

TOMMASO ALPINA

Al-Ġūzġānī's Insertion of *On Cardiac Remedies* in Avicenna's *Book of the Soul*: the Latin Translation as a Clue to his Editorial Activity on the *Book of the Cure*?*

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this contribution is to outline some preliminary remarks on the textual and editorial vicissitudes of chapters 2-9 of Avicenna's medical treatise *Maqāla fī l-adwiya al-qalbiyya*, also attested under the title *Aḥkām al-adwiya al-*

* This article has been written within the framework of the project *Psychology and Medicine between Arabic and Latin. Internal Senses and Cardiology in a key-work of the Arabic-Latin translation movement of the XII century* (2015-16), funded by Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa, which I have coordinated. For access to copies of the relevant manuscripts and information on their content, invaluable help has been received by the ERC Advanced Project 'Philosophy on the Borders of Civilizations and Intellectual Endeavours' (PhiBor), hosted by Scuola Normale Superiore.

I am deeply indebted to Amos Bertolacci, Silvia Di Vincenzo, Concetta Luna, and Marwan Rashed for having discussed with me the results of this paper, and to the two anonymous referees for their helpful comments and remarks. I also wish to thank Matteo Di Giovanni for having helped me to get a copy of the 1937 edition of the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*. All remaining flaws are solely my responsibility.

All quotations from and the translations of Avicenna's *Maqāla fī l-adwiya al-qalbiyya* are based on *Edviyei Kalbiye* (Arabic text), R. B. KILIŞLI ed., in *Büyük Türk Filozof ve Tıp Üstadı İbn Sina, Şahsiyeti ve Eserleri Hakkında Tetkikler*, İstanbul 1937, pp. 1-56, because Simone Van Riet refers to this edition in the Arabic-Latin apparatus of her edition of the Latin translation of an excerpt from this treatise.

All quotations from and the translations of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Nafs* are based on Avicenna's *De Anima [Arabic Text]*, being the *Psychological Part of Kitāb al-Shifā'*, ed. F. RAHMAN, Oxford University Press, London - New York - Toronto 1959, 1970². The quotation from Avicenna's *Nafs* is usually followed by the reference to the page and the line number of the corresponding passage in the Latin translation in square brackets. See AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus IV-V*, édition critique de la traduction latine médiévale par S. VAN RIET, introduction sur la doctrine psychologique d'Avicenne par G. VERBEKE, E. Peters - E. J. Brill, Louvain - Leiden 1968; AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus I-II-III*, édition critique de la traduction latine médiévale par S. VAN RIET, introduction sur la doctrine psychologique d'Avicenne par G. VERBEKE, E. Peters - E. J. Brill, Louvain - Leiden 1972.

All quotation from and the translations of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Qānūn fī l-ṭibb* [henceforth *Qānūn*] are based on IBN SİNĀ, *Qānūn fī l-ṭibb*, 5 vols., Ma'had tā'riḥ al-ṭibb wa-l-abḥāṭ al-ṭibbiyya, Dilhī al-Ġadīda, al-Hind 1402-17 [i.e. Institute of History of Medicine and Medical Research, Ġāmi'a Hamdard, New Dehli, India 1981-96]. The quotation from Avicenna's *Qānūn* is usually followed by the reference to the page and the line number of the corresponding passage in the Latin translation in square brackets. See AVICENNA, *Liber canonis*, Reprographischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Venedig 1507, G. Olms, Hildesheim 1964. I choose to quote from this edition of the *Qānūn* because, though not being a proper critical edition, it seems to record a larger amount of variant readings in the critical apparatus than those recorded in previous printings.

*qalbiyya*¹ (*De Medicinis cordialibus*, or *De Viribus cordis* in Latin, *On Cardiac Remedies* in English, henceforth *Adwiya Qalbiyya*), that Abū 'Ubayd 'Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Muḥammad al-Ġūzġānī (fl. XI c.), Avicenna's disciple and secretary, inserted between the end of the fourth treatise and the beginning of the fifth treatise of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Nafs* (*Liber de anima seu Sextus de naturalibus* in Latin, henceforth *Nafs*), which in turn forms part of the philosophical masterpiece written by Avicenna, the extensive and influential *summa* entitled *Kitāb al-Šifā'* (*Book of the Cure*).

In the introduction of the first volume of her edition of the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs* (1968), Simone Van Riet provides some pieces of information about this insertion and, at the same time, argues in favour of her decision of editing its Latin translation as an appendix to the edition of the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs*, unlike the editors of the Arabic text, who decided not to print this *foreign body*: « En tout cas, plusieurs manuscrits arabes insèrent ces chapitres là où les situe la tradition manuscrite latine. Celle-ci doit donc avoir eu comme modèle un ou des manuscrits arabes comportant l'insertion. Le texte arabe n'en a pourtant pas été repris par les éditions critiques du *De anima* de F. Rahman et J. Bakoš. Il nous a semblé au contraire que les chapitres du *De Medicinis cordialibus* devaient être édités en même temps que le *De anima* et d'après les mêmes manuscrits, puisque les mêmes copistes transcrivent le *De anima*, Livre IV, chapitre 4, puis l'extrait du *De Medicinis cordialibus*, et à la suite de celui-ci, le début du Livre V du *De anima*. Entre l'extirpation pure et simple du « corps étranger » pratiquée par les deux éditions critiques du texte arabe, et l'insertion des chapitres du traité de médecine venant couper le texte du *De anima*, comme le font les manuscrits latins, nous avons choisi de l'éditer en annexe (voir *Appendix*, p. 187) »².

These preliminary and cursory considerations, together with the further information provided by Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, Jules Janssens, and Simone Van Riet herself in other studies³, are a solid but meagre basis to reconstruct the

¹ See G. C. ANAWATI, *Essai de bibliographie avicennienne*, Dār Al-Ma'ārif, Cairo 1950, p. 170.

² Cf. AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus* IV-V cit., p. 99*.

³ M. T. D'ALVERNY, *Notes sur les traductions médiévales d'Avicenne*, « Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age », 1952, 19, pp. 58-337; J. JANSSENS, *Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), Latin Translations of*, in H. LAGERLUND ed., *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy. Philosophy Between 500 and 1500*, Springer, Dordrecht 2011, pp. 522-527; S. VAN RIET, *Trois traductions latines d'un texte d'Avicenne: « al-Adwiya al-qalbiyya »*, in A. M. DIAS FARINHA ed., *Actas do IV Congresso de Estudos árabes e islâmicos. Coimbra-Lisboa 1 a 8 Setembro de 1968*, E. J. Brill, Leiden 1971, pp. 339-344; EAD., *Avicenna xii. The impact of Avicenna's philosophical works on the West*, in E. YARSHATER ed., *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. III, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London - Boston 1989, pp. 104-106.

history of this text and to evaluate its importance, both in itself⁴ and in relation to the textual tradition of Avicenna's *Nafs* for, since then, no considerable progresses have been made in this field. Simone Van Riet's decision to publish the excerpt from the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya* as an appendix may be regarded as disputable: given that the excerpt is part of the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs*, and is apparently translated by the same translators, i.e. Avendauth and Dominicus Gundissalinus⁵, the editorial criteria for the edition of the entire bulk of the text should have been the same⁶. However, the Belgian scholar has had the undisputed merit of pointing out (both explicitly and implicitly) the directions along which it is worth pursuing research, that are: firstly, detecting the reason why al-ĞŪzğānī inserted a selection from Avicenna's *Adwiyā Qalbiyya* in this precise place of Avicenna's *Nafs*, and the related question of why al-ĞŪzğānī inserted in

⁴ On the content of the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya* in itself, its relation to Avicenna's *Qānūn*, and its contribution to cardiotherapy, see M. ULLMANN, *Die Medizin im Islam*, E. J. Brill, Leiden 1970, pp. 155-156; R. U. AHMAD, *Critical Appreciation of Avicenna's Theories and Terminology of Drugs for General and Cardiac Ailments* in K. al-Adwiyah al-qalbiyya, «Bulletin of Indian Institute for the History of Medicine», 7, 1977, pp. 138-143; Id., *Single Drugs mentioned by Avicenna for Cardiac Ailments in his Canon and Kitāb al-Adwiyah al-qalbiyyah*, «Bulletin of Indian Institute for the History of Medicine», 9, 1979, pp. 46-66; K. S. DURRANY, T. V. SIDDIQI, *Al-Adwiyā al-qalbiyya. Ibn Sīnā: Treatise on Cardiac Drugs, an Introduction*, «Studies on History of Medicine», 1/4, 1980, pp. 32-35; D. GRACIA, S. VIDAL, «Avicenna sobre el corazón», in *Actas XXVII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Medicina* 31 agosto-6 septiembre 1980, Academia de Ciencias Médicas de Catalunya i Balears, Barcelona 1981, vol. II, pp. 711-722; M. S. KHAN, *Ibn Sina's Treatise on Drugs for the Treatment of Cardiac Diseases*, «The Islamic Quarterly», 27/1, 1983, pp. 49-56; F. SANAGUSTIN, *Avicenne, XI^e siècle, théoricien de la médecine et philosophe. Approche épistémologique*, Institut Français du Proche-Orient, Damas 2009, p. 32. To these entries it has to be added: Y. TZVI LANGERMANN, *Restoring emotional health by repairing the pneuma in the heart: Ibn Sīnā's al-Adwiyā al-Qalbiyya*, paper delivered at the conference *The Body's Mind and the Mind's Body: Bodily States and Cognition in the Greek, Arabic and Hebrew Philosophical and Medical Traditions* (orgs.: K. Ierodiakonou, N. Germann, G. Freudenthal) held in Geneva on April 11-13, 2016.

⁵ That the translators considered the excerpt as integral part of Avicenna's *Nafs* clearly emerges from the prologue of the Latin translation where the fourth treatise is said to contain five chapters: «Pars quarta continet capitula quinque. [...] In quinto continetur id quod adiecit Auohaueth» (p. 5, 49-56). On the authorship, which however is not entirely certain, of the Latin translation of the insertion, see AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus IV-V* cit., p. 99*; VAN RIET, *Trois traductions* cit., p. 343; and D. N. HASSE, A. BÜTTNER, *Notes on Anonymous Twelfth-Century Translations of Philosophical Texts from Arabic into Latin on the Iberian Peninsula*, in A. BERTOLACCI, D. N. HASSE eds., *The Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Physics and Cosmology*, De Gruyter (Scientia Graeco-Arabica), forthcoming.

⁶ Given that all the Latin manuscripts of the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs* contain the insertion, one would have expected to find the text of the insertion in the exact place where the manuscripts have it, and an Arabic-Latin lexicon, and a Latin-Arabic lexicon of the entire translation. However, the editor publishes the insertion as an appendix, and provides an exhaustive Arabic-Latin and Latin-Arabic lexicon only for the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs*. As for the insertion, she provides only a separate lexicon of notable terms (pp. 328-330), which are basically those not occurring in the Latin translation of the *Nafs*. This choice makes a lexicographic comparison between the translations of the two texts almost impossible.

this place only an excerpt of this treatise and not all of it; secondly, looking at the Arabic textual tradition of this insertion, which is by no means reflected in the current editions of the Arabic text of Avicenna's *Nafs*; and, lastly, evaluating the relevance of this insertion and, consequently, the importance of studying it in relation to the textual tradition of both the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* and the *Nafs*.

This article will address all these issues by preliminarily providing an outline of the author and of the source of this insertion.

1. AUTHOR AND SOURCE OF THE INSERTION

1.1 *The Author*

The name of the author who is the responsible for the insertion, and the name of the work from which it is drawn can be derived from the *incipit* and the *explicit* of the Arabic text as well as of the Latin translation of the insertion⁷.

Text 1.

Incipit. Abū 'Ubayd 'Abd al-Wāhid ibn Muḥammad al-Ġūzġānī said: « These [sc. chapters 2-9] are chapters extraneous to this book [sc. to Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Nafs*], which I have transferred here from the medical books containing that at which the *ṣayḥ al-ra'īs* [sc. Avicenna] hinted [in this part of his *Kitāb al-Nafs*]. Most of them [are drawn] from his treatise *On Cardiac Remedies* [that he wrote] for a friend of his who was a beginner ».

Explicit. This is the end of the chapters of that book [sc. of *On Cardiac Remedies*] that Abū 'Ubayd has transferred to this place of the *Book of the Soul*⁸.

The authorship of this insertion can be therefore indisputably attributed to the already mentioned Abū 'Ubayd al-Ġūzġānī. However, very little is known

⁷ The Arabic text of the *incipit* and the *explicit* have been drawn from the manuscripts preserving the insertion, since there is no printed version of the Arabic text of the insertion. For the manuscripts preserving the insertion, see Appendix II to the present article.

⁸ *Incipit* of the Arabic text: « qāla Abū 'Ubayd 'Abd al-Wāhid ibn Muḥammad al-Ġūzġānī ḥāḍihi fuṣūl ḥārīġa 'an ḥādā al-kitāb naqaltuhā ilayhī min al-kutub al-ṭibbiyya allatī taṣtamīlu 'alā mā aṣāra al-ṣayḥ al-ra'īs 'alayhī wa-akṭaruhā min maqāla lahū fī l-adwiya al-qalbiyya ilā ba'd al-mubtadi'īna min aṣḍiqā'ihī » (*Fragmentum*, p. 187, 4-8: « Dixit Auohaueth Iurgianus: "Hae sunt distinctiones extra hunc librum, quas ego transtuli in eum a libris physicis in quibus est quod praecipit auctor praecipuus; et plures ex eis sunt ex epistola quam fecit de speciebus cordium ad unum amicorum suorum introducendum, dicens" [...] » [the confusion between *medicis* and *physicis* is due to the similar *rasm* of the two Arabic words: *ṭibbiyya* and *ṭabī'iyya*; while *risāla* (= *epistola*) is attested in Arabic as a variant for *maqāla* in the title of the work]). *Explicit* of the Arabic text: « fa-ḥādā āḥir mā naqalahū Abū 'Ubayd min fuṣūl qālika al-kitāb ilā ḥādā al-mawḍi' min kitāb al-nafs » (*Fragmentum*, p. 210, 74-75: « Et hic finis est eius quod transtulit Auohaueth ex capitulis illius libri ad hunc locum huius libri *De anima* »).

about his life. He probably was already a jurist (*faqīh*) in Ġurġān when he met Avicenna in 1012. He became one of his disciples and, above all, his secretary (as is common knowledge, he completed Avicenna's autobiography after his death). He studied logic and Ptolemy's *Almagest* with him. He also wrote a treatise entitled *Kitāb Kayfiyyat tarkīb al-aflāk* (*Book of the Manner of Arrangement of the Celestial Spheres*) on the problem of the so-called Ptolemaic equant, which apparently has not been preserved apart from a *mulaḥḥaṣ* (*compendium*) written by al-Ğüzğānī himself⁹. He aided Avicenna with the compilation of the *Kitāb al-Šifā'*, and he added the mathematical sections on geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music from Avicenna's earlier works to the *Kitāb al-Nağāt* (*Book of the Salvation*) as well as to the *Dānešnāme-ye 'Alā'ī* (*Philosophy for 'Alā' al-Dawla*). Al-Ğüzğānī also commented on the difficult passages of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Qānūn fī l-ṭibb* (*Canon of Medicine*), and translated the *Kitāb al-Ḥayawān* (*Book of Animals*), namely the zoology of the *Šifā'*, from Arabic into Persian¹⁰.

1.2 The Source

In his *Biography of Avicenna*, al-Ğüzğānī reports that Avicenna composed the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* after his arrival in Hamadān about 405H/1014-15¹¹. In the introduction, Avicenna states that he wrote it for an 'Alid dignitary (*al-šarīf*), one al-Sa'īd Abū l-Ḥusayn 'Alī bin al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥasanī, who, as Mahdavi suggests, may be the same person at whose home he stayed after his release from the fortress of Fardağān¹². Then, Avicenna briefly outlines the content of the work,

⁹ It is noteworthy that with respect to the topic of this work al-Ğüzğānī seems to show an anti-Avicennian attitude. For this work and its edition, see G. SALIBA, *Ibn Sīnā and Abū 'Ubayd al-Jūzjānī: The Problem of the Ptolemaic Equant*, in G. SALIBA ed., *A History of Arabic Astronomy. Planetary theories during the Golden Age of Islām*, New York University Press, New York - London 1994, pp. 85-112, and also A. DHANANI, *Jūzjānī: Abū 'Ubayd 'Abd al-Wāhid ibn Muḥammad al-Jūzjānī*, in T. HOCKEY ET ALII eds., *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Astronomers*, Springer, New York 2007, pp. 604-605.

¹⁰ For these pieces of information, see DHANANI, *Jūzjānī* cit. Some scattered information related to al-Ğüzğānī's role as Avicenna's secretary can be found in D. GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition. Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works*, Brill, Leiden 1988 (second, revised and enlarged edition 2014), p. 29. However, on the role that al-Ğüzğānī played in the compilation of Avicenna's *summae* and, in particular, of his *Šifā'*, there is no specific bibliography. What is more, although contemporary scholarship is showing an increasing interest in the intersection between psychology and medicine in Arabic philosophy (see, for example, P. E. PORMANN, *Epidemics in Context: Greek Commentaries on Hippocrates in the Arabic Tradition*, De Gruyter, Berlin 2012 (Scientia Graeco-Arabica); and *Islamic Medical and Scientific Tradition: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies* edited by P. E. PORMANN, Routledge, London 2011), the figure of al-Ğüzğānī and his activity of integration of psychology and medicine have remained shadowy.

¹¹ *The Life of Ibn Sina. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*, ed. W. E. GOHLMAN, State University of New York Press, Albany - New York 1974, p. 60, 6-8, and p. 61, n. 82.

¹² Y. MAHDAVĪ, *Fihrist-i nuṣṣahā-yi muṣannafāt-i Ibn-i Sīnā*, Intiṣārāt-i Dānišgāh-yi Tihirān, Tehran 1333/1954, p. 24.

i.e. the rules of cardiac drugs (*maqāla taštamilu 'alā aḥkām al-adwiya al-qalbiyya*, tr. *a treatise that includes [the treatment of] the rules of cardiac drugs*, p. 1, 4), and its main stylistic feature, i.e. brevity (*ataḥarrā fihā al-iḥtiṣār*, tr. *I pursue brevity in it*, p. 1, 5).

According to Maḥdavi's description, which is reflected in the first edition of the Arabic text¹³, this treatise consists of nineteen chapters bearing no specific titles. The internal subdivision of chapters reflects the content of the work, which can be ideally divided into two homogeneous parts. The first part (chaps. 1-9) contains a medico-psychological discussion about the pneuma, which is considered the vehicle (*maṭiyya*, *markab*)¹⁴ of the psychic faculties in the body, and the heart, which is not considered merely as a physiological organ, but also as the seat of emotions (happiness, sadness, fear, anger, etc.), and the regulator of the animal heat; and the second part (chaps. 10-19) divides drugs into several categories (e.g. stimulants, laxatives, diuretics, cooling, imparting warmth and vomit inducing), and prescribes simple (sixty-three) and compound (seventeen) drugs for the treatment of heart diseases¹⁵.

As to the Arabic manuscripts containing this work, Brockelmann records 33 manuscripts¹⁶, Maḥdavi 28 manuscripts¹⁷, and Gutas 33 manuscripts¹⁸. The list provided by D. Gutas encompasses all the manuscripts listed by Maḥdavi with the addition of five more manuscripts. It is noteworthy that the aforementioned lists encompass only witnesses of the direct tradition of the Avicennian treatise,

¹³ For the editions of the Arabic text as well as for its translations, see pp. 371-372 below.

¹⁴ These two terms are used also in the *Nafs* to refer to the pneuma. See *Nafs*, III, 7, p. 144, 2 [*markab*, *vehiculum*, p. 257, 50], and V, 8, p. 263, 9 [*maṭiyya*, *vehiculum*, p. 175, 50].

¹⁵ Although the discussion in the second part of the treatise is more detailed and comprehensive, the list of drugs provided here can be compared with that provided in *Qānūn*, III, xi, I, 7, p. 309, 4-13 for the treatment of cardiac diseases. In a recent article Ayman Shihadeh has shown that Ibn Ḡaylān al-Balḥī (ca. 505H/1111-2-590H/1194) criticized the lists of the nature of simple drugs that Avicenna provides in both the *Qānūn* and the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* because they contain « much inconsistency », and represent « an uncritical compilation from multiple earlier sources ». See A. SHIHADÉH, *A Post-Ghazālīan Critic of Avicenna: Ibn Ḡaylān al-Balkhī on the Materia Medica of the Canon of Medicine*, « Journal of Islamic Studies », 24/2, 2013, pp. 135-174.

¹⁶ C. BROCKELMANN, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur* [sic], vols. I-II, Brill, Leiden 1898-1902; 1943-1949² (vol. I, p. 599); suppl. vols. I-III, Brill, Leiden 1937-1949 (suppl. vol. I, p. 827). In his supplement, Brockelmann refers to a publication by A. Taymūr, appeared in « *Revue de l'académie arabe de Damas* », vol. V (1925?), p. 360 (n.c.), where other manuscripts containing the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* are possibly listed.

¹⁷ MAḤDAVĪ, *Fihrist*, p. 24.

¹⁸ GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (second edition) cit., p. 515. Although the number of manuscripts is accidentally the same of that of the list provided by Brockelmann, the two lists contain different items. For the list provided by Gutas is based on « Maḥdavi, with addition from Reisman's *Avicenniana*, Daiber's *Collection IV*, and my random findings » (see GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (second edition) cit., p. 414).

i.e. of the transmission of this treatise in separation from Avicenna's *Nafs*, with the exception of ms. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 822, which attests chapters 2-9 of this treatise inserted within Avicenna's *Nafs*. An inventory of all these manuscripts is provided as Appendix I at the end of the present article.

As for the edition of the Arabic text of the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*, there are four provisional editions:

1. The partial edition of the first part of the treatise with the exclusion of the discussion on drugs, based on the ms. San Lorenzo de El Escorial (Madrid), Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, 844/5, which has been published in the monthly *al-'Irfān* of Sa'īda (Syria) in 1345H/1926¹⁹;
2. The first entire edition of the text published by Rifat Bilge Kilisli at Istanbul in 1937 together with a Turkish translation, and apparently based on 18 manuscripts²⁰;
3. The transcription of the ms. St. Petersburg, State University Library, 171 Rosen, published at Tashkent in 1966 by the Uzbek Academy of Sciences together with a Uzbek translation²¹;
4. The edition published by M. Zuhayr al-Bābā in *Min Mu'allafāt Ibn Sīnā al-ṭibbiyya*, in 1984, and based on 3 manuscripts²².

There are three Latin translations of the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*:

1. The already mentioned partial translation of chapters 2-9 inserted between the fourth and the fifth treatise of the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs*, which was made by Avendauth and Dominicus Gundissalinus at Toledo in 1152-66²³;
2. The first entire translation made in 1306 by Arnau de Vilanova (Arnold of Villanova, 1240-1310/13)²⁴;

¹⁹ See BROCKELMANN, *Geschichte* cit., p. 599.

²⁰ *Edviyei Kalbiye* (Arabic text), ed. KILISLI cit., pp. 1-56. For the list of the manuscripts on which this edition is based, see Appendix I to the present article.

²¹ On this information, see KHAN, *Ibn Sina's Treatise* cit., p. 50.

²² *Min Mu'allafāt Ibn Sīnā al-ṭibbiyya*, M. Z. AL-BĀBĀ ed., *Ma'had al-turāt al-'ilmī al-'arabī*, Aleppo 1404/1984, pp. 221-294. For the list of the manuscripts on which this edition is based, see Appendix I to the present article.

²³ See AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus* IV-V cit., pp. 187-210.

²⁴ *Arnaldi Villanouani philosophi et medici summi Opera omnia, cum Nicolai Taurelli medici et philosophi in quosdam libros annotationibus: indice item copiosissimo*, ex officina Pernea per Conradum Waldkirch, Basileae 1585. A critical edition of Arnau's translation is currently being prepared by Michael McVaugh with the assistance of Gerrit Bos. For an insight into Arnau's medical conception, his sources, and his terminology, see M. McVAUGH, *Arnau de Vilanova and the Pathology of Cognition*, in G. FEDERICI-VESCOVINI, V. SORGE, C. VINTI eds., *Corpo e anima, sensi interni e intelletto dai secoli XIII-XV ai post-cartesiani e spinoziani*, Brepols, Turnhout 2005, pp. 119-138. For the impact of Arnau's translation on Latin tradition and, in particular, on Peter of Zealand, see J.-M. MANDOSIO,

3. The translation made between ca. 1487 and 1520 by Andrea Alpago (1450-1521), who revises the former translation by Arnau de Vilanova²⁵.

As to the translations in modern languages, apart from the aforementioned Turkish and Uzbek translations, there are:

1. a partial English translation made by O. C. Gruner in 1930 and included in his translation of Avicenna's *Qānūn*²⁶;
2. an Urdu translation, dependent on four manuscripts, which has been made by Hakim Abdul Latif in 1956²⁷;
3. a complete, English translation made by H. Abdul Hameed in 1983, about which it is hard to say on which Arabic text it is based²⁸.

Persian and Hebrew translations of the work are also attested²⁹.

*The Use of al-Kindī's Treatise On Rays in Peter of Zealand's Elucidation of Marvelous Things (end of the 15th century), « Micrologus. Nature, Sciences and Medieval Societies », The Impact of Arabic Sciences in Europe and Asia, 24, 2016, pp. 425-456, in part. pp. 430-431. It is noteworthy that in the title of the edition of the Latin translation of the *Qānūn*, the *Adwīya Qalbiyya*, and the *Urġūza fī l-tibb* (Poem of Medicine or Cantica) published in Basel in 1556, the name of Gerard of Cremona is mentioned as the first translator not only of the *Qānūn*, but also of the *Adwīya Qalbiyya* and of the *Urġūza*: 'Avicennae medicorum Arabum principis, Liber Canonis, De Medicinis Cordialibus et Cantica, iam olim a Gerardo Carmonensi ex Arabico Sermone in Latinum conversa, postea vero ab Andrea Alpago Bellunensi, philosopho et medico egregio, infinitis pene correctionibus ad veterum exemplarium Arabicorum fidem in margine factis ... decorata'. However, among the translations attributed to Gerard of Cremona there is no trace of the *Adwīya Qalbiyya* or of the *Urġūza*, which was translated for the first time by Armengaud Blaise, Arnau's nephew. Therefore, it might well have been the case that the name of Gerard of Cremona has been related to the Latin translation also of these two works because of their mention in the title of the Basel edition together with the *Qānūn*. On this issue, see AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus* IV-V cit., p. 98*, n. 28, and VAN RIET, *Trois traductions* cit., pp. 341-342.*

²⁵ *Principis Avic[ennae] Liber Canonis necnon de Medicinis cordialibus et Canticum ab Andr[ea] Bell[unensi] ex antiquis Arabum originalibus ingenti labore summaque diligentia correcti atque in integrum restituti una cum interpretatione nominum Arabicorum quae partim mendosa partim incognita lectores antea morabantur, Giunta, Venetiis 1527.*

²⁶ O. C. GRUNER, *A Treatise on the Canon of Medicine of Avicenna*, Luzac & Co., London 1930.

²⁷ *Kitāb al-Adwīyat [sic] al-Qalbīyah* by Ibn Sīnā, translated by H. A. LATIF, Iran Society, Calcutta 1956, pp. 31-122. The four manuscripts on which it is based are (the list number is that of the inventory provided as Appendix I): 33) London, British Library, Or. 5280; 34) London, British Library, Or. 5719; 46) St. Petersburg, State University Library, 171 Rosen; with the addition of a not further specified manuscript from New Delhi. For the notice on this translation see KHAN, *Ibn Sina's Treatise* cit., p. 49, and the preface (p. 7) by Hakeem Abdul Hameed to the English translation of the *Adwīya Qalbiyya* (see n. 28 below).

²⁸ *Risāla al-Adwīya al-qalbiyya. Avicenna's Tract on Cardiac Drugs and Essays on Arab Cardiotherapy*, H. A. HAMEED ed., Institute of History of Medicine and Medical Research, New Delhi, India - Institute of Health and Tibbi (Medical) Research Karachi, Pakistan, Hamdard Foundation Press, Karachi 1983.

²⁹ See, for example, ms. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 4719 preserving an anonymous Hebrew translation of the *Adwīya Qalbiyya*. On these translations see the book review M. S. KHAN, *Avicenna's Tract on Cardiac Drugs and Essays on Arab Cardiotherapy*, ed. By H. A. Hameed (New Delhi and Karachi) 1983, pp. 216, « Indian Journal of History of Science », 21/1, 1986, pp. 77-83, in part. p. 78.

2. THE REASONS FOR AL-ĞŪZĞĀNĪ'S SELECTED INSERTION

The most fundamental issue that the reader has to address in approaching this text is the reason why al-ĞŪzğānī decided to insert this excerpt from the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* between the fourth and the fifth treatise of Avicenna's *Nafs*.

D. Gutas briefly suggested that al-ĞŪzğānī « added some passages from this treatise at the end of the Book Four, Section Four of the *De anima* of the *Šifā'* (*Nafs* 201 Rahman) manifestly because in the last lines of that section Avicenna says that he treated extensively that subject in his medical books (*fī kutubinā ṭ-ṭibbiyya* [IV, 4, p. 201, 13]) »³⁰. Although I agree that the reference to the *medical books* at the end of *Nafs*, IV, 4 might have prompted al-ĞŪzğānī to insert this excerpt, the reason why he chooses precisely this work, and precisely chapters 2-9, remains to be explained. However, in order to answer these sub-questions, it is necessary to outline the context of the insertion.

After having provided the theoretical framework of the investigation of the soul (treatise I), having inquired into the external senses with the exclusion of sight (treatise II), having provided a close scrutiny of vision (treatise III), and before dealing with the intellect and its most specific activity (treatise V), Avicenna devotes the fourth treatise of his *Nafs* to the investigation of the internal senses³¹. This treatise consists of four chapters: IV, 1 contains a general survey of the internal senses belonging to animals³²; IV, 2 deals with the imagery or form-bearing faculty, the imaginative or cogitative faculty, and a mode of prophecy related to the imaginative faculty ('imaginative prophecy')³³; IV, 3 inquiries into estimation and memory³⁴; and IV, 4 deals with the locomotive faculty and

³⁰ GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (second edition) cit., p. 514.

³¹ For this reason in some manuscripts this treatise bears the general title 'On the internal senses' (*Fī l-ḥawāss al-bāṭina*). In *Nafs*, I, 5 Avicenna lists internal senses and their functions as follows: *al-ḥiss al-muštarak* (or *baṭṭāsiyā/ḥaṭṭāsiyā*), the 'common sense', in which the data perceived by the external senses are collected and distinguished; *al-muṣawwira*, the 'form-bearing faculty' or *al-ḥayāl*, 'imagery', in which the sensible forms perceived by the common sense are collected; *al-mutaḥayyila*, the 'imaginative faculty' or 'imagination', which combines or distinguishes the sensible forms and which is called *al-mufakkira*, the 'cogitative faculty', when it is used by the intellect in order to combine or distinguish concepts; *al-waḥm*, 'estimation', which perceives the non-sensible attributes of what is perceived by the external senses; *al-ḥāfiẓa* or *al-mutaḍakkira*, 'memory', in which the attributes and the notions perceived by estimation are collected.

³² [Chapter] containing a general discourse on the internal senses belonging to animals.

³³ [Chapter] on the activities of the form-bearing and the cogitative faculties among these internal senses, and containing the discourse on sleep, wakefulness, the true and false vision and a mode of the properties of prophecy.

³⁴ [Chapter] on the activities of the faculty of memory and estimation and on the fact that all their activities make use of bodily organs.

a mode of prophecy related to it ('operative prophecy')³⁵. In particular, in this chapter Avicenna distinguishes the perceptive faculties to which judgment and perception pertain, from desire, which propels the living being to locomotion; in this context he singles out the branches of the desiderative faculty, i.e. the irascible and the concupiscible faculty, and their accidents, such as fear, sadness, grief, etc., and he says that these accidents belong primarily to the soul insofar as it is in the body, and only derivatively to the body, on which they can act by changing its temperament, and in which at the same time they begin to exist. After having described the soul's capacity to act on its own body, Avicenna describes the soul's capacity to act on a different body: this is the 'operative prophecy' belonging to the prophet's soul. Then, he points out the corruptibility of all animal faculties, and adds a conclusive remark:

Text 2. *Nafs*, IV, 4, p. 201, 13-16 [p. 67, 70-75]:

« We have already dealt in our medical books (*fī kutubinā al-tibbiyya*) with the cause (*sabab*) of the dispositions of individuals, who differ in their temper and according to the difference of their states, towards happiness, sadness, anger, forbearance, rancour, blamelessness, etc., in a way that is not found in the predecessors (*li-l-mutaqaddimīna*) in similar detail and [degree of] validation (*fī tafṣīlihi wa-taḥṣīlihi*). Then, let it be read there ».

In these conclusive lines Avicenna mentions again the accidents of the branches of the desiderative faculty he has dealt with before in the same chapter (pp. 196, 1 - 197, 11), in order to add that, if one wishes to know the cause of the different dispositions of individuals towards these accidents, he should look to not further specified *medical books* where this subject is extensively treated. However, Avicenna does not limit himself to this footnote-like comment, but specifies the value of the text he is referring to: it is unparalleled in terms of articulation and precision (*tafṣīl*)³⁶, and ascertainment and validation (*taḥṣīl*) of the investigation in that field; thus, it represents a valuable supplement to the treatment of individual dispositions in the *Nafs*. Avicenna seems therefore to have a precise work in mind. Al-Ġūzġānī spells out this reference by adding here chapters 2-9 from the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya*.

The fact that al-Ġūzġānī interpreted Avicenna's reference to the *medical books* and his praise for the uniqueness of the investigation conducted therein as

³⁵ [Chapter] on the states of the locomotive faculties and a mode of prophecy connected with them.

³⁶ On Avicenna's use of *tafṣīl*, see A. BERTOLACCI, *The Reception of Aristotle's Metaphysics in Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā' . A milestone of Western Metaphysical Thought*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2006, p. 611, n. 23.

a reference to the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* might be explained by considering a passage from the *Qānūn* where Avicenna deals with the anatomy and the affections of the heart, and outlines the peculiar character of the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*.

Text 3. *Qānūn*, III, xi, i, 7, pp. 406, 23-407, 1 [*Liber III, Fen XI, Tractatus I, cap. 6, p. 277f, 23-26*]:

« Chapter [concerning] the general rules of the medical treatment of the heart.

We have [composed] a separate treatise (*maqāla mufrada*) on cardiac remedies (*fi l-adwiya al-qalbiyya*). When someone combines his knowledge of medicine with his knowledge of the fundamental principles that are more general than [the principles of] medicine (*idā ǧama'a al-insān bayna ma 'rifatihi bi-l-ṭibb wa-ma 'rifatihi bi-l-uṣūl allatī hiya a'ammu min al-ṭibb*), he takes advantage of it (*intafa'a bihā*)³⁷. But for now, we will point out what must be said in standard medical books (*fi l-kutub al-ṭibbiyya al-sādiǧa*) ».

This passage is a *unicum* in the *Qānūn* (but also elsewhere) since it seems to be the only case — at least to my knowledge — of Avicenna's explicit reference to another of his works and in such a circumstantial manner. What is more, the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* seems also to enjoy a special status within Avicenna's medical writings since, unlike the 'standard medical books', it combines the knowledge of medicine with that of the fundamental principles (*uṣūl*), which transcends the boundaries of medicine, and properly pertains to philosophy.

Avicenna has clearly said not to approve this sort of combination in the case of medicine as well as in the case of other particular sciences. In the opening lines of the *Qānūn*³⁸, where the epistemological status of medicine is outlined, Avicenna maintains that its philosophical and epistemological underpinnings, that is, the theory and principles of humoral pathology, are given in natural philosophy — the theoretical science to which medicine is said to be subordinated — and declares that their investigation is off-limits to the physician, who has to accept them on authority; the reason is that the first principles of particular sciences are taken as granted in those sciences and proven demonstratively only

³⁷ I interpret the pronoun *hā* as a reference to the *maqāla* occurring in the preceding sentence. Although *hā* can be also referred to the *ma 'rifa* in the same sentence, I think that here, in dealing with the advantage represented by a certain kind of knowledge, Avicenna is referring to the work (*maqāla*) containing that knowledge (*ma 'rifa*), and not to the knowledge itself. For in the opening line of this chapter Avicenna defers the ascertainment of 'the general rules of the medical treatment of the heart' to a certain work, namely the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*, and then he goes on to explain the nature of this work and the advantage deriving from the knowledge of what is contained therein.

³⁸ For this passage, see *Qānūn*, p. 36, 3-17. This text has been translated and analyzed in D. GUTAS, *Medical Theory and Scientific Method in the Age of Avicenna*, in D. C. REISMAN ed., with the assistance of A. H. AL-RAHIM, *Before and After Avicenna. Proceedings of the First Conference of the Avicenna Study Group*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2003, pp. 145-162, in part. pp. 149-151.

in other and higher sciences (this process continues until the first principles of all sciences are ultimately established in metaphysics³⁹). Among the things that the physician must accept on authority, Avicenna lists the psychic faculties, their existence, their number, and their location. Consequently, in dealing with the diseases related to and affecting the psychic faculties, Avicenna has to assume their ascertainment provided in natural philosophy and, notably, in psychology⁴⁰. This statement chimes with what Avicenna says in his *Risāla fī Aqsām al-‘ulūm al-‘aqliyya* (*Epistle on the Divisions of the Intellectual Sciences*), where he classes medicine as a derivative natural science (*al-hikma al-ṭabī‘iyya al-far‘iyya*)⁴¹. Then, despite its being part of Avicenna’s medical corpus, the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya* somehow contravenes what has been posited in the *Qānūn*, and stands at the crossroads between (natural) philosophy and medicine. The preeminence that Avicenna seems to assign to the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya* among his medical writings⁴² in the *Qānūn* and obliquely in the *Nafs*, together with the specific subject of this treatise, might have precisely been the reason for al-Ġūzġānī’s insertion.

In addition to this, Avicenna’s *Qānūn* seems to provide a supplementary reason for al-Ġūzġānī’s insertion. In the first book Avicenna recalls the psychological basis of the medical investigation, which has to be assumed by the physician and investigated by the natural philosopher, as has already been

³⁹ For the fact that the principles of each particular science are investigated by and ultimately founded in metaphysics, see *Ilāhiyyāt*, 1, 2, pp. 14, 18-15, 3 (Cairo ed.) [p. 15, 72-77 (Van Riet ed.)], and 3, p. 18, 12-17 [p. 20, 67-76]. On this passage, see BERTOLACCI, *The Reception of Aristotle’s Metaphysics* cit., in part. pp. 124-125. Avicenna might have drawn the idea of the subalternation of the particular sciences to a common, higher science (= metaphysics?) that proves the principles of the other, subordinated sciences, from Themistius’ paraphrase of Aristotle’s *Post. An.*, I, 9, 76a8-17. On this topic, see A. BERTOLACCI, *Avicenna and Averroes on the Proof of God’s Existence and the Subject-Matter of Metaphysics*, « Medioevo », 32, 2007, pp. 61-97, in part. p. 72.

⁴⁰ It is noteworthy that the theoretical underpinnings of Avicenna’s medical investigation, to which he refers in the first part of the *Qānūn*, seem to be derived from Galen’s works instead of — for example — from the part on natural philosophy of Avicenna’s *summae*. On the relationship between the first part of Avicenna’s *Qānūn* and the natural philosophy of the *Šifā’*, see my forthcoming paper *Avicenna’s treatment of nutrition in psychology and medicine: Intersection or Subalternation?*.

⁴¹ See IBN SİNĀ, *R. fī Aqsām al-‘ulūm al-‘aqliyya*, in *Rasā’il fī l-hikma wa-l-ṭabī‘iyyāt*, 2 vols., Dār al-‘Arab, Cairo 1980², p. 110, 8-10. On the relationship between medicine and philosophy, see P. E. PORMANN, *Avicenna on Medical Practice, Epistemology, and the Physiology of the Inner Senses*, in P. ADAMSON ed., *Interpreting Avicenna*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2013, pp. 91-108, in part. pp. 92-95; and my forthcoming paper *Avicenna’s treatment of nutrition in psychology and medicine*.

⁴² The preeminence of the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya* among Avicenna’s medical works is attested also in the Latin tradition where it circulated together with the *Qānūn* and the *Urġūza*. In a document dated to 19th January 1524, in which Paolo, Andrea Alpago’s nephew, asks the Venetian senate the permission to publish his uncle’s translations, the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya* is referred to as *Sextus de viribus cordis*, that is, the *Sixth* [book of the *Qānūn*] on cardiac faculties, probably due to the mode of their circulation. On this fact, see VAN RIET, *Trois traductions* cit., p. 341.

said. There, in outlining what the vital faculty (*quwwa ḥayawāniyya*, *virtus vitalis*) is according to physicians⁴³, Avicenna maintains that some issues concerning this as well as other psychic faculties cannot be settled in medicine, because they involve philosophical notions like unity and multiplicity. Therefore, only philosophy, notably natural philosophy, is entitled to deal with them. For instance, Avicenna does not answer the question, about which physicians and philosophers disagree, as to whether there is one soul for each activity in each limb or there is one single soul from which different faculties with different activities emanate in limbs⁴⁴. Or, in a more specific context, he does not answer the question as to whether the vital faculty, which has anger, fear, and the like as its own affections caused by another faculty, is for this very reason one or many, but defers the settlement of this issue to natural philosophy⁴⁵.

Now, the general question concerning the unity or multiplicity of the soul is actually answered in *Nafs*, V, 7, where the soul is said to be the incorporeal bond (*ribāṭ*, p. 253, 3, 6 [*vinculum*, p. 158, 95, 00]), that is, the unifying principle, of the psychic faculties observable in bodies. By contrast, no answer to the specific question about the vital faculty can be found therein, and this is because there is no reference to the vital faculty in Avicenna's *Nafs* in particular, and in his psychology in general⁴⁶. As we have said, in *Nafs*, IV, 4 Avicenna briefly maintains that anger, fear, and the like are accidents of the two branches of the desiderative faculty⁴⁷, and that different bodily temperaments dispose individuals towards these different accidents. However, in the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*, and precisely in the chapters added by al-Ğūzğānī, Avicenna, though not mentioning the vital faculty to which in the *Qānūn* emotions are said to be

⁴³ *Qānūn*, I, i, vi, 4, p. 126, 19-21 [*Liber I, Fen I, Doctrina VI*, cap. 4, p. 27a, 4-7]: « As for the vital faculty, they (sc. physicians) intend by it the faculty that, when it comes to be in the limbs, it prepares them to the reception of the faculty of sensation and motion, and to the activities of life, and [they] add to them (sc. to the activities of life) the motions of fear and anger because they find in that extension and contraction occurring to the pneuma related to this faculty ». On the Galenic terminology of Avicenna's outline of psychology in medicine, see n. 50 below.

⁴⁴ *Qānūn*, I, i, vi, 4, p. 127, 18-20 [*Liber I, Fen I, Doctrina VI*, cap. 4, p. 27c, 39-41]: « [(...)], and likewise in each limb to each genus of activities — according to them (sc. physicians) — belongs another soul, therefore the soul would not be one single [thing] from which faculties emanate, or the soul would belong to the sum of this whole ».

⁴⁵ *Qānūn*, I, i, vi, 4, p. 128, 4-7 [*Liber I, Fen I, Doctrina VI*, cap. 4, p. 27d, 60-63]: « And since anger, fear, and what is similar to these two are [each] an affection of this faculty (sc. of the vital faculty), although their (sc. of anger, fear, etc.) principle is sensation, estimation, and perceptive faculties, they are related to this faculty (sc. to the vital faculty). But the verified clarification (lit. the verification of the clarification) of this faculty, whether it is one or more than one, it pertains to the natural science, which is part of philosophy ».

⁴⁶ See n. 50 below.

⁴⁷ With respect to the accidents of the irascible faculty Avicenna adds that they occur « with participation of the perceptive faculties » (*bi-mušāraka min al-quwā al-darrāka*, p. 196, 1-2 [*propter communionem quam habent virtutes apprehendentes*, p. 58, 27]).

linked⁴⁸, deals *ex professo* with anger, fear, and the like: they are received in the cardiac pneuma, of which they are affections, in accordance with the appropriate bodily temperament, and their cause is to be searched for in the perceptive faculties. Therefore, al-Ğüzğānī, who knew Avicenna's *Qānūn*, and commented upon some of its difficult passages, might have had this passage in mind, and decided to add chapters 2-9 of the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* at the end of *Nafs*, IV, 4 precisely because he deemed it a good supplement to the brief treatment of the same topic in the *Nafs*⁴⁹.

As has been said earlier, in the first part of the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* Avicenna provides a medico-psychological account of emotions and, in particular, of the cause of individual dispositions towards them, i.e. the qualities (thickness, fluidity, opacity, clarity) of the cardiac pneuma, which in turn can be modified by external factors. This account perfectly fits with their philosophical treatment as accidents of the irascible and the concupiscible faculty in the *Nafs*, and with the deferment of the ascertainment of their cause to another work (possibly to the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*). Moreover, on a general level, despite the presence of Galenic terminology here and there⁵⁰, and the Galenic influence on the treatise⁵¹, the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* exhibits a cardiocentrism, though limited to the treatment of emotions and cardiac diseases⁵², that is in line with Aristotle's view: in this way, the theoretical framework of the investigation conducted in the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* does not seem to conflict with the Aristotelian orientation of Avicenna's *Nafs*, in

⁴⁸ See n. 45 above.

⁴⁹ The fact that for al-Ğüzğānī it was natural to look in the *Šifā'* for the philosophical background that the *Qānūn* presupposes, can be easily explained since these two works have been conceived as complementary, one providing the theoretical background of the other. This complementarity is not only reflected in structural analogies and cross-references, but also emerges from Avicenna's teaching praxis. For in his *Biography* it is reported that, during his stay in Hamadān (1015-1024) serving at the court of the Kākūyid emir Šams al-Dawla, Avicenna wrote the part on natural philosophy of the *Šifā'*, approximately ten years later the completion of the first book of the *Qānūn*, and gave lessons to a certain number of students who every night gathered in his house, and read in parallel passages from the two works. See *The Life of Ibn Sina. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*, ed. GOHLMAN cit., pp. 54.4 - 56.1.

⁵⁰ It is noteworthy that in the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* Avicenna refers to the Galenic tripartition of the faculties of the soul into natural (*ṭabī'iyya*), vital (*ḥayawāniyya*), and psychic (*naḥsāniyya*) faculty, which are in turn related to three different types of pneuma. See, for example, the mention of *quwā naḥsāniyya* (pp. 8, 13; 9, 5 [*virtutes animales*, pp. 195, 40; 196, 53]); *quwwa ḥayawāniyya* (p. 9, 2 [*virtus spiritualis*, p. 196, 49]); *quwwa ṭabī'iyya* (p. 12, 4, 5, 12 [*virtus naturalis*, pp. 201, 31-2, 33; 203, 46]). On this terminology, see my forthcoming paper *Avicenna's treatment of nutrition in psychology and medicine*.

⁵¹ See, in particular, Avicenna's statements about the anatomy and physiology of the heart and the circulation of blood.

⁵² In the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* Avicenna specifies that the primacy of the heart, on the creation of which depends the creation of all other organs, is a debated issue (*bi-ḥasabī ihtilāf al-maḍāhib fi ḍālīka al-wāḥid*, p. 2, 6-7).

which however there are many medical teachings (cavities of the brain, nerves, etc.), as well as of the *Šifā'* in its entirety.

In this connection, the reason for al-ĞŪZĞĀNĪ's selected insertion can be easily explained. First of all, the choice to add chapters 2-9 by skipping chapter 1 seems to have been dictated by reasons of both accuracy and argumentative strategy. As for the accuracy, chapter 1 belongs to the first, medico-psychological part of the treatise, and therefore it ideally fulfills the requirements for being inserted within the *Nafs* together with chapters 2-9; however, precisely because of the issues treated therein, its content partially overlaps that of *Nafs*, V, 8, where the primacy of the heart over other bodily organs, its physiology, and the cardiac pneuma are dealt with, and therefore its addition to the *Nafs* would have been redundant. As for the argumentative strategy, in this chapter the centrality of the heart and of its pneuma as a vehicle for the psychic faculties is maintained⁵³; however, this does not automatically imply an absolute cardiocentrism, namely that the heart is the source of all psychic faculties, as Aristotle maintained. In particular, in the brief doxography provided therein, Avicenna contrasts the opinion ascribed to 'the greatest of philosophers' (*ağallu al-ḥukamā'*, p. 2, 8, probably a reference to Aristotle), according to which the heart is the source of all psychic faculties, and that ascribed to not further specified opponents (*muḥālifūna*, p. 2, 14, probably a reference to Galen and his followers), according to which the source at least of the perceptive faculties is the brain. Therefore, given that the correctness of the Aristotelian position was not unequivocally established, al-ĞŪZĞĀNĪ might have considered it wiser not to include this chapter among those of his insertion.

Secondly, in chapters 2-9 there are at least three passages in which the aforementioned theoretical proximity between natural philosophy and medicine is explicitly stated. They are tellingly placed at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the text of the insertion. The first passage has a general tone: it shows that 'the philosophers and those of the physicians who followed them' (*al-ḥukamā' wa-atbā'uhum min al-aṭibbā'*, p. 5, 2, *sapientes et sequaces eorum*, p. 190, 47) agree upon the fact that happiness, sadness, fear, and anger are among the affections that are proper to the cardiac pneuma⁵⁴. On a less general level, in the second passage a parallel is established between the inquiry Avicenna is embarking on, i.e. that into the conditions of happiness and sadness, which are the strength/weakness of the psychic faculties and

⁵³ *Edviyei Kalbiye* (Arabic text), ed. KILISI, p. 1, 7-8: « God — may He be praised — created the left ventricle of the heart, depository (*ḥizāna*) of the pneuma and origin (*ma'din*) of its generation, and created the pneuma as vehicle (*maṭīyya*) of the psychic faculties by means of which they penetrate in the bodily limbs ».

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5, 2-3 [p. 190, 47-49].

the quality of the pneuma, and a similar investigation conducted in natural philosophy (*wa-ammā al-naẓar alladī huwa ašbahu bi-l-baḥṭ al-ṭabīʿi fa-li-anna* [...], p. 12, 3, *Quod autem magis convenit speculationi naturali considerare, hoc est quod* [...], p. 201, 30), which might be interpreted as a perspective reference to *Nafs*, IV, 4, p. 196, 1-8 where Avicenna hints at the way in which affections occur in the branches of the desiderative faculty⁵⁵. Lastly, on a more specific level, the third passage exhibits something more than a general theoretical proximity of (natural) philosophy and medicine, namely a real dependence of the medical discourse on the psychological investigation: for there the treatment of rancour (*ḥiqd*, p. 15, 2, *memoria iniuriarum*, p. 207, n. 27) and the consequent desire for revenge (*al-šawq ilā l-intiqām*, p. 15, 2, *desiderium vindictae*, p. 207, 27) are explicitly associated to the operation of two internal senses, i.e. imagery (*ḥayāl*, *imaginatio*) and memory (*dīkr*, *memoria*)⁵⁶.

Thirdly, in chapters 2-9 there are what al-Ġūzġānī may have considered as three perspective references to three different sections of the *Šifāʾ* (I say *perspective references* because Avicenna wrote the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya* in 1014-15, and the *Šifāʾ* between 1020-1027)⁵⁷. The first reference occurs at p. 6, 7-8 [p. 192, 76-77, in the Latin translation the mention of the title of the work is missing]. There, in arguing that happiness is a sort of pleasure, and in explaining how it can be experienced, Avicenna provides the principle according to which misconception (*sahw*, *error*) derives from taking what is *per accidens* in lieu of what is *per se* by referring in general terms to *Kitāb Sufisṭiqā* (*Book of Sophistics*), by which he might refer to Aristotle's *Sophistical Refutations*. In the *Šifāʾ* Avicenna expounds this doctrine in *Safsāṭa* (*Sophistics*), I, 3, pp. 20, 8 - 21, 10 where this type of misconception is treated⁵⁸. The second reference occurs at p. 7, 7-9 [p. 193, 3-5], where the cause of the disposition towards pleasure is said to be the quality and the quantity of the pneuma. The relation of the disposition to perceive pleasure to the characteristics of the substance of pneuma is justified by referring to another general principle, which has become clear in natural philosophy (*ʿalā mā tabayyana fī l-uṣūl al-ṭabīʿiyya, sicut declaratum est in principiis naturalium*): the more the substance in magnitude, the greater the power in strength. Al-Ġūzġānī might have connected this reference with *Afʿāl wa-Infiʿālāt* (*Activities and affections*) of the *Šifāʾ*, I, 4, since this chapter bears precisely the title: *Chapter on the notification of what is said about the fact that the more the*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12, 3 ff. [p. 201, 30 ff.].

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15, 1 ff. [p. 207, 27 ff.].

⁵⁷ On the chronology of these Avicennian works, see GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (second edition) cit., pp. 106-109; 514.

⁵⁸ *Safsāṭa* is the seventh section of the logical part of the *Šifāʾ*, corresponding to Aristotle's *Sophistical Refutations*.

magnitude of bodies, the more their strength⁵⁹. Lastly, at p. 10, 1-2 [p. 198, 74-5], in listing the causes of happiness and sadness, Avicenna refers to *Kitāb Riṭūriqā ay Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* (Books of Rhetoric)⁶⁰, possibly a reference to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, where other causes of these two emotions are said to have been dealt with (*wa-ḡayr dālīka min al-umūr al-muḥṣā fi Kitāb Riṭūriqā ay Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba, et cetera quae nominavimus in rhetoricis*). In the *Šifā'* Avicenna deals with the causes of these emotions in *Ḥiṭāba* (Rhetoric), III, 4⁶¹.

As for the exclusion of chapters 10-19 of the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* from al-ĞŪzĞĀNĪ's insertion, it can be easily explained by referring to their content: they are devoted to pharmacology, that is, to an aspect of practical medicine, which, unlike the medico-psychological discussion contained in chapters 2-9, does not fit with the philosophical treatment of the soul provided in the *Nafs*.

In sum, al-ĞŪzĞĀNĪ's choice of adding *Adwiya Qalbiyya*, 2-9 to *Nafs*, IV, 4 seems to be pertinent, and his operation accurate and informed.

3. THE ARABIC TEXTUAL TRADITION OF THE INSERTION

About the Arabic textual tradition of this insertion, Simone Van Riet simply says that « *plusieurs manuscrits arabes [du Šifā'] insèrent ces chapitres là où les situe la tradition manuscrite latine* »⁶². Therefore, we remain uninformed about the approximate amount of the many (*plusieurs*) Arabic manuscripts containing this insertion.

The current editions of the Arabic text of Avicenna's *Nafs* are of little help in that respect. As is common knowledge, there are five complete printed versions of Avicenna's *Nafs*, none of them providing a stemma codicum: (i) the Tehran lithography, published in Tehran in 1303/1885-6, which contains the natural philosophy and the metaphysics of the *Šifā'*, and is the reproduction of a manuscript, or a group of manuscripts, whose identity however has not been established yet; (ii) the edition made by Ján Bakoš in 1956⁶³, which is based on

⁵⁹ *Af'āl wa-Infi'ālāt* is the fourth section of the natural philosophy part of the *Šifā'*, corresponding to Aristotle's *Meteorology*, IV.

⁶⁰ *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* is the eighth section of the logical part of the *Šifā'*, corresponding to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

⁶¹ The general impression is that in the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* Avicenna is referring to the Aristotelian tradition of these disciplines, namely sophistics, meteorology, rhetoric, perhaps as treated by himself in his pre-1015 writings, possibly in his early *summae* like the *Kitāb al-Maǧmū'* or *al-Ḥikma al-'Arūḍiyya* (*The Compilation or Philosophy for 'Arūḍī*), which was written approximately in 391H/1000-1 (see GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (second edition) cit., pp. 86-93).

⁶² See n. 2 above.

⁶³ *Psychologie d'Ibn Sīnā (Avicenne), d'après son oeuvre al-Shifā'*, vol. I: Texte arabe, vol. II: traduction annotée, J. BAKOŠ ed., Travaux de l'Académie Tchecoslovaque des Sciences. Section de linguistique et de littérature, Prague 1956.

five manuscripts and the Tehran lithography; (iii) the edition made by Fazlur Rahman in 1959⁶⁴, which is based on eight manuscripts, the Tehran lithography, a manuscript containing the Latin translation of the work carried out in Toledo in the mid-twelfth century, and the Venice edition of the Latin text published in 1508; (iv) the edition made by G. C. Anawati and S. Zayed in 1975⁶⁵, which is based on the same manuscripts used by the two preceding editors with the addition of two more manuscripts; and, finally, (v) the edition made by Ḥ. Ḥ. al-Āmulī, for which, however, the manuscript basis is not clear⁶⁶.

The aforementioned editions (with the exclusion of the Tehran lithographed edition and the Āmulī edition), as well as the witnesses on which they are based are listed in the table below.

Table. 1

Manuscripts	Bakoš ed.	Rahman ed.	Anawati-Zayed ed.
Cairo, Maktabat Al-Azhar al-Šarīf, Beḥīt Collection 44988, 331 <i>falsafa</i>		x	x
Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now : Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā'iq al-Qawmiyya), 262 <i>ḥikma wa-falsafa</i>		x	x
Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now : Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā'iq al-Qawmiyya), 894 <i>falsafa</i>			x

⁶⁴ *Avicenna's De Anima (Arabic Text), being the Psychological Part of Kitāb al-Šifā'*, F. RAHMAN ed., Oxford University Press, London - New York - Toronto 1959; 1970².

⁶⁵ *Kitāb al-Šifā' : al-Ṭabī'iyāt*, vol. 6 : *al-Nafs*, G. C. ANAWATI, S. ZAYED eds., revised edition by I. MADKOUR, Al-Hay'a al-miṣriyya al-ʿamma li-l-kitāb, Cairo 1975.

⁶⁶ *AVICENNA, al-Nafs min kitāb al-Šifā'*, ed. Ḥ. Ḥ. AL-ĀMULĪ, Maktab al-l'ām al-Islāmī, Markaz al-Nashr, Qum 1417/1996-7. In the introduction (p. 6) Āmulī writes that he used several manuscripts of the *Šifā'* preserved in his collection; however, he does not provide any description of them. From the images printed at the end of his edition, it can be inferred that he had at least five manuscripts at his disposal: 1) a manuscript copied by Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ġa'far, known as Ḥalīl, on Saturday 15 Šawwal 1128H/2 October 1716 (pp. 369-370); 2) a manuscript copied in Safar 1011H/July-August 1602 (pp. 371-72); 3) a manuscript, containing the *Nafs* together with the excerpt from the *Adwiyā Qalbiyya*, dated to XI/XVII on the basis of the handwriting (p. 373); 4) a manuscript, containing the *Nafs* and the *Kitāb al-Nabāt* (*Book of Plants*), i.e. the seventh section of the natural philosophy part of the *Šifā'*, dated after XI/XVII on the basis of the handwriting (p. 374); 5) a manuscript dated after IX/XV on the basis of the handwriting (pp. 375-376).

Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 822		x	x
Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 4 (Golius Collection) (Catalogue CCO, n. 1444)		x	x
Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 84 (Golius Collection) (Catalogue CCO, n. 1445)		x	x
London, India Office (now : British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections), Ar. 1796 (n. 476 in Loth catalogue)	x	x	x
London, British Museum (now : British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections), Or. 2873 (British Museum Suppl. 711)	x		x
London, British Museum (now : British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections), Or. 7500			x
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 114	x		x
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 116	x	x	x
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 125	x	x	x
Tehran, Lithographed edition	x	x	x
Basel, D III 7 (Latin translation)		x	x
Venice edition (Latin translation)		x	x

In the critical apparatus of their editions, Bakoš and Rahman note that between the fourth and the fifth treatise of the text of Avicenna's *Nafs*, some of the manuscripts on which their editions are based contain an excerpt from Avicenna's *Adwiya Qalbiyya*⁶⁷. However, after having verified that this insertion was extraneous to the text of the *Nafs*, they both decided not to print it. What happened in the Cairo edition is more baffling : although some of the manuscripts

⁶⁷ *Psychologie d'Ibn Sīnā (Avicenne)*, p. 197, n. 6 ; *Avicenna's De Anima (Arabic Text)*, p. 201, n. 11.

consulted contain the insertion — as the direct inspection of these manuscripts discloses — the editors did not even record its presence in their apparatus⁶⁸.

In my current research I have drafted a provisional list of 172 manuscripts containing the second part of Avicenna's *Šifā'*, i.e. that on natural philosophy. 130 of these manuscripts⁶⁹ contain the *Nafs*: of the 89 manuscripts that I have inspected, however, only 84 have been taken into account since 5 manuscripts do not contain the fourth treatise at the end of which the excerpt is inserted⁷⁰. Only 23 manuscripts contain al-Ğüzğānī's insertion (24 if we consider the information provided by F. Rahman about the ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 262 *ḥikma wa-falsafa*, as containing the entire insertion, to which I did not have direct access). Besides these manuscripts, two more manuscripts, though not containing the insertion, have some references to the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*⁷¹.

That this portion of text is extraneous to Avicenna's *Nafs* is reflected in the table of contents that 13 manuscripts over the 23 containing the insertion⁷² provide at the beginning of the fourth treatise. There, this insertion is not indicated as part of the fourth treatise. What is more, in ms. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2441, f. 233r. the copyist points out the peculiar nature of this text by writing at the end of *Nafs*, IV, 4: « *And the discourse by Abū 'Ubayd al-Ğüzğānī follows it [sc. the fourth treatise] before the fifth treatise* » (*wa-yatlūhā kalām li-Abī 'Ubayd al-Ğüzğānī qabla al-maqāla al-ḥāmisa*).

In addition to the incipit and the explicit (see Text 1 above), in some of these manuscripts the insertion is also indicated in the margin. Two examples can be provided. (i) In ms. Tehran, Kitābhānah-i Milli Ğumhūri-yi Islami-yi Iran (National Library), 1327, p. 126, the Persian note 'Ğüzğānī's addition to the *Šifā'*' (*afzuda Ğüzğānī bar Šifā'*) can be read in the margin⁷³; perhaps in order to render immediately visible the extraneousness of this text to the work in which it is included. (ii) In ms. Cairo, Maktabat Al-Azhar al-Šarif, Beḥīt Collection 44988, 331 *falsafa*, f. 274r, there is an important marginal note. This note, which has been misunderstood

⁶⁸ *Kitāb al-Šifā'*: al-Ṭabī'īyyāt, vol. 6: *al-Nafs*, p. 178.

⁶⁹ A list of the 130 manuscripts is provided as Appendix II at the end of the present article.

⁷⁰ These five manuscripts are (the list number is that of the inventory provided as Appendix II): 39) Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Carullah 1333 (this ms. has actually a lacuna between *Nafs*, IV, 3 and V, 7); 77) Mashhad, Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 771; 85) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 114; 86) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 116; 94) Qum, Markaz-i Iḥyā'-i Mīrāt-i Islāmī, 3054.

⁷¹ In ms. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 4, f. 251r there is the entire text of the incipit of the insertion in the margin in correspondence with the end of the fourth treatise; and in ms. Mashhad, Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 13963, f. 99v in the margin there is the reference to the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* in correspondence with Avicenna's reference to his *medical books* ('*min kutubihī al-muštamila 'alā mā ḏakara kitābuhū fī l-adwiya al-qalbiyya*', [reference] from his books [sc. Avicenna's medical books] including what his book On Cardiac Remedies mentioned).

⁷² The other 10 manuscripts do not provide any table of contents of the fourth treatise.

⁷³ I wish to thank dr. Ivana Panzeca for having helped me read this note.

by D. al-Yāsīn⁷⁴, shows that the insertion was not attested in all the manuscripts consulted by the copyist, and that in all likelihood it was retrieved by means of collation: «*what al-Ğüzğānī added [sc. to the Kitāb al-Nafs] is what is written on two folios from here, which is found in some manuscripts, while is not found in some other*» (*allatī alḥaqahū al-Ğüzğānī al-maktūb fī l-waraqatayni min hāhunā fī ba'ḍ al-nusaḥ mawğūd wa-fī ba'ḍihā lā yakūnu mawğūdan*). This is clearly visible since two folios containing the insertion have been physically added to the codex.

As for the text of the insertion, the manuscripts do not attest significant variants⁷⁵. By contrast, they attest different divisions of the text: in 13 manuscripts the insertion is divided into two chapters, the first corresponding to chapters 2-6 of the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*, and the second to chapters 7-9; in 4 manuscripts only the first chapter is indicated, while in 2 manuscripts only the second; and in 4 manuscripts the insertion has no internal division. Among the manuscripts indicating the second chapter (either alone or together with the indication of the first chapter) two manuscripts, i.e. ms. Cairo, Maktabat Al-Azhar al-Šarīf, Beḥīt Collection 44988, 331 *falsafa*, and ms. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2441, deserve particular attention because, in addition to the indication of the second chapter, they also attest a title for it, i.e. 'Chapter from the addition of Abū 'Ubayd' (*faṣl min ilḥāq Abī 'Ubayd*), which corresponds to the title attested in the Latin translation for this part of the insertion, i.e. 'Capitulum de additione Auohaueth' (p. 203, 54).

The research on the manuscript tradition of this insertion is in progress, and further discoveries both about the number of manuscripts of Avicenna's *Nafs* in general, and about the number of manuscripts containing the excerpt, are predictable. However, this scenario, namely the presence of al-Ğüzğānī's insertion in a relatively small part of the manuscript tradition⁷⁶, though provisional, can be explained in four different ways.

⁷⁴ Al-Yāsīn misunderstands this note since on the basis of it and of the *explicit* of the insertion, he argues that the main text of this manuscript descends from an exemplar in the possession of al-Ğüzğānī. See *Al-Šifā', al-Ṭabī'īyyāt, I: al-Samā' al-ṭabī'ī*, ed. D. AL-YĀSĪN, Dār al-Manāhil, Beirut 1996, p. 25.

⁷⁵ What varies are the formulae that accompany the names of Avicenna and al-Ğüzğānī, like *raḥimahū Allāh* (may God have mercy upon him), *adāmahū Allāh* (may God make him lasting), or *ḥuğğat al-ḥaqq* ('Proof of the Truth', an epithet that would have been more appropriate to a theologian than to a philosopher). However, these elements do not reveal anything about the history of the manuscripts and their copy (whether, for example, they have been copied before or after the death of Avicenna or al-Ğüzğānī).

⁷⁶ The fact that the insertion is attested in a relatively small part of the manuscript tradition might explain the reason why, unlike what happens in the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs*, in the Latin translation of the insertion there is no trace of revision, as has been argued by S. Van Riet (AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus* IV-V cit., p. 99*): probably in the manuscript(s) on which the Latin translators of the *Nafs* based their revision — of course, if they are also the translators of the insertion — the insertion was not contained.

Firstly, there is the hypothesis according to which al-Ġūzġānī has inserted the excerpt from the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* in the copy he kept, i.e. in a sort of *school copy* of the work of his master, which is compatible with the information al-Ġūzġānī himself provides in the *Prologue* of the *Šifāʾ* about his activity of secretary and amanuensis of Avicenna⁷⁷. This hypothesis is plausible on the proviso that al-Ġūzġānī's copy was the *official* copy from which all the other manuscripts, in different times, were copied. If this is the case, we have to suppose a progressive transformation of the copy that al-Ġūzġānī made from Avicenna's autograph: the copy containing the insertion would reflect a later stage of al-Ġūzġānī's copy, after other copies had already been made from its previous stages, still lacking the insertion. In this case, we would be facing a proper *editorial activity* on the part of al-Ġūzġānī, comparable, within the *Šifāʾ*, to his addition of a *Prologue*, and, outside the *Šifāʾ*, to his addition of the mathematical part to the *Naġāt* and to the *Dānešnāme-ye ʿAlāʾī*⁷⁸. This might provide an explanation of the reason why this insertion is present only in a small part of the manuscript tradition: this insertion would have occurred at a later stage of the hypothetical progressive transformation of the *official* copy made by al-Ġūzġānī.

The second hypothesis is that according to which al-Ġūzġānī would have inserted the excerpt from the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* in his personal working copy, and that small part of the manuscript tradition containing the insertion would depend on this 'private' copy. This hypothesis is plausible on the condition that the 23 manuscripts attesting the insertion share errors that can be explained only by supposing their dependence on a common sub-archetype. We would then not be facing a progressive transformation of al-Ġūzġānī's school copy and, consequently, an editorial activity on his part, but a case of vertical descent of a branch of the manuscript tradition from the manuscript in which the excerpt from the medical work was inserted for the first time, that is, al-Ġūzġānī's personal working copy.

The third hypothesis is that it might well have been the case that the insertion, regardless of where it was originally inserted (either in al-Ġūzġānī's official copy or in his personal copy), was so brazen that some copyists might have decided not to copy it, as the modern editors of the Arabic text of the *Nafs* have done. Or, a non-philosophical copyist, like a theologian, might have skipped the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* because he was not interested in it. In order for this hypothesis to hold

⁷⁷ See IBN SĪNĀ, *al-Šifāʾ*, *al-Mantiq*, *al-Madḥal*, eds. I. MADKŪR, G. Š. QANAWATĪ, M. AL-ḤUDAYRĪ, A. F. AL-AHWĀNĪ, *Al-Maṭbaʿa al-amīriyya*, Cairo 1952, p. 1, 16: «I concerned myself in keeping (*wa-atammu bi-l-dabt*) [what he wrote]». The English translation of this passage is drawn from GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition* (second edition) cit., p. 29.

⁷⁸ On other possible evidence of al-Ġūzġānī's editorial activity on the *Šifāʾ*, see the article by A. Bertolacci in the present volume.

true, all the manuscripts containing the insertion do not have to share errors that can be explained only by supposing a common sub-archetype.

The fourth and last hypothesis, which unlike the preceding three is not Lachmannian, is that according to which a scholar, who is also a copyist *per accidens*, might have retrieved the text of the insertion not because it was attested in the manuscript from which he made his copy, but because he knew that it was attested in another (now lost) important manuscript, belonging to al-ĞŪzğānī or to some other immediate follower of Avicenna, which circulated in his school or was at his disposal. This hypothesis is plausible on the proviso that all the 23 manuscripts attesting the insertion do not show decisive connections or errors that would require a common antigraph to be explained, and retrieve the insertion by means of collation from another manuscript, different from that from which the copy was made.

I do not have a definitive answer, and therefore I will limit myself to formulate some considerations. Although none of the aforementioned hypotheses can be easily ruled out, the deliberate exclusion of this insertion on the part of the copyists, which has been suggested in the third hypothesis, seems less likely, since the author responsible for the insertion is al-ĞŪzğānī, who is the authoritative and well-known author of the *Prologue* of the *Šifā'*. The other alternatives are more likely. I limit myself to observe that, although the second and the fourth hypotheses might appear the most straightforward in order to justify the limited presence of this insertion in the Arabic manuscript tradition, the first hypothesis has the advantage of being more consonant with the *incipit* of the insertion, namely with al-ĞŪzğānī's announcement of his — perhaps unaccomplished — programme of intervention on the *Nafs* of the *Šifā'*, which seems hard to reconcile with a mere annotation on his working copy. However, these are just preliminary and tentative hypotheses: the verification of their validity demands further investigation of the manuscript tradition.

4. EVALUATING THE RELEVANCE OF THIS INSERTION. A CONCLUSION

The aforementioned considerations lead to the final part of this article, namely the conclusive evaluation of the relevance of this insertion. There are several reasons why this insertion is worth being studied. Firstly, a close scrutiny of this insertion might cast some new light on al-ĞŪzğānī's editorial activity on the *Šifā'*. In particular, the *incipit* of this insertion and the specification that most of the inserted materials — *akṭaruhā* — are from the *Adwiya Qalbiyya* leave room for other potential insertions in this place of the *Nafs* from other Avicennian medical works on the part of al-ĞŪzğānī, although he never accomplished them.

Secondly, this insertion is crucial for the reconstruction of the Arabic text of Avicenna's *Adwiya Qalbiyya*: for the editors of this work have never taken

into consideration the manuscript tradition attesting only the insertion, which sometimes seems to witness a better text than that preserved by the manuscripts containing the entire work. Also Rifat Bilge Kilisli, who lists among the inspected manuscripts the ms. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 822, which does contain only the insertion, does not seem to systematically use it in his edition. As to the Latin translation of the insertion, it is not only the most ancient, though partial, Latin translation of this work, but it is also more ancient than the most ancient manuscript used by Rifat Bilge Kilisli. For, the most ancient manuscript used by the Turkish editor, i.e. ms. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Fatih Camii 5316, dates to 590H/1194, while the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs* is dated around 1152-66 and, therefore, is based on a more ancient part of the Arabic manuscript tradition. What is more, according to S. Van Riet, the Latin translation of the insertion contained within the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs* is more faithful to the original Arabic than the Latin translations made by Arnau de Vilanova and by Andrea Alpago⁷⁹.

Lastly, in virtue of its relatively limited presence in the Arabic manuscript tradition of Avicenna's *Nafs*, this insertion might represent a vantage point from which valuable data can be collected in order to circumscribe the part of the Arabic manuscript tradition on which the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Nafs* depends: to this day we do not know exactly on which Arabic manuscript(s) the Latin version is based. In this manner new light can also be shed on the broader picture of the overall stemma codicum of the *Nafs*: the study of this insertion, together with other data, might contribute to isolate a branch of the Arabic tradition of this text.

⁷⁹ VAN RIET, *Trois traductions cit.*, pp. 343-344.

APPENDIX I. INVENTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS CONTAINING THE *MAQĀLA FĪ L-ADWIYA AL-QALBIYYA*

This list gathers all the manuscripts preserving the *Maqāla fī l-adwiya al-qalbiyya* that have been mentioned by Brockelmann, Ergin, Maḥdavi, and Gutas in their inventories, with the addition of some other manuscripts used by R. B. Kilisli and M. Z. al-Bābā, the editors of the Arabic text, and of some manuscripts that I have found in my research on the *Adwiya Qalbiyya*. The pieces of information concerning these manuscripts, e.g. foliation, dating, etc., have been drawn from the aforementioned sources. In square brackets it is also indicated whether the manuscripts have been consulted by the editors of the Arabic text.

Sigla:

B = C. BROCKELMANN, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur* [sic], vols. I-II, Brill, Leiden 1898-1902; 1943-1949² (vol. I, p. 599); suppl. vols. I-III, Brill, Leiden 1937-1949 (suppl. vol. I, p. 827);

E¹ = O. ERGIN, *İbn-i Sina Bibliyografyası*, in *Büyük Türk Filozof ve Tıp Üstadı İbn Sina. Şahsiyeti ve Eserleri Hakkında Tetkikler*, İstanbul 1937, pp. 3-80;

E² = O. ERGIN, *İbn-i Sina Bibliyografyası*, Yalçın Matbaası, İstanbul 1956, p. 8;

G = D. GUTAS, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition. Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works*. Second, revised and enlarged edition, Brill, Leiden 2014, p. 515;

K = *Edviyei Kalbiye* (Arabic text), R. B. KILISLI ed., in *Büyük Türk Filozof ve Tıp Üstadı İbn Sina, Şahsiyeti ve Eserleri Hakkında Tetkikler*, İstanbul 1937, pp. 1-56;

M = Y. MAḤDAVĪ, *Fihrist-i nuṣṣahā-yi muṣannaḥāt-i Ibn-i Sīnā, Intiṣārāt-i Dāniṣṣāh-yi Tihrān*, Tehran 1333/1954, p. 24;

Z = *Min Mu'allafāt Ibn Sīnā al-ṭibbiyya*, M. Z. AL-BĀBĀ ed., *Ma'had al-turāṭ al-ilmī al-ʿarabī*, Aleppo 1404/1984, pp. 221-294.

1. Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi (Faculty of Language, History, and Geography), Fund Ismail Saib I, 3471 (E¹);
2. Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi (Faculty of Language, History, and Geography), Fund Ismail Saib I, 3674 (E¹);
3. Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, 6359 (B, E², M, G);
4. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now : Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā'iq al-Qawmiyya), Qawala, II, 290 (B);
5. Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Ar. 3676, ff. 1r-43r (G);
6. Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, 1995 (B, E², M, G);
7. Hyderabad, Osmaniya University Campus, Oriental Manuscript Library and Research Institute, Ar. 10a (vol. 2);
8. Hyderabad, Osmaniya University Campus, Oriental Manuscript Library and Research Institute, 40585 (vol. 3);
9. Istanbul, Beyazit Kütüphanesi, 'Umūmī 50 (E¹, B);
10. Istanbul, Köprülü Halk Kütüphanesi, 869, ff. 206v-219v (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
11. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, 3456 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
12. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, 3590 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
13. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, 3494 (E¹, B);

14. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, 4894, ff. 316v-326v (E², M, G) [K];
15. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 3699 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K⁸⁰];
16. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 822 (VI-VII/XII-XIII) (E², M, G) [K];
17. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Efendi, Bagdatli Vehbi 1477 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
18. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Esat Efendi 3790 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
19. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Fatih Camii 3627 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K⁸¹];
20. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Fatih Camii 5316 (590H/1194) (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
21. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hamidiye 1448 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
22. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Lâleli 1647 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
23. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Şehid Ali Paşa 2031 (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
24. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Şehid Ali Paşa 2092 (E², M, G) [K];
25. Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Ahmet III 2112 (E¹, B) [K];
26. Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Ahmet III 2119 (E², M, G);
27. Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Ahmet III 3447 (866H/1461-2) (B, E¹⁻², M, G) [K];
28. Istanbul, Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi Kütüphanesi, Yıldız 'Umûmî 343 [K];
29. Istanbul, Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, 6172 (E², M, G);
30. Istanbul, Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Yıldız 'Umûmî 16917 (E¹, B);
31. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 958 (ex: 1330), ff. 255v-266v, (B, E², M, G)⁸²;
32. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 820 (ex: 1331), ff. 15r-28v, (B, G)⁸³;
33. London, British Library, Or. 5280 (B, M, G) [Z];
34. London, British Library, Or. 5719 (B, E², M, G);
35. Mashhad, Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī III, 9/14 (E², M, G);
36. Mosul, University Library, 14 (B, G);
37. Mosul, University Library, 260 (B);
38. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Ar. 5966 (B) [Z];
39. Rampur, Rampur Raza Library, I, 477 (B);
40. Rampur, Rampur Raza Library, I, 495 (B);
41. Rampur, Rampur Raza Library, 3066 (alternative number 2-3206) [Z];
42. San Lorenzo de El Escorial (Madrid), Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, 844/5, ff. 48v-67r (B);
43. San Lorenzo de El Escorial (Madrid), Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, 855 (B);
44. San Lorenzo de El Escorial (Madrid), Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, 860 (B);

⁸⁰ R. B. Kilisli mentions this manuscript together with ms. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 4795, which is said to be the apograph of the former.

⁸¹ R. B. Kilisli seems to refer to this manuscript by the shelfmark 3625 instead of 3267, possibly due to a misprint. He dates this manuscript to 678H/1279-80.

⁸² J. J. WITKAM, *Inventory of the Oriental manuscripts in Leiden University Library*, Ter Lugt Press, Leiden 2006-2016, p. 418.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 348.

45. San Lorenzo de El Escorial (Madrid), Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, 875 (B);
46. St. Petersburg, State University Library, 171 Rosen (B, G);
47. Tehran, Kitābhānah-i Millī Malik, 2005 (E², M, G);
48. Tehran, Kitābhānah-i Millī Ğumhūri-yi Islami-yi Iran (National Library), 9 (E², M, G);
49. Tehran, Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tihrān (Central Library of Tehran University), Miškāt 861 (E², M, G);
50. Tehran, Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tihrān (Central Library of Tehran University), Miškāt 1074 (E², M, G);
51. Tehran, Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tihrān (Central Library of Tehran University), Miškāt 1149, ff. 51r-61r (G);
52. Tehran, Kitābhānah-i Mağlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Mağlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), Tangābunī 324 (E², M, G).

SISMEL - EDIZIONI DEL GALLUZZO

APPENDIX II. INVENTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS PRESERVING THE ARABIC TEXT OF AVICENNA'S *KITĀB AL-NAFS*

Sigla:

A = ms. recorded in G. C. ANAWATI, *Essai de bibliographie avicennienne*, Dār Al-Ma'ārif, Cairo 1950;

Liste = ms. recorded in G. C. Anawati's edition of the *Kitāb al-Nafs* (see n. 65 above);

Ah = ms. recorded in A. Q. AHMED, *The Shifā' in India I: Reflections on the Evidence of the Manuscripts*, « Oriens », 40, 2012, pp. 199–222;

PhiBor = ms. recorded in the inventory provided on the website of the ERC Advanced Grant project 'Philosophy on the Border of Civilizations and Intellectual Endeavours: Towards a Critical Edition of the Metaphysics (Ilāhiyyāt of Kitāb al-Šifā') of Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā)' (<http://www.avicennaproject.eu>), or obtained within the framework of this project;

M = ms. recorded in Y. MAHDAVĪ, *Fihrist-i nushahā-yi muṣannafāt-i Ibn-i Sīnā*, Intiṣārāt-i Dānišgāh-yi Tihirān, Tehran 1333/1954;

An = ms. used in Anawati's edition of the Arabic text;

Ba = ms. used in Bakoš's edition of the Arabic text;

Ra = ms. used in Rahman's edition of the Arabic text;

+ m, r, i = ms. containing all the Šifā' (i.e. *maṭīq*, *riyāḍiyyāt*, and *ilāhiyyāt* in addition to *ṭabī'īyyāt*);

+ m, i = ms. containing *ṭabī'īyyāt*, *maṭīq* and *ilāhiyyāt*;

+ m = ms. containing *ṭabī'īyyāt* and *maṭīq*;

+ i = ms. containing *ṭabī'īyyāt* and *ilāhiyyāt*.

Within *maṭīq*, *ṭabī'īyyāt*, *riyāḍiyyāt*, and *ilāhiyyāt*, the sections (*funūn*) are designated by lower-case Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, etc.), whereas the treatises (*maqālāt*), and chapters (*fuṣūl*) are designated respectively by upper-case Roman numerals (I, II, III, etc.) and Arabic numerals (1, 2, 3, etc.). A date of copy in which the year is precisely indicated (e.g.: 1071H/1660-1) is usually taken from the manuscript itself (colophon or other), whereas a more generic date (e.g.: VII/XIII) is a tentative date provided by former inspectors of the codex.

* = ms. consulted;

bold = ms. attesting the insertion within the *Kitāb al-Nafs*.

Aligarh (Uttar Pradesh, India) (3 mss.):

- 1) Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University, Subḥān Allāh 110/27 'A (M, PhiBor);
- 2) *Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University, Subḥān Allāh 110/30 'A (1071H/1660-1; copyist: Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Maṣḥadī) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, Ah, M, PhiBor);
- 3) Maulana Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University, Subḥān Allāh 110/47 'A (Liste, Ah, M);

Baghdad (1 ms.):

- 4) *Maktabat al-Awqāf, 5353 (Catalogue 1953, n. 1523; Catalogue 1974, n. 3403) (885H/1480-1) (+ i) (PhiBor);

Beirut (Lebanon) (1 ms.):

- 5) *Université St. Joseph, Bibliothèque Orientale, 375 (1-10 Muḥarram 1021H/4-13 March 1612; copyist: Abū al-‘Ulamā’ Ibn ‘Alī al-Kāṭir) (PhiBor);

Cairo (9 mss.):

- 6) ***Maktabat al-Azhar al-Šarīf, Beḥīt 331 falsafa (ḥuṣūṣiyya), 44988** (‘umūmiyya) (VII/XIII) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor) (An, Ra);
- 7) **Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Qawmiyya) 262 ḥikma wa-falsafa** (1337H/1918-9) (+ m, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor) (An, Ra);
- 8) Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Qawmiyya) 675 falsafa (1177H/1763-4) (+ r) (Liste, M);
- 9) Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Qawmiyya) 753 (1074H/1663-4) (+ m) (Liste, M);
- 10) ***Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Qawmiyya) 894 falsafa** (X-XI/XVI-XVII; copyist: ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mīr ‘Abd Allāh) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor) (An);
- 11) Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Qawmiyya), Ṭal‘at 342 (Liste, M);
- 12) Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Qawmiyya), Ṭal‘at 402 (Liste, M);
- 13) Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Qawmiyya), Aḥmad Taymūr Pāšā 56 (Liste, M);
- 14) *Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (now: Dār al-Kutub wa-l-Waṭā’iq al-Qawmiyya), Aḥmad Taymūr Pāšā 140 (27 Šawwal 535H/12 June 1141) (+ i; ṭ incomplete: ṭ_vI,4, p. 35, 4 [ed. Rahman]-vii) (Liste, M, PhiBor);

Damascus (2 mss.):

- 15) Maktaba Zāhiriyya (now: Maktabat al-Asad al-Waṭaniyya, Asad National Library), 7905 (1043H/1633-4; copyist: Šāliḥ Ibn Šarīf Ḥāmid) (+ m, r, i) (PhiBor);
- 16) Maktaba Zāhiriyya (now: Maktabat al-Asad al-Waṭaniyya, Asad National Library), 698/م (PhiBor);

Dublin (2 mss.):

- 17) *Chester Beatty Library, Ar. 3983 (vols. i-ii) (1 Rabī‘ I 1002H/25 November 1593) (+ m, i) (PhiBor);
- 18) ***Chester Beatty Library, Ar. 5412** (Ġumādā II 885H/August-September 1480; copyist: ‘Alī b. Faṭḥ Allāh al-Ma’dānī al-Šābirī; owner: Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Murād) (+ i) (PhiBor);

Herat (Afghanistan) (1 ms.):

- 19) Herat Museum Library, no number (13 Rabī‘ II 898H/10 February 1493; copyist: Muḥammad Ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥayrī al-Anšārī) (+ m, r, i) (PhiBor);

Hyderabad (4 mss.):

- 20) Salar Jung Museum Library, 78 (Ah);
- 21) *Osmaniya University Library, acq. 696 (PhiBor);
- 22) Osmaniya University Library, 14 (1001H/1592-3) (+ i) (PhiBor);
- 23) Osmaniya University Library, 217 (PhiBor);

Isfahan (3 mss.):

- 24) Maktabat al-Zahrā', 86 (+ i) (PhiBor);
- 25) *Mahdawi, Muslah al-din S. 1284 = 85 (ṭ incomplete: ṭ_i-vii) (PhiBor);
- 26) *Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Asnād Dānišgāh-i Işfahān, 151 (PhiBor);

Istanbul (29 mss.):

- 27) *Atıf Efendi Kütüphanesi, 1597 (ṭ incomplete: ṭ_i-vii) (Liste, M);
- 28) *Beyazit Kütüphanesi, 'Umūmī 3966 (+ m, r, i; ṭ incomplete: ṭ_vi_I,1-IV,4, p. 201,13; V,7, p. 258,15-V,8) (PhiBor);
- 29) Türk İslam Eserleri Müzesi (Turkish Museum of Islamic Arts), Çoban Mustafa Paşa Kütüphanesi 572 (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 30) *Millet Kütüphanesi (now: Millet Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi), Feyzullah Efendi 1208 (1093H/1682; ṭ incomplete: ṭ_v-vii_I,6 + vi_IV,3) (Liste, M);
- 31) *Köprülü Kütüphanesi, Fazıl Ahmet Paşa 894 (before 886H/1481; owner: Abū l-Faḥḥ Sultān Muḥammad Ḥān Ġāzī [= Mehmet II, reg. 1444-6; 1451-81]) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 32) *Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, 2708 (X/XVI) (+ m, a fragment of r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 33) *Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, 2709 (886-97H/1481-92) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 34) *Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, 2710 (25 Rabī' I-25 Şawwāl 666H/21 December 1267-15 July 1268; copyist: 'Abd al-Kāfī Ibn 'Abd al-Mağīd Ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Tabrizī) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 35) *Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, 2711 (XI/XVII) (+ i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 36) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2441 (VII/XIII) (ṭ incomplete: ṭ_i-vi_V,6, p. 241, 6 [ed. Rahman]) (Liste, M);
- 37) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2442 (671-4H/1272-6; copyist: Amīr al-Dīn Māniyūl [pro: Manuwil?]; owners: Amīr al-Dīn Māniyūl; Buḥatnaşar Ibn Şim'un (Syr.: Nebukadnāzar Ben Şem'un), the Physician, from Qal'at al-Rūm [= Rumkale, nowadays Hromgla, South East Turkey]; Maḥmūd Ibn 'Alī Ibn Naşr Allāh al-Amī[n]; Sultan Maḥmūd I [reg. 1730-1745AD]; places of copy: Marāğa, Iran [671H]; Ḥarbart [= Ḥarbūt, nowadays Elazığ], East Turkey [674H]) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 38) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Carullah 1332 (882H/1477-8; copyist: 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad) (+ i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 39) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Carullah 1333 (+ i; ṭ incomplete: ṭ_v-vii) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 40) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Carullah 1424 (693H/1293-4; copyist: Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh Ibn Aḥmad Ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Nassāḥ al-Tabrizī) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 41) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat İbrahim Paşa 822 (before 886H/1481; owner: Abū l-Faḥḥ Sultān Muḥammad Ḥān Ġāzī [= Mehmet II, reg. 1444-6; 1451-81]) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor) (An, Ra);

- 42) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 823 (697H/1297-8; copyist: Şahāb al-Karmīnī; place of copy: Tabriz, Madrasat Ūrḡān) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 43) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 825 (A: 655H/1257-8; Liste: 837-8H/1433-5; M: 650H/1252-3) (A with asterisk, Liste, M);
- 44) Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Eyüp Câmîi Hz. Hâlid 883 (Liste, PhiBor);
- 45) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hamidiye 795 (Thursday 16 Rağab 1066H/10 May 1656; copyist: Ibn Muḥammad Ḥusayn Muḥammad Şâdiq al-Tabrizî) (+ m, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 46) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hamidiye 796 (M);
- 47) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hâlet Efendi 514 (X-XI/XVI-XVII) (Liste, M);
- 48) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 857 (23 Ramaḡān 1102H/20 June 1691) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 49) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ragıp Paşa 866 (Liste, M);
- 50) *Turkey, Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ragıp Paşa (ex: Ragıp Paşa Kütüphanesi) 910 (+ m, i, r) (PhiBor);
- 51) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Şehid Ali Paşa 1748 (27 Rağab 879H/16 December 1474) (+ m, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 52) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Yeni Câmî 770 (18 Rabî' II 888H/4 June 1483) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 53) *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Yeni Câmî 771 (885H/1480-1) (+ m) (Liste, M);
- 54) *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Ahmet III 3262 (IX/XV) (+ m, r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 55) *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Ahmet III 3263 (IX/XV) (+ r, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);

Kabul (Afghanistan) (1 ms.):

- 56) *Arşif-i Millî Afğānistān, Afghan National Archive, 2295 (ex:Private Library of King Zaher Shah 4926) (apparently copied in X-XI/XVI-XVII from an exemplar whose copy started the year before 469H) (+ m_ii.IV-ix, r) (PhiBor);

Khūy (Khoy) (Iran) (2 mss.):

- 57) *Kitābhānah-i Madrasa-i Namāzī, 247 (Ramaḡān 986H/November-December 1578) (+ m, r, i) (PhiBor);
- 58) *Kitābhānah-i Madrasa-i Namāzī, 248 (VII/XIII,) (+ i, ṭ incomplete: ṭ_i_I,8, p. 43,16-viii) (PhiBor);

Kolkata (Calcutta, Bengal, India) (2 mss.):

- 59) Asiatic Society of Bengal Library, Ar. 102 (469H/1076-7; the date of copy probably refers not to this ms., apparently copied in XI/XVII c., but to its exemplar) (+ m, r, i) (Ah, PhiBor);
- 60) National Library of India, Buhār Collection, MS. 287 (1089H/1678-9; scribe: Abū l-Barakāt al-Rāzī) (Ah, M);

Lahore (Punjab, Pakistan) (1 ms.):

- 61) Punjab University Library, Ar. H II 2 (1213H/1798-9; scribe: Mīrzā Naẓar ‘Alī) (Ah);

Leiden (2 mss.):

- 62) *Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 4 (Golius Collection) (Catalogue CCO, n. 1444), (before X/XVI) (+ m, i) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor) (**An, Ra**);
 63) *Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 84 (Golius Collection) (Catalogue CCO, n. 1445) (8 Rabī‘ II 881H/9 August 1476; copyist: Faḍl Allāh Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ḥāfiẓ) (+ m iii_II.5-end, r, i) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor) (**An, Ra**);

London (4 mss.):

- 64) *India Office (now: British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections), Ar. 1796 (n. 476 in Loth catalogue, p. 132) (1150H/1737-8) (*Liste*, M) (**An, Ba, Ra**);
 65) *British Museum (now: British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections), Or. 2873 (British Museum Suppl. 711) (1072H/1661-2) (*Liste*, Ah, M, PhiBor) (**An, Ba**);
 66) *British Museum (now: British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections), Or. 7500 (XI/XVII) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor) (**An**);
 67) *Royal Asiatic Society, Arabic 58 (Rabī‘ I 1082H/July-August 1671) (+ m, r, i) (PhiBor);

Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh, India) (2 mss.):

- 68) Naziriya Library, 65 (Daiber 1986, p. 37, no. 120) (PhiBor);
 69) Rajah of Mahmudabad Library, microfilm 76 (437H/1045-6?) (PhiBor);

Marāgha (Iran) (1 ms.):

- 70) Private Library of Y. B. Bābāpūr, 2 (PhiBor);

Mashhad (Iran) (11 mss.):

- 71) Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, catalogue, vol. IV,1, registration number: 872 (*Liste*, M);
 72) Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, catalogue, vol. IV,1, registration number: 873 (*Liste*, M);
 73) Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, catalogue, vol. IV,1, registration number: 874 (*Liste*, M);
 74) Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, catalogue, vol. IV,1, registration number: 875 (*Liste*, M);
 75) *Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 13963 (995H/1586-7) (+ i) (*Liste*);
 76) *Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 27166 (PhiBor);
 77) *Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 770 (PhiBor);
 78) *Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 771 (ṭ incomplete: ṭ_i-vi_III.6) (PhiBor);
 79) *Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 7787 (PhiBor);
 80) *Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 9045 (+ r) (PhiBor);
 81) *Kitābhānah-i Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī, 22582 (PhiBor);

Mosul (Iraq) (2 mss.):

82) University Library, 189.16 (+ m, r, i) (PhiBor);

83) Madrasat al-Mullā Zakar, 16 (678H/1279-80) (m, r, i) (PhiBor);

Najaf (Iraq) (1 ms):

84) ***Maktabat al-Imām Amīr al-Mu'minīn, 3070** (496H/1102-3) (+ i, ʔ incomplete: ʔ_vī.III.8, p. 139, 20-vii) (PhiBor);

New Delhi (1 ms.):

85) Hamdard Library, 715 (PhiBor);

Oxford (3 mss.):

86) ***Bodleian Library, Pococke 114** (Uri's catalogue I, 467) (603H/1206-7; fragmentary: 4v-29r = pp. 246-268 Bakoš's edition = V. 7-8) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor) (**An, Ba**);

87) ***Bodleian Library, Pococke 116** (Uri's catalogue I, 471) (603H/1206-7; fragmentary: IV-V + 185v-256r = pp. 8-68 Bakoš's edition = half premise, I. 1-II. 2) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor) (**An, Ba, Ra**);

88) ***Bodleian Library, Pococke 125** (Uri's catalogue I, 435) (Ğumādā I 561H/ March-April 1166 or 571H/November-December 1175; copyist: Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥasan Ibn al-Ḥusayn [...]) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor) (**An, Ba, Ra**);

Patnā (capital city of Bihar state, India) (2 mss.):

89) Khudā Bakhsh Oriental Public Library (Bankipur), (Catalogue vol. XXI, 2225 (= Library's handlist 1905)) (X/XVI) (+ r, i; ʔ incomplete: ʔ_v-viii) (Ah, PhiBor);

90) Khudā Bakhsh Oriental Public Library (Bankipur), (Catalogue vol. XXI, 3465 (= Library's handlist 4286)) (**m**) (PhiBor);

Pešawar (Pakistan) (1 ms.):

91) Maktabat Dār al-'Ulūm al-Islāmiyya, 1672 (+ m, r, i) (*Liste*, Ah, PhiBor);

Princeton (1 ms.):

92) ***Princeton University Library, 861** (972H/1564-5) (ʔ incomplete: ʔ_v-viii) (*Liste*, M);

Qum (Iran) (3 mss.):

93) Madrasa Faydiyya, 1428 (PhiBor);

94) ***Markaz-i Iḥyā'-i Mīrāt-i Islāmī, 3054** (ʔ incomplete: ʔ_i-vī_III_3) (PhiBor);

95) ***Kitābhānah-i Mar'ašī, 18742** (12 Rağab 1022H/28 August 1613; copyist: Muḥammad Mu'min Ibn Ḥāğğī Muḥammad Kātib Işfahānī) (+ i) (PhiBor);

Rampur (India) (6 mss.):

96) ***Rampur Raza Library, 3476ğ** (*ḥikma* 112) (Catalogue 1902, vol. I, p. 397) (718H/1318-9; copyist: Maḥmūd Ibn 'Alī Ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī Wandkilī; owners: Şadr al-Dīn Muḥammad Daştakī Şīrāzī, d. 903H/1498, his son Ğiyāţ al-Dīn

Manṣūr Daṣṭakī Šīrāzī, d. 948H/1542, and this latter's son Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ṭānī, d. 962H/1555; a student of Ġiyāṭ al-Dīn Manṣūr, Faṭḥ Allāh al-Šīrāzī, d. 997H/1589, presumably brought the ms. to the court of the Mughal ruler Aqbar (reg. 1556-1605AD) in India, where it was lodged in the Mughal royal library and later transferred to Rampur) (+ m, i) (PhiBor);

- 97) *Rampur Raza Library, 3477ع (Sunday, 6 Dū l-Ḥiġġa 468H/17 July 1076; the date of copy probably refers not to this ms., apparently copied in XII/XVIII c., but to its exemplar) (+ m, r, i) (PhiBor);
- 98) *Rampur Raza Library, 3478ع (1267H/1850-1; copyist: Fadawī Kahīmkarān Wās) (+ m, i) (PhiBor);
- 99) Rampur Raza Library, 3481ع (1293H/1876-7; copyist: by 'Izzat 'Alī Gorakhpūrī) (PhiBor);
- 100) Rampur Raza Library, 3486ع (1293H/1876-7) (PhiBor);
- 101) Rampur Raza Library, 3487ع (XIII/XIX) (PhiBor);

Tehran (27 mss.):

- 102) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), 135 (Ša' bān 871H/March-April 1467; copyist: 'Alī Ibn Faṭḥ Allāh al-Ma' dānī al-Iṣfahānī) (+ m, i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 103) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), 5254 (897-8H/1491-3; copyist: Aḥmed Ibn 'Alī) (+ r_i-ii, iv, i) (PhiBor);
- 104) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), 1894 (1097H/1685-6) (+ i) (PhiBor);
- 105) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), 1897 (PhiBor);
- 106) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), 1904 (ṭ incomplete: ṭ_i-vi) (PhiBor);
- 107) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), 1905 (ṭ incomplete: ṭ_i-vii) (PhiBor);
- 108) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), 18072 (PhiBor);
- 109) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), 3269 (PhiBor);
- 110) *Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Millī, (now: Kitābhānah-i Maġlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī = Parliament Library), Ṭabāṭabā'ī 865 (1029H/1619-20; copyist: 'Alī Ibn Ḥabīb Allāh Ṭāliqānī) (+ i) (Liste, M, PhiBor);
- 111) *Kitābhānah-i Millī Malik, 1041 (Liste, M);
- 112) *Kitābhānah-i Millī Malik, 1110 (Liste, M);
- 113) *Kitābhānah-i Millī Malik, 1243 (880H/1475-6) (Liste, M);
- 114) *Kitābhānah-i Millī Malik, 1275 (1116H/1704-5; copyist: Rafī' al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabasī) (+ r_i-iii-iv_II, i) (Liste, M);
- 115) *Kitābhānah-i Millī Malik, 2482 (Liste, M);

- 116) Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tihṛān (Central Library of Tehran University), Miškāt 241 Širāz, 1075H/1664-5; copyist: Muḥammad Šāliḥ al-Urdistānī) (+ m) (*Liste*, M);
- 117) *Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tihṛān (Central Library of Tehran University), Miškāt 243 (+ m, r, i) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor);
- 118) *Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tihṛān (Central Library of Tehran University), 2284 (PhiBor);
- 119) ***Kitābhānah-i Millī Ğumhūrī-yi Islami-yi Iran (National Library), 1327 (X/XVI) (+ r, i; ʔ incomplete: ʔ iii-viii) (PhiBor);**
- 120) *Kitābhānah-i Millī Ğumhūrī-yi Islami-yi Iran (National Library), 1757 (X/XVI) (+ i) (PhiBor);
- 121) Kitābhānah-i Millī Ğumhūrī-yi Islami-yi Iran (National Library), 945-307, AS/590 (PhiBor);
- 122) Kitābhānah-i Millī Ğumhūrī-yi Islami-yi Iran (National Library), 22608 (PhiBor);
- 123) *Kitābhānah-i Madrasah-i ʿĀlī-i Sipahsālār (now: Kitābhānah-i Madrasah-i ʿĀlī-i Shahīd Muṭahhari), 1438 (20 Muḥarram 1053H/10 April 1643; copyist: Muḥammad Muḥsin Ibn Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ḥātūnābādī) (+ m, r, i) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor);
- 124) *Kitābhānah-i Madrasah-i ʿĀlī-i Sipahsālār (now: Kitābhānah-i Madrasah-i ʿĀlī-i Shahīd Muṭahhari), 1439 (29 Rabīʿ I 1075H/20 October 1664; copyist: Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn Ibn Ḥāğğī Muḥammad Rāzānī) (+ m, r, i) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor);
- 125) *Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tihṛān (Central Library of Tehran University), 6596 (1076H/1665-6; copyist: Sulṭān Muḥammad Ibn Rafīʿ al-Dīn Muḥammad Iṣfahānī) (+ m, r, i-iii-iv-ii + i) (PhiBor);
- 126) *Kitābhānah-i Markazī-yi Dānišgāh-i Tihṛān (Central Library of Tehran University), 10582 (last decade of Ğumāda I 1076H/29 November-8 December 1665; copyist: Muḥammad Amīn Ibn Ḥaydar Naʿīnī) (+ i) (PhiBor);
- 127) *Kitābhānah-i Madrasah-i ʿĀlī-i Sipahsālār (now: Kitābhānah-i Madrasah-i ʿĀlī-i Shahīd Muṭahhari), 8331 (1055H/1645-6; copyist: Faḍl Allāh Ibn Ḥusayn Nāyīnī) (+ m, r, i) (*Liste*, M, PhiBor);
- 128) ***Kitābhānah-i Dāniškāda-i Ilāhiyyāt-i Dānišgāh-i Tihṛān (Library of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Tehran), 204 (1257H/1841-2) (PhiBor);**

Tonk (India) (1 ms.):

- 129) Arabic and Persian Research Institute, 2133 (ʔ incomplete: ʔ_i-viii.XIX.1) (Ah, PhiBor);

Varanasi/Banaras/Benares (Uttar Pradesh, India) (1 ms.):

- 130) *Ĝāmiʿa Ğawādiyya, 11 (early X/XVI) (+ i) (PhiBor).

ABSTRACT

Al-Ġūzġānī's Insertion of On Cardiac Remedies in Avicenna's Book of the Soul: the Latin Translation as a Clue to his Editorial Activity on the Book of the Cure?

The aim of this article is to outline the textual and editorial vicissitudes of chapters 2-9 of Avicenna's medical treatise *On Cardiac Remedies* (*Maqāla fī l-adwiya al-qalbiyya*) that Abū 'Ubayd 'Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Muḥammad al-Ġūzġānī (fl. XI c.), Avicenna's disciple and secretary, inserted between the end of the fourth treatise and the beginning of the fifth treatise of Avicenna's *Book of the Soul* (*Kitāb al-Nafs*). In particular, this article firstly aims at detecting the reason why al-Ġūzġānī inserted a selection from Avicenna's *On Cardiac Remedies* in this precise place of Avicenna's *Nafs*, and the related question of why al-Ġūzġānī inserted in this place only an excerpt of this treatise and not all of it. The reason seems to be that of providing the brief outline of Avicenna's theory of emotions in *Nafs*, IV, 4 with its medical background. Secondly, it provides a close scrutiny of the Arabic textual tradition of this insertion, which is by no means reflected in the current editions of the Arabic text of Avicenna's *Book of the Soul*. Lastly, this article offers an evaluation of the relevance of this insertion and, consequently, of the importance of studying it in relation to the textual tradition of both *On Cardiac Remedies* and the *Book of the Soul*.

TOMMASO ALPINA, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
tommaso.alpina@sns.it

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC grant agreement n° 339621.