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Codicological Observations on Bodleian Manuscript Pers. c. 37

Bodleian Library's manuscript Pers. c. 37 is the third oldest dated codex in Persian language. It was copied on the first of August 1085 (end of the rabi’ al-awwal 478 AH), and we are delighted to be able to present a facsimile edition of it to the scholarly community as the first volume in the series Folia Medicæ Iranica.

This codex has an interesting history. The text was composed by a physician by the name of Abu Bakr Rabî’ b. Ahmad al-Akhawâni al-Bokhari, who wrote it at the request of his son who wanted to use it as a textbook of medicine. Professor Minovi has estimated the date of its composition to have been sometime before the year 981 (AH 370). It came into the possession of another physician by the name of Abu Taleb ‘Abdollah b. Mohammad b. Abî Zaid al-Taleb in 1283 (AH 682), and was still in his possession in the year 1317 (AH 717). Two notes in Abu Taleb’s hand in this manuscript establish these dates. Of these the earlier, dated 23rd of July 1283 (AH 682) is part of the manuscript’s colophon (p.661), and the later, dated 1317 (AH 717) is found on its first page, in which Abu Taleb has specified the title of the book and the name of its author. Unfortunately Abu Taleb’s note on page one of the codex has been glued over the original contents of this page. Professor Afshar was the first to discover this feature of the manuscript during his careful physical examination of it at the Bodleian Library last year. This discovery puts the baseless rumor of the questionable authenticity of the codex to rest. There is no doubt that the manuscript has been tampered with; however, the alteration dates from the man who owned it in 1283 AD and has no bearing on the date of its copying or its authenticity. One hopes that the Bodleian Library would take advantage of Professor Afshar’s important discovery, and using available technologies, try and determine the nature of the original writing on page one of the codex that has been covered by Abu Taleb’s note.

Be that as it may, Abu Taleb collated his manuscript with another copy of the text and wrote a vast number of marginal corrections in it. By the beginning of the 16th century AD, the manuscript had come into the possession of yet another doctor by the name of Lutfollah, who also added marginal notes of his own on pages 216 and 222. The note on page 222 is dated 1500 (AH 906). Lutfollah has also stamped it with his seal between lines 10 and 11 of page 91, another feature of the codex that has been discovered for the first time by Professor Afshar. Following these two doctors, Bodleian Pers. c. 37 came to be owned by the learned Qajar prince, Farhad Mirza (1819 - 1888) who during his second governorship of the State of Farah purchased it in Shiraz in 1880 (AH 1297). Some time after the prince’s death the manuscript was inherited by one of his descendants who has the family name: Farhad, and he eventually offered it for sale to Iran’s National Library in 1939. The great Iranian codicologist, Professor Bayani, who was at the time serving at the National Library, has reported his encounter r with the manuscript’s owner, which I translate here.

1 See his essay in appendix 2 of the Persian introduction to the present volume.
2 As Professor Afshar has pointed out in his Persian introduction to the present volume, Prince Farhad Mirza was twice appointed to the governorship of Farah. The first time in 1257 (1841 AD), when he was only twenty-three years old, and the second time in 1293 (1876 AD).
3 This account was originally published in the journal Yaghma 3 (1329 [1950])12: 503 - 505 and later reprinted in Nameh-ye Baharestan 1 (2002 - 2003) 2:501 - 502. I’ve used the text of Bahrestan’s reprint in this translation. Professor Afshar tells me that Professor Qazvini had also seen the codex at about the same time.
The Pitiful Story of One of the Finest Persian Manuscripts

In the year 1318 [1939] when I had the honor of serving at the National Library, a manuscript was offered to me for sale. After a brief study I realized that I was holding in my hands a most important book, the unique copy of a work that was at least nine hundred years old and had survived the ravages of Mongol and Tartar attacks. The manuscript was a copy of *Hidayat al-muta'akl"f fi al-tibb*, composed by Abu Bakr Rabî 'Ahmad al-Akhawaini of Bukhara. I asked the seller to name his price. He offered it for one thousand *tumans*4 I did not argue about the price and told him that I will inform him if the National Library will purchase the manuscript by the next day. The seller left the manuscript with me and left my office. I immediately went to Mr. *Merâ',* who was at that time the minister of culture, showed him the manuscript, and told him of my understanding of its importance. The minister ordered me to purchase the codex without hesitation, and especially stressed that the codex must under no circumstances be given back to its owner. Overjoyed, I returned to the library and kept the manuscript at my office.

The seller returned the next day and asked about the library's decision. I said: "The Library is prepared to purchase your manuscript." He said: "I am willing to sell it, however, I will not part with it for less than two thousand *tumans.*" Although he had doubled his price, I did no refuse, but told him that I will give him the library's decision [about the new price] on the next day. He left and I informed the minister of this development. The minister told me to purchase the codex at any price. The next day, the seller returned and we went through the moves of our previous meeting except this time his asking price had been raised to three thousand *tumans.* Once again, I told him that I have to get authorization for the new price, and once again the minister told me to purchase the volume. On the fourth day, when the seller came to the library and I told him that we are ready to purchase his manuscript, he told me that he has changed his mind and no longer wishes to part with it. I immediately deduced that one of my colleagues who was aware of the situation has made the seller greedy. I told him: "I'm sorry to have to inform you that I've been ordered by the Ministry of Culture not to return the book to you, but am also authorized to purchase it for any price that you demand." Upon hearing this, he left for the Ministry of Culture in a state of agitation, and shortly afterwards I received a telephone-call from the minister who told me: "I have been told of the situation. You are not allowed to return the manuscript because it is a fine specimen of our nation's antiquities and belongs to the people of Iran. Naturally, you are authorized to purchase it on behalf of the Ministry at any price that the sellers demands."

I don't know what transpired between the minister and the seller, but whatever it was, the seller did not show up in the following days and I grew certain that the codex had for practical purposes come into the possession of the National Library. What's more, I knew no matter what his asking price would be, the government will pay it. Thus, I spent several days studying the manuscript. I took several pages of notes, had a number of photographs of its pages made and was looking forward to the conclusion of the transaction so that I may study it more carefully and introduce it to the scholastic community as it is customary with such things.

Exactly one month after these events had transpired, and I was no longer concerned with the fate of that manuscript, my telephone rang. It was the minister, who told me in a agitated tone: "They are driving me to despair. Give the manuscript back to its owner." I cannot describe how I felt after hearing these words. I was still in shock when the manuscript's owner entered my office and confidently stretched out his hand in order to receive his property. I gave him the manuscript, but I remember very well that the codex felt heavy in my shaking hands. He started to leave my office and I stared behind him with great anxiety, like a father who watches his only son embark upon a journey from which he knows he will never return.

Following this event I decided to follow up the affair, and having secured the services of a go-between, sent several messages to the manuscript's owner and tried to persuade him to be

---

4 It is difficult to give a dollar equivalent of this amount because I don't know the rate of exchange between the Persian currency and dollars in 1940. However, an amount between three to five thousand dollars at the 1940's value of dollars does not seem unreasonable.
considerate, don't let such a fine manuscript to leave the country for sale abroad, and agree to sell it to our library at a fair price. The owner assured me that should he decide to sell the manuscript he will sell it to the National Library rather than taking it abroad for sale. For three years after these events I was certain that the codex remained with its owner. But unfortunately the temptation that had been planted in his heart by that evil man finally bore its fruit and made him greedy. Knowing all of this, my only consolation was that since I was put in charge of all legal exports of manuscripts from the country, I was fairly certain that the codex cannot leave Iran without my written permission. But unfortunately two years ago I heard that it had been smuggled out of the country to London. Later I was very sorry to hear that it had been sold there. I could do nothing but to curse the evil fiend who by his machinations persuaded the codex's owner to sell it abroad, thus depriving his country from such a peerless jewel. I don't blame the manuscript's owner-who although from a scholarly family of bibliophiles, was a simple minded youth with no interest in such treasures. I blame the person who guided him behind the scenes, and wonder how is it possible for a decent Iranian to commit such treacherous inhumanity and allow one of the finest of his country's cultural relics to leave the country and to even help in facilitating the process?

This is how the manuscript left its country of origin. I don't know whether the Bodleian Library purchased it from the original owner or it changed hands before coming to rest at the Bodleian. Be that as it may, it is the scholarly community's good fortune that instead of disappearing into some private collector's vault, this manuscript found a home at the Bodleian, which makes it available to scholars.

Codicological Notes

The text of Bodleian's *Pers. c.37* is copied on 326 folios of beige paper. The folios measure 32.3 by 21.5 centimeters, and the written space is about 21.0 by 12.5 centimeters. The written space is slightly smaller on the folios that contain the table of contents and measures 20.5 or 19.5 by 13 or 14 centimeters. There are nineteen lines of text per page throughout the codex except for a newer folio (pp. 519 - 20), which is written in twenty lines. All folios must have had catchwords (rekābēh) on the lower left side, although these have frequently been cut off either during repairs or as a result of wear and tear. Generally the catchwords are not in the hand of the original scribe and seem to have been added by later owners. The manuscript lacks foliation, but paginations are inserted by prince Farhād Mirzā who has also written these numbers on the margin of the table of contents for ease of reference. The prince has made a small error in paginating in that he has numbered the page that follows page 329 as page number 340 instead of 330. In view of the similarities of the form of these numerals in Persian (٣٤٠) and ع (٣٣٠) respectively this is an understandable error, however, it may mislead those who examine the codex into believing that the manuscript has 661 pages, when in reality the number of its pages are only 650.

There are two flyleaves, which are fashioned from a newer paper that is of a darker color than the original paper of the text. One of these is at the beginning of the codex and the other is at the end of it. Farhād Mirzā has inscribed three bibliographic notes on the recto side of the flyleaf at the beginning of the volume. In the first of these he has indicated the date of the manuscript's purchase in numerals as the year 1297 AH (1880 AD), and has then subtracted the year in which the manuscript was copied, namely the year 478 AH (1086 AD) from the year of its acquisition and has computed the age of the codex to be 819 years. In his second note on this leaf, he has identified the text and its author, and has pointed out that the author was a student of Rāzī (Latin: Rhazes or Rasis). In the third note he has observed that Rāzī died in 311 AH (d.924 AD). There is also an English note probably in pencil by one of the Bodleian Library's staff which reads: "Ms. Pers. c. 37." On the flyleaf at the end of the volume the prince has once again computed the age of the manuscript by subtracting the date of its copying from the date in which he was writing his note, namely the year 1298 (1881 AD), and has written: "It is 820 years since it was copied." Since this second note is dated

---

5 Yaghma, volume 3, 1329, no.503, pp.505 - 12
6 I have used the terminology employed by N. R. Ker in his *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, (Oxford, 1969), pp.vii - xii as far as possible.
a year after the note that he inscribed on the flyleaf at the beginning of the codex, and judging from
the prince's other marginal notes in the volume (e.g., pp. 33, 434), we may deduce that he finished
reading the book a year after he purchased it.

All of the folios of this manuscript have been extended by gluing new paper on their margins in
order to mend their marginal wear and tear. This new paper is slightly darker than the original paper
and measures approximately five centimeters from the top, five centimeters from the bottom, and
about two centimeters from the fore and back edges of the folios. We know these repairs were
executed when the manuscript came into the possession of prince Fathād Mirzā, who had a binder in
Shiraz restore the folios and rebind the volume in leather in 1880.

A striking feature of this manuscript is that the leaf on which pages 519 and 520 are written is
not original to the volume and must have been appended to it some time after the codex was copied.
This is a leaf of light brown paper, and appears to be of a lighter color than the original paper, and
is transcribed in a different hand. This folio is important form a codicological point of view, and we
shall discuss it in greater detail later.

The name of the manuscript's copyist is not known, but he appears to have been a Shiite because
he ends the text with a formula that praises the prophet Mohammad and his "good and pure" family
without mentioning the prophet's companions (p.661). Although not conclusive, this strategy is
common to Shiite scribes. The text is written in an archaic form of naskh script, which shows
influences from what has been called "Eastern" or "Khurāsānīan Kufic." The scribe has carefully
vocalized and dotted the words of his text. Only the text of the newer folio (i.e., pp. 519 - 520) is not
vocalized and is carelessly dotted.

The manuscript has been compared with and corrected against either an accurate copy of the
work (naskheh-ye sabihah, p.661) or with the author's holograph (naskheh-ye asl, p.497). Corrections have
been added both on the margins as well as between its lines. Very few of these involve correcting
actual errors that require crossing out the wrong word and inserting the correct word in place of
what has been crossed out. The majority of these corrections involve actual additions of words or
phrases to the text. Most of these corrections are in the hand of Abu Tāleb who, as we've seen,
owned the codex between the years 1283 and 1317 (682 - 717 AH). By Professor Afshar's reckoning-
who has not included the interlinear corrections in his count-there are some 1066 marginal notes in
this manuscript that correct words or sentences that have been "left out" by the scribe. The large
number of these additions has led Professor Afshar to note the incongruity of the careful
vocalization and dotting of the text with the very large number of omissions in it that had to be filled
in nearly two hundred years after it was originally copied:

Although the general characteristics of this codex-its page set up, dotting, and general
preparation-implyes that it was copied with a great deal of care, the later collation of the
manuscript demonstrates the carelessness of its scribe. [One wonders] if its scribe were [in fact]
a physician who wrote it for his own use then why did he leave so many words and phrases out
[so that] the other physician who collated it in 1283 (682 AH) had to correct its many lacunae?
Could it be that the first physician who copied the original text did not think some of it
important enough to transcribe? Did he omit words and sentences that he did not consider
significant?

Although Professor Afshar's reasoning is sound, I think an alternative interpretation of this
manuscript's lacuna is possible. It is more likely, in my opinion, that the Hadīya had two redactions:
The original redaction was the one that was composed by Akhbarwī for the use of his son, and from
which the Bodleian codex was copied in the year 1085 (478 AH). A second redaction of the text that
was more detailed than the original composition, was prepared towards the end of Akhbarwī's
lifetime by one or more of his students. This is implicit in two pieces of evidence: First, a
comparison of the text of the Bodleian MS Pers. c.37 with another copy of this text that belongs to
the Malek Library in Iran, namely Malek MS 4501, shows that the text of the Malek codex has almost
none of the omissions of the Bodleian volume. Second, the new folio of the Bodleian codex to
which we've already had an opportunity to refer, and on which pages 519 - 520 of the text are
transcribed, begins with the following passage:

\[\text{See Afshar's Persin introduction to the present volume.}\]
Preparation of Diarrhetic Concoctions: I had asked master Abubakr [meaning the Akhwaini]-God rest his soul-to write an independent chapter concerning this topic so that what he has already said [in the book] be more fully expressed. [Although] he had agreed with my request, he grew sick and became so concerned with his own health that he could not attend to my request. We, however, looked into what other masters had said [on this topic] and appended [their observations] here [spīt tālq kardīm] (p.519, Ins.1 - 4).

Clearly, this note is written by one of the students of the original author, who having failed to obtain the additions to the text that he had asked his master to provide, prepared them himself-—perhaps in collaboration with his master's other students—and appended them to the text after his master's death.

It stands to reason that many more revisions of the text may have followed subsequently to the ones that were introduced by the student(s). These additions must have been chiefly added to the original composition after the author's lifetime. It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that in the fullness of time, the growing insertions and marginal additions to the original text created a new and more detailed redaction of it. Sooner or later, this new redaction must have come to be considered more authoritative and complete than the original composition. In view of the fact that the marginal additions to the Bodleian codex largely agree with the main text of Malek 4501, I believe the new redaction of the Hedadā, its more elaborate version, is represented by the Malek Library's manuscript that has almost all of the marginal additions of the Bodleian codex in the main body of the text, while the Bodleian manuscript represents the older less elaborate composition. The first redaction of the text if you will.

In the year 1283 (682 AH), when the copy of the first redaction came into possession of Abu Taleb, he decides to improve his copy by collating it against a copy of the second redaction in order to carefully insert the extra information in the margin of his codex. This is why almost all marginalia in the Bodleian codex seem to be mere "additions" rather than "corrections of errors" per se. Therefore, the meticulous vocalization and dotting of the text by the scribe of the Bodleian codex is not necessarily in conflict with the manuscript's myriad lacuna. The original scribe was not being careless. He was merely copying an earlier redaction which simply lacked what he seems to have left out. The lacuna-in other words-existent in his exemplar, which was shorter, more brief than the Malek manuscript. They were not of his making and he should not be held responsible for them. If I am correct in my conjecture, then the two manuscripts at Malek and Bodleian libraries have two exemplars representing two different redactions of the text; and this circumstance may be the source of the Bodleian codex's more than a thousand "omissions."

By way of explaining the obvious I should add that the second redaction of the Hedadā must have evolved gradually. It must have grown out of the original text over a long period of time following the author's death. At some point in its development the text with all of its marginal notes, revisions, and insertions, must have grown cumbersome and different enough from its original version to justify making an independent copy of it as a second redaction. Although we know that the original text was composed by Akhwaini sometime prior to 981 (370 AH), I don't believe that by the year 1085 (AH 478) when the Bodleian codex was copied, its revised form had gained enough prominence to have influenced the transmission of the text. However, by the year 1283 (AH 682) when Abu Taleb had come to own the Bodleian codex, the new redaction had already made a place for itself among physicians, and he felt it necessary to have his codex collated against a copy of it. The marginal insertions throughout the Bodleian codex are the result of this attempt at improvement. I see no other way of meaningfully explaining the incongruity of the meticulous scribal care in this manuscript with the large number of its omissions that one finds corrected on its margins. Professor Afshar has said all that needs to be said about the manuscript's orthographic and other features in his Persian introduction. It remains for me to express our profound gratitude to Bodleian Library's kind permission to reproduce this codex. We are especially grateful for the cooperation and professionalism of Mr. Colin Wakefield and Ms. Doris Nicholson of the Department of the Oriental

---

8 This is the date that Professor Minovi has suggested. See his essay in appendix 2 of Professor Afshar's Persian introduction.
9 I have not seen another manuscript of this text, which is kept at the Fathe Library in Istanbul (MF Nr.3646). However, judging from Professor Matini's report it must be a copy of the first redaction of the text. See Matini's introduction to his edition of the text, p.bkiii.
Collections at the Bodleian Library, who showed us every courtesy and assistance while we prepared for the publication of this volume. We are also grateful to Professor Matini, who kindly allowed us to summarize his scholarly preface to his fine edition of the text and include it in the Persian introduction to the present volume. My learned mentor, Professor Martin Schwarz of UC Berkeley suggested the Latin name for the series. Professor H. Katouzian and Dr. John Gurney favored us with their assistance during the preliminary stages of preparation. The technical expertise of our publisher, Mr. Abdolali Teymouri, and his son Babak Teymouri have been invaluable. But above all, we must thank two individuals whose contributions to this project have been indispensable: Mr. Nader Mottalebi Kashani, the learned editor of the incomparable Nāmeh-ye Bahārestān, for providing us with an electronic reproduction of the Malek Library's copy of the text, for his careful typing of Professor Afshar's Persian introduction, and for his invaluable assistance to Professor Afshar in preparing the film of this manuscript for publication in Tehran. Last but no least, the editors would like to thank Dr. Reza Bonabi, MD, without whose generous financial support the series, Folia Medica Iranica, of which this is the first volume, could not have been launched.

October 13, 2007

Mahmoud Omidsalar
John F. Kennedy Memorial Library
California State University, Los Angeles

10 Professor Afshar and I would like to thank the Bodleian library's kind permission to reproduce this manuscript in facsimile. We are especially grateful to Mr. Colin Wakefield and Ms. Doris Nicholson of Bodleian's Oriental Collections for their cooperation and professionalism. We would also like to thank Professor Katouzian for his help with getting the exact measurements of the codex.
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
باب ماهajaran معارف قطريات ومعالجات

197

باب كاذب خلاوي حسابة مقاله وصبع وعلاج ود

198

باب أغاظسدارسن صفاو والانزوع ومعالجات آن

199

باب ماهajaran معارف سحرية وإنزوع ومعالجات آن

200

باب ماهajaran معارف مالك ومان علاج وسد

201

باب اذ تحرر بيارICH أضعوه ومعالجات كسد

202

باب إهداء ممارس حضرتي خورخ من كمتم علاج

203

باب إهداء ممارس ردشة أربعإليفيز علاج آن

204

باب إهداء ممارس رجلة قنها ومعالجات ودي

205

باب إهداء ممارس نزلة وعلاج وسد

206

باب إهداء ممارس هواي اجتم وعالج واغ

207

باب ماهajaran معارف شفاء ومعالجات آن

208

باب ماهajaran معارف شفاء ومعالجات آن

209

باب إهداء ممارس سيلآ وإثر علاج وسد

210

باب إهداء ممارس طفولة كرجل آن وعلاج وسد

211

باب إهداء ممارس معي ضيأ وعلاج وسد

212

باب ماهajaran معارف فروة الأسد

213

باب إهداء ممارس شفاء وشبح علاج وسد

214

باب إهداء ممارس إنشاء العين ومعالجات وسد

215

باب إهداء ممارس عظام ومعالجات وسد

216

باب إهداء ممارس أوجاع الأذى ومعالجات آن

217

باب إهداء ممارس تمسيح علاج وسد

218

باب إهداء ممارس كفرعون جذور وعلاج وسد

219
السُّبْحَانُ عَلَيْهِمُ الْجَمِيعُ
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.