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The collective manuscript (mağmū'a) Hikma 6 of the Muṣṭafā Fādīl collection at the Dār al-Kutub in Cairo (Hikma 6M) is noteworthy in many respects. It is the only manuscript known so far of a number of works by Avicenna and of Arabic translations of Aristotle and Themistios; it was copied by a third generation student of Avicenna, 'Abd-ar-Razzāq as-Şīgnāḥī, from texts originally in Avicenna's library; it has repeatedly served as archetype for subsequent copies, a number of which can be identified; and it appears to be of palaeographic interest because of its relatively unusual hand.

I. THE MANUSCRIPT IN MODERN SCHOLARSHIP

Information about the existence of the manuscript first became publicly available in 1890. In the old catalogue of the Khedivial Library (now the Dār al-Kutub al-Misrīya), it is described as 'a collective manuscript, in one volume, written in a regular old hand (bī-qalām 'aḍī) by Abd-ar-Razzāq b. 'Abd-al-Âzîz b. Ismā'îl al-Fārābî'3, and is provided with an incomplete list of contents. The second catalogue of the Library (published in 1924), because of its arrangement by title and not by manuscript, offered no description and an equally incomplete as well as inaccurate list of contents4. The first three publications that drew upon it, and which appeared in 1910, 1917, and 1937, barely mentioned the manuscript (see nos. 3, 13, and 8, respectively, in the list of contents in Section IV below).

Paul Kraus first signaled in 1941 its importance for the study of Avicenna and noted that it contained fragments from the Insāf (Fair Judgment)5. 'Abd-ar-Rahmān Badawi, following the lead of Kraus, published in 1947 most of the texts from Avicenna's Insāf and Mubahāṭāt (Discussions), though in a highly eccentric way, and gave in his introduction the most extensive description of the manuscript to date6.

The contents of the manuscript relating to Avicenna were finally listed in a booklet prepared by the then cataloguer of the Dār al-Kutub, Fu'âd Sayyid, and published by the Library on the occasion of the lunar millenary celebration of Avicenna's traditional date of birth (1370/1950)7. The booklet included all the works of Avicenna and their commentaries preserved in the Dār al-Kutub — whether printed, in manuscript, or photographs — and contained indications about which of these manuscripts were copied from the Hikma 6M. F. Sayyid described the manuscript for the most part also as having been written 'in an old and common hand' (bī-qalam mu'tad qadīm) (pp. 11, 12, 13, 14, etc.), but in one entry (p. 32) he called the hand 'an old ta'liq' (bī-qalam ta'liq qadīm). This inadvertent waver ing on the part of an experienced manuscript reader like Sayyid well reflects the unusual character of the scribe's hand (see Section III below).

II. THE SCRIBE

The manuscript as a whole is very carefully written and scrupulously collated. The scribe signed his name a number of times: Abū-l-Fāṭḥ 'Abd-ar-Razzāq b. Abū-l-'Âzîz b. Ismâ'îl al-Fârâbî as-Şīgnāḥī10; and was a scholar of some standing. He was an older contemporary and an acquaintance of Zâhir-ad-Dīn al-Bayhaqī (d. 565/1169-70), who reported the following about him in the Tatimmat Šīwān al-ḥikmā11:

'The judge and philosopher, Mâd-al-Âfâdî [The Glory of Excellent Men], Abū-ar-Razzāq as-Şīgnāḥī10:

He was one of the pupils of the man of letters, Abū-l-'Âbbâs [al-Lawkâri]11. He was proficient in geometry and familiar with the intellectual sciences12, but he did not have a lively mind and would not deviate from the literal sense of books: in the debates which took place between him and al-Âlāqi13, he addressed himself only to the literal sense of
books. He had in his safekeeping most of the books of Avicenna and was familiar with the issues of his works, but he did not penetrate deeply into the intellectual sciences like the scholars of his time. A correspondence took place between him and me which I have related in my book The Most Beautiful Gems (Arā'īs an-nafa'īs) [...]. [There follow two sayings by 'Abd-ar-Razzāq.]

He used to teach medicine and arithmetic in the mosque of his neighborhood in Būḥārā until he died there. He was respected and esteemed.

Bayhaqī’s report on 'Abd-ar-Razzāq is important for two reasons. First, it establishes him as a third generation student of Avicenna: he was the disciple of Abu-l-Abbās al-Lawkārī, from whom ‘spread the philosophical sciences in Hurāsān’ and who was the disciple of Bahmaynār, one of the prominent students of Avicenna. The succession presented by Bayhaqī may have certain problems which, though not directly relevant to the present discussion, should not be minimized. The problems are primarily chronological and need to be solved in the larger context of the survival and transmission of Avicenna’s philosophy and works among his second generation disciples. The first generation consisted mostly of contemporaries of Avicenna and hence colleagues rather than students. Avicenna died in 428/1038 around the age of sixty (whatever the final verdict about his precise date of birth will be), and most of the prominent disciples died relatively shortly afterwards. Ibn-Zayla died in 440/1048, al-Ma’sumī died in 430/1038, Bahmaynār died in 458/1066 (although the earlier date of 430/1038 is also given), while al-Gūzgānī’s date of death is not known. This first generation, and particularly Bahmaynār, are related to the second generation rather tenuously, it seems, through Lawkārī. Lawkārī died after 503/1109, which means that he survived Bahmaynār by approximately fifty years, even if the latter’s later date of death is accepted; if the earlier date proves to be the correct one, then the teacher-student relationship between the two becomes almost impossible. In either case, the extent and intimacy of their association can be justifiably called into question. A detailed study of the lives and works of Avicenna’s immediate disciples is a major desideratum.

Second, Bayhaqī informs us about ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq’s bibliographic competence regarding Avicenna’s books: ‘He had in his safekeeping most of the books of Avicenna and was familiar with the issues of his works’. Since Bayhaqī knew our scribe personally, this report does not seem to be open to serious doubt. It implies that ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq had come into possession of a sizable portion of Avicenna’s library, presumably both manuscripts by Avicenna and books owned by him, as well as disciples’ notes and copies of the Master’s works, and that his texts are directly derived from these sources. This is corroborated by the evidence presented by ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq’s manuscript itself. The Marginal Notes on De Anima (ff.154r-168r = Badawī Arisṭātā 75-116) is a transcription of the comments Avicenna had written in the margins of his own of Aristotle’s De Anima, while the two recensions of the commentary on the Theología Aristotelis from the Inšāf (ff.142r-153v = Badawī Arisṭātā 37-74, partial publication; see Section IV below, nos.4(ii)-iii) derive from disciples’ copies. On this basis it may be further argued that the rest of the texts by Avicenna copied by ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq very likely derive from autographs or first copies. It might not be far-fetched to assume that, since ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq lived at least part of his life in Būḥārā, two of Avicenna’s works which are preserved only in this manuscript and which in all probability are to be dated from Avicenna’s early period (Bayān ḍawāt al-ḡīha = Modal Propositions; and Kalām fī ḍadd al-ḡīm = On the Definition of Body; see nos.6 and 9 in Section IV below) were copied from archetypes or autographs, originally in the possession of Būḥārā patrons and admirers of Avicenna, and subsequently acquired by ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq. The translations, finally, of Greek texts as well as Miskawayh’s Kitāb as-Sa’ādā, On Happiness, the only work by another Muslim philosopher contained in this manuscript, would seem to have been transcribed, if the De Anima copy just mentioned is any indication, from volumes owned by Avicenna.

‘Abd-ar-Razzāq’s manuscript is of crucial importance for the transmission of all of these works, and all other copies containing them should be carefully collated with it in order to determine their affiliation. Future editors can ill afford not to consider it seriously in the establishment of stemmata.

III. Description of the Manuscript

1. Codicological

240ff., numbered in pencil, in European figures (by Paul Kraus?) there is no numbering in Arabic figures. Folio size: 16 x 19.5 cm.; script area: 11 x 14.5 cm. 21 lines per page: 20 to 25 words per line. Paper: good quality oriental (no watermarks), thick, semi-glossy (slightly porous), light yellow/beige color. There are no quire numbers; the quires seem to be of 12 ff. each, but there are exceptions. Many inside edges are reinforced with transparent tape, which makes the establishment of the original quires difficult without ruining the binding. There are no catchwords at the foot of folia; in the case of irregular quires there is thus a distinct possibility that some folia may be missing. Binding: recent, black leather spine, heavy cardboard covers in striped dark green and gray paper. Condition: the spine is slightly torn on the outside, the edges of the paper are thumb worn, with some small worm holes; otherwise good. The manuscript bears marks of heavy use by modern researchers: there are numerous pencil marks, ink blots, underlining, and marginal signs.
2. Palaeographical

The manuscript is written throughout in a fine and minuscule hand that is essentially nashī, but cursive enough in its appearance to border on tālqīq. An exception is constituted by ff. 218r-219r, which are written in a larger hand, more angular and closer to nashī (apparently not by the same scribe but cf. Badawi Arisū [51]), and by ff. 239v-240v, which are written in a later and untidy tālqīq. Diacritical points are used mostly, but not consistently, only for crucial syllables; the imperfect prefix is very rarely pointed. Vocalization is much sparser, but again, only on key syllables. The ink is dark brown and concentrated, frequently showing through on the reverse. Most of the titles are in the same, but larger, hand, in light red ink, and so are the (inta)hā (ه) signs marking the end of paragraphs and sections. The few interlinear and marginal corrections and additions by the scribe himself are the result of collation with the archetype(s). There are no marginal notations in other hands. On f. 1r there is an incomplete table of contents in a later hand (copied in Badawi Arisū [43]-[44]).

Collation notes are found in the colophons on ff. 68r, 116r, 138r, 153v, 168r, 187r, 193r, 195v, 206r, 206v, 210r, 217v. The pious formula used after the basmāla throughout the manuscript (with the exception of the first work on f. 1v) is consistent: bi-l-'Arz al-Hakīm ātīq wa'-alayhi ātawakkallāhu. No date or place of copying is given in the colophons; but judging from the identification of the scribe discussed in Section II above, the manuscript was written, probably in Buḥārā, in the first half of the 6th/12th century, or approximately one hundred years after Avicenna's death.

3. Orthographic peculiarities

a) The hamza for the most part is not written, only its kursī, with the following exceptions:

(i) In cases where a misunderstanding might conceivably occur, the spelling is pleonastic, as on f. 140r, top. (for: Badawi Arisū 26.20 wrongly transcribes چملا لمه for ملا لمة), where not only both the hamza and its kursī, but also the tanwīn (see the second preceding paragraph) are indicated;

(ii) The hamza is omitted altogether when it comes after a long vowel, whether in the middle or at the end of a word, as on f. 139r, bottom. (Badawi Arisū 25.2), and f. 140r, middle, ی, and for علا and بی (Badawi Arisū 27.7-8 wrongly transcribes the first word as bihā);

(iii) In cases where the hamza stands by itself after a vowelless consonant, whether in the middle or at the end of a word, it is replaced by the letter wāw, i.e., the presumed kursī of the nominative, regardless of the case in which the word might be, as on f. 90v, top. (Badawi Arisū 184.19), and again, f. 154r, middle, حاتل for حاطل.

b) The alif ottosum is as a rule also used for the singular imperfect of third wāw verbs, and after the wāw of sound masculine plurals in construct state.

c) The unpointed letters dāl, rā', sīn, sād, and tā' are frequently distinguished from the corresponding pointed letters by a dot placed beneath them, while hā' and 'ayn by a smaller replica of the same letter (cf. Wright Grammar 1.4B-C).

4. Owners

There is a number of ex libris notes on f. 1r and on the recto of the folio bound in before f. 1, most of which are quite illegible to me. The notes that can be made out are:

a) ex libris Abd-al-Latīf Subhī (f. 1r);

b) ex libris Muḥammad b. 'Abd-ar-Rahmān al-Kābi, who bought the manuscript for four dinār and a dānaq; there follows a date, of which only the last digit of the year, a two (2), has been preserved; the other digits seem to have been trimmed away during the recent binding (f. 1r)27;

c) on the recto of the folio before f. 1 there is a note in Turkish (in Arabic script) reading, '... elinden alındı ....', i.e., 'received from the part of ...', most likely another notice of sale;

d) also on this page there is the following date of acquisition: 907/1501-2 (less likely 707/1307-8).

5. Copies of the Manuscript

'Abd-ar-Razzāq's manuscript repeatedly served as archetype for numerous transcripts, both before, it seems, its acquisition by the Khedivial Library and certainly afterwards. With the information available to me for the purposes of this paper, it has not been possible to document the history of its transmission and transcription beyond the mention of the two unidentified owners listed above; such documentation may be forthcoming only when the texts it contains are critically edited and manuscripts of known provenance directly dependent on it are identified. The copies that were made from it in Cairo after its acquisition by the Khedivial Library, on the other hand, are identifiable, and these are listed below in descending chronological order:

a) Dār al-Kutub 2694W. The entire manuscript of 'Abd-ar-Razzāq was most recently transcribed in the Dār al-Kutub itself between the years 1936 and 1955. Under the new system of classification adopted by the Library during this period, this copy was given the shelf number of 2694W, the wāw standing for the subject of philosophy.

b) Dār al-Kutub 2972W. During the same twenty year period, the entire manuscript was also photographed, and the photocopy volume was given the shelf number of 2972W.
c) Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 207(?), 209, 213-223. In 1335/1916-17, the voluminous manuscript of Abd-ar-Razzāq was copied in its entirety in a series of manuscripts commissioned by the authorities of the Khedivial Library. They were all written by a Library scribe (nassāḥ) named Muhammad Ibrāhīm (as indicated by the colophon of MS Hikma 219, f.36r), and were housed in the Library under the numbers of Hikma 207(?223. The contents of the individual manuscripts in this section are given in Section IV below.

d) Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 86. This manuscript is incomplete at the end, with about two quires missing, since it would have taken at least that much to complete the text which was being transcribed, Avicenna’s Marginal Notes on De Anima (no.5 in Section IV below). The text breaks off at a point corresponding to MS Hikma 6M, f.159r12 (= Badawi Aristu 89.22, waqṣu an yakhūn). There is accordingly no colophon, but the manuscript is obviously of recent origin: it was probably copied around the turn of this century, perhaps a little earlier. It is possible that it was commissioned by Taymūr Pāša himself, since it bears no owner’s mark other than the stamp of the Taymūr waqf. It is written in a high cursive hand, bordering on şekaste, on low quality, brittle paper without watermark, and in a black, flaking ink.

This manuscript was copied directly from that of Abd-ar-Razzāq, as indicated by the following peculiarities:

a) On f.210r of Abd-ar-Razzāq’s manuscript, the fourth and third line from bottom end as follows:

> Köfif hi wasa amat wpwsro wajb ghanib had wa-wl ... (= Miskawayh. Kitāb as-Sa‘āda, Cairo 1335 1917. p.37.6-6). The scribe of the Taymūr manuscript ignored the insert sign (‘) after al-ijtihād and added the marginal correction -ātti to the end of the top line, reading (p.58),

> Köfif hi wasa imam wpwsro wajb ghanib had wa-wl ... [sic] wpwsro wajb ghanib had wa-wl ...<br>

b) The note, added above the title on f.142r of Abd-ar-Razzāq’s manuscript, by a studious reader/owner about the meaning of the word Uṣūlūqiyta (see note 24) is duly reproduced by the scribe of the Taymūr manuscript, also as a note, in his margin (p.111).

c) On p.126 of the Taymūr manuscript, at the beginning of a new piece, the scribe wrote the customarily formula after the basmala, wa-bihi tiqatī, but then he crossed it out and wrote instead the unusual one of Abd-ar-Razzāq, <bihi> atiṣq wa-‘alayh atawakkalu (see Section III.2 above).

In addition to the works copied from Abd-ar-Razzāq’s manuscript, the Taymūr manuscript contains also the following:

i) Pp.1-54. Himām-ad-Dīn (?). Šarḥ Taḥmīs al-}

\[ \text{Qaṣida al-Ānīya al-musammā bi-Kitāb al-Kaṣf wa-l-bayān fi 'ibn ma'rifat al-insān <li-t-Tilīmsānī>. A commentary on Tilīmsānī's commentary on the 'Ānīya} \]

(Mahdavī p.196, no.7).


iii) Pp.58-176. See nos. 13, 14, 15, 4i-iii, and 5 in Section IV below.

e) Other MSS. It is extremely likely that other known manuscripts are also dependent, in some cases perhaps through a number of intermediaries, on Abd-ar-Razzāq’s manuscript. The probability is particularly high with manuscripts which contain works that have a tenuous record of transmission, like the fragments from Avicenna’s Inṣāf. I have examined some of these manuscripts, but the cursory inspection which I have been able to make of them for the present purposes has not provided conclusive evidence of their dependence. This is a task that the future editor of these works will have to perform. Nevertheless, in order to remind the reader of this probability. I have mentioned these manuscripts in the appropriate place in the list of contents of Abd-ar-Razzāq's manuscript in Section IV below.

IV. CONTENTS AND PUBLICATION RECORD

OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Each entry in the following list of contents contains:

a) the title of the selection as found in the manuscript, followed by references, in the case of works by Avicenna, to the entry numbers in the bibliographies of Mahdavī (note 16) and Anawati (note 8), and to my book on Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition (note 1). Since the works are sufficiently identified by the incipits and explicits provided by these bibliographies as well as by Badawi Ariṣtū (44)-(51), which should be consulted, no further details are given;

b) a listing of manuscripts directly transcribed from Abd-ar-Razzāq’s volume, as described in Section III.5c-d; manuscripts Dār al-Kutub 2694W and 2972W are NOT listed separately since they apply to all entries;

c) a listing of manuscripts probably dependent on Abd-ar-Razzāq’s volume (see Section III.5e above);

d) information about the record of publication of each selection, references directly relating to the text in question and not listed by the bibliographies in (a), and other comments.

1. AVICENNA, Notes.

a) Ff.1v-68r. Ar-Ta‘īqāt. The work starts immediately after the basmala, a pious formula (tiqāt bi-Llāhi wajdah) distinct from the usual one of Abd-ar-Razzāq; see Section III.2), and the hamdāla. The title is given at the end of the work, on f.68r only: aḥīr al-mawgūd min hādīhī t-ta‘īqāt, wa-li-Llāh al-ḥamda wa-l-
minna; tamma kitâb at-Ta'liqât, wa-katabahu Abd-ar-Razzâq.... Mahdavî 49, Anawati 8, Gutas W12.

β) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, Hikma 207(?).28.


δ) Published by Abd-ar-Ḥaṭîm Badawî from this manuscript, Ibn Sînâ, at-Ta'liqât, Cairo 1973.

2. AVICENNA, Discussions.


β) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, Hikma 209.

δ) Published by Abd-ar-Ḥaṭîm Badawî from this manuscript in his Arīṣṭī 119-249. The order in which the material is found in the manuscript was not always followed by Badawî, who also omitted arbitrarily certain passages. The following table lists in order the contents of this work in the manuscript with the corresponding pages from Badawî’s book.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANUSCRIPTS OF THE MIDDLE EAST ] (198I)</th>
<th>Badawî pp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, Hikma 209.</td>
<td>119-122.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ) Published by Abd-ar-Ḥaṭîm Badawî from this manuscript in his Arīṣṭī 119-249. The order in which the material is found in the manuscript was not always followed by Badawî, who also omitted arbitrarily certain passages. The following table lists in order the contents of this work in the manuscript with the corresponding pages from Badawî’s book.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS ff.</th>
<th>Badawî pp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68v-69v.</td>
<td>119-122.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to Kıyâ, otherwise known as Iḥtīlāl an-nâs fi amr an-nafs wa-l-qâlīl. Mahdavî 12. Anawati 259. See Gutas T12 for a translation and further references.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69v-104r5</td>
<td>122.9-222.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104r5-105r6</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The text of paragraphs 146-166, according to Badawî’s enumeration, is repeated here. Badawî does not collate the two versions (see p.222 note 1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105r7-107r penult.</td>
<td>222.21-229.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107r penult. - 107v11</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A doublet of par. 94; see Badawî p.229, note 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107v11-14</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A doublet of pars. 105-106; see Badawî p.229, note 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107v14-109r10</td>
<td>229.12-233.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109r10-110r21</td>
<td>240-244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter (Kitâb). Mahdavî p.203. no. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110v21-111v11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter (Kitâb). See Gutas T11 for a partial translation and further references. Badawî published these ff:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110v21-111r11</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111r11-111v4</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A doublet of par. 458; see Badawî p.245, note 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111v4-111v11</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111v11-112v4</td>
<td>247-249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112v4-11</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112v11-113v15</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badawî (p.249, note 1) claims, without specifying, that the paragraphs omitted here are doublets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113v15-115v17</td>
<td>233.18-239.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. AVICENNA, The Easterners.


β) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, Hikma 213.

δ) Published from this manuscript in Maṇṭiq al-maṣrîqîyîn, Cairo 1910. The publisher does not mention the number of the manuscript but only that it is preserved in the Khedivial Library (p.83). The colophon from f.138r which he provides, however, is sufficient to identify his source as Abd-ar-Razzâq’s manuscript. For reprints of the Cairo edition and further references see also Gutas T8.

4. AVICENNA, Fair Judgment.

i) ‘Commentary on Book Lambda’.


δ) Published from this manuscript by Badawî Arīṣṭī 22-33.

ii) ‘Commentary on the Theologia’.


β) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, Hikma 216, pp.22-43.

δ) Only that part of this work contained on ff.143v19-146v6 was published by Badawî Arīṣṭī 59.13-66.429. Ff. 142r15-143v19 were omitted by Badawî because they offer a different recension of some of the text included in the manuscript under the title Taʃfâr Uṭūlağîyâ (no.4iii below). The text omitted by Badawî overlaps with the following sections of the Taʃfâr published in Arīṣṭī: 37.14-38.10; 46.3-15; 47.1-6; 49.3-50.10; 50.10-18; 53.9-19; 56.14-57.8; 58.5-59.11. Badawî did not collate the two recensions.

iii) ‘Exegesis of the Book Theologia’.


β) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, Hikma 215.

δ) Published from this manuscript by Badawî Arīṣṭī as follows:

| 115v17-116r1 | omits |
| A doublet of par.152; see Badawî, p.239, note 1. | 239.17-22 |
5. AVICENNA, Marginal Notes on De Anima.

a) F. 154r-168r15. At-Tu'lbagí 'āla ūahāā Kitāb an-Nafs li-Aristāšāls min kalām as-Sayh ar-Ra'is ... Ibn Sīnā. Mahdavi 35g. Anawati 6, Gutas W10c.iii.

b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 214.32

Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Ḥikma 86, pp. 157-176 (incomplete; see Section III.5d above).

d) Published from this manuscript by Badawr Aṣrīṣū 75-116.16. The fragments of Ishāq b. Hunayn’s translation of De Anima contained in this work were identified and edited separately, on the basis of Badawr’s text, by R.M. Frank. ‘Some Fragments of Ishāq’s Translation of the De Anima’. Cahiers de Byrsa 8 (1958-59) 231-251.

5a. AVICENNA (?), A note on the numbers as principles.

a) F. 168r16-21. The note bears no title but simply begins, ‘inda kāfūr min al-awā'āl ilā l-ādād mahādī l-l-ālam.

b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 214, p. 81.

d) Published from this manuscript by Badawr Aṣrīṣū 116.17-25. Since the note bears no ascription, it is reasonable to assume, on the basis of its position in the manuscript, that Abdr-arrāzzaq found it either at the end of Avicenna’s copy of De Anima from which he was transcribing the Marginal Notes, or as a stray note in that copy. Frank ‘Ishāq’s Translation’ 239 note 7 suggests that it refers to Aristotle’s De Anima 404b19ff.

6. AVICENNA, An Exposition of Modal Propositions.

a) F. 168v-187r4. Bayān ġawālī al-ghība ‘an as-Sayḥ ar-Ra’is ... Ibn Sīnā. Mahdavic 42. Anawati omits.

b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 217.

d) The work remains unpublished.

7. AVICENNA, Twenty Questions to Contemporaries.

a) F. 187r5-193r. ‘Iršāna mas’ala sa’ala ‘anāhā s-Sayḥ r-Ra’is ... Ibn Sīnā aha l-ʿašr. Mahdavic 833, Anawati 39.

b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 222.


8. ARISTOTLE, Metaphysics A.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 220.


a) F. 206r9-206r6. Kalām fi hadd al-gīsim ‘an as-Sayḥ ar-Ra’is ... Ibn Sīnā. Mahdavic 56 (p.72), Anawati 60.

b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 218.

d) The work remains unpublished.

10. IBN-ZAYLA, Compilation on Metaphysics.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 221.

d) The manuscript contains only the title in the middle of the page, followed by one line of the hamda- la. Then follows the next treatise. It would seem that either ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq had no text to go along with the title and neglected to cross the latter out, or, more plausibly, Ibn-Zayla’s ‘Compilation’ consisted, in effect, of the next two selections in the manuscript.

11. ARISTOTLE, Metaphysics a.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 221.

d) This is an abridged version of Ishāq’s translation of the Metaphysics a., chapters 1-2. 993a30-994b31, pp. 3-41 in the edition of Bouyges, Averroès, Taṣfīr ma ba’d at-tabi’āt, Beirut 1938. Despite the claims of Badawr Aṣrīṣū(49), the text preserved here contains a number of readings better than those in the Leiden
Averroes manuscript used by Bouyges, and it should be consulted in a future edition.

12. THEMISTIUS. *Commentary on Aristotle’s Metaphysics Α.*


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 221.


13. MISKAWAYH, On Happiness.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 223. ff. 1v-19r.


d) Published from this manuscript by ‘Alī at-Tōbgī as-Suyūfī, *Kitāb as-Sā‘āda li-š-Sayyāb Abī ‘Alī.*

Cairo 1335/1917, reprinted Cairo 1928. The publisher refers to his source manuscript as Hikma 6 only (p.74), omitting the mīm for the Muṣṭafā Fādil collection. For the work, other manuscripts, and references see my ‘Paul the Persian’ (note 1 above) 231-232.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 223. ff. 19r-21r.

Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 86, pp. 89-92.

d) Published from other manuscripts by M. A. F. Mehren, *Traités mystiques d’Abou Alī al-Hosain b. Abdallāh b. Sinā ou d’Avicenne,* III Fascicule, Leiden 1894, pp. 32-36, and by Hasan ʿĀṣī, *Al-Tafṣīr al-Qurānī wa-l-huqūq as-sāfīya fi falsafat Ibn Sinā,* Beirut 1983, pp. 88-88. The fact that this letter is written in a hand that may be possibly different from that of Abd-ar-Razzāq (see Section III.2 above) raises the question whether it was, in fact, among Avicenna’s texts transmitted by Abd-ar-Razzāq, and ultimately of its authenticity.

15. PS-ARISTOTLE, Prayer.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 223, f. 21v.

Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 86, p. 93.

d) Published from this manuscript by Badawr Arisṭū (50).12-16. The same question raised in the preceding entry, paragraph (δ), applies to this entry also. *Ff.219v-221r* Blank.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 219.

d) None of the available editions of the text has drawn upon this manuscript. The first, and only critical edition by Mehren was apparently copied in Ǧamī‘ al-bada‘ī’ (as in No.14 above), pp.91-113, and both together were used by Yaltkaya, who also added arbitrarily his own corrections. Corbin used principally Mehren’s text for his own edition and translation, and so did Goichon for her translation and study. Subsequent oriental printings of the work that I have seen offer no improvements. References: Mehren *Traités mystiques* (I Fascicule, Leiden 1889); M. Serifeddin Yaltkaya, ‘Hayy Ibn Yakzan li-Ibni Sīna’, in Büyük Türk filozof ve Tıb Üstadı Ibni Sīna. Şasıyeti [sic] ve eserleri hakkında tıtkıklar. Istanbul 1937, pp. 1-8 of that particular fascicle; H. Corbin, *Avicenne et le récit visionnaire,* Tehran 1954 (two volumes, text and translation). Paris 2 1979 (translation volume only); A.-M. Goichon, *Le récit de Hayy Ibn Yaqẓān commenté par des textes d’Avicenne, Paris 1959.*

The different recension of the work (Hayy b. Yaqẓān ‘alā bayān ḍayr’) preserved in the Istanbul manuscripts Aya Sofya 4829 and Nuruosmaniye 4894 (Mahdāvī p. 96) has now been published by ʿĀṣī Falsafat Ibn Sinā (as in No.14 above), pp. 321-35.

The final three pieces in the manuscript are not in the hand of ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq (see Section III.2) and accordingly do not have a common source with the other texts. i.e., Avicenna’s library. They would appear to be notes by an owner.

17. F.239v1-8. An anonymous fragment in Persian on Greek philosophers. described as the seven pillars: Thales, Anaxagoras, Anaximenes, Empedokles, Pythagoras, Sokrates, Plato; then the six great philosophers: Plutarach, Demokritos, Aristotle, Xenokrates, Porphyry, Alexander Dīl-Qarnayn. This list appears to have been taken from Sahrastānī’s *Al-Milal wa-n-nihal.*

18. F.239v9-240r. A fragment of an unidentified commentary on Avicenna’s *Ayunīya.* Cf. the list of such commentaries in Mahdāvī 99, pp. 196-197.


NOTES

1 The first article in this series appeared in *Arabica* 24(1977)91-93. In a subsequent article, ‘Paul the Persian on the Classification of the Parts of Aristotle’s Philosophy: A Milestone between Alexandria and Bagdād’, *Der Islam* 60 (1983) 231, note 1, I announced that a description of the
manuscript in question would be included in my book, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition*, currently in press (E.J. Brill, Leiden). This is now published more appropriately here.

With the help of a grant from the Smithsonian Institution, administered under the auspices of the American Research Center in Egypt, I was able to visit the Egyptian National Library in Cairo in 1975-76 and 1978 and examine personally the manuscripts discussed here. This support, and the co-operation of the Egyptian authorities, are gratefully acknowledged.

My friend and colleague David A. King (Institut für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt) has been a constant and cordial provider of the wherewithals for scholarship in my study of these and other Cairo manuscripts. I dedicate this paper to him in gratitude and friendship.


3 *Fihris al-kutub al-arabiyya al-maḥfūza bi-l-Kutubbāna al-Hidwīyya*, vol. 6, Cairo 1308-1890, p. 103.  
*Fihris al-kutub al-arabiyya al-mağūda bi-d-dār li-gāyat sanat 1921*, vol. 6, Cairo 1342-1924, pp. 244-259.


5 'Abd-ar-Rahmān Badawī, *Arīṣṭa 'inda l-‘Arab*, Cairo 1947, pp. (43)-(51). For Badawī’s erratic publication of these texts see the contents of the manuscript in Section IV below.


8 The consistent misreading of the nisba in the secondary literature has prevented so far the scribe’s identification. In all five colophons in which he signs his name, the rasms of the nisba never vary (نسبة). While on f. 116r two of the three diacritical points are clearly legible, however, both Badawī Arīṣṭa (44) and G. C. Anawati, *Mu’alaffāt Ibn Sīnā*, Cairo 1950, p. 28, read Sīnīgy against the rasms and the pointing provided by the scribe himself, possibly following in this regard the same incorrect reading which had been provided by the publisher of the *Mantiq al-maqrīqīn*, Cairo 1910, p. 83. For further misspellings of the nisba see also below, note 10.

The correct spelling of the town and its location were directly inferred from ShaIFI’s apparatus that Abd-ar-Razzāq was ‘probably from the town of Saghā-niyyān or Chagānūn (Yāqut, *Muṣṣam al-buldān* III, 393, Wüstenfeld), however, is either Sagān or Saghāniyyān’ (Yāqut, *Muṣṣam al-buldān* III, 393, Wüstenfeld).

12 *Al-maqlūlāt l. i.e., the sciences transmitted from the Greek tradition, as opposed to the traditional Islamic sciences, al-maqāla‘at.*

13 Philosopher and physician, died in 536/1141 (*GAL I* 485); see Bayhaqī’s *Tatimma 126* and note 5 (ShaIFI), and Meyerhof’s ‘*Tatimma*’ 179. If Īlāqī was, as this passage implies, a contemporary of Bayhaqī, it would seem that there is no basis for the doubts about his date of death expressed by R. Sellheim, *Materialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte*, Wiesbaden 1976, p. 147.

14 This work does not seem to have survived. See M. ShaIFI, ‘The Author of the Oldest Biographical Notice of ‘Umar Khayyām & the Notice in Question’, *Islamic Culture* 6 (1932) 594, and D. M. Dunlop in *EI* 2, 1,131-32.

15 Bayhaqī’s *Tatimma 120* (ShaIFI) = 126 (Kurd ‘Alī). For the form of Lawkārī’s nisba see S. Pines, *Beiträge zur islamischen Atomlehre*, Gräfenhainichen 1936, p. 39, note 2.


17 The brief article by M. El-Khodeiri, ‘Silसila muttasila
critical analysis of the standard biographical notices. The marks a first attempt to treat the subject. but it offers no mentalámi Ibn Srná fT mi'atay ' ám' , Millënaire d'Avicenne, d'Avicenne et autres personnes qui se sont trouvées en même applies to the references and notes about the 'Eleves Congrès de Bagdad, 20-28 Mars 1952. Cairo 1952. pp. 53-59, the books of Abu Alï'. This hardly seems to be correct in the first part of the sentence as, 'He knew by heart most of the context, quite apart from considerations of mnemonic feasibility. Since Bayhaqi makes a distinction between kutub the feasibility. Since Bayhaqr makes a distinction between kutub and musannafat, the first must refer to physical volumes and the second to their contents.

For further details on these works see my Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition, Chapter 2, Work 10.

For the periodization of Avicenna's literary production and the distinguishing features of each period see ibid., Chapter 7, and the chronological chart at the end of Chapter 2.

21 Cf. ibid., Chapter 1. Text 2, note 8, and Chapter 4.

During his stay in Cairo, Kraus examined carefully the manuscripts in the National Library: some of his findings he incorporated in his review of GAL S in Orientalia 6 (1937) 283-289 and 8 (1939) 284-288. Numerous other notes, unpublished, can be found in the margins of his copy of GAL S, now (1976) in the Reference Room of the Library at the American University in Cairo. In the course of my examination of the Cairo philosophical manuscripts I frequently came across slips of paper inserted among the folia, containing notes in French written in pencil in a hand that was identical with that of the marginal annotations of the GAL S volume at the AUC Library. It is likely that he also numbered the pages of 'Abd-ar-Razzàq's manuscript.

Badawi Aristu (44) calls it 'a fine ruqa' (waw-l-hašt ruqa raft'). Cf. the other descriptions of the hand given above in Section I.

Despite the efforts of Dr. Remke Kruk, members of the staff of the Dutch embassy in Cairo and the Editor of this Journal, Drs. J.J. Witkam, for which I wish to express my gratitude. it has proved impossible so far to obtain photographs of the manuscript for publication here.

There are two problems with all these references. First, Brockelmans's reference to Ergin is wrong. Entry no. 103 in Ergin's first catalogue, 'Ibn Sina bibliografyası', in Büyük Türk filozofu (as in Section IV, no. 166 below), p. 22.

Second, apart from the references just given in the first paragraph above, there is absolutely no record of the existence of a book under the title ar-Ta'lîqât ... by Avicenna, but to the manuscript of an anonymous Šarh kitâb an-Nafs li-Aristâtâlis in Persian, preserved in the Istanbul manuscript III Ahmet 3447, ff. 709v-736a. (Another copy of the same Persian šarh is found in the manuscript Emanet Hazinesi 1730, ff. 304v-319v, under the title Kitâb an-Nafs li-l-Hukûm ... Aristât, said to have been translated into Persian by Fârâbî. See F. Sezgin. 'Uc macrû'at ar-rasâ'il'. İslam Tektikleri Enstîsi Dergisi 2.2-4 (1958) 235.)

Second. apart from the references just given in the first paragraph above, there is absolutely no record of the existence of a book under the title ar-Ta'lîqât ... by Avicenna, but to the manuscript of an anonymous Šarh kitâb an-Nafs li-Aristâtâlis in Persian, published in Istanbul in 1298 AH. Such a book is not listed by Ergin either in the first edition of his catalogue, cited above, pp. 75-76, where all works by Avicenna published in that year are given, nor in the corresponding section in the second edition, Ibn Sina bibliografyası, Istanbul 1956, pp. 129-131. (To complicate matters, Ergin says on p. 63 of the second catalogue, no. 177, that the Persian text contained in MS III Ahmet 3447 was printed in Tehran by Afdal-ad-Din Kâšâni, without giving the date of publication! I have no further information about this book.) There is, finally, no at-Ta'lîqât 'ala kitâb an-Nafs li-Aristût by Avicenna (Istanbul 1298) either in A. S. Fulton & A. G. Ellis, Supplementary Catalogue of Arabic Printed Books in the British Museum, London 1926, or in F. E. Karatay, İstanbul Üniversitesi Kitâbûhanesi Araçça Basmalar Alfabesi Katalogu, Istanbul 1953, or in Yusuf Elyân Sarkısı, Mu'gam al-maṭbû'at al-ārabîyya wa-l-mu'arraba, Cairo 1920.

Now the entire 'Abd-ar-Razzàq manuscript was copied by Muhammad Ibràhîm for the Dâr al-Kutub; it is quite unlikely that the very first selection of the manuscript, and one of the most extensive, should have been omitted (see the list of contents in Section IV below, No. 1). M. Ibràhîm's copies of all the other parts of the manuscript are duly accounted for by volumes Hikma 209 and 213-223; only the first selection, Avicenna's Ta'lîqât, is missing. I therefore suspect some confusion with a (presumed?) Istanbul volume, also entitled Ta'lîqâr, but nothing definitive can be said before an actual inspection of the volume(s) concerned.

28 See the preceding note.

29 The folio number given by Badawi Aristu 65.20 as '164a' is a misprint for 146a.

30 The number of the first manuscript listed under this title by Sayyid Ibn Sinâ 14 should be '6 Hikma M'.
Most of the manuscripts containing this work are also listed by Kraus 'Plotin' 274, note 2.

31 Sayyid Ibn Šīrāz cites the title inaccurately and does not list it under the ʿTafsīr on p. 14. Kraus, *idem*, is also guilty of the first oversight.

32 The number of the manuscript is wrongly given by Sayyid Ibn Šīrāz 13 as '214M'.

33 Mahdavī gives the page reference to the old Lhedian catalogue (note 3) listing of ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq's manuscript (i.e., vol. 6, p. 104), but not its number, Hikma 6M.