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Abstract

Galen’s treatise *Quod animi mores…* has fascinated generations of scholars investigating the ancient history and theory of Greek medicine. The Arabic version of the treatise, *Quwā l-nafs* (ed. Biesterfeldt 1973), has considerably extended the ground for establishing a proper Greek text. In addition to the then unique ms. Ayasofya 3725, which served as a basis for my edition, a second manuscript of the text recently emerged, Meshhed *Ridā ṭibb* 5223. It contributes valuable readings to the Arabic, and indirectly to the Greek, text and documents the work of a member of the group of translators from Greek into Arabic around Hunayn b. Ishāq, namely Iṣṭifan b. Basil. His readings and his copious marginal remarks show his excellent knowledge of Greek and of Greek culture and give us an idea of what the readers of this kind of scholarly heritage might have been interested in.

Galen’s treatise *On the fact that the capacities of the soul follow the mixture of the body* has always been considered as one of the most exciting works from the mature period of this towering late antique physician and medical author. Its interpretation of the interplay between body and soul, its arguments for a direct dependence of human reason and behavior on the bodily constitution, its discussion of the three Platonic parts, or functions, of the soul, its ways of developing the arguments offered by Plato (*Timaeus*, *Laws*), Aristotle (*De animalibus*) and other ancient authorities, and in particular its skepticism in regard of the idea of the immortality of the human soul have continued to call for debate among historians of medicine and philosophy, from medieval times up to the present day. A recent edition of the Greek text by Athena Bazou (2011) has re-examined and extended the manuscript basis that served Ivan von Müller’s edition 120 years before. Another edition is planned by Roland Wittwer in the Berlin *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*. A French translation was published by Vincent Barras, Terpsichore Birchler and Anne-France Morand in 1995, and an English

---

1 I thank the organizers of the Berlin Excellence Cluster *Topoi* and Dr. Roland Wittwer *in persona* for a fellowship at the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* in fall 2010, and again in fall 2018, which enabled me to resume my studies of *Ǧālīnūs Quwā l-nafs*, and I wish to express my particular gratitude to Manfred Ullmann (Tübingen), and Rüdiger Arnzen (Ottersberg), for reading the penultimate version of this paper and again generously sharing their expertise on *Graeco-Arabica* with me, and to Dimitri Gutas (New Haven CT), for encouraging me to undertake a second edition of the text in the light of recent new manuscript evidence to be presented in this article.


3 The current title of the project is: “Galen als Vermittler, Interpret und Vollender der antiken Medizin”. For Dr. Wittwer’s edition project, see <www.topoi.org/project/topoi-1-78> (last consulted on 19 November 2021).

translation with a valuable commentary on the treatise is part of the first instalment of the Cambridge Galen Translations series, directed by Philip van der Eijk. As it gradually becomes recognized also in Classicists’ circles (and as it is self-evident for the readers of this splendid journal), for the constitution of a critical text of almost any of the classical Greek works on philosophy, the natural sciences and on other parts of the late-Alexandrian syllabus of learning, an examination of their early Arabic translations, if extant, is indispensable. Almost invariably, the Greek exemplars from which the Arabic translations were made and whose readings are reflected in them antedate the earliest extant Greek manuscripts, and if not, they may well preserve a reading which offers a nearly-decisive choice between variant readings of the Greek manuscript tradition. Apart from that, these Arabic translations are witnesses to a process of a linguistic and cultural appropriation of an old system of thought by a new culture whose scope and depth have few parallels. Both aspects, the one addressing the constitution of a particular text and the other illustrating a decisive transitional period of intellectual history, are the object of my contribution to follow.

When I first edited the Arabic translation of Galen’s essay as part of my doctoral dissertation, I had no idea that this text would remain a life-long companion of mine. With a growing knowledge of Arabic and of a considerable number of medical, philosophical and other texts which make use of Quwā l-nafs, and not least due to substantial textual criticism from esteemed colleagues like Manfred Ullmann, Fritz Zimmermann and the compilers of the Greek and Arabic Lexicon, I decided to collect my “second thoughts” on the text of Quwā l-nafs in an article published in Der Islam in 1986 which also contained a number of quotations of and allusions to Galen’s thesis in late antique commentary literature and in Arabic sources.

I had to base my edition of Quwā l-nafs on a single manuscript, Ayasofya 3725, dated 457H./1064-5, where it is part of a maǧmūʿa composed of medical texts, many of them translations of Galenic treatises, which had been discovered and presented by Hellmut Ritter.
and Richard Walzer in 1934.\textsuperscript{11} It was Véronique Boudon-Millot, Paris, who first signaled the existence of a second manuscript of Quwā l-nafs, in a summary description of medical manuscripts in Meshhed, in 1991, and again à propos her study of Galen’s De Libris propriis, at a conference on Galen in 2002.\textsuperscript{12}

Boudon-Millot’s interesting remarks on the Meshhed ms. of Quwā l-nafs (Riḍā ṭibb 5223) are perhaps somewhat contradictory: on the one hand, she suggests that we have here a new, revised translation of Galen’s treatise;\textsuperscript{13} on the other, she describes the Meshhed text as a second witness of the translation already known to us in the Ayasofya ms.\textsuperscript{14} Through the kind mediation of Sabine Schmidtke, then in Berlin, now at Princeton University, and Reza Pourjavady, then in Berlin, now in Frankfurt am Main, I was able to obtain a copy of the Meshhed ms.\textsuperscript{15}

In addition to the Ayasofya and the Meshhed manuscripts, it should be mentioned, there is a Muḫtaṣar of Quwā l-nafs, extant in a Cairo maǧmūʿa, Taymūr, aḥlāq 290, datable to the 8\textsuperscript{th} or 9\textsuperscript{th} century Hiǧra, about which see the introduction to my edition, p. 12. The eight pages of this epitome are numbered (by a modern hand) from 235 to 242, with 17 lines to the page. The manner of abridgement and paraphrase may be illustrated by a comparison between the very first sentence of Galen’s treatise in the Ayasofya / Meshhed and the Taymūr version:

\textit{Ayasofya 3725 / Meshhed (M): Innī (M qālā Ġālīnūsu Innī) lammā faḥaṣtu wa-fattaštu ‘ani tībā‘ī quwā l-nafsi li-amzāği (M li-mizāği) l-badani lā marratān wa-lā marrataynī bal mirārān kāṭiratān wa-lam anfārid bi-ra‘yī fi l-nazārī fi dālika bal fa‘alṭūbī awwalān ma‘a l-mu‘addibīnī lī wa-fa‘alṭūbī bi-ahāratin ma‘a qawmin mina l-falāsifatī ‘ulāmā‘a wağadtu (M wa-wağadtu) l-qawla bi-dālika ḥaqqān tābitān nāfī‘ an li-man aḥabella ḡamālā amri (M has this word in the margin, to be inserted, with a [ṣaḥba] mark) nafṣībī.}

\textit{Taymūr aḥlāq 290: Qāla Ġālīnūsu Lammā faḥaṣtu ‘ani tībā‘ī quwā l-nafsi li-mizāği l-badani marrātān kāṭiratān ma‘a mu‘allīmiyya wa-bi-nfīrādīn min nafṣī wa-ma‘a ḥuḍḏāqī l-falāsifatī wağadtu l-qawla bi-dālika ḥaqqān wa-nāfī‘an li-llaḏīna yūrīdūn nūfusīyān.}

Apart from this customary technique of (1) textual abridgement and (2) replacement of one word by another (ḡamāl → zīna) and of several synonyms by one, the epitomator

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Boudon-Millot, “Galen’s \textit{On my own Books}” (above, n. 12), p. 12, note 13: “Folios 1r-21v contain another Galenic treatise, \textit{The soul’s dependence on the body} […] in the Arabic translation by Stephanos b. Basil”.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Boudon-Millot, “Deux manuscrits” (above, n. 12), p. 1207: “Nous avons donc ici retrouvé, dans le manuscrit de Meshed, non seulement un deuxième témoign de la traduction arabe du Quod animi mores déjà connue par le manuscrit d’Istanbul, mais qui plus est une version révisée et vérifiée directement sur le texte grec”.
\item My sincere thanks go to both colleagues and to the authorities of Meshhed library who graciously allowed me to make use of the text in their possession.
\end{itemize}
has omitted (3) almost all of Galen’s frequent doxographic and polemical digressions and, most substantially, has decided (4) to concentrate on only a few of the eleven chapters: the introduction (ch. 1), the difference of character observable in small children as an example of the capacities and the substance of the soul; the capacities according to the Platonic tripartite soul (ch. 2); the problem of the immortality of (a part of) the soul (ch. 3); a discussion of Aristotle’s concepts of substance and form, the effect of wine and drugs on the soul (ch. 3), and finally the ethical implications of Galen’s thesis (ch. 11). The other chapters, dealing with, e.g., physiognomy and the character of animals (Aristotle), and climate (Hippocrates) are barely hinted at or omitted.\(^{16}\)

Due to the paraphrastic character of this Muḫtaṣar, its text-critical value is limited. My edition has made only occasional use of its readings, and the comparative list of readings from the Ayasofya and the Meshhed manuscript, offered below, record only few contributions from the Muḫtaṣar.

Unfortunately, I have not yet had access to the volume of Uktāʾī’s (et al.) Fihrist-i kutubi-hašt-i ḫan-yi Aṣīrān-i qud-dāri (Meshhed 1354ff.), which lists and describes our magmūʿ-a Riḍā ṭibb 5223; but the recent Fihristgān-i nusḥāhā-yi hašt-i Irān (Fanāhā) (English title: Union Catalogue of Iran manuscripts)\(^{17}\) gives a partial description of the manuscript, in particular of foll. 22b-40b, which immediately follow the text of our Quwā l-nafs and contain Galen’s Finaks (or Fihrist kutubi-hī, Pinax or De libris propriis, On my own books).\(^{18}\) The tentative date of the manuscript given here is the first half of the fifth century. Fuat Sezgin, Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums, Band III (…), Leiden 1970, p. 79, has “7. Jh. H.”. Boudon-Millot’s informant, Živa Vesel, estimates again the fifth century.\(^{19}\) My own observations on the basis of my copy are the following: nashī sign, somewhat angular, 19 lines to the page (22 x 13 cm), sparse diacritical punctuation, few ḥarakāt signs, copious marginal notes whose connection to the respective words in the text is often indicated by a kind of madda sign and the cyphers 2, 3 and 4. The margins of the manuscript have been trimmed, depriving the reader of some words of the marginal notes. The last page is missing (fol. 22a); the last words on fol. 21b are mina l-manāši-i wa-l-maḍārri llati takūnu lanā (p. 43, line 15 of my edition).

The title-page of our treatise reads, in five lines: Maqālat Ģālinūs fī anna quwā / al-nafs tābi’a li-mizāg al-badan / tarqamāhū li-Muḥammad b. Mūsā min al-lisān / al-yūnānī ilā / l-lisin al-ʿarabī Īṣīfān / ibn Bāsīl rahimāhū līlāh wa-nawwara darībāh, “Galen’s treatise On the fact that the capacities of the soul depend on the mixture of the body, translated for Muḥammad b. Mūsā from Greek into Arabic by Stephen son of Basil, may have God have mercy on him and illuminate his tomb”. The two persons figuring here do not need an elaborate introduction: Muḥammad b. Mūsā is one of the three sons of Mūsā b. Šākir, a reformed highwayman and astronomer of unknown pedigree who entered the entourage of the future caliph Māʾmūn already during the latter’s governorship in Marw, after 809. The three sons of Mūsā grew up in Baghdad under the guardianship of al-Maʾmūn and received an excellent scholarly education. They also prospered economically, and this combination

\(^{16}\) On the difference in “philosophical intensity” between chapters 1, 2, 3 and 11 on the one hand and, in particular, chapters 6-10, cf. Singer (above, n. 5), pp. 354f.

\(^{17}\) 34 vols., 11 index vols., Teheran 2013-2015.

\(^{18}\) Vol. 24, compiled by Muṣṭafā Dirāyatī, 1392 h.š./2013, pp. 665f.

of scholarship and wealth enabled them to lavish extravagant salaries on translators from Greek into Syriac and Arabic and scholars working in the field of Graeco-Arabic studies. The brothers themselves, and especially Muhammad, were competent scientists in their own right in the fields of astronomy, mathematics, and mechanics, as attested by their surviving works. As for Iṣṭifān b. Bāsīl, the other person named in the title of the Meshhed ms., we know from Hunayn b. ʿIshaq’s invaluable Risāla ilā ʿAlī b. Yahyā fi ḍikr mā turğima min kutub Ġālinūs bi-ʾilmih wa-baʿḍ mā lam yutarğam that he was a colleague of Hunayn, specializing (a) in Arabic – not Syriac – and (b) in medical and pharmacological texts, and that he was a favored recipient of commissions from Muhammad b. Mūṣā. Ibn al-Nadīm’s Fihrist has a brief mention of him, and Ibn abī Uṣaybiʿa lists him in his ninth chapter on the ṭabaqāt al-atibbāʾ al-naqala allaḏīna naqalū kutub al-ṭibb wa-gayrib min al-lisān al-yūnānī ilā l-lisān al-ʿarabī, adding that he “comes close to Hunayn in translation, but that Hunayn’s style is more elegant and pleasant” (illā anna ‘ibārat Hunayn afṣaḥ wa-aḥlā illā anna ʿibārat Ḥunayn afṣaḥ wa-aḥlā). This Iṣṭifān, or Iṣṭifān, son of Bāsīl, or Basīl, famously cooperated with Ḥunayn in the translation of Dioscorides’s Materia medica. Manfred Ullmann has shown that Iṣṭifan is the actual translator of this compendium and that Hunayn merely furnished a – partial – revision (iṣlāḥ) of the text. Ibn Gülǧul, in his commentary to this text, writes that Iṣṭifān is responsible for the translation and that Hunayn’s job consisted in looking over it (taṣaffaḥa), correcting it (ṣaḥḥaḥa) and issuing a license for its transmission (aǧāza). In his entry, in Mā turğima, on Galen’s On the causes of breathing (‘Ilal al-tanaffus) Hunayn presents an exemplary account of the trilateral translation project between commissioner, translator and corrector. He writes: “Ayyūb [al-Ruhāwī] had produced an incomprehensible translation [into Syriac]. Next, Iṣṭifān has translated it into Arabic for Muḥammad b. Mūṣā. Muḥammad, however, asked me, before he commissioned Iṣṭifān, to take care of the translation, and told Iṣṭifān to collate the text with me. In this course, I have corrected the Syriac and rendered it comprehensible, saving it from many misunderstandings – I wanted to procure a copy for my son [Iṣḥāq b. Hunayn] – and at the same time [I corrected] the Arabic translation, although this was much better than the Syriac version from the beginning.”

When we look at Hunayn’s entry on Quwā l-nafs, again in his Mā turğima, we read the following: “This work is in one single part; its aim is evident from its title. Ayyūb had translated it into Syriac; then Iṣṭifān has translated it into Arabic for Muḥammad b. Mūṣā. Muḥammad, however, asked me, before he commissioned Iṣṭifān, to take care of the translation, and told Iṣṭifān to collate the text with me. In this course, I have corrected the Syriac and rendered it comprehensible, saving it from many misunderstandings – I wanted to procure a copy for my son [Iṣḥāq b. Hunayn] – and at the same time [I corrected] the Arabic translation, although this was much better than the Syriac version from the beginning.”


the caliph al-Mu’tasim]25, and on the basis of my translation Ḥubaysh has translated it [into Arabic] for Muḥammad b. Mūsā. I have heard that Muḥammad, together with Iṣṭifan, has collated [this version] with the Greek text and has corrected a number of passages”.

Now this information tallies almost perfectly with (a) what we know about the translation routine around Hunayn, (b) with the title of the Meshhed ms., and (c) what the Meshed version itself offers. As for (a), we have a forerunner to Ḥunayn’s Syriac translation in Ayyūb, we have Ḥubaysh, Ḥunayn’s nephew, as a translator of that version into Arabic, and we meet again Muḥammad b. Mūsā as a scholarly Maecenas. As for (b), we see, moreover, from the title of the Meshhed ms. that after the Arabic translation was completed, the same Muḥammad asked Iṣṭifan to take a second look at Ḥubaysh’s Arabic translation and to collate it with the Greek original. Thus, the tarḡamahū (!) of the title should better read something like ‘allaqa ‘alayhi (this may be the reason for Boudon-Millot’s imprecise wording, see above, note 13). As for (c), the following list of variant readings and marginal notes in the Meshhed ms. will offer a number of modifications of the text of Quwā l-nafs worth of consideration and document Iṣṭifan’s independent way of working, thus giving us a glimpse into the development of the Greek-into-Arabic campaign – in the same way, although on a quite preliminary scale, as Manfred Ullmann has documented this progress several times before.

Iṣṭifan basically gives us three kinds of information: first, in the text itself, concerning readings different from those of the Ayasofya ms., which reflect his own vorlage, secondly, indicated in the margin, his readings from another ms. (ba’d al-nusaḥ), and thirdly, remarks that concern linguistic and general topics occurring in the treatise which he deems worthy of comment. Accordingly, I shall divide this information into two lists. The first list registers the major variant readings of the Meshhed ms. as well as of the other manuscript(s?) available to Iṣṭifan, as they occur in the text or as marginal notes. (I have not recorded trifles, like differences in the orthography of personal names, such as Aflāṭun vs. F(a)lāṭun, and minor variants like ḏālika vs. ḏāka, and other such small variations. A new edition of the Arabic text will of course have to take care of all variant readings.) The second list records Iṣṭifan’s marginal explanations and comments. It should be stressed that all these notes are clearly Iṣṭifan’s, even when the ḥāšiya does not mention his name. This shows a comparison between Ullmann’s examples, collected in his study on Dioscorides,28 and the notes to the Meshhed manuscript.

The sequence of references follows the pages and lines of my edition.
The sigla employed here are the following:

A    ms. Ayasofya
Ba   Bazou’s edition of the Greek text
Bi   my edition of the Arabic text (specified only if my edition differs from the reading of the Ayasofya ms.)
M    ms. Meshhed
Mü   Müller’s edition of the Greek text
C    the ms. of the Taymūr muḫtaṣar

27 E.g., “Nicht nur …, sondern auch …”, Der Islam 60 (1983), pp. 3-36, and his study on Dioskurides (above, n. 23).
In my transliteration of Arabic words and passages, the letter “x” represents a “ridge letter” (bāʾ, tāʾ, ṭāʾ, nūn, yāʾ) without its diacritical point(s). References to variant readings in the Greek tradition are to the apparatus criticus of Bazou’s edition. References to my essay in 1986 are given as “Ǧālīnūs”. Occasional references to Peter Singer’s translation of, and commentary on, QAM (see above, note 5) are indicated by SINGER. A Dash “–” separates the evidence from my remarks.

9.7 waḡadtu: M wa-waḡadtu, C waḡadtu. – The long lammā-clause perfectly renders the basanisas… ereunēsas… passage (Ba 7.3f.), with waḡadtu (AC) marking the beginning of the apodosis.
9.7 amri: M amri, in the margin, to be inserted, with a ș[abha] mark.
9.8 Bi allati naf alu kulla yawmin: A xfʾ: MC allati tuf alu fi kulli yawmin, Ba 7.10: tōn … prattomenon. This might suggest following MC.
9.17 Bi ḡariʾ… šarih… raḡib… A ḡariʾan… šarih… raḡib… M ḡariʾan… šarihān… raḡiban… C gabāran… ḡariʾan… šarihān… ḥilāfā ḏālika. The accusative case throughout is of course correct.
10.3 Bi wa-ammā bāḥunā baʾdu fa-aktāfī: A wa-ammā bāḥunā baʾdu (perhaps fa-qad ?, written above the beginning of fa-aktāfī), M wa-ammā bāḥunā fa-qad aktāfī, Ba entaoutha dʾarkei – which suggests following M.
10.16 Bi illā annahū: In A, the initial alif of illā seems to be crossed out: M lā annahū. Following M, the translation would run: “They do not realize that… and that this effective cause, if you let it dwell in a certain thing, is not a cause that has a specific name.” C abridges and paraphrases: wa-lam yaʿlamū anna kulla mukawwanin (?) fa-lahū sababun fāʿilun wa-lahū fī ḏātihi smun mufradun.
11.4 Bi innahū yumkinubu <an> yuḡaffifa l-ʿaynayni… inna labū quwwwatan maḡaffifatan li-lʾ-aynayni: M inna labū quwwwatan maḡaffifatan li-lʾ-aynayni. M apparently misses one line – homoioiteleuton?
11.10 ʾabbarnā: M ḡayyarnā, Ba 11.6.f. perilabontes “encompassing, comprehending” – to which ʾabbarnā “expressing, formulating” is apparently closer, but not actually equivalent.
11.14 Bi guwwwatan mubṣiratun (!): M inna labū quwwwatan mubṣiratan.
11.20 li-baʾdi: M baʾda – which, as a direct object of Yusammū, is preferable.
11.24 šahibatun: M šahibatun bi-hāḏīḥī.
12.1 fa-l-musammā: M fa-l-muntahā (?) / fa-l-muṭṭahā (?) – last word of the last line of the page, and perhaps therefore a victim of scribal haste.
13.3 anna l-ḡawhara ḥuwa lʾ-ʾāmmu: MC anna l-ḡawhara lʾ-ʾāmma – the translation of MC would run: “We have shown that substance, common to all bodies, is composed of two primary things: …”, which tallies with the Greek text.
13.4 awwalayni l-hayūlā wa-l-sūrati aʿnī l-hayūlā l-mufrada min: M awwalayni aʿnī min al-hayūlā al-muʿarrāti (?) min. For a discussion of these readings, see the marginal gloss in M ad loc.

13.5 Bi wa-[min] al-mizāḡa: M wa-min al-mizāḡi. -- My reading of al-mizāḡ as a second object of aʿnī is not tenable. However, a reading that approximates the Greek Ba 14.8.f. echbouṣēs (scil. hylēs) d’en hauté poiotētón tettarōn krāsin (SINGER “but having in itself a mixture of four qualities”) is difficult to achieve.

13.11 Bi am āḥara [min] al-šayʿayni l-awwalayni: A am wāḥid (!), M am wāḥidan min al-šayʿayni l-awwalayni, Ba 15.2f. ē tēn heteran archēn.


14.14 muḥālifin: M muḥālīfīn li-raʿyi Aflāṭūn, Ba 17.8f. akolouthon... tō... dogmati tou Platōnos.

15.16[wa-] huwa yafʿalu dālika: M wa-huwa l-raʾsu yafʿalu dālika, Ba 19.6f. tēn oinopian rhizan... ergazesthai touto. – Could raʾs refer to rhiza, and would a translation “They also say that the drug called oinopia – and that is a root (raʾsun) – effects this to an even higher degree” be conceivable?

15.17f. Bi [a-lā] innī: M inna Ilānī (with marginal note, see below).

16.8 innamā: M ayḥad, C innamā, Ba 21.4f. dēlonhoti “clearly, that is to say”. – A seems to be closer to the Greek; ayḥad may be a scribal error for innamā. Part of dēlonhoti is also contained in the initial wa-bayyana anna (AM).

16.12 Bi wa-ʿasura, A wa-ʿasā, M wa-mā ʿasā (an yaqūla ahadun min l-nāsi ḡayra ḍāda) – which perfectly fits Ba 21.9f. ti gar an allo tis eipoi.

16.14 talsʿuḥi: M yalduʿuḥu, Ba 21.13 tous dēchthentas – ladağa seems to be often used for the bite of snakes, see WKAS s.v.

17.13 tuḥārabu wa-tuḥāribu: M tbʾdb wa-tbʾdb – offering the correct reading tuḡādabu wa-tuḡādibu, matching Ba 23.8f. epheronto te kai epheron.

19.18 Bi wa-inna Ḫurūsibus <ṣāra ilā l-fahmi min aqlīʿ tīdāli mishibīmīn wa-> innamā šarū ilā l-ḡabli, M wa-innamā Ḫurūsīfūs innamā ʿāqilan li-ʿtidāli bāḍayni fihi wa-bi-bīlāši dālika šarū ilā l-ḡabli, Ba 28.10f. kai synetos men ho Chrysippos apeirgastai dia tēn toutōn eukraton mixin,… ḡyōdeis.

19.20 Bi yasḥāḏūna bihim, A xshr/dūn, M xxsḥzūn, which suggests yastahzīʾīnna bihim (Ba 28.12f. skōptousin).

21.11 Bi wa-in kāna [layṣa] ḥāriqān ‘ammā nahmu fihi fa-īnnaḥū [layṣa] yaddulu, M has the same, Ba 32.1-3 ei kai parerga estin, all’... endeiknytai. The seclusion of layṣa seems to be apposite.

22.2 Bi fa-mā lam yudhib, A mimmā lam yudhib, M mimmā là yushamu (?) fa-ayṣa bi-šakkān anna dālika yadduluʾalā anna l-nafṣa lam yudhib, Ba 33.3 apōleias esti tekmerōn. M is apparently closer to the Greek text, although in fairly expansive fashion.

22.6 Bi wa-lā alaman labū [qwwa] wa-lā qwwvata labū: M wa-lā māddata labāwī wa-lā qwwvata labū, Ba 33.9f. mēte pathos mēte dynamis. A fits the Greek; māddata can hardly be explained as a hasty copy of alaman.

22.20 nadāwati, M nadāb (?) – the latter probably representing a misunderstanding of radāʾati (l-kaymūsī) (Ba 34.7 kakochymia) 22.20 [takūnu] fī l-badani: M allādi yakūnu fī l-badani.
22.21 munqarratan, A mxhxra, M mutahaxra. Read mutahayyiratan (Ba 34.10 planéthentes).
23.11 bi-ābla: M gābila – which naturally fits Ba 36.8. aphrona. At a second look, A allows the same reading.
23.21 Bi wa-tadbīrin bi-lā ta’addubin, AM aw ‘ādatin radi’atim, C wa-tadbīrin bi-lā ta’addubin, Ba 37.9f. kai apaideutous trophas – one of the rare places where the Cairene muhtaasar offers the better reading.
24.22 labibat… wa-tabaḫḫarat: M tabayya’at wa-tabaḫḫarat, Ba 40,4f. exatmizomenou. – The first part of the hendiadyoin in M looks like a misunderstood labibat “flares up”.
25.18 wa-ṭayši: M wa-baṭši, Ba 42.2 ekstatikoi – for which the translator chooses ḏayš in two other places. The rasm of both words is obviously quite similar.
26.18 tuʿaddu: M xuʿyy or xuʿxy.
27.19 yaḍaʿu: M yutbiʿu – a misreading of A?
27.23 Bi [al-qalīlatu] l-naẓari: M al-xātxa l-naẓari – probably to be read as al-nātiʾatu l-naẓari, the second part of a hendiadyoin for Ba 47.8 skardamyktikoi. Al-qalīla may be understood as an erroneous reading of al-nātīa.
28.2 wa-l-qalīlatu l-taḥdīqi ʿalā <ʿadami> ṣabātin: M wa-l-qalīlatu l-taḥdīqi ʿalā ṣabātim; with a marginal gloss à propos wa-l-qalīla: fī baʿḍi l-nusaḥ l-qalīlatu l-taḥdīqi – one of the rare places where the Cairene muḫtaṣar offers the better reading.
29.22 Bi ḥayrun: A šarrun, M ānasu, with marginal note: ānas – yurīdu bi-l-ānasi ḏidda l-waḥši.
30.20 mutaǧabbirūna: M mutaǧabbirūna mʿǧxūn – read muʿǧabūn “acting proudly and arrogant” for Ba 56.7 authadeas?
31.1 samīnatun: M samīnatun layyinatun for Ba 57.5f. pieira kai malthakē. In A, samīnatun is the last word.
31.22 yanbidu bi-surʿatin, M yanbidu bi-quwwatin, Ba 59.15 sphyzei. – Both adverbial clauses are conceivable.
32.6 Bi awwala murtabikan, A mrtbk’, M awwala man bada’, Ba 60.9 prōtos arxas. – Read awwala man badaʾa.
34.16 kānat al-kaymūsātu: M kānat minhu l-kaymūsātu, Ba 66.6f. ergazetai… tous chymous “from it (scil. the foodstuff)… the humors emerge”. – M offers the correct version.
35.16 yaʿtudū fi l-ahdī: M xxtadiʿū fi l-ahdī, Ba 68.8 encheirein. – Read yabtadiʿū bi-l-ahdī.
35.17 min aḡlī: M min bāli.
35.20 Bi yūdaʿu: A xwdʿw, M ṭumma duʿū, Ba 69,2f. Follow M and translate “then are invited”.
38.20 Bi laysa yadṣaʾu wa-lā yuʿaṭṭilu: A has perhaps yarfaʾu, M laysa yarfaʾu wa-lā yuʿaṭṭilu (the latter repeated in clearer script on top), Ba 77.5 anbaitetikos… esti. – Clearly, yarfaʾu is the correct reading.
40.22 la-kāna llaḍi: M la-kāna awwalu mā, Ba 82.4f. auto touto prōtos. 41.11f. ḡiddan… Ḥurūṣifūs: om. M (homoioiteleton).
Here follows, in my translation (with occasional references to the Arabic wording), a list of Iṣṭifan’s copious marginal notes which concern his explanations and comments on words and passages:

11.9 *al-ball wa-l-tarkīb*: He means (*yurīdu*) with “analysis” the differentiation (*taqṣīm*) between compound things and simple things from which they are compounded, and with “composition” (*tarkīb*) he means the opposite. The differentiation between genera and species does enter into this (*wa-laysa [*?]* yudḥalu [*yadḥulu?*] taqṣīmu l-āḡnāsi wa-l-anwāʾi fi ḫāḍa l-maʾnā*)

11.15 *al-qawwa al-ṣabrāniyya*: In this place, he means with “the appetitive faculty” that faculty which extends over (*taʿummu*) (all) appetites of the three (parts of the) soul.

11.17 *ḥāḍibī l-nafs*: He means with “this soul” the rational soul.

12.2 *al-lubb*: He means with *al-lubb* “excellence concerning the intellect” (*al-faḍīlata fī l-ʿaql*).

13.11 *al-āliyya*: He means with “the organic (parts)” the hand, the head and such.

14.1 *tābiʿa*: He means with “following it” following its substance.

14.6 *al-qūniyūn*: As it is mentioned, is what the inhabitants of Syria (*al-Šām*) call *al-šawkarān* (*Conium maculatum*); it is well-known to them.

15.7 *al-mālanḫūliyā*: *al-mālanḫūliyā* is the madness (*al-ǧunūn*) (due to an imbalance of) the black bile.

15.8 *līṯarġus*: This is an illness in which fever, slumber and loss of memory occur. – For definitions of this type cf. *WKAS* II 1968 a 42ff.


15.17f. *Bi [illā] innī*: Aʾlʾʾny, *M inna Ilānī*, in the margin: Ilānī is that young lady who was stolen by the Greeks. So between them and those who had stolen her mighty wars broke out.

16.9 *bi-tawassuṭ*: Here he means by *bi-l-mutawassiṭ* through what the matter is accomplished (*allādī bihī yatimmu l-amr*).

16.15 *asfīs*: It is said that this is the adder. – For ṭuʿbān, see M. Ullmann, *Das Schlangenbuch des Hermes Trismegistos*, Wiesbaden 1994, pp. 125-31.

17.17 *al-ibtidāʾ*: By this he means “when man first was created”.

17.19 *faʿ-ādat*: As if he wants to say “they return to their orbits” (*al-istidārāt*).

19.7 *ṛūḥ*: The meaning of *al-ṛūḥ* here is quasi an airy, delicate body (*ḡīsm latīf hawāʾī*), and his formulation (*qawlubū*) in this place “the soul is a pneuma” allows for the (interpretation) (*yaḡūzu ʿalā*) – the rest line in the margin is cut off.

19.11 *al-hawāʾī*: Galen’s formulation (*kalām*) here sounds as if he (*ka-annahū*) were of the opinion of the Stoics.

19.16 *ʿindahum bārid*: M *bāridun ʿindahum*. He means “according to the Stoics”.

19.18, 20 *Ḫurūsibus, al-qūmūd*: According to what Iṣṭifan thinks, Chrysippus was a
man among the leaders of the Stoics. *Al-qūmūd* are people who produce poetry which is called *qūmūḏiyā*.

20.16 *bi-l-mizāġ*: He means by “the mixture” the four natures (*al-ṭabāʾiʿ*) which it possesses (*allaḏī yakūnu labū*).

20.24 *al-lubb*: He means by this a superior intellect (*ruḡḥān al-ʿaql*).

21.7 *al-bawārī*: He means by this all stars (*kawākib*).

21.11 *wa-hāḏā l-qawl*: He means by this his remarks (*qawlahū*) on the previous statement, i.e. “I shall now furnish further proofs”.

21.19 *min qibālī šurbi l-adwiya*: His formulation “because of the intake of drugs and because of bad bodily juices (*kaymūsāt*)” refers to those obsessed with delusions (*al-muwāsatīna*) and those afflicted with madness, confusion and forgetfulness (*al-ǧunūn wa-l-āḫlāṭ* [*read wa-l-iḫtilāṭ*] *wa-l-nisyān*).

21.13 *fa-aqūlu*: His formulation (*qawluhū*) “So I state” quasi marks his returning to the previous statement, i.e. “I shall now furnish further proofs”.

21.24 *al-lubb*: He means by this a superior intellect (*ruḏḥān al-ʿaql*).

21.7 *al-bawārī*: He means by this all stars (*kawākib*).
semantically transferred to one of the organs of the body which he thinks to be the metacarpi on the dorsa of the hands (wa-yustaʿāru li-ʿuḍwin min aʿḍāʾi l-badani yaznnubū l-amšāṭa llati fi ḥabri l-kaffayn). (Qitaṣ) is also used for designating a species of animals which he does (we do?) not know.

28.22 Āsiyā: The lands of Asia constitute the middle of the climates.

29.15 ʿudmān: He means the absence of severe anger/wrath. – I do not have further references to ʿudmān in the sense of ʿadam.

30.7 al-qānūn: By this he means the status of equilibrium (al-iʿtidāl).

30.14 al-šahādāt: What is found between the two signals marked by “2” belongs to the discourse of Galen which he inserts into that of Hippocrates.

32.9 al-qāwyyyya: Hippocrates had used this word metaphorically (kāna ... istaʿāra) instead of “severe” (al-ṣaʿba).

33.16 bi-muhibbin li-l-qitāl: Another manuscript has li-anna llāha muḥibbun li-l-ḥarbi muḥibbun li-l-ḥikmati. The meaning of “loving war” is “loving courage” (li-l-naṣīda), for al-naṣīda may be called that way, i.e. “love of war”.

34.5 min al-arḍ: He means by “what comes out of the earth” the plants.

34.5 mā āshaba: He means by “what is similar to it” goodness and badness.

34.21 aʿaffa: By ʿiffa he means restraint (al-ʿiffa) from bodily pleasures (in general), not only from sex.

36.21 li-yatašāwara: He (is? allaḏī) who thinks that instead of “in order that the body is taken ill” it should be read “except of the falling ill of the body”.

36.24 ṣabība l-ʾaql: Iṣṭifan mentions that this passage may be understood in a different way, namely that for a person of sound intellect and a commendable way of life there are named many conditions (ḥālāt) which do not allow for the drinking of wine.

37.20 al-širrīrin: (I am marking the lines of this particularly interesting and problematic marginal note by [1], [2], etc.) [1] With Plato it is the case that evil people (al-širrīrin?) [2] are that way because of two natural dispositions (ḫillatayn), one linked to the [3] other in the relation (bi-manzilati) of the planting [4] to the planted, or the nourishing [5] to the nourished, and that [6] what takes the place of the nourishing is stronger / prevalent (aqwā) [7] and is more acceptable / plausible (awlā) [8] than the other. [9] So he means by “the evil person” [10] someone who leans towards drinking [11] and has much pleasure from it, and that [12] this is only the condition (ḥāl) of his soul [13], corresponding to the “planted”, [14] whereas the “planting” is what draws (the soul) [15] towards that condition.

38.20 fa-hāḏā l-qawl: In this passage, (Galen) quasi says (three illegible words) that the closeness to the evil and the attempt to procure its opposite happen (yakūnu) through food, actions and instructions. From this the necessity becomes clear for instruction and philosophy lest someone think that Galen says in this book that philosophy is something futile.

39.9 wa-nuḥibbahū wa-nahruba...: The meaning of this gloss is not quite clear to me. I give the Arabic as far as decipherable: ḥāšiya: ka-annabū arāda am hal faʾalāhū fībi ṣayrubū min qibali? [one unclear word - mimmā?] in yuẓannu annabū bi-ṣayri l-ṭabīʾi min al-ḥayri wa-l-ṣarri mā naẓīnu annabū min naṣī l-ṣarīri wa-l-ḥayri wa-min hu mā nastafīdūhū min ṣayrub.
Ǧālīnūs Quwā n-nafs revisited

39.12 ʿalā annahū kāna yaʿtaqidu: His formulation “the first deity” is to be understood in the sense that he believed (? ilāhāt kaṭirīn) an yakūna (two or three illegible words).

40.2 al-Mūsā: Presumably (fimā yuẓannu) belonging to the angels.

42.10 al-ālām: By these he means the disturbances and different states of the soul (ʿawāriḍa l-nafsi wa-ḥālātihā).

Evidently, the Meshhed manuscript offers us precious insights into the text of Ǧālīnūs Quwā l-nafs. In addition, it shows the role of Iṣṭifan as a competent commentator and independent interpreter. His explanatory ḥawāšī may be grouped in five kinds: (1) explication of a strange name, (2) explication of a single word, either by a synonym or by paraphrase, (3) explication of a difficult passage, (4) “translation” of a term in mainstream “Baghdadi” Arabic into his own Syrian Arabic, and (5) reference to another manuscript (or other manuscripts?).

For (1), I have in mind instances like 15.17f., where “Helena” is explained. (2) concerns cases such as Iṣṭifan’s explication of the transliterated terms (15.7f.) al-mālanḫūliyā and līṯargus, his comment on Ḥubayš’s translation of synesis by lubb (20.24): “he means the preponderance of intellect”, or his remark that Ḥubayš’s rendering of myelos by dimāġ may be substituted by muḥḥ. (3) may be exemplified by the way Iṣṭifan comments on a crucial passage from the Timaeus, at the beginning of chapter 6 (50 Mü, 35f. Ba), in which Plato argues that bodily “wetness” makes the soul forget “what it knew before being bound into the body” (SINGER, 384). Iṣṭifan starts out by explaining the term širrīr, and then takes a step backward, explaining the common stance of Galen and Plato concerning a person’s free will, or rather its determination by bad humors. For (4), compare for instance Iṣṭifan’s “translation” of (al-) qūniyūn by al-šawkarān, as “the Syrians call it”. Ullmann, Untersuchungen, p. 41ff., offers a number of similar testimonies of the specific usage of the ahl al-Šām (or ahl al-Ǧazīra, p. 46) as presented by Iṣṭifan (who apparently has a specific interest in botanical and zoological terminology, p. 49). As for (5), one may compare my critical apparatus to my forthcoming revised edition of Quwā l-nafs.

To sum up: The Meshhed manuscript of Quwā l-nafs offers a considerable number of readings that clear up or correct my readings on the basis of the then unique Ayasofya manuscript, and offers opportunities to take a second look at the Greek text. Secondly, the Meshhed manuscript, with its precious marginal annotations, presents us with a snapshot from the development of the enterprise “Greek into Arabic”, and a few glimpses into which topics members of the contemporary scholarly and political community involved in that enterprise might have been interested in. Thirdly, those annotations substantiate and corroborate the profile of a participant, already recognized and characterized by Manfred Ullmann,29 of great linguistic competence and remarkable medical and philosophical knowledge, in a “process of momentous importance in the history of ideas”.30

29 See above, notes 23, 27, 28.
30 See C. D’Ancona, “Greek into Arabic”, Encyclopaedia of Islam: Three.