The manuscript whose illustrations will occupy us here constitutes the tenth work of Ibn Butlan, a Christian physician and theologian of Baghdad (d. 1066), one of the eleventh-century physicians who, in contrast to many of his colleagues, fought for innovation in medicine. According to him, the physician has not only to know the theories of the ancient Greek and Roman philosophers whose works were translated into Arabic in Baghdad during the ninth and tenth centuries, but also to consider the information gained from practical experience acquired over the centuries and add it to his store of knowledge. His disagreement with many of his contemporary physicians and colleagues is epitomized by, and reached its climax in, his controversies with Ibn Ridwan, who ended a long series of arguments by accusing him of a complete lack of medical knowledge and understanding.

Due to the influence of Ibn Ridwan on the physicians of Cairo, Ibn Butlan, who in fact was much more knowledgeable and educated than his enemy, had to leave Cairo, where he had spent three years. Finally he reached Constantinople where he stayed in a monastery near the city; there in 1054 he wrote the Da'wat al-atibba' ("The Banquet of Physicians"). The original manuscript is not preserved, and it is not known whether it was illustrated, though, from what we know, the answer is almost certainly not. What is certain, however, is that it was dedicated to Nasr al-Dawla Ahmad b. Marwan, the Marwanid ruler of Mayyafariqin (r. 1010–60), a fact that may have some consequence for the illustrations under discussion. Be that as it may, Ibn Butlan's treatise is one of the earliest representatives of the Maqâmât literature that flourished in Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt throughout the thirteenth century.

The story is continuous. It is divided into twelve chapters, which are in turn divided into three parts. In chapter one, the reader becomes acquainted with a young physician who had left Baghdad in order to practice in the provinces, where life is much cheaper than in the capital. On his arrival in Mayyafariqin, or Amid (modern Diyarbakır), he meets an old medical shaykh sitting next to his apothecary shop and strikes up a conversation with him. The following two and a half chapters are dedicated to the character of the old shaykh who, among other things, practices medicine in order to make money. He is described as a greedy person, and his medical knowledge is much inferior to that of the young doctor. The fourth to eleventh chapters are dedicated to the topic of the treatise, the banquet, to which other physicians, musicians, and entertainers are invited. Finally, in the last chapter we again see the real character of the old shaykh, who at the end of the story closes the shutters of his house, while the young doctor leaves for an uncertain destination.

Although the work is mentioned by Arabic and European scholars alike, it did not attract the attention it deserved. First, it would seem that it contains some autobiographical items. Of the two protagonists, the 70-year-old medical shaykh apparently is meant to represent the old school of medical thinking, while the young physician might be identified with the new approach to medicine and represents Ibn Butlan himself. Secondly, the book, among other things, is meant to denounce medical quacks and charlatans who, according to the author, were extremely active in the eleventh century.²

To the best of my knowledge we possess no complete copy of the full text, and it was not until 1984 that Professor Klein-Franke, by using three manuscripts, managed to translate the full text into German.³ For illustrations he reproduced five out of the twelve miniatures from the Jerusalem copy without, however, referring to them. He only mentions that the Aya Sofya manuscript has no illustrations.

The purpose of the present essay is fourfold: first, it reproduces for the first time in one place all the
Fig. 1. An apothecary’s shop and two protagonists. Da’wat al-atibba’. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 4v.

Fig. 2. The two protagonists sitting in a house. Da’wat al-atibba’. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 10v.

Fig. 3. The doctor, the shaykh, and a servant. Da’wat al-atibba’. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 14.

Illustrations of the Jerusalem copy. Fig. 1 (p. 4v) shows the two protagonists sitting next to the pharmacist’s shop in Mayyafariqin; on fig. 2 (p. 10v) the shaykh and the young doctor sit in a house; fig. 3 (p. 14) depicts the shaykh, the young doctor, and a servant; fig. 4 (p. 17) again depicts the two protagonists. On figs. 5–6 (p. 20v and 24v) the shaykh is banqueting. On fig. 7 (p. 34) is an enthroned personage and one of the physicians; fig. 8 (p. 36v) shows a discussion between the shaykh and the young doctor. Fig. 9 (p. 41) depicts another discussion between the two protagonists. Fig. 10 (p. 44v) is a scene of music making and wine drinking; fig. 11 (p. 50v) shows the shaykh sleeping while his guests enjoy the rest of his food; and, finally, fig. 12 (p. 52) depicts the shaykh looking out of a window at the departing young doctor. It should be noted that an additional miniature, apparently meant to serve as a frontispiece, was inserted when the manuscript was bound or re-bound (fig. 13). It is scribbled all over, and is attributed by an inscription to a certain ‘Abd al-Qashubi al-Musawwir, an artist not known to me. In any case it differs stylistically from all the other paintings—the figures are haloed, and the composition diverges considerably from the
Fig. 4. The two protagonists in discussion. Daʿwat al-atibbiʿ. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 17.

Fig. 5. The shaykh and his guests banqueting. Daʿwat al-atibbiʿ. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 20v.

Fig. 6. Another banquet scene. Daʿwat al-atibbiʿ. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 24v.

Fig. 7. Enthroned person and physician. Daʿwat al-atibbiʿ. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 34.
Fig. 8. The two protagonists in discussion. *Da’wat al-atibba*. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 36v.

Fig. 9. The two protagonists in discussion. *Da’wat al-atibba*. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 41.

Fig. 10. The shaykh raising a glass, his servant playing the ‘ud and guests. *Da’wat al-atibba*. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 44v.

Fig. 11. The sleeping shaykh and his guests. *Da’wat al-atibba*. Courtesy Jerusalem, L. A. Mayer Memorial, p. 50v.
THE ILLUSTRATIONS FOR AN EARLY MANUSCRIPT OF IBN BUTLAN'S *DA'WAT AL-ATIBBA'*

Another illustrated copy of the *Da'wat al-atibba'* is an early Mamluk version in the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana (no. A 125) in Milan. In contrast to the Jerusalem copy, this one is dated 672 (1273) and signed by one Muhammad b. Qaysar al-Iskandari, who presumably was both the calligrapher and the painter. By comparing the Jerusalem illustrations to the Mamluk copy as well as to other, later (primarily fourteenth-century) Mamluk Maqamat manuscripts—which, as we shall see, often illustrate the same topic—we can point to some possible sources of the Jerusalem miniatures and a tentative date and place of execution.

The illustrations in the Jerusalem manuscript are less well preserved than those in the early Mamluk copy in Milan and most have been slightly retouched, but on the whole they are in good condition. The main protagonists, the old shaykh physician and the young doctor, appear in all but one picture and are easily identifiable. Most of the scenes correspond directly to incidents in the text and therefore are real illustrations. With the exception of page 10v (fig. 2), they are not framed and have no background. Set into the empty spaces reserved by the calligrapher, they occupy at least two-thirds of the page. As a result, above and below the illustrations no more than a few lines are left for the text. All paintings terminate in a nearly identical grass band, which in three cases is enriched by tiny plants. The human images are all stylistically of the same type. It is likely that the calligrapher and the painter were one and the same person.

Like the story, the miniatures can be divided into three groups. In the first one only the two protagonists, the shaykh and the young doctor, appear. On page 10v (fig. 2), for example, they sit, or rather kneel, opposite each other, while the shaykh explains the kind of food that is being presented to them. The shaykh, to the right, has a white beard, a turban, and a long light-blue gown. With his long finger he points to the food that lies on a tripod between the two men. His guest, the young doctor, has a brown beard. He, too, wears a turban, has a black and red gown on, and holds a broad-leaved plant, presumably representing the chicory mentioned in the text, and a round bread or pita, in either hand. On page 17 (fig. 4), where the two appear again, they are discussing something. The shaykh, again to the right, sits relaxed on the ground, supporting himself on a stool covered with a cushion. The gesture of his left raised hand suggests that he is explaining a point to the young doctor, who sits op-
posite him. The same topic is illustrated on pages 36v and 41, and differs only in that the discussants are standing instead of sitting (figs. 8–9).\(^6\) To judge by the gesture of the shaykh, it depicts a later phase in which he is insisting to the young doctor that he disagrees with his interpretation. Only in one case (fig. 3) did the artist add a third person: he stands behind the doctor and turns towards the shaykh as if he were asking for permission to leave.

In the second group we again see the shaykh facing four of his friends, one of whom—possibly a ghulam or servant—either holds or plays an 'ud. Again figs. 5 and 6 are very much alike: in both, the shaykh, holding a goblet (in his right hand in one case, his left in the other),\(^7\) invites his colleagues, who join him in a drink. The servant is clean-shaven and appears to be younger than the rest and, like two of the friends, does not face the shaykh. The same theme recurs in fig. 10, which, however, is reversed so that the shaykh figure is to the right and, like the rest of the participants, is standing. The miniature in the last chapter of the book (fig. 11) differs in content as well as in composition, but belongs to the same category.\(^8\) It depicts the moment at which the shaykh has fallen asleep and his guests, the young doctor, one of his friends, and the servant have decided to eat the remaining food and drink the rest of the wine. We see the sleeping shaykh in front of the picture to the right. He rests his head on a cushion, while his guests enjoy the meal and the music. Food and drink are shown twice—once near the ground and again, including a roasted lamb, in mid-air between the banquetting men.

In the third group the protagonists, instead of sitting or standing, as it were, in a natural environment, are placed in or next to an architectural device. On page 4v (fig. 1) they sit on a wall next to a pharmacy provided with a cellar for storing additional drugs. Both its interior and exterior are shown with the roof and the systematically drawn walls. Basically the same idea of showing the inside and outside of a building at the same time is found on page 10v (fig. 2), depicting the shaykh and the doctor inside a house, indicated by a rectangular frame with two pointed trefoil arches in the spandrels, each supported by a straight column. The last painting again depicts a systematically drawn house (fig. 12).\(^9\) It is painted in shades of blue and pale violet, has a slightly open door at the ground floor, an open window, with its lower part protected by a screen of metal bars, and a pair of open shutters painted in ochre. It actually seems to represent a type of private dwelling, but I know of no parallels to it. It does not appear in any of the Maqâmāt or other manuscripts of the thirteenth or fourteenth century.\(^10\) The shaykh peers through a window to discover the young doctor outside in the street.

As mentioned above, all the miniatures are stylistically alike and belong to the same school of painting. The men are clad in long garments that fall down in wide folds almost to the ankles and reveal the white pantaloons apparently worn by men and women alike (fig. 10).\(^11\) Robes and pantaloons are voluminous, and the folds are indicated by long loops that are shaded at the bottom. The robe of the young doctor, on the other hand, has no folds; it falls straight down to the ankles and is made of black cloth decorated with red flowering scrolls.\(^12\) In two instances only does the gown show a geometric pattern. On their heads the men wear more or less identical turbans, which have been retouched with black lines to show the winding of the cloth; some are fastened with a metal clasp, so that the end hangs down the back. Where the hair is visible it terminates in black pigtails, which also hang down the back. The faces are slightly Mongol, and the men either wear slippers or are barefoot.

The miniatures thus briefly described pose a number of questions. One is their sources. Another is their relation to other manuscripts from the Jazira, Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor, executed between the late twelfth and the early fourteenth century. Still another is their affinity to the early Mamluk, presumably Egyptian, Da'wat al-atibba' in Milan, whose miniatures are much better preserved and were published many years ago,\(^13\) and to other, later Mamluk painting.

In its depictions of architecture, most of its features ultimately go back to antique and Byzantine prototypes which, no longer correctly understood, have been adapted to contemporary taste. Take, for instance, the illustration to the meeting of the shaykh with the young doctor at the pharmacy in Mayafa'irîn (fig. 1). The roof of the store is composed of three triangles, of which the central one is topped by a dark colored ornament. The central triangle seems to be the reduced pediment of a Greek temple, while the three acroteria have become the side triangles and the ornament on the altered pediment. These features were adopted in early Christian art as well. They appear, just to cite one example, in many painted or sculpted representations of the tomb of Lazarus.\(^14\) Obviously certain parts of the tomb, such as the columns and the capitals, were either no longer understood or regarded as unneces-
sary for a shop, as were the steps that led up to the tomb.

Pharmacies, various other shops, and other architectural devices to represent houses (fig. 1) occur again in Arab, probably Syrian and Egyptian, manuscripts from the early thirteenth down to the fourteenth century. For example, in the forty-seventh maqāmah of al-Hariri’s Maqāmāt in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (ms. arabe 6094, fol. 174, attributed to Syria, 1220–23), the barber’s shop, though more sophisticated than the shop in the Paris copy, goes back to the same tradition.15 Or take the early-thirteenth-century copy of Ibn Bakhtishu’s Kalīla wa Dimna, which is probably contemporary with the Paris Maqāmāt.16 The illustration depicts a shop or dukkān, the salesman and the thief. The roof of the shop, represented by a rectangular frame topped with a central triangle flanked by two “balls” or small domes, is again an adaptation of the pediment and acroteria in late-antique and Byzantine tradition. In addition, the four bundles of merchandise inside the shop are stored under a polychromed arch that occurs in many thirteenth-century manuscripts.17 In the same Kalīla wa Dimna manuscript, the house of a judge and the house of a king (fol. 55 and 134v) adhere to the same convention.

Aside from the Da’wat al-atibbā’ manuscript in Milan, which shows the two protagonists inside the shop, painted in the form of a frame with identical bottles on three of its sides, for which no parallels are known to me (fig. 9),18 fourteenth-century Mamluk paintings continue the thirteenth-century style. In the British Library Maqāmāt (Or. Add. 22114, attributed to Syria, early fourteenth century), for example, the roof of the shop again shows the “pediment” in the form of a small dome and the two acroteria in the form of small triangles.19 The Vienna Maqāmāt (Nationalbibliothek, A. F. 9, fol. 98r, dated 1334), again shows the shaded bricks of the wall in the Jerusalem manuscripts (fig. 1) and the two protagonists, the young doctor sitting on the wall and the shaykh kneeling behind him.20 Needless to say, the diagonal half of the stones or bricks of the wall which are painted in a darker shade are again based on, and continue, Christian and Byzantine practice. Similarly the elimination of the wall in order to show the interior of a building is also an old device, used not only in antiquity but prefigured even in ancient Egyptian and Assyrian art.

All the illustrations of the Jerusalem Da’wat al-atibbā’ manuscript are bordered at the bottom by a band of grass, represented by either identical green loops or similar bands intersected with tiny blossoms or small plants. All the figures stand or sit on a ground line, but various objects—fruit bowls and the like—fly about in mid-air, a characteristic that conforms with many late-twelfth- to early-fourteenth-century paintings,21 although some of them have no ground line at all and the figures as well as the objects appear to float in empty space.22

Using grass bands as abbreviated landscape was, of course, not a convention invented by Muslim artists; it appears in different ways in Western as well as in Eastern art. In fact, most of the figures in the Roman mosaics in Tunisia (second to fourth century A.D.), to cite only one example, are set against a ground line of small stylized grass or plants meant to represent landscape.23 In the largest of the nine Byzantine silver plates discovered in Karavas, northern Cyprus, the ground line of the central register, showing the fight between David and Goliath, uses small floral designs to give the illusion of grass.24 In Sasanian art, too, landscape is indicated by a stylized pattern below the respective figure. A band of triangles engraved with small plants, for example, supports a female dancer on a silver plate in the Cleveland Museum of Art.25 Similarly a pair of winged horses walk, so to speak, over a series of “hills” with an incised flower in each.26 These triangular hills on Sasanian silver vessels are purely conventions for representing landscape, and generally are not intended to be ground lines.27

In contrast to Arabic translations of other Greek scientific texts, like the De Materia Medica and the Book of Antidotes,28 the Jerusalem Da’wat al-atibbā’ draws its inspiration primarily from illustrations to thirteenth-century literary texts. Thus the eating and drinking scenes, like the pictures of merrymaking (figs. 5, 6, 10), have parallels in the diverse illustrations of the Maqāmāt. The models for these scenes are not yet known, but to the best of my knowledge they are not to be found in either late-antique or Byzantine manuscripts or in Sasanian works of art. They appear to reflect some aspects of thirteenth-century everyday life in the Arab world and are an “innovation,” for which no antecedents are known. It is therefore not surprising that feasting and banqueting occur not only in the illustrations for thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Maqāmāt, but also in the early Mamluk copy of the Da’wat al-atibbā’ in Milan. Abu Zayd and his companion enjoying food and drink are depicted, for example, in the London Maqāmāt attributed to the mid to second half of the thirteenth century.29 In the twelfth
maqāmah, fol. 34v of the Paris Maqāmāt (ms. arabe 3929, variably dated between the late twelfth and early to mid thirteenth century), Abu Zayd, sitting cross-legged on a cushion and raising a wine goblet in his right hand, is feasting together with his ghulām playing the 'ud, other musicians, and another person raising his glass. His companions are dispersed over the space opposite him, and bowls of fruit and bottles are spread over the lower part of the picture. The composition differs from the Jerusalem presentation of the theme; but the composition for the twenty-eighth maqāmah of the London manuscript (ms. Or. 1200), comes much closer. Among the Mamluk manuscripts, the Da'wat al-atibba' in Milan, the fourteenth-century Maqāmāt in the British Library (Add. 7293), and the Vienna copy (A. F. 9) may again be referred to. In the Milan manuscript the subject is depicted twice, once on fol. 15 and again on fol. 29v (fig. 14). In the Vienna copy it is illustrated on fol. 42v, where the artist similarly adheres to a horizontal composition.

On page 50v (fig. 11) where the young doctor, a guest, and the ghulām have taken up feasting while the shaykh has fallen asleep, there is only one item that has to be mentioned here, and that is the oval cushion that supports the head of the sleeping shaykh. It would seem that this curious feature appears in manuscripts from the first half of the thirteenth century, and continues only in Mamluk illustrations that depended on them. To the best of my knowledge the earliest miniature showing this detail occurs in a manuscript of the De Materia Medica of Dioscorides, painted in 1224. According to the colophon, it was copied, and perhaps also illustrated, by 'Abd Allah b. al-Fadl, and almost certainly in Iraq. Of the seven illustrated folios in the possession of the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., two depict such cushions: one is on no. 47.5r, where Erasistratos talks with one of his attendants. On the other, no. 32.20v, a physician instructs one of his attendants to prepare a cataplasm. Similar oblong cushions also turn up in the
Paris Maqâmât (Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. arabe 5847). Painted by al-Mawsili and dated 654 (1237), it shows the oval cushion at least twice, once in the fourth, the other in the eighth maqâmât. In the first, three of the sleeping travelers in the caravan lean on oval cushions; in the second, one supports the back of the judge.\textsuperscript{33} To refer to just one more pre-Mamluk example, in the London Na'î al-hayawan ("Description of Animals," ms. Or. 2784, fol. 96), the head of Aristotle again rests on the upper point of a vertically standing oval cushion.\textsuperscript{34} Among the Mamluk manuscripts that continue this tradition are the Kalila wa Dimna of 733 (1333), which was at one time in the Sir Bernard Eckstein Collection; a copy of it is in Paris and another copy, transcribed in 755 (1354), is now in the Bodleian Library in Oxford.\textsuperscript{35}

The earliest known Mamluk manuscript of the Da'wat al-atibbâ’ in Milan, where the awakening shaykh interrupts his feasting guests (fig. 15), has no cushion.\textsuperscript{36} The painting is a reverse rendering of the Jerusalem copy and shows the next moment in the story. It is relatively lively; the eyes of the astonished dark-skinned ghulâm and the shaykh meet, and the ribs of the half-eaten lamb are clearly visible. As in other Mamluk paintings, the house is indicated by arches in the spandrels of the frame. Two trays, one carrying fruit and the other a wine bottle and two glasses, fly around in mid-air. The feasting of the shaykh and the young physician, both enjoying the meal of roasted lamb that lies between them, is also included in the Milan manuscript\textsuperscript{37} and other, later Mamluk copies of the Maqâmât (among many examples, the Vienna, ms. A. F. 9, fol. 6v, dated 734 [1334]).\textsuperscript{38}

In his discussion of the differences in subject matter and style between pre-Mamluk and early Mamluk book illustrations, Richard Ettinghausen rightly points to the lack of a real break, observable particularly in illustrations for belles-lettres.\textsuperscript{39} He uses the illustration of the shaykh who, upon awakening, sees his guests eating his meal, to explain some of the characteristics of the new style (fig. 15), including the schematic frame and the arches which indicate the interior of a house. He also draws attention to the intended clarity of the picture, in which the persons are either completely separated or overlap only slightly. In general, the artists concentrated on a few figures and omitted details. Third, he notes the frequent use of a central axis that, although not usually clearly indicated, divides the picture into halves. His fourth point concerns the treatment of the garments, specifically the drapery, which in Mamluk paintings consists not only of large ovoid shapes terminating at the bottom in darker shades, but in tiny ripples which generally appear at the hem of the dresses. In contrast to Syrian and Mesopotamian paintings of the earlier part of the century, they have lost their quasi-natural appearance and have become stylized, a pattern used also for textiles. A comparison between the Jerusalem manuscript of the Da'wat al-atibbâ’ and the early Mamluk copy in Milan reinforces Ettinghausen’s notion that "the spirit of the Maqâmât could survive into these early decades." For example, the schematic frame with the two arches in the spandrels to indicate the interior of a house occurs not only in the Jerusalem Da'wat al-atibbâ’ (fig. 2), but also in many of the earlier Mesopotamian and Syrian Maqâmât. As in the Jerusalem copy and the Na'î al-hayawan in the British Library (ms. Or. 2784, fol. 103v),\textsuperscript{40} the figures are either isolated or overlap only slightly,\textsuperscript{41} and the artists concentrated on a few figures only. Ettinghausen had already noted earlier that the drapery in both manuscripts was often combined with geometric designs or arabesques, as were the objects floating in mid-air (for instance, in figs. 5 and 11 of the Jerusalem copy). The double or single outline used for the base of the painting was prefigured in early-thirteenth-century manuscripts attributable to Syria.

As to the question of when and where our copy was executed, the answer remains unclear. The original manuscript was dedicated to the Marwanid ruler of Mayafariqin, Ahmad b. Marwan. Rachel Ward argues, however, that because it has features in common with the Paris Maqâmât (Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. arabe 3929), al-Jazari’s Automata in the Topkapi Palace Library (Ahmet III 3472), and the Jerusalem Da’wat al-atibbâ’, the last should also be attributed to the Artuqid school and dated to the beginning of the thirteenth century. But was there a school of painting at the Artuqid court which, according to her, was closely related to Mesopotamian and Syrian paintings of the first half of the thirteenth century?\textsuperscript{42} So far only thirteenth-century metalwork attests to the existence of such a school.\textsuperscript{43} Moreover, the style as well as the date of the Paris Maqâmât remain questionable. Unlike the Jerusalem manuscript, most of its Maqâmât miniatures are unframed and have no base line; in addition, many of the figures are haloed. Ward’s dating of the Automata to 602 (1206) may be correct, but the fact that the drinking shaykhs with their turbans and gowns on p. 220\textsuperscript{44} resemble the style found in the Jerusalem Da’wat
"al-atibbi" does not imply that both manuscripts should be given the same date. In view of my stylistic analysis and the insufficient evidence that an Artuqid school of painting existed, I am therefore inclined to attribute it to Syria, and to date it closer to the first Mamluk copy of 1273—that is, to about the second quarter of the thirteenth century.

To conclude, it would seem that Ibn Butlan’s manuscript in the L. A. Mayer Memorial demonstrates (as do the Kitāb al-diryaq in Paris and Vienna, the translation into Arabic of the De Materia medica in Istanbul, and a few other manuscripts) a growing interest in scientific books, particularly those connected with medicine and related subjects. This is epitomized by the ninth- to tenth-century translations of books of late classical origin, which were also illustrated. Whereas some painters still relied on more or less traditional models, those of most of the Mesopotamian and Syrian copies adopted a new style, which at its best can be seen in the Maqamāt of al-Wasiti, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The paintings in Ibn Butlan’s copy suggest, therefore, that in the early thirteenth century their artist, like those of the Kitāb al-diryaq and the De Materia medica, was interested in spreading the knowledge of late antique authorities among the Muslim population. This may equally well apply to the early-Mamluk version in Milan whose illustrations are more simplified. Both manuscripts convey, as has recently been observed by Oya Pancaroğlu, “the relevance of the pursuit of knowledge,” epitomized in the Jerusalem copy of Ibn Butlan’s treatise of “The Banquet of Physicians.”

Jerusalem, Israel

NOTES


5. For Arabic text, see pp. 10r–10v. For details of the dresses, see below.

6. P. 36v is distorted, possibly by a later hand.

7. P. 20v: between the shaykh and his colleagues is a short inscription reading “Drink friends,” but I suspect that this is a later addition.

8. P. 50v: Arabic text, p. 50r.

9. P. 52r: Arabic text, pp. 51r–52r.

10. Later Mamluk artists were primarily interested in religious and public buildings.

11. Clearly seen on figs. 3, 8, 10, 11, and 12.

12. On figs. 6, 8, 9, and 10 his garment is pleated like those of the other men.

13. See above, n. 2.

14. For example, see E. Billig, Spätantike Architekturdarstellungen, vol. 1 (Stockholm, 1977), p. 74, fig. 62. See also p. 50, fig. 35, a wall painting in the Roman catacomb of SS. Pietro e Marcellino, where the pediment is also topped by an ornamental device.

15. The shop is “three dimensional” and has a kind of portico attached to it; the roof of the portico has a triangular pediment topped by an acroteria; at the shop the triangular pediment has become a small cupola. Reproduced in color in Bernard Lewis, ed., The World of Islam (London, 1976), p. 112, no. 22.

16. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. arabe 3465, fol. 90v. See Hugo Buchthal, “Hellenistic” Miniatures in Early Islamic Manuscripts, Ars Islamica 7, 2 (1940), fig. 35. For color reproduction, see Lewis, ed., World of Islam, p. 48, n. 12, fig. 17.

17. Houses defined by a rectangular frame and either round or polylobed arches in the spandrels had become a common device in Arab paintings as early as the late twelfth century. For an early example, see Bishr Farès, Le Livre de la theriaque (Cairo, 1953), pls. VII to IX, XI.


21. The Kitāb wa Dimna manuscript, Paris, BN, ms. arabe 3465; the Pseudo-Galen, or Book of Antidotes, in Vienna, ms. A. F. 10; the Kitāb wa Dimna, Paris, BN, ms. arabe 3467, and many more.

22. Among them is the Kitāb al-diryaq in the Bibliothèque Nationale, dated 595 (1199), most of the illustrations of the Varqa wa Gulshah manuscript, and the Maqamāt (BN, ms. arabe 3929), also in Paris.

23. For example, see the horses in M’hammed Hassine Fantar, La Mosaique en Tunisie (Paris: Editions CNRS, 1994), pp. 104 and 105; the rabbits and the lions, p. 107; and the fourth-century mosaic from Tungar, pp. 137–38.

25. Frequently reproduced; see, for example, Oleg Grabar, *Sasanian Silver: Late Antique and Early Medieval Arts of Luxury from Iran*, exhibition catalogue (Ann Arbor, 1967), no. 23.

26. Ibid., no. 24.


29. British Library, ms. Or. 1290, first maqamat, fol. 4r. In contrast to the Jerusalem *Da'wat al-atibba',* the London *Maqamat* does not indicate any setting, but clearly shows the roasted goat on a tray and Abu Zayd and his companion enjoying the meal.


33. For the caravan asleep, see Eva Baer, "The Human Figure for *Kitaab al-Diryah*," *Muqarnas* 18 (2001): 155–72.