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PART ONE
ESSAY
I: INTRODUCTION

The Freer Gallery of Art is Washington, D.C. has, among its large holdings of Islamic ceramics, a sizeable collection of pottery traditionally attributed to medieval Raqqa, a city on the Euphrates in northern Syria. While there are over one hundred and fifty pieces in this collection, they have rarely seen the light of day in the Gallery or in print. This so-called Raqqa pottery rarely attains the technical and esthetic levels of other Islamic ceramic traditions; nevertheless, it provides the art-historian with an interesting set of problems. Foremost is the one of attribution: was Raqqa a ceramic center, what were the wares produced there, and when was this production? Secondly, what is the relationship of this pottery to other wares of Syria, Egypt, Anatolia, and Iran? And finally, there is the question of its very quality: if these wares were produced at Raqqa, what does it tell us about the place in which it was produced. Following George Kubler, is it possible to determine the shape of its time?

Sauvaget has categorized Islamic ceramic production into five classes: elements of architecture, vessels for the collection and retention of water, table ware, furniture and furnishings, and diverse objects with no similarity except that of the material from which they were made. To my know-
ledge, a statistical analysis of these classes has not been made, yet, considering the role of the collection and conservation of water and the extensive use of brick and tile in the arid Near East, it would not be illogical to assume that irrespective of site, the largest proportion of the ceramic production was devoted to water vessels and architectural elements. With this in mind, the Freer collection of "Raqqa" ceramics in no way could be said to characterize the presumed ceramic production of the site, for it contains but a few architectural elements such as glazed tiles, and no unglazed water vessels. Rather, the collection consists entirely of glazed pieces, mostly table ware, such as dishes, bowls, ewers, bottles, pitchers, storage jars, a few lamps, figurines, and a group of stands, often known as "tabourets."

There are twenty-odd "programs" of glaze decoration among the examples in the collection, yet over a third of the pieces are covered with a transparent, strong, bluish green glaze, and over a fifth are covered with the same glaze with the addition of black underglaze painting. A quarter of the collection is decorated with overglaze luster painting, in almost every case it being of a deep or moderate reddish brown color. 6

As for the body of this ware, it is usually soft (rarely more than 3 on Moh's scale), friable, rather coarse, and of a variable pale, "buff" tone. 7 Exceptional pieces may be harder, finer, or whiter, but the Syrian wares are usually easy to distinguish from the reddish Egyptian wares, or the consistently finer and whiter Persian ones.
History of the Collection

The scope of the collection cannot be disassociated from the personality of Charles L. Freer and his buying habits, who started the collection in 1902 with the purchase from D.G. Kelekian of a one-handled pot (02.244) attributed to Raqqa. In that same year he bought five more pieces of "Raqqa" ware from Kelekian, and in succeeding years continued to buy it in increasing quantities from dealers in New York and Paris. In 1908, he made a trip to the Near East, which took him to Cairo, Aleppo, Beirut, Jerusalem, and Istanbul, where he purchased forty-six pieces purportedly from Raqqa in addition to the eleven bought from dealers in the West. In 1909, 1910, and 1911, he again went to buy from dealers in the Near East. After that time, only two more pieces attributed to Raqqa were bought by Freer before his death; subsequent to that, the Freer Gallery has bought four pieces attributed to Raqqa and one attributed to Ayyubid Syria. The majority of the pieces, therefore, were bought during that period when the name "Raqqa" first was heard on the art-market.

Freer started buying Japanese ceramics in 1892; two years later he began collecting Chinese ceramics, and two years after that Korean. One cannot help but feel that Freer's taste was conditioned originally by his taste for Oriental, and especially Japanese, ceramics; judging from his comments on the earlier "Raqqa" purchases, he especially treasured the rich iridescent decay of the glaze on them. A pitcher, bought in 1903 (03.204) is called "beautiful and rare," although very little of the potter's original intention is visible
under the spectacular changes wrought on the glaze by long burial in the soil. With two exceptions, Freer did not buy "Raqqa" luster ware until 1908. The earliest purchases were of the turquoise-glazed ware, with increasing numbers of examples of turquoise glaze over black underglaze painting, and polychromed ware.
II: SCHOLARLY VIEWS

While most of the great collections of Islamic ceramics contain examples attributed to Raqqa, serious archaeological and scholarly efforts have yet to be made, even though the wares have been known for eighty years.\(^\text{13}\) No excavated wasters have ever been published, no kilns have ever been found at Raqqa,\(^\text{14}\) and there is no evidence, literary or otherwise, which would indicate absolutely its manufacture there. Indeed, the study of medieval Syrian ceramics lags far behind the study of contemporary Persian wares.\(^\text{15}\) Nevertheless, ceramics are still being attributed to Raqqa, or for polychrome wares to Rusafa, a town nearby to the south-west.\(^\text{16}\)

Fragments of Raqqa ceramics appeared on the European market in 1895,\(^\text{17}\) and by 1903 a large blue-glazed vase with black relief decoration from the collection of the Countess of Bearn was shown at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, attributed to the tenth or eleventh century.\(^\text{18}\) Enough interest in the site must have developed by the summer of 1906, when the Ottoman Museum in Istanbul carried out an "expedition" to Raqqa, the results of which were never published, although the finds were exhibited in the Çinili Köşk at the Topkapi Palace Museum, along with other pieces purchased for the collection.\(^\text{19}\) All this time, the inhabitants and dealers from Aleppo were undertaking clandestine operations to supply the
hunger for such objects in the West. This hunger is all the more understandable when one considers the original attribution of these pieces. Migeon, in his standard work on Islamic Art, wrote of Raqqa, which became, in the first years of the ninth century, the preferred residence of the caliph Harun al-Rashid, when, after the disgrace and the murder of his ministers, the Barmecides, he preferred to remove himself from Baghdad. The court of the caliphs having always been an artistic center, Migeon felt it was natural enough to suppose that the ceramic workshops prospered there. Although attributing these pieces to the ninth century, he stated that this attribution was very subject to caution, given their character.

In 1908, Garrett Chatfield Pier, writing in The Burlington Magazine, attributed a "certain type of coarse pottery...composed of a sandy argillaceous frit decorated with floral designs, floriated spirals, kufic inscriptions (rarely) in purplish black over an under-glaze blue, and covered with a thin siliceous glaze" to Raqqa, and datable as early as the ninth century A.D. In the second of his articles, he extended the range of dates to the twelfth century for "large green, cobalt or purple jars, with or without handles, often decorated with raised dot, wave or arabesque design raised in the paste," and attributed to the thirteenth century "those large jars in rich cobalt or purple having ornamentation of leaves in relief and, rarely, inscriptions which date them."

Meanwhile, Friedrich Sarre had undertaken an archaeological survey expedition in upper Mesopotamia with Ernst Herzfeld, the results of which would not begin to be published until
1911. However, responding to Pier's first article, in a letter to the editor of The Burlington Magazine, Sarre wrote that the two bowls illustrated and attributed to the ninth century by Pier had to be reattributed to the eleventh to twelfth century. Ceramic finds came not from the older Raqqa, the city of Harun al-Rashid, but from a newer city, a crescent-shaped site (now called the "horseshoe city"), the most remote date of which is given by an inscription of 561 H. (A.D. 1166) referring to Nur al-Din Mahmud.24

Four examples of ceramics from Raqqa were exhibited at the Berlin Exhibition of 1910, and were attributed to the eleventh, twelfth, or thirteenth centuries. Two were deep dishes with a broad flat rim, painted in luster over a transparent greenish glaze, one of them having light and dark blue spots under the glaze; one was a large jar decorated in the body with letters in relief, glazed with a greenish glaze with several narrow and broad vertical stripes in turquoise blue; and one was a vessel in the shape of a sitting figure, glazed in blue.25

The next year, the first and third volumes of Sarre and Herzfeld's findings appeared, but they did not treat the small finds until the fourth volume, which did not appear until after the First World War. Herzfeld divided the site into groups of ruins: the "horseshoe town," containing the Great Mosque restored by Nur al-Din, the ancient town, Raqqa al-Samra, etc. The horseshoe town was dug up all over by clandestine excavators who were looking for the prized Raqqa ceramics. Obviously, the ceramics were already fetching a good price
on the antiquities market.26

Rivière and Migeon, in their sumptuous publication, *La Céramique dans l'art Musulman*, placed the Raqqa ceramics from the ninth to the twelfth century.27 Migeon saw the same manganese brown luster, the same decoration of leaves or of geometric motifs without a great rigor of design in both Raqqa luster ware and in the Kairouan mihrab tiles exported from Baghdad in 242 H. (A.D. 855).28 As for the other wares, some he considered but a survival of Parthian and Achæmenid art. He waxed most enthusiastic describing the greatness of the decoration of Raqqa pottery.29

In 1920, Pézard already showed a note of skepticism, calling it "Céramique dite de Raqqa." He described four series of pieces: large vases with floral kufic characters in relief, various vessels with manganese brown luster of rather poor quality, a group glazed in copper blue with black decorations, and a group of wares decorated in cobalt blue under a lead glaze. He argued that there was no special school of ceramics at Raqqa, as the first group is closely related to Syro-Egyptian wares of the tenth to twelfth century; luster wares are all eleventh century and related to Rayy; the turquoise and black wares are related to the Persian; and the wares decorated in cobalt blue are related to the former with the addition of Syro-Egyptian influences of the eleventh century.30

The second and fourth volumes of Sarre and Herzfeld's findings were also published in 1920, presenting the first serious, though limited, study of surface ceramic finds at
Raqqa. Sarre described the condition of the site, where the inhabitants dug up the ground only for the more valuable twelfth-to-fourteenth-century luster wares; the less valuable ninth-to-eleventh-century primitive production did not interest the dealers. They attempted to obtain an excavation concession but ran aground on the objections of the local population.

Sarre said that all of the ceramic finds were made after A.D. 1000, and most belong to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. He mentioned, but did not publish, numerous wasters, proving that the production was local, although an earlier splash ware sgraffiato sherd, which he believed to have been imported, was found. Also, large unglazed vessels were found filled with small, finely-glazed pieces. They were all of the same body—fine, friable, white or brownish gray—and were all covered with a glaze containing flint, transparent and lightly green, though some were also colored turquoise, cobalt blue, or intensive dark green. Two examples of unglazed ware were shown, decorated in the body in relief, fragments of a basin and a large water jar, but the discussion was concerned solely with the glazed wares, of which there were four types: (1) ware decorated in the body with relief decoration, covered with a silicious monochrome glaze, usually turquoise blue, (2) ware with black painting under a turquoise transparent glaze, (3) a deep brown luster-painted ware, and (4) miscellaneous types which combine the above-mentioned techniques.

Among the vessels described, Sarre also mentioned certain other unusual pieces, such as the stands ("tabouretten"),
hollow vessels in the form of a sitting figure, and small blue-glazed animal figurines which were probably toys.

All this production was attributed to Raqqa of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries on the basis of the internal similarity of the pieces and Herzfeld's dating of the inscription-tile fragment to the time of Nur al-Din (A.D. 1146-1173), though it was not certain that the inscription frieze was to be associated with the renovations of the Great Mosque.

Although Sarre's description of his finds was the most complete information to date, in 1923 Fahim Kouchakji published his collection of Raqqa pottery, where he, although conscious of previous controversy over the Raqqa "question," agreed with Migeon on the earlier dating, feeling that Pézard, Nöldeke, Sarre, A.F. Butler had all placed it too late. His less-than-clear argument is based on a number of points which are not accepted today: persistence of Sassanian motifs not used at Rayy, similarities of the "Great Find" to Samarra wares, finds of Abbasid coins at Raqqa, the discovery of the "Palace of Jafar," the grand vizier of Harun al-Rashid, and pottery supposedly associated with it, and stylistic progressions. Of the nineteen pieces illustrated, he dates one to the eighth century (!), two to the eighth-to-ninth (a tabouret and a relief-jar), and the rest to the ninth century. It is difficult to accept any of his hypotheses, and significantly, they were ignored.

Sarre's publication of the ceramics and small finds from Bealbek, discovered during the excavations there from 1898 to 1905, illustrated and described large numbers of both glazed and unglazed ceramic wares. He divided the glazed
ware into thirteen groups: (II.A.) sgraffiato ware; (II.B.) monochrome (light green or reddish brown) glaze over red body; (II.C.) monochrome (blackish green or brown) painting and turquoise spots under colorless glaze; (II.D.) blue painting under colorless glaze; (II.E.) manganese violet painting under colorless glaze; (II.F.) bichrome painting in cobalt blue and greenish black under colorless glaze; (II.G.) bichrome painting in cobalt blue and greenish black under colorless glaze on a relief-ground; (II.H.) trichrome painting in cobalt blue, turquoise blue, and black; (II.I) trichrome painting in turquoise or cobalt blue, yellow-green, and black; (II.K.) trichrome painting in dark blue, light green, and black; (II.L.) trichrome painting in cobalt or turquoise blue, tomato red, and black; (II.M.) black painting under blue- or green-colored glaze; and (II.N.) painting in luster (dark brown). As Grube has explained, these groups are hardly of fundamentally different nature; rather, they are a variation of a basic type which appeared all over Syria in the early Middle Ages: a white-bodied ceramic with (at most) trichrome painting under a colorless, slightly greenish glaze, or black or dark blue only under the glaze. At the same time, other writers on Islamic pottery agreed that the earlier date for "Raqqa" ceramics was no longer tenable. Riefstahl dismissed the connection with Harun al-Rashid in his catalogue of the Parish-Watson collection as a charming story but unfortunately not founded in fact. Butler, writing on the origins of luster ware, which seemed of such importance in the 1920's, found Pier's dated bowl of A.D. 831 found at Raqqa unlike any other Raqqa ware, and considered it to have
been undoubtedly imported. After considering the historical sources, he dated the ceramic production to the twelfth and thirteenth century.

In the 1930's, the standard guidebooks to Islamic ceramics by Hobson and to Islamic minor arts by Dimand placed the production of Raqqa pottery in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Hobson limited it with the ante quem of the destroyed state of the city reported by Abu'l-Fida in 1321, although he dated the earliest specimens, having a plain green or turquoise glaze, from A.D. 600-1200, as they are related to Parthian ceramics. The black under "peacock-blue" pieces are not later than the eleventh or twelfth century on the basis of a possibly-Syrian dish-fragment found embedded in the wall of Sta. Cecilia in Pisa, founded in 1103. Luster ware was first produced in Raqqa in the twelfth century. Dimand said that some of the wares may belong to the eleventh century, but the majority of them dates from the twelfth or thirteenth, as they show elements characteristic of the era of the Seljuk atabegs of Syria and Mesopotamia. Again, he differentiated the production by glaze type: luster ware, black under turquoise glaze, polychrome ware, and the similar wares attributed to Rusafa, of slightly differently colored luster, and using a thick red-brown pigment.

Arthur Lane's standard work, *Early Islamic Pottery*, placed the pottery from Raqqa in various technical and stylistic groups: carved monochrome wares, underglaze painted wares, and luster wares. He believed that it could not be dated any earlier than the presumed dispersion of the Fatimid potters in 1171, nor later than the Mongol sack of the city in 1259.
According to him, the wares are all made of a white quartz body material, "softer than the Persian and more sugary in texture."\(^{56}\) Stylistically they are related to Seljuk wares of Persia, but the absence of whitening-matter in the glaze gives them a "dingy appearance" in comparison with those wares. Although but a brief treatment, Lane's work represented a concise presentation of the "state-of-the-field" at the time it was published.

These efforts were but a reworking of the earlier findings of Sarre and Herzfeld and the traditional attributions. It was not until 1948 that Jean Sauvaget attempted to provide new material for the attribution of Raqqa ceramics.\(^{57}\) The attribution had been based above all on the information given by dealers in antiquities—always subject to caution—and the finds of Sarre, which did not produce published wasters or kiln sites. Sauvaget's investigations supposedly produced undeniable evidence for a local ceramic industry, such as kiln furniture, wasters, and traces of kilns, especially in the eastern suburb of the site.\(^{58}\) He found innumerable sherds, since only the complete pieces had been sent to the dealers in Aleppo, yet all the fragments mentioned (except no. 22, 23, and 38) came from al-Rāfiqa or from its eastern suburb; the site of Raqqa, strictly speaking, did not produce one sherd, which was particularly unfortunate since he had hoped, because of the great age of the site, to find at least some sherds of the early Islamic period.\(^{59}\) Although he classified his finds into over a dozen types, only a few of them could have been
produced at Raqqa. Of the wasters found, only a few were published and they were only of three types: greenish glaze, white relief ware, and cobalt blue under colorless glaze. This might indicate that at least some of the other wares were imported. As all of the wasters were not illustrated, it is difficult to determine if they were indeed wasters. The technical analysis of eight samples by P. Munier appended to the article examined the white ware with incised decoration (no. 67) covered with cobalt blue glaze. Munier proposed that the series shows the characteristics of over-firing. Nevertheless, this ware had not previously been attributed to Raqqa, but rather to Rayy, Sultanabad, and Kashan.

Sauvaget dated this series to the eleventh and twelfth centuries. As complete pieces of this ware have not been found in or attributed to Raqqa, the observations were of doubtful value. In summary, Sauvaget's contributions are unfortunately quite meager or negative. No ceramics were found at Raqqa itself, but only in the eastern suburb. A kiln was found within the enceinte of al-Rafiq, but it was not associated with any wasters on the spot. And finally, thirteen classes of pottery, of which only a few might have been made at Raqqa, were attributed to it.

The ceramic finds from the excavations undertaken at the citadel of Hama were completely published by Poulsen. A terminus ante quem for the finds was provided by the destruction of the site in A.D. 1401. After separately classifying Chinese and Persian imported wares, Poulsen considered Syrian wares, of light-colored and sandy body, with a silicious glaze, characterized
A strong tendency to iridescence. Classification was made on the basis of decorative treatment, and within each class by stylistic development. Among the types relevant to our study are: (B.VII.) black painting under a blue-green glaze ("Faience de Raqqa"); (B.VIII.) black painting under cobalt blue, manganese violet, or colorless glaze; (B.IX.) painting in black, blue, and red under colorless glaze ("Faience de Rusafa"); (B.X.) the later ("tardif") style of luster decoration; (B.XI.) cobalt blue and black under colorless glaze; and (B.XII.) blue under colorless glaze. Unfortunately, neither kiln-sites nor significant wasters were found, and the possibility exists that material attributed traditionally to Raqqa could have equally been produced at Hama or a third site; indeed, the general similarities of Syrian pottery suggest that the differences are not primarily technical, but decorative.

The most recent attempt to explain "Raqqa" ceramics was made by Ernst J. Grube, publishing the collection of Raqqa ceramics from the Metropolitan Museum in New York, which claimed to be the definitive word on the subject. Grube divided the wares into four categories: (1) flat, coarse relief decoration covered with monochrome blue-green glaze; (2) decorative, rarely figural painting in black under a transparent turquoise or blue glaze; (3) polychrome painting, mainly in black, light green, cobalt blue, and dull tomato-red under a silicious, transparent glaze; and (4) a significant group of luster wares. He related the first group to earlier pieces of Mesopotamian origin and ultimately to Sassanian prototypes, attributing the earliest ones to the ninth or tenth century, and the relief
vases to the twelfth. The second group is dated to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and he considered it without prototype—an original Syrian creation. Yet he related some of these pieces in their use of the pseudo-Kufic inscription-band to the so-called *minai* wares of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, mostly attributed to Rayy, but actually from Kashan. The luster ceramics are clearly attributable to Syria on the basis of technical details, such as ceramic-body and glaze, as well as the characteristic dark olive-brown ("dunkles olivbraun") of the luster itself. Grube dated these wares using a published, but unillustrated dish in the collection of Eustache de Lorey, which mentions Shirkuh (reigned A.D. 1186-1239). Stylistic comparisons were not possible; on the basis of a relief vase decorated in luster, luster wares were associated with Group I production, and on the basis of the use of small spiral filler-motifs, they were related to Kashan production of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, so the dated dish is at least possible. As for the polychrome ware, it had usually been attributed to Rusafa, but on the basis of the similarities of the elements of decoration to the luster ware, Grube felt it must be the product of the same workshop. From the similarities of pose of the figures, he related the polychrome ware to luster and *minai* wares of Kashan and Rayy. He underscored his point by illustrating a plate formerly in the Guttman Collection in Berlin (figure 1) and a tile from Kashan in the Metropolitan Museum. Therefore, he stated that the turquoise and black wares can be dated to the twelfth century, the luster ceramics continue into the first half of
the thirteenth century, and the polychrome wares slightly later than that, as they are immediately related to Persian prototypes of the thirteenth century.82

It is remarkable, that after seventy years of research, so little is known about Syrian ceramics and especially those attributed to Raqqa. In summary, "Raqqa" wares are agreed to be of "buff" or whitish body, coarse, friable, with a thick glaze, either alkaline or lead, which is often turquoise, turquoise with black underglaze painting, lightly green with reddish brown luster overglaze painting, or with underglaze polychrome painting. The decoration is either geometric, floral and vegetal, animate but usually non-figural (except for the polychrome wares), or epigraphic or pseudo-epigraphic. Without much doubt, they may be dated from sometime between the early eleventh and the late thirteenth century, for the earlier dating to the ninth century is no longer tenable.

No discussion has been made of the characteristic shapes. As different decorative programs appear on virtually identical vessels,83 similar decorative programs appear on different vessels,84 and similar decorative programs appear in various media,85 a sensible course of investigation would be to study form, technique of decoration, and vocabulary of decoration simultaneously. As it would be most confusing to do so, each aspect shall be considered individually first, and conclusions drawn later.
As has been noted, most of the Freer examples of "Raqqa" pottery were bought from thirteen dealers during the first decade of this century. Three pieces were bought off the street in Aleppo. Marcopoli was mentioned by Sarre as one of the dealers in wares found at Raqqa.\(^86\) The likelihood is great that he was indeed dealing in wares found in northern Syria and quite likely in Raqqa, as Raqqa is not far from Aleppo. That likelihood diminishes increasingly as the dealers are further removed from the purported find-site. Therefore, it seems most likely that the pieces in the Freer collection bought from Marcopoli were found at Raqqa.\(^87\) These seventy-one pieces are quite representative of the collection as a whole, as there are examples of about twenty different shapes and twelve glaze programs. In addition, the vocabulary of decoration on the pieces of the group as a whole is sufficiently broad to relate them to pieces in other collections, as well as to those pieces in the Freer Gallery's own collection not from Marcopoli.

**Technique: Body and Glaze**

According to Wilkinson,\(^88\) sometime after the close of the Samanid period in Iran a new kind of ceramic ware began to be made. It was distinguishable from the previous production
in body, glaze, and prevailing color. This body—white, gritty, and hard—was artificially composed of silica, or silicon dioxide (SiO₂—from finely ground quartz), with perhaps a slight admixture of clay. This body was suited to accept a new glaze, which used an alkali (i.e. a sodium, potassium, or lithium mineral), rather than lead, as the main fluxing agent. Whereas copper oxides used in a lead glaze would produce a clear green, in an alkaline glaze they would produce a light, transparent blue, and manganese, which previously had produced a near black, would now produce a clear purple.

The fragments from Raqqa examined by P. Munier were made of a silicate body with numerous fragments of ground quartz, but the addition of lead was found to be in such quantity as to preclude its being an impurity; rather, it must have been intentionally added to constitute the amorphous glassy binder. The glaze, however, was found to be based on lead—transparent and non-opacified—which indicated the absence of tin. It does not appear that all the wares in the Freer collection were composed of this artificial body; examples such as 08.121, 08.125, 08.140, and 08.151 (all painted in luster), and 08.136 and 47.8 (glazed in turquoise over black), which exhibit whiter body, greater hardness, and finer over-all quality, may have been of artificial body, while the majority of the other pieces were composed of a natural clay, with varying additions of aplastic material (i.e. sand, grog, etc.).

The body, whether artificial or natural, was occasionally covered with an engobe, or layer of fine slip, which would provide a finer surface to receive decoration. The presence
or absence of the engobe may be a function of quality and use; monochrome (i.e. turquoise) wares do not appear to have an engobe, while it is fairly common on the turquoise over black wares (e.g. 04.292, 08.136, and 47.8), polychrome wares (25.7), and luster wares (08.140, 08.148, and 42.5). Owing to the condition of many of the pieces, it is often difficult to see the engobe, for where the original body is visible, it may be difficult to distinguish a buff engobe from a well-levigated clay surface.

Forms and Functions

A consideration of the forms of so-called Raqqa pottery is intimately related to a discussion of the functions these objects were made to perform. Therefore, the objects are classed primarily according to function and secondarily according to their geometrical composition. With any such grouping, there are bound to be some areas where one category blends into another; this ordering of objects is not meant to be definitive, but rather to provide a handle for their study.

A number of pieces in the collection are associated with architectural usage. A group of seven large, square revetment tiles were purchased from different sources, yet are virtually identical in body, size, and glaze. Three other square tiles are in the collection, covered with turquoise glaze, black under colorless glaze, and black under turquoise glaze. Sarre and Herzfeld and Sauvaget do not mention such tiles in their description of finds at Raqqa. Unfortunately, there does not seem to be a standard unit of length to which these
pieces refer. Since two of the large tiles (08.119 and 08.120) were bought in Lebanon, we may assume the others (08.173-177) were from the area. There is no indication that the smaller tiles came from the Levant or northern Mesopotamia. Two fragments from inscription frieze tiles are also in the collection.

Though neither can be associated absolutely with any specific building, one (10.33) may very well be from Nur al-Din's restorations of the mosque. A fragment of a molded screen for an opening (08.153) does not compare with any known fragments in shape. Two other pieces are neither architectural nor datable, but on general similarities with other wares have been given to Raqqa. It seems strange for a well-wheel (08.124) to have been made out of fairly fragile ceramic—perhaps that is why there are not more of them left. A grave-stele with a conventional inscription and name (05.257) does not provide much information.

There are no unglazed vessels for the gathering and storage of water in the collection, although they must have played a great role in the local ceramic industry. This lacuna must represent two factors: the reluctance of the local inhabitants to send them to dealers because they did not consider them commercially valuable, and the buying habits of Charles Freer. They were, however, found on the site by Sauvaget.

The largest group of wares in the collection consists of glazed "table" wares and storage vessels. They may be grouped in three broad categories: dishes and bowls for serving food and eating it from (III.A.-G.); pouring vessels for liquids (IV.A.-E.); and jars for storing provisions (V.A.-D.; VI.A.-G.).

The most common dish-form, represented by ten examples in the collection, is one with a deep well and broad, everted,
flat rim (III.A.3.). Variations of this shape have a slightly concave rim (III.A.4.b.: 08.28), or an inverted, rounded rim (III.A.5.: 09.125, 10.45). The unique sgraffiato ware dish in the collection (III.A.4.a.: 42.13) has a "broken" exterior profile and is more heavily potted. Unique forms in the collection are a flat, rimless dish on a slight basal ring (III.A.1.: 08.129), and one with short vertical walls on a hollow foot (III.A.2.: 11.6). Bowls are characterized by their deeper wells; there are two large groups in the collection: hemispherical bowls on a foot (III.B.1.), and truncated conical bowls (bowls with straight, everted sides) on a high, hollow foot (III.B.2.). Variations of the first group include a bowl on a high splayed foot (III.B.1.b.: 10.34), and a gadrooned or melon-shaped bowl on a high splayed foot (III.B.1.c.: 08.152). Of the second group, variations include a conical bowl or basin (III.B.4.: 08.148), which is most certainly an imitation of a contemporary metalwork form, and two truncated conical bowls with inverted rims on a hollowed foot (III.B.3.: 06.230, 07.183). There are single examples of a bell-shaped bowl (III.B.5.: 11.19), a one-handled cup with an everted rim (02.244), a deep cylindrical cup with a broad, flat, everted rim (10.32), a cylindrical vessel with flanged decoration (10.35), and a small cylindrical cup with an inverted rim (11.7). There is one goblet in the collection (III.C.: 05.248) which is surely a translation of a contemporary glass form.

Vessels with handles for the pouring of liquids take a number of forms: (IV.A.) pitchers—with necks but without spouts, (IV.B.) jugs—having very narrow necks, (IV.C.) ewers—
with spouts and necks, and (IV.E.) vessels with spouts but without necks. Bottles (IV.D.) have very narrow necks but
no handles. Only the pitchers are quite common, having at
least seven distinct shapes: (IV.A.1.) spherical body and con-
cave cylindrical neck; (IV.A.2.) flattened spherical body and
concave cylindrical neck; (IV.A.3.) pear-shaped body and narrow
neck; (IV.A.4.) pear-shaped body and broad cylindrical neck,
of which there is one variant (06.221) with a pinched lip
forming a spout; (IV.A.5.) pear-shaped body with concave
cylindrical neck; (IV.A.6.) squat, pear-shaped body with
short, broad neck (most common in the collection with six
examples; and (IV.A.7.) inverted pear-shaped body. The
two jugs are very similar in shape to Persian jugs, even in
the use of an air-hole to allow the liquid to pour freely.96
Of the three ewers, two (08.185 and 11.15) appear very close
to metalwork forms attributed to thirteenth-century northern
Mesopotamia. There are two bottles, one a flattened ovoid
(05.245) and one bell-shaped (11.3). The most puzzling of
these pouring vessels are the two with spouts but no necks.
They are of different shape (04.149 is a flattened sphere,
while 05.92 is a flattened vessica), one has a central handle
above, the other has two handles on either side of the spout,
but both appear similar in function, whatever it was.

The large group of jars in the Freer collection easily
divides into two broad families: coarse ware and finer ware.
Although the body of almost all of the pottery attributed to
Raqqa is considered coarse in comparison with the finer bodies
found, for example, in Persian ceramics, even within the group
itself certain pieces are far coarser and more crudely potted than others. As the collection has no water vessels, these coarse ware pieces represent the ordinary, every-day "kitchen" or "industrial" wares where an impervious glazed coating was necessary. These jars take four main shapes: (V.A.) short, cylindrical jars with sloping shoulders and a short cylindrical neck; (V.B.) double conical jars with a rolled mouth and four handles around the belly; (V.C.) elongated ovoidal jars with two handles on either side of the neck; and (V.D.1.-5.) inverted ovoidal jars having numerous variations in shape and size of the neck. Similarities between one example of this last group having a short cylindrical neck (V.D.2.: 02.190) and the first group (V.A.) would seem to indicate that they were of a unified production. The elongated ovoidal two-handled jars are quite similar to the unglazed form often known as the "Parthian Amphora," but it has been found to be part of the common repertoire of Islamic ceramic forms. 97

As for the jars of finer ware, two shapes appear to have been popular: inverted ovoidal jars (VI.A.1.-4.) and inverted pear-shaped jars (VI.C.1.-3.). The inverted ovoidal forms appear in small, medium, and large sizes; one significant variant is the inverted ovoidal jar with a broken shoulder and a concave tapering neck (VI.A.4.). In the Freer collection, of the six jars so shaped, five (08.113, 08.134, 08.135, 08.155, and 08.184) are decorated in relief carving, and one (09.5) is painted in luster with similar decorative effect. The one pear-shaped jar (VI.B.: 05.285) may well be a fragment of a very rare form with a very broad everted lip. 98 The inverted
pear-shaped jars also range in size, and exhibit variations with long necks, concave necks, and a broadened body.

Five small bulbous jars are in the collection (VI.D.); two (08.122, 08.127) are very small and have no handles, while three have handles on either side of the neck, which is cylindrical in two cases (05.286, 06.225) and concave in the third (08.30).

One of the finest jars in the collection (08.138) belongs to a small group of three flattened ovoidal jars with relatively narrow mouths (VI.E.). One (11.17) is perched on a very high spreading foot, a form which appears to be unique.

The albarello, or druggists' jar, appears in five examples and one variant (VI.F.1.-3.). Three are very small, and the body is worked in hexagonal panels, vertical panels, or arcades. Of the two larger pieces, one has a broader shoulder than base. The variant is a jar with a rounded bottom on a low foot (10.25).

Furnishings must have played no small role in this production, judging from the number of ceramic stands to be found in collections around the world. In this collection, the stands take two forms: (VII.A.1.) hexagonal, represented by five examples, and (VII.A.2.) oblong, represented by one example, although triangular stands similar to both the oblong and the hexagonal stands are in other museums and private collections. There are four lamps in the collection, each of different and unusual form: closed ovoidal or boat-shaped (05.93), domed and spouted (10.37), four-spouted (10.38), and six-spouted star-shaped (31.7). The domed and spouted lamp appears to be somewhat similar to Cairene forms, but it is
not identical to any one of them. 100

A final group of objects includes those modeled or molded in human or animal form. There are two fragments and one complete object shaped as human-figured vessels (VIII.A.1.). Of the three which are not vessels, one may well have been a talismanic symbol (08.154), and a small figurine of a Mongol-featured man (11.612) may have been a toy. Similar purpose is assumed for a number of animal figurines: a bird (08.137), a hyena (?) (10.29), a goat (?) (10.39); one may have been the handle on a vessel (11.617) as is seen on overglaze painted and gilded relief ware attributed to Sava and Kashan. Only one piece, a fragment of a stag (11.24) was meant to be a pouring vessel. 102

In summary, the collection contains architectural elements, figurines, and vessels which were used for serving food, pouring liquids, and storage. The vocabulary of forms is fairly narrow, although there exceptional pieces which may either be unique, or not from Raqqa. The jars and pouring vessels are usually of ovoidal or pear shape. These forms could be compressed or extended and inverted, and they could have necks, foots, spouts, or handles added in any number of ways. 103 The analysis of shape leads one to the realization that a very limited vocabulary of form could be used to create a wide variety of actual objects. Some of these forms are not pottery shapes per se. Among these would be the basin and the ewers which clearly relate to contemporary metalwork of northern Mesopotamia (figures 8, 19), and the goblet and the globular bottle, which have clear prototypes in glass forms. In the
case of the former group, it seems clear that the imitative process was virtually contemporary with the production of the ceramic object, for the handles on the basin (08.148) are made in the clearest imitation of metal handles, and the details of the neck of the ewers, especially 08.185, show similar imitation. In the case of the goblet or the bottle, it is not so clear and it is possible, indeed probable, that these shapes had had a long existence as ceramic forms after the initial imitation process. 104

Decoration: Glaze-Programs 105

I. Monochrome Glaze

A. Turquoise: The simplest glaze technique is the application of a monochrome glaze over the entire piece. Sixty-six of the pieces in the collection are so glazed, ranging from the largest storage jars (e.g. 05.236) to the smallest figurines (e.g. 08.187). By far, the majority is covered with what is called a "turquoise" glaze. Technically, a copper-derived color, the actual hue ranges from bluish green to blue-green to greenish blue, and the value from brilliant to deep. These variations are not particularly significant, because variations are due not only to the formulation of the glaze, but to its thickness, the firing conditions, weathering conditions, and presence or absence of irisation. This glaze is not peculiar to Raqqa alone, rather, it is the typical turquoise glaze of much Near Eastern pottery, 106 but it is rendered distinctive by its tendency to disintegrate into brilliant golden and silvery iridescence. Another characteristic feature
of this and indeed all these "Raqqa" glazes is its tendency to gather in heavy drops at the lowest point of the glaze, which rarely extends far enough to cover the foot. The ten objects bought from Marcopoli covered with this turquoise glaze represent, in large part, a subgrouping of the glaze applied to molded and carved wares. A lamp (10.37) is the exception and shows that this glaze was applied to make an object of common use impermeable to oil. Similar use of this glaze is to be seen on the large storage jars of varying provenance (e.g. 02.190, 02.191, 03.186, 03.202, etc.). Yet the glaze is also used on smaller objects, such as the lamp mentioned above, or the small two-handled jar (05.286). The glaze is used on all kinds of objects: the series of large, square revetment tiles (08.119, 08.120, and 08.173-177) are glazed essentially in the same way that the small two-handled jars or a simple, but nicely-made jug (06.65) are. Small, indeed tiny, figurines modeled in clay were glazed in turquoise (08.187, 10.40), though the thickness of the glaze tended to obscure the fine modelling of details. This is especially visible on the six-spouted lamp (31.7), or in some of the carved and molded wares covered in turquoise. These wares are carved and molded in a large and fairly clear fashion so that the glaze would not compete with the relief decoration, as can be seen on four jars (08.133, 08.134, 08.135, and 08.155) as well as on the series of stands (09.41, 09.42, 11.1, 11.2, and 13.11). Occasionally, on the latter group, the carving gets too complicated, the decorative intention is partially lost, and one is unable to read the inscription. It may therefore be said that the turquoise
glaze was the all-purpose glaze: it covered storage jars, furniture, lamps, jugs, small jars, and figurines—objects made for many uses.

B. Purple ("Aubergine"): A second color of monochrome glaze that is occasionally found is that often called "aubergine." Derived from manganese, it is usually reddish black or blackish red, though again, there are variations due to the thickness of the glaze. Only five pieces in the collection are glazed with this monochrome glaze; these pieces and those glazed in purple over black underglaze painting (II.B. below) were originally attributed by Charles Freer as "Hembodji," or from Hembodj, which must be a misinterpretation of Manbij, the ancient Hierapolis, which lies about one hundred kilometers northwest of Raqqa. While there is no great quantity of such purple wares, neither their body nor shape distinguishes them from the turquoise wares. The three large jars (03.203, 03.204, and 03.226) appear to be of the same production as the inverted ovoidal jar (02.190) and another flat-bottomed jar (04.146), both glazed in turquoise. Only one piece (10.25) is of smaller and finer treatment, and of unique shape for the collection.

C. Deep Blue ("Cobalt Blue"): One piece only (02.191) is glazed with an overall deep blue, derived from cobalt. It has been called "Syrian, 14th-15th century" at the Gallery, but neither its body nor shape is so different from that of the turquoise wares as to place it significantly later. As cobalt was a rather rare and expensive material, extensive use of it as a monochrome glaze may not have been economically
feasible; rather, its use appears to have been limited to being an accent on polychromed and luster wares. 107

D. Very Pale Green ("Colorless"): The last group of monochrome glazed pieces are covered in a very pale green, which is usually referred to as "colorless" (French: incolore; German: farblos) or "celadon" in the literature. Since so much of this lightly greenish glaze was used, not especially as mono-chrome, but more often in combination with other techniques such as underglaze painting (II.C., E., and F., III.A. and B., IV.A., B., and C. below) and with luster (V.A., B., C., D., and E. below), the glaze must have pleased the artisans, yet as there is no truly colorless (or white) glaze on any of the pieces under consideration, it would seem that this very pale greenish glaze, sometimes grayish, sometimes yellowish, and sometimes slightly olive, was the closest the artisans could get to a colorless glaze. 108 The greenish tints, therefore, are to be seen as the results of unavoidable impurities in that glaze which could also be colored with copper, cobalt, or manganese to achieve turquoise, deep blue, or purple, for this greenish glaze shows the same characteristics of flow, crackle, and tendency to iridescence as the other monochrome glazes. This lightly greenish glaze was used in similar ways as the turquoise: the jar with relief carving (08.184) is similar to the same jar type with turquoise glaze (e.g. 08.133), yet at the same time, it is not unlikely that there is at least a consciousness of highly-prized Chinese celadons or contemporary glass shapes in some of these wares (e.g. 10.36: a small arceded albarello, or 11.14: a pitcher on a high spreading foot). Other pieces
(e.g. 10.31: a pitcher) show no fundamental difference from those similar pieces glazed with this greenish glaze with luster overglaze (e.g. 11.22) or turquoise over black underglaze painting (08.69). Indeed, it may be suggested that the pitcher (10.31) never got its intended luster overglaze painting, which would have made it similar to a piece such as 11.22. One interesting use of the greenish glaze is for a few figurines, such as the stag vessel (11.24) or the female vessel (11.615). The former shows no indication of luster overglaze, while the latter, with such coarseness of features as to render them somewhat indistinguishable, certainly would have been enhanced by luster overglaze painting. Its fragmentary condition does not exclude the possibility of some firing mishap which made it unnecessary to finish it with luster as on the "talismanic" figurine (08.154).

II. Bichrome decoration

A. Turquoise glaze over black underglaze painting:

The addition of painted decoration in black under the turquoise glaze enlarged the decorative possibilities available to the artisan. Indeed, this is the second largest decorative program among the pieces in the Freer collection, and it is also quite common among other collections. Poulsen calls this ware "Faience de 'Raqqa'" and it has been generally accepted as one of the most common wares attributed to the site. The ware was also found in great quantity at Hama, Baalbek, Damascus, Fustat, and other sites. A large variety of wares is glazed in this way, ranging from moderate-sized storage jars (e.g.
04.144, 06.223, and 08.13) to small objects such as a lamp (10.38), or figurines (10.39 and 11.612). While none of the very large jars in the collection is decorated in such a fashion, it was used for architectural revetments (08.153). In other words, it was used on many of the same shapes as the monochrome turquoise glaze: two-handled jars (06.225), relief jars, and hemispheric bowls (09.110, 09.125, and 10.30). At the same time, certain shapes have this technique which are not found decorated with monochrome glaze: deep dishes with a wide, flat rim (08.29 and 47.8), and truncated conical bowls (05.76 and 05.241). The Freer collection contains two wasters of this ware (05.258 and 09.376), but as neither comes from Marcopoli, they provide no more information than that as a result of overfiring, the turquoise glaze gets quite pale.\footnote{111}

B. Purple glaze over black underglaze painting: Only one hemispherical bowl in the collection certainly has black painting under purple glaze and it comes from Marcopoli.\footnote{112} It was given, as the purple monochrome wares (I.B. above) the "Hembodji" attribution. Similar wares were not found at Baalbek, though two dishes were found at Hama which may be comparable to a doubtful piece in the Freer (08.129). Poulsen sensibly argues that it is understandable that this ware was rare, for the dark glaze is not sufficiently transparent for the under-glaze painting to be effective.\footnote{113}

C. "Colorless" glaze over black underglaze painting: Only two pieces in the collection exhibit this combination, a medium-sized square revetment tile (09.40) and a footed hemispherical bowl (10.46). The type was not found at Baalbek but was found at Hama in significant quantity such that it was
not considered rare, although it could not compare in beauty with the polychrome wares.\textsuperscript{114} While on the one hand it can be considered another variation of the bichrome wares, on the other it is very much like the trichrome ware (III.A. below) without deep blue.

D. "Colorless" glaze over deep blue underglaze painting: Another small group in the Freer collection, these pieces correspond to Baalbek group D, Poulsen's group B.XII from Hama, and Sauvaget's examples 84, 85, and 86 from Raqqa in technique, though the decorative vocabulary on the Hama finds is so Chinese in flavor (imitating "blue-and-white" wares) that it cannot be associated with the Freer pieces. Poulsen dates the entire blue-and-white series to the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{115} A large jar (04.143) is similar in shape to, but larger and more elaborate in detail than 04.144, 08.136, or 08.137; the segment from a large inscription frieze (10.33) is probably part of an inscription remains of which were found at Raqqa (figure 20). Certainly some of the Baalbek pieces\textsuperscript{116} are different in style from the Freer examples, but this technique cannot be limited to such a narrow span in time or space, for technically, it is no different from any other of these bichrome decorative schemes.

E. "Colorless" glaze with turquoise inglaze:\textsuperscript{117} Two pieces in the Freer combine the colorless glaze and turquoise underglaze, or, more properly, inglaze painting; in neither case (02.246 and 11.19) is there any design per se; rather, on the former there are irregular areas of turquoise, and on the latter the pale green interior gradually becomes turquoise
on the exterior. The technique is not reported from Baalbek or Hama, or in Sauvaget's examples from Raqqa. While the uneven, irregular spots on 02.246 might indicate the accidental introduction of turquoise coloring material into the "colorless" glaze, the example of 11.19 shows that it could also be intentional.

F. Turquoise glaze with deep blue in-glaze: Again only two pieces in the collection exhibit this combination, similar to the previous one in that the auxiliary color appears in the glaze. A small hemispherical bowl (02.198) is quite comparable to other of its shape, while the other piece, a cylindrical jar decorated with flange projections painted in deep blue (10.35) is unique in ceramic as far as I know. Nevertheless, the body and glaze are not dissimilar from other pieces in the collection.

III. Trichrome decoration

A. Deep blue and black under a "colorless" glaze: This combination corresponds to type F from Baalbek, type B.XI. from Hama, and example 80 from Sauvaget's investigations at Raqqa. Technically, it is but a combination of our groups II.C. and D. Six pieces belong to the group: one conical bowl (08.147), as well as two jars (05.242 and 05.285), one fragment of a jar (?) (08.123), a small dish (08.28), and an albarello (09.43). This last piece is in very poor condition and only one small area of its surface is visible. It might possibly be, as its style of decoration indicates, a polychrome (IV.B. below) piece.

B. Deep blue and turquoise under "colorless" glaze: This
combination of colors is found on a unique dish containing an
inscription (05.240). The inscription is entirely in deep
blue, the turquoise being restricted to four lines on the rim
and two dots in the interior not related to the diacritical
marks of the inscription itself. As part of the rim is missing,
and the dish is cracked, the possibility exists that the piece
was broken after the firing of the glaze, but before luster
painting was applied. 118

IV. Polychrome decoration

There are four varieties of polychrome decoration to be
found in the Freer collection, each represented by one example.

A. Deep blue, black, and olive green under "colorless"
glaze: This combination appears on the albarello (09.38) which
is wider at the top than at the bottom.

B. Deep blue, black, and grayish reddish brown ("tomato-red")
der under "colorless" glaze: This combination, which conforms with
type L from Baalbek and Sauvaget's examples 82 and 83, is found
here on a truncated conical bowl (04.293).

C. Deep blue, black, olive green, and grayish reddish
brown under "colorless" glaze: This combination, conforming to
Poulsen's "Faience de 'Rusafa'" (group B.IX.), is represented
by a small dish with an everted, flat rim (25.7).

D. Deep blue, black, dark green, and turquoise under a
"colorless" glaze: This combination is represented by a conical
bowl with an inverted rim (07.183). There are striking similarities
in shape and exterior decoration between this piece and Sultanabad
ware, yet the body is characteristically "Syrian," and the interior
decoration is not far from group B.XI. from Hama. Were it found at Raqqa at all, this bowl might have been imported, since the use of dark green is not found on any other pieces traditionally attributed to Raqqa.

IV. Luster Decoration

There are five groups of luster wares and none is significantly different from another; rather, they represent, as do all these above-mentioned categories, variations and permutations possible within a limited range of resources.

A. Luster over "colorless" glaze: This group, represented by ten examples, is but group I.B. above with the addition of luster painting over the glaze.

B. Turquoise under "colorless" glaze with luster overglaze: This group, represented by seven examples, is but class II.E. above with the addition of luster over the glaze.

C. Deep blue under "colorless" glaze with luster overglaze: By far, this is the most popular technique of the group, twenty-two examples being in the collection. It represents group II.D. above with the addition of luster over the glaze.

D. Deep blue and turquoise under "colorless" glaze with luster over the glaze: This group represents group III.B. above with the addition of luster over the glaze. There are three examples of this type in the collection. As group III.B. is somewhat doubtful, itself represented by only one example in the collection, and one altered waster (08.145) which certainly was meant to receive eventual luster decoration, the combination of turquoise and deep blue under a "colorless" glaze may have
only been used with luster overglaze painting.

E. Turquoise and black (?) under "colorless" glaze with luster overglaze: There is one possible example of this combination (08.149) in the collection.

The body of these luster wares is usually the characteristic pale, soft, and sandy ware, though occasionally it is of finer quality (e.g. 08.121, 08.125, 08.140). The glaze is the usual slightly greenish tint, and the luster is consistently a moderate reddish brown, with variation more often due to peculiarities of weathering than to compositional differences. The shapes of the pieces given luster decoration range quite widely, from a very large jar decorated with a sunburst (08.116) to small figurines (11.616: a tiger's head). Generally speaking, luster tends to be used on table wares: truncated conical bowls (e.g. small: 08.121, 08.125; large: 08.146, 08.149, 11.16, 11.18, 11.23), deep dishes with a broad, everted, flat rim (e.g. 08.150, 08.151, 11.8, 11.11, 42.5), pitchers (e.g. 10.27, 11.22, 08.139, 11.20), ewers (e.g. 08.185, 11.9, 11.15), albarelli (e.g. 08.144, 11.21), and a bottle (11.3). The underglaze deep blue or turquoise usually establishes the ultimate design of the piece: inscriptions are often painted first in blue, or else the division of the area to be decorated is accomplished through the use of blue bands, panels, or medallions.

Summary of Glaze-Programs

It should be apparent from this discussion that the wide range of decorative combinations due only to the glazing techniques is based on an extremely limited repertoire of materials.
A lightly greenish glaze could be colored with cobalt for deep blue, copper for turquoise, manganese for purple, or could be left untinted. Black, turquoise, and deep blue were commonly used for underglaze painting, with the occasional introduction of olive green, and a tomato-red (grayish reddish brown), which probably had a base of iron oxide. Only black was widely used for underglaze painting when it was the only decorative treatment, most commonly with a turquoise glaze where the contrast was effective, but occasionally with a colorless glaze which was less visually exciting, and a purple glaze, which did not have enough contrast. Two underglaze colors could be used, and even three or four, but these wares are undoubtedly less common. The addition of luster painting over the previously fired glaze was a very common technique, but it was used specifically over "colorless" glazed wares, with or without the addition of underglaze blues.

Even without scientifically conducted excavations, it is fair to assume that the three most common glaze programs were monochrome turquoise, turquoise over black underglaze painting, and luster over "colorless" glaze. As has been noted in the individual discussions of the glaze programs, the monochrome glaze, especially the turquoise, was all-purpose, covering large storage vessels as well as tableware, architectural revetment elements as well as figurines. The bichrome ware, especially turquoise over black, was equally broad in application, though the largest storage jars were not among this type. Trichrome and polychrome wares are limited to small pieces, usually bowls, dishes and jars. The luster painted wares are
again generally limited to table wares, though a few exceptional pieces, such as the sunburst jar (08.116) and the jar similar to the relief jars (09.5) are larger than the norm. This distribution, however general, reflects a very simple rule: the more valued the piece and the "higher" its function, the more complex the decoration.  

Decoration: Vocabulary and Grammar

Strictly speaking, glaze should be considered among the elements of the decorative vocabulary of ceramics. As mentioned above, unglazed vessels must have been common, although they are not present in the Freer collection, and they would normally represent the ceramic object in its "pure state." The addition of glaze would represent the addition of an element from the vocabulary to form a new "sentence," the ceramic object before us. However, as all of the pieces in the collection are glazed, and glaze has been used by other scholars as the determinant in any discussion of the wares attributed to Raqqa, we have kept separate the discussion of the vocabulary of glaze, and will deal here with the vocabulary and grammar of further decoration, that it, the elements of decoration and the systems of their combination.

A first group is comprised of those pieces which have no decoration other than the monochrome glaze itself. Almost all varieties of objects are included in this category: architectural elements such as tiles, large and small storage jars, pitchers, bowls, and lamps, to name a few. Undoubtedly it was the most utilitarian and cheapest method of finishing
a piece where a hard and impervious covering over the soft and porous ceramic body was necessary.

A second group is comprised of those pieces where the decoration is carved, modeled, added on, impressed, or pierced in the fabric of the piece itself, usually called "in-the-paste" decoration. This decoration would then be covered with the monochrome glaze, or more exceptionally (and rarely in the Freer collection) with a more complex glaze-program, such as bichrome or overglaze luster painting. This group includes architectural elements such as a relief revetment tile (10.33) and jars of coarse and finer ware. The simplest type of such decoration would be incising or impressing of the still-pliable fabric, and it is seen on a number of large storage jars where bands of impressed panels bordered by incised horizontal lines encircle the vessels at the shoulder and neck (02.190, 03.186, 03.202, etc.). A more complex type of carving is found on the "relief" jars, where the body of the jar was entirely covered with a program of decoration executed in low-relief carving. The elements composing this decoration could be vegetal, such as vines, leaves, and tendrils, or epigraphic, either inscriptions or material derived from epigraphic elements, such as the alif-lams (i.e. two equal vertical lines) organizing the decoration on all of the relief jars into rectangular panels. Certain elements could be added on to the vessel: this is seen quite simply on the jar with rope molding (06.224) and on a finer piece, the purely decorative handles on the basin (08.148). Another subdivision would be where the shape of the vessel is modified by carving the surface into facets.
These pieces are generally quite small, such as albarelli or pitchers, and the panels are either vertical or hexagonal. These pieces are to be distinguished from one such as the melon-shaped bowl, for the working of the surface in facets does not alter the basic shape of the object, while the melon-shaped bowl was never a hemispherical bowl to begin with.

Certain pieces have their decoration impressed, incised, or pierced in the body. While roulette decoration would be one example, the examples in the Freer are somewhat different from the vessels previously discussed because they were fabricated in molds as decorated objects. The group of stands, both hexagonal and oblong, as well as the molded hollow figurines, were probably cast in pieces in terra-cotta molds, which were then luted together with slip. The decoration on the stands consists primarily of geometrical and epigraphical elements, though pieces in other collections such as the stand in the British Museum (figure 15) show more extensive use of vegetal, and the introduction of figural elements.

The use of such modifications of the body of a piece was fairly common, yet certainly the most common decoration was painted. This is immediately apparent in the distribution of glaze-types, for nearly two thirds of the pieces exhibit combinations of glaze with under- and overglaze decoration, ranging from the simplest—one color painting under another colored glaze—to the most complex—luster painting over a glaze, itself over underglaze painting. The elements of this decoration are again geometrical, vegetal, figural, and epigraphic, with the addition of such "conjunctions" and "punctuations" as bands and lines.
The geometrical elements consist of dots, lines, curls, spirals, braids and interlaces, and knots. (Chart 3) The vegetal elements are mostly foliate: palmettes and split-palmettes which may be attenuated, curled, or interlaced, arrow-head shaped leaves, trefoils—either of three lanceolate petals or three curving petals suggesting a fleur-de-lys, quatrefoils, and trefoils filled with spirals. There are also vines and stems.

The figural elements are fairly narrow in scope: there is only one representation of a human (25.7), and only a few animals (04.292) or birds (10.30: a peacock, 11.23: a peacock, and 47.3: a heron). A small number of figurines were modeled, however, in animal or human shape.

Finally, epigraphic elements are very common. They fall into three categories: inscriptions, conventionalized inscriptions, and pseudoinscriptions. The first group is composed of inscriptions which were understood by the decorator of the piece and are clearly legible. Such inscriptions are found on the wall tiles, the grave-stele, and certain dishes. The conventionalized inscriptions ultimately derive from inscriptions, but have developed the formal and decorative elements of the words to the detriment of legibility. They are characterized by lapses in calligraphy and the placement of diacritical marks, but we can assume that they were understood nevertheless. Such examples are found on many of the luster ware pieces where a band of repeated words, such as baraka ("blessings") or al-sa'ada ("happiness") do suggest the shapes of the component letters, but are not necessarily
correct. A final group is composed of those "inscriptions" which are not Arabic or any other script, but which try to convey the visual effect of a kufic or cursive inscription which might have occupied a similar position on another piece. Such bands are very common, consisting either of loose spirals, lines, and dots, which imitate cursive script, or a series of verticals separated by round "letters" such as is found on many of the "Rusafa" polychrome wares, and which imitates kufic script.

The content of these inscriptions varies according to group; they all convey the idea of an inscription, while true inscriptions, in addition, convey an actual message. The message itself may vary from the unique to the conventional. The architectural fragments of which we have only single units of a much-larger whole, might have contained unique material, although it is highly probable that one such fragment (08.156) which may or may not come from Raqqa, is part of an inscription from the Qu'ran (II.255: the "Throne Verse"). The grave stele (05.257) has the message that "This is the tomb of Sa'ad 'Allah (Sadullah);" two stands have the inscription that this is "the work of Muhammad" with, in addition, an undecipherable inscription above, perhaps al-quzz ("power"); and a few vessels have inscriptions such as "Prosperity and enduring health" (10.27) or "Rar-reaching happiness and riches, riches super-abundant" (11.9). Similar, if shorter, sentiments are expressed by the repetitions of words such as baraka or al-saadah, which appear on so many of the luster wares. Cases where such an inscription appears to have degenerated into illegibility, or where only
a pseudocursive inscription fills a band, are to be understood to have originally functioned as inscriptions. The suggestion of a pious sentiment of good wishes appears to have been equal to the thing itself. 131

The grammar of the decoration would appear to be somewhat complicated at first glance, yet despite the major variations in the color and application of glaze, use of geometric, vegetal, figural, and epigraphic elements, the decoration appears to have been organized by very few concepts. Decoration in paint is applied only on the major surfaces of a piece, and more decoration is applied to the more visible areas. Therefore, the deep dishes with broad, everted, flat rims have minimal decoration on the underside (i.e. the outside) consisting usually of large spirals between narrow luster bands, while the interior, the more visible surface, is covered with a complex design. 132 Jars may be given a coating of glaze on the interior, but are never painted there, unless, as is the case with a deep jar with an everted lip (10.32), the interior is plainly visible.

Once the surface for decoration is chosen, it is divided into vertical or horizontal bands, rectangular or quasi-rectangular panels, or medallions. Often one decorative scheme may contain two or three of these divisions, so that bands may contain medallions, and the bands may separate rectangular panels. In almost all cases the major divisions of the decoration, the character that it will ultimately take, is decided upon relatively early in the entire decoration-process, and often represents the geometrical structure of the piece. For the
underglaze painted wares, the painting takes place before the glazing, while for the luster wares, in over half the cases there is underglaze blue which establishes the arrangement the ultimate luster painting will follow. Such cases are evident in the wasters of wares destined to be overglaze painted in luster, such as the Freer's truncated conical bowl (08.145), and pieces in the Hetjens-Museum in Düsseldorf and the Hitchcock collection. In the Freer example, four alternately turquoise and deep blue rings are cardinally oriented on the interior walls, on the Düsseldorf piece, vertical stripes replace the rings, and on the Hitchcock jar four rings, described only as "underglaze blue" are cardinally placed around the shoulder.

Within each area to be decorated, the maximization of contrast through the juxtaposition of different elements appears to be the most fundamental law of decoration. We have already noted Poulsen's explanation of the rarity of black-under-purple glazed wares, because of the lack of contrast inherent in such a combination. The use of turquoise and black, or luster and colorless glaze, shows strong contrast of color, and the actual composition of the designs shows contrast of form and decorative devices used. The importance of contrast as a design factor, coupled with the now-infamous horror vacui of Islamic art in general, works to create most of the design programs on the decorated Freer examples. It would be impossible and pointless to analyze each piece in the collection in this light here, but a few representative examples from each group will serve to illustrate the premise.
The hexagonal stand (09.41) is decorated in molded and pierced decoration on every exterior surface. The top is composed of six-pointed stars alternating with twelve pierced holes. Each of the identical six sides is composed of three panels: a narrow inscription band in relief, a square repetition of the decoration of the top, and another inscription panel below with the name of the maker. The hexagon rests on six stubby feet, so that the base is an arcade of trilobed arches. All these elements illustrate various contrasts: solid and void, geometrical and epigraphic, plane (the borders of each panel) and relief.

The "Heron dish" (47.8) is justly considered one of the Freer's finest examples of "Raqqa" pottery. The painted design is one of utmost simplicity and economy of expression, yet very effective. The exterior is encircled by a very thin black line—it would rarely have been seen. The interior is divided into its component parts—well and rim—and these are bordered by bands and lines. The heron was drawn to fill the well, painted in a technique exploiting contrast, for parts of the bird are drawn in black with details in reserve, while other parts, namely the wing, are left in reserve and drawn in black. But the total effect of the bird is black. Therefore, the heron is surrounded by a reserve contour panel, the outer edge of which is animated by the flowing calligraphic line. The ground, to contrast with the contour panel, but not to detract from the heron, is filled with random dots and curls. The rim is simply filled with a geometric pattern of evenly-spaced, somewhat irregularly-shaped, dots.
The one true polychrome figural dish in the collection (25.7) shows a similar use of contrast. The area to be decorated is similarly divided into rim and well. The well is decorated with a seated figure, outlined in black. While his features are drawn in black line, his clothes are filled in with color, but the patterns on them are left in reserve. Instead of being surrounded by a defined contour panel, the contour panel is only implicit, and the negative space beyond it is but loosely filled in with vegetal elements, painted against the reserve ground. The rim, separated by a few narrow black bands, contains a pseudoinscription, executed in reserve against a deep blue ground.

The pitcher on a high, spreading foot (08.140) exhibits similar qualities although it is executed in luster and deep blue underglaze. The horizontal blue lines set the limits of decoration: one just below the lip, one on the shoulder, and one above the foot. A fourth horizontal division is an inherent one: the break between the neck and the body. Therefore, the four divisions create three major bands which would accept decoration, in addition to solid luster bands above the upper blue band and below the lower one. The major band, around the body of the pitcher, is of interlaced split leaves and blossoms left in reserve, painted with luster details. The ground is filled with luster spirals. Above, on the shoulder, is a narrow band of pseudocursive inscription, executed in luster on a plain ground. Around the neck is an inscription in luster surrounded by a very narrow contour panel, the interstices filled with small luster spirals.
While these examples have been taken from the finer pieces in the collection, the organization of decoration in contrasting areas of paint or pattern and reserve is by no means limited to them. A pitcher, rather carelessly painted in luster (11.22), exhibits the same effect. There are two main decorative bands, one around the neck and one around the body. Around the neck is a pseudocursive inscription in luster on a plain ground, while around the body the kufic inscription is in reserve against a solid luster ground. This latter band is interrupted by medallions in reserve and panels with a single leaf, painted in luster, surrounded by a narrow reserve contour panel, the ground filled with luster spirals.

On a large, and somewhat complexly decorated object such as the ewer (08.185), these same characteristics are amplified and extended, so that the horizontal bands appear predominantly dark (luster) or light (reserve), and the repetition of elements in different bands, or the repetition of entire bands, serves to unify the decoration as a whole.

Certainly, there may be exceptions to this rule of contrast, but they are not as numerous as might be expected when one is dealing with at least four different types of decoration. Generally speaking, the grammar of decoration on the "Raqqa" ceramics consists of the use of a limited vocabulary of forms (geometric, vegetal, figural, and epigraphic) in organized areas which reflect or emphasize the characteristic shape or divisions of the object, and differentiate themselves from their neighbors through the use of strong contrasts, be they of positive/negative, or decorated/non-decorated, elements.
IV: COMPARANDA

Having examined the shapes, glaze-programs, and vocabulary and grammar of decoration of these Syrian wares, it should be apparent, to anyone familiar with Islamic ceramics of the eleventh to the thirteenth century in Iran, Egypt, and Anatolia, that very few of the elements are characteristic of Syria alone. Indeed, comparative examples of shapes, glazes, and decoration can be found in many non-Syrian sites. It is not the place here to present specific comparisons for each piece, as this is done for many of them in the appended catalogue. We may, however, briefly summarize the general relationships to be found between the ceramics in the Freer collection and the production of other sites in Syria, Iran, Anatolia, and Egypt.

Syria

As Grube has noted, while our knowledge of Persian and Egyptian ceramics of the early Middle Ages is well-founded, and the attributions are fairly-well assured, there is still great uncertainty about the ceramics of the same period in Syria. With the exception of only a few sites, excavations have not been carried out; our knowledge rests on the attributions of dealers, surface finds such as those of Sarre and Herzfeld and Sauvaget at Raqqa, or Sarre at Baalbek. Only Poulsen's excavations at Hama were scientifically conducted,
but his dating is based more on stylistic progressions than on stratigraphic analysis. We have stated before that types of decoration similar to those attributed to Raqqa were found at Baalbek and Hama, but as significant wasters were not found, the localization of that ceramic industry at either of these two sites is not certain. Baalbek was partially destroyed in 1260 by the Mongols, but was restored afterwards, especially in the fourteenth century under the Mamluks. But by the end of the century a slow decline had begun which was nearly complete by the time of the Ottoman domination, as it fell into the shadow of Damascus. Hama underwent a period of great prosperity beginning in the twelfth century, but the greatest period was under the Ayyubids, who conquered Hama in 1174. The city capitulated to the Mongols in 1260 and the walls of the castle were demolished, only to be rebuilt later, with the help of the Mamluks of Egypt, but the city retained its independence from Mamluk rule until 1341 when a Mamluk governor was installed. With the arrival of Timur in 1401, the citadel was completely destroyed. Therefore, at both these sites, the period to which the ceramics may be dated ranges from the twelfth to the end of the fourteenth century, and under the successive political domination of either Zangids or Fatimids, Ayyubids, and Mamluks.

The similarities between the so-called Raqqa wares and wares found at Baalbek and Hama are too numerous to mention. They are of the same body, show the same shapes, same glaze techniques, and often identical decoration. The ceramic finds from Hama are more completely published than those from Baalbek,
yet there are certain types of pieces in the Freer collection which were not found at Hama, such as the stands, or a large group of plain turquoise glazed wares. No pieces of the group associated with the Freer "Heron" dish found. Nonetheless, the great similarities between the "Raqqa" wares and those of other sites would certainly localize the actual production of "Raqqa" pottery in Syria.

Iran

Some of the finest wares produced in Iran were made under the Seljuks beginning in the twelfth century. Some of the major centers of ceramic production are said to have been Rayy, Kashan, Sava, and Sultanabad. Rayy wares have been relatively well-identified from excavations and the discovery of kiln-wasters, and at Kashan, finds of kiln-wasters and the potters' habit of signing their pieces enables similar fairly-sure attributions. The Mongol conquest is said to have forced potters to move from Kashan to other centers such as Sava and Sultanabad where the traditions of Kashan luster painting were maintained. Grube has attempted to relate "Raqqa" wares to contemporary production in Iran, notably overglaze minal painting from Rayy, and luster wares from Kashan. There is no doubt that overglaze painted wares from Iran are comparable with the polychrome underglaze painted wares of Syria. One finds the same use of the figure against the white or "colorless" ground, the drawing in black, the use of a kufic inscription band around the rim, painted in reserve against a colored ground. The drawing of the facial features is similar,
(figure 2) and even the posture of the sitting figure is to be found on these wares. More often, though, it would seem that the Persian potters were content to leave their figures against an absolutely blank ground, while the Syrian potters felt a need to enliven it somewhat with decorative elements.

As for the luster wares, Grube bases his argument primarily on two points: the use of the spiral as a filler-motif in Kashan wares, either scratched in the luster, or (as in Syria) painted on the light-colored ground. The other argument ties a dish, formerly in the Guttmann collection in Berlin, with a mihrab tile from Kashan. The dish was attributed by Sarre to Raqqa, and as the painting is identical, Grube believes that there must have been an intimate relationship between Raqqa and Kashan pottery painters. The painting on the dish is unlike any other "Raqqa" painting, and we are unable to determine whether the dish was actually made at Raqqa. Therefore, the argument of Grube remains tenuous.

Yet one must agree that there are similarities of a more general sort between Syrian and Persian luster wares, though they cannot be determined on the correspondence of a filler-motif such as the spiral or the comparison with a doubtfully-attributed object. Rather, I would tend to see similarities in the use of cursive inscriptions (figure 3), as well as the use of a luster reserve rectangular kufic in combination with the cursive script as seen on a fragment probably dated to 1218 from Iran (figure 4). There is, generally speaking, a much greater use of figural elements in the Persian wares, while in the Syrian examples, this is much rarer, if not non-existent.
The comparison with Persian ceramics is not limited only to decoration, for many of the shapes are also similar. This can be seen comparing the "Raqqa" jugs (06.65, 08.31) with one attributed to Kashan, where the similarities run to even the use of an air-hole in the handle to facilitate pouring. The truncated conical bowl on a high basal ring has parallels in Suljuk wares of the early thirteenth century. The bowl with straight flaring sides, shoulder set inwards at a sharp angle, and flat lip projecting inwards and outwards is a shape commonly attributed to Sultanabad of the late thirteenth century. Two examples in the Freer collection attributed to Raqqa exhibit this shape. One (06.230) has turquoise over black decoration, while the other (07.138) has black, deep blue, turquoise, and dark green painting under a transparent, colorless glaze. While the former could easily be seen to conform with other "Raqqa" wares, the unusual use of dark green in the latter points to a somewhat different locale of production, perhaps related to Hama group B.XI. or even "Sultanabad."

But perhaps most importantly, one must not fail to remember that the very popular Syrian combination of a blue glaze with black underglaze painting was very common in Seljuk Iran, though the blue differs significantly from the Syrian.

**Anatolia**

As for Anatolia, Katharina Otto-Dorn's publications of the finds from Kubadabad, near Konya, especially the tiles dated to 1235, present pieces with much similarity to Syrian wares. The use of the branch with small leaves on either side
of it, ending in a single flower, is seen both on the "Rusafa" wares and a number of Kubadabad examples (figure 5).\textsuperscript{159} We also find the contemporary use of underglaze painting and luster on revetment tiles where figures are surrounded by contour panels and the ground is filled in with spirals,\textsuperscript{160} or emphasis on the silhouette of animals,\textsuperscript{161} and very similar parallels to the dishes with silhouetted peacocks (figure 6).\textsuperscript{162} The underglaze painted tiles are most reminiscent of the "Rusafa" wares, although the colors used—dark blue, violet, turquoise, and black, with the occasional introduction of dark green—are not those of the Syrian wares. It is said that the tiles reflect, in part, "Abbasid, Iranian and Syrian Seljuk, and Fatimid influence,"\textsuperscript{164} and it is possible that Syrian potters moved to Konya in search of patrons just as Mesopotamian calligraphers moved to Konya at the same time to produce the Wargah and Gulshah manuscript in Istanbul.\textsuperscript{165}

**Egypt**

The final geographical region one must look at for comparanda is Egypt, which was under independent Fatimid rule until 1171, when Salah al-Din (Saladin) was able to install his own family of the Ayyubids; they ruled Egypt and Syria until 1249, when Mamluk rule in Egypt was firmly established. Fatimid wares are quite distinctive in their use of a gold-toned luster on a tin glaze and the characteristic figural iconography; wares made in Egypt, generally speaking, are characterized by sandy and coarse bodies and clumsy potting.\textsuperscript{166} The chronology of Egyptian wares is well known through the
excavations of the garbage dumps of Fustat, or Old Cairo. In general, Fatimid wares are related most closely to the school of Baghdad, which the Fatimid Caliphate attempted to rival in many spheres. The production of these Fatimid luster wares ceased with the burning of Fustat in 1168 and the advent of Ayyubid rule in 1171. The most typical types of Ayyubid ware in Egypt were sgraf:fiato and underglaze painted wares, and it is certain that they were produced in Fustat because of numerous wasters found there. A Syrian example of this sgraffiato ware is in the Freer collection (42.13). Bahgat and Massoul characterize all of this ware as significantly cheaper than luster wares because of the relative ease of production, two firings sufficing where perhaps three or four were needed for some luster wares. A similar economic reason influenced the introduction of underglaze painted wares in the twelfth century. The earliest wares used an underglaze violet made from manganese oxide, which was then replaced by black, cobalt and copper blues, and reds from iron, often under turquoise or "colorless" (i.e. light green) glaze. That these wares were produced in Egypt is again clearly demonstrated by an excavated waster (figure 7) where a fragment of black under turquoise ware is attached to a piece with the "colorless" glaze. The decoration of this black and turquoise piece is quite similar to Syrian examples of this type. The body of this waster is white, silicious, and fairly soft; it is said to be comparable, in most respects, to a Persian or Syrian body. From the number of fragments of this ware which were found, it is sure that the production was quite important.
The decoration on these Ayyubid wares is very close to the wares of Syria; it is only necessary to mention the use of the black silhouette and the ground filled with dots, lines, and curls, which is comparable to any number of pieces found at Hama or attributed to Raqqa. The polychrome painting has many similarities to polychrome painting attributed to Syria, including the use of the branch with many small leaves on either side, and the use of the black contour line, which, it should be remembered, were also found on the tiles from Kubadabad.

**Metal and Glass**

In addition to ceramic comparisons, there are comparisons to be made with objects made in other materials. Specific examples will again be cited in the catalogue, but generally speaking, certain forms, such as the ewers and the basin in the Freer collection, correspond quite closely to metalwork forms associated with Mosul or Syria. Perhaps too much has traditionally been made of the suggestion that luster wares are the poor man's metalwork, but a comparison of the organization of the decoration on such pieces as the "D'Arenberg Basin" (figure 8) or the "Freer Canteen" (figure 9) shows a division into bands, panels, and medallions, containing figural, vegetal, geometric, and epigraphic material which finds its reflection, most decidedly to a lesser level of quality, in Syrian luster ceramics. Although not present on the metal examples in the Freer, the use of a spiral filler-motif for the ground, which Grube has related to Kashan luster wares, could be equated
equally to the style of a group of inlaid brasses from the workshop of Ahmad al-Dhakî al-Mawsili; three important pieces, the Cleveland Ewer of 1223, the Boston Candlestick of 1225, and the Paris Ewer of 1258 use such spirals (figure 10). Rice has also noted this similarity. The question is whether Syrian artisans imitated imported luster ceramics from Iran (e.g. figure 3), or "locally-produced" metalwork motifs, or even both of them simultaneously.

Certain pieces, such as the goblet and a bottle, as well as the decorative treatment in facets on some albarelli and a pitcher, recall glass forms current in Syria in the preceding centuries. While specific imitation cannot be proven, it has been suggested above (p. 27) that such forms were translated long before into the less-expensive medium of ceramic and from there underwent independent development.

In summary, the external evidence for the dating of the "Raqqa" wares would point to strong ties with other sites in Syria, Iranian pottery centers, an influence on work being produced in mid-thirteenth-century Anatolia, and striking similarities with Ayyubid ceramics from Egypt. All these correspondences can be securely placed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.
V: DATING AND CONCLUSIONS

As we have noted before, previous studies concerning "Raqqa" ceramics tended to order the production chronologically by glaze type, so that the monochrome turquoise glazed wares were placed earliest, related ultimately to Sassanian prototypes. Then, it would seem, the artisans decided to add black underglaze painting, and under some influence from abroad (probably Iran), luster wares began to be produced. Somewhere along the way, polychrome wares were added to the repertoire. This thesis is untenable.

Simultaneity

A study of the examples in the collections which have ceramics attributed to Raqqa shows that while there are four basic glaze programs (i.e. monochrome, bichrome, polychrome—which includes our "trichrome," and luster) and these techniques are usually associated with specific decorative programs, these techniques may be used interchangeably. So far, I have found such correspondences between polychrome and bichrome wares, bichrome and luster wares, and luster and relief wares.

A bottle in the collection of Takashi Omiya in Kyoto is painted in a "rather pale green glaze" over black underglaze painting (figure 11).

It displays, around the body, a band of birds separated from each other by a branch with opposed leaves. This figured band is bordered by solid broad bands
of black, and around the neck another band, possibly figured, is placed. While the shape is not similar to any piece in the Freer collection, the decorative treatment immediately suggests the albarello (09.43) and many of the other pieces of polychrome ware attributed to Raqqa of Rusafa (figure 12). Indeed, it is impossible to know, judging from the black-and-white photograph, that this piece is not polychrome ware.

The fragment of a conical bowl with the figure of a bird painted in overglaze luster (11.23) is comparable, indeed almost identical, to any one of the series of bowls painted in black under turquoise glaze with the figure of a bird (figures 13, 14). The bird is drawn in the same way: solid color, with the details scratched out to be left in reserve. Even such a Morellian detail as the eye is identical. The luster bird is surrounded by a contour panel, and the ground is filled with vegetal forms painted in luster.

Two examples serve to illustrate the interrelationship of luster painting and the monochrome glazed relief wares. While all the Freer stands are monochrome turquoise blue, an example from the British Museum (figure 15) showing two "confronted griffins" around a "tree of life" is from the same mold as pieces in the Metropolitan Museum and the collection of Sami Shoucair (figure 16), both glazed in turquoise instead of the luster over a creamy white glaze of the London piece. A relief-carved jar from the Godman collection (figure 17) is decorated in luster painting and underglaze blue, and is quite comparable, if not identical in carving, to a number of the Freer relief jars. The elements are the same: foliated
alif-lams, trilobed leaves on elongated X-shaped stems. Furthermore, a jar in the Freer collection (09.5) painted in luster alone, but of comparable shape and body to the relief jars, is decorated to imitate the relief-carved jars, for we find the same use of foliated alif-lams to create panels, as well as floriated kufic, not to mention the same use of a dotted ground as is found on the Godman jar. A further example is a sherd published by Sarre and Herzfeld in 1920 of a bowl with relief decoration under a monochrome turquoise glaze; on the rim there is black painting under the glaze (figure 18). 193

The conclusions one must draw from these examples seem unavoidable: if polychrome designs appear on black-under-turquoise wares, if black-under-turquoise designs appear on luster wares, if luster appears on relief wares as well as imitates relief wares, and if monochrome relief and underglaze black decorations can appear on the same piece, these productions must be relatively synchronous. Practically speaking, it does seem somewhat unlikely that a workshop would have produced large and ungainly monochrome wares for a century, then decide to make smaller, finer wares with bichrome decoration, then decide to make some finer luster wares, etc. Rather, it is much easier to imagine that on some days the shop mixed up batches of turquoise glaze, on other days batches of a "colorless" glaze, and that on some days they did underglaze painting, while on other days they did luster painting. The traditional attributions have been based on a somewhat lengthy span of production, perhaps as long as three or four hundred years, to follow Hobson. While we can see such similarities between pieces that it would be
possible to think of them being painted by the same hand (e.g. 08.140 and 08.151), we cannot see such a broad range of style that would demand the extension of the production over such a long span of years without greater changes in style being apparent.194

External Evidence for Dating and Conclusions

As for the span of years, there is some external evidence for dating the period when ceramics might have been produced at Raqqa, apart from the De Lorey plate which may date from 1186-1239,195 or the possible relationship of the Freer fragment from the inscription frieze possibly associated with Nur al-Din's restoration of the Great Mosque of Raqqa in 1165-66 (10.33).

Muqaddasi, writing about 985, described Raqqa as a little town on the edge of the desert.196 Nasir-i Khusraw, writing about A.D. 1045, described it as a place with water flowing through it, with a mosque for the Friday prayers.197 Yaqut and al-Marâsîd, an unknown follower of Yaqut, who died in 1229, described Raqqa as a city which "lies in the middle of the Diyâr Mudar, and is much frequented by travelers and merchants. It is an emporium of merchandise, and is a fine city, lying on the eastern bank of the Euphrates. The city possesses bazaars, and merchandise, and workshops, and its people are well off..."198 Hobson states that the city was sacked by the Mongols in 1259, but from our knowledge of what happened after the Mongol sack of Hama, activity need not have ceased there. Hobson also quotes Abu'l-Fida, who wrote in 1321 and said that the whole place was reduced to uninhabited
ruins. Kamal al-Din's "History of Aleppo" mentions Raqqa not infrequently. The references seem to fall into two distinct eras: the first, to ca. 634 H., shows Raqqa to have been traded off or exchanged by various princes for other cities. The second era, from 636 to the end of his "History," cites Raqqa only as having a bridge across the Euphrates, of obvious importance during the struggles between the Ayyubids and the Khwarezmians. In addition to the above literary sources, we know from the inscription of the Great Mosque that Nur al-Din restored it in 1165-66. While this does not appear to be much evidence, it is quite significant.

It would appear that until the middle of the twelfth century Raqqa had little of the glory of its ninth-century former self, though it was nominally ruled by the Abbasids, then Hamdanids (905-1004), and Zangids. The mosque must have fallen into great disrepair, since Nur al-Din carried out extensive restorations. Under Zangid patronage, the city must have prospered so that it would fit Yaqut's description. As the Zangids were centered in northern Mesopotamia, the "renaissance" of Raqqa is not hard to accept, especially as it would have been a node on the trade axes east-west along the Euphrates, to the north towards NisibIn, to the northeast to Mosul, and, across the bridge over the Euphrates, south towards Rusafa, etc. With the rise of Ayyubid power superceding the Zangids, Raqqa would still have enjoyed an important position. Although Saladin's first conquests were of Fatimid Egypt, he was of Kurdish ancestry and felt that Syria was the true center of his realm. We must not forget the Crusader principalities
such as Edessa which lay about one hundred and fifty kilometers
to the north-northwest; Raqqa would have provided a convenient
base of military operations. At the least, during this period
it was traded with al-Ruha and Sarud for Damascus,206 which
would indicate its relative importance.

The Mongol conquest is too often used as a scapegoat
for the cessation of artistic production in Iran as well as
Syria. Recent scholarship has shown this not to be the case,
for in many places production continued as before, though with
the introduction of new iconographic motifs. The end of the
brief florescence of Raqqa would have been caused by the
shifting of centers of power. With the rise of Mamluk power
centered in Egypt, northwestern Mesopotamia and northern Syria
would have been far removed from centers such as Cairo, the
seat of the Mamluks, the various courts of the Seljuks in
Iran, or in Anatolia. Furthermore, with the destruction of
Baghdad, the old trade routes along the Euphrates were gradually
replaced by a more northerly route; by the end of the thirteenth
or early fourteenth century Tabriz had superseded Baghdad as
the great emporium and entrepot of the Middle East.

Therefore, a relatively brief period of about one century,
from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth,
would be the time when Raqqa could have been a ceramic center.
When one considers the ceramic material which has been attributed
to Raqqa, and comparative wares from Iran, Anatolia, and Egypt,
as well as from other sites in Syria, these artistic influences
might well have been present in the same period, especially if
Raqqa were playing a role as a center for trade, "much frequented
by travelers and merchants." At the same time, we must remember that what we believe to have been the ceramic production of Raqqa was not unique to that place alone, for too many similarities exist with Syrian ceramic productions in general to localize it in Raqqa alone. The town of Rusafa, to which the polychrome wares have often been attributed, lies no great distance from Raqqa to the south. There seems to be no real evidence for the attribution, for Kouchakji's "Great Find" at Raqqa was largely composed of such polychrome wares, and excavations there have not brought to light any wasters.

Sauvaget found many ceramic sherds on the surface at Raqqa, but he did not mention any very expensive imported wares such as Chinese celadons, which we know to have been popular in Hama and Cairo during the Ayyubid period. Contemporary metalwork produced in Mosul or in its orbit is obviously for princely patrons. It is full of figural scenes, combining Islamic, princely, and Christian imagery (figures 8 and 9). Raqqa ceramics show certain affiliations with this ware, but on a much lower economic level, one which was not able to afford such luxuries as Chinese celadons or expensive glass items. Therefore, the ceramics produced at Raqqa might generally be thought to reflect the patronage of those who lived there to service the "travelers and merchants." And it is also possible that these travelers and merchants took these wares back to other places in Syria, as well as bringing the latest wares from Egypt to Raqqa.

Within the "Raqqa" wares themselves, there is a variation in quality. The finest pieces, according to criteria of body,
shape, glaze, and decoration, seem to have an artificially-composed body generally harder and whiter than the general run of the ware. They may be decorated in black under turquoise glaze, polychrome, or overglaze luster painting, but never in a monochrome glaze. Certainly, many examples of a softer, coarser body were painted in luster, but the painting of such pieces (e.g. 08.185: a ewer) cannot compare in care of execution, and finessse of design to such artificial-bodied luster wares (e.g. 08.140: a pitcher). This should not be surprising, if one realizes that there might have been, as in a Sears and Roebuck catalogue, two or three qualities of work being produced in a workshop, that is, "our good model, our better model, and our best model." While Grube would seem to believe that Raqqa production was probably limited to one workshop, I would prefer to accept his other suggestion: a number of workshops producing the same kinds of wares out of an extremely limited vocabulary of form. Some pieces might have been made on commission, and some for general sale in the suq.

There remains one final question. Throughout this essay, we have dealt with the collection of ceramics in the Freer Gallery of Art attributed to Raqqa as if they had actually been produced at Raqqa. Actually, as has been noted, only one sizeable group of these ceramics may reasonably be assumed to have come from Raqqa, that is, found there, and there is very little concrete evidence as to what was made there. The question may be put more meaningfully in asking what ceramics were not, or might not have been made in Raqqa. Certainly, there are examples in the collection which seem to conform
less to a "standard" than others, but whether these represent wares which were imported, or human variation, cannot, at this stage, be determined. Let it suffice that no piece in the group is so totally alien with my criteria or with the criteria of the others who have written on the subject to exclude it out-of-hand.

At the beginning of this study I felt very unconvinced by the traditional attribution to Raqqa. At the end of it, I believe that it might very well have been the scene of ceramic production. But without scientifically controlled excavations, which, unfortunately, will not now take place, it becomes somewhat futile to try to determine, on the basis of such ultimately scanty evidence, what wares now scattered around the globe, were produced in one city on the northern Euphrates during the span of one century, for it seems likely that similar wares were being produced at a number of sites in Syria and Egypt.

It takes a long time for men to mend their ways, and seventy years of calling something "Raqa" is long enough to get it deeply embedded in catalogues, books, scholars' minds, and their articles. While I do believe that ceramics were produced at Raqqa, I would be hard pressed to say which ones. A surer, and more meaningful attribution of these wares as a group would be "Syrian, Ayyubid period," but this label is as arid as the Syrian desert in comparison with those images of the splendid court of Harun al-Rashid conjured up by that name out of The Arabian Nights, Raqqa.
NOTES

1Map 1. Now in Syria, Raqqa was, in the medieval period, in the district of the Diyār Mudar, part of al-Jazīra (Meso-


2Few of the pieces are of exhibition quality; those which are have recently been published by Esin Atil in Ceramics from the World of Islam (Washington, 1973) and Art of the Arab World (Washington, 1975). A few have been published elsewhere; the citations will be found in the catalogue under the entry for the individual object.

3Such as Samanid slip-painted ware, Seljuk polychrome (minai) and luster wares, and Fatimid luster wares from Egypt.


6The terminology used here for color names is taken from the National Bureau of Standards color charts which are keyed to the Munsell System. These somewhat-unwieldy terms have been
replaced, where specific colors are not important, by general
terms such as "turquoise," "deep blue," or "purple."

7 Color and hardness of the body are not especially
useful determinants of provenance, since color rarely has
much to do with the color of the original clay except in
a most general fashion, being affected more by the temperature
and conditions of firing. Hardness, though originally a
function of the composition of the body and the temperature
of firing, is also affected by conditions of weathering and
burial. For a fuller discussion of these questions in relation
to early Mesopotamian pottery, see the studies of Frederick
R. Matson, "Archaeological Ceramic Study Possibilities with
a Thermal Gradient Furnace," Archaeological Chemistry, ed.
Temperatures used in Firing Ancient Mesopotamian Pottery,"
Science and Archaeology, ed. Robert H. Brill, (Cambridge,
Mass., 1971), pp. 65ff., and pl. IV.

8 The references in the text to Freer accession numbers
(e.g. 02.244) refer also to the appended catalogue of Raqqa
ceramics in the Freer, with full description, photograph, and
measured profile of the individual objects. Comparative material,
both in the Freer and in other collections, will, where illustrated,
be cited with figure numbers (e.g. figure 1).

9 The record of Charles L. Freer's purchases of Raqqa
pottery is accessible through the "folder sheets" on file
in the Freer Gallery of Art. Each contains a brief description
of the piece, provenance, and comments by the staff of the
Freer Gallery since acquisition. Many of the inscriptions
on the pieces acquired prior to 1912 were studied by W.H. Worell in a typescript preserved at the Freer Gallery, "Inscriptions on Near Eastern Pottery in the collection of Charles L. Freer, Detroit."

10 The dealers used by Freer are listed in Appendix A: "Provenance of the Freer Collection."

11 Folder sheet 03.204.

12 I.e. 08.187 and 08.189.

13 Exceptions must be made for Sauvaget, who tried to make some sense from the site (Jean Sauvaget, "Tessons de Rakka," Ars Islamica 13-14 (1948):31-45), Grube, who tried to make some sense from a museum collection which, it would seem, has only pieces of first-rate quality (Ernst J. Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik in der Sammlung des Metropolitan Museum in New York," Kunst des Orients 4 (May, 1963): 43-79), and Poulsen, who dealt only peripherally with Raqqa, as he was excavating another site (P.J. Riis and Vagn Poulsen, Hama: fouilles et recherches de la Fondation Carlsberg 1931-1938—les verreries et poteries médiévales (Copenhagen, 1957). As it was Poulsen who published the ceramics, this will hereafter be referred to as "Poulsen, Hama."

14 Sauvaget found a kiln only at al-Rafiqa, but there were no wasters associated with it. See below, page 13, note 54, and Map 2.


16 R.L. Hobson, in his Guide to the Islamic Pottery of
the Near East (London, 1932), provides a most concise general
description of this ware: "...a loose sandy material, greyish
white in colour, lightly fired, and friable. It is, in fact, a
variety of that sandy whitish pottery which from about the
twelth century onwards became the standard pottery of the
Near East. This body is covered with a silicious glaze which,
though naturally clear and transparent, is sometimes rendered
opaque and cloudy by colouring matter of greenish blue or
turquoise tint. The soil of Rakka has acted as a strong
solvent of this glaze; and most of the buried specimens are
heavily encrusted with gold and silver iridescence, due to
decay." (p.19).

17Fahim Kouchkakji, "Glories of Er-Rakka Pottery," Interna-
tional Studio 76(1923):515.

18M. Gaston Migeon, Exposition des arts musulmans au
Musée des Arts Decoratifs (Paris, 1903), pl. 28.

19On the expedition, see Grube, "Rakka-Keramik," p.43;
the information about additional purchases was prvided by
Esin Atil, who is familiar with the exhibitions at the Museum.

20M. Gaston Migeon, Manuel d'Art musulman, 2 vols.
(Paris, 1907), 2:258.

21Ibid., p. 285. There may have been a special reason
for the interest in Harun al-Rashid: beginning in 1899, J.C.
Mardrus' new French edition of the "Thousand and One Nights"
appeared to replace the outdated translation of A. Galland
(1704-12). In England, Sir Richard Burton had just finished
his annotated and unexpurgated edition (1885-88), so that in
the Europe of the late nineteenth century there was great interest and familiarity with the great caliph of the ninth century. Pottery which could be associated with such patronage was sure to be considered quite special. It is therefore in this context that one must try to understand the original attribution of this group of Near Eastern ceramics. For a brief, but adequate, discussion of the history of translations of the "Arabian Nights" into European languages, see The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed., s.v. "Thousand and One Nights," by N. de Goeje.

Raqqa pottery fetched substantial prices on the art market of the day. A quick glance at Charles Freer's purchases of 1908 shows a range from a few dollars paid to the street dealers of Aleppo to the $3000 for 08.13 or $6000 for 08.116. The prices paid to Vicenzo Marcopoli in 1908 range from about $25 to $1300. R.W. Bliss paid Demotte 8500 francs ($1615 in 1912 dollars) for the "Heron dish" (47.8). In 1930, after the Great Crash of 1929, Raqqa pottery sold at the Doucet auction fetched prices ranging from 1120-10,000 francs ($45-$400 in 1930 dollars). See Galerie Georges Petit, Collection Jacques Doucet (Paris, 28 November 1930). Today, the price of Raqqa pottery varies considerably, going as low as a hundred dollars (Sotheby and Co., Catalogue of Antiquities,.. (London, 29 April 1974), where the prices paid for Raqqa pottery (nos. 177-182) ranged from £ 22-58 for modest pieces) to a few thousand dollars for important pieces (see Sotheby and Co., Catalogue of Egyptian...Antiquities (London, 18 June 1968),
no.82: "Important Rakka Lustre Basin," which had been published in Friedrich Sarre and F.R. Martin et al., ed., Die Ausstellung von Meisterwerken Muhammedanischer Kunst in München 1910, 3 vols., 2 (Munich,1912): Pl. .94, Cat. no. 1084, which went for £300 or $1920).


24Friedrich Sarre, "Rakka Ware," The Burlington Magazine 14 (March 1909):388.

25Sarre and Martin, Meisterwerke, p.ii, Pl. 94, and Pl. 104, cat. no. 1153.

26Friedrich Sarre and Ernst Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet, 4 vols. (Berlin, 1911-1920). See also note 21 above.


28Ibid., p. 3.

29"Enfin, les suprêmes réussites décoratives des ateliers de Rakka, nous sont apparues dans quelques pièces à décors d'animaux, d'une ingéniosité de composition, d'une puissance d'une splendeur harmonique de couleurs telles, qu'il n'y a sans doute à mes yeux aucun chef-d'oeuvre plus complet de
faiences décorée..." Ibid., p. 4.


32 Ibid., p. 21.

33 Ibid., fig. 385.

34 Ibid., pl. CXVI: Conch-shaped dish with colorless glaze; relief tile, part of an inscription frieze, the same technique with dark blue-painted ground (here, figure 20); pl. CXVII: 1, 6, and 7, sherd of a vessel with relief decoration and monochrome blue glaze.

35 Ibid., pl. CXVII: 2, 4: black painting under turquoise glaze; pl. CXIX: 8: clay lamp with black painting under turquoise glaze.

36 Ibid., pl. CXVII: 3, 5: fragment of a bowl and fragment of a relief vase with brown luster painting on a colorless glaze; pl. CXVIII: 1, 2, 4, and 5: fragments of bowls.

37 Ibid., pl. CXVII: 1: fragment of a bowl with relief decoration and monochrome turquoise glaze; on the rim there is black painting under the glaze; pl. CXVIII: 3: fragment of a bowl painted in blue and black under a colorless glaze.

38 Ibid., pl. CXVII: 7.


41 Ibid., p. 21.
Kouchakji, "Glories."

Kouchakji did not provide any specific references to these studies; the authors' views may be found in these roughly contemporary publications: Pezard, La céramique archaïque; A. Nöldeke, "Zur Kenntnis der Keramik von Raqa, Rahman, und Sultanabad," Orientalisches Archiv 1 (1910-11):16-17; F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, Arch. Reise; and A.F. Butler, Islamic Pottery (London, 1926).

Friedrich Sarre, Keramik und andere Kleinfunde der Islamischen Zeit von Baalbek (Berlin and Leipzig, 1925), pp. 11ff. His classifications were as follows:

II. Glasierte Keramik
A. Geritzte Zeichnung und farbige Malerei unter der Glasur (Sgraffito-Technik).
B. Einfarbige Glasur über rotem Scherben.
C. Einfarbige (schwarzgrüne oder braune) Malerei und türkisblaue Tupfen unter farbloser Glasur.
D. Hlumalerei unter farbloser Glasur.
E. Malerei in Manganviolett unter farbloser Glasur.
F. Zwei farbige Malerei in Kobaltblau und Grünschwarz unter farbloser Glasur.
G. Malerei in Kobaltblau und Grünschwarz unter farbloser Glasur auf reliquiierem Grund.
H. Malerei in drei Farben: Kobaltblau, türkisblau und schwarz.
I. Malerei in drei Farben: Blau (türkis- oder Kobaltblau), gelb-grün und schwarz.
K. Malerei in drei Farben: dunkelblau, hellgrün und schwarz.
L. Malerei in drei Farben: blau (türkis- oder Kobaltblau), tomatenrot und schwarz.
M. Schwarze Malerei unter blau- oder grüngefärbter glasur.
N. Malerei in Goldluster.


Garrett Chatfield Pier, Pottery of the Near East
(New York, 1909), p. 11, fig. 4.

48 Butler, Islamic Pottery, p. 42.


51 I have been unable to locate a photograph of this piece.


54 Arthur Lane, Early Islamic Pottery (London, 1947): p. 34; monochrome carved wares; pp. 34, 44, underglaze painted wares; pp. 38-39, luster wares. In all, Lane illustrates about twenty pieces attributed to Raqqa: pl. 45AB, 57AB, 59AB, 60AB, 76, 77AB, 78AB, 79AB, 80AB, and 81AB, of which I believe that three may be incorrectly attributed: 57B, and 59A and B.

55 Ibid., p. 39.

56 Ibid.

57 Sauvaget, "Tessons."

58 Ibid., p. 34.

59 Ibid., pp. 34-37.

60 The classification of Sauvaget is best seen extracted
from the discussion of his finds, as the article is uncharacteristically confusing.

A. Céramique non Glacée (Unglazed wares)
   Poteries Décorées à la Main (Pottery decorated by hand)
   Décor à la Matrice (Stamped ware)
   Céramique Moulée (Molded ware)

B. Céramique Glacée (Glazed wares)
   Céramique Partiellement Glacée (Partially glazed ware)
   Décor Peint sur Engobe et sous Glāçure (Underglaze painting on engobe)
   Glāçure Monochrome (Monochrome glaze)
   Décor Jaspé (Splash ware)
   Décor Jaspé ou Polychrome et Graffito (Sgraffiato splash- or polychrome ware)
   Décor en Champlevé (Champleve ware)
   Décor Gravé sous Glāçure Colorée Monochrome (incised ware with monochrome glaze)
   Réflets Métalliques (Luster ware)

Poterie Blanche à Décor Gravé (White incised ware)
Décor Peint sous Glāçure (Underglaze painted ware).

61 No. 58, 67, 73, and 84; 58: "Terre blanchâtre, sableuse, assez épaisse; glāçure alcaline, verdâtre, craquelée," but without luster decoration, with which this "group" is related ("Tessons," p. 41); 67 and 73: "Poterie Blanche à Décor Gravé;" and 84: "Décor peint (au bleu de cobalt) sous Glāçure (incolore)."

62 It seems inconceivable, judging from the general quality of the wares attributed to Raqqa specifically, and of Islamic pottery of the same period, generally, that the slightest flaw (e.g. Sauvaget, "Tessons," fig. 10, no. 58) would cause the piece to be discarded. While gross wasters are easy to spot (e.g. the three in the Freer collection: 05.258, 09.376, and 10.30) and as we do not know the quality control level of "Raqqa" potters, it would be difficult to say with assurance that the slightest flaw, known only on a sherd barely three cm. square, would be the basis for the attribution of a ceramic
industry to a site. It is likely that some "wasters" were sold at reduced prices to buyers who may not have been able to afford the "perfect" pieces.

63 Sauvaget, "Tessons," p. 44.

64 Ibid., p. 42, especially n. 36, 37. The problem of the attribution of wares to Kashan, Rayy, and Sultanabad is seemingly as complex as that of Raqqa and is similarly based on dealers' attributions. A most concise discussion of this problem is to be found in Gerald Reitlinger's article, "Sultanabad: Classification and Chronology," Transactions of the Oriental Ceramic Society 1944-1945 (London, n.d.), pp. 25-34. Nevertheless, when we do refer to "Kashan," "Rayy," or "Sultanabad" in this essay, we mean only to claim similarities with the wares traditionally associated to these names, and not to imply that those wares were actually produced at those sites. For the purposes of our discussions, such assuredly-Persian provenance is sufficient.

65 Sauvaget was surprisingly unclear as to the meaning of his ceramic finds. He did not claim that all were local production nor all imported wares, and in his observations seems to have drawn no concrete conclusions.

66 Poulsen, Hama.

67 Ibid., p. 117.

68 Of course, the discovery of a kiln-site in a fortified citadel would be extremely unusual, to say the least!

69 Poulsen, Hama, fig. 491, classed with "Raqqa" and a waster, has no decoration. Therefore, it cannot prove that that
type of ceramic was made at Hama or Raqqa (see p. 158). Another two wasters have at least firing faults, but are of such minor quality that their being imported from another city is not precluded (Hama, p. 158, and note 62 above).

The relationship between Syrian and Egyptian potteries is discussed on pages 54-56 below.

Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik." He modestly refers to his work as "Eine vollständige Publikation" in which "aller bedeutenden Stüke einer Sammlung wird hier zum erstenmal unternommen." The question of his "bedeutenden Stüke" is important, for the art historian's "significant" (i.e. beautiful, esthetically successful) pieces can be quite different from the archaeologist's "significant" pieces, for an understanding of the totality of ceramic production at a site is not accomplished in studying beautiful pieces alone. See Oleg Grabar, "Notes on the Decorative Composition of a Bowl from Northeastern Iran," Islamic Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York, 1972), p. 97, n.1, where he distinguishes between pottery studied on the esthetic level, i.e. with luxury or semi-luxury objects, and pottery considered in an archaeological context, i.e. "when the sum total of a moment's ceramic production is studied."

Ein Keramiktyp mit flachem, meist grossformigem Reliefdekor in monochromer, blau-grüner Glasur; ein Typ mit dekorative, seltener figürliche Malerei in Schwarz unter einer transparenten, türkisgrünen oder blauen Glasur; ein Typ mit polychromer Malerei, meist in Schwarz, Hellgrün, Kobaltblau und dumpfem Tomaten-rot unter stark silizloser, transparenter Glasur, und einer bedeutende Gruppe von Lüster-Keramik sind

73Ibid., pp. 48-49.

74Ibid., p. 51

75Ibid., p. 55.

76Ibid., pp. 58-59.

77Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe 11(1941): 118-19, No. 4178. Having traced the references given in the Répertoire (which, as Grube noted, are blind alleys), I fail to see how anything may be said about this plate, except that it is said to exist.

78Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," p. 66.

79Ibid., p. 67. Grube believes that the luster wares were the production of one workshop: "Die dekorativen Elemente sind im Grunde äusserst ähnlich und weisen entweder auf eine Werkstätte oder auf einen äusserst begrenzten Formenschatz hin." (Ibid., p. 42; emphasis original.)

80Ibid., p. 70.

81"Die Identität is so vollkommen, dass sich jeder weitere Vergleich erübricht. Nur einer unmittelbare Zusammenarbeit von Raqqa- und Kashan-Keramikmalern kann diese völlige Gleichheit der Motive erklären." Ibid., p. 76. As I will discuss below on page 52, we have no good reason to believe that the "Guttmann" dish was made in Raqqa, especially since it looks unlike any other "Raqqa" ware in its decorative vocabular.

82Ibid., p. 77.
83 E.g. Metropolitan Museum 17.120.36 and F. Sarre, in Amtlichen Berichten aus den Preussischen Kunstsammlungen 48 (1927):7, fig. 1, referred to in Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," p. 59, n. 71.

84 Any number of examples could be culled from the Freer collection alone; a notable one is 08.140 and 08.151.

85 The number of examples is not yet as broad as I believe it will be upon further study of pieces in collections not yet published. For some specific examples, see below, pp. 58–61.

86 Sarre and Herzfeld, Arch. Reise 4:21.

87 Other dealers in the Middle East used by Freer were Baroody in Beirut, Ohan in Jerusalem, Hatoum and Nahman in Cairo; the Paris dealers were Bing, Kelekian, Kalebdjian, Kouchakji, and Tabbagh Frères; the New York dealers were Kelekian and A. Khayat. The Freer Gallery bought pieces from Parish-Watson, Minassian, and Kouchakji; one piece bought from Dumbarton Oaks (47.8) was originally purchased by R.W. Bliss from Demotte in Paris. See Appendix A: Provenance of the Freer Collection.


89 The technical analysis of medieval Islamic pottery is problematical. A treatise on ceramics by Abū’l-Qāsim (ca. 1300) describes the many materials used by potters in Iran (J.W. Allan, "Abū’l-Qāsim's Treatise on Ceramics," Iran 9 (1973):111–20), however modern technical studies show that such formulae were rarely followed consistently, and wide

90"Tous les échantillons sont caractérisés par une pâte très silicicuse avec nombreux fragments de quartz broyés, cimentés par un liant vitreux amorphe très développé et partiellement dévitrifié. Les pâtes contiennent du plomb en quantité trop importante pour qu'il constitue une impureté; il a donc été intentionellement ajouté pour constituer le liant vitreux mentionné ci-dessus. . . . La glaçure est plombeuse, transparente et non opacifiée (absence d'oxyde d'étain). . . ." Sauvaget, "Tessons," p. 44.

It has not yet been possible to test fragments from the Freer collection to confirm these findings.

91Appendix B: Classification of the Collection According to Form and Function; and Chart 1: Shapes According to Appendix B.

92They are 08.119, 08.120, 08.173, 08.174, 08.175, 08.176, and 08.177. The first two were bought from Baroody in Beirut; the rest are from A. Khayat in New York.

9305.251, 08.111, 09.40.

94Their sides measure 347 mm., 245 mm., 147 mm., and 75 mm. The largest could be considered a "cubit," but is not long enough to be the Dhira' Maliki or ell. For contemporary weights and measures, see Guy LeStrange, Palestine under the Moslems
(London, 1890), pp. 48ff.


96 Specific comparanda will be found under the catalogue entry for 08.31.

97 Poulsen, Hama, p. 264.

98 The only other example of this shape known to me is in the collection of Sammy Y. Lee, Tokyo, published in Tsugio Mikami's Islamic Pottery, Mainly from Japanese Collections, 2 vol. (Tokyo, 1962-64), 1: no. 101.

99 A full list of comparanda will be found under the catalogue entry for 09.42.


102 For a fuller discussion of such figurines and vessels in the shape of humans and animals, see Ernst J. Grube, "Islamic Sculpture: Ceramic Figurines," Oriental Art (Autumn, 1966), pp. 165-75.

103 See Chart 2 (Schematic Representation of the Derivation of some of the more common Shapes of "Raqqa" Pottery).

104 Such a glass bottle is illustrated in Islamische Kunst: Ausstellung des Museums für Islamische Kunst (Berlin, n.d.), cat. no. 227, p. 67 and pl. 33. The body is modeled in panels, the neck is a plain vertical tube (H. 250mm, D. 112cm.).
See Appendix C: Classification of the Collection According to Glaze-Type. Ernst Grube and Vagn Poulsen, among others, have given their discussions of decorative treatment an historical-evolutionary interpretation, for they believe that a "Type I" was followed by a "Type II" and a "Type III," etc. In this discussion of decorative treatment, I am consciously avoiding any reference to such an interpretation. Questions of dating and the succession or simultaneity of "styles" will be discussed below. Therefore, the order in which the glaze programs and decorative vocabulary are discussed should be only interpreted as an ordering of increasing complexity of technique, and not one of stylistic evolution.

Oleg Grabar, in the first season's report from excavations at Qasr al-Hayr al-Sharqi (about 90 km. to the south of Raqqa), reported finds of the "ubiquitous green [turquoise?] glazed sherds with thick bodies known since the ninth century in Raqqa." ("Qasr al-Hayr al-Sharqi, Preliminary Report on the First Season of Excavations," Les Annales Archeologiques de Syrie (hereafter A.A.S.) 15 (1965):119). The dating is not important here; this kind of pottery is, in its ubiquitousness the commonest, simplest, glazed pottery of the region, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to date it exactly without stratified excavations. See also note 16 above.

The rarity of cobalt was suggested to me by Esin Atil.

We are assuming here for the moment that the ideal was represented by a white, opaque glazed ware (covered with polychrome painting) as on the minai pottery which was the most
common Persian pottery found at Hama (Poulsen, *Hama*, p. 120, group A.II.a.). Equally, the greenish tint could be considered a true preference, for the most common Chinese porcelain found at Hama was celadon ware (ibid., p. 118, group A.I.a) which some of these greenish wares could be seen as imitating, especially in the use of relief decoration carved in the body before glazing. However, a more faithful Near Eastern recreation of the Chinese celadons is to be seen in fourteenth-century Egyptian ceramics, discussed and illustrated by Aly Bey Bahaqat and Felix Massoul in *La céramique musulmane de l'Egypte* (Cairo, 1930), p. 69 and pl. XXXIII.

109 Poulsen, *Hama*, group B.VII.; Sarre, *Bealbek*, group M.; for Damascus and Fustat, see Poulsen, *Hama*, p. 157, n. 4. The ware appears to have been found at Qasr al-Hayr al-Sharqi (Grabar, "Preliminary Report," fig. 21). Although specific mention is not made of the combination, Grabar would seem to implicitly state its presence (the "vast repertory of polychrome glaze ceramics known as Raqqah and Rusafah wares...," ibid., p. 119) as Grabar was aware of Poulsen's terminology. It was also found at Rusafa (Anton Legner, "Islamische Keramik in Resafa," part 4 of "Die Grabungen in Resafa," *A.A.S.*, 14(1964): 103, no. 38).


111 On 09.376, the black underglaze painting now appears dark blue and the originally-turquoise glaze ranges from pale yellow-green to light bluish green.

112 One flat dish (08.129) is in very fragmentary condition
and heavily restored; it may have had underglaze black decoration.


114Ibid., p. 181, group B.VIII.c.

115Ibid., p. 228. These wares were certainly produced under Mongol (i.e. Chinese) influence, and thus are to be dated in the fourteenth century.

116Sarre, Baalbek, p. 13, fig. D.39 and pl. 20.

117I am using the term "inglaze" here, for upon examination of the examples with a binocular microscope, it appears that the two colors have merged together in the one layer of glaze so that it is not possible to speak of one under the other. However, the application of the glaze on these pieces was most certainly in two stages as on the underglaze painted wares.

118It would then be another of group V.D. below.

119Sauvaget, "Tessons," p. 43, n. 45. See also Daniel Rhodes, Clay and Glazes for the Potter (New York, 1957), pp. 127ff. The "tomato red" shows strong similarities to the Ottoman use of Armenian bole, although the Syrian red is much duller.

120Legner reports reddish-brown luster over a "jade green" ground on a piece attributed to Raqqa found at Rusafa (Legner, "Islamische Keramik," p. 104, no. 41). It could be considered as somewhat similar to the extensive use of underglaze deep blue and overglaze luster on 118, that is, in the
nature of an experiment.

121 Mention must be made of one piece of polychrome sgraffiato ware (42.13) which is attributed to Syria during the Ayyubid period (Atil, *Art of the Arab World*, p. 75, no. 29). It is different in body, glaze, and decoration from the other wares. It is the same ware that Sauvaget found at Raqqa ("Décor Jaspé ou Polychrome et Graffito"), but as mentioned above, p. 14, there is no evidence at all that this ware was made at Raqqa; rather, it was likely to have been imported from some as-yet-unknown place of production in Syria.

122 A note on the terminology: I have found it convenient to speak of decoration in a linguistic metaphor; therefore, elements of vocabulary (words) are combined according to rules (grammar) to form sentences (complete statements).

123 Unless decorated in the barbotine technique, for which see Gerald Reitlinger, "Unglazed Relief Pottery from Northern Mesopotamia," *Ars Islamica* 15-16 (1951):13-22.

124 I have avoided the use of the word "paste," which has so often been used by art historians to describe the body of ceramic wares, as incorrect. The preferred term is "body." (See Anna O. Shepard, *Ceramics for the Archaeologist* (Washington, 1968).)

125 For the terminology of inscriptions used in this essay, see below, p. 42.

126 Legible inscriptions are claimed to be on several of the relief jars cited in the catalogue entry for 08.135, but as far as I know, none of them has been read or reproduced
clearly enough to allow reading. The luster jar in the Freer which has decoration imitating the relief jars (09.5) may have an actual inscription, a conventionalized inscription, or else a pseudoinscription. In any case, it has not yet been read.


128 Hobson, Guide, pl. IX, fig. 28

129 If one accepts that the Syrian luster wares were influenced by the Iranian (see p. 52 below), then these pseudoinscriptions can be seen as a short-hand means of duplicating the visual effect of the original, not necessarily for an illiterate audience. See Don Aanavi, "Devotional Writing: 'Pseudoinscriptions' in Islamic Art," Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 26 (May 1968):353-358.

130 Ibid. Worell, in his catalogue of the inscriptions on Near Eastern pottery in Charles Freer's collection, often claimed to have found words such as 'Allah and al-Baqi ('the enduring') (see, for example 03.187 or 03.189) in the epigraphic decoration of Raqqa pottery. Considering those inscriptions which can be read clearly, and the epigraphic content on Near Eastern pottery in general, such readings are highly suspect. Rather, we should expect to find only expressions of good wishes and pious sentiments on vessels, and "religious" messages on wall-tiles (e.g. 08.156 inscribed with Sura II, 255; and 10.33), mihrabs, and mosque-lamps (neither known from Raqqa). See Worell, "Inscriptions."

131 Aanavi, "Devotional Writing." See also Appendix D: Register of Inscriptions.
This is not at all peculiar to "Raqqa" wares, but can be seen equally on Fatimid and Abbasid luster wares, Nishapur wares, etc. It has been suggested by Yolande Crowe that the decoration of the underside of a dish reflects the serving customs of the period. She believes that the dishes were brought to the table by servants carrying them high above the head so that the underside was then visible for a short time, but not long enough to merit careful painting.

Esin Atil suggests that decoration on the underside or exterior is the result of cost and function. Cost, in that any additional painting is more expensive to produce, and function, in that exterior painting is more often seen on bowls for drinking and eating from, where the exterior decoration would become visible as the bowl was raised to the mouth.

The problemmatical nature of the "apparent carelessness" of the exterior decoration on a Nishapur bowl is briefly discussed by Oleg Grabar. He only suggests two possibilities: lesser importance given by medieval ceramicists to the exterior of the object, or atelier marks with some internal significance. See Grabar, "Notes on the Decorative Composition," p. 92.

This piece undoubtedly has "forged" luster of a later (i.e. modern) date.

See p. 32 above and n. 113.

Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," p. 43.

Sarre, Baalbek, p. 1.

Poulsen, Hama, pp. 5-9.

Ibid., p. 148, group B.VI.e.

See n. 64 above.

Lane, Early Islamic Pottery, p. 50.

Ibid., p. 40.


Pope, Survey, pl. 666.

Ibid., pl. 657B.

Freer 25.7; Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," fig. 28, 30, and 32.

Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," p. 66.

Ibid., fig. 35.

Ibid., fig. 36.

Ibid., n. 99.

See p. 16 above and n. 81.

Lane, Early Islamic Pottery, pl. 52B dated 1179, pl. 62A dated 1207, and pl. 63A dated 1210.

Ernst Köhnel, "Datiierte Persische Fayencen," Jahrbuch der Asiatischen Kunst 1 (Leipzig, 1924): 43, pl. 23, fig. 2.

Attil, Ceramics, p. 105, no. 46.

Ibid., p. 125, no. 55; p. 127, no. 56; Lane, Early
Islamic Pottery, pl. 69B and 71A.

156 Lane, Hitchcock, no. 72; Atil, Ceramics, p. 155, no. 70; Hetjens-Museum, Islamische Keramik, no. 242.

157 Atil, Ceramics, p. 119, no. 52; p. 121, no. 53; Pope, Survey, pl. 728-731.


159 Ibid., fig. 1, 7, 10, and 29.

160 Ibid., fig. 5.

161 Ibid., fig. 10a.


164 Ibid., p. 81.


168. Bahgat and Massoul, Céramique musulmane, p. 66.

169. Ibid., p. 69.

170. Ibid., p. 70.

171. Ibid., p. 71.

172. Ibid., pp. 71-72.

173. Ibid., pl. 3b.

174. Ibid., p. 72.

175. Ibid., p. 73.

176. Ibid., pl. XXXIV-XXXVI.

177. Ibid., pl. XXXVI.

178. On the attribution of metalwork to Mosul, see the various studies of D.S. Rice, among them "Inlaid Brasses from the Workshop of Ahmad al-Dhaki al-Mawsili," Ars Orientalis 2(1957):283-326. A number of pieces were made for Badr al-Din Lulu' of Mosul; on this basis a workshop has been placed there. The brasses signed by Ahmad al-Dhaki al-Mawsili were probably not made in Mosul since the nisba adjective al-Mawsili or "from
Mosul" was used. Nevertheless, on the basis of stylistic similarities to the Badr al-Din Lulu' examples, the signed brasses are closely related to northern Mesopotamian, rather than Persian, centers. The flanged vessel (10.35) may be related, however, to similarly flanged bronze mortars made in tenth- and twelfth-century Iran. See Douglas Barrett, *Islamic Metalwork in the British Museum* (London, 1949), pl. 2a.

179 Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," p. 66.

180 Rice, "Inlaid Brasses."

181 Ibid., p. 291: fig. 6, p. 294: fig. 11, p. 296: fig. 16 and 18.

182 Ibid., p. 317: fig. 39.

183 Ibid., pl. 13d.

184 Ibid., p. 323: The spiral fillers were "imitated in turn on the backgrounds of luster ceramics from Raqqa."

185 Neither Grube, nor anyone else is specific on this point.

186 Mikami, *Islamic Ceramics* 1:no. 93, pl. 93. The piece is covered with fairly heavy iridescence, yet the decoration is still quite clear for the most part.

187 Freer 47.8 ("Heron dish"); Metropolitan Museum of Art 56.185.6 ("Peacock Dish") (Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," fig. 14), and a dish in the Idemitsu collection, Tokyo (Mikami, *Islamic Ceramics*, no. 94).

188 Lane, *Early Islamic Pottery*, pl. 60B.

189 Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," fig. 4. This stand is triangular.
Musée Nicolas Sursock, *Art islamique dans les collections privées libanaises* (Beirut, 1974), no. 29. This stand is rectangular.

Lane, *Early Islamic Pottery*, pl. 60A.

For the distinction between floriated and foliated kufic, see Adolf Grohmann, "The Origin and Early Development of Floriated Kufic," *Ars Orientalis* 2 (1957): 183ff.


Admittedly Medieval style is conservative, but there is a limit to conservatism. The vocabulary of decoration of these "Raqqa" wares is very narrow; variations may be due more to questions of hands (a problem which we are avoiding) and quality than to temporal distribution. Another indication of the narrow span in time may be the lack of significant development and variation in shape of "Raqqa" ceramics.

See p. 16 and n. 77 above.


Ibid.

LeStrange, *Palestine*, p. 42.

Hobson, *Guide*, p. 19. I have been unable to uncover any source which states explicitly that Raqqa was destroyed by the Mongols ca. 658H. (A.D. 1259). While Abdul-Kader Rihaoui does not appear to be familiar with all the sources (and gives a very different reading of Yaqut) he, too, did not find any evidence of destruction by Hulagu, save that Abu’l-Fida writes, over sixty years later, that the town is


201 Ibid., 4:162, 166, 218-19; 5:69, 72, 77, 88, 92, 94.

202 Ibid., 5:105; 6:3, 4, 10, 11, 13.

203 Creswell, Early Muslim Architecture 2:47.

204 For trade routes in the medieval Islamic world, see, for example, the map in Dominique and Janine Sourdel, La civilisation de l'Islam classique (Paris, 1968), p. 320-21.

205 For a discussion of Saladin and his attitude towards Syria, see Andrew S. Ehrenkreutz, Saladin (Albany, 1972).

206 Kamal-ad-Din, 5:77.

207 Kouchakji, "Glories."

208 Legner, "Islamische Keramik."

209 Poulsen, Hama, p. 120, group A.I.a.; Baghat and Massoul, Céramique musulmane, p. 69.

210 The inscriptions tell us such.

211 For the interpretation of the complex imagery on the Freer Canteen, see Laura T. Schneider, "The Freer Canteen," Ars Orientalis 9(1973):137-156. The imagery on the D'Arenberg
Basin is discussed by Esin Atil in *Art of the Arab World*, pp. 65-68.


213 The "Great Find" of ceramics found in large unglazed clay jars as described by Kouchakji ("Glories") and Sarre and Herzfeld (*Arch. Reise*, pp. 20ff.) suggests that these pieces were destined to be, or had been, moved from one place to another, rather than being stored in the place of production for sale. This might imply that Raqqa was not the seat of production of this ware; yet, as has been noted, they are not significantly different in body, glaze, or decoration, save for the use of figural imagery, than the other wares attributed to Raqqa. The use of figural imagery, coupled with the known use of figural imagery on the "high quality" metalwork, might allow one to infer that the patrons of such polychrome wares were closer to the princely tastes.

214 "Die dekorativen Elemente sind im Grunde äusserst ähnlich und weisen entweder auf eine Werkstätte oder auf einen äusserst begrenzten Formenschatz hin." Grube, "Raqqa-Keramik," p. 44.

215 For a similar case of differentiation of quality according to patronage, see Richard Ettinghausen, "The Bobrinski 'Kettle': Patron and Style of an Islamic Bronze," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, ser. 6, 24 (October, 1943):193-208. He distinguishes three categories of Islamic metalwork: a) general market works with
anonymous inscriptions, b) mostly anonymous inscriptions, but the name of the buyer is later inserted, and c) finest quality work, made to order, where the name of the patron was conspicuously integral to the decorative arrangement.

216. I have been informed by visitors to the site that it is considerably built-up in the last decade, and that excavations are now near-impossible.
APPENDIX A

PROVENANCE OF THE FREER COLLECTION

Aleppo (street dealers): 08.111, 08.112, 08.113.

Baroody (Beirut): 08.118, 08.119, 08.120, 08.121, 08.122, 08.123, 08.124, 08.125, 08.126, 08.127, 08.129.

S. Bing (Paris): 03.202, 03.203, 03.204, 04.143, 04.144, 04.145, 04.146, 04.147, 04.292, 04.293, 05.246, 05.248.

G. Camas (Cairo): 06.221.

Demotte (Paris), through Dumbarton Oaks: 47.8.

E. Hatoun (Cairo): 08.179, 08.180.

Kaleblijian (Paris): 04.149, 05.251, 07.183, 07.184.

Kelekian (Paris and New York): 02.190, 02.191(?), 02.198, 02.244, 02.246, 02.247, 03.187, 03.189, 03.226, 03.227, 04.51, 04.170, 05.76, 05.77, 05.92, 05.93, 05.236, 05.239, 05.240, 05.241, 05.242, 05.285, 05.286, 06.65, 06.223, 06.224, 06.229, 06.230, 08.13, 08.28, 08.29, 08.30, 08.31, 14.58.

A. Khayat (New York): 08.173, 08.174, 08.175, 08.176, 08.177, 13.11.


V. Marcopoli (Aleppo): 08.133, 08.134, 08.135, 08.136, 08.137, 08.138, 08.139, 08.140, 08.141, 08.142, 08.142, 08.144, 08.145, 08.146, 08.147, 08.148, 08.149, 08.150, 08.151, 08.152, 08.153, 08.154, 08.155, 08.184, 08.185, 08.186, 08.187, 09.5, 09.43, 10.25, 10.27, 10.28, 10.29, 10.30, 10.31, 10.32, 10.33, 10.34, 10.35, 10.36, 10.37, 10.38, 10.39, 10.40, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 11.7, 11.8, 11.9, 11.11, 11.12, 11.14, 11.15, 11.16, 11.17, 11.18, 11.19, 11.20, 11.21, 11.22, 11.23, 11.24, 11.612, 11.613, 11.614, 11.615, 11.616, 11.617.

Minassian: 42.5

Au Musée Orientale (Istanbul): 08.156
N. Ohan (Jerusalem): 08.251, 09.110, 09.125, 09.126, 09.376, 10.45, 10.46.


Tabbagh Frères (Paris): 08.116, 09.38.
APPENDIX B

CLASSIFICATION OF THE COLLECTION
ACCORDING TO FORM AND FUNCTION

I. Architectural elements
   A. Revetment tiles
      1. large square (ca. 350 mm.)
         08.119
         08.120
         08.173
         08.174
         08.175
         08.176
         08.177

      2. smaller square
         05.251
         08.111
         09.40

      3. with inscription
         08.157
         10.33

      4. corner-screen
         08.153

   B. Miscellaneous
      1. Well-wheel
         08.124

      2. Grave-stele
         05.257

II. Unglazed water vessels
    (none)

III. Dishes and Bowls
    A. Dishes
       1. shallow, vertical rim on slight basal ring
          08.129

       2. vertical walls on foot
          11.6
3. with well and broad, everted, flat rim
   05.240
   08.29
   08.126
   08.150
   08.151
   11.8
   11.11
   25.7
   42.5
   47.8

4. variations on (3) above
   a. exterior with broken profile
      42.13
   b. slightly concave rim
      08.28

5. with well and inverted rim
   09.125
   10.45

B. Bowls
1. Hemispherical
   a. Hemispherical on foot
      02.198
      05.258
      08.143
      08.180
      09.110
      10.30
      10.46
   b. Hemispherical on high, splayed foot
      10.34
   c. Melon-shaped (gadrooned) on high, splayed foot
      08.152

2. Truncated conical on high, hollow foot
   a. Small (diam. ca. 125 mm.)
      05.241
      08.121
      08.125
   b. Medium (diam. ca. 200 mm.)
      04.293
   c. Large (diam. ca. 240 mm.)
      05.76
      08.145
      08.146
      08.147
      08.149
3. Truncated conical with inverted rim on hollowed foot
   06.230
   07.183

4. Basin: conical on flat, slightly hollowed base, with two handles
   08.148

5. Bell-shaped
   11.19

6. Miscellaneous vertical-walled vessels
   a. Everted lip with one handle
      02.244
   
   b. Deep, with broad, everted, flat rim
      10.32
   
   c. Molded rim, sides decorated with flanges (mortar)
      10.35
   
   d. Inverted lip, on hollowed foot
      11.7

C. Goblets
   05.248

IV. Vessels for pouring
   A. Pitcher (without spout, with handle)
      1. Spherical body, concave cylindrical neck
         03.204
      
      2. Flattened spherical body, concave cylindrical neck
         08.140
      
      3. Pear-shaped body, narrow neck
         08.112
      
      4. Pear-shaped body, broad, cylindrical neck
         02.247
         06.221
         09.126
         11.12
      
      5. Pear-shaped body, concave cylindrical neck
         05.77
6. Squat pear-shaped body, short, broad cylindrical neck
   08.69
   08.139
   08.186
   10.31
   11.20
   11.22

7. Inverted pear-shaped body
   08.142

B. Jugs (very narrow neck, globular body, with handle)
   06.65
   08.31

C. Ewers (inverted pear-shaped body, long neck, spout, and handle)
   08.185
   11.9
   11.15

D. Bottles (narrow neck, no handle)
   05.245
   11.3

E. Vessels with spout but without neck
   04.149
   05.92

V. Jars—Coarse ware
   A. Cylindrical, sloping shoulders, short cylindrical neck
      03.202
      03.203
      04.146
      04.170
      08.179

   B. Double conical jars with four handles
      05.236
      05.246

   C. Ovoidal jars with two handles
      03.227
      04.51
      04.171

   D. Inverted ovoidal jars
      1. no neck
         04.145

      2. cylindrical neck
         03.226
         14.58
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3. short, cylindrical neck  
   02.190  
   08.133

4. enlarging ("funnel") neck  
   06.229

5. tapering neck  
   03.186  
   06.224 (four handles)  
   02.191 (long neck)  
   08.118 (long neck and handles)

VI. Jars—Finer ware  
   A. Inverted ovoidal  
    1. small (diam. ca. 100 mm.)  
       02.246

2. medium (diam. 200-275 mm.)  
   06.223  
   07.184  
   08.13

3. large (diam. over 275 mm.)  
   05.239  
   08.116

4. concave tapering neck ("relief jars")  
   08.113  
   08.134  
   08.135  
   08.155  
   08.184  
   09.5 (luster)

B. Pear-shaped  
   05.285

C. Inverted pear-shaped with short, cylindrical neck,  
everted or rounded lip, hollowed foot of varying height  

1. small (diam. ca. 125 mm.)  
   04.292  
   08.141

2. medium (diam. ca. 225 mm.)  
   03.189  
   04.144  
   08.136  
   08.137  
   11.4

3. Variations  
   a. broad, inverted pear-shape  
      03.187
b. concave neck
   04.143

c. long neck
   05.242

D. Bulbous
   1. no handles, very small (diam. less than 100 mm.)
      08.122
      08.127
   2. two handles
      05.286
      06.225
      08.30 (concave neck)

E. Flattened ovoidal with small mouth
   1. on low foot
      08.138
      10.28
   2. on very high spreading foot
      11.17

F. Albarelli
   1. Small (diam. less than 100 mm.)
      08.144
      10.36
      11.21
   2. medium (diam. over 100 mm.)
      09.38
      09.43
   3. Variation
      10.25 (rounded bottom)

G. Miscellaneous
   1. base sherd
      08.123

VII. Furnishings
A. Stands
   1. Hexagonal
      09.41
      11.1
      11.2
      13.11
   2. Oblong
      09.42

B. Lamps
   1. closed ovoidal ("boat-shaped")
      05.93
2. domed with spout 10.37

3. four-spouted 10.38

4. six-spouted, star-shaped 31.7

VIII. Figurines
A. Human
   1. Vessels
      11.613
      11.614
      11.615

   2. Closed form
      08.154
      11.612

B. Animal
   1. Vessel
      11.24 (stag)

   2. Closed form
      08.187 (bird)
      10.29 (hyena?)
      10.39 (goat?)
      11.616 tiger head
      11.617 tiger handle
APPENDIX C

CLASSIFICATION OF THE COLLECTION ACCORDING TO GLAZE-TYPE

I. Monochrome
   A. Turquoise
      02.190
      02.244
      02.247
      03.186
      05.202
      05.227 (?)
      04.51
      04.145
      04.146
      04.149
      04.170
      04.171
      05.77
      05.92
      05.236
      05.239
      05.245
      05.246
      05.251
      05.257
      06.65
      06.224
      06.229
      07.184
      08.113
      08.118
      08.119
      08.120
      08.124
      08.133
      08.134
      08.135
      08.155
      08.156
      08.173
      08.174
      08.175
      08.176
      08.177
      08.179
      08.187
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B. Purple ("Aubergine")
03.203
03.204
03.226
08.129
08.180

C. Deep Blue ("Cobalt Blue")
02.191

D. Very Pale Green ("Colorless," or "Celadon")
08.122
08.184
10.31
10.36
11.14
11.24
11.615

II. Richrome
A. Black under Turquoise
04.144
04.292
05.241
05.248
05.258
06.221
06.223
06.230
08.13
08.29
08.30
08.31
08.69
08.111
08.112
08.127
08.136
08.153
09.110
09.125
09.126
10.29
10.30
B. Black under Purple
08.129 (?)
08.143

C. Black under "Colorless"
09.40
10.46

D. Deep Blue under "Colorless"
04.143
05.93
08.251
10.33

E. Turquoise under/in "Colorless"
02.246
05.286
11.19

F. Deep Blue under/in Turquoise
02.198
10.35

G. Purple under/in "Colorless"
10.25

III. Trichrome
A. Deep Blue and Black under "Colorless"
05.242
05.285
08.28
08.123
08.147
09.43
09.376

B. Deep Blue and Turquoise under "Colorless"
05.240
08.145

IV. Polychrome
A. Deep Blue, Black, and Olive Green under "Colorless"
09.38

B. Deep Blue, Black, and Grayish Reddish Brown under "Colorless"
04.293
C. Deep Blue, Black, Olive Green, and Grayish Reddish Brown under "Colorless"
25.7

D. Deep Blue, Black, Dark Green, and Turquoise under "Colorless"
07.183

V. Luster
A. Luster over "Colorless"
  08.139
  08.154
  09.5
  11.3
  11.15
  11.17
  11.20
  11.23
  11.615 (perhaps with deep blue spots)
  11.616

B. Turquoise under "Colorless" with Luster over
  03.187 (turquoise on interior only)
  08.144
  08.146
  08.150
  11.11
  11.21
  42.5

C. Deep Blue under "Colorless" with Luster over
  03.189
  08.116
  08.121
  08.125
  08.126
  08.137
  08.140
  08.141
  08.142
  08.148
  08.151
  08.152
  10.27
  10.34
  11.6
  11.8
  11.9
  11.18
  11.22
  11.614
  11.617
D. Deep Blue and Turquoise under "Colorless" with Luster over
  08.185
  08.186
  10.28
  10.32
  11.16

E. Turquoise and Black (?) under "Colorless" with Luster over
  08.149

VI. Miscellaneous
A. Sgraffiato ware with Yellow, Green, and Purple under
   a "Colorless" glaze
   42.13
APPENDIX D
REGISTER OF INSCRIPTIONS

03.187 Medallions containing foliated kufic words, separated from each other by diagonal bands with cursive inscriptions or pseudoinscriptions. Not read.

03.189 Band of foliated kufic around the body, only partially visible. Not read.

04.143 Cursive inscription around body, reading "Complete happiness and perfect power."

04.293 Repeated Hebrew (?) inscription. Appears six times on interior walls. Worrell read it as the cabalistic combination of the letters of the name "Y*HW*H" to form HYWHWHWH.

05.76 Cursive inscription (?) around interior just below the rim. Illegible.

05.240 Cursive inscription in the center of the well, perhaps combining the words Ğuzz ("Power") and Ğalum ("Knowledge").

05.248 Pseudokufic inscription band on the exterior just below the rim.

05.257 Cursive inscription molded in relief: "This is the grave of Sa'dullah."

08.29 Large cursive inscription (?) filling well. Not read.

08.121 Kufic or pseudokufic band around the interior walls, just above the bottom, perhaps reading Baraka li-sahibibhi ("Blessings to the owner").

08.135 Inscription (?) in floriated and knotted kufic around the body, carved in relief, perhaps containing the word al-sa'ada ("Happiness").

08.138 Attenuated, foliated, conventionalized kufic band around the exterior, possibly a repetition of al-sa'ada ("Happiness").

08.141 Cursive inscription band on exterior, perhaps to be read as sa'ad lihi ("Happiness to him").
Conventionalized kufic inscription around lower body.
Not read.

08.143 Conventionalized kufic inscription around interior just below the rim, perhaps derived from baraka ("Blessings").

08.148 Conventionalized kufic inscription around interior wall, derived from baraka ("Blessings").

08.149 Cursive inscription in center of the well, possibly derived from al-sa'āda ("Happiness").

08.150 Conventionalized kufic inscription on cavetto, derived from baraka ("Blessings").

08.151 Conventionalized kufic inscription on rim, derived from baraka ("Blessings").

08.152 Cursive inscriptions on exterior lobes; only one word, sa'āda ("Happiness"), is visible.

08.156 Two cursive inscriptions in relief:
A. Quran II. 255: "(Allah, there is no God but) him, the living, the self-subsisting." ("Throne verse")
B. Not read

08.185 Cursive inscription around shoulder and body.
Not read.

09.5 Floriated kufic inscription (?) around body.
Not read.

09.38 Cursive inscriptions (?) on vertical panels of exterior.
Not read.

09.41 Molded kufic inscription (?) and cursive inscription repeated on each of six faces.
A. al-'uzz (?) ("Power").
B. ḍāl'amalu Muḥammad ("The work of Muḥammad")

09.42 Cursive inscription molded in relief on long sides: al-iqbal li-sahibih ("Prosperity to its owner").

10.27 Cursive inscription on body: al-iqbal wa-l-salāma al-dāima ("Prosperity and enduring peace").

10.28 Cursive inscription around body
Not read

10.33 Cursive inscription in relief (fragment): the letters sin, lam-alif ("S-L-A").
11.1 Kufic inscription (?) in relief on each of six faces. Not read.

11.2 Kufic inscription (?) in relief on one face only. Not read.

11.3 Conventionalized kufic inscription around neck, probably derived from baraka ("Blessings"); lower cursive inscription around body not read.

11.7 Pseudokufic inscription around rim

11.8 Conventionalized, foliated kufic inscription (?) around cavetto and in central medallion. Not read.

11.9 Cursive inscription around body: "Far-reaching happiness and riches, riches super-abundant."

11.22 Conventionalized kufic inscription around neck, probably derived from baraka ("Blessings").

13.11 Molded floriated kufic inscription (?) and cursive inscription repeated on each of six faces.
A. al-uzz (?) ("Power").
B. amalu Muhammed ("The work of Muhammad").

42.5 Cursive inscription on cavetto, only partially legible: ahlu lihi ("Worthy of it").
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ILLUSTRATIONS
### Chart 1: Shapes according to Appendix B

(not drawn to scale)

Correlation to glaze programs
Chart 2: Schematic Representation of the Derivation of some of the more-common Shapes of "Ragga" Pottery
Geometric:
dots  (09.5)
lines  (11.3)
curls  (08.136)
spirals:
large  (08.149)
right  (08.138)
braids  (08.138)
interlace  (08.135)
knot  (08.135)

Vegetal:
palmette  (09.5)

Split-palmette  (08.137)
arrow-head
leaves  (08.136)
quatre-foils  (11.15)

trefoils
lanceolate
"fleurs-de-lys"
filled with spirals

Epigraphic:
Kufic inscription (08.138)
conventionalized inscription (11.22)
pseudo-inscription  (08.143)  (08.139)

Chart 3: Major Elements of the Vocabulary of Decoration
Figure 1. Dish, formerly in the Gutmann Collection, Berlin. (Grube, "Raqa-Keramik," p. 75, fig. 35.)
Figure 2. Minai wares attributed to Rayy.
(Fope, Survey, pl. 666.)
Figure 3. Dated Persian luster wares.
(Lane, *Early Islamic Pottery*, pl. 62A, 63A.)
Figure 4. Dated Persian luster ware bowl, combining a cursive inscription and a reserve kufic inscription.
(Kühnel, "Datierte Persische Fayencen," pl. 23.)
Figure 5. Wall tile from Kubadabad.
(Otto-Dorn, Türkische Keramik, pl. 12.)
Figure 6. Wall tile from Kubadabad.
(Otto-Dorn, Türkische Keramik, pl. 13.)
Figure 7. A waster from Fustat.
(Bahgat and Massoul, *La céramique musulmane*, pl. 3.)
Figure 8. The D'Arenberg Basin.
FGA 55.10
Figure 9. The Freer Canteen.
FIA 41.10
Figure 10. A. Ear dated 657/1258, Louvre.
B. Detail of Same
(Rice, "Inlaid Brasses," pl. 13c,d.)
Figure 11. Bottle, in the collection of Takashi Omiya, Kyoto. (Mikami, Islamic Ceramics 1: no. 93.)
Figure 12. Pitcher, from the collection of Fahim Kouchakji. (Kouchakji, "Glories," p. 521.)
Figure 13. The "Peacock Dish" in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. (Lane, *Early Islamic Pottery*, pl. 77B.)
Figure 14. Dish decorated with a peacock from the Idemitsu Collection, Tokyo.
(Mikami, Islamic Ceramics 1: no. 94.)
Figure 15. Stand attributed to Raqqa in the British Museum.
(Hobson, Guide, pl. IX.)
Figure 16. Stand attributed to Raqqa from the collection of Sami Shoucair.
(Musée Nicolas Soursock, Art islamique, no. 29.)
Figure 17. Relief jar from the Godman Collection.
(Lane, *Early Islamic Pottery*, pl. 60A.)
Figure 18. Sherd from Raqqa decorated in relief carving and underglaze black under a turquoise glaze.  
(Sarre and Herzfeld, Arch. Reise 4: pl. CXXVII, 1.)
Figure 19. The Kevorkian Ewer.
FGA 55.22.
Figure 20. Relief revetment tile found at Raqqa. (Sarre and Herzfeld, Arch. Reise 3: pl. CXVI.)
Figure 21. Fragment of a stand found at Raqqa.
(Sarre and Herrfeld, Arch. Reise 4: pl. CXVII, 7.)