here does it suggest that Avicenna’s father married as soon as he moved to Buḫrā; it is only Avicenna’s condensed style that creates this impression. His father could have therefore very easily moved to Buḫrā as a young man, enrolled in the administration, and married some time later, in the days of Mašṭur b. Nūh, during whose reign Avicenna would also have been born. The mistranscription of Nūh b. Naṣr as Nūh b. Mašṭur is not only possible, but it has actually occurred, in reverse. In the printed text of Ibn Kašīr’s al-Bīḍāya wa-l-mīhāya, in the section on Avicenna’s biography, the alling Nūh b. Mašṭur who was treated by Avicenna is written as Nūh b. Naṣr! That this is no misprint in the published volume but that it has a manuscript basis is indicated by the occurrence of the same error also in ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Baġdādī’s Ḥiǧmat al-adāb 40.

III

Texts from Avicenna’s Library in a Copy by ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq aṣ-Ṣīḏnāḥī
(Notes and Texts from Cairo Manuscripts, II)

To David A. King

[8a] The collective manuscript (maḏmūn a) Ḥikma 6 of the Muṣṭafā Fāḍil collection in the Dār al-Kutub in Cairo (Ḫikma 6M)2 is noteworthy in many respects. It is the only manuscript known so far of a number of works by


1 This is a revised and updated version of the article that originally appeared in Manuscripts of the Middle East 2 (1987) 8–17. The page numbers in that publication are entered here in the text in brackets in bold, except in the case of footnotes, which appeared there as endnotes.


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 cooperation of the Egyptian authorities, are gratefully acknowledged.

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

Avicenna and of Arabic translations of Aristotle and Theophrastus; it was
copied by a third generation student of Avicenna, 'Abd-ar-Razzāq ʿaṣ-
Ṣīnāḥī, from texts originally in Avicenna’s library; it has repeatedly served
as exemplar 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-Miṣrīyya), it is described as ‘a collective manuscript,
in one volume, written in a regular old hand (bi-galam ṣāḥib) by Abd-ar-
Razzāq b. ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz b. Ismāʿīl al-Fārābī,2’ 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
contents.3 The first three publications that drew upon the manuscript, and
which appeared in 1910, 1917, and 1937, barely mentioned it (see nos. 3,
13, and 8, respectively, in the list of manuscripts in Section IV below).

Paul Kraus first signaled in 1941 its importance for the study of Avicenna
and noted that it contained fragments of the Insāf (Fair Judgment).4
‘Abd-ar-Rahmān Badawi, following the lead of Kraus, published in 1947
most of the texts from Avicenna’s Insāf and the Mushafat al-Mustaḍfī (Discussions),
though in a highly eccentric way, and gave in his introduction the most
extensive description of the manuscript to date.5 [8b]

The contents of the manuscript relating to Avicenna were finally listed in
a booklet prepared by the then cataloguer of the Dār al-Kutub, Fuʿād

Egyptian National Library, Indiana 1986, pp. 2–4. For further bibliographical references to
catalogues see F. Szarzynski’s GASVL 324–7.
1 Fihrist al-kutub al-ʿarabiyya al-mamlūkīyya bi-l-Dār al-Kutubbina al-Ḥīḍwīyya, vol. 6, Cairo
1038/1890, p. 103.
2 Fihrist al-kutub al-ʿarabiyya al-mamluḫīyya bi-d-Dār li-šifārat sunat 1921, vol. 1, Cairo
1342/1924, pp. 244–59.
272–5.
4 ʿAbd-ar-Rahmān Badawi, Aristic ‘indu l-ʿArab, Cairo 1947, pp. (43)–(51). For
Badawi’s erratic publication of these texts the contents of the manuscript in Section IV
below.

Sayyid, and published by the Library on the occasion of the lunar millenary
celebration of Avicenna’s traditional date of birth (1370/1950).6 The booklet
included all the works by 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. E. Sayyid described the manuscript for the most part also
as having been written “in an old and common hand” (bi-galam ma tāḏīq
gadīm, pp. 11, 12, 13, 14, etc.), but in one entry (p. 32) he called the hand
“an old ta liq” (bi-galam ta liq gaddīm). 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 and Figure 1).

II. The Scribe

The manuscript as a whole is very carefully written and scrupulously
collated. The scribe signed his name a number of times: Abīl-Fath ʿAbd-
ar-Razzāq b. ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz b. Ismāʿīl al-Fārābī ʿaṣ-Ṣīnāḥī (ff. 68r, 116r,
138r, 153v, 193r). He came, as his nisba indicates, from the town of Ṣīnāḥī
or Ṣīnāq on the Syr Darya,7 and was a scholar of some standing. He was
an older contemporary and an acquaintance of Zahrī-l-Dīn al-Bayhaqī

7 Fuʿād Sayyid, ʿIbn Sinā, muʿallafatunahu wa-tāfṣiratunhu l-mufṭiyya bi-Dār al-Kutub al-
Maṣrīyya, Cairo 1170/1950. 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.

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 room of
the nisba never varies (النسبة), while on f. 116r two of the three diacritical points are
clearly illegible (النسبة). However, both Badawi Arisat (44) and G. C.
Anwari, Muʿallafatunahu Ibn Sinā, Cairo 1930, p. 28, read Ṣīnāḥī against the room 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 Manṣūr al-mahfūzīn, 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, Huḍūl
al-Shām, “The Regions of the World” [E.J. Goodchild Memorial Series, N.S. 3], London 1937,
p. 358, no. 92, and recently approved by K. Leach, Das mongolische Weltrreich [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,
Ṣīnāḥī, 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, ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq.
The judge and philosopher, Maqdis al-Akhfajī [The Glory of Excellent Men], 1 'Abd-ar-Razzāq as-Sīghānī. 2 He was one of the pupils of the man of letters, Abū-l-Abbās al-Lawārī. 3 He was proficient in geometry and familiar with the intellectual sciences, 4 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-Līnqī, 5 he addressed himself only to the literal sense of [99] 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 relate in my book The Most Beautiful Gems (Ārā'īs an-nafā'īs) 6 ... [There follow

5 The Timmim was written toward the end of Bayhaqī's life; see my article referred to in the next note, p. 646b, and cf. Brockelmann, G. S. I. 557, note 1, for the correction of a previous error by O. Spies. Text in Timmim Siwān al-bilāma, ed. by M. Shaff, Lahore 1351/1935, pp. 124-5; M. Kurdi All, 'Alīḫīr i itkāmān, al-Is̱lām, Damascus 1365/1946, 1396/1976, pp. 130-31. Cf. the paraphrastic English translation by M. Meyerhof. 7 All al-Bayhaqī's Timmam Siwān al-bilāma, 'Azāzīs 8 (1948) 178.
6 I omit the nisba al-Thariqī, found only in the Berāni manuscript of the Timmim but admitted into the text by both Shaff and Kurdi All, and I include instead as-Sīghānī (for as-Sīghānī) found in the Is̱lām and Leiden manuscripts. For the manuscripts of the Timmim see D. Gutas, "The Siwān al-bilāma Cycle of Texts," Journal of the American Oriental Society 102 (1982) 646-7, nos. 2 and 7, and consult Shaff's apparatus for the variant readings. Shaff's suggestion of as-Sīghānī for the meaningless "as-Sīghānī" in the Istanbul and Leiden manuscripts is correct only insofar as it offers the alternate spelling of the town, Sīghū (see the references in note 8 above), but not the actual one used by 'Abd-ar-Razzāq himself. Meyerhof's "Timmam" 179 incorrectly inferred from Shaff's apparatus that 'Abd-ar-Razzāq was "probably from the town of Sāhānīlīn or Chagānīlīn in Turkestan," the nisba form for this well-known town, however, is either Sāhānī or Sīghūn (Yaqtān, Muṣlam al-bilām III. 393, Wustendieck). 7 See further below.
8 Al-ma‘ṣūl, i.e., the sciences transmitted from the Greek tradition, as opposed to the traditional Islamic sciences, al-ma‘ṣūlīn.
9 Philosopher and physician, died in 536/1141 (G. A. L. 4855); see Bayhaqī Timmam 126 and note 5 (Shaff), Meyerhof "Timmam" 179, and L. Richter-Bernburg in Edr. XII. 641-3. If Ilīnqī was, as this passage implies, a contemporary of Bayhaqī, there is no basis for his issues about his date of death expressed by R. Sellheim, Materialien zur arabischen Literaturgeschichte, Wiedenhein 1976, p. 147.
10 This work does not seem to have survived. See M. Shaff, "The Author of the Oldest Biographical Notice of 'Umar Khayyām & The Notice in Question," Islamic Culture 6 (1932) 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-Lawārī, from whom "spread the philosophical sciences in Ḥurāsān" and who was the disciple of Bahānīyān, one of the prominent students of Avicenna. 11 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 [cf. article II in this volume]), and most of the prominent disciples died relatively shortly afterwards. Ibn-Zayla died in 440/1048, al-Mā šāmī died in 430/1038, Bahānīyān died in 458/1066 (although the earlier date of 430/1038 is also given), while al-Ğāzinī's date of death is not known. This first generation, and particularly Bahānīyān, are related to the second generation rather tenuously, it seems, through Lawārī. Lawārī died after 503/1109, 12 which means that he survived Bahānīyān 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. 13

594, and D. M. Dunlop in EF. L. 1131-2.
14 Bayhaqī Timmam 120 (Shaff) = 126 (Kurdi All). For the form of Lawārī's nisba see S. P. In, Beiträge zur islamischen Abendlandes, Grünhanincbinen 1936, p. 39, note 2.
16 The brief article by M. El-Khodrī, "Ṣīlīl ṭammālīn min talāqīh Ibn Ṣīf fī mat'ūn 'ān," Milliardaires d'Avicenne, Congrès de Bogdād, 20-28 Mars 1952, Cairo 1952, pp. 55-9, 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
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. [98]

The Marginal Glosses on De Anima (ff. 154r-168v = Badawi Arīstū 75-116) is a transcription of the comments Avicenna had written in the margins of his own copy of Aristotle’s De Anima, while the two recensions of the commentary on the Theologiae Aristotelis from the Insāf (ff. 142r-153v = Badawi Arīstū 37-74), partial publication; see Section IV below, nos. 4ii-iii) derive from disciples’ copies.19 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 Buḫrā, 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 ‘an al-‘aql = Explanation of the Modal Propositions; and Kāfār fi ḥudūd al-alwān = On the Definition of Body; see nos. 6 and 9 in Section IV below) were copied from exemplars or autographs, originally in the possession of Buḫrā patrons and admirers of Avicenna, which were subsequently acquired by ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq. The translation, finally, of Greek texts as well as Miskawaih’s Kitāb as-Su‘ūd, On Happiness, the only work by another Muslim philosopher contained in this manuscript,21 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 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

18 Cf. ibid., Chapter 1, Text 2, note 8, and Chapter 4.
19 During his stay in Cairo, Kraus examined carefully the manuscripts in the National Library; some of his findings he incorporated in his review of GILS in Orientalia 6 (1937) 283-9 and 8 (1939) 284-8. Numerous other notes, unpublished, can be found in the margins of his copy of GILS, 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 GILS volume at the AUC Library. It is likely that he also numbered the pages of ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq’s manuscript.
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. [10a]

2. Palaeographical

The manuscript is written throughout in a fine and minuscule hand that is essentially naskhi, 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 naskhi (apparently not by the same scribe but cf. Badawi Arisi1 [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 (inter)stitial signs marking the end of paragraphs and sections. The few interlinear and marginal corrections and additions by the scribe himself are the result of collusion with his exemplar(s). There are no marginal notations in other hands.24 On f. 1r there is an incomplete table of contents in a later hand (copied in Badawī Arisi1 [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 baṣmala throughout the manuscript (with the exception of the first work on f. 1v) is consistent: bi-l ʿAzīz al-Hakim wādī wa-ʿalayhi sīrat kulluhā. 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

---

23 Badawī Arisi1 (44) calls it "a fine raqṣa" (raṣṣ-ḥaṭt raṣṣ a ṣaṭṭ). Cf. the other descriptions of the hand given above in Section I. See now the photograph of f. 116r in Figure 1.

24 There is one exception to this: on f. 142r, the word ʿUṣūlīyya in the title of Avicenna’s commentary (No. 4) in the list of contents in Section IV below) is explained as follows: ʿUṣūlīyya laṭṭ yimaṣṭu ma nāṣu bi-l ʿarabiyayn wa-raḥāliya: ʿaṣṣ al-dhikr fi tārīḥ al-haθamāt fī ḥaṭf al-haθāmāt ʿaṣṣ al-dhikr (Burāq al-haθamāt, an obvious reference to al-Qūṣayr awatsat 899-10) (Lippert). The ink and the hand in which this note is written seem to be identical with the ex libris note of Abd-al-Latif Şahbā on f. 1r (see paragraph 4a in this Section below).
was written, probably in Buhārā, 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 *kuršī*, with the following exceptions:

(i) In cases where a misunderstanding might conceivably occur, the spelling is pleonastic, as on f. 140r top, *من يدِح* (for *من يدِح*; Badawi *Aristi* 26.20 wrongly transcribes *من يدُح*), where not only both the *hamza* and its *kuršī*, but also the *tawwīn* (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, *تامة* (for *تامة*; Badawi *Aristi* 25.2), and f. 140r, middle, *وَي* and *وَي* (Badawi *Aristi* 27.7–8 wrongly transcribes the first word as *بياء*);

(iii) in cases where the *hamza* stands by itself after a vowelles consonant, whether in the middle or at the end of a word, it is replaced by the letter *waw*, i.e., the presumed *kuršī* of the nominative, regardless of the case in which the word might be, as on f. 90v, top, *خِزَاتِ يَوْمِ مَغَازِيةَ* (for *خِزَاتِ يَوْمِ مَغَازِيةَ*; Badawi *Aristi* 184.19), and again, f. 154r, middle, *حَرِيْدَة* for *حَرِيْدَة* (Badawi *Aristi* 75.20 again wrongly transcribes *حَرِيْدَة*).

b) The *alif awsūm* is as a rule also used for the singular imperfect of third *waw* verbs, and after the *waw* 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* 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 I can make out are:

a) *ex libris* ‘Abd-al-La‘īf Šubbî (f. 1r);

25 Kraus *“Ptolemy”* 274, note 2, without having identified the scribe, suggested nevertheless the 6th / 12th or the 7th / 13th century.

b) *ex libris* Muḥammad b. ‘Abd-ar-Raḥmān al-Khāṭīb who bought the manuscript for four dinārs and a half a day; 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);

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 exemplar for numerous transcripts, both before, it seems, its acquisition by the Kedivial 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 Kedivial Library, on the other hand, are identifiable, and these are listed below 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 *waw* 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. [IIa]
c) Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 207(7), 209, 213–23. 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 Khandīval Library. They were all written by a Library scribe (nassā'ī) named Muḥammad Ḫalīlīm (as indicated by the colophon of MS Ḥikma 219, f. 3v), and were housed in the Library under the numbers of Ḥikma 207(7), Ḥikma 209, and Ḥikma 213 through Ḥikma 223. The contents of the individual manuscripts in this series are given in Section IV below.

The Ḥikma 207 volume I have been unable to inspect; it was constantly “tabl maraqdī.” In the 1924 catalogue of the Dār al-Kutub (as in note 4), I, 245a, it is entered as Avicenna’s ‘At-Ta‘īqāt ‘alā kisāb ‘an-Naṣf il-Arīṣṭī, although published in Istanbul in 1298/1881; the same information is repeated by F. Sayyid Ibn Sīnā (as in note 7), p. 14. Brockelmann (GALUBI, no. 21a) also gives the same title and publication details for the book, citing as his source the entry no. 103 in Osman Erşen’s first edition of his catalogues, “İbn-i Sina bibliyografyasını,” in Bilgik Türk filosofu ve top ışıkta (as in Section IV, no. 165 below), p. 22.

There are two problems with all these references. First, Brockelmann’s reference to Erşen is wrong. Entry no. 103 in Erşen does not contain a reference to a published book entitled at-Ta‘īqāt ... by Avicenna, but to the manuscript of an anonymousSharī kisāb ‘an-Naṣf il-Arīṣṭī in Persian, preserved in the Istanbul manuscript III. Ahmet 3447, ff. 709v–736a. (Another copy of the same Persian Sharī is found in the Istanbul manuscript Emanett Harznesi 1730, ff. 304v–319v, under the title Kishāk ‘an-Naṣf il-Hikmat ... Arīṣī, said to have been translated into Persian by Fīrūz. See F. Sezgin, “‘Ūq ma‘mū’ ar-rishā‘ī,” İslam Tercümleri Etilitatisi Dergisi 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‘īqāt ‘alā kisāb ‘an-Naṣf il-Arīṣīt, published in Istanbul in 1298 A.H. Such a book is not listed by Erşen either in the first edition of his catalogue, cited above, pp. 75–6, where all works by Avicenna published in that year are given, or in the corresponding section in the second edition, İbni Sina bibliyografiyası, Istanbul 1956, pp. 129–31. (To complicate matters, Erşen says on p. 63 of the second edition of his catalogues, no. 177, that the Persian text contained in MS III. Ahmet 3447 was printed in Tehran upon request by Afdal-ad-Dīn Kālidī (“Ka‘lidī tāifa ‘indan Tahrīrān mas‘ulmīn,” without giving the date of publication! Erşen’s reference is in all likelihood to either one of the two printed editions of Ka‘lidī’s Persian translation of the Arabic translation of a late antique paraphrase of Aristotle’s De anima, published in Tehran in 1937 and 1952. For details see Rüdiger Armean, Aristoteles’ De anima. Eine verloren gebliebene Paraphrase in arabischer und persischer Überlieferung, Leiden 1998, p. 40. The incipit given by Erşen matches that of the Ka‘lidī translation, but not the explicit; see Armean pp. 41–51 and 677–80, where, however, does not list the III. Ahmet MS.) There is, finally, no entry for at-Ta‘īqāt ‘alā kisāb ‘an-Naṣf il-Arīṣī in Avicenna, published in Istanbul in 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. Karayev, İstanbul Üniversitesi Kitapfamesi Arapça Baskılar fries Kataloğu, Istanbul 1993, or in Yıldız Elyan Sarkın, Bir ‘arabiyya wa-ISM-i’aranba, Cairo 1346/1928.

The text 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 Gloses on De Anima (no. 5 in Section IV below). The text breaks off at a point corresponding to MS Ḥikma 6M, f. 159r12 (+ Badawi Arīṣī 89.22, wa-yuğen az yukkan). There is accordingly no colophon, but the manuscript is obviously of recent origin; it was probably copied around the turn of the 20th century, perhaps a little earlier. It is possible that it was commissioned by Tāyμīr Pasha himself; it bears no owner’s mark other than the stamp of the Tāyμīr waqf. It was written in a highly cursive hand, bordering on šekast, on low quality, brittle paper without watermark, and in a black, flaking ink. It was copied directly from the ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq manuscript, as indicated by the following peculiarities:

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

وکیف می یمآت ... 

الاجتهاد او ... 

(= Miskawayh, Kīthā as-Sa‘ād, Cairo 1335/1917, p. 37. 4–6). The scribe of the Tāyμīr manuscript ignored the insert sign (xor) after al-īgtihād, and instead of writing al-īgtihād, he added the marginal correction -ātī to the end of the line, reading (p. 58).

وکیف می یمآت ... 

الاجتهاد و ... 

:ر [الاجتهاد و ... 

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 Ugülungūya (see note 24) is duly reproduced by the scribe of the Tāyμīr manuscript, also as a note, in his margin (p. 111).

Now the contents of the entire ‘Abd-ar-Razzāq manuscript were copied by Muḥammad Ḫalīlīm 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). Muḥammad’s copies of all the other parts of the manuscript are duly accounted for by the volumes Ḥikma 209 and Ḥikma 213–23; only the first selection, Avicenna’s To‘īqāt, is missing. I therefore suggest some confusion with a presumed or other Istanbul) volume, also entitled To‘īqāt, but nothing definite can be said before an actual inspection of the volume(s) concerned.
7. On p. 126 of the Taymir manuscript, at the beginning of a new piece, the scribe wrote the customary formula after the hasmala, *wa-bihi ḫafi*, but then he crossed it out and wrote instead the unusual one of *ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq*, *bi-ʿamīn wa-ʾalayhi atawakkala* (see Section III.2 above).

In addition to the works copied from *ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq’s* manuscript, the Taymir manuscript contains also the following:


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

c) Other MSS. It is extremely likely that other known manuscripts are also dependent, in some cases perhaps through a number of intermediaries, on *ʿAbd-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 *Iṣāf*. 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 *ʿAbd-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 their serial numbers in the Inventory of his works in my book *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (*2014*, note 1 above), where the references to Mahdavi’s and Anawati’s bibliographies can also be found. Since the works are sufficiently identified there as well as by the *incipits and explicit* provided by Badawi *Aristi* (44–51), which should be consulted, no further details are given;
b) a listing of manuscripts directly transcribed from *ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq’s* manuscript, as described in Section III.5c–d; manuscripts ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq’s manuscript (see Section III.5c above);

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


a) FF. 1v–68r, *Ar-Riḍāt*. The work starts immediately after the hasmala, the pious formula (*qiṣāṭ bi-l-lāḥ wa-adhābahu; different from the usual one of *ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq*; see Section III.2), and the *hadīth*. The title is given at the end of the work, on f. 68r only: *al-mawqūf min ḥādhāt l-taʿlīf, wa-li-lāḥ al-bamid wa-l- [12a] minna; tamma kitāb ar-Taʿlīf, wa-katabahu *ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq* ...

b) Cairo, ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq, Hikma 207 (?).21

g) Cairo, ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq, Hikma 67, pp. 1–242. Copied in Muḥarram 1057/February 1647.

δ) Published by ʿAbd-ar-ʿAlīm Badawi from this manuscript, *Ibn Sīnā, ar-Taʿlīf*, Cairo 1973.


b) Cairo, ʿAbd-ar-ʿAlīm, Hikma 209.

δ) Published by ʿAbd-ar-ʿAlīm Badawi from this manuscript in his *Aristi* [199]. The order in which the material is found in the manuscript was not always followed by Badawi, 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 Badawi’s book (see

21 See the preceding note.

MS ff. 68v-69v = Badawi p. 119-122.8. Letter to Kiyā, otherwise known as ḥabīb an-nās fl'amr an-nās fī wa'amr al-‘āql (GP 13). See Gutas *Avicenna* T1 for a translation and further references.

Ff. 69v-104r5 = pp. 122.9-222.20.
Ff. 104r5-105r6, Badawi omits. The text of paragraphs 146–66, according to Badawi’s enumeration, is repeated here. Badawi does not collate the two versions (see p. 222, note 1).
Ff. 105r7-107r1 penult. = pp. 222.21-229.11.
Ff. 107r penult. - 107v11, Badawi omits. This is a doublet of par. 94; see Badawi p. 229, note 1.
F. 107v11-14, Badawi omits. This is a doublet of pars. 105–6; see Badawi p. 229, note 1.
Ff. 110v21–111v11. Letter (Kitāb) = Mubāḥaṭat II. See Gutas *Avicenna* T11 for a partial translation and further references. Badawi published only the following ff.:
ff. 110v21–111r11 = p. 245
ff. 111r11–111v4, Badawi omits; it is a doublet of 458: see Badawi p. 245, note 5.
f. 111v4-11 = p. 246.
F. 112v4-11, Badawi omits. Letter (Kitāb) to Abū-Ṭāhir b. Ḥassūl (GPW 4e). See Badawi p. 249, note 1.
Ff. 112v11–113v15, Badawi omits. Badawi p. 249, note 1, claims, without specifying, that the paragraphs omitted here are doublets.
Ff. 113v15-115v17 = pp. 233.18-239.16. [12b]


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikmā 213.

c) Published from this manuscript in *Montūq al-Mašrūqīyyīn*, 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 Ḥād ar-Razzāq’s manuscript. For reprints of the Cairo edition and further references see also Gutas *Avicenna* T8.


i) Comment on [Metaphysics] *Lambda*.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikmā 216, pp. 1–22.

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

c) Published from this manuscript by Badawi *Aristote* 22–33. A critical edition on the basis of this and the independent Bursa manuscript (discovered by Y. Michot, Ḥuseyn Çelebi 1194) and indirect sources, together with a French translation and notes, was published by M. Geoffroy, J. Janssens, and M. Sehti, *Commentaire sur le Livre Lambda de la Métaphysique d’Aristote (Chapitres 6–10) par Ibn Sīnā (Avicenne)*, Paris 2014.

ii) Comment on the *Theologia* [Aristotelis].


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikmā 216, pp. 22–43.


4.1. “Plato”, Plato’s Arguments for the Immortality of the Soul


8) Published from this manuscript by Badawi Arisîy 73,15–74, Translation and study by Ahmad Hasnawi, “Deux textes en arabe sur les preuves platoniciennes de l’immortalité de l’âme,” Medioevo 23 (1997) 395–408, according to whom, the arguments in Arabic, which go back to the Republic X, 608c9–611a3, the Phaedo 105b5–107a1, and Proclus’s Elements of theology, prop. 186–7, may derive from the translation of an otherwise lost essay by Proclus.

5. Avicenna, Marginal Glosses on Aristotle’s De Anima (GS 11c).

a) Ff. 154r–160v15. At-Ta’lîqà ‘ala ḥawâṣṣ Kûtub an-Nafs li-Aristâfâllàs min kânîn as-Sâyh ar-Ra’i fà l… Ibn Sinà. See Gutas Avicenna W10c.ii.

β) Cairo, Dîr al-Kutub, Hikma 214.22


21 The number of the manuscript is wrongly given by Sayyid Ibn Sinâ 13 as “214M.”
5a. Avicenna (?). A note on the numbers as principles.

a) F. 168r16–21. The note bears no title but simply begins, 'inda kāfīr min al-awā 'ilā anna l-a'dād mahādī li-t-ilām.'

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

c) Published from this manuscript by Badawi Arisî 116.17–25. Since the note bears no ascription, it is reasonable to assume, on the basis of its position in the manuscript, that Abû-ar-Razzâq found it either at the end of Avicenna's copy of De Anima from which he was transcribing the Marginal Glosses, or as a stray note in that copy. Frank 'Isâqiyyár's 'Translation' 239, note 7, suggests that it refers to Aristotle's De Anima 404b19ff.

6. Avicenna, Explanation of the Modal Propositions (GL 10).

a) Ff. 168v–187r. Bâyân dawûl al-ghâba 'an al-Šâyî ǧar-Ra'î is ... Ibn Sinâ.

b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, İlkmâ 217.

c) The work remains unpublished.


a) Ff. 187r5–193r. 'Irînâ mas' ʾala sa' ūla 'ašhâ ǧal-Shây ǧar-Ra is Abî 'Ali Ibn Sinâ ahl al-ʿasr.'

b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, İlkmâ 222.


— The reference to the old Khedivial catalogue of Cairo manuscripts, vol. VI, p. 104, given by Mahdavî p. 17 (week no. 8), and, on that basis, by Gotas, Avicenna (2014), 448, is to 'Abû-ar-Razzâq’s manuscript.

8. Aristotle, Metaphysics A.


b) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, İlkmâ 220.


a) Ff. 205v9–206r6. Kalâm fi hadd al-ǧism 'an al-Šâyî ǧar-Ra is ... Ibn Sinâ.

b) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, İlkmâ 218.

c) The work remains unpublished.


b) Cairo, Dâr al-Kutub, İlkmâ 221.


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, Tafsīr ma ba’d al-tabi‘at*, Beirut 1938. Despite the claims of Badawi *Aristiš* (49), the text preserved here contains a number of readings better than those in the Leiden [14a] Averroes manuscript used by Bouyges, and it should be consulted in a future edition. For the Arabic translations of this book of the *Metaphysics* see Bertolacci *Reception* 14–15.

12. Themistius, *Commentary on Aristotle’s Metaphysics A.*


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 221.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 223, ff. 1v–19r; Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Taymūr Ḥikma 86, pp. 58–88.

d) Published from this manuscript by ‘Ali al-Tobgr as-Suyūṭī, *Kitāb as-Sa‘āda li-Ibn Miskawayh*, Cairo 1335/1917, reprinted Cairo 1928. The publisher refers to his source manuscript as Ḥikma 6 only (p. 74), omitting the mīn for the Muṣaffā Fādūl collection. For the work, other manuscripts, and references see Gutas “Paul the Persian” (note 1 above), pp. 231–2.


b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Ḥikma 223, ff. 19r–21v.

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


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

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

d) Published from this manuscript by Badawi *Aristiš* (50) 12–16. The same question raised in the preceding entry, paragraph (6), applies to this entry also.

Ff. 219v–221r. Blank. [14b]

a) Ff. 221v-239r. Qisas Ḥayy b. Yaqqūn al-Maḍīsī.

b) Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, Hijra 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 Mühüldin Şahri al-Kurdi’s Gāmi‘ al-badā‘i’, Cairo 1335/1917, pp. 91–113, and both together were used by Yalıkkaya, 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 discernible improvements. References: M.A.F. Mehren, Traité mystiques (1st Fascicule, Leiden 1889); M. Şerefeddin Yalıkkaya, “Hāyy Ibn Yakzūn li-Ibnī Sīna,” in Bilgic Türk filozof ve Tarihi Üstad Ibn Sīna. Şartiyet [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 1979 (translation volume only); A.-M. Goichon, Le récit de Ḥayy Ibn Yaqqūn commenté par des textes d’Avicenne, Paris 1959.

The different recension of the work (Ḥayy b. Yaqqūn ‘alī baḥrūn abār) preserved in the Istanbul manuscripts Aya Sofya 4829 and Nurusmanliye 4894 (Mahdavi p. 96) has now been published by ‘Aṣī, Falsafat Ibn Sīna (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, Xenocrates, Porphyry, Alexander Dū l-Qarnayn [sic: for Alexander of Aphrodisias?]. This list appears to have been taken from Šahrastāni’s al-Mīlād wa-n-nihāl.
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FOREWORD

In the course of the research on my book on Avicenna, which was first published in 1988, I came across a number of issues which could not be adequately treated then within the scope of that project; others were kindly noted by some of the reviewers of the book. In the quarter century that has elapsed since then, I have investigated them at greater depth and tried to clarify them in a number of articles; these are now conveniently collected here. Their main results have been incorporated in the second edition of the book that just appeared, to which this complementary volume thus forms a companion.

The issues have to do with situating Avicenna in his historical, social, and philosophical context as a framework for reading his philosophical works, as the subtitle of the book has it. It is hardly a novel observation that authors—any authors, and not only philosophical ones—are received, interpreted, and valorized differently and variously at different times even within their own tradition (depending on the ideological orientations and social needs of that tradition at each point in time), let alone outside it, and this observation—this understanding of the distinction between authors and their heritage—has not only benefited the historical study of them all but has itself grown into an independent field in the humanities in the form of reception studies and cultural studies. To take Aristotle as a commensurate example, one need only recall the title of the path-breaking publication edited by Richard Sorabji, Aristotle Transformed, and the immensely fruitful era of the study of Aristotelian philosophy in late antiquity (and early Islam, as well) it inaugurated. So just as we have learned to separate the historical Aristotle from Aristotelianism(s) down the centuries, so also must we disentangle Avicenna from self-proclaimed Avicennism(s) and re-created Avicenna(s). If anything, this has to be done with greater intensity and diligence in his case: he was a thinker of such overwhelming authority and brilliance—and not only within the Islamic tradition—that he was pulled and pushed by posterity here and