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Preface

A recent work regarding Islamic metalwork and specifically the Fatimid contributions came to the author’s attention after the submission of this thesis. The work listed below is noted and will be reviewed for any additional Fatimid metal objects that might impact this thesis.
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Chapter 1
Historical Introduction

Metalwork in the Islamic world encompasses a large geographical area from Spain to India, over an enormous time-period with the earliest dynasty, the Rashidun Caliphate in 632 CE to the present. Islamic metalwork includes numerous categories of artisanship incorporating arms, armor, vessels, utensils, coins, jewelry, tools, scientific instruments, figurines and polycandela. The focus of this writing however will be to analyze the four categories of metal objects into which the vast bulk of Fatimid metalwork falls, namely vessels, utensils, figurines, lamps and polycandela.

The Fatimids (909-1171) were an Islamic dynasty of Shi ‘i origin which at one time occupied much of North Africa and other areas comprising modern Egypt, Sudan, Libya, the Maghreb, Malta, Sicily, the Levant and the Hijaz (app. I, A). The Fatimids began their conquest eastward from Tunisia in the 10th century and captured Egypt in 969 CE from the Ikhshidid dynasty, a vassal state of the Abbasids. The founding of the city Cairo was the result and it became a new seat for their caliphate. Emerging from the Fatimid capital would be a tremendous wealth of decorative art, including ceramics, ivory, woodwork, glass and today’s much-neglected medium of metalwork.

The bulk of Islamic metalwork in existence consists of luxurious metal objects made of copper, brass, bronze, tin and iron. These objects can be whole or inlaid, i.e., brass inlaid with silver or gold. It is estimated that there are only 70-80 surviving solid silver objects from the medieval Islamic world.¹ The scarcity of solid gold and silver metal objects in existence today was due to their portability and the need for their value during a financial crisis or war. Often they were melted down and reused to pay debts. In other cases, their high value and easy

¹ Allan, Pots and Pans 57.
mobility made them prized booty through invasions and wars, such as the allegedly looted Pisa Griffon (fig. 313).² Gold and silver metal objects however were abundant in the Islamic world especially during the Fatimid period. The 11th century Persian traveler Nasir-i Khusraw having visited the Ka’ba in Mecca mentioned the wealth of precious metals used to furnish the mosque. He particularly noted the silver plated doors, door rings, six silver mihrabs with gilt and niello decoration and silver mosque lamps.³ Nasir-i Khusraw in another journey to the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem recorded the presence of silver lamps donated from the Fatimid Caliph al-Zahir with his name inscribed in gold on the base.⁴ Another reason for the scarcity of expensive metal objects was the prohibition of their usage in funerary burial under the praxis of Islam. The utilitarian class of metal objects, those that were made coarsely, also does not boast many examples as the substance of this category was often melted for scrap when no longer functional or desired.⁵ Finally, although accounts of vast Fatimid wealth in silver and gold were recorded, there was a shortage of silver in the Near Eastern Region during the 11th and 12th centuries.⁶ This might account for the limited number of surviving Fatimid metal objects, as fewer were produced toward the decline of the Fatimid Caliphate. There was also a revolt in the 11th century that resulted in a sacking of the royal treasury in Cairo and consequently many objects were lost.

Islamic metalwork is found today in museums and private collections, with new objects appearing in auctions and exhibitions occasionally. In some instances religious organizations, ecclesiastical and Islamic houses of worship still host some fine examples. The treasuries of Christian-European religious organizations, churches and monasteries dating from the medieval period were a known source of Islamic decorative arts including metalwork. Their collections of

---

² Dodds et al., Al-Andalus 216.
³ Ward, Islamic Metalwork 14.
⁴ Bloom, Arts City Victorious 100.
⁵ Ward, Islamic Metalwork 14.
⁶ Allan, Pots and Pans 58.
Islamic metal objects often emerged from the spoils of the returning Crusaders (a supposed example would again be the Pisa Griffon, fig. 313) or through trade. Additional sources of Islamic metalware and particularly precious metal objects would be from archaeological investigations such as the recent discovery of the Fatimid hoard in Caesarea or the another Fatimid hoard from Tiberias. In the first example, a family that probably fled the violence from the city of Caesarea during the Fatimid era secretly buried their metal possessions for safety to be retrieved during more stable times. In the second example, a metalsmith, fleeing from the city of Tiberias, buried the contents of his workshop for later retrieval. The Tiberias hoard was actually the largest known discovery of Fatimid metalwork in the world. Other possible sources for hoards are shipwrecks, such as the cache of metalwork discovered in the 11th century shipwreck at Serçe Limani, Turkey. In this instance, a joint Fatimid-Byzantine commercial ship sank, which preserved a hoard of Islamic metalwork from both the eastern and western spheres, including some from Fatimid Egypt and Syria. A treaty was signed in 1037 between the Fatimid and Byzantine Empires which provided for peaceable relations and improved joint commerce. The result was an increase in the wealth of metal objects and acquisition of new skills to produce metalwork from the Byzantines. All of the hoards will be discussed in Chapter Three.

In sum, we understand that most of the existing Islamic metalwork today that is pre-1200 was preserved in mosques, European religious organizations, churches and monasteries of the Middle Ages and indirectly in buried hoards and shipwrecks. The remaining metal objects survived because they were too valuable to be melted for scrap and not valuable enough to be

---

7 Dodds et al., Al-Andalus 216.
8 Arnon et al., Fatimid Hoard Caesarea 246.
9 Dayagi-Mendels et al., Chronicles of the Land 196-200.
10 Ponting, Scientific Analysis Tiberias 35.
11 Allan et al., Metal Vessels 348-50.
12 Hasson, Islamic Jewellery 56.
13 Ibid., 56-7.
melted down to pay debts. A typical post-1200 example would be a brass object inlaid with silver. Although the silver was valuable, it needed to be extracted from the brass to have any monetary benefit. Consequently, few solid gold and silver metal objects survive today and the utilitarian objects, which were discarded or melted down when no longer of any use, remain few in number.

**Metalwork in Egypt and the Greater Islamic World under the Umayyad, Abbasid and Fatimid Dynasties**

“It is generally accepted that Islamic art has its roots in the Eastern Mediterranean area, in Byzantine and Coptic arts on the one hand and in Sasanian and Central Asian arts on the other.”¹⁴ This applies especially to early Islamic metalwork production concerning pre-Islamic influences however it should be noted that the term Greater Persia over Central Asia better characterizes part of the metalwork in this research. Metalware from Egypt can be characterized as combining exterior influences from neighboring cultures with traditional crafts and techniques native to Egypt prior to the Islamic conquest. The Islamic triumph over Egypt led to familiarity with Byzantine and Coptic metalworking techniques and styles. Numerous subsequent Islamic dynasties were established in Egypt and brought their own version of artisanship and skills from foreign lands but not without having been influenced from pre-Islamic techniques and styles to varying degrees. This explains the difficulty in establishing a concrete provenance for some metalwork in the Early Islamic Period (622-1200) and specifically Fatimid metalwork. In some instances, the metal object might have come from Syria or parts of North Africa controlled by the Fatimid Caliphate, but through stylistic evaluation could be attributed to the Byzantine period. For our purposes, all metalwork produced during the Fatimid Caliphal period (909-1171)

---

¹⁴ Fehérvári et al., 1400 Years Islamic Art 23.
in Egypt and its surrounding territories, whether for Christian or Muslim patrons, is considered Fatimid.

An additional factor, which further complicates attribution of an exact origin for metal objects to the Fatimid period and both the Umayyad and Abbasid periods is that metal objects are portable. Metalware could have been produced in any of the territories of the Umayyads, Abbasids and Fatimids and then have been transported throughout the land through trade or spoils of war and sometimes as gifts to neighboring states.\textsuperscript{15} Transportation of metal objects to their findspots makes a secure provenance difficult to discern and consequently, reliance on stylistic analysis provides the strongest evidence for attribution to one of the three dynasties.

Alternatively, some museums and private collectors use scientific testing of the metals in the objects to attempt to provide a more reliable dating or provenance. These tests are expensive and often require a sample piece to be removed from the object. Additionally, metalwork produced in the Early Islamic Period sometimes re-utilized scraps from the pre-Islamic world. Fatimid metal objects might be divided and reused with later period metal objects, i.e., an incomplete Fatimid lampstand in the Sackler Museum of Art at Harvard University in Cambridge (fig. 202). The middle section of the lampstand is datable to the Fatimid period but the top and bottom sections were not and are stylistically a Persian design, especially in regard to the feet. A test of the metals in the object therefore might produce inconclusive results. Scientific analysis of metalwork is not as reliable as it is for ivory, wood or other decorative arts, due to the vagaries of melting, remolding and soldering.

The usage of stylistic evidence to support identification of metalwork from the Umayyad, Abbasid and Fatimid periods does not necessarily produce a secured origin. Nonetheless, it remains an important factor in the identification of pieces from the three dynasties. Although

\textsuperscript{15} Hasson, Islamic Jewellery 58-9.
very few metal objects created in gold and silver remain from the three Caliphal periods in Egypt, historical and literary evidence provide accounts of their existence.16 A review of existing examples and historical and literary texts indicates that during the Fatimid period gold and silver metal objects were more common than in the Umayyad and Abbasid periods. This is partially supported through archaeological finds from the Umayyad period in Egypt, Syria and Jordan, which seldom provide any examples of precious metals. A majority of the surviving precious metal objects from the Umayyad period or earlier transitional Rashidun Caliphate (632-661) originated from Iran, although it was probable that during the Umayyad period, a large quantity of their precious metalwork was produced at their capital in Damascus. Undoubtedly, the great wealth the Fatimids commanded had a strong influence on the types of materials used in the creation of decorative arts. Regarding stylistic analysis, metalwork styles from the Fatimid period demonstrated a more distinctive influence of pre-Islamic decoration as compared to metal objects from the Umayyad and Abbasid periods. The Fatimid adoption of pre-Islamic ideas, especially from Egypt, developed into their distinctive conception of themes and decoration.

The hadith forbade the use of precious metals for any Muslim e.g., “He who drinks from a silver vessel will have hellfire gurgle in his belly.” Nevertheless, precious metal objects were prevalent during the Islamic periods of rule in Egypt and its adjacent territories. Figural decoration was also usually avoided in the Islamic world in a religious context. While not expressly condemned in the Holy Quran, it was generally forbidden because it was reminiscent of earlier religions that practiced idolatry and iconography. Human and animal decorations were very common however in Islamic decorative arts. Surprisingly, during the Fatimid period human decoration specifically on metalware remained scarce although it was very prevalent on

---

16 Bloom, Arts City Victorious 99-100.
17 Ward, Islamic Metalwork 14.
18 Ibid., 19.
other mediums such as carved ivory, wood and ceramics. As mentioned previously human figural imagery, particularly nude women during the Umayyad period seemed to be far more prevalent on metalwork than in the Fatimid period. One example from the Umayyad period is a bronze and iron brazier with two nude females from al-Fudayn, Jordan (fig. 1). The only surviving freestanding human figural example of metalwork remaining from the Fatimid period is the tambourine player from the Islamic Museum of Cairo (fig. 126). Although other figural imagery and two abstract figures were also known in Fatimid metalwork, they are not comparable to the female musician. There is no evidence to explain the disproportionate usage of human figural imagery employed on other mediums of the decorative arts except for metalware during the Fatimid period. Animal and zoomorphic decoration remained a common Fatimid theme. Numerous Fatimid zoomorphic metal objects survive such as aquamaniles, ewers, figurines, incense burners, lampstands and waterspouts, incorporating both realistic and fantastic animals such as birds, gazelle, hare, lions and griffons; these will be discussed in Chapter Three.

The response to a need for decoration other than figural in the Islamic world led to the creation and advancement of geometric, vegetal and epigraphic forms and designs. These forms of decoration were widespread throughout the Dar al-Islam and dominated the artistic program in the individual Islamic dynasties of Egypt. Elaborate epigraphy was developed on certain metalwork with intricately detailed arabesques or vegetal designs that filled the background and in some cases interacted with the epigraphic bands. It was in the Fatimid period that geometric, vegetal and epigraphic decoration particularly blossomed in the form of scrolling vines and palmettes. In the medium of Fatimid metalwork, epigraphy was not a common theme however one should note that some of the identified Fatimid metal objects do indeed contain epigraphy such as a silver spice box (fig. 233), a bucket (fig. 229) and a cylindrical box (fig. 236), despite
the contrary opinion of some scholars. Numerous Fatimid metalwork examples had some form of epigraphic details, even simple utilitarian objects.

A Concentration on Fatimid Metalwork

Metalwork produced during the Fatimid presence in Egypt yielded some of the finest metal objects in the Islamic world. Although metalwork manufactured under the Umayyads, Abbasids and Ayyubids was worthy of great regard, even with the Ayyubid usage of metal inlay work in Egypt, a novel 12th century technique, Fatimid metalwork surpassed the other dynasties as with most of their contributions to the decorative arts. Even the simplest most utilitarian object such as a cast bucket for washing (fig. 229) or a silver mirror-back (fig. 234) were decorated. The bucket was made of cast copper and contained patterns around the lip and below the Kufic inscription, which was situated just below the lip. The mirror reverse was made of hammered silver; the decoration consisted of a heart-shaped scrolling motif with three guard bands and two Kufic inscriptions, one of which circled around a large boss at the center. The great attention to detail and effort to provide some form of decoration even to simple metal items during the Fatimid period was evident from their work. It was this detail and decoration, which enabled Fatimid metalwork to develop and surpass the quality and style of previous Islamic dynasties in Egypt.

Attention to Fatimid metalwork is also warranted due to the modern world’s inadequate knowledge regarding Fatimid metal objects and the incorrect information regarding those that are in existence. The scarcity of metalware from the Fatimid period, for the reasons previously mentioned and the uniqueness of the surviving metalwork as compared with that produced in

---

19 Bloom, Arts City Victorious 97.
20 Ward, Islamic Metalwork 71.
21 Bloom, Arts City Victorious 98-9.
22 Ballian et al., Benaki Museum 71.
other dynasties thus requires a thorough review and for a corpus to be created, something not attempted before. An example of this uniqueness in Fatimid metalwork is the silver mirror-back (fig. 234), which came from a European collection assembled in Alexandria in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The mirror-back might be from the period of the Fatimid Caliph al-Mustansir whose treasury was sacked by rebelling mercenaries.

Chapter 2

Umayyad and Abbasid Metalwork

The Umayyads (661-750), having succeeded the transitional Rashidun Caliphate (632-661), ruled from their capital at Damascus over a vast territory, which would grow as the Umayyad Caliphate expanded and then later end with their expulsion under the Abbasids (app. I, A-D). The Umayyads who escaped would later reestablish their Caliphate in Spain at Córdoba (756-1031). It was the first Umayyad Caliphate in the Early Islamic Period and their metalwork production however that is most relevant to the Fatimid period. During the advent of Islam and under the development of an Islamic praxis, pre-Islamic cultures were an influential force on Islamic thought, culture and civilization. This was also apparent in the decorative arts, especially metalwork.

Metalwork produced during the Umayyad period was heavily dependent on Sasanian, Byzantine and Coptic styles, themes and imagery. As the Caliphate emerged, Umayyad metalwork developed its own characteristics. Although Christians, Zoroastrians and other non-Muslims were still produced metalwares into the Umayyad period that can also be classified as Umayyad metalwork. As a result a large quantity of metal objects of this period, particularly from Egypt and Syria are Christian themed, including bowls, censers, crosses, incense burners and other objects (figs. 4-6).
In the Abbasid period (in Egypt 750-969), metalwork advanced from the Umayyad period though retained certain common styles, themes and designs. Metalwork from the Abbasid Caliphate could have been produced in their capital at Baghdad and the styles copied in Egypt from imported examples. The development of metalwork between the Umayyad, Abbasid and Fatimid periods does have certain clear delineations. The differences are based mostly on style and in the Fatimid period additionally through theme, shape and greater attention to detail.

**Introduction to Umayyad Metal Objects**

In order to trace the development of Islamic metalwork that was produced in the Fatimid period, it is necessary to begin with a brief survey of that produced in the Umayyad and Abbasid periods. The majority of metalwork produced in the Umayyad period and that survives today can be classified as utilitarian. Such objects include basins, bottles, bowls, braziers, cups, ewers, flasks, kettles, keys, kitchen utensils, lamps, lamp-handles, lampstands, polycandela, trays, vases and weights. Additional objects include censers, crosses, incense burners, ornaments and throne embellishments, which cannot be considered utilitarian and instead were for decorative or ceremonial use. In the Umayyad period figural decoration of the decorative arts, although more prevalent in the Fatimid period, consisted only of small human, animal and zoomorphic features, which decorated some utilitarian and ceremonial metal objects. In the few examples of figural-shaped objects in the Umayyad period, their purpose is utilitarian such as two alleged spice boxes in the shapes of an elephant and ram (figs. 7-8). On the contrary, in the Fatimid period freestanding figures existed such as a tambourine player (fig. 126) and gazelle (fig. 129).

In Umayyad metalwork, the materials employed are bronze, brass, copper and iron, which are mostly cast. There are few examples of gold or silver metalware objects that are known to survive and the few known have been revealed through archaeological investigation.
Some of the limited examples of gold and silver objects include ewers datable to the 6th-7th centuries in Persia and a silver stand from the Umayyad period. These objects will be discussed in further detail. Additionally, several silver objects of non-utilitarian function or of unknown function were produced at the Umayyad court of Córdoba. These will be discussed in detail with a comparison to the Pisa Griffon in Chapter Four.

**Umayyad Metalwork and Figural Usage**

An example of human figural work as embellishment can be found on a bronze and iron brazier discovered at al-Fudayn, Jordan (fig. 1). The brazier probably consisted of four eagles used as protomes to support the arcaded sides, only one of which remains that consists of two eagle protomes and an arcade (fig. 1.2). In each of the niches of the arcade are figures in bas-relief. Above each of the two eagle protomes rests a nude woman, typical of the Umayyad style; each woman holds an eagle in her right hand (fig. 1.3). The brazier is mobile, as a wheel is disguised under each of the talons of the two eagle protomes (fig. 1.4). Another example of human figural use from the Umayyad period can be found at the Musée du Louvre at Paris, a copper female in the nude that likely comes from Egypt is strikingly similar to the al-Fudayn figures (fig. 2). The figure is adorned with a necklace; the same as the al-Fudayn figures and with a related animated pose, except in the Louvre example the figure holds crotales or clappers, instead of a perched eagle. The close resemblance between the Louvre and al-Fudayn figures cannot be overlooked, nor their similitude with Coptic imagery of nude women commonly found in the decorative arts especially on textiles, metalwork and ceramics. Two nude female figures in the Musée du Louvre at Paris (app. I, E-F) are datable to the pre-Islamic Byzantine period in Egypt, they both reflect Coptic styles in their shape and appearance. A comparison of these two nudes with the Umayyad period examples indicates the stylistic development that occurred in
Egypt between the pre-Islamic and Umayyad periods. It seems that in the Early Islamic Period
the usage of pre-Islamic human figural imagery was explored and led to an Umayyad ideal as the
praxis of Islam developed. Examples of the Umayyad ideal can be found in stucco architectural
embellishments and figures; examples are found at Khirbat al-Mafjar in Jericho, Palestine (app.
I, G) and a later example is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York (app. I, H). The
Umayyad adaptation of human figural embellishment utilizes a partially nude female although
physically different than the earlier examples, but still employs the necklace. The later example
that is datable to the early Abbasid period revives the nude female and again is adorned with a
necklace.23 This is a far contrast from the usage of human figural metalwork in the Fatimid
period, notably the tambourine player (fig. 126), which is a female figure fully clothed and more
naturalistic. While the opinion of other scholars is that the Louvre example is datable to 500-
1000 in the Fatimid period,24 without any other metalwork examples from the Fatimid period and
given the similarity to the al-Fudayn example it seems highly unlikely. A bronze bottle in the
Byzantine Art Museum of Berlin and datable to Egypt from the 5th-8th century is unique in some
of its features including the usage of architectural elements or arcades framing nude female
figures (fig. 3). A comparable theme to the al-Fudayn example, again with arcades and nude
female figural imagery, the shape of the bottle and its crowned top, although its hinged lid is
missing, would be reminiscent of the Persian regional style that will be discussed in the next
section. The usage of the arcades, female nudes, three feet and indications of a hinged lid
however allude to an Egyptian origin in the Early Islamic Period of the Umayyads.

Other Umayyad examples of figural decoration include ewers and a throne leg, while
zoomorphic decoration was common on many censers, incense burners and lampstands. The

23 Jenkins et al., Islamic Jewelry 29.
remnants of a cast bronze throne from Persia is datable to the late-Sasanian or early-Umayyad period consists of a throne leg (fig. 9) composed of an engaged griffon or protome (detail fig. 9.2), which was likely one of two or four. A griffon represented royal power in the Zoroastrian faith. It has been speculated that the griffon, a noted pre-Islamic theme, was adapted after the Umayyad conquest of Sasanian Persia in an effort to exert control and demonstrate legitimacy through imagery over the vanquished Sasanians. A bronze ewer datable to 7th century Umayyad Persia that had been originally inlaid and is decorated with an intricate plant motif was also adorned with figural decoration (fig. 10). The figure, a leopard acts as the handle of the ewer (fig. 10.2). The leopard’s cranium and frontal paws are attached to the lip of the ewer, its torso is stretched abstractly and its hind legs are attached to the ewer’s body. Another bronze Umayyad leopard handle datable from the 7th century, resides in the Bumiller Collection at the University Museum for Islamic Art in Bamberg, Germany (fig. 11). The Bumiller leopard is detached from a ewer or similar vessel; it is related to the previous leopard in shape and style, although the torso of the Bumiller leopard is not stretched as abstractly. This type of figural decoration serving on a utilitarian object was not common in Fatimid period metalwork. Figural decoration expressed on the handles of vessels or other utilitarian objects is seen on Umayyad and later Abbasid metalwork. Abbasid examples include a leopard (fig. 12) and a lion (fig. 13), both from private collections, which adorned handles of vessels similarly to the Metropolitan and Bumiller examples. The leopard figural form and other animals utilized on the handles of vessels extended from the Umayyad into the Abbasid periods in Greater Persia, particularly Iran. It seems probable that this adaptive usage of figural decoration was not seen in any Fatimid metalwork of similar style since none is known to exist today, the exception would be a gazelle aquamanile (fig. 181) that will be discussed in Chapter Three. Indeed since all of the above-mentioned

examples (figs. 10-13) are Greater Persian or specifically Iranian, perhaps the geographical distance hindered the importation of this type of figural usage to Fatimid Egypt. Its origin probably stemmed from earlier pre-Islamic decoration of Sasanian or Luristan cultures in Iran.26

Examples of completely figural Umayyad objects include two hinged bronze cases, one in the form of an elephant, the other a ram (figs. 7-8). Located on the upper dorsal sections of both the elephant and ram is an interlocking mechanism, which would support a pin or lock (fig. 7.2). This indicated that the two cases were produced with the intention of carrying something valuable such as spices. A further example is a kettle in the abstract shape of a load bearing camel datable to the 8th-9th century (fig. 14), discovered in excavations at Umm al-Walid, Jordan. The shape and figural usage of the kettle however are not typical of the Abbasid period, regardless of the later date. The kettle has a large hinged lid attached to the handle. This hinge design is similar to several hinged keys in the collection of the Musée du Louvre dated to the Umayyad period in Egypt (figs. 15-6). The employment of three legs, instead of a camel’s four, the long neck reminiscent more of a giraffe than a camel, the large spherical chamber and the large cylindrical spout are more expressive of an Umayyad abstraction rather than an Abbasid one, no similar themed or shaped objects exist from the Abbasid period. The unique figural shape and exaggerated features certainly are uncommon in Fatimid metalwork, which followed more conventional and realistic figural modes.

**Umayyad Precious Metal Objects**

A silver stand with four engaged eagles used as protomes datable to the 7th-8th century from Iran is one of the few known examples of precious metalwork from the Umayyad period (fig. 17). The stand probably served as a base for a jar or other vessel, since objects of this

\[26\] Pal, Nasli Heeramanec Collection 161.
function exist from the Sasanian period. The closeness in style of the eagles and the utilitarian object they adorn are similar to the Sasanian tradition both in the theme of the eagle and the actual utility of the stand. Eagles served a major purpose in Zoroastrianism and were representative of royal power or authority. The physical appearance of the eagles, with its defined features, sharp beak, folded wings and feathers is reminiscent of Sasanian metalwork. An almost identical silver eagle figure in the Brooklyn Museum, likely detached from its principal object is datable to the Parthian period (3rd century CE, fig. 18). The pre-Islamic link of eagle figural usage in metalwork and its subsequent use in the Early Islamic Period cannot be overlooked. Similarly to the griffon imagery (fig. 9) mentioned previously, it was in an effort to exert legitimacy over the vanquished and a repeat of pre-Islamic themes in metalwork. Although the eagle was a common iconographical theme in the Roman, Byzantine, Parthian and Sasanian periods, the silver eagle stand was an Umayyad creation attributable to Iran, which would indicate a Parthian or Sasanian direct influence and thus was likely the source for Umayyad adaptation for this post-Sasanian object. Additionally, a Sasanian throne leg with a griffon protome in the collection of the Musée du Louvre is datable to the 3rd century from Iran (app. I, I). The throne leg was ascribed to the court of Ardashir I and represented royal authority. This example further supports the Umayyad usage of the same theme and imagery with the post-Sasanian Metropolitan throne leg (fig. 9). The identical function of the Sasanian griffon throne essentially verifies the Umayyad version with its role and origin. Another additional example will be discussed in the next section.

Several ewers and a plate from various museum collections datable to the 6th-9th centuries in Iran and produced in gold, silver or bronze all are representative of the metalwork produced during the transitional period from pre-Islamic Sasanian culture to the Islamic Umayyad dynasty.
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A 7th century gold ewer from the Hermitage Museum at St. Petersburg (fig. 19) shows a simple design with a teardrop-shaped body, handle, spout and a knob-shaped base. The second ewer, in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York would certainly be more reminiscent of a Sasanian theme (fig. 20). The 6th-7th century vessel is similar in shape to the Hermitage ewer, yet it lacks a full knob-shaped base and detailed human figural decoration in bas-relief adorns its exterior. The image depicts a female figure in silver over a mercury-gilt background holding festival related objects. Although the theme is Sasanian, the ewer was produced in the transitional Islamic period and should be considered a product reminiscent of the pre-Islamic influence still present in Islamic metalwork. The post-Sasanian attribution for the object arises from the imagery, a cultic female figure in an unrealistic twisted form. This style of female figural imagery was seen only in a late Sasanian context, which transitioned into the Early Islamic Period. Additionally, the increasing secularization of Sasanian cultic imagery in the Early Islamic Period allowed for their continued usage during the changeover from Sasanian to Islamic and in some cases was later readapted to fit within an Islamic praxis. The third ewer is located at the Walters Art Gallery of Baltimore and is made of bronze in the 8th-9th century (fig. 21). The Walters vessel has a diminished base and neck in comparison with the two earlier ewers that have elongated necks and knob-shaped bases. The Walters ewer serves as an important link in the transition from pre-Islamic to the Islamic type, but would be dated to the Early Islamic Period because of its teardrop-shaped body and the absence of a knob-shaped base that was a common Sasanian style. The ewer is similar to the Hermitage and Metropolitan vessels, it lacks a large base however has a slender neck and a palmette serves as the handle. The decoration of the body consists of a rinceau motif that continues into the stem of the handle.
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culminating with the palmette at its apex. The Walters example serves as the typical Umayyad and later Abbasid decorative ewer. The use of bronze for the Walters ewer, which is datable to the early Umayyad period, again fits the notion that precious metals were possibly a less common commodity for metalwork under Umayyad rule.

The mention of a plate (fig. 22) grouped with the three previously discussed ewers (figs. 19-21) should be examined to further understand the genesis of Islamic metalwork. The 7th-8th century plate from the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York has Sasanian iconography. The Sasanian Empire collapsed in 651 with the advent of the Arab conquest in 642. It is decorated with a female figure displaying royal accouterments while riding a griffon over a representation of water, earth and sky. This plate would be considered post-Sasanian due to the stylistic differences between those produced during the Sasanian Empire and those from the Early Islamic Period, namely the Metropolitan plate contains the imagery of a figure, which is twisted in an abstract form. This type of abstraction is seen on wall paintings at the citadel in Sasanian Penjikent, now Tajikistan and subsequently after the Arab conquest from the 7th-8th century and not during the Sasanian period.31 As previously mentioned, certain Sasanian themes were readapted to satisfy popular notions of Islamic decoration, 32 the Metropolitan example with the female royal figure is reminiscent of Sasanian appearance but with a posture common only in the Early Islamic Period. Evidence for the usage of Sasanian themes in Early Islamic Period metalwork, particularly under the Umayyads, comes from the remaining figural decoration present on Umayyad architecture in Syria. Metalwork decorated with imagery was easily portable and its themes were transferred to architectural embellishment.33 The Umayyads had direct access to Sasanian metalwork through the conquest of Iran and its active metal workshops
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but also as tribute and taxes from conquered Iran that were paid in metalwork to the Umayyads during the Early Islamic Period.  

Precious metals were readily used in a pre-Islamic environment as evidenced through the quantity of gold and silver metal objects surviving today in various collections and from the discovery of buried hoards such as two 6th-7th century treasures from Syria, the silver gilt treasure from Attarouthi 35 and the silver treasure at Hama.  

The post-Sasanian 6th-7th century Metropolitan and 7th century Hermitage ewers are representative of the transitional period between the pre-Islamic and Umayyad stages: they are closer chronologically to the pre-Islamic world and retain numerous pre-Islamic attributes. The usage of precious metals for the previously discussed ewers and other objects were the product of the transitional period and after its close it is possible metalwork ceased to be produced in gold and silver. It is more likely however that other metalwork made of gold and silver was produced in the later Umayyad period but none survives today. Perhaps this was a consequence of gold and silver needed for debts, resulting from expansion under the Umayyads as they extended their empire, from the increasing disdain for precious metals as the praxis of Islam developed or another reason as was discussed previously in Chapter One. Nevertheless, precious metal vessels were more common at the end of antiquity then during the advancement of the Early Islamic Period, as evidenced from the quantity surviving today. The next largest period of precious metal production was during the Fatimid period.

**Umayyad Metalwork with Zoomorphic and Figural Usage**

Objects with zoomorphic and figural decoration include censers, ewers, incense burners and lampstands that were usually cast in bronze or brass. Anthropomorphic stylized
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characteristics are not seen in any metalwork of the Early Islamic Period. This was different from human figural imagery, which utilized the whole image of a human being, such as the women of the Umayyad brazier (fig. 1) or the Fatimid tambourine player (fig. 126) and not human segments or characteristics. Other examples of Umayyad metalwork with zoomorphic and figural usage that are Christian themed will be discussed in the next section.

Perhaps the most famous example of zoomorphic metalwork produced during the Umayyad period is a cast brass ewer discovered at Abu Sir al-Malaq at al-Fayyum, Egypt, which is currently in the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 23).\(^{37}\) The ewer was thought to have been the personal property of the Umayyad caliph Marwan II along with several other metal objects, since it was alleged that he was buried within one mile of Abu Sir al-Malaq. Although this idea was advanced by numerous scholars, along with the misconception that the ewer is cast in bronze and not brass,\(^{38}\) no evidence exists to support the burial place of Marwan II in al-Fayyum.\(^{39}\) Nevertheless, several similar ewers survive and have been attributed to the Umayyad period based upon style and location; they include key zoomorphic features like those of the Marwan ewer. The Marwan ewer is decorated with a rooster (fig. 23.2), birds, intricately pierced vegetal and geometric motifs (fig. 23.3), stylized acanthus leaves for the length of the handle and culminating with zoomorphic features reminiscent of dolphin heads (fig.23.4) and a series of dots (fig. 23.5) common on other metal or ivory objects of the Byzantine and Umayyad period. A parallel can be drawn between the intricate decoration of the Marwan ewer and the Umayyad architectural ornamentation at Qasr al-Mshatta or Khirbat al-Mafjar (app. I, J-L).\(^{40}\) Both structures are adorned with carved stucco or stone embellishment of elaborate geometric and
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vegetal patterns that were frequently found on metalwork decoration, including the Marwan ewer. The ewer is in the shape of a sphere with an elongated neck, a footed base, a long exaggerated handle and was hollow cast with a jointed neck. The pierced motif at the high point of the neck acted as a filter for water.\textsuperscript{41}

A cast bronze ewer with features corresponding to the Marwan vessel and from the Islamic Museum at Cairo is datable to the 8\textsuperscript{th} century (fig. 24). The ewer has an elongated neck with a less intricately pierced vegetal and geometric water filter than the Marwan example and has a heart-shaped palmette below the spout (24.2). The ewer is spherical, has a rooster spout and a beaded ring handle. The finial atop the handle is damaged and the remaining detail cannot be identified definitively. The hollow cast ewer is styled in a similar shape to the Marwan ewer and has a jointed neck.\textsuperscript{42} Another cast bronze ewer from the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York is datable to the 8\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} century and may have originated from Syria (fig. 25). The vessel is extremely close in size, shape and design to the Marwan ewer. The Metropolitan ewer has a detailed rooster as the spout, an intricate foliate water filter, an acanthus plant handle and a globular-shaped body. There is a small footed base and the ewer is fitted from individually cast pieces. The Metropolitan ewer was formerly in Count Bobrinsky’s collection from Russia; this is an issue which will be discussed later. The discussion regarding the series of ewers above and the one below, with origins suggested in Syria, Egypt or even Iraq indicate the difficulty in establishing secure provenances for metalwork. The probability that the ewers were created in the Umayyad capital of Damascus rather than other areas of their empire is high but still not definitive.

Further examples of Umayyad metalware with zoomorphic and figural usage are difficult
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to discern from those of the later Abbasid period and undeniably, there was a blend in the styles of certain metal objects between the close of Umayyad rule and beginning of Abbasid rule. The metal objects which were representative of this period include ewers and incense burners. A ewer that is an example from the overlap period and currently resides in the Hermitage Museum at St. Petersburg is attributed to the 8th-9th century from Iraq (fig. 26). Although the ewer is akin to the Marwan vessel in both shape and style it is attributed to the Abbasid period, possibly even originating from Baghdad. Evidence supporting this comes from the detail below the bird spout on the ewer, an unidentified insect. It was suggested the insect derived from Turkish tribal art in Central Asia. The interaction between Turkish tribes and Muslims in Central Asia occurred in the late-8th to early-9th centuries. Other scholars have indentified the insect as a butterfly and together with the figural bird and palmette decoration below the handle attribute the vessel to Central Asian design. The bronze ewer stylistically resembles Umayyad design with an intricately pierced vegetal and geometric water filter at the summit of the neck. The large bird that is either a hawk or eagle used as the spout with this particular example, the long handle resembling a stylized acanthus that culminates in a trefoil, the pomegranate and leaf handle ornamentation all indicate Central Asian influence. The spherical body has a simple leaf or lotus design; a theme more common on Egyptian based metalwork whereas Iranian metalwork utilized bosses in the shape of almonds. A pre-Islamic example from Egypt of a teardrop-shaped bottle with a lotus design was produced in the Roman or Byzantine periods (app. I, M) and is in the Musée du Louvre. An Umayyad bottle datable to the 7th-8th century from Egypt and in a teardrop-shape has a subtle leaf pattern (fig. 27), another bronze bottle from the 7th-9th century
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with a similar shape and leaf decoration is in the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 28). Examples of Abbasid vessels with almond stylized bosses are in the Keir Collection (figs. 29-30) and another from the Musée d’Art et d’histoire at Geneva (fig. 31). All three of these teardrop-shaped bottles are made of bronze and decorated with stylized almond bosses. The teardrop-shape was a common theme in Egypt and Iran: Sasanian precious metal ewers or bottles were likely the source of influence.\(^47\) Comparison of the leaf or lotus-shaped vessels indicates the vast stylistic differences in floral decoration. The varying lotus decoration of the two vessels indicates it was present in Umayyad Egypt and was later expressed in Abbasid Iraq with innovation of design. The Hermitage ewer and the analysis of its style, decoration and theme make the vessel datable to the transitional period between the Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphates and reinforcing the notion that there was an overlap in metalwork variety and influence between the two dynasties.

The Hermitage ewer is suggested to be Abbasid and even from Baghdad, yet evidence can be ascertained from its provenance before the Hermitage acquired it, which contests an Iraqi origin. The ewer was first in the collection of Count Aleksei Aleksandrovich Bobrinsky. It was confiscated at the initiation of the Russian Revolution in 1917. Count Bobrinsky was an archaeologist and most of his collection came from sites he excavated throughout the Russian Empire, including Persia and Central Asia or purchase from a collection at Dagestan north of Iran. It might be possible that the ewer originated from Abbasid influenced Iran, especially with the presence of the leaf and pomegranate handle ornamentation, a common theme with Sasanian and Iranian metalwork. Nevertheless, the difficulty in determining a firm provenance for Early Islamic Period metalwork is evident, especially regarding the Hermitage ewer (fig. 26). The notion of a transitional period between the Umayyads and Abbasids cannot be dismissed, as metal objects like the Hermitage ewer demonstrate.

\(^{47}\) Allan, Treasures of Islam 252.
An incense burner with zoomorphic and figural metalwork from the collection of the Freer Gallery in the Smithsonian Museum at Washington DC and datable to the 8th-9th century is an example from the transitional period (fig. 32). The incense burner is square-shaped with a body pierced geometric pattern. A large dome rests on the top, surrounded by four smaller domes. A large handle protrudes from the center of the body, there are two hinges allowing the body to open and four legs support the burner at its base. The ornate detail of the incense burner can be classified as figural and zoomorphic. The handle culminates with the head of a gazelle and the four legs resemble those of a turtle, above each leg is the face of a lion. The domes are all pierced with a foliate pattern and birds stand above two of the five domes, although it is likely birds crowned all the domes. Finally, encompassing the domes are several crenellations with a vegetal design. The shape of the body has been compared with incense burners in Egypt since it was an already common form in the Byzantine period. The shape of the Freer incense burner has also been compared to Byzantine church architecture where five domes were common.

Incense burners produced during the Abbasid period in both Egypt and Greater Persia however are very similar in style and theme to earlier Umayyad examples; these will be reviewed under Abbasid metalwork.

The major issues with much of the Islamic metalwork produced in the Umayyad and Abbasid periods remain the previously addressed concerns of portability and reuse of materials. There was a transitional period however between the Umayyads and Abbasids. Several of the objects discussed were from the collection of Count Bobrinsky in Russia through his purchase from the north of Iran and therefore it seems likely that some of these objects may have come from Iran. This is also supported from stylistic analysis and iconography evident on the
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Hermitage ewer (fig. 26). Although the attribution of Count Bobrinsky’s collection was Abbasid and probably from Iraq, some of the objects may have been produced at the close of the Umayyad period or in the transition to the Abbasid influenced period in Iran. Nevertheless, the style, shape, design and even theme of metal objects with zoomorphic and figural decoration produced during the Umayyad and Abbasid periods were not seen in the later Fatimid periods i.e., the eccentric pierced rinceau water filters from such objects as the Marwan ewer or from the Hermitage example disappeared with the development of Fatimid metalwork.

**Umayyad Metalwork with Christian Imagery and Themes**

Christians in the Early Islamic Period contributed to the development of Umayyad metalwork. Metal objects for Christian patrons continued to be produced and form a portion of the Umayyad metalwork known today. Similar metal objects were also produced in the Fatimid period and will be discussed in Chapter Three. A review of certain key objects from this group will better illustrate the advancement of Umayyad metalware and any influences upon this work.

A copper hanging lamp datable to the 6th-7th century in the shape of a peacock is in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York and is of the early Umayyad period (fig. 33). The peacock represented a common theme in Christian iconography and was later adapted in Islam becoming synonymous with paradisal imagery. In metalwork, peacock imagery continued to be used into the Umayyad period as evidenced from numerous examples including an 8th century Syrian pierced basin (fig. 34). The bronze basin is decorated with a pierced rinceau motif and several peacocks. Another image is expressed on the 8th century fragment of a bronze lamp-handle from the Keir Collection at Berlin; the imagery consists of two peacocks divided with the tree of life (fig. 35). An almost identical 8th century bronze lamp-handle was discovered in excavations at al-Fustat in 1921 and is presumed to be in the collection of the Islamic Museum.
at Cairo, it has the same imagery consisting of two peacocks separated with a tree of life (fig. 36). A further example from a private collection is a double-headed peacock handle likely from a chest or other vessel with a flat side (fig. 37). The double-headed peacock handle is datable to the 8th-9th century from Persia, but might be either Umayyad or Abbasid in origin as a definite period is difficult to identify. A form of the peacock image survived into the Abbasid period, one example is a bronze rooster-shaped incense burner with the characteristics of a peacock that is attributed to 11th century Iran (fig. 38). The Umayyads continued the peacock theme after their flight to Córdoba in 972; a peacock aquamanile now in the Musée du Louvre (fig. 39) is produced in bronze with prominent features and other examples from Egypt in the 10th-11th century will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Another form of Christian imagery appears on a copper censer in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art; it was Egyptian made and is datable to the 6th-8th century in the Umayyad period and was likely suspended with a chain (fig. 6). The imagery of the censer is the lion hunting a boar, which was probably reminiscent of earlier pre-Islamic symbolism regarding royal authority. This was expressed in the Dar al-Islam commonly as the lion attacking the gazelle. The animal figures surmounted a base with zoomorphic feet stylized as a lion. Comparable bronze examples can be found the collection of the Musée du Louvre and date from Byzantine rule in Egypt. An example from the Early Islamic Period is the Umayyad mosaic panel at Khirbat al-Mafjar (app. I, N).

A group of bronze censers that were produced in Egypt are datable to the 7th-10th centuries all share the same theme with scenes of Christ. A pair of censers from the group currently resides in the collection of the Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge (figs. 42-3). The two censers are bronze and bowl-shaped, except one of the pair has
six sides (fig. 43). The Sackler censers contain scenes illustrating the life of Christ, several brackets are present on either the top or the lip of the censers. The purpose of the brackets would be for suspending a chain. Some oil lamps however are formed in a similar way for resting on the pricket of a lampstand rather than suspension from a chain. Essentially the basic design of oil lamps and censers was very similar in metalwork from the 6th-10th centuries. Another possibility is that these oil lamps or censers are parallel in design to serve as an interchangeable object, to be suspended from a chain or fit to a pricket; one of the censers is pierced to serve this function (fig. 42). Another bronze censer in the group is from the Coptic Museum at Cairo and is datable to the Early Islamic Period in Egypt (fig. 44). The censer is akin to the Sackler examples in that it is similar in shape, has scenes of Christ and brackets for suspension with a chain. Three examples from the group are in the collection of the Musée du Louvre and datable to the Early Islamic Period in Egypt (figs. 43-5). The three censers are all made of bronze, are bowl-shaped and contain images of Christ. Two of the three censers have chain brackets on the lip (figs. 42-5). A final example from the group is a bronze censer from the David Museum at Copenhagen; it is also similar to the other censers (fig. 4). The David censer however has one significant difference from the others in the group, it has an Arabic inscription around its base. The inscription reads “…made by Yaqub son of Isaq of Damascus.” The censer is datable to the 8th century from Palestine or Syria. This would indicate it was possibly produced at the Umayyad capital during the end of their rule. The David censer demonstrates that metal objects with Christian imagery were produced by Muslim artisans and therefore further validates that all of these objects are indeed Umayyad metalwork. The inscription of the David censer however is supplementary evidence, since the censers were all likely produced in the Umayyad period.
A further group of metal objects from the Umayyad period for Christian use are lamps, lampstands and polycandela. These objects although with ecclesiastical overtones later influenced the development of metalwork in the Early Islamic Period, including that of the Fatimids. The basic form and design of the lamps and lampstands produced during the 6th-12th centuries can be traced throughout classical antiquity. Lampstand decoration in Egypt usually consisted of zoomorphic features and sometimes figural ornamentation. These characteristics, especially pertaining to zoomorphic features continued to be expressed on lampstands produced in the Fatimid period. Examples of 6th-8th century datable lampstands are found in the Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge (fig. 46), Musée du Louvre at Paris (fig. 47), Hermitage Museum at St. Petersburg (fig. 48) and a pair in the Coptic Museum at Cairo (figs. 49-50). These lampstands all have almost identical features and the same basic shape. They have tripod feet with zoomorphic characteristics such as the webbed feet of a duck (fig. 50), paws of a lion (fig. 46) or hooves of an ungulate (figs. 47-9). The lampstands are all cast in bronze sections and in almost all of the examples the shaft is composed of geometric knobs and discs. The pinnacle of the shaft ends in a pricket for an oil lamp. Nearly all of the lampstands have a drip-tray. The zoomorphic features of the feet and the general shape and style of the Umayyad period lampstands are seen on later Fatimid period examples and other metalwork. The Umayyad lampstands reflect a parallel style to the pre-Islamic lampstands fashioned under the Byzantine Empire in Egypt and Syria before the Arab Conquest. Examples of the Byzantine lampstands in Egypt and Syria from the 5th-6th century are found in the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York (figs. 51-52). 50 These two copper examples also illustrate an oil lamp fitting on a pricket, the same function in the Early Islamic Period.

50 These two oil lamps have a possible dating to 600-700 in the Umayyad period
Metal oil lamps produced during the 6th-8th centuries retain the same basic design and style from the Byzantine period into the Islamic world, especially with those created in Egypt. Examples of Egyptian oil lamps from the Byzantine period in the 5th-6th century are in the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York (figs. 51-52), although these were perhaps datable to 600-700. Another oil lamp from Egypt is in the collection of the Musée du Louvre and is datable to the Byzantine Period (in Egypt 4th- early 7th century, app. I, O). The significance of the lamp stems from its exterior decoration, which contains a series of dots (app. I, P) similar to those present on the Marwan ewer (fig. 23.5). Although the designs of the two vessels are not an exact match, the usage of a dotted motif is seen in the pre-Islamic decorative arts. An oil lamp produced in the Umayyad period with Christian symbols is currently in the Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge (fig. 53). The object is made of bronze in the Eastern Mediterranean region, probably Egypt and exists as an example of a Christian utilized oil lamp in Umayyad metalwork.

Polycandela were frequently produced metal objects that were mostly used to adorn churches and mosques. The polycandelon itself is a metal plate with a punched or cast design that allows slots for the placement of lamps for illumination of interior spaces (app. I, V). The polycandelon was a pre-Islamic invention that developed in the Islamic world through different styles and designs, especially in the Fatimid period. The range of patterns is enormous, from the simplest metal ring void of any design, to complicated cast geometric and cruciform motifs. Certain types of polycandela produced in Egypt and Syria had Christian themes. After the introduction of Islam in Egypt and into the Early Islamic Period, some polycandela retain Christian themes and are a part of Umayyad metalwork. Later polycandela with Islamic geometric designs were more common in Fatimid Ifriqiyya and Egypt than in the Umayyad and
Abbasid periods. In the collection at the Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge, a 6th-8th century bronze polycandelon reflects Christian themes from the Umayyad period (fig. 54). The Sackler polycandelon is Egyptian cast with the shape of a cross and has brackets allowing suspension from a chain. There are also several circular punches for the glass lamps. Another example of a 6th-8th century polycandelon is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York (fig. 55). The polycandelon is cast in copper and suspended from a chain. The design is a combination of crosses and geometric motifs. In the collection of the Musée du Louvre are numerous bronze polycandela from Egypt representative of the 6th-8th century. The variety of designs is wide with a simple bronze ring (fig. 56) from Edfu and datable closer to the Abbasid period to intricately cast bronze patterns (figs. 57-9). The elaborate polycandelas consist of two with geometric and cruciform motifs radiating from the center (figs. 57 and 59) while one is a cruciform (fig. 58) almost identical to the object in the Sackler Museum (fig. 55). The most elaborate example is from the Coptic Museum at Cairo (fig. 60), a 6th-8th century bronze geometric and cruciform polycandelon radiating from a central cross.

A final example of metalwork produced during the early Umayyad period of the 6th-7th century in the Near Eastern region is a griffon lamp-handle (fig. 61). Analogous in appearance to the Umayyad griffon throne from Persia (fig. 9), the griffon handle from the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York demonstrates that imagery of the griffon in Islamic metalwork is used as embellishment for utilitarian objects. The only known exception is the Pisa Griffon, which is an entire figure in itself. The griffon lamp-handle is made of copper with the face of a griffon fashioned at the end of the curved handle. The handle is decorated with pointed studs and functioned similarly to the handle of a typical period oil lamp. These studs are essentially pomegranate ornamentation, a noted Persian theme continued in the Early Islamic Period and
further evidence for an Umayyad provenance. These details will be discussed in great detail in the next section. An example of a complete oil lamp with a similar handle design is from the Musée du Louvre and is datable to the Byzantine period in Egypt (app. I, Q). The curvature of the handle and its placement on the body in the Louvre example is similar to the way the griffon lamp-handle would have been fitted to a lamp.

Auxiliary Umayyad Metal Objects

Numerous metal objects produced during the Umayyad period either through the hands of Muslims, Christians or other groups are all classified as Umayyad metalwork. These objects include basic utilitarian objects and decorative remnants of metalware but without any unique contribution for the purposes of this research. It is important to note however that these objects comprise a significant portion of the remaining metalwork known to exist from the Umayyad period. These objects are therefore relevant for comparison and are subsequently listed with the other examples of Umayyad and Abbasid metalwork (figs. 60-6).

Introduction to Metal Objects of the Abbasid Period in Greater Persia, Egypt and Syria

The Umayyad period was witness to the birth of Islamic culture and was the first enduring Islamic dynasty after the death of the Prophet. The development of an Umayyad decorative arts produced distinctive results especially in metalwork. The influence of pre-Islamic cultures and in some cases their continued existence under Umayyad rule however was a large factor in the creation of their metalwork. In the Abbasid period metalwork began to evolve from its Umayyad foundation, yet certain styles continued.

The Abbasid Caliphate spanned a large geographical area, the principal concentration of its empire was in Greater Persia. Its capitals of Baghdad and later Samarra were in Iraq. Abbasid control in Iran and Iraq remained firm while its other provinces became rebellious and gained
autonomy, such as in Egypt. In comparison, the Umayyads were of Meccan origin but established their sphere of influence in Syria and Jordan securely with only brief domination of Persia. The result expressed in the decorative arts therefore is evident; Abbasid metalwork retains more of a pre-Islamic influence from Persia, namely from the Parthian-Sasanian periods, while the Umayyads generally preserved the Greco-Roman and Byzantine traditions. After the Abbasid expulsion of the Umayyads in Syria, Jordan and Egypt, Persian influenced metalwork was produced in Egypt under the Abbasids and merged with the traditional metalware styles of the region.

In Egypt two states emerged in succession that ruled independently of the Abbasid Caliphate, the Tulunids and Ikhshidids. The metalwork produced during these independent periods is almost impossible to distinguish from Abbasid work and of the limited number tentatively identified, very few remain. Although the creation of two emirates in Egypt and in other places such as parts of Iran under the Samanids afforded autonomy, it seems that the artistic influence was centered at Baghdad and thus the style and imagery utilized, certainly in metalwork, should be considered overall Abbasid. There are some examples of metal objects that demonstrate a clear delineation from the Abbasid ideal, namely certain regional styles that were popular in Egypt remained prevalent and were incorporated with the influential Baghdad decorative program. These regional examples are few in number but are easy to distinguish from typical Abbasid metal objects, which can generally be classified as having a sole Persian influence. These metal objects in Egypt, although retaining their unique regional influence create a dilemma in identification. The examples are certainly Egyptian in design, though the style is often indistinguishable from the Tulunid, Ikhshidid or with some examples from the early Fatimid period. Therefore, it is necessary to classify these objects to the probable region of

51 Scholars dispute exact provenance of Tulunid and Ikhshidid period metalwork
origin, in this case Egypt and datable to the 9th-10th century. As the Abbasid hegemony of Egypt, Syria and the surrounding territories began to decline and with the eventual establishment of the Fatimid Caliphate, the metalwork styles of Abbasid Egypt became increasingly similar to those of the Fatimids with some differences though, these will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Abbasid metalwork can be grouped into categories of function and distinguished through style, zoomorphic or figural use and other miscellaneous decoration. The majority of the Abbasid metal objects produced and that remain today include ewers, vases and bottles. Additional examples include incense burners, censers and assorted other objects such as a mosque lamp. The vast quantity of these objects were all of utilitarian function and most contained simple embellishment or minimal zoomorphic decoration with the exception of some unique examples. Conversely, specific objects particularly incense burners, are cast with elaborate zoomorphic characteristics and utilize figural protomes. Figural protomes are occasionally applied to ewers, usually situated on the handle or integrated into the handle and body of the ewer. Few precious metal objects remain from the Abbasid period likely for the reasons previously discussed, although historical narrations recount stories of extraordinary wealth at the Abbasid court in Baghdad. One commentary reported that the members of the Abbasid court dined on precious metalware encrusted with jewels while entertainment was provided from a golden and silvered tree with mechanized chirping birds.52

**Abbasid Metalwork with Persian Influences**

Certain metal objects can be grouped into the category of utilitarian vessels, namely bottles, ewers and vases, other miscellaneous objects such as bowls and mortars should also be included. These objects generally contain limited decoration if any and are produced in the regional styles with themes from the objects’ origin, in combination with an underlying influence
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from Baghdad. The typical teardrop-shape of the bottles, ewers and vases traces its origin to Sasanian Iran and infrequently to classical Roman examples. Stylistic decoration however is regionally based, in Egypt leaf designs are common on these vessels (figs. 27-8 and app. I, M) while in Greater Persia, almond bosses are popular. It is known that almond bosses are present on Roman period vessels usually used for storing oils and thus the bosses made the vessel easier to grasp.\textsuperscript{53} The function of the almond bosses set aside, the stylistic choice of the bosses is a characteristic that was not employed outside of Persia during the Early Islamic Period. This decoration although possibly with Roman origins can be classified as an Iranian theme in the Early Islamic Period, again because it was utilized exclusively in Greater Persia. Examples of the almond bossed vessels include 8\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century bronze bottles of varying sizes (figs. 29-31 and 69-71) from a private collection in Germany as well as from the Keir Collection in Berlin and Khalili Collection in London. Further examples include a 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century bronze bowl (fig. 72) and a later example, a 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century mortar (fig. 73) all from the Keir Collection in Berlin. These objects are from Abbasid influenced Iran and demonstrate the affinity for almond bossed decoration even after the decline of direct Abbasid supremacy in Iran as evidenced by the later period mortar (fig. 73). The result of this analysis indicates that almond bossed decoration, although having origins in Roman decorative arts, was developed and maintained as a Persian style in the Sasanian and Early Islamic Period of Greater Persia and subsequently after 1200 exclusively in Iran and possibly Iraq. The absence of the almond bossed style on metalwork produced in Egypt or Syria even with Abbasid influence provides further evidence that it was a regional style sustained completely in Greater Persia especially Iran.

Another important attribute of Abbasid metalwork with an underlying Persian style is the decoration of handles on metalwork vessels. Ewers, jugs, cups, essentially any metal object with

\textsuperscript{53} Ward, Islamic Metalwork 61.
a handle are sometimes adorned with a superficial ornament for aesthetic reasons. The ornament is typically a bead, knob, leaf, pomegranate, blooming flower or another abstract form: the flower primarily relates to Abbasid period incense burners and will be discussed in the following section. An alternative view that the handle decoration serves as a thumb-piece and was thus utilitarian is probable\(^{54}\) however the elaborate detail of the ornaments, particularly the leaf designs indicates that aestheticism is a major concern.\(^{55}\) Zoomorphic figures are also applied but infrequently, these will be discussed separately in the section below. The use of a decorative ornament for the handles of metal objects is a Persian theme as it is seen on Sasanian metalware and continued into the Early Islamic Period with the Umayyads, the trend sustained beyond the Abbasid Caliphate into successive periods in Iran. The ornament appears on vessels in Egypt datable to the 9\(^{th}\)-10\(^{th}\) century during the period of the Tulunid and Ikhshidid emirates, but was probably a migration from Baghdad to Cairo. The style seemed to fade during the Fatimid period in Egypt as limited vessels were treated with ornamental handle details; the known examples of handle ornamentation were usually zoomorphic. Examples of vessels with handle ornamentation include a jug from the Bumiller Collection at the University Museum for Islamic Art in Bamberg, Germany (fig. 74) and ewers from a German private collection (fig. 75), David Collection at Copenhagen (fig. 76), al-Sabah Collection at the Kuwait National Museum (figs. 77-9) and Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 80). The bronze jug and ewers datable to the 8\(^{th}\)-10\(^{th}\) century from the Bumiller, David, Keir and German private collections are all decorated with knobs serving as handle ornamentation. The bronze ewers datable to the 8\(^{th}\)-9\(^{th}\) century from the Sabah Collection are all adorned with stylized pomegranates handles. Two of the ewers are shaped with longer slender bodies, short necks, knobbled feet and elongated handles with either
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beaded decoration (fig. 77) or a scrolling vine (fig. 78). The third ewer (fig. 79) is spherical-shaped with scrolling vine decoration, a slender elongated neck, a knobbed foot and long handle, the shape of this ewer is similar to the earlier Umayyad produced ewers of Egypt, Syria and Iraq (figs. 23-6). The ewers from the David, Keir and German private collections are spherical-shaped with long handles and wide elongated necks, two have knobbed feet (figs. 75 and 80) while the other lacks a base (fig. 76). The Bumiller jug is globular-shaped with a wide shortened neck and is also without a base (fig. 74). Further expression of the pomegranate and leaf ornamentation is also seen on the previously discussed Hermitage ewer (fig. 26). The Hermitage ewer is likely an example of the transitional period between Umayyad and Abbasid rule as evidenced from the combination of both Umayyad and Abbasid shapes, themes, imagery and decorative elements, whether produced in Egypt, Iran or Iraq. Nevertheless, the use of the leaf and pomegranate handle ornamentation on the Hermitage ewer remains an example of a Persian influence.

The final style of handle treatment utilized mostly on Abbasid metalwork is leaf decoration, which originated with Sasanian period metalwork. The Arab conquest of Greater Persia led to an adaptation of the regional decorative styles and the leaf use continued briefly on handles of Umayyad and later Abbasid metalwork. Handled leaf ornamentation is expressed mostly on ewers and it was employed typically in the territory held briefly under the Umayyads and later the Abbasids in Greater Persia, namely Iran and Iraq. The use of the leaf handle decoration was not generally seen in Egypt or Syria under Umayyad or Abbasid influence and was not a style readily applied by the Fatimids. Nonetheless, there are a few unique examples of leaf handle ornament applied in Egypt datable to the 9th-10th century, which could be attributed to the Tulunid, Ikhshidid or early Fatimid periods. These metal objects are ewers shaped in the regional Egyptian style and contain leaf handle decoration. This indicates that leaf
embellishment is a Persian theme limited generally to Iran and Iraq, developed prolifically during the Abbasid period and was not especially popular in Egypt or Syria. An example of an 8\textsuperscript{th} century Umayyad ewer with leaf decoration on the handle is in the Walter’s Art Gallery at Baltimore (fig. 21). Examples of Abbasid metalwork with leaf decoration on the handles include a ewer from the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 81) and from the Museum of Art at Tiflis, Iran (fig. 82). An example of a regional Egyptian style ewer with leaf handled decoration is in the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 113); the Egyptian regional style will subsequently be discussed in the next section. The Keir ewer (fig. 81) is made of bronze in Iraq and datable to the 8\textsuperscript{th} century, it is teardrop-shaped with a knobbled foot, fluted neck and elongated handle culminating with a leaf ornament. The Tiflis example is made of bronze and through an inscription is tentatively dated to 785 and produced under Ibn Yazid in Basra, Iraq.\textsuperscript{56} The ewer is teardrop-shaped with a knobbled foot, fluted neck and has an elongated handle with beads or pearls culminating with leaf ornamentation. This type of metalwork decoration would be considered an Abbasid adaptation of a Persian style, meaning it appeared primarily on Abbasid metalwork. It adorns few Umayyad examples and is used on objects in Egypt datable to the 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century, essentially during the period of Abbasid influence. Evaluation of the Persian themes used in Islamic metalwork from the Umayyad and Abbasid periods indicated that the pre-Islamic influence was hard to overcome during the formation of an Islamic identity and that certain pre-Islamic themes utilized shifted in popularity as trends and personal taste wavered and with the eventual establishment of independent Islamic styles.

It should also be noted that the actual teardrop-shape in the majority of ewers from the Abbasid period of metalwork production emphasized a previous pre-Islamic style. Ewers created under the Sasanian Empire in Persia particularly Iran, were based primarily of the teardrop-shape

\textsuperscript{56} Scholars dispute exact date: range is 689, 785 and 882 CE.
or some close variation. The adaptation of this shape in the Umayyad period and continuation under the Abbasid period indicate its popularity and regional influence within their metalwork.

**Abbasid Metalwork with Figural Usage and Zoomorphic Decoration**

During the Abbasid Caliphal period, figural usage was developed either as decoration or in some examples, whole objects were figural shaped. Additionally, certain metal objects were decorated with zoomorphic features and designs. This convention was not uncommon as it was observed in the Umayyad and the later Fatimid periods. Certain styles, themes and figural imagery were more common however in the Abbasid period than in other Islamic dynasties. A common theme in Umayyad figural metalware were eagles, especially utilized as protomes (figs. 1.2, 17-8 and 83) and griffons (figs. 9 and 61). The use of eagles and griffons was likely a pre-Islamic influence carried over into the Umayyad period. In the Abbasid period, eagles and griffons were less common in metalwork, although eagles were seen adorning incense burners mostly produced in Egypt and Syria, a former territory of Umayyad central power. Lion figures and protomes were more prevalent in Abbasid examples and scarcely found in the Umayyad period. Lion figures decorated 8th-11th century bronze ewers and jugs (figs. 84-5) while lion protomes were attached to the handles or utilized as feet of 8th-11th century bronze ewers, incense burners and censers (figs. 87-94). The absence of griffons in Abbasid metalwork is unusual considering the griffon is a major theme in Sasanian decorative arts, even utilized as a bronze throne leg protome (app. I, I), a 3rd century antecedent to later Umayyad examples (figs. 9 and 61). It was also unusual since the Abbasids largely inherited Persian styles and themes more so than the Umayyads. Additionally, while lions were largely non-existent in Umayyad metalwork, other species from the Panthera genus were utilized such as leopards (figs. 10-1). The usage of
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leopards also continued into the Abbasid period (fig. 12) although less frequently than lions. Nearly all of the lion protomes (figs. 85-94) were attached to 10th-11th century bronze incense burners and censers to embellish handles or legs. The typical design consists of a frontal view with two legs, varying stylizations of paws, a portion of the body and the head of a lion depicted in various forms, some more realistic and others highly stylized. The lions are usually hollow-cast in bronze, the reverse side of the lion is soldered to the handle. Lions utilized on Abbasid jugs or ewers (figs. 84-6) rest on the handle rather than integration into the handle as seen with the Umayyad leopard example (fig 12).

Although the majority of Abbasid period ewers were previously discussed as a group above, there remain some exceptional examples, which are atypical of the general trend. Four ornithomorphic examples are in the collections of the Hermitage Museum at St. Petersburg, Islamic Art Museum at Berlin and St. Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai, Egypt; three figural and the other with zoomorphic decoration deserve further analysis and represent an important development in Abbasid metalwork. The Hermitage example (fig. 95) is a bronze aquamanile essentially in the shape of a perched eagle. The hollow-cast bronze body rests on talons spread to provide a stable base, there is a pierced beak and the handle is missing. The Kufic inscription on the body indicates it is made in 796-7 by the artisan Sulayman, probably in Iraq. The second object is an almost identical bronze eagle aquamanile (fig. 96) datable to the 8th century from Iran. The Berlin aquamanile differs from the Hermitage eagle in that the handle is complete however it is without feet. The third object is from St. Catherine’s Monastery and consists of another eagle aquamanile, made of copper and datable to the 9th century in Iraq (fig. 97). The St. Catherine’s example is alike the previous two except the handle is in the shape of a lion or another related species. The usage of the handle figure is unusual in the Abbasid period as no
other comparable examples exist; it is a characteristic more common in the Umayyad period (figs. 10-2). Nevertheless, the three eagle aquamaniles are likely produced in Iraq and datable to the 8th-9th century in the Abbasid period, without other supporting evidence for the figural handle on the St. Catherine’s example, the originality of the handle to the aquamanile should be questioned. The fourth object is a bronze ewer datable to the 8th-9th century in Iraq (fig. 98) and contains zoomorphic decoration, namely the teardrop-shaped body is engraved with a stylized date-palm tree flanked with a peacock on each side. There is a small base, curving handle, elongated neck and finally the spout is reminiscent of a bird’s beak, a zoomorphic shape. The theme of the peacocks divided with the tree of life in symmetry reflects the pre-Islamic imagery of Sasanian themes, further evidence of Abbasid adaptation of Persian subject matter likely produced at Baghdad. Although it is important to note that the tree of life and peacock themes developed in Umayyad art as well. Peacock imagery is utilized in Umayyad metalwork; a censor (fig. 33), a pierced basin (fig. 34) and three handles (figs. 35-7) are the previously mentioned examples although one handle might be Abbasid (fig. 37), while the mosaic tree of life is seen at Khirbat al-Mafjar (app. I, N).

Another important part of Abbasid metalwork that combined figural and zoomorphic decoration is incense burners. Abbasid period incense burners produced in Iran and Iraq are cast with different zoomorphic themes or figural imagery than those made in Egypt and the Levant, those produced in the latter will be discussed in the next section; they do however have common designs and styles. Abbasid incense burners datable to the 8th-10th century or those that are pre-Fatimid generally follow the same trend, a squared chamber supported with four zoomorphic legs or a cylindrical chamber supported with three zoomorphic legs, a pyramidal or bulbous upper chamber is sometimes used. All incense burners are pierced with geometric or vegetal
decoration\textsuperscript{59} and crowned with a blooming flower, bud, pomegranate or knob. The crowning ornamentation serves as a handle, but similarly to the thumb-piece on Abbasid ewers, surpassed its utilitarian function and became more of an embedded aesthetic element in Abbasid metalwork. A protruding handle usually pierced and culminating in zoomorphic or figural decoration is common on most Abbasid period burners. Incense burners found in the Levantine region can be datable to the transitional period between the Umayyads and Abbasids however most retain the later characteristics of Abbasid influenced Greater Persia. The primary influence from Iran and Iraq would be the cylindrical shape of incense burners, which is reminiscent of architecture found in Sasanian Persia and remained during the Early Islamic Period. The design of pre-Islamic architecture in Persia is unique and was not found in the western Islamic world, namely Egypt or the Levant.\textsuperscript{60} Examples of the architecture that probably influenced Abbasid incense burners are depicted on wall paintings in Soghdian at Piandjikent, Iran and from the architecture of the Early Islamic Period mosque of Chahr Sutun at Termez, Iran.\textsuperscript{61} Moreover, the feet of Abbasid incense burners produced in Greater Persia are shaped in a simple style common with other comparable metal objects. In comparison and contrary to some scholars, western Islamic metalwork utilized feet that were larger and had more detailed zoomorphic features. Essentially zoomorphic feet stylization is regionally based, in the Early Islamic Period the territory was divided under the control of the different dynasties: the result was that the western centered dynasties generally retained the Byzantine and Roman styles as evidenced through the feet of similar 4\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th} century incense burners and lampstands, while the eastern dynasties retained the distinctive and simple Iranian or Sasanian style.\textsuperscript{62} Metalwork produced in 4\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century.
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century Egypt can be classified through the use of certain stylistic characteristics including distinctive zoomorphic features, notably lion paws and certain figural decoration; this is a part of the Egyptian regional style and is expressed on Fatimid period incense burners that is discussed in Chapter Three.

Examples of Abbasid incense burners with distinctive Persian influences are in the L.A. Mayer Memorial Museum at Jerusalem (fig. 99-100), several in the collection of the Coptic Museum at Cairo (figs. 101-3) and two from the Madaba Archaeological Museum in the Kingdom of Jordan (figs. 104-6). The L.A. Mayer bronze incense burners are datable to the 8th-10th century from Greater Persia, probably Iran, one is square-shaped and stands on four legs with simple zoomorphic feet and has a pierced pyramidal upper chamber crowned with a blooming flower surrounded with four knobs (fig. 99). The other burner (fig. 100) is cylindrical in shape with a pierced bulbous chamber and crowned with a knob, although the crown is probably a depiction of a flower yet to blossom or a bud. The burner stands on three legs with minimal zoomorphic feet and has a slender handle capped with a knob. The three bronze burners (figs. 101-3) from Cairo’s Coptic Museum are datable to the 8th-10th century and likely Iranian in origin. The three are cylindrical with pierced bulbous upper chambers crowned with blooming flowers, have slender handles and three legs with simple zoomorphic feet, one of the burners however is damaged (fig. 103). The Madaba bronze burners (figs. 104-5) datable to the 8th-10th century are also cylindrical with pierced bulbous upper chambers, stands on three legs with simplified zoomorphic feet, are crowned with blooming flowers and have slender handles. Other scholars note the pearl band present on a Madaba burner (fig. 105) as a link to the antique world, namely to a Roman or Sasanian influence but neglect the most important evidence, which is the handle ornamentation and is indicative of a Persian origin. The Freer incense burner (fig. 31) that
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is datable to the 8th-9th century in Egypt or the transitional period between the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphates in Egypt provides further evidence for the regional based influences on Early Islamic Period metalwork. The zoomorphic feet of the Freer burner are stylized lion paws that are typical of metalwork from 4th-6th century Byzantine Egypt and later in the Early Islamic Period under the Fatimids. The figural decoration of the Freer burner was commonly applied in Egypt from the 4th-12th centuries as evidenced through other metalware examples. Additionally, the shape of the Freer burner although likely inspired by Byzantine church architecture, another reason for an Egyptian origin, has been compared to the architecture from the Dome of the Rock and Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem as possible sources for influence, further proving a Western Islamic and Egyptian origin.

The Continuation of Abbasid Metalwork in Egypt from the 9th-10th Century

After the decline of Abbasid hegemony in Egypt and the Levant, their influence on the decorative arts continued. As a result, Tulunid and Ikhshidid produced metalwork cannot easily be distinguished from that produced at Baghdad or from Iran. The majority of the metal objects produced in Egypt and the Levant under the Tulunid and Ikhshidid emirates can thus be more accurately described as Abbasid metalwork datable to the 9th-10th century in Egypt. Certain Abbasid metal objects in Egypt were blended with the regional Egyptian style more than other objects; these include ewers and incense burners. Classification of these objects is difficult as they were possibly produced in Egypt from the 9th-12th centuries with slight stylistic differences. Some ewers although all similar are likely datable to Abbasid Egypt despite the opinion of other scholars, which allude to a Fatimid period origin.

The typical ewers are bronze or brass and usually have a teardrop-shaped body consistent
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with Abbasid style bottles (figs. 29-31, 69 and 71). The ewers are also similar in shape to pre-Islamic and Umayyad period bottles datable to the 5th-8th century from Egypt (figs. 22-8 and app. I, M). The ewers have a knobbed base, long ringed neck, a slender S-shaped handle and are topped with a lid crowned with a knob or another ornament. The handle has a hollowed and pierced box in its center; the handle ornament consists of knobs or figures common with other Abbasid metal objects of Persian origin. Examples of these ewers are in the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York (fig. 106), Keir Collection at Berlin (figs. 107-9) Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 110), British Museum at London (fig. 111) and other collections. The combination of the shape, style and ornament of the Abbasid ewers produced in Egypt and datable to the 9th-10th century is not seen elsewhere in the Early Islamic Period. Although similar ewers have been found in Lebanon, Mallorca, Sicily and Spain,⁶⁷ the shape of the ewers support an Egyptian origin. The portability of metalwork from plunder or trade is considered for their findspot outside of Egypt but the shape of the ewers, which is similar to those from Umayyad Egypt and the use of three feet seen on a ewer (fig. 106) correspond with kettles from Egypt, therefore indicating a likely Egyptian origin. The S-shaped handle with its Abbasid style ornament is not common on any other metal object in Greater Persia however the use of lion and horse figural decoration used as handle ornamentation on ewers from the Keir Collection (fig. 107), British Museum (fig. 111) and a ewer fragment from a private collection (figs. 13 and 13.2) is similar to those on other Abbasid ewers (figs. 82-3 and 112) and was not common in the Fatimid period, another indication for a 9th-10th century or pre-Fatimid dating. The shape of the ewers, the unique handles and other stylistic details, which are not utilized in Greater Persia would be considered the Egyptian regional style and indicate an Egyptian origin, the use of certain Abbasid themes including the figural handle ornamentation denote an Abbasid influence, thus making the ewers
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datable to the 9th-10th century in Abbasid Egypt. It should be noted that other scholars have alluded to an Egyptian origin, namely at Alexandria from 700-900. There is no extant evidence to support an Alexandrian origin or such an early dating. The shape of the ewers is similar to pre-Islamic precious metal vessels however; the S-shaped handle and figural ornament are not. It is a possibility that the Alexandrian port could have served simply as a center for export across the Mediterranean, which would also provide for such a wide range of sources for these ewers.

Additional bronze ewers produced in Egypt datable to the 9th-10th century share a common shape, a bulbous chamber with a slender fluted neck, a spout, looped handle and three simple feet. These ewers often contained two types of ornamentation consisting of a leaf or knob on the handle and a multi-lobed finial on the spout. Examples include a ewer from the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 113), Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 114), Islamic Museum at Cairo (figs. 115-6) and Musée d’Art et d’histoire at Geneva (fig. 117). The shape of the ewers including the spout and the three feet indicate an Egyptian origin as they are seen on comparable pre-Islamic and Early Islamic Period metal objects exclusively in Egypt. Numerous examples of Byzantine metal objects from pre-Islamic Egypt are in the collection of the Musée du Louvre. Nevertheless, these ewers were produced during the transitional period in Egypt between the Abbasid and Fatimid periods and create a dilemma in dating however based upon the handle ornamentation, which was popular under the Abbasids; it is likely they are pre-Fatimid.

Incense burners produced in Abbasid Egypt and datable to the 9th-10th century are found in the Khalili Collection at London (fig. 118) and numerous from the collections of the Coptic Museum at Cairo and Musée du Louvre, yet three examples which define the trend are in the Coptic Museum (fig. 119) and the Musée du Louvre (figs. 120-1). The incense burners are all
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bronze and cylindrical in shape with pierced geometric and vegetal bulbous upper chambers, handles frequently culminating with flowers, three zoomorphic feet and crowned with blooming flowers or knobs. The zoomorphic feet are representative of the regional Egyptian style; they are reminiscent of animal hooves over the simple Iranian stylized feet, while the use of the handle ornamentation indicates a distinctive Persian influence. The ewers and incense burners previously discussed (figs. 106-11 and 113-21) serve as examples of Abbasid metalwork blended with the regional Egyptian style, which can be defined through a shape, placement of a handle or style of zoomorphic feet, in any case these metal objects would only be created in Egypt.

Additional Abbasid Metal Objects

There remain some additional metal objects produced during the Abbasid period that form an important part of overall Abbasid metalwork. These objects include a pierced brass mosque lamp in the David Collection at Copenhagen (fig. 122), a bronze basin from a German private collection (fig. 123) and two bronze mirror-backs in the collection of the Musée d’Art et d’histoire at Geneva (figs. 124-5). The mosque lamp datable to the 10th century from Iran or Iraq is pierced with a geometric motif and has an intricate chain. The basin datable to the 8th-11 century from Iran is punched and carved with an elaborate geometric motif. The mirror-back (fig. 124) datable to the 10th-11th century from Iran contains imagery of a princely hunt on its reverse; a reference to an earlier Sasanian theme readapted in an Islamic context70 and includes a Kufic inscription with good wishes. The reverse of the second mirror-back (fig. 125) contains imagery of animals from the hunt surrounded with a pearl border and a Kufic inscription. These objects are the few surviving examples of alternative types of Abbasid metalwork that utilized decoration and styles previously discussed.
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Chapter Three

Fatimid Metalwork

Metalwork of the Fatimid period began in Ifriqiyya early in the 10th century and consisted primarily of simple utilitarian objects, however it developed into elaborate and distinctive aesthetic examples after the Fatimid conquest of Egypt and the surrounding territory. The pre-Islamic cultural influence and the regional Egyptian style were adapted under the Fatimids and this was reflected in their metalwork. A transitional period existed between the Abbasid Persian influence in Egypt and the Fatimid expansion that led to metalwork production inspired through their decorative arts program. Included in part of this chapter is the most complete body of all known examples of Fatimid metalwork from institutions both public and private, auctions, exhibitions and private collections. A comprehensive catalog of all Fatimid metalwork has never before been completed; it serves as only part of this chapter. The second part is the analysis of Fatimid metal objects and their relation to Umayyad and Abbasid objects.

Introduction to Fatimid Metalwork

The Fatimid period in Egypt (969-1171) was marked with great achievements in the decorative arts, especially metalwork. The metal objects they produced were innovative with highly intricate detail; even the most utilitarian object was often decorated. This was a contrast from the metalwork produced in Fatimid Ifriqiyya, which was simple and less ornate. It seems in Egypt, the Fatimids were unable to resist the stimuli of other pre-Islamic cultures and previous Islamic dynasties with their own styles and designs. Nevertheless, the Fatimids began to create examples in metal that had never been produced nor were repeated in successive Islamic dynasties. This applies especially to the idea of freestanding figural objects, both human and animal, with no purpose other than for aestheticism. In addition, they fashioned other metal
objects mostly in bronze, brass, copper, iron and silver: these include aquamaniles, boxes, bowls, buckets, candlesticks, door knockers, fans, faucets, hinges, incense burners, keys, ladles, lamps, lampstands, lamp-chains, lids, mirror-backs, plates, plaques, polycandela, protomes, tools and waterspouts. There are few surviving examples of precious metal objects from the Fatimid period, for the reasons discussed in Chapter One, the few surviving however will also be reviewed.

The Fatimid Identity and Development of Metalwork

The Fatimid reliance on pre-Islamic cultures of Egypt and the Levant and the lesser influence from Persia can be explained through geographical limitations. The origins of Fatimid culture can be traced to Ifriqiyya and their gradual conquest of North Africa, the Levantine region, Hijaz and the eventual domination of the Mediterranean Sea with its numerous islands. Not in their territory was Abbasid-controlled Mesopotamia and Greater Persia. In contrast, the cultural origins of the Umayyads and Abbasids included Egypt and Syria however especially in the Abbasid period were greatly influenced with pre-Islamic Iran and Iraq. This helps to explain the unique position Fatimid metalwork retains in comparison to other metal objects of the Early Islamic Period. Consequently, never before had the pre-Islamic influence of Egypt taken such a prominent role in Islamic metal arts before the Fatimids. The influence of pre-Islamic Egypt provided the Fatimids with a foundation to develop their own unique style.

Figural Metal Objects with an Aesthetic Raison d’être in the Fatimid Period

As previously discussed, the figural form was disparaged in the Islamic world and as the praxis of Islam was defined the figural image was seen less frequently than in other dynasties of the Early Islamic Period. The disdain for the figural image did not however prevent its use altogether and it is seen in numerous mediums of the decorative arts including metalwork. The
Fatimid use of animal figures as utilitarian objects is again not uncommon, as seen in previous metal examples from the Umayyad (figs. 7-9) and the Abbasid periods (figs. 95-7). The Fatimid use of human and animal figures as freestanding metal objects with an aesthetic raison d’être was a new concept. A unique experiment in Islamic metalwork occurred under Fatimid rule in Egypt. It can be classified as experimental largely because it was not seen in previous or successive Islamic periods with the same emphasis. Although the figural form was utilized in later Abbasid Iran and Iraq as well as in several successive Islamic dynasties in Greater Persia, the metalwork was not as naturalistic and usually accompanied a utilitarian object as embellishment such as protomes or was a zoomorphic detail. Fatimid figural work was often stylized yet the animal themes were numerous and unlike those produced in Islamic Persia. The figures can be grouped into the camel, gazelle, goat, hare, ibex, leopard and lion. There is only one surviving human figural example, the tambourine player at the Islamic Museum in Cairo (fig. 126). Although other animals were employed in Fatimid metalwork, they either served a utilitarian function or were considered zoomorphic detail and embellishment; they will be discussed in the next section along with two abstract human forms, one found on a bronze oil lamp.

The human figural example, the tambourine player from the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 126), is unique in Fatimid metalwork. The figure is made of cast bronze and datable to the 11th century from Fustat, Egypt. The female musician holds a tambourine and is bejeweled with anklets, bracelets, a diadem and necklace, she has long hair and almond shaped eyes reminiscent of human figural imagery from Fatimid ceramics. The figure uniquely serves an artistic purpose with no other function. Previously, as discussed in Chapter Two, human figural imagery was used in the Umayyad period to adorn utilitarian metal objects. The appearance of the tambourine player, although stylized, is more realistic than the highly exaggerated Umayyad

---
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examples (figs. 1.3-2). The use of jewelry on the tambourine player attests to the great wealth the Fatimids commanded and their interest in fine gold and silver metals: in comparison the Umayyad examples are not crowned and wore jewelry that appears simpler. The significance of the Fatimid musician is that she was produced in a period when an emphasis on aestheticism in the decorative arts flourished. Although this is the only example from the Fatimid period, the elaborate detail indicates a later dating, likely in the 11th century.

The first example of an animal figural object is a camel, the sole piece found in the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 126). The bronze camel, datable from the 10th-12th century in Egypt is supported with four legs, the hind two bent. The body is inscribed with a floral pattern, common in Fatimid figural metalwork. Intricate floral and vegetal roundels, scrolls, arabesques and other decorative designs were commonly used to enhance the unique detail of these objects. This style of embellishment was not previously seen on any other metalwork in the Early Islamic Period similar ornamentation on Islamic bronze animals was found in the Western Mediterranean;72 this will be discussed in Chapter Four with the Pisa Griffon. Another type is the gazelle of which there exist numerous examples. The gazelle, often misidentified by other scholars as a deer, was a popular Fatimid theme. The incorrect identification likely stemmed from damaged or incomplete examples of the gazelle figures that are without large antlers characteristic of the gazelle. Close examination of all the known Fatimid period examples reveals stylistically they are extremely similar and the damaged figures indicate the probable presence of gazelle-like antlers. The figures are likely modeled specifically after the Nubian Ibex, a species in the Gazella genus, which was indigenous to Fatimid period Egypt (app. I, R). The gazelle figures are found in the Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 128), Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 129), at the 1910

72 Gierlich et al., Islamic Art Germany 131.
Munich exhibition (fig. 130),\textsuperscript{73} David Collection at Copenhagen (fig. 131), a private collection consigned at Christie’s (fig. 132) and Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 133). The six bronze gazelle figures are all datable to the late 10\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century in Egypt. They are freestanding and supported on four legs, with the exception of the Munich (fig. 130) and David (fig. 131) examples which are fragmented and missing their hind legs: additionally the David example is missing its side. Five of the gazelle figures are decorated with exterior ornamentation consisting of scrolling floral and vegetal motifs. The Cairo (fig. 129) and Christie’s (fig. 132) examples contain the most elaborate ornamentation that include encircled pomegranate motifs and pronounced frontal legs with, as one scholar described it, a shield design.\textsuperscript{74} The well-defined legs and shield design would become more common with Fatimid metalwork. The Christie’s example is the best preserved and the most complete, yet it lacks the deep cut pomegranate detail of the Cairo example. The other gazelle from the Keir Collection (fig. 133) is highly stylized and has the least amount of detail in the group of six, however it is worn and original decoration may have been lost. It is more reminiscent of an ibex than the other five, but is part of the overall Gazella genus. The feet of the gazelle figures are similar to the stylized zoomorphic type common on Central Asian incense burners (figs. 101-3): the only exception are the Christie’s example (fig. 132) with zoomorphic hooves appropriate for a gazelle and the Berlin example (fig. 128) that is without hooves at all, the likely result of damage. These figures are certainly from Fatimid Egypt; supporting evidence derives from comparison with ceramics produced in Egypt in the same period that are decorated with gazelles.\textsuperscript{75} Additionally the Nubian Ibex, an animal almost exclusive to Egypt, closely resembles these figures and was native in the Fatimid period. It is very interesting to note that the gazelle figures are produced with such a wide variety of designs,

\textsuperscript{73} Current whereabouts unknown: Last exhibited 1910 Ausstellung Muhammedanischer Kunst in München
\textsuperscript{74} Abbas, The Fatimids 76.
\textsuperscript{75} Christie’s, Arts Islamic and Indian Worlds April 2011 92.
Another animal figure common in the Fatimid period is the goat; three examples are found in the Keir Collection at Berlin (figs. 134-6), all bronze and datable to the 10th-12th century in Egypt. One of the goat figures, perhaps the most detailed of the group (fig. 134) is decorated with four human figures seated under arches. The appearance of their faces and clothing indicate a Fatimid origin. The use of human figural decoration on the Keir goat differed from human figural use previously in the early Islamic approach of protomes and embellishments to utilitarian objects. In the case of the Keir goat, no other similar human figural decoration remains on any other Fatimid metalwork examples, therefore it cannot be determined if this was experimental or a common stylistic technique. Also the goat is inscribed in floriated Kufic, however only an ineligible trace remains. The Keir goat has stylized features (fig. 134). It is freestanding on four legs; although only one side of the object remains, the feet and horns are lost. The second Keir goat (fig. 135) is like the former in style, shape and decoration, except without human figural imagery. This goat is also missing its second half and horns; the feet are simple zoomorphic hooves. It seems a number of the animal figures from the Fatimid period are without a second half, since most of the figures are cast in halves. Over time the joint split and the other side was lost. The third goat (fig. 136) is devoid of any decoration and heavily worn. It is wrapped in a textile likely from the period that has shielded the exterior surface. The figure is complete, freestanding with four legs and has stylized feet.

An extremely popular theme in Fatimid Egypt is the hare, used to decorate ceramics, ivory, rock crystal, woodwork and of course metalwork. Perhaps the most prolific of animal figural objects produced in the Fatimid Caliphate, hare examples are found in the collections of

76 Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir 49.
the David Collection at Copenhagen (fig. 137), Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 138), Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 139), L.A. Mayer Museum of Islamic Art at Jerusalem (fig. 140), Musée du Louvre at Paris (fig. 141) and a private collection on loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York (fig. 142); other examples will be discussed in the next section. The hare figures are all cast in bronze and datable to the 10th-12th century in Egypt. Three of the hare objects (figs. 138-9 and 142) are more realistic in appearance although stylized while the others (figs. 137 and 140-1) are highly stylized with swinish features or those reminiscent of another mammal. Three in the group (figs. 137 and 139-40) might have served an additional purpose other than purely aesthetic, possibly as a waterspout or miniature aquamanile. Other scholars have alluded to this possible function, however without any evidence or additional examples the alternative purpose remains conjecture. Additionally, markings and piercings that indicate another function may not be original to the object. The various forms of the hare cast in Egypt suggest the varying appeal of the theme. The L.A. Mayer hare (fig. 140) shows a defensive pose, the Keir hare (fig. 138) an action position and the Metropolitan hare (fig. 142) is seated with its ears alert. The exterior decoration of the hare figures is mostly foliate and vegetal decoration: the L. A. Mayer (fig. 140) and Metropolitan (fig. 142) examples both share the same tri-lobed design while the Keir example (fig. 138) is engraved with marks representative of ribs, a decorative element that became a highlight of Fatimid figural metalwork and is not seen on metal objects from any other Islamic period. It is also a common Fatimid decorative element with animal figures on other mediums such as ceramics.

77 Other Scholars have incorrectly cited this object as part of Harvard University’s collection: this hare figure was in the Stoclet Collection of Belgium, published under Migeon, Manuel D’Art Musulman 1927: exhibited in Harvard University Collection, Cambridge (at least in 1998) and Metropolitan Museum of Art Collection, New York 2011 from anonymous private collection
78 Baer, Metalwork Medieval Islamic Art 156-7.
79 Scholars have suggested alternative functions: no research, testing or evidence exists supporting this argument
80 Islamic Art Egypt 55.
Finally, the last four examples of animal figural metalwork are the leopard (fig. 143) and three lions (figs. 144-6) from the Islamic Museum and Keir Collection at Berlin and a previous exhibition held at Munich. The four from the Panthera genus are all cast bronze and datable to the 10th-12th century in Egypt. It is difficult to discern the exact species of the four objects since they are all stylized and worn. The leopard (fig. 143) and a lion from the group (fig. 145) that are from the Keir Collection at Berlin are both similar in their pouncing stance; detailing can be seen on the leopard indicative of spots. A second lion in the group (fig. 146) is so worn that individual details are hard to discern; it is likely to be datable to the earlier Fatimid period, since it is highly stylized and simplistic. Another lion from the group (fig. 144) is cast in a seated position with the exterior rib markings, a noted Fatimid attribute. Other scholars have alluded to a Fatimid origin from Sicily and an alternative function other than artistic for one lion in the group (fig. 145).81 There is no evidence, testing or comparative material to support either argument, however a Southern Italian origin from the Fatimid period is not impossible. Additionally, limited information is available for the leopard (fig. 143) and a lion example in the group (fig. 144),82 that previously shown at the 1910 Munich exhibition. The difficulty in precisely dating the Fatimid period animal figures originates from the wide span of their production, not only in Egypt but throughout the Mediterranean, Levant and Iran. In Egypt animal figures were produced in ancient Egyptian, Roman and Byzantine art.83 They were produced in the Early Islamic Period as embellishments or utilitarian objects and in the Fatimid period the same function continued with an added purely aesthetic purpose. Nevertheless, in the absence of dated objects and stratified archaeological material much evidence can be drawn from stylistic

81 Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir 48.
82 No known publication since 1910 Ausstellung Muhammedanischer Kunst in München: current whereabouts unknown
83 Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir 43.
comparison and from related datable media such as ceramics.\textsuperscript{84} It can be said that the objects in motion and with sophisticated decoration are more likely to be from the later Fatimid period,\textsuperscript{85} compared to the simplistic metal objects produced at Kairouan and the nonexistence of animal figural metalwork. These difficulties might account for earlier scholars incorrectly attributing almost all animal figural metalwork from the Early Islamic Period to a Fatimid origin.\textsuperscript{86} The differences of Fatimid figural metalwork and those produced in the Early Islamic Period, notably under the Umayyads and Abbasids, are well defined. Fatimid examples were sometimes produced with the idea of an artistic raison d’être not seen in the previous periods; their attention to certain stylistic details such as the pronounced leg, rib marking, more realistic appearance of the figures and difference in popularity of certain animals are all elements not common on Umayyad and Abbasid metalwork.

**Fatimid Zoomorphic, Foliate and Figural Metalwork**

In the Fatimid period especially in Egypt, metal objects with a function were sometimes embellished with zoomorphic, foliate and figural details. These objects differed from those in the previous section, which were solely for artistic reasons; these objects were functional with decoration. The bronze and a few silver objects produced are aquamaniles, fans, faucets, hinges, incense burners, lamps, lampstands, lamp-chains, lids, plaques, protomes and waterspouts. The animals employed with this category of metal objects are more diverse than those used in metalwork probably in any other part of the Islamic world. These include the bear, birds (stylized), eagles, gazelle, hare, lions, a mouse, parrots, peacocks and worms. Certain zoomorphic features were applied to metal objects including stylized animal feet and vegetal or

\textsuperscript{84} Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir 43.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., 43.
\textsuperscript{86} Migeon in Manuel Musulman 374-83, including other early scholars incorrectly attribute almost all animal figural metalwork to Fatimid Egypt
foliate decoration. Additionally, some of the objects were adorned with human figural imagery, namely angels and abstract human forms.

Animal figural objects that served as protomes, decoration or had a function were numerous in the Fatimid period. The parrot is used prolifically in Fatimid metalwork in Egypt and until a complete example was discovered, currently in the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 147), its true purpose was unknown. The bronze parrot figures from Egypt and datable to the 10th-12th century are engaged as part of the lamp-chain that was suspended above a pierced bronze globe decorated with animals, namely gazelles and hares, as well as scrolling palmettes.87 Numerous other parrot examples are found in the Keir Collection; they all are pierced to allow the lamp-chain to pass through (figs. 148-54). One parrot (fig. 148) has incised decoration indicating feathers, wings and registers with pseudo-Egyptian hieroglyphics that suggest an Egyptian origin.88 The ornate detail of this parrot (fig. 148) is indicative of an advanced date in the Fatimid period, likely 11th-12th century, while the other parrots are void of exterior decoration with only pronounced wing markings. A final parrot example, also in the Islamic Museum at Berlin, is cast in bronze and datable to the 10th century in Egypt (fig. 155). This parrot is different from the other examples in that it has several piercings including through its center, beak, eyes and wings. Although it is void of any decoration, the wings are much more pronounced than the others and it was likely used for the same purpose with lamp-chains.

Previously in the Early Islamic Period animal figural forms are only utilized as protomes or embellishment to objects. Parrots in Fatimid metalware become a major artistic component of the object, in this case a lamp-chain, even adapting pre-Islamic writing as decoration, a dynamic use not seen in Islamic metalwork previously.

87 Fehérvári, Metalwork 120.
88 Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir, 52.
The lion in Fatimid Egypt was used largely as waterspouts; other uses such as protomes can be attributed to the early Fatimid period. On Umayyad and Abbasid metalware the lion was only used as a protome. In the transitional 10th century between the Abbasid and Fatimid administration of Egypt, their remained a period of Persian influence on the decorative arts and Fatimid metalwork reflected this impact, an example is the lion protome from the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 156). The cast bronze lion datable to the 10th century in Egypt has a pouncing stance and is devoid of decoration. Its position and looped tail indicate it was attached to another object. Another cast bronze lion protome datable to the 10th century in Egypt (fig. 157) and also in the Keir Collection reiterates a common theme in Islamic imagery, the lion attacking the gazelle (app. I, N). These two animals together likely crowned a lid,89 which would be a Fatimid development, since Umayyad and Abbasid metal objects are crowned with pomegranates and flowers, etc., but not animals. The decoration consists of detailed markings, including ribs, a noted Fatimid theme. Evidence for the lion and gazelle theme in the Fatimid period appears on wood carvings from the royal palace and in Cairo and variations from Fatimid period churches.90

The application of the lion evolved in Fatimid work to become in the 11th and 12th centuries a waterspout. The three known examples are found in the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 158), Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 159) and from the Hessisches Landesmuseum at Kassel in Germany (fig. 160): the lion waterspout was a new concept in art from the Early Islamic Period in Egypt. The 12th century Cairo waterspout (fig. 158) is cast in bronze with a pierced mouth, stomach and hollow interior. The lion is stylized and the decoration consists of dots, lines and triangles to denote its features including the eyes, nose, paws and whiskers (fig.

89 Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir 51.
90 Ibid., 44.
158.2). The lion has pronounced legs and ears; the leg detail is a recurring Fatimid theme. The tail is ribbed and culminates with the head of a dragon,\textsuperscript{91} imagery more common with later period aquamaniles or waterspouts from Greater Persia and Umayyad Spain. Further evidence for a Fatimid attribution comes from historical references to a contemporary lion waterspout at the Nilometer in Cairo.\textsuperscript{92} The Berlin waterspout is cast in bronze and datable to the 12\textsuperscript{th} century in Egypt (fig. 159). The lion is stylized with the Fatimid rib marks, has a pierced mouth and stomach, pronounced legs in the Fatimid tradition, is hollow and has exterior decoration consisting of dots with vegetal motifs. The feet are highly stylized with a Persian theme and the tail ending is unique; the ears match the Cairo lion. Most importantly, the Berlin lion has an inscription that states it is made for the governor of lower Egypt and Cairo, Shams al-Dīn. The third lion, from Kassel, is made of cast bronze and datable to the 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century in Cairo, Egypt (fig. 160). This waterspout is also inscribed with Kufic that states it is made by the sculptor Abdullah al-maththal. This was likely produced close to the Fatimid court in Cairo,\textsuperscript{93} although other scholars have indicated its style is a migration from the type formed in Islamic Spain.\textsuperscript{94} The Kassel waterspout does have parallels with Islamic bronzes in Umayyad Spain, notably with the sleek face and highly detailed paws with an emphasis on realism. The body lacks decoration or markings other than the inscription and has eyes and ears unlike the previous two lion examples and should therefore be dated earlier than the previous two. The body is hollow, the mouth and stomach are pierced. Other scholars have alluded to its function as an aquamanile and not a waterspout,\textsuperscript{95} citing markings that might indicate a handle.\textsuperscript{96} The origin of

\textsuperscript{91} Abbas, The Fatimids 74.
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these large Panthera waterspouts can be traced to Persian pierced incense burners in animal form from the 11th and 12th centuries of Abbasid or Seljuk rule. The trend began in Khorasan and was later adapted by the Fatimids that produced distinctive examples of waterspouts. Perhaps the lion waterspouts functioned similarly to those carved in stone at the Alhambra in 11th century Umayyad Spain (app. I, S-T) or like the Fatimid stone lion waterspout in the Hermitage Museum at St. Petersburg (app. I, U). Although there is no information about how Fatimid waterspouts were used in situ, their grandeur, similar high esteem in Umayyad Spain and political patronage as evidenced from the inscriptions suggest they were probably employed at the Fatimid royal palaces in Cairo.

A menagerie of animals utilized in the Fatimid period consisting of the bear, stylized birds, eagles, hare, mice, peacocks and worms were all used as protomes or decoration to adorn particular objects. In some examples multiple animals and zoomorphic features are present, a development in metalwork not seen in Umayyad and Abbasid examples, some objects become entirely anthropomorphic. In the Sabah Collection at the Kuwait National Museum are two peacock protomes, both cast in bronze and datable to the 10th-11th century in Egypt or possibly Syria (figs. 161-2). The two peacocks are stylized with limited decoration signifying a date in the early Fatimid period. The second peacock (fig. 162) is situated on a faucet whose opening consists of a lion’s head. The al-Sabah examples differ from the peacock themes in Byzantine and Umayyad metalwork in Egypt (figs. 33-9) in that they were used to a lesser extent, notably in the Fatimid period, as protomes. Earlier they were seen as figural aquamaniles, censers and incense burners, pierced in bowls and on plaques. The range of objects and popularity of the peacock is thus evidenced in Umayyad metalwork, while in the Fatimid period the style changed

97 Küehnel, Minor Arts Islam 158-60.
98 Ibid., 158-60.
or popularity waned as the peacock was used infrequently. In the Keir Collection at Berlin are a bear cast in iron and a mouse cast in bronze, both datable to the 10th-11th century in Egypt (figs. 163-4). The bear is upright but heavily corroded and the animated mouse is positioned on a loop. The two protomes were likely attached to a larger vessel probably from the earlier Fatimid period during the transition from Abbasid rule. The mouse has correlations with similar animals situated on loops for ornamentation, namely the ewers datable to the 9th-10th century in Egypt (figs. 106-12).

Various stylized birds, too nondescript or corroded to identify precisely the species, are found on several Fatimid objects including incense burners and plaques; others exist today as loose figures that are protomes, ornaments and finials that were likely attached to vessels. Examples of loose bird figures are in the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 165) and the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 166). The Cairo bird is stylized and is likely a finial; it is cast bronze and datable to the 11th century in Egypt. The Berlin bird is formed in silver, a rare surviving example of precious metal from Fatimid metalwork; it is from Egypt and datable to the 10th-11th century. The bird is stylized yet the feathers and wings are marked; it is integrated into a loop and is attached to a silver ewer. It is Egyptian in origin since stylistically it correlates with bird-themed jewelry fashionable in Fatimid Egypt. A plaque in the collection of the Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge features two birds perched above a cast brass pierced vegetal arabesque (fig. 167). The arabesque surrounds a rosette and a flowering crown divides the birds equidistantly, a reference to the tree of life. The plaque is datable to Egypt in the 10th century or transitional period, due to the absence of detail on the birds and the flowering crown between them, which is in the Persian style. The stylized birds that adorned
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incense burners often are paired with another bird popular in the Fatimid era, the eagle. The eagle is seen most often crowning incense burners and lids, but almost always is depicted with spread wings and in an active position, sometimes with another animal, i.e. with a worm in its beak (fig. 168). This representation differed from Umayyad period eagles, which are often perched, sometimes with spread wings and have stationary attributes (figs. 1.2 and 17-8). The Fatimid eagles, although stylized like their antecedents, have an animated twisted shape that implied locomotion. Examples of several loose eagles that likely crowned incense burners and lids are in the Keir Collection at Berlin (figs. 169-70) and the Musée du Louvre (fig. 172). These eagles are all cast bronze and datable to Egypt in the 10th-12th century. The birds are stylized and utilize dots with vegetal designs as decoration and to distinguish feathers, a noted Fatimid motif.

An eagle from the group in the Keir Collection (fig. 169) has a notably later dating in the 12th century, the detail of its beak, wings and tail are more defined than the earlier Fatimid eagles, although all in the group are worn.

Eagles that topped lids are found in the collections of the Islamic Museum at Berlin (figs. 173-4) and the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 175). The three bronze lids are datable to the 11th-12th century in Egypt and are inscribed in Kufic. The three lids are likely covers for braziers or incense burners: all of the eagles have spread wings, are animate and stylized, although worn. The stylization and lack of detail indicate a Fatimid dating probably in the 11th century, especially in comparison with two of the individual Keir eagles (figs. 170-1) that are datable to the 11th century and most likely from lids. Eagles used to adorn 10th-11th century Egyptian incense burners are in the collections of the Musée du Louvre (figs. 168 and 176) and the Coptic Museum at Cairo (figs. 177-9), although only a partial eagle remains from one of the Louvre examples (fig. 176). These cast bronze incense burners consist of a combination either with
cylindrical or squared bases with domed or squared lids; they are all pierced with vegetal motifs and scrolling vines. Certain features of the burners relate to earlier ones produced under the Umayyads, Abbasids and pre-Islamic Byzantine Egypt. These features include the blooming flower crowning four in the group (figs. 168 and 177-9), the pierced vegetal and scrolling vines decorating all of the examples and the shapes of the burners which are seen on earlier Byzantine and Islamic examples and other metal objects: these earlier features were discussed in Chapter Two. The characteristics of these incense burners that allow for a Fatimid period dating are the abundance of the hare used as protomes (a popular Fatimid theme), the eagle form that stylistically is Fatimid, the presence of rib marks and the numerous birds used as protomes or ornaments. The incense burners produced under the Fatimids in Egypt became a veritable menagerie and are unlike any produced in the Early Islamic Period. The burners are Egyptian because certain stylistic elements strongly suggest an Egyptian origin, especially the zoomorphic feet with hooves from the regional Egyptian style. Use of the crowning flower ornament however is a well-known Persian style. The Fatimids placed eagles and other birds above the flowering crown (figs. 168 and 177-9) one burner in the group has an eagle with a dangling worm (fig. 168), unseen imagery previously in the Early Islamic Period. The burners would then be datable to the 10th-11th century in Egypt, largely due to the Persian flower usage probably conveyed during the transitional period in Egypt and the detailed eagle protomes that were seen later in the Fatimid period. The hare protomes integrated as legs (figs. 168 and 177) are unique in Islamic metalwork and suggest another Fatimid stylistic development. Further evidence for a Fatimid provenance can be seen on the hare protomes (fig. 168), which have rib marks (fig. 168.2) common with other Fatimid animal figures. Although the group is without handles; the joint of a handle is visible on three (figs. 168 and 176-7), while the other two examples (figs.
178-9) are incomplete and only the lids remain from the actual burners.\textsuperscript{101} These incense burners were likely used in ecclesiastical ceremonies,\textsuperscript{102} including the Umayyad attributed Freer burner (fig. 32). It should also be noted that some of the incense burners are missing the eagle protome crown however remnants remain and it is presumed that they are eagles through stylistic comparison of similar incense burners with surviving eagle protome crowns.

The final example of an animal figure in Fatimid metalwork is the gazelle aquamanile currently in the collection of the Oriental Department in the Museum of Ethnology at Munich, Germany (fig. 180). The cast bronze freestanding gazelle is datable to the 11\textsuperscript{th} century in Egypt; it is hollow and has a pierced mouth. Several other piercings throughout the object are related to wear and not original, with the exception of two joints that possibly indicated the existence of a handle. The figure can be attributed to the Fatimid period as it has the pronounced legs, rib markings and scrolling floral or vegetal motifs, all of which are seen on other Fatimid animals. There are two issues with the gazelle aquamanile; the first that some scholars have classified the animal as a deer. Although this is plausible the majority of the physical features suggest an animal from the Gazella genus, especially in comparison to the known Fatimid gazelle (figs. 128-33). The antlers or horns of the Munich example however are more reminiscent of a deer. The second issue concerns the possible missing handle; since the handle is absent a definitive provenance cannot be made, nonetheless a comparison is often made with another Fatimid attributed gazelle aquamanile (fig. 181) that will be discussed in the next section with its Persian handle. The lack of a handle for the Munich aquamanile aside, affirmation that the object is Fatimid is suggested through the known Fatimid styles. The realistic appearance of the gazelle

\textsuperscript{101} Some scholars have incorrectly classified these incense burners as censers: the joint for a handle is visible on three of the five in the group and no indications for suspension via chain exists.

\textsuperscript{102} Atil et al., Islamic Metalwork Freer 59.
aquamanile is also similar to those on Fatimid ceramics,¹⁰³ further evidence for a Fatimid provenance.

The other known examples of human figural imagery in Fatimid metalware used as embellishment to objects, aside from the Keir goat (fig. 134), are angels found on Christian fans and two abstract human forms from oil lamps. The silver fans in the collections of the Brooklyn Museum at New York (fig. 182-3) and Coptic Museum at Cairo (fig. 184) are decorated with figural imagery consisting of humans and animals. These fans or rhipidia are liturgical objects produced for churches in Egypt and are datable to the 11th-12th century. The Brooklyn rhipidia contain imagery of an ox and lion on one (fig. 182) and of an angel with an eagle on the other (fig. 183). The Cairo rhipidion, similar in shape and appearance to the Brooklyn rhipidia is decorated with imagery of the four beasts from the Book of Revelations in the Holy Bible, namely cherubim and seraphim or different angels. The significance of these fans is that they were produced with Christian figural imagery far into the Early Islamic Period in Egypt¹⁰⁴ and especially unique is that they were produced in silver, which was less common in Fatimid Egypt than under the Umayyads. The other examples of human figural ornamentation are on oil lamps datable to the 10th century in the Medieval and Later Department of the British Museum (fig. 185) and the Musée du Louvre (fig. 186). The figures are both highly conceptual and almost impossible to identify as human, however the possibility that one from the pair might be a bird protome cannot be dismissed; it consists of a lone figural ornament separated from the lamp (fig. 186). The other example is situated on an oil lamp above the spout (fig. 185). The style of the figures is unusual and not something seen in the decorative arts of the Islamic world. Scholars have attributed the appearance of the two figures to elaborately festooned lamps from classical

¹⁰³ Trésors Fatimides Caire 120.
¹⁰⁴ Byzantine and Islam 74.
antiquity (figs. 51-2).\textsuperscript{105} It has been suggested that Louvre figure can be attributed to the Byzantine period in Egypt, however there are no other comparable examples and the similar British Museum figure is attached to a Fatimid period oil lamp, therefore the two examples likely both are Fatimid.

A group of metalwork from the Fatimid period that is comprised of zoomorphic features, foliate and vegetal shapes is a common theme on the numerous objects, but this decoration differed from the previous group of objects that included human and animal figures or figural imagery. The largest category of known objects in this second group that undoubtedly was widely used in the Fatimid period are lampstands. These form part of the collections in the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 187), Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 188), Coptic Museum at Cairo (figs. 189-91), Department of the Faculty of Arts in Cairo University at Giza (fig. 192), David Collection at Copenhagen (fig. 193), a German private collection (fig. 194), Nubia Museum at Aswan (fig. 195), al-Sabah Collection in the Kuwait National Museum (fig. 196), three previously offered at Christie’s (figs. 197-9), Victoria and Albert Museum at London (fig. 200) and an anonymous loan to the British Museum (fig. 201). The fifteen known lampstands include the aforementioned; there are also numerous incomplete sections from the Coptic Museum at Cairo (figs. 202-12) and Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge (fig. 213) as well as some complete examples in the four Fatimid hoards (fig. 286). The lampstands are produced in bronze or brass and all followed a certain design which can be classified as the Fatimid type. This differed from other lampstands produced in the Early Islamic Period that usually followed pre-Islamic models such as several Umayyad period lampstands datable to the 7\textsuperscript{th} century (figs. 46-52). The lampstands produced in the Fatimid period have developed beyond the Umayyad ideal to create a type with a combination of geometric designs
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and a zoomorphic theme transposed from Byzantine Egypt. The zoomorphic theme includes animate feet for each of the lampstands in the traditional animal stylization of Egypt, not Persian as was common with other examples of Early Islamic Period metalwork; although some lampstands had additional decoration of incised vine scrolls and floral motifs. All of the Fatimid lampstands are datable to the 10th-12th century in Egypt and consist of three parts, a plate, shaft and base that are cast in three sections. The shaft is designed with a cylindrical or hexagonal column that might be fluted, not to be confused with Persian models that have elongated and often pierced shafts; on either side is a spherical knob that might have lozenge-shaped facet decoration, bosses or triangles. The exact shape, length and degree of ornament varies slightly on each lampstand. The upper plate is a flat tray that holds the candle or lamp and is sometimes decorated as the David example demonstrates (fig. 193). The base is supported above three feet of varying stylized animal themes, usually hooves, which hold a drip-tray and the shaft, although one lampstand has Persian stylized feet (fig. 200). The drip-tray is either circular or in a star pattern with varying degrees of decoration, differing on each lampstand. Certain examples are inscribed with a Kufic benediction; the Cairo lampstand is dedicated to Ibn al-Makki106 (fig. 187) and the Sabah lampstand states there is a blessing from God (fig. 196). Some scholars have asserted that the elaborate design and ornament of certain lampstands (figs. 188, 194 and 200-1) are early Fatimid, while the less detailed lampstands are later (figs. 186, 192-3 and 195-9).107 The transition from complex to minimal decoration however is contrary to the general trend of metalwork in the Fatimid period; it is more likely that the elaborate details are a stylistic influence in tandem with the simpler styled lampstands and that both styles developed in the
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The significance of these lampstands would be that they are representative of a unique Fatimid type that is distinguishable from earlier lampstands in the same region. Although metalwork can be melted, soldered and conglomerated as discussed earlier, the Fatimid type is recognizable and the shaft or base can easily be identified among pirated lampstands (figs. 201 and 209-13). Composite lampstands can include parts from the Pharonic, Abbasid influenced Greater Persian and the Fatimid periods or any number of age unknown pieces.

The final objects with foliate decoration from the Fatimid period are three plaques in the Islamic Museum at Cairo (figs. 214-5) and Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge (fig. 167), hinges from the Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 216) and two oil lamps from the Coptic and Islamic Museums in Cairo (fig. 217-8). The plaques are cast bronze (figs. 214-5) and brass (fig. 167), datable to the 10th-12th century in Egypt. Vegetal designs of trefoils, leaves and scrollwork are the principle decoration for the Cairo plaques; they are used as chest armatures. Affirmation for their use comes from the nail holes positioned centrally on the plaques (fig. 214). The Sackler example is a flower surrounded with an arabesque, two birds crown the top with a tree of life theme as previously discussed; it is used in equestrian harnesses. The pair of bronze hinges in the Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 216) are used to fit a glass box from Egypt datable to the 11th century. The box was taken to Europe for use as a reliquary, however the importance is the stylization of the hinges that represent a trefoil and leaf. This is evidence that the most basic of utilitarian metal articles were stylized in zoomorphic or foliate form for artistic purposes. The two oil lamps in the Coptic and Islamic Museums of Cairo are unique in that they are the lone surviving of their type with foliate decoration. The bronze
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lamps are datable to the 10th century in Egypt and are similar in shape to typical ceramic lamps from the period; the typical Fatimid lamp will be reviewed in the next section. The distinguishing features of the two lamps are the known ornaments and an S-shaped handle on the Islamic Museum example from Cairo (fig. 218). The Islamic Museum example from Cairo is consistent with ewers and jugs datable to the 9th-10th century in Egypt with the same S-shaped handles (figs. 106-12). The S-shaped handle is a regional Egyptian style and on the typical Fatimid oil lamp (fig. 218), it demonstrated that the origin is Egypt. The knob ornament on both examples from the Coptic and Islamic Museums is a blooming flower (fig. 217) and a pomegranate (fig. 218); both ornaments are imported Persian features common on Abbasid metalwork in Egypt, namely ewers and incense burners (figs. 116-7 and 119-23). These objects are datable to Egypt in the 9th-10th century; the oil lamps are Fatimid shaped with popular Abbasid type ornament and thus are datable to the later transitional period in Egypt of the 10th century. The oil lamps represent a development of Fatimid metalwork in Egypt; the lamps are shaped in the Fatimid type that originated in Ifriqiyya and was produced throughout their Caliphate.

Utilitarian Metalwares and Precious Metals in the Fatimid Period

A large group of metal objects were produced in the Fatimid period lacking or with limited decoration that consists of geometric patterns or Christian symbols. These objects are utilitarian and most are heavily worn. The principal utilitarian object in this group is the bucket, numerous plain buckets were produced in Fatimid Egypt. The buckets are not comparable to grand waterspouts or aquamaniles likely made for the Fatimid palaces of Cairo. Nevertheless, some are decorated and inscribed. Eleven principal buckets can be found in the Islamic Museum and Keir Collection at Berlin (figs. 219-24), Hermitage Museum at St. Petersburg (fig. 225), Musée du Louvre (fig. 226), Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge (fig.
al-Sabah Collection in the Kuwait National Museum (fig. 228), Victoria and Albert Museum at London (fig. 229) and additional buckets were found at the various Fatimid hoards, notably at Serçe Limani and Tiberias (figs. 235 and 287); other examples will be discussed in the next section. They are all in bronze or brass (apart from one copper example), datable to the 10th-11th century in Egypt or possibly the Levant. They are inscribed with bands of Kufic; some examples are floriated and have benedictions expressing good wishes to the owner or relating to God. Some are decorated with incised registers of arabesques or geometric patterns with chevrons or circles; this decoration may be continued on the rims and handles. Nearly all are shaped alike, circular with straight walls, an open top with an encircled a rim, a rounded bottom and a semicircle handle attached via pins on either side. This differed from the typical Persian buckets that rest on three feet and have bulbous or pitched walls. The absence of feet from the Fatimid buckets despite their use on contemporary Persian examples is unusual especially since they are seen on ewers datable to the 9th-10th century in Egypt (figs. 113-5 and 117) and they are generally not utilized on Persian metalwork in the early Islamic centuries. The two buckets found in the Fatimid hoard at Tiberias are not of the Fatimid type, in that they have a bulbous body, which is an indication of a Persian design (fig. 287). The portability of metalwork as well as the lack of serious study and examination of the hoard objects likely eliminates the Tiberias buckets as Fatimid in origin. Other buckets discovered in the Fatimid hoard at Serçe Limani have a deviation in the handle from the principal eleven abovementioned examples, suggesting they are were produced outside of Egypt (fig. 285).111 Modern testing and the evidence from the Fatimid hoards indicate that some of the eleven buckets or certainly others were at least produced in Levantine coastal cities.112 Regardless of the bucket production in Egypt or the Levant, the
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eleven examples are all Fatimid. The purpose of the buckets was to transport water and for washing; they likely served affluent owners.\textsuperscript{113} In pre-Islamic Persia comparable buckets are depicted in Assyrian sculpture at Ashur-Nasir-Pal from the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE.\textsuperscript{114} The Assyrian relief sculpture shows the buckets utilized in religious ceremonies relating to fertility;\textsuperscript{115} perhaps this accounts for the Fatimid religious use of the buckets for ablutions and their benedictory inscriptions as seen on an example from the Keir Collection in floriated Kufic relating to God and the patron (fig. 222). It should also be noted that the central part of the handles are pierced with a hole and some have rings suspended from these holes; they could have been suspended either for storage, use, etc., the exact purpose is unknown.

Another corresponding object both in appearance and function are bowls. Examples are found in the Musée du Louvre (figs. 230-1), Sackler Museum of Art in Harvard University at Cambridge (fig. 232) and the Fatimid hoard at Tiberias (fig. 287). They are all datable to the 11\textsuperscript{th} century in Egypt and made of copper. Three are almost identical in shape and style (figs. 231-2 and 287); two have exterior incised decoration (figs. 231-2) while the third is heavily worn and thus decoration is difficult to discern (fig. 287); the fourth bowl is void of any decoration (fig. 230). The dots on the Louvre bowl (fig. 231) are analogous to those from the Umayyad ewer in the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 23.5), this design will be seen on other Fatimid objects in Egypt. The Sackler bowl (fig. 232) included the cross repeated with registers of pseudo-Kufic and a perpetual abstract design. Its shape, similar to the Louvre and Tiberias examples, show that it was a common Fatimid design utilized both for secular purposes and Christian patrons in Egypt and possibly the Levant assuming the hoarded bowl was produced in Tiberias. The bowls
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are hammered with pitched walls that sprung from their knobbed bases; only one had a rim (fig. 230).

As noted earlier, Fatimid metalwork produced from precious metals is scarce, however three examples of utilitarian objects survive, a silver ewer and mirror-back both in the Benaki Museum at Athens (fig. 233-4) and a silver spice box from the Real Colegiata de San Isidoro at León, Spain (fig. 235). The León spice box and fragmented Benaki ewer are both inscribed with Kufic in niello; the ewer is floriated and both are datable to Egypt in the 11th century. The spice box has an inscription stating it is made for the patron Sadaqa ibn Yūsuf, who from 1044-7 was vizier to the Fatimid Caliph al-Mustansir. This provides a clear provenance in Cairo; the silver and niello ewer was probably created for the Fatimid palaces in Cairo, similarly to the spice box. The ewer is shaped in the style common in the Early Islamic Period of Persia with a knobbed base, tear-drop shape and a knobbed neck. Aside from the niello inscription, the spice box has a geometric spiral in repeat that covers its four sides. The hinges of the box are cut deeply with possibly a foliate or abstract scroll, but it is not readily identifiable hence its categorization in this group of metalwork, although the decoration is reminiscent of the foliate hinges from the Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 216). Other scholars have suggested the spice box is unusual in Fatimid metalwork due to its combination of precious metal, inscriptions and geometric patterns. This argument cannot be proven since there are so few known precious metal objects from the Fatimid period. Scholars have also suggested the ewer is Persian in origin, based upon an Iranian discovered hoard datable to 1000. This argument again cannot be substantiated as there are no comparable Fatimid precious metals, although the Benaki ewer is evocative of a Persian style. The Tiberias hoard datable to the Fatimid 11th century contains some Abbasid
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period metalwork; any hoard, especially the Tiberias one, might hold examples from earlier periods. The Benaki silver mirror-back is datable to Egypt in the 11th century and it is plausible that it follows the trend of precious metal production for the Fatimid palaces of Cairo (fig. 234). The mirror-back is inscribed with Kufic that is read in a band around its circumference and is decorated with heart-shaped motifs. In the center of the mirror-back is a pierced boss that would allow for its suspension. The three silver objects from the 11th century are extremely rare and follow the trend in Fatimid metalwork that the more detailed and elaborate examples were produced later in the Fatimid period.

Other objects classified in this group are lamps, polycandela, a box and candlestick. These utilitarian objects are mostly decorated and are cast in bronze, brass and copper. A cylindrical box from the Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 236) is hammered in copper and is datable to the 11th century in Egypt. The box is almost unique in its shape and design; a similar example is known from the Tiberias hoard (fig. 287). It stands on three feet with two hinges and a clasp. It is incised with an interlaced strapwork and a benedictory Kufic inscription wraps around the circumference. The closeness to the box from the Tiberias hoard (fig. 287) and other hoards including one in the cathedral treasury at Bari reveals that this object was likely a popular example of Fatimid metalwork created for the upper class. The use of the three small feet on the box suggests an Egyptian origin again as previously seen on ewers (figs. 113-5 and 117). The feet (fig. 236.2) of the box are unusual those seen on the 9th-10th century ewers are simple with no detail, while those of the box are cylindrical, segmented and with rounded sides. Perhaps the 11th century box with the ornate feet was a development in Fatimid metalwork and followed the trend of later dated examples with more detail and ornament than those earlier.
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Further examination of the other boxes especially from the hoards and the detailed feet would be needed to establish a secure provenance.

Polycandela provided the same function as in the pre-Islamic world and other dynasties from the early Islamic centuries, most of the Fatimid examples are from both Kairouan and Egypt. They range from simple to highly complex in design and theme. The simpler examples were likely from the 10th century in Kairouan and developed into elaborate geometric patterns in Egypt datable to the 11th century. The polycandela are cast discs of bronze or brass with punched geometric designs that would have been suspended, most commonly in mosques or churches; the punched design includes several equidistant circular holes to support the tubular glass lamps (app. I, V). All of them have a design that originates in the center and radiates outward displaying the various patterns. Bronze examples are in the Musée du Bardo at Tunis (figs. 237-9), Great Mosque at Kairouan (figs. 240-1), St. Anthony’s Monastery, Egypt (figs. 242-3) and a private collection in Cairo (fig. 244); three additional brass polycandela are also from the Great Mosque at Kairouan (figs. 245-7). The three most developed models with elaborate motifs are punched in brass and are from the Great Mosque at Kairouan (figs. 245-7). These polycandela have sophisticated heart-shaped patterns, abstract designs and various geometric shapes. The 11th century datable patterns were said to match the mihrab of the Great Mosque at Kairouan, tombstones and book bindings from Fatimid Ifriqiyya. The significance of the 11th century Fatimid brass polycandela is that the designs for these objects had advanced into elaborate ornamentation far beyond what was produced in the Umayyad Caliphate as evidenced from the earlier polycandela (figs. 54-60). Additionally, the Fatimid brass polycandelon had
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mirrored other decorative arts in their beautiful designs, namely book binding, as well as
religious accouterments like the mihrab and tombstones, something not apparent in the Umayyad
or Abbasid periods. Some of the Umayyad polycandela however are similar to those produced in
10th-11th century provincial Egypt (figs. 242-4), an indication that the styles popular outside
Cairo changed little in the early Islamic centuries. Undoubtedly, the Fatimid elite were less
interested in provincial styles and themes proliferated in the provinces.125 It should be noted that
other scholars have suggested certain polycandela have leaf and other vegetal forms in the
designs,126 however the designs are so abstract that it is difficult to determine these details. The
sophisticated polycandela found in 11th century Tunisia indicate that they were probably gifted
from Cairo to Friday Mosques and important religious centers such as Kairouan, or possibly they
were purchased by wealthy congregations for their mosques. Byzantine period polycandela
indicate they were assigned to wealthy churches and that those parishes without means were
unlikely to receive or buy them;127 the same circumstances likely continued in the Early Islamic
Period, regarding mosques. The simpler examples were likely from the 10th century in Kairouan
and developed into elaborate geometric patterns in Egypt and gifted to provincial mosques.

Fatimid lamps are very distinctive from those created in the Umayyad period, which
generally follow a pre-Islamic design based on Roman and Byzantine models. Although the
Fatimid lamp design stemmed from earlier Mediterranean examples,128 it was developed and
differentiated from those in the previous early Islamic centuries. The geographic origin of its
development is unknown129 however since most of the examples are found in Ifriqiyya and
nearby Mediterranean countries, it is possible it expanded across North Africa to Egypt. Further
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evidence for this argument can be traced to ceramic lamps in Egypt that undoubtedly were based on the metal example.\textsuperscript{130} The lamps are cast in bronze and datable to the 11\textsuperscript{th} century in Sabra al-Mansuriyya and other places likely near Kairouan in Ifriqiyya; although more were probably produced throughout the whole Fatimid Caliphate and during every century. The surviving examples are datable to the 11\textsuperscript{th} century in the Museum of Islamic Art at Raqqada in Tunisia and Musée du Bardo at Tunis (figs. 248-50)\textsuperscript{131} and some in the Coptic Museum at Cairo (figs. 251-5). Other known comparable lamps will be discussed in the next section. The most distinguishing characteristic of Fatimid lamps is the long spouts, noted on every metal example and most ceramics. The lamps are produced with fluted spouts that jut from an ovoid or globular body, the neck is either narrow or enlarged but always tapered and usually with a simple hinged lid. The handles varies, ranging from unadorned loops to elaborate ones with an extended abstract finial. The finial might have been a thumb-piece but they are unnecessary and were added more for decoration than functionality (figs. 217-8 and 248-50), like Abbasid ewers and jugs (figs. 74-82) and 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century Egyptian ewers and jugs (figs. 107-15 and 117). Some lamps rest on a knobbed base (figs. 217 and 249) while others have a drip-tray (fig. 218); the majority are without bases (figs. 248 and 250-55). One of the lamps in the group is currently in the Islamic Museum of Art at Raqqada in Tunisia (fig. 247) and was discovered at Sabra al-Mansuriyya, the Fatimid royal capital founded in 946 outside of Kairouan. The lamp must have been made prior to the city’s destruction in 1016. The lamp has three elongated spouts that differs from the single one on the other lamps. The components remain the same as the other lamps but the three-sputed version was certainly not as common. It suggests that, although it is datable to the 11\textsuperscript{th} century and produced in a time long after the Fatimid transition to Egypt was completed,
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advanced metalwork design was still possible in Ifriqiyya. It also could have been imported from Cairo or Alexandria at a later date.

The other type of lamps created in the Fatimid period were expected to be used in mosques and other religious institutions. These include three known today in the Musée du Bardo at Tunis (figs. 256-7)\textsuperscript{132} and Museum for Turkish and Islamic Art at Istanbul (fig. 258). These consisted of punched geometric and abstract designs in bronze or brass. The Istanbul brass lamp was taken from the Great Mosque in Damascus and both Tunis bronze examples both from the Great Mosque at Kairouan, an indication that Fatimid metalwork was gifted to mosques or other religious foundations, like the previously discussed polycandela. The larger bronze lamp from Tunis (fig. 256) is inscribed in Kufic with the name of the patron, al-Mu’izz, providing for an 11\textsuperscript{th} century dating in Egypt, while the Istanbul lamp is dated by the inscription to 1090 and likely from Egypt. One of the lamps in the group has a spherical body with a large flared neck (fig. 258), another has an ovoid-shaped body with a wide tapered neck (fig. 256) and both have small bases. The third is spherical with a flared neck; the body culminates in a pinnacle reminiscent of a pomegranate but likely is an abstract finial, again probably from Egypt in the 11\textsuperscript{th} century. The punched designs of the lamps, aside from geometric and abstract patterns, sometimes contain additional detail. The Istanbul example has a seal of Solomon and some scholars have argued that vegetal designs are present, although the design is too abstract to discern. Two of the lamps are suspended via chains however the larger lamp in Tunis is suspended via three bars of pierced bronze plaques attached to a bulbous clamp and hook. These three examples are highly detailed and the superior quality of their designs further suggests a later Fatimid dating and probable Cairene attribution. The significance of these religious lamps is that they were likely produced in Cairo and could be inscribed with the name of the patron, the
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caliph to be distributed to the large congregations of Friday Mosques in major Fatimid cities, e.g. at Kairouan and Damascus. Understandably Fatimid caliphs were concerned with the metalwork gifts toward religious institutions in major metropolitan areas, while ignoring the styles and metalwork produced in provincial areas.

Several other metal objects from the Fatimid period which are not significant enough to discuss individually yet are worthy of mention are a bowl, keys, ladles, a plate and tools. These objects are all made of bronze, heavily worn, contain limited decorative detail if any and are utilitarian. Two simple bronze ladles datable to Egypt in the 10th century in the Musée du Louvre (fig. 259) and Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 260) were used for cooking purposes; the Louvre example has no decoration. The Keir ladle is decorated with engraved abstract designs, dots and a repeated Kufic benediction; related examples are found in the hoards. A copper plate in the Benaki Museum is datable to 11th century Egypt and its influence can be traced to comparable silver dishes (fig. 261). The plate, although modeled after precious metals, is a daily use object with engraved geometric, interlacing and entrelac decoration; several dotted bands circle the plate, again reminiscent of precious metalware. Finally, a Kufic benediction wraps around the circumference. The remaining objects are keys (figs. 262-76) and tools (figs. 277-81) all datable to the 10th century and made of iron in the Musée du Louvre, they hold limited information regarding the development of Fatimid metalwork, though should still be noted.

The Fatimid Hoards

In addition to the Fatimid metalwork held in public and private collections, sold at auctions and in religious institutions, there exist four known Fatimid hoards with metal objects. The four hoards of Caesarea, Denia, Serçe-Limani and Tiberias have all yielded vast amounts of metal objects from Fatimid workshops and merchant or mercantile inventories as well as great
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sources of information. More research and investigation of all the known hoards is required to fully understand the significance of metalwork, trading, exchanges and metals employed. The full scope of Fatimid metalwork from these sources is still uncertain.  

The first hoard from Caesarea, Palestine, amounted to 118 brass objects among other decorative arts examples including ceramics and glass. The brass vessels mainly consist of basins, bowls, boxes, braziers, buckets, ewers, handles, ladles, lampstands, protomes and trays that are datable to the late 10th-early 11th century in Egypt or the Levantine area. The dating is determined through the stratigraphic study and the epigraphy present on much of the ceramics, indicating no disturbance occurred to the hoard in situ. Based on the utilitarian nature of the items and the absence of any tools used in a metal workshop, the hoard was likely the contents of a household buried to avoid loss from an invasion, possibly from crusading Christian armies or another threat. Stylistic comparison of certain Caesarean brass objects in comparison to known Fatimid metalwork, namely the boxes, buckets and lampstands, provide for an 11th century dating based on the highly detailed and decorative elements that are not known on earlier Fatimid period metal objects (fig. 282). Two cylindrical boxes almost identical to the example from the Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 236) are significant; they indicate the object again was a popular Fatimid design and further substantiate its origin in the Fatimid repertoire. Comparison of the brass objects reveals parallel pieces found at Fustat and demonstrates that either the items were produced in Fustat or Cairo and transported to the Levant, showing the portability of metalwork, or that the brass items were produced in the Levant and were part of a common Fatimid theme among metalwork production throughout the caliphate; in any case the boxes
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were certainly a common design in the Fatimid Empire.

The second Fatimid hoard from Denia, Spain, is located near Valencia and is datable to the 11th century. The port city of Denia was a trading post in the Fatimid realm and possibly even under Fatimid administration. The store was discovered in ceramic vessels traced to Egypt, similarly to the Tiberias metal and Caesarean jewelry hoards (app. I, W). There are nearly 150 objects discovered at Denia including bronze metalwork; the most important are lamps and lampstands. The hoard is part of a larger archaeological site in Denia and more individual research and analysis of the metal objects is needed. Nevertheless, the bronze metalwork was probably the inventory of a merchant or merchants, buried to prevent loss at that time.

Examination of a bronze lampstand from a ceramic vessel reveals it is similar to the later Fatimid geometric type, providing for an 11th-12th century dating (fig. 283). A pierced incense burner with a scrolling vine motif and pomegranate or blooming flower crown is indicative of 9th-10th century metalwork in Egypt. This suggests these earlier styles were still popular or traded in at least the 11th century at Denia; the two objects above are part of this hoard. Other metalwork from the city of Denia, indicate it was imported from at least three defined production centers in Egypt, Iran and al-Andalus. This alludes to the fact that Denia was a major commercial center.

The third Fatimid hoard from Serçe Limani, Turkey, was discovered on a joint Fatimid-Byzantine shipwreck that was sailing from Egypt or the Levantine coast, to possibly Corinth on the Byzantine coast. The wreck is datable to the 11th century based upon the ceramics found in the cargo; the ceramic decoration indicated a Fustat origin. Included in the ship’s cargo are 15 metal vessels, nine of which have stylistically been labeled Fatimid in origin. The objects

---

138 Hirschfeld, Post-Roman Tiberias 203.
139 Ponting, Damascus to Denia 86.
140 Azuar, Denia Islámica 52.
141 Doorninck, Medieval Shipwreck 49.
142 Ibid., 51.
made of copper amounted to a box, bottle-necks, buckets, a jug, various assorted tools and four unusual heart-shaped objects with an unknown purpose. The small selection of metalwork and the utilitarian use for most of the objects indicates they were perhaps used onboard the ship. The assertion that the ship was a Fatimid vessel is based upon the anchor markings.\textsuperscript{143} This is further supported through the crockery supplied on the ship as a Fatimid proprietor would probably draw on local metalwares for supplies. The box mentioned as part of the ship’s inventory is similar in design to the Berlin example (fig. 236), yet the ship’s version, although hinged and cylindrical, seems smaller and has almost no decoration (fig. 284). The presence of the box on the ship alludes again to the popularity of the style and the contrasting types indicate elaborate examples were likely used in both affluent households and simpler examples for general use on ships and elsewhere. The hoards of Fatimid objects provide an invaluable source of information for both the context of Fatimid metalwork and for the role the various objects had in the Fatimid world, since limited examples survive today, the hoards are the lone sources for this information. Other objects on the ship, especially the buckets, are analogous to the eleven known buckets in public and private collections today and discussed previously (figs. 219-29). It should be noted that there was a handle deviation on the Serçe-Limani buckets (fig. 285); possibly they were provincial or are added cargo as the ship entered ports while on journey. The most interesting group of objects was the copper bottle-necks (fig. 286), a daily use item for pouring, none are known to exist other than from the Fatimid shipwreck for numerous reasons such as low value or remelting.

The last Fatimid hoard, from Tiberias, Israel, is datable to the 11\textsuperscript{th} century and consists of numerous copper objects (fig. 287). The frequency of metal hoards attributed to the Fatimid period in the 11\textsuperscript{th} century at Palestine, including a minor jewelry hoard from Caesarea (app. I, \textsuperscript{143} Doorninck, Medieval Shipwreck 50.)
W), attests to the great peril to which the area was subjected during the Crusades. The Tiberias hoard is the buried inventory of a metal workshop. This can be ascertained through the approximately 1000 objects found in three large ceramic vessels and since much of the inventory are tools and scrap parts for metal working. The objects have stylistically been attributed to Fatimid Egypt based upon the angular Kufic script, benedictory inscriptions, themes, figural imagery and the large range of the objects. The most significant items are boxes, bowls, buckets, lamps, and lampstands. Most of the objects display decorative styles developed in Egypt. Certain objects in the cache, including the buckets, bowls, cylindrical box and lampstands, have been compared above to other known Fatimid examples; there are also some hinged lamps and pouring cups that are of inexact origin and will be discussed in the next section.

**Fatimid Metal Objects with an Uncertain Origin**

In the field of medieval metalwork production, particular objects form a group that share one common distinction, they are similar to Fatimid examples but their Fatimid identity is uncertain or contested. A separate discussion of these objects as a group is necessary to fully understand the Fatimid identity in metalwork. The most distinguished object is the Pisa Griffon, which will be discussed in the next chapter, but there are minor examples, notably from Southern Italy, possibly Persia, the Levant, the Iberian Peninsula and Ifriqiyya. The first selection of metalwork in the group is attributed to Southern Italy, Sicily and Malta or the territories briefly under Fatimid rule or influence. The objects in the Italian group are a cast bronze cup in the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York (fig. 288), bronze and niello doorknocker in the David Collection at Copenhagen (fig. 289) and a bronze incense burner in the Aga Khan Collection at Geneva (fig. 290). The cup is attributable to Southern Italy or possibly Sicily in 1100-1150; it has a braided handle and figural imagery of a fantastic animal, namely the griffon.
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separated by fluted columns that support a frieze of scrolling vines. The griffon was a popular Islamic image in many of the decorative arts but is seldom seen in metalwork; the known examples from the Early Islamic Period, other than the Pisa Griffon, are the Umayyad throne leg and lamp-handle (figs. 9 and 61). The griffons on the Metropolitan cup are depicted with stylized fire emitting from the mouth, a detail not seen on other Islamic imagery. The cup likely is the product of an Italian artist with an Islamic influence, probably from Fatimid textiles or ceramics. The use of the fluted columns, stylized fire and braided handle are also not common on Islamic metalwork. Often with imagery in Islam the figures would oppose each other, usually separated with a tree or another object that are references to the tree of life theme; this is not the case with the cup. The absence of an inscription praising the owner of the object that undoubtedly paid for it is another reason to doubt a Fatimid provenance. The scrolling vine and griffon imagery however are Islamic, therefore the cup is probably Southern Italian in origin with a later period Fatimid influence from the 12th century.

The doorknocker (fig. 289) is attributed to Southern Italy in the 11th-12th century; it is adorned with a lion-faced protome serving as the knocker surrounded with its stylized mane. A rooster protome is integrated into the knocking ring and a floriated Kufic inscription is repeated around the circumference. The inscription professes faith to God and Islam while the rooster protome is suspended from the mouth of the lion. The idea that the knocker audibly and visually declared or roared devoutness to Islam has been suggested.\textsuperscript{145} Although there is no object similar to the doorknocker in the Early Islamic Period, the great detail of the lion head and its stylization are reminiscent of Fatimid waterspouts. The impressive floriated Kufic inscription with its clear declaration of Islam indicate the doorknocker is Islamic, as Western imitations would have used pseudo-Kufic. Considering the parallels with Fatimid waterspouts a suggested provenance would

\textsuperscript{145} Bloom et al., Cosmophilia 183.
be in 11th-12th century of Fatimid Egypt or parts of Southern Italy under their rule. The figural incense burner depicted as a bird is ascribed to the 11th-12th century in the Islamic Mediterranean region; it stands on two feet, has a sharp beak, an intricate pierced interlacing design around its neck and wings, another intricate design around the pierced eyes and the head is hinged to allow for incense. The bird is like those created in Fatimid Egypt, especially the parrot lamp chains, however no Fatimid parrot incense burners are known. The parrots are often inscribed with Kufic and are more stylized but with less decoration than the Aga Khan bird; the Berlin parrot (fig. 155) is the closest Fatimid example. The pierced interlacing motif on the neck and wings as well as the design around the eyes are highly detailed and not known on any Fatimid metalwares. The origin of this object in all probability is Persian 11th-12th century; there a similar pierced interlace design is known and bird incense burners are common. The attribution to Southern Italy might be possible however it must have been modeled after a Persian example. The Fatimid dominance of Southern Italy was known at this time, so it would be unexpected but not impossible for Italian artists to select a Persian model.

The next group of metalwork although ascribed to the 11th-12th century in Egypt and the Levant would more realistically be Persian 10th-12th century. The metal objects are a bronze bowl in the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 291), a brass bowl from a private collection consigned at Bonham’s (fig. 292), bronze gazelle aquamanile in the Museo di Capodimonte at Napoli (fig. 181), three bronze mirror-backs in the Islamic Museum at Berlin (fig. 293), a brass bucket in the British Museum at London (fig. 294) and a candlestick in the Keir Collection at Berlin (fig. 295). The Cairo bowl is accredited to 11th century Fatimid Egypt, it has incised decoration of medallions, dots and other abstract motifs; there is a running hare with a branch in its mouth. The imagery of the bowl is known from Fatimid luster ceramics in Egypt, yet there is another bronze
bowl in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York that is nearly identical to the Cairene model with a Persian attribution specifically from Iran and is datable to the 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century (app. I, X) and a further brass example that was consigned at Bonham’s in 2009 (fig. 292). The Iranian bowl has a Kufic inscription with blessings to the owner and an abstract trilobed design. The designs, shapes, sizes and types of metal for both bowls are related, with the exception of the hare and Kufic inscription. Hare imagery is known in Persia, though not as commonly as in Egypt. The Bonham’s brass bowl is datable to Egypt in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century and contains arabesques, interlaces and a floriated Kufic inscription. It also has heart-shaped and trilobed designs. The Bonham’s bowl has a later dating than the previous two and has similar decoration to the Iranian bowl. Review of the three bowls indicates they might be Persian in origin or possibly Egyptian from the 10\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century. The similarities between the three bowls combined with some decorative elements that are seen in Iran including the trilobed design and floriated Kufic make an exact origin difficult to determine. Regarding the three bronze mirror-backs from Berlin (fig. 293), two are indeed probably Persian, despite an earlier attribution to 12\textsuperscript{th} century dating in Syria (figs. 293.2 and 293.3). The imagery of a double harpy of one and the other with an abstract design frequently used in Iranian metalwork. The third mirror-back has a Kufic inscription encircling the perimeter with a running hare and predatory animals that are surrounded with a dotted band; there is a central boss. The hare imagery and style of the Kufic could suggest Fatimid Egypt, but they are also employed in Iranian metalwares. The additional predators chasing the hare are not seen on Fatimid metalwork, it is also varied from the Benaki mirror-back (fig. 234). The third mirror-back is probably 12\textsuperscript{th} century Iranian and not Syrian. The bucket (fig. 294) in the British Museum labeled as Mediterranean 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century is simply Persian in origin. It does not match any known Fatimid type from the group of eleven (figs. 219-
The bucket has a distinct handle that partially matches those from the Serçe Limani shipwreck, which were likely added cargo and not Fatimid. It has feet and slanted walls that correspond with the Bobrinsky model, but the Fatimid type has straight walls without feet. It has an incised angular Kufic inscription but the style of running animal imagery is not observed on Egyptian examples, therefore the bucket would be datable to Persia and specifically Iran in the 11th-12th century. The last object, a candlestick in Berlin’s Keir Collection, although previously attributed to 12th century Fatimid Egypt is probably from Siirt and of Persian design (fig. 295). A similar bronze example is in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum at London datable to the mid-13th century (app. I, Y).

The gazelle aquamanile in the Archeologico Nazionale department of the Museo di Capodimonte at Naples is often been compared with the Fatimid example in Munich (fig. 180), yet limited analysis of the Naples piece has been made. The Naples aquamanile is bronze and has been dated to Egypt in the 11th century. The gazelle stands on four legs with realistic hooves as feet, has a figural handle that supports a pouring cup, antlers and a minute tail. The Christie’s gazelle (fig. 132) is the only example from the group that has similar realistic feet with hooves in comparison to the supposed Persian designed Naples model, an unusual choice since the gazelle models (figs. 128-33) are all Fatimid and mostly have Persian stylized feet unlike the Fatimid type. The Naples aquamanile is the least reminiscent to the Nubian gazelle of all the previous examples (figs. 128-33 and 180); it has a figural handle that is stretched abstractly and the figure is likely a member of the Panthera genus, a feature absolutely unknown on any Fatimid metalwork. The only similar examples are 7th century Umayyad (figs. 10-1) and 9th-12th century Abbasid (figs. 12 and 96). The eyes, mouth and antlers are all unlike the other gazelle figures and the neck is unusually long; the head and neck are also disproportionate to the body. The mouth
specifically is reminiscent of an Iranian type and is also related to details of the Pisa Griffon. The use of the pouring cup is another feature unknown in Fatimid metalwork, none exist. An analogous Persian aquamanile with a pouring cup is in the Hermitage Museum at St. Petersburg and belonged to Count Bobrinsky (app. I, Z). All of these points amount to negation for a Fatimid or even Egyptian origin. There are however features which do support a Fatimid origin, namely the rib marks, pronounced legs and the overall gazelle theme, but these do not detract from the overwhelming evidence in affirmation of a Greater Persian, specifically Iranian origin datable to the 11th-13th century. The most difficult components to overcome are the Panthera handle and pouring cup that emphatically cannot be Fatimid.

The final objects in this group trace their origins to the Levant, Ifriqiyya and the Iberian Peninsula; a few lamps discovered in Spain and Portugal and another probably from the same region last listed in the collection of a French aristocrat, are made of cast bronze and dated to the 11th century in Fatimid Ifriqiyya. The three have ovoid bodies, thin flared necks, single spouts, knobbed bases, hinged tops and ringed handles with elaborate ornamentation and protomes. The lamp from Spain (fig. 296) is like the Kairouan models (figs. 248-9) in shape and size; the complex handle with its ornamentation in particular is comparable. The lamp from Portugal (fig. 297) is also related to those from Kairouan but it has two bird protomes, one located on the handle, the other on the spout. This theme is known on Fatimid incense burners (fig. 177) but not usually seen with oil lamps, except those of a Persian origin. The third lamp, last in a French private collection (fig. 298), is again similar to that previously mentioned and those from Kairouan, however it is incised around the body, spout, neck and base with figural and foliate imagery. The decorative themes are running hares and scrolling vines. There are no other known examples of Fatimid lamps with the decoration found on the two from Portugal and France.
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Although it is possible they are Fatimid and might have been imported from Ifriqiyya or Egypt without other models it seems hard to place them. The lamp from Spain stylistically looks Fatimid, but it was discovered in Spain and lamps produced in the Iberian Peninsula datable to the 10th-12th century stylistically resemble the Fatimid type. A ceramic example is in the Hispanic Society of America Museum at New York; the lamp is datable to the 10th century from Spain (app. I, AA). Additionally the bird protomes, hare and scrolling vine imagery are common on Iberian metalwork and other decorative arts. The possibility that the three lamps are Fatimid remains, yet evidence to support that argument is lacking, therefore the three are datable to the 11th-12th century with a possible Fatimid origin.

The objects with a Levantine or Egyptian provenance are in the Coptic Museum at Cairo (figs. 299-308) and Musée du Louvre (figs. 309-12), other examples are found in the Tiberias hoard (fig. 287). The Cairene metal objects consisted of numerous hinged lamps; they are all copper and datable to the 11th century. The lamps are all double spouted and are two types, one square with four supporting feet (figs. 299-305) and the second ovoid without feet (figs. 306-10). The hinged lamps were discovered close to Cairo, Fustat and in various places throughout Egypt. Most of them are worn with limited or no decoration; the decoration that is identifiable are a series of dots (figs. 305-7) and pomegranate knobs (fig. 305) that serve as the handle ornamentation, both common on previously discussed metalwork. The hinged lamps found in the Levant at Tiberias are square and single spouted; they both have pomegranate knobs except one is placed on a handle serving only as ornamentation (fig. 287). Regarding the Tiberias lamp with its artistic pomegranate is related to a Fatimid lamp in the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 218) in that the pomegranate is not functional. Other metal objects in the Tiberias hoard are known to be from Persia and datable to the 9th-11th century. The lamps found in Egypt and the Levant but
might be of Egyptian, Levantine or Persian in origin. If the lamps are Egyptian or Levantine from the 11th century they would be Fatimid however not enough information is established for this to be proven.

The four pouring cups from the Louvre (figs. 309-12) match two in the Tiberias hoard. They are all small handled cups with three symmetrically placed ornamental stylizations. One from the Tiberias workshop has zoomorphic feet. The four in the Louvre were referenced as possibly from the Byzantine period in Egypt,\(^\text{147}\) assuming this dating and origin are correct their discovery in the Tiberias workshop and one with a slight variation would eliminate an Egyptian exclusive provenance, unless through movement of metalwork. Nevertheless, the pouring cups are probably Fatimid 10th-11th century. The hinged lamps, pouring cups and some related objects from Tiberias certainly prove that not all of the metalwork found in the hoard is Fatimid and again further research and examination is required to fully understand all of the objects and their context.

**A Conclusion to Fatimid Metalwork**

The overall body of Fatimid metalwork comprises a large span of objects with varying styles, themes, shapes and decoration. Certain regional and pre-Islamic influences continued to be expressed in Fatimid metalwork as they were with the decorative arts of earlier Islamic dynasties. The Fatimids through their metalwork surpassed that produced under the Umayyads and Abbasids largely with their emphasis on aestheticism, detail and ability to provide ornament or decoration to almost every single object and especially through their conception of artistic raison d’être metal objects. Additionally, the unique identity of Fatimid metalware production was aided from their dependence on the Egyptian pre-Islamic influence, more so than in earlier periods and having been the only dynasty from the Early Islamic Period to originate in Ifriqiyya.
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spreading to Egypt, the Levant, the Mediterranean and Hijaz without Greater Persia. Consequently, they produced the first Islamic decorative arts program without a significant Greater Persian and specifically Iranian beginning and this provided for the distinctive Fatimid identity noticeably embodied in metalwork.

Chapter Four

The Griffon of Pisa

The Pisa Griffon, perhaps the most studied individual piece of Islamic metalwork that has been attributed to the Fatimid period, holds a distinctive position in history. Currently in the collection of the Cathedral Museum at Pisa in Italy, the bronze mythical beast however has a disputed origin and has been ascribed to numerous dynasties in the Islamic world. A review of the known literature and a comparison to similar metalwork examples will help to illuminate a probable source for the Pisa Griffon and define its unique place in Islamic metalwork. Additionally, recent scientific study conducted on the Pisa Griffon and the appearance of related metalwork have afforded a better perspective on its probable origin and function, since previously mainly stylistic comparison was used to determine its origin and purpose.

The griffon stands 107cm high on four feet that are stylized like those of a lion or other feline. It has four shield designs on pronounced legs; above the front two are a pair of swooping wings. The face is stylized like that of a chicken or other bird. It has two pointed ears and wattles below the neck. The body is large and measures 90 cm in length and 46 cm in width; it has a prominent chest. There are Kufic inscriptions in registers that run on either side of the body, the remainder is decorated with incised markings. Further detail will be discussed in the next sections.
Historical Introduction to the Pisa Griffon

The Pisa Griffon is said to have been placed atop the cathedral at Pisa, the resulting plunder of Crusaders returning from the Holy Land in the Levantine region. Symbolic evidence for the existence of the griffon dates to the early 1400s, an inlay example being from the choir stall in the Pisa cathedral (app. I, BB), while the first textual evidence dates from the 1540s. The first pictorial representation does not appear until around 1643, consisting of a watercolor painting by Paolo Tronci. In 1705 Giuseppe Martini made three engravings of it. Finally there was an examination datable to 1787-93 by Da Morrone. The accounts all allude to a bird rather than a griffon, except for the 1705 engravings and the 1787-93 dated examination that properly illustrate a griffon, but all perceive an antique origin.

A Review of Existing Literature Concerning the Pisa Griffon and a Comparison with Similar Figural Metalwork

A brief review of the existing scholarship concerning the Pisa Griffon and an analysis of the arguments is necessary to understand its complex history. A comparison to similar metalware and finally an analysis of its latest examination will supply the foundation for arguments concerning its provenance and function. In 1839 J.J. Marcel published the first scholarly article. He correctly identified the Kufic inscriptions and decorative markings as Islamic, although the reading was not accurate. Nevertheless, the griffon was now seen as Islamic rather than antique, as previously ascribed. Marcel attributed the animal to Southern Italy or Sicily, as an object made for the Normans by Muslim artisans. Marcel also recorded the traditional Pisan
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explanations for the griffon’s origin as spoils of war from the Balearic Islands\textsuperscript{153} in the Middle Ages, which at that time, particularly Mallorca, were under either Islamic rule or influence. He also notes another Pisan account of it having been found in the debris of Hadrian’s palace, the same site the cathedral now occupies.\textsuperscript{154} Marcel’s account alludes to a pre-1400 dating for the griffon. His presumption that the griffon derives from Southern Italian or Sicilian hands should not be dismissed, as two other important metalwork examples of Islamic origin probably were produced there as well; these include the griffon cup (fig. 288) and lion doorknocker (fig. 289), as previously discussed.

The next significant study was published by Gaston Migeon in 1927. He classified the Pisa Griffon as Fatimid produced in Egypt, along with numerous other metalwork examples with similar features.\textsuperscript{155} As noted above, many early Islamic scholars including Migeon grouped almost all figural metal objects into Fatimid Egypt, an undoubtedly inaccurate classification. In 1978 Marilyn Jenkins noted an account of Italian plunder in Ifriqiyya that resulted in a large haul of fine objects that were used to adorn the Pisan cathedral, namely a griffon. The report mentions a naval battle of the Pisan and Genoese against Fatimid controlled territory in 1088.\textsuperscript{156} Jenkins thus proposes a Fatimid North African rather than Egyptian origin. Unfortunately, no evidence directly indicates a griffon was part of the large haul of objects involved, therefore the argument cannot be substantiated. Assadullah Melikian-Chirvani in 1968 made a compelling argument for its Iranian origin. His comparisons utilized include the Kufic inscriptions, the appearance of the face and other physical features.\textsuperscript{157} A Persian influence is highly possible, especially in comparison to similar metalwares including the griffon protome throne leg from the Umayyad
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period (fig. 9); the face and foot greatly resemble the Pisa example. The feet however, do not represent the typical stylized version common in Persia. Although they match the throne leg, the feet also resemble those from a Fatimid lion waterspout (fig. 160). Corollaries in the appearance of the face of the Pisa Griffon and the gazelle aquamanile (fig 181), probably of Persian origin, also offer more evidence for an Iranian production. Additionally, a bronze lion pomander in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York (app. I, CC) attributed to Iran under the Seljuks in 1182, has similar Kufic inscriptions, decoration and a physical stance. The pomander exemplifies large figural metalwork production of Persia in the medieval period and its similarity with the Pisa Griffon suggests that the latter should be close to the pomander’s date of 1182.

The next group of scholars, Umberto Scerrato in 1966, Janine Sourdel-Thomine et al. in 1973, Anna Contadini et al. in 2002 and Oliver Watson in 2008 have all concluded that the Pisa Griffon is of Spanish origin produced under Islamic rule around 1000-1200. This suggestion is supported through comparison with other known figural examples from Spain, stylistic analysis, the Kufic and other details that will be reviewed below. Scerrato cites Spanish textiles produced under the Umayyad Caliphate in Iberia datable to the 11th century as proof of a Spanish origin.158 Indeed the registers of Kufic on the griffon resemble inscriptions found in these tirāz textiles.159 This is contrary to normal Fatimid figural decoration, yet it was not an entirely unknown choice as evidenced from the Keir goat (fig. 134), which is draped in a textile. Although tirāz textiles are indicative of Fatimid use, they were also used in Umayyad Spain. Sourdel-Thomine similarly reaffirms an 11th century Spanish origin for the griffon.160 Contadini both in 2002 and presently, has conducted the most extensive research and experimentation on the Pisa Griffon. Contadini
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has argued that the griffon is not a waterspout as previously thought, identification echoed by other scholars, rather it is a noise-producing metal object. Watson has affirmed this point and cites a treatise written in the 13th century by Ibn al-Razzaz al-Jazari that mentions automata noise makers, or self powered horns. Contadini conducted a broad examination of the Pisa Griffon and determined that the interior has a hollow chamber that leads to another hollow chamber with rims in the rear of the beast (fig. 313.2). The purpose of this dual chamber system, the griffon’s body and the interior one, is to allow air to pass through, emitting a loud noise. The automated noise maker would probably be placed in an elevated position where the ability to emit sounds was viable and could be heard.

Two figural metalwork examples with comparable features and similar origins are from Spain; they are the Monzón Lion and a hind. The Monzón Lion (app. I, DD) in the collection of the Musée du Louvre at Paris is a bronze lion waterspout datable to the 11th-12th century. It was discovered in the remnants of an Islamic fortress at Palencia in northern Spain. The lion stands on four legs with an unusual stylization for the feet, not seen on any other example of metalwork from the Early Islamic Period. The tail is stylized in the Persian tradition, but is also reminiscent of the lion’s tail from the Islamic Museum at Cairo (fig. 158). The Monzón Lion lacks the detailed incised decoration found on the other Spanish examples, although there is some limited decoration. The Monzón lion is similar to the griffon in theme, as well as certain decorative elements including the floral motifs. The hind from the Islamic Museum at Doha in Qatar (app. I, EE) is made of bronze, attributed to Córdoba in Spain and the 10th-11th century. The Spanish Umayyad animal is likely a waterspout; it stands on four legs with hoofed feet, in common with the Munich aquamanile (fig. 180). The hind is almost identical to another from Córdoba that was
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discovered in the ruins of Madinat al-Zahra.\textsuperscript{163} The possibility that large figural metalwork was widespread in Umayyad Spain is credible, especially with the mention of golden fountain heads from the Córdoban court.\textsuperscript{164} Research of the metals employed in the creation of the hind match those used to produce the Pisa Griffon, both originated in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{165} This further suggests a Spanish origin for the Griffon. The suggestion that the hind is draped in a textile is plausible;\textsuperscript{166} animals of the royal collection were clothed in fine fabrics.\textsuperscript{167} These two examples provide a basis for comparison with the Pisa Griffon and create a perspective for the griffon to be placed in the scheme of large figural metalwork formed in the Islamic world. The Monzón lion and hind are both Spanish in derivation; they present a view of the variety of figural metalwork from Spain in the 10\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century, the same period the griffon is alleged to have been produced.

Contadini compares the Mari-Cha Lion (app. I, FF), a bronze alleged waterspout also from Spain and datable to the 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century with the Pisa Griffon. Indeed, both the griffon and Mari-Cha Lion, in a private collection at Hong Kong, China, are very similar. They both utilize the same Kufic that is seen with tirāz textiles, they have a related position with a striking stance and pronounced legs or shield design. Additionally, the Mari-Cha Lion has the same double chamber as the griffon, displaying a hollowed body with a hollowed inner chamber in the rear.\textsuperscript{168} The decoration of the lion is unique. An incised griffon image is present on the body and a bird that is likely an eagle is on the leg. A similar bird, also likely an eagle, appears on the Pisa Griffon’s leg (fig. 313.3); the resemblance to known Fatimid eagles is strong.

Contadini suggests an Italian source for the Mari-Cha Lion, based upon the type of bronze used and in comparison with Early Romanesque stone lion sculpture common to central
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and southern Italy. Although the alloys used might be the same as those from the Italian peninsula, trade throughout the Mediterranean in the 11th-12th century was frequent, and the raw materials could have easily been transported to Spain. The lion does resemble counterparts produced in stone and Islamic influence in Southern Italy was widespread at this time. This might account for the similarity in style and shape between those produced in Spain and Italy.

The faces of the lion doorknocker (fig. 289) and three lion figures from the Keir Collection at Berlin (figs. 145 and 156) and the Hessisches Landesmuseum at Kassel in Germany (fig. 160) are all reminiscent of the Mari-Cha Lion’s face (app. I, GG). The doorknocker is attributed to Fatimid production in Italy and the lions are from Fatimid Egypt but might have been produced under a Fatimid aegis in Italy. Nevertheless, the Mari-Cha Lion is the closest in relation to the Pisa Griffon both in shape, style, decoration and the function of a noise maker.

A Probable Provenance of the Pisa Griffon

Having reviewed all of the research and publication concerning the Pisa Griffon and after a careful study and compilation of all known Fatimid metalwork, the evidence seems to support an Umayyad or Taifa origin in 11th-12th century Spain. The design of the griffon and its function seem to be in common with those produced in Spain, especially in regard to the Mari-Cha Lion, which I also attribute to Spain (app. I, FF). There is overwhelming evidence however that suggests Fatimid influence, if not production. The port city of Denia in the 11th century was controlled by the Taifa Caliphate, yet recent archaeological evidence such as the hoard of Denia indicate a Fatimid presence and influence, with the possibility of even Fatimid administration at the port. The portability of metalwork and the volatile circumstances in the Mediterranean and during the 11th-12th century suggest that Fatimid metalwork with its unique styles, decoration and
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themes, exchanged ownership easily and was conceivably transported to Spain. The usage of the pronounced legs and shield design is not seen on other metalwork of the Early Islamic Period or later. The complex decoration including the animals and birds incised on the griffon, particularly the bird wings (fig. 313.3) reveals a striking resemblance to known Fatimid imagery (figs. 170-5). Indeed griffon imagery was not wholly unknown to the Fatimid world as the cup (fig. 288) and carved wooden panels in churches of Cairo (app. I, HH) affirm. The doorknocker (fig. 289) with the face of a lion has an inscription that asserts the authority of God, the Prophet and Islam; the knocker strikes the boss and produces a visual pun,\textsuperscript{171} the visualization of the lion roaring (through the knocking sound) announces the Islamic faith proclaimed in Kufic around the border. Perhaps this was a precursor to the audible noise makers produced in Islamic Spain. Additionally, the doorknocker and lion waterspout at the Islamic Museum in Cairo (fig. 158.2) resemble the face of the Mari-Cha Lion (app. I, GG). Fatimid influence seems to be apparent with regard to the Pisa Griffon, although the majority of the influence probably comes from the Abbasids in Iraq or Seljuk Persia. The relation of the griffon, especially its face, to comparable Persian metalwork (figs. 9, 181 and app. I, CC) is certainly evident. The desire of the Umayyads and other Islamic dynasties in Iberia to imitate the Abbasid court at Baghdad came from the cultural exchange between the courts. Abbasid musicians and undoubtedly artisans along with other tradesmen appeared were renowned in the Andalusian court, an Iraqi singer named Ziryab being one of these musicians.\textsuperscript{172} The Abbasid court was already familiar with automata metalwork, the chirping bird tree being one example.\textsuperscript{173} The automata technology therefore existed in Abbasid Iraq and possibly in Persia and might have been transferred to Spain as well as the styles of the figural metalwork, since the Iberian courts idealized the eastern Islamic
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world. It seems that the Pisa Griffon is a conglomeration, produced in Islamic Spain in the 11th-
12th century with Fatimid Egypt, Abbasid and Persian influences, based upon the known
information available today.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

Islamic metalwork production in Egypt beginning in the mid 7th century passed through
many stages of development and evolved to form sophisticated and refined objects in the Fatimid
dynasty of the 10th-12th century. Numerous influences contributed to its advance both from
Egyptian pre-Islamic styles to external regional stimuli from the Levant, Ifriqiyya and especially
Greater Persia. In order to understand the impact and the uniqueness of Fatimid created metal
objects, a brief review of that made under the preceding dynasties will be made. This will allow
for the separation of the Fatimid contribution to be better appreciated.

Metalwork from the Early Islamic Period and the Fatimid Contribution

In Egypt, metalwork under the Umayyad dynasty was highly influenced by the Greco-
Roman and Byzantine worlds that had previously ruled there. This became the regional Egyptian
style in the Islamic period and would later influence the Abbasid and Fatimid Caliphates. The
Umayyads introduced the Persian styles in Egypt and they grew even stronger when they were
defeated by the Abbasids. Abbasid Egypt and even the later Tulunid and Ikhshidid periods
utilized the regional Egyptian styles, but also the decorative arts styles centered at Baghdad in
addition to pre-Islamic Sasanian influence. Most Abbasid metalwork in Egypt is easily
distinguished from the Fatimid type through Persian stylizations. The defeat of the Ikhshidids
along with an end to the Abbasid connection in Egypt brought Fatimid hegemony in the early
10th century and a new class of metalwork.
The Persian-inspired Abbasid styles remained in Egypt only briefly during the transitional 10th century as the Fatimids perfected their own decorative arts program. Fatimid metalwork produced impressive floriated Kufic inscriptions, elaborate geometric, zoomorphic and foliate decoration, a menagerie of animal and even some human themed objects and finally sophisticated pieces such as waterspouts. Fatimid metalwares are distinct from that produced in other periods specifically because of the beautiful, complicated and highly developed ornament and decoration carefully applied to almost every metal object. Including all of their other worked materials such as ivory, rock crystal and woodwork, metalwork became the arguably the most important as it was used in every aspect of daily life and was the most expensive, at least the precious metals. Although few precious metal examples survive from the Fatimid Caliphate, the number produced was probably enormous. The metalwork that endures today, approximately three hundred objects, from the Fatimid workshops is meager compared to the enumerable quantity from Greater Persia; yet it is in many ways superior both in quality, style and individuality.
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List of Figures

A. Name
B. Material
C. Date
D. Dynasty
E. Origin
F. Dimensions
G. Source
H. Inventory Number or Institution

Umayyad and Abbasid Metalwork No. 1-125
Fatimid Metalwork No. 126-313

1.
A. Brazier
B. Bronze
C. 8th century
D. Umayyad
E. Al-Fudayn, Kingdom of Jordan
F. H 47 cm – 18.5 in
G. Photograph by Author, National Archaeological Museum, Amman, Kingdom of Jordan
H. J15700, 15701, 15705

1.2
A. Brazier Detail (Eagle Protome)
F. H 15.2 cm – 6 in
G. Photograph by Author, National Archaeological Museum, Amman, Kingdom of Jordan

1.3
A. Brazier Detail (Figure Woman w/ Eagle)
F. H 10.2 cm – 4 in
G. Photograph by Author, National Archaeological Museum, Amman, Kingdom of Jordan

1.4
A. Brazier Detail (Hinged Wheel)
F. D 2.5 cm – 1 in
G. Photograph by Author, National Archaeological Museum, Amman, Kingdom of Jordan

2.
A. Female Figure
B. Copper
3. A. Bottle w/ Female Figures  
B. Bronze  
C. 5th-8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Egypt  
F. H 22 cm – 8 in  
G. Photograph from Byzantine and Islam 195.  
H. E25393

4. A. Christian Censer  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Syria or Palestine  
F. D 10 cm – 3.9 in, H 11cm – 4.3 in  
G. Photograph from von Folsach, Art David Collection 295.  
H. 7.1994

5. A. Cross  
B. Bronze  
C. 7th-8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Kingdom of Jordan  
F. H 30.5 cm – 12 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Kingdom of Jordan  
H. Department of Antiquities Jordan

6. A. Censer (Lion Hunting Boar)  
B. Bronze  
C. 500-700  
D. Umayyad  
E. Monastery of Epiphanius, Luxor, Egypt  
F. L 12.7 cm – 5 in, W 10.2 cm – 4 in, H 5.1 cm – 2 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York  
H. 1944.20.A.B

7. 
A. Elephant Case  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Al-Fudayn, Kingdom of Jordan  
F. H 10.2 cm – 4 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Citadel Archaeological Museum, Amman, Kingdom of Jordan  
H. J016514

7.2  
A. Elephant Case Detail (Hinge)  
G. Photograph by Author, Citadel Archaeological Museum, Amman, Kingdom of Jordan

8.  
A. Ram Case  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Al-Fudayn, Kingdom of Jordan  
F. H 10.2 cm – 4 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Citadel Archaeological Museum, Amman, Kingdom of Jordan  
H. J016515

9.  
A. Throne Leg (Griffon Protome)  
B. Bronze  
C. 7th–8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 57 cm – 22.4 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York  
H. 1971.143

9.2  
A. Throne Leg Detail (Griffon Protome Face)  
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

10.  
A. Ewer w/ Leopard Handle  
B. Bronze  
C. 7th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 48.5 cm – 19.1 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York  
H. 1947.100.90
10.2
A. Ewer w/ Leopard Handle Detail (Leopard)
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

11.
A. Bumiller Leopard
B. Bronze
C. 7th century
D. Umayyad
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. L 38 mm – 1.5 in
G. Photograph from Dahncke, Bronzen Bumiller Collection 4.
H. BC429

12.
A. Heeramaneck Leopard
B. Bronze
C. 12th-13th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. L 20.2 cm – 8 in
G. Photograph from Pal, Nasli Heeramaneck Collection 181.
H. M73.5.316

13.
A. Lion Handle
B. Bronze
C. 9th-10th century
D. Abbasid
E. Egypt
F. H 5.1 cm – 2 in
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author
H. 2011.80

13.2
A. Lion Handle Detail (Face)
B. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author

14.
A. Zoomorphic Kettle (Camel)
B. Bronze
C. 8th-9th century (likely 8th)
D. Umayyad
E. Umm al-Walid, Kingdom of Jordan
F. H 14 cm – 5.5 in
G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Jordan
15.  
A. Hinged Key  
B. Iron  
C. 7th-10th century (likely 7th-9th)  
D. Umayyad  
E. Edfu, Egypt  
F. L 19.5 mm – 11 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 250.  
H. AF10362

16.  
A. Hinged Key  
B. Iron  
C. 7th-10th century (likely 7th-9th)  
D. Umayyad  
E. Edfu, Egypt  
F. L 8.5 mm – 0.33 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 249.  
H. AF10364

17.  
A. Stand w/Eagle Protomes  
B. Silver  
C. 7th-8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. D 17.8 cm – 7 in H 8.5 cm – 3.3 in  
G. Photograph from Atil et al., Metalwork Freer Gallery 55.  
H. 53.92

18.  
A. Eagle Protome  
B. Silver  
C. 3rd-8th  
D. Parthian - Umayyad  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 7.6 cm – 3 in  
G. Photograph from Atil et al., Metalwork Freer Gallery 57.  
H. 50.91

19.  
A. Ewer  
B. Gold  
C. 7th century
D. Umayyad
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 43.7 cm – 17.2 in
G. Photograph from Atil et al., Metalwork Freer Gallery 63.
H. Z524

20.
A. Ewer
B. Silver
C. 6\textsuperscript{th}-7\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Umayyad
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 34 cm – 13.4 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1967.10

21.
A. Ewer
B. Bronze
C. 8\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Umayyad
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 37.2 cm – 14.6 in
G. Photograph from Walter’s Art Gallery, Baltimore, Maryland
H. 54.457

22.
A. Plate
B. Silver
C. 8\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Umayyad
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. D 20.6 cm – 8.1 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1963.186

23.
A. Ewer (So-Called Marwan)
B. Bronze
C. 8\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Umayyad
E. Abu Sir al-Malaq, al Fayyum, Egypt
F. D 28 cm – 11 in, H 41 cm – 16.1 in
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt
H. 9281
A. Ewer (So-Called Marwan) Detail (Rooster)
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt

A. Ewer (So-Called Marwan) Detail (Pierced Vegetal and Geometric Motifs)
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt

A. Ewer (So-Called Marwan) Detail (Dragon’s Tail)
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt

A. Ewer (So-Called Marwan) Detail (Dots)
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt

A. Ewer
B. Bronze
C. 8th century
D. Umayyad
E. Syria
F. D 10.5 cm – 4.1 in, H 35.5 cm – 14 in
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt
H. 15241

A. Ewer Detail (Heart Shaped Palmette)
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt

A. Ewer
B. Bronze
C. 8th-9th century
D. Umayyad
E. Syria
F. H 31.4 cm – 12.4 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1941.65

A. Ewer
B. Bronze
C. 8th-9th century
D. Umayyad - Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iraq
27.
A. Bottle w/ Leaf Design  
B. Bronze  
C. 7th-8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Egypt  
F. H 40.5 cm – 15.9 in  
G. Photograph from Piotrovsky et al., Beyond Palace Walls 4.  
H. I.R2316

28.
A. Bottle w/ Leaf Design  
B. Bronze  
C. 7th-9th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Egypt  
F. D 5 cm – 2 in, H 18 cm – 7.1 in  
G. Photograph from Allan, Treasures of Islam 252.  
H. Musée d’Art et d’histoire, Geneva, Switzerland

29.
A. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. D 4 cm – 1.6 in, H 13.4 cm – 5.3 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 20.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

30.
A. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. D 3.8 cm – 1.5 in, H 12 cm – 4.7 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 13.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

31.
A. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses
B. Bronze
C. 9th-11th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 17 cm – 6.7 in
G. Photograph from Allan, Treasures of Islam 255.
H. Musée d’Art et d’histoire, Geneva, Switzerland

32.
A. Incense Burner (Zoomorphic)
B. Bronze
C. 8th-9th century
D. Umayyad/ Abbasid
E. Egypt
F. H 32.5 cm – 12.8 in
G. Photograph from Freer Gallery Smithsonian Museum, Washington DC
H. 52.1

33.
A. Incense Burner (Peacock)
B. Copper
C. 500-700
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. H 15.2 cm – 6 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1961.111.A.B

34.
A. Pierced Bowl w/ Peacock Rinceau Motif
B. Bronze
C. 700
D. Umayyad
E. Syria
F. D 11.8 cm – 4.6 in, H 6.6 cm – 2.6 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1993.319

35.
A. Peacock Panel from Lamp-handle
B. Bronze
C. 8th-9th century
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. H 6 cm – 2.4 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 19.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

36.  
A. Peacock Panel from Lamp-handle  
B. Bronze  
C. 8\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Fustat, Egypt  
F. $\approx$ H 6 cm – 2.4 in  
G. Photograph from Bahgat et al., Fouilles d’al Fousṭāṭ PL XXIX.  
H. Current whereabouts unknown: presumed Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt

37.  
A. Peacock Handle  
B. Bronze  
C. 8\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Umayyad/ Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia  
F. L 5.1 cm – 2 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author  
H. 2012.150

38.  
A. Incense Burner (Peacock)  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 28 cm – 11 in  
G. Photograph from Junod, Spirit and Life 83.  
H. AKM00602

39.  
A. Aquamanile (Peacock)  
B. Bronze  
C. 972  
D. Umayyad  
E. Spain  
F. H 39.5 cm – 15.6 in  
G. Photograph from Qantara  
H. MR1519

40.  
A. Christian Censer  
B. Bronze  
C. 7\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century (likely 7\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th})
D. Umayyad
E. Palestine
F. D 8.1 cm – 3.2 in, H 8.3 cm – 3.3 in
G. Photograph from Walker, Byzantine Women 202.
H. 1975.41.140

41.
A. Christian Censer (Pierced and Six Sided)
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century (likely 7th-9th)
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. D 9 cm – 3.5 in
G. Photograph by Author, Sackler Museum of Art, Harvard University, Cambridge
H. 1975.41.142

42.
A. Christian Censer
B. Bronze
C. 8th-12th century (likely 7th-9th)
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. D 14.6 cm – 5.7 in, H 13 cm – 5.1 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 317.
H. 5144

43.
A. Christian Censer
B. Bronze
C. 7th-9th century
D. Umayyad
E. Akhmim, Egypt
F. D 15.5 cm – 6.1 in, H 8.5 cm – 3.3 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 88.
H. E11270

44.
A. Christian Censer
B. Bronze
C. 7th-9th century
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. D 9.5 cm – 3.7 in, H 9.7 cm – 3.8 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 90.
H. E11709
45. A. Christian Censer  
B. Bronze  
C. 7th-9th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Egypt  
F. D 10.8 cm – 4.3 in, H 9.5 cm – 3.7 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 92.  
H. E11710

46. A. Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 6th-7th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Eastern Mediterranean or Egypt  
F. H 24.6 cm – 9.7 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Sackler Museum of Art, Harvard University, Cambridge  
H. 1975.41.141

47. A. Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 6th-7th century (likely 7th)  
D. Umayyad  
E. Edfu, Egypt  
F. H 25.3 cm – 10 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 160.  
H. AF1328

48. A. Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 6th-7th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Akhmim, Egypt  
F. H 27.3 cm – 10.7 in  
G. Photograph from Piotrovsky et al., Beyond Palace Walls 4.  
H. 10584

49. A. Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 6th-7th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Qus, Egypt
F. H 31.5 cm – 12.4 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 58.
H. 5186

50.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 6th-7th century
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. H 35 cm – 13.8 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 79.
H. 5184

51.
A. Lampstand
B. Copper
C. 400-500 (perhaps 600-700)
D. Byzantine-Umayyad
E. Syria
F. H 16.3 cm – 6.4 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1961.1142.A.B

52.
A. Lampstand
B. Copper
C. 400-500 (perhaps 600-700)
D. Byzantine-Umayyad
E. Syria
F. H 14.7 cm – 5.8 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1961.1141.A.B

53.
A. Oil Lamp
B. Bronze
C. 6th-7th century
D. Umayyad
E. Eastern Mediterranean (Egypt or Syria)
F. H 9.8 cm – 3.9 in
G. Photograph from Walker, Byzantine Women 197.
H. 1975.41.138

54.
A. Polycandelon
B. Bronze
C. 7\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Umayyad
E. Bawit, Egypt
F. D 57.4 cm – 22.6 in
G. Photograph from Pagan and Christian Egypt 195.
H. 1975.41.137

55.
A. Polycandelon
B. Copper
C. 500-700
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. D 26.5 cm – 10.4 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 2002.483.7

56.
A. Polycandelon (Ring)
B. Bronze
C. 7\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century (likely 7\textsuperscript{th}-8\textsuperscript{th})
D. Umayyad
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. D 28.5 cm – 11.2 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 164.
H. AF1329

57.
A. Polycandelon (Cruciform and Geometric)
B. Bronze
C. 7\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century (likely 7\textsuperscript{th}-8\textsuperscript{th})
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. D 25.2 cm – 9.9 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 165.
H. E11916

58.
A. Polycandelon (Cruciform and Geometric)
B. Bronze
C. 7\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century (likely 7\textsuperscript{th}-8\textsuperscript{th})
D. Umayyad
E. Egypt
F. D 57.5 cm – 22.6 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 166.
59. H. AF11873
   A. Polycandelon (Cruciform and Geometric)
   B. Bronze
   C. 7th-10th century (likely 7th-8th)
   D. Umayyad
   E. Egypt
   F. D 24.5 cm – 9.6 in
   G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 166.
   H. AF11711

60. H. AF11711
   A. Polycandelon (Elaborate Cruciform and Geometric)
   B. Bronze
   C. 6th-8th century (likely 7th-8th)
   D. Umayyad
   E. Egypt
   F. D 48 cm – 18.9 in
   G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 211.
   H. 5222

61. H. 5222
   A. Lamp-handle (Griffon)
   B. Copper
   C. 6th-7th century
   D. Umayyad
   E. Egypt (likely Iran)
   F. L 17.6 cm – 6.9 in
   G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
   H. 1987.441

62. H. 672
   A. Lid
   B. Bronze
   C. 7th-8th century
   D. Umayyad
   E. Umm al-Walid, Kingdom of Jordan
   F. D 7.6 cm – 3 in
   G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Kingdom of Jordan
   H. 672

63. A. Mortar and Pestle
   B. Bronze
   C. 7th-8th century
D. Umayyad
E. Umm al-Walid, Kingdom of Jordan
F. D 7.6 cm – 3 in, H 12.7 cm – 5 in
G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Kingdom of Jordan
H. 673.4

64.
A. Bottle
B. Bronze
C. 7th-8th century
D. Umayyad
E. Kingdom of Jordan
F. H 15.2 cm – 6 in
G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Kingdom of Jordan
H. M4862

65.
A. Bottle
B. Bronze
C. 7th-8th century
D. Umayyad
E. Kingdom of Jordan
F. H 10.2 cm – 4 in
G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Kingdom of Jordan
H. unknown

66.
A. Plate
B. Bronze
C. 7th-8th century
D. Umayyad
E. Umm al-Walid, Kingdom of Jordan
F. D 5.1 cm – 2 in
G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Kingdom of Jordan
H. 787

67.
A. Ornaments
B. Bronze
C. 7th-8th century
D. Umayyad
E. Ayala, Kingdom of Jordan
F. All +/- 2.5 cm – 1 in
G. Photograph from Al-Asad et al., Umayyads 187.
H. AM 47, 45, 46, 546 and 44
68. A. Weight  
B. Bronze  
C. 7th-8th century  
D. Umayyad  
E. Kingdom of Jordan  
F. D 1.3 cm – 0.50 in, H 1.3 cm – 0.50 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author  
H. 2009.41

69. A. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. D 7.5 cm – 3 in, H 14 cm – 5.5 in  
G. Photograph from Gladiss, Oriental Splendour No. 95.  
H. German Private Collection

70. A. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 16 cm – 6.3 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 14.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

71. A. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 21 cm – 8.26 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári et al., 1400 Years Islamic Art No 33.  
H. Khalili Collection London, England

72. A. Bowl w/ Almond Bosses  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. D 15.2 cm – 6 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 15.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

73.
A. Mortar w/ Almond Bosses
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Abbasid or later
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. D 16 cm – 6.3 in, H 12.5 cm – 4.9 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 88.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

74.
A. Jug w/ Knob Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 8th-10th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 20.2 cm – 7.6 in
G. Photograph from Gladiss, Oriental Splendour No. 98.
H. BC.1506

75.
A. Ewer w/ Knob Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 9th-10th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran/ Iraq
F. H 32 cm – 12.6 in
G. Photograph from Gladiss, Oriental Splendour No. 96.
H. German Private Collection

76.
A. Ewer w/ Knob Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 9th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran/ Iraq
F. H 27.7 – 10.9 in
G. Photograph from Bloom et al., Cosmophilia 150.
H. 17.2001

77.
A. Ewer w/ Pomegranate Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 8\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 35.5 cm – 14 in
G. Photograph from Jenkins, Islamic Art Kuwait Museum 36.
H. LNS85M

78.
A. Ewer w/ Pomegranate Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 8\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 25.5 cm – 10 in
G. Photograph from Jenkins, Islamic Art Kuwait Museum 37.
H. LNS84M

79.
A. Ewer w/ Pomegranate Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 9\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 29.2 cm – 11.5 in
G. Photograph from Jenkins, Islamic Art Kuwait Museum 38.
H. LNSI32M

80.
A. Ewer w/ Knob Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 13.6 cm – 5.4 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 8.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

81.
A. Ewer w/ Leaf Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 8\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iraq
F. H 30 cm – 11.8 in
G. Photograph from Gladiss, Collector’s Fortune 109.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

82.
A. Ewer w/ Leaf Ornament
B. Bronze
C. 782
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Basra, Iraq
F. H ~ 33.02 cm – 13 in
G. Photograph from Khalili Research Center Image Archive
H. I.5

83.
A. Eagle Protome
B. Bronze
C. 7th-8th century
D. Umayyad
E. Syria/ Kingdom of Jordan
F. L 6.4 cm – 2.5 in, H 3.8 cm – 1.5 in
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author
H. 2011.79

84.
A. Ewer w/ Lion Handle
B. Bronze
C. 8th century
D. Abbasid
E. Egypt/ Syria
F. H 26.2 cm – 10.3 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári et al., 1400 Years Islamic Art No 32.
H. Khalili Collection, London, England

85.
A. Jug w/ Lion Handle
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 20 cm – 7.9 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 61.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

86.
A. Lion Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 5.7 cm – 2.25 in
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author
H. 2011.69D

87.
A. Lion Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 5.1 cm – 2 in
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author
H. 2011.69A

88.
A. Lion Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 5.7 cm – 2.25 in
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author
H. 2011.69B

89.
A. Lion Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 7 cm – 2.75 in
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author
H. 2011.69C

90.
A. Lion Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. H 3.2 cm – 1.25 in
G. Photograph by Author, Private Collection of Author
H. 2011.91
91.  
A. Lion Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Nishapur, Iran  
F. H 6.3 cm – 2.6 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York  
H. 1940.170.258

92.  
A. Lion Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Nishapur, Iran  
F. H 6 cm – 2.4 in  
G. Photograph from Allan, Nishapur No 173.  
H. Tehran, Iran

93.  
A. Lion Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Nishapur, Iran  
F. H 6 cm – 2.4 in  
G. Photograph from Allan, Nishapur No 176.  
H. Tehran, Iran

94.  
A. Lion Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th-13th century  
D. Abbasid or Later  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 8 cm – 3.1 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 116.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

95.  
A. Aquamanile (Eagle)  
B. Bronze  
C. 796-7  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iraq
96.  
A. Aquamanile (Eagle)  
B. Copper  
C. 9th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iraq  
F. H 36.1 cm – 14 in  
G. Photograph from Byzantine and Islam 65.  
H. St. Catherine’s Monastery, Sinai, Egypt

97.  
A. Aquamanile (Eagle)  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran/ Iraq  
F. H 34.5 cm – 13.6 in  
G. Photograph from Tunsch, The Fatimids and Sicily 28.  
H. I.5623

98.  
A. Ewer w/ Zoomorphic Decoration  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th-9th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iraq  
F. H 39.2 cm – 15.4 in  
G. Photograph from Piotrovsky et al., Beyond Palace Walls 7.  
H. KZ5753

99.  
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. ≈ H 26 cm – 10.2 in  
G. Photograph from Baer, Metalwork Medieval Islamic Art 48.  
H. M12870

100.  
A. Incense Burner
B. Bronze  
C. 8th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. $\approx$ H 17 cm – 6.7 in  
G. Photograph from Baer, Metalwork Medieval Islamic Art 49.  
H. M12170

101.  
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 17 cm – 6.7 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 348.  
H. 5141

102.  
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 10.5 cm – 4.1 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 350.  
H. 1201

103.  
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 6.4 cm – 2.5 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 357.  
H. 1203

104.  
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 8th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran  
F. $\approx$ H 11 cm – 4.3 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Kingdom of Jordan
H. Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Kingdom of Jordan

105.
A. Incense Burner
B. Bronze
C. 8th-10th century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. \( \approx H 8 \text{ cm} – 3.1 \text{ in} \)
G. Photograph by Author, Archaeological Museum of Madaba, Jordan
H. 667

106.
A. Ewer
B. Bronze
C. 9th-10th century
D. Abbasid
E. Egypt
F. H 28.4 cm – 9.76 in
G. Photograph from Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1949.49

107.
A. Ewer
B. Bronze
C. 9th-10th century
D. Abbasid
E. Egypt
F. H 23 cm – 9 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Metalwork No M3.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

108.
A. Ewer
B. Bronze
C. 9th-10th century
D. Abbasid
E. Egypt
F. H 25 cm – 9.8 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Metalwork No M4.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

109.
A. Ewer
B. Bronze
C. 9th-10th century
110.
A. Ewer  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. ≈ H 25 cm – 9.8 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt  
H. unknown

111.
A. Ewer  
B. Brass  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. ≈ H 25 cm – 9.8 in  
G. Photograph from Ward, Islamic Metalwork No 47.  
H. 1894.5-17.4

112.
A. Jug  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th or 12th-13th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Persia specifically Iran  
F. H 21 cm – 8.2 in  
G. Photograph from Gladiss, Collector’s Fortune No 88.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

113.
A. Ewer  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 28.5 cm – 11.22 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 3.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

114.
A. Ewer  
B. Bronze  
C. 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 21 cm – 8.3 in  
G. Photograph from Brisch et al., Islamische Kunst Loseblattkatalog No. 232.  
H. I.6758

115.  
A. Ewer  
B. Bronze  
C. 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. \approx H 25 cm – 9.8 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt  
H. unknown

116.  
A. Ewer  
B. Bronze  
C. 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. \approx H 25 cm – 9.8 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt  
H. unknown

117.  
A. Ewer  
B. Bronze  
C. 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 43 cm – 17 in  
G. Photograph from Allan, Treasures of Islam No 253.  
H. Musée d’Art et d’histoire, Geneva, Switzerland

118.  
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 9\textsuperscript{th}-10\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt or Syria  
F. \approx H 30.48 cm – 12 in
G. Photograph from Khalili, Islamic Art and Culture 110.
H. Khalili Collection, London, England

119.
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 9.9 cm – 4 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 351.  
H. 1202

120.
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 21.5 cm – 8.5 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 102.  
H. E11653

121.
A. Incense Burner  
B. Bronze  
C. 9th-10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 20.3 cm – 8 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 104.  
H. E11655

122.
A. Lamp  
B. Brass  
C. 10th century  
D. Abbasid  
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran/Iraq  
F. D 40 cm – 15.7 in, H 26 cm – 10.2 in  
G. Photograph from Folsach, Art David Collection No. 459.  
H. 17.1970

123.
A. Basin  
B. Bronze
C. 8\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. D 43.2 cm – 17 in
G. Photograph from Gladiss, Oriental Splendour No. 101.
H. German Private Collection

124.

A. Mirror-back
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. D 10.1 cm – 3.9 in
G. Photograph from Allan, Treasures of Islam No 259.
H. Musée d’Art et d’histoire, Geneva, Switzerland

125.

A. Mirror-back
B. Bronze
C. 12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. D 13.9 cm – 5.4 in
G. Photograph from Allan, Treasures of Islam No 260.
H. Musée d’Art et d’histoire, Geneva, Switzerland

126.

A. Figure Female Tambourine Player
B. Bronze
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 5 cm – 2 in, W 3 cm – 1.2 in
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt
H. 6983

127.

A. Camel Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 7 cm – 2.8 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Metalwork No M6.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

128
A. Gazelle Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 13.7 cm – 5.4 in
G. Photograph by Request from Islamic Museum, Berlin, Germany
H. I.4388

129.
A. Gazelle Figure
B. Bronze
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 21.5 cm – 8.5 in, H 28 cm – 11 in
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt
H. 15062

130.
A. Gazelle Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. ≈ H 15.24 cm – 6 in
G. Photograph from Sarre et al., Ausstellung Muhammedanischer Kunst in München No 3121.
H. current whereabouts unknown

131.
A. Gazelle Figure
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 6.5 cm – 2.6 in
G. Photograph from von Folsach, Art David Collection 299.
H. 50.1979

132.
A. Gazelle Figure
B. Bronze
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 19.5 cm – 7.7 in  
G. Photograph from Christie’s, Arts Islamic Indian Worlds April 2011 No 86.  
H. Consignment at Christie’s London

133.  
A. Gazelle Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 6.5 cm – 2.6 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 31.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

134.  
A. Goat Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th-12th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 11.5 cm – 4.5 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 29.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

135.  
A. Goat Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-12th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 12 cm – 4.7 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 29A.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

136.  
A. Goat Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 6 cm – 2.3 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 30.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany
137. A. Hare Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 13.5 cm – 5.3 in, H 5.6 cm – 2.2 in  
G. Photograph from von Folsach, Art David Collection 299.  
H. 33.2000

138. A. Hare Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 4 cm – 1.6 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 33.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

139. A. Hare Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 8 cm – 3.1 in  
G. Photograph by Author Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt  
H. 15301

140. A. Hare Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. \approx L 14 cm – 5.5 in  
H. L.A. Mayer Memorial Museum, Jerusalem, Israel

141. A. Hare Figure  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 14 cm – 5.5 in
G. Photograph from Taylor et al., Arabesques et jardins de paradis 146.
H. AF2020

142.
A. Hare Figure
B. Copper
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. \( \approx H \) 7.6 cm – 3 in
G. Photograph by Author from Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. L.2011.62

143.
A. Leopard Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. \( \approx H \) 5 cm – 2 in
G. Photograph from Sarre et al., Ausstellung Muhammedanischer Kunst in München No 3008.
H. current whereabouts unknown

144.
A. Lion Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. \( \approx H \) 5 cm – 2 in
G. Photograph from Sarre et al., Ausstellung Muhammedanischer Kunst in München No 3009.
H. current whereabouts unknown

145.
A. Lion Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 16 cm – 6.3 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 27.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany
146.
A. Lion Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 4 cm – 1.6 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 32.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

147.
A. Parrot Figure w/ Chain
B. Bronze
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th}
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 9.5 cm – 3.7 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Metalwork No M5.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

148.
A. Parrot Figure
B. Bronze
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 21 cm – 8.3 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 40.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

149.
A. Parrot Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 21 cm – 8.3 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 41.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

150.
A. Parrot Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 11 cm – 4.3 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 42.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

151.
A. Parrot Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 14 cm – 5.5 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 43.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

152.
A. Parrot Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 13 cm – 5.1 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 44.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

153.
A. Parrot Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 7.5 cm – 3 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 45.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

154.
A. Parrot Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 5.5 cm – 2.1 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 46.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

155.
A. Parrot Figure
B. Bronze
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 11 cm – 4.3 in
G. Photograph from Trésors fatimides du Caire 119.
H. I.5610

156.
A. Lion Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 6 cm – 2.4 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 34.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

157.
A. Lion w/ Gazelle Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 9.5 cm – 3.7 in
G. Photograph from Schätze der Kalifen No 62.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

158.
A. Waterspout (Lion)
B. Bronze
C. 12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 21 cm – 8.3 in, L 20 cm – 7.9 in
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt
H. 4305

158.2
A. Waterspout Detail (Lion)
B. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt

159.
A. Waterspout (Lion)
B. Bronze
C. 12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 11.5 cm – 4.5 in L 14.5 cm – 5.7 in
G. Photograph from Migeon et al., Art of Islam 107.
H. I.1959

160.
A. Waterspout (Lion)
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 29.5 cm – 11.6 in, L 31 cm – 12.2 in
G. Photograph from Gierlichs et al., Islamic Art in Germany 132.
H. BVIII.115

161.
A. Peacock Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 7.2 cm – 2.8 in
G. Photograph from Schätze der Kalifen No 64.
H. LNS5M

162.
A. Faucet (Peacock)
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 18.3 cm – 7.2 in
G. Photograph from Schätze der Kalifen No 65.
H. LNS166M

163.
A. Bear Protome
B. Iron
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 4.6 cm – 1.8 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 35.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany
164.  
A. Mouse Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 7.5 cm – 3 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 39.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany  

165.  
A. Bird Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 5.5 cm – 2.1 in  
G. No Photograph: Missing from Inventory, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt  
H. 23131  

166.  
A. Bird Protome  
B. Silver  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 4.7 cm – 1.9 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 38.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany  

167.  
A. Plaque w/ Birds  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 10 cm – 3.9 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Sackler Museum of Art, Harvard University, Cambridge  
H. 1975.41.148  

168.  
A. Incense Burner w/ Eagle, Worm, Hare and Bird Protomes  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt
F. H 28 cm – 11 in, L 17.8 cm – 7 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 27.
H. E11708

168.2
A. Incense Burner Detail (Hare)
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 27.

169.
A. Eagle Protome
B. Bronze
C. 12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 7 cm – 2.8 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 47.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

170.
A. Eagle Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 8 cm – 3.1 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 48.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

171.
A. Eagle Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 8.5 cm – 3.3 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 49.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

172.
A. Eagle Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 9.6 cm – 3.8 in
G. Photograph from Arnould et al., l'Islam collections nationales No 158.
H. AO8199

173.
A. Lid w/ Eagle Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 19.5 cm – 7.7 in  
G. Photograph from Schätze der Kalifen No 66.  
H. I.1485

174.
A. Lid w/ Eagle Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 19.2 cm – 7.6 in  
G. Photograph from Islamische Kunst Verborgene Schätze No 71.  
H. I.5694

175.
A. Lid w/ Eagle Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. ≈ H 19 cm – 7.5 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt  
H. 15206

176.
A. Incense Burner w/ Eagle Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 19 cm – 7.5 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 105.  
H. E11707

177.
A. Incense Burner w/ Eagle Protome  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 18 cm – 7 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 358.
H. 5205

178.
A. Incense Burner w/ Eagle Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 10 cm – 4 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 360.
H. 1205

179.
A. Incense Burner w/ Eagle Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 8.2 cm – 3.3 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 361.
H. 5912

180.
A. Aquamanile (Gazelle)
B. Bronze
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 46 cm – 18 in, L 30 cm – 12 in
G. Photograph from Sarre et al., Ausstellung Muhammedanischer Kunst in München No 3123.
H. 26N1

181.
A. Aquamanile (Gazelle)
B. Bronze
C. 11th-13th century
D. Fatimid or likely Abbasid
E. Egypt or likely Greater Persia specifically Iran
F. ≈ H 46 cm – 18 in, L 30 cm – 12 in
G. Photograph from Scerrato, Metalli islamici 73.
H. Museo di Capodimonte, Dep. Archeologico Nazionale, Napoli, Italia
182.
A. Fan w/ Figural Imagery (Rhipidion)
B. Silver
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 22 cm – 8.6 in
G. Photograph from Byzantium and Islam 73.
H. 1946.126.1

183.
A. Fan w/ Figural Imagery (Rhipidion)
B. Silver
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 22.7 cm – 9 in
G. Photograph from Byzantium and Islam 73.
H. 1946.126.2

184.
A. Fan w/ Figural Imagery (Rhipidion)
B. Silver
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. ≈ D 22 cm – 8.6 in
G. Photograph from Byzantium and Islam 73.
H. 1597

185.
A. Oil Lamp w/ Human Figure Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 11.5 cm – 4.5 in
G. Photograph from Ward, Islamic Metalwork 62.
H. 1757.8.15.36A

186.
A. Human Figure Protome
B. Bronze
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt  
F. H 3.6 cm – 1.4 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 229.  
H. AF1134

187.  
A. Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 50 cm – 19.6 in  
G. Photograph Schätze der Kalifen No 190.  
H. 8483

188.  
A. Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. ≈ H 50 cm – 19.6 in  
G. Photograph from Glück et al., Die Kunst des Islam 459.  
H. I.5683

189.  
A. Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 46.3 cm – 18.2 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 80.  
H. 4295

190.  
A. Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 43 cm – 17 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 81.  
H. 4296

191.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 61 cm – 24 in
G. Photograph from Bénézet, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 84.
H. 1216

192.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 48 cm – 19 in
G. Photograph from Hassan, Moslem Art 103.
H. 1511

193.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 37 cm – 14.6 in
G. Photograph from Folsach, Art David Collection 299.
H. 16.1970

194.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 60 cm – 23.6 in
G. Photograph from Gladiss, Oriental Splendour No 106.
H. German Private Collection

195.
A. Lampstand
B. Brass
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Qasr Ibrim at Nubia, Egypt
F. ≈ H 50 cm – 19.6 in
G. Photograph from Gaballa, Nubia Museum 68.
H. Nubia Museum, Islamic Section, Aswan, Egypt

196.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 51 cm – 20 in
G. Photograph from Jenkins, Islamic Art Kuwait Museum 66.
H. LNS120M

197.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 64.7 cm – 25.4 in
G. Photograph from Christie’s, Islamic Art and Manuscripts April 2002 No 85.
H. Consignment at Christie’s London

198.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 66.7 cm – 26.2 in
G. Photograph from Christie’s, Arts Islamic Indian Worlds October 2010 No 130.
H. Consignment at Christie’s London

199.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 40.8 cm – 16 in
G. Photograph from Christie’s, Arts Islamic Indian Worlds October 2012 No 92.
H. Consignment at Christie’s London

200.
A. Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 20.5 cm – 8 in
G. Photograph from Bamborough, Treasures of Islam 100.
H. IS.132.1954

201.
A. Lampstand
B. Brass
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 58 cm – 23 in
G. Photograph from Ward, Islamic Metalwork 63.

202.
A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 28.7 cm – 11.3 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 82.
H. 4298

203.
A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 27 cm – 10.7 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 83.
H. 4299

204.
A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 27.6 cm – 11 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 85.
H. 5896
A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 16.5 cm – 6.5 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 86.
H. 5168

A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 11 cm – 4.3 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 87.
H. 5206

A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 9 cm – 3.5 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 88.
H. 5203

A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 14.8 cm – 5.8 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 89.
H. 5169

A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 29.5 cm – 11.6 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 91.
H. 5172

210.
A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 26 cm – 10.2 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 92.
H. 1372

211.
A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 39 cm – 15.3 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 94.
H. 1612

212.
A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 10th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 22.5 cm – 9 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 95.
H. 3802

213.
A. Incomplete Lampstand
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 31.75 cm – 12.5 in
G. Photograph by Author, Sackler Museum of Art, Harvard University, Cambridge
H. 1940.164

214.
A. Plaque
B. Bronze  
C. 12th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 11 cm – 4.3 in  
G. No Photograph: Missing from Inventory, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt  
H. 20787

215.  
A. Plaque  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 6.5 cm – 2.6 in  
G. Photograph from Bahgat et al., Fouilles d’al Fousṭāṭ, PL XXIX.  
H. 1967.8

216.  
A. Hinges  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 15.6 cm – 6.1 in  
G. Photograph from Trésors fatimides du Caire 229.  
H. I.2199

217.  
A. Oil Lamp  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 13.5 cm – 5.3 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 185.  
H. 5205

218.  
A. Oil Lamp  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. ≈ H 18 cm – 7 in  
G. Photograph by Author, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt
H. 15228

219.  
A. Bucket  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th–11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 14 cm – 5.5 in  
G. Photograph from Brisch et al., Islamische Kunst Loseblattkatalog No 235.  
H. I.1770

220.  
A. Bucket  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th–11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 14 cm – 5.5 in  
G. Photograph from Brisch et al., Islamische Kunst Loseblattkatalog No 236.  
H. I.1482

221.  
A. Bucket  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th–11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. 18 cm – 7 in  
G. Photograph from Brisch et al., Islamische Kunst Loseblattkatalog No 237.  
H. I.1496

222.  
A. Bucket  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th–11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 12.5 cm – 5 in  
G. Photograph from Gladiss, Collector’s Fortune 112.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

223.  
A. Bucket  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th–11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 12.5 cm – 5 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 25.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

224.
A. Bucket (Small)
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 6.5 cm – 2.6 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 26.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

225.
A. Bucket
B. Bronze or Brass
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 12.5 cm – 5 in
G. Photograph from Piotrovsky et al., Beyond Palace Walls 14.
H. IR.1427

226.
A. Bucket (Small)
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 4.1 cm – 1.6 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 38.
H. AF1336

227.
A. Bucket
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 11.5 cm – 4.5 in
G. Photograph by Author, Sackler Museum of Art, Harvard University, Cambridge
H.1979.353
228. A. Bucket  
B. Bronze  
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 10.45 cm – 4.1 in  
G. Photograph from Schätze der Kalifen No 192.  
H. LNS894M

229. A. Bucket  
B. Copper  
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 15.8 cm – 6.2 in  
G. Photograph from Bloom et al., Arts City Victorious 99.  
H. M25.1923

230. A. Bowl  
B. Copper  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 9.3 cm – 3.6 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 38.  
H. AF1336

231. A. Bowl  
B. Copper  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 7.6 cm – 3 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 39.  
H. E13881

232. A. Bowl  
B. Copper  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt
F. H 15.75 cm – 6.2 in
G. Photograph by Author, Sackler Museum of Art, Harvard University, Cambridge
H. 1975.41.143

233.
A. Spice Box
B. Silver
C. 1044-1047
D. Fatimid
E. Cairo, Egypt
F. L 12.4 cm – 5 in
G. Photograph from Bloom et al., Arts City Victorious 97.
H. Real Colegiata de San Isidoro, León, Spain

234.
A. Mirror-back
B. Silver
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 18 cm – 7 in
G. Photograph from Ballian et al., Benaki Museum 71.
H. 13770

235.
A. Ewer
B. Silver
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. H 16 cm – 6.3 in
G. Photograph from Schätze der Kalifen No 194.
H. 13774

236.
A. Cylindrical Box
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 11.5 cm – 4.5 in
G. Photograph from Schätze der Kalifen No 71.
H. I.3679

236.2
A. Cylindrical Box Detail (Feet)
G. Photograph from Brisch et al., Islamische Kunst Loseblattkatalog No 238.

237.
A. Polycandelon  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Ifriqiyya or Egypt  
F. D 23.5 cm – 9.3 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 98.  
H. Presumed Location: Musée du Bardo, Tunis, Tunisia

238.
A. Polycandelon (Fragment)  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Ifriqiyya or Egypt  
F. D 44.5 cm – 17.5 in (Reconstructed)  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 103.  
H. Presumed Location: Musée du Bardo, Tunis, Tunisia

239.
A. Polycandelon  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Ifriqiyya or Egypt  
F. D 41.4 cm – 16.3 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 100.  
H. Presumed Location: Musée du Bardo, Tunis, Tunisia

240.
A. Polycandelon  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Ifriqiyya or Egypt  
F. D 29 cm – 11.4 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 99.  
H. Presumed Location: Great Mosque of Kairouan, Tunisia

241.
A. Polycandelon  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid  
E. Ifriqiyya or Egypt  
F. D 26 cm – 10.2 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 104.  
H. Presumed Location: Great Mosque of Kairouan, Tunisia

242.  
A. Polycandelon  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. St. Anthony’s Monastery, Egypt  
F. D 30 cm – 11.8 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 107.  
H. Presumed Location: St. Anthony’s Monastery, Egypt

243.  
A. Polycandelon  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. St. Anthony’s Monastery, Egypt  
F. D 30 cm – 11.8 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 113.  
H. Presumed Location: St. Anthony’s Monastery, Egypt

244.  
A. Polycandelon  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. D 40 cm – 15.7 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 112.  
H. Presumed Location: Private Collection from Cairo, Egypt

245.  
A. Polycandelon  
B. Brass  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Ifriqiyya  
F. D 32 cm – 12.6 in  
G. Photograph from Ward, Islamic Metalwork 68. (Top to Bottom)  
H. Great Mosque of Kairouan, Tunisia
246.
A. Polycandelon
B. Brass
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Ifriqiyya
F. D 30 cm – 11.8 in
G. Photograph from Ward, Islamic Metalwork 68. (Top to Bottom)
H. Great Mosque of Kairouan, Tunisia

247.
A. Polycandelon
B. Brass
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Ifriqiyya
F. D 34.5 cm – 13.6 in
G. Photograph from Ward, Islamic Metalwork 68. (Top to Bottom)
H. Great Mosque of Kairouan, Tunisia

248.
A. Oil Lamp
B. Bronze
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, Ifriqiyya
F. L 15 cm – 6 in
G. Photograph from Qantara
H. BR112

249.
A. Oil Lamp
B. Bronze
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, Ifriqiyya
F. L 15.1 cm – 6 in
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 115.
H. Presumed Location: Musée du Bardo, Tunis, Tunisia

250.
A. Oil Lamp
B. Bronze
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, Ifriqiyya
F. L 13.7 cm – 5.4 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 116.  
H. Presumed Location: Musée du Bardo, Tunis, Tunisia

251.  
A. Oil Lamp  
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 12 cm – 4.7 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 180.  
H. 1577

252.  
A. Oil Lamp  
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 11.7 cm – 4.6 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 181.  
H. 3960

253.  
A. Oil Lamp  
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 11.3 cm – 4.5 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 182.  
H. 1257

254.  
A. Oil Lamp  
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 11.4 cm – 4.5 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 183.  
H. 1257

255.  
A. Oil Lamp
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 10.8 cm – 4.3 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 184.  
H. 9169

256.  
A. Lamp  
B. Bronze and Copper  
C. 11th century during reign of Caliph al-Mu‘izz  
D. Fatimid  
E. Cairo, Egypt  
F. H 29.5 cm – 11.6 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais PL LXV.  
H. Presumed Location: Musée du Bardo, Tunis, Tunisia

257.  
A. Lamp  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 24 cm – 9.5 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 94.  
H. Presumed Location: Musée du Bardo, Tunis, Tunisia

258.  
A. Lamp  
B. Brass  
C. 1090  
D. Fatimid  
E. Cairo, Egypt or Damascus, Syria  
F. H 33 cm – 13 in  
G. Photograph from Şahin, Museum Turkish Islamic Arts 52.  
H. 192

259.  
A. Ladle  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. H 3.7 cm – 1.5 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 72.
H. AF1331

260.
A. Ladle
B. Bronze
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 33 cm – 13 in
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Islamic Metalwork Keir No 23.
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

261.
A. Plate
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. D 37.5 cm – 14.8 in
G. Photograph from Ballian et al., Benaki Museum 69.
H. 13144

261.2
A. Plate Detail (Drawing)
G. Photograph from Ballian et al., Benaki Museum 69.

262.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 9.4 cm – 3.7 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 252.
H. AF1393

263.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 8 cm – 3.2 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 252.
H. AF1394
264.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 9 cm – 3.5 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 252.
H. AF1395

265.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 14 cm – 5.5 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 253.
H. AF10363

266.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 11.8 cm – 4.6 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 253.
H. AF11647

267.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 12.5 cm – 5 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 253.
H. AF1392

268.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
269.

A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 6 cm – 2.4 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 259.
H. AF1399

270.

A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 5.2 cm – 2.1 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 259.
H. AF1400

271.

A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 5 cm – 2 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 260.
H. AF1401

272.

A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 4.2 cm – 1.7 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 260.
H. AF1403

273.

A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 4.3 cm – 1.7 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 260.
H. AF1127

274.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 4.7 cm – 1.9 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 261.
H. AF862

275.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 2.7 cm – 1.1 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 261.
H. AF1128

276.
A. Key
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 3.4 cm – 1.3 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 261.
H. AF1404

277.
A. Tool
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 13.7 cm – 5.4 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 267.
H. AF1408

278.
A. Tool
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 15.1 cm – 5.9 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 272.
H. AF10347

279.
A. Tool
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 14.4 cm – 5.7 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 272.
H. AF1416

280.
A. Tool
B. Iron
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 11.2 cm – 4.5 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 272.
H. AF1417

281.
A. Tool
B. Iron and Leather
C. 10th century
D. Fatimid
E. Edfu, Egypt
F. L 25.2 cm – 9.9 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l’ère chrétienne 27.
H. AF1420

282.
A. Caesarea Hoard Lampstand (Drawing)
B. Bronze
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid  
E. Caesarea, Palestine  
F. H 50-60 cm – 19.7-23.7 in  
G. Photograph from Arnon et al., Fatimid Hoard Caesarea 239.  
H. Israel Antiquities Authority  

283.  
A. Denia Hoard Lampstand  
B. Bronze  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Denia, Spain likely from Egypt  
F. \( \approx \) H 35 cm – 13.8 in  
G. Photograph from Azuar, Denia Islámica 51.  
H. El Museo Arqueológico Provincial de Alicante, Alicante, Spain  

284.  
A. Serçe Limani Hoard Cylindrical Box (Drawing)  
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Serçe-Limani Shipwreck likely from Levant or Egypt  
F. H 6.5 cm – 2.5 in  
G. Photograph from Allan, Metal Vessels No MV9A.  
H. GW313  

285.  
A. Serçe Limani Hoard Bucket (Drawing)  
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Serçe-Limani Shipwreck likely from Levant or Egypt  
F. H 12.5 cm – 5 in  
G. Photograph from Allan, Metal Vessels No MV8.  
H. GW970  

286.  
A. Serçe Limani Hoard Bottle-Neck (Drawing)  
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Serçe-Limani Shipwreck likely from Levant or Egypt  
F. H 5 cm – 2 in  
G. Photograph from Allan, Metal Vessels No MV11.  
H. GW531
287.
A. Tiberias Hoard Metal Objects
B. Bronze and Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Tiberias, Israel likely Egypt or Levant
F. (Various Heights)
G. Photograph from Dayagi-Mendels et al., Chronicles of the Land 198-9.
H. Israel Antiquities Authority in the Israel Museum, Jerusalem, Israel

288.
A. Cup w/ Griffon Imagery
B. Copper
C. 12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Southern Italy
F. H 9.1 cm – 3.6 in
G. Photograph by Author, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
H. 1964.101.1406

289.
A. Doorknocker
B. Bronze w/ Niello
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Southern Italy
F. D 44.3 cm – 17.5 in
G. Photograph from Bloom et al., Cosmophilia 183.
H. 50.2000

290.
A. Incense Burner (Bird)
B. Bronze
C. 11th-12th century
D. Fatimid
E. Southern Italy or Greater Persia
F. L 22.5 cm – 8.9 in
G. Photograph from Junod, Spirit and Life 82.
H. Aga Khan Museum Collection, Geneva, Switzerland

291.
A. Bowl
B. Bronze
C. 10th-11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt or Greater Persia
292.
A. Bowl
B. Brass
C. 10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid or Abbasid
E. Egypt or Greater Persia
F. D 26 cm – 10.2 in
G. Photograph from Bonham’s, Islamic and Indian Art April 2009 No 54.
H. Consignment at Bonham’s London

293.
A. Mirror-back
B. Bronze
C. 12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Fatimid or Abbasid
E. Egypt or Greater Persia
F. D 9 cm – 3.5 in
G. Photograph from Islamische Kunst Verborgene Schätze 96.
H. I.1615

293.2
A. Mirror-back
B. Bronze
C. 12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia
F. D 9 cm – 3.5 in
G. Photograph from Islamische Kunst Verborgene Schätze 96.
H. I.5135

293.3
A. Mirror-back
B. Bronze
C. 12\textsuperscript{th} century
D. Abbasid
E. Greater Persia
F. D 7.9 cm – 3.1 in
G. Photograph from Islamische Kunst Verborgene Schätze 96.
H. I.5643

294.
A. Bucket

F. D 17.2 cm – 6.8 in
G. Photograph from Islamic Art In Egypt PL VI.
H. 14487
B. Brass  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid likely Seljuk  
E. Egypt likely Greater Persia  
F. H 15 cm – 5.9 in  
G. Photograph from Byzantium and Islam 182.  
H. 1953.0217.1

295.  
A. Candlestick  
B. Bronze and Copper  
C. 12\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Seljuk  
E. Siirt, Greater Persia (Turkey)  
F. H 20 cm – 7.9 in  
G. Photograph from Fehérvári, Metalwork M7.  
H. Keir Collection, Berlin, Germany

296.  
A. Oil Lamp (Drawing)  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid likely Umayyad  
E. Spain  
F. \approx L 13.7 cm – 5.4 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 117.  
H. Current whereabouts unknown

297.  
A. Oil Lamp (Drawing)  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid likely Umayyad  
E. Southern Portugal  
F. \approx L 13.7 cm – 5.4 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 118.  
H. Current whereabouts unknown

298.  
A. Oil Lamp (Drawing)  
B. Bronze  
C. 11\textsuperscript{th} century  
D. Fatimid likely Umayyad  
E. Egypt or Ifriqiyya or Spain  
F. \approx L 13.7 cm – 5.4 in  
G. Photograph from Marçais et al., Objets Kairouanais No 119.
H. Current whereabouts unknown

299.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 11.8 cm – 4.6 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 187.
H. 5207

300.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 12.2 cm – 4.8 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 188.
H. 3827

301.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 14 cm – 5.5 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 189.
H. 4984

302.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 10.1 cm – 4 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 190.
H. 9130

303.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 10.7 cm – 4.2 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 191.
H. 1600

304.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 17.5 cm – in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 192.
H. 5208

305.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 12.7 cm – 5 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 193.
H. Inv. No Unknown: Coptic Museum, Cairo, Egypt

306.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 9.8 cm – 3.9 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 195.
H. 7445

307.
A. Hinged Lamp
B. Copper
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid
E. Egypt
F. L 9.7 cm – 3.8 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 196.
H. 1602
308.
A. Hinged Lamp  
B. Copper  
C. 11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 12.3 cm – 4.8 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, Catalogue général du musée copte du Caire 197.  
H. 1604

309.
A. Pouring Cup  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 11.2 cm – 4.4 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 52.  
H. AF11418

310.
A. Pouring Cup  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 9.6 cm – 3.8 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 52.  
H. AF5281

311.
A. Pouring Cup  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt  
F. L 10 cm – 3.9 in  
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 53.  
H. E22192

312.
A. Pouring Cup  
B. Bronze  
C. 10th-11th century  
D. Fatimid  
E. Egypt
F. L 7 cm – 2.8 in
G. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 53.
H. E22189

313.
A. Pisa Griffon
B. Bronze
C. 11th century
D. Fatimid likely Umayyad
E. Spain
F. H 107 cm – 42.1 in
G. Photograph from Dodds et al., Al-Andalus 217.
H. Pisa Cathedral Museum, Pisa, Italy

313.2
A. Pisa Griffon Detail (Interior Chamber)
G. Photograph from Pisa Griffon Project

313.3
A. Pisa Griffon Detail (Bird Decoration)
G. Photograph from Dodds et al., Al-Andalus 216.
Umayyad and Abbasid Metalwork Figures No. 1-125

1. Brazier
1.2 Brazier Detail (Eagle Protome)
1.3 Brazier Detail (Figure Woman w/ Eagle)
1.4 Brazier Detail (Hinged Wheel)
2. Female Figure
3. Bottle w/ Female Figures
4. Christian Censer
5. Cross
6. Censer (Lion Hunting a Boar)
7. Elephant Case
7.2 Elephant Case Detail (Hinge)
8. Ram Case
9. Throne Leg (Griffon Protome)
9.2 Throne Leg Detail (Griffon Protome Face)
10. Ewer w/ Leopard Handle
10.2 Ewer w/ Leopard Handle Detail (Leopard)
11. Bumiller Leopard
12. Heeramanick Leopard
13. Lion Handle
13.2 Lion Handle Detail (Face)
14. Zoomorphic Kettle (Camel)
15. Hinged Key
16. Hinged Key
17. Stand w/ Eagle Protomes
18. Eagle Protome
19. Ewer
20. Ewer
21. Ewer
22. Plate
23. Ewer (So-called Marwan)
23.2 Ewer (So-Called Marwan) Detail (Rooster)
23.3 Ewer (So-Called Marwan) Detail (Pierced Vegetal and Geometric Motifs)
23.4 Ewer (So-Called Marwan) Detail (Dragon’s Tail)
23.5 Ewer (So-Called Marwan) Detail (Dots)
24. Ewer
24.2 Ewer Detail (Heart Shaped Palmette)
25. Ewer
26. Ewer
27. Bottle w/ Leaf Design
28. Bottle w/ Leaf Design
29. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses
30. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses
31. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses
32. Incense Burner (Zoomorphic)
33. Incense Burner (Peacock)
34. Pierced Bowl w/ Peacock Rinceau Motif
35. Peacock Panel from Lamp- handle
36. Peacock Panel from Lamp- handle
37. Peacock Handle
38. Incense Burner (Peacock)
39. Aquamanile (Peacock)
40. Christian Censer
41. Christian Censer (Pierced and Six Sided)
42. Christian Censer
43. Christian Censer
44. Christian Censer
45. Christian Censer
46. Lampstand
47. Lampstand
48. Lampstand
49. Lampstand
50. Lampstand
51. Lampstand
52. Lampstand
53. Oil Lamp
54. Polycandelon
55. Polycandelon
56. Polycandelon ((Ring)
57. Polycandelon (Cruciform and Geometric)
58. Polycandelon (Cruciform and Geometric)
59. Polycandelon (Cruciform and Geometric)
60. Polycandelon (Elaborate Cruciform and Geometric)
61. Lamp-handle (Griffon)
62. Lid
63. Mortar and Pestle
64. Bottle
65. Bottle
66. Plate
67. Ornaments
68. Weight
69. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses
70. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses
71. Bottle w/ Almond Bosses
72. Bowl w/ Almond Bosses
73. Mortar w/ Almond Bosses
74. Jug w/ Knob Ornament
75. Ewer w/ Knob Ornament
76. Ewer w/ Knob Ornament
77. Ewer w/ Pomegranate Ornament
78. Ewer w/ Pomegranate Ornament
79. Ewer w/ Pomegranate Ornament
80. Ewer w/ Knob Ornament
81. Ewer w/ Leaf Ornament
82. Ewer w/ Leaf Ornament
83. Eagle Protome
84. Ewer w/ Lion Handle
85. Jug w/ Lion Handle
86. Lion Protome
87. Lion Protome
88. Lion Protome
89. Lion Protome
90. Lion Protome
91. Lion Protome
92. Lion Protome
93. Lion Protome
94. Lion Protome
95. Aquamanile (Eagle)
96. Aquamanile (Eagle)
97. Aquamanile (Eagle)
98. Ewer w/ Zoomorphic Decoration
99. Incense Burner
100. Incense Burner
101. Incense Burner
102. Incense Burner
103. Incense Burner
104. Incense Burner
105. Incense Burner
106. Ewer
107. Ewer
108. Ewer
109. Ewer
110. Ewer
111. Ewer
112. Jug
113. Ewer
114. Ewer
115. Ewer
116. Ewer
117. Ewer
118. Incense Burner
119. Incense Burner
120. Incense Burner
121. Incense Burner
122. Lamp
123. Basin
124. Mirror-back
125. Mirror-back
126. Figure Female Tambourine Player
127. Camel Figure
128. Gazelle Figure
129. Gazelle Figure
130. Gazelle Figure
131. Gazelle Figure
132. Gazelle Figure
133. Gazelle Figure
134. Goat Figure
135. Goat Figure
136. Goat Figure
137. Hare Figure
138. Hare Figure
139. Hare Figure
140. Hare Figure
141. Hare Figure
142. Hare Figure
143. Leopard Figure
144. Lion Figure
145. Lion Figure
146. Lion Figure
147. Parrot Figure w/ Chain
148. Parrot Figure
149. Parrot Figure
150. Parrot Figure
151. Parrot Figure
152. Parrot Figure
153. Parrot Figure
154. Parrot Figure
155. Parrot Figure
156. Lion Protome
157. Lion w/ Gazelle Protome
158. Waterspout (Lion)
158.2 Waterspout Detail (Lion)
159. Waterspout (Lion)
160. Waterspout (Lion)
161. Peacock Protome
162. Faucet (Peacock)
163. Bear Protome
164. Mouse Protome
165. Bird Protome – No Photograph Available – Missing from Inventory
166. Bird Protome
167. Plaque w/ Birds
168. Incense Burner
168.2 Incense Burner Detail (Hare)
169. Eagle Protome
170. Eagle Protome
171. Eagle Protome
172. Eagle Protome
173. Lid w/ Eagle Protome
174. Lid w/ Eagle Protome
175. Lid w/ Eagle Protome
176. Incense Burner w/ Eagle Protome
177. Incense Burner w/ Eagle Protome
178. Incense Burner w/ Eagle Protome
179. Incense Burner w/ Eagle Protome
180. Aquamanile (Gazelle)
181. Aquamanile (Gazelle)
182. Fan w/ Figural Imagery (Rhipidion)
183. Fan w/ Figural Imagery (Rhipidion)
184. Fan w/ Figural Imagery (Rhipidion)
185. Oil Lamp w/ Human Figural Protome
186. Human Figure Protome
187. Lampstand
188. Lampstand
189. Lampstand
190. Lampstand
191. Lampstand
192. Lampstand
193. Lampstand
194. Lampstand
195. Lampstand
196. Lampstand
197. Lampstand
198. Lampstand
199. Lampstand
200. Lampstand
201. Lampstand
202. Incomplete Lampstand
203. Incomplete Lampstand
204. Incomplete Lampstand
205. Incomplete Lampstand
206. Incomplete Lampstand
207. Incomplete Lampstand
208. Incomplete Lampstand
209. Incomplete Lampstand
210. Incomplete Lampstand
211. Incomplete Lampstand
212. Incomplete Lampstand
213. Incomplete Lampstand
214. Plaque
215. Plaque: No Photograph and Missing from Inventory, Islamic Museum, Cairo, Egypt
216. Hinges
217. Oil Lamp
218. Oil Lamp
219. Bucket
220. Bucket
221. Bucket
222. Bucket
223. Bucket
224. Bucket
225. Bucket
226. Bucket
227. Bucket
228. Bucket
229. Bucket
230. Bowl
231. Bowl
232. Bowl
233. Spice Box
234. Mirror-back
235. Ewer
236. Cylindrical Box
236.2 Cylindrical Box Detail (Feet)
Polycandelon
238. Polycandelon
239. Polycandelon
241. Polycandelon
242. Polycandelon
243. Polycandelon
244. Polycandelon
245. Polycandelon
246. Polycandelon
247. Polycandelon
248. Oil Lamp
249. Oil Lamp
250. Oil Lamp
251. Oil Lamp
252. Oil Lamp
253. Oil Lamp
254. Oil Lamp
255. Oil Lamp
256. Lamp
257. Lamp
258. Lamp
259. Ladle
260. Ladle
261.2 Plate Detail (Drawing)
262. Key
263. Key
264. Key
265. Key
266. Key
267. Key
269. Key
270. Key
271. Key
272. Key
273. Key
274. Key
275. Key
276. Key
277. Tool
278. Tool
280. Tool
281. Tool
282. Caesarea Hoard Lampstand (Drawing)
283. Denia Hoard Lampstand
284. Serçe Limani Hoard Cylindrical Box (Drawing)
285. Serçe Limani Hoard Bucket (Drawing)
286. Serçe Limani Hoard Bottle-neck (Drawing)
287. Tiberias Hoard Metal Objects
288. Cup w/ Griffon Imagery
289. Doorknocker
290. Incense Burner (Bird)
291. Bowl
292. Bowl
293. Mirror-back
293.2 Mirror-back
293.3 Mirror-back
294. Bucket
Candlestick
296. Oil Lamp (Drawing)
297. Oil Lamp (Drawing)
298. Oil Lamp (Drawing)
299. Hinged Lamp
300. Hinged Lamp
301. Hinged Lamp
302. Hinged Lamp
303. Hinged Lamp
304. Hinged Lamp
305. Hinged Lamp
306. Hinged Lamp
307. Hinged Lamp
308. Hinged Lamp
309. Pouring Cup
310. Pouring Cup
311. Pouring Cup
312. Pouring Cup
313. Pisa Griffon
313.2 Pisa Griffon Detail (Interior Chamber)
313.3 Pisa Griffon Detail (Bird Decoration)
Appendix I

List of Figures

1. Name
2. Date & Location
3. Source

A.
1. Map of Fatimid Caliphate
2. 909-1171 CE
3. Map from Wikipedia

B.
1. Map of Rashidun Caliphate
2. 632-42 CE
3. Map from Wikipedia

C.
1. Map of Umayyad Caliphate
2. 661-750 CE
3. Map from Wikipedia

D.
1. Map of Abbasid Caliphate
2. 750-1258 CE
3. Map from Wikipedia

E.
1. Female Figure Protome, Bronze, H 15.4 cm – 6 in
2. Byzantine, 4th-6th century Egypt
3. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 220.

F.
1. Female Figure Protome, Bronze, H 7.3 cm – 2.8 in
2. Byzantine, 4th-6th century Egypt
3. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 221.

G.
1. Female Figures, Stucco
2. Umayyad, 8th century Khirbat al-Mafjar, Jericho, Palestine
3. Photograph from Ali, Arab Contribution to Islamic Art 41.

H.
1. Female Figure, Stucco, H 15.6 cm – 6.1 in
2. Abbasid, 9th-10th century Greater Persia specifically Nishapur, Iran
3. Photograph by Author from the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

I.
1. Throne Leg (Griffon Protome), Bronze, H 32 cm – 12.6 in
2. Sasanian, 3rd century Greater Persia specifically Iran

J
1. Qasr al-Mshatta (Façade Detail)
2. Umayyad, 743-44 Amman, Kingdom of Jordan
3. Photograph by Author, June 2011

K.
1. Qasr al-Mshatta (Façade Detail)
2. Umayyad, 743-44 Amman, Kingdom of Jordan
3. Photograph by Author, June 2011

L.
1. Qasr al-Mshatta (Façade Detail)
2. Umayyad, 743-44 Amman, Kingdom of Jordan
3. Photograph by Author, June 2011

M.
1. Bottle w/ Lotus Design, Bronze, D 8.1 cm – in, H 14.3 cm – 5.6 in
2. Roman or Coptic, 5th-6th century Egypt
3. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 59.

N.
1. Khirbat al-Mafjar (Mosaic Panel)
2. Umayyad, 8th century Jericho, Palestine
3. Photograph from Ali, Arab Contribution to Islamic Art CPL 16.

O.
1. Oil Lamp, Bronze H 7.2 cm – 2.8 in
2. Byzantine, 5th-6th century Egypt
3. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 122.

P.
1. Oil Lamp Detail (Dots), Bronze, H 7.2 cm – 2.8 in
2. Byzantine, 5th-6th century Egypt
3. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 21

Q.
1. Oil Lamp, Bronze, L 24.5 cm – 9.6 in
2. Byzantine, 5th-6th century Egypt
3. Photograph from Bénazeth, métal au début de l'ère chrétienne 128.
R.
1. Nubian Ibex Gazella Genus
2. 2012
3. Photograph from Wikipedia

S.
1. Alhambra Lion Fountain, Stone
2. Umayyad, 11th century Granada, Spain
3. Photograph from Jenkins, Art of Medieval Spain 72.

T.
1. Alhambra Lion Fountain, Stone
2. Umayyad, 11th century Granada, Spain
3. Photograph from Jenkins, Art of Medieval Spain 82.

U.
1. Lion Waterspout, Stone
2. Fatimid, 11th-12th century Egypt
3. Photograph from Piotrovsky et al., Beyond Palace Walls 14.

V.
1. Polycandelon, Bronze
2. Byzantine, 4th-6th century Syria or Palestine
3. Photograph from Cradle of Christianity 107.

W.
1. Jewelry Hoard
2. Fatimid, 10th-11th century Caesarea, Palestine
3. Photograph from Schätze der Kalifen 124.

X.
1. Bowl, Bronze, D 13.3 cm – 5.2 in
2. Abbasid, 10th-11th century Greater Persia
3. Photograph from the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

Y
1. Candlestick, Bronze D 19.6 cm – 7.7 in
2. Seljuk, mid-13th century Siirt, Greater Persia (Turkey)
3. Photograph from the Victoria and Albert Museum, London

Z.
1. Aquamanile, Bronze, H 35 cm – 14 in
2. Abbasid, 9th-11th century Greater Persia specifically Iran
3. Photograph from Sarre, Kunst Alten Persien 138.
AA.
1. Oil Lamp, Ceramic
2. Umayyad, 900-999 Córdoba, Spain
3. Photograph by Author from Hispanic Society of America Museum, New York

BB.
1. Pisan Cathedral Marquetry Panel, Wood
2. Italian, 1400s Pisa, Italy
3. Photograph from Contadini et al., Beasts that Roared 82.

CC.
1. Lion Pomander, Bronze, H 85.1 cm – 33.5 in
2. Seljuk, 1182 Greater Persia specifically Iran
3. Photograph by Author from the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

DD.
1. Monzón Lion, Bronze, H 30 cm – 11.8 in
2. Umayyad/ Taifa/ Almoravid/ Almohad, 11th-12th century Palencia, Spain
3. Photograph from Qantara

EE.
1. Hind, Bronze, H 48.1 cm – 18.9 in
2. Umayyad, 10th century Córdoba, Spain
3. Photograph from Allan, Metalwork Treasures Islamic Courts 18.

FF.
1. Mari-Cha Lion, Bronze, H 73 cm – 28.7 in
2. Umayyad/ Taifa, 11th-12th century Spain
3. Photograph from Pisa Griffon Project

GG.
1. Mari-Cha Lion Detail (Face), Bronze
2. Umayyad/ Taifa, 11th-12th century Spain
3. Photograph from Islamic Art 1993 1.

HH.
1. Griffon Panel, Wood
2. Fatimid, 11th century Church of St. Barbara, Cairo, Egypt
3. Photograph from Pauty, Bois Sculpé Pl IX.
Appendix I

Figures

A. Map Fatimid Caliphate 909-1171 CE

B. Map Rashidun Caliphate 632-42 CE
C. Map Umayyad Caliphate 661-750 CE

D. Map Abbasid Caliphate 750-1258 CE
E. Female Figure Protome
F. Female Figure Protome
G. Female Figures
H. Female Figure
I. Throne Leg (Griffon Protome)
J. Qasr al-Mshatta (Façade Detail)
K. Qasr al-Mshatta (Façade Detail)
L. Qasr al-Mshatta (Façade Detail)
M. Bottle w/ Lotus Design
N. Khirbat al-Mafjar (Mosaic Panel)
O. Oil Lamp
P. Oil Lamp Detail (Dots)
Q. Oil Lamp
R. Nubian Ibex Gazella Genus
S. Alhambra Lion Fountain
T. Alhambra Lion Fountain
U. Lion Waterspout
V. Polycandelon
X. Bowl
Y. Candlestick
Z. Aquamanile
AA. Oil Lamp
BB. Pisan Cathedral Marquetry Panel
CC. Lion Pomander
DD. Monzón Lion
EE. Hind
FF. Mari-Cha Lion
GG. Mari-Cha Lion Detail (Face)
HH. Griffon Panel
Appendix II

Concise Table of Important Dates and Dynasties in Egypt 622-1517 CE

Byzantine Empire (Province of Egypt) 380-642

Birth of Islam 622

Death of the Prophet Muhammad 632

Rashidun Caliphate 632-642

Arab Conquest 642

Umayyad Caliphate (661-1031) in Egypt 661-750

Abbasid Caliphate (750-1258) in Egypt 750-909

Tulunid Emirate 868-905

Abbasid Caliphate (Partial Restoration) 905-935

Ikhshidid Emirate 935-969

Fatimid Caliphate (909-1171) in Egypt 969-1171

Ayyubid Sultanate (1171-1341) in Egypt 1171-1250

Mamluk Sultanate 1250-1517