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This book began at Princeton University, as a report in Professor Kurt Weitzmann's celebrated seminar on medieval book illustration during the academic year 1951–52. The following years were spent seeing all the manuscripts, gathering all the photographs, thanks to the generous help of the Charles L. Freer Fund at the University of Michigan, and giving seminars of my own on the Maqamat and on any number of related issues. By 1964 the bulk of the identifications, descriptions, and comments on individual miniatures (essentially chap. 3 of this book) had been completed. Why nearly twenty years elapsed before the last two chapters were written is more difficult to explain. Other concerns and endeavors interfered, and several queries about who might be willing to publish eight hundred illustrations met with such consistent lack of interest that I thought, at one point, of simply mimeographing and distributing free the identifications of illustrated subjects and whatever partial commentaries I had put together over the years. It was the appearance of the University of Chicago Press microfiche project that finally gave me the impetus to conclude a work begun so many years ago, and Wendy Strothman bears a great deal of responsibility for this. I hope this work will be only the first in a series of publications of manuscripts from the Muslim world, since plans are already under way for a publication of Sultanama manuscripts, of Turkish ones, and of a few others. The means exist, at last, to make large numbers of illustrations available at reasonable cost.

If I begin with a statement about years of inconclusive activity and frequent idleness surrounding the illustrations of the Maqamat, it is in part an apology for a text that bears many traces of evolution and change in my own thinking about miniatures and about manuscripts in general and whose approach may be seen by some scholars as somewhat old-fashioned. Codicological concerns played a minimal role in the study of Islamic illustrated manuscripts twenty years ago, and it is perhaps lucky that none of the manuscripts under consideration poses
significant problems of collation or of book manufacture. Questions about
the art of the thirteenth century that appear in the last chapter did not
guide my own thinking about how to present the miniatures as much as
they probably would now, though many of my views on the thirteenth
century were in fact based on years of intermittent immersion in the
Maqamat.

The decision to present the material story by story rather
than manuscript by manuscript can be justified on the grounds that the
stories of the Maqamat are not as widely known as biblical stories or even
Persian epics. Yet in many ways this is an arbitrary decision, one that
hardly corresponds to the ways the miniatures were seen and appreci-
cated in their time. If in the end more questions are raised than an-
swered, it is perhaps that I am now less clear than I was twenty years
ago about whether the study of miniatures is a study of illustrated books
or of the art of a certain time. There may be some inner contradictions
in the text, especially in terminology, since the field of art history is
groping at this time with old terms like type, typology, cycle, morphology, and so on, as well as with new approaches to works of art.
But then, in this new field of Islamic art, the full presentation of infor-
mation can only be a good thing, and even a tentative method is better
than none.

Over the years many people were involved with the prepa-
ration of this book. I would like to single four of them out. Eva Hoffman
spent considerable time and effort in gathering the elaborate documenta-
tion that accompanies chapter 5 and in reviewing a text that had ges-
tated so long. Her comments and evaluations have been invaluable. If
the text is legible at all, it is thanks to Margaret Ševčenko, whose talent
at ferreting out uncertainties and inconsistencies is unmatched. Whether
she managed to work her way through a text as complex and at times
unreadable as one of Abu Zayd’s speeches is, of course, for others to
judge. I would never have finished it all without her help. During the
very last stages of the work Linda Safran took over all final revisions
with efficiency and dispatch. Finally, I want to thank the anonymous
reader of the manuscript for the University of Chicago Press, since his
or her perceptive comments led me to a major recasting of the last
chapters.

A few technical warnings are in order. All diacritical marks
have been eliminated except in direct quotations. When capitalized, the
word Maqamat refers to the whole book; in lower case it refers to indi-
vidual stories—maqamah in the singular, maqamat in the plural. I regret
that I did not obtain better photographs of the Leningrad manuscript,
but circumstances made it impossible to do so. I am also sorry that I
never saw the manuscript in Sana’a.

For permission to reproduce the manuscripts in their pos-
session, I am grateful to Dr. Eva Ihrlich at Österreichische Nationalbiblio-
theck; Mme. D. Cohen, Division des Manuscrits Orientaux, Bibliothèque
Nationale; the authorities of the Photographic Service, the British Li-
brary, London; and Dr. C. Wakefield, Department of Oriental Books,
Bodleian Library, Oxford. The photographs of the Istanbul manuscript
were obtained courtesy of the late Richard Ettinghausen and those of
the Leningrad manuscript through the late D. S. Rice. Support for the
preparation of the manuscript was provided by the Charles L. Freer
Fund at the University of Michigan, the joint ACLS-SSRC committee,
and the Aga Khan Fund at Harvard University. Publication was made
possible by a grant from the Damon-Dilley Fund at the Fogg Museum,
Harvard University.
This book deals with eleven thirteenth- and fourteenth-century illustrated manuscripts of one of the most idiosyncratic masterpieces of Arabic literature, the Maqamat of al-Hariri. Interest in the Maqamat is not new. Beginning about 1900 the attention of scholars and laymen alike was increasingly drawn to the art of painting in Muslim countries, and from the start they recognized that the illustrations made for al-Hariri’s Maqamat claimed a particularly important place in the early stages of the long and brilliant history of Islamic painting. Edgar Blochet first published some Maqamat pictures in 1907, and F. R. Martin published others in 1912; since then our understanding of these miniatures has grown considerably, and many studies and exhibitions have dealt with them in more or less complete and worthy fashion. Two works by Kurt Holter, one on early manuscripts in general and the other on the Vienna manuscript in particular (both published in 1937), and an exhibition in 1938 at the Bibliothèque Nationale produced another round of commentaries, though more often by scholars concerned with the Mediterranean periphery of the Islamic world than by Islamic art historians. These efforts culminated in several important studies by Hugo Buchthal, who tried to identify the stylistic characteristics of the miniatures more precisely than had been done before and proposed hypotheses about their origins.

Since the early 1940s, however, although by no means forgotten or overlooked in general works on Islamic art, the Maqamat miniatures have attracted no particular attention except insofar as they have been used to interpret newly discovered or reexamined manuscripts or to illustrate broader issues of medieval Islamic culture. This was done in several books by Bishr Farès and in D. S. Rice’s brilliant explanation of the text and illustration on a long-known fragment of paper in Vienna. In a book for the general reader, Richard Ettinghausen provided detailed comments on a few miniatures and, more important, offered an interpretation of the style and social context of the early Maqamat that was both novel and historically and methodologically more far-reaching than
anything done before. On two occasions I used evidence from the Maqamat to elaborate on the problem of urban patronage, and in a more recent study I sought to discuss the character of its miniatures as illustration. About the same time David James investigated in a particularly original fashion the stylistic properties of some of the miniatures, as Alexandre Papadopoulos had done two years earlier. A series of pamphlets published recently in Iraq has dealt with the painter al-Nasiri and his importance for the art of the Arabs, emphasizing most particularly the aesthetic and design qualities of his Maqamat, so representative of Baghdad in the first half of the thirteenth century.

Ever since the Maqamat miniatures were rediscovered, a chosen few have been used over the decades as illustrations for a variety of historical, cultural, and technical studies. The striking range of uses to which they have been put is an obvious indication of their documentary and artistic merit. But for the most part the same few pictures have been used over and over again, the vast majority have remained unpublished, and no coherent and complete study of the characteristics of each manuscript or of the relation of the miniatures to each other has ever been made. The first objective of this book, therefore, is to make available all the preserved miniatures of the Maqamat without regard to aesthetic merit or to damages inflicted upon them by time and man, and thereby to furnish an easily accessible, complete collection to replace the arbitrary choices so frequently found until now. However useful this complete collection proves to be, this book also has another purpose. Both the fact that illustrations to the Maqamat exist at all and the particular time of their appearance raise a number of questions. The attempt to answer them has determined in turn how the 723 miniatures and the text were to be treated.

The word maqamat (pl. maqamat) meaning literally “session,” “seance,” or “assembly,” came to refer to a literary genre that developed in the tenth century by combining several motifs in Arab literature and applying them to the social and literary concerns of the age. The beggarly wretch with a gilded tongue and the peripatetic paragone hero moving from one end of the Islamic world to the other were joined to a fascination with the endless possibilities of the Arabic language; the reintroduction of an ancient literary form (the rhymed prose known as sa‘i), moralistic or religious preaching, and an enormous variety of physical and social settings drawn from the vast Muslim world came together in these short stories called maqamat. In them, organizations of vagrants appear side by side with a well-established bourgeoisie and a declining central authority, and most reveal a variety of intellectual and social concerns. First appearing in varying lengths and forms, the maqamat was given permanent shape by al-Hamadhani (d. 1008), who is credited, probably apocryphally, with some four hundred stories. He contributed not only artistry of language and variety of setting, but also the tradition of centering the story on two characters—a robust but eloquent hero with superb control of language, and a bourgeois narrator, slightly dim-witted when it came to action but appreciative of literary inventions. Al-Hamadhani’s creations were immediately successful and often imitated.

One of the imitators soon surpassed the creator of the genre and immediately enjoyed extraordinary popularity. This was Abu Muhammad al-Qasim ibn Ali al-Hariri (1054–1122). His fifty maqamat were frequently copied during his lifetime; it is reported that he himself signed some seven hundred manuscripts of his work. He was imitated in Syriac and Hebrew, and in countless Arabic continuations well into the twentieth century. The narrator in al-Hariri’s stories is al-Hariri, a slightly naive traveling merchant whose business takes him all over the Muslim Middle East and who everywhere is received by and participates in the meetings of “learned companies.”

The rogue is Abu Zayd of Saruj, who turns up in all sorts of disguises and in the most unlikely places and situations in order to impress, confound, or swindle wealthy merchants and government representatives. The stories are predictable, but the plots and settings vary; a few are quite amusing, or at least eventful. But plots are never the main point of a maqamat; they are only an excuse to indulge in pyrotechnics based on double or triple puns or on such tricks as composing Arabic poetry in which all the letters in one line of a couplet have diaritical marks and all the letters in the next line are without them. The tricks are often visual, in the sense that they can only be seen, not spoken, but the purpose and success of the story lie exclusively in its language, not in its narrative. Literary historians argue that this peculiarity, brought by al-Hariri to a perfection never again equaled, in fact ruined the original humor of the maqamat genre. As a result, his countless imitators ended up writing pointless and incomprehensible tales.

The problem, then, is to explain why so much attention was lavished on illustrations for stories that were meant to be enjoyed not for their plots or characters but for their literary inventions, which by their very nature could not be visually depicted. Other illustrated literary works of the time—the animal stories of Kalilah and Dimnah, epics like the Shahnama, or love stories like Wargah and Gulshah—use precise events and adventures to make their impact, regardless of the symbolic or moral interpretations given to them. Scientific or technical manuscripts, like the herbals or books on antidotes to snakebite attributed to Dioscorides or Galen and the manuals on mechanical toys by al-Jazari, were given practical illustrations as aids to understanding and using the text. But in the case of al-Hariri’s Maqamat the contrast between the purpose of the book and the content of its illustrations is so flagrant that it must have some explanation. Were these illustrated books made for
readers other than the literati who established the Maqamat’s reputation? Was there a social or cultural milieu for which the story rather than the language was memorable? Was there a tradition of illustrating stories that was more or less automatically applied to this inappropriate context? Whatever hypothesis or combination of hypotheses is chosen, it must confront the apparent paradox that illustrations for this particular book even exist, and it must address the broader issues of the purpose of a visual equivalent to a literary text and of the meaning of illustration in Muslim culture.

The illustrated Maqamat manuscripts form a discrete group of miniatures linked by a common and established text and distinguished from all other contemporary illustrated books. This is why both the arrangement of the plates in the present volume and its descriptive third chapter maintain the sequence of the text itself, not that of the individual manuscripts organized chronologically or in some other order. Only in this way could answers be suggested for two key questions: Why was this particular text illustrated? And how were subjects found to illustrate a text that a priori did not lend itself to visual expression?

Next to the very fact of their existence, another peculiarity of the illustrated Maqamat is that all but two of the thirteen known manuscripts date from the same limited period, roughly the thirteenth century and the first half of the fourteenth; the exceptions are quite late and depend on earlier models. That mere chance preserved manuscripts from that period only is not very likely. Several earlier manuscripts and hundreds of contemporary and later ones exist without a trace of illustration. Nor is the period entirely fortuitous: it was a time when, fairly suddenly, illustrated, particularly Arabic, manuscripts appear in considerable numbers within the Islamic world and when nearly all the minor arts—ceramics, metalwork, glass—are strikingly decorated with representations of all kinds. In other words, the illustrations of the Maqamat appear in the thirteenth century, when the whole Muslim world explodes with images, and disappear by the second half of the fourteenth century, when at least the Arab part of the Muslim world moves away from representation and in many ways weakens in intellectual and artistic creativity.

This rich and fascinating century and a half has been dubbed the “Middle Period” of Islamic history, and for several decades historians have sought to locate the illustrated Maqamat manuscripts in its main urban centers: Baghdad, Mosul, Cairo, and Damascus. As we shall see, there is little firm evidence to justify an attribution for most of these places, but a more important question is how the illustrations reflect the explosion of representation that was going on all over the Muslim world, from Egypt and Anatolia to Central Asia. In considering our pictures, therefore, we must go beyond the immediacy of their context and seek to understand them in terms of the art of the times. The problem is how
to do so without having to write the whole history of a period so far studied only in fragmentary and spotty fashion.

Classical art historical methods of dealing with manuscript illustrations are not entirely satisfactory for our purposes. The elaborate procedure that has been developed for studying biblical illustrations and medieval scientific manuscripts is feasible only because of the enormous documentation available, the obvious liturgical and pedagogical purposes they served, and the availability of evidence about their patronage or use that exists apart from the manuscripts themselves. The Maqamat, along with most other early Islamic illustrated manuscripts, enjoys no such plenty. A partial exception is al-Jazari’s Automata, where at least the initial purpose of making mechanical toys for a northern Mesopotamian princeling is clear. Even when the name of a patron or artist is known for a Maqamat manuscript, the information does not explain why it was illustrated or what kind of pleasure or excitement its owner or peruser may have had in acquiring it. Nor does the limited period of Maqamat illustrations allow for the kind of overall sweep that is possible for biblical illustrations and later for the Shahnameh. Other new artistic developments in pre-Renaissance times, for instance Umayyad and early Christian art, often lack explanations for changes and novelties as well. But in both of those recently investigated examples, or at least hypotheses for solutions, can be proposed, because the preceding artistic traditions—classical antiquity or eastern Mediterranean late antiquity—are reasonably well known, and changes in forms or attitudes, novelties or inventions, can be set against earlier or contemporary norms. No such background exists for the Maqamat or for most of Islamic art in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the occasional fragments of narrative illustrations that do exist are too few and too incomplete to be of much use.

In many ways the problems posed by the Maqamat are those often presented by secular narrative images. It is perhaps not entirely accidental that one of the most puzzling manuscripts in the well-studied art of the Byzantine world is the illustrated chronicle of Skylitzes, curiously enough nearly contemporary with the Maqamat illustrations. Secular art, especially a secular art that is not at first glance part of the traditional and repetitive art of princes, leads to individual and private visual experiences and purposes, a particularly complex realm to investigate and one for which no models exist.

It is clear, then, that except in the obvious technical areas of the relation between text and image or between manuscript and manuscript, an elucidation of the circumstances around the time of the Maqamat and the idiosyncrasies of the text itself preclude the automatic adoption of methods and procedures used elsewhere. None of those methods can easily answer the three main questions posed by the Maqamat manuscripts: Why were they illustrated? Why at just that time?
And how do the illustrations relate to the more general artistic explosion of which they were a part?

My premise is that to understand the illustrations of the Maqamat we must first get to know them better by looking at them as a closed visual system tied to an immutable text. The first step is to introduce the manuscripts themselves: each has its own peculiarities, and each will provide some information about the whole corpus. I shall then review the scholarly activities that have already been devoted to each manuscript. Finally I shall analyze, story by story, how the various books illustrate the text. In the process I shall tell each story; identify as precisely as possible the subject matter of every illustration; develop an understanding of how each artist set about interpreting the subject; and study any relations of the extant manuscripts to each other.

Next I shall distinguish the characteristics of the visual language in the Maqamat, that is, to say those features—representations of heroes, types of buildings, ways of expressing emotions or activities—that seem to be constant or consistent within all or most manuscripts. This will lead to a definition of each manuscript and to an understanding of their relationship. Before a conclusion dealing with more general issues, a final chapter will consider the formal sources of the miniatures and explain the process and procedures by which the manuscripts were illustrated.

2 The Illustrated Manuscripts of the Maqamat

Of the hundreds of extant Maqamat manuscripts, only thirteen have illustrations. Some of the thirteen have been known for several decades and have been the subject of many books or articles, but at least one, in the Sana’a Mosque Library, has never even been mentioned in print. Each of them has an individual artistic physiognomy whose details can emerge only after its illustrations have been thoroughly studied, but whose historical value depends on vital statistics that have little to do with illustrations, and on the scholarly opinions and controversies that have developed around them. Here I shall introduce the manuscripts and what has been said about them, as well as distinguishing the problems that appear to be raised by their internal, physical character and by those discussions. The manuscripts are cited according to collection rather than chronology. I shall return later to the question of their dates. Codex numbers are given first in full and later in abbreviated form. The bibliographical references found in Holter’s handlist and its supplement (to 1939) are not repeated. Subsequent literature is mentioned only as it pertains to the whole manuscript—without meaningful discussions, endless references to a single miniature only clutter pages and rarely serve any useful purpose.

One issue that often arises in manuscript studies will not be discussed systematically here—comparative textual analysis. So far as I can determine, the only significant textual differences between the manuscripts fall into two areas: the presence or absence of commentaries (tafsir), and variations in the titles given to the stories. Aside from one curious instance in London 1200 where the commentary is illustrated, however, the commentaries are not pertinent to our purpose. As for the titles given to the stories, a perusal of dozens of nonillustrated twelfth-, thirteenth-, and fourteenth-century codices failed to elicit a clear genealogy of titles. The idiosyncrasies of al-Hariri’s text make the search for significant textual variants a time-consuming task unlikely to lead to significant results. Furthermore, in some manuscripts the stories are
simply numbered; some include and others do not include the name of the city with which they are normally associated. Finally, since most of the manuscripts date from the same general period, applying paleographic analyses to the scripts is fruitless; in any case, this is an area in which Islamic historiography is strikingly underdeveloped.

1. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, arabe 3929
Page size: 32 × 21.5 cm

This manuscript is sometimes called the Saint-Waast Maqamat because it once belonged to the abbey of that name in northern France. It now has 196 folios; its initial pages are lost, and the first folio begins with the second maqamat. The last seven folios and several places in the body of the manuscript are of more recent date or are badly damaged, and the colophon has not been preserved. When damaged folios were replaced the copyist must have had the original in front of him, however, since in several places he left empty spaces for illustrations. Each maqamat is simply numbered; none is titled, and none includes the name of a city.

Seventy-seven miniatures remain of the more than ninety that formed the complete manuscript. Each one is provided with a caption lettered in gold and outlined in black ink. The captions either are descriptive (fol. 5, sūrah Abī Zayd wa qad wāla ya‘araj, “picture of Abu Zayd escaping while limping”) or are parenthetical additions to the text (fol. 2', wa hādhāhi sūratulku, “and this is its illustration,” from the second maqamat). Most of the illustrations are simple and at first glance quite literal, and for this reason most scholars have assigned the manuscript to the early thirteenth century or even to the late twelfth. A more sophisticated discussion by Rice of one group of illustrations led him to a date sometime in the 1240s, after the clearly dated (1237) Paris 5847.

The folios are no longer in their original order, but the text accompanying each miniature is sufficient to identify the subject of every illustration. Appendix 2 gives the maqamat illustrated by each folio for this and successive manuscripts.

2. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, arabe 6094
Page size: 30 × 23 cm
Holter, "Islamischen Miniaturhandschriften," no. 25.

This manuscript of 187 folios, many of them later than the original, is in a rather poor state of preservation. The first two folios contain marks and writing exercises of subsequent owners. On folio 3 the maqamat are listed in a later hand, but the lower left corner has traces of a frame, probably belonging to the original, that would have contained a dedicatory inscription or perhaps a frontispiece. The stories themselves begin on folio 5. Thirty-nine illustrations adorn the book, most of them large and framed by only a few lines of text. The end of the manuscript is incomplete.

The date and the provenance of the manuscript are in dispute. A date is given in two places in the manuscript: on folio 68 (fig. 4F2), where the hull of the boat bears the inscription "made the year 619 [A.D. 1222]"; and on folio 167 (fig. 9A1), where a similar statement appears on a schoolboy’s slate (the only difference being the addition of li, "in," after the verb umila, "made"). A second slate provides the additional information that "the book was completed [or adorned]—the verb cannot be read clearly—in ten days." This date was not accepted by Rice, who wrote that "on palaeographic grounds alone and for many stylistic details it seems to belong to the third quarter of the 13th century rather than to the first." Since Rice died before he could pursue the matter, we will never know what "stylistic details" he meant. I am not competent to judge the palaeographic characteristics of the text itself. It is undeniable, however, that the dates are not in a formal colophon but in secondary inscriptions with textual variants written in an artificial Kufic script that is consistent neither within each inscription nor between inscriptions. Although the practice of putting the date of a manuscript and the name of the artist in some small corner of an illustration is fairly common in later Islamic painting, it is very rare in the thirteenth century. Although some doubt does remain regarding the validity of the date, the existence of the two inscriptions certainly indicates that the model for Paris 6094, if not the manuscript itself, belonged to the first quarter of the thirteenth century, a conclusion Rice accepted.

As for its provenance, on the basis of its many similarities with a manuscript of Kitāb al-dinwah (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, arabe 3465) and the celebrated Coptic Gospel book of A.D. 1180 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, copie 13), and because of the presence of architectural motifs replete with classical and Byzantine reminiscences, Buchthal broached the hypothesis that Paris 6094 was made in or near one of the numerous Ayyubid courts of northern Syria, or perhaps even in Damascus. If this was true, the manuscript would be our clearest example of a Syrian school of painting of the thirteenth century. However, just as was the case for the date, the notion that the manuscript was a product of courtly patronage is for the time being no more than a possible hypothesis. On the other hand, the relation of its miniatures to eastern Christian art is definitely established. Even a cursory glance at the miniatures shows them to be stylistically quite different from most of the other Maqamat illustrations.
few seem unfinished, with large empty spaces surrounding a few figures and an occasional prop. Since the colophon clearly indicates that the manuscript and the illustrations were completed (fargha) by the same individual, these inconsistencies must be explained as reflecting either different models or peculiar whims of the painter as he made his choices for the treatment of subjects he or a patron had selected. Possibly—as I have tried to show elsewhere and as Ettinhausen suggested about one of the miniatures (fig. 2D)9—al-Wasiti commented upon the text by interpreting its stories as satires or as capsule morality tales. Several writers have insisted on the compositional complexity of some but not all of the manuscript’s miniatures, while the expressive variety of its portrayal of character was noted from the moment of its appearance.16 We are obviously dealing with an unusual manuscript that requires an explanation of its own.

The colophon translates: “Its [the manuscript’s] copying (naskha) was completed by the poor slave [carving for] the mercy of his Lord, His forgiveness, and His pardon, Yahya ibn Mahmud ibn Yahya ibn Abi al-Hasan ibn Kuwwarah al-Wasiti, [both] the writing (khuf) and illustrations (sunur) on the evening of Saturday the sixth [day] of the month of Ramadan of the year 634, praising God Most High for His grace, praying for the best of His creatures, our Lord Muhammad the Prophet, his family, and companions, the best, the most pious, the purest, with honor, generosity and salutation.”

4. Leningrad, Academy of Science, S. 23
Page size: 25 × 19 cm
Holter, “Islamischen Miniaturhandschriften,” no. 32.
This manuscript of 358 folios has been known for some time but was not properly studied until Rice and Ettinhausen published a few of its images in recent years. Its 98 miniatures are all damaged; not one is completely free of the ruthless scratches that deface most of the figures and often whole compositions. Despite its ill fortune, however, the Leningrad manuscript is still a striking document. All its miniatures are elaborate, though relatively small, with highly developed backgrounds around the main figures. Their high quality is marred only by the frequent repetition of almost identical images in which the setting seems almost more important than the events depicted.

The manuscript is undated, and its place of origin is unknown. It had first been considered approximately contemporary with Paris 5847, but Rice’s study of one specific iconographic unit and Ettinhausen’s more general essay have since led to suggestions for earlier dates and even to the hypothesis that the Leningrad manuscript is the earliest extant illustrated Maqamat. Whether that hypothesis can be maintained is a question to which I shall return.
5. Istanbul, Suleymanie, Esad Efendi 2961
Page size: 30 × 22 cm

This manuscript of 216 folios was discovered in 1960 by Ettinghausen, who encouraged me to publish it. The beginning and end of the manuscript are missing, and a few pages in the body of the text were replaced in comparatively recent times. The fifty-six miniatures are large and badly damaged, but it is clear that, like those of the Leningrad manuscript, they consistently deal with the elaborate depiction of natural and architectural settings. They differ from the Leningrad codex in their far greater variety and in their concern for complex compositional patterns. Unfortunately, very little can be said about the depiction of figures, since most of these appear to have been erased deliberately. The manuscript has no colophon, but an inscription on folio 204 (fig. 9012) mentions the name of the Caliph al-Musta’ sim, so the manuscript can be dated to the time (1242–58) of that last ‘Abbasid caliph. The place of its copying is unknown.

Page size: 24.5 × 17 cm, with restoration; originally 24.5 × 15.5 cm

The manuscript has 155 folios; its colophon provides the date 654 (1256), followed by an invocation to God that has Shi‘ite overtones. In a marginal commentary also on folio 177, among numerous glosses on the text, is a statement that the collation was completed by one Umar ibn Ali ibn al-Mubarak al-Mawsili. Only the century (seventh H.) of the date is still visible. It is likely, as Buchthal surmised, that this Umar was the copyst of the manuscript, but since the ductus of the marginal note is not the text’s, it is also probable that he was the copyist of a 1256 text or the author of the commentaries. In any case, the manuscript belongs to the second half of the thirteenth century, and either it or its immediate model dates from 1256.

The eighty-seven miniatures of the manuscript are badly damaged, and almost all have been clumsily repainted. At first glance the illustrations appear to be as simple and direct as those of Paris 3929, but, as Buchthal has already pointed out, complex models lurk behind them in a large number of instances (e.g., fols. 6, 10, 85r–86). The manuscript is clearly derivative and of inferior quality. Figures often look like emaciated dummies and are never shown in profile. Even if a few miniatures (fols. 96–97, for instance) do possess a sort of primitive vacuity, London 1200 is not a major masterpiece. It does, however, contain one otherwise unrecorded oddity: it illustrates (fols. 133r and 134) a commentary on the fortieth muqamah and does so by using two stock images, as if the artist were totally unaware that he was no longer dealing with the story itself. Methodologically, therefore, London 1200 is of far greater importance in its reflection of an existing tradition than its quality alone would justify. It could be either a provincial work or a cheap metropolitan production.

7. London, British Library, or. 9718
Page size: 26.5 × 18 cm, with restoration; originally 20.5 × 15 cm

This manuscript of 215 folios is in a particularly poor state of preservation. Many of its pages have been rewritten in fairly recent times, and most of its miniatures are heavily damaged. Its colophon dates it 1271 (a.d. 1855), but that is in fact the date of the later additions to the text and not of the bulk of the manuscript. Seventy-nine illustrations are preserved, and there are faint traces of a few others. On folio 53 we find the name of the scribe and artist, Ghazi ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Dimashqi, whose death in 1310 gives us a terminus ante quem for the miniatures. It is certain that Ghazi worked in Damascus. Since he lived to the ripe age of eighty, it is also likely that the manuscript belongs to the second half of the thirteenth century. Ghazi’s activities have been traced by Rice, and according to the sources he gathered Ghazi was trained as a calligrapher in the typical Muslim tradition. He is also supposed to have been a difficult individual, a feature that hardly appears in his miniatures. His architectural settings and landscape features are notable for their size and monumentality.

8. London, British Library, or. add. 22114
Page size: 26.75 × 19 cm

A large manuscript of 186 folios, London 22114 lacks its original beginning and end. Its pages are out of order, and a few miniatures are difficult to identify. Its eighty-four illustrations are all about the same size, with an equally standard and unified typography of facial and emotional expressions. Although qualitatively superior to the preceding two manuscripts, this rather dull and repetitive work gives the impression of being a faithful but unimaginative copy of some model. The routine character of its miniatures is paralleled in the text; devoid of commentaries or marginal additions, it suggests either that its owner was a linguistic genius or that he was not particularly interested in what was written there. The manuscript is not dated. It was thought first to be of the thirteenth century, but Buchthal has since assigned it to the early fourteenth and to Syria. Comparisons with manuscripts of *Kalilah
and Dimnah, some of which are dated, show that date to be reasonable, The place of manufacture is still a matter of speculation.

9. London, British Library, or. add. 7293
Page size: 43 × 30 cm

This impressive book comprises 437 folios and was certainly meant to be a luxury manuscript, since even the commentaries to Hariri’s text are carefully composed into patterns of circles and half-circles. Its colophon on folio 437 reads as follows: “This book was completed with the praise of God on the first of Rabii’ II of the lunar year 723 (9 April 1323), and praise be to God, the Lord of the Worlds.” The title of each story is beautifully illuminated. Unfortunately the manuscript was never completed; its pages are filled with blank spaces left for miniatures, often meant to face each other, that were never executed. A very few miniatures were finished; a few crude representations were added at some later time, and others have been sketched in red ink. These sketches have been frequently reproduced in manuals of Islamic art since they were first published by F. R. Martin in 1912.21 Buchthal concluded from those few that remain that the manuscript derived from models similar to Paris 5847.

This manuscript poses one minor problem. Holter gives the name of its scribe as Ahmad ibn Jullab al-Mawswi, inspector of alms (zakat) in Damascus. Buchthal correctly pointed out that this name does not occur in the colophon, which gives only a date. It is, however, given on the title page of the manuscript, in the following statement: “The fifty maqqasat of al-Hariri (may God have mercy upon him); this book came into the possession of Ahmad ibn Jullab al-Mawswi, inspector of alms in Damascus [one illegible word] in the year 777 [A.D. 1375–76]; the empty spaces are earlier.” It seems, therefore, that a manuscript was prepared in 1323 but left unfinished and subsequently acquired by a tax collector in Damascus in 1375–76.

The question is whether those miniatures that are not obviously late insertions should be dated 1323 or 1375–76. Because of their quality, the sketches on folios 17, 70, and 285 seem to be consistent in style with the manuscript’s original intent and to be datable to 1323. The less imaginatively drawn and completed miniatures on folios 7, 14, 73, 74 and elsewhere may have been attempts to illustrate the manuscript after 1375–76. That the Damascus tax collector may have done so is suggested by the curious fact that on some folios (for instance 20), a different red ink is used to outline figures and settings in imitation of the sketches, which therefore must be earlier.

This is of course all hypothetical, and for our purposes perhaps not of great importance, since the iconographic evidence from London 7293 is so limited. The significance of the manuscript lies elsewhere. It was intended to have a complete cycle of illustrations, more complete than any other known manuscript. It would have been a sort of summa of Maqamat miniatures, and it is perhaps symptomatic of the history of these illustrations that by the end of the first quarter of the fourteenth century this luxurious codex was left unfinished.

10. Oxford, Bodleian, Marsh 458
Page size: 37.5 × 26.5 cm

This damaged and incomplete manuscript has 131 folios. Its forty-two remaining miniatures are only a fraction of its original complement. It is provided with a colophon that dates its copying (nasabtu) to 738 (1337) and gives the name of its patron as an emir, Nasir al-Din Muhammad, son of Tarantayn, an official at the Maliuk court. There is no doubt about its Cairene origin. Even though apparently made for a prince, the illustrations and the text are not of the highest quality. The script is irregular, and the pictures are often awkwardly composed.

11. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, A.F. 9
Page size: 37.5 × 25.5 cm

This celebrated Vienna manuscript with its 195 folios has the distinction of being the only one published in its entirety. Several pages are missing from the original text, but they have been replaced by later ones and the manuscript is complete. A colophon states that the work of copying (nasabtu) was finished in Rajab 734 (March 1334). Below the colophon proper and curiously written to the side of the page, a second statement in the same ink and in a very similar style of writing relates that the scribe, vocalizer, provider of diarrhetic marks, and corrector (kataab, dabita, naysa, harrara) was one Abu al-Fadl Ibn Abi Ishaq. In spite of its peculiar placement, there is every reason to believe that the person referred to in the statement is the scribe himself.

The manuscript has a frontispiece, handsomely illuminated story titles, and seventy miniatures of consistently high quality in carefully drawn frames on a gold background. The immediate visual peculiarity of these illustrations is that they seem so tiny, with figures and other features squeezed into spaces that appear too small for them. More than any of the other manuscript illustrations, these give a feeling of
miniaturization. They are superbly drawn and colorful, but at the same time flat and expressionless. It has generally been agreed that, regardless of the influences that came to bear on this manuscript, its place of origin is in the Mamluk empire, most probably Cairo.\(^2\)

12. Manchester, John Rylands Library, arab. 680
Page size: 33 × 25 cm

This almost entirely unpublished manuscript contains 141 miniatures,\(^4\) more than any other Magamat. It is described by Rice as “crude folk art,”\(^2\) a judgment with which it is difficult to disagree. The thirteenth-century date 626(7) (1228–29(7)) found on folio 177 is certainly placed there much later—in the sixteenth or seventeenth century when the manuscript was actually put together.\(^9\)

In spite of its extremely poor quality, the Manchester manuscript is interesting for two reasons. One is that it obviously copied a work like Paris 5847, and some of its miniatures even seem to be directly inspired by al-Wasiti’s masterpiece. The other is that since it contains more miniatures than the Paris manuscript, it could help us reconstruct the latter’s original cycle. After careful examination, however, I felt that the Manchester manuscript need not be included in this study except as it can be used to explain some otherwise obscure features in other manuscripts. The problem of cycle copying is not pertinent to the Mağamat, and the inclusion of 141 poor images would have been an unnecessary addition to the already overwhelming number of illustrations provided here. But should the conclusions of the fourth chapter prove unacceptable, the Manchester manuscript could still play a major role in reconstructing Mağamat imagery.

13. Sana’a, Mosque Library

In 1974 Professor Mahmud al-Ghul, then of the American University in Beirut, provided me with photographs of twenty-six illustrations from a manuscript of the Mağamat in the library of the Great Mosque in Sana’a. Its colophon has the date Safar 1221 (April 1709), and most of its miniatures are in an Indian-inspired style appropriate to a Yemeni creation. Some of the miniatures have been provided with titles; others simply fill empty spaces left by the scribe.

One miniature illustrating the first mağamat (fig. 183) is in a totally different style. It is quite crude and has obviously been retouched, but the poses, the details of the clothing, and the elements of landscape found in it indicate either an early fourteenth century date or the faithful copying of a model from Mamluk times. Since I know of no evidence to support the claim that any part of the manuscript is earlier than its colophon, the Mamluk model seems the more likely explanation. Why this miniature alone copied a style so different from all the rest is a mystery for which I have no solution. I was not able to see the codex itself, and only this one miniature has been incorporated into this survey. I am grateful to Professor al-Ghul for having made his discovery available.

Despite the many problems of detail posed by every one of these thirteen manuscripts, when taken together the group still allows us to form a number of hypotheses, draw some conclusions, and pose some questions that can lead to a more precise focus on the broad issues raised in the introduction. First, all but two of the illustrated examples of the Mağamat form a neat chronological pattern within the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Of the two that are much later, one obviously depends on thirteenth-century models; the other, quite different in almost all respects, belongs to a time and style less relevant to our concerns. Of the remaining eleven manuscripts, one group of six—the three Paris examples, the Leningrad and Istanbul manuscripts, and London 1200—seems definitely not to be later than the Mongol onslaught against Baghdad and the Fertile Crescent (1258). These manuscripts provide four dates: 1222 (Paris 6094), 1237 (Paris 5847), 1242–58 (Istanbul), and 1256 (London 1200). A second group of four also forms a fairly tight chronological sequence: before 1310 (London 9718); 1323 with possible later additions, but not later than 1375–76 (London 7293); 1334 (Vienna); and 1337 (Oxford). The eleventh, undated manuscript (London 22114) is usually included in this group.

That the two groups taken together span hardly more than a single century leads to the conclusion that the history of the illustrated Mağamat was a short one and developed in spurts. It also raises the question of what social, intellectual, or cultural impulses led to the production of so many illustrated copies of al-Hariri’s masterpiece during that century. And, since the two groups are separated from each other by a good fifty years (ca. 1258 to ca. 1310) and a major upheaval,\(^7\) is simply identifying whatever may have tied them together a sufficient explanation for both?

The evidence from inscriptions and colophons tells us very little about where the manuscripts were produced. Only two are immediately localizable: London 9718, and probably parts of London 7293, in Damascus,\(^8\) and Oxford in Cairo. Evidence other than the style of the miniatures, such as the name of the copyist or the patron or a later owner, indicates that Vienna was probably executed in Cairo and that the early parts of London 7293 were either Cairene or Syrian. Thus for our second chronological group we may agree to a Syrian or Egyptian origin.

As far as the first group is concerned, attributions to various centers—Baghdad, northern Mesopotamia, Syria—are based on arguments by modern scholars, not on vital statistics. The alleged existence of a school of metalworkers in or from Mosul led to the conclusion that
a school of painting must have flourished there as well. That certain centers—Baghdad under al-Nasir and his successors, Mosul under Badr al-Din Lu’lu’, Aleppo or Damascus under the Ayyubids—were of cultural importance led to the assumption that organized and identifiable scriptoria for illustrated manuscripts also existed. But the truly significant point is that, unlike the manuscripts of the fourteenth century, those of the thirteenth do not lend themselves easily to precise localization. All the hypotheses for the existence of urban artistic schools are supported by such limited evidence that any association of unlocalized works with these alleged schools is at the very least premature. It is difficult to establish a Baghdad school on the single example of a rather mediocre, even if occasionally charming, manual of horsemanship. Rice has already pointed to similar difficulties in identifying a Mosul school of metalwork.

These observations do not necessarily mean that Baghdad or Mosul or Syrian attributions are wrong; they simply are not demonstrable on the evidence of the manuscripts alone. Nor does the knowledge of where a manuscript was illustrated answer our initial questions about how and why it acquired its imagery. At this stage, therefore, it may be safer simply to say that all our manuscripts come from the Arab Near East—none is Spanish or North African—and that the fourteenth-century ones seem to be either Syrian or Egyptian. One, Paris 6094, must have been illustrated in or near a center with strong Christian models, but such a center could have been in Egypt, Syria, Anatolia, or Mesopotamia.

There are considerable differences in quality between the manuscripts. Quality has to be understood here in two separate senses, the first of which is aesthetic; a manuscript like London 1200 is clearly inferior in artistic merit; it cannot be compared with Paris 5847, Leningrad, or Vienna. But quality can also refer less to purely artistic merit than to the way the manuscript was illustrated—the apparent intent of its creators. Thus the actual or probable existence of frontispieces in Paris 6094, Paris 5847, Oxford, and Vienna, and the large and elaborate illuminated titles of London 7293 are prima facie evidence for assuming that these codices were meant to be important and luxurious. Even where frontispieces have disappeared, it is apparent at a glance that there is a difference in kind between the carefully framed miniatures on gold background of Vienna and Oxford and the much expanded illustrations of Paris 5847 or Istanbul, on the one hand, and the illustrations integrated into the text of Paris 3929 or London 22114, on the other.

Other qualitative categories exist as well. Some miniature (Vienna or Paris 3929) tend to show figures more than setting; others (London 9718 or Leningrad) give precedence to architecture or landscape. Some (Paris 5847) depict active, energetic, and expressive figures; some (London 22114) are static scenes. To discuss in detail these various characteristics of the Magannat manuscripts would involve an equally intensive investigation of comparable miniatures in other manuscripts and of the art of painting in general and would take us far beyond our focus on the illustrations for specific texts. These stylistic and formal distinctions do bear on our topic to the extent that, whether reflections of local styles, patronage, market requirements, or simply artistic competence, they indicate that our manuscripts belong to different levels of social or private use. The question then becomes whether formal and qualitative distinctions are primarily cosmetic distinctions of taste or whether they also affect the visual interpretation given to the text of al-Hariri. A subsidiary question—or perhaps just another way of phrasing the same question—is whether the available or purposefully chosen means of depiction limited the effectiveness of the illustrations, or whether the text constrained the possibilities open to the painters.

This brief description of the manuscripts brings out a number of smaller and more technical questions and problems. Some are narrowly art historical, such as the implication that painter and copyist were probably the same in most instances or that most manuscripts imply preexisting models but not one of them (except Manchester) shows obvious dependence on another. Other questions are historical or social, such as whether the Shi’ite allegiance of two of the painters (Paris 5847, London 1200) is significant and why two manuscripts (Paris 5847, Istanbul) identify ruling caliphs in their depiction of mosques. Others are more broadly interpretative, such as whether preliminary impressions of narrative simplicity (Paris 3929, London 1200) or of self-contained images somewhat independent of the text (Vienna) are justifiable ways of explaining any one manuscript. It will not be possible to answer all these questions. My assumption is that before even attempting to do so we must first determine how the miniatures relate to the text and whether there was a Magannat idiom, or whether every manuscript is an entirely discrete creation.
3 The Illustrations: Descriptive Analysis

In describing all the known thirteenth- and fourteenth-century *Maqamat* miniatures, and in line with the premise that the written text inspired the illustrations, each *maqamah* is considered separately. An initial list of illustrations states which manuscripts contain an illustration of that *maqamah*, and the pictures are then described from the point of view of their relation to the text. With the partial exception of frontispieces, decorations or other features not directly connected with the story are not discussed. The very few bibliographical references to previous interpretations of individual miniatures are given, but I have made no attempt to list all reproductions of the more familiar miniatures. Appendix 1 restates the number of illustrations of each *maqamah* in a particular manuscript. Appendix 2 indicates folio/maqamah correspondence for each manuscript.

The text referred to is the English translation of the *Maqamat* by Chenery and Steingass (London, 1867 and 1898). The Arabic text (a 1958 Beirut edition) and the standard Silvestre de Sacy edition (Paris, 1847–53) are noted where textual problems require it.

Frontispieces

1A1–1A4

Paris 6094: traces on fol. 3
Paris 5847: fols. 1* (1A1), 2 (1A2)
Oxford: fol. 4 (1A3)
Vienna: fol. 1 (1A4)

The four extant frontispieces are remarkable chiefly for their variety. Paris 5847 and Vienna have an elaborate frame of ornamental designs around grouped figures. Probably only half of the original double-page frontispiece of the Oxford manuscript has been preserved; in it two horizontal borders with hunters above and three musicians and a dancer below frame yet another arrangement of figures. The Oxford frame belongs to a type most fully illustrated in the celebrated thirteenth-century frontispiece of the pseudo-Galen manuscript in Vienna, where formal and informal activities are similarly depicted in horizontal registers above and below the central figure of the prince. Although it is possible that the Oxford hunting group derives directly from the Vienna Galen, it is likely that the motifs on both frontispieces were inspired by objects rather than by manuscripts, since similar bands of hunters or musicians are found on metalwork, ivories, glass, and, more rarely, ceramics.

It is also on objects that we find obvious parallels for the frames of the other two codices. The handsomely precise design of the Vienna frontispiece can be found on Mamluk metalwork and lamps, but it had also been fully assimilated into the art of book illustration, and its most immediate parallels are in the great Egyptian Korans of the fourteenth century. To a similar but rougher outer border Paris 5847 has added an inner border of animals running in vegetal scrolls, a ubiquitous motif on Islamic metalwork and ceramics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

One aspect of the border of the Paris 5847 frontispiece seems at first glance trivial but has some important implications. It is that the execution of the design is not of the same quality on both folios. The birds and animals in particular are arranged quite differently: on folio 1* they are set symmetrically around a central vertical axis that includes both animate and inanimate elements of the design: a bird (frontal eagle) above and a segment of the vegetal ornament below. This was a deliberate arrangement, for the alternation of animals or birds facing left or right could be maintained only if a different number of them were painted on the top and bottom lines. But on folio 2 the arrangement breaks down: a bird more or less in the center above is shown in profile and is dependent on the decorative principle of alternating birds rather than on that of a vertical axis; the system of alternating birds and animals also falls apart in both the upper left and the lower right corners. The artist of this page does not seem to have realized that using two rabbits back to back as centers to the composition required adding a sixth animal in the lower part of the picture, and that only the use of a single animal in the center would permit a symmetrical composition of five units.

Comparing the individual animals in the two pictures also shows that those of folio 1* are more lively, more elongated, and especially better integrated within the vegetal ornament than those of folio 2, where the oval of the arabesque becomes a straitjacket. It is clear that folio 1* served as a model for folio 2, which was probably entrusted to a pupil or at least a less skillful artist. This situation has parallels elsewhere in Islamic art. Its importance lies not in its suggestion of several hands at work, but in its indication that an atelier functioned in such a
way that the planning and execution of certain miniatures could if necessary be entrusted to more than one individual.

The figure types in these frontispieces are ubiquitous in Islamic princely cycles, not peculiar to the Maqamat. In the Oxford and Vienna examples, the figure of the prince with a cup, framed by two winged creatures holding a scarf and accompanied by large numbers of attendants with specific symbols of function or authority (mace, horse, cheetah, peacock), as well as dancers, acrobats, hunters, and musicians, is common to other frontispieces and to representations of princes in other media. Each element in these pictures may have its own history, and oddities may turn up in one feature or another of our codices, but nothing in them is either particularly original to or indicative of the book's subject matter.

This conclusion does not apply to the double frontispiece of the Paris 5847 manuscript. Each picture has its central figure—one completely frontal, the other turned slightly to the right—sitting in front of a polygonal curtain or pillow fitted within a decorative archway that has winged figures in the spandrels. The figure on folio 1' wears a military fur cap characteristic of princes, and it is possible, though by no means certain because of heavy retouching, that he holds a cup. But two elements in these pictures are anomalous. First, the attendants are not the usual courtiers, officials, and entertainers but a crowd of soldiers and civilians surrounding the central figure in a curious composition. Two men are seen from the back, and the rest are squeezed in sideways; all appear to be listening to someone or something. The composition is awkward and artificial. The central figure on folio 2 has a turban and a robe, and he gestures with his right hand as if speaking, rather than like a prince drinking or in majesty. Although he is in more princely attire and set frontally, the figure on folio 1' could also have been making a speech rather than holding a cup.

How can one explain this obvious imitation of princely compositions, but with modifications sufficient to alter its princely character? Ethinghausen, the only scholar to have discussed these pictures so far, interpreted them as an attempt to make a realistic contrast between the world of the Turkish prince to the right and that of the Arab official (for instance, a judge) to the left. That this distinction was central to the illustrations of the thirteenth-century codices will be made abundantly clear in the following pages, and there is no doubt that it can explain the iconographic differences between the two figures. But it does not really explain the crowds in front. It is tempting to suggest that we have here a representation of the word magamat—"a group of people standing in front of someone telling a story." Since the idea of making such an image would have been new, al-Hasiti needed an iconographic model, and he found it in the closest existing approximation—a prince surrounded by his retainers. The new element is that the crowd now represents the "assemblies" of the text. The central figures change because, as we shall see, the two worlds of the qadi and the emir—the judge and the prince—provide the main settings for many of the stories. Al-Hasiti is subtly introducing his protagonists at the very outset by using the frontispiece as an illustration, not simply as an embellishment or dedication.

Al-Hasiti may also have been influenced by another theme of thirteenth-century Arab painting, which seems to have disappeared after 1300 and so far has gone unstudied. This is the author's portrait. No doubt derived from classical sources, it is characteristic of scientific manuscripts, and in some instances confusion occurred between author and prince. Authors were usually dressed like city Arabs, so it could well be al-Hariri, as he describes himself in the preface to his book, whom we see on folio 2 facing his predecessor and model, al-Hamadhan. This suggestion, however, moves us beyond the level of secure hypothesis, and it may be safer simply to say that al-Hasiti's double frontispiece is a rare instance of an introduction to the book proper and that the other two frontispieces are typical dedicatory pages with no particular reference to the text.

First Maqamat

1A5–1B5

Paris 6094: fol. 6 (1A5)
Paris 5847: fol. 3' (1A6) (where initially there may have been second miniatures, the text is incomplete and traces of paint can be seen on the recto side)
London 1200: fols. 4 (1A7), 5 (1A8)
London 9718: fol. 7 (1A9) (the lower third of the miniature is missing)
London 22114: fols. 3' (1A10), 5 (1A11)
London 7293: fol. 7 (1A12)
Oxford: fols. 6' (1B1), 7r (1B2)
Vienna: fols. 5 (1B3), 6' (1B4)
Sana'a: fol. 11 (1B5)

The story is simple. The destitute al-Harith arrives in the capital of Yemen looking for help. He reaches a wide open place where he finds a crowd reduced to tears by the eloquence of a slender man dressed as a pilgrim to Mecca. The speaker concludes his harangue against self-indulgence, takes up his waterskin, puts his staff under his arm, and gets ready to depart. The crowd theretupon collects some money for him, and he hastily retreats to a cave, leaving behind all except al-Harith. Al-Harith waits outside the cave for a while, then goes in to find the pilgrim eating roast kid and bread and drinking date wine with a companion. Al-Harith upbraids him for hypocrisy; the eloquent preacher
explains his lack of moral scruple, and the companion identifies him as none other than Abu Zayd.

Two episodes in the story are illustrated: the sermon of Abu Zayd and the feast in the cave. When there was space for only one illustration, three painters (Paris 5847, London 7293, London 9718) chose the cave scene and only one (Paris 6094) the sermon.

In dealing with the speech scene, we can leave aside for a while the very different picture in London 1200 and concentrate on the four similarly arranged versions that show Abu Zayd standing centrally with arms extended to indicate speech making and groups arranged in clusters on either side. In Paris 6094 and London 22114 the figures are rather abstract; in Vienna and Oxford they are more individualized. In none of the miniatures is al-Harith clearly identifiable, though one might suspect he is the last figure on the right in Paris 6094 or the right-hand figure in the upper row in London 22114. Neither is very certain or very important, however, since the composition of these scenes does not emphasize the narrator of the story. It directs our attention toward Abu Zayd and the crowd.

As for the hero, only Paris 6094 gives him all the attributes indicated by the text. He carries a staff and a waterskin, and he wears a long black hooded cape that is meant to distinguish him from the crowd, even though it is not technically a pilgrim's garb. Two other illustrations have preserved elements of these properties—the cape in Vienna and the staff in London 22114 in which, in addition, the light gray of Abu Zayd's dress may have been meant to suggest the traditional white of a pilgrim's clothes. In this group of illustrations Abu Zayd also stands out by his position in the composition rather than because of his clothing, though the latter is specifically described in the text. London 22114 sets him on a rock pile, to give further emphasis to his actions and to show that he is speaking to the whole crowd and not just to the half he is looking at. The formal definition is more pronounced in the two later manuscripts than in the earlier ones, where something remains of the closer relations between textual descriptions and visual effects.

The involvement of the crowd is expressed in two ways. London 22114 and Oxford emphasize the textual mention of tears by showing one or more of the listeners wiping their faces with their sleeves or with towels. Paris 6094 and Vienna make the same point more abstractly through gestures, including the rather extraordinary pose of a man with hands raised and fingers splayed as if he were counting. The two later manuscripts, Oxford and Vienna, show seated figures or a mix of standing and seated ones; in the earlier ones the whole crowd is standing. Almost all the compositions are closed and directed toward a central focal point; the exceptions are Vienna and London 22114, where the last figure on the right looks over his shoulder and out of the picture.

The specific moment chosen for illustration varies: London 22114, London 9718, and London 1200 show al-Harith bursting into the cave; Paris 5847 and Oxford depict the argument between al-Harith and Abu Zayd. London 7293 and Vienna are peculiar in that one of the three main characters is missing. In London 7293 it is the companion who has vanished; Vienna shows the youthful companion and Abu Zayd arguing, but no al-Harith. The miniatures probably derived from some older and more complete version that has since disappeared. However, even though the characters chosen for illustration are not always present, the more important theme of the self-indulgent feast is always made perfectly clear.

The last point about the waqafa is minor but interesting one. Ten of the eleven manuscripts show Abu Zayd’s companion in this story as the youthful tilmith, “student,” of the text. The exception is Paris 5847. There he is a bearded man, like Abu Zayd, wearing strange headgear and appearing to be more a partner in crime than a student. This in fact illustrates the meaning of the text and the point of the story more appropriately than the more literal student does, for al-Harith used the word tilmith primarily because he needed a word to rhyme with nabidh, “wine.” The general character of the story clearly calls for an
accomplice rather than a pupil. In either case, however, the companion performs the role given him by the story in that his pointing finger identifies the rogue as Abu Zayd.

**Second Maqamah**

186–1C2

Paris 3929: fol. 2r (IB6)

Paris 5847: fols. 4r (IB7), 5r (IB8), 6r (IB9)

Leningrad: p. 13 (IB10)

London 1200: fol. 6r (IB11)

London 9718: fol. 9r (IB12) (badly damaged)

London 22114: fol. 6r (IC1)

Vienna: fol. 8r (IC2)

Al-Harith, seeking a learned and friendly companion, finds Abu Zayd exercising his wit and talents in the city of Halwan. He stays with him for a while, but our peripatetic rogue suddenly disappears into the desert. One day al-Harith is in a library in Basrah, when an old man “with a thick beard and a squallid aspect” enters, salutes all present, and sits in the back row of the assembly. Turning to someone in the crowd, the old man asks what he is reading, then proceeds to improve upon it. After a series of these performances he is recognized by al-Harith, but as al-Harith draws near to greet him, the rogue recites a verse about fortune and departs.

Five illustrations of this story. Paris 3929, Paris 5847, Leningrad, London 9718, and London 1200, are closely related and present no particular iconographic problems. All five illustrate the central episode in the library, and all except Paris 5847 and London 1200 show Abu Zayd arriving there. The two exceptions depict a slightly later moment, when the hero is actually reciting. In other respects, however, the differences between these five images are significant. Paris 3929 uses a minimum of elements to suggest a setting, but the books on the shelf are clearly the poetry books required by the story. The old man arrives dressed in tattered clothes and greets the people, but his salute is answered by only one man, since the others either are indifferent or are busy arguing about a passage in some book as is related later in the story. In any case it is a synthetic picture, mixing a precise depiction of a subject drawn from the story with extraneous features added to provide the appropriate setting.

Leningrad, London 9718, and Paris 5847, on the other hand, emphasize the setting. The badly damaged miniatures in the Leningrad and London manuscripts do not permit an exact interpretation of the group (presumably collecting around the arriving Abu Zayd), but it is apparent that the library—with a man climbing a ladder to get some books in the Leningrad manuscript and a carefully drawn dome in Lon-

don 9718—is the artists’ main concern. In Paris 5847 the figures arranged in a row reflect the text only in their surprise at the beggar’s talents, indicated by hands and to a lesser degree faces. Abu Zayd can be identified only by his position to the right of the composition. The crowd forms a single open mass, carefully composed with a final profile figure to the left and a superbly expressive and varied group of turbaned gentlemen—round-faced, thin-faced, in profile, in three-quarters, or frontal. Two of them exhibit the curious “protruding eye” that will later be so pronounced in Indian art. But the integration of background and figure that is so obvious in the Leningrad manuscript is not even attempted here. The two elements appear to belong to two separate traditions, an impression enhanced by peculiar spandrel-like corners in the upper part of the library, which make no architectural sense here but are characteristic of interiors in Islamic and Christian miniatures.

The illustration in London 1200 is like Paris 3929 in its figures and like Leningrad or Paris 5847 in its expanded library. The same scene is also illustrated in the Vienna codex, but there the library has disappeared and the story has been shifted outside to become a mere type, that of the single figure before a crowd. The relation of the image to the text has disappeared.

The third of the Paris 5847 miniatures (fol. 6r) shows Abu Zayd reciting a last poem as he prepares to depart, taking with him “the hearts” of the assembled crowd. Al-Harith is shown with the crowd watching him leave and, in spite of the barbarous retouches, something of the expression of sadness suggested by the text appears in the faces, even though the gestures and the composition of masses are standard. But the strangest and most remarkable feature of the illustration is that the principal personage is absent. An open composition has thus been created, whose purpose is to illustrate a feeling or an emotion by withholding the main figure.

The last two illustrations of the maqamah are puzzling. Folio 4r in Paris 5847 and folio 6 in London 22114 illustrate the beginning of the story, before the events in the library, as al-Harith praises his attachment to Abu Zayd and describes in particularly florid language how he profited from the rogue’s wit and “precious qualities.” Then one day, adds the narrator, Abu Zayd ran out of money and left for parts unknown. This passage is characteristic of the literary style of al-Hariri, but it hardly lends itself to illustration. Yet this is what has been attempted here. The artist of the London manuscript created a landscape setting in which two men are simply conversing, but al-Wasiti appears to have tried to be more literal by specifically depicting al-Harith’s finding Abu Zayd in Halwan. Al-Harith’s gesture is quite clear, and the illustration can otherwise be understood only as an enactment of that precise point in the text.
Third Maqamah

1C3–1D5
Paris 3929: fol. 5 (1C3)
Paris 6094: fol. 11 (1C4)
Paris 5847: fol. 7 (1C5), 8 (1C6)
Leningrad: pp. 17 (1C7), 19 (1C8), 20 (1C9)
London 1200: fols. 8 (1C10), 10 (1C11)
London 9718: fols. 11* (1C12), 13 (1D1)
London 22114: fol. 8* (1D2)
London 7293: fols. 13* (not reproduced; too sketchy to be recognizable), 14* (1D3), 16 (1D4)
Vienna: fol. 11 (1D5)

Al-Harith is with a learned company when a lame man in a worn garment appears; in beautiful poems he explains how he has become destitute. Al-Harith offers him a dinar if he will compose a poem in praise of the coin; he does and is given the dinar. But as the old man is about the leave, al-Harith decides to tease him by asking him to make up a poem vilifying the coin. As he does so, al-Harith recognizes his old companion and asks him why he is lame. Abu Zayd explains that it is useful for exciting pity.

The illustrators of this story have chosen to depict three moments. The first is the arrival of Abu Zayd: it is in Paris 6094 (illustrating a slightly later moment); Paris 5847, folio 7; Leningrad, page 17; London 1200, folio 8*; London 9718, folio 11*; and London 22114, folio 8*. All instances show the same two elements: the crowd in its setting, and the lame Abu Zayd. The text gives no indication of setting, and thus the assembled crowd is represented in various locales. Several show a landscape: the people in London 1200 are standing in a simple open row on a patch of grass; a similar but smaller and better executed group in London 22114 is also on grass, and the large crowd shown in the Leningrad manuscript is conversing around a pool.

Of far greater iconographic originality are the miniatures in Paris 6094 and London 9718. The former has transformed the whole scene into an interior by using a schematic architectural frame, and the latter has incongruously associated a huge artificial flower with a paved ground behind an architectural unit consisting of a wall, a dome, and a minaret (or perhaps simply a tower). Whether it is a mosque or the corner of a city wall, the scene is set in a sort of maydan near a sanctuary and possibly outside the city. In none of these images is al-Harith specifically identified.

The second element, a lame man, is clearly depicted only in London 22114. Everywhere else it is represented by approximately the same formula, Abu Zayd with one leg bent. In two instances (Paris 6094 and London 1200) his foot has even been enlarged to rather grue-some proportions. More emphasis is placed on the limp than on his ragged clothes, even though these are mentioned in the text as well. In several manuscripts, however, he is shown in clothes that distinguish him from the other participants. The clearest instance is in the Leningrad manuscript, where he wears a short robe, a long black cape, and a hood. A similar costume is found in Paris 6094 and Vienna, where poverty is represented by ragged clothing.

The second subject for illustration is the dinar episode. This appears in Paris 6094, twice in London 7293, in Leningrad, on page 19, and in Vienna. In Paris 6094 and Leningrad the point is emphasized by showing one figure with a coin in his hand. In the Vienna manuscript al-Harith’s gesture is ambiguous—it could simply represent a greeting. The landscape of the earlier miniature is repeated in the Leningrad manuscript, with the one significant change that all the figures now face toward the hero. It is only in the unfinished London 7293 that an attempt has been made through gestures to emphasize Abu Zayd as a speech maker.

The third subject illustrated occurs in Paris 5847, folio 8*, Leningrad, page 20, London 1200, folio 10, and Paris 3929. It illustrates the very end of the maqamah, when al-Harith asks Abu Zayd why he is lame and Abu Zayd leaves the scene of his swindle. There is no indication in the text that the story takes place away from the assembled crowd, but all manuscripts—except London 9718, which simply reverses its earlier pattern—have so interpreted it. The reason for this near unanimity is that such an interpretation emphasizes more clearly the special relationship between al-Harith and Abu Zayd mentioned in the text, but the illustration of two figures standing in a landscape or without any indicative ground, as in both Paris manuscripts, does not identify this particular story to the exclusion of others. The Leningrad manuscript solves the problem by once more pointing up the lameness of the hero, but al-Wasit uses the occasion for a more significant work. The massive shape of al-Harith with a finger held to his mouth and the innocently-looking Abu Zayd making his point before departing transcend the specific events of the third maqamah and become almost portraits of the two protagonists. But the ambiguity of this type of image, at the same time specific and general, was not clear to the artist of Paris 3929. He copied the type but added a title, “Picture of Abu Zayd Going Away Limping” to make its character specific.

Fourth Maqamah

1D6–1E6
Paris 3929: fol. 84* (1D6)
Paris 6094: fol. 13 (1D7)
Paris 5847: fols. 9* (1D8), 10 (1D9), 11* (1D10)
Leningrad: pp. 22 (1D11), 25 (1D12), 26 (1E1)
This maqamat begins with a wealthy al-Harith journeying with a caravan. When the travelers sligt in the middle of the night, al-Harith overhears a brilliant conversation on the nature of moral behavior. In the morning he discovers that the two men conversing were Abu Zayd and his son, both seemingly destitute. He gives them money and gifts and encourages the other members of his caravan to do the same. Laden with gifts, Abu Zayd announces that he will go to a nearby village to wash and will then return. He does not come back, however, and al-Harith soon finds on the saddle of his camel a witty note revealing the ruse.

The illustrations of this story are among the best in the entire Maqamat cycle. Two groups of miniatures, those of Paris 5847 and the Leningrad manuscript, are particularly outstanding, and their significance is heightened by the remarkable differences in how they treat the subject matter.

Al-Waṣīṣī has drawn three scenes, at first glance independent. The first is of the caravan aslep; it shows four distinguished but slightly caricatured figures, a servant, a groom, and three grinning camels. No individual is clearly identified, but on the opposite page, as though simultaneously, al-Harith moves toward Abu Zayd, who is talking to his son “before the camels had risen.” His surprise and pleasure at finding his friend are expressed through the typical gesture of the finger held to the mouth. Although composed as two separate illustrations, these two facing miniatures can be understood either as two separate moments or as a single event. I prefer the latter interpretation primarily because in the text the illustrations come toward the end of the exchange that al-Harith overheard between Abu Zayd and his son. The third picture in Paris 5847 is at the very end of the story. One of the most successful compositions of the book, it shows two men looking at the saddle of a camel while a third throws up his arms in amazement at the discovery of Abu Zayd’s trick. No clear sign identifies the figure as al-Harith. We thus have two iconographic units, each representing a particular moment in the story and each fitted into a different physical setting.

The obvious and immediate intent of the Leningrad artist in his three illustrations of this story is seen in his concern for the camp setting, which reappears with only minor variations in all three images. A series of small events around a campfire and people resting or taking off their boots add a homely element to the scene. Their specific textual reference is fairly easy to establish in the case of page 22, where in the extreme upper corner two figures squeezed into a camel’s howdah are talking while a third lies on some sort of wooden platform and listens. The artist has elaborated considerably upon the text, since Abu Zayd and his son are not supposed to be part of al-Harith’s caravan, and two of the other figures appear to be youths.

The second illustration, on page 25, is also difficult to interpret iconographically. The camp is in the lower part of the picture; at the upper left are three figures, two clearly in the saddle, the third climbing up. By analogy with the previous illustration they seem to be Abu Zayd and his son. To the right three older men are arguing. The illustration occurs in the text at the point where, having acquired money from the travelers, Abu Zayd asks al-Harith’s permission to go to the village for a bath, then sets out on foot (the text says astanna istīḥn al-muḥāna, “prancing like a horse in a training ground”). This most likely illustrates Abu Zayd and al-Harith talking. All the other activities are meant to be typical of any camp with no specific illustrative reference, aside from the prominent figure in front who is putting on his boots to indicate that it is morning, as the text says. The two figures on the upper left, who could be iconographically identified in the preceding picture, are unidentifiable here. Regardless of the validity of this interpretation, neither of these pictures has any precise reference to the text. Instead they are both commentaries, reflecting the setting of the story rather than the people involved in it. This is not true of the third picture, where the tents and animals (among them a horse has now appeared) function as background for the scene in which Abu Zayd’s note is discovered on the camel’s saddle, a discovery made, as in Paris 5847, by three people.

The Paris 5847 and Leningrad manuscripts have one final feature in common in their techniques for developing space. In both the main element is a patch of grass that spreads upward and creates a second ground above the first one. The technique is very obvious in Paris 5847 but remarkably refined in the Leningrad manuscript. There the grass is added so that it becomes fully integrated with the various elements—tents, animals, and people—it supports.

Compared with these six pictures, the other illustrations of the fourth maqamat are less imaginative. In London 1200 a two-tiered organization like that in Paris 5847 has been imitated, but without the supporting ground and with considerable simplification of all the features. Similarly, both miniatures from London 9718, in spite of their damaged condition, clearly show their derivation from manuscripts like Leningrad and Paris 5847, with only minor differences. In Paris 3929 there is only the barest possible representation of al-Harith seeing Abu Zayd and his son. The caption—“and there is a picture of the two of
them”—shows once again that the artist of the manuscript was interested only in minimal comment on the text. Paris 6094 contains two original features: symbols of night, alluded to in the text without being greatly significant to the argument, and the addition of a horse and of a second figure listening to the conversation with al-Harith. The artist of the manuscript seems to have used models that lacked examples of youthful figures, since the son of Abu Zayd, to the extreme left, is depicted in a totally different manner from the rest of the assembly.

The consistent simplifier who illustrated the Vienna manuscript has kept a mere vignette of Abu Zayd and his son and, aside perhaps from the moon, nothing is identifiable as a story element. The unfinished London 7293 has a double page (folios 17–18) that one can assume was planned as a large image of a caravan at rest, since there are faint traces of camels and figures. The miniature would probably have been related somehow to the illustrations of Paris 5847 or Leningrad. But on folio 17, London 7293 shows a very different illustration of the caravan of friends described at the very beginning of the story. It is interesting in its attempt to depict the essential characteristic of the caravan—its concord and amiability ("like one soul in agreement of desires")—through gestures that give the impression of a continuous babble among its members.

Fifth Muqamah

1E7–1F9

Paris 6094: fol. 16 (1E7)
Paris 5847: folios 12' (1E8), 13' (1E9), 14' (1E10)
Leningrad: pp. 27' (1E11), 29 (1E12), 30 (1F1), 31 (1F2)
Istanbul: fol. 14' (1F3)
London 1200: fol. 13 (1F4)
London 9718: folios 18' (1F5), 19 (1F6)
Oxford: fol. 82 (1E7)
Vienna: folos. 17' (1F8), 18' (1F9)

As al-Harith is spending an evening in amiable conversation with friends, there is a knock at the door. When they open it and ask the visitor who he is, he replies with a beautiful poem describing his destitution. When candles and a repeat are brought, al-Harith recognizes his friend Abu Zayd. After he has eaten al-Harith asks him to tell a story, and Abu Zayd relates the following tale. Recently, being hungry, he had knocked at a door and improvised some verse asking for food. He was amazed when the young boy who had answered the door replied in equally beautiful verse that there was none. Astonished by the boy's skill at versification, Abu Zayd asked who he was. The boy answered that he was named Zayd, and that his father had abandoned his mother before he was born. So Abu Zayd discovered his son but did not reveal himself because he was so poor. On hearing this the assembled men give him some money, and he spends the night entertaining them. In the morning al-Harith accompanies him to see the child, but then Abu Zayd tells him in a sarcastic poem that the whole story was an invention.

Two moments in the story have been illustrated, sometimes by more than one picture. The first is the arrival of Abu Zayd at the house where the friends are assembled. It is shown in Paris 6094, folio 12' of Paris 5847, the first two illustrations of the Leningrad manuscript, folio 18' of London 9718, London 1200, Oxford, and Vienna, folio 17'. But the representations do not all show exactly the same moment. In Istanbul, London 9718, and Leningrad, page 27, the subject is precisely the moment when the stranger knocks on the door. Paris 5847, Paris 6094, London 1200, Vienna, Oxford, and Leningrad, page 29, represent the feeding of Abu Zayd. All but one of the pictures stress two very minor features of the story, the boy (ghumam) who brings the food and the candle that is lit. Paris 5847 shows the boy, but the candle plays a minor role in the composition. In most of the early instances the servant is given a central position, particularly in Paris 6094 and Paris 5847, where he appears to the side under a doorway. The candlestick is always depicted in considerable detail, even though the story says only that one was brought after Abu Zayd's arrival.

Aside from these small details, the striking feature of this group is the treatment of the house setting in Paris 5847, Istanbul, Leningrad, and London 9718. It is at its simplest in Paris 5847. Next comes London 9718, folio 18', which shows a broad open area covered with a canopy, a large door with heavy knockers, and detailed stonework. In Leningrad and in London 9718 the house is provided with a high brick stove, openable roofs, vents, domes, balconies, and stairways—even though in Leningrad, page 29, they do not lead anywhere. Although closely related, the two pictures from the Leningrad manuscript are not identical. In both there is a consistency in the realistic depiction of detail, but obviously the artist was much more interested in conveying the idea of a certain type of house than in repeating the exact stage for the story.

In the crowd scenes the people are sometimes arranged in masses, as in Paris 6094, and sometimes in rows, as in the Leningrad manuscript. Abu Zayd is clearly visible and identifiable throughout, as is the servant, but al-Harith is less so.

The second moment that is illustrated is the arrival of Abu Zayd at his son's house. Only the Vienna manuscript shows an iconographically simple version of the story. In three other examples (two in the Leningrad manuscript and one in Paris 5847, fol. 13') the central figure is the child's mother; she is always shown spinning. All we know from the text is that she existed and that she told the child how his father had abandoned them. Why is she the center of the story? I have
failed so far to discover a satisfying explanation for her presence. Do we have here an illustration of a virtuous woman to fit the one sentence that describes her—"My mother Barrah told me (and she is, like her name, 'pious')?"

A very different interpretation of the scene occurs on folio 19 of London 9718. There Abu Zayd stands under a tree to the left and the boy is shown in front of his home. The extraordinary feature is the character of the house. The polylobed entrance porch is shown in profile. Above it a gabled architectural unit is incongruously shown in perspective. Behind it a large open area is surmounted by a decorative floral band and an extended pavement. Throughout, great emphasis is put on the precise depiction of stonework.

Comparing the Leningrad manuscript and Paris 5847 shows yet another difference. The Leningrad artist used a particularly developed type of house with constant variation in detail. Al-Wasiti preferred a more abstract system of curtains and frames, in which the three principals appear in front of a setting rather than integrated into an architectural construction. These differences in tone between the two manuscripts perhaps appear most clearly in the representation on folio 14° of Paris 5847, where al-Wasiti shows al-Harith's amazement at Abu Zayd's callousness as the latter departs after reciting his cynical poem. The gesture is the standard one we have seen in the preceding story, but the intent is to depict an emotion whose exact character is understandable only through the text: "Then he took leave of me and passed away and set coals of the ghida [wood for the eternal fire] in my breast."

Sixth Maqamah

1F10–1G7
Paris 3929: fol. 7° (1F10)
Paris 6094: fol. 19° (1F11)
Paris 5847: fol. 16° (1F12)
Leningrad: p. 35° (1G1)
Istanbul: fol. 18° (1G2)
London 1200: fol. 16° (1G3)
London 9718: fol. 24° (1G4)
London 22114: fols. 10° (1G5), 30° (1G6)
Vienna: fol. 20° (1G7)

The setting of this maqamah, particularly well known for its literary merit, is the divan al-nazar, or main auditing office, at Maragha. In front of the presiding official, al-Harith and a group of learned men bemoan the fate of the language in their times. An old man disagrees violently; when asked by the president of the divan who he can do better, he maintains that he can. Then a professional scribe assigns him the task of composing a letter with alternating dotted and undotted words.

Abu Zayd—for this is, of course, who the old man is—thinks for a while and then produces such a letter. After being complimented for his feat he writes a poem that reveals his origins. The walls hear of this, renders the unusual gift of filling his mouth with pearls, and offers him a job as public scriber. But Abu Zayd refuses the job and leaves town, after explaining to al-Harith that he prefers his own way of life.

Two of the illustrations are easily identified. Paris 3929 clearly shows Abu Zayd having his mouth filled with pearls by the prince. Its relation to the text is simple and direct, but two features of the illustration deserve comment. First the prince is represented quite simply; he sits cross-legged, wearing boots, an open collar, and a fur cap and is surrounded by a rug, a pillow, a curtain, and a rather miserably-looking attendant. This standard imagery has been adapted to the subject matter of the story by providing the prince with a box of pearls, but the adaptation is betrayed by the very awkward position of the hand giving out the pearls. Abu Zayd assumes a rather curious kneeling pose, and al-Harith is the personage to the left with a sword, making a gesture of presentation. The second illustration that is simply explained is that of London 22114. It is a set piece showing al-Harith parting from Abu Zayd; movement is indicated by the position of the figures.

The other seven illustrations are more interesting. Although set in different places in the text, they all refer to the main locale of the story, the divan al-nazar, an office of considerable prestige. This institution, created in the ninth century, performed audits for the central caliphate, whether in Baghdad or Cairo. The nazareh al-divan, or head auditor, questions Abu Zayd after the latter's outburst against the disarrangement of the assembled crowd. Three illustrations—in Istanbul, Leningrad, and London 9718—recognize the high position of the dignitary and introduce a new figure into our artistic vocabulary. In the Istanbul manuscript he is dressed in a long robe and probably wears a turban; he is sitting on a high dais with a curtain behind him from which hang two tassels; a servant swishes a fly whisk. In the Leningrad picture a superb composition has been elaborated with a strikingly robed personage, half lying on a high throne surrounded by a wealth of architectural detail and with a curtain behind him. The London 9718 figure has been damaged, but the elaborate throne and the lance he holds testify to his high position. Infinitely simplified, this model was used for London 1200, where the main figure has acquired a strange crownlike turban. In all three of these pictures neither Abu Zayd nor al-Harith nor any of the several other speakers of the story is readily identifiable.

In Paris 6094, Paris 5847, and Vienna the setting is a simplified interior, and the high official is not visible. In al-Wasiti's work, Abu Zayd at center left is dictating his letter to one of the assistants, while three others look on. In Paris 6094 we have either Abu Zayd reciting
his poem to the left in front of a crowd or a group of people bemoaning the state of affairs, as "on the outskirts of the assembly" an old man jumps up to protest (upper right). In a much simplified manner the Vienna picture illustrates the same point, and in London 22114 all the people look alike except for Abu Zayd. The official has lost his formal character, although the sense of an impressive setting still remains.

In the two Paris examples there are also some features that seem to demand a more complex explanation. In Paris 5847, at the extreme left under an archway, a youthful figure sits pointing to the scene, and outside two horses are emerging. Neither feature makes any sense in terms of the story, but both can be explained if we think of them as features left over from an official picture of a prince or minister, who would have occupied the left side of the composition and whose common symbols of office were a youthful servant and horses. Seen from that point of view the composition of Paris 6094 also makes better sense. The figure to the left is the 'azim al-dawān, who bemoans the state of literary knowledge along with the others as Abu Zayd is about to intervene. In the handsome Vienna miniature, whose composition is like that of Paris 6094, we have further confusion of an older misunderstanding, since all the figures are shown bemoaning their times.

Seventh Maqamah

2A1–2A10 Paris 5847: fols. 18° (2A1), 19 (2A2)
Leningrad: pp. 41 (2A3), 44 (2A4)
London 1200: fols. 19 (2A5), 20° (2A6)
London 9718: fols. 25 (2A7), 27 (2A8)
London 22114: fol. 12° (2A9)
Vienna: fol. 25 (2A10)

The story takes place at the end of the month of Ramadan. Al-Harith sees the celebrations and goes to the mosque to pray. When everyone has gathered there appears "an old man in a pair of cloaks and with his eyes closed [i.e., as though blind]"; he carries a saddlegate and is accompanied by a woman. From his bag he takes pieces of paper that the woman distributes to those among the congregation who appear to be wealthy; on the paper is a poem requesting money. Al-Harith receives his copy, then watches the woman trying to collect alms. She is unsuccessful until she reaches Al-Harith, who has recognized the author of the poem. At the end of the sermon Al-Harith joins Abu Zayd and his female companion, takes them to his house, and discovers that the blindness was a ruse. They all enjoy a good meal, then Abu Zayd asks Al-Harith to get him some perfume. Al-Harith leaves the room, and when he returns the two beggars have gone.

The illustrations of this maqamah do not present any major problems of interpretation. Two episodes are illustrated: the scene at the mosque and the meal at the end. The meal occurs in the second of the two miniatures in Leningrad, London 1200, and London 9718 and in the single London 22114 illustration. The Leningrad manuscript uses, with minor modifications, the house setting we have already encountered. London 9718 shows an original tripartite interior arrangement with a curtain in the center that has been tied back, and carefully drawn tiled roofs receding to the right and left. The two principals do not pose any problem, but the woman holds a staff whose purpose is unclear. London 22114 has forgotten the woman and introduced an inexplicable gesture of the hand to the portrait of Abu Zayd, probably because of some confusion between the two characters in the story. London 1200's representation is remarkable only for the peculiar position of the woman as she points to the main actors.

Of far greater interest are the scenes in the mosque. The Leningrad miniature emphasizes the mosque setting at the expense of the story. Paris 5847 has created a sort of summary frieze: it simultaneously shows the procession at the end of Ramadan, the sermon in the mosque, during which all other activities cease, the two beggars, and Al-Harith, though in spite of the text's indications to the contrary he is here an observer rather than a participant. Yet this summary admirably manages to capture a whole series of very specific textural indications: the gesture of the woman who cannot get any money, the importance of the sermon in preventing Al-Harith from getting to Abu Zayd as soon as he notices his presence, the large crowd of attentive worshipers, the festive occasion, and the way the begging couple enter the mosque, although the faked blindness is not shown. The central point of these miniatures, in contrast with the Leningrad manuscript, is to illustrate the human rather than the physical setting of the story. London 9718 is similar in composition to Paris 5847 but is particularly remarkable for the detailed representation of the mihrāb.

The illustration in London 1200 depicting the distribution of the poem probably reflects the type of model used for Paris 5847, since both the couple and Al-Harith are portrayed in approximately the same fashion. Some different but related model led to the schematic miniature in the Vienna codex, whose only original feature is the clarity of the act of prayer performed by the meager crowd.

Eighth Maqamah

2A11–2B10 Paris 3929: fol. 13° (2A11) (there probably was another miniature on the original of fol. 14)
Paris 6094: fol. 25 (2A12)
Paris 5847: fols. 21 (2B1), 22 (2B2)
Abu Zayd is always distinguishable by his clothing and by gestures indicating speech or anger, as the case may be; only in Vienna, folio 30r, do we find him bowing from the waist in an attitude of respect that is at odds with his proud character. In London 1200 his pointing finger again reveals the confusion in gestures typical of this manuscript.

The artist of the London manuscript did not understand the picture he was copying; the Vienna artist had not read the text properly. The most successful representation of Abu Zayd is certainly in Paris 5847, where his protruding eye and the slight stoop of his body admirably outline his dual role as faker and pleader.

Except in Paris 5847, the narrator al-Hariri plays only a minor part in the imagery. In the Vienna manuscript, on folio 30r, he is clearly shown to the right; in London 1200 he is presumably the principal character to the left. In the Paris manuscript, whether in the middle of the miniature or on the side, he occupies a central position in the composition. He is also an observer, in one illustration seated with a finger to his mouth and in the other standing with his arms folded, looking and listening. The artist used two poses in illustrating one story, thereby giving different forms to the same event.

Few of the illustrations have many attendant figures. In London 22114 they are squeezed into the doorway but play little part in the composition or in the development of the story. In London 9718 and Paris 5847’s first miniature is a scribe who properly belongs to the usual depiction of the judge discussed earlier but whose head, at least in the Paris manuscript, is turned sharply toward the arriving heroes, thereby focusing attention on the story’s principal event.

Only in the Leningrad miniatures does the crowd of attendants play a major part, for the artist has attempted to suggest variety by manipulating that standard feature. In the first miniature the attendants are, from right to left, a scribe or a plaintiff unconnected with the story; two old men, one looking at the judge and the other in profile looking away from the main event; two standing figures, one of whom has his arms around a pillar of the building; and a figure seated on a brick platform. In the second miniature the same number of participants are shown, but they are more fully involved in the action. From right to left they have been transformed into a figure, perhaps meant to be al-Hariri, pointing to the scene; two seated individuals seen from the back as they look at the judge; a standing figure of an observer in the back, looking at Abu Zayd and serving to give spatial depth to the image; and two final figures who hardly differ from the same two in the first miniature except that they are grinning. It is as though two tableaux vivants have followed each other, the first simply identifying the inhabitants of a judge’s court, the second showing the participants in action.
Ninth Maqamah

2B11–2C11
Paris 3929: fols. 15' (2B11), 20 (2B12) (two illustrations)
Paris 6094: fol. 27' (2C1)
Paris 5847: fol. 25 (2C2)
Leningrad: pp. 52 (2C3), 57 (2C4), 58 (2C5)
Istanbul: fol. 27' (2C6)
London 1200: fol. 24 (2C7)
London 9718: fols. 32 (2C8), 34 (2C9)
London 22114: fol. 15 (2C10)
Vienna: fol. 31' (2C11)

Al-Harith arrives in Alexandria, where he makes a point of meeting the qadi and getting into his good graces. One day an ill-looking old man is dragged into court by his young wife, who complains that he is a loafer; she and her son are destitute because he has no trade. The husband, Abu Zayd, presents his case, saying that learning is his trade, but he cannot sell it because no one wants it. The judge sees the truth of his side of the argument and awards him some money. Al-Harith then tells the judge he has some doubts about the veracity of the story, and the judge sends an attendant to follow the two litigants. The attendant returns and relates that, after he left, Abu Zayd was seen dancing and singing in celebration of his narrow escape from jail. The judge laughs so hard that his hat falls off. He tries to have Abu Zayd brought back but cannot find him.

Of the illustrations to this story, the second and third from Paris 3929 are the most original. They are literal illustrations of the servant’s account, and the damaged figure at the lower right is probably the qadi with his hat falling to the ground. The gestures in the two pictures are clear, the identities are obvious, and the illustrations are so closely related to the text that the same page shows the servant relating the story and also what he saw, one scene below the other. However, the servant is not dressed identically in both scenes. The same scene of a prancing Abu Zayd occurs in the vivid second miniature of London 9718, but its damaged state prevents a full understanding of its details.

The other illustrations depict the scene in the judge’s court. We may dismiss the single illustration in London 1200, which is damaged beyond usefulness, and the Vienna illustration, which is so confused that the woman appears as a youth. The other illustrations are on the whole quite clear, but one of them (fol. 25 in Paris 5847) stands out as the most effective summary of the story. Placed at the end of the story, when half the characters involved are no longer mentioned, it shows simultaneously the pleading woman, Abu Zayd thanking the judge by kissing his hand, the judge admonishing the woman, and Al-Harith as the observer.

The first two illustrations in the Leningrad manuscript show the woman and man arguing, while the third, at the very end of the story, is less clear but should probably be understood as Al-Harith telling the judge his suspicions. Three miniatures accomplish what a single one achieved in Paris 5847. In the other four illustrations of this story we merely have one or another of the main characters speaking or all of them coming before the judge. The only iconographic peculiarity is the addition in the Istanbul manuscript of an attendant, most likely a stock character in the setting of a judge’s court. The relation of the illustrations to the text and the setting (except for the elaborate arches of London 9718) presents no particular problem. One of the figures does raise a question: the woman in Paris 6094 has clothes, headgear, and pose completely alien to those found in all the other representations of women.

Tenth Maqamah

2C12–2E5
Paris 3929: fols. 21 (2C12), 21' (2D1), 22' (2D2), 23' (2D3)
Paris 6094: fol. 31 (2D4)
Paris 5847: fols. 26 (2D5), 27 (2D6)
Leningrad: pp. 59 (2D7), 60 (2D8), 63 (2D9)
Istanbul: fol. 31 (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)
London 1200: fol. 27 (2D10)
London 9718: fols. 35' (2D11), 37 (2D12)
London 22114: fols. 18 (2E1), 19' (2E2)
Vienna: fols. 35 (2E3), 36 (2E4), 37' (2E5)

While in Rabbah, Al-Harith sees an old man holding onto a handsome youth, whom he accuses of having slain his son. The boy denies his guilt, and the matter is brought before the wali. The governor is charmed by the boy and asks the old man, who is of course Abu Zayd, how he knows the youth is the culprit. Since there were no witnesses, Abu Zayd makes up a frightful oath for the boy to swear, which he refuses to do. As the governor grows more and more fond of the youth, he suggests that for one hundred dinars the old man forget the whole affair. Abu Zayd agrees, but, since the governor only has twenty dinars on him, Abu Zayd remains in the court to guard the youth overnight. Al-Harith approaches the two of them, recognizes his old friend, and finds out that the boy is really his son and that both plan to escape at dawn. They do so, leaving Al-Harith to deliver a satirical letter to the governor. Instead he tears it up.

Three moments of the story are depicted: the argument between the old man and the youth (Paris 3929, fol. 21, Leningrad, p. 59, London 9718, fol. 37, Vienna, fol. 36); the meeting in front of the governor (Paris 3929, fols. 21', 22', 23, Paris 6094, fol. 31, Paris 5847, fol. 40
The only original cycle of illustrations is in Paris 3929, where settings are gone and only the principals involved in the action are shown. Thus in the scene of Abu Zayd trying to force a frightful oath on the youth (fol. 22v) those two alone are visible, even though in the story the governor and al-Harith were present; on folio 23 only the prince and Abu Zayd are visible, even though all were present. The artist illustrated so literally that his pictures make no sense without their captions.

The subject of the illustrations is similar in all the manuscripts except one, but the treatment of each episode varies significantly. Of the four pictures illustrating the argument, only one has captured its feeling: in the Leningrad manuscript an elderly person is grasping with the sleeve of a youth. Crowds, here arranged in two symmetrical masses of figures smaller than the principals, are rather rare in this manuscript, and a curious feature is the onlooker in the front row of each mass who turns away from the main scene. The two trees are not required by the text, but they are a convenient frame for the main scene and add an asymmetrical rhythm to the symmetrically composed figures. The Leningrad miniature is fairly close to that in Leningrad but has less striking crowds. The Vienna miniature shows all the elements of the story, but its figures are frozen, capturing neither the movement nor the impact of the story.

The scene in front of the governor is more interesting. The manuscripts use several different settings: a large open room with the throne of the governor in the center on a platform in the Leningrad manuscript; a simple architectural frame over a flat throne in Paris 6094; an odd portable arrangement in Paris 5847, curiously imitated in Paris 3929; a striking throne on steps—displaying rare interest in perspective—in London 9718; and a balcony-like affair in London 22114. The official himself is consistently rendered in the three Paris manuscripts and in London 22114 (probably also in the damaged miniature of London 9718): a military man with a fur cap, boots, and at least in the Paris examples imitated in the Vienna picture (fol. 36), a characteristic pose of one leg bent over the throne. Al-Wasiti’s work has introduced a satirical note by changing the fur cap into a high, somewhat foppish turban, probably used as a model by the artist of the Vienna book. The Leningrad manuscript, on the other hand, has made him into a civilian official and of his military attributes retains only the pose and the lance.

The governor is accompanied by an attendant, who in the Leningrad manuscript carries a huge sword to hold back the crowds. In Paris 6094 he is a very traditional short-skirted figure with a fly whisk, represented in a style so different from the other characters in the manuscript that a special origin must be sought for him. The other manuscripts appear to have not known quite what to do with the attendant. In Paris 3929 he stands aimlessly at the back in one of the throne scenes; in Paris 5847 he peeks out from behind the column supporting the throne; and in London 22114 one attendant is strangely wrapped around a column, while another behind the prince simply holds a flower. It is perhaps with this strangely misunderstood character that we must connect the figure in the Vienna manuscript, folio 36, who looks back from the main scene and holds onto a staff. Nothing in the text explains him, nor could he be al-Harith, the only extra person needed in the scene.

The representations of Abu Zayd, al-Harith, and the youth add nothing to what we already know about them, except in one instance. The wonderful depiction of coquetry, deceit, and lechery attempted by al-Wasiti has already been pointed out by Ettinghausen in his book on Arab painting and is another instance of this painter’s interest in going beyond the simple outline of an event. In Paris 6094 an attempt was also made to represent, through poses and gestures, the textual indication of the speed with which the two main characters raced to the governor.

The final scene, shown in four manuscripts, requires few comments. In the story its setting is a courtyard at night, but only the Leningrad illustration shows that setting. London 22114 curiously sets the scene inside a building. The meaning of one detail of the Leningrad miniature escapes me completely—Abu Zayd’s son is shown with a long sword, a peculiarity explained by nothing in the text.

Eleventh Maqamah

2E6–2F6 Paris 3929: fols. 26 (2E6), 26 (2E7), 30 (2E8), 30 (2E9)
Paris 6094: fol. 33 (2E10)
Paris 5847: fol. 29 (2E11)
Leningrad: f. 65 (2E12)
Istanbul: fol. 34 (2F1)
London 1200: fols. 29 (2F2), 31 (2F3)
London 9718: fol. 39 (2F4)
London 22114: fol. 21 (2F5)
Oxford: fol. 23 (2F6)

Al-Harith, saddened by some unexplained misfortune, goes to a cemetery to find peace in meditation. There he witnesses an interment, after which an old man appears standing high on a hill, leaning on a staff, his face hidden by a cloak. He makes a long and moving speech on fickleness in the face of death. At the end he begs for money and comes merrily down from his hillock. Al-Harith stops him by hold-
ing the hem of his cloak and upbraids him for his hypocrisy, but the old man, Abu Zayd, answers simply that all is fair in the world, and the two part angrily.

Only two manuscripts, Paris 3929 and London 1200, have more than one illustration (London 729 is thought to have had several, but none has survived). The first of the Paris miniatures illustrates the setting, al-Harith walking amid the tombs. It is a very simple image that makes its point clearly in ideographic fashion. The last two miniatures of Paris 3929 deal with the end of the story. In the first we see Abu Zayd descending from his hillock, with his distinguishing features of cloak and staff. The meaning is obvious once the story is known, but not without the text. The last picture is even more meaningless without explanation, since it shows two men, one of whom is apparently trying to escape from the other. It is only thanks to the title that we clearly see that it is “al-Harith pulling [Abu Zayd] by his cloak.” In London 1200 the illustration of the two men taking leave of each other is frozen into a standard image for greeting.

The major effort of all the illustrators was given to the episode at the cemetery. Although the components are fairly similar in all the pictures (tombs, mourners, etc.), the illustrations do not easily fall into clearly established categories because each treats the elements quite differently. Paris 6094, London 1200, and London 22114 do not show a body being buried; Paris 3929 does not show tombs other than the specific grave into which the body is being lowered; Paris 6094, Oxford, and London 22114 have no female mourners; Leningrad and Paris 5847 do not show Abu Zayd or al-Harith; Oxford and London 22114 place the episode at opposite times of day, one clearly at night, the other equally obviously in sunlight; only Istanbul, Leningrad, and Paris 5847 show large mausoleums amid simple tombs. In the first two manuscripts the constructions are clearly of brick; in the latter they could equally well be stone.

These differences and relationships between the manuscripts have various explanations. Rice’s is that they represent a series of deviations from older models and that their character and peculiarities derive from their relation to other models now lost. Thus the compositional awkwardness of Paris 3929 could be explained as resulting from two separate iconographic units put together into one picture. There is, I think, little doubt that such an explanation is correct for the Oxford miniature, since it combines two features characteristic of composite images: obvious and unnecessary errors in the interpretation of the text (the curious ax held by Abu Zayd and the mysterious youth pointing to the left) and conflation of separate elements of the story (the figure of al-Harith to the left, as Rice mentioned, is as he was at the beginning of the story and as he is shown in the earlier illustration of Paris 3929).

The difficulty of applying this explanation systematically to all the miniatures lies in its implication that all the illustrations began as literal commentaries on the text, then little by little became confused and acquired extraneous elements. In the case of the eleventh maqamh, an unbelievably large number of earlier and now lost models of various types would be needed to suit this explanation, since according to Rice almost every illustration had a different model or models.

Hence I should like to look at these images in a different way. If we except the iconographically derivative miniature in the Oxford manuscript, the other seven illustrations range along a spectrum formed by two clear motives issuing from the text itself: the speech of Abu Zayd and the setting in the cemetery. At one end of the spectrum is Paris 6094, which directs full attention to the speech by reducing the cemetery to a single tomb in the center of the composition and using it to separate a characteristically standing, massed crowd with emphasis on gesture of hands from a presumably orating Abu Zayd and a single person by the tombstone. At the other end stand the Leningrad and Paris 5847 images, which do not show Abu Zayd and al-Harith but depict the burial scene in considerable detail. The two illustrations also have a great deal in common in that they emphasize mausoleums, mourners of both sexes, and the precise way in which the body is laid to rest, including such details as a basket for earth, a shovel, and a servant with a lamp.

But the two illustrations also differ, both in composition and the types of figures. The Leningrad manuscript emphasizes two planes of monuments and people, while al-Wasiti has created a rather stunted single mass of men, trees, and monuments. One manuscript shows the corpse being laid in a tomb that is simpler than the vault depicted in the other. Al-Wasiti has emphasized male mourners arranged in one group of two at the left and a crowd in two rows in the center. A figure in profile frames this group from the left, and one of the crowd of mourners is transformed into a helper for the burial. The painter was apparently trying to evolve this standard depiction of a group of men into the main action of his subject. The Leningrad artist, on the other hand, has used female mourners. There are also women in the Paris picture, but they merely appear above and to the left of the central image, in five different poses ranging from sorrowful rest to the rending of clothes and throwing of ashes—motions and emotions that contrast with the more violent and varied gestures and poses of the Leningrad picture.

In the latter the rhythm of the miniature grows out of the ascending and descending movement of female mourners in the upper half of the picture (ending in a stunning picture of a kneeling woman viewed from the front), and from the wavy line of four figures below. The Leningrad artist achieves the more dramatic effect, but al-Wasiti’s more studied, slower, and more refined composition, individual gestures, and expressions better reflect the central point of Abu Zayd’s brilliant peroration.
on death. Once again an image in Paris 5847 transcends the episodic subject matter and illustrates the deeper reason for the success of that manuscript.

The other manuscripts fall between these extremes in interpretation. Istanbul preserved the extensive setting and the interment but has made it literarily correct by having Abu Zayd, to the left, preaching to the crowd on the right. The picture is badly damaged, but one can see that the speaker and the audience have been fitted into the burial scene without being made to participate in it. A picture of this same type inspired the artistically superior depiction in London 9718 and the miniature of London 1200, but it is much simplified there—the mourners are lost without a corpse. London 22114 is very close to Paris 6994 in its interpretation of the story except for the clearly weeping figure. The weeping is called for in the text not as a reaction to the speech of Abu Zayd, but rather as mourning for the departed.

In Paris 3929, the exact place of the illustration in the story is clear from the position of the miniature in the text: the burial is over, and Abu Zayd has just appeared. Yet all the activities involved in a burial are shown here—one could indeed, as Rice did, consider the picture a conflation of a burial scene with a speech scene, but I hesitate to do so for two reasons. First, the compositional cleavage of the picture into halves is suggested in the text, which describes the hillock as somewhat apart from the main burial scene; second, its original unity is suggested by the group of women to the right, who belong to the other half of the picture.

The derivative character of the illustration is demonstrated by the inclusion, so rare in this manuscript, of unnecessary figures such as the seated youth on the left side of the composition and the small figure to the extreme right. But it is difficult to imagine what the original model was like. If it had been something like the Leningrad and Paris 5847 illustrations, the superfluous figures would have been part of an original group of mourners, and the speaker and the pointing figure, perhaps even the clearly identifiable al-Harith at the extreme left, would have been added to fit a general model into the precise context. Or the model could have been like the Istanbul pictures, combining interment and speech in one composition but dividing it into two parts to correspond to different moments of the story and eliminating the nonessential background. It could have been borrowed from some completely different story involving a burial. This last explanation best justifies the extraneous youth and the small figure to the left. Whatever the correct explanation, however, there is no doubt that this simple miniature apparently presupposes a more complex model of the type provided by the Paris 5847, Leningrad, and Istanbul manuscripts and can only be understood through the influence of more complex renditions. The point has already been made by Rice, although on somewhat different grounds.

The illustrations for this maqamah are quite different from the ones found in the first ten stories. In all the manuscripts the main scene places its emphasis on the one feature—the tomb—that separates this particular maqamah from the rest; but only one artist has tried to interpret the more profound spirit of the text.

Twelfth Maqamah

2F7–2G10

Paris 3929: fol. 34' (2F7)  
Paris 5847: fols. 30' (2F8), 31 (2P9), 33 (2F10)  
Leningrad: pp. 72 (2F11), 76 (2F12)  
Istanbul: fols. 36', 39 (not reproduced; both too badly damaged for study)

London 1200: fols. 32 (2G1), 34 (2G2)  
London 9718: fols. 43 (2G3), 45 (2G4)  
London 22114: fols. 24 (2G5), 25 (2G6), 26 (2G7)  
Oxford: fols. 25 (2G8), 26 (2G9)  
Vienna: fol. 42' (2G10)

Having enjoyed the pleasures of Damascus, al-Harith and a group of companions want to return to Iraq, but they can find no one to guide them through the dangers of the desert. They are assembled on the outskirts of the town to discuss the problem when a youth in the garb of a holy man offers to lead them and, as a safeguard against all dangers, recites an incantation over a strange talisman. The travelers learn it and cast lots to see whose mount will carry the holy man. They cross the desert safely to Anah on the Euphrates, where the guide receives his money and disappears. Al-Harith finds him in a tavern: "amid casks and wine vats and about him were cup-bearers of surpassing beauty, and lights that glittered, and myrtle and jasmine, and pipe and lute. And at one time he bade them broach the wine casks, and at another he called the lutes to give utterance; and now he inhaled the perfumes and now he courted the gazelles." Abu Zayd answers al-Harith's reproaches with one of his usual poems.

The illustrations for this story present no major problems. Two moments are depicted: the caravan about to start on its journey, and the scene at the tavern. For the first subject all but three manuscripts have essentially the same structure: a single man standing on one side in beggar's garb (in London 1200 and Oxford; damaged almost beyond recognition in Paris 5847), and on the other side a group of riders on horseback (in London 1200 and Oxford; with both camels and horses in Paris 5847). Al-Wasiti spreads his composition over two pages, but the second is too badly damaged to be studied; he puts camels in half his picture and horses in the other half. His emphasis is on the travelers' skepticism when the holy man describes his talisman, as two groups of
faces are turned doubtfully toward each other. An added humorous element is the young boy holding onto an older man on camelsback, perhaps a way of identifying the unfortunate merchant who had to carry the guide on his mount. The Oxford manuscript obviously used part of a similar composition, since the single person to the right seems to be conversing with a missing figure.

More original miniatures occur, first of all, in the Leningrad manuscript, which illustrates the beginning of the story where the members of the caravan assemble to discuss their predicament. A mendicant is standing among them, presumably the figure in the middle toward the right, but the painter’s interest was obviously in the setting of tents and camels; he used almost the same series of tents in a landscape as in earlier miniatures, with the curious addition of a young camel nursing. In other words, he had at his disposal a single picture or type whose details he then adapted to match the requirements of the story.

Another original touch can be seen in London 22114, which illustrates the first part of the story with two miniatures. The first shows the travelers with Abu Zayd in a simple set piece not related in detail to the story. But in the second, showing the caravan on the march, Abu Zayd is seen walking amid the riders as if he had been artificially introduced into a preexisting type of camel scene. The small detail of a camel eating grass while on the march reinforces this hypothesis.

The third unusual interpretation of the scene occurs in London 9718. Even though almost half of the picture has been lost, a tripartite architectural composition can still be distinguished, with a large gate in the center framed by lower crenelated borders. Crowds of people on either side turn their attention to a single figure with a staff in an open gateway. The latter must be Abu Zayd, and his appearance in this unusual setting may be explained by the fact, unnoted by other artists, that the meeting took place at the Layrun Gate in Damascus.

The scene in the tavern is one of the most celebrated in the Maqamat series and has been studied in part by Rice. The text provides the elements in the setting: casks and wine vats, beautiful cupbearers, lights, myrtle, jasmine, flute, flute, perfumes, and lovers. Not one of the renditions is a perfect illustration of all the elements of the scene, but Paris 3929 comes close, though no women or young boys are shown and a drummer has been added. In the later manuscripts (Oxford and Vienna) and in London 1200, backgrounds and many figures have been eliminated; but in a rare instance of precision, the Vienna codex has preserved the amorous motif by showing Abu Zayd caressing a youthful figure by his side. Although Paris 3929 shows most of the features indicated by the text, they are visually disorganized.

Leningrad, Paris 5847, and to a lesser degree London 9718, on the other hand, have unified images around the theme of the tavern and have exploited the theme beyond the requirements of the text. Other drinkers, wine being filtered, and grapes being pressed illustrate the general theme of drinking in a tavern rather than the concrete instance of Abu Zayd being discovered by al-Harith. The joyful activities of the hero are symbolized simply, by showing musicians and dancers. In the Paris 5847 miniature Abu Zayd sits on a throne in front of a curtain, holding a cup and carrying a napkin over his arm. The Leningrad picture introduces two formal attendants framing the central figure.

The treatment of the setting varies from one manuscript to another. The Leningrad miniature emphasizes the depth of its construction and moves its figures in circular compositions, while al-Wasiti preferred a simple superimposition of two separate frizelike developments, united only by the action of two servants passing wine from one level to the other. This more traditional spatial arrangement is carried through in the clear separation of the main iconographic unit and the enlarged setting, through two spandrels in the lower part of the miniature.

**Thirteenth Maqamat**

3A1–3B6

| Paris 3929: fols. 37 (3A1), 38 (3A2), 61 (3A3) |
| Paris 6094: fol. 40 (3A4) |
| Paris 5847: fol. 35 (3A5) |
| Leningrad: pp. 79 (3A6), 82 (3A7) |
| Istanbul: fol. 41 (3A8) |
| London 1200: fols. 35 (3A9), 37 (3A10) |
| London 9718: fol. 49 (3A11) |
| London 7293: fols. 70 (3A12), 73 (3B1), 73°–74 (not reproducible; damaged beyond recognition), 74 (3B2) |
| Oxford: fols. 28 (3B3), 29 (3B4) |
| Vienna: fols. 44 (3B5), 46 (3B6) |

Al-Harith is discoursing with learned men on the bank of a river when suddenly an old woman appears, followed by thin, sickly children, and makes a brilliant speech full of metaphors. She then recites a witty poem, which inspires all the members of the group to give her money. As she leaves, al-Harith follows her. In the crowded street she dumps the children borrowed for the occasion and disappears into a ruined mosque. Watching through a keyhole, al-Harith sees her undress and turn into Abu Zayd. Hoping to catch him, he hears Abu Zayd sing a song justifying his ruse and revealing he knows perfectly well that al-Harith has followed him. The narrator does not enter but instead returns to his companions and tells them what has happened.

Most of the illustrations deal with one of the two main events in the story: the meeting by the bank of the river and al-Harith’s discovery of Abu Zayd. The exceptions are in Paris 3929, where the first two illustrations deal with the early part of the story and show a woman
arriving with a child and a woman talking, and London 7293, which has preserved three sketches (out of five planned), one of which shows the disguised Abu Zayd leaving with the children. It is quite literal and suggests an attempt to create new imagery without the help of earlier models.

Among the illustrations for the first part of the story, two manuscripts depict a body of water: Istanbul shows a pool with fish, and London 1200 surprisingly adds a little boat with a small figure in it. The other manuscripts—except Paris 3929 and Oxford—emphasize the outdoor setting by including trees. Male figures are shown throughout in the manner characteristic of each manuscript: two large groups talking to each other in Leningrad, one smaller and more closely viewed group in Paris 5847, a composed mass in Paris 6094, a few figures of varying ages in other manuscripts. Only Paris 3929 has added a military-looking participant in a fur cap. Nowhere is al-Harith identifiable, which is proper enough since he is supposed to be part of a crowd.

The depiction of the woman is more uniform. In Paris 6094, Paris 5847, Leningrad, and Istanbul, and, probably under their influence, in London 1200, we see a large, bent figure covered with a veil of varying thickness and a huge cloak. The figure is most successful in the Leningrad example. Elsewhere we find a simple standing figure with a veil and cloak, and it is only in Paris 3929 that the old woman has become a rather petulant veiled figure in boots and a short robe. The probable reason for these features is that the artist was trying to show that it was really Abu Zayd in disguise.

The children clearly posed problems for all the artists. In Paris 3929 they look like adults; in the Oxford manuscript they are also adult, but undersized; in the Vienna manuscript they are oddly dressed in pointed caps; in Paris 5847 and in London 1200 and 7293 they are mere shadows in long robes. It is only in Paris 6094 and Leningrad that the short clothes and, especially in the latter, the variety of garments and clothing suggest something of the ragamuffins of the text. All the oddities can probably be attributed to the scarcity of models for representing children.

Little need be said about the illustrations for the scene in the mosque. All the manuscripts but one illustrate Abu Zayd quite literally throwing himself on the ground, as the text implies by the use of a very rare verb, *aslan*; the most amazing version is in Paris 3929, where our hero finds himself suspended in midair. All but two of the manuscripts show al-Harith peeping through the door. The exceptions are the unfinished picture of London 7293 with al-Harith in the mosque, and Vienna with its two figures sitting in a room. The text requires that the mosque have a door, and as a result all the architectural compositions are out of balance. The mosque is identified by lamps except in the Oxford manuscript, which also adds a bulbous cupola, marble columns,

and a candle. Only the Leningrad manuscript and London 9718 have a more expanded architecture. The former shows a two-aisled riwaq and a mihrab; this permits fitting Abu Zayd between columns and thereby emphasizes the artist's interest in the depiction of depth. London 9718 has a gateway shown in profile and surrounded by a cupola; beyond it a single large arch on a column has a sort of polylobed shape, but the rest of the picture is no longer visible.

Fourteenth Muqarnah

387–3C6

| Paris 5847: fols. 37* (3B7), 38 (3B8) |
| Leningrad: pp. 85 (3B9), 88 (3B10) |
| Istanbul: fol. 44 (3B11) |
| London 1200: fol. 38 (3B12) |
| London 9718: fol. 50* (3C1) |
| London 22114: fols. 30* (3C2), 32 (3C3) |
| London 7293: fol. 76 (3C4) |
| Oxford: fol. 30* (3C5) |
| Vienna: fol. 48 (3C6) |

While returning from Mekkah, al-Harith is under a tent with other people when an old man appears, followed by an agile youth. The two of them list their needs, and the assembled crowd provides them with camels and provisions. They depart after Abu Zayd has made an impassioned speech about his past.

The main features of this group of illustrations are quite clear: a crowd in a tent either greets or converses with an older man and a youth. If it is a greeting scene, Abu Zayd and his son are outside; if it illustrates the story of the poems the two men recite, they are usually inside. The clearest distinction between the two types of scene occurs in London 22114, where both aspects of the story are illustrated separately. Yet the two images were so closely related that they could be confused. This is the case with the Oxford miniature, which shows Abu Zayd in the middle of his poem but also places the two heroes outside. It is more spectacular in the double-page spread of Paris 5847, which illustrates the very end of the story yet shows the arrival, rather than the departure, of two people. The point is made clear if we compare this double image with the second miniature in the Leningrad manuscript, where the son is conspicuously moving out during his father's last speech.

The minimal background of this miniature is a rarity in the manuscript: no particular new feature is brought out in the figures, which singly or in groups follow patterns established earlier. Variants in setting are provided by London 1200 and 9718, where the scene takes place in a house. London 1200 simply shows a frame characteristic of
interiors, but London 9718 has a rather extraordinary composition of arches with curtains, walls with carefully drawn stones, and an unintelligible domelike structure, creating an ensemble that is as odd as it is incompatible with the text.

Two manuscripts, Istanbul and Leningrad (p. 85), develop the image on two separate planes. Leningrad uses the planes in typical fashion for another variant of its tents and camels series and reduces the main subject matter to a minor element. The Istanbul manuscript creates a foreground of a bird and an animal united to the main area above by side patches of green.

Fifteenth Maqamah

3C7-3E5

Paris 3929 (the illustrations here are very mixed up and are given in the order of their original appearance in the text): fols. 90 (3C7), 83* (3C8), 185 (3C9)
Paris 5847: fols. 40 (3C10), 41 (3C11)
Leningrad: pp. 90 (3C12), 91 (3D1), 93 (3D2), 94 (3D3), 95 (3D4)
Istanbul: fols. 47 (3D5), 48* (3D6)
London 1208: fols. 40 (3D7), 41* (3D8), 43 (3D9)
London 9718: fols. 53 (3D10), 55 (3D11)
London 22114: fols. 35 (3D12), 36 (3E1)
London 7293: fols. 80 (3E2), 83* (83* and 85 are too badly damaged to merit illustration), 87 (3E3)
Oxford: fol. 32* (3E4)
Vienna: fol. 50* (3E5)

During a sleepless night al-Harith hears a knock at the door. A traveler is seeking shelter for the night, and when al-Harith lets him in he finds standing before him an exhausted Abu Zayd. Al-Harith offers him food, but Abu Zayd refuses on account of the adventure that has befallen him that morning. Hungry, he was begging in the market in front of a store selling superb dates and fresh milk. No one gave him anything, and he was about to leave when he noticed a shaykh lamenting the passing of science and learning because no one could solve an absurd legal riddle for him. Abu Zayd agreed to do so in exchange for a dirhem. The shaykh brought him to his small house, where Abu Zayd asked for fresh milk and dates. After the shaykh had brought him food he solved the riddle, but the shaykh then rudely kicked him out, insisting that he had eaten too much to stay long among the living. Abu Zayd had wandered all night pursued by dogs until he came upon his old friend.

This long but rather pointless story has been profusely illustrated, with a total of twenty-five pictures in various places in the text. Precise episodic identifications of settings are rare, however, and regardless of their actual position in the text almost all the illustrations deal with one or another of the following themes: Abu Zayd arriving at night in al-Harith’s house; al-Harith offering him food, which he refuses; Abu Zayd and the shaykh in the market; Abu Zayd eating at the shaykh’s house; the shaykh bringing ink and paper to Abu Zayd; Abu Zayd being kicked out by the shaykh; the hero and narrator together; and Abu Zayd leaving al-Harith. The only completely anomalous illustration is that on folio 185 of Paris 3929, which illustrates the very peculiar small incident of Abu Zayd leaving the shaykh’s house in a storm and being pursued by dogs.

The events of the story involve no more than two characters at any one time: Abu Zayd with al-Harith or Abu Zayd with the unknown shaykh. Abu Zayd and al-Harith are not shown in any new way except that in London 7293 al-Harith, bored and alone in the first miniature (fol. 80) and bidding adieu to his friend on folio 87, is represented in a sort of semiprincely manner with a curtain behind him. In Paris 3929, folio 90, the image of the shaykh deserves some comment; he is shown dressed in boots and a handsome knee-length robe, as though he belonged to the military aristocracy.

In two instances additional characters intrude. In London 1208, folio 40*, a servant is bringing food; his presence is odd because the text very precisely makes the point that the shaykh himself brought the food. A second extraneous figure holding a knife or a fly whisk appears in the Istanbul manuscript, on page 91 of Leningrad, and in the Oxford manuscript. This figure can possibly be explained by considering the nonhuman elements in the story—milk and dates—which play an important role as a source for puns and metaphors.

Nearly all the illustrations can be neatly divided into those that emphasize the specific character of the food and those that do not. The two Paris manuscripts, Leningrad and Istanbul, and probably the badly damaged folio 83* of London 7293 belong to the first group: the rest transform milk and dates into a more abstract representation of food in general. London 22114, folio 36, deals with an earlier moment in the story, when Abu Zayd refuses the food offered by al-Harith; this explains why its representation of food is so different from that in other manuscripts. In Leningrad, page 91, and Istanbul, folio 48*, the food appears when it is first mentioned in the text—that is, at a market—and the illustration shows a hungry Abu Zayd watching it (Leningrad) or arguing with the shaykh in front of it (Istanbul). In both instances the merchant selling the milk and dates is added, and in both he is showing holding something that could be either a frond of the palm from which the dates were picked or a fly whisk. There is no doubt that this kind of image influenced the Oxford illustration, but there the vendor’s whisk is transformed into a knife, and the precise identity of the food is obscured. Even more remarkable is that the vendor is given gestures that suggest
he is participating in the conversation, for this later artist had not read the text and therefore could not understand why the picture included an extraneous figure.

The most striking feature of this group of miniatures is their treatment of the setting in which the story takes place. Paris 3929 has no setting, and two pictures in London 1200 (folios 40 and 43) have only an arched frame. London 22114 has a somewhat more elaborate doorway for one of its miniatures (fol. 35), but it was inspired by the iconographic need for a door and does not represent an attempt to enlarge the composition. On folios 90 and 94 of the Leningrad manuscript and on folio 47 of Istanbul we encounter the characteristic house with stairways and open or openable domes, already seen, and both manuscripts share such details as a big jar under the stairs. Differences between them are in details of construction, some of which were inspired by the story. Folio 93 of the Leningrad manuscript illustrates a simplified version of the same house structure. In London 7293 interest in complex structures is reinterpreted in terms more appropriate to this particular artist: the complex system of vaults has been maintained and even enlarged, but without any real interior setting. In addition to its characteristic polylobed arches, London 9718 again introduces a striking cupola. The later miniaturists did not understand the original purpose of such large architectural compositions and kept only those features that did not interfere with the story. At its extreme limit this is the solution of the Vienna artist, who kept the door, a curtain, and a lamp in al-Harith’s hand but let everything else go.

The Leningrad and Istanbul illustrators introduced another so far unknown type: the market booth of a vendor. In the former manuscript a simple arch is created within a brick wall, with scales in the center and both food and the merchant on a platform. In the Istanbul manuscript the very same architecture is seen in elevation, creating a unique vision of an architectural ensemble that helps us imagine the street where the two men meet. It is such a model that we must assume was behind the shop in the Oxford version.

Finally we have the architectural setting of Paris 5847. At first glance it seems to be merely a primitive, simplified box, indicating that the story is taking place indoors. Since it differs from architectural settings elsewhere in the same manuscript, however, we must take another look. When the text describes the house of the shaykh to which Abu Zayd was brought, it says, “and he brought me into a house narrower than the ark of Moses, more fragile than a spider’s web.” The size and character of the house illustrate the description literally, and it is curious that this version was not imitated by any other illustrator. The reason must be that, though the illustrators may have read the text, the typology of houses from which they could draw precluded their un-

derstanding this unique attempt to invent a house that would reflect the text’s specifications.

One last iconographic group is found in only two manuscripts, Leningrad, page 93, and London 1200, folio 44. The subject is Abu Zayd reading the legal puzzle given him by the shaykh. The scene is supposed to take place right at the market where the two men met, yet the setting is a flowery landscape.

Sixteenth Majmā‘ah

3E6–3F6

Paris 3929: fol. 186 (3E6)

Paris 6094: fol. 49 (3E7)

Paris 5847: folos. 42 (3E8), 43 (3E9), 44 (3E10)

Leningrad: pp. 99 (3E11), 103 (3E12)

Istanbul: fol. 52 (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)

London 1200: folos. 44 (3F1), 46 (3F2)

London 9718: folos. 57 (3F3), 60 (3F4)

London 22114: fol. 39 (3F5)

Vienna: fol. 55 (3F6)

This story is set in a mosque, where a group of men, including al-Harith, are making up palindromes for each other. A beggar to whom they have given some food amazes them by his virtuosity in this art. Eventually a lamp is brought, and the beggar introduces himself as Abu Zayd. The company asks him to stay with them, but he answers that he has to go and feed his children. They send a boy with him to carry his bag, but when they arrive at a simple hut Abu Zayd takes the bag and dismisses the boy, telling him he has what he wants and will not return.

From a purely iconographic point of view the thirteen illustrations of this majmā‘ah are easy to interpret. Except for Paris 5847, folio 44, Leningrad, page 103, London 9718, folio 60, and London 1200, folio 46, all deal with the scene in the mosque. The four exceptions depict Abu Zayd dismissing the boy sent to accompany him. The only anomalous illustration in this group is that of Paris 5847, folio 43, which shows a group of men turned toward the illumination of folio 44, showing Abu Zayd taking his bag from the servant boy. There is no setting in 43, and it reflects no spatial or temporal data provided by the text. It can only be understood as an attempt to represent people listening to the servant’s account of what happened. The narrator is not seen; instead, the event he relates appears in front of the astonished crowd.

The manuscripts all follow their individual methods of portraying groups and individuals. The only significant point is that in Paris 3929 Abu Zayd is shown as a jaʿfarī, a desert wanderer, in a hair shirt.
In all other instances his costume is not particularly original, although it varies enough to suggest some confusion about what the hero's attire ought to be.

The main scene is set in a mosque, and only London 1200 fails to include some sort of architectural device. Paris 3929, London 22114, and Vienna have simplified it to such a degree that only lamps and sections of a riwaq are shown. The Leningrad manuscript uses a similar device of three arcades with lamps but gives them a more precise architectural character by showing railings, crenellations, a wide central nave leading to the mihrab, and precisely depicted screens between arches. The illustration is on the whole less developed and more static than earlier mosque settings in the same manuscript. A similar mosque with particularly exact details is found on folio 57r of London 9718. Paris 5847 does not have any obvious mosque attributes, and its characteristics seem to be more those of a house. Centrally planned mosques existed in the thirteenth century and developed further after 1300, so it is uncertain whether we have here an original mosque type, the mistaken substitution of a house for a mosque, or perhaps a depiction of some specific part of a mosque complex in which meetings like the one described in the story would have taken place. At any rate it is a mere backdrop to a scene with which it is not fully integrated.

The other setting illustrated here is the place to which Abu Zayd takes the servant. The text refers to it as a masahkh, an abode, but the term was often used to refer to a halting place, especially for camels. It does not seem to have had a very specific architectural character, hence the way it is treated is particularly telling. The Leningrad manuscript offers a variant on its theme of the extensive house, whereas al-Wasiti created a towerlike wall that could either indicate an unusual type of building or identify the walls of a city, outside which such a masahkh would be found. London 9718 also has a towerlike structure but has provided it with a door, perhaps an interpretation of the Paris 5847 model.

**Seventeenth Maqamah**

3F7–3G1

- Paris 6094: fol. 52r (3F7)
- Paris 5847: fol. 46r (3F8)
- Leningrad: p. 105 (3F9)
- Istanbul: fol. 55r (3F10)
- London 1200: fol. 47r (3F11)
- London 9718: fol. 61r (3F12)
- London 22114: fol. 43r (3G1)

This purely literary maqamah involves the traditional company of men, but with no clear indication of setting. Al-Harith joins the group, and they make up riddles. An old man, Abu Zayd, produces long lines of words that can be read backward and still be meaningful.

The story hardly lends itself to illustration. With no iconographic requirements to speak of, most of the miniatures simply use their purest form the types available for representing crowds and nature. Nature is fully depicted, with trees and other vegetation, only in the Istanbul manuscript; all others limit themselves to trees or to grass. As usual, London 9718 has a peculiar floral arrangement. The Leningrad manuscript shows a circular assembly with considerable variety of facial types within the circle; Paris 5847 individualizes the faces and composes them in a row framed by two profiles, one of which shows amazement; a similar arrangement seems to have existed in the Istanbul manuscript. London 1200 has no setting, and both London manuscripts simplify crowds to the extreme. Paris 6094 uses its own traditional mass composition.

Only two iconographic peculiarities are found in this group. Al-Wasiti does not show Abu Zayd; instead the assembled crowd and a standing al-Harith seem to be staring amazed after Abu Zayd, who has just left. In the Leningrad manuscript either figure to the left could be Abu Zayd; it is as though the illustrator showed rogue and narrator in exactly the same fashion, since both are described as joining an already assembled group.

**Eighteenth Maqamah**

4A1–4B6

Paris 3929 (the folios are mixed up in the manuscript; here they are given in the original order): fols. 139 (4A1), 151 (4A2), 40r (4A3)

Paris 6094: fol. 55 (4A4)

Paris 5847: fols. 47r (4A5), 48r (4A6), 50r (4A7), 51 (4A8)

Leningrad: pp. 109 (4A9), 112 (4A10), 116 (4A11)

Istanbul: fol. 58r (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)

London 9718: fols. 64 (4A12), 67 (4B1)

London 22114: fols. 45 (4B2), 46 (4B3), 49 (4B4)

Vienna: fols. 59 (4B5), 59r (4B6)

While traveling together al-Harith and Abu Zayd stop at Sinjar, where a merchant is holding a wedding feast. He invites the whole caravan to join in. They sit down and food is brought to them, including sweetmeats in a glass dish. At the sight of the glass dish Abu Zayd jumps up and announces he will not return until the dish is removed. When this is done he is asked the reason for his tantrum. He answers that glass is a betrayer, and he relates a story. At one time he kept a beautiful maiden in seclusion. Then one day, under the influence
of drink, he described her to a friendly neighbor, who then told the governor about her. Abu Zayd was coerced into selling the girl to the governor, and he vowed never again to find himself in the presence of a betrayer. Glass, he adds, is a betrayer because it is transparent and shows what is inside. The merchant who is giving the party expresses his admiration for Abu Zayd’s verses, sets him in a place of honor, and has food brought in silver dishes. Abu Zayd accepts the dishes and some more food from the merchant, then invites everyone into his tent, where they are entertained until Abu Zayd departs with his camels.

Of the cycles of illustrations encountered so far, none is stranger than the one for this story. Only two illustrations depict the story within a story. One is folio 151 of Paris 3929, a unique representation of that paragon of beauty kept by Abu Zayd, a sort of thirteenth-century Miss Near East, totally different from any other woman shown in the Maqamat. Identified by her elaborate clothing and curious veilike headgear held on by a string of pearls, she is shown in a garden with a mirror in her hand. Her head is surrounded by a halo. The second illustration of the story within a story is found in Leningrad, page 112; it shows the neighbor whispering Abu Zayd’s secret to the governor. Neither the official on his throne with a curtain and two servants, the great archway iwan, nor even the rather ridiculous stool onto which the betrayer has climbed is particularly original. But the typical house setting has been simplified to make room for an ante-chamber where an additional person, possibly Abu Zayd, is sitting.

All the other miniatures illustrate the frame story. One group, showing a camp with all the travelers (Vienna, Leningrad, p. 109, London 22114, fol. 45), is found either at the beginning or the end of the story, with each manuscript using its own system for depicting tents and camels. The Leningrad artist added to the upper part of his picture a group of riders, presumably being invited to the banquet by the single figure to the right. The Vienna manuscript is as usual less clear, since the single figure standing to the extreme left is quite meaningless. The second illustration of London 9718 has been too badly damaged to be properly explained, but it seems to depict the meeting in Abu Zayd’s tent; the tent has become a house like the one found earlier in the same maqamat.

The end of the manuscript is illustrated in its most literal form in Paris 3929, folio 40; it shows Abu Zayd riding away with two loaded camels. Al-Wasiti has epitomized both this story and the whole book in a superb portrait of Abu Zayd on camelback, quite divorced from any setting but psychologically remarkable in its depiction of a wily old man. The Leningrad artist chose the immediately preceding episode of Abu Zayd feasting everyone in his tent and has kept his typical camp structure. The only modification is the single large tent on the upper plane for the main event.

The rest of the illustrations are concerned with the opening meal. Paris 3929 simply shows a typical group of men, including one in a fur cap, around a table laden with food. Although perhaps clearer in its inclusion of the glass dish, the Vienna version is also simple. The two miniatures in London 22114 are quite literal, with Abu Zayd jumping up and accepting ten plates—here shown as cups. The scenes are set both outside and inside and show one person looking out of the main part of the picture. No problem is posed by the miniature in London 9718. Paris 6094 deals more originally with a specific moment of the story, when Abu Zayd leaves the room because of the glass dish and everyone is annoyed by the violence of his reaction.

I have not been able to solve entirely the puzzle of the pictures in Paris 5847, though the damaged state of the miniatures may in part explain the difficulty. On folios 47–48 we see the same building twice. On the right the scene is fairly clear: the assembled and distorted crowd is seated in front of a table laden with food; in the back a servant brings the glass dish; and Abu Zayd jumps up to complain about it. But on the facing page the scene is less clear. Does one see the dish being sent away and Abu Zayd being asked to return? Although not impossible, such a sequential composition of different moments in the story is not very characteristic of the manuscript, nor is the group to the left facing in the proper direction, since it looks away from the main event. The last illustration on folio 50 shows Abu Zayd leaving, followed by the boy carrying the dishes he has just received as a gift. The subject is clear; its open composition is nothing new to this particular manuscript, nor do its crowds and gestures present any novelties. But the group somehow does betray a lower quality of execution and interpretation than we have come to expect in Paris 5847.

Nineteenth Maqamat

4B7–4C6 Paris 3929: fols. 41 (4B7), 66* (4B8)
Paris 6094: fol. 59* (4B9)
Paris 5847: fols. 52* (4B10), 53 (4B11)
Leningrad: pp. 118 (4B12), 121 (4C1)
Istanbul: fol. 64 (4C2)
London 22114: fols. 50 (4C3), 55 (4C4), 56 (4C5)
Vienna: fol. 64* (4C6)

In Nisibin al-Harith meets Abu Zayd, who has been taken seriously ill. His friends come to see him when he begins to recover, and while there they talk and sleep and are offered a supper by Abu Zayd and his son; then they leave. The whole point of the story appears to be to display the author’s extraordinary vocabulary of foods.
The story may be uneventful, but the twelve available illustrations are nonetheless peculiar. The subject most frequently used is the ailing Abu Zayd visited by his friends. We find it in a double-page miniature in Paris 5847, in the Istanbul manuscript, on page 118 of Leningrad, in folio 55 of London 22114, and in the Vienna illustration. All these pictures show a sick man, a crowd, and an interior. For the interior al-Wasiti and the artist of the Istanbul manuscript have skipped purely architectural features altogether, and the other painters have reduced them to a minimum. The Leningrad artist has divided his building into two parts instead of the usual three, but this is easily explained by the text—it mentions that friends assembled in the courtyard of Abu Zayd’s house to hear about his health, which is the particular moment illustrated here.

The representation of the sick man occurs in the same fashion in all the manuscripts except Leningrad and Paris 6094. It shows a high bed with the figure lying on it covered by a blanket and propped up by two pillows. Paris 5847 and Istanbul make a clear attempt to relate the body to the pillows; London 22114 has Abu Zayd almost hanging in midair on an unusually high bed, and the Vienna artist has flattened him out completely. The Leningrad painter, on the other hand, did not choose to suggest sickness in the same manner; his Abu Zayd is seated, leaning on a pillow, and the only reference to his incapacity appears to be his bare feet. In Paris 6094 Abu Zayd is lying on a low bed and seems to be propped against the architectural frame, but his part of the illustration is damaged.

The most interesting depiction of the friends is in Paris 5847, where the crowd is awkwardly spread over two pages. Some of the figures are in a row with their faces all turned in the same direction; the rest are in a centrally planned group with framing figures in profile and central figures seen from the back. Two figures emerge from the group to frame the sick hero—one of them is a youth, the son of Abu Zayd, and the other is presumably the narrator. The compositional pattern of the Istanbul picture is the same as that of folio 53 in Paris 5847. One significant difference, however, is the far greater variety given to individual members of the crowd: the kneeling figure to the extreme lower left, the speaking gesture of the figure above and to the left, and the curious fellow to the right who has dropped his shoe in order to scratch his foot.

The London and Vienna manuscripts have reversed the position of the crowd by showing them behind the bed. They are arranged in a semicircle in London 22114 but are more fully individualized in Vienna, where the son and al-Harith can easily be identified and two sad-looking individuals express the emotion of the rest of the crowd. Paris 6094 has used its traditional crowd grouping, but the Leningrad manuscript utilizes an altogether different system—a mass of people gathered together so they may be advised of Abu Zayd’s condition. The most original depiction of the crowd is found in folio 66 of Paris 3929, where Abu Zayd is gone and only the group of friends asleep in his house is shown. Both the amazing conglomeration of caricatures and the choice of subject are unique.

Two illustrations (Leningrad, p. 121, and London 22114, fol. 56) depict a second moment in the story: the feeding of Abu Zayd’s friends. The changes introduced into the composition are interesting. The London picture has simply shifted its focus by moving the reclining Abu Zayd above the crowd and giving prominence to the group of men eating. The representation of eating is accomplished far more by the gestures of the men than by the food, which is very sketchily shown at the bottom of the miniature. Exactly the reverse occurs in the earlier Leningrad manuscript, where the food being prepared by a servant occupies the central place; Abu Zayd is shown in a leisurely pose in front of a princely curtain; the crowd is placed above, as if to make it clear that its members are not involved in the food preparation. The architectural setting is here much more characteristic of the type used elsewhere in this manuscript than was that in the first miniature for this story.

An unusual picture is Paris 3929, folio 41, where a solitary camel rider illustrates a passage at the beginning of the story saying that as al-Harith went to Nisibin he “mounted a camel of Mahnah and fixed a lance of Samhar.” What is depicted, then, is a metaphor indicating that he went off into the desert like a Bedouin. It is thus a rare instance of the literal illustration of a figure of speech. Equally strange is the last of the illustrations of London 22114, which shows two men conversing between two towerlike structures. Here again is a very prosaic illustration of a precise phrase in the story: al-Harith, arriving in Nisibin, found Abu Zayd “roaming the quarters” of the city.

**Twentieth Maqamah**

4C7–4D8

Paris 3929: fols. 42° (4C7), 45 (4C8)

Paris 5847: fols. 55° (4C9), 56 (4C10), 57° (4C11)

Leningrad: p. 124 (4C12)

Istanbul: fol. 67 (4D1)

London 1200: fol. 56 (4D2)

London 9718: fols. 72 (4D3), 73° (4D4)

London 22114: fols. 104 (4D5), 58° (4D6)

Vienna: fols. 67° (4D7), 69 (4D8)

A caravan is resting after a long journey when an old man appears and makes a speech about the loss of his virility. (The poem is improper enough to have been translated into Latin.) After some dis-
cussion the old man receives gifts of clothing from all the assembled people, and he then leaves. Al-Harith follows him and realizes that the old man is none other than Abu Zayd, who, as usual, is not speaking the truth. He returns to the assembly and makes everyone laugh by his account of the swindle.

The illustrations do not present any particular difficulty. The manuscripts that illustrate the story at all choose the meeting between the old man and the crowd. In terms of composition, the Leningrad artist uses the primitive solution of showing a crowd above Abu Zayd without any attempt at relating the two planes. London 9718 emphasizes the floral setting. It is particularly odd, therefore, to find Paris 5847 using a two-page spread for a picture that is remarkably unsuccessful: The repetition of the pointing finger is curious, especially on folio 56, where it is clearly meant to tie the two sides of the full picture together.

The most interesting feature of these illustrations is that, even though the text specifically mentions that the crowd belonged to a resting caravan, the usual tent and camels are absent. It is hard to explain this lapse in identifying the setting. Perhaps it can be connected to the operating procedures of ateliers, but it could simply mean that no real artist was inspired by the story.

Five manuscripts illustrate the last moment of the story, when Abu Zayd shows his penis to al-Harith. Except for that one obvious detail, the scene is standard for a meeting between two men.

Twenty-first Maqamah

4D9–4E11
Paris 3929: fols. 46 (4D9), 173 (4D10), 52 (4D11)
Paris 6094: fol. 64 (4D12)
Paris 5847: fols. 58 (4E1), 59 (4E2)
Leningrad: p. 133 (4E3) (p. 131 (4E4) has an additional space for a miniature that was never executed)
Istanbul: fol. 70 (4E5)
London 9718: fols. 74 (4E6), 77 (4E7)
London 22114: fols. 59 (4E8), 61 (4E9)
Vienna: fols. 70 (4E10), 72 (4E11)

In front of the governor and a large crowd that includes al-Harith, a preacher delivers a great sermon about the equality of all in the face of death. At its end someone turns to the prince to complain about a tyrannical agent. The prince does nothing until the preacher rises again with a moving poem and an equally moving speech. The governor then deals with the complaint and gives gifts to the preacher. After al-Harith discovers he is none other than Abu Zayd, the preacher promptly disappears.

The illustrations for this maqamah are important in determining how the miniatures were created for Hariri's work. Four pictures (Leningrad, p. 133, Paris 3929, fol. 52, London 9718, fol. 77, Vienna, fol. 72) illustrate the end of the story when Abu Zayd departs after revealing himself to al-Harith, and all four show peculiarities that are rather difficult to explain. According to the text, Abu Zayd leaves the place of his sermon with a small crowd of followers (gaben), but after his meeting with al-Harith he departs alone, the text being quite specific that his followers stayed behind. The most curious illustration of this episode is in Paris 3929, where a later commentator felt compelled to add his own interpretation of the characters involved. To the left the representation of Abu Zayd with his staff, mendicant's cap, and bag corresponds to the description of the event in the text ("then he took leave of his followers and departed"). But to the right the seated youth and old man, one with a book, the other instructing, are subtitled ashab, "companions." The central character, al-Harith, is not shown.

The illustrations of the same scene in the Leningrad and Vienna manuscripts provide a landscape setting, with three figures on one side and one on the other. The moment chosen is the arrival of al-Harith. He is clearly the figure to the right; Abu Zayd and his companions are on the left. In the Leningrad manuscript Abu Zayd is certainly the central figure, about to begin his speech. In the Vienna manuscript the identity of Abu Zayd is less certain, but he is probably the individual to the right of the group of three. More curious in the Vienna manuscript is the standing figure to the left who, probably as a result of iconographic confusion, appears to be arguing with someone beyond the frame of the picture. In the London 9718 miniature the attendants have been transformed into witnesses.

All the other illustrations deal with the main scene, in which Abu Zayd exords a large crowd and one individual manages to obtain justice from the governor. The problem faced by the illustrators was to emphasize three elements: the prince, the preacher, and the plaintiff. Folio 70 of the Vienna manuscript has rendered the illustration almost meaningless by its simplification. Two manuscripts, London 22114 and Paris 3929, solved the problem by painting two pictures, and the differences between these two pairs demonstrate two completely different methods of illustration.

London 22114 uses the same groupings at its center for both pictures: to the left, a prince in front of a curtain with two attendants, Abu Zayd in the middle, and two figures to the right, one of whom is turning away. In the first scene the people are merely listening to an excited Abu Zayd and show no particular reaction except for a few hand gestures. In the second scene, on the other hand, handkerchiefs in the hands of three of the figures indicate the emotional impact of Abu Zayd's
speech, and an extraneous character popping up in the back represents the plaintiff. The main elements of the story are clear, and the maintenance of the same composition emphasizes the unity of setting and action.

When we turn to Paris 3929 the differences are striking. The first scene shows the preaching, with Abu Zayd on one side and two rows of listeners on the other. Among them the prince is not clearly indicated—if he is present at all—except in the form of the small princely attendant in front. Only one person (upper row, second from right) shows his specific emotional involvement, while another (lower row, right) uses a traditional sign of generalized emotion. The second scene is one of royal audience, with a prince enthroned and a slave holding a fly whisk behind him. A plaintiff has been brought to him by an armed guard, and presumably Abu Zayd and al-Harith (or a member of the crowd) are at the extreme left. The unity of setting and narrative is gone, but a conceptual unity is maintained, for an effective sermon and the granting of a request are indeed clear features of the story. It is as though the artist understood the magianah as a series of totally separate moments visually unrelated but meaningful as the story was read.

Finally, four illustrations (Paris 6094, Paris 5847, Istanbul, and London 9718) introduce some original interpretations of the story’s main elements. All of them provide an architectural frame for the setting, though the text uses the very general term nish, which has no exact architectural connotation. Their architectural elements vary. In Paris 6094 we have a minbar in front of a tiled wall that might be a mihrab; it is possible that an open musalla (a usually uncovered prayer place outside city walls) was meant to be shown here. A similar interpretation can be given to the London 9718 miniature with its stone mihrab and additional floral element. The Istanbul manuscript has a mosque with an arcade and balcony, a minbar, and a Koranic quotation on the wall; in front there is a dikkah, or platform, and to the left may be an attempt at a minaret, whose effect is partly destroyed by the architectural decoration of stucco or terra-cotta that frames the text.

The double-page spread of Paris 5847 is less successful but more interesting. Its right side shows a mosque with some of the elements found in the Istanbul miniature. Its left side is clearly outside the mosque, since horsemen are passing by. We might be dealing with an attempt at representing a suq next to a mosque. Particularly noteworthy among the details are the unmistakably Bedouin headgear worn by the throngs who have gathered to hear the preacher, visible at the upper right, and the movement of the horsemen, who have just stopped to listen to the speech. The artist captures the particulars of the listeners (specific headgear) and the “gathering process” essential for assembling a group (the sudden halting of the horses). But al-Waṣāḥi made no attempt to unite his composition; the suq is shown as a simple cross section identifiable only by the action within it, and the mosque has the usual props but no setting.

All four manuscripts also deal differently with figures and setting. The artist of Paris 6094 uses his own characteristic form for Abu Zayd, but the other principals are simplified. He creates a masslike crowd, from which a figure emerges at the upper left (probably the plaintiff); it includes an observer with his finger to his mouth (possibly al-Harith) and a more fancifully dressed individual in front (perhaps the prince). The type is that of a sermon in a mosque, or perhaps in the open air; there is no attempt to identify iconographically the features of this particular sermon.

Unfortunately the Istanbul miniature is severely damaged, yet even in that condition it is clear that the artist has tried to integrate figures and architectural setting by making the figures small and fitting them into identifiable parts of the building. He was also careful to provide the viewer with the appropriate cast of characters: a prince in the center with a servant holding a fly whisk, a figure jumping up in front to the right, and especially the crowd, with a humorous figure climbing up the minbar.

The artist of Paris 5847 has not tried to fit his crowds into any architectural frame; he simply suggests numbers by bracketing a line of figures with facing profiles. Along the top he has added a group of veiled women, a princely figure (now damaged) surrounded by four soldiers with swords, and a civilian attendant whose movements are quite disconnected from the scene. There is no sign of the plaintiff. The effect sought is that of an attentive crowd—a point clearly made by the text—and a social occasion. Although the latter impression has been considerably diminished by subsequent damage and repainting, it is still apparent in details of the clothing, especially the gloves, and in the faces of the ladies, one of whom is accompanied by a servant girl whose gesture parallels that of the prince’s attendant. Few of the magianah considered thus far are as varied in their illustrations as this one, and at the same time few have so conspicuously failed to express in their content the magnificent quality of Abu Zayd’s moralizing.
Abu Zayd’s brilliant disquisition concerning the respective merits of accountants and secretaries is remarkable for two reasons: it takes place in a boat on the Euphrates, and Abu Zayd actually refuses the gifts offered him on the grounds that his miserable look made the crowd treat him discourteously in the first place.

The choice of illustrations for this maqamat is obvious, since there is no ‘story’ in it. Two manuscripts have more than one illustration. Leningrad depicts two scenes—the characters in the boat and the departure of Abu Zayd from the boat. Paris 3929 shows a rather curious illustration from the very beginning of the text where it is told that al-Harith “met with scribes.” Otherwise all the illustrations represent a boat with people in it. There is not much that is original about the figures. Some are very literally represented, as in the Istanbul manuscript and Paris 6094, and some are quite frozen, as in Paris 5847, where none of the characters is identifiable.

Of greater interest are the boats. The text says that boat was black, and all manuscripts abide by this description. The text also says it was a sailboat, but only Paris 6094, London 22114, and Vienna show any sails; the rest use a rowboat and, aside from Istanbul and Leningrad, a very simple one at that. The Istanbul artist pilled people into his boat; the Leningrad artist put a pavilion in the middle of his. Although the techniques for representing water vary from manuscript to manuscript, all but Vienna show water framed by some kind of land, either ground, grass, or rocks. One of the Leningrad pictures and Istanbul include a flock of aquatic birds.

Twenty-third Maqamat

4F10
Paris 3929: fol. 163 (4F10)

4G11
Paris 6094: fol. 70* (4F11)
Paris 5847: fols. 63* (4F12), 64 (4G1), 67* (4G2)
Leningrad: pp. 147 (4G3), 148 (4G4), 149 (4G5)
Istanbul: fol. 77 (4G6)
London 1200: fol. 67 (4G7)
London 9718: fols. 81* (4G8), 85* (4G9)
London 22114: fols. 66 (4G10), 68 (4G11)

This is one of the longest of the maqamat. Al-Harith hurries to an unidentified government office where riders and pedestrians have gathered to watch an old man holding a youth by the collar. In answer to the governor’s questions, the old man says that the child is his son, who has systematically stolen poems from him by cutting them off at the end. He illustrates what happens. The boy protests that he simply is as proficient in versification as his father is, and the governor rewards them both. At that point al-Harith is about to recognize Abu Zayd publicly, but the latter holds him back with a glance and presents him to the governor. Then Abu Zayd and al-Harith both leave but are overtaken by a messenger from the governor’s office asking al-Harith to return. He does so and eventually explains to the governor who Abu Zayd is. The wall becomes very angry when he realizes the swindle.

Few groups of illustrations are as damaged as this one, which is particularly unfortunate because an unusually large variety of episodes were illustrated, and the differences between them are not easy to explain. Three manuscripts (Paris 5847, fol. 67*, Leningrad, p. 148, and London 1200) illustrate the meeting of Abu Zayd, his son, and al-Harith on a plain outside the city after the events at the governor’s court. The differences between the various versions are striking indeed. London 1200 simply shows two staring old men; Paris 5847 depicts the principals in characteristic Arab dress and using typical hand gestures; Leningrad adds a tall soldier sent by the governor and shows Abu Zayd’s son lying on the ground.

The single miniature from Paris 3929 at first seems to illustrate the same episode. But in fact, as the caption makes clear, it illustrates a passage in the text where, when al-Harith comes near to salute Abu Zayd in front of the governor, the rogue “stopped me with a sign of the hand.” Once again we see the extreme literalness of the manuscript’s illustrations and its almost total abstraction of setting. Exactly the same subject is illustrated in Leningrad, page 147, in a peculiar picture that lacks the architectural setting so characteristic of that manuscript, although it preserves its stock figures. In front Abu Zayd is being helped into a robe of honor by his son, while al-Harith attempts to make his gesture of recognition. The presence of other people clearly contradicts the text, which emphasizes that all the bystanders had gone.

Of the people shown, two groups can easily be explained as part of the prince’s entourage—the two fierce soldiers standing with swords unsheathed on either side of the throne, and the two guards on the lower left, each in the same rare pose of the bent knee. On the other hand, a group on the right is not quite understandable either compositionally or iconographically. Finally, the seated figure to the left in the upper part of the picture is an excellent example of the single attendant. The miniature is at the same time conventional and odd, for it lacks the architectural support for figures that appears on page 149, where al-Harith relates to the governor what he knows about Abu Zayd. There the repetitive architectural setting of the manuscript is once more found with only minor modification.

The other illustrations of the story pose fewer problems. The badly damaged double-page spread of Paris 5847, like London 22114, folio 66, shows a general scene that emphasizes the gathering crowds and includes some horsemen mentioned briefly in the text. The only difference between the two is that the artist of the London manuscript
has squeezed interior and exterior into one page, whereas al-Wasiti spreads them over two. A related composition, which conveys something of the vivacity of the story, is found in Paris 6094. The second illustration of London 22114 simplifies the setting and freezes the principals into standard poses; Abu Zayd does not have his usual headgear, although little in the text justifies a change. Finally, the wall of the Istanbul miniature has all the characteristics of a qadi. The two illustrations from London 9718 show a rather original architectural setting for the throne room of the prince.

**Twenty-fourth Maqamah**

5A1–5A8

Paris 3929: fol. 165* (5A1)  
Paris 6094: fol. 75* (5A2)  
Paris 5847: fol. 69* (5A3)  
Istanbul: fol. 82* (5A4)  
London 1200: fol. 68 (5A5)  
London 9718: fol. 87 (5A6)  
London 22114: fol. 69 (5A7)  
Oxford: fol. 136 (5A8)

This celebrated story consists of a series of grammatical riddles and is always followed by a commentary. It is a pleasant day; twelve friends, accompanied by cupbearers, wine, and a singer, move outdoors into a flower garden. The usual old man, who turns out to be Abu Zayd, arrives. The rest of the story consists entirely of literary pyrotechnics.

All the manuscripts that have preserved any illustration at all for this story have a single miniature showing the same subject. Although the existence of seven illustrations of the same topic should help us determine the relations between these seven manuscripts, each artist has interpreted the scene in a different manner, and each manuscript uses its individual vocabulary of figures in its own way. All emphasize the music and the drinking, but only Paris 5847 shows the full cast of twelve characters required by the story.

A more important feature is that all the versions involve a landscape setting, and the group therefore gives us the full range of landscape types then available. In the late Oxford manuscript, only a vague arabesque of stems and tulips is visible; Paris 3929 simply has a few tufts of grass with flowers. Although their details vary, Paris 6094, London 9718, and London 1200 all use the same system of grassy ground and three trees. The trees are more realistic and more fully depicted in the last of these three manuscripts, but that these in the other two are not merely decorative motifs is emphasized by the two birds. London 22114 and Istanbul introduce a more extensive landscape, with a forest occupied by small bodies of water as well as trees. Finally, al-Wasiti has depicted an often-reproduced fountain whose running water is pumped from a well by a mechanism powered by oxen. Occupying the upper plane of his illustration, this mechanism is related to the front plane by the various figures to the right. Of the group, only this manuscript achieves a full integration of the basic iconographic unit with its setting. One can conclude from these comparisons that three basic units of landscape were available: clumps of grass and flowers, groups of trees, and small pools of water. All appear in their standard form except in Paris 5847, which shows some originality.

**Twenty-fifth Maqamah**

5A9–5C3

Paris 3929: fols. 54* (5A9), 56 (5A10), 93 (5A11)  
Paris 6094: fols. 81* (5A12), 82* (5B1)  
Paris 5847: fols. 74* (5B2), 75 (5B3), 76 (5B4)  
Leningrad: pp. 163 (5B5), 164 (5B6)  
Istanbul: fol. 89 (5B7)  
London 1200: fols. 73* (5B8), 75 (5B9)  
London 9718: fol. 95 (5B10)  
London 22114: fols. 76* (5B11), 78 (5B12)  
Oxford: fols. 39 (5C1), 40* (5C2)  
Vienna: fol. 84* (5C3)

On a cold day al-Harith goes out on an errand. Suddenly he sees an old man, naked except for a turban and loincloth, reciting a poem to a crowd. He points out his nakedness in the midst of people bundled up in fur-trimmed coats. After Abu Zayd requests in veiled terms that his identity not be betrayed, al-Harith gives him a coat. The others then give him gifts, and he leaves loaded down with garments. Al-Harith follows him and is rewarded with a lengthy recounting of Abu Zayd’s life.

In the cycle of illustrations for this story, Paris 5847, folio 76, Leningrad, page 164, London 1200, folio 75, London 9718, and Oxford, folio 40*, all represent Abu Zayd talking to al-Harith. The setting is the same throughout and consists of scant indications of landscape. Al-Harith’s extended arms show that he is speaking. In Paris 5847 and Oxford, Abu Zayd is carrying all his gifts in a bag, which in later manuscripts becomes more symbolic than realistic. The Leningrad artist clearly shows Abu Zayd carrying coats, while London 1200 represents a sort of half-nude rug merchant. All the manuscripts except Oxford follow the text in showing Abu Zayd lightly clad and in emphasizing the number of gifts he has received by having him bent over under their weight.

The most frequent subject chosen for illustration is, however, the central scene of Abu Zayd addressing the crowd. Several as-
pects of the scene are used. The most common illustration (Paris 6094, fol. 81r, Paris 5847, fols. 74r–75r, Istanbul, London 1200, fol. 73r, both London 22114 miniatures, Oxford, and Vienna) shows a crowd and an almost naked speaker. In a few instances (Paris 6094, fol. 92r, Leningrad, p. 163, and Paris 3929, fols. 54v and 93r) the scene chosen is the giving of coats to Abu Zayd, usually with special emphasis on al-Harith’s gift. The only anomalous subject is in Paris 3929, folio 56, which is one of the few heavily retouched miniatures in the manuscript. Here Abu Zayd sits in the midst of listeners, just at the point where after one of his speeches he sat down “bowed together and shivering.”

With a few exceptions there is nothing particularly remarkable about the choice of scenes illustrated, nor can we say much about the crowds. Two manuscripts, Paris 5847 and Leningrad, are very careful to depict fur collars on the robes the figures wear; all other examples use standard groups in typical clothes. Istanbul and Paris 5847 both include riders. In the latter the single rider appears to be al-Harith himself, on a mule, an idea that may have been suggested by the verb farz in the text, which has several connotations related to riding. The argument is not very secure, however, and would in any case not apply to the Istanbul manuscript, which shows two horsemen. It seems, rather, that a type we have so far encountered only once—a crowd that includes riders—was used in these two manuscripts. This feature may be connected with another element the two manuscripts have in common: the tower above Abu Zayd, which I will discuss in a moment.

Although the crowds, with this one unexplained exception, are standardized, the central figure of Abu Zayd is not. Two features must be recalled: first, that he was supposed to wear nothing but a turban and loincloth, and second, that he appeared suddenly to al-Harith. On the first point most manuscripts are quite consistent in showing a man naked except for the two required features, the only addition being a shawl in Paris 3929 and in Leningrad. The exceptions are particularly interesting in defining the modus operandi of some of the artists. Thus the first miniature in Leningrad 22114 shows the man naked, but in the second, later in the story, the artist has reverted to his customary way of representing Abu Zayd; it is as if the clothing change required by the text interfered with the more important requirement of identifying Abu Zayd in a consistent fashion throughout the manuscript. Similarly, the Oxford codex indicates nakedness only by showing Abu Zayd with bare legs, and in Paris 6094 the hero does not wear a turban.

The illustrations depicting the sudden appearance of Abu Zayd can be divided into three groups. The first is quite simple and shows Abu Zayd standing to one side of an assembled crowd. This is the solution used by Paris 3929, where the crowd is even made to sit down—unrealistically, considering the cold weather. The Vienna illustration belongs to this cycle; it suggests the suddenness of Abu Zayd’s appearance by showing a half-naked figure marching into a diminutive crowd. A second type shows Abu Zayd standing or seated on a rock. This is the solution of the Leningrad and Oxford manuscripts and of London 22114, and it may also be a type that inspired Paris 6094 and perhaps London 1200, although the latter is unlikely. This interpretation is peculiar in that it emphasizes the speaking figure and uses as its model one of the available speaking types.

Finally, in two instances Abu Zayd is shown in a tower or gate. Looking at the subject merely from the point of view of how it reflects the text, these architectural monuments can be explained only as a device for emphasizing the suddenness of Abu Zayd’s appearance to al-Harith, which would not have been achieved had the hero been shown standing on a rock.

Twenty-sixth Maqamah

5C4–5D6
Paris 3929: fol. 96r (5C4)
Paris 6094: fol. 84r (5C5)
Paris 5847: fols. 77v (5C6), 79r (5C7)
Leningrad: pp. 166 (5C8), 167 (5C9), 169 (5C10)
Istanbul: fol. 92r (5C11)
London 1200: fol. 76r (5C12)
London 9718: fols. 96r (5D1), 98v (5D2)
London 22114: fols. 79v (5D3), 82r (5D4)
Oxford: fol. 41r (5D5)
Vienna: fol. 87r (5D6)

While an impoverished al-Harith is traveling, he comes across a tent filled with many servants and beautiful furnishings. The old man who lives in it turns out to be Abu Zayd, now happy and rich. Al-Harith follows him for a while and soon finds out the reason for his good fortune. Once in Tus, relates Abu Zayd, he had troubles with a creditor who wanted to take him to the qadi. That particular qadi was notorious for his severity, so to avoid his court Abu Zayd beat up his creditor so that he had to appear before the higher court of the governor. When brought before the governor, he composed a magnificent epistle with alternating pointed and unpointed letters. Impressed, the governor paid his debt for him and kept him in his service. Having profited sufficiently from this lucrative post, Abu Zayd left the governor’s employ and went roaming again. He has kept some of the gifts he received, and he shares them with al-Harith.

The two main subjects chosen for illustration are the first meeting of al-Harith and Abu Zayd in the tent and, less frequently, the moment when Abu Zayd is about to tell al-Harith the source of his wealth. Only Leningrad and London 9718 illustrate both moments, and
they use almost the same setting to do so, even though the text is very vague about the location of the story within a story.

This group of illustrations is remarkable in all the manuscripts. The text mentions a pitched tent, a kindled fire, fair servants, handsome furniture, a richly dressed old man with a bowl of fruit nearby, together conjuring up an air of opulence. Paris 6094, London 1200, London 9718, Paris 5847, and Vienna illustrate the scene in a similar manner. The first four show a large, angular tent—Vienna has a plastically rendered but much simplified round one—and in two instances (Paris 5847 and Vienna) the tent is framed by animals as in earlier examples. They also show a bowl of fruit (Vienna shows the kindled fire instead) and a more or less richly dressed man in the tent (London 22114 alters the usual robe of the manuscript's standardized Abu Zayd). There is a variable group of attendants, clearly identifiable as servants only in London 1200 and Vienna (in the latter case one of them is a Negro), and finally al-Haritih arriving in his impoverished state or seated with Abu Zayd. None of these renditions is particularly original, and regardless of variations in quality of execution they all present a straightforward setting for the story. Among small details are the knotted sides of the tent in London 1200, the platform inside the tent in Paris 5847, and the curious excrescences in the corner of Paris 6094, probably meant to represent some feature of the tent's construction.

The Leningrad and Istanbul miniatures are far more interesting. I have commented elsewhere on the Istanbul picture, so the points there need only be summarized briefly. Abu Zayd is transformed into an enthroned figure surrounded by attendants; an artful two-plane composition is used to expand secondary elements, such as the attendants kindling the fire and a tethered horse with a groom. An even more extraordinary composition is found in the Leningrad manuscript: a handsome tent with a flagpole and banners is set within an enclosure consisting of a low front wall decorated with representations of animals, a gateway, and a back wall with a superb dragon on an arabesque ground. The figures have shrunk and appear at different levels of the composition, thereby emphasizing its spatial concerns. The two heroes are shown in the tent, but the other figures, who seem to be a kawār or (doorkeeper) at the entrance and a servant behind the tent, do not fully correspond to what the text describes; their presence and specific positions make them accents of composition rather than actors in the story. Thus, by using figures on two planes and expanding the physical setting, the three Leningrad miniatures manage to provide the sumptuousness demanded by the text. Although sacrificing some of the precise iconographic requirements and adding extraneous elements in the process, they succeed in illustrating the spirit of the text more fully than the more literal versions do.

Five illustrations of the twenty-sixth maqamat deal with various other subjects that bear no relation to each other. On folio 79 of Paris 5847, a simple scene (half of which has been heavily retouched) shows Abu Zayd copying his address to the governor for al-Haritih; it is literal and of little interest. Two, Leningrad, page 169, and London 22114, folio 82°, represent Abu Zayd in front of the governor. Except in very small details, such as the sheet of paper in the governor's hand, they do not differ from other illustrations of Abu Zayd in front of officials; the only point worth making is that the Leningrad artist deemphasized the military character of the governor by dressing him as a civilian judge.

The much more original folio 41° in the Oxford manuscript shows al-Haritih and Abu Zayd, one on horseback and the other riding a camel, at the moment when Abu Zayd is about to begin his account of the source of his wealth. Quite obviously the two characters are talking to each other, but aside from the fact that al-Haritih has just announced his imminent departure, nothing in the text suggests the setting employed. The one illustration from Paris 3929 is entitled “picture of Abu Zayd and his creditors fighting it out,” and it refers to the specific moment of the story when Abu Zayd assaults his creditor to ensure being tried by the governor. Identifying the three figures is almost hopeless, since the youthful central figure who is doing the “attacking” cannot possibly be Abu Zayd and can hardly be the creditor; the figure to the left could be a witness or the narrator of the story, but in either case his presence would be unusual. Yet it is perfectly clear that the picture represents a fight. Once again Paris 3929, with its usual simplicity, comes up with an abstract representation of a story (the fight) rather than of the elements specific to it (the characters involved in the fighting).

**Twenty-seventh Maqamat**

SE7–SE11

Paris 3929: fols. 101° (SD7), 103 (SD8), 104 (SD9), 105 (SD10)
Leningrad: pp. 173 (SD11), 174 (SD12), 176 (SE1), 177 (SE2)
Istanbul: fols. 96° (SE3), 98 (SE4)
London 1200: fols. 79° (SE5), 81° (SE6)
London 9718: fols. 100 (SE7), 102 (SE8)
Oxford: fols. 44 (SE9), 45 (SE10)
Vienna: fol. 92 (SE11)

This is one of the rare stories in the book that can be described as eventful. Al-Haritih is traveling and living with Bedouins when one day his camel is stolen. He takes a horse and goes to search for it, but he cannot find it. When he stops to rest in the shade of a tree, Abu Zayd appears. Then al-Haritih falls asleep, and while he slumbers Abu Zayd disappears with his horse. Shortly thereafter al-Haritih sees the camel thief and attacks him, but it is the arrival of Abu Zayd with his
lance that really sends the thief running. Al-Harith recaptures his camel, but Abu Zayd keeps the horse.

All the illustrations of this story center on two episodes: al-Harith’s search for his camel combined with his meeting with Abu Zayd, and the recovery of the lost camel combined with the attack on the thief. Five miniatures (Paris 3929, fol. 101v, Istanbul, fol. 96v; London 1200, fol. 79, London 9718, fol. 100, Oxford, fol. 44) illustrate the encounter between the two heroes in almost exactly the same way. Aside from minor details, such as the rock in the Paris manuscript, the only real differences between these are in the costume of Abu Zayd (though all manuscripts show him quite clearly as the mendicant of the text) and in the landscape—especially the trees, which vary in character and size or in compositional purpose.

The artists of the Paris 3929 and Leningrad manuscripts introduced other illustrations that are less immediately understandable. In the Leningrad manuscript a first picture (p. 173) shows al-Harith on his horse looking for his lost camel; the composition is unusually simple for the manuscript, with a single vegetal frame of two tall, artificial-looking tree trunks ending in fanciful flowers. The second and third illustrations (pp. 174 and 176) represent Abu Zayd arriving while al-Harith is resting and leaving, while he is asleep. There is something awkward about the position of al-Harith’s left arm, perhaps an attempt to illustrate a very precise point in the text: al-Harith tries to stay awake but is so tired he falls asleep in spite of himself. Far more curious is the second illustration from Paris 3929: it depicts both heroes asleep and has omitted the horse that is the whole point of the story.

The second major episode is illustrated in four manuscripts: Leningrad, page 177, Istanbul, London 1200, and London 9718. Oxford, folio 45, is close to the first group in showing two figures riding, but the pleading figure to the left appears to be al-Harith, the horseman is Abu Zayd, and the camel rider is a Bedouin shown in the characteristic garb of a nomad. There is no indication of a fight, and the picture has thus lost its illustrative point. The iconographic muddle is even greater in the Vienna illustration, where two men are fighting with the alleged thief, another figure appears to the left, and the horse is absent. Clearly, several images have been confused in some inexplicable way. The interpretation of folio 104 of Paris 3929 is equally absurd—the thief and Abu Zayd are sitting quietly as al-Harith walks in; the animals are absent. The absurdity is even greater on folio 105, where the illustration of the conversation between the two heroes after the departure of the thief is simplified to the extreme. The architectural frame is a later addition; it shows that the image was already misunderstood at some unknown time.

Twenty-eighth Maqamah

5E12–5G1

Paris 6094: fol. 93 (5E12)
Paris 5847: fols. 84v (5F1), 86 (5F2)
Istanbul: fol. 104 (5F3)
London 1200: fols. 85v (5F4), 86 (5F5), 87v (5F6)
London 9718: fols. 107v (5F7), 109r (5F8)
London 22114: fols. 94 (5F9), 95 (5F10)
Oxford: fols. 48 (5F11), 49v (5F12)
Vienna: fol. 95v (5G1)

On a journey to Samarkand, al-Harith hears a superb sermon in a mosque. He discovers that the speaker is Abu Zayd and accompanies him home. There Abu Zayd offers him wine and, when al-Harith protests, recites a poem.

Like many similarly structured stories, this maqamah has two subjects for illustration. The first is the mosque scene, and all the manuscripts have one. The Istanbul version was originally the most highly developed. Its architectural composition features remarkable structural details, whose major elements, however, are not different from what we have seen before in the same manuscript. In the other illustrations of the mosque scene only two details stand out. One is the peculiar double-page spread of London 1200, closely related to what we have seen more than once in Paris 5847 but much simplified. The other is the architecture of the Oxford illustration, which is reduced to two corner spandrels, one of them curiously placed between the huge mihrab and wavy flaps and the large, aimless figures. One figure in particular, with hands hidden in long sleeves, has no clear compositional or iconographic function. The almost contemporary Vienna manuscript shows an unusually large crowd and an almost cubist composition of faces and forms.

The second group of illustrations shows two individuals drinking, and it too is unexceptional aside from the unusually simple architectural setting and the drinking vessels represented with particular care, especially in the Oxford miniature. Only London 9718, folio 109r, differs by providing the hero’s house with a large curtain and an impressive dome.

Twenty-ninth Maqamah

6A1–6B12

Paris 3929: fols. 177 (6A1), 178v (6A2), 179 (6A3), 114 (6A4), 116 (6A5)
Paris 5847: fols. 89 (6A6), 90 (6A7)
Leningrad: pp. 194 (6A8), 196 (6A9)
Istanbul: fols. 110 (6A10), 116* (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)
London 1200: fols. 89 (6A11), 90 (6A12), 91 (6B1)
London 9718: fols. 111* (6B2), 114 (6B3)
London 22114: fols. 98 (6B4), 99 (6B5), 100* (6B6)
Oxford: fols. 50* (6B7), 51* (6B8), 53 (6B9)
Vienna: fols. 98 (6B10), 98* (6B11), 100 (6B12)

Al-Harith is secluded in one of the rooms of the khan, or hostel, of Wasit. He overhears a conversation next door, in the course of which one man, using particularly florid language, sends another to the market. Al-Harith follows the youth and discovers both the meaning of the witticisms (they involve certain kinds of food) and the identity of their author. He also finds out that Abu Zayd is destitute but has laid a plan for getting rich. He arranges a matrimonial alliance for al-Harith and invites all the wealthy guests of the hostel to a meal. First, however, he performs a series of magical incantations with an astrolabe, then serves drugged food that puts everyone to sleep. While the guests slumber he and his son rob their rooms. As al-Harith turns away from him, he recites a long poem asking for forgiveness and disappears with his son and the stolen goods. Al-Harith then goes his own way.

The story is generously illustrated. The choice of episodes is quite consistent and presents no major problems. Paris 3929, folio 177, London 1200, folio 89, London 9716, folio 111*, London 22114, folio 98, Oxford, folio 50*, and the first two of Vienna’s illustrations of the story deal with al-Harith’s discovery of Abu Zayd. From al-Harith’s discovery of Abu Zayd, from the iconographic point of view the most interesting of them is in the Vienna Codex, whose two miniatures are very similarly constructed, with a door and spandrels indicating an interior and with two similarly positioned figures. Yet the first picture represents not something described in the text but what al-Harith heard from his room, while the second depicts the meeting of the two heroes in the court of the khan; the flower may have been meant to indicate that the event was taking place outside.

The main episode to be illustrated is the swindle of the travelers. Most manuscripts have several versions of the story: Abu Zayd with an astrolabe (Paris 3929, Leningrad, London 1200, London 22114), the feast (Paris 3929), and especially the drugged victims asleep (all manuscripts). Only in the Vienna and Oxford manuscripts do the pictures have no precise relation to the text; they are merely typical scenes of a single man in front of a crowd. Paris 3929 and Paris 5847 show the two rogues taking leave of a disappothing al-Harith. The curious point about both pictures is their setting in a landscape, though the text clearly states that the parting took place within the caravansera.

With respect to figures, crowds, compositional patterns, and precise relation to the text, none of these miniatures presents any particular problem of interpretation—although we might note again the peculiarity of Paris 3929, where Abu Zayd’s son is depicted as a royal servant (fol. 178*) and where a servant holding a fly whisk has been added to the banquet scene. It may also be significant that both Paris 3929 and London 1200 have astral symbols in the scene showing the astrolabe and that London 22114 has dropped the architectural setting in one of its illustrations. Finally, both the Leningrad manuscript and London 9718 show the detail we saw earlier of a person curled around a column.

The originality of the illustrations to this story lies in the architectural settings, for the scene takes place not in a house, a government office, or a mosque, as in all previous stories involving a building, but in a caravanseri. The peculiarities of this group of architectural depictions are attributable to how artists and viewers imagined a caravanserai would look. In Paris 3929 (except fol. 177), Vienna, and possibly Oxford, the architectural details merely indicate an interior. But in the other manuscripts the architecture has original features. The structure has two stories, particularly striking in the Leningrad, Paris 5847, and London 9718 manuscripts, whose other buildings never have more than one level. It is seen most clearly in Paris 3929, with its stairs emphasized by two figures, its balcony, and its rooms opening either onto the balcony or on the ground floor. Finally, the hostel had particularly strong doors. Some are exterior, as in the Leningrad manuscript (where they may, however, be considered merely as typical parts of a house), London 22114 (fol. 98), and London 1200. Others are interior doors, as in Paris 3929, Leningrad, and London 22114 (fol. 99), which strongly emphasize heavy locks, and Paris 5847, which shows heavy, closed wooden doors. The other visible features—a well, grillwork, an upper balcony, and a heavy roof—are perhaps less clearly identifiable as features specific to caravanserais. The departure from the norm in these illustrations is particularly noteworthy in the case of Paris 3929, since this is almost the only instance of major architecture in the manuscript.

Thirteenth Maqanah

6C1–6D10 Paris 3929: fols. 117 (6C1), 120 (6C2)
Parus 6094: fol. 101 (6C3)
Paris 5847: fols. 91* (6C4), 92 (6C5)
Leningrad: pp. 201 (6C6), 202 (6C7), 205 (6C8)
Istanbul: fol. 130 (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)
London 1200: fols. 93 (6C9), 95 (6C10)
London 9718: fols. 116* (6C11), 118 (6C12)
London 22114: fols. 103 (6D1), 105 (6D2)
Oxford: fols. 54 (6D3), 55 (6D4), 56 (6D5)
In Cairo al-Harith encounters a group of people riding to a wedding. He follows them and arrives at a fine house hung about with old clothes and begging baskets. An old man is seated on a bench in the vestibule. To al-Harith’s astonishment, it is the house of the chief of all beggars. Al-Harith goes inside, where everything is beautifully decorated. The bridegroom appears and turns out to be a celebrated rogue and wanderer; he is followed by an old man who makes a great speech about poverty and marriage. Then the speaker goes to a table loaded with food. As al-Harith is about to leave, the old man calls him back and explains that he is Abu Zayd.

Immediately remarkable are the five miniatures depicting this maqamah in the Vienna manuscript; all of them are iconographically much clearer than is common in that codex. The five subjects of the Vienna manuscript are also found elsewhere and serve to identify the specific themes chosen by the illustrator: the wedding procession (also Paris 3929, fol. 117, and London 1200, fol. 93); the doorman in a vestibule hung with rags and begging baskets (also Leningrad, p. 201, London 22114, fol. 103, Oxford, fol. 54); the appearance of the bridegroom (unique to the Vienna manuscript and, because of its ambiguities, probably copied from an earlier model); the speech of Abu Zayd (Paris 6094, Paris 5847, fols. 91'-92, Leningrad, p. 202, London 22114, fol. 105, Oxford, fol. 55); and the meal at the end of the story (Paris 3929, fol. 122, Leningrad, p. 205, London 1200, fol. 95, Oxford, fol. 56). Only the two pictures in London 9718 illustrate slightly different moments: al-Harith meeting the prince of beggars, and al-Harith about to leave and being recalled by Abu Zayd.

As far as individuals and crowds are concerned, not much can be added to the points previously made except that on Oxford’s folio 56 three men wear unusual high black caps that are perhaps meant to identify the rogues in whose house the scene takes place. The precisely depicted figures in Leningrad, page 105, are remarkably placed inside a circle.

The most interesting feature of this group of illustrations is the clear indications of what the story says about the house: its opulence inside and its vestibule adorned with implements of the begging trade. Paris 5847 uses a traditional and generalized architecture, though it is possible that damage to these two miniatures has obliterated some more specific features of the original. For the banquet scene most manuscripts omit any architectural fittings (except for a curtain in the Vienna manuscript), but both Paris 3929 and Oxford add a servant with a fly whisk. The Leningrad codex uses one of its own traditional organizations for an interior. The great speech scene has no elements specifically men-

tioned in the story. In most instances the speaking Abu Zayd stands in front of a princely curtain, and the Oxford manuscript confuses things by suggesting a mosqueslildeck that never touches the ground and includes a functionless curtain.

There remain the four illustrations of the encounter in the vestibule (diliz) of the house between al-Harith and the old man sitting “on a cloth of piled stuff upon a handsome bench,” with tattered garments and begging baskets hanging all around. The London 22114 illustrator has hardly modified his much simplified architectural system, and only wicker baskets and rags identify the scene. The Oxford manuscript tries to emphasize the impressiveness of the architecture by making it spacious, giving it a particularly colorful door, and adding domes to the side. In the Vienna picture al-Harith is not visible and the artist has shown only the baywah on his bench, with floating rags and beggar’s baskets. The relation between door and interior is clear, and the careful tile decoration on the spandrels of the court and the upper part of the door show the artist’s interest in expressing general prosperity rather than specific iconographic detail. Quite the same effect is given in the Leningrad picture, with its strange diliz and its superb stone decoration on the gate tower.

Thirty-first Maqamah

6D11–6F4  
Paris 3929: fols. 68’ (6D11), 69 (6D12)  
Paris 6094: fol. 103’ (6E1)  
Paris 5847: fols. 94’ (6E2), 95 (6E3)  
Leningrad: pp. 208 (6E4), 211 (6E5)  
Istanbul: fols. 116’ (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study), 117’ (6E6)  
London 1200: fols. 96’ (6E7), 97 (6E8), 98’ (6E9), 99 (6E10)  
London 9718: fols. 119 (6E11), 120 (6E12)  
London 22114: fols. 107’ (6F1), 108 (6F2)  
Oxford: fol. 57 (6F3)  
Vienna: fol. 108’ (6F4)

While camping at Ramleh, al-Harith decides to join a caravan going to Mekkah. During a halt, a naked man appears from the mountain and makes a long, beautiful speech about the meaning of the pilgrimage. Al-Harith recognizes his old friend and, after embracing him, asks him to join the caravan. Abu Zayd refuses and instead climbs back onto the hill and, after reciting another poem, disappears like a jinn.

The most important subject in this cycle of illustrations is the halted caravan being addressed by Abu Zayd, and there are many variants of it. The one most remote from the text is in Paris 6094. Abu Zayd stands on a rock like a prophet, while the group listens. The
travelers are dressed in the short tunics and capes of pilgrims, though the text does not specify that the event took place during the pilgrimage, when such attire would be proper. At the other extreme, the Istanbul miniature simply shows a caravan without any identifiable characters. In addition, this miniature contains the small genre element of a young camel nursing. All other illustrations of the episode fit somewhere between these extremes. London 22114 has a second illustration of campers and speaker and includes a little rabbit. The Vienna and Oxford manuscripts have greatly simplified the setting, and Oxford once again uses its floral background to indicate the outdoors. The four London 1200 illustrations are simplified repetitions of other themes. The most remarkable groups of illustrations belong to the Paris 5847 and Leningrad manuscripts. There we meet with two very different sets of representations of pilgrims on the way to Mekkah. A main feature is the mahmal, a wooden structure covered with cloth and brought from Egypt and Syria to Mekkah (see below, pp. 124–25). It appears twice in Paris 5847 and once (p. 211) in Leningrad, surrounded by dancers, musicians, and flag bearers. The illustrations correspond approximately to descriptions of mahmal processions found elsewhere. But while both manuscripts depict the sacred object, only Leningrad shows the rest of the participants in consecrated vestments, and the grouping of figures posed as though praying is quite unusual. Al-Wasiti has maintained his traditional depiction of crowds but has added some new types: on folio 94' two footmen are shown in strange leggings and pointed hats, and on folio 95 rather odd fur caps are worn—they may, however, be later retouches.

The basic composition of the scenes is typical of other large miniatures in both manuscripts. In the Leningrad pictures and on folio 94' of Paris 5847 the division between two spatial planes is maintained. In Leningrad, page 208, the encampment is similar to other camps from the same manuscript, with its white and blue tent in the corner and the small detail of a groom trying to make a camel kneel. The procession of Leningrad, page 211, is typical of a linear type, showing figures and camels in one row.

Two major innovations appear in Paris 5847. One is the unity given to the composition of folio 95 through several spatial planes, identified by rocky masses rather than grassy lines and emphasized by grouped figures. The compositional pattern seems not to have been fully mastered by the artist, however, for though he tried to unify diverse elements into a single image leading up to the figure of Abu Zayd at the top, two of the faces at the extreme left and right (which belong to a type we have already seen in other manuscripts) turn completely away from the central event, and others seem almost as disconnected from it. Faces turning away in opposite directions are rare, and these indicate a further misunderstanding of the theme. Al-Wasiti was probably ex-}

perimentering with an organizing system new to him; his success is limited in composition but admirable in combining the various elements of the assembled campers. His success is far greater, however, in the composition of the mahmal scene on folio 94', where the movement of camels, trumpeters, banners, and drummers, contrasted with the simple quiescence of the holy subject, captures the point of Abu Zayd's poem that a pilgrimage is a holy event and should remain unspoiled by worldly trappings.

The two illustrations from Paris 3929 are quite literal. Folio 68' represents the embrace of Abu Zayd and al-Harith, who became, says the text, like a lam-ahlīfī (letters usually shown entwined), and folio 69 shows Abu Zayd leaving. Its major peculiarity is the figure of the black servant of al-Harith.

Thirty-second Maqamah

6F5–6G5 Paris 3929: fols. 85 (6F5), 122 (6F6)
Paris 6094: fol. 106' (6F7)
Paris 5847: fols. 100' (6F8), 101 (6F9)
Leningrad: pp. 213 (6F10), 223 (6F11)
Istanbul: fol. 121 (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)
London 1200: fols. 100 (6F12), 106 (6G1)
London 9718: fol. 133' (6G2)
London 22114: fol. 111' (6G3)

This very long maqamah has no real plot. On his way back from Mekkah al-Harith stops at a Bedouin camp. Everyone there is flocking to hear a great jurist answer questions of law. The jurist is Abu Zayd, and most of the story consists of his various legal opinions. At the end he is given a singing girl and a drove of camels, and the two friends leave together.

London 1200, folio 100, Paris 6094, London 22114, and Oxford, folio 59', have typical depictions of a speaker in front of a crowd. The most interesting variants are on page 213 of the Leningrad manuscript, with its particularly impressive camp with animals, and folio 85 of Paris 3929, which illustrates a brief passage describing the chieftains of the tribe around Abu Zayd and identifies the figures who wear kermels around their mouths and hold large swords. The man to the extreme left with a curious hairstyle and clothing is probably al-Harith dressed as a pilgrim.

A second theme shows al-Harith with Abu Zayd and his gifts, and its iconography is extraordinary. Only London 9718 shows a camel and a dressed-up female. Al-Wasiti and the artist of the Leningrad
manuscript represent the whole drove of camels, and the female to the extreme right of both droves looks more like a shepherdess than a singing girl. The camel pictures are well known, and the precision of al-Wasiti's composition has often been mentioned. More rarely noted is that the camels take up only half the picture; the whole extends across two folios and shows Abu Zayd displaying them to his friend. This is not to deny the brilliance of the camels in Paris 5847, particularly when compared with the dry rhythm of Leningrad's alternating grazing and walking camels. The London 1200 illustration is a summary of a model similar to the Paris miniature.

The Oxford illustration is also remarkable. The two men to the right are certainly al-Harith and Abu Zayd. The girl is shown nursing a child under a beautiful tent with a porch, and there are horses and camels behind the tent.

The vivid image on folio 122 of Paris 3929 shows al-Harith and Abu Zayd departing together in friendly embrace. Nowhere among all the illustrations of the Maqamat is there a more charming cartoon of our two heroes, and it shows once more the amazingly literal way the artist of this particular manuscript worked.

**Thirty-third Maqamat**

6G6–7A6


Paris 6094: fol. 117 (6G8)

Paris 5847: fol. 103 (6G9)


Istanbul: fol. 131* (6G12)

London 1200: fols. 107* (7A1), 108* (7A2)

London 9718: fols. 134* (7A3), 136* (7A4)

Vienna: fols. 114* (7A5), 116* (7A6)

In a mosque in Tiflis, an old man with a contorted face appears after prayer and tells of his misfortunes so elegantly that the congregation, poor though it is, gives him money. Al-Harith follows the old man out and finds that the contorted face was a fake.

The mediocre illustrations of this story include one of the few instances where al-Wasiti eliminates background and simply shows a man standing in front of a crowd. The painter of London 1200 has added a landscape to the mosque scene but confused it with the setting for a later episode. Even the artist of Paris 3929 was not particularly inspired; in folio 76* all he shows is Abu Zayd running away.

As far as setting is concerned, only the Leningrad manuscript and to a lesser degree London 9718 show the mosque as a major construction; Paris 6094 and Paris 3929 use traditional simplified symbols for a building; Istanbul makes a rather original division of people into three groups under a portico. The artists apparently had far more difficulty representing facial contortions than they had depicting lameness in an earlier story. Paris 3929 simply avoids the problem by showing a traditional mendicant; Paris 6094 contorts the body instead; and Vienna represents Abu Zayd with his penis exposed. The other illustration in the same manuscript is more effective, with its three figures in three different postures of prayer.

**Thirty-fourth Maqamat**

7A7–7C4

Paris 3929: fols. 78 (7A7), 79 (7A8), 82 (7A9), 57* (7A10)

Paris 6094: fol. 120 (7A11)

Paris 5847: fols. 105 (7A12), 107 (7B1)

Leningrad: pp. 231 (7B2), 235 (7B3), 236 (7B4), 238 (7B5)

Istanbul: fols. 134 (7B6), 136* (7B7)

London 1200: fols. 110 (7B8), 112 (7B9), 113 (7B10)

London 9718: fols. 138 (7B11), 141 (7B12)

London 22114: fol. 115 (7C1)

Vienna: fols. 118 (7C2), 121 (7C3), 122 (7C4)

Al-Harith's slave dies, so he goes to the slave market to look for a new one. None is satisfactory. Then a man with a veiled face, holding a boy by the forearem, accosts him and describes the boy's qualities. Al-Harith buys the boy at a bargain price, but a condition of the sale is that it can be canceled if the old man so requests. Then the old man leaves, and the youth tells Al-Harith that the sale was illegal because he is in fact a free man. The qadi agrees. The boy says that his father has disappeared, but Al-Harith eventually manages to find him, and his accusations are met with amusement by Abu Zayd.

The choice of illustration poses no particular problem except in folios 78, 82, and 57* of Paris 3929; their relations to the text are unusual. Folio 82 represents Abu Zayd kissing his son before leaving him (a subject otherwise illustrated only in Leningrad, page 235—the faces have escaped retouching, permitting us to study the technique used for facial representation in that manuscript). Folio 78 shows Al-Harith mourning his dead servant at the beginning of the story, and folio 57* shows Abu Zayd laughing at al-Harith toward the end. The first two illustrations, though involving minor incidents, are easily identifiable, and the third depicts in all vulgarity the word used in the text for Abu Zayd's reaction: darata, "to cause or make mad."

Otherwise most of the illustrations are of the obvious scenes: the meeting of the heroes and the purchase of the slave, the scene with the judge, and the final meeting of the two principals. This last scene, in Leningrad, page 238, London 1200, folio 113, London 22114, London 9718, folio 141, and Vienna, folio 122, has no distinguishing features.
The four judgment scenes (Paris 5847, fol. 107, Leningrad, p. 236, Istanbul, fol. 136*, London 1200, fol. 112), on the other hand, deserve some comment. First of all, the Leningrad and Istanbul manuscripts utilize architectural settings of a type they also use elsewhere. In Leningrad it is a tripartite arrangement with two planes of action and some figures fitted in between them, in Istanbul it is a single covered space with a porch in profile, whose position and originality are emphasized by a figure half inside and half out. In both cases we have a standard architectural setting that is not identifiable as an institutional building by its physical details. In all these pictures the central figure is that of the qadi, superbly shown in Paris 5847 as a turbaned Arab seated on a high platform-throne in front of a curtain of authority. Only in the Leningrad manuscript do we have the additional features of a small group of spectators and a scribe. Finally, all three of the major depictions include a curious character: in Paris 5847 he is a pointing figure at the right; in Leningrad he is behind the judge, also pointing but in the opposite direction; and in the Istanbul manuscript he is partly outside the building. All these figures can be explained in terms of the formal needs of the respective compositions, but the pointing suggests the particular iconographic meaning of al-Harith as narrator.

The most original subject is the slave sale. It occurs in all manuscripts; even Vienna probably meant to represent it on folio 121, though the result is too simplified to be immediately recognizable. London 9718, folio 138, has also simplified its composition to the point where the groupings can be related to what is found in other manuscripts, but their meanings are unclear. Paris 3929, folio 79, has illustrated the story most clearly; it shows Abu Zayd wearing a veil and holding the slave while al-Harith weighs his coins as required by the text. The significance of the kerchief al-Harith holds is not very clear, unless it is the container in which he brought the money.

The three other manuscripts greatly enlarge the scene. The Istanbul manuscript divides the frame into halves and provides an interior of no special interest. Leningrad and Paris 3929, however, show an original type of building, although the Leningrad structure bears some compositional relation to its other interiors with its visible beams, long-gabled tile roofs, and paved floor. These three illustrations all show the same arrangement—two planes of action, one above the other, two men weighing money, two older men and a youth involved in a discussion—but their relations vary. Leningrad has a sort of circular group moving from one plane to the other; Paris and Istanbul place the three figures on the same plane, the former separating them by an extraneous group. All three illustrations include a seated group of slaves, more obvious in Paris 3929 and Leningrad than in Istanbul. The one uncommon feature is an additional figure at the upper left in the Paris manuscript.

One question posed by this group is whether it depicts one moment or two. Since the weighing of the coins is in the story, the two characters involved in that activity ought to be Abu Zayd and al-Harith. But it is also quite certain that Abu Zayd, his son, and al-Harith are shown as they meet, and the weighing figures could simply be part of the background, like the slaves. Their introduction may have been inspired by a reference in the text, but they have no iconographic purpose in the illustration. This second interpretation is preferable, simply because there have so far been no instances of clear-cut conflations of iconographic units. If so, these images are of particular significance in defining the modus operandi of the artists. They do not merely look to their visual memories for specific identifying features but on occasion utilize a textual indication to develop the settings of their illustrations. This additional source makes interpreting their figures a more complex problem.

All these illustrations are supposed to show a youthful slave, but in the Leningrad manuscript he is a grown man; in Vienna he is only beardless, and in Paris 3929, consistent with its earlier illustrations, he is shown in the garb of a princely attendant. Apparently the artists had difficulty in finding an appropriate way to portray a slave boy.

Thirty-fifth Maqamah

7CS–7C12 Paris 6094: fol. 124 (7C5)
Istanbul: fol. 138* (7C6)
London 1200: fols. 114 (7C7), 115* (7C8)
London 9718: fol. 142* (7C9)
London 22114: fol. 116 (7C10)
Vienna: fols. 123 (7C11), 123* (7C12)

An old Abu Zayd performs before a crowd; none of the illustrations shows any novel features aside from the second Vienna miniature, where either Abu Zayd or al-Harith is portrayed as a youth—a particularly incongruous mistake—and the Istanbul illustration, which uses its own landscape formula for the gathering. The latter contrasts with Paris 6094, where the scene is set inside a building.

Thirty-sixth Maqamah

7D1–7D12 Paris 3929: fols. 180 (7D1), 180* (7D2), 181 (7D3)
Paris 6094: fol. 126 (7D4)
Paris 5847: fol. 110 (7D5)
Leningrad: p. 240 (7D6)
Istanbul: fol. 141 (7D7)
Al-Harith, about to depart on a journey, joins nine people who have gathered on a hill to drink wine. After a while they begin to tell riddles. At that moment an old man appears at a distance, starts to leave again, but finally joins the group and displays his usual abilities. When al-Harith recognizes Abu Zayd and starts to explain to the crowd who he is, the old man disappears.

From an iconographic point of view the most curious illustrations are found in Paris 3929. They depict three successive moments: Abu Zayd arriving, talking briefly, then sitting down with the company. This comic-strip effect is unique among all the *Maqamat* illustrations and is interesting in that it omits any reference to the setting. Setting is given greater attention in the other illustrations, but only Istanbul and, to a lesser degree, Leningrad succeed in providing any real impression of a hill full of wine drinkers; other manuscripts emphasize other aspects. This particular cycle of miniatures exemplifies most clearly the characteristic landscape features of each manuscript: the complex rocks, water, and animals of Istanbul; the carpetlike ground and decorative trees of Paris 5847; the very artificial floral designs of Paris 6094; and the peculiar hills of London 9718.

**Thirty-seventh Maqamah**

7E1–7E12

- Paris 3929: fols. 50 (7E1), 50° (7E2)
- Paris 6094: fol. 130° (7E3)
- Paris 5847: fols. 114° (7E4), 117° (7E5)
- Leningrad: pp. 250 (7E6), 254 (7E7)
- Istanbul: fol. 146° (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)
- London 1200: fol. 120° (7E8)
- London 9718: fols. 150° (7E9), 152° (7E10)
- London 22114: fol. 125° (7E11)
- Vienna: fol. 130° (7E12)

Al-Harith has ingratiated himself with the qadi of a town and witnessed all his court proceedings. One day an old man appears with his son. The two fight it out in front of the judge and eventually extract a gift from him. Al-Harith follows them and manages to discover that they are Abu Zayd and his son, but both escape him.

However remarkable the qualities of one of the Paris miniatures, there is little new in these illustrations, which use the standard qadi scene and a fairly characteristic meeting of two or three people in a landscape. The only interesting points are the use of crowds and of the observer, who the context makes clear is al-Harith. In the Leningrad manuscript the figure curled around a column is presumably the son of Abu Zayd, about to appear. The text makes a distinction between the arrivals of the father and the son, but only Paris 3929 has shown them in two separate miniatures. At the same time the motif of the person curled around a column is also part of the general architectural setting and does not necessarily refer to the story. London 9718, oddly enough, uses a particularly simple architectural frame.

**Thirty-eighth Maqamah**

7F1–7F12

- Paris 3929: fols. 129 (7F1), 131° (7F2)
- Paris 6094: fol. 133 (7F3)
- Paris 5847: fol. 118 (7F4)
- Leningrad: pp. 256 (7F5), 259 (7F6)
- Istanbul: fol. 150° (7F7)
- London 1200: fol. 124 (7F8)
- London 9718: fol. 153° (7F9)
- London 22114: fol. 128° (7F10)
- Oxford: fol. 85° (7F11)
- Vienna: fol. 134° (7F12)

While in attendance at the court of the governor of Merv, al-Harith sees a tattered Abu Zayd appear and make an eloquent speech advocating generosity. He is rewarded with a gift, and al-Harith later compliments him on his success.

All manuscripts depict Abu Zayd in front of the governor, usually shown as a military prince in full regalia, although Leningrad, London 1200, and Vienna transform him into a judge. Only Leningrad and Oxford have a picture of the later meeting of the two heroes. The two miniatures of Paris 3929 use a court slave in a strange pose as a framing figure.

**Thirty-ninth Maqamah**

7G1–8A3

- Paris 5847: fols. 119° (7G1), 120° (7G2), 121° (7G3), 122° (7G4)
- Leningrad: p. 260 (7G5)
- Istanbul: fols. 153 (7G6), 154° (7G7)
- London 1200: fols. 125° (7G8), 126° (7G9), 128 (7G10)
- London 9718: fol. 157 (7G11)
Al-Harit is about to depart on a voyage one night when, just before the ship sails, a voice calls from the shore. It is Abu Zayd, who talks his way onto the boat. In the course of the voyage, a storm forces the ship’s passengers to take refuge on an unknown island. When the travelers run out of provisions, Abu Zayd and al-Harit start walking inland and come to a palace with its gates guarded by slaves. The slaves are crying because, as an old man explains, the king’s wife is in difficult childbirth and everyone fears for her life and that of her offspring. Abu Zayd volunteers his services. He is brought in and, demanding a reed pen, some meerschaum, and some saffron, he composes a poem that is then tied to the woman’s leg. This and a few other magical tricks produce an immediate and safe delivery. After receiving many gifts, Abu Zayd decides to stay on the island, but al-Harit departs.

Four aspects of this story are illustrated—the voyage, the mysterious island, the arrival of the heroes in front of the palace, and their visit to the king and to his wife who is giving birth—but only Paris 5847 shows all four. The voyage is also found in Leningrad, Istanbul, London 22114, and Vienna. In the London codex the gestures of the figures and the position of the boat indicate the storm vividly, but, as in the Vienna manuscript, the craft itself is a simple rowboat with a small sail, hardly distinguishable from the river boats depicted earlier. The other manuscripts, however, introduce a large seagoing vessel. Leningrad and Istanbul illustrate exactly that moment when Abu Zayd calls to the boat from shore and is about to be brought on board. Paris 5847 reflects no specific incident in the text. But the boats in all three are similar, with large, high frames and multidecked internal arrangements, though each image emphasizes a different detail—the erecting of the mast in the Leningrad codex, the rudder in Istanbul, the raising of sails in Paris. The crew and the servants throwing refuse into the water are totally different in dress, hair, and color from the figures encountered so far and clearly belong to one iconographic type.

In the scenes showing Abu Zayd and al-Harit arriving at the gates of the mysterious palace, London 1200 and 22114 show a simple towerlike structure with a door and one or two people in front. London 1200 makes the guard tall and black, suggesting his “foreignness”; London 22114 uses a more standard type. London 9718 depicts an elaborate towerlike pavilion on a large platform, and its slaves are distinguished by their fur-lined clothes, an unusual feature. Al-Wasit and the artist of the Istanbul manuscript have made the entrance a much more remarkable construction. In Paris 5847 a tall central structure with a balcony, a dome, and superb wooden overhangs on the roof are nicely decorated and are very different from what we have encountered thus far. The Istanbul palace has the same basic structure, but it is placed inside a heavily walled garden. The Paris picture shows three strangely attired dark servants in poses signifying grief; the Istanbul manuscript uses a more typically Near Eastern type of servant in the form of a doorman sitting on a bench built into the wall. The originality of these representations is particularly striking inasmuch as the text simply says that the palace was lofty.

The mysterious island is illustrated only in Paris 5847, where the artist has populated it with monkeys, birds, and fanciful animals. Of the illustrations of Abu Zayd inside the palace, London 22114 has a very standard throne scene; London 1200 shows a woman and child with two people rejoicing, one of whom probably holds a potion prepared by Abu Zayd. In Paris 5847 a simple architectural frame unites all the actions and characters of the story. Above it a foreign king sits in front of a traditional curtain, but here it is given an exotic shape by the addition of a pearl-borderd mandora of pillows; behind the king appear the faces of two servants. The picture fits the spirit if not the letter of the story. On either side a figure in Arab dress consults an astrolabe and writes a note—certainly Abu Zayd as described in the text. Below, a woman held up by a servant is about to give birth with the help of a midwife. Another servant carries the items that are probably to be tied to the woman’s leg; another figure looks on. Altogether, this larger miniature is a fairly rare instance of a summary image in which several incidents have been combined.

**Fortieth Maqamah**

SA4–88B5

Paris 3929: fols. 134 (SA4), 137 (SA5)

Paris 6094: fol. 139 (SA6)

Paris 5847: fols. 125 (SA7), 126 (SA8)

Istanbul: fol. 157* (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)

London 1200: fols. 129 (SA9), 130 (SA10), 133* (SA11), 134 (SA12)

London 9718: fol. 159* (SB1)

London 22114: fols. 135* (SB2), 137 (SB3)

Vienna: fols. 141* (SB4), 142 (SB5)

This rather amusing account tells how al-Harit witnesses a wonderful battle of insults between Abu Zayd and his wife in front of a miserly judge. Eventually the judge is forced into giving them each a gold coin just to get rid of them.

One group of illustrations (Paris 3929, fol. 134, Paris 5847, fol. 125, London 1200, fol. 129, London 22114, fol. 135*), Vienna, fol. 141*) shows Abu Zayd with several wives, even in front of the qadi,
Though only one of them is involved in the action. The reason is probably that the text specifically indicates that al-Harith first saw Abu Zayd with a bevy of wives. The depiction of the qadi is not particularly innovative, although the second miniature in Paris 5847 does a remarkable job of expressing his bewilderment. The same miniature has al-Harith pointing in the wrong direction, suggesting that the figure was copied from a model, and the wife is mysteriously transformed into a youth both here and in London 9718. The miniatures provide us with two types of women: one wears a long cloak, part of which forms the veil, and the other has a veil that is separate.

A peculiar feature of this story is that London 1200 has two miniatures (133° and 134°) illustrating the commentary (tafsir) that follows the maqamah rather than the maqamah itself (the exact text around the illustrations is found in de Sacy's edition, 2:529–30). One picture shows a man and a youth, the other shows two riders. These are stock figures, and their presence simply shows that the copyist of this maqamah did not really understand what he was copying.

**Forty-first Maqamah**

8B6–8C7

Paris 3929: fol. 144 (8B6)
Paris 6094: fol. 144° (8B7)
Paris 5847: fols. 130 (8B8), 130° (8B9)
Leningrad: pp. 275 (8B10), 276 (8B11)
Istanbul: fol. 165 (not reproduced; too badly damaged for study)
London 1200: fol. 135 (8B12)
London 9718: fol. 166 (8C1)
London 7293: fol. 285° (8C2)
London 22114: fols. 143 (8C3), 144 (8C4)
Oxford: fols. 72° (8C5), 74 (8C6)
Vienna: fol. 147° (8C7)

In a mosque al-Harith encounters a preacher delivering a sermon. When he finishes impressing his audience, a child jumps up and asks everyone to follow the old man's precepts by giving him alms. Al-Harith follows the speaker and the child when they leave and discovers that they are Abu Zayd and his son. Abu Zayd invites him to his house for a glass of wine, but the indignant al-Harith refuses and Abu Zayd leaves.

The illustrations for this story can be divided into two groups, neither of them very new or original. One group includes both illustrations in Paris 5847, and the second illustrations in London 22114, Leningrad, London 9718, and Oxford. Their subject is once again the meeting and parting of Abu Zayd and al-Harith in an unspecified place after the main event. The landscape is typical, with particularly good examples of the type in Paris 5847 and Oxford. Two deviations are that the Paris manuscript has two illustrations of the same subject; one is typical of al-Wasiti's work, showing two men around a tree, but the other is less so, representing one man walking away and the other gaping in amazement. In its simplicity and neglect of setting it is more characteristic of a manuscript like Paris 3929, and no clear explanation can be given for this sudden appearance of a mode of illustration so atypical of al-Wasiti's work. Another peculiarity of this group is that only the Oxford manuscript is iconographically faithful to the text in its portrayal of Abu Zayd's son.

All the other illustrations deal with the main scene in the mosque. London 1200 and Vienna entirely ignore the architectural setting, but this is not unusual. More original is London 7293, with its celebrated unfinished drawing of the moment when Abu Zayd's son speaks up. It not only avoids any representation of the mosque but gives the whole scene an exterior setting beneath a carefully underlined sky. Its composition of crowds in groups of two is also original in its emphasis on caricaturing facial types.

The other manuscripts all symbolize mosque architecture with arcades and lamps or even an occasional small dome, as in Paris 6094, Oxford, and London 22114. The mosque is provided with an elaborate minaret in the Leningrad manuscript, and on the side of the ritaq in Paris 3929 there is a curious towerlike affair that could also be explained as a misunderstood minaret. Finally, both London 22114 and Oxford have unusually developed spatial arrangements to vary the ways the speaker and the crowds are fitted between the columns.

**Forty-second Maqamah**

8C8–8D8

Paris 3929: fol. 65° (8C8)
Paris 6094: fol. 147° (8C9)
Paris 5847: fols. 131° (8C10), 133° (8C11)
Leningrad: pp. 278 (8C12), 283 (8D1)
Istanbul: fol. 167° (8D2)
London 1200: fol. 137° (8D3)
London 9718: fols. 169 (8D4), 171° (8D5)
London 22114: fol. 145 (8D6)
Oxford: fol. 75 (8D7)
Vienna: fol. 150 (8D8)

Al-Harith is visiting with his usual crowd of learned men. An old man comes and proposes that he be given a fee for every riddle he poses that no one can solve. After winning some money with his
unsolvable riddles, Abu Zayd proclaims his place of birth and his qual-
ities, then departs.

The elements of the story do not lend themselves to original il-
ustrations. The two manuscripts that provide two illustrations have
in effect simply repeated the same image with minor modifications. All
the manuscripts use the theme of the individual and the crowd. The
very composed crowds of Paris 5847, the lively ones of the Leningrad
manuscript, the differentiated ones in Istanbul and Paris 6094, and the
crowd with a Negro in the Vienna codex all utilize frequently encoun-
tered ways of representation.

Of greater interest are the settings, since the text does not
specify one. Paris 5847 and London 1200 have none; Vienna shows the
barest indication of an interior; Paris 6094 uses its usual architectural
frame. London 22114, London 9718, and Oxford add a few symbolic
external elements, including, in the latter, a particularly effective bird.
A remarkable setting is found in the Istanbul manuscript, where we see
a tree well populated not only with birds, but also with a figure. This
unusual feature could be an attempt to represent the density of the
crowd indicated in the text, though the artist could also have had avail-
able a model of a tree with people in it.

It is, however, in the Leningrad manuscript that the most
extraordinary development is found: in both its illustrations we see a
whole city. On page 278 outer walls with high windows and heavily
emphasized battlements enclose a minaret to the left and two small
domed structures, which could be either small mausoleums or towers
extending from the walls, to the right. A figure with a stick is involved
in some unidentified activity. On page 283 the same image is repeated
more simply. Nothing in the story calls for this representation, and we
are left with two possibilities: that it is an actual picture of the city of
Najran where the story takes place, or that a towered city existed as
another typical landscape feature.

Paris 3929, folio 65*, and London 9718, folio 171*, clearly
illustrate the specific moment at the end of the story when a member
of the crowd holds onto Abu Zayd to keep him from leaving. In the
London miniature the gestures of the assembled crowds indicate the
attempt; the Paris artist quite literally shows a figure (whose face has
probably been repainted) trying to pull on Abu Zayd’s bag. Another
innovation is the hero’s climbing a hillock, which enhances the impres-

sion that he is moving away.

**Forty-third Maganah**

8D9–8F10
Paris 3929: fols. 156* (8D9), 157 (8D10)
Paris 5847: fols. 134 (8D11), 138 (8D12)

Leningrad: pp. 258 (8E1), 286 (8E2), 288 (8E3), 293 (8E4),
295 (8E5)
Istanbul: fols. 171* (8E6), 176 (8E7), 177* (8E8)
London 1200: fols. 140 (8E9), 141 (8E10), 142 (8E11), 143
(8E12), 145 (8F1)
London 9718: fols. 173 (8F2), 176 (8F3)
London 22114: fols. 149 (8F4), 150 (8F5), 153* (8F6)
Oxford: fol. 77* (8F7)
Vienna: fols. 154 (8F8), 156 (8F9), 159* (8F10)

This story is one of the longest and most profusely illust-
trated. As it begins, al-Harith, riding along on a camel, encounters an-
other camel carrying a sleeping rider, who turns out to be Abu Zayd.
The two friends ride together throughout the night. As they rest in
the morning Abu Zayd tells the story of how he acquired a beautiful camel,
how he lost it, how someone else found it and refused to give it back,
and how a judge returned it to him. Al-Harith is amazed by the story
and asks his friend whether he has ever met his match. This inspires
Abu Zayd to tell a second story about a fruitless discussion he had with
a youth on whether it was better to marry a virgin or a matron. Eventually
they arrive at a village where they meet a young man. Abu Zayd asks
him whether the village would appreciate his literary talents, and the
youth wittily answers in the negative. So Abu Zayd borrows al-Harith’s
sword to pawn it and never returns.

Of the large number of illustrations for this lengthy tale,
some belong to standard types already encountered. Leningrad, page
295 (badly damaged), and London 1200, folio 143, for example, are stan-
dard departure scenes for the end of any story. The scene is standardized
beyond recognition in the London manuscript but a bit more precise in
Leningrad, which at least indicates the sword transfer the text demands.
The second of the two illustrations in London 9718 is also routine, though
it keeps the camels from earlier moments in the story. Paris 3929, folio
156*, London 9718, folio 171*, and London 1200, folio 141, simply show
our two heroes riding. The only peculiarity is seen in the usually very
literal Paris manuscript, which shows the riders on horseback—a point
emphasized in the caption—even though the text clearly specifies cam-
els. There are several other unusual features about this image: al-Harith
is shown with a servant rather than with Abu Zayd, and his saddle is
decorated with a rabbit motif, a rare feature in this manuscript. Here,
at least, the literal artist of Paris 3929 did not escape the influence of
other models and did not always check his textual sources.

Among the less standardized images is London 22114, folio
150, which shows Abu Zayd fighting it out with the camel thief. To this
same general category belongs a group of miniatures showing Abu Zayd
and the thief in front of the qadi (Paris 3929, fol. 157, Leningrad, p. 388,
London 1200, fol. 142, Vienna, fol. 156). With one exception all fit into the traditional version of a judgment scene in their respective manuscripts. Once again, for example, the artist of Paris 3929 has made his judge primely, this time giving him a particularly rich robe and an attendant with a rare fibellum.

The only original treatment of the scene occurs in the Leningrad manuscript, where the qadi appears as an itinerant judge in a tent. Although the story presumably took place in a region inhabited by nomads, nothing in the text suggests that the judge was not in his usual setting of an urban court. The artist has therefore added a new twist to his repertory of judges, and to his repertory of tents as well. The tents here are large and black, in contrast to the small individual tents seen earlier. The partly visible figures between the judge’s tent and the others and the six upright lances in the background form an unusual arrangement of successive planes. Finally, the chief in the Leningrad manuscript is bearded and adult, reflecting once more the Leningrad artist’s inability to paint young people; in both the Paris and Vienna manuscripts he is a youth.

One commonly illustrated scene in the cycle involves the meeting and subsequent conversation between al-Harith and Abu Zayd, and it occurs in Paris 5847, folio 134, Leningrad, pages 285 and 286, London 1200, folio 140, Istanbul, folio 171; London 22114, folio 149, Oxford, and Vienna, folio 154. All of them are rather standard. Leningrad, page 286, has a typical arrangement under trees, and London 22114 has as its only point of interest the odd vivacity of the camels. The illustrations of the encounter between the heroes do, however, come with the unusually specific detail of the text regarding the meeting: “There appeared to me the form of a camel in the shelter of a mountain ... and [it] made for it cautiously ... ; the riding-beast [was] a swift dromedary whose master was wrapped in his striped cloak ... and drowned in sleep.” As a description of nature this offers little, yet apparently the words “shelter” and “mountains” inspired completely new landscapes. The Oxford manuscript shows a sort of wide cavern in a mountain; Leningrad and London 1200 depict a high conical mountain next to, and partly overlapping, the two principals of the story. The Vienna manuscript has followed a similar model but has somewhat flattened the mountains. In a much more audacious fashion, al-Wasiti has created a rocky mountain specifically adapted to a sleeper, a resting camel, and an approaching al-Harith, whose camel turns its head toward the resting beast and thus creates a ring of animals around the principals in the center. The Istanbul artist has invented a full mountainous landscape with al-Harith’s camel in the back and the heroes lined up in front; he uses the other camel to introduce a feeling of spatial depth into the whole image, emphasized by the position of the feet.

This creation of a different landscape is the more remarkable in that in three instances (Leningrad, Istanbul, London) the representation of the mountain is the same: a combination of bold, curved parallel strokes of various colors. The convention is a fairly common one, distinguishable from the structure of clearly visible rocks found in the Vienna manuscript and the original composition of Paris 5847. Only in the latter does the sleeping figure appear propped fairly restfully; the remainder show him rigid as death, and the Leningrad manuscript avoids the issue altogether by showing him awake, though indicating that al-Harith has just arrived.

The last group of illustrations for the story includes some of the most extraordinary illustrations in the Majasat manuscripts. They deal with al-Harith and Abu Zayd’s arrival in the village and their meeting with the young man. London 1200 shows the youth with a bundle of grass on his shoulders. London 22114 has transformed the grass into a bag, consolidated the village into a single tower, and altogether eliminated the heroes’ mounts. The most simplified version occurs in the Vienna manuscript, where a curiously decorated spandrel in one corner is iconographically meaningless; the other four instances (Paris 5847, fol. 138, Leningrad, p. 290, and Istanbul, fols. 176 and 177) are out of the ordinary in that they simplify the main subject matter but develop the background considerably.

Comparing the four versions raises several problems, leaving aside the Leningrad miniature, whose village background belongs to its standard type and whose only peculiarity is a trio of lean cows. Of greater interest is al-Wasiti’s composition, similar to Leningrad in its arrangement of planes but surprising in its panoramic village with identifiable buildings and activities, none of which are even suggested by the text. The artist’s departure from the text and his interest in background are given particular strength by eliminating the one iconographic feature specified in the text: the grass carried by the young fellow (whose beard is a later addition) who meets Abu Zayd and al-Harith. The depiction here of an entire village does not reflect any obvious point in the story, except insofar as it describes a boorish community without intellectual enthusiasm or literary taste. Perhaps we have here the artist’s, or his patron’s, notion of what the “provinces” were like.

The two Istanbul miniatures illustrate something of the same point and vary only in their more integrated composition and in details such as the rather odd gate and the woman filling a pitcher in folio 176. They are, however, far less faithful to the story than is the Paris 5847 illustration. The first miniature shows no identifiable heroes; the second does not show them on camelback, as they should be. Al-Harith, at the extreme right, is identifiable by his sword, but Abu Zayd
is not clearly defined, though he is probably the small figure second from the right. The youth with the grass must be the person at the extreme left being addressed by Abu Zayd.

**Forty-fourth Maqamah**

8F11–9A3

Paris 6094: fol. 156 (8F11)
Paris 5847: fols. 139v (8F12), 140 (8G1), 143 (8G2)
Leningrad: pp. 296 (8GC3), 298 (8GC4)
Istanbul: fols. 180 (8GC5), 184a (8GC6)
London 1200: fols. 146v (8GC7), 151 (8GC8)
London 9718: fol. 179 (8GC9)
London 22114: fol. 155 (8GC10)
Oxford: fols. 88r (8GC11), 92 (8GC12)
Vienna: fols. 161r (9A1), 162 (9A2), 165 (9A3)

On a cold night al-Harith is greeted at a rich tent filled with guests, servants, and food. After they dine one old man—as usual Abu Zayd—recites strange riddles. When asked to explain their meaning, he first demands gifts, then announces that he will reveal the solutions in the morning. After everyone is asleep he leaves on a camel given him by one of the guests.

The pictures for the end of the story pose the fewest problems. Paris 5847, Istanbul, and London 1200 merely show Abu Zayd departing on his camel, and, aside from differences in the treatment of landscape, their most interesting feature is al-Wasiti’s extraordinarily expressive Abu Zayd, the best portrait of the hero in any of the stories. The Vienna and Oxford manuscripts depict a slightly different moment, Abu Zayd leaving while everyone is asleep, and both manuscripts show the sleeping figures wonderfully, though Vienna exhibits a particular disregard for space.

The other illustrations all include the tent. Only the simplified Vienna codex chooses two moments of Abu Zayd’s appearance, first at the side of the crowd, then in its center. All the other manuscripts emphasize the setting, usually in terms suggested by the story itself. Paris 6094 and London 22114 stress the fire al-Harith sees in the cold night, with people warming themselves by pulling their robes up to their knees. The Leningrad manuscript (p. 296) probably has the same emphasis, but it is too badly damaged to be certain. Other emphasize the food. London 1200 and Oxford show only food and people; Istanbul goes a step further and includes some animals. In Paris 5847 a two-page spread shows an animal being slaughtered, cooked, and served.

The Istanbul, Leningrad, and Paris manuscripts also show in some detail the same basic type of large, wide tent supported by a central pole, with a lance or lances projecting beyond it and the heads

of animals framing it. On page 296 the Leningrad manuscript has added a small cylindrical tent of a type seen in some of its early miniatures. London 9718 has once again turned the tent into a simple house. The Oxford miniature shows a rather curious rocky base for the tent, probably in imitation of the more fluid ground indications in the earlier manuscripts.

The only figures that present any particular novelty are in Paris 5847—a humorous youth blowing on the fire and huge female servants bringing food. The spatial relations are no more original there than in any previous miniatures.

**Forty-fifth Maqamah**

9A4–9A10

Paris 5847: fol. 146 (9A4)
Istanbul: fol. 188v (9A5)
London 1200: fol. 154 (9A6)
London 9718: fols. 188 (9A7), 190 (9A8)
London 22114: fol. 164 (9A9)
Vienna: fol. 167v (9A10)

Abu Zayd and his wife act out a quarrel in front of the qadi then leave after receiving a reward. The qadi has them followed but fails to get them back.

The illustrations are routine, resembling earlier scenes of the same type. The Vienna manuscript again uses a youth instead of a woman, and Istanbul has an architectural setting. In all cases but Vienna, al-Harith is identifiable as the “observer” with his traditional gestures: finger at the mouth, finger pointing, and hand extended. London 9718 has two renditions of this simple story; the architecture is striking, and the second one, the attempted recall of Abu Zayd and his wife by the judge’s messenger, has been transformed into a set piece showing three characters together.

**Forty-sixth Maqamah**

9A11–9C5

Paris 6094: fol. 167 (9A11)
Paris 5847: fols. 148v (9A12), 152 (9B1)
Leningrad: p. 318 (9B2)
Istanbul: fol. 192 (9B3)
London 1200: fols. 156v (9B4), 161 (9B5)
London 9718: fols. 191 (9B6), 196 (9B7)
London 22114: fols. 85 (9B8), 85v (9B9), 86 (9B10), 168 (9B11), 168v (9B12), 169 (9C1), 169v (9C2), 170 (9C3)
Oxford: fol. 116 (9C4)
Vienna: fol. 170v (9C5)
This very long story finds Abu Zayd in school with ten young pupils, who take turns displaying their verbal prowess for al-Harith.

Aside from London 22114, the illustrations deal with the subject in the same manner. The setting is the school, at times represented twice because of the length of the story, but usually with no clear iconographic differences. All the manuscripts use their own systems of architectural background for the school, but none develops a specific school architecture. In all of them the teacher is on a high brick or wooden platform, which in the Oxford manuscript is decorated with a particularly remarkable textile. The pupils are arranged in groups similar to those of adult crowds elsewhere. The Leningrad and Istanbul codices have added their own details—the beating of a recalcitrant boy and the arrival of a servant with a basket. In the second of the London 1200 and London 9718 illustrations Abu Zayd and al-Harith have been abstracted from the setting and made into a separate picture.

To all of this London 22114 stands as a glaring exception. Eight pictures show a boy performing in front of the two heroes; the structure of each picture is the same except for the clothes. Their departures from the system of illustration probably reflect the artist’s own decision, since for detail he seems still to have relied on other manuscripts; in folios 169r and 170, architectural elements and the stick in Abu Zayd’s hand would have made better sense in a single expanded picture. The reason for this departure from the norm is difficult to explain. The same system is used in the late Manchester manuscript, whose sources are usually thirteenth rather than fourteenth century, so in all likelihood it was a fairly early but rare manner of illustrating this maqama.

Forty-seventh Maqama


Once again Abu Zayd has teamed up with his son to fleece bystanders. The entire story takes place at a cupper’s shop, where Abu Zayd is the cupper and his son the patient. Their argument is couched in such wonderful terms that the audience is conned into giving them money.

Since the story is static, the early manuscripts repeat approximately the same scene. The later London 1200, London 22114, and Oxford manuscripts have excerpted the main elements from the crowds; the Vienna is simplified beyond recognition, since the cupper is improbably exercising his talents on a fully dressed young man. On folio 164r of London 1200 and folio 200r of London 9718, the last conversation between al-Harith and Abu Zayd has been transformed into a typical meeting in a landscape. Again the Leningrad artist shows his reluctance to represent a youth.

The handling of architectural settings and of crowds presents significant novelties, however. To represent a cupper’s place of business, the earlier manuscripts show a small, usually domed structure open to the outside, with a shelf or two for instruments. All the artists, even the unimaginative illustrators of Paris 6094, have departed quite clearly from their standard architectural types to make sure that the cupper’s booth has all the features of a shop in a suq, including small size and visibility from the outside. Its urban and public character is particularly emphasized in the Istanbul manuscript, where two dogs are shown foraging in garbage near the building. In the Leningrad manuscript the urban setting is indicated by linen hanging on a line. In the Leningrad and Paris 5847 manuscripts the crowds appear on high, curved ground, as though they had climbed onto the rooftops around the shop.

The crowds themselves also display original features. The Istanbul picture simply has two groups—including women, a horseman, and some strangely caricatured figures—framing the main unit; there is nothing unusual about the arrangement. The Paris manuscript shows horsemen, and the crowd is remarkable only for its extraordinary size. In the relation of profiles to figures seen from the back and the individuals looking away from the picture it does not differ noticeably from earlier examples. But in the Leningrad manuscript the same oversized crowd is made almost circular, though the poses and faces of individuals are no different from what we have seen before. Why did both manuscripts increase the size of the crowd in this fashion and, in the case of the Leningrad codex, why was the crowd given a circular form? The large crowd may protect the diminutive cupper’s shop of the story from being overwhelmed by its larger architectural setting, a whole street of shops. If an entire row of stalls had been represented it would have blurred the focus on the cupper’s establishment, but this effort to stress the setting of the story has forced the elimination of the usual architectural framework and created a very artificial composition. The circular shape of the crowd is an attempt to give formal structure to an image
that lacked both architecture and landscape, the traditional conveyers of compositional structure in the manuscript.

The strange figure who appears in Paris 6094 is the result of some iconographic confusion, for his gesture suggests that he is the youth arguing with Abu Zayd, yet still another youth appears between them. His costume is unusual for the manuscript.

Forty-eighth Maqamah

9D11–9E5
Paris 5847: fol. 158° (9D11)
Istanbul: fol. 204 (9D12)
London 1200: fol. 167 (9E1)
London 9718: fols. 203 (9E2), 205° (9E3)
London 22114: fol. 175 (9E4)
Vienna: fol. 180 (9E5)

In this story, the first composed by al-Hariri, Abu Zayd tells how he listened one day to a moving speech made by a former wine addict. Afterward he wrote a superb poem about his own great need and was given enough money to go drinking.

The illustration in the Vienna manuscript merely shows Abu Zayd and al-Harith at the beginning of the story. London 1200 is unenlightening, but London 22114 quite unusually depicts Abu Zayd in a mosque about to begin ritual prayer. He is merely one of the faithful, to the right; the central figure is the imam whose sudden arrival is described in the text. The explanation for this odd illustration probably lies in the unusual vantage point of the maqamah itself, with Abu Zayd as its narrator. Since the illustrator was unable to show him as the main character, he almost gave him up altogether.

Istanbul, Paris 5847, and London 9718 emphasize the mosque. In the first two the scene appears to take place in a sort of maqalat or enclosed space usually reserved for the prince. A remarkable feature of the Istanbul manuscript is its mihrab of stucco and brick; the Paris miniature shows a house roof with open blinds placed on a mosque.

The second of the two miniatures in London 9718 illustrates the end of the story and portrays our two heroes in conversation. It is the only manuscript that shows Abu Zayd holding a napkin in the manner of a drinking prince to illustrate the point of the story.

Forty-ninth Maqamah

9E6–9F2
Paris 6094: fol. 180 (9E6)
Paris 5847: fols. 160° (9E7), 162° (9E8)
Istanbul: fol. 207° (9E9)
London 1200: fol. 169 (9E10)

This uneventful piece simply recounts a long speech made by a dying Abu Zayd to his son. In the first of the Paris 5847 illustrations, in Istanbul, and in London 1200, we have a literal interpretation of the story, with Abu Zayd in bed. The Paris and Istanbul manuscripts use standard architectural forms; London 9718 belongs to the same group but shows Abu Zayd on a sort of throne. A second type occurs in Paris 6094, Paris 5847 (second illustration), and London 22114 and consists of a simple meeting between the two seated characters without any major architectural effects. Finally, the Oxford and Vienna manuscripts depart from the text to the point where father and son are seen in a landscape. Simple and obvious though they may be, these illustrations demonstrate the strikingly different ways a story can be understood, from the strictly narrative and textually faithful interpretation to the highly abstract, in which the meeting of Abu Zayd and his son takes precedence over the specific circumstances.

Fiftieth Maqamah

9F3–9G9
Paris 6094: fol. 181° (9F3)
Paris 5847: fols. 164° (9F4), 166 (9F5)
Leningrad: pp. 345 (9F6), 349 (9F7), 350 (9F8), 351 (9F9)
Istanbul: fol. 211° (9F10)
London 1200: fols. 172 (9F11), 174° (9F12), 177 (9G1)
London 9718: fols. 210 (9G2), 213 (9G3)
London 22114: fol. 180 (9G4)
Oxford: fols. 127° (9G5), 129° (9G6), 131 (9G7)
Vienna: fols. 188° (9G8), 192 (9G9)

The last maqamah is one of the most beautiful. In the Basrah mosque al-Harith sees an old man on a high rock surrounded by people, delivering an eloquent paean to the city of Basra. The speaker then describes his own life, asks for the prayers of the congregation, and receives some gifts. As he leaves with al-Harith, Abu Zayd explains that he has had a change of heart and will now lead an exemplary life. He then disappears. One day al-Harith meets a caravan, whose members bring him the news that Abu Zayd has gone back to Saruj to become a holy man. Al-Harith eventually finds him there, living in a mosque and reading pious verse. The two friends then part forever.

Many subjects in this long story are illustrated. The one most commonly used (Paris 6094, Paris 5847, fol. 164°, Leningrad, p.
4 Morphology and Manuscripts

Assuming that each topic illustrated in our eleven manuscripts has been correctly identified and that most problems of literal interpretation have been solved, we can now turn to the illustrations with further questions in mind. Did the Maganat inspire the creation of a discrete visual idiom in which the contemporary viewer's awareness of subject and interpretation became largely independent of the picture's context in the manuscript? Or should each miniature be considered as fulfilling the requirements of a particular text by introducing artistic effects from other sources? In a sense the answer lies in defining the degree of autonomy possessed by each miniature. Further, each manuscript has its own personality and its own visual interpretation of the text. Therefore, in addition to evaluating the visual autonomy of individual miniatures, we must also determine what constitutes each manuscript's character.

A rapid glance at the rate of illustration of each maganah yields inconclusive results. Some, like the thirty-fifth, are hardly illustrated at all or merely have a single picture to indicate setting. For others, like the first maganah, the same episodes are consistently illustrated. Still others—the fifteenth, twenty-first, and forty-third maganah, for example—not only are profusely illustrated but depict a variety of episodes. In part, of course, the character of the story itself dictates the manner of its illustration. Stories like the seventeenth, the twenty-fourth, or the thirty-eighth, which simply recount speeches by Abu Zayd, would be difficult to illustrate more than once. The forty-third maganah, on the other hand, is particularly eventful and thus is richly illustrated. Nonetheless, narrative complexity is not a consistent explanation for the number of illustrations. The twenty-first maganah is static, consisting mainly of two speeches, but is richly illustrated; the rather dull nineteenth is provided with several pictures, but they are meaningless and almost absurd; and the third maganah has a large group of illustrations that belabor the same point. All the miniatures of the comparatively involved first maganah deal with the same two moments in the story, and the
illustrations of the very eventful twenty-seventh maqamah are not elaborate. It seems safest, then, to conclude that no set relation exists between the narratives of the maqamat and their illustrations, and that while variations from one story to the other have at times led to differences in manner of illustration, it is not necessarily the purely narrative side of each story that inspired them.

Nor is it possible to argue that consistent differences in the number or character of illustrations from one manuscript to another derived from a copyist’s or patron’s decision. A manuscript like Paris 3929 is often highly original in its interpretations of otherwise unillustrated passages, but not always. The illustrator of the Vienna manuscript misunderstood many stories, but not all of them. Only Paris 6094 consistently shows a single illustration for each maqamah (the only exception is the twenty-fifth) that summarizes a key moment in the story. All the others have no clear justification for increasing or decreasing the number of illustrations made for one story or another. For the thirteenth maqamah Vienna, whose miniatures otherwise always have parallels in other manuscripts, has the largest cycle of any manuscript and includes one unique subject.

I shall return later in this chapter to the possibility that the manuscripts are related to each other through common models, and in the following chapter I shall examine sources for the illustrations other than Maqamat manuscripts. In the meantime, two conclusions seem inescapable: that each story seems to have been treated without an obvious correlation between narrative complexity and the number of images and that, except for Paris 6094, there is no consistency in the way any one copyist chose what to illustrate.

A different approach can be proposed to our original question about the existence of a visual idiom peculiar to the Maqamat. We can identify and explain these features consistently manifested in all manuscripts. Whether required by the text or not, these features form the morphology of Maqamat illustrations—that is, the corpus of the visual elements these illustrations share. Yet to identify and explain features, motifs, and devices based on visual observation alone will not quite answer our initial question about the discreteness of the Maqamat illustrations. Therefore I have organized the definition of the morphology around subjects expected or required by the text, with two main objectives in mind: to define and explain the typology—that is, recognizable, meaningful forms with their variations—without which no system of visual or other communication is possible; and to assess the range of variations that exist among the manuscripts. The first objective should help define the specificity of the language, or at least the vocabulary, of the Maqamat and thus set the stage for considering the sources of its images. The second objective will make it possible to determine the personality and aims of each manuscript.

Morphology of Illustrations

Abu Zayd

The hero of the Maqamat is clearly Abu Zayd from Saruj—there are only a few illustrations, mostly in Paris 3929, in which he fails to appear. But a rapid glance at his portrayals shows no facial or bodily characteristic, no attire, gesture, or attribute that clearly identifies him in all manuscripts. He is given no obvious iconographic type in the way Christian saints, antique gods, or Zal and often Rustam in the Persian epic acquired standard attributes.

London 22114 is a partial exception. Its Abu Zayd is definitely distinguishable from the other characters. In almost every instance he alone wears a long light gray robe, which contrasts with the bright costumes of other figures. Although his features are fairly standard for the manuscript—except perhaps in the greater fullness of the beard—his headgear is also different. It consists of a high, pointed qalansuwarī whose tip is visible above the turban wound around it; in most instances one end of the turban hangs down over his shoulders. The significant point, however, is not what his costume looks like but that it is an identifying attire, purposely used to separate Abu Zayd from the others involved in the story rather than to identify him as a member of a class or category. It has no iconographic value in the sense of the cross of Saint Andrew or the white beard of Zal, but it does make the hero of the story immediately perceptible.

The originality of Abu Zayd’s clothing is most striking in what might have been exceptions to the rule and in some unusual uses of the type. In London 22114’s two illustrations of the nineteenth maqamah (fols. 55 and 56), Abu Zayd is shown in bed; only his head is visible, but he still wears his characteristic turban. On folio 76, illustrating the twenty-fifth maqamah, he is supposed to be naked but again wears his identifying turban. The twenty-first maqamah (fols. 59, 61) requires him to wear a tayba, identifying him as a legal authority, and this is clearly the meaning of his long white cloak; but it is worn over his turban, and his coat remains the same. The peculiar scarf visible on folio 21 also corresponds to a requirement in the text, but the sudden change in the kind of fabric used on folio 79 symbolizes his newly acquired wealth.

Less clear is the reason for the transformation of Abu Zayd’s headgear on folios 66 and 68, illustrating the twenty-third maqamah. In one instance his tayba has been exchanged for a woman’s veil, which makes no sense and must be the result of some confusion. I dealt earlier with the confusions of folio 175. Departures from the norm are few, and with the exception of the twenty-third maqamah they are minor and inspired by the needs of the text. In the many instances when the story
calls for Abu Zayd to be in disguise or to affect some infirmity, the London manuscript has chosen to ignore it to maintain the clarity of his identity, at times leading to incongruous results, especially when the model the painter used did not show the hero of the story. Thus on folio 25 the artist simply picked one of the figures from his model and transformed him into the hero. Similarly, the lack of proper identification of the hero in the twenty-first and forty-eighth maqamat can best be explained by the artist’s inability to decide which of the figures should be Abu Zayd.

The examples indicate that, although London 22114 developed a new and original way of dealing with the representation of the hero, its painter also used a model in which Abu Zayd was not differentiated. His own way of identifying Abu Zayd is a later attempt to make sense of existing models rather than a reflection of an earlier practice. His choices were arbitrary, but once chosen the figures could no longer be used as anyone else.

None of the other ten manuscripts displays such a consistent visual identification for Abu Zayd. But upon closer examination his attire does exhibit distinctive features often enough to raise the question whether there were not one or more types behind his representation. He is frequently shown with a large, generally black, cloak covering his head and shoulders and falling over his back. The Leningrad manuscript uses this means of identification on several occasions, as in the illustrations of the third, eighth, ninth, thirty-third, and fiftieth maqamat. The same cloak is used in Paris 6094, London 1200 (especially striking in the illustrations of the twelfth maqamat), Paris 3929 (fols. 56 and 180), and the Vienna manuscript. He arrives wearing a pointed hat with flaps over his ears, a black cloak, and a shirt of leaves, presumably characteristic of the particular vocation of men, carrying a bag on his back; these ideas may well have been inspired by a specific iconographic or possibly directly observed model. In folio 52 he has the depart Abu Zayd is differently dressed, this time wearing a short tunic and holding a staff, but with the same pointed hat with flaps and a bag tied on his back. The text says nothing about his clothing, so the artist of Paris 3929, using folio 186° as his model, seems simply to have dressed Abu Zayd in a costume associated with wandering beggars. He does not do this consistently, however. As a rule he tends to show him in such clothes when he is arriving or departing, but not when he is involved in other kinds of activity. In other words, the costume is used to identify Abu Zayd in set or repeated scenes but not in scenes where the event depicted would identify him.

Abu Zayd as a mendicant is shown most clearly in Paris 3929 but also appears in other manuscripts. In Paris 6094 exaggerated versions of the turban are seen in the illustrations of the fifth, eighth, twentieth, thirtieth, and fortieth maqamat; a pointed hat appears in the sixteenth. The unusual costume encountered in the ninth maqamat
can perhaps be explained as a misunderstanding of some unusual dress taken from the tradition in which the painter was working. Even for the well-known representation of Abu Zayd preaching to the pilgrims (fol. 103'), whose “Hellenistic” background has often been noted, the artist may have picked up the strange clothes from a Muslim tradition of depicting beggars and combined them with a Byzantine compositional pattern.

The iconographic confusions in the Vienna manuscript are more difficult to explain, but the fairly frequent occurrence of exaggerated turbans, as on folio 87', may reflect a common iconographic idea. The type turns up much less frequently in Leningrad, Paris 5847, and Istanbul, and in the first only in the form of overcrowding the black turban’s coils (illustrations of the twenty-third, thirty-third, and forty-seventh maqamat). Paris 5847 depicts Abu Zayd as a mendicant only twice—once in the first illustration of the fifteenth maqamat, when the text actually demands it, and again in a curious illustration of the thirty-first maqamat (the speech to the pilgrims), when the text demands that the hero be half-naked but he is shown instead with a taylasan like that of beggars or judges. Finally, London 9718 often pictures Abu Zayd with a staff.

It seems possible from these examples to conclude that Abu Zayd is often portrayed as a mendicant in most manuscripts, but also that this interpretation did not become standardized. From the ninth and tenth centuries onward, the beggar-brigand played a significant role in society in the Arab world—Jahiz, among others, has preserved a fascinating list of the various kinds of vagrants and their characteristic activities, and many examples of both eventually found their way into the Maqamat. Although literary evidence is not very clear, these people were likely to have been identifiable by their costumes, which—to judge from comparable examples in the western Middle Ages and from a few incidents in popular shadow plays—often included caricatured versions of clothes normally worn by important personages. The tall hat of Abu Zayd can be explained as a modification of the šalmuwaž imāla in of certain officials; the shawl, as a modification of the taylasan or the iḥāba of judges. And the cloak in the Leningrad manuscript, theoretically of the kind worn by judges, had probably been adopted by some category of beggar or confidence man with whom Abu Zayd was identified.

I shall return later to the significance of the relation between Abu Zayd and contemporary society. At this stage I need only say that whatever visual interpretations of Abu Zayd may have existed, and however they can be explained, they were never systematic; apart from the one London manuscript, an Abu Zayd recognizable by physical features, by costume or belongings, or by arbitrary colors or accessories did not emerge. It is this absence of an Abu Zayd type that led to confusions, most frequently in the derivative Vienna manuscript. London 22114’s effort to produce such a type, however interesting and logical it may have been from the viewpoint of the history of pictorial representation, was without either forebears or progeny. That we can identify Abu Zayd by his clothing in Paris 3929 and a few other manuscripts should be understood as the translation into visual terms of a well-known social and literary convention, not as the inspiration of image makers concerned with communicating through a visual language. They produced a prototype for Abu Zayd, but not yet a type.

Al-Harith

The second consistent character in the Maqamat is the narrator, al-Harith. He introduces every one of the fifty stories. Although in a few instances he is very much involved in the action, they are the exception. Usually he either just happens to be wherever Abu Zayd turns up, or the gathering of a crowd attracts him there. He is often either the spokesman of a group or the one who accidentally discovers and deliberately reveals Abu Zayd’s identity; more rarely, he follows the rogue to remonstrate with him and is given some artful reply. He is a passive but essential character in the narrative, a foil for the hero’s cleverness.

Because al-Harith’s function is so passive, it is not always easy to decide whether he is really present in a miniature and, if he is, whether any particular visual feature distinguishes him. The illustrations of the twenty-seventh and twenty-ninth maqamat, the ones most thoroughly involving al-Harith as a participant, portray him as a typical “Arab” with no specifically identifiable features. He can be recognized by his position or by his gestures, but in a miniature like folio 90 of Paris 5847 there is no way of knowing whether al-Harith is the older man on the left or the one on the right. One can only deduce his identity by figuring out that the man on the left is about to depart with the youth in the center (who is certainly Abu Zayd’s son); therefore, by elimination, the figure to the right must be al-Harith. Once we know the details of the story the identification is confirmed by his gestures, but the gestures are rather difficult to interpret by themselves. Other examples confirm that al-Harith did not acquire a fully defined iconographic form within any one manuscript. This is why even al-Wasiti could transform him into a youth on folio 13 without a second thought.

There are exceptions, however. One occurs in London 22114, where almost every miniature includes a man with a red beard, somewhat thinner and more pointed than most other beards. In the very first miniature of the manuscript (fol. 3') he is the figure closest to Abu Zayd, pointing his finger. Although he turns up in almost all the miniatures, he is not as immediately striking as Abu Zayd himself. Still, his consistent
presence confirms that the illustrator of the manuscript consciously identified the narrator as well as the hero by using a consistent visual symbol, in this instance an arbitrary facial feature, without textual prompting.

On folio 41 of Paris 3929, a rare illustration of a literary metaphor shows al-Harith as a Bedouin—he also acquires the odd pointed hat otherwise peculiar to Abu Zayd in that manuscript. The explanation is that the readily recognizable al-Harith was abandoned whenever text or context even indirectly called for a better-known type.

In the illustration of the first ʿmuqarnah of London 22114, al-Harith is shown pointing toward the hero in the center, a gesture often associated with him in this manuscript. Another equally standard gesture is holding the finger to the mouth, for instance on folio 26. Both gestures occur in all manuscripts, though not in all miniatures, and in most cases the character using it is either clearly or at least possibly al-Harith. In the cruder London 1200 the gesture is at times transformed into an extended hand, which may be a modification of the pointing finger or an allied gesture, for the badly damaged Istanbul manuscript shows extended hands more often than pointing fingers. Pointing fingers and fingers at the mouth do not have the same expressive intensity in all manuscripts. They are less evident in the Leningrad codex and in Paris 6094, and they can be confused with other motifs, as in an illustration of the sixth ʿmuqarnah in Paris 3929.

While there are many instances where al-Harith makes one or the other of these gestures, he is not necessarily the only one to use them. Like the hat, these gestures have both the specific purpose of identifying al-Harith and the more general one of indicating any observer. The distinction is apparent in Paris 5847, where on folio 130ʿ al-Harith is shown with one finger on his mouth and the other hand pointing toward the departing Abu Zayd, signifying amazement at Abu Zayd’s action. Al-Harith’s gesture on folio 125 and on many other occasions performs the same function. But on folio 38 several figures are shown using variants of the same gesture, and there is no way to determine which is al-Harith. The same is true of folio 105, in which, regardless of how one interprets the scene, al-Harith is not the figure in the upper left corner pointing to the main scene. Similarly, in the thirty-fourth ʿmuqarnah a whole group of figures have been transformed into observers, and on folio 126 the pointing figure may originally have been al-Harith, but this was obviously misunderstood, since he is turned in the wrong direction.

Thus in some illustrations the gesture clearly identifies al-Harith, and in others the same gesture used in the same fashion has no iconographic purpose. The explanation is that the gesture was created not to identify al-Harith, but to identify a narrator or an observer more generally. Although not necessarily indicating the narrator or observer in a story, it often made that identification possible and on a number of occasions made it compelling. But its primary purpose was compositional. The gesture played a specific role in the organization of the miniature. In a crowd of men it provided direction; in other places it filled an empty space.

Compositional pointing gesture is related to another device of similar function: the figure in a crowd who is turned away from the rest of the action as though leading the viewer from the picture into the world beyond. The figures to the right on folio 154ʿ in Paris 5847, a simple standing figure on folio 72ʿ of the Vienna manuscript, a seated one on folio 59ʿ of London 22114, and many others are examples. The exceptions are the Leningrad and Istanbul codices, where the feature is rare. The connection between the turned-away figure and the two gestures—pointing and finger on mouth—is established by the man at the extreme left on folio 44ʿ in the Vienna codex, who is pointing to the scene in the middle but looking away. He in all probability represents al-Harith. The varying function of the gesture—ranging from a precise iconographic meaning in one context to a very general compositional one in another—explains the apparent confusions found on folio 126 in Paris 5847 and other manuscripts.

In short, like Abu Zayd, al-Harith did not acquire a consistent iconographic form, although, again like Abu Zayd, he did become associated with an otherwise existing type, this time through the gesture of the narrator/observer. But while the variations and inconsistencies of the prototype of Abu Zayd arise from the requirements of the text, the type of narrator/observer used for al-Harith belonged to an existing conventional form and, as we shall see, its appearance in the ʿmuqarnah had a very different source.

Al-Harith’s depictions may also reflect another type of picture. All the manuscripts except Istanbul use a set formula for showing al-Harith and Abu Zayd together, usually in a landscape setting. Sometimes at the beginning, but more often at the end of a story, it is used to illustrate the stock moments in the text when the two heroes meet, part, or argue about the propriety of this or that action. Now and again a figure might be added or the heroes might be shown on horseback, but for the most part the formula triumphs over textual requirements, as for instance at the end of the twentieth ʿmuqarnah. Especially in the later manuscripts, such as Vienna, it also weakens the narrative effectiveness of the miniatures, although Paris 5847, London 1200, and Leningrad often use it more or less successfully. This type may actually have originated with the ʿmuqarnah, for it strikingly illustrates the stock scene common to most the stories: the meeting of the two protagonists.
Crowds

Whatsoever attributes Abu Zayd or al-Harith did or did not acquire, they were always typologically definable as members of an "Arab" crowd. The antics of Abu Zayd are conceivable only before an audience, which could act, react, and especially listen to him. Therefore an audience is required for a successful representation of the setting of the *Maqamat* as, among many examples, in the illustrations of the twentieth *maqamat*. This point is particularly striking when one compares the Vienna codex with any of the thirteenth-century manuscripts; Vienna's few figures crowded into small frames never succeed in giving the impression of that audience without whom the character of Abu Zayd remains meaningless.

Although they vary in size from miniature to miniature or manuscript to manuscript, all the crowds can be viewed on two levels. The first is the level of components. All manuscripts—even the abbreviated Vienna codex—form their crowds from the same ingredients. One is a group of standing or seated men, all but one of whom are bearded, dressed in long robes, and wearing turbans. There are variations among the bearded figures—some are thick-jawed and rotund, others elongated and thin—but the emphasis is always on faces and facial expressions rather than on bodily features, with the occasional exception of the hands. Regardless of stylistic variations between manuscripts, these figures are consistent enough to justify being considered an urban Arab type. Different kinds of people, Arabs or not, occasionally appear, sometimes required by the text like the nomads in the twenty-seventh and thirty-second *maqamat*, the slaves in the thirty-fourth *maqamat*, administrative and military officials, and servants (usually shown as youths). Each of these groups (except the foreign sailors in the thirty-ninth *maqamat*, for whom an outside source must be assumed) will eventually require a separate investigation in order to determine its consistency within the manuscript.

The second level on which the crowd motif can be viewed is in terms of composition, both its own makeup—the way the individual figures are brought together to form a group—and its function in the picture as a whole. The first consideration was accomplished in two ways. One scheme, most commonly found in the Leningrad manuscript (for instance the fifth *maqamat*), is essentially additive and linear, with figures set next to each other and generally in the same position. We find it also in the Istanbul manuscript and in Paris 5847, where quite often the row has been composed more carefully by framing it with standard figures in profile. An imaginative transformation of this linear type of crowd is seen in the illustration of the forty-seventh *maqamat*, where Paris 5847 and Leningrad have their crowds arranged into almost perfect circles. The other basic scheme, which can be called "clustered," is more sophisticated. It is characteristic of Paris 6094 (for instance the fifth *maqamat*), where all the crowds are shown as massed figures occupying different positions in space, with considerable variations in pose and often including a figure looking out of the main composition.

The Leningrad manuscript recognizes the compositional value of the clustered crowd, as for instance on page 163, but al-Wasiti was obviously equally aware of the compositional advantages of both schemes, especially in his two-page spreads (for instance in the eighteenth *maqamat*). Paris 3929 and the Oxford manuscript also combine both, but in a different way. Their crowds are arranged on two different planes, each consisting of a line of figures. The Vienna manuscript reduces the number of figures involved, but the variety of poses and the combination of seated and standing figures show it was inspired by the second scheme. Both schemes were obviously adopted from some other source, since they are at times forced incongruously into ill-adapted settings. In the eleventh and the thirty-first *maqamat*, even the ambitious Leningrad and Paris 5847 manuscripts do not avoid awkward arrangements of figures.

Whether considered as compositions or as collections of figures, the representations of crowds abound in anomalies and peculiarities that lead to all sorts of problems. Some are minor; such as the occasional introduction of Negroes into the Vienna manuscript. Some are more interesting, such as the representation of slaves in the thirty-fourth *maqamat*, where three of the early manuscripts (Leningrad, Paris 5847, and Istanbul) use compositionally different scenes but show slaves strikingly similar in such features as number, particularities of pose, scantly clothing, and the presence of blacks. Another peculiarity, clearest in the thirty-second *maqamat*, involves the representation of the nomad. Even the usually conservative Paris 6094 indicates nomads by a different type of headgear and a *kuffiyah* around the face. That these details identify nomads is clear from folio 45 in the Oxford manuscript, where the same features are used for a desert chief, and by a figure added to the crowd in Paris 5847's illustration of the twenty-first *maqamat*. Pilgrims in the Leningrad manuscript and in Paris 6094 for the forty-first *maqamat* are shown in the same way. All these examples—and probably many others—pose the question whether these subgroups or subtypes are reflections of otherwise existing cycles.

Within the crowd category are some instances that either are hardly justified by the text or occur in only a few manuscripts. Among them are some of the best-known and most spectacular miniatures from the *Maqamat*. For instance, the illustration of the cavalcade celebrating the end of Ramadan in Paris 5847 (fol. 19) has a monumental quality that has often been pointed out, but the interesting point here is that it is the only manuscript to illustrate the scene. Its conception of depth...
and its open composition are also quite unusual within the manuscript, though the facial features of the figures are typical.

A more complex question is raised by the caravan of pilgrims in the thirty-first maqamah. Paris 5847 and Leningrad show an elaborate procession whose paler reflections are also found in the Istanbul codex and in London 1200. The existence of several such illustrations with the same basic idea argues against an individual artist’s whim and for the existence of a precise typological model. The figures in it are again typical for crowds, but both manuscripts have additional walking figures in unusual leggings and hats similar to those identifying Abu Zayd as a mendicant.

Crowds provide rhythm, but their overwhelming presence also makes them the focal point of an illustration. Only the Leningrad manuscript is a partial exception: quite often figures other than the heroes (and at times even they) are subordinated to the organization of the landscape or architecture. As a result the crowd is broken up into individuals that are used to emphasize aspects of the setting, such as its colonnades, or to focus attention on its spatial arrangement or functions. Although most common in the Leningrad manuscript, this device of using figures split off from the crowd can also be found elsewhere. In the twelfth maqamah, Paris 5847 creates a tavern by showing the activities of a typical Arab crowd in the upper part of the building. A merchant appears in several illustrations of the fifteenth maqamah, and an oddly depicted set of praying figures in a Vienna miniature identifies the kind of building in which the action is taking place. Yet in spite of variants and peculiarities, what is most clearly revealed in the representations of crowds is a restricted range of human vision. Exceptions are few, and the limited range of males found in these pictures may in fact reflect the narrow range of visual experience available to artists and their audiences.

Women, Children, and Youths

Illustrations to the seventh, thirteenth (with modifications, because it calls for Abu Zayd to be disguised as a woman), forty-fourth, and forty-fifth maqamah establish what can be regarded as the standard representation of women—usually the wife or wives of Abu Zayd. It is on the whole used consistently throughout the manuscripts and shows a large figure, especially broad at the hips, wearing a long, often white wrap that is clearly the zar known from written sources. Women are not always veiled, but when they are, as is usual in the Vienna manuscript and in London 1200, the veils belong to the so-called burqa type, covering the face up to the eyes, though the illustrations of the fortieth maqamah show several variants. The earlier manuscripts, such as Leningrad and Istanbul, curiously avoid representing women altogether, and in two instances in the Vienna manuscript (ninth and twelfth maqamah) women are replaced by boys.

Some of the variations in the general type of what may be called the common Arab female are minor. In illustration of the fifth maqamah several manuscripts introduce a woman spinning, difficult to explain as an illustration of the text. The beautifully attired female in the single illustration for the eighteenth maqamah from Paris 3929, whose model was perhaps a bride, and the fancily dressed women in a mosque scene from Paris 5847 (twenty-first maqamah) are also deviations from the standard. Whether these were already existing types or were invented by the painters is difficult to decide from the evidence at hand. Representations of women with specific professions or functions are more intriguing—the mourners of the eleventh maqamah, for example, with their long braids and open white robes. Among the pictures of the twelfth maqamah is one miniature (Paris 3929) that shows a female companion of Abu Zayd in a tavern wearing clothes that probably signify the class of singer/prostitute. In the thirty-second and forty-fourth maqamah servant girls are shown with only slightly different clothing. An odd example in the Oxford manuscript turns the slave girl in the thirty-second maqamah into a wet nurse, indicating that even in the fourteenth century there was no set type of female slave. On the other hand, one miniature illustrating the thirty-ninth maqamah (fol. 122v of Paris 5847) is almost certainly derived from a source outside the Maqamat tradition. This birth scene was adapted to the vocabulary of the Maqamat, however, for the midwife has its typical amule form even though the attending servant girls are of a more elongated, thinner type. An equally alien source probably inspired the women in tight garments who illustrate the ninth and fortieth maqamah in Paris 6094.

If women are not very brilliantly depicted in these manuscripts, children fare even worse. Necessary only in the thirteenth and forty-sixth maqamah, they appear, when they do, as small, thin adults in short robes and in a few manuscripts, odd pointed hats—the type represented in the miniatures of the fifth maqamah illustrating the meeting of Abu Zayd with his young son. The thirteenth maqamah, folio 37 of Paris 3929 and the fifth maqamah of the Leningrad manuscript show children as full-fledged adults. While at least some models may well have existed for women, there were apparently none for children.

A more clearly differentiated figure is the youth. He can be Abu Zayd’s son and partner in deceit or, when the text requires or allows it, a companion for the hero (first, fourteenth, and sixteenth maqamah): whether son or companion, he is usually shown in more or less the same way in every manuscript. Paris 5847 depicts a beardless youth dressed like a full-grown man, at times with slightly fancier clothes. The Leningrad manuscript usually turns him into a true adult with a short black beard, often a short robe, and fancy leggings (for instance
in the fourteenth _maqamah_), although as a rule its illustrator seems to have had difficulty representing youths (in the forty-third _maqamah_). The most interesting youths are in Paris 3929. There, almost without exception, they are dressed in semi-military garb of boots, a short tunic, and a cap with a triangular metal plate in front, at times somewhat exaggerated and ridiculous (fol. 165, illustrating the twenty-third _maqamah_!). Their inspiration is probably to be sought in representations of authority, though since they are found only in this manuscript they may also reflect the dress associated with a specific class of beardless youths who accompany beggars. Regardless of his meaning, the youth does not reflect the clearly differentiated type we find for women. In the thirty-fourth _maqamah_, three manuscripts fail altogether to depict the young man required by the text.

**Power and Authority**

Representation of people in positions of power can be related a priori to the princely iconographic cycle, whose history and development go back to the beginnings of Islamic art. Two varieties of authoritarian figure occur. One is the judicial office of the qadi in the eighth, twenty-sixth, thirty-seventh, forty-third, and forty-fifth _maqamah_, where standard qadi form is apparent at a glance. The judge is an Arab in a long robe, with a very prominent white or black _taylasan_ over his head and shoulders as befits his position and function. His beard is usually long and impressive, and in the Leningrad manuscript he is sometimes shown in spectacular poses. Elsewhere he sits cross-legged, usually on pillows (at times on a pedestal), almost always with a curtain behind him. Except in Paris 5847, where he is often seen in profile, the qadi appears in a rather hieratic frontal position, more strongly emphasized in minor manuscripts like London 22114 and Vienna than in the main body of the thirteenth-century works, where the qadi is often violently involved in the action.

Additions and exceptions to this standard representation can be found. In a number of instances, especially in the Leningrad manuscript (pp. 46, 236, 250) and on folio 21 of Paris 5847, a figure is added to the qadi’s entourage. He is a writer or secretary who does not figure in the story but is obviously a necessary aid to a judge. A second peculiarity is unique to Paris 6094. While its qadi follows the regular pattern in most instances, he has been set more systematically than elsewhere in a pseudoarchitectural honorific frame identifying his position. This frame sometimes is given a small, symbolic cupola (eighth, ninth, and thirty-seventh _maqamah_), and in the illustrations of the forty-third _maqamah_, the qadi is shown with a leg extended forward, a pose unusual for a judge but common for a prince. Princely attributes can also be found in London 22114, folio 82r, which shows the judge in a fur cap and an attendant behind the curtain carrying a fly whisk. A similar attendant appears on folios 139 and 157 of Paris 3929, whose judges otherwise tend simply to be Arabs without particular emphasis on the _taylasan_. But these peculiarities are minor and easily fall within the clearly definable type of urban Arab promoted to a position of power.

Another authority was the wall, or governor, who appears in the tenth, twenty-first, twenty-third, and thirty-eighth _maqamah_. Not all manuscripts have differentiated him clearly. Sometimes, as in the illustrations of the twenty-first _maqamah_ from Paris 6094 and 3929, he is hardly distinguishable or is identified merely by the presence of an attendant or a richly dressed companion. Illustrations of the twenty-third _maqamah_ in the Leningrad and Istanbul codices interpret the wall as a judge, as do the Vienna illustrations for the twenty-first and thirty-eighth _maqamah_. Finally, the Leningrad illustration of the thirty-eighth _maqamah_ shows a strangely elaborate Arab figure on an impressive throne with no indication of status except the military figure to the left. A similar minor sign of official power, in both cases a sword, is all that distinguishes princes from judges in the tenth _maqamah_ in the Leningrad manuscript and the thirty-eighth in London 1200.

In spite of such confusion, however, there is no doubt that these are princely types. The clothes are different from those of the judge: shorter coat, boots, fur cap with a triangular gold plate in front, often braids, and usually a shorter beard. They are generally seated on pillows but on occasion may occupy elaborate thrones, as in the London 22114 illustrations of the tenth and twenty-third _maqamah_ or the Istanbul illustration of the thirty-eighth. The wall is shown cross-legged at times but equally commonly has one leg extended and the other bent under his body. This is the pose found in the only miniature of the Vienna manuscript where a governor is clearly differentiated from a judge (tenth _maqamah_). The most important characteristic of the wall, however, is that he is almost always accompanied by attendants. Whether they carry swords or fly whisks or even flowers (London 22114 for the tenth _maqamah_ or merely stand around the throne, they are clearly part of the official iconography of the prince. These attendants are always youthful and unbearded; their influence on a number of other figures of adolescents throughout the manuscripts has already been pointed out. A more specific, but rarer, class of attendant appears in the _kuttab_ or scribes found in the twenty-second _maqamah_ and the “people of the sword and of the pen” in the twenty-sixth. Finally, in the sixth _maqamah_ the Leningrad illustrator may recall yet another princely attribute by adding horses.
Settings

A setting defines the physical location of a scene and establishes the relations between the figures in it. Only Paris 3929 uses settings sparingly. Most of its miniatures show only figures, with a tuft of grass here and there; rarely did the illustrator depict iconographically meaningful themes—a house or a hill—even when they were essential to the story, and nowhere did he supply settings when they were not. London 1200 and Vienna are also limited in their settings, but with notable exceptions. Paris 5847 vacillates from highly developed settings to none at all. The other manuscripts—especially Paris 6094, Leningrad, Istanbul, London 22114, and Oxford—are on the whole quite consistent in giving some indication of locale, even if it does not always correspond to the story’s specifications.

One can study the settings of the Maqamat miniatures in several ways. One way is to separate the iconographically specific settings, like the tombs of the eleventh maqamat or the caravanserais of the thirty-fourth, from extraneous or emphatic settings like the masses of tents in the Leningrad manuscript or the island of the thirty-ninth maqamat, from which figures are absent. This could provide a sort of graduated list that ranks the various artists or sets of miniatures according to the extent to which they have created or utilized the settings suggested by the story. The advantage of this method for identifying the characteristics of each manuscript is obvious.

A second approach is to consider the settings in terms of varying degrees of abstraction or concreteness in any one manuscript. Thus the tombstones of the eleventh maqamat or the detailed houses of the Leningrad and Istanbul codices are conceptually different from the simple frames Paris 6094 uses to indicate that the scene is taking place inside a building. This method permits us to define precisely the characteristics of individual manuscripts, and it also has the advantage of establishing the range of precision found in the visual language of the Maqamat illustrations.

I have chosen a third approach, however, partly because it solves most of the problems posed by the other two and partly because it contrasts with the method followed in dealing with figures yet conforms to the objective of understanding the illustrations as a whole. It is a more traditional approach, since it begins by defining the typology of the settings throughout the manuscripts; settings are at first glance particularly repetitive and therefore dependent on existing norms that were independent of the text’s requirements. Variants, whatever their explanation, should reveal the extent, if any, of the manuscripts’ originality.

Two different kinds of settings can be distinguished: natural landscape and human constructions. Some settings belong to both categories—tents in a landscape or the village of the forty-third maqamat combine architecture with landscape—but for the most part they are easily classified.

Natural Setting

Landscape is on the whole limited in scope and repetitious. The most common type is a sort of grass rug, sometimes dotted with flowers. The Leningrad and Istanbul manuscripts frequently use grassy banks to relate various planes of action to each other, but few other codices use that device systematically. In a few instances the flowers are higher than the ground, and sometimes small flowers are transformed into enormous, almost monstrous, treelike plants, usually serving some compositional purpose. They are most exaggerated in London 9718, but Paris 6094 and a number of other manuscripts also have them. Trees are limited both in variety (usually with articulated trunks, several branches, and symmetrically arranged leaves or with full trunk and heavy ornamental, bushlike branches) and in function (generally compositional, since they rarely if ever play a part in the story). Curiously, London 1200 often depicts actual palm trees or other botanically identifiable specimens. Most of the time, however, the landscapes have no recognizable natural models; we are dealing with conventional types that have no relation either to the specifications of the text or to the natural world.

The use of landscape primarily as a pictorial device is particularly striking when one looks at a mediocre manuscript like London 1200 or at late ones like Vienna and Oxford. In the first instance grass or trees and flowers are represented simply by green bands; in the second, plants are used in an iconographically meaningless but often decorative fashion as compositional fill-ins or as background to the main subject. But even in the earlier and better manuscripts, representations of nature usually serve only to indicate exterior settings, not to differentiate kinds of natural settings. For instance, the same arrangement of flowers and grass are used for deserts (forty-fourth maqamat) and for settled areas. In a few instances, landscape has even been substituted for the interior or other setting required by the text, as though its artistic function superseded its iconographic meaning.

There are, of course, a few cases where the text specifically indicates a natural setting and individual painters have followed the text. The cave in the first maqamat, the bank of a river in the thirteenth, the Euphrates in the twenty-second, the flower garden in the twenty-fourth, the mountains out of which Abu Zayed emerges in the thirty-first, the hill of the thirty-sixth, the mysterious island of the thirty-ninth, and the mountain of the forty-third nearly exhaust the textual indications. These requirements were not followed systematically by all manuscripts; only two miniatures illustrate the riverbank demanded in the
teenth maqarnah, and several manuscripts transform the cave of the first maqarnah into a house. On the other hand, the Euphrates is shown in all the illustrations for the twenty-second maqarnah.

Textual requirements are in fact limited to caves, water, hills, and mountains. The cave of the first maqarnah is enough alike in all manuscripts to be definable as a single type: an open space surrounded by rocks. Although the manuscripts vary in style, the rocks are always shown as rather shapeless globular units that are given the appearance of volume by an identifying tone or color. Comparatively successful in Paris 5847, this scheme has become purely ornamental by the time of Oxford, whose rocks belong to the established convention, as in the illustration of the forty-fourth maqarnah.

The representation of water also follows a single common type: no distinction is made between rivers, oceans, and pools. A border of grass, or more rarely of rocks, surrounds an area of wavy lines related by different tones and in later manuscripts arranged in patterns. Fish were commonly used as an identifying sign for water, but in London 1200, folio 35', a little boat performs that function instead. Boats are also used in the twenty-second and thirty-ninth maqarnah. There they come in three varieties. The first has a long, narrow hull with one end curved back, is sometimes decoratively carved, and is powered by either oars or sail; it is the ancestor of the ballast or mudhulab of contemporary river transport in Iraq. The second type occurs only in the Leningrad manuscript's illustration of the twenty-second maqarnah; an elaboration of the first type, it has a small cabin or pavilion. The third type appears only in the miniatures illustrating the thirty-ninth maqarnah, most remarkably in the Leningrad and Paris 5847 manuscripts, where we see a large, obviously seaworthy ship. Under the influence of those models, London 1200 and Istanbul modified their models of the first type, extended the hulls, and filled the interiors with more or less complex structures and with figures. The derivative character of these two illustrations and the fact that London 22114 and Vienna use the first type lead to two conclusions: that only the first type of boat can be assumed to be part of the general artistic vocabulary of the Maqamat, and that the third type was an original innovation limited to a few manuscripts.

The clearest and best-developed representations of hills and mountains are in the illustrations of the forty-third and thirty-first maqarnah. A comparison between them reveals no common or traditional typology for hills as we find for water and boats. They usually combine conical shapes and unevenly parallel lines of color. The type is at its most obvious on page 285 of the Leningrad manuscript, becoming more complex in the Istanbul manuscript and more simplified in London 1200. In Istanbul (particularly the thirty-sixth maqarnah) the conical shapes are small and create several planes, each identified by an animal. This feature, later commonly found in Persian miniatures, is otherwise unknown in the Maqamat. Paris 3929, though it rarely includes symbols of nature, quite incidentally invented a peculiar concoction of its own in the forty-second maqarnah. Utilizing the conical shapes found elsewhere and a related technique of approximately parallel lines of different colors (fols. 94 and 134), al-Wasiti also created an unconventional and effective construction of masses. The same type of mountain probably inspired the Vienna illustration of the forty-third maqarnah. Less clear are the two miniatures from the Oxford manuscript illustrating the thirty-sixth and forty-third maqarnah, but this artist obviously felt ill at ease with mountains and hills. As a last example of landscape imagery directly inspired by the text, we have the unique miniatures of Paris 5847 illustrating the mysterious land of the thirty-ninth maqarnah. Its lush vegetation and exotic animals make it completely alien to the general system of the Maqamat illustrations.

In addition to automatic devices and specific natural elements prescribed by the text, the artists sometimes provided a landscape setting of their own inspiration. In the third, seventeenth, and twenty-fourth maqarnah the text is either imprecise or completely silent on the setting, but the Paris 5847, Istanbul, and Leningrad manuscripts nonetheless created landscapes. The most interesting ones are in the Istanbul and Leningrad codices, where a river or pool is surrounded by grass, trees, and rocks. Al-Wasiti provided his own interpretation when he avoided the standard form in illustrating the twenty-fourth maqarnah and created instead a truly unique and justly celebrated image of a fountain powered by a chain of oxen in an otherwise conventional composition. Such instances are rare, however; for the most part nature is arbitrarily and conventionally drawn. In spite of variations between manuscripts, most of its features—flowers, trees, grass, water, and the first kind of boat—are consistent enough to be regarded as types taken from a formal vocabulary not restricted to the Maqamat.

Animals form a minor theme for the most part; they simply belong to the natural setting. Aside from the Istanbul miniatures, in which animals are used to identify spatial planes, and two unusual examples of dogs in Paris 3929 (fifteenth maqarnah), horses and camels are the only animals used. They are depicted either as mounts for the characters or as routine elements in iconographic ensembles such as a camp or a prince's entourage. They rarely form an independent typological or iconographic series. One exception is the forty-third maqarnah, in which camels play a considerable part. Most artists either avoid representing camels alone or make them into static, standing animals as though stamped from a mold. But the Paris 5847 and Istanbul artists have used camels to heighten their compositional pattern, and the uniqueness of the attempt testifies to its originality. Another exception is found in the illustrations of the thirty-second maqarnah, in which Abu Zayd is given a drove of camels as a gift. The Oxford manuscript has
used a simple formula taken from a depiction of tents; London 9718 simply shows a single, partly hidden beast; London 1200 simplifies a related scheme; and Leningrad provides a particularly dull frieze of animals. Al-Wasiti, however, has created one of the most successful paintings in the whole manuscript. These variations—and especially the unusual failure of the Leningrad manuscript—testify to the lack of an existing typology for the subject.

**Human Constructions**

This category includes both purely architectural forms and also settlements such as camps and caravans that involve human labor and organization. The first type of architectural setting does not represent a building at all but is merely a symbolic indication of interior space—at its simplest a single spandrel, as in the corner of a miniature from the Vienna manuscript illustrating the fifth maqamah. Such spandrels are also found in more elaborate miniatures like those of the second and twelfth maqamah in Paris 5847. A slightly more developed architectural symbol is the frame, at times simply a narrow border enclosing the figures, at other times a three-sided boxlike form. A detail like the books on the shelves in the second maqamah transforms the box into a library. Although not very common, this system turns up somewhere in every manuscript except Leningrad and Istanbul.

A second type might be called "frame architecture." It consists of clear architectural elements—a column, an arch, a lintel, at times a small dome—with no specific function. The setting is not a house, a palace, or a mosque, but it could be turned into any one of those in context or through the addition of a special prop, such as the lamp that indicates a mosque. Frame architecture is rare in these manuscripts except in Paris 6094, where it is the norm. The same effect is obtained by using props such as curtains, pillows, tables, or a throne to suggest other interior settings. Among the early manuscripts, Paris 3929 uses such items most consistently, but Paris 5847 (for instance in the fifteenth maqamah) also has a number of props, and later manuscripts like the Vienna codex use them characteristically. In either of the two categories of interior, variations are found here and there, such as the addition of some ornamental feature (the most common being crenellations on the box type of frame). But in general, like the flowers, grass, and trees of the natural settings, these remain in their simplest form and belong to a general typology of routine symbols found in other contemporary and earlier representations.

The illustrations of al-Hariri's work, however, also include elaborate architectural and social settings long recognized as among their most original features. Most of them are confined to three manuscripts (Paris 5847, Leningrad, and Istanbul), but they are echoed in all the others except Paris 6094 and London 9718.

Three main iconographic types can be distinguished: the house, the mosque, and the camp. The clearest definition of the house occurs in the Leningrad manuscript, and the illustrations of the fifth and fifteenth maqamah also show its major features: a large door with heavy knockers set in a sort of towerlike bastion; a tripartite division of the remainder into a wide central area with a balcony overlooking it; domed roofs over the side areas; a wooden dome in the center that has removable mats or can itself be removed on small wheels; an elaborate ventilation system of pipes; a chimney that can be turned toward the wind; and a staircase with cooling jars underneath. A simplified version is common enough (for instance, eighth, ninth, and forty-sixth maqamah) in the Leningrad manuscript, in Paris 5847, and in London 9718 to deserve being called a second house type. It usually is tripartite and lacks a doorway, but in a few instances it consists simply of a single large opening. Its characteristic device is a pair of curtains used as a frame or else a large hanging coming down from the ceiling. Whether the hanging represents an actual furnishing, is an adaptation of an architectural frame, or indicates a generalized interior is impossible to determine. That it represents a general interior is suggested by its use in a mosque (Leningrad, forty-eighth maqamah) and by its common occurrence in the Vienna manuscript, which is otherwise poor in architectural features.

Both versions of the house lend themselves to variations in details (such as the side views of the Istanbul codex and of London 9718) and to such additions required by the text (such as the lamps in the illustrations of the fifth maqamah). Quality of execution also varies, but on the whole the type remains consistent in its main features, and its influence is seen in a manuscript like London 1200. It is absent in Vienna, except for the curtains. The occasionally elaborate setting of London 2214 seems on the whole to belong to a different tradition, perhaps an elaboration of the box type. The other two early manuscripts, Paris 3929 and Paris 6094, hardly ever show elaborate architecture.

The house type is used for schools, hardly surprising if one considers that elementary schools were unlikely to have developed an architectural physiognomy of their own. But it is also used wherever the courts of judges and governors are called for, and that is more surprising, since one might have imagined there would be special architectural representation for official buildings like tribunals or diwans.

The second architectural type is the mosque. Its most complete statement occurs on four miniatures of the Istanbul manuscript illustrating the twenty-first, twenty-eighth, forty-eighth, and fiftieth maqamah, but its elements are also found in the Leningrad codex, in Paris 5847, and, less obviously, in most of the London manuscripts. It is
essentially a representation of the hypostyle mosque with arcaded riwaqs, a mihrab, lamps, sometimes a small dome in the center, more rarely a minaret, and a railing that might be meant as a maqasrah. The main variations lie in the presence or absence of architectural ornamentation. The significance of the type is that it illustrates the traditional older hypostyle mosque and never shows the newer dome-centered architectural plan. The one apparent exception, on folio 158 of Paris 5847 (forty-eighth maqasrah), seems to be a confusion between house and mosque rather than an attempt to depict a different kind of sanctuary.

A third architectural type is the camp, though our three main manuscripts may not share it as obviously as they do mosques and houses. At its most complete and consistent the type appears in the Leningrad illustrations of the fourth, fourteenth, eighteenth, and thirty-first maqasrah. Usually spread over two planes, it shows a series of colorful tents of two basic shapes, rounded and pointed, with camels and figures in the tents or interspersed among them. At times the camp settings merely illustrate routine activities; at other times they are modified to fit the action demanded by the text. A central feature is that the type always includes a small closed tent with a triangular top. No other manuscript uses this type as often as Leningrad, and except in the case of the thirty-first maqasrah (to which I shall return shortly) other illustrators have usually preferred a single large tent or some other feature that more directly reflects the narrative. Yet almost all the manuscripts show features best explained through the influence of the type depicted in the Leningrad manuscript, as in the illustration of the fourth maqasrah with the rather unusual structure and the sleeping figures on folio 9 in Paris 5847, the camels of folio 10 in London 1200, and even the group of camels in Paris 6094. In two later examples, London 7293 and Vienna, the tent is framed with a camel’s head and a horse’s head, and in the latter there is an additional camel’s head above the tent. This decorative device is not found in the earlier manuscripts, but it may well reflect the typology of camp representations found earlier in the Leningrad manuscript.

The type’s consistent influence and a hypothesis about its origin emerge from the illustrations of the thirty-first maqasrah, which deals with the caravan of pilgrims traveling to Mekkah. The miniatures representing it are strikingly consistent. Among their details, all manuscripts except London 1200 show a small tent-shaped object, either loaded on a camel or on the ground. It is certainly a mahmal, the rather mysterious object pilgrims carried to Mekkah. It is tempting and even logical to assume that a similar shape visible in the Leningrad pictures is also a mahmal. On page 211 another small object could be a murkhah, the tentlike, semisacred symbol of tribal identity whose history has often been traced and whose presence on a number of objects has been studied by Ettinghausen. It is also tempting to conclude that the camp-caravan type derived from a cycle of illustrations dealing with the pilgrimage, but there are other explanations for the consistency of its features within our group of illustrations. The only point important to make at this stage is that, whatever its sources, the camp type was not created for the Maqasrah.

The house, the mosque, and to a lesser degree the camp appear as identifiable visual types that the illustrators of the Maqasrah used to express a variety of settings demanded by the text, with the house and less frequently the camp used in several different contexts. But defining the type does not explain all the architectural backgrounds in the manuscripts. A number of departures from the typological norm are particularly important. Some are shared by several manuscripts; others are peculiar to only one. Some appear to be innovations, while others can better be understood as reflecting other picture cycles.

The first and most obvious departure from the norm occurs in the illustrations of the caravanserai in the twenty-ninth maqasrah. There, all but one of the manuscripts introduce an anomalous architectural setting—Vienna has simplified its setting beyond recognition. A monumental building has a second story showing the doors of several rooms secured by heavy locks; a stairway leads down into the court, where in one instance there is an interior wall. Paris 3629, a manuscript that usually keeps its architectural setting to a minimum, has in this instance created an original one.

Another departure is found in the fifteenth and forty-seventh maqasrah, whose illustrations represent shops in the suq. For the forty-seventh maqasrah all the manuscripts except Vienna show a small, narrow cupping booth open to the outside, with instruments on shelves; for the fifteenth, only the three principal manuscripts—Paris 5847, Leningrad, and Istanbul—illustrate a shop in the market as an arched opening in a wall. The striking difference between the spread of the two motifs suggests that the cupper’s booth had become a type, while the shop in the fifteenth maqasrah was peculiar only to the three main manuscripts. A less clear example of a representation of a city street occurs in Paris 5847’s illustration of the twenty-first maqasrah, in which the construction above the horsemen can be interpreted as a covered street. In a third instance, in the thirty-fourth maqasrah, three manuscripts departed from a typical architectural setting to create an original slave market. A fourth instance is less obvious: in illustrating the tavern of the twelfth maqasrah, the illustrator of Paris 5847 transformed a traditional frame-like architectural system by his use of figures; the Leningrad artist produced a rather unbalanced setting whose variety of wooden railings and internal division suggest either a misunderstood model or an unsuccessful attempt at modifying the traditional house type into whatever image of a tavern the artist had in mind.
All these departures from the norms established by schematic architectural conventions or by the main house type have one major feature in common: they all involve municipal institutions of particular significance to the city's merchant class. It is the schools, judicial courts, and princely palaces that are standardized. Some of the anomalies, like the slave market and the tavern, are peculiar to the thirteenth-century manuscripts; others, like the cupper's booth or the caravanserais, are common to virtually all the manuscripts.

Departures from the norm turn up in other settings as well. One occurs in the miniatures of the forty-second maqamat, where Paris 5847, Leningrad, and Istanbul each created a city, or rather a village, which according to the text is inhabited by particularly obdurate people. The Leningrad representation has simplified walls with towers and a mosque inside. It belongs to some extraneous type; without any particular textual requirement or parallel in the other manuscripts, it occurs in the illustrations of the forty-second maqamat and nowhere else. Only the unsuccessful addition of three cows relates Leningrad to the other three pertinent miniatures. The Istanbul and Paris 5847 pictures differ from each other but are clearly meant to illustrate the same thing: simple houses with animals perched on the roofs, a village mosque as distinct from the hypostyle mosques of the cities, animals, spinners, and a village pond. Even though small details like the spinner, the rooster on the roof, and people peeking out of openings are similar, the pictures differ both in general appearance and in many details (in particular the remarkable gate of the first Istanbul miniature). They relate to each other through a common idea or a common experience of a village rather than through a common memory of a model. The Istanbul and Paris 5847 pictures can appropriately be called imaginative creations with reminiscences of typological elements such as the spinner, but the Leningrad village comes straight out of another model. Its modifications in the form of cows can probably be explained by the influence of an earlier interpretation of the story in a manner akin to the illustrations of the Paris 5847 and Istanbul manuscripts.

A second original setting illustrates a contrary situation, an instance where the extension of the setting remained in nearly all manuscripts. It is the cemetery scene in the eleventh maqamat, discussed in some detail in the preceding chapter and by D. S. Rice.

The third instance of anomalous architectural setting is found in three illustrations of the thirty-ninth maqamat, in Paris 5847, Istanbul, and London 971B. There we see a representation of a palace on a far-off island, and even though they differ in details, the three illustrations bring out the same main characteristics of a towerlike pavilion in a more or less elaborate setting. The very uniqueness of these three within the cycle of the Maqamat illustrations and their relation to each other suggest that they were taken from some external source.

The fourth original architectural feature in the cycle of manuscripts is found in London 9718 where, especially in the illustrations of the third, fifth, twelfth, and fifteenth maqamat, a totally different style develops perspective, emphasizes domes and construction, and lends precision to details of columns and arches. That some tradition was copied here without being understood is obvious from the meaningless walls in folios 27, 19, and 11'. The manuscript reflects a system of architectural representations otherwise unknown in the Maqamat cycles. The fifteenth maqamat has a particularly curious tent setting transformed into an architectural one. Since the maqamat is known as the Mekkan, could it be that Mekkah is represented here?

The last departure from the typological norm belongs to the camp scenes. In illustrating the twenty-sixth maqamat, several manuscripts have unusually elaborate tents, reflecting the story, in which Abu Zayd was found living in great luxury. In the Leningrad manuscript a particularly interesting construction is provided, whose quality, precision, and radical departure from the usual tent style suggest some external model or a careful observation of the surrounding world. This is again suggested by the depiction of luxury (grilled windows, special masonry, decorative stone carvings) in the architecture of the thirteenth maqamat. In the miniatures of the forty-fourth and thirty-second maqamat, by contrast, the story takes place among the Bedouins, and in our three principal manuscripts the wide black tent still seen among the Bedouins today is represented.

Representation of Actions

Vivacity and movement characterize the thirteenth-century illustrations, but so does repetition. The same gestures and poses constantly recur. Do particular poses and gestures depict specific actions? Or are they, like the pointed finger of the narrator/observer, generalized visual devices that acquire concrete meanings only in certain contexts?

Speaking is the most common action in these stories, and as such it is expressed throughout by hand and arm gestures. Abu Zayd gestures in three different ways within the same set of subjects in the first maqamat (right arm extended upward in London 22114 and downward in Paris 6094, arms crossed in Oxford and Vienna). The extended arm, the open palm, and the pointed finger are found in all the manuscripts, and almost always the same gesture is used for speaking and for listening (for instance, in the illustrations of the twenty-first maqamat). They express conversation generally, and as a rule it is not possible to say which character is speaking and which listening without appealing to the text. Since so many pictures depict speech making of one sort or another, the illustrations of the Maqamat that depict it never acquire narrative precision in showing the specific moments mentioned by the text, except...
where another feature or detail—the background, for instance—provides it. Thus the very common picture of two or three people sitting or standing in a natural setting is completely meaningless as an illustration and significant only as a symbol or reminder of a characteristic aspect of the Maqamat as a whole. Except in the instance of Paris 3929, therefore, the main activities of the story remain general, and we do not encounter either the stereotyped battle or enthronement scenes found in the later Shahnama illustrations, or the iconographic specificity of biblical illustrations.

Most other activities can be summarized quite simply. Eating is most clearly defined through the presence of food rather than through precise gestures, although at times (for instance Vienna’s illustration of the thirty-second maqamat) rather crude gestures of eating are attempted. Food and eating are also identified through a servant bringing food, as in the fifteenth maqamat. Fighting, as it might have occurred in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh maqamat, is usually omitted altogether or shown by very rough movements of bodies. Sleeping is indicated by figures lying on their backs. Attempts at representing dancing or other unusual modes of behavior are few and usually, as in the ninth maqamat, meaningless without reference to the story. In the forty-ninth maqamat teaching and learning are symbolized by men reading and writing, but in the twenty-first maqamat one manuscript (Paris 3929) translates the word eebah (companions) into a master and pupil, perhaps reflecting some colloquial understanding of the word or an existing visual type.

A few attempts have been made at subtler effects. In the twenty-fifth maqamat two manuscripts try to indicate the suddenness of Abu Zayd’s appearance by showing him emerging from a tower; in the second maqamat Paris 5847 illustrates through gestures the sadness of al-Harith at the time of Abu Zayd’s departure. A number of manuscripts try to portray the more complex emotions of despair or greed, as in the tenth or nineteenth maqamat. But none of these subtleties is understandable by itself, and most fail to become an integral part of the system of illustration. The point is particularly striking in Paris 5847, where al-Wasiti has in many cases tried cleverly to develop a meaningful translation of the deeper aspects of the text. But his efforts are not always successful because they do not replace the text even when they translate it, and they are not used frequently enough to be regarded as characteristic of the manuscript’s illustrations in general.

This failure to achieve a coherent expressive vocabulary for activities other than speaking is particularly striking when one contemplates the diversity of the manuscripts’ settings, especially the architectural ones. It poses a fundamental problem for these works and possibly for any large group of illustrations: Did the painters simply reach the limit of their technical abilities? Or did they consciously seek to emphasize setting rather than action, with a few miniatures in Paris 5847 as partial exceptions? I shall return to these questions in the conclusion.

From Morphology to Manuscripts

Our investigations so far have dealt with the Maqamat miniatures as illustrations of individual stories, then as transcriptions into visual form of the most consistently posed requirements of the text. In the first instance the point of departure was always the written source; in the second it was also in part the evidence of the miniatures, as certain themes—architectural setting or landscape—appeared in the pictures, though not necessarily required by Hariri’s account. Two sets of coordinates were thereby suggested for the Maqamat illustrations: their degree of literalness in expressing a narrative, and their degree of autonomy in the elements used for that expression. In both instances the discussion so far has constantly alluded to a real or supposed reliance on models or types and to the idiosyncrasies of individual manuscripts. Models and sources will be discussed in the following chapter, but a definition of the characteristics of each manuscript and of their relation to each other is a convenient way to conclude this analysis, since it returns to the illustrations as parts of a finite syntactic set, the completed book. I shall first summarize the arguments that force me to conclude that not one of the extant manuscripts is a direct copy of any of the others, then turn to a definition of each manuscript’s way of dealing with the text.

Even though here and there (for instance in the thirty-ninth maqamat between Paris 5847 and London 1200, or in the fourth maqamat between several manuscripts) a miniature can best be explained as repeating another existing one, these parallels are neither numerous nor consistent enough to establish a thread that would tie them all together. The landscape setting of Paris 5847 and Leningrad in the fourth maqamat does indeed suggest a relation between the two manuscripts, but an instance like the twenty-fourth maqamat, where eight manuscripts illustrate the same subject in eight different ways, is in my judgment far more common, and this judgment holds both for the choice of subjects illustrated and for the manner of illustration. Considering the limited range of episodes to be illustrated, the variety of topics is remarkable. Even the Vienna manuscript picked otherwise unknown topics for the thirtieth and forty-fourth maqamat. In spite of the existence of an eminently consistent typology of forms and interpretations, the variety of ways presumed types appear is astounding.

Yet even if inconsistent in relation to each other, all the manuscripts show some kind of dependency on models. The question is whether these models are necessarily other manuscripts. Most of the peculiarities and misunderstandings of the Oxford and Vienna codices,
and even of London 22114 and London 9718, can in fact be explained by reliance on illustrations of the same topics (most typical examples in illustrations of the first, second, twenty-first, twenty-ninth, and forty-fourth maqamah). Only occasionally, as in Oxford’s illustration of the singing girl in the thirty-second maqamah or the Negroes in some of the Vienna crowds, does the possibility of an outside model arise. It is particularly regrettable that London 7293 was never completed, for in a few instances (especially in the fourth, thirteenth, and fifteenth maqamah) it appears to have sought new types for its illustrations. Since it was meant to have more of them than any other manuscript of the Maqamat, it could have provided a useful range for the originality of fourteenth-century manuscripts. In the absence of this document, the essentially derivative character of Mamluk illustration seems a reasonable conclusion; the originality of architectural settings in London 9718 notwithstanding.

Matters are less clear for the thirteenth-century works. The derivative character of London 1200 is obvious from its first illustrations of the first maqamah, and the models are indubitably other versions of the Maqamat, in many instances one or more manuscripts with a highly developed setting for the figures. This is not to say, however, that London 1200 actually copies another version of the Maqamat. The absence of clear models in the seventh maqamah and its confusion in the thirty-second and thirty-ninth maqamah suggest instead that its illustrator was the poor imitator rather than the willful copier of some other manuscript.

The situation posed by the other five manuscripts is more complicated. Two of them, Leningrad and Istanbul, exhibit a few instances of obvious borrowing from other illustrations of the same or related subjects. Only two definite instances occur in the Leningrad manuscript. One, in the tenth maqamah, shows Abu Zayd’s son with a sword, a rather meaningless misuse of standard imagery; the other, in the nineteenth maqamah, represents a sick Abu Zayd in a manner incompatible with the manuscript’s usual precision. The Istanbul manuscript does not exhibit any feature that requires a model. Only the awkward composition of its illustrations of the thirty-fourth maqamah and the narrative oddity of two images with practically the same subject matter for the forty-third maqamah make it unlikely that its imagery was a totally new creation. In neither manuscript, however, is it possible to assert that the sources of these minor incongruities were other Maqamat manuscripts.

The highly complex Paris 5847 is remarkable for containing most of the unusual illustrations and also for having the greatest variety of possible models. These models may be other Maqamat illustrations, as in the seventh maqamah, but many are certainly external to the Maqamat, as in the thirty-ninth maqamah or possibly the tavern scene in the twelfth. There are even internal confusions, such as al-Harith pointing in the wrong direction on folio 126, illustrating the fortieth maqamah.

Moreover, the coexistence of very complex scenes with developed back-grounds and of scenes of pristine simplicity suggests either that al-Wasiti had several Maqamat models at his disposal, which he followed, simplified, or expanded according to whatever interest or purpose he had in mind, or that he was a creator inspired to innovate and to vary his effects.

A most peculiar case is presented by Paris 3929. Quite consistently, its typological components and especially its choice of subjects are the exceptions. Its scenes are always close to the text, sometimes almost absurdly so. Sometimes the principals of the story are missing or the picture has been telescoped into a few components. At times the principals appear in odd ways, like Abu Zayd’s kneeling position in the sixth maqamah. At other times, as in the second or the twenty-ninth maqamah, a fuller image with its proper setting is depicted. These anomalies and variations and the consequent lack of visual intelligibility of the miniatures suggest that the manuscript was influenced by partially misunderstood models (for instance in its illustrations of the forty-third maqamah, for which this literal artist did not check his sources) or at least affected by the existence of other illustrated manuscripts.

Finally there remains Paris 6094. Its stylistic characteristics set it apart from the rest of the manuscripts. Typologically also it is least often comparable to other versions of the Maqamat, but it is incomplete and lacks illustrations for the thirty-fourth and the thirty-ninth maqamah, in which parallels and deviations are elsewhere most visible. In some instances—such as in the first maqamah, it is the only one that has attempted a correct depiction of the garb worn by Abu Zayd. The presumed models for the illustration of the fourth maqamah need not be another illustrated Maqamat, although the house, the resting camels, and the two seated figures are too closely related to similar illustrations in other manuscripts to be inventions. The importance given to the servant in the fifth maqamah is again too consistent with other Maqamat illustrations of the same scene to be considered fully accidental, and its miniature for the sixth maqamah makes better sense if related to the type of imagery apparent in the Leningrad manuscript. And when in the twenty-fifth maqamah Abu Zayd is shown without a turban, it is probably because the model used for a naked man did not wear any headgear. In short, it seems that Paris 6094, in spite of its oddities, also depended on existing illustrations for the same story.

We can see, then, that the illustrated manuscripts of the maqamah are independent of each other, but that all of them—with the possible exception of Istanbul and Leningrad—consistently show the influence of other illustrations from what can almost always be identified as Maqamat manuscripts. The exception of the Leningrad manuscript can be explained by assuming that it is earlier than the others, as Rice has already concluded. The Istanbul manuscript, however, is dated be-
between 1242 and 1248 and is therefore later than both Paris 5847 (1237) and Paris 6094 (1222) and roughly contemporary with London 1200. Therefore a purely chronological ordering of the remaining manuscripts must be based on some other principle. Enlarging upon an interpretation developed elsewhere around a small number of miniatures. I should like to propose first that all manuscripts should be defined in terms of their relation to the text; second, that certain kinds of relations to the text must by their very nature be earlier than others; but, third, that such chronologies are not absolute, since any relation can disappear and reappear in a later manuscript even if versions and imitations of earlier types have occurred in the meantime. For it is both legitimate and logical to assume that illustration of works of literature reflected not only a contemporary style of representation but also a variety of individual tastes and attitudes toward the book itself.

The earliest kind of illustrated Maqamat is represented by the Leningrad and Istanbul manuscripts, which belong to the same "set" and share the same characteristics: consistently "expanded" illustrations in which the setting plays a part equal to or greater than the incidents of the story; interest in developed architectural backgrounds typologically common to both manuscripts; interest in the manipulation of crowds; minimizing of nature except when it emphasizes the representation of heroes or of crowds; minimizing of the animal world except for a few stereotyped camels in caravans; and almost always a clear relation to the text.

There are also differences between the manuscripts. Istanbul introduces a number of comic figures and original landscapes; it also limits the number of illustrations. Leningrad is repetitive and tends to obscure the narrative character of its illustrations by overdeveloping their settings. Each manuscript has its own style of gesture and feature; Leningrad more often is fascinated with caricatured figures, Istanbul prefers sedately rounded ones. Yet these differences should not overshadow the profound similarity in the way these two manuscripts translate al-Hariri’s work. It is through them that we can best define the types and repetitive features found in all the illustrated manuscripts of the Maqamat. They have established the primacy of the setting in illustrations of this particular text. Chronologically, all we can say is that this manner of illustration was still in use between 1242 and 1258 and that it had to have existed before the earliest dated evidence for Maqamat illustration, that is, before 1222. Whether the Leningrad manuscript is indeed earlier than 1222 and if so how much earlier are conjectural matters, for so far we have no evidence one way or the other.

The set of miniatures illustrated by the Leningrad and Istanbul codices must have been in existence before the other manuscripts, because all the others can be explained by their relation to this “key set” although not necessarily to the two remaining manuscripts that illustrate it. Paris 5847 can be understood in terms of a particular taste, whether al-Hasiti’s or his patron’s, modifying an existing tradition. The influence of the latter is obvious in much of the manuscript’s iconography (for instance, in the several miniatures illustrating the thirty-ninth maqamat), but the manuscript also clearly has invented original settings (for instance, in the twenty-fourth maqamat) and new, purely narrative sequences using some simple recession like that of Paris 3929. It has attempted to go beyond the tradition in several ways. First, it is not fully consistent in its use of settings, but when it does use them they frequently become ends in themselves. The entombment in the eleventh maqamat, the cavalcades in several stories, and the boat in the thirty-ninth maqamat lose their immediate narrative significance and are transformed into self-contained pictures because they omit references to the heroes of the book. Most of these pictures are still typologically related to their sources, but their connection with the story is frequently unique and odd.

A second characteristic of Paris 5847 is its psychological refinement in representing the heroes of the stories. Examples are the wonderful delineation of individual characteristics in the main illustration of the twentieth maqamat, the ways the illustrations for the eleventh maqamat capture something of the text’s moral character, the precise quality of gesture in the illustration of the seventh maqamat, the capture of the sense of Abu Zayd’s speech in the thirty-first maqamat, and many other instances that display the full expression of the human values in al-Hariri’s words. But in discussing the second and seventh maqamat, among others, we have also seen that the gestures in themselves were often meaningless or part of a typology too general to be truly understandable as illustrations of the specific context. In other words—and this is the third characteristic feature of the manuscript—Paris 5847 is a learned manuscript in the sense that its painter read and reread the text in order to endow his images, whatever source they came from, with the most complex interpretative possible. The peculiar representations of Abu Zayd at the end of the fifth maqamat and of the nomads in the twenty-first can easily be explained as highly sensitive translations of the text, but also as a visual failure of the manuscript, for the impact is apparent only to a viewer immersed in the Maqamat and aware in each case of the very specific incident or statement illustrated. The failure is, of course, not one of artistic merit, but a failure to create a self-supporting, self-evident, discrete visual syntax.

The explanations for Paris 3929 are entirely different. Its narrative imagery is closely tied to the text, so closely in fact that in many instances (second, eleventh, twenty-ninth maqamat) Paris 3929 has simplified existing types to the extreme or emphasized them by being quite faithful to the type of Abu Zayd as a pseudomendicant. Yet this
The most difficult to fit into a coherent system of filiation are the Oxford and Vienna manuscripts. Oxford has a number of original features and a number of clear misunderstandings, especially in settings, where it consistently confuses exteriors and interiors. At the same time its gaunt and somewhat shapeless figures have a monumentality and size reminiscent of the mainstream of thirteenth-century painting. And in the last magamat it has preserved something of the emotional power found among the Paris 5847 miniatures. Throughout it is reasonably close to the text.

This is not true of the Vienna manuscript. Regardless of its considerable aesthetic merit, it is illiterate; its artist almost never read the text and merely copied, in a superb and luxurious manner, an earlier model. Only on one occasion, in its illustrations of the thirtieth magamat, does it show originality and clarity in subject and representation. The lack of consistent interest in nature and in architecture makes it somewhat doubtful that it derived directly from the main tradition; only in its figures, especially in the poses of the crowds, can one imagine models from manuscripts like Leningrad or Paris 5847. Whether the Vienna manuscript was actually an indiscriminate transformation in gold and brilliant colors of some less elegant predecessor or of a mere commentary like Paris 3929, whether it reflects some otherwise unknown tradition, or whether it should simply be considered as the finest visual expression—a brilliant giberish of pure images rather than illustrations—of a dead but still admired tradition are the choices we confront.

These considerations lead to three conclusions. The first is that a system of stemmata, or relationships, between manuscripts can only be based on the nature of each manuscript's interpretation of the text. There is, of course, nothing particularly original in proposing that a later manuscript can exemplify a much earlier tradition than that displayed by a manuscript that precedes it in time. This conclusion, common enough in textual studies, is less commonly drawn by art historians, whose concerns for stylistic evolution and change lead them to establish sequences based on progressive chronology alone. Largely because of the peculiar character of the Magamat as a work of literature, the manuscripts illustrate a variety of attitudes toward the text, and it is those attitudes that form a logical and at times chronological sequence.

The second conclusion is that the tradition illustrated by the Leningrad and Istanbul manuscripts (for instance, the illustrations of the sixth magamat)—and to which Paris 5847 belongs, although it exhibits an originality all its own—holds the prime place. The significance of this point, and its main corollary, is that the first cycle of Magamat illustrations emphasizes the setting of the stories and interprets the book as a series of natural, human, and architectural backgrounds within which the speeches and adventures of Abu Zayd take place. These backgrounds consist of types transferable from one setting to another.
and of a series of exceptions, some of which (such as the side tent or the prince) belong to a different visual language, while others (the caravanserai, the suq, the mendicant) seem peculiar to this group of manuscripts. The types originated primarily in the thirteenth century and were the main inspiration for almost all the manuscripts that followed.

The third conclusion is that the original thirteenth-century manuscripts are by far the clearest in their interpretation of the book. Limited though they may be in their emphasis on setting, they were followed by manuscripts that lost visual clarity and occasionally became iconographically and expressively meaningless. The lack of visually meaningful innovations and the resulting confusion are among the most characteristic features of the history of Maqamat illustrations. The impetus for the illustrations in the thirteenth century was not the same as for those of later manuscripts. Whatever the merits of clarification introduced by the artist of London 22114, his reason for illustrating the Maqamat was simply that it had been illustrated before; it was not to explain or translate anew a given text. That manuscripts should be illustrated, that pictures should be provided, became more important than any concrete meaning the illustrations might be given. The Maqamat is primarily a thirteenth-century phenomenon and has to be explained in thirteenth-century terms. It never quite succeeded in formulating a fully coherent visual language or a characteristic imagery.

5 The Sources of the Illustrations

If there was no specific visual language common to all Maqamat manuscripts and if the manuscripts themselves are related to each other primarily by their approach to the text and not by shared subjects of representation, how can one explain their formation? What was the matrix of forms, ideas, and experiences from which the Maqamat miniatures derived? By suggesting answers to these questions, we shall come closer to answering some of our initial queries about how the Maqamat manuscripts relate to the art of their time and why they were illustrated at all. I shall concentrate on the thirteenth century, since the later manuscripts are more clearly derivative. To identify the sources for the Maqamat illustrations, I propose first to define their vocabulary in terms of a sort of scoring scale of originality, starting with types commonly shared throughout the period and ending with truly unique features, then to explain as many as possible of these types and features.

Common Types

At a morphologically elementary level of simple forms, the Maqamat manuscripts of the thirteenth century share with several other manuscripts three consistent features: landscape setting, simple architectural frames, and the representation of what I earlier called the urban or bourgeois Arab. Round faced or long, pub nosed or aquiline, rotund or thin, arms carefully folded or vigorously gestulating, erect or stooped, young and smooth cheeked or, much more often, maturely bearded, this figure appears in most of the Dioscorides manuscripts, in the Vienna Galen, in the manuals on horsemanship copied in Baghdad, and in several Christian manuscripts form the Fertile Crescent and Egypt, including a 1220 Syriac lectionary in the Vatican and a Coptic Gospel Book written and illustrated between 1178 and 1180. His clothes—a tall turban with clearly marked bands, a long robe with patterned decoration, white trousers, and simple slippers—are always the same. Apart from the
peculiarities of Abu Zayd’s dress for which an iconographic model can be proposed, variations are usually minor and reflect the stylistic idiosyncrasies of individual manuscripts or subgroups of manuscripts within the larger thirteenth-century set. They include expression and quality, as in the range from the full and active figures of the Paris 5847 Magamat to the schematic outlines of London 1200 or the emaciated figures of Paris 6994 so obviously derived from eastern Christian models. Or they involve varieties of textile patterns on clothing, since each manuscript uses the same basic type or closely related ones—carefully drawn two-dimensional designs, arbitrary folds indicated with darker (or more rarely lighter) lines, or the so-called teardrop arrangements—in peculiarly uneven proportions. Unusual variations occur as well, for instance the curious presence in the 1224 Dioscorides of figures of the same type but with no feet and with the lower body narrow and immobile, either artificially straight or incongruously bent to support a gestulating upper part. The origin of this odd manner of pictorial representation may be found in the animated writing of metalwork, but the type of figure is still the same.

It is far more difficult to identify the sources for this type, the date of its first appearance, and the chronological range of its use. It rarely turns up on ceramics. The two battling men (possibly Rustam and Sohrab) on a star-shaped tile in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore, the sternly caricatured teacher on a dish in the David collection in Copenhagen, and the physician depicted on a plate in Berlin do suggest that the richly illustrated pottery of Iran in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries used the type. But considering the total number of extant objects the instances are few indeed. Ceramics in the Fertile Crescent are even poorer in these representations, and their exact chronology is particularly unsettled for the centuries that concern us. The only possible precursor for our type occurs in Egyptian ceramics of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, where we find several bearded and beardless figures with tall turbans, robes, and gestures similar to ours. Whether these Egyptian fragments and objects, most of them in Jutland, were also typical of the Fertile Crescent is still debated.

For our immediate purposes, a medallion in the celebrated 1252 Blacas ewer, made in northern Mesopotamia and now in the British Museum, may serve as a starting point for a hypothesis. In it a turbaned “Arab,” probably a representative of the “people of the pen,” the typical bureaucrat of the classical Muslim state, is shown holding the hand of a prince. Examples of the type also appear on other inlaid metalwork. The hypothesis is that at some time during the eleventh or early twelfth century, either under the influence of the “realism” of the period or because of the iconographic requirements of an expanded princely cycle, the Muslim world of the Fertile Crescent and Egypt developed a prototypical adult male city dweller who could function as a learned man, a government official, a merchant, an artisan, or simply an idle member of a crowd. The type was perfectly suited for the new art of book illustration, because the contents of those books—popular science, tales of Arab heroes, pseudoclassical literature—dealt with just the kinds of individuals suggested by the type, and it is in these books that the type reached its full development. In the totally different idiom of early fourteenth-century Rashidinah paintings, for instance, it is used to represent either Arabs, as is probably the case in a miniature from the Berlin album, or bureaucrats, to distinguish them from the military. Its influence on other early Iranian miniatures is more difficult to assess, but it does turn up in the representation of the Prophet in the last miniature of the Farah and Gulshah manuscript, in the undated chronicle of Tabari in the Freer Gallery, in Biruni’s Ahbar al-Numayr, where it is consistently used to represent holy men, and now and again in fragments from a small-sized Shahnama in the Berlin album. It remained in the Mediterranean Arab world throughout the fourteenth century, and it may have influenced the representation of Arabs in the illustrations for the Byzantine chronicle by Skylitzes.

The hypothesis I am proposing, then, is that the ubiquity and consistency of a single general urban Arab type in the manuscripts of the early decades of the thirteenth century can be explained by the existence of specific earlier pictures representing functions and activities of the nonmilitary population of the Fertile Crescent and Egypt; these pictures may or may not have been socially restricted to the art of the prince. To my knowledge, there is no evidence so far for models earlier than those of Fatimid art of the later eleventh century. While the type was affected by non-Islamic sources in the Magamat (and probably other manuscripts), it must on the whole be regarded as an invention of the predominantly Arab world.

Somewhat different explanations suggest themselves for the other two consistent types found in the Magamat—the landscape types and the simple architectural frames. Both are found in all contemporary manuscripts, Muslim and Christian. The only significant difference is that our three key Magamat manuscripts consistently introduce architectural settings that are iconographically more complex than the rest. But the simple architectural frame (with or without curtains or decorated spandrels), the grassy ground with a few flowers and an occasional tree, and the halfhearted and artificial attempts to unite two planes by means of vertical bands all have a very long tradition. They are typical devices of late antique Mediterranean art and of art throughout the middle Byzantine period. Even more specific elements of the landscape, like caverns, rocks, and water, can all be found in the very same group of Christian Mediterranean paintings. Whether the architectural frame was a peculiarly eastern Mediterranean motif, and therefore the one most easily taken over by Islamic art, or whether it was
a very general motif is not pertinent to our purposes. What is pertinent is that the type of frame, like the type of landscape, is almost totally absent from Iranian art and must therefore derive from or be closely related to Mediterranean sources.

A certain kind of figure, simple indications of buildings or of interior spaces, and a primitive type of landscape are elements that appear repeatedly in the Maghmat and in most manuscripts related to it, because they had become the exclusive means for depicting natural or architectural settings and Arab crowds or individuals. But the types common to the Maghmat and other Arabic manuscripts are not limited to these obvious elements. There are others, perhaps less consistently used, but still found in other Arabic manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and even in other artistic traditions. Like our first three motifs, they have no specific iconographic meaning. A few examples will suffice.

The figure holding a finger to his mouth to show emotion, attention, or whatever the context may require was explained by Tikkanen many years ago as having derived from classical painting. 25 A similarly antique origin can be suggested for the two figures conversing, 26 though in this case it is possible to argue for coincidental discovery of the same motif. We are on safer ground with crowd compositions, since both the linear and mass arrangements we have seen are found throughout Byzantine manuscript painting 27 but are curiously absent from the little Persian painting we have. Final examples of common types are the organization of space and the general principles of composition, both topics analyzed by Papadopoulou and by James. 28 Papadopoulou discussed the two-dimensional principles behind the relation of the figures to each other, but, though valid at times, his suggestion that spirals are the determining factor in formal arrangements is not much help; spirals are too common a pattern to be useful for the stylistic reconstruction of a specific period.

James, on the other hand, sought to explain the variety of effects in the Maghmat pictures by identifying several techniques of what he called “space-forms”: lateral expansion, double page, multiple groundplane, elliptical baseline. A critical analysis of his definitions and of their validity for the corpus of Maghmat illustrations would take us too far afield; here I need only point out that all but one (the double page) of the space forms analyzed by James, and much in Papadopoulou’s analysis, lead back to typical formulas of both earlier and contemporaneous Byzantine art. Whether we assume a direct influence or a common basis in the use of a “floating” typology derived from Hellenistic sources, it is undeniable that compositional analyses of the Maghmat lead to a small number of repeated formulas, often unrelated to context, and therefore to common typologies.

Specific Sources

Motifs for which an external source can be either demonstrated or assumed turn up throughout the illustrations of the Maghmat, but they do not occur systematically or frequently enough either in the Maghmat corpus or in related monuments to be considered part of a broadly defined visual language. Some are probably fairly rare, some are unique, and still others may have been common types even though they occur only occasionally in our corpus of images. All of them can be considered “specific” sources, however, in the sense that either they had a limited and restricted use in the Maghmat manuscripts or they belonged to limited or as yet undiscovered series outside them.

One category of specific source is the cycle, by which I mean an indeterminate number of subjects related to each other by usage and meaning or through some ideological bond. Such is, for instance, the princely cycle with its representations of enthroned princes and of appropriate princely activities like hunting, fighting, drinking, and dancing. 29 It is unlikely that the cycle was ever codified in the way Christian or Buddhist cycles were, but it always included certain subjects and forms, among the latter a tendency toward frontal representation of the princes themselves. It was also a cycle that certainly articated the appearance of the Maghmat. Motifs drawn from the princely cycle in our illustrations are rare, however, and except in frontispieces they almost never appear as a direct borrowing. One exception is in the twelfth maqamah of Paris 5847, where Abu Zayd in a tavern is depicted as a drinking prince, probably because representing the act of drinking had already been bound to the image of a drinking prince. Miniatures like the picture of Abu Zayd in front of the governor of Raibah (tenth maqamah) also recall the princely cycle, but there it is likely that al-Waṣīṭi was caricaturing princely life, not just using its visual devices.

Perhaps we should understand as ironic interpretations of a social order, rather than as simple iconographic borrowings, the thrones and garb of governors, or the servants, attendants, and youths attired like the ghulams (pages or companions) of princes, in almost all thirteenth-century manuscripts. The only instance of a sort of blind borrowing from the princely cycle might be the tents and settlements that the Leningrad and Istanbul manuscripts use to illustrate the twenty-sixth maqamah, for there the transformation of Abu Zayd into a prince is almost complete and totally lacking in irony. The only problem is that no princely image I know of shows the same handsome tents, but that may simply mean that at least in this instance the Maghmat can supplement the examples we already have of the princely cycle. Occasionally, as in the fourth maqamah, details appear—houses, for instance—that may
originally have come from the princely cycle but that here are hardly more than meaningless remnants.

Another source was clearly the theater. It was, I believe, Richard Ettinghausen who first drew attention to the similarities between the shadow plays, known from at least as early as the eleventh century, the style of a group of Persian ceramics, and the subjects and at times the forms of some of the Maqamat miniatures. 13 We know of no specific texts of shadow plays before Ibn Danial, who died in 1310 or 1311, and the fragments of actual shadow-play figures we have are probably no earlier than the latter part of the fourteenth century. 14 It is reasonable to assume, however, that the medium itself was a conservative and technically constricted one, with built-in limitations on its formal possibilities. The plots were generally topical and satirical adaptations of the popular stories typical of all societies; their relation to the more sophisticated Maqamat of al-Hariri has been pointed out. 15

The influence of shadow figures on our illustrations is both compositional and formal. For instance, several of the extant fragments of buildings interiors and boats made for shadow plays emphasize frames, with the figures appearing to be glued to them, and divide space into superimposed registers—both features typical of Maqamat illustrations. 16 The jerky gestures of so many of the figures, especially in Paris 3929, with their waists that serve almost as pivots and their thin, bare legs and long thin arms, find parallels in several shadow puppets where these very features fulfilled the practical requirement of articulation. Even groups of figures, especially children, are arranged in the shadow plays in the additive fashion so typical of the linear arrangements of crowds found in some of the Maqamat illustrations. 17

Another possible influence of the shadow plays is more speculative. The extant shadow figures are few and of rather late date, leaving us to wonder whether anomalous features of the Maqamat could have derived from earlier types for which we have no evidence. In particular the representations of women, especially the extraordinary bride in Paris 3929 (eighth Maqamat), may derive from that source, for women played an important part in the topical and at times scabrous plots for those plays, and one reported by Ibn Danial actually dealt with a bride whom he described in great detail. 18 Perhaps any setting using houses, a tavern (as in the twelfth Maqamat), schools, or any architectural arrangement that emphasizes simple frames subdivided into sections is shared by the Maqamat and the shadow plays.

The relation, however broad or narrow, between Maqamat illustrations and shadow figures is more likely to have gone from play to illustration than the other way around. A shadow theater existed even before the Maqamat stories were composed, and the nature of the relations—the importance in both of limited subjects and especially of certain formal arrangements—reflects the fullest visual potential of theatrical figures but not of painting. In any case, theatrical sources did not affect all manuscripts equally. They are found most consistently in Paris 3929, appear in some features of Paris 5847 and Leningrad, but are almost totally absent from Istanbul and Paris 6094. Whether we can infer from this a more popular background for the illustrator of Paris 3929 than for the others cannot be proved, but it does seem likely.

Two other cycles can be proposed as sources for the Maqamat miniatures, but only briefly, because we have few comparative documents. The illustrations of the thirty-ninth Maqamat, especially in Paris 5847, are sufficiently different from the rest of their miniatures in human types, in the representation of boats, 19 and in landscape to suggest some external origin. The most likely source would be the illustrations for travel and fantastic literature, since the island with unusual animals and the kiosklike palace fit with tales of voyages to foreign lands. The only extant illustrated manuscripts that use these motifs are the 1279 A’ijd ibn al-Mukhlasat (Marvels of Creation) by Qazwini in the Munich Library, which depicts the queen of an exotic land, 20 and later fragments from a possible travel book in the Berlin album. 21 But none of their illustrations seems closely related to ours. Nevertheless it remains likely that the literature dealing with exotic subjects and faraway lands excited the imagination of painters; even such a piously prosaic writer as al-Harawi, who described holy places all over the Muslim world, felt compelled to add to his account the picture of a miraculous stone with hieroglyphic writing. 22 In the Maqamat, pseudo-Indian, dark-skinned figures in cloths were probably standard for the representation of foreigners, since they also occur in fourteenth-century Persian painting. 23

Connections to another minor cycle are far less clear. The similarities between the illustrations for certain specialized skills like wine making and wine tasting or slaughtering large animals in the Dioscorides manuscripts, 24 and the depiction of the same activities in the Maqamat (twelfth and forty-third Maqamat) tempt one to infer a common source in technical manuals. Unfortunately, though we have early thirteenth century manuals on horses and horsemanship, 25 there is little outside evidence for other practical manuals.

Finally there is the category of single motifs randomly spread throughout the major manuscripts. These are either so meaningless that they almost require us to assume an external model, or they have obvious parallels elsewhere. To the first group belong motifs like the figures in a tree illustrating the forty-second Maqamat in the Istanbul manuscript— for which it is tempting to assume a Christian model, either an entry into Jerusalem or more likely Christ and Zaccheaus as in Ms. copte 13 26 — and the automatic spinning machine used by the woman in the fifth Maqamat. To the second group belongs the Oxford manuscript’s odd use of a nursing woman as the slave girl given to Abu Zayd in the thirty-second Maqamat, since the nursing woman is borrowed from a small but
distinctive set of sculpted ceramics. 14 To this group one should perhaps add the birth scene in the thirty-ninth mawqat, which probably derives from the long history of representations of births of heroes going back to classical antiquity and continuing into later Persian painting. Its iconography and typology have not yet been precisely established, so our pictures cannot be located in it exactly.

Paris 6094 holds a special place in our investigation of sources; it is the only manuscript that can be taken as an independent unit, since it alone displays a consistently distinctive style. 15 While I am doubtful about the several attempts of Buchthal, Weitzmann, and Ettinghausen to identify specific Christian scenes as models for the manuscript’s miniatures, 16 it is undeniable that the long faces and bodies, the folds of the robes, the poses, the beards, and some of the compositions use devices from Hellenistic representations reworked by Byzantine art and its provincial offshoots. 17 Among these the Coptic strain during the Fatimid period is most clearly detectable in style, 18 composition, 19 and motif. 20

Inventions or Imitations of Life

In dealing with those elements of the Mawqat that can be related to other more or less contemporary manuscripts or to the minor arts of ceramics and metal, and in considering those that derive from specific models of various known or presumed origins, it is difficult to determine which ones result from straightforward copying with only minor adaptations to suit the requirements of a story or the idiosyncrasies of a manuscript. But however many elements there are, a substantial number of motifs have no demonstrable or likely parallels outside the Mawqat manuscripts themselves. These include the mendicant, the specific functions of some of the buildings, the encampments in the Leningrad manuscript, the variety of boats found in all the major manuscripts, and the gestures and expressions that contribute so much charm and excitement to Paris 5847 and Paris 3929. Some of these features (the tents, for instance) have no true counterparts in relatable artistic traditions, 21 and there are no literary or logical reasons to assume lost models. These original features of our manuscripts can be explained only as new inventions, inspired by observations of the world rather than by other pictures. Both visual and literary arguments can be advanced to support this observation.

The visual arguments are most applicable to Paris 5847, Paris 3929, and Istanbul; they are somewhat attenuated in the Leningrad manuscript because its illustrator frequently repeated his formulas and thus transformed original creations into types. Characteristically, however, the first three manuscripts avoid repetitions. For instance, al-Wasiti provides variations for his mosques, and almost all of them differ from one another. Like the painter of the Istanbul manuscript, he makes a point of giving functional variations to his architectural settings, even if this means occasional awkwardness, as when he represents streets and the marketplace (twenty-first mawqat). The wonderful ways Paris 5847 arranges its sleeping figures among otherwise typical rocks (forty-third mawqat) and the way the Leningrad manuscript organizes its travelers among their tents suggest they are translating observed phenomena into pictures rather than copying or even adapting existing formulas. 22 This is not to say that any part of these miniatures should be described as realistic: they do not seek to translate physical reality into a visual illusion. What they do instead is translate memories of the surrounding world into partly conventional signs. In almost all instances the artists chose for their themes and motifs urban architectural settings, 23 the Arab bourgeoisie man, encampments (probably the camps involved in the pilgrimage to Mekkah), and also the characteristic stopovers of commercial caravans. They hardly ever chose observable nature, women, the military elite, or foreigners.

Literary evidence is more difficult to utilize because we lack adequate studies that separate traditional clichés from novelties and provide a sense of contemporary concerns. In addition, in spite of the many Western attempts to relate art and literature, 24 no truly usable method of doing so has been worked out. While textual data have led me to propose that certain white objects in encampment scenes were the mahmal or markab of pilgrimages, that the shawls on the heads of judges and Abu Zayd were the iyyasan or the tarah, and that Abu Zayd was at times shown as the mendicant, we can prove none of these interpretations because we cannot compare the miniatures with the actual objects they seem to suggest. No images exist that are comparable to the Venetian settings of Bellini or even the more generalized urban settings of the early Flemish painters, and no known literary sources are strictly contemporary with the manuscripts or derive from the same region.

What the literary sources can do is tell us about the characteristics and habits of the time and acquaint us with incidents that may accidentally explain a picture. It is clear, for instance, that the activities surrounding the functioning of the social organization so typical of the Arab world in the early thirteenth century, known in general terms as the futuwwah, 25 involved a variety of unusual costumes, 26 which may have been satirized or at least reproduced in Abu Zayd’s garments. But as soon as one moves to a somewhat higher level of generality, problems arise. For instance, all writers of social history agree about the importance of an Arab (Muslim and Christian) and a Jewish merchant bourgeoisie. 27 Occasional references even imply that this bourgeoisie became politically powerful in the second half of the twelfth century, shortly before our manuscripts appeared. Yet it is also generally argued
that among both the elites and the masses, townpeople tended to identify themselves not in terms of social class but either as inhabitants of a given quarter dominated by a particular ethnic or family unit, or by sectarian allegiances.\textsuperscript{5} If I am correct in identifying the primary subject of our manuscripts as the Arab bourgeois world, it is curious that it is depicted visually as a homogeneous group. Does this mean the distinctions and differentiations made in the stories had no visible counterpart, that the inhabitants of medieval cities could not be distinguished by clothing or appearance? Or are we simply no longer able to recognize the distinctions—the color of the robes, perhaps, or the shape and decoration of a turban? Or, in spite of appearances, did the miniatures consist of arbitrary images and signs only remotely inspired by the surrounding world? The same questions can be asked about the architectural details. It is clear that the caravanserais of the twenty-ninth maqamah look different from other buildings, yet the differences do not correspond to what we know about the largest group of thirteenth-century caravanserais, the Anatolian and Syrian.\textsuperscript{6} Instead they fit with the best-preserved Umayyad caravanserais built some five hundred years earlier.\textsuperscript{7} Were the pictures conservative or were the Seljuq and Ayyubid architectural monuments too new to be used in representation?

It is difficult, then, to establish properly the documentary value of those aspects of our miniatures that at first seem so closely influenced by direct impressions. But specific incidents do indicate direct parallels with recorded events. The difficulty usually lies in finding the right event among thousands of sources, often still unpublished. A few examples may prove the point.

In Ibn Jubayr’s account of his travels beginning about 1180, he tells about the arrival of a Seljuq princess at Mosul. His description of the domelike litter with its heavy ornamentation and of the bewildered animals is reminiscent of the bridal procession depicted in Paris 5847 (thirteenth maqamah).\textsuperscript{8} His account of how the popular Jamal al-Din Ibn Ali al-Jawzi came preaching and his description of a belvedere where the mother of the caliph and the other ladies of the court sat remind us of a two-page miniaturization in the same manuscript (twenty-first maqamah).\textsuperscript{9} His preacher clothed all in black who climbs up the minbar and stands flanked by flags also corresponds to some Maqamat miniatures.\textsuperscript{10}

Other earlier and later stories and events are more difficult to assess; at best they suggest practices that may have been common for centuries. Nasir-i Khusrow tells how an inhabitant of eleventh-century Cairo had a calf brought to the seventh floor of his house so that when it became an ox it could power a hydraulic wheel to irrigate a roof garden.\textsuperscript{11} The story may have been invented for credulous tourists, but it made sense to the Persian traveler, because in Persia oxen pumped water by mechanisms similar to those shown in illustrations of the twenty-fourth maqamah. Both earlier\textsuperscript{12} and later\textsuperscript{13} sources tell us that holy men wrote magical formulas before the birth of children, just as Abu Zayd did in the thirty-ninth maqamah. Ibn Ilyas, several centuries later, reports that a mosque thief was not suspected because he wore long hair and the clothes of a holy man.\textsuperscript{14} Ibn Battuta, writing in the tenth century, considers it an innovation (and a reprehensible one) for women to follow a funeral procession striking their faces.\textsuperscript{15} Even contemporary anthropological evidence—for instance, descriptions of food brought in on large, round metal tables—occasionally corresponds to Maqamat miniatures.

It is obvious, then, that any purveyor of texts is bound to uncover examples showing that our miniatures reflected common practices and at times perhaps even concrete events. One corollary to that observation is that al-Wasiti’s illustrations remain the most original in our corpus because they are easiest to relate to specific occasions. Al-Wasiti alone seems to have recalled his own visual impressions as he recorded Abu Zayd’s antics, just as he alone sought to illustrate something of the depth of al-Hariri’s text. Another corollary is that visual inventions that owe comparatively little to earlier or contemporary models predominate in architectural settings and in the representations of figures. Natural settings and formal compositions depend more obviously on models. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that people and houses were of greatest interest to the most creative Maqamat illustrators of the thirteenth century. The point is demonstrated by Paris 6094, which relies heavily on an established visual typology and style—a Christian one in this case. To the extent that it does so, it loses intelligibility and interest. Its miniatures do not interpret the text, nor do they help one understand it; they are a set of stock formulas, minimally modified to fit the basic requirements of a literary work.

The first conclusion to be drawn from these observations is that the identifiable sources of the Maqamat are almost always Mediterranean and almost never Iranian. Occasionally the pose of a princess (for instance in the tenth maqamah, where he is seen with one leg extended, the other bent at the knee), the bizarre appearance of the “outer eye” in a few of al-Wasiti’s miniatures (second maqamah, for instance), or a few items of clothing are clearly of Eastern origin, but they are rare and in most cases are related to an already assimilated princely style. For the most part the sources of the Maqamat belong to the broad heritage of the so-called Hellenistic tradition. This is not, of course, a particularly original conclusion; it has been accepted for decades. What is new is the realization that those elements that do derive from such a tradition are not really characteristic of the Maqamat illustrations. They may provide their foundation, but certainly not their flavor or originality. Flavor and originality are equally absent from whatever may have come from earlier centuries of Islamic art, since on the whole there are very few
instances where we can clearly identify Magamat sources in Fatimid art or in Iraqi ceramics. It is possible that information is simply lacking, for a presumably very derivative and popular technique like the ceramic filters of Egypt does exhibit a few stylistic details (certain kinds of beards, a sharp outline of facial features) that can be related to the Magamat. But even if the Magamat illustrations had more precursors in the Arab world than we know, they are not likely to have been a major factor; instances are few where we must assume such sources to understand our miniatures. In large part a new imagery was created that used whatever limited resources were available, then added in a more of less effective and successful way a vision of its own surroundings.

With this second conclusion we can begin to formulate some answers to the questions raised at the beginning. The Magamat manuscripts were illustrated because, about 1200, illustrations became part of the established taste of the Muslim, and more particularly Arab, world. This can be explained by the cultural and artistic explosion of the period. Imaginatively called by Marshall Hodgson the time of “the victory of the new Sunni internationalism,”68 it seemed like a balanced moment before the Mongol invasion. The new territories of Anatolia and India had been conquered, the Crusades had been almost entirely repulsed, heterodox groups had weakened or were being incorporated into new political and intellectual syntheses, mysticism and orthodoxy were developing a symbiotic relationship, and, in spite of considerable bickering and fighting among various dynasties, the Ayyubids, Seljuqs of Rum or Kirmans, Ghurids, Khwarizmshahs, and other locally based feudal kingdoms had settled into a certain equilibrium. The long rule of the caliph al-Nasir (1180–1225), the only imaginative and powerful ‘Abbasid to reign after the second half of the tenth century, in many ways symbolizes what seemed a reasonable and satisfied state within the Muslim body politic.69

It was also a time of intense artistic activity, though the intensity does not seem to have been generated equally over all the Middle East. In architecture, for instance, Iran (except for Azerbaijan) was not as active after 1150 as Syria, Anatolia, and Mesopotamia.71 Yet Iran developed and fostered a striking art of objects, especially the ceramic types—usually, and with only partial justification, called Gurgan, Kashan, and Rayy—that flourished and spread westward,72 just as the twelfth-century inlaid metalwork associated with Herat appeared later in northern Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt, and Yemen.73 As important as their techniques was their characteristic decoration.74 Nearly all the artistic media, including architectural decoration,75 became animated with figures and scenes of all sorts; even inscriptions on many objects became “inhabited” with people.76 The study of the meanings and associations carried by this rich repertory of representations has barely gone beyond the easy identification of princely pastimes or of astronomical cycles,77

but it is clear that the patrons came from a socially broader population than appears to have been the case earlier. Most particularly, the urban bourgeoisie played an important role in sponsoring or at the very least buying and using these objects.78 Although different from items known in previous centuries, luxury ceramics, bronzes, and glassware were typical productions of earlier Islamic art. Books pose a problem, however. It is true that books were illustrated before the end of the twelfth century, as we know from several literary references, from a few fragments, and from one complete astronomical manuscript.79 But the sudden appearance after 1200 of several illustrated medical or pharmaceutical manuscripts, of illustrated literary works other than the Magamat, and of fancily decorated technical manuals cannot be considered the result of the purely accidental preservation of a kind of manuscript also produced in earlier times but totally lost.80 Moreover, the new art of book illustration was not limited to the Muslim Arab world but characterized almost all of Eastern Christendom as well.81 That the illustrated Magamat manuscripts are part of the explosion of this new art has long been recognized, but perhaps not quite in the proper way. Nearly forty years ago Buchthal pointed out that the illustrations for pharmaceutical texts attributed to Galen or Dioscorides did not serve any purpose of scientific or technical instruction: on the contrary, the text served as a pretext for the pictures,82 and Buchthal found in those pictures and in the idea of making them the influence of literary works like the Magamat. But if the elucidation of the latter is as dependent on the text as I have concluded, they are hardly likely to have inspired the illustrations for other texts, at least not in a direct process from one figural element to the other. All these illustrations, literary and pseudoscientific, can be related to each other only as a class of objects or as an attitude toward books in the sense that images of a certain kind become expected of certain kinds of books; their purpose is not to make the subject more understandable but to make the book itself more attractive. They are particular cases of a general cultural concern for and interest in images and representations, an interest that partakes of a much deeper artistic vitality and of a new taste.
Two questions have dominated the preceding pages: Why were the Maqamat manuscripts illustrated? And how were they illustrated? The first question was answered in contextual and historical terms: the Maqamat manuscripts were illustrated because, in the second half of the twelfth century, the Middle Eastern core of the Islamicate world underwent a revolution in taste that affected all manufactured products from books to buildings. In terms of this answer, the works themselves, either as a literary genre or as individual books, played no part; something external to them was imposed on a small number of preserved codices. The second question was not answered as simply, because we had to identify two processes of artistic decision making: the attitude or approach to the book and its written content and the choices made between available units of visual meaning. We found that there were several attitudes or approaches and that, in the absence of a standard set of Maqamat images, idiosyncratic choices ranging from already existing images from many sources to inventions and impressions from the surrounding world characterize each manuscript in varying degree.

These answers and the arguments that led to them have additional implications both for understanding the illustrated Maqamat and for the study of illustrated manuscripts in general. I will consider these implications under three headings: the Maqamat illustrations in history; the book and the text; and the significance of these manuscripts. These headings are choices among the many issues raised by our manuscripts. They serve primarily to identify the historical, cultural, and methodological questions raised by our investigations.

The Maqamat Illustrations in History

The explanation provided for the appearance of illustrated Maqamat manuscripts is that the new taste of the twelfth century called for adding representations to whatever was made. The thirteen-century manuscripts are thus seen in a pan-Islamic context. But this is no longer so with examples from the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries—after the Mongol invasion—whose importance is purely local. The latter exhibit two tendencies: one, exemplified by London 22114, toward a formalized and independently meaningful imagery; the other, as in Vienna, toward almost meaningless pretty pictures. These are in part characteristic tendencies of Mamluk art visible in the Baptisterium of Saint Louis and in the grand series of later Mamluk metalwork. They correspond to an attitude toward the visual world in which representations play a smaller part than in the previous century but formal qualities and technical sophistication are much higher. The two later examples of illustrated Maqamat manuscripts, in Manchester and Sana'a, are antiquarian flukes, whims of some moment and place as yet unknown. They are antiquarian, because they must have been inspired by the knowledge of thirteenth- or fourteenth-century examples; they are flukes because there seem to be neither intermediaries between them and their models nor a sufficient number of examples to explain them in any sort of context. The latest and most fascinating avatar of Maqamat illustrations is occurring in modern Iraq, as stamps, postcards, and other means of modern image making pick up these miniatures as part of a new awareness of history and as symbols of national glory. And I am aware of one contemporary artist who has designed in sophisticated modern idiom an abstract graphic layout for seven of al-Hariri's stories.1

Leaving aside this particular development, why is it that the fascinating experiments of the thirteenth century did not take root within the Arab culture of the Near East? There are, I believe, two reasons. One is internal and lies in one of the conclusions of the fourth chapter—that there was no coherent visual language identified exclusively as that of the Maqamat. The point bears some elaboration. It is not that personages, groups, or elements of setting are not identifiable as illustrations of the Maqamat; it is that they did not acquire, as a group or individually, an autonomous function, separated from the passages they illustrate. As I discussed at great length with respect to Abu Zayd, the terms of the illustrations did not become types—that is, independently operative visual units—but remained as prototypes. For the history of art, this conclusion is of considerable importance, since it implies that the creation of an independent imagery requires a critical mass of activities around the images. This critical mass may lie in the sheer number of manuscripts, which almost necessarily leads to copying and repetitions; in a long chronological sequence within a limited area or social setting that refines and hones a small number of forms; or else in a social, ceremonial, or liturgical context that ascribes to the images meanings other than illustrative ones and uses all or some of them in other media. Medieval Christian manuscripts and perhaps some post-Mongol Iranian ones offer examples supporting any one of these pos-
sibilities, but none of them occurred with respect to the illustrated Maqamat.

One could argue that this was so because the Maqamat is a difficult book whose appreciation was bound to be restricted and idiosyncratic. But the variety of approaches and interpretations, especially in the early manuscripts, is too great to make an intellectually elitist explanation acceptable. This is where my second, external reason why no Maqamat imagery emerged comes in. It is curious that, except in architecture, nearly all the elements of the artistic explosion of the twelfth century failed to survive the Mongol invasion or continued for only a short period, as with early Mamluk objects and Kashan luxury wares, soon to be replaced by other concerns and other forms. Yet it is difficult to attribute this simply to Mongol devastation. Of the regions where Maqamat illustrations were developed, only Iraq was truly ravaged, but even there, a few decades after the invasion, Arabic and Persian illustrated manuscripts were manufactured. It is true that there were substantial dislocations of populations, which certainly involved artists and artisans, but the examples of Anatolia and Egypt show how actively brilliant expatriate artisans could be. The real explanation lies, it seems to me, in a change in the social purposes of art. It was more than a change in taste, since it did not involve simply a preference for new forms or new ways. It was a change in spirit, in the expectations of visually acquired knowledge. Its full understanding awaits future investigations in social and cultural history, but the contrast between the exuberance of Iranian and Anatolian art and the refined and repetitious art of the Arab world suggests that known and tried geometric or calligraphic formulas were preferred to bold experiments, some exceptions notwithstanding.

For purposes of explaining the illustrations of the Maqamat, the appropriate conclusion then becomes that they were born in a unique moment of artistic effervescence, but a moment that was too short-lived or too restricted socially to establish itself profoundly within the culture of the Arab Near East. I suspect, without quite being able to demonstrate it, that the social restriction is indeed the more operative factor-than what we possess is a series of unique and at times brilliant works of art that never formed a discrete set but reflected a series of individual answers to the challenges of a new taste. This is precisely why each one of them has a style of its own, easy to distinguish from the style of any other manuscript, for they illustrate superbly a definition of style proposed many years ago as the visual response to a new challenge. This explanation may also solve another problem associated with the Maqamat illustrations. They have frequently been associated with an alleged school of Baghdad, and many of its major masterpieces like Leningrad or Paris 5847 have been attributed to the 'Abbasid capital. As has by now been made abundantly clear, I trust, there is no intrinsic justification for this attribution, nor is there any argument against it. But, if the explanation of each manuscript as its own response to the needs of a taste is correct, then the issue of attribution to a particular place becomes irrelevant. The Maqamat codices were illustrated for and by individuals from an as yet unidentified and probably unidentifiable literate class or classes of the main Arab cities of the Near East. They were personal answers to a pan-Islamic need, not the expression of a regional or temporal style. Whether the same general explanation could and should be provided for all other pre-Mongol illustrated manuscripts, for later Arabic illustrated manuscripts, and for the rich visual vocabulary of ceramics and metalwork in Iran as well as in the Arab world remains to be seen, but the possibility certainly exists.

The Book and the Text

Throughout the previous pages, words like *book,* "manuscript," or "text" have sometimes been used interchangeably, while at other times they have suggested quite different things. The reason for the confusion derives, at least in part, from a more complex methodological issue that may well have been clarified by this investigation of the miniatures.

If the miniatures have been properly interpreted, their main point was to transform books, not to illustrate a text. The distinction is a crucial one for the Maqamat, since it allows me to propose the following process for their illustration. Beginning with the tenth century and the expansion of paper manufacture, the Muslim world became the first medieval civilization to multiply the making of books for all purposes, religious as well as secular. Among those books were the Maqamat of al-Hariri, which became a sort of best-seller in the early part of the twelfth century. When a new interest in representations developed in the second half of the twelfth century, it affected the existing practice of copying books as a possible but not compulsory dimension was added to their appearance. Only at the stage when an illustrated book was wanted did it become necessary to turn to the text to find an appropriate way of introducing representations. In other words, the discrete and complete semantic unit was the book, to which a new dimension of illustrations could be added.

While this scheme may in its rough outline appear reasonable, it is far more difficult to imagine who made the decisions involved in it. Was it booksellers and copyists preparing editions of varying quality for different markets? Was it patrons who ordered these books according to some specification or whim? Was it scribes and artists, often the same person, who made codices for their own enjoyment or for some internal, private system of gifts, as with the celebrated pen case of 1152 in the Hermitage Museum? In raising these questions we are entering un-
charted territory, for which very little evidence has been gathered. And yet the analyses of the miniatures may provide some inkling of what happened. I noted before that, although the thirteenth-century Maqamat manuscripts failed to create a coherent vocabulary for the narrative of the stories, they did succeed in expressing the setting of an urban Arab world with its people and its buildings; and I asked whether this emphasis on setting was a conscious decision or the result of some technical limitations on the pictorial potential of the time. Taking the first of these possibilities as the more likely, one could argue that the emphasis on setting was the decision of bookmakers, because it provided them with a way to persuade a certain social class to acquire illustrated rather than unadorned manuscripts of the Maqamat. Within this scheme, al-Wasiti stands out as the grand exception of a copyist and artist who sought to interpret the text rather than simply illustrate a book. Some of the peculiarities of Paris 5847 can be best explained thus. Al-Wasiti was not equally affected or inspired by all the stories or all the speeches of Abu Zayd. He made choices—personal choices—and thereby created a book of contrasts ranging from simple, almost meanly prosaic pictures to profound pictorial interpretations.

But the issue of book versus text, or rather the necessity to separate the book from the text, goes much beyond the specifics of the Maqamat. It may just be that the nature and character of illustrations in any one manuscript receives its key or its tone from someone's decision whether it is a text or a book that is illustrated. How far and wide this generalization is valid is for others to decide, but within the book-centered world of Islam it is perhaps legitimate to propose that books took precedence over texts. An even more intriguing methodological implication of this point is that it allows us to transfer the interpretation of miniatures from those who made them to those who used them—from the artists to a public—and thus conjure up the viewer as an active participant in the creation of manuscripts. Yet, with the exception of al-Wasiti, it was not an active and direct participation; it was the participation of a potential consumer, whose taste and requirements in a book are being teased by a book producer.

The issue can perhaps be broadened by questioning the habit of historians of art of excerpting miniatures from their physical setting in a book. Or, rather, removing the pictures this way is legitimate only once their visual autonomy has been established, as may indeed be the case with certain frontispieces and possibly with later luxury manuscripts to which several painters identified by name contributed, thereby giving primary importance to individual artists. Yet even in these cases the painting is still, in some way or other, the function of the book.

The Significance of the Maqamat Illustrations

My initial approach was conditioned by the scholarship that has developed around medieval Christian manuscripts, with its well-defined objectives of establishing the relation between miniatures or manuscripts and the ways painters interpreted a given text by manipulating otherwise existing forms (roughly what I called morphology in the fourth chapter), some of which had become types—that is, arrangements with more concrete meanings and associations, like an enthroned prince or a nativity. The illustrations of this volume juxtapose miniatures from different manuscripts illustrating the same stories, thus fulfilling one of the first requirements of this approach, which is to identify shared and divergent ways of dealing with the same topics, then draw conclusions about the relation between individual cycles such as the illustrations of a given story or between individual manuscripts.

The results were quite unexpected. There are no clear stemmata to be established between manuscripts. Each one turned out to be less the visual interpretation of a text than its own transformation of a book through images. It was possible to define attitudes toward the text, but not an independent visual language; thus the sacrosanct art historical principle of post hoc ergo propter hoc—that is to say, that there is a continuous and largely irreversible evolution of forms—became of very little use in explaining the Maqamat. In a sense, then, presenting the miniatures by individual maqamat is an arbitrary device necessary for identifying the subjects illustrated defining the differences between manuscripts; but it is only a practical device of scholarship, not the appropriate way of looking at manuscripts. And, finally, the traditional search for models in earlier or parallel artistic endeavors as well as the elaboration of archetypes for our images appeared, with a small number of exceptions, not to be very fruitful.

Explanations for these results must in part be speculative, but the hypotheses that follow seem to me to open up all sorts of theoretical and historical issues that may be of much wider use and interest than the Maqamat manuscripts themselves.

First of all, there may well be the genre of the Maqamat itself. I do not mean simply that it is a work of enormous literary and verbal merit that does not easily lend itself to visual expression. It is that the Maqamat is a work of secular art and therefore that the social and intellectual parameters of its use are governed by far greater variety than those of books or images dealing with religious matters. Yet it is primarily through the study of religious images that the general theory of miniature production in Western medieval art has been demonstrated, and—at least until the Gothic period and with the exception of scientific manuscripts, where accurate repetition is obviously needed—secular manuscripts in Western art are either uniquely preserved examples of a given
text or hypothetically reconstructed ones. While we know fairly well the
liturgical practices, the pietistic behavior, and the spiritual needs of Mus-
lim and Christian medieval cultures, those aspects of their daily life that
involved literature, poetry, stories, jokes, manners, and personal feelings
have hardly been studied or imagined. The studies that do exist either
are so general and all-encompassing that the specificity of any one mo-
ment in history is impossible to explain or are so narrowly involved
with only one feature that it is difficult to generalize from them. As
instances of secular art, the peculiarities and apparent anomalies of the
Maqamat may simply be the accidentally preserved pieces of one di-
mension of the unrecorded daily existence of thirteenth-century Arabs.
What this dimension is may not be easily identified, at least from one
example alone, but it is likely that the Maqamat belongs somewhere
within a wide range of collective or personal activities of a time and
provides it with a sensual or aesthetic function. And perhaps it is in
these terms that all secular arts should be seen, unless one can dem-
onstrate for them ceremonial or propaganda purposes such as the
expression of royal power.

A second explanation of the Maqamat may be more nar-
rowly technical and has been alluded to before. It is that the preserved
manuscripts do not constitute a critical mass of sufficient magnitude to
have developed visual coherence. This implies that, by comparing dif-
ferent series of books illustrating the same text, it may be possible to
establish the minimal conditions required to create a discrete visual lan-
guage. These conditions could be numerical, though this is hardly likely.
They are most likely to lie in the presence of some sort of visual contract
within society whereby automatic associations are made between certain
subjects and certain forms. This contract makes possible the mimetic
continuity and autonomy of illustrations, as occurs, for instance, in Shiraz
painting of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries or in Byzantine religious
illustrations. Whether such a contract can emerge within the art of the
book alone or whether it always requires external impulses such as public
images or social organizations with concerns leading to a sharing of
common visual experiences remains an open question. Perhaps in deal-
ing with books scholarship has all too frequently overlooked their private
character. Secular books in particular are likely to require a far greater
concentration and constancy of manufacture to achieve the coherence
more easily found in religious or liturgical codices.

Finally, it may well be that we are wrong to expect a single
process in the making of illustrated books, whether Christian, Muslim,
or Buddhist, beyond the elementary level of technical production. It is
possibly less fruitful to try to force the Maqamat into an alleged universal
way of making illustrated books than to conclude that the manuscripts
represent the earliest example of an Islamic way of creating books. Their
subject matter is secular, with all the implications discussed earlier. They
may aim to enhance the pleasure of reading a text, be an attractive way
of selling books, or have some other objective yet to be discovered. But,
whatever the aim, or rather whatever proportions of several aims may
be involved, the key point is that every book represents a single, unique,
and largely private experience whose components lie in two definable
areas. One is a matrix of images or visual impressions and memories
that are transferred or adapted to any given codex. The other is a range
of social agreements or individual preferences that delineate the taste
and expectations of an artisan and a user. For the first of these areas,
the originality of the Maqamat lies in the extraordinary quantity of formal
and signifying units with no precedents in the visual arts of the time,
but its process of creating these images can be explained in general art
historical terms as a language in the making. But the social setting in
which this was created is unique in its strong emphasis on the individ-
uality of the choices made for any one manuscript. This individuality,
with its concomitant assumption of privacy in use, may reasonably be
attributed to Islamic culture with its assertion of personal responsibility
and its lack of a social, ecclesiastical, or governmental system for visual
arbitration. It is this freedom of choice at a time of artistic explosion
that made the illustrated Maqamat manuscripts what they are. Other social
circumstances in the fourteenth century prevented the further growth of
the Maqamat, and in Iran after the Mongol invasion a similar variety
in early creativity led, on the contrary, to a continuing history of an art
of making books. But the very fact of these variations within Islamic
civilization suggests that, like any art, the art of making books differed
from culture to culture, from period to period, and perhaps even from
region to region within any one area. It is, then, perhaps the liturgical
and monastic manuscripts of the Christian world that are exceptional
by their diachronic consistency and internally grown systems of copying.

It is probably through a combination of these three expla-
nations that the Maqamat illustrations must be understood. Ultimately
their importance extends much beyond their wonderful vignettes of
thirteenth-century life or their numerous interpretations of a difficult
text. They provide us with a way to penetrate the creative process behind
the most medieval of all arts, to identify the Muslim uniqueness in
making books, to explain the peculiarities of a rich historical moment in
the Arab Near East, and to raise a host of broader theoretical and meth-
odological questions.
# Appendix 1

## Number of Illustrations of Each Maqamah, by Manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maqamah Number</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Leningrad</th>
<th>Istanbul</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Vienna</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3029 6094 5947</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2
Illustrated Folios and *Maqamah* Illustrated on Each, by Manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris 3929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2°</td>
<td>Second 42°</td>
<td>Twelfth 83°</td>
<td>Fifteenth 137°</td>
<td>Fortieth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Third 45</td>
<td>Twelfth 84°</td>
<td>Fourth 144°</td>
<td>Forty-first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sixth 46</td>
<td>Twenty-first 85°</td>
<td>Thirty-second 149°</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Eighth 50</td>
<td>Thirty-seventh 90°</td>
<td>Fifteenth 151°</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17°</td>
<td>Ninth 51°</td>
<td>Thirty-seventh 93°</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth 155°</td>
<td>Twenty-second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ninth 52°</td>
<td>Twenty-first 95°</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth 156°</td>
<td>Forty-third</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tenth 53</td>
<td>Twenty-second 101°</td>
<td>Twenty-seventh 157°</td>
<td>Forty-third</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21°</td>
<td>Tenth 54°</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth 103°</td>
<td>Twenty-seventh 163°</td>
<td>Twenty-third</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tenth 56</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth 104°</td>
<td>Twenty-seventh 167°</td>
<td>Twenty-fourth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23°</td>
<td>Tenth 57°</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth 105°</td>
<td>Twenty-seventh 173°</td>
<td>Twenty-first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eleventh 61°</td>
<td>Thirteenth 114°</td>
<td>Twenty-eighth 177°</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26°</td>
<td>Eleventh 63°</td>
<td>Fourteenth 116°</td>
<td>Twenty-ninth 178°</td>
<td>Twenty-seventh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Eleventh 66°</td>
<td>Sixteenth 117°</td>
<td>Thirtieth 179°</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°</td>
<td>Eleventh 68°</td>
<td>Thirty-first 123°</td>
<td>Thirty-first 180°</td>
<td>Thirty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34°</td>
<td>Twelfth 69°</td>
<td>Thirty-second 122°</td>
<td>Thirty-second 180°</td>
<td>Thirty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37°</td>
<td>Thirteenth 75°</td>
<td>Thirty-third 123°</td>
<td>Thirty-first 181°</td>
<td>Thirty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38°</td>
<td>Thirteenth 78°</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth 129°</td>
<td>Thirty-eighth 185°</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40°</td>
<td>Eighteenth 79°</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth 131°</td>
<td>Thirty-eighth 186°</td>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nineteenth 82</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth 134°</td>
<td>Fortieth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 6094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frontispiece 40</td>
<td>Thirteenth 82°</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth 130°</td>
<td>Thirty-seventh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>First 49°</td>
<td>Sixteenth 84°</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth 133°</td>
<td>Thirty-eighth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Third 52°</td>
<td>Seventeenth 93°</td>
<td>Twenty-eighth 139°</td>
<td>Fortieth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13°</td>
<td>Fourth 55°</td>
<td>Eighteenth 101°</td>
<td>Thirtieth 144°</td>
<td>Forty-first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fifth 59°</td>
<td>Nineteenth 103°</td>
<td>Thirty-first 147°</td>
<td>Forty-second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sixth 64°</td>
<td>Twenty-first 106°</td>
<td>Thirty-second 156°</td>
<td>Forty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Eighth 68</td>
<td>Twenty-second 117</td>
<td>Thirty-second 167</td>
<td>Forty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25°</td>
<td>Ninth 70°</td>
<td>Twenty-third 120</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth 174</td>
<td>Forty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tenth 75°</td>
<td>Twenty-fourth 124</td>
<td>Thirty-fifth 180°</td>
<td>Forty-sixth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33°</td>
<td>Eleventh 81°</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth 126</td>
<td>Thirty-sixth 180°</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 5847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frontispiece 33</td>
<td>Twelfth 69°</td>
<td>Twenty-fourth 121°</td>
<td>Thirty-seventh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frontispiece 35</td>
<td>Thirteenth 74°</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth 122°</td>
<td>Thirty-seventh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Magnemt</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Magnemt</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Magnemt</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Magnemt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Fortieth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Fortieth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Forty-first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Forty-first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Forty-second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8'</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Forty-second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9'</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Seventeenth</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Forty-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Seventeenth</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Forty-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11'</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Forty-fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12'</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Forty-fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13'</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Forty-fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14'</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Thirty-first</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Forty-fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15'</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Nineteenth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Thirty-second</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Forty-sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16'</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nineteenth</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Thirty-second</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Forty-seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17'</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Twentieth</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Forty-seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18'</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Twentieth</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Forty-seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19'</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Twenty-first</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Forty-seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20'</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Twenty-first</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Thirty-fifth</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Forty-eighth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21'</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Twenty-first</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Thirty-seventh</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Forty-ninth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22'</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Twenty-second</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Thirty-seventh</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Forty-ninth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23'</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Twenty-third</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Thirty-eighth</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Fiftieth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24'</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Twenty-third</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Thirty-ninth</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Fiftieth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25'</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Twenty-third</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Thirty-ninth</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Fiftieth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**London 1200**

| 4    | First  | 41    | Fifteenth  | 90    | Thirty-first  | 135   | Forty-sixth |
| 5    | First  | 43    | Fifteenth  | 97    | Thirty-fifth  | 140   | Forty-seventh |
| 6    | Second | 44    | Sixteenth  | 98    | Thirty-fifth  | 140   | Forty-seventh |
| 7    | Third  | 46    | Sixteenth  | 99    | Thirty-third  | 143   | Forty-seventh |
| 8    | Third  | 47    | Seventeenth | 100   | Thirty-fourth | 146   | Forty-seventh |
| 9    | Fourth | 56    | Twentieth  | 106   | Thirty-fourth | 148   | Forty-seventh |
| 10   | Fifth  | 67    | Twenty-third | 107   | Thirty-fourth | 148   | Forty-seventh |
| 11   | Sixth  | 68    | Twenty-fourth | 108   | Thirty-fourth | 149   | Forty-seventh |
| 12   | Seventh  | 75   | Twenty-fifth | 112   | Thirty-fourth | 151   | Forty-seventh |
| 13   | Eighth  | 76    | Twenty-fifth | 113   | Thirty-fourth | 151   | Forty-seventh |
| 14   | Ninth  | 79    | Twenty-fifth | 114   | Thirty-fourth | 151   | Forty-seventh |
| 15   | Tenth  | 81    | Twenty-fifth | 115   | Thirty-fourth | 156   | Forty-sixth |
| 16   | Eleventh | 85   | Twenty-sixth | 116   | Thirty-sixth  | 164   | Forty-seventh |
| 17   | Twelfth | 86    | Twenty-sixth | 120   | Thirty-seventh | 162   | Forty-seventh |
| 18   | Twelfth | 87    | Twenty-sixth | 124   | Thirty-seventh | 164   | Forty-seventh |
| 19   | Thirteenth | 89  | Twenty-sixth | 125   | Thirty-seventh | 167   | Forty-seventh |
| 20   | Thirteenth | 90  | Twenty-sixth | 126   | Thirty-sixth  | 169   | Forty-sixth |
| 21   | Thirteenth | 91  | Twenty-sixth | 128   | Thirty-sixth  | 172   | Fiftieth |
| 22   | Fourteenth | 93  | Thirteenth  | 129   | Thirty-sixth  | 174   | Fiftieth |
| 23   | Fifteenth | 95  | Thirteenth  | 130   | Thirty-sixth  | 177   | Fiftieth |

**London 9728**

| 7    | First  | 50    | Fourteenth | 162   | Twenty-fifth  | 199   | Forty-sixth |
| 9    | Second | 53    | Fifteenth  | 167   | Twenty-sixth  | 167   | Forty-sixth |
| 11   | Third  | 55    | Fifteenth  | 169   | Twenty-sixth  | 167   | Forty-sixth |
| 13   | Fourth | 57    | Sixteenth  | 111   | Twenty-sixth  | 169   | Forty-sixth |
| 14   | Fourth | 60    | Sixteenth  | 114   | Twenty-sixth  | 171   | Forty-sixth |
| 16   | Fourth | 64    | Seventeenth | 116   | Thirteenth  | 173   | Forty-seventh |
| 18   | Fifth  | 64    | Eighteenth | 118   | Thirteenth  | 176   | Forty-seventh |
| 19   | Fifth  | 67    | Eighteenth | 119   | Thirty-first  | 179   | Forty-seventh |
| 21   | Sixth  | 72    | Twentieth  | 120   | Thirty-first  | 188   | Forty-seventh |
| 22   | Seventh | 73   | Twenty-third | 133   | Thirty-second | 190   | Forty-sixth |
| 23   | Seventh | 74   | Twenty-fourth | 134   | Thirty-third  | 191   | Forty-sixth |
| 24   | Eighth  | 77   | Twenty-fourth | 136   | Thirty-fourth | 196   | Forty-sixth |
| 25   | Ninth  | 78   | Twenty-third | 138   | Thirty-fourth | 197   | Forty-sixth |
| 26   | Ninth  | 87   | Twenty-fourth | 141   | Thirty-fourth | 203   | Forty-sixth |
| 27   | Ninth  | 85   | Twenty-five  | 152   | Thirty-sixth  | 210   | Forty-sixth |
| 28   | Tenth  | 87   | Twenty-five  | 153   | Thirty-sixth  | 213   | Fiftieth |
| 29   | Tenth  | 95   | Twenty-five  | 159   | Thirty-sixth  | 206   | Forty-sixth |
| 30   | Twelfth | 96   | Twenty-sixth | 152   | Thirty-sixth  | 210   | Forty-sixth |
| 31   | Twelfth | 98   | Twenty-sixth | 153   | Thirty-sixth  | 213   | Fiftieth |
| 32   | Fourteenth | 100  | Twenty-sixth | 159   | Thirty-sixth  | 211   | Fiftieth |

**Istanbul**

<p>| 12   | Fourth  | 55    | Seventeenth | 116   | Thirty-first  | 165   | Forty-first |
| 14   | Fifth   | 60    | Sixteenth  | 117   | Thirty-first  | 167   | Forty-first |
| 16   | Sixth   | 64    | Nineteenth  | 121   | Thirty-second | 171   | Forty-first |
| 18   | Sixth   | 67    | Twenty-first | 130   | Thirteenth  | 176   | Forty-sixth |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London 22114</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9°</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Forty-ninth</td>
<td>Thirteen-ninth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5°</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Forty-eighth</td>
<td>Thirteen-sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6°</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nineteenth</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Forty-seventh</td>
<td>Thirteen-fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8°</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Twenty-second</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Forty-sixth</td>
<td>Thirteen-first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10°</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Twenty-fourth</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Forty-fifth</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12°</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Forty-fourth</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15°</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Twenty-ninth</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Forty-third</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18°</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Forty-second</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19°</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Forty-second</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21°</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Thirty-first</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Forty-first</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24°</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Forty</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25°</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Forty</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26°</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Forty</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Twenty-sixth</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32°</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Twenty-seventh</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Thirty-fifth</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35°</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Twenty-eighth</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Thirty-sixth</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36°</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Twenty-ninth</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Thirty-sixth</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38°</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Thirty-first</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Thirty-sixth</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43°</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Forty-ninth</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Thirty-second</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45°</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Forty-ninth</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London 7293</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7°</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>1°</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>7°</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13°</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14°</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16°</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17°</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>73-74</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6°</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Twenty-second</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Thirty-second</td>
<td>Eighty-fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7°</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Twenty-third</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>Forty-fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23°</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Twenty-seventh</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Thirty-second</td>
<td>Sixty-sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25°</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Twenty-seventh</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Thirty-second</td>
<td>Sixty-sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28°</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Twenty-eighth</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>Sixty-sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28°</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Twenty-eighth</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>Sixty-sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29°</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Twenty-ninth</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Forty-second</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Twenty-ninth</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Forty-second</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32°</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Thirty-first</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Forty-third</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36°</td>
<td>Twenty-fourth</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39°</td>
<td>Twenty-fifth</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Third-eight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vienna</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1°</td>
<td>Firstspace</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Twenty-ninth</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3°</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6°</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8°</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11°</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15°</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Thirtieth</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17°</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nineteenth</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Thirty-first</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18°</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Twentieth</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Thirty-second</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20°</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Twentieth</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Thirty-third</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25°</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Twenty-first</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Thirty-fourth</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

Chapter 1

1. Some illustrations from Majamat manuscripts were published by Achille Prisse d'Avennes, *La décoration arabe* (Paris, 1885); but the first serious description was provided by Edgar Blochet, "Peintures de manuscrits arabes à types byzantins," *Revue Archéologique* 9, 4th ser. (1907): 219–228, who, who returned to the subject many times, especially in *Les enlumineurs des manuscrits arabes—turcs, arabes, persans—de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1926). Equally important was the great work by F. R. Martin, *Miniature Painting and Painters of Persia, India and Turkey, from the 8th to the 18th Century* (London, 1912); after his work the miniatures were mentioned in all surveys.


4. The most important is Hugo Buchthal, "Hellenistic Miniatures in Early Islamic Manuscripts," *Ars Islamica* 7 (1940): 125–53. Others will be cited later.

5. Buh-Al-Farès, *Le Livre de la Thérapie*, *Art Islamique* 2 (Cairo, 1953); or ideen, *Vues chiffrées et signes musulmans autour d'un manuscrit arabe illustré au XIIIe siècle. Mémoires présentées à l'Institut d'Egypte*, 56 (Cairo, 1962), among other places.


11. Isa Salman, Al-Warif (Baghdad, 1972); Abd al-Fattah al-Nuaimi, Al-
Magicfi fi ran al-Waaz (Baghdad, n.d.); other pamphlets by Muhammad Makayah, Mikhail Awd, Hassan al-Salih, Khalid al-Sudai, and Nuri al-Ibai, all apparently published in 1972. See also Mohammed Aziz, L'images et l'Islam; L'image dans la societe arabe contemporaine (Paris, 1976), 54f., for the development, based on the Ma'mar, of the idea of miniatures as a characteristic Arab artistic expression.


16. For Dissertations, the latest survey of the manuscripts is Ernst J. Grube, "Materialien zum Donkurdies Arabiscos," in Aus der Welt der islamischen Kunst (Festschrift für Ernst Kittel zum 75. Geburtstag, ed. Richard Ettlingerhaus, 163-94 (Berlin, 1959). For the Automa, see al-Jazari, The Book of Knowledge of Ingenious Mechanical Devices, trans. Donald R. Hill (Dover, 1974), with bibliography. For Galen, see Alas, Théophraste, and Holte, "Galenc handchrift." All these manuscripts actually pose a number of problems of interpretation that require study.

17. See this volume, 16-17.


21. It is curious that the Muslim West was largely excluded from the artistic changes of those centuries, perhaps because it was only the part of the Muslim world that was shrinking instead of expanding.


23. The difficulty of adequately understanding evidence about names of artists has been suggested in my review of various studies by Bishar Faris, Ars Orientalis 3 (1959):224-26.


25. I am referring primarily to the numerous fragments found in Egypt and usually attributed to the Fatimids; most recent discussions with full bibliography by Ernst J. Grube, "Fotfat Fragments," in Islamic Painting and the Arts of the Book, ed. Basel W. Robinson, 23-66 (London, 1976). For other examples, see Thomas W. Arnold and Adolf Greer, The Islamic Book: A Contribution to Its Art and History from the VII-VIII Century (Leipzig, 1929). Examples are also found in pre-1150 ceramics, but they have not yet been adequately collected.


Chapter 2


2. This date was first suggested by Edgar Blochet, followed, for instance, by Gaston Migeon, Manuel d'art musulman: Arts plastiques et industriel (2 ed, Paris, 1927), 1:126.


4. The existence of this second inscription may have been one of the difficulties Rice had in mind as making the date of the manuscript uncertain, for the style of the writing is far less consistent and especially less successful than in the other two inscriptions. This could be explained by assuming that a copyist imitated an earlier-dated inscription but added something of his own that he did not quite succeed in matching the style of the original.


6. On folio 68 one can see the difference between the shin of 'ashsh and the 'sh' and the ligatures in umm and mib'; on folio 107 the inscriptions are more careless, as though they were imitating those of folio 68; cf. also note 4.

7. Hugo Buchthal, "Théotistic miniatures in Early Islamic Manuscripts," Ars Islamica 7 (1940):130-33; Ettlingerhaus, Arab Painting, 80.

8. Ettlingerhaus, Arab Painting, 104.

9. To my knowledge the full colophon has been published only by Bishar Faris, "Philosophie et jurisprudence illustrées par les Arabes: La quereille des deux images in Islam," Mélanges Louis Masson 2 (Damasuc, 1957):85, n. 1; it clearly refers both to writing (halála) and picture (sawla).


11. The most coherent argument for the existence of the School of Baghdad was made by Zaki Muhammad Hassan, "Madrasah Baghdad al-Dawir al-Islamiyah," Sumer 2 (1955):15-46; but see also Ettlingerhaus, Arab Painting, and the new Iraqi publications mentioned in chap. 1, n. 11.

12. Faris, "Philosophie et jurisprudence," 85, n. 3, mentioned the argument that one miniature (fig. 94) has an inscription with the name al-Mustarisi, a caliph ruling from Baghdad; but, as he himself noted, it is not a decisive argument.

14. Another Baghdad manuscript dated to 1229 is a Disrodescis in Oxford, Bodleian ms. d. 138; c.Editors, Ernst J. Grube, “Materialien zum Dodgerskriese Arabischer,” in Aus der Welt der islamischen Kunst: Festschrift für Ernst Kühn zum 75. Geburtstag, ed. Richard Ettinghausen, 163–96 (Berlin, 1998), no. 9. This strange manuscript has few illustrations other than an interesting author’s portrait, and it bears little relation to the other manuscripts attributed to Baghdad.


22. I am puzzled by the word hirzun but am tempted to translate it “proofreading.”


27. The actual influence of the Mongol invasion on the arts and on culture in general is a complicated subject. That the invasion had a major psychological effect on the Arab world and that it led to a different sociopolitical configuration of the Fertile Crescent is hardly debatable points. But artistic creativity may not have been as strongly affected throughout the Muslim world as was believed in the past. Objects such as the later ceramics of the Kasbah and Raqag types certainly continued to be made during the decades of political upheaval, and the 1282 miniatures of the Bhawana al-Safa (Faras, “Philosophie et jurisprudence,” 79ff.; Ettinghausen, Arab Painting, 100ff.), are examples of continuity in spite of cataclysm. On this whole issue, especially as it pertains to Baghdad, se Marnassa S. Simpson, “The Role of Baghdad in the Formation of Persian Painting,” Art et Société dans le Monde Islamique, ed. C. Adle (Paris, 1982)91–116.

28. See, however, Rice, “Oldest Illustrated Arabic Manuscript.”

29. Only four thirteenth-century illustrated Arabic manuscripts can be definitely attributed to Baghdad: Kithab al-Bayyara, dated 1209–10 in Istanbul, Topkapi Sarayi, Ahmet III, 2115; the same work in Cairo, Khali Ali, 81; 1209; Bhawana al-Safa, dated 1287, Istanbul, Silaymeyn Esad Enden, 3638; and Disrodescis, dated 1239, arab. 138 (Buchthal, Kunst, and Ettinghausen, “Supplementary Notes,” 192).


31. See preliminary remarks on this topic in Grabar, “Pictures or Commentaries.”

32. This was already the conclusion reached by Rice on the basis of the illustrations of a single story: “Oldest Illustrated Arabic Manuscript.” The several attempts by Hugo Buchthal (as in “Three Illustrated Hariri Manuscripts in the British Museum,” Burlington Magazine 77 [1948]:144–52) to establish direct lines of descent from one manuscript to the other have not really worked out, except for single pictures. For more on this see this volume, 129–36.

Chapter 3

1. Richard Ettinghausen, Arab Painting (Geneva, 1962), 91–92; Kurt Holter, “Die Galen-handschrift und die Makkens des Hariri der Wiener Nationalbibliothek,” Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, n.s. 2 (1937), 3–4 and pl. 1; this page has often been reproduced, but its exact iconography has yet to be worked out.

2. For instance, the celebrated d’Avenberg basin in the Freer Gallery, Fain Attil, Art of the Arab World (Washington, D.C., 1975), 64ff; or a curious group of ivory plaques in the Berlin Museum, Museum für islamische Kunst Katalog (Berlin, 1971), no. 21, fig. 42.


4. For instance, Douglas E. Barrett, Islamic Metalwork in the British Museum (London, 1949), pls. 7, 24, 26. A curious point about this motif is that it occurs on objects of very different qualities.

5. The most striking are the mosaics of the intrados of the arches in the Dome of the Rock, where one half of the design is almost superior to the other. That this occurs in a monument still under the technical influence of late antiquity suggests that it was a very common practice.


Three themes seem to predominate, if one excepts Faris’s interpretations, which have not been generally accepted: (1) expression of royal glory and activities through embellishments, hunting, pleasure, processions, etc.; (2) astrological symbols presumably implying good wishes; and (3) unique and usually unexplained motifs. Until further investigations have modified this conclusion, we may assume that most frontispieces were either
dedications to a prince (as in the case of Badr al-Din Lu’lu’ for the Kitab al-Aphain) or general embellishments of a book, unrelated to its contents.


8. The main examples are a series of Dioscorides manuscripts, listed in Ernst J. Grube, “Materialien zum Dioskourides Arabicus,” in Aus der Welt der islamischen Kunst: Festschrift für Ernst Kühnel zum 75. Geburtstag, ed. Richard Ettignhausen, 163–94 (Berlin, 1959), the pseudo-Galen in Paris (Paris, Théâtre) and Vienna (Holter, „Galen-handschrift“: the curious frontispieces of al-Mubashshir’s manuscript in Istanbul (Ettignhausen, Arab Painting, 74f.), and the Bulaq al-Safa, also in Istanbul (ibid., 98f.).

I am thinking in particular of Ayvanyos 3704, Grube, „Dioskourides Arabicus,” fig. 6.


Chapter 4

1. In a way, most previous authors writing on the Mnasmat sought to do exactly that, as we shall see in the following chapter. But they explained only individual miniatures, after having made choices from the whole corpus. Martin discussed the miniatures that pleased him; Blochet’s choices are totally arbitrary and in fact bear little relation to his text; Buchthal identifies miniatures for which he can demonstrate a model elsewhere; Stchoukine discovers Islamic elements in a few examples; and so on. The only exceptions so far have been Rice, who did see the importance of studying all the illustrations of a given story (e.g., miniatures in the Mnasmat), and to some extent Ettignhausen, who identified the general characteristics of the manuscripts, though the restricted scope of his book made completeness impossible.

2. In part this has already been the approach developed by Ivan Stchoukine, as early as in his Le peinture islamique (Leipzig, 1923).

3. I take the word in its classical meaning of the implement worn under the turban; R. P. A. Dozy, Dictionnaire détaillé des noms des vêtements chez les arames (Amsterdam, 1845), 366. The history of the glaçounat has barely been sketched and certainly deserves more thorough literary and visual investigation. See the article “Kalaruzwa” by W. Björkman in Encyclopædia Islamica, 1st ed. (Leiden and London, 1927), 2:677–80; Richard Ettignhausen, From Byzantium to Islamic Iran and the Islamic World (Leiden, 1972), 20–33, which deals primarily with early Islamic times and practices; and Leo A. Mayer, Mamluk Costume (Geneva, 1952), 49–50.

4. Other variations, such as those on folios 96, 98, and 143, are the result of later retouches that heightened the contrasts of the robe’s design and transformed the tip of the glaçounat into a strange construction. On folios 96 and 135 the second figure in the same clothes is also an addition.

5. See Dozy, Dictionnaire, 278–80. The valliés was something between a veil and a cloak reserved to legal authorities and prelates, but, like other items of clothing, it probably underwent numerous changes, and these require investigation. Mayer, Mamluk Costume, 30, and below, note 7.

6. This volume, 100.

7. The distinction between the two is most, if it existed at all. See Dozy, Dictionnaire, and Mayer, Mamluk Costume; also Etienne M. Quatremer, trans., Histoire des costumes mamlouks de l’Égypte (Paris, 1845), 1:21.


12. Mayer, Mamluk Costume, 70.

13. Ibid., 73.

14. Bosworth, Medieval Islamic Underworld, 92ff., for a fascinating account of “companions”—partners in crime and adventure to various heroes.

15. Ugo Monesteroli di Villardo, Le pitture minorali al sotto della Cappella Palatina in Palermo (Rome, 1950), 37–44, has the only coherent presentation of certain themes of representation (enchirion, hunt, music) as a prince’s „cycle.” Whether it was a cycle in the technical and narrow sense of the word (i.e. a closed and discrete set of images with a consistent meaning) requires serious study.


18. Jacques Jeremi, Le Mahom et la caraume égyptienne (Cairo, 1953), Richard Ettignhausen, „Notes on the Lustreware of Spain,” Art Bulletin 1 (1954):153–60 exp. If my interpretation is correct, representations of the mural preceded references to it in literary sources. The further discussion of this point for the history of the pilgrimage is not pertinent here (see this volume, 124–25).

19. Ettignhausen, „Lustreware of Spain.”


Chapter 5


In addition to figure and garment styles, similar comparisons regarding motif and composition can be drawn for each subgroup of manuscripts discussed here. Furthermore, some interchange occurs between the subgroups. For example, London 9718 shares elements with the earlier 1199 Pseudo-Galen in the Bibliothèque Nationale, despite my grouping that places the earlier Galen in the same set as Paris 3929. Also the garment pattern in Khatib ad-Dirjaq, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, ms. codex 3468, fol. 10, 60, and 133, is found in many of the Maghribi manuscripts, for example, the eighth maghribi in Paris 5847, fol. 21; London 22114, fol. 114; Paris 6094, fol. 25; and the ninth in Paris 3929, fol. 15'. Paris 6094 will be discussed below, see note 45.


15. Probably representing the siege of Baghdad: Mazhar Şevket İşpiroğlu, Das Bild im Islam: Ein Verbl. und seine Folgen (Vienna and Munich, 1971), fig. 36.


17. Melikian-Chirvani, Romen van vergel, pl. 65.

18. Pope, Survey of Persian Art, pl. 816b.


22. Muslim manuscripts:
(1) Discorsi, dated 1224. In addition to Bichthal, "Early Miniatures from Baghdad," note that the frame composed of two stories in the miniatures at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, nos. 57.51.21 (color plate, Ettinghausen), Arab Painting, 85) is of the type used for the seventeenth nanamul in both Paris 5847 and Leningrad; another frame with the upper story composed of neat rows of small rectangular compartments filled with objects in the second nanamul of Paris 5847, Leningrad, London 1978, and London 1237 is similarly found in 1200 Dioscorides, Ayasofya no. 3703, fol. 2' (in Grabe, "Dioskorides Arabicus," 171, fig. 1).


(3) Vienna Pseudo-Galen, Architectural structures and entrances of Pseudo-Galen (Holter, "Galen-handgesch"), fig. 3 compare with London 1978, M 16, fols. 57 and 60. The particular device of interrupting an arch of a building by the head of a figure is found in both the Galen, fol. 1 (Ettinghausen, Arab Painting, 91), and London 1978, M 14, fol. 50, and M 28, fol. 107. Furthermore, note a similar use of a horizontal register above the main scene to contain gardeners in the case of the Galen (Ettinghausen, Arab Painting, 81) and balustrery figures in the case of London 1978, M 29, fol. 111.

(4) Rosee Binom al-Saheb, dated 1287, Baghdad, at the Library of the Sur-lemamiye Mosque, Istanbul, Emad Esfendi 3638, fols. 3' and 3' (Bishar Fares, "Philosophie et jurisprudence illusrees par les arabs: Le querelle des images en Islam," Mélanges Louis Massonier 2 (Nantesus, 1957), pls. 2 and 3 and color plates in Ettinghausen, Arab Painting, 98-99). The angled architectural frame is partially used in Istanbul, M 48, fol. 204, and is translated into a throne in Paris 5847, M 46, fol. 148'. Furthermore, a darkened area suggesting shadows is used in the Ikhwan al-Safa (in upper level) and Paris 5847 (arch on right).

(5) Kalilah wa Dimnah, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, ms. arabe 3465, fols. 49' cod. 1200-1220. The structure of bushes, the type of leaves, and the use of leaves to frame figures in Kalilah wa Dimnah (Ettinghausen, Arab Painting, 60', 100', 132', 135', and others appear in London 1978, M 20, fols. 72 and 73'). Note the similarity of the large floral devices in Kalilah wa Dimnah and the Maqamat.

(6) Wargh and Guishah, Topkapi Saray, Istanbul, Persian. For the similar use of floral devices by this manuscript and the Maqamat compare: Wargh and Guishah (Melikian-Chirvani, Roman von Vargh und Guishah, pl. 29 with London 1978, fols. 11 and 13; Wargh and Guishah (ibid., pls. 13 and 15) with 1978, fols. 72 and 73 respectively); Wargh and Guishah (ibid., pl. 13) with 1978, fol. 187, and London 2211, fol. 13 (the Wargh and Guishah examples are generally larger and flatter); see also Wargh and Guishah (ibid., fol. 33) and Leningrad, fol. 173. A similar way of representing an architectural complex is adopted by both Wargh and Guishah (ibid., pls. 26-28, 31-32) and London 2205, M 15, fols. 80 and 87. (Compare this structure with the other more sophisticated structures in the M 15 episode.) The generally sparse settings in Wargh and Guishah compare with Paris 3929.

Christian manuscripts:

(1) Vétitian sirius 599. Use of trees (Guillaume de Jerphanion, Les miniatures du manuscrit syriaque no. 599 de la Bibliothèque Vétitiane [Vatican, 1940], pl. 20, no. 42), similar to Paris 5847, M 17, fol. 46'.

(2) British Museum add. 7170. For instance, the two-tiered composition of the Mariage a Cans, fol. 67, which Hugo Bichthal, "Hellenistic Miniatures in Early Islamic Manuscripts," Ars Islamica 7 (1940):25-33, compares with Paris 5847, fol. 33 (see ms. copie below).

(3) Paris, Institut Catholique 1 (Leroy, Manuscrits copies, pl. 80). The animal emerging from behind a rock hole, fol. 59', may be compared with Istanbul, M 43, fol. 171'. Despite the general abbreviation of background in this manuscript, the key elements of trees and water (ibid., pl. 84), hills, boats, and simple architectural frames are all part of the Maqamat.

(4) Paris, Bib. Nat., ms. copie 13. The unusually large floral devices here (Leroy, Manuscrits copies, pls. 60, 1, 65, 2) compare with London 1978, M 3, fols. 11 and 13. Perhaps of greater interest is the conscious use of foliage as a compositional device in both copie 13 (ibid., pl. 60, 3) and London 1978, M 50, p. 349. Note, however, the greater abstraction and size of the Coptic example. Rocks depicted in the Coptic manuscript (ibid., pl. 46, 2) compare with those in the Maqamat. Simple architectural frames with hanging lamps are common to both copie 13 and the Maqamat. The two-tiered composition of a banquetting scene in Paris 5847, fol. 33 (mentioned in comparison with the Syriac manuscript, British Museum, add. 7170, fol. 67), compares even more closely with the Marriage a Cans in copie 13 (ibid., color plate D).


50. See Weitzmann, Byzantinische Buchmaleri, fig. 394; Lazarev, Historische Bildnisse, figs. 117, 174, 360. Note also the creative crowd arrangements among the Norman twelfth-century manuscripts in Sicily: for example, ibid., fig. 360, and Ernst Kitzinger, I Miniaturen des Minnesingers Luigino de Monti in Palermo (Palermo, 1960), fig. 68 and pls. 65 and 68, as random examples. Also compare Paris 5847, M 43 and a mosaic from the Cappella Palatina, Palermo (Kitzinger, Mosaics, pl. 5). In each there occurs a curious juxtaposition of two heads, resulting in the illusion of simultaneous frontal and profile views.


52. Do I know who was the first to isolate the primordial cycle as a typical component of Islamic images, but it has been accepted by most writers on major monuments for example, Ugo Monneret de Villard, Le pitture musulmane all’ottobre della Cappella Palatina in Palermo (Rome, 1950); and D. S. Rice in several major articles dealing with metalwork. One can, of course, question the automatic with which certain topics are identified as "primordial" and in recent years somewhat more elaborate explanations have been provided for some pictures.


55. Jacob, Geschichte des Schattenzeichners, 61.

34. Ibid., Isola 1, figs. 8-10. 35. Jacob, Geschichte des Schattenhutes, 68.
36. Note that the same boat type as in Paris 5847, fol. 119°; Leningrad, fol. 260, and Istanbul, fol. 153, is used in the 1224 Diocesaries (Florence II. Day. "Metropolitan Manuscripts of Diocesaries."
Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 9 (1950):278; and Daul Jones and George Michell, eds., The Arts of Islam, Hayward Gallery Exhibition 1976 (London, 1976), p. 324, no. 520). In the Maqratm depictions, however, more attention is given to the sailing and the activities of the crew on deck as contrasted with the concentration on the arcades of passengers in the Diocesaries representation; the Diocesaries also does not include the "Indian". A fruitful line of research would be to try to identify these boats within the wide Arabic vocabulary on the subject; Hans Kieffer, "Schiff" im arabischen: Untersuchung über Vorkommen und Bedeutung der Termin (Zwickau 15, 5, 1953).
38. Ippoliti, Senigallia, pl. 26, among published instances.
42. Grube, "Hippotriaq Arabica Illustrata," compare the motif of two horsemen in Paris 3929, M 43, fol. 156°, with the same motif in Kitab al-Bayyana, written in Baghdad in 1210, now at the library of the Topkapi Sarayi, Istanbul (Grube, "Hippotriaq Arabica Illustrata," 1524°, pl. E, and color plate in Ettinghausen, Arab Painting, 97). The emphasis on motion in the Kitab al-Bayyana is, however, replaced in Paris 3929 by graceful poses at rest and an interest in the details of their armor and their trappings, as in the rabbet on one of the saddles.
43. For the Entry into Jerusalem, see ms. siracusa 559, fols. 105° in the Biblioteca Apostolica, Vatican (color plate in Ettinghausen, Arab Painting, 94°). For the more likely scene of Christ and Zacharias, see Bih. Nat. ms. copie 23, fols. 109° and 199°. This last miniature compares with the entire composition of the upper register, including the group of figures seated in front of the tree as well as the unusual detail of the figure perched on the tree. This detail may in fact provide a clue for the origin of the larger composition, for it is precisely this larger scheme, including the perched figure, that is adopted by many of the Maqratm illustrations. Examples: Paris 5847, M 3, Paris 6948, M 42, fol. 147°, M 3, fol. 11, M 4, fol. 19; London 1200, M 42, fol. 145°, M 3, fol. 8°; Oxford, M 42, fol. 79; Vienna, M 3, fol. 11. Several other single motifs in the Istanbul Maqratm find counterparts in twelfth-century Coptic manuscripts. For example, the camel emerging from behind a mountain in M 43, fol. 171°, is close to the upper-left register of the Coptic manuscript in Paris, Institut Catholique 1, fol. 1°, where the animal is a donkey instead of a camel (Levy, Manuscripts copes, pl. 80). The rooster perched on an architectural structure and the seated figure leaning on an arm may be noted in M 43, fol. 176, and Inst. Cath. 1, fol. 56° (ibid., pl. 81).
44. Ernst J. Grube, "Islamic Sculpture: Ceramic Figure," Oriental Art 12 (1966):165-75.
45. Paris 6094 shares much of its distinctive style with the roughly contemporary Kallâk in Damascus in Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. arabe 3465; compare, for example, the pose of the standing figure with right knee bent in M 1, fol. 6, and M 50, fol. 187°, with ms. 3465, fol. 3° (also fol. 121°). Other comparable poses are: M 38, fol. 133°, and 3465, fol. 12°; M 19, fol. 59°, and 3465, fols. 10 (redrawn) and 83. This similarity in rendering occurs even in such details as the delineation of the downward-pointing small finger of the frontal seated figure in each miniature. The appearance of comparably clothed women approaching enthroned personages may be noted in M 9, fol. 27°, and 3465, fols. 130°, 131°, 137. The cloak frequently used for Abu Zayd and the qadi appears in M 1, fol. 6; M 40, fol. 139; M 41, fol. 144°; and in 3465, fols. 55, 89°, 101°, 105° (with varying degrees of simplification). Similar compositional and figural arrangements occur in M 16, fol. 49°, and 3465, fol. 10; M 8, fol. 25, and 3465, fol. 35, M 50, fol. 31, and 3465, fol. 20°. Comparable outdoor settings are M 24, fol. 79°; M 36, fol. 126; and 3465, fol. 32° (damaged). Finally, one system of folds employed in 6094 can be compared with that of 3465, despite the simpler rendering and heavier dark outlining in the latter manuscript: M 44, fol. 156, and 3465, fol. 20°.
46. In comparing 6094 with ms. arabe 3465, the Maqratm manuscript appears closer to the Byzantine models employed, not only because of its superior draftsmanship but also because it synthesizes a much greater variety of Byzantine sources.
47. Ettinghausen, Arab Painting, 80, summarizing Weissman and Buchthal.
48. In addition to examples given by Buchthal and Ettinghausen, compare the figure types of Paris 6094 with the late eleventh century Byzantine manuscript of the Heavenly Ladder by John Climacus (Losaruz, Patras Bibliotita, 248); Abu Zayd's dervesh-like pose with the pose of Peter in the nineteenth-century Chlodvich Palet in Moscow, Historical Mus., cod. 129, fol. 51° (Weissman, Byzantische Buchmalerei, fig. 371); the kneeling Abu Zayd in Topkapi Sarayi, fol. 117, with Christ in Vat. Sac. 589, fol. 127° (Christoff, pl. 16, no. 32); Abu Zayd in M 10, fol. 31, with Saint Peter in the earlier sixteenth-century Syriac Rossano Gospel (Ciro Santoro, Il codice parrocchiale di Rossano (Reggio Calabria, 1974)).
49. It is curious to note that 6094 can easily be compared with late twelfth-early thirteenth century Byzantine wall paintings from Asia Minor, especially since both 6094 and the Asia Minor paintings represent provincial translations and interpretations of Constantinopolitan work. See, for example, the figures in Carlikli Kilise, Göreme Chapel 22 (Mardoci Rossano, Painting in Asia Minor, 2 vols. [Greenwich, Conn., 1967], vol. 2, pls. 203 and 205) and Karakhis Kilise, Göreme Chapel 23, ca. 1200-1210 (Restle, vol. 2, pl. 229).
50. The composition of M 11, fol. 33°, is comparable to an octoectomy from Ashos-Valopedi (Huber, Bild und Botschaft, 30).
51. Remarkably close comparisons can be drawn between Paris 6094 and twelfth-century Coptic manuscripts. The draperies of the main personages follow the system of compartmentalization of folds and the distinctions between shadowed folds and folds used for figures in the Coptic manuscripts. A second stylistic component of 6094 appears as a key feature in cope 13. Among the many possible comparisons, see M 37, fol. 130°, and Levy, Manuscripts copes, color plate D. An identical convention, employed to reveal the body under the draped robes, consists of a series of repetitive horizontal folds at the sides of the mitrull and a ring for the belly that inscribes a clearly marked navel. These conventions appear prominently in Fatimid ceramics, such as the "dancer" on a bowl at the Freer Gallery (All, Art of the Arab World, 44-45, no. 16), and many others (see n. 12 above). This garment type appears to be an invention of the Fatimid period, when the works of Muslim and Coptic Craftsmen were indistinguishable (Marilyn Jenkins, "An

49. A similar separation of figures within the tripartite architectural frame occurs in both the Paris 6094 and Copitc miniatures M 3, M 4, M 42 and Leyroy, Manuscripts copitc. pls. 82 and 87.

50. Compare the seated figure in M 28, fol. 93, obviously an Islamic interpretation of the well-known classical and Byzantine author-evangelist portrait type, with the patriarch Mark in Bibl. Nat. ms. cope 13, fol. 1 (Leyroy, Manuscripts copite, pl. 41). Note also the comparable Evangelist portraits in the Institutio Catholicae (ibid., pl. 83). Similarly, a common Byzantine source may explain the refining pose in M 19, fol. 91, and Saint John in Institutio Catholicae, fol. 178v (ibid., pl. 88). Note the similar type of small boats in Paris 6094, M 22, fol. 68, and cope 13, fols. 41 and 279v (ibid., pls. 1 and 74.3).

51. The texts of the Wazagh and Gohish manuscript are quite different, as are the few texts found on ceramics; see the Freer Book in Pope, Survey of Persian Art, vol. 5, p. 660.

52. Note that, in contrast to most of the Maymon artists, who simply repeat the formula of M 3 for M 42, al-Wasiti varies his choice.


54. See the classic by Mario Praz, Munusmuo: The Parallel between Literature and the Visual Arts (Princeton, 1970), and the continuing concerns of a journal like New Literary History, esp. vols. 3 and 4 (1971–73).


58. Roger Le Tourneaux, trans., Denis de 1175 à 1154 (Damasco, 1952), 18.


63. Ibid., 231.

64. Ibid., 54.


72. There are no complete histories of this period, but in recent years two monographs have been devoted to an-Nasir: Angelika Hartmann, Al-Nasir Il-Din Allah: Politik, Religion, Kultur in der späten Abu-Bakr-Scháibánid-Zeit (Berlin and New York, 1970); Herbert Mason, Two Statues of Medieval Islam: Visir Ibn Husayn and Caliph an-Nasir Il-Din Allah (The Hague, 1972).


77. For Anatolia, see Derek Hill and Oleg Grabar, Islamic Architecture and Its Decorators, A.D. 800–1500 (Chicago, 1964); Richard Ettinghausen, "The Flowering of Seljuk Art," Metropolitan Museum journal 3 (1970), fig. 21; Ernst Kühnel, Die Sammlung türkischer und islamischer Kunst im Tschaliński-Kleines, Meisterwerke der archäologischen Museen in Istanbul 3 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1938), pls. 7 and 10.

78. See n. 8, above.
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"Athar al-Baghiyah," 139
author’s portrait, 23
ax, 44
Ayubids, 9, 18, 146, 148
Azerbaijan, 148
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Baghdad, school of (so-called), 10, 17, 18, 152
baccalaureate, 33, 64, 77, 88, 123
baldachin, 38
banners, 72, 81
banquet, 36
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Blochert, Edgar, 1
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bourgeoisie, 145, 146, 149
braid, 115, 117
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Buchthal, Hugo, 1, 12, 13, 14, 144, 149