

Notes and Texts from Cairo Manuscripts, II: Texts from Avicenna's Library in a Copy by 'Abd-ar-Razzāq aṣ-Ṣignāhī¹ by Dimitri Gutas

University of Crete, Rethymno

To David A. King

The collective manuscript (*mağmū'a*) Hikma 6 of the Muṣṭafā Fāḍil collection at the Dār al-Kutub in Cairo (Hikma 6M)² 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 aṣ-Ṣignāhī, 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-Miṣrīya), it is described as 'a collective manuscript, in one volume, written in a regular old hand (*bi-qalam 'ādī*) by 'Abd-ar-Razzāq b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz b. Ismā'īl al-Fārābī'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 *Inṣāf* (*Fair Judgment*)⁵. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Badawī, following the lead of Kraus, published in 1947 most of the texts from Avicenna's *Inṣāf* and *Mubāḥaṭāt* (*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'ād 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' (*bi-qalam mu'tād qadīm* (pp. 11, 12, 13, 14, etc.)), but in one entry (p. 32) he called the hand 'an old *ta'liq*' (*bi-qalam ta'liq qadīm*). This inadvertent wavering 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-Faṭḥ 'Abd-ar-Razzāq b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz b. Ismā'īl al-Fārābī aṣ-Ṣignāhī (ff. 68r, 116r, 138r, 153v, 193r). He came, as his *nisba* indicates, from the town of Ṣignāḥ or Ṣignāq on the Syr Darya⁸, and was a scholar of some standing. He was an older contemporary and an acquaintance of Zāhīr-ad-Dīn al-Bayhaqī (d. 565/1169-70), who reported the following about him in the *Tatimmat Ṣiwān al-ḥikma*⁹:

'The judge and philosopher, Mağd-al-Afāḍil [The Glory of Excellent Men], 'Abd-ar-Razzāq aṣ-Ṣignāhī¹⁰:

He was one of the pupils of the man of letters, Abū-l-'Abbās [al-Lawkarī]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-Īlāqī¹³, 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'is an-nafā'is*')¹⁴ [There follow two sayings by 'Abd-ar-Razzāq.]

He used to teach medicine and arithmetic in the mosque of his neighborhood in Buḥārā 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 Abū-l-'Abbās al-Lawkarī, from whom 'spread the philosophical sciences in Ḥurāsān' and who was the disciple of Bahmanyār, one of the prominent students of Avicenna¹⁵. 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 428/1037 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'ṣūmī died in 430/1038, Bahmanyār died in 458/1066 (although the earlier date of 430/1038 is also given), while al-Ġūzġānī's date of death is not known. This first generation, and particularly Bahmanyār, are related to the second generation rather tenuously, it seems, through Lawkarī. Lawkarī died after 503/1109¹⁶, which means that he survived Bahmanyār 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 desideratum¹⁷.

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'¹⁸. 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 *Aristū* 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 *Theologia Aristotelis* from the *Inṣāf* (ff.142r-153v = Badawī *Aristū* 37-74, partial publication; see Section IV below, nos.4ii-iii) derive from disciples' copies¹⁹. 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 Buḥārā, 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 period²⁰ (*Bayān dawāt al-ġiḥa* = *Modal Propositions*; and *Kalām fī ḥadd al-ġism* = *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 Buḥārā 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'āda, On Happiness*, the only work by another Muslim philosopher contained in this manuscript²¹, 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?)²²; there is no numbering in Arabic figures. Folio size: 16 × 19.5 cm.; script area: 11 × 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 12ff. 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 *ta'liq*²³. 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. Badawī *Aristū* [51]), and by ff. 239v-240v, which are written in a later and untidy *ta'liq*. 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*)*hà* (هي) 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 hands²⁴. On f. 1r there is an incomplete table of contents in a later hand (copied in Badawī *Aristū* [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 *basmala* throughout the manuscript (with the exception of the first work on f. 1v) is consistent: *bi-l-'Azīz al-Ḥakīm aṭīqu wa-'alayhi atawakkalu*. 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 century²⁵, 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, *فِيدُو* (for *فِيدِ*; Badawī *Aristū* 26.20 wrongly transcribes *فِيمِيدِ*), 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, *ملا ملامته* for *ملاء ملامته* (Badawī *Aristū* 25.2), and f. 140r, middle, *هه* and *علاء* for *ههء* and *علاءء* (Badawī *Aristū* 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, *حزويه* (bis) for *حزئية* (Badawī *Aristū* 184.19), and again, f. 154r, middle, *حرو حده* for

(جزءٌ وحده) (Badawī *Aristū* 75.20 again wrongly transcribes *جزءٌ وحده*).

b) The *alif otiosum* 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*, *šād*, and *ṭā* are frequently distinguished from the corresponding pointed letters by a dot placed beneath them, while *ḥā* and *'ayn* by a smaller replica of the same letter (cf. Wright *Grammar* I.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-Laṭīf Ṣubḥī (f. 1r);
- b) *ex libris* Muḥammad b. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān al-Kābī, who bought the manuscript for four *dīnārs* 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)²⁶;
- 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 Muḥammad Ibrāhīm (as indicated by the colophon of MS Hikma 219, *f.* 36r), and were housed in the Library under the numbers of Hikma 207(?)²⁷, Hikma 209, and Hikma 213 through Hikma 223. The contents of the individual manuscripts in this series 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 (= Badawī *Aristū* 89.22, *wa-yağūzu an yakūna*). 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 Paşa himself, since it bears no owner's mark other than the stamp of the Taymūr waqf. It is written in a highly cursive hand, bordering on *šekaste*, 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:

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

... وكيف هي وما ات

... بضروب الاجتهاد وهل

(= Miskawayh, *Kitāb as-Sa'āda*, Cairo 1335/1917, p. 37.4-6). The scribe of the Taymūr manuscript ignored the insert sign (◌) after *al-iğtihād* and added the marginal correction *-āti* to the end of the top line, reading (p. 58),

... وكيف هي وماآت [sic!] ... بضروب الاجتهاد وهل

β) 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 *Uṭūlūğiyā* (see note 24) is duly reproduced by the scribe of the Taymūr manuscript, *also as a note*, in his margin (p. 111).

γ) On p. 126 of the Taymūr manuscript, at the beginning of a new piece, the scribe wrote the customary formula after the *basmala*, *wa-bihi ṭiqatī*, but then he crossed it out and wrote instead the unusual one of 'Abd-ar-Razzāq, < *bihi* > *aṭīqu wa-'alayhi 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 Tahmīs al-*

Qaṣīda al-'Aynīya al-musammā bi-Kitāb al-Kašf wa-l-bayān fī 'ilm ma'rifat al-insān <li-t-Tilimsānī>. A commentary on Tilimsānī's commentary on the 'Aynīya (Mahdavī p. 196, no. 7).

Pp. 55-56. Blank.

ii) P. 57. Ibn Sīnā. *Al-Qaṣīda al-'Aynīya* (Mahdavī No. 99, Anawatī No. 93).

iii-ix) 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

α) 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 Anawatī (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 Badawī *Aristū* (44)-(51), which should be consulted, no further details are given;

β) 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;

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

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

1. AVICENNA, *Notes*.

α) *Ff.* 1v-68r. *At-Ta'liqāt*. The work starts immediately after the *basmala*, a pious formula (*ṭiqatī bi-Llāhi waḥdahu*; different from the usual one of 'Abd-ar-Razzāq; see Section III.2), and the *ḥamdala*. The title is given at the end of the work, on *f.* 68r only: *āḥir al-mawğūd min ḥādīhi t-ta'liqāt, wa-li-Llāh al-ḥamd wa-l-*

minna; tamma kitāb at-Ta'liqāt, wa-katabahu 'Abd-ar-Razzāq ... Mahdavī 49, Anawati 8, Gutas W12.

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

γ) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 67, pp. 1-242. Copied in Muḥarrām 1057/February 1647.

δ) Published by 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Badawī from this manuscript, *Ibn Sīnā, at-Ta'liqāt*, Cairo 1973.

2. AVICENNA, *Discussions*.

α) *Ff.* 68v-116r. *Kitāb al-Mubāḥaṭāt 'an aš-Šayḥ ar-Ra'īs ... Ibn Sīnā*. Mahdavī 105, Anawati 19, Gutas W12.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 209.

δ) Published by 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Badawī from this manuscript in his *Aristū* 119-249. The order in which the material is found in the manuscript was not always followed by Badawī, 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 Badawī's book.

<i>MS ff.</i>	<i>Badawī pp.</i>
68v-69v.	119-122.8
Letter to Kiyā, otherwise known as <i>Iḥtilāf an-nās fī amr an-naḥs wa-l-'aql</i> . Mahdavī 12. Anawati 259. See Gutas T12 for a translation and further references.	
69v-104r5	122.9-222.20
104r5-105r6	omits
The text of paragraphs 146-166, according to Badawī's enumeration, is repeated here. Badawī does not collate the two versions (see p. 222 note 1).	
105r7-107r penult.	222.21-229.11
107r penult. - 107v11	omits
A doublet of par. 94; see Badawī p. 229, note 1.	
107v11-14	omits
A doublet of pars. 105-106; see Badawī p. 229, note 1.	
107v14-109r10	229.12-233.17
109r10-110v21	240-244
Letter (<i>Kitāb</i>). Mahdavī p. 203, no. 1.	
110v21-111v11	
Letter (<i>Kitāb</i>). See Gutas T11 for a partial translation and further references. Badawī published these ff:	
110v21-111r11	245
111r11-111v4	omits
A doublet of par. 458; see Badawī p. 245, note 5.	
111v4-111v11	246
111v11-112v4	247-249
<i>Nuṣṣat 'ahdin 'ahida li-naḥsihi</i> . Mahdavī 92, Anawati 232.	
112v4-11	omits
Letter (<i>Kitāb</i>) to Abū Ṭāhir b. Ḥassūl. Mahdavī 79 <i>bā'</i> [<i>sic</i> , not <i>gīm</i>], Anawati 262. See Badawī p. 249, note 1.	
112v11-113v15	omits
Badawī (p. 249, note 1) claims, without specifying, that the paragraphs omitted here are doublets.	
113v15-115v17	233.18-239.16

115v17-116r1

A doublet of par. 152; see Badawī, p. 239, note 1.

116r

omits

239.17-22

3. AVICENNA, *The Easterners*.

α) *Ff.* 116v-138r. *Min Kitāb al-Mašriqīyīn*. Mahdavī 63, Anawati 12, Gutas W9.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 213.

δ) Published from this manuscript in *Manṭiq al-mašriqīyīn*, 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-Razzāq's manuscript. For reprints of the Cairo edition and further references see also Gutas T8.

4. AVICENNA, *Fair Judgment*.

i) 'Commentary on Book Lambda'.

α) *Ff.* 138v-142r14. *Min Kitāb al-Inṣāf. Šarḥ ḥarf kitāb (sic) al-Lām li-š-Šayḥ ar-Ra'īs ... Ibn Sīnā*. Mahdavī 35a, Anawati 6, Gutas W10c.i.

β) Cairo. Dār al-Kutub. Hikma 216, pp. 1-22.

Cairo. Dār al-Kutub. Taymūr Hikma 86, pp. 97-111.

δ) Published from this manuscript by Badawī *Aristū* 22-33.

ii) 'Commentary on the *Theologia*'.

α) *Ff.* 142r15-146r6. *Fī šarḥ Uṭūlūgiyā min Kitāb al-Inṣāf 'an aš-Šayḥ ar-Ra'īs ... Ibn Sīnā*. Mahdavī and Anawati omit; Gutas W10c.ii.

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

Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 86, pp. 111-126.

δ) Only that part of this work contained on *ff.* 143v19-146r6 was published by Badawī *Aristū* 59.13-66.4²⁹. *Ff.* 142r15-143v19 were omitted by Badawī because they offer a different recension of some of the text included in the manuscript under the title *Tafsīr Uṭūlūgiyā* (no. 4iii below). The text omitted by Badawī overlaps with the following sections of the *Tafsīr* published in *Aristū*: 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. Badawī did not collate the two recensions.

iii) 'Exegesis of the Book *Theologia*'.

α) *Ff.* 146r7-153v. *Tafsīr Kitāb Uṭūlūgiyā min al-Inṣāf 'an aš-Šayḥ ar-Ra'īs ... Ibn Sīnā*³⁰. Mahdavī 35b, Anawati 6, Gutas W10c.ii.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 215.

Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 86, pp. 126-157.

γ) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 102, pp. 2-20; copied end of Muḥarrām 1095/mid-January 1684 in Awrang <ābād>. The title of this work is worded differently: *Ta'liqāt ra'īs al-ḥukamā' al-muta'allihīn 'alā Uṭūlūgiyā* (p. 2)³¹.

Oxford, Bodleian, Marsh 536, *ff.* 69v-84v.

δ) Published from this manuscript by Badawī *Aristū* as follows:

- ff. 146r7-151v15 = Badawī pp. 37.1-59.11
 151v15-20 = 59 note 7
 151v20-153v = 66.5-74

The 'Exegesis' was translated into French from Badawī's text by G. Vajda, 'Les notes d'Avicenne sur la «Théologie d'Aristote»', *Revue Thomiste* 51 (1951) 346-406, and studied, on the basis of this translation, by L. Gardet, 'En l'honneur du millénaire d'Avicenne. L'importance d'un texte nouvellement traduit: les gloses d'Avicenne sur la pseudo Théologie d'Aristote', *Revue Thomiste* 51 (1951) 333-345, reprinted in his *Études de philosophie et de mystique comparées*, Paris 1972, 135-146.

5. AVICENNA, *Marginal Notes on De Anima*.

α) Ff. 154r-168r15. *At-Ta'liqāt 'alā ḥawāšī Kitāb an-Nafs li-Aristūṭālīs min kalām aš-Šayḥ ar-Ra'īs ... Ibn Sīnā*. Mahdāvī 35ḡ, Anawati 6, Gutas W10c.iii.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 214³².

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

δ) Published from this manuscript by Badawī *Aristū* 75-116.16. The fragments of Ishāq b. Ḥunayn's translation of *De Anima* contained in this work were identified and edited separately, on the basis of Badawī'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.

α) F. 168r16-21. The note bears no title but simply begins, 'inda kaṭīr min al-awā'il anna l-a'dād mabādi' li-l-'ālam.

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

δ) Published from this manuscript by Badawī *Aristū* 116.17-25. Since the note bears no ascription, it is reasonable to assume, on the basis of its position in the manuscript, that 'Abd-ar-Razzāq 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*.

α) Ff. 168v-187r4. *Bayān dawāt al-ḡiha 'an aš-Šayḥ ar-Ra'īs ... Ibn Sīnā*. Mahdāvī 42, Anawati omits.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 217.

δ) The work remains unpublished.

7. AVICENNA, *Twenty Questions to Contemporaries*.

α) Ff. 187r5-193r. *'Iṣrūna mas'ala sa'ala 'anhā š-Šayḥu r-Ra'īsu ... Ibn Sīnā ahla l-'aṣr*. Mahdāvī 8³³, Anawati 39.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 222.

δ) Published from three Istanbul manuscripts by M. T. Dāneš-Pažūh, 'Al-Masā'il al-ḡarība al-'išrīniya li-Abī 'Alī Ibn Sīnā', in *Collected Texts and Papers on Logic and Language*, eds. M. Mohaghegh & T. Izutsu [Wisdom of Persia Series VIII], Tehran 1353 Š/1974,

pp. 15-16 (introduction), 79-106 (text). In his introduction (p. 16) Dāneš-Pažūh merely mentions 'Abd-ar-Razzāq's manuscript on the basis of Badawī's introduction (*Aristū* [47]).

8. ARISTOTLE, *Metaphysics* Λ.

α) Ff. 193v-195v8. *Faṣl fī ḥarf al-Lām min Kitāb Mā ba'da ṭ-Ṭabī'a li-Aristūṭālīs al-faylasūf*. The translator is not named.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 220.

δ) This slightly paraphrastic version of *Metaphysics* Lambda, chapters 6-10 (1071b3-1076a4) was first published by Abū-l-'Alā 'Afīfī, 'Tarḡama 'arabiya qadīma li-maqālat al-Lām min Kitāb Mā ba'da ṭ-Ṭabī'a li-Aristū', *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Egypt* 5,1(1937)89-138, in parallel columns with his own Arabic version of the 1928 English translation by Ross. The text was published anew from the same manuscript by Badawī *Aristū* 3-11, and described as 'an otherwise unknown shortened paraphrase of *Metaphysics* Λ, chapters 6-10' by R. Walzer, 'New Light on the Arabic Translations of Aristotle', *Oriens* 6(1953)92 [= *Greek into Arabic*, Cambridge, Mass. 1962, p. 61]. For the relation of this translation to others, and further references, see A. Neuwirth, *'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baḡdādī's Bearbeitung von Buch Lambda der aristotelischen Metaphysik*, Wiesbaden 1976, pp. 166-168.

9. AVICENNA, *On the Definition of Body*.

α) Ff. 195v9-206r6. *Kalām fī ḥadd al-ḡism 'an aš-Šayḥ ar-Ra'īs ... Ibn Sīnā*. Mahdāvī 56 (p. 72), Anawati 60.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 218.

δ) The work remains unpublished.

10. IBN-ZAYLA, *Compilation on Metaphysics*.

α) F. 206r7-9. *Min ḡumlat al-maḡmū' fī l-ilāhīyāt 'an aš-Šayḥ Abī Maṣṣūr b. Zayla*.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 221.

δ) The manuscript contains only the title in the middle of the page, followed by one line of the *ḥamdalla*. 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* α.

α) Ff. 206r10-206v15. *Min ḥarf al-Alif aš-Šuḡrā min Kitāb Mā ba'da ṭ-Ṭabī'a li-Aristūṭālīs al-faylasūf*. The translator is not named.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 221.

δ) This is an abridged version of Ishāq's translation of the *Metaphysics* α, chapters 1-2, 993a30-994b31, pp. 3-41 in the edition of Bouyges, *Averroès, Tafṣīr ma ba'd at-ṭabī'at*, Beirut 1938. Despite the claims of Badawī *Aristū* (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* Λ.

α) Ff. 206v16-210r7. *Min Šarḥ Tāmistiyyūs li-ḥarf al-Lām*. The translator is not named.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 221.

δ) Published from this manuscript in Badawī *Aristū* 12-21. See R. Walzer 'New Light' 92-93 and A. Neuwirth 'Abd al-Laṭīf' 172, and especially R. M. Frank, 'Some Textual Notes on the Oriental Versions of Themistius' Paraphrase of Book I of the *Metaphysics*', *Cahiers de Byrsa* 8 (1958-59) 215-230.

13. MISKAWAYH, *On Happiness*.

α) Ff. 210r8-217v. *Kitāb as-Sa'āda li-š-Šayḥ Abī 'Alī b. Miskawayh*.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 223, ff. 1v-19r. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 86, pp. 58-88.

δ) Published from this manuscript by 'Alī at-Ṭōbgī as-Suyūṭī, *Kitāb as-Sa'āda li-Ibn Miskawayh*, 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 Fāḍil collection. For the work, other manuscripts, and references see my 'Paul the Persian' (note 1 above) 231-232.

14. AVICENNA, Letter to Abū-Sa'īd Ibn-Abī-l-Ḥayr on Prayer and the Visitation of Holy Sites.

α) Ff. 218r-219r13. *Kitāb aš-Šayḥ as-sa'īd Abī Sa'īd b. Abī-l-Ḥayr ... ilā š-Šayḥ ar-Ra'īs Abī 'Alī Ibn Sīnā (fī sabab iğābat ad-du'ā' wa-kayfiyat az-ziyāra)*, Mahdavi 4 dāl, Anawati 213.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 223, ff. 19r-21v. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Hikma 86, pp. 89-92.

δ) Published from other manuscripts by M. A. F. Mehren, *Traité mystiques d'Abou Alī al-Hosain b. Abdallāh b. Sīnā ou d'Avicenne*, III^e Fascicule, Leiden 1894, pp. 44-48, by Muḥyi-d-Dīn Šabrī al-Kurdī, *Ġāmi' al-badā'ī*, Cairo 1335/1917, pp. 32-36, and by Ḥasan 'Āṣī, *At-Taḥsīn al-Qur'ānī wa-l-ḥuḡa aš-šūfiya fī falsafat Ibn Sīnā*, Beirut 1403/1983, pp. 283-88. 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.

α) F. 219r14-18. *Du'ā' Aristātālīs*.

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

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

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

16. AVICENNA, *Ḥayy b. Yaqzān*, with the commentary by IBN-ZAYLA.

α) Ff. 221v-239r. *Qiṣṣat Ḥayy b. Yaqzān al-Maqdisī*. Mahdavi 65, Anawati 219.

β) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hikma 219.

δ) 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 *Ġāmi' al-badā'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 *Traité mystiques* (I^{er} Fascicule, Leiden 1889); M. Šerefeddin Yaltkaya, 'Ḥayy İbni Yakzan li-İbni Sina', in *Büyük Türk filozof ve Tib Üstadı İbni Sina. Şasiyeti [sic] ve eserleri hakkında tetkikler*, Istanbul 1937, pp. 1-8 of that particular fascicle; H. Corbin, *Avicenne et le récit visionnaire*, Tehran 1954 (two volumes, text and translation). Paris 1979 (translation volume only); A.-M. Goichon, *Le récit de Ḥayy ibn Yaqzān commenté par des textes d'Avicenne*, Paris 1959.

The different recension of the work (*Ḥayy b. Yaqzān 'alā bayān āḥar*) preserved in the Istanbul manuscripts Aya Sofya 4829 and Nuruosmaniye 4894 (Mahdavi p. 96) has now been published by 'Āṣī *Falsafat Ibn Sīnā* (as in No. 14 above), pp. 321-35.

The final three pieces in the manuscript are not in the hand of 'Abd-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: Plutarch, Demokritos, Aristotle, Xenokrates, Porphyry, Alexander Dū-l-Qarnayn. This list appears to have been taken from Šahrastānī's *Al-Milal wa-n-niḥal*.

18. Ff. 239v9-240r. A fragment of an unidentified commentary on Avicenna's *ʿAynīya*. Cf. the list of such commentaries in Mahdavi 99, pp. 196-197.

19. F. 240v. An anonymous fragment on the *laylat al-mi'rāğ*.

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 Bağdād', *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.

² A list of the various collections housed at the Dār al-Kutub, and of some of their catalogues available in print, is given by Abū-Nahla Aḥmad b. 'Abd-al-Mağīd (who signs his name as Aḥmad 'Abd-al-Mağīd Harīdī in the series *Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem* published by the American Research Center in Egypt). 'Fahāris maḥṭūṭāt Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriya. Qā'ima bi-maḥṭūṭāt al-ḥikma wa-l-falsafa bi-maktabāt Ḥalīm wa-Taymūr wa-Ṭal'at bi-Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā'iḳ al-Qawmiya bi-l-Qāhira', *Al-Mawrid* 5, 4 (1976) 237-239 (Abū-Nahla omits from his list the Makram collection). A description of the arrangement and classification of these collections is given, in Arabic, by David A. King, *A Catalogue of the Scientific Manuscripts in the Egyptian National Library*, Cairo 1981, pp. yh-yz; and in English, in the same author's *A Survey of the Scientific Manuscripts in the Egyptian National Library*, Indiana 1986, pp. 2-4. For further bibliographical references to catalogues see F. Sezgin's *GAS* VI.324-327.

³ *Fihris al-kutub al-'arabiya al-maḥfūza bi-l-Kutubhāna al-Ḥidwīya*, vol. 6, Cairo 1308 1890, p. 103.

⁴ *Fihris al-kutub al-'arabiya al-mawgūda bi-d-dār li-ḡāyat sanat 1921*, vol. 1, Cairo 1342/1924, pp. 244-259.

⁵ P. Kraus, 'Plotin chez les Arabes', *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte* 23 (1940-41) 272-275.

⁶ 'Abd-ar-Rahmān Badawī, *Aristū '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.

⁷ Fu'ād Sayyid, *Ibn Sīnā, mu'allafātuhi wa-Šurūḥuhā l-maḥfūza bi-Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriya*, Cairo 1370/1950. The few inaccuracies and misprints in this very useful handlist of Avicenna's works in the Dār al-Kutub are corrected 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 *rasm* of the *nisba* never varies (الصعاعي), while on f. 116r two of the three diacritical points are clearly legible: الصعاعي. However, both Badawī *Aristū* (44) and G. C. Anawati, *Mu'allafāt Ibn Sīnā*, Cairo 1950, p. 28, read *Šfn'ḡy* against the *rasm* 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-mašriqīyīn*, 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 suggested by V. Minorsky, *Hudūd al-'ālam*, 'The Regions of

the World' [E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, N.S. XI], London 1937, p. 358, no. 92, and recently approved by K. Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich* [Asiatische Forschungen 22], Wiesbaden 1968, p. 305, note 74.

It is to be noted that, as far as I can trace the word in the literature, this is the first time that the correct form of what appears to be one of the oldest spellings of the town's name, Ṣignāḥ, is actually attested in a known manuscript. It is a tribute to Minorsky's scholarship that his conjecture in the passage referred to above is corroborated by the signature of a native of the town, 'Abd-ar-Razzāq.

⁹ The *Tatimma* was written toward the end of Bayhaqī's life; see my article referred to in the next note, p. 646b, and cf. Brockelmann, *GALS* I.557, note 1, for the correction of a previous error by O. Spies. Ed. M. Shaḫī', *Tatimmat Šiwān al-ḥikma*, Lahore 1351/1935, pp. 124-125 = M. Kurd 'Alī, *Ta'rīḥ ḥukamā' al-Islām*, Damascus 1365/1946, ²1396/1976, pp. 130-131. Cf. the English translation by M. Meyerhof, 'Alī al-Bayhaqī's *Tatimmat Šiwān al-Ḥikma*', *Osiris* 8 (1948) 178.

¹⁰ I omit the *nisba* 'at-Turkī', found only in the Berlin manuscript of the *Tatimma* but admitted into the text by both Shaḫī' and Kurd 'Alī, and I include instead 'aṣ-Ṣignāḥī' (for 'aṣ-Ṣignānī') found in the Istanbul and Leiden manuscripts. For the manuscripts of the *Tatimma* see D. Gutas, 'The *Šiwān al-ḥikma* Cycle of Texts', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102 (1982) 646-647, nos. 2 and 7, and consult Shaḫī''s apparatus for the variant readings. Shaḫī''s suggestion of 'aṣ-Ṣignāqī' for the meaningless 'aṣ-Ṣignānī' in the Istanbul and Leiden manuscripts is correct only insofar as it offers the alternate spelling of the town, Ṣignāq (see the references in note 8 above), but not the actual one used by 'Abd-ar-Razzāq himself. Meyerhof 'Tatimma' 179 incorrectly inferred from Shaḫī''s apparatus that 'Abd-ar-Razzāq was 'probably from the town of Ṣaghā-niyān or Chaghāniyān in Turkestan'; the *nisba* form for this well-known town, however, is either Ṣagānī or Ṣāgānī (Yāqūt, *Mu'ḡam al-buldān* III.393. Wüstenfeld).

¹¹ See further below.

¹² *Al-ma'qūlāt*, i.e., the sciences transmitted from the Greek tradition, as opposed to the traditional Islamic sciences, *al-manqūlāt*.

¹³ Philosopher and physician, died in 536/1141 (*GAL* I.485); see Bayhaqī *Tatimma* 126 and note 5 (Shaḫī'), and Meyerhof '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. Shaḫī', 'The Author of the Oldest Biographical Notice of 'Umar Khayyam & the Notice in Question', *Islamic Culture* 6 (1932) 594, and D. M. Dunlop in *EI*², I.1131-32.

¹⁵ Bayhaqī *Tatimma* 120 (Shaḫī') = 126 (Kurd 'Alī). For the form of Lawkarī's *nisba* see S. Pines, *Beiträge zur islamischen Atomenlehre*, Gräfenhainichen 1936, p. 39, note 2.

¹⁶ In 503/1109 Lawkarī prepared a table of contents for Avicenna's *Ta'liqāt*; see 'Abd-ar-Rahmān Badawī's edition of the work, Cairo 1973, p. 9, and Yaḥyā Mahdavi, *Fehrest-e noṣṣahā-ye moṣannafāt-e Ebn-e Sīnā*, Tehran 1333Š/1954, p. 62. Brockelmann gives the date of death as 517/1123 without, however, indicating his source (*GAL* I.602).

¹⁷ The brief article by M. El-Khodeiri, 'Silsila muttaṣila

min talāmīd Ibn Sīnā fī mi'atay 'ām', *Millénaire d'Avicenne, Congrès de Bagdad, 20-28 Mars 1952*, Cairo 1952, pp. 53-59, marks a first attempt to treat the subject, but it offers no critical analysis of the standard biographical notices. The same applies to the references and notes about the 'Elèves d'Avicenne et autres personnes qui se sont trouvées en rapport avec lui' collected by S. Nafīsī in his *Zendegī va kār va andīše va rūzgār-e Pūr-e Sīnā*, Tehran 1333Š/1954, and in his *Le livre du millénaire d'Avicenne*, Tehran 1953, pp. 52-53.

¹⁸ *Wa-kāna ḥāfiẓan li-akṭar kutub Abī 'Alī, 'ālīman bi-maṭālib muṣannafātihi*. Meyerhof 'Tatimma' 178 translates the first part of the sentence as, 'He knew by heart most of the books of Abū 'Alī'. This hardly seems to be correct in the context, quite apart from considerations of mnemonic feasibility. Since Bayhaqī makes a distinction between *kutub* and *muṣannafāt*, the first must refer to physical volumes and the second to their contents.

¹⁹ For further details on these works see my *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition*, Chapter 2, Work 10.

²⁰ 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.

²² During his stay in Cairo, Kraus examined carefully the manuscripts in the National Library; some of his findings he incorporated in his review of *GALS* 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 *GALS*, 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 *GALS* volume at the AUC Library. It is likely that he also numbered the pages of 'Abd-ar-Razzāq's manuscript.

²³ Badawī *Aristū* (44) calls it 'a fine ruq'a' (*wa-l-ḥaṭṭ ruq'a rafī'*). 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.

²⁴ There is one exception to this: on f. 142r, the word *Uṭlūgiyā* in the title of Avicenna's commentary (No. 4ii in the list of contents in Section IV below) is explained as follows: *Uṭlūgiyā lafz yūnānī ma'nāhu bi-l-'arabīya ar-rubū-bīya; kaḍā dukira fī Ta'rīḥ al-ḥukamā' fī ḥarf al-bā' 'inda ḍikr Buruqlus al-ḥakīm*, an obvious reference to al-Qifṭī/Zawzanī 89.9-10 (Lippert). The ink and the hand in which this note is written seem to be identical with the *ex libris* note of 'Abd-al-Laṭīf Šubḥī on f. 1r (see paragraph 4a in this Section below).

²⁵ Kraus 'Plotin' 274, note 2, without having identified the scribe, suggested nevertheless the 6th/12th or the 7th/13th century.

²⁶ For the text of these notes see Badawī *Aristū* (44) top. Neither these two owners, nor 'Abd-ar-Razzāq himself, are found in the list of owners and scribes of the *scientific* manuscripts in the Dār al-Kutub given in the indices of *King Catalogue* (as in note 2). In my review of the Cairo

philosophical manuscripts I have not come across another manuscript in the same hand. This would suggest that this manuscript was an isolated acquisition by Muṣṭafā Fāḍil.

²⁷ The *Ḥikma* 207 volume I have been unable to inspect; it was constantly '*miš mawḡūd*'. In the 1924 catalogue of the Dār al-Kutub (as in note 4), I.245a, it is entered as Avicenna's *At-Ta'liqāt 'alā kitāb an-Nafs li-Aristū*, allegedly published in Istanbul in 1298/1881; the same information is repeated by F. Sayyid *Ibn Sīnā* (as in note 7), p. 14. Brockelmann (*GALS* I.817, no. 21a) also gives the same title and publication details for the book, citing as his source the entry no. 103 in O. Ergin's first catalogue, 'İbni Sina bibliyografyası', in *Büyük Türk filozofu* (as in Section IV, no. 16ḍ below), p. 22.

There are two problems with all these references. First, Brockelmann's reference to Ergin is wrong. Entry no. 103 in Ergin does not contain a reference to a *published* book entitled *at-Ta'liqāt ...* by Avicenna, but to the *manuscript* of an anonymous *Šarḥ kitāb an-Nafs li-Aristū* in Persian, preserved in the Istanbul manuscript III Ahmet 3447, ff. 709v-736a. (Another copy of the same Persian *šarḥ* is found in the manuscript Emanet Hazinesi 1730, ff. 304v-319v, under the title *Kitāb an-Nafs li-l-Ḥakīm ... Aristū*, said to have been translated into Persian by Fārābī. See F. Sezgin, 'Üç macmū'at ar-rasā'il', *İslām Tetkikleri Enstitüsü 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 *at-Ta'liqāt 'alā kitāb an-Nafs li-Aristū*, 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, *İbni Sina bibliyografyası*, 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 Afḍal-ad-Dīn Kāšānī, without giving the date of publication! I have no further information about this book.) There is, finally, no *at-Ta'liqāt 'alā kitāb an-Nafs li-Aristū* 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 Kütüphanesi Arapça Basmalar Alfabe Kataloğu*, Istanbul 1953, or in Yūsuf Elyān Sarkīs, *Mu'ğam al-maṭbū'āt al-'arabīya wa-l-mu'arraba*, Cairo 1346/1928.

Now the entire 'Abd-ar-Razzāq manuscript was copied by Muḥammad Ibrāhīm for the Dār 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. Ibrāhīm's copies of all the other parts of the manuscript are duly accounted for by volumes *Ḥikma* 209 and 213-223; only the first selection, Avicenna's *Ta'liqāt*, is missing. I therefore suspect some confusion with a (presumed?) Istanbul volume, also entitled *Ta'liqāt*, but nothing definite can be said before an actual inspection of the volume(s) concerned.

²⁸ See the preceding note.

²⁹ The folio number given by Badawī *Aristū* 65.20 as '164a' is a misprint for 146a.

³⁰ The number of the first manuscript listed under this title by Sayyid *Ibn Sīnā* 14 should be '6 *Ḥikma M*'.

Most of the manuscripts containing this work are also listed by Kraus 'Plotin' 274, note 2.

³¹ Sayyid *Ibn Sīnā* 13 cites the title inaccurately and does not list it under the *Tafsīr* on p. 14. Kraus, *idem*, is also guilty of the first oversight.

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

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

