THE LEIDEN MANUSCRIPT OF THE
KITĀB AL-MUSTAʿĪNĪ

Introduction

The Leiden copy of the tabular pharmacopoeia, the Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī by Yusuf b. Ishaq Ibn Baklarish al-Israʿili (c. 500/1106), is one of the oldest Oriental possessions of Leiden University Library. It is associated with Jacobus Golius (1596–1667), who acquired the manuscript while participating in a diplomatic mission to Morocco in 1622–4, before his dazzling scholarly and academic career had even started. In 1629 the manuscript was incorporated in the Library, together with the other manuscripts which Golius had collected by that time, not only in North Africa, but above all in Aleppo and Constantinople.

The sudden influx of more than 200 Oriental manuscript volumes in the Library made it necessary to organize these materials. The University librarian decided to create an Oriental manuscripts section and to place the new arrivals together, with a separate system of class-marks. These are the well-known Cod. Or. numbers of Leiden University Library, a system which is in use to this day. That moment in 1629 can be regarded as the foundation of the Oriental collection within the Leiden Library. Oriental manuscripts had already been available in Leiden, albeit in small numbers, but it was the sheer bulk of Golius’ acquisitions which made this novel approach necessary. The Golius manuscripts were simply and roughly arranged according to their size, and then numbered from Cod. Or. 1 onwards. Since the binding of the Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī is of considerable size (30.5 cm high), it became the fifteenth entry in the inventory in order of size, and the volume consequently received the class-mark Or. 15, by which it has been known in scholarly literature ever since. The most important catalogues containing references to the manuscript are De Jong and De Goeje’s of 1865 (pp. 246–9), and Voorhoeve’s Handlist, p. 243.

1. The medical materials are given in a rough alphabetical order by their names, divided into sections in the following order: a’ll, bā’, fā’, dāl, hā’, waw, zāy, hā, tā’, yā’, kāf, lām, mīm, nūn, sīn, ‘ain, fā’, qāf, rā’, sād, tā’, thā’, khā’, dhāl, ghayn, shīn. This order is neither the Maghribi nor the Mashriqi order of abjad. The sequence of the lemmata within each letter (the first six simplicia given are: amīr bāris, aqṭāqāya, aḥḥawān, aḥḥal, anjara, anjarīn; the last ones are shāhm al-rūbb, shāhm al-thaʿlab, shāhm al-himār, shāhm al-batt, shāhm al-daṭājī, shuṭīm nakhtalīfa) does not follow this alphabetical order, nor does the order of the letters within each lemma.

2. In fact the Golius collection now comprises 211 inventory numbers, several of which consist of more than one volume, and which together contain many more texts.

3. At the time of writing (February 2006), the highest number was Cod. Or. 26,515.

Provenance of the Leiden manuscript

We are more than usually well informed about the Leiden manuscript's earlier provenance and history. While in Morocco Golius corresponded with an old acquaintance of his professor of Arabic in Leiden, Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624). This learned Muslim was Ahmad b. Qasim al-Andalusi (c. 1570—after 1640), an experienced traveller in partibus infidelium. Jacobus Golius and Ahmad b. Qasim corresponded. Golius was in Safi on the Atlantic coast, acting as an engineer attached to the Dutch diplomatic mission, while his correspondent was in Marrakesh in an influential position in the Moroccan court. Hardly surprisingly, books are indeed among the subject of the correspondence and the Kitāb al-Musta’īn is mentioned several times. Two of Ahmad b. Qasim's letters to Golius are particularly relevant to the earlier provenance of the Leiden manuscript of the Kitāb al-Musta’īn and deserve to be quoted in full. On 12 Rabi’ II 1033 (Friday 2 February 1624) Ahmad b. Qasim wrote from Marrakesh to Jacobus Golius [Fig. 28]:


6. Ahmad b. Qasim’s letters are now kept in Leiden Cod. Or. 1228, nos. 32, 33, 34, 101, 114. Not so long ago, the former companion volume of Leiden Cod. Or. 1228 was discovered by Jan Schmidt in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, MS Persian no. 913. A film of that manuscript is in Leiden (A 2092). See Jan Schmidt, ‘An Ostrich Egg for Golius: The Heyman Papers Preserved in the Leiden and Manchester University Libraries and Early-Modern Contacts between the Netherlands and the Middle East’, in his The Joys of Philology: Studies in Ottoman Literature, History and Orientalism (1500–1923), vol. 2: Orientalists, Travelers and Merchants in the Ottoman Empire, Political Relations between Europe and the Porte, Istanbul 2002, pp. 9–74, esp. pp. 19–20. The Manchester manuscript also contains other materials in the hand of Ahmad b. Qasim. Ahmad b. Qasim left other traces during his peregrinations. In their historical study on Ahmad b. Qasim’s memoirs, van Koningsveld, al-Samarrai and Wiegers (p. 31, n. 83) mention several manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris which contain notes in Ahmad’s hand (MSS ar. 1181, 4119, 4213 and 4348). Ahmad b. Qasim’s somewhat nostalgic note in MS ar. 1181, fol. 99b, deserves to be quoted here in full, if only to enable us to dismiss the fantasies of the three Dutch scholars about Ahmad b. Qasim’s way of writing his own name:

كتبت في مدينة باريس ورأيت هذا الكتاب وعرفت أنه كتب في بلادنا وهي بالمغرب اغتنامي الله أن ي长度ي وسلام أحمد بن قاسم فقير

الأندلسي عفا الله عنه

‘I was in the town of Barrish [Paris] and I saw this book and I knew that it had been written in our land, which is in the Maghrib, may God return us to it safe and sound, wa-l-Salam. Ahmad b. Qasim, poor [servant of God], the Andalusian, may God forgive him.’

The writer of these lines was in France between 1610 and 1613. MS Paris ar. 1181 (containing al-Jazuli’s Da‘ā’il al-Khayrāt, dated 1 Ramadān 1007/1599 and copied by a certain Ahmad b. Ibrahim) was then in the possession of Etienne Hubert (a mutual friend of Ahmad b. Qasim and Thomas Erpenius), as becomes clear from Hubert’s owner’s note on the second flyleaf at the end of the volume: ‘De la Bibliothèque de E. Hubert Lecteur du Roy en langue Arabique s’il se perd il vous supplie luy rendre.’ Hubert apparently acquired the manuscript, still almost brand-new, when he himself was in Morocco, a few years earlier.

7. Golius’ part of the correspondence is not known to have been preserved.

8. John Rylands Library, Manchester, MS Persian no. 913, fol. 169 (no. 57).
السلام على رسل الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

الكتاب المثالي المكي

النبي الذي السماء

يحكى: مكة بعد أن تخطى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بجانبها ثلاثة

وقد أتى الخبر وعزم عليه بالنار بعد أن التحق به كان نبياً

والداب المسجد المكي المعنى يوم القيامة في نوراً لما يسهله.

ما تقرب منها، ثم ماتت ما قبلها، وعمرة صاحبها الصبي، ومنها تكمل ما

وضعها، وحسبه على سلاسل الملوك. ورغم عليه السلام طاعته، وزمثله

بضع فئة، كما هو عظيماً، ولا أحدث فيه، بل من جهة، بل تكلف

واختفى لابن مازرج، ونها يبلغ خدمه مرتاب، فهذ البهت تأكله

دم خدي إياه، وإنه يحب نجله برجلان، ويعترف بذلك، يلبس

مارج فمته، وهو غمر هذا اليوم، فتغطى لما بين الصيف.

الله تعالى يا أحياء يا نوراً أن نسابة أيديه، ويركز سلامه

وصن تنبأ به، وعمره، فما بعده، فبالأمانات، يحكي:

السما، ومرأحة النجمة، وناسب من الصياح، وعشر، وسعيد،

البهجة، وكتاب مملوك الأهداف العلمية، وأسيرة شبه

الهدي الذي

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

(توقيع)
Praise be to God, and blessing and peace be upon His most noble messengers and on those who follow them till the Day of Judgement.

This letter is to our honoured, intelligent, courteous, learned, Christian, Dutch friend, Jacob Cool.

Your kind letter has reached us and we rejoiced at it very much, and we have understood what you wrote and what was contained in the letter. In connection with what you said about the manuscript that we had copied of the book entitled al-Musta‘id, I did my best to do this in a perfect way, as will be clear to you from the translations in it, as I have translated most of the names of the simple medicines into Spanish bi-l-a‘jamiyya [sic], which should facilitate your comprehension of it, and I have collated it with another copy, an additional one to the copy of our friend, the doctor. From these two we corrected your copy. I was induced to do this by two matters. The first is the word of our Prophet, upon him: 'God has mercy on whoever performs his craft to perfection.' The second is that I assumed that you wanted, mostly, to have these included, and that it is only appropriate to include something in it which is correct. As to what you said about informing the land of origin of the author, I think this is Andalusia, but I was unable to ascertain from the documents in the second book of the Muruj al-Dhahab, is in so far remarkable that it has, among several other similar notes, a
which period. This may become clear from the book ‘The Golden Meadows’, since it was
said at the beginning of the Kitāb al-Tīb that he presented it to so-and-so, and from that
date it is clear in which period the person to whom it was presented lived. On another
day I will write for you the answer to your Sheikh, the learned professor Erpenius, God
willing, and from Him we ask to enlarge your blessings and to bring you back safely to your
country. Thus written in Marrakesh, may God protect it, on twelve Rabi‘ II of the year
one thousand and thirty-three, and in the Christian era on the second of February of the
year one thousand six hundred and twenty-four. Thus written by the servant of the High
Authority and the prisoner of his sins, Ahmad b. Qāsim, may God treat him with kindness.

Preliminary remarks on the basis of this letter:

~ allātī ansakhnā ‘that we had copied’, and which was therefore a manuscript which
was apparently not copied by Ahmad b. Qasim himself. The owner of the first
original was the medical doctor, whose name is not mentioned in either letter.
~ ‘translations into Spanish’. These were apparently made by Ahmad b. Qasim.
~ ‘I have collated it with another copy, an additional one to the copy of our friend,
the doctor.’ This means that there was another, presumably unrelated, manuscript
copy of the Kitāb al-Musta‘inā around and available.
~ ‘From these two we corrected your copy.’ From this sentence, in which the
grammatical dual is clearly visible, we may conclude that at least three copies of the
Kitāb al-Musta‘inā are involved: the copy belonging to the doctor, the other copy,
and finally ‘your copy’ (= Golius’ copy).
~ ‘may become clear from the book “The Golden Meadows”’. But the copy of that
manuscript, which may have contained valuable information on the provenance of
MS Leiden Or. 15, was stolen (as we read in Ahmad b. Qasim’s letter to Golius of 29
February 1624, quoted below), and that information must now be regarded as lost.
~ ‘the beginning of the Kitāb al-Tīb’. The meaning of this passage is unclear, unless
al-Tīb is to be understood as al-Tībb, and then refers to the Kitāb al-Musta‘inā.

On 10 Jumādā I 1033 (Thursday 29 February 1624) Ahmad b. Qasim wrote again
from Marrakesh to Jacob Golius in Safi [Fig. 29]:

Alseñor jacob gul flamenco en safi

الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على رسله

اما بعد حمد الله الواحد الاحد الفرد الصمد الذي لم يولد ولم يولد ولم يكن له كفوا واحد فاتى قبلت كتابك
وفرحت بما رآيت من ضبط خطتك ففهمت معناه ورماه اما ما ذكرت من كتاب مرح الذهاب أنه لم يبلغ اليك

birth note on its title page (added later) for a boy ‘Abd al-Malik born on a Tuesday 12 June or 17 or 15 Rajab
(year not clear, but after 988/1580, the date mentioned in a previously written birth note). May we conclude
from the double calendar notation that this manuscript was once in the possession of Moriscos such as Ahmad
b. Qasim, or were Christian dates used more often than one would think? In his first letter to Golius Ahmad b.
Qasim also refers to both calendars.

12. Leiden Cod. Or. 1228, no. 32.
To Mr Jacob Gool, Dutchman in Safi

Praise be to God. Blessing and peace be to His messengers.

After thanking God, the One, the Unique, the Eternal, Who is not born, and to Whom no one is born, and to Whom there is no equal, I have received your letter and I was glad to see how well you can write, and I have understood its content and meaning. What you wrote about the 'Book of the Golden Meadows', namely that it had not arrived with you and that the Arabs had taken it from its bearer, well this is their habit in this land and in this difficult time. It gives me pleasure to receive the news that it is your purpose to acquire Kitab al-Musta’tni on the Art of Medicine. I am writing to you once more about this because I think strongly that the copy, which is with its owner, the doctor, was written about four hundred years ago. It is a marvellous book and it is very much appreciated by the Muslims. You mentioned that you had with you a text on astronomy literally: 'the declination of the Sun'. If it would be possible to translate this into Arabic or Spanish, and then send it to me, that would give us pleasure. Greetings.

Thus done in Marrakush, may God preserve it, on ten Jumada I of the year one-thousand and thirty-three.

The Servant of the High Authority,
Ahmad b. Qasım, may God be kind to him.
الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على نبينا محمد وآل محمد

لقد حضر الله العشاء أخبر بأمير الجهد لبعل إذا علم واليود ولم يش

في حضرة السأسLEN بعد سلسلة حضوره. وقد حضر بعدها رضي الله عن

في هذه الأماكن مع حاله. وقدمه لبعل إذا علم الصحبة. فالله عليه.

لقد علم بعل إذا علم الصحبة. فстал الاستجابة. فإن هذا الزمان الصعب.

وفي هذا الأجواء علمت في الكتب المستعبرة، في صفة الله. ماژندنكمه له

بشأنه شبيهًا. فغالبًا عليه، إلى ندمة ماهياً، بما ينبه في هذا الكتاب

الكتب المصريون لمكافحة معبر عن المباني. وهو

هذا الكتاب المفكر عجيب مفتوحة إنها مسيح، ف منهم

كثيرًا. في الدروازة. لمعروف الكنسي، لو أعاد

استجابة أو رفع الأسال إلى السائرين، وتعايشه. نعم ذلك

والسلام وحبيب عم وله التمبييض، وسند على الناس، وشفاء جامع

الواعر عام نجله وناثير إلى السنة.

تحديم المقام للعلم

أحمد بن بكر

اللهجة
Preliminary remarks on the basis of this letter:

~ The present owner of Kitāb al-Musta‘īnī is, again, said to be a medical doctor.
~ The book is said to be held in high esteem.
~ The doctor’s manuscript is said to be four hundred years old.
~ Nothing is said about an incomplete or damaged manuscript.

The first two details can be taken at face value, but not so Ahmad b. Qasim’s note on the antiquity of the manuscript. If this applies to Leiden Cod. Or. 15 (which is by no means sure) it can only apply to the old part of the manuscript, which is certainly medieval.

From the two letters of Ahmad b. Qasim we can gather that Golius’ appetite for Kitāb al-Musta‘īnī was whetted by the first letter. To this he may have answered that he wished to acquire a copy of the work, and we can assume that his interest was further aroused by the four-hundred-year-old manuscript mentioned in the second letter.

**Physical description of the Leiden manuscript**

When leafing through the Leiden manuscript the reader is immediately struck by the fact that the physical constitution of the volume is diverse. At first glance it is evident that a medieval manuscript of the Kitāb al-Musta‘īnī had become very incomplete in the course of time, and that this incomplete copy (still containing 101 folios of old paper) had been supplemented by 34 newly written paper leaves. Old and new leaves together more or less make up the entire work, although only a full review of all existing witnesses of the text can confirm this. A clue for the dating of the repaired part of the text is the watermark in the new paper: an ornamented and crowned pot, with a crescent on top.

Although Briquet and Heawood give many pots in watermarks dating from the latter part of the sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries, none of these is similar to the watermark in Leiden Cod. Or. 15, nor is the identification of the watermark as given by Wiegers correct. In Heawood, as in Briquet, several of the pots have peculiarities very similar to those in the watermark in Leiden Cod. Or. 15, but none is positively identifiable with it. It shows, once more, that the reference works on watermarks can only be used as rough guides, not as precision instruments. The world of papermaking is infinitely more complex than can be described in such books. Personally I only use them for the purpose of corroboration, or refutation, and always in order to have an additional argument.

19. Wiegers, *A Learned Muslim Acquaintance*, p. 66, n. 159, where there is a reference to Heawood No. 3563. Heawood’s No. 3563, however, is not dated 1620, but 1600. The letters PR in Heawood 3563 are also at variance with what the watermark actually has: HL, as can been seen clearly in fol. 135.
Wiegers was the first scholar to point out that the supplemented leaves in the Leiden manuscript of the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī* are in fact written by Ahmad b. Qasim himself. For this he convincingly adduces palaeographical evidence, by a simple juxtaposition of Ahmad b. Qasim’s letter in Or. 1228, no. 32, to a random supplemented page in Or. 15.  

If we compare this with the words by Ahmad b. Qasim in his letter of 2 February 1624 (*ansakhnāhā, ‘we had it copied’*) it is clear that this cannot apply to MS Leiden Cod. Or. 15, which Ahmad b. Qasim did copy, but to another manuscript of the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī*, which must have been copied by someone else. In the time immediately preceding Golius’ acquisition of his copy of the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī* there must have been at least three manuscripts of the text around.

It may also be assumed from this that the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī* was not a very rare work. When Ahmad b. Qasim writes to Golius on 29 February 1624 that the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī* ‘is a marvellous book and ... very much appreciated by the Muslims’, this implies a certain popularity and availability of the text. If Ahmad b. Qasim, in that same letter to Golius, mentions four centuries as the age of the manuscript, and if he is writing about the manuscript which is now Leiden Cod. Or. 15, this can only apply to the part of the text on old paper. Ahmad b. Qasim’s estimate is not meant as an accurate dating, but even if the four centuries are an exact indication of the manuscript’s age in 1624, the old part of the manuscript would date from around 1224.  

I do not wish to exclude this as a possible estimate for the age of the old, original parts of the Leiden manuscript.

The division between the old part and the supplement on new paper is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New paper</th>
<th>Old paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>folios 1–13</td>
<td>folios 14–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–23</td>
<td>24–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31–43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>45–47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>49–82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>84–96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Wiegers, *A Learned Muslim Acquaintance*, p. 66. Wiegers’ remark on Golius completing the manuscript is wrong. A rather puzzling remark about Or. 15 was already made by Dozy, *Catalogus*, vol. 1, p. 162, n. 1. It would imply that Or. 15 also contained copies of other books. This is not the case at present, nor, in all probability, was it the case in Dozy’s time, since the previous printed catalogue of the Leiden Library (*Catalogus Librorum tam Impressorum quam Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Publicae Universitatis Lugduno Batavae*, Leiden 1716, p. 443, no. 809) mentions the text as the only one in the binding. In the description of Or. 15 (De Jong and De Goeje, *Catalogus*, vol. 3, no. 1339), p. 249, n. 1, we find the further specification that the supplemented leaves were probably made *Golii jussu*, at Golius’ request. Dozy, De Jong and De Goeje did not realize that Ahmad b. Qasim was in fact the copyist himself, but they all knew Golius’ handwriting too well to commit the error which Wiegers ascribes to them.

22. This ‘four hundred years’ may be based on knowledge of part of Leiden Cod. Or. 15, which is now lost. This may be a colophon or some owner’s note. We do not know. It is also possible that such information was somehow preserved in the (stolen) copy of the *Murağ al-Dhañah*. 
The manuscript as a whole now consists of 135 leaves, which were numbered in the 1970s by a Leiden librarian, in pencil, as 1-135 in the upper margin of each recto page. All references to the Leiden manuscript in this article follow this foliation. Roughly three-quarters have been preserved on old paper and one quarter was supplemented by Ahmad b. Qasim on new paper. The structure of the old paper occasionally shows a pair of parallel chain lines (e.g. fol. 93) and is evidently of much older date than the newly added leaves, the early thirteenth century having been mentioned already as a possibility. The old paper is of a somewhat smaller size (26.7 x 19.2 cm and sometimes less because of wear and tear) than the new paper (29 x 19.5 cm). The volume is now bound in a European-style full parchment binding, which may mean that the pages were only bound when Golius brought them back to Leiden. He did the same with other piles of paper which he collected, such as the Leiden Cod. Or. 14.

All the old leaves, and a number of the new ones, have been fixed on guards of paper, with the result that no bifolium of the old part of the manuscript has been preserved. If there were still bifolia intact when Golius acquired the manuscript, these must have been cut into single folia for the purpose of the restoration scheme which was applied to the entire manuscript. These guards of paper of about 1 cm width have been made in such a way that they constitute quires and give the book as a whole a quired structure. A conspectus of the quires of Leiden Cod. Or. 15 is as follows: I (1-8), II (9-14), III (15-23), IV (24-31), V (32-9), VI (40-7), VII (48-55), VIII (56-63), IX (64-71), X (72-9), XI (80-7), XII (88-95), XIII (96-103), XIV (104-11), XV (112-19), XVI (120-7), XVII (128-35). There is an evident preference of Ahmad b. Qasim, who did the restoration work, to make quires of eight leaves. Bifolia of the newly supplied paper were kept intact as far as possible: quires I and XVII consist entirely of the new paper and these therefore consist of bifolia. The fact that these quires had to be fully replaced shows, again, that the most vulnerable parts of a book block are the beginning and the end.23 All the other quires are of mixed composition and only rarely do we see bifolia in the new paper in such mixed quires (fols. 10-13, 11-12 and 21-2 only).

---

23. One might even wonder whether the traditional Islamic horizontal storage of books may have been more likely to aggravate this type of damage, which would be less likely to occur in, or would be less detrimental to, books which are stored vertically.
Maintaining the order of the leaves

That several owners of the manuscript have tried to maintain the correct order of the leaves becomes clear by their numbering of the leaves or pages. Apart from the modern foliation, the Leiden manuscript shows five older systems of foliation or pagination, only one of which was made on both the old and the new paper. This full foliation was probably made by Ahmad b. Qasim. He did not number the folios of the introductory part, since the correct order of the leaves there is secured by a system of catchwords. The double-page openings with the jadāwil, the first being fols. 12b–13a, are numbered by Ahmad b. Qasim from the first one onwards. These numbers (1–122) are written, almost without a break, in the upper right-hand corner of each verso (i.e. right-hand) page, from fol. 12b onwards. Sometimes one can see corrections in mistakenly written numbers. The purpose of this numbering was to count the double openings of the text. Where a double opening has text which may be disregarded, this page has been crossed out and the opening is not numbered [fols. 13b–14a: Fig. 30]. This system of numbering is therefore related to the restoration work on the Leiden manuscript.

The other numbering systems are older, since they can only be seen on the leaves of old paper. Their relative age could not be established, but there may be a relationship between some of them:

~ A foliation with roman numerals on fols. 14a, 15a, 17a, 19a, at the bottom of each recto page, sometimes somewhat centred. It shows the numbers 3, 4, 6 and 8, respectively. Note that numbers 1, 2, 5 and 7 are missing, but for these the old paper was replaced by the new, meaning that the foliation was added when the old paper part of the manuscript was (more) complete.

~ A pagination with roman numerals (2–11) at the bottom of the page in the section consisting of fols. 25a–29b. There is no numeral visible on fol. 24a. Fols. 24 and 25 are apparently the leaves that were on top of the pile and have suffered most from wear and tear. The pagination had been added when these leaves were on top of the bundle of paper.

~ A system of foliation in large ghubārī numerals, written with a thick pen in the upper margin of a recto page. The first of these that can be observed is on fol. 28a, followed by a fragment of a numeral which is on fol. 29a; neither can be identified with certainty. The tens seem to be written in reverse order: '03' for '30' (fol. 43a), '04' for '40' (fol. 52a), '05' for '50' (fol. 60a). To this series of ghubārī numerals belong the numbers within the section consisting of fols. 42a–65a [Fig. 31]. After fol. 65a this thick numbering suddenly stops. Not all of these ghubārī numerals are very legible, but remnants of most numerals can still be seen. Several lacunae in the numbering can be observed as well (if '40' is on fol. 52a and '50' on fol. 60a, either two leaves are missing or the scribe has skipped two numbers by mistake). To find out whether these lacunae in the numbering coincide with lacunae in the text is the editor's task.

~ Another system of foliation in large ghubārī numerals, now written with a thinner pen in the upper margin of each recto page. Between fols. 59a and 63a there is an overlap of the two ghubārī foliation systems. The thinner one there is possibly meant to be a correction to the thicker one. The entire system of these thin ghubārī numerals
صحيح الادعية الغاية بها والإسراء أحسن حالاتنا إنا لأتمنى أن نكون من أهل الصلاة في هذا الإTokenizer.

أما فيما يتعلق بالصوت والصورة، نحن نشدد على أهمية الترويج لكلمة الله وتقديمها بacularي وصريح.

من فقهنا، وما صاحبنا وهو استغاثاً لهما.
في بليني الأقدم، عبر عن حزنه ورعبه من الأخطار التي كنتما تسكنها. كما توحده من الصمود في القضايا الذي تواجهه. يُعرف هذا النص بـ "المضطصح" الذي كتبته بليني الأقدم. يشير النص إلى حقيقة أن الحياة مليئة بالمخاطر والتحديات، والحصول على النجاح يتطلب قوة وصبرًا.

تلاحظ أن النص يبرز importância القيم الوراثية في التفكير الإنساني. يشير إلى أن الحياة مليئة بالمخاطر والتحديات، وأن النجاح يتطلب قوة وصبرًا.

نلاحظ أيضًا أن النص يبرز قيمة الوعي الصادق، حيث يتطرق إلى أن الحياة مليئة بالمخاطر والتحديات، وأن النجاح يتطلب قوة وصبرًا.

وتذكر النص أيضًا أن الحياة مليئة بالمخاطر والتحديات، وأن النجاح يتطلب قوة وصبرًا.

وتذكر النص أيضًا أن الحياة مليئة بالمخاطر والتحديات، وأن النجاح يتطلب قوة وصبرًا.
can be observed on the old paper, from fols. 59a to 127a. On fol. 59a the thin ghubārī numbering has '48', whereas the thick ghubārī numbering has '49'. The thinly written large ghubārī numerals continue until the last leaf of old paper ('tt7'; Fig. 33). This series too has lacunae. Its '50' is on fol. 61a, whereas its '60' is on fol. 70a. This means that somewhere one old leaf is missing (or otherwise that this is an instance of ancient miscounting). Later on, the leaf that should have carried '90' is missing. It should have been between fols. 99a and 100a, but these are numbered '89' and '91' respectively. At the end of the section written on old paper, which is far more heavily damaged than the part in the middle of the book block, several leaves would be missing if the defective numbering were a decisive argument.

Ahmad b. Qasim’s restoration of the Leiden manuscript

The tabular structure of the Kitāb al-Musta‘inī makes it possible for the copyist to copy the work double-page by double-page. Both the Leiden and the Arcadian manuscripts have a layout of seven rows per page, the upper row being used in both manuscripts for the titles of the columns, the six remaining rows for the explanatory text. By maintaining the tabular layout of their copy according to the one in the exemplar copyists made their task easier. In this case, this may be somewhat misleading, however, since this open structure of the Kitāb al-Musta‘inī also allows for all sorts of additions by owners and readers, which may affect the integrity of the text. That this has happened is clear from the numerous variants which can be observed between the Leiden and the Arcadian manuscript, but I leave remarks about variant readings in the manuscripts to the editors of the critical edition of the Kitāb al-Musta‘inī. Another aspect of the vulnerable integrity of the text in tabular books such as the present one is that, when one leaf is lost, the right and left sides of the opening are no longer a conceptual unit.

Notes and additions by a great number of readers can be observed on many of the pages on the old paper, some very faded. They are often introduced with the word quf, the equivalent of nota in Latin manuscripts. It is tempting to identify the thickly written note on dawā al-khanāzir (fol. 57a) with the hand which also wrote the thick ghubārī numerals.

On fol. 97a of the Leiden manuscript (a leaf of modern paper) we can observe that an extra or explanatory text was struck out at the bottom of the page. The text contains an old medical judgement against the use of copper eating and drinking vessels (ad ḥanāb). Ahmad b. Qasim, the copyist, may have struck it out because he believed it was not part of the text. The Arcadian manuscript (pp. 196–7) has a similar addition at the bottom of the page at the same lemma, but of two lines only, with the mention of Aristotle (as in the penultimate line of the Leiden manuscript). It shows, again, the enormous variety of readings. The philological significance, however, of these variants, notes and additions falls outside the scope of the present study.

A few more isolated details in the Leiden manuscript of Kitāb al-Musta‘inī may be observed here:

24. I have desisted from specifying and counting them.
The title in the Leiden manuscript (over the beginning of the text, on fol. rb [Fig. 32]) is given in a somewhat confused way, certainly as compared to the Arcadian manuscript, which has a regular title page. Title and author are mentioned in a marginal addition written over the beginning of the introduction:

Kitāb al-Mustā'īnī on simple medicines from what was collected and composed by Yūnus b. Ishāq b. B-k-lār-sh al-Isrā’īlī for al-Musta’in bi-llāh (the Exalted) Abu Ja’far Ahmad b. al-Mu’tamin bi-llāh

Over the beginning is also written in bold script:

Kitāb al-Mustā’īnī on medical simples

This may be due to a damaged exemplar. Textually speaking, the addition in the Leiden manuscript does not greatly differ from the title in the Arcadian manuscript.

~ There are a few conjectures of Ahmad b. Qasim in the margin, which are not confirmed by the Arcadian manuscript. For example, on fol. 1b: اظنه يحق the Arcadian manuscript has haqīq, the reading in the body of the Leiden manuscript. The same goes for the conjecture in the last line of fol. 1b of the Leiden manuscript, where the text in the body of the page is not so clear, whereas the copyist in the margin conjectures: اظنه مهببا. The copyist has also written under the last line: سيبها, — a reading supported by the Arcadian manuscript, p. 5, line 6. There is a marginal correction for الزلج in the body of fol. 10a of the Leiden manuscript قال في نسخة: اخري الزراج which refers to a manuscript other than the exemplar. This remark may be understood in connection with the other manuscript mentioned by Ahmad b. Qasim in his letter to Golius of 2 February 1624. The marginal conjecture al-zāj seems to be correct. The originally written al-rajlaj does not seem to make sense, nor does al-zājaj in the Arcadian manuscript, p. 24, line 4 from the bottom.

~ The first double page of the tabular text in the Leiden manuscript Kitāb al-Mustā’īnī (fols. 12b–13a) is in fact the beginning of the text, with the six lemmata amīr bāris, aqāqiya, aqhawān, abhal, anjarā, anjarān. The Arcadian manuscript opens its tabular text (pp. 32–33) with the same six lemmas in the same order. This continues for a while, but then the two manuscripts first diverge and later reconverge again:

~ Arcadian, pp. 34–5 = Leiden Or. 15, fols. 20b–21a
~ Arcadian, pp. 36–7 = Leiden Or. 15, fols. 21b–22a
~ Arcadian, pp. 38–9 = Leiden Or. 15, fols. 14b–15a
~ Arcadian, pp. 40–1 = Leiden Or. 15, fols. 15b–16a
~ Arcadian, pp. 42–3 = Leiden Or. 15, fols. 16b–17a
~ Arcadian, pp. 44–5 = Leiden Or. 15, fols. 17b–18a
It is evident that the copyist of the modern part of Leiden Or. 15, Ahmad b. Qasim, had become confused, probably because the beginning of the old part of the manuscript, the text of which he intended to complete, was still quite defective. He therefore skipped fol. 14a, which contains the old version of the text (now struck out), and replaced it by a new text on fol. 22a (see the corresponding text in the Arcadian manuscript, pp. 36–7). The newly made text on fol. 23a was skipped as well, since it was already available on fol. 15a on old paper.

~ All lemmata have been provided with Spanish translations in the margins. These may be identified with the translations mentioned by Ahmad b. Qasim in his letter to Golius of 2 February 1624.

~ Not only did Ahmad b. Qasim number the openings, which was essential for maintaining order in what was then just a pile of loose leaves, and not only did he translate the lemmata in order to help his young friend Golius about whose proficiency in Arabic he apparently had his doubts, but he also improved the legibility of some of the illegible and faded text by writing over it, and he added text inside the rows and in the margins of many pages [Fig. 34].

~ On fol. 108, 109, 127, Ahmad b. Qasim has partially repaired the old paper by sticking some modern paper on the upper side of the original, and substituted the lost text on these strips in his own handwriting [Fig. 33]. This restoration lacks the neatness with which he usually worked, and we may, perhaps, assume that he was in haste, and lacked time now that he had come near the end of his restoration work.

The difference is striking. In the beginning of his reconstruction work on the text he replaced entire pages when this was not necessary (compare fol. 14a, 22a), but now he may have had a deadline to keep. From fol. 117 onwards the Leiden manuscript shows, mostly at the top of the pages, considerable damage with the consequent loss of entire lines of text. Apparently this lost text could not be supplemented. Ahmad b. Qasim’s two other manuscripts may not have given him the text he needed to complete the copy for Golius. But, again, lack of time may also have been the actual reason why his ambitious restoration programme of the manuscript was not entirely completed. Another consequence of lack of time may be seen in the last quire, which is entirely in the hand of Ahmad b. Qasim. His haste to finish the copying was apparently such that he forgot to use one top row (fol. 132a) for the title of the page, a mistake he could only correct by leaving the bottom row empty. On fol. 131a he even forgot to make this correction and filled in seven rows of text, but then struck out the text in the bottom row. These are not essential mistakes, but Ahmad b. Qasim, who by now had almost completed what must have been an extensive editing job, made them, one assumes, because he was in a hurry and had no time to replace the faulty leaves neatly.
كتاب المستعين في المفردات العربية

فار المورد

أولاً: بالله أرتُب فتحًا وددًا، وأسند موقتًا وحيًا، وخلع قلبيًا وستًا، ولعوبًا وغزًا، ومألوفًا وفاجًا، وتعبدًا وجمًا، وقلويًا وسحًا، و אירועًا وحذًا، وأثارًا وطاشًا، وألقى وغمًا.

ثانيًا: فأخرج بي من نار الفضول، وبنجى عني من نار الفهم، وطحى على يدي نار السوء، وحرب على فرحتي نار الخوف، وسلام على نار الفناء، وسلام على نار الفناء، وسلام على نار الفناء.

ثالثًا: فلقد دفع الله عني نار الفهم، ونار البغاء، ونار السوء، ونار الفهم، ونار الفهم، ونار الفهم، ونار الفهم، ونار الفهم.

رابعًا: فانظر إلى ما تملكني الله، وما يملكني خالق، وما يملكني خالق، وما يملكني خالق، وما يملكني خالق، وما يملكني خالق، وما يملكني خالق، وما يملكني خالق.

خامسًا: واجعلني الله ما يريد، واجعلني الله ما يريد، واجعلني الله ما يريد، واجعلني الله ما يريد، واجعلني الله ما يريد، واجعلني الله ما يريد، واجعلني الله ما يريد.

سادسًا: فلنر تفضل الله، ولنر تفضل الله، ولنر تفضل الله، ولنر تفضل الله، ولنر تفضل الله، ولنر تفضل الله، ولنر تفضل الله.

سابعًا: فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله.

ثامنًا: فانظر لما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون.

نinth: فانظر لما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون، وما يكون.

تenth: فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله، فارح الله.
عندما عا弱势 حقه الفرصة، وظل قلبه واضحًا. فلعلما كان بحث عن عرضة، معاً ضلعت أيضًا.

أطلب من رجله، وأنا فلكل见证了، يجري عقاب عند منه، وأنا بناءً من عبدٍ من عبد العبد.

فما جرى، وما عادت بحث عن عرضة، استمعه ما.

معبِّر

تم تصميم هذه الجمل، وتبني المكتبة بعملية، وحذرت الأشخاص، وأنا بناءً من عبد العبد.

بمجرد أن يتم تصميم هذه الجمل، تم تصميم هذه الجمل، وحذرت الأشخاص، وأنا بناءً من عبد العبد.

بمجرد أن يتم تصميم هذه الجمل، تم تصميم هذه الجمل، وحذرت الأشخاص، وأنا بناءً من عبد العبد.

بمجرد أن يتم تصميم هذه الجمل، تم تصميم هذه الجمل، وحذرت الأشخاص، وأنا بناءً من عبد العبد.

بمجرد أن يتم تصميم هذه الجمل، تم تصميم هذه الجمل، وحذرت الأشخاص، وأنا بناءً من عبد العبد.

بمجرد أن يتم تصميم هذه الجمل، تم تصميم هذه الجمل، وحذرت الأشخاص، وأنا بناءً من عبد العبد.

بمجرد أن يتم تصميم هذه الجمل، تم تصميم هذه الجمل، وحذرت الأشخاص، وأنا بناءً من عبد العبد.
Concluding remarks

In addition to the numerous new details that can be gathered from a close inspection of the Leiden manuscript, the following conclusions may be drawn. The earlier view that Leiden Cod. Or. 15 was a copy of the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī* made by Ahmad b. Qasim at the request of Jacobus Golius, on the basis of a single manuscript, is no longer tenable. A newly discovered letter by Ahmad b. Qasim in the Manchester library shows that at least two *exemplaria* were involved, one to be copied from and the other for advanced collation work. Traces of both can be discerned in the Leiden manuscript.

Notwithstanding the new information, Ahmad b. Qasim’s involvement in procuring a copy for Golius has not become any clearer. It has, if anything, become harder to understand. His was an exhausting editorial task, for which time almost failed him. An analysis of the traces of several pagination systems in the Leiden manuscript shows that the old part, apart from being incomplete at the beginning and at the end, seems to have had lacunae in the text.

Finally, the description of the Leiden manuscript of the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī*, here undertaken for the first time since Dozy’s remarks in 1851 and the description of 1865 by De Jong and De Goeje, together with newly discovered material in Manchester, shows that the Leiden manuscript is one of several codices that clearly need to play a key role in a critical edition of the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīnī*. It is to be hoped that such a project will receive an extra impulse now that the important manuscript of the Arcadian Library has come to light.
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