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The term ‘Mosul metalwork’ is reassuringly familiar, yet disconcertingly elusive.¹ In a generic sense it presents no issue, as it conjures up for any student of Islamic art images of thirteenth-century brass vessels in a limited range of distinctive forms, profusely inlaid with silver. It is the precision of the word ‘Mosul’ that creates unease, as no one seems any longer willing to specify which objects were made in Mosul and which elsewhere by artists who had emigrated from Mosul.² Scholars over the last fifty years have increasingly treated the issue of attribution with resignation or dubiety; few have been as brave as Souren Melikian-Chirvani and dismissed Mosul’s claims altogether.³

Epigraphic, circumstantial and stylistic evidence exists, however, to permit a more positive stance, and to enable us to attribute a core group of documentary items to Mosul, and others to Damascus and to Cairo. While these can form the basis for further attributions on stylistic grounds, there is, I hope, enough presented here to begin to shape a picture of a metalwork ‘school’ in Mosul, and to identify one of the principal ways in which its techniques and styles were transmitted to Mamluk Cairo. I intend to show that this was a ‘school’ in multiple senses: relationships existed between artists who shared techniques, styles and motifs that they developed...
over the course of more than half a century; and they transmitted these through apprenticeships; and there was a conscious sense of community that was expressed not only in the persistent use of the nisbah ‘al-Mawsili’, but in the use of at least one, if not two, identifying motifs.  

**SHIFTING SCHOLARSHIP ON ‘MOSUL METALWORK’**

At first it seems almost perverse that there should be any uncertainty about inlaid metalworking in Mosul, as no other group of artefacts from the medieval Muslim world carries so much inscribed documentation, not even the contemporary ceramics of Kashan (see Table 1.1 on pp. 58–66). Over the course of the thirteenth, and the first decades of the fourteenth centuries we have 35 metal objects signed by some 27 craftsmen who style themselves ‘al-Mawsili’. And we have no less than eight with inscriptions stating that they were made in Mosul or for the ruler of Mosul or for members of his entourage. Current uncertainty is largely a reaction to the reductive assertion at the turn of the twentieth century that Mosul was the principal production centre of inlaid metalwork in the thirteenth century.

Silver-inlaid brasses of the first half of the thirteenth century were among the first Islamic objets d’art to be studied in Europe. Examples reached Europe at an early date, and were accessible, at least in Italy, well before the Orientalist fashion for scouring the bazaars of Egypt and the Levant from the mid-nineteenth century; and, well before the emergence of art-historical studies, the objects offered iconographic and inscriptive challenges that attracted scholars who were historians, epigraphers and numismatists.

Scholarship on the subject began with the publication of an ideal marriage of a documentary object and literary documentation. In 1828 Joseph Toussaint Reinaud published the collection of the French royalist and antiquarian Pierre Louis Jean Casimir (Duc) de Blacas d’Aulps (1771–1839), which included the only item known – until recently – to record that it was produced in Mosul itself, the celebrated ‘Blacas ewer’ made in 1232. Reinaud also translated the account by an Andalusian visitor to Mosul in 1250, Ibn Sa’id: ‘Mosul…there are many crafts in the city, especially inlaid brass vessels which are exported to rulers.’ In the 1840s Reinaud’s friend Michelangelo Lanci published several items of thirteenth-century inlaid metalwork, including the tray in Munich made for Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, the ruler of Mosul. Mosul’s reputation was assured.

By the 1860s Mosul’s precedence was being questioned. Claiming to have studied several hundred objects and to have found the names of some twenty artists, Henri Lavoix concluded that Damascus, Aleppo, Mosul, Egypt, and unnamed cities on the
Mediterranean coast all produced inlaid metalwork. He provided no details, and tested credence by listing names and places like litanies, and by claiming he had seen works produced for a roll-call of famous twelfth-century rulers, works, incidentally, that have still to surface. He adopted a more nuanced tone some fifteen years later, when he acknowledged that the artists of Mosul deserved an independent chapter in the history of Islamic art: their work, he said, can be distinguished by its figural imagery, whereas in Syria and Cairo the engraver’s burin ‘imprisons itself, by contrast, in ornament and lettering’. Lavoix was the first to draw attention to a ewer made by Husayn ibn Muhammad al-Mawsili in Damascus in ‘659/1260’. He made little of this crucial discovery, however, and the object itself disappeared from scholarly sight for the next thirty years.

Mosul was accorded precedence and primacy by Lavoix’s numismatic colleague, Stanley Lane-Poole. Writing in the 1880s and 1890s, he proposed a Syrian school that was intermediary between Mosul and Mamluk Cairo, but his arguments were slight, and his proposal tentative, especially as he knew nothing of the ewer made in Damascus.

A critical point came in the first decade of the twentieth century, when Gaston Migeon’s over-enthusiastic advocacy of Mosul provoked a stern reaction whose influence is still felt today. In the space of eight years, from 1899 to 1907, Migeon reached out to a broad public, publishing a two-part article on ‘Cuivres Arabes’ in the generalist art journal Gazette des Beaux-Arts, organising a major exhibition of Islamic art in Paris, and writing the first comprehensive introduction to Islamic objets d’art. In these he vaunted the role of Mosul, and claimed its production of inlaid metalware ran from the twelfth until the fifteenth century.

He acknowledged in the article that his classification of inlaid metalwork was ‘de peu doctrinal’, but three years later – in the 1903 Palais Marsan exhibition – he adopted an even more doctrinaire classification, assigning the metalwork to three families: Mosul, Egypt and Persia. He recognised that other centres, such as Damascus, had competing claims, and tempered his schema with caveats, but his labels and captions were uncompromising. To Mosul he attributed a farrago of items we now know were made in several different regions (Fig. 1.1). The striking differences in technique, material and style must have been obvious to many visitors. Friedrich Sarre, a lender to the exhibition, expressed serious reservations. Even a non-expert, the critic and historian of French eighteenth-century painting Virgile Josz, raised doubts about the classification. Such unease may explain why one of the scholars who collaborated with Migeon on the Paris show, Max van Berchem, promptly wrote what amounts to a disclaimer.

Van Berchem’s classification seems at first even more rudimentary: his ‘Oriental’ group comprises works from Khurasan to Mosul, his ‘Occidental’ consists of items in the
name of Ayyubid rulers of Syria and Egypt, a group he said might even already be ‘syro-
égyptien’ – a prelude in other words to the presumed situation under the Mamluks. The difference, however, is that van Berchem’s approach was methodical, and based on a scrupulous reading of the epigraphic and historical evidence of works with documentary inscriptions, whereas Migeon’s classification was an attempt to impose order on a large miscellany of objects, the majority of which lacked historical inscriptions.

Over the next three years van Berchem twice returned to the topic of Mosul metalwork, arguing that only six known silver-inlaid objects could be connected with Mosul itself, whereas many others must have been made in Syria and ultimately Cairo. He countered Migeon’s principal arguments in favour of Mosul: its access to regional copper mines, Ibn Sa’id’s praise for Mosul metalwork, and the large number of items signed by artists who styled themselves ‘al-Mawsili’. Van Berchem argued that other cities had access to those mines, and that the last two points merely testified to Mosul’s fame as a metalwork centre. They did not justify treating all items in a comparable style as if they came from a geographically restricted ‘school’, a term that should be used with ‘prudent reserve’.

Van Berchem’s studied caution had an immediate effect not only on his co-author Friedrich Sarre, but on Migeon himself, who in 1907 dedicated his book on Islamic minor arts to van Berchem, and abandoned his three-part classification in favour of van Berchem’s bipartite schema. Nevertheless, the notion of a ‘Mosul School’ was hard
to dislodge, and Maurice Dimand27 and Ernst Kühnel28 used the term liberally in the scholarly and popular publications they produced between the two World Wars. This was more than a matter of tradition and convenience, and more than a default label because it was difficult to distinguish products from different centres.29 It was based on what both considered to be positive evidence: the plethora of al-Mawsili signatures; and the frequent occurrence of a personification of Luna, a figure holding a crescent moon, which Dimand thought was probably the ‘coat-of arms’ of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, and Kühnel took to be an emblem of the city of Mosul, points we shall return to later.30 Many previously unrecorded objects were published in the interwar period, when Gaston Wiet, among others, provided invaluable listings of metalwork in the name of Arabek, Ayyubid, Rasulid and Mamluk dedicatees.31

In 1945 Mehmed Ağa-Oğlu published a study on incense-burners, using detailed typological and decorative analysis to attribute groups to different regions of the Central Islamic Lands. In the process he made strong assertions, and often highly perceptive observations, about the style of both Mosul and Syrian inlaid metalwork, with the result that his work proved influential.32 In his characterization of Mosul and Syrian work, ‘The artists of Mosul were interested primarily in the general effect of inlaid decoration, and were less particular about the engraving of details. The inlaid metals of Syria, however, showed a marked tendency and a steadily increasing devotion of the artist to the difficult engraving of details, be it the pattern of a gown, the plumage of birds, or the fur of animals.’33

There were, however, problems with Ağa-Oğlu’s method. He overlooked the admittedly few items carrying express documentation that they were made in Syria,34 and instead made conclusions about a Syrian style based on several assumptions: that items with Christian imagery were from Syria; that the Barberini vase was ‘most certainly from a Syrian atelier’ as it bears the name of an Ayyubid ruler of Aleppo and Damascus; that a well-known incense-burner in the name of Muhammad ibn Qalawun was from Egypt but under Syrian influence; and that the Baptistère de St Louis was definitively from Syria. None of these assumptions are proven, though, and several illustrate a tendency to retroject onto the thirteenth century ‘evidence’ from the fourteenth; this is a particular problem given that Ağa-Oğlu tends to assume a static view of Mosul metalwork of the thirteenth century, whereas, as we shall see, it exhibited considerable stylistic change.

In the decade between 1949 and 1958 David Storm Rice transformed the study of Islamic inlaid metalwork with a series of articles in which he combined van Berchem’s epigraphic exactitude with, as he termed it, ‘searching’ examination of individual objects – an examination that van Berchem had said was essential and that Ağa-Oğlu had shown was possible.35 The results were magisterial, and have dominated the field for the last
half century. Rice’s erudition and observation were not, however, always matched by his reasoning. What appear at first to be objective and inductive arguments seem coloured from the outset by scepticism.

The quotation marks in the title of his earliest article – ‘The oldest dated “Mosul” candlestick’ – are an instant signal of doubt that is clarified in the opening statement: ‘The name “Mosul bronzes” is often given to an important group of medieval silver-inlaid Islamic brasses, although whether or not there was such a “school” still remains to be proved.’ By 1957, when he published his seminal article on the work of Ahmad al-Dhaki and his assistants, Rice was unwilling to attribute to Mosul any more than the six items van Berchem had granted it.

Rice argued instead that over some two decades Ahmad al-Dhaki’s workshop operated first in a ‘Mesopotamian’, then a ‘Syro-Egyptian’ style. Whatever it was, it was not a ‘Mosul’ style. Rice pictured al-Dhaki moving from an Artuqid centre such as Amid (Diyarbakır) to Ayyubid Egypt or more likely Syria. His argument rested on epigraphic evidence purportedly relating to the patron, and art-historical evidence relating to technique, style and iconography. Issues abound with both lines of argument.

The attribution to ‘Mesopotamia’ – that is, to Amid rather than Mosul – rests entirely on Rice’s interpretation of two graffiti on a candlestick now in Boston, dated 622/1225 and signed by (‘amal) Abu Bakr ibn Hajji Jaldak, the ghulam of the naqqash Ahmad al-Dhaki al-Mawsili. It is not inscribed with the name of a patron, but is incised with two ownership marks, one that reads ‘The pantry of Mas‘ud [al-tishtkhanah al-mas‘udiyyah]’, the other dar ‘afīf al-muzaffar, which Rice translated as ‘For the harem (dār) (under the supervision of) ‘Afīf al-Muzaffarī’. Rice connected this Mas‘ud with Abu’l Fath Mawdud, the last Artuqid ruler of Amid, and suggested the candlestick ‘may have been made in Amida itself’. In the 1957 article he expanded the scenario by suggesting that the Muzaffar mentioned in the second graffito referred to the ruler of Hama who gave refuge to al-Malik al-Mas‘ud after 1237. He might have added that an important figure in Hama in the period was ‘Afif al-Din b. Marahil al-Salmani.

Despite the coincidence of names, this was a tendentious argument for several reasons. First, these were not the only candidates, and this was not the only historical scenario. Second, the graffito referring to the pantry of al-Mas‘ud does not prove that the candlestick was made for a Malik al-Ma’sud. Third, even if it was made for the last Artuqid ruler of Amid, this does not prove that the workshop was in Amid.

Other potential owners include al-Malik al-Ma‘sud, who was the Ayyubid ruler of Yemen between 612 and 626 (1215 and 1228/9), but for no given reason Rice dismisses him as someone ‘who might possibly, but not probably, have been the owner of the candlestick’ (my italics). Rice presumably restricted his search to princes ruling in 1225 when the candlestick was made, otherwise he might have mentioned al-Malik
al-Mas’ud who was the last sovereign of the Zangid line (d.1251), ruled Jazirat ibn ‘Umar, and was the son-in-law of the overlord of Mosul, Badr al-Din Lu’lu’.43

As for ‘Afif and his owner or patron, al-Muzaffar, there were several rulers in Hama with the regnal title of al-Malik al-Muzaffar and several in the Yemen, not to mention the Ayyubid Shihab al-Din Ghazi of Mayyafarinqin (1220–44) and even one of Badr al-Din’s own sons.44 One could therefore imagine several different histories for this object, one connected to the family of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, another to the Rasulids of Yemen. Which is the correct hypothesis is unclear, but Rice’s scenario seems an uncertain foundation on which to posit a workshop in Amid.

A second difficulty is that the graffito referring to al-Mas’ud does not prove that the candlestick was made for a Malik al-Mas’ud. It lacks the introductory phrase bi-rasm (for) which is found on almost all objects where a graffito refers to the person for whom the object was originally made. Neither of the graffiti on the Boston candlestick proves who the original owner was, let alone who commissioned the candlestick.45

Third, even if the candlestick was made for the last Artuqid ruler of Amid, a single commissioned object is scant reason on its own to argue that the ‘workshop of Ibn Jaldak and his master was in Amida or in a place under the control of the Urtuqid branch of Hisn Kaifa-Amida’. In 1949 Rice acknowledged his arguments were ‘admittedly hypothetical’; a decade later hypothesis had hardened into near certainty.46

Rice attributed Ahmad al-Dhaki’s later work to Syria or Egypt on the evidence of the basin that al-Dhaki made for the Ayyubid ruler al-Malik al-’Adil II.47 Datable to between 1238 and 1240, almost two decades separates the Louvre basin from al-Dhaki’s earliest surviving signed work, a ewer in Cleveland dated 622/1223, and from the earliest work by al-Dhaki’s ghulam, the Boston candlestick of 1225. Rice pointed out differences in technique and style between these phases (Figs 1.2a and 1.2b), but his interpretations are problematic. He admits the technical differences might be ‘a matter of chronology rather than geography,’ but he attributes the differences in style to a change in geography – they ‘denote an adaptation to Syro-Egyptian fashions’. For no given reason, then, the change in technique was a question of time, the change in style a question of location.48

An initial difficulty is that Rice provided no indubitably Syro-Egyptian object as a comparison.49 Second, the items he principally compared to the Louvre basin were two he attributed to Mosul – the Blacas ewer and the Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ tray in Munich. He juxtaposed details from the Munich tray and the Louvre basin, but it is hard to see why he claimed one was made in Mosul and the other was in an ‘Ayyubid Syrian’ style (Fig. 1.3). Conversely, he is silent on their similarities: each has a frieze of double-T frets interrupted by lobed medallions that occupy the full height of the frieze and that are set off by thin contour lines tied into the top and bottom of the frieze by small loops; and
above Changes in the style of Ahmad al-Dhaki’s work over fifteen years: a) Cleveland ewer, dated 1223; b) Louvre basin, datable to 1238–40. Height of the medallions respectively 4cm and 5cm.

left Rice’s juxtaposition of medallions from Ahmad al-Dhaki’s Louvre basin (a–d) and the Munich tray in the name of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ (e–i).
the medallions enclose human and animal figures against a scroll background which contrasts with the dense geometry of the frieze.

Rice did not illustrate the Blacas ewer, but it has similar geometric friezes interrupted by comparable figural medallions. The Blacas medallions have twice as many lobes as those reproduced from the Louvre basin or the Munich tray (Figs 1.4a and 1.4b), but medallions with identical profiles to those on the Blacas ewer can be found on the inside of the Louvre basin (Figs 1.4c and 4d). The stylistic distinction

---

**FIG. 1.4** Medallions from the ‘Blacas’ ewer, dated Mosul 1232 (a and b); the exterior and interior of Ahmad al-Dhaki’s Louvre basin, datable to 1238–40 (c and d).
between the medallion friezes on these three object escapes me. There are differences in the drawing and detailing of the figures, and in the treatment of some of the background scrolls – as one would expect to find in the work of different craftsmen – but there is no justification for defining two broad stylistic groups attributable to two different regions.

Rice argued that Ahmad al-Dhaki worked in Amid and then in Syria (or Egypt), with no mention of Mosul. He decried the term ‘Mosul School’ as ‘too specific and too narrow to be useful’, and denied the existence of a ‘Mosul style’ as ‘a suggestion which is not borne out by the facts’. Yet he was postulating an ‘Ayyubid Syrian’ style largely from a single object made in the name of a ruler of Egypt and Syria, while denying that the same style might be from Mosul, even though it appeared on an object indubitably made in Mosul and on another made for the ruler of Mosul. This seems perverse, especially as the Blacas ewer preceded al-Dhaki’s basin by almost a decade.

In summary, Rice’s argument that al-Dhaki’s basin is stylistically different from Mosul work is not convincing. He made valid observations about the differences between al-Dhaki’s early and later work – between work from the 1220s and work from the late 1230s – but failed to prove they stemmed from a change in location rather than the passage of time. Rice’s work warrants a critique because it has dominated the study of Atabek and Ayyubid metalwork for the last half century. In his sceptical stance on the role of Mosul as a metalworking centre, Rice was heir to van Berchem’s circumspect approach, which had been provoked by Migeon’s uncritical attributions.

Rice’s initial premiss was doubt, and his case against a Mosul School was predicated on a faulty inference and a questionable deduction. The inference was that the graffiti on the Boston candlestick by a pupil of Ahmad al-Dhaki indicated that al-Dhaki himself was working in Amid/Diyarbakir. The deduction was that Ahmad al-Dhaki must have been working later in Syria (or Egypt) because the Louvre basin was dedicated to an Ayyubid who was briefly ruler of Egypt and of Syria.

Rice and many others have tended to deduce provenance from two generalised assumptions. One is that a dedicatee’s name indicates that he was the ‘patron’ of an object. In other words that he actively commissioned the item rather than passively received it. By blithely referring to dedicatees as ‘patrons,’ we subconsciously ignore the possibility of gifts.

The second assumption is that Mawsili metalworkers were active where their patrons were located. Taken to its logical conclusion, this would mean that for every ruler for whom we have a surviving inlaid metal object there would have been a local
workshop. In an era when minor principalities proliferated, we would end up with no less than nine production centres, best illustrated in a map (Fig. 1.5). No one in the last half century has been prepared, it is true, to argue for this fully dispersed model of production; on the other hand, no one has proposed a fully centralised model, with Mosul as the sole production centre in the first half of the thirteenth century. The result is that we are left with six objects long accepted as having been produced in Mosul; Rice’s tendentious attributions to a ‘Syrian’ school; and numerous ‘orphan’ objects with no specific attributions. We might do well to look for an alternative strategy.

In what follows I have adopted three of several possible strategies, though each deserves more attention than I can give it here. One is to see whether the documentary inscriptions on the metalwork reveal more than we have assumed. The second is to see whether stylistic criteria can be used to identify workshop groupings. The third is to look for stylistic relationships with other media known to have been produced in Mosul or its immediate environs.

![Fig. 1.5](image-url) A ‘dispersed’ model of production of Atabek, Ayyubid and Rasulid inlaid metalwork in the first half of the thirteenth century. Map by Robert Foy.
THE ‘PRINCIPLE OF PARSIMONY’

We might begin by lancing the presumption of doubt engendered by van Berchem and Rice, by invoking the principle of parsimony, the precept that opposes more complex explanations when a simpler one will do. In this case, why assume an unsubstantiated model of dispersed production when the simpler solution would be that much of the inlaid metalwork of the first half of the thirteenth century was produced in Mosul and exported?

This approach is supported by the express testimony of the Andalusian Ibn Sa’id who visited Mosul in 1250 and noted, ‘There are many crafts in the city, especially inlaid brass vessels which are exported to rulers, as are the silken garments woven there.’ As Rice observed, the phrase *tuhmal minha ila’l-muluk* means more than just ‘is exported.’ The expression indicates that the vessels were of high quality and fit for kings. Rice therefore added a parenthesis to the translation – ‘are exported (and presented) to rulers’ – but he failed to pursue the implications.

If Mosul exported metalwork commercially, why are we reluctant to attribute objects to Mosul? If Mosul exported metalwork as princely gifts, why do we presume that an object dedicated to the ruler of a rival city was produced there rather than in Mosul? Paradoxically, we assume a different model for the first half of the thirteenth century than for the second. In the 1290s the Mamluk sultan in Cairo ordered hundreds of candlesticks from Damascus, while an inlay workshop in Cairo was supplying metal objects, complete with individualised dedications, to the Rasulids in Yemen. We are content then with the idea of exports from two centres of production in the late thirteenth century. Contrariwise, we tend towards a picture of dispersed production some half century or so earlier, even though we are told that Mosul exported metalware.

Metal craftsmen may well have emigrated from Mosul in the first half of the thirteenth century, but the first certain evidence dates from the 1250s. By that decade at least one workshop was established in Damascus, and by the 1260s another in Cairo. In both the craftsmen signed themselves ‘al-Mawsili’. A shift in the centres of production emerges clearly from Table 1.1a (pp. 58–62), which is an attempt at a comprehensive list of documentary inlaid metalwork from the Jazira, Syria and Egypt between 1200 and 1275. Table 1.1b is a partial continuation which highlights (1) all the known items signed by Mawsili craftsmen over the subsequent fifty years, (2) all the items with certain provenance, and (3) for the period 1275–1325 a selection of the more important dedicatory objects.

Over the course of 125 years, starting in about 1200, we have 35 objects made by some 27 craftsmen who used the *nisbah* al-Mawsili. This is a remarkably high ratio.
of named artists to documentary objects. Of these 35, 28 are dated, of which four are scientific instruments. Eighty per cent of the objects signed by craftsmen who used the *nisbah* al-Mawsili can be assigned to between about 1220 and 1275, with the remaining 20 per cent from the next half century (Table 1.1b). Two objects are recorded to have been made in Mosul, but none after 1255. Excluding astrolabes, no silver-inlaid metalware is recorded to have been produced in Damascus or Cairo before 1257 and 1269 respectively. If we apply the principle of parsimony, the simplest explanation is that some craftsmen moved from Mosul to Syria in the middle of the thirteenth century. Our task is to see if this straightforward conclusion holds when we take a closer look at the evidence for all three centres.

**PRODUCTION IN MOSUL: THE EVIDENCE FROM INSCRIPTIONS**

The fifty years between van Berchem’s and Rice’s studies saw the publication of a large number of previously unknown objects signed by Mawsili craftsmen. Rice, however, accepted none of these as Mosul products, and adhered to the handful identified by van Berchem, namely the Blacas ewer and five items bearing the name and titles of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’. The last fifty years have seen several more Mawsili masters added to the roster, and one item inscribed as having been produced in Mosul, and I would suggest that over three times as many documentary objects can be linked to Mosul as van Berchem and Rice accepted – not six but 19.

Until recently the Blacas ewer was the sole object known to bear an inscription identifying it as a product of Mosul. In 1997 the David Collection in Copenhagen acquired a pen-box inlaid by ‘Ali ibn Yahya in Mosul in 653/1255–56.61 The artist is previously unrecorded, and his hand cannot immediately be detected on other known objects. No other works by the artist of the Blacas ewer, Shuja’ ibn Man’a, are known either, and two objects with a stated Mosul origin may seem a small number on which to construct a ’Mosul School’. There is, however, biographical information, in particular relating to master–pupil relationships, that provides a fuller picture.

Shuja’ ibn Man’a belonged to a family of considerable importance in Mosul in the first half of the thirteenth century.62 Shuja’ must have had a workshop with at least one assistant: Muhammad ibn Fattuh calls himself Shuja’a s *ajir* (hireling) on a candlestick that he inlaid.63 The candlestick was fashioned by al-Hajj Isma’il, but his affiliation, if any, with Shuja’ is not mentioned. The candlestick is undated, but in terms of form and decoration a date in the 1230s seems fitting.64 As Shuja’ ibn Man’a was working in Mosul in 1232, that was presumably where Muhammad ibn Fattuh and al-Hajj Isma’il produced their candlestick; if they were working in another city, it would have been
curious for Muhammad ibn Fattuh to refer to his employer by name, whereas in Mosul Shuja’ was presumably a celebrated practitioner.

Another Mawsili master with several recorded assistants was Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya. Isma’il ibn Ward identified himself as Ibrahim’s tilmidh (pupil) on a box he decorated in 617/1220, and Qasim ibn ‘Ali signs himself as Ibrahim’s ghulam in 1232. A fortunate item of evidence indicates that Isma’il was active in Mosul. On 6 February 1249 (20 Shawwal 646) he finished transcribing a copy of al-Baghawi’s Masabih al-Sunna, signing himself Isma’il ibn Ward ibn ‘Abdallah al-Naqqash al-Mawsili. Only four months later the manuscript was certified after a series of readings to religious scholars in Mosul, which makes it very likely that Isma’il was in Mosul when he copied the manuscript. This does not prove that he was working in Mosul almost thirty years earlier, when, as a young pupil, he would have been in his teens. We can either surmise that he and his teacher were working in an unknown city, to where they must have moved from Mosul, as he refers to both himself and his teacher as Mawsili, and that he, with or without his teacher, later moved back to Mosul, or we can adopt a simpler solution: that Mosul was where Isma’il was trained, worked and transcribed his manuscript. In that case, Mosul by extension becomes the workplace of Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya, and by further extension of Qasim ibn ‘Ali.

Isma’il ibn Ward was likely to have been active in Mosul for at least three decades. We have no other works signed by him using the nasab Ward, but it is conceivable that he was the al-Hajj Isma’il who produced the candlestick decorated by Muhammad ibn Fattuh. Biographical information largely derived from their signed works suggests that out of some twenty Mawsili metalworkers active before 1275 at least eight – or, if Isma’il ibn Ward and al-Hajj Isma’il were two different individuals, nine – were operating in Mosul. Two testify to the fact; in the case of Isma’il ibn Ward the evidence is circumstantial; in the case of the others the evidence is contingent; in the case of Ahmad al-Dhaki the evidence, as we shall see shortly, comes from a distinctive motif.

Inscriptions bearing the name of the recipient provide further evidence. Five items universally accepted as work from Mosul are the three trays, a candlestick (Fig. 1.6), and a box carrying the name and titles of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’. None of these items records the date or place of manufacture, but one, a tray in the Victoria and Albert Museum, bears a graffito confirming it was destined for Badr al-Din’s commissariat. In addition, two items can be connected to members of Badr al-Din’s court. One is a bowl in Bologna that was a calque on a well-known contemporary ceramic shape from Kashan or Raqqa. It was made for a Najm al-Din al-Badri. Rice acknowledged that Najm al-Din’s nisbah made it likely he was an officer of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, and he even wondered whether his name Najm, which translates as star, was connected to the Badr (moon) of his master. Yet no one has stated the obvious: if we accept that the metalwork made for Badr
al-Din Lu’lu’ was produced in Mosul, why not assume the same for a bowl made for one of his officers?70

The second item is a candlestick in the Louvre that has largely been overlooked (Fig. 1.7).71 Inside the footring it bears two graffiti: one reads ‘By order of the buttery of Amir Sayf, son [son?] of the Lord of Mosul’ (bi-rasm sharāb khānāh almīr [sic] sayf [?] ibn ibn [sic] sāhīb al-Mawsil); the other ‘Sharaf the Coppersmith [Sharaf (?) al-nahbās]’. Sharaf could have been the maker, as Leo Mayer suggested, but I would be cautious about including him in the roster of Mawsili craftsmen, as his name is not prefaced by the equivalent of *fecit*. The name on its own may indicate that Sharaf was a subsequent owner of the candlestick. In contrast, the use of the phrase *bi-rasm* in the other graffito suggests that the object was made for a member of the ruling household, and that it has almost as good a claim to be a product of Mosul as the items inscribed in the name of Badr al-Din.

Another purported craftsman is Muhammad ibn ‘Isun, whose name appears on its own in a small cartouche on the front of the great tray in Munich inscribed with the names and titles of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’. Muhammad ibn ‘Isun’s name is inlaid in a similar script to the main inscription, but is anomalous in its isolation and brevity. Two of the most eminent epigraphers, Max van Berchem and Moritz Sobernheim, took him to be the craftsman, but I would agree with Rice and advise caution, as the cartouche lacks
any equivalent of *fecit*.72 There is a formal, inlaid inscription – not a graffito – on the back of the tray recording that Badr al-Din had the object made for a princess entitled Khatun Khawanrah,73 and I wonder if Muhammad ibn ‘Isun might not have been the groom. This could explain two of the graffiti on the back of the tray. One indicates that it was made for the buttery of a courtier of Badr al-Din (*bi-rasm sharāb khānāh al-badrī*).74 The other is in the name of al-Hasan ibn ‘Isun, which puzzled both van Berchem and Sobernheim; however, if Muhammad ibn ‘Isun was the groom, ownership of the tray might have passed to his brother.75

I would not, therefore, propose adding the name of either Sharaf or Muhammad ibn ‘Isun to the roster of Mosuli metalworkers. On the other hand, the basin in Kiev which bears the name and titles of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ appears to have a signature partially deciphered by Kratchkovskaya as ‘...Yusuf’. She was unaware of any artist with this name, but, as Oleg Grabar pointed out, the ewer in the Walters Art Gallery is signed by Yunus ibn Yusuf al-Mawsili. The ewer does not mention a patron’s name, nor where it was made, but it is dated 644/1246–47, which falls within the dates of Badr al-Din’s admittedly long rule (1233–59).76 If the maker of the Kiev basin and...
the Walters ewer were one and the same person, that would surely help localise the ewer to Mosul.\textsuperscript{77} The basin can be dated to the latter part of Badr al-Din’s reign on the basis of the titles used, and it and the ewer certainly belong to the same stylistic period, with a common use of both arabesque and T-fret grounds; and several figures on both objects have awkwardly thin arms. Nonetheless, I would caution against too hastily assuming they were made by the same craftsman: though the Kiev basin is in very poor condition, it is still evident that the outlines of the figures are uneven, whereas those on the Walters ewer maintain a much firmer line.

Curiously, few of the objects signed by Mawsili craftsmen in the first half of the thirteenth century bear personalised dedications (Table 1.1a). One is the geomantic table by Muhammad ibn Khutlukh, but no one has yet identified the patron. Another is Ahmad al-Dhaki’s Louvre basin made for al-Malik al-‘Adil II Sayf al-Din Abu Bakr. The third is the ewer – now in the Freer Gallery of Art – made in 1232 by Qasim ibn ‘Ali, Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya’s ghulam. In this case signature and dedication appear to offer contradictory evidence about where the object was made.

The ewer is inscribed in the name of a Shihab al-Din, who has plausibly been identified as Shihab al-Din Tughril, the regent for the young Ayyubid sultan of Aleppo, al-Malik al-‘Aziz Ghiyath al-Din Muhammad (r.1216–37). On the traditional assumption that the domicile of the dedicatee indicates where the object was made, Qasim ibn ‘Ali is alleged to have been active in Aleppo, or at least Syria.\textsuperscript{78} However, Qasim ibn ‘Ali’s association – via Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya – with Isma’il ibn Ward points to Qasim ibn ‘Ali working in Mosul. By 1232 he could have moved to Aleppo. Alternatively, the ewer may have been made for Shihab al-Din Tughril as a gift or commission, and produced in Mosul.

The ewer is afigural, which was unusual for the period, and it may have been designed for ritual ablutions or in deference to Shihab al-Din’s well-attested religious scrupulosity.\textsuperscript{79} It was produced in Ramadan of 629, a year after Shihab al-Din had stepped down from the regency and handed the reins of government to al-Malik al-‘Aziz; it was, in fact, the very month he was obliged to hand over his estates and castle at Tell Bashir to the young sultan, who was surprised at how small Shihab al-Din’s treasury was; and it was some 16 months before he died.\textsuperscript{80} Ramadan 629 was also the month when al-Malik al-‘Aziz’s bride arrived from Cairo.

None of this allows us to determine whether the ewer was personally ordered by Shihab al-Din,\textsuperscript{81} or by someone who was well aware of Shihab al-Din’s preferences. The manner in which the inscription refers to Shihab al-Din as ascetic, devout and god-fearing might suggest that the ewer was a gift from someone who admired his piety, rather than that it was an expression of self-satisfaction. The wording (\textit{al-zāhid, al-‘ābid, al-wari‘}) is distinctive, and is not found on any published item of metalwork except one.
This is the bowl in the name of Najm al-Din al-Badri, where he is described as al-amīr al-kabīr and zayn al-hājj, which may mean that he was in charge of the pilgrimage to Mecca. Precisely the same epithets are used in the same order on both the Shihab al-Din ewer and the Najm al-Din al-Badri bowl, suggesting they were a formula rather than a special commission. As Najm al-Din is identified as a member of Badr al-Din’s court, the implication is, first, that the ewer and the bowl were produced in Mosul, and, second, that they were presentation items rather than commissions.

In the case of the ewer we cannot even rule out Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ himself as the donor. Despite continuing struggles with the princes of Aleppo, he had strong contacts with the city, and might even have wished to earn the goodwill of the former regent at a time when he was effectively being marginalised. Indeed, Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ and Shihab al-Din Tughril were both patrons of ‘Izz al-Din ibn al-Athir, who was effectively Badr al-Din’s court historian, and Ibn Khallikan records that towards the end of 626/November 1229 he saw Ibn al-Athir staying at Shihab al-Din’s residence in Aleppo as his guest.

Contrary to common assumption, then, the ewer could have been made in Mosul, whereas it is somewhat unlikely it was made in Aleppo when there is no independent proof – such as literary references, inscriptions or craftsmen’s nisbahs – and no subsequent evidence from the Mamluk period that Aleppo ever produced inlaid metalwork, though the son of al-Malik al-‘Aziz, al-Nasir II Salah al-Din Yusuf (b.1230; r. Aleppo 1237–60) did build a metalwork market near the Great Mosque. Damascus, by contrast, certainly became a centre of metal inlay, but the earliest evidence, apart from an astrolabe, dates almost thirty years later than the Freer ewer. The earliest dated inlaid vessels that record a Damascus manufacture are a candlestick of 1257 and a ewer of 1259, the latter, intriguingly, also connected with al-Nasir II Yusuf (Table 1.1a).

Badr al-Din did make gifts of metalware: he is recorded to have presented a metal candlestick every year to the Mashhad ‘Ali, though it was of gold, not inlaid brass, and weighed 1000 dinars. He may have given gold objects to secular recipients too, but the Munich tray is proof that he gave inlaid metalwork. We should therefore allow the possibility that he presented inlaid metalwork as diplomatic gifts, and that Mosul could have been the source for some of the items that carry the names of Ayyubid princes. Gifts served many purposes: they could be a gesture of submission in sporadic instances, or on a recurrent basis the equivalent of tribute; they could be blandishments and bribes; they could be a form of reward, or one of the many niceties of the diplomatic protocol of the Muslim world. Badr al-Din used gifts in all these modalities.

Badr al-Din was not famed for his military victories, yet he managed to stay in power for almost half a century, despite pressures from local Jaziran rivals, the Ayyubids of Syria and Egypt, the Seljuks of Rum, not to mention the tidal wave of eastern invaders,
first the Khwarazmians and then the Mongols. He achieved this longevity through a policy of appeasement and frequent realignments with the great powers. His realpolitik is borne out by his scatter of marriage alliances, and by the changing allegiances that appear on his coinage. Gifts too played their part, and it would have been natural if Badr al-Din had used Mosul's luxury products, such as its textiles and inlaid metalwork, to lubricate his diplomatic efforts.

For example, in the course of two years Badr al-Din lavished gifts on al-Malik al-Salih Najm al-Din Ayyub, the son of the ruler of Egypt, al-Malik al-Kamil. In this time the gifts went from the placatory to the celebratory. In 635/1237–38 Badr al-Din used presents to try to dissuade al-Malik al-Salih from encouraging the dreaded Khwarazmians to make raids on his territory — to no avail. In 636, following al-Malik al-Kamil's death and al-Malik al-Salih's takeover of Damascus, the two erstwhile foes were on the best of terms and Badr al-Din sent forty mamluks and horses, and clothes, garments, gold and dirhems. He sent [this][sic] to apologize for his previous behavior. These two kings became as one after great hostility. Between them a friendship arose which could hardly be interrupted. No express reference is made to metalwork among the presents, but it was very possible such objects were included. In the intervening period al-Malik al-Salih had persuaded the Khwarazmians to attack Badr al-Din, and he fled, abandoning his treasure and baggage train. There was evidently a surfeit of inlaid metalwork, because items were being sold at a fraction of their normal cost — Sibt ibn al-Jawzi (d.1256) says that an inlaid pen-box worth 200 dirhams sold for a mere 5 dirhams, a ewer and basin for 20. If so much inlaid metalwork was available among Badr al-Din’s possessions, it may have played a common role in his gift-giving. This, of course, raises questions about whether any, or all, of the four known items in al-Malik al-Salih’s name might have been commissioned by Badr al-Din as gifts.

Even in the case of a ruler such as al-Malik al-Nasir II Salah al-Din Yusuf, for whom, as we have seen, a ewer was produced in Damascus in 1259, we cannot rule out the possibility that other known objects in his name — the Barberini vase in the Louvre and a large basin in the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (Table 1.1a) — might have been made in Mosul. In 649/1251, for example, Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ sent al-Nasir Yusuf in Damascus gifts worth 20,000 dinars, which Ibn Shaddad described as ‘horses, cloth, and articles’. The nature of those ‘articles’ is not specified, but the word al-ālāt could certainly comprise inlaid brasses, as it is used in this sense by al-Maqrizi, describing a market in Cairo.

While the possibility of gifts makes the issue of the provenance of items with dedicatory inscriptions more complicated than scholars have previously assumed, several different forms of inscriptive evidence suggest that at least 14 items, some signed by craftsmen who used the nisbah al-Mawsili, some bearing the name of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ or figures associated with his court, can be linked to Mosul with differing
degrees of probability: Table 1.2a (p. 67) comprises items with inscriptions that provide direct, contingent or circumstantial evidence of a connection with Mosul. Table 1.2b includes five works by Ahmad al-Dhaki and his assistant Ibn Jaldak. Their inscriptions are not sufficient to prove that Ahmad al-Dhaki and Ibn Jaldak worked in Mosul, but several features link their work to items with a strong connection to Mosul.

One of these is the remarkable similarity in size and, above all, form between the ewers produced by Ahmad al-Dhaki in 1223 and Qasim ibn ‘Ali in 1232, a similarity that extends to their cast handles (Fig. 1.8). Another is a highly distinctive motif – an octagon filled with a complex geometry – that occurs on Ibn Jaldak’s two known works and al-Dhaki’s 1238–40 basin, and on two core items in the Mosul corpus, the Blacas ewer and the Munich tray. We have already seen that these last two are stylistically close to Ahmad al-Dhaki’s basin.

This octagon appears on at least thirteen items over the course of three decades from the 1220s to the 1240s (Fig. 1.9) (Table 1.2a–c). It does not occur, to my knowledge, on any other published metalwork of the thirteenth century. The manner in which it
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**Fig. 1.8** Ewers produced by (a) Ahmad al-Dhaki, dated 1223 (b) Qasim ibn‘Ali, dated 1232. Respectively, Cleveland Museum of Art and Freer Gallery of Art.
often interrupts the flow of the design arguably makes it look more like a ‘brand’ than an integrated decorative motif. This is the case on the Blacas ewer, for example, and on an incense-burner in the British Museum dated 1242–43 which has a conspicuous example of the octagon on its lid. If the octagon functioned as workshop mark, perhaps as a mark of master-craftsmanship, it would be one of the most important diagnostics of the prime phase of Mosul inlaid metalwork.96

The octagon connects signed and unsigned objects. It occurs, for example, on the candlestick made by Dawud ibn Salama in 646/1248–49, and, though most of the silver

---

**FIG. 1.9** Octagon motif, identified here as a possible workshop or guild emblem, found on (a) candlestick by Abu Bakr b. al-Hajj Jaldak al-Mawsili, 1225. MFA Boston (b) candlestick, c.1225–30. MIA Doha (cf. Fig. 1.25d–f and note 145) (c) candlestick. Nasser D.Khalili Collection (see note 138) (d) candlestick. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (cf. Figs 1.20 and 1.21) (e) ‘Blacas’ ewer by Shuja’ ibn Man’a al-Mawsili, 1232. British Museum (f) tray with titles of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’. Munich Staatliches Museum für Volkerkunde (g) box. Sold London, Christie’s 2011 (see note 96) (h) incense-burner, 1242. British Museum (i) basin by Ahmad al-Dhaki. Louvre (j) ewer by Yunus ibn Yusuf al-Mawsili. Baltimore, Walters Art Museum (k) candlestick by Dawud b. Salama al-Mawsili, 1248. Louvre Museum (l) pen-box by Abu’l Qasim b. Sa’d b. Muhammad. Louvre Museum (m) jug made for Isma’il ibn Ahmad al-Wasiti. After Rice 1957b.
inlay of the figures has been replaced, this object has a clear stylistic link with the later work of Ahmad al-Dhaki (Figs 1.13a and 1.13b). The octagon also occurs on three impressive candlesticks which lack documentary inscriptions. Two of these have strong links to the work of Ibn Jaldak, while the third, as we shall see later, has figurative decoration that can be related to painting from Mosul (Figs 1.20 and 1.21). The octagon connects about half of the principal artists who call themselves al-Mawsili between 1200 and 1250: Ahmad al-Dhaki, Ibn Jaldak, Shuja’ ibn Ma’na, Dawud ibn Salama, and Yunus ibn Yusuf, artists who belong to what we might term the second phase or generation of Mosul metalwork (Fig. 1.11). The exceptions include Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya, who belongs to the first phase, and members of his workshop. Others are Muhammad ibn Khutlukh and Iyas, who may have been less closely linked to the main group of metalworkers in that their primary focus was scientific instruments, and Husayn al-Hakim ibn Ma’sud. There is no documentary evidence to connect Husayn to the main group either, but his only known work, a jug that came to light in the last few years, has scenes whose iconography and style are intimately linked to works that bear the octagon, such as a candlestick in the Metropolitan Museum and the ewer by Yunus ibn Yusuf (Fig. 1.20).

Intriguingly, the octagon seems to disappear from use after 1250. It does not occur on objects made by al-Mawsili metalworkers documented to have worked outside Mosul. Nor is it used by ‘Ali ibn Yahya, who records that the pen-box he decorated was made in Mosul in 653/1255–56. The evidence suggests that, at least for the first half of the thirteenth century, the octagon may be a sufficient – but not necessary – indicator that an object was made in Mosul.

Another feature that occurs on those two key items – the Blacas ewer and the Munich tray – is a figure holding a crescent moon, used not as part of an astrological cycle, but on its own. This motif recurs on many metal objects, and it has been the focus of controversy, as some scholars, notably Dimand and Kühnel, claimed it as diagnostic of Mosul work, seeing it either as the badge of Badr al-Din himself, though Badr means full moon, or as an emblem of the city of Mosul. This was a view sternly rejected by Ağa-Oğlu and then by Rice. Both produced about five similar counter-arguments, and Rice triumphantly concluded, “These last shattering revelations should suffice in themselves to dismiss once and for all the thought that it is possible to attribute an inlaid brass to Mosul at the mere sight of the “Moon figure” in its ornamentation.” It is not possible here to go into details, but none of Ağa-Oğlu’s or Rice’s arguments survive close scrutiny. However, unlike the octagon, the independent personification of the moon continued to be used well into the fourteenth century, and can also be found on work by émigré Mawsili craftsmen. It is still to be determined, then, what import this motif had for metalwork in the first half of the thirteenth century.
The octagon, on the other hand, suggests a stronger association between the principal Mawsili metalworkers in the first half of the thirteenth century than the inscriptive evidence alone indicates, and this is supported by a feature that has been largely overlooked – a rosette, with ten or twelve leaves, that is sculpted in relief on the base of several ewers and on the underneath of the shaft of two candlesticks (Fig. 1.10). The sequence of examples extends over some forty years. The two by Ahmad al-Dhaki illustrate a degree of change which is understandable given the fact that they are separated by some twenty years. The last example, the rosette on the candlestick made by Dawud ibn Salama in 646/1248–49, looks a rather depressed descendant at the end of a fine lineage.

It is perhaps not surprising that this rosette has been overlooked, as it is not normally visible. While it makes sense on a ewer, providing a nice visual accent when the ewer is tilted to pour, it serves no purpose on a large candlestick that would rarely be seen tilted or upended. As the rosette served no practical purpose, it was understandable that it got abandoned: it does not occur on the ewers by Yunus ibn Yusuf al-Mawsili (644/1246–47) or ‘Ali ibn ‘Abdallah al-Mawsili, and does not occur, to my knowledge, on any Mamluk ewers. It was, like the octagon, an idiosyncrasy of the first half of the thirteenth century, and an idiosyncrasy of the same group of craftsmen. Unlike ‘Morelli’s earlobes’, the octagon and the relief rosette were not an unconscious signal of a workshop’s practice; instead they seem to have been deliberate devices – one visible, the other rarely seen. They required consummate, but very different, skills, and an expenditure of time. This suggests that they were a craftsman’s flourish, and together these two seemingly minor features indicate a much closer relationship between the majority of al-Mawsili metalworkers in the first half of the thirteenth century than has previously been assumed. This can be best appreciated in graphic form (Fig. 1.11).

This chart suggests that Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya may have been a seminal figure, even if neither he nor members of his workshop used the octagon. His influence can be detected in the benedictory inscriptions that are often dismissed as banal because they consist of generalised good wishes and contain no documentary data. Nevertheless, they can still be informative when the vocabulary and phraseology are distinctive. The same or similar combinations of blessings and epithets occur on Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya’s ewer, Isma’il ibn Ward’s box, two candlesticks attributable to the 1220s – one by Abu Bakr ibn Hajji Jaldak, the other a candlestick with crusader figures on it (Fig. 1.25) – the ewer by Qasim ibn ‘Ali, the jug by Husayn al-Hakim ibn Maš‘ud, and the candlestick by Dawud ibn Salama, to name just those it has been possible to confirm. The wording is ornate compared to most later examples, though more such inscriptions need to be recorded before a definitive picture emerges. This epigraphic connection is valuable in that it directly links Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya’s work to at least four items that carry the octagon motif (See Figs 1.9, 1.11 and Table 1.2a–c).
The chart also suggests that Ahmad al-Dhaki’s workshop was intimately connected to others in Mosul, and that, wherever he may finally have worked, he was surely not in Amid/Diyarbakır in the 1220s, as Rice proposed.  

If we return to Table 1.1a, we see that it covers the period from about 1200 to 1275, which is three-fifths of the 125-year period for which we have the names of al-Mawsili metalworkers. Similarities can be observed often in minor details, but the overall impression is one of diversity and invention – many hands and many styles. Such diversity is not surprising given several factors. One is that there was a high number of different makers who styled themselves al-Mawsili between about 1200 and 1275, and for most of these we know only a single documented object. Second, work from even the same workshop differed considerably over time, as is the case with Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya’s and Ahmad al-Dhaki’s ateliers (Fig. 1.2). Major differences in style can be detected from the 1220s and 1230s, for example. Nonetheless, most of the complex compositions in this list display an approach Richard Ettinghausen eloquently described as ‘the monophonic co-ordination of equal parts has been replaced by a polyphonic form, of graded subordination, in which the many different parts of a complex composition are made to interact and interrelate.’ This hypotactic system is replaced by a simpler paratactic structure on two items on the list, the candlestick in
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**FIG. 1.1**  Chart of a selection of Mawsili craftsmen thought to have worked in Mosul in the first half of the thirteenth century, showing their affiliations, where known, and their use of comparable features: relief rosettes, octagons, moon figures and similar ‘banal inscriptions’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Master</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>Isma’il b. Wurd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmad al-Dhaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abu Bakr b. al-Hajj Jaldak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Umar b. al-Hajj Jaldak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Qasim b. ‘Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shuja’ b. Man’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muhammad b. Fattuh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>Ahmad al-Dhaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmad al-Dhaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husayn al-Hakim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Yunus b. Yusuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Da’ud b. Salama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 1.12 Medallions showing figure reclining on a raised couch (a) al-Dhaki ewer, dated 1223. Cleveland Museum of Art (b) candlestick, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. no 1891-1.563 (see note 107).

FIG. 1.13 Medallions from (a) Ahmad al-Dhaki’s Louvre basin datable to 1238–40 and (b) Dawud ibn Salama’s Louvre candlestick, dated 646/1248–49.
the name of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ and the candlestick signed by Muhammad ibn Fattuh (Figs 1.6 and 1.19).

There are marked contrasts between the documentary metalwork of the first 75 years of the thirteenth century (Table 1.1a) and that of the succeeding 25 (Table 1.1b). In the second period, which coincided with the ascendancy of the Mamluks and the Mongols, few items exist in the name of a sovereign; in lieu of Mosul as the attested place of manufacture, we have Damascus and Cairo; instead of a plethora of different signatures, several of the most productive artists appear to belong to a single family. Appropriately, then, in place of the stylistic diversity of the first 75 years, there are strong stylistic connections between the work of these family relatives, and, intriguingly, their preferred approach to composition is paratactic rather than hypotactic.

Even a brief review of inlaid metalwork produced in Damascus and Cairo in the second half of the thirteenth century enables us, on the one hand, to distinguish these products from most earlier work by Mawsili artists, and, on the other, to identify a link to a specific artist who worked in Mosul in the first part of the century. The link, as we shall see, is not just artistic, and cautions us against assuming there was a wholesale movement of metalworkers from Mosul to Syria and Egypt in the mid-thirteenth century.

PRODUCTION IN DAMASCUS AND CAIRO: THE EVIDENCE FROM INSCRIPTIONS AND STYLES

Metalwork was certainly being inlaid in Damascus in the 1250s, and in Cairo by the late 1260s. We know the names of five Mawsili craftsmen based in Damascus or Cairo in the second half of the thirteenth century (see Table 1.3 on p. 68).

We can see numerous connections in these artists’ works – there are links between objects produced in the 1250s and the 1290s, and links between objects produced in Damascus and objects produced in Cairo (Fig. 1.15a–d). Such connections are not surprising given that at least three, if not four, of the makers were almost certainly from the same family, different generations of which worked in Damascus and in Cairo. Although none of the patronymics are unusual, Husayn ibn Muhammad of Damascus is generally thought to have been the father of ‘Ali ibn Husayn ibn Muhammad. From his name alone, we cannot be certain that Muhammad ibn Hasan was a relative, but the decoration on his one documented work strongly suggests a relationship. While there is nothing to indicate that ‘Ali ibn Kasirat was a blood relative of the other four artists, his work shows affinities, and he too might have been shi’ite.
The earliest documented silver-inlaid vessels from Damascus are Husayn ibn Muhammad al-Mawsili’s work from the late 1250s. There was evidently continuity in Damascus in the second half of the century, as Husayn’s work can be linked to candlesticks produced in the 1290s by two inscriptive features: the primary *thulث-muhaqqqaَ* calligraphy and the secondary friezes of ‘knotted Kufic’ punctuated by roundels (Figs 1.14–1.16). James Allan has attributed the candlesticks to Damascus, on the twin grounds that one of them was produced by ‘Ali ibn Kasirat in Damascus for the *mihrab* which Sultan Lajin (r.1296–99) renovated in Ibn Tulun’s mosque in Cairo, and that Damascus was so noted for its candlesticks in this period that Sultan Ashraf Khalil placed an order for 150 of them to be sent to Cairo in 1293.

The earliest known silver-inlaid work from Cairo is a candlestick by Muhammad ibn Hasan dated 1269, its inscription suggesting he had recently died, evidently before he completed the work. The key figure for early Mamluk metalwork from Cairo is ‘Ali ibn Husayn ibn Muhammad al-Mawsili. One can only surmise that he had moved to Cairo from Damascus, where his father was working several decades earlier. Two objects ‘Ali ibn Husayn produced in the 1280s illustrate, on the one hand, his dependence on a style that originated in Mosul half a century earlier, and, on the other, his adoption of a different, what we can call early Mamluk, idiom.
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**FIG. 1.15** Narrow friezes of knotted Kufic inscriptions on candlesticks (a) inlaid by Muhammad ibn Fattuh, probably in Mosul in the 1230s. MIA Cairo (b) produced by Husain b. Muhammad in Damascus in 1257. MIA Doha (c) produced for Katbugha between 1294 and 1296. MIA Cairo (d) produced for Sunqur al-Takriti before 1298. MIA Cairo.
FIG. 1.16  Comparison of *thulth-muhaggag* inscriptions on candlesticks (a) (d) produced by Husayn b. Muhammad in Damascus in 1257. MIA Doha (b) (e) produced by 'Ali b. Kasirat in Damascus for the *mihrab* of Lajin in 1296. MIA Cairo (c) (f) dedicated to Badr al-Din Lul’lu. St. Petersburg, Hermitage.
The difference is most obvious in the decoration of the ground. On his candlestick of 681/1282–3 ‘Ali ibn Husayn used the double-T-fret found, for example, on the Blacas ewer and Badr al-Din’s tray in Munich. On the basin he made in 684/1285–86 he covered the ground with a small-scale Y-fret pattern. This form of Y-fret proves to be a prime characteristic of work by ‘Ali ibn Husayn’s family: it barely features in the first half of the century, with one notable exception we will come to, and is then used sparingly on the neck of the candlesticks by Husayn ibn Muhammad (Damascus 1257), and Muhammad ibn Hasan (Cairo 1269) before its liberal employment by ‘Ali ibn Husayn.

The Y-fret is a diagnostic of early Mamluk metalwork. Together with other features we can identify several subgroups, and a broad and tentative chronology.

First, the use of wide, undecorated bands to create zonal divisions and to create a contrast to an often dense ground can be associated with the third quarter of the century. These bands feature on a basin bearing the titles of a dignitary associated with two short-lived Mamluk sultans, al-Mansur Nur al-Din (r.1257–59) and al-Muzaffar Sayf al-Din Qutuz (r.1259–60), as well as on a tray made for Amir Qulunjaq some time between 1264 and 1277. They also occur on a tray made for the Rasulid ruler Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Dunya wa’l-Din Yusuf I, though his long reign (647–94/1250–95) does not aid the dating of this type.

Second, a variant approach in which fields of dense decoration are contrasted with larger undecorated zones occurs on basins in Baltimore and Doha. One of the few documentary examples is a tray in the Metropolitan Museum that was also made for the Rasulid al-Malik al-Muzaffar Yusuf I. Although his extended rule makes it feasible that this group dates, as has been suggested, to the middle of the century, I would intuitively date it somewhat later, to the 1270s or 1280s.

Third, the Y-fret occurs in selected areas on the tray made for Qulunjaq (1264–77), and on a candlestick in Lyon in the name of the Rasulid al-Muzaffar Yusuf I. Over time its use became more extensive. By the last quarter of the thirteenth century the Y-fret was being used as an overall ground: it occurs on ‘Ali ibn Husayn’s basin of 1285, as well as on a basin in Boston which bears an extended dedication to Sultan Qalawun (r.1280–90).

Linking several objects in these different groups is the motif of an eagle attacking a long-billed duck (Fig. 1.17). It occurs, for example, on the basin in Doha, on ‘Ali ibn Husayn ibn Muhammad’s ewer of 1275, and, more prominently, on his 1285 basin. This motif was certainly not ‘Ali ibn Husayn’s invention. Nonetheless, it becomes a feature of this family’s work, and the duck’s long bill is distinctive.

In general, ‘Ali ibn Husayn’s works display a notable lack of dynamism in their compositions. This applies to both the 1282 candlestick with the Mosul-style T-fret and the 1285 basin with the Y-fret ground. On the candlestick he populated the body...
with a rigid network of round and lobed medallions so close in size that the effect is one of stasis rather than movement. The composition of his 1285 basin relies on large figurative roundels linked by small roundels filled with the eagle-and-duck motif, but the contrast in size does not produce the dynamic interchange of the hypotactic compositions on many earlier al-Mawsili products.

A marked change occurs in the late thirteenth century in the work of Husayn ibn Ahmad ibn Husayn, who employed a more linear, fluid style, with large-scale figures under the influence of a graphic tradition. This marked a new departure in Mamluk metalwork that culminated, I suspect, in the figural style of the Baptistère de St Louis.

This family’s output was seminal for later Mamluk metalwork, initiating, it seems, two of the most characteristic features of fourteenth-century Mamluk metalwork: large-scale inscriptional candlesticks (1257), and large multi-lobed medallions with a wide border that eventually became filled with flying ducks.

This family’s products also connect back to Mosul in the first half of the thirteenth century. Several of the diagnostics occur on the candlestick inlaid by Muhammad ibn Fattuh when he was the hireling of Shuja’ ibn Man’a: the Y-fret, the Kufic border inscription (Fig. 1.15), the eagle-and-duck roundel, and the duck with a long bill (Fig. 1.17) – the eagle-and-duck motif occupying a small but prominent position in the centre of some of the large multi-lobed medallions.

---

**FIG. 1.17** Eagle and duck motif on (a) basin produced by ‘Ali b. Husayn al-Mawsili in 684/1285–86, presumably in Cairo. Louvre Museum, Paris (b) candlestick made by Hajj Isma’il and inlaid by Muhammad b. Fattuh, attributed here to Mosul 1230s. MIA Cairo.
This family's work also links to the candlestick in the name of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ (Fig. 1.6), which has a form of arabesque – against a background of tight whorls – that relates to those on the 1259 Damascus ewer (Fig. 1.18); a style of thulth-muhaqqaq that prefaces the inscriptions on the Damascus candlesticks (Fig. 1.16); and a paratactic composition with a semée of small, independent figural roundels with a broad, plain frame. The resemblances are not strong enough to assert that Badr al-Din’s candlestick was made by Husayn ibn Muhammad, but it seems closer to his work than to Muhammad ibn Fattuh’s or any other known Mawsili metalworker working in the second quarter of the thirteenth century. Compositional simplicity can be seen to be a feature of this family’s work at least until the 1290s, and Muhammad ibn Fattuh’s candlestick and the Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ candlestick are compositionally among the simplest of the large-scale works attributable to Mosul, and rather far from what Ettinghausen described as ‘graded subordination’.

One scenario, then, is that Muhammad ibn Fattuh, who worked in Mosul in the 1230s, was the father of Husain ibn Muhammad, who may have worked in Mosul in
the second quarter of the century but was certainly in Damascus in the 1250s; and the grandfather of ‘Ali ibn Husayn ibn Muhammad, who was in Cairo by the mid-1270s at the latest; and the great grandfather of Husayn ibn Ahmad ibn Husayn, who was active at the turn of the next century, producing a major work for the Rasulid Sultan al-Malik al-Mu‘ayyad Hizâb al-Din Dawud b. Yusuf (r.1296–1321).¹²⁷

The imprint of this family’s style can be found on many of the known major works attributable to Cairo and Damascus in the second half of the thirteenth century, and, while it is possible that there were other Mawsili craftsmen who emigrated to Syria and Egypt, the only two documented before the fourteenth century are Muhammad ibn Khutlukh and Ali ibn Kasirat, and the latter’s inscriptive style suggests that he was part of this family’s milieu. We should be cautious, then, about assuming a large-scale exodus of craftsmen from Mosul to the Mamluks.

PRODUCTION IN MOSUL: THE EVIDENCE FROM MINIATURE PAINTING

Objects with documentary inscriptions attest to a variety of craftsmen and styles from the first sixty years of the thirteenth century, and a more narrow concentration of artists and styles in the succeeding three decades. They reveal, however, only part
of the picture. The names of the craftsmen who made the majority of the surviving objects will probably never be known, though in some cases anonymous objects can be linked to named artists, as James Allan has shown in attributing the ewer in the name of Abu'l-Qasim Mahmud ibn Sanjarshah to Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya's workshop, which he located in Mosul on the evidence that connects Isma'il ibn Ward to the city.\textsuperscript{128} As a further example one can cite a candlestick in the British Museum which may have been decorated by Muhammad ibn Fattuh. These two examples merely underline how much remains to be done on particularities of style.\textsuperscript{129}

Likewise, a detailed study of forms will surely reveal affinities between objects we can assign with confidence to Mosul and objects with no documentary evidence. Even a small detail such as a cast openwork finial on a candlestick recently acquired by the Burrell Collection in Glasgow can prove a clue.\textsuperscript{130} The only other known candlestick on which such finials appear was made for Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ (Fig. 1.6). They point, then, to a Mosul provenance for the Burrell candlestick. This object in turn affiliates a candlestick in the Louvre which has very similar decoration, but lacks the finials.\textsuperscript{131}

Another approach – the third of our principal strategies – is to compare works by the Mawsili masters not to other metalwork, but to miniature painting from Mosul. D.S. Rice believed that the ‘indebtedness of the metalworkers to the miniature painters is most evident’ in works by Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya and by Ibn Jaldak from the 1220s which had comparatively small-scale cartouches with figures executed against a plain background in an outline style with relatively little surface modelling, and that this phase was superseded by a more ornamental approach.\textsuperscript{132} In fact, in the second quarter of the thirteenth century several objects were decorated in a large-scale figural style that parallels miniature painting, and the use of plain backgrounds is not a vital criterion.

Rice and others have cited parallels with manuscripts such as the Paris \textit{Kitab al-Diryaq} of 1199 or the undated copy of the same work in Vienna, but the precise provenance of these manuscripts remains to be settled. While they were likely produced in the Jazira, it is not certain if it was in Mosul itself. A more useful comparison is with the six surviving frontispieces to the 20-volume set of the \textit{Kitab al-Aghani} that was made for Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ in the late 1210s, when he was still Regent but in the process of usurping power.\textsuperscript{133} Iconographic parallels exist between these frontispieces and the small-scale figures on the early works studied by Rice,\textsuperscript{134} but the scale is too small for detailed stylistic comparison. On the slightly later group of metalwork with large-scale figures, style and iconography combine to make a strong case for a Mosul provenance. Two examples will have to suffice here.

One is a candlestick in the Metropolitan Museum which has depictions of an enthroned ruler in both a frontal, and a three-quarter, pose.\textsuperscript{135} Excellent parallels exist
in the Kitab al-Aghani for both (Figs 1.20 and 1.21). The ruler wears a similar toque, his face is elongated and he has a long, full beard, which is a distinguishing feature of several of the images of Badr al-Din in the Kitab al-Aghani.136 The second example is a candlestick in the British Museum which has several friezes of standing courtiers that recall those on the frontispiece of volume XIX of the Kitab al-Aghani (Fig. 1.22).137 The rather fey pose of one of the courtiers on the candlestick compares nicely with that found on two of the other frontispieces. These close connections between metalwork and manuscript allow us to attribute both these candlesticks to Mosul.138

In addition, Christian miniature painting and objects from the Mosul area permit us to assign to Mosul the most studied of the silver-inlaid vessels, the canteen in the Freer Gallery of Art. The canteen is usually attributed to Syria, a claim which stems in part from Dimand’s claim that its Crusader figures suggest it was made by a Christian who had emigrated from Mosul to Syria.139 In fact, the figures of Crusader and Muslim knights on the reverse of the canteen relate to those on a candlestick we have already

FIG. 1.20  (a) detail from candlestick, here attributed to Mosul 1230s. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, acc. no 1891 91.1.563 (b) detail from the frontispiece of vol. IV of the Kitab al-Aghani produced for Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, c.1217. Cairo, National Library.
associated with Mosul, while the figurative imagery on the front has strong links not to Syria but to Jacobite Syriac imagery connected to monasteries in Mosul and what is now southeast Turkey.

On the front of the canteen three narrative scenes of the life of Christ encircle a roundel of the Virgin Hodegetria. The scene of the nativity is iconographically close to the version in two Syriac lectionaries, one of which is datable to 1216–20, while

FIG. 1.21 Details showing seated ruler receiving homage, from (a) frontispiece of vol. XI of the Kitab al-Aghani produced for Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, dated 1217. Cairo, National Library (b) candlestick, here attributed to Mosul 1230s. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, acc. no 1891 91.1.563 (c) jug dated 1239 by Husayn al-Hakim ibn Mas’ud, sold Christie’s, London.
the other was produced in a year that has traditionally been read as the equivalent of 1219–20 but is more probably 1260.\textsuperscript{141} Whether the earlier manuscript was produced near Mardin or in Mosul is still debated, but the second was definitely made in the monastery of Mar Mattai outside Mosul.\textsuperscript{142}

Occupying the central boss on the front of the canteen is an image of the Virgin Hodegetria that can be connected with Mosul in two ways. First, this particular rendering of the Virgin was not especially common in Eastern Christian contexts, but was employed by the Syriac community in Mosul in the thirteenth century: examples

\begin{figure}[htp]
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\caption{Details from (a–b) candlestick, here attributed to Mosul 1250s. London, British Museum, acc. no OA 1969 9-22 1 (c–d) the frontispieces of, respectively, vol. XIX (image reversed) and vol. XVII of the Kitab al-Aghani produced for Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, these volumes between 1217 and 1219.}
\end{figure}
can be found in the two thirteenth-century lectionaries just referred to, as well as on a stone sculpture from the Church of the Virgin in Mosul. Second, close parallels occur on a pair of brass liturgical fans that can be linked to Mosul.

These brass *flabella* bear Syriac inscriptions indicating they were produced in Anno Graecorum 1514/1202 (Fig. 1.24). They were found in the Deir al-Suriani in the Wadi Natrun in Egypt, a monastery with a long history of relations with the Jacobite communities of the Jazira, and at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century with Mosul especially. The *flabella* are engraved, and not
inlaid with silver, but there is no evidence of such work in Egypt, and it seems most likely that they were produced in Mosul and sent as gifts, which would make them the earliest dated examples of Mosul metalwork, and important evidence of the contribution of Christian metalworkers to the tradition that developed over the next half century.\textsuperscript{144}

It would be hasty, though, to assume that the canteen was produced by an isolated Christian workshop. On the rear of the canteen there is a frieze showing a combat between Crusader and Muslim knights, and the figures are a simplified version of those found on a candlestick we earlier associated with Mosul – it bears the diagnostic octagon motif, and uses banal inscriptions similar to those on the ewer by Ibrahim

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig124}
\caption{Virgin Hodegetria from (a, c) a pair of \textit{flabella} produced in 1202, almost certainly in Mosul, for the Dayr al-Suryani in the Wadi Natrun in Egypt, respectively in the Louvre Museum and the Mariemont Museum, and (b) the Freer canteen, here attributed to Mosul 1240s or 1250s.}
\end{figure}
FIG. 1.25 Mounted knights in combat (a–c) from the ‘Freer canteen’, here attributed to Mosul, 1240s or 1250s (d–f) from a candlestick in the MIA, Doha, here attributed to Mosul, late 1220s or 1230s.
ibn Mawaliya.145 The figures on the candlestick are considerably more detailed than those on the canteen; and the flying pennants are intelligible on the candlestick in a way that they are not on the canteen (Fig. 1.25). As the candlestick dates, I believe, to the late 1220s or early 1230s, and the canteen to a decade or more later, we can see the process of deformation over time. Yet the two objects seem ultimately to have shared a common model. The relationship between the candlestick and the canteen strengthens the attribution of the canteen to Mosul, and their dependence on a graphic model confirms what we have seen from the other few examples cited: that there was a phase of Mosul production in the second quarter of the thirteenth century that drew on a pictorial tradition for inspiration.146

This paper has focused on metalwork attributable to Mosul in the period between about 1225 and 1250, and it has touched upon the emigration of one family from Mosul to Damascus and Cairo between about 1250 and 1275. Both topics – efflorescence and emigration – are often ascribed to the impact of the Mongol invasions, in driving Iranian craftsmen to settle in the Jazira, and then in driving metalworkers from the Jazira to the Mamluk realm. The topic of diaspora raises the question of whether Mosul was an exclusive centre of silver-inlay production in the Arab-speaking world in the first half of the thirteenth century, and, while I have attempted here to stress its importance, I would like in this last section to comment briefly on, first, the production of silver-inlaid brass objects in Arab cities other than Mosul, and, second, the purported impact of the Mongols on the genesis and decline of metalworking in Mosul. I would like to conclude by considering what the evidence assembled here has revealed about ‘the Mosul School’ of metalwork.

The origins of inlaid metalworking in Mosul are still vague, and require further research. Objects signed by metalworkers who dubbed themselves al-Mawsili span almost exactly a century – from 1220 to 1323 (Table 1.1). Mosul, though, was a metal centre long before that: al-Muqaddasi in the late tenth century noted that it exported iron and finished goods such as buckets, knives and chains, and Ibn al-Azraq mentions how in 544/1149–50 he sold iron in Mosul on behalf of the ruler of Mayyafariqin.147 Yet no object is known bearing the name of a Mosul metalworker before the thirteenth century. Something changed, and that surely was the development of inlaying silver into beaten ‘brass’.

The production of inlaid brasses and bronzes eventually ranged from Egypt to the Punjab, and James Allan has brilliantly demonstrated how the technique was developed in the twelfth century by silversmiths in Khurasan who were faced with a growing
shortage of silver. By the middle of that century metalworkers in Herat achieved a high level of virtuosity, and from Khurasan the technique spread westwards. The craft required relatively few tools, and émigré artisans could have taken their skills to several centres in western Iran, Iraq and the Jazira.

The picture that emerges from Table 1.1 points, however, to few production centres in the first half of the century. The picture may be partial, as we have to rely on a handful of objects whose place of manufacture is clearly stated, and on the less certain evidence of the maker’s nisbahs. Nonetheless, the available evidence is overwhelming. The Mawsili nisbah was the pre-eminent appellation for metalworkers working in Iraq, the Jazira, Syria and Egypt throughout the thirteenth century. Only two other geographical nisbahs are known in connection with makers of silver-inlaid vessels – al-Is’irdi, relating to Siirt, and al-Baghdadi (Table 1.1). In both cases, however, we can identify a stylistic connection with Mosul, including the use of the octagon (Fig. 1.9). From the thirteenth-century Arab-speaking world no maker of silver-inlaid vessels is known who has a nisbah connected with any city in Egypt or Syria, not even Cairo, Damascus or Aleppo. There is, however, an exception – makers of scientific instruments in Syria. The available evidence suggests they were the pioneers of silver inlay in Syria (Table 1.1).

The earliest instrument known to have been inlaid with silver in Syria was produced in 619/1222–23, more than three decades before the earliest dated inlaid vessels indubitably produced there – those by Husayn ibn Muhammad al-Mawsili from the 1250s. There was not necessarily a clear dividing line between the production of scientific instruments and objects of a domestic type, as is made clear by Muhammad ibn Khutlukh, who made an elaborate geomantic table and an inlaid incense-burner. On both objects he signs himself ‘al-Mawsili’. The geomantic table he made in 639/1241–42, though it is not known where, and the incense-burner in Damascus, though it is not known when. It remains uncertain, therefore, when he settled in Damascus, but it is possible he preceded Husayn ibn Muhammad in Damascus by a decade or more. In short, scientific instruments warn us against oversimplifying the history of silver inlay in the Middle East. Having underestimated Mosul for so long, we should not now make the error of overestimating it. Nothing, however, can gainsay that the earliest inlaid vessels documented as made in Syria all have a Mawsili connection.

In Mosul itself the technique seems to have been established by the turn of the thirteenth century at the very latest. The Louvre ewer by Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya is tentative in design and execution, and Rice dated it to around 1200, given that Ibrahim’s pupil Ismail ibn Ward produced an accomplished object in 615/1220. The two flabella of 1202 are not inlaid with silver, but they evince an assured figural style and a background of ‘cogged’ wheels and leafy scrolls that is a feature of much Mosul work in the first half of the thirteenth century, including the Blacas ewer, indicating that this tradition
may well date from the closing decades of the twelfth century (Fig. 1.24). It is not, though, until the 1220s that we have several signed and dated items, which probably reflects the craft’s growing status and production. The next fifteen to twenty years saw rapid innovations in technique, decoration and composition, and metalworkers drawing inspiration from contemporary miniature painting of the Mosul area.

Comparing three ewers produced in Mosul over the space of some thirty years – Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya’s, Ibn al-Dhaki’s (1223) and Shuja’ ibn Man’a’s (1232) – we can see that stylistic and technical changes were rapid in the first decades of the century. The difference between those of 1223 and 1232 is considerable, whereas the contrast between the decorative style of Shuja’s Blacas ewer (1232) and al-Dhaki’s Louvre basin (1238–40) seems comparatively insignificant (Fig. 1.4).

By the 1250s, in the vexed last years of the reign of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, and as the members of what I take to be the second generation of silver-inlay craftsmen may have been drawing to an end of their working lives, we have the first certain evidence of a metalworker from Mosul – a man who might have been the son of Muhammad ibn Fattuh – operating elsewhere, in this case Damascus. Others, such as Muhammad ibn Khutlukh, may have emigrated earlier, but there is no current proof.

This chronology raises questions over several common assumptions about the impact the Mongols had on metalworking in Mosul: that it was pressure from the Mongols in the early thirteenth century which forced craftsmen in Herat and its environs to move westwards and to establish an inlay tradition in Mosul; that their attacks and exactions in the Jazira in the middle of the century drove Mosul craftsmen to flee to Syria and Egypt; and that the Mongol sack of Mosul brought on the demise of the industry there.

First, the tradition in Mosul began earlier than most have assumed, and its origins were more complex than the arrival of metalworkers from Iran. Second, with the exception of Muhammad ibn Khutlukh and ‘Ali ibn Kasirat, the only metalworkers known to have emigrated from Mosul belonged to a family whose earliest recorded practitioner – Muhammad ibn Fattuh – was a hireling not the owner of a workshop. His skills did not compare well to most of his contemporaries, and it may, therefore, have been an issue of aptitude and economic standing rather than Mongol pressure that persuaded his family to seek its fortune elsewhere, though I concede this is a highly speculative suggestion.

As for the end of the tradition, instability following the death of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ in July 1259, and the Mongol siege and occupation of Mosul in July 1262 must have caused local upheaval. Indeed, the dearth of documented metalwork that can be associated with the Jazira in the second half of the thirteenth century contrasts with the profusion of Mamluk and Rasulid material from Damascus and Cairo. This surely indicates a shift in the centres of production, but we should not assume that
production ceased in Mosul, because there may also have been a shift in the process of commissioning.

A considerable amount of inlaid metalwork, much of it related to the work of ‘Ali ibn ‘Abdallah al-Alawi al-Mawsili, can be stylistically attributed to the second half of the century, and none of the inscriptions connects the objects to the Mamluks. Some, like the wallet in the Courtauld Gallery of Art, bear distinctly Ilkhanid iconography, while it has been proposed that the candlestick in the Benaki Museum dated 717/1317–18 and signed by ‘Ali ibn ‘Umar ibn Ibrahim al-Sankari al-Mawsili may have been made for an Artuqid ruler of Mardin. Such work was not Mamluk, and may well have been produced in Mosul, from where it fed, in a process that has yet to be fully defined, into the west Iranian and Fars tradition of metal inlay in the fourteenth century. One factor may have been the Mongol practice of corralling artisans, and we read that in 1283 one of their advisors, Shams al-Din ‘Abd al-Rahman, the Greek who has the dubious fame of having killed the last Caliph of Baghdad, al-Musta’sim, collected craftsmen in Tabriz, including jewellers, and ‘made everything to a royal pattern’. This was the centralised production of an empire, very different from a model of small workshops working for the open market and a plethora of petty princes.

In short, the silver-inlaid brass industry in Mosul was not a straightforward import from Iran occasioned by the invasions of the Mongols. Iranian artisans seem to have played a role, but from the 1220s and 1230s production in Mosul had an internal dynamic, following a model of innovation in which, after a period of experimentation, an early group of innovators establish in a burst of creativity the standards and techniques that provide the basis for successive generations.

Three factors – the longevity of this tradition, spanning a hundred and twenty years or more; the rapidity of stylistic change, at least in the opening decades; and the diversity of craftsmen, at least in the first half of the century, when 19 items were produced by at least eight craftsmen – ensured a variety in production that prompted Richard Ettinghausen to lament ‘how difficult it is to make attributions of metal objects from this period’. Looking at minor details has, however, helped us identify from the first half of century a core group of artists whose work was interrelated. This was a period that witnessed a fecundity of ideas and imagery, in the context of a cultural efflorescence that embraced Sunnis, Shi’is and Christians in the Mosul region in the first half of the thirteenth century, and in a period of material prosperity for Mosul under Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, lauded, if the reading of an inscription is correct, as the ‘killer of barrenness’.

Even if some Mawsili metalworkers eventually moved away from the city, they seem to have formed, in the 1220s and 1230s, a close-knit group. This closeness manifests itself in several ways. First, there was a kinship in their products, in terms of shapes,
imagery, motifs and skills. In the case of the relief rosette, that skill was practiced even though it would be rarely seen.

Second, while the high number of signatures reflects personal pride, the phrasing attests to a sense of community, to a pride in the transmission of skills and professional relationships. Whether or not the octagon was a guild or workshop motif, what is certain is that these metalworkers declared their association in unparalleled fashion, for this is the only body of metalwork from any period in the Muslim world on which we find reference to the craft relationships between master and pupil, apprentice, perhaps slave, and hireling – *tilmīdḥ*, *ghulam*, and *ajīr*.\(^{163}\) This was different from a master craftsman expressing pride in his own work by prefacing his signature with the word *mu‘allīm*.\(^{164}\) This was the pride of a pupil or apprentice at being attached to a master.\(^{165}\)

Something similar occurs in Ottoman calligraphy, where calligraphers often indicate their *isnad*, usually following the issuance of an *ijāza*, or certificate of competency, by the master calligrapher. We have no such evidence for the metalworkers of Mosul, but two items may provide physical proof of a system of workshop training. One is the box by Isma‘īl ibn Ward, on which he declares himself to be the *tilmīdḥ* of Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya. The complexity of decoration and fineness of execution seem to defy its

---

**FIG. 1.26** Diminutive bucket, here attributed to Mosul c.1225–35, British Museum, inv. no 1948 5-83. Height 8.3cm. Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.
diminutive size (6.3 by 3.6cm), and perhaps that is the very point. Was it an apprentice's or a journeyman's tour-de-force on his quest to move into the guild of craftsmen?

The box was arguably large enough to have been of functional use, but that is hardly the case with a miniature bucket in the British Museum (8.3cm) (Fig. 1.26) which seems more like a jeu d'esprit – a known category of functional object but in a size so small as to render it useless, yet decorated in elaborate fashion, including a scene of an enthroned ruler whose hand is being kissed by an obeisant subject, and a complex anthropomorphic inscription. If these two items were the credential work of an apprentice or journeyman, it would be physical proof of a guild system that was ubiquitous in the Muslim world at the time but rarely expressed in epigraphic terms as it is on Mosul metalwork.

Craftsmen's names reveal that the community of metalworkers was much more inclusive than a few family networks, and that some of them were from Muslim families of long standing, while others were recent converts, and others Christian. Pride in the larger community of metalworkers and pride in their city were embodied in the nisbah 'al-Mawsili'. Practitioners continued to use it for over a century with a dedication that can only be paralleled by the potters of Kashan; and its aura – its 'brand value' – was evident when it was used by Husayn ibn Ahmad ibn Husayn in Cairo in the 1290s, as he seems to have been from a family that had not lived in Mosul for one or even two generations.

Over the course of more than a century, Mawsili metalworkers displayed a conscious sense of community and tradition, and, at least in the early years, a proud acknowledgement of transmission. Their products gained fame, were disseminated, and eventually emulated in other centres. All of these are vital elements in the definition of an artistic school – in this case what we are justified in calling the Mosul School of metalwork.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Method of dating</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Made in</th>
<th>Geographical nisbah</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1182–1231</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>al-Makki al-Amid Bahram Shah</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Egypt/Damascus</td>
<td>ex-Albert Goupil, Paris</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200–25</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Ibrahim b. Mawaliya</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Doha, MIA, ex-Nahid es-Said collection</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201–39</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Artuq Arslan ibn al-Ghazi</td>
<td>Mardin and Mayyafariqin</td>
<td>Egypt/Damascas</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 2/2210</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208–51</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>door</td>
<td>Abu'l Qasim Mahmud ibn Sanjarshah ibn Ghazi</td>
<td>Mardin</td>
<td>Mayyafariqin</td>
<td>Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218–51</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Abu'l Qasim Mahmud ibn Sanjarshah</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 2/2210</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220–30</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shihab</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615/1218</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>Ahmad b. 'Umar, known as al-Dhaki</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617/1220</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>box</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Abu Bakr</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618/1221</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Almir Sayf ibn ibn [sic] sahib al-Mawsil</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619/1222</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Sirr (inlay)</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620/1223</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Abu Bakr b. al-Haji</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621/1226</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Abu Bakr b. al-Haji</td>
<td>Jaldak</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622/1227</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Abu Bakr b. al-Haji</td>
<td>Jaldak</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–35</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Abu Bakr b. al-Haji</td>
<td>Jaldak</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226/1230</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Abu Bakr b. al-Haji</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230–80</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Abu Bakr b. al-Haji</td>
<td>Jaldak</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, inv. no 13171</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:** 1200–75: Near Eastern inlaid metalwork with documentary inscriptions, including known makers and dedications. Bold type indicates a precisely recorded date or provenance. Italics indicate a strong presumption.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Method of dating</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Geographical nisbah</th>
<th>Made in</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Ruler of</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1225-50</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>candelstick</td>
<td>Haji Isma'il and Muhammad b. Fattuh</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cairo, MIA inv. no 15121; ex-Harari collection no 174</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225-50</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>casket</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>al-Baghdadi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location unknown; ex-Edward Falkener collection</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225-50</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>Isma'il b. Ahmad al-Wasiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>location unknown</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225-50</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>incense-burner</td>
<td>Sini-i Razi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York, Pierpoint Morgan collection</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623/1226</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>'Umar ibn Hajji Jaldak</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, acc. no 91 1 586</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625/1227</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>astrolabe</td>
<td>'Abd al-Karim</td>
<td>al-Marr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford, Museum of the History of Science, CCA 103; ex-Lewis Evans Collection</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627/1229</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Iyus, ghulam of 'Abd al-Karim b. al-Turabi</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Istanbul, Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231-33</td>
<td>regnal titles</td>
<td>box</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Aziz Ghiyath</td>
<td>al-Din Muhammed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy, Naples, Museo Nazionale, Capodimonte, inv. no 112095; ex-Borgia Collection</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629/1232</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Qasim b. 'Ali</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington DC, Freer Gallery of Art, acc. no F1955.22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629/1232</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Shuja` b. Man'a</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London, British Museum, inv. no 1866 12-69 61; ex-Duc de Blacas collection</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233-59</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>box</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik al-Rahim</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>London, British Museum, inv. no 1878 12-30 678; ex-Henderson collection</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233-59</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>candelstick</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik al-Rahim</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Hermitage</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236-60</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Nasir II Salah</td>
<td>al-Din Yusuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montreal, Museum of Fine Arts</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236-60</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>vase</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Nasir II Salah</td>
<td>al-Din Yusuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris, Louvre, inv. no OA 4090; ex-Barberini collection</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634/1237</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>Abu'l Qasim b. Sa'd b. Muhammad</td>
<td>al-Is'irdi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamal al-Din Ahmad ibn Ghazi</td>
<td>Cairo MIA, ex-Harani collection, no 226</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636/1238-1240</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>Ahmad b. Umar, known as al-Dhaki</td>
<td>al-Malik al-'Adil II Sayf al-Din Abu Bakr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris, Louvre, inv. no 5991</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636/1238-1240</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>box</td>
<td>al-Malik al-'Adil II Sayf al-Din Abu Bakr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London, Victoria and Albert Museum, acc. no 8508–1863</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636/1238-40</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>incense-burner</td>
<td>al-Malik al-'Adil II Sayf al-Din Abu Bakr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keir Collection, on loan to Berlin MIK</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Method of dating</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>Made in</td>
<td>Dedicated to</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637/1239–40</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>Husayn al-Hakim ibn Mas'ud</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638/1240</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Salih Najm al-Din Ayyub</td>
<td>Location unknown</td>
<td>University of Michigan, Kelsey Museum of Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638/1240</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>astralabes</td>
<td>Abd al-Karim al-Misri</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639/1240</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Khutlukh</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640/1241</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>'Umar al-Is'irdi</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641/1242</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>Dawud b. Salama al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642/1243</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Ahmad b. 'Umar, known as al-Dhaki</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643/1244</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>'Abd al-Qasim b. Sa'd b. Muhammad al-Is'irdi</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644/1245</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645/1246</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646/1247</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647/1248</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648/1249</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649/1249</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650/1250</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651/1251</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652/1252</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653/1253</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654/1254</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655/1255</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Badr al-Din Lu'lu' al-Malik</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Method of dating</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Geographical nisbah</td>
<td>Made in</td>
<td>Dedicatee</td>
<td>Ruler of</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646/1248</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>door</td>
<td>‘Umar b. al-Khidr al-Maliki</td>
<td>al-Badri</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosul, Mausoleum of ‘Awn al-Din</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-64</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Mughith ‘Umar</td>
<td>Kasak</td>
<td>Cairo MIA</td>
<td>inv. no 8870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Harar Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Athens, Benaki Museum, inv. no 13075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Cairo MIA; ex-Harari Collection, no 321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>brazier</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no 91.1.540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Lyons, Musée des Beaux-Arts, inv. no d.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Cairo MIA no 10839; ex-Paravicini Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Paris, Collection Marquet de Vasselot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Paris, Louvre; ex-Siradjian Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Cairo MIA, inv. no 3155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Paris, ex-Homberg Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Cairo MIA, inv. no 4022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Cairo MIA, inv. no 15153; ex-Harari Collection no 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-95</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf I</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no 91.1.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1250</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>vase</td>
<td>Abu Bakr ibn Ibrahim ibn Juma’i</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris, Louvre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650/1252</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>Dawud b. Salama</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654/1256</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>casket</td>
<td>Rumamiq (?) al-Sha’m</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>ex-Peytel Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I.1a (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Method of dating</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Geographical nisbah</th>
<th>Made in</th>
<th>Dedicated</th>
<th>Ruler of</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>655/1257</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Husayn b. Muhammad</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>Abu Durr Badr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doha MIA; ex-Homayzi Collection</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Husayn b. Muhammad</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Nasir II Salah</td>
<td>al-Din Yusuf</td>
<td>Paris, Louvre, inv. no OA 7428; ex-Delort de Gléon</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>vase</td>
<td>'Ali b. Hammud</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haqta or Qusta b. Tudhra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, inv.no 360</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260–70</td>
<td></td>
<td>basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Anon. officer of) al-Muzaffari al-Mansuri</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doha MIA; ex-Homayzi Collection</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261–93</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qara Arslan b. Il-Ghazi</td>
<td></td>
<td>London, Sotheby's, April 2012, lot 538</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668/1269</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Hasan</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cairo MIA, inv. no 1657</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669/1270</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>astrolabe</td>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>al-Dimashqi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London, British Museum, inv. no 903–15 3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673/1274</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>'Ali b. Hammud</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emir Atmish Sa’di</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tehran, Iran-Bastan Museum</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>by association</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>'Ali b. Hammud</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tehran, Iran-Bastan Museum</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1.a (cont.)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Method of dating</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Geographical Nisbah</th>
<th>Made in</th>
<th>Dedicatedee</th>
<th>Ruler of</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1275–1300</td>
<td>date range</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>'Izz al-Din Aydamur Jamdar Qaimari</td>
<td></td>
<td>Viceroy of Syria in 1270, died Nov 1300</td>
<td>Cairo MIA; ex-Harari Collection no 7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275–1300</td>
<td>date range</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>Rukun al-Din Baibars al'Adili</td>
<td></td>
<td>as amir</td>
<td>Cairo MIA, no 8241</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275–1300</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>'Ali b. 'Abdallah</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin MIK, inv. no L6580</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275–1300</td>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>'Ali b. 'Abdallah</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin MIK, inv. no L6581</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674/1275</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>globe</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Hilal al-Munajim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London, British Museum, acc. no 71 3–1 1.a,b</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277–79</td>
<td>titles</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Sayf ad-Din Qulunjaq al-maliki al-Zahir al-Sa'id</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London, British Museum, acc. no 78 12–30 682; ex-Fould collection</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676/1277</td>
<td></td>
<td>handwarmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris, Musée Jacquemart-André</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277</td>
<td>date of death</td>
<td>hanging lamp</td>
<td>Damascus Tomb of al-Zahir Rukn al-Din Baybars in Damascus</td>
<td>Egypt and Syria</td>
<td>Doha MIA; ex-Nathanial Rothschild collection (?)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277</td>
<td>date of death</td>
<td>hanging lamp</td>
<td>Damascus Tomb of al-Zahir Rukn al-Din Baybars in Damascus</td>
<td>Egypt and Syria</td>
<td>Location unknown; ex-Schefer Collection; ex-Edmond de Rothschild Collection</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281–82</td>
<td>date of rule</td>
<td>tray and stand</td>
<td>Rukun al-Din Garaqush al-Aydamuri al-Nasir</td>
<td>Governor of Qu and Akhmin in 680</td>
<td>Cairo MIA</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686/1287</td>
<td>dated</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>'Ali b. Abi Bakr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eyrichshof, Baron Rotenhan</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290–93</td>
<td>titles</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Damascus Zayn al-Din Kattughra while an officer of al-Ashraf Khalil</td>
<td>Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, inv. no 54.459 (body); Cairo MIA inv. no 4483 (neck)</td>
<td>Cairo Art Market</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290–93</td>
<td>reign date</td>
<td>candlestick fragment</td>
<td>al-Ashraf Khalil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt and Syria</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1284–95</td>
<td>titles</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Damascus Sunqur al-As'ar when he was an amir in Damascus (?)</td>
<td>Athens, Benaki Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.1.b** 1275–1325: a selection of Near Eastern inlaid metalwork with documentary inscriptions, including all known makers and some dedicatees. Bold type indicates a precisely recorded date or provenance. Italics indicate a strong presumption.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Method of dating</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Geographical nisbah</th>
<th>Made in</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Ruler of</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694/1292-1311</td>
<td>titled basin</td>
<td>Sayf al-Din Asandamur Silahdar</td>
<td>Cairo MIA; ex-Harari Collection no 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296-1321</td>
<td>reign date candlestick</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad Hizabr al-Din Dawud b. Yusuf</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formerly Kraft Collection</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296-1321</td>
<td>reign date candlestick</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad Hizabr al-Din Dawud b. Yusuf</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cairo MIA; ex-Harari Collection, no 54</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>date of death candlestick</td>
<td>Amr Sunqur Takrit</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cairo MIA, inv. no 7949</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698/1298</td>
<td>dated astrolabe</td>
<td>Al-Sahl al-Asturlabi al-Nasabur</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad Hizabr al-Din Dawud b. Yusuf</td>
<td>Hama (?)</td>
<td>Nuremberg, Germanisches Museum, inv. no WI 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296-1322</td>
<td>reign date tray</td>
<td>al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad Hizabr al-Din Dawud b. Yusuf</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York, MMA, inv. no 91.1.605; ex-Edward C. Moore Collection</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296-1322</td>
<td>reign date tray</td>
<td>Husayn b. Ahmad b. Husayn al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York, MMA, acc. no 91.1.602; ex-Edward C. Moore Collection</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704/1304</td>
<td>dated pen-box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris, Louvre, inv. no 3621</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708/1308</td>
<td>dated candlestick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boston MFA, inv. no 55.106</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709/1309</td>
<td>dated ewer</td>
<td>al-Hajj Muhammad ibn al'Amili</td>
<td>Paris, Louvre, inv. no OA 7427; ex-Delort de Gléon Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717/1317</td>
<td>dated candlestick</td>
<td>'Ali b. 'Umar b. Ibrahim al-Sankari</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athens, Benaki Museum, inv.no 13038</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723/1323</td>
<td>dated Qur'an box</td>
<td>Ahmad b. Bara</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Nasir al-Din Muhammad</td>
<td>Egypt and Syria</td>
<td>Cairo, Library of al-Azhar Mosque</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Geographical nisbah</th>
<th>Made where</th>
<th>Octagon/moon</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200–25</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Ibrahim b. Mawāliyā</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>box</td>
<td>IsmA’il b. Ward</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Qasim b. ‘Ali</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shahib al-Din Tughrul al-Azizi</td>
<td>Freer Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Shuja’ b. Man’a</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>octagon and moon</td>
<td></td>
<td>British Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–50</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Hajj Isma’il and Muhammad b. Fattuh</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>moon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cairo MIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233–59</td>
<td>box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kiev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233–59</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moon</td>
<td></td>
<td>British Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233–59</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon and moon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hermitage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon and moon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>door</td>
<td>‘Umar b. al-Khadr</td>
<td>al-Malik</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–50</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Najm al-Din ‘Umar al-Badri</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–50</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>son of the Lord of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238–40</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>Ahmad b. ‘Umar, known as al-Dhaki</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Ahmad b. ‘Umar, known as al-Dhaki</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keir Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Abu Bakr b. al-Hajji Jaldak</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boston MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>‘Umar ibn al-Malik</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>MET, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Yunus b. Yusuf</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walters Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Dawud b. Salama</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–50</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nasser D. Khalili Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–50</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doha MIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–50</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon and moon</td>
<td></td>
<td>MET, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>incense-burner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–50</td>
<td>box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>ex-Christie's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>pen-box</td>
<td>Abu’l Qasim b. Sa’d bim Muhammad</td>
<td>al-Mawsili</td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–50</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td>al-Wasiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>octagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

table 1.2 Inlaid metalwork attributable to Mosul: (a) items whose inscriptions provide direct, contingent or circumstantial evidence of a connection to Mosul (b) items by Ahmad al-Dhaki and his assistant Ibn Jaldak (c) items that have no inscriptive evidence linking them to Mosul, but include the octagon motif illustrated in Fig. 1.9.
NOTES

1 I write this article with a deep sense of indebtedness to James Allan, who has been my teacher, mentor, colleague and friend. I hope he will accept it as a small token of thanks for all his contributions to the study of Islamic metalwork, and for the inspirational lectures he delivered on the subject in Oxford.

2 I owe special thanks to Robert Foy, who helped me in numerous ways, especially in creating an illustrated database of documented items. Friends in numerous collections have been exceptionally obliging, providing information and images. In several cases, they have spent a lot of time allowing me access to the objects, and for their patience and generosity I would particularly like to thank: Venetia Porter at the British Museum; Tim Stanley at the Victoria and Albert Museum; Sophie Makariou at the Louvre; Anatoli Ivanov at the Hermitage; Stefan Weber at the Museum für Islamische Kunst, Berlin; Sheila Canby at the Metropolitan Museum; Amy Landau at the Walters Art Museum; Laura Weinstein at the MFA, Boston; Bashir Mohamed on behalf of the Furusiyya Foundation; and William Robinson and Sara Plumbly at Christie’s. Others have been patient in dealing with enquiries and generous in supplying photographs. Here I would like to thank Nahla Nassar at the Nasser D. Khalili Collection; Hélène Bendejacq at the Louvre; Adel Adamova at the Hermitage; Jane Portal at the MFA, Boston; Ruth Bowler at the Metropolitan Museum; Louise Mackie, Tehnyat Majid and Deirdre Vodanoff at the Cleveland Museum of Art; Oliver Watson and Aisha al-Khater at the Museum of Islamic Art in Doha; Dr Claudius Müller, then Director of the Staatliches Museum für Volkerkunde, Munich; Kjeld von Folsach at the David Collection in Copenhagen; Bernard O’Kane in Cairo; and Mariam Rosser-Owen and Moya Carey at the Victoria and Albert Museum. I would also like to thank Rozanna Ballian of the Benaki for sending me a copy of her recent article before it went to press. Sheila Blair was very generous in providing a critique, but the remaining flaws are my responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>655/1257</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Husayn Muhammad</td>
<td>Rasulid vizier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>657/1259</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>Husayn Muhammad</td>
<td>Ayyubid ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>668/1289</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>Muhammad Hasan*</td>
<td>anon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>674/1275-76</td>
<td>ewer</td>
<td>'Ali Husayn Muhammad</td>
<td>Rasulid ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>681/1282</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>'Ali Husayn</td>
<td>Imad al-Din eunuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>684/1285-86</td>
<td>tray</td>
<td>Husayn Ahmad Husayn**</td>
<td>anon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>1296-99</td>
<td>candlestick</td>
<td>'Ali Kasirat</td>
<td>Mamluk ruler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1.3 Al-Mawsili craftsmen documented in Cairo or Damascus in the second half of the thirteenth century.

Key
* The inscription indicates that the maker was deceased.
** This is how the name is read in Dimand 1931, p. 324, and RCEA vol. XIV, no 5454, which Mayer says is how Martinovitch read it. However, it is given as Ahmad b. Husayn by Mayer 1959: 29, and Atıl, Chase and Jett 1985, cat. no 22: 80. The longer name has kindly been confirmed by Sheila Canby (correspondence 30 August 2011).
Melikian-Chirvani 1974.

Given that a geographic sobriquet (*nisbah*) such as ‘al-Mawsili’ (a man from Mosul) does not necessarily indicate that the respective individual was living in Mosul, I have employed the term ‘Mawsili’ to refer to craftsmen who used the *nisbah* al-Mawsili regardless of where they were active, and *Mosuli* only to those known to have been based in Mosul itself.

Although Kashan ceramics include many dated objects, and a good number with signatures, there are few instances where an artist signs himself ‘al-Kashani’; and there are also few objects in the names of notables. On the other hand we do know a good deal about family relationships (Sarre 1935; Watson 1985).

At about the time that Michelangelo Lanci (1845–46) published a good number of silver-inlaid brasses of the thirteenth century, mostly from Italian collections, the eminent collector and publisher in Paris Eugène Piot surprisingly said that he knew of only four such objects (*pace* Reinaud’s publication of the Blacas Collection) (Piot 1844: 387). The collection of the banker Louis Fould included by 1861 a sizeable number of examples of inlaid metalwork, though the majority of these appear to have been fourteenth-century Mamluk (Chabouillet 1861). The appeal of Islamic inlaid metalwork also lay in their affiliation to the European *azzimina* tradition (see Lavoix 1862; Lavoix 1877: 27–28). See also the contribution by Tim Stanley to this volume (Chapter 9).

The greater part of the collection was sold to the British Museum in 1866.


Reinaud 1828; Lanci 1845–46 (the work was published, however, in only 125 copies). Lanci dedicated his study of a Kufic epitaph to Reinaud as a ‘dono di amicizia’ (Lanci 1819: esp. 4). See also Lanci 1845–46, vol. II: 107.

‘Nous en avons vu de Nour-ed-din Mahmoud, de Salah-ed-din, de Masoud, de Zenghi, de tous ces sultans qui vivaient à la fin du XIIe siècle’: Lavoix 1862: 66. There is a solar quadrant inscribed to Nur al-Din Zangi, but it is not inlaid; see Casanova 1923; Paris c.1993: 436.


Lavoix 1878: 786. Lavoix’s dating was followed by van Berchem (1904: 22).

Lane-Poole 1886a: 151–200; Lane-Poole 1886b: 180–240; Lane-Poole 1893–94.

Lane-Poole 1886a: 159, 183–86; Lane-Poole 1886b: 189, 220–23.


Migeon (1899: 467–68) claimed two items in the Piet-Lataudrie Collection to be twelfth-century Mosul work, but Friedrich Sarre (1903: 527–28) pointed out that the ewer of 1190 bears the name of the city of Nakhjavân in Azerbaijan, and the *repoussé* candlestick belonged to a group all found in Iran. Cf. Migeon 1907: 179.


Differences occur in the attributions in the handlist and the commemorative album of the 1903 exhibition.
Josz 1903: 818: ‘car rien n’est encore plus arbitraire que c’est classification’. Josz, who wrote books on Watteau and Fragonard, even cited Migeon’s own doubts on the subject.
Van Berchem 1904: esp. 27ff.
Van Berchem 1904: 39–40. Three years later he claimed it was difficult to distinguish ‘Mosul’ from ‘Syro-Egyptian’ work, which suggests that he recognised the problems with his classification (Sarre and van Berchem 1907: esp. 35.)
Van Berchem 1906: 210, n. 1; Sarre and van Berchem 1907: 33–37.
Van Berchem 1906: 210, n. 1; Sarre and van Berchem 1907: 33–37, esp. 35.
Sarre and van Berchem 1907: 18–19; cf. Sarre 1904: 49. See also Sarre and Mittwoch 1906: 12; cf. Sarre and van Berchem 1907: 35, n. 1.
Van Berchem 1904: 27ff; Migeon 1907: 165ff., see esp. 171–73; Migeon 1922: 16; Migeon 1926: 34; Migeon 1927: 37–38.
He did, however, know the ewer produced in Damascus in 1259; see Ağa-Oğlu 1945: 41.
Rice 1957: 286; van Berchem 1904: 33.
Rice 1949: 334.
Rice 1950b; Rice 1957a: 285.
Rice 1957a: 320.
Rice 1957a: 320. The same graffito occurs, as Rice notes, on the other surviving object by Ibn Jaldak, the ewer in the Metropolitan Museum. Alternative readings would be ‘the harem of ‘Afif al-Muzaffari’ or ‘the wife of ‘Afif al-Muzaffari’. On the different meanings of dar, see van Berchem 1903: 188; Wiet 1955: 245. See below, n. 40.
Rice 1949: 339.
Humphreys 1977: 173. He was not a eunuch, whereas Rice assumed ‘Afif was the eunuch who supervised the harem.
Rice 1949: 339, n. 35.
Amedroz 1902: 804; Patton 1991, esp. 44–46, 87–88. The date of his father’s death is a matter of dispute.
items known to have been produced in San'a was made for 'Afif al-Dunya wa'l Din 'Ali: Wiet 1932: 49, and esp. 78–80, no 3259; 97, Pl. LXIV; Porter 1988: 229; Allan 1986e, cat. p. 37.

Rice (1957a: 319) compared it to several graffiti he termed 'redundant', where the graffiti refers to the person honoured in the vessel's dedicatory inscription, and begins with the phrase bi-rasm. Neither applies in this case, and these differences mean the graffiti may relate to a subsequent owner. The use of the phrase bi-rasm on graffiti is complex. By itself it does not prove that the named individual was the original owner, since it was often used to introduce the name of a later owner. Examples suggest that, when used in graffiti, bi-rasm was necessary but not sufficient to indicate original ownership; mutatis mutandis, the absence of bi-rasm was sufficient but not necessary to indicate subsequent ownership.

In 1949 Rice thought al-Dhaki was working in Syria. In 1957 he proposed Syria or Egypt: Rice 1957a: 311.

Rice 1957a, Pls 5 and 8. There are further contradictions in Rice’s argument, illustrated by his discussion of the Blacas ewer (1957a, esp. 322), and I suspect that they may in part result from unresolved changes prompted by an editor.

Rice assumed that inlaid objects with Christian motifs, such as the Homberg ewer, were from Syria. He did not, however, invoke other pieces in his definition of a Syrian or Egyptian style, such as the box in the Victoria and Albert Museum dedicated, like Ahmad al-Dhaki’s Louvre basin, to al-Malik al-‘Adil II (Lane-Poole 1886a: 173–74 and Fig. 80; Lane-Poole 1893–94: 909).

The Blacas ewer uses a ‘straight’ and a ‘wavy’ version of the T-fret ground (Figs 1.4b and 1.4a, respectively). This is the earliest instance I know of the ‘wavy’ version.

These are rarely illustrated, but see Rice 1957a, Fig. 31a.

On the Louvre basin Ahmad al-Dhaki does not call himself ‘al-Mawsili’. His signature is in a key position on the outside of the basin, and it is even possible that such an object may have been a gift from the artist himself (cf. Raby and Tanindji 1993: 89–90; Los Angeles 2011: 162–64, cat. 74).

See below, n. 76.

Also known as Occam’s Razor after the fourteenth-century Oxford scholar William of Ockham.

Rice 1957a: 284, n. 9. Rice did not ask if al-Dhaki’s basin might have been an export or a gift from Mosul, but he did wonder whether the Blacas ewer might have been made for export ‘to be carried to princes’ and ‘designed to satisfy “foreign tastes”’, an idea he then rejected (Rice 1957a: 322).


Muhammad b. Khutlukh al-Mawsili produced an incense-burner in Damascus, and a geomantic table in 639/1241–42, but it has yet to be determined where that instrument
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was made (see Table 1.1). If in Damascus too, he is the earliest of the Mawsili metalworkers to be documented as having emigrated.

59 'Documentary' here refers to objects with any combination of signatures, dedications and dates, and Table 1.1 draws on the list of craftsmen compiled by Wiet (1932), Kühnel (1939b), Rice (1957a: 286), Allan (1986: 39–40), and Auld (2009: 69–71).

60 The cautious expression 'some 27' reflects uncertainty over whether Isma'il b. Ward and al-Hajj Isma'îl were one and the same craftsman (see above, p. 24, and n. 68), and whether Abu Bakr ibn Al-Hajji Jaldak and 'Umar ibn Hajji Jaldak were the same person.


62 Kamal ibn Man'a, for example, was a celebrated teacher of science, in particular geometry, who was patronised by Badr al-Din Lu'lu', though we do not know the family relationship between him and Shuja'. Patton 1991: 66. On some noted members of the family see Ibn Khallikan (Paris 1842–45) vol. I: 90–92; II: 656–59; IV: 597–98.

63 RCEA vol. XI, no 4361; Wiet 1932: 178, no 66.

64 There are few dated candlesticks in Table 1.1 on which to build a morphology. However, the body of Hajj Isma'îl's and Muhammad ibn Fattuh's candlestick has sides with a slight curvature compared to the much straighter walls of Ibn Jaldak's candlestick of 1225; straighter sides seem to be a feature of the earliest examples and give way to slightly curved walls in the 1230s. There are also some differences in the mouldings that relate to candlesticks attributable to the 1230s and 1240s on stylistic grounds.

65 In 1953 Rice believed that Lanci's attribution of Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya's ewer to Mosul had 'much to commend it' (Rice 1953b: 78), but he did not pursue the implications.

66 James 1980: 320. The number of months should read four not three.


68 His piety is not in doubt from the manuscript he copied later in life, but there he refers to himself as a naqqash, and twice on the Benaki box to his work as naqsb. Al-Hajj Isma'il, however, takes credit for making ('amal) the candlestick, not for inlaying it, which was done by Muhammad b. Fattuh: RCEA vol. XI, no 4361. Kühnel (1939: 10) wondered if the two Isma'îls were not one and the same person.

69 'Umar ibn Khidr al-Maliki al-Badri, whose nisbah clearly connects him to Badr al-Din Lu'lu', made a massive door for the shrine of Imam 'Awn al-Din in Mosul in 646/1248–49: RCEA vol. XI.2, no 4291; Sarre and Herzfeld 1911–20, vol. I: 21; vol. II: 269; vol. III, Pl. viii. See Ward 2004: 349 on the multiple skills of some of the metalworkers of the period, arguing against the assumption that metalworkers always specialised in only one technique or material.

70 With regard to Najm al-Din, Rice (1957a: 285) overlooks his previous article on the Bologna bowl (Rice 1953c: 232–38). However, Wiet (1932: 179, no 72) identified Najm al-Din as a functionary of Badr al-Din.

71 Pace Corbin in Corbin, Cottevielle-Giraudet and David-Weill 1938: 194–95, cat. no 205; Mayer 1959: 83.
Sarre and van Berchem 1907: 33–37, esp. 33; Sobernheim 1905, esp. 199. Kühnel (1939: 10) included Muhammad ibn ‘Absun (sic) in his list of Mosul metalworkers. Pace Rice 1950b: 634 and Mayer (1959), who did not include him in his Dictionary of Islamic Metalworkers.


As van Berchem (1906: 206, n. 1) observes, it does not mean it was made for Badr al-Din’s buttery, which is, however, the way it is read in RCEA vol. XII: 38–39, no 4456. It is worth noting that Rice’s reproduction of the graffito on the Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ tray in the Victoria and Albert Museum is a little misleading. It is clear that someone originally wrote bi-rasm al-sharāb khānah al-malikī and then altered it to al-malikiyya al-badriyya.

Van Berchem (1906: 205) was unsure whether the reading should be ‘Absun or ‘Isun, though subsequent scholars have mostly preferred ‘Absun. However, detailed photos kindly provided me by Dr Claudius Müller make it clear that the reading should be ‘Isun. as James Allan read the inscription in Allan 1976a: 180, cat. no 197. On the custom of including inlaid metalwork in trousseaux in the Mamluk period, see Maqrizi 1853, vol. II: 105; Lane-Poole 1886: 165–66; cf. Ibn Battuta 1853–58, vol. I: 136.

I am extremely grateful to Anatoli Ivanov for providing me with very useful images of this basin.

Rice 1953c: 232: it ‘was made for the amir of an Ayyubid ruler and is almost certainly Syrian’. Cf. Rice 1953b: 66–69. Atil (1985: 117) expressly attributes it to Syria, though on p.120 she qualifies this: ‘it is more likely that Qasim ibn Ali worked in Syria, since his patron, Shihab al-Din Tughril, was residing in Aleppo’; cf. Atil 1975, no 26; cf. RCEA vol. X, no 3977, with a faulty reading of the date.

Sauvaget 1941: 133; Rice 1953b: 68. Qasim ibn ‘Ali states he completed the ewer in the month of Ramadan. For another afigural ewer, made by Iyas, see Rice 1953c: 230–32.

Ibn al-Adim-Blochet 1897: 82, 84. Tughril moved from the citadel to a residence opposite its main gate.

There was presumably a companion basin, but the only complete sets are those in Berlin (Kühnel 1939b) and, arguably, in Tehran (Wiet 1931).

Rice 1953c: 234, where he also claims that this is ‘a set row of epithets which often appear in the same sequence’. However, the only reference he gives is to the 1232 ewer. The same combination of epithets but in the sequence al-‘ābid, al-zāid, al-wari’ occur on two tombstones from Mecca, one dated 592/1196 (Paris 2010: 514, cat. no 296), the other 627/1229 (RCEA vol. XI.1, no 4017). For the partial use of this group of epithets (al-‘ābid, al-zāid without al-wari’) on closely contemporary objects, see RCEA vol. XI.1: 117, no 4176 (princely tombstone, Damascus c.642/1244); 172, no 4259 (tomb of mother of Rum Seljuk sultan Kaykusraw II, Kayseri, c.644/1246); cf. RCEA vol. XII: 155, no 4633, anno 670/1271; RCEA vol. XIII: 206, no 5103, anno 700/1300. For a rare use of some of these epithets (al-zāid, al-‘ābid) in an inscription referring to someone who was
not deceased, see RCEA vol. XII: 65, no 4488. The word *al-wari*’ appears to occur in the ‘animated’ inscription of the Freer canteen. It is incorrectly given as *al-wad*’ in Atıl, Chase and Jett 1985: 124.

86 A box now in Naples is inscribed in the name of al-Malik al-‘Aziz. In contrast to Tughril’s ewer, its decoration includes lively figural scenes. On the basis of the titulature in the dedicatory inscription, and the reference in a graffito to the Palace of Marble, which most probably relates to the palace in the Citadel built by al-‘Aziz Muhammad in 628/1231, Umberto Scerrato dated the box to between 1231 and 1233: Scerrato 1967, cat. 7: 7–12. Two years earlier Scerrato (1966: 94, 107) dated it ‘circa 1230’, but without discussion of the inscriptions. Where this box was made is not known. Whether it too was a present from Mosul cannot be proved, but there were at least two major occasions when Badr al-Din might have seen fit to send presents: one was when al-Malik al-‘Aziz assumed full control of government in 629, or in Ramadan that year when his prospective bride, the daughter of al-Malik al-Kamil, arrived from Cairo.

87 *Pace* Migeon 1900: 126, who believed the Barberini vase was produced in Syria, most probably in Aleppo, as it is in the name of the Ayyubid al-Malik al-Nasir II Salah al-Din Yusuf, who ruled Aleppo from 634/1237 until his death in October 1260. He failed to notice, though, that Salah al-Din Yusuf was also ruler of Damascus from 648/1250, and that the ewer of 1259 was made for him in Damascus itself. Kühnel (1938: 24) attributes another object, a candlestick in Istanbul dedicated to a Malik Ghiyath al-Din, to Aleppo, but I suspect this is a misunderstanding of the inscription. The lack of evidence for Aleppo producing inlaid metalwork compares vividly with the evidence for it producing exceptional glassware. Cf. Auld 2009: 47.

88 Eddé 1999: 533; Ibn al-Shihna-Sauvaget 1933: 14; Sauvaget 1941: 150. Al-Nasir Yusuf was some seven years old when he acceded to the throne, and the regency was in the hand of his grandmother Dayfa Khatun until her death in 1242. See Tabbaa 2000, esp. 19.
91 On Mosul’s textiles, see von Wilckens 1989.
93 Rice 1957a: 284. To get a sense of the comparative cost of such items, see Eddé 1999: 557.
This is most conveniently seen in the images in Atil, Chase and Jett 1985: 117, 121, Fig. 47. The handle of Qasim ibn 'Ali’s ewer is slightly more fussy in the treatment of the flanges that connect it to the body and neck, and in the round finial. Al-Dhaki’s ewer is 36.5cm high, Qasim ibn ‘Ali’s 36.7cm, but the base of al-Dhaki’s has been reworked.

Pace al-‘Ubaydi 1970: 174, scholars have ignored this octagon motif entirely, though its possible importance was recognised in the auction catalogue entry for an inlaid metal box sold at Christie’s London, Art of the Islamic and Indian Worlds, 6 October 2011, lot 130. The motif appears in several different sizes, ranging from 16 to 33mm, including sometimes on the same object. This suggests that it may have been worked from memory rather than a cartoon. A related hexagon appears on other works, though these all appear to be from the second half of the century. They include the ewer by ‘Ali ibn Abdallah and the candlestick made in Cairo in 1269, and it remains to be established what links, if any, existed between these objects.

Despite a gap of seventy years, the layout of Dawud ibn Salama’s 1248 candlestick, with two friezes of standing figures under lobed arcades framing the top and bottom of the body, is closely echoed in the candlestick dated 1317 in the Benaki Museum (Combe 1931; Ballian 2009). As this was made in all probability for an Artuqid ruler of Mardin, it seems likely that the schema was Mosuli, and that Dawud ibn Salama operated there rather than in Syria, as is often assumed.

The candlestick in the Khalili Collection (see n. 138) has the same form of elaborate arcading as the 1225 Ibn Jaldak candlestick in Boston; it also has figures against a plain ground, and figures arranged in several registers, sometimes with diminutive figures in a lively scene in the bottom register, and both these candlesticks have a frieze of chasing animals on the lower skirt. Both the Khalili and the Doha candlestick with a frieze of mounted warriors, to be discussed later, are framed top and bottom by an inscriptional band in knotted Kufic, punctuated by the octagon. There are knotted inscriptional bands in the same positions on the Ibn Jaldak candlestick, but the Kufic is plainer and the hastae terminate in human heads. The candlestick in the Metropolitan Museum has a knotted Kufic inscription but it encircles the middle of the body; overall, this candlestick is more elaborate, and may date to a decade or so later than the others, as its ground displays a similar ‘wavy T-fret’ as the upper body of the Blacas ewer of 1232.

Is it possible that the octagon served to indicate a level of status in the guild or workshop, which would explain why it was not used by Muhammad ibn Fattuh, who was a hireling (ajir)? It is clear, however, from Ahmad al-Dhaki’s work that a craftsman was not obligated to use it.

Muhammad ibn Khutlukh is known for an incense-burner that he produced in Damascus, but it seems likely that he was primarily a maker of scientific instruments such as the geomantic table he made in 639/1241–42, as he introduces his name on both objects with the word san‘at (work of). This was used on objects whose ‘dimensions were based on mathematical or astronomical calculations’, and was thus standard on instruments such
as astrolabes, but highly uncommon on table and other metalwares (Rice 1953c: 230; but cf. Baer 1983: 339, n. 238). On Muhammad ibn Khutlukh, see Allan 1986: 66–69, cat. no 1. Iyas also uses san‘at on his ewer of 627/1229–30, in which he records that he was the ghulam of ‘Abd al-Karim ibn al-Turabi al-Mawsili, whom Rachel Ward has forcefully argued was likely to have been the astrolabe-maker ‘Abd al-Karim al-Misri (Ward 2004: 248. See also below, n. 152).

It remains unclear whether al-Hajj Isma‘il is to be identified as Isma’il b. Ward. See above, p. 24 and n. 68.


103 Dimand 1926: 196; Dimand 1934: 16, 21; Kühnel 1939: 14–19; see also van Berchem 1906: 201; Karabacek 1908: 16.

104 Ağa-Oğlu 1945: 42–43; Rice 1957a: 321.

105 The relief rosette does not occur on the ewer by Qasim ibn ‘Ali. It has been queried whether the current base is original, as it is poorly formed, but it has the same analytical composition as the body (Atıl, Chase and Jett 1985: 122). Nor does the rosette occur on the base of the ewer in the name of Abu’l Qasim Mahmud ibn Sanjarshah (see Table 1.1). James Allan in his discussion of this ewer notes a 12-petal rosette, but this refers to the entire base which is gadrooned, rather than to a small central relief rosette on a stem (Allan 1982a: 54). The origins of the Mosul rosette may trace back to Herat, as the Bobrinsky bucket has, in the centre of its base, a small disk on a stem, with decorative petals inlaid with alternating cooper and silver petals rather than the repoussé petals seen in the Mosul group: Glück and Diez 1925: 451, ill. For two later versions of the relief form of rosette, the first with eight lobes, the second with ten, see the mosque lamp produced in Konya in 679/1280–81 (Rice 1955a, esp. Pl. 1) and the underside of the Mamluk incense-burner made for Sultan Muhammad ibn Qalawun (Allan 1982a: 86–89, cat. no 15). A similar-looking rosette is used as a finial on an intriguing domed casket in the Furusiyya Art Foundation (Etude Tajan, Paris, Art Islamique, 7 November 1995, lot 365). This object deserves fuller study. It is an unusual form, yet carries banal inscriptions of the Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya type (see the following note).

106 On inscriptions that consist overwhelmingly of blessings, see Baer 1983: 208–12, though she does not identify the peculiarities of the Mawsili group. The inscriptions on the ewer by Qasim ibn ‘Ali and on the Freer canteen are related to, but simpler than, what we might call the ‘Ibrahim b. Mawaliya type’ (Atıl, Chase and Jett 1985: 118, 124). Those on the ewer in the name of Abu’l Qasim Mahmud ibn Sanjarshah, which Allan has attributed to the workshop of Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya (Allan 1982a: 54–57, cat. no 6), are even simpler variants. Intriguingly, the Blacas ewer and the candlestick by Muhammad b. Fattuh have banal inscriptions that differ from the ‘Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya type’ (Allan 1976a: 179, cat. no 196; The Arts of Islam: 182, cat. no 200). Few catalogues of such inscriptions have been published, but nothing similar is to be found in Sarre and Mittwoch 1906, with the exception of p. 25, cat. no 53 (B147). In Melikian-Chirvani’s
catalogue of Iranian metalwork in the Victoria and Albert Museum, there are only three
inscriptions of this type. Cat. 72 is on a cast brass stem-bowl that Melikian-Chirvani
attributes to West Iran in the second or third quarter of the thirteenth century; James
Allan (1977c: 160) initially supported this attribution, but for his re-attribute of the
type to Anatolia or the Jazira, see Allan and Maddison 2002: 80, cat. no 25; see also
Rice 1955b: 14 on the example in Naples, which, it turns out, has a banal inscription of
the ‘Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya type’ (Scerrato 1967: 2–3, cat. 2). The two other items are
a candlestick and a ewer (respectively, V&A inv. nos 333–1892; 381–1897, Melikian-
Chirvani 1982: 166–73, cat. no 74–75); Melikian-Chirvani attributes both to western
Iran, and relates their inscriptions to items found in the Baznegerd hoard, found near
Hamadan (see esp. 172). Intriguingly, both these items make extensive use of the seated
figure holding a crescent moon. See Ağa-Oğlu 1945: 43, n. 132. The only instances of
the ‘Ibrahim ibn Mawaliya type’ of banal inscription cited by Lanci (1845–46, vol. II:
124, 129, 145) are from items signed by Mawsili artists or, in the case of the Bologna
bowl, here attributed to Mosul. See also Reinaud 1828, vol. II: 420–21, and Mittwoch
in Sarre 1905: 86.

Another connection can be found in what Rice (1957a: 295) described as ‘probably
the most remarkable among the unusual scenes of the Cleveland ewer’ – ‘a youth nonchalantly
reclining on a couch’. The same scene (Fig. 1.12b) can be found on the shoulder of the

candlestick in the Metropolitan Museum, inv. no 1891 91.1.563, which I have connected
to Mosul (see p. 45 and Figs 1.20 and 1.21).


Kühnel (1939: 11) says he is ‘Enkel von nr. 12 oder Neffe von Nr. 14’.

Husayn’s ewer was made in 657/1259 for the ruler of Aleppo and Damascus, al-Malik
al-Nasir II Salah al-Din Yusuf (r.1237–60). (Following Lavoix 1878: 786, van Berchem
[1904: 22] gives the date of the ewer as 659AH). The candlestick was made in 655/1257
for a Taj al-Din Abu Durr Badr, who has been identified as an amir of the Rasulid Sultan
al-Malik al-Muzaffar Shams al-Din Yusuf. Abu Durr Badr actually died in 654AH,
but presumably news took time to reach Damascus from the Yemen. (James Allan in
cat. no 125.) On Taj al-Din Badr’s architectural patronage in Yemen, see Giunta 1997:
123–30. On features of its main script, see below, p. 42 and Fig. 1.16. The Kufic on the
shaft of the neck of Husayn’s candlestick shares a number of idiosyncrasies with that on a

candlestick in the MFA Boston, acc. no 38.19. In turn the Boston candlestick relates in its
decoration to an unpublished candlestick in the Hermitage. The knotted Kufic friezes in
Fig. 1.15 are paralleled, however, by a band on the massive Ilkhanid basin in Berlin: Sarre
and Mittwoch 1904, Fig. 2; Enderlein 1973, Tafel 2.


On ‘Ali ibn Husayn’s 1282 candlestick and 1285 basin the medallions are bordered by
thin frames.
James Allan in Louisiana 1987: 91, cat. no 123; see also Paris c.1993: 467. The titles ‘al-Muzaffari’ and ‘al-Mansuri’ appear in that order, and suggest that the unnamed dedicatee was connected to both sultans and that the object must therefore post-date 1259, while the lack of the word *maliki* suggests that both were deceased. I wonder, therefore, if so much importance should be placed on the graffito *khizanat nuriyya Hasan ibn Ayyub*, which has been taken to indicate that the basin was made for the treasury of al-Mansur Nur al-Din, and is thus datable to 1257–59. A further difficulty is that the inscription on the exterior refers to the dedicatee as *al-Mu‘ayyadi*. The Rasulids were ruled by al-Mansur (1229–50), al-Muzaffar (1250–95), and al-Mu‘ayyad (1296–1322), but the object surely cannot belong to the first quarter of the fourteenth century stylistically.


Cairo MIA no 15153 (ex. Harari no 12): see RCEA vol. XIII, no 4991; Atıl 1981: 62–63, cat. no 14; O’Kane 2006, Fig. 102. Atıl dates the tray to circa 1290, but it more probably dates to the third quarter of the century, a conclusion also reached by Ballian (2009).

115 Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, acc. no 54.526, unpublished. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, acc. no 91.1.603. The basin now in Doha was formerly in the Nuhad es-Said Collection, see Allan 1982a: 76–79, cat. no 12, where it is attributed to Syria 1240–60.


117 On the Boston basin (acc. no 50.3627), see Ward 2004: 353–54. She suggested it was made for Shihab al-Din Ghazi, ruler of Masyafarqin (d.1247), and was later reworked for al-Nasir Yusuf II (d.1260). The main inscriptions have been tampered with, but there is a diminutive Kufic inscription on the interior which carries the full name and titles of Sultan Qalawun. I hope to publish this in the near future, and am extremely grateful to Laura Weinstein for allowing me to study it.

118 It occurs on the Barberini vase in the Louvre, which was made for the Ayyubid al-Malik al-Nasir Salah al-Din Yusuf of Damascus and Aleppo, who died in 1260 (see Table 1.1a). It can also be traced back to earlier work in Mosul, such as the Freer canteen; and Eva Baer (1972) has shown how it was used over an extended period in both Iran and the Near East in various media. Characteristic of this family’s work in both Damascus and Cairo is a narrow border with an animal chase which is arguably distinctive in its choice of animals and in the extreme elongation of their bodies. (There is no detailed study of this, but see Baer 1983: 178–79; cf. Rice 1957a: 323; ‘Izzi 1965: 257, 259, Figs 10, 11.)

A candlestick in the Furusiyya Art Foundation can be attributed to ‘Ali ibn Husayn’s workshop, as it uses similar ‘static’ roundels against a T-fret ground, though it differs in

78
having an inscriptional band running around the middle of the body. It must be close in date to the 1282 candlestick, and was presumably also made in Cairo. However, the script on the candlestick in the Furusiyya Art Foundation shows affinities to the examples in Fig. 1.16, including the Lajin candlestick. This raises questions about whether these examples should be attributed to Cairo rather than Damascus, or whether the same form of scripts was used in both cities. This was perfectly possible, as both cities may have had workshops that ultimately traced back to Husayn ibn Muhammad. Sotheby’s London, Islamic Works of Art, Carpets and Textiles, 14 October 1987, lot 387.

Atıl 1981: 80–81, cat. no 22, with bibliography. This pictorial mode is well illustrated by the boating scene on the inside base of a large basin in the Victoria and Albert Museum, acc. no 2734-1856. The basin is not fully published, but see Lane-Poole 1893–94: 909; Baer 1977: 329 and Fig. 21; Baer 1983: Fig. 195.

Baer 1983: 181, 184–85, Fig. 159 for the Muhammad ibn Fattuh candlestick; Atıl 1981: 57–8, cat. no 10 for the 1269 candlestick. When scrollwork ending in animal heads was replaced by flying ducks is yet to be determined precisely, but it was certainly by the 1290s. On misguided attempts to read the duck as the ‘armes parlantes’ of Sultan Qalawun, see Mayer 1933: 7, 10, 26.

It would seem from the prominent position of this motif on this candlestick, and its recurrence on works by later generations of this family, that it may have held some significance for them, but it is probably far-fetched to think that the eagle-and-duck was an allegorical motif (like canting arms in heraldry) referring to Muhammad’s father’s name, Fattuh, which means ‘Little Victor’. For details of this motif on this candlestick, see Baer 1983: 171 and Figs 142, 159.

Characteristic of these inscriptions is the use of ‘hanging’ letters; the lam of the lam–alif has a short, strongly curved base, while the lower part of the alif is tangent, not conjunct. The horizontal return of the kaf is set about one-fifth of the way down the hasta, and has a slight concave swing. The terminal ya can be compact, with a reflex tail that angles back acutely.

Atıl 1981: 80–81, cat. no 22.


British Museum, acc. no 1954 0215 1.

Christie’s London 2011, lot no 129.

Louvre, acc. no OA 7439.

Rice 1949; Rice 1957a: 323.

Doubts have been raised about the connection of this manuscript with Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, but, first, the scribe of at least volumes I to XI styles himself, in the colophon to volume XI, as al-Badri; second, on the frontispieces to volumes XI, XVII, XIX and XX the main figure wears tiraz bands that read Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ with or without bin ‘Abdallah. Bishr Farès (1948, also 1953–54) queried the date of these inscriptions (see the rebuttal by Stern 1957), but he overlooked the braided frame surrounding the frontispiece of volume XVII, which has undecorated squares in its four corners that are inscribed, anti-clockwise
starting top right: (1) Badr (2) al-Din (3) Lu’lu’ (4) bin ’Abdallah. This is a highly unusual feature, and there is little doubt that the scheme and inscriptions are original. See Rice 1953a: 130, and Fig. 18. (The frame inscriptions read more clearly in colour: see Sourdell-Thomine and Spuler 1973, Pl. XXX.) On the turbulent period during which this manuscript was being produced, when Lu’lu’ was fighting for survival, see Patton 1991: 16ff.

134 Cf. for example, the central scene of an enthroned figure flanked by flying genii holding a canopy or veil over his head (Rice 1957a: 288 and Fig. 3) and Farès 1948, Pl. XI. Note too the unusual figure of the courtier looking away from the enthroned figure.

135 For a selection of such images, see Nassar 1985, Fig. 2. On the scene where the ruler is seated in three-quarter pose, and having his hand kissed in obeisance, see Rice 1953a: 134. On the candlestick in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, acc. no 1891.91.1563, see Dimand 1926; Dimand 1944: 146–47; Baer 1983: 264–65.

136 Some of the silver inlay has fallen out, making it possible to see that the ground has been pitted where the long beard would have been, indicating that the silver inlay would have been worked to highlight the beard.

137 British Museum, acc. no OA 1969 9–22 1: Baer 1983: 147, Fig. 124. Auld 2009: 62 attributes it to the Mamluk period. On the painting, see Fares 1955, Pl. III.

138 A relationship with miniature painting may have extended beyond a link to frontispieces: scenes on a candlestick in the Nasser D. Khalili Collection (MTW 1252) have been linked to narrative painting: Paris 2001: 140–41, cat. no 114; Auld 2009: 56–58. Fehérvári (1976: 96) compares the enthronement scene on the Keir Collection candlestick to those in the Kitab al-Aghani, but it is considerably different in style and dates from the early part of the fourteenth century (pace al-Harithy 2001: 366).

139 Dimand 1934. In subsequent studies boundaries of place and patronage and even sectarian meaning became increasingly porous, and two of the most recent interpretations have centred on the notions of porosity, liminality and portability – an object of no fixed abode. Schneider 1973; Katzenstein and Lowry 1983; Baer 1989, passim; Khoury 1998; Hoffman 2004. See Ecker and Fitzherbert 2012. This is not the place for a detailed discussion, but I would contend that the imagery does not reflect a pan-sectarian concordat as some have implied; the imagery on the rear of the canteen has a polemic cast, with the outer band depicting the Annunciation followed by 25 saints, several of them military saints, while the inner band depicts not a friendly tourney (pace Schneider 1973) but a mounted battle between Muslims and Crusaders, who are clearly identifiable by their surcoats and pennants (Baer 1989: 46). For comparable scenes of Christian and Muslim knights in combat, see Paris 2003: 168, cat. nos 129–30. Some have doubted that the canteen shows a battle, but I find it difficult to accept this as a tourney or a parade when several of the figures are shooting crossbows. A more detailed rendering of a comparable scene occurs on a candlestick now in Doha (see below, n. 151, and Fig. 1.25), and there arrows can be seen flying. The two bands can be seen as complementary, one conveying a heavenly, the other the mundane, protection of the Christian community. The presence of Crusaders
does not imply that the object must have been made in Syria, as Crusaders were a known
sight to some Mosulis, since there was a settlement of Mosul merchants in the Crusader
town of Acre in the thirteenth century, and, according to Fiey, Badr al-Din even allowed
the crusading army of St Louis to enter Mosul with pennants flying (Fiey [1959]: 46, but
with no reference).

The evidence of form, iconography and style suggests that the canteen was not an object
with generalised Eastern Christian imagery, nor a portable object made for a Christian
client in Syria. Its imagery has strong links to that employed by the Syrian Jacobites of
northern Iraq and eastern Turkey. It was more likely, then, to have been produced in
Mosul rather than Syria where the Syriac Orthodox church enjoyed a limited presence
at this time (Snelders 2010: 74, esp. no 20). The form of the canteen has encouraged
scholars to label it a ‘pilgrim flask’, and to assume that the deep hole on the rear was to
attach it to a pommel or a pole. There are, though, good structural reasons against this,
and an alternative explanation is that the recess was intended to receive a glass reliquary,
preumably intended to bless the large quantity of liquid contained by the canteen (see
Ecker and Fitzherbert 2012). The canteen weighs 5kg, and, with a capacity of 3.6 US
gallons, it would weigh 13.6kgs if filled with water, making a total of 18.6kg or 41lbs, a
very substantial weight for an allegedly portative object. (I owe thanks to Blythe McCarthy
for the information on the capacity.) The size of the canteen seems excessive if it contained
water, as it could have been refilled with comparative ease, while its remarkable state of
preservation suggests it was used infrequently and with care. The neck, which has an
internal filter, seems small in comparison to the body, suggesting that the liquid was to be
dispensed sparingly. With such a large capacity, the canteen most likely contained a liquid
that would remain stable over a long period, such as an oil. An alternative explanation,
then, is that it was intended to hold a precious liquid such as chrism (Gk Myrrhon).

Baer (1994) argues for a more diverse set of sources.

and on the revised dating of the Vatican MS from Anno Graecorum 1531 to 1571/1219–
20 to 1260, see Fiey 1975 and Brock 2002. For a full discussion, see Snelders 2010,
Chapter IV. It is still a matter of debate whether the London lectionary was produced at
Deir Mar Hananiya near Mardin, as Leroy proposed, or in or near Mosul.

The pictorial origin of another of the scenes – Christ’s entry into Jerusalem – is more
complex than has previously been assumed (Fig. 1.23), but here too the derivation is from
a Jacobite lectionary cycle, though the only known exemplar dates from the early eleventh
century and originates from near Mardin (British Library MS. Or.3372). This lectionary
has traditionally been dated to the twelfth or thirteenth century, but can now be definitively
attributed to the nephews of John of Qartmin, who was consecrated Bishop in 988 or a
decade later (see Brock and Raby forthcoming). The Monastery of Qartmin (Mar Gabriel)
is in the Tur Abdin. This newly established dating and provenance means that there is
no immediate connection with Mosul in the thirteenth century. Yet a closer look at the
image on the canteen reveals links to the Mar Mattai manuscript, even if not directly.
If we reverse the image on the canteen and flatten out its curvature, the similarities and contrasts between it and the scene in Or.3372 become more obvious still. (I would like to thank Robert Foy for adjusting the images to make this comparison clearer.) The principal difference is in the rendering of the building and its occupants. The building on the canteen bears a close resemblance, though, to that shown in the entry into Jerusalem in both the British Library lectionary datable to 1216–20 and the Mar Mattai lectionary in the Vatican. Fig. 1.23 is a composite image that combines sections from the entry into Jerusalem from Or.3372 and from the Mar Mattai lectionary. Liberty has been taken in removing the tier of nimbed spectators in an upper window, but the result reveals how closely related the building in the Mar Mattai manuscript is to the version on the Freer canteen, and that even the posture of the hands of the front figure inside in the building is similar. (The front figure in both manuscripts does not, however, carry a child on his shoulders, as on the canteen.) This suggests that the craftsman who decorated the canteen relied on a later derivative of Or.3372 that was closer in date and milieu to the Vatican manuscript, that is to the Mosul region in the first half to mid-thirteenth century. This derivative may also have included the Z-meander border which appears on both Or.3372 and the Freer canteen.

The *flabellum* in the Musée Royal de Mariemont in Belgium was published by Leroy 1974–75, and recently by Snelders 2010: 104–50, with further references; he also publishes the stone sculpture found in Mosul in 2005 (115–16). The second *flabellum* has, however, been largely overlooked. It is in the Louvre, acc. no OA 7947; see St Petersburg 2008: 338, cat. no 251. On the close relations between the monasteries of the Mosul region and the Deir al-Suriani, see Snelders 2010: 127 ff., esp. 138–48, 194 on the political role the Deir al-Suriani played in the schism affecting the Syriac community in the Jazira.

It is intriguing, however, that in the twelfth century – presumably some time between his ordination in 1126 and his death in 1165 – Bishop John of Mardin ordered metal objects, described as exceptional, not from Mosul but from Alexandria: Assemani 1719–28, vol. II: 225.

As already noted by Marian Wenzel in Sotheby’s London 1992, lot no 52.

The canteen has three roundels containing a seated figure holding a crescent moon, and while the significance of this motif remains uncertain, it certainly occurs on several objects of undoubted Mosul provenance (cf. Table 1.2a–c).

Muqaddasi-de Goeje: 145 (see also Lombard 1974: 166); Amedroz 1902: 787.

Allan 1976/77.

I hope to return to these two topics in another article. On Siirt as a metalworking centre, see Allan 1977, Allan 1978, Allan 1982: 58–61 and Allan 2009: 499, col. 1; cf. Atıl 1972; Soucek 1978, cat. nos 69–70; Melikian-Chirvani 1985. However, their discussion is not primarily focused on the items signed by al-Is’irdi craftsmen: see Pevzner 1969.

By far the earliest evidence for brass inlaid with silver from Syria in this period is an unusually large astrolabe made in Damascus in 619/1222–23 for al-Malik al-Mu’azzam.
‘Isa. It was constructed (sana‘ahu) by ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn Sinan al-Ba‘labakki al-Najjar, and the inlay work (ta’tim) was signed by al-Siraj al-Dimashqi, a muezzin and himself a maker of astrolabes. The positions of the markings were done by ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn Abi Bakr al-Muqawwim al-Tabrizi. Three other examples of al-Siraj/Sarraj al-Dimashqi’s work are known (King 1996–97; Mayer 1956: 83; van Cleempoel 2005: 210–16, for an astrolabe made in Damascus in 628/1230–31, though it is not silver-inlaid). Whether ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Ba‘labakki had any connection with Mosul is not known, but his Syrian contemporary, the celebrated mathematician, architect, engineer and globe-maker Qaysar ibn Abi’l Qasim studied in Mosul with one of the greatest polymaths of the era, Kamal al-Din ibn Yunus ibn Man‘a, who could have been a relative of Shuja‘ ibn Man‘a, the maker of the Blacas ewer (see above, n. 62). In 622/1225–26 Qaysar made a globe for the Ayyubid al-Malik al-Kamil Muhammad, inlaying the inscriptions in silver: Wiet 1932: 170, no 40; RCEA vol. X, no 3924; Mayer 1956: 80–81; Scerrato 1967, cat. no 38, who provides a photograph of the inscription; Savage-Smith 1985: 218–19, cat. no 30. From either the mid-century or the end of the century the socalled al-Naisaburi made an astrolabe with silver-inlaid figures on the rete for a ruler of Hama with the title al-Malik al-Muzaffar (Mayer 1956: 82–83, assigning it to the ruler from the close of the century; the object is reproduced in colour in Bott, Willers, Holzamer 1983, cat. no 2; but see David King in Paris c.1993: 432–34 for issues on the dating). Ibrahim al-Dimashqi 669/1270 made an astrolabe, a plate of which is now in the British Museum (acc. no 90 3-15 3), but he only inlaid the star points.}

152 See n. 100 above on ‘Abd al-Karim ibn al-Turabi al-Mawsili and Iyas, who produced an inlaid ewer. (Cf. Baer 1983: 339, n. 242 on an astrolabist who made the cover of a pen-box). If ‘Abd al-Karim ibn al-Turabi al-Mawsili and ‘Abd al-Karim al-Misri were one and the same person, as Rachel Ward has argued (2004b), it is instructive: he is the only Mawsili metalworker of the thirteenth century to employ a nisbah that indicated a royal affiliation. In fact, he worked for no less than three Ayyubid princes, all brothers, his soubriquet ‘al-Misri’ referring not to Egypt but to his peripatetic attachment to different regional centres and royal encampments (sing. misr). He illustrates how some makers of scientific instruments may have enjoyed a closer connection to court circles, especially if they were astrologers, whereas metalworkers in general belonged to a craft that ranked low in status, lower than textile workers, for example. Indeed, it is conspicuous how few of the Mawsili metalworkers in the first half of the thirteenth century signed works for noted patrons. It seems likely that they operated on a market system rather than in a court environment. At almost the same time that al-Siraj al-Dimashqi was inlaying his astrolabe in Damascus, a craftsman who signs himself al-Ibari (the needle-maker) al-Isfahani inlaid an astrolabe that prefaces, in its use of larger sheets of silver and, in particular, incised linear detailing, Mosul work of the 1230s and 1240s. Although it is not known where al-Ibari was working, the coincidence of production by a Dimashqi and an Isfahani should caution us against assuming that Mosul somehow enjoyed a

153 Allan (2009: 498, col. 2) suggests that a silver-inlaid bronze Ka’aba key dated 1180 may have been made in Mosul or the Jazira area, as Sourdel-Thomine (1971: 46–51, cat. no 2) proposed.

154 Cf. Kühnel 1939: 8; Ağaoğlu 1945: 44. The Khwarazmshahs’ invasion into Khurasan in the last quarter of the twelfth century may have destabilised the economy.


156 There was an important tradition of silver-inlaid bronze/brass doors in eleventh-century Byzantium, some of which were made in Constantinople, and one of which bears inscriptions in Syriac. Cyril Mango has suggested influence from Syrian Jacobites: see Frazer 1973; Mango 1978: 249–51; Iacobini 2009; Ballian 2009. I am grateful to Cyril and Marlia Mango for their thoughts on the topic. This is not to deny the possibility, however, that well after the establishment of the industry in Mosul Iranian immigrants may have arrived: cf. Ağaoğlu 1945: 40.

157 For the wallet, see Robinson 1967; Allan in London 1976a, cat. no 199. The candlestick was subsequently donated in waqf to Medina by Mirjan al-Sultani, who is almost certainly Mirjan ibn ‘Abdallah ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Sultani al-Uljayti, the Ilkhanid vizier connected to Uljaytu, and who is well known for constructing the Mirjaniyyah madrasa in Baghdad in 758/1357: Combe 1931; Ballian 2009; Los Angeles 2011: 67, Fig. 62.

158 Meanwhile, see the important contributions on the subject made by James Allan (Allan 1995a); and Eva Baer 1973–74.

159 Barhebraeus 1932, vol. I: 468. This event occurred, however, shortly before he went to Mosul.

160 See above, n. 100 on al-Turabi, whose nisbah suggests he or his family were from Merv. See also Ağaoğlu 1945: 40

161 Ettinghausen and Grabar 1987: 364; Ettinghausen, Grabar, Jenkins-Madina 2001: 247: ‘Many Mawsili artists worked in styles quite different from those attested by these six pieces, and in the work of one single artist there are stylistic differences that may imply various locales. This pattern reveals how difficult it is to make attributions of metal objects from this period when historical inscriptions are lacking.’

162 For the inscription, see Grabar 1957: 549. On the so-called ‘renaissance’ among the Syriac communities, see Snelders 2010: 69.

163 Mayer 1959: 13–14; Rice 1953b: 67. The most detailed discussion is Kana’an 2012, where she suggests that Qasim ibn ‘Ali’s ghulam status might indicate that he was manumitted or could have had a contract towards manumission.

164 For instances of metalworkers who called themselves al-mu’allim or ibn al-mu’allim, see Mayer 1959, passim; Rice 1950a; Rice 1951; Auld 2004; Behrens-Abouseif 1995: 13.

Kana’an (2012) discusses the concept of employee and trainee solidarity and pride (wala’).
Families played an important part in metalworking in Mamluk Damascus: see Ağa-Oğlu 1945: 34–35; Allan 1986: 52.

The enigmatic figure holding a crescent moon has been variously been taken to be an emblem of the city of Mosul or of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ himself. If either were to hold true, it would be another indication of affiliation, but more work is needed before we can be certain of its significance, even if none of Rice’s five ‘shattering revelations’ against the emblematic significance of the motif hold true.
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