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ABSTRACT

The extant corpus of early Islamic metalwork is characterized by a considerable variety as regards vessel types, shapes and functions. The large number of these surviving objects can provide extensive potential clues regarding the understanding of early Islamic metalwork. Despite this readily available pool of exploitable material, however, Islamic metalwork of the early period has not as yet been the subject of a wholly comprehensive study, and even discussions of specific sections belonging to this discipline remain surprisingly few.

The present study on "Early Islamic bronze and brass ewers from the 7th to the mid-13th century" is intended to contribute to this as yet largely unexplored line of research. Early Islamic bronze and brass ewers form a vast and very heterogeneous class of objects. Given the large number of objects that survive and the diversity of their appearance, an ample spectrum of research material is at hand.

The aim of the present thesis is to present a preliminary manual, which assembles, as comprehensively as possible, all relevant information available on early Islamic bronze and brass ewer types developed between the 7th century and the mid-13th century.

The main body of the thesis is divided into four parts, comprising 1. the Introduction, 2. the Discussion of the Ewers, 3. Additional Research Material and 4. the Conclusion. In Part 2 ca. 350 ewers are assembled according to type, i.e. on the basis of a common or closely related profile. All in all 16 different major ewer types are described and discussed with regard to their typological origin, date and attribution in Islamic times, and its function. A catalogue completes each chapter. The first five chapters deal with ewer types developed in eastern Mediterranean and Egyptian workshops (ewer types EMW 1-5). Chapters 6-10 discuss types developed
in Mesopotamian workshops (ewer types MW 1-5) and chapters 11-16 those developed in Iranian and Central Asian workshops (ewer types ICAW 1-6).

Part 3 deals with 1. Problem pieces, i. e. ewer forms that could not be linked with any of the main typological categories, and 2. Additional Ewers of Known Type.

In the Conclusion (Part 4), the results of each individual chapter are assessed in conjunction. Most importantly, it is argued that the sudden occurrence of brass ewers with precious metal inlay in both east and west from a background of primarily utilitarian pouring vessels with very modest or no decoration may have been due at least partly to an artistic impulse from 11th-century Byzantium. As for the vessels’ typological origin it is argued that the Hellenistic legacy is more significant and the Iranian legacy much less significant than has hitherto been believed. In an assessment of the ewers’ provenance and date, it is shown that a curious discrepancy exists between the amount of ewers from the Near East and that of ewers from Iran and Central Asia: the latter clearly outnumber the former. It is suggested that this situation may be due to several factors, including flawed traditional conventions of attribution, cultural, historical and economic factors in the Near East or the status and importance of the local metal working industry. Finally, an investigation into the ewers’ functions reveals a wide range of utilitarian as well as ritual uses.
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FIG. 24: Late Sasanian Bronze Ewer. 5th Century A.D. (?).

FIG. 25: Late or Post-Sasanian Bronze Ewer from Swanetia (Caucasus).

FIG. 26: Silver Spout Fragment from the Water Newton Treasure. Ca. 4th Century A.D.

FIG. 27: 7th-Century Gold Ewer.
FIG. 28: 7th/8th-Century Silver Jug from Semirechie.

FIG. 29: Silver Vessel from the Shores of the Vjatka River. First Half of the 8th Century A.D.

FIG. 30: Late Sasanian, Silver-Gilt Ewer with Female Dancers. Eastern Iran.

FIG. 31: Late Sasanian Silver Ewer allegedly from Gilān.

FIG. 32: 8th-Century Silver Bowl from Mazanderān.

FIG. 33: Early Byzantine Eagle Figure. Cast Bronze, 6th/7th-Century A.D.

FIG. 34: 5th/6th-Century Stone Relief from Venice showing Two Peacocks flanking a Central Pedestal Basin.


FIG. 36: Ancient Mesopotamian Palm-Tree Crowns. (After Danthine 1937, figs. 358, 369, 384, 589).

FIG. 37: Date Palm on a Mesopotamian Stone Vessel. Early 3rd mill. B.C. (After Danthine 1937, fig. 35).

FIG. 38: Palm-Tree on an Assyrian Cylinder. Late 2nd mill. B.C. (After Danthine 1937, fig. 230).


FIG. 40: Cobalt-Painted White Ware Dish. Mesopotamia, 9th/10th Century A.D.

FIG. 41: Early Islamic Lustre Dish. Mesopotamia, 9th Century A.D.

FIG. 42: 10th-Century Islamic Lustre Plate allegedly from Rayy.

FIG. 43: Palm-Tree from the Inner Face of the Octagonal Arcade in the Dome of the Rock (691 A.D.).

FIG. 44: Early Islamic Pottery Jug from Sīsa. 7th/8th Century A.D.


FIG. 47: 7th/8th-Century Bronze Animal Support.

FIG. 48: 7th/8th-Century Bronze Griffin Support from Western Iran.

FIG. 49: Late Sasanian Silver Plate from Northern Iran. 8th Century A.D. (?)

FIG. 50: Late Sasanian (?) Silver Plate, perhaps depicting Drvaspa rididng Tishtrya.
FIG. 51: Tree-of-Life Motif on a 5th-Century Textile from Antioch.


FIG. 53: Early Islamic Green- and Yellow-Glazed Pottery Dish. Mesopotamia, 8th/9th Century A.D.

FIG. 54: Foliage on a Marble Panel from the 9th-Century Mihrab in the Great Mosque of Qairawān.

FIG. 55: Early Islamic Earthenware Ewer allegedly from a Christian Cemetery in Tikrit, Iraq.

FIG. 56: Early Islamic Pottery Jug with Blue Glaze allegedly excavated at Rayy. 7th-9th Century A.D.

FIG. 57: Late Sasanian Silver Vase, 6th/7th Century A.D.

FIG. 58: Wooden Panel with Scrollwork, Egypt or Syria, 8th Century A.D.

FIG. 59: Detail of a 12th-Century Stucco Panel from Rayy.

FIG. 60: Central Medallion of a Silver Bowl found in the Punjāb. Kabulistān (?), 5th/6th Century A.D. (after Marshak 1986, fig. 180).

FIG. 61: Silver-Gilt Bowl with Royal Banquet Scene. Iran (?), 7th Century A.D.

FIG. 62: Detail of a Banquet Scene on a Silver Dish depicting the Exploits of Heracles. Northern Tokharistān, 7th Century A.D.

FIG. 63: Ewers belonging to a Banquet Scene on a probably late Sasanian Silver Plate.

FIG. 64: 5th/6th-Century Pottery Amphora with Royal Banquet Scene. Discovered in Merv.

FIG. 65: Silver Plate depicting a Royal Banquet Scene. Tokharistān, 8th Century A.D.

FIG. 66: Detail from a Floor Painting at Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī. 8th Century A.D.

FIG. 67: Royal Drinking Scene on a Būyid Gold Coin.

FIG. 68: Royal Drinking Scene on a Ghaznavid Silver Dish. 11th Century A.D.

FIG. 69: Silver Bowl depicting a Princely Lute Player. Fātimid, 11th Century A.D.
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FIG. 1: MW 3/1. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 34 cm (Kuwait, Private Collection, inv. no. I/511).

FIG. 2: MW 3/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 35.8 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 1425).

FIG. 3: MW 3/3. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 30.3 cm (Kuwait, Private Collection, inv. no. I/68).

FIG. 4: MW 3/4. Bronze Ewer, h. 31.7 cm (Detroit, Institute of Arts, inv. no. 30.441).


FIG. 6: MW 3/6. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 33 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 454).

FIG. 7: MW 3/7. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 37 cm (Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, inv. no. 54.457).

FIG. 8: MW 3/9. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 31 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 453).


FIG. 10: MW 3/11. Bronze Ewer, h. 30.1 cm (Cairo, ex Harari Collection).

FIG. 11: MW 3/12. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 34.5 cm (London, Keir Collection).

FIG. 12: MW 3/13. Bronze Ewer, h. 27.5 cm (Sotheby’s 25.4.90, lot 83).


FIG. 16: MW 3/V.3. Bronze Ewer, h. 24.6 cm (Bumiller Collection, inv. no. BC 662).

FIG. 17: MW 3/V.4. Bronze Ewer acquired in Daghestan. H. 34.5 cm (Leningrad, Hermitage KZ-5750).


FIG. 19: MW 3/V.6. Bronze Ewer, h. 33 cm (Frankfurt am Main, Museum für Kunsthandwerk, inv. no. 14741).

FIG. 20: MW 3/I. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 48.9 cm (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 47.100.90).

FIG. 22: MW 3/III. Bronze Ewer, h. 36.8 cm (Koç Collection).

FIG. 23: MW 3/V. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 40 cm (London, Keir Collection).

FIG. 24: MW 3/VI. Bronze Ewer, h. 49.5 cm (Lewisohn Collection).


FIG. 26: MW 3/VIII. Bronze Ewer allegedly from Ghazna. H. 29.5 cm (Kabul Museum, inv. no. 58.2.22).

FIG. 27: MW 3/IX. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 31.5 cm (London, Victoria & Albert Museum, inv. no. 1434-1902).

FIG. 28: MW 3/X. Cast Bronze Ewer purchased in Samarkand. H. 38.8 cm (Leningrad, Hermitage, inv. no. SA 12745).

FIG. 29: MW 3/V.II. Bronze Ewer, h. 25 cm (Sotheby’s New York 19.10.83, lot 36).

FIG. 30: 4th-Century Silver Ewer from Chaourse.

FIG. 31: 4th-Century Silver Ewer excavated in Antioch.

FIG. 32: Roman Bronze Ewers excavated in Hungary.

FIG. 33: Hellenistic Stone Mould for casting Handle Attachment Systems. From Egypt.

FIG. 34: Late Sasanian Silver Ewer.

FIG. 35: Two 4th-Century Glass Ewers allegedly from the Western Provinces of Asia Minor.

FIG. 36: Roman Bronze Ewer from Hungary.

FIG. 37: Hammered Silver Ewer found in the Grave of a Khazār (?) Prince at Malaya Perestshepina. Early Byzantine, 6th Century A.D.

FIG. 38: Fragment of a Facetted Silver Flagon unearthed at Trapain Law in Scotland. 4th Century A.D.

FIG. 39: Hammered Bronze Ewer (MW 4/5). Late 9th/10th Century A.D.

FIG. 40: Detail of Early Islamic Bronze Ewer (MW 4/6). Ca. 10th Century A.D.

FIG. 41: Palmette Designs beneath the Lower Handle Attachments of Ewers EMW 5/5 & 5/6.

FIG. 42: Cast Bronze Ewer (EMW 4/V.1/2). Iran, 9th/10th Century A.D.

FIG. 43: Detail of a High Tin Dish from Iran. Probably 10th Century A.D.

FIG. 44: Geometric Design on a 9th/10th-Century Papyrus from Egypt.
FIG. 45: Early Islamic Bronze Ewer (MW 4/1) found in Baghdad. Mesopotamia, late 8th/9th Century A.D.

FIG. 46: Late Sasanian Silver Dish. Northern Iran, 6th/7th Century A.D.

FIG. 47: Late Sasanian or Early Islamic Silver Cup.

FIG. 48: Early 7th-Century Gold Stem Cup from Malatya Perestshepina. Probably made by Avar Craftsmen.

FIG. 49: Detail of a Capital from the Colonnade in the Eastern Apse of a Ruined Church in Ishkhâmi, Eastern Turkey.

FIG. 50: Silver Cup discovered in Tomiz. Sogdia or Chach, Mid 8th Century A.D.

FIG. 51: Detail of a 9th/10th-Century Qurʾān Leaf probably executed in Iraq or Persia.

FIG. 52: Wooden Minbar Panel from Tikrit, Iraq. Late 8th Century A.D.

FIG. 53: Detail of the Marble Panels adorning the Mihrāb in the Great Mosque of Qairawan. 9th Century A.D.

FIG. 54: Silver Bowl discovered in Tomiz. Central Asia, 9th Century A.D.

FIG. 55: Detail of a Qurʾān Page illuminated by one ʿAlī in Iraq or Persia in 1092 A.D.

FIG. 56: Late 8th/9th-Century Silver Bucket from Sogdia or Usrushana.
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FIG. 1: MW 4/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 30.5 cm (London, Keir Collection).

FIG. 2: MW 4/3. Cast(?) Bronze Ewer, h. 31 cm (Sotheby’s 26.4.82, lot 13).

FIG. 3: MW 4/4. Cast(?) Bronze Ewer, h. 30 cm (Sotheby’s 15.10.85, lot 42).

FIG. 4: MW 4/5. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 19 cm (Kuwait, National Museum, inv. no. LNS 195 M).

FIG. 5: MW 4/6. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 33 cm (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 1932.32.66).

FIG. 6: MW 4/7. Cast Bronze Ewer from Tepe Madraseh, Nishapur. H. 33.5 cm (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 38.40.240; after Allan 1982, pp. 82-5).


FIG. 8: MW 4/10. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 37 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 460).


FIG. 11: MW 4/V.2. Bronze Ewer, h. 18 cm (Sotheby’s 12.4.89, lot 50).

FIG. 12: MW 4/V.3. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 21.5 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 143).


FIG. 14: MW 4/V.5. Cast Bronze Ewer allegedly from Ghazna. H. 29.2 cm (Kabul Museum, inv. no. 58.2.21).


FIG. 16: MW 4/V.7. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 29.2 cm (Kuwait, National Museum, inv. no. LNS 132 M).

FIG. 17: MW 4/V.8. Bronze Ewer, h. 23.5 cm (Sotheby’s 15.10.86, lot 126).

FIG. 18: MW 4/I. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 31 cm (Copenhagen, C.L. David Collection, inv. no. 21/1967).

FIG. 19: MW 4/II. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 29.3 cm (Sotheby’s 15.10.86, lot 120).


FIG. 21: MW 4/IV. Bronze Ewer, h. 30 cm (Christie’s 20.4.79, lot 13).


FIG. 23: MW 4/VI. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 30 cm (West Berlin, Islamic Museum, inv. no. I 3563).


FIG. 26: MW 4/X. Bronze Ewer, h. 23 cm (Sotheby’s 10.10.78, lot 293).

FIG. 27: MW 4/V.II. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 36.3 cm (London, British Museum, inv. no. 1980, 7-1, 1).

FIG. 28: MW 4/V.III. Bronze Ewer, h. 25 cm (Sotheby’s 19.10.83, lot 35).

FIG. 29: MW 4/V.IV. Bronze Ewer, h. 20.3 cm (Sotheby’s 15.10.86, lot 118).

FIG. 30: 1st-Century Roman Glass Vessel Type (after Ising 1957, p. 69 form 52).

FIG. 31: 1st/2nd-Century Roman Glass Vessel Type (after Ising 1957, p. 71 form 53).
FIG. 32: Late Antique Glass Ewer from the Royal Tombs of Qustūl in Nubia.

FIG. 33: Upper Handle Attachment of a Bronze Ewer from Pompeji. 1st Century A.D.

FIG. 34: Sasanian Stucco Panel from a Villa in Umm Za’tir near Ctesiphon.

FIG. 35: Reconstructed Sasanian Stucco Frieze allegedly from Nizāmabād, Northwestern Iran.

FIG. 36: Carved Wooden Panel attributed to 8th/9th-Century Egypt.

FIG. 37: 9th-Century 'Abbāsid Pottery Bowl with Blue Design on an Opaque White Glaze.

FIG. 38: Sasanian Capital from Bisutun, Western Iran.

FIG. 39: 5th-Century Floor Mosaic from Antioch on the Orontes, Northern Syria.

FIG. 40: Detail of a Floor Fresco discovered at Qasr al- Ḥair al-Gharbī in Syria. Ca. 730 A.D.

FIG. 41: 9th-Century Pottery Fragment from Sāmarra, Iraq.

FIG. 42: Dark-Blue Glass Vessel with Incised Decoration. 9th-11th Century A.D.

FIG. 43: Early Islamic Bronze Ewer (MW 3/V.3).

FIG. 44: Early Islamic Bronze Ewer with Double Spout. Allegedly from Dagestān (EMW 4/V.1/1).

FIG. 45: Early Islamic Bronze Ewer (MW 2/V.2/7).

FIG. 46: Early Islamic Bronze Ewer (MW 1/2).

FIG. 47: Detail of an 8th/9th-Century Bronze Bowl allegedly from Iran.

FIG. 48: Lamp of Rock Crystal. Egypt, Fatimid Period. Late 10th - Early 11th Century A.D.

FIG. 49: Early Islamic Bronze Ewer (MW 2/V.1/1).

FIG. 50: Early Islamic Bronze Ewer with Bull-Head Spout (ICAW 2/7).

FIG. 51: Miniature from the Kitāb al-Diryāq, depicting the Preparation of an Antidote. Northern Mesopotamia, 1199 A.D.
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FIG. 2: MW 5/10. Beaten Brass Ewer Body, h. 28.5 cm (Sotheby’s 12.4.89, lot 62).

FIG. 4: Late Sasanian (?) Silver Ewer with Horizontally Fluted Body.

FIG. 5: Archaic Greek Bronze ewer from Cyprus.

FIG. 6: Silver Libation Vessels from Ur. 3rd Millennium B.C.

FIG. 7: 8th-Century Bronze Ewer with Zoomorphic Body Spout excavated at Umm al-Wafīd in Jordan.

FIG. 8: Early Islamic Pottery Vessels with Body Spout from Qaṣr al-Ḥair al-Sharqī and Khirbat al-Mafjar.

FIG. 9: 4th-Century Silver Ewer from the Water Newton Treasure.

FIG. 10: 6th-Century Silver Ewer discovered in Ḥama, Syria.

FIG. 11: 4th/5th-Century Silver Ewer from the Esquiline Treasure discovered in Rome.

FIG. 12: 6th/7th-Century Silver Ewer found in Malaja Perestshepina.

FIG. 13: Late Antique Bronze Ewer from Predotto Cividale, Northern Italy.

FIG. 14: Late 8th - 10th-Century Pottery Ewer discovered in the Armenian Garden in Jerusalem.

FIG. 15: Pottery Ewers from 11th/12th-Century Azerbaidjān.

FIG. 16: Ewers depicted in 12th-Century Coptic Gospels.

FIG. 17: Ewers depicted in 13th-Century Arab Miniature Painting.

FIG. 18: Medallion "b" on Ewer MW 5/1.

FIG. 19: Shrub-like Plant in the 35th Miniature of Warqa and Gulshah. Late 12th/early 13th Century A.D.

FIG. 20: Plant from Ghāzl’s Mufīd al-Khass. Ca. 1200 A.D.

FIG. 21: Sketch of a Tree found on a late 9th or early 10th-Century Paper Fragment from the Fayyūm, Egypt.

FIG. 22: Detail of the Interlaced Scroll Frame enclosing a Frontispiece of the Kitāb al-Aghānī. Mosul, 1219 A.D.

FIG. 23: Syrian Brass Basin probably executed between 1240-1260 A.D.

FIG. 24: Raised Brass Ewer Fragment attributed to 14th Century Fars, Iran.
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Map 1: Distribution and Findspots of Ewer Type ICAW 1.

FIG. 1: ICAW 1/1. Beaten Bronze Ewer (Fragmented) found in Tepe Madraseh, Nishāpūr, Iran. H. 30.2 cm (Tehran, Archaeological Museum; after Allan 1982, fig. 93).

FIG. 2: ICAW 1/2. Beaten Bronze Ewer (Fragmented) found at Tepe Madraseh, Nishāpūr, Iran. H. 30 cm (Tehran, Archaeological Museum; after Allan 1982, fig. 94).

FIG. 3: ICAW 1/3. Beaten Bronze Ewer found in Tepe Madraseh, Nishāpūr, Iran. H. 26.6 cm (Tehran, Archaeological Museum; after Allan 1982, fig. 95).

FIG. 4: ICAW 1/4. Beaten Bronze Ewer (Fragmented) found in Tepe Madraseh, Nishāpūr, Iran. H. 29 cm (Tehran, Archaeological Museum; after Allan 1982, fig. 96).

FIG. 5: ICAW 1/5. Beaten Bronze Ewer (Fragmented) found in Tepe Madraseh, Nishāpūr, Iran. H. 28 cm (Tehran, Archaeological Museum; after Allan 1982, fig. 97).

FIG. 6: ICAW 1/6. Beaten Bronze Ewer (Fragmented) found in Qānat Tepe, Nishāpūr, Iran. H. 18.4 cm (Tehran, Archaeological Museum; after Allan 1982, fig. 98).

FIG. 7: ICAW 1/7. Beaten Bronze Ewer (Fragmented) found in Tepe Madraseh, Nishāpūr, Iran. H. 26.6 cm (Tehran, Archaeological Museum; after Allan 1982, fig. 99).


FIG. 9: ICAW 1/9. Beaten Bronze Ewer found at Maimāna, Afghanistan. H. 34.4 cm (Kabul Museum).


FIG. 12: ICAW 1/12. Beaten Bronze Ewer (Fragmented), h. ca. 21 cm (Baghdad Museum).


FIG. 15: ICAW 1/15. Beaten Copper Ewer (Fragmented) found near Foelhagen, Gotland, Sweden. H. ca. 31 cm (Stockholm, Statens historiska Museum, inv. no. 3547).
FIG. 16: ICAW 1/17. Beaten Bronze Ewer (Fragmented) found at Aska Fraeselsgard, Oestergoetland, Sweden. H. 31.4 cm (Stockholm, Statens Historiska Museum, inv. no. 16429:1).


FIG. 18: ICAW 1/19. Hammered (?) Bronze Ewer from Susa. H. ca. 26 cm (?) (Tehran, Archaeological Museum ?).

FIG. 19: ICAW 1/20. Bronze Ewer, h. 20 cm (Christie’s 19.2.80, lot 178).
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FIG. 1: ICAW 2/2. Cast Bronze Ewer. Dimensions unknown (Frankfurt, Motamed Collection).

FIG. 2: ICAW 2/3. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 19 cm (Sotheby’s 12.10.81, lot 58).

FIG. 3: ICAW 2/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 20.5 cm (Paris, Louvre, inv. no. AO 6101).

FIG. 4: ICAW 2/5. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 15.2 cm (West Berlin, Islamic Museum, inv. no. 1.6177).

FIG. 5: ICAW 2/6. Ewer of Cast Quaternary Alloy, h. 15.5 cm (Paris, Louvre, inv. no. AA 60).


FIG. 7: ICAW 2/10L. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 38 cm (Chicago, Art Institute).

FIG. 8: ICAW 2/12L. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 26.5 cm (Frankfurt, Private Collection).


FIG. 11: ICAW 2/V.2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 6.4 cm (Munich, Museum für Völkerkunde, inv. no. 31-2-3).

FIG. 12: ICAW 2/V.4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 16.5 cm (Hotel Drouot Rive Gauche 16./17.11.1978, lot 276).
FIG. 13: ICAW 2/V.I. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 21 cm (London, Keir Collection).

FIG. 14: ICAW 2/V.II. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 21.5 cm (Beirut, Private Collection).

FIG. 15: ICAW 2/V.III. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 13.3 cm (London, British Museum, inv. no. 1956,7-26,1).

FIG. 16: ICAW 2/V.IV. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 19.1 cm (Sotheby’s 16.4.85, lot 28).

FIG. 17: ICAW 2/V.IVa. White Bronze Ewer, h. 13 cm (London, Keir Collection).

FIG. 18: ICAW 2/V.IVb. Bronze Ewer, h. 12 cm (Sotheby’s 19.10.83, lot 24).

FIG. 19: ICAW 2/V.V. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 21 cm (Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, inv. no. 1960-18).

FIG. 20: Bull-shaped Terracotta Vessel from Cyprus. Discovered in a Grave in Ugarit (modern Syria). 16th-14th Century B.C.

FIG. 21: Bull-shaped Vessel from Bogazköy. Painted and Burnished Clay. 17th/16th Century B.C.

FIG. 22: Silver Cup in the Shape of a Kneeling Bull. Turkey, 15th/14th Century B.C.

FIG. 23: "Amlash" Bull Vessel made of Clay. North-Western Iran, 2nd mill. B.C.

FIG. 24: Islamic Bull-Shaped Pottery Vessel. Iran (?), 10th-12th Century A.D.

FIG. 25: Cast Bronze Ewer (ICAW 5/7), probably from Transoxiana or North-Eastern Iran. 11th/12th Century A.D.

FIG. 26: Cast Bronze Ewer (ICAW 4/V.2/3). Eastern Iran or Modern Afghanistan, 10th-12th Century A.D.

FIG. 27: Cast Bronze Vase. Iran, 12th/13th Century A.D.

FIG. 28: Mural found among the ruins of Kotcho, the Ancient Royal Residence of the Uigur Turks (after Esin 1980, pl. LXXXVI/d).
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FIG. 1: ICAW 3/1. Bronze Ewer, h. 23.2 cm (Ghazna, Muza-i Rawza).

FIG. 2: ICAW 3/2. Bronze Ewer, h. 18.4 cm (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 54.64).

FIG. 3: ICAW 3/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 20.3 cm (Sotheby’s 16.4.85, lot 34).

FIG. 4: ICAW 3/5. Bronze Ewer, h. 27.8 cm (Sotheby’s 16.4.85, lot 33).
FIG. 5: ICAW 3/6. Bronze Ewer, h. 15.8 cm (Sotheby's New York, 20.11.75, lot 72).


FIG. 7: ICAW 3/8. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 25.5 cm (Aron Collection).

FIG. 8: ICAW 3/9. Bronze Ewer, h. 23 cm (ex Momtaz Gallery).

FIG. 9: ICAW 3/10. Bronze Ewer, 22.2 cm (Sotheby's 15.10.85, lot 199).


FIG. 11: ICAW 3/12. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 28 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 585).


FIG. 14: ICAW 3/15. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 25.4 cm (Detroit, Institute of Arts).

FIG. 15: ICAW 3/16. Bronze Ewer, h. 20.5 cm (Copenhagen, C.L. David Collection, inv. no. 34/1969).

FIG. 16: ICAW 3/17. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 23 cm (Paris, Louvre, inv. no. AO no. 6314).

FIG. 17: ICAW 3/18. Bronze Ewer, h. 19 cm (Brussels, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, inv. no. IS 58).

FIG. 18: ICAW 3/V.1/1. Bronze Ewer, h. 26 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 146).

FIG. 19: Cast Bronze Ewer of Composite Shape. Found in Shahristān, Usrūshana (ICAW 5/5).


FIG. 21: Cast Bronze Lion attributed to 11th/12th-Century Iran.

FIG. 22: Lustre Vase. Iran, late 12th Century A.D.

FIG. 23: Bronze Bucket from Iran. 12th-13th Century A.D.

FIG. 24: Bronze Perfume Container. Iran, late 12th Century.

FIG. 25: Bronze Kettle from Iran. 12th-13th Century A.D.

FIG. 26: Bronze Stirrup from Ghazna. 10th-11th Century A.D.

FIG. 27: Doctors and Their Disciples. Miniature from the Kitāb al-Diryāq. Iraq, 1199 A.D.
Chapter 14

**FIG. 1**: ICAW 4/1. Hammered Bronze Ewer from Maimāna, Afghanistan. H. 24 cm (Kabul Museum).

**FIG. 2**: ICAW 4/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 36.5 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 754).

**FIG. 3**: ICAW 4/3. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 29.5 cm (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 59.53).

**FIG. 4**: ICAW 4/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 39.5 cm (Private Collection).

**FIG. 5**: ICAW 4/5. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. ca. 35 cm (Damascus, National Museum, inv. no. 15381).

**FIG. 6**: ICAW 4/6. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 24 cm (West Berlin, Islamic Museum, inv. no. I. 1598).

**FIG. 7**: ICAW 4/7. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 31.7 cm (Private Collection).

**FIG. 8**: ICAW 4/9. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 24.5 cm (Sotheby’s 16.10.85, lot 185).

**FIG. 9**: ICAW 4/10. Ewer of Cast Quaternary Alloy, h. 33.8 cm (Kuwait, Private Collection, inv. no. 1/270).

**FIG. 10**: ICAW 4/11. Bronze Ewer, h. 26 cm (Sotheby’s 27.4.81, lot 47).

**FIG. 11**: ICAW 4/12. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 21 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 1067).

**FIG. 12**: ICAW 4/V.1/1. Hammered Bronze Ewer excavated at Maimāna, Afghanistan. H. 25 cm (Kabul Museum?).

**FIG. 13**: ICAW 4/V.1/2. Bronze Ewer, h. 30 cm (Copenhagen, C.L. David Collection, inv. no. 10/1970).

**FIG. 14**: ICAW 4/V.1/3. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 30 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 1246).


**FIG. 16**: ICAW 4/V.2/2. Bronze Ewer, h. 25.5 cm (Christie’s 23.11.84, lot 555).

**FIG. 17**: ICAW 4/V.2/3. Bronze Ewer, h. 32 cm (London, Keir Collection).

**FIG. 18**: ICAW 4/V.2/4. Bronze (?) Ewer from Khasaw-Jurt (Cummukhsh Province, Russia). H. 38 cm (Tiflis Museum).

**FIG. 19**: ICAW 4/V.2/5. Bronze Ewer, h. 30 cm (Christie’s 10.10.89, lot 527).

**FIG. 20**: ICAW 4/V.2/6. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 37 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 170).

**FIG. 21**: ICAW 4/V.2/7. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 36 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 171).


FIG. 24: Pottery Ewer with Beak-Spout from a Karluk Site in Central Asia. Ca. 8th-10th Century A.D. (after Esin 1969, fig. 12A).

FIG. 25: Lion Figurine in Bronze. Iran, 11th-13th Century A.D.

FIG. 26: Bronze Shaft from Nīshāpūr. Iran, 10th/11th Century A.D. (After Allan 1982, fig. 180).

FIG. 27: Detail of a 12th-Century Bronze Bowl allegedly produced in Samarqand.

FIG. 28: Detail of a Sūra-Heading belonging to a 12th-Century Qurʾān (after Rice 1953 (II), p. 66 fig. 6).

FIG. 29: Early 11th-Century Bronze Incense Burner acquired in Sīstān.

FIG. 30: Margin Medallions belonging to a Qurʾān Page executed in Iraq (?) in 1036 A.D.

FIG. 31: 9th/10th-Century Bronze Hook from Iran.

FIG. 32: Silver Dish with Royal Banquet Scene. Attributed to a Sogdian Workshop active in the early 9th Century A.D.

FIG. 33: Funerary Stele for the Kök Türk Prince Bilge Kagan (d. 734 A.D.) (after Esin 1980, pl. XLVIII/a).

FIG. 34: Seljuq Bronze Bowl showing an Enthroned King during a Drinking Feast (after Esin 1968, pl. XV B).
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FIG. 3: ICAW 5/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 25.7 cm (Leningrad, Hermitage).

FIG. 4: ICAW 5/5. Bronze Ewer from Shahristān, Usrušana. H. 21.5 cm (Location unknown).


FIG. 7: ICAW 5/V.1/1. Cast Bronze Ewer acquired in Ghazna. H. 23 cm (Ghazna, Mūza-i Rawza).

FIG. 8: Cast Bronze Ewer with Bull-Head Spout (ICAW 2/2).
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**FIG. 1:** ICAW 6/1. Bronze Ewer allegedly from Ghazna. H. 32.5 cm (Kandahar, Antiquarian Trade).

**FIG. 2:** ICAW 6/2. Bronze Ewer, h. 33 cm (Sotheby's 9.10.79, lot 178).

**FIG. 3:** ICAW 6/3. Bronze Ewer. Dimensions unavailable (Sotheby's 10.10.78, lot 295).

**FIG. 4:** ICAW 6/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 44.5 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 464).

**FIG. 5:** ICAW 6/5. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 33.5 cm (Christie's 21.11.86, lot 296).

**FIG. 6:** ICAW 6/6. Bronze Ewer, h. 36.2 cm (Sotheby's New York 30.6.80, lot 284).

**FIG. 7:** ICAW 6/7. Cast Bronze ewer, h. 31 cm (West Berlin, Islamic Museum, inv. no. 1. 5377).

**FIG. 8:** ICAW 6/9. Bronze Ewer, h. 34 cm (Copenhagen, C.L. David Collection).

**FIG. 9:** ICAW 6/11. Bronze Ewer. Dimensions unavailable (Ani Museum?).

**FIG. 10:** ICAW 6/12. Bronze Ewer, h. 28 cm (Cairo, Islamic Museum).

**FIG. 11:** ICAW 6/13. Detail of a Cast Bronze Ewer Body. H. 22.2 cm (Tehran, Private Collection).

**FIG. 12:** ICAW 6/14. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 35.5 cm (Riyadh, King Feisal Research Centre?).

**FIG. 13:** ICAW 6/15. Bronze Ewer, h. 29.5 cm (London, British Museum, inv. no. 1956,7-26,5).

**FIG. 14:** ICAW 6/16. Hammered Bronze Ewer from Kawat Kala, Khwarazm (Present Location unknown).

**FIG. 15:** ICAW 6/17. Bronze Ewer, h. 34 cm (Brussels, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire, inv. no. 8756).

**FIG. 16:** ICAW 6/18. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 32 cm (Sotheby's 26.4.82, lot 15).

**FIG. 17:** ICAW 6/19. Hammered Bronze Ewer. Dimensions unknown (Present Location unknown).

**FIG. 18:** ICAW 6/22. Beaten Bronze Ewer allegedly from Ghazna. H. 31 cm (Kabul Museum, inv. no. 58.2.18).

**FIG. 19:** ICAW 6/23. Beaten Bronze Ewer, h. 33 cm (Sotheby’s New York 9.12.80, lot 266).

**FIG. 20:** ICAW 6/24. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 35.2 cm (Sotheby’s 19.10.83, lot 29).
**FIG. 21**: ICAW 6/25. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 38.5 cm (London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 591).

**FIG. 22**: ICAW 6/V.1/2. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 41 cm (Christie’s 24.4.90, lot 496).

**FIG. 23**: ICAW 6/V.1/3. Hammered Bronze Ewer Body allegedly from Ghazna. H. 26.5 cm (Kabul Museum, inv. no. 58.2.16).

**FIG. 24**: ICAW 6/V.1/4. Hammered Bronze Ewer Body, h. 22 cm (Christie’s 11.10.88, lot 356).

**FIG. 25**: ICAW 6/V.1/5. Hammered Brass Ewer, h. 38 cm (Sotheby’s 11.10.89, lot 97).

**FIG. 26**: ICAW 6/V.1/6. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 38.5 cm (ex Khalili Gallery).

**FIG. 27**: ICAW 6/V.1/8. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 33 cm (Christie’s 24.11.87, lot 154).

**FIG. 28**: ICAW 6/V.1/9. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 38 cm (Copenhagen, C.L. David Collection, inv. no. 15/1969).

**FIG. 29**: ICAW 6/V.1/10. Hammered Brass Ewer, h. 36.5 cm (Sotheby’s 12.10.81, lot 55).

**FIG. 30**: ICAW 6/V.1/12. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 38.5 cm (London, Keir Collection).

**FIG. 31**: ICAW 6/V.2/2. Hammered Bronze Ewer Body. Dimensions unknown (Ashkhabad Museum ?).

**FIG. 32**: ICAW 6/V.2/3. Hammered Brass Ewer, h. 32.7 cm (Kabul Museum).

**FIG. 33**: ICAW 6/V.2/4. Beaten Brass Ewer, h. 38 cm (Christie’s 10.10.89, lot 530).

**FIG. 34**: ICAW 6/V.2/5. Beaten Brass Ewer, h. 38 cm (London, V & A, inv. no. 592-1898).


**FIG. 37**: ICAW 6/V.2/11. Beaten Brass Ewer, h. 44.5 cm (Nuhad al-Said Collection).

**FIG. 38**: ICAW 6/V.2/14. Hammered Brass Ewer, h. 39.9 cm (Kuwait, Private Collection, inv. no. I/356).

**FIG. 39**: ICAW 6/V.3/1. Hammered Bronze Ewer, h. 37.5 cm (Sotheby’s 8.6.64, lot 149).

**FIG. 40**: ICAW 6/V.3/7. Beaten Bronze Casket worked from a Ewer (Chicago, Institute of Fine Arts, inv. no. 34.504).
FIG. 41: ICAW 6/V.3/13. Beaten Bronze Ewer, h. 29.2 cm (Cleveland, Museum of Art, inv. no. 45.27).

FIG. 42: Hammered Bronze Ewers from Maimana, Afghanistan (ICAW 1/8-9).

FIG. 43: Hammered Bronze Ewer from Maimana, Afghanistan (ICAW 4/1).

FIG. 44: 12th/13th-Century Bronze Ewer from Persia or Central Asia (ICAW 4/V.2/1/1).

FIG. 45: 11th-Century Qur’an Page from Baghdad.

FIG. 46: Miniature with Author Portraits belonging to the Mukhtar al-hikam wa mahāsin al-kalim. Syria(?), Early 13th Century A.D.

FIG. 47: 12th/13th-Century Lidded Cup from Barsov-Gorodok near Surgut. Probably from a Workshop on the eastern Borders of the Byzantine Empire.


FIG. 49: Silver-Inlaid Bronze Vase. Iran, Late 12th/Early 13th Century A.D.

FIG. 50: Details from a Pencase executed by Shādhī in Merv or Herat in 1210 A.D. (after Harari 1964-5, figs. 841a & b).

FIG. 51: Scene of Animated Revellers on the Vaso Vescovali. Iran, Late 12th/Early 13th Century A.D.

FIG. 52: Harpies from the Temple of Shiva in Prambanan, India. 9th Century A.D. (after Baer 1965, pl. XXXII fig. 59).

FIG. 53: 12th-Century Bronze Ewer with “Oil-Lamp” Spout (ICAW 3/14).

FIG. 54: Seated Figure with Dragon-Headed Staff on a 12th/13th-Century Inkwell from Iran.


FIG. 56: The Letter Alif as found on a Tombstone from the Mosque of Tha’bād in Yemen. 1146 A.D. (after Grohmann 1957, p. 191, Diagram a fig. 38).

FIG. 57: 12th/13th-Century Bronze Mortar from Khurasan.

FIG. 58: 10th-Century Lid now placed on a late 12th-Century Inkwell from Iran.

FIG. 59: Revelling Scene on the Cover of a probably 12th-Century Circular Casket from Iran (after Baer 1983, p. 144 fig. 121).

FIG. 60: Revelling Scene on the Cover of an early 13th-Century Inkwell attributed to Herat.

FIG. 61: Revelling Scene on the Vaso Vescovali. Iran(?), late 12th/early 13th Century A.D.

FIG. 62: Scene of Entertainment on the Bobrinsky Bucket. Herat 1163 A.D.
FIG. 63: Cylindrical-Bodied Silver Ewer with Obliquely Rising Beak-Spout.

FIG. 64: The Zodiacal Sign of Aquarius on ewer V.3/10.

FIG. 65: The Zodiacal Sign of Aquarius on ewer V.2/11.

FIG. 66: Silver-Inlaid Bronze Tray. Iran, late 12th/early 13th Century A.D.

FIG. 67: Silver-Inlaid Bronze Tray. Iran, late 12th/early 13th Century A.D.

FIG. 68: Late 12th-Century Bronze Basin from Khurāsān.
INTRODUCTION

1. General Remarks

The extant corpus of early Islamic metalwork - datable roughly to the period between the 7th and the mid-13th century A.D. - is characterized by a considerable variety as regards vessel types, shapes and functions. The large number of these surviving objects, their materials, profiles, decoration and original function provide extensive potential clues not only to the understanding of early Islamic metalwork as a discipline, but also that of Islamic art and culture as a whole.

Despite this readily available pool of exploitable material, however, Islamic metalwork of the early period has not as yet been the subject of a wholly comprehensive study, and even discussions of specific sections belonging to this discipline remain surprisingly few.

Generally, Islamic metalwork is treated either by very generalized surveys like that of Ralph Harari in the Survey of Persian Art (1938), or in a more precise way by studies dealing with individual objects either contained in public and private collections or assembled specifically for an exhibition on the subject. Among the former, D. Barrett in his discussion of the major Islamic metalwork objects in the British Museum (1949) and A. S. Melikian-Chirvani’s survey of pieces in the Victoria and Albert Museum (1982) deserve recognition as pioneering works.

Admirable work was also undertaken by G. Fehérvári on the Islamic metal objects in the Keir collection, by M. Dahncke on those in the Bumiller collection and by J. W. Allan on the metalwork collections assembled by Messrs. Aron and Nuhad al-Said. In addition to general surveys based on selective objects such as these, several very specialized articles on individual objects have also been published over the last decades, the most competent ones being those by D. S. Rice between 1949 and 1961.
More recently, A. S. Melikian-Chirvani has been the main exponent in the study of individual objects, although regrettably his discussions are more often than not overshadowed by a certain bias regarding Iranian supremacy in everything to do with Islamic art. Other scholars concerned with the publication of specialized articles on metalwork objects as well as the discussion of particular metalworking schools include Baer and again Allan.

All these publications attempt to place the objects within a certain cultural, artistic or historical context within the early Islamic environment. Accordingly, they mostly concentrate on the pieces' decoration. Studies on the history of particular vessel forms, on the other hand, are very rare indeed. In fact, they are still restricted to two theses by A. S. Melikian-Chirvani (1972) and J. Allan (1976), who both discuss, though comparatively briefly, groups of vessel forms in the context of their studies on the early Islamic metalworking industry in Iran, and the pioneering book on Islamic metalwork by Baer, published in 1983. In addition a rather brief, unpublished M.A. thesis by Sokoly on some early Islamic ewer types, which was submitted in 1990, has to be mentioned here.

2. The Subject of this Thesis

The present study on "Early Islamic bronze and brass ewers from the 7th to the mid-13th century" is intended to contribute to this as yet largely unexplored line of research. Early Islamic bronze and brass ewers form a vast and very heterogeneous class of objects. The latter incorporates an array of diverse profiles, manufacturing

---

1 In the literature the terms "ewer" and "jug" are often used indiscriminately to denote an object that holds and pours liquids. Allan was the first to suggest a workable formula to distinguish a "jug" from a "ewer" on the basis of size and shape. He defined a "jug" as being up to ca. 20 cm high with a round mouth. His general definition of a "ewer" is a vessel with a height of ca. 20 cm or more, preferably with a spout. If an object is smaller than 20 cm but has a spout it is also defined as a "ewer", as the spout clearly marks it primarily as a pouring vessel and its form generally suggests a close connection with typologically related pieces of a larger size (cf. Allan 1976, Vol. 1, pp. 72, 204). As Allan's definition is concise and accurate, it has been adopted for the selection of objects in this thesis.
techniques and, if the vessels are not plain, decorative schemes, which vary in extent and sophistication, as well as with regard to the various decorative techniques used, such as incising, punching, relief, repoussé, open-work and precious metal inlay.

Given the large number of objects that survive and the diversity of their appearance, an ample spectrum of research material is at hand. Accordingly, the choice of this particular vessel type as the subject for a comprehensive study promises to be particularly fruitful. At the same time it provides ample challenge along the way.

2.1. Objective of the Thesis

The first and foremost aim of the present thesis is to present the interested scholar of Islamic metalwork (and indeed Islamic art in general) with a preliminary manual, which assembles, as comprehensively as possible, all relevant information available on early Islamic bronze and brass ewer types developed between the 7th century, i.e. the earliest years of Islamic rule, and the mid-13th century, when the Mongol abolition of the caliphate in Baghdad in 1258 and the advent of the Mamluks in Egypt in 1250 effectively mark the end of the early Islamic period.

2.2. Limitations

Every effort has been made to present a study of early Islamic bronze and brass ewers which is as accurate and concise as possible. However, it must be conceded that certain factors beyond my control may have increased the likelihood of minor inaccuracies, which should not, however, impair the validity and quality of the study as a whole.
In assembling the research material for the present study I had to rely to a large extent on the cooperation of all the museums with major collections of Islamic art in supplying me with photographs and relevant data. Unfortunately, several of my requests for assistance received no reply, and it is regrettable that some of the museums most important to this study were among those that did not respond. Consequently, the ca. 350 pieces assembled in this thesis can only provide a preliminary corpus of early Islamic bronze and brass ewers, which will need adding to as further objects emerge or are made accessible.

In preparing the analytical chapters on the ewer types assembled in this thesis, I was, to a large degree, dependent on the examination of photographs. This method of research is of necessity flawed and may lead to minor inaccuracies on occasion, as the visibility of the objects is often somewhat restricted and may sometimes not allow the identification or interpretation of a particular detail. However, if this situation does occur anywhere in this study, the fact is clearly noted to enable the reader to avoid any misconceptions resulting from such uncertainties.

A further problem connected with the visibility of the objects on the photographs to hand is that of deciphering and stylistically assessing the epigraphy encountered on many of the vessels. Quite apart from the fact that epigraphy is a discipline that really deserves expert attention in its own right, dealing with inscriptions in detail proved impossible on the basis of photographs alone. Consequently, it seemed best under the circumstances to deal with the epigraphy of the ewers only if relevant information in this respect could be extracted either from the literature or from a direct examination of a particular object.
3. Structure of the Thesis

In order to keep the proposed work as accessible as possible for the reader, the thesis has been divided into four parts:

Part 1: INTRODUCTION
Part 2: DISCUSSION OF THE EWERS
Part 3: ADDITIONAL RESEARCH MATERIAL
Part 4: CONCLUSION

After the Introduction, the subsequent parts are structured as follows:

Part 2: DISCUSSION OF THE EWERS

2.1. Layout of the Discussion

In Part 2 all the individual ewers, ca. 350 in number, have been assembled: from published literature known to the author, from material provided directly from museums worldwide and, finally, by viewing several museum and private collections as well as auction houses, mainly in Britain, but also abroad.

The objects thus collected have been grouped according to type, i.e. on the basis of a common or closely related profile. This way of categorization appears at present to be the most systematic one. Attempts to group the individual ewers according to other criteria such as a common geographical or chronological attribution, or according to function, prove futile at present, as in too many cases any one of these aspects or indeed all of them are either entirely unknown, or are at best based on purely hypothetical considerations.
Each typological category has been examined as an independent entity and is dealt with along the same lines. To start with, the type is described with regard to the pieces' general appearance, including structural features and, where known, details regarding the manufacturing technique. Then, where applicable, the decoration and the techniques of its application will be discussed, again on a purely descriptive basis only. These descriptive paragraphs are consciously designed to be as precise and detailed as possible, even if as a result they may at first appear rather lengthy and tedious to plough through. Their purpose is to familiarize the interested reader, who may not be able to view the objects or even detailed photographs of them while reading this study, with the visual characteristics of the objects, and thus provide him with the tools for the ensuing sections of the discussion, which are, for the most part, of a more analytical and interpretative nature.

These subsequent paragraphs are devoted to

* the typological origin of the ewer type,
* the dating and attribution of the ewer type in Islamic times and
* the function of the ewer type.

An attempt will be made to trace the typological origin of each ewer group, either by consulting extant pre-Islamic vessels, whether executed in base or precious metal, pottery, glass or any other material; or, if this is not possible, by reconstructing the evolution of the ewer design. This will be done by comparing individual elements of the vessel structure to those on other contemporary as well as earlier Islamic and pre-Islamic vessels, again executed in various media.

The section dealing with dating and attributing the ewer type will attempt to establish a chronological and geographical setting for each individual piece. This will be done by assessing its archaeological find-spot, or by comparing its profile to other contemporary artefacts in other media, or, more often, by comparing its decorative scheme as well as individual motifs to similar ones on other Islamic
artefacts for which date and provenance are better established. On the basis of the evidence provided by the individual pieces, the chronological and geographical distribution of each ewer type as a whole is discussed.

The last section in each category deals with the type's original function. On rare occasions the vessels' purpose is known. Mostly, however, speculative considerations come into play here. These can be based on preliminary clues provided by the ewers' profile as well as on the study of certain decorative features and their iconographical significance, which may conceal the inner meaning of the vessel or at least be linked to the latter in some way.

In addition evidence provided by the epigraphy - where known - can also in some cases prove helpful. Apart from the clues provided by the vessels themselves, other artefacts with figural depictions, whether found on metal, pottery, stucco or in miniature painting, were scanned for possible images of ewers and for evidence as to their original function. Finally, literary sources were also examined, though with somewhat limited success. This was because most authors, if they mention pouring vessels at all, do not trouble to describe the ewers' appearance when referring to their function, thus making it impossible to match a vessel described in the literature to an actually extant object. The analytical discussion of each ewer type is followed by a short summary, meant to provide an easy reference for each category.

In order to ease the reader's comprehension of every aspect of the thesis, each section of a chapter has been provided with a large number of images. The figure count always starts with images of the ewers in the relevant part of the catalogue. It then continues with the comparative material meant to illustrate the analytical parts of each chapter.

Most of the figures are drawings. These are intended as an introductory visual reference only. They do not attempt to be accurate enough to serve as reliable study material in future research. Such a purpose would require proper photographs and a repeated examination of any object involved.
2.2. The Catalogue

Each typological chapter is completed by a self-contained catalogue. The purpose of the latter is to allow the reader easy access to any individual ewer within a typological group. Each catalogue entry will note an object's present location, its provenance, if known (otherwise the abbreviation n.p. will designate "no provenance") and, where applicable, other historical details such as the artist's signature, the date and/or the original owner.

Then follow technical details such as the material used, the manufacturing technique, decorative techniques and dimensions. These details are followed by a brief description of the object, noting its structural and, where applicable, decorative features. If the situation arises that a particular aspect of the vessel could not be identified beyond doubt, this will be highlighted by a (?) following the uncertain descriptive detail.

It may happen on occasion that a catalogue entry virtually repeats certain passages already encountered in the descriptive paragraph of the preceding discussion. This is particularly possible when a certain ewer displays a unique decorative scheme, which has to be noted as such in the text. However, such instances of repetition were deemed unavoidable in order to keep both the text and the catalogue complete in themselves and allow the reader to consult either of them independently without referring between them in order to gain a complete knowledge of the pieces.

Each catalogue entry is completed by a plate or figure number, which refers to the image of the relevant ewer in the context of the preceding text, and a comprehensive bibliography. For the sake of utmost completeness all the references which have come to my notice for the ewers will be listed in the bibliography, including those which I myself could not or chose not to consult. These references

2 As most of the objects have not been analysed as yet with regard to the exact composition of the metal they are made of, the terms "bronze" and "brass" appear as stated in the relevant literature.
will be clearly marked by an asterisk (*) in the main bibliography at the end of the thesis.

When a ewer type comprises several typological varieties distinguished by divergences from the main profile, the numbering system of the objects has been adjusted accordingly. Two major systems have been adopted. If there are several ewers which are united by a common profile which, however, is somehow distinct from the main type, these are designated by V(ariation)1/1, V.1/2, V.1/3 etc. (V.2/1, V.2/2, V.3/1, V.3/2 etc. for more than one sub-group). This system appears for example in chapters 7, 10 or 16.

In several instances an array of individual ewers (which are not only distinct from the main type but also from each other) had to be attached typologically either to the main type or to one of its major sub-groups (cf. ewer types MW 3 & 4, chapters 8 & 9). In these cases the numbering system is as follows: ewers belonging to the main type are counted as 1, 2, 3, 4 etc. Individual varieties assignable to the main type are counted as V.1, V.2, V.3, V.4 etc. Ewers of a subsequent sub-group and individual varieties assignable to the profile of the ewers in that sub-group are distinguished by Roman numerals (I, II, III, IV etc., V.I, V.II, V.III etc.).

On one occasion (ewer type ICAW 2, chapter 12) the two sub-groups assigned to the main type are not as homogeneous as in the other categories. The ewers have a similar spout treatment but are otherwise quite different from each other. In this case vessels of the first sub-group are counted as V.1, V.2, V.3 etc., and ewers of the second sub-group as V.I, V.II, V.III etc.

All in all 16 different major ewer types are discussed in Part 2. After the study of all the typological categories had been completed, it emerged that, roughly speaking, all the ewers assembled in this thesis seem to have been developed in three major geographical spheres within the early Islamic empire: 1. Egypt and the lands of the eastern Mediterranean, 2. Mesopotamia and adjacent regions and 3. Iran and Central Asia.
Consequently, the 16 chapters dealing with the ewer types were grouped accordingly, i.e. the first sub-heading assembles ewer types developed in eastern Mediterranean and Egyptian workshops, the second one those developed in Mesopotamian workshops and the third one those developed in Iranian and Central Asian workshops.

It has to be stressed that these geographical sub-divisions are as yet preliminary and may need correcting in the future. However, for now they provide us with a rough idea as to the cultural ambience within the early Islamic empire to which the ewers probably belonged.

In order to identify a respective ewer type as belonging to one or the other of the chosen sub-groups, the prefixes EMW (Eastern Mediterranean Workshops), MW (Mesopotamian Workshops) and ICAW (Iranian and/or Central Asian Workshops) have been chosen to precede the numbering of each ewer type. Accordingly, the structure of Part 2 appears as follows:

Chapter 1

EMW 1: Cast Bronze Ewers with Facetted Ovoid Body on Low Foot, Curved Handle and Trefoil Mouth

Chapter 2

EMW 2: Cast Bronze Ewers with Wide Facetted, Pear-Shaped Body on Waisted Foot, Long Tubular Neck, Domical Lid and S-Shaped Handle with Central Openwork Knob
Chapter 3

**EMW 3:** Cast Bronze Ewers with Cylindrical Body on Three Feet, Cylindrical Neck and Tubular, Obliquely Rising Body Spout

Chapter 4

**EMW 4:** Cast Bronze Ewers with Ovoid Body on Three Feet, Bipartite Neck and Curved Body Spout/s

Chapter 5

**EMW 5:** Cast Bronze Ewers with Rounded Body, Long Tubular Neck, Openwork Crown, Crozier-like Handle and Bird-Shaped Body Spout - The "Marwan Ewer" Group

Chapter 6

**MW 1:** Cast Bronze Ewers with Cylindrical Body on Three Feet and Bipartite Neck

Chapter 7

**MW 2:** Cast Bronze Ewers with Pear-Shaped Body, Waisted Neck and Horizontal Spout issuing from the Mouth
Chapter 8

MW 3: Cast Bronze Ewers with Pear-Shaped Body on Splayed Foot, Waisted Cylindrical Neck, Round Mouth and Curved Handle - The "Basra Ewer" Group

Chapter 9

MW 4: Cast Bronze Ewers with Rounded Body, Tall Cylindrical Neck and S-Shaped Handle with Central Beading and Pomegranate Thumbpiece

Chapter 10

MW 5: Beaten Brass Ewers with Inverted Pear-Shaped Body on Waisted Foot, Cylindrical Neck, Obliquely Rising, Tubular Body Spout and Arched Handle

Chapter 11

ICAW 1: Hammered Bronze or Copper-Alloy Ewers With Cylindrical Body and Neck
Chapter 12

ICAW 2: Cast Bronze Ewers with Pear-Shaped Body on Low Foot and Zoomorphic Spout issuing from Mouth

Chapter 13

ICAW 3: Cast Bronze Ewers with Pear-Shaped Body on Low Foot and "Oil-Lamp" Spout

Chapter 14

ICAW 4: Cast and Hammered Bronze Ewers with Globular Body on Low Foot, Cylindrical Neck and Obliquely Rising Beak-Spout

Chapter 15

ICAW 5: Cast Bronze Ewers with Bulbous Pear-Shaped Body on Bipartite Foot, Flat Shoulder with Conical Neck and Large Beak-Spouted Head

Chapter 16

ICAW 6: Hammered and Cast Bronze and Brass Ewers with Plain or Facetted Cylindrical Bodies, Cylindrical Neck and Obliquely Rising Beak-Spout
Part 3: ADDITIONAL RESEARCH MATERIAL

The discussion of the 16 major ewer types in Part 2 of the thesis will be followed by two short appendices in Part 3. These will deal with:

3.1. Appendix 1: Problem Pieces

Here, unique ewer forms have been assembled which could not be linked with any of the main typological categories and about which hardly any or no further information could be found.

3.2. Appendix 2: Additional Ewers of Known Type

In this section several ewers of known type have been listed. These have come to my notice shortly before or indeed after the completion of the main body of this thesis and should be considered in conjunction with the relevant categories during future research.

Part 4: CONCLUSION

The conclusion will be concerned with two aspects that emerged during the writing of this thesis.
4.1. Results

Firstly, the results of each individual chapter are assessed and considered in conjunction. Each aspect of the investigation will be assessed individually. First, conclusions are drawn from the general appearance of the vessels, i.e. from their structural features, from the decorative techniques used and from their iconography. Most importantly, it is argued that the sudden and as yet unexplained occurrence of brass ewers with precious metal inlay in both east and west from a background of primarily utilitarian pouring vessels with more or less modest decoration, or indeed no decoration at all, may have been due to an artistic impulse from 11th-century Byzantium, where the art of precious metal inlay experienced a renaissance after having lain dormant for some 600 years.

Next, the investigation into the vessels' typological origin is assessed. It is argued that the Hellenistic legacy in the development of early Islamic ewers in general is much more significant, and the Iranian legacy much less significant, than has hitherto been believed.

In an assessment of the ewers' provenance and date, it will be shown that a curious discrepancy exists between the amount of ewers to survive from the Near East as distinct from Iran and Central Asia: the latter clearly outnumber the former.

It is suggested that this situation may be due to several factors such as flawed traditional conventions of attribution, or cultural, historical and economic factors in the Near East. Here, the status and importance of the local metalworking industry in general and its position vis-à-vis other contemporary industries responsible for the manufacture of pouring vessels at the time, such as the glass, rock crystal and pottery industries, is assessed.

Finally, the results regarding the ewers' function are discussed. It is shown that ewers had a wide range of utilitarian as well as ritual uses.
4.2. Limitations

In conjunction with the results of this thesis, it is necessary to highlight certain questions which arose with regard to the material investigated in this study, and could not be answered satisfactorily. In view of such still unsolved problems, new challenges for future research are identified.
Chapter 1

Ewer Type EMW 1: Cast Bronze Ewers with Facetted Ovoid Body on Low Foot, Curved Handle and Trefoil Mouth

1. General Description

The cast bronze ewers comprising this group, with a height varying from 17.2 cm to 26.2 cm, are characterized by an inverted pear-shaped and facetted body, which can be squat (cat. nos. 1, 2, V.1/1; plate 1, figs. 1 and 6), slightly elongated (cat. nos. 3, V.1/2; figs. 2 and 7) or rounded (cat. nos. 4, 5; figs. 3 and 4). Only in the case of cat. no. 6 (fig. 5) is the body slender and ovoid; it features a plain upper section and a facetted main part demarcated by a cusped upper edge executed in relief.

The body rests either on a low splayed foot-ring supported by three tiny feet (cat. nos. 1, 6; plate 1, fig. 5) or, more commonly, on a bipartite foot composed of a low rounded or angular upper part and a broader, splayed and perfectly flat base. On the flattened shoulder an angular and perhaps in some cases facetted collar introduces the cylindrical neck, which can be executed in several different ways. It can taper towards the top and flare out just below the lip (cat. no. 1; plate 1). In other cases it is fairly broad and squat with sides flaring only slightly towards the lip (cat. no. 2; fig. 1). In three cases (cat. nos. 3-5; figs. 2-4) the neck is tall, slender and nearly straight, again flaring slightly just below the lip. Cat. no. 6 (fig. 5) features a very slim tubular neck with perfectly straight sides tapering towards the mouth. Finally, ewers V.1/1 and V.1/2 (figs. 6 and 7) feature similar necks to that applied to no. 6 (fig. 5), but here they are characteristically interrupted in their upper halves by an angular collar which receives the upper termination of the handle.
Most typical for this group is the indented and rounded or angular trefoil mouth, which is surrounded by a thick lip over which the liquid is poured. Ewers V.1/1 and V.1/2 (figs. 6 and 7) on the other hand have a small round aperture covered by a conical lid, which is attached to the upper handle by a small chain. This aperture is not intended for pouring, but only for filling, as the former function is performed through a tubular body spout rising obliquely from the shoulder.

The handle, which is flattened to varying degrees, can be either S-shaped (cat. nos. 1, 3-6, V.1/1, V.1/2; plate 1, figs. 2-7) or C-shaped (cat. no. 2; fig. 1). Typically it joins the back of the lip and the upper body, in the latter case sometimes by means of a decorative trefoil in relief (cat. nos. 3, 5, V.1/1; figs. 2, 4, 6). In the case of no. 6 (fig. 5) two triangular and vertically orientated extensions flank the upper handle attachment area just above the lip.

The thumbpieces are rendered in two ways. They are either of a stylized leaf-shape with a globular finial (cat. nos. 3, 4, 6, V.1/2; figs. 2, 3, 5, 7), in one case positioned just behind the loop receiving the lid chain (cat. no. V.1/2; fig. 7), or they depict a reclining or seated quadruped (cat. nos. 1, 2, V.1/1; plate 1, figs. 1 and 6), which sometimes rests its front paws on a globular element or a loop which receives the chain affixed to the lid (cat. nos. 2, V.1/1; figs. 1 and 6). In the case of cat. no. 5 (fig. 4) the thumbpiece is broken off and only the base remains.

2. Decoration

All the ewers in this category remain undecorated apart from the motifs chosen to represent the thumbrest. The first one, a simple leaf with a globular finial is too stylized to allow any botanical identification. The second type of thumbpiece, as
mentioned before, is a reclining or seated feline, sometimes resting its front paws on a ball (cat. nos. 1, 2, V.1/1; plate 1, figs. 1 and 6).  

3. Origin of Ewer Type

The profile of this ewer type is certainly not an Islamic innovation as it appears closely related to certain bronze vessels already current in the Hellenistic world. In this context the characteristic trefoil mouth is most revealing. It occurs frequently among Roman and Byzantine ewers, particularly those classified as oinochoe, i.e. vessels for the serving of wine.  

However, it is not only the spout adopted on the majority of such ewers, which reveals direct links to Romano-Byzantine traditions. In fact, their profile as a whole closely relates to that encountered on several bronze ewers from either Hellenistic or Byzantine archaeological contexts.

Thus ewer 6 (fig. 5) undoubtedly derives from pouring vessels of the type excavated in the royal tombs of Ballana in Nubia and datable to the 5th century A.D. (fig. 8). Remarkably, features like the three tiny feet, the cusped upper facet border executed in relief, the angular interpretation of the trefoil mouth, the slender and narrow curvature of the handle and the leaf-thumbpiece all appear hardly

1 This very individualistic and somewhat genre-like motif already occurs in Early Christian metalwork from Egypt, where it appears for example on a tall and slender bronze ewer, apparently from the Cairo area and datable to the 4th/5th century A.D.; cf. Wulff 1909, p. 216 no. 1037, pl. LIV no. 1037. A closely related rampant feline figure, purchased in Egypt, was dated by Fehérvári to the period between the 9th and 11th centuries and attributed to Egypt; cf. Fehérvári 1976, p. 51 no. 34, pl. 10c no. 34. As for the significance of miniature animal figures such as the latter and those on the ewers discussed here, Fehérvári suggested that they served a purely decorative purpose. However, considering that similar figures seem to have been known in Egypt in Early Christian times and perhaps even earlier (Fehérvári suggested that such bronze animals can already be identified in ancient Egyptian art), it seems at least worth asking whether the motifs might not have had a quite specific inner significance at some stage, relating exclusively to the local traditions and beliefs of the Egyptian people. At present such a symbolic meaning for the figures cannot be verified, but perhaps in future further consideration of the finials may prove more rewarding; cf. Fehérvári 1976, p. 43.

2 Sokoly 1990, p. 18; De Ridder 1915, pl. 98 nos. 2749, 2751, pl. 99 nos. 2752-65.

3 Sokoly 1990, pp. 18-9; Emery 1938, nos. B 80-73, 80-74, 118-8.
changed over the centuries. Only the body and neck of this particular piece have become more elongated and thus account for a somewhat more elegant overall profile.

Ewers 2-5 (figs. 1-4) and in particular ewer 1 (plate 1) seem more or less directly derived from another variety of the oinochoe family, one example of which was unearthed from an apparently Byzantine find-spot located at Predotto, Cividale near Trieste in northern Italy (fig. 9), an area, as Sokoly pointed out, that was closely linked with the eastern Mediterranean world through Byzantium in pre-Islamic times. 4 Similar vessels, though apparently of smaller proportions, were also produced in glass as early as Roman times and one example, a small ewer from a set originally intended for washing hands and datable to the 3rd century A.D., may suffice here to illustrate this fact (fig. 10). 5

The similarity between the Hellenistic prototype and the Islamic objects is striking. The only major modification affects the vessels' base, which seems to have evolved from the traditional low splayed base on three minute feet to the more sturdy and robust bipartite footing encountered on all but one of the Islamic pieces.

As for the profiles of ewers V.1/1 (fig. 6) and V.1/2 (fig. 7) they stand somewhat apart from the other pieces considered here, and no direct pre-Islamic parallel seems to exist as far as their very unusual appearance is concerned. Certain features such as the faceted, inverted pear-shaped body, the bipartite foot, the handle curvature and the thumbpieces do undoubtedly relate them to the other ewers of this group. However, at the same time other features such as the short and faceted, obliquely rising body spout and particularly the tubular faceted neck - interrupted by the handle attachment collar in its upper part and with its aperture covered by a slightly conical lid - are unprecedented in this group and call for an examination of their source of inspiration.

4 Sokoly 1990, pp. 18-19; Richards 1980, pl. 59. It is worth mentioning here that a very similar ewer with a thumbpiece rendered as a rampant quadruped is preserved in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. Unfortunately, no details as to provenance or dating are known. I am very grateful to Dr. J. Allan for bringing this piece to my attention.
5 Harden 1988, pp. 128-9 no. 58.
As for the body spout, its occurrence was probably a Near Eastern speciality, as has been discussed more comprehensively elsewhere in this thesis (cf. ewer types EMW 3, EMW 5, MW 5)\textsuperscript{6}, and in fact spouts similar in profile and proportion occur once again among the bronze ewers from Ballana (fig. 11).\textsuperscript{7}

The peculiar neck treatment which has the upper termination of the handle attached to its upper part by a collar, and also the chained lid covering it, find close parallels on two other, quite obviously typologically related ewers attributed to early Islamic Mesopotamia or western Iran. One of them, which comes from Sūsa, is characterized by a squat cylindrical body, a cylindrical neck and a round mouth, which is covered in very similar fashion by a nearly square lid secured by a chain. Its handle is attached to the neck by a narrow metal band running all round its upper part, a system directly comparable to the one adopted on ewers V.1/1 (fig. 6) and V.1/2 (fig. 7), and additionally by a second one connecting it to the central handle by means of a very thin metal stem (fig. 12; cf. ewer type ICAW 1/19).

A second ewer, attributed to the same place and time as the preceding piece, has a squat rounded body on a low base and features the same handle attachment system as well as a domical lid, which originally was also chained to some part of the handle, as the remaining loop at the top indicates (fig. 13; cf. ewer type ICAW 1/20). Both these pieces can in their turn be directly associated with Byzantine prototypes on the basis of their body shape, the domical lids, the crozier-shaped handles and in particular the handle attachment method.

This typological connection may be most strikingly exemplified by two cylindrical-bodied vessels in the British Museum and the Victoria & Albert Museum in London, both datable to the 7th century A.D. (figs. 14 & 15).\textsuperscript{8} In addition to the obvious relationship between the Islamic ewers and Byzantine bronze vessels the

\textsuperscript{6} Cf. also Allan 1985, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{7} Emery 1938, nos. B.10-11, 80-67, 6-14, 90-5.
\textsuperscript{8} BM 1982, 12-1,1; V & A M 434-1910.
conspicuous handle attachment collar enclosing the upper neck of ewers V.1/1 and V.1/2 (figs. 6 and 7) can also be paralleled in Early Christian glass.\(^9\)

To sum up, the early Islamic ewers assembled in this category show close links with Roman, Byzantine and Coptic bronze and glass shapes current in the Near East and particularly in Egypt and adjacent areas. Accordingly, the origin of this particular ewer type can undoubtedly be sought in that specific geographic and cultural sphere and most certainly not, as has been suggested in one instance, in Iranian lands.\(^10\)

4. Date and Provenance

As established in the preceding section of this chapter, a geographical attribution of the pieces under discussion to Greater Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean seems more or less certain. A more awkward problem involves the specific dating of the objects. No conclusive evidence can be presented so far, and the extremely close generic links between the objects classified as Islamic and the Hellenistic prototypes have even provoked the question whether the former pieces are Islamic at all.\(^11\)

However, it has been pointed out already that several evolutionary changes can be observed when comparing the Islamic and pre-Islamic objects. Thus, the more slender and elegant profile of ewer 6 (fig. 5) for example seems to have evolved from the more sturdy vessel shapes from Ballana, and the low splayed base on three tiny feet encountered on Hellenistic bronze ewers, while still retained on the latter piece, was apparently replaced in most cases by a sturdier bipartite foot.

In addition the profile of ewers V.1/1 and V.1/2 (figs. 6 and 7) presents a link between the majority of pieces discussed here and certain other, typologically related ewers, which, as mentioned before, have been identified as being of early

---

\(^9\) Mariemont 1954, p. 38 no 213, pl. XIX.
\(^10\) Keene 1984, no. 25.
Islamic date. Accordingly, a 7th- or 8th-century dating may be suggested until more detailed research into this type can establish a more precise date and perhaps even a chronological succession within the group.\(^{12}\)

5. Function

Unfortunately, no decisive comments can be made with regard to the original function of the ewers in this category. However, considering their strong reliance on pre-Islamic oinochoe shapes, it may be that they, too, were meant as individual wine vessels or, if one is to judge from the functional purpose assigned to the above-mentioned glass ewer, as water containers used when washing hands. It is to be hoped that future research or even discoveries of more related objects may throw new light on the exact ambience in which the ewers were put to use.

6. Summary

Islamic bronze ewers with inverted pear-shaped and faceted body, waisted neck and trefoil mouth were derived from various oinochoe shapes current in bronze as well as glass throughout the Hellenistic world before the advent of Islam, and most closely related prototypes can be found especially in Egypt. Accordingly, the pieces of this category have been tentatively attributed to that country and the regions directly adjacent to it, and a 7th/8th-century dating has been suggested. As for the objects’ original function, no evidence survives, but to judge by the apparent use of their prototypes, it may be suggested that they served as wine vessels or water containers for cleansing.

\(^{12}\) The 10th/11th-century dating put forward for ewer 6 in Sotheby’s auction catalogue was unfortunately published without any explanatory comment and could therefore not be commented on. In fact, the first publication of this piece in 1984 suggested an 8th-century dating, which seems at present more conceivable considering the observations made above; cf. Sotheby’s 15./16.10.85, lot 61; Hannover and Stuttgart 1984, p. 231, no. 194.
Catalogue

1. Kuwait National Museum LNS 194 M; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 21.5 cm, max. diam. body 11.5 cm.
Inverted pear-shaped, faceted body on low splayed foot supported by three tiny feet; on shoulder, angular faceted collar receives tall cylindrical, faceted (?) neck tapering towards the top and flaring out again just below the lip; trefoil mouth with thick projecting lip; flattened S-shaped handle attached to back of lip and upper body; thumbpiece, reclining quadruped (feline) resting its front paws on a globular element. Undecorated (Plate 1).
Lit.: Keene 1984, no. 25; Qaddumi 1987, p. 124 no. LNS 194 M.

2. Bumiller Collection BC 907; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 20 cm.
Shape as 1, but bipartite foot with narrow, angular upper part and broader splayed base without supporting feet; facets more worn and now less prominent; neck broader and shorter with nearly straight sides flaring slightly below the lip; lip projects less towards the front; handle more rounded and C-shaped; thumbpiece, seated quadruped (feline or bear?) resting front paws on globular element. Undecorated (fig. 1).
Lit.: Christie’s 24.11.87, p. 67 lot 158.

3. Sotheby’s 14.10.87, lot 363; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 21.6 cm.
Virtually identical to 2, but facets more visible; neck slightly slimmer and taller; handle with relief trefoil at base and leaf-shaped finial surmounted by rounded knob, resting on almond-shaped base. Undecorated (fig. 2).
Lit.: Sotheby’s 14.10.87, lot 363.

4. Khalili Collection MTW 1269; n. p.; cast bronze; h. ca. 18 cm.
Shape as 2 and 3, but wider facets; neck taller, waisted stronger below the lip at the front (similar to 1); thumbpiece like that on 3, but resting slightly further down the handle and with stronger curve. Undecorated (fig. 3).
Lit.: Unpublished.

5. Bumiller Collection BC 659; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 17.2 cm.
Virtually identical to 4, but body more globular and elongated; handle base with trefoil termination; thumbpiece broken off, only base remains. Undecorated (fig. 4).
Lit.: Sotheby’s 15.10.86, p. 29 lot 125.

6. Sotheby’s 15./16.10.85, lot 61; n. p.; cast bronze, incised; h. 24.5 cm.
Facetted, elongated ovoid body with plain shoulder, the transition area emphasised by cusped edge in relief; low splayed foot on three tiny feet; around central shoulder flat ridge, above - introduced by projecting angular collar - very tall and slim cylindrical neck tapering towards mouth; angular, trefoil-shaped mouth with strongly projecting spout section; flat arched handle, upper attachment area flanked by two lateral triangular elements; thumbpiece, flat abstract leaf shape surmounted by tiny knob. On foot, lower body and below cusped edge, narrow bands of incised double lines (fig. 5).
Lit.: Hannover and Stuttgart 1984, p. 231 no. 194; Sotheby’s 15./16.10.85, lot 61.

V.1/1. Nur Collection; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 26.2 cm, diam. base 7.6 cm.
Body and neck collar like 1; foot as on 2-5; tall, upward tapering neck, interrupted in its upper part by collar of triangular section receiving the handle; round mouth covered by cylindrical lid; looped, slightly S-shaped handle branches off from upper
neck collar and joins upper body by means of relief trefoil; thumbpiece, seated quadruped (dog?) resting front paws on loop, from which chain runs to another loop at top of lid; diametrically opposite handle short, obliquely rising body spout of hexagonal section. Undecorated (fig. 6).
Lit.: Fehérvári and Safadi 1981, p. 86 no. 32.

V.1/2. Khalili Collection MTW 458; n. p.; cast bronze; h. ca. 25 cm. Virtually identical to V.1/1; thumbpiece, curved leaf shape with surmounting knob, positioned just below loop for lid chain; on lid, squat globular element receiving ring, set on flat projecting base. Undecorated (fig. 7).
Lit.: Unpublished.
Plate 1
EMW 1/1. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 21.5 cm
(Kuwait National Museum LNS 194 M).
FIG. 1
EMW 1/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 21.6 cm
(Sotheby's 14.10.87, lot 363).

FIG. 2
EMW 1/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 20 cm
(Bumiller Collection BC 907).
FIG. 3
EMW 1/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. ca. 18 cm
(Khalili Collection MTW 1209).

FIG. 4
EMW 1/5. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 17.2 cm
(Bumiller Collection BC 659).
FIG. 5
EMW 1/6. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 24.5 cm
(Sotheby's 15./16.10.85, lot 61).
FIG. 6
EMW 1/V.1/1. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 26.2 cm (Nur Collection).

FIG. 7
EMW 1/V.1/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. ca. 25 cm (London, Khalili Collection MTW 458).
FIG. 8
5th-Century Bronze Ewer from the Royal Tombs of Ballana in Nubia.

FIG. 9
Late Roman Bronze Ewer from Fiesole, Northern Italy, h. ca. 26 cm.
FIG. 10
3rd-Century late Roman Glass Ewer found in Cologne (after Harden 1988, p. 128 no. 58).

FIG. 11
5th-Century Bronze Ewer from the Royal Tombs of Ballana in Nubia.
FIG. 12 Early Islamic Bronze Ewer, h. 26 cm (after Mecquenem 1947, p. 11, fig. 7).

FIG. 13 Early Islamic Bronze Ewer, h. 20 cm (Christie's 19.2.80, lot 178).
**FIG. 14**

7th-Century Byzantine Copper-Alloy Ewer, h. 14.8 cm
(British Museum, inv. no. 1982, 12-1, 1).

**FIG. 15**

7th-Century Byzantine Copper-Alloy Ewer, h. ca. 18 cm, (V & A, inv. no. M 434-1910).
Chapter 2

Ewer Type EMW 2: Cast Bronze Ewers with Wide Facetted, Pear-Shaped Body on Low Foot, Long Tubular Neck, Domical Lid and S-Shaped Handle with Central Openwork Knob

1. General Description

The next category comprises a group of cast bronze ewers, which, as far as their body profile is concerned, can be subdivided into two major varieties.

1.1. Sub-group 1 (cat. nos. 1-8, figs. 1-7, plate 1)

Pieces belonging to the first sub-group, which vary from 16.4 cm to 27 cm in height, are characterized by a facetted pear-shaped body\(^1\), which in all but one case (cat. no. 1, fig. 1) is very wide and splayed near the base and always rests on a broad, slightly splayed footring, often additionally surrounded by a flat, indented and pierced outer edge (cat. nos. 2-4, 7, 8, fig. 2, pl. 1, figs. 3, 6, 7). Above, the body continues into a long, likewise facetted cylindrical neck, which is typically interrupted by a protruding rounded collar in its upper part. Above, the neck flares towards an almond-shaped mouth. The mouth is surrounded by a broad projecting edge, which is usually enhanced by either horizontal grooving (cat. nos. 1, 4-7; figs. 1, 3-6) or a succession of small round cavities (cat. nos. 2, 3, 8; fig. 2, pl. 1, fig. 7).

Apart from ewer 1 (fig. 1) all pieces have their apertures covered by a hinged lid. This is either of domical (cat. nos. 2-4, 7; fig. 2, pl. 1, figs. 3, 6) or conical

---

\(^1\) The body of ewer 7 appears to be plain, to judge by the available photograph.
shape (cat. nos. 5, 6, 8; figs. 4, 5, 7) and can be solid (cat. nos. 5-8; figs. 4-7) or pierced (cat. nos. 2, 3; fig. 2, plate 1). In one case (cat. no. 6; fig. 5) it is additionally facetted. In all cases the lid is surmounted by an either skittle-shaped (cat. nos. 2-5, 8; fig. 2, pl. 1, figs. 3, 4, 7) or cone-shaped finial (cat. nos. 6, 7; figs. 5, 6).

The handle is of angular section and either fairly broad (cat. nos. 1, 5-7; figs. 1, 4-6) or very flat (cat. nos. 2-4, 8; fig. 2, pl. 1, fig. 7). It is of strong S-shape and attached to the back of the mouth and the lower body. Above the attachment is a small rectangular joint, while below, the outward curving handle termination and the body are connected by a rectangular bridge which is either broad (cat. nos. 5-7; figs. 4-6) or flat (cat. nos. 1-4, 8; figs. 1-2, pl. 1, figs. 3, 7).

The central handle is enhanced by a rectangular (cat. nos. 1, 4, 8; figs. 1, 3, 7) or square (cat. nos. 2, 3, 5-7; fig. 2, pl. 1, figs. 4-6) openwork knob, flanked above and below by projecting angular elements of varying size. Higher up, the back of the handle carries a projection of varying appearance. In one case (cat. no. 1; fig. 1) it is rendered as a horse’s head, but flat, downward curving leaf shapes with a rounded finial (cat. nos. 2-4; fig. 2, pl. 1, fig. 3) or horizontal thorns (cat. nos. 5-8; figs. 4-7) are more common. If a thumbpiece survives, it is either rendered as a square (cat. no. 1; fig. 1) or polygonal pierced knob (cat. nos. 6-8; figs. 5-7) on a tall angular stem (likewise pierced), or a small quadruped (cat. nos. 3-4; pl. 1, fig. 3).²

Generically linked to the handle type applied on the vessels discussed here but of more elaborate execution is the handle in the Bumiller Collection (handle 1; fig. 13), which originally was most probably also attached to a ewer belonging to this

² This ewer type has been briefly discussed in Baer 1983, p. 84, p. 85 fig. 64, and Sokoly 1990, pp. 19-21. Apart from the twelve ewers assembled in this category, Fehérvári and Sokoly refer to other examples in the Ann Arbor University Museum in Michigan and the University Museum in Beirut, none of which I have been able to trace so far. However, the Beirut piece is published in Beirut 1951, pl. XVI, fig. 6. I was unable to obtain this publication; cf. Fehérvári 1988, pp. 112-3; Sokoly 1990, p. 20. Yet another piece was apparently sold by Sotheby’s in New York on March 1st, 1984 and is now housed in the Wolfe Collection. Again I could not trace any information about this vessel; cf. Dahncke 1988, p. 7.
type. Its upper and lower terminations are rendered as a goose (?) head and a reclining feline respectively, and the central rectangular knob is flanked by large pierced globes. One large and one small quadruped are attached further up the handle’s back.

1.2. Sub-group 2 (cat. nos. V.1/1 - V.1/4; figs. 8-11)

Ewers assembled in the second sub-group are characterized by a small and slightly squat globular body, which can in some cases be enhanced by oblique grooving running all round (cat. nos. V.1/2-4; figs. 9-11). The body has a flattened shoulder area and a more elongated, tubular neck with thin rounded collar. The foot is higher and splayed, but a flat outer edge can also be observed sometimes (cat. nos. V.1/1-2; figs. 8-9).

Above, the mouth area is covered in most cases by a bulbous domical lid with skittle-shaped finial (cat. nos. V.1/2, V.1/3, handle 2; figs. 9, 10, 14). In the case of ewer V.1/4 (fig. 11), however, this entire area has been replaced by an abstract "head" with a pouring aperture in its projecting, beak-like extension. Ewer V.1/1 (fig. 8) may not have featured a lid originally, as no hinge or remains of one can be made out.

The handles are thicker than those of the first group and their curvature rather resembles a question mark. Typically, just below the nearly circular loop an elongated rectangular projection is applied, either enhanced by round cavities (cat. nos. V.1/1, V.1/4, handle 2; figs. 8, 11, 14) or by projecting circles with punched centres (cat. no. V.1/2; fig. 9). In one case (cat. no. V.1/3; fig. 10) five small superposed "tubes" replace the rectangular knob. Sometimes, the handle can be further enhanced by a trilobed projection above the knob (cat. no. V.1/2; fig. 9). The small rounded protrusion encountered in the same place on ewer V.1/4 (fig. 11) may perhaps also have been part of such a decorative detail originally. The
22

thumbpiece is virtually identical in all cases - a globular element with rounded finial, set on an obliquely rising stem with rounded base and with its lower termination projecting outwards from the handle below.

Handle 2 (fig. 14) is virtually identical to those found on pieces of the second sub-group, with the exception that its upper termination curves inwards and develops into a trilobed half-palmette, which joins the inner side of the handle.  

Finally, ewer V.2/1 (fig. 12) appears to be a simplified and squatter version of the type encountered in the first sub-group. It has a bulbous pear-shaped body, the upper part of which is facetted, and rests on a low splayed base. A thick rounded neck collar introduces the flaring and originally lidded mouth section. The handle is a sturdy version of those discussed above with a solid grooved knob in the centre and skittle-shaped horizontal protrusion above.

2. Decoration

Nearly all the pieces of this category are completely void of decoration, the only feature enlivening their surface being the vertical or oblique facetting. Only ewer V.2/1 (fig. 12) displays modest incised decoration with guilloches on the foot and upper neck, vertical scrollwork on the facetted section and animal roundels on the body.

\[\text{This handle type appears remotely reminiscent of that encountered on vessels associated with the "Marwān" ewer with regard to the execution of its upper half; cf. ewers EMW 5/1-2, 5-6.}\]
3. Origin, Provenance and Date

3.1. Sub-Group 1

At present the precise origin of this particular ewer type cannot be determined with certainty. Previous scholars discussing the group have repeatedly drawn attention to a ewer in the British Museum (of virtually identical appearance to the ewer in the Keir Collection (cat. no. 1; fig. 1)), which had come to London from a Coptic monastery in the 19th century (fig. 15). They accordingly assumed, or at least alluded to, a Coptic source for this ewer type in general.

Unfortunately, however, the fact that the ewer in the British Museum once belonged to a Coptic monastery does not in itself necessitate its being of Coptic workmanship, as theoretically it may well have been acquired from a Muslim workshop at any point in time - an observation already put forward by Sokoly. In fact, most recently the ewer in question was reassessed by the museum and subsequently transferred to its Islamic Department. Thus, the circumstantial evidence provided by this piece is no longer regarded as decisive and other considerations have to be brought into play to establish the typological source of the Islamic ewers discussed here.

Starting with the first sub-group the characteristic body profile is undoubtedly the most striking feature that calls for analysis. Fehérvári related the profile of the Keir ewer (cat. no. 1; fig. 1) to the post-Sasanian ewers of Iran, but in fact this comparison is too general to be of any consequence. Truly related shapes are to my knowledge absent in pre-Islamic metalwork.

---

4 Dalton 1901, p. 107 no. 539.
5 Fehérvári 1976, p. 46, no. 21; Fehérvári 1988, p. 112; Palol-Salellas 1950, p. 83.
7 Fehérvári 1976, p. 42.
However, several varieties of vessels with a clear emphasis on an extremely broad lower body - some of them faceted - are well attested in Roman glass. Thus, for example, a blue-green flask from Olbia in north-eastern Sardinia and datable probably to the 3rd century A.D. seems immediately to anticipate the profile of the ewers in this category, with its very wide rounded body on a low, but wide foot-ring and its neck collar (fig. 16).

The type of lid covering the mouths of such ewers can be traced back to prototypes found in Coptic metalwork, such as for example the covers on a slender ovoid-bodied ewer from 4th/5th-century Giza and a probably Coptic bottle also from Egypt (figs. 17 & 18).

As for the peculiar handle type encountered in this group, both Fehérvári and Palol-Salellas pointed out that their design is characteristic of Coptic workmanship, without however giving any evidence. In this context the design of the handle fragment preserved in the Bumiller Collection (handle 1, fig. 13) is interesting. The suggestion made by Dahncke that its composite zoomorphic character precedes the abstract design of the other handles seems feasible. Accordingly, the origin of this object is of vital importance. Dahncke suggested an Iranian provenance, but her arguments are not convincing.

Certainly, zoomorphic handles are well attested on Iranian vessels from pre-Islamic times up to at least the 12th century (cf. ewers MW 2/V.2/1, MW 3/1, ICAW 3/14 & 18), but their only additional element is always a single animal, most typically a stylized elongated feline, and not - to my knowledge - a combination of

---

8 Cf. Harden 1988, p. 37 no. 13 for a more angular version, a 1st-century lagynos; p. 141 no. 69.
9 Auth 1976, p. 124 no. 154, colour plate p. 87.
10 Wulff 1909, no. 1045, no. 1035. It has to be mentioned here that Fehérvári in his catalogue of the Keir Collection describes a bottle virtually identical to the one mentioned by Wulff as being Coptic (no. 1045) and dates it to the 9th/early 10th century; cf. Fehérvári 1976, p. 46 no. 22, pl. 7c.
11 Fehérvári 1976, p. 42; Palol-Salellas 1950, p. 83. Allan assumed the bejewelled handle of a pre-Islamic precious metal vessel to be a potential prototype for the handle type discussed here; cf. Allan 1986, p. 17.
12 Dahncke 1988, pp. 6-7.
13 Ibid.
various animal forms and elements like beads or knobs perhaps borrowed from contemporary jewellery. In addition, the application of an abstracted quadruped as thumbpiece (Dahncke’s identification of the creature as a bear cannot be confirmed) is found not only on ewer 3 in this category (plate 1), but more importantly on other early Islamic bronze ewers with most probably Coptic or Mediterranean prototypes (cf. ewer type EMW 1).

Even if this animal and its smaller counterpart should indeed represent a bear, such an identification can by no means suffice to determine an Iranian provenance, as Dahncke asserted in arguing that this species was not to be found among the local fauna of Egypt.14 In fact, a lute-playing bear occurs for example among the early 8th-century murals of Qusayr 'Amra, a princely Umayyad bath complex located in the Jordanian desert and therefore not far removed either geographically or culturally from early Islamic Egypt (fig. 19).15

More research is undoubtedly needed to establish this handle’s true provenance, but the preliminary observations possible at present seem at least to show a Near Eastern provenance is worth discussing, while a confirmation of the suggested Iranian provenance would require more solid evidence.16

To sum up, from the evidence available at present it appears that the ewers belonging to the first sub-group have generic links with Roman glass, Coptic metalwork and early Islamic metalwork current in the Near East. Accordingly, it may be suggested that they originated somewhere in the eastern Mediterranean region, perhaps in Egypt, the country where the ewer in the British Museum was also preserved until its transfer to Europe, and where the Keir ewer (cat. no. 1; fig. 1) was purchased.17 One of the potential centres of manufacture where the pieces

14 Op. cit., p. 7. It should be noted in this context that thumbpieces rendered as abstract quadrupeds do occur on several Iranian vessels of probably 12th-century date; cf. Berlin 1979, pp. 99-100 no. 367 and ewer type ICAW 3/16.
15 Ettinghausen 1979, p. 190 fig. 4, p. 191 no. 4.
16 A closer examination of the object’s iconography may also help to establish the cultural ambience it once belonged to. Dahncke suggested an astrological interpretation of the various animal forms, without, however, entering into detail; cf. Dahncke 1988, p. 6.
17 Fehérvári 1976, p. 46 no. 21.
may have been produced might be sought in Alexandria, which, as Allan has pointed out already, had long been famous for its foundries; but obviously such a hypothesis would have to be proved by further evidence.\textsuperscript{18}

3.2. Sub-Group 2

The ewers of the second sub-group, though undoubtedly typologically related to those discussed above, have a profile which is clearly distinct from the former, featuring, as has been mentioned before, a squat globular body, a narrow tubular neck with domical lid and a broader and simplified handle. Three of these pieces (cat. nos. V.1/2-4; figs. 9-11) were found in various regions of Spain. Ewers V.1/2 (fig. 9) and V.1/4 (fig. 11) come from Andalusia, the latter having been excavated near Cordoba. Ewer V.1/3 (fig. 10) was unearthed in Bunyola on the Balearic island of Mallorca, together with an Islamic bronze lamp. In addition, handle fragment 2 (fig. 14) came to light near Jaen.\textsuperscript{19}

Keeping in mind this extensive archaeological evidence and the close typological ties between these pieces and those belonging to the first sub-group, it seems probable that the eastern Mediterranean type travelled to Spain along one of the busy Mediterranean trade routes operating in the early Islamic period, either via North Africa or direct from the eastern Mediterranean across the sea.

Here in Spain, a country which was famed for its metal industry at the time, producing lamps, incense burners, braziers and incidentally ewers which all revealed a strong reliance on Coptic prototypes, the type was then obviously adopted and modified according to local taste.\textsuperscript{20} During that process the peculiar oblique spiral grooving found on the bodies of the Spanish ewers may have been

\textsuperscript{18} Allan 1986, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{19} This information was kindly provided by the Director of the Archeological Museum in Cordoba; cf. also Palol-Salellas 1950, pp. 82-3; Allan 1986, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{20} On the importance of early Islamic Spain as a metalworking centre see Palol-Salellas 1950, p. 82; Gabrieli and Scerrato 1979, p. 541.
inspired by a technique already applied on 3rd/4th-century Roman glass vessels (fig. 20).21

Ewer V.1/1 alone (fig. 8) was excavated in the town of Syracuse in Sicily. There is, until now, little material evidence for a local metal industry comparable in scale to the one which operated in Spain in early Islamic times, and accordingly, it could be argued that this piece was not manufactured locally.22 However, at a symposium on Islamic art held in Trani in 1989 local archaeologists reported the discovery of a metalworking site from the period of Arab rule in Sicily.23

Islamic Sicily was certainly an important meeting place and transit station for merchants from all over the Mediterranean, and local workshops would undoubtedly have had flourishing custom. On the other hand it cannot be denied that commodities such as the Spanish bronze vessels may also have reached the island with incoming traders.

Perhaps ewer V.1/1 (fig. 8) was the object of such a transfer, a theory that may be supported by the fact that the vessel’s profile is virtually identical to that of the Spanish pieces.24 However, the possibility of its local manufacture must not be overlooked and will have to be kept in mind as more evidence for a Sicilian metalworking centre emerges.25

Finally, brief consideration has to be given to ewer V.2/1 (fig. 12). This unique piece was likewise found on Spanish soil, i.e. in the city of Cordoba.26 As it

22 Gabrieli and Scerrato 1979, p. 542.
23 I owe this information to an oral communication from Prof. R. Hillenbrand.
24 Orsi relates this vessel to 4th/5th-century glass bottles and suggests a Byzantine dating, which, however, seems unlikely in the face of the observations made above. He also refers to a similar (but larger and richer) piece with cavities for incrusting stones or glass, a very typical Byzantine technique. This object was also found in Syracuse. Unfortunately, Orsi does not provide any image of the latter, and therefore I cannot comment on his observations; cf. Orsi 1912, p. 196; Palol-Salellas 1950, p. 83.
25 When discussing the possibility of a metalworking centre in Islamic Sicily, one should keep in mind that the island was famous for high quality artefacts in other media such as ivory and silk and also yielded precisely executed manuscripts as for example a 10th-century Qur’an in the Khalili Collection which, according to its colophon, was executed “IT madinati Siqilliya”. I am grateful to Prof. Hillenbrand for passing this piece of information on to me.
26 This information was provided by the Archeological Museum in Cordoba.
displays a profile that is closer to the eastern Mediterranean examples of this category than to the other Spanish vessels, it may represent a second local ewer type that developed from the original imports. Its Spanish provenance is borne out by the style of its modest decoration, which is comparable to other contemporary metalwork known from that country.27

As for the dating of the pieces in this category, no detailed chronology is as yet possible. Allan attempted a general dating of the group as a whole between 700 - 900, based on several observations. Firstly, the ewers' profile cannot be paralleled among Coptic vessels, which are either known from the 5th/6th-century royal tombs at Ballana and Qustūl in Nubia or from findspots in Europe, which they reached with other trade commodities during the 6th and 7th centuries. On the other hand, there is also a total lack of resemblance to any identifiably Fāṭimid objects.28

In general terms, such a dating certainly comes close to the truth, but it seems useful to attempt a more differentiated chronology in this context. It has been pointed out that the ewers of the first sub-group show typological links with Roman glass and Coptic metalwork. Accordingly, it may be suggested that they are the earliest examples in this category. Their production may well have started in the early 8th century, as Allan suggested. Nevertheless, one has to keep in mind that pre-Islamic prototypes executed in metal may have existed, but did not survive, in which case their production would have been merely the result of an earlier tradition and would have continued rather than started during the first centuries of Islamic rule.

The ewers from Spain and Italy were probably manufactured some time between the 9th and early 11th century, when the culture of early Islamic Spain reached its peak. Such a dating seems to be confirmed by the decoration on ewer V.2/1 (fig. 12), which is quite typical of that time, and also by the fact that handle fragment

27 Cf. Gomez-Moreno 1951, figs. 390-396 for early Islamic metal objects from Spain with stylistically closely related ornamentation.
28 Allan 1986, p. 17.
no. 2 (fig. 14) was excavated in Jaen together with ceramics which are datable to the 10th/11th centuries.  

4. Function

There is no evidence at all at present as to the original purpose of the vessels in this category. In one instance it has been suggested that they were used for dispensing olive oil, a function well imaginable considering the small dimensions of the pieces concerned. However, further evidence is needed to confirm such a use or indeed suggest other functions.

5. Summary

Cast bronze ewers with wide pear-shaped and faceted bodies, tubular necks covered by domical lids and S-shaped handles with a central openwork knob probably originated in eastern Mediterranean lands, the most likely source being Egypt. From there they were apparently transmitted to early Islamic Spain, whether by land via North Africa or directly by sea is at present impossible to say. Here, the type was adopted and modified, receiving a squat globular body with oblique grooving, a slimmer and taller neck with bulbous domical lid and a simplified handle. This new version also travelled to Sicily. Apparently, a second variety was also developed in Spain from the original type, represented here by ewer V.2/1.

30 Abercrombie 1988, p. 92, caption of left figure.
31 There are indications, as Professor Hillenbrand kindly pointed out to me, that metal objects may gradually have been transmitted westwards across northern Africa in early Islamic times, an example being an eastern type of polycandelon which appears as far west as Taza.
As for the dating of this group, it appears that the earliest pieces from the eastern Mediterranean lands were produced from the early 8th century onwards, while the Spanish pieces most probably date from the 9th to the early 11th century.

The function of the vessels is unknown, but it has been suggested that they were containers for olive oil.
Catalogue

1. Keir Collection; purchased in Egypt 1967; cast bronze; h. 14.5 cm, h. with handle 17.5 cm, diam. of base 5 cm.
Facetted pear-shaped body on fairly high waisted foot-ring, tapering towards tall narrow neck interrupted by projecting structured collar flanked by two small ridges; upper neck widens to introduce originally lidded, almond-shaped mouth emphasised by horizontally grooved, slightly projecting outer edge; strongly S-shaped handle joins hinge for lid at back of lip and lower body by means of long horizontal joint; on central handle long rectangular, pierced knob; further up horse-like animal head projecting horizontally from back of handle; thumbpiece, cubical pierced knob with cut edges resting on smaller cube of similar appearance (fig. 1).
Lit.: Fehérvári 1976, p. 46 no. 21, pl. 7b; Allan 1986, p. 16 note 8; Sokoly 1990, pp. 19-21.

2. Benaki Museum 13130; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 26 cm, diam. base 9.8 cm.
Shape as 1, but lower body broadening out rather than ovoid; outer edge of base scalloped and with small pierced circles; on central neck thick and strongly rounded collar with oblique grooving; around outer edge of mouth small, hollowed out circular cavities with tiny pierced intermediate dots above and below; mouth with squat domical lid pierced by large central and small intermediate holes, surmounted by skittle-shaped finial; in centre of handle, shorter and broader openwork knob with tiny hollowed-out dots above and below; similar but larger dots on lower handle attachment; projecting out- and downwards from upper handle back, a palmette-like leaf terminating in tiny hinge-like element corresponding in shape to another one attached to upper handle termination; thumbpiece broken off (fig. 2).
Lit.: Unpublished (?)

3. Cairo Islamic Museum 15266; n. p.; brass (?); h. 27 cm, diam. 18 cm.
Shape as 2; slightly wider base plate; smaller circular cavities around mouth edge and on lower handle attachment; on lower handle attachment plate decoration recalling that of handle knob; more slender, skittle-shaped finial on lid; thumbpiece quadruped (pl. 1).

4. Keir Collection; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 23 cm, diam. base 8.5 cm.
Shape as 3; horizontally grooved outer mouth edge; fragmented skittle-shaped lid finial; elongated rectangular handle knob; thumbpiece, feline with tiny ring in front of hind legs (fig. 3).

5. Benaki Museum 13129; n. p.; cast bronze; dimensions unavailable.
Shape as 2, but body with large areas broken off; straight foot with rounded base; neck collar thinner and plain; mouth less pointed with horizontally grooved, projecting outer edge; lid not pierced; handle thicker with broader, pierced lower attachment and cubical openwork knob in centre, above projecting abstract element; upper handle termination pierced; thumbpiece wanting (fig. 4).
Lit.: Baer 1983, p. 85, fig. 64; Sokoly 1990, pp. 19-21.

6. MMA 49.49; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 25 cm.
Shape as 5; thicker neck collar; cone-shaped lid finial; thumbpiece a pierced polygonal knob on likewise pierced tall rectangular base (fig. 5).
7. Keir Collection; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 25 cm, diam. base 7.5 cm. Shape as 6, but facets less obvious; thinner neck collar; short lower handle attachment (fig. 6). Lit.: Fehérvari 1988, p. 119 fig. M4, p. 120 no. M4; Sokoly 1990 pp. 19-21.

8. MMA 1973.338.6; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 16.4 cm, length of mouth 4.6 cm, diam. base 6.2 cm. Shape as 7, but facetted body and neck; wider pierced base plate; obliquely grooved neck collar; small circular depressions around rim; flattened lid with bulbous skittle-shaped finial; rectangular openwork knob on handle; lower handle attachment flat openwork strap with rectangular slot and circular depressions, set obliquely (fig. 7). Lit.: Unpublished.

V.1/1. Syracuse Archaeological Museum; Syracuse, Sicily; cast bronze; h. 13.9 cm. Squat globular and facetted body on fairly high splayed foot, with very tall and slender, likewise facetted neck; slim projecting neck collar; strongly pointed, projecting mouth with narrow, horizontally grooved outer edge; thick S-shaped handle with horizontal lower attachment, narrow rectangular knob with circular depressions in centre; thumbpiece a large globular knob on tall rectangular stem with narrow horizontal projection near base (fig. 8). Lit.: Orsi 1912, p. 196, fig. 9; Palol-Salellas 1950, p. 83, pl. XLII.2; Gabrieli and Scerrato 1979, pp. 542-3, 567 left figure; Sokoly 1990, pp. 19-21.

V.1/2. Granada Museo Archeologico (Gomez Moreno Collection, Madrid ?); Andalusia; cast bronze; dimensions unavailable. Shape as 9 but wider base plate; elipsoidal grooving on body; rounded domical lid with angular finial; rounded projection terminates lower handle; on central handle elongated rectangular projection with circular elements (pierced in centre) in relief, above trilobed projection; thumbpiece a globular knob with ovoid finial on tall bent stem with projecting lower termination, set on rounded elongated base (fig. 9). Lit.: Palol-Salellas 1950, pp. 82-3, pl. XLII.2; Abercrombie 1988, figure on p. 92.

V.1/3. Collection of the Archaeological Society Luliana; Bunyola, Mallorca; cast bronze; dimensions unavailable. Shape similar to 10, but body more globular on broader, slightly splayed foot, its outer edge emphasised by two grooved lines; neck shorter and broader; short, skittle-shaped lid finial; ?-shaped thick handle with small tubular element emphasising joint of lower handle termination and horizontal attachment plate; five small superposed, tubular elements on central handle; thumbpiece apparently broken off, only fragment of base remains (fig. 10). Lit.: Palol-Salellas 1950, p. 83, pl. XLII.3; Sokoly 1990, pp. 19-21.

V.1/4. Cordoba Archaeological Museum 7.413; Puente de Alcolea near Cordoba; cast bronze; h. 7.4 cm. Shape similar to 11 but body more ovoid tapering towards splayed foot; thick rounded neck collar; lidded mouth replaced by element resembling animal head with pierced beak; handle more S-shaped with worn, pierced rectangular element in the centre, above horizontally projecting thorn; thumbpiece as on 10 (fig. 11). Lit.: Palol-Salellas 1950, p. 83, pl. XLII.1.

V.2/1. Cordoba Archaeological Museum 92/2; Cordoba; cast bronze, incised; h. ca. 12 cm. Shape comparable to 1 but much squatter on broad but low sloping base with superposed grooving around the edge; only lower neck facetted; broad rounded neck collar flanked by very narrow ridges; superposed grooving around originally lidded mouth (large hinge remains); sturdy handle with squat, hollowed out and
Plate 1
EMW 2/3. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 27 cm
(Cairo, Islamic Museum, inv. no. 15266).
grooved central knob and horizontal protrusion higher up. On foot, guilloche between dotted borders; on sides of body, roundels with gazelle-like animal; on alternate neck facets, abstract scrollwork; on neck collar, oblique hatching; on upper neck, decoration as on foot (fig. 12).
Lit.: Unpublished.

Handle 1

Bumiller Collection B.C. 131; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 18.8 cm, w. 7.4 cm.
Form similar to handle on 1 but section below knob rendered as reclining feline; knob flanked by pierced globes; above two quadrupeds, the lower one small, the upper one large; upper handle termination rendered as a goose’s (?) head (fig. 13).
Lit.: Dahncke 1988, pp. 6-7, fig. 6.

Handle 2

Instituto Valencia de D. Juan, Madrid; Segura de la Sierra, Jaen; dimensions unavailable.
Form similar to handle on 10, but thicker; central knob thicker and shorter; two round projections on upper handle; thumbpiece a large globe on conical base; upper handle termination rendered as half palmette curving inwards to join inner handle; rounded lid with globular finial still attached (fig. 14).
1. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 17.5 cm (Keir Collection, London).

2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 26 cm (Athens, Benaki Museum, inv. no. 13130).

3. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 23 cm (Keir Collection, London).
FIG. 4
EMW 2/5. Cast Bronze Ewer, dimensions unknown
(Athens, Benaki Museum, inv. no. 13129).

FIG. 5
EMW 2/6. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 25 cm
(New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art,
inv. no. 49.49).
FIG. 6
EMW 2/7. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 25 cm
(Keir Collection, London).

FIG. 7
EMW 2/8. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 16.4 cm
(New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art,
inv. no. 1973.338.6).

FIG. 8
EMW 2/V.1/1. Cast Bronze Ewer excavated
in Syracuse, Sicily. H. 13.9 cm,
(Syracuse Archaeological Museum).
FIG. 9
EMW 2/V.1/2. Cast Bronze Ewer found in Andalusia. Dimensions unknown, (Location uncertain).

FIG. 10

FIG. 11
EMW 2/V.1/4. Cast Bronze Ewer found at Puente de Alcolea near Cordoba. H. 7.4 cm (Cordoba, Archaeological Museum, inv. no. 7.413).
FIG. 12 Cast Bronze Ewer found in Córdoba. H. ca. 12 cm (Córdoba, Archeological Museum, inv. no. 92/2).

FIG. 13 Cast Bronze Handle Fragment belonging to a Ewer of Type EMW.2. Found at Segura de la Sierra, Jaén (Instituto Valenciano de Don Juan, Madrid).

FIG. 14 Cast Bronze Handle Fragment belonging to a Ewer of Type EMW.2. Found at Segura de la Sierra, Jaén (Instituto Valenciano de Don Juan, Madrid).
FIG. 15
Cast Bronze Ewer from a Coptic Monastery in Egypt. H. ca. 17 cm (London, British Museum).

FIG. 16
3rd-Century Glass Flask from Olbia, North-Eastern Sardinia.
FIG. 17
4th/5th-Century Bronze Ewer from Giza, Egypt.

FIG. 18
Coptic Bronze Bottle from Egypt.
FIG. 19
Lute-Playing Bear. Detail of the Ceiling Decoration at Qusayr 'Amra, Jordan (724-743).

FIG. 20
3rd/4th-Century Roman Glass Bottle with Oblique Spiral Grooving.
Chapter 3

Ewer Type EMW 3: Cast Bronze Ewers with Cylindrical Body on Three Feet. Cylindrical Neck and Tubular, Obliquely Rising Body Spout

1. General Description

The cast bronze ewers comprised in the next group are characterized in general terms by a cylindrical body of varying appearance with more or less slanting shoulder, resting on three feet. They mostly have simple, sometimes slightly curved handles with varying thumbpieces and - most characteristically - a long tubular spout rising obliquely from the shoulder edge diametrically opposite the handle. Three major sub-groups can be distinguished.

1.1. Sub-group 1

The ewers assembled in this first sub-group range from 17.2 cm to ca. 30 cm in height. Their cylindrical bodies are mostly broad and squat with slightly slanting shoulders. Only ewer 5 (fig. 4) has a somewhat more elongated body with a steeper shoulder plate. The body rests on three legs in all cases. These can be either very long with waisted sides and central grooving (cat. nos. 2, 5; pl. 1; fig. 4) or short (cat. nos. 1, 3, 4; figs. 1, 2, 3), sometimes again with a central recess (cat. no. 3; fig. 2).

In the centre of the shoulder, which slants slightly (cat. nos. 1-4; fig. 1, pl. 1, figs. 2, 3) or strongly (cat. no. 5; fig. 4) a fairly broad, rounded collar introduces a

---

1 This group has already been discussed briefly by Sokoly; cf. Sokoly 1990, pp. 16-18; see also Baer 1983, p. 90.
sturdy cylindrical neck - faceted in the case of ewer 1 (fig. 1) - flaring slightly towards the mouth. The lip is flat and projects strongly. Sometimes it carries curved lateral extensions of varying size towards the back, where the handle is attached (cat. nos. 2, 5; pl. 1, fig. 4), while in other cases (cat. nos. 1, 3, 4?; figs. 1, 2, 3) the handle joins the lip without any such decorative emphasis.

The handle itself is more or less rounded and can either be straight and positioned in near perfect verticality with a small curve in the centre (cat. nos. 1, 2; fig. 1, pl. 1); straight and positioned obliquely (cat. nos. 3, 5; figs. 2, 4); or S-shaped with two superposed triangular projections near the base (cat. no. 4; fig. 3).

The thumbpieces are very varied in appearance. In one case (cat. no. 2; pl. 1) it resembles a pine cone resting on a cylindrical base. The handle of ewer 3 (fig. 2) carries a tall rectangular knob on a low rounded base, somewhat similar in profile to that of the ewer’s feet. Finally, the thumbpieces of ewers 4 and 5 (figs. 3, 4) are skittle-shaped. Ewer 1 (fig. 1) alone does not feature a thumbrest.

In nearly all cases the tubular spout, which rises obliquely from the shoulder edge of the body, is of extraordinary length, reaching the level of the mouth (cat. nos. 2, 3, 5; pl. 1, figs. 2, 4) or even exceeding it (cat. no. 1; fig. 1). Only in the case of ewer 4 (fig. 3) is the spout shorter, and it terminates at the height of the central neck. All spouts terminate in a pronounced narrow ring around the tip.

1.2. Sub-group 2

The ewers of the second sub-group range from 31 - 38 cm in height and are therefore generally taller than the pieces of the first variety. These pieces have a waisted cylindrical body, which can be fairly squat (cat. nos. V.1/1, V.1/2; figs. 5, 6) or extremely slender at times (cat. nos. V.1/3, V.1/4; figs. 7, 8). In two cases (cat. nos. V.1/3, V.1/4; figs. 7, 8) the body appears additionally faceted. In all instances the body rests on short rounded feet, sometimes surmounted by small
projecting collars (cat. nos. V.1/2, V.1/4; figs 6, 8). Only ewer V.1/1 (fig. 5) features long and waisted feet with central grooving, which are virtually identical to those supporting ewer 5 (fig. 4) of the first subgroup.

The shoulder, which can show traces of facetting (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5), slants to a varying degree on these vessels, from fairly slightly (cat. no. V.1/2; fig. 6) to modestly (cat. no. V.1/3; fig. 7) and strongly (cat. nos. V.1/1, V.1/4; figs. 5, 8). In two cases the shoulder edge is further emphasised, either by vertically orientated lozenge-shaped indentations - two on each side of the vessel (cat. no. V.1/4; fig. 8) - or by a succession of what appear to be narrow horizontal ovals, which are slightly recessed (cat. no. V.1/3; fig. 7).

In the centre of the shoulder a narrow rounded collar receives a strongly waisted and faceted cylindrical neck of varying height with a broad annular moulding flanked by thin borders around the centre. The lip around the mouth can either be flattened (cat. nos. V.1/2, V.1/3, V.1/4; figs. 6-8) or completely flat (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5). In one case (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5) two backward-curving half-palmette plaques protrude laterally towards the back of the lip in a manner very similar to that enhancing the upper handle attachment area on ewer 4 of the first sub-group (fig. 3). In all the other cases the handle joins the lip without any such decorative emphasis.

The handle can be angular (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5), ovoid (cat. no. V.1/2; fig. 6) or round (cat. nos. V.1/3, V.1/4; figs. 7, 8) in section and is fairly thick in all cases, thinning out near its upper termination. In one instance (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5) a small triangular projection near the top interrupts the handle’s otherwise fluent profile.

The thumbpiece can be rendered as a flat, leaf-shaped plaque with a lozenge-shaped opening in the centre (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5), a simple conical knob on a rounded base (cat. no. V.1/2; fig. 6) or a tall skittle shape (cat. no. V.1/4; fig. 8). Only the handle of ewer V.1/3 (fig. 7) does not feature any thumbrest.
The tubular, steeply rising spout generally exceeds the level of the mouth in length, sometimes quite considerably (cat. nos. V.1/2, V.1/3; figs. 6, 7) in a manner already encountered on ewer 1 of the first sub-group. In the case of ewer V.1/1 (fig. 5) the spout, which here is facetted rather than just tubular, bends outwards near the top and terminates in a multilobed plaque surrounding the aperture.

1.3. Sub-group 3

The two vessels included in the third sub-group are much larger than the other pieces discussed previously - 43 cm - and reveal yet again certain distinguishable features that set them apart from the other typologically related ewers in this chapter.

Both ewers are characterized by a slightly elongated cylindrical body, straight in the case of ewer V.2/1 (fig. 9) and strongly waisted in that of ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10). Both bodies are subdivided into six large and more or less concave facets. Kite-shaped indentations infringing into the shoulder area additionally emphasise the upper edges of the facets on ewer V.2/1 (fig. 9), a feature that relates this piece to ewer V.1/4 (fig. 8) of the second sub-group.

Here, as with all the preceding pieces, the body is again supported by three feet, long and waisted with central grooving in the case of ewer V.2/1 (fig. 9) (cf. ewers 2 and 4 of the first sub-group; pl. 1, fig. 3) and cone-shaped with projecting rounded collars above in the case of ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10).

In the centre of the strongly-waisted shoulder, a thin rounded collar introduces a cylindrical neck, which is tall and slightly waisted in the case of ewer V.2/1 (fig. 9) and very broad and squat in the case of ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10).

The mouth is surrounded by a flat projecting lip, which receives the upper handle termination either directly (cat. no. V.2/2; fig. 10) or by means of a small
projecting plaque (cat. no. V.2/1; fig. 9). The handle is rounded and fairly thick. It surmounts the mouth either slightly (cat. no. V.2/1; fig. 9) or quite considerably (cat. no. V.2/2; fig. 10) before bending downwards to join the edge of the shoulder. In both instances a skittle-shaped thumbrest surmounts the handle, lacking the often encountered rounded knob finial above in the case of ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10).2

The spouts featured on these two vessels are identical to those found on the objects of the other varieties. The spout of ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10), which protrudes beyond the level of the mouth, is similar to those found on the ewers belonging to the second sub-group and displays three superposed grooves near the tip, rather than the pronounced annular ridge emphasising the spout tips of the ewers assembled in the first sub-group.

2. Decoration

2.1. Sub-group 1

The ewers of the first sub-group are virtually undecorated and certainly do not feature any ornamental elements that could be interpreted or even identified to advantage. Thus, the central body of ewer 2 (pl. 1) reveals a few enigmatic incisions that, to judge from the available photograph, may or may not be remnants of an original design.

Along the length of the spout belonging to ewer 3 (fig. 2) a punch-dotted line can be made out. All the remaining pieces are left quite plain.

2 The thumbpiece of this piece seems directly to recall the shape of the ewer's feet, a fact which led Zick-Nissen to suggest that both elements were cast in the same mould; cf. Berlin 1979, p. 49.
2.2. Sub-group 2

Ewers V.1/2 (fig. 6) and V.1/4 (fig. 8) are undecorated. Ewer V.1/3 (fig. 7) features a simple Kufic inscription on both sides of the shoulder, displayed just next to the handle. It reads *baraka li šāhibihi*. Another inscription, in this case ring-punched rather than incised, which has not yet been read, was identified by Allan on the spout of this vessel.³

The subtle decoration encountered on ewer V.1/1 (fig. 5) is most interesting. Apart from punch-dotted lines on the lip and a crudely incised Kufic inscription - *'atar bihi* - surmounted by horizontal grooving on the lower handle, the main ornamentation, which is extremely fine, is centred underneath the lower handle attachment area on the back of the upper body. It seems to depict an abstracted, elongated motif made up of addorsed vertical zig-zag lines flanked by punch-dotted circles around a central incised line. Above, this design is terminated by elements evoking vegetal details and rows of punch-dotted circles and individual dots (fig. 5a). This design will have to be discussed again later on when the geographical and chronological context of the ewers under discussion is interpreted.

2.3. Sub-group 3

In the third sub-group only ewer V.2/1 (fig. 9) reveals any ornamental enhancement, and this is mainly punch-dotted and incised in a simple manner. Thus, punch-dotted circles and punched lines appear on the lip, and dense horizontal grooving emphasises the back of the upper and central handle.

The intricate, vertically orientated design executed underneath the lower handle attachment on the back of the upper body is, however, most interesting. It involves an incised curved double band with punch-dotted lines in the centre and flanking it.

³ Allan 1985, p. 132 note 19.
This decoration introduces a faintly indicated leaf motif below, which terminates in a vertical band of confronting zig-zag lines with central lines along the outside (□). This design is nearly identical to that found below the handle of V.1/1 (fig. 5) of the second sub-group, a fact that emphasises the close generic relationship between these two pieces and may perhaps even indicate a common provenance.

3. Origin, Provenance and Date

Much controversy has surrounded the origin, dating and particularly the provenance of the vessels under discussion, and places as diverse as Egypt, Syria, Iraq and even Iran have been suggested for their possible place of manufacture.

In one instance such an attribution was undertaken somewhat uncritically on the basis of the alleged find-spot of a single piece. Thus, Melikian-Chirvani in discussing ewer 1 (fig. 1), assumes that this ewer, because it is housed in the Kabul Museum and has the characteristic patina of a recently unearthed object, must have been found in present-day Afghanistan and concludes immediately that it is therefore of eastern Iranian and not western origin. At the same time, however, he does not hesitate to ignore the Egyptian find-spot near Abūsīr al-Malik in the Fayyūm of ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10), which he cites as "the closest parallel" to the object of his discussion and associates the former with Sogdian shapes and their Chinese counterparts, but only as far as the lower part of their bodies are concerned.

In fact, in an objective discussion of the objects in this category, the Egyptian find-spot of ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10) should be considered as carefully as the alleged Afghani one of ewer 1 (fig. 1), especially as another ewer of the group (cat. no.

---

4 Melikian-Chirvani 1974, p. 130; Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 127-130.
5 Op. cit., p. 130 note 23; Zick-Nissen also associated ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10) with Iranian parallels, without, however, providing any evidence or references; cf. Berlin 1979, p. 49.
V.1/3; fig. 7) was excavated in Aswān in 1968, while a third one was purchased in the Lebanon - not too far away geographically (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5).6

Leaving aside the admittedly controversial and currently incomplete evidence of the findspots, a close consideration of the ewers' typological features, and a search for related vessels which are more clearly defined both chronologically and geographically, may prove more fruitful. It may at least serve to confirm or reject the existing attributions.

Attempts have already been made to liken the ewers under discussion to another Islamic ewer type current in eastern Iran during the 9th - 12th centuries (fig. 11, cf. ewer type ICAW 1)7. However, as was recently pointed out quite correctly by Dahncke, the similarities between these two ewer types are restricted to very general features such as the cylindrical body and neck (the former of which, however, is much taller in the case of the Iranian pieces), as well as the basic handle shape. Apart from these details the two types are in fact clearly distinct as far as specific body features and manufacturing technique are concerned - the ewers under discussion in this chapter are cast while the Iranian pieces are hammered.

Thus, the tubular body spout, the three feet, the recurrent type of decorative handle attachment, and even the application of a thumbpiece - all these features set the category under discussion clearly apart from the ewers cited as parallels. Accordingly, both types should be seen as having an undoubtedly separate identity.

Dahncke, in her discussion of ewer 2 (pl. 1), takes the lateral extensions found on that object's upper handle attachment as a reason to associate the piece with another category of early Islamic ewers, commonly associated with the famous "Baṣra" ewer. These also display two wing-like lateral extensions at the back of the lip, where the handle is attached, in a comparable manner (cf. ewer type MW 3).8 She then argues that as the Iranian origin for that specific group of vessels was not

---

6 Fehérvári 1976, p. 34.
7 Baer 1983, p. 90. The author does, however, acknowledge that simple ceramic ewers of the same type were found also at Khirbat al-Mafjar.
8 Dahncke 1988, p. 10; see also Fehérvári 1976, p. 29.
in doubt, the very similar handle enhancement on the Bumiller piece (cat. no. 2; pl. 1) must be seen as further evidence for the Iranian origin of the ewer type discussed here.

Unfortunately, Dahncke was apparently unaware of the fact that the vessels surrounding the "Baṣra" piece are by no means all attributable to Iran and that Marshak as early as 1972 tried to establish in a painstaking study that ewers of the "Baṣra" type actually originated to the west of Iran in early Islamic times and then spread eastwards during the following centuries.9 Dahncke also ignores the occurrence of very similar handle attachment systems on several other early Islamic ewer types (cf. in particular ewer types MW 3 & 4), which again either have both western and eastern connections or appear to belong only to lands to the west of Iran. In all cases the emphatic adornment of the upper handle attachment and its stylistic execution can be traced back to Romano-Byzantine traditions, as has been discussed elsewhere in this thesis (cf. chapters 8 & 9). Therefore this feature cannot serve as a safe indicator of provenance when considered in isolation.

Quite apart from such a minor detail the over-all appearance of the ewers assembled in this category gives vital clues as to their true origin and geographical attribution in Islamic times. Firstly, the several varieties of the cylinder shape that were chosen to form the body of these ewers are significant. As for the plain and squat examples (cat. nos. 1-5; fig. 1, pl. 1, figs. 2-4) their profile can be compared to the bodies of another group of early Islamic ewers, which also rest on three feet, but feature a bipartite neck with round mouth instead of the body spout (cf. ewer type MW 1). These pieces appear to have been current in the lands to the west and north-west of Iran proper during the early years of Islamic rule.

Another, even more interesting parallel occurs among the early Islamic pottery excavated in the area around Sūsa in south-western Iran (fig. 12).10 Here a blue and green glazed pottery ewer (unfortunately fragmented) was unearthed that

---

9 Marshak 1972.
10 Koechlin 1928, p. 67, pl. XIII no. 94.
features not only a squat cylindrical body and three short feet, but also a body spout - now partly broken off - and vertical pseudo-facetting indicated by areas of green glaze interrupted by blue lines.\textsuperscript{11}

The concave-sided varieties of the type discussed here were examined by Allan. He established that this peculiar shape of concave-sided cylinder was apparently only one expression of a specific fashion for concave shapes in general. This had affected vessels current in Egypt since Coptic times, was retained until the Fātimīd period and eventually influenced the shapes of local Ayyūbid and Mamluk metalwork.\textsuperscript{12}

Apart from their body shape, the ewers under discussion stand out because of their somewhat exaggerated tubular spout, which rises at a steep angle from the edge of the shoulder. Such body spouts do not seem to occur on metal objects of proven Persian Islamic provenance before the 14th century A.D., as Allan has already pointed out in his study\textsuperscript{13}, and accordingly, other geographical areas, where this particular feature did form an integral part of pouring vessels from pre-Islamic times onwards, should be considered.

One region with a long history of body-spouted ewers is Iraq. Since Sumerian times such vessels can be traced in large numbers and great variety of body shape. The profile of some libation vessels executed in silver, which were found in the royal tombs of Ur and date to the third millennium B.C. (fig. 13), is most interesting in this context. Its body spout is narrow and extremely long, and it rises at an angle very similar to that observed on several of the ewers discussed in this chapter.\textsuperscript{14}

Pre-Islamic Egypt also once again provides some valuable comparative material. In the 5th/6th-century royal tombs of Ballana and Qustul in Nubia several bronze ewers came to light which, although they have generally ovoid rather than

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} Allan 1985; Sokoly 1990, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{13} Allan 1985, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{14} Woolley 1934, pp. 302, 553, 557, 574, pls. 171-2.
cylindrical bodies, reveal a virtually identical neck treatment to that found on ewers V.1/1-4 of the second sub-group (figs. 5-8), and a body spout - though this is shorter (fig. 14).^{15}

Body spouts also occur on other early Islamic ewer types such as the globular vessels with tall cylindrical neck associated with the famous "Marwān" ewer, which incidentally was found together with ewer V.2/2 (fig. 10) in the Fayyūm in Lower Egypt (cf. ewer type EMW 5/1), and several ovoid-bodied ewers with bipartite neck and either a single or double spout of S-shaped curvature, which ends most typically in a polylobed finial closely resembling that encountered on the spout tip of the Keir ewer (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5; cf. ewer type EMW 4).^{16}

Although the provenance of virtually none of these ewers can as yet be determined with certainty, none of them have seriously been associated with eastern Islamic regions such as Iran.^{17} In fact, both the ewer type associated with the "Marwān" ewer and the ovoid-bodied ewers with curved spouts have several individual features that link their origin to the Near East and to the lands to the west and north-west of Iran proper. At least one piece belonging to the latter type, though found in Ani, Armenia, shows amazing similarities to one of the ewers excavated in Ballana (fig. 15).^{18}

The last significant feature of the ewers under discussion concerns the three legs of varying length on which their cylindrical bodies rest. Again, early Islamic ewers of proven Iranian provenance do not generally seem to display three individual feet, but either a flat base, a tall pedestal foot or a foot-ring of varying height, often

---

^{15} Emery 1938, no. B 6-14, pp. 318-9, pl. 80.
^{16} In addition to these more or less well known pieces, a small ewer with globular body, broad and facetted neck, arched handle and tubular body-spout with animal head termination has most recently been excavated at the late 8th/early 9th-century site of Umm al-Walīd near ‘Ammān; cf. Geneva 1992/3, p. 13, p. 17 fig. 11.4, p. 18 fig. 14, p. 23. I owe this piece of information to Dr. James Allan. Body-spouted vessels can also be observed among the early Islamic pottery excavated at Qasr al-‘Hair al-Sharqi and Khirbat al-Mafjar; cf. Hagedorn 1989, p. 29, Grabar 1978, Vol. 2, pp. 158-9, pl. B no 16, pp. 130-1, pl. A1 nos. 15 & 16; Baramki 1940, p. 101 fig. 15.1.
^{17} The hypothesis put forward by Melikian-Chirvani in his thesis that both comparative types are of Khurāsānī origin is not supported by convincing evidence; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 98-102, 144-160.
^{18} Emery 1938, no. B. 6-14, pp. 318-9, pl. 80.
more or less splayed or rounded. Three feet do occur, however, on the above-mentioned cylindrical ewers with biparite neck (ewer type MW 1), the ceramic ewer from Susa and the ovoid-bodied ewers with curved spouts (ewer type EMW 4). On the latter they spring from a round base ring, a feature perhaps adopted from a Byzantine type of water heater, to which this particular group shows striking similarities.  

The application of three individual feet, if in a much less prominent way, can already be observed on certain Byzantine bronze vessels, such as for example a particular jug type current in the eastern Mediterranean in the pre-Islamic period (fig. 16) and, as was mentioned before, on the detachable sub-structures of Byzantine water heaters. Finally, comparable feet can also be observed on several Coptic bronze vessels (fig. 17).

To sum up, it appears that all the characteristic features of the ewer type discussed here either hark back to pre-Islamic Byzantine or Near Eastern traditions, or find parallels on other more or less contemporary vessels from lands to the west and north-west of Iran.

One additional detail may support a tentative attribution of the group as a whole to those regions. The intricately incised and punched decoration encountered twice in very similar fashion below the handles of ewers V.1/1 and V.2/1 (figs. 5, 9), and the style of their ornamentation, can apparently be paralleled on several other metal objects associated with the Coptic and early Islamic culture of Egypt.

If one accepts the attribution put forward here, there arises the problem of the apparently maverick Afghan provenance of ewer 1 (fig. 1). Typologically it undoubtedly belongs to the category under discussion, and the fact that it seems to be the only representative of the type associated with eastern Iranian lands, and that

---

20 Richards 1980, pl. 59.
21 Cf. Wulff 1909, no. 1040, no. 1047; Gayet 1902, p. 314 top left figure.
22 Geneva 1985, no. 253; similar comments were made to me by Dr. Allan in person.
this connection is based on find-spot alone, might suggest that it was imported there from the west.

However, its material - high-tin bronze - actually suggests that this piece may be a local copy of a more western type introduced to the area at some point in early Islamic times. This specific alloy was not widely used, but was apparently a speciality of eastern Iran and especially of the region around Kirmān at that time, having been used in China and India long before the advent of Islam.23

The transfer of a ewer type originating in the West to Iran and its eastern fringes could of course have occurred in many ways which are no longer traceable today. One anecdote does, however, show that such transference did indeed take place. In the late 9th century 'Amr ibn Laith, the Saffārid ruler of Sīstān, sent a courier to Baghdād with a considerable amount of money to obtain a number of precious rock crystal vessels. However, the courier considered the objects too expensive, and in order not to waste the money intrusted to him, he had metal vessels made and took those back to his master instead.24

Another potential way of transmission may involve the closely knit economic network of Jewish metal merchants, who had dominated this particular trade since pre-Islamic times.25 They maintained close trading links between Egypt, the Yemen and western India throughout early Islamic times and established trading posts for metal as well as actual factories along this particular route and others, especially in the Mediterranean region. Jewish merchants also owned copper mines in Iran. The factories in western India in particular constantly received orders from merchants in Aden and above all Egypt, specifying exactly the required shapes, measurements and details of the objects to be manufactured.26 In addition damaged vessels were

---

23 Allan 1976, V.1, pp. 156-8; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1974 for a discussion of high-tin bronze and its centre of production; Fehervári 1976, pp. 21-2. The fact that early Islamic literary sources indicate that high tin bronze was used for drinking vessels and water jugs because this specific material did not cause verdigris is interesting in this context; cf. Allan 1976, V. 1, p. 158.
sent from those regions to be repaired there or re-fashioned into new objects. Considering such practices one could at least speculate whether vessels like the ewers discussed here might thus have reached production centres in western India, whence the type might have been transmitted along other trade routes northwards to the regions of modern Afghanistan.27

As for the dating of the ewer type discussed in this chapter, there is no conclusive evidence at present. Dealing with ewer V.1/3 (fig. 7) Allan commented that the style of its inscription suggests a date around ca. 900 A.D.28, and perhaps the vessels most closely related to that particular piece may be tentatively dated along those lines, as well.

The remaining pieces vary with regard to their previously proposed dating from the 8th (cat. nos. 1, 2, V.2/1; fig. 1, pl. 1, fig. 9)) to the 9th/10th centuries (cat. nos. 3, V.2/2; figs. 2, 10), and indeed it seems quite possible, as Sokoly has already suggested, that these quite simple and functional vessels may have been in use over several centuries.29 No precise chronological order can at present be established among the individual pieces either, and it is to be hoped that further research into this particular ewer type may elucidate its precise development and geographical distribution.

4. Function

At present the original function of this ewer type is not known. The fact that the pieces vary quite considerably in size, from 17.2 cm to 43 cm, may indicate that the type had several functions, to each specific one of which its proportions were adjusted. One of the largest vessels (cat. no. V.2/2; fig. 10) was excavated in the Fayyūm together with, among other objects, several bronze buckets, which are

28 Allan 1985, p. 132.
29 Sokoly 1990, p. 17.
somewhat similar to this particular piece in their sturdy appeal. Perhaps, it may be speculated, the buckets and the ewer formed a washing set intended for religious ablutions or personal hygiene as well as general domestic purposes.

Another usage may be indicated by the inscription applied to the lower handle of ewer V.1/1 (fig. 5) - 'atār bihi. Fehérvári translated these simple Kufic words as "sprinkle with it", an interpretation not quite precise enough.30 'Atar bihi in fact means "to perfume" or "to scent" and thus indicates clearly that the liquid contained in this ewer would not simply have been water, but a much more precious substance like scented essence, rose-water or some kind of perfume. Such fragrances of course played an important part in Eastern culture and were an indispensable element of personal hygiene among people proud of their elegant life-style.

Indeed, many detailed instructions about perfuming oneself can be found in medieval adab literature, as for example in the 9th-century kitāb al-muwashsha' by Ibn al-Washshā', which specifies minutely the nature and combination of the right fragrances and essences to be used by elegant gentlemen and their appropriate manner of application.31

A more general use of essences also formed part of the social habits practised by a wider spectrum of early Islamic society. Thus, in ‘Abbāsid times and certainly later as well, a banquet was ended by the washing of hands, after which the guests reclined on couches prepared for them all along the walls of the reception room. Then a servant of the host would pass around small graceful ewers containing rose-water or other fragrant liquids, which were sprayed over the face or the clothes of the user. Finally, this refinement was followed by the fumigation of perfumes, incense or sandalwood burnt in a censer.32 The inscription on ewer V.1/1 (fig. 5) might well refer to such a specific usage as the sprinkling of guests with aromatic essences.

30 Fehérvári 1976, p. 34.
32 Ahsan 1979, p. 162.
The only problem that arises in putting forward such a suggestion is the comparatively large size of the ewer. Ahsan specifically mentions "small and graceful" ewers, which would have been well suited to contain a fugitive perfumed essence to be used in small quantities by only a few individuals. Certainly, ewer V.1/1 (fig. 5) may just have been destined to serve a large number of guests one by one, but this assumption presupposes a fairly rich household able to hold extensive banquets, a setting that makes one imagine vessels of somewhat more elaborate appearance than the quite plain visual appeal of the ewer under discussion. Such apparent discrepancies cannot as yet be explained satisfactorily and therefore have to be left for future investigation.33

5. Summary

Cast bronze ewers with straight or more or less strongly waisted and sometimes facetted cylindrical bodies on three feet, cylindrical necks and obliquely rising tubular body spouts seem to have evolved from pre-Islamic vessel shapes current in Coptic Egypt, the Byzantine world and the ancient Near East, an assumption further underlined by the characteristic punched and incised decoration found on two of the pieces discussed, which can be paralleled stylistically on Coptic metalwork.

---

33 It seems surprising that - presumably - the craftsman felt it necessary to explain the ewer's specific function in this inconspicuous inscription. Under normal circumstances one would assume that the traditional use of a certain vessel type - especially with a quite conspicuous profile such as this - was known to anyone acquiring it in the bazaar. However, as Prof. Hillenbrand kindly pointed out to me, the habit of emphasising an object's function by an inscription referring to it is not unparalleled in early Islamic art, and appears for example on a 9th/10th-century pottery plate attributed to Nishāpur. Here, the imperative ukul! - eat! appears four times in Kufic on the bottom and thus evokes most graphically the perfectly obvious function of the plate; cf. Ghouchani 1986, p. 130 no. 55. According to Dr. Allan, in a personal comment to me, another explanation of the inscription on ewer V.1/1 (fig. 5) may be that the vessel was made for export to an area where such objects were in demand because of similar cultural and social traditions, but where the shape was not familiar and therefore would not automatically be associated with a specific function.
The pieces of this category share several of their features - such as the three individual feet, the body spout, the polylobed spout tip encountered on ewer V.1/1 (fig. 5) and the frequently occurring lateral extensions of the upper handle attachment - with other early Islamic bronze ewers, which all have associations with Near Eastern rather than Iranian lands, a fact that seems further to encourage an attribution of this type to this area of the Islamic world. The ewers seem to have been in use at least from the 8th to the 11th century A.D.

Their original function is unclear, but the discovery of one of the pieces (cat. no. V.2/2; fig. 10) alongside several buckets may suggest its use as a purification vessel, while the inscription on another piece (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 5) may hint at another purpose of this ewer type in connection with the perfuming and perhaps the sprinkling of guests after a banquet.
Catalogue

1. Kabul Museum; n. p.; cast high tin bronze; h. 17.2 cm, diam. 5.8 cm.
Angular cylindrical body resting on three triangular feet; in centre of slightly raised shoulder, rounded moulding introduces very broad and squat cylindrical neck with facettng and flat protruding lip around the mouth; simple rounded handle bending outwards, attached to back of lip and shoulder; diametrically opposite, obliquely rising, tall tubular spout. Undecorated (fig. 1).
Lit.: Melikian-Chirvani 1974, pp. 126, 130, fig. 8; Baer 1983, pp. 90, 321 note 204; Sokoly 1990, pp. 16-8.

2. Bumiller Collection; n. p.; cast bronze, incised, areas of incrustations (?); h. 19.5 cm.
Form generally like 1, but more squat body on taller and slimmer legs; angular shoulder collar; neck plain, slightly tapering towards mouth; two backwards curving, lateral extensions at back of lip flanking handle attachment; handle very slightly S-shaped; cone thumbpiece on high cylindrical base; spout with small protruding ring around its aperture rising at steeper angle than that on 1. Incised superposed grooving around central legs; traces of engraving on body (?) (pl. 1).
Lit.: Christie’s 21.11.86, p. 150 lot 309; Dahncke 1988, pp. 8-10, fig. 7; Sokoly 1990 pp. 16-8.

3. Sotheby’s 16.4.85 lot 6; n. p.; cast bronze, punching; h. 20.6 cm.
Shape like 2, but slightly more elongated body; shorter rounded feet with central groove; no decorative upper handle attachment; handle bends outwards; on lower handle, two lateral and two vertical projections; tall angular knob on rounded cylindrical base, recalling shape of feet as thumbpiece; spout steeper as on 2. Punch-dotted line along length of spout (fig. 2).
Lit.: Sotheby’s 16./17.4.85 lot 6.

4. West Berlin, Islamic Museum I 6758; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 21 cm, width 13.8 cm.
Shape like 2 and 3, but taller body slightly tapering towards the base; handle flattened and clearly S-shaped; on back of lower handle small molded figure (?); skittle-shaped thumbpiece on high angular base; spout shorter than on 1-3 (fig. 3).

5. Khalili Collection MTW 465; n. p.; cast bronze; h. ca. 25 cm.
Shape similar to 1, but more elongated body tapering towards base; longer, slightly waisted feet; strongly sloping shoulder with wide rounded moulding; taller, slightly waisted neck; flat lip with decorative lateral protrusions at back; taller handle surmounts mouth level; skittle-shaped thumbpiece on low rounded base (fig. 4).
Lit.: Unpublished.

V.1/1. Keir Collection; purchased in Lebanon; cast bronze, incised; h. 36.5 cm (with thumbpiece), diam. mouth 9.5 cm, diam. base 2.0 cm.
Shape similar to 5 but wider, squatter body with waisted sides; neck strongly waisted with broad central collar, lower neck facettng; palmette-shaped extensions at back of lip; tiny projection on upper handle; thumbpiece pierced leaf-shaped plaque; tubular facettng spout curving outwards at top with polylobed plaque surrounding aperture. Below handle, conventional tree motif; on handle, archaic Kufic inscription (‘atar bihi) followed by seven horizontal lines; ring-matting on upper handle attachment; double grooved lines around lower feet (fig. 5).
V.1/2. Christie’s 9.12.68, lot 124; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 33 cm.
Shape like V.1/1, but longer body on low rounded feet with collar at top; no decorative extensions at back of lip; on handle, conical knob thumbpiece on low rounded base; tall tubular spout (fig. 6).
Christie’s 9.12.68, lot 124.

V.1/3. Cairo Islamic Museum 24261; excavated at Aswān; cast bronze, incised, punched; h. 31 cm, diam. base 14.5 cm, diam. mouth 11 cm.
Strongly waisted, facetted cylindrical body on three low rounded feet; shoulder edge emphasised by shallow horizontal ovals; neck similar to V.1/1 & 1/2 but shorter and facetted, with rounded collar in centre; handle thicker with narrower loop; spout like on V.1/2 (fig. 7).
Inscription on shoulder either side of handle: baraka lī-sāhibīhi; on spout, unread inscription in ring-punching.

V.1/4. Cairo Islamic Museum 15240; n. p.; cast bronze; h. 38 cm, diam. 14 cm.
Shape like V.1/3, but less waisted body on higher feet with rounded collar above; diamond-shaped indentations on shoulder edge; shorter neck, spout and handle; tall skittle-shaped thumbpiece on rounded base (fig. 8).
Lit.: Baer 1983, pp. 90, 91 fig. 69, 321 note 207; Sokoly 1990, pp. 16-8.

V.2/1. Geneva Private Collection (?); n. p.; cast bronze, punched, incised; h. 43 cm, diam. 17 cm.
Six-sided, slightly waisted body formed by large concave facets on three high, very slim feet drawn in at centre; six large kite-shaped indentations mark facet junctions, interrupting the shoulder edge; raised shoulder with slim rounded collar; tall, slightly waisted cylindrical neck with flat lip around mouth; thick rounded handle with thin upper attachment plaque joined to back of lip and lower end joining shoulder edge; skittle-shaped thumbpiece on low conical base; very long tubular spout.
Punch-dotted circles and punched line on lip; on handle back, dense horizontal grooving; below handle, incised and punched outlining underneath attachment, below vertically orientated design of incised zig-zag lines and punch-dotted circles springing from a but indicated leaf-like motif (fig. 9).

V.2/2. Berlin Islamic Museum I 3553; excavated at Abūṣīr al-Malak; cast bronze, incised; h. 43 cm, diam. 17 cm.
Shape similar to V.2/1, but more waisted body without indentations on three pine cone-shaped feet; broader and shorter neck; taller handle with pine cone-shaped thumbpiece corresponding in shape to feet. Three superposed lines near spout tip (fig. 10).
Lit.: Rubensohn and Sarre 1929, fig. 3; Berlin 1967, pl. 10, p. 22 no. 62; Berlin 1971, pp. 47-8 no. 139, pl. 29; Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 123ff no. III/22; Berlin 1979, pp. 48-9 no. 139, pl. 33; Baer 1983, pp. 90, 321 note 205; Sokoly 1990, pp. 16-8.
Plate 1
EMW 3/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 19.5 cm
(Bumiller Collection).
FIG. 1
EMW 3/1. Cast High-Tin Bronze Ewer, h. 17.2 cm (Kabul Museum).

FIG. 2
EMW 3/3. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 20.6 cm (Sotheby's, 16/17 April 1985, lot 6).
FIG. 3
EMW 3/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 21 cm
(Berlin, Islamic Museum, inv. no. I 6758).

FIG. 4
EMW 3/5. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. ca. 25 cm
(London, Khalili Collection, inv. no. MTW 465).
FIG. 5
Bronze Ewer purchased in the
Lebanon. H. 36.5 cm (London, Keir Collection).
FIG. 6
EMW 3/V.1/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 33 cm
(Christie’s 9.12.68, lot 124).

FIG. 7
H. 31 cm (Cairo, Islamic Museum, inv. no. 24261).

FIG. 8
EMW 3/V.1/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 38 cm
(Cairo, Islamic Museum, inv. no. 15240).
FIG. 9
EMW 3/V.2/1. Cast Bronze Ewer excavated at Abu Mena, Egypt, H. 43 cm (Berlin, Islamic Museum, inv. no. 13553).

FIG. 10
EMW 3/V.2/2. Cast Bronze Ewer, h. 43 cm (Geneva, Private Collection(?)).
FIG. 11
Hammered Bronze Ewer (Ewer Type ICW 1)
(after Dahmke 1988, fig. 8).

FIG. 12
Fragmented Early Islamic Pottery
Ewer with Blue-Green Glaze from
Susa, Southern Mesopotamia.

FIG. 13
Silver Libation Vessels from the
Royal Tombs of Ur, Mesopotamia,
3rd Millennium B.C.

FIG. 14
Fragmented Early Islamic Pottery
Ewer with Blue-Green Glaze from
Susa, Southern Mesopotamia.

FIG. 15
Fragmented Early Islamic Pottery
Ewer with Blue-Green Glaze from
Susa, Southern Mesopotamia.
FIG. 14
5th/6th-Century Bronze Ewer found in the Royal Tombs of Ballana and Qustul in Nubia.

FIG. 15
Cast Bronze Ewer from Ani in Armenia.
(Ewer Type EMW 4).
FIG. 16 Late Roman Bronze Ewer from Predotto, Northern Italy.

FIG. 17 Coptic Bronze Flacon.
Chapter 4

Ewer Type EMW 4: Cast Bronze Ewers with Ovoid Body on Three Feet, Bipartite Neck and Curved Body Spout/s

1. General Description

The cast bronze ewers assembled in this category - apparently of quite considerable size to judge from the measurements of V.1/1 (38 cm) and V.1/2 (44.5 cm) alone (fig. 4, pl. 1) - are characterized by an ovoid (cat. nos. 1, 2, V.1/1; figs. 1-2, 4), globular (cat. no. V.1/2; pl. 1) or inverted pear-shaped body (cat. no. 3; fig. 3), most typically resting on a low base-ring supported by three, sometimes awkwardly positioned feet of zoomorphic derivation (cat. nos. 1, 2; figs. 1-2). In the case of ewer 3 (fig. 3) the clearly demarcated ridge of the base has been omitted, and the feet join the flat base of the body directly. On ewers V.1/1 (fig. 4) and V.1/2 (pl. 1) the feet have been abandoned altogether and substituted by a low splayed footring.

A slightly projecting moulding of varying circumference receives the base of the neck in the centre of the flattened shoulder. The neck can be of very tall, cylindrical and facettted appearance with strongly waisted sides (cat. no. 1; fig. 1) or strongly conical in its lower part with an annular ridge above, from which it flares towards the mouth (cat. no. 3; fig. 3). Most characteristic, however, is the application of a bipartite neck of peculiar appearance. The lower section recreates in a shortened version the neck design on ewer no. 1 (fig. 1), i.e. a strongly waisted and facettted cylinder, while the upper part is cylindrical and either plain (cat. no. 2; fig. 2) or facettted vertically (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 4) or horizontally (cat. no. V.1/2; pl. 1). The lip around the round mouth is flat and projects to a varying degree. In most cases it shows lateral decorative extensions on the sides or towards the back, sometimes at
least apparently identifiable as birds' heads with copper-inlaid eyes\textsuperscript{1}, enhancing the upper handle attachment.

The handle varies considerably in appearance. It can be rounded with five full round beads in the centre (cat. no. 2; fig. 2), rounded, but flat on the inside, with five half-beads (cat. no. 1; fig. 1), angular with four half-beads (cat. no. V.1/1; fig. 4) or more or less flat without further enhancement (cat. nos. 3, V.1/2; fig. 3, pl. 1). In all cases the handle displays a more or less emphatic S-shaped curvature. The lower handle attachments also receive quite diverse ornamentation. On ewer 1 (fig. 1) the handle seems to be attached merely by a simple lancet-shaped extension.

In two cases (cat. nos. 2, V.1/1; figs. 2, 4) the handle terminates in a trilobed or five-lobed leaf in slight relief, while the angular lower attachment on ewer 3 (fig. 3) resembles a stylized animal head. On ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1) the attachment area is heart-shaped with pearled border and filled with foliage executed in slight relief.

The thumbpiece is mainly rendered as a pomegranate (cat. nos. 1, 2, V.1/2; figs. 1-2, pl. 1), but a naturalistic, backward-curving palmette leaf with rounded knob finial does also occur (cat. no. 3; fig. 3). The thumbpiece of ewer V.1/1 (fig. 4) is now wanting.

All ewers of this category feature one or two (cat. nos. V.1/1, V.1/2; fig. 4, pl. 1) body spouts rising from the shoulder. Most typically, they are curved with bulging rounded bases, and faceted (cat. nos. 3, V.1/1; figs. 3-4). Their tips are emphasised by flat, polylobed plaques. Only on ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1) the two adjoining spouts are short and tubular, inclined towards each other and rising obliquely. Their tips feature a grooved annular ridge.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch.III, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{2} This group of ewer was briefly described and discussed by Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 98-102; Allan 1976, Vol. 1, p. 219; Baer 1983, pp. 87-90, 321 note 199.
2. Decoration

Most of the pieces assembled in this group are quite plain (cat. nos. 2, 3; figs. 2-3) or feature merely a subtly incised emphasis of the upper and lower facet terminations on the neck, achieved by the application of curved lines and intermediate diamond motifs (cat. no. 1; fig. 1).

In the case of ewer V.1/1 (fig. 4) the surfaces of all its major structural elements are facetted, thus strongly enforcing the visual impact of its remarkable heterogeneous profile. Ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1) alone carries dense all-over decoration displaying free-flowing scrollwork and foliage with copper-inlaid details, executed in relief.

These cover the foot and the sides of the body respectively. The areas below the handle and the spouts are clearly demarcated by pearled heart medallions enclosing vegetal designs, resting on symmetrical palmette structures. The back of the handle additionally carries a vertical succession of bud motifs in relief. Further decorative enhancement involves the facets on the lower neck, which are incised in a manner comparable to that applied on the neck of ewer 1 (fig. 1), and the centre of the upper handle attachment, where a copper-inlaid rosette is positioned.

3. Origin of Ewer Type

There do not seem to exist any directly comparable pre-Islamic prototypes for the fanciful profile of the ewers under discussion here. The peculiar bipartite neck, certainly the most characteristic feature of this ewer type, may have derived from the very pronounced neck collar featured on certain types of pre-Islamic pottery current in the eastern Mediterranean as early as the 10th - 8th century B.C. (fig. 5)\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) Kempinski and Avi-Yonah 1979, p. 208 pl. 42.
and also found later for example on many vessels of Roman terra sigillata ware (fig. 6).  

Most interesting in the search for a typological model for the Islamic pieces as whole, however, is the existence of a type of Byzantine authepsa, i.e. samovar-like water heaters, which harks back to models already current in 1st-century Pompeii and known today particularly from excavations at the royal tombs in Ballana, Nubia, which are datable to the 5th/6th centuries A.D., and from the Byzantine strata at Sardis, located to the east of modern Izmir in western Turkey (figs. 7 & 8). Made of bronze or hammered copper with cast handles, feet and base, they feature a bulbous, inverted pear-shaped body with pronounced shoulder moulding and a pierced base plate, resting on a tripod. The latter consists of a ring to which three abstracted zoomorphic legs of quite considerable length are attached.

The neck of these vessels can be cylindrical and waisted, just like that on ewer 1 (fig. 1) and the lower parts of the bipartite necks encountered on the other Islamic pieces, or tripartite as on the piece from Ballana. Here, the neck features a low and waisted base, surmounted by a similarly-shaped element and finally a tall and strongly waisted cylindrical section. The similarity in the allover appearance between this vessel type and ewers 1 - 3 (figs. 1-3) at least, and in particular the closely related neck treatment and the tripod support system, seem quite striking, if one ignores the addition of the spouts in the case of the ewers.

Ewer 3 (fig. 3) in addition, although allegedly from Ani in Armenia, shows a relatively close resemblance to certain vessels again from Ballana, and so does the body profile of ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1) and particularly the shape and proportion of its body spouts (fig. 9).

---

4 Cf. Gose 1984, pl. 11 nos. 170, 172, 173, pl. 12 nos. 176, 177, also pl. 19 nos. 270, 271, pl. 33 nos. 388, 389.
5 Emery 1938, p. 357 no. 790, pl. 93D; Waldbaum 1983, pl. 34, pp. 92-3. I am very grateful to Chris Entwhistle from the Department of Medieval and Later Antiquities in the British Museum for bringing the second reference to my attention.
6 Emery 1938, p. 357 no. 790.
Finally, one particular feature of the Islamic ewers' profile - the spout - deserves a special mention here, as it, too, seems to corroborate the alleged connections of these vessels with Byzantine and earlier pre-Islamic Egyptian metalwork. The characteristic spout type applied to all but one of the pieces appears at present to be quite unprecedented with regard to its curvature and its peculiar shape.

It involves a bulging drop-shaped base which develops into a narrow tapering tube, sometimes with facetted sides. It can, however, be quite closely paralleled among ancient Egyptian libation vessels, such as for example the slender pear-shaped heset or senbet vase fashioned from gold sheet in ca. 990 B.C. and used to consecrate the lustral waters, to sprinkle people with or for pouring a libation (fig. 10). Interestingly, this vessel was crafted from five individual pieces, i.e. the body and neck, the lip, the foot, the base and the spout, a manner of construction which makes it feasible that individual components of the vessel shape, such as the spout, may have been available for attachment to other vessel forms, as well, if felt appropriate.

Thus, the same spout design also appears on another ancient Egyptian vessel type, a squat, kettle-like nemset vase made from silver and again datable to ca. 990 B.C. (fig. 11). This vessel was used for various purification rites and also for water libations. Its peculiar shape on the whole incidentally seems curiously to relate to the body profile of the Ani ewer (cat. no. 3; fig. 3).

To sum up, it appears that the fanciful body profile of the early Islamic ewers in this category may have certain generic links with pre-Islamic eastern Mediterranean and Roman pottery and glass, as far as their bipartite neck is concerned, while at the same time showing a curious resemblance in their over-all profile to a group of early Byzantine water-heating vessels.

---

8 Edinburgh 1988, p. 44 no. 16. This type of vase also occurs repeatedly on ancient Egyptian reliefs and other artefacts; cf. Stuttgart 1984, p. 59 no. 44, p. 124 no. 99, p. 128 no. 102 as examples.

9 Edinburgh 1988, p. 44 no. 17. It is to be hoped that future research may be able to find the as yet missing intermediate pieces, which might help to verify whether there is indeed a typological link between the spouts on the ancient Egyptian pieces and those on the Islamic vessels.
A third influence affecting the pieces’ appearance may have come from the body shapes and spout designs of certain ancient libation vessels, current as early as the 10th century B.C.

In view of such observations it seems justifiable to forward a Near Eastern and perhaps more specifically Egyptian origin for the development of this specific ewer type as a basis for further research.

4. Provenance and Date

On the basis of the comments made above concerning the origin of the ewer type discussed here, it is perhaps most likely that the Islamic pieces have been manufactured in eastern Mediterranean and Egyptian workshops rather than in Iran or even Central Asia as has been suggested occasionally. The reasons for this assumption lie not only with the type’s apparent links with pre-Islamic material from those regions, but also with its typological position within a range of other early Islamic vessel types, which most likely originated from there as well.

To start with, Allan established as early as 1976 that no body-spouted ewers of any kind can be proven to be of early Islamic Iranian origin. Furthermore he pointed out, that it seems unlikely that Persian craftsmen, who after all contributed a lot to the evolution of several pre-Islamic vessel types, would have abandoned such a style had it already been in common use locally before Islam and thus at their direct disposal for further development. Furthermore, the ewers discussed here share certain features with other early Islamic vessel types, all of which seem to have originated in lands to the west of Iran, even if some then spread eastwards in

10 Allan supports an attribution of the pieces to Mesopotamia; cf. Allan 1976, Vol. 1, p. 219. Melikian-Chirvani finds the alleged Georgian provenance of the pieces acquired in Dagestān plausible, while Marshak points to the existence of the upper part of the ewer type discussed here in the Samarkand museum; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 53; Marshak 1972, p. 88 note 36.
later centuries. Thus, the concept of three feet supporting the base can be found on a group of cylindrical-bodied ewers with long tubular spouts rising obliquely from the vessels’ shoulder (cf. ewer type EMW 3).

One piece of that particular type additionally features a curved, though considerably longer, facetted spout with a polylobed finial identical to those adorning the spout tips on most of the ewers discussed in this chapter. The two plain and tubular spouts on ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1) on the other hand resemble to a certain degree the spout applied on ewer EMW 3/4 in the same above-mentioned ewer group.\(^\text{12}\)

Three feet can also be found on another group of early Islamic ewers, related to both the type under discussion here and the cylindrical ewer type mentioned before in that it combines the squat cylindrical body with a bipartite neck (cf. ewer type MW 1). The four pieces of this latter type have apparent connections with Mesopotamia and north-western Iran as is shown in the relevant chapter dealing with these particular pieces (cf. chapter 6).

The facetted neck profile of ewer 1 (fig. 1) and that of the lower necks of ewers 2, V.1/1 and V.1/2 (figs. 2, 4, pl. 1) have been quite plausibly compared to those applied to vessels associated with the famous "Baṣra" ewer. Additionally, the incised facet enhancement found on the necks of these two types is very similar indeed.\(^\text{13}\) As for the neck of ewer 3 (fig. 3), it appears to provide yet another reference to the cylindrical and body-spouted ewer type, and more precisely to the vessels of the latter’s second sub-group, which feature a very similar waisted cylindrical neck with an annular collar in its centre or upper part.

Among the varied handle treatments encountered on the ewers in this chapter, only the handle of ewer 2 (fig. 2) is rounded with central beading, a feature[

\(^{12}\) Baer relates the ewers under discussion in this category to those associated with the "Marwān" ewer on the basis of the tubular spout and the shallow shoulder ridge, which she sees as an anticipation of the formation of the flat shoulder found on the latter ewer type. However, to my mind these comparisons are too general to be sustainable; cf. Baer 1983, pp. 89-90.

\(^{13}\) Op. cit., p. 89.
encountered on a group of globular-bodied ewers with tall cylindrical necks, probably originating from early Islamic Mesopotamia and the Near East (cf. ewer type MW 4). The flattened handles with half-beading on the remaining pieces can also be paralleled among ewers of the latter type and additionally among vessels of the "Baṣra" type, which were most probably again developed in Mesopotamia and adjoining areas (cf. ewer type MW 3).

Finally, a secondary feature encountered on the ewers in the category discussed in this chapter links them again to all the other comparable types, i.e. the decorative extensions - sometimes identified as bird heads, but often floral or abstract - applied either on the sides of the lip or towards its back, flanking the handle attachment area. This decorative detail, which can be found on nearly all early Islamic ewers with a round mouth and a handle directly attached to the lip, can be traced back to Romano-Byzantine fashions, where two lateral clasps, preferably bird heads, frequently enclose the mouth of a vessel on the sides and then join towards the back, where they are often flanked by two volutes, to receive the upper handle terminations.14

In view of the preceding considerations it seems that the ewer type discussed here has more or less far-reaching generic links with other contemporary vessels that apparently originate from the lands of Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia and the north-western fringes of Iran. Accordingly, it may be suggested that the extraordinary ewers assembled in this category may also come from these regions. However, it has to be stressed that a more precise localization is not yet possible.

As for the dating, the circumstantial evidence provided by the typological links between the ewers under discussion here and other previously mentioned early Islamic ewer types may indicate that all these wares belong into the same kind of chronological framework, i.e. the early 8th to 11th centuries. As for a chronology within the category itself, there is very little evidence that might clarify the

14 This aspect has been discussed in more detail in chapters 8 and 9 (ewer types MW 3 & 4).
interrelationships between these pieces. However, it may be suggested that ewers V.1/1 and V.1/2 (fig. 4, pl. 1) are a development of ewers 1 - 3 (figs. 1-3), as they feature a stable splayed base rather than the rather precarious, perhaps tripod-inspired construction encountered on the other pieces.

In addition, on both the former ewers the single spout has been replaced by a double spout, which was perhaps considered more appropriate as a pouring device on a vessel of quite considerable proportions.

The precise dating of the individual pieces is also hampered by the fact that most of them do not display any decorative features that could help to determine their precise chronological place among early Islamic bronze vessels. The only exception is ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1) with its all-enclosing vegetal sprays, interrupted by pearled heart medallions and palmette motifs positioned below the spouts and the handle.

This decorative treatment has been compared to that found on a ewer in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore related to the "Baṣra" group and dated, mainly on the basis of its inlay and relief technique, to the late 8th or 9th century (cf. ewer type MW 3/7). However, the design of that particular piece appears somewhat heavy and stiff in comparison with the decoration applied on ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1). Here, the ornamentation is characterized by considerable naturalism and a vibrant fluency, with much more attention paid to the detailed execution of individual details such as leaves and buds, which at the same time display subtle engraving as well as being inlaid with copper.

In fact, a much closer stylistic parallel to ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1) is provided by a large bronze or brass tray attributed to 9th/10th-century Iran, but clearly based on earlier prototypes which follow Byzantine iconographic conventions (pl. 2). The treatment of the floral elements on this plate as well as the characteristic pearled

---

15 Marshak suggested a dating prior to the 11th century for ewer V.1/1 (fig. 4) and a 10th - 12th-century dating for the Ani ewer (cat. no. 3; fig. 3); cf. Marshak 1972, pp. 76-7, 79-80.
medallions are remarkably close to those on the ewer and accordingly a similar attribution for the latter may provide a starting point for future investigations.17

5. Function

At present, there are no indications whatsoever as to the original purpose of these enigmatic vessels. However, if the suggested generic links between the pieces and the Byzantine water heaters were to be confirmed in the future, this may provide a first lead in the search for their usage.

Certainly, the application of three feet may indicate that the ewers were indeed intended to contain a hot liquid, but as there are other early Islamic ewer types with such feet, which were most probably used to contain water for ablutions or perfumed essences (cf. ewer type EMW 3), such a suggestion must remain purely hypothetical until substantiated by future research.

6. Summary

Cast bronze ewers with ovoid bodies on three feet, bipartite necks and curved body spouts with polylobed finials seem to originate in eastern Mediterranean lands and perhaps Egypt, to judge from their apparent generic links with pre-Islamic pottery, glass and precious metal vessels coming from that area.

Their suggested dating may lie somewhere between the 8th and 11th centuries, as they share various body features with other early Islamic bronze ewers also datable to that period in time.

17  Kuwaiit 1990, p. 28 no.8, p. 11 no. 8 (English text), cf. also p. 24 no. 4, p. 11 no. 4 (English text).
Their exact place of manufacture in Islamic times is unknown, but was probably confined mainly to those areas, where the type originated. Only ewer V.1/2 (pl. 1) may have links with 9th/10th-century Iran, which would indicate that the type travelled eastwards after having been developed in the West.
Catalogue

1. Cairo Islamic Museum (ex. Hariri Collection); n. p.; cast(?) bronze, incised; dimensions unavailable.
Bulbous ovoid body on low rounded base ring supported by three abstracted zoomorphic feet; in centre of shoulder, small rounded collar receiving very tall and facettcd cylindrical neck with strongly waisted sides; flattened projecting lip with lateral extensions at the back flanking handle attachment area; slightly S-shaped, rounded handle with flat inside attached to upper body below; on central handle five half beads; thumbpiece, bulbous pomegranate; diametrically opposite handle, curved spout with widened and rounded lower part tapering towards the tip with surrounding lobed plaque. Facet terminations on neck enhanced by arched lines and drop-shaped motifs in between (fig. 1).
Lit.: Cairo 1935, M 25.

2. L.A. Mayer Memorial 83-69; n. p.; cast bronze; dimensions unavailable.
Shape as 1, but body tapers slightly towards base; feet set at awkward angle; on central shoulder, wider and flatter collar; bipartite neck with waisted cylindrical lower part ending in protruding, "lip-like" upper edge, and cylindrical upper part surmounted by strongly projecting, flattened lip with lateral extensions flanking handle attachment; rounded handle slightly S-shaped with five full beads in centre and five-lobed leaf in relief as lower termination; thumbpiece pomegranate on low conical base; spout as on 1. Undecorated (fig. 2).
Lit.: Baer 1983, p. 87, p. 88 fig. 67, p. 321 note 199.

3. Ani Museum; (?) Ani, Armenia; cast bronze; dimensions unavailable.
Shape as 2, but more bulbous and tapering stronger towards base; feet more similar to those on 1; fairly broad and strongly waisted cylindrical neck with rounded collar around upper part; flat projecting lip; flat S-shaped handle with decorative extensions above (?) and abstracted animal head (?) below; thumbpiece, backward curving palmette leaf with rounded knob finial. Undecorated (fig. 3).
Lit.: Arakelyan 1956, pp. 120-1, fig. 1; Marshak 1972, pp. 79-80.

V.1/1. Hermitage; acquired in Daghestān; cast bronze; h. 38 cm.
Shape as 2, but body and neck facettcd; low splayed foot ring; neck with shorter upper part; on lip lateral extensions (bird heads) on sides and towards the back near handle attachment; flat and angular handle with four half beads in centre and trilobed leaf attachment below; thumbpiece missing, only circular hole remains; curved and facettcd double spout with polylobed finials. Undecorated (fig. 4).
Lit.: Sarre and Martin 1912, pl. 127, no. 2972; Orbeli and Trever 1935, pl. 78, p. 46; Pope 1938, pl. 244 B; Marshak 1972, p. 88 note 36; Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 101-2, no. III/12; Allan 1976, Vol. 1, p. 219; Melikian-Chirvani 1982, p. 37 note 27.

V.1/2. Hermitage; acquired in Daghestān; cast bronze, relief decoration, incised, copper inlay; h. 44.5 cm.
Shape as V.1/1, but short tubular double spouts tapering towards tip; upper part of neck fluted horizontally; very flat, slightly S-shaped handle with pomegranate thumbpiece and decorative projections flanking upper attachment area (crested bird heads with broken beaks and copper inlaid eyes). In centre of attachment plaque, eight-lobed copper-inlaid rosette; on back of handle, superposed bud motifs in relief; lower attachment pearled, heart-shaped medallion with floral designs; on foot, scrolling motif; on body, free-flowing branches with copper-inlaid buds, lancet leaves and trefoils; on spouts, bud motifs as on handle back; below, medallion like that below handle, underneath symmetrical six-armed palmette motif;
facet terminations on neck with incised arched lines and small intermediate diamonds (pl. 1).
Plate 1
EMW 4/V.1/2. Cast Bronze Ewer with Copper-Inlaid Vegetal Ornament. Allegedly from Daghestan.
H. 44.5 cm (Leningrad, Hermitage).
Plate 2
9th/10th-Century Bronze Tray allegedly from Iran.
FIG. 1

FIG. 2

FIG. 3
FIG. 4

FIG. 5
Phoenician Pottery Ewers. 10th-8th Century B.C.
FIG. 6
Two Roman *Terra Sigillata* Ewers excavated in Cologne.
Late 2nd/Early 3rd Century A.D. (after Gose 1984, figs. 170 & 172).

FIG. 7
5th/6th-Century Bronze Water Heater from the Royal Tombs at Ballana, Nubia.
FIG. 8
Early Byzantine Copper-Alloy Water Heater from Sardis, Western Turkey (after Waldbaum 1983, no. 522 (reconstruction)).

FIG. 9
5th/6th-Century Spouted Bronze Ewer from the Royal Tombs at Ballana, Nubia.
FIG. 10
Egyptian Senset or Ileset Libation Vase
made from Gold Sheet. Ca. 990 B.C.

FIG. 11
Egyptian Nemset Libation Vessel
made from Silver Sheet. Ca. 990 B.C.
Chapter 5

Ewer Type EMW 5: Cast Bronze Ewers with Rounded Body, Long Tubular Neck, Openwork Crown, Crozier-like Handle and Bird-Shaped Body Spout - The "Marwān Ewer" Group

This type of ewers is represented by only six extant vessels. The most famous of them (cat. no. 1; fig. 1), from which the group derives its name, is housed in the Islamic Museum in Cairo. It was found, together with two buckets and another ewer (EMW 3/V.2/2), in Abūsir al-Malak in Lower Egypt, near the legendary burial place of the last Umayyad caliph Marwān II, who is said to have been killed there in 750 A.D. while fleeing the ʿAbbāsids. Since then this ewer has repeatedly been associated with that ruler and even been termed the "Marwān" ewer, although there is in fact no proof of any kind that this vessel, or indeed any of the objects in the find, belonged to the unfortunate caliph.¹

The other pieces in this group are housed in the MMA (cat. no. 2; fig. 2), in the Keir Collection (cat. no. 3; fig. 3) and (a very similar one) in Cairo (fig. 4). The remaining two vessels, which were acquired in Dagestān, are preserved in the Hermitage (pl. 1, fig. 5).

1. General Description

All the vessels in this group are made of cast bronze and were, according to Melikian-Chirvani, assembled from up to seven individually moulded sections,

¹ Baer 1983, pp. 84-7; Sokoly 1990, p. 13.
namely the foot, the body, the shoulder, the neck, the openwork crown, the handle and the spout.²

Varying from 34 cm to 41 cm in height, the ewers all share the general features distinguishing this type, i.e. a rounded body on a low foot, a tall tubular neck surmounted by an openwork crown, a crozier-shaped handle and a shortish tubular body spout surmounted by a bird, which rises obliquely from the shoulder.

However, despite these general conformities each object reveals certain deviations in the rendering of its shape, which in each case result in a unique individuality. Thus, as on ewers 1 and 2 (figs. 1 & 2), the body can be squat and globular with a flat projecting shoulder plate, resting on a likewise projecting base which tapers towards a low splayed foot with flat outer edge. In the case of ewers 3 and 4 (figs. 3 & 4) an inverted pear-shaped body with a flattened shoulder area rests on a low splayed foot. The bulbous globular body of ewer 6 (fig. 5) is unique in this group and so are its large, downward pointing petals executed in relief. Here again, as on ewers 1 and 2 (figs. 1-2), the body is received by a projecting base tapering towards a low foot with flat outer edge. Finally, the squat globular body of no. 5 (pl. 1) resembles that of ewers 1 and 2 (figs. 1-2), but it is distinguished by a sloping, slightly raised shoulder plate and a flat base. The latter may not be original, but may have resulted from the loss of the original support system.³

The tubular neck is always introduced by a rounded (cat. nos. 1, 3, 4, 5; figs. 1, 3, 4, pl. 1), flattened (cat. no. 2; fig. 2) or facetted (cat. no. 6; fig. 5) moulding and varies in height. In one case (cat. no. 6; fig. 5) the neck is facetted and the facets’ lower terminations, located slightly above the actual neck base, have been executed in relief, thus reflecting the relief petals on the body.

The openwork crowns surmounting the neck also vary in their execution. In two cases a relief band with pearled borders containing a succession of round and

² Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 147, 150, 156. This suggestion needs further investigation, as in my view not all the sections identified by him were in fact worked separately.
³ The altered base was already noted by Melikian-Chirvani; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 153.
diamond-shaped cavities joined by small globes introduces a succession of vertical palmette structures or "trees", placed between obliquely hatched stems or "columns" with palm tree-like finials (cat. nos. 1, 6, figs. 1, 5). Ewer 5 (pl. 1) features a narrow recessed band with oblique hatching and pearled border below, supporting a more stylized version of the crowns on nos. 1 and 6 (figs. 1, 5). Finally, a simple pearl border only, placed above a thin ridge, runs below the crowns of ewers 2, 3 and 4 (figs. 2-4). Among the latter the crown of ewer 2 (fig. 2) is similar in execution to those on ewers 1 and 6 (figs. 1, 5) with pointed extremities like those on ewers 1 and 4 (figs. 1, 4). The openwork finials of ewers 3 and 4 (figs. 3-4), on the other hand, are much more stylized and crude in comparison.

All ewers but one (cat. no. 4; fig. 4) feature a relief-ornamented and in some cases beaded crozier-shaped handle. Its inward-curving upper termination, which is joined to the openwork section of the neck, ends either in a tripartite vegetal motif (cat. nos. 1, 2, 6; figs. 1, 2, 5) or a dolphin (cat. no. 5, pl. 1). In the case of ewer 3 (fig. 3) it just thins out without displaying any decorative detail. Ewer 4 (fig. 4) was equipped with a completely different handle type, which is not only unique in this group, but in fact in early Islamic ewers in general. It consists of a straight stem, which is attached to a large beaded ring with a skittle-shaped finial. The annular section is joined to the back of the openwork crown.

Below, the handles join the upper body, and the attachment area is often emphasised by various decorative means. In two cases (cat. nos. 3, 4; figs. 3-4) they are rendered as slightly raised, heart-shaped medallions with a central palmette motif, but more commonly the handle continues into an elaborate design consisting of superposed and geometrically disposed palmette leaves executed in relief (cat. nos. 1, 2, 5, 6; figs. 1, 2, pl. 1, fig. 5). In addition, small dolphins flank the handle in most cases (cat. nos. 1, 2; figs. 1, 2).

4 Fehérvári describes a five-lobed palmette and two dolphins inside the heart-shaped medallion of the Keir ewer; cf. Fehérvári 1976, p. 33. In the case of ewer 5 the completely abstract S-shaped elements flanking the handle appear to have been derived from the dolphin motifs on the other pieces. Melikian-Chirvani, on the other hand, compares them to details found on an apparently eastern Iranian stirrup in the Kabul museum, a
The thumbpieces also vary in appearance. The handle of ewer 1 (fig. 1) is surmounted by an acanthus base intended to receive an unidentifiable rectangular structure. Ewer 2 (fig. 2) features a squat and rounded knob, no. 3 (fig. 3) a grooved and polygonal one. On ewer 4 (fig. 4) the finial is skittle-shaped as mentioned above, while ewer 6 (fig. 5) displays a backwards-curving leaf shape terminating in a small knob resembling a pomegranate.\(^5\)

2. Decoration

In addition to the moulded ornamentation which enhances the spout, neck terminal, handle back and lower handle attachment area of this ewer type, and which contributes to its unique profile, several pieces in this group have incised decoration, which is applied to the body as well as the shoulder plate and the neck.

Thus, on ewer 1 (fig. 1) both the body and the neck are densely covered with incised ornamentation. Around the centre of the body runs a broad architectural frieze, which projects very slightly in its upper half. It consists of six arches, which are enhanced by small circular cavities and rest on large triangular bases, which in their turn are supported by small, obliquely hatched double columns with simple capitals.\(^6\) The soffit of each arch is indicated by a tiny zig-zag pattern. Underneath each arch a large rosette is displayed, which in all but one case is surrounded by a circular frame subdivided into tiny squares with a circle in the centre.\(^7\)

\(^5\) A similar type of thumbpiece can also be observed on several ewers associated with the famous "Baṣra" ewer; cf. ewer type MW 3, chapter 8.

\(^6\) It has been suggested that the deep cavities of the arches may originally have been filled with glass pieces, enamel, precious stones or, probably the most likely medium, with copper discs; cf. Sarre 1934, p. 14; Dimand 1959, p. 348.

\(^7\) The first arch to the left of the handle is framed by a guilloche band.
Below the rosette two sets of three different animal scenes are displayed, i. e.
twice a succession of (1) an addorsed animal pair, (2) an animal carrying a bird and
(3) a single animal. Viewed clockwise from the left of the handle these are (1) a
pair of addorsed rams flanking a central flower, (2) a ram surmounted and
apparently subdued by a bird (of prey ?), (3) a lion or similar quadruped walking to
the left, (4) two addorsed hares or rabbits flanking a central plant motif springing
from a vase, (5) a ram with a small bird on its back and (6) a long-eared quadruped
walking to the right. Each of these scenes is flanked by a jagged and pointed tree
design on either side. Below, the architectural frieze is terminated by a narrow
guilloche and further down by a band of scrollwork. A similar scrolling pattern,
springing from a vase positioned between the second and third arch as seen from the
left of the handle, occurs above the arcading and fills the remaining space between
the latter and the shoulder plate.

The shoulder plate in its turn displays a succession of circular whirling motifs
with slightly recessed circular centres. The remaining spaces in between are filled
with tiny trefoil motifs. The neck, finally, is covered with superposed, densely-
petalled rosette roundels separated by small star motifs consisting of a small
concentric centre flanked on four sides by drop-shaped motifs. In the area behind
the rooster spout this decorative scheme makes way for a plain vertical panel.

Ewer 3 (fig. 3) displays a similar, but simpler architectural frieze on its body,
which, together with the decoration on the neck, is confined to the front of the
vessel. Unlike the frieze on ewer 1 (fig. 1), the arcading on this piece is incised in
a very subtle manner and does not project from the surface in any way. The semi-
circular arches are very thin and plain. They rest on single columns with stylized
acanthus-like capitals. A slender wing design fills their interstices. The area
underneath each arch is filled alternately with a single animal shown in profile
accompanied by small floral motifs or by a composite palmette tree. Above and
below, the arcading is terminated by scrollwork, the upper band containing

8 Fehérvári 1976, p. 28.
individual animal figures including, according to Fehérvári, cock-like birds, the lower one remaining purely floral.

Immediately below the neck collar on the shoulder there are remains of a narrow panel with, as far as I could see, fragments of an archaic Kufic inscription. On the neck vertical bands, separated by plain borders, contain either a scrolling vine stem or a succession of geometric motifs evoking a four-petalled flower with intermediate diamond motifs. All the decorative panels on this ewer are set against a ring-matted background.

Ewer 6 (fig. 5) is the third and last vessel in this group which features an architectural frieze as its principal decorative element on the body. As on ewer 1 (fig. 1) the arches are worked very slightly in relief at the top. Here, they consist of two double bands with small inverted triangles enhancing the upper one and a succession of concentric circles the lower one. The arcading rests on simple columns with abstracted acanthus-like capitals. Each arch contains a different fantastic plant structure not unlike a tree design. Below, this frieze is demarcated by a narrow register of interconnected, broadly drawn lancet leaves. On the upper body the remaining space below the shoulder plate is filled with large leaf-like motifs between the arches and several intermediate details not intelligible from the available photograph.

The shoulder plate seems to receive a kind of scrolling design, while the neck is covered by an array of individual motifs which may originally have been contained within a system of scrollwork. They include a rabbit-like animal in motion, flowers, leaves, remnants of scrolling stems and small, shell-like designs. Finally, incising is again used to enhance the relief palmettes below the handle and to fill the spaces in between the upper and lower section of this design with small flower heads.

9 Ibid.
10 This detail was apparently missed by Fehérvári during his examination of the piece.
The incised ornamentation on the faceted body and neck as well as the handle of ewer 5 (pl. 1) is quite worn. However, it can be made out that the lappets of the body and the remaining surface below were originally densely covered with leafy scrolls, which contained animals in places. The lower terminations of the body facets were apparently emphasised in places by a plaited band as well as vegetal motifs. On the neck each facet receives a vertical succession of inverted heart shapes with a central leaf and additional motifs of a similar nature occupy the spaces created between these panels. The sides of the handle, finally, are enhanced by a simple conventionalized scroll with five-lobed leaves positioned to the right and the left of the stem, alternately.

Further down, additional vegetal detail is engraved on the relief palmettes marking the lower handle attachment area. Ewers 2 and 4 (figs. 2, 4), finally, remain undecorated.

3. Origin, Provenance and Date

The ultimate typological origin of the ewers in this category remains elusive at present, as no pre-Islamic prototypes that could have inspired their unusual profile have as yet been cited - neither from the Hellenistic sphere of the Near East nor the lands of the Sasanian empire.\textsuperscript{11} In the face of such lack of evidence, an analysis of the various structural features and decorative elements that characterize the pieces may help to link them to other pre-Islamic and early Islamic artefacts and subsequently reveal their origin.

\textsuperscript{11} Already in 1959 Dimand established that this ewer type was unknown in the Sassanian era; cf. Dimand 1959, p. 348.
3.1. Structural Features

To start with, it appears that the globular body and the tubular, slightly tapering neck found on ewers 1 and 2 (figs. 1-2) are linked to Romano-Byzantine prototypes executed in glass from the 1st to at least the 5th century A.D. and current in Near Eastern lands at the time (fig. 6). One variety of Roman glass bottle in particular comes closest to the basic shape of those ewers. Its profile, exemplified here by an early 4th-century vessel with tiny blue ovals spaced out all over the body, is characterized by a squat globular body with a flat projecting shoulder plate, a rendering directly comparable to that of the metal vessels (fig. 7).

Even more interesting in this context is the existence of one particular, probably Syrian, 3rd-century glass bottle in the Louvre, which not only reveals a shape closely related to the metal ewers but in addition displays a decorative scheme which seems to anticipate the engraved decoration on the "Marwân" ewer (cat. no. 1; fig. 1) and that of the vessel in the Keir collection (cat. no. 3; fig. 3). Here, as on the Keir vessel, the body is covered by a system of arcading (in this case painted), with each arch here enclosing a Pan or Satyr figure. Above, this design is bordered by scrolling tendrils inhabited by birds (fig. 8).

In addition to these late antique glass vessels at least one, though fragmented, glass flask, again with a body profile virtually identical to that of the metal pieces,
has been attributed to the eastern Mediterranean and dated to the early Islamic period. This attribution, if accurate, is of some significance, as it would indicate that such vessels survived right up to the era when the metal ewers were most probably executed (fig. 9).\(^\text{15}\)

The inverted pear-shaped body profile with tall tubular neck encountered on ewers 3 and 4 (figs. 3, 4) can also be paralleled on Roman glass bottles, such as for example a green translucent vessel datable to ca. 50 - 150 A.D. (fig. 10).\(^\text{16}\)

Ewers 5 & 6 (pl. 1, fig. 5) seem to represent variations on the profiles of ewers 1 - 4 (figs. 1-4) and ultimately share the latter pieces’ typological origin. The petalled body of ewer 5 (pl. 1) is quite unique, but it may be worth mentioning that there are vessels in Coptic art which feature a curiously similar body design. Here, however, the body is facetted below and the upper terminations are worked in relief with a recessed plain shoulder area above, a decorative scheme identical to the one on Ewer 5 (pl. 1) but applied exactly the other way round.\(^\text{17}\)

In addition to the general body and neck profile of the metal ewers discussed here, the peculiar openwork crown which surmounts the latter also deserves some consideration. Visually, this accessory seems strangely unrelated to the remaining structural elements of the vessel and rather gives the impression that it was originally added to the neck as an ornamental afterthought. Allan speculated in this context whether this element could not originally have been a precious metal terminal inlaid with precious stones that was attached to the neck of a glass vessel. This assumption is certainly feasible and it is interesting to observe that special

\(^{15}\) Clairmont 1977, pp. 87-8 no. 288.

\(^{16}\) Harden 1988, p. 119 no. 51. Baer compares the profile of ewers 3 and 4 to another early Islamic ewer type with rounded body and tall cylindrical neck (ewer type MW 4). However, the similarity between both types is of an extremely general nature and does not to my mind justify an assumption of generic links between the two. Perhaps, however, both ewer types originally developed independently from the same type of glass vessel with rounded body and long cylindrical neck; cf. Baer 1983, p. 87. Sokoly points out that the shape of the vessels in this group can be compared in general terms to certain objects unearthed in the Coptic tombs of Ballana and Qustul in Upper Egypt. He particularly mentions one small ewer which, although displaying a wider neck and a different handle, apparently features a body and spout comparable to the pieces under discussion; cf. Sokoly 1990, p. 16; Sokoly’s source is Farid 1963, p. 119 reg. no. 418, pl. XXXVc. I was unable to obtain this book.

\(^{17}\) Emery 1938, pl. 79 no. B 118-8, pl. 78 nos. B 80-73, B 80-74.
attention was already given to the execution of the upper neck termination of certain glass vessels during the Roman period. Thus, the neck of the aforementioned 3rd-century vessel from Syria (fig. 8) appears to display a somewhat demarcated top, indicated by superposed horizontal threads. It is tempting to see this treatment as anticipating the openwork crown which surmounts the neck of the metal ewers discussed here. The concept of a clearly demarcated upper neck section which protrudes from the tall tubular neck below can also be observed on a 4th/5th-century glass bottle from the Roman Near East and on an extremely tall-necked Syrian flask from the same period (fig. 11). 18

A closer look at the decorative elements of which the openwork crown was composed reveals another potential source of inspiration for its design. It appears that the crowns are made up of a succession of axial trees with central stem and two superposed single scrolls on either side. On a monumental scale very similar plant structures, also executed in openwork, can be observed repeatedly among Umayyad stucco window grilles like those from Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī (fig. 12). 19 Why such tree designs should have been chosen for the openwork crown of a metal object remains to be examined.

The last noteworthy aspect of the ewers’ design is the crozier-shaped handle with its remarkable relief decoration on the back, its occasionally beaded edges and its elaborate lower attachment area. 20 Most of its decorative details can again be paralleled on late Roman vessels. Thus, vegetal or figural ornamentation in relief already enhances the handle backs of Roman saucers, amphorae, pitchers and (in this case most relevantly) bronze and silver jugs with solid cast handles of a type

---

18 Saldern 1968, no. 49; Harden 1968, p. 86 no. 118.
19 Sourdel-Thomine and Spuler 1973, figs. 47a-c.
20 It has already been pointed out that ewer 4 features a different handle type which is unique in early Islamic metalwork. Melikian-Chirvani has pointed out that its pearled ring section evokes the ring handles on cups from Central Asia, a point that should be particularly noted as it is known that influences from that area did indeed enter the artistic canon of Umayyad and even more Abbasid art; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 156; Marshak briefly enters into this subject while discussing the small bow design which supports the bird spout on ewer 5 in this group; cf. Marshak 1972, p. 81.
current as early as the 1st century B.C. Many of these handles also display tiny pearl beading identical to that encountered on the Islamic vessels. This can be applied either in addition to the central relief motifs or in some cases instead of them.

The same late antique source of inspiration can be quoted for the treatment of the elaborate lower handle attachments on the Islamic vessels, in particular the small stylized dolphins which flank the lower handles on several of the pieces (cat. nos. 1, 2; figs. 1, 2). These creatures are, as Allan and Baer have pointed out already, typical elements on Roman artefacts throughout the Mediterranean sphere and are a familiar feature in the pre-Islamic arts of Syria and Palestine. At the same time, as far as we can say today, they are virtually unknown on pre-Islamic objects of purely Iranian inspiration.

The closest parallel for this curious detail can again be found in late Roman glass and metalwork. Thus, stylized dolphins of a style very similar to that of the handle ornaments on the ewers form small attachments on a tall cylindrical glass bottle datable to the 2nd half of the 3rd century A.D. and on a small oil jug from the same period discovered in the Sudan (figs. 13 & 14).

Interestingly, objects of the latter type were also executed in metal, a fact that exemplifies a situation where ornamental details such as the dolphin figures could have been transmitted from one medium to the other as well as being freely transferable from one vessel type to another as the need arose.

On ewer 6 (fig. 5) the lower handle is not accompanied by dolphins. A single dolphin, however, occupies the curved-in termination of the upper crozier-shaped handle section. This animal can be closely compared to the handle of an early

---

21 Strong 1966, pp. 140-2, pl. 39 A/B; Tarbell 1912, pl. LXXIX centre and below; Radnoti 1938, pls. XL no. 3a, XLI nos. 2 & 2a, XLIII no. 2.
22 Tarbell 1912, pls. LXXIX centre, LXXXVII below right. The thumbpieces of ewers 1 and 5 were also linked with Hellenistic traditions; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 147, 151.
24 Harden 1988, pp. 201 no 110, 202 no. 111.
Islamic 8th-century bird aquamanile which is preserved in the Islamic Museum in Berlin and is probably attributable to Iraq or north-western Iran.\(^6\)

The elaborate palmette designs executed in relief below the lower handle attachment area can be compared quite closely to the fantastic palmette designs among the mosaics adorning the Dome of the Rock, the Aqṣa Mosque in Jerusalem and the Great Mosque of Damascus.\(^7\)

The last characteristic structural element in the ewers’ design is at the same time its most enigmantic one. This is the **bird spout**. So far I have been unable to find any directly related prototypes for this spout type. However, there is evidence that in the ancient Near East body spouts were at times endowed with zoomorphic or ornithomorphic characteristics. Thus a squat bronze vessel from Sumerian times features an S-shaped tubular body spout, which has its tip enhanced by an incised animal head (fig. 15).\(^8\)

From the 9th or 8th century B.C. dates a terracotta jug found in Sakkiz (Azerbaijdān), which clearly imitates a metal prototype. This piece again features an S-shaped body spout, which here, however, has been rendered as the upper half of an animal, identified by Bussagli as a stylized goose (fig. 16).\(^9\) Admittedly, such pieces are very far removed in time from the pieces under discussion here, but it is not impossible that such early artistic conventions of spout treatment actually survived in some form up to the early centuries of Islamic rule.\(^10\)

---

\(^{26}\) Sokoly 1990, p. 15.

\(^{27}\) Allan 1976, Vol. 1, p. 220. Melikian-Chirvani on a more general note points out that the palmette designs reflect Hellenistic traditions; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 157-158. Indeed, similar palmette designs occur for example on several Roman vessels; cf. Pernice 1925, pl. VI, p. 27 fig. 38, p. 28 fig. 39; cf. also Finster 1970-1, p. 90 fig. 21, p. 100, fig. 41, p. 101 fig. 43, p. 102 fig. 44 for examples of similar plant structures in the Great Mosque of Damascus (705-715). Dimand likens the relief motifs to Sasanian stucco from Kish, Ctesiphon and Nizāmābād. He also notes that such ornamentation was also popular in woodwork and Qur’ān illuminations of the 8th and 9th centuries, without, however, giving specific examples; cf. Dimand 1959, p. 348.

\(^{28}\) Davidson 1992, p. 22.

\(^{29}\) Bussagli 1956, p. 123 no. 204, pl. XXVI-204.

\(^{30}\) There is at least one indication at present that this hypothesis has some truth in it. Most recently, a small metal ewer of rather unusual shape, characterized by a globular body on three tall legs, a broad and faceted cylindrical neck, an angular looped handle and, most interestingly in this context, a tubular body spout ending in an animal head, has been excavated at the late 8th/early 9th-century site of Umm al-Walīd, situated to the south-
If one analyses the construction of the spouts on the ewers in this category, they basically consist of a short, obliquely rising tube surmounted by a hollow bird figure with the opened beak serving as the pouring aperture. A tubular body spout as such is not unusual on early Islamic ewers and occurs on several vessels of varying shape, all of which have been associated with Near Eastern and eastern Mediterranean lands rather than Iran (cf. ewer types EMW 3 and EMW 4, chapters 3 and 4).31

As for the bird sculptures, ewers 1 - 4 (figs. 1-4) display a naturalistically rendered rooster, ewer 5 (pl. 1) an apparently hybrid creature with feline, ornithomorphic and aquatic features and ewer 6 (fig. 5) a bird of prey not unlike an eagle or vulture. The cock figures encountered on ewers 1 - 4 (figs. 1-4) have been related to the artistic traditions of Sasanian Iran and Dimand in particular regards them as "skillfully modelled in the best tradition of Sasanian art".32

In fact the naturalistic depiction of a domestic rooster in the pre-Islamic and early Islamic arts of Iran and Central Asia is at best very rare indeed. If a cock does occur, it is always rendered in a static and abstracted mode which more often than not makes a zoological identification of the bird all but impossible.33

A few examples may suffice to highlight such observations. One of the earliest examples of the depiction of a cock in ancient Iranian art can be found on two bronze statuettes from Luristan, one depicting Ashi, the goddess of fertility, and the other Sraosha, the god of justice (figs. 17 & 18). Both figurines are flanked by cock heads, which are treated in a perfectly abstract manner that defines the bird just enough to allow its identification.34

Another early example of the cock in eastern art comes from the Pazyryk kurgan in the Altai mountains and dates from the 5th century B.C. Both objects are leather

31 Body spouts can also be observed among early Islamic pottery objects excavated in the region; cf. Hagedorn 1989, p. 29; Grabar 1978, Vol. 2, pp. 158-9, pl. B no 16, pp. 130-1, pl. A1 nos. 15-16; Baramki 1940, p. 101 fig. 15.1
33 See in this context the discussion between Pfister and Picard regarding the identification of Sassanian cocks; cf. Picard 1938, Pfister 1939.
34 László 1974, pp. 124, 125 figs. 70-1.
fragments and show very stylized depictions of a rooster, which, according to the catalogue entry, found their way into the local artistic repertoire probably through Iranian influence (fig. 19).35

From the same period comes a small gold plaque with a rooster, probably intended to be attached to a piece of clothing. This piece, however, was executed much further to the west in the heartlands of Scythian rule situated to the north and north-east of the Black Sea. It reveals clear Greek influences. Here, the cock, though shown in an unnatural, curled-up position typical of Scythian taste, is rendered in a much more naturalistic and life-like manner than its counterpart from the Altai (fig. 20). The same treatment can be observed a century later on the hilt of a gold scabbard again executed by Scythian goldsmiths (fig. 21).36

In Sasanian art the depiction of the domestic rooster appears to be virtually unknown.37 In general, birds referred to as cocks show little resemblance to domestic fowl, but rather evoke pheasants, peacocks and other related species. In all cases these birds are depicted in a completely abstract and static manner, with accessories such as pearl necklaces or garland-like bands in their beak, which remove them from a realistic context and give them clearly symbolic implications well in line with the cock’s sacred status in ancient Iranian thought (fig. 22).38

In the arts of early Islamic Iran roosters can be found, but again their execution is generally stylized and lacks the naturalism typical of the cocks on the ewer spouts. Thus on possibly 9th-century ‘Abbāsid textiles, for example, the figures of a cock clearly resemble Sasanian conventions in their static treatment and the addition of pearl necklaces.39 In the 10th century, finally, a majestic cock in a very similar

35 New York 1976, p. 120 nos. 121/122, no. 123.
37 So far I have only been able to trace naturally drawn cock images on Arsacid and Sasanian seals and in one instance on a stucco fragment; cf. Herzfeld 1927, p. 53 fig. 36: last bird in the first row and third bird in the third row; Pope 1938, pl. 177B (this bird could also be interpreted as a peacock).
38 Pfister 1938 for a discussion of Sassanian cocks on textiles; Picard 1938 for a discussion regarding the identification of Sassanian cocks; Pfister 1939 for a response to the latter article.
39 Kühnel 1957, p. 367, pl. 1 figs 1-4. The small cock depicted in the centre of a fragmented lustre tile from Sāmarrā’ seems to show a synthesis of western and eastern styles in that its
style still appears on the famous "Suaira de St. Josse", a textile attributed to Khuräsan (fig. 23).  

Similar cocks also appear in Islamic Iranian metalwork, but unfortunately none seem to survive from the very early Islamic period. One small cock-like statue in bronze has been dated to 10th-century eastern Iran and a very similar piece to 12th/13th-century Iran. Both objects carry a small round terminal at the end of their beak, thus clearly recalling the rings and garlands carried by Sasanian birds. Their bodies are engraved with floral ornament. Both these aspects as well as the general treatment of these birds have little in common with the animated naturalism evident in the cock spouts under discussion here, but seem to hark back directly to the cock figures from the Altai, with which our brief survey began (fig. 24).  

Such observations regarding the depiction of the cock in ancient and early Islamic Iran make it more likely that, as Grube has pointed out, the rooster spouts on the ewers discussed here have their roots in the Hellenistic tradition of animal representation, which was known all over the Near Eastern lands, including Egypt and Syria.

In fact naturalistic representations of the domestic rooster can already be found in ancient Mesopotamia, where it appears for example on a box from the 13th century B.C. (fig. 25), and in Pharaonic Egypt. Here it occurs as early as the 15th-12th

overall appearance is close to the above-mentioned contemporary textiles, but its detailing and the fact that its body is turned slightly towards the beholder to reveal the right wing seem to reveal a certain naturalism inherent in the Near Eastern world; cf. Berlin 1979, p. 53 no. 161, pl. 36; Sarre 1934, p. 13.
40 Paris 1977, p. 65 no. 51; Bernus, Marchal and Vial 1971.
42 Grube is cited by Melikian-Chirvani in his thesis, but I was unable to find the actual reference on the microfiche at my disposal; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 146; Baer 1983, pp. 86-7. Dimand regards the crowing rooster spout as of strongly Sasanian character but gives no evidence for his statement; cf. Dimand 1941, p. 203. It should also be mentioned in this context that ewers with body spouts ending in a cock's head also existed in 4th- and 5th-century Chinese pottery. However, the overall shape of these vessels is very different from the objects discussed here, and it appears that the Chinese ewers were used primarily for funerary purposes; cf. Medley 1976, p. 64, fig. 40, p. 69, fig. 44.
43 Moortgart 1985, p. 76 fig. 34, pl. 37; Stevenson-Smith 1965, fig. 40; Haller 1954, p. 135 no. 6, fig. 161. Peters in addition mentions the depiction of a cock as a finial on two bow heads, found on a bas relief from the palace of Sennacherib, ascribed to the 7th century B.C.: Peters 1913, p. 392. Howard Carter, as well as Peters, mention cock representations
century B.C. on a limestone ostracon excavated in Thebes (fig. 26). In the Greek world from at least the 7th century B.C. onwards representations of the cock abound on artefacts as well as coins. A small bronze cock, which incidentally (although less animated) comes quite close in style to the spout of ewer 2 (fig. 2), comes from Cyprus and has been tentatively dated to the early 6th century B.C. (fig. 27).

In Syria the earliest representation of the cock, dated to the 2nd century B.C., can, according to Peters, be found on the outer face of a door post leading to the inner chamber of a tomb at Marissa. Interestingly, in this depiction the cock seems to be preparing to crow. Again from Egypt comes a fragmented mosaic roundel, which was discovered on the ground of the great hall of the bath belonging to the Cleopatreion d’Ariston of Kom Trouga (Markaz Abū’l-Mātāmīr) and has been attributed to the Greco-Roman period (fig. 28). It depicts a naturalistically drawn rooster flanked by birds and flower motifs. Another cock statuette, executed in clay, was executed by Coptic artists according to Grünwiesen (fig. 29).

To summarize the evidence, it appears that the stylistic treatment of the cock statuettes surmounting the spouts on ewers 1 - 4 (figs. 1-4) reveals clearly traceable links with pre-Islamic cock representations from Egypt and the Near East. It is also

also on New Babylonian seals and some probably from the Achaemenid period; cf. Carter 1923, p. 3; Peters 1913, p. 394.

Carter 1923, pp. 1-4. There is some argument about the earliest depiction of the cock in Egypt, and despite Carter’s early dating of the ostracon mentioned here, more conservative scholars seem to prefer dating the first pictorial occurrence of the cock to Ptolemaic times; cf. Nauert 1986, col. 361. It is interesting to note here that apparently, according to Carter, whole vessels were sometimes shaped in the form of a cock or at least as a cock’s head. Thus a metal vase of rhyton type fashioned as a cock-like bird head appears among tribute depicted on one of the chapel walls of a vizier serving under Tuthmosis III (15th century B.C.). Red pottery vessels shaped as cocks probably date from the Ptolemaic period (4th-1st century B.C.); cf. Carter 1923, p. 4.

Peters 1913, pp. 380, 382.

Richter 1915, p. 47 no. 73. Carter reports the existence of another small bronze figure of a cock in the British Museum, which, according to him, is in all likelihood to be attributed to the Parthian period and says it shows classical influence; cf. Carter 1923, p. 3.

Peters 1913, p. 386.

Cairo 1982, p. 231 no. 6367A, p. 232 fig. 6367A.

Grünwiesen 1922, pl. VI.8.
in clear contrast to the artistic conventions expressed in ancient and more or less contemporary cock images from Iran and Central Asia.

As for the birds which replace the cock on ewers 5 & 6 (pl. 1, fig. 5), their zoological identification is more difficult. In the case of ewer 5 (pl. 1) the bird rather appears to be of a fantastic nature with feline-like head and ears, a bird’s wings and fin-like legs. The figure on ewer 6 (fig. 5) resembles a bird of prey with its somewhat fierce aspect. Both birds seem to recall the profile of two early Islamic bird aquamaniles, one of which has most recently been attributed (though with caution) to 8th-century Iraq (fig. 30), while the other one, now housed in the Islamic Museum in Berlin, was likewise dated to the 8th century but attributed to north-western Iran (fig. 31).

To sum up the observations made above, it appears that, as far as the structural elements of the ewers in this category are concerned, each one of them reveals generic links with Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine artefacts as well as certain early Islamic vessels with mainly Near Eastern associations.

An examination of the engraved decoration which enhances the ewers’ bodies and neck is the next step in an attempt to consolidate the evidence assembled so far.

3.2. Decorative Features

Among the four decorated pieces in this category (cat. nos. 1, 3, 5, 6; figs. 1, 3, pl. 1, fig. 5) three display a system of arcading enclosing the body. Underneath each arch various motifs can occur, such as a large rosette with animal scenes flanked by trees below in the case of no. 1 (fig. 1), alternating palmette trees and

---

50 Kuwait 1990, p. 21 no. 1 (p. 10. no. 1); Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 150-1. According to Dimand the bird in the Hermitage was found in the Caucasus, but unfortunately he does not give the evidence for this assertion; cf. Dimand 1959, p. 349.
51 Berlin 1979, p. 70 no. 234, pl. 41.
long-eared quadrupeds on no. 3 (fig. 3) and fantastic tree-like plant compositions on no. 6 (fig. 5).

As regards this preference for arcading as a decorative device, King in a recent study elaborated on the importance of the architectural frieze in early Islamic decoration and pointed out that this motif has its roots in the arts of the classical and Hellenistic world of the Mediterranean as well as those of Sassanian Iran. In early Islamic times it occurs regularly in Umayyad art and architecture. Thus, arcading can be found among the repoussé bronze panels attached above the west entrance and the octagonal arcade of the Dome of the Rock, which was built in 691. Similar, though here three-dimensional, arcading adorns the gateway of several Umayyad castles located in Syria, such as Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī (724-7), Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Sharqī (728-9) and Khirbat al-Mafjar (ca. 743). In early Islamic minor arts arcading is frequently used to adorn pottery and metalwork as well as early Islamic Qurʾān illumination. Considering the obvious popularity of the architectural frieze over a large geographical area from pre-Islamic times onwards, this motif in itself cannot yield any decisive evidence as to the vessels’ provenance. However, if one considers the arcading in conjunction with the decorative motifs underneath the arches, the allover scheme allows a more fruitful analysis.

On ewer 1 (fig. 1) each arch encloses a large rosette above and either a single animal or scenes of paired animals flanked by stylized pointed trees below. On a

---

52 King 1982, pp. 23-9. It is interesting in this context to note Orbeli’s statement that on pre-Islamic glass from Syria arcading could sometimes be rendered in high relief in a fashion similar to Sassanian silver vessels, thus recalling the slightly raised arcades on ewer 1 and 6; cf. Orbeli 1938, p. 742.
53 King 1982, p. 26; Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 149; for miniature arcading from Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī see also Sourdrel-Thomine and Spuler 1973, fig. 47c (this example has to be viewed with some caution, though, as it has recently been argued that the latter may actually be later work. This point was communicated to me by Professor Robert Hillenbrand).
54 For arcading on another type of early Islamic bronze ewer cf. ewer type MW 1/4. For an architectural frieze on a possibly 8th-century bronze tray see Pope 1938, pl. 237; Fehérvári 1976, p. 28. For a 9th-century example see Rice 1984, p. 38 fig. 31: pottery cover from Sūsa with moulded system of arcading enclosing rosettes on the top. This piece is interesting as its decoration shows certain similarities to that found on ewer 1 in this group; Sokoly 1990, p. 14; Sarre 1934, p. 14 note 10; for arcading in early Islamic Qurʾān illumination see Moritz 1905, pls. 1, 2, 5, 6, 11 as examples.
monumental scale, a somewhat comparable decorative scheme can be observed, although executed in a much more elaborate and intricate fashion, on the façade of the palace at Mshatta, executed around 743 A.D. Here large triangles likewise contain a rosette with various animal scenes below and additional scrolls filling the remaining space. Apart from such admittedly general similarities between the limestone ornamentation of Mshatta and ewer 1 (fig. 1) it is in contemporary metalwork that the closest stylistic parallel for the vessel’s decoration can be found, i.e. on the aforementioned bird aquamanile in Berlin attributed to north-western Iran and dated to the late 8th century (fig. 31). The bird is completely covered with intricately incised motifs consisting of scrollwork on the lower parts of the body, rosettes and half-rosettes on the wings and the lower neck and medallions with representations of hares or rabbits. Small flowers and single rabbits fill the remaining space (fig. 32). Here, one can observe not only very similar rosette designs, enclosed by interlacing guilloche bands as in the case of at least one of the rosettes on the ewer, but also a closely related style of scroll with animals (particularly hares or rabbits) interspersed within. Interestingly, this object in its turn shows close stylistic links with another bird aquamanile, now in the Hermitage, which was attributed most recently to 8th-century Iraq.

55 Rice 1984, p. 21 fig. 12; Dimand 1937, fig. 59. Rosettes with all their infinite variations were very popular in rural Palestine and Syria from long before the advent of Islam. In these lands they appear repeatedly on churches, synagogues and private houses as well as in ossuary design; cf. Avi-Yonah 1950, pp. 58-75 for an extensive discussion of this point and numerous pictorial examples. Melikian-Chirvani, on the other hand, relates the rosette motif on the ewer to stylized marguerite blossoms common in Iran since antiquity, without however, as far as I could see, giving any specific examples; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 148.


57 It is most interesting in this context to point out that a very similar rosette to that on the ewer serves as the ornamental initial O in a 9th-century Coptic manuscript concerned with the life of the martyr Miḥri Elīs of Ahnas. Significantly, this rosette is accompanied by simple plant motifs and a single rabbit, which is very close in style to those found on the ewer; cf. Cramer 1959, p. 32 fig. 15, p. 38. On the other hand it has to be noted that similar rosettes can also be found in the stucco decoration at Varakhshā near Bukhāra in Central Asia; cf. Shishkin 1963, fig. 93.

As for the whirling roundels on the ewer's shoulder they are, according to Frantz, a common feature in Syrian art and can also occur, though apparently very rarely, in early Byzantine book illumination.\(^59\) The rosettes on the neck, finally, seem to represent an abstracted version of certain flower heads found on late Sasanian silverware and among the stone reliefs of Tāq-i Bustān, while the layout of the neck's ornamentation - a system of large roundels with tiny intermediary motifs - can be quite closely paralleled in the decorative sura headers of certain Qur'āns datable to the 8th and 9th centuries.\(^60\)

On ewer 3 (fig. 3) the architectural frieze is much simplified and incised in a much less prominent manner that that on ewer 1 (fig. 1). Between the arches, small wing designs on tall stems can be observed. Arcading with superposed wing motifs can again be found in early Islamic Qur'āns, where, however, the wing motifs are much larger in proportion to the arcing below and are placed not between each arch but at longer intervals.\(^61\) In architectural ornament similar motifs occur as well, as for example on a gilded frieze which runs above the marble panels covering the interior of the outer wall of the octagon in the Dome of the Rock.\(^62\)

The motifs enclosed by the arches also differ entirely from those encountered on ewer 1 (fig. 1), with individual animal figures and fantastic tree structures filling each alternative space. While the latter can again be compared to the above-mentioned frieze in the Dome of the Rock, where similar yet slightly more elaborate plants occur, the source for the animal figures must be sought elsewhere.\(^63\)

---

59 Frantz 1934, p. 57, pl. IX fig. 24. For a discussion of the whirling motif in Palestine during the Roman and Byzantine periods see also Avi-Yonah 1950, pp. 73-4.
60 Herzfeld 1927, p. 70 figs. 10, 17; Moritz 1905, pls. 25, 28. Similar decorative systems with large roundels separated by small filler motifs also occur in Byzantine book illumination before the 10th century A.D.; cf. Frantz 1934, p. 56, pl. IX figs. 3 & 4. It may be interesting to mention in this context that Ettinghausen considered the rosette in pre- and early Islamic art as a motif with royal and possibly divine associations; cf. Ettinghausen 1972, p. 38.
61 Moritz 1905, pls. 1, 2.
62 Flood 1990-2, p. 76 fig. 10, p. 77.
63 Melikian-Chirvani compares the palmettes on the Keir ewer to similar motifs found in the Aqṣā mosque. However, these plant motifs or tree structures are much more
One particular creature among them is of particular interest (fig. 3). It is rendered as a long-legged quadruped with straight front legs and curiously bent, inward-pointing hind-quarters. Its neck is of exaggerated length in proportion to the body size and its head is surmounted by long and pointed ears. A creature of very similar appearance, but executed in bronze as a statuette fully in the round, is preserved in the Völkerkundemuseum in Munich and was attributed to Fātimid Egypt (fig. 33). Apart from the antlers that identify this animal as a stag, its all over appearance and especially the inward-curving legs, the extremely tall neck and the long pointed ears are rendered in an identical fashion.

The scrollwork which fills the remaining space of the body above and below the architectural frieze is rendered in very similar fashion both times, with the exception that the scroll on the shoulder contains a single animal figure in each loop. Similar animal scrolls can be cited among the 9th-century wall paintings from Sāmarra and also occur later in Fātimid wood carving as well as on a 10th-century ivory casket from Spain.

The design on the neck is made up of rectangular panels with alternating geometric and naturalistic designs. A similar decorative layout can already be observed on a Coptic column shaft from Saqqāra, datable to the 5th or 6th century A.D. (fig. 34). Here, vertical panels with vine scrolls and geometric patterns alternate in similar fashion with additional narrow demarcation panels in between.

As for the types of vine scroll and geometric design employed, Fehérvári likened the vine scrolls to those found on the faceted body of the famous "Baṣra" ewer which was executed in the 8th or 9th century, while the continuous pattern of abstract, four-petalled flowers with small intermediate diamond motifs has its roots naturalistic and elaborate in their execution; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 158; Hassan 1956, p. 99 fig. 310.

64 Hassan 1956, p. 148 fig. 450.
65 Herzfeld 1927, p. 61 fig. 45; Hassan 1956, p. 277 fig. 822, p. 110 fig. 340, p. 142 fig. 423.
66 Grabar 1967a, p. 268 fig. 309, p. 404 no. 309.
67 Fehérvári 1976, p. 28; Marshak 1972, fig. 4.2. Melikian-Chirvani considers the vine on the Keir ewer as strongly Iranian, but gives no reason for this statement; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, p. 159.
in Hellenistic art and can for example be paralleled among the border designs of an early 6th-century Greek manuscript (fig. 35).\(^6^8\)

Finally, a technical aspect of the ornamentation on ewer 3 (fig. 3) needs to be discussed here, i.e. the punch-dotting chosen to enhance the background of all the decorative motifs applied on this piece. Melikian-Chirvani considered this detail as an indication for the ewer’s origin from eastern Iran, as this background treatment is typical for pre-Islamic metalwork from that region, particularly from Soghd.\(^6^9\)

However, the technique of punch-dotting the background of a design was also known in the West in pre-Islamic times, where it can be found for example on certain Roman bronze vessels.\(^7^0\) Consequently, this particular detail should not be overestimated as an indicator for an object’s origin. It has to be considered in conjunction with the evidence derived from other aspects of the vessel’s appearance, i.e. its profile and decorative elements. In the case of the Keir ewer, then, the presence of punch-dotted backgrounds does not suffice to negate the evidence provided by the vessel’s shape, which clearly relates it to Romano-Byzantine glass and metal ware, and its decorative elements which show close links with the artistic conventions current in the Islamic Near East from Umayyad up to Fatimid times.\(^7^1\)

The third and last vessel in this group which shows arcading as its main decorative feature is ewer 6 (fig. 5). Unfortunately, the ornamentation is very worn and therefore allows only general remarks rather than a more detailed analysis of its individual elements. The various tree-like plant designs displayed underneath each arch appear like very degenerated versions of the numerous tree designs met with in Umayyad stucco, woodwork and other media.\(^7^2\)

---

68 Frantz 1934, pl. VII fig. 1.
69 Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 61, 158-9.
70 Cf. Radnoti 1938, pl. XLV.2a. See also comments made in chapter 8, footnote 136.
71 Another aid in determining the vessel’s provenance as well as its dating may be the group of Kufic letters which can still be made out on its shoulder. Their characteristic triangular terminations can for example be paralleled in certain early Islamic Qur’āns; cf. Moritz 1905, pl. 13.
72 Cf. Flood 1990-2, p. 78 fig. 12. At present it cannot be established whether the degenerated appearance of the tree designs is due to the technical inability of the artist or due to the fact that the vessel was executed at a time somewhat removed from the Umayyad period. This question will need further discussion.
Among the scattered motifs on the neck, the small rabbit recalls similar animals on ewer 1 (fig. 1) as well as on the 8th-century bird vessel in Berlin (fig. 31). The small shell-like motifs, on the other hand, resemble similar, though obviously much larger, leaf motifs on the soffits of certain arches in the Dome of the Rock (fig. 36).  

The dense overall scrollwork on ewer 5 (pl. 1) has been compared to a probably 7th-century ivory pyxis in the Berlin Museum of Islamic Art, but the treatment of the former is less detailed and naturalistic. A closer parallel can in fact be cited around the lower body of ewer 1 (fig. 1), where very similar five-lobed leaves are employed. The heart-shaped designs on the neck facets have their roots in Classical art. They also appear in Sasanian art and it is from here, according to Frantz, that the motif seems to have entered Byzantine decoration. In early Islamic art they can again be observed among the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock.

To summarize the various pieces of evidence assembled above, it appears that the ewers of this group, from a purely structural point of view, have close generic links with Romano-Byzantine glass and metal ware as well as certain pre-Islamic artefacts from Egypt and Mesopotamia. In addition certain details of the relief and openwork decoration and most importantly the incised ornamentation on the vessels are firmly rooted in Umayyad art.

If one were to attempt a chronological order within the group it might be suggested that ewer 1 and ewer 2 (figs. 1-2), because of its close structural links with the former, are the oldest pieces, considering the elaborate treatment of the structural elements and the incised decoration. The decoration places ewer 1 (fig. 1)

---

73 Creswell 1979, Vol. 1, Part 1, pl. 11b, pl. 23e.
74 Sokoly 1990, pp. 14-15; Berlin 1979, p. 47 no. 130, pl. 32.
75 Frantz 1934, pp. 62-3. According to Sokoly the feature was also quite common in the early Islamic arts of Egypt, where it occurs on metal mirrors, book bindings and wood carvings. However, he does not cite specific examples to support this claim; cf. Sokoly 1990, p. 15.
76 Creswell 1979, Vol. 1, Part 1, pls. 10a, 11a, 12a-c, 24c as examples.
in close relationship with the bird figure in the Berlin Museum (fig. 31) and its dated counterpart in the Hermitage (fig. 30). Accordingly, a dating to the late 8th or early 9th century may be put forward for the first two ewers in this group.\(^7\)

As for their place of manufacture, the close iconographic reliance of ewer 1 (fig. 1) on the arts of the Umayyads suggests a Syrian provenance. However, the fact that the closely related bird vessels have been attributed to Iraq and north-western Iran respectively should not be overlooked, and therefore such an origin may deserve equal consideration.\(^8\) The same provenance may also apply, in general terms, to ewers 5 and 6 (pl. 1, fig. 5), which, as has been pointed out, feature bird spouts that are very similar in appearance to the bird vessels mentioned above. In addition they show certain iconographic links with the latter as well as with ewer 1 (fig. 1) and stylistically related artefacts from the Umayyad era. However, their unique body profiles set them clearly apart from the other pieces as well as from each other, and it seems most likely that they were manufactured in other workshops within the same geographical sphere, active either during the late 8th/early 9th centuries or - if one were to interpret their appearance as a deteriorated version of the other ewers - at a somewhat later date.

Ewers 3 and 4 (figs. 3-4) seem to have been manufactured further to the west and again at a slightly later date. This assumption is based firstly on the much more careless and somewhat degenerated treatment of the cock spout, the openwork section and the relief decoration enhancing the handle. Secondly, the incised decoration on ewer 3 (fig. 3) was shown to reveal links with the art of 9th-century Sāmarrā,\(^5\) Fāṭimīd art and even certain artefacts from 10th-century Spain. Accordingly, a dating between the late 9th and perhaps the 11th century may be put forward here as a basis for further research. As for the provenance, Egypt may be

\(^7\) This dating was already suggested by several other scholars previously dealing with the objects discussed here; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 147, 150; Marshak 1972, p. 81; Allan 1976, Vol. 1, p. 220.

\(^8\) This attribution was already put forward by Allan in 1976; cf. Allan 1976, Vol. 1, p. 220.
considered as the most likely place of origin, if the ewer’s artistic links with Fatimíd art are anything to go by.\textsuperscript{79}

To sum up, it appears that the vessels assembled in this category were produced in eastern Mediterranean lands some time between the late 8th and perhaps the 11th century. An Iranian provenance for the group, which has sometimes been advocated, appears highly unlikely in view of the evidence presented in this chapter and can now be rejected.\textsuperscript{80}

4. Function

At present nothing is known about the original use of the vessels of this category, neither has any attempt been made as yet to examine any potential evidence provided by the pieces themselves which might yield clues as to their function. This is surprising, as the artistic complexity and individuality of their design is striking and remains unparalleled in Islamic metalwork. Moreover, their scarcity suggests that this ewer type may not have been in general use among large sections of early Islamic society for daily tasks, but may have had a more specific and limited purpose in a clearly defined cultural setting. An assessment of the ewers’ most outstanding features may help to clarify such use.

Undoubtedly the most revealing detail of this ewer type is the bird spout, rendered as a crowing rooster in the majority of cases (ewers 1-4; figs. 1-4) and birds of prey in the case of ewers 5 and 6 (pl. 1, fig. 5), the former of which appears to be of hybrid nature. To start with the choice of the rooster, it appears

\textsuperscript{79} Fehérvári speculated that if the dolphins adorning the handle are interpreted as sea horses, the pieces of this group may have been executed in Alexandria, as those creatures were associated with that city; cf. Fehérvári 1976, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{80} Cf. Melikian-Chirvani, who notes the pieces’ links with the Umayyad arts of Syria but eventually concludes that they are of Khurásánían origin, without, however, giving any comprehensive evidence for that attribution; cf. Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, pp. 160, 177-178, 180; in Sourdel-Thomine and Spuler 1973 the same author is more cautious and concedes that the Iranian origin of the ewers is by no means certain and notes that a Syrian provenance may even be more likely; cf. op. cit., pp. 186-7 no. 70.
quite deliberate and was certainly not undertaken for purely decorative purposes. Any animal could have served that purpose, and indeed there are many creatures, real and imaginary, that were much more popular in early Islamic art, including lions, gazelles, sphinxes, harpies and generalized bird figures.

Perhaps the rooster was chosen to surmount the spout because its presence was significant either with regard to the liquid contained within the vessel or with regard to the specific context in which such ewers were to be used. The cock’s symbolic significance in early Islamic as well as pre-Islamic times will therefore require analysis.

Coming originally from India the cock first reached Iranian lands sometime between the 11th and 8th century B.C. Here it subsequently acquired a role of greatest importance in ancient Persian religion, a fact borne out by its frequent appearance in Zoroastrian literature. Its religious name was Parodash, i. e. the foreseer of dawn, who lifts his voice to scare away the evil of darkness and announces the approach of a new day. Created by God to fight the demons of idleness, the cock was seen as a bird of the sun and light in general and stood for righteousness and ultimate resurrection.

From Persia the cock was transmitted via Mesopotamia, where it was apparently also considered as a sacred bird associated with the gods, to Greek lands probably sometime between the 7th or 6th century B.C. The Greeks valued the cock mainly as a fighting bird, but nevertheless, it was also frequently associated with various gods. Most importantly, perhaps through Persian influence, it became sacred to Apollo as the herald of the sun. Its solar associations also led to the popular belief in its apotropaic and health-dispensing qualities. Accordingly, it was sacrificed to Aesculapius. The Greeks also saw the cock as a bird of resurrection, and as such it can be found repeatedly on contemporary tombs. In more general

---

82 Peters 1913, p. 378; Orbeli 1938, p. 766; Sarre 1934, p. 13.
84 Nauerth 1986, col. 367; Cirlot 1962, p. 49.
85 Peters 1913, p. 381.
terms, popular superstition saw the cock as a good omen and it was therefore frequently slaughtered in the hope of averting evil.86

From Greece the cock was introduced to Italy, where it is again revered as a sacred bird with solar characteristics and as a symbol of resurrection.87 Down to Roman times the cock retains its symbolic significance and apotropaic character, which made it a potent talisman against the evil eye.88 Its crow signified the end of the evils of the night and scared the demons away. In the early hours of the morning sacrifice was given to Jupiter before the cock crowed for the second time. Other gods such as Mercury and more significantly the solar god Mithras were likewise associated with this bird.89

By the third century B.C. the cock had become known in Palestine, and it is from early Jewish sources that the bird’s importance in this particular area can be assessed most comprehensively. Thus, according to Jewish apocryphal literature the phoenix, which is situated in the third heaven, rustles its wings before dawn to alert the cocks of the sunrise. These then in their turn announce the approach of a new day to the world by their crowing.90 In the 1st century A.D. the Talmud mentions a custom common in Palestine at the time, according to which a cock and hen had to be present at a wedding celebration, a concrete example of popular belief in their apotropaic and evil-averting properties as well as their importance as fertility symbols.91

With the rise of Christianity in the eastern Mediterranean many of the ancient traditions regarding the sacred nature of the cock were absorbed into the new religion and partly adapted to fit into new religious contexts.92 In Christian thought

87 Peters 1913, pp. 383-4.
90 This tradition may reflect Persian influence; cf. Peters 1913, p. 370.
91 Ibid.
92 One interesting piece of evidence exemplifying such a transformation of meaning from pagan to Christian symbol involves the motif of the cock on the column which originally accompanied Greek depictions of athletic events and eventually became an integral part of many Christian images of Christ’s betrayal by Peter; cf. Callisen 1939 for a discussion of this motif.
the cock’s crow came to symbolize the arrival of the light of Christ and his victory over the demons of darkness. It also heralds the resurrection of the Lord and thus, ultimately, that of all true believers. The cock’s most famous role, however, is eternalized in the writings of the New Testament. Here, it is the bird of conscience which makes Peter realize the sin of his treason and consequently leads him from the sin of his denial to recognizing the truth of his master’s message.

In Islamic tradition, finally, similar reverence is given to the cock. Popular folklore revered both the white cockerel and the ordinary coloured rooster as sacred and magical birds and their crowing was received with delight. Al-Jāhiz reports in the 9th century A.D. that the devil will not enter a house if a white cockerel can be found there and, indeed, the bird’s apotropaic powers were considered strong enough not only to avert evil from its own home but from seven more houses surrounding it. Its ability to announce dawn and the rising of the sun made it a symbol of the sun and light in popular thought - just as in the earlier traditions of the Iranian, Greek and Hellenistic world.

On a religious level several hadīths refer to the cock and its outstanding importance and popularity, even in the eyes of God himself. He was believed to have created the rooster - adorned with pearls and precious stones - to sit under his throne with its head bent. Its wings were spread out towards the East and the West and its feet rested on the earth. At the end of the night it spreads its wings and crows in the name of God. This crow is heard by all the roosters of the world which then respond and echo the heavenly bird to announce the new day and the hour of prayer. Only on the day of resurrection will God order the cock to take in its

93 Leclercq 1914, columns 2886-7; Nauerth 1986, col. 364.
95 Daneshvari 1986, pp. 58, 60.
97 Op. cit., pp. 58-60; Badiee 1978, pp. 198-9; Kopf 1965, p. 275; Wensinck 1921, pp. 36ff. A depiction of this divine cock can be found for example in a 15th-century manuscript of the Mi’rajnāme which was executed in Herat by Malik Bakhshī (fol. 11r); cf. Séguy 1977, p. 46, pl. 9.
wings and lower its voice in order to let the inhabitants of heaven and earth know that the last hour is near.98

Such cosmological legends yet again stress the cock’s solar connotations - not least by the description of the position of its wings. They also use the cock as a symbol of the world as a whole, when they speak of the bird reaching from the earth to the highest heavens. Indeed, some cosmological sources actually state that the earth was created in the form of a bird.99 The Prophet was also said to have been fond of the cock and kept such birds in his house and mosque. He and his companions were even believed to have taken cockerels with them on their journeys because of their time consciousness and knowledge of the hours of prayer.100

It becomes clear from this survey of the cock’s symbolic associations that its significance remained virtually unchanged throughout the centuries and was even added to by the advance of Christian and Islamic thought. Thus, throughout history up to Islamic times the cock was a bird of the sun with strong apotropaic properties, and was a symbol of good health and fortune. It also had strong eschatological and cosmological connotations.

Keeping these factors in mind, the significance of the choice of this bird as a spout on the majority of vessels discussed in this category can now be discussed. In general terms it can certainly be argued that the cock was chosen for its apotropaic properties, which would have protected the liquid flowing from the vessel, as well as its recipient. However, it is possible that a more specific meaning was to be expressed alongside the merely talismanic message, and that this was directly related to the specific function of the vessels.

One important use of pouring vessels in Muslim life was for ablution purposes before prayer time. These ablutions not only served to cleanse the believer from a purely physical point of view. In fact they had ritual importance, because in Semitic thought ablutions were meant to drive away demons or, in other terms, sin and

98 Wensinck 1921, p. 36.
100 Daneshvari 1986, pp. 58, 60.
disease, both considered synonymous with death.¹⁰¹ In view of such beliefs, the use of a cock on a ewer used for ritual washing would have been most appropriate. Indeed, it would have established a powerful visual link between the bird - symbol of light and averter of evil - through which the water was poured and the function of the liquid contained within the vessel: just as the cock with its crow (which is evoked on all four ewers despite differing levels of naturalism) drives away the demons of the night and darkness, so the ablution water washes the believer of his sins, thus rinsing away the evil demons threatening his soul. In a sense the cock’s voice and the flow of the water become one, and the evil-averting and health-inspiring influence of the cock passes into the water. The belief in the cock’s ability to announce the hours of prayer correctly throughout the day may further underline the significance of its presence on an ablution vessel.¹⁰²

Finally, the cock’s cosmological importance could have been yet another facet of symbolism evoked in the eyes of the user. It has been stated before that Muslim tradition places a cock below the throne of God. In other sources this particular area is said to be filled by "a sea of green water", which will be used by Allah to refresh the dead on the day of their resurrection.¹⁰³ As both elements - cock and water - appear to belong to the same cosmological context, one can surmise that the sight of the cock on the ablution vessel and the water flowing from it also served to remind the faithful of their ultimate goal, i. e. their resurrection and eternal refreshment by the heavenly waters of Paradise.

Such suggestions regarding the cock’s significance are still only hypothetical. However, there are certain other decorative aspects found on ewers 1-4 (figs. 1-4) that appear to reflect these particular symbolic features of this bird. Thus, decorative arcading like that applied to ewers 1 and 3 (figs. 1, 3) - a very popular motif in early Islamic art, often enclosing varying motifs like rosettes or trees - has

¹⁰¹ Wensinck 1918, p. 60.
¹⁰² Kopf 1965, p. 275.
¹⁰³ Wensinck 1918, pp. 57, 60.
been interpreted on several occasions as having paradisal connotations. Moreover, the whirling motifs on the shoulder of ewer 1 (fig. 1) and the rosettes on its neck are ancient lunar and solar symbols, respectively, and apparently had apotropaic value, too. Thus, they would be well suited to supplement the symbolism of the cock, provided that it could be proved that they still had the same inner meaning when they were applied to the vessel.

As for the birds chosen to surmount the spouts of ewers 5 and 6 (pl. 1, fig. 5), a similar interpretation regarding the function of the vessel offers itself. Thus, the bird of prey on ewer 6 (fig. 5) may evoke an eagle or vulture, both of which were considered solar birds in ancient Semitic thought and were connected with the concepts of resurrection and immortality. The bird figurine on ewer 5 (pl. 1) is a more enigmatic creature, as it seems to combine ornithomorphic, feline and aquatic elements. However, such hybrid birds are not unknown in pre-Islamic and Muslim thought and again they have a very similar significance to the other bird species discussed above.

104 Most recently, this theory was discussed by F. B. Flood in his article "The Earliest Islamic Windows as Architectural Decoration: Some Iranian Influences on Umayyad Iconography, Observations and Speculations"; cf. Flood 1990-2, p. 87.
106 Wensinck 1921, pp. 38-9. In ancient Iran birds are also frequently endowed with solar associations and carry in addition astral and cosmic significance; cf. Schmidt 1980, who mentions several such birds. It is interesting to observe that on this ewer, again, an architectural frieze has been applied, which may enforce, as was mentioned before, the message of resurrection and ultimate abode in paradise.
107 In ancient Iran the most famous composite animal is the senmurv, which is perceived as a hybrid creature with varying elements, including that of a wolf, a dog or a feline. In all instances, however, it shows ornithomorphic features as well; cf. Schmidt 1980 for an excellent study of the senmurv and its appearance. In it the author mentions one of the earliest senmurv-like animal depictions which, to judge from his description, is curiously similar to the bird on ewer 5. The image is found on a golden scabbard from the 6th-5th Kurgan of Elisavetovskaya in the Don region. Just like the bird spout it is characterized by the head of a raptor with large ears, legs rather like those of a bird of prey with three claws stretched out in front, and erect wings with tail feathers reminiscent of a fish tail. The creature’s posture is not static but somewhat suggests a leaping bird of prey. Schmidt interprets the three elements of this hybrid creature - those of a bird, a fish and a beast of prey - as symbols of the three main elements of the universe i.e. air, water and earth; cf. Schmidt 1980, pp. 22-4. In Islamic tradition the ānāf bird deserves mention; it had become assimilated both with the Iranian senmurv and Garuda, the mount of the Indian god Vishnu; cf. Pellat 1960a, p. 509.
In view of the considerations presented above, the identification of the vessels in this group as ablution equipment seems not impossible. However, one major problem arises in suggesting such a hypothesis. As ritual ablution was a central and fundamental part of Muslim daily life, ewers for that purpose must have been plentiful, and one would expect more than just six pieces to survive. Indeed several other ewer types discussed in this thesis which may also have served for cleansing purposes survive in far greater numbers (Cf. ewer types MW 3 & 4, ICAW 1).

Moreover, the design of the ewers seems rather too structurally complex and elaborate for daily and constant use. In fact they have a somewhat liturgical feel about them. Perhaps they were special creations for important personalities of the time, who had, like qādis for example, to perform ablutions as part of their official duties. Perhaps the vessels may also have had a very specific ritual importance within Muslim worship, such as serving as ablution vessels on special occasions such as Ramadān, where the arrival of the sun heralds the beginning of the fast, and thus the rejection of the evil of darkness and the "enlightenment" of religious purification, for the true believer.

In a cultural rather than religious context, a totally different hypothesis regarding the vessels' original function also deserves attention and further discussion. From earliest times there were concepts in Persian thought that perceived wine as liquid sunlight. Such wine, referred to as moğhane, i. e. the Zoroastrian beverage, was drunk with quasi-ritual solemnity at dusk and at dawn.\textsuperscript{108} If one imagines the vessels in this group as having been used in such contexts, the application of the cock spout would again be most appropriate, given the bird's importance as herald of dawn, one of the times when wine was consumed. Here, then, the cock's crow to announce the sunlight in real life would be reflected as it were by the "liquid sunlight" issuing from the bronze bird's beak.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{108} Melikian-Chirvani 1990, p. 105.
\textsuperscript{109} This interpretation may also have some bearing on the significance of the numerous cock-headed pottery ewers executed in Iran during the 12th and 13th centuries; cf. Daneshvari 1986, p. 64 fig. 39; Hassan 1956, figs. 111, 139, 168 as examples.
It is well known that many aspects of Iranian art and culture entered Umayyad and particularly Abbāsid life, and accordingly, the reflection of Iranian traditions on 8th- or early 9th-century metal vessels, even if they were executed in the Near East, is possible. The identification of the ewers as wine vessels, on the other hand, would explain the small number of extant pieces. Certainly, the drinking parties where they might have been used would have been restricted to high dignitaries or members of the court and their intimate boon companions. Accordingly, the requisite vessels would have been especially ordered and executed according to the wishes of the patron, i.e. they would never have been produced on a large scale to satisfy the needs of the general populace.

Finally, it should be considered whether these ewers necessarily served in an Islamic context, or whether they could not actually have been used in a Christian context too. Such an assumption is based on several factors. Firstly, as we have pointed out already, the small number of surviving pieces makes it unlikely that they were used by many sections of contemporary society. Secondly, their handles show a curious resemblance to the staff of a bishop.\(^\text{110}\) Thirdly, the cock, as was discussed above, was of greatest significance in Christian thought, symbolizing the arrival of the light of Christ and his victory over darkness as well as the Lord’s resurrection and the redemption of all sins.

It has been shown above that, typologically and indeed artistically, the ewers showed clear links with the lands of the eastern Mediterranean and Egypt. Here, flourishing Christian communities existed. These remained largely intact after the Islamic invasion and continued to practise their religion virtually undisturbed. Interestingly, in Egypt one of the trades of the Coptic communities was metalwork production\(^\text{111}\) and, given their continued survival throughout early Islamic times, there is no reason as to why their traditional fields of activity should have been

\(^{110}\) This fact was kindly pointed out to me by my colleague Avinoam Shalem.

\(^{111}\) Fehérvári 1976, p. 40.
abandoned. Consequently, they may well have executed bronze vessels laden with symbolic significance (such as the ewers discussed here) for ecclesiastical use.

One of the ritual occasions in church life during which ewers with a cock spout would have been appropriate is baptism, when the novice was meant to leave sin and darkness behind and join the light of Christ. Most significantly in this context, even in modern times the pottery vessel used for the baptism of boys by Copts is adorned by a cock’s head (fig. 37). 112

Ultimately, the true function of the ewers in this group still remains uncertain and it can only be hoped that the suggestions made above may lay the foundations for new research into this most beautiful of all early Islamic ewer types.

5. Summary

Cast bronze ewers with rounded body, long tubular neck, openwork crown, crozier-like handle and bird-shaped body spout seem to have been inspired by Hellenistic and pre- as well as early Islamic eastern Mediterranean artefacts. They probably first appeared in eastern Mediterranean lands towards the late 8th century A.D. and remained in use until the 11th century. The function of this ewer type is unknown, but it has been suggested that the vessels may either have served for ritual ablutions in an Islamic or indeed Christian context or may have been intended to serve wine during special banquets.

112 Wald 1982, p. 204.
1. Cairo, Islamic Museum 9281; Abū Sīr al-Malik, Fayyūm; cast bronze, relief and openwork, incised, formerly inlaid (?); h. 41 cm, diam. 28 cm.
Squat globular body with slightly projecting lower part joined to low splayed foot with flat outer edge; flattened shoulder plate with central rounded moulding receives tall tubular neck which tapers slightly towards projecting openwork section; croziershaped handle, with beaded edges and superposed vegetal motifs in relief on back, joins openwork section before terminating in inward-curving trefoil detail attached to inner handle; Below, flanked by dolphins, the handle joins upper body with attachment area enhanced by complex palmette design in relief; composite thumbpiece; short tubular body spout rendered as crowing rooster in upper part rises obliquely from upper body. On central body, arcading enclosing large rosettes, animal scenes and plant motifs and terminated below by guilloche; above and below arcading, scrollwork; on shoulder, whirling motifs and tiny trefoils in between; on neck, rosette roundels and star-like intermediate motifs (fig. 1).
Lit.: Sarre 1922, p. 15 pl. 137; Rubensohn and Sarre 1929, pp. 85-95; London 1931, pl. 74H; Wiet 1933, p. 63, pl. 1 (left); Sarre 1934, pp. 10-16; Orbeli 1938, p. 766; Pope 1938, pls. 245-6; David-Weill 1948, pp. 79-85; Dimand 1959, pp. 348-9; Scerrato 1966, p. 15; Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, no. III/28, pp. 54, 144-50, 177-8, 180, 186, 203; Sourdél-Thomin and Spuler 1973, pl. 70, pp. 186-7; King 1982, pp. 23-41; Baer 1983, fig. 65, pp. 84-7; Sokoly 1990, pp. 13-16.

2. MMA 41.65; n.p.; cast bronze, relief and openwork decoration, incised; dimensions not available.
Form as 1, but shorter openwork section without broad, beaded panel below; cock spout less detailed; handle not beaded; relief palmettes of lower attachment less detailed; globular thumbpiece on rounded base. Undecorated (fig. 2).
Lit.: Ettinghausen 1940, p. 116, figs. 18 & 20; Dimand 1941, pp. 203-4; Dimand 1947, pl. 75; David-Weill 1948, pp. 79-85; Dimand 1959, p. 348; Scerrato 1966, pp. 11-12, fig. 1; Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, no. III/31, pp. 154-5, 160, 203; Baer 1983, pp. 84-7, fig. 66; Sokoly 1990, pp. 13-16.

3. Keir Collection; acquired in Egypt; cast bronze, relief and openwork; incised; h. 34 cm, h. neck 11 cm, diam. mouth 4 cm, diam. base 11 cm.
Form similar to 1, but inverted pear-shaped body on foot without flat edge (base missing); no shoulder plate; shorter and very stylized openwork section; plainer handle with stylized scroll on back and heart-shaped attachment area containing central five-lobed palmette and two dolphins with two animal legs on either side; grooved knob as thumbpiece. On neck, vertical bands with scrollwork and geometrical design; on body, three horizontal bands separated by plain borders: below neck, narrow frieze with remains of Kufic(?), then scrollwork with individual animals (horned animals and cocks?); around central body, arcading with each arch enclosing either composite palmette structures or long-eared animals; all decoration on punch-dotted background (fig. 3).
Lit.: Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, no. III/33, pp. 156-160, 177-8; Fehérvári 1976, pp. 27-8, 33 no. 2, colour plate A, pl. 1; Sokoly 1990, pp. 13-16.

4. Cairo, Islamic Museum 15241; acquired in Cairo; cast bronze; openwork and relief decoration, incised; h. 35.5 cm, diam. 10.5 cm.
Form as 3, but wider upper body on taller foot; jagged openwork section; simple handle with straight stem and beaded ring above joined to upper neck and body, the lower attachment area enhanced by heart-shaped medallion containing inverted palmette motif; thumbpiece fragmented globular knob. Undecorated (fig. 4).
5. Hermitage KZ 5755; acquired in Daghestan; cast bronze; openwork and relief decoration, incised; h. 40 cm.
Form similar to 1, but globular body with large projecting "petals"; projecting base joined to low splayed foot with flat edge; faceted collar and neck, the latter with projecting rounded facet terminations near the collar; openwork section very similar to that on 1; angular crozier-shaped handle with relief trefoils on back and relief plaiting on inner side; lower attachment area similar to that on 1; thumbpiece comprises outward curving leaf with finial resembling small pomegranate; spout comprises fantastic bird supported by plaque with bow-like design. All over body and on handle sides, scrollwork; on neck, superposed heart-shapes with central trefoil and similar motifs in between (pl. 1).

Lit.: Sarre and Martin 1912, pl. 132; Orbeli and Trever 1935, p. 46, pl. 75; Orbeli 1938, p. 766; Pope 1938, pl. 246A; David-Weill 1948, pp. 79-85; Marshak 1972, p. 81, fig. 16; Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III, no. III/29, pp. 150-152; Kuwait 1990, p. 23 no. 3 (Arabic text), pp. 10-11 no. 3 (English text); Sokoly 1990, pp. 13-16.

6. Hermitage; acquired in Daghestan; cast bronze; relief and open work decoration, incised; h. 38 cm.
Squat bulbous ovoid body flattened at base (trimmed off); projecting sloping shoulder plate with central rounded collar introducing neck with very worn openwork section; on handle, back relief foliage with lower attachment area similar to that on 1; spout in shape of bird of prey.
On central body, arcading with arches in slight relief, underneath various tree-like structures and (?) animals; around lower body, large lancet leaves; above arcade, intelligible motifs; on shoulder scrolls (?) on neck, worn ornamentation with rabbits, flowers, leaves and shell-like motifs (fig. 5).

Lit.: Sarre and Martin 1912, pl. 131/2; Sarre 1922, pl. 136; Orbeli and Trever 1935, p. 46, pl. 76; Orbeli 1938, p. 766; Pope 1938, pl. 246B; David-Weill 1948, pp. 79-85; Melikian-Chirvani 1972, Ch. III no. III/30, pp. 152-4; Allan 1979, figs. 2a & b; Sokoly 1990, pp. 13-16.
Plate 1
EMW 5/5. Cast Bronze Ewer, allegedly from Daghestan. H. 40 cm (Leningrad, Hermitage, inv. no. KZ 5755).
FIG. 1
EMW 5/1. Cast Bronze Ewer found at Abū Sir al-Malik, Faiyum, Egypt. H. 41 cm (Cairo, Islamic Museum, inv. no. 9281).
FIG. 2
EMW 5/2. Cast Bronze Ewer. Dimensions unavailable
(New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no. 41.65).

FIG. 3
H. 34 cm (London, Keir Collection).
FIG. 4
EMW 5/4. Cast Bronze Ewer, acquired in Cairo. H. 35.5 cm (Cairo, Islamic Museum, inv. no. 10241).

FIG. 5
FIG. 6
Late Roman Glass Bottle Forms.
FIG. 7
Early 4th-Century Roman Glass Bottle decorated with Blue Ovals.

FIG. 8
3rd-Century Roman Glass Bottle, probably from Syria.
PIG. 9
Fragmented Early Islamic Glass Flask from the Eastern Mediterranean.

FIG. 10
Translucent Green Glass Bottle. Roman, 50-150 A.D.

FIG. 9
Fragmented Early Islamic Glass Flask from the Eastern Mediterranean.
FIG. 11
Two 4th-/5th-Century Glass Bottle Forms from the Roman Near East.

FIG. 12
Early Islamic Stucco Window Grille from Qasr al-Hayr al-Gharbi.
**FIG. 13**
Tall Cylindrical Glass Bottle.
Roman, 2nd half of the 3rd Century A.D.

**FIG. 14**
Small Glass Oil Jug discovered in the Sudan.
FIG. 15
Sumerian Bronze Vessel with Body Spout terminating in an incised Animal Head.

FIG. 16
Terracotta Jug with Zoomorphic Body Spout, found in Sakkiz (Azerbaijan), 9th/8th Century B.C.
FIG. 17
Bronze Statuette from Luristan, depicting Ashi, the Goddess of Fertility. 9th/8th Century B.C.
FIG. 18
Bronze Statuette from Luristan, depicting Sraosha, the God of Justice. 9th/8th Century B.C.
FIG. 12
Two Leather Fragments With Roosters. Pazyryk (Altai), 5th Century B.C.
FIG. 20
Small Gold Plaque with Rooster. Scythian, 5th Century B.C.

FIG. 21
Gold Scabbard Hilt with Roosters. Scythian, 5th Century B.C.
FIG. 22
Sasanian Cock Figures (after Pfister 1938, figs. 2 & 4, Orbeli 1981, fig. 256a.)
FIG. 23
Cock Figure on the "Saire de St. Josse".
Khurasan, 10th Century A.D. (after Pfister 1959, fig. 1).

FIG. 24
Two Bronze Cocks from Iran. 10th-13th Century A.D.
FIG. 25
Toilet Box from Assur with Roosters in Trees. 13th Century B.C.
(After Stevenson-Smith 1965, fig. 40).
FIG. 26
Limestone Ostracon with Rooster. Thebes, 15th-12th Century B.C.

FIG. 27
Small Bronze Cock. Cyprus, Early 6th Century B.C.
FIG. 28
Mosaic Roundel with Cock. Graeco-Roman Period.
Kom Trouga, Markaz Abūl-Maṭamīr, Egypt.

FIG. 29
Coptic Cock Statuette executed in Clay.
FIG. 30
Cast Bronze Bird Aquamanile. Iraq(?), 8th Century A.D.

FIG. 31
Cast Bronze Bird Aquamanile. North-Western Iran, 8th Century A.D.
FIG. 32
Decoration on the Body of the 8th-Century Bird Aquamanile from North-Western Iran.

FIG. 33
Bronze Statuette of a Stag from Fāṭimbīd Egypt.
FIG. 34
Coptic Column Shaft from Saqqara, Egypt. 5th/6th Century A.D.

FIG. 35
Border Design from an Early 6th-Century Greek Manuscript.
(After Frantz 1934, pl. VII.1).
FIG. 36
Leaf Motifs on the Soffit of an Arch in the Dome of the Rock.

FIG. 37
Modern Pottery Vessel used in the Baptism of Coptic Boys.