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Abstract

The manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fonds arabe 6734 contains a Syriac translation of the Hippocratic Aphorisms. This text remains one of the few examples of an entire Greek medical work translated into Syriac. The copyist however did not include information about the Syriac translator, which has left his identity open to speculation. Since this bilingual manuscript contains both the Syriac translation of the Aphorisms as well as the lemmata from Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq’s Arabic translation of Galen’s commentary on the Aphorisms, it is generally accepted that Ḥunayn is also the Syriac translator. Although the Arabic translation is the key to identifying the Syriac translator, no one has yet attempted to situate the Arabic text within the tradition of Ḥunayn’s Arabic version of the Aphorisms in order to better understand the work of the copyist. This article will analyse the copyist’s editorial process when working with these Arabic lemmata. In doing so, the relationship between the Syriac and the Arabic translations will be explored, providing new insight into the identity of the Syriac translator.
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1 Introduction

The manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France fonds arabe, 6734 contains a Syriac translation of the Aphorisms as well as the Arabic lemmata taken from Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq’s (d. 873) Arabic translation of Galen’s Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms. Since its publication by Pognon in 1903, this text has remained one of the few examples of a complete translation of an entire Greek medical text into Syriac. Yet, the copyist did not include information about the Syriac translator in the manuscript. The inclusion of Ḥunayn’s Arabic text in this manuscript has, nevertheless, led many scholars to assume that Ḥunayn was the Syriac translator, and his authorship is generally accepted by scholars. Though the Arabic portion of this manuscript is the key to identifying the Syriac translator, no one has attempted to either situate the Arabic text within the tradition of Ḥunayn’s Arabic version of the Aphorisms, or to better understand the methods employed by the copyist when editing this text. This paper will analyse the copyist’s editorial process when working with these Arabic lemmata, and will detail the relationship between the

---

1 Images of this codex are available to the public thanks to the Bibliothèque nationale de France, on its Gallica website: “Gallica,” last accessed 02 March 2016, http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b5250910j. On Ḥunayn’s translation of this commentary, see Peter E. Pormann and N. Peter Joosse, “Commentaries on the Hippocratic Aphorisms in the Arabic Tradition: The Example of Melancholy,” in Epidemics in Context: Greek Commentaries on Hippocrates in the Arabic Tradition, ed. Peter E. Pormann (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 211–49. The author is currently preparing an edition of this translation, and will rely on the following six manuscripts: Madrid, Escorial, MS árabe 789 (copied circa the thirteenth century C.E.; henceforth E5); Madrid, Escorial, MS árabe 790 (copied in 1209; henceforth E6), a part of which is bound in Madrid, Escurial, MS árabe 818, fols. 88a–127b (henceforth E11); Madrid, Escurial, MS árabe 791 (copied in 1101; henceforth E7); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS 2837 fonds arabe (copied in 1227; henceforth P1); Rome, Vatican Library MS ebr. 426 (a Judaeo-Arabic manuscript; copied circa the fourteenth century C.E.; henceforth R1); and Yale, Arabic MS suppl. 87 (copied in 1691; henceforth YA). Moreover, I also refer to the (rather problematic) edition of Ḥunayn’s Arabic lemmata by John Tytler, The Aphorisms of Hippocrates: Translated into Arabic by Honain Ben Ishak, Physician to the Caliph Motawukkul (Calcutta: Education Press for Committee of Public Instruction, 1832).


Syriac and the Arabic translations of this manuscript. This will provide new insight into the real identity of the Syriac translator.

2 Description of BnF ms fonds arabe 6734

BnF ms fonds arabe 6734 (henceforth P7) contains an Arabic translation of the Hippocratic Epidemics (folios 1a–29a), a Syro-Arabic version of the Hippocratic Aphorisms (folios 29b–92b), and a Syro-Arabic version of the Hippocratic Prognostics (folios 93a–127b). The style of handwriting suggests that one individual copied each of the Arabic and Syriac texts in this codex. The same scribe added the following Arabic colophon at the end of the segment of the manuscript that contains the Hippocratic Aphorisms:

Colophon (folio 92b)

جوّلت فصول أثبات وهو مsembه مقالات عددها ثمانية وثمانون فصلاً سويّاً المرّدة والمكتوبة
مرار في عناشر تشرين الأول سنة ألف وخمس مائة وسومة عشر ملك الإسكندر وسنة ستّ
مائه واثنين للهجرة كتبهنهام بن الحداد المتّلمّب.

The Aphorisms by Hippocrates, which are the seven books, and whose number is 308 aphorisms, excluding those, which are dubious, or repetitions, were completed on the 10th of Tishrin al-Awwal of the year 1517 [according to the calendar] of King Alexander [i.e. the Seleucid calendar] and the year 602. H. Bahnâm ibn al-Ḥaddād the physician wrote it.

As indicated by this colophon, this codex was copied by Bahnâm ibn al-Ḥaddād on 10 October 1517 A.G. (or 10 October 1205 C.E.). In the Arabic text of the Hippocratic Aphorisms, the copyist did not add any notes in the margins;


5 The Arabic text can be found in Vagelpohl, Galeni in Hippocratis Epidemiarum, 22. The text, Pognon, Une version syriaque, vol. 1, ii. Pognon, Une version syriaque, vol. 1, ii also transcribes and translates the Syriac colophon appended to the Syriac portion, which provides nearly the same content as found in the Arabic colophon.
however, the copyist did add several notes to several Syriac lemmata, as well as a lengthy Syriac memorandum on Aphorisms iv. 47.

Additionally, the Arabic lemmata were heavily annotated by at least three different hands (which I here designate as A1, A2 and A3). The notes are clearly derived from Ḥunayn’s translation of Galen’s Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms. Comparing P7 with the manuscripts of Ḥunayn’s translation suggests that Bahnām’s Arabic exemplar was written in the later tradition of Ḥunayn’s lemmata. In many cases, P7 shares readings with E6, P1, R1, and YA (i.e., manuscripts in a later stage of the transmission of this translation) as opposed to E5 and E7 (i.e., those in an earlier stage).6 The following three examples provided below aptly demonstrate how P7 relates to the other manuscripts of the Aphorisms:

Example 1: Aphorisms ii. 31

Τῷ ἐξ ἀρρωστίης εὐσιτέοντι, μηδὲν ἐπιδιδόναι τὸ σῶμα, μοχθηρόν.7

When a person who is recovering from a disease has a good appetite without improving the condition of his body, it is a bad symptom.

ءيدركلذفًائيشهندبدّيزتيالفماعطلانمىظحيهقانلاناكاذإ

When a person who is recovering has an appetite, but his body does not increase, that is bad.

*P7 shares the reading من المرض with P1 and YA.

---

6 The author will soon publish the Arabic of Galen’s commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms. The sigla referred to in this paper are as follows: Madrid, Escorial, MS árabe 789 (copied around the thirteenth century c.e.; henceforth E5); Madrid, Escorial, MS árabe 790 (copied in 1209; henceforth E6), a part of which is bound in Madrid, Escorial, MS árabe 818, fols. 88a–127b (henceforth E1); Madrid, Escorial, MS árabe 791 (copied in 1101; henceforth E7); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS 2837 fonds arabe (copied in 1227; henceforth P1); Rome, Vatican Library MS ebr. 426 (a Judaeo-Arabic manuscript; copied around the fourteenth century c.e.; henceforth R1); and Yale, Arabic MS suppl. 87 (copied in 1691; henceforth YA).


8 E5, fol. 134a; E6, fol. 137b; E7, fol. 19a; P1, fol. 38b; R1, fol. 38a; YA, fol. 34b; Tytler, The Aphorisms, 15; P7, fol. 37b.
Example 2: *Aphorisms* v. 34

Γυναικὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσῃ, ἢν ἡ κοιλιὰ ρυῇ πολλὰ, κίνδυνος ἐκτρῶσαι.  

When a pregnant woman has violent diarrhoea, there is danger of her miscarrying.

μαισυάη ἡ ἐν ἀφλόν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτὴς ἡ ἐσταλεκταὶ ἐπὶ θητέρησιν ἀποκαθίσταται.

When a pregnant woman is harassed by diarrhoea, there is danger of her miscarrying.

*P7 shares the reading ἀλ with E6 and R1.

Example 3: *Aphorisms* vi. 49

῾Οκόσα ποδαγρικὰ νοσήματα γίνεται, ταῦτα ἐν τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρῃ σιν ἀποφλεγμήναντα ἀποκαθίσταται.

In gouty afflictions, the inflammation subsides in the course of forty days.

When a person is in the course of gout and has swelling, his swelling subsides in forty days  

*P7 shares the reading ἀρα with E6, P1, and YA.

Moreover, the note on ἀλ belonging to the text in Example 2 shows that one annotator (A1) collated the text of P7 against another manuscript of Ḥunayn’s Arabic translation and recorded a variant reading in the margin. Like this gloss, the annotator incorporated corrected or variant readings found in the manuscript throughout for all the Arabic lemmata.


E5, fol. 34b; E6, fol. 19a; E7, fol. 95a; P1, fol. 87b; R1, fol. 88a; YA, fol. 123b; Tytler, *The Aphorisms*, 46; P7, fol. 71b.


E5, fol. 64a; E6, fol. 133b; E7, fol. 95a; P1, fol. 124a; YA, fol. 179b; Tytler, *The Aphorisms*, 58; P7, fol. 84a. Note that R1 does not contain this lemma.
Although the Arabic portion is undoubtedly taken from Ḥunayn’s Arabic text, it is clear that the sequence of the lemmata in P7 does not always agree with Ḥunayn’s standard Arabic version, which is based on Galen’s work. The order of the lemmata in P7 differ from the typical order of the Arabic Aphorisms in the following ways:

- P7 omits: lemma v. 4, v. 29, v. 63, vii. 28, vii. 46, and vii. 57;
- P7 changes the order of lemmata iv. 17 and 18; lemma v. 65 and 66;
- P7 combines: lemmata i. 7 and 8; lemmata iii. 13 and 14; lemmata iii. 25 and 26; lemmata iv. 19 and 20; lemmata v. 17 and 18; lemmata v. 65 and 67 after changing their order; lemmata vi. 55 and 56; and lemmata vii. 8 and 9

Significant changes have been made in lemma vii. 59–81. Given that Galen questioned the authenticity of lemmata vii. 59a, 59b, 63–69, and 71–81, he mentioned them only in the body of his commentary. Although Ḥunayn accepted Galen’s view that these aphorisms were spurious when composing his translation, in P7 the copyist unexpectedly decided to include lemmata vii. 59a, 60, 75, 78, and 81.

These three points highlight the copyist’s seemingly arbitrary arrangement of Ḥunayn’s Arabic lemmata. What is remarkable about the text in P7, however, is how each Arabic lemma on the left side has a corresponding Syriac lemma on the right (see Figure 1). In other words, the Arabic and Syriac lemmata in P7 mirror each other, both with respect to which lemmata are combined and which lemmata are omitted.

Given that the sequence of the lemmata in Ḥunayn’s standard Arabic version corresponds to Galen’s interpretation of the text, we can conclude that the arrangement of the lemmata in the Syriac exemplar of P7 had already been changed, and that Bahnām had copied it faithfully on the right side. Thus, for each Syriac lemma he extracted the corresponding Arabic lemma from Ḥunayn’s version and copied it onto the left side.\(^1\)

\(^1\) It is possible that Bahnām only copied his exemplar, which already contained a bilingual text, without additional editorial work. Even so, we can assume that someone before him edited the Arabic and Syriac Aphorisms in this bilingual style. Consequently, I assume that Bahnām was the editor of this bilingual text (based on the “law of parsimony”), although we cannot entirely certain of this fact.
3 Analysis of Aphorisms iv. 47

The standard Greek Hippocratic Aphorisms iv. 47 is as follows:\(^{14}\)

Αἱ ἀποχρέμψιες ἐν τοῖσι πυρετοῖσι τοῖσι μὴ διαλείπουσιν, αἱ πελίναι, καὶ αἷμα-
τῶδεις, καὶ δυσώδεις, καὶ χολώδεις, πᾶσαι κακαί· ἀποχωρέουσαι δὲ καλῶς, ἄγα-
θαι· καὶ κατὰ τὴν διαχώρησιν καὶ κατὰ τὰ οὖρα· ἢν δὲ μή τι τῶν συμφερόντων
ἐκχρίνηται διὰ τῶν τόπων τούτων, κακόν.

In fevers not of the intermittent type, expectorations that are livid, bloody,
fetid and bilious are all bad; but if evacuated properly, they are favourable.
So it is with the excretions and the urine. But if something beneficial is not
excreted through these places, it is bad.

---

The difficulty regarding this lemma is how to interpret the last part, “ἢδὲμὴ
ti ἃυν 
τι 
συμφερόντων ἐκκρίνηται διὰ τῶν τόπων τούτων, κακόν.” This sentence is generally interpreted as, “But if something beneficial is not excreted through these places, it is bad.” In the Syriac lemma, however, this sentence was translated as follows:

But if something does not benefit be expelled through these places, it is bad.

This translation is almost certainly based on Galen’s commentary, as it is most likely that Galen was the only person who read μὴ with τι τῶν συμφερόντων.16

The Syriac annotator recognised the difference between the Syriac translation and the standard interpretation of the text, as P7’s scribe, Bahnām, appended the annotator’s note, which follows the Syriac lemma.17 In this note, he criticised Galen’s interpretation by referring to the last portion of Aphorisms vii. 70, “and wherever any discharge remains without being purged, it is bad (καὶ ὅκου ἀν τῇ ἀποχωρέον στῇ μὴ ἴσωσθαι, κακόν).” Instead the annotator read the last part of Aphorisms iv. 47 as, “but if things that benefit are not expelled [it is bad],” just as the standard—that is, the non-Galenic—interpretation had done.18

As for Ḥunayn’s Arabic version, we find that he initially translated this part based on Galen’s interpretation, just as the Syriac translator had done. The following is Ḥunayn’s Arabic translation:19

But if that which is not beneficial is excreted through one of these places, that is bad.

---

15 Pognon, Une version syriaque, vol. 1, 17; P7, fol. 59a.
17 The Syriac text is found in Pognon, Une version syriaque, 1:17. French translation in ibid., 2:27–8.
19 E5, fol. 16a; E6, fol. 151a; E7, fol. 71a; P1, fol. 68b; R1, fol. 72a; YA, fol. 95a; Tytler, The Aphorisms, 35; P7, fol. 59a.
When Ḥunayn translated Galen’s commentary on Aphorisms vii. 70, however, he recognised Galen’s misinterpretation of Aphorisms iv. 47. Thus, after translating Aphorisms vii. 70, Ḥunayn appended his own note, replacing the last part of the previous translation of Aphorisms iv. 47 with the following:20

\[ \text{فإن لم يخرج ما ينفع بخروجه من أحد هذه المواضع فذلك رديء} \]

If that whose coming out is beneficial is not expelled from one of these places that is bad.

Remarkably, the Arabic text of this part of Aphorisms iv. 47 in P7 (fol. 59a) is as follows:

\[ \text{فإن لم يخرج ما ينفع بخروجه من أحد هذه المواضع فذلك رديء} \]

If that whose coming out is beneficial is not expelled from one of these places that is bad.

In other words, the scribe replaced this portion of iv. 47 with Ḥunayn’s corrected version in Aphorisms iv. 70. This example suggests that the copyist, Bahnām, recalled Galen’s mistake by reading the Syriac note that appeared in his Syriac manuscript. The fact that Bahnām kept the mistranslated version in Syriac along with the note—and yet inspired by the opinion of the Syriac annotator, he selected the corrected Arabic version from Ḥunayn’s comment on Aphorisms vii. 70—demonstrates his faithfulness to his Syriac exemplar.

As is mentioned in the above variant to the Arabic Aphorisms iv. 47 preserved in P7, annotator A1 detected this emendation by Bahnām, and entered, “But if that which is not (لا ما خرج فإن)" from Ḥunayn’s standard version in the margin. Interestingly, A1 also noted the difference between the Syriac Aphorisms iv. 62 and the corresponding Arabic version.

---

20 E5, fol. 87a; E6, fol. 90a; E7, fol. 160a; P1, fol. 148b. Note that R1 and YA lack this part.
4 Analysis of Aphorisms iv. 62

The following is the standard Greek version of Aphorisms iv. 62:\n

When jaundice supervenes in fevers before the seventh day, it is a bad symptom, unless there be watery discharges from the bowels.

The Syriac is literally translated as follows:\n
When jaundice occurring during fevers before the seventh day is bad, unless watery discharges take place through the belly.

Ḥunayn, on the other hand, translated this lemma as follows:\n
If jaundice occurs in fevers before the seventh day, it is a bad symptom.

Clearly, Ḥunayn’s version omits the last part of the standard Greek Hippocratic lemma, that is, “unless there be watery discharges from the bowels.” As is

\footnotesize

21 Magdelaine, “Histoire du texte,” 2:424. In what follows, I sometimes quote critical apparatus from Magdelaine’s text, where she uses the following sigla of the Greek Manuscripts of the Hippocratic Aphorisms: C: Parisinus gr. Suppl. 446 (copied around 10 c.e.); M: Marcianus gr. 629 (copied around 10 c.e.); Va: Vaticanus gr. 276 (copied around 12 c.e.); and her sigla for the Greek manuscripts of Galen’s Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms are as follows: Gal(M): Marcianus gr. 278 (copied around 13 c.e.); Gal(P): Parisinus gr. 2266 (copied around 13 c.e.); Gal(S): Scorial 226 (copied around 13 c.e.); Gal(V): Vaticanus gr. 283 (copied around 13 c.e.).

22 Pognon, Une version syriaque, 118.

23 E5, fol. 19a; E6, fol. 157a; E7, fol. 74b; P1, fol. 71b; R1, fol. 74b; YA, fol. 99a; Tytler, The Aphorisms, 38; P7, fol. 62b.
recorded in the critical apparatus to the Arabic lemma, annotator A1 recognised the difference between the Arabic and Syriac. In the margin, he then added the sentence “if it will not be accompanied with purging (إذا لم يكن معه أسهل).” In order to draw attention to the missing Arabic phrase, this sentence is followed by the symbol “ح,” which A1 uses to indicate the existence of a variant reading. This example also confirms that the copyist, Bahnām, was faithful to the Syriac text and did not change it based on Hunayn’s Arabic lemmata.

As for Hunayn’s version, the reason why he omitted a part of the Greek lemma is made clear when one refers to Galen’s comment on this lemma, in which Galen transmitted the lemma with the final part omitted:24

\[\text{إن تسي دة تون الانتيغرافون برسكيت تف أفراريما كاتا تو تلوب هن مه خوندوسيه غرريفن كاتا تين كولينه ينينوتاى.}\]

In some manuscripts of Galen’s commentary, however, the sentence “unless there be watery discharges from the bowels (هن مه خوندوسيه غرريفن كاتا تين كولي فيا ينينوتاى)” is added to the last part of the aphorism. For example, Hunayn’s Arabic translation of the above comment says the following:25

\[\text{والنجد في بعض النسخ زيادة في آخر هذا الفصل وهي هذه: إلاأ أن تبعوث رطبوات من البطن.}\]

we find in some manuscripts an addition to the last part of the lemma below, that includes, “unless there be watery discharges from the bowels.”

In fact, the last part is preserved in several Greek manuscripts such as M and Gal(M), but several copies including C’ and Va lack this. The inclusion of this comment with Galen’s lemma illustrates how Hunayn’s Arabic lemma fits Galen’s commentary in a way that is similar to the Greek lemma in the majority of the Greek manuscripts of Galen’s Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms (Gal [PSV]). Given that the Arabic text of A1’s addition, “if it will not be accompanied with purging (إذا لم يكن معه أسهل),” is different from the one translated by Hunayn in the body of Galen’s commentary, “unless there be watery discharges from the bowels (إلاأ أن تبعوث رطيبوات من البطن),” A1 clearly supplied this portion of the text by translating the relevant Syriac text in P7 into Arabic rather than taking it from Hunayn’s translation of Galen’s commentary.

25 E5, fol. 19a; E6, fol. 157b; E7, fol. 74b; P1, fol. 71b–72a; R1, fol. 74b; YA, fol. 99b.
On the other hand, this example could also indicate that the Syriac version transmits the standard lemma, but that Ḥunayn adjusted his version to Galen’s comment. In Aphorisms iv. 70, we also find an interesting difference between the Arabic and Syriac versions, which further supports this view.

5 Analysis of Aphorisms iv. 70

The standard Greek lemma is as follows:26

Ὁκόσοι δὲ ἐν πυρετοῖσι τὰ οὖρα ἀνατεταραγμένα οἷον ὑποζυγίου, τούτοις κεφαλαλγίαι ἢ πάρεισιν ἢ παρέσονται.
ἐν πυρετοῖσι] om. Gal(MP)

In fevers, when the urine is turbid, like that of a beast of burden, in such cases there either is or will be headache.

The Syriac provides a literal translation of this text:27

Those who, during fevers, discharge turbid urine like that of beasts have or will have a headache.

Hunayn’s Arabic, however, omits “in fevers (ἐν πυρετοῖσι)”:28

When someone discharges urine like that of beast, he has or will have a headache.

27 Pignon, Une version syriaque, 1:18. Note that Pignon omits the plural sign, although P7 has it. The author is grateful to Grigory Kessel for drawing his attention to this fact.
28 E5, fol. 21a; E7, fol. 77a; P1, fol. 73b; R1, fol. 76b; YA, fol. 101b–102a; Tytler, The Aphorisms, 38; P7, fol. 63b. Note that E6 lacks this lemma.
It is possible that this omission is a result of Ḥunayn’s reaction to Galen’s comment on this lemma.29 At the beginning of his commentary on this aphorism, Galen mentions that in some copies this lemma was recorded as, “when the urine is turbid, there is a headache (οἷσιν δ’ ἀνατεταραγμένα τὰ οὖρα, τούτοις κεφαλαλγίαι),” and was sometimes combined with the previous lemma Aphorisms iv. 69. Since Galen’s report lacks the word, “in fevers,” the majority of the Greek manuscripts of Galen’s Commentary Gal (MP) deleted this word. In like manner, Ḥunayn removed it.30

These examples illustrate the difference between the Syriac and Arabic versions. While Ḥunayn’s Arabic lemmata fit Galen’s commentary, the Syriac lemmata are translated from the standard Greek. To analyse this discrepancy, one must further explore the ways in which Ḥunayn translated the lemmata.

6 Ḥunayn’s Risāla

Fortunately, Ḥunayn reported on how he translated Galen’s Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms into Syriac and Arabic in his epistle entitled Epistle from Hunayn ibn Ishāq to ‘Alī ibn Yahyā, or simply the Risāla.31 The following is a section from Galen’s Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms:32

Ayyūb [ar-Ruhāwī] had translated it [i.e. Galen’s Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms] badly [into Syriac]. Jibril ibn Bukhtīshū’ wanted to improve it, but he only corrupted it further. Then I collated the Greek with it, and corrected it, almost retranslating it [into Syriac]. Then I added to it Hippocrates’ text (faṣṣ) separately (ʿalā ḥidatihī).

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, known as Ibn al-Mudabbir, had asked me to translate it for him. I translated one section of it into Arabic. Then he asked me not to begin with the translation of another section before he had read the one that I had translated. Yet, the man was too busy, and therefore, the translation was interrupted. When Muḥammad ibn Mūsā

31 On this work, see Overwien, “The Paradigmatic Translator,” 161–3.
32 The Arabic text with an English translation is found in Pormann and Joosse, “Commentaries on the Hippocratic Aphorisms,” 217.
saw this section, he asked me to complete [the translation] of the book. Therefore I translated it completely.\textsuperscript{33}

This explanation shows that during the last stage of his translation, Ḥunayn updated the previous Syriac translation of Galen’s \textit{Commentary}, and added the Syriac lemmata. Furthermore, the word “separately (‘alā hidatīhī)” suggests that in addition to a Greek manuscript of Galen’s \textit{Commentary}, he also referred to other Greek manuscripts of the Hippocratic \textit{Aphorisms}.\textsuperscript{34} This perhaps could be because some of the lemmata in his Greek manuscript of Galen’s \textit{Commentary} were truncated.

As Jacques Jouanna notes, it was typical for Galen to quote a part of a lemma in his commentaries on the Hippocratic works.\textsuperscript{35} Ḥunayn could supply the omitted phrases by referring to Greek manuscripts of the Hippocratic works. Ḥunayn confirms this usage of Greek Hippocratic manuscripts in his other Arabic translations of Galen’s commentaries on the Hippocratic works. For example, Jouanna has shown that a part of the Hippocratic \textit{Prognostics}, which is missing in the Greek manuscripts of Galen’s commentary on the \textit{Prognostics}, was supplied by Ḥunayn in his Arabic translation.\textsuperscript{36} Concerning the Hippocratic \textit{Epidemics}, Ḥunayn reports in his \textit{Risāla}: “To my translation [of Galen’s commentary] on the second book of the \textit{Epidemics} I added a translation into Syriac and Arabic of Hippocrates’ text in this book, separately.”\textsuperscript{37} This report indicates that Ḥunayn supplied a missing part of the Hippocratic text in his Greek manuscript of Galen’s commentary on the \textit{Epidemics} by using other manuscripts of the Hippocratic \textit{Epidemics}. In fact, in a note appearing in the midst of his translation of \textit{Epidemics}, Book 2, Ḥunayn makes the following remark:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item These manuscripts might not only contain the Hippocratic lemmata, but also commentaries on them. Regarding Hippocratic manuscripts in Ḥunayn’s days, see Oliver Overwien, “Syriac and Arabic translators of Hippocratic texts,” in \textit{Hippocrate et les hippocratismes: médecine, religion, société}, eds. Jacques Jouanna and Michel Zink (Paris: Belles-Lettres, 2014), 421–35.
\item See Jouanna, \textit{Hippocrate: Pronostic}, cliv–clvii.
\item See Jouanna, \textit{Hippocrate: Pronostic}, clxiii–clxix.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
 Hunayn said: I have noticed that, at this point in the text of the Greek book from which I translated, a certain passage from Hippocrates, which followed the preceding one [just discussed], was missing, as was some of Galen's commentary on it. I have written down this missing passage from Hippocrates' text and added to it a commentary, which I thought, would be similar to that of Galen in doctrine, as well as in what he would oppose.38

These examples demonstrate Hunayn's keen interest in Hippocratic texts, and reveals how his pursuit of authentic lemmata led him to collect these manuscripts.

Among Hunayn's Arabic lemmata of the Hippocratic Aphorisms, however, one finds some cases where he failed to obtain the "genuine" lemmata to Galen's commentary, likely owing to defects in his Greek manuscript. One such example is Aphorisms iv. 21.

7 Analysis of Aphorisms iv. 21

The standard Greek lemma is as follows:39

Ὑποχωρήματα μέλανα ὁκοῖον αἷμα ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου ἱόντα καὶ σὺν πυρετῷ καὶ ἀνευ πυρετοῦ κάχιστα καὶ ὁκόσω ἀν χρώματα πλεῖω καὶ πονηρότερα ἤ, μάλλον κάχιστο σὺν φαρμάκῳ δὲ ἀμεινοῦ, καὶ ὁκόσω ἀν πλεῖω χρώματα ἤ, οὐ πονηρά.


Excretions which are black, like blood, taking place spontaneously, either with or without fever, are very bad; and the more numerous and unfaavourable the colours, so much the worse; when with medicine it is better, and a variety of colours in this case is not bad.

In this lemma, several major direct manuscripts lack the reading, “and the more numerous (πλεῖω καὶ).” The Syriac and Arabic lemmata also lack this reading as shown by the corresponding parts of them:40

38 Pormann, "Case Notes," 256.
40 Syriac text: Pognon, Une version syriaque, vol. 1, 15; Arabic text: E5, fol. 7a; E7, fol. 58b; E1, fol. 17b; R1, fol. 64b; YA, fol. 82a; Tytler, The Aphorisms, 31; P7, fol. 54a. Note that P1 lacks this lemma.
Whenever their colours are worse, it is worse.

And whenever the colours of the excrements are worse, this is a worse symptom.

Because Galen mentioned “the more numerous colours of the excrements (τὰ πλείων διαχωρημάτων χρώματα)” in his commentary, Galen's lemma clearly contained this reading. In this case, Ḥunayn failed to adjust his lemma to Galen's commentary because his Greek manuscript lacked a portion of the text. Thus, the difficulties Ḥunayn faced when attempting to restore the Hippocratic lemmata are clear.

As evidenced by the analysis of the Arabic Aphorisms iv. 62 and 70, we must note that Ḥunayn endeavoured to integrate the Hippocratic lemmata into Galen's commentary. This is also true in the case of the Syriac lemmata, for, in the Risāla, Ḥunayn reports that he added them after he had reviewed the Syriac translation of Galen's Commentary. He did this in order to adjust the Hippocratic lemmata to the Commentary, just as he did in his previous Arabic translation. Therefore, the fact that the Syriac Aphorisms iv. 62 and 70 are not adjusted to Galen's Commentary casts strong doubt on Ḥunayn's authorship of the Syriac translation preserved in P7. This doubt is further strengthened upon analysing Aphorisms vi. 18, which strongly suggests that Ḥunayn did not know of this Syriac translation.

8 Analysis of Aphorisms vi. 18

The standard Greek lemma is as follows:

Κύστιν διακοπέντι ἢ ἐγκέφαλον ἢ καρδίην ἢ φρένας ἢ τῶν ἐντέρων τι τῶν λεπτῶν ἢ κοιλίην ἢ ἣπαρ, θανάτωδες.

A severe wound to the bladder, brain, heart, diaphragm, small intestines, stomach or the liver is deadly.

41 Kühn, Galeni opera omnia, 17b:684.
The Syriac lemma is a literal translation of the standard lemma, as follows:

If the bladder, brain, heart, diaphragm, some of the small intestines, stomach, or liver is cut, it is mortal.

But Ḥunayn's Arabic contains a variant reading, as follows:

When a break occurs in the bladder, brain, heart, kidneys, in some of the small intestines, in the stomach or the liver, that is fatal.

Ḥunayn, thus, clearly read "νεφρόν (kidneys)" instead of "φρένας (diaphragm)."

Yet, in the commentary, Galen comments on the diaphragm:

It is agreed that such a wound in the bladder cannot be jointed, just exactly as [a wound] in the nervous place of the diaphragm and the small intestines.

Which Ḥunayn faithfully translates in the following way:

---

43 Pognon, Une version syriaque, 1:26.
44 E5, fol. 54a; E6, fol. 45b; E7, fol. 118a; P1, fol. 109a; YA, fol. 153a; Tytler, The Aphorisms, 55: P7, fol. 80a. Note that R1 lacks this lemma.
45 Owing to the similarity of the Greek orthography of νεφρόν and φρένας, they were often miscopied. See Magdalene, "Histoire du texte," 3:668–9.
46 Kühn, Galeni opera omnia, 18:28.
47 E5, fol. 54a; E6, fol. 45b; E7, fol. 118a; P1, fol. 109a; YA, fol. 153a. Note that R1 lacks this part.
People agree about the wound that has this condition, that when it occurs in the bladder, it [the flesh] cannot join and reunite. The condition in the sinewy part of the diaphragm (al-ḥijāb) and in the small intestines is like this.

This comment by Galen confirms that Galen’s lemma had “diaphragm,” rather than “kidneys.” Thus Ḥunayn failed to obtain the appropriate lemma for his Arabic translation of Galen’s Commentary.

Remarkably, as indicated in the above text of the Arabic lemma, Tytler’s edition adds the phrase, “or in the diaphragm (أو في الجب)" before the phrase, “or in the brain.” The same addition is found in the margin of E6 (by a second annotator) and P7 (by A1) before the phrase, “or in the kidneys.” This addition suggests that some later scholar recognised an omission in Ḥunayn’s version.

Al-Biṭrīq’s version of the Hippocratic Aphorisms could serve as one possible resource for detecting this error. For in addition to Ḥunayn’s version of the Hippocratic Aphorisms, there is another translation of the Arabic lemmata, likely carried out by al-Biṭrīq (fl. 750–800), which is preserved in the Book of History (Kitāb al-Ta’rīkh) by al-Ya’qūbī (fl. ca. 850). They are partially transmitted, too, in the Arabic commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms, which has been incorrectly attributed to Palladius (fl. ca. sixth century).48

Fortunately, al-Ya’qūbī’s History contains this lemma. The following is al-Biṭrīq’s version:49

If someone suffers a break in the bladder, brain, heart, diaphragm, in some of the small intestines, in the stomach or liver, that is fatal.


49 Martijn T. Houtsma, Ibn Wadhih qui dicitur al-Ja’qūbi Historiae (Leiden: Brill, 1883), 1314.
It is quite clear that al-Biṭrīq translated this lemma literally based on the standard reading. The existence of this version suggests that a later scholar realised the difference between al-Biṭrīq’s version and Ḥunayn’s version. This scholar may have extracted the word “ṣifāq (diaphragm)” from Ḥunayn’s Arabic translation of the quoted part of Galen’s commentary. Recognising that the corresponding word in al-Biṭrīq’s lemma is “al-ḥijāb (the diaphragm),” the scholar may have tried to merge the two versions by adding the phrase “or in the diaphragm” in the margin of Ḥunayn’s lemma.

This example also illustrates how a defective manuscript prevented Ḥunayn from obtaining the genuine Hippocratic lemma that was in keeping with Galen’s commentary. Had he referred to the Syriac translation, he could have avoided this error, especially since Galen had mentioned the correct reading in the commentary. From this evidence, it is evident that Ḥunayn did not refer to this Syriac translation of the *Aphorisms*.

Moreover, given that the Syriac translation was based on the correct reading, we can also conclude that the Syriac translator was in possession of another Greek manuscript that was not used by Ḥunayn for this Arabic translation. And there are other examples that make it evident that there were differences between the Greek exemplar of Ḥunayn’s Arabic version and the text utilised for the Syriac translation.

9 Analysis of *Aphorisms* iv. 41

The standard Greek lemma is as follows:50

"Ἱδρὼς πολὺς ἐξ ὑπνοῦ ἀνευ τινὸς αἰτίης γινόμενος, τὸ σῶμα σημαίνει ὅτι πλείον τροφὴ χρῆται; ἢν δὲ τροφὴν μὴ λαμβάνοντος τοῦτο γίνηται, σημαίνει ὅτι κενώσιος δεῖ τείται. σημαίνει ] C’M Gal(M): εἶδέναι Gal(P): εἶδέναι δεὶ Va"

A copious sweat after sleep occurring without any manifest cause indicates that the body is using too much food. But if it occurs when one is not taking food, it indicates that evacuation is required.

The Syriac lemma is a literal translation of the standard Greek text:51

---

51 Pognon, *Une version syriaque*, 1:16.
A copious sweat after sleep occurring without a known cause indicates that the body uses too much food. But if a person suffers from the same thing without food, it means that his body requires purging.

Ḥunayn's version, however, contains a variant reading:52

A copious sweat after sleep occurring without any manifest cause indicates that the patient's body takes more food than it can bear. But if that occurs when he is not taking food, know that purging is required.

In this example, Ḥunayn's Arabic transmits a different reading "know (εἰδέναι)" rather than "indicate (σημαίνει)" found in the Syriac version. As the critical apparatus to the Greek lemma shows, this Arabic reading is supported by Gal(P) and Va, while the Syriac reading is found in the majority of the Greek manuscripts, including those of Galen's Commentary.53 This example provides further evidence that the Greek manuscript used for the Syriac translation is different from the one Ḥunayn referred to for his Arabic translation. The following example from Aphorisms iv. 36 likewise demonstrates that the Syriac translator worked with a more accurate copy of the Greek than Ḥunayn.

10 Analysis of Aphorisms iv. 36

The standard Greek lemma is as follows:54

52 E5, fol. 14b–15a; E7, fol. 69b; P1, fol. 67b; R1, fol. 71a; YA, fol. 93a; Tytler, The Aphorisms, 35; P7, fol. 58a. Note that E6 lacks this lemma.
καὶ μὴ καὶ εἰκοστῇ καὶ ἐβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ καὶ τριήκοστῇ πρώτῃ: οὗτοι γάρ
οἱ ίδρωτες νούσους κρίνουσιν· οἱ δὲ μὴ οὕτως γινόμενοι πόνον σημαίνουσιν καὶ
μῆκος νούσου καὶ ύποτροπιασμοῦ.

Μίτεριτες λατ.: ύποτροπιασμόν Gal(MP) Theo(UV) ύπο-

στροφήν τοῦ νοσήματος καὶ ἀνατροπιασμὸν C': om. Va.

In febrile diseases, sweats are favourable if they set in on the third, fifth, seventh, ninth, eleventh, fourteenth, seventeenth, twenty-first, twenty-seventh, and thirty-first day, for these sweats indicate the disease comes to its crisis. Sweats not occurring in such a manner, however, indicate pain, a protracted disease, and relapses.

A significant difference between the Syriac and the Arabic appears in the last line, “but sweats not occurring thus, indicate pain, a protracted disease, and relapses.” The Syriac version is a literal translation:

Those which do not occur indicate pain, a protracted disease, and its relapse.

Ḥunayn’s Arabic version however lacks the last word “and relapses” owing to an omission in his Greek manuscript:

As for the sweat not occurring in these days, it indicates pain or a protracted disease.

Whereas the majority of the Greek manuscripts, including Galen’s commentary, preserve the reading “and relapses (καὶ ύποτροπιασμὸς),” Ḥunayn did not emend his reading of the Greek manuscript because Galen’s commentary does not discuss the aphorism in a way that would have alerted Ḥunayn to the fact that there was a lacuna in his Greek manuscript.

55 Pognon, Une version syriaque, 1:16.
56 E5, fol. 13b; E7, fol. 66a; E11, fol. 126a; P1, fol. 66a; R1, fol. 69b; YA, fol. 91a; Tytler, The Aphorisms, 34; P7, fol. 57a.
We should also note that this lemma is included in the set of al-Biṭrīq’s Arabic lemmata transmitted by al-Yaʿqūbī. This version is a literal translation of the standard lemma, the last part of which reads as follows:

فَأَيْامَ الَّذِي يَكُونُ فيَمِيُّهُ هَذِهِ الْأَيَامُ فَذَلِكُ عَرَقٌ مَّؤْذَنٌ بِوَجْعٍ وَطُولٍ مَرْضٍ وَنُكْسَةً.

As for that which occurs in other than these days, that is sweat notifying pain, a protracted disease, and a relapse.

As is mentioned in the above critical apparatus of Ḥunayn’s version of Aphorisms iv. 36, E5, E1, and P1 detected the omission. Consequently, they added the phrase “or its relapse (أو على نكسة),” either in the text or in the margin, even though the location in which they insert the missing phrase does not match the Greek text. The fact that the wording “أو على نكسة” resembles al-Biṭrīq’s lemma “ونكسة” suggests that they were alerted to the fact that there was an omission in Ḥunayn’s Arabic by referring to al-Biṭrīq’s version.

The above examples show that Ḥunayn’s Arabic was based on a Greek manuscript that was different from the Greek exemplar of the Syriac translation. If Ḥunayn was the translator of the Syriac version, he would have needed to be in possession of an additional Greek manuscript of the Hippocratic Aphorisms in addition to the one he used for his Arabic translation. Yet, his Arabic lemmata indicate that he used neither this Syriac translation nor the Greek manuscript upon which the Syriac translation was based. If Ḥunayn were, in fact, the translator of the Syriac Aphorisms, he evinces a disinterest in his previous translation work into Syriac and its Greek source text that runs contrary to his well-documented practice of securing the most accurate Hippocratic text for his Arabic translations. The assumption that Ḥunayn is responsible for the Syriac version of the Hippocratic Aphorisms preserved in P7 leads to conclusions about Ḥunayn that sit uncomfortably with what we know for certain about his translation techniques. What is more, assuming that Ḥunayn is the translator of the Syriac Aphorisms preserved in P7 leads to the absurd conclusion that he was ignorant of his own Syriac translation and of the Greek manuscript on which it was based. This leads me to conclude that the Syriac translation was not, in fact, composed by Ḥunayn.

57 Houtsma, Ibn Wadhih, 1:112. Note that this lemma is only found in al-Yaʿqūbī’s History.

58 It is possible that Ḥunayn translated the Aphorisms into Syriac in his early career, and then he composed the Arabic translation in the later stage, so that the Arabic version was done almost independently from the Syriac. But as his Risāla shows, throughout his
Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed how the copyist Bahnām created this bilingual version of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*. In doing so, I have also tried to shed light on the problem of who produced the Syriac translation. By comparing the Syriac and Arabic lemmata in P7 with Ḥunayn’s Arabic version preserved in other manuscripts, we have gained further understanding about the process by which this version of the *Aphorisms* came into being. On the right side of the page, Bahnām faithfully copied the Syriac exemplar (including the note following *Aphorisms* iv. 47). On the left side, he added to each Syriac lemma the corresponding Arabic lemma taken from Ḥunayn’s Arabic.

A thorough analysis of the annotations in the margins reveals critical differences between Ḥunayn’s Arabic and the Syriac translation. According to Ḥunayn’s report in the *Risāla*, his Syriac lemmata should be adjusted to the commentary. Yet, several of the Syriac lemmata do not are incompatible with Galen’s commentary. What is more, comparing Ḥunayn’s Arabic with the Syriac version indicates that the Greek exemplar of Ḥunayn’s Arabic translation does not match the one used by the Syriac translator. This observation also suggests that Ḥunayn did not know about this Syriac translation or its exemplar. As discussed earlier in relation to *Aphorisms* iv. 36 and vi. 18, while Ḥunayn did not correct defects in his Arabic, later Arabic scholars recognised his mistakes and corrected them, most likely having recourse to al-Bīṭrīq’s version. Most significantly, the Syriac translation of the *Aphorisms* contains none of these errors. Thus, the evidence complied from a comparison between the Syriac and Arabic translations leads to the conclusion that Ḥunayn is not the author of the Syriac translation.

career he was highly interested in Syriac and Arabic translations of Hippocratic works that existed at the time. When he read Hippocratic works, he had a firm grounding of Galen’s commentaries on them. Given the existence of the Syriac lemmata, which do not match Galen’s commentary (e.g., *Aphorisms* iv. 62), as well as his ignorance of this Syriac version (attested to by e.g. *Aphorisms* vi. 18), it is unlikely that Ḥunayn composed this Syriac translation, even if we were to entertain the idea that Ḥunayn produced a Syriac translation at an earlier stage in his career.
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