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The garden-nymphs [the flowers] were brilliant,
Their cheeks shone like lamps;
There were fragrant buds on their stems (or “under their rind”),
Like dark amulets on the arms of the beloved.
The wakeful, ode-rehearsing nightingale
Whetted the desires of wine-drinkers;
At each fountain the duck dipped his beak
Like golden scissors cutting silk;
There were flower-carpets and fresh rosebuds,
The wind fanned the lamps of the roses,
The violet braided her locks,
The buds tied a knot in the heart.

—Recited by the Emperor Jahāngīr, describing the meadows of Kashmir
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With the exhibition “Flowers Underfoot: Indian Carpets of the Mughal Era,” The Metropolitan Museum of Art pays tribute to India, as the country celebrates its fiftieth year of independence. The exhibition features works from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the period during which Indian carpet weavers produced their most stunning works. Despite their breathtakingly delicate beauty, Indian carpets are little known even to carpet experts, so “Flowers Underfoot: Indian Carpets of the Mughal Era” and the accompanying catalogue are crucial additions to both the study of Indian art and carpet studies. The Metropolitan Museum has chosen to honor this historic year for India by highlighting a glorious part of her heritage that has until now been regrettably neglected. This exhibition has grown from the work of Daniel Walker, Patti Cadby Birch Curator of Islamic Art, who has been devoted to the research of Indian carpets for twenty years; his vision and scholarship illuminate the beauty of these works.

Indian carpets are very difficult to study as a group since there are about five hundred surviving pieces, a large number of which are scattered in private collections around the world. Consequently, a long period of research was necessary to gather information on the extant pieces and to have an understanding of this impressive body of material. The exhibition and its catalogue constitute the first in-depth study of Indian carpets and will surely take their rightful places in the history of carpet studies.

The works in the exhibition represent the broad range of carpets produced during the most artistically creative and prolific period of the Mughal Empire. The discussion of carpets in the catalogue roughly follows a chronological development. The earliest works are from the period of the Mughal emperor Akbar (r. 1556–1605), an active patron, who is believed to have established the first imperial carpet workshops in India. These carpets combine the dynamism of Akbar’s reign with traces of Persian design (due to the large number of Persian artists who immigrated to India at this time). The basic elements of Mughal design were established during this period; they can also be traced in later works. Akbar’s son Jahāngīr (r. 1605–27) succeeded to the throne, and his relatively peaceful period of rule allowed further concentration on the arts. The Persian style continued to dominate court aesthetics during Jahāngīr’s reign, but it became quite different from its Persian prototypes and acquired a distinctly Indian character. It was during the reign of Jahāngīr’s son, Shāh Jahān (r. 1628–58), that the flower style in Indian art came into popular use. This aesthetic was characterized by naturalistic flowers, either arranged in rows or shown against a plain background. The flower style came to dominate not only carpet design but all aspects of Mughal art. Later examples of Indian carpet design built on these classical examples, and various styles evolved. A unique aspect of Indian carpets is the choice of materials. Although in many carpet-making societies the most luxurious carpets have silk pile, in Indian carpets of the highest grade pashmina wool was the choice pile material. Pashmina is the wool of Himalayan mountain goats and therefore was imported to India, which shows that it was not the convenience of available materials but deliberate selection that led to its use. The same material is used in shawls from Kashmir, which contributed the word *cachemire* to the English language.

The carpets exhibited in “Flowers Underfoot: Indian Carpets of the Mughal Era” are among the best surviving examples of the classical period of Indian carpets from distinguished lenders around the world. A number of pashmina examples are included. We are proud that seven carpets from the Museum’s own collection—one of the most comprehensive and finest collections of Oriental carpets to be found anywhere—are part of this distinguished array. On this occasion we are pleased to have the opportunity to share more of the Indian jewels of our carpet collection with our visitors than our permanent
display permits. Most of our choicest pieces were gifts of retailer Benjamin Altman in 1913 and financier J. Pierpont Morgan in 1917. Both were avid collectors and generous benefactors to the Museum.

That the Museum has been able to bring together such an outstanding assemblage of Indian carpets is due entirely to the generosity of our many lenders, to all of whom the Museum offers its sincere thanks.

In India, we are grateful to B. P. Singh, Secretary, Department of Culture in the Ministry of Human Resource Development, for his assistance. We offer special thanks to His Highness Brigadier Sawai Bhawani Singh, Maharaja of Jaipur, and the Trustees of the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, as well as to Martand Singh for facilitating our efforts in Jaipur. Indeed it is a signal privilege for the Metropolitan Museum to have undertaken the conservation of the grand pashmina carpet from Jaipur.

This effort, which will ensure that the carpet is enjoyed in Jaipur by future generations of museum visitors, was undertaken by the Metropolitan as a special gift to India during her anniversary year. We also acknowledge, with gratitude, the generous assistance and hospitality we have received from the Metropolitan’s many friends in India during the years that this exhibition has been in the making.

In Japan, other very special loans are from the Gion Matsuri Preservation Associations in Kyoto. Their carpets are with us due to the assistance of Shigeru Fukami, Chairman, and Kojiro Yoshida, Vice-Chairman, of the Gion Matsuri Preservation Associations. We are most thankful to the members of the Minami-Kannon-yama, Kanko-boko, Tsukiboko, and Kita-Kannon-yama Preservation Associations for allowing their prized possessions to travel.

Since 1654, the Girdlers’ carpet, made for the Girdlers’ Company of England in 1630–32, has been allowed to leave its permanent home in the Girdlers’ Hall, London, only once before. For their exceptional generosity we offer special thanks to the members of the Girdlers’ Company.

The Museum gratefully acknowledges substantial support from Enron and the National Endowment for the Arts. Additional support was received from Dodsal. Transportation assistance has been provided by Air India. Without their collective generosity, the exhibition would not have been possible. We are also deeply indebted to The Hagop Kevorkian Fund and the Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf Foundation for their continued dedication to this project and their contributions toward this publication.

Philippe de Montebello
Director
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
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Early Indian carpets comprise the last major group of classical Oriental carpets to become the objects of scholarly study. They have been trivialized by some as being derivative, based too strictly on Persian carpets to be considered original or too dependent on the art of manuscript illustration to be truly carpetlike in appearance. Indian carpets are unfamiliar to many viewers because they are difficult to find in any quantity: few collections own more than one or two, numerous important pieces remain in private hands, and many examples remain in India. Despite the popular impression that few classical Indian carpets have survived the ravages of climate, vermin, and time, more than five hundred examples exist today—some intact, others fragmentary—representing many different types, patterns, and generations, and forming a very substantial body of material.

Indian carpet designers and weavers have made distinct and meaningful contributions to the Oriental tradition of carpet weaving; in itself this is ample justification for giving Indian carpets the attention they have generally been denied. First, the most technically accomplished classical carpets of all time were woven in India. Throughout this publication, geographical terms should be understood in a seventeenth-century context. The historic India thus encompasses modern-day India and Pakistan, and Lahore is considered as part of northern India. These are the pieces made with pile of fine goat’s hair (cashmere wool, or pashmina) on silk foundations, with knot counts occasionally approaching (and in one case exceeding) two thousand per square inch. These textiles should not be considered just as a technical tour de force, however, for they are works of art of great sensitivity and beauty. Indian carpet weavers were not the first to employ pashmina, but it was certainly they who fully exploited the marvelous properties of this material as a pile fiber. Second, Indian carpet weavers, more than any others, were really painters: they learned to employ dyed yarns just as painters used pigments, which resulted in a coloristic range and sophistication otherwise unknown. Yarns of different colors were directly mixed or used in combination to yield new hues or subtle variations on existing ones. And third, there was also a stylistic contribution. It is true that in the earlier years of court carpet production, from about 1580 to 1630 or so, the patterns of Indian carpets were heavily dependent upon Persian models (nevertheless displaying an unmistakably Indian aesthetic). But then a particular fashion for formally but naturalistically depicted flowers came into vogue. This truly indigenous style came to dominate Indian ornamentation in all media and even influenced foreign artistic production, particularly in Iran, perhaps as a result of carpet or textile imports.

It is worthwhile to review briefly the history of the study of Indian carpets. Unlike that of many fields, progress in this area has not been marked in steady increments and gradual clarification; rather, an enviable (although slightly flawed) body of knowledge evolved early in this century, but only slow and relatively minor refinement has followed. A microcosmic view of this trend and the relative state of knowledge can be gained through the example of one of the standard works on Oriental carpets and its several revisions over the years. The first edition of Wilhelm von Boden’s Vorderasiatische Knaipfsteppiche aus Ältere Zeit appeared in 1901, an expanded version of an article published in 1892. Although the article contained no references to or illustrations of Indian carpets, the 1901 volume included three but identified each as Persian (one, the pictorial rug in Vienna, is in the present volume as fig. 31; cat. no. 3). A second edition, revised, with contributions by Ernst Kühnel was published in German in 1914. This edition was reorganized into more valid and useful categories; Indian carpets were removed from the
Persian groups and given their own brief chapter entitled “Die indopersichen Teppiche,” reflecting the perception that these were Persian-style pieces woven in India. Five examples were shown, including the fantastic-animal fragment now in Detroit (fig. 21; cat. no. 1a), but with the then owner incorrectly identified.

The third (revised) edition of Bode–Kühnel, as it has come to be known, was published in German in 1922, and an English edition, *Antique Rugs from the Near East*, translated by R. M. Riefstahl, came out the same year. The Indian chapter shows little change, just the addition of one illustration, the pictorial rug in Boston (fig. 29; cat. no. 2). The fourth edition was revised and published in German in 1935, and an English version, translated by Charles Grant Ellis, followed three years later. This edition shows considerable revision throughout, and Kühnel is for the first time given full billing as co-author. The Indian chapter, now called “Mogul Rugs from India,” is still brief and has only five illustrations but indicates an awareness of more variety in patterns and a recognition of high quality in likening the wool (still not identified as pashmina) to the fineness of velvets. The strength of the concluding sentence (“the fine pieces “take their place among the most outstanding achievements of the art of knotting”), with which this author concurs, stands in sharp contrast to the brevity and superficiality of the section. In 1934, the English version of the fourth edition was reissued with minimal text changes but revised captions. The Indian section seems unchanged. The translator, himself a great authority on classical carpets, had by this time formed his own strong opinions—sometimes in sharp variance to those held in Bode–Kühnel—about Indian carpets, and it is surprising that the translator’s notes do not reflect this.

The most significant changes to the Indian chapter of Bode–Kühnel occurred in the 1914 edition following the publication of two works of seminal importance. In 1905 appeared Colonel T. H. Hendley’s *Asian Carpets: XVI. and XVII. Century Designs from the Jaipur Palaces*, containing valuable descriptions and one hundred plates of carpets belonging to the maharaja of Jaipur (there are also fifty plates illustrating carpets in other collections). Short on analysis, Hendley’s volume nevertheless brought recognition to the Indian carpet for the first time. This was followed in 1908 by the monumental *History of Oriental Carpets before 1800* by F. R. Martin, Swedish diplomat, collector, and connoisseur. Although flawed in its chronology and dating, Martin’s work coherently presented a vast quantity of new material, and it stands as the basis for the 1914 edition of Bode–Kühnel (and later ones as well), and of all discussions since.

Over the last twenty years or so, several publications have broadened the discussion of Indian carpets. Murray Eiland’s 1979 publication, *Chinese and Exotic Rugs*, contains the lengthiest treatment of Indian carpets to date and is the first to pay proper attention to technical issues, but it will mislead the unwary reader with attributions of Persian carpets to India and speculation that multistrand (more than four) warps mean late production. A 1982 issue of the journal *Hali* focused on Indian carpets with essays on eight fine examples by different experts and an article by the author on classical Indian carpets that included two types now felt to be Persian (more on this below). Erwin Gans-Ruedin’s *Indian Carpets* of 1984 makes no effort at synthesis but presents a wealth of illustrations, including some of unfamiliar material. Two studies of individual carpets are of special merit: John Irwin’s booklet on the Girdlers’ carpet (fig. 62; cat. no. 14), published in 1962, and Steven Cohen’s recent commendably thorough treatment of the fantastic-animal fragments (figs. 21, 22; cat. nos. 1a, 1b).

Beginning with the great Vienna exhibition of 1891, exhibitions of classical carpets have typically included very few Indian pieces (the Vienna exhibition had three, each identified as Persian), whereas exhibitions of Indian art have occasionally had a handful or more of Indian carpets. The 1947–48 London exhibition, *The Art of India and Pakistan*, featured thirteen carpets, including the Girdlers’ carpet, the only occasion prior to the present one that the carpet has left Girdlers’ Hall in London since 1634. *The Indian Heritage: Court Life and Arts under Mughal Rule*, organized in 1982 at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, also had thirteen carpets. These two exhibitions represent the largest clusters of Indian carpets assembled from diverse sources until the present exhibition.

This study and the exhibition it accompanies focus on Indian carpets of the “classical” period, that is, from about 1580 to 1800. The earlier date is established by the proposed dating of the oldest
surviving Indian carpet, the fantastic-animal fragments. The later date is more arbitrary, selected because carpets and relevant documentation are relatively plentiful until that time, and because the carpets themselves show a clear and continuing line of development from the superb court production of the seventeenth century. It was also about 1800 that Mughal rulers became mere puppets of the British in India. Carpet weaving in the nineteenth century is imperfectly understood and seems poorly represented until the advent of commercial production in the latter decades of the century, when older styles were perpetuated through copies instead of continuing tradition.

In the absence of an adequate survey of Indian carpets, it was decided to present this text as a monographic study, with chapters treating history, commerce, technical issues, and the carpets themselves, rather than in the more conventional catalogue format of essay and substantial entries. A checklist of the exhibition is included so that the publication can still serve as a catalogue. In one sense this study is a survey of Indian carpet weaving until 1800, but it is in fact a survey of the best that tradition produced. Over five hundred pieces survive and only about ten percent are represented in the exhibition. But apart from a very few pieces that were not available for loan, mainly for reasons of condition, this ten percent represents, or is typical of, the highest level of achievement.

The astute reader may notice the wording of the title, which concludes with the phrase "of the Mughal Era," and wonder if these carpets are not all Mughal. Certain types of carpets surely are: the finest pashmina pieces, for example, represent the top production of the court workshop in Kashmir and perhaps Lahore. In other cases it is more difficult to say. Carpets in the flower style popularized by Shah Jahan were depicted in Mughal paintings and might have been woven in court workshops, but many were acquired and probably even commissioned by Rajput patrons as well. And in the case of the Deccan, the south-central plateau area, there is a semantic problem. The Deccan in its totality was part of the Mughal dominion just from 1687 until 1722, so theoretically only carpets woven during that period, especially when they conform to Mughal taste, ought to be called Mughal. None of the carpets attributed in this volume to the Deccan can be assigned with certainty to that precise period. In the end, then, it seems wiser not to impose an identifying label on the carpets that is too strict.

A few words should be said about what the present study does not include. Because flat weaves represent an independent weaving tradition, only pile carpets are treated in this study. Two types of pile carpets thought by some specialists to be Indian are excluded because the author now believes, contrary to the opinion put forth in a 1982 article, that they are Persian. These are the Portuguese type, so named for the maritime scenes whose ships and figures have been called Portuguese, and the Indo-Persian group, commercial successors to the Persian Herat type. The Indo-Persian question in particular has become very controversial over the last generation, chiefly because of the opinions of two highly respected specialists. May Beattie, seeking a way to explain differences in coloring and style, proposed that certain examples might well be Indian, whereas Charles Grant Ellis took the more extreme step of assigning the whole group to India, specifically Agra. These judgments notwithstanding, the author believes that technical and design features link the Indo-Persian carpets to other Persian production. This is a subject that deserves its own detailed study.

The overview that follows draws on many kinds of evidence. The accounts of travelers to India, chronicles by the historians of the Mughal court (on specific events as well as on the laws and organization of the empire), and the memoirs of the emperors themselves have all been consulted, although it is often impossible to match verbal information with surviving carpets. Records of the various trading companies contain extremely important information about sources, commercial value, and even specific carpets, such as the Girdlers'. Crucial inventory documentation has been kept particularly for carpets in the collection of the maharaja of Jaipur (the source of a number of the carpets now in collections around the world) and the Gion Matsuri Preservation Associations in Kyoto, Japan. The latter has been published, but the former is available only in an unpublished report of 1929 written by A. J. D. Campbell of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. It was originally thought that translations of the Jaipur inventory labels and register, ably performed by Dr. Chandramani Singh and Dr. Gopal Narain
Bahura, could be included in this volume, but the value of that material chiefly to specialists argues that it be made available through other means. Paintings, both Indian and European, can often be helpful in issues of dating, although Indian representations of carpets are difficult to judge and are rarely to be taken as literal depictions of contemporaneous pieces. Finally, there are the carpets themselves, whose patterns, materials, construction, and colors (and just one inscription) speak volumes about their manufacture if we are prepared to listen.

Note on transliteration: The transliteration system utilized here for Persian and Arabic words, a slightly modified version of the system used by the Library of Congress, is the one adopted for general use by the Department of Islamic Art. It has been employed for words not having come into general English usage (according to Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, Webster’s New Geographical Dictionary, and Webster’s New Biographical Dictionary).
India in the seventeenth century
Flowers Underfoot
1. India During the Mughal Era

The Mughal era began in 1526 when a Muslim prince named Bābur invaded northern India from his homeland in Central Asia. Invited to intervene by a discontented faction of the weak Lodi government at Delhi, Bābur defeated the Lodi army at Panipat in 1526 and the next year overpowered combined Rajput forces near Agra. Bābur was of Chaghatay Turkish and Mongol (from which the term “Mughal” was derived) stock, descended from two renowned conquerors, Timur (Tamerlane) and Chingiz Khan. This regal lineage understandably served as a point of pride for future Mughal rulers. Bābur's dominion in India was not an empire; when he died, just four years after assuming power, the borders were not secure and no effective central governing authority had been established. Bābur had little time to be a patron of the arts, and few buildings or objects survive from his reign. But we know from his autobiography that, like his successors, Bābur was interested in architecture, painting, and music, and was himself a poet.

Bābur's son Humāyūn was twenty-three when he assumed the throne in 1530. His reign began on a positive note when he led his army to victory in Gujarat. He settled in Agra, where he led a life of pleasure until Afghan forces led by Shīr Shāh Sūr, formerly one of Bābur's officers, drove him from India. Humāyūn sought refuge in Shīr Shāh Tāhmāsp's Persia and made his residence at Kabul. He bid his time until an incompetent heir succeeded to Shīr Shāh's throne in 1555. Then, with Safavid military help (given in exchange for the city of Kandahār), he reestablished Mughal authority in Delhi and Agra. He died only six months later from a fall, his realm virtually the same one he inherited.

Despite the instability and intermittent character of his rule in India, Humāyūn's artistic legacy there is enormously important. The visual arts in early Safavid Iran had reached new heights of sophistication and technical brilliance under the enlightened patronage of Tāhmāsp. But about 1540, as Tāhmāsp's tastes became austere, he turned away from the arts. As a result, patronage declined, and many fine artists left the service of the court. Two distinguished painters, Mir Sayyid 'Āli and 'Abd al-Ṣamad, joined Humāyūn in Kabul in 1549 and went with him when he returned to India, where, working with Hindu and Muslim painters, they founded the Mughal school of painting.

Islam had reached India long before the Mughals arrived there. Arab armies invaded Sind in the eighth century, but Muslim rule was not secure until after the successful incursion of the Ghūrids from Afghanistan, late in the twelfth century. The Ghūrids and their successors (some Turkish, some Afghan) ruled the Delhi Sultanate until power was wrested by the Mughals. Other sultanates also predated the Mughals—those of Bengal, Kashmir, Gujarāt, Jaunpur, Malwa, Khāndesh, and the Bahmani state of the Deccan, which broke up into five provincial dynasties just before the Mughal dynasty was founded. Most of these rulers, like the Mughals, were Sunni Muslims; notable exceptions were in the Deccan. Although in these cases the ruling class was Muslim, the population remained largely Hindu.

What the Mughals achieved in India, which their Muslim predecessors had not, was a truly centralized government authority with a strong administration and the bureaucracy to support it—and the military might to sustain and even enlarge it. This was not accomplished by Bābur or Humāyūn but by the emperor Akbar, son of Humāyūn, who ascended the throne in 1556 at the age of fourteen. It took him some time to establish himself and overcome court intrigues that challenged his authority and abilities, but every threat was met successfully. He was an inspiring leader, fierce and able in combat, and by 1576 he had, by conquest, added Gujarāt and
Bengal to the small realm won by Bābur and lost and regained by Humāyūn. Through a series of brilliant alliances—including his marriage to a daughter of the raja of Amber (now Jaipur)—he secured the loyalty of the Rajput chiefs (except the rana of Mewar). Now it was no exaggeration to call the Mughal domains an empire, for Akbar's rule extended over all of northern India, as far south as the edge of the Deccan plateau. Akbar's administrative system was based on the one put in place...
by the Afghan Shir Shâh—Humâyûn's nemesis—and it involved an official aristocracy that ran the government and pledged troops in return for payments in cash or the revenues from land grants (which reverted to the Crown upon the death of the fief holder).

Akbar (fig. 1) was a truly remarkable individual. He was an admired (and feared) leader and a courageous warrior. Though he could not read (it is thought that he was dyslexic), he had a keen intellect and he was particularly open-minded and tolerant of religious diversity, much to the dismay of the orthodox mullahs. Akbar was a Sunni himself, but his policy was to find common ground among various beliefs; he led religious discussions involving Islam, Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity, and even developed a syncretistic religion that incorporated what he felt were the best features of each, but few at his court responded.

The essential features of Mughal art were established under the active patronage of Akbar. These features include a love of and respect for the natural world, an interest in the historical record, an insistence on workmanship of the highest standard and, perhaps most important, a synthesis of Iranian, European, and Indian traditions. Architectural monuments from his reign, all in red sandstone, include the walls of Agra Fort and the so-called Palace of Jahângîr there (his other buildings in the fort were demolished to make room for marble structures erected by Shâh Jahân), as well as the palace complex at Fatehpur Sikri, the capital city not far from Agra. This extraordinary monument, occupied only from 1571 until 1585 and then seemingly frozen in time, was built in tribute to the birth of a male heir.

Akbar's artistic legacy is perhaps best seen in illustrated manuscripts. These include the monumental Ḥamzânâma of about 1562–77, consisting originally of 1,400 paintings on cotton, each 2½ by 2 feet with text on the reverse, recounting the adventures of Amîr Ḥamza, an uncle of the Prophet. In the 1580s and 1590s, the period of greatest religious ecumenism, the Hindu epics were translated and illustrated copies produced. During the 1590s, when the capital was at Lahore, the royal atelier completed a number of sumptuously illustrated literary works, as well as illustrated versions of the history of Akbar's reign and the autobiography of Bâbur, his grandfather. There are comparatively few objects that can be associated with Akbar's reign (but see cat. nos. 1–5, 7).

The origins of pile-woven carpets in the Indian subcontinent are obscure. No surviving carpet can plausibly be dated earlier than the late sixteenth century. Several authorities have credited the Mughals, and Akbar in particular, with establishing the industry, but literary references show that woolen carpets were manufactured and in use in pre-Akbari India. The earliest texts containing relevant references are Buddhist works from northern India dating to about 500 B.C.–A.D. 100. Some of the words that translate as "carpet" are problematic in terms of the weaving technique involved: some seem to refer to flat-woven (tapestry-weave) pieces involving a very different technique that will not be discussed in this study, but other terms probably refer to pile-woven types. Carpets were observed in use in Daulatabad, Delhi, and Multan in the fourteenth century, in Delhi again in 1517, and in Gaur in Bengal in 1536, but it is not clear whether they had been imported or produced locally. Carpets adorned a platform in the so-called Mystic House in Agra, where Humâyûn's accession was commemorated in 1532, but these were identified as Persian.

In 985 the Arab historian Makdisî equated the woolen carpets of Sind with those of Khorânân in eastern Iran. Later references to carpet production and even to trade concentrate on the kingdom of Gujarat. Between about 1458 and 1472 the Gujarati sultan Maḥmûd Bîqara presented to the sultan of Kashmir a gift of kattâh, from the Arabic al-katîfâ, usually meaning a pile-woven carpet. Such gifts were typically made locally, but Gujarat was such a nexus of international trade that the sultan conceivably would have had easy access to imported goods of higher quality. One of the key centers of commerce in Gujarat was Diu, a small island at the tip of the Kathiawar Peninsula on the west coast of the Gulf of Cambay. According to the Portuguese trader Duarte Barbosa, by about 1518 various Indian goods, including large carpets, textiles, and spices, were brought to Diu for transshipment to diverse countries around the Arabian Sea. Another hub of mercantile activity was the Gujarati port town of Cambay, cited as a place full of foreigners and merchants by Ibn-Bâṭtûṭa in the fourteenth century and again by Barbosa almost two hundred years later. Barbosa also mentioned, among other textiles, the thick carpets woven there. One wonders if the carpet looms of Gujarat—and they surely constituted no more than a minor industry—operated under royal auspices or subsidization, or if, more likely, they were purely commercial enterprises.
Reference to a flourishing carpet-weaving industry in India was first made during the rule of the great Mughal emperor Akbar by his biographer, Abū’l Fāzil. Although the weaving of pile carpets did not begin in India with Akbar, it was his great contribution to establish the art of carpet weaving firmly within the context of court workshops, perhaps following the Persian model. It is to Akbar’s reign that the earliest surviving Indian carpets can be attributed. Akbar’s involvement with the arts was intense. This interest derived not only from the leisure made possible by his success as a military leader and administrator but also from the nature of his personality and intellectual curiosity. He was an accomplished musician and craftsman, and he demanded excellence from the artists and artisans who worked for him.

The official account of Akbar’s reign was given by Abū’l Fazl, a close adviser and friend, in a work called the Akbarnama (The Book of Akbar). The first two volumes of the chronicle record the events of the reign (down to the year of Abū’l Fazl’s death, 1602), but the third volume, named the A’in-i Akbari (The Institutes of Akbar), records in detail the organizational structure and administrative policies and regulations related to governing the vast kingdom. This remarkable work, compiled about 1590, is a combination gazetteer, almanac, manual for kingship, and annotated organizational chart. Along with a few other sources, it provides special insight into Akbar’s artistic interests and the organization of his workshops.

At his magnificent royal complex at Fatehpur Sikri, the capital from 1571 to 1585, Akbar established a kitābkhana, an atelier for book production. Although he could not read, Akbar was a great patron of the arts of bookmaking, Hindu and Muslim painters, calligraphers, illuminators, papermakers, and binders worked side by side to produce volumes for Akbar’s royal library. A series of imperial workshops employed craftsmen who turned out the luxury items—furnishings, perfumes, clothes, tents, weapons—requisite for royal life. The workshops and storerooms were part of the vast royal household, an administrative unit encompassing “one hundred offices and workshops each resembling a city, or rather a little kingdom.” At least some of the workshops were situated near the emperor’s palace, including “studios and work-rooms for the finer and more reputable arts, such as painting, goldsmith work, tapestry-making, carpet and curtain-making, and the manufacture of arms.”

Carpets were part of the court furnishings and, artistically, were not viewed in the same way as, for example, illustrated books. They were stored with other household goods and not in the treasury or royal library, where especially prized possessions were kept. Akbar’s fascination with the various crafts of his workshops led him to participate actively in their production. He understood the value of direct experience and expressed his conviction in this way: “Although knowledge in itself is regarded as the summit of perfection, yet unless displayed in action it bears not the impress of worth; indeed, it may be considered worse than ignorance.” In 1580 Akbar was observed by the Jesuit missionary Antonio Monserrat “making ribbons like a lace-maker, and filing, sawing, and working very hard.” One can almost picture the emperor sitting before a vertical carpet loom, tying knots according to the instructions of the master weaver.

Workmen such as carpet weavers, at least those employed in commercial workshops, lived in virtual slavery, at the service of nobles and officials, with a small wage in return; presumably those employed in the service of the emperor fared somewhat better.

The private storehouse for the most prized textiles was known as the farrādbhāna (carpet house), and Akbar demonstrated a particular interest in it:

His Majesty considers this department [of the royal household] as an excellent dwelling-place, a shelter from heat and cold, a protector against the rain, as the ornament of royalty. He looks upon its efficiency as one of the insignia of a ruler, and therefore considers the care bestowed upon it as a part of Divine worship. The department has been much improved, both in the quality and quantity of the stores, and also by the introduction of new fashions.

The storeroom was devastated by fire in 1579. A record of the damaged contents gives an indication of the quantity and variety of material housed there:

Approximately one crore [10,000,000 pieces] of awnings (shamiya), tents (kargah and khayama) and screens (sara pande) made from gold cloth, European velvet, woolen cloth, Damask silk, satin and brocade, brocaded carpets and European velvets, gold cloth and embroidery of an amount beyond description were all burnt and lost.
Only brocaded carpets (that is, carpets with supplementary wefts woven in during the weaving process on the loom) are listed, and it is not clear whether or not they were pile-woven. It is possible that pile carpets were stored elsewhere or were not among the damaged goods, but it may also be that pile carpets were not woven there until after 1579 (all references postdate the fire).

The section of the A’in-i Akbari that deals with the farrāḥkhāna, in which various portable encampment structures are fully described, closes with a brief section on carpets that merits careful attention:

His Majesty has caused carpets to be made of wonderful varieties and charming texture; he has appointed experienced workmen, who have produced many masterpieces. The gilms [kilims] of Iran and Turan are no more thought of, although merchants still import carpets from Goshkan, Khuzistan, Kirman, and Sabzwar. All kinds of carpet weavers have settled here, and drive a flourishing trade. These are found in every town, especially in Agra, Fatehpur and Lahor. In the imperial workshops single gilms are made 20 gaz 7 tassēyès long, and 6 gaz 11½ tassēyès broad [approximately 55 feet 6 inches by 17 feet 9 inches], at a cost of 1810 rupees, which those who are skilled in the business have valued at 2715 rupees. Takya-namads, or woollen coverlets, are brought from Kabul and Persia, but are also made in this country. It would take up too much time to describe the jājams, sbatrinjis, baluchis, and the fine mats which look as if woven of silk.11

An analogous situation seems to have occurred with regard to the Wardrobe, the household department responsible for garments and garment fabrics:

Skilful masters and workmen have settled in this country to teach people an improved system of manufacture. The imperial workshops, the towns of Lahor, Agra, Fatehpur, Ahmadābad, Gujarāt, turn out many masterpieces of workmanship; and the figures and patterns, knots, and variety of fashions which now prevail, astonish experienced travellers.12

Abū’l Fazl also states that although “the imperial workshops furnish all those stuffs which are made in other countries,” foreign (Iranian, European, Mongolian) articles of wear were still abundant, no doubt because of Akbar’s fascination with the exotic.14

The reader of the translated passage about the farrāḥkhāna might think that Abū’l Fazl is making a distinction between pile-weave and flat-weave carpets, but only the word gilm is used in the original text.14 Although the word gilm (in one form or another) refers to flat-weave carpets in Iran and Turkey, in Mughal Farsi it has a more generic meaning, merely as a carpet or rug.15 If gilm were intended here as a flat-weave rug, flat weaves (jājams and sbatrinjis) would not be addressed as a separate topic in the last sentence. The comment that the carpets of Iran and Turan (Turkish-speaking Central Asia) are no more thought of is simply an expression of pride in local accomplishments (and flattery of the ruler), but Abū’l Fazl admits that Persian carpets were still being imported.

There are few other references to carpet weaving during Akbar’s time. Agra, already noted by Abū’l Fazl as a weaving center, was cited as the point of departure for a shipment of carpets that went by river to Bengal in 1584, but these may not have been of local manufacture.16 The Deccan, the great south-central plateau of India that extends to the coast east of Hyderabad, is mentioned just once: in about 1680 an English mission to the eastern Deccan found Persian-style carpets being woven in Ellore (modern Eluru, still a carpet-weaving town) by a family of weavers descended from Iranian weavers who were said to have settled there a hundred years earlier.17

With the death of Akbar in 1605, the son whose birth had resulted in the construction of the palace complex at Fatehpur Sikri ascended the throne.
Prince Salīm became Jāhāngīr (fig. 2), the “world-taker,” and he ruled until 1627. He inherited a well-ordered, sensibly administered empire and he had the good sense to avoid drastic change. His reign was essentially peaceful, and Jāhāngīr was thus able to indulge in pleasurable pursuits. He was sensitive and enlightened but more erratic as ruler and patron than his father. His mind was often clouded by alcohol or narcotics, but Jāhāngīr fortunately had a powerful wife, Nūr Jāhān, who capably managed the governance of the empire. Jāhāngīr exhibited a special gift for personal insight and an empathy for natural history. His autobiography, the Tāzuk-i Jāhāngīrī, amply displays his sensitivities and interests, for example, his fascination with the habits of sānas cranes.

Jāhāngīr was a collector and connoisseur, and he took special pleasure in the art of painting. While still a prince and governor of Allahabad, he had his own painting workshop. Paintings from his atelier tend to be more naturalistic than those from Akbar’s, and some of the most perceptive Mughal portraits of people, flora, or fauna were executed at his behest. He took pride in recognizing the hand of a specific painter, even in minute passages. Paintings of the subjects that fascinated him were gathered into albums, which formed a kind of microcosmic view of Jāhāngīr’s life. He collected unusual animals, birds, and objects, and depictions of them were sometimes added to the albums. Not especially known as a builder, Jāhāngīr nonetheless left his mark by instituting construction in white marble instead of sandstone and by favoring elaborate intarsia decoration in both marble and sandstone structures. These are features of his tomb of Akbar in Sikandra and the tomb of I’timād al-Daula in Agra.

Alas, there is no literary work equivalent to the A’in-i Akbarī for the reign of Jāhāngīr—or for any other Mughal ruler—and there is no documentary evidence of imperial workshops for carpet weaving during his time. However, judging by the technical and artistic sophistication of the carpets attributable to his reign, activity in the imperial workshops must have continued. Under Jāhāngīr there was a farrābkhana within the imperial bureaucracy, just as there had been under Akbar.

There are numerous references to Indian carpets and weaving centers under Jāhāngīr, although none refer to specifically royal workshops. The book of Francis Pelsaert, who was in Agra from 1620 to 1627 as an agent for the Dutch East India Company, is particularly valuable because it is essentially a commercial report on the commodities produced and traded in India. He noted that carpets were woven to order (fine or coarse) in moderate quantities in Agra and Fatehpur. Carpets were the only local product he found in Agra. A specially commissioned carpet was reported to be in the process of manufacture there in 1619. Agra was also a commercial center; carpets from Jaunpur, east of Agra, were sold there, and it was a principal outlet for the sale of carpets made in Lahore.

Lahore carpets were clearly held in special regard. They were eagerly sought by the East India Company, and the first shipment of carpets back to England, in 1615, consisted entirely of carpets from Lahore. Sir Thomas Roe, the first English ambassador to the Mughal court, speaks of wanting to acquire Persian carpets (probably meaning Persian-style Indian pieces) in Ajmer but finding them unavailable there because they were all spoken for by the emperor; he concludes that he will have to go to Lahore to get them. An agent for the English company reported, hinting at their rarity and appeal: “Carpets to be well chosen would require a long time; those which are true Lahore carpets are not suddenly to be gotten.”

Cambay, in Gujarat, was noted for carpets made with Persian patterns but not so fine or expensive, and the English agent Downton was instructed in 1614 to look for carpets from Cambay. In the 1620s the only local products observed in Ahmadabad were textiles, including carpets woven “with an intermixture of silk and gold thread.” Jaunpur was known for its coarse carpets, which were traded by the Portuguese. Further east, the weavers of Bengal were said to weave pile carpets of various kinds with great skill. Other references to carpets made at this time involve issues of trade and appear in Chapter 2.

Shāh Jahān (fig. 3) ruled for thirty years, from 1628 to 1658. The period saw its share of military campaigns, which had, however, scarcely any effect on the empire as a whole or on daily life. A successful assault was conducted against the nettlesome Portuguese—held in contempt for their idol-worshiping ways—at Hooghly in West Bengal. A campaign was waged by the emperor’s third son, Aurangzēb, to punish the increasingly independent raja of Orchha. The raja was captured and executed, his magnificent palaces in Orchha and Datia were occupied by imperial Mughal forces, and a mosque was erected
Fig. 2. Emperor Jahangir Weighs Prince Khurram, Mughal, ca. 1615–25. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper. From a manuscript of the Tuzuk-i Jahangiri (The Memoirs of Jahangir). British Museum, London (1948.10-9.069)
Fig. 3. Bichitr. Shah Jahan Receives His Three Eldest Sons and Äauf Khan During His Accession Ceremonies. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper. From the Padshahnama (The Book of Kings) manuscript (f. 308). Mughal, ca. 1630. The Royal Collection, Windsor Castle. © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II
on the site of a temple, built by the raja’s father, that had been demolished during the invasion.

The expansion of the empire into the Deccan and Central Asia was Shāh Jāhān’s primary military concern. The lure of the Deccan lay in its fabled wealth. The process had begun under Akbar, with the capture of Burhanpur in the northern Deccan. Shāh Jāhān, through a great show of force, secured a treaty with Bijapur and token submission from Golconda before naming his son Aurangzeb viceroy of the Deccan, but complete subjugation of the territory would not come until Aurangzeb’s reign as emperor. Central Asia attracted Shāh Jāhān’s attention because it was the ancestral homeland of the house of Timur. With instability in Transoxiana, he saw an opportunity to succeed in taking Samarkand where Bābur, founder of the Mughal dynasty, had failed. Shāh Jāhān knew Bābur’s story well, for he was fond of having passages from his great-grandfather’s memoirs read to him at night before retiring. To his dismay, the two-year campaign was an unmitigated disaster; many lives were lost, the treasury was depleted as a fortune was expended, and the army never even reached Samarkand.

The early years of Shāh Jāhān’s rule were marked by increasingly severe Muslim actions and pronouncements, perhaps under the influence of the orthodox Sunni hierarchy at court. Tensions between the ruling Muslim minority and the Hindu majority were inevitable. Most inflammatory, because of its effect on the general population, was the order to destroy recently built Hindu temples and the prohibition of new building. Such repressive measures were tempered later in Shāh Jāhān’s life, and he became known as an active patron of Hindu music and literature. He even chastised the orthodox Aurangzeb for his anti-Hindu stance. The softening of his formerly severe attitudes may have been due to the influence of his eldest son, Dātā Shīkhā, a cultural aesthetic and religious eclectic who was later denied the throne by his more ambitious and ruthless brother.

In several ways the defining event in Shāh Jāhān’s reign was the death of his beloved wife, Mumtāz Mahal, in 1631 as she was giving birth to their fourteenth child. She had been his confidante and adviser on all state affairs, and his sense of loss was so profound that he remained in mourning for two years. Her death may have influenced his spirituality, and it provided him the reason to erect the building for which he is justly famous, the tomb of Mumtāz Mahal, known as the Taj Mahal. The costly edifice took years to build: construction began in 1632 and was completed, apart from secondary buildings, by 1648. Only by 1643 had enough work been done to allow the annual memorial service for Mumtāz Mahal to be held there. Rich materials were used without restraint, and the Englishman Peter Mundy was duly impressed, even in the first year of construction: “Gold and silver esteemed common mettall, and Marble but as ordinary stone.” From his private apartments in Agra Fort, Shāh Jāhān could watch the slow progress of the lofty dome and corner minarets on the site downriver.

In artistic terms Shāh Jāhān is thought of primarily as a builder. Apart from the Taj Mahal, he embarked on major projects in the forts of the three imperial capitals, Lahore, Delhi, and Agra. In Lahore and Agra, he built marble palaces after razing existing buildings within the fort walls. In Delhi, which became his official capital in 1648, he built his own fort between the river and the new city he founded (known today as Old Delhi; the New Delhi of today was designed by Sir Edward Lutyens in 1912). His buildings are characterized by the copious use of white marble and of pietra dura inlays of contrasting color.

Shāh Jāhān loved stones and collected jewels avidly. Shortly after his accession, he commissioned the fabulous Peacock Throne, so named for the two jeweled birds adorning its canopy. The throne took seven years to complete, and finally, in 1639, it graced the Hall of Public Audience in Agra. When the imperial capital was moved to Delhi in 1648, the throne was sent there and continued in use during the reigns of Aurangzeb and his successors, until it was seized by the invader Nāder Shāh. It was then taken to Iran, where it was eventually dismantled.

The royal book atelier was active under Shāh Jāhān’s patronage, and several albums were assembled from new and existing paintings and calligraphies, Indian and Persian, for imperial pleasure. Among the works associated with Shāh Jāhān are the Kevorickian Album, the Wantage Album, and the Minto Album.” One volume of the history of Shāh Jāhān’s reign was copied and illustrated, the Pādshāhīnāma (The Book of Kings) now in the collection of the Royal Library at Windsor Castle. The paintings of the Pādshāhīnāma are, in their exact and rather detached portrayal of historical events, superbly executed reminders of Shāh Jāhān’s preference for recording rather than interpretation or analysis.
Historical references to carpet weaving in the time of Shāh Jahān are few, perhaps because texts at this time, like paintings, show more concern with recording than with description. Most important is a letter written at Lahore in 1640 by Is̄lam Khan, the vizier of the Mughal Empire, to the grand vizier of the Ottoman Empire, explaining that a messenger had been dispatched by Shāh Jahān to convey certain oral messages to the new sultan, Ibrahim. About the mission he says:

Arslan Agha is being sent by one of the royal ships (jaz̄rat-i Padshahi). He has been given a box (huqa) of 'att-i Jahangiri, a specialty of this country, and two prayer-carpets of rare quality made in the karkhana-i Padshahi at Lahore and Kashmir, so that he may present these to the Sultan on his own behalf (az jamāb-i kawud).41

We thus know that there were imperial carpet workshops at Lahore—something implied by Abūl Fāz̄l about forty years earlier—and at Kashmir.

Kashmir has not been otherwise mentioned as a center for carpet production, and it would be the first noncapital city, to our knowledge, to have a workshop. The fact that the unusually observant Jahāngīr, who had much to say about the weaving of fine shawls in Kashmir,42 did not make any mention of woven carpets suggests that an imperial workshop might have been established there between 1620, the year of his visit, and 1640, the date of the letter. The Āsār Mahāl, a shrine for relics of the Prophet in Bījapur, contains carpets—some now also in the Archaeological Museum in Bījapur—that were said to have come from Kashmir in 1657,43 but the reliability of this reference is suspect. It has yet to be verified and, furthermore, many of the Āsār Mahāl carpets are Persian in origin.44

There are several references to nonimperial carpet factories within Mughal dominions. One concerns Amber, ancestral residence of the Kachhwāhā clan and original home of a vast collection of carpets, some dispersed, some still belonging to the maharaja of Jaipur. Amber Palace is said to have had a factory for carpets of silk and wool prior to 1640.45 The history of Shāh Jahān’s reign refers to a prayer carpet made to order in a carpet factory of Multan, in the Punjab, as a donation to the mosque at Medina.46 Woolen carpets were still being made at Fatehpur, and carpets of gold and silver and silk were manufactured in Guaṛat, specifically in Surat and Ahmadābād.47 It is uncertain whether the latter were actually pile carpets or a type of brocaded cloth. If carpets, they may have resembled the so-called Polonaise carpets of Iran (a type once mistakenly thought to be Polish, hence the name), whose silk pile contrasted with brocaded areas of gold and silver.

Extremely valuable documentation of carpet weaving, mainly during Shāh Jahān’s reign, survives in the form of inventory records for many of the carpets now or formerly in the collection of the maharaja of Jaipur (hereafter referred to, for convenience, as the Jaipur Collection). These carpets were kept at and presumably acquired for Amber Fort, and they remained there until their transfer to Jaipur in 1875 and later. Records survive in the form of labels on some of the carpets and in an inventory register that repeats some of the label information. The register lists some 266 carpets.

In 1905 Colonel T. H. Hendley published a large volume that includes illustrations of some of the Jaipur carpets. Hendley repeats two contradictory legends concerning the formation of the collection: that the carpets had been brought by Raja Man Singh from Kabul as spoils of war from Herāt in the early seventeenth century, and that the carpets had been presented by Shāh Jahān to the Jaipur raja in exchange for ground on which he would build the Taj Mahal.48 These legends may be dismissed on two counts. First, each explanation is too early for the evidence of the inventories, and, second, the large number of carpets of unusual shape suggests they must have been commissioned for use in specific spaces.

In 1929 A. J. D. Campbell of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, was invited to Jaipur to prepare a report on the maharaja’s carpets, primarily for conservation purposes. Campbell’s unpublished report lists 212 carpets, with measurements and descriptions of design and structure, as well as label and register information.49 A full set of photographs was taken. A second report on the Jaipur Collection was prepared by May Beattie in 1972, but it too was never published. Her report lacks the text planned for the final report, but it attempts a classification of the Jaipur carpets based on structure, color, and design.50 Most recently, a full translation of the inventory labels and register has been done by Dr. Chandramani Singh and Dr. Gopal Narain Bahura.51

The carpets in several Indian museums were originally in the Jaipur Collection and can be matched with Campbell’s entries. Carpets in the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Jaipur
(hereafter referred to as the City Palace Museum) were donated by the present maharaja’s father, and the rugs belonging to the Government Central Museum of Jaipur were also part of the maharaja’s collection. The Calico Museum of Textiles in Ahmadabad and a museum in Varanasi, the Bharat Kala Bhavan, possess Jaipur pieces too, but most came from the secondary storage and were thus not part of the maharaja’s own collection and do not appear in the Campbell report. A number of carpets in Western collections are also from the Jaipur holdings, acquired both before and after the Campbell report was prepared.

The Jaipur inventory records must be used with some care. A few labels contain information that is contradicted elsewhere. For example, Campbell #1 was acquired in 1656, whereas its pair, Campbell #2, was purchased in 1701. The earlier date can be accepted here, because a number of similar pieces were also acquired in the 1650s. Several labels do not belong to the carpets to which they were attached. Two of the large Indo-Persian carpets are described as wālīyati, or foreign (here meaning Persian), but others are not. One unquestionably Indian piece is called foreign, suggesting a switch in labels. But on the whole, the label and register information seems reliable and consistent.

Of the 212 carpets described in Campbell’s report (and photographs exist for most, thus ensuring correct identification), 64 bore inventory labels. The information is variable, depending also on the condition of the labels, but it may include date of acquisition, date of inventory, place of acquisition, name of vendor, and sometimes even the price. Some carpets were acquired in Aurangzeb’s time, but the majority of carpets bearing labels were
acquired during Shāh Jahān’s reign. The earliest
were bought in 1632, but many were purchased from
dealers in Lahore in the 1650s. The two principal
types were the flower carpets and the durbar carpets.
These are sometimes referred to as “Lahori gelim,”
or Lahori carpets, but it is unclear whether they
were actually manufactured there. Lahore in its hey-
day must have served as an entrepôt for the north,
and the products of Multan and Kashmir may well have been obtained through Lahori sources.

The documentation afforded by the Jaipur mate-
rial is complemented by a number of other carpets that can be securely dated to Shāh Jahān’s reign.
The Girdlers’ carpet (figs. 11, 62; cat. no. 14) was
woven between 1630 and 1632; the Fremlin carpet
(fig. 49) was woven about 1640; and a small Lahore
rug in Kyoto was acquired in 1650 (see p. 20). The
Kinghorn carpet (fig. 65), a European copy of a
Lahore rug, was woven either in 1640 or 1618, in
Jahāngīr’s reign.

Shāh Jahān was succeeded in 1658 not by his eldest
son, Dārā Shikhā, but by the more politically astute
and ambitious Aurangzeb, who had brutally out-
maneuvered his brothers and virtually imprisoned
his father, confining him to his private apartment
inside Agra Fort. Aurangzeb’s initial military
campaigns focused on the northwest frontier, but
he became obsessed with bringing the remaining
independent Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan
into the Mughal fold. In this he ultimately suc-
cceeded, taking Bijapur and Golconda in 1686 and
1687 and subduing the intransigent Marathas, but
at the cost of overexpansion. He died in 1707,
and the Deccan was independent again less than
twenty years later.

Aurangzeb (fig. 4) became increasingly reactionary
in his religious views. He continued his predeces-
sors’ encouragement of Hindu participation in the
administration and the military, but he attempted
to undo some of the very reforms that had made
Muslim-Hindu relations generally uneventful and
even cordial. For example, he revived the jizāya,
the despised poll tax on non-Muslims, which had been
judiciously dropped by Akbar. This act caused the
Rajput chiefs, on whose support he depended, to
be reluctant to fight for him.

Aurangzeb was not the patron of the arts his
father, grandfather, or great-grandfather had been.
Royal artists were active in the early part of his
reign, producing sensitive paintings, but soon his
overzealous reforms resulted in the closing of the
painting ateliers and the suppression of music and
poetry at court. Patronage continued at the princely
level, albeit on a less lavish scale. Natural forms in
decoration, so sensitively and lovingly captured
in the ornament of earlier times, became increas-
ingly stylized and unnatural in their patterning.

References to carpet weaving during Aurangzeb’s
time are few, and they fail to suggest any royal
involvement in the production, not surprisingly
given the ruler’s austerity and rejection of artistic and
other pleasures. If there had been a royal carpet
workshop anywhere, one would expect it to have
been in the fort at Delhi, the capital, but there was
none. The absence of workshops in Delhi, royal or
not, was attributed to lack of encouragement, not
lack of talent. The physician Manucci wrote of
carpets “plain and flowered” that were made at
Lahore. It is doubtful that the looms were still
weaving under imperial direction, especially since
several visitors commented that the city was falling
into a state of ruin, implying royal neglect. Finally,
there is the reference to Persian-style carpets woven
in the Deccan about 1680, previously cited with
respect to Akbar’s time because of weavers said to
descend from Iranians who settled there a hundred
years earlier. One gets the sense from these limited
references that carpet weaving was no longer carried
out with imperial support or direction but had been
marginalized to the provincial northern and south-
ern edges of the empire.

Aurangzeb was the last Mughal emperor to wield
real authority. He was succeeded by a long line of
weaklings and pleasure lovers. Of the fifteen rulers
who governed the empire over the next one hundred
years, the longest continuous reign was that of
Muhammad Shāh (r. 1719–48), famous for hosting
the Persian invader Nāder Shāh’s occupation of
Delhi and looting of the Mughal treasury in
1738–39. Throughout the century dissident groups
in the provinces, as well as European trading com-
panies, the British most of all, gained power as the
central authority lost it. The Mughal era officially
ended in 1858, when the last emperor was deposed,
but in reality the Mughal rulers were no more
than British puppets by the turn of the nineteenth
century. Artistic patronage during the eighteenth
century came from local courts. Carpet production
followed the pattern set under Aurangzeb: key pro-
duction centers were the north and the Deccan,
and manufacture was stimulated by both local and
foreign demand.
Less than half of the five hundred or so known surviving Indian carpets are in India today, in various collections but particularly in the possession of the maharaja of Jaipur. The vast majority of first-rate examples, based on quality or condition, are now in the West and a few are in Japan. Some are known to have left India in this century: the rectangular flower carpet (see fig. 93; cat. no. 22) acquired by the Metropolitan Museum in 1970 from the Kevorkian sale at Sotheby’s, for example, was still in Jaipur in 1929 when A. J. D. Campbell prepared his report for the maharaja. The shaped flower rug now in Cincinnati (fig. 101; cat. no. 25) was not in Jaipur at the time of Campbell’s visit, but it was there in 1905 when Colonel T. H. Hendley published his important volume on the maharaja’s carpet collection; the Cincinnati carpet was singled out with over twenty plates. It is impossible to know when many of the Indian carpets in Western collections left India because information about provenance is so often lacking. For example, Benjamin Altman, a great benefactor of the Metropolitan, gave to the Museum, by bequest in 1913, all seven of its fine-weave Indian pieces, the rarest type of all, and a few others, but nothing is known about their source.

Certainly some of the carpets in Western and Japanese collections reached their ultimate destinations as a result of the commercial activities of the English, Portuguese, and Dutch during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. All three, beginning chronologically with the Portuguese, sought to profit from the newly established maritime trade with East Africa, the Persian Gulf, India, the East Indies, and China and Japan. The sea route from Europe to the East around the Cape of Good Hope, first navigated in 1497–98 by the Portuguese Vasco da Gama, afforded the European powers the possibility of trade free from the costly taxation imposed on goods shipped via the overland route through the Middle East.

It was the English who first expressed interest in the potential of Indian carpets as trade goods. The English East India Company was created in 1600, under a charter from Queen Elizabeth I, to establish trade by sea with Asia as the Portuguese had already done. It was a private entity led by a board of directors, and its purpose was to earn a profit for its shareholders. Several early voyages by company vessels to India were essentially exploratory in nature, and the English merchants predictably found strong resistance to their presence in India among the Portuguese (and, in the East Indies, among the Dutch). In Surat, the English established a trading center, or warehouse, known as a factory although goods were not manufactured there, and they dispatched agents, or factors, to other cities to obtain commercially viable merchandise. The first mention of carpets in company records appears in a letter dated 1611 in which one agent tells another that he is expecting delivery of their “Turkey carpets,” apparently as personal rather than company property. Oriental carpets were very much in vogue as status symbols in England, and since most carpets had until then come from Turkey, they were generically called “Turkey carpets,” regardless of their actual source.

In 1614 a group of merchants gathered on board a ship anchored at Surat and prepared a list of goods thought suitable for sale in England. Carpets were one of the seven items noted, but only a modest level of investment was proposed; the major investments were to be in indigo from Sarkhej and painted cottons. The first consignment of carpets (and they were called Lahore carpets) was shipped from Surat in 1615. The carpets, measuring from 2½ by 1½ yards to 7 by 2½ yards, were sold the following year in London for prices of £2.11 up to £30 each. The large sizes sold well, and that is what the agents in Surat were told to obtain. Lahore carpets were clearly considered the most desirable, for
they are repeatedly mentioned by name in company correspondence. The next shipment of Lahore carpets also consisted of various sizes, probably because the agents decided to take what they could get of what they considered a scarce commodity.

Repeated efforts to obtain large carpets met with failure, and in a letter three agents in Agra tried to explain the situation to their superiors in December 1619:

Carpetts of such length and breadth as Your Worships desire them we shall hardly ever be able to procure; for of such sizes we find very few ready made, and we perceive, by experience of a few bespoken here, that the tattines, slownes and poverty of the workmen to be such that it is endles labour to bespeake them, and those bespoken to cost dearer than others ready made. Of th' ordinary syzes here made we have sent you of all sorts this yeare, and a good quantety, as hereafter you will perceive; and of other syzes than these you may never expect them, unless we can perswade the workemen of themselves to make them broader; which we will endeavour.¹

Ten days later, another communication, from different agents, provided further elaboration:

Carpetts of Lahore and Agra, yf your Worships have had information that quantities maye bee had, being bespoken, of those lengths and breadths you have advised for, it is a great error; for to my knowledge there hath bin a carpett in Agra house this twelve month amakinge, and yett is little more than half don; and they neither make them soe well nor good collors as when they make them without bespeakinge. And therefore yf those carpetts and threere sizes like you that this yeare are sent, questionlesse you maye have greate quantities of them sent yearelye from one or both places; but Lahore is the cheife place for that commoditie.²

This quandary doomed the company's carpet trade in India to failure: the large sizes desired at home were unavailable except by special order (to bespeak), which involved long delays and a lowering of quality standards, since weavers took shortcuts when the sale was guaranteed. Company agents came to realize that Persian carpets brought better prices in London, and there was even demand for them in India. Interest in Indian carpets thus waned. A list of goods to be purchased at various factories during the coming year, prepared in 1621 by a group of company officials and agents, did not include any carpets at all. Lahore goods—indigo, calicoes, musk, civet—are specifically mentioned as easily available at Agra, since the short-lived factory at Lahore had been closed to reduce expenses.³ Indian carpets were referred to (in terms of the company account) only twice more in company correspondence, in 1622 and again in 1625 (thirty Lahore carpets).³ By 1626 shipments of all carpets from Surat were forbidden because they were not considered economically viable.⁴

There was a resumption of trade in carpets between 1660 and 1686, the result of renewed demand in Europe. English correspondence is mute on the subject, but Dutch sources reveal that in 1683 the English ordered at least fifteen hundred carpets in India.⁵ It is not specified whether these were Indian or Persian carpets (in fact either could be obtained in and shipped from India), but they were probably Persian, for in 1686 the London directors notified Surat that no more Persian carpets were to be sent because they were already falling from fashion.

The number of Indian carpets imported to England was not limited to the few shipments consigned by the company: there was simultaneously a very active private trade being conducted by agents in all kinds of goods, as souvenirs and for personal profit. This was a matter of concern to company officials, for the private trade posed a competitive threat to company profits, and they tried, without success, to forbid the practice. Agents were simply paid too little to give up the opportunity to make a quiet profit on the side. Flagrant offenders were punished, but the practice continued. Company correspondence is filled with references to private trade, and it is not difficult to imagine carpets being concealed among other goods for shipment to England. Near the end of his term of service in India, Sir Thomas Roe, the English ambassador, was asked by the emperor Jahānghīr what he would like as a present to take back to England. Persian carpets, said Roe, probably meaning Persian style.⁶ Roe, feeling some sympathy for the underpaid agents, had taken a moderate position in the private-trade arguments, and he did in fact take home a carpet, one he had commissioned in India, bearing his coat of arms.⁷ Private trade in carpets was legalized in 1631, probably because the company, having by then given up the trade, no longer feared the competition offered by its own employees.
Roe’s carpet has long since disappeared but two other commissioned pieces survive. Like Roe’s, both carpets incorporate coats of arms in the design. The Girdlers’ carpet (figs. 11, 62; cat. no. 14) was ordered from Lahore in 1630 by Robert Bell for a livery company of girdlers in London; it was delivered and presented as a gift to the company in 1644. The transaction was possible because Bell, a past master of the Girdlers’ Company, was also an official of the East India Company. The Fremlin carpet (fig. 49) must have been commissioned by William Fremlin, President of the Council at Surat, in the early 1640s, since he retired from the company and returned to England in 1644. The Girdlers’ carpet is well documented and would be recognized even without the identifying coats of arms and panels of initials. But
the Fremlin carpet can be linked to the Fremlin family, and logically to William Fremlin, only because of the coat of arms, for no documentation exists.

Why were these carpets specially ordered when the problems of commissioning pieces were well known to company officials? Because requests for special features, most obviously the coats of arms, necessitated weaving to order following drawings provided in advance. There was also the matter of function. In the Middle East, carpets were traditionally used as floor coverings and occasionally, in India, as wall hangings or tent screens. In Europe they were rarely used as floor coverings until later in the seventeenth century; materials such as rush were
woven for that purpose. The practice in Europe, as depicted in paintings and described in inventories, was to use Oriental carpets as covers for tables and chests. This could affect the size and even the design of a commissioned piece. The Girdlers' carpet was woven to cover the main table in Girdlers' Hall, a function it fulfilled from delivery in 1634 until sometime early in this century, when concerns about its preservation led to relocation in a permanent case. The intended use may have determined its size and even its proportions: the main border seems unusually wide in relation to the field, perhaps because it would be viewed hanging from the edges of the table. That the Fremlin carpet was also meant to cover a table is clear from the orientation of the coats of arms in the border; they are oriented to be seen correctly when the borders are hanging down on all sides. Generally, patterns and colors were unaffected by tastes prevalent in foreign markets; coats of arms were merely superimposed on otherwise conventional designs. Although it is clear that commissioned carpets could have distinctive features, it cannot be claimed that export goods represented a separate category.

Several country houses in England have classical Indian carpets among their furnishings, and it is possible that the oldest were acquired in the seventeenth century when the East India Company was engaged in shipping carpets from India to England. The great Morgan pictorial carpet (fig. 31; cat. no. 4) in the Metropolitan Museum formerly belonged to the Sackville-West family, and it was depicted in a late-nineteenth-century painting as a floor covering in use at Knole, their fifteenth-century house, which contained many early furnishings. Today, Knole still has a few Indian rugs, but they are from a somewhat later period than the Morgan carpet. A pair of large carpets at Ham House in Richmond, England, may be the ones referred to in a 1677 inventory. The blue-ground carpet with scrolling vines and animals (figs. 45, 46; cat. no. 8) formerly belonged to the earls of Ilchester, and the red-ground carpet of the same type (fig. 48; cat. no. 10) in the National Gallery, Washington, D.C., was once in the collection of the duke of Rutland at Belvoir Castle. A carpet commemorating a marriage in the Kinshorne family in either 1618 or 1640 (fig. 65) is a European copy of an Indian carpet that surely came to Europe through trade.

The Portuguese were already well established in the Indian Ocean trade by the time English and Dutch ships arrived in the last decade of the sixteenth century, and they resisted the threat to their monopoly with military might. The Portuguese trade was an official activity of empire and crown, unlike the private English and Dutch trade. Portuguese fortunes suffered during the first half of the seventeenth century as a result of naval defeats, efficient competition, and loss of support by the Mughals. By the 1640s the Portuguese trading network was so weak that Indian carpets obtained by the Jesuit fathers in Agra were shipped to the viceroy in Goa by the English East India Company. The Portuguese are known to have exported Jaipur carpets. Otherwise, commerce may be inferred from the existence in Portugal of seventeenth-century Indian rugs. Half a dozen examples belong to the Museu Nacional de Machado de Castro in Coimbra and three more to the Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga in Lisbon, collected at some point from local churches to which they had been donated. One wonders if some of these rugs were not among the group sent from Agra to Goa.

The Dutch East India Company (or V. O. C., for Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie) was formed in 1602 from the merger of several trading companies. Like the English company, it was privately held and profit oriented. During the period from about 1620 to 1650, the V. O. C. achieved dominance over the rival Portuguese and English companies. Records of the Dutch East India Company have yet to be carefully scrutinized, and they are likely to provide a more complete view of the Dutch carpet trade than we now have. Nevertheless, certain facts are known. The Dutch started to ship carpets from India in about 1625. The year before, the governors of the V.O.C. ordered from the factory in Surat (both the English and Dutch had factories there) several hundred Persian carpets to be used as table covers.

And, in case Indian carpets were found to be of better quality and cheaper than Persian ones, they also wanted five hundred Indian carpets or at least one hundred, as samples. A magnificently preserved carpet in the Tokugawa Art Museum, Nagoya (figs. 52, 53), probably came to the Japanese Tokugawa emperor about this time. It is not known whether this carpet was a gift or a purchase, or whether it came on an English, Portuguese, or Dutch ship; the English closed their Japanese factory in 1623, the Portuguese were expelled in 1638, and, from 1640 on, the Dutch were the only Europeans allowed to trade in Japan, from their factory on an island at Nagasaki.
One incident involving the Dutch is especially interesting to us. A Persian carpet was being taken by a company ship to Japan as a gift for the emperor. The ship was lost in a wreck, but a replacement was obtained in India in 1650 and presented to the emperor. It is tempting to associate this event with the carpet still in the former imperial family's collection, but that carpet seems somewhat earlier and it was surely brand-new when acquired (it still seems virtually new today). Another possibility is a smaller piece in the Gion Matsuri Kanko-boko Preservation Association in Kyoto, said in association records to have been acquired in 1650; the emperor of Japan may well have donated this and other carpets to the Kyoto associations.

As late as 1683, when the English were said to have ordered fifteen hundred carpets, the Dutch requested seven hundred and fifty, although all or some of these may have been Persian. This is the extent of our knowledge of the Dutch carpet trade so far gleaned from records, but there is one additional source of information about seventeenth-century trade. Onno Ydema, in a study of depictions of Oriental carpets in Dutch painting, found that there were two periods when the number of representations of recognizably Indian carpets went up significantly, in the 1630s and from 1660 to 1680. Since these dates correspond roughly to heightened activity in the English carpet trade, they probably also indicate parallel Dutch interest. Of the numerous examples of Dutch painting containing depictions of Indian carpets, two are illustrated here (figs. 5, 6).

The pattern of trade in carpets in the eighteenth century was quite different. English and Portuguese interest seems to have ended altogether, but Dutch trade continued. Representations of Indian carpets continued in eighteenth-century painting, although some of these rugs look like seventeenth-century types. The eighteenth-century Indian carpets in Kyoto, some with inventory dates, surely arrived with the Dutch, since among the Europeans only the Dutch had access to Japan during this period. The eighteenth-century Indian rugs in Kyoto—and several other related pieces in Japanese collections—are attributed here to the Deccan (see p. 146), and Dutch trade from the nearby Coromandel Coast thrived until well into the eighteenth century. In fact, Dutch trade in carpets from the Deccan was recorded as early as 1666, when samples were sent to the Netherlands from the area of Masulipatnam, near the coast.
3.

Technical Characteristics

Understanding the technical aspects of carpets is now recognized as a crucial part of carpet studies. The nature of the materials used, how they have been prepared, the dyes employed, the characteristics of the weaving structure, the features of side and end finish—all these elements and others combine to yield a kind of fingerprint. It has been well demonstrated over the last generation of carpet research that such technical features are more important than design or pattern in isolating distinctive groups and even in localizing production. A close examination of Indian carpets, then, can not only help us to differentiate Indian carpets from others (a distinction most valued with respect to Persian carpets, since the patterns may be very similar), but it may also allow us to establish distinct groups of carpets and in some cases assign groups to particular production centers. The Girdlers’ carpet (figs. 11, 62; cat. no. 14) is of special importance in this regard, for it is the only classical Indian carpet whose source of manufacture, Lahore, is documented beyond question. Based on similarities of technical features, color usage, and design, we may group other carpets with the Girdlers’ and conclude that these too may have been woven in Lahore. Since Abūl Fazl, Akbar’s biographer, late in his subject’s reign mentions three weaving centers—Fatehpur Sikri, Agra, and Lahore—we may conclude that those early carpets with features unlike the Lahore type were probably manufactured in one of the other two cities.

Material

Cotton and silk were the fibers used in the foundations of classical Indian carpets. For the pile, wool (from sheep, goats, even camels) and silk were the preferred materials. All these fibers were readily available from Indian sources except pashmina, fine goat’s hair, which was imported from Central Asia. Wild or uncultivated silk (tussah) was produced in the provinces of Bengal and Assam, but the silk used in pile carpets was imported from China or northern Iran. According to sources cited in Chapter 1, notes 36, 47, metallic thread was used for brocading some carpets, particularly those woven in Gujarat, but we are unable to produce even a single example of an Indian weaving of this sort. If the works cited resembled the seventeenth-century Persian Polonaise carpets, which featured metallic thread, then we cannot as yet distinguish the Indian pieces from the Persian. It is perhaps more likely that the brocaded Gujarati “carpets” are actually metallic-woven brocade textiles, in which case it would be fair to say that, to our knowledge, Indian pile carpets were not decorated with metallic threads at all.

Cotton was the fiber chiefly used for the foundation. The warp typically consists of multiple strands of undyed yarn, usually at least six strands and sometimes as many as twelve. Persian carpets, in contrast, invariably have four-strand warps. The only Indian rugs with four-strand warps are found among the pieces attributed to the Deccan (fig. 132; cat. no. 38), where Persian weavers are said to have settled during the late sixteenth century. Cotton was also used as the weft material, sometimes in its natural state, sometimes dyed a pale red, rust, or apricot color or, in later examples, blue. Many of the carpets that for numerous other reasons can be grouped around the Girdlers’ carpet (which has beige cotton wefts, perhaps with a slight pinkish cast in places) have distinctive pink or apricot-colored wefts, so this would seem to be a feature of Lahore carpets manufactured earlier than the Girdlers’ of 1630–32. Some later carpets that are not consistently of one type have reddish or rust-colored wefts, but they might not all come from Lahore. These fibers are invariably Z-spun and S-plied, when plied. Cotton was occasionally used in Persian and Turkish carpets as a pile fiber,
just for highlights in small areas, but this rarely seems to have been the case in India (however, see p. 133).

Silk was sometimes used as a foundation fiber in India. The fine yet strong strands permitted a much finer weave than could be achieved on a cotton foundation. The finest Indian carpets, those woven with a pile of pashmina wool, have foundations entirely of silk. It is a characteristic of these pieces that the warps and, rarely, even the wefts appear in stripes of different colors (fig. 7). Inconsistency of stripe or band width indicates that the purpose was perhaps not registration or alignment of design but the pleasing aesthetic of the multicolored fringe. This effect can be seen in a few carpets depicted in paintings (fig. 8). A second grade of fairly fine weave, with pile of either pashmina or sheep's wool, typically has a cotton foundation except that the middle weft strand, of each cluster of three that separates rows of knots, is red silk. Silk was apparently not used as a pile fiber in carpets produced in the north but was utilized in the Deccan, mainly in the eighteenth century (see pp. 147ff.).

Wool was the preferred pile fiber, particularly in the north. Sheep's wool was the standard material, and it came in different grades of fineness. Undyed camel's hair has been identified in one carpet (figs. 66–68; cat. nos. 16a–c; see Appendix 1). The origin of this piece has been controversial, but here it is judged to be of early-seventeenth-century Indian manufacture. The camel's hair is one of several unusual features that suggest an experimental stage in the development of carpet weaving (see discussion, p. 77).

The finest Indian carpets of all, really the finest of all classical carpets from any culture, are the pieces made with a pile of pashmina wool, the undercoat of the Himalayan mountain goat (Capra hircus laniger). India is the only carpet-weaving society where silk was not the luxury material of preference. Pashmina, from the Persian word for wool, is popularly known in the West as cashmere wool, from the old spelling of Kashmir. Indian weavers were already familiar with pashmina because it was used in fine shawls. Akbar showed interest in the material and is said to have had it dyed; it had
previously been generally used in its natural undyed state. By Jahāngir's time, those engaged in the manufacture of fine shawls must have fully understood the suitability of pashmina for spinning and accepting dyes and been able to assess its potential as a material for the pile of knotted carpets.

At one time it was thought that Kashmir was the source of this special wool, but this is not so. The fiber is a product of western Tibet. It was sent to Kashmir, however, since the trade in this valuable commodity was controlled by the maharaja of Kashmir. In accordance with the treaty that followed the Tibeto-Ladakh-Mughal War of about 1681-84, Tibet from that point on sent its entire supply of pashmina to Ladakh, which, following a separate treaty with the Mughals, passed it on to Kashmir. These treaties probably formalized what had been the practice for some time.

Shawl wool was imported in two grades. The finer—and far less plentiful—grade, known locally as a'sli ỉbē, came from wild goats (known as ỉbē, a'sli means “true”) that shed their fleece in spring against shrubs and rocks, from which it was collected by villagers. The second grade, from domesticated goats, made up the bulk of the material imported. Although Indian weavers may be credited with developing the pashmina carpet into the highest luxury grade of carpet ever woven, they were not the first to use pashmina as a pile fiber. A Persian carpet (see fig. 90 for two fragments) from the Herāt group, dating from the second half of the sixteenth century, has a pile of pashmina wool. It would seem that Kashmir shawl wool was also exported to Iran.

There is evidence that shawl weaving in Kashmir may date back to the eleventh century, and Kashmir shawls are mentioned by name in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century sources. An early reference to a shawl of goat's hair exists in Jain literature, but that fiber seems to be specifically linked to Kashmir shawls in literary sources only by the time of Akbar. It is certain that Kashmir was, in Akbar's day, the preeminent source for shawls. Secondary status was accorded to Lahore, with over a thousand workshops, so the industry in Kashmir must have been vast. Lahore was known for a kind of shawl made of silk and wool mixed, so the pashmina shawl may have been primarily a Kashmiri product. Jahāngir describes the famous shawls of Kashmir as if Tibetan goat's hair were the standard material used there. One may speculate that Kashmir, with its tradition of manufacturing pashmina shawls, was also the source of pashmina carpets, but some might have been made at Lahore.

Fiber samples from twelve carpets were submitted to Martin Youngberg for microscopic analysis and identification, and the findings are reported in Appendix 1. The results are interesting in several ways. The identification of camel's hair in one piece is surprising because this material has not, to my knowledge, been observed before in a classical carpet. It is no surprise that the finest carpets of those sampled turned out to have pashmina pile. But it is very difficult to distinguish fine sheep's wool from relatively coarse pashmina simply by feel. It is thus useful to know that one carpet has pile of pashmina wool (see Chapter 4, n. 124) despite having a relatively coarse weave (272 knots per inch) and a foundation of cotton and silk. It is evident from this and from actual measurements of the fibers that there is a wide range in thickness within the pashmina fibers, and the finest fiber tends to be found in the carpets of finest weave.

**Dyes and Color Usage**

Little research has been done on the dyes employed in carpets produced in the eastern part of the Islamic world. A brief article by Mark Whiting in 1978 summarized work done by Anthony Clemson and other students, which was based in part on methods that have now been superseded. No statistical base for findings has been published. The two contributions found here in Appendix 2 are therefore of
special value. In the first part, Dr. Harald Böhmer presents a useful survey of natural dyes used in the Near and Middle East and India, so there is no need to discuss that information here. The second part consists of recent analyses of dye samples by Dr. Recep Karadag, Prof. Dr. Nevin Enez, and Dr. Harald Böhmer. For the brief discussion that follows here, further information is drawn from unpublished findings of samples taken from twenty-nine carpets analyzed in 1985 and 1986. All of the analyses referred to concentrate on reds, but in some cases they examine orange, yellow, and green dyes. Both Persian and Indian carpets were sampled.

The results of the dye analyses should be considered only a second step, after Whiting and Clemson's work, and much more research needs to be done to offer conclusive findings. Nonetheless, a number of interesting points may be raised from the findings at hand. The bluish red quality of the insect dye known as lac and produced in India and South Asia is thought by some to indicate Indian production, as opposed to Persian, but lac was widely traded and appears in many Persian as well as Indian carpets. Its use would not seem to be a valid indicator of origin. The 1985 work is especially interesting in this regard in that it suggests two different types of lac. One type is found chiefly, but not exclusively, in Indian pieces; the other type is found mainly, but not exclusively, in Persian pieces. One Indian carpet, the shaped piece from Cincinnati (fig. 101; cat. no. 25), has red pile dyed with one type of lac but its red silk second weft was dyed with the other type. Could the silk have come, already dyed, from Iran? This work needs to be refined and examined further, but it promises to be a fruitful line of inquiry.

The red dye obtained chiefly from plants of the madder family is associated more with Persian production by some, but it appears in both Persian and Indian pieces, often in combination with another dye substance. The 1986 results suggest that the combination of lac and madder appears only in Indian carpets, but more pieces should be sampled to bear out this indication. The madder plant of India differs from the Persian variety, but the chemical composition is difficult to distinguish in analysis.

Cochineal was found only in Persian pieces generally attributed to Kashan and in the blue-ground fragments (figs. 66–68; cat. nos. 16a–c). This might suggest a Persian origin for the latter, but numerous other qualities indicate Indian production (see discussion, p. 76), so perhaps we are dealing in this case with the importation of pre-dyed silk from Iran.

Not much can be concluded at this point from the limited results with yellows, but this is an area that should be pursued. Yellows tend to be locally produced, and the identification of the specific dye source may be very helpful in distinguishing plant groups and localizing production sources. Most yellows were found to be derived from a compound that is found in weld, but the yellow of one silk rug attributable to the Deccan was determined to be not from weld.

Color usage is more an aesthetic matter than a technical one, and it is addressed several times in Chapter 4, in the course of discussing the carpets themselves. It will be sufficient here to note certain key features. Indian carpet weavers approached the level of painters when it came to "applying" color, and they used certain techniques rarely found, or seen far less frequently, outside of India. One may be called "color mixing," for it involves the juxtaposition of knots of different colors, usually in
Fig. 10. Fragment of a carpet with niche-and-flower design. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1630–40. Pashmina pile on silk foundation, 6" x 2'1½" (15.2 x 64.8 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 (14.40.722)

Fig. 11 (cat. no. 14). Detail of fig. 62. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms, known as the Girdlers’ carpet. Northern India, Lahore, 1630–32. The Worshipful Company of Girdlers, London
checkerboard fashion, to yield a third color. A good example of this may be seen on the bellies of jumping antelopes in the scrolling-vine-and-animal carpet in Washington, D.C. (figs. 9, 48; cat. no. 10), where the color of the upper body is mixed with the white of the belly to create an intermediate hue. Blue and white are mixed in several pieces to indicate water (see fig. 21; cat. no. 13), a convention seen also in Persian weavings, but its use in more varied ways was developed by Indian craftsmen.

A second coloristic device is shading, where different hues or shades of the same color are juxtaposed, without separating borders or lines, to create the effect of shading. Forms depicted in this manner, for instance, the landscape of a fine pashmina fragment in the Metropolitan Museum (fig. 10), achieve substance and form, almost a sculptural quality. This is closely related to the Indian tendency, first seen in Persian carpets of the Herāt type, to juxtapose colors, sometimes similar ones (the so-called ton-sur-ton effect), sometimes not, without outline, a feature evident, for example, in the Girdlers' carpet (figs. 11, 62; cat. no. 14).

Shading was so favored in European art that one is tempted to seek a Western model. Many Akbari manuscript paintings of the 1590s depict landscapes in a northern European style. The images might well be copies of engravings brought in by the Jesuits, but this does not explain the Europeanized use of color, shading, perspective, and even sfumato. Tapestries have been proposed as a pictorial source that, when new, would also have provided brilliant color. Despite their seeming unsuitability due to size, tapestries had an appeal in Mughal India; Sir Thomas Roe even recommended (in 1617–18) that pictorial tapestries be presented as gifts to the Mughal court.
Western objects such as tapestries, panel paintings, and tinted engravings may have had some influence, but it is evident from examples of Mughal manuscript illumination that a local tradition of shading colors to create the illusion of form and substance had been developed in ornamentation by the 1590s. In the resplendent shamsa, or decorative roundel (fig. 12), in the 1597–98 Khamsa of Amir Khusrau Dihlawi, largely in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, the outer edge is defined by flaming cone-shaped leaves in gold, each containing a double or triple whirl in shaded color. Color shading is also seen in the pink and dark red palmettes around the central unit of design. Illumination is the more convincing source of influence because it is essentially concerned with ornament, not representation; additional examples showing the close relationship between the arts of illumination and carpet weaving will be described in the next chapter.

**Structure**

Carpets in India are a product of palace ateliers or urban workshops and were thus woven on fixed upright looms (fig. 13). Carpet weaving was not a cottage industry, so the looms were set up in quantity in permanent workshops. The carpets of the late sixteenth and the seventeenth century, some of them manufactured at or for the Mughal court or a Rajput court, involve such elaborate patterns and demonstrate such carefully drawn corners, always a challenge for the weaver, that knot-by-knot cartoons or weaving instructions, known as ta’lims, in which colors, sequence, and number of warps are specified for knotting, were surely used. It is possible that certain eighteenth-century rugs, far simpler in pattern, were executed without this graphic assistance.

The warps of Indian carpets are usually on two levels, resulting in a rather corrugated feel in coarser pieces (the backs of the finest pieces seem almost smooth because one is aware only of alternate warps, so depressed are the others). There are invariably three passes or shoots of weft between rows of knots; the first and third run straight, and the second meanders in and out around the warps on two levels (fig. 14). In some carpets, not the finest but a grade or two below, the second weft is silk and the others cotton. The suppleness and strength of the silk allow tighter packing than cotton would permit in the severely meandering second weft. The Persian, or asymmetrical, knot, open to the left, is standard (fig. 15a). Jufit knotting (15b), a labor-saving technique in which knots are tied over four warps instead of two, appears rarely in Indian carpets, only in early and experimental weavings (see figs. 66–68). It is of some interest that jufit knotting is virtually a hallmark of the carpets of Khorasan, in eastern Iran, the original home of weavers who later immigrated to India.

Finesseness of weave varies tremendously, ranging from fewer than 50 knots per square inch in coarse
mats and audience carpets to about 2,100 knots per square inch in the finest pashmina carpet known (fig. 7), an unbelievable achievement matched only in modern times. The length of pile varies considerably and is usually proportional to the fineness of the weave. In other words, the finest pashmina carpets are normally extremely thin and almost velvetlike, no doubt contributing to frequent confusion in earlier literature as to whether they were velvets or pile carpets. Side finish is usually a cable or two of plied warps held in place by wefts and overcast in silk or wool, depending on the pile material. Ends normally involve a plain-weave band and then fringe, sometimes still in loops as it was held in place on the loom and sometimes clustered and knotted.

Fig. 14. Typical structure with three weft passes

Fig. 15. a: Persian (asymmetrical) knot;  b: paji (paired or “false”) knot
The order of the carpets discussed in this chapter has been arranged according to groups best understood in terms of their common or related patterns, technical characteristics, and features of color—a scheme that has the virtue of following a roughly chronological development. The specialist might prefer the establishment of a strict typology based first on technical features, but the general reader will be better served by the more narrative approach adopted here, which still takes significant typological issues into account.

THE PERSIAN STYLE

The first generation of Indian court carpets encompasses those woven under the auspices of the Mughal rulers Akbar (r. 1556–1605) and Jahāngīr (r. 1605–27). Surviving pieces date back to the 1580s. Carpet weaving under royal patronage surely took place at Fatehpur Sikri, then a royal capital, by the early 1580s and possibly even the 1570s, before a major fire destroyed much of the carpet stores there in 1579. Whatever pile carpets were produced during that decade were lost in the conflagration (or perhaps since). So experimental and original are the oldest surviving fragments (figs. 21, 22) that it is difficult to speculate as to what might have preceded them in their country of origin. Given the fact that pile carpets were not specifically cited among the losses from the fire (see p. 7), it is also possible that the carpet workshop was only then established, about 1580, and that these fragments truly reflect the beginnings of court workshop production in India.

Carpets attributed to the reigns of Akbar and Jahāngīr display a variety of patterns that betray a debt to Persian styles currently in vogue. The debt is apparent in all artistic media, literary and visual, which is quite understandable, given the tremendous influx of Persian poets, calligraphers, and painters to the Muslim courts of the Mughals and the Deccani sultans of south-central India and given the appreciation of high Persian culture at these courts. Iranian patronage had waned, and the Muslim courts of India welcomed the artists who offered their talents. The result was that an artistic style based to some extent on Persian models became dominant in India at this time.

The Persian style in carpets can be seen in two forms: pictorial scenes adapted from the book-illustration tradition and patterns comprising networks of scrolling vines and palmettes, sometimes symmetrical and sometimes overlaid with animals or a central medallion. Both forms depended upon the creative output of the book atelier: the first relates to both paintings and illuminated margin scenes, the second, to illuminated openings and panels (and architectural decoration in paintings, which must have been done by illuminators). Both forms involved patterns of sufficient complexity—with curvilinear drawing and figural motifs—that cartoons showing the design and written notations regarding the colors would have been necessary. Apparently, it was the artists of the book atelier who developed the patterns of ornamentation that were then adapted for use in all other media, including architecture, according to the tastes of the ruler and his family. Persian artists who came to India brought their acquired skills, cultural memory, and experience of workshop practice in Iran. It can be no coincidence that at precisely this moment in India pile carpets bearing complex patterns of Persian origin began to be produced in royal workshops.

Only a handful of carpets can be attributed to the reign of Akbar, but they include some of the most inventive and spirited weavings of all. We have seen that carpets were manufactured in pre-Akbari India, but it was Akbar's great inspiration,
Fig. 16. Folio from a *Khamsa* (Quintet) of Nizami. Iran, Safavid period, ca. 1540. Gold, silver, opaque watercolor, and ink on paper. British Library, London (Or. 2265, f. 20r)

Fig. 17. Folio from a *Khamsa* (Quintet) of Amir Khusrav Dihlavi. Mughal, Lahore, 1597–98. Gold and ink on paper. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Gift of Alexander Smith Cochran, 1913 (13.228.26)

Fig. 18. Carved sandstone wall in the Turkish sultan's house at Fatehpur Sikri. Mughal, 1570s
perhaps following the Persian model, to bring their production into a court workshop, where designs could be easily conceived by or in collaboration with artists employed in manuscript and even textile design and execution. It is thus logical that the first generation of surviving Indian carpets should reflect such a close connection to those other media.

Persian styles were brought to India by émigré painters, who worked side by side with local artists. Imported Persian manuscripts and furnishings were also available and highly prized. The Persian landscape style, which evolved from fifteenth-century painting and became popular in sixteenth-century Persian manuscript illumination (fig. 16), was adopted wholesale, replete with leaping animals and animal combats, in Akbar-period manuscripts (fig. 17). Similar conventions can be seen in contemporaneous painting such as a scene of Akbar hunting (see fig. 1), with its fleeing animals. An album produced for Jahangir between 1609 (when he was still a prince) and 1618 contains numerous leaves with borders featuring similar decorative landscapes, demonstrating the longevity of these conventions. The album also has leaves with margins of vine-scroll patterns. Apart from the occasional inclusion of strictly Indian forms, the principal distinction between Mughal and Safavid versions lies in the Indian artist’s preference for more naturalistic, less rigidly conventionalized representation.

A close relationship between textile and carpet design in India is also apparent, not from the survival of textiles and carpets sharing common patterns but from the appearance in carpets of pattern units that repeat. The drawlooms on which figured textiles were woven required the services of a drawboy who lifted particular warps in a prescribed order (according to a diagram, which had to be worked out in advance) to weave the pattern motifs. The motifs were organized into a pattern unit that was then repeated directly or reversed along a vertical or horizontal axis (or both). Pile carpets are woven on simple looms, not drawlooms, since there is no need for the insertion of pattern wefts. The pattern results from individual knots rather than complex combinations of multiple interlocked warp and weft yarns, so there is no technical reason for a pattern unit. If a repeating pattern is present in a carpet—as it is in a number of pieces with the pictorial or scrolling-vine-and-animal or scrolling-vine-and-blossom patterns discussed below—it is in imitation of textiles whose weaving involved pattern repeats. It thus seems likely that designs for textiles, adapted from ornamental designs conceived in the book atelier and frequently in a Persian style, were sometimes utilized in weaving pile carpets. Repetition of pattern in carpets thus had no impact on labor or time expended but was done to achieve a particular style.

Mughal architecture also shows the influence of the Persian style. Decorative stone panels carved in relief at Fatehpur Sikri, Akbar’s magnificent capital (occupied from 1571 to 1585), include ones with
Persian landscapes into which Indian forms have been introduced (fig. 18). Akbar’s tomb at Sikandra, near Agra, completed by his son and successor, Jahangir, contains wall painting with symmetrically disposed vines and palmettes and blossoms, an utterly Persian arrangement of both Persian and Indian motifs. But among the most absolutely Persian architectural decoration on Indian soil is that found in the tomb of Itimad al-Daula, Jahangir’s chief minister, in Agra. Completed in 1628 and representing the highest level of imperial patronage, this was the first white marble building in India to be adorned with inlaid stone. Decoration is in patterns of vases, some holding flowers, within niches, and of scrolling vines and blossoms (fig. 19), both essentially Persian designs. Their appearance on the monument was particularly appropriate because of the Persian origins of the man entombed there.

It seems likely that Indian carpets in the Persian style may have been modeled on actual carpets, so close are certain idiosyncrasies of color and design.
Many Indian paintings depict carpets with Persian-style patterns. Often these representations are strictly generic in nature and should not be taken as anything but indicators of general taste. But when the representation is more specific than generic (a situation not always easy to judge), the presence of Indian motifs such as segmented blossoms, wisteria, or grape clusters (see fig. 55) signals an Indian origin for the carpet, but the absence of such motifs or the presence of certain Persian features probably means a Persian carpet is depicted (fig. 3 shows a compartment carpet that may well be Persian in origin). Persian carpets retained their status appeal in India even after local production had reached a high level of proficiency, so there were undoubtedly Persian carpets on hand to be imitated. A significantly large number of carpets in the Jaipur Collection are Persian in origin.

Certain types of Persian carpets influenced Indian weaving. The Herât class of the second half of the sixteenth and first quarter of the seventeenth century is important in this regard. The standard field pattern for this class involves a symmetrical arrangement of scrolling vines with carefully placed palmettes and blossoms (fig. 20). A particular rhythm results from palmette pairs turned in, alternating with palmette pairs turned out. Sometimes animals are incorporated into the pattern, superimposed on the vine scrolls. Also influential was the more varied Sanguszko group, dating from the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century. Vine scrolls with animals are present in some, including the carpet (see fig. 38) for whom the group is named (Sanguszko is the name of a former owner); other points of reference shall be brought up in due course.

The term "Persian style" should not be construed to imply slavish copies. In most instances it means simply that ornamental models found in Persian art were used as points of departure by Indian artists. The "Indianness" of a carpet will usually be recognizable once certain hallmarks of Indian production have been pointed out.

The Persian style was not abandoned, even when a new, truly Indian style emerged about 1620, late in the emperor Jahângîr's reign, and it flourished into the nineteenth century. But the greatest works created in the Persian style are from the first generation of Indian court carpets—made during the time of the emperors Akbar and Jahângîr, before the Indian flower style became popular—and the second generation, when under Shâh Jahân (r. 1628–58) carpets in the Persian and flower styles were both produced.

**Fantastic-Animal Pattern**

Probably the earliest of all surviving Indian carpet types is also the most famous and, in some ways, enigmatic. This is the "grotesque" or fantastic-animal carpet (figs. 21, 22; cat. nos. 1a, 1b), known today in fifteen sizable fragments and a few smaller pieces. A menagerie of Indian animals and birds is combined with monster masks, vases, and flowering plants in a complex and seemingly indecipherable way. Against a wine red ground, the animals, birds, and masks are depicted issuing from one another's mouths or foreheads. A close look at the fragments reveals that certain images and configurations are repeated. Several fragments are large enough to show that there are vertical axes about which the pattern turns, sometimes in exact mirror image, sometimes in very altered form. There is such an axis down the middle of the Detroit fragment (fig. 21), indicated by the full-width monster mask that is upside down at the top, but it does not appear as such because the patterns flanking the axis are not symmetrical.

Two recent studies provide convincing analyses of this carpet's design. Four rectangular grids, or pattern units, can be isolated (fig. 23), each with a constellation of forms emerging from half of a monster mask. The four grids are combined in rows and repeated vertically in reversed and staggered form, creating an extended alternating point repeat. Figure 24 shows the overall reconstruction of the pattern and the original positions of the dispersed fragments. It is important to reiterate that this kind of pattern repeat is to be expected in drawloom-woven textiles but has no technical justification on a carpet loom, the implication being that it was done solely for aesthetic reasons, perhaps following a textile design. The genesis of this pattern type can be linked to the "in-and-out palmette" designs found in so-called Herât carpets from late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century Iran, with monster masks substituted for large palmettes and adjacent animal clusters equivalent to the small floral forms surrounding the palmettes (fig. 25). The underlying influence of Persian design is thus practically concealed.

It seems likely that the surviving fragments come from two carpets made from the same cartoon. The designs on some pieces are upside down in relation to others when all are oriented as they were woven.
Fig. 21 (cat. no. 12). Fragment of a carpet with pattern of fantastic animals. Northern India, probably Fatehpur Sikri, ca. 1580–85.
The Detroit Institute of Arts, Founders Society Purchase, Edsel B. Ford Fund (11.64)
on the loom, with the pile facing down. Based on a
probable loom width of four pattern units, giving
an original width of 10 feet 2 inches or slightly
more (field only), a single carpet would have had to
be over 65 feet long. To account for the different
pattern orientation among the fragments, a com-
plete reversal of pattern direction about a horizontal
center line would have had to occur. Assignment of
the fragments to two carpets, woven essentially
from the same cartoon but in opposite directions
on the loom, is therefore more plausible and also
explains a number of design and technical idiosyn-
crasies of each group of fragments.

Although one fragment retains a trace of guard
stripe,7 no part of the main border is known to
survive. Given the unique nature of the design—
at least among carpets—it is difficult to imagine
what the border might have looked like. It has been
suggested that early efforts to market such fragments
as parts of very old carpets, from the fifteenth cen-
tury, for example, would have thwarted by
the existence of a border immediately recognizable
as late-sixteenth- or seventeenth-century work. A
late copy8 of this design has a bizarre main border

---

Fig. 22 (cat. no. 1b). Fragment of a carpet with pattern of fantastic animals. Northern India, probably
Fatehpur Sikri, ca. 1580–85. The Textile Museum, Washington, D.C. (169.00.20A)

Fig. 23. The four grids or pattern units of the fantastic-animal carpets. From Cohen, “Fearful Symmetry,” 1996,
fig. 5, p. 108
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Fig. 24. Schematic reconstruction of a pair of fantastic-animal carpets. From Cohen, "Fearful Symmetry," 1996, fig. 12, p. 117
adorned with what appear to be winged insects, but it is a copy of only one of the fragments, the Detroit piece, not the full design, so the border must be an act of imagination rather than imitation.

This grotesque design is unique among carpets. It has nothing to do with scrolling vines terminating in human, animal, or bird heads where blossoms or leaves might conventionally be found (see fig. 66; cat. no. 16a), although there is a connection in the substitution of an animal for a vegetal or floral form. Steven Cohen relates it to two Indian traditions. One involves an architectural form, the makara-torana arch, an evolved form of which featured a scrolling-vine system emerging from the mouths of two makaras, fantastic elephant-headed crocodiles that symbolized water. The peak of the arch was interruped by a grotesque "face of glory," or kiritimukha, a monster mask not unlike the Chinese tao-tieh. These forms originally had religious significance, but over time they became purely decorative. The point is that images of the makara and kiritimukha were often combined and depicted grasping something in their mouths (fig. 26).3

The second tradition involves the representation of mythical composite animals, most commonly in paintings and drawings but also in the form of objects such as powder flasks (fig. 27), in which animals sometimes emerge from the jaws of other beasts. The genesis of this tradition, which became popular at the end of the sixteenth century, has been linked to European grotesques of this period. To date, however, no direct counterpart has been identified and no European pattern book has been traced to India.4

The grotesque carpets are not technically refined; the drawing is rather awkward and in places the knotting (from the back) has a somewhat jumbled irregularity. This may be the sign of a new or young workshop. There is an experimental quality to certain aspects of the use of color, an area in which later Indian carpet weavers excelled. One feature, adopted from Persian practice, is the alternation of blue and white knots to simulate shimmering water represented in the pools at the bases of trees (see fig. 21; cat. no. 12) and in a dish holding a vase.5 Another feature, evident in both fragments illustrated here, seems to be an Indian innovation, perhaps intended to create an illusion of depth or solid form: one or two stripes of unrelated color are sometimes inserted between the main color of an animal and its dark blue outline. In later carpets several shades of the same color were used, providing in this way a more naturalistic effect.

The energy and fantasy of the design are consistent with Akbar's patronage, which encouraged the amalgamation of elements from diverse artistic and cultural traditions. The spirited animals, however fantastic their behavior, are presented in the seminaturalistic style typical of Akbar's taste. The popularity of this type of grotesque, beginning with the monsters depicted in the Hamsanama dating from about 1562-77 (see p. 5) and continuing through the seventeenth century, reached a peak in the 1580s. Several paintings from manuscripts completed during that decade show column bases and capitals with monster masks, posts with composite-animal designs, or complex designs with masks and projecting animals on thrones (fig. 28) or caparisons for horses.6 The grotesque carpets were probably manufactured in the 1580s at Fatehpur Sikri before Akbar moved his capital to Lahore in 1585.7

Pictorial Designs

The close relationship between carpet design and the art of the book is particularly apparent in a
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Fig. 26. Stone makara-torana arch from a temple interior at Badoli, Rajasthan, Pratihara dynasty, 10th century

Fig. 27. Ivory powder flask. Mughal, first half of the 17th century. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Rüstkammer (Armory) (Y181)

Fig. 28. Page from the Razmnama (detail), Fatehpur Sikri, ca. 1582–86. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper. Collection of the maharaja of Jaipur, India. From Thomas Holbein Hendley, Memoirs of the Jeypore Exhibition 1883. London, 1883, vol. 4, pl. cxxxviii.

group of pictorial, or scenic, rugs woven late in the sixteenth or early in the seventeenth century. These masterful weavings, which in general do not seem derivative, are meant to be viewed from one end (or hung vertically). Like the other carpets assigned to Akbar’s rule, they rely heavily on figural imagery, both realistic and fantastic.

Two small rugs perfectly represent the pictorial style found in manuscripts of the 1590s from Akbar’s atelier. Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts owns one of the most famous Mughal rugs of all (see fig. 29; cat. no. 2). It was purchased in 1882 by the donor, Frederick L. Ames, on the advice of William Morris, the English artist and poet, who appreciated its superb condition, color, and pictorial qualities. The field design is a composite of three main scenes. At the top is a palace scene. Two men converse in a pavilion, cooled by the fanning of a servant and entertained by a musician on the roof above. In the open archway of a larger building behind the pavilion, two women attend to a child’s needs. Nearby cypress trees and a peacock on the roof contribute to the bucolic spirit. A hunting party moves from right to left across the central zone of the field. A spotted bullock draws a cart holding a tethered cheetah that stands on a striped flat-woven textile; a hunter whisks flies from the face of the feline. A man carrying a slain ibex on his shoulders precedes the cart. In the lower zone, a fantastic beast, a winged elephant-headed lion, clutches seven elephants in his paws, mouth, trunk, and tail as he is attacked by a fantastic bird with streaming tail feathers. The spaces between these vignettes are filled with leaping and recumbent animals and a combat between a lion and a bull.

The palace scene is generic in nature and resembles countless versions depicted in paintings of the 1590s. Variations of the hunt scene are also common in paintings of that era, and one depiction in particular, from a manuscript dating from about 1590, is extremely close, down to the striped textile on which the cheetah stands (see fig. 1). These two passages are typical nonspecific views of court life based on the Persian model. The fantastic creature holding the tiny elephants is a more complicated issue. The composite animal, half lion and half elephant, known as gajā-simba, is common in Indian mythology and represents sovereignty and strength. The strength of the creature is such that seven elephants are held in submission. The simurgh, mythological bird of the Persian epic and perhaps here equivalent to the Indian Garuda, sun bird and
Fig. 29 (cat. no. 2). Carpet with pictorial design. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1590–1600. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Gift of Mrs. Frederick L. Ames in the name of Frederick L. Ames (93.1480)
vehicle of Vishnu, attacks the elephant-lion. Several versions of this group exist, later in date than the rug, in the form of drawings (fig. 30) and the decoration of an inlaid chest. Another drawing shows the simurgh either attacking the back of the elephant-lion or carrying it in its beak as it flies. One earlier Mughal version of the composite animal is seen in inlaid marble and sandstone panels adorning the Delhi Gate of Agra Fort, completed in 1568–69.

The simurgh is missing from this composition. The gate to the emperor’s capital is of course a perfect spot for a symbol of sovereignty, but the significance of the elephant-lion combined with the simurgh on all later examples remains unexplained.

A second small rug (fig. 31; cat. no. 3), in Vienna, depicts a landscape consisting of different types of flowering or leafy trees and a profusion of birds. The designs of these pictorial elements surely originated in the book atelier; individual passages are seminaturalistic in form and coloring, but they are combined in a totally unnaturalistic way, as a two-dimensional pattern appropriate to the medium. Trees are ordered loosely in rows, and the spaces between are occupied mainly by large showy birds—peafowl, cranes, and a cock and hen. A subtle spatial play, unnaturalistic but aesthetically effective, is created by the juxtaposition of fully colored trees with flowering plants and smaller trees in pink silhouetted against the wine red ground.

Calling carpets of this class “Persian style” may seem unjustified in the absence of an underlying scroll system that unites the elements, thus providing order within the design, but certain features of the Boston and Vienna rugs suggest familiarity with late-sixteenth-century Persian carpets that are also pictorial in nature (and we know from Abū’l Fazl that they were still being imported). The approach to pictorial design alone indicates a connection. Four small Persian rugs of the silk Kăshān type have directional designs consisting of rows of animal combatants, and a carpet of the so-called Sanguszko class in Paris (fig. 32) combines various pictorial vignettes, some of them recognizable literary themes, in a loosely ordered manner similar to the Indian pieces. There are analogies in details as well. Monster and animal masks appear in the borders of both Indian pieces, in small silk Kăshāns, and in Sanguszko carpets (figs. 32, 38). Unlike the masks in the grotesque carpet they do not form part of a larger grotesque pattern but are subordinate to a foliate pattern. Also, the small figures set in the foliage between the main border palmettes in the Indian rugs (birds in the Boston rug, leopards or cheetahs in the Vienna) have counterparts in certain Kăshān and Sanguszko carpets.

Enormous carpets were also made with pictorial designs. The largest, at 27 feet 4 inches long, is the Morgan carpet in the Metropolitan Museum (figs. 33, 34; cat. no. 4), once part of the collection at the Sackville-West house, Knole. In this case, a full-width pattern unit appears almost four times to fill the length of the field. The pattern is like that of the Vienna rug, but with real and mythological animals and a palm tree added. The pattern unit is reversed with each repetition, again reminiscent of woven textile design. The uppermost pattern repeat is incomplete, suggesting that the carpet was woven to order and a specific length was prescribed. The border pattern is a geometrized version of the cartouche-and-medallion design employed in a number of sixteenth-century Persian carpets. The design probably originated with artists who worked on manuscripts, since it appears first in illuminations and bindings. A similar arrangement to that seen here appears in Akbari painting as architectural
Fig. 31 (cat. no. 3). Carpet with pictorial design. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1550–1600. Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Vienna (Or 292)
Fig. 32. Carpet with pictorial design from the Sanguszko group. Iran, late 16th or early 17th century. Wool pile on cotton, wool, and silk foundation, 12' 5/8" x 8' 10 1/8" (375 x 269.9 cm). Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (inv. no. 10615)

Fig. 33 (cat. no. 4). Carpet with pictorial design. Northern India, Lahore, late 16th or early 17th century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 (17.190.898)

Fig. 34 (cat. no. 4). Detail of fig. 33 (opposite)
A somewhat similar effect (but in reverse) was achieved in contemporaneous architectural decoration featuring intarsia work of white marble patterns set into red sandstone.

A few other pictorial carpets, either fragmentary or less well preserved than the preceding examples, merit comment. A worn rug in the Textile Museum, Washington, D.C.,44 is long enough, at almost 20 feet, to have repeating pattern units, yet it does not. Meandering streams divide the landscape of the field into three nonmatching units, a device employed by illuminators and binding designers, Persian and Indian alike. The shimmering effect of the stream was achieved by mixing blue and white knots, a feature seen in the grotesque carpets. A narrow and worn strip of field, also in the Textile Museum,45 combines landscape elements divided by a stream with the elephant-lion holding elephants—the same mythological creature seen in the Boston rug. A splendid fragment in the same Washington collection (fig. 36; cat. no. 5) presents a figural image familiar in other media but not otherwise found in carpets, an elephant combat. This sport of kings was described and depicted many times in historical manuscripts, and the image of two animals fighting became a popular one. A similar elephant combat, executed in tile, adorns the exterior wall of Lahore Fort near the main gate, where it reminded those approaching of the power and sovereignty of the king.46

With the exception of the elephant-combat fragment, whose coloring, drawing, and weave characteristics set it apart (and most probably link it to the grotesque carpets), the pictorial carpets form a homogeneous group. The small Boston and Vienna rugs (figs. 29, 31) are much finer than the others but are otherwise similar to the larger pieces. To varying degrees they exhibit a taste for distinctive color, with either contrasting (often black or red on white) or similar colors (often red and pink, light and dark blue, or ochre and ivory or beige) silhouetted without outline or interior definition. In general, these carpets have seven- or eight-strand ivory cotton warps and pale pink or apricot cotton wefts. They may be attributed to Lahore because of technical and, especially, coloristic similarities to the Girdlers' carpet (figs. 11, 62), known to have been made at Lahore, which was established as a royal capital in 1586 and had a carpet factory or workshop.

The pictorial carpets can all be dated to the end of the sixteenth or the beginning of the seventeenth century. Some aspects remind us of conventions or
designs associated with Fatehpur Sikri, the capital from 1571 to 1585. There is a strikingly close parallel in spirit and design between landscape vignettes in the carpets (fig. 34) and finely carved stone panels decorating a pavilion at Fatehpur (fig. 18). These panels have a similar lace- or weblike effect. The connection between the silhouette style of carpet-border elements and illumination of the Hamzanāma of about 1562–77 has already been noted. These styles persisted, however, and a somewhat later date is consistent with Mughal manuscript illumination (see fig. 17) and Persian carpets of that time. From the evidence of painted representations (fig. 37), textiles with similar pictorial patterns of animals leaping amid landscape elements were very much in vogue at this time.

Scrolling-Vine-and-Animal Pattern

The majority of Indian carpets manufactured during the reigns of Akbar and Jahāngīr have patterns based on the scrolling-vine systems of classical Persian carpets; the style even survived the sudden popularity of the new floral style that became the vogue during the reign of Shāh Jāhān. Many variations of this type exist in Indian carpets, and they
reflect the comparable variety found in Persian examples. The earliest group of Indian carpets featuring patterns of scrolling vines and palmettes are really still figural in nature, so richly endowed are they with animal forms imposed upon the underlying vine network. They date from the first quarter of the seventeenth century, mainly from the reign of Jahangir, and follow the Persian Sanguszko type, woven about 1600, with special emphasis on figural imagery of leaping animals and animal combats (fig. 38), and the Herät type, with or without animals, whose patterns (fig. 20) place greater emphasis on palmettes than do the Sanguszko pieces.

A fine version of the scrolling-vine-and-animal type woven in India belongs to the Museum für Islamische Kunst, Berlin (figs. 39, 40; cat. no. 6). The most prominent elements of the field pattern set against a white ground are the huge feathery palmettes that anchor the vine system along the central axis and the edges. Contrary to typical Persian practice the field pattern is not symmetrically arranged about a central vertical axis. In fact, the palmettes along this axis are sideways. A different approach has been taken here, one that relates to woven textiles: a single pattern unit, stretching from one central palmette to the next, is shown four times, mirrored each time across the horizontal axes through the central palmettes. The sideways orientation of the pattern units suggests that the carpet was perhaps intended to be viewed from a long side, like carpets furnishing royal audience halls (see figs. 2, 3). Amid the vines and palmettes is found a stock assortment of natural and mythological animals, alone or engaged in combat. There are none of the distinctly Indian types of animals found in earlier carpets. The bright colors on a white ground give the carpet a striking appearance matched in several Sanguszko carpets. The complex multi-colored cloud forms present in the Berlin carpet may also be seen in a Sanguszko carpet (fig. 38). The border has a green band which meanders in reciprocal fashion behind a series of leaf-shaped cartouches. This pattern appears against a red ground decorated with a floral design in pink, an arrangement used in several later carpets.

An examination of the Berlin carpet provides a valuable introduction to a spectacular piece of this type that survives only in fragments. At least fifteen fragments from border and field are known (there are actually more because several of these fragments are made up of joined pieces). Several pieces give a sense of the lively drawing, luminous coloring, and gigantic scale of the original (large field palmettes are 2 feet long), but only the largest fragment (fig. 41; cat. no. 7a) gives an idea of the overall field pattern and proves which border belongs to the field design. Enough remains to determine that there was a repeating pattern unit. The fragment includes more than one pattern unit in length; note that the combat between feline and stag at the bottom of the field is repeated near the top, along with surrounding elements. It shows less than a full width, but fragments with field elements not found in the large piece help us to almost complete the pattern unit (see fig. 42 for a proposed reconstruction). Note that the leaping bull in one fragment (fig. 43; cat. 7b) is partially preserved at the left edge of the large piece, thus permitting correct placement of the curious front-facing tiger and large palmettes above and below. Another fragment (fig. 44, cat. no. 7c), also with original border, fills most of the lower left portion of the pattern unit and was in fact the lower left corner of the entire field.

From the evidence of surviving fragments, the original layout and number of pattern repeats can be established with some authority. There were at least four repeats since the hind legs and tail of a leaping cheetah appear on four separate fragments. The field must have been only one pattern unit wide since more would have required a loom much larger than any used for weaving other Indian carpets of the period. Also, the pattern unit, being laterally asymmetrical, was not meant to be repeated horizontally (it is true that the pattern could have been repeated in mirror reverse, but none of the surviving field fragments show a change in pattern direction). The carpet was thus long and narrow, with a field consisting of a single column of three repeated pattern units and at least enough of a fourth to include the leaping cheetah that appears near the bottom of the pattern unit. This translates into approximate dimensions of 37 feet 4 inches by 10 feet 8 inches. The carpet may have been longer, and it is also possible that it was one of a pair.

The border pattern consists of giant brightly colored palmettes with feathered edges, connected by vines and separated by clusters of blossoms and leaves. There is a close connection to the Berlin carpet in the full-bodied, spiky palmettes seductively
colored with juxtaposed light and dark blue, ochre and yellow, and in the use of a white ground, one in border, the other in field. Several border fragments are in the collection of the maharaja of Jaipur, so the carpet must once have been in Amber Fort, ancestral home of the Jaipur rajas.

A beautifully designed and well-preserved carpet (figs. 45, 46; cat. no. 6), formerly in the collection of the earls of Ilchester, has a color combination rarely seen—the rich colors of the animals and the floral network of the field appear against a blue ground. Again, this is familiar from the famous Sanguszko carpet (fig. 38). The asymmetrical field pattern consists of a pattern unit shown twice and a bit more, each time reversed from left to right as in the Morgan pictorial carpet in the Metropolitan Museum (fig. 33). A small rug in Japan (fig. 47; cat. no. 7) also has a pattern unit shown twice but without any reversal of direction. The leaping animals and the phoenixes are imposed on a vine network that seems to be only a small part of a much larger system. The border designs of these two carpets, combining masks, rampant animals, and palmettes, are closely related.

Two other scrolling-vine-and-animal carpets exhibit somewhat stiffer drawing but present particularly interesting design variations. The piece in the National Gallery, Washington, D.C. (figs. 9, 48; cat. no. 10), combines the leaping fauna familiar in a Persian context with an assortment of Indian types, including a gavial, or crocodile, and an elephant ridden by a mahout. A dragon devours a deer, briefly reminding us of the grotesque carpets, and a rhinoceros lumbers across the top of the field. Two camels locked in combat reflect a composition known in several painted versions and two other carpets. The cartouche-and-medallion border has white-ground cartouches holding foliate elements and a central mask flanked by two animal heads. The red and pink decoration of the border ground has been seen in the Berlin animal carpet (fig. 39).

The Fremlin carpet (fig. 49) is somewhat clumsy in design and execution, but it offers a pedigree that provides an approximate date of execution. William Fremlin, an official in the East India Company, served in India twice, once in the 1620s and again from 1634 to 1644. He most likely acquired this carpet by special order shortly before his return to England in 1644 (the ban on private
Fig. 39 (cat. no. 6). Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1800. Museum für Islamische Kunst, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin-Preussischer Kulturbesitz (1. 6/74).

Fig. 40 (cat. no. 6) Detail of fig. 39 (below)
Fig. 42. Schematic reconstruction of a pattern unit of the scrolling-vine-and-animal carpet fragments (figs. 43, 44).

Fig. 41 (cat. no. 72). Fragments of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1800. The Textile Museum, Washington, D.C. (R6.000.2).
Fig. 43 (cat. no. 7b). Fragment of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1600. Collection Howard Hodgkin, London

Fig. 44 (cat. no. 7c). Fragment of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1600. Collection Howard Hodgkin, London
trade had been lifted in the early 1630s). The Farnham coat of arms, rather sweetly Indianized by the little elephant on top, appears seventeen times in all. The field pattern is the asymmetrical vine network seen in earlier animal carpets, with palmettes placed sideways along the vertical center line. Stiff scrolls are supplemented by flowering trees, and the full-width pattern unit repeats twice and a bit more.

The carpets with patterns of scrolling vines and animals belong essentially to the time of Jahangir’s rule (1605–27). Artistic taste was expressed in a higher state of finish and refinement, a stronger interest in naturalistic representation and insight into personality, and a somewhat diminished sense of the unrestrained creative energy that was a hallmark of Akbar’s workshop products. The animal rugs reflect this trend. The general popularity of the “animal style” during Jahangir’s time is reflected in the frequency of its appearance in carpet and textile patterns during the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Two volumes of an album made for Jahangir include pages dating as early as 1599 and as late as 1618. The margins of many of these leaves are illuminated in the landscape-and-animal style so popular in the 1590s, but there are variations in the vine-scroll pattern, including a leaf dated to 1610–11 whose margins show animals leaping across a carefully arranged pattern of palmettes and scrolling vines (fig. 50).

An approximate chronology for these carpets can be proposed, beginning with the fragmentary carpet with giant palmettes, whose ambitious scale and powerful images encourage association with other objects made in the later years of Akbar’s reign (figs. 21, 22). It contains at least one unusual image, the tiger seen in full frontal view, which is otherwise found in a few manuscripts of the 1590s (fig. 51). The Berlin carpet comes a little later, perhaps about 1610; its distinctive border design, particularly the feathered or serrated edges, closely matches the border of an album made for Jahangir about that year.

At the end of the sequence comes the Farnham carpet, woven probably about 1640, when the general taste for figural imagery in decorative objects had already lapsed, as it had in Iran. It can only have appeared this late because the specific design was commissioned. Between these extremes fall the other pieces, first the Ilchester and Toyama rugs with their refinement of color and design, then the National Gallery carpet with its full menagerie but stiffer execution.
Fig. 47 (cat. no. 9). Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20. The Toyama Memorial Museum, Saitama, Japan (no. 14)
Fig. 48 (cat. no. 10). Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Widener Collection (1942.9.475)
Fig. 49. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals, known as the Fremlin carpet. Northern India, Fatehpur Sikri or Agra, ca. 1640. Wool pile on cotton foundation, 19’ x 8’ (579.1 x 243.8 cm). Victoria and Albert Museum, London (IM. 1-1916)
Apart from the Fremlin carpet, which may well come from the same northern production center (Fatehpur Sikri or Agra) as the elephant-combat fragment, the rest of the scrolling-vine-and-animal carpets discussed here may be assigned to Lahore based on similarities to the Girdlers’ carpet (figs. 11, 62).

**Scrolling-Vine-and-Blossom Pattern**

There is one more group of Persian-style carpets to be considered, those having patterns of scrolling vines and blossoms but no figural imagery. These are not merely figureless versions of the Jahāngīr type just discussed; they reflect a more faithful and tighter interpretation of Persian models. They date primarily from the 1620s, but some later examples follow the type closely. The Persian models are later carpets of the Herāt class that include little or no figural imagery and date from the beginning of the seventeenth century and early carpets from the so-called Indo-Persian category, the commercial-grade descendants of the Herāt type.

A magnificently preserved carpet in the Tokugawa Art Museum, Nagoya (figs. 52, 53), probably acquired by the Tokugawa emperor of Japan in the seventeenth century via Dutch traders, has a version of this pattern. The design is symmetrical about the central axis and is not turned on its side, as in the animal rugs, but it again involves a full-width pattern unit that is repeated in mirror image across several horizontal axes. The oversize palmettes and blossoms remind us of the animal fragments with giant palmettes, but the Tokugawa example possesses the refinement and elegance of a later generation. Indian motifs such as segmented and serrated blossoms are interspersed with elements that are Persian in character. The border almost matches that of the carpet with animals and scrolling vines in the National Gallery, Washington, D.C. (fig. 48), and also has a counterpart in a slightly later piece in Hannover.

Another giant Morgan carpet in the Metropolitan Museum (figs. 54, 55) involves a relatively small pattern unit. Only half the field width, it is repeated once in mirror image to fill the field width and shown six times, again in mirror reverse, to complete the length. The effect is that of a drop-repeat patterned textile. The border has an elaborate interlocking compartment design based closely on late Herāt examples (fig. 63; see also fig. 20 for an earlier and more complex version).

Several examples have classic Persian medallions superimposed on the repeating floral designs. A large piece in the Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon (figs. 56, 57; cat. no. 11), closely matches the Morgan rug in underlying field pattern (and also in the main border) but adds an eye-catching
Fig. 52. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30. Wool pile on cotton foundation, 23'4" x 8'5" (712 x 257 cm). Tokugawa Art Museum, Nagoya, Japan (1-2)
Fig. 54. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30. Wool pile on cotton foundation. 50' 3" x 11' 10" (1522 x 357.8 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 (17.190.857)

Fig. 55. Detail of fig. 54 (opposite)
Fig. 36 (cat. no. 11). Medallion carpet. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30. Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon (T 62).

Fig. 37 (cat. no. 11). Detail of fig. 36 (opposite).
Fig. 98 (cat. no. 12). Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30. The Detroit Institute of Arts, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Edsel B. Ford (29.2.42)
Fig. 59 (cat. no. 13). Medallion carpet. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30. Gion Matsuri Tsuki-boko Preservation Association, Kyoto
lobed medallion whose flaming edges actually pulsate into one minor border. A carpet in Detroit (fig. 58; cat. no. 12) has an unusual arrangement of smaller ogival medallions that do not float on the floral field pattern but are part of its design. A pattern repeat fills slightly less than half the field and includes all of one central medallion and the inner quadrants of the corner devices. It is repeated once in mirror image to complete the field length, and lateral repeats are implied by a brief extension of the design, also in mirror image.

A rug in Kyoto (fig. 59; cat. no. 13) has a central medallion that floats on an unpatterned red field; corner medallions complete the field design, which resembles a Persian or Mughal binding. This splendid piece is one of about thirty classical Persian and Indian rugs that belong to various block associations in Kyoto. Every July these associations stage a procession through the streets of Kyoto. The procession is a part of the Gion festival, which has religious origins and dates back to the ninth century. Giant wagons draped with textiles acquired through the centuries by the association are towed by members (fig. 60). The textiles are generally in good condition because they are kept in storage for the rest of the year. A somewhat cruder version of the rug, acquired in 1632, survives in the collection of the maharaja of Jaipur,\textsuperscript{11} so a date in the 1620s for the Kyoto piece seems appropriate. The majority of the Indian rugs in Kyoto belong to another group and are discussed on pages 136ff.

The earlier of two surviving circular Indian carpets (fig. 61)\textsuperscript{16} probably dates from this decade as well. From a central circular medallion radiate sixteen escutcheon-shaped pendants, set off against a white ground otherwise embellished with scrolling vines and blossoms. The brilliant polychrome display against white is reminiscent of the large Berlin carpet with vines and animals (fig. 39) and, in turn, of Sanguszko carpets. In fact, one of the few surviving circular carpets from Iran belongs to the Sanguszko class.\textsuperscript{17}

The Indian carpet owned by the Girdlers' Company of London (figs. 11, 62; cat. no. 14) is important particularly for its fine state of preservation and, most of all, because its history has been fully documented.\textsuperscript{18} The carpet was commissioned in 1630 in Lahore by Robert Bell, a former master of the company, and delivered in 1634. Bell was a long-standing director of the East India Company, and it was in that capacity that he ordered the carpet for his beloved Girdlers' Company, a livery company chartered in 1449 whose early craft involved the manufacture of leather and brass girdles, or belts, worn outside the tunic or gown and used to suspend the wallet, purse, or side arms. The dominant elements of its design are the various large devices superimposed on the floral field pattern. In the center is the company's coat of arms (inexplicably woven in reverse except for the motto underneath), flanked by a pair of panels bearing Bell's initials and his own coat of arms. Note the incorporation in the company's arms of three gridirons, or girdle irons, a punning allusion to their patron saint, Lawrence, who was literally grilled to death on a girdle iron.

We have seen this type of floral field pattern before; although based on a Persian scheme, it has been handled in a particularly Indian way. The asymmetrical system of scrolling vines and blossoms can be reduced to a pattern unit that fills half the field and in most details is repeated in mirror image in the other half, but with variations in color. The unusual proportion of border to field has already been mentioned with regard to the rug's use as a table cover (p. 19). Spiky, segmented leaves
embellish field and border. The presence here of
certain colors (ocher, light blue) and color combi-
nations (ton-sur-ton ocher with ivory, pink with red),
of a particular type of guard stripe, and of certain
common characteristics of weave and material
enables us to attribute numerous other carpets to
Lahore, including most of the pieces discussed in
the section on Persian-style carpets. This is essen-
tially corroborated by the remarks of East India
Company agents, who singled out Lahore as the
source of the best Indian carpets (see pp. 8, 15–17),
at least in the 1610s and 1620s.

These Persian-style carpets are not true copies
of Persian types. They were inspired by Persian
models but in fact possess many features not found
in the sources of inspiration. In many Indian pieces,
vine networks are not fully realized symmetrical
patterns but are off-center portions of larger designs.
Repeating pattern units, relatively rare in Persian
carpets and closely linked to textile design, are com-
mon. Specific images are purely Indian—the gavial,
the gaja-simha figure, the frontal lion or tiger, and
the elephant combat, among animals; grape clusters
and segmented blossoms, sometimes wisteria-like,
among floral forms. Silhouetted and ton-sur-ton
coloring are Indian characteristics and may, together
with technical features, be the main way of distin-
guishing the two groups, especially in the absence
of figural imagery.

A comparison of two rugs belonging to the
Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C., is instruc-
tive. A small rug of the Herāt class (fig. 65), prob-
ably dating from the first quarter of the seventeenth
century, has a nicely symmetrical field pattern of
vine scrolls and palmettes, with a clear distinction
in size between major and minor elements and a
border of interlocking compartments. A small rug
of Indian origin (fig. 64; cat. no. 15), specifically
Lahore, we can now propose, dates probably from
the 1620s or a little later. The field pattern bears a
family resemblance to the Herāt, but individual elements are closely packed and not clearly differentiated by size. The design is not vertically symmetrical but involves the vertical repetition of a pattern unit, something we have seen in many Indian pieces. Perhaps the biggest difference lies in the use of color. In the Herāt, adjacent colors are generally contrasting and separated by a dark outline, whereas the Lahore rug has a profusion of tiny pink floral forms strewn across the red field with no outlining, creating a warmer, sweeter effect. There are also significant technical differences that distinguish Indian production, for example, the presence of multistrand (more than four) cotton warps and, in many instances, apricot or pale pink cotton wefts (in many of the Lahore pieces). These technical points hold true for the two Corcoran rugs.

Indian carpets with patterns of scrolling vines and blossoms were sufficiently prized in Europe that copies were made. One surviving example (fig. 65), known as the Kinghorn carpet, can be distinguished from its eastern model by a distinctive pinkish red in the pile and also by the use of flax (or hemp) as the foundation material. Possibly made in England, the carpet has a border monogram incorporating the initials of John, 2nd earl of Kinghorn, and those of either his first wife, whom he married in 1618, or his second, whom he married in 1640. Either date is plausible for such a design, but the earlier one has been favored on historical grounds.9 The presence of segmented blossoms confirms that the model was Indian, not Persian, and most probably a Lahore carpet.9 Carpets with related patterns, but rarely symmetrical, were also woven in the Deccan (see fig. 137); these were also based on Lahore versions.

Fine-Weave Type

Jahāngrīr’s patronage encouraged new refinements in the arts. The energy, originality, and monumentality that were the hallmarks of painting and the decorative arts under Akbar were replaced gradually by a quiet elegance of line and finish. In carpets this refinement was achieved partly through the use of luxury materials that allowed a higher density of knots. Elaborate and intricate patterns could be knotted more successfully, and a tighter weave yielded grace-
ful, subtly graduated curvilinear forms. The ability to achieve beautiful curves was particularly desirable for the Persian-style designs with scrolling vines and animals or blossoms, because the balance and harmony of the pattern depended on those curves. All carpets attributed here to the period of Akbar consist of sheep’s wool on a cotton foundation.

The beginning of the refinement process, in terms of materials, can be seen in a brilliant carpet now surviving in eight fragments, enough to reveal glorious colors and drawing but not enough to permit a reconstruction of the full pattern. The pile is short, which heightens the definition of the pattern. The fragments have a silk foundation and pile of fine sheep’s wool, resulting in a count of slightly less than 500 knots per square inch. Only two rugs of the Akbar period, the small pictorial examples in Boston and Vienna (figs. 29, 31), with 460 and 430 knots per square inch, respectively, approach the fragments’ tightness of weave, and it is unlikely that a finer weave could have been achieved on a cotton foundation.

Four fragments come from the field, four from border areas. Three pieces from the field (fig. 66; cat. no. 16a) belong to the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris. They do not adjoin but nevertheless convey a sense of the pattern. Two sinuously scrolling vine systems, one in light brown, one in green, are set against a blue ground. Each system crosses over and under the other and thus may be seen as of equal value, but, in fact, the green vines recede by virtue of their darker color, and the light brown vines incorporate more interesting and prominent elements: while the green stems terminate in leaves or blossoms, the brown vines have terminals of animal or bird heads. Two animal heads shown in frontal view, a lion holding fluttering ribbons in its mouth and an antlered stag, mark points where the brown vine splits in two. The heads of a rooster and an elephant are also included. Two fragments have triangular zones in one corner; these contain flowering plants in profile and a curious pluglike element. It is unclear what role these triangular zones might have played in the complete pattern; they might have been parts of a huge central medallion (although the arc of the third side is extremely shallow) or corner pieces in the field. The fourth field fragment, in Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts, essentially repeats...
Fig. 61. Herat carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Iran, first quarter of the 17th century. Wool pile on cotton and silk foundation, 6'11 1/2" x 5' (212 x 152.4 cm). Collection of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., William A. Clark Collection (26.287).

Fig. 64 (cat. no. 15). Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Northern India, Lahore, second quarter of the 17th century. Collection of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., William A. Clark Collection (26.297).
Fig. 65. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms, known as the Kinghorn carpet. England(?), ca. 1618 or 1640. Wool pile on flax (or hemp) foundation, 7' x 7'11" (218.2 x 241.3 cm). Royal Museum of Scotland, Edinburgh (inv. no. S020)
the pattern seen in two of the Paris pieces—the design centered on the antlered stag's head. This means that the pattern unit was employed, in one direction or the other, at least three times.

Two fragments of the main border survive, one in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum, and one, slightly less than full width, in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (fig. 67; cat. no. 16b). The border is divided into yellow and dark blue zones by a reciprocal trefoil outline. The border pattern, as fanciful and zoomorphic as that of the field, features lion masks and horned bovine heads, both shown frontally, in the alternating zones. These are complemented by pairs of fish, horses' heads (visible only in the full-width Burrell fragment), and wolves (?) biting the trefoil outlines. All are linked by a network of scrolling vines that continue uninterrupted from one color zone to the next.

Two additional fragments, one in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (fig. 68, cat. no. 16c), and the other in the Kestner-Museum, Hannover, come from another border, one about seven inches wide with a repeating pattern of arabesques and palmettes. The Paris piece has a narrow band of secondary pattern along one side.

These fragments have long been controversial in various ways. The first point of contention concerns their compatibility—whether they come from one carpet. Certain perceived technical differences have led some specialists to conclude that field and main border fragments come from separate carpets, but these observations do not seem to be based on firsthand examination. On the contrary, close examination provides strong arguments that the fragments do indeed come from one carpet. The warps are variously green, yellow-green, light green, and even ivory, with different shades sometimes
Fig. 67 (cat. no. 16b). Border fragment of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animal heads. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20. Nationalmuseum, SKM, Stockholm (NMK 157/1899)

Fig. 68 (cat. no. 16c). Border fragment of a carpet with scrolling vines and animal heads. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20. Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (A5212D)

Fig. 66 (cat. no. 16a). Fragments of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animal heads. Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20. Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (A5212A, A5212B, A5212C)
present in the same piece. Discrete vertical bands of color (in the foundation), a feature of later silkfoundation carpets, occur so rarely that they must be accidental rather than planned. Indeed, some warps consist of strands of different shades plied together, which simply suggests that different dye lots were used. Wefts are generally red silk, but two fragments have areas of white silk used in random fashion.

Field fragments and main border pieces have in common two related “painterly” features previously noted in rather developmental stages—the use of color mixing and color shading (see Chapter 3, pp. 24ff.). In the field, red and pink knots are mixed in the large blossoms, and there is color shading from red to pink and from green to dark greenish blue. In the main border, red and pink are mixed in the circles around the horses’ eyes, and there is color shading from gray to beige on the fishes’ bellies. Knot counts are very close, averaging about 480 per square inch, and occasional jufit knitting (with knots tied over four warps instead of two, to save time) is found in several pieces.

The correspondence of these fragments on technical grounds, coupled with similarities of color, design, scale, and even provenance (several pieces have been linked to the Swedish diplomat-collector F. R. Martin), provides compelling evidence that these fragments once belonged to the same carpet. If that is so, then a rather prominent anomaly must be explained, or at least acknowledged: the unusually wide secondary border with a pattern of arabesques and palmettes. It might have separated field and main border or, more likely, framed the main border, with the narrow band of pattern visible on the Paris border fragment serving as the outermost band.

The other main point of controversy surrounding these fragments concerns their origin. Although most experts accept an Indian origin, doubts have been expressed because of the formality and classical restraint of the pattern. It is indeed true that close parallels may be found in Persian art, especially the art of the fifteenth-century Timurids. A pattern consisting of scrolling vines terminating in animal and bird heads, with tendrils splitting off at points marked by lion masks shown frontally, is found as border illumination or manuscript decoration and is also depicted in paintings as textile decoration.

The pattern is conceptually very different from the fantastic-animal design of the red-ground Akbari fragments (figs. 21, 22; cat. nos. 1a, ib), where animals emerge from the jaws of other animals. Animal heads as terminals of vine scrolls are derived from other traditions. The heads themselves, in both Timurid and Mughal examples, remind us of earlier depictions of the “talking tree” of the Alexander legend, the oracular tree that urged Alexander not to invade India, and of the terrible tree of hell, known as Zaqqūm, whose poisonous fruit resembled human and animal heads. However, these images do not involve scrolls. Animated scrolls, that is, vine scrolls incorporating human and animal heads, were a decorative staple of medieval Islamic metalwork made in Egypt, Syria, and the Jazira (fig. 69). This decorative tradition—perhaps reinforced by the appearance of European grotesques in Eastern courts—was continued by the Timurids and their heirs, the Mughals.

Could these fragments come from a Timurid carpet? There is little material with which to make a direct comparison, since only two carpets have been put forth as plausibly Timurid and they represent, in their comparative lack of refinement, very different types of production. As we have seen, the sophisticated pattern woven into these fragments was certainly not beyond the abilities of a major Timurid artist, but did the type of court workshop required for a luxury production based on cartoons exist in Herāt at that time? Whatever the answer to that question, the presence of cochineal in this carpet (see Appendix 1) rules out Timurid production, since cochineal does not appear in Old World weavings until the sixteenth century.
Fig. 70. Tamer Granting an Audience in Balkh on the Occasion of His Accession to Power in April 1370 (detail). Opaque watercolor and gold on paper. From a Zafarnāma (The Book of Conquests) manuscript. Iran. Herat(?), ca. 1480 (painting). The John Work Garrett Library of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore (Gar.3, f. 83b)
There are several reasons to consider the fragments Indian. First, although the pattern may seem Persian in its refinement and formality, specific elements betray an Indian interest in naturalism. The rooster has colorful streaks of red and white on its neck, and the elephant’s head is drawn with a degree of sympathy and understanding unknown in Timurid examples. Depictions of elephants in Timurid decoration are rare and those that exist do not seem to be based on actual observation. Second, the use of color in an almost painterly way is a distinctly Indian characteristic. One can point to the color mixing and color shading in this regard, and both techniques were developed more fully in later and more finely woven Indian carpets. And third, these fragments share certain technical features, such as dyed silk warps and wefts, with other unquestionably Indian carpets. (The foundation silk of Persian carpets is rarely dyed.)

The source for the animate-scroll pattern was probably Timurid, which explains its classical formality. In fact, a model was close at hand, in the Zafarnāma, a manuscript dated 1467, with paintings added about 1480, that entered the imperial library during Akbar’s time. Inscriptions in the hands of Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān show that the volume remained in the royal library during their reigns. The emperor Shāh Jahān, in fact, who called it “one of the marvels of the age” and pledged to keep it in his presence and read it often, recorded its transfer to his library from his father’s on the very day of his accession to the throne. One painting in the Zafarnāma, Timur Granting an Audience in Balkh, shows the king enthroned before a yurt, or domed tent (fig. 70). The scene is replete with brilliant textile designs, especially the one with a pattern of scrolling vines and animal heads covering the dome of the yurt.

A date of about 1610–20 may be proposed for the animate-scroll carpet. Although there are signs of experimental production (jufti knotting, zones of irregular coloring in both warps and wefts, and camel’s hair in the pile), the sophistication of color usage suggests an intermediate point of development between the carpets of Akbar’s time and the even more refined pieces from the end of Jahāngīr’s reign. The first “luxury” production might have been an experiment. Playful aspects of the design are mirrored in the margins of an album made for Jahāngīr during this decade; relevant motifs include fantastic bird heads and fish (fig. 71). Two carpets featuring scrolling vines, lion masks, and an animal head in profile are depicted in a painting of about 1615, Jahāngīr Weighs Prince Khurram (Shāh Jahān) (figs. 2, 72).
The role of manuscripts in the royal library as reference tools for artists at the Mughal court should not be underestimated. Another example, and one that demonstrates Jahāngīr’s respect for his Timurid ancestry, is a painting from the beginning of his rule, about 1605–6, which shows him seated on a gold throne under a canopy as Prince Khusrū offers him a cup of wine (fig. 73). The feet of the principals in this private audience scene rest on a Timurid carpet with a pattern of rows of geometric units, a type well known from fifteenth-century painting. Small portable Timurid objects of value, such as manuscripts and jades, were prized at the Mughal court, but it is unlikely that such a large object as a Timurid carpet would have found its way to India, so Jahāngīr must have had his court painter, Manohar, take the design from a representation in a fifteenth-century manuscript housed in the imperial library. Jahāngīr was thus able to have himself portrayed in the setting of the Timurid court.

The substitution of silk for cotton in the foundation was just the first step in the process of achieving a finer weave. The next step was to replace sheep’s wool with pile material of a fineness commensurate with that of the silk foundation. One might expect silk to be the pile material of choice, as it was in most carpet-weaving societies, but the preferred luxury fiber was fine goat’s hair, or pashmina, discussed
Fig. 74 (cat. no. 17). Fragmentary pashmina carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1620–25. Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon (T 72)

Fig. 75 (cat. no. 17). Detail of fig. 74 (opposite)
on pages 22ff. Only in India were sumptuous silk carpets made in imitation of a type even more luxurious, the pashmina carpets that represent the peak of Indian carpet weaving.

Only about forty pashmina carpets have survived. Of these perhaps twenty, almost all in fragmentary or damaged form, date from the period of Shah Jahān. Several dispersed fragments come from one magnificent carpet that was probably made late in Jahāngīr’s reign. The largest piece, representing the full length but just half the original width, is in the Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon (figs. 74, 75; cat. no. 17). Another large fragment, now in a private collection in Europe, full length and about a quarter of the original width, with no trace of side border, comes from the middle of the right half of the field. A third element is a small piece in the Metropolitan Museum.19 The provenance of the Gulbenkian piece is not known, but the second fragment is said to have come from Hyderabad. One can imagine splendid carpets among the holdings of the fabulously wealthy nizams of Hyderabad, but
the founding of the dynasty in 1722 precludes the
possibility that a carpet such as this was acquired by
them when new. When the Hyderabad fragment
appeared on the London market a number of years
ago, it was literally in shreds, consisting of many
small bits (rather like the small Metropolitan frag-
ment) that were then carefully joined.

The motifs are purely floral, and the rug suggests
a lush garden of a classical Persian type. Three dis-

tinct vine-scroll systems are superimposed on a
brilliant red ground in a distinctly Persian way.
Blossoms and complex combinations of blossoms
partially covered by curving serrated leaves are taken
from Persian designs of the late sixteenth and early
seventeenth century. The huge fantastic blossoms,
particularly the circular rotating ones with the outer
ring of little flowers partially concealed by leaves,
derive from the finest carpets of the Herāt type
(fig. 76). The distinctly Indian quality of this carpet
can be seen in its vivid coloring and ultranaturalistic
representations of floral forms, whereby natural
form is turned into something truly fantastic. It is
also specifically Indian in certain of the motifs used,
such as the large multicolored segmented leaves.
The main border consists of two overlapping vine
scrolls that bifurcate and reciprocate, in the most
lyrically beautiful fashion, against a sumptuous yel-
low ground. The combination of silk foundation and
pashmina pile allowed the weaver to work at a new
level of excellence, and the resulting count of
almost 800 knots per square inch explains the skill-
fully drawn curves in field and border.

This earliest of surviving pashmina carpets proba-

dy dates from late in the reign of Jahāngīr, between
1620 and 1625, when the appeal of Persian classicism
was at its strongest and before the flower style had
been adopted as the new standard in taste under Shāh Jahān. A good example of the Persian style as
favored by Jahāngīr may be seen in a painted panel
of about 1613 decorating Akbar’s tomb in Sikandra
(fig. 77). The classical Persian symmetrical vine-
scroll network is enlivened with large complex
blossoms similar to ones in the carpet. Indian ele-
ments in the form of curving segmented blossoms
have been incorporated, and the overall effect is
brightened by the use of a gold ground (a rich
yellow ground figures in the borders of both the
animate-scroll carpet and the Gulbenkian example).

The Gulbenkian carpet and related fragments
date from just a few years later than the animate-
scroll carpet that began the new trend to greater
luxury and fineness of weave. Certain details of
leaves, such as the representation of interior veins
and the juxtaposition of two colors with no separ-
ating outline, suggest a close connection between
the two. The Gulbenkian fragment, like all later
pashmina carpets, is woven on a silk foundation
whose multicolored warps (ivory, red, and green
in this case) are organized in bands. Such stripes
are hinted at in the animate-scroll fragments, but
there they seem more the result of different dye
lots than of intent. Here it was intentional. It is
possible that the stripes, although not absolutely
consistent in width, provided a method of registra-
tion for the weavers tying the knots. Be that as it
may, the result is an appealingly bright warp fringe
at both ends.

The vast majority of the next generation of fine-
weave carpets exhibit the flower style introduced
by Jahāngīr and popularized by Shāh Jahān, as dis-
cussed in the section that follows. However, there
are two carpets with pashmina pile on silk founda-
tion, both in the collection of the Metropolitan
Museum, with field patterns in the Persian style.
The more spectacular one aesthetically (figs. 78, 79;
cat. no. 18) is unfortunately very fragmentary. The
narrow sliver of field that remains reveals sensuously
coiled vine scrolls featuring complex blossoms. Its
style approximates the Gulbenkian’s but is a little
more stolid in effect, slightly less lyrical in its use
of heavier outlining. The second carpet (figs. 80, 81)
is complete. The field pattern is a variation of the
old Herāt “in-and-out palmette” type, with pairs of
serrated lancet leaves inserted. Motifs are organized
into rows in a repeat pattern.

Field patterns alone might tempt us to consider
a date of execution in the 1620s, contemporaneous
with the Gulbenkian piece, but the main border de-
signs necessitate a later dating, about 1650, because
of their relationship to flower-style carpets probably
of that time. The fragmentary piece has a border
with sweeping scrolls with little cloud wisps attached;
this pattern is seen also in a pashmina flower-and-
lattice carpet (see fig. 104; cat. no. 26). The complete
carpet features a border with a row of flowering
plants; the multidirectional floral spray in the center
of each long side border is found also in Jaipur
carpets acquired slightly after mid century.34 These
two carpets prove that demand for Persian-style
goods was not altogether supplanted at the imperial
level by the new flower style.

The attribution of these fine-weave carpets will be
discussed with the carpets of flower style (see
pp. 113ff.).
Fig. 78 (cat. no. 18). Fragments of a pashmina carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 (14.40.719)

Fig. 79 (cat. no. 18). Detail of fig. 78 (opposite)
Fig. 8o. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1640. Pashmina pile on silk foundation, 13 4/7" x 5' 6" (406.4 x 167.6 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York: Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 (14.40.725)

Fig. 8t. Detail of fig. 8o (opposite)
THE FLOWER STYLE

The key development in carpet design—and in all art—during the reign of Shâh Jahân was the widespread appearance of a new style that featured naturalistic flowering plants shown in profile against a plain background or formally arranged in rows. More elaborate patterns combining various flowering plants or just vines and blossoms—but exhibiting a heightened degree of naturalism—with lattice patterns followed. The flower style came to dominate artistic decoration in all media—architecture, manuscript margins and bindings, textiles, carpets, and objects such as metalwork, jade, glass, and wood and ivory marquetry work. Its preeminent position may be seen in paintings such as Shah Jahan Receives His Three Eldest Sons and Asaf Khan During His Accession Ceremonies (fig. 3), in which the walls of the Hall of Public Audience in Agra bloom with flowers, and Awrangzeb and His Third Son, Sultan Al'zam, with Courtiers (fig. 4), full of costumes and a carpet blossoming in the new fashion.

The flower style did not emerge suddenly, nor was it originated by Shâh Jahân’s court artists. Floral motifs, blossoms and vines, even whole plants, were commonly represented in Indian art during Akbar’s reign and well into Jahângîr’s. But the representations were not especially naturalistic and they were not formally arranged. Plants were routinely treated as secondary decorative elements or as parts of large-scale repeat patterns. It is important to note that two of the most significant artistic projects of Jahângîr’s reign, the great album compiled between 1599 and 1618 and the tomb of I’timâd al-Daula, completed in 1628, are classic examples of the Persian style in India (see pp. 31, 33). The absence of formally arranged flowering plants on these two imperial productions signifies that the flower style had not yet become part of the standard decorative vocabulary, but the origin of the style can in fact be linked to Jahângîr’s time.

In March 1620, Jahângîr achieved a long-desired ambition to visit Kashmir in springtime, and he was simply overwhelmed by the beauty and abundance of its flora:

Kashmir is a garden of eternal spring, or an iron fort to a palace of kings—a delightful flowerbed, and a heart-expanding heritage for dervishes. Its pleasant meads and enchanting cascades are beyond all description. There are running streams and fountains beyond count. Wherever the eye reaches, there are verdure and running water. The red rose, the violet, and the narcissus grow of themselves; in the fields, there are all kinds of flowers and all sorts of sweet-scented herbs more than can be calculated. In the soul-enchanting spring the hills and plains are filled with blossoms; the gates, the walls, the courts, the roofs, are lighted up by the torches of banquet-adorning tulips. What shall we say of these things or of the wide meadows and the fragrant trefoil?

The emperor then recites a version that continues this theme, using typical Persian metaphors, in which he calls flowers “garden-nymphs” and refers to “flower-carpets.” His interest was quite specialized and his powers of observation acute, and he describes tulips, jasmines, red roses, lilies, and a flower called the ja’fari in appreciative detail. His enthusiasm was such that he had his most accomplished natural history painter, Mańşür, make more than a hundred paintings of flowers. Only three of Mańşür’s flower paintings are known to survive, a western Asiatic tulip in the Maulana Azad Library of the Aligarh Muslim University in Uttar Pradesh and an iris and a narcissus in the Golestan Palace, Tehran.

Another factor in the process was the undocumented but certain presence of European herbas at the Mughal court. Specific copies of European engravings have been identified in slightly later albums, but even Mańşür’s western Asiatic tulip, a species not native to Kashmir, has certain hallmarks of the European herbalist style, including the formal pose and the hovering butterfly and dragonfly overhead. Perhaps the inspiration to focus on flowering plants was Jahângîr’s and the specific model employed by Mańşür was from an herbal. An album assembled for Prince Dârâ Shikuh and dedicated in his hand to his wife in 1641–42 contains numerous paintings of flowers that combine Indian naturalism with European herbalist formality in the way the style came to be popularized (fig. 82).

Mańşür’s flower “portraits” do not seem to have evolved into the flower style and been adapted to general decorative use until the reign of Shâh Jahân. They appear first as painted architectural decoration in the Padshâhnâma, the chronicle of Shâh Jahân’s reign, beginning about 1630 (see fig. 3). They appear in fully developed form, in rows, in marble dado reliefs in the Shâh Burj (Royal Tower) at Agra Fort (fig. 83). That structure was completed in 1637. They
also appear in the marble dadoes of the Taj Mahal, finished in 1648. Formal flowering plants were executed in the *pietra dura* technique in the Hall of Private Audience in Delhi (fig. 84), sometime between 1639 and 1648, and on the cenotaphs in the Taj Mahal in Agra and in the tomb of Jahangir in Lahore. In the latter instances, the flowers are incorporated into a Europeanized lattice pattern defined by vines that twist and fold. Gilded ceiling decoration in the Ārāmghā (emperor’s sleeping chamber) in the Red Fort, Delhi (fig. 85), has a lattice design that incorporates a continuous pattern of blossoms and vines, a variation of the flower style that became popular at this time. The flowers are not shown as full plants in profile; only their blossoms are utilized. Formal flowering plants are also a feature of album margins and objects of the Shāh Jahān period; these are found in rows and also in a variety of lattice patterns related closely to contemporaneous *pietra dura* work (figs. 86, 87).

Manṣūr’s depictions of flowering plants are extremely naturalistic and the species are easily identified. Later, however, as plants became part of the decorative repertoire, considerable artistic
liberties were taken, often making identification problematic. Certain identifying details may be omitted, blossoms of different plants may be shown growing from a single stem, and various parts of different plants may be combined. Each part may be shown in a most realistic way but in combinations that are imaginary. Also, over time, depictions of plants became more stylized and less naturalistic, making identification yet more difficult. Patterns became more elaborate, and complicated lattice systems were introduced as matrices for the plants.

These trends tended to diminish the naturalistic effect prevalent in earlier, simpler representations. The flower style may justifiably be seen as the epitome of Mughal decoration. It may also be viewed, particularly in contrast to the Persian-style vine-scroll patterns, as a local style in that it was developed in India by court artists. But these artists drew from several different sources, just as they had under the patronage of Akbar and Jahângîr. The flowers themselves may be indigenous types, foreign varieties introduced to India, or foreign varieties copied from depictions in herbarials, but they were typically depicted, until greater stylization occurred, in the naturalistic mode favored by Mughal painters. We have seen that the poses, extra details such as insects hovering overhead, and even certain images were taken from European herbarials. Even Chinese tradition is invoked in the little cloud wisps that occasionally scud by. One artistic tradition apparently not represented in this process of synthesis is the Persian, perhaps because that was the origin of the style that was largely being displaced, but the cloud wisps, like other motifs of Chinese origin, may well have entered the Indian decorative vocabulary through Persian sources.

**Single-Flower Design**

A small number of rugs have field patterns featuring a single large flowering plant contained within a
Fig. 85. Gilded ceiling in the Ārāmgāh, Red Fort, Delhi, Mughal, 1639–48

Fig. 86. Margin of a folio (detail). Opaque watercolor and gold on paper. From an imperial album. Mughal, ca. 1620–30. Private collection

Fig. 87. Margin of a folio (detail). Opaque watercolor and gold on paper. From an imperial album. Mughal, ca. 1645. Private collection
space defined by a niche. Because of their pictorial
nature, these are the most visually arresting of the
flower-style carpets. Here the flowering plant tends
to be shown almost as a portrait rather than as part
of a repeating pattern, as in other types. A splendid
example in pashmina on a silk foundation is in a
private collection in Belgium (fig. 88; cat. no. 19).
With about 2,000 knots per square inch, it has
the finest weave of any classical Indian carpet to
survive intact.6

The large poppy plant, with five round blossoms
consisting of myriad small pointed petals, has a
leafy base and stems. It stands erect against a soft
light brown background and is flanked by two
small tulips with red and pink petals. These plants
seem to be in motion, with a perceptible sway in
the stems and a twist and curl in the leaves. The
plants grow from a little landscape that adds to
the pictorial aspect of the representation. Color
changes define irregularities in the ground area of
the landscape, and tiny plants sprout in profusion.
The field zone is surmounted by a heavily outlined
arch defined by a thick vine that turns on itself
and has leafy projections. Above this are ivory
spandrels patterned symmetrically (the field pattern
is not exactly symmetrical) with vines, leaves, and
more poppy blossoms. The crimson main border
has a fine undulating vine whose offshoots terminate
in alternately reversed ivory flower heads.

Long twisted leaves project from the main stem,
giving a subtle sense of movement.

An architectural niche is implied by the arch
of this rug. Small fragments of another example of
this type show the architecture more explicitly in
the form of engaged columns flanking the field
area. A piece in the Metropolitan Museum (fig. 10),
from the lower field, has, at the left of the strip of
landscape, the lower part of an architectural column
and its base. The Museum of Fine Arts in Boston
has three small pashmina fragments probably from
the same rug. One of them preserves this rug’s
right-column capital, on which the vine scroll of
the niche head rests. The other two fragments have
an undulating vine and white blossoms similar to
the border of the Belgian rug; these must be from
the border of the Metropolitan fragment.69

The Belgian rug and the Metropolitan/Boston frag-
ments are unusual among pashmina rugs in having
silk warps of just ivory instead of the normal
colored stripes.

The Metropolitan owns a complete piece with a
closely related design (without engaged columns),
but it is not finely woven and has standard materials
(fig. 89; cat. no. 20). The foundation is all cotton
except for the second weft (of three), which is red
silk. The pile is sheep’s wool and there are 225
knots per square inch. One is at first tempted, in
comparing the McMullan rug with the Belgian
flower-and-niche rug, to consider the lower quality
as a sign of degeneration and hence later produc-
tion. But similarities in pattern, drawing, and color
argue for contemporaneous manufacture, possibly
at the same workshop. Confirmation of this notion
can be found in other examples as well, and this
suggests that cartoons were used for the manu-
ufacture of carpets of different grade. It may also
mean that standard-grade rugs were made at the
same imperial workshops that produced the finest
pashmina pieces.

Comparing the Belgian and McMullan rugs allows
us to judge how much more effective coloristic
“tricks” are in a fine-weave rug than in a standard
grade. The leafy branches of the large flower in the
Belgian rug are subtly graduated through several
shades of green and ivory, giving substance and
form to what would otherwise be merely a pattern
or shape. The landscape is handled the same way,
giving three-dimensionality and texture to a grassy
hillock. Such subtlety of effect could not be
achieved in the McMullan rug, although a limited
attempt at shading may be seen in the combined
red and pink in the border blossoms and in the
ivory and beige in the flower heads of the large
plant in the field.

The multigrade approach to manufacture has a
parallel in Persian production. One thinks first
of certain related Polish and Indo-Persian de-
signs but, apart from the rich appearance of metal
brocading in the former, there is not a significant
difference in quality. More relevant comparisons
may be found in the Herāt group. Three finely woven
fragments in Boston and Washington from one car-
pet (see fig. 90 for two) are made of pashmina on
a silk foundation, but they are not Indian.69 With
a knot count exceeding 600 per square inch, these
are perhaps the finest wool pile carpets known from
Iran. The field has a pattern of lobed compartments
containing vines and leaves and, most noticeably, sin-
uously twisting cloud bands. A closely related field
pattern is found in the Clam-Gallas carpet in Vienna
(fig. 91), but the quality of weave is much lower.

The three fine-weave Persian fragments have
several qualities that are seen later in Indian pieces.
One, of course, is the use of pashmina as a pile
Fig. 88 (cat. no. 19). Pashmina carpet with niche-and-flower design. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–40. Private collection.
Fig. 89 (cat. no. 20). Carpet with niche-and-flower design. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1630–40. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Bequest of Joseph V. McMullan. 1973 (1974.149.2)
material. Although the material is perhaps best known from Kashmir shawls, there is no reason to assume that Indian weavers came up with this idea first. Another is the employment of ton-sur-ton coloring, in which shades of the same or similar colors are juxtaposed without any separating outline. Vines, leaves, and blossoms in pink on a red ground and in ochre on an ivory ground are evident in field compartments of one Washington fragment. This feature, uncommon in Persian carpets, becomes a characteristic of Indian examples. A third point is the fact that the portion of black inner border visible on the same Washington fragment was woven on the diagonal, meaning that the carpet was originally polygonal. A polygonal Indian carpet survives in the Calico Museum of Textiles in Ahmadabad. These points, plus the production of carpets with similar designs in different grades, strengthen the previous connections noted between Indian and Persian carpets.

Another example of the flower-and-niche design in pashmina is the so-called Aynard carpet (fig. 92;
Fig. 92 (cat. no. 21). Pashmina carpet with niche-and-flower design. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1630–40. Carmen Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection on loan to Fundación Colección Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid (T-90)
cat. no. 21), named for a former owner but now belonging to the Carmen Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection. It has a somewhat more active field pattern than the others, with many more fantastic blossoms sprouting from the main plant. Leaves twist and turn while little Chinese-style clouds puff through vacant spaces. Cockscomb, tulips, and poppies (?) emerge from the graduated ground, and a stream is represented at the bottom in ivory with black ripples. Cypress grows at the sides of the field and support the niche head like columns. Since there are no borders at the sides and only narrow borders at the top and bottom, this rug must have been reduced from its original format. The surviving border seems too narrow to have been the main border and too wide to have been a guard stripe. This, plus the presence of patches (particularly the smaller flower on the central stem) from another very similar example, has led to the suggestion that the Aynard carpet might once have been part of a multiple-niche work with several field sections united by a larger border that is now missing.  

Indian rugs with flowering plants within niches have customarily been called prayer rugs, but there is good reason to reconsider this identification. First, the few depictions of prayer rugs in Mughal paintings show them with plain fields, not elaborate directional floral patterns. Second, there is ample evidence that panels with flowers, in various media, were used vertically as decoration for architecture, both fixed and portable, and would have had nothing to do with prayer. Qanāts, the screens surrounding the tents of imperial cities that were set up when the emperor was traveling or campaigning, are described in literature and depicted in paintings as bearing flower designs. These were normally made of painted cotton, but Akbar was said to have introduced panels made of carpet. Perhaps the Aynard carpet was part of a qanāt.

Some painted scenes of Shāh Jahān in audience show a framed, recessed rectangular space behind the throne. The recess contains a representation of a flowering plant in color. What is suggested here is a window open to a garden behind, a niche through which the viewer sees flowering plants in a splendid setting beyond the building's walls. Many of these flower images seem to adorn matchstick-type hangings that allow an obstructed glimpse of what lies behind, but other hangings may be velvets or pashmina rugs.

It is difficult to be precise about the dating of these flower-and-niche rugs. If any of the flower-style carpets come from early in Shāh Jahān's reign, though, the flower-and-niche rugs would be the most likely. They are closest in spirit—in their naturalistic and pictorial qualities—to the flower paintings Maṣūr made for Jahāngīr. Other types are less pictorial, and the flowers serve only as elements in repeat patterns. Also, it is tempting to put them early in Shāh Jahān's period—at least the Belgian rug—because of a style that Jahāngīr's powerful and influential wife, Nur Jahān, is said to have originated: under her influence, carpets known as farsh-i chandānī (sandalwood-colored) became fashionable. Although all of these rugs employ light brown to a considerable degree, the Belgian rug, with its soft brown field, seems by far the best candidate. However, the nature of the thick vine defining the arch in the field, with its twisting around implied "bars" in a very European style, suggests a somewhat later dating, so perhaps its coloration is just reminiscent of the fashion initiated by Nur Jahān.

Rows of Flowers or Trees

The group of carpets with field patterns of flowering plants arranged in rows is quite large, numbering over fifty pieces. The standard format is rectangular, but within this format there are many variations. A well-preserved example in the Metropolitan Museum (figs. 93, 94; cat. no. 22), formerly in the Jaipur Collection, once had an inventory label stating that it had been purchased in 1656 in Lahore. The plants are arranged in seven rows, all oriented to the same end of the rug. The border is an intricate pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms flanked by pairs of curved leaves or little blossoms forming a leaf shape. The materials and weave are typical of the standard grade. The pile is wool and the foundation is cotton. Knotting, at about 150 knots per square inch, is fine enough to achieve considerable definition in the plants and the border pattern.

A smaller example, now in a European private collection, was also formerly in the Jaipur Collection (fig. 95; cat. no. 23). Here the plants are arranged in two rows, each oriented to the long central axis of the field, a line now damaged, probably from folding. Although this is not a fine-weave rug, related colors are juxtaposed, in leaves and blossoms, giving three-dimensionality to some of the floral forms. The border pattern repeats the motifs seen in the field in reduced scale and in a single row oriented
Fig. 93 (cat. no. 22). Carpet with flower pattern. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Purchase, Florance Waterbury Bequest and Rogers Fund, 1970 (1970.321)

Fig. 94 (cat. no. 22). Detail of fig. 93 (opposite)
Fig. 95 (cat. no. 23). Carpet with flower pattern. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650. European private collection
Fig. 96. Carpet with flower pattern. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650. Pashmina pile on silk foundation, 6'4" x 1'10" (193 x 118.8 cm). The Frick Collection, New York (16.10.8)
to the field. About fifteen other examples with flowering plants in the main border survive. Most come from or are still part of the Jaipur Collection. These rugs are unlike figure 95 in that the rows of flowers in the field are all oriented toward one of the long sides; all are large carpets (two approach 34 feet in length), and several may have been made as pairs, since they are so close in size (although the patterns do not match precisely) .

There are just two pashmina rugs with rows of flowering plants from this period. One belongs to the Frick Collection in New York (fig. 96). It is small, and its field accommodates just two rows of plants oriented to the same end of the rug. The composition here is crowded and individual units lack clarity. The other, in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, also a small piece, has thirteen rows of small gold marigolds on a taupe ground. This rug is atypical in having rows of flowering plants of such small scale that the design seems more appropriate to a textile. It is no wonder that pashmina rugs were often mistaken for velvets in older literature; they feel like velvet, and some have patterns seen in that material.

The largest part of an unusual flower-style carpet survives in the collection of the maharaja of Jaipur (fig. 97). Other fragments are scattered among various collections. What is evident only from the large Jaipur section is that borders actually intrude into the field pattern and define a separate interior space. This is not the result of some later piecing of fragments; the carpet was woven this way. One can only speculate that the carpet, whose original format has not been established, might have had some ceremonial function or that it could have been commissioned for a tent, with interior borders indicating the placement of interior partitions. If pashmina carpets may be termed imperial grade, then this carpet, and many others in the flower style, may be considered subimperial because there is some silk in the foundation, usually the second weft shoot (the rest are cotton).

One variation on the pattern of rows of formal plants is present in two carpets formerly in Jaipur (their present whereabouts are unknown), in which flowering plants, bouquets, and symmetrically arranged sprays of flowers are all given an ovoid shape and placed in staggered rows. The red
Fig. 98. Fragmentary carpet with tree pattern. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1850. Pashmina pile on silk foundation, 7 1/2" x 6 1/2" (217.3 x 192.8 cm). The Frick Collection, New York (61.10.7)
ground appears between these ovoid forms almost as a lattice, but undefined, or reserved. One might expect this rather rococo design to reflect projection later than that of the carpets with straightforward flowering plants, but inventory labels on these two pieces prove they are contemporaneous with the others; both were purchased in Lahore, one in 1654, the other in 1656. A further variation on this pattern can be seen in a carpet in Jaipur in which rows of ovoid floral forms alternate with rows of secondary floral motifs. Also surviving, mainly in the Jaipur Collection, are runners, or mats, with narrow borders and plants oriented to one long side.

Trees may also be incorporated into the flowering plant pattern. A pair of large carpets, one in the Musée Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon, the other in the Blau Collection, New York, have designs involving rows of alternating irises and vases of narcissus; each element is separated by a small cypress tree. Perhaps the designer was already familiar with the famous tree carpet (fig. 98) in the Frick Collection, New York, in which cypresses alternate with flowering trees in just one row. The design of the Frick rug includes only trees, organized in rows, as are the flowering plants of other pieces. It was once somewhat larger, and there are many small fragments in various collections; these must have been removed when the damaged carpet was restored to a visually complete but reduced form. Given the border proportions and the variety of tree forms on extant field fragments, Charles Grant Ellis has speculated that the field originally held seven or eight rows, each with four trees. The demarcation of the rows is emphasized by the undulating landscape of rocks and tiny shrubs, a Persian convention also found in earlier Indian pictorial carpets.

The Frick rug is one of the pashmina glories of Indian weaving, but its colors have suffered from overexposure to light (the colors are better preserved in some of the small fragments). At 576 knots per square inch, its weave is not as fine as that of other pashmina rugs, but its drawing is beautiful and its design lyrical. The tree design is another instance where there are similar examples in different grades. Much coarser versions with sheep’s-wool pile are known: a damaged but complete piece appeared in the London market in 1956 (fig. 99), and two fragments from another carpet with this pattern are in the Textile Museum, Washington, D.C.

Two flower-style carpets of unusual shape were formerly in the Jaipur Collection: a circular rug now belongs to the Government Central Museum of Jaipur, and what remains of an octagonal piece is now in the Calico Museum of Textiles, Ahmadabad. The circular rug (fig. 100; cat. no. 24), whose flowering plants in field and border are oriented to be seen from outside, surely comes from the same workshop as the larger rectangular pieces and was acquired at the same time, in 1655. There is a medallion-like unit at the center composed of plants with iris blossoms and S-shaped leaves arranged radially. The S-shaped leaves appear in pairs, thus forming vasilike brackets. Related S scrolls are extended into figure eights in a number of the lattice-and-flower carpets to be discussed below.

The octagonal flower-style carpet, complete when photographed for Campbell in 1929, is now fragmentary and very worn. It has a medallion of a flattened circular shape. The radial flower pattern is framed by a collar related to minor border designs. The flowers in the field are arranged radially, facing out, but in this case the main border pattern is not a row of flowering plants but of scrolling vines and...
blossoms, reminding us that the Persian style had not been forgotten. This was a high-grade carpet, but not quite of the best quality. Wefts are all silk, and the pile is probably of pashmina, but the warps are cotton and the knot count is about 400 per square inch. The fragment that survives is full length and measures 7 feet 7 inches, so it was not a large piece. According to an inventory label, the rug was purchased in 1657.

The polygonal format is familiar to us from painted representations, although it is often difficult to judge the number of sides. There are two octagonal pavilions on the roof of Amber Fort, but, at a width of 12 feet 9 inches and 12 feet 11 inches, they are too wide for the piece just discussed, a piece probably made to order. The polygonal format may well have been based on a Persian model. We have already discussed the fragments from a polygonal pashmina carpet of the Herât type (see fig. 90). The second Mughal emperor, Humâyûn (r. 1530–56), had a special palace for feasting, including the celebration of his accession. The Mystic House, as it was known, was situated on the river-bank in Agra. It had a large octagonal room containing an octagonal water tank, in the middle of which was an octagonal platform covered with Persian carpets. This description and perhaps the building itself may have been familiar to later Mughal emperors.

A large series of curiously shaped rugs can also be associated with the Jaipur Collection. One long side of these carpets is typically arched, as in the example in the Cincinnati Art Museum (fig. 101; cat. no. 25), or has a straight-sided indentation, as in a rug in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (fig. 102). The arch may be stepped or somewhat elongated, and one side projects out farther than the other, usually to a point. Campbell reported sixteen such pieces in the collection in 1929. More than half of these were gone by 1973 (three as gifts from the maharaja to the City Palace Museum). Some of the examples in Western and other Indian collections are from the Campbell group, but others, like the arched piece in Cincinnati, are not, proving that some material
left the collection before 1929. Eight of Campbell’s sixteen arched carpets had inventory labels bearing legible dates of purchase: 1654 (on two), 1658 (on three), 1660, 1661, and 1689. One was received in 1656. The only source named is Lahore.

Technically, the arched flower rugs make up a homogeneous subgroup. Warps are ivory cotton, and wefts are customarily off-white or beige cotton (nos. 1 and 3) and red silk (no. 2). The pile is sheep’s wool (there is no trace of pashmina in this type), with an average of about 150 knots per square inch. At least one example has cotton wefts of an apricot color.

The arched carpets seem to have been made as pairs, going by their dimensions, but the patterns of flowers never match exactly, as was the case with one rectangular pair previously noted (p. 99). Cartoons for individual flowering plants may well have
Fig. 103. Proposed configuration of a pair of shaped flower carpets

existed to aid the weavers—work from memory is certainly conceivable too—but in any case the differences in pattern between pairs indicate that an overall cartoon was not employed.

The use to which such oddly shaped carpets might have been put has long been the subject of speculation. One hypothesis is that they were hung on walls to match (or even to substitute for) architectural arches, but the arches are often highly irregular in shape, and the sides, when the rug is turned this way, would seem too short. Putting a pair of arched carpets together at the long points yields an overall rectangular shape with a circular, polygonal, or somewhat elongated void inside and a narrow aisle connecting that void to the periphery of the rectangle (see fig. 103). It has been suggested that the pairs of carpets could have flanked fountains, but the orientation of the flowering plants argues against this. The flowers would only be properly viewed, in fact, by someone sitting within the void, perhaps on a throne on a raised dais, as is the case in a painting of Aurangzeb shortly after his accession (fig. 4). One speculates that the dais, too, would have had a carpet. Unfortunately, the two surviving candidates mentioned above, one circular and one octagonal, are not suitable by size or detail of design (the borders are very different).

The notion of sets of such carpets is an appealing one, but the arched pieces rarely match up well with rectangular pieces. Most arched carpets have narrow borders of scrolling vines and blossoms, a border pattern seen on only a few rectangular pieces.

Only one arched rug has a more complicated border pattern, one similar to the rectangular carpet in the Metropolitan Museum (fig. 93; cat. no. 22). Rectangular carpets usually have wide borders containing a row of flowering plants, a pattern not found on any arched rug (but present in the circular flower carpet in Jaipur).

Traditional lore had it that, whether to be used on walls or floors, the flower carpets, many acquired in the 1650s or 1660s by Mirza Raja of Amber, were obtained, indeed, presumably ordered, to furnish the royal apartments at Amber Fort. Systematic searches by various authorities have yet to discover spaces with dimensions suitable for these carpets. The most recent suggestion, more plausible but still unproved, is that the flower rugs were made to furnish tent complexes used by the Amber-Jaipur maharajas. Again, as with fixed buildings, it is difficult to envision their specific placement. Jon Thompson, citing a small octagonal tent in Jodhpur as evidence, speculates that pavilion-like tents, erected inside larger tents, may have been flanked by arched rugs.

**Lattice-and-Flower Pattern**

Elaborate field patterns were conceived involving flowering plants placed in compartments within various lattice systems. Several of these were made of pashmina in what can be considered the imperial grade. One example (fig. 104; cat. no. 26), acquired recently by a European private collection, is a nearly square piece whose lobed field compartments are defined by a leafy vine that twists and coils. The square format of this rug is not original; it was once considerably longer. Such shortening is customarily done to remove a damaged area, and indeed two stray fragments from the original field are known.

The plants radiate about central points marked by a yellow blossom, so they are not oriented to be seen from any particular vantage point. The border pattern consists of a broad scrolling vine to which cloud wisps are attached. Within the curvature of the reciprocal vine are clusters of blossoms. The naturalistic effect of the floral motifs is heightened through the use of color shading, particularly in the blossoms and leafy vines of the field.

Fragments of a second pashmina lattice-and-flower rug are divided between the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (fig. 105; cat. no. 27), and the Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf.
flowers are arranged facing one end of the rug, each occupying an ovoid compartment formed by vertical serrated vines that scroll back and forth. The Düsseldorf fragment has attached border pieces featuring a pattern of alternating cypresses and flowering plants in a kind of landscape, but it is not certain that these border pieces belonged to the original rug.  

The finest weave of any classical Indian carpet occurs in a badly damaged pashmina rug (fig. 7) whose tilelike lattice-and-flower pattern is now scarcely discernible. This rug has an astonishing 2,400 knots per square inch. It stands apart too because of its small horizontal format, unusual for a rug but consistent with textiles known as runals, generally thought to be coverings for ceremonial gifts.

To our knowledge, only one pashmina carpet (fig. 106; cat. no. 28) remains in India. Once part of the Jaipur Collection, it was given to the City Palace Museum in 1959 by the maharaja. In spite of areas of damage, the pattern reads very clearly as a
lattice formed by thick scrolling vines that loop into figure-eight patterns and larger units that hold blossoms and vines and sprays of blossoms with clusters of leaves. The leaf clusters sprout from the vine terminals and not from the ground, so the naturalistic effect is diminished. The field pattern is also known in several standard-grade carpets in the Jaipur Collection.

A pleasing variation on the lattice-and-flower theme involves bouquets of flowers (of different species) placed in vases that mark the junction points of the lattice scrolls. A large fragment of a carpet with such a motif belongs to the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (fig. 107), and smaller ones to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Keir Collection, Richmond, England.

This is another instance where wefts are red silk (no. 2) and apricot cotton (nos. 1 and 3).

A slightly later version of the lattice-and-flower type (fig. 108), almost thirty feet long, is of special interest because its main border design, featuring palmettes and blossoms flanked by sprays of little flowers, later evolved into a standard type favored in millefleur rugs (see fig. 125). One example of that group even mimics the field pattern.

Lattice-and-Blossom Pattern

A more ornamental effect was achieved through various lattice patterns that involved blossoms and vines rather than whole flowering plants. Blossoms may be portrayed in a naturalistic way, with fine details and shading of colors, but the overall artistic goal was to achieve a decorative pattern more than a naturalistic effect. Lattice-and-blossom designs are found in carpets of many different grades, but the most accomplished are, as one would expect, those with pashmina pile. One version belongs to the Metropolitan Museum (figs. 109, 110; cat. no. 29). It is incomplete, consisting of two fragments, but the existence of the center point in side and end minor borders (the point where the design reverses) allows us to calculate the original dimensions of the carpet as 23 feet 7 inches by 8 feet 2 inches, an enormous size for a carpet with such a fine weave (900 knots per square inch). All the characteristics of fine pashmina carpets are present. The foundation is all silk; warps are in colored stripes, and wefts are red silk in three shoots. Painterly coloristic effects are present in the color mixing and shading found in the imaginary blossoms in the field and the grassy hillocks in the border.

The field pattern, with a lattice formed by serrated vines scrolling back and forth, is reminiscent of the lattice-and-flower rug in London (fig. 105) and Düsseldorf. Also, the distinctive landscape design of the border, featuring a row of cypresses and flowering plants growing out of little hills, repeats in a general way the design of the border fragments attached to the piece in Düsseldorf. The most extraordinary feature of the Metropolitan carpet is the arrangement of giant circular blossoms in alternate rows in the lattice. Although presented in seemingly naturalistic detail, these blossoms, with their concentric rings of petals, are truly fantastic creations. The earlier Persian-style pashmina carpet in Lisbon (fig. 74) had equally fantastic blossoms.

Another fine lattice-and-blossom carpet has large blossoms centered within diamond-shaped compartments rather than at crossing points of the
Fig. 106 (cat. no. 28). Pashmina carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650. Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Jaipur, India (C-15)
Fig. 107. Fragment of a carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers incorporating vases (detail). Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650. Wool pile on cotton and silk foundation, 11'6½" x 6'4½" (353.8 x 194.3 cm). Victoria and Albert Museum, London (1M. 67-1930).

Fig. 108. Carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers (detail). Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, second half of the 17th century. Wool pile on cotton and silk foundation, 29'9" x 10'6" (906.8 x 320.0 cm). Victoria and Albert Museum, London (IS. 244-1964).
Fig. 109 (cat. no. 29). Fragments of a pashmina carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 (14.40.721)

Fig. 110 (cat. no. 29). Detail of fig. 109 (opposite)
lattice framework (figs. 111, 112; cat. no. 30). The Metropolitan Museum owns six fragments from this carpet, enough to permit a reconstruction of the full width of almost thirteen feet. The original length may have exceeded thirty feet. Four other fragments of this rug are known.74 A final example of this pattern in pashmina survives in numerous fragments, the largest of which belongs to the Museu Calouste Gulbenkian in Lisbon (fig. 113; cat. no. 31). Both field and border are preserved, so we know which patterns belong together. The field has elongated, cartouche-shaped compartments formed by the thick vines of the lattice. Each compartment has a poppy blossom flanked by pairs of leaves and clusters of smaller blossoms. All elements are linked by a vine scroll that continues from one compartment to the next. These conventions appear in the numerous surviving versions of this type, in all levels of quality. The border has blossoms and leaves arranged within the compartments formed by a reciprocal vine-scroll pattern.

Versions of the lattice-and-blossom pattern were also woven in carpets that were less luxurious and less finely knotted. One example (fig. 114; cat. no. 32), although reduced in length, is large—and complete—enough to provide a clear reading of the repetitious nature of the textile-like pattern, with its alternating compartment forms and groupings of poppy blossoms flanked by curved leaves. A date of manufacture in the second half of the seventeenth century is indicated by the increased stylization of the floral pattern here and also by the diminution in scale of the floral motifs relative to the size of the carpet, a tendency seen in other rugs from this period (see pp. 121ff.). A second version, quite coarsely woven, survives only in a series of damaged and restored fragments.75 The chief distinction of this carpet is its size, which was estimated to be approximately 18 by 9 meters (59 by 291/2 feet) when it was last seen intact in the mid-1870s.76 Legend has it that the carpet was ordered by Shāh ‘Abbās for the Chihil Sütūn (Hall of Forty Columns) in Isfahān, completed in 1611, but this cannot be, for the Chihil Sütūn was not completed until 1648, and the carpet surely dates from the second half of the century, as does the carpet illustrated in figure 114.
The highly ornamentalized nature of the lattice- and-blossom pattern might suggest that it represents a later stage of evolution, a step further removed from the naturalism of the first flower-style representations. But dated monuments and works of art show that the pattern, which actually predates the advent of the flower style, became a staple of the decorative repertoire developed under Shāh Jahān, and it was in popular use at the same time as the lattice-and-flower style and the type with rows of formal plants. Imperial buildings such as the Arāmgah in Delhi’s Red Fort (fig. 85) are adorned with the pattern, and the paintings of the 1650s, including an audience scene from the Pādkāhāma, \(^{87}\) show these carpets in use.

**Attribution and Provenance**

All of the flower-style rugs discussed in this section can be attributed to northern India, to Lahore or Kashmir. It is possible that all were made in Kashmir, that the place of inspiration for the flower style became the production center for its carpets sometime between 1620 and 1640, and that the looms of Lahore, after 1640 or so, were yielding only carpets of the durbar class (whose reddish cotton wefts and partiality to light blue in the pile recall earlier Lahore pieces). Certainly Kashmir, with its pashmina shawl-weaving tradition, produced most of the pashmina rugs. Several subimperial or standard-grade carpets are so close in design and color to pashmina examples that a Kashmir origin may be inferred for them as well. Yet, at this point, it seems wise to leave open the possibility that some were woven in Lahore, given that so many of the flower rugs in Jaipur were originally purchased in Lahore or were called Lahori carpets.

Also, there are strong similarities in weave and color between standard-grade carpets in the flower style and Persian-style carpets attributed to Lahore. Pashmina carpets in the Persian style are also attributed to Kashmir or Lahore, but the blue-ground fragments with scrolling vines and animal heads (figs. 66–68) are assigned to Lahore since they were made before the royal factory was established in Kashmir.
Fig. 112 (cat. no. 30). Detail of fig. 111 (opposite)

Fig. 113 (cat. no. 31). Fragment of a pashmina carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650. Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon (760)
Fig. 114 (cat. no. 32). Carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, second half of the 17th century.
Private collection
It is tempting to associate all flower carpets with the Jaipur Collection because so many can be traced from that source. Although the Jaipur rajas may have been the main clients, at least for the arched rugs, there is ample evidence that such carpets were used at the Mughal court and at provincial courts as well. In addition to the audience scene from the Pādshāhnāma (see p. 113), a Mughal painting of about 1660 shows the very young emperor Aurangzeb holding audience as his throne rests upon a flower carpet (fig. 4). In another painting of about the same date, from Bilaspur in the Punjab Hills, the raja sits upon a carpet with a lattice-and-flower pattern, evidence that Mughal taste influenced local courts very quickly or that Mughal carpets were being acquired by local rulers (fig. 115). It is unlikely that Jaipur was the only royal collection to contain such carpets; although evidence is lacking, one suspects that Bikaner, Jodhpur, and Rampur at one time had similar material in their stores.

So far in this discussion, the artistic dialogue between Iran and India has been dominated by Iran, but the Mughal flower style had an impact on Safavid art around the middle of the seventeenth century. Neatly arranged rows of flowering plants and trees, more formal and conventionalized than their Indian counterparts but at the same time more naturalistic than earlier Persian flower representations, can be seen, for example, in several wall paintings in the Chihīl Sūṭūn in Isfahan and in several so-called vase carpets.88

LATER CARPET TYPES

Many of the carpet patterns favored under Shāh Jahān continued to be popular under Aurangzeb (r. 1658–1707) and his successors in the eighteenth century. It is not certain that any of the looms were still part of the imperial household; the factories may by then have been strictly private or commercial in nature. In any case, this was the period in which provincial carpet weaving came to the fore. Versions of the flower style were produced in the north and also in the Deccan, the plateau of south-central India. The popularity of the Persian style waned in the north but endured in the south. A certain conservatism in Deccani carpet weaving is implied in the virtual abandonment of the Persian style in the decoration of other objects fashioned in the Deccan, for example, textiles (fig. 116) and metalwork (fig. 117), despite the contemporaneous production of carpets still bearing patterns of scrolling vines and blossoms. This conservatism may be due to the Persian origins of the carpet weavers there or it may relate to the Kyoto tradition of having Deccani copies made to replace older rugs (see p. 138).

During the period from Aurangzeb’s accession in 1658 to about 1800, various tendencies can be seen in artistic decoration, of carpets and of other media as well, and in the choice of materials. The clarity and even the simplicity of patterns popular during the reigns of Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān were superseded
by a taste for fussier and busier ornamentation. Drawing became stiffer, although this impression is partially due, as before, to different levels of quality. Pashmina continued to be used in the north in carpets of the highest grade, but silk became the luxury material of choice during this period in the Deccan plateau.

**Durbar (Audience) Type**

We have already seen a number of very large carpets, 30 feet or more in length. A surprisingly high percentage of carpets manufactured during Akbar’s time were enormous, even though these represent the earliest works of court production and in some ways must be seen as experimental. The carpet thought to be the oldest surviving Indian piece, the fantastic-animal carpet (figs. 21, 22), might have been a single work of about 65 feet in length, although it is more likely that it represents parts of two carpets, each about 32 feet long (see pp. 33, 35). Huge carpets were also made during Jahangir’s reign: the Morgan Persian-style carpet in the Metropolitan (fig. 54), for example, at 30 feet 3 inches and the Gulbenkian medallion carpet (fig. 36) at 23 feet 2½ inches. Paintings showing the emperors in audience (durbar), particularly Jahangir and Shâh Jahân, often depict vast carpets placed longitudinally before the throne, so they were certainly used on these occasions in the palaces (figs. 2, 3).

Enormous carpets, some exceeding 60 feet in length, were in demand during the second half of the seventeenth century. Some were even made in pairs. Most of these very large works are in the Jaipur Collection, and several have inventory labels indicating that they were purchased in Lahore in 1656." The largest pair, at a length of 63 feet 3 inches, has a fascinating combination of motifs and patterns (fig. 118)." The field has a central rectangular zone containing a full medallion with serrated edges and four quarter medallions. Floral decoration saturates this zone; with its palmettes, blossoms, and vines, it recalls the Persian style but is very Indian in its lushness. The end thirds of the field are marked off with rows of squares containing flowering trees—cypress, palm, and ones with “weeping” branches—oriented to be viewed from the ends of the carpet. This pattern is perhaps based on the formal squares of the Persian garden, or *zhâbâr bâgh*, and in fact the most famous carpet with a variation of this design was among the first to be inventoried in the Jaipur Collection," although the effect is quite different. The main border bears an unusual continuous color made pattern, with large capitals surmounting the double columns. Each niche contains more flowering trees.

One pair has a similar field pattern but a main border consisting of small diamond-shaped compartments of varying ground color, a pattern probably based ultimately on the interlocking compartment design of some Herât-type rugs."
One pair has a field pattern with Persian-style floral motifs, which, however, look very Indian, and another pair is similar but with brackets incorporated into the design.13

These carpets are related to other northern Indian types, but we are unable to pinpoint production to Lahore, Kashmir, or perhaps even Multan (but see discussion on pp. 12, 14). One must remember that Lahore was the point of purchase but not necessarily of manufacture. Warps are of multi-ply white cotton, with as many as 10 or 12 strands, and wefts are of rust or orange cotton. The weaving is quite coarse, at about 60 knots per square inch. The palette is not unlike other northern Indian pieces, with cherry red and ochre and mint green, but there is a heavier use of pink, which gives the carpets a rosy appearance. The pile has a somewhat shaggy look, partly because it is longer than that of other types but also because the backing is loose, allowing the pile to lie flat. This group also seems distinctive for its blend of Persian and Hindu motifs and styles. A number of carpets of more modest size, mostly in the Jaipur Collection, also share these features.

The original function of these gigantic carpets is not specifically known, but they were surely used for audiences or other ceremonial occasions in Amber Fort. They have little similarity to flower-style carpets in either design or technical characteristics, but there are certain parallels. There are, for example, three oddly shaped arched carpets in the Calico Museum of Textiles, Ahmadabad, formerly in Jaipur, which may be from the same workshop as the durbar carpets.14 What little pile has survived the ravages of local vermin shows that the floral pattern of the field and the geometric design of the border have nothing to do with the arched carpets in the flower style, but the shape, although exaggerated in width and multilobed, certainly does. One was purchased in 1660,15 so the two types of arched rugs are virtually contemporaneous. But it is very difficult to imagine these shaped carpets, singly or in pairs, adjacent to a platform or dais. Ultimately, the function of these carpets is as mysterious as that of the shaped carpets in the flower style.

One audience carpet, 52 feet 4 inches in length (figs. 119, 120; cat. no. 33), stands apart from the others. It is less shaggy and much finer, with a knot count of about 200 per inch, and its peculiar pattern, unknown in any other Indian carpet, draws from various sources, mostly Persian. From Persian vase carpets come the three superimposed lattice systems incorporating palmettes and vases; certain lobed medallion forms with broad collars are derived from northwest Persian medallion carpets (one "medallion" seems to be a whole rug, a rectangle with medallion, field, and borders); from Indo-Persian carpets come particular palmette types. Various square, lobed, and void medallions are arranged throughout the field in staggered fashion; many are ornamented with small-scale geometric patterns and stripes, perhaps suggesting an awareness of Anatolian or Mamluk weaves. The main border consists of lobed medallions containing flowers and arabesques, set against a light blue background. The coloring is distinctive, with warm hues and an abundance of orange.

The carpet has been attributed recently to the Deccan, with emphasis given to the frequent appearance of fish and the use of a band of multilobed medallions, both features of Deccani ornament.16 Even in the absence of other large-scale carpet weaving in that region, the attribution is endorsed here on the basis of features found in other carpets attributed to the Deccan. Three-strand warps are in contrast to northern pieces, which invariably have six or more. Furthermore, Deccani weavers seem to have been prone to heavy borrowing, even copying, particularly from Persian carpets. As an act of imagination, this carpet is hard to match. The carpet is here dated to the second half of the seventeenth century, the period of greatest demand for such enormous weavings.

Millefleur

A sizable group of carpets woven in the north—in Kashmir and perhaps in Lahore as well—throughout the second half of the seventeenth and the eighteenth century are known as millefleur carpets because the strictly floral patterns incorporate a profusion of tiny blossoms, often clustered together in groups of three, five, or seven. Millefleur carpets can be divided into two main pattern types: those with repeating pattern units of small-scale floral elements and those with small-scale floral elements growing out of a hillock or vase to fill a field whose upper zone is defined by an arch. The repeat-pattern carpets are not directional in nature, whereas the niche rugs are. The repeat-pattern rugs will be discussed first since they fall into three subgroups whose production covers the full range of the 150-year period; the niche rugs make up a more homogeneous group that falls essentially into the last segment of the chronology.
Fig. 118. Durbar carpet with medallion and garden design. Northern India, ca. 1650. Wool pile on cotton foundation, 63'3" x 15'7"
(1927.9 x 475 cm). Collection of the maharaja of Jaipur, India
The millefleur style developed from European influences on Mughal floral patterns combined with a trend toward reducing the scale of ornamental elements. From the European aspect came certain motifs such as brackets and acanthus and serrated leaf forms (also, some of the lattice types already seen). These motifs had been introduced much earlier, evident in a carpet depicted in a painting, *Jahāngir Preferring a Sufi Shaikh to Kings*, executed about 1615–20 by the artist Bichitr (fig. 121). Under the royal throne lies a fantastic carpet that incorporates European design elements, including grotesques. The floral elements are relatively small in scale and are clustered in pattern units that repeat, in reverse, across the length and breadth of the field. Such a carpet existed only in the mind of the painter (or on paper), but it shows the kinds of influences that would affect patterns then and in later years.

Some carpets manufactured during Shāh Jahān’s reign contain these motifs, particularly durbar carpets purchased in the 1650s. Brackets and serrated leaf forms are routinely found in these pieces. It is interesting to note that the grouping of small-scale floral elements in repeating pattern units finds a parallel in Indo-Persian carpets made in Iran during the period of about 1660–80. These might have been simultaneous developments, or perhaps the Persian model influenced what happened in India at this time or slightly later; we have seen numerous other instances of Persian influence on carpet design, and Persian carpets were still esteemed in India.

The earliest group of millefleur carpets can be assigned to the reign of Aurangzeb, although they are not necessarily the result of his patronage. One example is of special interest because it is one of the few surviving pashmina rugs with a flower-style pattern (fig. 122). Staggered rows of white-blossomed plants with twisted leaves fill the field, and intermediate and smaller versions occupy the remaining spaces around the edges. The stiffness of the drawing and the compression, or crowding, of the pattern elements are indicative of post-Shāh Jahān manufacture. With silk warps arranged in colored stripes (red, ivory, yellow, and blue-green) and the fine weave of about 800 knots per square inch, this rug undoubtedly comes from one of the same workshops as earlier pashmina pieces. The rug survives in two fragmentary pieces. The border pattern is the key to this first group. It consists of lotus blossoms and pods systematically arranged and connected by vine scrolls. Bands of lotus plants occur frequently in the lower zone of Rajput and northern Deccani painting of the second half of the seventeenth century and become rather conventionalized in their decorative form.

Several other carpets with the lotus border are probably roughly contemporaneous with the fragmentary flower-style rug. All have deep red fields, dark blue or blue-green borders, and white minor borders. A splendid example in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (fig. 123; cat. no. 34), has a field pattern similar to others in the group. Diverse palmettes, leaves, and blossoms—some clustered into little floral sprays—are connected by scrolling vines in small pattern units that repeat seven times, reversed, over the length and five times over the width of this small rug (6 feet 10¼ inches by 4 feet 10 inches). The scale of the individual elements is necessarily diminutive. A similar pattern, but with shelflike brackets incorporated, fills the field of a rug said to have been acquired in Bengal in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century by a former East India Company official. A third version, once belonging to the dealer Arthur U. Dilley, involves brackets and long leaves arranged to form elongated vertical compartments for the floral sprays.

Very similar carpets were woven in less fine grades, just as had been done (probably at the same workshop) under Shāh Jahān. Two examples in the Metropolitan Museum have identical patterns: many of the same floral devices plus repeating rows of twisted, serrated leaves assembled in the form of medallions. The general crowding of elements and lack of clarity in differentiating pattern units distinguish the standard-grade carpets from those with pashmina pile, perhaps suggesting a slightly later date, in the early eighteenth century.

The second millefleur group is a small one, only two pieces, and represents another transitional stage between Shāh Jahān’s pashmina rugs and the last, most numerous, millefleur type. Both are fine pashmina rugs of the traditional sort, with striped silk warp groups, and both have field patterns derived from Shāh Jahān lattice forms. A date of manufacture in the first half of the eighteenth century can be proposed. The carpet in the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg (fig. 124), has the finer weave of the two, with about 1,000 knots per square inch. The diamond lattice is very rococo in style, with twisting vines attached to rings at the corners and gently interlocked at the midpoint of each side. Each compartment contains a flowering plant; the two varieties are arranged in diagonal rows.
Fig. 119 (cat. no. 33). Durbar carpet with medallion design. The Deccan, second half of the 17th century. Private collection

Fig. 120 (cat. no. 33). Detail of fig. 119 (opposite)
The other rug in this small group, in the Textile Museum, Washington, D.C., has about 700 knots per square inch. The field pattern has an intricate lattice formed from quadripartite compartments containing blossoms and leaves placed radially about a central blossom flanked by brackets. The stems of the lattice are knotted and twisted and full of little extensions and projections. The main border of each carpet has a pattern in the millefleur style, with myriad tiny blossoms growing from vine scrolls. A good precedent for this development in border designs—the proliferation and clustering of small flower heads—may be observed in an earlier lattice-and-flower carpet (see fig. 108).

The third group of millefleur rugs featuring repeating patterns in the field would seem to be the last in the sequence of development. These pieces probably date from the second half of the eighteenth century. The pile is pashmina in pieces directly examined, but even then the foundation is not necessarily silk; some rugs have mixed silk and cotton or all-cotton foundations. The weave averages about 150 knots per square inch. Several carpets have wefts of blue cotton, an indicator of relatively late production in India. Field patterns vary but are characterized by stiff drawing and extremely dense packing of tiny floral motifs. Design variations include repeated pattern units, repeated pattern units with little medallions (fig. 125), and lattice patterns, among others.

There are design parallels between the latest millefleur rugs and Kashmir shawls and hangings dating from about 1800. A painting of about 1820 shows a carpet of the millefleur type (unmistakable because of the clusters of little blossoms), but the carpet might not have been brand-new (fig. 126). The end date for the type would seem to be about 1800, for that is when northern Indian carpets became even more pronounced in their shawl-like patterns and began to incorporate the leaf-shaped forms known as bots, so popular in the shawls, in their patterns. Even at this late date, the traditional striped silk warp groups persist, although some of the colors—purple, dark brown—have not been observed before in carpets.

The second millefleur pattern type involves a directional design of a niche filled with a profusion of tiny blossoms growing out of a hillock or vase at the bottom of the field. About a dozen examples are known, and most of them have various points in common with the last group of the repeat-pattern type; border patterns, colors, materials, weave, and
Fig. 122. Fragmentary carpet with flower pattern. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, second half of the 17th century. Pashmina pile on silk foundation, 5' 8" x 5' (172.7 x 152.4 cm). Collection Paul Nels, London
Fig. 124 (cat. no. 44). Pashmina carpet with millefleur pattern. Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, second half of the 17th century. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (EA 1975.17)
Fig. 124. Carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers. Northern India, Kashmir, first half of the 18th century. Pashmina pile on silk foundation, 6'2" x 4'9" (187.9 x 144.8 cm). Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, Hamburg (inv. no. 1961.27)
certain field motifs are identical or similar. On the whole, then, the niche type can also be dated to the second half of the eighteenth century. As to the issue of their presumed function as prayer rugs, the millefleur niche rugs are no more likely to have been intended for or used in that capacity than were the pashmina niche-and-flower rugs of Shah Jahan's time. It seems likely that the millefleur type was also utilized in a decorative way on the floor or as hangings, as were contemporaneous textiles from Kashmir (fig. 127), which were not sturdy enough for functions of prayer.

Two millefleur niche rugs, by virtue of the relative clarity of their designs, seem earlier than the rest. These pieces are in the Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Vienna (fig. 128; cat. no. 35).
and in the Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University. The Vienna rug retains a degree of naturalism in its representation despite the transformation of the field blossoms into an abundant bouquet of many species growing from a single stem and base. The system of branches is cleanly defined and has not yet become schematized and turned into a purely decorative pattern. The cypresses flanking the field are also relatively naturalistic. The flowering plant grows from an undulating hillock against which appears a row of formal flowering plants in silhouette. The Harvard rug has a composite flowering plant sprouting from a vase standing in a shallow footed dish. A degree of schematization has set in, and naturalistic effects have been abandoned. A date in the first half of the eighteenth century for the Vienna rug and a mid-century date for the Harvard piece seem appropriate. Both rugs have pashmina pile and all-silk foundations, with warps of colored stripes; the Vienna rug has 780 knots per square inch, the Cambridge piece just under 300, so these are not unusually fine weaves given the luxury materials utilized.

Among the main group of millefleur niche rugs, the McMullan piece in the Metropolitan Museum (fig. 120; cat. no. 36) is a typical but particularly attractive example. Main elements of the field pattern basically repeat the Harvard rug, but blossom clusters are highly regularized and arranged in a stiff schematic pattern. The lower end of the field no longer bears any resemblance to a landscape, but it has been given its own “spandrel” to balance the top of the field while retaining the basic niche format. Despite the degradation of design and the further departure from naturalism, this is a very fine rug, as are some of the others. It has pashmina pile in a fine weave of about 700 knots per square inch, considerably finer than the Vienna or Harvard rugs, despite an all-cotton foundation. The inclusion of some blue cotton wefts, especially at the ends, supports the late-eighteenth-century dating and is a feature of several other pieces of this class.

The earliest pieces of the millefleur type, those dating from the second half of the seventeenth century, may have been manufactured in Kashmir or Lahore, like the pashmina carpets of Shāh Jahān’s time. Given the decline of Lahore, due at least in part to imperial neglect, it seems unlikely that such high-grade production was maintained there, so late millefleur rugs have been attributed just to Kashmir.

**Multiple-Niche Prayer Type (Saph)**

Two major carpet-weaving regions seem to have been active in India during the late seventeenth and the eighteenth century. One was in northern India—Kashmir, Lahore, and perhaps Multan—where the millefleur carpets and some later flower-style pieces were manufactured. The other center was the Deccan, the great south-central plateau area, home to various Muslim sultanates over several centuries and for long a real obsession of the Mughal emperors because of its fabled wealth. The annexation of the vast area of the Deccan to Mughal territory was finally completed by Aurangzeb in 1687, only to be lost again just thirty-five years later as Mughal central authority waned. The kingdom of Hyderabad lasted, under the rule of the Muslim nizams, from 1722 until it was finally absorbed into the Indian state in 1950.

The Deccan has long been known for its weaving. Justly famed are the painted, printed, and resist-dyed cotton chintzes of Burhanpur and Golconda and the brocades of silk and gold or silver of Aurangabad and Paithan. Cotton flat weaves (dhurries) were made in the form of multiple-niche prayer carpets (saphs) for use in mosques. As noted previously, pile carpets were made in Ellore in the

---

Fig. 120. *Nauch Party in a European Mansion* (detail). Delhi, ca. 1820. Opaque watercolor on paper. Victoria and Albert Museum, London (IS. 9-1955)
Fig. 127. Hanging in the millefleur style. Northern India, Kashmir, ca. 1800. Pashmina, twill-tapestry weave. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Rogers Fund, 1917 (17.123.3)
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Fig. 128 (cat. no. 35). Pashmina carpet with niche-and-millefleur pattern. Northern India, Kashmir, first half of the 18th century. Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Vienna (1-1539)
seventeenth century and, later records show, in Masulipatnam and Warangal. A number of nineteenth-century pieces can in fact be linked to those centers. Only recently has a serious attempt been made to identify Deccani carpet production prior to 1800.

Just as there were dhurrie saphs, so were there pile carpets woven in multiple-niche form for the mosques of the Deccan. These survive in two varieties. One type features a continuous row of niches defined by columns with pronounced bowl-shaped capitals. The largest piece with this pattern, in a private collection, has a single row of seven niches (figs. 130, 131; cat. no. 37). There are also carpets (a pair) with three niches each as well as an incomplete rug with six and two-thirds niches. In its complete form the latter would have been larger than the illustrated rug, which is 18 feet 1 inch in length, even if it had only seven niches, and it might have had more. Because of the lateral orientation of the niches, all were woven with the pattern sideways on the loom.

There is little variation among these rugs either in pattern or coloring—all have a deep red ground in all niches and spandrels and a yellow main border. Perhaps these rugs were made as a set. The flower style is evoked by the two types of flowering plants or trees—one with pomegranates—that alternately fill the deeply lobed niches, whose points are capped by little lotus finials. The drawing is stiff and geometrized, and even the vine scrolls of the border possess an angularity of line. In the spandrel above each column is a shield-shaped motif reminiscent of the finial of the Shi'ite ceremonial standard, or 'alam, but a more probable origin is the distinctive lotus palmette of similar shape found in certain Indo-Persian carpets. Guard stripes have patterns of geometrized S's end-to-end and vine scrolls and heart-shaped devices.

The second group of Deccani saphs consists solely of fragments or rugs reduced in size, and, although they are very similar, there is enough variation in pattern, color, and material to show that they came from several separate carpets. One large fragment with a single row of six niches, from the Wolf Collection, New York (figs. 132, 133; cat. no. 38), is characteristic. Each niche occupies its own self-contained rectangle framed by a narrow continuous border of scrolling vines and leaves with blossoms, all against a white ground. This border is flanked by pairs of guard stripes, including one with geometric end-to-end S's. Supported by columns at the outer edge of the field, each niche head comes to a sharp point without lobes and is capped by a lotus finial. The spandrels contain pairs of large rosettes. Monotony is avoided most effectively through the variation of pattern and ground color in spandrels and field. Designs include scrolling vines and blossoms, geometrized grids of small-scale blossoms, rippled water patterns, lattice patterns, and even rows of flowering plants.

A carpet recently seen in the trade retains its main border framing all the rectangular fields and lesser borders, a reciprocal trefoil design in dull red and pale olive green. Although the seemingly pieced outer border indicates that the carpet was once larger, the internal arrangement of two rows of niches seems correct. Such an arrangement of "stacked" rows was simple to execute when each niche was given a discrete zone, whereas the continuous colonnade of the first Deccani saph type made this unworkable. This carpet, the Wolf piece, and a seven-niche saph in the Textile Museum, Washington, D.C., are so similar in every detail that they probably were once part of the same carpet or at least the same set of mosque furnishings. The arrangement of internal borders on these pieces is similar to the incomplete borders of the much earlier pashmina niche rug in the Carmen Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection (fig. 92); it is thus the one surviving seventeenth-century niche rug that might have been part of a multiple-niche carpet, either a saph or a qanat.

Several fragments have a much narrower repertoire of color, and their patterns consist mainly of highly schematized, lacy arrangements of angular vines and leaves, which suggests a slightly later date of production (but still in the eighteenth century). One of these, in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, surprises us with a pile primarily of cotton, a material that is seen, however, in the pile of other rugs made in the Deccan. All other saph carpets and fragments of both Deccani types have wool pile on a cotton foundation, with knots ranging from 75 to 100 per square inch. It is interesting to note that all pieces examined have cotton warps consisting of either three or, more usually, four yarns. This accords well with standard Persian practice, perhaps reflecting the Persian origins of some of the area's

Fig. 129 (cat. no. 36). Pashmina carpet with niche-and-millefleur pattern. Northern India, Kashmir, second half of the 18th century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Gift of Joseph V. McMullan, 1970 (1970.302.7)
weavers. In contrast, northern Indian carpets generally have six or as many as twelve warp yarns.

The reader might wonder why these Deccani carpets, some with flowers in the niches, should be considered prayer rugs when most of the single-niche rugs made during Shāh Jahān’s reign are not (see p. 94). For one thing, the Deccani carpets have multiple niches. These could be part of a qanāt, or tent screen, but only as a single row. The survival of one piece with “stacked” rows rules this out, so use as a saph is most likely. Secondly, at least one of the Deccani pieces shows considerable wear in the lower part of the niche areas, where knees would have rested during prayer. Mosques in the Deccan must often have been furnished with saphs, based on surviving flat-woven cotton versions that were made locally, and it is logical that some of them would have been pile-woven. It also seems that the rows of niches presented by saphs on the floor of the covered hall of the mosque were in some cases extended for congregational prayer by saph patterns carved in the stone floor outside the prayer hall (fig. 134). The carved niche outlines closely parallel the carpet niches in their shape and proportions and also in the two rosettes in the spandrels.

The attribution of these rugs to the Deccan is based on similarities to other, sometimes later, pieces known or believed to have been acquired or woven there. A saph fragment close to the Wolf type, acquired early in this century by the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, was said to have come from the collection of the nizām of Hyderābād and to have been woven at Warangal. Two other rugs in the stores of the Victoria and Albert are thought to have been woven at Warangal, and they have many similarities in color and pattern, particularly in details, to the saphs. One has a dark brown ground patterned with rather angular scrolling vines and blossoms, and the other has sparsely placed, stiff flowering plants on a white ground. Both patterns have close counterparts in various saph niche fields.

In sum, this entire group, whether saphs or not, is from the Deccan, probably Warangal. Some of the features that recur include the use of colors unusual in the north, such as soft pink, orange, beige, pale green, and golden yellow; a granular appearance to the pattern and the frequent use of white outlining; a preference for designs involving stiff, angular vine scrolls in a repeat pattern based on Persian models; minor border patterns of angular vine scrolls and leaves in green with red and pink blossoms on a white ground; guard bands of geometrized end-to-end S’s and reciprocal vines with hearts; and corner solutions for main border patterns involving
diagonal "seams" at the meeting points of perpendicular bands. An ingenious suggestion was made by Charles Grant Ellis that the diagonal corner solution was based on the actual diagonal seams of joined velvets.  

The Kyoto Group

Within just the last decade or so, specialists have become aware of an intriguing collection of Oriental carpets in the Gion Matsuri Preservation Associations in Kyoto. The carpets do not form a single homogeneous group. There are seven classical Persian rugs of the Polonaise, Herat, and Indo-Persian types; three seventeenth-century Indian rugs (see pp. 20, 66 for two); three nineteenth-century Turkish or Caucasian pieces; and nineteen rugs in a Chinese style of uncertain origin, perhaps from a Chinese frontier area such as Mongolia. Of particular interest here is a fascinating group of twenty-three rugs that share features of color, weave, and certain minor pattern details but exhibit a variety of patterns overall. Inventory or acquisition information that survives for some of the Kyoto rugs suggests that the group dates essentially from the eighteenth century, even though an earlier date might be expected for certain patterns.

Some patterns are Persian in origin, based on symmetrical or at least regularly spaced arrangements of blossoms and palmettes connected by a scrolling-vine network. A fine example belongs to Kanko-boko (fig. 135; cat. no. 39), the association that, records show, purchased the rug in 1773. Too long (11 feet 6 inches) for vertical display on the association float (see fig. 60 for a typical float), the carpet was cut in two, and the halves were mounted for display on opposite sides. The field pattern consists of a rather stiffly drawn lattice network of vine scrolls linking palmettes and blossoms in pattern units that repeat in staggered rows across the width and length of the field and, implicitly, beyond. In the main border, against a black ground, various floral motifs—rosettes, palmettes, and spotted bulblike blossoms—are arranged, each angled diagonally, in a row connected by a meandering vine scroll. Guard bands are patterned with end-to-end S's against a white ground.

Variations of all these patterns can be found in seventeenth-century Indo-Persian and northern Indian carpets, but the Kyoto carpet should not be confused with either of those types. Although it has

---

Fig. 134. Saff pattern in the stone courtyard of the Jami Mosque, Hyderabad, completed in 1597
Fig. 132 (cat. no. 38). Multiple-niche prayer carpet (sep²). The Deccan, probably Warangal, 18th century. The Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf Collection, New York

Fig. 133 (cat. no. 38). Detail of fig. 132 (below)
many technical features in common with carpets of the Indo-Persian class (warp, weft, and pile materials and construction), it also has features that readily distinguish it. The red ground of the field is worn more than the other colors, exposing much of the nubby cotton foundation. Black and white are used prominently, particularly as outlines for motifs and as ground colors in the border. Olive green and mustard yellow stand out as colors not found in northern Indian or Indo-Persian rugs. The surface of the rug has a distinctly granular appearance.

Several other carpets in the Kyoto group have patterns in the flower style. A carpet in another association, Kita-Kannon-yama (fig. 136; cat. no. 40), acquired in 1752, has a stiff flower-and-lattice design—consistent with a late Mughal date—and a white-ground border. Another piece, in Minami-Kannon-yama (fig. 137; cat. no. 41), has a decorative blossom-and-lattice pattern derived from the more formal versions made under Shāh Jahan and Aurangzeb. This rug is mentioned in documents dated 1814, so it was acquired before then. Several very similar pieces were in the Jaipur Collection, but unfortunately none has inventory information on labels or in registers.

Some of the Kyoto carpets have unexpected patterns, that is, unexpected in rugs with these technical features. Two have medallion designs associated with seventeenth-century Persian types; one of these was acquired in 1754. Another has pairs of large serrated lancet leaves, a pattern that goes back ultimately to the Persian vase type, but the model was surely a seventeenth-century Indian version of the pattern. A northern Indian carpet with this design belongs to Knole, the English country house of the Sackville-West family, and the pattern appears again in a Deccani painting of about 1680. A most unusual carpet has a Mamluk or Anatolian design of a type otherwise lost, in which a central rosette or medallion occupies an octagon within a square, bound at the ends by rows of smaller squares containing versions of the central motif (fig. 158). The pattern here relates to fifteenth-century Anatolian carpets known as large-pattern Holbeins, but the coloring, with green and yellow predominant, is more Mamluk Egyptian than Anatolian (or Indian either, for that matter). One explanation for the use of an atypical and unfamiliar color scheme is that the carpet was made to order as a copy of the worn original whose place it was intended to take on the float, a system still in use today. One may speculate here that the original was a carpet of Anatolian design but Mamluk manufacture, a type unknown to us today except for the copy in Kyoto.

Another unusual type has a field pattern with a central star medallion containing an eight-pointed star and palmettes radially placed within each medallion lobe. Quarter medallions fill the corners of the field, and from them flowering trees grow toward the central medallion. The two examples in Kyoto have different borders, one with scrolling vines, palmettes, and blossoms, the other with cartouches containing highly stylized floral elements (fig. 139). A third rug has a similar cartouche border, but its Persian-style field pattern of palmettes and vines links it to other members of this stylistically disparate group.

Apart from the pieces in Japan, the star-medallion rugs are known to us only from a series of Dutch paintings dating from the second half of the seventeenth century. The rugs were depicted draped over tables in the homes of wealthy burghers. Deprived of actual examples to go by, scholars have speculated that rugs of this type were made in Anatolia, northwestern Iran, or even Europe. Could the star-medallion pieces preserved in Japan be seventeenth-century rugs, the very ones depicted in Dutch paintings, the very ones traded by the Dutch in opposite directions? Not according to inventory data in Kyoto, where records indicate that donations were accepted toward the acquisition of two of these rugs in 1791. The third rug was inventoried (or possibly acquired) in 1773. The rugs must have been new when acquired, for they are still in fine condition today. The star-medallion rugs in Kyoto must therefore be copies of the earlier pieces illustrated in the paintings.

The eighteenth-century Indian type in the Gion Matsuri Preservation Associations Collection seemed novel to the author and colleagues Nobuko Kajitani and Charles Grant Ellis when first seen in 1886, but other examples may now be added to the twenty-three in that collection. The Toyama Memorial Museum of Art, near Tokyo, possesses four rugs of this class, three with variations of Indo-Persian patterns and one with a blossom-and-lattice design. Eight rugs of this class belong to the Tokugawa Art Museum in Nagoya; seven have Indo-Persian patterns and one is the star-medallion type. In addition, quite a number of rugs of this class passed through Japanese auctions earlier this century; twenty-six examples have been found for the second decade of this century alone. Most of these are simply variations of the Kyoto rugs, but three rugs have field
Fig. 135 (cat. no. 39). Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. The Deccan, ca. 1770. Gion Matsuri Kanko-boko Preservation Association, Kyoto, Japan
Fig. 136 (cat. no. 40). Carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers. The Deccan, ca. 1750 or earlier. Gion Matsuri Kita-Kannon-yama Preservation Association, Kyoto, Japan
Fig. 137 (cat. no. 41). Carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms. The Deccan, late 18th century. Gion Matsuri Minami-Kannon-yama Preservation Association, Kyoto, Japan.
Fig. 138. Carpet with a geometric pattern based on a Mamluk Egyptian or Anatolian model. The Deccan, early 18th century. Wool pile on cotton foundation, 5'6" x 4'6" (170 x 137.2 cm). Gion Matsuzi Kita-Kannon-ya Preservation Association, Kyoto, Japan
Fig. 139. Star-medallion carpet. The Deccan, ca. 1790. Wool pile on cotton and wool foundation, 7' 1" x 3' 10½" (212 x 118 cm). Gion Matsuri Kita-Kannon-yama Preservation Association, Kyoto, Japan
Fig. 140 (cat. no. 42). Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. The Deccan, ca. 1650. By kind permission of His Grace, the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry K.T., from his Collection at Boughton House, Northamptonshire, England (62-506)

Fig. 141 (cat. no. 42). Detail of fig. 140 (opposite)
patterns of rows of flowering plants, the formal flower style not otherwise known in this class.\textsuperscript{65}

Two carpets in Western collections may indeed belong to the Kyoto group, a term that shall be used here for convenience despite the existence of examples elsewhere. One belongs to the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry K.T., Boughton House (figs. 140, 141; cat. no. 42), and the other is in the Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst in Vienna.\textsuperscript{66} The field of each shows a section of a repeating pattern of vines, palmettes, and pairs of curving segmented leaves, a typical Indian variation on the Persian style. The Boughton carpet’s border has a full-width, carefully drawn version of the compartment border found in both Herātī and northern Indian carpets (see figs. 63, 64). The border of the Vienna rug looks like a highly compressed version of the same design, but it is actually a half-width of the full pattern. Although they look at first glance like northern Indian carpets with Persian-style designs (see especially fig. 54), these two carpets actually have many features characteristic of the Kyoto group: the surface has a granular appearance, the red ground of the field shows considerable wear, the colors include olive green and golden yellow, and there is a considerable amount of black and white outlining. They are also similar technically.

Neither carpet comes with provenance information useful for dating, but the clarity of design and drawing, balance of proportions, and close similarity to northern Indian carpets of the second quarter of the seventeenth century suggest that these two pieces may well be older than the rest of the Kyoto group. Thus, the Boughton rug is dated here to about 1650, and the Vienna carpet to the second half of the seventeenth century. Carpets with these borders are represented in Dutch paintings of the second half of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{67}

The Kyoto group is rather diverse technically, perhaps reflecting a process of experimentation, changes in production over time, or multiple workshops. Warps are white cotton, Z-spun and S-plied with a yarn count ranging from four to ten. Wefts are usually cotton in three shoots but with variation in color: light brown, white, orange, medium brown, off-white or beige, even blue, a color often linked to later production. One rug has both blue and light brown cotton wefts,\textsuperscript{68} and two pieces have undyed brown wool wefts, whereas a rug with a related design has light buff cotton wefts.\textsuperscript{69} Knotting is Persian, open to

the left, with knot counts averaging 30 to 40 per square inch, the finest having 110. Two examples that otherwise seem closely matched to the Kyoto rugs have Turkish knots, so technical diversity is the rule.\textsuperscript{70}

Carpets of the Kyoto group have features in common with the saphs, and they too may be attributed to the Deccan. In addition to heavy outlining in black and white and a granular surface appearance, certain guard-stripe patterns, particularly end-to-end geometric S’s, occur on both types. Another guard stripe characteristic of the Deccan, featuring hearts and a meandering vine, appears on rugs of the Kyoto group and also on nineteenth-century Deccani pieces. Guard stripes are often reliable indicators of a common source: major patterns of field and border may be dictated by external factors, but guard-stripe patterns usually follow local convention or tradition. Colors are similar to those in other Deccani rugs. For example, compare the hues of the blossom-and-lattice rug in Kyoto (fig. 137) with those of one of the saphs (fig. 131).

A painting (fig. 142) attributed to the northern Deccan, about 1650, shows Krishna enthroned atop a carpet with Persian palmette-and-vine patterns with pronounced outlining, slightly oversize floral elements, and a narrow border. The rug may represent Deccani production, our Kyoto group type.

Rugs of the Kyoto group were essentially trade goods. The numerous pieces in Japan must have arrived with the Dutch, who had the concession at Nagasaki from 1640 on. The Dutch obtained carpets from Masulipatnam as early as 1666 (see p. 20). Dutch paintings of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century show carpets that may well be, now that we are more familiar with the type, Kyoto group examples. Compare the border design of figure 135 to the border of the rug depicted in figure 6. But without precise hints of design or color, it may be impossible to judge whether a depicted carpet is an Indo-Persian or a northern Indian or Deccani version. And without solid inventory information, it may be difficult to know that a rug similar to ones depicted in seventeenth-century paintings is actually an eighteenth-century version or even a copy. Only a few examples of the Kyoto group found their way to the Jaipur Collection, which otherwise provides a good overview of Indian production prior to 1800; these are relatively late (about 1800) pieces with a lattice-and-blossom pattern, similar to one illustrated here (fig. 137).\textsuperscript{71}
Silks

In most settled carpet-weaving societies, the pile fiber of choice for luxury carpets has always been silk. Its seductive shimmer and exclusivity have an undeniable appeal to the wealthy, to whom high cost and relatively poor wearing qualities are of little importance. India is exceptional in this regard. It is not that silk was not highly valued. At the annual weighing of the Mughal emperor’s son, when his weight in valuable materials was distributed among the poor, silk was considered the third most costly commodity after gold and silver. Various types of luxury textiles were woven of silk, but another fiber, pashmina, the underhair of the Himalayan mountain goat and the material favored for the finest shawls made in Kashmir, was considered the supreme fiber for carpet pile. Indeed, its fineness and ability to take dyes gave Indian weavers the means to produce some of the most finely woven and exquisitely colored carpets ever made.

Silk carpets were woven in India, but they are relatively late—with only one exception, eighteenth century or later—and provincial versions of the high Mughal style. Some examples are extremely attractive; others are derivative and slightly vulgar. They seem not to have been produced in the north, where pashmina dominated the luxury market even through the eighteenth century, just in the south, in the Deccan, where pashmina was rarely used. Indeed, in design certain silk pieces closely resemble sheep’s-wool rugs we have attributed to the Deccan. It is significant that no silk carpets are known to have been in the Jaipur Collection, so rich in northern Indian and Persian carpets.

Only about a dozen Indian silk rugs dating from before 1800 are known. More than half form a distinctive group with a field pattern of flowering plants arranged in staggered rows within the diamond-shaped compartments formed by a thick, twisting lattice. The main border typically has a row of circular blossoms, probably carnations, connected by a meandering vine scroll. The palette is limited mainly to wine red, golden yellow, and very dark green, but pink, yellow-orange, and dark brown also appear. Even with such a limited palette, there is some color mixing—of red and yellow, red and pink—in blossom centers. These are not particularly fine rugs; they have cotton foundations and about 200 knots per square inch. The field pattern is based on the Mughal flower style, as is the use of color mixing, but its stiff, repetitive quality argues for an eighteenth-century dating. The color scheme and border pattern are related to nineteenth-century rugs said to come from Hyderabad, so a probable attribution to that city can be made for the whole group.
Fig. 143 (cat. no. 43). Fragment of a silk carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms. The Deccan, probably Hyderabad, late 17th or early 18th century. Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah, Kuwait Museum of Islamic Art (LNS 208)
Fig. 144 (cat. no. 44). Silk carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms. The Deccan, probably Warangal, dated 1192 A.H./A.D. 1778-79. Cincinnati Art Museum, Gift of Beatrice Kelekian in memory of Charles Dikran Kelekian (1985.398)
Two fragmentary pieces from this group stand slightly apart from the rest. One belongs to the Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah in Kuwait (fig. 143; cat. no. 43), the other to a private collection in Europe. They were adjoining parts of a half carpet once owned by the Austrian dealer Julius Orendi; the other half has never appeared. In knot count and coloring these fragments are very close to the other pieces of the type, but the foundation is silk and goat's hair. More important, the flower-and-lattice pattern of the field is more graceful and curvilinear, and the main and secondary borders have far more complicated and less schematized floral designs than those seen in the other pieces. One is inclined to attribute this carpet to the time of Aurangzeb—the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century—between the high flower style of Shāh Jahān and the stiffly repetitive pieces of the eighteenth century.

A second distinctive group of silk rugs, comprising only three works, features a broader palette, deeper colors, and a much finer weave. Field patterns are all variations of the flower style. The foundations are cotton, cotton and silk, or all silk, and the knot count ranges between 324 and 568 per square inch. The piece in the Cincinnati Art Museum (fig. 144; cat. no. 44) has a blossom-and-lattice pattern that is very stylized but well designed and beautifully drawn. A rug that passed through the London trade in 1982 also has a blossom-and-lattice pattern, but the lattice is very subtle and it looks at first glance to be simply a repeating floral design. The third rug, supposedly once in the collection of the king of Afghanistan, Muhammad Zahir Shāh, survives in numerous small fragments that began to appear in the London market in the 1980s. Here the field has staggered rows of formal flowering plants.

This group also represents eighteenth-century Deccani production, but from a center different from that of the previous group. There are striking similarities between the rug seen in the London trade in 1982 and a sheep's-wool rug attributed to Warangal (see pp. 134, 136), notably in the main border design, especially the diagonal corner solution, and in the small-lobed quarter medallions in the corners of the field, so a probable assignment to Warangal can be proposed. These three pieces would be dated to the eighteenth century on stylistic grounds alone, but it is helpful to have a date of 1192 A.H./A.D. 1778–79 in a cartouche in the main border of the Cincinnati rug. This is the only Indian carpet known with an inwoven date, and it is fortunately the only part of the inscription not to have been garbled by repair.
Appendix I

Microscopic Analysis of Animal Fibers Found in Classical Indian and Persian Carpets

MARTIN N. YOUNGBERG
Laboratory Manager
Fashion Institute of Technology, New York

It is often possible to identify animal fibers by studying their microscopical characteristics. The recognition of a single feature very rarely establishes the identity of the genus; more often, it is necessary to recognize a unique combination of characteristics.

With the exception of silk, all animal fibers are covered by a scaly outer surface layer called the cuticle. The shape, size, and prominence of the scales in the cuticle offer, perhaps, the most characteristic features of animal fibers. Angular prominent scales suggest sheep’s wool, whereas the specialty fibers have smoother scale edges. Cashmere, particularly from the undercoat, has scales that are relatively far apart or longer along the axis than most other fibers, and this, coupled with fineness and distribution of any pigment, is a distinguishing feature. (Scales look like stacked flowerpots.) Some animal fibers have a medulla, a central core of air-filled cavities, and this can be another identifying characteristic. Some fur fibers have a ladder-type medulla. Cross-sectional shape is another distinguishing characteristic, especially for alpaca and llama.

One fragment from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (05-58), is composed of camel’s hair.

Methods

Twelve carpets were selected for sampling in 1996 by Nobuko Kajitani and Daniel Walker, and samples of the pile material from the Metropolitan Museum pieces were taken by Shelley Greenspan of the Museum’s Textile Conservation staff. All carpets sampled belong to the Metropolitan Museum except two that belong to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (BMFA). All samples were undyed fiber except 1983-494-5, which was yellow. The identification of animal species is as follows: sheep’s wool (genus Ovis), cashmere wool (Capra hircus laniger), camel’s hair (Camelus dromedarius or bactrianus).


a. An initial examination was made and differences were noted before the samples were prepared in any manner.

b. Microscopical examination began by preparing whole (longitudinal) mounts using two mounting mediums of different refractive indexes (1.577 and 1.704). Wool and other hair fibers have a refractive index of 1.55-1.56. When wool and other hair fibers are mounted in a medium of similar refractive index (1.577 mountant), surface characteristics are practically invisible, but internal structure and the presence of medullae and pigments are clearly revealed. When wool and other fibers are mounted in 1.704, the surface details, i.e., epidermis scales, are clearly revealed.

c. The examination proceeded with the fibers mounted in 1.577 and 1.704 refractive index mediums. The results obtained will be found in the chart. Following is a list of the carpets, arranged in the order of the chart, indicating the type of carpet and the figure and catalogue numbers of those included in Flowers Underfoot. Bibliographical references for other carpets are included when appropriate.

05-58 (BMFA)
Fragment of Indian carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animal heads. From same carpet as fig. 66, cat. no. 168

1983-494-5
Fragment of Indian carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. From same carpet as fig. 74, cat. no. 17
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14.40.722
Fragment of Indian carpet with niche-and-flower design. Fig. 10

1970.321
Indian carpet with flower pattern. Fig. 93, cat. no. 22

1983.494.6
Fragment of Indian carpet with flower pattern. From same carpet as fig. 97

14.40.712
Fragments of Indian carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms. Fig. 111, cat. no. 30

32.100.457
Fragment of Indian carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms. Fig. 111, cat. no. 30

14.40.713
Indian carpet border fragments. Dimand and Mailey 1973, cat. no. 62, p. 124, fig. 138

14.40.725
Indian carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms. Fig. 80

67.267
Indian carpet with millefleur pattern. McMullan 1965, no. 33, pp. 140–41

04.111 (BMFA)
Fragment of Persian (Herāt) carpet with compartment design. From same carpet as fig. 90

1091.154
Fragment of Persian (Khorāsān) carpet with compartment design. Martin 1908, p. 41, fig. 103
Fiber Identification and Characteristics (Per AATCC Method 20, Table 1)

According to ASTM D2817, cashmere coarse hairs are those fibers having widths greater than 30 micrometers. Cashmere fine down fibers have widths of 30 micrometers or less.

The upper-case X denotes an especially significant feature; the lower-case x indicates a less significant feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>camel's hair</td>
<td>cashmere wool</td>
<td>cashmere wool</td>
<td>sheep's wool</td>
<td>sheep's wool</td>
<td>cashmere wool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal mount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidermis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronounced</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faint</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbricate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrated edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medulla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom present</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x fine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never present</td>
<td>x fine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x fine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x some tan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineness measured</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>26.85</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in micrometers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. number of scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per 100 micrometers</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>7 to 11</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiber Identification and Characteristics (Per AATCC Method 20, Table 1)

According to ASTM D2817, cashmere coarse hairs are those fibers having widths greater than 30 micrometers. Cashmere fine down fibers have widths of 30 micrometers or less.

The upper-case X denotes an especially significant feature; the lower-case x indicates a less significant feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>cashmere wool</td>
<td>cashmere wool</td>
<td>cashmere wool</td>
<td>cashmere wool</td>
<td>cashmere wool</td>
<td>sheep's wool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal mount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidermis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronounced</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronal</td>
<td>X fine</td>
<td>X fine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x some</td>
<td>x some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbricate</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth edge</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrated edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medulla:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually present</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never present</td>
<td>x fine</td>
<td>x fine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x fine</td>
<td>x fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted</td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x coarse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steaky</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineness measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in micrometers</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>27.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. number of scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per 100 micrometers</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>6 to 15</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>5 to 8</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>5 to 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2A

Natural Dyes in the Near and Middle East and India

Harald Bohmer
Marmara University, Istanbul

Indigo
Indigo is the only natural blue dyestuff that imparts a high degree of lightfastness to textile fibers. Its formula has been known since 2883 B.C. In the third century B.C., Mohenjo-Daro, in what is now Pakistan, was the center of the so-called Indus Valley culture. After 490 B.C., archaeologists excavating the ruins, led by Sir Mortimer Wheeler, found small amounts of indigo in the cracks of hollows in a stone floor, which indicated that the hollows had been used for dyeing. The first use of indigo to dye textiles probably occurred in the Indian subcontinent. The leaves of a shrub, Indigofera tinctoria, yield a colorless aqueous chemical substance, indican, from which indigo is derived in a complicated fermentation process. The shrub, a pantropical plant, has been cultivated in India for more than four thousand years. In 1220 Arabs tried to cultivate Indigofera tinctoria L. near Jericho, but they did not succeed.

The oldest excavated textiles dyed with indigo are Egyptian, dated 1580 B.C. but perhaps as much as one hundred years older. Most of these fabrics were woven from linen, and the dry climate of Egypt preserved them very well.

Indigo is a vat dye, which means that the dyestuff is insoluble in water and must be made water soluble to be fixed on the fiber. This is done by the chemical process of reduction in a solution called the dyeing liquor, which has a complex composition. The main ingredients were bran, sweet fruits or honey, and urine or chalk. Through reduction, the blue indigo turns into a water-soluble yellow substance. The fibers were put into this yellow dyeing liquor. Then, by exposure to air, the water-insoluble blue indigo is re-formed on the fiber by oxidation. Thus indigo lies on the fiber rather than bonding with it, which explains why blue jeans are not resistant to rubbing.

In the Middle East there is another plant that yields indigo: Isatis tinctoria L., or dyer’s woad. It is a cruciferous plant, a biennial that in the first year forms only a leaf rosette and in the second develops a stalk about three feet high. Indigo was obtained in a fermentation process from isatin B in the leaves.

A method for vat dyeing with dyer’s woad is described in detail in the papyrus Graecus Holmensis of the third century A.D., which was derived from a book on dyeing by the Greek Bolos Democritus, who lived in the Nile Delta in the second century B.C.

The Indigofera tinctoria of India is superior to Isatis tinctoria. Its leaves contain much more of the substance that produces indigo during the fermentation process. Large quantities of indigo were exported from India to the Mediterranean markets after the Portuguese Vasco da Gama discovered the sea route to India in 1498. The term indigo, which is derived from “India,” came into use at that time, but indigo produced locally from dyer’s woad was also used for many centuries; Ottoman tax lists show that in the sixteenth century people of the Peloponnese had to pay their taxes partly in dyer’s woad.

One cannot distinguish by chemical analysis whether the indigo of dyed textiles has been derived from Isatis tinctoria, Indigofera tinctoria, or other plants, and no difference can be seen between natural and synthetic indigo, which became available at the end of the nineteenth century.

Scarlet
Scarlet is a bluish red obtained from various dye insects found in many parts of the world. A scale insect of India, Cambodia, Thailand, and Sumatra produces lac (Kerria lacca Kerr). The Mediterranean coast is the most important source of kermes (Kermes vermilio Planchon), but they are also found near the Zagros Mountains in Persia. Ararat kermes (Porphyrophora hamelii Brandt) are found near the foot of Mount Ararat in both Armenia and Turkey. The dye insect grain-cochineal (Porphyrophora tritici) was found in central Anatolia until twenty-five years ago. Eastern Europe is the home of Polish kermes (Porphyrophora polonica L.).

Dye from the Mexican cochineal (Dactylopius coccus Costa) came on the market soon after the Spaniards arrived in Mexico early in the sixteenth century. Cochineal insects have been cultivated on Lanzarote, one of the Canary Islands, since the middle of the nineteenth century. The dyeing quality of cochineal is superior to that

*Notes for this essay are on pages 158–59.
of any other dye insect, so within a short time it almost displaced the other insect dyes.

The term kermes means, in general, bluish red. The Turkish word for red, kermes, is related to the Arabic qermiz, the French cramoisi, the English crimson, and the German Karmin. Kermes red is a dye obtained from an insect (Kermes vermilio Planchon), a parasite that feeds on the dwarf evergreen kermes oak (Quercus cocifera L.), which grows in the Mediterranean coastal areas. The insect can still be found in the Aegean region of Turkey, in southern France, and in Tunisia. Adult females containing hundreds of eggs were collected in May, killed by immersing in vinegar, dried, and then powdered for the dyeing process. Kermes vermilio, with an alum mordant, gives both wool and silk a high degree of lightfastness. On silk the dye imparts a brilliant bluish red, but is less brilliant on wool.

According to a text of 1300 b.c., kermes were already known to the Babylonians. The dye has been detected in Roman textiles from Palmyra, dated to the first and second centuries a.d.7

The main dye substance in Kermes vermilio Planchon is kermesic acid; flavokermesic acid is a minor dye ingredient. It is known from Ottoman tax registers of the sixteenth century that villagers had to collect the kermes insects and deliver them to the Ottoman court, but researchers have not been able to find the characteristic dye ingredients of Kermes vermilio in carpets from Turkey, Iran, India, and elsewhere that have been tested.

Polish kermes (Porphyrophora polonia L.) are found from eastern Germany to the Ukraine, as parasites on the roots of a perennial plant (Silkenanthus perennis L.) and also on some other plants. At some time they were probably found much farther to the east, because we know that the fifth-century b.c. Pazyryk carpet and Siberian felts of the same era contain the characteristic combination of the two red dyestuffs derived from Polish kermes, carminic acid and kermesic acid.8 The Pazyryk carpet is the earliest pile carpet known, named for the valley in the Altai Mountains of Siberia where it was found in the late 1940s. Red dye obtained from Polish kermes has also been found in Roman textiles from Palmyra.9 According to Donkin, in the middle of the seventeenth century Ukrainian Jews rented land bearing the plants that sustained Polish kermes; they organized the harvest and sold the dried insects to Armenian and Turkish merchants. Thus it is certain that Polish kermes were traded in the seventeenth century and probably considerably earlier because we found Polish kermes in a caftan attributed to Sultan Mehmed II, the conqueror of Constantinople in 1453.10

Lac (Kerria laca Ker) is obtained from insects that live on various trees in India, Cambodia, Thailand, and Sumatra. Clustered together, they suck on branches until they are totally covered by their red excrement. Twice a year the encrusted insects are collected, dried, powdered, and then traded as lac dye. The dye ingredients are laccic acids that are not present in other dye insects. Therefore, textiles dyed with lac can be distinguished by chemical analysis from those whose dyes come from other insects.

Lac was first used in India. It found its way from there to the Mediterranean area very early: it has been found in Roman textiles from Palmyra11 and was probably used in the Ottoman Empire as early as the fifteenth century. In Turkey lac was mentioned in the Bursa guild and market regulations of the early sixteenth century.12 It was in Bursa that Ottoman silk velvets were woven. Lac is also usually found in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Ottoman court carpets, the Mamluk carpets from Cairo,13 and Iranian and Indian carpets.

In the eighth century b.c., Sargon II, king of Assyria, defeated the Urartean kingdom and plundered its palaces. “Scarlet red textiles from Ararat” are listed as booty.14 We can assume that these highly appreciated textiles were dyed with Ararat kermes (Porphyrophora hamelii Brandt), which is referred to in the literature as Armenian kermes or Armenian cochineal. The essential dye ingredient of these insects, carminic acid, has been found in Roman textiles of the first and second centuries a.d. from Palmyra. Armenian literary sources15 from as early as the fifth century cite their use in dyeing silk and for color employed in miniature painting. Ararat kermes fell into disuse many years ago, but several Armenian institutions are now trying to reintroduce them.16 The insect is a parasite that feeds on the roots of a common reed (Phragmites australis Trin.) that grows near the slopes of Mount Ararat and in the salty marshes near the Araks River. In the fall of 1950 the author found Ararat kermes on the Turkish side of the river. During a few days in autumn the full-grown insects come to the surface of the marsh for a short time after sunrise to lay their eggs. Then it is easy to collect them.

Ararat kermes dye wool and silk easily and quickly. Using 20 to 50 percent Ararat kermes in relation to the weight of the fiber yields only a light purplish red. The most striking colors are obtained by using 100 percent Ararat kermes, on both wool and silk.

An unfamiliar dye insect will be mentioned here: ekin, or grain cochineal (Porphyrophora tritici), of central Anatolia. This insect is a parasite on the roots of wheat and various wild grasses, but it was probably eradicated by DDT thirty years ago when it caused devastating losses in the Turkish wheat harvest. Only some samples preserved in alcohol at the Agricultural Institute in Karapinar in central Anatolia were available in 1991. The dyestuff in Porphyrophora tritici turned out to be carminic acid, the same dye found in Porphyrophora hamelii from the Ararat region and cochineal (Dactylolophus coccus) from the New World.

Neither the local people nor the literature indicated that these insects were ever used for dyeing. But we
cannot reject the idea that they were used many centuries ago. Carmine acid present in Palmyran textiles might have been derived from ekin cochineal as well as from Ararat kermes.

**Dye Insects and Their Characteristic Dye Ingredients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dye insect</th>
<th>Dye ingredients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kermes (Kermes vermilio P.)</td>
<td>kermesic acid + flavokermesic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish kermes (Porphyrophora polonica L.)</td>
<td>carminic acid + kermesic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat kermes (Porphyrophora hameli B.)</td>
<td>carminic acid + traces of kermesic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grain cochineal (Porphyrophora tritici)</td>
<td>carminic acid + traces of kermesic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lac (Kerria lacca K.)</td>
<td>laccic acids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cochineal (Dactylopus coccus C.)</td>
<td>carminic acid + traces of kermesic acid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations to the table:

Three of the dye insects, namely kermes (Kermes vermilio), Polish kermes (Porphyrophora polonica), and lac (Kerria lacca) contain different dyestuffs or different dyestuff combinations and can easily be distinguished from one another by dye analysis.

Carmineic acid is the main component of the three other dye insects, making them difficult to distinguish in dyed fabrics.

Two of these three insects are found in the Old World, namely Ararat kermes (Porphyrophora hameli) and grain cochineal (Turkish ekin cochineal; Porphyrophora tritici); the third, cochineal (Dactylopus coccus), is found in the New World.

Cochineal (Dactylopus coccus Costa) is a parasite that lives on several species of cactus cultivated in Mexico, the Central American countries, and, since the mid-nineteenth century, on Lanzarote, one of the Canary Islands.

Of the four dye insects that contain carminic acid, cochineal has the largest quantity, fifteen to thirty-three times as much, and it is the easiest to use for dyeing. Literary sources indicate that cochineal was sold in the markets of Europe and found its way to Istanbul shortly after the conquest of Mexico. By 1560 cochineal was reported in Venice, and Venetian merchants controlled much of the trade with Istanbul. An English merchant who lived there wrote in a letter of 1586 that cochineal stored in Peru (modern Beyoğlu) was to be shipped to Cairo and Aleppo. Donkin writes: "The dye stuff was at all times costly and found a ready market only where luxury textiles, such as brocades and carpets, were manufactured in Western Asia." The most luxurious brocades were woven in the Ottoman court workshops of Bursa in the fifteenth century and in Istanbul after the middle of the sixteenth century. Logic would indicate that the best red dye available would have been used for these prestigious silks: the latest, most expensive, and best dye, cochineal from Mexico. It was often used mixed with indigo to obtain a special kind of brilliant shellfish purple, commonly known as Phoenician purple.

**Madder Red**

The Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans all used madder for dyeing.

Madder red was seldom used in cloth-related silk textiles because of its poor lightfastness. However, madder is lightfast on wool.

There are three important madder plants. They belong to the Rubieae family. *Rubia tinctorum* L. is found in Anatolia, Iran, and Central Asia; *Rubia cordifolia* L. and *Oldenlandia umbellata* L. in India.

*Rubia tinctorum* L. is a shrub. Every year its branched, creeping rootstock thrusts up stalks to a height of 4.5 feet. These stalks bear tiny thorns and are surrounded by whorls of lanceolate leaves. Madder thrives especially when grown on loamy soil that is not too dry. It is probably indigenous to Anatolia and was cultivated in western and central Anatolia, Iran, and in some areas of Central Asia. Because of the emergence of synthetic dyes, its cultivation declined rapidly in the last third of the nineteenth century. Today, madder can only be found growing wild in the old areas of cultivation.

To prepare the dye, roots of plants at least two years old were dried and ground up. In former times the dried roots were known in the trade as lizari or alizari. Many dyeing methods were known, one of them being the famous Turkey-red dyeing of cotton. Through the choice of mordants such as alum and iron salts and additions such as fruits containing acids or sour milk to the dye bath, various red hues can result and it is even possible to obtain purple. The main dye ingredients of madder are alizarin and pseudopurpurin, but there are up to fourteen others. Carl Graebe and Carl Liebermann produced the first synthetic alizarin in 1868, and since 1871 it has been manufactured in industrial quantities.

*Rubia cordifolia* L. is indigenous to India, Nepal, China, Japan, and tropical Africa. It is a climbing plant, formerly cultivated in India, and it contains almost the same dye ingredients as *Rubia tinctorum*. Therefore it is difficult to determine by dye analysis which plant was used for dyeing.

*Oldenlandia umbellata* L. is a shrub indigenous to India, Burma, Sri Lanka, and Java, where it grows in the sandy soil of coastal areas. It is commonly called chay root. The dried roots were traded as a dye material. According to our research, the roots contain high amounts
of pseudopurpurin and munjestin but only traces of alizarin. Therefore it is easy to distinguish between red obtained from this madder plant and red from the other two. Tibetan carpets are often dyed with *Oldenlandia umbellata*.

**Yellow and Green**

The yellow and green of court-related and some tribal carpets come mainly from the dyestuff luteolin, which has the highest degree of lightfastness of any yellow dye ingredient. The most important source for luteolin is weld, also called dyeer’s rocket. The blue component in green is indigo.

Weld (*Reseda luteola L.*) is a perennial plant of the Reseda family that grows to more than 4.5 feet in height. In May and June it bears numerous small yellow flowers, which form into slender clusters. The whole plant—except for the root—is used in extracting luteolin. In addition, the blossoms contain small amounts of apigenin, a yellowish crystalline substance. With alum mordant, brilliant lightfast yellows are obtained.

Weld was used by the Romans as a dye plant. It was cultivated and traded in Anatolia and Persia. It was used in court-related dye houses in Ottoman Turkey, Safavid Iran, and Mughal India.

*Asharg* (*Delphinium simbarbature*) is the Iranian name for a yellow flowering larkspur. It grows in Iran, Afghanistan, Central Asia, and some areas of India, but not in Anatolia. Flowers, leaves, and stems contain three different dye-stuffs, but the lightfast luteolin is absent. *Asharg* has often been used for yellow and green dyes in village and tribal rugs, but seldom in court rugs.

In the carpet-weaving areas there are at least fifty different plants that produce yellow dyestuff. Many of the dye plants were only used locally, for village rugs or nomadic weavings. Through chemical analysis, some dye ingredients can be identified as corresponding to a specific plant. For instance, the dye ingredient mostin comes from dyer’s sumac (*Cotinus coggyria*); datiscetin comes from bastard hemp (*Datisca cannabina L.*).

Dyer’s sumac (*Cotinus coggyria L.*) is a shrub that grows to more than 15 feet in height and can be recognized by its ovoid, long-stemmed leaves. In late summer large fructescences envelop the shrub like a wig, thus its popular name, wig shrub. These fructescences, which can grow to 12 inches in diameter, consist of numerous threadlike, feathered fruit stems, but only a few bare small fruits.

The wig shrub prefers sunny slopes; it is found in Mediterranean coastal areas, and in the eastern Black Sea and Caspian Sea regions. The source of the dye is the heartwood, which contains the largest amount of mostin. The extract of the heartwood, with an alum mordant, produces a clear yellow dye, which becomes orange with the addition of an alkali. Neither hue is quite lightfast; after some time the colors become duller and browner.

According to Pliny the Elder, dyeer’s sumac was used in ancient times for dyeing leather yellow, and heartwood was traded. Fisetin, the characteristic dyestuff of dyeer’s sumac, has been detected in Ottoman court carpets, Mamluk carpets, and Anatolian village rugs.

Bastard hemp (*Datisca cannabina L.*) is a shrub that grows to about 6 feet in height. In form it resembles the true hemp (*Cannabis sativa*) but differs from its green-flowering relative in its yellow blossoms, small and closely packed in long branched clusters. Bastard hemp flourishes in warm moist ravines and forests, and it is found in western Anatolia, the Black Sea region, the Caucasus, the Caspian Sea region, and on the slopes of the Himalayas. The entire plant is usable for dyeing. The typical dye ingredient is datiscetin. It has been detected in Anatolian village carpets and flat weaves.

**Notes**

1. Adolf von Baeyer first synthesized indigo in 1880 and three years later formulated its structure. He received the Nobel Prize for chemistry in 1905.
5. Information provided by Dr. Reindl-Kiel, University of Bonn, to the author in 1980.
7. Harald Böhmer and Recep Karadag, "Farbanalytische Untersuchungen an Textilien aus Palmyra"; to be published by the German Archaeological Institute.
8. See note 5 above.
10. See note 7 above.
13. See note 5 above.
17. Ibid.


21. This result contradicts Schweppa's finding. He writes (in his Handbuch, p. 241, note 3 above) that alizarin is the main dye component of Oldelandia umbellata. This contradiction has not been clarified until now. Probably the roots we analyzed were not labeled with the correct scientific name.


24. Ibid., p. 102.
### Dye Analysis of Classical Indian and Persian Carpets

Recep Karadağ, Nevin Enez, and Harald Bohmer  
Laboratory for Natural Dyes  
Marmara University, Istanbul

Fourteen carpets were selected for sampling in 1996 by Nobuko Kajitani and Daniel Walker, and samples of the pile (red, yellow) and weft (red) of the Metropolitan Museum pieces were taken by Shelley Greenspan of the Museum’s Textile Conservation staff. All carpets sampled belong to The Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA) except one that belongs to the Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Vienna (MAK); one, to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (BMFA); and two, to private collectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMA 1970.121</th>
<th>Indian carpet with flower pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figs. 93, 94; cat. no. 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red pile</td>
<td>lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow pile</td>
<td>luteolin and another unidentified dye ingredient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMA 1983.494.6</th>
<th>Fragment of Indian carpet with flower pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From same carpet as fig. 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red pile</td>
<td>lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow pile</td>
<td>luteolin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMA 1970.302.7</th>
<th>Indian carpet with niche-and-millefleur pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 120; cat. no. 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red pile</td>
<td>lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow pile</td>
<td>luteolin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMA 17.1233</th>
<th>Indian hanging in the millefleur style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red weft</td>
<td>lac and another unidentified dye ingredient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow weft</td>
<td>luteolin and probably another unidentified dye ingredient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wolf Collection</th>
<th>Indian multiple-niche prayer carpet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figs. 132, 133; cat. no. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red pile</td>
<td>lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light red pile</td>
<td>lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow pile</td>
<td>luteolin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAK (Or. 349)</th>
<th>Indian carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 4, n. 166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red</td>
<td>lac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMFA 05.58  
Fragment of Indian carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animal heads  
From same carpet as fig. 60; cat. no. 16a  
red pile | lac  
yellow pile | luteolin  
red weft | alizarin (madder)  
red weft | cochineal

BMFA 1983.494.5  
Fragment of Indian carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms  
From same carpet as figs. 74, 75; cat. no. 17  
red pile | lac  
yellow pile | luteolin

MMA 17.190.857  
Indian carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms  
Fig. 54  
red pile | lac  
yellow pile | luteolin and another unidentified dye ingredient  
red weft | lac
Weksler Collection
Fragment of silk Indian carpet with flower pattern
Another fragment from same carpet: Hali 33, October 1990, p. 102 (adv.)
red pile lac
yellow pile dye ingredient not identified; it is not luteolin
light yellow pile dye ingredient not identified; it is not Luteolin

MMA 1970.302.1
Fragment of Persian (Herât) carpet with pattern of scrolling vines, blossoms, and birds
McMullan 1965, no. 13, pp. 66–67
red pile lac
yellow pile luteolin

MMA 14.40.711
Persian (Indo-Persian) carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms
Dimand and Mailey 1973, cat. no. 30, p. 70, fig. 99
red pile lac
yellow pile luteolin

MMA 30.95.228
Fragment of Persian (Indo-Persian) carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms
Dimand and Mailey 1973, cat. no. 55, p. 109
red pile lac

Appendix 2B
1a. Fragment of a carpet with pattern of fantastic animals

Northern India, probably Fatehpur Sikri, ca. 1580–85
5' x 3' 8½" (152 x 113 cm)

EX COLL.: Dr. Roden, Frankfurt (acquired in Paris); Collection Octave Homberg (sold at auction, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, June 3–5, 1931, no. 123); acquired by the Detroit Institute of Arts from the Homberg sale.

LITERATURE: Martin 1968, pp. 80, 82, fig. 192; Munich 1912, pp. 3–6, pl. 84; Bode and Kühnel 1922b, p. 29, fig. 4; Paris 1911, no. 123, p. 58, pl. 161; Cohen, "Fearful Symmetry," 1996, p. 109, fig. C

EXHIBITION: Munich 1910

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 266, 275, alternates moderately depressed
Weft: buff cotton, 23, 24, x 3 (scattered lazy lines)
Knit: wool, 21 or 22, Persian open to the left, 14 horizontal x 13 vertical (210 per square inch)

The Detroit Institute of Arts, Founders Society Purchase, Edsel B. Ford Fund (31.64)
Fig. 21, p. 34

1b. Fragment of a carpet with pattern of fantastic animals

Northern India, probably Fatehpur Sikri, ca. 1580–85
3' 5½" x 4' 2¼" (106 x 129.2 cm)

EX COLL.: Acquired by the Textile Museum in 1950 from de Hauke.


TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 266, alternates moderately depressed
Weft: light beige cotton, 24, x 3 (lazy lines)
Knit: wool, 22, Persian, 14 horizontal x 13 vertical (182 per square inch)

The Textile Museum, Washington, D.C. (R63.00.20A)
Fig. 22, p. 35

2. Carpet with pictorial design

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1590–1600
7' 11½" x 5' 7¼" (245 x 154 cm)

EX COLL.: Purchased by Frederick L. Ames in 1882 on the advice of William Morris; donated to the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, in 1893.

4. Carpet with pictorial design

Northern India, Lahore, late 16th or early 17th century
27 4" x 9'6" (83 x 280.5 cm)


TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker, N. Kajitani):
Warp: white cotton, 288, alternates very depressed
Weft: ivory cotton, 28(?)s, alternates very depressed
Knots: wool, 22, Persian open to the left, 15 horizontal x 14 vertical (210 per square inch)

Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Vienna (or 292)
Fig. 31, p. 41

5. Fragment of a carpet with pictorial design

Northern India, Fatehpur Sikri or Agra, 16th–17th century
2 10 7/8" x 2 8 1/4" (88 x 82 cm)

EX COLL.: Friedrich Sarre; acquired by the Textile Museum in 1949 from Mrs. Friedrich Sarre.


TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 268, alternates moderately depressed
Weft: light beige cotton, 24, x 3 (lazy lines)
Knots: wool, 22, Persian open to the left, 15 horizontal x 14 vertical (210 per square inch)

The Textile Museum, Washington, D.C. (863,00.13)
Fig. 36, p. 43

6. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610
25 1 1/2" x 9 1/4" (765 x 293 cm)


TECHNICAL INFORMATION (Spuhler 1987, p. 109):
Warp: white cotton, 29–115 (22), bundled
Weft: pink cotton, 24, x 3
Knot: wool, 23, Persian, 145 per square inch

Museum für Islamische Kunst, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin–Preussischer Kulturbesitz (1.6/74)
Fig. 39, 40, pp. 48, 49
7a. Fragments of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1600
16’4” × 4’10” (497.8 × 147.3 cm), as assembled

EX COLL.: Dikran Kelekian, New York; Karrkin Beshir (until 1951); acquired by the Textile Museum in 1951.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 210s, 211s, alternates very depressed
Weft: pink cotton, 24, some 23, x 3 (some lazy lines)
Knot: wool, 22, 23, 24, 25. Persian open to the left, 10 horizontal x 10 vertical (100 per square inch)
Ends: bottom: plain weave (with wefts), then fringe

The Textile Museum, Washington, D.C. (863.00.2)
Fig. 41, p. 50

8. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20
19’3½” × 8’ (604 × 244 cm)

EX COLL.: Earl of Ilchester, England


TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 288, alternates very depressed
Weft: apricot (pinkish) cotton, 23, x 3
Knot: wool, 22, 23, 24, 25. Persian open to the left, 13½ horizontal x 16 vertical (216 per square inch)
Sides: ivory cotton cable (2 warps?), z-plyed; red wool overcasting

Private collection
Figs. 45, 46, pp. 52, 53

7b. Fragment of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1600
5’8½” × 3’4½” (174 × 99.7 cm)


CONDITION: This fragment is itself pieced.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, z multistrand (more than 4) s
Weft: pinkish beige cotton, 23, 24, x 3
Knot: wool, 23, 24. Persian open to the left, 10 horizontal x 10 vertical (100 per square inch)

Collection Howard Hodgkin, London
Fig. 43, p. 51

9. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20
6’5½” × 4’6” (197 × 137 cm)

EX COLL.: Acquired by Mr. Kawakatsu Kenichi in 1934 from an auction at the Kyoto Art Club (said to come from a Kyoto merchant house); acquired by the Toyama Memorial Museum from Mr. Kawakatsu on April 4, 1969.


TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, 265, alternates depressed
Weft: light brown cotton, 23, x 3
Knot: wool, 22, 23, 24, Persian open to the left, 12 horizontal x 14 vertical (168 per square inch)
Sides: 2 cords of one warp each held by weft-wrapping, overcasting in red wool
Ends: warp twining in red silk (also trace of green) over doubled-back carpet ends; added fringe

The Toyama Memorial Museum, Saitama, Japan (no. 14)
Fig. 47, p. 54

7c. Fragments of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1600
4’8” × 3’2½” (142.2 × 97.5 cm)

EX COLL.: Acquired by Howard Hodgkin in 1977 at auction.

CONDITION: This fragment is itself pieced (the main border is original to the field).

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, 288, alternates depressed
Weft: pink, dull orange or beige cotton, x 3
Knot: 10 horizontal x 12 vertical (120 per square inch)

Collection Howard Hodgkin, London
Fig. 44, p. 51

10. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animals

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30
13’1” × 6’1¼” (403.5 × 191.2 cm)
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11. Medallion carpet

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30
23'1" x 15'11" (706 x 235 cm)

Ex coll.: Acquired by Calouste Gulbenkian in 1921 from the Spanish Art Gallery, London.

Literature: Walker 1982, pp. 255–56; fig. 8; Lisbon, Tapetes, 1985, no. 16

Exhibition: Lisbon, Tapetes, 1985

Technical information (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 26s, alternates moderately depressed
Weft: apricot cotton, 23, 24, x 3
Knot: wool, 22, 23, 24, Persian open to the left, 10½ horizontal x 12 vertical (116 per square inch)
Sides: two cables of warps held by wefts

Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon (T 62)

Figs. 56, 57, pp. 62, 63

12. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30
12' x 5'10" (366 x 178 cm)

Ex colls.: Parish Watson and Co.; Mr. and Mrs. Edsel B. Ford, Detroit; donated to the Detroit Institute of Arts in 1929.

Literature: Ellis, “Indian Carpets,” 1965, p. 13, fig. 4; Gans-Ruedin 1984, p. 128

13. Medallion carpet

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30
6'9" x 4'3½" (206 x 136 cm)


Exhibition: Osaka 1994

Technical information, results tentative (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, probably 26 or 27, alternates depressed
Weft: pink cotton, 22, 23, x 3
Knot: wool, 22, 23, 24, Persian open to the left, 11 horizontal x 10 vertical (110 per square inch)

Gion Matsuri Tsuki-boko Preservation Association, Kyoto

Fig. 59, p. 65

14. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms, known as the Girdler's carpet

Northern India, Lahore, 1630–32
24'7¼" x 7'6" (732 x 229 cm)


Exhibition: London 1947–48

Technical information (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 295, 275, alternates moderately depressed
15. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms

Northern India, Lahore, second quarter of the 17th century
6'8" x 4'5" (203 x 135 cm)

EX COLL.: Senator William A. Clark; bequeathed to the Corcoran Gallery of Art in 1926.

LITERATURE: Corcoran 1921, p. 90

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, Z3, alternates very depressed
Weft: off-white (slightly reddish) cotton, usually Z4S, also Z3S, x 3
Knots: wool, Z3, Z4, occasionally Z2, Z5, Persian open to the left, 10 horizontal x 10 vertical (100 per square inch)

Fig. 64, p. 70

16a. Fragments of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animal heads

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20
A5212A: 3'10" x 2'9" (123 x 85 cm); A5212B: 3'4½" x 10½" (103 x 27.5 cm); A5212C: 3'4½" x 12½" (103 x 32.5 cm)

EX COLL.: Acquired in 1889 by the Musée des Arts Décoratifs from the Beshiktash Collection.


TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: light green (sometimes close to ivory, but no discernible stripes) silk, Z3S, alternates moderately depressed
Weft: red silk, single U, x 3 (some lazy lines)
Knots: wool, Z2, some Z3, Z4 (beige), Persian open to the left (occasional 7/9), 21 horizontal x 23 vertical (483 per square inch)

NOTE: Undyed beige pile fiber in another field fragment (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 03,58) has been identified as camel’s hair (see Appendix 1).

Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (A5212A, A5212B, A5212C)
Fig. 66, pp. 72–73

16b. Border fragment of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animal heads

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20
2'7½" x 12½" (80 x 32 cm)

EX COLL.: Acquired by the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, in 1899 from F. R. Martin.

LITERATURE: Martin 1908, pp. 27, 38, fig. 90; Pope 1935–39, pp. 2359–61, pl. 1212B

TECHNICAL INFORMATION, another border fragment from the same carpet, Burrell Collection, Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum, inv. no. 9/23

(D. Walker):
Warp: yellow (greenish; greener in places, but distinct stripes not discerned) silk, Z2S, alternates very depressed
Weft: red silk, single U, x 3
Knots: wool, Z2, Persian open to the left, 21 horizontal x 22 vertical (462 per square inch)
Sides: at top right edge wefts seem to wrap around single warp; no cable and no visible overcasting

NOTE: Fragment is probably from right side of carpet.

Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (NMK 153/1899)
Fig. 67, p. 73

16c. Border fragment of a carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and animal heads

Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20
A5212D: 2'7½" x 7½" (80 x 20 cm)

EX COLL.: Acquired in 1889 by the Musée des Arts Décoratifs from the Beshiktash Collection.

Checklist of the Exhibition

17. Fragmentary pashmina carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–75
1½" x 4' 1½" (570 x 125 cm)

Ex coll.: Purchased in 1928 by Calouste Gulbenkian from M. Kahyaian, London.


Technical Information (D. Walker):
 warp: ivory, red, green silk, in bands, 225, alternates moderately depressed
 weft: red silk, single u, x 3
 knots: pashmina wool, 23, 24, Persian open to the left, 32 horizontal x 24 vertical (768 per square inch)
 ends: plain-weave band using wefts, then fringe

Note: Fragment is the left half of the carpet.

Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon (172)

Figs. 74, 75, pp. 78, 79

18. Fragments of a pashmina carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650
1' 1½" x 2' 6½" (390 x 78.1 cm), as assembled

Ex coll.: Benjamin Altman, New York

Literature: Dimand and Mailey 1973, no. 64, pp. 131–32

Technical Information (D. Walker, N. Kajitani):
warp: ivory, red, light green silk, 225
weft: red silk, 54, some 54, x 3

Knot: wool, 24, 25, Persian open to the left, 26 horizontal x 26 vertical (676 per square inch)

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Bequest of Benjamin Altman, 1913 (14.40.719)
Figs. 78, 79, pp. 82, 83

19. Pashmina carpet with niche-and-flower design

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–40
5' 2½" x 3' 4½" (157 x 102 cm)

Ex coll.: F. Engel-Gros (sold at auction, Galeries Georges Petit, Paris, May 30–June 1, 1921, lot 295); acquired by the Paravicini Collection, Cairo, at the Engel-Gros sale; sold in 1961 at auction in Paris to present owner.


Exhibitions: London, Indian Heritage, 1982; Los Angeles, Taj Mahal, 1989–91

warp: ivory silk, 225, alternates very depressed
weft: red silk, 32 or 22, x 3
knots: pashmina wool, 23, 24, Persian open to the left, 43 horizontal x 45½ vertical (1,056 per square inch)
sides: 3 cord singles, red pashmina overcasting
ends: bottom: light yellow plain-weave band

Private collection

Fig. 88, p. 91

20. Carpet with niche-and-flower design

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–40
5' 1½" x 3' 4½" (155 x 102.8 cm)

Ex coll.: Charles Yerkes; Elbert Gary (sold, American Art Association, Anderson Galleries, New York, December 7–8, 1914, lot 401); purchased by Dikran Kelekian, New York, at the Gary sale; Joseph V. McMullan, New York.


Exhibitions: Chicago 1947; New York 1964;
21. *Pashmina carpet with niche-and-flower design*

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1690–40
4'1" x 2'11½" (124.5 x 90 cm)

**EX COLL.**: Edouard Aynard, Lyons


**CONDITION**: Slightly reduced in length; side borders missing

**TECHNICAL INFORMATION** (Beattie, *Thyssen-Bornemisza*, 1972, no. IX):

*Warp*: Ivory, white, golden yellow, and blue silk, in stripes, 22s, alternates depressed

*Weft*: Crimson silk, u. x 3

*Knot*: Pashmina wool, 26, Persian open to the left, 35 horizontal x 31 vertical (1.085 per square inch)

*Carmen Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection* on loan to Fundación Colección Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid († 96)

**Fig. 92, p. 94**

22. *Carpet with flower pattern*

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650
14' x 8'7" (426.7 x 260.6 cm)

**PROVENANCE**: Acquired in 1656 in Lahore by Maharaja Jai Singh I of Amber.

**EX COLL.**: Maharaja of Jaipur; Hagop Kevorkian (sold at auction, Sotheby's, London, September 11, 1970, part II, no. 8); purchased by The Metropolitan Museum of Art at the Kevorkian sale.


**EXHIBITION**: New York 1966

**TECHNICAL INFORMATION** (D. Walker, N. Kajitani):

*Warp*: Ivory cotton, 28s, alternates depressed

*Weft*: Light brown (pinkish) cotton, 23s, 24s, x 3

*Knot*: Wool, 22, 23, 24, 25, Persian open to the left, 11 horizontal x 13 vertical (1.415 per square inch)

*Side*: 2 warps weft-wrapped, red silk overcasting

*End*: Bottom end still has warp fringe in loops; these have twisted into groups of 2–12 warps.


**Fig. 93, 94, pp. 96, 97**

23. *Carpet with flower pattern*

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650
7'10½" x 5'5¾" (240 x 167 cm)

**PROVENANCE**: Probably acquired by Maharaja Jai Singh I (*† 1622–68*) of Amber.

**EX COLL.**: Maharaja of Jaipur (transferred to Jaipur from Amber in 1924); Vigo Gallery, London

**LITERATURE**: Campbell 1929, no. 19

European private collection

**Fig. 95, p. 98**

24. *Circular carpet with flower pattern*

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650
12'10½" x 13'7¼" (392 x 414.6 cm)

**PROVENANCE**: Acquired in 1655 by Maharaja Jai Singh I of Amber.

**EX COLL.**: Maharaja of Jaipur; donated to the Government Central Museum of Jaipur in 1949.

**LITERATURE**: Martin 1908, pp. 100–101, fig. 247; Campbell 1929, no. 154; London 1950, no. 997, p. 212, pl. 65; K. Erdmann 1960, pp. 112–13, pl. 6

**EXHIBITION**: London 1947–48

**TECHNICAL INFORMATION** (D. Walker):

*Warp*: Ivory cotton, 27s, alternates depressed

**Fig. 97, p. 98**
25. Shaped carpet with flower pattern

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650
14’8” x 8’5”; other end: 6’8½” (447 x 256.5 cm; other end: 204.5 cm)

PROVENANCE: Probably acquired by Maharaja Jai Singh I (r. 1622–68) of Amber.

EX COLLS.: Maharaja of Jaipur; Mrs. Audrey Emery, Cincinnati; donated to the Cincinnati Art Museum in 1952.


EXHIBITIONS: Cincinnati 1985; Los Angeles, Taj Mabel 1989–91

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 255, 265, 275, alternates moderately depressed
Weft: #1 and #1 beige cotton, 22; #2 beige cotton, 22, or red silk, u, x 3
Knot: wool, 22 or 23, Persian open to the left, 11 horizontal x 15 vertical (165 per square inch)
Sides: overcasting of 22, 23 red wool; in arch: plain weave, no overcasting
Ends: warp fringe

NOTE: Woven with design sideways on the loom.
Cincinnati Art Museum, Gift of Mrs. Audrey Emery (1952.201)
Fig. 101, p. 104

26. Pashmina carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650
9’10” x 4’1” (300 x 124.5 cm)

CONDITION: Reduced in length.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION, fragment from same carpet, private collection (N. Kajitani):
Warp: green, white, red silk, 225, alternates moderately depressed
Weft: red silk, u, x 3

Knot: pashmina wool, Persian knot open to the left, 20 horizontal x 24 vertical (304 per square inch)

Private collection
Fig. 104, frontispiece, p. 106

27. Fragment of a pashmina carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1690
4’8” x 2’11” (142 x 89 cm)

EX COLL.: George Salting, London; donated to the Victoria and Albert Museum in 1910.


TECHNICAL INFORMATION (Eilard 1979, p. 134, no. 109):
Warp: red, green, white silk, in stripes, 2 strands, alternates depressed
Weft: red silk, x 3
Knot: wool, 225, Persian open to the left, 23 horizontal x 26 vertical (598 per square inch)

Trustees of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (t. 409–1910)
Fig. 105, p. 107, not exhibited

28. Pashmina carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650
9’10” x 4’1” (300 x 124.5 cm)

PROVENANCE: Probably acquired by Maharaja Jai Singh I (r. 1622–68) of Amber.

EX COLL.: Maharaja of Jaipur; donated to the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Jaipur, in 1961.

LITERATURE: Campbell 1929, no. 60; Walker 1982, pp. 256–57, fig. 12; Gans-Ruedin 1984, pp. 104–5

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):
Warp: red and ivory silk in stripes, 235, alternates depressed
Weft: red silk, u, x 3

Knot: pashmina wool, 23, some 22, 24, Persian open to the left, 20 horizontal x 23 vertical (460 per square inch)
31. Fragment of a pashmina carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650
10'6" x 4'7" (320 x 140 cm)

EX COLL.: Acquired by Calouste Gulbenkian in 1922 from Georges Demotte, Paris.

LITERATURE: Lisbon, Reserves, 1985, no. 22.

EXHIBITION: Lisbon, Reserves, 1985

CONDITION: This piece is made up of fragments.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (D. Walker):

Warp: ivory, red, green silk, 225, alternates moderately depressed

Weft: red silk, 1 x 3

Knits: pashmina wool, 24, 25, Persian open to the left, 25 horizontal x 26 vertical (650 per square inch)

Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon (760)
Fig. 113, p. 115

32. Carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, second half of the 17th century
15'3" x 14'4" (464.8 x 448.9 cm)

EX COLLS.: French and Co., New York (as of 1947); acquired by present owner at auction, Sotheby's, New York, April 10-11, 1981, lot 516.


EXHIBITION: Chicago 1947

CONDITION: Reduced in length.

Private collection

Fig. 114, p. 116

33. Durbar carpet with medallion design

The Deccan, second half of the 17th century
52'4" x 10'8" (1596 x 325 cm)

EX COLLS.: Hagop Kevorkian, New York (sold at auction, Sotheby's, December 11, 1970, lot 11); purchased by John Hewett, London, from the Kevorkian sale; sold to a private collection; subsequently acquired by present owner.

34. **Pashmina carpet with millefleur pattern**

Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, second half of the 17th century

6'10½" x 4'10" (210 x 147.3 cm)

**EX COLLS.**: Henry Marquand (sold at auction, American Art Association, New York, January 23, 1903, lot 1284); French and Co., New York; G. Farrow.

**LITERATURE**: New York 1903, lot 1284; Leeds 1964, no. 39; London, *Indian Heritage*, 1982, no. 204. p. 76


**TECHNICAL INFORMATION** (Leeds 1964, no. 39);

*Warp*: ivory, red, yellow, green silk, in stripes, 2(?)s, alternates depressed

*Weft*: red silk, 22, x 3

*Knot*: pashmina wool, 25, Persian, 26½ horizontal x 25½ vertical (675 per square inch)

*Sides*: red silk overcasting

*Ends*: top: plain-weave band using wefts; bottom: plain-weave band using wefts, traces of elaborately pleated silk warp fringe

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (EA 1975.77)

Fig. 123, p. 126

35. **Pashmina carpet with niche-and-millefleur pattern**

Northern India, Kashmir, first half of the 18th century

5'1" x 3'6" (155 x 107 cm)

**EX COLLS.**: Purchased by the Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst in 1867 from the Mekhitarist Monastery, Izmir.

**LITERATURE**: Vienna 1892–93, vol. 5, part 9, p. 2; pl. lxxxiv; Martin 1908, pp. 98, 101, fig. 238; Munich 1912, no. 173, p. v, pl. 8; Bode and Kühlert 1922, p. 30, fig. 52; Sarre and Trenkwald 1926, vol. 1, p. 12, pl. 37; Eiland 1979, pp. 140–41, fig. 113; Bode and Kühlert 1984, pp. 164, 166, fig. 121; Gans-Ruedin 1984, pp. 80–81; Bennett 1986, p. 17

**EXHIBITIONS**: Vienna 1891; Munich 1910

**TECHNICAL INFORMATION**, results tentative

*Warp*: ivory, yellow, red, medium blue, light blue silk, 22s, alternates moderately depressed

*Weft*: ivory silk, single u, x 3

*Knot*: pashmina wool, 22, 23, 24, Persian open to the left, 20 horizontal x 19 vertical (380 per square inch)

Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Vienna (T-1539)

Fig. 128, p. 131

36. **Pashmina carpet with niche-and-millefleur pattern**

Northern India, Kashmir, second half of the 18th century

6' 2½" x 4' (188.6 x 121.9 cm)

**EX COLLS.**: M. Bela de Rakovsky; Benguit Collection (sold at auction, American Art Association, New York, 1926, lot 73); acquired by French and Co., New York, at the Benguit sale; Joseph V. McMullan, New York.


**EXHIBITIONS**: Paris 1903; Dartmouth 1991–92

**TECHNICAL INFORMATION** (E. Stein);

*Warp*: ivory cotton, 245, alternates very depressed

*Weft*: ivory (especially at ends), some blue cotton, 22, x 3

*Knot*: pashmina wool, 23, 24, 25, Persian open to the left, 26 horizontal x 27 vertical (702 per square inch)

*Sides*: three warps held by weft-wrapping


Fig. 129, p. 132

37. **Multiple-niche prayer carpet (saph)**

The Deccan, probably Warangal, 18th century

18' 1" x 4' 7" (551.2 x 139.7 cm)


**NOTE**: Woven with design sideways on the loom.

Private collection

Figs. 130, 131, pp. 134, 135
38. Multiple-niche prayer carpet (saph)

The Deccan, probably Warangal, 18th century
16' 2" x 4' 4" (492.8 x 122 cm)

Ex coll.: Sold at auction, Sotheby’s, London, April 18, 1984, lot 210.

Literature: Cohen, “Textiles,” 1986, pp. 120, 122, fig. 6

Condition: The carpet is incomplete.

Technical Information (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, 24s, alternates slightly depressed
Weft: white, some off-white, light brown cotton, 22, x 3
Knot: wool, 22, Persian open to the left, 8 horizontal x 8 vertical (64 per square inch)
Sides: cable of 3 unplied warps, held by weft-wrapping; overcast in white/off-white cotton

Note: Woven with design sideways on the loom.

The Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf Collection, New York
Fig. 132, 133, pp. 136, 137

39. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms

The Deccan, ca. 1770
5' 9" x 4' 4 1/4" (175 x 134 cm)

Provenance: Purchased by the Kanko-boko Association in 1773.

Literature: Kajitani and Yoshida 1992, no. 17x, pp. 60–61; Walker 1992, p. 179

Condition: Carpet cut into halves for display on float during Gion procession.

Technical Information, results tentative (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, 24(?), alternates moderately depressed
Weft: light brown cotton, 22(?), x 3
Knot: wool, 22, Persian open to the left, 7 1/2 horizontal x 7 vertical (52 per square inch)

Gion Matsuri Kanko-boko Preservation Association, Kyoto
Fig. 135, p. 139

40. Carpet with pattern of lattice and flowers

The Deccan, ca. 1750 or earlier
10' 5 1/2" x 4' 2" (319 x 127 cm)

Provenance: Acquired and repaired by the Kita-Kannon-yama Association in August 1752.


Technical Information, results tentative (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, 24s, alternates not depressed
Weft: medium brown cotton, 52, x 3
Knot: wool, 22, Persian open to the left, 4 horizontal x 5 vertical (20 per square inch)
Sides: cord held by weft-wrapping, overcast with red wool

Gion Matsuri Kita-Kannon-yama Preservation Association, Kyoto
Fig. 136, p. 140

41. Carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms

The Deccan, late 18th century
7' 11 1/4" x 4' 1 1/4" (243 x 126 cm)

Provenance: Acquired by the Minami-Kannon-yama Association prior to 1814.


Technical Information, results tentative (D. Walker):
Warp: white cotton, 275, 28s, alternates moderately depressed
Weft: blue cotton, 25 or 26, x 3
Knot: wool, 22, Persian open to the left, 6 horizontal x 8 vertical (48 per square inch)

Gion Matsuri Minami-Kannon-yama Preservation Association, Kyoto
Fig. 137, p. 141

42. Carpet with pattern of scrolling vines and blossoms

The Deccan, ca. 1690
18' 4" x 6' 10" (559 x 208 cm)


Technical Information (D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 275, alternates very deppressed
Weft: buff cotton, 25 or 24, x 3
Knot: wool, 22, Persian open to the left, 8 horizontal x 8 vertical (64 per square inch)
Ends: top: plain-weave band, warp fringe; bottom: plain-weave band, warp fringe in uncut loops
43. Fragment of a silk carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms

The Deccan, probably Hyderabad, late 17th or early 18th century
6' 2\(\frac{3}{4}\)" x 4' 3" (190 x 130 cm)

EX COLLS.: Julius Orendi, Vienna; John Eskenazi, Milan (25 of 1982).


EXHIBITION: Milan 1982

CONDITION: Fragment is from lower right quarter of carpet.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION (Milan 1982, no. 35):
Warp: ivory silk, 59, alternates moderately depressed
Wefl: brown goat’s hair, 24, x 3
Knots: silk, 3 yarns, Persian open to the left, 202 per square inch

44. Silk carpet with pattern of lattice and blossoms

The Deccan, probably Warangal, dated 1192 A.H./A.D. 1778-79
6' 1\(\frac{1}{4}\)" x 3' 1\(\frac{1}{8}\)" (186 x 100 cm)

EX COLL.: Charles D. Kelekian, New York

TECHNICAL INFORMATION, results tentative
(D. Walker):
Warp: ivory cotton, 295, 215, alternates moderately depressed
Wefl: light brown (pink near bottom) cotton, 23, x 2
Knots: silk, single u, Persian open to the left, 18 horizontal x 24 vertical (432 per square inch)
Sides: single warsps, weft-wrapped, to edges
Ends: bottom: plain-weave band of pink cotton, then fringe

Cincinnati Art Museum, Gift of Beatrice Kelekian in memory of Charles Dikran Kelekian (1985-398)
Fig 144, p. 149
Notes

Introduction (pp. xv—xviii)


1: India During the Mughal Era (pp. 3–14)

7. Serjeant 1972, p. 95 n. 86.
13. A good discussion of the imperial workshops at Fatehpur Sikri may be found in New York, Akbar’s India, 1985, pp. 107–21.
15. Monserrat 1922, p. 201.
18. This is clear from later sources such as Pelsaert 1925, p. 60, and Bernier 1916, p. 234ff.
22. Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 93–94.
23. Ibid.
26. Ralph Fitch in Foster 1921, p. 18.
34. Letters Received, vol. 6 (1617: July to December), pp. 249–50.
43. Watt 1903, p. 412.
44. The Persian pieces are vase carpets or Indo-Persians. The origin of the latter is controversial but even those who argue for an Indian provenance have yet to propose Kashmir as a source.
45. Singh 1979, p. x, n. 10.
Notes


49. Campbell 1929. The report by A. J. D. Campbell is on file at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. References to “Campbell numbers” throughout this catalogue are to this report.


51. This material, differing slightly from readings contained in the Campbell report, has been utilized for the present study but is too lengthy and specialized in nature to be included in this publication. It will be incorporated in a projected catalogue raisonné of Indian carpets to be compiled by the author and others.


55. See note 27.

2: International Commerce (pp. 15–20)


6. Ibid., p. 168.

7. Ibid., pp. 215, 326.


12. Ibid., p. 351 n. 1.


16. The painting is now at Ockinton Manor, a country-house hotel. I am grateful to Michael Franses for bringing this picture to my attention.

17. “Two great Turkie work Carpets” are first referred to in a Ham House inventory of 1677; see Thornton and Tomlin 1980.

18. English Factories in India, 1642–1643, pp. 60, 63, 66.


3: Technical Characteristics (pp. 21–28)


5. Ibid., p. 1 n. 12.


9. In 1984, Nobuko Kajitani and Daniel Walker selected eight Indian and Persian carpets from the collections of their respective employers, The Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Cincinnati Art Museum, and from a private collection, for dye analysis. Samples were sent to Dr. L. Masschelein-Kleiner at the Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium, Brussels, and a report was issued by Dr. J. Wouters on April 24, 1985. The following year twenty-two Indian and Persian carpets from the Metropolitan Museum’s collection and a private collection were chosen, again by Nobuko Kajitani and the author, for dye analysis by Dr. Wouters and Won Ng, textile conservator at the Metropolitan Museum working under a Museum Travel Grant. This report was completed in October 1986. In both instances the method employed was high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC).


12. But note two Deccani exceptions with Turkish knots; see chapter 4, note 170.

4: The Carpets (pp. 29–150)

1. At least thirty-seven, if one includes the garden carpet now in the collection of the Government Central Museum of Jaipur. Most of these are carpets of the Indo-Persian class.


3. Ibid., p. 870.
4. All fifteen fragments are illustrated in color and discussed in Cohen, “Fearful Symmetry,” 1996.


10. Ibid., pp. 129–35.


13. This represents a change from the view expressed in Walker 1982, p. 256, resulting from the persuasive arguments put forth by Cohen and by Stuart Cary Welch in New York 1964, p. 185, and in New York, India, 1985, pp. 159–60.

14. For another version, see the Dyson-Perrins Khamu of Nizami, British Library, London, inv. no. 08.12208, fol. 82a, signed by ‘Abd al-Šamad; published in H. 1924, pl. XXXVII. A close, later version is in the Chester Beatty Anthurus, about 1604; published in Arnold 1936, vol. 2, pl. 25.


16. Codrington 1931, pl. 110. A variation on this, featuring the fantastic bird and elephants, is found in a similar table in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London; see Codrington 1931, pl. 111.

17. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, inv. no. 25.51, published in Comaraswamy 1930, no. CXXXVI, pl. LXIII.


23. Numerous paintings from the Hmzanã show a simplified version of this pattern; see Hmzanã 1747, vol. 1, pls. 20, 118, 121, 133, 145.

24. Inv. no. 865.001.1.


27. (1) Textile Museum, Washington, D.C., inv. no. 865.001.1; (2, 3) Collection of Howard Hodgkin, London (2 fragments); (4) Private collection, Paris (2 fragments); (6) Whor Collection, Switzerland, no. 14685; (7) Brooklyn Museum, New York, inv. no. 45.66.4; (8, 9) Calico Museum of Textiles, Ahmedabad, inv. no. 2753; 2762; (10–15) Jaipur Collection, Campbell nos. 98, 108, 111, 112, 113.

28. For a painting by ‘Abd al-Šamad of about 1850, and references to a later version by Nana of 1608–9 and to the Persian painting by Hizlud of about 1725, which was in Akbar’s collection and served as a model for the Indian paintings, see New York, Akbar’s India, 1985, no. 58, pp. 92, 93, 151. Fighting camels are also depicted in an unpublished Indian painting in the Calico Museum, Ahmedabad (no. 2753), and in a badly damaged Persian fragment of the Sanguszko class in Berlin; see Pope 1938–39, vol. 6, pl. 1215.


30. A number of leaves of the Dyson-Perrins Khamu of Nizami, British Library, London, inv. no. Or. 12208, have margins incorporating lions or tigers directly facing the viewer.

31. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Orientabteilung, Lihr i patkuri 227, fol. 22b.


33. Kestner Museum, Hannover, inv. no. 5422; published in H. 1966, no. 57. A related pattern is found on a Mughal tile; see London, Indian Heritage, 1982, no. 5.


35. Campbell no. 28.

36. Formerly in the Jaipur Collection, Campbell no. 128.


40. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. no. 17.190.877 (figures 34 and 35), has a similar field pattern of repeating units of palmettes and diagonal segmented leaves, as does a piece in Coimbra in the Museu Machado da Castro (inv. no. unknown). Both of these carpets have interlocking-compartment borders based on the Herat type. For a border in a Lahore carpet similar to the Kinghorn’s, see London, Berneker, 1996, lot 2.

41. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, inv. no. 05.38, unpublished.
43. Inv. no. 5428; published in H. Erdmann 1966, no. 4.
44. H. Erdmann 1982, pp. 224, 237 n. 5.
46. Thompson 1991, pp. 166–8; Martin 1908, pp. 35, 38, fig. 89.
48. For the “talking tree,” see Grabar and Blair 1980, no. 38, pp. 132–33; for Zaqqum, see *Miʿrājnāma* 1977, pl. 45.
52. Briggs 1940.
54. Campbell nos. 163, 209.
55. This development was recognized by Robert Skelton in Skelton 1972.
57. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 145.
58. The tulip was published in New York, *India*, 1985, no. 145; the iris, in Godard 1937, pp. 273–74, fig. 113; the narcissus is unpublished.
60. For example, the leuconium; see Rich 1987.
61. The very damaged piece in the Textile Museum, Washington, D.C. (inv. no. 863.00.22), illustrated in figure 7, is slightly finer with almost 2100 knots per square inch.
62. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, inv. no. 08.3884ab.
63. The Boston Museum of Fine Arts fragment is inv. no. 04.111; unpublished. The Washington fragments are discussed in Ellis, “Compartment,” 1965, pp. 43–47, figs. 1, 2.
64. Beattie, *Thyson-Bonnemaison*, 1972, pp. 67–68. Since this rug was woven upright on the loom, if it was a sepah or qanat it was probably made up of joined pieces. Otherwise, it would have been made with its design sideways on the loom, like the sepahs discussed on p. 120ff.
65. Ibid., p. 68.
66. For a painting in Berlin showing the emperor Jahāngir at prayer in a mosque, see *Hali* 68 (April–May 1993), p. 121 (“Album Leaves”).
71. Campbell no. 162.
72. Campbell no. 19.
73. Campbell nos. 165 and 166, 158 and 164.
74. Dimand 1977, pp. 278–79.
75. Inv. no. 84.119; unpublished.
76. Campbell no. 67.
78. Campbell nos. 160, 163.
79. Campbell no. 42.
80. Campbell no. 161, purchased in 1656, along with others.
82. Ellis 1982, p. 211; see also Dimand 1977, pp. 274–77.
83. Fragments are widely dispersed and include seven pieces in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London; five pieces in the Museum für Islamische Kunst, Berlin; five fragments in the Textile Museum, Washington, D.C.; one piece in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; and at least two fragments in private collections.
84. Ellis 1982, p. 231.
85. London, *Islamic Art*, 1996, lot 313; one portion was previously published by Irwin 1956, p. 155.
86. Inv. nos. 863.00.11A and B.
87. Campbell no. 154.
88. Calico Museum, Ahmadabad, inv. no. 2767; Campbell no. 22.
90. The Cincinnati piece was in Jaipur in 1905 when Hendley’s volume on the Jaipur carpets was published but was gone by the time of Campbell’s visit.
92. Campbell no. 127.
93. Campbell no. 159.
94. See especially Thompson 1985; Sahai 1984–85.
95. City Palace Museum, Jaipur, inv. no. c-12; Campbell no. 25.
96. Thompson 1989, p. 51. Another pavilion-like tent from Jodhpur was illustrated in New York, India, 1985, no. 165.
97. One fragment belongs to the City of Bristol Museum and Art Gallery, inv. no. Or. 1977-09-04; published in London, Eastern Carpet, 1983, no. 84, p. 107. The second fragment, unpublished, is in a private collection. A border fragment belonging to the Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Vienna, may also come from this carpet; published Sarre and Trenkwald 1926–29, vol. 1, pl. 38.
98. See Gans-Ruedin 1984, pp. 144–53; for a color illustration of the field fragment; see Martin 1988, p. 92, fig. 221, for a view with border attached.
99. Martin (1908, pp. 92, 97) says yes; K. Erdmann, in Hamburg 1950, no. 111, says no; the author has not examined the Düsseldorf fragments.
100. Smart 1987, nos. 11–18.
101. Campbell nos. 147, 148, 184.
102. A full view of the Victoria and Albert fragment was published in Walker 1982, p. 235, fig. 5. The Keir Collection piece is published in Spuhler 1978, no. 61. The fragment in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (inv. no. M 70.37) is unpublished.
103. See note 128 for the Wher Collection rug.
105. For a discussion of this carpet, further references, and an illustration of one large fragment, see Cincinnati 1985, no. 69, pp. 86–87.
108. I am grateful to Dr. Sussan Balai for sharing her excellent photographs of the Chihil Sutun paintings. For a carpet of this type, see London, Eastern Carpet, 1983, no. 86.
109. Campbell nos. 1, 3, 6, 10.
110. Campbell nos. 5, 6.
111. Government Central Museum of Jaipur, inv. no. 2225, published in Dimand 1940, fig. 2.
112. Campbell nos. 9, 10.
113. The first pair is Campbell no. 1 and no. 2. The second pair, Campbell no. 3 and no. 4, is now in the City Palace Museum (inv. nos. c-10 and c-11).
114. Calico Museum inv. nos. 2747, 2748, 2749.
115. Calico Museum inv. no. 2747; Campbell no. 27.
117. See, for example, the carpet in New York 1982, lot 192.
118. The second piece is in the collection of the Association pour l’Étude et la Documentation des Textiles d’Asie, Paris, inv. no. 150; published in Okada et al. 1995, pl. 8.
121. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. nos. 44.70 and 14.40.7144, actually from the same carpet; published in Dimand and Mailey 1973, pp. 126–27, figs. 141, 142.
123. Inv. no. 863.00.21, published in Walker 1982, p. 236, fig. 7.
124. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 67.267 has cotton warps and wefts but pashmina pile; see Appendix 1.
125. The rug illustrated in figure 125 and the one cited in note 127 all feature blue cotton wefts. Several rugs in Kyoto, datable to the eighteenth or early nineteenth century by virtue of local inventory records, also have blue cotton wefts; see Kajitani and Yoshida 1992, nos. 22 and 24–27. The latter are contemporaneous with the third group of millefleur rugs but represent the work of a different production center.
129. Cohen, “Ten Thousand,” 1996, p. 75, fig. 2; see also figure 114 in the present text.
130. For an image of the complete painting, see London, Indian Heritage, 1982, no. 103.
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133. A rug in the Budapest Museum of Applied Art may also be early, but it has not been examined by the author; Gombos 1985, no. 110, p. 94.


135. Harris 1908, pp. 7–8, 64.


138. Note, for example, the border “palmettes” of a carpet formerly in the Getty Collection, published in New York 1990, lot 3.

139. Published in Hab 70 (August–September 1993), p. 59 (advertisement).


142. Andrews 1905–6, second Hyderabad plate.


144. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, inv. no. 1M 148-1924; information from Victoria and Albert Museum files, courtesy Rosemary Crill.


149. Ibid., no. 23, pp. 62–63.

150. Ibid., no. 22, p. 62.

151. Campbell nos. 74, 91, 117, 126, 135, 138, 189, 190.


153. Ibid., no. 33, p. 69.


156. Two Indo-Persian carpets seen in 1986 on the float of the Hoka-boko Preservation Association had been replaced by 1990 with copies.


158. Ibid., no. 14, pp. 58–59.


161. See notes 155 and 156.


163. These pieces, viewed in 1986, are unpublished.

164. The author is extremely grateful to Kojira Yoshida for providing this information.

165. July 8, 1918, lot 150; March 29, 1920, lot 169; and April 4, 1929, lot 273, all sales at the Kyoto Art Club.

166. Inv. no. 08 349; published Sarre and Trenkwald 1926–29, vol. 1, pl. 34.

167. Ydema 1991, pp. 92, 93, 104; figs. 97, 98, 107.


171. See note 151.


177. For one fragment, see New York 1994, lot 50.
Technical

Note: The following technical notations and definitions are, with a few changes, those found in May Beattie, *Carpets of Central Persia*, Kent, 1976, pp. 29–30. Terms are given in the order found in the weaving process and are keyed especially to the technical information given for most items in the Checklist of the Exhibition.

**z or s** The direction of the twist (spin) of a single strand of yarn, when viewed vertically, conforms either to the diagonal of the letter Z or to that of the letter S. The same symbols are used for the direction of two or more strands of yarn when twisted together (plied). In a plied yarn, the direction is usually opposite to that of the spin.

**spin** see above

**ply** see above

**z2 or s2** Two strands of z-spun yarn or of s-spun yarn used together without plying.

**z2z** 2-spun yarn, two strands of which are s-plied, and by analogy z2s, s4z, etc.

**U** Yarn, apparently unspun, or in which the direction is undetermined. This is not unusual in silk.

**foundation** The basis, or groundwork, of a carpet formed of a plain weave of warps, to which knots are attached, and wefts that hold them in position. It determines the strength of a carpet.

**warp** Yarns, frequently tightly spun and plied for strength, that extend from end to end of the carpet and around which the knots are tied. The cut ends usually form the fringes at the ends of a carpet. Warps may lie in one plane or two; in the latter case, alternate warps are described as depressed.

**weft** Yarns which are passed from side to side of a carpet between rows of knots. They are usually loosely spun and unplied or only lightly plied.

**lazy line** A diagonal line formed by a series of weft returns defining a discrete area of knotting, whereby the weaver, especially one working alone, will not have to shift to left or right so often to insert wefts and apply knots to the carpet's full width.

**x 3 etc.** The number of plain-weave weft passes after each row of knots.

**knots** As used in carpet literature, the term “knot” denotes the interlacement around the warps of yarn, which forms the pile of the rug. Because the ends are not knotted about each other and drawn tight as in a true knot, the term is a misnomer. The asymmetrical (Persian, Senna) knot open to the left is the one commonly found in great Persian and Indian carpets of the classical period. When tied over four warps, instead of two, it is known as the *jufti* (paired) or false knot, the latter name derived from the fact that, in total, the rug requires less yarn, and in consequence the pile lacks density and wears poorly. See figs. 14 and 15.

**jufti knots** see knots

**knot count** The number of knots per linear inch (2.5 cm) transversely, multiplied by the number per linear inch longitudinally, gives the count per square inch. Where the metric system is in use the linear count is based on the decimeter (10 cm or 4 in.).

**pile** The soft velvety surface of a carpet formed by the projecting knot yarn.

General

**brocading** Specifically, discontinuous supplementary wefts introduced in specific areas to produce a special effect or pattern. Unlike embroidery, brocading is incorporated during the weaving process while the textile or carpet is still on the loom.
Glossary

Idiomatically, the term is used to refer to all types of elaborate, fancy textiles.
millefleur
A pattern consisting of many clusters of small blossoms sometimes arranged in pattern repeats. The pattern is characteristic of one group of Indian carpets woven primarily during the eighteenth century.
dhurrie
An Indian tapestry-woven carpet made of cotton.
pashmina
Fine wool, made from the undercoat of Himalayan mountain goats; used for luxury production of shawls and carpets.
drawloom
A loom for weaving figured textiles, equipped with pattern heddles that make possible the regular repetition of the pattern.
pietra dura
Inlay of hard or semiprecious stones.
durbar
An audience hall or court of a ruler; a formal royal audience. The term is applied to particularly large Indian carpets (see p. 186f).
carpets
Polonaise
Sumptuous silk (and cotton) carpets, sometimes with silver and gold brocading, made in Iran from the end of the sixteenth to the second half of the seventeenth century. The name is a misnomer based on the incorrect identification of these carpets in the nineteenth century as Polish.
farrāshkhāna
Literally “carpet house”: the storehouse for carpets, tents, and furnishing (non-costume) textiles.
ganat
A wall or screen of canvas or cloth, used to form an enclosure around a tent.
flat weave
A kilim or similar carpet or fabric without pile.
Sanguszko
A small group of Persian carpets of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century distinguished by figural decoration and a bright appearance owing to brilliant colors and, in some instances, a white ground. The type is named after a previous owner of the best-known example.

Herāt
A type of Persian carpet made in the second half of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century and named for the Persian city of Herat. The field pattern most often consists of scrolling vines with palmettes and leaves, sometimes with animals or birds superimposed. Most examples have a red field and dark green border, and the finest pieces have silk foundations.
carpets

Indo-Persian
The commercially produced successor to the Herāt type, made throughout the seventeenth century in Iran. Normally woven with wool pile on cotton foundations, Indo-Persian carpets often have simplified versions of Herāt designs. The name results from confusion about their origins.
carpets

karkāhana
Workshop
spandrel
In architecture, the space above the sloping sides of an arch. In carpets, the triangular space above the sloping sides of a niche, as in a prayer rug.

Kāshān
A group of fine silk pile carpets of the sixteenth century, generally attributed to the Persian city of Kāshān. Several large pieces with medallions and figural designs range in date from about 1540 to late in the century. More numerous pieces in a small format, dating from the second half of the century, feature figural patterns or medallion and floral designs.
carpets
ten-sur-ton
The coloristic effect created by juxtaposing shades of the same color or similar colors, as in pink and red, ochre and beige, etc.
vase carpets
A confusing term applied to a group of Persian carpets, mostly from the seventeenth century, often with floral lattice patterns and sometimes incorporating conspicuous vases. True members of the group have a distinctive construction featuring three weft shoots of wool and silk or cotton. The type is generally attributed to Kirman.
kilim
A tapestry-woven carpet, usually made of wool.

hiābkhāna
Library, or center for the production and collection of books.
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Artistic experiments of, 6, 12
artistic patronage of, 6, 29, 37–38
carpet weaving under, 6–8, 29–31, 33, 76, 118
carpet workshops of, 29–31
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depiction of, fig. 4
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Bird-head motif, 74
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carpet making: under AKBAR, 6–8 under Aurangzeb, 14 under Jahangir, 29–31, 52 under Shah Jahan, 11, 12, 33, 80, 81, 86, 121

carpets (general): European copies of Oriental carpets, 68, 158 function of, in India vs. in Europe, 118–19 history of use of, in India, 5 imported, 7 structure of, 14 technical studies of, 21

See also Indian carpets; Persian carpets

carpets (specific): circular, with flower pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, 102, 103; fig. 100; cat. no. 24 with fantastic-animals pattern, Northern India, prob. Fatehpur Sikri, ca. 1580–85, fragment, 5, 26, 29, 33–37, 34, 35, 52, 74, 118; figs. 21, 22; cat. nos. 12, 16 with flower pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, 15, 95, 96, 97, 98, 103; figs. 93, 94, 95; cat. nos. 22, 23 with flower pattern, pashmina pile on silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, 99, 100; fig. 96 with flower pattern, pashmina pile on silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650; fig. 101 with geometric pattern based on a. Mamluk Egyptian or Anatolian model, wool pile on cotton founda-
tion, Deccan, early 18th c., 138, 142; fig. 138 with lattice-and-blossoms pattern, Deccan, late 18th c., 68, 138, 141, 146, 147; fig. 137; cat. no. 41 with lattice-and-blossoms pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, second half of 17th c., 112, 116; fig. 114; cat. no. 32 with lattice-and-blossoms pattern, silk, Deccan, prob. Hyderabad, late 17th or early 18th c., fragment, 146, 150; fig. 145; cat. no. 43 with lattice-and-blossoms pattern, silk, Deccan, prob. Warangal, 1778–79 (1792 d.h.), 149, 150; fig. 144; cat. no. 44 with lattice-and-flowers-and-vases pattern, wool pile on cotton-and-silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, fragment, 107, 109; fig. 107 with lattice-and-flowers pattern, Deccan, ca. 1570 or earlier, 118, 140; fig. 138; cat. no. 40 with lattice-and-flowers pattern, pashmina pile on silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir, first half of 18th c., 121, 127; fig. 124 with lattice-and-flowers pattern, pashmina pile on silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–40; fig. 108 with niche-and-flower design, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–40; 90, 92, fig. 83; cat. no. 20 with niche-and-flower design, pashmina pile on silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–40; fragment, 24–25, 26, 90; fig. 10 with pictorial design, Northern India, Fatehpur Sikri or Agra, 16th–17th c., fragment, 5, 44–45, 45; fig. 36; cat. no. 43 with pictorial design, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1590–1600, 5, 38–40, 39, 40–44; figs. 20, 21; cat. nos. 2, 3 with pictorial design, Northern India, Lahore, late 16th or early 17th c., 5, 19, 40, 42, 43, 45–47, 48; figs. 31, 34; cat. no. 4 with pictorial design, wool pile on cotton, wool, and silk foundation, late 16th or early 17th c. (Iran, Sanguszko group), 40, 42; fig. 12 with scrolling-vines-and-animal-heads pattern, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1650–20; fragment, 22, 24, 27, 37, 69, 72–73, 81, 115; fig. 66; cat. no. 18a with scrolling-vines-and-animal-heads pattern, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20, fragment of border, 22, 24, 27, 37–37–77, 73, 81, 115; figs. 67, 68; cat. nos. 16b, 16c with scrolling-vines-and-animals pattern, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1600, fragment, 5, 47–48, 50, 51, 53; figs. 41, 43, 44; cat. nos. 74, 75, 76 with scrolling-vines-and-animals pattern, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610, 47–48, 48–49, 53, 54; figs. 40, 41; cat. no. 6 with scrolling-vines-and-animals pattern, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1610–20, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54; figs. 45, 46, 47; cat. nos. 8, 9 with scrolling-vines-and-animals pattern, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30; 19, 23, 26, 48, 52, 53, 57; figs. 9, 48; cat. no. 10 with scrolling-vines-and-animals pattern, wool pile on cotton foundation, Northern India, Fatehpur Sikri or Agra, ca. 1640 (Fremlin carpet), 14, 17, 48, 52, 56; fig. 49 with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, Deccan, ca. 1650, 144, 145, 146; figs. 140, 141; cat. no. 42 with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, Deccan, ca. 1770, 178–18, 139, 146; fig. 135; cat. no. 19 with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30, 64, 66; fig. 38; cat. no. 12 with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1630–42 (Girdlers’ carpet), 14, 17, 21, 25, 26, 44, 77, 66, 68–69; figs. 11, 62; cat. no. 14 with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, Northern India, Lahore, second quarter of 17th c., 67, 70, 145; fig. 64; cat. no. 15 with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, pashmina pile on silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, 81, 84, 85; figs. 80, 81 with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, wool pile on cotton foundation, Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–30, 19, 33, 57–66, 58, 59, 60, 61, 118, 146; figs. 52, 53, 54, 55 with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, wool pile on flax (or hemp) foundation, England (?), ca. 1618 or 1640 (Kinghorne carpet), 14, 19, 68–69, 71; fig. 63 shaped, with flower pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, 15, 24, 103, 104; fig. 101; cat. no. 25 shaped, with flower pattern, wool pile on cotton-and-silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, 103, 104; fig. 102
silhouetted. 44, 45, 67
Se also color mixing; shading
compartmented carpet pattern. figs. 90, 91
composite animals, 37
Corcoran Gallery of Art (Washington.
D.C.), figs. 85, 87; cat. no. 15
Coromandel Coast, trade with. 20
cotton, 21–22, 77, 135
court workshops, 6, 7, 8
Se also carpet workshops, imperial
D
The Dancing Dgg, oil on canvas (Jacob
Ochtervelt), 18, 20, 146; fig. 6
Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah, Kuwait
Museum of Islamic Art, fig. 143;
cat. no. 43
Daraki Shukh, Prince, 11
Daraki Shukh Album, 86
An Iron Plant and Butterfly from, 86, 87;
fig. 82
Darji, 8
Daulatabad, 5
David Collection (Copenhagen), fig. 51
Deccan, The, 3
carpet made in, 10, 20, 21, 22, 24, 68, 119,
123–30, 140, 150; figs. 135, 136, 171, 178,
140; cat. nos. 99, 140, 41, 42
carpet workshops in, 7, 14, 117
courts, Persian influence on, 29
durbar carpets, fig. 115; cat. no. 35
Mughal expansion into, 11, 14, 129
painting, 121
star-medallion carpet, fig. 19
weaves in, 7
Indians, 108

Dari: Herat-type carpets; Kashan-type carpets;
Khorasan carpets; medallion carpets;
mille-fleurs carpets; pashmina carpets; Persian carpets; Persian-style carpets;
Polonezce carpets; Sangukou-group carpets
workshops, 8
grades of carpet produced by, 90, 121
operations of, 27
provincial, under Aurangzeb and later, 117
Se also carpet workshops, imperial
carpet workshops, imperial (farsukhina),
6–7, 12, 29–31, 117
under Akbar, 29–31
decline of, under Aurangzeb, 117
under Shah Jaham, 12
cartoons (weaving instructions; shahm),
27, 29, 90, 104
cartouches-and-medallion design, 40, 48
cashmere, 22
Se also pashmina
Caucasian rugs, 116
Central Asia: imported materials from, 21
weaves from, 7

darab khani (Persian garden) motif, 118
Chihil Sutun (Hall of Forty Columns)
(Isfahan), 112, 117
China, carpet materials from, 21
Chinese art, influence of, on Indian art, 88
Chinese-style rugs, 116
Chingiz Khan, 1
chintzes, 129
Chitarman, Shah Jahan Nimbed in Glory,
watercolor, 1627–28, 22, 21; fig. 8
Cincinnati Art Museum, figs. 20, 101, 144;
cat. nos. 25, 44
Circular carpets, 166, 162
with flower pattern, Northern India,
Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, 102, 103;
fig. 100; cat. no. 24
City Palace Museum (Maharaja Sawai
Man Singh II Museum) (Jaipur,
India), 11, 106
Clam-Gallas carpet, 90–91, 92; fig. 91
cloth-wisp motifs, 88, 95, 105
cochlear, 24, 74
Cohen, Steven, 37
color mixing (juxtaposition of knots of
different colors), 24–26, 74, 76, 107
colors of carpets, 23–27
Europeanized use of, 26
experimental use of, 37
multicolors, 22
Persian vs. Indian, differences in use of,
68, 76
with medallion design, Deccan, second
half of 17th c., 112, 122, 123; figs. 119,
120; cat. no. 33
Dutch:
trade with India, 15, 19–20; with Japan,
57, 146
Dutch East India Company (V.O.C.,
Vereenigde Oost-Indische
Compagnie), 8, 19
Dutch carpets, carpets depicted in, 138,
140; figs. 5, 6
dyes, 23–27; Appendix 2
research on, 23–24

E
East India Company (English), 8, 15–17, 19
Egypt, 74
carpets from, 118
Egypt or Syria, basin from, fig. 69
elephants:
combat motif, 44, 67
depiction of, 76
Ellis, Charles Grant, 102, 114–16, 138
Ellore (modern Eluru, Deccan):
carpets made in, 129
carpet workshops in, 7
Emperor Jahangir: Wright Prince Khurram
(formerly Jang Bahar); The Memoirs of
Jahangir), 8, 9, 33, 47, 49, 56, 118;
figs. 2, 72
ends (carpet); structure of, 28
English, trade with India, 8, 15–19
English carpets, fig. 65
European art:
influence of, on Mughal art, 26–27, 74,
86–87, 121
motifs of, in Indian art, 121
European copies of Oriental carpets, 68,
128; fig. 65
European private collections, 80, 150;
fig. 95; cat. no. 23
export goods:
for Dutch–Japanese trade, 146
not usually a separate category, in
Indian trade, 19

F
fantastic-animal-pattern carpets, 35–38
pair of (reconstruction), fig. 24
pattern of, fig. 25
pattern units of, figs. 22, 23
Se also under carpets (specific)
fantastic animals motif, 37
farsukhina (carpet-production house),
Akbar's, 6–7
fire of 1759 in, 6, 29
fawzi-i shandari (sandalkwood-colored
rugs), 95
Fatehpur Sikri, fig. 18
Akbar's capital at, 6
carpets made in, 12, 21, 20, 37, 45–47, 57
carpet workshops in, 7, 8

Index
Index

Fatehpur Sikri (continued):
- palace complex at, 4
- stone panels carved in relief at, Persian influence on, 31
  See also Turkish sultan's house
- fibers used in Indian carpets, 21-23, 24, 69; Appendix 1
- figural imagery, rise and decline of, 52
- fine-weave carpets, 68-81
- flat-weave carpets, 7
- flax, 68
- floor cover, cotton, Deccan, probably
  Burhanpur, late 17th or early 18th c., 117, 118; fig. 116
- flower-and-niche carpet pattern, 95
- flower-bouquets-in-vases carpet pattern, 107
- flower carpets (Indian), 14, 31, 81,
  86-117
- attributions and provenance of, 113-17
- shaped, proposed configuration of, 103
  See also under carpets (specific)
- flowers, naturalistic representation of,
  86-88
- flowers-or-trees-in-rows carpet pattern,
  95-105
- flower style in Indian art, 86-88, 117, 123,
  150
- foundation (carpet), materials used for,
  21-22, 69, 77, 133
- Freer Gallery of Art (Washington, D.C.),
  figs. 69, 121
- Fremlin, William, 17-18, 48
- Fremlin carpet, 14, 17, 48, 52, 56; fig. 49
- Frick Collection (New York), figs. 96, 98
- Fringes, multicolored, 22
- structure of, 28

G

gana-simha (lion—elephant composite animal) motif, 58, 67
- garden (shahar kila) motif, 118
- Gaur (Bengal), 5
- gavel motif, 67
- geometric pattern-carpet, based on a
  Mamluk Egyptian or Anatolian
  model, wool pile on cotton foundation,
  Deccan, early 18th c., 118, 142; fig. 118
- Ghuridah, 5
- gilm, generic term for flat-weave carpets, 7
- Gion Matsuri festival, 66
- procession through the streets of
  Kyoto, fig. 60
- Gion Matsuri Kanko-boko Preservation
  Association (Kyoto, Japan), 20, 130
  fig. 132; cat. no. 39
- Collection, 138
- Gion Matsuri Kita-Kannon-yama
  Preservation Association (Kyoto,
  Japan), figs. 136, 138, 139; cat. no. 40
- Gion Matsuri Minami-Kannon-yama
  Preservation Association (Kyoto,
  Japan), fig. 117; cat. no. 41
- Gion Matsuri Tsuki-boko Preservation
  Association (Kyoto, Japan), fig. 59;
  cat. no. 13
- Girder's carpet, 14, 17, 21, 25, 26, 44, 57,
  66, 68-69; figs. 21, 64; cat. no. 14
- Girder's Company, 17, 66
- Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum, 72
- Goa, 19
- goats, Himalayan mountain (Capra hircus
  laniger), 22
- goat's wool, 21
  See also pashmina
- Golconda, 11, 14, 139
- Golestán Palace (Teheran), 86
- Government Central Museum (Jaipur),
  15; figs. 61, 100; cat. no. 24
- grape-cluster motif, 30, 67
- Great Album of Jahangir. See Jahangir
  Album
- grotesque carpets. See fantastic-animal
  pattern carpets
- grotesques, European, 17, 74
- guard stripes, 35, 146
- Gujarat:
  - carpets made in, 12, 21
  - carpet trade of, 5-6
  - sultanate, 3

H

Hall of Private Audience (Delhi), 87
- Hall of Public Audience (Agra), 11
- Ham House (Richmond, England), 19
- Hamzanama (The Book of Hamza), 5, 37,
  45
- Häfth Being Killed While He Sleeps
  from, manuscript page, 44, 44; fig. 35
- hangings, 128
- influence on carpets, 124
- millefleur style, pashmina, twill-tapestry
  weave, Northern India, Kashmir,
  ca. 1800, 128, 130; fig. 127
- Hannover, a collection in, 57
- Heckner, Abraham van der, *A Philosopher in
  His Studio*, oil on canvas, ca. 1650, 17,
  20; fig. 5
- Hemp, 68
Hendley, Colonel T. H., inventory of
  Jaipur Collection, 12, 15
- Herat (Iran), carpets possibly made in, in
  Timurid period, 74
- Herat-type carpets, 23, 26, 31, 47, 57, 67,
  81, 90, 118-19, 136
- with compartment design, pashmina
  and cotton pile on silk foundation,
  Iran, second half of 18th c.,
  fragments, 23, 90-91, 93, 103; fig. 90
  with compartment design, wool pile on
  cotton-and-wool foundation, Iran,
  last quarter of 18th c. (Clam-Gallas
  carpet), 90-91, 93; fig. 91
  with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms
  pattern, wool pile on cotton-and-silk
  foundation, Iran, first quarter of
  17th c., 57, 67, 70, 126; fig. 63
  with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms
  pattern, wool pile on cotton-and-silk
  foundation, Iran, last quarter of
  18th c., fragment, 32, 33, 47, 57, 80,
  81; figs. 20, 76
- herbas (plant books), European, Mughal
  artists' knowledge of, 86-87
- Hindu epics, illustrated copies of, 5
- Hindus:
  - literature, 5, 11
  - music, 11
  - relations with Muslims, 11, 14
  - religion of, under the Muslims, 5, 11
  - temples, 15, 17
- Hodgin, Howard, Collection, figs. 43,
  44; cat. nos. 7b, 7c
- Holbeins, large-pattern, 138
- Humaíní, 1, 101
- hunting scenes, 38; figs. 1, 51
- Huqqa base, metal, Bidar (Deccan), last
  quarter of 17th c., 117, 118; fig. 117
- Husain Naqqash, Khamsa (Quintet) of
  Amir Khusrau Dihlavi, illuminated
  roundel, Lahore, 1597-98, 26, 27; fig. 12
- Hyderabad, 80, 120; fig. 134
- carpets made in, 150
- nizam of, collection, 154
  See also Jami Mosque

I

Ibn-Battuta, 5
- Ilchester, Earl of, Collection, 19
- illustrated manuscripts, 5
- influence on carpet design, 29, 31, 44
- use of, by Mughal artists, as reference
  tools, 77
- See also book illustration
- in-and-out palmette designs, 33, 81

India:
- carpet trade of, 16, 19
- history of Mughal era, 3-14
- private trade with, 16
- trade routes to (sea vs. overland), 15
- Indian art. See Mughal art
- Indian carpets:
  - in collections outside India, 14, 15, 20,
    66, 117, 136-47
  - demand for, in West, 16
  - depicted in paintings, 20, 118, 121, 124,
    146; figs. 5, 6
  - design influence of book illustration
    on, 29, 31, 44
  - design influence of textiles on, 31, 47
  - eighteenth-century trade in, differences
    from earlier trade, 20
  - exports of, from India to West, 19
  - finest, materials used in, 22
  - grades of, 90, 121
  - international commerce in, 15-20
  - large, 40, 118-19
  - later types of, 117-50

194
materials used for, 21–23, 24, 69;
Appendix 1
modelled on Persian carpets, 52, 53, 81, 90–95, 121
motifs of, 67
numbers surviving, 15
provenance, information lacking on, 15
specially ordered (bespoke), problems with, 16
structure of, 27–28
style of, as distinguished from Persian carpets, 35, 67–68
technical characteristics of, 21–28
terminology for, 7
unusual shapes of, 102–5
See also carpets (specific); Persian-style carpets
Indo-Persian-type carpets, 57, 90, 119, 121, 145, 146, 158
intersia work, 44
interlocking compartment design, 118
Iran, 1
artists from (emigrés), 31
carpet materials from, 23
letters of patronage of art, 29
exports of manuscripts and furnishings from, 31
weavers from, 7, 21, 27, 117, 133
See also Iranian art
An Iron Plant and Butterfly (from Dürer’s Shikoh Album), 80, 87; fig. 82
Islam, in India, 3, 11; 14
Islamic metalwork, 74–76
Ismail Khan, 12
I’timād al-Daula, Tomb of, in Agra, 8, 42, 86
inlaid decoration, 31, 32; fig. 19

J
Jahāngīr, 16
Carpet weaving under, 29–31, 33, 47, 52, 76, 80, 118
Commissariat of, 8, 23, 68, 76
depiction of, fig. 2
painting under, 8, 86
Palace of (Agra), 5
regn of, 8
Tomb of (Lahore), 87
visit to Kashmir in 1620, 86
Jahāngīr Album, 31, 86
margin illumination from, 76, 76; fig. 71
page from, 52, 57; fig. 50
Jahāngīr in Private Audience (Manohar), 77, 77; fig. 73
Jahāngīr Preferring a Sufi Shaikh to Kings
(From St. Petersburg Album, Bichitr), 121, 124; fig. 121
Japar, maharaja of, 12
Japar Collection, 12–14, 15, 53, 48, 66, 81, 95, 102, 103–5, 106, 117, 118, 158, 147;
figs. 28, 97, 118
studies and inventories of, 12–15, 104–5
Jāmī Mosque, Hyderabad, sāfī pattern in courtyard of, 114, 116; fig. 114
Japan:
collections in, 20
Western trade with, 19–20, 57
Japanese imperial collection, 20
Jaypur:
carpet made in, 8, 19
sultanate of, 3
Jazira, 74
Jeju, 26
jiiya (poll tax on non-Muslims), 14
Jodhpur, 117
Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore), fig. 70
jīfi knot (paired or “false” knot), 27, 74; fig. 15
K
Kachhwāh clan, 12
Kajitani, Nobuko, 138
Kāshān, 24
Kāshān-type carpets, 40–44
Kashmir:
carpet materials from, 23
carpet made in, 12, 113, 119, 129
imperial carpet workshops in, 12
Jahāngīr’s visit to, 86
sulmanate of, 3
textiles from, 26, hangings, 128
kotla (term for pile-woven carpet), 5
Kett Collection (Richmond, England), 107
Kestner-Museum, Hannover, 72
Kevoianik Album, 11
Kevoianik sale, 15
Khamsa (Quintet) of Amir Khusrav Dihlavī:
illustrated by Husain Naqqāsh, 26, 27; fig. 12
manuscript page of (Lahore, 1597–98),
30, 31, 45; fig. 17
Khamsa (Quintet) of Nizāmī, manuscript page, 30, 31; fig. 16
Khāndesh, sultanate of, 3
Khūrān (Iran), 3
carpet made in, 27
Kinghorne carpet, 14, 19, 68–69, 71; fig. 65
Kinghorne family, Collection, 19
kriṣṇamukha (monster mask), 37
kāṭhākha (book-production workshop), 6, 11, 29
Knoke (Sackville-West house), 19, 40, 118
knots:
finesse of weave of, 27–28, 106
illustration of, fig. 15
types of, 24, 27, 74
Krishna Enthroned, Attended by Gopis (from Rāgāmālā [Garland of Memories, dispersed set]), 146, 147, fig. 142
Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, 105
Kyoto (Japan), Indian carpets in, 14, 20, 66, 117, 166–47
Kyoto-group carpets, 166–47

L
lac, 24
ladak, wood trade of, 23
Lahore:
building in, 11
carpet made in, 8, 14, 16, 21, 44; 57, 67, 68, 113, 119, 129
carpet trade of, 14, 15–16, 119
carpet workshops in, 7, 12
Mughal capital at, 5
shawl weaving in, 23
See also Jahāngīr, Tomb of Lahori carpets, as term, 15–16
Lahore Fort, exterior tilework, 44
landscapes:
northern European style, 26
Persian style, 31
on rugs, 40
lattice-and-blossoms carpet pattern, 107–11
lattice-and-flowers carpet pattern, 105–7
lattice-form carpet pattern, 121
See also carpet pattern (specific); leaf, serrated, motif, 121
Lilian, Solomon, Collection, fig. 5
Lodi dynasty, 3
loums, 27, 31; fig. 13
Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 107; fig. 37
lotus motif, 121
Lutyens, Sir Edward, 11

M
madder dyes, 24
Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum
(City Palace Museum) (Jaipur, India), fig. 106; cat. no. 28
Mahmud Bihārī (Gujarati sultan), 5
makhara-torana arch, 37
Makdisi (historian), 5
Malwa, sultanate of, 3
Mamluk carpets, 119, 118
Manohar (painter), 77
Jahāngīr in Private Audience, watercolor, 77, 77; fig. 73
Mainur (painter), 86
flower paintings of, 86–88, 95
Manucci (physician), 14
manuscript pages:
Akbar Hunting Mountain Lions from Akbarnameh (The Book of Akbar), 52, 57; fig. 51
Akbar Hunting with Chetahis from Akbarnameh (The Book of Akbar), 4, 5, 31, 38, 40; fig. 1
Aungzep and His Third Son, Sulaiman A’zam, with Courtois, 13, 4, 86, 105, 177; fig. 4
Emperor Jahangīr Weighs Prince Khurram from Tānq-e-Jahāngīr (The Memoirs of Jahāngīr), 8, 9, 47, 76, 76, 118;
figs. 2, 72
margin of a folio, with flower pattern, 196
Index

manuscript pages ('continued'): margin of a folio, with flower pattern, ca. 1354, 8, 90, 87
Qâhid Bîng 'îlled While He Sleeps from Hamzanama ('The Book of Hâmza'), 44, 45, fig. 15
Râmânamâ, 37, 38, fig. 28
Shah Jahan Receives His Three Eldest Sons and 'Afsâ Khân During His Accession Ceremonies from Padshahnama ('The Book of Kings, Bichitr'), 8, 10, 15, 47, 86, 118, fig. 3
Tarîm Gaining an Audience in Bâlk on the Occasion of His Accession to Power in April 1770 from Zafarnamâ ('Book of Conquests'), 75, 76, fig. 70
manuscript paintings, Mughal, with landscapes in a northern European style, 26
manuscripts: Akbar period, 37
Persian, 31
See also illustrated manuscripts
Marathas, 14
Martín, F. R., 74
Masûlapatnam: carpets made in, 133
trade with, 20
medallion carpets, 29

Circular, wool pile on cotton foundation, Northern India, ca. 1620–90, 66, 67, fig. 61
from Northern India, Lahore, ca. 1620–90, 57, 62, 63, 65, 66, 118; figs. 96, 97, cat. nos. 11, 13
Persian, 119
with scrolling-vines-and-animals pattern, wool pile on cotton, wool, and silk foundation, Iran, Sangesuzko group, late 16th or early 17th c. (Sangesuzko carpet), 35, 40, 46, 47, 48, fig. 38
metallic thread, 21
metallwork, 74–76
Metropolitan Museum of Art, The (New York), 15, 80, 121; figs. 8, 10, 17, 15, 34, 78, 80, 89, 90, 93, 109, 111, 116, 117, 127, 129; cat. nos. 4, 18, 20, 22, 29, 30, 36
Millefeur carpets, 119–20
with small medallions, pashmina pile on cotton-and-silk foundation, Northern India, Kashmir, second half of 18th c., 107, 124, 128; fig. 125
See also under pashmina carpets
Minho Album, 11
mirror-image patterns, 33
Mir Sayyid 'Ali, 1
Mirza Raja of Amber, 105
Monstress, Antonio ('missionary'), 6
Morris, William, advice of, in buying carpets, 38
Mughal art: beginnings of, 1
Chinese influence on, 88
distinguished from Persian art, 31, 33, 67, 68, 76
essental features of, 5
European influence on, 26–27, 37, 86–87, 121
influence of, on Persian art, 117
Islamic traditions in, 74
motifs of, 31, 67, 119
naturalism in, 5, 8, 31, 76, 86–88, 129
Persian influence on, 29, 31–33, 86, 88
synthesis of artistic traditions in, 5, 88
Mughal court: Persian influence on, 29
Westerners' gifts to, possible artistic influence of, 26–27
Mughal empire in India, 3–5, 129
a brief history of, 3–14
decline of, 14
Mughal royal library, 76–80
Muhammad Shah, 14
Muhammad Zahir Shah, king of Afghanistan, collection, 150
Mulan (Punjab), 5

carpets made in, 119, 129
carpet workshops in, 12
multiple-niche prayer-type carpets (uga`, 129–36

Mumtaz Mahal, 11
Mundy, Peter, 11
Musée des Arts Décoratifs (Paris), 58
figs. 32, 66, 68; cat. nos. 164, 166
Musée Calouste Gulbenkian (Lisbon), 102; figs. 76, 74, 113; cat. nos. 11, 17, 31
Museum für Islamische Kunst, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin–Preussischer Kulturbesitz, fig. 39; cat. no. 6
Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe (Hamburg), fig. 124
Museum of Fine Arts (Boston), 69–72, 90; figs. 29, 102; cat. no. 2
Museo Nacional de Arte Antiga (Lisbon), 19
Museo Nacional de Machado de Castro (Coimbra), 19
Muslims, relations with Hindus, 11, 14
Mystic House (Agra), 103
N
Näder Shah, 11, 14
Nagasaki (Japan), Western trade at, 19
Nârâstak Museum (Prague), fig. 50
National Gallery of Art (Washington, D.C.), fig. 48; cat. no. 10
Nationalmuseum (Stockholm), figs. 6, 67; cat. no. 168
naturalism, 5, 8, 31, 76, 86–88
loss of, with stylization, 87–88, 129
nature illustration, in Mughal art, 5

Nautch Party in a European Mansion, watercolor, 124, 125, fig. 128

Nél, Paul, Collection (London), fig. 122


Nice-style carpets, 90, 95, 119, 124–25
See also under carpets ('specific'), pashmina carpets
Nizami, Khamsa (Quintet) of, 30, 31; fig. 16
Northern Deccan, Rayamâla (Garland of Memories, dispersed set), watercolor, 147, fig. 142
Northern India: carpets from, 113, 129
durban carpet, fig. 118
medallion carpet, circular, fig. 61
Northern India, Fatehpur Sikri or Agra: carpet, fig. 36; cat. no. 5
Fremlin carpet, fig. 49
Northern India, Kashmir: carpet, fig. 124
hanging, fig. 127
millefeur carpet, fig. 125
pashmina carpets, figs. 128, 129; cat. nos. 15, 36
Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore: carpets, figs. 7, 10, 80, 89, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108, 114, 142; cat. nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 32
pashmina carpets, figs. 74, 78, 88, 104, 105, 106, 109, 111, 113, 123; cat. nos. 17, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34
Northern India, Lahore: carpets, figs. 29, 31, 33, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 52, 54, 58, 64, 66, 67, 68; cat. nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16a, 16b, 16c
Girâlers' carpet, figs. 11, 62; cat. no. 14
medallion carpets, figs. 36, 39; cat. nos. 21, 31
Northern India, prob. Fatehpur Sikri, carpets, figs. 21, 22; cat. nos. 12, 1b
Nur Jâhan, 8, 95

O

Ochtervelt, Jacob, The Dancing Dog, oil on canvas, ca. 1671–73, 18, 20, 146; fig. 6

Octagonal carpets, 102–3

Oil-on-canvas paintings depicting carpets: The Dancing Dog (Jacob Ochtervelt), 18, 20, 146; fig. 6

A Philosopher in His Studio (Abraham van der Hecken), 17, 20; fig. 3

Orchha, 8
Onishi, Julius, 150

Oriental carpets: as covers for tables and chests, in Europe, 19
depicted in Dutch paintings, 17, 18, 20, 146; figs. 5, 6
European copies of, 68, 158
as status symbols in England, 15
ornamentation in Mughal art: architectural, 29, 32–33, 44
influence of book-artist artists on, 29
reduction of scale on, 122

Osterreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst (Vienna), 146; figs. 31, 35, 128; cat. nos. 1, 35

Ottoman Empire, 12
powder flask, ivory, first half of 17th c., fig. 27

prayer carpets (sargs), 129–14

 carpets unlikely to have been used as, 95, 128

multiple-niche pattern, 129–36

Deccan, prob. Warangal, 18th c., 211, 133, 134–35, 136–37, 146; figs. 130, 131, 132, 133; cat. nos. 37, 38

Prince with a Falcon, watercolor, 45, 47; fig. 37

Private collections, figs. 4, 44, 86, 87, 88, 90, 114, 119, 130, 142; cat. nos. 8, 19, 32, 33, 37

See also European private collections

Q

ganits (tent screens), 95, 143

Qubul Being Killed While He Sleeps (from Hamzanama [The Book of Hamza]), 44, 46; fig. 35

R

Ragulanal (Garland of Memories, dispersed set), Krishna Entangered, Attended by Copy from, watercolor, 146, 147; fig. 142

Raja Dip Half of Bijapur Listening to Singers, watercolor, 117, 117; fig. 115

Raja Man Singh (of Jaipur), 12

rajas, court styles of, 137

Rajput chiefs, 3, 4, 14

Rajput painting, 121

Rampur, 117

Razmnama, manuscript page from, 37, 38; fig. 28

dried red, 24

Red Fort, Delhi:

Azamgah, gilded ceiling with flower pattern, 87, 89, 113; fig. 85

Hall of Private Audience, pita dura panel, 87, 88; fig. 84

religions of India, 5

conflict between Hindus and Muslims, 11, 14

repeating patterns, 31–32, 33, 67, 119

Roe, Sir Thomas, 8, 16, 26

Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, fig. 3

Royal Museum of Scotland, fig. 65

rugs, 87, 35

rugal carpets, 105

runners (mats), 102

Rutland, Duke of, Collection, 99

S

Sackville-West Collection, 40

Safavid art:
distinguished from Mughal art, 91

influence of Mughal art on, 117

See also Persian art

Shah Jahan Revises His Three Eldest Sons and Aqib Khan During His Acession

Ceremonies, manuscript page (Bidir), 8, 10, 37, 48, 86, 118; fig. 3

painting:

under Akbar, 40, 86

under Aurangzeb, 14

flower style in, 121

under Jahangir, 8, 86

Pathan (Deccan), 129

pashmina (goat’s wool), 21, 22–23, 77–78, 93, 118, 147

pashmina carpets, 22, 80–81, 100–102, 105–9, 121

centers of production of, 111

with lattice-and-blossoms pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, fragment, 112, 115; fig. 115; cat. no. 31

with lattice-and-blossoms pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, fragments, 107, 110, 111, 121, 122–12, 114; figs. 109, 110, 111, 112; cat. nos. 29, 30

with lattice-and-flowers pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650, fragment, 105–6, 107, 107; fig. 105; cat. no. 27

with lattice-and-flowers pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650 (in a Jaipur collection), 106, 108; fig. 106; cat. no. 28

with lattice-and-flowers pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650 (in a private collection), 81, 105, 106; fig. 104, frontispiece; cat. no. 26

with millefleur pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, second half of 17th c., 121, 126; fig. 121; cat. no. 54

with niche-and-flower design, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–40, 90, 91; fig. 88; cat. no. 19

with niche-and-flower design, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1650–40, 91, 95, 94, 156; fig. 92; cat. no. 31

with niche-and-millefleur design, Northern India, Kashmir, first half of 18th c., 128–29, 131; fig. 128; cat. no. 35

with niche-and-millefleur design, Northern India, Kashmir, second half of 18th c., 130, 132; fig. 130; cat. no. 36

with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or Lahore, ca. 1620–25, fragment, 78, 79, 80, 107; figs. 74, 75; cat. no. 17

with scrolling-vines-and-blossoms pattern, Northern India, Kashmir or

Lahore, ca. 1690, fragment, 81, 82, 83; figs. 78, 79; cat. no. 18

patterns:
mirror-image, 3

repetition of, 31–32, 33, 67, 119

units of, figs. 25, 42

Peacock Throne, 11

Pelaer, Francis, 8

Persia, 87, 8

Persian art, 74–80
distinguished from Mughal art, 31, 67, 68, 76

influence of, on Indian art, 29, 86, 88

influence of Mughal art on, 117

motifs of, 35, 57, 119

Persian carpets (made in Iran), 177, 179, 188

demand for, in West, 16

distinguished from Indian carpets, 21, 26, 67–68, 76

exports of, from India to West, 19

history of use of, in India, 5

imports of, into India, 7

Indian carpets modeled on, 32, 33, 81, 90–95, 121

materials used for, 21, 23, 24, 26

pictorial, 40

quality distinctions of, 90

status appeal of, in India, 35

See also Herat-type carpets; Indo-Persian-type carpets; Kashan-type carpets; Polonaise carpets; Sanganerkar-type carpets; vase carpets

Persian knot (asymmetrical), 24, 27; fig. 15

Persian-style carpets (made in India), 29–81, 90–95, 113, 121

beginnings of, in India, 31

decline of demand for, 117

differences of actual Persian carpets, 21, 26, 67–68, 76

status appeal of, in Mughal court, 81

term on, 33

Philadelphia Museum of Art, 135

A Philosopher in His Studio, oil on canvas, ca. 1650 (Abraham van der Hecken), 17, 110; fig. 5

pictorial carpets, 29, 37–47

See also under carpets (specific)

pita dura technique, 87, 88; fig. 84

pale, 90–95, 113

A Pole-Carpet Zoom at Harrow, drawing, 27, 27; fig. 13

pale carpets:

beginnings of, 5–6, 7, 29

made for prayer rugs, 133

method of making, 31–32

mistakenly taken for brocaded cloth, 12

Polonaise carpets of Iran (so-called), 12, 21, 90, 156

polygonal carpets, 102–3

Portuguese:

Mughal campaign against, 8

trade with India, 15, 19

Index
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Safavid dynasty, 1
St. Petersburg Album, Jahangir Preferring a Safi Shāhī To King, watercolor (Bichitr), 121, 124, fig. 121
Samarkand, 11
Sanguzko-group carpets, 33, 40–44, 47, 66
with pictorial design, wool pile on cotton, wool, and silk foundation, late 16th or early 17th c., 40, 42; fig. 32
the Sanguzko carpet (so-called),
medallion carpet, 33, 40, 46, 47, 48; fig. 38
saph, Se multiple-niche prayer-type carpets
sculpting-vine carpet patterns, Se under
carpets (specific)
sculpting-vine-and-animal carpet pattern, 45–57
pattern unit of, fig. 42
sculpting-vine-and-blossom carpet pattern, 57–69
sculpting-vine-and-palm leaf carpet pattern, 25, 47
sculpting-vine-with-animal-heads carpet pattern, 74–77
scrolls, animated, 74–77
shading, 26–27, 74, 76, 80, 107
Shāh ṬAbbās, 112
Shāh Jahān: building under, 11
carpet making under, 10, 13, 33, 48, 81, 86, 102
connoisseurship of, 76
depictions of, figs. 3, 8
flower style developed under, 86–88, 95, 113
Shāh Jahān Nimed in Glory, watercolor (Chittranjan), 22, 22, fig. 8
Shāh Jahān: Receives His Three Eldest Sons and an Ask Khan During His Accession Ceremonies (from Paddahhāna [The Book of Kings]) (Bichitr), 8, 10, 33, 47, 86, 118; fig. 3
shaped carpets, 102–5
So also under carpets (specific)
shawls, 22, 23, 113, 124
influence on carpets, 124
sheep’s wool, 21, 22, 23, 77
Shōtōshūmaki (Japan), fig. 38
Shin Shāh Shīrū, 3, 5
side finish, structure of, 28
“silhouette style” (color against color technique), 44, 45, 57
silk, 21, 22, 77, 118, 147
preyed, from Iran, 24
wild, uncultivated (tussah), 21
silk carpets, 147–50
simurgh (mythological bird), 38
Simurgh Attacking a Gaja-simha Catching Seven Elephants in Its Claws, watercolor, 40, 45, fig. 30
Singh, Dr. Chandramani, 12
single-flower design carpets, 88–95
South India, Mysore, A Pale-Carpet Loom at Hanson, drawing, 27, 87; fig. 15
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, 27
Staatliche Kunsthalle zu Karlsruhe-Orientabteilung, 61
star-medallion carpets, 118
wool pile on cotton-and-wool foundation, Deccan, ca. 1700, 108, 143; fig. 139
Suni Muslims, as rulers, 3
Surat: carpets made in, 12
carpet trade of, 15, 16, 19
symmetry in carpet design, 33, 47
Syria, 74
T
Tāhirisāfī, Shāh (Persia), 3
Taj Mahal (Agra), 11
decoration of, flower style used, 87
talking tree (of the Alexander legend), 74
tapestries, imported from the West, 26
temples, Hindu, 11, 17
tent furnishings, 95, 105, 113
Textile Museum (Washington, D.C.), 102, 104, 113; figs. 7, 22, 38, 41, 90, 125
cat. nos. ib, a, 4, 72
textiles: centers of production of, 129
drawloom-woven, 33
as hangings, 128
related to carpets, 31, 47
repeating patterns in, 31, 47
Thompson, Jon, 109
Thysen-Bornemisza, Carmen, Collection, fig. 82; cat. no. 21
Tibet, western, carpet materials from, 23
Tibeto-Ladakhi-Mughal War (c. 1688–84), 23
tiger, frontal view of, motif, 52, 67
Timur (Tamerlane), 3, 11, 77
Timurid art, 74–80
appreciation of, at Mughal court, 77
Tokugawa Art Museum (Nagoya, Japan), 146; fig. 92
tan-ser-tan effect, 25, 67, 73
Toyama Memorial Museum (Saitama, Japan), 138–40; fig. 47; cat. no. 9
trade routes, Europe to India, 15, 20
trading centers (warehouses, factories) of Europeans in India, 15
tree carpet patterns, 102
So also under carpets (specific)
Turkish carpets, 15, 16
materials used for, 21
Turkish Sultan’s house, Fatehpur Sikri, carved sandstone wall, 39, 52, 45; fig. 38
Turks, 3
Tusuz-i Jahangiri (The Memoirs of Jahangiri), 8
Empress Jahangir Weighs Prince Khurram from, manuscript page, 8, 30, 44, 76, 78, 108; figs. 2, 72
vase carpets, Persian, 117, 119
Victoria and Albert Museum (London), 114; figs. 1, 30, 35, 49, 105, 111, 115, 126; cat. no. 27
W
Walser Art Gallery (Baltimore), 100; fig. 12
Warriage Album, 11
Warangal, carpets made in, 133, 124, 130
warpes: materials used for, 21
structure of, 27, 119
watercolors: Jahangir’s Preferring a Safi Shāhī to King from St. Petersburg Album (Bichitr), 121, 124, fig. 121
Kishna Enthroned, Attested by Gopis from Rājamandala (Garland of Memories, dispersed set), 146, 147; fig. 142
Nacht Party in a European Mansion, 124, 125; fig. 126
Prince with a Falcon, 45, 43; fig. 37
Raja Dhup Chand of Bilaspur Listening to Singers, 137, 117; fig. 115
Shāh Jahān Nimed in Glory (Chitranjan), 22, 22; fig. 8
Simurgh Attacking a Gaja-simha Catching Seven Elephants in Its Claws, 40, 45; fig. 30
weavers: origins of, in other countries, 7, 21, 27, 117, 135
working conditions of, 6
wefts: materials used for, 21
of multiple colors and materials, 22
structure of, 27
weld (Rosta lata) dye, 24
Western art; Se European art
wisteria motif, 33, 67
Wolf, Marshall and Marilyn R., Collection (New York), fig. 132; cat. no. 38
wool, 21, 22–23
woven carpets, origins of, 5
Worshipful Company of Girdlers (London), figs. 11, 62; cat. no. 14
Y
Ydema, Onno, 20
yellow dyes, 24
Z
Zafrānā (Book of Conquests), 76
Timur Granting an Audience to Balkh on the Occasion of His Accession to Power in April 1370 (from Zafrānā [Book of Conquests]), 75, 76; fig. 70
Timurid art, 74–80
appreciation of, at Mughal court, 77
Zaqqum (tree of hell), 74
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