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known for their expertise and
talents, the nomadic Turkmen
people of Central Asia have been
long distinguished themselves as the
makers of extraordinary silver jewelry. This book
presents more than two hundred examples of Turkmen jewelry,
created in the nine
teenth and early twentieth centuries, from
the renowned collections of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf.

These remarkable objects—bracelets,
bracelets, amulets, and rings, medallions,
and similar bronzes—are characterized
by geometric forms, bold geometry, deli
crate work, and often exquisite rakes.
Working with a limited set of materials
silver, accented by gold, carnelian, tur
qen, and colored glass and relatively
simple techniques, Turkmen artisans used
great ingenuity to achieve their
dazzling effects.

This book, the first publication in the United
States devoted to Turkmen jewelry, high
lights the aesthetic aspects of these objects,
which until recently have been valued primarily
for their ethnographic significance. Leslie
S. Diba situates Turkmen ornament within
both its historical context and the tradition
of Islamic silver jewelry production. By tak

ing an art historical approach and providing
detailed formal analyses of the objects, she
presented by gorgeous color photographs.
She further examines the appreciation of
these objects, including their artistic develop
ments and their link to the art.
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It is my great pleasure to introduce this groundbreaking publication on Turkmen silver ornaments from the Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf Collection. This volume significantly advances the scholarship on the arts and culture of nineteenth-century Central Asia and Iran. For the first time, the Turkmen and Kazakh tribal jewelry and ornaments of this region are discussed within the framework of Islamic art history. The breadth and significance of this tradition are examined in detail in the introductory essay and catalogue entries by Islamic art scholar Layla S. Diba, and the visual splendor of the works is fully revealed in more than two hundred color images. A technical essay by conservator Jean-François de Lapérouse is of critical importance in documenting both the techniques and materials employed by Turkmen and Central Asian silversmiths in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Through the Wolfs' generosity and promised gift of more than 250 objects, The Metropolitan Museum of Art's collection of Islamic art will now strongly represent the tribal as well as the urban cultural traditions of Central Asia and Iran in the nineteenth century. With this acquisition, the Museum will also possess the largest holdings of Turkmen jewelry in the Western hemisphere.

This important project was conceived during the tenure of my predecessor, Philippe de Montebello, Director Emeritus of the Museum. It was initiated by Daniel Walker, former Patti Cadby Birch Curator in Charge, Department of Islamic Art, and brought to fruition by the curatorial staff of the department, led by Sheila Canby, Patti Cadby Birch Curator in Charge.

We have greatly benefited from the sage counsel, impressive scholarship, and generous support of Marshall and Marilyn Wolf, and we remain truly grateful for their contribution to this uncharted area of Islamic art and cultural study.

I am delighted that a selection of the works in this volume will be installed in the newly renovated Galleries for the Art of the Arab Lands, Turkey, Iran, Central Asia, and Later South Asia this fall and that these extraordinary objects will remain on permanent view for the Museum's visitors.

THOMAS P. CAMPBELL
Director
In the autumn of 1978 I took what would prove to be an unforgettable trip to Turkmen Sara in eastern Iran. To this day, memories of that journey conjure up images of an arid yet majestic landscape; of magnificent embroidered felt coverings adorning horses and donkeys; of piecework camel coverings for wedding ceremonies; of embroidered legging cuffs treasured as family heirlooms; and, most especially, of dignified women sharing their pride in their heritage by donning the treasured silver ornaments of their ancestors. The research trip was organized in conjunction with an exhibition of Turkmen silver and textiles from Iranian collections that was planned to open in December 1978 at the Negarestan Museum of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Iranian art in Tehran. For those who know their history, you will understand why the exhibition never took place and its accompanying catalogue was never published.

In 2000, during my tenure as Hagop Kevorkian Curator of Islamic Art at the Brooklyn Museum, I was instrumental in securing for the museum a promised gift of Iranian Turkmen silver ornaments and costumes from the collection of Monir Farmanfarmaian in memory of her late husband, Abol Bashar Farmanfarmaian. The Farmanfarmaians were among the original lenders to the Tehran exhibition, and the subsequent generosity of Monir Farmanfarmaian reinvigorated my interest in the subject of Turkmen contributions to the history of Islamic art.

A decade later Marshall and Marilyn Wolf, who were major supporters of Islamic art at the Brooklyn Museum, have given me the opportunity not only to return to this topic but to broaden the field of investigation to include Central Asia and the arts of the Kazakh tribes. The themes I have addressed in this publication and the approach I have adopted emerged in part from my background as an Islamicist and in part from extended conversations with Marshall and Marilyn about their collecting philosophy. The Wolfs are intrepid explorers and collectors, passionately involved in the acquisition and presentation of their collections of Islamic art. They acquired their collection of Turkmen silver ornaments over the course of more than thirty years. Whether traveling to Central Asia and buying directly in the bazaars of Bukhara and Samarqand or bargaining with determined dealers steeped in the local lore and market parlance of Istanbul or Tehran, the Wolfs have brought a broad knowledge of Islamic art and a sophisticated appreciation of the finest traditions
of Islamic design to all aspects of their collecting. I am deeply grateful to them for their encouragement of this publication, which we hope will break new ground in the appreciation of Turkmen and Central Asian art.

The list of acknowledgements for such a project is bound to be extensive. Within The Metropolitan Museum of Art I wish first to express my thanks to Philippe de Montebello, Director Emeritus of the Museum, and Thomas P. Campbell, Director.

In the Editorial Department, thanks are due to the late John P. O'Neill, former Publisher and Editor in Chief; Mark Polizzotti, Publisher and Editor in Chief; Gwen Roginsky, Associate Publisher and General Manager of Publications; Michael Sittenfeld, Managing Editor; Peter Antony, Chief Production Manager; Harriet Whelchel, Senior Editor; Jane S. Tai, Image Acquisitions and Permissions Specialist; Chris Zichello, Production Manager; Elizabeth Zechella, Editor; Robert Weisberg, Assistant Managing Editor; and especially to editor Kate Norment, for her patient, skillful, and devoted shepherding of the publication to its conclusion. In the Photograph Studio, I wish to thank Anna-Marie Kellen, Senior Photographer, for her exceptional images. Steven Schoenfelder's beautiful design for the book provided an understated, elegant showcase for the objects.

Jean-François de Lapérouse, Conservator, Objects Conservation, who wrote the technical essay in this volume, and his colleagues Adriana Rizzo, Associate Research Scientist, and Marco Leona, David H. Koch Scientist in Charge, Department of Scientific Research, have added immensely to our understanding of the technical and material aspects of Turkmen and Central Asian ornaments.

In the Museum's Department of Islamic Art, I wish to recognize the assistance of Sheila Canby, Patti Cadby Birch Curator in Charge; Walter Denny, Senior Consultant; Stefano Carboni, former Curator and Administrator, and now Director of the Art Gallery of Western Australia; Daniel Walker, former Patti Cadby Birch Curator in Charge; Navina Haidar Haykel, Associate Curator and Administrator; Stefan Heidemann, Associate Curator; Maryam Ekhtiar, Senior Research Associate; Annick Des Roches, Collections Manager; Michelle Ridgely, Associate for Administration; Melody Lawrence, Assistant for Administration; and Britt Eilhardt, former Assistant for Administration. I would also like to thank Helen C. Evans, Mary and Michael Jahanis Curator of Byzantine Art at the Museum.
For their invaluable research assistance, I am greatly indebted to numerous colleagues and friends, including Michael Bates, former Curator of Islamic Coins, American Numismatic Society; Abdullah Ghouchani, Epigraphy Consultant and former Fellow, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Robert D. McChesney, Professor Emeritus of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies, New York University; Morris Rossabi, Distinguished Professor of History at the City University of New York; Brooke Kamin Rapaport, independent curator; Haideh Sahim, Adjunct Instructor, Hofstra University; Hermann E. Rudolph, Senior Counsellor; Michael Franses, Research Associate, Museum of Islamic Art, Berlin, and Research Associate, Textile Museum, Washington, D.C.; Robert Chenciner, St. Antony’s College, University of Oxford; Dr. Jon Thompson; Said Amir Arjomand, Distinguished Service Professor of Sociology, Stony Brook University; Peter B. Golden, Professor Emeritus and Academic Director, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Rutgers; and Dr. Allen Frank.

I am equally grateful for the insights of Turkmen silver jewelry collectors Iran Ala and Eskandar Firouz, Monir Farmanfarmaian, and Serga and Daniel Nadler.

Museum colleagues who were generous with their time and knowledge include Barry D. Wood, PhD, former Curator, Victoria and Albert Museum; Na‘ama Brosh, Curator, Israel Museum; Ladan Akbarnia, Curator of Islamic Art, The British Museum; Andrzej Wawrzyniak, Director/Curator-in-Chief, Asia and Pacific Museum of Warsaw; Annette Krämer, Linden-Museum Stuttgart; and Nahla Nassar, Acting Curator and Registrar, Nasser D. Khalili Collection.

I would like to recognize with gratitude the tireless efforts of my talented and dedicated research assistant Sarah Malaike, Project Associate, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, as well as those of Caitlin McKenna and, in the early stages of the project, Lain Hart and Karen Lee.

Finally, I wish to thank my mother, Leona, and my son, Ahmad Reza, for their devotion, support, and advice throughout this long and immensely rewarding journey.

LAYLA S. DIBA
Note to the Reader

**DATES** The system employed for calculating dates, except where exact months and days are specified, is that used in the calendar conversion table in Jere Bacharach, *A Middle East Handbook* (Seattle, 1984). For exact dates (as in dated works of art), we have included both A.H. and A.D. dates.

**TRANSLITERATION** This publication employs terms from a range of languages. For transliterating Arabic, Persian, and some Turkish words, we have chosen to follow a modified version of the *IJMES (International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies)* system for the sake of consistency. Diacritical marks have not been used. "Ayn" and "hamza," both letters of the alphabet, are marked. The transliteration of Arabic words differs from that of Persian words for some letters, such as dhal and waw, and for a few additional consonants in Persian (see below).

While Arabic and Persian are old standardized literary languages, this is not the case with Turkestan Turkish. Central Asian Turkish languages did not become widespread literary written languages until the twentieth century. In the absence of a standardized language and alphabet for the whole of historical Turkestan, the spelling and transcription of Turkestan Turkish words might reflect—where appropriate—a Cyrillic or Persian-Arabic transliteration, or a modern literature.

Where a word in Arabic, Persian, or Turkish is found in *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary* with a standard English spelling, this form is generally used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>- p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>th s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>چ</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh kh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>- zh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh sh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ</td>
<td>gh gh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ک</td>
<td>k k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گ</td>
<td>- g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>m m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>w v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vowels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Persian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(alif maqura)</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dipthongs</td>
<td>aw au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ay ai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

The Persian silent "أ" is transliterated "a," e.g. Shahnama.

The Persian silent "و" following "خ" is transliterated "khw," e.g. Khwarazm.
INTRODUCTION

The Department of Islamic Art at The Metropolitan Museum of Art is one of the great repositories of works of art produced on the African and Asian continents (and the Iberian peninsula) since the seventh century A.D. The consistent focus of the collection, and its display, has been on what is commonly described as "courtly," "high-end," or "sophisticated" art made for and enjoyed by the upper echelons of Islamic society. In the storage areas, however, a remarkable percentage of the collection tells a more complete and complex story through a great array of objects from archaeological excavations, including domestic items that were created for the local suqs and acquired by anyone who could afford them, as well as fragments of textiles that once made up tunics, coats, turbans, curtains, covers, and even socks and undergarments.

The same can be said for the Islamic jewelry and jeweled objects in the collection: the use of high-carat gold, of the refined techniques of filigree and granulation, and of precious emeralds, rubies, and diamonds reminds us of the incredible wealth and ostentation of the Fatimid, Mughal, and Ottoman courts, while beautifully constructed silver amulet boxes, seal rings, lapis and carnelian necklaces, and pearl earrings speak to us about everyday life in Islamic society: births and circumcisions, weddings and dowries, trade and the hajj.

More often than not, collecting household objects and jewelry ornaments is a chance process—the latter because silver and gold works have a relatively short life when they are in constant use—and a low priority in the acquisitions policy of an institution. The holdings are inevitably scattered and uneven and do not form substantial groups of academic interest; they are rarely studied and published by curators, and are seldom on public view. The collections of the Department of Islamic Art are no exception.

Opportunities to rectify this situation are few and far between. I am thrilled to witness one stunning example, which has been achieved in a single sweep through the dedicated pursuit over many years, the spirit of adventure, the discerning eye, the impressive knowledge, the loving appreciation, and ultimately the great generosity of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf. Thanks to their regular visits to Turkey and Central Asia and their avid enthusiasm as collectors, once they chose to focus on urban and tribal Turkmen jewelry they were able to amass an outstanding collection—
mostly silver ornaments, ranging from crowns to temple pendants, from necklets to amulet holders, from plait ornaments to pectorals—that is unrivaled outside the former Soviet republics and perhaps anywhere in the world. In the past few years a selection of more than 250 objects (all types of ornaments and other pieces as well) has been donated steadily by Marshall and Marilyn to the Department of Islamic Art with the specific purpose of filling gaps in the collection and making it more accessible to the public.

The couple’s generosity and forward thinking, however, go well beyond their straightforward gift: their goal was to make both the specialists and the general public aware of this fascinating subject through groundbreaking research, scholarship, and presentation. In that spirit the present publication single-handedly brings scholarship in this particular field to a different level. Layla Diba was the ideal choice as the author of the text: her rigorous research is beautifully matched by her interpretive analysis of the historiographic, geographic, and cultural contexts of the Turkmen. A proper understanding of the materials and the technology used in these pieces is offered through her accurate observation and description of the works and the insightful essay provided by Jean-François de Lapérouse, a conservator at the Metropolitan. The photographic documentation of the works by Anna-Marie Kellen reflects the Museum’s usual amazing standards.

In the relatively young field of Islamic art studies we continuously witness the progress of scholarship—often by leaps and bounds—in the various individual disciplines that make it such an exciting subject of research. From the point of view of a museum curator, which was my profession for many years, when academic progress in the field is prompted by generous patronage and by the enrichment of a public collection, it cannot get any better.

**STEFANO CARBONI**

Former Curator and Administrator, Department of Islamic Art,
The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Director, Art Gallery of Western Australia
Turkmen Jewelry
Turkmen Jewelry: A Tradition Rediscovered

Layla S. Diba

Nomadic tribes have played a crucial political, social, and cultural role throughout the history of Islam. Among them are the Turkmen people, who have inhabited southwestern Central Asia and nearby northeastern Iran for more than a millennium. For much of that time the powerful Turkmen tribes were an ongoing threat to regional stability; yet they also contributed to the artistic legacy of the area, particularly in carpet, textile, and jewelry production. Their vibrant cultural traditions continued virtually unchanged into the early twentieth century. While the Turkmen have been celebrated for their mastery of carpet and textile weaving, their silver jewelry and ornaments—whose production can be documented from approximately 1800 on—have only recently begun to be appreciated.

Islamic and Persian arts, especially miniature painting and carpet production, have been widely known and appreciated since the nineteenth century. Tribal arts, however, were virtually ignored by collectors and museums and were of interest only to ethnographers—many of them Russian, since the areas of Central Asia occupied by the Turkmen were annexed by czarist Russia in the late nineteenth century. The incorporation of this region into the Russian empire resulted in the formation of Islamic art collections at the State Hermitage Museum and of Turkmen art collections at the Museum of Ethnography in Saint Petersburg and the State Museum of Oriental Art in Moscow. It also produced pioneering publications on Turkmen carpets, which were particularly prized by the Russians. During this same period, when the methodologies and dynastic classifications in the study of Islamic art were being established, tribal jewelry was excluded from the literature and was housed in ethnographic museum collections not only in Russia but in Germany, Switzerland, and Britain as well.

Later in the twentieth century, Soviet ethnologists produced substantive studies of the various tribes and subtribes of Central Asia. In the aftermath of the opening of Soviet Central Asia to travelers in the 1970s, several public collections of Turkmen ornament
were created, in particular at the Musée de l'Homme in Paris and the Linden-Museum in Stuttgart. Extensive private collections were also formed, such as those of Reinhold and Dieter Schletzer, Kurt Gull, Monir and Abol-Bashar Farmanfarmaian, and Iran Ala Firouz and Eskandar Firouz. The public collections were again housed in ethnographic museums, and the accompanying lavish publications presented the jewelry primarily from an ethnographic viewpoint, focusing on its typology and social function. In spite of this scholarly output, the German scholar Hermann Rudolph noted in 1985 that "outstanding questions remain [regarding] the attribution of jewelry to individual tribes, dating and evolution, and origins and meaning of forms and motifs." In the next two decades, the Russian museum collections were published in richly illustrated volumes, and Turkmen silver began to be included in surveys of Islamic jewelry, although it was mainly described as "folk" or "ethnic" jewelry.

This book, by adopting an art historical approach to Turkmen silver, seeks to highlight its aesthetic value for the first time, situating this material within the traditions of Islamic and Central Asian art. I have chosen to focus on certain aspects of Turkmen craftsmanship that—despite the now voluminous literature on the subject—have not received sufficient scholarly consideration. After a historical overview, I will explore the origins and evolution of Turkmen ornament in relation to its Islamic influences. I will also investigate the relationship between tribal and urban traditions of craftsmanship in nineteenth-century Central Asia. While the Qajar painting and decorative arts of Persia, as well as the luxury textiles and court regalia of the khanates, were dependent on court patronage, remarkable artworks were also produced by and for tribal cultures, particularly the Turkmen. I hope to draw attention to the coexistence of these two separate yet interrelated artistic traditions, both of which are strongly represented in the Wolf collection. Consideration will also be given to the circumstances that gave rise to the enormous scale and grandeur of these ornaments, which were so widely used by the Turkmen, whether they were living at subsistence level or were khans of great wealth.

It might seem fruitless to attempt to trace the evolution of an art form with the limited evidence available for pre-nineteenth-century Central Asian material culture. In this case, however, there are several factors that justify the undertaking: historical evidence of the Turkmen in Central Asia; documented archaeological finds that exhibit remarkable similarities to later material; and an increasingly nuanced understanding of nineteenth-century Central Asia due to the mass of recent Russian publications. These factors, along with a close examination of nineteenth-century ornaments and traditions of the Turkmen, both from historical sources and from the significant collection accumulated by Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, make possible the discussion that follows.
The World of the Turkmen

The story of Turkmen silver ornament can be pieced together primarily from abundant travelers’ accounts from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Because of the paucity of contemporary indigenous sources relating to the Turkmen, these accounts serve as a useful resource, although their colonialist perspective must be kept in mind. Among the earliest known observers was the English merchant Jonas Hanway, who traveled to Persia in 1743 seeking his fortune on the shores of the Caspian Sea for “the glory and welfare of the British monarchy.” According to Hanway, the Turkmen were known throughout the area for their bravery as well as for the ferocity with which they ravaged the coast in search of booty and slaves. During his stay at Astarabad (present-day Gurgan), the author experienced firsthand the character of the Turkmen; in fact, he was almost delivered up to the Turkmen as a slave by his Persian hosts. Hanway described the Turkmen as dressed in rags, despite their plundered wealth.

The German explorer and scholar S. G. Gmelin, traveling to Central Asia from Russia some twenty years later, gives us the earliest description of a Turkmen woman’s lavish jewelry, which consisted of a foot-wide band worn on the forehead and composed of silver rings, small balls, corals (probably carnelians), and lozenge-shaped leaves in the center. There are no surviving examples of eighteenth-century jewelry, but Gmelin’s precise description illustrates the enduring traditions of Turkmen jewelry, since similar terms may be applied to surviving ornaments from the second half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century.

Nineteenth-century European travelers often had extended contact with the Turkmen, particularly the Teke Turkmen, and provided keenly observed accounts of Turkmen life and artifacts. It is fortunate that such visitors were often political agents or military officers who were trained not only to observe the terrain for future military purposes but also to evaluate local inhabitants as potential allies or rivals. These travelers were succeeded in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by Russian scholars, archaeologists, and explorers, including S. M. Dudin. Dudin emerges as a pioneering figure who helped amass the ethnographic collections for the museums in Saint Petersburg and recorded the appearance of the Turkmen in his photography.

GEOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT In the nineteenth century, Turkmen strongholds extended from eastern Iran to Central Asia, bordered on the south by present-day Afghanistan and Pakistan and on the north by Kazakhstan (see map, p. xx). At the time, the area that today encompasses the modern states of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and
Kazakhstan was known as Turkestan. It is a land of mountain ranges, irrigated agricultural lands, steppes and deserts, and oases. Uzbek and Tajik peoples also dwelled in this area, while Jewish, Indian, and Persian artisans populated the cities. The region is perhaps best known historically as the Silk Road, where wares were sold that arrived overland by caravan from the East, in the fabled trading centers of Bukhara, Khiva, and Samarkand.

Central Asia’s legendary wealth and exotic culture have drawn explorers and adventurers to the region since the time of Marco Polo. Henri Moser, a Swiss diplomat and entrepreneur, visited the area in the 1860s and 1880s and wrote an account of his travels. His vivid prose is accompanied by illustrations based on photographs he took during his travels. One watercolor (fig. 1), commissioned by Moser from an English artist after he returned to his homeland, vibrantly evokes the square and bazaar of Registan in Samarkand. A rider is shown in the center of this animated and colorful composition, magnificently clothed in velvet brocade and mounted on a fine steed. The horse is decorated with a jeweled harness, and in the foreground two figures are seen wearing ikat (tie-dyed silk) coats.

**HISTORICAL OVERVIEW** The Turkmen belong to the Turkic Oghuz tribes, who originated in Inner Asia and established vast nomadic empires beginning in the third century B.C. They are first mentioned in the historical sources of Central Asia in the eighth and ninth centuries A.D., when they moved westward out of Inner Asia to Central Asia and Persia and were incorporated as slave soldiers into Arab Muslim armies. The most prominent of these Turkic tribes were the Ghaznavids in the tenth century and the Seljuqs in the eleventh century. They founded lasting dynasties in Central Asia, Persia, and Anatolia, converted to Sunni Islam, and adopted Persian court customs and usages. This great migration was to have an enormous effect on the Muslim world.

According to the *Oghuznama*, an epic written sometime between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, the Turkmen comprised twenty-four tribes or branches. The Turkmen tribes included both nomadic and settled elements, some of whom converted to Islam, while others retained their pagan beliefs. Some of the Turkmen joined the
Seljuq and later the Mongol forces, establishing in the fourteenth century their own small principalities in Anatolia and Persia, while other groups remained in Central Asia. It should be noted that the early thirteenth-century Mongol invasions had a lasting impact in Central Asia, resulting in the wholesale destruction of urban areas and irrigation systems, a reversion to pasturelands, and the incursion of new Uzbek tribal elements.16

In the mid-fourteenth century, the Aq Quyunlu ("They of the White Sheep") and Qara Quyunlu ("They of the Black Sheep") Turkmen tribal federations founded their own states, briefly ruling in western Persia and Anatolia. Their reign, which was reinforced by a remigration of Turkmen elements from Central Asia to Persia, coincided with that of their better-known rivals, the Timurids, who ruled in Central Asia and Persia. Their artistic patronage and manuscript production, especially that of the Aq Quyunlu Turkmen of Tabriz, is now thought to equal the achievements of the Timurid bibliophiles (fig. 2).

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Timurid and Shaibanid dynasties brought relative stability and cosmopolitanism to the area.17 The sixteenth century witnessed a political revival under Shaibanid rule, accompanied by a return to pastoralism and flourishing agriculture centered on fruit and grain production. Overland trade to Central Asia continued to thrive during this period, despite the earlier discovery of the sea route to Asia in 1498.

The history of the Turkmen in Central Asia becomes better documented in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when they came into conflict with the Shaibanid dynasty.18 The principal Turkmen tribes of the area—which included the Teke, Ersari, and Salur—are recorded in Abu l-Ghazi’s genealogical history of the Turkmen, composed in 1660–61.19 In the seventeenth century, the Yomut and Göklan tribes migrated to Central Asia from the East. The Teke and Yomut would become the principal tribal groups in this area.20 Subsequently, the Turkmen joined the Qizilbash troops of Shah Isma’il Safavi. These tribes included the Afsard and Qajar branches—Turkmen people who would found their own dynasties in Persia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

From the eighteenth century on, the Turkmen played an increasingly prominent role in Central Asia and Persia. Central Asia witnessed the incursion of Uzbek tribes21 and by the mid-nineteenth century was divided into the three khanates of Khiva, Bukhara, and Khuqand. These khanates fought not only among themselves but also with various
Further complicating matters, some of the Turkmen allied themselves with the Khivans and thus earned a degree of political independence. The khanates were extremely despotic in rule and conservative in nature, reflected in their continuation of Timurid court traditions.

During this period pasturelands diminished, resulting in a decline of the nomadic population and an increase in the number of settled Turkmen. Although the Turkmen are primarily perceived as nomads inhabiting the steppes and deserts, they also formed a sedentary agrarian society and developed extensive contacts with the merchants and craftsmen of the great urban centers where textiles, jewelry, and metalwork were manufactured. Their ikats and suzanis (cotton or silk embroideries) are among the best-known products of the area.
The Turkmen had prospered somewhat earlier under the rule of the Persian leader Nadir Shah Afshar (1736–47). In the early nineteenth century the Turkmen assisted in the rise to power of the Qajar rulers of Persia. Later in the century, believing that their support was not sufficiently rewarded by the Qajar rulers after Fath 'Ali Shah, the Turkmen frequently challenged Qajar authority. They continued the warlike traditions of their ancestors, raiding and plundering large territories as far away as Isfahan (particularly Khurasan), effectively destabilizing the country and disrupting trade.

The impact of this constant threat to Qajar rule is exemplified by a magnificent lacquer box from the Historisches Museum Bern (figs. 3a–c). This box forms part of a distinguished collection of nineteenth-century Central Asian art at the museum acquired by Henri Moser during his travels. Painted in 1865, the box is the work of one of the most notable painters of the late Qajar period, Muhammad Isma'il. According to extensive inscriptions, the work portrays on its cover the siege of Herat by Muhammad Shah Qajar (1834–48) in 1838. The sides are embellished with scenes from this campaign as well as another waged against the Turkmen tribes more than twenty years later. Verses allude to the commander in chief of the forces, Sipahsalar, identifiable as the Qajar prince Mirza Muhammad Khan Sipahsalar, who is shown accepting the submission of the Turkmen. The decorative scheme of the box commemorates his victory and places the event within the Qajar territorial claims over Herat and the neighboring areas. The box was most likely commissioned by the Qajar prince as a gift to Nasir al-Din Shah (1848–96), Muhammad Shah's successor.

THE SLAVE TRADE  The practice of slavery had been an integral part of the Turkmen economy since the Early Islamic period. Although it is difficult to believe today, the Turkmen were feared throughout the Qajar domain because their principal source of revenue was slave trading—and the slaves were primarily Persians (fig. 4), held for ransom or sold in the slave markets of Central Asia. Being Sunni, the Turkmen justified their actions by claiming (as they did about Jews) that Shi'a Persians were heretics. Other Turkmen slaves included Russian Cossacks captured by the Kirghiz, and Russian fishermen from the Caspian Sea. In the seventeenth century there were more than three thousand Russian captives, but after 1840 their numbers decreased as a result of the conquest of Kirghiz by the Russians. By the late nineteenth century, cotton had become the principal crop in the region, and Persian slaves by the thousands were used as agricultural laborers in the production of this and other crops. Male Persian slaves also worked in urban areas as domestics and craftsmen and sometimes rose to positions of power as advisors to the khans; women were used as household servants or concubines. By 1861 the number of Persian slaves had swelled to over twenty thousand after
a decisive defeat of the Qajar forces by the Turkmen. These slaves were liberated following the Russian victory in 1873 over the khanate of Khiva. Slavery was abolished in the region soon thereafter, a development that would prove to have a disastrous impact on Turkmen economic life.

Ironically, Persia itself was a slave-owning and slave-importing society; slavery in Persia, however, was not conducted on as vast a scale as in Central Asia, nor did it take on the same violent form. Christian, Caucasian, and later African slaves were recorded in Persia until the late nineteenth century, although under pressure from the British, Muhammad Shah had forbidden the import of slaves by sea.

The issue of slavery in Central Asia was of keen interest to European travelers and their readers during the late nineteenth century, doubtless a reflection of the movements to abolish slavery in the Western world. It was also a useful tool for polemicists such as Charles Marvin, who in the 1880s advocated more aggressive action by the British in Central Asia, claiming that the Russians were gaining great support in the region thanks to their liberation of these unhappy slaves.

**Sociopolitical Evolution** The role of the Turkmen in local politics was described extensively in European accounts of the late nineteenth century. Europeans had a great deal of interest in Central Asia at the time, as it was the principal theater in which the “Great Game” of the imperial powers was being played out. Simply put, the
Russians conquered much of Central Asia in the course of the second half of the nineteenth century; the British were determined to limit this expansion in order to protect Afghanistan and the British route to their eastern empire in India. From 1865 to 1876 Russia annexed most of Central Asia and the eastern coastal area of the Caspian Sea and its neighboring states. The Turkmen alone continued to offer resistance; it was not until 1881, after the defeat of Göktepe, that they capitulated, followed by the surrender of Merv in 1884.35

A. C. MacGahan, an American journalist who covered the Russian campaigns against the khanate of Khiva and the Turkmen in 1873 for the New York Herald, portrayed the Turkmen as noble warriors and movingly described their bravery in battles against superior Russian artillery and manpower (fig. 5). MacGahan considered them more trustworthy than the Uzbeks, whom he saw as infected by unnamed Islamic vices.36 In 1882 the English journalist Edmond O’Donovan described the defense of Merv as “a last stand,” in an echo of the pacification of the American West.37 These romanticized views of the Central Asian “noble savage” are balanced by other accounts, such as that of Arminius Vâmbéry, who caustically described the Turkmen men as indolent except when they were engaged in raids, and as cruel taskmasters to their Persian slaves.38

After 1884, the Turkmen domains were incorporated into the Russian Empire and administered as part of the General Governorate of Turkestan.39 Later, under the Soviets, the Turkmen SSR was founded in 1925; this was eventually succeeded by the Republic of Turkmenistan in 1991.40 The Russian conquests and the end of the Great Game, signaled by the signing of the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, precipitated the demise of Turkmen political power in Central Asia. However, the Turkmen continued to actively challenge the central power in Persia, though their numbers were severely diminished throughout Qajar rule until they were completely subdued under the Pahlavi dynasty. But old habits die hard, and the Turkmen once again showed echoes of their former independence in 1978, when reports of scattered uprisings were recorded.41

CUSTOMS AND CULTURE  All accounts from the nineteenth century agree that as a people, the Turkmen were fiercely independent and egalitarian. As fighters they had no equal; they employed guerilla tactics that were especially successful against their Persian foes. In general, outsiders—even if they were held as slaves for ransom—described the Turkmen as courteous, intelligent, and dedicated to their own code of honor. Their character is favorably contrasted with that of the Persians, who are depicted as cowardly, perfidious, and—worst of all—militarily incompetent.

Eyewitness accounts describe the tents (or yurts) of the nomadic peoples and the settlements of the sedentary Turkmen, particularly in Merv. Tents were circular, domed dwellings made of wooden frameworks covered by felts. The military officer Henri de Blocqueville, writing in 1866, describes feathers surmounting the tents. The tent interiors were covered with carpets, and the sides were hung with cooking implements and saddlebags used for safekeeping belongings. Tent bands encircled the interiors, and the entrances were sometimes also hung with rugs.

The settlements featured both tents and modest buildings, side by side, and were sometimes located near fortresses that dotted what was essentially a frontier (fig. 6). One traveler described how the local khan lived in his tent and used the other structures for his receptions and administrative functions.

Each tribe was ruled by an elected official, or katkhuda, and advised by a council of elders. The economic status of the tribes varied considerably, from the subsistence level found among the poorer Yomut fishermen and pirates to the great wealth of the Akhal Teke chieftains. Within the family unit, the women were not only responsible for child rearing and the management of daily life, but were also skilled embroiderers, rug weavers, and felt makers. Travelers generally noted that women were quite well treated and respected for their skills; in fact, an older woman was considered a more desirable partner because of her experience. The women were only lightly veiled and, because of the communal conditions of tent living, were quite free to interact with men and even European visitors.

The men worked either as field laborers or as cattle herders. It is no wonder that the economy constantly needed to be supplemented by raids, known as an alaman (predatory expedition) or a chapao (surprise attack), words that became very familiar to all nineteenth-century travelers venturing into the area. These raids were not only directed against their enemies but also, as if for sport, against any neighboring Turkmen tribes encountered along the way. The military officer Blocqueville, who was appointed in 1866 to accompany a Persian punitive expedition against the Turkmen, had a clause inserted in his contract guaranteeing that his ransom would be paid by the Persian government in the event of his capture by the Turkmen. This clause finally secured his freedom from the Teke of Merv after fourteen long months of captivity.
Opinions differ as to the level of education among the Turkmen, but all accounts confirm that they loved music and had great reverence for their bards, or bakhshis. The bards sang war songs composed by Central Asian poets (particularly the eighteenth-century poet Maqtum Qulii), which were sometimes directed against their hereditary enemies, the Persians. Travelers were of the opinion that, in the cultural sphere, musicians were more valued by the Turkmen than poets. Their spoken language was a type of Chagatai Turkish.

Turkmen religious beliefs are best described as syncretistic, combining traditional Sunni practices—Friday mosque attendance, pilgrimages to holy sites, and the officiating by local clerics at marriages—with Sufi and even pre-Islamic beliefs. This synthesis was condemned by Sunni clerics (ulamas) of the urban centers, and Persian theologians did not even consider the Turkmen Muslims. The Turkmen appear to have been far from fanatical and remarkably practical, adapting their beliefs as political and ethnic changes swept through the area. For instance, both local Muslim clerics and tribal shamans were called upon to write protective amulets, depending on the circumstances. Even a Christian like Blocqueville was considered learned enough to perform this function! Also, rams and goats, Turco-Mongol totems, were still used by local shamans in the practice of their arts (fig. 7).
Turco-Mongol and pre-Islamic beliefs and practices were routine among the Turkmen, who called upon whatever forces they deemed helpful. This can be seen very clearly in the totemic decorative motifs—such as rams’ heads, double-headed eagles, and tree-of-life images—on Turkmen clothing, embroidery, rugs, and silver ornaments. This natural traditionalism was reinforced by the isolation of Central Asia in the nineteenth century, when, except for its strategic value to other nations, the region’s historical and economic power had declined.

The marriage ceremonial was an influential factor in the tradition of lavish jewelry among Turkmen women. Blocqueville recounts that young girls were not considered marriageable until age sixteen or seventeen, quite old by Muslim standards. Their “bride price” varied according to their beauty and status. The marriage contract was drawn up by a Muslim cleric and the wedding day chosen. The groom’s wedding party, consisting of jewel-bedecked women and camels laden with precious textiles and rugs, fetched the bride. Amid elaborate feats of horsemanship by the men that mimicked a kidnapping, the bride was brought to live with the groom’s family during a one-year period of engagement and then returned to her own people (fig. 8). During this engagement she prepared carpets and accoutrements for the tent, while the groom was responsible for the full payment of the bride price. Finally, the bride, mounted on a richly decorated camel, was taken by the groom’s family

FIG. 7. Maigicien et sa chèvre [Shaman with his goat]. From Henri Moser, À travers l’Asie centrale (Paris, 1886), p. 104

to live in her new home.\textsuperscript{63} Blocqueville’s account is accompanied by intricate illustrations of the principal jewelry forms worn by the Turkmen (figs. 9a–c). Although the ornaments are only briefly referred to in his writing, these illustrations are probably the most important renderings of nineteenth-century Turkmen jewelry we possess today.

Animals were integral to the lifestyle of the Turkmen; their horses were their most prized possessions. According to Vâmbéry, the horses were more highly valued by “these sons of the desert” than their wives, daughters, or even their own lives.\textsuperscript{64} No wonder, since their daily existence depended so heavily on these animals. Turkmen steeds were famed for their speed, hardiness, and ability to traverse great distances. Travelers, many of them connoisseurs of horses, discussed the animals’ qualities and merits at length. Turkmen tradition held that their horses were the result of the crossing of Arab and local breeds during the reign of Nadir Shah in the mid-eighteenth century. Their hardiness was also attributed to a special diet.\textsuperscript{65} The value that the Turkmen placed on their horses is reflected in their elaborate jeweled trappings of gilded silver and leather and beautifully embroidered felt coverings. Camels were also indispensable to nomadic life and, like horses, were decorated with fine fabric coverings.\textsuperscript{66}

As with all nomadic peoples, the Turkmen’s principal wealth lay in portable items such as carpets and saddlebags (fig. 10). Their magnificent pile carpets and flat weaves were noted in contemporary accounts and were highly valued as

---

souvenirs by Russians and Europeans. Little is recorded about other crafts, although from travelers’ descriptions of the wares in bazaars, it appears that urban centers (such as Khiva and Bukhara) and Turkmen settlements (such as Merv and Gurgan) supplied the Turkmen with the artifacts and goods they needed. Accounts confirm that the Turkmen could avail themselves of silver ornaments from local village jewelers as well as jacks-of-all-trades.

![Fig. 10. Shallow wall bag, first half of the 19th century. Teke. Textile Museum, Washington, D.C., Gift of Bernard B. Lieder](image)

Blocqueville, who, as noted above, was a Turkmen hostage for fourteen months, was also a keen observer, noting the presence of specialized jewelers in the encampment at Merv: “On trouve parmi eux quelques bijoutiers, qui fabriquent dans le gout du pays des parures en argent massif, avec filets d’or et incrustations de cornalines” [One finds among them some jewelers who produce sets of matching jewelry in the local style in solid silver with gold inlays and encrusted with carnelians]. O’Donovan described a village artisan in 1882: “The village smith is the uesta-adağ, the English equivalent of which would be handyman or jack-of-all-trades; for here there is no division into guilds, and one uesta-adağ acts in many capacities for the immediate population. He will make silver rings for the women, shoe horses, repair gun locks, and even bleed a plethoric individual. . . . The uesta-adağ could work silver and gold . . . and perform all manner of skilled labor.”

The enormous scale and sheer weight of Turkmen silver ornaments must have alerted European travelers to the fact that this was no ordinary parure and its appearance could be well worth recording. Moser noted that the purpose of these ornaments was not just to display affluence; they were also trophies of the Turkmen’s victorious campaigns. That these objects also served as their principal form of wealth is confirmed by the Turkmen use of jewelry in the payment of war reparations demanded by the Russians.

Another aspect of Turkmen life that drew the attention of European visitors was coinage, although their evidence is sometimes conflicting. O’Donovan noted in 1882 that the Turkmen did not mint their own coins but rather used Persian and Russian
coins, whose value constantly fluctuated, and that this made commercial transactions
difficult.73 Around the same time, however, Colonel C. E. Stewart described the Turk-
men as excellent forgers who produced copies of Russian coins with which they flooded
the bazaar of the town of Muhammadabad in northeast Iran.74

In 1886 Moser noted that local coinage was minted in Merv. The Persian kran, the
Bukharan tanga, and Russian paper money were also used, and everyone struck coinage
according to their needs. Most significant in Moser’s account is a long passage describ-
ing a local master minter who struck Russian, Khivan, Bukharan, and Persian coins of
little value, composed of an alloy of one-third silver and two-thirds copper. He was
highly valued for his skills, not the least of which, according to Moser, was the produc-
tion of false coinage for large payments—perhaps including the large reparations that the
defeated Turkmen were required to make to the Russians.75 O’Donovan was of the opin-
ion that one of the principal motivations for the Russian colonization of this area was
to replace these local currencies and forgeries with authentic Russian paper money.76

JEWELRY CRAFTSMANSHIP Beginning with the earliest accounts dating from the
late eighteenth century, Turkmen jewelry was described in conjunction with both men’s
and women’s clothing. As far as we can determine, the descriptions in eighteenth- and
early nineteenth-century accounts refer primarily to the Yomut in the Caspian Sea area,
and those in the later nineteenth century refer to the Teke and Yomut of Central Asia.
Men wore collarless shirts and wide pants, robes with wide sleeves belted with sashes,
and sheepskin caps. On their feet they wore slippers or simple soles with leggings in
summer and leather boots in winter. A dagger and flint completed this outfit. Women
wore long, wide shifts over pants, often elaborately embroidered, which narrowed at the
ankle. A short robe was worn with the outfit, and the head was covered with either a silk
headband or a high cap with a veil attached.

Women’s clothing was made of brightly colored silks77 and served, along with their
headgear, to display monumental silver ornaments, which covered them from head to
waist, front and back. Travelers described a high headdress decorated with plaques,
chains, bells, and coins made of silver, embellished with gilded plaques or gold inlay,
and inset with carnelians and agates. One Russian traveler, S. G. Karelkin, who visited the
Caspian Sea area in 1836, recorded that the jewelry was made of silver-plated copper.78
Necklets with attachments of cordiform and lozenge-shaped components and amulets
with chains were also noted, as well as cartouches attached to straps and worn on the
side. Earrings with long chains were attached to the headdress as well. Ornaments with
chains and coins were used to adorn braids on both back and front. Even the earliest
accounts described heavy silver cuffs inset with carnelians and worn at the wrists.79
Travelers often did not appreciate the aesthetic value of the jewelry, probably because they regarded this tradition as folk art rather than high art, and understood it only in ethnographic terms. Furthermore, they were never close enough to the women to examine the jewelry carefully. Many accounts refer to the jewelry as “armor” or “breastplates,” and one traveler invokes a flattering comparison with Minerva, the Roman goddess of war and wisdom. The women, thus outfitted, were also compared with horses or mules, who, the travelers noted, were similarly bedecked and also produced the sound of ringing bells as they moved.80 These statements contrast strongly with descriptions from the 1970s literature. Iran Ala Firouz, who witnessed the ornaments worn with colorful clothing at wedding ceremonies, appreciated both the brilliant color and sounds of the bridal outfits and jewelry.81 Bernard Dupaigne described the luminescent golden splendor of the overall effect of a bride arrayed in all her finery.82

Descriptions frequently referred to the weight of the jewelry, and writers marveled at the Turkmen women’s ability to carry such heavy ornaments. Travelers also recorded the lavish use of bells. Vámbséry in particular noted that the Turkmen loved the music produced by these “trinkets,” as he described them: “These accompany every movement of the body with a clear sound, as it were of bells.” With his usual wit Vámbséry adds: “The Turkmen is very fond of such clatter, and attaches articles that produce it either to his wife or his horse; or, when the opportunity there fails him, he steals a Persian, and suspends chains upon him.”83

Regrettably, these authors paid little attention to jewelry-making techniques, although materials were noted. Only Bloqueville described the use of arabesques and openwork in the silver ornaments of the Teke of Akhal and Merv. Fortunately, we are able to supplement these observations with a few illustrations, the most useful of which are Bloqueville’s detailed drawings of almost every type of jewelry then known (figs. 9a–c), and a set of drawings of a Turkmen woman near the border of present-day Afghanistan wearing a full complement of silver ornaments (figs. 11a–c). The photographs taken by Henri Moser and S. M. Dudin also provide valuable documentation of how the jewelry was worn and furnish approximate dating for certain types.84

Bloqueville’s drawings of the silver ornaments supplement his pithy descriptions. The images vividly illustrate the elegance of form and graceful design, the clarity of geometric shapes, and the contrast between the stones and the plain background that are characteristic of Turkmen ornaments. Unfortunately, the artist did not provide detailed renderings of the ornamental patterns, although Bloqueville’s use of the term arabesque—referring to the type of unending vegetal motifs current in the late nineteenth century—indicates that he understood the Islamic origin of the design.

The drawings in the second set of illustrations and their accompanying text also provide information of interest. The anonymous short text assigns these drawings to a
British officer. According to inscriptions located at the bottom of the images, the drawings were executed at the Mayo School of Art in Lahore, one of a number of European-style art academies established in British India in the late nineteenth century to teach classical European fine arts and improve the standards of indigenous crafts.55

The text praises the ornaments for the regularity and delicacy of their silver wire edgings and the skillful rendering of their gilded arabesque patterns executed with relatively unsophisticated techniques.56 This must be understood as a comparison to the technically more advanced and heavily jewel-encrusted late Mughal tradition in Indian jewelry, which would have been the standard against which the Turkmen pieces were judged.

The drawings, which provide clear renderings of the decorative motifs, were obviously executed by someone who had excellent graphic skills and was familiar with the Islamic decorative vocabulary. We may surmise from their sophistication that an artist from the school either accompanied the officer on his journey or fleshed out the original sketches from Lahore on his return.

In the drawings, hatching and shading are used on the arabesques to add volume and to establish a contrast of dark designs against a light ground. Although this is the opposite effect of that usually desired by Turkmen in their silver jewelry. Hatching is sometimes found in Turkmen ornaments (see nos. 111–13), but it is used exclusively for the ground and in no way mitigates the flatness typical of Islamic design. Furthermore, the arabesque pattern in the drawings is centered and rounded off at the corners, a design feature that reflects the influence of European, not Islamic, design traditions.

Unlike the Mayo School drawings, which leave considerable areas of empty space around the arabesques, the designs found on Turkmen ornaments such as cordiform pendant no. 58 and roundel no. 87 fill the ground completely; this reflects the Islamic preference for overall patterning, which is characterized by seemingly endless repetition and the impression that the decoration continues beyond the framing elements or borders. The tendency of nineteenth-century European designers and artists to “improve upon” the original appears to distort certain design features of Turkmen silver ornament and lessens the documentary value of these drawings. Nevertheless, they are invaluable tools for dating and determining the usage of the ornaments depicted.

Turkmen Ornaments: Sources

The elaborate and distinctive Turkmen clothing and ornaments described above can be clearly seen in a ca. 1886 drawing based on a photograph of two Teke women taken by Henri Moser and published in the account of his travels (fig. 12). The women are wearing silk robes and embroidered coats with vestigial sleeves worn as head coverings
(chirpys). The woman at the left wears a high cylindrical headdress made of a silkwrapped reed frame. The headdress is decorated with layered rows of silver ornaments consisting of a headband of small linked plaques surmounted by rows of coins or other plaques, and a crownlike band of pointed terminals with attached silver temple pendants falling at the sides.7 The overall appearance of her parure is very similar to the jewelry shown in Blocqueville’s drawing (fig. 9c). The woman at the right wears a semi-circular ornament at the neck and sewn-on plaques that cover her entire chest. Two straps decorated with plaques are worn diagonally across her chest and hang to the sides. Pouches (hakals) containing amulets or prayers were attached to straps of this type; they are not visible here but can be seen in a well-known photograph of a Turkmen woman by S. M. Dudin (see page 210).8

What is the history of this remarkable bejeweled and ornamented attire, crowned with headdresses of such monumental proportions? The historical overview in the preceding pages has shown that the Turks may be traced as far back as the third century B.C. and that the Turkmen are recorded in Central Asia by the ninth century A.D., when they are mentioned by al-Muqaddasi, the Arab historian.9 Yet despite their historical importance, very little is known of Turkic or Turkmen material culture, either before their westward migrations or after they settled in the Islamic world. Even nineteenth-century descriptions, as informative as they are, provide few details about their artifacts. Due to this relative lack of documentation—as compared to that of pre-Islamic Byzantine and Sasanian traditions—the extent and nature of Turkish influence in the formative periods of Islamic art are frequently debated issues.10 Once the Turks attained dynastic status, as happened with the Seljuqs and Ghaznavids and the Turkmen themselves in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, their arts on the whole reflected Persian artistic traditions and court culture. But the lacunae in tracing their earlier material culture present some of the greatest challenges to understanding the origins and evolution of Turkmen ornament.

One approach has been to see the Turkmen as living in isolation from the Islamic world. Reinhold and Dieter Schletzer have argued that Turco-Mongol religious beliefs and emblems were the decisive influences on the forms, decorative repertoire, and
meaning of Turkmen silver ornament. Their argument is based primarily on Russian ethno-graphics studies of Turkmen tribal life and is supported by the perceived seclusion and traditionalism of the Turkmen tribes of Central Asia. However, their conclusions are problematic, since the visual documentation they present is drawn exclusively from ancient Altaic—that is, pre-Islamic—Central Asian sources. The presence of Islam in Central Asia, the conversion of the Turkmen to Sunnism, and the subsequent influence of urban Islamic culture, although considered, are dismissed as irrelevant.91

A similar oversimplification has sometimes taken place in discussions of the historical development of Turkmen designs, which are interpreted as examples of the conservative nature of Islamic tradition. Johannes Kalter has proposed that the stylized vegetal designs found primarily on Teke ornaments are derived from Early Islamic versions of the arabesque. He supports this view with line drawings showing the similarities between nineteenth-century Turkmen jewelry designs and tenth- to eleventh-century Samanid and Ghaznavid architectural details (fig. 13).92 His argument should be modified, however, to take into account the survival into the fourteenth century of the “beveled style” of Abbasid ornament in a wide range of media and in geographical areas from eastern Iran to Central Asia.93 Furthermore, Kalter's theory does not fully consider the variety of Turkmen vegetal designs, which ranged from the early simplified wide form to elegant and delicate variations and, finally, to highly abstracted forms. Nor does it explain the survival of such archaic designs or consider how Turkmen silversmiths may have had access to such artistic models.

While following the same line of reasoning as Kalter, Hermann Rudolph illustrates his conclusions with drawings from a wider chronological range of styles, from antiquity to the seventeenth century,94 that parallel the designs in Turkmen jewelry.

This suggests that the decorative tradition of Turkmen jewelry, with its varied vegetal styles, was in fact the result of an ongoing historical evolution that was reinvigorated in the nineteenth century. However, the eclecticism of the Turkmen designs also suggests that, as in other areas of the Islamic world in the nineteenth century, what we are really witnessing is a revivalist style, in essence a historical anachronism. The lack of Chinese floral decoration, which changed the Islamic decorative vocabulary after the Mongol invasions in the early thirteenth century, is an intriguing aspect of Turkmen ornament that would benefit from further investigation.

The following discussion of the origins of Turkmen jewelry is predicated on the understanding that the Turkmen, although nomadic, did not live in isolation from the sedentary populations in the region; to a degree, their histories are intertwined.95
ORIGINS AND EVOLUTION  The earliest descriptions of Turkmen silver ornaments date from the late eighteenth century, while surviving examples cannot be dated earlier than the mid-nineteenth century. Although the exact date of origin is uncertain, the early accounts suggest a well-developed tradition, using a single medium, silver (gilded or plain); a single stone, the carnelian; arabesque designs; and coinage. I would also suggest that the jewelry reflects much older decorative styles and traditions that include, but are not limited to, those of Turkic culture.

A study of the most prominent component of Turkmen ornament, the headdress, helps to illustrate the complexity of historical references and ethnic influences that characterize the Turkmen ornamental tradition. Early prototypes for the Turkmen headdress appear in the ancient traditions of jeweled women’s headdresses like those found in royal Scythian graves in Central Asia and the Caucasus, dateable to the fourth and third century B.C.; in Parthian-period statuettes of females with jeweled decoration; and in Eastern Hellenistic headdresses from the fourth to first century B.C. The tradition of elaborate headdresses continued in a somewhat different form in the thirteenth century during the Mongol period, as shown in album paintings illustrating the court councils of the Great Khan, his consort, and Mongol princesses, detached from an early fourteenth-century copy of the Mongol historian Rashid al-Din’s Universal History (fig. 14). The paintings depict tall, cumbersome, bright red headdress surmounted by circular discs. According to historical sources, this type of headdress was worn well into the seventeenth century. Similar examples were still found among the Mongol tribes in the first half of the twentieth century and present remarkable parallels with the Turkmen versions. Iran Ala Firouz, the first scholar to note these similarities, has argued that Turkmen ornaments generally described as necklets were actually a form of headdress related to Mongol models.

A high headdress with bejeweled ornaments worn by the consort of
Timur Lang (Tamerlane), founder of the Timurid dynasty, was described in the account of Ruy de Clavijo, Spanish ambassador to the court of the ruler in Samarqand, in 1400. The headdress took on a more elegant and decorative form compared to the Mongol prototypes. Lisa Golombek has published a fifteenth-century Central Asian painting depicting the mother of the bride in a wedding procession, purportedly that of a Chinese princess traveling to the Timurid court. She is shown wearing a delicate, jeweled gold headdress. Opulent headdress ornaments were still in use in the Persian courts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

An intriguing feature of the Turkmen headdress is how sumptuous, almost regal, it is when compared with that worn by equally powerful nineteenth-century tribes such as the Qashqa’i; or with jewelry of the neighboring Persian courts as illustrated in Qajar painting (fig. 15); or with the prevailing taste in Central Asian cities such as Bukhara, which favored delicate gold jewelry in an intricate filigree style. However, the scale and monumentality of the Turkmen headdress do not seem so puzzling when compared with the headgear worn during this period by Mongol, Kurdish, and Kyrgyz women. Consequently, it is possible to establish the broad outlines of a continuing tradition of ornamented headdresses of various cultures dating from antiquity through early and later Islamic periods that served as the prototypes for the Turkmen styles.

SILVER PRODUCTION  Among the Turkic tribes, the Turkmen preference for silver is no doubt connected to the history of silver production in Central Asia, the homeland of the Turkmen for centuries. The presence of rich silver mines and large-scale production of coinage and luxury vessels during the Soghdian and Sasanian periods in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. has been extensively documented and studied. This production continued in the early medieval period under the Samanid and Ghaznavid dynasties, when the Turkmen are first recorded in the area. Coinage from Central Asia was exported all over the Islamic world and as far away as Europe. Silver plate and drinking vessels were produced in significant numbers and were considered essential to court rituals and ceremonials.
Several silver hoards, such as the Harari hoard, dated to the tenth and eleventh centuries, attest to this lavish silver production. After the eleventh century, the availability of silver declined, and from this period on in Central Asia, it was used only as inlay in brass and bronze vessels.

A rare surviving example of an aquamanile (silver water vessel) in the form of a mounted horseman has been dated to the eighth or ninth century and assigned to Central Asia (fig. 16). The rider's features are Turkic and he is clothed in metal plate armor, as is his horse; the vessel clearly represents one of the conquering Turkic rulers. The work is remarkable for the extremely accurate rendering of the rider's features and the realism with which both his ornaments and those of his horse are depicted.

The memory of the ritual use of silver in royal ceremonials may have survived among the Turkmen who remained in Central Asia. In the nineteenth century, when the Turkmen once again attained a measure of prosperity and acquired access to large quantities of silver coinage, the wealthiest among them, particularly the Teke, considered silver the prime expression of royal status. However, during this period Turkmen chose to lavish their wealth not on silver plate, but on decorating their women and their horses. The presence of craftsmen, itinerant minters, and even silversmiths among the Turkmen tribes—recorded from the eighteenth century on—must have contributed to the continued use of silver.

**ISLAMIC INFLUENCES** I have discussed the traditions of headdress ornaments and of silverwork in Central Asia. Islamic jewelry and ornaments also present evidence of stylistic and formal links to the later Turkmen silver ornaments that help to fill in the broad picture of its evolution prior to the nineteenth century. The following discussion focuses on silver, although gold jewelry also presents prototypes. James Allan, writing in 1986, expressed the hope that the publication of nineteenth-century silver jewelry would address some of the unanswered questions related to Early Islamic jewelry production. I would suggest that we also look at Early Islamic silver for the origins of certain forms and decorative motifs found in Turkmen ornaments.

Although gold was the preferred medium from the beginning of the Islamic era in the seventh century A.D., a survey of recent scholarly literature reveals that silver was more extensively used throughout the Islamic world than previously thought. Fewer examples of silver jewelry have been preserved, since they were more likely to be melted down than those made of precious gold. Some examples from Central Asia that have

---

**FIG. 16. Drawings of a silver aquamanile in the form of a mounted horseman, Central Asia, 8th–9th century**
survived include a hoard of silver jewelry, dated to the tenth and eleventh centuries, from Sayram Su in the Shymkent district (fig. 17). These finds exhibit remarkable similarities to Turkmen ornaments in the forms of cylindrical amulet holders with suspension loops and in the use of bells, which were commonly attached as ornaments on Turkmen jewelry. The publication of the silver finds from Nishapur in eastern Persia, dated to approximately the same period, also yields intriguing evidence, as the pieces include similar silver amulet cases with suspension loops and conical and spherical bells.13

However, the major design element of that period, ornamental kufic script (an early form of Arabic calligraphy), is not found in Turkmen ornaments. Rather, the other principal motif, the arabesque, which plays only a subsidiary role in these early silver pieces, would become the primary element of the Turkmen decorative repertoire. This is not surprising, since by the nineteenth century it was no longer considered necessary to proclaim adherence to the faith through the prominent display of religious inscriptions, as it had been in the early centuries of Islamic rule in Central Asia. Moreover, as discussed earlier, travelers’ accounts attested to the fact that Turkmen beliefs were far from orthodox. Even urban jewelry of the period in Central Asia rarely used calligraphic designs.
CORDIFORM ORNAMENTS  Silver and gilded bronze men’s belt fittings and horse harness elements also provide significant precedents for the silver ornaments created for Turkmen women. This connection leads to particularly fruitful explanations of the origins of the misleadingly named “heart-shaped” or cordiform ornament (fig. 18). Its distinctive shape, which has inspired some of the finest and most creative examples of Turkmen design, has puzzled scholars. The ornament’s identification with a heart shape has led to the interpretation of this ornament as a symbol of fertility. It has also been described as a spear, and perceived primarily as an amulet to ward off evil.114 The Turkmen themselves, when questioned in 1886 as to the origin of this form, claimed that it was at least 2,500 years old, though their interlocutors found this doubtful.115

A more convincing explanation of the origin of the form may be found in small cordiform pendants described as belt fittings, examples of which are found in both the Nishapur excavated pieces and in works in the Nasser D. Khalili Collection (fig. 19). The pendants range in size from one-half inch to three-quarters of an inch. The Nishapur finds include three detached gilded bronze elements. Six silver gilt belt plaques, originally part of a set of belt fittings in the Khalili collection—assigned to the Caucasus and dated to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—include two cordiform plaques. The author David Alexander asserts that such plaques were found in large numbers in Iran, the Caucasus, and Southern Russia and were favored by the Alans and Turks of the Altai region. Allan also notes the use of such belt plaques in Central Asia during the great migrations of the tenth and eleventh centuries.116 Belts comprising similar elements can be seen in contemporary wall paintings in Iran and Central Asia.117

Comparable cordiform pendant forms—though somewhat larger in scale—were also utilized as Turkic equestrian ornaments. For a remarkable example of this, we may turn to the Moscow aquamanile (see fig. 16), where numerous cordiform pendants are depicted hanging from a horse’s harness. A silver dish assigned to fourteenth-century Bulgaria also features a rider whose horse harness displays similar pendants.118 In neither of these instances can we be certain that the ornaments are made of leather with metal or silver plaques, although it seems very likely.119 Ottoman and Safavid horse harnesses of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries suggest how the tradition of ornamenting horses continued and evolved, and one example dated to the mid-seventeenth century even features cordiform pendants with openwork decoration.120 It is possible that the use of cordiform equestrian ornaments continued until the nineteenth century, although no Turkmen harnesses with such pendants appear to have been identified.
The cordiform pendants utilized by Turkmen women range in size from the very large types, which were believed to be worn singly on the torso, to smaller examples, which were grouped by twos and threes, attached to braids at the back, and interconnected. These smaller pendants present greater similarities to those seen on horse harnesses. If the assumption that earlier pieces are smaller in scale is correct, this would further support the argument that the origins of Turkmen ornament may be traced not only to the Islamic jewelry tradition (belt fittings in particular), but also to related crafts such as leather horse trappings with gilded metal plaques; both types of objects are closely associated with and were highly developed by Turkic peoples.\textsuperscript{121}

This demonstrates the value of looking beyond the narrow confines of jewelry for the evolution of Turkmen ornament and clearly shows how forms were transferred from one craft to another. In a culture where horses were valued more highly than women and harnesses were made of precious metal and lavishly decorated, it is logical that early versions of adornment for horses would provide precedents for later jewelry for women.

\textbf{OTHER SOURCES} Other examples of silver jewelry from eastern Iran from the Seljuq period (from the eleventh to the thirteenth century) and from farther west in Caesarea and Beit Hashita in Palestine (from the eleventh to the fourteenth century) also exhibit similarities to Turkmen ornament, especially in their arabesque decoration and the use of beads, bells, and filigree.\textsuperscript{122} By way of example, an Iranian bracelet fabricated from silver sheet features silver wire, chased and punched decoration, and a wide split-leaf arabesque design (fig. 20), all familiar aspects of Turkmen jewelry. Silver jewelry excavated in Caesarea includes cylindrical amulets with twisted silver wire chains and pendants, intended to be worn as necklaces, as well as bracelets or anklets with beads, bells, cylinders, and pendants—all common features of Turkmen jewelry.\textsuperscript{123}

A rare example of a crescent-shaped silver amulet has been dated to the thirteenth century and assigned to Transoxiana (fig. 21).\textsuperscript{124} Providing that the date of the piece is confirmed, its large scale (8¼ by 7½ inches) when compared to earlier crescent-shaped amulets,\textsuperscript{125} its copper-inlay arabesque decoration, and its inclusion of suspension loops...
for attachments—presumably so it could be worn as a pectoral or dorsal ornament—all anticipate features of Turkmen amulets.

Surviving jewelry from the Mongol and post-Mongol periods from the thirteenth century on is extremely rare and can be traced mainly through manuscript illustrations. Lisa Golombek has presented evidence of eastern Islamic jewelry production in her discussion of two surviving gold necklaces. The necklaces, one incomplete in the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto and the other a complete example now in The Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 22), are described as golden garlands. Golombek dates the
two works to the fifteenth century, although recently they have been dated to the fourteenth century. As evidence for her dating and attribution, Golombek reproduces an illustration from a royal manuscript of the great Persian epic *Shahnama* (fig. 23). The image, produced in Tabriz in the mid-fourteenth century, illustrates an episode from the love story of Zal and Rudaba depicting Sindukht (Rudaba’s mother) becoming aware of Rudaba’s actions. Rudaba is shown rewarding the maid who has acted as a go-between for the couple with new clothes, precious headdresses, and a rug; the gifts are displayed prominently in the foreground. The Persian artist has chosen to depict the maid’s headdress but has added an impressive necklace with a central lobe-shaped half-medallion and round and square elements that may or may not have been attached to the crown. This necklace is very similar to the ones discussed by Golombek and dated by her to the fifteenth century. However, the evidence of the *Shahnama* illustration that she cites may also support the fourteenth-century dating that has been proposed in more recent publications.

In her discussion of these pieces, Golombek also reproduces mid-fifteenth-century paintings from the Istanbul albums to help in the proposed reconstruction of the Royal Ontario Museum necklace elements. The first, depicting a Chinese dancer, shows a long necklace with a semicircular central element, similar to the two surviving necklaces, attached around the neck by connecting links (fig. 24). The necklace bears a marked resemblance to Turkmen silver cordiform ornaments attached by chains.
and worn in front or on the back. Similar necklaces are depicted in a number of other fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscript illustrations produced in Timurid, Turkmen, early Safavid, and Bukhara workshops.\textsuperscript{128}

The literature on Islamic jewelry of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has produced only a single example of a silver cylindrical amulet holder. The work is embellished with silver filigree, decorations of inlaid stone, and a cordiform pendant. Dates ranging from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries have been proposed, and the work has been assigned a Near Eastern or possibly Turkmen origin (fig. 25).\textsuperscript{129} If the earlier dating is correct, this work may represent the only surviving link to Turkmen examples of this type.

**Turkmen Ornaments: Analysis**

**DATING** Nothing is known about the beginnings of Turkmen jewelry. The topic has not been thoroughly addressed in the literature, which has focused on questions of typology and interpretation. Nevertheless, as previously discussed here, I would assert that the quality of the earliest surviving examples of the early to mid-nineteenth century indicates a well-developed tradition and that the stylistic diversity of the extant works testifies to the influence of much older decorative styles, as well as Islamic and Mongol jewelry traditions.

Of the tools available to the scholar, neither dated inscriptions nor stylistic evidence provide conclusive evidence for dating. Inscribed works are few, and most of them may
be assigned to the first two decades of the twentieth century. According to Johannes Kalter, the last known dated piece bears the inscription 1956, and although silver jewelry continued to be produced in a modified, modernized style into the 1970s, gold jewelry was preferred by then. Despite numerous studies, firm stylistic evidence for the dating of Turkmen ornament of the early to mid-nineteenth century on is still lacking, resulting in much speculation and frequent contradictions in the current literature. Kalter, the most reliable source, has noted that works from the 1980s exhibit a decline in the clarity of design, an increase in scale, and, in the case of Yomut jewelry, an evolution toward the use of overall gilding. He also notes that reproductions of nineteenth-century Turkmen jewelry have been made in Afghanistan since the 1980s. Recent reproductions, along with attempts at craft revivals during the 1970s, have resulted in further confusion, as well as a conflation of different tribal styles.

DECORATIVE VOCABULARY AND STYLE Turkmen ornament is monumental in scale and regal in appearance. It is often described as possessing a martial quality, evoking images of the bravery of Turkmen women during the late nineteenth-century wars with Russia and of the warrior queens of the ancient Near East. These breathtaking adornments, when worn in their most lavish form on special occasions, have elicited comparisons with those of ancient goddesses and sun symbols. Dupaigne offered this eloquent description of a Turkmen bride:

“Apparition étrange et éblouissante que cette jeune femme qui s'avance, véritable soleil, reliquaire hiératique témoin de la splendeur de sa famille, objet d'art et de fierté, confiée, telle une reine précieuse, à sa nouvelle famille.” [She is a strange and dazzling apparition, this young woman who advances—a veritable sun, a holy reliquary embodying the splendor of her heritage, a work of art and a work of pride—entrusted, like a precious queen, to her new family.]

Turkmen ornament is largely geometric in form, composed of triangles, squares, rhomboids, and discs. Designs were applied or incised. The decorative vocabulary features stylized vegetal designs, zoomorphic imagery, tree-of-life motifs, rams’ heads, floral designs (particularly tulips), and forms such as bows and arrows (used on boys’ amulets to signify strength). The works are distinguished by simplicity and elegance in the materials employed, coupled with remarkably complex and creative designs, especially given the limited range of techniques in the workmanship. The silver is generally of high quality, melted down from coinage. Plaques, spheres, coins, pendants, terminals, linking elements, silver wire, turquoise, carnelian, and colored glass stones are repeated and endlessly varied to produce a kaleidoscope of form, color, and sound.

A significant stylistic feature is the ambiguous design, in which equal importance is
given to foreground and background. This feature characterizes many periods of Islamic art; it is associated primarily with the "beveled style" of the arabesque, which originated in the early Abbasid period (750–1258 A.D.), but also with linear arabesques of even width. Although the beveled technique is not found in Turkmen jewelry, arabesques of even width are common (see cordiform pendants nos. 46 and 47). Intriguingly, this was one of the techniques identified by Richard Ettinghausen as typically Turkish in Seljuq-period art. Another stylistic tendency found in many of the pieces is the illusion that the design extends indefinitely in either direction, a characteristic of Islamic vegetal design or arabesque first noted by Alois Riegl in 1882.

Two primary design categories may be identified, and they are associated with the two principal Turkmen tribes. Teke ornament is characterized by elegant arabesque designs, executed in fire gilding or openwork, covering the surface of the work. A pleasing color contrast is created between the gold arabesque and the silver background. Economical use of carnelians and other stones results in uncrowded, balanced, and symmetrical designs, almost classical in appearance. Yomut ornament, on the other hand, is characterized by profuse decoration and a preference for small, brilliant stones. Gilded appliqués in myriad shapes are scattered over the surface and contribute to an aesthetic of horror vacui (fear of empty space), or perhaps amor infiniti (love of the infinite), a term used to identify a preference for filling the entire surface of a work with small-scale, busy patterns. Yomut ornament is noticeably influenced by Persian artistic traditions, as in the adoption of the gulyaka, or flower-shaped collar stud, the preference for small-scale, colorful patterning, and the use of brilliant stones or glass. To a lesser extent, the decorative style of Ersari and Saryk jewelry may also be categorized. In these traditions, gilding is not used, and there is a preference for a very spare style with minimal decoration. Saryk ornament also features extensive use of twisted silver wire.

Many Turkmen ornaments fall into subcategories that are difficult to assign to either of the two major groups. This is especially true of recent works; although there must always have been some borrowing among the different tribal styles, it seems to have increased in the twentieth century.

The ornaments of the Kazakh tribes, for instance, utilize forms related to the Turkmen tradition yet exhibit their own distinctive style and decorative idiom. Kazakh ornaments are characterized by an extensive use of stamping that resembles granulation and oval or teardrop-shaped glass components. The glass is backed by red paper or fabric to imitate the color of carnelians and sometimes backed by foil to enhance its brilliance. Two decorative styles may be seen in Kazakh ornament. The first features lavish small-scale geometric patterns of sun and star shapes, executed in pseudo-granulation surrounding glass compartments or, more rarely, carnelians. The false granulation frames the glass or the stones, creating zigzag and diagonal patterns, all on a fire-gilded ground.
The second style exhibits larger, less intricate designs on a plain silver ground. The technical richness and variety are more limited than in the first style, and the surface patterning is reduced.

**DESIGN INFLUENCES** Besides drawing on the historic Islamic silver jewelry and tribal traditions outlined above, nineteenth-century Turkmen jewelry design was also influenced by the urban workshop production of the region. Recently the jewelry of Bukhara, Khiva, and Samarqand has been sufficiently published to demonstrate that although there are great differences, there was also some mutual borrowing. Examples of this cross-fertilization include a Teke cordiform pendant (no. 47) with niello decoration appropriated from the urban workshop tradition and a Khivan pendant whose cordiform shape is borrowed from the iconic Turkmen form. More rarely, the Persian decorative vocabulary of the Qajar period provided inspiration, as seen in a cordiform Turkmen pectoral embellished with a typically Persian rose-and-nightingale design.

As in earlier times, nineteenth-century crafts also borrowed from each other. The variety of arabesque designs found on Teke silver ornaments can easily be explained by the large quantities of Timurid-style metalwork produced in this region and often found in Turkmen households and tents. Central Asian metalwork was very conservative, and the decorative repertoire limited; most pieces were made of brass, but a few rare examples of silverwork have been documented and present convincing evidence of an interchange of techniques, styles, and motifs between the urban workshops and Turkmen craftsmen (fig. 26). There were also considerable numbers of Timurid and Safavid wares for sale in bazaars; these would have provided models for the variety of arabesques found in Turkmen ornaments, thus explaining their archaic character, as noted earlier.

The popularity of metalwork-style arabesque design, particularly in the Teke jewelry tradition, was probably due to its effectiveness in decorating the large flat surfaces of Turkmen silver ornaments; most Islamic jewelry is composed of elements whose surfaces are too small to accommodate such designs. It may be significant that the Teke tribes generally lived closer to urban metalworking centers than the Yomut did and would thus have been more familiar with the styles practiced there.

Turkmen silversmiths also borrowed significantly from coinage. The use of coins in jewelry was widespread throughout the entire Islamic world, but rarely did it play as important a role as it did in Turkmen ornament. Clearly, minting techniques were among the primary influences on Turkmen jewelry making; there is much use of dyes to produce the materials, and the components are assembled in a repetitive or additive fashion. The coinage aesthetic is most apparent in Yomut works.
RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER TURKMEN CRAFTS  Turkmen ornaments were produced by indigenous silversmiths as well as made to order—to Turkmen taste—in neighboring Central Asian urban centers. In the late nineteenth century specialized communities of silversmiths emerged in Central Asian oasis settlements such as Merv, whose artisans were celebrated for the quality of their wares. Traditionally, jewelry craftsmen in Turkmen culture were almost exclusively male. Men constructed silver pieces and other metalwork, while women were responsible for producing textiles, embroidery, lightweight felts, and carpets. Consequently, Turkmen works are often divided into two aesthetic categories: a Turkic tribal tradition in works created by women, and a more Islamic, urban-influenced tradition in works assigned to male members of the tribe.

This paradigm does not always hold true, however, as the two types of work sometimes shared similar motifs. Some nineteenth-century rugs and flat weaves, for instance, display motifs based on Turkmen jewelry, particularly amulets. It must be noted, though, that these forms were included for their protective function or as symbols of women’s wealth and should not be interpreted as examples of aesthetic influence. And in one rare instance, the gul motif characteristic of carpet production was adopted for a pectoral ornament (no. 77), but this appears to be a late twentieth-century example of cross-fertilization. Correlations can also be made between the arabesque designs of jewelry and the aesthetic of felt making, although the ambiguity of design often seen in both crafts may be no more than a superficial resemblance and may not prove a rewarding avenue of investigation. The closest connections to Turkmen jewelry appear to be with Central Asian metalwork and coinage, as discussed above.

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS  Turkmen ornament is remarkable for its extreme size and heaviness. Sources often give the exact weight of each piece, and some are as heavy as thirty-eight pounds. The weight of the jewelry may have been mitigated by the custom of wearing ornaments on both the torso and the back, helping to distribute the weight. Also, in many of the larger items, openwork decoration must have had a similar effect of lightening the mass.

Despite these large proportions, the delicate musicality of Turkmen ornament was striking; when one saw it worn, one actually heard it as well. Bells, spheres, cones, long chains: all
created cheerful and pleasing sounds. Nineteenth-century sources remarked on the Turkmen love of music and on the reassuring quality the tinkling of bells must have had in the vastness of the desert and its long nights. The musical dimension of the jewelry was not accidental. An examination of pieces in the Wolf collection shows that each sphere or bell emits a different note, producing a harmonious sound overall.

Another unusual feature of Turkmen jewelry is the introduction of original ornamental types. Two forms are without precedent: The first is the wide cuff composed of cylindrical tubes with dentated edges, suggesting snakes’ or dragons’ heads. The other is the egmε, or stiff wide headband, whose origin remains controversial, but which became uniquely identified with the Turkmen.

**FUNCTION AND MEANING** Turkmen silver ornament fulfilled multiple purposes. As in all cultures, jewelry served an important decorative function, as evidenced by the care and creativity lavished on its production by Turkmen jewelers. Jewelry was worn almost exclusively by women and, to a lesser extent, children; men’s ornaments were limited to daggers, whips, belts, and seal rings. The parure was an indicator of a woman’s ethnic identity and stage of life. Her jewelry varied according to her age and marital status, identifying her as a young girl, newlywed, or married woman, and it became increasingly elaborate as she became older. Jewelry played a very important role in Turkmen wedding ceremonials, not only to adorn the bride, but also as a dowry and as wedding gifts for the bridal party.

Ornament also served as a safeguard against all manner of ills; carnelian and, to a lesser extent, turquoise were widely used for their protective properties. This protective function is most clearly seen in amulet holders and amulets, worn particularly by young boys. Although many of the design elements that characterize Turkmen pieces have been interpreted in Turco-Mongol terms, with an emphasis on shamanistic beliefs, amuletic forms, and magic functions, most authors on the subject have been cautious in their interpretations. While admitting that ancient beliefs and customs may account for some of the decorative idiom, they also accept the influence of Islamic designs and culture and recognize that many beliefs were common to both pagan and Islamic cultures.

Another significant function of silver ornament was its use as portable money; many accounts describe moving scenes of Turkmen women divesting themselves of their precious jewelry to ensure the survival of their tribe. This function poses an intriguing question for the scholar. Turkmen jewelry used high-grade silver on a massive scale. How do we account for such a lavish use of this material? The explanation lies in the fact that the Turkmen amassed silver coins of all kinds as ransom for captured prisoners and as a result of the slave trade. Thus Turkmen jewelry throws light on a fascinating chapter
of tribal life, when for a brief period, before the Russian occupation and the abolition of slavery, the Turkmen had one last era of glory.

This brings us to the question of beauty. Whereas most jewelry is intended to enhance the beauty of a woman's face or body, this is generally not the case with Turkmen ornaments, which are exceedingly beautiful, but not in a dainty or feminine way. Their distinguishing features—massive scale, strong design, visual impact, and an aura of power and splendor—evoke masculine ideals rather than feminine ones while also making reference to the qualities of endurance and experience for which Turkmen women were valued. This aesthetic ambiguity contributes to the allure of Turkmen jewelry for the modern collector.

Turkmen ornament offers a fascinating study of creativity, the display of portable wealth, the appreciation of beauty, and the development of distinctive styles and techniques. This living tradition was maintained by the Turkmen, even in reduced circumstances, until the 1970s, as can be verified by the numerous travelers and collectors who visited them. By the last decades of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first, when the Wolf collection was formed, Turkmen jewelry had become an art form to be collected and preserved for future generations.
Foil-backed carnelian and turquoise inlays on no. 125 (page 171)
Techniques of Turkmen and Central Asian Jewelry

Jean-François de Lapérouse

A close examination of Turkmen jewelry reveals that its dazzling effects were achieved through the skillful variation of a rather limited set of techniques based primarily on the manipulation of silver sheet and wire. Their manufacture reflects the ingenious practicality of craftsmen who were adept at exercising a sleight of hand when necessary in order to realize their aesthetic conceptions.1 An examination of the jewelry produced by a variety of Turkmen peoples that comprised the first group of objects given to the Museum by Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf provides some general insight into the raw materials and working methods used in the entire collection.

The silver and gold used in Turkmen jewelry is thought to have been largely derived from the Persian, Russian, and Chinese coins that were used for trade in the region.2 As seen in a Yomut dorsal plait ornament (no. 43) from this group, coins themselves were often incorporated into their design. Surface analysis by X-ray fluorescence of the coins and the cordiform plaques in this plait ornament indicates that the composition of both are indeed very similar, consisting of about 99 percent silver and 1 percent copper. Based on analyses of other pieces in the collection, this composition appears to be fairly typical and indicates the intentional use of an alloy that was highly malleable yet able to be work-hardened when hammered. Plating of baser metals also occurred—as shown by a Yomut amulet holder (no. 138) that was constructed using silvered brass alloy sheet—but this appears to have been less common.

Reminiscent of the textile and leatherworking arts from which it may have at least partially derived, Turkmen jewelry tends to be planar in construction and linear in design. Faint lines discernible on many of the objects are the vestiges of layout lines made by tracing a fine point across the metal surface that guided the craftsmen in the decoration and construction of the jewelry. Linear decoration was produced by hammering shaped metal tools held against the metal surface—a process known as chasing.
Cutting and removing metal by engraving with a burin appears to have been rarely practiced, but a form of chip carving using a chisel with a finely serrated edge was used to create the subtle pattern found on an amulet case (no. 125) (fig. 1) that may have been intended to mimic the texture of textiles or feathers. Openwork decoration was produced by cutting through silver sheet using a chisel or fine fret saw. Minimal finishing along the cut edges resulted in the preservation of tool marks and the slightly angular curves found in the openwork of a large cordiform pendant (no. 48), while more careful filing and polishing resulted in the smoothly sinuous lines seen in a pair of Teke temple pendants (no. 32).

The technique of casting does not seem to have been used in creating this jewelry. Instead, a sense of volume was produced by soldering together pieces of silver sheet in boxlike constructions. A radiograph of a bird-shaped headdress ornament (no. 19) reveals how narrow L-shaped spacer strips were used to support the large front and back plates of this object as it was being assembled (fig. 2). Rounded forms such as that of a Kazakh teapot (no. 181) were created by hammering out two hemispheres of silver sheet that were then soldered together.

Three-dimensional texture was also achieved by embossing thin silver sheets using molds or intaglio dies. According to direct observations of Yomut craftsmen, the silver used for embossing was annealed by heating in order to make it as malleable as possible. A warmed sheet of lead was then placed on top of the silver before it was forced into the surface of the mold using chisels and hammers. Dies made of metal—similar to those used in the minting of coinage—were used to produce multiple copies of the same form in an efficient manner that evoked the more labor-intensive art of repoussé.

Stamped elements were grouped together, as seen in a crown and whip in Caucasus style (nos. 4a and 4b), or laid out symmetrically as appliqués over a flat background, as on the exterior of the Yomut amulet holder previously mentioned. Backed with a flat metal plate, stamped designs were also used to form pendants. The perforations commonly found on the back of these pendants and other box constructions allowed for dissipation of the heat that was applied during soldering, which otherwise would have melted the thin sheet metal.
Stamping was also used to mimic the highly esteemed decorative technique of granulation, which figured prominently in ancient and early Islamic jewelry. Close examination of the pseudo-granulation on the aforementioned Kazakh teapot (no. 181) reveals that it was produced by stamping triangular pieces of silver from behind that were soldered onto the surface before the vessel was partially gilt (fig. 3). This decorative theme was often continued in shot-sized beads that were soldered onto the surface of many pieces.

Round and patterned wire played an important role in the decoration of Turkmen jewelry. Unlike ancient round wire, which was produced by hammering or rolling chisel-cut strips of metal, the wire in Turkmen jewelry was created using iron alloy drawplates with tapered holes of various sizes. After snipping one end of a silver strip to a sharp point and lubricating it with soap or oil, the craftsman pulled it through holes of diminishing diameter until the desired width was obtained. Round wire was used to create the jump rings and double loop-in-loop chains that commonly served to suspend pendants, and was also twisted together to form wire rope. Patterned wire was created by running annealed flat or round wire through circular molds to produce repeating relief patterns. Ropes were soldered together side-by-side or combined with patterned wire to form decorative bands that were cut to length as needed and used to delineate borders and hide solder joins (fig. 4).

The lacelike appearance of wire filigree was largely limited in Turkmen jewelry to a simple serpentine pattern framed by rope, found in the border decoration of many pieces. The serpentine wire itself was produced by weaving round wire around two staggered rows of nails hammered into a wooden block (fig. 5). A pectoral ornament in the style of the Central Asian city of Khotan (no. 116), however, stands out for the elegance of its filigree, which appears to have been fashioned using twisted wire. Close examination reveals that this impression was produced instead by chasing the upper edge of flat wire strips that were soldered onto a background plate. This pendant also features an
edging of thick round wire that was completely wrapped with wire reminiscent of the beaded wire often found in ancient jewelry (fig. 6).

Articles made of solid gold alloy are not found in Turkmen jewelry. Instead, individual silver elements were gilt to look like gold or, more frequently, planar silver surfaces were partially gilt to produce striking bimetallic contrasts. Gilding was achieved by the amalgam process, also referred to as “wash” or “fire gilding,” which had been practiced in the Near East since the Achaemenid period. In this technique, gold filings—possibly obtained from Russian coins⁴—was mixed with mercury to form a paste that was then brushed onto a silver surface that had been pretreated to assure adhesion. After the volatile mercury was driven off by heating, the porous gold left behind was burnished to provide a brilliant sheen. Since the amalgam tended to flow freely when heated, partially gilt areas typically were delineated and contained by chased or engraved lines. The gold that entered the recessed lines and could not be burnished still retains a porous texture, which can be seen under magnification (fig. 7).

Care was taken to ensure that the silver solder used to join the various elements in these constructions was not readily visible. However, the high heat required to melt this solder—which contained a borax flux and more copper than found in the sections being joined—presented risks given the ready conductivity of heat through metal. Evidence of surplus solder and overheating can be seen in some Turkmen objects in the blurring of their more delicate decorative elements. It appears, however, that the primary concern of the craftsmen was to make their heavy jewelry robust enough to withstand the mechanical stresses of being actively worn and displayed. Evidence of solder failures and repair can be found, but they are rare.

In addition to gold, colored semiprecious stone inlays and occasionally pearls played an important part in the decoration of this silver-based jewelry. By far the most important stone was carnelian, a hard siliceous mineral usually recovered in pebble form from alluvial deposits over a large area from Iran to India. Carnelian, which had been highly prized for centuries in the Near East due to its lustrous rutilescent color, was incorporated either in table-cut or cabochon form, usually within a simple flat-band bezel that facilitated the placement of the stones after all the soldering and gilding had
been completed. Foil backings were sometimes used to intensify this stone’s color and brilliance (see fig. 1). Red accents found on other objects in the Wolf collection were supplied by red coral, which was most likely obtained from the Indian Ocean.

The second most common inlay stone was turquoise, a relatively soft hydrated copper aluminum phosphate found in Iran, Afghanistan, and Turkistan. Since turquoise is usually recovered in small irregularly shaped nuggets, bezels for turquoise inlay tend to be smaller than those for carnelian. However, large surfaces such as those found on the aforementioned crown and whip (nos. 4a and 4b) could be inlaid with a mosaic of turquoise fragments held in place with mastic.

The resourcefulness of Turkmen craftsmen in obtaining the material needed for their work is suggested by the reuse of drilled turquoise beads in inlays on the whip that are also set in mastic. When natural materials were not available, man-made substitutes were used. Clear glass set over a red substrate to mimic carnelian or colored light blue to resemble turquoise is found on several pieces.

In addition, wax and synthetic resins were employed. For example, while the small inlays on the filigreed pectoral ornament in Khotan style (no. 116) are turquoise, the large central one is colored wax and may be a replacement for an earlier inlay that was lost.

Inlaid decoration consisting of enamel and niello, both of which were employed in Early Islamic jewelry, are found only occasionally on Turkmen and Central Asian jewelry. In enameling, a colored glass frit is applied to the metal surface in recesses created by engraving (known as champlevé) or cells created by soldered-on metal strips (known as cloisonné). Niello, a black inlay material made of silver, copper, and lead sulfates, could also be laid into engraved lines, melted in place with the aid of a flux and polished. Coloristic contrasts using black inlay could also be obtained using pigments, waxes, bitumen, or resins similar to inlaid Islamic metalwork.

The addition of such a large corpus of Turkmen and Central Asian jewelry to the Museum’s collections will facilitate its in-depth technical examination. Since each stamp, die, or chasing tool has unique surface details that are imparted to the object being created, it may be possible in the future to assign Turkmen objects to specific workshops. Additional information might also be obtained regarding the sources of the raw materials used and the evolution of decorative techniques.
CROWNS AND HEADDRESS ORNAMENTS
One of the principal glories of Turkmen art is the female headdress and its manifold ornaments. Lavish crown-shaped headdresses, metal caps, headbands, temple pendants, and earrings were worn in combination under soft cloth caps, tall stiff headgear, or scarves and veils. Headdresses denoted the wearer’s tribe and marital status. Young girls wore embroidered caps with dome-shaped silver ornaments (qubba). Pointed or flat-topped stiff silver caps in the Wolf collection—which are new to the literature—are referred to in the trade as bridal crowns, although it remains unclear whether they were worn by unmarried or married women.

The emphasis on adorning the head and face of the bride was a distinctive feature of Turkmen ornament. The bride’s headdresses and silver ornaments are elaborate and vary from tribe to tribe; the most sumptuous and decorative of them were produced by the Teke. The stiff headdress was composed of a tall base (as high as eighteen inches)\(^1\) that widened at the top and was made of reeds or plant fibers stitched together and covered in red silk. The headdress was embellished with silver decorations consisting of headbands in a range of shapes and styles, sewn or attached by hooks to the base; long temple pendants attached with pins; circular earrings; and sometimes hairpins. It was surmounted by a chirpy or cloak, traditionally made with overall embroidery and vestigial sleeves. The headdress was also accompanied by a heavy veil, although the use of veils among the tribes has always been less strict than in urban areas.
CROWNS

Boy’s or girl’s cap
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork decorative wire, stamped decoration, table-cut carnelian, embossed pendants, and openwork edge
6 1/8 x 7 1/2 in. (15.6 x 20 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparables:
Bloqueville 1866, pp. 258–59, fig. 2
(see fig. 9c, p. 15, in this volume)
Journal of Indian Art 1886, p. 54,
fig. 2 (see fig. 11a, p. 19, in this volume)
Dupaigne 1978, p. 17, fig. 20
Firouz 1978, p. 13, fig. 9 (for girl’s qubba)
Scheleter and Scheleter 1983,
p. 246 (for photograph of woman wearing similar cap)

Solid silver caps like these, worn by both boys and girls, are known from a number of nineteenth-century sources. A 1886 article in The Journal of Indian Art featured an illustration of a similar piece described as a girl’s cap or helmet. The cap was composed of small silver plaques with stamped floral decoration surmounted by an aigrette and a feather; according to the source, the silver facets were sewn onto a red silk or wool foundation (see fig. 11a, p. 19). In the cap here, the plaques are somewhat larger than those in the cap described above and are soldered together, and the stamped decoration is of stylized rams’ heads. Instead of a feather on top there is a carnelian, suggesting this headgear was worn by a boy, since feathers indicated a girl’s availability for marriage. Turkmen embroidered cloth caps, when worn with the accompanying young girl’s silver ornament (qubba) and other headdress ornaments, appear markedly similar to the solid silver cap. This cap may have been made somewhat later than the examples published in the late nineteenth-century literature: the perforated terminals are probably a twentieth-century feature, and gilded sheet-silver plaques with stamped patterns are commonly found on Yomut collar disks dated to the early to mid-twentieth century.

Whereas in most such examples carnelians are used lavishly to form designs, a single stone sufficed here. The main aesthetic effect of this cap is achieved by the gilding, which creates a look of martial splendor.
Crown
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, with decorative wire and stamped decoration, table-cut incised carnelians, turquoise beads, openwork, and silver coins; quilted cotton lining, cotton cords and tassels with beads, and velvet strip with metal ornaments
Crown 5 ¼ × 7 ¼ in. (14.9 × 18.1 cm); tassels 12 × 3 in.
(30.5 × 7.6 cm)

A second type of “crown” is illustrated by this pointed silver cap, which exhibits typical Yomut features of small colored stones and stamped silver decoration in delicate designs of small-scale patterns. The base and pointed top of the cap are lavishly ornamented with 208 turquoise beads, set in two circular bands and organized into triangular plaques at the top. Twelve carnelians are set at regular intervals and the corners of the cap are accented with silver coins.

The carnelians are inscribed in nasta‘liq script with the names of Shi‘ite saints and Qur‘anic verses, the protective powers of the stones enhancing the amuletic quality of the texts. The coins belong to a category known as dirāhim kha‘fifs (light coins), manufactured in either gold or silver and produced from the mid-eighth century on. They were stamped on one side only and were intended for ceremonial uses such as wedding ceremonies, when they were showered over participants’ heads with or without flower leaves.

Caps of this type can be documented as early as 1866, when one was included in an illustration by Henri de Bloqueville. They were worn with long silver attachments or silken cords with tassels, most of which no longer survive. Although the velvet strip, cords, and tassels of this piece are probably not original, they illustrate how the cap looked when it was first made. The loop at the top of the cap was intended for a feather.
Crown
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Baluchi (?)
Silver, with openwork, decorative wire, and slightly domed and table-cut carnelians and turquoises; cotton foundation
7 × 7¼ in. (17.8 × 18.7 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2006 (2006.544.4)

NOTE: Assigned to Baluchi tribe by the trade.

No. 3 employs a similar construction to that of no. 2, but it features a larger-scale design of openwork arabesques and decorative lettering in cursive script on the body. In addition, the openwork is punctuated by large carnelians and turquoises. Another difference is the use of a closed finial at the top, inset with a small carnelian. Neither the decorative lettering nor the nasta’liq inscriptions on the carnelians are legible, although the stones were undoubtedly used for their protective function.
This matching set of cap and whip is more lavishly embellished than nos. 2 and 3. The striking design of the cap is composed of four layered rows of small silver appliqués, each in a different shape and design, including chevrons and rectangles. In Turkmen ornaments such forms are usually utilized as connecting links and pendants, but here they are used as the main design element of the base of the cap. The top of the cap is organized into triangular compartments of large table-cut turquoise plaques of various shades and divided by silver strips of varying width; it is ornamented with a loop, probably for a feather. The whip is of similar manufacture.

This set is remarkable for its beauty and sumptuousness. Although the crown and whip share certain features with Turkmen silver ornaments, it is atypical and its place of manufacture is difficult to determine.\(^6\)
This crown exhibits a remarkably effective use of oversize carnelians, a flat surface treatment, and a gold and silver palette, elements of Teke workmanship that appear in many other examples. As in no. 9, the large flat stones are skillfully arranged in a balanced symmetrical design, which here articulates the form of the high arched crown. There is a pleasing interplay between the stability of this pattern and the movement and vitality of the background forms. The flatness of the design is enhanced by the red felt backing and the dark red opaque tone of the stones. The design of triangles, lozenges, and S-shapes, however, is considerably more abstract than the floral and vegetal designs typically found in such Teke pieces as no. 9. Another distinctive feature of this work is that the design is reserved in silver against a gold ground.

A comparison of the two works reveals that the seemingly abstract geometric forms in no. 5 are markedly similar to the more realistically rendered interstitial areas of the openwork design at the base of no. 9, demonstrating the inventiveness of the Turkmen silversmith. This tendency toward stylization and abstraction is frequently seen in Islamic art, where positive and negative carry the same visual weight and foreground and background are equivalent. Another feature that Turkmen Teke design shares with Islamic design is its adaptability: the same design works equally well with the flat circular pillbox cap and the high arched crown shape.

But this style is also related to the cut-out and appliquéd felt work of ancient Turkish tradition, which was still current among the Turkmen and Kirghiz tribes in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.³ This piece therefore illustrates the dual nature of Turkmen decorative design, drawing as it does from both Islamic and Turkish traditions.
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Crown
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke or Nochurli
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, table-cut carnelians, wire chains, and embossed pendants
8¼ × diam., 7 in. (22.2 × 17.8 cm)
(with pendants)

Comparable Works:
Schleitner and Schleitner 1983, p. 179, pl. 127
Kalter 1987, p. 126, fig. 175
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Headband
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
7 × 1¾ in. (17.8 × 37.5 cm)
(with pendants)
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, table-cut carnelians, loop-in-loop chains and pendants, and embossed and applied decoration
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
These two bridal headdress ornaments, with curved front elements and straight-sided flaps, are variants of the group of high curved rectangular crowns known as *egnie*, a term that, according to Johannes Kalter, means “curved bent.” The silver chains hanging on the forehead gracefully frame the wearer’s face and veil her features. Tall crowns like these are among the most impressive and sumptuous elements of the bridal accoutrement. In both nos. 6 and 7, the openwork design must have made them lighter to wear than a stiff crown without openwork. In the earliest recorded examples, such as the crown described in the late eighteenth-century account of Samuel Gottlieb Gmelin, small silver headbands and rows of coins were layered one above the other and sewn onto a tall fabric headdress. According to the literature, heavier crowns became fashionable among the Turkmen late in the nineteenth century, perhaps paralleling the taste for Russian-style marriage crowns in urban centers, and then fell into disuse by the mid-twentieth century. Both examples feature graceful openwork designs of tripartite elements derived from floral shapes.

Close examination strongly suggests that these shapes are tulips, which are rarely noted in the relevant literature; the tulip is generally related to Ottoman design traditions, but it can also be found in Central Asian textiles made in nineteenth-century urban workshops.
Crown
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke (?)
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with wire chains, table-cut carnelians, and turquoise beads; quilted cotton lining
4⅝ × diam. 7 in. (11.4 × 17.8 cm)
(with pendant)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2006 (2006.544.5)

These works, three “crowns” of similar construction in the Wolf collection, are not unlike pillbox hats: circular in shape, relatively low in height, and flat at the top. Inside, the caps were lined with quilted cotton. They illustrate a variety of organizational approaches to decorating the flat surface of the top and feature an array of patterns ranging from chased arabesques to appliqués in geometric form.

No. 8 features an elaborate and colorful arabesque design. The arabesque is set on a stippled ground, and more than 125 turquoise beads are used in combination with sixteen carnelians. This design is related to that of an embroidered pouch in the Wolf collection (see photograph, right), exhibiting a similar division of the surface into triangular compartments and an overall design of vegetal arabesques. In both this crown and no. 10 we see the use of silver chains and ornaments that hang over the forehead; such elements were flattering but also acted as a veil, symbolizing the modesty and purity of the wearer. The hanging ornaments include a variety of shapes, roundels, leaves, and bells, which add variety and charm to the design and provide a pleasing musicality as the head is turned.

No. 9 is remarkable for the elegance of its arabesque design, executed in fire gilding on a polished silver ground and enhanced by...
Crown
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased,
with openwork, decorative wire, and
table-cut carnelians
2 ½ x diam. 6 ½ in. (5.7 x 15.9 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf

Crown
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut (?)
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative
wire, synthetic resin inlays, loop-
in-loop chains, embossed pendants,
and helic; quilted cotton lining
7 ½ x diam. 6 ½ in. (20 x 17.5 cm)
(with pendants)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R.
Wolf, 2006 (2006.544.6)

twenty-four carnelians in
simple silver settings—a
sophisticated design charac-
teristic of Teke style. The top
features a two-level palmette
and a split-palmette design
that emanates from the cen-
ter. The graceful arabesque
covers the entire surface in
a balanced, symmetrical,
and open design. The sides
of the cap are decorated in
a complementary manner,
with a single row of similar
palmettes in a reciprocal
design whose scale has been
adjusted to the width
of the cap.

Three types of carnelians are
skillfully used to articulate
the design. On the top,
a large round, flat stone
indicates the center of the
design, and eight smaller fac-
eted table-cut carnelians are
disposed in a circle, carefully
placed in the middle of each
palmette. On the sides, nine-
teen table-cut oval stones are
placed in the lower row of
palmettes.
These two works illustrate types of bridal crowns that combine Turkmen and other urban or tribal decorative traditions. The ram's-head terminals, fire gilding, arabesque design, and hatching of the silver ground of no. 11 are Turkmen features, whereas the curved shape of the crown's edge, the use of turquoises in combination with carnelians, the teardrop shape of the turquoises, and the diadem form of the crown are features associated with Central Asian urban workshops. In the nineteenth century the cities of Khiva, Bukhara, and Samarqand each produced different variants of the bridal crown, which was worn on the forehead, above the eyebrows; the ideal shape of joined eyebrows celebrated in Persian poetry and painting is echoed in the curved edge of no. 11. City workmanship, however, produced more delicate pieces than this crown, which was clearly adapted to the Teke taste for stylized, elegant design and bold shapes. This example, along with a pectoral ornament in the Wolf collection (see no. 95), illustrates the development of a fluid, undulating arabesque style akin to Art Nouveau in Turkmen design, suggesting a date for these pieces in the second or third decade of the twentieth century.

The height, basic shape, construction, and hanging chains with pendants seen in no. 12 are all features shared with Turkmen bridal crowns. However, the setting of the stones and the crescent-shaped terminals are clearly related to Uzbek jewelry produced in urban workshops, while pseudo-granulation is characteristic of Kazakh ornaments. The characteristics of both these decorative traditions await further study, making a firm attribution of this piece difficult. One of the most richly decorated works in the collection, the crown is covered with a sumptuous overall pattern that embodies the Islamic tradition of amor infiniti. The relief decoration uses more than four hundred small turquoise beads and circular and oval carnelians in teardrop, oval, and round shapes. The design is executed with consummate skill, using contrasting colors, shapes, and textures to great effect.
Crown
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Teke or urban workshop
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with ram’s-head upper terminals, table-cut and slightly domed carnelians, turquoise beads, and decorative wire
5 3/4 × diam. 7 in. (13 x 17.8 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Crown
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; urban workshop
Silver, with silver shot, table-cut carnelians, turquoise beads, and gilded loop-in-loop chains with pendants
9 3/4 × diam. 8 1/2 in. (23.5 × 21 cm)
(with pendants)

Comparable Works:
Sycheva 1984, pp. 26–31, figs. 1–3
Komleva 1988, p. 117
Headbands
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Headband
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased,
with openwork, decorative wire,
and cabochon carnelians
3¾ × 13¼ in. (8.6 × 34.9 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R.
Wolf. 2006 (2006.544.10)

Turkmen headbands made of linked plaques were lighter and more malleable than the high, stiff egme. Attached to the side of the headdress by pointed triangular hooks and worn with temple pendants and earrings, these headbands appeared in many styles and variants. Nos. 13 and 14 represent two of these types. The design of the former is austere and massive; it has great weight and balance, with minimal decoration. The design of the latter is graceful and delicate, and the crowded though not haphazard pattern is contained by the geometric forms of the plaques.

No. 13 is an example of owurme, a type of headband comprising single vertical elements—in this case displaying three rows of carnelians set in plain silver mounts—alternating with two stacked lozenge-shaped plaques. Visual interest is created by rows of flat, opaque oval carnelians alternating with rows of slightly domed, transparent marquise-shaped stones. Small variations in the shape of the stones, similar to the “mistakes” or color variations found in hand-woven Islamic carpets, remind us that this is an artwork, not a mass-produced object. The vertical plaques have pointed terminals and lateral elements whose shapes have been described both as floral forms and as rams’ horns or rams’ heads. This ambiguity of form is typical of Turkmen design, and both identifications may be valid.

Another headband type, the mangyalik, seen in no. 14, was particularly favored by the Teke, and this example exhibits all the characteristic features of Teke style. Such headbands comprised five to seven rectangular plaques attached to the headdress with triangular hooks at the end, and sometimes (as here) with a hook at the center. This example features a highly stylized arabesque design, openwork decoration, and a veil of silver chains with lozenges and embossed pendants, held together by a horizontal thread. The headdress has a radiant effect, achieved by the sheen of gold and silver and the brilliance of numerous cabochon carnelians.
Nos. 15, 16, and 17 are lighter in construction and use thinner plaques than those in nos. 13 and 14. These *silsila*-type headbands exemplify the plain tradition in Turkmen silver ornament associated with the Ersari. No. 15 is composed of three rows of small, narrow linked plaques. The top row features embossed plaques made in matrices, a ram’s-head terminal, and pointed rectangular shapes at the ends. The second row also features plaques, and the third row is made up of very thin lozenges in alternating layers. The headband’s elegant effect was enhanced by the addition of graceful, elongated, and graduated temple ornaments with long chains. The whole produced an effect similar to that of ancient Scythian and Hellenistic headdresses, as has been argued by Peter Andrews.14

Similarly, the profusion of lozenges and the lightweight...
construction of no. 17, an example of a *sanjalik* headband, recall the oldest tradition of ancient Near Eastern headgear adornment, with garlands of flowers or ears of corn hanging on either side of the face. The large, shot-size beads and pseudo-granulation are related to eleventh- to thirteenth-century Fatimid and Seljuq jewelry tradition. Works such as these are the principal evidence supporting the archaistic character of Turkmen ornaments as well as their originality and power.
Pair of headbands
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with stamped decoration, Persian coins, carnelians, glass stones, and silver links
Both 2¾ x 14¼ in. (6.7 x 37.8 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Firouz 1978, pl. 17
Schleitzer and Schleitzer 1983, p. 174, fig. 121
Rudolph 1984, p. 127, fig. C39
Hireshima 1999, p. 22, fig. 57

This pair of headbands belongs to a type that was worn flat across the head, securing a head scarf, either singly or in pairs (see illustration, below). Exemplifying the love of ornament and color and the use of coinage typical of Yomut jewelry, the headbands are constructed of three rows of patterned silver coins joined by silver loop-in-loop chains and end-pieces with gilded appliqués. The pattern of the end-pieces is crowded yet controlled, created by a careful arrangement of rows of small half-moon, lozenge, and roundel forms. The appliqués are themselves embossed with minute patterns. These forms harmonize with the design of the lion and sun used in the Persian coins. The Qajar coins are stamped with this emblem on what seems to be the obverse, and with the ruler's name and title on the reverse. In this case, the coins may be dated to 1848–96, the reign dates of Nasir al-Din Shah. The lion and sun was the royal emblem of the Qajar dynasty.

Yomut silversmiths typically used green and red stones, as seen in these headbands. The meaning of the crescent and moon motif on two of the round red stones, recorded here for the first time, is obscure: it could be a tribal or political emblem, a workshop symbol, or an amulet. Works like these—where a lavish use of coins is the principal design element—illustrate the quantity of Qajar coins available to the Turkmen as a result of their participation in the slave trade. The coins used here were probably obtained as loot during a raid in Persian territory.

Two further points regarding coinage are of interest. C. E. Stewart noted in 1881 that the Turkmen were clever at manufacturing false Persian money, with which they flooded the bazaar in Muhammadabad. Future research may allow us to distinguish authentic Qajar coinage from Turkmen copies, and may reveal that some of the Qajar coins in Turkmen ornaments are in fact forgeries. Edmond O’Donovan makes another intriguing suggestion when he notes that because the western Yomut knew the value of money, their women were less adorned than Turkmen tribeswomen farther east. In the late 1870s and 1880s western Yomut lived in the Caspian region, where the Russian economy dominated, and they were familiar with a monetary economy that included paper money. Coinage would therefore have been useless for decoration. The eastern Turkmen (the Teke) remained more independent from Russian political and cultural influence and would thus have retained the traditional use of coinage as ornamentation.
Headdress Ornaments

In these rare examples of headdress ornaments with pins, two addorsed crested bird shapes spring from a central shaft, which is surmounted by a turquoise-encrusted ball and ram’s head finial. The birds hold similar balls in their beaks. The second work is more simplified and abstract, suggesting a pair of eyes, and is perhaps a form of amulet to protect against the evil eye. Decorated front and back, these charming ornaments convey a sense of movement, whimsy, and playfulness that is sometimes found in Turkmen jewelry.

Stylized birds appear often in Turkmen ornaments and decorative arts as secondary motifs. They also belong to the Islamic decorative tradition, where images of addorsed or confronted birds—sometimes holding bunches of grapes or leaves in their beaks—are a favored motif, particularly in the early Islamic period. The workmanship seen in the turquoises of nos. 19 and 20 and the hatching pattern of the former suggest that these are products of a Central Asian urban workshop made to order for a Turkmen patron, since the rams’ heads are distinctly Turkmen forms (see no. 11).

The function of these works is unclear. The basic form of an ornament on a pin corresponds to descriptions of
both hairpins and turban pins and may have been worn by either men or women. During the Seljuq period in Iran (eleventh to thirteenth century) gold hair pins with bird’s-head finials were worn by women, yet the surviving examples are both smaller and lighter than these pieces. Hair pins and lightweight headdress ornaments continued to be depicted in Persian painting in the following centuries, and twentieth-century headdress ornaments worn by Mongol women also present parallels with these works. A turban pin assigned to a nineteenth-century Bukhara workshop has been called a jiqqa and its function described as a headdress ornament for a bridegroom. Similarities with Turkmen sanjalik headdress ornaments such as no. 17, which also feature pins, argue for the identification of these works as headdress ornaments.

---

Headdress ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; urban workshop
Silver, fire-gilded, with cabochon carnelians, turquoise beads, turquoise-colored glass, balls, and links
5½ × 3¼ in. (14 × 7.9 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
These three pairs of ornaments, decorated in the finest style of Yomut workmanship, present an exceptionally elegant and refined surface ornamentation of gilded appliqués, ram’s-head and foliate motifs, and interspersed carnelians. Although they exhibit the usual Yomut preference for small scale and busy patterning, they are distinguished by a subdued color scheme based on the modulated browns, honeys, and reds of the carnelians. The symmetry and harmony of the design are particularly evident in the skillful balancing of the horizontal and vertical components.

The underlying shapes are based on the bow-and-arrow motif associated with boys’ amulets, oksay (nos. 21 and 22), and the double-bird motif (no. 23). Similar works have been described both as boys’ amulets and as dorsal and plait ornaments for women, illustrating the interchangeability of designs and adaptability of forms typical of Turkmen ornaments.
This piece is an exceptional example of the carefully executed small-scale patterning and abstraction of the Yomut style. The crescents, leaves, and roundels stamped with circular patterns and bird forms are arranged in a symmetrical design that conforms to the shape of the piece. The eye-catching decoration almost obscures the underlying structure of two repeats of large elongated split-leaf arabesques surmounted by a small tripartite tulip/ram's head at the top.

A close examination of the design's shape clearly reveals its vegetal and floral origins, and calls to mind the stylization and abstraction of vegetal ornament that occurred in the early Abbasid period (ninth century A.D.), as seen in a plate with a split-leaf palmette tree design and surface patterning (see photograph, below). This ornament thus reveals the affinities between Turkmen jewelry and early Islamic design rather than a close connection with the totems and symbols of Turco-Mongol shamanistic culture.

The suspended chains, embossed elements, and bells are as important to this work as the centerpiece. The ornament exhibits a beautiful balance between the two elements, which are linked together by small suspension loops, suggesting it may have been part of a larger parure.
TEMPLE PENDANTS

Extremely long temple pendants (up to two feet in length), which are attached to headresses and hang down on either side of the head, are among the most striking Turkmen ornaments. Nineteenth-century engravings depicting women wearing this elaborate parure show that they are almost hidden by the ornaments and overwhelmed by their weight and sheer volume.

In their construction, length, proportions, and materials, Turkmen temple pendants bear a striking resemblance to early twentieth-century Mongol headgear. Two types of temple ornaments can be distinguished.

The *adamilik*, meaning man- or womanlike, refers to the upper unit, whose form has been interpreted as the body of a woman and whose function has been proposed as amuletic. The upper units of no. 26, for example, evoke a female shape with flowing hair, shoulders, waist, and bell-shaped skirt. Similar shapes are sometimes found in Central Asian embroidered textiles.

The anthropomorphic interpretation of these pieces must be viewed with skepticism, however, since it may reflect a modern, not contemporary, understanding. Close examination of these units, particularly in their tenechir form (see nos. 30–32), suggests that a vegetal origin may be just as likely.
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Pair of temple pendants
Early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran: Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, applied and openwork decoration, connecting links with applied decoration, embossed pendants, and table-cut carnelians
(a) 25¼ x 4¼ in. (65.4 x 11.7 cm)
(b) 25½ x 4¾ in. (65.7 x 11.1 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2009 (2009.530.6a,b)

Comparable works:
Dupaigne 1978, p. 20, fig. 24
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, p. 195, fig. 149
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Pair of temple pendants
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran: Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, applied and openwork decoration, connecting links with applied decoration, embossed pendants, and table-cut carnelians
(a) 25½ x 4⅝ in. (64.8 x 12.1 cm)
(b) 25¼ x 4¼ in. (64.8 x 12.4 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Sychova 1984, p. 83, fig. 42
Medzhitova et al. 1990, unpaged
27  Temple pendant
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with applied and stamped decoration, table-cut carnelians and glass stones, loop-in-loop chains, and bells
21¼ × 4½ in. (54 × 11.4 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparables works:
Firouz 1978, p. 22, fig. 15 upper right

28  Pair of temple pendants
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; probably Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, table-cut carnelians, loop-in-loop chains, bells, and embossed pendants
Both 21¼ × 3½ in. (54 × 8.9 cm)

29  Pair of temple pendants
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia, Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, silver shot, glass stones, and wire chains with embossed pendants
(a) 14¼ × 2¼ in. (37.1 × 5.4 cm)
(b) 14¼ × 2¼ in. (37.5 × 6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
Pair of temple pendants
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; probably Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, table-cut carnelians, glass stones, turquoise beads, loop-in-loop chains, and embossed pendants
(a) 2⅝ × 3⅜ in. (62.5 × 9.2 cm)
(b) 2⅝ × 3⅜ in. (61.3 × 9.2 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2007 (2007.497.2a, b)

Comparable works:
Medzhitova et al. 1990, unpagged
Temple pendant
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; probably Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, table-cut carnelians, glass stones, loop-in-loop chains, and embossed pendants
37 x 4½ in. (94 x 11.4 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Temple pendants in tenechir form are composed of four or five units that recall the adamlik shape but are not as anthropomorphic, making reference to a more vegetal and floral decorative vocabulary. They are also somewhat more narrow and graduated, with either the units or the linking elements diminishing in size.

Examples from this group are decorated in Teke and Yomut styles. The aesthetic effect of nos. 30 and 31 is achieved by the elegance of the tripartite vegetal forms and the profusion of stones in subtly varied tones. No. 32 relies on the pleasing regularity of the design of vertical units and the lacelike openwork of arabesque units. The impression of delicacy is enhanced by short, graduated chains with pointed pendants that hang gracefully over each arabesque element.
**Pair of temple pendants**

20th century (?)  
Central Asia or Iran; Teke  
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, cabochon carnelians, chains, and embossed pendants  
(a) 26 ¼ × 3 ½ in. (66.4 × 8.9 cm)  
(b) 26 ¼ × 3 ½ in. (66.7 × 8.9 cm)  
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2005 (2005.443.2a, b)
Pair of temple pendants
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia: Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded, with stamped beading, silver shot, decorative wire, cabochon carnelians, glass inlays backed with fabric, lacquer, or paper, and turquoise beads
Both 26¼ × 3 in. (67.3 × 7.6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

The availability of new Kazakh works on the market is constantly changing our understanding of Central Asian jewelry. This magnificent pair of ornaments, acquired in 2010 and described as temple pendants by the trade, is unparalleled among the known ornaments in this category for its scale, weight, and the configuration of its components. Comparison with the other pair of Kazakh temple pendants in the collection (no. 29) reveals the rich variety of solutions within the same basic design vocabulary in Kazakh works. These approaches range from the delicate and small-scale to the monumental, as seen in these pendants. As more works appear, we may be able to establish a chronology and better trace the stylistic evolution of Kazakh jewelry, as well as identify sites of production and patronage.

Despite the originality of these ornaments, they present a number of stylistic and technical features that allow them to be clearly identified with Kazakh production.

The pendants’ use of silver shot to imitate granulation, as well as their complex geometric forms, massive scale, and spectacular impact, are typical of other Kazakh ornaments in the collection, such as a coriform pendant (no. 57) and a decorative pendant (no. 180). These temple pendants are also similar in construction to a tripartite pectoral in the collection (no. 117). In addition, the teardrop shape at the top of these works, combined with the repeated boxlike components, relates them to tenechir temple pendants, although they lack the long chains and graduated scale of Turkmen works of this type.

The distinctiveness of these pendants is not surprising in the context of Kazakh ornaments, which reinvent and reinterpret traditional Turkmen forms: the boxlike components, for instance, are familiar from Yomut works, but here they take the form of irregular polygons, the bottom one terminating in massive balls ending in arrowheads.
Short Temple Pendants and Earrings

Pair of short temple pendants
Mid–late 19th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, chains, openwork, and carnelians
(a) 8¼ × 2¼ in. (22.2 × 7 cm)
(b) 9 × 2½ in. (22.9 × 7.3 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Journal of Indian Art 1886, p. 55, fig. 5 (see fig. 11b, p. 19, in this volume)
Victoria and Albert Museum (unpublished), accession numbers 738-1900 and 738a-1900
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, pp 184–85, fig. 134
Rudolph 1986, pp. 40–41, fig. C56
Hiroshima 1999, p. 74, fig. 88
Medzhitova et al. 1990, unpaged

Temple pendants such as nos. 34 and 36 are shorter versions of both adamık and teneçhir hanging temple pendants, composed of a single unit. Both are decorated in typical Teke style and can be dated at least as far back as the 1880s, with some sources dating them as early as the eighteenth century, though this is unlikely. The triangular components of no. 34 are embellished with arabesque scrolls reserved in gold against a silver ground with a carnelian...
set in the center. Above and below, the temple pendants are embellished with openwork designs of arabesques in split-leaf and tulip shapes respectively. This work and no. 36 are excellent examples of the sober elegance and stylization of the Teke decorative style. Particularly notable is the upper terminal, where the leaf curls around itself and the separate elements are joined to form a rectangular shape. The teardrop-shaped ornaments in no. 36 are decorated with a sophisticated design: the arabesque is skillfully deployed around the center, which is set with a transparent cabochon, also teardrop shaped, and the whole is surmounted with openwork, again in the teardrop shape. The ornaments are fastened with hooks to the headdress or ears with a fabric backing, which lessens the weight.

The elongated triangular form used for belt fittings was also used for short temple pendants (no. 35), which are executed in typical Kazakh style. These pieces were acquired as a pair, though the designs are complementary rather than matching. Similar silver ornaments have been ascribed multiple functions and described as pendants and shawl pins in the relevant literature (see Comparable Works).

35
Pair of short temple pendants
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Kazak
Silver, fire-gilded, with stamped beading, silver shot, applied decoration, chains, embossed pendants, and turquoise beads
Both 6⅝ × 1½ in. (16.2 × 4.5 cm)
Comparable works:
Journal of Indian Art 1886, p. 55, fig. 13 (identified as a shawl pin) (see fig. 11b, p. 19, in this volume)
Schletter and Schleitzer 1983, pp. 260–61, figs. 237, 240–41 (identified as belt fittings and tenenčir temple pendants)
Rudolph 1984, pp. 95–100, figs. A29–32 (identified as pendants for women’s headdresses)
NOTE: These works are not an identical pair.

36
Pair of short temple pendants
Mid–late 19th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork and cabochon carnelians
(a) 5 × 2⅛ in. (12.7 × 5.4 cm)
(b) 4⅜ in. × 2⅞ in. (12.4 × 5.4 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
Comparable works:
Firouz 1978, p. 17, fig. 14
Schleitzer and Schleitzer 1983, p. 193, figs. 146, 147
Hiroshima 1999, p. 73, fig. 80
No. 37, earrings consisting of flat spirals of wrapped and silver wire, are strikingly modern and sculptural. The ram’s-head elements identify them as Turkmen, although there is no consensus on the specific tribe they should be assigned to.

Earrings made in Central Asian workshops exhibit their own distinctive features but are also related to Turkmen types, illustrating that tribal and urban jewelry traditions borrowed from, and were mutually enriched by, each other. The circular shape of the earrings in no. 38, for example, is a typical feature of urban workshop production, as is their small scale and the use of carnelian and turquoise beads in combination. However, the circular shape was also used by Yomut craftsmen. The tubular shape of the earrings in no. 39 is related to the tunar amulet holders (see pages 171–79) worn by Turkmen women as pectoral ornaments. Since amulet holders almost identical to these earrings were manufactured in Central Asian urban workshops, it seems likely that the earrings were originally amulet holders and then transformed for a new use, or that they represent examples of a multipurpose form.
Pair of earrings
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Khiva
Silver, fire-gilded, with carnelians, turquoises, coral beads, wire, and embossed pendants
(a) 6⅜ × 3⅝ in. (16.2 × 8.6 cm)
(b) 6¼ × 3⅜ in. (15.6 × 7.9 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2009 (2009.530.10a, b)

Comparable works:
Kalter and Pavao 1997, p. 304, fig. 613 bottom left
Steffan and Schwabl 2004, p. 99, fig. 53

Pair of earrings
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Bukhara
Silver filigree with applied gilt plaques, bells, and coral beads
(a) 6 × 4 in. (15.2 × 10.2 cm)
(b) 5⅞ × 4 in. (16.6 × 10.2 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Steffan and Schwabl 2004, p. 102, fig. 56
Kalter and Pavao 1997, p. 291, fig. 581, and p. 302, fig. 604
DORSAL ORNAMENTS
Dorsal plait ornaments were worn by married women of the Turkmen tribes to embellish their long braids. Consisting of vertical linked elements or variations on cordiform pendants to which hair extensions were sometimes added, these jeweled decorations may be seen as forerunners of today’s beaded cornrows and elaborate hair extensions. Plait ornaments served to counterbalance the heavy pectoral jewelry worn by Turkmen women and to ward off the evil eye, since the back was considered particularly vulnerable. They were sometimes lined with fabric, which enhanced their visual impact, although they were generally concealed by the wearer’s head scarf.

Cordiform pendants, ashik, which were produced by all the Turkmen tribes, are probably the most original and distinctive component of their ornaments. Although the cordiform shape is not unknown in other Islamic jewelry traditions, it is never as monumental in scale as it is in Turkmen pieces. Compared to other types of Turkmen jewelry, cordiform ornaments also present the richest array of designs, probably due to the large size and flatness of the surface to be covered. Hermann Rudolph has grouped the ashik pendants into eight categories based on style and construction. Teke pieces present infinite variations on the arabesque, from the readable to the abstract, while other tribal pieces present a dazzling repertoire of designs based on overall geometric patterns, strapwork, coloristic effects, or borrowings from other media.
Dorsal plait ornaments consist of either two vertical rows of elements linked by a horizontal chain or cordiform pendant (see pages 90–113), or multiple rows of vertical and horizontal chains connected in a ladderlike configuration. The elements are composed of flat geometric shapes (lozenges, floral and teardrop forms, coins), embossed roundels, or hollow round compartments. At the end of the chains is a cordiform or leaf-shaped pendant or bell.

Although the elements that make up nos. 40 and 41 are of similar construction, the first piece is flat and decorative, featuring gold arabesques and floral and teardrop forms, while the second is more striking and geometric. No. 41 is a remarkably sophisticated example of the musical dimension of Turkmen jewelry: each bell and pendant is filled with a different weight, resulting in a symphony of diverse notes as the body moves.
40
Pair of dorsal plait ornaments
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with wire chains, embossed pendants, and table-cut carnelians; probably missing connecting chain
(a) 23¾ × 3¼ in. (59.7 × 8.3 cm)
(b) 23½ × 3¼ in. (60.3 × 8.3 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

41
Dorsal plait ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with stamped, decorative wire, applied decoration, table-cut and slightly domed carnelians, loop-in-loop chains, and bells; mounted on fabric
21¼ × 21¼ in. (54.3 × 55.6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparative Works:
Firoz 1978, p. 22, figs. 27 and 28, pl. 30
Kalter 1983, pp. 116–17, fig. 109
Rudolph 1984, p. 58, fig. E3
Medzhitova et al. 1990, unpaged
Dorsal plaits ornament
Late 19th—early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut (?)
Silver, fire-gilded, with stamped and applied decoration, table-cut carnelians, Persian silver coins, loop-in-loop chains, and semispherical bells
22 1/2 x 6 1/4 in. (58.1 x 17.4 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Firouz 1978, p. 21, fig. 26
Rudolph 1984, p. 206, fig. E12

Dorsal ornaments created by the Yomut tribe are particularly original and appealing. In nos. 42 and 43 modest materials are combined with great artistry to create a sumptuous display as lavish as any achieved with more precious stones or pure gold. Both of these examples, as well as nos. 44 and 45, display numerous variations in the configuration of the coins. They also feature a wide diversity of shapes, including cordiform ornaments, roundels, floral forms, and semispherical bells, and a sense of volume introduced by the boxlike compartments.

Particularly intriguing is the way coins are used in these pieces. In no. 42 the ten coins are not visible, since they serve as the base for gilded, embossed plaques, which is rather unusual, while no. 43 displays the more typical use of coins as decorative elements in and of themselves. Close examination by the Museum’s conservator has revealed that
the coins in the latter piece (see photo of back) were flattened at both ends to adapt them to the ladderlike construction.3

The coins utilized in these two pieces are Persian, dating from ca. 1848–1907. The use of such coins for decoration reflects the Turkmen’s success as slave traders and proclaims their pride in their prowess as warriors.

The jewelry produced by local silversmiths shares a decorative vocabulary with horse trappings, which they also created, and no. 43 exemplifies the interrelationship between these two types of ornaments in the Turkmen tradition.

43

Dorsal plait ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomud
Silver, fire-gilded, with stamped and applied decoration, Persian silver coins, table-cut carnelians, loop-in-loop chains, bells, and cordiform pendants
22 1/4 x 5 3/4 in. (56.8 x 14.9 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2005 (2005.443.6)
Dorsal plait ornament
Early—mid-20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with applied decoration, loop-in-loop chains, semispherical bells, table-cut carnelians, and faceted glass stones 20¼ × 4½ in. (52.4 × 11.4 cm)

Comparable works:
Firouz 1978, p. 21, fig. 22
Medzhitova et al. 1990, unpaged

Dorsal plait ornament
Early—mid-20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with applied decoration, loop-in-loop chains, semispherical and spherical bells, and table-cut carnelians 18½ × 6½ in. (46 × 15.6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Rudolph 1984, p. 207, fig. E14
Aas original a type as the cordiform pendant appears to be, it may have evolved out of earlier cylindrical amulets with pendants, which themselves originated in cylindrical amulet holders commonly found in the Islamic world from the eleventh century on (see the section on amulet holders, pages 170–89). Its evolution in size and complexity would suggest, once again, that the design and construction of Turkmen jewelry developed not in isolation from the rest of the Islamic world but rather in tandem with it, with the great cities of Central Asia among the main conduits.

The relationship between the cylindrical amulet with pendants and the cordiform pendant may be seen in fig. 11a, page 19, an 1886 illustration of a Turkmen woman wearing, on the front, both a double cordiform ornament and a cylindrical amulet holder with pendants below it and, on the back, a large cordiform pendant. Due to a lack of historical evidence, it is not possible to determine at what point the cordiform pendant increased in scale to become the dominant shape of the ornament. Although it would seem logical that the smaller double and triple types, which are more similar to the cylindrical amulet holders, would precede the larger single-unit type, this may not be the case, at least not universally: as early as 1825, the German traveler Eduard Eichwald noted the use of cordiform pendants as wide as twelve inches among the Yomut Turkmen.6

Cordiform ornaments appear in single, double, and triple forms. Single cordiform ornaments are constructed of a small triangle surmounting a narrow horizontal cylinder and a large cordiform pendant with a vertical connecting element. (Surviving examples sometimes lack the triangle.) Double and triple cordiform ornaments are smaller and wider. In the double and triple types, the cylinder is either surmounted by triangular shapes or repeat forms, or left plain.

In general, single units are worn on the back attached to braids, as shown in fig. 11a, while double and triple units are worn to connect braids. Although the use of cordiform ornaments is not consistent—double units, for instance, are sometimes worn on the front as part of the overall parure—I have included them all in the dorsal category for the sake of clarity.
Teke cordiform pendants nos. 46–48 present three variations on the arabesque design in its clearest, most legible form. In no. 46 an arabesque of even width, composed of a trellis pattern of palmettes, covers the entire surface of the pendant. Other decorative elements such as carnelians and strips of decorative silver wire are used sparingly. The relatively small scale, skillful execution, and silver and gold palette of the chased design make for an elegant, harmonious, and sophisticated work. However, we see the tendency to make the design abstract emerging in problematic areas: where the pendant narrows at the bottom, for instance, the design becomes increasingly illegible, while at the top, in the narrow cylinder, it becomes completely stylized into a tiger-stripe design and crowded in the triangle above it. The challenge of adapting the arabesque to different surfaces is a common one in Islamic art, leading to more or less successful solutions.

No. 47 presents another skillful variation on the arabesque. Here it is organized on either side of the central vertical in a symmetrical design of imposing scale and color contrast. The elements in this piece are more striking than in the previous work, creating a stronger visual impact. Prominent large carnelians anchor the design, and a lavish use of decorative silver wire strips emphasizes the cordiform shape of the piece. Three bands of varying widths are present: a wide gold-on-silver arabesque of even width at the top, centered around a table-cut oval carnelian; a narrow gold interlace that springs from the bottom of the pendant; and, within the compartment bordered by that interlace, a graceful arabesque of varying width encapsulated in a half-cordiform outline executed in niello. The piece displays classic features of the Islamic arabesque: the equal importance given to positive and negative parts of the surface, seen particularly in the vertical section at the top, where both the gold and silver areas create arabesque forms; and the versatility of the design and its ability to impart vitality and interest to the surface.

The arabesque of even width is first identified in Abbasid or Seljuq silver ornament.
The question of whether its use in Turkmen jewelry is a survival or a revival is controversial. While a similar approach to the arabesque appears in Turkmen and Kazakh felts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the design may have been appropriated from early metalwork pieces available in urban Central Asian markets.

The arabesque of varying width in no. 47 is in a split-palmette form of fleshy, pointed intertwining leaves. This very distinctive form of arabesque, which emerged in the thirteenth century during the Seljuq period in Iran and Turkey, is particularly well documented in that era’s metalwork. Once established, it became increasingly attenuated and elegant in the Timurid period (the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) and later. Here we see its survival into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Unlike so many typical Islamic designs, however, the arabesque folds back on itself, rather than extending to the very edges of a surface where it is abruptly cut off to create the effect of an infinite and unending design. This indicates that it is a relatively late piece, made after European preferences for symmetrical, centered designs had begun to influence Islamic art.

What we see here is thus a reflection of the conscious revival of earlier styles in urban workshop production throughout the Middle East and Central Asia—one of the hallmarks of colonialism in this period. The jewelry in this collection reveals that Turkmen silversmiths used both centered and unending arabesque designs, continuing the tradition of classic Islamic ornament.

This work also illustrates the sometimes close relationship between Turkmen craftsmanship and that of Central Asian urban workshops. Niello, rarely used in Turkmen art, is adopted from the Central Asian urban jewelry and metalworking repertoire. And while the technique is the same, the form has been adapted to the Turkmen taste for bold design, in contrast to the urban taste for smaller, more precious floral and vegetal leaf designs, again illustrating the originality of Turkmen art. This piece may have been a special commission produced by an urban workshop for a Turkmen patron, or it may have been created by a Turkmen silversmith familiar with the more sophisticated urban techniques. In its use of the arabesque, this pendant also exhibits a clear relationship to nineteenth-century chased silversmith from Bukhara (see fig. 26, page 33).

Finding dated parallels for Turkmen pieces is rare, which is why we are fortunate to
have drawings dating from 1886 that show comparable examples utilizing the same style of interlace and split-palmette arabesque. Were it not for this piece, one might assume that the European artist of these drawings had reinterpreted the designs according to Western criteria, by shading and creating a sense of volume that seems to mitigate the flatness characteristic of Islamic design, although shading and volume are found in a number of Turkmen works.

The third work, no. 48, an example of monumental size and weight, illustrates the use of a cut-out arabesque, which in this case lightens the piece enough to make it wearable. A large carnelian is displayed in a floral setting at the center, surrounded by an arabesque that reaches to the edge of the pendant but also doubles back on itself. A border is richly embellished with a continuous design of smaller carnelians in elongated ovals with split palmettes on either side. At the top the cylinder displays a more stylized arabesque, whereas the triangle exhibits an elegant design similar to those of the main field, centered around a flat-cut carnelian. The piece is surmounted by finials in ram's-head and trefoil motifs. The aesthetic effect is achieved by the delicate, lacelike arabesque openwork, a lavish use of gilding in proportion to the silver on the surface, and a total of thirty-one stones sprinkled over the piece.

48
Cordiform pendant
Probably 20th century
Central Asia or Iran: Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, cabochon and table-cut carnelians, and embossed terminals
18 1/4 × 10 3/4 in. (47 × 27.6 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2005 (2005.443.1)

NOTE: See nos. 58, 59, and 66 for similar openwork decoration.
Cordiform pendant
19th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire and table-cut carnelians
11 1/4 x 8 1/4 in. (30.2 x 21.3 cm)

Comparable works:
Schlazer and Schlazer 1983, pp. 214–17, figs. 178, 179
Rudolph 1984, p. 238, fig. E22
Pastorino 2005, pp. 48–49, fig. 32

This very rare dorsal ornament is one of only three published examples of single cordiform pendants of complex structure (see the Comparable Works for this piece). However, as Rudolph has correctly noted, new works are constantly emerging and further examples may eventually appear. The construction is original and inventive: more elaborate than a single cordiform pendant, it features connecting units in cordiform and polygonal shapes that dramatically increase the scale and apparent importance of the pendant. This complexity has led to some controversy in the dating of the piece. Rudolph sees the large scale as evidence of a recent trend and therefore dates the work accordingly, while Linda Pastorino, recalling Eichwald’s account of large-scale pieces among the Yomut in 1725, dates a comparable Yomut work to the first half of the nineteenth century. Further research into the date of introduction of the decorative silver wire technique used here may provide further clues.

The piece is typically Teke, with a very stylized arabesque (although the leaf/palmette is still recognizable). Decorative silver wire strips are prominently used, contributing to the striking design of three cordiform shapes on the body of the piece as well as the connecting cordiform elements. The result is a powerful work where the fire-gilded design is full of movement and vitality, barely contained by the strapwork of decorative wire, a well-known approach in Islamic design to organizing the surface.

Finally, the piece’s splendor is enhanced by the sixteen table-cut carnelians. This work is a remarkable testament to the skill of the Turkmen silversmith in placing the stones so they enhance the decorative effect of the piece rather than overloading it.

Although technically the work belongs in the single cordiform category, the elaboration of forms is related to the triple cordiform group (see especially no. 65).
Figural ornament is rare in Islamic art and plays an equally subordinate role in Turkmen jewelry and decorative arts. Exceptions are rams’ heads and horns (no. 60) and bird forms (no. 129), animals linked to the Turco-Mongol system of beliefs. This small pendant, perhaps for a child, is decorated on both sides with an astonishing range of motifs. Although in Islamic art every surface, whether visible or not, tends to be embellished, double-sided pieces are rare in the case of Turkmen ornament: the Wolf collection features only four such pieces (in addition to this example, see nos. 51, 53, and 57). In this pendant, which could be worn to show either side, the two surfaces have distinct decorative programs.

The design of Surface A is centered on a carnelian set within a lobed frame ending in a trefoil or palmette. The border of flamelike arabesques is a more abstract version of the narrow gold interface of no. 47. What appear to be spearlike forms are actually reciprocal trefoil shapes, and the cylinder bears a stripe pattern similar to that on no. 46 (see also no. 76). Surface B presents a remarkable compendium of amuletic forms grouped around a central carnelian, all protective symbols of courage or martial prowess expected of boys: swords, daggers, bows, birds and snakes, and, at the center, what appears to be a scorpion or crab, a motif known from Turkmen pile carpets. Three triangles with split-palmette vegetal
ornament are displayed to the sides of and below the central stone, the lower one serving as a base for two winged mythical beasts. Such animals are a common feature of ancient Iranian and Islamic art and take the form of the senmurv and unicorn, but the beasts in this example are clearly drawn from ancient Near Eastern representations of a winged bull, leading to the suggestion that this imagery, foreign to the Turkmen, was reproduced from some graphic source. This hypothesis is reinforced by the samplerlike quality of the design, which shows no visual connection between the elements. Although some would see the introduction of new motifs as evidence that the piece was of mid- to late twentieth-century manufacture for the trade, such a development may also be traced back to the late nineteenth century, when the region came under Russian cultural influence. During that time, intrepid collectors such as Henri Moser were making their way to Central Asia, Russian experts were gathering works for museums in their capital city, and Orientalist publications on Islamic art and design may have been available locally, as was the case with the Mamluk revival style in Egypt. Nineteenth-century design books often reproduced images of works of widely differing historical periods and styles grouped together solely for design purposes. Whatever its date of origin, the piece is intriguing and displays great charm and originality.
In contrast to the Teke style, where the vegetal arabesque is the principal element of decoration, these cordiform pendants are embellished with overall designs of applied or punched lozenges, half-lozenges, or rosettes. No. 51 is typical of the Yomut aesthetic, with gilt appliqués or floral rosettes on Surface A and lozenges on Surface B. In contrast to recent Yomut pieces that feature brilliant glass stones in a wide range of hues, this piece exhibits a subtle color sense, using single-color dark carnelians.

This decorative program illustrates the love of splendor and richness—the amor infiniti—found in so many Islamic artworks. The decoration may initially appear haphazard, but it is in fact carefully aligned around the central carnelian on Surface B, and is arranged in a more open placement of scattered rosettes and half-rosettes on Surface A. The appliqués are treated like filigree and precious jewels in the tradition of Islamic gold jewelry, which differs from Teke pieces where arabesques recall a metalwork approach to design (see fig. 26, page 35). The rosettes are delicate, almost feminine, in contrast to the monumentality and power of most Teke designs.

In no. 52 punching creates a lively design of overlapping circles and whorls, accented by leaf-shaped appliqués, decorative wire, and skillfully set stones. Like
Cordiform pendant
Late 19th—early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut (?)
Silver, punched and stamped, with decorative wire and slightly domed and cabochon carnelians and turquoises
6¼ × 4 in. (17.5 × 10.2 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
the previous example, this piece has never before been published. The decorative approach here, which seems similar to that of Art Nouveau, may represent a foreign influence, as was suggested for no. 50. In a similar development, the imperial czarist motif of the double-headed eagle was adopted for the dagdan, a traditional Turkmen pectoral pendant form.

No. 53 might be described as a somewhat feminine piece, due to the delicacy of its ornament. The two sides of the pendant are embellished with an applied design of hundreds of minute whorls, roundels, and double teardrops (Surface A), and rosettes and cruciform shapes (Surface B) in red and turquoise-colored synthetic resin inlays. The stones are disposed across the surface skillfully so the pattern can be read in a variety of ways. Visual
Cordiform pendant
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or northern Afghanistan; Kazakh (?)
Silver, with applied decoration, decorative wire, synthetic resin inlays, blue and red glass beads, and table-cut and cabochon carnelians
12 × 7 in. (30.5 × 17.8 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2006 (2006.544.2)

Interest is created by the kaleidoscope of small forms and varied hues and by the sense of depth achieved by the raised appliqués on the flat surface. This textile-like approach may be inspired by embroideries such as those produced by the Lakai tribe, which feature a composite design of heart or ram’s-horn shapes known as kasa kalkhan, similar to the design of Surface B.18 Strapwork is used to encircle the central stone and reinforce the power of the center.
Cordiform pendant
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; possibly Saryk
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire and table-cut carnelians
7¼ x 4⅞ in. (18.5 x 11.8 cm)

Comparable works:
Kalter 1983, p. 100, fig. 83 lower left (identified as Teke)
Kalter 1987, p. 129, fig. 179 (identified as Saryk)
Steffen and Schwab 2006, p. 25, fig. 25 (identified as Saryk)

Cordiform pendant
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut or Erzari
Silver, with decorative wire, applied decoration, and table-cut and inscribed carnelians
11⅝ x 6⅞ in. (28.9 x 16.2 cm)

Comparable works:
Schlechter and Schlechter 1983, p. 216, fig. 181

No. 54 may be grouped with Rudolph's category of cordiform pendants of mixed provenance related by their design of carnelians bordered by strapwork; no. 55 belongs to Rudolph’s grouping of triangular “crowns”; and no. 56 presents similarities with his Saryk14 group. Taken together, the three pieces illustrate how a single element such as decorative silver wire could be used to great effect. In all three, the surface is left plain and the decorative effect is achieved with a limited number of stones and strapwork wrapping, which draws the eye to the pieces' powerful form and geometric design.
Cordiform pendant
19th–20th century
Central Asia or Iran; possibly Saryk
Silver, with decorative wire, cinnabar and slightly domed
carnelians, and turgosiozes
12 1/4 x 6 1/4 in. (31.4 x 16.2 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Rudolph 1984, pp. 226–27, figs. 563–68

In no. 54 the only decorative
motifs utilized in addition to
the stones are two abstract
forms resembling rams’
horns. These motifs, called
gochak, are commonly found
in Turkmen, Caucasian, and
Turkish carpets. As in other
examples in the Wolf collec-
tion, this group illustrates
how Turkmen silversmiths
drew inspiration from
sources outside the parame-
ters of traditional Turkmen
ornament.

No. 55 displays a remarkable,
powerful design using only
the simplest of decorative
elements, inscribed stones,
and strapwork. It is one of
the most unusual and origi-
nal pieces in the collection.
The twelve carnelians bear
inscriptions including the
names of Allah, the Prophet
Muhammad, and Hazrat-i
‘Ali. The phraseology of ‘Ali’s
title indicates the engraver
was of the Sunni faith.20 In
no. 56 the ornament is
reduced to its simplest form,
with multiple rows of deco-
orative silver wire, large bold
carnelians, and geometric shapes
(triangles, rectangles, and so
on) creating a totemic effect.
Cordiform pendant with tassels
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded, with silver shot,
decorative wire, cabochon and
table-cut carnelians, slightly domed
turquoises, and wool tassels
13⅝ × 6 in. (34.6 × 15.2 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R.
Wolf, 2009 (2009.530.1)

Comparable works:
Rudolph 1984, p. 228, fig. E69
Kalser 1983, p. 100, fig. 83
upper left:
Kalser 1987, p. 128, fig. 178

Ornaments of the Kazakh tribe, among the most
spectacular and striking Central Asian pieces
to have become available
since the 1980s, are thought
to have been produced
in Afghanistan as well as
Central Asia. They exhibit
a highly original decorative
vocabulary and unusual
technical features, yet are
related to the well-identified
Turkmen types. Their
appearance is well illustrated by
this powerful piece, never
before published. One can
imagine its almost totemic
impact when worn on the
back of a Kazakh woman.
The work’s double-sided
decoration consists of strips
of decorative silver wire,
a central carnelian ending
in palmettes, and a flame-like border familiar from
other Turkmen pieces in the
collection. But the archi-
tectonic forms and pointed
and curved shapes are atyp-
ic of Turkmen work, as is
the use of black matter akin
to niello and an elongated
upper section. The elaborate
shoulder shapes, the pointed
cylinder at the top, and the
large scale of the trefoils
combine to give the work a
graceful yet fierce presence,
almost like an African mask,
and create a crescendo of
forms and colors. Techni-
cally, the use of pseudo-
granulation is a well-known
feature of Kazakh jewelry.

Among known Kazakh
pieces, which consist mainly
of rings, cuffs, and narrow
pectorals, this is one of the
most imposing works, with
its complex vocabulary of
decoration and forms. Mar-
ilyn Wolf points out that the
trefoil crenellations also
appear in kaitag embroider-
ies and Turkish kilims. The
work is made even more
distinctive by its fine-quality
stones and a gold sheen that
contrasts with the granula-
tion.
**Double cordiform pendant**
Mid- to late 19th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, openwork, ram’s-head terminals, and cabochon carnelians
8 × 6/4 in. (20.3 × 15.9 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparable Works:**
*Journal of Indian Art* 1886, p. 55, fig. 7, and p. 56, fig. 8
Beresneva 1976, unpagd. fig. 73
Schlechter and Schlechter 1983, p. 229, fig. 191

Cordiform dorsal pendants were also produced in double and triple formats. The double cordiform pendants in this group (nos. 58–62) were sometimes worn as pectoral ornaments as well.12 Most of these ornaments display the Teke style, but the Wolf collection also includes a rare example of Yomut design (no. 61). Although most are of medium size, one example is a charming small-scale pair (no. 62). In the double pendants in the Wolf collection, the Turkmen silversmith tackled the design problem of how to link multiple cordiform units by using a flat tubular bar at the top, and openwork floral arabesque designs (nos. 58 and 59) or a triangular cordiform unit (nos. 60 and 61) at the bottom. In both types, the pendant is outfitted with suspension loops. The Teke pieces illustrate both the readable, graceful arabesque and the striking abstract tiger-stripe variant. The Yomut piece exemplifies the masterful use of simple geometric units of lozenges, roundels, rosettes, and crescents in parallel and symmetrical designs, here combined with particularly fine mottled carnelians and bordered by trefoil appliqués.
Double cordiform pendant
Mid- to late 19th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with
decorative wire, openwork, and
cabochon carnelians
7¼ x 7¼ in. (19.1 x 19.1 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Journal of Indian Art 1886, p. 55,
fig. 7, and p. 56, fig. 8
Schlechter and Schlechter 1983,
p. 229, fig. 191
Kalter 1984, p. 116, fig. 108

Double cordiform pendant
1914
Central Asia or Iran; probably Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with
decorative wire and stamping,
ram’s-head terminals, and cabochon
carnelians
5¼ x 4 in. (13.3 x 10.2 cm)
Illegible inscription in nasta’liq
script and dated A.H. 1332/
1913–14 A.D.
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf
61

**Double cordiform pendant**

Late 19th—early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with applied decoration, stamping, decorative wire, ram’s-head terminals, and table-cut and cabochon carnelians
5 3/4 × 4 1/4 in. (14.7 × 10.8 cm)

**Comparable works:**
Schleitzer and Schleitzer 1983, pp. 224–25, fig. 185

62

**Pair of double cordiform pendants**

Late 19th—early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, ram’s-head terminals, embossed decoration, and cabochon carnelians
Both 3 3/4 × 3 1/4 in. (9.5 × 7.9 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
TRIPLE

One method of construction for triple cordiform pendants used suspension tubes at the top, to which the pendants were attached. They were connected to the braids by silver chains or fabric cords inserted through the suspension tubes. The most common format consisted of two or three large elements alternating with smaller units of similar shape, as seen in nos. 63, 64, and 66.

No. 63 is a complete example of elegant design similar to temple pendants no. 36. In the former, pendants terminating in cut-out palmettes echo the chased designs of the main fields, whereas in the latter the teardrop shape is used in both form and design. This work also features a technique found in examples that are new to the field: stippling, borrowed from metalworking technology, which creates a modulated effect of light and shade and depth in contrast to the flatness and brilliant sheen of most Teke examples.

No. 64 presents a rare format, with cordiform pendants of equal size and an interstitial oval unit. A notable feature is how the setting of the central carnelian has been anthropomorphized by scratched-in facial features: what was originally a floral form becomes an unidentifiable animal, which...
Triple cordiform pendant
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased,
with decorative wire, ram's-head
terminals, and cabochon carnelians
7¼ × 6¼ in. (18.1 × 17.5 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn B.
Wolf, 2006 (2006.544.3)
somewhat resembles a turtle. Though it may have some amuletic significance, this form may be purely decorative and even whimsical, a quality not often seen in Turkmen art. This piece also presents parallels with gold necklaces, or garlands, of the Timurid period (discussed on pages 30–31), which were also cordiform units strung together, but worn as a pectoral ornament.

The other examples in this group are no longer connected to smaller units or suspension mechanisms, and both feature variants on the openwork arabesque, no. 66 with a more readable variation and no. 67 with an abstract version. Both feature an elegant and graceful combination of border and field design, the former emphasizing the quality of the stones, the latter the overall pattern of S-shaped forms.

65

Triple cordiform pendant
Mid- to late 19th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire and stamping, openwork, ram’s-head terminals, and table-cut carnelians
9⅞ x 7⅜ in. (24.1 x 19.1 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

COMPARABLE WORKS:
Journal of Indian Art 1886, p. 55, fig. 7, and p. 56, fig. 8
Kalter 1987, p. 131, fig. 181
Rudolph 1984, p. 231, figs. E77, E78
Group of three detached cordiform pendants
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; probably Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork and table-cut carnelians
(a) 5 x 2¼ in. (12.7 x 7 cm)
(b) 5¼ x ¾ in. (14.3 x 8.3 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2009 (2009.530.2a–c)
COMPARABLE WORKS:
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, pp. 224–25, fig. 186

Pair of detached cordiform pendants
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork and table-cut carnelians
Both 6½ x ¾ in. (16.5 x 11.8 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
COMPARABLE WORKS:
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, p. 234, fig. 198, and pp. 224–25, fig. 186
TORSO AND PECTORAL ORNAMENTS
The range of jewelry worn by Turkmen women was extremely varied and impressive, especially when viewed from the front. Not only was the woman’s head surmounted by a magnificent headdress, but every other segment of her body also had its assigned ornament, all the way to knee level, where applied ornaments were sewn onto the edges of outer coats.

The display of jewelry was carefully orchestrated, with geometric forms—roundels, rhomboids, triangles, and so on—balancing and complementing one another. The various units were linked by vertical chains, which contributed to the effect of armor noted by nineteenth-century travelers. Careful examination reveals that the overall configuration of pectoral and dorsal ornaments worn by Turkmen women (see fig. 11a, page 19) uses design principles that are surprisingly similar to those used in other Turkmen works. The closest parallel occurs in the gul motif of Turkmen carpets, a polygonal form that appears in rows of alternating or stepped units.¹

Beyond the parameters of Turkmen culture, pectorals were a mainstay of jewelry production and ornamentation throughout Central Asia. The Wolf collection features a selection of such works in an impressive variety of shapes and techniques, providing an interesting comparison with the Turkmen ornaments.
Necklets

The Turkmen necklet captured the attention of nineteenth-century travelers, most famously Edmond O’Donovan, who likened it to a dog collar. (See fig. 9a, no. 3, page 15, and fig. 11b, no. 4, page 19, incorrectly identified as a coronet.) However, when compared with the range of cordiform ornaments or roundels acquired for the Wolf collection, necklets appear to be relatively rare in recent times.

A type of necklet known as a *bukov*, which consisted of a stiff collar and horizontal pendant that were attached to the neck, was particularly distinctive. The pendants took various forms: half-moon, rectangular, and the most spectacular, the double lozenge/hexagon, which when combined with the stiff collar was known as a *gursakcha* (see photograph, right). *Bukovs* with rectangular pendants were ornamented with a graceful design featuring a double row of palmettes ending in winglike forms, which led to it being identified as a butterfly design. Rows of chains as long as the horizontal unit and terminating in bells, leaves, or rhomboids hang from the bottom edge (see photograph, left).

In addition to accompanying a stiff collar, necklets were also attached to the neck by chains in suspension loops. The Wolf collection features two examples from this category that exhibit construction and design features similar to those of necklets described in the literature, albeit smaller and probably of more recent manufacture.
No. 68 exhibits the aforementioned features of stiff collar, palmettes with terminals, and chains. However, there are significant divergences from the nineteenth-century prototypes. The length of the collar may indicate that it is not original, since necklets generally fell at the level of the clavicle and this example would have sat much farther down. Other differences from earlier examples include a more stylized and horizontal palmette design, more prominent and brightly colored stones, and the introduction of a new decorative technique, hatching. No. 69 is closer to the prototypes, retaining the original proportions of the rectangular plaque, the double row of palmettes, the exclusive use of carnelians, and the inclusion of flat surfaces of silver with fire gilding. The small quatrefoils and palmettes that link the chains to the main body of the work are an attractive feature of this necklet.
Iran Firouz has suggested that bow-shaped pendants usually described as boys' dorsal amulets (oksay), but of larger size, were sometimes worn as pectorals by women, in which case they were known as atekh. Hermann Rudolph concurs, but also suggests that such pieces were used as bridal jewelry by grooms in Turkmen wedding ceremonials. Firouz's observation is supported by an 1888 depiction of a bow-shaped amulet worn as a pectoral, either attached to a stiff necklet or worn directly beneath it (fig. 11a, left, page 19). Furthermore, the date of the illustration shows that this practice may be dated to the mid- to late nineteenth century. This usage seems to be the case for the following four works, nos. 70–73. Nos. 70 and 71 are approximately four inches wider than the boys' dorsal amulets. They present so many similarities that they were probably made in the same workshop. In a typical example of the Yomut amor infiniti aesthetic, the underlying bow shape is almost obscured by the applied decoration of roundels, crescents, and stars. Yet closer examination reveals not only the relationship to the boys' amulets, but also to the bakuov necklet type with half-moon pendant. Here the bow shape may actually be interpreted as two half-moons. Thus, the works
Pectoral ornament (?)
19th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, with applied decoration, twisted wire, connecting links and embossed pendants, and table-cut carnelians
9¼ x 5¼ in. (23.2 x 14.3 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

COMPARABLE WORKS:
Fireoz 1978, pls. 34–36
Kalter 1983, p. 96, fig. 78 top
Schlechter and Schlechter 1983, p. 93, fig. 19 (for decoration)
Hiroshina 1999, p. 130, fig. 709
Kalter 1987, p. 138, fig. 196

These works also illustrate the permeability of gender boundaries in Turkmen ornaments, since a form clearly associated with masculine pursuits and protective function for boys was successfully adapted or reused for feminine accoutrement. Finally, both these works exemplify the delicacy and harmony achieved in Yomut jewelry before the adoption of imported, brilliant glass stones and simulated coral and turquoise in the late nineteenth century and the close relationship with horse trappings, which utilize appliqués with indented concentric circles as the principal decorative element.
Pectoral ornament (?)  
19th century  
Central Asia or Iran; Teke  
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, applied decoration, wire chains, bells, ram’s-head terminals, and table-cut and cabochon carnelians  
8¼ × 8¼ in. (21 × 21 cm)  

Comparable works:  
Firouz 1978, pls. 34–36  
Kalter 1984, p. 96, fig. 78 bottom  
Schletter and Schletter 1983, p. 93, fig. 19 (for decoration)  
Hiroshima 1999, p. 129, fig. 706  
Kalter 1987, p. 138, fig. 195

Nos. 72 and 73 are easily identified by the use of openwork arabesques and overall fire gilding as being of Teke manufacture and present variations on the oksay as feminine ornament. The relationship is particularly clear in the former, due to the smaller scale and differentiated half-moons. However, in the latter work the oksay form has been translated into a larger scale and stylized. The very pleasing design presents the undulating, flowing form of the palmette, similar to no. 69. Marilyn Wolf has noted the presence of only two loops for fastening, supporting the hypothesis of a pectoral ornament, since boys’ amulets feature multiple fastenings used to sew the amulets onto the clothing.2

Pectoral ornament (?)  
Probably 20th century  
Central Asia or Iran; Teke  
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, decorative wire, wire chains, bells, and table-cut and cabochon carnelians  
10¼ × 9¼ in. (27 × 23.8 cm)  
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf  

Comparable works:  
Firouz 1978, pls. 34–36  
Kalter 1983, p. 96, fig. 78 bottom  
Schletter and Schletter 1983, p. 93, fig. 19 (for decoration)  
Hiroshima 1999, p. 129, fig. 706  
Kalter 1987, p. 138, fig. 195
DOUBLE LOZENGE / HEXAGONAL PLAQUES

Pectoral ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Teke
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, stamping, decorative wire, pendants with applied decoration, wire chains with embossed pendants and bells, and table-cut carnelians
12¼ x 15 in. (31.1 x 38.1 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Dupuis 1978, p. 26, fig. 31 (see photograph, p. 116 [ganakchi])
Firouz 1978, p. 29, fig. 39 and pl. 23
Kalter 1983, p. 119, fig. 111
Schleitzer and Schleitzer 1983, p. 125, fig. 65
Kalter 1987, p. 135, fig. 188

Surviving pectorals in the double lozenge/hexagonal format are mainly of Teke manufacture. Nos. 74–76 exemplify different design approaches within the basic format of two lozenges alternating with two triangular plaques. The interstitial space in all three works is filled by openwork designs. However, the similarities end there.

No. 74 exhibits a rich and complex articulation of split-leaf and palmette arabesques in the triangular plaques, repeated in mirror-image in the lozenges. The interstitial openwork design of tulips or three-leaved palmettes is airy and graceful, successfully rendered at the sides (but less so at the midsection). Carnelians are skillfully set into the middle of the interstitial tulips/palmettes and the center of the plaques. The pendants consist of flat, gilded leaf shapes, connected by delicate graduated silver wire chains to bells alternating with molded leaf shapes. This is a masterpiece of the genre, producing an effect that is both charming and elegant.

Nos. 75 and 76 present stylized variations on the form of no. 74, and are probably from the same workshop: the arabesque designs of both the plaques and interstitial spaces are more abstract and the chains and pendants less varied.

This group also illustrates how a basic repertoire of motifs was altered and adapted to the jewelry’s different geometric shapes. The lozenge form that is used in pairs in these ornaments to produce a large hexagon is also used singly in pectorals and clasps (see nos. 100 and following).
Pectoral ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, openwork, loop-in-loop chains with embossed pendants, and table-cut carnelians
8⅞ × 9⅞ in. (21.6 × 25.1 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Dupain 1978, p. 24, fig. 31 (see photograph, p. 116 [gorakhal])
Firouz 1978, p. 29, fig. 39 and pl. 23
Kalter 1983, p. 119, fig. 111
Schlechter and Schlechter 1983, p. 131, fig. 71
Kalter 1997, p. 135, fig. 188
Hiroshima 1999, p. 34, fig. 181, and p. 83, figs. 183, 186

Pectoral ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded, with stamping, decorative wire, openwork, wire chains with embossed pendants, and table-cut carnelians
8⅞ × 9⅞ in. (21.6 × 24.8 cm)

Comparable works:
Dupain 1978, p. 24, fig. 31 (see photograph, p. 116 [gorakhal])
Firouz 1978, p. 29, fig. 39 and pl. 23
Kalter 1983, p. 119, fig. 111
Schlechter and Schlechter 1983, p. 125, fig. 65
Kalter 1997, p. 135, fig. 188
Gul-shaped pectoral ornament

20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with loop-in-loop chains, spherical bells, and table-cut and slightly domed carnelians
9¼ × 9 in. (23.2 × 22.9 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable Works:
Bereneva 1976, unpagd., figs. 106, 107 (for gul form)

Scholars have argued that the origin of the Turkmen gul motif is to be sought in the Chinese lobed medallion form and that the stepped gul is the foundation of all Turkmen carpet designs. It is rare to find an echo of this form in silver ornament, and this piece in a stepped gul shape is new to the literature. Similar guls were used as decorative designs for a silver purse and as a link for a European-style necklace during the Soviet era in the 1970s (see Comparable Works), although the skillful workmanship of this piece argues for an earlier dating.

This work also exhibits the use of an embroidery pattern of crossed palmettes in squares (see photograph, page 56), also noted in a crown in this collection (no. 8), suggesting that textile designs were increasingly appropriated for Turkmen jewelry in the twentieth century. Marilyn Wolf has also convincingly argued that the thinness of this piece and the relatively light weight of the silver may be indications of a later twentieth-century date, when silver was less plentiful among the Turkmen than it had been in earlier times. Although silver ornaments were no longer produced in the late 1970s, according to Bernard Dupaigne, they were still preserved as family heirlooms. This may have changed by the 1980s, when, evidence shows, heirlooms were increasingly melted down and used for dowries, to be replaced by cheaper and more lightweight gold jewelry.
The roundel form was favored by Turkmen silversmiths for disc-shaped pectorals, collar studs, and amuletic armlets worn as pendants (see nos. 86–88 for the latter). Such ornaments were worn on the breast, at the opening of a woman’s shift if it was round, or at waist height if the shift had a V-shaped opening. They were worn both singly and in pairs, either sewn onto the shift or attached by hooks or textile bands. They varied in size from one inch up to seven inches for the large Teke examples. For the most part, these ornaments were flat discs, but a number of examples referred to elsewhere as amulets worn on the shoulders were more than an inch thick. Chains and pendants were sometimes attached. I have included in this group an example of a dagdan or double bird ornament, since it was also worn at the opening of the shift.

Roundels are believed to have first come into use among the Yomut in the later nineteenth century; Henri de Blocqueville’s illustrations from 1866 show Yomut women wearing such ornaments at the opening of their V-shaped bodices. The roundel form was transmitted eastward in the course of the twentieth century to most of the other Turkmen tribes, but Yomut examples are still the most common. According to Hermann Rudolph, writing in 1984, roundels in the form of collar clasps became the principal element of everyday jewelry among the Yomut by midcentury, when other major types of ornament for ceremonial occasions were no longer in use. Collar clasps are well represented in the Wolf collection, from Yomut, Teke, Ersari, and urban workshop examples to Afghan and Kazakh pieces.

The circular shape afforded the silversmith the opportunity to execute his designs in a variety of formats, decorative styles, and techniques. The two primary organizational principles were cross-shaped and centered designs; the decorative repertoire ranged from arabesques to appliqués; and the techniques included fire gilding, punching, chasing, embossing, openwork, pseudo-granulation, and silver decorative wire.
Nos. 78–80 may be assigned to the Yomut on stylistic and technical grounds. The surface of nos. 78 and 79 is divided by cross-shaped silver wire strips, studded with carnelians and, in the case of no. 79, small turquoises. The design is striking and very spare, the ground strewn with a delicate pattern of minute circles and rosettes. A notable feature is a tripartite leaf-shaped cut-out, which occurs on all these pieces as well as on no. 91, and probably indicates they were made in the same workshop.

No. 78 also features on the back an image of a quadruped, so stylized as to be scarcely recognizable. A reminder of the Islamic aversion to imagery is found in the cloud-shaped, cut-out design of the animal’s torso, a strategy used by Muslim
The pair of pendants no. 80 is particularly delicate and precious, encrusted with a jewel-like array of small gilded and embossed appliqués. Each small motif has a different pattern, exhibiting the Turkmen silversmith’s remarkable attention to detail. The chains are also finely worked: they consist of two rows of lozenges with raised molded appliqués, terminating in a row of delicate conical and spherical bells.

**79**

**Pectoral disc ornament**

19th century

Central Asia or Iran; Yomut

Silver, with applied and punched decoration, openwork, decorative wire, and slightly domed turquoises and carnelians

Diam. 6½ in. (16.2 cm)

Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparative Works**

Kalter 1983, p. 121, fig. 113 middle

Schletter and Schletter 1983, p. 208, fig. 168

Kalter 1987, p. 136, fig. 192

Medzhitova et al. 1990, unpagd

**80**

**Pair of pectoral disc ornaments**

19th century

Central Asia or Iran; Yomut

Silver, with gilt: applied decoration, openwork, decorative wire, connecting links with applied decoration, cone-shaped and spherical bells, and table-cut carnelians

Both 7½ × 4½ in. (18.1 × 10.8 cm)

Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparative Works**

Rudolph 1984, p. 46, fig. D37 (without chains)
Gilded Yomut collar studs were decorated with embossed radiating panels emanating from a central stone of either carnelian or glass. The collar studs could be flat or slightly rounded as in no. 81, with a large central boss. This example features a polygonal dark blue glass rosette rimmed with turquoise beads at the center; a border of alternating blue and red glass stones encircling the central boss, and an outer rim of turquoise beads. The piece’s dazzling and lavish effect is achieved by mixing modest artificial materials such as glass stones with semiprecious ones, opaque with transparent stones, faceted with cabochon cuts—a veritable kaleidoscope of color and form. The whole is set against a delicately patterned ground of feathery floral and leaf sprays, as in this case, or in other cases geometric forms or rams’ horns. The design of the roundels references both floral forms with unfolding petals and solar symbols with radiating panels.

It should be noted that this ornament is exceptionally large; most examples range in size from a little over an inch to less than five inches. This work clearly illustrates the influence of Persian jewelry traditions among the Yomut and the slow decline of silver jewelry in favor of gold among the Turkmen tribes in the twentieth century.

The term for this type of ornament, gulya ("collar flower"), was adopted from Persian jewelry terminology, as was the form. Since at least the golden age of Persian culture during the reign of the Safavid dynasty in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, women’s transparent shifts were fastened at the collar by small jeweled studs made of gold and embellished with precious stones or pearls (see fig. 15, page 24). This work clearly illustrates the influence of Persian jewelry traditions among the Yomut and the slow decline of silver jewelry in favor of gold among the Turkmen tribes in the twentieth century.
When glass stones first became available in Central Asia in the late nineteenth century, they were considered a desirable novelty since they offered the opportunity for increasingly lavish coloristic effects. As E. von Schwartz noted in 1900: “The native silversmiths make much use of coloured stones but they are seldom genuine. Of genuine stones about the only ones used are turquoises, the favorite gem of Central Asia. Cornelian and agate mainly decorate silver-decked horse harnesses. All other coloured stones are either of Bohemian glass or simply consist of clear glass underlaid with a piece of coloured paper.”

The glass imports were soon adopted by Yomut silversmiths. It is a well-known tradition in the Islamic world to replicate precious materials with cheaper synthetic ones as long as they achieve the same aesthetic impact. Examples of such practices are the use of turquoise-colored enamel in place of true turquoise by medieval Iranian jewelers; the creation of lusterware in Abbasid Iraq to achieve the effect of precious metals; and the invention of imitation lusterware in Samanid Iran before the secret of Iraqi lusterware was rediscovered by Persian potters in the thirteenth century.

The taste for coloristic effects is apparent in the use of turquoise and carnelian together, a combination seen in a number of Central Asian urban workshop ornaments (see no. 12). A small disc-shaped pectoral of plain silver (no. 82) exhibits a design of a central large carnelian in a floral setting of small turquoise beads. A series of spokes emanates from the center, and the rim is decorated with turquoise beads. Although the basic design vocabulary references the Yomut tradition, the turquoises are placed in silver decorative wire settings in teardrop shapes, a distinctive feature of Central Asian and Afghan jewelry.
These pectoral disc ornaments (nos. 83–88) may be assigned to Teke manufacture based on style and technique. The flat discs (nos. 83 and 84) and circular amulet cases (nos. 85–88) all feature variations on the arabesque as the main design element and are executed in openwork. As in most Teke works, they exhibit a rich variety of arabesque styles, ranging from the delicate two-layer version ultimately derived from Timurid designs (no. 83) to stylized and undulating variants with an Art Nouveau feeling (nos. 84 and 85). The graphic quality shared by all Turkmen ornaments is especially evident in these pieces. These openwork discs were either attached to clothing with chains or were sewn on. Backings of green or red felt enhanced the contrast between the arabesque design and the ground.

Ambiguity is an essential characteristic of Islamic ornament. Equal importance was given to positive and negative space, a quality that is particularly evident in Turkmen
amulet cases. Pattern-ground ambiguity was also a feature of Central Asian felts, particularly Kirghiz and Kazakh, which are characterized by the same skillful balance of light and dark found in these works. According to James Trilling, Kazakh and Kirghiz artisans created sophisticated and skilled designs that “change shape almost endlessly according to the form and color which one sees first,” an apt description of the patterns on these roundels. Johannes Kalter has also noted aesthetic similarities between felts and nineteenth-century Central Asian urban jewelry. This provides further evidence that Turkmen jewelry was not created in isolation, but arose from a shared Islamic and Turkic artistic tradition.

Like the Yomut works, the Teke pectoral ornaments nos. 86 and 87 are decorated with central rosettes, but instead of appliqués the rosettes are surrounded with S-shaped elements derived from the negative spaces of arabesque designs or with tulip-shaped or palmette forms. These two works were probably produced in the same workshop, since they bear the same stylized four-lobed floral motif on the back, likely a workshop emblem. No. 88 exhibits an arabesque whorl decoration, which is abstract though still derived from the vegetal arabesque.
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**Pectoral disc ornament**

Late 19th–early 20th century (!)

Central Asia or Iran, Teke

Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, decorative wire, and table-cut carnelians; backed with green felt

Diam. 7½ in. (19.7 cm)

Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
86  
Pair of pectoral disc ornaments  
Late 19th–early 20th century  
Central Asia or Iran; Teke  
Silver, fire-gilded and chased,  
with openwork, decorative  
wire, and table-cut carnelian  
Both diam. 4¼ in. (10.5 cm)  
Promised Gift of Marshall and  
Marilyn R. Wolf  

Comparables Works:  
Rudolph 1984, p. 88, fig. 25
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**Pectoral disc ornament**

Late 19th–early 20th century

Central Asia or Iran: Teke

Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, decorative wire, and table-cut carnelians

Diam. 5¾ in. (14.5 cm)

Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**COMPARABLE WORKS:**

Rudolph 1984, p. 88, fig. 25

---
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**Pectoral disc ornament**

Late 19th–early 20th century

Central Asia or Iran: Teke

Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, decorative wire, and table-cut carnelian

Diam. 4½ in. (11.1 cm)

Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
The other roundels in this group (nos. 89—94) are not as easy to categorize as the preceding works. Most are new to the literature, and while some are related to Teke works, others, such as the Kazakh and Afghan examples, represent a different style. However, when taken together they illustrate that the roundel form was widespread. Nos. 89 and 90 are perhaps closest to the Teke examples: they exhibit arabesque designs in fire gilding and ram's-head terminals as well as rosettes inset with cornelians, all previously noted Teke design features. No. 90 is particularly notable for its musical qualities. According to Marilyn Wolf, each large bell emits a different tone when struck,22 a skillful arrangement that would have created a pleasing melody as the wearer moved.
Pair of pectoral disc ornaments
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with stylized floral terminals, openwork, pendants, wire chains, bells, and table-cut carnelians
(a) 13¾ × 8¼ in. (34.3 × 22.5 cm)
(b) 12 × 8¼ in. (30.5 × 22.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

NOTE: These works are not an identical pair.
Pair of pectoral disc ornaments

Probably 20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Tekke (?)
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, decorative loop-in-loop chains, bells, and table-cut carnelians
(a) 23¼ × 5¼ in. (59.1 × 14 cm)
(b) 23¼ × 5¼ in. (60.3 × 14 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

NOTE: These works are not an identical pair.
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**Pair of pectoral discs**

Probably 20th century

Central Asia; Kazakh

Silver, with stamped beading, glass inlays, wire chains, and bells

Both 24½ × 6¼ in. (61.6 × 17.1 cm)

Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
Pectoral disc ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Ererai (?)
Silver, with decorative wire, embossed pendants, ram’s-head terminals, loop-in-loop chains, conical bells, and table-cut carnelians
7½ × 4¼ in. (18½ × 11¼ cm)

Pectoral disc ornament
20th century
Afghanistan; Tajik (?)
Silver, with decorative wire, stamped beading, silver shot, applied decoration, chains, bells, and table-cut carnelians
6½ × 4¼ in. (17.5 × 12.1 cm)

Comparable works:
Janata 1991, p. 151, fig. 53.2 (described as Tajik)
Although not a roundel, this ornament may well have been worn as a pectoral. The form recalls an element of a headdress ornament, but seems too wide for such a use. The design is extremely graceful and well balanced, and the skillfully executed, fluid line is an outstanding example of arabesque design. The vegetal ornament emanates from the birds’ beaks and flows into the central palmette, unifying positive and negative space. It is then repeated across the surface of the birds’ bodies, where again the design can be read as a clear split-leaf arabesque (gold-positive) and an abstract pattern (silver-negative). The central palmette motif is itself connected to a lower palmette, with the axis emphasized by three translucent marquise-shaped carnelians.

The confronted-birds shape is derived from multiple sources. On the one hand,
it resembles the *dagdan*, one of the most important forms of Turkmen boys’ amulets (see photograph, below), which was appropriated for women’s pectoral jewelry, worn on the chest with collar studs and clasps (see photograph, right). A similar development occurred with the reuse of the *oksay* boys’ amulet for women’s pectorals, as discussed on page 118. On the other hand, the shape is related to bird symbolism in the Central Asian and Russian ornamental repertoire.

Birds’ heads, double birds’ heads, and the double-headed eagle in particular were emblems of sovereignty in the Near East as early as the third millennium B.C. as well as in Central Asia. This symbolism is also found in the czarist emblem of the double-headed eagle, well known throughout Central Asia in the nineteenth century. Edmond O’Donovan, writing in 1882, mentions that as a reward to their Yomut allies, Russians presented them with decorations that were a modified version of the Cross of St. George, representing a double-headed eagle to avoid offense at the Christian religious symbol (see photograph, above right). The emblem could also have been appropriated from other Russian products available in the region, such as Gardner ceramics, or from coinage. The image of a bird with a leaf emanating from its beak is often cited as a classic example of the early stages of the development of the arabesque. This begs the question of whether pieces such as these are the end result of a living yet archaic tradition or a historicizing revival. In either case, the high standards of execution still prevalent are never in doubt.
Lozenge-Shaped Plaques and Clasps

The works in this section are primarily of Teke origin. Lozenge-shaped ornaments (gonjuk) were worn singly or in pairs, when they were used as clasps for coats (chapraz). It is important to emphasize, however, that they were traditionally combined with other ornaments to form large composite parures, as noted in the discussion of cordiform pendants on page 90. A nineteenth-century illustration (fig. 11a, left, page 19) depicts two small lozenge-shaped plaques linked by chains to cordiform pendants above and large amulets below.

Some scholars have noted that Turkmen women wore entire parures for marriage ceremonials and important occasions and individual pieces for everyday use. Other sources have asserted that Turkmen women wore their jewelry at all times; still others have recorded that use varied according to the wealth of the family. Regrettably, given the state of the field and the adaptation of ornament to current economic, political, and social conditions, it is difficult to be more specific about use or to propose a convincing chronological development.

Single lozenge-shaped plaques could be attached by chains, hooks, or loops. They were also sewn onto a plain fabric backing attached at the neck and worn as pectoral ornaments on the chest or waist, or sewn onto the bottom of wide vertical black fabric panels that were then applied to coats. In more recent times, rows of discs ending in clasps were sewn directly onto coats (see no. 170). The latter were decorated with multiple rows of small embossed discs or leaf-shaped appliqués, embroidery, or coins, producing a magnificent display of overall ornamentation.

The effect of such ornamentation is reminiscent of the dress of Persian court ladies of the Qajar period whose headdresses and turbans were so heavily bejeweled that, according to contemporary European visitors, they had difficulty moving. In both cases, the discomfort of wearing the stiff costume or heavy jewelry was far outweighed by its grandeur. Turkmen women were turned into a form of living art, and the tribes’ wealth and power were embodied by the display of the heavy silver ornaments they so proudly wore.

The most common organizing principle for the surface decoration of these pieces was the cross-shaped design, as was the case for roundels. Other approaches included lozenge-within-lozenge and centered floral designs. For the most part the decorative repertoire is again vegetal ornamentation or arabesques. Although little has been said about the floral repertoire of Turkmen ornament, in contrast to the better-known geometric design vocabulary, the objects in this section, which are generally new to the literature, illustrate the important development of floral forms, used not only for decorative motifs but for the shape of the ornament as well.
In addition to the techniques already described for Teke works, the use of bottom swages to produce a wide range of forms for pendants is particularly well illustrated by the works in this category. (Both the technique and the patterns produced have been discussed in detail by Johannes Kalter.) These works also illustrate the various types, shades, and shapes of carnelians and the ways in which they were cut, set (in collets or boxes to achieve an effect of relief), and enhanced (backed with foil, red lacquer, varnish, or fabric to intensify and reflect their color).
to the general characteristics of the type.35

No. 100, for instance, does not follow the typical Teke style, since it features an undecorated ground, silver whorl and silver wire decoration instead of arabesque patterning, and a single stone at the center. No. 97 exhibits a chevron-patterned border—also found in nos. 62 (cordoniform pendant) and 127 (triangular amulet holders), and fig. 11b, nos. 7 and 8, page 19—which may represent a particular Teke subtype or workshop. The use of the chevron motif, commonly found in late nineteenth-century Central Asian urban silver and metalwork production, may indicate that the pieces were produced in these workshops or by Teke silversmiths working near urban centers such as Merv.36

Even within this simple format, Turkmen silversmiths demonstrated remarkable inventiveness and produced an infinite variety of form and pattern. The basic lozenge-shaped unit, for instance, is extended at the bottom either with a plaque of openwork in the familiar tulip or three-leaved-palmette decoration, or with narrow silver strips studded with table-cut or cabochon-cut carnelians. In many examples, the lozenge is further extended vertically by a row of multiple chains with pendants, as many as thirty-seven in the case of the imposing clasp no. 100. Each work in this selection exhibits a different organization of the silver wire chains and their pendants: the chains vary according to width, length, number, and even spacing.
Pectoral ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Tekke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, decorative wire, wire chains and pendants with applied decoration, embossed decorations, bells, and table-cut carnelians
13¾ × 9½ in. (34.9 × 23.8 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
The variations of motifs and forms found in the embossed pendants—bells, leaf and fruit shapes, forms suggesting larvae or beetles, fish forms, and even faces—impart great charm to Turkmen jewelry. No. 96 exhibits a spherical bell at the center, along with a single pointed-leaf pendant and fish-form pendants with eyes and rounded heads. Johannes Kalter has observed that these pendants, as well as the way the edges of the jewelry are fashioned, may indicate specific workshops or tribal affiliations, particularly in the case of Teke pieces. This intriguing suggestion could provide the answer to some of the more vexing questions of attribution in Turkmen jewelry, but it has yet to be systematically investigated by researchers.

Pectoral ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Teke or subtribe
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, stamped beading, wire chains, bells, and table-cut carnelian
13 × 8¾ in. (33 × 20.6 cm)
The design of this impressive pair of clasps is particularly elegant and graceful, exhibiting an exquisite balance and symmetry between the lozenge-shaped plaque, the wider panels at the bottom, and the hanging chains and pendants. The placement of the stones enhances the design, articulating the cross shape and the diagonal shape of the hanging plaque. The openwork floral design is executed with great skill and clarity, so the silhouette is easily read. More importantly, this is the only example in the literature in which the palmettes are facing downward and outward and are so graceful in shape and proportion. The chains are very evenly spaced and proportionate to the rest of the piece. Finally, the tapered, pointed shape of the embossed pendants contributes to the elegance and beauty of the design.
Pair of pectoral ornaments
Dated A.H. 1321/1903–4 A.D.
Central Asia or Iran: Teke (?)
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with stylized ram’s-head upper terminals, decorative wire, wire and loop-in-loop chains, bells, cabochon carnelians, and turquoises
(a) 8½ × 4½ in. (22.5 × 11.1 cm)
(b) 8¼ × 6¼ in. (22.2 × 12.1 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

NOTE: The date and the number 860/840 (?) are inscribed on the back of the ornaments.

These two small works illustrate the lozenge-within-lozenge design format. Both are richly ornamented with hanging chains and pendants. No. 102 displays two unusually long rows of chains, separated by a row of turquoises and carnelians and ending with spherical bells in stepped configuration. The Turkmen skill at creating a lively and colorful design with limited means but varied decorative repertoire is on full display in no. 103: the double-lozenge design is enlivened by the openwork pattern of whorls and by the brilliance of the stones. The pieces are crowned with circular perforated terminals and end with chains featuring molded and striated lozenge shapes, flat lozenges set with stones, spherical bells, and fish-shaped pendants.
Pair of pectoral ornaments
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke (?)
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, perforated upper terminals, loop-in-loop chains, pendants with applied decoration, bells, and table-cut carnelians
7¼ x 5¼ in. (20 x 13.3 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Journal of Indian Art, 1886, p. 55, no. 9
Rudolph 1984, p. 163, fig. D75 (a pair of clasps)
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, p. 133, pl. 74 (a pair of clasps dated second half of the 19th century)
Sycheva 1984, p. 107, fig. 60, and p. 109, fig. 63 (dated late 19th or early 20th century)
The third type of lozenge-shaped clasp is represented by five works, each decorated with centered floral designs. The first four are of Teke manufacture: no. 104 presents an intermediary type using both the cross shape and floral ornament, while nos. 105–7 all feature centered floral designs in openwork or fire gilding. The Turkmen skill at using the decorative repertoire to great effect is well illustrated by no. 107: a central lobed medallion is framed by split-leaf and palmette designs in the main field and the border is decorated with similar palmettes, while five carnelians are placed at the center of the medallion and the encircling palmettes. The last work in this group (no. 108) is of uncertain origin and presents both Central Asian and Turkmen design features. Similar works have been assigned to Tajikistan and Erarsa manufacture (see Comparable).
Pectoral ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Teke
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, openwork, and table-cut carnelians
5 3/4 × 5 3/4 in. (13 × 13.3 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
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**Pectoral ornament**

Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, openwork, stylized floral terminals, and table-cut carnelians
6½ × 6½ in. (16.5 × 16.8 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Works), and the use of turquoise in conjunction with carnelians and the setting of small turquoise beads recalls an amulet holder (no. 143) also of uncertain origin. In any case, the design is intermediary between that of the lozenge-shaped clasps using floral decorative motifs, such as no. 107, and that of the floral-shaped clasps discussed in the following section.
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**Pectoral ornament**

Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; origin uncertain
Silver, with decorative wire, openwork, turquoise beads, loop-in-loop chains, simulated coral and mother-of-pearl beads, and table-cut carnelians
9½ × 5¾ in. (24.1 × 14.9 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparable works:**
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, p. 121, pl. 60 (for use of beads, assigned to Enzai around 1900)
Sycheva 1984, p. 37, no. 8 (for technique, assigned to Tajikistan, late 19th century)
Large palmette motifs in floral or tulip shapes, executed in openwork, are present in a number of Teke ornaments in the Wolf collection. Variations on this theme can be seen in a pillbox-shaped cap (no. 9), necklets (nos. 68 and 69), cordiform and lozenge-shaped pectorals (nos. 58, 96, and 101), and belts (no. 174). The enthusiasm for large-scale floral designs is also evident in the collection in floral plaques and clasps, both single pieces and pairs, the majority of which may be assigned to Teke manufacture.

The basic design of these objects is composed of four palmettes facing outward with a cross shape as the underlying form. This particularly graceful design seems somewhat atypical for Turkmen ornaments, which tend to be massive and imposing, emphasizing the display of tribal wealth and power rather than the enhancement of the wearer’s beauty, as seen in these examples.

Floral plaques and clasps probably represent an evolution in the function of Turkmen ornaments from tribal emblems to jewelry per se, although as usual with this material, any such suggestion must remain speculative, since definitive dating and provenance for most of the works is unavailable. Nonetheless, the beginning of this evolution may be dated to the late nineteenth century, when the Turkmen were first exposed to Russian tastes and styles. Russian prototypes may have included jewelry as well as decorations such as the Cross of St. George. The impact of Russian taste on Central Asian artistic production increased considerably in the twentieth century, during the Communist era, and can be documented in all areas of production, both for tribal use and market distribution. Numerous Russian publications from the 1970s on document new styles in Turkmen jewelry that are related to these examples in the Wolf collection.39

Yet, as noted in discussions of other objects in this collection, Turkmen jewelry drew on both tribal and Russian sources for inspiration. In this case, the floral form appears to be related to the gul motif seen in Turkmen carpets and textiles. I have discussed the adoption of the stepped form in the entry for no. 77 and suggested that it is a relatively recent development. That may also be the case with these floral clasps, which resemble the flower-shaped gul motif and illustrate the Turkmen silversmiths’ search for new forms and motifs.
Pair of floral pectoral ornaments
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Tibet
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, stamping, openwork, wire chains, pendants with applied decoration, bells, and table-cut carnelians
Both 6 x 3 3/4 in. (15.2 x 9.2 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Firouz 1978, pl. 5
Schletter and Schletter 1983, p. 133, pl. 75 (dated 1907)
Rudolph 1984, p. 167, fig. D73
Sycheva 1984, p. 109, fig. 62 (dated late 19th–early 20th century)

These elegant clasps (nos. 109 and 110) were undoubtedly made by the same craftsman or workshop, given the similar treatment of the surface in the gul, the harmony in the balance between the gul and pendants, the rich but subdued color palette, and the use of identical chains and pendants. Differences include the form of the palmette (compact in no. 109 and elongated in no. 110) and the overall design.
principle (cross shape in the former and centered in the latter). A number of comparable works for no. 109 have been identified in the literature, but none for no. 110, perhaps indicating that the latter was a special commission, a suggestion supported by the exceptional quality of the piece.

Of particular note is the beauty of the surface decoration in no. 110, where the silver motifs of the pendants are recalled in embossed silver appliqués on the gul, a rare example of harmony of conception in Turkmen ornament, where the pendants and terminals are generally treated as separate units from the body of the ornament.

Pair of floral pectoral ornaments
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with applied decoration, openwork, wire chains, pendants with applied decoration, embossed decoration, and table-cut carnelians
(a) 8¼ x 6¼ in. (21.9 x 12.1 cm)
(b) 8¼ x 4¾ in. (22.2 x 12.1 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
These four works (nos. 111–14) may at first seem foreign to the Turkmen design tradition, due to their floral shape and their resemblance to the European brooch. Certainly, except for a pectoral from the Linden-Museum collection comparable to no. 111, which is described as “rare” by Kalter in 1984, this type is new to the literature. The Linden-Museum piece was acquired in the 1960s and thus may serve as a terminus ante quem for the group (see photograph, right).²⁰

It may also be argued that the floral form is actually indigenous and derived from the lobed medallion, which originated in China. The lobed medallion is ultimately the model for the gul motif of Turkmen carpets, from which it was adopted by the Turkmen silversmith.⁴¹
Nevertheless, it is also possible that Russian influences were at play here and that these works represent another hybrid Turkmen type attributable to the increased transmission of designs and artistic exchange in Central Asia in the later nineteenth century.

No. 113 is probably closest in design to better-known types of floral clasps illustrated by nos. 109 and 110. Not only does the pair have the same subdued color scheme and sophisticated use of stones, but the shape of the palmette and the cross form are similar to no. 110 and no. 109 respectively. The increased stylization, larger scale, and reduction in detail, coupled with the horizontal linking of the chains and pendants, relate this pair also to the work from the Linden-Museum (see above).

Nos. 112 and 113, which are closely related stylistically, present exceptionally graceful variations on the floral type based on four palmettes. The surface embellishment of the pieces, which includes hatching the ground to give it shading and texture, sophisticated color harmonies, and polishing the stones, contributes to the impression of luxury conveyed by these pieces. No. 114 presents a more stylized but still recognizably floral form, perhaps closest to the Chinese lobed medallion prototypes.
113
Floral pectoral ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran: Tekke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, wire chains, embossed pendants, slightly domed carnelians, and turquoise beads
8 ¼ x 5 in. (20.6 x 12.7 cm)
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Pair of floral pectoral ornaments
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; possibly Ersari
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, wire chains, embossed pendants, bells, and table-cut carnelians
(a) 6 ¼ x 4 in. (15.6 x 10.2 cm)
(b) 6 ¼ x 3 ¼ in. (15.6 x 9.8 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2007 (2007.497a, b)

Comparable works:
Stefan and Schwäbisch 2004, p. 24, fig. 21 (dated early 19th century)
This work is new to the literature and presents both Yomut and Teke features. Although it is related to stylized Teke bird-shaped pectorals (see no. 120) and bow-shaped amulets in shape and conception, there is no exact parallel for this form, which is even more abstract than its models. The overall form is atypical, and closer to Chinese forms and aesthetics.

This hybrid quality suggests a mid-twentieth-century date for the piece, when tribal styles became less distinctive; jewelry in various tribal styles, including Teke and Kazakh from Afghanistan, appeared on the market; and modern jewelry inspired by Turkmen styles was being produced for Soviet patrons and collectors.42

**115**

*Plaque*
Mid-20th century
Central Asia; tribe uncertain
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, table-cut carnelians, chains, and bells decorated with stones and beads
7¼ × 4½ in. (19.7 × 12.1 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparable Works:**
Kalter 1983, p. 99, fig. 82 (Yomut pectoral in center)
Rudolph 1984, pp. 200–201, figs. D186–90 (Yomut pectorals)
Kalter 1987, p. 138, fig. 197 (Yomut bow-shaped amulet)
Mezdhitova et al. 1990, unpagd
Although this striking piece is probably an element of a larger parure, it has a powerful presence and can stand on its own as an independent work of art. The piece is very sculptural and consists of a small rectangular plaque inlaid with a row of turquoise attached to a pendant of sweeping form. Pattern interest is created by the contrast of the bold polished form and the larger scale of the pendant with the delicate small-scale filigree workmanship of the center. The work is new to the literature and forms part of a group of chinoiserie-style works in the Wolf collection that share a similar treatment of chased floral and leaf designs (see nos. 158 and 184). This piece is clearly related to Tibetan prototypes (see photograph, right). The work also displays features of Central Asian workshop production. The combination of plain and patterned surfaces in this piece is related to the gold filigree jewelry of Bukhara, Khiva, and Khwarazm, although the latter generally favored delicate and sometimes overly busy forms and motifs. The use of decorative silver wire for the setting of the stones, in addition to the plain collet, is also a Central Asian urban workshop technique. Additionally, triangular amulet containers with a comparable combination of silver filigree and polished silver inset with stones have been attributed to Khwarazm. Until a definitive study based on a larger corpus appears, two possible scenarios remain: either the works in this group were produ-
Kazakh and Kazakh-style ornaments that were produced in Afghanistan in the 1970s were introduced to the field by German and Russian museum publications of that era. Kazakhstan jewelry is well represented in the collection by a total of twenty-four works, including cordiform pendants, a pectoral, amulet holders, armbands, and rings. As noted in the discussion of the decorative style on page 33, Kazakh jewelry relies on pseudo-granulation and foil-backed glass to create a bold and original effect, and on forms that are distinctive but related to those of Turkmen jewelry.

Long vertical pendants such as no. 117 were sewn onto fabric panels in a similar manner to the large lozenge-shaped Turkmen plaques. Kazakh pendants were composed of rectangular and polygonal hollow plaques linked
Element of a pectoral ornament
19th century
Central Asia: Kazakh
Silver, with stamped beading, silver shot, glass inlays over red foil, lacquer, or cloth, loop-in-loop chains, embossed pendants, and stamped fire-gilded decoration. 
6½ × 3½ in. (17.1 × 9.5 cm)

Comparable works:
Kalter 1983, p. 106, fig. 92 right
Sychova 1984, p. 125, figs. 80, 81
Steffan and Schwab 2004, pp. 91–93, figs. 45–48

together with silver chains and ending in leaf- and bell-shaped terminals, all elements that were also common in Turkmen jewelry. Kazakh pieces thus decorated the torso in the same way and used the same basic vocabulary of form as Turkmen jewelry.46

Authentic Kazakh works assigned to Central Asia and Kazakh-style ornaments from Afghanistan can be very close in workmanship, and it is difficult to differentiate between the two. According to Alfred Janata, the first Kazakh ornaments to appear on the market were rings, followed by cuffs and other types.47 It should not be concluded that Kazakh works acquired by collectors since the 1970s are of inferior workmanship or recent date. The detached element no. 118, for instance, provides clues to the dating and authentication of Kazakh jewelry through its quality and condition. The excellence of Kazakh craftsmanship is evident in the skilled decoration using delicate motifs in combination to form a dense pattern of ornament. This superb workmanship, combined with evidence of heavy wear on the back side of the ornament, the deformation and loss of portions of the metal, and the corrosion of the silver, suggests an early date for this piece, sometime in the late nineteenth century.

The practice of enhancing the brilliance of stones with foil backing originated in India, but it is commonly found in Central Asian urban jewelry, where paper, lacquer, and fabric backing were also used to deepen the color of stones,48 and was adopted for Kazakh jewelry. According to Natalya Sychova, the Kazakh plaques were filled with a heavy white paste, a technique that had been used for sculpture in this region since the fourth century A.D.49
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Tripartite pectoral ornament
19th century
Afghanistan; Pashtun
Silver, with applied decoration, decorative wire, turquoise beads, and pendants
Left and right elements: 4¼ × 3½ in. (10.5 × 8.9 cm); middle element: 4¼ × 3¼ in. (10.8 × 9.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Steffan and Schwabl 2004, p. 124, fig. 76 (enameled prototype)
Janata 1981, pp. 72–73, figs. 3a, 3b (for technique)

Tripartite pectoral ornaments were also produced in northern Afghanistan in Pashtun style. This example, which consists of three trapezoidal elements related in form to amulet cases, was worn horizontally. It features a small-scale overall pavé design of roundels, leaf shapes, turquoise beads, and strips of decorative silver wire.
Pair of ornaments worn laterally
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, loop-in-loop chains, bells, and table-cut carnelians
(a) 25 x 5½ in. (63.5 x 14 cm)
(b) 24½ x 5½ in. (62.2 x 14 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

This pair of ornaments consists of double-bird-shaped pendants with attached chains and bells connected to long chains made up of rectangular and polygonal plaques. In form, this ornament is related to dorsal plait ornaments as well as to small Yomut pectorals in bird shapes with long chains. In function, however, it appears to be closer to clothing panels attached under the arms and decorated with silver ornaments (see no. 171).
Turkmen children’s ornaments have a special charm, different from the more imposing works made for women; they are smaller and more whimsical. Amulets in various shapes and sizes, singly or in pairs, were sewn onto boys’ clothing, generally on the back but sometimes on a bib. They illustrate the original function of ornament in Turkmen culture as protection against the evil eye and sickness, but also evoke the children’s world of play. Examples of the latter are animal-shaped amulets such as a pair of camels (no. 121) or bow-and-arrow-shaped amulets (smaller versions of the works discussed under pectorals nos. 70–73 and headdress ornaments nos. 21–24). Square amulets surmounted by ram’s-horn terminals are among the most distinctive Turkmen ornaments because of the prominent terminals. Nos. 122 and 123 present variations on this type. Both are square, inset with carnelians at the center, and embellished with appliqué or fire gilding. The ram’s-horn terminals are both playful and anthropomorphic; the latter characteristic is sometimes attributed to other Turkmen ornaments, particularly adamlik temple pendants. The last piece in this group (no. 124) is a small square box with chains and bells. Originally the box would have contained prayers or invocations.
against the evil eye and would have been sewn onto a boy’s cap. Even this small-scale work presents the same fine workmanship seen in larger pieces.
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**Amulet for boy’s cap**

Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, openwork, loop-in-loop chains, bells, and table-cut carnelian
5½ × 5½ in. (14 × 13.3 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparable works:**
Firouz 1978, p. 39, fig. 59 and pl. 30
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, p. 106, fig. 36
Medzhitova et al. 1990, unpaged
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**Boy’s amulet**

19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke (?)
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, ram’s-horn and stylized flower upper terminals, wire chains, bells, embossed pendants, and table-cut carnelians
11¼ × 8 in. (28.3 × 20.3 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparable works:**
Dupaigne 1978, p. 16, fig. 19 (described as Ersari)
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, p. 268, fig. 254 (described as Teke, mid-20th century)
Rudolph 1984, p. 82, fig. A24
Kalter 1987, p. 139, no. 199
Hiroshima 1999, p. 130, fig. 717 (described as dorsal boy’s amulet gönjük, Saryk, first half of the 19th century)
Medzhitova et al. 1990, unpaged
Along with the cordiform pendant, the tumar, or triangular amulet holder, is the most spectacular and distinctive of Turkmen ornaments; the Wolf collection features a varied and visually exciting selection of these objects. Their tripartite construction consists of a triangular component joined at the base to a hollow cylinder, which is edged with chains and pendants. (Some amulet holders consist of only the cylinder.) Surviving cylinders are empty, but they originally housed protective prayers or Qur’an verses written on paper.\textsuperscript{53} Tumars were worn on the chest, at the sides, or at the waist, singly or in pairs. Pairs of small tumars were also worn on the shoulders. They were attached by chains or by leather straps, either decorated with ornaments or left plain.\textsuperscript{54}

In addition to the triangular format, amulet holders were produced in a variety of sizes and styles across the entire Central Asian tribal and urban spectrum. Small polygonal boxes with and without attached cylindrical tubes, small rectangular plaques, large rectangular plaques, and cylindrical or polygonal cases, sometimes surmounted with triangular plaques or outfitted with suspension loops, are among the most common forms. Techniques included silver filigree, enamel, niello, fire gilding, and chasing.\textsuperscript{55} Examples in both silver and gold were likewise produced in this period in Qajar Persia and the Ottoman Empire.\textsuperscript{56}

Descriptions from the mid-nineteenth century on discuss the use of triangular tumars. Edmond O’Donovan, describing women’s ornaments in 1882, begins with the headdress and then states: “On her neck was a massive silver ornament resembling . . . the collar of a Newfoundland dog. . . . From its front hung at least twenty silver chains, . . . broken halfway down by lozenge-shaped pieces of silver, also embossed with gold, and supporting a cylinder of silver hanging below the level of the waist, and containing talismanic writings, to preserve her from the Ginns and other evil spirits which are supposed to haunt these Central Asian wildernesses. . . . On either shoulder was a flat cylindrical silver box. About four inches in diameter, in the centre of each was also set a flat cornelian.”\textsuperscript{57} Such nineteenth-century descriptions are supported by illustrations that correctly identify the ornaments as cylinders holding relics or Qur’an verses (see fig. 11c, no. 10, page 19, described as a relic holder, and fig. 9, page 15, described as “cylindre renfermant les versets du Coran”).

Other Turkmen ornaments such as cordiform pendants and dagdan-shaped pectorals also have a general amuletic function or use forms that may be more closely related to Turco-Mongol shamanistic beliefs than the tumar. Scholars who argue for the primacy of shamanistic belief systems in Turkmen ornaments interpret the tumar triangle as an ancient fertility symbol, and argue that this object was a powerful amulet.
to ensure the birth of healthy children. However, of all the Turkmen ornaments the tumar form exhibits the clearest links with Islam and Islamic jewelry traditions.

This is due, on the one hand, to the shape, which, as discussed in my essay in this volume, was well known in the Islamic world since at least the tenth century, and, on the other, to the function of the container, which was intended to house a long paper scroll, rolled into a cylinder. Islamic amulets were generally inscribed. By way of example, an oblong octagonal silver amulet case assigned to India, 1630–40, bears verses on four sides from a chapter of the Qur’an, Sura al-Baqara (The Cow) 2: 255–56. The other four sides are decorated with arabesque designs. Anthony Welch, who published the piece, writes that these verses were favored in India for architectural ornament but were equally appropriate for the tumar. He adds that the case was intended to hold pages of the Sura al-Baqara, described as the Qur’an in miniature because it contains all the principal themes of the revelation; or, alternatively, to house a miniature Qur’an. While Turkmen tumars do not have such inscriptions, their relationship with Islamic culture and belief is strong.

The tumar is not just a talisman related to shamanistic beliefs but also a symbol of the conversion of the Turks to Islam and their adherence to the tenets of the faith. The lack of inscriptions on Turkmen tumars is understandable in a context in which the silversmith may not have been well versed in Arabic literature, may not have been a particularly observant Muslim, or may even have been of the Jewish faith. As discussed elsewhere in this book, music and oral tradition were the principal forms of Turkmen culture, not poetry or Qur’anic learning.
Every tumar exhibits the same basic features: a hollow cylinder divided into three to six compartments, usually set with carnelians, open at one end to insert the rolled paper document and terminating in long chains with pendants. Within this format, tribal variations are numerous. The four Tekke pieces in this category illustrate a range of scales and formats.

The largest (no. 125) features large-scale openwork and a massing of carnelians, like other pieces new to the literature. This work exhibits a particularly skillful treatment of the openwork arabesque border at the bottom, a swirling motif at either end of the cylinder, and imposing terminals of palmettes/rams’ heads. The bells at the end of the chains are fitted with bands of decorative wire and set with small carnelians, a particularly refined touch.

The pair of pendants in no. 126 is distinguished by the wavy outline of the triangular element and by the use of a solid lower band as opposed to the more usual openwork with arabesques. The pendants in no. 127 are delicate and graceful, with brilliant polished stones, lace-like openwork, and skillfully executed chevron and arabesque decoration. No. 128 presents an intriguing example of an abstract design derived from a stylization of the arabesque. The undulating, seminaturalistic vegetal scroll is reinterpreted as a geometric design of wavy lines, comma-shaped voids, and pointed forms, punctuated by dots and minute circles.

126
Pair of triangular amulet holders
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Tekke Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, table-cut carnelians, loop-in-loop chains, and bells
Both 6¼ × 6¼ in. (16.2 × 17.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Note: This type seems rare. Published examples have openwork at the bottom and straight-edged triangles. See nos. 130 and 131; Rudolph 1984, p. 171, fig. D102; and p. 176, fig. D112; and Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, pp. 76–77, fig. 5.
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Pair of triangular amulet holders
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased,
with decorative wire, openwork,
cabochon carnelians, wire
chains, and bells
Both 7¼ x 4½ in. (18.7 x 11.4 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf
COMPARABLE WORKS:
Schleitzer and Schleitzer 1983,
p. 75, fig. 1

128
Triangular amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased,
with decorative wire, table-cut
carnelians, wire chains, and bells
10¼ x 9¼ in. (26.7 x 23.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf
COMPARABLE WORKS:
Rudolph 1984, p. 176, fig. D109
Triangular amulet holder
Late 19th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, applied decoration, pendants, loop-in-loop chains, spherical bells, table-cut carnelians, and faceted stones
9\(\frac{1}{2}\) \(\times\) 10\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (24.1 \(\times\) 26.7 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Schletter and Schletter 1983, pp. 92–93, fig. 19 (assigned to western Yomut and dated late 19th century)

Works produced by other tribes and urban workshops include a *tumar* decorated in characteristic Yomut style with an intricate fire-gilded design of lozenges, wide scrolls, and bird motifs (no. 129). Masses of small carnelians (twenty-four oval carnelians and thirteen round glass stones, for a total of thirty-seven stones) add to the effect of piled-up richness. The delicate polygonal pendants alternating with rosettes and strung together by horizontal silver chains add to the impression of luxury. The triangle is surmounted by five small birds, represented in a lively manner, that seem to be bending their heads to peck at something. Birds are among the most popular ornaments in Islamic jewelry, representing health and good fortune, and are frequently found in Turkmen ornaments as well, though usually in the form of stylized eagles. As in no. 125, the ends of the cylinder of no. 129 are richly ornamented: here, stylized vegetal forms and stones are favored. These forms become clearer when compared with the cylinder ends of *tumar* no. 130, which exhibits a related but more spare design.

Here, the highly polished silver surface predominates, with limited use of vegetal appliqués, decorative silver wire, and terminals. The simplicity of the decoration contrasts with the lavish and
detailed design of the cylinder ends (see detail, right). Small palmettes alternate with larger elongated trefoil forms on a stippled ground. The piece is unified by the repetition of the palmette form in four ways: as a terminal, in appliqués on the cylinder, in chased decoration on the cylinder ends, and as an embossed pendant. Again we see the Turkmen skill at using limited forms in a wide range of techniques to achieve a lavish decorative effect.
Triangular amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Erzari
Silver, with decorative wire, loop-in-loop chains, bells, and table-cut carnelians
10 ½ x 9 ½ in. (27.3 x 24.4 cm)

Comparable Works:
Kalter 1983, p. 128, fig. 121 bottom right
Rudolph 1984, p. 182, fig. D161
Sieffan and Schwabi 2004, p. 62, fig. 16 top

Nothing could provide a greater contrast with the Yomut tumar no. 129 than no. 131. This tumar has a stark, severe treatment, with geometric forms such as triangles, squares, and pentagons predominating. The shining silver surface is left completely undorned except for the carnelians, creating an aesthetic effect that is particularly appealing to modern sensibilities.

A Kazakh interpretation of this form (no. 132) and a Central Asian workshop tumar (no. 133) exhibit more typically lavish ornamentation, color, and small-scale patterning. The former presents a remarkable conception of massed forms and volumes in an imposing sculptural design, while the latter features elaborate color effects with red and turquoise stones, appliqués, silver shot imitating granulation, and decorative silver wire: almost a compendium of the decorative and technical repertoire available at the time. The pointed, pagoda-like winged forms of the triangular element and lower band and the conical bells add a feeling of chinoiserie to the work. Similar forms are seen in tiaras assigned to Khivan and Bukharan workshops of the period and to a lesser extent to the Karakalpak tribe.41

The last two works in this group are less elaborate but
Triangular amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Kazakh
Silver, with stamped beading, decorative wire, ram’s-head terminals, glass inlays over red foil, lacquer, or cloth, wire chains, and spherical beads
11¼ x 9¼ in. (29.2 x 23.8 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2006 (2006.544.9)

Comparable works:
Kalter 1983, p. 128, fig. 121 bottom left
Rudolph 1984, p. 189, fig. D156
Steffan and Schwabl 2004, p. 23, fig. 17 (for related example assigned to Chourer)
equally appealing versions of the tumar. No. 134 is exceptionally bold in conception, with only three extended oval crenellations, each set with a single oval carnelian, as the focal point of the piece. The darkish brown hue of the carnelians is exquisitely balanced by the intense blue of the small turquoises, while shining silver embossed roundels contrast with the matte ground of the cylinder and the rough surface of the twisted silver wire bands dividing the cylinder. The effect is deceptively simple but powerful. Cylinder no. 135 is left undecorated except for narrow silver decorative wire bands and hanging triangular pendants on chains. The opaque cobalt blue stones used to ward off the evil eye appear even more striking in this simple piece denuded of most ornamentation, reminding us of the original all-important protective function of the amulet.

134
Triangular amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; tribe unknown
Silver, with decorative wire, applied decoration, loop-in-loop chains, spherical beads, slightly domed and table-cut carnelians, and turquoise beads
8⅛ × 7¾ in. (22.5 × 19.7 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
COMPARABLE WORKS
Rudolph 1984, p. 180, fig. D129
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Amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Afghanistan;
tribe unknown
Silver, with decorative wire,
loop-in-loop chains, embossed
pendants, and glass stones
6⅜ x 7 in. (16.5 x 17.8 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparables:
Rudolph 1984, p. 179, fig. D127
Amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, gilt applied decoration, table-cut carnelians, and turquoise beads
2¾ × 4 in. (7.3 × 10.2 cm)

Comparable works:
Rudolph 1984, p. 190, fig. D162, and p. 192, fig. D168

The works in this group all perform the function of housing amulets or prayer scrolls, which were inserted in the detachable triangular tops with which these boxes or flat panels are generally outfitted. The first two works, exemplifying the type of small box attached by chains to the neck known as kümush-doga, are of Yomut manufacture.

Front panel of an amulet holder
Early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver, with decorative wire, gilt applied decoration, chains, bells, table-cut carnelian, coral beads, and glass stones
5 × 3¼ in. (12.7 × 9.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Rudolph 1984, p. 192, fig. D168

The versatility of the Turkmen decorative repertoire is illustrated by the way motifs are adapted to adorn square and rectangular surfaces. The design of no. 136 consists of rectangular panels with a vertically oriented decoration of geometric appliqués surmounted by a single large ram’s-head ornament. No. 138 has a much more complex and multilayered decoration, which is organized into four square panels anchored by a large carnelian at the center and four smaller carnelians in the surrounding panels. The decoration of appliqués in each panel is perfectly
Another approach to decorating square surfaces is illustrated by a sparkling, bejeweled pendant (no. 137). Here, the careful symmetry and almost classical elegance of no. 138 give way to a looser and more playful decorative style. The charm of this ornament is enhanced by the contrast between the small colorful glass stones and the large polished hanging spherical bells.

Amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Yomut
Silver and brass alloy, fire-gilded, with ram’s-head terminals, loop-in-loop chains, bells, decorative wire, gilt applied decoration, table-cut carnelians, and appliqué discs on leather
Qur’an case: 7 × 7¾ in. (17.8 × 20 cm); leather strap: 26 × 4¾ in. (66 × 11.4 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2005 (2005.443.8)
Comparable works:
Rudolph 1984, p. 54, fig. D160

symmetrical and in diagonal format. The decoration can also be read as emanating from the center or as a sunburst/medallion design. The complexity of the design is enhanced by the use of numerous terminals (twelve small rams’ heads and a single large ram’s head); chains with bells; and leather straps with rectangular silver and gilt embossed plaques.
These four Teke amulet holders (nos. 139–42) are the same basic shape as no. 138, but instead of boxes they consist of flat panels and instead of leather straps with embossed plaques they are attached to the neck by chains with openwork plaques. Although these four works are new to the literature, Iran Firuz already noted in 1978 that pectoral amulet holders were produced in both Teke and Yomut styles. Firuz also published a piece that is related to this group in shape and decoration, although it appears to be smaller and features leather straps with openwork silver plaques and studs instead of the openwork plaques with chains characteristic of this group.

These works are all quite heavy and thick, and exhibit on the reverse a lobed or heart-shaped motif, indicating they were produced in the same workshop. Furthermore, they all are adorned with elegant and graceful arabesque designs and large carnelians, with extensive use of openwork. Some originally had red or green felt backing for the openwork panel (as in no. 142).
139
Amulet holder
20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, wire chains, bells, and table-cut carnelians
23 1/4 x 7 1/2 in. (54 x 18.7 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

NOTE: Lobed motif with arabesques incised on back. See also nos. 125 and 140–42.

140
Amulet holder
20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, wire chains, and table-cut carnelians
19 1/4 x 6 1/4 in. (48.6 x 15.6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

NOTE: Lobed motif with arabesques incised on back. See also nos. 125, 139, 141, and 142.
141

Amulet holder
Early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork and table-cut carnelians
17 × 6 in. (43.2 × 15.2 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

NOTE: Loped motif with arabesques incised on back. See also nos. 125, 139, 140, and 142.

142

Amulet holder
20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, decorative wire, and table-cut carnelians
10½ × 9¼ in. (26.4 × 23.8 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2007 (2007.497.8a, b)

NOTE: Loped motif with arabesques incised on back. See also nos. 125 and 139–41.
Amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Karakalpak (?)
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with opal, gold chains, table-cut carnelians, and turquoise beads
18¾ x 6 in. (46 x 15.2 cm)

Variants of the Yomut and Teke amulet holders were made in Karakalpak and Kazakh styles, while a trapezoidal form of pectoral amulet holder may be assigned to Afghanistan (no. 146). No. 143 is adorned in a style very close to the Teke prototypes but with the additional embellishment of floral-shaped settings of carnelians surrounded by small turquoises typical of the Karakalpak style.  

The two Kazakh works are very different from each other and illustrate the variety of Kazakh production. The first amulet holder, no. 144, perhaps earlier in date, exhibits a delicate surface design identical to that of the Teke pieces, yet executed in the pseudo-granulation typical of Kazakh taste. Oval and marquise-shaped

145
Amulet holder
20th century
Central Asia: Kazakh
Silver, with stamped
beading, glass inlays over
red lacquer, paper, or fabric
backing, and chains
18¼ x 6¼ in. (46.4 x 15.6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf

146
Amulet holder
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia: Afghan
Silver, fire-gilded, with filigree,
decorative wire, gilt-applied
decoration, glass stones, and
turquoise beads
4½ x 3½ in. (10.5 x 14.6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf
Flat folded leather pouches with wide straps were also used to house amulets or prayer scrolls and are frequently described in the trade as Qur’an holders, although they are clearly too flat to house an entire Qur’an. The term used to describe them, *haikai*, originally designated an idol, and appears to indicate that the wearing of amulet holders can be traced to pre-Islamic periods and practices. The pouches were decorated with a flat plaque in front, embellished with carnelians, fire gilding, chasing, and openwork. The straps bore similarly decorated fire-gilded plaques and studs. Hermann Rudolph has noted that this category of ornament was sometimes mistakenly described as a horse trapping, due to the extensive use of silver studs common to both categories. He has convincingly argued that the construction of the straps with more plaques on one side than the other clearly shows that they were intended to be folded over each other and worn across the chest in pairs, a tradition of female ornament described by nineteenth-century travelers and documented by contemporary photographs.
Armbands and Rings
Turkmen and Central Asian armbands hold great appeal for the modern collector and jewelry connoisseur because of their originality, wearability, and striking form. Their popularity is demonstrated by the fact that a group of Turkmen silver armbands (comparable to the selection in the Wolf collection) was used to illustrate the jacket of a lavish 1994 publication devoted to silver jewelry.\(^1\) The Wolf collection includes the two main types of Turkmen armbands: simple armbands, and those with attached finger rings. Representative examples from across the tribal and Central Asian spectrum are found in the collection and feature a range of decoration, from extremely elaborate to almost plain.

Rings did not play a pivotal role in Turkmen culture. Whereas in Europe and the West engagement and wedding rings almost exclusively signify a couple’s commitment, in Turkmen culture it is dowries, embroidered trousseaus, and ceremonial bridal headdresses that are invested with special significance. Turkmen rings per se are not included in the Wolf collection; they are rare\(^2\) and, when available, of modest aesthetic and visual interest. This is not the case with Kazakh, Tajik, and urban workshop rings, which are truly spectacular, and are well represented in the collection. Their appeal for today’s collectors has been enhanced by the recent fashion for oversize cocktail rings.
Armbands

Turkmen armbands consist of a cylindrical cuff open at the back, which is generally edged with a series of tines. Hermann Rudolph has argued that each tribe used a different type of tine (see nos. 148–51, 153, 154, and 157), thus making armbands one of the few categories of Turkmen ornament that present the possibility of clear identification and stylistic grouping based on technical features. The most sumptuous examples are executed in the Teke style and include two to eight bands or registers. The largest of this type were tapered to fit the arm from wrist to elbow. A Teke piece with eight bands from the National Museum of History and Ethnography in Ashqabad illustrates the most magnificent form of the armband with finger rings (see photograph, right).

In the Islamic world, the large, tapered armband as a form of ornament is found only among the Turkmen, admirably illustrating the highly original contributions of this culture to the world’s jewelry tradition. Nonetheless, Turkmen armbands do appear to be related to silver jewelry of the Indian subcontinent, where wide armbands were a common feature of village jewelry. Since northern India borders Central Asia, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, mutual influences and borrowings among these regions are not unexpected.

On the Indian subcontinent, certain historical and social conditions similar to those in Central Asia led to silver’s being the favored material for ornaments for the lower classes: in both regions, although silver mines were rare, silver coins were plentiful. In Central Asia the principal source of wealth was a lucrative slave trade, but scholars have recently convincingly proposed a different source for silver in India. Nadler and Nadler have noted: “Our surmise is that much of it was hoarded in the 18th and 19th centuries when most of the country was under British rule. Silver coinage was used to pay peasants and lower classes for services, and this monetarized silver was turned into wearable art to an . . . unparalleled degree.”

Both Turkmen and Indian women’s armbands were fashioned of silver decorated with chased and applied ornament, often in bands or registers. The opening of Indian armbands at the back, however, was either wider than those of the Turkmen or fitted with a pin-type closure. Thus, though Turkmen armbands may be related to Indian tradition, their construction—with a very narrow back opening and no pin mechanism—indicates that they were a regional development.

Armbands similar to those in the Wolf collection were described and illustrated in nineteenth-century sources; their distinctive shape was recognized in 1866 by Henri de Blocqueville, who noted that the armbands had such narrow openings that women had to use their saliva to remove them.
Pair of armbands
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran: Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with table-cut carnelians
(a) 2¾ x 2¼ in. (7.3 x 6.4 cm)
(b) 3 x 3½ in. (7.6 x 6.4 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
*Journal of Indian Art* 1886,
p. 56, fig. 11
Rudolph 1986, p. 241, figs. F2, F4
Schleuter and Schleuter 1983,
p. 253, fig. 225 (dated A.H. 1342/
1924 A.D.), and p. 250, fig. 220
(assigned to second half of the
19th century)
Kalter 1983, p. 127, fig. 119 right
Stefan and Schwabl 2004, p. 75,
fig. 29 (Teke, mid-19th century)

As is the case with the
cordiform pendants in the
collection, these armbands
illustrate a range of deco-
ration, from arabesque to
abstract. Three Teke armbands—one pair (no. 148)
and one single (no. 149)—
are tapered, divided into
three bands or registers,
and embellished with fire
gilding, arabesque decora-
tion, and a dazzling display
of carnelians. A pair of
Yomut armbands (no. 150)
features an equally lavish
decoration focusing on sur-
face patterning with fifteen
carnelians and eighteen
small turquoises each, while a pair of cuffs assigned to an as yet unidentified Turkmen tribe⁵ (no. 151) exhibits its unadorned polished silver surface and a modest decoration of scalloped registers in fire gilding. Another set of armbands (no. 152) is embellished with multiple bands and different decorative patterns, including delicate fretwork, floral motifs, and lozenges. This type of decoration can be traced back to the decorative vocabulary of nineteenth-century Central Asian urban workshops, a tradition that continued to flourish until recently in that area as well as in northern India.
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**Pair of armbands**

Late 19th–early 20th century  
Central Asia or northern Afghanistan; unidentified tribe  
Silver, fine-gilded, with decorative wire  
2½ × 2¼ in. (7 × 6.7 cm)  

**Comparative works:**  
Rudolph 1984, p. 246, fig. F23  
Steffan and Schwabi 2004, p. 74, fig. 28
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**Pair of armbands**

Late 19th century  
Central Asia or northern Afghanistan; possibly Baluchi  
Silver with openwork, decorative wire, and applied decoration  
Both ¾ × 2¼ in. (19.8 × 6.4 cm)  
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparative works:**  
Janata 1981, pp. 112–13, figs. 1, 2 (Baluchi)  
Steffan and Schwabi 2004, p. 104, fig. 58 (Bukhara, mid-19th century)  
Nadler and Nadler 2005, p. 175, fig. 9-55, and p. 201, fig. 9-91 (Himachal Pradesh, India)
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Pair of armbands
20th century
Central Asia; Kazakh
Silver, with stamped beading, silver shot, decorative wire, and glass inlays backed with cloth, lacquer, or paper
Both 2⅛ × 2⅛ in. (5.1 × 6.7 cm)
Comparable Works
Kalter 1983, p. 127, fig. 119 left (identified as Kazakh style)
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Pair of armbands
20th century (?)
Central Asia or northern Afghanistan; Kazakh or Kazakh style
Silver, with silver shot, decorative wire, and glass inlays backed with cloth, lacquer, or paper
Both 2 × 2¼ in. (5.1 × 6.7 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2007 (2007.497/a, b)
Comparable Works
Kalter 1983, p. 127, fig. 119 left (identified as Kazakh style)
Janata 1981, pp. 152–53, fig. 3
Stein and Schwab 2006, p. 95, fig. 49

Triangles and lozenge shapes and glass inlays in typical Kazakh style are skillfully deployed in two pairs of armbands of medium width (nos. 153 and 154) to embellish a single band of decoration. In a third set of armbands, no. 155, a central oval stone, in this case a turquoise, is surrounded by smaller motifs such as filler-type lozenge-shaped arrangements of silver shot that resemble granulation, combined here with very distinctive whorl shapes. Although the origin of this type of ornament is not certain (see also cordiform pendant no. 53), it presents similarities with jewelry made for the Pashtun tribe in Afghanistan.

An unusual set of bird-shaped armbands new to the literature (no. 156) exhibits the same fierce and dazzling style seen in a Kazakh-style cordiform pendant in the collection (no. 57), very different from the more common Kazakh style of nos. 153 and 154. These remarkable armbands feature a wavy outline and surface embellishment consisting of myriad small turquoise stones with floral roundels and slightly rounded carnelians in various shapes on a black ground. Bird forms are evoked here by the shapes of adorned birds’ heads with beaks above and below the center of the cuff, which is
Inset with a large carnelian. This truly dazzling design is an innovative concept that reinterprets and reinvents familiar ornamental themes.

The design is quite eclectic, drawing from a variety of traditions. Familiar Kazakh elements such as the triangular and lozenge-shaped motifs in silver shot are used as fillers for the main design, while the wavy outline and combination of carnelian and pavé decoration of small turquoises is typical of pieces made in Bukhara workshops. Although bird forms are ubiquitous in Turkmen and Central Asian jewelry, they are rarely treated with such boldness and imagination. The cuffs are also distinguished by their thick boxlike construction, filled with an unidentified material to retain their shape.
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Pair of armbands with rings
20th century
Central Asia, Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with silver shot, wire chains, turquoise beads, and table-cut and cabochon carnelians
Both 7 1/8 x 2 1/2 in (18.7 x 6.4 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable Works:
Rudolph 1984, p. 251, fig. F39
Schletzer and Schletzer 1983, p. 255, fig. 230 (for type), and p. 259, fig. 236 (assigned to Teke)
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Pair of armbands with bells, rings, and thimbles
Late 19th century
Central Asia or northern Afghanistan, urban workshop, Khotan or Karakalpak* (?)
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire and applied decoration, loop-in-loop chains with bells, and turquoise
(a) 13 1/2 x 3 in (34.3 x 7.6 cm)
(b) 14 x 3 in (35.6 x 7.6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable Works:
Kalter 1983, p. 129, fig. 122
(Errari)
Komleva 1988, p. 90 (Caucasus)

Armbands with attached rings or thimbles were produced across Asia from the Caucasus to India, although the form appears to have originated in India. Such armbands are the only silver Turkmen ornaments that refer directly to women’s work, perhaps a reason for their ubiquity. Most often they incorporate thimbles, which make reference to the embroidery for which Turkmen women, in particular, were renowned. Worn over the back of the hand, they consist of a single band, a connecting plaque, and chains to which rings (and thimbles, if present) are attached. The plaque was made in a variety of shapes, including ovoid, polygonal, and floral; the latter shape appears to be related to the term handrose used to describe this type.

The two examples in this collection (nos. 157 and 158) are new to the literature and present exciting evidence of the evolution of this type in Kazakh and Central Asian jewelry. They are especially graceful, almost dainty, when compared with Turkmen works. In contrast to most Turkmen pieces, which are impressive for their splendor and massive scale, these armbands appear designed to draw attention to and beautify the hands, not unlike the tradition of tattooing.
Pair of armbands with sleeves
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative wire, metal netting of interlocking rings and pearls, stamped beading, cabochon and table-cut carnelians, and turquoise beads
(a) 18½ × 3¾ in. (47 × 9.5 cm)
(b) 19 × 3¼ in. (48.3 × 9.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

These three armbands (nos. 159 and 160) are new to the literature and have been identified as Kazakh by the trade. This attribution is probably correct, although the technique of silver shot and stamped beading imitating granulation, which is currently identified with Kazakh production, may have been used in urban Central Asian workshops to decorate ornaments for other patrons as well.

The pair of armbands with sleeves (no. 159) exhibits typical Kazakh stamped decoration in star and solar shapes, here combined with turquoises and carnelians, a design approach found in both Kazakh and Central Asian jewelry workshop production. The sleeves consist of silver latticework netting embellished with delicate ovoid pearls, an unusual choice of material heretofore undocumented in Central
Asian and Turkmen ornament. Furthermore, unlike previously known armbands from the area, these works—with graceful hanging sleeves that widen toward the bottom—were intended to be worn on the upper arms. The armbands have a crenellated outline that evokes the tiara-like headbands made in urban workshops, and they may in fact have been part of a parure that included such a headband.

The single armband (no. 160) is related to the previous work by its overall conception and the use of pearls in silver netting, although it lacks stamped decoration.

Designed to be worn on the forearm, this armband tapers in toward the wrist, as do Turkmen armbands in the Wolf collection. The hinge closing with wire and pins is common to Indian and northern Indian jewelry traditions (see no. 152), but is not found in Turkmen armbands, which feature open backs with tines instead.

The profusion of pearls used in these two works suggests a commission for a wealthy patron, since the gems appear to be rare in jewelry of this region. Pearls were, however, available in Asian and Southeast Asian urban centers. India, because it was a major jewelry production center, was the principal crossroads for both freshwater and marine pearls from China, Russia, Japan, and the Persian Gulf, and pearls could have reached Central Asia through various merchant trading networks.

The use of such precious materials confirms that these armbands were a very special commission, like other luxury objects in the collection, such as the teapot (no. 181) and slippers (no. 186). Both works are remarkable for their grace and delicacy and were clearly intended to beautify the feminine form.

160

Armband

Late 19th–early 20th century

Central Asia: Kazakh

Silver, fire-gilded, with silver shot, decorative wire, metal netting of interlocking rings, red and green semiprecious stones or glass, pearls, slightly domed turquoise, and table-cut carnelians

7½ x 3⅜ in. (19.1 x 8.9 cm)

Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Note: The armband is hinged. One side features pearls and glass or semiprecious stones; the other side is decorated with pearls only.
The rings in the Wolf collection are massive, heavy, and very original in design. They are also new to the literature, except for the Kazakh examples, which appeared on the market in the 1960s and 1970s. Rings were worn by both men and women. In some instances it is possible to specify the gender of the owner, as in the case of two-finger rings (nos. 163 and 165), which were given to matchmakers (presumably female).\textsuperscript{13} Seal rings (such as no. 166) are generally assumed to have been used by men.
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**Ring and thimble**

Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, table-cut carnelian, loop-in-loop chain, and attached thimble
Shank: diam. ¾ in. (1.9 cm); setting: H. 1¼ x diam. 1 in. (3.2 x 2.5 cm); chain and thimble: L. 3½ in. (8.3 cm)

**Comparable Works:**
Dupaigne 1978, p. 26, fig. 60 (group)
Rudolph 1984, p. 251, fig. F38
Hiroshima 1999, p. 62, figs. 674, 676
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Ring
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or northern Pakistan; Multan
Silver, fire-gilded, with enamel decoration and table-cut carnelian
Shank: diam. 1 in. (2.5 cm); setting:
H. 1¾ x diam. 1¼ in. (3.8 x 4.5 cm)

Comparable works:
Janata 1981, p. 129, fig. 5
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Two-finger ring
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia: Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded, with stamped beading, silver shot, decorative wire, and glass inlays backed with fabric, lacquer, or paper
Shanks: W. 1¼ in. (4.8 cm); setting:
H. 1¾ x diam. 2¼ in. (3.8 x 7 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Kalter 1983, p. 127, fig. 120 right
Kalter and Pavlova 1997, p. 143, figs. 206–8
Komleva 1988, p. 126 right
Sychova 1986, p. 123, fig. 78

Kazakh rings are represented here by three works. The first, no. 161, featuring a single large carnelian set in an oval bezel and an attached thimble, is an example of the smaller versions of these rings. The other two, nos. 162 and 163, illustrate the spectacular elaboration of this Central Asian form: both are flat-topped, oval in shape, and extremely heavy. (Rings were also made in teardrop shapes.) The rings are embellished with striking variations on powerful designs that, as seen in other Kazakh ornaments, may be interpreted as solar or wheel symbols. The surface of no. 162 is encrusted with triangular motifs emanating from the center, which bears a colored-glass setting decorated with a cross-shaped form. The bezel of no. 163 bears a vertical element flanked by two oval-shaped colored-glass settings with a zigzag motif, perhaps symbolizing the couple brought together by the matchmaker who owned the ring.

A flat-topped circular ring in the collection (no. 164), executed in champlevé enamel, is related to the Kazakh rings in form but not in design. The design of chevrons, rosettes, and triangles executed in three colored enamels is characteristic of jewelry produced in Multan, Pakistan. Similar rings are also worn by the Pashtun tribe of Afghanistan and Pakistan. Comparable rings fitted with mirrors instead of carnelians were worn by brides to glance at the groom during wedding ceremonies.14
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Two-finger ring
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Afghanistan; urban workshop
Silver, with decorative wire, silver shot, table-cut carnelian, and turquoise beads
Shanks: W. 2 1/4 in. (6.4 cm); setting: H. 3 3/4 x diam. 2 1/2 in. (8.3 x 7 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

These four rings are characterized by massive scale, domed shapes, and architectural references. They also feature a similar use of applied decoration and small multicolored stones in conjunction with carnelians, a tradition associated with both Afghan and Tajik workmanship. Nos. 165 and 167 bear an applied motif of silver shot evoking granulation, a common feature of Kazakh production (see also no. 163). The eclectic nature of the technique and the unusual shapes make it difficult to identify the rings’ geographical origin.

Perhaps the most spectacular of these rings, no. 165 is composed of four circular,
interlocking, and graduated compartments surmounted by a carnelian. The shape has been compared to that of the Indian stupas, an observation that may help to identify its origin. When viewed from the side, the decoration of sixty small turquoise beads, which must have been extremely labor intensive to produce, evokes a series of arches. The shank of the ring is fitted with three holes or hollow cylinders, seemingly to house pins, a feature that indicates there were other components to the piece and raises doubts about its function.

No. 166 is rounded on the sides and flattened at the top, which is set with a carnelian engraved in naskhi script that reads “The lowly Muhammad Ali.” The sides bear a most unusual design of thirteen kneeling male figures wearing pointed caps and set within niches. The figures are ambiguous. On the one hand, they evoke similarly proportioned and attired figures from Buddhist sculptures excavated in Afghanistan, thus suggesting an Afghan origin, perhaps a Kabul or Herat workshop. On the other hand, remarkably similar profiles and pointed caps appear in photographs of dervishes from Samarra and Khiva taken in the late nineteenth century. Differentiating between mere resemblance and a documentable source is extremely difficult in this
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Seal ring
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Afghanistan;
urban workshop
Silver, with decorative wire,
stamped beading, glass and
turquoise beads, and incised
table-cut carnelian
Shank: diam. ¾ in. (2.2 cm); setting:
H. 1¼ x diam. ¼ in. (3.5 x 1.59 cm)
Premised Gift of Marshall and
Marilyn R. Wolf
case, and we must leave final conclusions until further evidence emerges.

Nos. 167 and 168 are conical in form, which again evokes architectural shapes such as the eleventh- to thirteenth-century tomb towers with pointed domes of Afghanistan and eastern Iran. The overall conception of the rings corresponds to rings assigned to northern Afghanistan or southern Uzbekistan for Tajik patronage, although they have been assigned to Daghestan by the trade. This attribution should not be entirely discounted, since it is possible that craftsmen from that region may have worked in Central Asia and brought their design traditions with them.
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Ring
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Afghanistan; urban workshop
Silver, with stamped and applied decoration, silver shot, decorative wire, and synthetic resin, glass, and turquoise beads
Shank: diam. ¾ in. (2.2 cm); setting: H. 2 × diam. 1¾ in. (5.1 × 4.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
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Ring
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Afghanistan; urban workshop
Silver, fire-gilded, with decorative silver wire, flat-cut turquoise, and slightly domed synthetic resin and turquoise beads
Shank: diam. 1 in. (2.5 cm); setting: H. 1¼ × diam. 1⅛ in. (4.8 × 3.8 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
Ring
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Afghanistan; urban workshop
Silver, chased, with vegetal and animal motifs, openwork, and inset turquoises
Shank: diam. 1 in. (2.5 cm); setting: H. 3 x diam. 2 in. (7.6 x 5.1 cm)

Comparable works:
Kalter and Pavlenskaja, 1997, p. 302, fig. 606 (for simpler example assigned to Tajik style)

This ring is embellished with deeply engraved designs of elegantly proportioned deer and seated female figures set against a background of foliate scrolls, comparable in style to the kneeling male figures in ring no. 166. The ring exemplifies the Central Asian urban workshop style, whose decorative vocabulary of animal-style designs and vegetal arabesques originated in the eastern Iranian metalworking tradition beginning in the Seljuq period (see fig. 26, page 35).

The ring may be grouped with two other works in the collection, a pair of combs (no. 184) and a cudgel (no. 182), both of which feature similar engraved designs with deer. All three were probably produced in the same workshop. The sophisticated quality of the animal style in this group contrasts sharply with the naïve rendering of animals in Turkmen silver, even though the Islamic arabesque was used with great skill in the latter pieces.

The form of the ring, shaped like an upside-down bell, and the use of an engraved carnelian relate this work to seal rings. The form seems to be adapted from Indian silver seals dated from the late eighteenth to early twentieth century. However, because the text, of which only the word “lowly” is legible, is not engraved in mirror image, this ring cannot properly be labeled a seal ring.
Clothing and Objects
Turkmen silver ornaments are beginning to be appreciated today for their purely aesthetic value and displayed as artworks in both museum and private collections. Yet it is important to remember that they were either worn with or sewn onto or attached to brilliantly colored or lavishly embroidered Turkmen clothing and headgear. A few pieces in this collection, including crowns, pectoral discs, and plait ornaments, still exhibit the plain green, black, or red felt lining onto which they were sewn and which enhanced the graphic qualities of the silver. This chapter features a silk coat and a pair of clothing panels that illustrate silver ornaments in the context in which they were typically worn. In addition, a selection of belts is presented here that shows how ornamental silver was mounted on leather to create striking accessories for the Turkmen wardrobe.

Also included in this chapter are silver objects from the Wolf collection that are embellished with the same decorative styles and techniques found in the jewelry and ornaments. Two objects for household display are enlarged versions of common types of Turkmen ornaments: the amulet holder and the lozenge-shaped pectoral. Other objects in this section are ceremonial or purely decorative versions of everyday items, which achieve the status of luxury objects through their sumptuous appearance. This Central Asian treasury includes ordinary items—whips, a cudgel, combs, a mirror, slippers, and dervish drinking and begging bowls—made extraordinary by their rich ornamentation.
Coats
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Coat
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silk coat decorated with silver circular discs and lozenge-shaped clasps, edging, and floral-printed Russian cotton and synthetic fabric lining
43⅞ x 53 in. (111 x 134.6 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable Works
Kalter 1983, p. 87, fig. 68

Nineteenth-century reports and photographs record the fashion for decorating the front of women’s shifts with silver coins (see photograph, right). Although the tradition of decorating shifts in this way apparently faded sometime in the twentieth century,1 outer coats continued to be embellished with panels decorated with vertical rows of embossed silver discs ending in lozenge-shaped decorative clasps either attached to panels or directly sewn onto the fabric of the coat. Panels were generally attached at the neck and reached to the waist or knees.

This woman’s coat (no. 170) and pair of ornamented panels (no. 171) illustrate how silver ornaments looked when worn. The coat, made of typical Teke raw silk of cranberry red, has four vertical rows of silver discs along the length of the coat and two rows of silver discs ornamenting the sleeves. It appears that the silver ornaments, as well as a new Russian cotton lining, were added in the Tehran bazaar where the coat was sold well after it had been made.2

The pair of panels is too short to have been worn down the front of a coat and is lacking

Lozenge-shaped pectoral, 19th century. Central Asia or Iran; Teke. Silver and carnelians; mounted on silk. Linden-Museum Stuttgart, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde

S. M. Dudin, photographer. Wife of a Teke khan, Central Asia, before 1890
Pair of clothing panels
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran: Tekke
Felted cotton piecework and block-printed cotton, decorated with silver ornaments, fire-gilded and chased, with table-cut carnelians, synthetic and glass stones, and embossed pendants
Panel (a): 28 × 7 in. (71.1 × 17.8 cm), top ornament diam. 6¼ in. (16.8 cm), bottom ornament 9½ × 7¼ in. (24.1 × 19.1 cm)
Panel (b): 27 × 7 in. (68.6 × 17.8 cm), top ornament diam. 6¼ in. (16.8 cm), bottom ornament 9½ × 6½ in. (24.1 × 16.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

Comparable works:
Komleva 1988, p. 137 (nephrite dagdan)
Kal’er 1983, p. 41, pl. 23 (Russian-style dagdan ornaments), p. 87, fig. 68, and p. 106, fig. 92 (front coat panels)
Medshitova et al. 1990, unpaged (for disc pectoral with pendants similar to dagdan)

The V-shaped opening of panels worn as pectorals (see photograph, opposite right). It has been suggested that they were worn down the sides, apparently a recent fashion. The panels also differ from traditional examples in their use of patterned fabric, which complements the red and green stones of the ornaments.

These works exemplify how a traditional mode of ornamentation using silver coinage was transformed and modernized in more recent times.
In addition to their visual and formal appeal, Turkmen and Central Asian belts serve to illustrate two important aspects of Turkmen ornament. The first is the interrelationship of crafts practiced within a small tribal context, where a single craftsman or a group of craftsmen in the same workshop produced work whose style was remarkably unified. This was a significant feature during some of the greatest periods of Islamic art: for instance, products made in the royal workshops of the fifteenth-century Timurid rulers of Herat, such as illuminated manuscripts, stamped leather and lacquer-painted book bindings, and woodwork, all featured the same highly developed arabesque designs.

The second feature, which does not appear to be widespread in the Islamic world, is the interchangeability of techniques and decorative styles used for ornaments for both sexes. Whether this is a recent phenomenon or a traditional feature of Turkmen culture is not clear. As a general rule, women wore heavily ornamented loose shifts and coats that did not call for belts, although a massive belt, called a tegbent, appears to have been worn by women of high social status.

No. 172 is a sumptuous example of this type, featuring a clasp decorated with strikingly modern-looking
geometric motifs in fire gilding and carnelians in a distinctive tripartite configuration. The sides are ornamented with a double row of appliqués, and various forms of pendants hang from the bottom of the belt. Previously published belts of similar design have been assigned to the Saryk tribe. Leather horse trappings with comparable pendants illustrate how related techniques were used for these ornaments and for women’s silver belts.5

Another belt of connecting floral plaques (no. 174) may have been used by a woman or a man. Some Turkmen ornaments were multipurpose and considered appropriate for either sex. For example, a similar belt sewn onto a fabric backing that was wrapped around the wearer’s body and over the right hip and shoulder has been described as a man’s belt.6 The clasp on the man’s belt is simpler, however, and not floral, as it is in no. 174. The overall impression of delicacy and elegance in the latter belt suggests it was recently reconfigured for a woman.

The most elaborate men’s belts were produced in urban ateliers. They were very wide and made of luxurious fabrics such as velvet or silk, embroidered in gold thread, and fitted with roundels or ornamental plaques and buckles set with precious stones or decorated in niello. These belts matched the sumptuousness of the dazzling silk ikat coats with which they were worn by wealthy city dwellers. Somewhat less elaborate tribal versions using more modest materials were just as striking. Such is the case with a wide leather belt (no. 173) studded with rows of small gilded appliqués and two large roundels in fire gilding and carnelians in typical Teke style. Another Teke example (no. 175) consists of pointed leaf-shaped and fire-gilded plaques, similar to those in no. 173 but of much larger scale, mounted on brown leather. Comparable work can again be seen on horse trappings.7 Although the leather here is not original and the belt may have had more elements, the result is a splendid work of art.
Objects for Display

Wall decoration in the form of an amulet
20th century
Central Asia; Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, silver shot, stamped beading, embossed pendants, ram’s-head terminals, cabochon and table-cut carnelians, and turquoise beads
15 × 21 in. (38.1 × 53.5 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

These two works illustrate the interchangeability of forms in Turkmen and Central Asian ornaments. In both pieces, amuletic and lozenge-shaped pectorals have been enlarged and modified to function as large-scale decorative objects for display, according to a local source. Even given the well-documented scale and magnificence of Turkmen jewelry, the size of these two objects is such that it is impossible to imagine they could have been worn.

The amulet-shaped wall decoration (no. 176) is delicately ornamented and graceful despite its massive scale, as would be expected of bejeweled Kazakh luxury objects. Its form is clearly related to that of a smaller amulet in the collection (no. 133). The latter has been assigned here to Central Asia or the Karakalpak tribe, suggesting that these traditions shared many features; as more works appear on the market, attributions may well change.

The wall decoration relies for its aesthetic impact not only on its scale but also on the masterful deployment of swirling arabesque, palmette, and half-palmette
forms above the cylinder, which is balanced by the regularity and symmetry of the pendants below. Undulating lines of small turquoise and skillfully placed carnelians brilliantly enhance this effect.

Formally, the door surround (no. 177) is an expansion of the lozenge-shaped pectoral unit. We have already seen how the basic lozenge form was multiplied to create larger double-lozenge-shaped and hexagonal ornaments, and here we find the ultimate expression of that additive approach to design. The work is composed of three units: a central lozenge flanked by two rectangles. Aesthetically the piece is consistent with the highest level of Teke production, in the graceful openwork arabesque design and the brilliance of the stones. This work mimics textile panels that were used as door surrounds or as borders to other textiles—and the silver chains and pendants evoke the fringes of such textiles—illustrating how designs in various Turkmen crafts were interrelated.
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Door surround
20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Teke
Silver, fire-gilded, with openwork, decorative wire, twisted wire chains, bells, and cabochon and table-cut carnelian
15½ x 26 in. (39.4 x 61 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
The beautification of mundane objects with simple techniques in imitation of more luxurious materials is one of the defining features of Islamic decorative arts, a quality that characterizes many other works in the collection. Imitation lustre stood in for real lustre as a glaze for ceramics; inlays of base metals were substituted for gold, silver, and copper inlay; alloys imitated pure gold or silver; and enamel and glass stones replaced turquoises or rubies.

Another tradition in luxury objects was a taste for exotica and whimsy, such as medieval jeweled automata and water clocks, as well as dazzling court regalia related to the hunt and horsemanship such as life-size birds of enameled gold, and leather trappings studded with gold, rubies, and turquoises. An awareness of these traditions and their relationship to Turkmen and Central Asian urban art undoubtedly informed the acquisition of these works for the collection.

The style of most of these objects indicates that they were created in Kazakh and Central Asian urban workshops (see photograph, below). The question of who commissioned such works is intriguing, since they seem too sophisticated and precious to have been created for nomadic tribespeople. A plausible explanation has been offered by Marilyn Wolf, who suggests that wealthy tribal communities settling in cities such as Bukhara, Khiva, and Samarqand since the late nineteenth century may have commissioned such lavish paraphernalia. A similar trend occurred in the production of luxurious Turkmen carpets during this period.10
Matched pair of whips
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Kazakh
Both silver, fire-gilded, with
horse-head terminals, stamped
beading, silver shot, twisted
wire, cabochon turquoise,
and glass beads; with waxed-
fabric attachment (a), leather
attachment (b)
(a) 27¼ x 2⅞ in. (69.2 x 6.4 cm)
(with attachment); (b) 34⅞ x 2⅛ in.
(88.6 x 6.4 cm) (with attachment)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R.
Wolf, 2010 (2010.501.11a, b)

Islamic horse trappings and
arms and armor are espe-
cially sumptuous, a tradition
that was carried on by both
Turkmen tribes and city
dwellers. A matched pair of
whips (no. 178) features a
highly unusual decoration of
two horses’ heads at the top.
The entire surface is covered
with an overall decoration of
pseudo-granulation and tur-
quises in various settings
and sizes in Kazakh style. A
whip and pommel (no. 179)
are embellished with vertical
bands of knotted silver
designs (as in the drinking
bowl no. 187) alternating
with bands of minute tur-
quises, numbering more
than three hundred. The
whip case houses a sharp
silver goad inscribed with the
name of the maker, Amanal-
lah, the name of the owner,
the ruler Harun al-Yamani
(son of Jamal al-Din Zava),
and the date, A.H. 1216/
1801–2 A.D.

The rich decoration of these
works is reminiscent of the
sumptuous regalia of the
Safavid and Ottoman dynas-
ties, which undoubtedly
served as models for these
works. Photographs and
watercolors of nineteenth-
century Bukhara illustrate
the magnificent robes of
honor and horse trappings
that were still being pro-
duced in this period for the
court and tribal elites (see
fig. 3, page 6).11
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Royal whip and goad
Late 19th–early 20th century,
dated A.H. 1216/1801 A.D.
Central Asia; urban workshop
Silver, fire-gilded, with applied
decoration, decorative wire, and
turquoise beads; on a wood base
with leather extensions
35 × 1 1/8 in. (88.9 × 3.2 cm)
(with extensions)
Inscribed in thuluth script
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R.
This extremely heavy Kazakh object of trapezoidal shape has an effect of sculptural mass. The work features a smooth opening as if for a ring, yet its sheer weight and awkward shape—even when compared with the massive rings in the collection—seem to preclude such use. It may be a decorative pendant for a harness, or a symbol of rulership, like the spheres that hung over Ottoman chair thrones. The solar pattern is skillfully rendered, and a barely visible, mysterious emblem is stamped on two small triangular panels beneath the loop. It may represent a heraldic bird, signifying a workshop emblem, or more likely a personal blazon.

This suggestion is based on the evidence of two silver Kazakh whips in the Wolf collection (no. 178). These feature small stamped decorations in the form of heraldic birds with a shield-shaped blazon that resembles a Russian imperial symbol. Could the whips have been created for a Russian patron whose personal emblem was the heraldic bird image? Or were the whips perhaps commissioned by a Kazakh khan adopting Russian imperial symbolism?
This charming teapot-shaped ornament in typical Kazakh style is sumptuous yet whimsical. The charm of the piece derives from its small scale (4½ inches high) and zoomorphic quality. The decorative repertoire is remarkable even for the highly inventive Kazakh style: silver shot is used to create a necklet and scale pattern that resembles granulation for the birdlike spout and snake-headed handle. The object recalls the Islamic world’s fondness for its animals and domesticated pets, evidenced in bejeweled falcons, ewes with necklaces, and magnificently outfitted horses.

The ornament, perhaps commissioned by a wealthy patron involved in the tea trade, was modeled on both Islamic and European prototypes. The use of snakes and dragons’ heads as spouts was a longstanding tradition in Islamic metalwork, one that continued in nineteenth-century Bukharan engraved brass ewers. The work also vividly recalls the taste for exotica recorded throughout Islamic history and especially evident at the Mughal court. A Mughal pouring vessel made of dark green jade and inlaid with a transparent enamel design of poppies has a similar scale to the Wolf ornament and is also shaped like a teapot. Another precedent for the work was certainly the small, globular porcelain teapots that were made by Gardner, a Russian firm.


These were sold as common trade items in Central Asia, presented in easily transportable boxes with compartments (see photograph, above).
181

Teapot-shaped ornament
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; Kazakh
Silver, fire-gilded, with stamped beading, silver shot, applied decoration, decorative wire, cabochon carnelians, and turquoise beads
4½ × 5¼ in. (11.4 × 13 cm)
Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf, 2005 (2005.443.1a, b)
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Cudgel or ceremonial staff
Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; urban workshop
Silver in two sections, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire, cabochon carnelians, and turquoise beads
16¼ × 3¼ in. (41.3 × 9.5 cm)
Inscribed in nasta’liq script with "844" and the number 2, possibly the marker of a craftsman

NOTE: This work has been described as a sugar breaker by the trade.

This cudgel or ceremonial staff is inscribed with what appear to be markers of a craftsman. The short staff closely resembles depictions of the bejeweled regalia in late nineteenth-century Qajar paintings of the Persian Sufi saint Nur ‘Ali Shah. He is shown holding a jewel-encrusted staff described by Maryam Ekhtiar as a bird-headed cudgel, or mantasha, used by dervishes to defend themselves against wild animals. This work could very well be a Central Asian interpretation of that form, intended for the head of a Sufi order.
**Whorl collar**

Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran, Teke
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with decorative wire
6 x 2 in. (15.2 x 5.1 cm)
Inscribed in naskhi script

**Comparable works:**
Firouz 1978, pp. 37–38, fig. 38 (spindles)
Schlitz and Schlitz 1983, p. 101, fig. 30 (balls)
Kalter 1983, p. 136, fig. 128 (spindle)
Rudolph 1984, p. 253, fig. H1

Objects used by Turkmen and Central Asian women were sometimes made of silver and richly ornamented. Such is the case with these four items.

Wool for fine textiles and carpets was spun on tools consisting of a wooden spindle, a whorl collar, and a spinning strap. A silver whorl collar in the collection (no. 183) is decorated in the typically sober Teke style and inscribed in naskhi script with the name Muhammad.

A pair of combs (no. 184) may have been produced in the same workshop as the cudgel no. 182, as both are chased with similar designs of split-leaf arabesques and deer, and inlaid with settings of carnelian and turquoise in combination.

The oval form with a handle seen in an exquisite mirror in the collection (no. 185) is rare in Islamic art and attests to the variety of influences and traditions that were available to Central Asian urban craftsmen. The mirror features typical Kazakh solar designs, but here they are combined with an unusual strapwork pattern on the handle, further evidence of the originality of Kazakh design seen throughout this collection.

Delightful silver slippers (no. 186) evoke the glass slippers of Cinderella or Dorothy’s red shoes in *The Wizard of Oz*. Imitating the designs and form of Central Asian silk and velvet embroidered slippers, these silver versions are beautifully ornamented with a rarely seen variety of appliqués. Of particular note are the whorls, which are based on the forms of silver ingots used in the ancient Near East. Although lined with felted fabric, the slippers seem extremely uncomfortable; it is doubtful that they were actually worn.
**185**

**Mirror**
Late 19th–early 20th century (?)  
Central Asia: Kazakh  
Silver, fire-gilded and chased, with openwork, decorative wire, stamped beading, silver shot, cabochon and table-cut carnelians, and turquoise beads  
10½ × 3½ in. (26.7 × 8.9 cm)  
Inscribed on reverse in nasta’liq script  
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

NOTE: The chased decoration on the reverse is also found on a number of other works in the collection made by Teke (amulet holders nos. 125 and 139–42) and Yenut (roundels nos. 78 and 79) craftsmen and may eventually lead to the identification of a workshop.

**186**

**Pair of slippers**
Late 19th–early 20th century  
Central Asia or northern Afghanistan: urban workshop  
Silver, with applied decoration, decorative wire, slightly domed turquoise and carnelians, and turquoise beads; lined with red cotton fabric  
Both L. 11 in. (27.9 cm)  
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

**Comparable works:**  
Babazaxrova 2003, p. 220, fig. 33
Drinking bowl

Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia; urban workshop, Uzbek or Karakalpak (?)
Silver, fire-gilded, with applied decoration, inset carnelians, turquoises, synthetic resins, chains, and tassels
9½ × 8¾ in. (23.5 × 21 cm)
(with tassels)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf

These three metalwork objects are drinking bowls and begging bowls, the latter being the most common attribute of wandering dervishes and Sufi mystics.

Drinking bowls outfitted with spouts are commonly carried by water-sellers in eastern Turkey. Nos. 187 and 188, luxurious versions of drinking bowls, may have served as symbols of the water-seller’s trade rather than as functional objects.¹⁵ No. 188 has straight sides, while no. 187 is based on the shape of a half coco-de-mer or coconut. Nineteenth-century begging bowls were often made of coco-de-mer shells, sometimes enriched with gold or silver decoration and carved versified inscriptions and vegetal designs (see photograph, opposite). The coco-de-mer form was also popular for metalwork and, more rarely, for porcelain begging bowls.¹⁶

Both bowls are embellished with a double bird’s-head design on either side of the opening at the top. The overall organization of the surface is similar in the two works, but no. 187 is embellished.
with brilliant primary colors and bold designs, whereas no. 188 is ornamented with softer hues and daintier patterns related to textiles or embroideries.


The dating of Turkmen and Central Asian pieces is often challenging. In the case of no. 188, technical analysis of the bright blue and red melamine styrene resin inlays indicates a date no later than the 1930s, suggesting that the use of synthetic material is not necessarily an indication of very recent manufacture.
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Drinking bowl shaped as a begging bowl

Late 19th–early 20th century
Central Asia or Iran; Karakalpak (?)
Silver, fire-gilded, with applied and stamped decoration, inset carnelians and turquoise, and carnelian, turquoise, and coral beads
3½ × 9 in. (8.3 × 22.9 cm)
Promised Gift of Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf
The third work in this grouping, a begging bowl (no. 189), is a fitting culmination to the collection, since it synthesizes Islamic design and Central Asian traditions and workmanship. The form of the bowl is based on wine boats of the pre-Islamic era that found special favor in Iran in Timurid and Safavid times and predated the coco-de-mer form discussed above. This example is closely related to sixteenth-century prototypes in shape, medium, overall decoration, and use of epigraphic panels. The panels bear prayers addressed to the Twelve Shi’i Imams. The inscriptions contain errors and omit two of the imams, Musa al-Kazim and ‘Ali ibn Musa al-Rida. Such mistakes are rare in Timurid and Safavid pieces.17

The rendering of the narrow-waisted felines, the ovoid form of the cartouches on the body, and the elongated style of the lettering appear to be developments from post-Timurid and Safavid times. All of these features, coupled with the skilled execution, suggest a date in the seventeenth rather than nineteenth century. Similar small-waisted felines are found in Central Asian decorative arts of the fifteenth century, suggesting that this piece was made in one of the region’s urban workshops.18
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Begging bowl
17th century or later
Central Asia; urban workshop
Brass, chased with floral and animal-motif decorations; dragon’s-head finials are probably later replacements
6½ × 9¾ in. (15.6 × 24.8 cm)

Comparable works:
Allan 1982b, pp. 114–17, fig. 26
Froom et al. 2007, p. 60, fig. 32 (for 16th-century Safavid example and references)
Piotrovsky and Vrieze 1999, pp. 128–32, figs. 72–76
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adamlik</td>
<td>A temple pendant that consists of a triangular element surmounted by an ovoid form and, below it, a cascade of silver chains linking embossed roundels, bells, or leaf-shaped pendants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arabesque</td>
<td>One of the principal decorative elements of Islamic art, characterized by a continuous stylized vegetal design of palmettes and half palmettes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ashik</td>
<td>A Turkmen cordiform pectoral ornament attached with a chain and worn on the back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bazuband</td>
<td>An armband, worn on the upper arm, that usually holds Qur’anic verses or amuletic texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bukov</td>
<td>A necklet made of a stiff collar and a horizontal pendant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapraz</td>
<td>A lozenge-shaped ornament used as a clasp for robes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chirpy</td>
<td>An embroidered robe worn by Turkmen women as a head covering over silver headdress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dagdan</td>
<td>A Turkmen pectoral pendant whose bird-shaped form is derived from wooden amulets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eginlik</td>
<td>A triangular amulet holder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egme</td>
<td>A high, convex, fire-gilded headband ornamented with openwork, silver twisted wire, and carnelians and sewn onto fabric attached to headgear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gochak</td>
<td>A stylized ram’s-horn motif found in Turkmen jewelry, as well as Turkmen, Caucasian, and Turkish carpets of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gonjuk</td>
<td>A lozenge-shaped ornament, worn singly or in pairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gul</td>
<td>A decorative flower motif originating in Chinese lobed medallion forms. This common Turkmen design element appears in textiles and carpets as a polygonal unit arranged in alternating or stepped rows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guyaka</td>
<td>A round pectoral ornament with a radial design, used as a button to close the front of a dress. The term, which translates as “flower collar,” was adopted from Persian jewelry terminology, as was the form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gursakcha</td>
<td>The combination of a stiff collar with a pendant of double rhomboid/hexagonal form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haikal</td>
<td>A flat leather pouch containing amulets or prayers, frequently described in the trade as a Qur’an holder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikat</td>
<td>Warp resist-dyed silk used for textiles and coats throughout Central Asia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiqqa</td>
<td>A turban pin—a type of headdress ornament for a bridegroom—commonly associated with nineteenth-century urban workshops such as Bukhara.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaitag</td>
<td>A type of embroidery produced in Dagestan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasa kalkhan</td>
<td>A Turkmen composite design motif resembling hearts or rams’ horns and produced by the Lakai tribe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
kilim  A flat-woven covering or embroidered rug, produced in the Islamic world—especially Iran, Turkey, and Central Asia—and generally made from wool (although camel hair, goat hair, and cotton are occasionally used).

kümuş-doga  A small boxed amulet holder, of Yomut manufacture, attached by chains to the neck.

mangyalik  A headband made of rectangular plaques and worn primarily by married women. It was attached to the headdress with triangular hooks at the ends or in the center.

mantasha  A staff used by dervishes to defend themselves against wild animals.

naskhi  A cursive Arabic script that, starting in the eleventh century, began to replace the angular _kufic_ as the preferred script for the Qur’an and architectural inscriptions.

nasta’liq  An elegant handwriting with flowing horizontal and oblique strokes, developed from _naskhi_ in fourteenth-century Persia.

oksay  A boy’s amulet, sometimes reused as a woman’s pectoral ornament.

owurme  A Turkmen headband made up of single vertical elements alternating with two stacked rows of delicate lozenge-shaped plaques.

qubba  A hand-embroidered cap with radiating dome-shaped silver ornament decorations, usually worn by young Turkmen girls of nearly all tribes.

sanjalik  A lightweight Turkmen headband using lozenge shapes and suggesting leaves of wheat, ultimately derived from eleventh- to thirteenth-century Fatimid and Seljuq jewelry traditions.

senmurv  A composite creature taking the form of a winged dog covered in fish scales with lion’s paws and a plumed tail.

silisila  A relatively plain, lightweight Turkmen headband consisting of rows of small, narrow linked plaques associated with the Ersari tribe.

tegbent  A massive belt worn by Turkmen women of high social status.

tenechir  An ornamented temple pendant that features two triangular plaques with hanging chains attached with hooks to the sides of headgear.

thuluth  A rounded Arabic script, taller and more sinuous than _naskhi_, used primarily for the Qur’an and Qur’anic inscriptions.

tumar  A triangular pectoral ornament that also serves as an amulet holder, consisting of a hollow cylinder divided into compartments and open at one end to allow for the insertion of a rolled paper document.

‘ulama  The educated class of Muslim legal scholars who are engaged in fields of study such as jurisprudence, philosophy, and Qur’anic hermeneutics.

usta-adam  The village smith, the English equivalent of which would be the jack-of-all-trades, who worked silver and gold and performed other skilled labor.
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Islamic jewelry traditions and, 171
Karakalpak (nos. 133, 143), 176, 177, 177, 186, 186
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wearing of, 170
Yomut (nos. 121, 122, 129, 130, 136–38), 39, 168, 168, 178, 174–75, 175, 176, 180, 180–81, 181
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Anglo-Russian Convention (1907), 11
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animal-shaped amulets (no. 121), 168, 168
Aq Quyunlu (“They of the White Sheep”), 7
aquamanile (silver water vessel) in form of mounted horseman (fig. 16), 25, 25, 27
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an amulet holder. See nos. 125–28, 139–43
an amulets. See nos. 148, 149
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development of, 34, 58, 143
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Arabic calligraphy. 26
architectural references, rings with. See nos. 165–68
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Afghan (nos. 151, 152, 154, 155, 158), 194–98, 195–97, 199
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Teke (nos. 148, 149), 192, 192–94, 193–94
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Chinese Dancer (fig. 24), 30, 30–31
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bridal (nos. 11, 12), 47, 58, 58–59, 59
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pillbox shape (nos. 8–10), 52, 56, 56–57, 57, 156
pointed silver caps (nos. 2–4a), 40, 43, 49–51, 49–51
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cudgel (no. 182), 207, 221, 221, 222
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dagdan-shaped pectorals (double-bird ornaments), 100, 126, 143, 143, 170
daggers, 36
Daghestan, 206
dating Turkmen ornaments, 31–32
european drawings and, 18, 20
manuscript illustrations and, 29–31
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double-headed eagles, 14, 100, 143, 143, 219
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ersari, 7, 33, 152
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head bands (no. 15), 61, 61
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trefoil motif (fig. 13), 22, 22

triangular amulet holder (no. 131), 176, 176
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Fath 'Ali Shah. 9
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clothing panels. See no. 171
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G

Gardner ceramics, 143, 220, 220

General Governorate of Turkestan, 11

Ghaznavids, 6, 21, 24

architectural motifs of (fig. 13), 22, 22
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goats, in shamanistic practices (fig. 7), 13, 14

goshak (abstract ram’s-horn motif), 103

Göktepe, defeat of (1881), 11
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gold jewelry, 42, 170
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fourteenth-century necklaces (fig. 22), 29, 39–31, 112
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H
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Harun al-Yaman, 217
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seal rings (no. 166), 36, 202, 205, 205–6, 207
Seljus, Seljuk period, 6, 7, 21, 28, 62, 91, 92, 207
semenov (mythical beast, 97, 229n.15
settlements, Turkmen (fig. 6), 12, 23, 16
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triangular amulet holders (nos. 125–24), 40, 40, 171–73, 171–73, 223
whorl collar (no. 183), 222, 222
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ring with (no. 161), 202, 202–3
thuluth inscription. See no. 179
Tiaras, 176
Tibet, woman’s amulet box from, 163, 163
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1
tortoises, 13–14
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trefol motifs (fig. 13), 22, 22. See also nos. 48, 50, 57, 61, 130
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in crowns and caps. See nos. 2, 8a, 8c, 8
in temple pendants, 70. See also nos. 25–28, 34, 35
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tumars (triangular amulet holders) (nos. 125–34), 40, 40, 80, 163, 170–78, 171–78, 232
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evolution of Turkmen jewelry and, 21–22, 36, 170–71

shamanistic beliefs in (fig. 7), 13–14, 14, 68, 96, 170–71
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religious beliefs of, 13–14, 21–22, 26
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dating issues and, 31–32
decorative vocabulary and style of, 32–34
design influences on, 21–22, 25–26, 28, 31, 34, 171
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jewelry craftsmanship and (figs. 9a–c, 11a–c), 15, 17–20, 19
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silver production and, 24–25
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Twelve Shi’i Imams, 226
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two-finger rings (nos. 163, 165), 203, 203, 204, 204–5
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armbands with bells, rings, and thimbles (no. 158), 198, 199
begging bowls (no. 189), 226, 226
chevron motifs, 146
combs (no. 184), 207, 222, 222
crowns (nos. 11, 12), 58–59, 59
cudgel or ceremonial staff (no. 182), 221, 222, 222
drinking bowl (no. 187), 217, 224, 224–25, 229
earrings (nos. 38, 39), 80–81, 81
fail backing for stones and glass, 165
headress ornaments (nos. 19, 20), 40, 40, 64, 65
mutual influence of Turkmen and, 34
pectoral disc ornament (no. 82), 131, 131
rings (nos. 165–69), 171, 203, 204–7, 204–7
royal whip and goad (no. 179), 217–18, 218
slippers (no. 186), 201, 222, 223, 223
triangular amulet holder (no. 133), 176, 177, 177, 214
šita-adam (village smith), 16
Uzbek, 6, 7–8, 58
drinking bowl (no. 187), 217, 226, 224–25, 229n.5
Uzbekistan, 5–6, 206
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Vámbéry, Arminius, 11, 15, 18
veils, 12, 47
chains and ornaments acting as, 55, 56
Vereschchagin, *The Charge from design by* (fig. 5), 11, 11
vessels, silver, 24

W
wall decoration in form of amulet (no. 176), 214,
214–15, 231n.8
wax, 43
wedding ceremonies (fig. 8), 14, 14–15, 18, 32, 36, 49,
118, 144, 203. See also bridal accoutrements
Welch, Anthony, 171
wheel symbols, 203
whips, 36
in Caucasus style (no. 4b), 40, 43, 51, 51
Kazakh (no. 178), 217, 217, 219
royal (no. 179), 217–18, 218
wheel collar (no. 183), 222, 222
wheel motifs. See nos. 52, 53, 88, 100, 103, 155, 186
wire, 41
chains, 28. See also nos. 6, 8, 13, 14, 29, 34, 40, 68,
72–76, 76, 90, 92, 96–102, 109, 110, 112–14,
117, 123, 125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 139, 140,
157
decorative, 28, 41, 41–42, 42. See also nos. 1–5,
9–11, 13, 14, 25, 26, 29–31, 33, 34, 41, 46,
47, 51–62, 64, 65, 69, 73–76, 78–80, 82,
85–89, 93, 94, 96–102, 104–9, 115–17, 119,
120, 122–38, 142, 166, 194–55, 158–63,
165, 166, 168, 172, 179, 181–83, 185, 186
filigree, 24, 28, 31, 41, 41–42, 42, 98, 170. See also
nos. 39, 116, 146
twisted, 28, 33, 41, 41. See also nos. 37, 70, 71,
134, 177, 178
women, Turkmen, 12, 35
clothing and jewelry worn by (figs. 11a, 12),
17–18, 19, 20–21, 21, 25, 28, 32, 36, 37, 63,
63, 83, 90, 115, 126, 143, 143, 144. See also
nos. 170–72, 174; specific ornaments

Y
Yomut, 12, 17, 32, 34, 40, 80, 94, 143, 167
armbands (no. 150), 193–94, 194
bow-shaped pectoral ornaments (nos. 70, 71),
118, 118–19, 119
boys’ amulets (nos. 121, 122), 168, 168
collar stud (gulyaka) (no. 81), 33, 130, 130–31,
143
cordiform pendants (nos. 51, 52, 55, 61), 98–100,
98–100, 102, 102–3, 107, 109, 109
crowns (nos. 1, 2, 10), 48, 48, 49, 49, 56, 57, 57
design characteristics of, 33
dorsal headress ornaments (nos. 21–26), 66, 66,
67, 68, 69
dorsal plait ornaments (nos. 42–45), 39, 86–88,
86–89
headbands (nos. 15, 19), 61, 61, 63, 63
rectangular amulet holders (nos. 136–38), 39,
180, 180–81, 181
roundels (pectoral disc ornaments) (nos. 78–80),
temple pendants (nos. 25, 27, 30, 31), 70, 70–71,
72, 73, 74, 74–75, 75, 77
triangular amulet holders (nos. 129, 130), 174,
174–75, 175, 176

Z
zigzag motifs, 33. See also chevron motifs; no. 163
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Turkmen Jewelry
Silver Ornaments from the Marshall and Marilyn R. Wolf Collection

Known for their expertise and skill, the nomadic Turkmen people of Central Asia have been long-distinguished as the makers of extraordinary silver jewelry. This book presents more than two hundred examples of Turkmen jewelry, created in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, from the renowned collections of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

These remarkable objects—trinkets and bracelets, amulets and rings, medallions and senior brooches—are characterized by graceful forms, bold geometry, delicate craftsmanship, and often intricate designs. Working with a limited set of materials and tools, the artisans of Turkmenistan and the Middle East have mastered the techniques of their craft, creating jewelry that is both functional and decorative.

This book, the first publication in the United States devoted to Turkmen jewelry, highlights the aesthetic aspects of these objects, which until recently were valued primarily for their ethnographic significance. Dila S. Dila situates Turkmen ornament within both its historical context and the tradition of Islamic silver jewelry production. By making an aesthetic approach and providing detailed formal analysis of the objects, accompanied by gorgeous color photographs, the publication enhances the appreciation of these objects, elevating them from folk art to fine art.
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