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Activities

In our previous issue we ended a statement of our activities on a happy and hopeful note — that the Museum would soon find a suitable home in the old Chemistry building, just north of the “President’s House” on the Red Campus. This sturdy building was assigned to us for permanent and adequate quarters, to house both the Department of Art History and Archaeology and the Museum, and was expected to be ready for occupancy by September 1973. Although the building has now been vacated, this ideal situation has not yet begun to be implemented, chiefly because of the considerable funds needed to renovate it and adjust it to our needs. Now we must contemplate the first major fund-raising operation since the Museum was founded fifteen years ago. Plans are being made together with the University’s Development Fund, and it is hoped to enlist the support not only of the Alumni and the many friends of the Museum, but of the entire Central Missouri community, for all these are served by the Museum in many ways. The whole future of the Museum depends on the success of this fund-raising campaign.

Thus we find ourselves still with our main exhibition and storage space on part of the fourth floor of the Ellis Library, with temporary exhibits on two floors of Jesse Hall, and with laboratories in the basement of a nearby house. The result is that most of our collections, new and old, cannot be exhibited, and even storage has become a very difficult problem. Nevertheless our work continues. The year’s acquisitions reflect the broad lines of growth of the collections through gifts and purchase, though they are fewer in number than usual because of the financial situation within the University and in general. Still, we have been able to acquire objects of the highest quality and of particular interest to the teaching program. One of the finest is the gold medallion, donated by a native Missourian, which is featured on the covers of this issue.

Although it is extremely arduous to mount temporary exhibitions because of lack of space, a number have been assembled which show the variety of the Museum’s holdings: Bronze Age Palestine and its Neighbors, Iranian Art, Mahadevi: the Great Goddess, Prints of the 17th and 18th Centuries, 20th Century Painting and Sculpture, Contemporary Prints. All the objects exhibited are in the Museum’s own collections. As usual, several of the exhibitions were coordinated with courses being given in the Department. The Museum’s collection of ancient glass was used for a special seminar on the occasion of a visit from Dr. D. B. Harden, Director Emeritus of the London Museum. Individual objects, or groups of them, continue to be investigated by students, faculty, members of the Museum staff and scholars outside the University. This is reflected in the articles in this issue of Muse. We are particularly pleased to present the first article by an undergraduate in the Honors Program in Art History, Miss M. Williams.

Mrs. Jane C. Biers again served capably as Acting Director for the first two-thirds of 1971, while the Director was in Jerusalem. Two graduate students worked there during the summer, on the pottery from the Jalame glass factory and the decorated stucco from Tel Anafa. Other studies continue on lamps, pottery and glass. Because no excavations took place in 1971, it is possible to present in this issue the results of the 1972 campaigns at both Tel Anafa and at Philias.

To over-emphasize the serious condition of the Museum’s housing problem would be impossible. Through Muse, through visits of scholars, and through the students who have been trained with its facilities, the Museum has become known on all five continents as an important institution. Now it is our duty to give it a home suitable to the collections in its possession. We enlist the help of all who care for the art of the world and for the prestige of the University of Missouri.

SAUL S. WEINBERG
Director
Acquisitions 1971

OCEANIC ART

New Guinea

Wooden war shield, painted white, with red design (160)*, Asmat tribe, gift of Dr. and Mrs. Milton Gross.

AFRICAN ART

Wooden objects, all the gift of Dr. and Mrs. Milton Gross: statue of mother with child (154), Adansi tribe, Gold Coast; painted figure of seated woman, decorated with glass beads (144), Ashanti tribe, Ghana; two Akua’ba (fertility dolls) with disk heads (146, 147), Ashanti tribe, Ghana; Akua’ba with rectangular head (150), Fanti tribe, Gold Coast; two Akua’ba with conical bodies and crested heads (148, 149), Dogon tribe, Mali; male fetish, body covered with cloth (155), Dan tribe, Gold Coast; two-part lock in human shape (153), Bambara tribe, Mali; mask for spirit dances (151), Ibibio tribe, Nigeria; ibeji figure of male child (152), Yoruba tribe, Nigeria.

Pair of wooden statues, male and female (141), Senufo tribe, Ivory Coast; two wooden fetishes with strings of cowrie shells, each having four figures bound together (142, 143), Yoruba tribe, Nigeria, all the gift of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Merrin.

Terracotta painted figure of seated woman (145), Ashanti tribe, Ghana, gift of Dr. and Mrs. Milton Gross.

CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN ART

Ecuador

Feather pectoral with toucan head and beak (158), gift of Dr. and Mrs. Milton Gross.

Mexico

Limestone block with Maya glyph in low relief (7), A.D. 600-900, anonymous gift.

Fresco panel with plant decoration (136), from Teotihuacán, A.D. 300-700, gift of Mr. and Mrs. Cedric H. Marks.

Gourd-shaped pottery jug (159), Monte Alban, A.D. 300-500, gift of Dr. and Mrs. Milton Gross.

Peru

Two tapestry fragments with multicolored figures (156, 157), Precolumbian, gift of Dr. and Mrs. Milton Gross.

*The numbers in parentheses are museum accession numbers and normally are given in full, as 71.160. A few items which were accessioned through error in 1969 are actually gifts for 1971. In these cases the accession number is given in full.
Limestone block with Maya glyph in relief, A.D. 600-900 (7) H. 18.7 cm.

Fresco panel fragment with series of painted floral designs, from Teotihuacán, A.D. 300-700 (136) H. 33 cm.

Tapestry fragment with human figures, from Peru, Pre-Columbian (157) H. 28.7 cm.
FAR EASTERN ART

China

Bronze ko (dagger axe) (34), Chou dynasty, 1100-450 B.C. Silver-gilt bowl (69.44), Sung period, ca. A.D. 800-900, gift of Mrs. Josefa Carlebach.

Indonesia

Volcanic stone sculpture of Shiva as teacher (Agastya Rishi) (133), from east Java, Late Madjapahit, 15th c., gift of Dr. Samuel Eilenberg.

All the following objects from Indonesia are the gift of Mrs. Josefa Carlebach: wooden bowl with incised patterns on lid and shoulder (69.29); wooden figure of bird (69.36), from Bali, 19th c.

Fragmentary terracotta head (69.57), Madjapahit style, A.D. 1294-1520.

Two lengths of red silk brocade with designs in gold thread (69.24, 25), from Sumatra. Bell-shaped hat woven of cotton, metal and glass (69.38), from Atjeh, Sumatra, ca. A.D. 1850.

Ceramic bowl with lid, decorated with black and gold glaze (69.39).

Metal objects: bronze bowl with pedestal foot (69.42), from Bokor, Java, A.D. 900; cast bronze bowl with cast and incised decoration (69.41), from Java, A.D. 900-1200; bronze bowl with incised decoration (69.40), from Java, ca. A.D. 1400; brass tripod (69.35), 18th c.; curved steel dagger with brass handle and wooden sheath (69.45), from Java, 18th c.; eight-sided silver bowl and cover, with repoussé decoration (69.46), from Java, 18th c.; rectangular silver plaque, with peacocks and foliage in repoussé (69.47), from Sumatra, 18th c.; bronze bowl on high ring foot (69.43), A.D. 1800; small brass mask with face and foliage in repoussé (69.60), from Java; rectangular brass box with lid, scrollwork cast in relief (69.48), from Sumatra.

SOUTHEAST AND CENTRAL ASIAN ART

India

Stone sculpture in high relief, seated Buddha (134), from Bengal, Pala period, 10th c.; stone relief, seated Buddha with attendants in niches above (133), from Bihar, 11th c., both the gift of Dr. Samuel Eilenberg.


Afghanistan

Bronze coin or weight (99), 17th c., gift of Mrs. Victoria Riback Wilson.

Iran

Bronze: axe (33), from Luristan, 2500-1500 B.C. (?); spearhead (28), 1200-1000 B.C.; spear or dagger (29), two daggers (30, 31), all ca. 1200-1000 B.C.

Iraq

Clay nail with cuneiform text describing restoration of a temple for Ningirsu by King Gudea of Lagash, from a foundation deposit (26), ca. 2200 B.C.; two clay cuneiform tablets with agricultural records (24, 25), from Ur, 3rd dynasty, 2100-1950 B.C.

NEAR EASTERN ART

Anatolia

Ceramic "depas amphikypellon" (10), from Afyon, Turkey, Early Bronze IIIa/b, ca. 2200 B.C.
Cyprus

Ceramics: juglet with white-filled incised designs (86), Middle Bronze Age I, ca. 2000 B.C.; one-handled pitcher with painted geometric designs on white slip (127), ca. 1500 B.C.; bowl with painted black and red bands (87), Iron Age II, 900-586 B.C.

Egypt

Fragment of limestone ushabti (18), Dynasties XIX-XX; inscribed diorite base, probably for a figurine (23), Dynastic.

Bronze ushabti with inscription (19) from Tanis (?), Dynasty XXI; bronze tool with folded socket (32) First Intermediate period, ca. 2000 B.C.

Ceramics; black-topped vase (104), Badarian, ca. 4200 B.C.; Proto-Dynastic vase with painted diagonal stripes (8) from Lower Egypt, Dynasty I, early 3rd millennium B.C.

Two blue-glazed ushabtis with inscriptions (21, 22), Dynasty XXI-XXII; funerary cone with text stamped on bottom (16), time of Thutmose IV, 1412-1403 B.C.; sealing with fragmentary text (15), Dynasty XVIII; sealing (17), time of Ramses II, 1290-1223 B.C.; sealing (20), reign of Sa-Amun, ca. 1000 B.C.

Palestine

Bronze: hoard from the Ramallah area including ten dagger blades (39-46, 50, 51), four javelin heads (47-49, 52), javelin or arrowhead (53), two arrowheads (54, 55), netting needle (64), fishhook (72), nine pins of various kinds (56-63, 73), Bronze Age. Spatula or stylus (89), Hellenistic or Roman; two-part spherical object pierced at both ends (91), Hellenistic.

Ceramics: bowl with white slip and painted concentric circles inside, radial strokes on rim (80), Iron IIA, 12th c. B.C.; one-handled jug with reddish slip (79), Iron IIB, 900-800 B.C.; two burnished black pyxides (84, 85), Iron IIC, 800-586 B.C.

GREEK AND ROMAN ART

Greek

Head of Cycladic marble figurine (125), 2300-2000 B.C., gift of Dr. and Mrs. Werner Muensterberger. Rock crystal amphoriskos (126), Hellenistic-Early Roman.

Ceramics: plaque with standing female in relief (12), said to be from Tarentum, 7th c. B.C.; oinochoe with grazing ram in panel on shoulder (113), from Rhodes, 7th c. B.C.; oinochoe painted with ships and fish (114), Italo-Protocorinthian, 7th c. B.C.; vase in form of female head (9), from Attica, 475-400 B.C.; painted satyr-mask with suspension loop (138), 3rd c. B.C.

Left: head of Cycladic marble figurine, 2300-2000 B.C. (125) H. 10.5 cm. Center: Rhodian oinochoe with grazing ram painted on shoulder, 7th c. B.C. (113) H. 30 cm. Right: Italo-Protocorinthian oinochoe with painted decoration of ships and fish, 7th c. B.C. (114) H. 34.8 cm.
Three bronze bracelets with incised terminals (11, 38), from Chalcis, northern Greece, Late Geometric, 8th c. b.c.; bronze jug with handle formed of floral elements (137), Hellenistic, ca. 100 B.C.

Glass unguentarium in core technique (27), 2nd c. B.C.

Silver coin of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (94), Ptolemais mint, 254-253 B.C.

Roman

Bronze: protome representing one of the Dioscuri (?) (6), 1st c. A.D.; figurine of Sabazios from a “magic hand” (139), probably from Turkey, Roman (see E. Lane, “Two Votive Hands . . .,” Muse 4 [1970]); ladle with deep bowl and sieve at end of handle (93), Roman; crossbow fibula with iron pin (88), 4th c.; belt buckle decorated with iron studs (90), European, 4th c.

Lamp with gorgon head in relief on discus (92), 2nd c.; lamp fragment with relief inscription in tabula ansata: SABINUS POPILLIUS (75), 2nd c.

Glass jug with square body, one handle, mould-blown inscription on bottom (in Greek): Theodorou (82), from the Near East, 2nd c. A.D.; glass flask with spout (103), probably 2nd c. A.D., gift of the Department of Antiquities, Israel; fragmentary glass cosmetic stick, spiral rod with curved end (96), Roman.

Two bone whorls with incised circles (76, 77); bone stylus with incised decoration (78).

Gold medallion of Constantius II (pictured on covers) with value of four solidi (37), Thessalonica mint, a.d. 323-361, gift of Mrs. Maureen C. Mabbott in memory of Prof. Thomas O. Mabbott. Bronze coin of Trajan (14), Ancyra mint, ca. A.D. 96-99; bronze coin of Geta (13), from Pisidian Antioch, A.D. 209-212.

EARLY CHRISTIAN AND BYZANTINE ART

Ceramic censer with pierced and incised decoration and suspension hook (81), probably from Hebron area, Palestine. Mould-blown glass jug, nine-sided, diagonal ridges on body (83), from the Near East, 6th c. or later.

Bronze belt buckle with remains of iron tongue (97), 5th c. A.D.

EUROPEAN ART

Prehistoric

Bronze figure of standing bull wearing torque (95), from Central Europe, 7th-3rd c. B.C.
Migration Period

Bronze attachment with decoration of birds and floral patterns in niello (35), from the Ardennes, France; bronze belt buckle with rectangular plate and settings for gems now missing (98), Visigothic.

Renaissance to 1800

Paintings: Antwerp Mannerist, The Adoration of the Magi, oil on panel (115), Flemish School, ca. 1510-1530; Hans I Rottenhammer, The Baptism of Christ, oil on copper (5), German, 1564-1625.

Graphics: after Hans Brosamer, Katharina von Bora Luther, woodcut (116), German, ca. 1500-1554; Hans Brosamer, St. Peter reading, seated in an outdoor scene, woodcut (120), German, 1500-1554; Hans Burgkmair the Elder, three sheets from The Triumph of Maximilian series, 2nd ed. 1777, woodcuts (36), German, 1473-1531; Albrecht Duerer, Madonna and Child on a Crescent, 1514, engraving (109), German, 1471-1528; Jacob II de Gheyen, Angels Opening the Tomb of Christ, etching (111), Flemish, 1565-1629; Monogrammist I.K., four pages from the Wappen der heyligen Roemischen Reichs Teutscher Nation series 1545, woodcuts (121-124), German, 1500-1550, published by Cyriakus Jacob, Frankfurt a. Main; Monogrammist S.F., Saint Matthew Seated Writing and Susanna and the Elders, woodcuts (118), German, ca. 1550-1600; Adriaen van Ostade, The Spectacle Seller (108) and The Smoker and the Drinker (110), etchings, Dutch, 1610-1684; Christoffel II van Sichem, The Marriage of Mary and Joseph, woodcut (119), German, 1581-1658; Franz Sigrist, untitled etching (112), Austrian, 1727-1803; Hans Springinklee, Mary Magdalen and Saint Margaret, two hand-colored woodcuts (117) German, 1512-1522.

1800 to the Present

Drawings: Laurence Adams, Negro male head, drawing in conte crayon (132), American contemporary, gift of Prof. Frederick Shane.

Graphics: Georges Braque, untitled lithograph (1), French, 1882-1963; Hilaire Edgar Degas, Nude Arising, print (105), French, 1834-1917; Pierre Auguste Renoir, Chapeau Épinglé, etching (107), French, 1841-1919; Maurice de Vlaminck, Autumn Road II, lithograph (106), French, 1876-1958; Alexander Calder, Albi, lithograph (128), American contemporary; Rupprecht Geiger, untitled serigraph (3), German contemporary; Marian Humfeld, Central City, lithograph (131), American contemporary, gift of Prof. Frederick Shane; Lowell Nesbitt, Lunar Module, serigraph (4), American contemporary; Ben Nicholson, Cathedral, etching (2), English contemporary; Mark Tobey, October, lithograph (130), American contemporary; Paul Wunderlich, Chasing Girls, lithograph (129), German contemporary.

Loans During 1971

Four vases (60.10, 61.15, 62.26, 67.60) to the Museum of Art, University of Iowa, Iowa City, for the exhibit “Etruscan and Villanovan Pottery.”
Tel Anafa-1972: The Fourth Season

Tel Anafa, a mound in Upper Galilee, yielded a great mass of important Late Hellenistic remains during the first three seasons of excavation (1968-1970)\(^1\) and in 1972 presented a much enlarged range of material.\(^2\) Four new squares were opened on the mound, bringing the total exposure to 429 square meters, and an attempt was made to investigate the Hellenistic town below the mounds to the east. It was, however, the deeper digging in areas previously investigated that lengthened the site's cultural sequence back to at least 2200 B.C.

The new squares were opened with specific problems in mind, and some have already answered questions raised in previous seasons. We were particularly eager to learn about the lower Hellenistic town, which we had tried in 1968 to test in an abandoned fish pond below the northwest corner of the mound. Here the water table proved too high. We hoped that the deep modern channel along the east edge of the mound, which had revealed Hellenistic debris, had sufficiently lowered the water on that side to allow excavation. Two pits, each two meters square, proved fruitless, for water flowed in at 2.50 m. below the surface, before any ancient remains appeared.

The mass of huge rocks on the northeast slope of the mound had long attracted our attention, and investigations here in 1969 and 1970 had revealed the north side of the Hellenistic enclosure wall of the late second century B.C. and of the large building of about 100 B.C. which replaced and encroached on it. A 4 x 5 m. square (2.12—see Plan) was opened among the rocks immediately north of it (Fig. 1). We had already noted that the fill north of the enclosure wall had little Hellenistic material, and was distinctly different from that to the south; this was now confirmed. In topsoil there was little Hellenistic pottery; the deep yellow-brown fill below contained mostly Bronze Age pottery and some Iron Age sherds, while the stony fill at a depth of 1.50 m. yielded very little pottery but many flint implements and chips. The great rocks occupied a good third of the area at the surface, but as much as three-quarters of it 1.50 m. below. The only architecture was a stone foundation between two rocks in the south part; this seems earlier than the enclosure wall, most likely pre-Hellenistic. There were some beaten earth floors and small installations: a pot set into a clay mass, a hemispherical pit lined with stone and clay, a cup-hole cut into the top of the great southern rock (see Fig. 1). Most of a Middle Bronze I pot lay against a rock at the northwest (Fig. 2); a Late Bronze jar hugged the rock in the southeast. This is clear evidence of occupation as early as Middle Bronze I, and probably earlier in the stony fill we have begun to penetrate. Our surmise that occupation of the site began among these rocks and that the mound grew southward has thus received some support, but this is not yet confirmed, for nowhere else have we reached virgin soil.

A second area (5.1) was opened in the east-central sector, east of Square 2.1, to test our theory\(^3\) that the richly painted and gilded stucco decoration found here, some of it on ashlar blocks, came from the collapse of the second story of a large structure. This is now certain. Across the east end of the trench runs a wall built, like other exterior walls, of both basalt field stones and limestone ashlar blocks (Fig. 3); it extends from the surface to the depth now reached, almost two meters. While in the other walls single ashlar blocks were placed at fairly regular intervals, in this wall one was used as a header through its thickness, and others of the same height were placed on both faces of the wall as stretchers, both contiguous with the same side of the header. Three levels of such groups occur in the two-meter depth of the wall dug thus far; they are never exactly one above the other. Just before this wall reaches the north baulk of the area, another abuts at right angles to it on the west; its construction is similar, with one header and stretcher group close to the east wall. A floor at a high level is associated with the topmost course of these two walls, and immediately beneath is a deep fill containing the collapsed walls of the upper story.
These seem to have fallen toward the west and south, filling the room with debris over a meter in depth—a rich harvest of architectural members and stucco decoration. Of great significance was the finding of a large basalt boulder split to give a fairly smooth face; on this is thick stucco decoration (Fig. 4) like that found last season on a large ashlar block. It is thus evident that the walls of the upper story were built both of basalt rocks and limestone blocks. The stucco found this year will help greatly in reconstructing the decorative scheme of the upper story.

Below the fall of masonry and stucco there is a distinct layer, as much as a half-meter deep, made up chiefly of the collapsed floors of the upper story, including thousands of tesserae from mosaics and many more large pieces of floor mosaics than found previously. The tesserae are, as before, exceptionally small and in an unusually wide range of colors, mainly stone but also some of glass. We know that in one room the mosaic had a border of three rows of large white tesserae (Fig. 5), then a zone of tiny black tesserae in which were set circles of green glass tesserae. In the center of each circle is a cross formed of a central white cube and four yellow cubes; other such crosses occur in the field. The smooth edge of these border fragments shows that the mosaic was laid after the walls had been stuccoed. Clearly, the main body of the mosaics included, besides areas of white, decorated panels depicting floral, animal or possibly even human figures.

The floor debris contained many iron nails of various sizes, the only evidence preserved of the wooden construction, which must have been strong enough to support the heavy mosaics. While some ash and bits of charcoal were mixed with the remains, there is no evidence of a destructive conflagration.

Square 2.13 was opened this season in order to fill in the plan of the large building in the east-central sector; thus far only high-level walls have been disclosed. The fourth new area opened was Square 3.5, an addition to the step trench down the south side of the mound; it is discussed below.

Deeper digging in areas already worked gave us a clearer picture of the site’s earlier history. In the northwest sector, Squares 1.2 and 1.3, we reached Early Hellenistic levels. In 1.2 digging was restricted to the northwest part of the trench, where a mass of fill had been left in 1969. The three main Hellenistic architectural phases again appeared, the lowest dating before 150 B.C. The Early Hellenistic fill yielded a succession of floors but no foundations. Most of the floors had hearths and were covered with burnt debris. Many had small pits, often connected with channels, some stone-lined; in these were masses of burnt organic matter. Quantities of grains and seeds were recovered by flotation and are now being analyzed. In the northwest corner a large bell-shaped pit
2. Middle Bronze I vessel found against a rock in Square 2.12, from west.

4. Split basalt boulder with stucco on one face.

3. Wall along east side of Square 5.1, seen from west.

1. Northeast sector, showing Square 2.12 in the background, Square 2.6 in the foreground.
has part of its stone lining preserved for a height of one meter. Many lamps suggest that these floors belong to the third century B.C. or earlier; they yielded much pottery and metal, including an unusual fibula (Fig. 19) and the first piece of Attic black-figured pottery found at the site.

In Square 1.3 the complex of ovens continued to occupy our attention. Two superimposed pairs of ovens had been dug in 1969 and 1970, and it was clear that more were to come. Another pair and a single oven below were found in 1972—four phases in all. The floor of the single oven was made of typical oven brick laid in concentric circles. Close by, in the south baulk, three layers of other ovens are now clearly visible. The courtyard in which all these ovens stood also contained several stone-lined pits from which came a variety of interesting finds; one small enclosure at the north baulk yielded an unusual collection of pendants (see page 16 and Fig. 10). Coins and stamped amphora handles show that all this activity belongs in the second half of the second century B.C. Deeper digging has revealed the top of a heavy north-south wall, at the same level as the lowest one in 1.2, and earlier types of pottery and lamps suggest a date in the first half of the second century B.C.

In Square 2.5 the bottom of the heavy north-south wall was finally reached, showing it to be preserved for a height of over two meters. It had cut through three clearly marked floors, and just beneath its bottom was another floor, uninterrupted over the entire area. Still deeper, a heavy stone foundation has appeared in the east half of the trench. Like the heavy walls in 1.2 and 1.3, it must date either to the early second century B.C. or even to the third century, as indicated by many Early Hellenistic lamps.

To the east, in Squares 2.3 and 2.4, the jumbled mass of stone foundations, some still supporting mud-brick walls, which had been revealed earlier, were disentangled this year and seen to represent at least three sub-phases of the second Hellenistic architectural phase (ca. 150-100 B.C.); the long section of mud-brick wall described in our last report may be a fourth. Careful sectioning of this wall and its socle showed clearly the method of construction (Fig. 6): a low socle, rather flat on top, the wall made of square bricks
7. Domical structure found in Square 3.4, as seen from the west.

8. Jug probably of Persian date (525-330 B.C.) as found in Square 3.5, from northeast.

10. Group of pendants, left to right: flat glass bead, glass sphere, bone forearm and hand, glass pyramid, glass Negro head, another glass pyramid, bone turret, glass phallic figure, multicolored glass loop. Scale 3:2.
about 0.90 m. on a side and 0.18 m. thick. One and one-third bricks are in the width of the wall, which overlaps the socle on both faces.

Below these foundations both squares were riddled with pits, apparently dug mostly from the second-phase levels, and little earlier fill was left intact. These disturbed areas produced a great variety of pottery, dating from Middle Bronze I (2200-2000 B.C.) or even earlier, to Hellenistic. After the removal of this confused fill, a thick white plaster floor appeared, covering much of Square 2.3 and extending beyond to east and north, though destroyed by intrusions all along its western edge. An Early Iron Age pottery fragment adhering to the floor may indicate its date. When the eastern half of the floor was lifted, a second similar floor, also disturbed, was revealed beneath it in the western third of the cut. In much of the area an array of Middle Bronze II B pottery was found; many nearly complete vessels at a similar level suggest that we may be reaching the floor of this early period (1750-1570 B.C.). On the other hand, this could be the bottom of an MB II B pit; in either case it is obvious that a major
12. (above): Canaanite jar of Late Bronze Age.

14. (upper right): painted pottery juglet, Middle Bronze II B.

15. (right): large jar, Middle Bronze I, found in situ in Square 2.12.

13. Two carinated bowls, Middle Bronze II B, found with juglet (Fig. 14).
leveling operation preceded the laying of the first plaster floor and that here, at least, our stratigraphy is drastically telescoped.

The step trench on the south slope, to which Square 3.5 was added, is now twenty-four meters long; this season the southern fourteen meters (Squares 3.3-3.5) were worked. The heavy diagonal wall of the second architectural phase, the most prominent feature in this area, was found broken off half way across Square 3.5. In dismantling the wall, two phases of construction were observed, and a well-leveled socle a little wider than the wall. With the wall removed, it was possible to clear the domical stone structure partially revealed in 1970 (Fig. 7); we did not dig within it because of the weakness of the corbelled dome. The foundations for this structure penetrated masses of burnt brick debris and cut a stone foundation in its northeast section. But the domed structure had itself been partially robbed on its north side by a large pit; the outline of another pit was found farther north. These pits were later cut by two others, also dug through the burnt brick debris. Professor Richard Schiemann, supervisor in this area, believes that these pits were dug from the levels of the second architectural phase and represent activity during its two sub-phases. The domical structure is then earlier, probably from before 150 B.C.; the burnt brick and the foundation cut by the domed structure are still earlier, while two stone socles at the very northern edge of 3.3 may be as early as the third century B.C.

The burnt brick debris showed individual bricks and the line of the walls, but no socles beneath. The debris lay on a thick layer of carbonized material and ash over a hard earth floor. A large wooden beam fragment appeared in a brick wall just above this floor.

While past experience had led us to expect much disturbance by animal runs in the upper levels of Square 3.5, it was greater than anticipated, and only bits of undisturbed fill remained. Between two large runs, however, lay an almost complete jug (Fig. 8) which we believe to be from the Persian period. The jumbled fill produced Late Bronze and Iron Age pottery as well. Yet beneath this, Square 3.5 produced the largest expanse of early architecture thus far found. A socle about one meter wide runs diagonally across the width of the trench (Fig. 9) and to the north a handsome flagstone pavement covers the area; these are clearly contemporary. To the south of the socle is a cobblestone pavement which seems to have been robbed out when the foundation was dug and thus must be earlier. The period of this complex is not fixed by the fill above it except at the northern edge, where a mass of burnt brick debris lies above, separated from the pavement by a layer of unburnt fill. Thus the socle and pavements in 3.5 are at least as early as the lowest walls in 3.3 and would be either Early Hellenistic or, more probably, of the Persian period. In absolute level, the pavements in 3.5 are not so low as the white plaster floors in 2.3, which are the lowest and probably the earliest architectural feature reached thus far.

Both coins and stamped amphora handles were fewer in the earlier levels; two of the thirteen amphora stamps date to the late third century B.C., the rest to the second half of the second century. Most of the thirty-four coins found are also of this time, but there are three coins, all from the uppermost levels, which have clear dates of 81 B.C. These strongly confirm our belief that the town came to an end not long after 80 B.C.

The moulded glass bowls previously found in exceptional abundance do not appear in the levels before about 150 B.C. There are few additions to the repertory of shapes and types of decoration in these bowls. Little cored glass was found. A most interesting find was a group of glass and bone pendants from 1.3 (Fig. 10), found in a late second century context. The glass pieces include a very finely moulded negro head, a phallic amulet, two pyramids, a sphere, a multicolored loop and a flat bead with threads marvered in. There are two bone pendants, one in the form of a tower and the other a forearm with clenched fist.

The fine red ware also made its first appearance about 150 B.C. and thus was much less in evidence this season. Still, there are many fine pieces and one hemispherical bowl with the name KACIAC neatly cut on the bottom of the ring base. Below the levels of the second architectural
phase we are finding what might be termed incipient red ware, with a mottled red-brown to black surface, showing no signs of dipping for the application of the slip; in fact, vases are often unslipped on the lower part of the exterior. While the ware is often identical with that of the later red ware, there is less variety in the shapes. The incurved-rim bowls, seldom found in levels dating after 150 B.C., are now frequent, both in incipient red ware and in black-glazed pottery, which is also more common in the lower levels. Among the semi-fine wares, which usually have a dull, fugitive, red-brown slip, there are crude imitations of fish-plates, a shape common in black-glazed wares. A baby feeder with a sieve top is typical of this ware. The heavy-walled, unslipped unguentaria and amphoriskoi are also rarer in lower levels.

In coarse wares, the cooking pots are noticeably deeper in earlier Hellenistic levels, and we now find complete shapes in the spatter-painted ware, which increases in quantity as we go down. There is as yet no clear indication of how far back into the Early Hellenistic period the horizontally ribbed cooking and storage vessels extend, but exterior ribbing diminishes in earlier levels.

In previous reports little mention has been made of early pottery, as not much was found. Although Persian pottery is still elusive, we have a biconical, round-bottomed jar (see Fig. 8) of pale greenish-buff clay, the fabric somewhat gritty. More certainly Persian is a fragment of a storage jar found in 2.3; its pinkish-buff fabric is typical. Iron Age fragments of cooking pots with the characteristic elongated rim, triangular in section, are common, and there is a fragmentary early krater (Fig. 11). Large amounts of Late Bronze Age pottery occur in the areas disturbed by pit digging, but there is as yet no stratified Late Bronze Age material. One Canaanite jar (Fig. 12), found close against a rock at the east side of 2.12, was in situ; a large baking-tray found in 2.5 clearly was not. There are fragments of bichrome ware, of imported Mycenaean ware and local imitations, of Cypriote "milk bowls" and Base-Ring ware.

The quantity of Middle Bronze Age pottery was most unexpected this season; it came mainly from the MB IIIB deposit in 2.3. The predominant shape is the carinated bowl (Fig. 13), found in many sizes; there are also open bowls with inverted rims, one with radial burnishing inside, a painted juglet with concentric circles on the body (Fig. 14) and a large jar with a vertical handle on the shoulder. Still earlier pottery from 2.3 includes typical horned knobs from MB I jars and handles with impressed decoration, both characteristic of the Northern Group of MB I pottery. While these are strays in 2.3, the large jar found in 2.12 (Fig. 15) was in situ (see Fig. 2); we consider it to be MB I. A ledge handle with incised decoration is indicative of the scattered Early Bronze Age pottery.

While we still found many Late Hellenistic mould-made lamps, in particular those with erotes, the type most common at Tel Anafa, we now have a quantity of Early Hellenistic wheel-made lamps, both imported and locally made (Fig. 16), which in Greece date mainly from the second half of the fourth century and the early third B.C. and were much imitated in Palestine in the third century. Fragments of Persian and Iron Age lamps continue to appear, but not in context.

Early Hellenistic levels have produced more terracotta figurines than the later levels, and we now have two fine heads (Fig. 17), one of a satyr, the other a Persian youth with headgear that leaves only the face exposed; another fragment of excellent quality is from a draped female figure. The lower half of an Astarte plaque was the only earlier terracotta found. Loomweights appeared in a variety of forms, generally conical or pyramidal; two of the latter bear gem impressions.

While there are many whorls of bone, as well as handles and a stylus, the most interesting bone object is a scarab with a bird in flight (a Horus falcon?) incised on the back and the seal depicting a pharaoh seated on a throne on a sacred barque and holding a crook, the insignia of office (Fig. 18). In a small depressed circle in front of his head a piece of gold leaf is preserved, while in the deeper cutting on the sides remain traces of the glaze which once covered the scarab.

Some of the finest objects found this season were again of metal, both bronze and iron. The bronze fibulae are particularly interesting, including a rare type of pincer-fibula (Fig. 19), which has the pin and bow joined with a rivet, with the claws of the pincers arranged to close before the
16. Lamps of Early Hellenistic period: left, import from Greece; right, local imitation.

17. Terracotta heads: left, satyr; right, Persian youth.

18. Bone scarab, glazed and gilded. Above: incised bird in flight; below: pharaoh on sacred barque. L. 1.6 cm.

19. Bronze fibulae. Left: pincer-type; center and right: triangular bow-types. The fibula at right has a metal core within the pin spring.
pin is fastened, thus creating pressure to keep it there. Rare in ancient Palestine, the type is known in Greece at least as early as the fourth century B.C. and it has many Roman derivatives in Europe; our example is from an Early Hellenistic context. There are also triangular-bow fibulae (Fig. 19), used in Palestine from Assyrian to Roman times; those at Tel Anafa are Early Hellenistic. A bronze finger ring has a bezel with a winged female figure in relief.

While iron implements and weapons were not so common as in previous seasons, a number of new types were found: a razor, a large grappling hook, a buckle with attachment plate, a fragmentary pair of shears and an unusual hook and ring with a nail through it. There is also a key like that found in 1968, as well as chisels, points, a large variety of nails, a fine curved knife with a long tang and a large dagger which may preserve a considerable part of the scabbard. In quantity and variety, the iron objects from Tel Anafa can claim to be of first importance among Hellenistic sites.

It is the Early Hellenistic town at Tel Anafa, as distinct from that dating after 150 B.C., which looms large in the account of the recent season. Clearly, before the two main architectural phases of the later town, there were several earlier phases belonging to the first half of the second century and to the third. In most cases we are only beginning to reveal walls of these earlier stages, but more abundant pottery and lamps of Early Hellenistic date give us an idea of the strength of this period at Tel Anafa. By contrast, the still earlier Persian period (586-330 B.C.) has remained singularly elusive, more so than the Iron Age (1200-586 B.C.) and the Late Bronze Age (1570-1200 B.C.). For the last the evidence is becoming ever more solid, while for the Middle Bronze Age (2200-1570 B.C.) we now have unexpectedly substantial remains. Even earlier occupation of the site is hinted, as Tel Anafa repeatedly surprises and enlightens while the excavations continue.

Saul S. Weinberg
University of Missouri-Columbia


\[2\] As before, the excavations were under the sponsorship of the Museum of Art and Archaeology of the University of Missouri-Columbia, with a Foreign Currency Grant from the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., supplemented by dollar funds from the Museum. The writer was again Director, assisted by Dr. Gladys D. Weinberg; Miss Barbara Johnson served as Assistant Field Director and also supervised one section. Most of the field supervisors were veterans of one or more campaigns: Mrs. Shirley Patterson, Miss Helen Caldwell, Professor Richard Schiemann, Leslie Cornell and Robert Gordon; new members of the staff were Dr. Sharon Herbert and David Morrison. These were assisted by the field by Mrs. Noor Mulder-Hymans, Miss Barbara Wittman, Carl Berkowitz, Jack Blanks, David Groenfeldt and Klaas Smelik. Seven of the supervisors and assistants were Ford Foundation Trainees. The technical staff was also comprised largely of veterans: Mrs. Irene Travlo Einhorn and Harold Einhorn—architects, Miss Gail Cook—draughtswoman, Aaron Levin—photographer, Edgardo Pires-Ferreira—chief conservator, assisted for six weeks by Miss Krystyna Spiryadowicz and for four weeks by Robert Haber. Misses Sharon Applebaum and Carol Golden mended pottery throughout the season in our workshops in Ratisbonne

Monastery, Jerusalem. The work force was made up of some sixty volunteers, mostly students, including a majority from the United States (several from the University of Missouri) but also a number from eight other countries. The expedition was housed in the Youth Hostel at Tel Hai. For many favors we are particularly indebted to the Director of the Hostel, Mr. Michael Koppel, and to his wife for the delicious food that enhanced the morale of the expedition.

Our work was again greatly facilitated by the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums, with whose permission we excavate, and we wish to express our indebtedness for assistance to Dr. William G. Dever, Director of the Albright Institute for Archaeological Research in Jerusalem. Dr. Y. Meshorer of the Israel Museum again generously identified the coins, and the stamped amphora handles are being read by Miss Virginia Grace of the staff of the American Excavations in the Athenian Agora.


\[4\] *Muse* 5 (1971) 10; color plate on back cover.


\[7\] *Muse* 5 (1971) 11.

\[8\] *Muse* 3 (1969) 22.
Further Investigations at Phlius

In 1972 a team from the University of Missouri returned to Greece to continue work begun in 1970 at Phlius, a small city site in the Peloponnnesus. Our goal was to continue the cleaning and study of the large rectangular building known as the “Palati” and the theater complex to the north. We were able to complete the study of the Palati’s later periods, revealing evidence of a long life extending through more than sixteen hundred years. We can distinguish, if dimly, the different periods of use, but destructions and later disturbances have made it impossible to be certain of the use or even of the complete plans represented by the parts of walls which have been cleared.

Built originally in the second half of the fifth century B.C., the Palati was destroyed possibly toward the end of the first century B.C. At this time the upper portions of the building, at least, were damaged, for in several places we found roof tiles and other debris from the destruction (Fig. 1). Apparently this debris was intentionally dumped along the east side of the building, where we could distinguish definite layers of fill. The cleaning up of the debris may have been done in preparation for the re-use of the building, possibly in the second century of our era. At this time a rough wall was laid on the axis of the building just east of the interior colonnade. This wall was apparently destroyed some time in the fourth century, perhaps by the Visigoths under Alaric. We found ample evidence of this destruction in a mound of debris from the wall, which sloped over the tops of the column bases along the east side of the building. The debris was made up of tiles, re-used architectural fragments from the original superstructure, triangular Roman bricks and disintegrated Roman mortar. Here was the Trajanic inscription (A.D. 116-117) found in 1970;

1. Fragment of decorated eaves tile from the original roof of the Palati.

2. Ionic capital found built into Byzantine grave.
Plan of excavations of the theater at close of 1972 campaign.
it had evidently been built into the wall.

The Late Roman period (fifth-sixth century) saw a construction of some sort erected in the courtyard of the building, but we know little about it. Finally, the building probably went out of use, and by the tenth century part of a cemetery extended over its east side. Some Byzantine graves were uncovered, several containing a number of disjointed skeletons. A handsome Ionic capital (Fig. 2) of the second half of the fifth century B.C. was found built into the wall of one of these graves. The walls of the building were also robbed out, even down to the foundations, to provide building material for a late Byzantine settlement farther to the south on the plain.

North of the Palati lies the theater, the existence of which was confirmed in 1970. This year’s studies raised many more questions. We investigated two areas in the theater—the cavea and the scene building (see Plan). In the cavea the cuttings in the bedrock of the hill, noticed in 1970, were found not to continue to the east but to be interrupted by a semicircular cutting (A on Plan) which extends to the retaining wall of the cavea on the east. Within this cutting (to the south) the bedrock appears to have been removed to a depth of almost 1.30 m. and the space packed with a filling of clay and mud brick; in this were placed at least four square stone blocks which project from its surface. These line up with the rock cuttings

4. First row of the theater seats, seen from the west, also showing the three entrance blocks.
5. View of the excavations from the north at the end of the 1972 season. In the foreground the theater seats; in background the scene building and beyond, the Palati.
mentioned above and probably were supports for wooden seats. Moreover, the surface of the packing is divided into alternating strips (about 0.50 m. wide) of pebbles and clay, the blocks being set in the clay and the pebble strips probably used as foot- rests for the audience (see B on Plan).

These alternating strips of clay and pebbles, while obvious around the blocks on the west, could not be discerned in the center of the area and were only occasionally visible on the east. A test trench (C on Plan) dug into this packing in an area where there were no surface indications yielded Early Roman sherds, indicating that the packing must have been laid down at this time.

This Roman building activity in the theater, which apparently also included additions to the retaining wall to the east, must be considered as reconstruction and reworking of a basically older structure. The stone theater benches, still in situ and forming the first row of the auditorium, are of Greek workmanship and must belong to an earlier period (Fig. 3).

This year we found that three meters to the west of the retaining wall these benches are interrupted by an entrance into the cavea consisting of three blocks laid at right angles to them. The highest one (at the north) is set in the line of seats slightly below their upper surfaces (Fig. 4). The lowest block spans the theater drain which runs in front of the seats. These blocks are re-used and thus of a later period. The sides of the seats framing the entrance are smoothly worked, indicating that an earlier opening, of the same period as the benches, existed here.

A test trench dug 7.50 m. to the west (D on Plan) indicated that the benches continue in that direction and there is a good possibility that the whole front row of the theater will prove to be preserved.

Investigations around the scene building located to the south of the auditorium (see Plan) yielded interesting results. An extension consisting of a narrow wall of stone blocks was found to run parallel to and 1.56 m. north of the scene building (E on Plan). This looks very much like the foundations for a raised stage, a common addition to Greek theater stage buildings, usually in the Hellenistic period. These foundations (Fig. 5), then, would have supported a stage which may have been reached by a staircase in the narrow rectangular projection at the east end of the scene building (F on Plan).

At the end of the 1972 season a number of problems remained with regard to the theater, especially its chronology. The enormous space (about seventeen meters) between the scene building and the auditorium is puzzling and unusual (see Fig. 5). Ordinarily only a few meters separate the stage from the retaining wall of the auditorium, thus forming an entrance to the orchestra. Perhaps such a large space was needed at Philus for theatrical reasons, or perhaps other buildings may have been placed between the scene building and the cavea, as in the early theater at Thorikos in Attica, where a temple and storage buildings partially closed off the orchestra to the east and west. If such buildings exist, they must be at the west, where excavation has not yet extended. Here, too, the other problems of the theater may be solved.

WILLIAM R. BIERS
University of Missouri-Columbia

1W. Biers, "Investigations at a Small Greek City," Muse 5 (1971) 17-19; Hesperia 40 (1971) 424-447. The excavations, sponsored by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, extended from July 3 to August 11. William Biers was director. Trench masters were graduate students: Harriette Weis of Bryn Mawr College, Nancy Reed Eals and Karl Kilinski II of the University of Missouri. All three were Ford Foundation Archaeological Trainees. The architect this season was Kenneth Schaar from the University of Illinois (Chicago). This excavation was funded by grants from the Research Council of the University of Missouri-Columbia and the American Council of Learned Societies.

2The capital bears a deep cutting in its top surface and an unfluted shaft, indicating that it was not part of a building but served as a base for a statue, perhaps a choragic monument close to the theater.

3Apparently here, as well as farther to the south, wash from the hill may have done considerable damage to a construction made essentially of mud brick. This is perhaps borne out by our difficulty in identifying an orchestra floor immediately to the south. Indications are that we may expect to find better preservation in the area farther to the west, which is not under the steepest part of the hill.

An Attic Black-figured Band Cup

In contrast to the movement toward fewer and larger designs in vase painting of the mid-sixth century B.C., some Athenian workshops revived an earlier miniature style by developing the so-called Little Master cups: Lip cups, Band cups, Droop cups and hybrid forms combining features of types within the category. The Lip cup has the handle zone and offset lip reserved (unpainted), often with a single figure or a small group decorating the lip on each side of the vase. Usually a more elaborate scene ornaments the tondo (the circular portion in the interior). The Band cup is covered with black glaze on the exterior, except for the reserved handle zone, which usually bears a figured scene. The interior is rarely decorated except for a circle or other simple design. The Droop cup, besides having some minor differences from the other members of the category, is usually decorated on the lower portion of the body with floral and figured patterns sectioned into zones. Among the Little Master cups, a Band cup in Missouri is a particularly attractive example.¹

The appearance of the Missouri cup is quite similar to that of most Band cups. The lip passes smoothly from a slightly concave curve into the bowl itself. The latter is covered with black glaze on the exterior except for the band in the handle zone bearing a figured frieze, and a horizontal reserved strip about one-third the distance down from the frieze to the stem. The stem and foot are also black-glazed except for a chamfered, reserved edge, and both are reserved inside and underneath. The handles are black-glazed, with a reserved inside edge except where some black glaze has spattered and dripped onto this area. The cup's interior is covered with black glaze except for a reserved band at the rim and a reserved tondo bearing a central black-glazed dot surrounded by two concentric circles, the smaller in a very thin black wash which is barely visible, the wider and larger in a thicker black glaze. Unlike most Band cups, this example lacks the purple fillet which often appears on the exterior at the juncture of stem and bowl.

The figured scenes consist of four figures on each side. One side reveals, in the center, two rams
plunging toward each other. Incision is used to define all features of the face, ribs, shoulders and hindquarters. Red paint is applied to the neck region and between the incised lines for haunches and ribs. White paint is used for the horns and some irregular splotches on the shoulder and hindquarters. The hooves are accurately indicated in black glaze. At each end of the same frieze is a male runner (the one on the left nude, the other dressed in a short tunic) moving toward the center. Each has his hair painted red, and on an extended arm (the right arm of the dressed figure, the left of the nude) carries a red cloak accented with white dotted rosettes which have been somewhat smeared. The other arm of each figure extends to the rear, with a red staff held in the hand. A double incised line filled with black glaze and white dots (now faded) defines the edge of each cloak. The tunic worn by the male on the right also has double incised lines with white dots between to designate the edges of his tunic. Muscles, facial features, knees, elbows and ankles are all indicated by incision.

On the other side of the vase are depicted satyrs and maenads dancing in pairs. The maenads look to their left while moving right, away from their partners. The latter look at the maenads and advance toward them. Red paint is used for the satyrs' hair, beards and tails, white for the maenads' faces, arms, feet and the rosettes (white circles around red dots) decorating their drapery. Facial features, muscles and hair lines are denoted by incision, as well as various parts of their clothing. The maenad on the far left extends her left arm while holding her garment with her right hand, while the other maenad grasps her garment with both hands at her thighs. Both satyrs extend their arms, on which hang white wreaths (now hardly visible). The satyr on the right, with the front of his torso exposed, raises his left leg; the other, showing his back, raises his right leg.

The style and poses of these figures and the cup type correspond remarkably well with the works assigned by J. D. Beazley to the so-called Centaur Painter. A Band cup in the Vatican Museum attributed to this painter displays many affinities with the Missouri cup. One scene reveals a group of six dancing satyrs and maenads, each glancing and moving in the same directions as those on our cup. The use of red and white paint and incision corresponds to that on the Missouri cup. The characteristic use of white wreaths on the satyrs' arms, the ornamentation of the maenads' drapery and the angle of the drapery indicating the knee, as well as three brief curved incised lines to denote one satyr's back, are all immediately apparent in the Missouri cup as well. The obverse of the Vatican cup bears two scenes, one of which is a nude runner holding a red cloak and staff decorated like those on the Missouri cup. The youth chases a ram drawn in similar pose, with front legs raised, and the application of color is similar to the respective areas on our cup.

Another Band cup, in Copenhagen, assigned to the Centaur Painter depicts a nude runner similar to those on the Vatican and Missouri cups. The similarities are most apparent in the use of incision for indicating muscles and facial features. The brief single line for the thigh and two small circles within larger semicircles for the male chest are common to nude males drawn by the Centaur Painter.

The Centaur Painter did not restrict his work to Band cups. A Lip cup in Tübingen depicts a satyr with red hair, beard and tail and white wreaths about his arms. Muscles are indicated by incision. On the reverse a maenad dressed in black with red and white rosettes resembles our figures precisely.
Missouri cup. Above: scene on one side showing rams and men. Below: scene on other side depicting satyrs and maenads.

Most important for comparison is a Band cup in Brussels. On this cup one scene corresponds exactly to the satyrs and maenads of the Missouri cup in number of figures, use of color and incision, pose of head, arms and legs and dress, except that in the Brussels cup the artist alternated the position of the maenads and bent the elbows of the satyrs for variety. In addition, the small size of the bowl and the absence of a purple fillet at the juncture of stem and bowl strengthen the likeness to the Missouri cup.

Generally, the Lip cup precedes the Band cup in date, the former ranging from ca. 565 to 530 B.C., the latter from the 550s to ca. 520 B.C. Considered as groups, the Lip cups cluster about 540 B.C., while the Band cups’ greatest period of production centers at about 530 B.C. The Lip cup incorporated the use of small palmettes, or sometimes sphinxes, near the handles in the lower frieze zone, and transmitted this device to the Band cup, where it eventually disappeared. In Beazley’s lists of twenty Band cups attributed to the Centaur Painter, only one retains the handle zone palmettes. The sketchy rendering of the back views of satyrs drawn by the Centaur Painter anticipates the inclinations of vase painters in the late sixth century B.C. However, their awkward body contortions, with legs in profile and torso in
frontal or back views, are just as cumbersome as contemporary sculptural figures, such as the fleeing giant on the north frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi, which is dated by a statement in Herodotus to between 530 and 525 B.C. 10

That the Band cup in Missouri was painted by the artist known as the Centaur Painter seems certain. Because of the fact that he painted Lip cups as well as Band cups, applying similar styles and subjects to both (as seen in the comparison of the Missouri cup with the Lip cup in Tuebingen), it is likely that the Centaur Painter flourished during a time when Lip cups were still in use but when Band cups had already begun to become more popular. That the vast majority of his Band cups, including ours, lack the handle zone palmettes, may indicate that the Band cup had been developing long enough for this subsidiary decoration to be abandoned. Though the miniature style may not correspond exactly with larger contemporary works, the awkward body contortions of the nude figures on the Missouri cup cannot allow the presumption of a date much later than that of the Siphnian frieze.

1Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Missouri-Columbia. Acc. No. 69.111. Provenience unknown. Broken and mended, small fragments of rim restored in plaster. Height 9.1 cm.; diameter rim 13.3 cm.; diameter base 6.1 cm. For previous illustration see Muse 4 (1970) 6-7.
2Though the right forefoot of the left ram touches the ground line, comparison of similar rams by the same painter (see below) indicates that this was probably unintentional.
3J. D. Beazley, Attic Black-figure Vase-painters (Oxford 1956) 189f.; Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-figure Vase-painters and to Attic Red-figure Vase-painters (Oxford 1971) 78-79. A more detailed list can be found in F. Villard, “Le peintre des Centaurs,” Studies Presented to David M. Robinson II (St. Louis 1953) 65-69. In a letter of February 7, 1969, to the Museum of Art and Archaeology-Columbia, Dr. Kurt Deppert suggested that the Missouri cup Acc. No. 69.111 be attributed to the Centaur Painter, but this fact was unknown to the writer.
4C. Albizzati, Vasi antichi dipinti del Vaticano V (Rome 1925) pls. 35-36.
5Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Denmark 3 (National Museum, Copenhagen) 3) pl. 117, no. 3.
6C. Watzinger, Die griechischen Vasen des archäologischen Instituts in Tuebingen (Tuebingen 1926) 69.
7Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Belgium 1 (Musées Royaux du Cinquantenaire, Brussels 1) pl. 2, no. 2.
8R. M. Cook, Greek Painted Pottery (London 1966) 80.
10Herodotus III.57.
A Pilgrimage to Indian Museums

It was early on a Sunday morning; my husband and I were taking tea together. Suddenly I thought of my father in India, who is very old and who had not written to me for more than two years. I expressed a desire to visit India together that summer. My husband immediately agreed, but because the children could not be left by themselves, I had no choice but to go alone.

It occurred to me that in view of this trip I could visit museums as well. Many Indian objects in the Museum of Art and Archaeology are of unusual nature and hence difficult to identify. I had made lists of these as an aid to discussing them with specialists when an opportunity might arise. This would be a splendid chance, I thought, to visit my homeland after a lapse of five years, and also to learn more about Indian art. I prepared my itinerary, informed museums in India about the purpose of my visit, collected photographs of our objects and gathered the pertinent information. Then I was all set to embark upon my journey.

On June 5, 1971, I left Columbia and reached Bombay on June 8. The first museum I visited was the Prince of Wales Museum, which has a large sculpture collection from Gandhara. Mr. Shetti and Mr. Shekhar, both Curators of Sculpture, discussed my photographs. Studying them critically, we realized that I had not always noted details, as I had been working with the objects themselves, not with photographs. Thus in some cases it was difficult for them to determine the provenance, date, etc. then and there.

It was fortunate that Dr. Kala, Director of the Archaeological Museum, Allahabad, a specialist in terracottas, happened to be in the Bombay Museum that day. Since his museum was not on my itinerary, I took advantage of his presence and showed him my photographs of terracottas.

The weather was very good; the rainy season had not yet started, and on Sunday I went sightseeing with my nephew, his family and friends, to the Vihar Lake, a beautiful place in natural surroundings. But our stay was short as I had to leave for Delhi.

The next day I visited the National Museum at Delhi. I met the Director, Dr. Sivaramamurti, in the visitors’ gallery and accompanied him to his office. On the way he stopped near a colossal image of Shiva in front of the entrance to the sculpture gallery, and knelt down in devotion. This action gave me an insight into one of the important roles museums in India play. A museum there is not only a place for the collection, preservation and display of art objects; it is also a place of worship, for the people to pay homage to gods personified in images.

It was a thrilling experience to meet a great person such as Dr. Sivaramamurti, so simple, devoted and scholarly, who would rather be a scholar than an administrator. Apparently he had not received my letter concerning my intended visit, but he was happy to know about my study project. We started discussing my photographs. His exposition was very detailed and scholarly; I wanted to note it extensively but he walked very fast. I had taken along a cassette recorder for such contingencies, but he did not approve of this; thus I had to remain content with brief notes. We spent two mornings together and went through a large number of photographs.

There was considerable difference of opinion among the specialists regarding one and the same object from our museum. A black schist stone relief (Fig. 1) from Bihar, of the ninth century, seems to Dr. Sivaramamurti to be a portion of a slab of nine planets. He believes that the figures, both two-armed, are Shukra and Shani holding rosaries in their right hands. Shukra holds a water vessel in the left hand while Shani carries a walking stick as he limps. This view is shared by Dr. U. P. Shah, of Baroda, and confirmed by Banerjea. But according to Mr. Shekhar, the figure on the right is Maitreya, holding a rosary and water vessel, accompanied by an unidentifiable figure. Mr. Desikan, Curator of Sculpture of the Govern-
Sketch map showing cities and towns with museums, most of which were visited by the author. Scale: 1 inch = 266 miles.

2. Right: bronze figure at Missouri, representing the Goddess of Smallpox. From South India, probably seventeenth century.
ment Museum, Madras, pointed out that if these figures are Shukra and Shani, they should be of the same height and the figure on the left should have the right hip curving outward, as is not the case here. He thinks they might be Brahmac and Sarasvati, Brahmac holding a rosary and water vessel, Sarasvati holding a rosary and vina (a stringed musical instrument), provided the figure on the right is four-faced, which was not clear because the face is mutilated. Upon my return to Columbia I examined our object and found that it has only one face. Thus it could not be Brahmac and Sarasvati. However, I believe it could represent Shiva with rosary and water vessel, and Parvati carrying rosary and shaft.

Another bronze is believed by Dr. Sivaramamurti to represent Jyestha, the Goddess of Smallpox, a South Indian folk goddess (Fig. 2) of the seventeenth century, called Shitala in the north. She holds a bunch of margosa leaves to relieve the itching caused by smallpox, and a winnowing fan in her left hand. This is confirmed by Hastings. But according to Dr. Joshi, Director of the State Museum of Lucknow, the Goddess of Smallpox is never so attractive and this may be Lakshmi holding a lotus and winnowing fan to offer wealth and grain to her devotees. Dr. Motichandra, Director of the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, thought she might be Annapurna holding grain.

Upon my return I looked carefully at this attribute. It is neither lotus nor grain; it looks like a bunch of margosa leaves, flat in back and with an incised line in the center of a leaf with serrated edges. Apparently the figure is indeed the Goddess of Smallpox.

I left for Lucknow on June 22 and was met by my sister at the airport. After spending the morning with her, I went to the State Museum; Dr. Joshi was expecting me. Though the museum had some objects similar to ours, comparative study was not possible as no one had yet studied the bronzes. In the sculpture gallery Dr. Joshi showed me a beautifully carved stone statue of Kartikeya from Garhwal State.

The Lucknow Museum is located in two places in the city: the sculpture gallery in Kaisarbagh, the bronzes and other objects in Banarsibagh. Though the following day was a museum holiday, Dr. Joshi arranged to keep the sculpture gallery open for me. I was glad that I overpowered my inertia and came to the museum, although I was tired and wanted to stay with my sister, whom I had not seen for six years. But if I had not come that day, I would have missed the opportunity entirely. Dr. Joshi’s assistant, Mr. Srivastava and his friend Mr. Agrawal also joined us. We started discussing my photographs. A bronze bowl, a ritual object from Nepal.

(Fig. 3), has its lid decorated with repoussé work—three circular bands, the first with an incised lotus pattern, the second a floral motif; the third, the most interesting, has eight pairs of geese facing each other, with eight figures between them representing various yantras, as noted by Dr. Joshi. Fortunately I located a similar piece in the State Museum, Hyderabad (Acc. No. 486). Here it is identified as Tibetan; no other details were available. The figure on the round boss of the lid is Vishnu, seated at ease, while ours has Shiva and Parvati seated. The beautiful scroll work is similar to that on our bowl.

Next we discussed a terracotta female figure with four short legs (Fig. 4). Dr. Joshi believes that its basic conception is Islamic, while the treatment is Hindu. This seems to be the she-mule Dul Dul, sent as a gift to Mohammed, the prophet of Islam, by the governor of Egypt. But Dr. Sivaramamurti thinks it is Kamadhenu, probably from the Middle East, a product of a long close relationship between two regions. Mr. M. L. Gupta, Superintendent of the Archaeology Department of Jaipur, agrees, but there is a problem: the headdress is Mohammedan, while the round incised mark on the forehead is Hindu. In the opinion of Dr. Kala it may be an Egyptian sphinx. According to the record of Francis Dean Mitchell, the original owner, this pregnant female is a thank offering to Lingam, a fertility god, from a nineteenth-century temple in Madura (South India). No other such figure seems to be known.

By way of Varanasi I reached Khajuraho, a famous place of architectural glory and wonderful sculptures. Although the archaeological museum is very small, it contains some rare objects of the Chandela dynasty (10th-12th century). The real wealth of sculptures is preserved in the temples of Khajuraho, built in three quarters of the city: Western, Eastern and Southern. Most of these are not now used for worship but are maintained by the Archaeological Department of India. Accompanied by Mr. Rao, the museum Curator, I started with the Western quarter, close to the Museum. Here are a great many Brahmanic temples of the Shaiva and Vaishanava sects. We first went to visit Varaha temple; the entire body of the colossal Varaha figure displays beautifully carved images of nine planets, eight dikpalas (guardians of directions), seven mother goddesses and many other gods. Heavy rain started and we waited over an hour for it to stop. Mr. Rao had to leave and I decided to go back to the hotel.

Next day I visited the Western quarter alone and saw many dikpala figures on the temple facade similar to the one in our museum. Many images of Shiva are shown as a dikpala, with four arms: a snake in the left, trident in the right, lower right in boon-bestowing position and the lower left holding ambrosia in a vessel. The head is crowned with jata-makuta (plaited hair). I believe our figure (Fig. 5) is Ishana, the guardian of the northeast direction, holding a trident in the upper right hand, a snake in the upper left; the lower right hand in exposition pose, which seems incongruous, and the headgear is that usually worn by Bhairava figures in Khajuraho. Mr. Dhaky of the American Academy of Varanasi holds the same view, but Mr. Rao thinks the figure may be Bhairava because of the headdress. According to Dr. Sivaramamurti, this is Dhanvantari, an incarnation of Vishnu holding a vessel for ambrosia in his lower left hand, but Mr. Desikan does not believe that Dhanvantari holds the vessel in this way.

Later Mr. Rao accompanied me to the Eastern quarter temples which enshrine Jain

4. Terracotta figure at Missouri, with painted decoration. From South India, nineteenth century.
5. Sandstone sculpture at Missouri, representing Ishana. From Khajuraho, eleventh century.


7. Brass figure of Rama at Missouri. Western India, sixteenth century.
Tirthankars, such as Parsvanatha, Adinath and Shantinatha. The Southern quarter consists of Chaturbhuj temple, which houses a colossal four-armed image of Harihara standing in tribhanga pose (body bent in three places). On the west outer side of the temple is carved a rare figure of Narasimhi (female energy of Narasimha, an incarnation of Vishnu). Evidently the Buddhist religion did not find a place in Khajuraho.

I had prepared my itinerary so that Sundays could be used for travel. On June 27 I left for Varanasi, and on Monday I visited the Archaeological Museum at Sarnath, five miles to the north. Sarnath is famous for its excavated sites, stupa and museums. This is the place where Buddha gave his first sermon. The sculpture collection ranges from the second century B.C. to the medieval period, and there are objects from excavations in the region.

Bharat Kala Bhavan, the Museum of Banaras Hindu University in Varanasi, has a large collection of paintings and a gallery of sculptures, many found around Varanasi.

The American Academy of Varanasi, which I visited later, specializes in the collection of photographs of Indian art from all over the country. These can be procured gratis for research purposes. I met Mr. M. A. Dhaky, a Research Associate there, and discussed a few of my photographs with him. One was a terracotta relief fragment. Mr. Dhaky believes that this (Fig. 6) is Yaksha holding a leaf or branch in his right hand. Dr. Kala, Dr. Shah and Dr. Agrawal hold the same view. On the other hand, Dr. Sivaramamurti identifies it as Kamadeva, God of Love, holding a flower arrow in the right hand and wearing a Kushan type of turban, and Mr. Gupta agrees, because of the facial expression and the floral decoration on shoulders and head. Dr. Joshi disagrees, however, because of the absence of a bow and five flower arrows. In my view it is possible that Kamadeva may be holding just one arrow and that the rest may be in the quiver. Since the figure is mutilated, it is difficult to be sure. Dr. Bhattacharya of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, and Dr. Motichandra think it might be Kubera, the Lord of the Yakshas, holding a corn branch in the right hand.

At Varanasi I caught the train and reached Patna, where it was raining heavily. Very few taxis were available, and to make things worse, the city had an epidemic of eye disease. The Curator of Patna Museum, Mr. Gupta, was ill and on leave; consequently I had to go to his house, which fortunately was near the museum. A very large collection of early terracottas and bronzes of Buddha from Kurkihar and Nalanda (Bihar) is in this museum.

I found it difficult to photograph in the museum as the galleries were always crowded. As we have said, many Indians go to a museum not to view the objects but to pay homage to the deities represented.

Nalanda, fifty miles from Patna, a beautiful and peaceful, though lonely place, attracts visitors from all over the world for its significant contribution to Buddhist art and religion. Its archaeological museum has a large collection of terracotta
seals and metal coins. The bronze images are displayed in niches; the door lintels and jambs of the temples are shown on the museum doors so that the museum looks spacious.

I also visited the excavations of the Old Nalanda University, destroyed in the twelfth century, where big halls were built for the monks to listen to the sermons delivered by Buddha. Later, in order to provide more space for the monks, two more stories were added, and it is amusing to see how the original stone images of Buddha in the four corners were enclosed in larger stone statues on these stories. This university was famous for the teaching of bronze casting during the 9th-12th centuries.

CALCUTTA, though a famous city, did not prove an exciting place for me. Owing to the political disturbances, it was not safe to go about alone, and almost impossible to get a taxi. The Director of the Indian Museum, Dr. A. K. Bhattacharya, was very busy in conferences, though he spared some time for the discussion of my photographs.

Of great value is the mobile exhibition, which was a unique experience for me. This exhibition, started in 1968, goes twice a year to the several nearby districts of West Bengal and Bihar and is brought back to headquarters during the rainy season for overhaul. The vehicle is especially constructed for this purpose. Niches are built into the sides, both outside and inside, and in these are displayed plaster models of original sculptures. Wooden boards are hinged on the outer walls to protect the models, and opened when the public comes to visit. Inside, glass doors are used. Each case shows the historical development of the art of one period. The displays are well organized and from time to time are changed. A guide goes with the driver to furnish explanations. Publications, postcards, pictures and replicas are offered for sale. The district schools and public libraries are informed of the schedule and they in turn inform the general public. This type of exhibition could be imitated usefully elsewhere.

My next halt was Bhubaneswar, known for its temples. Until recently the University of Missouri has been working with the Orissa University of Agriculture and Technology, under the University Development Program started in 1960 and sponsored by the United States Agency for International Development. Dr. Clifton Murphy, who was then chief of the program, arranged for me to stay in the State Guest House. The Curator of the State Museum, Mr. R. P. Mahapatra, was expecting me. The museum has a good collection of sculptures, mostly on Orissan art, and a few bronzes. The bronzes from Orissa are unusually heavy because the clay core is generally not removed from the larger pieces. Often the bronzes crack because the clay contracts.

Mr. Syam Sunder Patnaik, who escorted me to the galleries, told me that I must see the temples where lies the true beauty, and the study of which

would be really rewarding. I visited about eight large temples. Many beautifully carved figures have been stolen from their friezes. The most attractive and famous temple of Bhubaneswar is the Lingraja temple, surrounded by many small temples constructed later. The Jaina caves in the nearby Udaigiri and Khandagiri hills are very ancient; only remnants still exist. A modern Jain temple was constructed in 1837 on the crest of the Khandagiri hills. Although all the three major religions of India—Brahmanical, Jaina and Buddhist—flourished in Orissa during the 8th-11th centuries, yet the people of Orissa give prominence to Shiva.

The next day was reserved for Konark, sixty miles from Bhubaneswar, known for its Sun Temple. The place is named after the temple and means “corner for the sun.” Constructed in the twelfth century by Narasimha Deva, the temple represents the highest point of Orissan art. Its beauty lies in the depiction of scenes from all walks of human life and attempts to satisfy the expectations or desires of all types of people—warriors, scholars, priests, lovers, children and worshipers. The figure of the main deity is no longer in the temple. The archaeological museum displays parts of the Sun Temple beautifully and precisely restored.

Next I went to Hyderabad, the capital of Andhra Pradesh, which is predominantly Muslim. The Salar Jung Museum houses one man’s collection, an amazing variety of art objects from many parts of the world. It has a good collection of Western sculptures and bronzes, but only a few of Indian origin. Mrs. Tayaba Aijaz, the senior Technical Assistant, took me around the galleries. The museum contains, besides contemporary art, some early Jaina sculptures and Indian, Nepalese and Tibetan bronzes.

Later I went to the State Museum of Hyderabad. This museum, like many others, has some bronzes similar to ours, but comparative study was impossible because work on them is just beginning.

My visit to the Archaeological Museum of Nagarjunakonda was very short and not of much benefit because of misinformation on how to go there.
Very early on Friday, July 18, I left for Madras, a great center of learning and arts. When I reached the Government Museum, the Curator, Mr. Desikan, told me that the galleries were closed every Friday. I suggested that we might discuss some of my photographs instead. Mr. Desikan identified our brass figure (Fig. 7), a sixteenth-century object from Western India, as Krishna in preaching pose, not Rama, who was never a preacher. But Dr. Sivaramamurti thinks that this Rama seated in virasana pose, presenting the truths to sages, holding his right hand in preaching pose. He wears a sri vatsa mark on his chest. I agree with this view.

The Government Museum of Madras is one of the largest in South India, as far as the sculpture and bronze collection is concerned. Originally, I had thought I could complete my work in the museum on Saturday and spend Sunday visiting temples in the outskirts of Madras, since the museum offices would be closed. But the great variety of collections and the generous readiness of the curator to spend Sunday with me in the museum changed my plan. Thus I spent both days very usefully in visiting the galleries and photographing the objects. I realized that it is difficult to plan a definite schedule until one has seen or known the museum and the person in charge. I could well have used more time in Madras. Mr. Desikan gave me all his time, even outside regular museum hours. I learned a great deal visiting the galleries with him and bringing up problems that came to mind. One bronze figure (Fig. 8) interpreted by the Museum as a door keeper, in my opinion, Virabhadra. Another similar bronze (Fig. 9) in the Salar Jung Museum, identified as Bhairava, is also Virabhadra.

In Bangalore most of my time was spent in shopping, sightseeing and mailing my purchases home. In comparison to the Government Museum of Madras, the collection at Mysore Government Museum is very, very small. The museum displays some beautiful sculptures in the open. Since the curator, Mr. Manickyam, had read my paper on Virabhadra, he showed me some sculptures to ask my opinion whether they represented Virabhadra. They may rather be door keepers.

I was very anxious to go to Halebid and see the sculpture of the Hoyasala dynasty (12th-13th centuries) still preserved in the temples there. But I had only one day at my disposal, too little to make the trip. Thus I decided to spend my last day in Bangalore visiting the Vrindavan Gardens, that fairyland which has been the outdoor stage for many Indian movies, as well as some temples and picture galleries.

I returned to Bombay and went to the Prince of Wales Museum, where I had an appointment with Dr. Khandalavala, the Chairman of the Museum. He had not yet arrived, but Dr. Motichandra, the Director, was there, working in the same office. I introduced myself and told him that I had come to see Dr. Khandalavala to discuss some photographs I had brought. Dr. Motichandra expressed a desire to see them. I took out one photograph of Dipa Lakshmi (Fig. 10). He suggested it might be a village mother goddess holding a child, perhaps from Kerala, of the late eighteenth century. Dr. Khandalavala thought it might be a sixteenth-century bronze, probably from Tanjore District, Madras. Dr. Sivaramamurti, on the other hand, suggested that this rare bronze is of the late eighteenth century, from South India. In the opinion of Dr. Joshi, it might be earlier than the seventeenth century and from Andhra Pradesh, because of the tattoo marks on the cheeks and chin and button-type nose ornament (launga) on both sides. But Dr. Agrawal thought that the figure might be a folk art Ambika in the form of Dipa Lakshmi, because Ambika is fond of parrots, and this figure is accompanied by three parrots. However, Dr. Samuel Eilenberg, who presented the figure to our museum, pointed out what was not clear in the photograph: that the figure held by Dipa Lakshmi is an adult with a mustache, representing the donor in devotion. He mentioned that he has seen many similar figures in the temples of south India.

Later I went to see Mr. Shetti to find out about the bronze collection of the Prince of Wales Museum which I had not seen earlier. He told me that I could see it the following Monday. The Museum has a good collection on Nepal and Tibet but very little on India. By this time I had gotten a bit tired of visiting museums. Just for a change, I decided to visit my relatives in Bhavnagar and Ahmedabad to engage in some extra-museum activities.
A non-stop bus was the most convenient way to go to Baroda, and I was happy to see Dr. U. P. Shah at the bus station. Dr. Shah took me to his son’s home, where he had kindly arranged for me to stay, and gave me a message from Shri M. N. Gandhi, Keeper of the Baroda Museum and Picture Gallery, with whom I made an appointment to see the galleries on Sunday. Dr. Shah, who had seen our collection in Missouri, said that many of our objects are very good and being of unusual nature, they are worth studying in depth. Many more sources need to be consulted for comparative illustrations. He made these useful observations:

(a) Most of the objects are manifestations of folk art, and so far, Indian folk art has not been studied in great detail;

(b) The best way to locate similar objects is to go to various areas, see the sculpture, talk to the people of the region, and learn the names and purposes of the objects. Old specimens of art still in the temple remains can yield good results if studied comparatively;

(c) The art dealers themselves often know details of the objects such as their date, name and provenance.

At the Baroda Museum I found that the Director had left for Europe to make inquiries about a missing stone Surya (sun god) idol of the ninth century which was presumed to have been stolen. This unhappy incident had created uneasiness among those who work in the museum. Despite this, Mr. Gandhi was good enough to take objects out of the showcases for me to photograph them.

JAIPUR, the beautiful pink city of India and the capital of Rajasthan, is famous for its myriad palaces and its ivory work. My brother is a surgeon in Jaipur, and I had planned to be there on August 6, the day of Raksabandhan, a festival when sisters tie an auspicious thread on their brother’s wrist. After a lapse of twenty-five years, I was able to offer this in person to my brother. It was an immensely valuable occasion for me to be with my brother on that day. Since it was a holiday, I did not want to disturb Dr. R. C. Agrawal, Director of the State Archaeological Department. I called to find out when he would be in his office, and next morning I went to see him. When I showed him my photographs, he confirmed my view that our objects are of a complex nature. He had not seen similar ones. He made a number of useful suggestions with the aim of making our objects known to museums and collections in India. He also recommended that I see the Amer Museum, only five miles from Jaipur, which has a very good collection of sculpture from Rajasthan.

I then went to see Mr. Gupta, Superintendent of the State Archaeology Department, as Dr. Agrawal had suggested. Mr. Jagadhari, the Curator of the Government Central Museum, was also there. They were quite keen to see my photographs. Mr. Gupta confessed that although he had been working in the field from the beginning of his career, he had never met such a challenge. He liked my method of research and documentation.

Mr. Gupta observed that one bronze (Fig. 11) could be Arjuna in devotional pose,17 while the other (Fig. 12), which is of the same style,18 is identified by Dr. Sivaramamurti as Kiratamurti. The four-armed figure represents Shiva as a Kirata (hunter) who challenged Arjuna in wrestling to test his prowess before he could give him the most
powerful weapon, *pasupatastra*. Shiva's consort Parvati, in the guise of a huntress, is seated on his left thigh. The pair is from Maharashtra, of the seventeenth century.

The Government Central Museum of Jaipur does not have many sculptures, but the specimens of modern and folk art are displayed in a well organized manner and there is a collection of recordings of folk songs and conversations, played for visitors when desired.

Having successfully completed my visits to nineteen museums in India, I returned to Delhi on August 11. I was extremely gratified that by God's grace, I did not get even a headache during these two months. I kept in perfect health, although I lived in all sorts of climates and had to eat all types of food. But the moment I returned to Delhi, I fell ill. Nevertheless, I visited the Archaeological Museum in Mathura, which is well known for early terracottas and sculptures excavated at nearby sites. Most of the sculptures date around the 2nd century A.D., a little later than the Gandhara School, showing less Hellenistic influence. Some Gandhara and Pala sculptures are also displayed.

It seemed as if I had reached the end of my journey. During those days in Delhi, the buses were on strike and it was almost impossible to get a conveyance of any sort. On August 18 I intended to leave for Sanchi, but was compelled to cancel the trip as I was feeling too weak. Finally, I left India on August 29.

I am happy to conclude that my trip was on the whole a great success. I visited the sculpture and bronze galleries of every museum and learned more about the art of the regions.

This tour also gave me an opportunity to meet some of the most learned authorities in the field. My deliberations with them enabled me to know their views on certain objects which I was not able to identify at all. In other cases, they helped me to confirm or correct my views.

Another great gain of this visit was my acquaintance with the collections of various museums in India. I had thought that many museums might have objects similar to ours, and that I would be able to do some comparative study, but I found that this was not true. I concluded that I should have visited smaller regions, to which my objects belonged. My trip was organized mostly around the museums in the capitals of the various states of India, and although I visited some site museums, in most cases I was short of time to visit sites or temples for deeper study and detailed observation. The establishment of professional relationships with the museum heads and arranging exchange of publications was also most valuable.

Evidently I accomplished what I wanted to do. I am grateful to all the specialists who gave me their valuable time in spite of heavy administrative responsibilities. All except a few site museums willingly permitted me to photograph the objects in their collections and provided all the help they could. I am most thankful to them.

SARLA D. NAGAR

University of Missouri-Columbia
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Portrait of a Lady

LINING THE CORRIDORS of university buildings and old homes are the forgotten remnants of America's once flourishing portrait painting tradition. For the two and a half centuries before the invention of photography, unknown numbers of itinerant artists worked to record the likenesses of prosperous Americans, and many of the surviving examples of their work—remarkable mostly for their unimaginative compositions, dull coloring and awkward technique—seemingly justify the neglect shown them by both passers-by and art historians.

Occasionally, however, among the ranks of uniformly expressionless faces there will be one which has a human immediacy for the viewer. A fine portrait owned by the Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Missouri-Columbia, exemplifies both the best and worst aspects of this tradition: the features are conventionally immobile, the composition is arranged according to formula, and so forth, but nonetheless our nineteenth-century matron is portrayed with a presence that is more than the mere recording of her image.

The portrait shows a woman seated, her arms resting on the arms of a chair, so that beneath her right hand is visible the scroll forming the end of the chair arm. She is presented in the conventional three-quarter view and is placed before a background of light brown with red and yellow tints. To break up the solid ground, the artist used the common compositional device of a vertical line, which represents a corner of the room.

The hands have a rubbery look, and their streaked highlighting and boneless form resemble the drapery seen under her left arm and behind her shoulder rather than the flesh of the face. The latter exhibits a loose brushwork, in contrast to the smooth linear treatment of the dress, and it is painted in yellow, pink and white, applied in dots. The lace of the cap, crowned by a bow lined with orange, is also handled in this sketchy, impressionistic way. It was common for itinerant portraitists to have their canvasses pre-painted except for the head, which they filled in after they received a commission, and this could account for the different ways in which the two parts of the canvas are treated in the Missouri portrait.

Contrasting with the directness of presentation, however, is the mystery that surrounds the sitter's identity and the portrait's origin. Not only is the work undated, untitled and unsigned; but thus far an attempt to trace it back through previous owners has been totally unsuccessful. However, even without a known provenance, it is possible to place the portrait in the historical context of American portrait painting.

The earliest tradition in the New World, that of the untrained "limners," dates from the Colonial period and reflects the conscientious effort of the artist to record the features of his sitter. Puritanically rejecting such concerns as color, texture or flattering likeness as being vain and "Catholic," they concentrated on recording unmercifully every wart and wrinkle. As they were unschooled, their shading fails to attain any semblance of threedimensionality; instead, their pictures become maps of facial depressions and protuberances. Traces of this style still persisted in isolated cases as late as the 1830s, even though it had long been subordinated to other portrait painting traditions.

The inferiority which many American artists tended to feel toward their counterparts in Europe may account for the expatriation of many of them just before 1776. Benjamin West, John Trumbull, Gilbert Stuart and John Singleton Copley all followed this trend, only to return years later to the United States to practise their art and spread European ideas of style. The Van Dyck tradition, with its broad masses of light and dark, graceful poses and aristocratic overtones had some followers; though by far the most important influence on painting in the late eighteenth century was the baroque Grand Style of Gainsborough and Reynolds. Also aristocratic in concept, this style is most easily recognized by the careful concern these artists show in rendering the luxurious sheen and texture of fabrics. Their paintings have a self-conscious delicacy and grace, tending toward a
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rejection of realism in favor of idealization and prettiness. They sacrifice the focus on the face to a concern for clothing, or for elaborate architectural or landscape backgrounds.

The most important trend in Early American portraiture, however, revolves around the monumental figure of Gilbert Stuart. This artist, who painted the portrait of George Washington that appears engraved on one-dollar bills, also studied in England under West, but quickly showed a real distinctiveness of style and ability. In 1792 he returned to America and began to paint the works that transformed the fashionable mode of portraiture. Stuart’s major contribution came in shifting the emphasis back to the face—and specifically to character expression. In order to do this he disregarded excessive emphasis on clothing and replaced the illusionistic background with a plain field of a dark neutral color; he insisted that his sitters disarrange perfectly combed hair and wear ordinary clothing. He still attempted to make the effect pleasing to the eye, however, mostly by using warm colors and concentrating on the translucent flesh tones which he portrayed so convincingly. Still, his primary concern was always the representation of the transitory expression that revealed character.

It can easily be seen that our portrait is closely tied to this tradition. It has the same emphasis on the face, limiting the background to a brown field and toning down the sheen of the taffeta dress which the sitter wears. Also there is a distinct difference between the painterly handling of the flesh of the face and the precise linear treatment of the rest of the picture. This concentration on the face shows the influence of Stuart’s hierarchical approach to portraiture.

But though this explains historically the origin of some of the motifs used in the Missouri portrait, stylistic connections do not help us very much in attempting identification. There were so many portraitists at work in America, some completely isolated and developing on their own, others traveling all over the country assimilating and spreading ideas, that it is impossible to discern from known schools much about date or origin. Instead, the most important evidence we have for dating relies on a field much better documented than that of American portraiture, namely fashion trends in women’s clothing.

Costume history can often establish precise limits for the period in which a given style was popular. For example, in our portrait the sitter wears a black taffeta dress with “leg-of-mutton” sleeves, and both this kind of sleeve and the black dress are known to have come into fashion in 1820.\(^4\) In the opinion of E. P. Richardson, the cap could not be earlier than 1825.\(^5\) However, if the collar and waistband are velvet, as they appear to be, we can narrow the dating somewhat in that “Black velvet came into fashion for trimming, for belts, for wristlets in 1832.”\(^6\) This date then, would seem to be the earliest at which our portrait can have been painted; as for the latest possible date, it must be 1835, when both this type of hat and the leg-of-mutton sleeves suddenly disappeared from fashion.\(^7\) Of course, a dress can survive after a change in fashion, but well-to-do women (and
only these could afford to have their portraits painted) were very conscious of new trends in clothing.

By far the most fascinating clue discovered in studying the portrait, however, is a name written in pencil on the stretchers as well as on the frame, which, from its script, appears to be quite old. It seems to read:

Mrs. G. Hume 912 St. Paul

And on the frame, partly obscured by a nail, one can make out the first part of the same name. At the suggestion of the Missouri State Historical Society, I began to trace the name genealogically through the Hume family.9

The Humes, descended from Scottish nobility, were a prosperous, widely scattered family, highly conscious and proud of their family history.10 The most common name in the family is George, and owing to the large size of the families, there were a great many women named Mrs. G. Hume at one time or another. Unfortunately, the book I consulted is confusing, besides being without indices, so it was not of much help. Thus far I have been unable to locate those Humes who have the family records.

Street guides for cities in the nineteenth century are relatively rare, and it was possible only to determine that New York has never had a street named St. Paul and neither has St. Louis (where many Humes settled). Boston acquired one sometime after 1856, but the city directories list no Humes living there. Baltimore, one of the few cities founded by Catholics, seemed a likely location for a St. Paul street, and indeed it has a main street of that name. From information supplied by the Maryland Historical Society, however, it appears that no Humes ever lived in Baltimore before 1850.

Early hopes that it might be possible to identify the artist of the portrait by stylistic analysis were virtually destroyed by the advice received from Mr. Richardson:

There were scores, even hundreds of artists capable of painting good portraits at that time (1825-35). Unless you can trace this canvas back to a place of origin, I should despair of narrowing down the list of possible artists. Chester Harding, Waldo, Inman, William E. West, why go on?

This admonishment made the search seem vain, as did the dearth of information on American portraitists beyond the usual ten or so that are frequently discussed and reproduced. Consequently, I was surprised when I did find an artist whose work exhibited remarkable parallels to our portrait.

The artist’s name, barely known outside his home state of Vermont except for one-line references in general works, is Benjamin Franklin Mason (1804-1871).11 In the example of his work shown here one can immediately sense its close relationship to our portrait: the turn of the head, the relationship of the size of the head to the canvas, and the large dark eyes of the two women. One can see similarities in the handling of the chair drapery as well as in the sheen of the hair. The authors of the article on Mason also remark on the distinction he makes between the texture of the black taffeta and the black velvet of Mrs. Wainwright’s dress. Other portraits by Mason from 1832 show a similar rubbery treatment of the hands, and one shows the same use of drapery over the subject’s left shoulder.12 Even more convincing, however, is this statement:

The portrait of Judge Fay . . . brings out, for the first time . . . a very characteristic device—that of placing a small highlight on the upper surface of the under eyelid. This device, which we have not observed in the work of any of Mason’s contemporaries . . . serves plastically to place the eyeball of a painted subject definitely and surely behind the lid. Mason’s eyes are often very large, and without the lid-spot they might easily seem to come forward.13

The University portrait also has this lid-spot device. However, though these parallels are striking, it is impossible to propose a secure attribution.

Recent restoration of the painting has returned to us a considerably older woman.14 It seems that an attempt was once made to soften the lines of the face, and in so doing the aging jaw was painted over. Now this paint has been removed along with the overpaint of the background, and the work restored to its original condition. The result,
Portrait of Mrs. Rufus Wainright, by Benjamin Franklin Mason. Photo courtesy of the Sheldon Museum, Middlebury, Vermont.
though somewhat less grand, is rather more interesting in the unflinching realism that shows the artist’s acquaintance with the limner mode.

The portrait’s identity has not been discovered despite the restoration and careful cleaning. All in all, an attribution probably will have to wait until the field of American portraiture is better documented.

MELISSA WILLIAMS
University of Missouri-Columbia

1 Acc. No. 68.456. 86.7 x 68.5 cm. Gift of Mr. Russell M. Arundel. See Muse 3 (1969) 13, for a reproduction of the painting before restoration.

2 See, for example, portraits in the North Carolina Portrait Index (Chapel Hill 1963) 62, 124.

3 For example, one book on the subject is entitled 1440 Early American Portrait Painters (Newark 1940).


5 This information came from Mr. E. P. Richardson, author of Painting in America, who wrote on November 29, 1971, a reply to my letter asking his opinion of the Missouri portrait. His help was very much appreciated.

6 McClellan, op. cit., 14.

7 Mr. Richardson is the source of the information regarding the hat; for the sleeves, see McClellan, op cit., 160. Hair dyeing became popular at this time, which may account for the fact that the subject of our portrait looks older than her dark brown hair would suggest.

8 Discovered by Mrs. Barbro Evans, whose help has been invaluable to me.

9 I am grateful to the staff of the Missouri Historical Society, particularly Mrs. Oliver Howard and Mrs. James Comfort, for their time and help.

10 At least two books have been written on the Hume genealogy by members of the family: E. E. Hume, Hume. A Colonial Scottish Jacobite Family (Richmond, Virginia 1931) and J. R. Hume, History of the Hume Family (St. Louis 1903).


12 From North Carolina Portrait Index, 70.


14 The painting was cleaned and restored by James Roth.
An Extraordinary Teotihuacán Mural

A Teotihuacán mural with an indisputable notation of glyphs arranged in columnar form is a rarity. Such a mural is in the collections of the University of Missouri.¹ We believe that it has considerable potential importance for the study of the Teotihuacán writing system.

The mural is a relatively small fragment, painted in tones of red, which comes from the site of Teotihuacán, an enormous ancient metropolis in Central Mexico noted for its two great pyramids, located about twenty-five miles northeast of modern Mexico City. Considered the most highly urbanized center of its time in the New World (its life span extended from about the time of Christ to A.D. 750), the city at its peak (ca. A.D. 500-600) extended over an area of about eight square miles, had a probable population of about 125,000 people, and was the preeminent power in

Mural fragment from Teotihuacán, Mexico (ca. A.D. 500). Left: detail of the mural, showing two glyphs.
Aerial view of Teotihuacán. In the foreground is the Pyramid of the Moon, at the north end of the central ceremonial avenue, the "Street of the Dead." On the east side of the great avenue is the much larger Pyramid of the Sun. Beyond it is the precinct known as the Ciudadela (citadel). Across the avenue from it are remains of a huge precinct known as the "Great Compound" (mostly unexcavated); here the city's largest market place was probably located. The structures lining the Street of the Dead are both religious and residential. The surrounding area was densely crowded with dwellings, many in the form of walled apartment compounds. Photo courtesy of R. Millon.

much of Middle America.²

Mural painting was the major art form of the Teotihuacanos, who decorated both their residences and their sacred structures with wall paintings. Unfortunately, there is no way to determine from what type of building this fragment comes. But the position of the little figure within the diamond-shaped border shows that it came from the upper part of a wall which must have been painted with a series of interlocking, diamond-shaped designs, each enclosing an identical figure. This manner of decorating upper walls, which became popular sometime during the Xolalpan phase (ca. 450-650), produces a kind of wallpaper effect.³

Paintings executed in tones of red sometimes are the only paintings in a structure, or they may occur side by side with polychrome paintings. In style and technique the fragment is an excellent example of "typical" Teotihuacán mural painting. In subject matter, however, it is strikingly different, even though the figure represented is like many figures in other murals, usually described as priests clad in ceremonial attire.⁴

This priestly figure wears round ear ornaments, a feathered headdress which seems to extend partway down his back, a necklace in two parts (one of which may have been obsidian or shell rings), an elaborately tied loin cloth, a short cloak, a dotted undergarment, and sandals. His eyes are surrounded by the "goggles" characteristically associated with the Teotihuacán deity known as the "Rain God," and a painted line decorates his cheek. Emerging from his mouth is an object known as a "speech scroll." In his left hand the figure holds an incense container, the bag designed in the form of a rattlesnake tail. From his right hand falls a panel-like object which, like the "speech scroll," is decorated with dots. Frequently such "panels" also contain representa-
tions of seeds, shells, discs of jade and, occasionally, figurine heads and ceramic vessels. Most standing figures seem intended to be visualized as walking, and the presumption is that whatever is being represented in the “falling panel” is being cast on the ground in the course of a ritual. This may take the literal form of a libation, which appears to be the case here, or may allude to objects related in some way to the ritual being enacted. The diamond-shaped border surrounding the figure is decorated with footprints (visible in the upper left corner), one of the most common symbols in Teotihuacán art.

The unusual, indeed extraordinary, element in this painting is the fact that its two glyphs are painted one above the other in front of the figure. The columnar form used by the artist, brief as it is, resembles inscriptions of the Maya and Zapotec peoples contemporary with the Teotihuacanos, and also inscriptions common at a much later date, such as those found in Mixtec codices. In these inscriptions the columnar form indicates that the symbols are ordered to produce a text of some sort. Teotihuacán glyphs were not arranged in this manner. Glyphic representations range widely from what looks like a random scatter of symbols over a surface to a patterned repetition within the border of a painting. But they are not found painted one above the other, as they are in the Missouri example.

The upper glyph is a cone-shaped object, probably representing a tassel adhering to a bar. It resembles what Caso called a “tied object” associated with the headdress of the “Rain God” (a deity often called by the same name as his later Aztec counterpart, Tlaloc). The lower glyph is the head of a canine, probably a coyote, seen in profile, its tongue hanging out. The furzy pelt is represented by thin lines. Animals believed to be coyotes are found in a number of Teotihuacán murals and also on decorated ceramic vessels. The coyote is represented at Tula, the later Toltec center (ca. A.D. 1000); and even later, in the Aztec period, at the time of the Spanish Conquest in 1521, it was still regarded as a sacred animal, the deity of craftsmen who did elaborate work with feathers.

The glyphs undoubtedly refer to the figure which they accompany. One possibility is that they represent a name, whether of place, person or group. But other interpretations cannot be precluded. The meaning of the two glyphs is, for the present, an intriguing puzzle.

GLARA MILLON
University of Rochester

EVELYN RATTRAY
University of Missouri-Columbia

1Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Missouri-Columbia, Acc. No. 68.474. Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Merrin. Preserved height 43.5 cm., width 54 cm. Lime-plaster surface irregularly chipped along edges. Some surface deterioration, but major outlines clearly visible.


4For a well known example of such figures see E. Edwards, Painted Walls of Mexico (Austin 1966) 17, pl. 2; M. Covarrubias, Indian Art of Mexico and Central America (New York 1957) pl. 31, above.

5See, e.g., E. Edwards, op. cit., pl. 6, above, opposite 20, and pls. 12, 25, for “falling panels” with such representations. See also Covarrubias, op. cit., color plate opposite 132.

6One other column of glyphs, much longer, is known at present, very badly fragmented and unrestored. Among the symbols represented are a number which appear to be foreign. The pictorial context in which the glyphs occur also contains foreign representations. See A. Villagra, “Trabajos Realizados en Teotihuacán: 1952,” Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia: 1952 (Mexico 1955) VI, part 1, no. 34, 69-78; C. Million, op. cit.; C. Hall, op. cit.

7See Covarrubias, op. cit., 210-212 for a brief discussion of ancient Middle American writing systems. Covarrubias also illustrates Zapotec glyphic texts from Oaxaca (150, fig. 62); texts from the Maya of Southern Mexico and Guatemala (212, fig. 92; color plate opposite 228); and examples of Mixtec writing (301, fig. 129; 302, fig. 130). Mixtec-speaking peoples lived in what are now the states of Puebla and Oaxaca, where the Spanish conquerors found them.

8See, e.g., E. Edwards, op. cit., 19, pl. 3; 30, pl. 16; Covarrubias, op. cit., 128, fig. 53, second row from bottom, left; bottom row, right.

9A. Caso, “Dioses y Signos Teotihuacanos,” Teotihuacán 1, 253, figs. 6a, b, c, 7. Onceava Mesa Redonda, Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología (Mexico 1967).
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