, à l’intérieur, la coupole présente tous les attributs ifriqiens classiques (trompes en coquille, voussures concentriques en encorbellement, etc.), à l’extérieur, elle présente un aspect nouveau qui l’apparente à l’ensemble des monuments signalés ci-dessus : l’appareil systématiquement alterné, les corniches concentriques enveloppant le clavage bicolore de hirch, etc. Jusqu’au tympan employé autant pour boucher la paroi nord que pour consolider le monument, qui ne soit en harmonie avec le reste, bien qu’il représente une troisième phase de travaux. Il suffit pour s’en rendre compte de considérer la corniche supérieure, la plate-bande appareillée bicolore qui constituait un linteau à l’origine, enfin l’appareil alterné qui surmonte cette plate-bande.

LA COUPOLE “MSID AL-QUBBAH” À TUNIS

Cet édifice à claire-voie (fig. 11) est de la même famille que la coupole de “Sidi Bou Khrissan” bien qu’apparemment plus archaïque. Mais à défaut d’éléments de datation sûre, force nous est de classer cette coupole du Msid al-Qubbah comme contemporaine de la coupole de “Sidi Bou Khrissan,” c’est à dire, comme étant un édifice de la fin du onzième siècle.

LA MOSQUÈE DU “Q’SAR” À TUNIS

Construite dans les vingt premières années du douzième siècle, par le grand Khorassanide Ahmad, cette mosquée a, comme mīhrāb, une niche à coquille rayonnant du fond (fig. 12), exactement identique aux niches de la coupole du bahou de la Zaytūnah. De plus, la partie semi-cylindrique est meublée par des arcatures aveugles identiques à celles repérées par M. Georges Marçais, dans l’ancien mīhrāb fatimite de la grande mosquée de Mahdiyah.

En outre, la mosquée d’ “al-Qsar” présente à l’est une façade dont les ouvertures sont surmontées par des voussures concen-
Fig. 1—Tunis: La Coupole du Bahou de la Grande Mosquée.

Fig. 2—Tunis: La Coupole du Bahou de la Grande Mosquée; la Décoration Extérieure (Face Nord).

Fig. 3—Tunis: La Coupole du Bahou de la Grande Mosquée.

Fig. 4—Tunis: La Mosquée "El Ishbili"; Façade.

Fig. 5—Tunis: La Mosquée "El Ishbili"; le mihrāb.
Fig. 6—Tunis: La Grande Mosquée Zaytūnah; Deux Portes sur la Façade Extérieure Orientale.

Fig. 7—Tunis: La Grande Mosquée Zaytūnah; Porche sur le Côté Nord.

Fig. 8—Tunis: La Grande Mosquée Zaytūnah; Porche sur la Façade Ouest.

Fig. 9—Tunis: La Mosquée al-Mihrās; Inscription sur la Façade Principale.

Fig. 10—Tunis: La Coupole de "Sidi Bou Khrissan."

Fig. 11—Tunis: La Coupole "Msid al-Qubbah."
Fig. 12—Tunis: La Mosquée du "Qsar"; le mihrab.

Fig. 13—Palerme: Le Cloître de l'Église San Giovanni.

Fig. 14—Tunis: La Mosquée Sidi an-Nu'mân.

Fig. 15—Tunis: La Mosquée de la Rue de la Tente.
Fig. 16—Tunis: La Mosquée Maghouch.

Fig. 17—Palerme: Le Palais de la Kubbah.

Fig. 18—Palerme: Le Palais de la Zizah.

Fig. 19—Palerme: Le Palais Royal.
Fig. 20—Palerme: Le Clocher de San-Giovanni.

Fig. 21—Palerme: L'Église de San Cataldo; la Partie Ancienne.

Fig. 22—Palerme: L'Église de San Cataldo; le Crénelage.

Fig. 23—Palerme: L'Église de l'Amiral J. d'Antioche; la Partie Ancienne.
Fig. 24—Sousse: La Mosquée al-Baqalîn.

Fig. 25—Sousse: Le Four Dit "Kouchat El-Haram"; Niche Fatîmite.

Fig. 26—Monastir: La Mosquée "ed-Dizz."

Fig. 27—Monastir: La Mosquée al-Tawbah.
Fig. 30—Sfax: Mosquée dans
UNE TOUR DES REMPARTS.

Fig. 31—Sfax: LA GRANDE MOSQUÉE; FAÇADE DU ONZIÈME SIÈCLE.
Fig. 32—Tunis: La Mosquée de la Rue El-Khomsa; le mihrab.

Fig. 33—Tunis: La Mosquée El-Fal.

Fig. 34—Tunis: La Mosquée Sidi Mansour.

Fig. 35—Tunis: La Mosquée du Sûq al-Sakkâjîn.

Fig. 36—Tunis: La Mosquée du Sûq el-Grana (Rue de l’Agha).
triques en encorbellement et de corniches moulurées. Ne disposant pas de photos de cette partie qui est masquée par un mur et des arbres, nous en donnerons une idée en présentant le cloître de l'église San-Giovanni à Palerme (fig. 13).

Les mosquées tunisoises comme Sidi al-Nu'mân, à Tunis (fig. 14), de la rue de la tente à Tunis (fig. 15), et Maghouch (fig. 16), ont, d'évidence, un air de famille avec les monuments signalés plus haut.

On n'ira pas plus loin avant de présenter quelques-uns des monuments d'art arabe des Normands de Sicile: le Palais de la Kubbah (fig. 17); le Palais de la Zizah (fig. 18); le Palais royal (fig. 19); le clocher de San-Giovanni (fig. 20); l'église de San-Cataldo (fig. 21) dont le crénelage (fig. 22) rappelle étrangement celui du minaret de la grande mosquée de Sfax qui lui est contemporaine; la partie ancienne de l'église de l'amiral Jean d'Antioche (fig. 23) et surtout sa coupole qui rappelle un peu celle du Bahou de la Zaytunah.

Sans vouloir aller jusqu'à des conclusions très poussées, on ne manquera tout de même pas de constater un fait: la proche parenté de ces deux arts, celui de Tunis et celui de Palerme.

Nous disons bien Tunis et non Tunisie, car les autres villes de notre pays ont pour cette période, un art différent. Signalons pour mémoire, à Sousse: la mosquée al-Baqqālīn (fig. 24); le four dit "Kouchat El-Ḥaram," qui devait être, à l'origine, un palais et où l'on trouve aujourd'hui une curieuse niche fatimite (fig. 25).

Signalons, pour Monastir: la mosquée "ed-Dizz" (fig. 26); la mosquée al-Tawbah (fig. 27); le bain qui se trouve à proximité de la grande mosquée (figs. 28 et 29).

Pour Sfax, signalons, une petite mosquée dans une tour des remparts (fig. 30) et qui se signale par une corniche à modillons concentrique par rapport à l'arc de tête et que nous trouvons sur la façade du onzième siècle de la grande mosquée locale (fig. 31).

Pour Tunis, nous signalerons encore quelques autres oratoires qui diffèrent de la série présentée plus haut mais qui ont leur place, sans aucun doute, dans la période fatimite. Ce sont: la mosquée de la rue El-Khomsa (fig. 32); la mosquée el-Fâl (fig. 33); la mosquée Sidi Manṣūr (fig. 34); la mosquée du Sûq al-Sakkâjin (fig. 35); la mosquée de la Place Sidi Ali Azzouz; la mosquée du Sûq "el-Grana," à hauteur de la rue de l'Agha (fig. 36); la mosquée du Sûq "el-Grana," à hauteur du Sûq du Cuivre; la mosquée de la rue Sidi Mahrez, à hauteur de la rue Lakhoua; la mosquée de la rue Sidi Ben Arous, près de la Place Romdhane Bey; la mosquée de la rue Sidi Ben Arous (No. 27); la Mosquée de la rue des Teinturiers (No. 21).

Voilà le fruit des travaux de prospection que nous avons accomplis jusqu'ici et que nous ne comptons pas interrompre. En effet, l'avenir semble réserver à la recherche, dans ce domaine, de riches perspectives qui nous permettront d'étoffer d'avantage le chapitre de l’architecture fatimite d'Occident. Si nous nous sommes presque cantonnés dans les édifices religieux, c'est que, à part le Palais d'al-Qâ'im à Mahdiyah et le Palais d'al-Manṣūr à Sabrah-Manşūriyah dont la fouille n'est pas encore achevée, et à part le "Kouchat El-Ḥaram" à Sousse et le Bain de Monastir—à part ces quatre monuments—nos investigations ne nous ont pas permis de repérer un plus grand nombre d’édifices autres que les monuments religieux qui doivent, d’ailleurs, leur survie au caractère sacré qui s’attache à eux.
By Oleg Grabar

THE UMAYYAD DOME OF THE ROCK IN JERUSALEM

It is a commonplace of classical Islamic religious writing that the Prophet himself considered Mekkah, Madinah, and Jerusalem as the three holiest places of the faith. All three centers were places of pilgrimage and in them liturgical requirements, sacred memories, and traditions acquired a monumental expression. Medieval writers and modern scholars and travelers have often described the religious topography of the Muslim holy places and the significance of the numerous structures erected on these sacred spots. But the problem is not only one of description and identification. The question must also be raised whether the current identifications of holy places and their present architectural expression date from the earliest times of Islam, and, if not, when and why these identifications were made and the monuments built. In other words the major sanctuaries of Islam must be considered in their historical context. For the mosque of Madinah, for instance, we possess the masterly study by J. Sauvaget, who succeeded, on the basis of texts and a limited archeological documentation, in reconstructing in detail the nature of this central monument of Islamic religious architecture in the Umayyad period.

In the case of Jerusalem, the problem presents itself differently. First, in dealing with the Haram al-Sharif, we are not dealing with a new holy area, as in Madinah, but with one of the most ancient sacred spots on earth. Second, in Jerusalem, the monuments themselves are better known. The Dome of the Rock is still essentially the Umayyad building. The Aqsâ mosque, to be sure, has undergone numerous reconstructions, but recent studies by K. A. C. Creswell, J. Sauvaget, and especially R. W. Hamilton, have given us a good idea of the nature of the Umayyad mosque. The problem, therefore, is neither reconstruction nor dating, but essentially interpretation: if we consider the long tradition of Mount Moriah as a sacred place, what was its significance in the eyes of the Muslims? The fadâ'il or religious guidebooks for pilgrims of later times provide us with an answer for the period which followed the Crusades, but it may be questioned whether all the complex traditions reported about the Haram at that time had already been formulated when the area was taken over by the Arabs. Through its location, through its inscription, and through its mosaics, the Dome of the Rock itself provides us with three strictly contemporary documents, which have not so far been fully exploited in an attempt to define the meaning of the structure at the time of its construction. The Dome of the Rock is especially important in being not only the earliest remaining monument of Islam, but, in all likelihood, the earliest major construction built by the new masters of the Near East. The first
mosques in Kufah, Basra, Fustat, and Jerusalem were certainly not very imposing structures; little is known about Mu'awiyah's secular constructions in Damascus, but it is not likely that they were done on a very lavish scale. The Dome of the Rock, on the other hand, has remained to this day one of the most remarkable architectural and artistic achievements of Islam. It is therefore important to attempt to understand its meaning to those who lived when it was built.

Discussion of the meaning of Jerusalem, and especially of the Haram al-Sharif, in medieval times is greatly simplified since most of the geographical and descriptive texts dealing with the city have been gathered by Father Marmarji, and since many of them have been translated into English by G. Lestrange, into German by Gildmeister, into Russian by Miednikov, and into French by Father Marmarji. Furthermore, the inscriptions found on the Haram have been published and analyzed by Max van Berchem in the second series of his Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum. But, except for Miednikov, whose conclusions have been summarized and by and large accepted by Caetani in his Annali dell'Islam, and to a certain extent by van Berchem, these authors have dealt largely with purely descriptive texts, for the most part taken from geographers, and have only too rarely tried to set the building up of the Haram area by the Muslims within the historical circumstances of the time.

The Dome of the Rock is dated in the year 72 A.H./A.D. 691-692 and there is some evidence that it was begun in 69. It has been described many times and its location (on a platform to the north of the center of the vast artificial esplanade of the Haram al-Sharif; fig. 1), as well as its plan (an octagonal structure consisting of two octagonal ambulatories and a circular area within which lies the Rock; fig. 2), is familiar to all travelers to Palestine and to all students of Muslim archaeology. K. A. C. Creswell and Mademoiselle van Berchem have dealt in great detail with the character and the origins of the building and of its mosaics, and Creswell has analyzed the purpose of the building, but only briefly and, as will be shown, incompletely. In this study, as far as possible, only texts earlier than the Crusades will be used, for the Crusades superimposed over the earlier Jewish and Muslim traditions a whole series of more or less artificial Christian ones which confuse all problems connected with the Haram and often prevent certain identifications. As Max van Berchem has shown in a number of cases, the conscious attempt by Saladin to reconvert all buildings to their ancient usage was not always successful and has at times led to extraordinary misunderstandings. It is also quite certain that the numerous legends and

---

12 N. A. Miednikov, Palestina ot zavoevaniya arabami do kristovskikh pohodov, Pravoslavnjy Palestinskij Sbornik, vols. 16 and 17 (1897).
14 Max van Berchem, Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum II Syrie du Sud, 3 vols., Cairo, 1922-23, 1927.
UMAYYAD DOME OF THE ROCK IN JERUSALEM

traditions which are associated with the Haram in the group of faḍā‘il of the Mamlik period were not introduced in the Umayyad period. The comparative simplicity of the legends accepted even in Ayyubid times is now fully shown by the published and translated K. al-Ziyārāt of al-Harawi. Except in a few cases it is almost impossible to determine exactly when a specific tradition or identification of a holy place with a sacred event became sufficiently common to be accepted and propagated by the spiritual Baedekers of a given time, but in the early period of Islam the religious system and the spiritual life of the faithful were yet too simple—or too disorganized—to allow for as definitive and complete a system of religious-topographical associations as appears in later writing. More often than not later traditions tend to confuse rather than clarify the essential issue of the purpose and origin of the Umayyad structure.

As far as the Umayyad Dome of the Rock is concerned, two explanations are generally given for its construction. The first has the apparent merit of agreeing quite well with the historical circumstances of the years 66–72 A.H., and it has been adopted by Creswell after having been introduced by Goldziher. This interpretation is based on texts of al-Ya‘qūbī (260 A.H./A.D. 874), a shi‘ite brought up in Baghdad who had traveled widely throughout the empire, and Eutychius (d. 328 A.H./A.D. 940), a melkite priest from Alexandria. It is also found in other

12 Two of these late faḍā‘il have been recently translated by C. D. Matthews, Palestine-Mohammedan Holy Land in Yale Oriental Series, vol. 24, New Haven, 1949, with important notes.
15 This interpretation of the Muslim sanctuary has been very recently criticized by S. D. Goitein in a brief communication on the background of the Dome of the Rock. His argument is partly negative. He points out that the statements of al-Ya‘qūbī and Eutychius are unique in the annals of early Muslim historiography and that as momentous an attempt as that of changing the site of the hajj could not have been overlooked by such careful historians as al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhuri, and especially not by a local patriot like al-Maqdisī. Furthermore it would have been

politically unsound for 'Abd al-Malik to have "marked himself as Kāfr, against whom the Jihād was obligatory." The theologians of his entourage were not likely to have approved of it. Al-Ya'aqūbī does say that 'Abd al-Malik leaned on the testimony of al-Zuhri to justify his decision, but the statement is hardly creditable, since al-Zuhri was barely 20 years old at the time. An important point of Goitein's article is to have brought attention to the unfortunately still largely unpublished Ansāb al-Ashrāf of al-Balādhūrī. In the description found there of al-Ḥajjāj's operations around Mekkah, it is made clear that the Syrian forces considered Mekkah as the center for pilgrimage. Before starting for Mekkah the soldiers are told that they must be ready for the pilgrimage; during the fighting al-Ḥajjāj requests permission for his troops to make the ṭawāf; and there appears to have been a fairly constant stream of people going on pilgrimage in spite of the fighting. It may also be pointed out that al-Ḥajjāj would not have taken such pains to restore the Ka'bah to its original shape, had it been replaced in the mind of the Umayyads by the new building in Jerusalem. And a statement in Ṭabari to the effect that in 68 A.H. at least four different groups went on pilgrimage shows beyond doubt that, at that time at least, the bitter factional strifes between Muslims were held somewhat in abeyance during the pilgrimage.


Goitein also shows that the accounts of al-Ya'aqūbī and of Eutychius contain errors which indicate that they were highly partisan in their opposition to the Umayyads and not always in full control of the facts. Eutychius and al-Muhallabi attribute to al-Walid, 'Abd al-Malik's successor, an attempt to divert the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, while al-Ya'aqūbī adds that the practice of having the ḥajj in the Palestinian city continued throughout the Umayyad period. Finally it is doubtful whether the comparatively small area of the Dome of the Rock could have been conveniently used for the long and complex ceremony of the ṭawāf; and it may be argued that, had 'Abd al-Malik wanted to replace Mekkah, he would have chosen a type of structure closer in plan to the Ka'bah than the Dome of the Rock, since the sacramental and inalterable character of the Mekkan sanctuary is fully apparent in its several reconstructions and, in particular, in that of al-Ḥajjāj.

The second explanation for the Dome of the Rock was destined to become the one that was, and still is, generally accepted by the faithful. It is connected with the complex problem of the exegesis of sūrah 17, verse 1, of the Koran: "Glorified be He Who carried His servant [i.e., Muḥammad] by night from the masjid al-ḥarām (i.e., Mekkah) to the masjid al-aqṣā [i.e., the farthest place of worship]." As early as the first part of the second century, the biographer of the Prophet, Ibn Iṣḥāq, connected this Night-Journey (isrā')

22 Cf. below for a possible interpretation of Eutychius' error.

23 Goitein has suggested that the pilgrims from Syria mentioned by Nāṣir-i Khusrow did not in fact accomplish the regular ḥajj, but only the ṭawāf, a practice which was observed in many provincial cities.

24 On all these problems cf. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Le pèlerinage à la Mekke, Paris, 1923, p. 49, and Encyclopaedia of Islam articles on Ka'bah, Mekkah, etc.
with the no less complex Ascension (mi'raj) of Muḥammad, and claimed that the masjid al-aqṣā was in fact in Jerusalem and that it is from Jerusalem that the Prophet ascended into heaven.²⁵ Al-Ya'qūbi mentions in his account the fact that the Rock in the Ḥaram al-Sharif is “the rock on which it is said that the Messenger of God put his foot when he ascended into heaven.”²⁶ Furthermore all the geographers describing the area mention a great number of qubbahs, maqāms, miḥrābs, etc. . . . connected with the events of Muḥammad’s Ascension. It might thus be suggested that the Dome of the Rock was built as a sort of martyrium to a specific incident of Muḥammad’s life.²⁷ The arguments could be further strengthened by the fact that, without doubt, the architecture of the Dome of the Rock follows in the tradition of the great Christian martyria and is closely related to the architecture of the Christian sanctuaries in Jerusalem, one of which commemorated the Ascension of Christ.

But, just like the first one, this explanation leads to more problems than it solves. A. A. Bevan has shown that among early traditionists there are many who do not accept the identification of the masjid al-aqṣā, and among them are to be found such great names as al-Buhkārī and Ṭabarî.²⁸ Both Ibn Ḥishāq and al-Ya’qūbi, loc. cit.

²⁶ al-Ya'qūbi, loc. cit.
²⁷ B. Schrieke, art. Isrā’ in Encyclopedia of Islam, and Die Himmelsreise Muḥammeds, Der Islam, vol. 7 (1916), attempted to show that the Ascension of the Prophet was a sort of Initiationsklimmfahrt for prophethood. On the more general problem of the Ascension, see the recent contributions of G. Widengren, The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book, Uppsala, 1950, and Muḥammad, the Apostle of God and his Ascension, Uppsala, 1951, whose interesting conclusions go far beyond the specific problem of Muḥammad.
²⁸ A. A. Bevan, Muhammed’s Ascension to
still stand today, most having been rebuilt after Saladin’s reconquest of Jerusalem. Next to the Dome of the Rock stood—as it still stands today—the qubbah al-mi’raj, the martyrium of the Ascension. Had the first and largest of all buildings on the Haram (outside of the congregational mosque on its southern end called al-Aqṣā) been built as a martyrium to the Ascension of Muḥammad, there would certainly not have been any need for a second martyrium. And the Persian traveler Nāṣir-i Khusrow, one of the first to attempt a systematic explanation of all the buildings of the Haram, still considers the Rock under the Dome simply as the place where Muḥammad prayed before ascending into heaven from the place where the qubbah al-mi’raj stands.³²

It appears then that the textual evidence is incomplete and cannot provide us with a satisfactory explanation of the purpose for which ‘Abd al-Malik built the Dome of the Rock. It is, therefore, necessary to turn to the internal evidence provided by the building itself. The Dome of the Rock can be analyzed from three different points of view: its location, its architecture and decoration, and the inscription (240 meters long) inside the building, which is the only strictly contemporary piece of written evidence we possess. While none of these could alone explain the Dome of the Rock, an analysis of all three points can lead to a much more complex and, at the same time, much more precise explanation than has been offered hitherto of the reasons which led to the erection of the first major monument of the new Islamic civilization.

The first question to be raised is that of the location of the building. More specifically, since it can be shown that the Rock was not considered at the time as the place whence Muḥammad ascended into heaven, why was it chosen as the obvious center of the structure? In order to answer this question, we must ask ourselves what significance the Rock had at the time of the Muslim conquest and whether there is any evidence for a Muslim explanation of the Rock at the time of the conquest or between the conquest and the building of the Dome by ‘Abd al-Malik.

The exact function of the Rock in the earliest times is still a matter of conjecture. While there is no doubt that the Haram was the site of the Solomonic temple, there is no definite Biblical reference to the Rock. Whether it was “the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite” (I Chron. 3:1; II Sam. 14:18), whether it was an ancient Canaanite holy place fitted by Solomon into the Jewish Temple, perhaps as a podium on which the altar stood,³³ or whether it was the “middle of the court” which was hallowed by Solomon at the consecration of the Temple (I Kings, 8:63–64) cannot be certainly determined.³⁴ The Herodian reconstruction of the Temple is not any clearer, as far as the Rock is concerned. From the Mishnah Middoth it would appear that the Rock was only a few inches above the level of the terrace and that it was used as a cornerstone in the Herodian building.³⁵ No where have I been able to find definite evidence for an important liturgical function of the Rock.

But in medieval times Mount Moriah in


general and the Rock in particular were endowed in Jewish legend with a complex mythology. Mount Moriah, through its association with the Temple, became the omphalos of the earth, where the tomb of Adam was to be found and where the first man was created. But another, more specific, tradition was attached to the Rock, that of the sacrifice of Abraham, through a confusion between the land of Moriah (Gen. 22:2) and Mount Moriah. It is not possible to say when the confusion first occurred, but it is already found in Josephus in the first century A.D., and it became common throughout Talmudic literature. In other words, in the Jewish tradition, the Rock and the area surrounding it acquired mystical significance as the site of the Holy of Holies and became associated with a series of legends involving major figures of the Biblical tradition, especially Abraham and Isaac. The importance accorded to the Haram and to the Rock by the Jews is evidenced in early medieval times by the statement of the Pilgrim of Bordeaux who mentions a lapid pertusus “to which the Jews come every year and which they anoint,” probably a reference to the Rock itself which appears here to be thought of as a tangible remnant of the Temple.

During the Roman and Byzantine period, the whole Haram area was left unoccupied, but, under Christian rule, the Holy City itself witnessed a new and remarkable development. This development took place in the “New Jerusalem,” and no Christian sanctuary appears to have been built on the area of the Haram, since the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple had to be fulfilled. There is some evidence in patristic literature that the Jewish associations were accepted by some Christians. But, with the building of the Holy Sepulchre, the omphalos of the earth was transferred to another hill of Jerusalem, Golgotha, and together with it were also transferred the associations between Jerusalem and Adam and Jerusalem and Abraham.

H. Vincent and F. M. Abel, Jerusalem II Jerusalem Nouvelle, Paris, 1926, vol. 1, pp. 16–18. As far as the Roman period is concerned, this is not entirely certain, and there is some evidence that there were Roman monuments on the Haram area.


The relevant texts are all in the collection of the PPTS, vol. 1, p. 24: “Here (Golgotha) Adam was formed out of the clay; here Abraham offered up Isaac his son as a sacrifice, in the very place where our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified.” See also vol. 2, pp. 14–16. On the omphalos at Golgotha, see A. Piganiol, L’Hémisphérian et l’Omphalos des Lieux Saints, Cahiers Archéologiques, vol. 1, 1945; A. Grabar, Martyrium, Paris, 1946, vol. 1, p. 253. That the Christian tradition was rather confused, at least in the beginning, is shown by the Terra Sancta of Theodosius, where both Golgotha and Mount Moriah are seen as the place where Abraham sacrificed Isaac (in PPTS, vol. 1, pp. 25–26, and vol. 2, p. 10). This association between Abraham and the Holy Sepulchre was maintained after the conquest by the Muslims, since it appears in Arculfus (ibid., vol. 3, pp. 10–11) and later in the account of the Russian abbot Daniel (ibid., vol. 4, pp. 15–16). It is interesting to note that the abbot considers the Rock to have been the site of Jacob’s struggle with the angel (p. 20). The identification with Jacob occurs also in Eutychius and
Such then appears to have been the situation at the time of the Muslim conquest: the Jewish tradition considered the Haram area as the site of the Temple and the place of Abraham’s sacrifice and Adam’s creation and death, while the Christian tradition had moved the latter two to a new site.

The main features of the chronology of the conquest of Jerusalem are fairly clear and have been fully stated by chroniclers and discussed by scholars.\(^\text{43}\) That the taking of the Holy City was a major moment in the conquest of Syria is apparent both in the fact that the Christians demanded the presence of ‘Umar himself for the signing of the treaty of capitulation and in the fact that ‘Umar acquiesced. Once the treaty was signed, ‘Umar, accompanied by the patriarch Sophronius, was led through the city. But as this “tour” of the Holy City was endowed by later writers with a series of more or less legendary incidents, it is not very easy to ascertain what happened. There are two points on which most sources, early or late, Muslim or not, seem to agree. First it seems that ‘Umar was definitely intent on seeing one specific site in the Holy City. All sources agree on that, and, in later traditions, his quest and the patriarch Sophronius’ opposition to it were transformed into a dramatic contest.\(^\text{44}\) Second, the early sources do not refer to the Rock as the main object of ‘Umar’s quest, but to the Haram area in general, which is seen as the place where the Jewish Temple stood, the mihrāb Dāwūd of the Koran (38:20–21), the naos tôn Ioudaiôn of Theophanes.\(^\text{45}\) The Greek text only mentions ‘Umar’s interest in the area of the Jewish Temple and adds later that a Muslim sanctuary was built on the place of the Jewish Temple.\(^\text{46}\) The tradition transmitted by Ṣabarī does mention the Rock, but it plays no part in the prayer and recitations (Kor. 38) made by the caliph when he reached the Haram area, and ‘Umar rejects the suggestion made to him by Ka‘b, a Jewish convert, that the Rock be on the qiblah side of the Muslim sanctuary. His reason is that this would be reverting to the Jewish practice. Eutychius also mentions the Rock and implies that Sophronius succeeded in persuading ‘Umar to take over the Jewish Temple area in exchange for a treaty which would leave the rest of Jerusalem free of mosques. In his relation of the discovery of the Rock and of the construction of the mosque, he follows a tradition similar to Ṣabarī’s, but without naming Ka‘b.\(^\text{47}\) Al-Musharraf emphasizes the fact that ‘Umar was looking for the place where the Temple of Solomon stood; he does mention the Night Journey of the Prophet, but not the Rock.\(^\text{48}\) Agapius of Manbij, a contemporary of Eutychius, does not mention either Rock or Ascension, but simply states that ‘Umar ordered the building of a mosque on the site of the Jewish Temple.\(^\text{49}\)

Whenever it is mentioned in these texts, the Rock, together with the whole Haram

---

\(^{43}\) L. Caetani, *Annali dell’Islam*, vol. 3, Milan, 1910, p. 920 ff., with all the texts known to that time.

\(^{44}\) LeStrange, *Palestine*, pp. 139-142.


\(^{46}\) Theophanes, p. 524. The Bonn text is not very explicit, since it simply talks about a naos. The de Boor edition (vol. 1, p. 342) has an addition which specifies that we are dealing with a mosque on the site of the Jewish Temple. It is the more likely interpretation of the text, and LeStrange’s translation, *Palestine*, p. 91, is incorrect.


area, appears as the symbol of the Jewish Temple. But the Rock itself is not taken into any particular consideration by ‘Umar. It may be, as is suggested by Eutychius, that ‘Umar was merely looking for a large area on which to build a mosque and that Sophronius used the Jewish background of the Haram to try to persuade the caliph to build the mosque in the empty space of the Haram. But it is perhaps more likely in the face of the enormous impact of Jewish traditions on early Islam, and specifically on ‘Umar at the time of the conquest of Jerusalem,59 that ‘Umar was genuinely interested in reviving the ancient Jewish holy site, inasmuch as it had been the first Muslim qiblah.61 At any rate, the Mus-

59 See, for instance, ‘Umar’s several conversations with Ka‘b and other Jews in Ṭabarī, vol. 1, p. 240 ff. On Ka‘b and the other major transmitters of Jewish lore into Islam, see M. Lidzbarski, De Propheteticis, quae dicuntur, legendis Arabicis, Leipzig, 1893. All this makes rather suspect the statement in Ṭabarī, vol. 1, p. 2405, that the treaty between ‘Umar and Sophronius contained a prohibition for Jews to live in Jerusalem. See also Michel le Syrien, Chronique, tr. J.-B. Chabot, vol. 2, Paris, 1901, p. 425. De Goeje, Mémoire sur la conquête de la Syrie, Leyden, 1900, p. 155, explains it as a “concession faite aux Chrétiens, dont la disposition envers les Juifs était tout autre que bienveillante.” But there is no evidence that ‘Umar would agree to discriminate against the Jews. It was not so in Alexandria, where the Jews were specifically permitted to remain in the city (R. H. Charles, The Chronicle of John of Nikiuon, London, 1916, p. 194). And in many instances, the Jews actually helped the invading Muslims (Ṭabarī, vol. 1, p. 2579; Baladhuri, Futūk, ed. M. de Goeje, Leyden, 1866, p. 167). De Goeje had admitted that parts of this treaty should be considered as later interpolations, although there is no reason to doubt the whole text; it may be advanced that the statement on the Jews is one such interpolation. For a more negative attitude, see Caetani, Annoti, vol. 4, p. 299 ff.

61 It may be wondered whether the Muslims would have actually taken over the Haram area simply because it had been the first qiblah, since it is in opposition to the Jews that Muhammad changed the direction of prayer (Ṭabarī, vol. 1, pp. 1680–

limes took over the Haram area with a definite knowledge and consciousness of its implication in the Jewish tradition as the site of the Temple.

But the later chroniclers are very clear in pointing out that the caliph withstood pressures to transform the site into a major center of Muslim worship. This fact in itself has important implications. It shows, on the one hand, that ‘Umar was subject to many pressures from Jewish and Christian groups to take up their religious quarrels. The caliph wisely remained aloof from these and thereby emphasized the unique character of the new faith in the face of the two older ones. But, at the same time, in building anew on the Temple area, even though in primitive fashion, the Muslims committed a political act:62 taking.1681). The need for a large area and ‘Umar’s desire not to take churches away from the Christians were probably more important arguments.

62 It is, of course, often difficult to distinguish between political and religious acts in the Middle Ages. And yet, in the prophecies related by Ṭabarī, vol. 1, p. 2409, to the effect that the conquest of Jerusalem was a victory over the Rūm and that it was a revenge of the bani Isrā‘îl who had been oppressed by the Rūm, one can see more than a mere statement of the new consecration of a holy spot, rather a sense of victory over an alien power. It is interesting also to compare the images of Sophronius as given by Eutychius and Theophanes. To Eutychius, a Christian who was living under the rule of Islam, the speaker for a minority under alien domination, Sophronius appears as a shrewd politician who had succeeded in baiting the mighty conqueror away from the Christian sanctuaries. To Theophanes, living in the security of the capital of the Christian empire, the patriarch of Jerusalem was a broken man, who had to submit to the tragedy which befell him and his city, but who remained aloof and contemptuous of the heretical barbarian; cf. below, n. 127. These two attitudes could easily find parallels in recent times, when conquests and foreign occupations have led men of the same nations, but in different places, to varying interpretations of the same events.
ing possession for the new faith of one of the most sacred spots on earth and altering the pattern imposed on that spot by the Christian domination, without restoring it to its Jewish splendor. But, in all these undertakings the Rock itself played but a minor part.

Some sixty years after the conquest of Jerusalem, however, the Rock will become the center of the whole area. The question is what occurred between the time of 'Umar and the reign of 'Abd al-Malik. The texts, so far as I have been able to ascertain, are silent on this score and we will have to turn to other sources to find a solution. If we consider only the location of the building and the traditions which were associated with it, two possible solutions can be envisaged, since neither the Ascension of Muhammad nor the imitation of the Ka'bah can be accepted. One would be that 'Abd al-Malik decided to commemorate the Jewish Temple, and therefore built a ciborium over what was thought to be the only tangible remnant of the structure. There is no evidence for this, nor is it likely that 'Abd al-Malik had such an idea in mind at a time when the Islamic state was fairly well settled. A second reason might be that the Muslims had brought back to the Rock and to Mount Moriah in general the localization of some biblical event of significance to them, for instance the sacrifice of Abraham. As such the hypothesis is not impossible. The importance of the "Friend of God" (khalil Allâh) in the Koran is well known and it is equally well known that Abraham was considered as the ancestor of the Arabs. In later times the major events of his later life were associated with Mekkah or the neighborhood of Mekkah; and it is interesting to note that the life of Adam was also transferred to the Holy City of Arabia, just as Abraham and Adam had moved together from Mount Moriah to the Golgotha in Jerusalem. But is there any definite evidence about the localization of the sacrifice of Abraham in the early Islamic period?

Our only almost contemporary source is John of Damascus. In his account of heresies, he has several extremely interesting pages on Islam. As far as Abraham is concerned, he relates that the Black Stone in Mekkah was supposed to have been either the place where Abraham had intercourse with Agar or the place where he tied his camel when he was about to sacrifice Isaac. Neither one of these And Professor A. Guillaume has informed me that he will bring out a series of documents which will shed a new light on the origins of Muhammad's view of Abraham. R. Blachère, in his translation of the Koran, gives a complete index and full bibliographical references on all passages concerned with Abraham. For later interpretations, see the major chroniclers and traditionists. For Abraham as related in one way or another to the whole of mankind, see the interesting text in Ibn Sa'd, Tabaqat, ed. F. Sachau and others, vol. 1, Leyden, 1905, p. 22. Balâdhuri, Anṣāb al-Ashrâf, ed. W.ähwardt, Anonyme Arabische Chronik, Greisswald, 1883, pp. 254–255, relates an interesting story going back to al-Mada'ini, in which the descendence from Abraham through Isma'il and the cousinage with Ishâq are understood as meaning that to the Arabs belong both mulk (kingship) and nubuwâwah ( prophethood).

52 On all these problems see art. Ibrâhim in Encyclopedia of Islam, also art. Kâbah, both by A. J. Wensinck, who reflected Snouck Hurgronje's ideas on the development of the Abraham concept in the Koran. Recently these ideas have been challenged in part by G. H. Bousquet, La légende Coranique d'Abraham, Revue Africaine (1951), pp. 273–288 (cf. Abstracta Islamica, Revue des Études Islamiques, 1952, p. 156).
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stories is a common Muslim interpretation of the Ka'bah and it may be wondered whether this text does not reflect a calumniuous Christian tradition. On the other hand the insistence with which John of Damascus "dispels" that the sacrifice of Abraham took place in Mekkah should be construed as indicating that the idea was fairly common at the time in Muslim circles. In the Muslim tradition itself the problem is complicated by uncertainty whether Isaac or Ismā'il was the object of the sacrifice.65 Ṭabarī, after a lengthy consideration of the problem, leans toward Isaac, both in his history and in his tafsîr; so do al-Kisâ'îî 67 and Ibn Qutaybah.68 It seems true that in the early period the official Muslim tradition tended to consider Isaac as the dhabîh.69 Ṭabarī does not try to give an


65 See Ṭabarî, vol. 1, p. 290 ff., for an enumeration of the different traditions on the subject. Similar enumerations are also to be found in the other major chroniclers and in Ṭabarī's Tafsîr, Cairo, 1321 A.H., vol. 23, p. 44 ff. (commentary on Koran 37: 101 ff.). It may be added that in a later tradition the sacrifice was even moved to Damascus, Ibn 'Asâkir, Al-ta'rikh al-ka'bîr, Damascus, 1329, I, pp. 232-233. The tradition is uncommon but points to the importance of the Abrahamic legend in Islam.


specific place for the event, but he does bring out one tradition which maintains that the sacrifice took place two mîls from Jerusalem at a place called Qûţ or Qâţ.66 Al-Ya’qûbî, as usual, relates the standard hagiographical tradition and puts the event at Minâ. But he acknowledges that the People of the Book set the sacrifice in the "land of the Amorites in Syria."67 Al-Kisâ’î relates that the dream of Abraham took place in Jerusalem, but omits any specific mention of the place of sacrifice.68 Many other writers have omitted any reference to the location. In other words, as far as one can gather, it is impossible to say that the sacrifice of Abraham was, in early Islamic times, definitely connected with any one specific place, whether around Mekkah or Jerusalem. Both identifications were made and the tradition is obviously uncertain, but the majority of the early traditionists and chroniclers have tended to think of Isaac as the sacrificed one and hence of Palestine as the place of sacrifice. The evidence of John of Damascus can be explained through the common polemical device of attacking the opponent’s position, even when it is uncertain, in its weakest side. Furthermore there are indications, in the known descriptions of Jerusalem, that certain places on the Haram were definitely associated with Abraham.69 And one writer, Nâšîr-i Khusrow, some 50 years before the Crusades, recorded that the footprints on the Rock were those left by Isaac when, together with his father, he came to the Temple area.64 Thus even in

66 Ṭabarî, vol. 1, p. 273; that Abraham had lived in Palestine and had built a masjid there is not doubted; ibid., pp. 271 and 347-348. This is accepted by other writers.


68 al-Kisâ’î, p. 150.


64 In PPTS, vol. 4, p. 47.
the eleventh century there still was a lingering memory in Muslim circles of a relationship between Abraham and the Rock. It is not possible, with the evidence in our possession, to prove that the early Muslims considered Jerusalem as the place of sacrifice; but, since the Muslim knowledge of Jewish traditions was mostly derived from Talmudic and other para-Biblical sources, and since a great number of Jews were converted to Islam in the first decades of the new religion, it is very likely that the early Muslims did know of the association between the Rock and Abraham's sacrifice.

One might suggest then that 'Abd al-Malik, in accord with his well-known policies, would have "islamized" the holy place and chosen the one symbol associated with it which was equally holy to Jews and Muslims, that of Abraham. It was a symbol which would, in Muslim eyes, emphasize the superiority of Islam, since in the Koran Abraham is neither a Christian nor a Jew, but a hanif (Kor. 3: 58 ff.) and the first Muslim. This suggestion finds support in one interesting feature of the Christian polemic against the Muslims. John of Damascus and others after him always insist on the fact that the new masters of the Near East are Ishmaelites, that is, outcasts;


69 A physical relationship could be established between the maqām Ibrāhīm in Mekkah, the stone on which Abraham stood while building the Ka'bah and which bore his footprints, and the Rock in Jerusalem which also has footprints.

67 Torrey, p. 102. See also the interesting comments of G. Widengren, Muhammad, p. 133 ff., who, however, have been too strongly influenced by the possible impact of Gnostic doctrines.

and it is with this implication that the old term Sarakenoi is explained as meaning "empty (because of or away from?) of Sarah" (ek te Sarras kenous) and that the Arabs are often also called Agarenoi, obviously in a pejorative sense. It is true that already Jerome, for instance, when writing about nomadic incursions in Palestine and elsewhere, mentions the posterity of Abraham, but his terms are very vague; and, while of course the term Ishmaelites goes back to Biblical times, there seems to appear in Christian writing with the arrival of the Muslims a new and greater emphasis on the sons of Agar. Whether this

68 John of Damascus, De Haeresibus, col. 763. See also the Homily to the Virgin in PG, vol. 96, cols. 657–658; for the term "sons of Agar" see also Michel le Syrien, vol. 2, p. 450, and other Greek or Syriac sources.


70 Professor Ihor Sevcenko, of Columbia University, has pointed out to me another Greek source, probably to be dated in the seventies of the seventh century, which introduces the concept of the Ishmaelites as forerunners of the Anti-Christ and as enemies of the true faith. The source is the body of prophecies attributed to Methodius of Patara, E. Sackur, Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen, Halle, 1848, pp. 1–96. On p. 68 the invaders against whom Gideon fought are called "sons of Ume" originally from Ethrib. The editor points out, p. 25, that we are probably dealing with a veiled reference to the Umayyads. Through Methodius of Patara the concept of the Ishmaelites was carried over to other "barbarian" invaders, even though the term was misunderstood; see, for instance, The Russian Primary Chronicle, S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, Cambridge, 1953, p. 184; and the references in Sackur. See also S. H. Cross, The earliest allusion to the Revelations of Pseudo-Methodius, Speculum, vol. 4 (1929), p. 329 ff. For other texts pertaining to this problem and a different interpretation, see M. B. Ogle, Petrus Comestor, Speculum, vol. 21 (1946), p. 312 ff. But for Methodius and eschato-
new emphasis on the posterity of Abraham in Greek and Syriac writers was the result of Arab claims to descent from Abraham (and the resulting building up of Ismā‘īl) or whether it derived solely from a Christian attempt to show contempt for the new masters of the Near East is difficult to say. But granting Abraham’s importance in early Islamic thought and in the traditions associated with the Rock, ‘Abd al-Malik’s building would have had an essentially polemic and political significance, as a memorial to the Muslim ancestor of the three monotheistic faiths.

But the problem of Abraham in early Islamic times can also be discussed in a purely Muslim context. It will be recalled that one of the most interesting acts of Ibn al-Zubayr in Mekkah was his rebuilding of the Ka‘bah, after it had been destroyed during the first Umayyad siege. The important point is that he reconstructed it not as it had been built in Muḥammad’s youth and with the Prophet’s participation, but differently. A later well-known tradition transmitted by ‘Aysah says that he built it as the Prophet said it was in the time of Abraham.61 Al-Ḥajjāj, on the other hand, rebuilt the Ka‘bah as it had been at the time of the Prophet. This curious attempt by Ibn al-Zubayr to use the prestige

of Abraham to justify his building may be brought into relation with another tradition reported by al-Azraqi. The Mekkans were apparently attempting to disprove the contention that Jerusalem was “greater than the Ka‘bah, because it (Jerusalem) was the place to which Prophets emigrate (mahājar al-anbiyā‘) and because it is the Holy Land.” 72 Within the Muslim koiné, therefore, it may be suggested that ‘Abd al-Malik, while “islamizing” the Jewish holy place, was also asserting a certain preeminence of Palestine and Jerusalem over Mekkah, not actually as a replacement of the Ka‘bah, but rather as a symbol of his opposition to the old-fashioned Mekkan aristocracy represented by Ibn al-Zubayr.73 The symbol was chosen from the religious lore which had not yet been definitely localized, but which was important to the new faith as well as in the beliefs of the older People of the Book. It was not, however, infringing—as any change of center for the pilgrimage would have done—on the very foundations of Islam.74 The opposition be-

61 Al-Azraqi, p. 39-40, where the statement about Jerusalem is attributed to the Jews; ibid., p. 41, where it is related that the earth of Tā‘if had been brought from Syria. The statement about the prophets should be related to Ibn Hawqal, p. 161, where Jerusalem is mentioned as the city of the prophets, and Ḫatāhirī, in Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vol. 1, pp. 56–57, where Jerusalem is described as having a miḥrāb for every prophet. For Mekkan claims see Azraqi, p. 39, where it is said that 70 prophets were buried in Mekkah. A curious point about the text of Ibn Hawqal is that the Rock of Jerusalem is referred to as the Rock of Moses, probably because the tradition has it that it was Moses who made the Rock into a qiblah, ʿAṣīr-i Khusrow, p. 27, unless we meet with a confusion with another Rock of Moses which has been set any place from Antioch to Persia (Maqdisi, pp. 19, 46, 151; Ḫatāhirī, p. 62).


74 Goldziher, Wellhausen, and Nöldeke gave a great deal of importance to the statement in a later
tween Jerusalem and Mekkah and ‘Abd al-Malik’s involvement in it may have given rise to the tradition transmitted by al-Ya’qūbi and others about the hajj and Jerusalem. What had been a religious-political act entailing an unsettled point of religious lore would have been transformed by them into a religious-political act of impiety intended to strike at the very foundation of one of the “pillars of Islam.” Thus did the propaganda machine of the shi‘ite and ‘Abbāsid opposition attempt to show the Umayyads as enemies of the faith.

Thus, from the consideration of the location of the Dome of the Rock, it would appear that, at the time of the conquest, the main association was between the Jewish Temple and the Haram area, but that this association does not in itself explain the building of the Dome of the Rock. It is only through the person of Abraham that the ancient symbolism of the Rock could have been adapted to the new faith, since no strictly Muslim sym-

Syriac source that Mu‘āwiyah was made king in Jerusalem and then prayed in various Christian sanctuaries; Th. Nöldeke, Zur Geschichte der Araber... aus syrischen Quellen, Zeitschr. Deutsch. Morgen. Gesell., vol. 29 (1875), p. 95, or Corp. Script. Christ. Orient., ser. 3, vol. 4, Paris, 1903-5, p. 55; J. Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich, Berlin, 1902, p. 136 ff. The story seems little reliable as such, especially in its implication of a kind of pilgrimage to Christian sanctuaries, but, if one recalls the dislike of the Umayyads for Madinah, the first capital of the Muslim state, this Syriac source may indeed reflect some specific relation between the Umayyads and Jerusalem. See, for instance, al-Isfahānī, K. al-Aghānī, Būlâq, 1868, vol. 19, p. 90, where Khālid al-Qaṣrī is said to have been ready to move the Ka‘bah to Jerusalem, if the caliph so ordered. In itself that type of statement is not very trustworthy, since it appears to be a literary image, but it may reflect the very same tradition which is more completely expressed in Ya‘qūbi.

In theory the person of Adam could also have been used as a connection between Mekkah and Jerusalem, since his life is described in both places. However, to my knowledge, there is no evidence to that effect.
the architecture confirms the symbolic quality of *place of commemoration* of the Dome of the Rock, but it does not provide us with any more specific clue with respect to its meaning at the time of 'Abd al-Malik.

As far as the mosaics are concerned, most of the decorative themes consist of vegetal motives interspersed with vases, cornucopias, and what have been called "jewels." All these elements, except the "jewels," are common enough and their significance in late seventh-century art has been analyzed more than once. But the "jewels" present a peculiarity which may help to explain the meaning of the structure. It must be pointed out first that we will not be dealing here with the gems and mother-of-pearl fragments set on tree trunks, fruits, rosettes, and cornucopias, which belong to a purely decorative scheme. We are only concerned with jewels that are worn, such as crowns, bracelets, earrings, necklaces, and breastplates. We shall not try to solve all the problems connected with these jewels, inasmuch as J. Deer has announced that he is preparing a special study of their importance for our knowledge of medieval and especially Byzantine royal ornament. We shall restrict ourselves here to a few remarks which bear directly on the problem of the significance of the Dome of the Rock.

Mademoiselle van Berchem has already noted that the jewel decoration does not appear uniformly throughout the building, but almost exclusively on the *inner face of the octagonal colonnade*. The reason for that, it has been suggested, is that the decoration will appear more brilliantly when seen against the light. It can be pointed out, however, that the difference between this part of the mosaic decoration and the rest of it does not lie in the usage of a jewel-like effect, but in the type of jewels used. Had the intended effect been purely formal, gems and mother-of-pearl, as used elsewhere in the building, would have served equally well here. It may rather be suggested that these actual crowns, bracelets, and other jeweled ornaments were meant to be shown as surrounding the central holy place toward which they face, and that it is in this sense that they contrast with the purely decorative gemlike fragments seen throughout the building.

the type of "jewels" found in the Dome of the Rock in a forthcoming work.

The wing motifs found on the drum (*fig. 4*) do not really belong to the category of actual jewels, as can be seen by comparing to them *fig. 5*, which occurs on the inner face of the octagon and which is a crown. It is certain, however, that the decoration of the drum has been redone and it may be that the later artists misunderstood the crown motif, which was there originally, and transformed it into a purely decorative one of wings. The existence of crowns on the drum of the building would agree with the proposed explanation of the decorative theme in the Dome of the Rock.

Marguerite van Berchem, pp. 196–197.
A second point to be made about these jewels is that, although in most cases they have been adapted to the vegetal basis of the decorative scheme, they are identifiable. There are crowns, some of which were discussed by J. Deer, either diadems with hanging and encrusted precious stones, in many cases topped with triangular, oval, or arched forms (figs. 6–8), or diadems surmounted by wings and a crescent (fig. 4). There is also a variety of breastplates, necklaces, pins, and earrings (figs. 9–11), almost all of which are set with precious stones either as incrustations or as hangings. These ornaments can all be identified either as royal or imperial ornaments of the Byzantine and Persian princes, with the former largely predominant, or as the ornaments worn by Christ, the Virgin, and saints in the religious art of Byzantium. Recent studies, in particular those of A. Grabar, J. Deer, and P. E. Schramm, have shown that these were all, in varying degrees and in different ways, symbols of holiness, power, and sovereignty in the official art of the Byzantine

82 It is in fact in images dealing with religious matters—of which we have a larger number—that we can find most of our parallels with the jewels of the Dome of the Rock. The monuments of Ravenna and of Rome provide us with the best repertory of jewels and crowns. See Marguerite van Berchem and E. Clouzot, Mosaiques Chretiennes du IVe au Xme siecle, Geneva, 1924, figs. 275 (Orans in Florence), 50 (Annunciation Mary in Santa Maria Maggiore), 144 and following (San Apollinario Nuovo), 197 and following (San Vitale); W. de Gruneisen, Sainte Marie Antique, Rome, 1911, figs. 77, 105. For royal examples see R. Delbrück, Die Consulardiptychen, Berlin, 1926, pls. 16, 22, 32, 38; W. Wroth, Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine coins in the British Museum, London, 1908, vol. 1, pls. XXIII ff.; A. Pasini, Il tesoro di San Marco, Venice, 1885, pl. L, 1. All these examples occur on coins, seals, consular diptychs, silver plates, mosaics, and paintings are no later than the eighth century. For other examples see the studies devoted to the subject of crowns by J. Deer, which are enumerated in Schramm, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 379–380. and Persian empires. In other words, the decoration of the Dome of the Rock witnesses a conscious (because of its position) use by the decorators of this Islamic sanctuary of representations of symbols belonging to the subdued or to the still active enemies of the Muslim state.

What can the significance of such a theme be in the decoration of an early Muslim holy place? We must ask ourselves first whether

82 Schramm et al., Herrschaftszeichen, passim. See also J. Deer, Der Ursprung der Kaiserkrone, Schweizer Beiträge zur Allgemeine Geschichte, vol. 8 (1950), pp. 51–87. For Sasanian crowns, see K. Erdmann, Die Entwicklung der sassanidische Krone, Ars Islamica, vol. 15–16 (1951). It is interesting to compare the representations of crowns on the Dome of the Rock with the later ones at Qusayr ‘Amra, A. Musil, Qusyr ‘Amra, Vienna, 1907, vol. 2, pl. XXVI. In the Umayyad bath, the Sasanian crown is, on the whole, quite similar to that of the sanctuary, comprising a row of pearls, a diadem, wings, a stand, and a crescent. The Byzantine crown, however, is different and, to the extent to which it is visible, it belongs to a variety of the “helmet” type (cf. Deer in Schweizer Beiträge) rather than to the “open” crown type which is characteristic of the Dome of the Rock. The Umayyads obviously used two different traditions as models. In Qusayr ‘Amra we meet with a strictly imperial tradition, whose characteristic was, as was shown by Deer, the “helmet” type with additions and variations. In Jerusalem the tradition was different. Deer, in Schramm, Herrschaftszeichen, suggested that most of the Dome of the Rock crowns were actually crowns of women, which were usually open. Although the problem goes beyond the scope of our study, it may be wondered whether the Byzantine emperor wore “helmet” crowns in all his functions. Furthermore, votive crowns were generally open and it may be wondered whether they should be considered as women’s crowns; cf. Schramm, vol. 2, p. 377 ff., and below. It is important to remember also that votive crowns and jewels, just as the crowns and other jewels worn by Christ, the Virgin, and saints (cf. the preceding note), belong to the same typological and, in many ways, ideological repertory as the insignia worn by princes. The open crown was common in the west, A. Boinet, La miniature Carolingienne, Paris, 1913, pl. 131, for instance.
there is any evidence in other places for the practice of hanging crowns or for representations of crowns and jewels in sanctuaries. The representational evidence is limited. A group of Gospels, mostly Armenian and Ethiopian, but certainly harking back to early Christian and Byzantine models, show, in the pages devoted to the representation of canon tables, structures, ciboria or tholoi, at times with hanging curtains between the columns. In a number of cases hanging crowns also appear between the columns or on the side (figs. 12–13). Professor Nordenfalk has suggested that these tholoi represented the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The well-known Pola casket (fig. 14) shows such a crown in the sanctuary of St. Peter’s in Rome. Crowns are also shown hanging over the hands of the bishops of Ravenna in San Apollinario in Classe and over the head of an emperor on an ivory. All these crowns, in a number of cases difficult to distinguish from lamps with holy oil, serve to emphasize the greatness or sanctity of either person or place. Actual crowns and jewels have also survived to this day. The unique group of Visigothic crowns discovered in Spain, many of which bear such a remarkable resemblance to the crowns of the Dome of the Rock, are among our best examples. A number of texts have also preserved for us evidence for this practice of hanging votive crowns. In Christian Egypt, the builders of a church hung a crown over the altar of the church opposite a gold and silver cross in the center of the edifice. In Constantinople emperors are known to have ordered crowns to be suspended over or around the holiest spot in the sanctuary of Hagia Sophia. Although less precise, similar practice of the palace of Theodoric and on certain Carolingian miniatures. It must also be added that the Byzantines were not the only ones to have hanging crowns in royal palaces. It was a common Sassanid practice, as can be seen through the well-known example of the crown of Ctesiphon (A. Christensen, L’Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhagen, 1944, p. 397) and through numerous incidents in the Shāh-nāmeh. All references to crowns in the latter work have been conveniently gathered by K. H. Hansen, Die Krone in Shāh-nāme, Der Islam, vol. 31 (1953).

84 C. Nordenfalk, Die Spätantike Kanontafel, Göteborg, 1938, pls. 24, 33, 39, fig. 2 in the text, p. 104. Armenian examples are also illustrated in S. Der Nersessian, Armenia and the Byzantine Empire, Cambridge, 1945, pl. 21, 1; and K. Weitzmann, Die armenische Buchmalerei des 10. und beginnenden 11. Jahrhunderts, Bamberg, 1933, pl. 9, No. 37. Also K. Weitzmann, Byzantinische Buchmalerei des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts, Berlin, 1935, pl. 17, No. 92, for the Greek example from the Marciana Library. Other Greek examples occur on an unpublished Gospelbook in the Greek patriarchate in Jerusalem.

85 Nordenfalk, pp. 103–108, where, however, the author describes as a lamp what, on the Marciana Gospelbook, appears rather to be a crown with a hanging in the shape of a cross.

86 It has been illustrated many times. Cf. B. M. Apolloni Ghetti et al., Esplorazione sotto la Concessione di San Pietro, Rome, 1951, figs. 118, 121, pl. H.

87 Marguerite van Berchem-Etienne Clouzot, op. cit., figs. 203–206.

88 Delbrück, Consulariptychen, pl. 22. The usage of such crowns in the imperial tradition goes back to the ancient practice of giving a crown of laurels, but jeweled crowns are in evidence in Ravenna’s representational evidence.
tices seem to have been common in the Mazdaean world as well. In all these cases we are dealing with an emphasis on the holiness of a sanctuary—or, as in the cases of Ravenna and the Visigoths, of a personage—through suspending around it or over it royal insignia. This explanation might be offered for the use of the decorative theme in the Dome of the Rock. It could be argued that, perhaps under the impact of the Christian sanctuaries of Jerusalem, and in particular the Holy Sepulchre, the Dome of the Rock was decorated with votive crowns to emphasize the holiness of the place.

Yet such an explanation would lead to difficulties. It would not explain the inclusion of a Persian crown within the decorative scheme. Moreover, this explanation, while agreeing with the purely formal aspect of the decoration, agrees perhaps less well with the historical and cultural milieu of the Umayyads and of Islam. It is no doubt true that the early Muslim civilization owed most of its ideas and a great deal of its art to the cultures which preceded it in the conquered areas; but it would be a mistake to consider that the imitation and copying which took place were absolutely blind. It should be possible to explain an early Islamic monument in Muslim terms. In other words, we must ask ourselves whether there is any evidence in the early Islamic period for the use of crowns and other royal objects in religious buildings and, if so, for what purposes. Were they really ex-votos? Or did they have a different significance? An essential piece of evidence is provided by the list of objects sent to Mekkah and kept there in the Ka’bah. This list can be made up from different authors, especially from al-Azraqi, whose early date is of particular significance to us.

In older times the Mekkan sanctuary had had paintings and sculptures, which were destroyed on the Prophet’s order, as a well-known story tells. Apparently until the time of Ibn al-Zubayr the shrine also kept the two horns of the ram which had been sacrificed by Abraham and other prophets. When he destroyed the Ka’bah, Ibn al-Zubayr tried to reach for them, but they crumbled in his hands. In Islamic times a new series of objects was brought into the Temple. ‘Umar hung there two crescent-shaped ornaments taken from the capital city of the Persians. Yazīd I gave two ruby-encrusted crescents, belonging to a Damascus church, together with two cups. ‘Abd al-Malik sent two necklaces (shamsatayn) and two glass cups. Al-Walid I also sent two cups, while al-Walid II sent a throne and two crescent-shaped ornaments with an inscription. Al-Saffāh sent a green dish, while al-Mansūr had a glass cup of an ancient Egyptian type hung in the shrine. Hārūn al-Rashid

In a recently published posthumous article M. Aga-Oglu has gathered much of this information, although in a totally different connection; M. Aga-Oglu, Remarks on the character of Islamic art, The Art Bulletin, vol. 36 (1954), p. 182.


Cf. above.

Al-Birūnī, K. al-Jamāḥir, ed. F. Krenkow, Heyderabad, 1936, p. 67. This text was unavailable to me and I owe the reference to the article by Aga-Oglu.

The inscription is supposedly dated in 101/719-720; E. Combe, J. Sauvaget, and G. Wiet, Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe, Cairo, 1931 (and subsequent years), No. 101. The date is, of course, impossible. Either the name of the caliph or the date were misread by the chronicler.

Thus (altägyptisch) does C. J. Lamm, Mittel-
put there two gilded and jeweled cases (qasbatayn) containing the celebrated oaths of allegiance of his two sons to the complex system he had established.\(^{100}\) Al-Ma’mûn sent rubies attached to a golden chain, while al-Mutawakkil had a necklace of gold with precious stones, rubies, and topazes hung on a chain of gold. At a later date, the agreement between al-Muwaffaq and al-Mu’tamid about the division of the empire was also sent to the Ka’bah.\(^{101}\) But the most important group of objects from our point of view is that which was sent by al-Ma’mûn.

The text of al-Azraqi is somewhat confused on this score. This is not the place to define the exact historical circumstances involved, but it would seem that two more or less contemporary sets of events were mixed up by the chronicler. First, an unnamed king of Tibet had an idol of gold with a crown of gold and jewels set on a baldachin throne of silver covered with a cloth with tassels in the shape of spheres. When this king became a Muslim, he gave the throne and the idol to

alterliche Glaser, Berlin, 1930, p. 490, translate the word fara’îniyâ.

\(^{100}\) This succession has been described by F. Gabriele, La successione di Hârân al-Rashid, Rivista degli Studi Orientali, vol. 11, 1928. The Tabari texts on the subject have been translated by the same scholar, Documenti relativi al califfato di al-Amin, Rend. della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, ser. 6, vol. 3 (1927), p. 191 ff. Although well known in its modalities this partial division of the empire has not been fully analyzed from the point of view of religious-political ceremonies (see, for instance, Azraqi, p. 160 ff.) or of feudal institutions (a comparison with the almost contemporary Carolingian divisions of an empire may be quite fruitful). For a discussion of the formulas used in the inscriptions made on that occasion see A. I. Mihailova, K oformleniui gosudarstvennykh aktov vremenâ Abbasidov, Epigrafika Vostoka, vol. 7 (1953).


the Ka’bah. They were sent to Mekkah in 201 A.H. and exhibited at the time of the pilgrimage with an inscription\(^{102}\) emphasizing the fact that the throne was given as a gift to the Ka’bah as a token of the king’s submission to Islam.\(^{103}\) In 202, during a revolt, the throne was destroyed,\(^{104}\) but the crown remained in the Ka’bah certainly until the time of al-Azraqi. Second, the Mekkah sanctuary also acquired the spoils of the Kâbûl-shâh, who submitted and became converted in 199. His crown seems to have been taken to Mekkah immediately, as is ascertained by an inscription of that date.\(^{105}\) The throne was kept for a while in the treasury (bayt al-mâl) of the Orient, but then was also moved to Mekkah in 200.\(^{106}\) The inscriptions which were put up together with these two objects are quite revealing in showing the extent to which the nature of an inscription in a religious sanctuary is related to the circumstances of the time. They emphasize, on the one hand, the victory of the “righteous” prince al-Ma’mûn over his perjured brother and, on the other hand, the victory of the “Commander of the Faithful” over the unbelievers.\(^{107}\)

\(^{102}\) Répertoire, No. 119.

\(^{103}\) See B. Spuler, Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden, 1952, p. 55, and the bibl. references in n. 4. A. I. Mihailova, Novye epigraficheskie dannye dlia istorii Srednei Azii IX v., Epigrafika Vostoka, vol. 5, 1951, who discusses this whole group of inscriptions, doubts (p. 18) the veracity of the story on the grounds that, aside from al-Azraqi, we only have the testimony of al-Ya’qûbî (vol. 2, p. 550) about the conversion of a Tibetan king. But both authorities are quite early and, while certain features may very well have been invented, the fairly precise statement of al-Azraqi certainly refers to an event which did take place.

\(^{104}\) See also al-Ya’qûbî, vol. 2, p. 550, where several thrones are implied. The gold and silver of the throne or thrones were used to strike coins.

\(^{105}\) Répertoire, No. 100.

\(^{106}\) Répertoire, No. 116.

\(^{107}\) The difference in mood between the two in-
All these objects found in the Ka'bah can be divided into three categories. Some were merely expensive gifts whose purpose was to emphasize the holiness of the place and the piety of the donors. Just as in Byzantium, there was, in this category, a preponderance of royal jewels. Another category of objects need not concern us here: the statements of oaths were put in the sanctuary not to enhance the sanctuary's holiness, but to acquire holiness and sacredness from it. But there was also a third category of objects, from 'Umar's gift, acquired in the palace of the Persian kings, to the throne and crown of Kābūl-shāh. Such objects had an uplifting value to the beholders, used as they were to symbolize the unbeliever's submission to Islam through the display of the Herrschaftszeichen of the unbelieving prince in the chief sanctuary of Islam.

If we return now to the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock, two possibilities are open. One can argue, first, that the crowns and jewels reflect an artistic theme of Byzantine origin which, also in an Islamic context, used royal symbols in a religious sanctuary to emphasize the sanctuary's holiness. But one can also suggest that the choice of Byzantine and Sasanian royal symbols was dictated by the desire to demonstrate that the "unbelievers" had been defeated and brought into the fold of the true faith. Thus, in the case of the mosaic decoration, just as in the problem of the choice of the location of the building, one can present at the same time an explanation of the Dome of the Rock which would be purely religious and self-sufficient in Islamic terms alone (even though it may reflect practices found in other civilizations) and an explanation which brings up the relationship of the non-Muslims to the new faith. The third document in our possession, the inscription, will give us a definite answer.

The Dome of the Rock is unusually rich in inscriptions, of which three are Umayyad. The major one, 240 meters in length, is found above the arches of the inner octagonal arcade, on both sides. With the exception of the well-known place where al-Ma'mūn substituted his name for that of 'Abd al-Malik, this inscription is throughout contemporaneous with the building. The other two inscriptions are on copper plaques on the eastern and northern gates. They, too, have been tampered with by the 'Abbāsid prince, but Max van Berchem has shown that they should be considered as Umayyad.

The content of the inscriptions is almost exclusively religious, the exception being the part that gives the name of the builder and the date, and to a large extent it consists of Koranic quotations. The importance of this earliest Koranic inscription we have lies in the choice of the passages and in the accompanying prayers and praises. That Koranic excerpts were used in Islamic times to emphasize or even to indicate the purpose of a structure can easily be shown by a few examples. For in-

---

108 Max van Berchem, Matériaux, pp. 223-371.
109 Ibid., pp. 228-255; Répertoire, Nos. 9-11.
stance, the Nilometer of Rawdah contains Koranic inscriptions from the 'Abbâsid period, which refer to the importance of water as a lifebringing element (42: 27–28; 14: 37; 16: 10–11, and so on).110 In the mosque of al-Ḥakim a passage was chosen which refers to an imām (28: 4).111 Much later the hospital of Nur al-Din in Damascus contained various quotations dealing with the art of healing (10: 59; 16: 71; 26: 78–80).112 Most mosques generally contain in some obvious place 9: 18, which specifies the duties of those entering sanctuaries. It is thus perfectly legitimate to infer from the tenor of a Koranic inscription the purpose and the significance of a building. Often, as in the Dome of the Rock, these inscriptions can in fact be read only with difficulty. However, Max van Berchem has shown in numerous instances that the significance of inscriptions was essentially symbolic and this is particularly evident in the Dome of the Rock, since otherwise there would have been no reason for al-Ma'mūn to replace 'Abd al-Malik's name with his own.113

The inscription in the interior of the building can be divided into six unequal parts, each of which begins with the basmalah. Each of these parts contains a Koranic passage, except for the one that has the date. The first part has sūrah 112: "Say: He is God, the One; God the Eternal; He has not begotten nor was He begotten; and there is none comparable to Him." The second part contains sūrah 33: 54: "Verily God and His angels bless the Prophet; O ye who believe, bless him and salute him with a worthy salutation." The third passage is from sūrah 17: verse 111.

110 Max van Berchem, Matériaux pour un GIA: 1, Égypte, Paris, 1903, p. 19 ff.
111 Ibid., pp. 50–51.
112 E. Herzfeld, Damascus, studies in architecture 1, Ars Islamica, vol. 9 (1942), p. 5.
113 M. van Berchem, Matériaux, Syrie du Sud, p. 235 ff.

This is the sūrah of the Night Journey, but the quoted passage is not connected with the īsra' of the Prophet, a further argument against the belief that at the time of 'Abd al-Malik the Rock of Jerusalem was already identified with the place of the Night Journey whence Muhammad ascended into heaven. Verse 111 goes as follows: "And say: praise be to God, Who has not taken unto Himself a son, and Who has no partner in Sovereignty, nor has He any protector on account of weakness."114 The fourth quotation, 64: 1 and 57: 2, is a simple statement of the absolute power of God: "All in heaven and on the earth glorify God; to Him is the Kingdom; to Him is praise; He has power over all things." The last part is the longest and contains several Koranic passages. First 64: 1, 67: 2, and 33: 54 are repeated. They are followed by 4: 169–171: "O ye People of the Book, overstep not bounds in your religion; and of God speak only truth. The Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, is only an apostle of God, and His Word which He conveyed into Mary, and a Spirit proceeding from Him. Believe therefore in God and His apostles, and say not 'Three.' It will be better for you. God is only one God. Far be it from His glory that He should have a son. His is whatever is in the heavens, and whatever is on the earth. And God is a sufficient Guardian. The Messiah does not disdain being a servant of God, nor do the Angels who are near Him. And all who disdain His service and are filled with pride, God will gather them all to Himself." This quotation is followed by a most remarkable invitation to prayer: "Pray for your Prophet and your servant, Jesus, son of Mary."115 But this is

114 This last sentence is still fairly obscure, as can be seen from the varying translations by Pickthall, Palmer, and Blachère, but the reference to Christ is unmistakable.
115 This expression might be compared to the expressions found on early coins: Muhammad rasūl
followed by 19:34-37: "And the peace of God was on me (Mary) the day I was born, and will be the day I shall die, and the day I shall be raised to life. This is Jesus, the son of Mary; this is a statement of the truth concerning which they doubt. It beseems not God to beget a son. Glory be to Him. When he decrees a thing, He only says to it 'Be,' and it is. And verily God is my Lord and your Lord; adore Him then. This is the right way." And the inscription ends with the exhortation and threat of 3:16-17: "God witnesses that there is no God but He; and the angels, and men endowed with knowledge, established in righteousness, proclaim there is no God but He, the Mighty, the Wise. The true religion with God is Islam; and they to whom the Scriptures had been given, differed not until after the knowledge had come to them, and through mutual jealousy. But, as for him who shall not believe in the signs of God, God will be prompt to reckon with him." 116

The two inscriptions on the gates are not as explicit. The one on the east gate bears a number of common Koranic statements dealing with the faith (2:256; 2:111; 24:35, 112; 3:25; 6:12; 7:155) and a long prayer for the Prophet and his people. The inscription on the north gate is more important since it contains two significant passages. First it has 9:33 (or 61:9): "He it is who has sent His messenger with the guidance and the religion of truth, so that he may cause it to prevail over all religion, however much the idolaters may hate it." This is the so-called "prophetic mission" which has become the standard inscription on all Muslim coins. But, while it is true that it has become a perfectly commonplace one, its monumental usage is rarer and this is its first known example. And second, this inscription contains an abridged form of 2:130 (or part of 3:78), which comes after an enumeration of the prophets: "We believe in God, in that which was passed down to Muḥammad (this is not Koranic) and in that which the Prophets received from their Lord. And we make no distinction between any of them and unto Him we have surrendered.”

These quotations emphasize three basic points. First the fundamental principles of Islam are forcefully asserted, as they will be in many later inscriptions. Then all three inscriptions point out the special position of the prophet Muḥammad and the importance and universality of his mission. Finally the Koranic quotations define the position of Jesus and other prophets in the theology of the new faith, with by far the greatest emphasis on Jesus and Mary (no Old Testament prophet is mentioned by name). 117 The main inscription ends with an exhortation, mingled with the threat of divine punishment, pointing to Islam as the final revelation and directed to the Christians and the Jews ("O ye people of the Book"). These quotations do not, for the most part, belong to the usual cycle of Koranic inscriptions on monuments. Just as the Dome of the Rock is a monument without immediate parallel in Islamic architecture, so is its inscription unique. Moreover it must be realized that even those quotations which will become commonplace were used here, if not for the first time, at any rate at a time when they had

116 The last few words are missing on the inscription, probably because the artist miscalculated the space he had at his disposal.

117 This point had already been made by M. de Vogüé, Le Temple de Jérusalem, Paris, 1864, p. 89. Max van Berchem, p. 251, n. 4, has denied that most of the quotations deal with Jesus. While it is, of course, true that the inscriptions on the doors are not overly explicit, the main inscription inside the building is quite unique for its emphasis on the relations between Islam and Christianity.
not yet become standard. Through these quotations the inscription has a double implication. On the one hand it has a missionary character; it is an invitation, a rather impatient one, to "submit" to the new and final faith,\textsuperscript{118} which accepts Christ and the Hebrew prophets among its forerunners. At the same time it is an assertion of the superiority and of the strength of the new faith and of the state based on it.

The inscription also had a meaning from the point of view of the Muslims alone. For it can be used to clarify the often quoted statement of al-Maqdisi on the reason for the building of the Dome of the Rock. One day al-Maqdisi asked his uncle why al-Walid spent so much money on the building of the mosque of Damascus. The uncle answered: "O my little son, thou hast not understanding. Verily al-Walid was right, and he was prompted to a worthy work. For he beheld Syria to be a country that had long been occupied by the Christians, and he noted there the beautiful churches still belonging to them, so enchantingly fair, and so renowned for their splendor, as are the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the churches of Lydda and Edessa. So he sought to build for the Muslims a mosque that should be unique and a wonder to the world. And in like manner is it not evident that 'Abd al-Malik, seeing the greatness of the martyrion (qubbat) of the Holy Sepulchre and its magnificence was moved lest it should dazzle the minds of the Muslims and hence erected above the Rock the Dome which is now seen there."\textsuperscript{119}

It is indeed very likely that the sophisticated Christian milieu of Jerusalem had tried to win to its faith the rather uncouth invaders. And it is a well-known fact that eastern Christianity had always liked to use the emotional impact of music and the visual arts to convert "barbarians."\textsuperscript{120} That such attempts may have been effective with the Arabs is shown in the very interesting, although little studied, group of accounts dealing with the more or less legendary trips of Arabs to the Byzantine court in early Islamic times, or sometimes even before Islam.\textsuperscript{121} In most cases the "highlights" of the "guided tours" to which they submitted was a visit either to a church where a definite impact was made by the religious representations or to a court reception with similar results. In the pious accounts of later times the Muslim always leaves impressed but unpersuaded by the pageantry displayed. One

\textsuperscript{118} Goitein has also pointed this out, in JAOS, vol. 70 (1950), p. 106. At a slightly later date, John of Damascus, Homily on the Holy Sabat, in PG, vol. 96, cols. 641-642, reflects Muslim missionary work: "Whoever does not confess that Christ is the Son of God and God is an Antichrist. If somebody says that Christ is a servant (doulos), let us close our ears in the knowledge that he is a liar and that he does not possess the truth." The reference to the Muslim view of Christ is unmistakable.

\textsuperscript{119} Al-Maqdisi, p. 159; LeStrange, Palestine, pp. 117-118.

\textsuperscript{120} For a later example see The Russian Primary Chronicle, tr. S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, Cambridge, 1953, pp. 110-111. See also the Arabic traditions mentioned below.

\textsuperscript{121} See, for instance, al-Dinawari, K. al-akhbâr al-tiwâl, ed. V. Guirgass, Leyden, 1888, pp. 21-22; al-Isfahâni, K. al-Aghâni, Bûlâq, 1868, vol. 14, pp. 5-8; ibn al-Fakih, K. al-Buldân, in Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vol. 5, p. 141 ff. There is a whole body of such stories which should be sorted out. Often these stories are connected with the stories dealing with Muhammad's missions (cf. below), but some have already acquired a literary flavor suggesting that we are in fact dealing with a theme which was not merely historical. For legends and history, see R. Goossens, Autour de Diginis Akritas, Byzantion, vol. 7 (1932), pp. 303-316; M. Canard, Delhemma, ibid., vol. 10 (1935), pp. 283-300; H. Grégoire and R. Goossens, Byzantinische Epos und arabischer Ritterroman, Zeitschr. Deutsch. Morgen. Gesell., n.f., vol. 13 (1934), pp. 213-232; and especially M. Canard, Les aventures d'un prisonnier arabe, Dumbarton Oaks Papers, vol. 10 (1955-56).
may wonder, however, whether such was always the case and whether the later stories should not be considered, at least in part, as moral stories intended to ward off defections. That the danger of defections existed is clearly implied in Maqdisi’s story. From a Muslim point of view, therefore, the Dome of the Rock was an answer to the attraction of Christianity, and its inscription provided the faithful with arguments to be used against Christian positions.

* A priori, as we have seen, two major themes must be present in the construction of the Dome of the Rock. First, the building of a sanctuary on Mount Moriah must be understandable—and must have been understood—in terms of the body of beliefs which had been associated with that ancient holy spot, since Islam was not meant as a totally new faith, but as the continuation and final statement of the faith of the People of the Book. In other words, the Dome of the Rock must have had a significance in relation to Jewish and Christian beliefs. Second, the first major Muslim piece of architecture had to be meaningful to the follower of the new faith. These two themes recur in the analysis of all the three types of evidence provided by the building itself. Its location can be explained as an attempt to emphasize an event of the life of Abraham either in order to point to the Muslim character of a personage equally holy to Christians and Jews or in order to strengthen the sacredness of Palestine against Mekkan claims. The royal symbols in the mosaics could be understood as simply votive or an expression of the defeat of the Byzantine and Persian empires by the Muslims. Finally the inscriptions are at the same time a statement of Muslim unitarianism and a proclamation to Christians and Jews, especially to the former, of the final truth of Islam.

But in the inscriptions the latter theme is preponderant and it is in the inscription, with its magical and symbolic significance—far greater than that of representational art in Islam from the very inception of the new faith—that we find the main idea involved.

122 Cf. references to Max van Berchem, above, n. 113. This point poses again the question of the formation of Muslim iconoclasm. The earliest definite evidence from a literary source derives from the complicated body of documents known as the “edict of Yazid,” which has been recently analyzed by A. A. Vasiliev, *The iconoclastic edict of the caliph Yazid II, A.D. 721*, Dumbarton Oaks Papers, vols. 9–10 (1956). But the archaeological evidence of the Dome of the Rock and of the mosque of Damascus shows that, even before the time of Yazid, it was fully accepted that a Muslim religious building did not admit of representations of living beings. There was thus a definite distinction in Umayyad times between an imperial art which permitted images and a religious art which did not. It is unlikely, however, that Muslim theology in the second half of the first century of the Hegira had already made all the conclusions which will be drawn later from the concept of God as the only Creator. It may be that the simple incident of the destruction of idols by Muhammad in Mecca created a precedent which was followed without being fully rationalized. The conscious destruction of religious representations in Central Asia by the Arab conquerors, which is evidenced both in literary sources and by archaeological documents, seems to have been the result of an opposition to idols rather than to representations. It may also be suggested that the Muslim opposition to religious images was connected with the tremendous importance of images in Christianity and that we are in fact dealing with a reaction against means of conversion and teaching with which the Muslims could not compete. The whole question of the origins of Muslim opposition to religious images is far from being solved, but a solution should not mean, as it has at times, the attribution to early Islam of the systems of thought and conclusions characteristic of a later period, but rather an understanding of the problem within its historical context. On the question of the work of art as a symbol of sovereignty, it may be interesting to relate the following story told by Eutychius, ed. L. Cheikho, vol. 2, pp. 19–20. At the time of the conquest, we are told, the Arab forces under Abū 'Ubaydah signed an armistice for one year
in the erection of the Dome of the Rock. What the inscription implies is a forceful assertion of the power and of the strength of the new faith and of the state based on it. It exemplifies the realization by the Umayyad leadership of its own position with respect to the traditional heir of the Roman empire. In what was in the seventh century the Christian city par excellence ‘Abd al-Malik wanted to affirm the superiority and the victory of Islam. This affirmation, to which was joined a missionary invitation to accept the new faith, had its expression both in the inscription and in the Byzantine and Persian crowns and jewels hanging around the sacred Rock. But its most

immediately striking expression was the appropriation for Islam of the ancient site of Mount Moriah. Thereby the Christian prophecy was voided and the Jewish mount re-habilitated. But it was no longer a Jewish sanctuary; it was a sanctuary dedicated to the victorious faith. Thus the building of the Dome of the Rock implies, on the part of ‘Abd al-Malik, what might be called a prise de possession of a hallowed area, in the same sense that, as Max van Berchem has shown, the substitution of al-Ma‘mūn’s name for that of ‘Abd al-Malik in the inscription was not the act of a counterfeiter or a vainglorious prince but had a political aim: “détourner à son profit le prestige religieux et politique attaché aux créations de ses prédécesseurs.”

In meaning, therefore, the Dome of the Rock should not so much be related to the monuments whose form it took over, but to the more general practice of setting up a symbol of the conquering power or faith within the conquered land. Such were the tropaia of the Roman empire. Such were, in a different way, the inscriptions in the Christian basilica of Bethlehem. Such were the well-known inscriptions of the Nahr al-Kalb north of Beyrout. Such was probably the meaning of many an Assyrian sculpture, whose brutality was really meant to strike fear in the heart of the subdued. And even today such commemorative inscriptions or monuments are not

129 Max van Berchem, p. 238. It may be added here that, of all later Muslim caliphs, al-Ma‘mūn was probably one of the most likely to understand the symbols involved in the Dome of the Rock, since, it will be recalled, he was responsible for the inscriptions on the treasure of Kābūl-shāh, above.


uncommon within the territory of the conquered peoples. The forms may change according to the time, place, and circumstances, but the monumental expression of an essentially political idea is as ancient as the existence of empires. And in Umayyad Islam this affirmation of victory is bound with a definite missionary spirit.

Two points remain still to be discussed. We must see first in what ways such an interpretation of the Dome of the Rock agrees with the Byzantine-Umayyad relations of the time. Then we must try to find out at what time the Dome of the Rock and the area surrounding it acquired the significance which became prevalent in later times.

The years 69–72 were not very favorable for the fortunes of the Umayyad caliphs. They were fighting Muslim forces in Arabia and Iraq. They were paying an enormous tribute to the Byzantines and, furthermore, they had to face the invasion of that odd group of Christian irregulars, the Mardaites, while the Cyprus situation was still unsettled. However, the interesting point is not in the actual events, but in the psychological climate of Christian-Muslim relations in the latter part of the seventh century. The important fact here is that there was a constant ambiguity in these relations, for they were, on the one hand, relations between two faiths and, on the other, between two empires. By the end of the seventh century it appears fairly certain that an important fraction of the Christian population within the Muslim empire—and especially the hierarchy of the church—was in reality a sort of “fifth column” for the Byzantine state, which was all too

126 It is in fact in Christian sources that this phenomenon becomes evident, since from a Christian point of view this was a very desirable activity. See the epistle of Sophronius to Sergius in Migne, PG, vol. 87, pt. 3 (Paris, 1865), cols. 3197–3200; cf. also the texts gathered by M. de Goeje, La conquête de la Syrie, pp. 174–176. The Sophronius letter was read anew at the sixth ecumenical Council in Constantinople in 680. J. D. Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum . . . collectio, Florence, 1765, vol. 11, cols. 459 and following. The pretext offered by Theodore, the representative of the see of Jerusalem (col. 455), was his desire to know whether the thoughts expressed in it were orthodox. This is a strange pretext at best, since the theological position of Sophronius was always recognized as one of the strongest expressions of orthodoxy in the face of Monothelitism. It is much more likely that Theodore wanted to draw the attention of the Council to the situation of the see of Jerusalem and, in a disguised form, to invite intervention. It had, of course, to be done in a disguised form, since there were, at the Council, representatives of other “occupied” areas, who were favorable to Macarius and the heretics on trial (see cols. 618–619) and who might have informed the Umayyads of orthodox activities. The stories dealing with John of Damascus’ betrayal of the caliph to the emperor are probably legendary (PG, vol. 94, cols. 453–456); see the article (Saint) Jean Damascène in Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, Paris, 1924. Yet what is unlikely is not the story itself but the fact that John of Damascus would have been plotting with Leo. Theophanes (Bonn ed., p. 559) relates that ‘Abd al-Malik wanted to use the columns of the Gethsemane church for the rebuilding of the Mekkan Temple; various Christian notables requested him not to do so, but suggested instead that they would ask Justinian II’s permission to substitute columns from another church. So it was

the easier, since communications were not interrupted between the two empires, as has recently been shown again.\footnote{127a}

'Abd al-Malik directed himself against the Christian danger no less effectively than against the danger of disaffection in the very ranks of Islam. The Mardaiotes were taken care of by an expedition\footnote{128} and by a treaty with Byzantium.\footnote{129} A few years later, 'Abd al-Malik changed the coinage\footnote{130} and transformed it into an instrument of opposition to the Byzantine empire. Already the earlier experimental issues had contained symbols of the new state,\footnote{131} but the new coinage included in a nutshell all the themes of the inscription of the Dome of the Rock: the unitarian affirmation (There is no God but God, One, without associate), the emphasis on Muhammad (Muhammad the Apostle of God), and the mission verse from the Koran quoted above. The argument that coinage was an element of ideological warfare is all the more convincing since, around the same time, and probably before the Muslim change of coinage, Justinian II introduced a new Byzantine coinage with a definite Christological emphasis (\textit{servus Christi} in the inscription and an image of Christ with the inscription \textit{rex regnantium}) which had hitherto been absent.\footnote{132} It may be pointed out in passing that it is on problems of Christology that all later discussions between Muslims and Christians will center.\footnote{133}

As to the third Christian element, the Christians of the Muslim empire, 'Abd al-Malik's attitude toward them was a mixture of sternness and persuasion. It is exemplified in the erection of the Dome of the Rock, whose meaning was that the Islamic state was here to stay and that the new faith was simply the

---

\footnote{127a}{H. A. R. Gibb, in Dumbarton Oaks Papers, vol. 12, p. 221 ff.}
\footnote{128}{Baladhuri, \textit{Ansab}, vol. 5, p. 335.}
\footnote{129}{Theophanes, pp. 558–559.}
\footnote{130}{Tabari, vol. 2, pl. 939, and the other chroniclers. On all questions of coinage, see now J. Walker, \textit{Arab-Byzantine Coina}, London, 1956, esp. pp. XXV, XXIX, LVII ff., for expressions showing political concern.}
\footnote{132}{Wroth, Catalogue, vol. 2, p. 330 ff.; cf. A. Grabar, \textit{L'Empereur dans l'art byzantin}, Strasbourg, 1936, p. 19, n. 4, where the symbolic elements of Justinian's coinage are emphasized. See also E. Kitzinger, \textit{The cult of images before iconoclasm}, Dumbarton Oaks Papers, vol. 8 (1954), p. 126, where the change is explained in purely Byzantine terms. This was no doubt so, but it may be suggested that, in the case of Justinian II, just as in the case of 'Abd al-Malik, important changes or decisions had both an internal and an external significance. See the extensive discussion in A. Grabar, \textit{Iconoclasme}, p. 67 ff.}
final statement of what was true in Christianity.

One may introduce here yet another document which may have a bearing on the problem. Most Arab chroniclers, when relating the major events of the Prophet's life, relate that Muhammad had sent a series of embassies to the rulers of the world, and, among them, of course, to Heraclius. The historical value of many of these stories has been questioned and there is no doubt that much in their later forms was certainly made up, although the mere fact of Muhammad's sending messengers is not implausible, especially after his first successes over Jews and pagans, when he began to emphasize the universality of the new faith. One of the stories transmitted by Tabari may have some significance in our investigation. It goes back to al-Zuhri, who claims to have heard it from a Christian bishop at the time of 'Abd al-Malik, and, like many other accounts, it says that Heraclius himself was quite convinced of the truth of the Prophet's mission, but that the upper ranks of the church refused to follow him and that he had to submit to them. Regardless of whether Muhammad sent messengers, it is extremely improbable, to say the least, that Heraclius would have even considered becoming a Muslim. But it could be suggested that the Umayyads, in order to arouse the Christians against the hierarchy of the church, which was closely tied to the Byzantine empire, and in order to further the aims of conversion which certainly existed among their followers, might have created the fiction that the hero who brought the True Cross back to Jerusalem was ready to become a Muslim. And it is under 'Abd al-Malik and at the time of the construction of the Dome of the Rock that such a story might have been put into circulation.

By itself this account has little significance, but, together with the coins, the inscriptions of the Dome of the Rock, and the Christian activities in the Muslim empire, it contributes to the suggestion of an interesting group of propagandistic activities taking place during the ideological "cold war" between the Christian and Muslim empires at the time of 'Abd al-Malik. All together they created a climate of opinion which certainly influenced the spirit of crusade and the consciousness of a struggle between the two faiths and the two states, which characterized the great Muslim expedition against Constantinople in the years 97/99–97/9915–717.

These facts would, I believe, show that the interpretation here proposed of the Dome of the Rock does agree with the known historical development of Islam and Byzantium in Umayyad times. But this significance could only last so long as the circumstances permitted. Its faint echo is still apparent in Maqdisi, but it may be noted that the Muslim geographer claimed that in the tenth century A.D. Christian and Jews still maintained the upper hand in the affairs of the city: the building, therefore, still served its original purpose, albeit on a very restricted level.

In the meantime, however, the whole

124 There are many versions of the story and some are confused with other similar themes (cf. above, n. 121); see Tabari, vol. 1, p. 1585 ff.; Aghani, vol. 6, p. 64 ff.; Ibn Sa'ad, Tabaqat, ed. E. Sachau, vol. 1, 2, p. 15 ff., etc.; see also M. Hamidullah, Corpus des Traités et Lettres Diplomatiques, Paris, 1935, pp. 14–15, Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Mahomet, p. 178 ff.


126 Tabari, vol. 1, p. 1565; see also pp. 1561–1562 for another tradition transmitted by al-Zuhri to the effect that Heraclius dreamed that "circumcised people" will rule over Jerusalem.


Haram area underwent considerable change, both in its physical aspect and in its significance. The identification of the masjid al-aqṣā with Jerusalem was more generally accepted than before and all the small memorial structures connected with the Ascension of Muḥammad were built. The question is whether one can date the moment when this change took place. The inscriptions are not very helpful. The earliest one to mention the isrā of the Prophet and to quote Koran 17:1 is the one which was seen by Harawi and which is dated in 426/1035.\textsuperscript{139} It was in the large congregational mosque at the southern end of the Haram, which is generally called the Aqṣā mosque. Basing himself on that inscription, Max van Berchem suggested that it is there and not on the Rock that the Muslim tradition had first localized the event of the Prophet’s life.\textsuperscript{140} This is quite possible, inasmuch as Ibn al-Faqqih, one of our earlier sources, mentions that in this mosque there was a black plaque with the inscription khilqah Muḥammad,\textsuperscript{141} and behind the qiblah there was another inscription connected with the Prophet. At the same time, the existence of a qubbah of the Ascension on the central platform of the Haram would lead one to believe that it is in a more central part of the esplanade that the miraculous event was thought to have taken place. Were both places accepted at the same time? Or was there a difference in meaning between them? Could one have been more definitely commemorative than the other? The question of localization is still not clear.

As far as dating is concerned, it may be suggested that it was under al-Walid, ‘Abd al-Malik’s successor, that the identification of the isrā and mi’raj with the Haram area was accepted and translated into architecture. Al-Walid was known as a great builder. He built the new mosque at Madinah, the royal mosque at Damascus, and he restored a great deal in Mekkah.\textsuperscript{142} In the case of Madinah, Sauvaget has shown that the plan of the new mosque depended in many ways on the preceding structure which was like the shrine of the house of the Prophet.\textsuperscript{143} And the Egyptian papyri show that under al-Walid a major mosque was built in Jerusalem. There is little doubt that it is the present Aqṣā mosque which was centered on the previously built sanctuary of the Rock, perhaps in architectural imitation of the complex of the Holy Sepulchre, as has been suggested, although the idea of adapting a congregational mosque to a formerly built sanctuary is also that of Madinah.\textsuperscript{144} If, then, the Ascension of Muḥammad was supposed to have taken place on the site of the mosque, there is some justification in attributing to al-Walid the monumental recognition of the fact. If, on the other hand, the localization was on the central platform, we can still argue that al-Walid was responsible for it. And this for the following reason.

It will be recalled that two writers, al-Muhallabi, quoted by Abū al-Fidā,\textsuperscript{145} and

\textsuperscript{139} Max van Berchem, p. 382 ff.; Guide des Lieux de Pèlerinage, p. 64. It is only after the arrival of the Ottomans that we meet with inscriptions on the Dome of the Rock itself with the theme of the Night Journey.

\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., p. 383.

\textsuperscript{141} It is not clear whether we should understand the word to mean “form (of the name) of Muḥammad” (LeStrange, Palestine, p. 100) or “figure of Muḥammad” (Marmarji, Textes, p. 211), the former being more likely, unless we are dealing with some imprint on a stone which was associated with the Prophet.

\textsuperscript{142} On all these activities see J. Sauvaget, La Mosquée Omeyyade de Médine, Paris, 1947, passim and esp. p. 93 ff.; also Gibb, op. cit., p. 224.

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., p. 121.


\textsuperscript{145} Text in Gildmeister, ZDPV, vol. 13, p. 18.
Eutychius\(^{146}\) attribute the building of the Dome of the Rock to al-Walid. Al-Mu'allab\(\)i adds that al-Walid was also responsible for the small qubbas around the Dome of the Rock, while Eutychius claims that the dome of the main sanctuary was taken from a Christian church in Baalbek and brought to the Holy City. The errors of these two writers could be explained if we suppose that al-Walid was indeed responsible for the building of the small mausoleums and consequently for the architectural translation of the Ascension of the Prophet. It may even be that al-Walid did have a small cupola moved from some remote Christian church, while it would of course be unthinkable to imagine the transportation of the dome set over the Rock. Knowing al-Walid to have been the builder of the large congregational mosque and of the small mausoleums, al-Mu'allab\(\)i and Eutychius would have simply concluded that the building up of the Haram in general was his doing. It may finally be added that all the religious foundations of al-Walid are characterized by their concern with a lavish expression of the power of the Umayyad state and with their emphasis on the places sanctified by Mu\(\)hammad. It would have been natural for the builder of the mosque of Madinah to have used the Ascension of the Prophet as a reason to build a large mosque in Jerusalem.

Be this as it may, we can see that the evidence which can be gathered from the mosaics, the inscriptions, and the location of the Dome of the Rock shows that the first major Muslim attempt at monumental architecture can only be understood in all its complexity and uniqueness when seen in its Umayyad context. Political and religious, directed to the Muslim as well as to the Jew and especially the Christian, symbol of a state and of a mission, the Dome of the Rock reflected the centuries of traditions and beliefs which had accumulated on Mount Moriah, just as it was intimately tied to the specific historical situation of the time.\(^{147}\) As a political and immanent structure, the Dome of the Rock soon lost its meaning. But as a religious building it continued the great tradition of the Temple and its significance went far beyond that of a mere martyr\(\)ium to a moment of the Prophet's life. It must be seen as the first of a long series of Muslim sanctuaries connected with the lives of Prophets, although it is still to be investigated whether, and, if so, to what extent, both architecturally and conceptually the Dome of the Rock influenced the development of later qubbas and welis. Moreover, with the development of mysticism the concept of the Ascension of Mu\(\)hammad became one of the richest and most profound themes of Islamic thought and reached even beyond the frontiers of Islam, influencing the spiritual progress of the western world.\(^{148}\) Thus the Haram area in Jerusalem acquired a sacredness far greater than and much different from the temporal significance that was given to it at the time of its revival by the Umayyads through the building of the Dome of the Rock.


\(^{147}\) Max van Berchem, p. 252, n. 1, pointed out that the 'Abb\(\)\(\)āsid chroniclers were curiously reticent about 'Abb\(\)ād al-Malik's work in Jerusalem, while quite voluble about al-Walid's programs, and suggested that the reason was 'Abb\(\)ād al-Malik's reputed impiety. It might be more likely to consider that the later chroniclers were not fully conscious of the significance of the building in the historical situation of the time.

\(^{148}\) See lately H. Adolf, Christendom and Islam in the Middle Ages, Speculum, 32 (1957), pp. 103–115, with an extensive bibliography on the question of the impact of the Muhammad stories on the West. See also, Americo Castro, The structure of Spanish history, Princeton, 1954, p. 130 ff., for an interesting explanation of the formation of the sanctuary of Saint James in Santiago. The apostle is seen as a "counter-Muhammad, and his sanctuary [as a] counter-Ka'bah" (p. 151). Here also the development of a religious center is explained through its relation to a specific historical situation.
TÜRKISCHE GRABSTEINE KLEINASIEN


Von völlig anderer Art ist der "Krötenstein" (Abb. 5, 6, und 7). Die besondere Note geben ihm die als Bekrönung aufgesetzten Tierplastiken. Sie sind zwar heute stark zerstört, lassen jedoch die Ergänzung auf zwei Eckfiguren und eine mittlere Plastik zu. In dem breit hingelagerten Körper der leider auch nur fragmentarisch erhaltenen Eckfigur wie in
den langen Hinterschenkeln ist zweifellos Kröte oder Frosch zu erkennen (Abb. 6), zu der wir uns das entsprechende Pendant auf der Gegen-
seite ergänzen müssen. Über die ehemalige Form der Mittelfigur lässt sich leider nichts mehr ausmachen. Neben diesen plastischen Tiergestalten, die in der türkischen Grabkunst Kleinasiens einzigartig sind, zeigen beide Sei-
ten des Steins weitere Tierreliefs und zwar wiederholt sich beiderseitig die gleiche Tier-
gruppe: ein Wildziegen- oder Steinbockpaar rahmt eine mittlere Tierfigur, deren kurz-
sprossiges, hochstehendes Gewei auffällig an das des Rentieres erinnert (Abb. 7).

Eine Zwischenstellung zwischen den Grab-
steinen in Plattenformat, deren Dekor die reine Tierdarstellung beherrscht, und der nächstfolgenden Gruppe vom antiken Sarkophagtyp bildet der "Sphinxstein" (Abb. 8, 9, 10, 11, und 12). Er ahmt die im Islam-
bereich typische Sargform nach und trägt einen durch die menschliche Figur und ein Fabel-
wesen bereicherten Dekor. Er ist von allen Stücke das am reichsten ausgestattete und ist nicht nur auf den beiden Hauptflächen, sondern auf den Schmalseiten und am Oberteil mit Reliefs geschmückt. Die Vorderfront wird durch zwei nach links gerichtete Figurenbilder eingenommen, einer Sphinx von ausgesprochen seldschukischem Typ mit dreieckzackiger Krone, lang herabfallendem Haar, knopfartig sich einrollendem Flügel und schnörkleriger Schen-
kelbetonung (Abb. 9 und 11) und einem Reiter, der eine vor ihm stehende Figur mit der Lanze durchbohrt (Abb. 10 und 11). Leider ist der Reiter nur sehr fragmentarisch erhalten, jedoch ist die in diagonaler Richtung geführte Lanze noch deutlich sichtbar. Die stehende Figur ist in starker Stilisierung durch Dreiwicklformen angedeutet, sie erhob eine Waffe (Schwert ?) über der rechten Schulter. Auch auf den Schmalseiten des Steins wechselt Tier-und Menschendarstellung. Im einen Fall erscheint ein Vogelpaar—Adler oder Falken—mit rückgewandten Köpfen, die Brust an Brust auf einer am unteren Ende zweigartig ausladenden Stange sitzen (Abb. 12 und 5), im andern Fall ist eine stehende menschliche Figur dargestellt. Die Rückseite trägt zwei Tierkampfszenen, von Zackenbordüren ge-
rahmt, die das Stück an den "Drachenstein" anschliessen und zwar schlägt hier der Adler ein Rehwild oder einen Steinbock (vgl. Abb. 10), der Löwe ein weiteres, nicht deutlich erkennbares Horntier. Auf der Oberseite des Steins endlich finden sich drei aus konzen-
trischen Kreisen zusammengesetzte Scheiben (Abb. 11), die ihrerseits auf den "Drachen-
stein" und zwar auf die von Drachen um-
wundene Rosette (Abb. 2) hinweisen. Auch sie sind mit Tierfiguren verbunden, die jedoch leider nicht mehr identifizierbar sind.

Kommen wir zu den Grabsteinen, die antikene Sarkophag-Formen nachbilden und die durch Jagd- und Kampfszenen charakterisiert sind. Sie bilden eine Gruppe von fünf voll er-
haltenen Steinen und einem Fragment. Aus ihr sonder sich ein Stück größerer Qualität ab, das auch in der Thematik eine Variante dar-
stellt, und das als letztes behandelt werden soll. Kennzeichnend für die Gruppe sind die dreieiligen Seitenwangen, die durch Schrä-
riefelungen belebte Oberseite sowie ihre Re-
liefs, die übereinstimmend auf der Frontseite Jagd- und Kampfszenen, auf der Rückseite Tierdekor tragen. Ein auffälliges Leitmotiv, das auf allen Bildkompositionen wiederkehrt, ist die Figur eines Reiters, der eine mehrzip-
felige Fahne trägt und dem ein gesatteltes und bepacktes Handpferd folgt. Dass dieser Szene besondere Bedeutung und ein bestimmter Sinn-
gehalt zukommt, erhebt aus dem Stein Abb. 13, den allein die Fahnenreiter- Handpferd-
Gruppe beherrscht. Auch das Grabsteinfrag-
ment zeigt einen typischen Bestandteil unseres "Leitmotivs," das Handpferd, und ist daher
auf eine ähnliche Szenerie, wie sie die übrige Gruppe zeigt, zu ergänzen.


Ein gemeinsamer Stilcharakter ist den Grabsteinen vom antiken Sarkophagtyp eigen. Er äussert sich einerseits in der Lebendigkeit der Pferde, die durch ihre kleinen Köpfe, schmale Taillen, stilisierten Schweif und Eleganz der Linienführung auffallen, andererseits

in der schematisierten Darstellung der menschlichen Figuren, ein frappierender Kontrast, der im übrigen nahezu die gesamte islamische Figurenkunst bestimmt.

Überblicken wir zusammenfassend die bisher behandelten Grabstein-Gruppen, so müssen wir feststellen, dass sie trotz ihrer jeweiligen Eigenart dennoch stark verbindinge Züge zeigen. Wir wiesen bereits auf die Zusammenhänge hin, die sowohl in der Thematik, wie in der Art der Stilisierung zwischen den beiden Hauptgruppen—den Steinen vom Grabplatten- und Sarkophagtyp—bestehen (S. 64 f.). Daraus dürfen wir auf eine gemeinsame Herkunft und auf eine gleiche Entstehungszeit der Steine schliessen. Es wird darauf im Datierungs-Abschnitt zurückzukommen sein (S. 75 f.).


Wo liegen nun aber, so müssen wir uns fragen, die Wurzeln zu dieser eigenartigen, in der Welt des Islam höchst ungewöhnlichen Grabkunst. Um hier einen Zugang zu gewinnen, müssen wir uns in den Bezirken innerasiatisch-nomadischer "Zeltkultur" umsehen, denen die Türkvolker Kleinasiens vor ihrer Islamisierung zugehörig waren.

Eine wahre Fundgrube von Vergleichsmaterial sind zunächst die frühmittelalterlichen türkischen Denkmäler aus Sibirien und der Mongolei. Von dieser magisch bestimmten Kunstwelt, in der Jagd-Kampf- und Tiermotive die Hauptrolle spielen, stehen einige der als kirgisisch angesprochenen Felszeichnungen vom oberen Jenissei- und Lenagebiet, die sich in das fünfte bis achte Jahrhundert datieren lassen, unseren Monumenten besonders nahe. Auffällig ist etwa die Verwandtschaft zwischen der Reitergruppe von Schischkino vom oberen Lenafluss (Abb. 23) und unseren Reiter-

\footnote{Abbildung nach O. Maenchen-Helfen, *Crenelated mane and scabhard slide*, Central Asiatic Journal, vol. 3, 2, Abb. 30, S. 121; vgl. auch die reiche Materialiensammlung innerasiatischer Fels-
TÜRKISCHE GRABSTEINE MIT FIGURENRELIEFS


zeichnungen bei H. Appelgren-Kivalo, Alt-Altaiische Kunstdenkmäler, Helsingfors, 1931.


Uryankhai (Abb. 26, a) in vielen Fällen vom reinen Tierdekor beherrscht—wobei Steinbock, Hirsch und Rentier die Hauptrolle spielen—and bilden damit eine wichtige Parallele zu unserem "Krötenstein" (Abb. 5), auf dem Steinböcke und aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach auch das Rentier dargestellt sind. Ein besonderer Typ dieser Stelen mit der Wiedergabe geometrischer Figuren, die sogenannten astronomischen Steinpfeiler (Abb. 26, b), erinnert hingegen an die doppelflankierten Rosetten des "Sphinx- und Drachensteines" (Abb. 2, 11). Die Gruppe dieser mittelasiatischen Steelen ist durch ihre Inschriften einwandel frei als türkisch erwiesen und zwischen das siebte und neunte Jahrhundert zu datieren.

Ein weiteres Verbindungsglied zur Erhellung der Afyon-Denkmäler sind die vorchristlichen Funde nomadischer Fürstengräber aus Sibirien und der Mongolei. Zu ihnen gehört ein Holzsarkophag aus Sibirien vom Fundort Baschadur, etwa dem dritten Jahrhundert v. Chr. zugehörig, dessen Einzelplatten vom Format her, aber auch im Hinblick auf den reinen Tierdekor—sie zeigen eine Prozession von Tigern (Abb. 27) und auf der Oberseite Hirsche, Steinböcke und Wildschweine—unseren "Drachen- und Krötenstein" (Abb. 1, 5)


zur Seite zu stellen sind. Daneben enthalten die innerasiatischen Graberfunde wertvolles Vergleichsmaterial für unsere Tierkampfszenen, die im frühmittelalterlich-asiatischen Raum eine erstaunlich geringe Rolle spielen. Nah verwandt unseren Reliefs, vor allem unserem "Drachenstein," aber auch den Darstellungen auf der Rückseite des "Sphingen- und Reiterkampfsteines" (Abb. 1, 18a, S. 64 f.) sind etwa die Tierbilder auf Sätteln aus den zwischen dem fünften bis dritten Jahrhundert v. Chr. anzusetzenden Grabfunden aus Pazyryk im Ostaltaı (Abb. 28, 29). — Auch hier schlagen Adler und Räubertier (Tiger oder Panther) Horntiere, und zwar Elch oder Hirsch. Die Szenen tragen in der Dramatik der Bewegung und in der Kraft der Stilisierung deutlich die bestimmten Züge eurasischer Tierstilkunst, als deren Ausläufer die Tierbilder aus Afyon gelten müssen. Aber auch für ein weiteres Bildmotiv, die Sphinx (Abb. 9, 11), stellt die Pazyryk-Kunst mit ihrer in Filz applizierten Sphingenfigur—der hier noch ein Fabelvogel beigegeben ist—(Abb. 30) den mittelasiatischen Prototyp dar; auch dem Sinngehalt nach bestehen aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach enge Zusammenhänge; es wird im Folgenden noch darauf zurückzukommen sein.

Haben wir so im Thema und Stil überraschend enge Verbindungen zwischen unseren Afyon-Steinen und der Bildwelt der asiatischen Steppenkunst feststellen können, so muss im Folgenden versucht werden, dem Symbolgehalt der Reliefs näher zu kommen. Auch er kann sich uns nur aus der Vorstellungswelt der Steppen erschliessen, zumal es sich um Grabdenkmäler handelt, die in besonderem Masse traditionsgebunden sind.

“Herold” mit der Siegesbeute, in diesem Fall mit der Fahne und dem Beutepferd. Im Zusammenhang mit unserem aus der Jagd erfolgreichen und im Kampf siegreichen “Helden” ist die Szene noch in verstärktem Masse ein Siegesymbol. Das heisst also, die Reiterdarstellungen unserer Grabsteine sind sämtlich Triumphbilder.10

Was bedeutet nun aber, so fragen wir weiter, Siegesszenen auf Grabsteinen? Auch hier ergibt sich die Antwort aus der alttürkischen Überlieferung. Nach den chinesischen Chroniken über das Bestattungsritual der türkischen Tüküe stellte man am Grab hervorragender Führer Steine auf oder Kriegerplastiken in der Zahl der erlegten Feinde. Sie werden in den türkischen Orkhon-Inschriften des achten Jahrhunderts balbal genannt (russisch kamennaya Baba) worauf oben (S. 67) im Zusammenhang mit den “astrologischen Steinpfletern” bereits eingegangen worden war. “Ihre Helden tödend, machte ich sie mir zum Balbal!” ist dafür ein bezeichnender Ausdruck.11 Die chinesischen Quellen gehen je-


Gehen wir nach der Klärung der Reiterreliefs auf die Symbol-Hintergründe der Tierfiguren ein. Ihre Deutung ist, da es sich hier um weit komplexere und zum Teil noch kaum erhellte Vorgänge handelt, weit schwieriger. Aber auch sie müssen, zumal es sich um “Grabtiere” handelt, die zum Teil mit den Siegesbildern, d.h. mit dem Verstorbenen auf ein und demselben Stein in engstem Kontakt miteinander dargestellt sind, in irgend einer Form auf Gebräuche des innerasiatischen Totenrituals Bezug nehmen. Wir dürfen daher ziemlich sicher annehmen, dass sie mit den Tierwesen von magisch-schamanistischem Charakter, die die Vorstellungswelt der Steppenvölker in starkem Masse beherrschen, in Zusammenhang stehen. In erster Linie ist hierbei an die tiergestaltigen Hilfsgeister zu denken, die den Schamanen als “Seelengeleiter” oder als Schutzgeist auf seinen verschiedenen Reisen begleiten, sei es, um die Seelen der Verstorbenen in die Unterwelt zu geleiten, sei es, um ihm auf der Reise in den Himmel zu assistieren.13 Versuchen wir noch


12 Wilhelm Schmidt, op. cit., S. 34; vgl. dazu auch die Landschaftsmalerei mit Tierdarstellungen aus dem Grab eines Tatarenfürsten vom zehnten bis zwölften Jahrhundert (E. Diez, Shan Shui, die chinesische Landschaftsmalerei, 1943, Abb. 2).

13 Über die Hilfsgeist im Schamanismus siehe M. Eliade, Schamanismus und archaische Ekstasetechnik, Zürich, 1957, S. 96–106; vgl. dazu auch H.
einen Schritt weiter zu gehen und einige der Tierfiguren der Afyon-Reliefs aus dem “Tierzauber” Innerasiens heraus zu deuten. Hierfür bietet sich das Tier mit hochstehendem Geweih auf dem “Krötenstein” (Abb. 7) an, bei dem es sich mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit um ein Rentier handelt, dessen schützende Funktion sich im zauberkräftigen Schamanengewand vom Rentiertyp manifestiert.14

Aber auch die Sphinx auf dem Stein Abb. 9, 11, die dort auf ein und derselben Bildebene, in engster Berührung mit dem jugendwiedergegebenen Helden auftritt, gehört in diesen Zusammenhang. Sie erinnert an den monstrartigen Schutzgeist der Goldenen (butschlu), der als Fabelwesen mit Menschengesicht, Federn und einem Fuss vorgestellt wird. Nur mit der Hilfe dieses Wesens—dem ausserdem noch der Fabelvogel “mit langem Hals” (Koori) beigegeben ist—gelingt es dem Schamanen aus der Unterwelt wieder zurückzukehren.15

Eine ähnliche Funktion wie die oben aufgezeigte dürfen wir auch von den plastisch dargestellten Krötenwesen (Abb. 6) erwarten, denn auch die Kröte gilt als Begleitier des Schamanen in die Unterwelt und sie ist zugleich Träger des Opfertrankes auf seiner Reise in den Himmel.16 Kröte oder Frosch sind im übrigen ausgesprochen lunare Tiere und damit zugleich Fruchtbarkeitsymbole.17


15 Siehe M. Eliade, op. cit., S. 204. Überraschenderweise ist die Sphinx von Pazyryk (Abb. 30), die wir oben als innerasiatischen Prototyp für die Afyon-Sphinx anführten, zusammen mit einem “Vogel mit langem Hals” dargestellt, in dem wir den ihr nach der Legende zugeordneten vogelgestaltigen Hilfsgeist vermuten dürfen.

16 Siehe Wilhelm Schmidt, op. cit., S. 266.

17 Vgl. auch den “Frosch Ülgän’s,” d.h. den Frosch des höchsten Himmelswesens der Altai-


Wenden wir uns nochmals dem “Sphingenstein” zu, dessen Symbolik äusserst vielschichtig ist. Ausser dem Kampfthema und dem Sphingenwesen interessieren uns die beiden auf einer “Stange” hockenden, gegenständigen Tataren, das stark lunare Züge trägt. Er ist dargestellt auf einer Schamanen-Trommel bei den Sor-Tataren (Wilhelm Schmidt, op. cit., S. 266, 179, 446 ff.; der Frosch ist auch gleichzeitig der Ratgeber Ülgän’s (ibid., S. 445); ein Krötenpaar findet sich auch unter den Zeichnungen auf den Schamanen-Trommeln der Katsänzen, an das man sich bei Krankheiten der Arme und Beine wendet (ibid., S. 699, 703).


Die Verbindung der Vögel mit der am unteren Ende zweigartig ausladenden "Stange" hingegen deutet auf die komplexe "Adler-Weltenbaum"-Symbolik schamanistischer Prägung. Wir haben es hier aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach mit der sibirischen "Adlerbaum"-Vorstellung zu tun, wie sie uns am klarsten von den Yakuten überliefert ist. Nach ihnen verkörpernt der Adler den Schöpfer (Ajiy oder Ajiy tojen), der als zweiköpfiger Vogel im Wipfel des "Weltenbaumes" gedacht wird, während sich dessen Kinder in der Gestalt von Vogelgeistern in den Zweigen des Baumes befinden.21 In der seldschukischen Sakralkunst Kleinasiens haben sich nahezu wortgetreue Bildanalogien zu diesem sibirischen "Adlerbaum" erhalten. Am nächsten steht uns das Beispiel aus der Döner Gümbet-Türke aus Kaysari, die um 1276 anzusetzen ist.22 Schliesslich ist nach der scha-


manistischen Theologie der Adler zugleich auch der Stammvater des Schamanen und auch ihn stellt man sich auf der Spitze des „Schamanenbaumes“ sitzend vor.\footnote{22}

In völlig andere Bezirke weist der Dekor auf der Obersseite des „Sphingensteines“ den drei doppelkonturigen Rosetten, umgeben von heute leider nicht mehr bestimmmbaren Tierfiguren, kennzeichnen (Abb. 11). Sie gehören fraglos zu den im Steppenbereich weitverbreiteten Gestirnszeichen, wofür sich Parallelen in den oben bereits herangezogenen „astronomischen Pfeilern“ (Abb. 26, b) anführen lassen. Jedoch muss hierbei auch an den Gestirnkult der innerasiatischen Türkvolker gedacht werden, in dem an erster Stelle Sonne und Mond, daneben aber auch die Dreieinigkeit Sonne, Mond und Venus, oder Sonne, Mond und „Sterne“ eine Rolle spielen.\footnote{24} Zugleich aber weisen die Gestirnymeyle in ihrer Verbindung mit Tierfiguren auf astralmythologische Zusammenhänge hin, die uns der „Drachenstein“ (Abb. 2) näher aufhellt. Im Phasenzyklus der Mondfinsternis, das hier die Rosette, d.h. das Gestirn, umzingelt, ist die Urmethyle vom Drachengestaltigen Ungeheuer verkörpert, das während der Phasen von Sonnen- und Mondfinsternis das Gestirn verschlingt.\footnote{26} In unserem Fall scheint eine Bedrohung beider Gestirne, von Sonne und Mond, angedeutet worden zu sein, wenn wir die Strahlen-Rosette als Sonne, die in den aufgesperrten Rachen der Drachen befindliche Raupe hingegen, die ein ausgesprochenes Mondzeichen ist, das sich im Fries wiederholt, als Mond interpretieren.\footnote{26} Bildparallelen von verwandtem Typ sind in der seltsamischen Kunst auffällig häufig, es wird darauf bei der Datierung der Grabsteine näher eingegangen werden. Deutlich lunare Zusammenhänge lässt auch der Fries laufender Hasen erkennen, die ihrerseits ausgesprochenen lunare-geographischen Tiere sind. Bei ihnen fällt auf, dass ihre Hinterläufe raubtierartig ausgebildet sind, was auf lunare-Mischwesen bisher unbekannter Art hindeutet.\footnote{27}

Die Drachenpaar nämlich, das hier die Rosette, die Geschlechtsflügel der Drachen, und unterstützt durch die Strahlen-Rosette, die sich vom Gestirn umhüllt, und der Mond, wie in der Gruppe der Mondkult (Abb. 29, 1910, Abb. 34, S. 84 f.)

\footnote{25 \(W.\) Hartner, \emph{The pseudoplanetary nodes of the moon’s orbit in Hindu and Islamic iconographies}, \textit{Ars Islamica}, vol. 5, pt. 2 (1938), S. 131.}

\footnote{26 Das gleiche Thema des „Mondverschlingens“ ist dargestellt in dem Drachenrelief aus dem Grab des Mamlukken-Sultans Malik Mu’ayyad Sheikh in Kairo, jetzt im Arabischen Museum in Kairo, (mögliicherweise ein Orttokisches Denkmal?) Hier wird die Raute, das Mondzeichen, durch die Doppelmotive der Drachen gebildet (M. v. Berchem—J. Strzygowski, \emph{Amida}, Heidelberg, 1910, Abb. 43, S. 34 f.). Von ähnlicher Rosettenform wie auf dem Afyonstein ist das von den Doppeldrachen bedrohte Gestirn am Tor der Zitadelle von Aleppo (W. Hartner, \textit{op. cit.}, Abb. 29).

\footnote{27 Der Hase als das am meisten vorkommende lunare-geographische Tier gehört auch in die religiöse Mythologie der Altäier, vgl. etwa die besondere Bedeutung des Hasenfells, das mit dem höchsten Himmelswesen ’Ulgän, auf dessen lunaren Charakter oben bereits hingewiesen wurde (Anm. 17), identifiziert wird; der mythologische Hase gilt dort ausserdem als der menschliche Stammvater (Wilhelm Schmidt, \textit{op. cit.}, S. 323, 223, 773); schliesslich findet bei den Altai-Tatären die Jagd des Schamanen auf }
Scherwer durchschaubar sind für uns die Tierkämpfe, die sich auf dem "Drachenstein" (Abb. 3, 4) und auf der Rückseite des "Sphinxen"- und Reiterkampfsteines (Abb. 18a) abspielen und für die wir Parallelen aus den Pazyryk-Funden heranziehen konnten (Abb. 28, 29). Es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass es sich auch hier um astral-mythologische Vorgänge, etwa um den Antagonismus von Sonne und Mond handelt, versinnbildlicht im Kampf solarer Tiere (Hase und Löwe) mit solchen von lunarem Charakter (Hase und Horntier). Mit grösserer Wahrscheinlichkeit spielen jedoch auch hier magisch bestimmte Tierkämpfe mit hinein, etwa solche zwischen rivalisierenden Schamanen, die Tiergestalt angenommen haben oder solche zwischen Schamanen und tiergestaltigen bösen Geistern.  

Schliesslich ist an totemistische Hintergründe zu denken, etwa an Stammes- oder Landnamenkämpfe, wobei in letzterem Fall nach den Legenden regelmässig Raubtiere Cerviden überfallen. Ein derartiger Landnahme-Mythos liegt eindeutig dem zwischen Elch und Vielfrass ausgetragenen Tierkampf auf einem hunnischen Grabfund aus Noin Ula (Montgolf), der kurz nach Chr. anzusetzen ist, zu Grunde.  

Nach dem Versuch, den Sinne inhalt der Afyon-Reliefs zu deuten, bleibt nun noch die Aufgabe, ihre zeitliche Herkunft näher zu bestimmen. Suchen wir nach dem Kulturkreis, dem unseren Reliefs am nächsten stehen, so bietet sich uns ohne weiteres der Bereich seldschukischer Kunst an. In ihr ist eine Bildwelt lebendig, die wie jene der Afyon-Steine der nomadisch-innerasiatischen "Zeltkunst" verhaftet ist, die ausserdem—und dies bedeutet eine revolutionäre Neuerung innerhalb des Islam—in der Sakralkunst eine Rolle spielt, und die endlich starke Bezüge zur Symbolwelt Innerasiens erkennen lässt. Ihr Symbolcharakter spiegelt sich naturgemäss auch hier am stärksten in der Grabkunst. Allein der seldschukische Grabbau, die Türbe, geht formal und funktional auf das nomadische Bestattungsrecht zurück.  

Über den Bereich der Grabkunst hinaus haben sich aber auch in den seldschukischen Profandenmäulern überzeugende Parallelen zu Einzelmotiven der Afyon-Reliefs erhalten. Besonders auffällig demonstriert dies die Figur der Sphinx (Abb. 9, 11). Sie ist nicht nur das beliebteste Fabelwesen im seldschukischen Bildbereich überhaupt, das sich in bunter Fülle in der Keramik und im Metallgerät des persisch-seldschukischen Kunstbereichs tummelt, besiegen Gegners der Name Hirsch zu lesen ist. (Der Islam, Bd. xxix/2 (1949), S. 244 ff.)  


Über die Symbolik seldschukischer Sakralkunst ist eine Untersuchung des Verfassers in Vorbereitung.
sondern sie entspricht bis in die Details hinein, in den knopfartig sich einrollenden Flügeln, dem herabfallenden Haar und der Schenkelbetonung absolut dem seldschukischen Sphingen-Typ.\textsuperscript{32} Stilistisch kommt ihr aus dem seldschukischen Kleinasiern die Sirenen-Darstellung aus Konya (\textit{Abb. 32}) am nächsten mit der gleichen Art der Flügel- und Haarwiedergabe und verwandter Schenkelbetonung. Aber auch die dreigeteilte Krone, die die Afyon-Sphinx trägt, die wir oben bereits als alttürkische Kronenform nachweisen konnten (\textit{Abb. 25}), ist im Seldschukischen häufiger belegt. Am deutlichsten zeigt dies ein Lüsterteller mit einem Sirenenmotiv, der in das elfte Jahrhundert datiert wird.\textsuperscript{33}

Ferner finden sich vielfältige seldschukische Parallelen zu dem gegenständigen Vogelpaar auf der Schmalseite des “Sphingensteins” (\textit{Abb. 12}), das die Köpfe nach aussen wendet. Von besonderem Interesse ist hier die friesartige Wiederholung des Motifs auf der Aussenseite einer in das Jahr 1208 datierten Minai-Schale (\textit{Abb. 33}).\textsuperscript{34}

Schliesslich finden sich zu Einzelelementen der Reiterbilder Entsprechungen im seldschukischen Bildbereich. Hierher gehört vor allem die Darstellung der mehrzipfeligen Fahne, die uns an alttürkischen Denkmälern—sowohl auf den sibirischen Felszeichnungen (\textit{Abb. 24}) wie im Schatz von Nagy-Szent-Miklos (\textit{Abb. 31})—begegnete. Wir treffen

\textsuperscript{32} A. U. Pope, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. 5, Taf. 738, 744, 746.

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Ibid.}, Taf. 631; vgl. auch die Kronen auf der Rückseite eines Spiegels des elften bis dreizehnten Jahrhunderts (\textit{ibid.}, vol. 6, Taf. 1302 H).

\textsuperscript{34} Abbildung nach M. Bahrami, \textit{Further dated examples of Persian ceramic wares, Bulletin of the Iranian Institute}, vol. 6 (1946) Abb. 5; vgl. auch das Vogelpaar auf der Rückseite eines Spiegels vom elften bis dreizehnten Jahrhundert (A. U. Pope, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. 6, Taf. 1302 E) und die Vögel über dem Thron des hochenden Fürsten auf einem Barbotin-Gefäss aus Mesopotamien vom dreizehnten Jahrhundert (G. Reitlinger, \textit{op. cit.}, Abb. 17).


\textsuperscript{34} A. Salmony, \textit{Daghestan sculptures, Ars Islamica}, vol. 10, Abb. 4, 6.

Abb. 1—"Drachenstein" aus Afyon.
Abb. 5—"Krötenstein" aus Afyon.

Abb. 6—"Sphingenstein" aus Afyon.

Abb. 7—"Krötenstein" aus Afyon.

Abb. 8—"Sphingenstein" aus Afyon.
Abb. 9-12—"Sphinxstein" aus Afyon.
Abb. 13—Grabstein aus Afyon mit Fahnenträger-Gruppe.

Abb. 14—"Jagdstein" aus Afyon.

Abb. 15—Tierprozession, Rückseite des "Jagdsteine" aus Afyon.

Abb. 16.

Abb. 17.

Abb. 16, 17—Afyonstein mit Kampfszene.
Abb. 18. Detail von Abb. 16.

Abb. 19—Afyonsteins mit Kampfszene.

Abb. 18, 18a—Rückseite des Afyonsteins, Abb. 16.

Abb. 20—Afyonsteins mit Falkenjagd.
Abb. 22—Afyonstein mit Falkenjagd.

Abb. 23—Felszeichnung von Schischkino (Lenafluss).

Abb. 24—Felszeichnung von Suljek (Jenissei).

Abb. 25—Felszeichnung aus Kudyrge (Ostaltai).

Abb. 26, a and b—Stelen aus Uryankhei (Mongolei).
Abb. 27—Holzsarkophag-Platte aus Baschadur (Sibirien).

Abb. 28—Detail eines Goldkruges aus Nagy-Szent-Miklos.

Abb. 29—Tierkämpfe von Sätteln aus den Grabfunden von Pazyryk.

Abb. 30—Filzapplikation aus Pazyryk.

Abb. 31—Seldschukisches Steinrelief aus Konya.
Abb. 33—Minai-Schale, dat. 1208.

Abb. 34—Persisch-seldschukische Silberschale (Hermitage, Leningrad).

Abb. 35—Seldschukische Steinreliefs aus Konya.
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darüber bestehen, dass die Afyon-Grabsteine in den Bereich seldschukischer Kunst gehören. Möglicherweise dürfen wir sogar noch einen Schritt weiter gehen und die Steine an Hand zweier weiterer datierter seldschukischer Denkmäler zeitlich näher begrenzen. Es handelt sich dabei zunächst um das bekannte 1221 datierte Drachen-Relief vom heute zerstörten Talismantor in Baghdad, zu dem sich vor allem von der Thematik her enge Zusammenhänge zum „Drachenstein“ aus Afyon ergeben. Hier wie dort bedroht ein Drachenpaar, dessen Leiber verschlungen sind, zwischen den drohend geöffneten Rachen das symbolisch angedeutete Gestirn: in Afyon im Rautenzeichen einwandfrei den Mond (vgl. dazu S. 72) am Talismantor in der Figur des hockenden Fürsten Mond oder Sonne.38 Aber auch


die durch die Inschrift gegeben ist.59 Plattenform, Tier-Thematik, stilisierende Qualität, sowie die Aufteilung in Einzelfelder—vgl. dazu die Tierdarstellungen auf den Rückseiten der Afyonsteine (Abb. 15, 18a)—machen die Verwandtschaft zu den Afyon-Monumenten offensichtlich. Wir dürfen es daraufhin wagen, die Afyonsteine, die wie oben dargelegt wurde (S. 66) eine einheitliche Gruppe bilden, den beiden seldschukischen Denkmälern, dem Talismantor-Relief aus Baghdad und dem Fischstein aus Konya zeitlich anzunähern und in das erste Drittel des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts zu datieren.40 Auszunehmen hiervon ist jedoch der „Falkenjagdstein“ (Abb. 20–22), der, wie bereits oben dargelegt wurde, eine grobe Variante der „Sarkophag-Gruppe“ darstellt und daher als Spätwerk zu betrachten ist.41

59 Der Stein befindet sich im Ince Minare-Museum in Konya.
41 Figurenszenen auf kleinasiatischen Grabsteinen sind bisher ausserdem von einigen Beispielen aus der Taş-Medrese in Akşehir her bekannt. Hier sind von Granatsteinen gerahmte, hockende Figuren dargestellt, von denen die eine den auf dem Koranständer liegenden Koran vor sich hat, eine zweite einen Granatapfel in der Hand hält. Auch ein hockendes Paar mit Früchten oder Blüten in den Händen ist wiedergegeben und endlich auf zwei Beispielen Frauenfiguren am türkischen Stickrahmen hockend. Bemerkenswert ist, dass in einem Fall die beiden Vögel

Die Bedeutung der Afyon-Monumente liegt auf der Hand. Sie sind nicht nur eine wertvolle Bereicherung des seldschukischen Denkmälerschatzes überhaupt, sondern mit ihnen sind fraglos neue Zeugen aus der „klassischen“ Epoche des seldschukischen Kleinasien gewonnen, die ihre Blüte dem grossen Seldschukan-Sultan „Alä ad-Din Kaykobad verdankt. Vor allem aber kommt in unseren Denkmälern, sowohl in der Thematik wie im Symbolgehalt ein markantes Merkmal seldschukischer Kunstschaffens, die Bindung an vorislamisch-nomadische Traditionen, überzeugend zum Ausdruck.42


42 Zur gleichen Feststellung kommt auch A. Sal-mony bei seiner Untersuchung der seldschukischen Daghestan-Reliefs (Daghestan-Sculptures, Ars Islamica, vol. 10 (1943), S. 163). Im Zusammenhang mit unseren Afyonreliefs gewinnt eine Gruppe von Felsreliefs mit allerdings weit primitiverer Reiter- und Tierdarstellungen auf den Felswänden des Plateaus der Mideastadt, auf die mich freundlicherweise K. Erdmann aufmerksam machte, neues Interesse. Möglicherweise reichen die Schmuck- und die gleichen inner-asiatisch-nomadischen Traditionen zurück, die für die Afyon-Steine bestimmend sind, noch dazu, da sich die Felsbilder an die alttürkischen Felszeichnungen aus Sibirien und in der Mongolei, von denen oben (S. 66 f.) die Rede war, engen anschliessen lassen; K. Bittel (Kleinasiatische Studien, Istanbuler Mitteilungen 5, 1942, S. 106) weist auf ein weiteres verwandtes Reiterrelief in einem der Felsstunneln der Mideastadt hin.
"... in Konya blieb von der Residenz die Ruine eines Turmes mit loggiaartigem Aufbau auf mächtigen Stalaktit-Konsolen aufrecht."² Das war alles, was einer der besten Kenner 1929 vom Rüm-seldschukischen Seraybau aussagen konnte, und selbst das war noch zu viel, denn zu der Zeit, in der Kühnel schrieb, waren von dem loggiaartigen Aufbau nur noch die Konsolen erhalten (Abb. 1).³

Wenn ich hier über Seraybauten des dreizehnten und vierzehnten Jahrhunderts in Anatolien berichten will, so um zu zeigen, dass wir, wie auf den meisten Gebieten der Rüm-seldschukischen Kunst, auch beim Seraybau in den letzten 25 Jahren manches dazu gelernt haben.

In Konya allerdings ist die Lage wohl hoffnungslos. "Les pachas de Konieh" so schreibt Charles Texier, der 1833–37 in Anatolien war, "ont imaginé de faire une carrière de ce palais. Tout ce qu’on a pu tirer de pierres, de marbres et de dorures a été successivement enlevé, de sorte qu’il ne présente plus aujourd’hui qu’un amas de ruines déplorables, au milieu desquelles il est presque impossible de reconnaître la disposition primitive."⁴ Heute steht nur noch der sogenannte Kösk, besser der Rest dessen, was einmal der Kösk war, ursprünglich ein quadratischer Raum mit Balkonen an drei Seiten, der zehn Meter über dem Boden auf einem Turm der Seraymauer gebaut war, eine Anlage also, die, auch als sie erhalten war, nicht allzuviel über den Palastbau der Rüm-seldschuken aussagte. Dafür besteht die Hoffnung, dass eine Durchsicht der Reisbeschreibungen vor 1830 weitere Auskünfte über das Aussehen des Seray's von Konya geben wird. Zur Zeit bin ich auf die Angaben Texier's angewiesen, den Friedrich Sarre in seiner Monographie über den Kösk als einzigen heranzieht.⁵ Danach be- stand der Palast aus einzelnen, selbständigen Gebäuden, die regellos (oder doch scheinbar regellos) auf dem Burgberg verstreut waren. Ein grösserer Bau enthielt wohl den Audienssaal. Auch mehrere Moscheen verschiedener Bauart sollen nach Texier zum Palastbezirk gehört haben.⁶

Im Jahre 1931 hat Albert Gabriel einen vier Kilometer nordöstlich Kayseri beim Dorf Isfahan. "Mustawi relates that the town possessed a great Aywân, or hall, in the palace which had been built by Sultan Kilij Arslan," (nach Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge, 1930, S. 148.)


Abb. A—Argınçık bei Kayseri, Haydar Bey Köşk. (Nach A. Gabriel.)


Der Bau ist anepigraph, muss aber, worauf auch Gabriel hinweist, aus der besten Zeit des Rüm-seldschuken Sultanats, also aus den Jahren 1220–1250 stammen. Am nächsten steht ihm der ebenfalls in der Umgebung von Kayseri gelegene, allerdings sehr viel grössere, 1241 datierte Karatay Han (Abb. 5),

Doch könnte der hier auch aus späterer Zeit stammen.
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Abb. B—Karatay-Han bei Elbasi östlich Kayseri, Räume an der Eingangseite des Hofes: (a) Türbe. (b) Mesçit. (c) Hammam. (d) Wohnräume des Bauherrn (?).
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Bruchsteinbau, der heute, wo die Aussenhaut der Mauern fehlt, einem Steinhaufen ähnlicher sieht als einem Gebäude (Abb. g).


23 Bei einem Bad glaubten meine Frau und ich, an der Nordseite des grossen Palastes Reste einer Hafenanlage in der Art des Tershane von Alanya zu sehen. Vier oder fünf Bogenansätze waren zu erkennen und im Wasser lagen Quadern. Leider hatten wir keine
Abb. F. Kubad Abad am Beysehir See, Planskizze des grossen Palastes. (Nach M. Zeki Oral.)

Zeit zu einer näheren Untersuchung, da in diesem Augenblick der Motorkutter kam, der uns zurückbringen sollte; denn eine nochmalige Fahrt durch die Çiçekdağları hielt der Bürgermeister von Beşehir, der uns lebenswürdigerweise begleitete, nicht für ratsam.


25 Wenn Zeki Orals Datierung des Palastes in das Jahr 1224/5 richtig ist, wäre dieser Vierbogenbau älter als die entsprechenden Anlagen, die der gleiche Sultan in seinen Karavansrayes bei Aksaray und Kayseri errichten liess. Die nächste Parallelen bilden zweifellos die Chehār Tāq's des iranischen Feuerheiligtums (Vergl. K. Erdmann, Das iranische Feuerheiligtum, Leipzig, 1941) doch wird man, auch wenn man in Rechnung stellt, dass Kappadokien ein Zentrum des Feuerkults war, kaum an einen Zusammenhang zwischen diesem Vierbogenbau 'Ala al-din Kaikobā'ds und den ähnlichen Anlagen des iranischen Kultbaus denken. Trotzdem kann ein solcher bestanden haben. In Richard Pococke's A Description of the East and some other countries, London, 1743-5, findet sich S. 91 folgende Notiz, die zwar eine "second hand information" ist, die ihm während seines Aufenthalts in Ankara zuteil wurde, die aber gerade durch die Ungewöhnlichkeit ihres Inhalts Vertrauen verdient. "'Towards the foot of it (gemeint ist der Erciyas) there are several monuments, which consist of a cupola, built on four pillars; there are inscriptions on them in a character not known, which they say, is Persian, and they tell them the monuments of the Persians." Am Fuss des Erciyas—leider ist diese Lokalisierung wenig exakt, jedenfalls doch wohl in der Nähe von Kayseri—stehen in der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts noch mehrere Chehār Tāq's. Sie tragen Inschriften in einer unbekannten Schrift. Das kann nur Pehlevi sein, denn eine neupersische, in arabischen Zeichen geschriebene Inschrift wäre in keinem Fall "a character not known." Es sind also Bauten sasanischer Zeit. Wozu sie gedient hatten, wusste man, verständlicherweise, damals nicht mehr. Aber es war noch bekannt, dass die unleserliche Schrift persisch (richtiger natürlich mittelpersisch) ist, und dass diese Bauten einst von Persern oder für Perser gebaut wurden. Wenn das im 18. Jahrhundert noch bekannt war, wird es im 13. wohl auch gewesen sein. Auf jeden Fall waren diese Vierbogenbauten iranischen Ursprungs zur Zeit Sultan 'Ala al-din Kaikobā'ds in


26 Die Liste von Ausnahmen, die R. M. Riefstahl, Turkish Architecture in Southwestern Anatolia, Cambridge, 1931, S. 52 gibt, liess sich erweiter, doch handelt es sich wohl in allen Fällen um Verwendung aus anderen Zusammenhängen stammender Stücke, also um eine Parallele zu den ja auch in der islamischen Baukunst nicht seltenen "Bacini."

Manufaktur weisen, dem Kubad Abad Typ zuzuordnen sind. Sie sollen vor einigen Jahr-

zehnten in einem Garten in der Stadt gefunden worden sein.28 Näheres war nicht zu er-

fahren.29 Ich möchte meinen, dass es die Stelle des Seray's war.

Dass im römischen Theater von Aspendos Einbauten seldschukischer Zeit waren, ist seit

Lanckoronski bekannt.30 Sie befinden sich in den beiden mächtigen Treppentürmen, die

die scenae frons flankieren. Die aussen liegen-

den Treppenhäuser sind noch gut erhalten.

In den dahinter liegenden quadratischen Räu-

men haben die drei oberen Geschosse ihre

Decken eingebüsst. In beiden Türmen war das

Zimmer im dritten Geschoss mit Fliesen aus-
gestattet. Reste des Mörtelbetts sind noch

in situ. Bei der vor einigen Jahren erfolgten

Säuberung der Räume wurden die grösseren

Fragmente nach Antalya gebracht, wo sie in

dem 1956 renovierten Museum in der Yivli

Minare Cami ausgestellt sind. In Aspendos

selber findet man nur noch kleine Bruchstücke

und Glasurenblätter.31 Ähnliche Fliesenfrag-

mente kommen in Alanya in der Iç Kale vor,

was wohl dafür spricht, dass das Seray dort

lag. D. S. Rice hat Fliesenbruchstücke dieser

Art auf der Burg von Alara gefunden.

1954 machten wir von Alanya aus einen


29 Die uns im Museum gemachte Angabe, die

Fliesen stammten aus der oberhalb der Yivli Minare Cami gelegenen Zindjir Qyran Türbe, kann nicht

richtig sein.

30 K. von Lanckoronski, Stadte Pamphyliens und

Pisidiens ... , Wien, 1890–92, Bd. I, S. 116.

31 S. Fikri Erten, Antalya Fildiyesi Tarihi, Is-

tanbul, 1940, S. 75 und B. Onat, Turistik Antalya,

S. 112, bezeichnen die Einbauten als Karavansaray.

Dafür wären sie denkbar ungeeignet. Auch die

Fliesenausstattung spricht dagegen. Ausserdem be-

findet sich nur wenige Kilometer südlich am rechten

Ufer des Körprü Su die Schutthülle eines Gebäudes,

bei dem es sich sehr wohl um ein Karavansaray

handeln kann.

Abstecher nach den etwa fünf Kilometer

nordöstlich gelegenen Obaköy, um die 1373

datierte Külliye des Yusuf Bey Öğlu zu be-

suchen.32 Die Medrese fanden wir nicht, von

der Moschee standen nur noch die Aussen-

mauern, die Türbe war unbedeutend. Dafür

stießen wir auf ein kleines Gebäude von 6 x 10

m., das offensichtlich nicht zur Külliye gehört

(Abb. 12). Das Erdgeschoss (Abb. G) ent-

hielt zwei Tonnenräume, von denen der linke

etwas schmäler war als der rechte, in den die

Tür führte. An der einen Schmalseite lief

eine Treppe zum Dach, das in seinem vorderen

Teil flach war, an der Rückseite ein Zimmer

zeigte, von dem noch zwei Mauern standen.

Auch der Rückweg nach Alanya standen wir

etwa 300 m. rechts der Strasse einen zweiten
Bau dieser Art von gleicher Grösse und

Raumanordnung (Abb. H), nur waren hier

die beiden Tonnenräume des Erdgeschosses

gleich breit und vom Zimmer des Oberge-

schosses nur geringe Spuren erhalten. Beide

waren derbe Bruchsteinbauten für ihre

geringe Grösse auffallend starken Mauern im

Erdgeschoss. Wir hielten sie für Köşke. Aber

aus welcher Zeit? 1955 fand ich, von Anamur

kommend, kurz vor Alanya links der Strasse

in einem Bananengarten einen dritten Bau

(Abb. I), bei dem, wie eine frische Schutthalbe

bewies, das Zimmer des Obergeschosses

erst kürzlich zusammengefallen war. In dieser

Halde lag ein grösseres Fragment einer

Kreuzfliese mit schwarzen Arabeskedekor

unter türkisfarbener Glasur. Damit war der

Beweis erbracht, dass diese drei eng zusam-

mengehörenden in der näheren Umgebung

Alanyas Köşke des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts

sind, wenn man das Wort Köşk auf Bauten

anwenden darf, die nur ein hochgelegenes Zim-

mer mit einer flachen Dachterrasse sind, das

auf einem Sockel aus zwei Tonnenräumen im

32 E. Diez-O.Aslanapa-M. M. Koman, Karaman

Erdgeschoss liegt, deren abnorme Mauerstärke wohl der Kühlung diente.  


1953 fuhren wir mit einer Gruppe von Studenten von Kayseri nach Nevşehir. In Ürgüp konnten wir nicht widerstehen, einen Abstecher nach dem etwa 20 Kilometer süd-westlich gelegenen Damsaköy zu machen, um die dortige Taşkin Paşa Külliye (eine Cami, deren Holz-mihrab zu den schönsten Stücken

Peçin, die malerisch gelegene Bergfeste der Mentesche, die die Strasse von Milas zum Hafen Güllük schützt, besuchten wir zum erstenmal 1953. Von ihren Ruinen war ausser der Gazi Ahmet Bey Medrese besonders der neben der völlig zerstörten Ulu Cami liegende "Kyzyl Han" genannte Bau (Abb. 15) in-

37 G. de Jerphanion, Mélanges d'archéologie anatolienne, Beyrouth, 1928, S. 100, Anm. 2.
teressant, da er einen uns unbekannten Typ darstellte. Der Bau ist zweigeschossig. Das Erdgeschoss wird von einem Saal von 6.30 m. unterfangen ist, die auf Konsolen ruhen. Er ist nordsüdlich orientiert und war durch ein Portal in der Mitte der Westwand zugänglich.


x 22 m. Länge eingenommen, (Abb. L) dessen Bruchsteintonne von vier Quadergurtbögen von dem nur geringe Reste der äusseren, rechteckigen Umrahmung erhalten sind. Das Obergeschoss hat an den Schmalseiten je eine Kuppel von 6,30 Durchmesser, die auf etwa

Abb. 1—Konya, Burgberg, Rest des Köşk.
(Aufn. H. Erdmann.)

Abb. 2—Arginçik bei Kayseri, Haydar bey Köşk, von Nordwesten.
(Aufn. H. Erdmann.)

Abb. 3—Arginçik bei Kayseri, Haydar Bey Köşk, Mittelsaal, Westwand. (Aufn. H. Erdmann.)

Abb. 4—Arginçik bei Kayseri, Haydar Bey Köşk, Torraum, Treppe zum Dach. (Aufn. H. Erdmann.)
Abb. 10—Palast von Laşkari Bazar. (Nach D. Schlumberger, Syrien, 1952.)

Abb. 11—Kairobadiye bei Kayseri, Viertelbau. (Aufn. H. Erdmann.)

Abb. 12—Obaköy bei Alanya, Kösk. (Aufn. H. Erdmann.)

Abb. 13—Kayseri, Kösk (?), Innenaufnahme. (Aufn. H. Erdmann.)
Abb. 15—Peçin bei Milas, der so genannte Kyzyl Han, Eingangsseite.
(Aufn. H. Erdmann.)

Abb. 16—Peçin bei Milas, der so genannte Kyzyl Han. Blick auf ein Pendentif der Obergeschosskuppel.
(Aufn. H. Erdmann.)

Abb. 17—Dazya bei Turhal, seldschu- kischer Tonnenaum.
(Aufn. H. Erdmann.)

Abb. 14—Damsaköy bei Urgüp, Portal der sogenannten Medrese.
(Aufn. H. Erdmann.)
1 m. über dem Boden ansetzenden, flachen Pendentifdreiecken aus sauber geschnittenen kleinen Quadern ruhte (Abb. 16). Beide sind heute eingestürzt. Wie im Untergeschoss sorgen grosse Rundbogenfenster für Beleuchtung. Zugänglich ist das Obergeschoss über Ostwand stehende Mauerreste wirken wie Zinnen. Vielleicht war hier nur eine Dachterrasse. Die Mauerdicke von 1.60 m. ist erheblich, sie wird noch verstärkt durch sechs flache Stütztürme an der Ostwand, die nur bis zum Tonnenansatz reichen. Im Westen stehen
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**Abb. L—Peçin bei Milas, Planskizze des sogenannten Kyzyl Han:**

(a) Erdgeschoss. (b) Obergeschoss.


Bei unserem ersten Besuch waren wir ziemlich ratlos. Als wir den Bau 1956 wiedersahen, fielen uns sogleich die Köşke bei Alanya ein. Gewiss, sie sind viel kleiner. Ihr grösster
misst 6 x 10 m., der "Kyzyl Han" 11 x 25 m. Aber sonst besteht mancherlei Verwandtschaft: die Zweigeschossigkeit, das Erdgeschoss als Tonnenraum mit auffallend starken Mauern, die Verbindung zum Obergeschoss durch eine aussen angebaute Treppe, das Obergeschoss mit Einzelräumen an der Schmalseite und die, in Peçin allerdings nicht gesicherte, flache Dachterrasse. Nimmt man an, dass die wie "Wochenendhäuschen" wirkenden Einraumköşke in der Umgebung von Alanya in der Stadt selber oder an anderen Orten der Antalya-Ebene grössere Vorbilder hatten, was nicht unwahrscheinlich ist, dann könnten diese sehr wohl ausgesehen haben wie der "Kyzyl Han" von Peçin, den man damit auch als einen Seraybau — und zwar wieder des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts — wird ansprechen dürfen.69


41 Die Lage erinnert an Erkilet.
eher von einem Kösk, dessen Nachfolger dann der gegenwärtige Bau wäre.


Abb. N—Moschee in Dazya bei Turhal.

und sind durch zwei prachtvolle Marmortüren und eine reiche Innenausstattung in Stuck ausgezeichnet. Die beiden Räume im Osten sind

42 Albert Dietrich war so freundlich, die Inschrift am Hauptportal zu lesen, sie ergibt das Jahr 777 = 1375/6 und als Erbauer Yüsuf ibn Säwi (oder Musāwi) al-Ḳaisari.


MNARANI OF KILIFI: THE MOSQUES AND TOMBS

BY JAMES KIRKMAN

On a tall bluff near the ferry on the south side of Kilifi Creek (fig. 1), 35 miles north of Mombasa, are the remains of two mosques, the foundations of a third, and a group of tombs with carved coral decoration and Arabic inscriptions. The bluff is on a headland, between a steep gully and an inlet fringed with mangroves, now dry except at very high tides. Across the base of the headland was a boundary wall with a gate, enclosing an area of between 5 and 10 acres. Between wall and mosque is a well and the foundations of stone houses. In this vicinity a coin was found. The type is illustrated by Walker and is of Sulaymān ibn ʿHassan, Sultan of Kilwa (1294–1308), who is credited by the Kilwa Chronicle with the conquest of most of the coast. The whole area, bluff, inlet, and high ground behind, has been known as Mnarani at least since 1884 when it was visited by Sir John Kirk. Mnarani must have formed part of the old “city state” of Kilifi (the Quelife of the Portuguese) which would have included three townships, namely Mnarani, Kilifi, and Kioni, probably the site now known as Kitoka. Kilifi is described by the Portuguese as a town ruled by a brother of the Sheikh of Mombasa, which is mentioned as joining in the general uprising against the Portuguese in 1585. In 1589, the Sheikh of Kilifi was killed in battle with the Wasegeju, the allies of the Sheikh of Malindi, and Kilifi became part of the new Sultanate of Malindi-Mombasa. In 1614 the Sultan Hassan ibn Ahmed, in the course of his quarrel with the Portuguese captain, Manuel de Mello Pereira, re-


2 Walker, *op. cit.*, pl. viii, 3.

There is a brief description of the ruins in an unpublished account by Captain Gissing of a journey from Mombasa to Malindi in company of Sir John Kirk in August 1884, sent to me by Sir John Gray.

3 Kitoka is a large Arab town with mosques and tombs, apparently belonging to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.
tired to Kilifi. According to local tradition, Kilifi was destroyed by the Galla, as were many other towns on the mainland, presumably in the first half of the seventeenth century.

Kilifi appears on several eighteenth-century maps—on the de Lisle map of 1708 as a river between Malindi and Mombasa, on the d’Anville map of 1749 and the d’Après chart of 1775 as a town on the north bank of a river named R. Quilimanci. The R. Quilimanci in 1631 was the R. Sabaki, north of Malindi, but it is possible that the name was later transferred to Kilifi Creek as civilization shrank southward. On the Robert map of 1756 the town is shown without the river, but on the Vandermeulen map of 1827 the river is put back but without a name. On this map the river is shown as the boundary between Melinde and Zanguebar. On the Admiralty chart of 1827, Kilifi is put on the south bank and Kioni on the north bank. On the Blackie and Ravenstein maps of 1882, Kilifi appears on the north bank of a river now called R. Magudo.

THE GREAT MOSQUE

The present Great Mosque (fig. 2 and pl. 1) is set at 7° and has a three-aisled musalla with two ribāt, or side rooms, on the east. The musalla, or main hall of prayer, is entered by three doorways, one in the west wall, one in the south, and a third through the north ribāt on the east. The roof was of coral tiles, carried on small square timbers running lengthwise, which were in turn supported on heavier timbers set at right angles, resting on two rows of five square pillars. The mihrāb façade consists of a wide pointed arch of five frames, rising from flat capitals resting on shallow pilasters, which project on each side of the opening (fig. 3 and pl. 2). On both sides beyond the pilasters are traces of inscriptions in a floriate naskhi script. The whole was surrounded by a square frame with five carved coral bosses, one above the crown of the arch and two on each side of it. Only the boss of the east spandrel has survived and bears a saltire with the ends of the cross end-

![Diagram of Great Mosque at Mnarani](image_url)

FIG. 2—PLAN OF GREAT MOSQUE AT MNARANI.

ing in volutes (pl. 2, B). A similar boss, but surrounded by an inscription, is on a tomb at Ras ya Mwana 6 7 miles north of Kipini. The

6 Ras ya Mwana is the most easterly projection of Ras Shaka, on which is a group of tombs known as Mwana Mwali wa Sebaa (The Seven Virgins),

Kirkman, Malindi, op. cit.
typical East African apsidal mihrāb recess has a keel-shaped fluted vault and fluted sides, embellished with bands of cable ornament, arabesques, and two inscriptions in monumental naskhi with volute ends and diacritical marks (fig. 4). The first part of the inscription on the upper band is clear: *Wa anna al masājid lillāh fa-lā tad’ū i’a Allāh aḥada* entrance lobby for the mosque. This entrance, being on the opposite side of the mosque to the well and cistern, could only have been used by the distinguished few, who would have performed their ablutions in their homes. The lobby would also provide a place where they could leave their shoes before entering the building.

At the south end is an ablution court with wide veranda, 2 feet above the level of the well court, a well, conduit, and two cisterns. The east cistern has steps at each end and blocked corners, and is divided by a wall carried on two pointed arches. On the analogy of the walls across wells at other mosques, the purpose of the wall across the cistern would be to exclude part of the cistern from the service of the mosque. Its construction presumably would have followed the blocking of the outer door of the ribāt. On the west side of the cistern and against the wall of the veranda, were coral heads used as footscrapers. The well is 7 feet wide and has today about 1 foot of barely drinkable water at a depth of 74 feet from the parapet.

The original mosque as planned (whether it was not immediately enlarged is uncertain) consisted of the present musalla and mihrāb, and a structure on the west indicated by the projection of the mihrāb wall. This structure appears to have been a court, perhaps a sunken court, rather than an earlier anteroom. The shallow skirting or projection, known as a kiuno, which runs round all four walls of the musalla, is never found on the inside walls of buildings. The base of the kiuno under Level C. 5, a fine plaster floor under A. 5, the surface of the tombs at the northeast corner, the plaster surface under B. 5, and the cobbled surface under C. 4 are all at the same level. This universal level must be considered the last occupation level of the pre-mosque period and the building level of the original Mosque I.
The enlarged Mosque II consisted of a musalla with three doors in each of the long walls and one in the south wall. On the east was a ribāṭ, entered by two doors from the musalla, one from the ablution court on the south, and a fourth from the entrance lobby on the north (pl. 3, A). The entrance lobby was approached by two steps from the ground level on the north, and provided access to both musalla and ribāṭ. On the west was a court or ribāṭ entered from the ablution court, in the same way as the ribāṭ on the east. On the south there may have been a court or chamber running the whole width of the mosque, with a design of interlacing quadrants (pl. 2, C). A new central door with splayed outer face was made in the west wall, and the remains of the old north and south doors were incorporated in the fabric of the wall. The section of the qiblah wall between the mihrāb and the northeast corner of the musalla is slanted southward, and may have been rebuilt at this time. The pillars were rebuilt of mortared masonry, 18 inches square, to carry a roof of coral tiles. The doors in the middle of the wall between the musalla and the ribāṭ, between the ribāṭ and the lobby, and at the south end of the ribāṭ were blocked. A wall well, conduit, and cistern beyond it. This was, however, soon converted into an open platform. The doorways had pointed arches, except the outer door of the entrance lobby, which had a square architrave. The pillars were rectangular, 18 inches by 32 inches, with long axis north and south. The floor was of plaster and gravel, laid over a heavy foundation of red earth (A. 3 and N. 3) at north and middle, and gray earth and rubbish (B. 4 and G. 3) at the south end of the mosque.

This building collapsed and was restored with extensive modifications (Mosque III). The south and west walls of the musalla were entirely rebuilt. The new south door, since fallen, had a wide arch with slightly ogival jambs and was ornamented with four bosses was built across the platform at the south end of the mosque, following the line of the wall between musalla and ribāṭ, and was carried across the cistern. The outer wall of the west court or anteroom was rebuilt, rather smaller, to carry a red earth roof. The door at the south end seems to have been retained and another door was added in the middle of the new outer wall. The large cistern on the west side of the court, 18 feet by 10 feet and 3 feet 9 inches deep, was built at right angles to the platform. Its floor is in perfect condition and had been filled with builder’s debris of small stones and lime. It was apparently in use for a very short time. To keep it filled imposed perhaps too great a strain on the well or on the labor resources of the mosque. There was
A. Mihrab of Great Mosque at Mnarani.

B. Boss with Cross Ending in Volute from mihrab Façade.

C. Boss with Intersecting Quadrants from South Door of the Great Mosque.
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A. Lobby and Steps at Northeast Entrance of Great Mosque

B. Tombs to North of Great Mosque
A. Tombstone of Tomb C.

B. Tombstone of Tomb G.

C. Tombstone of Tomb H.

D. Tomb Tablet of Tomb L.
A. Small Mosque at Mnarani, from South.

B. Plate in blue-and-white Maiolica, probably Portuguese, from cistern of small mosque.

C. Plate in blue-and-white porcelain in Wan Lee style from surface on west side of Great Mosque.
   (Inventory No. 46, Great Mosque, Stratum III.)

D. Figs. 1, 2, 3—Sherds of blue-and-white bowls and dishes from large cistern of Great Mosque.
   (Inventory No. 39, 42, 43, Great Mosque, Stratum III.)

Fig. 4—Sherd of blue-and-white bowl from surface in front of Tomb C.
   (Inventory No. 44, Great Mosque, Stratum III.)
nothing to suggest that it was filled with rain-water from the roof of the building. It would have held nearly 4,000 gallons.

From the clearance of the site, a little has emerged to throw a few gleams of light on the last days of Mnarani. The northeast corner of the building had crumbled away to floor level, and the east side of the steps leading up to the lobby had similarly disintegrated (pl. 3, d). Over the remains of the steps and on the ground level beside them, was a 2-foot 6-inch deposit of calcined lime, reaching down to the foundation level. This burning cannot be attributed to bush fires, and I believe it to be evidence of the traditional destruction of Kilifi by the Galla. The surviving inhabitants may have locked themselves in the mosque, hoping that help would come or that the Galla would go away. But the attackers set fire to the door and their victims surrendered and walked out to slavery or death. Inside the mosque were found 12 pottery lamps, which probably belonged to the people who had taken refuge there.

The fragments of monumental inscriptions from the tombs were not all found where they had fallen. The tombstone of Tomb C was found in Tomb D, and fragments of inscriptions from Tombs A or D were found in front of Tomb D and in the south court of the mosque. But this disarrangement probably occurred in recent times. I am informed that as late as 1925 the tombstones of Tombs C, D, G, and H were still standing, and that it was only subsequently, when Kilifi Administrative Headquarters developed, that they were destroyed by firewood cutters and cultivators. In this way was ruined what must have been one of the richest monuments in Kenya. In 1939 useful work was done by the Public Works Department in consolidating the mihrâb and Tombs A and K, without which they would not have been standing today. The restoration of the paneling on the sides of the mihrâb was seen to have been mistaken when the mosque was completely cleared. The plan and elevation (fig. 3) show the correct form of this feature.

THE TOMBS

To the north of the mosque are two groups of tombs and one isolated tomb (see pl. 3, B, and fig. 2). The tombs are rectangular paneled enclosures without roofs, with an ornamented tombstone above the east face. Tomb A has a pillar behind the tombstone, and Tomb K another tombstone on the west face. In Tombs C and H, and probably in the other tombs, there was at first only a low wall across the east end. Later this wall was raised to the height of the side walls and crowned by the ornamented tombstones. It is not customary in Kenya today for Moslem Arabs to build their tombs during their lifetime, but, I am informed, to do so would not be repugnant to local sentiment. The low walls in front of the tombs suggest that they may have been built in the lifetime of the occupant and completed after burial. A similar feature was observed on the pillar tomb at Kilepwa, where it was compared to the sill of an unfinished door. It does not occur at Gedi or Ungwana.\(^7\)

Tombs A, B, E, F, and K were independent constructions with four walls, to which the other tombs (with the exception of C) were subsequently attached. Structurally, B must follow A, and D must follow B and C. C is contemporary with or later than B. In the other group, E is probably later than F; I must follow F; G must follow E, F; I, L, and H must follow G; and J must follow L.

\(^7\) Ungwana is the present name of a large ruined Arab town, dating from the twelfth or thirteenth century, where excavations have been carried out and the report is awaiting publication.
The connection between the two groups cannot be decided in this way. A, E, and F are potentially the oldest and could be earlier than the mosque itself. K is at a slightly higher level and stands apart from the others.

The decoration is carved in blocks of varying size of a fine-grained coral, known as *mutambawe*. The motifs are linear or geometrical interlace, as on the bosses of Tombs B and D (pl. 4, B and C), or an interlace derived from plant tendrils, as on the bosses of Tombs A, C, G, and H (pl. 5, D, and pl. 5, A, B, C), and Tomb E which is not illustrated. The borders consist of a narrow herringbone, the commonest mosque ornament in East Africa (see Tomb A in pl. 4, D), with variations of cable pattern, as in Tombs D, H, and K. Some specimens of inscriptions are illustrated on plate 4, A.

The inscription on the tombstone in front of Tomb A is close in style to the inscription on the *mihrāb* façade, while the style and cutting of the bosses and inscriptions on Tombs D and H (pls. 4, C, and 5, C) resemble the bosses from the south door (pl. 2, C). On an argument of style, Tombs A, E, and G would be assigned to the period of Mosques I or II, and Tombs B, D, and probably H, to Mosque III. However, the inscription along the front of Tomb A is so close in style to that of Tomb D that it is uncertain to which the stones found in front of Tomb D should be assigned. Similarly, the boss of Tomb H, which is one of the later tombs of the second group, resembles the boss of C (pl. 5, C and A), while the ornament below it resembles the boss of Tomb B. On this argument, the dating of the first and last tombs of the group cannot be far apart. The first quarter of the fifteenth century for Mosques I and II and the first Tombs of the series A, E, and F, and the third quarter for Mosque III and Tombs D and H, with Tombs B, C, and G between them, would be a not unreasonable position. This is supported by the evidence of the finds. The plaited *naskhi* of the tablet of Tomb L (pl. 5, D) is in a style of its own. A similar tablet at Kinuni was found in a sixteenth-century context. The inscription of Tomb K (pl. 4, A, bottom) with its diacritical marks, is in this respect also apart from the others and should be ascribed to the sixteenth century.

**Tomb A.**—The Pillar Tomb, is built parallel with the west end of the *qiblah* wall of the mosque and the destroyed west court of the anteroom (pls. 4, B, 4, D). The east front consists of the pillar with an oval tombstone in front of it and rounded projections at each end. The tombstone is decorated with a boss and an inscription in the style of the façade of the *mihrāb* of the Great Mosque. Along the top of the wall below the pillar was another inscription, largely obliterated, in spindly letters with long volute-ended serifs and flat-topped verticals set close together, resembling the style of the inscriptions found in front of Tomb D. The pillar is octagonal and rises over 30 feet from the top of the 6-foot façade. At the top is a roll moulding and a small rounded crest, like a skullcap.

**Tomb B.**—This tomb is placed in front of Tomb A, but parallel with the *mihrāb* recess. The east wall of the recess is 6 inches shorter than the west wall, so it is set at an angle to the *qiblah* wall of the mosque. The main feature of the façade is an oval tombstone with a boss in the middle (pl. 4, B). There was no trace of any inscription or ornament around the boss, and in this respect it recalls the tomb of Ras ya Mwana. The boss itself has a design of interlacing circles, resembling one of the panels of the small tomb at Malindi, which is dated to the early fifteenth century. Around the edge of the tombstone was a herringbone border and possibly an inscription. There are also traces of an in-
cription along the top of the wall below the tombstone.

Tomb C.—This tomb stands against the east end of the north wall of the mosque, in the angle of the mihrāb recess. This end of the wall is not in line with the west end (the original line of the north wall), but is slanted to the northeast. The north wall of the tomb, however, follows the line of the north wall of the mihrāb, showing that the tomb antedates the rebuilding of the corner of the mosque, presumably at the time of the construction of Mosque III. The tombstone (pl. 5, A) was not in position, but was found inside Tomb D. It had a boss with a design of interlacing tendrils surrounded by two bands of inscriptions with volute ends, the whole inside an oval frame. The letters of this inscription are more entwined than the letters of any of the other tombs, except the tablet of Tomb L. With it were found two more fragments of inscription, with the same red stain as the tombstone, which are believed to belong to it. The crossed-links motif in the bottom corners is found on a tombstone now in the Mombasa Municipality Office, dated 866 H./A.D. 1462.

Tomb D.—This tomb was set against the north face of Tomb C and the north side of the façade of Tomb B, so as not to obscure it completely. The tombstone (pl. 4, C) has a boss with a design of plaited ribands surrounded by tendrils, resembling the plaited boss on the mihrāb of the destroyed Great Mosque at Pate.8 Below the boss is an inscription with elongated verticals, as on Tombs A and G, but in a different style. The other inscriptions are in the style of the inscription along the front of Tomb A, and some of them could have belonged to it. A similar fragment was found in the south court of the mosque, showing that position is not necessarily a guide to origin.

Tomb E.—This tomb has been only partially cleared. It is the earliest of the front rank of the second group. In front of it were found the boss and a number of stones with ornament and inscriptions in good style (pl. 4, A, top). The boss resembled the boss of G; the letters had sloping tops to the verticals and were rather widely spaced. Ornament and inscription were so worn as to be almost unrecognizable.

Tomb F.—Although the original tomb of the rear rank, it has not yet been excavated.

Tomb G.—This large tomb, perhaps a mausoleum, is attached to Tombs E, F, and I. In front of it was found the oval tombstone with a boss decorated with winding tendrils ending in volutes (pl. 5, B). It is surrounded by panels of similar ornament with an inscription with elongated letters at the bottom, as in Tombs A and D. Around it, and probably along the front of the tomb, was an inscription with well-rounded letters with floriate ends and verticals with concave tops (pl. 4, A, second from top).

Tomb H.—The tombstone (pl. 5, C) of this small tomb attached to G was found in front of it, together with fragments from Tombs G and K. The oval tombstone consisted of a boss with interlacing tendrils, a single sunflower between Arabic words in a tympanum above, and a geometrical interlace ornament border of cable pattern and herringbone. The execution was poor and the coral had badly flaked, either as a result of fire or plant action.

Tomb I.—An early tomb, attached to Tomb F, and preceding Tomb G, it has not yet been investigated.

---

8 Pate was once the most powerful town of the Lamu Archipelago and is mentioned frequently by the Portuguese. During the eighteenth century the control of the surviving Arab settlements was disputed between the Nabahani sultans of Pate and the Mazzrui governors of Mombasa.
Tomb J.—This is a small tomb which has not been investigated; it is attached to the north side of Tomb L. It is probably the last of this group.

Tomb K.—This tomb, or more likely mausoleum, was built in front of the group E-J, and L, and to the northeast of the mosque (pl. 3, B). It consists of a large square enclosure with a square tombstone in the middle of the east wall. There was once a similar feature in the middle of the west wall, but this has disappeared, leaving traces of an inscription on the stump. Below the tombstone on the east wall is a small opening or window with miniature arch surrounded by herringbone ornament, resembling the window in the Domed Tomb at Ungwana, dated by a late Ming bowl to the end of the sixteenth century. The tombstone had an inscription set in a double square around a projecting undecorated boss, like the umbo of a shield. Along the top of the tomb ran another inscription, of which only the central portion has survived in position. It is possible that there were other memorials on the walls. Fragments of inscriptions were found outside the rear wall of the tomb (pl. 4, A, bottom). The inscriptions on the square tombstone are in naskhi but without volute ends, with flat tops to the vertical letters and many diacritical signs. Some have well-formed letters, others bad angular letters; both are widely spaced, distinct in style from the other inscriptions. This is the latest of the tombs and should be ascribed to the end of the sixteenth century. The umbo-like boss has a foreign, perhaps Indian look.

Tomb L.—This is attached to Tombs G and I and has not been investigated. On the outside of the north wall (inside Tomb J) is a square plaque with the name of the deceased, “Shaykh 'Isa ibn Shaykh Nahafah,” incised in a cursive script within a border framed by an elaborate, deeply undercut, interlaced text from the Koran (pl. 5, D). These funeral tablets are known from other sites in Kenya and two have survived intact on pillar tombs at Mtwapa and Kinuni. The Kinuni example, which was never incised, cannot have been placed in position earlier than the beginning of the sixteenth century.

SMALL MOSQUE

Two hundred yards to the southwest of the Great Mosque is a small square mosque, with mihrāb with pointed arch and square niches in the surrounding frame (pl. 6, A). The roof was supported on four octagonal pillars on square bases, with small bracket niches in them to hold incense bowls. These also occur in a mosque at Kitoka on Takaungu Creek, about 3 miles to the southeast. There was one door in the east wall and three openings in an arcade of pointed arches on the west. The northernmost of these arches opened onto a cistern with blocked corners. Set in the cistern was a blue-and-white glazed earthenware dish, with a design of water plants and, perhaps, a river in the bottom and strawberries on the rim, and leaf sprays on the outside (pl. 6, B). The design is of Chinese inspiration but the dish is probably Portuguese. A small well is beyond the cistern, and on the north side of the mosque are two large enclosures.

It was clear that the building had undergone several transformations in a comparatively short period. To the east of the mihrāb was a second mihrāb, and 9 inches below the present floor was the floor of the original mosque, to which it belonged. The original mosque was much smaller and built up against a paneled tomb, whose paneled southern face was incorporated in the new building. In front

9 Mtwapa is a small walled town in an area once closely settled by Arabs, frequently mentioned by the Portuguese.
of this tomb was a coral boss, similar to the boss found in front of the cistern. Below the surface of the coral boss was an earlier occupation level, and a pit filled with black earth and stone. None of these levels was older than the beginning of the fifteenth century.

In Level 4 was found a jar with a long neck, almost complete, which appears to have been broken by the laying of the floor. Several instances of this have been noticed at Gedi. They may be evidence of the prophylactic rite, known as “jingo,” by which a spell is buried in a pot in the floor, and a djinn thereby induced to live in the pot. If any stranger should come with evil intentions, he would be driven out of his mind by the djinn.

The finds are listed below in the levels in which they were found.

**STRATIFICATION AND FINDS**

Three general strata, I, II, and III, were distinguished at the Great Mosque (see section, fig. 5, and chart), with a fourth intermediate Stratum, IIIa, between Mosques II and III on the south and west sides. The table below shows the correlation of the seven cuttings: four in the mosque, A, B, G, and N; three outside, C, H, and M; and their relation to each other and the buildings, and dating. Cuttings D, E, F, I, J, K, and L are merely clearance areas. The Small Mosque can be correlated with Stratum III of the Great Mosque. Traces of use in modern times, in the form of imported pottery and locally made lamps, were found on the floor of this building.

In the cuttings there was nothing abnormal: A 2–3, 4–5; B 1a, 1b, 2–3, 6; C 2, 4–6; G 1, 4; N 1–3, 4–5; H 3 were floor and filling levels; A 6–7, B 4–5, G 2–3 were occupation levels before, and A 1, B 1, C 1, 3, and H 1–2, 4 after the building of the mosque; G 5 was the filling of a pit. In the Small Mosque, 1 and 5–7 were occupation levels, 2–4 filling, and 8 a pit under 5.

The finds from Mnarani are of minor interest in themselves, but they are of value for the dating of the buildings and the foundation and desertion of the site. The more interesting are shown in figure 6, and the inventory is given in the Appendix with the chart of beads (p. 112). References are to Gedi, *The Great Mosque, Architecture and Finds* (G. GM),
(j) Small bronze spoon.
Stratum III (59), p. 110.
(k) Iron knife or razor with handle in one piece.
Stratum III (65), p. 110.
(l) Chinese white porcelain bowl.


*Strata I and I/II.*—These are the two first strata on the site. Stratum I is an occupation level overlying the natural red earth. Stratum I/II is the makeup level of the first buildings on the site.

The single sherd of imported ware was the celadon of G.GM 7. This is a class found in both the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The absence of any Islamic wares weakens the force of any conclusions drawn from the absence of *sgraffito*, the characteristic ware found at the earliest levels on the coast. The carinated pot with a pattern above and below carination (No. 1) can be paralleled from the lowest level at Ungwana, but there is nothing in the rest of the deposit to suggest a dating earlier than the fourteenth century. The interesting new class of local earthenware (No. 4) consisting of bowls of normal 1/4-inch thickness and 9-inch diameter, probably shoulder bowls with combed basketwork pattern, has been found on no other site. Bowls with similar ornament are said to be made today by Giriama in the Godomo area, but not in the semi-Swahili coast. It may be the true pottery of the Nyika tribes, untouched by Arab influence.

The wound glass beads with "old gold" tint (No. 11) are also a new find. The countersinking of the sides of the quern-shaped shell bead has not been found before on beads of this material. The proportions of colors,

10 The Giriama are the largest section of the Nyika group settled between Mombasa and the Sabaki River. Godomo is one of the inland districts.
viz, green, yellow, black, in the drawn beads, would suggest the middle of the fourteenth century.

The few sherds from Stratum I/II are identical with those from Stratum II. This would suggest that Stratum II was not of long duration.

Strata II and II/III.—Stratum II is the main pre-mosque occupation level, and Stratum II/III the building level of the Great Mosque—the most important level at Mnarani.

The predominant Islamic ware was the yellow-and-black geometrical ware G.GM 1, which is characteristic of the fourteenth century but dies out in the early fifteenth. The sherd of the polychrome dish, with design in black and blue in a circle on the bottom over a hard pink body (No. 8), is probably also fourteenth century.

The Chinese wares included celadon and stoneware of G.GM Cel. 25 and Ston. 6, ascribed preferably to the fourteenth century, and G.GM Cel. 10, 12, to the fifteenth century.

The local earthenware contained sherds of shouldered bowls of the Kilepwa class, and bowls and jugs with overall burnish. These are characteristic of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, but they occurred high up, below the dated tomb at Gedi (1399) and so must have continued with decreasing frequency up to the end of the fourteenth century. The most interesting individual piece was the lamp with carination and frilling on the edge (fig. 6, c). The carinated pots, G.GM 10 xx, xxxiv, and 11 xx are equally common in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century levels, but the double chevrons of 10 xx are an early motif. Class 11 xxvii, pattern AN, is uncommon both in form and decoration. This ornament has been found in earlier levels at Gedi since the publication of the Great Mosque. The jars with straight necks (Strata II 2 and II/III 5), more prominent here than at Gedi, the bowls with notched ornament in sandy-buff ware, and the bowl with a wide mouth and straight sides are fifteenth- rather than fourteenth-century classes. It is largely on their presence that the date of Mosque II has been advanced a quarter of a century, from c. 1400 to c. 1425.

Stratum III.—The majority of the finds from the surface levels came from the south court. Finds from other areas are noted against the entry in the inventory. At some time, loose gravel was thrown into the depression in the south court, but this did not make a stratified level. Perhaps contemporaneously, the large cistern on the west side of the court was filled with builder’s debris of gravel and plaster.

The sherds of local earthenware comprised no new varieties. The interesting forms, Nos. 16–18, have been found at Gedi in fifteenth-century levels, but unfortunately in the same fragmentary condition.

In the Islamic wares there was one new type, No. 26, in which a yellow-green monochrome glaze was laid on a white paste body, similar to G.GM 15. The glaze was thin and produced the effect of a matte surface, similar to the vessels of G.GM 11. The base with a yellow glaze, No. 22, is uncommon.

The Chinese wares require no comment. Nos. 35, 42, and 43 are new varieties.

The bronze toilet utensils, Nos. 59–60, have simple forms that are probably still made. The iron knife, No. 65, has more decided characteristics and it may be possible to trace its place of manufacture.

The sherd pattern of the local and Islamic wares from Stratum III points unmistakably to the sixteenth century as the last period of Mnarani. The fifteenth-century sherds are those from the floor of the western cistern. The absence of sherds of burnished ware and cooking pots with fingernail ornament, the presence of the mzigia, and the Islamic mono-
chromes of G.GM 18 as opposed to those of G.GM 19, are sufficient evidence for this dating.

The Chinese wares, on the other hand, the celadon, the white and blue-and-white (except for Nos. 45–47), are of the fifteenth century, predominantly of the later fifteenth century. Among them, the earliest sherds in the celadon (Nos. 28–32) and in the blue-and-white (Nos. 39–41) are from the filling of the cistern. However, the cistern could not have been filled in before the third quarter of the century, as No. 41 is clearly of this period. The two dishes of late sixteenth-century blue-and-white (Nos. 46–47) show that attention was still being paid to the site at the end of the century.

This predominance of fifteenth-century blue-and-white in a sixteenth-century level is noteworthy. This could be explained by Portuguese interference with the dhows based on Indian ports, which brought the porcelain.

Gedi received its porcelain from Malindi, and Malindi, as the loyal ally of the Portuguese, was privileged in the matter of Indian trade. The same factors did not operate in respect to Islamic wares, as the Portuguese were not able to exercise the same effective control of the Persian Gulf ports. If prosperity is to be measured by Chinese imports, then the fifteenth century must have been the most prosperous time of Kilifi and perhaps other towns. A decline set in in the sixteenth century, from which there was a partial recovery after the foundation of the Sultanate of Malindi-Mombasa—witness the bowls with the panel borders. However, this had not time to get going before the coast was again convulsed by the rebellion of Yusuf ibn Hassan or Don Jeronimo, in 1631. This tragedy and possibly a deterioration of natural conditions such as a period of low rainfall, failing crops, and a falling water table, prepared the way for the Galla invasion and the end of civilization on the mainland.

Chart of levels—Mnarani

I. LARGE MOSQUE AND TOMBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of levels</th>
<th>Cuttings</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humus, debris and gray earth occupation level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>c. 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray earth occupation level on surface of period of Mosques II and III, covered by gravel surface in H, or red earth in C, Mosque II</td>
<td>2 3 4 1 a</td>
<td>IIIa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster and red earth makeup of floor and surface of 2 Mosques I and II</td>
<td>2 2 5 3 6</td>
<td>III/II</td>
<td>c. 1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray earth occupation level on last pre-mosque surface</td>
<td>4 2 5 3</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster and red earth makeup of last pre-mosque level</td>
<td>4 4 6 5 4</td>
<td>II/I</td>
<td>c. 1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray earth occupation level on natural red earth, plaster floor in A above 6</td>
<td>7 5 4 3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>c. 1350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MNARANI OF KILIFI: MOSQUES AND TOMBS

Chart of levels—Mnarani (continued)

II. SMALL MOSQUE

Description of levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum III Level</th>
<th>Approximate date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humus, debris, and gray earth occupation level, possibly modern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray earth and stone makeup of floor of mosque</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red earth and sand makeup of floor of original mosque</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray earth occupation level on surface of tomb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black earth and stone filling of pit, probably closed by</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray earth and ash occupation level below surface of tomb</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVENTORY OF FINDS


GREAT MOSQUE

STRATUM I

Local earthenware:


2. Sherds of red burnished bowls from B. 7.


4. Sherds of bowls of normal 3/4 inch thickness, diameter 9 inches, with combed basket pattern from A. 7 (fig. 6a). This is a new class not yet found at Gedi or any other site.

Chinese porcelain:

5. Sherd of dark green crackled celadon, G.GM 7, with turned-out lip and lotus petals on outside from A. 6.

Beads:

6. 7 small red opaque drawn glass beads, G.GM 1: 2 from A. 6, 5 from B. 7.

7. 16 small drawn glass beads, G.GM 2: 5 transparent green from B. 7, 3 transparent green, 1 green, 2 small black, 3 small yellow, and 2 small transparent red, from A. 6.

8. 3 large drawn glass beads: 1 green, G.GM 2 xi; 1 cobalt, 2 vi; 1 cobalt cylinder, 2 xvii; from A. 7.

9. 2 wound and pressed glass beads: 1 green, G.GM 4 xiv; 1 yellow, 6 x, from A. 6

10. 8 old gold wound glass beads: 1 with white strand, 1 banded on one side as G.GM 8, 2 G.GM 4 v, 2 G.GM 4 xiv, 2 G.GM 6 xx, from A. 6.

11. 5 shell beads G.GM 10: 2 standard cylinder, 1 long cylinder, 1 quern 3/8 in. diameter as G.GM 13 from A. 6; 1 large barrel 1/2 in. x 3/8 in., from B. 7.

STRATUM I/II


3. Sherd of jar with notches on shoulder and three holes for suspension, from N. 4 (fig. 6 f).

4. Sherd of lamp painted red with overall burnish G.GM 27, but with more pointed lip, from B. 6.

STRATUM II

Local earthenware:

1. Sherds of carinated pots G.GM 10 xx with double chevron pattern, from B. 4; 11 xx plain, from G. 2; 11 xxvii pattern AW but crescents with points up, from B. 4.

2. Sherd of large jar with thick straight neck G.GM 19 i, from G. 3.
3. Sherd of bowl on base with wide mouth and straight sides G.GM 9 and KIL fig. 5 h, from G. 3.
4. Lamp with pointed lip (fig. 6 c).
5. Sherd of straight-sided bowl with red coat and overall burnish, from B. 4.

Islamic ware:
7. Sherds of yellow and black ware G.GM 1 iv, xi, from B. 4.
8. Sherd of polychrome dish with design in circle on bottom in black and blue on a white ground over a pink body, from G. 2.
9. Sherd with light green non-glossy glaze on a buff body, from G. 2.

Celadon:
10. Sherd of dark olive bowl with cordons G.GM 12, from G. 3.

Chinese stoneware:
12. Sherd of small jar with fine brown glaze G.GM 6, from G. 3.

Beads:
13. 1 small red opaque drawn glass bead G.GM 1, from B. 4.
14. 3 drawn glass beads G.GM 2: 1 green, 2 transparent green, from B. 4.
15. 1 wound and pressed bead G.GM 6 yellow, from B. 4.
16. 2 shell beads G.GM 10, 1 short cylinder and 1 long cylinder, from B. 4.

STRATUM II/III

Local earthenware:
2. Sherd of jar with turned-out neck G.GM 21 iii, from A. 3.
3. Sherd of shouldered bowl G.GM 22, KIL fig. 4 c, from A. 3.
4. Sherds of straight-sided bowls as G.GM 30 i, painted red with overall burnish, from A. 3 and B. 3.
5. Sherd of jar with near upright neck as G.GM 19 iii with red coat and overall burnish, from B. 3.
6. Sherd of new ware with basket pattern (see I 4 above), from N. 3.

Islamic ware:
7. Sherds of yellow and black ware G.GM 1 ix, from N. 3; x, xi from A. 3; new pattern (fig. 6 e) from N. 3.

Celadon:

Chinese white:

Beads:
10. 1 drawn glass bead G.GM 2 transparent green, from B. 3.
11. 3 wound and pressed glass beads G.GM 6 vi green, from A. 3; x green from C. 5; xi yellow from N. 3.
12. 1 shell standard cylinder bead, from C. 5.

STRATUM III

Local earthenware:
1. Sherds of bowls with round bottoms, normal (¼ in.) thickness, G.GM 4; also from M. 2.
2. Sherds of bowls of thin (⅜ in.) fabric, nearly spherical, G.GM 6; also from M. 1a.
3. Sherds of bowls with hollowed and flat disk bases, G.GM 8 and 9, KIL fig. 5 f.
5. Small unguent pots used also as incense burners, G.GM 16 i, and miniature carinated pot, diameter and depth 1½ in.
6. Sherds of jars with neck 2½ in. G.GM 21 ii, and criss-cross pattern below neck; also from M. 2.
7. Sherd of jar with moulded neck, variant of G.GM 23.
8. Sherd of jar or pot with moulded rim, diameter 4½ in., in soft pink ware.
10. Lamp with frilling along projecting edge (see II 6 above), from M. 2.
11. Lamps in sandy-buff ware with red paint on level or nearly level rim G.GM 34 i, ii; sherds of a new variety with chevrons, instead of notched edge, also from M. 2.
14. Sherd of jar in sandy-buff ware with near upright neck and flat top to rim, painted red; another sherd with slight beak to rim.
15. Sherds of large round jar with alternating pattern of hatched and blank panels in sandy-buff ware.
17. Sherds of vessel with studs on outside, one with studs of white plaster; also from M. 2.
18. Sherds of vessel with sharp ribbing; also from M. 2.
19. Sherds of large jar without neck, wide mouth and inturned lip.
20. Sherd of *mziga* or horned stove, from M. 1a.

*Islamic ware:*

21. Sherd of base of bowl as G.G.M. fig. 24 w, with formal design in polychrome including manganese black on a white ground over a buff body G.G.M 10, from M. 1a.
23. Sherds of lead glazed monochrome dishes and one bowl, G.G.M. 18 ii, bases dark blue, light blue; iv blue, sage; vii blue; x green; xii dark blue, blue, from M. 1a; bases as G.G.M. fig. 26, s yellow, t blue, c green.
25. Sherd of bowl with straight sides and rounded lip, thick white glaze outside and inside on a red body. Similar vessels were found in surface levels at Gedi.

*Chinese porcelain:*

*Celadon:*

27. Sherd of lid of jar with light green glaze G.G.M. 5, unglazed inner surface, red from kiln, from D. 1.
28. Base of G.G.M. 5, cracked on outside, base unglazed, red from kiln, V-shaped groove against inside of ring as fig. 30 q, from M. 1a.
29. Sherd of lip of bowl, dark green cracked glaze G.G.M. 7 P with sketchy key fret border and floral spray incised with strokes of medium depth on outside in style of G.G.M. fig. 31 q, from M. 1a.
30. Flat base of bowl with wide mouth G.G.M. 5, from M. 1a.
31. Sherd of fluted lid of jar with dark olive glaze of G.G.M. 11 on outside and gray-white on inside, from M. 2.
32. Base of heavy bowl with greenish-yellow crackled glaze G.G.M. 29, base splashed with glaze as G.G.M. fig. 30 p, from M. 1a.
33. Small sherd of G.G.M. 2, 4, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, and 23.

*Chinese white:*

34. Sherd of Ch'ing-pai (Ying Ch'ing) G.G.M. 1.
35. Small shallow bowl with cordons and ribbing in cream-colored glaze, slightly concave base, gray-buff body G.G.M. 5, from K. 1 (fig. 61).
37. Base of dish with white glaze G.G.M. 2, base flat with low ring.

*Blue-and-white:*

39. Base of bowl in pale blue on bluish-white ground, design with spray in outlines on bottom, base unglazed slightly convex and undercut against ring as G.G.M. fig. 32 i, from M. 1a (*pl. 6 D*).
40. Sherd of bowl in dark blue, black spotting, trellis pattern, from M. 1a. Similar sherds came from Pillar Tomb at Malindi and from Tomb of the Cross Fitché at Ungwana.
41. Sherd of bowl with petals in rich blue, from M. 2.
42. Base of bowl with flower with broad petals in bottom in dark gray-blue (*pl. 6 D 2*).
43. Base of large dish with design of chrysanthemums and tendrils with trefoil ends in dark blue, scorched in kiln, pale Ch'ing-pai (Ying Ch'ing) tint on outside (*pl. 6 D 3*).
44. Sherd of bowl in gray-blue, on outside design of chrysanthemums and tendrils with trefoil ends, black spotting, sketchy cloud scroll border; on inside tendrils with long leaves, more open pattern, sketchy trellis border, from D. 1 (*pl. 6 D 4*).
45. Sherds of small bowl with border of flower sprays, better drawn than in most examples of this class.
46. Small dish with wavy edge, design of deer and foliage on bottom and panels with floral sprays from rim to bottom of dish in a gray-blue, from C. 1 (pl. 6 C).
47. Similar dish and design but in dark blue, from D. 1.

Chinese stoneware:
48. Base and neck of jar with horizontal handles, yellow-brown glaze on a gray body G.G.M 8 (fig. 6 k).
49. Sherds of yellow-brown and black glazed jars on gray-buff and black bodies G.G.M 1, 2, and 5.
50. Rim of large jar 7 in. diameter in yellow-brown glaze, beveled below roll of rim, from H. 3.

Beads:
51. 72 red opaque drawn glass beads G.G.M 1; 10 from M. 2, all small; remainder include 6 medium-sized (1/4 in. long) beads, generally more roughly made than in most collections.
52. 77 drawn glass beads G.G.M 2; 17 black (9 from M. 2), 36 green (14 from M. 2); 3 transparent green; 19 yellow (5 from M. 2); 1 blue cylinder; 1 blue transparent.
53. 14 wound and pressed glass beads G.G.M 4: 6 green (2 from M. 2); 2 black (6 xi and xx); 2 orange (1 from M. 2); 2 yellow (6 xx); 2 yellow or green (6 xx).
54. 16 shell beads G.G.M 10: 5 long cylinders (I from M. 2); 9 standard cylinders (from M. 2); 1 small biconical.
55. 4 carnelians G.G.M 15, hexagonal cylinders.
56. 1 crystal G.G.M 16, hexagonal bicone.
57. 2 ivory standard cylinder beads (I from M. 2).

Bronze:
58. Coil of bronze wire 1/24 in. gauge.
59. Small bronze spoon or spatula with spiral shaft (fig. 6 i).
60. Similar small spatula and awl on ring from M. 1a (fig. 6 i).
61. Bronze ring 1 in. diameter, 1/12 in. gauge.
62. Bronze chain links 1/12 in. x 1/8 in., 1/24 in. gauge.
63. Ring with sexfoil mark at back.

Glass:
64. Base of green glass vessel as G.G.M fig. 38 c.

Iron:
65. Knife or razor with iron handle (fig. 6 k).

Stone and miscellaneous:
66. Coral slingshot 1/2 in. diameter, traces of ocher.
67. Rubber of quartz conglomerate 2 1/2 in. x 3 in.
68. Lump of red ochre.
69. Fragments of ostrich egg.

SMALL MOSQUE STRATUM III

Level 2

Local earthenware:
1. Sherd of bowl with inward sloping rim with red coat as Large Mosque III 15.
2. Sherd of carinated pot G.G.M 13 viii AB.
3. Sherd of rim of jar without neck, wide mouth with groove round opening, as fig. 6 b.

Chinese stoneware:
5. Sherd of large jar with black glaze on both sides G.G.M 1, on gray-buff body.

Level 4

Local earthenware:
2. Sherds of lamps with red rims G.G.M 25 and 35.
3. Neck of large jar with long neck, round bottom, girth about 18 in. at maximum, height between 2 1/2 ft. and 3 ft., G.G.M 19 iii (fig. 6 d).

Celadon:

Level 5

Local earthenware:

Islamic ware:
2. Sherd of lead glazed monochrome G.G.M 18 (blue).

Beads:
3. 2 red opaque drawn glass beads G.G.M 1.
4. 2 drawn glass beads G.G.M 2, 1 black and 1 yellow.
5. 2 shell beads, 1 long cylinder and 1 standard cylinder.

Level 6

Local earthenware:
2. Jar with straight neck as Level 4 No. 3, above.

Chinese white:

Blue-and-white:
4. Small sherd in pale blue with black spotting.

Beads:
5. 5 red opaque drawn glass beads G.GM 1.
6. 23 drawn glass beads G.GM 2, 5 black, 8 yellow, 10 green.
7. 1 shell standard cylinder bead G.GM 10.

Miscellaneous:
8. Roughly square blocks 2 in. x 1½ in. x ½ in.

of red stoneware as G.GM Chin. Stone. 10 covered with a thick green glaze.

Local earthenware:
9. Coral ear plug ¼ in. x ½ in.

Level 8

Local earthenware:
2. Sherd of bowl with sharp ribs as Large Mosque Stratum III 18.

Islamic ware:

Chinese stoneware:
4. Neck of large jar in gray stoneware G.GM 5, cream-colored slip on inside, no trace of glaze material on outside (fig. 6 g).
5. Sherd of small yellow-brown glazed jar G.GM 2.
**APPENDIX**

**BEADS—MNARANI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Drawn glass</th>
<th>Wound and pressed glass</th>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Ivory</th>
<th>Crystal</th>
<th>Carnelian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red opaque</td>
<td>Red transparent</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green transparent</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GREAT MOSQUE**

**SMALL MOSQUE**

| L. 5    | —            | 2                        | 1     | —    | —     | —     | —     | 1     | —     | —     | —     | —     | —     | 1      | 1     | —     | —     | —     | —      | —     | —     | —     |
| L. 6    | —            | —                        | 5     | 10   | —     | 8     | —     | —     | —     | —     | —     | —     | —     | 1      | —     | —     | —     | —     | —      | —     | —     | —     |

*Note:* Most of these yellow drawn beads have a greenish tint; the one blue bead has the same tint as the inside of many green beads; the blue transparent bead is probably a cobalt; the yellow or green wound and pressed beads are probably yellow.
NEAR EASTERN BOOK COVERS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON EUROPEAN BINDINGS

A REPORT ON THE EXHIBITION “HISTORY OF BOOKBINDING” AT THE BALTIMORE MUSEUM OF ART, 1957-58*

By RICHARD ETTINGHAUSEN

IF ANYONE SHOULD STILL REGARD BOOKBINDING as an ancillary craft of minor importance, a visit to the exhibition “History of Bookbinding” held at the Baltimore Museum of Art from November 1957 to January 1958 would have shattered such preconceived ideas. Certainly the sumptuous bindings with gold, silver, ivory, and jewels assembled in a special treasure room would have shown him how the efforts of great artists working in the finest and costliest materials led to achievements that are of equal rank with other creations in the realm of decorative arts. The same can be said with equal force about the less showy and more restrained bindings in leather, the more usual material, of which the exhibition displayed a large and unsurpassed assemblage starting with the earliest examples when the codex first needed protective covers, down to the spectacular contemporary bindings of specially printed texts or collections of graphic arts. All this splendid material was collected by Miss Dorothy E. Miner, the librarian of the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore, who thus once more demonstrated her excellent taste, profound connoisseurship, and full grasp of the historical problems pertaining to the whole history of the art of the book—qualifications nowadays unmatched. In the very successful installation of these bindings—which are not easily displayed to please a larger museum public—she was ably assisted by the director and staff of the Baltimore Museum of Art whose earlier cooperation with the Walters Art Gallery in the shows of Byzantine art and of medieval manuscripts and illuminations had already made notable contributions in the field of international art exhibitions. An overwhelming majority of the bindings came from American collections, particularly from the Walters Art Gallery, but also from the Pierpont Morgan Library, the Harvard College Library, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and the collections of Messrs. Philip Hofer, Raphael Esmerian, and others. A large-sized, detailed, and well-illustrated catalogue is being prepared by Miss Miner, which promises to be a most useful tool for further research.¹

The exhibition opened with five Coptic bindings from possibly the seventh to the early tenth century, all originally from the Monas-

¹ The catalogue was not available at the opening of the exhibition or shortly afterward, when this report was being written. Miss Miner has, however, kindly put at the writer’s disposal, a set of galleys of the first part, which are here quoted in a number of cases. The title of the catalogue will be: The history of bookbinding, 525-1950 A.D. An exhibition organized by the Walters Art Gallery in cooperation with the Baltimore Museum of Art. Compiled by Dorothy E. Miner. November 12, 1957, to January 12, 1958. Baltimore, 1957.

* The photographs for figures 3 and 5 to 41 are here reproduced by courtesy of the Walters Art Gallery, those of figures 1, 2, and 4, by courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art. The author wishes to thank Miss Dorothy Miner for all the help given during his visits to the exhibition.
tery of St. Michael’s of the Desert, in the Fayyum, and now in the Pierpont Morgan Library. The earliest of these was the splendid binding of the Gospel Book MS. 569, (Cat. No. 26) which displayed the various techniques used—leather openwork tracery against a gilded background, ribbon threading, stitching, and punching—in such a monumental and even sculptural manner that it becomes at once clear how their appropriateness and artistic qualities assured them a long life well after the Copts had ceased to exert a creative influence. By comparison, the other Coptic bindings (Cat. Nos. 27–30) were not quite so impressive, but they displayed the possibilities of the blind-tooling technique which became even more widely used than the techniques of MS. 569. Another early piece seems to be one of the rare painted vellum end papers from a Coptic binding, dating probably from the fifth or sixth century (No. 31; fig. 2 and text fig. A). Here the designs in yellow, red, and black on red include rows of circles, alternately filled with a leaf or a bird, the whole framed by several borders. The main composition has its closest parallel in contemporary textiles and painted woodwork, which in turn was influenced by the woven fabrics. It will be recalled that the idea of using textile designs for the interior decoration of a book was taken up again several centuries later by the Ottonian illuminators of the late tenth century.

Thanks to the cooperation of the Government of Tunisia it was possible to include as the earliest Muslim bindings of the exhibition

2 For Coptic vellum end papers see Sir Thomas W. Arnold and A. Grohmann, *The Islamic book* . . . n.p., 1929, pl. 21 (sixth and seventh centuries), and for examples from Arabic bindings, *ibid.* , pl. 26, D and E (tenth century). If this should not be an end paper, it would be a painted cover (see *ibid.* , pl. 26, A, and Theodore C. Petersen, *Early Islamic book-bindings and their Coptic relations*, Ars Orientalis, vol. 1 [1954], figs. 23–26).

a group of 12 covers (Nos. 35–46) from the now famous find in the Great Mosque of Kairouan; before this event none of these had been seen outside the country of their recovery. All of them had the horizontal format so characteristic of early Islamic manuscripts and with one exception showed an infinite pattern which was applied by blind tooling, though in one case the application of short parallel strokes showed reminiscences of the Coptic ribbon-threading method as well (No. 36). The main motifs were a series of circles each with an inscribed dot and, on a larger scale, a cable pattern, both used for the borders, and more intricate braided bands or plaited strands for the field. The one different example, the finest of these Kairouan bindings, was said to be of the eleventh century. In this, the raised design of a horizontally placed palmette and four arabesque leaves is fashioned over a series of thin cords glued to the poplar wood board (No. 43; text fig. B). The discovery of this technique in Kairouan was of great importance because it suggested a Mediterranean and most probably a Coptic origin of the same decorative method as was used in the famous Gospel of St. Cuthbert, now in Stonyhurst College (and unfortunately not available for the exhibition), a manuscript made in Northumbria (England) about the time of the saint’s death in 687 (text fig. C).4


Fig. A—Drawing of End Paper Shown in Figure 3. (The feet of the birds are no longer recognizable and are here hypothetically given; the bird on the left in the lower row is also only barely visible.) (Drawn by Frank A. Haentschke.)
Fig. B—Lower Cover (Alone Extant) of Kairouan Binding No. 119A. Eleventh Century. (Drawn by T. C. Petersen.)
FIG. C—COVER OF ST. CUTHBERT'S GOSPEL. NORTHUMBRIA, ABOUT A.D. 687.
(After A History of Technology, ed. Charles Singer et al., vol. 2, fig. 133.)
Fig. D and E—Reconstruction of the Upper and Lower Covers of a Bookbinding, Egypt, Tenth to Eleventh Century. Now Walters Art Gallery.

(Drawn by Frank A. Haentschke.)
This earlier assumption became a near certainty by the discovery in Egypt of a lyre-shaped piece of red parchment (applied to a coarse linen backing) which probably was once part of a pouch or saddle (fig. 4). This piece was included in the exhibition (No. 32). At its damaged edge, it was quite easy to see that here the same technique of string molding was employed that was used in the Gospel and Koran bindings and again for a floral pattern, though in this instance in conjunction with the painting of flowers in black, yellow, and green. In view of the archaeological significance of this piece for the Stonyhurst Gospel and the Kairouan bindings the question of its date is of some importance. The clue lies in the central palmette design which is of Sasanian origin. It occurs on certain late capitals in that Iranian period, such as those found at Qal'a-ye kohneh or Ṭāq-e Bostān; it continues to be used, together with smaller lateral floral branches, in the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock (72 H./691–692) and, in a slightly different fashion, on the columns of the Mosque of al-Ḥajjāj at Wāsīt (83 H./702); finally it occurs as marginal ornaments of sūrā dividers in a Koran in Cairo attributed by B. Moritz to the first to second century H., which, like the design on the leather fragment, are much more Sasanian than the marginal palmettes in another Koran, attributed to the second to third century. Hence a late seventh- or, possibly, an eighth-century date suggests itself for the pouch or saddle piece, which would make it about contemporary with the binding of the Stonyhurst Gospel and thus assure an Egyptian origin for the technique of the latter, as had already been suggested by Mlle. van Regemorter, Father Petersen, and R. Powell.

Another unexpected survival of a Coptic technique in early Islamic times was demonstrated by yet another rare object, two now detached leather coverings of similar design which originally had been applied to a square codex (No. 33, figs. 1 and 2 and text figs. D and E). It was known that openwork tracery over a gilded background was introduced to Europe and survived there in one of the oldest bindings, the Ragyndrudis Codex at Fulda, believed to have belonged to the English missionary, St. Boniface (died 755), but about the only recorded case of this technique in the East outside the Coptic milieu was in a Manichaean binding with geometric cut-out patterns on a gold background, found by A. von Le Coq in Chotscho, Turfan, and tentatively attributed by him to the eighth or ninth century (text fig. F). The binding

5 First referred to in this context by Petersen, op. cit., p. 51, n. 10. This piece measures 6 3/4" x 5 1/8" (172 x 134 mm.). It has since been given to the Walters Art Gallery.
6 This material is all assembled in K. A. C. Creswell, Early Muslim architecture, Oxford, 1932, vol. 1, figs. 253, 255, 256, and 259.
7 Ibid., figs. 260–261, pls. 5–6.
8 Fuad Safar, Wāsīt, The sixth season's excavation, Le Caire, 1945, pp. 24–26, 34, pls. 14–16. The forms here used are slightly more advanced than those found on the leather fragment.
9 B. Moritz, Arabic palaeography, Cairo, 1905, pls. 15–16.
10 Ibid., p. 31, 33–36.
11 The history of bookbinding... No. 26.
12 Petersen, op. cit., figs. 27–29; Arnold-Grohmann, op. cit., pl. 16–19.
13 A. von Le Coq, Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien. Zweiter Teil: Die manichäischen Miniaturen, Berlin, 1923, p. 40 and pl. 4e, after which Mr. Frank A. Haentzschel of the Freer Gallery of Art has drawn fig. F. Von Le Coq has already remarked that the technique (cut-out filigree over gold background and small punched-out circles) and decorations as well point to Egypt. Since the writing of this report, several other so far unpublished fragments with openwork leather tracery showing floral designs and decorative stitching set against a gold ground have been found by this writer in the Leather Museum in Offenbach. Many of these pieces are of uncertain shapes and functions, but there were also
shown at the Baltimore exhibition was, however, found in the Cairo antiquity market and was undoubtedly discovered in Egypt. In one cover, probably the less abraded top one, the gilding of the parchment background for the openwork is still well preserved, but small traces of the gilding are also visible on the slightly less elaborate lower cover. Another vertical, as on the later ones from about the late eleventh century on, but, so to say, on the bias. The design of spiral rinceaux ending in palmettes or leaves also is no longer infinite like those on the early Islamic bindings. The question of the date again presents a difficult problem. One fact is clear, however, namely, that the piece was made in an Arab milieu

Coptic feature here is the use of stitching as a decorative means (text figs. D and E); as the leaves of figure D indicate, the design in this stitching might, in parts, have been originally further elaborated by additional painted details. An unusual feature of this binding is the orientation of the design which is neither horizontal, as on all the early covers, nor two square pieces which closely resemble those in the Baltimore exhibition here under discussion.

because of a few words of Arabic writing in naskhi on the paper under the stitches with which the leather is applied to its backing. This also provides a clue for the date, as papermaking became known to the Arabs in A.D. 751, when its secrets were divulged by Chinese craftsmen taken captive at the time of the subjugation of Transoxania; but it was introduced into Egypt only in the first half of the tenth century, since this country continued
NEAR EASTERN BOOK COVERS

with its papyrus production, even after the Asiatic provinces of Islam had turned to the new writing material. Hence, it must still have taken some decades for scrap paper to be used as backing for Egyptian bookbindings, something that might have happened from the middle of the tenth century on. 14 This date is corroborated by the stylistic analysis of the design. The best parallels are provided by Egyptian wood carvings, which, though undated, at least give some general clues. Thus a carving attributed to the beginning of the ninth century represents an earlier stage in the formal treatment of leafy branches, as they are more realistically rendered. 15 On the other hand, the versions of this theme in the eleventh century show a slightly greater degree of stylization than that found on the leather covers. 16 This suggests that it was executed between the two date limits, but closer to the latter. This fits well with the date of A.D. 950 given by A. Grohmann to the fragment of a Coptic shoe whose leather appliqué work is slightly earlier in style than the bindings exhibited in Baltimore. 17 The conclusion, then, is that the binding is early Fāṭimid, possibly from the late tenth century, or the first half of the eleventh.

The book production in the Fāṭimid period of Egypt is still very obscure, but the exhibition included one more binding of that period.


15 Edmond Pauty, Les bois sculptés jusqu'à l'époque ayyoubide, (Catalogue général du Musée arabe du Caire), Le Caire, 1931, pl. IX, No. 2462.

16 Ibid., pls. XXXIV, No. 6878/1 verso; XLII, Nos. 2111, 3392, and 5924, and XLIII, No. 3390.

17 Arnold-Grohmann, op. cit., pl. 17 A.

It was made of black goatskin which was originally placed over papyrus boards, and possibly dates from the eleventh century (No. 34, Walters Art Gallery; fig. 5). 18 Like the whole binding, its unusual oval-shaped central medallion had a horizontal orientation; in its use of circular and angular outlines for the main decoration it prefigures later pieces, especially in Morocco (Nos. 53 and 57; figs. 8 and 9). The binding is the earliest known example using triangular corner pieces for the central field, a feature to be employed in Iran until the early fourteenth century and in Mudéjar and Renaissance bindings through the fifteenth. It is also the first to employ colored pigments, here yellow or pink, for dot punches at points and intersections, again a device found in subsequent centuries and to be regarded as a forerunner of gold tooling. The main decorations are, however, made up with the help of two stamps and the line roller.

The second important foreign loan to the exhibition, made by the Government of Morocco, demonstrated that the art of bookbinding had reached a new high point under the Almohads in the thirteenth century. Two sections of a magnificent Koran set, written in Marrakesh in the year 654 H./A.D. 1256 by the next-to-the-last Almohad Sultan, Abū Ḥafs Umar al-Murtadā (No. 52; fig. 6), 19 establish a number of important points: (1) The bindings are now clearly vertically orientated; (2) they present the earliest known use of strapwork design which appears reserved (that is, undecorated) against a


richly tooled background pattern, the whole being constructed around an eight-pointed star, a design which continued to be used and became a characteristic feature of fifteenth-century Spanish and Mudéjar bindings (cf. No. 137; fig. 26); and finally, the most important feature, viz., these are the earliest known examples of gold tooing (applied with a hot iron, from all we know) to form a dense rope interlace; the use of this technique is thus more than 200 years earlier than its earliest use in Europe, where it probably first appears in Venice before 1459, coming ultimately from Iran. Even this might not be the earliest use in the Maghrib as an eleventh-century treatise on bookbindings by the Zirid author Ibn Bādis (1007–61) gives technical information about a more primitive form of stamping with gold.

Three bindings from another thirteenth-century Koran set—though in this case none

189 This earliest occurrence in Europe of a binding with gold tooing has recently been established by A. R. A. Hobson (Two Renaissance bindings, The Book Collector, vol. 7, London, Autumn 1958, pp. 265–266: “A binding presented to René of Anjou, 1459”). Before this discovery it had been assumed that gold tooing appeared first in Naples, around 1480, probably coming from a Moorish country. A “romanesque” binding in the Pierpont Morgan Library from about the beginning of the thirteenth century and possibly from northern France shows already traces of gilding, but they are assumed to have been made with a brush, and not with a hot tool (The history of bookbinding . . . No. 111, with bibliography).

20 This is the pertinent passage: “You take a red gold which is formed into thin leaves and apply thereon the glue on the same day. Do not delay more than that. If the gold resists adhering to the glue, heat the gold on the fire. . . . Then if you stamp it, leave it two days and polish it with a stone with black stibium on it, and then polish it with the knuckles of the middle finger between the gold letters.” (Martin Levey, Miroslav Krek, and Husni Haddad, Some notes on chemical technology in an eleventh century work on bookbinding, Isis, vol. 47 [1956], p. 241.)

of its 30 volumes is dated—demonstrate the continued high niveau of Moroccan craftsmanship (No. 53; figs. 7 and 8). They also acquaint us with a number of characteristic features, i.e., the possibility of changes in the cover designs not only from binding to binding within a set, but even from the upper to the lower covers of a single binding (fig. 7); the rendition of the central motif either as a circular medallion or as a configuration in which circular and angular edges alternate, both of which became common Maghribi features; the use of two stars, one on top of the other, each in its own suggested field unit, a two-partite scheme derived from horizontal compositions used earlier for the frontispiece illuminations of Kūfic Korans and later on taken over by Mudéjar and Italian Renaissance bindings (cf. figs. 24 and 27); the jutting out of the framing border to form corner designs (fig. 7, right), a feature which distinguishes the Maghribi from Egyptian and Persian examples also using the same composition scheme; and finally, the use of silver for the tooing with small stamps and its alternation with gold.

These principles continued to be used in the Maghribi bindings and the exhibition presented several splendid examples of the fifteenth century (Nos. 54 and 57) belonging

21 This applies also to some Coptic bindings, e.g., the Morgan MS. 569, referred to above (Petersen, op. cit., figs. 27 and 28), to early Persian bindings (Ettinghausen, op. cit., pp. 465–466), and to nearly all European bindings till the thirteenth century (Powell, op. cit., p. 371, quoting C. D. Hobson).

22 F. R. Martin, The miniature painting and painters of Persia, India and Turkey . . ., London, 1912, vol. 2, pl. 235 B; other examples in the Freer Gallery of Art (No. 37.11 verso), in the Philip Hofer Collection, and in other collections. The Mudéjar bindings follow also other decorative schemes found in the illuminated frontispieces of Kūfic Korans; this deserves to be investigated. See also below, p. 127, with regard to fig. 26.
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Fig. 38—France, ca. 1562.

Fig. 39—France, ca. 1560-70.
Fig. 41—Italy, ca. 1550.

Fig. 40—North Italy, ca. 1555-60.
to the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. The single cover of a giant codex measuring 56 x 40 cm. was artistically outstanding, as the craftsman understood how to contrast his complex design with the grain of the leather (fig. 9). A marked feature of these later bindings, but already indicated in the thirteenth-century Korans, is the cusped outline of the four corner pieces which still belong to the borders and extend dartlike into the field. Two other Maghrībi examples of the same century, belonging to the same collection (Nos. 55 and 56), present another typical Moorish decorative scheme, a large central medallion which, as the catalogue of the exhibition described it well for No. 55, “is essentially an eight-pointed star inscribed within a circle, the composition being elaborated by developing the forms of strapwork using concave curves to interlace the rectangles.”

All the subsequent periods in the main areas—Iran, Egypt, South Arabia, Turkey, and India—were well represented. The one missing link was one of the great folio bindings done for the Mongol Üljäytü Khudâbandeh, but all efforts to get one of these as a loan proved in vain. The Oriental Institute had sent its splendid Mamlûk bindings from the Moritz Collection, which included one cover of a giant Koran of the early fifteenth century “with an all-over linear interlace pattern based on twelve-pointed stars . . . the web of gold lines being organized into subordinate patterns by variation in blind tooling, gold punch-dots, and by outlines of white and blue” (No. 66). The earliest of this group was a fine set of gold and blind-tooled covers with ogival medallions encompassing an octagon traced in blue (No. 61, Walters Art Gallery). This Koran part is approximately dated, as it contains an illuminated waqf dedication by the Amir Aytmish al-Bajâsî, who died in 1400; the present-day dispersion of antique bindings is indicated by the fact that, of 30 such sectional volumes, another with its text is in the Library of Congress, while the Freer Gallery of Art, the Chester Beatty Library, and Henri Vever Collection own empty covers. The show included a number of very fine flaps, now detached (Nos. 65 and 69) and an embossed doublure with textile-like design of ovoids in diapers (No. 67), all owned by the Oriental Institute.

The Iranian series started with covers of two sections of a Koran written at Marâqîgh in 738–739 H./A.D. 1338–39 whose central design of a polylobbled medallion with an inscribed interlaced star pattern is varied on the two covers of a single binding (Nos. 72 and 73, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). Strange enough, only one of these contains gold-tooled dots, which in Iran was apparently still a rarely used technique, since the earliest known case is a set of Üljäytü bindings in Cairo made in Hamadân which dates from 713 H./1313. A very similar empty binding of the same design, and likewise with points of gold amid the blind tooling, was sent by the Library of Congress (No. 74); being of larger size it must have belonged to another set of the same date.

Following these rather austere early Persian pieces a splendid set of bindings demonstrated the flowering of the craft in the Timûrid period. Probably the earliest in this group was an empty binding from the Library of Congress in which the round central medallion with its fine polylobbled edge and inscribed gilt star interlaced with a blue decagon, the rather chaste corner pieces, the elaborate arabesque design on the flap, and finally, the two geometric interlaces on the flap joint all point to the end of the fourteenth or, possibly,

29. Ibid., p. 462 and fig. 346.
the beginning of the fifteenth century as its probable date (No. 76; fig. 10). The next binding in historical sequence was the covers of a large richly illuminated undated Koran with Persian interlinear translation which likewise uses blind and gold tooling and a blue pigment as well, and which also has, as in the last-mentioned piece, a large thulth inscription on the flap joint (No. 75, Walters Art Gallery; fig. 11). Otherwise, however, there is a new decorative spirit which banishes all geometric patterns and abounds in floral designs. The well-balanced compositional scheme consisted of a central medallion with pendants and related corner pieces, and of panels in the wide border, every unit being filled with flowers and arabesques in gold outlines, the designs, and particularly the background, being textured with blind tooling.

One of the rare embossed pictorial bindings, now without text, which also belongs to the Walters Art Gallery (No. 81; fig. 14) dates from the end of the first half or the mid-fifteenth century. Here the design consists of a landscape in low relief with monkeys playing in a tree and underneath it a large bird attacking one of two wolves. It is important to note that on the two covers the same design varies slightly in the size of details which indicates that it could not have been made with a stamp or mold, but by direct manipulation in a still unknown technique. The exterior of the flap is decorated with two mythological animals of Chinese derivation in a landscape—another motif tallying with the taste of that period—while the inside shows a red leather filigree against gold, blue, and green backgrounds. Unlike this piece, another Timūrid binding with a similar landscape of monkeys, various quadrupeds, and birds (No. 80, Library of Congress) must have been made with one large mold, because both covers had a faulty line running across them in the same place. However, sometimes certain details within larger units differ slightly, which seems to indicate that the binding was hand-finished after the main design was mechanically applied with a large stamp. Although it had all-over gilding, now rubbed off on the raised parts, it is still perfectly preserved on the better protected flap, its decoration containing the same kind of Chinese monsters as on No. 81, but the binding was not as perfect artistically as the related piece in the Walters Art Gallery.

An extraordinary contrast was provided by the exterior and interior of the binding on a MS. of Assār’s Mehr o-Moshtari, dated 881 H./1477 (No. 78, Walters Art Gallery; figs. 15 and 16). On the outside, the black leather showed a textile-like all-over trellis of small ogival medallions each enclosing a flower on a gold ground. The whole was again embossed in relief by means of a panel, used here as in the case of No. 80 instead of the small tool impressions of the earlier periods. Although stone molds of the twelfth century (No. 60, Boston Museum of Fine Arts) indicate that the block-stamping technique was known in earlier centuries, being employed for saddles, boxes, and doublures, it was applied to the outside of bindings only in the second part of the fifteenth century. In contrast to this rather restrained design, the doublure shows a much more delicate, complex, and colorful scheme of medallions and arabesques cut out as filigree from red leather; certain parts of the design are rendered in gold and the whole is set against a blue background. The combination of staggered rows of medallions and of a second all-over design in the background recalls certain later rug compositions and prefigures the system of the “vase carpets.” The same connection with carpets,

25 Ibid., pp. 472-473, fig. 359, and end piece on p. 473.
especially those represented in late Timurid miniatures, is indicated in an embossed arabesque binding with an all-over design of polylobed medallions and small circles, enclosing a MS. of sayings by 'Ali b. Abi Talib, dated 941 H./1534; but the binding apparently dates from the late fifteenth or, less likely, the early sixteenth century (No. 79, Walters Art Gallery; fig. 17). Here, as Miss Miner has pointed out, "the gilt ground is textured, doubtless by hand, so as to give the raised design the effect of being a cutwork tracery." Details of the design are again picked out by pink and blue pigments.

Another late Timurid binding of exquisite taste and excellent craftsmanship is important as an indication of future developments (No. 82, Dhakirat Khwârizmshâh by Ismâ‘îl b. al-Hasan al-Ḥoseynî al-Jorjâni 889 H./1484, Walters Art Gallery; figs. 12 and 13). Its exterior, doublures, and the two sides of the flap present variations of the scheme of a central ogival medallion with quarter medallions in the four corners, all units mainly filled with delicate arabesques. On each part not only outlines and sizes vary, but also techniques: on the outside is an early example of printing with a number of medium-sized stamps and, in addition, the traditional hand tooling, gilding, and texturing, while the more protected inside has fine red leather filigree over a blue and gold background. This composition of a large central medallion and four quarter medallions in the corners was to be repeated many thousand times in Safavid and Ottoman bindings in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, though then technically coarsened in spite of richer gilding, the delicate arabesques being combined with heavier cloud bands. Some decades later, the Timurid medallion theme is to appear also on some Venetian bindings and later on French ones, but again, not with the same artistic refinement as in the originals (see below). There is no doubt, however, that the Walters binding is contemporary with the text it covers, as the deeply lobed half and quarter medallions derived from the Chinese cloud collars which appear on both sides of the flap and in the corner pieces of the doublure, are a Timurid feature, as are some minor floral details on the outside medallions.

There was a splendid series of Safavid and Ottoman Turkish bindings, but they all represented types which are well known from many other examples shown in museums, exhibitions, or publications. The finest were probably a pair of detached covers with gilt leather filigree of arabesques over a blue background, a design resembling a type of Tabriz carpets (No. 84, Library of Congress; fig. 18), and three lacquer bindings. The earliest of the latter group was the well-known one with animals in a forest on a MS. dated 964 H./1557 which came from the Sarre Collection to the Metropolitan Museum (No. 92), while the second, in Shâh ‘Abbâs style, with cavaliers on the lion hunt had not been known before and was illustrated for the first time in the Catalogue (No. 93, Walters Art Gallery; fig. 19). The third of these lacquered bindings covers a Shâh-nâmeh MS. of 1011 H./1619 showing groups of mythological animals in and around a central medallion, again very much like certain carpets, but of much better quality than animals would be in carpets of the early seventeenth century (No. 95, Walters Art Gallery; fig. 20). The one unusual, if not unique, piece was a jeweled Koran binding of the mid-sixteenth century, which has the typical half-plate embossed ogival medallion scheme with cloud bands and floral stems surrounded by a cartouche border, but shows, in addition, many small turquoises inserted in the richly gilded design (No. 87, Metropolitan Museum of Art). There are pieces of jade
of that period which have such jewel incrustations, and in the collections of the Topkapu Sarayi Müzeesi there are potteries similarly adorned. There is nothing strange in finding this method also used for leatherwork, although it is also possible that these stones were applied in later times.

The group of Mughal bindings started with a most unusual lacquered binding of the late sixteenth century enclosing a MS. of an undated *Khamseh* by Amir Khosrow Dehlavi (No. 94, Walters Art Gallery; *figs. 21* and 22). Here two full-fledged paintings in the late Akbar style have been applied: On the upper cover one finds in the foreground and middle ground a hunting scene in which a prince supervises attendants who are hoisting a dead tiger on an elephant, and in the background a visit to a hermit, a combination which denotes the mundane and spiritual sides of life; the decoration of the lower cover consists of a curious scene in which angels wrestle with demons in a mountain landscape with a pond in the foreground. Another fine Mughal lacquered binding is decorated with a symmetrical design of flower-decorated gold bands on green and black backgrounds (No. 96, Walters Art Gallery; *fig. 23*). The MS. which it covers is dated 1011 H./1602, but the binding could also be somewhat later. This uncertainty about the precise date of this binding is indicative of our limited knowledge of such Mughal work.

Of the Turkish bindings shown, possibly the most unusual one was an eighteenth-century binding with a foliate design embroidered in colored silks, lent by the Library of Congress (No. 91); however, this piece is a late example in this technique which was started in the sixteenth century.  

While this limited account makes it amply clear that the show presented an unprecedented opportunity to review every type of Muslim bindings from all the major regions, it also had another important asset in providing an unusual chance to survey the influences exerted by Muslim bindings on European book covers. This aspect is all the more significant because, of all the decorative arts, book covers, next to textiles, exerted the greatest influence on late medieval and Renaissance craftsmen.

The first of these fountaineheads of Muslim inspiration was Spain. As is to be expected, the most immediate influence is to be found in the Mudéjar art of the Iberian Peninsula itself. A characteristic example is the Catalan heraldic binding covering an Aegidius Colonna text of ca. 1455 from the Philip Hofer Collection (No. 135; *fig. 24*). Here the designs in blind tooling of two quatrefoils and various borders are made of stamped and punched rope plaitwork, such as had already occurred in the great Moroccan bindings of the thirteenth century. From the same source comes the two-partite division of the field and the repetition of the same motif (cf. *fig. 7*). The triangular corner pieces and the undecorated square pieces in 12 corners are also typical Mudéjar features of the fifteenth century though they appear also on fourteenth-century Persian bindings. Actually the only Western

28 Ettinghausen, *op. cit.*, figs. 348 and 350.
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element is the coat of arms which is rather incongruously placed in the two quatrefoil medallions. Another binding that heavily leans on the ropework design covers a Tractatus by Alfonso de Benevento, of the second half of the fifteenth century, belonging to the Walters Art Gallery (No. 139; fig. 25); here, however, the austerity of the blind tooling for the all-over design was somewhat relieved by colored punches of circles with inscribed dots. Another archetype, the circle with the inscribed star composed of undecorated bands set against a tooled background and with plaited borders, is found on the impressive binding of a Hebrew Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary and the Targum of Onkelos, a Lisbon incunabulum of 1491 (No. 137, Philip H. and A. S. W. Rosenbach Foundation; fig. 26). The most unusual Near Eastern aspect of this binding is, however, its boxed-in character. Such a makeup had been assumed by Georges Marçais and Louis Poinssot when they first described 125 of the Kairouan bindings, only there the boxing-in was done by leather flaps of double thickness, while in the Mudéjar binding the leather covers an actual box. The great bulk of the Hebrew book might have demanded this sturdier construction, which, in any case, is an infrequent survival of a much older binding technique, then outmoded, even in Muslim countries.

The purest of the Moorish-type designs outside the Peninsula was found on the lower cover of a Petrarch MS. written on the Island of Chios in 1461 (No. 136, Harvard College Library; fig. 30). Again, it contained a simple strapwork ornament of undecorated bands set against a dense background of rope braidwork in blind tooling. One can only guess how such a design could have come into the Eastern Mediterranean.

In the second half of the fifteenth century bindings with obvious Moroccan influence appear in northern Italy, that is, in Florence, also in Rome, and possibly in Bologna. The earliest example, from ca. 1455, shows the characteristic two-partite composition with two roundels in the inner rectangle with filling rope braidwork, which likewise appears in the triangular cornerpieces. The blind tooling of the binding is brightened up by colored punches (No. 198, on a Cicero, De Oratore, Florence, 1453, T. E. Marston Collection). Four other bindings have only a single feature in the central upright panel, but whether it is the (then horizontally orientated) illuminated frontispieces of early Kufic Koran manuscripts.

For a very close Spanish prototype of this Chios binding see Thomas, op. cit., pl. 22.

One possible solution would be to assume that the work was done by a Jewish refugee craftsman from Spain, just as it has been noted that certain Moorish binding patterns appear about the same period in South Arabia, the stamping tools having been brought there by Sefardic binders. See the comments to H. Thomas, Early Spanish bookbindings . . ., by the late Dr. Emil Graetz in E. Graetzl, K. A. C. Creswell, and Richard Ettinghausen, Bibliographie der islamischen Einbandkunst, 1871 bis 1956, Ars Orientalis, vol. 2 (1957), pp. 537-538.
a roundel, a diamond-shaped figure, a central knot with two appendices, or an eight-pointed star, they, like the triangular cornerpieces (and in one case also the border), are filled with or composed of rope braidwork. Three bindings show gold punches for circles with a central dot, another characteristic Muslim design, combined in the binding of ca. 1485–90 with punches in yellow, red, and green, while the binding of ca. 1480 has punches with green and blue pigments (No. 197, on a Diogenes Laertius, Florence, 1450–60, Marston Coll.; fig. 31; No. 195, on Aelianus, De instruenidis aciebus, Florence, ca. 1480, Harvard College Library; fig. 27; No. 194, on G. Sabadino degli Arienti, Triumphus Victoriae Tornamenti Johannis Bentivoli...Bologna(?), ca. 1490, Philip Hofer Coll.; No. 196, on Caesar, Bellum Gallicum, Italy, second half of the fifteenth century, Yale University Library).

The Moorish influence was felt even farther afield. Thus it appears on the Opera of Tacitus which, in about 1480, was bound in Buda for King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary, one of the greatest Renaissance bibliophiles (No. 205; Yale University; fig. 28). The whole composition of this binding—the only one from this royal library in the United States—as well as the central medallion with its alternating circular and angular exences, the braided border, and the dotted circle punch, point to the same ultimate prototype, although the floral design in the medallion and corners is a European intrusion. The bindings of this court atelier were inspired by bindings made in Naples for the Aragonese kings, but those from that court shown at the exhibition were much less Moorish in their general appearance than are others in European collections.\(^{32}\) Still, a binding like that on an Aretino, De Bello Punico, of about 1480 has a certain Muslim cachet in its predilection of braidwork, coarse though it is by Muslim standards, its borders, wider on top and bottom and thus replacing the two horizontal rectangles of the field, its interstitial rosettes, substituting for the dotted circle, its central ruglike design of interlocking hexagons, and finally in its rich gold tooling (No. 199, Harvard College Library; fig. 29).

From about 1450 on, Iran became an ever growing source of Muslim influence on European bindings, and here the main port of entry was Venice. The earliest of such bindings in the exhibition covering the Ceremonial of the Doge Leonardo Lauredano's accession dated 1502 is now in the Walters Art Gallery (No. 209; fig. 32). A narrow raised leather border along the edge decorated with a simple gold cable pattern turns the whole field into a sunken panel. Here a large round central medallion is filled with a configuration in relief of partially gilded arabesques set against a stippled gold background. The corners do not repeat this design, as they do in a more orthodox composition, but are filled with a fine arabesque leather filigree on red, green, and light-blue silk backgrounds. On the area between the medallions and corners, two floral branches, each with a central lotus flower, are drawn in gold on the grainy leather ground. All these elements are Persian, but in this combination they would hardly be found on contemporary or earlier Eastern bindings;\(^{33}\) the arabesques in the all-too-large central medallion are also slightly hybrid in their forms, and the way they are combined with four pots is un-Persian. If this binding is by a Muslim craftsman, as it is assumed in 48, 50 (like the Corvinus binding discussed above), 52, 54, and 63 A.

\(^{32}\) For such Neapolitan bindings in Moorish style see Tammaro de Marinis, La Biblioteca Napoletana dei Re d’Aragona, Milano, 1947–1952, vol. 1, pls.
the catalogue, the taste of this artist must have been affected by his European surroundings. However, the idea of an imported Persian bookbinder at this period is quite possible in view of the Muslim brassworkers like Mu'allim Maḥmūd al-Kurdi, Zayn al-Dīn, and others who shortly after 1500 manufactured and signed “all'Azimina” vessels in Venice where, however, their style soon underwent a Europeanization.\(^{34}\)

A later red leather binding from the Walters Art Gallery, enclosing the text of Petrarch’s *Opera*, printed by Aldus in 1546, is actually much purer in its Persian style (No. 210; figs. 33 and 34). The exterior follows the usual medallion scheme with related quarter pieces in the four corners; they appear as sunken units, being deeply impressed by large stamps, and are decorated with rather sparsely drawn arabesques and flowers raised in the gilt background. The doublure of blackish-green leather has a red leather filigree of arabesques with gold tooling set against a green silk background. Here the only non-Persian features are probably the profusely radiating strokes (especially the wavy ones) and the little flowers on the corner of the outer and inner medallions, but the binding as a whole comes very close to Eastern originals.

That Persian influence was exerted all through the sixteenth century in Venice is shown by the *Dogale* which encloses a commission by the Doge Marino Grimani of the year 1597. It now belongs to Mr. Raphael Esmerian (No. 238; fig. 35). As usual, the design on red, blue, and gold backgrounds with the lion of St. Marc or, respectively, the coat of arms of the Doge, in the center of the cover is under a lacquer finish; it covers a series of sunken panels created by wide, golden, somewhat baroque bands. This particular group of Persian-type binding was current during a rather long period, and as it always encloses official documents is usually dated; it would, therefore, form a suitable starting point for an investigation of the Persian influence on Venetian bindings. However, the pure Renaissance style of another *Dogale*, dated 1577 and belonging to the Walters Art Gallery, demonstrates that such bindings do not necessarily have to be in Persian style although it, too, has sunken panels (No. 240).

Many other bindings mostly from Venice at the exhibition show a marked Persian influence, with the arabesques being the main constituent element—just as they are on the metal vessels in Near Eastern style. Sometimes, as in the upper cover of a binding of ca. 1540 on Petrarch’s *Sonetti* of 1519, they are placed in the center and corner pieces, and in the border as well; but, at the same time, the different compositional scheme of the lower cover shows that the traditional form of corner decorations is here, as in many other such arabesque bindings, gradually disappearing (No. 234, Harvard College Library; fig. 36). Many beautiful bindings have the arabesque more or less as a symmetrical all-over design composed along the vertical axis, with an undecorated cartouche-like space in the center into which the initials, name, or coat of arms of the owner, or the title of the book, are inserted (Nos. 230 and 236, Walters Art Gallery; fig. 40). These decorations are no longer made by combining the impressions of many different stamps, but they derive from the imprint plate, a labor-saving device, which at that time was also widely used in Iran and Turkey. Many of these arabesques are no longer drawn as in the Orient, but are of a hybrid nature. Another elaboration of the scheme is the change of color within the various compartments created by the arabesque-carrying stems, and possibly suggested by the

differently colored backgrounds in Persian doublures with arabesque filigrees. This happens, for example, in the yellow leather binding on De Iobilo et Indulgentiis printed in Rome, 1550, where areas laid out by the gold arabesques are colored red, green, and light blue, here creating the effect of inlays with colored leather (No. 231, Walters Art Gallery; fig. 41). In the volume containing the works of Basil the Great, printed by Froben at Basle in 1540, but bound in Venice, we finally have the eclectic combination of Moroc- 
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The Persian compositional scheme with a central medallion and four cornerpieces was finally taken up by French and English binders. It appears first on “custom bindings,” such as on a small volume of Diogenes Laertius printed in Lyons in 1561 which was bound for King Henry III as Duke of Orleans (No. 293, Esmerian Coll.; fig. 38). Its central medallion is in Western taste, but the cornerpieces have the deeply lobed outline derived from Timùrîd bindings and are filled with arabesques. It contains also, like most bind- 

7 Visitors to the splendid exhibition of manuscripts and bindings in the British Museum will recall another binding for Queen Elizabeth shown there, this time, however, in nearly pure Persian style (No. C. 20 a, 21). It is of red morocco and applied to a dedication copy for Mascher’s Il fiore della retorica, Venice, 1560. Its sunken ovoid center medallion has the royal coat of arms and “Eli/sa/bet/ta” written in gold letters, while the equally sunken two appendices and four quarter medallions in the corners show dark brown arabesques against a gold ground.
In none of the Western bindings in Oriental style do we witness the use of one very characteristic Oriental feature: the flap. What seems to be an exception, but is not really so, are bindings containing blank books for accounts or official records, like the one with the records of the College of Lodi of 1571 shown at the exhibition by Count Louis Cremascoli de Foix-Crenascol (No. 232). Although its flap, like those on Persian bindings, is decorated in the same manner as the covers (i.e., with two impressions of the same large stamps in Renaissance style), its wavy (not pentagonal) edge and especially the fact that it is not tucked under the cover but fastened on top to secure the contents indicate that the flap is here used differently.

This account has pointed to only some of the finest bindings, and many others of lesser significance had to be passed over. However, everyone interested will be able to get a good insight into this material from the detailed descriptions and illustrations of the catalogue. There is no doubt that the publication, like the show itself, will represent a landmark in our understanding of the fine art of bookbinding and will serve as a major tool of research in the future.
EARLY MUGHAL MINIATURE PAINTINGS FROM TWO PRIVATE COLLECTIONS SHOWN AT THE FOGG ART MUSEUM

BY STUART C. WELCH, JR.

A small exhibition of Mughal art was held at the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, during the winter of 1956–57. Although primarily a display of paintings, a number of carpets were included. The earliest, lent by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, was a fragment of a knotted woolen carpet said to have been in the palace of the king of Delhi when Bābur (1526–30) stormed it in 1529. Decorated with a huge arabesque formed of beasts devouring and disgorging one another, it seems almost to presage ominous happenings. Dating from the first part of the seventeenth century is the well-known carpet in the same material, also from the Boston Museum, showing genre and hunting subjects as well as the Simorgh attacking a gajasimha. Although the design would perhaps be better suited to painting than carpet decoration, this is certainly one of the most exciting of Mughal textiles. Mr. Joseph V. McMullan lent his sumptuous prayer rug of the period of Shāh Jahān (1628–58), with its hypnotic arrangement of white flowers against a deep red ground.

The paintings gave a fuller picture of the development of Mughal style, beginning with two pages from the largest and earliest of Mughal manuscripts, the Dāstān-e Amīr Hānuzah. Although neither example could be said to represent the designs of Mir Sayyid 'Ali, the painter who was brought to India by Homāyūn (1530–56) and who was first responsible for the project, they showed vividly the bold and often naturalistic manner of this phase of Mughal book painting. The period most fully represented was that of Akbar (1556–1605). There were included paintings from several of the historical manuscripts, as well as from the translations of Hindu epics into Persian whereby Akbar hoped to bridge the gap between Hindu and Muslim elements in his empire. A number of miniatures from fable books, poetry, and natural histories completed the documentation of Akbar's library.

Portraits and album paintings of the Akbar period were also displayed, but such extraordinary studies as that of a poet and The dying Ināyat Khān, both lent by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, gave evidence of the advancement of portraiture during the reign of Jahāngir (1605–27). From the same


Several paintings, mostly Deccani, are described here although they were not exhibited at the Fogg at this time.


3 Boston Museum of Fine Arts, No. 93.14801; Erdmann, op. cit., Abb. 172.

4 This rug has since been given to the Metropolitan Museum of Art by Mr. McMullan.


The style of the reign of Shâh Jahân was shown by Mr. MacDonald's portrait of Akbar in grisaille with two putti hovering overhead, the latter borrowed from European work. The minutiae of detail of which Mughal painters were capable was perhaps best displayed in a picture of Shâh Jahân in old age visiting an ascetic, lent by Eric Schroeder.

During the second half of the seventeenth century, Mughal painting reached a sort of lapidary perfection that seems lifeless when compared with earlier work. Ironically, if drastically, Awrangzib, the most doctrinaire Muslim of Mughal emperors, brought the cure; he withdrew imperial patronage to such an extent that painters fled to the provincial courts. Forced to conform to different standards, Mughal artists profited from their contact with local styles. Hindu subject matter enriched the Mughal repertoire and with it came an intensity of feeling that had been lost to Mughal painting since the Jahânghir period.

Paintings dateable to the reign of Awrangzib are rare. Mr. MacDonald lent two portraits of the emperor which are exceptionally attractive if not of the period; one shows him hunting duck at dawn in a marsh, the other on horseback in old age.

Muhammad Shâh's reign (1719–48) brought a brief revival of imperial patronage. The portrait lent by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts shows the emperor in an attitude typical of a man interested exclusively in the arts of peace: the flaccid ruler, his face recalling that of a prize bull, is being carried by a great many attendants through his vast gardens in a palanquin. Although the era of this emperor is remembered primarily for the disastrous invasion of Nâdir Shâh, who even sacked the imperial library, it was an important period in the history of painting. A portrait of Muhammad Rezâ Khân, the deputy navvâb of Bengal, reveals clearly the influence of the Muhammad Shâh imperial style on later Lucknow work.

Two of the most interesting eighteenth-century pictures were lent by Mr. MacDonald. By Mehr Chand, the eclectic painter of the Lucknow school, these attest the strong influence of Tilly Kettle, one of the first English painters to go to India to make his fortune. One a portrait of Shâh 'Alam the Second (1759–1806), the other of his vazîr, Shujâ' al-Dawlah (1754–75), they are from an album that once belonged to Colonel Polier, the Swiss soldier of fortune, by whom it was given to Lady Coote, presumably the wife of Sir Eyre Coote. Also of the eighteenth century was an illustration to a Hindu story, lent by Eric Schroeder, combining Mughal and Hindu traditions in an unusually poetic fashion.

None of the paintings on ivory made for tourists in Delhi during the nineteenth century were shown, late painting being represented by two large watercolors of the type commissioned by Europeans. One was of a "Gangi Vulture," the other a study of a lotus plant. Such pictures are the last significant vestiges

---

1 Ibib., pl. 34, No. 14,554.
2 Similar rams are reproduced by Coomaraswamy, op. cit., pl. 42, No. 17,3104, and I. Stchoukine, La peinture indienne à l'époque des grands moghols, Paris, 1929, pl. 46c.
3 Boston Museum of Fine Arts, No. 26,283.
of the Mughal tradition and, at their best, reveal the Indian painters' unrivaled sympathy for living things.

CATALOGUE

1.—A page from the Dāstān-e Amīr Ḥamzah (fig. 1). Inscribed in Khárishidehshīr, having made the jailers insensible and cut off their heads, befriends Ḥamid. Ḥamid was the son of Ḥamzah, the uncle of the Prophet and hero of the apocryphal tales to which this is one of the 125 odd surviving illustrations. The face of Ḥamid has been clumsily repainted and that of the giant slightly retouched. Margins and text on the back have been covered, but fortunately an opening was made for the title of the picture.

Color is bright: green tile floor, dark-blue rug, brick-colored walls, orange-red, green, and blue costumes. The rocks are blue, gray, and violet.

‘Abd al-Qādir Badā‘ūnī wrote during the reign of Akbar that the Dāstān-e Amīr Ḥamzah had been completed by 1582, at which time the illustrations to the Mahābhārata were begun. He added that the project had taken 15 years, implying that Akbar, rather than Ḥomāyūn, commissioned it in 1567. On the other hand, as M. A. Chaghatayi has shown, Mollā ‘Alā‘ al-Dawlah Qazvīnī wrote: “It is now seven years that in compliance with the Royal Command of his Imperial Majesty (Ḥomāyūn), Mir Sayyid ‘Alī has been busy in the Imperial Library, preparing an illustrated edition of the Assemblies described in the Romance of Amīr Ḥamza.

The idea of producing the unique edition is an invention of the radiant genius of his Imperial Majesty and the Mir is trying to complete it with scrupulous care. It is in fact a book the like of which no one has ever seen. . . .”

There seems little reason to doubt either statement. Mollā ‘Alā‘ al-Dawlah Qazvīnī was writing contemporaneously and would certainly not have invented his remarks. However, Ābū al-Fa‘lī, Ferishteh, and the Ma‘āthir al-umarā agree with Bada‘ūnī that Akbar commissioned the manuscript. If one turns to the paintings, the evidence is not conclusive, for although one or two of them might be attributable to the period when Mir Sayyid ‘Alī is said to have been working, most seem to date from the Akbar period. One wonders whether the truth is not that the project was undertaken during the reign of Ḥomāyūn and then, after his death, neglected until 1567, when Akbar revived it.

69 x 51 cm.
Circa 1580.
Private collection.

2.—Two pages from a dispersed manuscript of the Wāqī‘at-e Bābūrī, the Persian translation of his grandfather’s memoirs made for Akbar and presented to him in 1589. Seventeen miniatures from the same manuscript are

[Further text not visible]
in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum. It seems likely that this is the earliest illustrated version that has survived.

The first page (fig. 2) shows Bâbur receiving the daughters of Sulţān Maḥmūd Mîrzā while encamped on the banks of the Oxus.\(^{18}\) The miniature is thinly painted, some of the outline drawing being still visible. Colors are subdued; pale greens, blues, and reds emerge from a tan ground. Faces and gestures are expressive and considerable attention has been given to the problem of showing the recession of space. The figure of Bâbur is modeled in exactly the fashion one would expect of Basâwan,\(^{19}\) who, according to a contemporary inscription, drew the outline. Dharm Dās did the painting. Inscriptions of this sort were probably written when the painters submitted their work to the person in charge of the project.

A border with floral decorations painted in gold has been added to the miniature which is otherwise in good condition. 23.6 x 13.2 cm. (inside gold margin). Circa 1590. Private collection.

The second miniature (fig. 3) from the same manuscript shows Bâbur later in life, probably bidding farewell to Fakhr-e Jahân Begam and Khadijah Sulţān Begam at the Fort of Agra.\(^{20}\) Pigmentation is heavier and brighter than in the first painting. Bâbur rides a dapple blue horse and wears a coat decorated in gold. As the miniature has been re-


\(^{19}\) Vide W. Staude, Contribution à l'étude de Basâwan, Revue des Arts Asiatiques, t. 8, No. 1 (1934), and idem, Les artistes de la cour d'Akbar et les illustrations du Dastân-i-Āmir Ḥamsâh, Arts Asiatiques, t. 2, fasc. 1 (1955), p. 47.


mounted, the text is hidden. Unfortunately, the contemporary attribution was removed. 26.4 x 14.7 cm. Circa 1590. Private collection.

3.—Two miniatures from a dispersed copy of the Divān-e Shâhī.\(^{21}\) The manuscript, although far smaller in page size, belonged to the same group as the Bahāristān\(^{22}\) at the Bodleian Library and the Khamisch\(^{23}\) in the library of Mr. C. W. Dyson-Perrins, the first of which is dated 1595 at Lahore, the second 1596. Both manuscripts contain paintings notable for their subtleties and finish; only the most admired painters contributed and each worked without assistants. In them problems of light and atmosphere are dealt with more fully than in any other early Mughal paintings. In this connection, it is interesting to note that a further delegation of Jesuits, certainly well armed with paintings and engravings, reached Lahore in 1595.\(^{24}\)

A (fig. 4).—The Arrival of a Prince. Dressed in a pale blue jāmeh, the prince rides a spirited horse worked in muted gold. His followers, in clothes ranging from delicate grays and pinks to vermillion, form a sort of

\(^{21}\) Shâhī was the poetical name of Āqā Malek b. Amir Jamāl al-Dīn Fīrūzkūhī of Sabzavar, who died at Astarabad in 857 H. The present manuscript appears to have been textually reliable and gives good readings in the portions of text that are visible compared with variants in other copies.

\(^{22}\) Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Elliot 254. Vide B. Gray, op. cit., p. 146; also, Mughal miniatures of the earlier periods, Bodleian Picture Book, No. 9, Oxford, 1953, pls. 8–12; also, P. Brown, Indian painting under the Mughals, Oxford, 1924, pls. 35, 40, fig. 1.

\(^{23}\) Cf. G. Warner, Catalogue of the library of C. W. Dyson-Perrins, Oxford, 1920; also, P. Brown, op. cit., pls. 18, 36, 37, 40, fig. 2.

flitting frame round the horseman. The sky is an intense blue, the ground that silhouettes the rider, subtly graded whites; a burnished gold sun rises over tan rocks, casting a beam of reflected light on a distant cityscape. A clear, invigorating morning is brilliantly achieved.

The verses illustrated read:

If my lot from you becomes sorrow and sighing
I am content that the remembrance of favour should come from time to time.
You go forth and from every side the people of the city
Hurry to see, for the king is coming.
The dust of your path is the kohl of my mind’s eye;
For collyrium in my view is becoming the dust of the road.
Why should there be any likelihood of my supplication being accepted
In a nation where worship is becoming a crime?

This miniature and its companion have been removed from their manuscript and attached to ugly blue mounts. The text is written in nasta’liq, possibly by ‘Abd al-Rahim, who wrote the Dyson-Perrins Khamsah and whose writing it resembles. At the extreme lower left is an inscription reading ‘amal-e Kish Dâs, which is certainly genuine and probably a signature. It is to be noted that the horseman appears to wear a pointed coat (châkdâr jâmeh), the ends of which are tied around his legs. One wonders whether this might not have been the purpose of these curiously designed Indian garments.

12.6 x 8.5 cm.
Circa 1595.

B (fig. 5).—The Poet Disappointed by His Friend. In the foreground, Shâhî in a red-orange jâmeh leaves a drinking party unceremoniously. Above, an older man in a deep vermilion coat drinks with a companion, seated on a lavishly worked gold rug. The scene takes place on a lawn by the side of a stream. In the distance, poplars, buildings, and a water wheel complete the setting.

The verses illustrated are:

My heart, which has been pierced by the cruelty of a certain person,
Had no inclination for the lawn and the bank of the stream.
Unwillingly Shâhi went from your door
Since in your sight he had no honour.

Both figures and background are painted with the greatest attention to giving a sense of three-dimensional space. These characteristics, as well as the Europeanized treatment of drapery, expressiveness of faces and gestures, and a certain “sweetness” of style are unmistakable earmarks of Basâwan’s style.25

The removal of the margins has destroyed the attribution to him which one could otherwise expect to find.

12.7 x 8.1 cm.
Circa 1595.
Private collection.

4 (fig. 6).—A page from the Razm nâmeh26 dated 1007 H. /1598. Inscribed “Picture of a

25 For other miniatures by Basâwan working unassisted see P. Brown, op. cit., pl. 35; E. Wellesz, Akbar’s religious thought reflected in Mogul painting, London, 1952, pl. 9; M. Dimand, A handbook of Muhammedan art, 2d ed., New York, 1944, fig. 33. (This is No. 13.228.29.) Another of this series, No. 13.228.30, can be attributed to Basâwan. Another miniature from a related manuscript belongs to the Archaeological Museum, Teheran. It is a night scene depicting a thief caught while escaping from a Zanâneh. Size is 21.6 x 12.1 cm.

The style of the Teheran miniature is similar to that of the present one and it can perhaps be attributed to Manôhar, the son of Basâwan.


To the list of collections containing miniatures
fanatic at the time that he worshipped in two rivers (the Ganges and the Jumna) and the fisherman drawing him in the net with the water creatures and then the falling (of that?) . . ." Color is subdued: pale tans, deep greens, violets, and warm browns rather than reds. The paper is heavy and dark. A contemporary attribution in the clumsy writing usual in this manuscript reads, "Bulāqī son of Hoshang."

Certainly the best-known Razm nāmeh and probably the original one, is at the Jaipur State Library. The manuscript from which this miniature comes must have been one of the most fully illustrated. 26.7 x 15.3 cm. A.D. 1598. Private collection.

5 (fig. 7).—A page from the South Kensington Akbar nāmeh. Kāmrān Mirzā is shown, in continuous narration, leading his troops from the gates of Kabul, above, and battling the forces of Homāyūn, below. He was Akbar's paternal uncle and one of the villains of Indian history. The confusion and movement of a battle scene are vividly portrayed; large irregular areas of glowing orange, as in the elephant's blanket, vibrate against a pale green, tans and blues.

Painting and text are well preserved. The lower margin contains an attribution, "Painted by Mahesh; special faces by Padārath." Size, marginal rulings, text, and style demonstrate that this miniature is from the South Kensington manuscript, the largest and most fully illustrated Akbar nāmeh that has survived, and probably the finest Mughal historical manuscript.

A comparison of this miniature with those illustrated in figures 4 and 5 brings out a difference which is important for the history of Mughal book painting. The Akbar nāmeh page is typical of the large manuscripts commissioned by Akbar as official projects. It is the work of more than one hand and painted in a broad, almost cursory fashion. Often, such pages were outlined by the master painters, a Miskin, Basāwan, or Lāl, then finished by assistants. As in the atelier of Rubens, the master added a few vivifying touches to the almost completed work. Figures 4 and 5 were commissioned for more intimate enjoyment. Smaller in scale (the manuscript from which these were taken would have fitted a pocket) and painted with greater attention to subtleties, these were carried out by one


29 Other miniatures separated from this manuscript are in the collections of the India Office Library (vide B. Gray, op. cit., pl. 130), and the Freer Gallery of Art (vide Islamic art, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, 1944, pl. 25). The South Kensington Akbar nāmeh is the last and most developed of a series of three manuscripts that must have been produced between 1595 and the first years of the seventeenth century. The others are a Jāmīl-Tawārīkh dated 1595, at the Gulistan Library (vide B. Gray and A. Godard, Iran: Persian miniatures, New York, 1956, pls. 29–34) and the Timūr nāmeh at the Bankipur State Library (P. Brown, op. cit., pl. 34).
Fig. 1—Khûrshidchehr Frees Hamîd. Page from the Dâstân-e Amîr Hamzah.
(Private collection.)
Fig. 2—Bābur Receiving the Daughters of Sultan Mahmūd Mirzā. Page from the Wāqī'at-e Bābūr. (Private collection.)
Fig. 3—Bābur Bidding Farewell to the Begams at Agra.
Page from the Wāqīyat-e Bāburi. (Private collection.)
Fig. 4—The Arrival of a Prince. Page from the Divān-e Shāhī. (Private collection.)

Fig. 5—The Poet Disappointed by His Friend. Page from the Divān-e Shāhī. (Private collection.)

Fig. 6—A Worshipper Caught by Fishermen. Page from the Razm nāme. (Private collection.)
Fig. 7—Battle Between the Forces of Homāyûn and Kāmrân Mîrzâ.
Page from the Akbar nāmeh. (Private collection.)
Fig. 8—A Sword Bearer. (Private collection.)

Fig. 9—A Courtier. (Private collection.)

Fig. 10—A Fat Woman Harassed by Flies. (Private collection.)
Fig. 11—King Solomon. (Private collection.)
Fig. 12—A Celebration. Page from the Akbar nāma. (Collection of John D. MacDonald.)
Fig. 13—A Master and His Pupil. (Private collection.)

Fig. 14—A Loving Couple. (Private collection.)
Fig. 15—A Mughal and Rajput Converse.
(Private collection.)

Fig. 16—An Emaciated Horse with Groom.
(Collection of John D. MacDonald.)

Fig. 17—Allegorical Figure. (Private collection.)
Fig. 18—Two Miniatures from the Gulistān-e Sa'dī. (Private collection.)

Fig. 19—Awrangzīb with Courtiers. (Private collection.)
Fig. 20—Young Man Seated Beneath a Plane Tree. (Private collection.)

Fig. 21—Seated Woman. (Private collection.)
Fig. 22—Muhammad ‘Adil Shāh and a Minister.
Double page from the Divān-e ‘Orfī. (Private collection.)

Fig. 23—Shīrīn and One of Her Maids in a Garden.
From the Divān-e ‘Orfī.
(Private collection.)

Figs. 24, 25—Khosraw’s Messenger before Shīrīn.
From the Divān-e ‘Orfī. (Private collection.)
painter and are the most finished work of the period.
33 x 21.2 cm.
Circa 1600.
Private collection.

6.—Two small portraits.
A large number of portraits, small in size
and showing single figures standing against
green grounds upon which there is no indication
of setting, can be found in various collections
of Mughal painting.\textsuperscript{32} Abū al-Fazl refers
to a huge portrait album commissioned by
Akbar, "whereby those who have passed away
received new life and those who are still alive
have immortality,"\textsuperscript{31} and it is likely that
at least some of these small paintings were once
part of this project although many of the
examples we know belong to early Jahāngīr
period. The type seems to have derived from
Persian examples associated with Bukhara.\textsuperscript{32}
It later developed into the elegant full-length
portraits of the later Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān
periods.

A (fig. 8).—A sword bearer. Standards
and swords were generally carried in fitted
cloth or leather bags. In this case, the bearer
wears a pale-yellow pointed coat (chākhār
jāmeh), dark-green trousers (pāṭjāmeh), a
salmon-colored scarf (dūpatteh), and gold
kamarband with geometric ornament. His
carring and the fact that his jāmeh ties on
the right indicate that he is a Muslim.
11.3 x 7.2 cm.

\textsuperscript{31} Vide Coomaraswamy, op. cit., pls. 28, 29.
India Office Library, London, Johnson Collection:
1–6; 18–18; 57–46; 59–7; 60–8, 9; 60–13. E. Kühnel
and H. Goetz, \textit{Indian book painting}, London and
Berlin, 1926, pls. 5, 6, 7, 8, 35, 36, 37.

\textsuperscript{32} Abūl-fazl 'Allāmi, \textit{A‘īn-i Akbari}, tr. H. Bloch-
mann, Calcutta, 1875, vol. 1, p. 105.

\textsuperscript{33} Cf. L. Binyon, J. V. S. Wilkinson, and B.
76, No. B, 104.

Early seventeenth century.
Private collection.

B (fig. 9).—The second portrait shows a
man in a red-orange jāmeh, his hands crossed
in front of him. A very wide blue scarf
(chādār) lined in green, gold and black
kamarband, shoes, and dagger complete the
costume. The background is a paler green
than that of the first portrait.
11.5 x 8.3 cm.
Early seventeenth century.
Private collection.

7 (fig. 10).—A fat woman, harassed by flies,
riding a led camel. She wears an orange dress
(jaguli) with short sleeves, transparent white
scarf (dūpatteh), and black pompons at wrists
and shoulders. The camel's blanket is red with
a blue border, its attendant wears a blue
jāmeh lined with orange. The miniature is
probably from a dispersed fable book, such as
the \textit{Anvār-e Sohaylī}. It has been remounted;
no text is visible. Hardness of the drawing
and treatment of landscape suggest an early
seventeenth-century date rather than earlier.
25.1 x 20.3 cm.
Early seventeenth century.
Private collection.

8 (fig. 11).—King Solomon.\textsuperscript{34} Dressed in
white, he is convincingly the most resplendent
of the four great world rulers of Islamic trad-
tion. Solomon sits on his gold throne be-
neath an orange and red canopy, surrounded
by his remarkable court. Pink and blue angels,
djinn offering vessels of pearls and precious
stones, satans, birds, beasts, and even a
simorgh pay their homage. The wind, over
which Solomon had power, is represented by

\textsuperscript{34} Reproduced in R. Grousset, \textit{The civilizations
of the East}. \textit{India}, London, 1932, fig. 218, and
J. Strzygowski, \textit{Asiatische Miniaturmalerei}, Vienna,
1933, pl. 80, fig. 216.
a flowing orange banner. News of the queen of Sheba is being given by a hoopoe, perched on the edge of the throne. Solomon’s vezir Āṣaf ibn Barkhiyā surveys the scene with him.

The beasts are thoroughly idealized; they are modeled in gold and far more benevolent than most animals in Akbar period painting. A light khaki foreground is a foil to the rich green landscape behind the resplendent king. The painter, probably Madhū Khānābād, has almost strained his resources in varying the tones of blues, greens, and reds in the costumes and feathers of the court.

The text is written in two columns of nastālīq. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to identify the manuscript. The miniature has been remounted as an album page. 27.3 x 15.4 cm. (text: about 8 7/8" x 4 3/4""). Circa 1600. Private collection.

9 (fig. 12).—A Celebration. Dancing girls in chaqṭāi hats, musicians, courtiers, and beggars surround Akbar, who is enthroned in a tiled courtyard. This seems to be the episode from the Akbar nāmeh of Abū al-Fażl describing the soldiery and peasantry of zabulistan, male and female, who flocked in from every side and became recipients of various farmanās. It is, however, difficult to differentiate the many scenes of this sort. Tilework is light green, dresses orange and salmon pink, the walls the usual brick tone. The landscape is painted with atmospheric perspective.

This miniature is one of several that have been fitted into borders from a Farhang-e Jāhāngīrī manuscript, said to have been dated 1608. Most of the miniatures that one finds in these borders are from an Akbar nāmeh, the two best-known versions of which are those in the collections of Sir Chester Beatty and the Victoria and Albert Museum. Neither of these is complete. It is certainly more than a coincidence that all the Akbar nāmeh miniatures I have been able to find in these borders are in the same style as the Beatty manuscript, illustrate missing sections of it, and are of the same size.

Although the original attribution is missing, this miniature was probably painted by Dharm Dās. 22.9 x 12.2 cm. Circa 1605. Collection of John D. MacDonald.

10 (fig. 13).—A Master and His Pupil. A bearded man in a green cloak (qabā) worn over a white jāmeh sits on a terrace reading a book. In front of him stands a nervous young man in a red-orange coat (akhān), his hands clasped in front of him. The atmosphere is that of a final examination. Although this painting at first invites an early dating, owing to its similarity to the Hamzah illustrations, it is probably not earlier than the first part of the seventeenth century. Architecture and


Cf. ibid., vol. 2, pl. 18.
decorative elements lack the vitality of the sixteenth century.

Akin to this painting in style are a miniature from the Bankipur Timur nameh, which bears an attribution to Madhû the Elder and Tulsi the Elder, and the Murder from the Berlin Album. 21.2 x 14.9 cm. Early seventeenth century. Private collection.

11 (fig. 14).—A Loving Couple. Apparently derived from a European print or painting, this version is several stages removed from the original. The costume of the woman has become almost Indian; she wears a thumb mirror, pompons, orange dress, and a violet shawl or dupatteh. The soldier’s white, striped trousers, blue gorget, rose shirt, and green cloak can hardly compete. Bright color is quite in keeping with the swirling, almost baroque rhythm of the composition. The green background is brushed in feathery strokes, gradually merging at the top with a streaked blue sky.

Originally an album picture, it was remounted during the nineteenth century. A painting of a Yogini in the Berlin Album is probably by the same hand. 20.1 x 12.9 cm. First quarter, seventeenth century. Private collection.

12 (fig. 15).—A Mughal and Rajput Converse. Wearing a brown jameh with black and gold kamarband, turban, and katër, the Mughal faces a Hindu dressed in green jameh, orange turban, and a white scarf or dupatteh. Although the Hindu is adorned with ropes of pearls, and quantities of gold jewelry, he is plainly not master of the scene; his posture, expression, and hands suggest that he is forcing himself to accept a bad situation gracefully. The Mughal, on the other hand, is trying very hard to reassure him. A gold rose-water sprinkler or lamp in the form of a bird rests in front of the Mughal. Behind a lily pond, a peacock rustles through a dense garden. It is dusk and the colors glow against a dark ground.

A quarter of an inch has been added all around, perhaps in order to fit the painting to the green border decorated with gold vine leaves. 13 x 7.9 cm. Circa 1610. Private collection.

13 (fig. 16).—An Emaciated Horse with Groom. The horse is dapple gray. His groom wears a violet hat and coat, gold kamarband, orange stockings, and black boots. They are set against the natural tone of the paper. Horses of this type were first painted in China under the Yuan dynasty. The subject probably went to Persia during the Mongol period, although I have not found Persian examples that can safely be dated prior to the late sixteenth century. This example was copied from a Persian miniature (the stance, costume, and proportions of the groom suggest a Bukhara original) during the early years of Jahangir’s reign. At that time, Persian subject matter was very much in vogue. Inscribed: “The work of Mohsen.” 11.4 x 19.2 cm. First quarter, seventeenth century. Collection of John D. MacDonald.

59 Brown, op. cit., pl. 34.
49 Kühnel and Goetz, op. cit., pl. 2.
42 Kühnel and Goetz, op. cit., pl. 40, upper left.
43 W. Cohn, Chinese painting, London, 1948, pl. 137, by Kung K’ai. Other examples, by the wife of Chao Meng Fu, known as Lady Kuan, are known.
44 Cf. Kühnel and Goetz, op. cit., pls. 1, 3, 4, 9, 31, 32, 33.
14 (fig. 17).—Allegorical figure. A formidable woman dressed in blue, with a flowing orange cape and gold belt, holds up a bucket, the handle and spout of which are a seemingly live dragon. Trees, hills, and a town with a church form the background. Of European origin, the subject is very like one of the so-called Tarochi cards of the school of Mantegna in which a similar Amazon, entitled Logic, supports a veiled dragon. The background has flaked and the picture was re-mounted during the eighteenth century.

13.2 x 7.65 cm.

Early seventeenth century.

Private collection.

15.—Two miniatures from Sa'di's Gulistān, chap. 1.

A. Story 1 (fig. 18, above).—A criminal is condemned to death by a pādīshāh: "When a man is in despair his tongue becomes long and he is like a vanquished cat assailing a dog." He abuses the king as foully as he knows how. When the king asks what he is saying, a good-natured vazīr replies, "He says that Allah loves those who forgive." Pleased with this remark, the king spares the prisoner's life. At this point, a second vazīr, jealous of the first, complains that "Men of our rank ought to speak nothing but the truth before pādīshāhs," and tells the ruler of the prisoner's bitterness. Irritated, the king replies, "His lie was more acceptable than your truth, for a falsehood resulting in conciliation is better than a truth producing trouble."

The pādīshāh sits on a jeweled gold throne, dressed in an orange jāmeh with green ties, white turban, and gold kamarband. The kindly vazīr addresses the king, wearing white, and a pale blue turban. His wicked counterpart, in fierce red, makes an ugly face and clutches his fists. Troubled looking, and wearing a white loin cloth, the prisoner resembles a St. Sebastian from whom the painter has compassionately and conveniently removed the arrows. Probably by Manōhar.47

6.5 x 8.9 cm.

B. Story 32 (fig. 18, below).—An imposter, claiming to be a descendant of Ali entered the town with a caravan from the Hejaz, saying that he had come from a pilgrimage. He presented the king with an elegy, saying that he had himself composed it. One of the king's courtiers said, "I have seen him recently at the Basra during the Ashah festival. How can he have been on a pilgrimage?"

Another pointed out that, "His father was a Christian at Miletus. And his poetry has been found in the Dīvān of Anvārī!" The king ordered him to be beaten and expelled.

Although this is not quite the end of the story, it explains the scene of the miniature. Dressed in green and purple, adorned with gold, the king leans against a gold pillow decorated in figured brocade. A skeptical courtier, clutching his book, wears a rich brown coat (qaba) over green. The Ḥājji's robe of honor is of black and white stripes, beneath which he wears green stockings. Orange sleeves call attention to the attendant in blue who pummels him. Other courtiers, from left to right, wear orange, green, brown, white, and yellow jāmehs. Faces in this picture are especially expressive; even the well-controlled amusement of the king's fan bearer is indicated, and the "Ḥājji's" grimace is worthy of the Japanese theater.


46 Adapted from an anonymous translation of The Gulistan, Kama Shastra Soc., Benares, 1888, p. 23.


48 Ibid., p. 68.
Seven miniatures at the Walters Art Gallery, although slightly narrower than these, might come from the same manuscript. Like ours, the Baltimore miniatures were remounted during the nineteenth century and the two that are closest in style bear the same punched holes and signs of water damage.

6.2 x 8.8 cm.
Circa 1620–30.
Private collection.

16 (fig. 19).—Awrangzib. The emperor sits beneath a canopy decorated with birds of paradise, symbols of auspiciousness. Four courtiers, an attendant with a peacock-feather fan, and a small boy stand about him. Although one cannot be certain, the boy is probably Sultan A'zam, Awrangzib's third son. The figure beyond the boy is probably Shâyisteh

Two of these are reproduced by Basil Gray, op. cit., pl. 133. Five others, mounted on two folios, are No. 10.668 (48 Vo. 49), Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore. Ralph Pinder-Wilson, in a recent article (Three illustrated manuscripts of the Mughal period, Ars Orientalis, vol. 2 [1957]), publishes a Bûstân at the British Museum, dated 1629, containing miniatures similar in style and form to the Fogg and Baltimore ones. In the present writer's opinion, the miniatures of this Bûstân are considerably later than the date of the manuscript. A Gulistân, from the Library of Sir Chester Beatty, apparently a companion volume to the British Museum Bûstân, will have been published in the same volume of Ars Orientalis by J. V. S. Wilkinson. As I have seen neither the article nor the manuscript, I can only suggest that it bears some relation to the Fogg and Walters Art Gallery miniatures.

This miniature has been reproduced in color in Marten and Vever, Miniatures Persanes . . . , Paris, 1913, vol. 1, pl. 20. A late eighteenth-century version, probably painted at Lucknow, is in the India Office Library, Johnson Album, 2–5.

Muhammad A'zam was born in 1653, the son of Dilras Banu Begum, a daughter of Shâh Navâz, and Awrangzib's principal wife. He is the only son who could have been the suitable age for this portrait in 1660. J. N. Sarkar, History of Awrangzib, Calcutta, 1912, pp. 57–71. Another portrait of this boy is in the Oriental Public Library, Patna.

Khân, in whose care Sultan A'zam was to be left in the event of danger.

Painted in the style of the Shâh Jahân period, this miniature must be dated soon after the accession of Awrangzib in 1658. Bernier and Manucci have suggested that the emperor's austerities, although more apparent in public than in private, extended to music and painting. The paucity of contemporary portraits more than justifies their statements; most of the surviving likenesses are a result of nostalgia during the eighteenth century for the period when the expansion of the Mughal empire had reached its limit. Ironically, the

For iconography, see Stchoukine, op. cit., pl. 34, showing him as a considerably younger man; E. Blochet, Peintures Hindous, Paris, 1926, pl. 15; F. R. Martin, op. cit., vol. 2, pl. 204.


Portraits of Awrangzib:


N. C. Mehta, Studies in Indian painting, Bombay, 1926, pl. 39, includes a portrait as a young man but it is of the eighteenth century.

Brown, op. cit., pl. 30, eighteenth century; pl. 65 might be contemporary. This drawing is also given by Martin, op. cit., pl. 186.

Stchoukine, op. cit., pl. 40. Contemporary, showing Awrangzib as a youth. Plate 53 might be contemporary; resembles the drawing at the British Museum reproduced by Brown, see above.

E. Kühnel, Miniaturmalerei im Islamischen Orient, Berlin, 1922, pp. 120. Late eighteenth century.

Loan Exhibition of Antiquities, Coronation Durbar, 1911, Calcutta, 1911, pls. 38g, 46a, 47a, 48, 49, 50, 52b; all eighteenth century.

Y. Godard, Un album de portraits des princes Timurides de l'Inde, Athâr e-Irân, vol. 2, No. 2 (Harlem, 1937), fig. 76. Does not resemble Awrang-
tonality of this picture, perhaps the last great imperial portrait group, is that of a sunset.

At least an inch has been removed from the bottom of the painting and the top and sides have been trimmed.
19.1 x 21.4 cm.
Circa 1660.
Private collection.

17 (fig. 20).—A Young Man Seated Beneath a Plane Tree. Painted in thin but opaque pigments of low intensity except for the costume, which is brilliant blue and warm brown. The sky is gold, terrain sandy pink, becoming cooler as it approaches rocks.

Obviously, this is the work of a Persian painter, the same man whose “Youth Sleeping under a Willow Tree” is in the collection of the Cleveland Museum of Art.55 Alike in drawing, brushwork, and color, these miniatures, from the same Muraqqā,56 differ from other Persian album paintings in the style associated with Isfahan. Strikingly different from Persian work is the manner in which the landscape looms up behind the figures, a characteristic found often in early seventeenth-century Deccani compositions, such as the Yogi57 in the collection of Sir Chester Beatty, zib, probably same courtier as India Office Library, Johnson 58–8.

Arnold and Wilkinson, op. cit., vol. 3, pls. 90, 91. These are rightly published as eighteenth-century work and not necessarily portraits of Awrangzib.

Manucci, op. cit., frontispieces to vols. 2 and 4. Although contemporary, these portraits painted at Golconda do not resemble the emperor. These may be accepted as indirect evidence of the scarcity of portraits of Awrangzib during his lifetime.

55 Islamic Art, op. cit., frontispiece in color. For a related miniature, probably painted in Persia, see Marteau and Vever, op. cit., vol. 2, pl. 130, No. 169. Other quasi-Deccani miniatures usually identified as Persian can be found in many collections and books.

56 I am indebted to Miss Adrienne Minassian of New York for this information.

57 Arnold and Wilkinson, op. cit., vol. 3, pl. 93. another at the British Museum,58 figure 21 here, and the Siesta59 at the Berlin Museum. Other traits shared by our picture and most of this Deccani group are gold skies, uncommon in Persian album painting at this time, the use of stipple in rendering grass, the placing of a stream bordered with rocks and flowers in the immediate foreground, parallel to the border, and trees with sawn branches silhouetted against the sky.

One wonders whether our painter was not another Persian émigré working in the Dec- can?60 One or two stray examples could not account for the substantial influence of his style.
20.2 x 11.5 cm.
Circa 1600.
Private collection.

18 (fig. 21).—Seated Woman. It is regrettable that this painting cannot be seen in color as much of its charm lies therein. The plump, pinkish-gray lady holding a wine bottle sits against an azure ground, her head draped with an orange dupatteh that flows as though blown by a wind. Her hips are covered by a purple cloth twisting with a will of its own. She is seated on a gold platform (chārpāī) covered in orange with a green border. A gold bottle and plate lie nearby and pink and white pillows add to the comfort of the setting.

59 E. Kühnel, op. cit., pl. 104. I believe this painting to be an accurate eighteenth-century copy after an early seventeenth-century work.
60 Persian painters and poets often emigrated to the Deccan. M. A. Ghani, A history of Persian language and literature at the Mughal court, Allahabad, 1930, tells of several, including Zuhūrī, who went from Persia to the Deccan, where he was courted by Bijapur, Ahmadnagar, and the Mughals. Robert Skelton suggests that the Persian painter Farrokh Beg migrated to Bijapur after working for Akbar; vide The Mughal artist Farrokh Beg, Ars Orientalis, vol. 2, pp. 393–413.
In the background, a pair of deer and a leopard disport on rocky hills, painted with all the hues of the rainbow. The sky is gold. Pink, red, and yellow flowers are dotted about, those in the foreground echoing the circular motif of the border, which is painted on the same paper as the miniature. It is certainly contemporary and reminds one of textile design in its green, blue, yellow, and crimson arabesque against a vermillion ground.

Deccani characteristics other than those listed under the last item are the "windiness" of the drapery, use of purple in treatment of rocks and outlinings, and the intense color, which is closer to Rajput than to Persian or Mughal work. A curious similarity to figure 20 is seen in the tilt of the neck. This picture is the work of a native Deccani artist, perhaps a pupil of the painter of our "Man beneath a Plane Tree."

Miniature: 19.9 x 12.6 cm.
Border: 30.5 x 18.7 cm.
First quarter, seventeenth century.
Private collection.

Folio 1b (fig. 22, right).—A Bijapuri minister, probably Sayyid Nūr Allāh, for whom the book was doubtless made for presentation to Muḥammad 'Ādil Shāh. He wears a white jāmeh, yellow coat (qabā) with salmon ties, and stands in a niche, saluting the king.

Folio 2a (fig. 22, left).—Muḥammad 'Ādil Shāh (1626–56). The ruler is seated in a niche, dressed in orange jāmeh, gold dūpattēh and turban, and adorned with two ropes of pearls. He leans against a violet pillow. A young cup bearer in green with orange turban and yellow scarf stands below the throne.

I am indebted to Ralph Pinder-Wilson for the translation, of which, however, I have amended the last few words, in order to bring out the connection with Nūr Allāh, which Mr. Pinder-Wilson read as, "Our Lord, the Light of Allah." It is possible that both readings were intended.


64 Cf. two mural portraits showing figures in similar niches, G. Yazdani, Mandā, The City of Joy, Oxford, 1929, pls. 25, 26; and B. Gray, Treasures of Indian miniatures in the Bikaner Palace collection, Oxford, 1951, pl. 4.
Folio 10b (fig. 23).—Shirin and one of her maids in a garden. ‘Orfī shortened and adapted this tale, more fully treated by Niẓāmi. The two women wear yellow and gold; the garden is a brilliant green with tropical plants, the trees superimposed in dark green. Walls are tiled blue and the gate is gold.

Folios 12b and 13a (figs. 24, 25).—Khosraw’s messenger before Shirin. Both figures stand against a green ground with gold sky. Costumes are predominantly gold and yellow, with small areas of orange, blue, and white. Shirin’s missing leg was caused by the corrosive green pigment that surrounded it.

Folio 21a (fig. 26).—Farhād gazing at Shirin’s bust while hewing away at Mount Bisūtūn. Armed with gold tools, he wears a dark blue jāmeh dotted with white, yellow pājāmeh, gold kamarband, and turban. The mountain is green, changing to brown and blue toward the top.

Folio 79b (fig. 27).—Prince Salim, later Jahāngir, holds court. ‘Orfī presents a book to him. Prince and throne are gold, the former outlined in red, the latter in black. ‘Orfī’s jāmeh is orange, his turban blue. The background is a rich tan, typical of Bijapuri work; the foreground green.

Folio 80a (fig. 28).—An elderly darvīsh in a blue cap with his disciples in a green field. Their bodies are various shades of pink and tan and are an amusing contrast to the court scene on the opposite page. The qaṣideh which this illustrates was written for Jahāngir while still a prince. It begins,

“On the morning of ‘id, in the hall of dainties,
and comforts,
The beggar put on his felt cap boastfully, and
the king his crown.”

Folio 282a (fig. 29).—‘Orfī seated on the steps of a building is offered wine by a woman with a gold cup. Costumes are green and gold, the building salmon with purple pillars and a dark tan roof. The sky is green.

The ghazal begins:

“Last night to the monastic retreat came a fair
one selling wine,
In her hand a cup and over her shoulder a
sacred cord.”

Page: 10.4 x 5.8 cm.
Text: 7.1 x 3.6 cm.
Miniatures: 7.0 x 3.6 cm.
A.D. 1636.
Private collection.

20 (fig. 30).—A portrait of a young man inscribed “Muḥammad Hāshim, son of Shāh ‘Ali Bijāpūri.” Shāh ‘Ali probably refers to the second of that name who came to the throne in 1658 and ruled until 1688. Hāshim’s face is shown in profile but his shoulders, exaggeratedly broad in Bijapuri fashion, are shown in three-quarter view. Embroidered bands at the neck and shoulder of his transparent jāmeh are painted with thick impasto. Purple pājāmeh and a richly ornamented gold turban complete the costume. In his right hand Hāshim holds a small blossom, while his left rests on a gloved sword with red scabbard. A gold katār with red sheath, tulwar in black, and a black shield with gold rivets are also carried. A few flowers, a small red finch, and blades of grass painted on the light-green background establish the ground level. A portrait of Muḥammad ‘Adil Shāh at the British Museum has the same leathery surface and is probably by the same hand.66

Condition is excellent except for trimmed edges and remounting.
19.1 x 10.8 cm.
Circa 1680.
Private collection.

65 If this represented a son of the first ‘Ali, he would undoubtedly be dressed in the costume of the late sixteenth century. A further confirmation is found in an unpublished portrait of ‘Ali, in the collection of Dr. Moti Chandra, Bombay, in which Hāshim stands behind the ruler.

66 British Museum, 1937–4-10-04.
THE ARTS OF THE T'ANG DYNASTY

By HENRY TRUBNER

AN IMPORTANT AND HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT loan exhibition, "The Arts of the T'ang Dynasty," was held at the Los Angeles County Museum from January 8–February 17, 1957. The exhibition was organized and assembled by the Los Angeles County Museum, drawing upon the generous support of public and private lenders in the United States, Canada, Japan, and Europe. The exhibition presented some 385 objects, fully described and almost all illustrated in the catalogue published by the Museum.

Among the lenders, in addition to the foremost museums, private collectors, and dealers in the United States, were some of the most prominent English collectors, the majority of them, like Lord Cunliffe, Sir Alan Barlow, and Mrs. Alfred Clark, well-known collectors of Chinese ceramics. Other lenders in England were the Victoria and Albert Museum; City Art Gallery, Bristol; Percival David Foundation of Chinese Art, London; and the Museum of Eastern Art, Oxford, now the owner of the famous collection of Sir Herbert Ingram.

The Musée Guimet, Paris, very generously contributed to the exhibition a most important group of votive banners and paintings, on silk, linen, and paper, from Tun-huang (Cat. Nos. 9–12, 14–20), part of the unique material recovered from this site by Paul Pelliot. The Musée Guimet also lent its well-known and unique Dancing Bodhisattva (fig. 1, Cat. No. 76), previously shown at the International Exhibition of Chinese Art, London, 1935–36.1

Japanese lenders to the exhibition included


the Tokyo National Museum, the Osaka Municipal Museum, which lent its well-known scroll entitled "Gods of Five Planets and Twenty-Eight Constellations," formerly in the Abe Collection (Cat. No. 29),2 the Tenri Art Gallery, and a number of private collectors: Mr. Moritatsu Hosokawa, Mr. Goro Akaboshi, and Mr. Yasunosuke Ogiwara.

The above-mentioned group of Buddhist paintings was further enriched by two small painted fragments in color on silk, from the Turfan region in northeastern Turkestan (Cat. Nos. 6–7), and a larger fragment of a wall painting from Bázäklik (fig. 3, Cat. No. 5), from the collection of the German State Museum, Berlin. These paintings and a small embroidery fragment from Chotscho (Cat. No. 377) are among the few surviving examples of the priceless material, made famous through the magnificent group of wall paintings, discovered by the late Albert von Le Coq in Central Asia and in the Turfan Oasis. This material, once housed in the great Museum für Völkerkunde of prewar days, was almost entirely destroyed in the course of World War II, but it was most gratifying that at least a few of the surviving examples could be shown in Los Angeles.

The fragment of a wall painting from Bázäklik (fig. 3) shows a group of seated Bodhisattvas, their hands held in an attitude of prayer or adoration. The original composition probably included a central Buddha as the principal figure of the group. The painting is

distinguished by brilliant colors, particularly a bright red for the garments, and a purplish blue for the faces. The aureoles and jewelry are partially rendered in gold, in some areas applied over details, notably in the jewelry, which are embossed in slight relief. Touches of bright red accent the sensitively painted lips of the divinities and contrast with the bluish color of their faces. Stylistically the painting closely follows the mature T'ang style of the late seventh and first half of the eighth century, and may be accepted as a fairly accurate reflection of T'ang religious painting in China proper, such as decorated the walls of the temples in the imperial capitals of Ch'ang-an and Lo-yang.

The Bodhisattvas suggest a feeling of weightiness and solidity, imparted by full modeling and broad proportions, with rounded, spheroidal heads, fleshy, full cheeks, and delicately modeled, sensuous lips. The fleshiness and voluptuous quality suggested in the faces ultimately derives from the Buddhist art of India of the Gupta period, as does the plastic, smooth modeling of the bodies, but modified by a Chinese feeling of restraint and sensitivity. The fleshy forms of Indian art are further modified by an overlay of flowing scarfs, drapery folds, and chains of jewelry which lend to the figures a more obvious linear quality and rhythm, also characteristic of T'ang sculpture from the period of maturity, the late seventh and first half of the eighth century A.D.

The lines, notably the contours of the faces and drawing of the noses and lips, also the lines of the neck, arms, and fingers show great strength and vitality. There is no swelling or thinning of the line to suggest shading and modeling; the tight contours and interior lines are of even thickness. This "iron-wire" line, as it is commonly referred to, a firm, tight line of uniformly even quality and strength, formed an important element of T'ang court and religious painting. It was apparently of foreign origin and is said to have been introduced to T'ang China from the west, from the remote countries of Central Asia. This type of brushwork is associated in particular with the two Khotanese painters Wei-ch'i-h Po-chih-na, and his son Wei-ch'i-h I-seng who came to China early in the T'ang period. Wei-ch'i-h I-seng is said to have arrived at the imperial capital of Ch'ang-an in 630 to enter the service of the T'ang court. It is reported in the Li Tai Ming Hua Chi that his brushwork was tense and strong and that his line was like "bent and coiled iron wire." The same tight "iron-wire" line may also be observed as far west as Bamiyân, in Afghanistan, in some of the wall paintings at this site, for example in the seated Bodhisattva of group E.3 In the Far East, the best examples of the "iron-wire" line were, until their recent damage by fire, the wall paintings in the Kondô of Horyûji, in Japan, notably the Amida or Western Paradise and the Yakushi Paradise.4 The Bamiyân paintings in group E are probably from the sixth century, the paintings in the Kondô of Horyûji were presumably executed about A.D. 711. Both form part of what might be described as an "international" style of the trade routes, which originated in the westernmost part of Central Asia, spread to China in the sixth and seventh centuries, and eventually reached Japan. The Horyûji paintings, until the recent disastrous fire, were our best and sole surviving examples of a tradition of Buddhist painting which in the seventh century must have flourished at Ch'ang-an and other metropolitan centers of the T'ang empire. The fragment from Bâzâ klik assumes added significance because it, too, reflects with only slight modifications the same tradition.

3 B. Rowland, The wall-paintings of India, Central Asia and Ceylon, Boston, 1938, p. 10.
of Buddhist painting which earlier had spread from Afghanistan in the west to China and Japan in the Far East. The Buddhist paintings from the Turfan region represent a late T'ang phase of painting, when the artistic influence of eighth- and ninth-century T'ang China spread westward into this area. The fragment, though T'ang in style, is perhaps of late eighth- or more likely ninth-century date.

It is interesting to compare the Bázálik fragment with the ink sketches of Buddhist figures on the back of a sutra from Tun-huang, lent by the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City (Cat. No. 23). The sutra is of sixth-century date, but the drawing quite obviously is from the T'ang period, conforming to the prevailing style of T'ang Buddhist art. In the left half of the sutra scroll (fig. 4) may be seen several heads of Buddhist divinities, also a seated Bodhisattva and Buddha, all drawn at random on the sutra paper. The single heads and the figure of the seated Bodhisattva are quite similar in style to corresponding details in the fragment from Bázálik. In both examples, the Bodhisattvas are distinguished by full, solid bodies with round heads, fleshy cheeks, lotiform eyes, and sensuous lips. The drawing of the figures and details on the sutra paper displays extreme freedom and versatility, based on swift contours and facile line drawing, considerably less restrained and more fluid than the "iron-wire" line of the wall painting.

The sculpture section of the exhibition included a number of well-known and representative examples of the period, among them the magnificent stupa front and powerful white marble guardian lion, lent by the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City (Cat. Nos. 40 and 41), one of the pair of standing Bodhisattvas in the University Museum, Philadelphia (Cat. No. 34), and the gray limestone relief with 11-headed Kuan-yin, lent by the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Cat. No. 33), which originally formed part of the group of reliefs decorating the Terrace of Seven Treasures, the Ch'i-pao T'ai, of the Kuang-chai Temple in Ch'ang-an. Also of exceptional quality and interest is the torso of a Bodhisattva from T'ien-lung Shan, which was lent by the Seattle Art Museum (fig. 6, Cat. No. 35). The torso is reported to come from cave 18 at T'ien-lung Shan, which forms part of the group of T'ang caves at this site decorated in all probability during the closing years of the seventh and first half of the eighth century A.D., the period of maturity of T'ang sculpture. Like most of the T'ang sculpture at T'ien-lung Shan, the torso shows strong Indian influence, derived from the Buddhist art of the Gupta period. Like many other examples from T'ien-lung Shan, the torso is distinguished by a sharp S curve and déhanchement of the body, with one hip thrust out, and by the emphasis upon the nudity and naturalistic modeling of the upper torso, resulting in a markedly sensuous quality which is only slightly subdued by the usual overlay of flowing scarfs and jewelry, characteristic of most T'ang sculpture. The lower body is draped in a tight-fitting skirt of the Indian dhoti type, held up by a sash tied around the waist. The garment is of a thin, transparent nature, which reveals the body underneath in a manner recalling the smooth, transparent garments of Indian Buddhist images of the Gupta period. The overlay of folds, in the form of parallel, raised pleats of crescent shape, is no more than a surface pattern which in no way detracts from the modeling of the limbs and torso beneath, but simply provides a rhythmic movement and decorative pattern. This feeling for decorative, linear detail betrays the Chinese origin of the sculpture, as opposed to the generally more plastic
and more obviously sensuous figures of Gupta art. The T'ien-lung Shan torso is, however, more sensuous than most Chinese sculpture, resulting from the elegant, broken pose, soft and effeminate modeling, and rhythmic flow of the scarfs and thin, clinging drapery.

The exhibition included a large group of Buddhist bronzes, which reflected perhaps in a more accurate way the development of T'ang sculpture in general than, of necessity, the fewer examples of monumental scale. Some of the bronze objects were religious paraphernalia, such as censers, āṇḍikā bottles, and other items of undoubtedly religious usage; also a most unusual Chinese gilt-bronze figure of Ganesa, the Hindu elephant-headed deity, lent by Mr. L. B. Davenport, Cleveland, through the courtesy of the Cleveland Museum of Art (Cat. No. 125), and a very remarkable gilt-bronze figure of a seated Demon, of grotesque appearance with contorted, grimacing face, from the Eugene Fuller Memorial Collection of the Seattle Art Museum (fig. 2, Cat. No. 126). Although no comparable example is known to the writer, the bronze is presumably Chinese, and of the T'ang period.

Among the bronze mirrors were examples of most known T'ang types, but perhaps of greatest importance is the large eight-lobed mirror lent by Mr. Goro Akaboshi, Japan (fig. 5, Cat. No. 140). The mirror has a very unusual type of decoration, consisting of alternating pairs of flying apsaras and kinnari, half-human and half-bird, encircling the central boss, which is surrounded by a pattern of lotus scrolls. Between each pair of apsaras is a lozenge-shaped medallion containing a swastika, perhaps a solar emblem and symbol of the revolution of the sun, as it was in ancient India. The other divinities have female heads and upper bodies, but also wings, and the lower body and tail of a bird. All the figures wear elaborate crowns. A marvelous sense of flight and continuous motion is given by the gracefully curving bodies of the divinities, the flowing lines of drapery, and fluttering, windblown scarfs. Floral scrolls, lotuses, and cloud scrolls complete the decoration of the mirror. Within the flat, slightly raised, eight-lobed outer rim is an inner border in the form of a narrow, raised band with "rope" pattern.

The many types of T'ang ceramics formed by far the largest group of objects in the exhibition. The exhibition presented, aside from the more commonplace earthenware tomb figures and animals, all the well-known types of T'ang ceramics, single colors and the more popular polychrome or "three-color" wares, white wares, celadons of Yüeh and related types, marbled wares, various T'ang ceramics of miscellaneous types, and a small group of Liao Dynasty wares, generally closely related to T'ang prototypes. The ceramic section was greatly enriched by a considerable number of loans from some of the foremost collections in England, several outstanding examples of unique importance from Japanese collections, and a very significant group lent by the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Canada.

Probably one of the most striking and unique ceramics in the exhibition was the large pottery dish on high foot, lent by Mr. Mori-tatsu Hosokawa, Tokyo (fig. 7, Cat. No. 203). This celebrated dish is not only of exceptional size, 13½ inches in diameter, but on the interior displays a very original and most unusual type of decoration. The polychrome glazes form a large stylized lotus medallion of four petals, surrounded by a circle of similar lotus petals. The design is in bright poly-
Fig. 1—Dancing Bodhisattva, Gilt Bronze. Musée Guimet, Paris.

Fig. 2—Demon, Gilt Bronze.
Seattle Art Museum, Eugene Fuller Memorial Collection.
FIG. 3—Bodhisattva Group, Fragment of a Wall Painting from Bäzäklik, Turfan Region.
Museum für Völkerkunde, Berlin.
Fig. 4—Fragment of a Sūtra (Detail of Left Half of Scroll), with Random Ink Sketches of Buddhist and Lay Figures. William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City.

Fig. 5—Bronze Mirror. Mr. Goro Akaboshi, Fujisawa, Japan.
Fig. 6—TORSO OF A BODHISATTVA, FROM T'IEH-LUNG SHAN.  
Seattle Art Museum, Eugene Fuller Memorial Collection.
Fig. 7—Pottery Dish with Three-color Glazes. Mr. Moritatsu Hosokawa, Tokyo.

Fig. 8—Jar, Cream-colored Glaze. Mrs. Walter Sedgwick, London.
Fig. 9—Gold Phoenix. The Minneapolis Institute of Arts. Gift of Mrs. Charles Stinson Pillsbury in memory of her husband.

Fig. 10—Bowl, Silver with Parcel Gilt. Mr. and Mrs. Frederick M. Mayer, New York.
chrome glazes and white on brilliant green and amber ground, resulting in a striking, colorful effect. The exterior of the dish is treated in a more conventional manner with running and mottled three-color glazing of characteristic T'ang type. The glaze only partially covers the foot, with much of it rubbed off, thus exposing the pinkish-white clay body.

The white wares, of which many examples were of pure white, translucent porcelain, included some quite exceptional examples from English collections. The small porcelain stem cup, lent by Sir Alan and Lady Barlow, Wendenover, England (Cat. No. 236), is a masterpiece of its kind, of unusual perfection and refinement. Equally fine is the deep porcelain bowl with cream-colored glaze, lent by Lord Cunliffe, London (Cat. No. 229), and the magnificent large jar of ovoid shape, lent by Mrs. Walter Sedgwick, London (Fig. 8, Cat. No. 228). It has a transparent, cream-colored glaze of greenish tint, characteristic of the majority of T'ang whitish glazes, and also has a wide, irregular crackle. On the shoulder are four double-strand loop handles, also found on a similar jar in the Cleveland Museum of Art. One of the finest and most interesting of the white pieces was the porcelain ewer with stopper in the form of a pheasant head, lent by the Minneapolis Institute of Arts (Cat. No. 231). Only one other piece of such type is known to the writer, namely, the example in the Yokogawa collection, Tokyo National Museum, Japan. The Minneapolis ewer is beautifully potted and covered with a smooth, lustrous creamy-white glaze. The shape undoubtedly derives from Sasanian prototypes in gold and silver.

At least a few remarks should be devoted to the magnificent examples of T'ang gold and silver in the exhibition. These objects, by their uniformly high technical standard and craftsmanship, reflected more than any other aspect of the exhibition the great splendor and luxury of the T'ang civilization. The shapes, designs, and techniques of many of the objects also emphasize the close and intimate relationship which was maintained between T'ang China and ancient Iran. Long before Sasanian Persia met with its ultimate downfall at the battle of Nehavend in 642, Persian refugees, seeking escape from the steadily advancing forces of Islam, came to China in large numbers in search of a more peaceful existence at the T'ang capital. Among the refugees were undoubtedly many craftsmen and artisans, long trained in the art of Persian metalwork, whose talents must have been greatly welcomed in T'ang China.

Most of the gold in the exhibition and many of the silver objects were lent by the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, from the large and important collection of Chinese gold and silver recently given to this institution by Mrs. Charles Stinson Pillsbury in memory of her husband. Among the most spectacular pieces from this collection, besides a magnificent group of T'ang hairpins and other ornaments, were the gold crown (Cat. No. 300) and gold phoenix (Fig. 9, Cat. No. 298). The latter, constructed of sheet gold and gold wire in openwork pattern, may be assumed to have formed part of a headdress. The spread wings and raised tail give the suggestion of imminent movement and in the delicacy of their silhouette greatly enhance the decorative effect of the object. The phoenix is a magnificent example of the high technical standards, quality, and perfection achieved by the T'ang craftsmen.

The marvelous silver bowl with parcel-gilt decoration lent by the William Rockhill Nel-
son Gallery of Art, Kansas City (Cat. No. 332), is in every respect an almost exact mate to the famous silver bowl in the Hakutsuru Art Museum, also lent to the exhibition (Cat. No. 333). Both bowls are in the shape of an open lotus and have the exterior divided into large and small petal-shaped lobes in repoussé. They are beautifully decorated with a chased design of floral scrolls, as well as running animals, birds, and insects in an outdoor setting, replete with stylized tree and plant forms, rocks, and swiftly drawn cloud puffs which reinforce the sense of motion conveyed by the galloping animals and birds in flight. Centered on the interior of both bowls is a most unusual design in the form of a separately applied inset decorated in repoussé relief with a design of fantastic animals, catfish, and ducks among waves. Another bowl of similar type, but different design on the interior, was lent by Mr. and Mrs. Frederick M. Mayer, New York (fig. 10, Cat. No. 334). The exterior, as in the case of the Kansas City and Hakutsuru bowls, is divided into petal-shaped lobes in repoussé relief which are decorated with a design of floral scrolls and birds. Above the petals and in the areas between them is a very delicate design of plant and tree motifs, animals and birds. A stag may be recognized in the center of the section here reproduced, while an animal in “flying” gallop, with fore and hind legs off the ground, and a group of birds in flight appear to the right. The naturalistic outdoor setting with animals and birds, characteristic of this group of three bowls, surely derives from Near Eastern prototypes. The inspiration for such motifs of decoration may be sought in the metalwork of Sasanian Persia, for example in the decoration of Sasanian silver platters.10

Various other objects, among them a number of important T’ang jades, examples of glass, ivory, gold and silver inlay on lacquer ground, a technique known as heidatsu in Japan (Cat. Nos. 145, 362), and a group of T’ang textiles rounded out the exhibition in an attempt to present as complete as possible a picture of the manifold aspects of T’ang civilization. Also included were a number of rubbings and a few full-size collotype reproductions of the Buddhist wall paintings formerly in the Kondō of Hōryūji. It is hoped that in presenting this exhibition of one of the world’s great civilizations we have not only grown richer in our knowledge and understanding of T’ang art, but that the exhibition will help to clarify some of the many still unsolved problems pertaining to the art of this period.

8 Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America, vol. 10 (1956), p. 72, fig. 18.
9 Selected specimens of the Chinese bronze collection in the Hakkaku Art Museum, 1951, pl. 36.
10 Cf. A. U. Pope, A survey of Persian art, vol. 4, 1938, pls. 204, 213, 214, 217, for motifs of birds, running animals, stylized plant and tree forms, etc.
JAPANESE SCREEN PAINTINGS OF THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES

By KENJI TODA

The development of the Japanese byōbu-e, the painting of folding screens, reached its climax in a period from the late sixteenth to the late seventeenth century. The famous Momoyama screens, the paintings of early ukiyo-e, and the works by Honnami Kōetsu (1558–1627), Tawaraya Sōatsu (?–1643), and Ogata Kōrin (1655–1716) can be studied together as the products of a continued movement of that period. Although these screen paintings are of diverse form and subject matter, some unmistakable characteristics of the Yamato-e seem to predominate in a majority of them. Byōbu-e works preceding this period include the ink paintings of the Chinese school of the fifteenth century and some Yamato-e figures and landscapes by Tosa painters such as Hirochika, his son Mitsunobu (1434–1525) and Mitsunobu’s son Mitsushige. Yamato-e screens older than the fifteenth century are very rare. A few extant examples like the two-panel screen of lotus flowers and birds attributed to Kanaoka, in the Hōryūji, or the two six-panel senzui-byōbu of the Tōji and Jingoji, do not give us complete data of the early development of this most important part of Japanese painting.

It may be possible for one to trace the characteristics of Japanese screen paintings through the few early works like those mentioned above, and from many varieties of pictures found in scroll paintings, but because of the lack of adequate records, the full extent of byōbu-e done in the ninth and tenth centuries, when Japanese painting fully matured, remains rather obscure. The present study is an attempt to find material for such a record from collections of Japanese poems.

Japanese poetry of 31 syllables called waka, Yamato-uta, or simply uta, is found in its crude form in the mythology of the Kojiki. It probably was established as the national form in the early fourth century. We find that of the total of 4,496 poems contained in the oldest collection, the Manyō-shū, 4,173 are of this form of 31 syllables. The history of the Manyō-shū is not clear, but the poems contained in it cover the period of 500 years from the fourth to the eighth centuries.

It is to be remembered that the influence of Chinese literature was already prevalent in Japan at the time of three representative poets of Manyō, Kakinomoto no Hitomaro (ca. 662–710), Yamanoc no Okura (?–733), and Otomo no Yakamochi (?–785). The oldest collection of Japanese poems in Chinese form, called Kaifū Sō, contains 120 poems by 64 poets. This collection has its preface dated Tempyō Shōhō 3 (A.D. 751). The compiler’s name is not given but the work has been attributed to Aumi no Mifune (722–785), a great-grandson of Prince Otomo (648–672) who was the eldest son of Emperor Tenchi. We find that some of the poets represented in the Manyō have their Chinese poetry given in the Kaifū Sō. Three collections of Japanese poems in Chinese form were compiled under Emperor Saga (810–823), who was personally interested in Chinese poetry and calligraphy. It seems that most of the poets represented in these collections specialized in the Chinese form, but in a few cases we find poets who could write proficiently in both Japanese and Chinese forms. This coexistence of native and foreign forms of poetry and their interactions that made for variety in the elements of Japanese culture present one of the interesting problems in the study of Far
Eastern art. The native and the foreign lines never developed in parallel; one may be dominant at a certain period, while the other may rise again after years of comparative inaction. Thus we find the revival of native elements in the compilation of *Kokin-waka-shū*, the first imperial collection of Japanese poetry, in A.D. 905.

In the succeeding three centuries seven more imperial collections of *waka* were compiled. They are: *Gosen-waka-shū* of 951, *Shūi-waka-shū* of 997 (?), *Go Shūi-waka-shū* of 1086, *Kinyō-waka-shū* of 1128, *Shika-waka-shū* of 1151, *Senzai-waka-shū* of 1188, and *Shin *Kokin-waka-shū* of 1205. The total of eight collections including the first *Kokin-shū* (the word *waka* is omitted in the common reading of the titles of these collections) are called the *Hachi-dai-shū*, the “Collections of the Eight Eras.” There are altogether 21 imperial collections; the last, called *Shin-zoku Kokin-waka-shū*, was compiled in 1439.

Some of the poems included in these collections may reflect only the sophisticated plays of court nobles and ladies, but the works of more serious poets, to whom the study of *uta* meant their lifework, are inspired with a quality akin to good music. The phonetic character of the Japanese language and its significance in poetry can be understood only by those who are brought up with the language. In order to condense ideas in the limited form, a highly concentrated selection of words must be made. The beauty and effectiveness of expression depend upon the tone and rhythm in the arrangement of those words, which come only from the sincerity of emotions and not from artifices. This was strongly pointed out by *Kino Tsurayuki* (?–946) in his introduction to the *Kokin-shū*, and it was upon this principle of emotional sincerity and refinement as the basic criterion that the selections of poems were made. Thus each collection represents the standard of the era in which it was made. The New Year Imperial Poetry Party of present-day Japan has its origin in this tradition of such periodic selections of poems.

It has been well known among the students of Japanese poetry that an unusually large number of poems contained in the *Shūi-shū* were written on painted screens. The importance of these poems as a record of paintings is obvious, since in their dates, descriptions, and appreciations they represent authentic material without a trace of attempts made in later periods to change their original aspects. The *Shūi-shū* has therefore been taken as the chief source of the present study, with other collections of *Hachi-dai-shū* and a few collections of individual poets as additional references.

The selection of poems for the *Shūi-shū* was made under Emperor Kazan (968–1008), who, after his short reign of 985–986, abdicated and spent the rest of his life in retirement. He was a poet and a painter, and it is considered that his interest in painting was responsible for the unusual number of poems on paintings contained in this collection. The actual selection of the poems was made by *Fujisawa no Kintō* (966–1041), who is noted for his selection of the 36 immortal poets.

A definite form of the collection of Japanese poems was established with the compilation of the *Kokin-shū*. The poems are classified into nine groups: Spring, Summer, Autumn, Winter, Love, Miscellaneous, Felicitation, Travel (Farewell), and Lamentation. There may be a minor group or two added to this

---

1 There is another collection called *Shūi-shū* which contains fewer poems than *Shūi-shū*, and the question as to which of the two represents the original selection has not been definitely settled among the specialists. For our present purpose the *Shūi-shū* is preferable because of the greater amount of material contained in it.
classification, according to individual preferences, but the order of these nine divisions is generally constant. It is significant to find that the poems of the four seasons are always given first in all collections. The four seasons signify man's contact with nature, and the place of nature in Japanese cultural life is clearly reflected in this tradition in poetry. In the 17-syllable haiku, developed after the early sixteenth century, special emphasis is given to the topic of the four seasons.

There are 1,353 poems in the Shūi-shū. Of this total number, 421 are in the group of Four Seasons, and 446 are in the group of Love. The majority of poems on byōbu-e is found in the group of Four Seasons; 35 in Spring, 17 in Summer, 34 in Autumn, and 18 in Winter. There are altogether 129 poems on paintings, with 3 on sliding doors, 4 on sketches on paper, and 1 each for a fan, for the design on the back of a mirror, and for an ornamental stand. Thus the total number of byōbu-e recorded by the poems in the Shūi-shū is 119.

Poems selected for the Shūi-shū do not represent works of only the contemporary poets. In fact all collections of the Hachi-dai-shū followed the precedent of Kokin-shū which, as its title ko (ancient)-kin (modern) indicates, contains poems of the period as well as those of the past. It is in the choice of the compilers that one finds the trend in the cultural standard of each period. About 25 poets are represented in the poems on byōbu-e that are found in the Shūi-shū. The exact dates of some of these poets are not clear, but the dates of all the famous poets are well known. Besides, some of the poems are dated. There are nine definite dates: Engi 2, 13, 15, 19 (A.D. 902, 913, 915, 919); Enchō 4, 7 (926, 929); Shōhei 4 (934); Tentoku 4 (960); and Kanwa 2 (986). Two eras, Ninwa (885-889) and Tenryaku (947-957), and the names of three emperors, Yōzei (877-884, d. 949), Enyū (970-984, d. 991) and Reizei (968-969, d. 1011) also are found in the poems on byōbu-e in this collection.

The fact that so many poems were composed for the folding screens seems to indicate that they represented a luxury even for wealthy people. Many brief notes accompanying the poems on byōbu-e in the Shūi-shū show that in most cases these screens were made for special occasions in the aristocratic households. The collection of the Kokin-shū, with its total of over 1,100 poems, contains only six poems on byōbu-e representing three different cases, but these three cases illustrate the general situation which was recorded more completely in the poems of Shūi-shū compiled over 90 years later. Among the poems of autumn in Kokin-shū there are two poems about the Tatsuta River with floating maple leaves. The poems are by the priest Sosei and the court noble Ariwara no Narihira (825-880). We learn from the note to his poems by Sosei that these poems were composed for a painting of the Tatsuta River on a folding screen made in celebration of the birth of a prince to Empress Nijō, consort of Emperor Seiwa (850-880). The birth of this prince was on the sixteenth of the twelfth month of Jōkan 10 (868). This case represents the custom of celebrating a special event with a new byōbu. The custom of making two screen paintings called Yuki and Suki for the coro-

2 Yuki and Suki are two regions in the provinces, Yuki to the east, and Suki to the west of Kyoto. Two sites for rice fields are determined by divination, one in each region, for every occasion of the coronation. The crop produced in these two rice fields is used in the ceremony of Daitōsai which is attended by the new emperor after his coronation. This ceremony seems to symbolize the prime importance of agriculture for the nation. Paintings on the two screens prepared for the ceremony represent the scenery of these selected regions.

The earliest information about Yuki and Suki is
nation, still observed in present-day Japan, can be traced to these old historical events.

In the Miscellaneous group in Kokin-shū there is a poem about a waterfall by the poetess Sanjō no Machi. According to the note for this poem, the poetess was with a number of other court ladies at the palace in the presence of Emperor Montoku (827–858) when the emperor's attention was attracted by a painting of a waterfall on a byōbu, and he asked the ladies to compose poems on this subject. This is an example of impromptu cases where a screen painting furnished the subject for poetry.

In the group of poems of Felicitation there are three poems, all of which were composed for screen paintings made to celebrate birthdays. A poem by Fujiwara no Okikaze is on the picture of a man under cherry blossoms painted on a screen which was made to celebrate the fiftieth birthday of a princess. Ki no Tsurayuki has his poem on the painting of plum blossoms on a byōbu for the seventieth birthday of a prince, and the priest Sosei is represented by his poem on a screen of the Four Seasons made for the birthday of a court noble.

Many of the screen poems found among the group of Four Seasons in the Shūi-shū may be more appropriately classified in the group of Felicitation. They are grouped under the Four Seasons because of the subjects of the paintings for which the poems were composed.

An interesting account about the preparation of byōbu for some special occasion is given in volume 14 of the Konjaku Monogatarī, a collection of anecdotes compiled by Minamoto no Takakuni (1004–1077). This account is about a poem by Lady Ise (?–939?), given in the group of Spring in the Shūi-shū.

A new screen was made for the hakama-gi ceremony of a prince of Emperor Daigo (885–930). Hakama-gi is the celebration of the first formal wearing of hakama trousers when a boy reaches his seventh birthday. All paintings on the screen panels were finished and the emperor had already asked some of the best poets at his court to compose poems for the pictures. Copies of these poems were handed to the famous calligraphist Ono no Tōfū (896–966), and as he started writing the poems on the shikishi for the appointed pictures he found that the poem for a picture representing a lady's oxcart on a mountain road with cherry trees in full bloom was missing. The emperor had overlooked this particular picture when he assigned his request to the poets. The day of the ceremony was coming close on the morrow and two best poets, Tsurayuki and Mitsune, were out of town. The situation required a special measure, and the emperor decided to send the young courtier Fujiwara no Korehisa to the home of Lady Ise. This poetess was the favorite of Emperor Uda (867–931), to whom she bore a prince. Emperor Uda abdicated and entered Buddhist life in 897, and at the time of this account Lady Ise was in retirement, away from the glamour of court life. Emperor Daigo selected the courtier Korehisa for this special mission because he was noted for his great personal beauty and refinement. Much depended upon the young man's personal charm.

On arrival at the lady's mansion in the Gojō district of the capital, he was conducted...
directly to the main building where an attendant invited him into the reception hall. It was customary for a lady to meet a man only from behind a screen unless they were in an intimate relationship. Thus the imperial messenger Korehisa was seated in the hall with silk curtains and ornamental bamboo screens concealing the view of the lady and her attendants, although he was able to notice the cool fragrance of incense and occasional rustles of the ladies' garments. With a proper introduction Korehisa delivered the message, telling the lady that both Tsurayuki and Mitsune were not at home and that the emperor was hoping that she would favor him with a poem for that particular picture. Then he heard her speak in bewilderment, how unexpected and impossible such a request was to her. Even if she were given enough time she would never be able to compose as well as those two poets. Her voice, dignified and yet so full of sweet charm, made Korehisa realize that he was in the presence of a rare personality. Meanwhile refreshments were served and some time was spent as Korehisa was thus entertained. Then the lady's poem, written on thin paper tinted in purple and folded and wrapped with paper of the same color, was placed on a lady's garment and slid out from under the bamboo screen to the imperial messenger. The garment was a gift for him. He thanked the lady for her generous favor and departed immediately for the palace where the emperor was waiting impatiently.

The beauty of the handwriting of Lady Ise greatly impressed the emperor and he read aloud the poem:

Chiri chirazu
kikamahoshi sa o
furusato no
hana mite kaeru
hito mo aranan

"Fallen or not yet fallen, I am anxious to know;
Perchance I may meet a person who is returning from a visit
Viewing the flowers in my home province."

The poem was then shown to the attending courtiers and they all read it with much acclamation. It is said that Tōfū read the poem many times before he took up his brush to write it on the screen.

The Konjaku Monogatari gives another account about a screen painting with a poem by Fujiwara no Kintō. This poem, on the picture of a blossoming wistaria, is found also in the Shūi-shū. The author of the Konjaku, Takakuni, was a court noble and his anecdote seems to represent the talks of bygone days still fresh in the memory of some of the court people of his time. The note for the poem by Lady Ise, found in both Shūi-shū and in her own individual collection, describes the subject of the picture simply as "a person on a mountain road in spring." The screen is listed as a byōbu for Sai-in, the virgin princess who was destined to serve at a special ceremony of the Kamo shrine. Takakuni's account, of course, should not be taken as a historical record in the strict sense, but it shows certain vivid details of the circumstances in which some of these poems for the paintings were composed.

Highly talented and of great personal beauty, Lady Ise and the famous Ono no Komachi are known as the two outstanding poetesses of glamour in the history of Japanese literature. The individual collection of Lady Ise's poetry, which was presented to Emperor Murakami (926–967) by her daughter Nakatsukasa, who also was a noted poetess, contains 48 poems on byōbu-e, some of them with interesting introductory notes. As to Tsurayuki, mentioned in the account about Lady Ise, we find that he was a specialist
in poems on byōbu-e. He has a greater number of poems on paintings than any other poet in the Shūi-shū. His own individual collection, consisting of 10 volumes with a total of 848 poems, has its first 5 volumes devoted entirely to his poems on screen paintings. Among these poems, 366 in number, 20 are dated from Engi 5 (905) to Shōhei 7 (937). Poems composed on paintings are usually considered to be of secondary importance by the students of poetry, but some of Tsuyayuki’s best are found in his poems on byōbu-e. Either he had great interest in painting or he was specially gifted in his play of imagination on the given subjects. At any rate, there can be no question about the enormous amount of pictures painted on folding screens in those days.

We have no records about the names of the artists who painted those screens. However, from various literary sources compiled in volume 32 of the reference work Koga Bikō,4 we find that it was the followers of Kose no Kanaoka who were mainly responsible for those byōbu-e. Kanaoka himself and his son Aumi were active in the late ninth century. In the early history of Japanese painting two names, Kudara no Kawanari and Kose no Kanaoka, stand out as landmarks. These two painters left something tangible at least on the pages of history. The record about Kawanari is more complete than that of Kanaoka. The historical record Montoku Jitsuroku, compiled by Fujiwara no Mototsune (836–891) and bearing a preface dated Genki 2 (878), gives a detailed life of Kudara no Kawanari (782–853). We learn from this record that Kawanari was a strong realist, probably specializing in portrait and figure works. Unfortunately he had no followers to succeed him, while Kanaoka had able descendants and followers who served the imperial court and thus established the Kose school.

All records about Kanaoka are rather fragmentary, but his painting of the portraits of Chinese sages at the imperial palace in 880 or 888 seems to have been at the reliable time of his activity. There are many paintings attributed to Kanaoka, and he probably worked on a wide variety of subject matters, including Buddhist themes. Masterpieces in Japanese Buddhist painting such as the “Red Fudō” and the portrait of the priest Kinsō (747–826) at Köyasen, the wall painting of Murōji, or the portraits of the founders of the Shingon sect at Tōji, show highly developed technical forms that gave basic standards to the Japanese artists of that time. It can be assumed that they were trained in the technique of Buddhist painting and extended the scope of their art to other fields in accordance with popular demands and their own tastes. Thus developed, side by side with the serious religious works, an art of a more intimate nature. This art, which expressed a natural trend in Japanese taste, developed into the school of the Yamato-e just as the 31-syllable poems expressive of the same trend developed into the poetry of the Yamato-uta. The close relationship between them is most convincingly demonstrated in the poems on byōbu-e and it seems probable that the first really characteristic masterpieces of the Yamato-e were painted on folding screens. There were, of course, paintings on walls and sliding doors, but judging from the number of cases found in the collections of poems, folding screens were more commonly used for the pictures in the old Japanese households. Walls and sliding doors are fixed parts of the architecture while the screens can be moved and changed without difficulty. Pleasant subjects naturally were chosen for the pictures that were kept so close to daily life, but aside from such obvious

4 Compiled by Asaoka Sakisada (1800–56) about 1845–50, the Kōga bikō 古畑備考 was published in Tokyo in 1904.
reasons there may have been a more fundamental cause to control the selection of subject matter for the screen paintings.

Excepting some critical comments in the study of poetry, very little is found on aesthetics in the old Japanese literary sources. The comments on painting by Lady Murasaki Shikibu (978?–1030?) in chapter 2 of the Genji Monogatari are a rare case of a view in matters of art appreciation being stated. In a talk about various personalities of women, one of Genji’s young friends illustrated his opinion with an argument on painting: “In the Office of Painting at the imperial court there are many good artists whose real abilities could not be easily discerned as they are chosen by their [skill in] ink drawing. Thus in the painting of [spectacular subjects such as] Mount Hörai which has never been beheld by a mortal eye, the raging monstrous fish in a rough sea, ferocious beasts of foreign lands, or the faces of imaginary demons, artists may paint according to their fancy, and their works, though with no likeness to the real, may merely impress people by their striking effects. On the other hand, in the painting of [peaceful scenery such as] ordinary hills and streams, familiar houses, gentle mountain slopes aloft in deep foliage, or the intimate charm of enclosed space within rustic hedges, a master would render his work with spirited effectiveness while inferior artists would be mostly lacking in the real qualities.” The complete absence of spectacular or sensational subjects in the poems on byōbu-e seems to indorse Lady Murasaki’s view.5

There is only one case of a Chinese subject in the whole collection of Shū-shū, namely Chōgon Ka (“The Everlasting Wrong”), the story of Yang Kuei Fei as given by the T’ang poet Po Chü-i (772–846). The poem is by Lady Ise, and we find 11 more poems on this same screen by the poetess in her own individual collection. Evidently she was familiar with Chinese poetry. Three screen paintings of Chinese subjects are mentioned by another noted court lady, Sei Shōnagon of the tenth century in her Pillow Book, and there can be no question about the continued appreciation of Chinese poetry, but what we find predominant in their poems are the same features that make all poems of the Hachi-dai-shū distinctly Japanese. The study of Chinese poetry gave the Japanese a philosophical depth in the aesthetic appreciation and refinement in the technique of expression, but the innate character remained little affected and the direct, objective causes of inspiration came naturally from the local scenes and events. The natural trend to seek subtle beauty in the more familiar objects close to us was cultivated in Japan to a great extent under the influence of the climatic and geographical features of the country. Environment alone, however, could not develop such a distinct tendency in a group of people without a certain character inherent in them.

The court people who represented the cultured class in Japan of the ninth and tenth centuries were direct descendants of the founders of the empire. They have been generally associated with an idle life of sophistication and a tendency to avoid strong stimuli in their art and literature, reflecting their effeminate mentality. History, however, gives us a somewhat different story. Ki no Tsurayuki, who left so many poems on byōbu-e, served as the governor of the province of Tosa in the island of Shikoku from about 930 to 934. During his stay in Tosa he conducted a vigorous campaign against the bands of pirates that infested the sea around that region. Arihara no Yukihiro (818–893), the elder brother to the romantic courtier Narihira, was noted for his

5 See the selected list of the subjects of byōbu-e given at the end of this article.
plan of national defense in consolidating the economic status of Iki and Tsushima by shipping grain from Kyūshū to these small islands that are situated so close to Korea. The aggressive attitude of the new Korean dynasty of Silla presented serious problems to Japan of that time. Yukihiro also founded an educational institution for young men in Kyoto. Under Emperor Daigo, in whose reign the poems of Kokin-shū were selected, the great record of Engi-shiki was compiled. It took over 10 years of work to finish this monumental document that gives thorough descriptions of the systems of government and industry of the nation in that period. Thus it seems that those court people did serious work beside their playful activities.

The landscape screen, sensu-kyōbu, of the Jingoji in the hills of Takao near Kyoto is selected to illustrate this article. Although this work does not belong to the period of the Shūi-shū, it is the oldest example of Yamato-e on the folding screen in existence. There are three other sensu-kyōbu, one at the Tōji, one at the Daigoji, and one at the Taimadera. These four temples are all of the Shingon sect, and the screens were made for the Kanjō ceremony of the sect in which perfumed water is sprinkled over the head of the person who is initiated to the secrets of their esoteric principles. "Senzui" is a special reading of sansui (Chinese, shan-shui) which means landscape, and some representations of landscape are given on all these four screens.

The painting of the Jingoji screen is done on silk. Most of the old paintings of large dimensions are done on silk, probably because it was difficult to obtain good paper in large sizes. Four cases of kami-e (paper picture) occur in the Shūi-shū, and their subjects seem to indicate small pictures more in the nature of album leaves or scrolls.

Each panel of this screen is bordered individually with brocades. This is the old form of Japanese screens. A good representation of four panels of a screen is found in a scene in chapter 34 of Takayoshi's Genji scroll, showing Kashiwagi seriously ill in bed visited by Yūgiri, the son of Genji. Most of the screens of the later periods have their pictures composed over the whole stretch of the panels without interruption by individual mountings. The rooms in the old Japanese homes for which the screens were made evidently did not provide enough space to exhibit big compositions, and the paintings were made for rather close inspection. Sensu-kyōbu were made for temples, but the ceremony of Kanjō probably does not require a spacious hall.

The screen of the Jingoji was not kept in good condition. Some of the panels were separated, and when they were reassembled and remounted there were questions as to the original order of the six panels. Each panel is done in an independent vertical composition made more or less in three zones of near, middle, and far distances. One notices, however, some indications of the artist's having planned a definite relation between the six pictures. The spaces assigned for the masses of the hills and the expanse of water in the distance are given distinctly as parts of a long stretch of landscape. The buildings which occupy the center of this whole landscape are drawn with considerable skill, with every structure integrated as an essential part of the design. The delineation of the figures and the plant and animal forms is also done very effectively, and these naturalistic studies give us some idea of the byōbu-e of the naturalistic subjects described in the old poems. "Floating Maple Leaves" or "Blossoming Plum Tree by a Water," suggesting the decorative designs of Köetsu and Sōtatsu, probably developed from such forms of naturalistic painting.

Three of the panels are decorated with...
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shikishi with no poems written on them. There are a number of cases of Buddhist paintings decorated with shikishi. The most noted case is the wall painting of the Phoenix Hall of the Byōdōin at Uji, built in 1053. The landscape in this work is similar to the landscape of the Jingoji screen. and one may assume that many of the representations of famous places on byōbu recorded in the old poems were of such form. Owing to the constant exposure to the elements, the colors in the old screen paintings are not as well preserved as in the scrolls, but one can see general schemes common to all works of Yamato-e, with a rich green accented by a golden brown.

In regard to the artist who painted the screen at Jingoji we find two literary sources: the Honchō Gashi, 本朝畫史, a history of Japanese painting, by Kano Einō (1634–1700), 1693, 4 vols., ills., and the Yōshū Fushi, 畠州府志, a historical geography of Yamashiro Province, by Kurokawa Dōyū, publ. 1686 (modern ed. vol. 3 of Kyoto Soshō, Kyoto, 1934). The name of the artist is recorded as Kōhō or Kōbō (Yasufusa?). According to the Honchō Gashi, he was a priest at the Daigoji. The Yōshū Fushi mentions that the senzai-byōbu of the Jingoji was painted originally in a pair, and that one of the pair had been kept at the Daigoji. No date has been suggested, but the work shows unmistakable characteristics of Yamato-e of the early thirteenth century. We find a number of artists in the thirteenth century with the kō(yasu) character in their names. The record, Meigetsu Ki, 明月記, by Fujiwara Teika (1162–1241), Tokyo (Kokusho Kan-kōkai), 1912, gives a detailed account, dated fourteenth of the fifth month of Shōgen 1 (1207), about paintings of 46 famous places on the sliding doors in the palace, done by four painters, Tayūbō Sonchi, Yawata Mitsutoki, Shinanobō Kōshun, and Muneuchi Kaneyasu. The names Sonchi and Kōshun suggest painters of the Buddhist school. It seems to be certain that our artist Kōhō belonged to the Buddhist school, and his painting of this screen shows a close relationship between Yamato-e and Buddhist painters.

The abundance of poems on byōbu-e reviewed in the present study seems to prove that the art of painting on the folding screens was well developed in Japan of the ninth and tenth centuries. The subjects selected for those screen paintings show a characteristic appreciation of the intimate expressions of life, an attitude that prevails throughout the history of Japanese art, from old screens and scrolls to ukiyo-e prints of the later period. One finds, of course, certain differences due to individual tastes and foreign influences that occasionally relieve art from monotony and stagnation, but the main trend has persisted even to the present day. This is a specialization that distinguished Japanese culture in the past. It may still lead to a new development in the future.

7 The house of the famous Buddhist sculptor Unkei of the Kamakura period had the hereditary use of kō character in their names. Unkei was the sixth heir to the house after the great Jōchō (?–1057). Jōchō's father was Kōshō. The fourth heir was Kōjo, and the fifth Kökei. Of the six sons of Unkei, the eldest, Tankei, is recorded as a sculptor as well as a painter. The second son, Kōun, the third son Kōshō, and the fourth son Köben, all had the same kō character in their names.
SUBJECT MATTERS OF SCREEN PAINTINGS IN THE COLLECTIONS OF JAPANESE POEMS

I. THE FOUR SEASONS, FROM Shūi-shū

SPRING:
1. Felicitation for the empress, Shōhei 4 (934).
2. Monthly events, Engi era (901–923).
3. Guest at a house with plum blossoms, for Emperor Reizei (968–969, d. 1011).
4. Young greens.
5. Blossoming plum tree by water.
6. Willow trees.
7. Cherry blossoms.
8. Rice field at Iso-no-kami in the province of Yamato.
10. Falling blossoms.
12. Yamabuki (Kerria japonica).

SUMMER:
1. Deutzia flowers.
2. Wistaria, for Emperor Enyū.
3. Cuckoo.
4. Iris.
5. The ferry at Yodo, Tenryaku era (947–957).
6. A traveler resting under the shade of a tree.
7. Deer at Ogura Hill.
8. Hills in summer.
9. Big trees in the woods.

AUTUMN:
1. Lespedeza plant in autumn wind, Engi era (901–923).
2. Tanabata festival, Engi era (901–923).
3. Autumn flowering plants in the field.
4. Falconry, for Emperor Yōzei (877–884, d. 949).
5. Horses for the imperial stables, Engi era (901–923).
6. Party in full moon at a house with a pond in the garden.
7. Moon.
8. Insects in the autumn field.
9. Chrysanthemum.
10. Falling leaves.
12. Woman in outing costume under maple tree.

WINTER:
1. Maple trees in rain, Engi era (901–923).
2. Plovers, Shōhei 6 (936).
3. Floating maple leaves, Engi era (901–923).
4. Ice at the ferry of Yodo.
5. Pine trees in winter.
7. The White Mountain of the North.
9. Snow at a deserted house.
10. Butsumyō (Buddhist festival held for 3 days from the 19th of the 12th month).

II. MONTHLY EVENTS, CALLED Tsukinami (THE MONTHLY), FROM THE INDIVIDUAL COLLECTION OF POEMS BY KI NO TSURAYUKI

1. Gathering young greens.
2. Pulling young pine trees on the first day of Rat in the New Year.
3. Inari festival.
4. Inariyama in spring haze.
5. Cherry blossoms.
7. Festival of the Kamo shrine.
8. Wistaria.
9. Iris.
10. Match-cord fires in a deer hunt.
11. Cormorant fishing.
12. Tanabata festival.
13. Arrival of new horses for the imperial stables.
15. Falconry.
17. Music and dance at a Shintō shrine.
18. Butsumyō festival.

III. FAMOUS PLACES, FROM THE INDIVIDUAL COLLECTION OF POEMS BY MINAMOTO NO SANEAKIRA

Pictures of these famous places were painted on two screens made in the Tenryaku era (947–957).
1. Kasugano field.
2. Mikumano.
3. Bridge of Nagara.
5. Suma.
6. Fushimi.
7. Sahoyama.
8. Tago-no-ura.
10. Tsukubayama.
11. Shirayama.
12. Futagoyama.
14. The marsh of Asaka.
15. The barrier of Nakoso.
17. Ukishima.
18. Iso-no-kami.
19. Takasago.
20. Obasuteyama.

IV. HUMAN INTERESTS, FROM Shūi-shū, AND
    THE INDIVIDUAL COLLECTIONS OF POEMS
    BY LADY ISE AND HER DAUGHTER
    NAKATSUKASA

1. Love scene at a house with a pond under full moon.
2. A party under a blossoming tree.
3. Viewing plum blossoms.
4. Burning dead grass in the field in spring.
5. Return of a flower-viewing party.
6. At the game of go.
7. Digging bamboo shoots.
8. Looking at one’s reflection on the water in a tub on the day of Tanabata.
10. Maple leaves falling into a deserted house.
11. Cranes at a beach where women are drawing seawater to make salt.
12. Women gathering seaweed.
13. Smoke from a seaside cottage.
14. Rowing a boat out in the sea.
15. A man by a waterfall.
16. A man with a falcon in a field with flowering plants of autumn.
17. A man with a spray of ominaeshi (Patrinia) laid by his ink stone.
18. A woman in a pensive mood.
19. A man visiting a mountain temple in haze.
20. Hunters approaching a rustic house.
KENJI TODA

SPRING
1 — 承平四年中宮の賀し待てる屏風に
2 — 延喜御時月名うの御屏風に
3 — 冷泉院御時の屏風の絵にむめの花咲たるかたかげる所
4 — 期佐右大臣家の屏風
5 — 延喜御時御屏風水辺に梅の花咲たるかたかげる所
6 — 屏風に（射恒）
7 — 賀の御屏風に（千姿）
8 — 天智御時御屏風に（真言）
9 — 斎院の屏風に春色を入かせる所
10 — 延喜の御時御屏風に（真言）
11 — 圓融院の三尺の御屏風に（真言）
12 — 屏風に（射恒）

SUMMER
1 — 屏風に（卯の花、朝開）
2 — 圓融院の御屏風（真言）
3 — 敦長院家の屏風の絵に山里に採花のかたかげる所
4 — 屏風に（早作花、能宜）
5 — 天智御時御屏風に花のたよりときる人ある所にほ
6 — 月なみの御屏風にたび人木のかけにやすむ
7 — 九條右大臣賀屏風に（真言）
8 — 延喜の御時御屏風（真言）
9 — 右大将頼国か四の賀に内反より屏風開して給けて

AUTUMN
1 — 延喜御時御屏風に（おきの葉、賀之）
2 — 修理大臣俵平家の屏風に七夕まつりのかたかげる所
3 — 斎院の屏風（惠慶）
4 — 圓融院の御時御屏風にかたかりしたる所
5 — 延喜の御時月名の御屏風に騒迎のかたかえる所
6 — 屏風に八月十五夜に池ある家に遊ぎたるかたか
7 — 延喜御時御屏風に（射恒）
8 — 屏風に（はたをするむし、賀之）
9 — 三条の前宮の賀し待てる御屏風（元輔）
10 — 右大将頼国内の屏風（忠慈）
11 — 延喜御時御屏風（賀之）
12 — 西宮左大臣家の屏風（源頼）

WINTER
1 — 屏風に（しけれど紅葉、賀之）
2 — 承平六年春左院門主屏風歌（賀之集巻三）
3 — 延喜御時女四のみこ家の屏風
4 — 屏風絵に（真言）
5 — 恵め公家の屏風（能宜）
6 — 屏風に（能宜）
7 — 屏風の絵にこしの山のかたかきて待けるに
8 — 入道側改家の屏風に（真言）
6 — 冷泉院御時御屏風（真言）
10 — 延喜御時御屏風に物名したるかたかえる所

MONTHLY EVENTS
1 — 若葉切る所（延長四年八月廿四日清貫民部卿六
2 — 子日の松のもとてて遊ひ居たる所（延喜十九
3 — 稲荷謡（承平二年二月狩流の屏風）
4 — 稲荷山かすみ（延喜六年月次夜の屏風）
5 — 櫻花のちる所（延喜十八年承従殿女御屏風）
6 — 田畑盛し（延喜六年月次夜の御屏風）
7 — 四月神社（承平六年夏八条の右大臣北方七十貫の
8 — 池のほとりの藤松にかれる（延喜十五年齢院御
9 — あやめ（延喜十九年春末御息所御屏風）
10 — ともの鹿（延喜六年月次月の御屏風八帖歌四十五
11 — 釣川（延喜六年月次）
12 — 七月七日（延喜六年月次）
13 — 駱駱（延喜六年月次）
14 — 窄見たる（延喜十九年春末宮息所御屏風）
15 — 小 鷹 狩（延喜六年月次）
16 — きぬた（延喜六年月次）
17 — 神 楽（延喜六年月次）
18 — 仏 聖（延喜六年月次）
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FAMOUS PLACES

1 一 春 日 野
2 一 三 熊 野
3 一 三 桐 横
4 一 七 桐 波
5 一 す ま
6 一 ふしみの里
7 一 佐 保 山
8 一 田 子 浦
9 一 しかすがの塚
10 一 つ く ば 山
11 一 し ら 山
12 一 ふ た ご 山
13 一 よ し の 山
14 一 あ さ か の 塚
15 一 な こ ぞ の 塚
16 一 な ぎ さ の 塚
17 一 う さ し ま
18 一 石 上
19 一 高 砂
20 一 お ば で て 山

HUMAN INTERESTS

1 一 八 月 十 五 日 月 の 彫 波 に よ る 家 に 女 居 て け さ
う た る 所（国 篆 院 屏 风一 作・造）
2 一 花 に み た る 師（国 篆 院 三 尺 屏 风一 作・造）
3 一 松 の 木 壁 に み た る 所（国 院 屏 风一 作・造）
4 一 野 い ろ く に み た る 所（国 院 屏 风一 作・造）
5 一 木 藤 の 木 壁 に み た る 所（国 院 屏 风一 作・造）
6 一 花 に み た る 所（国 院 屏 风一 作・造）
7 一 た か ふ な は に み た る 所（国 院 屏 风一 作・造）
8 一 七 月 七 日 に よ る 人 に み た る 所（き さ の
宮 の 五 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
9 一 紅 葉 の に み た る 所（き さ の 宮
の 五 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
10 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（村 上
先 帝 屏 风一 作・造）
11 一 あ ま か た る に み た る 所（仁 和 屏 风一 作・造）
12 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（五 条 の 内 侍 督 の 五十 賀 の 御 屏 风
し 代 屏 风一 作・造）
13 一 あ ま の 家 よ り み た る 所（五 条 内 侍 督 四 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
14 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（五 条 内 侍 督 四 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
15 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（五 条 内 侍 督 四 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
16 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（五 条 内 侍 督 四 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
17 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（五 条 内 侍 督 四 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
18 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（五 条 内 侍 督 四 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
19 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（五 条 内 侍 督 四 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
20 一 へ た ろ と へ た ろ の に み た る 所（五 条 内 侍 督 四 十 賀 の 御 屏 风一 作・造）
EXPLANATION OF PLATES

1. Senzui Byōbu of Jingoji.
   (Details of this plate, shown in plates 2–6, are numbered in order of the panels from left to right, facing the screen.)

2. Hunting Party in the Mountain (second panel, top).
   Three men in hunting costume on horseback, followed by three attendants on foot, are shown in the foreground. Four more attendants are shown coming down the mountain road.
   Delineation of the ground masses and the trees in this picture is typical of the Yamato-e landscapes in vertical organization. Similar form of the representation of pine groves in the distance is observed in the wall painting of the Phoenix Shrine in the temple Byōdōin at Uji.

3. A Mansion by the Pond (second panel, center).
   This picture shows a part of a mansion of the regular shinden-zukuri form which represented the aristocratic residences of the Heian and Kamakura periods.
   Shinden-zukuri consists of the six units: (1) Shinden (living house), the main building where the master lived and received his guests; (2) north tai (tai-no-ya means the accompanying house) at the back of shinden, for the mistress; (3) east tai, and (4) west tai at the left and right sides of shinden, provided for other members of the household and servants; (5) izumidono (fountain house) extending from the east tai to the pond; and (6) tsuridono (fishing house) extending from the west tai to the pond. All these units were joined by the corridors. It was customary to have the front of shinden facing straight south.

Part of the shinden and the roof of the north tai are shown at the left side of this picture. The fountain house extending from the east tai is shown at the right.

4. Along the Beach (third panel, top).
   Three women are shown in the distance. They seem to be at work gathering some objects, probably clams. Two oxen are lying peacefully in the grass.
   This rustic scene with graceful sweeps of the land accented with pine trees, rocks, and tufts of grass, represents an example of typical Yamato-e landscapes in horizontal organization.

5. A Country Residence (third panel, bottom).
   Three ladies are shown in the house. A man is entering the small gate while an attendant is holding his horse outside of the fence. Trace of some object above the left arm of the man suggests that a falcon probably was represented there.

6. Visit to a Lady’s Villa (fifth panel, center).
   A young courtier is calling on a lady at her villa. Two attendants are shown by the trees behind. An ox is lying beside the cart in the back yard where another attendant and a boy who takes care of the ox are seated on the ground. The villa is built by a river which extends farther down to a considerable width. The whole scene, beautifully arranged, is one of the gems of Yamato-e.

It has been observed that all Senzui Byōbu give some pictures of the visiting scenes. The “Visit” evidently had an important significance. The preference to have pure Yamato-e instead of Buddhist pictures for a serious ceremony at the temples shows an interesting character of Japanese Buddhist priests of those times. Many priests are recorded as good poets in tanka, and their tastes probably were responsible for the choice of these pictures.
SANZO ROBON OF JINGOJI.
(See explanation at end of text.)
Plate 2. Hunting Party in the Mountain (Second Panel, Top).
(See explanation at end of text.)
Plate 3. A Mansion by the Pond (Second Panel, Center).
(See explanation at end of text.)
Plate 4. Along the Beach (Third Panel, Top).
(See explanation at end of text.)
(See explanation at end of text.)
Plate 6. Visit to a Lady's Villa (Fifth Panel, Center).
(See explanation at end of text.)
APROPOS OF TWO PAINTINGS ATTRIBUTED TO MI YU-JEN

BY MAX LOEHR

It is rather paradoxical that there seems to be little doubt and no stated disagreement as to the landscape style of the painter Mi Fei (1051–1107), a friend of Su Tung-p’o (1036–1101) and a contemporary of the painters Chao Ling-jang (fl. ca. 1070–1100) and Li T’ang (1049–1130?), for it is quite uncertain whether any of his works have survived. Yet his style is readily recognized in the paintings of later men, Yüan and Ming masters who freely imitated or reinterpreted it in their personal idioms. Our concept of Mi Fei’s landscapes, far from being guided by any reliable specimen, rests on the gross reflections in later works. His style became what these later works permit us to imagine it to have been. Properly diffident, therefore, the critics are in agreement.

If the authentic image of the painter has thus almost disappeared in the fog of later tradition, what hope is there to rediscover the true Mi Fei—free of the exaggerations and distortions, eccentricities or touches of irony of his followers?

The common aspect of pictures attributed to Mi was summed up by Laurence Binyon in these words: ¹

“He loved to paint wooded peaks towering over mists, and with a fully charged brush dashed in his strokes, leaving effects of extraordinary richness and intensity of tone.”

Quite similar is Sir Percival David’s characterization of the style: ²

“He painted thickly-wooded, cloud enveloped mountains, in blobs of ink and with the flat of the brush, in an extravagant and impressionistic manner.”

Mi’s oeuvre cannot have been very large if, according to his own statement made in Hua Shih,³ he began to paint only some time after 1100. Teng Ch’un, author of the Hua Chi which covers the history of painting between A.D. 1074 and 1167,⁴ had seen no more than two paintings of Mi Fei, neither of which was a landscape.⁵ What Chao Hsi-ku (thirteenth century) in his Tung-t’ien ch’ing-lu contributes are observations on Mi’s preference for paper instead of silk, on his use of odd writing tools instead of brushes, and on his “copying nature” which accounts for the “naturalness” of his landscapes; nothing is said about style and design.⁶ T’ang Hou of the Yüan Dynasty again states that paintings by Mi Fei were rare; he suggests that Mi’s landscapes were derived from Tung Yüan (ca. 900–962)⁷ and that Mi’s new ideas

⁴ Chao Hsi-ku, Tung-t’ien ch’ing-lu (first half of thirteenth century), quoted in Chang Ch’ou, Ch’ing-ho shu-hua-fang (1762), vol. 9, 42b. Cf. Sirén, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 32.
⁵ An interesting discussion of the question of Tung Yüan’s lifetime by Yao Ta-jung is quoted by J. D. Chen (Ch’en Jen-t’ao), Chin-k’uei ts’ang shu-hua p’ing-shih, “Notes and Comments on the Paintings of King Kwei Collection,” Hongkong, 1956, p. 21 ff. The date A.D. 902 (= cyclical year jen-hsi = 2d year
showed rather in his pictures of old trees, pines, and rocks. Thus the literary record of Mi's landscape style would appear to remain a blank up to the Yüan dynasty.

Arthur Waley, who likewise doubted if any actual work by Mi or his son survives, significantly linked the Mi style with the painter's age at the time of his death and hence offered an explanation for the scarcity of Old Mi's paintings in the "typical" style:  

"It is probable that he painted comparatively few pictures in the style which is popularly associated with his name. He died at fifty-seven, and the style is one which seems to belong to a mature age."

Yonezawa and Shimada flatly deny the existence of any authentic work of Mi Fei. Is it surprising, then, that most recently Sirén, aware of the scantiness of documentation regarding the painter Mi, rather stresses his importance as an art historian, collector, calligrapher, and critic, leaving open the question of attributions altogether?

"... important as Mi Fei may have been ... as a painter and a calligraphist, it is no longer possible clearly to discern the reason for this from the pictures which pass under his name. There is no lack of such works, and most of them represent a rather definite type of pictorial style which survived far into the Ming period or later, but to what extent they should be considered as Mi Fei's own creations is still a matter of opinion. In other words, we know the general characteristics of his style, but we cannot be sure that the paintings ascribed to him represent the rhythm and spirit of his individual brush-work as faithfully as the authentic specimens of his calligraphy which still exist."

The following passage in the Ch'ing-ho shu-hua-fang of Chang Ch'ou (1577-1643), which has been quoted and translated also by Sirén, aptly demonstrates the degree of uncertainty regarding the Mi style perhaps as early as the twelfth century.

"... in the Shao-hsing era 1131-1162 there was a certain Chao Fei living at Pei-ku, Chen-chiang (Kiangsu), whose paintings did have some spiritedness. In his signatures he often omitted his surname (signing only Fei). People of later times who came into the possession of his paintings always mistook them for Mi Nan-kung's (i.e., Mi Fei's), the scroll of "Ten Thousand Miles of Rivers and Mountains by Fei" described by Wen Hsiuch'eng (i.e., Wen Chia, 1501-1583) in Mr. Yen's Shu-hua-chi being a case in point."

The period in question was that of the main activity and rise to fame as a painter of the younger Mi, Mi Yu-jen (1086-1165), who continued, and in wider circles presumably made first known, his father's style. If Mr. Chao's paintings could at all be accepted as Mi landscapes later on, he must have had some knowledge of the Mi style; that he knew Mi's calligraphy can be taken for granted. To

---

sign their pictures without mentioning their surnames was nothing uncommon for Chinese painters to do. In the case of Mr. Chao from Chen-chiang, however, the implication is obvious. All the world knew his given name, Fei, as that of one of the country's foremost calligraphers, and we may imagine that Mr. Chao felt tempted to pass off—without risk of fraudulence—some of his paintings as "Fei's."

In any case we learn that about the middle of the twelfth century it was possible for a painter (who perhaps had never seen a genuine Mi Fei in his life) to affect features connected with Mi Fei's work and thus contribute to the formation of the "school." As it is unlikely that the rare works of the older Mi became widely known during the short span of his later years when he had "begun to paint" (between 1100 and 1107), we shall have to conclude that it was through the work of the younger Mi, productive and long-lived Yu-jen, that artists and art lovers first became acquainted with examples of the Mi mountainscapes.

It goes without saying that Mi Yu-jen's manner, even though he may not always have closely adhered to his father's ideas, is apt to shed light on the original character of the Mi style with which he doubtless was more familiar than any of Mi's contemporaries or followers. Unfortunately there is no certainty about his oeuvre either, although Sirén is inclined to consider at least one of the paintings ascribed to the younger Mi as possibly authentic. A few others he classifies as "specimens with the younger Mi's seals and signature, which may have been executed in the Sung period and are distinguished by a rather homogeneous stylistic character." Still, Sirén makes us listen to Tung Ch'i-ch'ang (1555–1636) "who admired the two Mi more than any other painters and studied their pictures with the eye of an experienced expert" and yet "seems to have had moments of hesitation in front of paintings ascribed to Mi Yüan-hui," the younger Mi:

"The mountain-scrolls by Mi Yüan-hui have all been copied by President Kao (K'o-kung) in the Yüan period. Such is the case with the handscroll representing 'White Clouds over the Hsiao and Hsiang Rivers' in my collection. There are numerous colophons on it by famous gentlemen of the Sung and Yüan periods. . . . But I am still doubtful whether these annotations, even though they are genuine, are not something like an empty pearl-box from which the divine object has disappeared. . . ."

This paper will bring to the reader's attention two paintings which are signed with the name of Mi Yu-jen and dated in accordance with A.D. 1138. They may have no greater claim to authenticity than other pictures ascribed to the younger Mi, but they show an unfamiliar aspect of the Mi style which, in contrast to the commoner manner, appears to fit well into the period around and after A.D. 1100. As striking versions of the theme of "Clouds and Mountains," moreover, these paintings which are executed with a loving care for detail and are of high quality deserve to be known in their own right. To my knowledge, they have not so far been discussed in Western literature.

The first of the two pictures is a hanging roll (pl. 1) showing scenery dominated by a

---


15 Sirén, op. cit., p. 35.
16 Ibid., p. 36. The passage translated is found in An Ch'i, Mo-yüan hui-kuan (preface dated 1742), section on S. Sung, fol. 3.
17 Chang-kuo ming hua, "Famous Chinese Paintings," Shanghai (Yu Cheng Book Company), s.a.,
bare mountain that rises above an inlet surrounded by a dense grove; a group of larger trees on a folded slope occupies the lower left corner. A long-drawn band of smoke hovers low over the water; descending from the mountains, it cuts across the dark groves and again bends down to envelop the tree tops at the left side: a spectacular yet most sensitively treated formation with a softly billowing outline that melts into the dark foliage of the trees. The trees are rendered with lively and diversified small dabs for the leaves; the stems are straight and no roots are shown. The typical oval dots of the Mi school are used with restraint, and there is here nothing of the somewhat forced uniformity of technique characteristic of the common Mi style. Perhaps most remarkable is the noble and feelingly drawn outline of the master mountain, a mountain that has structure and volume—in contrast to the flat and fuzzy silhouettes of other works, such as in plates 4 and 5. A faintly legible inscription in the upper left corner reads "Shao-hsing eighth year, third month, second day, Mi Yu-jen pinxit," the date corresponding to April 12, 1138.

Exactly the same date appears on the second picture to be described (pl. 2), a slightly sombre rainscape painted in ink on silk, a picture that once was in the collection of E. A. Strehlneek. This painting has so much in common with the preceding one as to both motif and style that it is tempting to think of it as a work of the same artist, just as was done by those who supplied the identi-

---

vol. 39, pl. 3; also in Nanshū ikatsu, vol. 2. Unknown collection.


19 Strehlneek shi shozōhin tenran mokuroku, "Exhibition Catalogue of Mr. Strehlneek's Collection," Tokyo (Tokyo Fine Arts Club), s.a., No. 183.

cal inscriptions. Again, scenery dominated by a gently and smoothly outlined large mountain that towers as a steep black cone against a murky sky. A whitish cloud forms a long, curved, and rather compact belt between the trees and dissolves into the sky. Again, the sloping terrain at the left with furry trees hiding a hamlet, and the reposeful rhythm of the many low banks stretching from right and left into the shallow water. As far as the rather blurred reproduction permits of recognizing details, it would seem that there are here even fewer of the horizontal Mi blobs than in the first painting.

These two works (pls. 1 and 2) pose a series of problems. Quite obviously they represent one stylistic aspect of the Mi style which is no longer found in the works of Mi's Yuăn dynasty followers such as Kao K'o-kung, Kuo Pi, or Fang Ts'ung-i. It is an aspect which, on the contrary, points to the late Northern and early Southern Sung periods, the time when the two Mi were active, an aspect that agrees with other works of the period and relieves the Mi style from the unintelligible isolation from the contemporary artistic scene.

These two paintings are distinguished by a tenderness and purity of feeling that tends to exalt the subject matter and accounts for the restraint, precision, and richness in the rendition of mountain and vapor and tree. The primary concern here is the quality of the things depicted rather than the quality of the brushwork or matters of design. On the other hand, a mountain does form part of a pictorial design and as such reveals an artistic attitude which in the light of the artistic atmosphere of the period may be understandable to us. Through the smooth and incredibly strong and
LANDSCAPE ATTRIBUTED TO MI YU-JEN, DATED 1138.
(After Chung-kuo ming-hua chi, vol. 39.)
Landscape Attributed to Mi Yu-jen, Dated 1138.
(Formerly in the E. A. Strehlneck Collection.)
LANDSCAPE ATTRIBUTED TO MI FEL.
(Freer Gallery of Art, Washington.)
Landscape Attributed to Mi Fei, Dated 1102.

(Tokyo, Nakamura Collection. After Tō Sō Gen Min meiga taikan, pl. 47.)
Landscape Attributed to Mi Yu-jen.
(After Shina Nanga taisei kaisetsu, vol. 3, pl. 13.)
Loehr

Plate 6

Landscape Scroll by Chao Lung-Jang (Detail), Dated 1100.
(After So Gen Min Shii metsa taise, vol. 1, No. 5.)
Landscape Scroll by Chao Ling-jang, Dated 1100.
Detail, Continued from the Preceding Section.
ALBUM LEAF IN FAN-SHAPE ATTRIBUTED TO LI T'ANG.
(After Sung Yüan P'ao Hui.)
graceful contour of his mountain (as in pl. 1) the painter gives us to understand that he turns away from the outworn pattern of “horrid crags” \(^{21}\) of a Fan K’uan or a Kuo Hsi. What in the recent past was a common ideal is here rejected; a lingering T’ang tradition of marvelous cliffs, sheer drops, and slanting outcrops has given way here to stillness and serenity. If these paintings belong in the period around 1100, they are revolutionary by virtue of their motifs rather than their technical extravagance.

It is not the shapes of the mountains alone through which these paintings testify to the presence of artistic consciousness and tendency; the trees, too, contrast strongly with those of earlier paintings. Instead of dramatically twisted and tortured shapes and pathetically exposed roots clawing over rocks and boulders, we see here unassuming and simple straight stems and a luxuriant foliage rendered in fine detail.

Another question that demands to be answered is how these paintings which, in their refined and almost shy technique seem all but incompatible with the broad, assured, and bold manner of the works regarded as Mi Fei’s, can at all be linked with his oeuvre. This question, of course, touches on the basic argument occasioned by the very paintings here discussed; it cannot well be answered independently. But I should like to refer to one or two specimens that are among the most widely known and important ones, viz., the “Spring Mountains with Pine Trees,” often reproduced,\(^ {22}\) and the exquisite picture of the “Rounded Hills and Leafy Trees in Mist” of the Freer Gallery (pl. 3).

The Spring Mountains (Palace Museum collection, Taiwan), which I was able to examine recently, are painted in strong colors on a very smooth and fine paper. Both the composition and the format of the small painting suggest that it formed part of a scroll that was cut up. Its original character has been spoiled by heavy retouches in colors and ink on the mountains and foreground slopes, three of the pines and the rudely redrawn or possibly inserted pavilion, one of the most disturbing features. In its original state this picture was free of the obtrusive “Mi blobs” that disfigure the contours of the mountains; it did not show the harsh and exaggerated contrast of tone in the pine trees; the clouds were gently and sensitively set off—without defined contours—against the bluish green of the hills and the delicate bluish gray of the sky. If the general effect of the picture is dull, in Sirén’s judgment,\(^ {23}\) allowance for a more pleasing and tender effect of the unretouched original should be made. It is my impression that the Spring Mountains of the Palace Museum, though of a different hand, do not fundamentally disagree with the style of the Mi Yu-jen pictures under discussion. Was the signature in the lower left corner added by the person who “made a Mi Fei” of this painting? In the Shih Ch’ü Pao Chi (ch. 40) the painting is listed as an anonymous Sung work.\(^ {24}\) This means that either the cataloguers overlooked the signature which is clearly and legibly written, or that it was added after cataloguing—a crucial assumption to make for a painting in the Imperial Collection. The Sung date of this small picture depends on the reliability of

---


the colophon written by the Sung emperor Kao-tsung (1127-62), while a seal of the collector and painter K'o Chiu-ssu should warrant at least a Yüan date.

The large and sombre silk roll of the rounded hills in the Freer Gallery (pl. 3) contrasts strongly. It is a classical example of the Mi style, executed as it is in a perfectly unified technique of quiet, broad blobs of ink, and of a lofty and reposeful design of gently swinging curves and evenly alternating light and dark areas. The mountains and trees are not reduced to mere silhouettes but are “cubic volumes with structure and three-dimensional form,” as Sirén rightly observed. This picture does not come very close to the two paintings discussed above (pls. 1, 2), and some critics are inclined to date it as late as Yüan. Even so, when compared to another work that goes under Mi Fei’s name and carries his signature and a date (corresponding to A.D. 1102; pl. 4), the picture in the Freer Gallery (pl. 3) proves to be of a different order. It is free of the slightly awkward or arbitrary shapes and the obtrusive, overly temperamental hand and callous brush of the Nakamura specimen; it shows an integrity as to the shapes and a purity of purpose such as distinguish also the two paintings attributed to the younger Mi (pls. 1, 2). The same discrepancy will be felt in the case of the “Cloudy Mountains and Solitary Pine” ascribed to Mi Yu-jen (pl. 5); the picture, close to that of the Nakamura landscape, is a far cry from that of the Freer Gallery or the two shown in plates 1 and 2. Both plates 4 and 5 are examples of what might be termed “Mi-scapes.”

23 “... looks more like a copy than an original of the Southern Sung period,” in Sirén’s opinion; op. cit., vol. 2, p. 30.
24 Ibid., p. 31.

pieces of a more or less skillful brushwork displayed through motifs rendered in the Mi manner; in the case of plates 1, 2, and 3, the artist’s concern is not primarily style or brushwork but tree, cloud, and mountain.

The two paintings of A.D. 1138 (if we were to trust the inscriptions) are perhaps less typical of the Mi style than is the majestic landscape of the Freer Gallery; they seem to be rather isolated outsiders within the Mi tradition. However, there is one curious parallel to mention, an album leaf in the shape of a round fan contained in an album called Hikkōen in a Japanese collection. This painting, showing “an inlet of water, old trees and distant mountains” in a style reminiscent of Chao Ling-jang (Chao Ta-nien) as well as Li T’ang and dating probably from early Southern Sung, surprisingly is attributed to Mi Yu-jen. Although there is not a single Mi dot in it, it somewhat recalls the landscapes in plates 1 and 2 in its fine execution, its motif of a band of fog cutting across a pine forest, and its calm and gentle mood.

The reverse instance of a painting calling the Mi school to mind but avowedly based on Chao Ling-jang is provided by a work of Shang Chi of the early fourteenth century in the Palace Museum collection. It depicts a lake with lotus flowers and mountains beyond, mountains with floating clouds done in the purest Mi fashion. But the inscription says that the painting was made after (lin) Chao Ling-jang! This example gives proof of a certain proximity of the Chao and Mi styles.

26 Formerly in the Kuroda collection, the album was published whole under the same title, Hikkōen, by Shimbi Shoin, Tokyo, 1912. See No. 47. Sirén lists this fan in his Chinese painting, pt. 1, vol. 2, p. 78, as “late Sung or Yüan.”
27 Ku Kung chou-k’an, No. 430. Cf. Ferguson’s Li-tai chu-lu hua-mu, fol. 258a. The date, barely recognizable in the reproduction, appears to read “Yen-yü, 1st year” corresponding to A.D. 1314.
much as the preceding one does—though less reliably so—by the unexpected attribution, and as the two pictures (pls. 1, 2) already suggested.

A glance at a scroll painting signed by Chao Ling-jang and dated in accordance with A.D. 1100 (pls. 6, 7) gives clear evidence of that stylistic proximity. Painted "before Mi Fei had begun to paint," this scroll contains many elements which we observed in plates 1 and 2. It depicts a remote and still scene of an autumnal forest along the banks of some narrow lake, with narrow, winding bands of fog hovering under treetops and a few huts half hidden behind trees. It is painted in a delightfully transparent manner, with a certain tempo and vibrancy in the foliage of the trees but on the whole with a noticeable restraint. The simple, straight stems of the trees, the dotted foliage—with something like Mi blobs here and there—the cluster of small huts, and especially the treatment of the atmosphere are exceedingly close to our two problematic Mi Yu-jen pictures (pls. 1, 2). But, for all its charm, the Chao scroll does not have the lofter touch of austerity, daring, and elegance of design in the two landscapes just mentioned; in the Chao Ling-jang scroll, the little things seem to matter more than grandeur of design.

Finally, a small painting ascribed to the eminent academician of late Northern and early Southern Sung, Li T'ang (1049–1130?) will be introduced (pl. 8). Mi Fei certainly was aware of Li T'ang's achievement. Li

T'ang, two years older than Mi, Director of the Academy at Pien-ching, the Northern Sung capital, could not be overlooked. Whatever Mi Fei may have thought of Li T'ang, he was a formidable and great painter who, however, did not necessarily have any influence on Mi's taste and ideals; and, as a scholar, critic, and calligrapher, Mi Fei may indeed have been far beyond the other's reach. The fan attributed to Li T'ang (pl. 8) shows a secluded gorge with two men in contemplation of a waterfall. A group of gnarly trees and a pine occupying most of the left half of the picture rises over the two figures who are gazing at the thin cascade flanked by rocks and partly hidden by a broadening band of a cloud that fills the narrow valley beyond the big trees. All this is painted impeccably, with feeling and competence. The cloud is reminiscent of what we saw in the other paintings described: it is a motif that must have been dear to the painters of that age. The same may be true of the setting that evokes a sense of the inaccessible, hedged-in and protected. For the rest, this painting is not in keeping with the love of the humble and unobtrusive that speaks of Chao's scroll, or the elegant tidiness that distinguishes the problematic Mi paintings discussed.

As further studies will perhaps enable us to come to a more definite concept of Mi Fei's contribution, it may become possible to differentiate between Mi Fei and Mi Yu-jen. For the present, an understanding of the beginnings of the Mi style is about all that can be attempted. In the light of some contemporary and later works, the two paintings with the probably false attributions to Mi Yu-jen appear to give a glimpse of what Mi Fei's original ideas were like.

31 Sung Yuan Pao Hui, Shanghai(?), 1903–(?), vol. Shu, pl. 4. Formerly in Peking, Manchu Imperial Household collection.
Kuo Pi 郭畀 was an official and scholar-painter who flourished in the first part of the fourteenth century. A native of Chenchang on the Yangtze, and a person of influence in the Hangchow area, he was on intimate terms with some of the greatest artists of his time. He seems to have been respected by them and to have been recognized to a certain degree as an artist by the Chinese, but as far as I can determine he has been completely neglected by western art historians.¹

He is not mentioned in the official history of the Yuan dynasty, the Yián shì 元史, and the extremely brief and stereotyped Chinese biographies of him say that his painting was based on the style of Mi Fu 李芾 and his calligraphy on that of Chao Meng-fu 趙孟頫.²

Admittedly a minor artist, Kuo Pi's talents surely rise above the strange evaluation of Chinese artists made by John Barrow, secretary to the 1793 Macartney embassy to Pe-

¹ I refer in general to all works on Chinese art published up to the time of this writing. Mr. James Cahill, Freer Gallery of Art, has kindly supplied me with references to several reproductions of Kuo's paintings of which I was unaware. These came from the proof of the Annotated Lists of the second part of Osvald Sirén's still unpublished Chinese painting, leading masters and principles, but I do not know if he gives any space to Kuo Pi in this part of his new work.

² Typical of these are the 50 to 60 character accounts found in Chung kuo jen ming ta ts'ao tien 中國人名大辭典, Shanghai, 1921, p. 1049, and in Ku kung chou kan 故宮週刊, No. 122, Peking, 1932, p. 3. These and other biographies seem to have originated from a common source and to have remained static. This source may very well have been the Chih shun ch'i ch'iai chih 至順稿江志, the gazetteer of Kuo's native place compiled by his friend, Yü Hsi-lu 俞希魯, around 1333. It gives only the scantiest information about him and does not include his dates.

king, when he said, "With regard to painting, they can be considered in no other light than as miserable daubers."³ Kuo Pi left an extremely interesting diary which gives considerable information on his own painting, the paintings of others, and the art world of his time in general. Although not a formal treatise on art, it seems to qualify to a certain extent as one of those works Mr. John Pope had in mind when he wrote: "Future progress will depend in great measure on how much we can find out about the circumstances under which the objects were made and on the answers to such questions as 'why?,' 'how?,' 'when?,' and 'where?' If the answers exist at all, they are to be found in the writings of the men who made and used the bronzes, paintings . . . and other objects which raise the questions in the first place. . . ."⁴ For these and other reasons it seems to me that Kuo's paintings and his diary are worthy of some attention.⁵

³ John Barrow, Travels in China, London, 1804, p. 323. Barrow was apparently disturbed by the lack of western perspective and shading in Chinese painting, but it is nevertheless difficult to understand why this diplomatic official, after having been shown important collections in Peking, maintained such a low opinion of Chinese art. On page 328 of his otherwise intelligently written work he condemns sculpture: "In a country where painting is at so low an ebb, it would be in vain to expect much execution from the chisel. . . . In the whole empire there is not a statue, a hewn pillar, or a column that deserves to be mentioned."


⁵ Kuo's diary first came to my attention 15 years ago while I was searching for information on thirteenth-century Hangchou. Although I had found reproductions of several of his paintings, I was not
The diary.—In the autumn of 1308, Kuo left Chen-chiang by boat and traveled by the Imperial Canal to Hangchou and returned home by the same means some three months later. He kept a detailed record of this trip, but the work used as the basis for this study actually covers the period from the twenty-seventh day of the eighth lunar month of the first year of the Chih Ta 熙王 period (12 September 1308) to the thirtieth day of the tenth lunar month of the second year of Chih Ta (2 December 1309). Abridged versions that are concerned primarily with the Chen-chiang-Hangchou trip have the title K'o hang jih chi 客杭日記, “Diary of a Visit to Hangchou.” ⁶ The longer version used here is called Kuo T'ien-hsi jih chi 郭天錫日記, “Diary of Kuo T'ien-hsi.” ⁷

I became interested in Kuo as an artist until 1953 when I saw an original painting by him in the Yûrinkan 官館, a privately owned museum in Kyoto. I am indebted to the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation and the American Philosophical Society whose support led to a study trip to Japan, the discovery of this painting, and the undertaking of this study on Kuo Pi. I have read papers on different aspects of this study at the meetings of the American Oriental Society in Philadelphia and the Association for Asian Studies in Boston in 1956 and 1957, respectively.

These appear in such collectanea as Chih pû tsu chai ts‘ung shu 知不足齋叢書 and Wu lin chang ku ts‘ung pien 武林掌故叢編. A third and probably also abridged edition is Yûn-shan jih chi 雲山日記 which appears in the Heng shan ts‘ao t‘ang ts‘ung shu 横山堂叢書, not available to me. A postscript to the first-mentioned edition refers to it also as Yûn-shan jih chi, so the two must be identical. Yûn-shan is a hao of Kuo’s and is probably derived from the hill of that name in his native town of Chen-chiang.

Because Kuo Pi’s journal remained in its original state for almost 500 years before the Diary was published, its transmission is of importance and will be described briefly. A short preface to the Diary written by Sung Pao-shun 宋葆淳, ⁸ throws considerable light on its bibliographical history:

The original manuscript diary of Kuo T’ien-hsi of the Yüan dynasty is in four fascicles. It begins on the 27th day of the 8th month of the first, Wu shen, year of Chih Ta and ends on the 30th day of the 10th lunar month of the second, Chi yu, year. Including an intercalary month, it covers 16 months in all, daily recording in detail whether the weather was cloudy or clear, cold or hot, social relations, and the returning of obligations. . .

He was always certain to write in most detail about wining and dining, requests for his painting and calligraphy, works of art he saw, monasteries and temples he visited. When he described things, he implied his evaluation of them; when he made emotional utterances, he illustrated his reasoning in them. One careful reading of it is like seeing into the feelings and experiences of this man and going around with him, chatting and laughing, for a period of sixteen months.

The original works by him that have been handed down are very few. These volumes are finely written in both model and running calligraphy that is remarkably close to that of Chao Meng-fu. In these four volumes of more than 30,000 characters, he made daily entries without a single careless stroke of the brush. It is truly one of the marvels of the empire.

Mr. Li Fan-hsieh 李樊樵 ⁹ made extracts from the Diary of a Visit to Hangchou, and my friend Pao Yi-wen 鮑以文, ¹⁰ published it in the first series

⁸ Sung Pao-shun (1748–1820), a minor official, scholar and landscape painter, the person responsible for preserving the complete text of Kuo Pi’s journal, was a native of An-yi, Shansi Province.

⁹ Fan-hsieh is the hao of Li E 劉鶚 (1692–1752), a prominent literary figure of the Ch‘ing dynasty. See A. W. Hummel, Eminent Chinese of the Ch‘ing Period, Washington, 1943–44, vol. 1, pp. 454–455. He was a native of Hangchou and this may explain his interest in Kuo Pi’s manuscript. His connection with it is explained in his preface to the abridged version, infra.

¹⁰ The tsu of Pao T’ing-po 鮑廷搏 (1728–
of his collections; but it was not the complete text.

In the winter of the Chi yu year of the Ch'ien Lung era (1789), I exchanged a copy of the "Ode on the Red Cliff," written by Mi Fu, in the running style, with Wang Chu-nung 汪竹農 of Yang-chou 揚州 (for the four manuscript volumes of the diary). Later it was borrowed for reading by Wu Tu-ts'un, a graduate of the same year as myself, and only last winter when I again traveled to Yang-chou I demanded its return. Making a trip to Wuch'ang 武昌 on the 19th day of the 12th month, I wrote out a second copy aboard ship and stored it in my luggage. Written by Sung Pao-shun of An-yi 安邑, New Year's Day of Chia yin year (1794), while anchored at Chiü-chiang 江上.

Two other short forewords to the Diary, both dated corresponding to 1800, tell of other (apparently complete) copies being made from the original manuscript. The second foreword is by Pao T'ing-po who had already published the abridged K'o hang jih chi in his collectiona in 1776. The preface to this latter work is by Li E and is dated in correspondence to 1725. In the spring of that year he was visiting Yang-chou. One evening while he was drinking with some friends, among them one Chiang Yen-nan 江飄南, in the Pavilion of Seven Hibiscuses belonging to Mr. Ch'eng, he was shown Kuo Pi's original manuscript remains. "Among them was the 'Visit to Hangchou' ... in one fascicle. I examined it by candlelight, and with eyes heavy from drinking, but did not remember much about it. Some ten days or so later, harboring a feeling of frustration, I strongly urged Yennan to borrow and copy it. ... He brought it to my lodging place, called for a lamp, seized a brush and wrote out a draft copy, abridging and correcting. ..." Li praises the calligraphy and the factual contents of the work very highly.

It thus appears that after Kuo Pi's manu-

script had lain in storage for about 400 years Li E was the first to reproduce it, at least in part. He had extracts made from the part concerning the trip to Hangchou made in 1724 and these were published by Pao T'ing-po in 1776 while the latter made a copy of the entire manuscript in 1800. In 1789 the original manuscript was obtained by Sung Pao-shun, in exchange for some of Mi Fu's calligraphy, and this was not published until 1912.

As a diarist, Kuo does not compare with England's Pepys in the latter's inimitable account of manners, customs, and politics, and it is most regrettable that he does not. The notices are short, and are couched in a terse and sometimes abstruse style. His diary gives the impression of having been an aide-mémoire meant for his own eyes, and it does not contain entries intended for the edification or amusement of posterity.

The Diary contains the names of innumerable people—officials, artists, priests, friends, relatives—with whom he came into contact in one way or another. And it covers a broad range of subjects: paintings shown to him by friends, mural paintings in various temples, detailed descriptions of some of these paintings, paintings done by himself and sometimes why he did them, early bronzes, ruins of the Sung palace in Hangchou, the hardships of canal travel in winter, family affairs, personal finances, food, divination, festivals, parties, games, medical matters, and many other things. In short, it gives a fair idea of the life of the scholar-artist of his times. Like diarists the world over, he also gives us a daily record of the weather. One of the most frequently mentioned subjects is that of people seeking ex-

11 This particular aspect of the Diary has been the subject of a special study. See R. C. Rudolph, Medical matters in an early fourteenth century Chinese diary, Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences, vol. 3 (1947), pp. 299–306.
amples of his calligraphy or painting, and at times he cannot refrain from admiring his own work. He makes frequent reference to Mongols, but he does not once mention the name of Marco Polo who traveled over approximately the same route between Chen-chiang and Hangchou some 20 years earlier.

Kuo’s Chen-chiang-Hangchou round trip itinerary was as follows:

1308, September 30. Left Chen-chiang. “This evening I went to Lü-ch'eng 呂城 to make the trip to Ch'ien-t'ang 錦唐” (Hangchou).

October 1. Reached Lü-ch'eng, took a small boat for Pen-niu 周牛; reached Ch'ang-chou 常州.
2. Left Ch’ang-chou by night boat for Suchou 蘇州. “There were some passengers from the north (Mongols?) who made an awful clamor until I fell asleep.”
3. Reached P'ing-chiang 龍江 (Suchou) in the afternoon.
4. Left Suchou.
5. Stopped at Ch’ang-an 長安 in the afternoon to buy food.
6. “Arrived outside the walls of Hangchou at the fourth watch (1–2 a.m.). A frosty moon filled the sky and the cold pressed upon us. We waited at the North Gate for the bells in the Chieh Tai Temple 接待寺 to sound; then we changed boats and entered the city at dawn.”

November 17. Left Hangchou on return trip; traveled at night.
18. Reached Hu-chou and took a boat that night for Ch’ang-hsing 長興.

December 28, Left Ch’ang-hsing, reached Hu-chou that afternoon.
29. Arrived at P’ing-wang 平望 at dusk.
30. “Left P’ing-wang early. A strong nor’wester arose... we shipped water and the boat rocked in an alarming manner.” Reached Wu-chiang 武江 in the afternoon and P’ing-chiang that night.
31. Left P’ing-chiang early and reached Wu-hsi 無錫 that afternoon but rice boats blocked the river and delayed anchoring until dusk.

1309, January 1. Left Wu-hsi, stopped that night at the mouth of Hsin-k’ai River 新河口. Snow.
2. Extremely cold. Left Hsin-k’ai River, reached Pen-niu and Lü-ch'eng weirs. Ice.
3. Boats frozen in the ice and cannot move but finally reached Tan-yang 丹陽.
4. Boats frozen; forced to wait overnight.
5. Reached his home. “I have been on the road for 97 days.”

He reached his home on the twenty-third day of the intercalary eleventh month of the first year of Chih Ta (5 January 1309), but the Diary has entries in it until the thirteenth day of the tenth month of the second year of Chih Ta (2 December 1309). This additional period after his return home is taken up with two trips to Yangchou (where his original diary was found), a three weeks’ visit to Hsing-hua 興化 some 60 miles up the Yangtze from his home in Chen-chiang, and trips to several other places. During this period he

12 It is of interest to note that he made this part of the long boat trip in six days. The distance from Chen-chiang to Hangchou is 780 li or about 260 miles according to D. Gandar, Le canal impérial, Variétés Sinologiques, No. 4 (1903). This work gives a detailed list of the stops along the canal between these two cities.

13 Part of this itinerary is included in an interesting study on a still earlier travel diary; unfortunately it is not complete because the greatly abridged edition of Kuo’s account was used instead of the complete text of the Diary which was published in 1912. See A. C. Moule, Hang-chou to Shang-tu, A.D. 1276, T’oung Pao, ser. 2, vol. 16 (1915), pp. 418–419.
is as much concerned with art as he was during his trip to Hangchou, and in general the entries are of the same nature.

Kuo Pi.—For information on Kuo Pi's life we must turn to the Diary itself and a preface to Kuo's writings composed by an official and friend, Yü Hsi-lu, in 1355. There are scattered references to him in other sources, but they are very scanty. There is even some question about Kuo's birth and death dates. Various sources, including catalogue cards of Chinese libraries in this country, give his dates as 1301-55. But the cataloguers and others have overlooked the simple fact that one born in 1301 would scarcely be an artist and government official—not to mention making such a trip alone and keeping a record of his relations with officials and other prominent people—in 1308. Because there is no question about the date of his diary, the birth date of 1301 is obviously incorrect.

The Diary contains considerable evidence that may be used to prove that Kuo Pi was born at a much earlier date. During one of the trips taken by him in 1309 he met an old acquaintance of his and they "spoke of the time thirteen years before" when they were last together (Diary, ch. 10, p. 12b); this would be about 1297. Four critiques written by Kuo on important specimens of calligraphy contain dates corresponding to 1285, 1289, 1291, 1292, 1293, and 1294 that relate to himself (Diary, ch. 11A, pp. 5a-7b). From another source we may deduce that Kuo was an adult as early as 1285. Chou Mi 周密 (1232-1308), in his collected notes on various art objects that he had seen, mentioned a fine T'ang dynasty lute (ch'in 筝) in a collection that had once belonged to a Kuo Pei-shan. Pei-shan was one of the style names used by Kuo, so it is highly probable that this actually was a lute once owned by him. The date of the compilation of this work is obscure, but at least we may be sure that this lute had been owned by Kuo some years before the death of Chou Mi in 1308 because it had passed into another's collection at the time it was seen by Chou. This would place Kuo's birth much earlier than the 1301 date referred to above. For example, if he had been only 20 years old at the time the lute passed to the collection noted by Chou Mi, and if the latter had seen it, say, in 1305, this would place Kuo's birth date around 1285. But we have seen above that he was collecting and evaluating calligraphy of importance at this time and we must presume he was at that time a young man. Assuming that he was at least 15 years old in 1285, the date when he acquired a fine specimen of calligraphy, then it seems reasonable to presume that he was born around 1270. This would then make him about 85 years of age in 1355, the year always given for his death, and we may also be justified in questioning this date.

In writing about Kuo, his friend Yü Hsi-lu said: "Alas! Heaven did not grant him a longer life" (Diary, ch. 11A, p. 2a). There is no doubt that this is a stereotyped expression, but it probably would not be used in speaking of an octogenarian. Moreover, the famous Yüan artist Ni Tsan 倪瓚 wrote a laudatory colophon on one of Kuo's paintings in 1363 in which he said that he and Kuo were friends for a long time and that they were parted by death "more than twenty years ago." If we take this to be 24 years, then his death would have occurred around 1339.

14 This is included in an appendix to the Diary and is cited in this paper as Diary, ch. 11A.
15 Typical of the works on which cataloguers rely for such information is the Li tai ming jen nien li pei ch'uan tsung piao 稽代名人年里碑傳緯表 (Shanghai, 1937), and this in turn is based on earlier sources. This work gives the dates 1301-55 on p. 270.
16 Yün yen kuo kuo lu 云烟过眼录 (T'sung shu chi ch'eng ed.), p. 62.
17 P'ei wen chai shu hua p'u 佩文齋书画谱, ch. 85.
There are five dated paintings of his in existence and they were done within the 12 years 1327 to 1339, and it is possible that he died shortly after this date. From this evidence we may postulate the hypothetical dates c. 1270 to c. 1339.

The preface by Yü Hsi-lu to Kuo’s writings, dated equivalent to 1355, provides us with two clues that would appear to solve the problem of his dates. In one place he says that Kuo was one year younger than himself and in another he says that Kuo was 56 years old when he died (Diary, ch. 11A, pp. 1a, 2a). Now Yü Hsi-lu was born in 1279. Thus we should be able to say that Kuo Pi was born in 1280 and died 56 years later in 1335. This terminal date has further substantiation from Yü’s preface because he says that when Kuo’s son brought his father’s writings to him, he said that his father died “over twenty years” before. But three of the paintings mentioned above bear dates corresponding to 1334, 1337, and 1339. Assuming these to be genuine, we cannot accept a death date before 1339.

Thus, in spite of this evidence, his dates are still open to question, and except for suggesting the approximate dates 1280–1340, a non possumus must be declared for the present.

Like all Chinese artists, he had several names beside the normal ones. His tsu was T’ien-hsi 天锡, and he used the names Pei-shan 北山, Yu-chih 佑之, Kuo Jan 郭駿, and Ssu-t’ui 虞退, as well as other designations which will be explained in connection with his seals. He is said to have spent very tall and of manly appearance and dignified bearing that impressed even the highest officials (Diary, ch. 11A, p. 1a). He was at one time director of classical studies in Wu-chiang 吴江 district of Suchou Fu and held other similar posts, and seems to have come from a family of means. He was one of three sons and his father was a prominent official and scholar of Chen-chiang. There is no doubt that he was an accomplished scholar, and yet he did not receive his degree although he went up for the examinations. This is explained in the flattering, posthumous account of him by his friend Yü Hsi-lu who says that Kuo finished one part of the examination so much sooner than his competitors that he became bored and spent the time talking to an examination proctor and was for this reason disqualified (Diary, ch. 11A, p. 1b).

As well as being a literatus of some standing, Kuo Pi was also something of a collector and connoisseur. He was very much the type of artist Sickman had in mind when he said “... many of the Yuan painters were in a sense cultured amateurs for whom painting was but one form of expression available. They were scholars for whom such accomplishments as poetry, painting, calligraphy, and also connoisseurship, were closely allied. The ideas portrayed in their pictures could, with perfect consistency, be reinforced by a poem executed in beautiful and expressive writing.” In this connection it is interesting to note the close affinity between some of Kuo’s poems, which sometimes sound like descriptions of paintings, and the actual paintings done by himself or others.

We have the names of some 25 paintings that were in Kuo Pi’s personal collection and some of them are of considerable interest and importance. One of these paintings had a colophon by Hui Tsung 徽宗, the last of the


19 Chih shun chen chiang chih, ch. 19, p. 3b.
21 Shan hu wang shu lu 瑚瑚網書錄, ch. 10, p. 9b, and Diary, ch. 11A, pp. 3a–5a.
22 Shan hu wang hua lu, ch. 23, p. 13b.
rulers of Northern Sung. Among the outstanding painters represented in this collection were Chao Meng-fu, Li Ch'eng 李成, and Li Kung-lin 李公麟. Wen T'ung 文同, generally called the greatest of the bamboo painters of Sung times, was represented by a painting of this type for which he is so famous. This painting was viewed with some ceremony by a number of artists and prominent people and bore several annotations of interest. One was by Li K' An 李衎, himself a well-known Yuan artist. Li K' An's son, Li Shih-hsing 李士行, wrote in 1321 that he visited Kuo Pi in order to see this painting by Wen T'ung. There are also two annotations by K'o Chiu-ssu 郭九思. An undated one says that it was in Kuo’s collection and the second annotation written in 1342 says that he and Ni T’san saw it together, but there is no mention of Kuo Pi.\(^23\)

Of what was probably a much more extensive collection, we still have the titles of 12 items that were in Kuo’s collection of calligraphy.\(^24\) Two are attributed to Wang Hsi-chih 王羲之, the greatest of all Chinese calligraphers, and one of these has a colophon by Mi Fu. Kuo also had a fairly long piece of writing by the famous seventh-century Ou-yang Hsün 陽叔本 who copied the master Wang Hsi-chih. This had formerly been in the collection of a Sung artist and Kuo’s own colophon on it is included in the appendix to the Diary (ch. 11A, pp. 7a–7b).

Art matters in the diary.—As may be expected in a diary written by an artist, there are many entries in Kuo’s journal relating to paintings, calligraphy, and objects of archaeological interest. Of these three categories paintings are most frequently mentioned, with the exception of references to his own calligraphy. Some of those that can be identified are by artists of renown while others are by people of less importance or are impossible to identify for one reason or another. But regardless of the importance of the painting or the artist, the entries regarding them are of interest because they give us a feeling of the times and the flavor of the life of the scholar-painters of the fourteenth century, and even, sometimes, they tell us why a certain picture came to be painted.

In the 16 months of 1308 and 1309 covered by the Diary there is no mention of pictures in Kuo’s own collection but there are many entries regarding paintings shown to him by others. Once, when visiting a friend, he was shown handscrolls by Hsiao Mi 小米 or Mi Yu-jen 杜仁, son of the famous Mi Fu. These were “Horses,” “Snowy Forest,” and “Walking Tiger,” copied after Li Kung-lin’s originals (Diary, ch. 8, p. 2a). Kuo stated that they belonged to “Mr. T’ai-hai 塔海,” whose name suggests he was a Mongol.\(^25\) He seems to have been unimpressed with these paintings because he made no comment on them, nor did he show any enthusiasm, as he did in other cases, but simply said that when he finished looking at them he went to the marketplace with a friend. He was much more interested in some paintings by Huang Chü-ts’ai 黃居樞, again shown to him by friends. One was “Birds in Snow,” and Kuo made the following entry regarding it: “He used a double-size silk for the painting. In a corner at the top was a golden dragon six or seven inches in length. It surrounded a gourd-shaped seal with the characters yü shu 御書 in it. Another seal read nei fu t’u shu 內府圖書. It is composed of snow with several trees and cold-looking sparrows perched here and there on them. Below are also two waggats. It is truly a marvelous object. He invited me several times to see his pictures, but only this one could


I call superior. I also saw a painting of the ragged immortal Lü Tung-pin 吕洞賓. It belongs to Secretary Ch'en. And I also saw a small scroll, from the Hsüan Ho 宜和 collection, of flying birds, but I do not dare judge it to be genuine.” (Diary, ch. 8, p. 15.) He also saw other paintings by this artist: "Today I visited Meng Yün-hsin 孟雲心 and he brought out to show me two scrolls by Huang Chü-ts'ai, "Lilies and Rocks" and “Butterflies and Cats.” They are Ts'ai Yüeh-ch'ing's 蔡月卿 things. The Huangs, father and son, in painting rocks drag the brush horizontally and seldom make circles. These strokes are colloquially called “wild magpie wings” (yeh chi'iao ch'ih 野鶴翅, Diary, ch. 9, p. 3a). Several times Kuo observed that paintings shown to him by an acquaintance actually belonged to some other person. In such cases, were the people who showed the paintings dealers?

In Hangchou he saw a painting by Li K'an: “I went to the Hsüan T'ung Taoist temple 玄同觀 to visit Wu Jo-yi 吳若道. He had other business to attend to, so . . . I was given breakfast. After breakfast was over, we went into the garden of the temple and opened the Hall of the Dipper and admired the two pines painted on the wall by Li Hsi-chai 李息齋.” (Diary, ch. 8, p. 4a). When he was in Ch'ang-chou on his way down the canal to Hangchou, he went with friends to the T'ai P'ing Temple 太平寺 to look at the wall paintings. “The water (in the paintings) was made with one stroke of the brush that wound around without a break. I stood looking at it for a long time and it was like feeling the movement of the rushing water.” What wonderful brushwork!” (Diary, ch. 8, p. 3a.) He did not give the name of the artist. Back in his native town of Chen-chiang he visited the Taoist temple Chi Hsien Kuan 楚仙觀 and admired a painting done by a priest on the wall of “a pine tree with its roots growing over the rocks.” He was asked to paint a bamboo with rocks as a mate to the pine tree. He did this, and wrote that he was quite satisfied with his work (Diary, ch. 9, p. 7b).

A painting by Hsü Tao-ning 許道寧 of Northern Sung that was seen by Kuo is of interest because there is what seems to be a similar painting by this artist in the Nelson Gallery. According to Kuo’s description (Diary, ch. 8, p. 17b), the painting has a Hsüan Ho seal on the front and annotations on the back by Hsien-yü Shu 鄭于潄, Li K'an, and Chao Meng-fu. It is called "Pleasure of Fishing in the Streams and Hills."

Among many other paintings mentioned we may note the following: T'ang dynasty: Wu Tao-hsüan's 吳道玄 painting of Nirvāṇa with nine weeping and grieving Lohans.

27 An interesting parallel to this terse description by Kuo is found in H. A. Giles, An introduction to the history of Chinese pictorial art, London, 1918, p. i18: “Another artist painted on a temple wall a kind of panorama of a mountain stream, in which there was one stroke of his brush forty feet in length. 'To stand and look at its eddying onrush made one's eyes quite dazed; while if you stood near and raised your head, you would feel a chill as though the spray were splashing on your face.' Unfortunately, Giles does not give his source, but the similarity of the two passages seems to be more than accidental.

28 Cf. Sherman Lee, Chinese landscape painting, Cleveland, 1954, pl. 12 and p. 25 where the name of the Nelson Gallery painting by Hsü Tao-ning is given in translation and without Chinese characters as "Fishing in a Mountain Stream." The title given by Kuo that is quite similar to this is ch'i shan yü lo t'u 溪山漁樂圖, and could possibly be translated this way.
KUO PI AND HIS DIARY

(Diary, ch. 11, p. 9a). Five Dynasties: Kuo visited Sheng Chi-kao 常季高, who several times showed him paintings, and there he saw two paintings by Li Yü 李煜, one of bamboos, and another of a singing thrush (Diary, ch. 8, p. 3a). Sung dynasty: (Diary, ch. 11, p. 5a) a wonderful painting of “Men and Horses” by Li Kung-lin. Four horsemen, who seem to be alive and full of spirit, are shooting bows and arrows as they ride. He was shown a group of paintings including “Wild Goose in Reeds” by Ts’ui Po 崔白 (Diary, ch. 8, p. 13b). This and several others he judged to be genuine, but the others are “all inferior” (hsia p‘in). Mi Fu is mentioned several times but only one of his pictures is specifically named. This is “Yen Mountain” 29 which he saw while visiting a friend in Hangchou (Diary, ch. 8, p. 4b), but he gave no comment on it. Although he is supposed to paint in the style of Mi Fu, he has much more to say about the latter’s calligraphy. He visited the priests of Wan Shou Ssu 萬壽寺 in Chen-chiang and was shown their sizeable collection of paintings and calligraphy (Diary, ch. 11, p. 9a). Among the various items shown to him there was an album containing four items by Mi Fu. One of these, “Lute Poem” in Mi’s own writing, seemed to impress him. Other Sung artists whose paintings he saw are Su Han-ch’en 蘇漢臣 and Chao Po-su 趙伯諧 (Diary, ch. 8, pp. 16b, 3a). Of Yuan artists, Kuo frequently mentioned Chao Meng-fu but generally as an acquaintance rather than in connection with any specific painting. Other Yuan artists mentioned are Kao K’o-kung, 高克恭 and Yang Wei-han 楊維翰. He saw a painting of an old pine tree by the former (Diary, ch. 8, p. 5a) and exclaimed, “How lovely!” It is interesting to note that this painting was mounted on a screen (p’ing pei), probably of the wooden type that one still sees in China today.

In addition to paintings, a few other objects are mentioned in the Diary that are of interest to the art historian. Almost a month after his arrival in Hangchou, he made one of the longest entries in his diary, and it included several interesting items (Diary, ch. 8, p. 9b):

... Today I strolled to the Ta Pan Jo Temple 大盤若寺. It is on the left side of Feng Huang Hill 鳳凰山 and is on the site of the old (Sung) palace, but owing to the uneven configuration of the ground one cannot determine its location. Then I went to look at the Tibetan Buddhist pagoda built by Controller General Yang. Its impressive height reaches to more than 200 feet. Stone slabs were laid around the base on which were inscribed the names of some successful candidates for the doctorate of the former dynasty. 30 There were also various decorated pieces of stonework from the former palace including reliefs of dragons and phoenixes; they were all spread out on the ground in disorder. Because the hill was steep and the wind cold, I did not wish to examine these things in detail so I descended. I next went to the Wan Shou Tsun Sheng Pagoda and Temple which were also constructed by Yang. The Buddhist images in the Main Hall were all of Tibetan appearance. They had red bodies and were standing in attendance, and although gold had been used to decorate them they did not have a naturalistic feeling. At the door stood four granite columns on which were very finely carved writhing dragons. And there was still a bronze bell there on which was cast “beginning of the Shun Hsi 淳熙 period (1174).” The inscription in seal characters is still preserved. 31 These are all ancient things. ...
According to Marco Polo, the former Sung palace buildings were in good repair when he visited this site approximately 20 years before Kuo, and he gives a glowing description of their size, excellent condition, and decorations. Their rapid destruction, if we take both of the accounts at face value, was due in part to Controller General Yang mentioned by Kuo. This is the infamous Yang-lien Chen-ch’ieh, a Tibetan priest who was put in charge of Buddhist affairs in this area by the Mongols. Kuo must have known of his wanton destruction of Sung monuments but said nothing of this in the Diary, perhaps for fear of reprisal. From other sources we learn that when Controller General Yang started to build the pagoda mentioned by Kuo, sometimes called the White Pagoda, he selected a site in the former palace grounds and proposed to use for building purposes the stone slabs on which the texts of the Classics in the writing of the Sung Emperor Kao Tsung were engraved. He did take some of the Stone Classics for this purpose and only stopped his destruction of this important monument because of the strenuous objections of a high official, Shen-t’u Chinh-yüan 申屠致遠. He had already destroyed 11 of these engraved slabs when he was forced to stop, but he and his followers went on to destroy numerous other stone monuments for their own purposes.

Frustrated in his attempt to reduce this literary monument to building material, in 1284 Yang proceeded to plunder and desecrate the tombs of the emperors of the Southern Sung dynasty, which were located near Hangchou in the Shao-hsing and Ch‘ien-t’ang areas. According to the standard history of this period, his depredations extended even to the ministers of the emperors and he is said to have broken into 101 tombs in all and to have gathered great wealth in gold, silver, jade, and other materials from them. This event is said to have started a general wave of tomb plundering, so that “in the whole empire there was no tomb that was not opened.” These and other acts so outraged the Chinese sense of propriety that the hatred engendered by Yang remained in the minds of the people for at least two and a half centuries. This feeling was manifested around 1560 when an official of that region caused his statutes to be destroyed. But Kuo is also silent on this matter.

A detailed account of this set of Stone Classics, including an inventory of the 86 stones remaining around 1800, may be found in Liang che chin shih chih 兩浙金石志 (1824), ch. 8, pp. 5b–34a. The stones were moved from time to time and this source quotes one writer who says more damage was done through the moving than was done by Yang. Another detailed and similar account is given in Chin shih ts’ui pien 金石萃編, ch. 148, pp. 5a–19a. For a recent, comprehensive survey of all sets of Stone Classics, see Li tai shih ching k’ao 晉代石經考, Peking, 1930.


Kuei hsin tsu shih 奏幸雜識 (Hsüeh chin t’ao yüan 學津討原 ed.), hsü chi, shang, pp. 34b–35b.

Tokiwa Dajö and Sekino Tadashi, Shina bunka shiseki, Tokyo, 1939, vol. 4, p. 9. This work also gives a running account of Yang’s depredations, paissim, and the present condition of the Sung tombs, pp. 118–121.
According to the *Diary*, there was a great amount of temple building going on in 1308 and 1309. Whether this was brought about through destruction wrought by the Mongols in their conquest, or whether this was due to their patronage of Buddhism, is not clear. But there are many entries in Kuo's record that speak of pagodas or temples as "just finished," and newly constructed Buddhist images. Wall paintings (whether done directly on the plaster or on silk or paper which is applied to the wall, we do not know) are frequently mentioned in connection with specific temples but very little information is given about them. While in Hangchou, he visited a new Taoist temple in order to see 24 newly done wall paintings (*Diary*, ch. 8, p. 6a).

As far as Kuo Pi's own paintings are concerned, Ferguson lists 22 or 23 that are recorded in Chinese art literature but none of these can definitely be identified as paintings mentioned by Kuo in 1308 and 1309. At least 11 of his paintings are still in existence.

We must assume that the recorded and existing paintings form only a fraction of his total output. The very first entry in his diary says that he painted an ink bamboo which was "rather extraordinary" (*Diary*, ch. 8, p. 1a), and he mentioned many other paintings done by himself but hardly ever gave details about them. A few of his entries about his paintings give us some insight into the man. "I painted a Ying stone for Mr. Chan. The stone was less than a foot long and six or seven inches high. It was truly unique and wonderful, a perfect composition without any retouching. When it was finished we called the painter Wang Sheng to come and see it and we drank from coconut wine ladles until after midnight when I became drunk" (*Diary*, ch. 10, p. 10b). When he stopped in Ch'ang-hsing on his return to Hangchou, he went to a friend's home "to see a scroll of a Lohan. Then we went to the guest house to see a painting I did (some time before) of two pines and a mountain stream in the snow ... and all acclaimed me a master painter" (*Diary*, ch. 1, p. 16a). One day in Hangchou, friends brought 10 fans and asked him to write on them and the next day another "sent me some paper and begged me to paint and write something for him. But because I am somewhat piqued I shall wait for one or two days before putting brush to paper" (*Diary*, ch. 8, p. 10b).

Gifts were sometimes offered to Kuo along with requests for his calligraphy or paintings, but not knowing the relative social or economic value of these things in Yüan times we do not know just how his friends judged his ability. He is often asked to paint or write when being entertained at the home of a friend, and sometimes friends bring a jar of wine to Kuo's place and in return he paints or writes for them. But two presents of food appear to have been offered as inducements for him to comply with such requests; these were 10 catties of dried fish and a cooked goose.

He mentions a number of paintings by himself on the walls of temples and they seem to have been done in a spontaneous manner whenever it struck his fancy. Returning from Hangchou he stopped over at Ch'ang-hsing and on his first day there he writes: "I visited Kuang Fu Temple. A priest kept me for tea and I painted a scene of bamboos and rocks on one of the walls" (*Diary*, ch. 8, p. 13a). One day after his return to Chen-chiang he was "sitting around with nothing to do," so he went to P'u Chao Temple and painted a pine tree on the wall of a pavilion (*Diary*, ch. 10, p. 6a).

The 11 paintings attributed to Kuo Pi that still exist are:

1. Misty Mountains (fig. 1a and 1b).
   Handscroll; ink on paper; L. 53"; H. 10¾".
   Signed Kuo Pi T'ien-hsi (fig. 7a).
   Dated Ting mao year, 10th month, 24th day (7 December 1327).

---

Seals of artist, Chin-ch'eng Kuo Shih and Kuo Pi T'ien-hsi; nine others.

This painting is in the Yūrinkan Museum, Kyoto; reproduced in Yūrin taikan, vol. 2 (1929), pls. 49–50; the last half only is in Hsi yü so ts'ang Chung-kuo ku hua chi (Shanghai, 1948), No. 5, pt. 1, sheet 37.

2. Monastery in Misty Mountains.

Signed.

Dated in correspondence with 1330.

Reproduced in Shina Nanga taisei, pt. 9, pl. 35.

3. River Landscape after Rain (fig. 2a).

Hanging scroll; ink on paper; L. 53"; W. 18".

Signed Kuo Pi T'ien-hsi (fig. 8a).

Dated Yüan T'ung 2d year, 1st month, 7th day (11 February 1334).

Seals of artist, Chu-fang Kuo Pi; 15 others.

Ex Hayashi coll., Tokyo, now J. D. Ch'en, Hongkong; reproduced in Kokka, No. 412, and Harada, Pageant of Chinese painting, Tokyo, 1936, pl. 307.

There is a detailed description in Chuang t'ao ko shu hua lu, ch. 7, pp. 70b–71a, of a painting that is either this one or one very much like it, but this gives rise to several questions. The title is given as "Misty Mountains in the Style of Mi Fu"; this offers no difficulty because it does describe the painting well enough and two almost identical titles appear in Ferguson's list mentioned above. Still another title, "Summit Hills after Rain," is given in Kokka, although no Chinese title can be seen in the reproduction. But titles are frequently given by connoisseurs to paintings that bear no formal title, and in general the titles of Chinese paintings are used so loosely that this cannot be used for a basis of judgment. But there are some specific discrepancies between the seals as described in Chuang t'ao ko shu hua lu and those appearing on the painting reproduced in Kokka. In several cases the descriptions tally with the seals shown in Kokka. But there are twice as many that differ, either as to red on white or white on red, location of the seal on the painting, or presence or absence of a seal. The seals of two nineteenth-century collectors appear on the picture in Kokka, but are not mentioned in the description in Chuang t'ao ko which was published in 1937.

Mrs. P. K. Mok, curator of the Chinese-Japanese library at UCLA, has kindly drawn to my attention the present owner's description of this painting. It appears in Chin kuei tsang hua p'ing shih 金匮藏畫評釋 (Hong Kong, 1956), vol. 1, pp. 96–97. Here Kuo Pi's seal is correctly given as Chu-fang Kuo Pi, while it is incorrectly given in Chuang t'ao ko shu hua lu. Unfortunately, the reproduction given by the present owner is too poor for close comparison with the earlier ones.

4. River Landscape (fig. 2b).

Hanging scroll; ink on paper; L. 49½"; W. 17½".

Signed T'ien-hsi (fig. 8b).

Dated 3rd year of Chih Yüan, 9th month, 1st day (25 September 1337).

Seals of artist, K'uai hsüeh chai, and Chu-fang Kuo Pi; eight others.

Collection of Chang Hsüeh-liang; reproduced in Sögen minshin meiga taikan, Tokyo, 1931, pl. 70.

5. Illustration of Kao Shih-ch'in's Poem (fig. 3a).

Hanging scroll; ink on paper; L. 32"; W. 12".

Signed Kuo T'ien-hsi (fig. 9a).

Dated Chi mao year, 4th month, 6th day (14 May 1339).

Seals of artist, none distinguishable; 20 others.


Kao Shih-ch'in was an official under the Eastern Chin in the early fourth century. The two lines from his poem that inspired this painting are in Kuo's writing at the right edge of the picture.

6. Bamboo (fig. 4).

Handscroll; ink on paper; L. 19¾"; H. 12¼".

Signed Kuo Pi T'ien-hsi (fig. 9b).

Seal of artist, Kuo Pi T'ien-hsi; 23 others.

Ex Emperor Ch'ien Lung's collection; reproduced in Loan Exhibition of Chinese paintings...
Fig. 1a—Misty Mountains

Fig. 1b—Misty Mountains
Fig. 2a—River Landscape after Rain.

Fig. 2b—River Landscape
Fig. 3a—Illustration of Kao Shih-chün's Poem.

Fig. 3b—Mountains and Trees in Mist.
Fig. 4—Bamboo.
Fig. 5a—Bamboos in Snow.

Fig. 5b—Bamboos in Snow.
Fig. 6—Cloudy Mountains after Mi Fu.

Fig. 6a—River Landscape in Mist.
Fig. 7a—Signature, Misty Mountains, Kuo Pi T’ien-hsi.

Fig. 7b—Signature, Cloudy Mountains, T’ien-hsi.
Fig. 8a—Signature, River Landscape after Rain, Kuo Pi Tien-hsi.

Fig. 8b—Signature, River Landscape, Tien-hsi.
Fig. 9a—Signature, Illustration of Kao Shih-chun's Poem, Kuo T'ien-hsi.

Fig. 9b—Signature, Bamboo, Kuo Pi T'ien-hsi.
Fig. 10a—Signature, Mountains and Trees in Mist, T'ien-hsi.

Fig. 10b—Signature, River Landscape in Mist, Kuo Pi T'ien-hsi.
organized by Frank Caro for the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology, Toronto, 1956, No. 14. This painting is now in the possession of Frank Caro, successor to C. T. Loo, and is probably the only painting by Kuo Pi in the western hemisphere.

The painting has a poem on it by the Emperor Ch’ien-Lung, signed and dated 1762, and is followed by four colophons. One of these is by Tuan T’ien-yu 段天佑 (1260–1341) who is mentioned by Kuo in his Diary (ch. 10, p. 5a). Tuan uses the period name Chih Shun (1330–33). At the left edge of the painting Kuo says that he did it for the “head priest of the assembly hall,” without any indication of the name of the priest or the temple of which the hall was a part. But there can be little doubt that it was done for a priest named 伏虎林 Fu Hu-lin who is mentioned some 15 times in the Diary, generally in conjunction with the title used in Kuo Pi’s inscription. He was a member of the Kan Lu Temple in Chen-chiang. In the seventh lunar month of 1309, Kuo Pi “had dinner in Fu-lin’s quarters in Kan Lu Temple. The wine, although not plentiful, was extremely strong, and several drinks made one tipsy” (Diary, ch. 10, p. 13b). Four days after having dinner with the priest, Kuo Pi sent him a landscape that he had painted (Diary, ch. 10, p. 14a), and several months later the priest brought paper to Kuo and asked him to write something for him (Diary, ch. 11, 10a).

7. Bamboos in Snow (fig. 5a and 5b). Handscroll; ink on paper.
   Signed Kuo Pi. Differing considerably from his other signatures, the name may have been placed there at a later date to identify it.
   Seals: None of Kuo Pi; 19 others and a signed poem of Emperor Ch’ien Lung.
   Collection of Chinese National Government; reproduced in Ku kung chou k’an, Nos. 122–123.

8. Cloudy Mountains after Mi Fu (fig. 6a). Handscroll; ink on paper.
   Signed T’ien-hsi (fig. 7b).
   Undated.
   Seal of artist, Kuo Pi T’ien-hsi; six others.
   Reproduced in Chin t’ang sung yün ming ch’ing ming hua pao chien.

9. Mountains and Trees in Mist (fig. 3b).
   Hanging scroll; ink on paper.
   Signed T’ien-hsi (fig. 10a).
   Undated.
   Seals of artist, Chin-ch’eng Kuo Shih, and Kuo Pi T’ien-hsi; seven others.

10. River Landscape in Mist (fig. 6b).
    Handscroll; ink on paper.
    Signed Kuo Pi T’ien-hsi (fig. 10b).
    Seal of artist, Chu-fang Kuo Pi; 12 others.
    Reproduced in ibid., pl. 199.

11. Old Tree and Bamboo.
    Handscroll; ink on paper.
    Signed Kuo T’ien-hsi.
    Seal of artist, Kuo Pi T’ien-hsi; six others.
    Ueno collection, Ashiya.

The majority of the seals of Kuo Pi appearing on the accompanying illustrations are composed of his various names and are quite obvious, but several need a word of explanation. The upper seals in figures 1a and 3b begin with the words Chin-ch’eng; this is a poetical name for Chen-chiang, and here the common practice of putting the name of one’s native place before his name is observed. In figure 8b, the upper seal reads K’uai hsüeh chai, the name of Kuo’s study. The expression Chu-fang appears in seals in figures 8a, 8b, and 10b; this was at one time the name of the south gate in the city wall of Chen-chiang and Kuo probably lived near it.

In conclusion, one may say that Kuo Pi, in common with some other Yuan painters, continued the Northern Sung tradition in landscape painting, and that the oft-repeated assertion that he followed Mi Fu’s style is substantiated by some of the existing paintings such as figure 1.
POSTSCRIPT

After the preceding essay had been read in final page proof, Mrs. Mok brought to my attention a new acquisition of the University of California, Los Angeles, Chinese library which is of considerable importance to this study. It is entitled Kuo T'ien-hsi shou shu jih chi, and was published in Shanghai in June 1958. It contains a facsimile reproduction of 52 folios of Kuo's original manuscript diary, a title page with three annotations, and a colophon. In addition to this, there is a modern postscript and a collation of the manuscript with the different printed editions. This new material, with a plate from Kuo's manuscript, will be the subject of a note in a future issue of Ars Orientalis.
NOTES

DATATION DES TISSUS COPTES
EN FONCTION DES MOSAIQUES
MEDITERRANEENNES: PRECISIONS NOUVELLES

La comparaison des sujets représentés sur les tissus coptes avec ceux qui ornent les mosaïques méditerranéennes des premiers siècles de l’ère chrétienne s’impose à l’esprit. Elle a été utilisée d’abord par A. F. Kendrick, lequel, en 1920, s’efforçait de constituer comme une première catégorie de tissus coptes, ceux où il pouvait déceler une influence hellénistique; puis par M. Dimand qui, en 1924, l’instaurait formellement par l’étude systématique des motifs parallèles et de leurs origines. Mais bien des données manquaient alors concernant les mosaïques et, dans le rapprochement avec les tissus coptes, ou bien il fallait placer tel ou tel tissu à l’intérieur d’une période aussi longue que un ou même plusieurs siècles, ou bien des marges d’erreur considérables subsistaient. Un certain nombre de ces données nous ont été apportées récemment par l’ouvrage magistral de Doro Levi sur les mosaïques d’Antioche, sorte de somme sur les mosaïques en général, dont on ne semble pas avoir tiré parti jusqu’ici pour la datation des tissus coptes.

C’est ce que je voudrais faire, en dégageant les points établis par l’auteur lui-même, puis en déterminant à partir de ces bases une chronologie plus précise en ce qui concerne quelques groupes de tissus coptes antérieurs au septième siècle après J.C.

Ce sont là des bases solides, et dont l’importance est d’autant plus grande qu’elles peuvent servir de point de départ pour des recherches d’une plus grande extension que celle à laquelle on songerait en premier lieu.

Sans doute, en effet, peut-on dès lors abandonner un certain nombre d’approximations dont on se contentait généralement et assigner une date précise et sûre aux pièces exactement semblables, par leurs motifs caractéristiques, à celles qui ont été dégagées dans notre première partie.

On peut voir, dans le tableau qui suit, le rapprochement établi par Doro Levi entre une mosaïque de la House of Porticoes (fig. 11) et les portraits sur tissu de Nil et Gê (figs. 12 et 13) au Musée de L’Ermitage. Dans les deux cas, un buste est figuré, dont la tête est présentée de trois-quarts et qui est encerclé dans une guirlande de lauriers traités dans un style naturaliste. La date assignable à la mosaïque autorise Doro Levi à placer le tissu en 190 ap. J.C. La ressemblance reste assez grande avec un panneau carré (fig. 14) du Victoria and Albert Museum pour que nous considérons celui-ci comme étant de la même date, bien que Kendrick le range aux quatrième–cinquième siècles. Il s’agit encore d’un buste présenté de trois-quarts dans un cercle tracé à l’intérieur d’un carré, dont les bords sont ornés d’entrelacs dessinés à la navette volante.

2 Die Ornamentik des Aegyptischen Wollwirkereien, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1924.
4 Kendrick, op. cit., pl. XII, en bas, à droite.
TABLEAU DES RAPPROCHEMENTS INSTITUÉS PAR DORO LEVI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sujets</th>
<th>Doro Levi</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tissus Coptes</th>
<th>Lieu de conservation</th>
<th>Éléments communs</th>
<th>Datation des tissus jusqu'ici adoptée</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Portraits</td>
<td>1. House of Porticoes t. 2, pl. XIX, b (fig. 11)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Nil et Gé (figs. 12 et 13)</td>
<td>Ermitage</td>
<td>Lauriers de style naturaliste</td>
<td>III : s. ap. J.C. (K. et D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fleurs entrelacées</td>
<td>2. House of Porticoes t. 2, pl. XCIX, a (fig. 1)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>K. pl. XXIX, no. 199, (fig. 2)</td>
<td>Victoria and Albert Museum</td>
<td>Fleurs entrelacées</td>
<td>IV : V : s. (K.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sujet géométrique</td>
<td>4. House of Dionysos and Ariadne, t. 2, pl. C 1, a (fig. 4)</td>
<td>220–230</td>
<td>Cp. (fig. 5)</td>
<td>Collection privée</td>
<td>Losanges, contenant un carré coin en haut et disposés autour d'un carré côté en haut</td>
<td>IV–V : (K. pl. XI, 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Poissons</td>
<td>5. Building under Bath F, t. 2, pl. LXII, a (fig. 6)</td>
<td>310–330</td>
<td>Collection Guimet</td>
<td>Musée des Tissus (Lyon) et Louvre (fig. 7)</td>
<td>Ombre sous les poissons</td>
<td>épisode alexandrin, III :–IV : (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cailles</td>
<td>6. Building under Bath F, t. 2, pl. LXI, c (fig. 8)</td>
<td>310–330</td>
<td>K. pl. XXIV, No. 177</td>
<td>Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 9) et Louvre (fig. 10)</td>
<td>Plumes stylisées</td>
<td>IV : V : (K.) hellénistique (Pf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Néréides</td>
<td>7. Bath E, t. 2, pl. CLXIV, b (fig. 15) et Musée du Bardo (Tunis)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Louvre T.C. 38</td>
<td>Louvre (fig. 16)</td>
<td>Corps disloqué</td>
<td>V : (Pf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sujet géométrique</td>
<td>8. Mosaic of Ananéosis (fig. 20)</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>K. pl. XXVII, No. 188 (fig. 23) et D. pl. X 34, (fig. 24)</td>
<td>Victoria and Albert Museum, Lund et Louvre</td>
<td>Carrés coin en haut alternant avec carrés disposés côté en haut</td>
<td>III–IV : (K.) III–V : (D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rinceaux</td>
<td>9. House of the Worcester Hunt (fig. 27)</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>D. pl. XV, 54 (fig. 29)</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Feuilles couchées de trois quarts et renfermant animal ou fruit</td>
<td>III–V (D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Abréviations utilisées :
  K = Kendrick, op. cit. t. 1.
  D = Dimand, op. cit.
  Cp. = Collection privée.

On voudra bien se reporter à l'ouvrage de Doro Levi pour tout ce qui concerne la datation des mosaïques elles-mêmes laquelle est fortement approximative.

Il va sans que dire certains motifs ne sont pas limités dans le temps à la date de leur apparition et ne suffisent point, à eux seuls, à dater les monuments qu'ils décorent. Mais, s'ils sont assez caractéristiques et joints à d'autres, ils forment avec ceux-ci autant d'indices dont l'accumulation fournit une base valable de datation.
Fig. 6—Antioche, Building under Bath F (LXII, a).

Fig. 7—Musée du Louvre.

Fig. 8—Antioche, Building under Bath F (LXI, c).

Fig. 9—Victoria and Albert Museum.
(D'après Kendrick, I, pl. XXIV).

Fig. 10—Musée du Louvre. (D'après Pâster, pl. 8).
Fig. 11—Antioche, House of Porticoes (XIX, b).

Fig. 12—Tissu de Nil et Gé, Musée de l’Ermitage. (D’après Dimand.)

Fig. 13—Tissu de Nil et Gé, Musée de l’Ermitage. (D’après Dimand.)

Fig. 14—Victoria and Albert Museum. (D’après Kendrick, I, pl. XIV).

Fig. 15—Antioche, Bath E (CLXIV, b).

Fig. 16—Musée du Louvre, T. C. 38. (D’après Pfister, pl. 19).
Fig. 17—Victoria and Albert Museum. (D'après Kendrick, I, pl. XI).

Fig. 18—Musée du Louvre. (D'après Příšer, pl. 6).

Fig. 19—Musée du Louvre. (D'après Příšer, pl. 6).

Fig. 20—Antioche, Mosaic of Ananéosis.

Fig. 21—Tissu d'Une Tombe d'Hawara. (Fl. Petrie.)

Fig. 22—Collection Privée.
à l'intérieur de caissons, ceux-ci séparés par des feuilles de lauriers de style très proche de celles de la mosaïque d'Antioche et des médaillons de l'Ermitage.

Conformément à une méthode dont nous avons esquissé ailleurs les grandes lignes, nous voudrions aller plus loin. Dès lors, en effet, qu'un motif caractéristique est daté, il y a chance pour que les motifs importants qui l'accompagnent soient de même époque. De proche en proche, on peut ainsi assigner à une même période tout un groupe de tissus dans lequel la dernière pièce, quoique entièrement différente de la première, est finalement liée à celle-ci, grâce à tous les intermédiaires, et par conséquent justifiable de la même date. C'est ce qui va apparaître si nous reprenons plusieurs des tissus déjà mentionnés.

Un exemple frappant est celui que fournit le corps disloqué des Néréides dans les mosaïques de la maison Bath E d'Antioche (fig. 15) et les nombreux tissus copiés qui reproduisent ce motif (fig. 16). La date de Bath E est 330. Et elle permet de restreindre les marges de datation: quatrième-cinquième siècles, généralement données aux tissus correspondants. Mais un panneau carré (fig. 17) du Victoria and Albert Museum que nous permet d'assigner cette date ainsi précisée à d'autres tissus qui ne comportent pas de Néréides. Ce panneau présente sans doute une Néréïde au centre et une autre dans chaque coin. Mais celles qui occupent les angles rentrants sont séparées par des cercles à fond sombre où s'épanouissent des fleurs à allure de roues dentées. Ces fleurs d'un genre spécial ornent les côtés d'autres panneaux carrés, cette fois au Musée du Louvre, dont le centre est occupé, non par une Néréïde, mais soit par un cavalier (fig. 18), soit par un danseur (fig. 19). Elles permettent de placer vers 330 ces tissus datés par Pfister des quatrième-cinquième siècles.

La mosaïque d'Ananéosis (fig. 20), dont le décor est formé de carrés placés alternativement le côté ou le coin en haut, est datée par Doro Levi des environs de 450. Un tissu rond offrant le même motif (fig. 21) et trouvé avec une pièce de monnaie par Fl. Petrie dans une tombe d'Hawara est à placer vers 340. Nous pouvons dès lors rapprocher de ces deux dates un tissu d'une collection privée (fig. 22), où l'ensemble du motif est présenté sous forme d'étoile par combinaison des deux positions (côté ou coin en haut) des carrés et successivement préciser celle d'un tissu du Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 23) que Kendrick 10 attribue aux troisième-quatrième siècles et celles des trois tissus de Lund (figs. 24, 25, 26) que Dimand 11 attribue aux deuxièmes-cinquième siècles. Les deux derniers (figs. 25, 26) se relient au motif des carrés par la présence sur le premier (fig. 24) du motif du câble conjointement à celui des carrés.

Parmi les mosaïques de la House of Worcester Hunt, datées par Doro Levi de 530 ap. J.-C., se trouve un motif qui n'apparaît qu'à partir de cette époque, celui de feuilles de rinceaux couchées de trois-quarts et tenant un oiseau, un quadrupède ou un fruit (fig. 27). De cette date confirmation est donnée par un ornement semblable, dûment daté, de l'église de la Nativité à Bethléem (fig. 28). Il est donc indiqué de corriger les attributions imposées par Dimand 12 à trois tissus (figs. 29, 30, 31), les deux derniers, dans lesquels la feuille se stylise, étant même à placer plus bas dans le sixième siècle. Mais le dernier (fig. 31) nous autorise à placer à la même date (fin sixième) deux tissus où évoluent

8 Kendrick, op. cit., pl. XII en haut, à droite.
9 Pfister, op. cit., pl. 6.
10 Kendrick, op. cit., pl. XXVII, No. 12.
12 Ibid., pl. XV, 54; pl. IV, 8, 7.
des danseurs de même facture, bien qu'on n'y retrouve point la feuille couchée de trois-quarts, l'un d'une collection privée (fig. 32), l'autre au Musée du Louvre (fig. 33), ce dernier placé pourtant par Pfister 13 aux quatrième-cinquième siècles. Celui-ci nous apporte d'ailleurs une confirmation : sur les côtés du panneau carré, au centre duquel évoluent deux danseurs, se suivent des cercles à fond sombre (alternant avec certains à fond clair et ornés d'autre façon) où s'épanouit la fleur épanouie que nous avons vue plus haut associée à une Nérèide. Mais ici, cette fleur, qui déploie de même ses six pétales, est stylisée au point d'apparaître réellement comme une barre de timonier. Cette stylisation nous invite à placer ce tissu beaucoup plus bas que ceux où la même fleur, plus proche de la nature, est associée à d'autres sujets, et donc vraisemblablement au début du septième siècle.

* * * *

L'étude des mosaïques méditerranéennes nous permet donc non seulement de préciser, mais même de corriger bon nombre d'attributions antérieures en ce qui concerne les tissus coptes qui vont du deuxième au septième siècles. L'écart, en effet, peut aller, on l'a vu, du deuxième au quatrième, ou même, du deuxième au septième siècles. La sécurité qui s'attache, semble-t-il, à ces nouvelles datations fournirait les bases nécessaires pour fixer dans le temps d'autres tissus à première vue différents, mais que l'on est autorisé à leur relier.

On s'aperçoit, en outre, devant le dernier groupe analysé, que certaines dates sont à descendre plus bas qu'on ne s'y attendrait : des sujets d'allure proprement hellénistique, par le motif aussi bien que par le style, sont en fait de la seconde moitié du sixième siècle, s'ils ne sont pas du début du septième.

Cette constatation confirme, à propos des nombreux tissus coptes que l'on plaçait aux septième-huitième siècles, l'abaissement général des dates, pouvant aller jusqu'au douzième siècle après J.C., que j'ai proposé ailleurs.14

PIERRE DU BOURGUET

KA'BAH-FLEISEN

Im Jahre 1934 hat R. Ettinghausen1 einen Aufsatz über Die bildliche Darstellung der Ka'ba im islamischen Kulturkreis veröffentlicht,2 in dem er auch auf die türkischen Fliesen des siebзehnten und achtzehnten Jahrhunderts, die Darstellungen der Ka'bah zeigen, eingehend und sieben Beispiele bringt.3 Diese Liste hat K. Otto-Dorn 1941 um sieben weitere Stücke vergrössert.4 Damit ist der Bestand nicht erschöpft. Ich habe in den letzten Jahren 24

13 Pfister, op. cit., pl. 7.


1 Ich möchte ihm die folgende Notiz widmen als Zeichen langjähriger wissenschaftlicher Verbundenheit und als Dank für seine aufopfernde Arbeit als Herausgeber der Ars Islamica V–XVI und der Ars Orientalis I/II.

2 Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Neue Folge, vol. 12 (1934), S. 111 ff. (im Folgenden zitiert: Ettinghausen.)

3 No. 5 (Abb. 4), 1662 datierte Fliese, damals in Berliner Privatbesitz, heute daselbst Staatliche Museen; No. 6, Fliese des gleichen Typs auf der Zitadelle in Kairo (Abb. bei Prisse d'Avennes, L'Art arabe, Paris, 1877, Text Abb. 46); No. 7, Panneau aus sechs Fliesen, damals in der Sammlung A. E. Benaki, Alexandria, heute im Musée Benaki, Athen, (Abb. bei G. Migeon, Exposition d'art musulman, Alexandria, 125, Tafel 24 b); No. 8 (Abb. 5), 1726 datierte Fliese im Museum of Islamic Culture in Kairo; No. 9 Panneau aus 12 Fliesen, Ende achtzehntes Jahrhundert (Abb. bei Prisse d'Avennes, 2, Tafelband, pl. 111); ausserdem werden die beiden Fliesen im Louvre und im Victoria and Albert Museum S. 116, Anm. 1 erwähnt.

4 Das islamische Iznik, Istanbuler Forschungen,
neue Beispiele gefunden, zu denen noch 5 Fliesen mit der Darstellung von Medina 5 und ein Panneau mit der Wiedergabe des Mahmals kommen.6 Auch die Fliesen mit den Fussspuren des Propheten, von denen ich drei Exemplare kenne,7 dürften in diesen Zusammenhang gehören.8 Ich werde in absehbarer Zeit kaum die Möglichkeit finden, mich mit dem Thema, das ja mehr kulturhistorisch als kunsthistorisch interessant ist, zu beschäftigen. Um nicht zu den vielen Akendeckeln, die ich habe, einen neuen "brachliegenden" hinzuzufügen, möchte ich hier einen kurzen Hinweis geben, der vielleicht jemanden anregt, sich der Sache anzunehmen. Es würde mir eine Freude sein, ihm mein Material an Photos und Notizen zur Verfügung zu stellen.

Von den vierzehn bisher bekannten Beispielen, waren neun in Abbildungen zugänglich.9 Das genügte, um zu zeigen, dass es sich um zwei Gruppen handelte, eine im dritten


5 Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi; Kairo, Museum of Islamic Culture; Aya Sofya (neben der Fliese A 10); im Harem des Top Kapı Sarayı und in der Sammlung Nomico in Alexandria.

6 Istanbul, Top Kapı Sarayı, Harem.


Nach meinen Angaben hat meine Schülerin Muazzzez Diker das Material, so weit es sich in türkischen Museen befindet, zusammengetragen.

Vergl. die Angaben im folgenden Katalog.


15 Kat. No. A 3, A 4, A 5, A 6, A 7, A 8, B 8, B 9, C 1, C 2, C 3, D 1, D 2.


17 Kat. No. C 3, D 5.
Für die vorläufige typologische Einteilung, die hier nur vorgenommen wird, um, da es nicht möglich ist, alle Stücke zu veröffentlichen, einen Überblick zu geben, spielt es keine Rolle, ob es sich um eine einzelne Fliese, oder um ein Panneau handelt.18 Die gleichen Typen, so grob wie sie hier geschildert werden, kommen bei beiden vor. Bei der Trennung der Typen ist die Angabe der Gebäude im Hof, die ja topographisch festliegt, zunächst von sekundärer Bedeutung.19 Das gegebene "Leitmotiv" sind in diesem ersten Stadium der Ordnung die Minare, die entweder radial ausstrahlend ausserhalb der riwaq (Gruppe A), innerhalb bzw. ausserhalb stehend (Gruppe B) oder von diesen Ecken radial nach innen gerichtet (Gruppe C) wiedergegeben werden.

GRUPPE A


No. 1 (Abb. 1). Deutscher Privatbesitz. Einzelfliese. 31 x 51 cm., ungewöhnlich ausführliche Beischriften.

No. 2. Istanbul, Top Kapi Sarayı, Bibliothek (früher Betasaal Ahmet's I). In die Mauer eingelassen. Einzelfliese, 30.5 x 52.5 cm., spärliche Beischriften.

No. 3. Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi (Inv. No. 527). Einzelfliese, 33.5 x 61.5 cm. (soll aus einer Moschee am Edirne Kapi stammen).

No. 4. Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi (Inv. No. 828). Einzelfliese, sehr ähnlich No. 3, unten beschädigt. 37 x 44 cm. (aus der Süleyman Subaşı Cami in Eyüp).

No. 5. Istanbul, Top Kapi Sarayı Müzesi (Inv. No. 539). Einzelfliese, 34.5 x 56 cm., die Farben teilweise in die Glasur geflossen.

No. 6. Istanbul, Top Kapi Sarayı Müzesi (Inv. No. 541). Einzelfliese, 32 x 61 cm., ähnlich No. 7 und 8.

No. 7. London, Victoria and Albert Museum (Inv. No. 427-1900). Einzelfliese, 38.7 x 61 cm.21

No. 8. Paris, Louvre (Inv. No. 3919, aus der Sammlung Soslin Doréquey). Einzelfliese, 35 x 59 cm.22

No. 9. Istanbul, Kunsthandel. Einzelfliese, 34 x 52 cm., im Schriftfeld das bismillah.


18 Erwähnt bei Ettinghausen S. 116, Anm. 1.
22 Erwähnt bei E. Mamboury, Stambul, Reiseführer, Istanbul, S. 263; Otto-Dorn, S. 141 liest die Inschrift Tabaqzade Mehmed Beg aus Iznik und das Datum 1053/1643; Abb. bei Nurettin Can Gulekli, Hagia Sophia, Turkish Press, Broadcasting and Tourist Department, ohne Erscheinungsjahr, ohne Tafelnummer, im Text nicht erwähnt.
Abb. 1—(A. 1) Deutscher Privatbesitz.

Abb. 2—(B. 2) Istanbul, Top Kapi Sarayi, Haram, Karaağaçlar Mescidi.

Abb. 3—(B. 4) Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi.
Abb. 4—(B. 8) Bursa, Müzesi.

Abb. 5—(B. 12) Niğde, Murat Paşa Cami, Qiblawand.

Abb. 7—(C. 6) Kütahya, Ulu Cami, neben dem mihrab eingemauert.

Abb. 6—(C. 1) Bursa, Müzesi.

Abb. 8—(D. 1) Bursa, Müzesi.
Yeri Mehmet Bey al-Iznigi al-Jundi und das Datum Anfang rajab 1053 = September 1642.

GRUPPE B

Im Hof unten links ein, rechts zwei schlanké Minare, zwei weitere rechts aussen neben dem Hof und je eines aussen an den Ecken der oberen Schmalseite des Hofes, alle stehend.


24 Abb. bei B. Miller, Beyond the sublime port. The Grand Seraglio of Istanbul, New Haven, 1931, opp., S. 66; erwähnt bei Tahsin Şükrü Öz (s.o. Anm. 4); danach bei Otto-Dorn, S. 141. (P.S. Ein sehr ähnliches Stück wurde kürzlich dem Museum of Islamic Culture in Kairo geschenkt. Es besteht ebenfalls aus 60 quadrateischen Fliesen und misst 145 x 240 cm. Es ist 1087 H. (beg. 16. III. 1676) datiert und trägt unten rechts die Beischrift “Medrese Sultan Suleyman”).

25 Nach freundlicher Lesung von Albert Dietrich, nach dem die beiden letzten Worte auch umgestellt werden können.


Diese drei Panneaus gehören eng zusammen und sind von einer Hand. Sie dürften für die Stellen gearbeitet sein, an denen sie sich noch heute befinden.

No. 4. Istanbul, Türk ve Islam Eserleri Müzesi (Abb. 3) (Inv. No. 830, aus der Çelebi Sultan Mehmet Camii in Bursa), 54 x 81 cm. Aus 64 Fliesen von 27 x 27 cm. zusammengesetzt. Einfache Variante von B 1–3. Im Hof links aussen ein, rechts aussen zwei Minare übereinander, zwei weitere an den Ecken der oberen Schmalseite des Hofes, alle stehend.

No. 5. Athen, Benaki Museum. 49.5 x 73 cm. Besser erhaltene, sechseiliges Panneau vom gleichen Typ wie No. 4.


No. 8. (Abb. 4). Bursa, Müze. Einzelfliese. 35 x 35 cm. Im Hof zwei Minare, aussen je zwei Minare übereinander. Die Inschrift lautet nach freundlicher Lesung von Albert Dietrich: Şâhib al-khayrât Yağıği Hasan ‘an qaryat Qar(a?)sılı Yenîşhehir. (aus dem Dorf Qarşal


28 Die aber hier keine Koranverse enthält, sondern die Überschrift: Ka’bah al-sharifah.
im Bezirk Yenisehir) Datum 1085 (beginnt 7. IV. 1674).


No. 10. Üsküdar, Solaksinan Cami, neben dem mihrāb eingemauert, Einzelfliese, 26.5 x 26.5 cm. Gleicher Typ wie B 9, nur ist im Hof ein drittes Minar angegeben.

No. 11. Küre, Hoça Şemseddin Cami, neben dem mihrāb eingemauert. 50 x 100 cm. Aus acht Fliesen zusammengesetzt. Im Hof stehen links ein, rechts, zwei Minare, wie bei B 1-3, aussen nur je ein Minar.

No. 12. (Abb. 5). Niğde, Murat Pacha Cami, in die Qiblawand zusammen mit B 7 eingemauert, oben und unten etwas gestossen. 23 x 25 cm. Die Anordnung der Minare im Hof wie bei B 11, die der Minare ausserhalb des Hofes wie bei B 6-10.

No. 13. Istanbul, Yeni Valide Cami, an der dikkah neben dem nordwestlichen Pfeiler, aus einem Stück, etwa 30 x 30 cm., Typ B 6-10, aber mit perspektivischen Elementen bei den Säulen am Umgang und den Kuppeldächern der riwaqs.

GRUPPE C

Bei dieser Gruppe sind die riwaqs nicht angegeben, und in den Ecken des Hofes ist je ein Minar diagonal nach innen gestellt. Zwei weitere stehen unten, eines an der rechten Seite, alle im Hof.

No. 1. (Abb. 6). Bursa, Müze. Einzelfliese, 30 x 30 cm.
No. 2. Berlin, Staatliche Museen Inv. No. 6220. Einzelfliese, 28.5 x 36.5 cm., datiert 1073 (beginnt 16. VIII. 1662).
No. 6. (Abb. 7). Kübah, Ulu Cami, rechts vom mihrāb eingemauert. Einzelfliese, 41 x 41 cm. Das ganz abweichende Stück ist aus dem achtzehnten Jahrhundert und steht zwischen den Gruppen C und D.

GRUPPE D

Mit perspektivischer Wiedergabe der Ka‘bah.
No. 1 (Abb. 8). Bursa, Müze. Einzelfliese, 30 x 30 cm. Achtzehntes Jahrhundert, vielleicht aus der Manufaktur von Tekfur Saray.

No. 2. Kairo, Musée Arabe. Einzelfliese, 29 Abb. bei Ettinghausen, S. 115, fig. 4; erwähnt bei Otto-Dorn, S. 141, Anm. 3.
31 Erwähnt bei Ettinghausen, S. 115, No. 6.
32 Otto-Dorn, S. 141.
Masse unbekannt, signiert von Muḥam-
mad al-Shāmi, datiert 1139 (beginnt 29.
VIII. 1726).
No. 3. Istanbul, Cezerī Kasīm Paşa Cami,
rechts vom mihrāb eingemauert. Pan-
neau aus 6 Fliesen von je 25 x 25 cm. 
Albert Dietrich liest: Sāḥib al-khayrāt
(?) wa al-ḥṣān (?) ‘Uṯmān ibn
Ahmād. Das Datum ist 1138 (beginnt 9.
IX. 1725).
No. 4. Istanbul, Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa Cami,
in der Qiblawand eingemauert. Panneau
aus 16 Fliesen, mit der Rahmenleiste
100 x 100 cm., wohl aus der Bauzeit der
Moschee 1732–34. Arbeit der Fabrik
von Tekfur Saray.
No. 5. Prisse d’Avennes, pl. II, CXI (mir
nicht zugänglich). Nach Ettinghausen
aus zwölf Platten, Ende achttzehntes
Jahrhundert, also wohl zur Gruppe D
gehörig.
Unter diesen 34 Beispielen kommen, so
weit ich sehe, acht datierte Stücke vor. In der
frühen, in Iznik entstandenen Gruppe die
Jahre 1643 (A 10), 1660 (C 4), 1662 (C 2),
1663 (B 9), 1666/7 (B 1), 1675 (B 8), in
der späteren Gruppe das Jahr 1725/6 (D 2,
D 3), Acht Beispiele tragen Namen, von
den fünf (A 10, B 8, B 9, C 4, D 3) Be-
sitzer, d.h. wohl Stifternamen sind. Bei
dreien (B 1, B 2, D 2) wäre zu untersuchen,
ob es sich um Besitzer- oder Handwerker-
namen handelt. Nur bei einer (B 9) ist es
sicher, dass wir die Signatur des Verfertigers
haben, da sie neben einem Stifternamen steht.
K. Otto-Dorn wird also Recht haben, wenn
sie in diesen Fliesen fromme Stiftungen sah.
Auffallend ist, dass bei den bedeutendsten
Stücken (Gruppe A) mit der Ausnahme von
A 10, keine Daten oder Stifternamen vorkom-
men, dagegen bei geringeren Stücken (B 8,
B 9, C 2, C 4). Schon Ettinghausen hat diese
Fliesen mit den Handbüchern der Mekka-
Pilger in Verbindung gebracht. Es wäre eine
reizvolle Aufgabe, nach den Vorbildern zu
suchen. B 1–3 sind zweifellos Sonderanfer-
tigung. Bei 4–13 ist mit mindestens fünf ver-
dichten Vorlagen zu rechnen, und auch die
Gruppen C und D sind keineswegs einheitlich.
Überhaupt gibt es, das ist erstaunlich, da man
bei solchen von Stiftungen, die sicher
einst in die Hunderte gingen, mit Serienfa-
brikation rechnen möchte, keine zwei wirklich
identischen Stücke. Selbst bei A 1 bis A 10, die
auf denselben Prototyp zurückzugehen schei-
nen, sind die Abweichungen, besonders in den
Beispielen, erheblich. Wie erklärt sich das?
Gab es so viele Varianten von Pilgerbüchern
desselben Grundtyps oder legten die Stifter,
die wohl alle in Mekka waren, vielleicht Wert
darauf, eigene Notizen verarbeitet zu sehen?
Ich habe den Eindruck, dass das Material für
den Hajj, so weit er im siebzehnten und acht-
zehnten Jahrhundert von der Türkei aus ging,
kulturhistorisch recht interessante Auskünfte
verspricht.

KURT ERDMANN

FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE
WADE CUP

In the following note a number of observa-
tions are presented which either supplement
or correct statements in the writer’s earlier
article on the footed bowl in the Cleveland
Museum of Art, now called the "Wade Cup." 1

1 R. Ettinghausen, The "Wade Cup" in the Cleve-
land Museum of Art, its origin and decorations, Ars
Orientalis, vol. II (1957), pp. 327–366. For other
information about the piece see D. S. Rice, The
Wade Cup in the Cleveland Museum of Art, Paris,
P. 329 B: The two staggered rows of roundels on the outside of the footed bowl in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, No. 91.1.542, originally were not left undecorated as most of them appear nowadays. When this piece was turned to a different position in the museum’s show case, some of the roundels on the lower part showed traces of silver-inlaid multiple swastikas which probably once decorated all these units.

P. 332 B: To the group of Islamic copper- or silver-inlaid bronze or brass vessels which are undated, but earlier than A.D. 1148, a dated piece can now be added: the bronze eagle of the year 105 H./723–724 in the Hermitage in Leningrad. According to R. Kessati there are silver wires for details on its body, while Mehmet Aga-Oglu states that “its neck is decorated with engraved and silver inlaid bands of kufi inscriptions and scrolls. . . .” Unfortunately, no good photographs of sections of this piece, nor even of the whole object, have been published to allow an examination of this inlay work.

P. 342, n. 27: The combination of fish and bird occurs also in the border of the late sixteenth-century “Cassirer Carpet” in the Islamic Department of the Berlin Museum; here the fishes form the wings of the birds (E. Kühnel, Ein neuerworbener Tieretteppich, Berliner Museum, N. F., vol. 7 (1957), p. 8, figs. 1–3); the same phenomenon is found in a related fragment in the Hermitage (loc. cit., fig. 4).

1955. The designation “A” or “B” after the page references in the following text refers to the first (A) or second (B) column of the respective pages in the original article.

2 R. Kessati, The bronze figure of an eagle (in Russian), Soobshcheniia Gos. Ermitazha, No. 1 (1940), p. 12. The writer is grateful to Mr. George Soulis for a translation of this passage.


4 P. 343 B: The first important occurrence of the tripartite vase with flower sprays on a Khorasanian metal object is in the top figural frieze with persons engaged in drinking and various forms of entertainment that is found on the Bobrinsky Bucket made in 559 H./1163 in Herat.

6 P. 345, n. 34: The assumption that the combination of bird and fishes “stands for the sun and water” is supported by the well-known connection of the bird with the sun on the one hand, and the way in which the sun is said to rise from the sea or a well in descriptions of the Shâh-nâmeh. As for the identification of sun and bird, two passages in the Shâh-nâmeh can be quoted which have so far not been considered in this connection: There is the first passage in which the Magi test Zâl with difficult questions. In one of these he is asked about the meaning of two tall cypress trees on which a bird nests, on one in the morning and on the other at eve, and whose departure causes the leaves to dry up and whose arrival turns them green. In explanation, the cypress trees represent the two lighter and two darker seasons of the year and “the bird which flieth ’twixt them is the sun.” The picture of the sun as a bird is also evident in the following expression; “When the radiating sun spread its wings. . . .” Finally, Professor Rozunfar of the University of Teheran was kind enough to inform me

5 N. I. Vesselolfski, A bronze vessel from Herat, dated 559 H./A.D. 1163 (in Russian), St. Petersburg, 1910, pls. I and V (at the left of group 20).


Fig. 1—Detail of Cassope, Mychael.
(Victoria and Albert Museum 1.M. 8-1925.
Photograph by Stuart C. Welsh, Jr.)

Fig. 3—Bowls Offered to Muhammad (Detail).
(Topkapi Sarayi Museum,
Hazine 2154, fol. 2a.)

Fig. 4—Detail of Cassope, Mychael.

Fig. 5—Mamluk Enamelled Glass Bowl.
(Possession of Mr. Wilhelm Henrich, Frankfurt am Main.)

Fig. 2—Vaso del Torata. (After Lanci.)

Fig. 2—Vaso del Torata. (After Lanci.)
that the metaphors *morgh-e zarrin par, simorgh-zarrin par*, or *tā’ūs zarrin par* ("the gold feathered bird, simorgh or peacock") are used for the sun, i.e., in the *Divān* of Khāqānī (twelfth century).

A rather late, but still valuable, iconographic document showing the association of bird and sun is the design in the canopy over the head of the enthroned Timūr in a Mughal miniature which also shows Bābur, Homāyūn, and three courtiers; here the bird with outstretched wings is right in the center of the sun (fig. 4). The miniature in the Victoria and Albert Museum (No. I.M. 8–1925) is of the fourth decade of the seventeenth century.

On the other hand, there are some early Islamic sculptural representations of birds which have wheel or rosette designs on their chest. The best known is the Umayyad incense burner in the form of a hawk in the Berlin Museum (F. Sarre, *Bronzeplastik in Vogelform. Ein sasanidisch-frühislamisches Räuchergefäß*, Jahrbuch d. preuss. Kunstsammlungen, vol. 51 [1930], p. 162, fig. 4). This bird is covered with a braided all-over pattern whose central circle is filled with a rotating motif, a kind of multiple swastika, while other circles have smaller rosettes or a star, birds, and, interestingly enough, realistically rendered rabbits (for this combination of rosette and rabbit, see p. 344 B). Another smaller example is a solid bronze falcon which has a rosette on its chest; this is also in the Berlin Museum.

The passages describing sunrises have been collected by Paul Horn; not having available the editions he used so as to trace the various references and to give an English translation of them, I am quoting Horn’s German versions after the Turner Macan and Leiden editions:

"Als die Sonne aus den Fischen ihre Krone zeigte, und das Ehrengewand aus Elfenbein über die Erde hinbreitete. . . ."  

"Als die Sonne aus dem wallenden Meere heraufeilte. . . ."

"Es kam ein gelbes Schiff aus dem Wasser herauf. . . ."

"Als die Sonnenquelle aufwogte und die Köpfe aus dem Schlaf wach wurden. . . ."

"Einen Strahl warf die Sonnenquelle. . . ."  

"Als die Sonne ihr Banner aus dem Meere erhob, und die dunkle Luft poliert ward. . . ."

"Als die Sonne ihr weisses Banner aus dem Meere erhob, und die Sterne keine Hoffnung mehr auf die Finsternis setzten."  

P. 345 ff.: Various forms of the sun motif appear on many other pieces: The straight symbol of the sun with radiating strokes;  the combination of the triple-faced sun and the ring of fishes (fig. 1); or of a star with surrounding fishes (fig. 2).  

P. 351 A: Professor Schuyler Cammann made the following pertinent comment with which I now fully agree: "Four birds or animals undoubtedly represent the rising sun, the sun at zenith, the setting sun, and the sun beneath the earth (or waters) on its way back to rise again. That is why solar systems are so often in cross-form, or in multiples of four. It is the rotation of the sun in its course that is important, and not the rotation of the seasons (in this case), although there may possibly have been a secondary interpretation to

---

10 Zaky M. Hassan, *Some Persian lustre ceramics in Dr. Ali Pacha Ibrahim’s collection*, Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University, vol. 9 (1947), pl. 9, fig. 18.  
12 *Ibid.*, pl. 30, No. 2, after which our figure 2 is made.
this end,—seasonal symbols are generally shown outside the Cosmic diagram or in its outer portions."

P. 355: It now seems fairly certain that the star represents the sun, especially in the combination with fishes as, for instance, in the interior of the Vescovali Cup. For this combination see also the star created by circular segments filled with fishes and bird heads (fig. 2) which has its parallel in the wheel design with bird heads and fishes in the center of the writer's metal bowl. A Mamlûk enameled glass bowl shows the curious transformation of the symbolic fish part into something realistic. The center still has the characteristic six-pointed star as in the Vescovali Cup, but the fishes around it are no longer strictly in line, as they are part of a seascape in which some boats are sailing (fig. 3). In any case, Muslim cosmographers of the Middle Ages regarded the sun as the biggest star.

P. 359: The genesis and growth of anthropomorphic writing is more complex than hitherto assumed, but it can probably be explained out of the Zeitgeist of the period and by the milieu in which the earliest pieces were made. This problem will be discussed in a special paper soon to be published as its ramifications go beyond the scope of this note.

P. 361 B: The date of the basin in Berlin whose Arabic inscription is quoted should be "about 1300 or early fourteenth century." Professor Giorgio Levi Della Vida kindly suggested the following rendering of the quoted verse: "May destiny and the spheres in their course never cease removing misfortunes from you." He also suggests that the second lâ must be omitted since it spoils the kâmîl meter and makes no sense.

P. 366 A: The footed bowl was apparently also used as a drinking cup. Golden cups of this shape are offered, apparently with various drinks, to the Prophet in a miniature from a Mi'râj-nâmeh (fig. 5), probably painted about 1330 by Âlûmâd Mûsâ. The realistic decoration of fishes would fit such a usage (see also p. 352 A). If the bowl has this function, its designation was probably kâseh. Such a vessel is mentioned by Hâfez who speaks of a kâseh-ye zar (golden bowl) or a sefâlin kâseh (pottery bowl); he also juxtaposes kâseh with the cranial bowl and he uses the term kâseh-ye chashm (eye socket). The word was probably used for a bowl-like vessel, whether it had a foot or not; but even if it served as a drinking cup at times, it was also used as a sweetmeat dish, especially the covered version.

Richard Ettinghausen

NEUE ISLAMISCHE BERGKRISTALLE

Die islamischen Bergkristallarbeiten haben in den letzten Jahren viel Beachtung gefunden. Ein wenig liegt das wohl daran, dass die

13 Ettinghausen, op. cit., fig. 17.
14 Said to have been found in the Imperial Palace in Peking. Formerly Bourbe-Borrows collection, now in the possession of Mr. Wilhelm Henrich in Frankfurt am Main. The piece was exhibited in the Victoria and Albert Museum from 1931 to 1938. An iconographically related glass fragment with a central rosette and a seascape with a rowboat in the area around it is in the Islamic Collection of the Berlin Museum (C. J. Lamm, Mittelalterliche Gläser und Steinschnittarbeiten aus dem Nahen Osten, Berlin, 1929, vol. 2, pl. 165, 7.

Der in Abb. 1 wiedergegebene Flakon ist zwar seit 46 Jahren publiziert, aber der Spezialforschung offenbar bisher entgangen. Er befindet sich in der Stiftskirche in Gandersheim und ist mit einer Höhe von 112 mm eines der grössten Stücke dieser Art. Der L 1½". No. 98: Two Fāṭimid carved rock crystal bibelots. 11-12 cent. One in the form of a fish, the other a floriform tearbottle. L. 1½" and 1¼". No. 99: Fāṭimid rock crystal ornament with carved stellate mushroom finial, and a cylindrical bottle carved with floriated volutes. L. 1¼" and 2¼".

13 Some rock crystals of the Fāṭimid period, British Museum Quarterly (1955), S. 84-87.
15 Karl Steinacker, Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler des Kreises Gandersheim, Wolfenbüttel, 1910, S. 144, Abb. 89 als "byzantinisch, erstes Jahrhundert."

Der zweite Flakon (Abb. 3) war 1956 auf der iranischen Ausstellung in Rom.24 Er gehört dem Nationalmuseum in Teheran 25 und Metropolitan Museum (Lamm, Taf. 68, 18) etwa 130 mm.

18 Steinacker (s. o.) nimmt an, dass die Fassung 1697 entfernt wurde.
19 So z. B. Lamm, Taf. 68, 4, 12, 18; 70, 6, und Erdmann (s. o. Anm. 3) Abb. 8, 9, 17.
20 R. Pinder-Wilson (s. o. Anm. 14) pl. 33, a.
21 K. Steinacker (s. o. Anm. 16) "Jetzt ist das Fläschen umgekehrt auf einen Holzzapfen gestülp t, der durch eine schlichte, 7,2 cm. breite Glasskugel geht und auf einer ebenso kunstlosen kupfernen, mit vier Anheftern versehenen Fusscheibe befestigt ist."
22 das. "crux in qua habetur de ligno dominis una cristallina; vs cristallinum cum scrinio argenteo; cristallinum; calices; cristallini cum patenis; ampula cristallina."
24 Nicht im Katalog verzeichnet.
25 Nach liebenswürdiger Auskunft von Herrn Di-rektor Mostafawi, der ich auch für die Publikationserlaubnis zu danken habe. Danken möchte ich auch Herrn Professor Mario Bussagli und Herrn Dr. E. A. Voretzsch in Rom, die mir behilflich waren, den Besitzer des Stückes ausfindig zu machen.
27 Lamm, Taf. 68, 15.
28 Director-General of Antiquities, Sr. Exellenz Dr. Naji al Asil möchte ich an dieser Stelle aufrichtig danken für seine vielfache Unterstützung während meines Aufenthaltes in Baghdad.
29 Zu danken habe ich dem Inspector General of Excavations, Herrn Dr. Fuad Safar.
Abb. 1—Bergkristallflakon, Gandersheim, Stiftskirche (mit Erlaubnis des Landesamtes für Denkmalpflege, Braunschweig).

Abb. 2—Bergkristallflakon, London, British Museum, Department of Oriental Antiquities (mit Erlaubnis des Museums).

Abb. 3—Bergkristallflakon aus Gurgan, Teheran, National Museum (mit Erlaubnis des Museums).
Abb. 4—Bergkristallflakon aus Wasit, Bagdad Museum (mit Erlaubnis des Directorate-General of Antiquities).

Abb. 5—Rest eines Bergkristallflakons, als Anhänger montiert. The Wellcome Historical Medical Museum of London (mit Erlaubnis des Museums).

Abb. 6—Abgearbeiteter Bergkristallflakon, Köln, Max Baron von Oppenheim Stiftung (mit Erlaubnis der Universität Köln).

Abb. 7—Bergkristallflakon, Braunschweig, Herzog Ulrich Museum (mit Erlaubnis des Museums).

Abb. 8—Bergkristallflakon, ehemals im Stadtmuseum Dresden.

Abb. 9—Knauf des ungarischen Szepters, Budapest, Burg.

Abb. 10—Fragment eines Bergkristallgefasses, Berlin, Museen (mit Erlaubnis der Islamischen Abteilung).

Abb. 11—Bergkristallflakon aus Nishapur, Besitz A. Rabenou, Teheran.

Abb. 12—Bergkristallnapf aus Nishapur, Besitz A. Rabenou, Teheran.

Abb. 13—Bergkristallflakon, Madrid, Museo Arqueologico Nacional.
Ganay, Paris sind.\textsuperscript{30} Wie diese wird man das Baghdader Stück in vorfatimidische Zeit setzen müssen.\textsuperscript{31}

Während ich mit der Zusammenstellung des Materials beschäftigt war, schickte mir Mrs. E. Ettlinger die Photographie eines Kristallanhängers im Wellcome Historical Medical Museum in London \textsuperscript{32} (Abb. 5), der 1911 von Dr. W. L. Hildburgh in Nürnberg erworben wurde.\textsuperscript{33} Bei dem 45 mm. grossen Stück handelt es sich um den unteren Teil eines Flakons, den man, obwohl er weder Dekor Kristalle wurden also als Schmuckstück, vielleicht auch als Amulett,\textsuperscript{34} weiter verwendet.

Bei dieser Gelegenheit möchte ich auf ein lange bekanntes, aber verkanntes Stück hinweisen (Abb. 6). Das scheinbar walzenförmige Gefäß hat eine Höhe von 29 mm., der obere Durchmesser beträgt 18.5 mm., der untere 19 mm. Die röhrenförmige Durchbohrung liegt nicht genau in der Mitte. Sie ist oben 8 unten 6.8 mm. weit. Die Wandung trägt eine kufische Inschrift, die dem Besitzer Segen wünscht. Etwa 10 mm. unterhalb dieser

\begin{center}
\textbf{ABB. A—BERGKRISTALLFLAKON AUS WASIT. ISLAMISCHES MUSEUM, BAGHDAD. (Courtesy of the Directorate-General of Antiquities.)}
\end{center}

noch charakteristische Profile hat, doch wohl als islamische Arbeit wird bezeichnet dürfen. Die silberne Fassung zeigt Blattornamente, die sie in das siebzehnte oder achtzehnte Jahrhundert datieren. Selbst beschädigte Inschrift finden sich Reste eines Profils. Das Stück war 1910 aus dem Besitz von Professor B. Moritz in München ausgestellt \textsuperscript{35} und wurde in den "Meisterwerken" abgebildet.\textsuperscript{36} Danach

\textsuperscript{30} Lamm, Taf. 77.
\textsuperscript{31} K. Erdmann, "Fatimid" rock crystals, Oriental Art, vol. 3 (1951), S. 142–146.
\textsuperscript{32} Mrs. Ettlinger war auch so liebenswürdig, mir verschiedene wertvolle Auskünfte zu geben.
\textsuperscript{33} Dem Direktor des Museums Mr. E. Ashworth Underwood danke ich verbindlich für seine Auskünfte und die Erlaubnis, das Stück zu veröffentlichen.
\textsuperscript{34} Nach Auskunft von Mrs. Ettlinger enthält die Ausbohrung Spuren eines schwarzen Pulvers. Die Fassung schliesst das Gefäß völlig ab.
\textsuperscript{35} Amtlicher Katalog No. 2083.
hat Lamm es in einer Zeichnung in sein Buch aufgenommen,\textsuperscript{37} wo er es als "winziges, zylindrisches Gefäß, dessen Mündung als oben abgefasster Wulst gebildet ist" beschreibt. Das Stück ist heute im Besitz der Max Baron von Oppenheim Stiftung im Orientalischen Seminar der Universität Köln.\textsuperscript{38} Eine Untersuchung des Originals ergab, dass es sich um den oben und unten abgeschliffenen Rest eines Flakons von geläufigem Typ (Abb. 7) handelt.\textsuperscript{39}

Als letztes sei auf das eine der 1930 von W. Holzhausen publizierten Stücke\textsuperscript{40} hingewiesen (Abb. 8), das in Form und Dekor abweicht. Es ist gedrungener als die anderen Flakons\textsuperscript{41} und seine Wandung zeigt nicht wie sonst üblich vegetabilen oder Schriftdekor, sondern die Figuren zweier Löwen, die, so weit die Photographie es erkennen lässt, Ähnlichkeit mit den Löwen des ungarischen Szepters (Abb. 9) haben.\textsuperscript{42} Ein Löwe könnte auch auf dem Wandungsfragment eines bauchigen Gefäßes in der Islamischen Abteilung der Berliner Museen dargestellt sein (Abb. 10).\textsuperscript{43} Das Stück misst 24 × 40 mm. und hat eine Wandung von 4 mm. Dicke. Die Stege der Figur sind 2 mm. hoch. Tiere in Relief kommen bei den Bergkristallarbeiten in erster Linie bei Henkelkannen vor.\textsuperscript{44} Ich habe das Berliner Fragment lange nicht in der Hand gehabt, nach meiner Erinnerung ist es zu klein und zu stark gewölbt, um von einer solchen stammen zu können.\textsuperscript{45}

KURT ERDMANN


\textsuperscript{37} Nach Abschluss des Manuskripts sah ich in Teheran im Besitz von Herrn A. Rabenou vier weitere Bergkristallarbeiten, die nach seiner freundlichen Auskunft in Nishapur gefunden sind. Die beiden ersten, ein ovalen Schlöchlen von 32 × 26 mm., das an die bootförmigen Gefässe der sasanidischen Tereutik erinnert, und ein massiver Knauf in Sternform dürften kaum islamische Arbeiten sein, dagegen sind es die beiden anderen Stücke wohl sicher. Das 85 mm. hohe grössere (Abb. 11) ist ein stark beschädigter Flakon von normaler Form, der anscheinend vier Füsse in der Art der "Backenzahnflakons" hatte und dessen ziemlich hoch angebrachter Palmettdekor etwa dem des Flakons im Schnügten-Museum in Köln (Lamm, 68, 12) entspricht. Der gebrochene Hals hat drei Ringe und ist achtzackig facettiert. Das kleinere ist ein 30 mm. hoher Napf (Abb. 12) von 35 × 35 mm. Seitenlänge und einer 15 mm. messenden kreisrunden Öffnung, der auf jeder Seite eine rechteckige Vorlage hat, die unten etwas vorspringend als Fuss dient und mit einer Halbpalmetten endenden Ranke verziert ist. Mir ist kein zweites Gefäss dieser Form bekannt. Das in Abb. 13 wiedergegebene 120 mm. hohe Stück im Museo Arqueológico Nacional in Madrid, an das mich Herr Professor Kühnel aufmerksam machte und dessen Photo mir Dr. K. Brisch besorgte (beiden herzlichen Dank) ist bei Gómez-Moreno, Arq Hispaniae, Bd. 5, Taf. 403 abgebildet. Die bei Lamm, Taf. 74 und Taf. 78 abgebildeten 20 Bergkristallarbeiten der Sammlung Harari sind inzwischen in den Besitz des Museum of Islamic Culture in Kairo übergegangen. Dieses besitzt außerdem einen zylindrischen Flakon ähnlich dem Stück Lamm, 74, 5, einen herzförmigen Flakon ähnlich Lamm, 74, 1, ein etwa 7 cm. hohes, achtseitiges, undeckiertes, durchbohrtes Prisma und einen 8 cm. grosser kugeligen Knauf mit 2 cm. breiter Durchbohrung und einem Zickzackband, dessen sechs Felder gegenständig angeordnete Segenswünsche in kufischem Duktus tragen. Dieses Stück ist grösser als die ähnlichen Knäufe in Bamberg, Berlin, Budapest und Essen (Lamm, 75, 7–10) und in seiner ornamentalen Ausstattung Unikum. Der Aufsatz von José Camon

\textsuperscript{38} Der Aufsatz von József Camon

\textsuperscript{39} In meinem o. Anm. 5 genannten Aufsatz Abb. 9.

\textsuperscript{40} Ich kenne das Stück nicht im Original, offenbar sind Hals und Fuss beschädigt, aber auch wenn man beide ergänzt, bleiben die Proportionen ungewöhnlich.

\textsuperscript{41} Lamm 75, 9. Die in Abb. 9 wiedergegebene Aufnahme verdanke ich Herrn Dr. Kelleher in Kansas City.

\textsuperscript{42} 6372, in Kairo erworben.

\textsuperscript{43} Lamm, Taf. 65–67; K. Erdmann, Die Fatimidischen Bergkristallarbeiten. In Forschungen zur
BOOK REVIEWS

THE ICONOGRAPHY OF UMAYYAD COINAGE


The publication of the second volume of John Walker's new catalogue of Islamic coins in the British Museum provides an opportunity to draw to the attention of scholars not generally familiar with numismatics the significance of coins as documents of Islamic history, archaeology and, to a certain extent, art. The two volumes here taken under consideration contain a large body of more or less precisely datable material which is of prime importance to political historians and which cannot be ignored by students of early Islamic iconography. All of the first volume and a large part of the second are concerned with transitional coin types deriving in the first instance from Sasanian and Byzantine prototypes. The nonspecialist may perhaps be under no obligation to make detailed use of the 570-odd catalogue pages, but the 71 excellent plates, taken in conjunction with the 265 pages of introduction, fully justify the presence of these volumes in the working library of every serious student of early Islamic history and art.

Several considerations have prompted the compilation of a new catalogue of the Islamic coins in the British Museum's Department of Coins and Medals. In the first place, Stanley Lane-Poole's monumental 10-volume Catalogue of Oriental Coins, published between 1875 and 1890, is out of print and virtually unobtainable. Second, since 1890 there have been many additions to this great collection. Furthermore Lane-Poole's catalogue omitted entirely the important Arab-Sassanian class, while the Arab-Byzantine was relegated to the first volume of additions (Vol. IX), unaccompanied by any discussion or elucidation of the iconography. Since the coins of both these categories are relatively rare and are of uncommon interest, Dr. Walker made the wise decision to expand the two volumes far beyond the scope of simple catalogues into virtual corpora. The Arab-Sassanian volume contains references to literally every published coin of this class so that only in rare instances does even the specialist have to consult the scattered works of the pioneers in the field (Mordtmann, Thomas, Tiesenhausen, etc.). So also with the Arab-Byzantine and post-reform Umayyad volume, although in these categories the number of published specimens being very much larger the author has quite understandably restricted the number of references. In order to make the record as complete as possible not only is the entire published literature laid under contribution, but much unpublished material, amassed by visits to many public and private collections and through correspondence, is included in both volumes. For example, Volume I contains unpublished coins from the following collections among others: American Numismatic Society, Osman Arıdağ, Ashmolean Museum, Sir Richard Burn, Convent of Ste. Anne in Jerusalem, Damascus Museum, D. D. Dickson, Fitzwilliam Museum, Ernst Herzfeld, Istanbul Museum, Stockholm Museum, Philip Thorburn, J. M. Unvala, Philip Ziegler. In Volume II there is unpublished material from the collections of Abdul Wahab Pasha, American Numismatic Society,

The British Museum specimens are given consecutive numbers in each volume (of course with cross references to Lane-Poole’s numbers where appropriate), while published and unpublished specimens elsewhere are numbered with prefixed letters whose meanings are explained at the bottom of the page. Full indices of dates, mints, names, and inscriptions accompany each volume.

For both the general reader and the numismatist it may perhaps be useful to give here a summary of the categories of coins in the two volumes. The first class of Volume I contains the coins of Umayyad governors in the East, the vast majority of them resembling the coins of Khosrau II (but bearing distinctive legends, whether in Kufic or in Pahlavi), a few only modeled after the coinage of Yezdigird III and Hormuzd IV. This class is subdivided into: (a) Anonymous coins (both with and without the Sasanian king’s name); (b) coins with the name of the Caliph (Mu’awiyah and ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwân); (c) coins with the names of provincial governors or usurpers (over 30 different names, almost all of them easily identifiable in the written historical sources); and (d) barbarous imitations. Class II contains the extraordinary trilingual Arab-Epithalite coins; class III, the smaller-sized dirhems of the ‘Abbâsid governors in Tabaristan, imitating the coins of the Isphahbad princes. The Arab-Sasanian coinage of this isolated mountain province continued down nearly to the end of the eighth century (last quarter of the second century H.). In class IV are the ‘Abbâsid coins of Bukhârâ, based on a prototype of Bahram V. Finally, in class V there are some isolated bronze coins of Sasanian or hybrid types; many more of these local issues and of unrecorded types have come to light in recent excavations, and doubtless the number will increase greatly if and when more early Arab sites in Iran are excavated.

As for the iconography of the Arab-Sasanian types, by far the commonest representation is that of a bust closely resembling Khosrau II’s on the obverse and of the usual Sasanian fire altar and attendants on the reverse. There are, however, several anomalous types produced toward the end of the century and overlapping with ‘Abd al-Malik’s coinage reform. These are of particular interest, especially to the student of early Islamic art and institutions, for they reflect efforts on the part of the Arabs to devise an iconography of their own. There is, for example, the anonymous type with an exceptional form of bust and headdress on the obverse, and the representation of a mihrab and the ‘anazah (probably) on the reverse (B.M., p. 24, ANS, 5; cf. G. C. Miles in Archaeologica Orientalia in Memoriam Ernst Herzfeld, Locust Valley, N. Y., 1952, pp. 156–171). Two more specimens of this remarkable type in the collection of Mr. M. Azizbeglou of Teheran have recently come to light (G. C. Miles, Some Arab-Sasanian and related coins, in American Numismatic Society Museum Notes, vol. 7 [1957], pp. 187–209, Nos. 7 and 8; the specimen illustrated here in plate 1, figure 1, is No. 8 of this article), so that the ANS specimen is no longer unique. Then there is another anonymous type with a conventional bust but a Kufic date (75) on the obverse, and the Arab-Byzantine standing Caliph on the reverse accompanied by his titles in Kufic (B.M., p. 25, fig. 2). A second specimen of this interesting hybrid type, also in the collection of Mr. Azizbeglou, was published by Walker in Numismatic Chronicle, 1952, Some
new Arab-Sasanian coins, pp. 106–110, No. 4. This specimen is illustrated in figure 2. The innovation of dating in Arabic instead of Pahlevi had already been introduced on some dies of conventional Arab-Sasanian type: figure 3 reproduces a piece of the year 74, struck at Damascus (or were they struck for Damascus at a Persian mint?). This is Dr. Paul Balog's specimen (P. Balog, An Arab-Sasanian dirhem with Kufic inscriptions, in Spink's Numismatic Circular, 1950, cols. 435–436). Walker describes two of this type (B.M., p. 23) dated 73 and 74; and we now have one of the year 72 (Museum Notes, vol. 7, p. 191, No. 6).

Other experimental iconographical types, combining altered Sasanian and Byzantine motives, were issued by Bishr b. Marwān at ATRA (Adharbayjān ?) and Bāṣra. The reverses present the Caliph "orans," with two attendants, a theme doubtless deriving ultimately from the Byzantine coins of Heraclius with his two sons (figures 4 and 5, in Mr. Azizbeglou's collection; Walker, op. cit. NC, 1952, Nos. 1 and 2). Equally remarkable is a trilingual (Pahlevi, Arabic, and Ephthalite) coin of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab struck at Jūzjān (?), showing a distinctive type of helmet on the obverse and a heavily armed warrior on the reverse (figure 6, also in the Azizbeglou collection, Walker, ibid., No. 3). The future may reveal other surprises of this sort. In no medium other than numismatics do we have authentic representational documents for the history of Arab costume and arms at this early date.

The introduction of Walker's Volume I is a mine of information. A general survey of the history of the period and its chronology (complicated by the use on the coins of three different eras, Yezdigird, post-Yezdigird, and Hijrah, but all set aright by the author) is followed by well-documented biographical sketches of the governors and their opponents. Five pages are devoted to a discussion of the difficult Arab-Ephthalite coins and some 17 to the even more complex problems of the 'Abbasid coins of Bukhurā. In this connection interested readers should consult R. N. Frye's Notes on the early coinage of Transoxiana, Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 113 (New York, 1949); idem, Additional notes on the early coinage of Transoxiana, in ANS Museum Notes, vol. 4 (1950), pp. 105–114; and a second lot of Additional notes, in Museum Notes, vol. 7 (1957), pp. 231–238, by Frye and W. B. Henning. The rest of Walker's introduction comprises more than 40 pages of notes on the mints—a difficult subject owing to the enigmatic Pahlevi abbreviations or monograms, and one to which the author has made very important contributions (cf. the late F. D. J. Paruck's Mint-marks on Sasanian and Arab-Sasanian coins, in Journal of the Numismatic Society of India, vol. 6 [1944], pp. 79–151, where, despite the usefulness of the lists, really very little is added to our knowledge); a listing and discussion of the interesting Ephthalite and other countermarks (cf. G. C. Miles, Museum Notes, vol. 7, pp. 187–190); a chapter on metrology, and epigraphical tables, including a complete listing of varieties of Pahlevi dates as they occur on the coins.

In view of the time that has elapsed since the publication of the Arab-Sasanian volume, readers may welcome in this place a bibliography of contributions in the relevant field that have appeared since 1941 and therefore are not included among Walker's sources. In addition to the books and articles mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs, the following have come to the writer's attention: J. M. Unvala, Ephthalite coins with Pahlevi legends, Journal of the Numismatic Society of India (1942), pp. 37–45; idem, Numismatic notes, JNSI (1945), p. 38 (bilingual copper of Jayy); T. O. Mabbott, Another coin of the

We now turn to the contents of Walker’s Volume II. The catalogue consists of two distinct parts, the pre-reform coinage (i.e., Arab-Byzantine) and the post-reform, this latter category containing all the Umayyad coins, for the most part purely epigraphical, which are not dealt with either in Volume I or in the first part of Volume II, regardless of whether they were struck in the West or in former Sasanian lands. The first section, needless to say, is of greater interest to the student of iconography. Here we meet with two main subdivisions and one minor category. The first of the two subdivisions is named by Walker the Greek Byzantine class, the second the Latin Byzantine. The first, of Syrian-Palestinian provenance, is systematically broken down into several types, to which Walker has assigned approximate dates, and of which the following are the most important: A small group (issued at Baisân) for which the prototype is, curiously, a sixth-century type of Justin II and Sophia, datable ca. A.D. 650; a large group in which the figures are derived from coins of the Heraclian family (emperor enthroned, emperor standing, with son, with two sons, and imperial bust), datable ca. 640 and 650, and a few later; an equally large group (again with subtypes) in which the bearded Caliph is portrayed in his robe, standing, wearing a kâfiyeh and holding a sword, these coins datable between 670 and ca. 697 (there are dated dinars of the standing Caliph type of the years 74, 76, and 77, see pp. vi and 42–43); and a rare late category with twin standing Arab figures, deriving from the Justin and Sophia type (see below and figure 22, for an example).

The second large subdivision of Arab-Byzantine coins is the "Latin" class, of North African and Spanish origin and based largely on the Carthaginian coinage of Heraclius. This group is datable between ca. 80 and 97 H.; many coins are specifically dated by indication and Hijrah dates, and Walker has performed a superb service in finally putting this difficult series in order. The abbreviated legends translating Qura’anic sentences and Arabic formulae into Latin are quite fascinating.

At the end of the section of the catalogue dealing with the pre-reform coinage is a small but interesting group which Walker calls the "Byzantine (Pehlevi) Type," a curious lot of hybrids (cf. Walker’s article in the Herzfeld Memorial volume, referred to above).

To illustrate some of these Arab-Byzantine types the present reviewer has selected several unpublished specimens in the Museum
Arab-Sasanian and Arab-Byzantine Coins.
of the American Numismatic Society acquired since the publication of Rare Islamic coins in 1950. Walker's Class II, type (b), Nos. 27 ff., Emesa, with Greek and Arabic legends, is illustrated (figure 7) by a variety with KACO (instead of KALON) on the obverse (ANS 54.262, gift of J. F. Lhotka, 20 mm., 4.79 gr.). Another of the Heraclian family, Class II, type (c), No. 37, emperor and son, Baalbek, appears in figure 8, the reverse better preserved than the B.M. specimen, although the Greek legend is barbaric (ANS 54.110, 20 mm., 3.30 gr.). Of the same class, but of the Damascus mint and with Arabic legend only (cf. B.M. No. 42), is figure 9 (ANS 56.89, gift of E. Seferiades, 19 mm., 3.46 gr.). The word at the left of the reverse is enigmatic. Related to this type but with quite a distinctive character is figure 10, a fals of 'Ammān (University Museum Collection, at ANS, 19 mm., 2.19 gr.), which appears to be entirely new and would take its place on page 14 in Walker's catalogue. Also unpublished is figure 11 (ANS 54.112, gift of H. Seyrig, 22 mm., 5.92 gr.) with imperial bust resembling Walker's Class II, type (e), the word طيبٌ to the right, the reverse worn and illegible at the left and bottom, but the letters at the top TA'it suggest that the mint may be Tiberias (THBEPIΑΔΟ). Three varieties of the bilingual Emesa/Ḥimṣ issues with imperial bust and cursive m reverse (B.M., pp. 20–22) are illustrated in figures 12–14. The first of these (ANS 54.112, gift of H. Seyrig, 21 mm., 3.95 gr.) is a fine specimen of B.M. No. 59. The other two (ANS 54.112, also gifts of H. Seyrig, 21 mm., 20 mm., 3.77 gr., 4.33 gr.) resemble B.M. No. 66.

Walker's Class III, the standing figure of the Caliph, is represented by several specimens. The first is a nice example of Ḩilāl Filastīn (Jerusalem), figure 15, similar to B.M. No. 75 (ANS, Wood Collection, 21 mm., 3.21 gr.). This is the type without name or title which Walker assigns to ca. A.D. 670–685. The second stage of development, Class III, type (b), without the Caliph's name but with titles, امیرالاموٴمین خليفة الله, ca. A.D. 670–690, is illustrated (figure 16) by a specimen of Ma'arrat Misrin, rather better preserved and somewhat more literate than B.M. No. 100 (ANS 54.119, 22 mm., 2.80 gr.). A battered piece (figure 17, University Museum Collection, 22 mm., 2.82 gr.) illustrates Walker's type (c), bearing the name and titles of Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, A.D. 685–705, struck at Ḥalab (cf. B.M. Nos. 106 ff.); a variety of the same type and mint (cf. B.M. No. 115) appears in figure 18 (ANS 54.119, 19 mm., 3.04 gr.). A similar issue at Ḥimṣ (a variety of B.M. No. 120) is presented in figure 19 (ANS 54.119, 23 mm., 4.15 gr.). This type at Damascus is illustrated by figure 20 (ANS 54.119, 22 mm., 4.46 gr.), somewhat better preserved than B.M. No. 121.

A specimen of 'Ammān similar to B.M. No. 129 appears in figure 21 (ANS 54.112, gift of H. Seyrig, 17 mm., 2.80 gr.). It is remarkable that, although the obverse legend is retrograde, the position of the Caliph is not reversed. Particularly clear here are the three bands or ribbons that hang from the Caliph's right arm, or from the hilt of the sword (Walker, p. xxix, compares these bands to a maniple). What do they signify? Perhaps a student of Arab dress or regalia can throw some light on this detail, which obviously has symbolic significance.

Figure 22 is a badly worn specimen of Walker's Class IV, Twin Standing Figures (B.M., p. 43, pl. IX), a type which he has convincingly assigned to Baisān (Scythopolis) and which, like Class III (c), can definitely be attributed to 'Abd al-Malik because of the
legend on the reverse. Earlier varieties of this type, bearing the Greek mint name, imitated, as stated above, from bronzes of Justin II and Sophia, are illustrated in Walker's plate I. The present type is a later development: the seated Justin and Sophia have become two standing sword-girt Arabs (the Caliph and his son?). The type, first published by Walker in Numismatic Chronicle, 1935, pp. 124–125, is discussed in the introduction, pages xviii–xx, with particular reference to a bilingual specimen of the “Justin and Sophia” type found in the Jerash excavations (A. R. Bellinger, Coins from Jerash, ANS Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 81, New York, 1938). The specimen illustrated here (ANS, no accession record, 26 mm., 6.84 gr.) was recently found by the writer among unattributed coins in a “junk box” in one of the vaults of the American Numismatic Society. It is in miserable condition but is worth reproducing because only two other specimens (in the Amman Museum) are known.

Finally, figure 23 (ANS 54.169, 23 mm., 3.97 gr.) illustrates another stage in the evolution of early Arab coinage: a restriking with post-reform dies (الله إله وحده محمد رسول الله) on an Arab-Byzantine flan of Himṣ (type of B.M. Nos. 57 ff.). The word الله of the under-type is clearly visible on the obverse, as well as part of the Greek name of the mint on the reverse. Doubtless many Arab-Byzantine planchets were restruck in this way after the reform but not many have been recorded, largely because the resulting coin is not a thing of beauty and seldom appeals to the collector's eye.

Equally comprehensive is the second part of Walker's Volume II, presenting the post-reform coinage. Incidentally, Walker (p. liii) definitely fixes the date of the reform at 77 (A.D. 696/697) for the gold and 79 (A.D. 698/699) for the silver (although there were, of course, delays in abandoning the old types in parts of the farflung empire); the conflicting statements of the Arab historians and others need no longer trouble us. Unfortunately Walker's discussion of the notorious Justinian II-'Abd al-Malik controversy and its relation to the coinage reform (p. lv) is not very clear. Would not the Caliph's "natural retort" to Servus Christi be 'Abd Muḥammad? It is, by the way, worth noting that the first recorded epigraphical instance of the title 'Abd Allāh as applied to the Caliph is not the Qubbat al-Ṣakhrāh inscription of 72 h., but Mu'āwiya's dam inscription near Tā'īf of 58 h. (G. C. Miles in Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 1948, p. 237).

In this second part of the catalogue a complete corpus of products in the three metals, gold (pp. 84–103), silver (pp. 104–201), and copper (pp. 201–296) is presented in admirably clear fashion. The footnotes contain references to a restricted but nevertheless very large number of additional specimens of the coins described. The attention of the general student is drawn to the copper, to which Walker devotes nine fine plates: here there are numerous figural types, some of which reveal interesting survivals of Palestinian and North African iconography of Roman times.

As with the Arab-Sasanian volume, the long introduction to Volume II should be required reading for every student of the Umayyad period. Especially worthy of note are: The analysis of the geographical distribution of Heraclian and standing Caliph types; the study of the varieties of "transformed cross," perhaps in origin influenced by the initial letter of bilingual papyrus protocols (pp. xxiii and xxxii ff.); the exposition and chronology of the North African and Spanish types (p. xxxix ff.); and the mint notes (pp. lxx–xcii), concluding with tables (pp. xci–xciv) demon-
strating the revival under the Arabs of long-inactive pre-Byzantine mints. To the table of post-reform dirhem mints should be added: Bahurasir (see addenda, p. 296, discovered by Walker just before the volume went to press); al-Janzah (cf. 135 and now another specimen, Ashmolean Museum, Report of the Visitors, 1956, pl. X, k); Harrän (perhaps, cf. p. 138); Mihrajânqadâ (D. Eustache, Monnaies musulmanes trouvées â Volubilis, Hespéris [1956], p. 166; cf. Numismatic Literature, 1957, pp. 265-266, for abstract and comment on this mint). The section on metrology (pp. xciv-xcvi) is perhaps a little skimpy. In this connection it may be of interest to record the following statistics which the writer of the present review has compiled from the weighing of all the Umayyad post-reform dirhems in the collection of the American Numismatic Society: Average weight of 289 specimens, 2.8920 grams (traditional theoretical weight of the dirhem, 2.97 grams; B.M. average, 2.90 grams); mint with heaviest average weight, al-Andalus, 2.9345 grams; average weight at Damascus, 2.8369 grams; at Waṣît (108 specimens), 2.8488 grams. With reference to metrology, attention is invited to a recent study by E. R. Caley, Chemical composition of some early Arab dirhems, in ANS Museum Notes, vol. 7, pp. 211-217 (specimens ranging in date from 85 to 188 H.), in which evidence is presented showing a gradual increase in the silver content of the coins. In the section on mint characteristics of Umayyad post-reform silver, some observations might have been made regarding the form which the obverse marginal legend takes (circular, partially circular-partially rectilinear, etc.): such studies may throw some light on the undecided question of possible centralized cutting of dies and mint administration (cf. pp. lxiii-lxiv).

There is a long road ahead if the rest of the immense body of Islamic coinage is to be treated in the same fashion as the coins of the first Moslem century have been handled in these volumes. Such treatment certainly is desirable, but the task cannot conceivably be accomplished by one man in one lifetime. Let us hope not only that Dr. Walker will be spared many years to proceed with the work but that worthy collaborators will be found who are prepared to share in the task and lighten the burden.

George C. Miles


There can be little doubt that interest in the Old Testament has been much involved in the archaeological and scholarly work of the past century which has led to the recovery of ancient Near Eastern history and culture. Consequently, there is now a long tradition of publications designed to make readily available to the nonspecialist the results of research in the ancient world, of which ancient Israel was a relatively insignificant part. Already by 1901, E. Schrader's pioneering work, Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, was in its third edition, utilizing the cuneiform literature of Mesopotamia for elucidation of the Old Testament. Shortly afterward, Hugo Gressmann published the first edition of his Altorientalische Texten und Bilder zum alten Testament, which was content rather to present the primary sources—the works of ancient art and literature which seemed relevant to a better understanding of the religion and culture of the ancient Near East. Gressmann's work was considerably revised and enlarged in a second edition published in 1927, but which has now long been out of print and almost impossible to obtain.
The present work is a successor to Gersmann's approach, and is a companion volume to the Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament first published in 1950, and reissued in a new, enlarged edition in 1956—an indication of the wide demand which it met in admirable fashion. Pritchard's present volume is certain to take its place as the standard source, and is to be welcomed with enthusiasm, particularly since the excavations of the 1920's and 30's increased tremendously the range of art and artifact from which to choose. It needs to be emphasized, however, that in spite of the title, this is not the sort of work that is of interest only to the biblical scholar. It is true that biblical studies furnish the broadest public support which makes possible the publication of works like this one, but its value consists primarily in the fact that here is collected a wide range of objects of ancient civilizations which are of interest in their own right. Studies in the Ancient Near East have for many years, if not decades, become increasingly dissociated from biblical studies, and stand as disciplines in their own right. Many specialists tend to resent the fact that the public at large, and even specialists in other fields who should know better, still suffer under the illusion that the ancient historian and archaeologist is primarily interested in "proving the Bible." As Pritchard points out in the introduction, the biblical relevance of the illustrations included in this work consists largely in the fact that ancient Israel was a part of the ancient world, and its culture intimately associated in many ways with those of its neighbors on all sides. The reference to the Old Testament in the title is justified only because this did serve as a criterion for the selection of illustrations. The result is obvious in an emphasis upon religion and religious subjects—but this is no one-sided emphasis when all aspects of higher culture in the ancient world were intimately bound up with religion, and indeed any distinction between religion and culture is extremely tenuous. The index to the catalogue includes only 43 references to the Bible; there are three times as many references to beards.

The figures are arranged under nine headings, by subject matter rather than by cultures. First comes a group illustrating peoples and their dress, from Anatolia to South Arabia, from Egypt to Elam. It is an excellent repertory of styles of clothing and coiffures for comparative study. As an example of interest may be mentioned the crested helmet from Carchemish, strikingly similar to those known from the Aegean world at a later time. The next section deals with daily life: the arts, crafts, and occupations of ancient man, from agriculture to wine drinking. Both objects as well as ancient pictures of activities are given here, including, of course, many of the vivid illustrations from Egyptian tombs. The third section deals with writing, including portraits of scribes, representations of scribes at work, illustrations of their equipment, and finally illustrations of inscriptions in most of the writing systems so far discovered, together with an excellent table showing the evolution of the Canaanite alphabet from the tenth century to the Persian Period. Section IV presents scenes from history and monuments. Inevitably, of course, it has to do largely with battle and victory scenes, especially from Egyptian and Assyrian sources. There follow sections on royalty and dignitaries, gods and their symbols, and objects connected with cultus: altars, incense stands, ceremonies. Section VIII is devoted entirely to cylinder seals. Here the criterion of selection is most obvious, for only those that illustrate myth, legend, and ritual have been included. The last group (section IX) presents views and plans of excavations with heavy emphasis on Palestine (over half), which would not have been justified by the intrinsic importance of
AND IMPRESSED

The catalogue of illustrations that follows compresses into less than a hundred pages a great deal of information. It was not the author's intention to discuss problems of interpretation, relationship, or development, nor would it have been possible in such a work as this. Instead, a brief description points out the significant details of each illustration, together with information on date, provenience, and present location of the object, and finally bibliography which can be consulted for further discussion and interpretation for each item. It is, of course, to be expected that further work will change the dating of various objects. For example, Albright is now arguing strongly for a tenth-century date for the Halaf orthostates,¹ and a revision of older solutions to the problem of Syro-Hittite and Phoenician art during the early part of the Iron Age.²

The work concludes with a good index to subjects and names mentioned in the catalogue, serving also as an index to the illustrations themselves. A spot check revealed that it is easy to find any desired illustration either by subject matter or by provenience when known.

The reviewer is impressed with the unusually high quality of the reproductions, at least in comparison with earlier works of this nature. Occasional exceptions which could have been improved should not make us ungrateful for the obvious care in the selection and production of good photographs, many of them done by Prichard himself. Some objects

¹ The date of the Kapara Period at Gozen (Tell Halaf), Anatolian Studies, vol. 6 (1956), pp. 75–85.
interim period 1938–53. This is most welcome news and everyone doing research in the Islamic field is and will be most grateful to the two compilers for all the effort and care they have unselfishly given and will give to this undertaking.

The present volume contains 355 bibliographical items and a five-page index of authors. It follows (with slight changes in the arrangement) the system evolved by Professor Mayer, only leaving out sale catalogues, ethnography, and musical instruments, but now including Muslim India, a very important addition which increases the register's general usefulness. As to the sale catalogues, no one will miss these lists which usually contain such items as late Turkish and Persian rugs, embroideries, third-rate Persian and Raqqa wares and so on, but still it can be assumed that the authors will use their good judgment in the rare cases when a sale catalogue of an important collection is published and then make an exception to their rule.

Small and unpretentious as this publication seems to be, it embodies, nevertheless, a great deal of work and organization. More than 200 periodicals were examined for pertinent material in three major libraries in London under the supervision of Dr. Pearson, and an additional number of bibliographical reference works were searched for further clues in out-of-the-way publications. Then a checklist was prepared which was sent to several scholars in various parts of the world so that they might add materials which had been unavailable in England. The next step was the addition of Dr. Rice's brief comments about the contents of the various books and articles, which are, of course, a most useful and necessary addition. Indeed, if possible, every effort should be made to extend this feature and if this work should be too time consuming, collaborators could probably be easily found to help out just as they did in the case of Professor Mayer's earlier series.

In the meantime scholars working in the field of Islamic art will be pleased to hear that the preliminary work for the 1955 volume has reached the checklist shape, so that the continuation of the publication seems happily guaranteed. Let us hope that the value of and interest in this Register will induce the compilers and the publishers, W. Heffer and Sons, in Cambridge, soon to bring out the 1938–53 volume.

Richard Ettinghausen

‘Islamic Pottery from the Ninth to the Fourteenth Centuries A.D. (Third to Eighth Centuries A. H.) in the Collection of Sir Eldred Hitchcock. With an introduction by Arthur Lane. Faber and Faber Limited, London, 1956. 36 pp., colored frontispiece, 7 additional figs. on 5 colored pls., 62 monochrome figs. on 33 pls., 1 map. 25s. net.

To the group of renowned British collectors of Near Eastern pottery, which comprises such names as F. Du Cane Godman, George Eumorfopoulos, Oscar Raphael, Sir Ernest Debenham, Sir Alan Barlow, and Frank Brangwyn, should now be added that of Sir Eldred Hitchcock, who in 25 years of collecting has brought together a very representative collection. A catalogue of it by Arthur Lane, the distinguished Keeper of Ceramics of the Victoria and Albert Museum, is now presented in this nicely printed and well-illustrated publication.

The collection comprises 79 pieces which are, with the exception of an Egypto-Roman vase of the first-second centuries A.D., 3 vessels from the fifteenth-eighteenth centuries, and a doubtful piece of probably modern manufacture (and politely indicated as such), of the main period of Near Eastern pottery making—the ninth to fourteenth centuries. While
the collection as a whole is not of the same artistic quality as most of the earlier British collections, it nevertheless is kept on a high level. There are many very characteristic pieces and some, such as a slip-painted bowl with a central bird of the ninth century (No. 3), a dish with carved decoration with polychrome glazing (No. 40), a Kâshân plate (No. 56), a Raqqah dish (No. 67), and finally a Sultânâbâd bowl with two figures (No. 74), would be distinguished in any collection. Even one of the later pieces, a bowl with a wild goat in blue on white (No. 78), is an unusual piece from a period of which we have few documents and is, as such, a valuable addition to our knowledge.

The publication starts, after a short foreword by the collector himself, with a succinct history of Near Eastern pottery making up to the Mongol period which is probably as clear and precise an exposition as can be competently made in a few pages. All the basic data are set forth, although with due caution where necessary, as when, for instance, the author makes it clear, with regard to mînâʾî pieces, that “at present it is not possible to distinguish with any certainty between the types made at different centres.” Then follows the catalogue proper, which, with its careful descriptions of technique and design and its attributions and datings, should be most useful for anybody interested in the field and especially for one who wants to make a similar catalogue. There are even found new observations, as when the author distinguishes between opaque and transparent turquoise glazes on the same piece, the first being applied to the inside and the latter to the outside of bowls Nos. 16 and 17. Most of the pieces listed are illustrated in black and white, and there are also six colored plates illustrating eight pieces. The book closes with a very brief bibliography and a map showing the main pottery centers.

There is nothing to criticize in this handsome and useful book. One could only add that the Arabic in Kûfî letters on bowl No. 5 can still be made out as a repeat of al-yûnum, “happiness, success.” Also the word in naskî in the center of the Raqqah bowl No. 68 can be read as al-ʿâfiyâh, “good health.” In view of the similar technique and color scheme used in Bâmiyân, which was destroyed in 1221, it is probably permissible to attribute the Amol pottery, Nos. 12–14, to the early thirteenth century, if not to the end of the twelfth. This reviewer also wondered whether the Kâshân pieces, Nos. 44 and 53, might not be somewhat later than the early thirteenth century, to which they are attributed by Mr. Lane. On the other hand, the Sultânâbâd bowl, No. 73, could have been made around 1275, like a dated piece of this type. These remarks are, however, only observations of minor importance and in no way meant to minimize the value of this publication, which is a fine addition to the still all-too-meager scholarly literature of Near Eastern pottery.

RICHARD ETTINGHAUSEN


This is the sixth volume dealing with painting in different countries brought out by the UNESCO World Art Series. As its title implies, it is restricted to miniatures and, therefore, excludes the purely decorative illuminations found in medieval and later Koran manuscripts, and what has been preserved of wall paintings in Iran. Since the material all comes from the Imperial Library,
the lesser collections in Iran, in particular those in Archæological Museum in Teheran, the library of the Shrine of Imám Režā in Mashhad, and those in the few private collections are not represented. Owing to this restricted source, the volume does not contain any of the paintings of Iran before the early fifteenth century, which means that particularly those from the very important fourteenth century, the formative period of Iranian miniature painting, are lacking, apparently, since there are no paintings of this type left in the country. Nor are there any color reproductions given of the final flowering of Persian miniature painting in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this period being solely represented by the less important half of a mid-seventeenth-century double frontispiece.  

In a way, this is to be regretted, because the Iranians are particularly fond and proud of the period of Shāh 'Abbās, in whom they see the last great representative of their historical past. There is also no example of the often charming, though usually underrated, Qājār paintings, which are well represented in the Imperial Library.

Mr. Gray gives a succinct but very instructive outline, placing Persian paintings within the framework of Persian art, starting with a reconstruction of this artistic medium in earlier periods and then dealing with the high points within the range of actually preserved examples (pp. 5–11). One noteworthy feature of this preface is the author's statement that the earliest illuminated Iranian manuscripts come from the Mongol period (p. 7), thereby going implicitly on record for excluding a recently published manuscript carrying an eleventh-century date. M. Godard covers in his Introduction more or less the same ground as Mr. Gray but he does so more extensively. He also lays greater stress on the periods represented by miniatures in the publication and analyzes the various manuscripts and individual paintings and interprets them from an aesthetic viewpoint (pp. 13–25). The selection of the miniatures was, we presume, also made by M. Godard who was Director General of the Services of Antiquities of Iran.

However good and valuable these introductory comments are, for the public at large the value of the publication lies in its color plates. The questions of choice and technical quality are, therefore, of paramount importance. The reviewer feels that in neither case has the result been entirely successful. Every scholar will be very happy that the last six plates of this publication are devoted to paintings from a Mughal Rashíd al-Din manuscript, finished in Ramazān, 1004 H./May 1596, and dealing with the history of Genghis Khan, his successors, and the Īlkhāns of Iran. There is no doubt that the discovery and first presentation of this large-size dated manuscript is a boon to historical research. Yet, as the title of the book refers to the art of Iran and in particular to Persian miniatures, the entirely different aesthetic aspect of these Indian paintings might easily give rise to wrong ideas in the mind of the uninitiated, especially as the individual captions at the side of each picture do not specifically point
out the different countries of origin of the paintings. It is true that Persian painting is undoubtedly one of the sources of Mughal painting and probably its main one, but in this manuscript the Iranian elements are already well integrated into an Indian style and only recognizable to an experienced scholar. It is also a fact that M. Godard states in the introduction that these are Indian miniatures and "with these paintings, we have left Iran, its pure, clear, soft light and its elegant grace. We are in the land of crowds and agitation" (p. 23). However, modern reading habits being what they are, such an earlier caveat will probably not insure against mistaking these final plates as just another type of Persian miniature painting, as proclaimed in the title. On the other hand, it seems quite appropriate that the author selected a painting of Farrokh Beg (pl. 20) and one of 'Abd al-Šamad (pl. 24), as these Persian expatriate painters in India were two of the fountainheads of Persian art forms at the Mughal court and thus represent a diffusionary phase of Iranian painting and demonstrate its viability on foreign soil. One even regrets that M. Godard did not include more of these paintings in this publication, especially those of Farrokh Beg, of whom there are several other so far unpublished examples in the Imperial Library in Teheran, as indicated by him on page 23.

As to the technical quality of the reproductions, one marvels at the precision of the registers and the clarity of the minute and intricate designs found on the saddles, quivers, and body armor, and on the rich courtly robes, all of which are clearly recognizable in these reproductions. One admires, also, the fine marginal ornaments (again made in India) which contain delicate designs executed in gold tones and tiny realistically rendered birds on colored paper (pls. 16–26). Yet when one is looking at some of these plates, one wonders whether the colors really faithfully reproduce those of the original. Some of the blues and reds do not seem to have come out too well and certain miniatures look rather sombre and dull (pls. 3–6), lacking the brilliance which we associate with the Timurid painting. By contrast the colors of the early fifteenth-century Bidpai manuscript appear rather pale (pls. 12 and 13).

The volume contains 9 miniatures from the celebrated Shāh-nāmeh of Bāysonghor of 1429–30, 6 paintings of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries from the magnificent Album of Jahāngir called the "Moraqqa' Golšān," including the celebrated painting of "Shāh Hoseyn Bāyqarā and His Ladies," attributed to Behzād, 2 miniatures from the Jāmī manuscript dated 1481 and 1522, and 2 more of a Shiraz Neżāmī of the mid-sixteenth century, the whole being rounded out by the 6 Indian miniatures of 1596 already referred to.

There are a number of minor flaws which mar the statements on the miniatures. As it is hoped that this book will have a wide distribution and will therefore be reprinted, we append here some comments that might be of help for a new edition.

P. 14. The Khwājū Kermānī manuscript in the British Museum (Add. 18.113) is dated 1396 (798 H.), not 1398.

P. 17. Chinese clouds are not called "tchi," but yin (as I am informed by A. G. Wenley). Ch'ī stands for "breath, steam, aura, vapor, spirit," somewhat like the Greek pneuma. What probably caused the use of the term ch'ī in this case and in the earlier literature is that this word can be used to designate the cloud-like vapors emanating from vessels or gourds and turning into figures, such as are found in Taoist paintings.

It is curious to note that this man carries a falcon on his bare right hand, while he holds his cup in his blue-gloved left.
P. 19. The full-page miniature (whose caption is found in the Table of Contents) does not represent a scene from the Khamseh of Jâmi of the end of the fifteenth century but from a Khamseh of Nezâmi, from the first half of the sixteenth century, probably even midcentury. That it is from a Nezâmi manuscript can easily be verified, as the first verses found on top of the page occur also on the miniature of the same scene in the celebrated manuscript of Nezâmi’s poems made for Shâh Țähmâsp in 1529–43 and now in the British Museum.6

P. 24. Târâ should not be regarded as the painter “responsible for the victorious horseman preparing to enter the conquered town” on plate 32, since this artist is accredited in the subscription with having executed the faces. The spelling of “La’il” on this page is the correct one rather than “L’al,” as given on page 25.

To the bibliography at the end of the text should be added G. D. Guest, Shiraz painting in the sixteenth century, Washington, 1949, since two of the color plates and one of the black-and-white plates deal with miniatures of that school.

Pl. 19. The scene represents probably three separate stages of a hunt visualized in three different spacial units so that the king in front is unaware of the hunting scene which takes place in the valley behind. Actually the hunter on the right in the middle ground might be identical with the king in the foreground.

Pls. 25 and 26 do not form a double page, as can easily be seen from the fact that the decorative borders and their triangular center units do not correspond. Plate 25 is page 138 of the manuscript; it represents the left part of the often reproduced double miniature attributed to Qâsim ‘Ali, showing a lady arriving for Zoleykha’s party, during which Yûsûf’s beauty is admired by all those present.4 The feasting prince in a pavilion, attributed to Maqṣûd, on plate 26, is on page 339 of the manuscript. The left part of this double miniature shows a circular group of ladies playing music and dancing around a central male figure accompanying them on a stringed instrument.5

Richard Ettinghausen


The two volumes under review are the first chapters of a larger project devoted to a complete corpus of Islamic craftsmanship. They are the product of the most complete and painstaking scholarship, an encyclopaedic scholarship of a type introduced by Max van Berchem and to which Professor Mayer has accustomed his readers through his previous studies on Mamlûk costume and Saracenic heraldry. The comparison with Max van Berchem is not only valid with regard to the completeness of the scholarship, but also with regard to the subject matter. For one of the major wishes of the founder of Islamic archaeology was the creation of repertories of basic information either with or without extensive commentaries, but always with complete ref-


5 Illustrated in color in Minory, loc cit., col. pl. (fig. V) opp. p. 71, and described with its other half on p. 74; compared to this earlier color plate the colors of the new reproduction of the right half (pl. 26) are much softer.

erences for further work. In these two volumes Professor Mayer has used both archaeological and textual information to give a sort of *dictionnaire raisonné* of known Islamic craftsmen in the two areas of architecture and astrolabe making. In both volumes an important introduction precedes an alphabetically ordered roll of artists with a short description and a complete bibliography accompanying each entry. In both cases the presentation as well as the thoroughness of the scholarly apparatus leaves little to be desired. The printing mistakes which this reviewer has been able to find are few and of little significance. But the wider meaning to Islamic art of the information found in these volumes is different for the two, and it may be worth while to comment on them separately.

To make up a roll of Islamic architects through the early nineteenth century involves two major problems. On the one hand it is difficult to decide who was an architect in medieval Islam (the problem is equally difficult in the western or Byzantine Middle Ages) and, therefore, a standard must be established for choosing among the names given to us by inscriptions and in literature. On the other hand the question must be raised of the range and limitations of the information thus provided for an understanding either of Islamic architecture or of Islamic civilization.

Much of the author's introduction (pp. 18–29) is devoted to the question of who was an architect in Islam. The facts are quite contradictory and it seems apparent that there was no word in medieval Arabic which would correspond exactly to our modern word *architect*. There were no official schools and there seems in general to have been very little theoretical training. The three designations of *muhandis*, *banna*', and *mi'mar* can mean what we mean by architect, but are also differenti-

ated from each other in ways which are not always clear and which may very well have varied according to the time or the place where they were used. The problem is further complicated by the fact that in a number of cases all three professional titles have been used for craftsmen involved in other arts. Although it is known that many an architect had also other talents, it is unlikely that all craftsmen were also architects and the question arises in particular with the usage of the word *mi'mar*. It is also quite clear that the different tasks implied in the construction of a building were not always assigned to the same people. A simple mason at times had to make the decisions of an architect and many a patron imposed his wishes even in technical details, inasmuch as (Professor Mayer proves this quite conclusively) "architects" were generally "part of the retinue of the patrons of their time" (p. 23) and not "officials," except perhaps under the Ottomans. The fluidity of the concept of architect together with the conflicting data at our disposal prevented Professor Mayer from providing a clear-cut technical definition of an architect, while in many ways his work and that of G. Wiet have told us more about the social position of those who were responsible for buildings than about their work as such. Thus Professor Mayer was compelled to use a set of negative standards in making up his roll, except in a small number of clear-cut cases, such as that of the Ottoman builders. All patrons, often difficult to distinguish in an inscription but for whom independent sources can be found, are eliminated. Craftsmen known only through works other than constructions are included if they were called *banna*’, or if there was some likelihood of their having actually been architects. All architects known only through historical and

geographical sources have been excluded, since in most cases it would be difficult to decide what their contribution of characteristics was without monuments. An exception might perhaps have been made for the muhandisin who were in charge of the laying out of Baghdad, since the general aspect of the 'Abbāsid capital and of its buildings is pretty clear from the sources. Altogether, while minor inconsistencies and omissions may occur, there can be little doubt that the list furnished by Professor Mayer gives as complete a view as can be gathered with the information presently at our disposal about the men who were responsible, or who were thought by their time or by themselves as responsible, for the remaining monuments of Islamic architecture. That a very coherent picture of a medieval Islamic architect does not emerge in spite of the large number of names should perhaps be attributed not so much to the meagerness of our information as to the very nature of medieval architecture in general.

The second major question raised by this book is, what can this information about individual architects tell us about Islamic architecture? Several comments can be made. Out of some 320 names given, over one-third are from Turkey and another 25 from Spain. This is not merely the result of the existence of archives in Turkey or of the comparatively late date of most Turkish monuments. In Spain the systematic efforts of such scholars as L. Torres Balbás have helped in clarifying the picture and it is probable that systematic efforts in other centers of Islamic civilization may yield better results, especially in Safavid Persia. And yet the case of Cairo, with its splendid collection of epigraphical material and with an unusual wealth of chronicles, especially in Mamlûk times, seems to lead to the conclusion that the role and importance of the architect varied from area to area and that in the more peripheral areas of Islamic civilization such as Turkey and Spain the architect had indeed a more highly individualized status than in Egypt, the Fertile Crescent, and Persia until the sixteenth century. This could perhaps be attributed to the greater preservation of the classical tradition in the former areas, although in the case of Ottoman Turkey, we are also moving away from the medieval world. Further studies must raise the question whether this difference in the status of the architect also implies a difference in architecture. Professor Mayer hopes in his conclusion that a work such as his must eventually lead "to a new, more fruitful and more just approach to Islamic craftsmanship" and that "unsigned works of these and other masters will be identified, and that we shall be able to assess and appreciate the share of the individual in the development of Muslim art as a whole" (p. 29). Whether this lofty ideal can be reached is a difficult question to answer with the material in our hands. One may wonder, however, whether putting the question in this manner is not attempting to set the development of medieval architecture and art in a mold belonging to post-Renaissance western art. It seems fairly clear from the examples given by Professor Mayer that there was no one specific object of an architect's concern, just as there was no one specific way of becoming an architect. Is it likely in these circumstances that definite styles and ideas would have emerged as the property of one man or even of a specific school of architecture? In a world where the architect did not

---

2 Ya'qūbī, in Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vol. 7 (Leyden, 1892), p. 241; Wiet's tr., Les Pays, Cairo, 1937, p. 17, with further references.

3 For western architecture, see P. du Colombier, Les chantiers des cathédrales, Paris, 1953, p. 50 ff., for an attempt to define the medieval architect; M. S. Briggs, The architect in history, Oxford, 1927, pp. 53-129, for an inclusive list of names.
have a high status of his own, the symbols and ideas which influenced architecture came from realms other than those of the technicians. Hagia Sophia and St. Denis are the symbols of an age, of Justinian and Suger perhaps, rather than of architects, whose names are known, at least in the case of the Constantinopolitan sanctuary. Would not the same be true of the great architectural masterpieces of Islam, even if we did know the names of those who were responsible for their construction? A further pessimistic note can be added. While it is true, as Professor Mayer points out, that Muslim architects worked fast and that therefore several monuments could have been planned and executed by the same master, this very rapidity led often to poor construction, and many monuments which were not destroyed crumbled away. Except for Ottoman works, and perhaps some Seljuq military works in Anatolia, it is not very likely that many more than one or two monuments by the same master will be discovered. Mam-lūk Cairo could have been a good place for a comparative investigation along these lines; and perhaps an attempt should be made, but the comparatively meager information on architects which can be gathered from the great wealth of sources at our disposal has already been pointed out. As to the activities of Yuhannā al-Rāhib in the military architecture of Cairo in the late eleventh century, they exemplify the impact of a foreign architectural tradition rather than that of a man.

A last comment can be made which derives from one of the most important remarks made by Professor Mayer. He points out (pp. 22–23) that "although the bulk of public buildings in Islam were either devoted to religious use . . . or founded out of a religious impulse . . . , with very few exceptions they were constructed by order of laymen." While it is true that Islam knew no official ecclesiastical organization and that the point may seem, therefore, self-evident, the real importance of the remark appears fully when one compares the situation in Islam with that of western Europe at the same time. There, as is well known, the ecclesiastical authority was one of the prime movers in the building of churches, monasteries, hospitals, and palaces. As a result, the history and interpretation of architecture and the work of architects were very closely related to the intellectual and spiritual currents of the time. No such relation is apparent in Islamic religious architecture, except in very general terms, such as the introduction of the madrasah plan; but, even there, a political development was needed to permit an architectural one. Another interesting, although much less known, case would be the development of mausoleums, but its solution may perhaps lie in the examination of spiritual development in the mass of Muslim society rather than in an intellectual development at the top, as was the case for certain basic features of Gothic architecture.\(^4\) Both the madrasah and the mausoleum still deserve fuller examination. The point seems to remain, however, that the development of Islamic architecture was not as consciously related to the intellectual and spiritual history of Islam as Christian architecture was to Christian thought. Conversely, the close relation of Islamic architects to princes should lead to a palace architecture which would be much more conscious of the major themes and ideas of royal ceremonial and of royal iconography. While it is unfortunate that so few palaces are known or have remained, they form a field where Professor Mayer’s results could be used with much profit.\(^5\) Thus while the information

\(^4\) On such Gothic problems see Otto von Simson, The Gothic cathedral, London, 1956, where all earlier studies are mentioned and discussed.

\(^5\) Preliminary remarks of that type, but from a different point of view, are already found in J.
gathered by Professor Mayer may be inconclusive as far as the work of the individual in Islamic architecture is concerned, it is highly suggestive of certain problems relating to the place of architecture in medieval society and should lead to further studies on the subject. It is also valuable to the social and economic historian, for here we have a carefully annotated roster of men involved in one of the major activities of any human group. A careful study of the sources might lead to an interesting analysis of the status of the professional man in medieval Islam with particular emphasis on the later periods and on Anatolia.

The volume on astrolabists comes much closer to fulfilling the ideal of the series. For the more limited technique of astrolabe making developed in its craftsmanship, who were often professional astronomers and/or metalworkers, a great pride in their work and a definite consciousness of belonging to a higher status in society. As a general rule astrolabes are signed and in more than one case several are known to have been made by the same artists. Thus it should be possible to define the specific characteristics of each artist and the general development of the art of making astrolabes from one school to the other. For this task all the pertinent information is in Professor Mayer’s book: an extremely suggestive introduction, a roll of astrolabists, a list of known astrolabes, a chronological list of dated or datable objects, a most exhaustive bibliography, and 26 excellent plates arranged chronologically, which are in themselves a summary of the instrument’s evolution. The volume is in fact a direct invitation to examine the development of masters and schools in a specific craft whose relation to the wider field of metalwork may lead to interesting conclusions. And here also the historian of society may find much interesting material on a comparatively privileged group of artisans.

The comparative inequality in the amount of information about each art provided by these first two volumes of the projected Corpus of Islamic Artists is perhaps one of its most valuable, immediately accessible contributions, for this inequality points the way to further study and thinking. Other problems and questions will no doubt be posed and solved from the large body of information found in these two volumes and from the suggestive remarks which precede the rolls of artists. These two volumes are not a mere “Who’s who” of Islamic artists, but real sources of work and inspiration. They fully justify the hope put in such compendia by Max van Berchem nearly 70 years ago.

Oleg Grabar


In recent years the distinguished Egyptian writer and scholar Bishr Farès has written an important series of books and articles which have not only greatly improved our knowledge of early Islamic miniature illustration, but which have also introduced many new and often highly challenging ideas and interpretations. His latest work, a contribution to the Mélanges offered to Professor Louis Massignon, comprises two parts which differ greatly in purpose and in scope. First the author publishes miniatures from two manuscripts and then he brings a few new documents to the dossier of the problem of imagery in Islam.

The new material published by the author consists of the two miniatures which open the text of Istanbul, Sulaymāniyah library, esat
efendi 3638, a manuscript of the rasā'il ikhtezān al-Ṣafā; and a single leaf of a work on jurisprudence in a private collection. The Sulaymāniyah manuscript is dated 686/1287 and was made in Baghdad. The single leaf is not dated, but belongs probably to the early fourteenth century; it seems to have been signed by a personage whose name is read by Bīshr Farès as 'Ali al-Lūwirānī. The Sulaymāniyah images form a frontispiece showing twice five scholars involved in different activities. B. Farès interprets them as the five authors of the rasā'il mentioned above one of the images and then shows definite similarities between the style of these images and that of the Schefer Maqāmāt, suggesting again that the Baghdadi origin for the latter manuscript should be maintained. The single leaf, of a much rougher style, also shows various personages, but this time they are set around a bookstand with an open book. B. Farès interprets them as the author, a well-known shiîte apologist, his son, and followers. The image is also connected with the school of Baghdad, although here perhaps the lower quality of the work makes it doubtful whether one can really associate it with a specific center. It is certain, however, that it does continue the tradition of an "Arab" manuscript illustration and that it is different from the best-known Mamlūk examples of the same period or of a slightly later one. Too little has been done so far about stylistic characteristics in each of the possible centers of this group of manuscripts to permit specific associations, and one may even question whether any one center was likely to have only one style.

These three images lead B. Farès to a few remarks on the question of the author's portrait in Islamic art. He lists some of the known or possible author's portraits and mentions their probable origin in Christian manuscripts, but whether the groups found on the Sulaymāniyah manuscript and on the leaf in a private collection have the same meaning and belong to the same tradition as the large author's portraits of certain Dioscorides manuscripts and the series of individual images found on the Galen manuscripts is still a problem which requires further discussion. It will be necessary some day to gather all examples of thirteenth-century frontispieces before definite conclusions can be reached. The difficulty of dealing with only partial evidence may be shown in the case of the Dioscorides, Top Kapi Seray Ahmet III 2127, dated in 626/1229, mentioned by B. Farès on page 93 (p. 19 of the offprint). The frontispieces of this work have already been published by A. Süheyl Üver and R. Ettinghausen.¹ On the basis of the colophon with its grammatical errors, the name abū Yūsuf Behnām ibn Mūsa ibn Yūsuf al-Mawṣili in the colophon, and a short Syriac sentence following the colophon, Dr. Farès suggests that a Christian from Mosul made the manuscript. The question is complicated, however, by two facts. First the name in the colophon is preceded by the expression 'ala yad which does not always introduce the person by whom a work was made, but sometimes the person for whom it was done.² But, what is more important, on folios 29 and 29v the name of the artist is given on the roots and leaves of the illustrated plants.³ The words are much effaced, but it is possible to interpret them as: [fol. 29v] عمل عبد الجبار(4) بن علي


³ I am grateful to Professor Üver, whose amiability is known to all scholars working in Istanbul, for providing me with photographs of these two pages.
It is hardly likely that a son of 'Ali was a Christian. This is not to say, of course, that we are not dealing with Christian models, but merely to suggest that a thorough understanding of the sources of thirteenth-century painting and of the public for whom these manuscripts were made will require a more complete analysis of all the known medical manuscripts of the time than has been done hitherto. In fact TKS Ahmet III 2127 could be used to date definitively Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, arabe 4947, where, on folio 19v, the name “Behnäm b. Mūsa b. Yūsuf, the Christian, the Doctor, known as ibn al-Bawwāb” occurs also as the name of the copyist (naqala), in the early thirteenth century. It is likely that we are dealing with the same man and it seems clear also that he was only the copyist. A comparison of scripts between the two manuscripts, one written on paper, the other on parchment, should be done. Similarly the illustrations should be compared, inasmuch as it has been argued by Bonnet that the illustrations of Paris 4947 depend on the images in the ninth-century Greek Dioscorides also in the Bibliothèque Nationale, grec 2179, which, according to K. Weitzmann, was made in Egypt. The implications of these remarks, if they are justified, are quite significant for the formation of Islamic painting in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, since they show the tremendous complexity of the problems involved. But these points go beyond the aim of Bishr Farès’ work and we must be grateful to him for bringing yet new documents into the constantly shifting picture of thirteenth-century Islamic art.


In an appendix to his article Bishr Farès presents new documents in what he calls “la querelle des images” in Islam. Basing himself on a passage from al-Qurṭubī’s Alkām al- Qur’ān relating to some tenth- and eleventh-century religious opinions, he suggests the existence of an actual struggle among religious leaders about the permissibility of images and connects the position of the defenders of images with mu’tazilite traditions, in both sunnite and shi’ite milieux. This suggestion and the following esquisse of a Muslim thought on the question of images can, of course, not be fully substantiated, as Dr. Farès recognizes, without further discoveries and analyses, but they open up interesting perspectives in a field where general ideas on basic aesthetic and ideological problems are only too rare.

Oleg Grabar

Vorderasiatische Knöpfeppiche aus alter Zeit.
Von Wilhelm von Bode und Ernst Kühnel.
Vierte, vollständig, umgearbeitete Auflage.
Braunschweig, 1955.

The interest in the study of the history of Oriental rugs is just 80 years old. In 1877, Julius Lessing published Altorientalische Teppichmuster nach Bildern und Originalen des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts; with its excellent color plates this work belongs now to the most highly treasured possessions of great libraries. It was followed in 1891 by Alois Riegl’s ever delightful book Altorientalische Teppiche, and a year later by an essay of Wilhelm von Bode, Ein Altpersischer Teppich im Besitz der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin (in Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, pp. 26–49, 108–139). Ten years later, in 1902, Bode published Vorderasiatische Knöpfeppiche aus älterer Zeit. Those of us who owe our first youthful introduction to the ever new theme of the Oriental rug to Dr. Bode have retained our adherence to the Handbook,
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and hail this fourth edition with gratitude. For, while in our libraries we may feast our eyes on the magnificent reproductions in works like F. R. Martin's *A History of Oriental Carpets before 1800* (Vienna, 1908), F. Sarre and H. Trenkwald's *Altorientalische Teppiche* (Vienna, 1926, 1928), and A. U. Pope's dissertation on carpets in *A Survey of Persian Art* (London, 1938/39, vol. 3, pp. 2259-2465, vol. 6, pls. 1107-1275), we always come back to our own copy of the Bode Handbook. A second and a third edition appeared in 1914 and 1922, both revised by Ernst Kühnel and adapted by him to the steadily increasing results of scholarly research. And now we greet with joy the fourth edition of the Bode/Kühnel, which has preserved all its sprightliness through the 53 years of its existence.

In this new edition Dr. Kühnel has kept not only the title and outward appearance of the monograph but also many of the actual words of his friend and teacher. For the technique of rug knotting he quotes the description of Alois Riegl (p. 17), a homage that will please many admirers of that great scholar. The illustrations are again placed within the text. They bring much new material, especially from the collections in the museums of America.

The most important change in the book is also the most logical; to begin with the earliest preserved, the Anatolian rugs. A short paragraph is devoted to the fragments discovered in central Turkestan by Sir Aurel Stein and by the Turfan expedition of the Berlin Museums, and to those found in the Altai district at Noin-Ula and Pazyrik by Russian expeditions. Unfortunately, these fragments are too small to show any clear patterns.

How rug weaving found its way from Central Asia to Anatolia is still not known, for neither literary sources nor actual fragments help in tracing the history of the long trek. Rugs which had been brought from the far distant home by their wandering ancestors would be treasured; each coming generation would be taught the craft by the mothers and would in turn pass on the knowledge to the daughters. New ideas in patterning might be introduced, but the actual technique only slightly changed. It may even have survived unchanged in the farthest western corner of Europe, in Spain, while in the culturally more advanced countries through which the Turk people traveled, it became "improved" to what today we call the Senna and the GhiorDES knot.

By the eleventh century the fashion for knotted fabrics had taken firm root; the Seljuks, master weavers and designers, also spread this kindred craft in their settlements in Persia and Asia Minor. How well it developed in the following centuries can be guessed from Marco Polo, globetrotter *par excellence*, who traveled through the Seljuk empire toward the end of the thirteenth century, and mentions that he had seen there the best and handsomest rugs being made. These may have been not unlike the five fragmentary rugs which have been transferred to the Islamic museum at Istanbul from the mosque of Alâ al-dîn in Konya. These Konya rugs are far from primitive, they look like the outcome of a long period of evolution. The Handbook illustrates one Konya rug with staggered rows of octagonal motifs and two others with continuous designs based on stars and diamonds, with borders of Kufic letters or rows of star-rosettes.

Rugs of the Konya type were exported to Italy; Giotto painted one in the frescoes of the Arena chapel at Padua, and there is preserved a document to the effect that rugs were lent by Venice for the consecration of Santa Maria dell’Arena in 1305. We hope that Dr. Kühnel will tell more of this document and where and how he discovered it.
The Italian painters of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries often portray rugs, and two important designs, the Chinese-inspired flight of a dragon and a phoenix, and a tree with confronting birds, are preserved both as actual rugs, and as illustrations in several paintings. The two rugs are the well-known fragments at Berlin and Stockholm; of the paintings, I mention especially a Madonna by Baldovinetti in the Jarvis collection of the Yale University Gallery of Art at New Haven. Rugs appear in paintings by Jan van Eyck and Memling, and a certain rug type of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century is known today by the name of the German painter Holbein, who may have owned several specimens which appear repeatedly in his paintings. Many pictures of the Dutch schools of the seventeenth century would appear drab, were it not for the rugs which are spread over the table rather than on the floor.

An excellent proof of the widespread interest in these rugs is provided by an embroidered copy, which bears the date 1553, has been used as a wall hanging, and is preserved in the Swiss Federal Museum at Zürich. A diligent search might lead to the finding of more embroideries inspired by Oriental rugs.

The occurrence of coats of arms knotted into the field or border, and the indisputable fact that many rugs closely fit the rooms in which they are preserved, in England and Holland especially, proves that the industry depended largely on orders from European dealers who themselves merely executed commissions by their patrons at home. From an early time, Smyrna may have been a center of exportation, but the industry was spread over a wide hinterland. Certain localities, such as Ushak, can be associated with special rug types. An excellent chapter is devoted to this moot question and illustrated with a wide diversity of large and small rugs, the latter are often prayer rugs. Here I will mention my one and only peeve: why does Dr. Kühnel call them “Betteppich” (pray rug) rather than “Gebetteppich” (prayer rug)? It sounds incongruous in both languages.

A separate chapter deals with the Caucasian rugs. They are seldom found in old paintings. Dr. Kühnel brings only one illustration of a rug hanging from a balcony. But since this special rug was painted by Piero Pollaiuolo, we know at least that it existed in Florence before 1496, the year of the painter's death. Later these Caucasian rugs seem to have been all but forgotten. Bode drew attention to them in the first edition of the Handbook where he tells of four rugs. At the Munich exhibition in 1910 six dragon rugs were shown, but in 1948 Mehmet Aga-Oglu was able to find 30 of them, all owned in America, for his exhibition at the Textile Museum in Washington. Kühnel sees them as the creation of a highly developed folk art; the chapter is full of exciting references and should instigate more specialized study of the many possibilities involved.

Dr. Kühnel distinguishes three groups of Egyptian rugs, of which the earliest covers and to some extent overlaps the Mamluk period, while the second comprises rugs woven in a factory at Cairo for the Osmanli court at Istanbul. The third group seems to me rather artificial and superfluous. The “chessboard rugs” might just as well be grouped with the Osmanli rugs, though possibly they are due to private enterprise.

The early group differs vastly from all other Oriental rugs, and has therefore been ascribed to many varied regions, from Samarkand to Morocco. In 1902 Bode suggested Syria and mentioned that the *tappeti damascini* of many Venetian inventories of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries may have belonged to this group. “Damascus rug” became henceforth the accepted term, until
Dr. Sarre suggested that an Egyptian origin was indicated, with Damascus as the probable center of trade between Egypt and Turkey. Now Dr. Kühnel suggests that the Venetian denomination really refers to the “damascening” effect of the kaleidoscopic design which is supported by the color scheme. Here I want to draw attention to the articles Kairener Teppiche by Dr. Kurt Erdmann, in Ars Islamica, vol. 5 (1938) and vol. 7 (1940).

The important chapter on Persian rugs has been moved from the beginning of the book in the earlier editions, to a more logical place where it appears as the apex, the crowning glory of the entire industry. It has also been given a new classification, much more detailed but slightly tending to reiteration. The so-called Polish rugs are still allotted a chapter of their own. The closing chapter deals with the Indian rugs. The Mughal empire was, from its foundation by Baber, great-great-grandson of Chinghiz Khan, in close relation with Persia. Yet, even the earliest rug, of which several fragments are preserved in Europe and America, has an unmistakable character of its own. Protomae of animals growing out of each other’s snout are arranged in arabesque style, on a ground of rosy wine red. The illustration is not very clear—the specimen seems to be poorly preserved—and I regret that Dr. Kühnel did not chose the handsome fragment of the Detroit Institute of Arts. There it hangs next to a rug of Herat design, but woven probably at Lahore, much finer and firmer than its Persian prototype. Persian picture rugs must have been known in India, but here again the Mughal artist shows his independence and designs his rugs with truly local color; the two specimens at Boston and Washington are splendid examples. Even finer are the prayer rugs; their surface, though of wool, looks as delicate as that of the beautiful velvet woven silk mats which competed with them as a passing fashion.

In his Closing Considerations Dr. Kühnel speaks of the decline of the industry which led to absolute decadence about the middle of the eighteenth century. Every lover of rugs will be grateful for the compilation of the characteristic features of design, to which the last three pages are devoted. Now I hope that the new Bode/Kühnel will speedily be made available in English. I hear that a translation is practically ready for publication; that is good news indeed.

Adèle Coulin Weibel


To Philosopher Laotze, author of the Taoist Tao-te-ching on which this book is based, the primal simplicity is symbolized by the “Virgin Block” of wood. This Virgin Block, to him, is substance untouched and has therefore untold potentials. As he saw it in the third century B.C.:

The Way eternal has no name.
A block of wood untooled, though small,
May still excel the world.
And if the king and nobles could
Retain its potency for good,
Then everything would freely give
Allegiance to their rule.

(Tr. by R. B. Blakney, The Way of Life, Lao Tzu, chap. 52.)

Laotze was then directing his advice to politics of the time. He was for a laisser-faire government as against rigid state control. In subsequent centuries his philosophy has been applied to other fields of human activities, and because of its encouragement of imagination and its closeness to nature, it is particularly suited for the scholar and artist. Its spirit permeates Chinese belles-lettres and art.
Now Dr. Amos Ih Tiao Chang has applied Laotze's thinking to architecture. In the true spirit of Taoism, Dr. Chang's book is a chip off the "Virgin Block"—and embodiment of the seemingly paradoxical but accepted truism that simplicity is elegance. This simplicity is more than plainness, however. It originated with the chosen habitat of Laotze, or "untouched nature" as symbolized by the "Virgin Block." Basically it serves as a call for men to put away their artificial manners of civilization so that the basic virtues of honesty and goodness may find expression in them again. How do honesty and goodness come about? Nature will take care of that, as it does with all living things, said Laotze; all that men have to do is to abide by nature's ways, and great potentials will be bestowed upon them. Thus simplicity to Laotze is intangible in content and positively negative in action.

For the Taoist, a wise man is like a deliberate fool in the eyes of the average. He chooses the simple joys of life in preference to the artificial glitters of society. After a rain he would rather enjoy a leisurely walk than huddle around his TV set. He is wise to have a natural distrust for overpadded civilization and wants to avoid the dangers of civic deterioration by keeping close to basic habits of life. He is mature, though he need not be old, for through his tenacious clinging to nature's ways, he is youthful as nature always is. His joy of life is thus prolonged, his charm is ever growing, simplicity is his secret.

Dr. Chang's book implies this theme or outlook on life, and would have become less of a tedious monologue than it turned out to be, had he made some reference to it. Instead, partly to tighten his grasp on the purpose of proving some principles from Laotze's *Tao-te-ching* on the intangible content in architectonic form, and partly to make an airtight scientific case out of his search so as to direct his attention to visual fundamentals, Dr. Chang has given us an architect's pioneer research so compact that at points it is laden with heavy reasoning over the archaic language of the *Tao-te-ching*.

This is no criticism of the author, however. A thesis as difficult as his could not be otherwise. Furthermore, the reading difficulty rather emphasizes the very point that the author aims at in his most lucid introduction. He said in his very first paragraph: "Physical manifestations of life are plastic and when they fail to suit the requirements of time and place they may be manipulated and changed by man. But that which is intangible is beyond the power of man, existing as a permanent reservoir from which the potential of life may be drawn as the need arises. Beyond the power of manifestation, this unseen factor usually is not only unseen but tends also to be unappreciated."

If every reader of the book could have been prepared at least in the thinking of Laotze, Dr. Chang's job would not have been such a formidable one. As it is, his message makes a dull thud to some ears. Many readers of this progressive age simply cannot let themselves be moved by anything as "negative" in approach as Laotze's philosophy. And yet if these same people were reading Laotze without any preconceptions, or without a context as concrete as architecture beside it, the chances are that most of them would be able to appreciate and accept it as a school of thought, different though it may be from any Western one they have known.

For example, let us follow Dr. Chang in one of his passages (pp. 26–27):

Laotze's idea of formation is heavily concerned with emptiness or nonexistence. To him who regards nothing as persistent, what is essentially important in things is the possibility of becoming something, not the opportunity of remaining as something confronting deterioration. Consequently, meaningful incompletion is taken as the most desirable state of tangible being.
And he went on to cite an example of the circle in this way:
While conjecture may blind insight to things, an impartial but active attitude may lead us to see truer beings. A conscious comparison will reveal the fact that a complete circle will be distorted in perception and might be interpreted as elliptical. A section of this circle, on the other hand, probably will be interpreted, because of our desire of the least effort in apprehension of simplest form, still as “a section of a circle.” Everything else being equal, it seems that a shape consisting of disconnected sections, rectilinear or curvilinear, can convey its real being better.

After reading these two paragraphs, the readers may well join him in the conclusion that:
The point which is more important is that a fragmentary shape has the potential to grow, to become a finished entity in our mind. A complete one appears static, rigid and lacks vividness because it allows no room for the growing mind to function.

For the visual fundamentalists, this is dealt with in the principle of closure. To quote Gyorgy Kepes (Language of Vision, p. 51):

Forces of organization driving toward spatial order, toward stability, tend to shape optical units into closed compact wholes. . . . A closed area appears more formed, more stable, than one which is open and without boundaries. A psychological fill-out of the intervals between the units occurs, and one constructs latent connections. This factor of closure may act on the flat dimension, generating from open linear units the experience of a closed shape, but it may also unify further dimensions. . . .

Due to the laws of visual organization . . . each unit leads beyond itself and implies a larger whole. Thus units not only live on the picture-plane; they also grow. They merge into wholes with a common function . . . the optical units organized into spatial configurations become more than the sum total of their component parts. These larger wholes form with other groups a still farther-reaching unit, and this process continues until all possible relationships are exhausted; that is until the limit of attention is reached. . . .

With the two quotations before us, we can now understand Dr. Chang's approach even more clearly. Referring back to his example of the circle, or rather the incomplete circle, there he makes full use of the psychology involved in the principle of closure, and besides, goes beyond it to show how to be the master of the situation. He proposes to make his composition vivid by means of understatement. He does this by paying full respect to, and therefore at the same time making use of, the viewer's imagination. He thus achieves his own end and with the same stroke provides a deep satisfaction for the viewer as being the active participant. What subtler way is there to achieve the maximum with the minimum? To put this in Laotze's parlance, a positive, active composition is achieved by negative means in terms of intangible contents.

With scientific research on visual fundamentals still in its infancy, Dr. Chang's research into an ancient but still potent philosophy to furnish architecture with some basic ways of making use of these principles, should be welcome as a timely effort.

But like all self-sufficient men, the author makes no apologies, no explanations, no sugar-coating for the pill which some readers might find hard to swallow. For our purpose, however, a little recapitulation of the nature and influence of Taoism would help in a better understanding of the book.

Against the very proper humanistic approach to life of the Confucian School of thought in Ancient China, men's deeper craving for freedom of imagination and nature brought them to fasten their vision upon Laotze, whose Tao-te-ching served as the inspiration for the School of Taoism. Thus Taoism is the naturalistic school of Chinese thought. It advocates the return to nature and revolts against the artificiality and dogged realism of civilization. It calls for rural freedom for life, arts, and literature, and emphasizes basic simplicity as being the supreme virtue. It seeks the secrets of nature and
abides by them, and thus achieves peace and harmony with time and space. It provides positive value for the negative intangibles, making them complementary to the positive tangibles, and views life as possessing both.

Taoism is not unknown in the West, but the absence of a good interpreter of its archaic language gives it an overtone of mysticism. The Chinese people live it in some degree at all times, and it is so much a part of them that they do not bother to talk about it as being something different. Besides other things, it influences their art of architecture in a very basic way. In Japan, its way of life is carried over by Zen Buddhism—a fusion of Taoism and Buddhism, as the two were imported from and through China. Because of the historic mental block over real Chinese art heritage by a preoccupation with curios Chinois of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Europe, and because of political reasons of the time which we cannot enter into here, Japanese art and architecture captured the imagination of the West without any reference to their origin from the mainland. And yet Japanese architecture embodies the philosophy of Laotze.

Dr. Chang could very easily have fallen for the temptation of making use of Japanese architecture, so popularly known in the West, to expound his interpretation of Laotze. Instead, he makes the fundamental effort to bridge the unemotional tie between the remote philosopher with modern architecture in terms of visual principles. From this viewpoint, the book becomes a monument dedicated to the universality of human ideas and effort. An ancient Eastern philosopher is called to life to give encouragement, as it were, to the modern science of architectonic form, to recall for our progressive material age the importance of human quality for our physical environment and of harmony and unity for our structures.

JOSEPH T. A. LEE AND WENYI CHOU


"In the vast literature of Chinese painting," begins the first volume of this book, "there is continual reference to a tao or way." The author's dominant theme and attitude are thus established at the outset, and the person who has done any reading in Chinese texts is given pause before he has fairly begun; for he is likely to have found, as has the reviewer, that references to the "tao of painting" are relatively uncommon, especially in the more important and meaningful discussions. One may read through some well-known texts without encountering any tao at all; and when, in others, the word occurs, it is as likely to be in some more concrete than metaphysical sense. The ordinary reader, however, will accept the statement on faith, or, if he is of an uncommonly suspicious turn of mind, will turn to the Index to try its validity in the case of the work translated in the second volume, the seventeenth-century Chieh tsu yüan hua chuan or "Mustard Seed Garden Manual of Painting."

Doing so, he might be persuaded by the profusion of references under the word tao that the manual dwells on the subject; but such is not the case. Not only is this portion of the index curiously padded—perhaps half of the references are to pages on which there is no mention whatever of tao—but references to the second volume are more often to translator's notes than to text, and of the few to the text proper, some prove to be misunderstandings of tao used in the simple sense of "road," or even outright insertions of the word. At one point, for example (II/123), the Chinese author writes, "Looking at [such
groves of bamboo], one realizes that this is a bypath trodden by recluses." The absence of the word tao from the sentence does not deter the translator, who writes, "In looking at these bamboos, one has the feeling that they are like the hermits who follow unswervingly the tao."

Eliminating all such spurious occurrences, one is left, I think, with a single bona fide reference to the tao of painting in the Chinese manual; and its context makes of it an ironic comment on the preoccupations of the translator. Li Yü tells, in his preface to the manual (II/11–12), that he himself would like to have learned to paint, but that when he would question painters, they would usually knit their brows and reply, "This tao [of painting landscape] can be understood conceptually, but is difficult to transmit in forms." This, he comments (in a sentence omitted from the English text, which renders the identical key phrase in quite different ways) to wonder why, when illustrated treatises have been devoted to the painting of other subjects, there is none for landscape. "Why, then, should it be true of landscape method that it 'can be understood conceptually but is difficult to transmit in forms?' Can it be that the painters themselves have kept their traditions secret, instead of publishing them to the world?" Or, by obvious implication: "Can all this talk of the mysterious tao have been aimed at keeping me in the dark rather than at enlightening me?" It is unfortunate that the true sense of this passage is not conveyed in the translation; for the reader, having presumably come this far by making his way through the first volume of Miss Sze's book, would by now feel a real bond of sympathy with Li Yü and his suspicions of obscurantism.

The charge of knowingly beclouding a subject is not one to be made lightly; but in this case it seems to me inescapable. Even so, the faults of the book might not merit extended consideration, were they not symptomatic of unfortunate tendencies in much of present-day writing about Far Eastern art. The growing popular fascination with Chinese and Japanese painting concentrates more and more on an ill-defined mystique which is supposed to underlie this art, and to separate it from post-medieval Western painting into what amounts to a fundamental dichotomy, "spiritual" vs. "materialistic" art. Not only have nonspecialist writers and artists embraced this viewpoint eagerly, but some writings on a fairly informed and scholarly level have shown an alarming inclination to bolster it by maintaining that the paintings are only to be properly understood in relation to Ch'an Buddhism, to Taoism, to the cosmology of the Book of Changes, instead of attempting to replace the popular view with one more in accord with prevailing tenets of art theory in the Orient and with the nature of the paintings themselves.

The first volume of the work "attempts an exploration of certain ideas that have motivated and governed Chinese painting, and of the methods used to express them." The point of view which guides this exploration may be further established with a few quotations: "Painting, like every other activity in Chinese life, retained most of its character as an act of reverence long after its original motivations had become obscure" (1/7). "The attitude that painting was a magic art never entirely disappeared" (1/43). "Since Chinese painting is dedicated to expressing in forms aspects of the tao and what pertained to the spirit, ..." (1/43). "Since the works of the Chinese painters were, in a deep and important sense, 'religious paintings' ..." (1/77). "The application of the term shan shui to landscape painting ... lends painting a worshipful attitude, making it a ritual act of
reverence in praise of the harmony of Heaven and Earth" (1/87).

The volume deals, as these quotations lead one to expect, more with metaphysics and religion than with art. The author would object to the distinction; in early China, she points out, "Religion included philosophy and art" (1/13); and nowhere does she give any indication that this situation ever changed. But change it did; and the transition from metaphysical to more rational modes of thought about art, which began at an early date in China, is one of the basic phenomena which confront any student of the subject.

Many centuries before the composition of the Chieh-tzu-yüan text, the concept of painting as the ritual creation of religious and cosmological symbols had been relegated in most writings to the status of infrequent and, one feels, rather half-hearted conventional quotations and allusions, playing minor roles in the midst of more down-to-earth discussions. (The metaphysical bent of the seventeenth-century Tao-chi's treatment of painting in his Hua-yü lu only emphasizes this fact by its somewhat isolated position among later treatises, and is besides based chiefly, as Victoria Contag has shown, on the Neo-Confucian system, having more to do with Chu Hsi, Lu Chiu-yüan, and Wang Shou-jen [Yang-ming] than with Lao-tzu and Ch'an.)

A large part of the book deals with the Tao, Yin and Yang, Ch'i, and related concepts; the graphs for these words are subjected to lengthy analyses as "pictograms." The author reveals, in her reference to the Six Classes of characters (II/191), that she is aware of the various ways in which a character may be formed; why, then, does she treat them all as if they belonged to the hsiang-hsing, chih-shih (which she illustrates with the familiar, mistaken interpretation of ming, "bright," as the sun and moon) or hui-i classes, when these cover only a small proportion of Chinese logograms, the great majority belonging to the hsieng-sheng class, combining semantic and phonetic indicators? For example, the graph for ch'ing, "request," tells us only the pronunciation and that the word has to do with speech; to interpret it as "asking for the fire of life" (II/17), or the "head" element in Tao as "a man walking along the path" ("following a path implies thinking about and choosing the path to take") (1/8), and the whole character as "from head to foot—total harmony" (1/9), or ch'i "ether" or "spirit," as depicting the ch'i "distributing sustenance in every direction" (1/54), is pure fantasy. The fortuitous resemblance of the radical in tao to "a boat with a tall prow" introduces a discussion of the Egyptian barge of the sun, and the way in which "Man's efforts toward integration, conceived as tao in accord with the Tao, closely parallel the progress of the Sun Barge." The fallacies of the "pictographic" interpretation of characters have been pointed out again and again; it had best be retired to the status of a sinnologue's parlor game or a substitute for the Rorschach test, except in those cases in which it is truly relevant to the actual semantic configurations of the words in question.

Of the second chapter, "The First Canon of Painting," over half is given to further metaphysical musings on Cosmic Forces. When at last we come to the Six Laws of Hsieh Ho, it is not to have any new light shed upon them. They are given in paired renderings, the first presumably the literal meaning, the second more free. In several cases, how-

1 Notably by Peter A. Boodberg, Some proleptical remarks on the evolution of archaic Chinese, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, vol. 2 (1937), pp. 329-372. Boodberg deplores "the general tendency of insisting that the Chinese in the development of their writing, as in the evolution of many other of their cultural complexes, followed some mysterious esoteric principles that set them apart from the rest of the human race."
ever, it is difficult to discern the relationship between the two. If the sheng in the first law means “life,” whence comes the “produces” of the expanded rendering? If ying in the third means “establish” (and why should it?), how does it become “according to” in the freer translation? The quotation of 17 Western-language renderings of the first law (II/19), and the comment that “intuitively they are in agreement,” reduces it to total meaninglessness; if none of these renderings is quite wrong, the first law must have been jargon from the beginning.

I do not believe that it was jargon, although it became so in the works of some later writers, as the quotation from Chang Keng (I/55) illustrates. In any event, the author does not help the matter by her conviction that Hsieh Ho, the first to use the term ch‘i-yün (I do not know what is meant by the statement [I/34] that the first law “had been applied to painting in the earliest essays that have survived, those attributed to Ku K’ai-chih, Tsung Ping, and Wang Wei”), wrote the character yün “to revolve,” and that the other yün, “harmony,” was substituted for it in the Sung period. Actually, the reverse is true; all standard texts of Hsieh Ho’s Ku hsia-p‘in lu use the latter yün. Miss Sze bases a long discussion on her version of the substitution, evidently believing that the use of one character or the other greatly changes the significance of the phrase. It is evident from the texts, however, that by the Sung dynasty it was employed so loosely that any yün at all might have been inserted without seriously disturbing anyone; ch‘i-yün, by this time, seems to have functioned at best only as a somewhat nebulous criterion in statements of value—a good picture has it, a bad one hasn’t—and at worst was merely a comforting sound to the intellectual ear of the time, as is “ritual disposition” today, sliding smoothly over the surface of the mind without leaving any profound impression.

The statement (I/51) that the eleventh-century writer Kuo Jo-hsü altered Hsieh Ho’s third law from hsieh-hsing (transcribe forms) to hsiang-hsing (portray, or “image,” forms), is likewise mistaken. All standard texts of the Six Laws write hsiang; hsieh occurs only in the late and corrupt Chieh-tzu-yüan quotation. In the same paragraph, the standpoint of Kuo Jo-hsü is wrongly equated with that of the academicians of his time; he was in fact of the opposite persuasion, reflecting the views of the Su Tung-p’o group of scholar-painters, and did not by any means “stress faithful representation.” Kuo did not, moreover, confine his use of the complicated graph for fa to his citation of the fifth law, and the substitution has no such significance as the author draws from it.

A few other points in this chapter require comment. It is not wholly correct to say that the “main portions” of the Admonitions scroll after Ku K’ai-chih in the British Museum have been “certified as his work after intensive and prolonged investigation by experts” (I/34); I know of no authority who would still insist that it is, even in part, a genuine work of Ku K’ai-chih. There is simply not enough evidence to decide the matter definitely one way or the other; and a strong body of opinion holds the picture to be a T’ang copy. The “basic consideration” of Ku’s essay on Painting the Cloud Terrace Mountain is hardly that paintings “should be expressions of spiritual significance.” Whether or not he thought so is another question; the essay is almost entirely straight pictorial description. The phrase i hsing hsieh shen, “transcribe the spirit by means of forms,” which occurs in the fragmentary Wei Chin sheng-lin hua-tsan attributed to Ku, may be what the author is referring to. The quotation from the Wang Wei
essay, on the following page, is so garbled as to be meaningless. The rendering of the line from the Tsung Ping text (I/90) is misleading; Tsung does not use shan-shui for landscape paintings. His point is that the actual landscape of nature has an expressive power beyond its material forms.

The two remaining chapters, one dealing with brush, ink, inkstone, and paper, the other with "The Elements of a Picture," contain a greater proportion of pertinent and valuable information on pictorial subject matter; but the discussions revert constantly to the same cosmological generalities. Art, it appears, must either be metaphysically motivated or meaningless. Colors were regarded as of secondary importance because "the manner in which they came to be used in painting, simply to add a tint of the natural color of objects with little reference to the elaborate symbolism of each color, relegated them to the superficial status of mere decoration." Ink, "with its Yin and Yang associations, ... admirably suited to suggesting the presence of the Tao," was preferred (I/74). The concept of aesthetic choice is nowhere allowed. At one point (I/101) the author quotes the remark that Chinese painting "has a long and vigorous tradition, a vague aesthetic, and a great deal of taste." The Chinese painters, as they are presented to us in this book, are denied any taste at all; they are compelled to use one color or another, organize their pictures, choose their motifs, according to the symbolic content of those colors, compositions, and motifs, and their suitability to the particular "ritual" they are performing. The painters and critics not only have a vague aesthetic; they are, as we find them here, too incapable of coherent thought on any subject to have survived in a material world.

A clue to one source of the author's viewpoint is provided in the Preface, in which she refers to conversations with the late Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy as having led her to undertake the translation. The book represents, in fact, a misapplication of the Coomaraswamy approach, an approach which is valid and valuable when focused upon those bodies of material which qualify as "normal" or "traditional," i.e., good art, under its almost Manichaean dualist dogma. As such, the book does not stand alone; the efforts of some adherents of this point of view to make Chinese painting into something other than what it is have been going on for a considerable while, and are, in view of the obstacles they face, impressive. They cannot continue indefinitely, however; for adequate translations and analyses of Chinese writings on art must ultimately reveal that, in the periods from which enough works survive to command our interest, and for the vast majority of painters, the act of artistic creation was not a "ritual act" at all; that the greater part of Chinese painting, quantitatively and qualitatively, is not "in a deep and important sense" or any other, religious painting; and that recognition of a major portion of it, at least, as primarily an art of personal expression does not "miss the main point" (I/104), but is, on the contrary, the very point.

The second volume consists of a reproduction, with parallel translation, of most of the Chiec-tzu-yüan manual. A few minor prefaces, and some 400 pages of "additional examples" illustrating various styles without explanatory text, are omitted. The edition reproduced is one published by lithography in Shanghai in 1887-88. The choice of this edition was probably dictated by the practical impossibility of reproducing the original; even with the color sacrificed, the rendering of tonal gradations would have required some more difficult and expensive process. Granted this, Miss Sze and her publishers need not have argued that their unavoidable choice was also desirable. This edition is not "more satisfac-
tory . . . to demonstrate the technique of the brush"; it conveys, after a fashion, the shapes of individual strokes, but so does the original; and the loss of all intermediate tones produces a harshness and heaviness which greatly lessen the value of the pictures as models for students, even supposing that there is anything worthy of imitation in the first place about the brushwork of the late nineteenth-century copyist.

The translation possesses the important virtue of readability, and a great part of it is faithful enough to the original to be serviceable. Perhaps its major shortcoming, aside from some misunderstandings and faulty renderings, lies in the fact that numerous proper names are either incorrectly identified, or not identified at all. The reviewer began a list of identifications, but it became far too long for inclusion here. To insist that persons mentioned, particularly artists, be assigned their common names, even in a popular book, is not pedantry; one can easily imagine a reader who might search in other publications for works by artists discussed in the manual, and be unable to find them. He is not even told that the "Ch'ien Shun-ch'i" who is mentioned several times in the manual is the same as Ch'ien Hsüan, two of whose paintings are reproduced in the first volume. Nor will the index help in this case, for both names appear there, with separate page references following. Also in the Index he will find both T'ang Cheng-chung and T'ang Shu-ya ("XIV cent.?") and "XII cent.?") respectively, Ch'iu Ying and Ch'i Shih-chou ("XVII cent.?"), Huang Kung-wang and Huang Tzu-chiu. And what are we to make of such a curious cross-reference as "Li Ying-ch'i, see Ch'eng Ying-ch'i" leading to "Ch'eng Ying-ch'i (Li Ch'eng)," the latter with a page reference of its own?

Throughout the second volume, lists of artists and others, introduced only by their additional names (tsu and hao), are often accompanied by apologetic footnotes informing the reader that the task of identifying them at this late date is a near hopeless one, or else the same conclusion is implied by frequently erroneous guesses. Contrary to these assertions, any of a number of common reference works would have enabled the author to locate most of these men easily; many of them are not obscure at all, but are well-known painters.

An exhaustive list of mistakes or debatable points in the translation is outside the scope of the review; here are a few representative examples which seem of some interest and importance:

II/4: For "Ch'en Yao-tsui" read "Yao Tsui of the Ch'en dynasty." It does not seem wise to render the term i-p'in as "spontaneous"; that word had best be reserved for tsu-jan, and i-p'in translated as "untrammeled class."

II/6: For "Hua Ch'ien . . . by T'ang Hu" read "Hua Chien . . . by T'ang Hou." For "Shih Chu Pao Chi (Shih Chu's Treasured Album)" read "Shih Ch'ü Pao Chi"; this is, of course, the catalogue of the Ch'ien-lung imperial collection.

II/17–18: This line means: "Han Kan was unique, a 'Riding Yellow' (a divine horse,
used figuratively for outstanding personages); when he set about to paint, he could summon all his faculties to it.” The rendering of ch'ing hua as “used to pray before he painted” is impossible, and the long footnote “analyzing” the character ch'ing and interpreting it as a desire “to become identified with the Tao . . . ” is unwarranted. The translation of this passage, as of so many others, seems to depend more upon Petrucci’s French version than on the Chinese original.

II/20: In the fifth of Liu Tao-ch’un’s Six Qualities, wu mo (“without ink”) refers to the common criteria of “having brush” and “having ink,” as explained in the manual (II/29). It designates an absence of rich and wet brushwork, and is certainly not “rendering space by leaving the silk or paper untouche.” Sirén’s rendering, “to be without ink (to work in a dry fashion) yet strive for tone” is much better. His version of the sixth, “to paint in an ordinary fashion, yet strive for quality,” is also adequate, whereas Sze’s, “On the flatness of the picture plane, to achieve depth and space” is impossible.

II/21: In the third of Jao Chieh’s “Things to Avoid,” the word mo, “veins,” as applied to mountains, is borrowed from the terminology of geomancy, as Dr. Roger Goepper has pointed out; 3 in pictorial terms, it designates the lines establishing the basic continuity between parts of the mountain mass. Jao’s own explanation, omitted from the Chieh-tzu-yian text, makes this clear. The term does not, in any event, call for such a rendering as “the pulse of life” and a long footnote about the Yin and Yang.

II/23: Wang Wei did not “inaugurate” the kou che (“broken outline”) manner; it was instead an already-existing orthodox manner which he “completely transformed” (ji-pien), presumably reducing the importance of outline drawing by a more versatile handling of ink wash. The explanation of the term in note 17 is thus erroneous; it is not by any means to be equated with p’o-mo. In the similarly misrendered passage on II/172, the beginning, “At first he used light washes,” should be “He was the first to use light washes.” The statement is probably untrue, but that does not concern us here.

II/24: The opening sentence of the second paragraph should read: “From ancient times there have been men famous for their literary accomplishments, who, even though they have not always been known to later ages as painters, were profoundly versed in painting.” Throughout the following paragraph, references to paintings done by these men are misunderstood as referring to pictures owned by them. Thus Chu-ko Liang did not “collect pictures done in the Southern School manner, which brought about such great changes”—and which did not exist in his time—but “did a picture of the southern barbarians, to change their [uncouth] customs.” 4 Yuan-kung is surely not Tung Yu, as he clearly belongs in the Liu Sung dynasty, not the later Sung; I am not certain, however, with whom he should be identified.

II/25: Ch’eng chia refers to those painters who, as stylistic innovators, formed “schools” of their own; “Great masters” is an inadequate rendering, and best reserved for ta-chia, which occurs in the same passage. Thus the sentence about Ni Tsan and the others should conclude, “although

---


4 The story is told in the Chin dynasty Hua-yang-kuo chih; see Pei-wen-chai shu-hua p’u, XI/11b. A shorter account in Li-tai ming-hua chi, ch. 4.
they belonged to the i (untrammelled) class, they, too, were outstanding enough to establish separate schools,” instead of simply, “also were Great Masters.”

II/26: Li T’ang, not Li Kung-lin, belongs in the list with Liu Sung-nien and Ma Yuán.

II/31: The first sentences should read, “The poets of the Southern dynasties [of the Six Dynasties period] spoke of literature directly as pi (brush). [For example], the biography of Shen Yo (Liang dynasty) says, ‘Hsieh Yüan-hui was good at poety, while Jen Yen-sheng was skilful at [prose] literature (pi).’” The quotations which follow also illustrate this special use of pi.

II/32, heading: Chung-jun is not simply “brushwork”; it is “piling up richness,” i.e., beginning with light ink and working into richer. Hsüan-jan refers to ink washes as well as color. The first four paragraphs of this section are quoted verbatim from the treatise of Huang Kung-wang. There are mistakes in the translation; for example, fan-l’ou is not a type of ts’un (texture stroke), but a name for the rounded boulders depicted by Tung Yüan and his followers. The term is similarly misrendered on II/167.

II/34: The painters listed are not “lost to a reader of today” as the note states; they are all known Ming artists, most of them belonging to the Che School: Cheng Tien-hsien, Chang Fu, Chung Li, Chiang Sung, Chang Lu, Wang Chao, Wu Wei. All except Chung are represented by extant and published pictures. The sentence should end, “. . . are dismissed in T’u [Lung] Ch’ih-shu’s Hua Chien as ‘evil demons.’” Below, “Avoiding the banal:” in this para-

cograph, ch’i is used for specific qualities, “the spirit of the marketplace,” etc.; through wrong punctuation, it is throughout rendered in an abstract sense, e.g., in “encourage the spirit (ch’i) to rise. . . .”

II/35: Kuo ts’e is the Ch’uan-kuo ts’e, not the Kuo yü.

II/36: Ch‘ien chiang is not “variations in light and dark tones of colors,” but, literally, “light purple-red,” a term which in painting texts designates the system of using two thin tones, warm and cool, in painting landscapes. It is said to have begun with Tung Yüan, was developed by Huang Kung-wang, and became the orthodox method of coloring in wen-jen hua landscape. The following sentence would read, “This is [also] known as Wu chuang” (from the use of color on wall paintings by Wu Tao-tzu; the term is so explained by Kuo Jo-hsü in his section “On Master Wu’s Use of Colors”; see T’u-hua chien-wen chih, 1/15a). The rendering, “It is said that the figures in their pictures were dressed in the costumes of Wu” appears to follow Petrucci’s misunderstanding.

II/49: For “Master Liang Hsia” read “Master Li-hsia,” i.e., the famous connaisseur Chou Liang-kung, 1613–72.

II/53: Yin and yang, in relation to tree branches, probably means only “shady and sunny,” as it is rendered elsewhere in the manual. Since it occurs in a series with “facing forward or back, right or left. . . .” it is surely not an allusion to the cosmic forces Yin and Yang, as suggested in note 4.

II/75: Hsin Shih-ch’ang is a recorded Yüan dynasty landscapist, not a misprint for Hsü Shih-ch’ang of the Sung period.

II/94, 149, etc.: Shen Shih-t’ien, i.e., Shen Chou, is throughout wrongly identified as Shen Hao, who used a different t’ien in his
name. At another point (II/158) Shen Chou appears as “Ch’en Chi-nan,” un-
identified.
II/135 ff: “Brushstrokes” is not specific enough to render ts’u’an. “Brushstrokes for modeling” (II/120, 153) is better; I prefer Soper’s “texture strokes.”
II/110: There is no evidence that Wu Chen was ever a Taoist monk.
II/111: Chao Ch’ien-li is Chao Po-chu, not Chao Ling-jang.
II/125: By this period, Ni Tsan was ordi-
narily included in the Four Great Masters, and Chao Meng-fu omitted. Two of the four were born in Chekiang Province, which was also a part of the Chiang-nan region.
II/131: The second paragraph is actually quoted from Huang Kung-wang, not from Wang Su-shan (Wang I). The misattribution to Wang of many passages by other writers begins with the highly suspect “T’ang Yin” compilation Liu-ju ch’i-chih hua-p’u.
II/276: Sheng-tung chih ch’i is only “an animated (lively) spirit,” hardly “filled with the power (sheng tung) of the ch’i.” Miss Sze tends to render phrases involving the gen-
tive chih in reverse; in order to have the meaning she gives it, the phrase would have to read “ch’i chih sheng-tung.”
II/323: There is nothing in the Chinese text about “starting with the basic strokes con-
tained in the character ch’iu.” Ch’iu is “to seek,” and the sentence means, “These [var-
iou techniques of painting orchids] must be sought (i.e., learned) in the proper order.” The character offered in the fol-
lowing paragraph as containing the eight basic strokes of calligraphy is not ch’iu, but, as always, yung, “eternal.”
II/361: Wang Tan-yu is Wang Man-ch’ing, Chin dynasty painter of bamboo. Li K’an could not have studied under Wang T’ing-
yu, who died 43 years before Li was born.
II/362: For “Yüan-yen and Shu-hsien” read “Wan-yen Shu-hsien,” i.e., Wan-yen Chu, Chin dynasty painter of bamboo. Below: hua tzu-chu is not “used purple in his bam-
boo compositions,” but “painted purple bamboo” (a variety of bamboo, the stalk of which is purple in color.)
II/438: The occurrence of the word fan in connection with turned leaves on plants hardly justifies a note on “the characteristic action of ‘returning’ to the Tao”; the “de-
ductions” on other words in this passage are equally irrelevant.
II/475: last paragraph: pi and hsing are two of the six “meanings” or expressive devices of poetry; they might be rendered as “metaphor” and “evocative allusion” respectively. The end of the sentence should read, “. . . they lodged (or conveyed) their conceptions through these.” Whether or not this was a process of symbolizing, the Chinese text does not specify it as such. The translation of a related passage on II/325 also misses the point of pi and hsing.
II/525: “. . . though that may not have been nature’s prime intent.” There is no suggestion, here or in Taoist or Neo-Con-
fucian cosmology generally, that nature (Creation, tsao-wu) has any “intent” at all. The phrase in question means, “Al-
though Creation has never operated with purposefulness. . . .”

It will be seen from these examples that the translation, although in parts very good, cannot be relied upon throughout as an accu-
rate rendering of the Chinese text; nor is the first volume of Miss Sze’s work an adequate presentation of Chinese attitudes toward painting. It is not, I think, by approaching Chinese texts—and, more important, Chinese paintings—with pre-formed notions of what we will find in them, that we can eventually come
to a thorough understanding of them; but rather by allowing them to speak for themselves. We might well, I believe, spend less of our time on the pursuit of the elusive ch’i-yüan and more on painting; we might, until we can demonstrate more convincingly the actual relevance of Yin and Yang, Ch’an Buddhism, etc. to painting, leave them to the realm of philosophy, religion, and the dabbling of the pseudomystics among our contemporary poets and painters. Less Tao, please, more painting.

James F. Cahill

The Landscape Painting of China and Japan.

By Hugo Münsterberg. Rutland (Charles E. Tuttle Company), 1935, XV+144 pp., 101 pls. and 1 color pl.

The late Oskar Münsterberg was the author of two pioneer works, the Japanische Kunstgeschichte which was published during 1904–07, and the Chinesische Kunstgeschichte which appeared in 1910–12. In the past 50 years, knowledge of Far Eastern art has greatly increased and deepened. For this our thanks are due to the pioneers in this field. The critical standards we have to apply today are, naturally, higher than even a generation ago and, we hope, will become much more exacting still. By such standards the present book by Mr. Münsterberg’s son falls by the wayside.

There is hardly anything in this book that cannot be found in one or several of the older standard publications or that has not been taught in classrooms, in Europe as well as in this country, for 20 years and more. At the same time, methods and results of more recent research have, on the whole, not been applied or assimilated, and many important discoveries are not even mentioned. The illustrations, 71 for China and 31 for Japan, contain hardly a handful of pictures that have not been reproduced over and over again and with which we are not thoroughly familiar. However, some of the very best are lacking, while, as in all older publications, originals, early and late copies, and worse are indiscriminately thrown together. Paintings that obviously are neither by the same hand nor of the same period or of the same quality are reproduced or mentioned as works of the same painter. This should, perhaps, not surprise us for the author tells us that it is “next to impossible to determine with certainty which scrolls are by the artists to whom they are ascribed and which are no more than copies of originals or works inspired by some famous masterpiece of one of the great painters of the past” (p. 9). He explains that this is the case because (p. 22) “not only did the Chinese throughout their history assiduously copy the old masters, often with remarkable skill, but when doing so they also copied the signature, seals, and colophons. Likewise, they painted in the manner of an old master, not with any intention of deceiving but rather to show their veneration for the great artist in whose style they were working. Finally, in modern times, there are copies which are outright forgeries of older paintings.”

Now, forgeries were made as soon as there was a market for them, which in China was the case at least as early as the Northern Sung period (see Mi Fu, Hua Shih; and A. Soper, Kuo Jo-hsi’s Experiences in Painting, p. 87).

Legitimate copying was indeed standard practice in China, for the purpose of studying and for the purpose of creating a reproduction. In these cases, signatures and colophons were sometimes copied to have them on record, in the handwriting of the copyist or with an additional signature or note by the latter. Wherever this is not the case, this reviewer doubts the legitimate intention. However, these inscriptions were often added later. The seals certainly were never copied in good faith.
Paintings "in the manner of" often have little in common with their source of inspiration, sometimes as little as a Van Gogh painting after Millet with its model.

Without minimizing the difficulties which face us, it is, in this reviewer's opinion, precisely the job of the art historian to find out which is which. These difficulties, incidentally, are not unknown to students of Western art, as Messrs. Dossena and Van Meegeren have reminded us.

To be fair, in the text the author makes an attempt to be more specific in his evaluations of the pictures he describes or mentions. However, this reviewer regrets that, in most cases, he cannot accept the dates or attributions given by the author, generally without any substantiating proof or argument.

Frequently the author uses a later and rather poor copy to illustrate the style of an artist or of a period. His choice seems to be quite deliberate for he tells us (p. 24, speaking of two paintings of the Palace Museum which were exhibited in London): "They are rather poor in quality but for that reason probably closer to the originals than they would have been if the artist who painted them had had a stronger artistic personality."

There is, of course, a grain of truth in this. But even a poor copyist is bound to introduce, unconsciously, stylistic elements of his own period into the transmission of an earlier work or style. The poor copy is esthetically unsatisfactory in addition to being art-historically misleading. Its use does not seem justified when paintings even of the earlier periods exist which are genuine though not by the hand of a famous master.

The text is spattered with well-worn clichés and with excerpts from Chinese sources which are culled from existing translations. It is liberally larded with Chinese and Japanese terms which for the innocent reader must give an esoteric aspect to the book.

However, "chii-jei" neither means "gentleman" nor is it a sobriquet of the bamboo (p. 6); it is the title of the holder of the second degree in the literary examinations; the bamboo is called "tzu ch'u" ("this gentleman"); For "ch'i-yin sheng-tung," which is called "as elusive and profound as the writings of Lao-tzu" (p. 10) in order to be finally identified with inspiration, compare the searching analysis of A. Soper (Far Eastern Quarterly, vol. 8 [1949], p. 412 ff.) and more recently W. Acker (Some T'ang and Pre-T'ang texts on Chinese painting, Leiden, 1954, p. XX ff.). "Ku-hua" would mean "bone-painting" and not "boneless painting" (p. 27); the term is "mu-ku lua" (B. March, Some technical terms of Chinese painting, No. 120) and means "painting without outline, in colour" (March, op. cit.). Meditation is dhyäna, not dhyani (p. 56); Soami's catalogue is called Kundaik (w)an Sayuchoki and not Kintaikan . . . (p. 95); the isle of the immortals, Mt. P'eng-lai and not Pen Lai (p. 96), etc.

Though the author makes a half-hearted obeisance in the direction of Ming and Ch'ing painting, he cannot conceal a strong bias in favor of the earlier periods. This bias should be tempered by more knowledge and understanding. During the Ming dynasty, he tells us, "the landscape was no longer as important as it had been"; painting "lacks the depth of feeling and profundity of thought" (of Sung art); it is concerned with "human activities," "with his (man's) life in the daily world"; it also puts "greater emphasis upon realistic detail" (p. 65). True, there was a lot of genre painting in Ming times, but perhaps not much more than earlier. And the great Ming painters like Shen Chou were not the least bit interested in man's life in the daily world nor in realistic detail. The author sees a "marked decline in painting during the last part of the Ming period" which lasted until the middle of the seventeenth century and was the result of
Tung Ch'i-ch'ang's academic teachings (p. 72). Now the late Ming period (the dynasty ended 1644) was precisely the time when "new currents in art arose" (ibid.) ; these new currents cannot be understood without seeing the influence of Tung's paintings and teachings; they embrace the more traditional group of Wang Chien and Wang Shih-min as well as the individualists whom the author surprisingly calls "mostly Taoist monks" (p. 75) and places in the Ch'ing period. True, many of the latter were still very young at the fall of the dynasty, but their attitude, their writings as well as their art leave no doubt that they belong with or are an outgrowth of the late Ming period.

The author deplores the traditional aspect of Ch'ing painting but admits that these pictures after early masters have an unmistakable character of their own (p. 74). He calls Wang Hui a painter without originality, but, in the same sentence, a man of great inventiveness (p. 74). He characterizes the latter's beautiful handscroll in the Freer Gallery as "thin and uninspired" and lacking ch'i-yüan; at last we have somebody who knows ch'i-yüan when he sees it! The other three Wangs are barely mentioned by name.

Yüan Chiang, incidentally, is a typical product of the Northern and not of the Southern school (p. 76 and pl. 67).

Though the author is aware of the historical reasons for the emphasis on Late Sung painting which pervades Western criticism (pp. 52 and 73), his own taste shows the same preference. For him "Ma Yüan and Hsia Kuei have few if any equals in the history of painting" (p. 58). Sung painting seems to have become identical with Late Sung painting (cp. the selection of titles on p. 8 or the remark that "infinitely-receding depth [is] so characteristic of Sung painting," p. 61). The importance and the characteristics of the tenth century and the Early (Northern) Sung period do not seem to have been clearly understood by the author who perhaps is less responsive to the beauty of the few existing originals by its great masters. There is a chapter on the Five Dynasties and Early Sung period and another on the Northern Sung period; Early and Northern Sung are in general usage synonymous.

"No doubt landscape painting itself underwent considerable development during the fifth century" (since Ku K'ai-chih; p. 16); "there must have been landscape scrolls painted during the period which showed a more advanced style" (than Tun-huang; p. 17). "With the sixth century, developments reached a climax which led to the establishment of true landscape painting" (p. 17); "it may be assumed that some pure landscapes were painted at the time" (p. 17). "It would thus appear that the sixth century already knew landscape painting as a distinct genre . . ." (p. 18). "Not until the T'ang period (618–907) did landscape painting evolve into a separate and major genre" (p. 19). Of a T'ang (style) picture: "This is not [yet] landscape painting for its own sake . . ." (p. 22), "this is by no means a pure landscape . . ." Wang Wei "was somewhat more advanced in the evolution of the pure landscape" (p. 25). "While the T'ang painters had always seen the landscape in relation to human activity, the tenth century artists created a pure landscape . . ." (p. 31).

The above excerpts show a somewhat contradictory way of arguing and a considerable disregard of the existing authentic material. The Tun-huang frescoes are summarily called provincial and "only a crude reflection of the style current at the Imperial court and in the other cultural centers" (p. 16, p. 28); the sixth-century wall paintings of T'ung-kou in Manchuria and the Heijō district in Korea, the Six Dynasties and T'ang wall paintings in the Mai-chi-shan caves in Kansu, as well as the
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T'ang ones at the Wu-t'ai-shan (discovered by Liang Su-ch'eng) are not mentioned.

Going still further back, we read that "the earliest landscapes in Chinese art are found in the Han period" (p. 13). The author here means landscape elements like mountains and clouds, trees and buildings. He adds that no examples of actual paintings have survived (ibid.). The earliest surviving examples of landscape elements date from the late Chou period; these are to be seen on painted lacquers, engraved and inlaid bronzes, and in at least two real paintings on cloth or silk. As for the Han period, there are also painted lacquers and tiles and the murals of Liao-yang (South Manchuria).

Summing up, this reviewer regrets that the author does not seem to be sufficiently acquainted with the existing material, or to be equipped with the necessary critical approach to the individual examples. Consequently he does not show any real grasp of the historical and stylistic development and of its background and is satisfied with using the traditional pigeonholes of dynastic periods, the contents of which are oversimplified or distorted. His stylistic and compositional analyses are sometimes quite competent but, especially with periods or artists that do not inspire him, he fails to understand the poetic mood or message of a painting which, in the case of the "literary" paintings, generally is clearly indicated by its inscription (v. pp. 76 and 78 on Wang Hui and Shih-t'ao, pp. 60 and 64 on Huang Kung-wang and the other Yüan painters). Obviously it is a very difficult task to condense 2,000 or even 1,000 years of Chinese landscape painting into some 70 pages and 70 illustrations, but in this reviewer's opinion it has not been solved here.

The chapters dealing with Japanese landscape painting seem to show more understanding. Apparently the author has profited from his prolonged stay in that country. However, we encounter some of the same wishful thinking about the earlier periods: "It would seem likely that a painter who could do such a charming landscape on a rough piece of cloth (the Shōsōin hemp-cloth) could have painted highly developed landscapes on silk or paper . . ." (p. 86); speaking of the Genji scroll: "probably the pure landscape also existed" (p. 88).

Speaking of the Ippen and Saigyō scrolls, the author says that the landscape is "again influenced by the Chinese" and that there is "a new dependence on Chinese models" (p. 91). He goes on to say: "There is no doubt that by the end of the Kamakura period Sung painting had begun to reach Japan and that it was exerting an influence which was to become dominant during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries" (ibid.).

In fact, relations with China were resumed toward the end of the Fujiwara period and paintings and painters of the Ch' an (Zen) school as well as of the so-called Chekiang school (of religious painting) reached Japan. However, the scrolls mentioned above do not show a trace of Sung landscape painting but are typical (and very beautiful) Japanese developments of the T'ang style.

The choice of illustrations is more consistent than in the Chinese section though it is open to discussion whether Sōtatsu's Genji screens (pl. 90) are his most famous and most typical work (p. 113), and the wisdom of including five prints and one Western-style Nagasaki-school painting among the 31 plates is debatable.

Notes, Bibliography, and Index wind up the handsomely presented volume.

Aschwin Lippe

By Oliver Statler. Tokyo (Charles E.
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Tuttle Company, 1956. XXI+209 pp., 100 ills. (13 full-page, 11 of which are in color), 1 wood-block print.

The modern printmakers are one of the most interesting and probably the most creative group of artists working in Japan today. The hanga prints have no direct connection with the still surviving ukiyo-e tradition. The only connection is by rebound from the West, through the influence of Western artists of the beginning of the century who in their turn had been influenced by ukiyo-e. However, the great technique of the wood-block print is a national heritage, even though the hanga prints do not imitate the lines of the brush and also in content are a new independent and modern development.

The book is an excellent introduction to this fascinating art. It gives us, furthermore, vivid sketches of the lives and personalities of the artists constituting this group, from Kanae Yamamoto (1882-1946) to Thoru Mabuchi (born in 1920) and detailed descriptions of their techniques. (They are their own designers, carvers, and printers.) The 100 illustrations are well chosen. Besides the better-known artists like Kiyoshi Saito and Shiko Munakata, this reviewer would like to point out Koshiro Onchi (to whose memory the book is dedicated), Un'ichi Hiratsuka, Hide Kawanishi, Umetaro Azechi, and Gen Yamaguchi.

An appendix makes us familiar with the words used for the blocks and with their characteristics; another supplies a detailed description and analysis of the prints which are reproduced; a useful index (artists' names are given with Japanese characters) rounds out this handsome book.

ASCHWIN LIPPE

Chinese Porcelains from the Ardebil Shrine.

Outside China, there were three great collections of Oriental porcelain formed before the close of the eighteenth century. The largest of these is the vast collection brought together by the Turkish Sultans, chiefly Ming in date, which contains some 10,000 pieces, of which over 1,300 are Ming celadon, mostly dishes, which can be seen in the Old Seraglio at Constantinople. The next in size were the collections of Chinese and Japanese porcelain amassed by Augustus the Strong, King of Poland and Elector of Saxony, in the closing years of the seventeenth, and early years of the eighteenth century, which, previous to the last World War, were housed in the Johanneum at Dresden. The third, and perhaps the most interesting of the three, is that of the legendary Chini-Khâneh (China House) dedicated to the Shrine of Sheikh Safi at Ardebil, situated some 20 miles west of the Caspian Sea, and not far from the Russian border in the Persian province of Azerbaijan. What remains of this collection has now been transferred to the Archaeological Museum in Teheran, and a few pieces are on exhibition in the Chihili Sultan at Isphahan.

For the study of Ming blue-and-white porcelain in its earliest phases this collection provides a body of material probably unrivaled in any one place. Out of the 1,162 items, which include a number of hardstone vessels, originally deposited there by Shah Abbas, 805 pieces of porcelain survive today; of these 618 pieces are blue-and-white. The collection is provided with a documentary terminal date of 1611, the date of dedication by Shah Abbas the First; a date which brings its completion to a close 8 years before the end of the reign of the Ming Emperor Wan Li, and 33 years before the fall of the Ming dynasty.

In the inventory the collection is arranged
according to the type of vessel, and it is impossible to identify individual items. All but 31 of the surviving pieces carry the engraved mark of Shah Abbas (presumably an unimpeachable guarantee of their age) and only when this mark is absent is there perhaps any justification for questioning the date of acquisition. For it is hardly conceivable that the same mark should have been used by Shah Abbas II (1642–67) or any of his successors, and unlikely that it has been counterfeited. Pope, however, taking the term “Martabani” in the inventory to apply in this context only to the celadon wares, writes that “it is curious that more of them remain today than were noted in the original list,” but as he himself points out elsewhere, this term has been used, outside India, to describe wares other than celadons, usually large stoneware storage vessels with a brown glaze; it is equally possible that some of the Ardebil celadons are recorded under headings other than “Martabani” in the inventory. It is intriguing to speculate on the fate of the missing pieces; and perhaps not uninteresting to mention in this context that during the war a jade bowl carrying the Shah Abbas mark was bought in Cairo.

It is the surviving pieces of the collection of Chinese porcelain at Ardebil which Mr. Pope has presented to us for the first time in a catalogue, of which the text is a remarkable combination of painstaking scholarship and judicious comment. In fact the value of this catalogue lies just as much in its subsidiary chapters, of which I find the “Evaluation of Chinese Sources” and “The Beginnings of Blue-and-White” of particular interest, as in the tabulation and description of the collection itself.

Between the date of dedication to the Shrine by Shah Abbas I and the handling and cataloguing of the collection by Pope, the varying fortunes of the Shrine, its library, and its collection of Chinese porcelain are reflected in the accounts of foreign travelers. That the porcelain once occupied beautifully gilded and painted niches in the Shrine is evident from the earliest accounts. It is not until the early years of the nineteenth century we hear of it stacked on the floor. It appears that sometime probably between 1806 and 1821 part of the collection was destroyed by earthquake, and in 1828 the Russians sacked Ardebil and carried away about 160 manuscripts from the library. It is not recorded, however, whether they helped themselves to any porcelain on this occasion. In 1845 we see the porcelain described as consisting “principally of large dishes, vases, drinking cups and flagons, spread out on the floor, the numerous recesses in the walls, originally intended for their reception, being left empty.” In 1875 a visiting German, whose enthusiasm, according to Pope, got the better of his judgement, described their numbers at 2,000 or more, adding, “Owing to want of care a great many of them have unfortunately been cracked or otherwise injured, and each individual piece is buried beneath an inch of dust. It would have been a great gain to the world at large and to art in particular, if Paskiewitch had equally sent this collection to Saint Petersburg.” A quarter of a century later the collection was visited for the first time by the great authority on Islamic Art, Friederich Sarre, who was able to estimate its significance. He reported that “the porcelain vessels, which were originally placed in niches, now stand upon the ground, approximately 500 in number . . . they are Chinese Ming blue and white porcelain in a number of forms . . . the greater part of these vessels is well preserved.”

After retailing the history of this collection, Pope proceeds to divide the blue-and-white porcelain into groups of the fourteenth, fifteenth (e.g., early, middle, and late), and sixteenth centuries; then come the white wares,
the polychromes, and the celadons. His opening chapters on fourteenth-century blue-and-white are particularly stimulating and in the discussion of supporting evidence, the blue-and-white fragments found at the Kharakhoto site by Sven Hedin provide new material of an important nature. He sums up the position by saying "At the present writing something like a hundred pieces of blue-and-white have been found assignable to the middle decades of the fourteenth century by virtue of their stylistic and physical relationship with the David vases, dated in correspondence with 1351; and another group of smaller and lighter wares has also been accepted as belonging to the same century on less precise grounds." Some of this second group, as Pope suggests in a footnote, may in fact date from the early part of the fourteenth century. This last family is unfortunately not represented at Ardebil, and Pope does not reveal whether he is prepared to consider the possibility of pushing them back into the late years of the thirteenth century. If this could be done, we should come near to establishing the existence of the much-debated Sung blue-and-white; for the Southern Sung dynasty came to an end in 1279.

The view generally held in Chinese ceramic circles in the West is that the earliest Chinese blue-and-white has developed from the Shu-fu porcelain of the Yuan dynasty in the fourteenth century, which was in turn developed from the Ying Ch'ing ware of the Sung dynasty. Up to date there has been no evidence forthcoming to support the Chinese tradition that Chinese blue-and-white goes back to the Sung dynasty; a view also upheld in the past by some Japanese scholars, but without any supporting evidence, beyond the fact that various excavated pieces are said to have come from Sung tombs. It is evident from his chapter on the "Beginnings of Blue-and-White" that Pope, although he does not commit himself, is skeptical of the existence of Sung blue-and-white, and even more of the accuracy of the Chinese texts, which support this view, in which the passages in question would seem likely to be later interpolations. But all this evidence is negative. It does not banish the possibility that the technique of blue-and-white was introduced into China from the Near East in the thirteenth century, when Persia was brought into close relationship with China under Hulagu Khan, who reigned in Persia from 1256-65, when the Mongols had established themselves in North China under his brother Kublai Khan; for the underglaze blue painting, together with black, was certainly practiced in Persia from the earliest part of the thirteenth century.

It is impossible, owing to limitations of space, to follow Pope in detail through his description and evaluation of the Ardebil collection. His chapters on the early, middle, and late blue-and-white wares of the fifteenth century are models of industry and precise scholarship.

It is when he comes to identify the more provincial wares of the middle fifteenth century and to separate them from similar wares of the late fifteenth century, that there is room for slight differences of opinion. One might differ slightly in emphasis perhaps on the dating put forward by Pope for a group of coarse dishes, illustrated on plates 71, 72, 73, and 74, which Pope calls "late fifteenth century." Another dish of the same family, decorated with a peacock, appears as "about 1500" on plate 78. I should rather prefer an early sixteenth-century date for this group, which carries designs strangely reminiscent of Hsüan Tê, and yet unlike any known Hsüan Tê original. This mysterious family may or may not have been made at Ching-tê Chên, but if one assumes they were made between 1480 and 1520 one cannot go far wrong. His real love is the blue-and-white of the fourteenth
and fifteenth centuries. It is only when he comes to the sixteenth-century blue-and-white that his enthusiasm begins to wane. The bulk of the unmarked blue-and-white pieces in the collection attributed to this period are lumped together on plates 89-109 as "late sixteenth century." Among them, the ewer of octagonal shape on plate 108 would appear to me to belong to the earlier half of the century, and the same applies to at least two of the ewers on plate 98, the first of which has a typical Chia Ching look. In a footnote to page 135 it is suggested that another ewer, decorated with the well-known fountain design and with a Chia Ching nien hao might have been made in the Wan Li period. This novel idea seems to me unlikely.

The chapters devoted to the white wares and the polychrome wares are full of startling revelations. It is of absorbing interest to note that a white fifteenth-century dish (pl. 111) bears traces of an overglaze decoration in gold and that two bowls have gold metal bands to the lip. Another white bowl bears the incised mark of Jahangir, in addition to that of Shah Abbas, showing that it came from India. As Jahangir did not assume the title till 1605, it must have been acquired by Shah Abbas between 1605 and 1611.

But it is among the polychrome pieces that one meets with the biggest surprises. The dish with the Chêng Tê mark decorated with fishes and aquatic plants in dark cobalt under a turquoise blue glaze (pl. 116) has, as far as I know, no parallel in any English collection. The existence of Hung Chih enameled wares decorated with other than green (and possibly yellow) enamel designs is debatable, for unfortunately they are quite often subject to subsequent redecoration. In fact, the broken dish (pl. 116) enameled on the inside with lions and streamers, and on the outside with fruiting trees and birds in red, yellow, and green enamels, which is one of a pair, is such a rarity that one wonders if it is too good to be true. There are also two bowls belonging to this same group, which Pope unfortunately does not illustrate. One of them is reproduced by Bahrami in his article on the Ardebil Porcelains in volume 25 of the Transactions of the Oriental Ceramic Society, but at such an angle that it is impossible to see the decoration, which appears to be lions in a landscape with rocks and trees. The enamels described as wu ts'ai (five colors) include blue, yellow, green, brown, and black. Apart from this little group at Ardebil, which in no way, I admit, resembles any of the others, there is only a small family of marked Hung Chih pieces known to us, decorated in two or more enamels (three of these are in English collections), and with the exception of a single stem-cup incised with enameled green dragons on a yellow ground in the Palace Collections, Taiwan, I would say the decoration of all the other pieces is not beyond suspicion. Nor did I see any other examples of this family on my recent visit to the Palace Collections at Pei Kou, Taiwan, although this does not necessarily mean that it does not exist there. The collections are so vast that it may have been overlooked. It is impossible, I think, to question the nien hao on either the Hung Chih dish or bowl from Ardebil which have been illustrated, both of which carry Shah Abbas's mark, so that if redecoration took place it must have been before 1611; up to date one has associated such work exclusively with the eighteenth century or later. Another piece I find difficult to date without handling it, is the dish 29.763 (pl. 117) which Pope calls "late fifteenth century." Is this Ch'êng Hua or Chêng Tê, or is it only a fine version in enamels of No. 29.371 (pl. 87) to which the drawing of the pomegranates bear a certain resemblance? This would make it Chia Ching, or Wan Li. It is interesting to notice in passing that Bahrami reproduces the bottom of a large
dish, enameled on the inside with red, green, and yellow, with lions and foliage, on the base of which a Hsüan Tê mark in red enamel in a ring has been imposed over an incised Chia Ching nien-hao original. Pope reproduces another dish enameled with figures in red, green, and yellow in a landscape (pl. 118) which has been treated in the same way. No explanation of this curious phenomenon is given by either. This last dish Mr. Basil Gray, who has handled it, tells me has not only the incised mark of Chia Ching, but in addition, incised decoration under the glaze. But it would be rash to rush to the conclusion that this dish, together with the Hung Chih group, has been redecorated. Without handling the pieces it is impossible to express an opinion. If the latter are not redecorated they establish a completely new family of Hung Chih wares.

Chêng Tê enameled wares are less difficult to find than Hung Chih (there are several curious examples in the Palace Collections), but the bowl with a Chêng Tê mark with touches of gold with a lion, pai-t'sê, elephant, and ch'i-lin (pl. 117) is, as far as I know, unique. From a casual glance at the illustration the drawing of the animals looks almost seventeenth century. Since, however, this piece also carries the Shah Abbas mark it provides, with the four Hung Chih pieces, a new and important criterion for the study of Ming polychromes.

These slight differences of attribution are questions of personal opinion and in no way detract from the monumental character of the catalogue, which will remain the authoritative work on this collection. One hundred and thirty plates are devoted to the collection, and all the more important pieces are discussed. One cannot praise too highly this valuable piece of research, nor be sufficiently grateful for all the hard work it has entailed.

Soame Jenyns


This scholarly publication with its excellent illustrations is a study of the export porcelains manufactured in China during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to the special order of the European patrons. These wares, made with great care to suit in shape and decoration the Western requirements, are of particular interest. In the first place, they show the ingenuity of the Chinese potter in his successful assimilation of European designs and shapes. Secondly, they mirror the vogue for chinoiserie that developed in the ornamental designs of the eighteenth century rococo art style of Europe. The China trade porcelain made for Europe falls into two distinct types. The first of these is the ordinary variety that is represented mainly by the blue-and-white and plain white wares which were manufactured in large quantities for the markets. The second group consists of the finer porcelains which were made to special order and decorated with enameled designs based on European patterns. Of the various types in this class none is as interesting as the colorful dinner and tea services that were enameled at Canton with European coats of arms and pictorial subjects. Mr. Phillips's book is devoted to the study of this particular family of wares, especially the armorial china of the type that is so fully represented in the magnificent collection of the late Helena Woolworth McCann. His work is a valuable contribution in the field of Chinese ceramics and a worthy tribute to the memory of this discriminating collector.
The McCann collection, comprising some 4,000 pieces, contains two dozen nearly complete dinner services numbering 3,000 pieces, and a dozen almost complete tea services consisting of 400 pieces. The remaining 600 consist of miscellaneous dishes from various services and objects for other use, such as vases, etc.

The bulk of the collection consists of table wares embellished with armorial and pictorial designs which were executed to the order of the patrons in England and in various countries of the continent of Europe, such as Portugal, Scandinavia, Germany, and Holland. The collection also includes a small number of armorial ware that was made for America in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

The presence in a collection of such a magnitude of only a small number of "American" pieces is explained by the fact that, since direct trade between the United States and the Far East began only near the end of the eighteenth century, her share was insignificant in the intensive commerce, particularly in porcelains, that was carried on between Europe and China during that century. Of the porcelains made to special order for Europe, the major portion was destined for England, as is evidenced by the McCann collection. This, as the author states, is not surprising in view of the fact that the great China trade of the eighteenth century, in which various European East India Companies participated, was controlled by the powerful English East India Company for over a century, i.e., from the time it established trading posts, or factories, at Canton in 1715 until 1834 when the Company was dissolved. It was during the period of the British dominance of the East-West trade that the armorial porcelains eamed at Canton were in vogue in England and Europe.

Mrs. McCann's interest was in the armorial porcelain, which she collected systematically and with great care. To give the reader an idea of the quality of her collection, we quote the following statement by the author: "Indeed, one can safely say that no collection represents with more distinction the China-Trade ware at the peak of its popularity" (p. 64). The McCann collection, which is presented in its entirety in the book under review, has been donated to 26 museums in the United States and one in Canada. The names of the institutions and the amount of the porcelain given to each are listed on page VII.

Mr. Phillips's book is well planned, his text is easy to follow and is full of valuable information for the student in this field. In the first part of the book, divided into six chapters, the author presents a clear and adequate review of the background of his main topic, while in the second part he describes and illustrates the McCann collection. Part 1 opens with a brief introduction on the scope and plan of the book, and is followed by a chapter on the history of the famous pottery town of Chingtechen in the Kiangsi province and on the technique of manufacturing of porcelain there. Chingtechen, where the finest porcelains of China were manufactured for centuries, was also the home of the wares that were made for export to Europe.

The second chapter is devoted to the early days of the trade relationship between Europe and China. With the advent of the sixteenth century, the Portuguese opened the sea route via the Cape of Good Hope and established trading centers in various parts of the Far East. The first trade activities were regularized during the second half of that century, following the establishment of the Portuguese settlement at Macao in 1557. The silks and

1 For more detailed information on the Chinese porcelain made for the United States, see J. A. Lloyd Hyde, Oriental Lowestoft . . ., 1954.
other goods of China that were then imported to Europe included also porcelain, a novel commodity which created a great sensation. But it was during the following century that the Chinese wares became better known in Europe. Early in the seventeenth century the Dutch gained control of the China trade by establishing settlements in Batavia and various other parts of the Far East. The Dutch East India Company, founded in 1602, imported yearly a great variety of Chinese goods, including tea and a considerable amount of the then famous blue-and-white porcelain. The greatly intensified trade, which was conducted by the Dutch throughout the seventeenth century, reached the peak in the following century when other European East India Companies were founded and established trading centers (called factories) at Canton. Of these, the most prominent was the English East India Company which controlled Europe's commerce with the Far East throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. While the important commodities of that trade were tea and silk, porcelain formed the bulk of the cargoes of the Companies' ships. That was the era in which the Chinese porcelains became so popular in Europe and England that there grew a demand for the wares of special shapes and decorations to suit the European usage and taste. As a result, the ingenious Chinese produced novel wares of which the most outstanding was the armorial porcelain.

It may interest the reader to note that, of the Chinese commodities brought to Europe from the sixteenth century onward, it was the tea and porcelain that made a lasting impression on the European culture. If the coming of the tea resulted in the introduction of the tea-drinking custom among the Europeans, so the importation of the porcelain aided them in the manufacture of that precious material. We may also add that, while the Portuguese were the first in bringing porcelain to Europe, it was the Dutch who made it a familiar article of use in Europe, where they also introduced the tea.

The third chapter of the book under review deals with the organizations of the European East India Companies, particularly the English, and with their systems of operation through their factories in Canton, China's great commercial center. Interesting in this chapter is the author's discourse on the relations of the Companies to the Chinese officials and merchants and the difficulties that faced the European traders in their dealings with the complex and often unreasonable terms set by the Chinese. But, in spite of all the difficulties, the China trade grew steadily in scope, with the Companies making great profits. Of the representative Companies of the time, such as the English, Dutch, French, Swedish, and Danish, the most powerful was that of the British which controlled Europe's China trade for over a century.

In Chapter 4 the author discusses the trade in porcelain, giving a detailed account of the system used by the agents of the English East India Company in carrying out special orders for the decoration of porcelains, particularly the armorial wares. Of great interest are his illustrations of the sample plates made in China to assist the European patrons in the choice of the border motifs for their armorial services (fig. 22) and of an invoice for a service made for Charles Peers and dated 1731 (fig. 24).

In the following chapter, "China in Europe," the reader is given a vivid account of the impact of Chinese art upon Europe.

2 On the Dutch trade of the seventeenth century and on the importance of the Chinese porcelain in that trade, see the distinguished work of T. Volker, Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company, Leiden, 1954.

brought about by her products such as porcelains, silks, lacquer, etc. That influence, which affected mainly the decorative arts, created a style known as “chinoiserie” in which the elements of the florid art of eighteenth-century China were successfully combined with those of the equally ornate rococo style of contemporary Europe.

In Chapter 6 the author gives a detailed description of various types of porcelains that were made for Europe, particularly the armorial ware which forms the core of his study. Very useful and revealing is his critical analysis of the styles of armorial designs and border motifs of this ware that were copied by the Chinese from the drawings and prints sent from Europe. Particularly welcome are the reproductions of European ceramic pieces, coats of arms, and other ornamental designs which served as models for the Cantonese artisans in their execution of the wares destined for Europe. The armorial wares, which can be closely dated by comparing the style of their coats of arms with that of the European armorial bookplates, are important in that they throw much light upon the problem of dating of various other contemporary Chinese wares that were made either for home markets or for export to countries other than Europe.

The second part of the book is devoted to the McCann collection of porcelains which the author presents in 109 excellent plates of which 16 and the frontispiece are in color. Many of the pieces in the collection are illustrated for the first time. The plates are arranged in chronological order in which each group of wares is illustrated by a number of representative examples, accompanied by brief pertinent commentaries.

An appendix gives the location of the McCann porcelains illustrated in the plates and the distribution of the various services among the museums to which they were donated. This is followed by a bibliography, references to the source material, and an index.

If any criticism of this book is due, a few points are pertinent in the opinion of this reviewer. The major weakness of the work is the absence of footnotes, making it difficult to trace the sources which are listed in the “Acknowledgments and References,” giving only the pages in which the quotations appear. Secondly, in a work devoted to eighteenth-century China trade porcelain that evolved mainly from the famille rose ware of the contemporary Ch’ien Lung (1736–95) period, reference should have been made also to Hobson’s The Later Ceramic Wares of China, in which the famille rose and its offspring made for Europe are so brilliantly discussed. Finally, considering the fact that the greater portion of the first part of the book deals with the survey of the trade relationship between Europe and China and the role porcelain played in it, no reference is made to Volker’s Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company, which is an indispensable source for a study on Chinese export wares.

But these are only minor faults in this book, the value of which lies in the thoroughness of the treatment of its subject and in the superb and generous illustrations.

KAMER AGA-OGLU


This is a monograph of 15 tan kas (a mistake for thang ka, “temple picture,” in western books often parading as “temple banner”) peculiar to Tibetan Tantric Buddhism (ineptly termed Lamaism).

Thirteen of the paintings belong to the City Art Museum of St. Louis while the remaining two are the property of the author. They illustrate stories of the Jātaka cycle.
The preface gives an account of the careful preparation completed by the author before she entered upon the complicated task she had set herself. She studied Sanskrit, Pali, and Tibetan chiefly under the guidance of erudite Professor Bernard Geiger, and did considerable research with books written both in Oriental and Western languages until she was equipped to identify the diverse scenes of the *thang ka* reproduced in her monograph. With laudable gratitude she lists the names of persons who had a part in her work.

A glance at the table of contents shows that Miss Bryner designed her work not for the specialist, since it includes much material which is of common knowledge to most students of Tibetan-Mongolian Buddhism.

The author ventured into the maze of comparative literature by tracing some of the ramifications of the stories in Western writings. I believe that the statement that “fables of Aesop are now known to have come from India, stemming from these same Buddhist tales” (p. XI) is much too sweeping.

The assertion that “the earliest Western text of this ubiquitous *jātaka* [a birth story reflected in Barlaam and Josaphat] is that of Aristides” (p. XII) has no basis in fact. All we find is that the seven sermons of the famous apologist are put into the mouth of the anchorite who converts Budasaf or Bodhisat, son of the anti-Christian Indian King Avenner, to Christianity and that these purely Christian apologies were imbedded in the famous religious epic, Barlaam and Josaphat, when it appeared in Europe many centuries later. In West Europe, it seems the oldest version mentioned is that of Abraham bar Samuel Halevi ibn Chisdai (thirteenth century) under the title of *Prince and Derwish*, closely following the Arabic version.

Such motifs as the “pound of flesh” are Indian, to be sure, and have a definite Buddhist flavor, but is there certainty that they originated in Buddhism?

I am happy to concede that the author displays a wide range of reading and endeavors to make the best use of it. In most cases, if not all, the identifications of the many scenes portrayed in the *thang ka* are correct. Miss Bryner reproduces not only the paintings but also their main captions in the *dpe yig* script with transcription added. While the color plate of the frontispiece is not too successful, the collotypes are more satisfactory in that they permit the reader to study with the aid of a magnifying glass the many details they reveal and to compare them with the elaborate explanations.

The statement on the jacket that the book contains 15 full-page illustrations is somewhat misleading. The reproductions cover about 70 percent of each page. If they had occupied the whole space, they would have been more usable. But these drawbacks are of minor weight. From the standpoint of the general reader Miss Bryner deserves encouragement for her bold step into a little-cultivated field.

**Ferdinand D. Lessing**


I wish we had more books like this. For what we need most urgently in the field of Far Eastern art are detailed monographic analyses of individual works of high artistic merit as to technique, style, quality, specific position and function in art history, because only in this way can we hope to arrive at a fairly reasonable and consistent understanding of such matters as the development and artistic
values of Chinese painting in its entire range and on a sound methodological basis. Such analyses should be made “microscopically” and should be based on a rich display of reproductions of details, if possible in the original size, and of related works. So far, it seems to me, we have had quite a sufficient supply of generalizations, and many statements had to be accepted at face value because, in a great number of cases, nothing but small and perhaps nebulous or fragmentary reproductions and insufficient comparative material were presented. And I am afraid we have not even established a commonly accepted standard for what we mean by and expect from an all-around interpretation and evaluation of a Far Eastern work of art.

The authors’ monograph on the magnificent Chinese handscroll recently acquired by the Cleveland Museum of Art answers a good number of these demands. Even in its more problematical portions it provides useful starting points for discussion. In a review we can give only a survey of the book’s content and a few critical remarks.

Chapter I relates how the landscape scroll “Streams and Mountains without End” (Ch’i Shan W’u Chin) was acquired and explains the aims and method of the study. It describes the scroll and mentions its former owners, among them Emperor Ch’ien Lung and the eminent collector Liang Ch’ing-piao of the seventeenth century (a valuable list of some notable paintings in his collection is added on page 4). As to the date of the scroll, a terminus ante quem is set by a number of colophons reaching back “to at least the year 1205 at which time the painting was already old enough to have lost the name of its painter and fine enough to have been worth preservation and comments” (p. 5). Chapter II describes the subject matter of the painting following the leftward movement of the composition and giving due consideration to its representational and narrative elements. In Chapter III the aesthetic organization is analyzed, mainly by comparing the painting with works of earlier masters, e.g., Fan K’uan and Chü Jan. A careful comparison of later versions of these works, by Wang Shih-min (?), supplies criteria for an interesting interpretation of the copy of the Cleveland scroll owned by the Metropolitan Museum in New York. In Chapter IV the authors date the scroll by style and technique, attributing it to the late Northern Sung period, i.e., to the early twelfth century. The scroll thus having been interpreted as an individual painting, in Chapter V a general scheme of classification of Sung painting is set up which is a revised version of the typology proposed by Dr. Lee in an article of 1948. It is now made up of five types instead of four: the Courtly, the Monumental, the Literal, the Lyric, and the Spontaneous Style. In Chapter VI is described what Lee calls the “Sung crisis” of Chinese painting and what he interprets as a transition from the Courtly and Monumental to the Lyric and Spontaneous Styles: within this scheme the Cleveland scroll is given its relative position (see below). The appendices contain, first, a very useful schematic diagram of the entire scroll with all its colophons and seals, showing all silk joints and other technical details; then a description of the scroll and a discussion of its mounting and the alterations caused by remounting; this is followed by a reproduction of all seals; and finally the eight colophons are added in Chinese characters, in translation and in photographic reproduction. The 25 plates are excellent; they include a large folding plate showing the entire painting in the size of about 7 by 40 inches, and several detail and infrared photographs in addition to

\footnote{The story of Chinese painting, Art Quarterly, vol. 11 (1948), pp. 9–31.}
a great number of plates presenting comparative material.

This organization of the book is excellent because it gives nearly exhaustive information about one individual work of high quality and of an historically important position in one of the decisive periods of Chinese painting. Therefore it might well serve as a model for many followers. Is it a utopian idea to imagine a series of small volumes—smaller than this magnificent and costly Artibus Asiae Supplementum—publishing at least the most important Chinese paintings in Western collections?

Now this assent given to the general purpose, organization, and procedure of this study does not preclude a certain amount of dissent concerning some of the authors' statements and methods. Since the criteria for an adequate interpretation of Far Eastern paintings, especially scroll paintings, have yet to be worked out and agreed upon, the following remarks should be taken as a modest contribution to our common task of finding our way through the intricacies of the representational methods, the compositional and pictorial principles, and the stylistic types and changes of Chinese painting. Nobody has stated more realistically how feeble are the foundations of our knowledge in this field than Dr. Lee himself.

On page 6 the composition of the Cleveland scroll is described as being divided into four sections according to the chief groupings of the landscape elements. I feel that these sections are singled out rather arbitrarily and that the intrinsic nature of mature scroll painting categorically demands that the interpreter look not so much for sections and divisions as for the pictorial methods employed to create a coherent whole in which no single element stands isolated but is connected with all its neighbors, each portion belonging, at least partly, to the portions preceding and following it. This is a consequence of the specific scroll format lacking intersections and requiring a compositional technique that gives the spectator freedom to draw the boundaries of a section at his own will; as he is gliding along, he always sees a picture with a well-balanced composition built up around a center of interest but at the same time open on both sides and always ready, by giving up its individual bodily frame, to merge into a new complex crystallizing around another center of gravity. This constant gliding and shifting process should be kept in mind whenever a scroll composition is analyzed lest we fail to see exactly those things in which lie the highest merits of this format. Thus valleys are not only and always intersections between mountain groups but may be meant as centers of a scenery framed by those very mountains, and the greatest achievement of the scroll painters is their skill in keeping us in doubt as to just where to put in our dividing lines. Therefore I cannot agree with the authors' statement (p. 7): "The effect is not continuous but is additive; the scroll is divided into units which can succeed one another one by one as the scroll is unrolled, not one into one, or one as part of another." Even granted that the Cleveland scroll does not represent the most mature type of compositional unification, this statement does not describe the visible facts correctly. The "skewering" line above middle distance which is said (p. 7) to hold those separate units together is, as a matter of fact, not as dominating as we are made to believe because the entire composition is knitted together so closely as not to be in need of an artificial backbone. The fact that the scenery does not lead out of the scroll frame above and below (p. 8) is due to its being seen as from a distance—another device to secure unity of composition and not to relate its components only by addition. Therefore the
sweeping statements (p. 9) on a "general rule" of Sung painting requiring "articulation of parts" and "lack of physical continuity of elements both in depth and in the picture plane" call for the most careful qualification.

Corresponding to the statements on the "additive" method of composition it is said (p. 9) that in the Cleveland scroll we find "an eclectic assemblage" of mountain types taken from a variety of painting styles between T'ang and Sung; this is repeated on page 25 with reference to Kuo Hsi's recommendations on landscape painting. But when he says: "The great man and the virtuoso . . . will not limit himself to one school, but will cull and compare, discuss and investigate until he is able to establish his own school . . . . Narrow specialization has from ancient times been an evil. It is like harping on one note or playing on one string"—does he really advocate eclecticism? To master several styles of painting is one of the indispensable accomplishments required of a Chinese painter which may be compared to the training of our pianists in all musical styles from Bach to Schönberg. Should not we call the Chinese method "inclusive" rather than "eclectic"?

To return to our scroll: I simply do not see those sharp differences between the mountain types allegedly borrowed from different styles. To be sure, there are a variety of such types, but all of them are found all over the painting (and not distributed to certain definite areas of it, p. 9). True, the "sharply vertical, crystalline peaks" are concentrated in the left part of the middle portion of the scroll, but there they fulfill an important compositional task, namely, to form a contrast to the differently shaped mountain groups on their right and left. The towering, angular type and the round type are "elementary forms" used in a sort of counterpoint. And because the towering mountain type occurs not only in this area and in the middle distance but also in the far background it helps to connect all picture areas and planes and to bring about a unity of closely interwoven components. Quite a number of such form types are found. The slender vertical peak, e.g., is but one of half a dozen basic elements—"characters," as it were—which are set against each other in ever changing groups to perform the dialectic interplay of forms giving the painting its strong rhythm of life. Others are the rounded, boulder-shaped rock or mountain, appearing in small or large size and in rhythmic spacing; the slanting cliff with its diagonal trend; the flat wall with squarish outline; the small compact stone or rock; the long flat wave of a low hill or of a shoreline stretching horizontally. All of them are used in various ways: arranged in simple, quiet and static groups or crossing and overlapping each other, intertwined, leaning over in different directions and sometimes rising dramatically in dynamic waves. It is no mere chance that this more elaborate and dynamic arrangement is found in powerful concentration just near the end of the scroll where it produces an impressive climax. Variations and changes like this are part and parcel of the intrinsic artistic nature of the scroll format and bring about unification and integration of a rich variety of single and different elements into an organic whole.

The authors use the term "conceptual" for the artistic treatment of nature forms and sceneries (p. 10): "each [mountain] is separately considered and . . . shown as lapped by or lapping its immediate neighbor. . . . The relationship of one part to the next is not organic as seen in nature but conceptual as known in nature by observations made separately and then mentally related" (italics

---

mine). In this way, I am afraid, the artistic method is described a little too rationally; and what is more important, the fact is ignored that, first, no landscape painting has ever been produced without “seeing,” “knowing,” and “mentally relating” natural forms; and second, that at all times it is the characteristic Chinese way to create paintings by giving not a depiction of forms as seen in nature but a “mental picture” based on knowledge gained by observation but integrated by a powerful synthetic imagination. In this respect our scroll does not differ basically from all other Chinese landscape paintings; its real differences should be described in other, more appropriate terms. I wonder if the term “conceptual” is an adequate one for an artistic method like that of a Sung landscape painting. When the New York copy is described as more unified in contrast to the “conceptual differentiation” of the Cleveland scroll, the fact is overlooked that the aesthetic integration of the latter is much stronger. The New York painting is broken up into monotonously repeated schematic and manneristic form complexes which have a harder plastic volume and are treated more zeichnerisch. Its unity is the result of uniformity rather than of aesthetic integration. It severs many delicate compositional links which help to unite all parts of the Cleveland scroll into an organism and, in “copying” it, it ignores a great many optical connections binding all parts together even over great distances and in different picture planes. The original, when I had the privilege of seeing it at Cleveland three years ago, impressed me by its very unity and aesthetic synthesis, accomplished by a steady, smooth, continuous flow of clearly articulated rhythms, by a lyrical mood combined with strength, and by a fine, delicate texture combined with greatness of vision. Feeling bound to criticize the authors’ interpretation, I derive some consolation from the fact that I seem to value the artistic merits of their treasure even more highly than they do.

The authors’ attempt at fixing the date of the scroll by comparing it with contemporary material (p. 16 ff.) does not seem to me very successful. The mural from the tomb of the Liao Emperor Shên-tsung at Ching-ling is, in my opinion, too much different (and, incidentally, much too early: c. 1030) to be considered in this connection, and the fragment of a landscape drawing from Khara Khoto (probably twelfth century) differs too much in its technique (a pure line drawing or, rather, scribbling) and its artistic level to be of any real value. What is said about the fragment on pages 16 and 17 is rather enthusiastic overstatement. In order to give the Cleveland scroll its due position in the development of Sung painting and to determine its relative rank and quality it could certainly be compared with earlier, contemporary, and later pictures of a really comparable nature. To do this as exactly as possible and without preconceived classification schemes would be a fascinating piece of work.

Now the last point I want to mention: the typology of Sung pictorial styles which Dr. Lee here presents in a revised form. It calls for the same critical argument as before: some of those styles are no “styles” at all, e.g., the Monumental or the Lyrical; although the five types seem to form a sequence, they actually belong to different logical categories: subject matter, approach to reality, psychological attitude, artistic method, etc. The author admits that the five styles overlap but still he sees in them a chronological order which may help to determine the date of a Sung painting. To avoid repetitions, I wish to underline the critical remarks made by Mr. Hochstader in this connection. 3 Those five

styles not only overlap but they may even include each other, e.g., when a "literal" painting of a "courtly" subject has a "lyrical" quality, or when a "monumental" painting is executed in a "spontaneous" manner. In Chao Po-Chü's "Entry of the First Han Emperor into Kuan-chung" (Boston) we see a high degree of monumentality while at the same time it is a "courtly" painting with a good deal of "literal" treatment of details. We know that many a Sung painter used several styles and that this was usual in other periods as well. Therefore the scheme cannot be applied without so many qualifications that its usefulness seems to be badly limited. Even the description of some of the styles in themselves is not very convincing; e.g., when it is said (p. 23) that the literal style examines a subject "part by part." Hui Tsung's painting competition on the theme "Bamboos envelop the inn by the bridge" is taken as an example; does it not show the exact contrary of a "literal" treatment, namely, a treatment suggestive by abbreviation? (The winner of the contest showed "simply the sign of the inn with the word 'spirits' written on it, peeping through the thicket of bamboos.") Or is Chao Ta-nien really "monumental?" (P. 22.)

Although the particular classification proposed in this book and its usefulness for establishing a sound and safe history of style is in some respects problematical, it may serve as a thought-provoking starting point. The setting up of something like a system of coordinates by which a given painting could be assigned its proper place certainly deserves serious consideration and the authors' attempt should be understood as an appeal to work one out as satisfactorily as possible.

Dietrich Seckel
IN MEMORIAM

J. V. S. WILKINSON

J. V. S. Wilkinson was fortunate in his career, which gave him the ideal discipline of the humane scholar. He went to Oxford with a Classical Scholarship, and there gained a blue for rugby football. In 1911 he joined the Indian Civil Service, doing most of his service on the Northwest Frontier and in the United Provinces. In 1924 he came to the Department of Oriental Manuscripts in the British Museum. He soon began his work on Persian and Mughal painting and published in 1929 his first book, The Lights of Canopus, a study of the famous Jahángír fable book (M.S. Add. 18579) under his care. In 1930 he was a member of the Committee of the International Exhibition of Persian Art held at the Royal Academy. On this occasion he edited a monograph on the fifteenth-century Shāh-nāmeh belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society. In 1934 a memorial volume on the miniatures in the Exhibition was published. This book, which was to prove a landmark in our knowledge of Persian painting, was jointly written by Wilkinson and his friends and colleagues Laurence Binyon and Basil Gray. Wilkinson’s contribution was the chapters dealing with later Timurid and Safavid painting. He was also responsible, on the death of Sir Thomas Arnold, for the Catalogue of the Indian Miniatures in the Chester Beatty Library, which appeared in 1936 in three splendid volumes. In 1946 he left the British Museum to become the Librarian of the Chester Beatty Collection. He held the post until his death on January 28, 1957, and was thus responsible for the transfer of this great collection to Dublin and its installation there. He had in the meantime given great assistance in the selection and cataloguing of the Mughal miniatures in the International Exhibition of Indian Art at the Royal Academy in 1947–48. This prompted him to write two charming accounts of Indian painting, one for the symposium edited by Sir Richard Winstedt, the other for the Faber Gallery of Oriental Art. The Jōg Bāshishī of 1602 in the Chester Beatty Library was also published by him in the Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, volume 12, 1948. He was unfortunately deprived of the satisfaction of seeing his Catalogue of the Persian Miniatures in the Chester Beatty Library finally laid before the public. Visitors to the British Museum and the Chester Beatty Library will not need to be reminded of his courtesy, patience, and charm of manner. He was stern only when faced by a slipshod argument or an effusive style. His greatest praise was that a thing was nicely written. His own style was clean and fastidious. His appreciation of Oriental art and literature was keen and sensitive, but detached. His real comfort lay elsewhere, and he warmly approved the judgment of a colleague, another distinguished orientalist, who expressed his intention of occupying his retirement with the study of Shakespeare, Johnson, and the Old Testament.

DOUGLAS BARRETT

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS
OF J. V. S. WILKINSON

Compiled by Richard Ettinghausen

1929


1 The compiler is most grateful to Miss Evanna McGilligan of The Chester Beatty Library, and to Miss Sarah W. Alexander and Mrs. Bertha Usilton for the kind assistance given with this bibliography.
2. *The Light of Canopus, Anvār i Suhailī.*
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28. "An Indian Manuscript of the Golestân of the Shâh Jahân period." Ars Orien-


WALTER PERCEVAL YETTS

Professor W. Percival Yetts, C.B.E., D.Lit., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., was born on April 25, 1878, and died on May 14, 1957. From Bradfield College he went to Lausanne before beginning his medical studies at London, where he qualified as physician and surgeon in 1903. In the same year he entered the Royal Naval Medical Service, in which he won the Admiralty Gold Medal in Naval Hygiene. His interest in Chinese art and culture was aroused on his first arrival on the China coast in H.M.S. Thistle, and the subject soon began to attract him irresistibly. In 1911 he was promoted to Staff Surgeon, but resigned from the service on his marriage in the following year. Then came the turning point in his career. He was appointed Acting Physician to the British Legation in Peking, and at once fell under the spell of the beauty and dignity of that city. On the outbreak of war in 1914 he volunteered to rejoin the Navy, but was promptly commissioned in the Army Medical Corps, in which he served with distinction and was appointed an Officer of the Order of the British Empire. After further service as a medical officer in Government departments he retired and devoted himself entirely to the pursuits which had now come to occupy almost the whole of his leisure time.

He had already published articles on a variety of subjects connected with China, and these earned him the recognition of older scholars such as L. C. Hopkins, the doyen of Chinese epigraphists in the West, whose writings in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society were then attracting keen attention. Yetts’s interest in the ancient script, thus stimulated, led him inevitably to the study of the ritual bronzes and Buddhist sculpture, the most important vehicles of the inscriptions. His three volumes of the Eumorfopoulos Catalogue, published between 1929 and 1932, set a new standard of scholarship in Chinese art studies in England, and when the University of London decided to establish a Chair of Chinese Art and Archaeology at the Courtald Institute in the latter year, there could be no doubt as to who would be chosen to fill the post. He held it with distinction until his retirement as Professor Emeritus in 1946.

There have been few men to whom the name “perfectionist” could be more fairly applied. His sense of responsibility to his students and his readers for accurate information and balanced judgment was prodigious. It was reflected as much in the care with which he corrected his students’ essays as in his attention to the smallest details of phrasing, referencing, and typography in his published work. He expected at least comparable stand-
ards in the work of his colleagues, and if such standards were not attained, his criticism, though always courteous, was outspoken and sometimes devastating. One consequence of his devotion to accuracy and completeness has been a sad disappointment to his friends. For more than 20 years he had been engaged on a great work to be called Ceremonial Bronzes of Ancient China. Had it been possible to publish it during the war, a book of reasonable size and completeness could have been produced, but since the war the spate of archaeological discovery in China has demanded continual revision and rewriting. At the suggestion of friends in 1948 he executed a will appointing a literary executor, myself, to publish the book, if this should not have been achieved in his lifetime. The will, however, authorizes publication only of such sheets of manuscript and block proofs as bear the endorsement “Completed for Publication” and signed by the author. Not a single sheet has been found so endorsed.

Of the few books bearing the name of Yetts the best known is The Cull Chinese Bronzes of 1939, a volume of essays inspired by objects in the collection of Mr. A. E. K. Cull. But his reputation rests largely on his articles in periodicals, which number nearly a hundred, apart from reviews. A majority appeared in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society or in The Burlington Magazine, and many continue to be of great value to students years after publication. His last work was his part in The Rulers of China, an important book on chronology in which he collaborated with the late Professor A. C. Moule. A feature of his writings is the excellence of his drawings of designs and inscriptions.

Yetts joined the Royal Asiatic Society in 1910, and served on its Council and Publications Committee for many years from 1916 until 1945, when he was made an Honorary Vice President. In 1956 he was awarded the Society’s Triennial Gold Medal. He was Chairman of a Selection Committee for the great International Exhibition of Chinese Art at the Royal Academy in 1935–36, and Chairman of Council, The China Society, in the difficult war years, 1940–45. He served for many years on the Universities’ China Committee in London and was an Honorary Member of the Oriental Ceramic Society. For his services to sinology he was appointed a Commander of the British Empire in 1944 and awarded the Order of the Brilliant Star (China) in 1947. He was a gifted artist in watercolor, etching, and tempera, while his neighbors in Buckinghamshire remember him with gratitude for his lively enterprise as local-branch Chairman of the Council for the Preservation of Rural England.

S. Howard Hansford