A SECOND “HERAT BUCKET” AND ITS CONGENERS

In 1978 the late L. T. Giuzalian published a cast brass or bronze bucket (fig. 1) in the Hermitage collections.¹ His detailed description of the object and reading of its inscriptions are unnecessary to repeat here. Giuzalian proposed that it should be known as the “Fould bucket,” because at the time it was first illustrated in the scholarly literature it was in the collection of the distinguished French collector Louis Fould, in Paris.² Subsequently the bucket came to Russia, where it passed into the Fabergé family, one of whom offered it to the Hermitage for purchase in 1926, though for some reason it was not bought. On the closure of the Fabergé workshops and the emigration of the family it remained behind in Leningrad. It appeared in an antique shop in 1946 and somewhat later, in 1953, was acquired by the State Hermitage. That in brief is its recent history.

In its somewhat different shape, its unusual decorative composition, and many details of its ornament, the Fould bucket differs markedly from buckets associated with late-twelfth- or early-thirteenth-century Khurasan. This was all noted in Giuzalian’s article, though he still attrib-
uted it to Herat of the late twelfth century (ca. 1180–85) because of the form of its handle, the similarity of its decorative scheme to strapwork on the minaret of Jam, and the nisba of the craftsman who signed it, Muhammad b. Nasir b. Muhammad al-Haravi.3

What distinguishes the Fould bucket from other buckets of similar shape, however, is the overall gilding of its ground, which Giuzalian attributed to its patron’s or purchaser’s desire to emphasize its exceptional character.4 And indeed, if it is to be considered to be of Khurasani manufacture, it is the only gilt piece among a large group of late-twelfth- and early-thirteenth-century brass or bronze vessels.5 A. S. Melikian-Chirvani, while not disputing Giuzalian’s conclusions, has expressed some doubt as to its Herat provenance.6 Gilding on Iranian silver vessels was known well before the coming of Islam and continued to be practiced from the eleventh to the thirteenth century.7 But no gilt brass or bronze Iranian vessels are known.

If we approach the gilding on the bucket as something other than a patron’s chance whim, we need to turn our attention to later vessels—not Iranian but Turkish. Sixteenth-century Turkish gilt copper and brass or bronze vessels are discussed by Melikian-Chirvani in an article of 1975,8 and by James Allan in an exhibition catalogue of 1982.9 The former alludes to the widespread use of gilding on copper or brass in sixteenth-century Turkey but considers the technique to have come from Venice,10 since gilding is so totally uncharacteristic of Persian metalwork.11 The latter also stresses the widespread use of gilding on Ottoman Turkish copper vessels, though its author is more cautious in approaching the possibility of gilt brass or bronze in Iran, citing finds at Nishapur.12 Nevertheless Allan disputes Melikian-Chirvani’s attribution to Venice of the use of gilding in Ottoman Turkey, pointing to Byzantine gilt copper vessels and artifacts and to a bronze plaque with gilding and an Arabic inscription13 from the period of the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum. In the collections of the State Hermitage there are two such objects: a bronze portable icon of the twelfth century,14 and a twelfth-century copper cross.15 Interestingly, in Byzantium even gilt stone portable icons are known.16

As the 1983 Istanbul exhibition demonstrated, gilt bronze objects were also manufactured in areas of Asia Minor under Muslim domination, i.e., in the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum,17 and it must be stressed that the well-known bronze openwork lamp made in Konya, signed by the craftsman ʿAli b. Muhammad al-Nusaybini and dated 679 (1280–81), was also gilt.18 In Central Anato-

lia this technique was employed in the second half of the thirteenth century.

We may thus suppose that the gilding of bronze vessels was well known in both the Christian and the Muslim areas of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Asia Minor. Later, when these territories were absorbed into the Ottoman Empire, this indigenous craft tradition simply became more widespread and so did not have to be brought in from outside. It thus follows that the gilding of the Fould bucket is a fully characteristic element of its decoration and not the whim of a customer, and the place of its manufacture is to be sought in the Sultanate of Rum, somewhere in Anatolia.19

In favor of this view are the following considerations:

1. The bucket is faceted, whereas all the known twelfth-century Khurasani buckets, more than eighty to date, are of plain globular shape.

2. On all the Khurasani buckets the decoration is in horizontal registers, whereas on the Fould bucket it is in vertical stripes.

3. The strapwork on alternate vertical bands of the Fould bucket is indeed similar to the decoration on the shaft of the minaret of Jam. However, this can be fully explained by the influence of Khurasani architectural decoration on the monuments of Seljuk Anatolia, which has long been accepted as an established fact.20

4. The Fould bucket is signed by the craftsman Muhammad b. Nasir b. Muhammad al-Haravi. As usual, we know nothing about him. It was the nisba al-Haravi that evidently led Giuzalian to attribute the bucket to a Khurasani workshop. But no nisba can be conclusive evidence that anyone, let alone a craftsman, was born or worked in the city from which his nisba was taken. As study of the careers of ulema has shown, their nisbas played the role of surnames. All we can assert here is that our craftsman’s family was from Herat, but as to his own connection with that city nothing clearly follows.

5. Nor is the name of the bucket’s patron or owner of much help. The technical execution of the inscription on the rim that records these is mediocre if not poor, and severely damaged as well. The Kufic and naskh inscriptions on the body are calligraphic in the full sense of the word, which cannot be said of that on the rim. The tips of the shafts of its ascenders are in the form of human heads, though they are carelessly executed. This connects the inscription on the rim with inscriptions on many Khurasani vessels of the later twelfth and the early thirteenth centuries, though on these, in contrast, the execution is generally very fine. Moreover, some of the letters of the inscription on the rim are carelessly engraved.
and inlaid with silver, to the extent that they make the inscription difficult to read and convey the impression that it is not original but replaces an earlier one. I must add that that this is only an impression, for I have been unable to make out any trace of an original craftsman’s inscription, though such there should have been on a piece of this magnificence.

Giuzalian’s reading of the inscription is as follows: “Glory to its exalted possessor, the merchant Jamal al-Din, champion of Islam, well known to emperors and sultans, ‘Ali b. Ahmad al-Bistami (?). May Allah prolong his merits! Long may he abide!”21 However, by no means are all the words in the inscription clearly legible. In the present article there is no space to deal with all the questionable readings. The patron’s unusual nisba, al-Bistámí in Giuzalian’s tentative reading, admittedly points to western Khurasan. We know nothing of his life, however, and so far nothing can be learned of him from the historical sources. His nisba is therefore of no help in demonstrating a Khurasani provenance for the Fould bucket.22

Now to the title, which Giuzalian did not discuss: bahádur al-Isám, “champion of Islam.” It is, to begin with, unclear whether the titles “champion of Islam, well known to emperors and sultans” could properly be applied to a merchant, as Giuzalian asserted; they appear to be much more appropriate to a high military officer. Secondly, bahádur, as fairly reliably read in the inscription, derives from the Turco-Mongolian baatær (hence Russian bogatyri). It is somewhat unclear when it became standard in Persian. The articles on bahádur in the Encyclopaedia Iranica and the dictionary of Dehkhoda both give only late uses of it—fourteenth- and fifteenth-century uses, to be precise—in Persian. Its first appearance can scarcely be so late, but because of its absence from the Sháhnáma, some doubt attaches to when this occurred.

We may suppose that the title bahádur first came into Persian following the Mongol invasion of Iran in the 1220s. And indeed there are three occurrences of it in Shihab al-Din Muhammad al-Nasavi’s account of the life of the Khwarazmshah Jalal al-Din Mankuburni, completed in 639 (1241–42).23 This shows that the term was well known to the author of this work, which was written in western Iran, or even further west. This circumstance further weakens, both chronologically and geographically, the probability that the bucket was made in twelfth-century Khurasan.

As I have already said, the shape of the bucket and the vertical arrangement of the decoration on its facets have no analogies among the vessels that can with fair confidence be attributed to twelfth-century Khurasan. There is, however, another reason for questioning the early date of ca. 1180–85 that Giuzalian proposed.24 This is the fact that the human heads and the heads of birds and monsters on the Fould bucket all have haloes, whereas on the Bobrinsky bucket and other buckets near it in date haloes are absent.

On closer inspection we observe that these heads have something like outer contours surrounding the haloes. This feature is clearly visible on objects made by Shadhi, who was working in the first decade of the thirteenth century,25 or perhaps slightly later. Human heads with haloes are also to be seen on Mosuli brass-work of the 1220s26 and subsequently become widespread. The date of the Fould bucket is thus to be brought forward to the first decades of the thirteenth century.

A second noteworthy element of the decoration is the representation of Bahram Gur and Azada out hunting. The theme is from the Sháhnáma of Firdawsi. It seems that scenes from the Iranian national epic may have been used in art of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, though there is little extant evidence for this, but on Khurasani brasses or bronzes they do not occur. The only scene from the Sháhnáma to appear on metalwork of the first quarter of the thirteenth century is that of Bahram Gur hunting, six occurrences of which Eva Baer has already listed.27 Another appears on a straight-spouted brass ewer of Syrian workmanship, datable to the first half of the thirteenth century, in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris;28 with the Fould bucket, that makes a total of eight occurrences in all. All these pieces are datable to the early thirteenth century or later, but, more important, not one of them was made in Khurasan.

A third noteworthy element of the decoration is also of relevance to the dating of the piece. In the lower parts of the alternate vertical stripes with sun rosettes in the middle are human-headed birds wearing triangular caps. The birds are addorsed, and their tails appear to be joined by a ring, but they turn backwards to face one another. This element is exceptionally rare in contemporary decoration, and a survey of parallels in the scholarly literature gives only a few analogies. Addorsed birds or animals that are also facing backwards are encountered in various parts of the Near East, but one gains the impression that they were more widespread in the countries to the west of Iran, and that they are in some way Mediterranean motifs, though further work remains
to be done on this. So far I have only been able to identify a few objects bearing them:

(a) A fragmentary silk bearing the name of a Seljuk Sultan of Konya, ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad—perhaps, though not necessarily, Kayqubad I (d. 1236)29—where the hind legs of addorsed lions are joined.
(b) Two bronze doorknockers in the Khalili collection, in the form of dragons with their tails intertwined, attributable to thirteenth-century Anatolia or the Jazira,30 and a further doorknocker of this type from the great mosque at Jazirat b. ‘Umar (the modern Cizre), shown in the 1983 Istanbul exhibition, The Anatolian Civilisations.31
(c) A rectangular brass tray inlaid with silver with a cruciform depression at the center in which are represented four pairs of dragons with their heads turned back and their tails intertwined. The compilers of the exhibition catalogue Islam and the Medieval West32 attributed the tray to thirteenth-century northeastern Iran. Its shape and silver inlay and the content of its Arabic well-wishing inscriptions are certainly typical of Khurasani work of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. However, the dragons with intertwined tails suggest a place of manufacture to the west of Iran, and it now seems more correct to attribute the tray to Anatolia or the Jazira in the first half of the thirteenth century.
(d) A brass or bronze inkwell inlaid with silver in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, bearing a unique representation of Gemini in the form of two birds (?) shown back-to-back but with their heads turned so that they face each other. Eva Baer, who published the inkwell, dates it to the first half of the thirteenth century and attributes it to Syria or Northern Mesopotamia, rather than to Iran.33 Such pairs of addorsed creatures, both animals and birds, with their heads turned so that they face each other and with their tails linked, must thus be seen as originating to the west of Iran and have no connection with Khurasani metalwork of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

The pointed triangular caps of the harpies on the Fould bucket have a number of parallels:

(a) On a well-known covered brass or bronze bowl in the Ethnographic Museum in Ankara, published by D. S. Rice.34 The object is composite, being made up of two pieces of different dates, the bowl being from eleventh-century Transoxania35 and the cover, with its inlay in copper and silver, of later date. On it we see human figures with haloed heads and foliate ornament, the only analogies to which (though not very close ones) appear on the brass ewer of Ibrahim b. Mawali, made at Mosul in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century.36 This suggests that the cover was also made at Mosul in the first or second decade of the thirteenth century.
(b) The base of a brass or bronze candlestick inlaid with silver in the Khalili collection, attributable to early- or possibly mid-thirteenth-century Jazira.37
(c) A fragmentary unglazed dish in the National Museum in Damascus, datable to the first half of the thirteenth century.38
(d) A brass or bronze inkwell with silver inlay, most probably from early-thirteenth-century Mosul, with human figures with haloes.39
(e) A brass casket inlaid with human figures with haloes, attributable to Mosul or the Jazira in the second quarter of the thirteenth century.40
(f) A brass or bronze inkwell sold at auction in 1998. This is catalogued as from twelfth-century Khurasan. However, the haloes around the figures’ heads and the rather different character of the silver encrustation cast doubt on a Khurasani provenance, and the object must, rather, be from early-thirteenth-century Mosul or the Jazira.41

These parallels also connect the Fould bucket not with Khurasan but with the Jazira, Northern Syria, or possibly Anatolia.

To sum up, the Fould bucket certainly has some features in common with Khurasani vessels. This is clear from its general shape and, in particular, its handle. But when we turn to the details it shows marked differences in the general scheme of its decoration in vertical stripes, in its faceted body and gilt ground, and in the haloed heads of its human figures and its addorsed sirens or harpies with their linked tails and pointed triangular caps. None of these elements are present on Khurasani metalwork of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries; on the contrary, they appear no earlier than the thirteenth century, and on metalwork primarily manufactured to the west of Iran—Northern Mesopotamia, the Jazira, Syria, and Anatolia.

We may say that the decoration in pairs of elongated half-hexagons forming figures-of-eight has a direct analogy on the minaret of Jam. But this is substantially the so-called Seljuk chain motif (or more exactly, form of composition), which was widespread in the Near East in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This brings us, how-
ever, to a dead end: we have no idea where exactly the man who made the bucket was working. Was he trained in Khurasan, or in some Khurasani workshop active in the lands to the west of Iran? And where and when was he born? In light of the considerations advanced above, particularly of the gilding, it would appear that the Fould bucket was made about the middle of the thirteenth century, most probably in Anatolia. It would doubtless help if we could read the name of its owner, but the ownership inscription, by comparison with the other inscriptions on the bucket, is poorly executed, and the reading of it is in many places unclear. In any case, at present the owner’s name, as read by Giuzalian, is not to be found in any of the sources. We cannot therefore regard the study of the piece as complete, and it will have to be reviewed at a later date. Interestingly, scholars are increasingly coming to recognize a new geographical school of metalwork located in Anatolia. We may therefore expect the number of pieces attributable to this area to increase. It will be necessary not merely to read their inscriptions but also to study their decoration.

In conclusion I should like to dwell briefly on two other buckets. The first is still unfamiliar to the scholarly world: it was sold at auction by Sotheby’s, London, twelve years ago. The catalogue illustration is too small to allow one to make out its decoration completely. It is of silver-inlaid brass or bronze (fig. 2); at 26.5 cm, it is taller than the Fould bucket though like it is facetted. The number of facets is not given, but I calculate that there are eighteen, whereas the Fould bucket has twelve. As one may judge from its scalloped rim, the Sotheby’s bucket is thin-walled—beaten rather than cast like the Fould bucket and the overwhelming majority of Khurasani buckets. I have not deciphered the Arabic inscription below the rim. The decoration of each facet is identical, a grid of similar rhomboids.

From the catalogue illustration it would appear that the lower part of the bucket and the foot were added later, as repairs following major damage or breaks, for I cannot make out any decoration on them. However, the piece is interesting and important: a second faceted bucket, though of beaten, not cast, metal, it is plainly connected not with the Khurasani group but with the Fould bucket. The two pieces are evidence for a tradition of faceted buckets. As a working hypothesis we could suggest their manufacture in thirteenth-century Anatolia, though where in Anatolia is unclear.

The second bucket (fig. 3), with its rather strange and exceptional decoration, has long been known. It is in the British Museum and was first published in 1962 by Ralph Pinder-Wilson, who dated it to the twelfth century. In 1979 it was the subject of a study by Eva Baer. After a detailed description of the piece and discussion of numerous analogies to both its shape and its decoration, with which I am in complete agreement, she unexpectedly concluded, “Persian bronzes and works of art comparable to the British Museum bucket are too scarce to be more precise about its date. Tentatively, and considering the technical examinations undertaken by Dr. Werner, we believe that the bucket is not older than one hundred to one hundred and fifty years.”

How can this conclusion follow? How can the technique of its manufacture have been so changeable and unconservative? And how can analysis of the metal alloy allow such precision in dating? We are still far from being able to make such judgments, for which thousands of analyses would be necessary to bring even a degree of
clarity to dating by technique or alloy composition. In recent years I have become interested in nineteenth-century Iranian copper and brass vessels. Among them one frequently finds pieces with precise dates, while the style of their decoration and the workmanship of their grounds are already clear enough. I may confidently assert that neither the shape nor the ornament of the British Museum bucket has anything at all in common with these late Iranian vessels. Certainly they use punched dotting, but for the whole ground. On the British Museum bucket, punched dotting is used for the ornament itself, in registers: this is a difference of principle. The bucket must therefore be re-admitted, in the full sense of the word, to the corpus of early metalwork. To the early decorative parallels adduced by Eva Baer one may add that the handle type does occur on Khurasani pieces, though rarely, and that the scalloped foot is also known on an early openwork brass lamp, perhaps of the thirteenth century, formerly in the collection of Charles Schéfer and then that of Edmond de Rothschild, though its present location is unknown. One should mention that the ground of the British Museum bucket is decorated with a different tool, to wit, a gouging instrument that leaves a wedge-shaped groove, which is used on a number of Byzantine silver vessels for the execution of linear ornament. There can be no doubt that it was made in the eleventh or twelfth century, though it is difficult to specify the date more closely. Its body is globular, while its decoration consists of ten vertical stripes, a feature that associates it with the bucket sold at Sotheby’s, London, in 1990 and with the Fould bucket. On one of the stripes, as on all the facets of the Sotheby’s piece, is a grid of rhomboids. One should add that the British Museum bucket is not cast but beaten, though of rather thick brass or bronze, which also associates it with the Sotheby’s bucket.

Admittedly, the decoration of the British Museum bucket is, all in all, extremely individual. In fact, the decoration of the vertical stripes with broken lines forming pseudo-inscriptions may recall the unexpected broken lines both on some pieces of Anatolian art and on the carved stonework of certain thirteenth-century Anatolian buildings. These analogies may be rather distant, but they are real and deserve mention. It cannot therefore be excluded that the piece is of Anatolian manufacture, though the evidence for this is so far only indirect. In any case, the only connections with Khurasan are in the shapes of the body and the handle; everything else is totally different. It is entirely possible that buckets were made not only in Khurasan but also in other areas from which the survivors are few or have not so far been identified.

On the basis of the early analogies to both the shape and the decoration of the British Museum bucket adduced by Eva Baer in her article, we might suggest a working hypothesis connecting the three buckets treated in this article. It is both possible and probable that globular buckets without inlay were made somewhere in twelfth- or thirteenth-century Anatolia or the Jazira, and that the British Museum bucket was one of these. Subsequently, the bucket auctioned at Sotheby’s in 1990 was made in this same area. Whereas the decoration of the former was simply in vertical stripes, the body of the latter has both well-defined facets and silver inlay; this second feature in my view demonstrates its later date. What also connects the two buckets is that they are of beaten metal, since the great majority of late-twelfth- and early-thirteenth-century Khurasani buckets are cast. These include, however, a small group

Fig. 3. Bucket. British Museum, London. Inv. no. OA 1959 7–23 1.
of beaten vessels that are not well understood: either they are earlier in date—perhaps eleventh century—or they were made in some provincial center or workshop by Khurasani craftsmen.

These two lines of evolution—of Khurasani cast buckets and of beaten buckets attributed here to Anatolia—combined somewhere in Anatolia about the middle of the thirteenth century to produce the splendid Fould bucket, which is just as much an ornament to the collections of the State Hermitage as the world-famous Bobrinky bucket.
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4. Ibid., p. 78.

5. Gilt bronze belt trappings and other small gilt bronze objects were found in the Nishapur excavations. See J. W. Allan, Nishapur: Metalwork of the Early Islamic Period (New York, 1982), nos. 7–9, 15–21, 25, 28–32, 78, 133–38, 143, 148–50, 152, 186, though not all of these are necessarily to be connected with Iran. Between 1998 and 2000 a series of gilt bronze objects was sold at auction by Christie’s, London, catalogued as “Iran, twelfth century”: (a) Sale of Oct. 13, 1998, lot 231, five small human figurines (height 8.9 cm), evidently the feet of a casket, of cast bronze, with traces of gilding on some of them. These might be associated with twelfth-century Khurasan, though it is unclear from the black-and-white illustration whether they were all gilt. (b) Sale of Apr. 13, 2000, lot 258, a figurine of a falcon (height 8.9 cm), the function of which is not apparent but whose decoration is difficult to accept as twelfth-century Khurasan. It is evidently Near Eastern, though its exact provenance remains to be determined. (c) Sale of Oct. 29, 2000, lot 343, a set of cast gilt bronze belt trappings, the ornament of which has little in common with that of Khurasan work: one ought to compare it in the first instance with other belt trappings, though we still know very little of these. Quite possibly, as the catalogue entry suggests, they are not of Iranian manufacture. It is difficult to suggest a date, but one should note that their decoration differs from that of belt plaques found in the Nishapur excavations. This completes the material so far known.


7. For example, a jug in the State Hermitage, inv. no. VZ-795, Iran, tenth century, reproduced in Zennye iskussto, Nebesnaya krasota: Iskussto Islama = Earthly [sic] Art, Heavenly Beauty: Art of Islam, cat. of an exh. at the State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, June–Sept. 2000 (St. Petersburg, 2000), no. 111; a small dish, also in the State Hermitage, inv. no. S-499, Iran, early eleventh century, reproduced in Earthly Beauty, Heavenly Art: Art of Islam, cat. of an exh. at De Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam, Dec. 1999–Apr. 2000 (Amsterdam, 1999), no. 111; a small box from the Nishapur excavations, Iran, eleventh–twelfth centuries, reproduced in Allan, Nishapur, no. 1; two fragments of a silver jug from the Gubkor hoard in the province of Perm, attributed to thirteenth- or early-fourteenth-century Anatolia or Iran, State Hermitage Museum, inv. nos. VZ-884–85, reproduced in V. P. Darkevitch, Khudozhestvennyj metally Vostočnyj XIII vv. (Moscow, 1976), p. 31, fig. 46.


11. Melikian-Chirvani, “Recherches”: 152, 160–61. Some years ago I saw a seventeenth-century Iranian dish with gilding. In 1988 a mid-seventeenth-century Iranian gilt copper bowl was auctioned at Sotheby’s, New York (Dec. 2, 1988, lot 210). These are the only two gilt copper objects of the later period known to me. Of course, the question arises whether this gilding is contemporary with the pieces or was done much later.

12. See note 5, above.

13. Allan, Nishapur, p. 34.


18. The date on this has been read as 679 (1280–81) and as 699 (1299–1300). D. S. Rice’s reading of 679 seems to be the more likely. See D. S. Rice, “Studies in Islamic Metalwork 5,” Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 17 (1955): 207–12. Recently two more bronze openwork pieces close to the Konya lamp have been sold by Christie’s in London. One, sold Apr. 23, 2002, lot 145, is a large lamp (height 53.7 cm), or possibly a birdcage, as the catalogue concedes. It bears no trace of gilding. It was catalogued as from thirteenth- or fourteenth-century Khurasan. This also is devoid of gilding. A thirteenth-century gilt bronze inkwell was auctioned at Sotheby’s, New York (Dec. 2, 1988, lot 210). These are the only two gilt copper objects of the later period known to me. Of course, the question arises whether this gilding is contemporary with the pieces or was done much later.

19. D. S. Rice’s reading of 679 seems to be the more likely. See D. S. Rice, “Studies in Islamic Metalwork 5,” Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 17 (1955): 207–12. Recently two more bronze openwork pieces close to the Konya lamp have been sold by Christie’s in London. One, sold Apr. 23, 2002, lot 145, is a large lamp (height 53.7 cm), or possibly a birdcage, as the catalogue concedes. It bears no trace of gilding. It was catalogued as from thirteenth- or fourteenth-century Khurasan. This also is devoid of gilding. A thirteenth-century gilt bronze inkwell was auctioned at Sotheby’s, New York (Dec. 2, 1988, lot 210). These are the only two gilt copper objects of the later period known to me. Of course, the question arises whether this gilding is contemporary with the pieces or was done much later.
there in the later thirteenth century can only be guessed at. This piece is also devoid of gilding. As for a third openwork lantern in the Keir collection, which has long, and doubtless correctly, been associated with twelfth-to-thirteenth-century Anatolia (see G. Fehérvári, *Islamic Metalwork of the Eighteenth to the Fifteenth Century in the Keir Collection* [London, 1976], no. 99, pl. E), its decoration is completely different from that of these two pieces.

19. It must be said that this conclusion was anticipated by Professor Oktay Aslanapâ many years ago (see his *Turkish Art and Architecture* [New York and Washington, DC, 1971], p. 284). He attributed the Fould bucket to Seljuk (or Turkic) metalworkers. But since he included in this group the Bobrinsky bucket, all twelfth-century Khurasan metalwork, and the brasses of Mosul without a shred of evidence for his assertion, it evoked little scholarly attention.


22. We should remember that although the Bobrinsky bucket was made at Herat for Rashid al-Din `Azizi b. Abu 'l-Husayn al-Zanjani, Zanjand is a town in Persian Azerbaijan. On the basis of the patron’s name and nisha, K. Inostrantsev has even suggested that the bucket was made for an Isma‘ili in western Iran (Azerbaijan), though confirming that the place of manufacture, Herat, was correct. See K. Inostrantsev, "Bronzovy kotelok 559 goda khidzhry," *Izvestiya Imperatorskogo Arkeologistskogo Komissi i* 60 (Petrograd, 1916): 52–56.


25. Melikian-Chirvani, *Islamic Metalwork*, p. 71, fig. 41; A. S. Melikian-Chirvani, *Les bronzes du Khorasan–7: Sazi de Herat, ornementiste,* *Studia Iranica* 8, 2 (1972): fig. 2; E. Atul, W. T. Chase, and P. Jett, *Islamic Metalwork in the Freer Gallery of Art* (Washington, DC, 1985), no. 4. We also see the same feature on the Wade cup, which is dated to ca. AD 1200 (cf. R. Ettinghausen, *The ‘Wade Cup’ in the Cleveland Museum of Art: Its Origin and Decoration*, *Ars Orientalis* 2 [1957]: 364–65, fig. 1), and on the Vaso Vescovati in the British Museum, which is to be dated to the first decade of the thirteenth century (see Ettinghausen, "The Wade Cup," fig. 9; and E. Baer, *Metalwork in Medieval Islamic Art* [Albany, 1983], figs. 207, 225). Haloes may possibly have been used for the heads of harpies on Khurasani metalwork, but such occurrences require further attention.


30. MTW 1407, MTW 1928. See *Earthly Beauty*, no. 3.


32. *Islam and the Medieval West*, cat. of an exh. at the University Art Gallery, Binghamton, NY, Apr.—May 1975 (Binghamton, NY, 1975), no. 58. Dimensions: 9 inches sq. At the time the piece was in the collection of N. Anavian.


38. Ibid., no. 132.


40. See *Earthly Beauty*, no. 122, D. N. Khalili collection, MTW 850.


42. A. S. Melikian-Chirvani some time ago (in "Anatolian Candlesticks: The Eastern Element and the Konya School," *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 59, 1–4 [1987], pp. 225–66) reattributed to Anatolia a large group of brass or bronze candlesticks that D. S. Rice had associated with Tabriz. In my view he is correct, though this rather large group of pieces requires further study. In particular, they are clearly products of different workshops. Cf. also n. 18, above.


44. Among the globular-bodied buckets attributed to Khurasan, beaten vessels occasionally appear, though they are of lesser—even mediocre—quality, and they have no silver inlay. One should also mention thin-walled—i.e., beaten—cylindrical-bodied buckets with engraved decoration and without inlay in other metals. In scholarship of recent decades these have been associated with Egypt. See Fehérvári, *Islamic Metalwork*, pl. 86, nos. 24 and 26.


47. Baer, "Traditionalism or Archaism," p. 92.
48. Pope, Survey, pl. 1291A.
49. For a drawing, see D. S. Rice, “Studies in Islamic Metalwork 5,” p. 233, fig. 11.
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