

How Many Recensions of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Šifā'*?

Amos Bertolacci

Pisa

Abstract

The article discusses the possibility that Avicenna's *magnum opus* in philosophy might have had multiple recensions, either by the author himself, or in a very early phase of its manuscript transmission, possibly as a result of scholarly discussions within Avicenna's school. As test case, the fifth treatise of the metaphysical section (*Ilāhiyyāt*) of the *Kitāb al-Šifā'* is chosen: in some very ancient testimonia, this treatise presents an arrangement of chapters that is coherent and straightforward, but sensibly different—both in the number and the disposition of chapters—from the mainstream version transmitted by the current printed editions of the work. Some hypotheses on the origin of these variations—which cannot be classified as simple accidents of transmission, on account of their rational and macroscopic character—are finally advanced. Appendix B fixes to six the number of codices employed in the standard edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* published in Cairo in 1960.

Keywords

Avicenna, philosophy, metaphysics, manuscripts, critical edition, multiple recensions

Fundamental questions about the composition of the *Kitāb al-Šifā'* (*Book of the Cure*) still wait to be properly addressed. One of these is the issue of whether Avicenna licensed the text of this work once and for all at the end of the process of redaction, leaving it unmodified afterwards, or, on the contrary, he submitted it to one or more revisions after its completion, thus prolonging the literary genesis of his philosophical masterpiece. In other words, one may wonder whether only

¹ I am very grateful to Dimitri Gutas for his invaluable remarks on a first draft of this paper. I wish also to thank the participants to the Graduate Seminar of History of Islamic Philosophy at Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa during the academic year 2011–2012 (Tommaso Alpina, Alessia Astesiano, Gaia Celli, Soroor Coliaei, Silvia di Vincenzo, Satoshi Horie, and Maria Cristina Rossi) for the fruitful discussion on the subject-matter of this paper. I am deeply indebted to a number of scholars for having kindly shared with me information on, or copies of, the codices discussed in the present article: my gratitude goes in particular to Asad Q. Ahmed, Hans Daiber, Marc Geoffroy, Jules Janssens, Hamed Naji Isfahani, and Robert Wisnovsky. Alexander Kalbarczyk's careful revision of the style and format saved me from many imprecisions: I wish to express to him my sincere gratitude. Amos Bertolacci, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Piazza dei Cavalieri, 7, Palazzo della Carovana, 56126 Pisa, Italia, a.bertolacci@sns.it.

one authorial version of this work ever circulated, or different versions of it existed from a certain point of Avicenna's life onward. In the latter alternative, if we assume that both the original and the modified version of the work were disseminated through the process of copying, we should assume the presence of different recensions of the work in the manuscript tradition. For the prospective critical editor, asking this question is tantamount to investigating whether the entire manuscript tradition of the *Šifā'* converges towards a single archetype, or rather it stems originally from distinct archetypes, whose number will depend on the amount of Avicenna's successive interventions on the work. The consequences of this alternative are, needless to say, momentous.

The possible existence of different recensions of some of Avicenna's minor works has been documented.¹ We know, likewise, that among other Medieval Arabic philosophers the practice of revising already finished works was quite common, the most notorious case being that of the Aristotelian commentaries by Averroes.² To the best of my knowledge, however, the issue that concerns us here has never been directly discussed with reference to Avicenna's *Šifā'*. In connection with this work only the question of whether certain of its parts, in the form according to which they have been transmitted, might have been left unfinished by Avicenna and thus reflect a preliminary stage of composition of the work, has been raised, with uncertain outcomes.³ By contrast, a series of biographical circumstances converge in making the hypothesis of authorial revisions of the *Šifā'* plausible. To start with, we are informed that Avicenna's masterpiece in philosophy was not commissioned by an external patron, but rather requested by the circle of Avicenna's disciples, above all by Avicenna's "secretary" Abū 'Ubayd al-Ġuzġānī, who kept in all likelihood a copy of the

¹ See Dimitri Gutas, "The Study of Avicenna. Status Quaestionis atque Agenda," *Documenti e Studi sulla Tradizione Filosofica Medievale* 21 (2010): 45–64 (60–61).

² See Ruth Glasner, *Averroes' Physics: A Turning Point in Medieval Natural Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 28–40 ("4: Versions and Revisions"); Averroes, *On Aristotle's "Metaphysics": An Annotated Translation of the So-called "Epitome"*, ed. by Rüdiger Arnzen (Berlin [a. o.]: De Gruyter, 2010), 8–11 ("2: Transmission, revision, and completeness of the treatise").

³ The eleventh treatise of the zoological part (*Ḥayawān*) of the *Šifā'*, consisting of six lines in the Cairo edition of the work (Ibn Sīnā, *al-Šifā'*, *al-Ṭabī'īyyāt*, *al-Ḥayawān*, ed. by 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Muntaṣir, Sa'īd Zāyid, 'Abd Allāh Ismā'īl [Cairo: al-Hay'a al-miṣriyya al-'amma li-l-ta'līf wa-l-naṣr, 1970], 188), is regarded as unfinished by Bāsim F. Musallam, "Avicenna. Biology and Medicine," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, vol. III (London-Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), 94–99. Musallam's opinion is cautiously discussed by Remke Kruk, "Ibn Sīnā on Animals: Between the First Teacher and the Physician," in *Avicenna and His Heritage: Proceedings of the International Colloquium "Avicenna and his Heritage"*, Leuven-Louvain-la-Neuve, 8–11 September 1999, ed. by Jules Janssens and Daniel De Smet (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 325–341.

work at Avicenna's disposal as part of this latter's library.⁴ Moreover, the work at hand is a *summa* of enormous extent and immense doctrinal density, rightly considered the quintessence of Avicenna's thought in all fields of philosophy, that was written about ten years before the author's death, during the mature—but in no way last—period of Avicenna's life. Finally, we know that the lively discussions performed within Avicenna's group of disciples targeted also doctrines of the *Šifā'*, thus prompting Avicenna to clarify and possibly revise his thought.⁵ The aim of the present contribution is to show that also the manuscript tradition of Avicenna's work provides evidence that must be kept into account in order to provide a sensible answer to the question under discussion.

In what follows, I will take into account one of the *loci* of the *Šifā'* that are preserved by the available testimonia in a particularly great variety of different forms. Object of investigation will be the fifth treatise of the metaphysical section of Avicenna's work (*Ilāhiyyāt*), devoted to the metaphysical treatment of the doctrine of universals, after its first account in logic. In the following pages, special attention will be paid to the number and disposition of the chapters of this treatise as they appear in the Cairo standard printed version of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, in Arabic codices not taken into account by the Cairo editors, and in the Latin Medieval translation. The additional evidence analyzed here documents substantial variations with respect to the Cairo edition: modifications consist in the split of single chapters into distinct textual units, the merge of pairs of chapters (both consecutive and non-consecutive) into a single chapter, and the transposition of chapters (both single chapters and pairs of chapters merged together) before or after the place they occupy in the Cairo edition. First, I will expound the outline of treatise V that appears in the Cairo edition, pointing to its problematic aspects. Then, in the following three sections, I will indicate the existence, in Arabic codices and in the Latin translation, of modifications of the structure of treatise V as reported by the Cairo edition, in which the problems faced in this latter do not subsist. If at least some of the differences taken into account here should prove to be other than mechanical accidents or scribal interventions, they might indicate the existence of different recensions of the work.

⁴ Ahmed H. Al-Rahim, "Avicenna's Immediate Disciples: Their Lives and Works," in *Avicenna and His Legacy: A Golden Age of Science and Philosophy*, ed. by Y. Tzvi Langermann (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 1–25 (4–8).

⁵ A statement by Avicenna's disciple Ibn Zayla is worth quoting in this regard (translation taken from David C. Reisman, *The Making of the Avicennan Tradition: The Transmission, Contents, and Structure of Ibn Sīnā's al-Mubāḥaṭāt* (The Discussions) [Leiden: Brill, 2002], 195–196, slightly modified; cf. Al-Rahim, "Avicenna's Immediate Disciples," 14): "In our Master's statement at the beginning of *The Cure*, I came upon some contradictory and conflicting points that fall outside the consensus of scholars. So it would behoove him to provide a correction of that and to disclose the [different possible] points of view, if he can" (emphasis mine).

The present survey is based on a limited sample of the numerous codices that form the massive manuscript tradition of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, and contains the provisional results of a still ongoing research on the subject.⁶ The Cairo edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* is based on five main codices, an additional manuscript consulted occasionally, and the Tehran lithograph of 1303H/1885.⁷ Only two of the main manuscripts used in the edition are dated: the most ancient of them was copied in the thirteenth century (Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 144 *ḥikma* [684H/1285]), the other in the seventeenth century, whereas the additional codex consulted by the Cairo editors is much more recent (twentieth century), although depending on an exemplar of the sixteenth century (see the conspectus in Appendix B); the manuscript basis of the Tehran lithograph, on the other hand, remains obscure. On account of the current available information, a considerable number of dated manuscripts containing the *Ilāhiyyāt*, of different geographical provenience, antedate the most ancient manuscript used in the Cairo edition. Of these, at least three known dated codices go back to the twelfth century (the most ancient of them is the ms. Tehran, Milli Malik Library 1085 [509H/1115]), whereas several others are of the thirteenth century. The Latin translation should be grouped together with the most ancient manuscripts of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, since it was made from an Arabic exemplar of the last decades of the twelfth century, at the latest, and is therefore one of the earliest witnesses of the work. The inspection of these testimonia shows, on the one hand, that the structure of treatise V of the *Ilāhiyyāt* as it appears in the Cairo edition is widely attested in the most ancient phase of the work's transmission (section I). Some of these codices, on the other hand, document substantial variations of the structure of *Ilāhiyyāt* V: a manuscript of the beginning of the thirteenth century, followed by many later codices (section II), the Latin translation (section III), and a manuscript of the late thirteenth century (section IV) report the variations described above. The chronological data at our disposal indicate therefore the existence of different

⁶ See Amos Bertolacci, *The Reception of Aristotle's Metaphysics in Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā: A Milestone of Western Metaphysical Thought* (Leiden [a. o.]: Brill, 2006), 483–558 (“Appendix A. Towards a Critical Edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt*: List of Corrections of the Cairo Printed Text”); Id., “On the Manuscripts of the *Ilāhiyyāt* of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Šifā*,” in *Islamic Thought in the Middle Ages: Studies in Text, Transmission and Translation, in Honour of Hans Daiber*, ed. by Anna Akasoy and Wim Raven (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 59–75; Id., “A Hidden *Hapax Legomenon* in Avicenna's *Metaphysics*: Considerations on the Use of *Anniyya* and *Ayyiyya* in the *Ilāhiyyāt* of the *Kitāb al-Šifā*,” in *Proceedings of the Conference The Letter Before the Spirit. The Importance of Text Editions for the Study of the Reception of Aristotle*, Huygens Instituut, Den Haag (The Hague), 2–5 June 2009, ed. by Aafke van Oppenraay and Resianne Smidt van Gelder-Fontaine (Leiden: Brill, in print).

⁷ Ibn Sinā, *al-Ilāhiyyāt min al-Šifā' li-Šayḥ al-Ra'īs Abū 'Alī Ḥusayn Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sinā ma'a ta'liqāt* (Tehran, 1885), vol. I, 266–567.

accounts of treatise V in the very early stage of the transmission of the work. The textual evidence discussed in each of the following sections is cumulatively resumed and summarized in the synoptic table of Appendix A. Appendix B discusses how many manuscripts were precisely used in the Cairo printed version of the *Ilāhiyyāt*.

I. The Cairo Edition

In the current edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, published in Cairo in 1960,⁸ the fifth treatise consists of nine chapters (which are here conventionally designated with the numerals V, 1, V, 2, V, 3 etc.), whose content is summarized in their respective titles:

- V, 1 [First Chapter] (1) Chapter on common things [= universals] and the modality of their existence (pp. 195–206)
- V, 2 [Second Chapter] (2) Chapter on the modality according to which universality belongs to universal natures (completion of the discussion of this [topic]) and on the difference between whole and part, universal and particular (pp. 207–212)
- V, 3 [Third Chapter] (3) Chapter on the distinction between genus and matter (pp. 213–219)
- V, 4 [Fourth Chapter] (4) Chapter on the modality according to which the notions external to the genus enter into its nature (pp. 220–227)
- V, 5 [Fifth Chapter] (5) Chapter on the species (pp. 228–229)
- V, 6 [Sixth Chapter] Chapter on determining and ascertaining the differentia (pp. 230–235)
- V, 7 Seventh Chapter (7) Chapter on determining the relationship between the definition and the thing defined (pp. 236–242)
- V, 8 [Eighth Chapter] (8) Chapter on the definition (pp. 243–247)
- V, 9 [Ninth Chapter] (9) Chapter on the relationship between the definition and its parts (pp. 248–252)

The Cairo editors provide two kinds of numeration of the chapters of treatise V (as well as of the other treatises of the *Ilāhiyyāt*): first, they report between square brackets the term “chapter” (*faṣl*) followed by an ordinal number;⁹ second, they

⁸ Ibn Sīnā, *al-Šifāʾ, al-Ilāhiyyāt (1)*, ed. by Ğürğ Š. Qanawātī and Saʿīd Zāyid (Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-ʿamma li-šūʿūn al-maṭābīʿ al-amīriyya, 1960); *al-Šifāʾ, al-Ilāhiyyāt (2)*, ed. by Muḥammad Y. Mūsā, Sulaymān Dunyā and Saʿīd Zāyid (Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-ʿamma li-šūʿūn al-maṭābīʿ al-amīriyya, 1960) (henceforth: *Ilāhiyyāt*).

⁹ Only in the case of chapter V, 7 the square brackets are absent, possibly because of a misprint.

add between round brackets a cardinal numeration by means of the *abġad* system.¹⁰ These two kinds of numeration are rarely attested in manuscripts and, as the square brackets indicate, are in all likelihood editorial additions.¹¹ Numeration apart, the concrete disposition of the various chapters of treatise V in the Cairo edition is attested by the majority of codices: beside the manuscripts used by the Cairo editors and the Tehran lithograph, it is also found in a variety of other manuscripts, and goes back to some of the most ancient witnesses of the work.¹²

The structure of the treatise looks straightforward: two introductory chapters (V, 1–2), regarding universals in general, are followed by a series of chapters deal-

¹⁰ On this system of numeration, see Adam Gacek, *Arabic Manuscripts: A Vademecum for Readers* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 11–13 (“Arabic alpha-numerical notation”).

¹¹ I am aware of only one case of (partial) adoption of the first kind of numeration in the marginal annotation of the Berlin manuscript discussed in Section III below. This type of numeration is occasionally adopted by the Tehran lithograph of the *Ilāhiyyāt* (see, for example, the mention of chapters I, 1, and I, 2). The second kind of numeration is attested, to the best of my knowledge, only in the list of chapters that precedes the beginning of treatise V in the main text of some manuscripts (see, for example, ms. Oxford, Bodleian Pococke 110, discussed in section II), or in the margins of others (see, for instance, ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub 826, below, n. 33). Other codices place cardinal consecutive Arabic numerals, not *abġad* letters, on the various occurrences of the term “chapter” (see below, n. 24).

¹² Of the thirteen dated manuscripts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries mentioned in Bertolacci, “On the Manuscripts of the *Ilāhiyyāt*,” 71, the arrangement of chapters proper to the Cairo edition can be found in the following: Tehran, Milli Malik Library 1085 (509H/1115; I wish to thank Hamed Naji Isfahani for having checked this manuscript, which I have not been able to consult personally); Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, Aḥmad Taymūr Pāšā 140 (535H/1140); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 125 (561H/1166 or 571/1175); Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2710 (666H/1267); Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Carullah 1424 (693H/1293); Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 823 (697H/1297); Khoy, Madrasa Nimāzī 248 (whose dating to the thirteenth century is tentative). On the “anomalous” mss. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 110 (601H/1204 or 604H/1207) and Ankara, Milli Kütüphane (National Library) B153 (694H/1294), see below, sections II and IV respectively. Ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 117 (601H/1204 or 604H/1207) does not contain treatise V of the *Ilāhiyyāt*. Ms. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2442 (671H/1272) presents an abrupt transition from chapter V, 4, p. 222, 12 to chapter V, 8, p. 245, 4, probably due to the loss of some folia in the exemplar; for the rest, chapters V, 1–3 regularly precede chapter V, 4 and chapter V, 9 follows chapter V, 8. I have not been able to inspect ms. Mašhad, Āstān-i Quds-i Razavī Library XI, 7347 (whose dating to the eleventh century proposed by Hamed Naji Isfahani is tentative and should be further corroborated). Contrary to what is reported in the aforementioned article, ms. Cairo, Al-Azhar, Baḥīt 331 *falsafā*—one of the mss. used in the Cairo edition (see below, Appendix B)—has no date. Among other manuscripts transmitting treatise V as in the Cairo edition, see Khoy, Madrasa Nimāzī 247; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 4; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 84 (on these two Leiden codices, see the contribution of Jan J. Witkam in the present volume); Manchester, John Rylands University Library 378; Tehran, Dānishgāh, Mishkāt 243; see also the ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub 262, discussed in Appendix B below.

ing with the universals that constitute the essence of things, namely the genus (V, 3–4), the species (V, 5) and the differentia (V, 6); the last three chapters (V, 7–9), on the other hand, focus on issues concerning the definition. Whereas chapters V, 1–6 are the resumption and the ontological “foundation” in metaphysics of topics already discussed in the logical part of the *Šifāʾ* (especially, in the first section of logic, which corresponds to Porphyry’s *Isagoge*),¹³ the last two chapters (V, 8–9) are Avicenna’s reformulation of themes expounded by Aristotle in *Metaphysics*, book Zeta, chapters 4–5 and 10.¹⁴ The account of treatise V that Avicenna offers in the preliminary chapter I, 4, devoted to outlining the content of all the following treatises of the work, does not contradict this scheme, although it joins the topic treated at the end of chapter V, 2 (whole and part) together with the exposition of the senses of universal and particular with which chapter V, 1 starts, and does not mention explicitly the treatment of differentia and definition in chapters V, 6–9 (possibly included under the phrase “what is like” genus and species in I, 4).¹⁵

On closer inspection, however, the arrangement of the nine chapters of the fifth treatise is less coherent than it may seem at first sight. In particular, three structural problems emerge. First, in the middle of chapter V, 4 one finds a recapitulation of the theme of the first three chapters of the treatise (V, 1–3) and of the previous part of chapter V, 4, that is quite unexpected in the central part of chapter V, 4, since a transition passage like this would fit much better the beginning (or, alternatively, the end) of a textual unit. Here is the English translation of the passage in question:

Text 1

We have made known the nature of the universal, how it exists [= V, 1–2], and how the genus, among them [i.e. the universals] differs from matter [= V, 3], according to a way [of investigation] from which other ways [of investigation]—which we will expound later—can branch out. We have [also] made known which things the genus contains among those through which it is specified [= previous part of V, 4].¹⁶

Moreover, the part of chapter V, 4 that follows immediately this passage contains a prospective reference to two forthcoming topics, only one of which appears to

¹³ See Amos Bertolacci, “The ‘Ontologization’ of Logic. Metaphysical Themes in Avicenna’s Reworking of the *Organon*,” in *Methods and Methodologies: Aristotelian Logic East and West 500–1500*, ed. by Margaret Cameron and John Marenbon (Leiden [a. o.]: Brill, 2011), 27–51.

¹⁴ See Bertolacci, *The Reception*, 352–354.

¹⁵ *Ilāhiyyāt*, I, 4, p. 26, 3–6.

¹⁶ *Ilāhiyyāt*, V, 4, p. 225, 5–7. Cf. Avicenna, *The Metaphysics of The Healing: A parallel English-Arabic text*, translated, introduced, and annotated by Michael E. Marmura (Provo [Utah]: Brigham Young University Press, 2005), 172.

be treated in the remaining part of chapter V, 4, whereas the other lies apparently outside its boundaries. Here is the English translation of the passage:

Text 2

Two investigations, connected with what we are dealing with, remain. The first is [investigating] which things the genus contains among those that do not specify it. The second is [investigating] how this unification [i.e. the unification that conveys the specification of the genus] takes place, and how one single thing, realized (*mutahaṣṣil*) in act, comes to be from the genus and the differentia, which are two [distinct] things.¹⁷

Whereas the first of the two aforementioned investigations starts immediately after Text 2 (see “As to the first investigation, ...”, *ammā l-baḥṭu l-awwalu*, in the following line), it remains uncertain where the second investigation precisely occurs. The sentence “As to the second investigation, ...” (*ammā l-baḥṭu l-tānī*), which one reads ten lines later in chapter V, 4 of the Cairo edition, is omitted in some of the oldest Arabic codices (among which one of those used in the Cairo edition) and in the Latin translation.¹⁸ This sentence is quite suspect: the pericope that it introduces does not fit the description of the second investigation announced by Avicenna in Text 2. The sentence looks therefore a somewhat pedestrian attempt by a later scribe or reader of the *Ilāhiyyāt* of finding a *posteriori* within chapter V, 4 a referent of the second investigation mentioned in Text 2 by Avicenna.¹⁹ The second investigation alluded to by Avicenna in Text 2 refers probably to a portion of the *Ilāhiyyāt* that goes beyond chapter V, 4. The following chapter V, 5 would be a plausible referent of the second investigation, since it deals with the universal “species” and canvasses this latter as a nature realized (*mutahaṣṣila*, the same term employed in the announcement of the second investigation in Text 2) from the genus and the differentia.

Second, chapter V, 5 is unexpectedly very short (less than one page and half, i.e. sixteen lines, in the Cairo edition), being in this way the shortest chapter of the treatise. Being pivotal in the layout of the treatise because of its centrality,

¹⁷) *Ilāhiyyāt*, V, 4, p. 225, 7–10.

¹⁸) See Bertolacci, *The Reception*, 515. Among the codices used in the Cairo edition, ms. London, British Museum (now: British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections), Or. 7500, omits this sentence. The same omission occurs, for instance, in mss. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 125; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 110 (on this codex, see below, section II); Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 4 (on this codex, see the article by Jan J. Witkam in the present volume); London, India Office, Islamic 1811 (on this codex, see below, section II); Ankara, National Library B153 (on this codex, see below, section IV).

¹⁹) Although maintained in all available modern translations of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, I have omitted this phrase in my Italian translation of the work (*Libro della Guarigione, Le Cose Divine* di Avicenna [Ibn Sīnā], a cura di Amos Bertolacci [Turin: UTET, 2007], 457).

as well as fundamental doctrinally, in so far as it deals with the most important of the essential universals, namely the species, one would expect this chapter to be much more extensive. The impression of an anomalous extent is confirmed by the comparison of chapter V, 5 with the other chapters of the work: chapter V, 5 is by far the shortest chapter not only of treatise V, but also of the *Ilāhiyyāt* in its entirety: more precisely, it is less than one third of the chapter that follows it in the rank of shortness, i.e. chapter I, 4, which covers fifty-six lines. Chapter I, 4, however, is an introductory chapter devoted to summarize preliminarily the content of the *Ilāhiyyāt*; its relative shortness, therefore, is not at all surprising. The exceptional brevity of chapter V, 5, by contrast, is incongruous with the average length of the chapters of treatise V and of the other chapters of the *Ilāhiyyāt*.²⁰

Third, chapter V, 8, according to its title, deals with definition in general. Nonetheless it does not precede, but rather follows chapter V, 7, whose topic is a particular aspect of definition, namely the relationship of the definition with the thing defined. The sequence of chapters V, 7 and V, 8 would therefore much more reasonably be inverse. Moreover, chapter V, 7 starts with the exposition of an objection regarding the commonly accepted view of definition, an objection which is subsequently rejected: this abrupt incursion into a “dialectical” issue is unusual for Avicenna: our author usually faces objections and provides their refutations after having positively expounded his own standpoint on a certain topic.²¹

With regard to the last two problems a further observation is in order: chapters V, 5 and V, 8 bear very short titles (“Chapter on species,” “Chapter on definition”) in comparison with the more comprehensive and articulated titles of the other chapters of treatise V. These latter invariably integrate the mention of their main topics (like universals, genus, differentia) with supplementary notations. The climax of this tendency is reached in chapter V, 2. Brevity in titles of chapters is not totally unusual in the *Ilāhiyyāt* (see, for example, the equally short title of chapter IX, 7 “Chapter on the [celestial] destination [of human souls after death]”), but represents in any case, both in treatise V and in the *Ilāhiyyāt tout court*, the exception to the rule.

It can be hardly coincidental that exactly the three chapters (V, 4; V, 5; V, 8) that present the structural difficulties just recalled undergo in the manuscript tradition multiform ways of transmission. Distinct textual witnesses, some of

²⁰⁾ The *wa-ammā ... fa-* construction at the beginning of chapter V, 5 (*wa-ammā l-naw'ū fa-innabū ...*) might be taken as the correlative of the sentence “As to the first investigation, ...” (*ammā l-baḥṭu l-awwalu*) in chapter V, 4. This construction, however, is in no way unusual at the beginning of a chapter: see, for example, the same construction at the beginning of chapters I, 3, I, 8; III, 8 etc.

²¹⁾ See Bertolacci, *The Reception*, 240–245.

which are considered in the following sections, convey a layout of treatise V that is considerably different from the one transmitted in the Cairo edition.

II. Ms. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Minutoli 229, Ms. London, India Office, Islamic 1811, Loth 477, and Ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 110

Max Horten in his pioneering German translation of the *Ilāhiyyāt* of 1906 noted that the four manuscripts of the work he had at his disposal articulated differently the portion of text corresponding to chapter V, 4 in the Cairo edition: two of them (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Minutoli 229 [1083H/1672], and London, India Office Islamic 1811, Loth 477 [1154H/1741]) split this pericope into two distinct chapters, whereas the other two (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Or. 4 [uncertain dating] and Or. 84 [881–882H/1476–1477]) transmitted it as a single chapter.²² In his translation Horten adopted the articulation of chapter V, 4 proper of the former two manuscripts, so that, because of the bipartition of this chapter, his translation of treatise V consists of ten, rather than nine, chapters. Direct inspection allows to observe that in both manuscripts the beginning of the additional chapter starts exactly at the same place, corresponding to p. 225, 5 of the Cairo edition, namely at the beginning of Text 1 above; the start of a new chapter is signaled by the interlinear addition of the term “Chapter” (*fāṣl*) by the same hand in the Berlin manuscript (confirmed by a marginal addition of this term by another hand) and by the marginal addition of this term, apparently by the same hand, in the London manuscript.²³ In both manuscripts, however, the resulting division into ten chapters does not match with the number of chapters indicated at the beginning of the treatise: the Berlin manuscript mentions eight chapters, whereas the London manuscript seven.²⁴ The reason of the divergence between the number of prospected chapters and the number of actual chapters remains obscure.²⁵

²² *Die Metaphysik Avicennas enthaltend die Metaphysik, Theologie, Kosmologie und Ethik*, übersetzt und erläutert von Max Horten (Halle a. S. [a. o.]: Rudolf Haupt, 1907; repr. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1960), 328, n. 2. On the two Leiden codices used by Horten, see the article by Jan J. Witkam in the present volume.

²³ The title of the second part of chapter V, 4 that one reads in Horten’s German translation (“Die Bestimmungen (Dinge), die das Genus enthält,” 328) is apparently an insertion by the translator.

²⁴ In the London manuscript, the term *fāṣl* of chapters V, 1–9 is accompanied, above the line, by Arabic numerals forming a progressive series (the *fāṣl* of chapters V, 7 and V, 8 are both numbered with number 7).

²⁵ As a matter of fact, the Berlin manuscript leaves a lacuna at the beginning of chapters V, 7 and V, 10 (i.e. chapters V, 6 and V, 9 according to the Cairo edition) and omits in these two places the term “Chapter” (*fāṣl*). Thus the actual number of times that the term “Chapter” appears in the titles of the

The layout of treatise V in these two manuscripts is therefore the following (among square brackets I add the number of chapters that results from the division adopted by these two codices, and their correspondences with the chapters of the Cairo edition):

- [1] Chapter on common things and the modality of their existence [= V, 1]
- [2] Chapter on the modality according to which universality belongs to universal natures (completion of the discussion of this [topic]) and on the difference between whole and part, universal and particular [= V, 2]
- [3] Chapter on the distinction between genus and matter [= V, 3]
- [4] Chapter on the modality according to which the notions external to the genus enter into its nature [= V, 4 until p. 225, 4]
- [5] Chapter [= V, 4 from p. 225, 5 to the end]
- [6] Chapter on the species [= V, 5]
- [7] Chapter on determining and ascertaining the differentia [= V, 6]
- [8] Chapter on determining the relationship between the definition and the thing defined [= V, 7]
- [9] Chapter on the definition [= V, 8]
- [10] Chapter on the relationship between the definition and its parts [= V, 9]

Also H. Ḥasan Zādah al-Āmulī, the editor of a printing of the *Ilāhiyyāt* published in Qum in 1997/8, records in a footnote to chapter V, 4, p. 225, 5, that two of the codices that he uses present at this point the beginning of a new chapter, although the number of chapters of treatise V that these codices announce at the beginning of treatise V is, in both cases, nine rather than ten.²⁶ The identity and date of these codices, as of the other manuscripts used by al-Āmulī, remains regrettably unknown. What al-Āmulī says in the aforementioned footnote lets one surmise that the kind of articulation of chapter V, 4 attested by these two codices is similar to the one presented by the Berlin and the London codices, i.e. that it is effected through the insertion, either in the text or in the margins,

chapters of treatise V is eight, rather than ten. The number seven in the London manuscript might be the result of a confusion of “seven” with “nine,” two numerals whose unpointed skeleton in Arabic is identical. reckonings of seven chapters of treatise V are otherwise attested in the manuscript tradition (see section III below).

²⁶ Ibn Sīnā, *al-Ilāhiyyāt min Kitāb al-Ṣifāʾ*, ed. by Ḥasan Ḥasan Zādah al-Āmulī (Qum: Maktab al-ʿIlām al-Islāmī, Markaz al-Naṣr, 1418 H.q., 1376 H.š. [= 1997/8]), 227, n. 2: “This place is introduced by “chapter” (*fāʾil*) in two manuscripts I have. This does not contradict what is said at the beginning of the treatise, namely that it consists of nine chapters, since the determination of the number of chapters at the beginnings of treatises is not by Avicenna, but is someone else’s addition” (translation mine).

of the term “Chapter” (*faṣl*). Differently from Horten, al-Āmulī maintains the articulation of treatise V in nine chapters, as in the Cairo edition.

Indications of the division of chapter V, 4 into two autonomous parts surface in manuscripts of the *Ilāhiyyāt* decidedly older than those considered so far. It is noteworthy, for example, that ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 110 (601H/1204 or 604H/1207) presents treatise V as divided into nine chapters, as in the Cairo edition, but, at the point of transition from p. 225, 4 to p. 225, 5 of chapter V, 4, it reports a marginal abbreviation (the *ʔ* of *intabā*) similar to those that regularly occur at the end of chapters V, 1–9 (and of most of the other chapters of the *Ilāhiyyāt*) to indicate the conclusion of these chapters. One can therefore take this sign as equivalent to, although less conspicuous than, the term *faṣl* in the Berlin and the London manuscripts: while *faṣl* marks there the beginning of a new chapter at p. 225, 5, the sign *ʔ* marks here the end of a chapter at p. 225, 4.²⁷

In all these witnesses, a bipartition of chapter V, 4 conducive to making Text 1 the beginning of a new chapter removes the structural problem given by the presence of the transitional passage (Text 1) within chapter V, 4 in the Cairo edition.²⁸ Moreover, the fragmentation of chapter V, 4 thus obtained makes less noticeable the shortness of chapter V, 5: this latter results to be preceded, not by a long chapter like V, 4 in the Cairo edition, but by two briefer textual units. Some of the problems presented by the Cairo edition and recalled in section I above are therefore avoided or lessened.

The circulation of the second part of chapter V, 4 as a textual unit simply introduced by interlinear or marginal markers (either the term *faṣl* or the abbreviation for *intabā*), without an autonomous title, may look suspect, and be taken as an intervention on the text by a scribe or reader puzzled by the content of the chapter and willing to evidence its inner structure. The omission of the descriptive part of the title of chapters after the term *faṣl* is not unusual in codices of the *Ilāhiyyāt*:²⁹ these chapters, however, albeit lacking titles, do not cease to be

²⁷ A bipartition of chapter V, 4 analogous to that examined in the present section, although not totally identical (since the beginning of the additional chapter falls in this case a few lines later, on p. 226, 3 of chapter V, 4 of the Cairo edition), occurs in the Ankara manuscript that I am going to examine in section IV.

²⁸ All the aforementioned witnesses present chapter V, 5 as an independent chapter. The sentence “As to the second investigation, ...” (*ammā l-baḥṭu l-tāni*) in chapter V, 4 is absent in the Oxford and the London manuscripts.

²⁹ The descriptive part of the title of chapter V, 5 (“... on the species”) is absent, for instance, in ms. Daiber Collection III 131, where only the term *faṣl* (“Chapter”) appears. An analogous omission regards the descriptive part of the title of chapter V, 8 (“... on the definition”) in ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 125 (561H/1166 or 571/1175); also in this case, only the term *faṣl* (“Chapter”) appears, without the other two following elements of the title. Other codices too

autonomous units, structurally distinct from previous and following chapters, since in their case the term *faṣl* occurs in the text and not in the margins or between the lines. Future research will hopefully assess whether the manuscript tradition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* presents more effective ways of bisecting chapter V, 4.

III. The Latin Translation, and a Marginal Annotation in Ms. Berlin, Minutoli 229

A much more clear-cut and radical variation in the articulation and disposition of the chapters of treatise V of the *Ilāhiyyāt* occurs in the Latin Medieval translation, datable approximately to the third quarter of the twelfth century in Toledo.³⁰ This time the variation with respect to the Cairo edition presents three aspects: (1) the conflation of a first pair of consecutive chapters, (2) the conflation of a second pair of consecutive chapters, and (3) the transposition of the second pair of consecutive chapters before the chapter that precedes them in the Cairo edition. In this way, the Latin translation presents treatise V in its entirety as consisting of only seven chapters:

- I Capitulum de rebus communibus et quomodo est esse earum [= V, 1]
- II Capitulum qualiter naturas comitatur universalitas et completur dictio in hoc et deinde de differentia universalis et particularis ad totum et partem [= V, 2]

preserve the title of V, 8 incompletely. An old manuscript like Oxford, Bodleian Pococke 125 witnesses that this kind of omission occurred quite early in the process of manuscript dissemination. The tendency to convey the title of chapters of treatise V only partially is particularly conspicuous in the manuscript I am going to examine in section IV, in which only one chapter of this treatise (V, 3) bears the description of the content after the word *faṣl*.

³⁰ Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de Philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, I–IV*, ed. by Simone Van Riet (Louvain-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1977); *Liber de Philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, V–X*, ed. by Simone Van Riet (Louvain-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1980); *Liber de Philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, I–X: Lexiques*, par S. Van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1983; on pp. 6*–14* one finds *addenda et corrigenda* regarding the previous two volumes). On the Latin translations of Avicenna's *Šifā'*, see Jules Janssens, "Ibn Sinā (Avicenna), Latin Translations of," in *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy. Philosophy Between 500 and 1500*, ed. by Henrik Lagerlund (Berlin: Springer, 2011), vol. I, 522–527, and Amos Bertolacci, "A Community of Translators: The Latin Medieval Versions of Avicenna's *Book of the Cure*," in *Communities of Learning: Networks and the Shaping of Intellectual Identity in Europe 1100–1500*, ed. by Constant J. Mews and John N. Crossley (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 37–54, and the bibliography quoted therein. Since the first signs of circulation of the Latin translation of the *Ilāhiyyāt* surface in the last decades of the thirteenth century (see Amos Bertolacci, "On the Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics before Albertus Magnus: An Attempt at Periodization," in *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics*, ed. by Dag N. Hasse and Amos Bertolacci [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012], 197–223) the translation can be retrospectively dated around 1150–1175.

- III Capitulum de assignanda differentia inter genus et materiam [= V, 3]
- IV Capitulum de intellectibus qui sunt extra intentionem generis quomodo recipiuntur intra naturam generis [= V, 4 + V, 5]
- V Capitulum de assignanda comparatione definitionis et definiti [= V, 7 + V, 8]
- VI Capitulum de differentia et eius certitudine [= V, 6]
- VII Capitulum de comparatione definitionis cum partibus suis [= V, 9]

The first three chapters of the Latin translation (I–III)³¹ faithfully reflect chapters V, 1–3 in the Cairo edition. The fourth chapter (IV), on the other hand, is the result of the conflation of chapters V, 4 and V, 5. Two other consecutive chapters (V, 7 and V, 8) are not only conflated in a single chapter but also regarded as the fifth unit (V) of the treatise, i.e. they are moved before the chapter that precedes them in the Cairo edition (V, 6), which becomes the sixth chapter (VI) of the treatise. The seventh, last, chapter (VII) of the Latin translation corresponds to chapter V, 9 in the Cairo edition. In this way, the Latin translation provides a sufficiently coherent outlook of treatise V: after the two introductory chapters on universals in general, one finds two chapters dealing with the genus, one with the species/definition, one with the differentia, and one with the relationship between the definition and its parts (one of which is the differentia). In this way, the three problems that emerge in the Cairo edition—namely (a) the transitional passage and the announcement of the topic of chapter V, 5 in the middle of chapter V, 4 (see Texts 1–2 above); (b) the succinctness of chapter V, 5; and (c) the postponement of a chapter on definition in general (V, 8) to a chapter dealing with a particular aspect of definition (V, 7)—do not subsist anymore: since chapters V, 4 and V, 5 constitute one and the same textual unit, the transitional passage in chapter V, 4 appears as an internal articulation of this unit, the prospective reference to a second investigation is concretely implemented by the annexation of chapter V, 5 to chapter V, 4,³² and this annexation considerably increases the length of chapter V, 5; likewise, in so far as chapter V, 8 is the continuation of chapter V, 7, its topic does not represent a *hysteron proteron* with respect to the topic of the preceding chapter.

The same roster of chapters that we find in the Latin translation appears in a marginal annotation of the Berlin manuscript (Minutoli 229, fol. 67^r) analyzed

³¹ In all likelihood, the Roman numerals preceding the titles of the chapters in the critical edition of the Latin translation are editorial insertions.

³² In the Latin translation nothing corresponds to the phrase “As to the second investigation, ...” (*ammā l-baḥṭu l-ṭānī*) in chapter V, 4 (see above, the considerations on Text 2).

in section II. This annotation, by a different hand, occurs at the beginning of treatise V and is meant to provide a division into chapters alternative to that offered by the manuscript. In all likelihood, it is the marginal annotator who corrects the number “eight” that the Berlin manuscript uses to count the chapters of treatise V (fol. 67r, 7) with a number “seven” written above the line:

- [1] The first [chapter]: Chapter on common things
- [2] The second [chapter]: On the modality according to which universality pertains to universal natures (completion of the discussion of this [topic]) and on the difference between whole and part, universal and particular
- [3] The third [chapter]: Chapter on the distinction between genus and matter
- [4] The fourth [chapter]: Chapter on the modality according to which the notions external to the genus enter into its nature
- [5] The fifth [chapter]: Chapter on determining the definition and the thing defined
- [6] The sixth [chapter]: Chapter on ascertaining the differentia
- [7] The seventh [chapter]: Chapter on the relationship between the definition and its parts

The resemblance with the Latin translation is striking. The number and disposition of chapters is exactly the same, although in the marginal annotation the titles are occasionally shortened. The manuscript from which this annotation is taken belongs in all likelihood to the same family of Arabic codices from which the Latin translation derives. On account of the aforementioned elements of similarity, we can assume that also in this manuscript the fourth chapter encompassed both chapter V, 4 and chapter V, 5 in the Cairo edition, whereas the fifth chapter embraced chapter V, 7 and chapter V, 8.

The two confluents that characterize the Latin translation and the marginal annotation in the Berlin manuscript have some partial correspondences also in other Arabic codices. Some manuscripts, for example, provide a defective count of the chapters of treatise V by disregarding chapter V, 5.³³ Other codices, on the

³³ Ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub 826 (1084H/1673), for example—a codex used in the Cairo edition (see below, Appendix B)—transmits all nine chapters of treatise V as distinct from one another, each with its own complete title, but shows in the margins a numeration of these chapters, made by means of letters of the Arabic alphabet according to the system *abġad*, in which chapter V, 5 is not taken into account and is not associated to any letter. In this way, only chapters V, 1–4 and 6–9 are reckoned in the marginal numeration, and the overall series of chapters of treatise V is made by eight, rather than nine, units. Accordingly, a marginal note presents treatise V, after its first mention (*al-maqālatu l-hāmisatu*), as consisting of eight rather than nine chapters (*wa-fihā ṭamāniyatu fuṣūlin*).

other hand, omit completely the title of chapter V, 8, although they report the content of this chapter at its place, and state from the outset that the treatise consists of nine chapters.³⁴ Finally, some manuscripts transmit all nine chapters of treatise V as distinct from one another, each bearing its own title, and nonetheless indicate initially, at the beginning of the treatise, that the number of chapters amounts to eight, rather than nine.³⁵ Although this fact can depend on the neglect of any chapter of treatise V (some codices, for instance, fix to eight the number of the chapters of treatise V just because they overlook chapter V, 3 in the reckoning³⁶), it is also compatible with a scenario given by one of the two confluations examined in the present section.

The rearrangement of the chapters of treatise V that occurs in the Latin translation and in the marginal annotation of the Berlin manuscript is too complex to be coincidental. The two confluations and the transposition do not seem to be produced by bare mechanical accidents of the process of copy. On the other hand, the agreement between the Latin translation and a note of an Arabic manuscript of different geographical provenience (we know from the colophon that the Berlin manuscript was copied in Işfahān, and we can suppose that also the codex from which the marginal annotation was taken came from the Islamic East) prompt us to exclude that the Latin translator(s) used an Arabic manuscript (or a sample of Arabic codices) in which the series of chapters of treatise V was as it is in the Cairo edition, but decided on his (their) own to give a new arrangement to the structure of the treatise. The only alternative we are left with is that some agent of the manuscript transmission of the work decided to change radically the disposition of the chapters of treatise V in the period of time going from the composition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* to the epoch of its Latin translation (third quarter of the twelfth century).

³⁴) This happens, for example, in ms. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek Or. 4 (see above, n. 22), in which the title of chapter V, 8 (“Chapter on the definition,” *faṣṭṭ fi l-ḥadd*) is absent in the main text, and is only added in the margin by a different hand.

³⁵) This happens, for example, in mss. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub 262 (1337H/1918, copy of a ms. of 992H/1584)—a codex occasionally employed in the Cairo edition (see below, Appendix B)—and Lucknow, Nadwat al-‘Ulamā, *ḥikma wa-falṣafa* 59 (no date; on this codex, see the article by Asad Q. Ahmed in the present volume): in these two codices, after the mention of “the fifth treatise” (*al-maqālatu l-ḥāmisatu*), we find the indication that its chapters are eight (*wa-fihā ṭamāniyatu fuṣūlin* in the former, *ṭamāniyatu fuṣūlin* in the latter).

³⁶) See the list of chapters that precedes the beginning of treatise V in ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 110 (see above, n. 11). The same neglect of individual chapters can be noticed in the list of chapters of treatises III and VIII in this manuscript.

IV. Ms. Ankara, National Library B153

The climax of the tendency to present an outline of treatise V different from the one found in the Cairo edition is reached by the ms. Ankara, Millî Kütüphane (National Library) B153. This codex, that only recent research has discovered, was written in 694H/1294 by a certain ‘Abd Allāh ibn Argūs al-Bağdādī in the city of Mārdīn (or Māridīn) in South East Turkey.³⁷ The Ankara manuscript sums up all the modification we have seen so far in the other textual witnesses examined, namely the splitting of single chapters into distinct units, the merging of distinct chapters into a single unit, and the transposition of chapters from the place they occupy in the Cairo edition. In this case, however, all these variations are more far-reaching than in the manuscripts or translations examined before: the splitting of single chapters occurs twice (chapter V, 1 and chapter V, 4); the chapters merged together are non-consecutive (V, 5 and V, 8); and the transposition involves a three-step removal of a chapter from its original position (chapter V, 8 precedes both chapter V, 6 and chapter V, 7). The outline of treatise V in the Ankara manuscript is the following:

- [1] Chapter [= V, 1, until p. 200, 13]
- [2] Chapter [= V, 1, from p. 200, 14 until the end]
- [3] Chapter on the modality according to which universality pertains to universal natures (completion of the discussion of this [topic]) and on the difference between whole and part, universal and particular [= V, 2]
- [4] Chapter [= V, 3]
- [5] Chapter [= V, 4 until p. 226, 2]
- [6] Chapter [= V, 4, from p. 226, 3 until the end]
- [7] Chapter [= V, 5 + V, 8]
- [8] Chapter [= V, 6]
- [9] Chapter [= V, 7]
- [10] Chapter [= V, 9]

All the chapters but one (the third in the sequence of the Ankara manuscript, corresponding to chapter V, 2 in the Cairo edition) are reported without the part of the title following the term “Chapter” (*fāṣṣa*). Two chapters (V, 1 and V, 4) are split into two parts; conversely, two other chapters (V, 5 and V, 8) are merged together. In this way, the Ankara manuscript articulates treatise V into a series of ten chapters. The division of chapter V, 4 falls precisely where the Cairo

³⁷ The colophon states: (1) *farāḡa min ta’līqihī l-‘abdu l-muftaqīru ilā raḥmati* (2) *Rabbihī wa-ḡuf-rānihī ‘Abd Allāh ibn Argūs (?)* (3) *al-Bağdādī wa-ḡālīka bi(?)*-*awāḡiri šahri Rabī‘i* (4) *l-āḡiri min*

edition reports the sentence “As to the second investigation, ...” (*ammā l-baḥṭu l-ṭānī*), which the Ankara manuscript omits; the division of V, 4 can therefore be seen as an attempt to stress the transition to what might be taken to be the second topic announced in Text 2, but it could also have other explanations. The merging of chapters V, 5 and V, 8, on the other hand, removes, with a single move, the other two structural problems affecting these chapters in the Cairo edition: by the addition of chapter V, 8, chapter V, 5 ceases to be short; through its association with a previous chapter, chapter V, 8 ceases to be an autonomous and noticeable treatment of a topic that would naturally precede, rather than follow, that of the previous chapter. The association of two chapters dealing with the same topic (species in chapter V, 5; definition in chapter V, 8) looks therefore particularly effective.

The division of chapters V, 1 and V, 4 into two halves does not occur by chance, but reflects fundamental junctions of the chapters under consideration.³⁸ Similar bipartitions of single chapters take place also elsewhere in this manuscript;³⁹ in one case (chapter VI, 5), a single chapter is divided into three distinct units. To the best of my knowledge, this tendency to articulate the content of the work in discrete textual units represents a peculiar aspect of the manuscript under examination. The systematic omissions of the descriptive parts of the titles of chapters is another striking feature of this codex, also beyond the boundaries of treatise V.⁴⁰ This omissive attitude with regard to titles is congruent with a more general tendency to brevity proper of this codex: one notices in it omissions of passages, even of considerable length, as well as shortenings of sentences.⁴¹ The

sanati arba'in wa-tis'ina wa-sittim'atin (5) al-hilāliyyati bi-maḥrūsati Mārdīna (or: Māridīna) ṣānahā (6) Allāhu 'ani l-aḡā. I wish to thank Jan J. Witkam and Adam Gacek for their enlightening remarks on difficult points of this text.

³⁸ In the case of chapter V, 1, the bipartition falls at p. 200, 14, immediately after a sentence (p. 200, 13) in which Avicenna declares that he is going to summarize and rephrase the previous treatment of the doctrine of universals. In the case of chapter V, 4, the bipartition is posited at p. 226, 3, where the Cairo edition and some codices place the sentence “As to the second investigation, ...” (see above, section I). The Ankara manuscript does not report this sentence.

³⁹ Chapters I, 1; III, 6; IV, 2; VI, 3; VII, 2; VIII, 1; VIII, 3; IX, 2.

⁴⁰ Of the 61 chapters of the *Ilābiyyāt* (each of which has a title in the Cairo edition), the Ankara manuscript reports a title only in fourteen cases (besides chapter V, 2, also chapters I, 4; VI, 4–5; VII, 1–3; VIII, 1–3; VIII, 4–6; IX, 1); in seven other cases (the remaining seven chapters of the first treatise), the titles are added in the margins by a second hand.

⁴¹ See, for example, the omission on fol. 65^r of the pericope V, 1, p. 197, 2–5, or the shortening on fol. 71^r of the sentence V, 3, p. 215, 12 (*fa-in ubīda l-ḥassāsu ḡisman aw ṣay'an labū l-ḥissu ...*, “If the sensitive is taken as a body or something having sensation ...”) into *fa-in ubīda l-ḥassāsu ḡisman labū l-ḥissu ...*, “If the sensitive is taken as a body having sensation ...”), where the precision *aw ṣay'an* (“or something”), common to other codices, looks in fact redundant. These two, and other similar cases, do not appear to be omissions by homeoteleuton, like, for example, that regarding the passage V, 9, p. 252, 2–5 (*fa-inna l-quwwata min ḥaytu hiya quwwatun ... ṣārat tilka l-quwwatu*

opposite trend to add textual material lacking in the Cairo edition looks, at first sight, more rare.⁴² By contrast, the transposition of chapter V, 8 and its conflation with chapter V, 5 represents a unique case in the codex. The joint presentation of chapters V, 5 and V, 8 is quite noteworthy, since the conflation of two distinct chapters seems to go against the aforementioned tendency of this manuscript to split chapters, rather than to merge them.

Thus, on the one hand the Ankara manuscript emphasizes pivotal structural splices of treatise V by introducing two new chapters, without paying too much attention, in general, to the titles of chapters; on the other hand, it audaciously and smartly transposes chapter V, 8, placing it as the continuation of chapter V, 5. Whereas the first aspect can be taken as a peculiarity introduced by the extensor of the manuscript itself or of its immediate ancestors, the second aspect can hardly be considered an accident of transmission in this way, and seems rather to point to a “core” original feature of the text as conveyed by this codex, far beyond the idiosyncracies of copyists or readers. As in the case of the textual witnesses examined in the previous sections, the modification at hand is so precise and effective that one has to suppose a willful intervention on the text of the treatise by some agent involved in the process of its transmission. The issue that has to be settled is, of course, which kind of agent was able and entitled to introduce into the text of the *Ilābiyyāt* modifications so marked as the ones we have observed in the Ankara manuscript and in the other testimonies.

Conclusion

The examples discussed in the previous sections have different weights, and the three cases taken into account should in principle be kept distinct from one another. The first case regards a thin kind of evidence (marginal or interlinear additions regarding a single chapter of the treatise, which become more and more visible in late manuscripts), in comparison with the much stronger evidence of the second case (a markedly original arrangement of many of the chapters of the treatise in one of the earliest testimonia of the work), whereas the evidence provided by the third case is mixed (deriving partly from peculiar features of the codex in question, partly from an original restructuring of the text it transmits).

al-qaribatu mawğūdatan bi-l-fi'li ...) which becomes on fol. 84^r, 1–3, of the Ankara manuscript *fa-inna l-quwwata al-qaribata mawğūdatun bi-l-fi'li*. I am very grateful to Silvia Di Vincenzo for the observations contained in the present and in the following footnote.

⁴² See, for example, the addition of a few lines before *fa-naqūlu* at V, 3, p. 213, 11, on fol. 71^r, 2–9. The Ankara manuscript is the only codex known to me to add this passage, which might be omitted in other codices because of homoarchton (the added passage reads: *fa-naqūlu yağibu an ta'lama anna l-ma'nā etc.*). One may notice the authorial tenor of this passage (“We say: you must know that the meaning etc.”) which resembles closely Avicenna’s style.

Nonetheless, this varied evidence documents cumulatively that the manuscript tradition of treatise V of the *Ilāhiyyāt* is quite multifarious in the very first centuries of the transmission of this work. The most ancient witnesses of the work corroborate, on the one hand, the disposition of chapters of treatise V adopted in the Cairo edition; on the other hand, at least three of them, of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, arrange the profile of this treatise quite differently from one another and from the *versio vulgata* reproduced in the Cairo edition. The variations are wide ranging, since they regard, directly or indirectly, five of the nine chapters of the treatise that appear in the Cairo edition. The overall situation can be summarized as follows:

- Chapter V, 4: self-standing (Cairo edition); split in two (mss. Oxford, Berlin and London; ms. Ankara); merged with V, 5 (Latin translation)
- Chapter V, 5: self-standing (Cairo edition); merged with V, 4 (Latin translation); merged with V, 8 (ms. Ankara)
- Chapter V, 6: placed before V, 7–8 (Cairo edition); placed after V, 7–8 (Latin translation); placed after V, 8 (ms. Ankara)
- Chapter V, 7: self-standing (Cairo edition); merged with V, 8 (Latin translation); placed after V, 8 (ms. Ankara)
- Chapter V, 8: self-standing (Cairo edition); merged with V, 7 (Latin translation); merged with V, 5 (ms. Ankara)

Moreover, all the witnesses examined here present coherent and sensible ways of arranging the roster of chapters of treatise V, without getting involved in the structural problems that the Cairo edition raises, namely the anomalous presence of a severing transition passage in the middle of chapter V, 4, the puzzling shortness of chapter V, 5, and the unnatural postponement of chapter V, 8 to chapter V, 7. In so far as chapter V, 4 is divided into two distinct parts or continues uninterruptedly in chapter V, 5, it either gives structural force to the transition passage that it contains, or it acquires a textual width sufficient to make sense of it; in so far as chapter V, 5 is conflated with another chapter (be it V, 4 or V, 8), it stops amazing the reader because of its brevity; and in so far as chapter V, 8 is merged with a previous chapter (be it V, 7 or V, 5), the treatment of definition as such in V, 8 ceases to follow the treatment of the definition in connection with the thing defined in V, 7. Some configurations are more effective than others, with a peak represented by the Latin translation. But also the other, less comprehensive, ways of escaping the structural odds of the Cairo edition are, although on a more limited scale, forcible and persuasive. In other words, in all cases we are in front of alternative ways of structuring the content of treatise V that are both reasonable and, in all likelihood, deliberate, i.e. too reasonable not to be deliberate. Although a confusion regarding chapters is more likely to happen in a treatise

on universals than elsewhere,⁴³ we are definitely in front of conscious and willful decisions, rather than of mechanical accidents of the process of textual transmission.

We can reasonably suppose that treatise V of the *Ilāhiyyāt* does not represent an exceptional case, and that the same situation of multiform manuscript tradition may regard also other treatises of the *Ilāhiyyāt* or other parts of the *Šifāʾ*. A perusal of the content of the *Ilāhiyyāt* shows a series of *loci critici*, like internal incoherences (see, for example, those resulting from the comparison of the outlines of some of the treatises of the works presented in the preliminary chapter I, 4, and the actual content of the treatises in question),⁴⁴ duplications of sections having the same content (like the repetition of the topic of chapters I, 6–7, on the Necessary Existent's unity, in chapter VIII, 5, whose title stresses the presence of a previous treatment of the same subject),⁴⁵ and stylistic imperfections (like the abrupt beginning of chapter II, 2, which looks more like the continuation of the title than the actual start of the chapter).⁴⁶ All these problematic passages, which indicate a painstaking process of composition of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, may constitute additional test-cases for the type of investigation proposed here.

⁴³ The polysemic term *faṣl* (“chapter,” “distinction”) acquires in the context of the discussion of universals a further shade of meaning, conveying also the idea of “differentia,” i.e. “specific difference” (these three different meanings are visible in the titles of the chapters of *Ilāhiyyāt* V). This being the case, the possible confusion of *faṣl* in the sense of “chapter” with *faṣl* in the sense of “distinction” or “differentia,” and its neglect as a marker of the beginning of a chapter—especially if this term occurs alone, not accompanied by the rest of the title, or if it is not sufficiently evidenced by rubrication or other devices—is more likely to occur. However, to explain all the variations we have discussed here simply as scribal errors would be too laborious: we should suppose, for instance, that the exemplars of the various testimonia taken into account articulated very sharply the content of some chapters (like V, 4) or omitted, either in part or totally, the titles of other chapters (like V, 5 and V, 8), and that careless copyists or translators of these exemplars split the former chapters or joined together the latter. Even in this case the transposition of chapters (especially of non-consecutive chapters) would be hard to explain as a mechanical event. Above all, all these different types of mistakes should have occurred in a very short period of time (about a century and a half after the composition of the *Ilāhiyyāt*).

⁴⁴ The problem concerns in particular treatises III and VII (I, 4, pp. 25, 14–26, 1, and pp. 26, 17–27, 8, respectively), since the treatment of unity originally announced in treatise VII is actually placed by Avicenna in treatise III; and treatise IV (*ibid.*, p. 26, 1–2) whose outline in I, 4 does not seem to match in any particular way the actual content of the treatise. Of course, Avicenna might have changed his own mind on the most suitable content of the various treatises while he was writing the *Ilāhiyyāt*, or he might have simply chosen to present the outlook of the work in the preliminary chapter I, 4 differently from its actual content. Nonetheless, the aforementioned incongruences might have also solicited an effort of revision and refinement of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, regardless whether by Avicenna or by someone else.

⁴⁵ See *Ilāhiyyāt*, VIII, 5, p. 349, 8–10.

⁴⁶ See *Ilāhiyyāt*, II, 2, p. 61, 4.

In front of this scenario, future research is asked to address a series of interrelated issues. The first and fundamental task is to determine how many other witnesses of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, beside the aforementioned testimonia, convey the alternative versions of treatise V considered here, and which is their genetic affiliation and stemmatic relation, determined on the basis of their date, geographical provenience, common errors etc. The second *desideratum* is to assess whether the *versio vulgata* represented by the Cairo edition, despite being apparently the most widespread, is also the first version of the treatise, or rather an adjustment, which subsequently gained wider diffusion, of a previous account of it, like one of those documented in sections II–IV above. Finally and most importantly: if, as it seems, the variations taken into account in the present article presuppose an intentional effort of reformulation of the profile of treatise V, shall we ascribe them exclusively to post-Avicennian agents (scribes, owners of manuscripts, first disciples etc.?) or can we trace them back to Avicenna himself? In other words, is Avicenna responsible of only one version of this treatise (regardless of whether the author's version is the *versio vulgata* or a different one), from which the others derived through conscious revisions by scribes and users, or did he author more than one of the aforementioned accounts?

Only a future exhaustive investigation of the countless codices preserving the text of the *Ilāhiyyāt* will be able to provide a clarification of these questions. The line of research proposed here, however, is worth pursuing also before the definitive solution of queries like the aforementioned. On the one hand, it points to the existence, if not of recensions, at least of hyparchetypes that stand very high in the *stemma codicum* and originate distinct fundamental families of codices of the *Ilāhiyyāt*. On the other hand, it shows the importance of the Latin translation as a witness of the Arabic text of the *Ilāhiyyāt*,⁴⁷ and, conversely, it sheds important light on the Arabic background of this translation, paving the way towards the identification of the Arabic manuscript(s) (or family thereof) from which the Latin version was made. Finally, it is conducive to a better grasp of the way in which Avicenna's works were used by immediate disciples, subsequent scholars, knowledgeable owners of manuscripts etc., showing possibly that Avicenna's philosophical masterpiece prompted not only the effort of faithful transmission, but also the tendency towards free adaptation, and that these two trends might have interacted within the process of manuscript dissemination. A paradigmatic figure is, again, Abū 'Ubayd al-Gūzġānī. He was, on the hand, the "amanuensis" of Avicenna,⁴⁸ namely the disciple who recorded the master's dictations and took

⁴⁷ See, on this topic, the article by Jules Janssens in the present volume.

⁴⁸ This expression is aptly used by T. Street in his Introduction to *Avicenna's Deliverance: Logic, Translation and Notes* by Asad Q. Ahmed (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), xxii.

good care of his works. On the other hand, he was the real editor of some of the master's writings, most famously of Avicenna's *Book of Salvation* (*Kitāb al-Nağāt*), which al-Gūzġānī assembled from scattered pieces and wrapped up.⁴⁹ Also from the ecdotic point of view, a better knowledge of the "school" of Avicenna, of the attitude of his members towards authority, and of the textual activities performed in its circuit, remains a crucial task of future research.

⁴⁹) See Dimitri Gutas, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works* (Leiden [a. o.]: Brill, 1988), 112–114.

Appendix A. Synoptic Table of the Manuscript Evidence Discussed in the Article

| | ed. Cairo | Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Minutoli 229 (1083H/1672) | London, India Office Islamic 1811 Loth 477 (1154H/1741) | Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pococke 110 (601H/1204 or 604H/1207) |
|------|--|---|---|---|
| | al-maqālatu l-ḥāmisatu | al-maqālatu l-ḥāmisatu | al-maqālatu l-ḥāmisatu | al-maqālatu l-ḥāmisatu |
| | wa-fihā tis'atu fuṣūlīn | wa-fihā ṭamāniyatu fuṣūlīn | sab'ātu fuṣūlīn | list of chapters |
| V, 1 | [al-faṣlu l-awwalu] (١) faṣlun fī l-umūri l-'āmmati wa-kayfiyyati wuḡūdhā | faṣlun fī l-umūri l-'āmmati wa-kayfa wuḡūdhā | faṣlun fī l-umūri l-'āmmati wa-kayfa wuḡūdhā (¹ s.l.) | faṣlun fī l-umūri l-'āmmati wa-kayfa wuḡūdhā |
| V, 2 | [al-faṣlu l-tānī] (٢) faṣlun fī kayfiyyati kawni (luḥūqī corr. i.l. a.m.) l-kulliyati li-l-ṭabā'ī l-kulliyati wa-itmāmi l-qawli fī ḡālika etc. | faṣlun fī kayfiyyati kawni (luḥūqī corr. i.l. a.m.) l-kulliyati li-l-ṭabā'ī l-kulliyati wa-itmāmi l-qawli fī ḡālika etc. | faṣlun fī kayfiyyati (luḥūqī corr. mg.) kawni l-ṭabā'ī l-kulliyati wa-itmāmi l-qawli fī ḡālika etc. (² s.l.) | faṣlun fī kayfiyyati luḥūqī (wa-kawni add. s.l. a.m.) l-kulliyati li-l-ṭabā'ī l-kulliyati wa-itmāmi l-qawli fī ḡālika etc. |
| V, 3 | [al-faṣlu l-tālītu] (٣) faṣlun fī l-faṣli bayna l-ḡinsi wa-l-māddati | faṣlun fī l-faṣli bayna l-ḡinsi wa-l-māddati | faṣlun fī l-faṣli bayna l-ḡinsi wa-l-māddati (³ s.l.) | faṣlun fī l-faṣli bayna l-ḡinsi wa-l-māddati |
| V, 4 | [al-faṣlu l-rābi'u] (٤) faṣlun fī kayfiyyati duḥūlī l-ma'āni l-ḥārīḡati 'ani l-ḡinsi 'alā ṭabī'ati l-ḡinsi | faṣlun fī kayfiyyati duḥūlī l-ma'āni l-ḥārīḡati 'ani l-ḡinsi 'alā ṭabī'ati l-ḡinsi (at p. 225, 5) faṣl add. s.l., faṣl add. mg. a.m. | faṣlun fī kayfiyyati duḥūlī l-ma'āni l-ḥārīḡati 'ani l-ḡinsi 'alā ṭabī'ati l-ḡinsi (⁴ s.l.) (at p. 225, 5) faṣl add. mg. | faṣlun fī kayfiyyati duḥūlī l-ma'āni l-ḥārīḡati 'ani l-ḡinsi 'alā ṭabī'ati l-ḡinsi (at p. 225, 5) sign of end of chapter (⁵) add. mg. a.m. |
| V, 5 | [al-faṣlu l-ḥāmisu] (٥) faṣlun fī l-naw'i | faṣlun fī l-naw'i | faṣlun fī l-naw'i (⁶ s.l.) | faṣlun fī l-naw'i |
| V, 6 | [al-faṣlu l-sādisu] (٦) faṣlun fī ta'rifi l-faṣli wa-taḥqīqihī | [lac.] fī ta'rifi l-faṣli wa-taḥqīqihī | faṣlun fī ta'rifi l-faṣli wa-taḥqīqihī (⁷ s.l.) | faṣlun fī ta'rifi l-faṣli wa-taḥqīqihī |
| V, 7 | al-faṣlu l-sābi'u (٧) faṣlun fī ta'rifi munāsabati l-ḥaddi wa-l-mahdūdi | faṣlun fī ta'rifi munāsabati l-ḥaddi wa-l-mahdūdi | faṣlun fī ta'rifi munāsabati l-ḥaddi wa-l-mahdūdi (⁸ s.l.) | faṣlun fī ta'rifi munāsabati l-ḥaddi wa-l-mahdūdi |
| V, 8 | [al-faṣlu l-tāminu] (٨) faṣlun fī l-ḥaddi | faṣlun fī l-ḥaddi | faṣlun fī l-ḥaddi (⁹ s.l.) | faṣlun fī l-ḥaddi |
| V, 9 | [al-faṣlu l-tāsi'u] (٩) faṣlun fī munāsabati l-ḥaddi wa-aḡzā'ihī | [lac.] fī munāsabati l-ḥaddi wa-aḡzā'ihī | faṣlun fī munāsabati l-ḥaddi wa-aḡzā'ihī (¹⁰ s.l.) | faṣlun fī munāsabati l-ḥaddi wa-aḡzā'ihī |

| | Latin Translation (1150-1175ca.) | Marginal Note in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Minutoli 229 | Cairo, DK 826 (= ٤٨) (1084H/1673) | Leiden, Or. 4 (uncertain dating) | Ankara, National Library B153 (694H/1294) |
|------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | tractatus quintus | | al-maǧālatu l- hāmīsatu | al-maǧālatu l- hāmīsatu | al-maǧālatu l- hāmīsatu |
| | --- | | wa-fihā ṭamāniyatu fuṣūlin add. mg. | tiṣ'ātu fuṣūlin | --- |
| V, 1 | I Capitulum de rebus communibus et quomodo est esse earum | faṣlun al-awwālu fī l- umūri l-'ammati | faṣlun fī l-umūri l- 'ammati wa-kayfa (kayfiyyati corr. mg.) wuǧūduhā (l' [=1] mg.) | [1] faṣlun fī umūri l- 'āliyyati wa-kayfiyyati wuǧūduhā | [1] faṣlun [2] (at p. 200, 14) faṣlun |
| V, 2 | II Capitulum qualiter naturas comitatur universalitas et completur dictio in hoc etc. | al-ṭāni fī kayfiyyati luhūqi l-kammiyyati [sic] li-l-ṭabā'i l- kulliyati wa-itmāmi l- qawli fī ḡālika etc. | faṣlun fī kayfiyyati kawni l-kulliyati li-l- ṭabā'i l-kulliyati wa- itmāmi l-qawli fī ḡālika etc. (↔ [=2] mg.) | [2] faṣlun fī kayfiyyati luhūqi l-kulliyati li-l- ṭabā'i l-kulliyati wa- itmāmi l-qawli fī ḡālika etc. | [3] faṣlun fī kayfiyyati luhūqi l-kulliyati li-l- ṭabā'i l-kulliyati wa- itmāmi l-qawli fī ḡālika etc. |
| V, 3 | III Capitulum de assignanda differentia inter genus et materiam | al-ṭāliṭu faṣlun fī l- faṣli bayna l-ǧinsi wa-l- māddati | faṣlun fī l-faṣli bayna l- ǧinsi wa-l-māddati (ح [=3] mg.) | [3] faṣlun fī l-farqi bayna l-ǧinsi wa-l- māddati | [4] faṣlun |
| V, 4 | IV Capitulum de intellectibus qui sunt extra intentionem generis quomodo recipiuntur intra naturam generis | al-rābi'u faṣlun fī kayfiyyati duḥūli l- ma'āni l-hārīǧati 'ani l- ǧinsi 'alā ṭabī'ati l-ǧinsi | faṣlun fī kayfiyyati duḥūli l-ma'āni l- hārīǧati 'ani l-ǧinsi 'alā ṭabī'ati l-ǧinsi (s ut. vid. [=4?] mg.) | [4] faṣlun fī kayfiyyati duḥūli l-ma'āni l- hārīǧati 'ani l-ǧinsi 'alā ṭabī'ati l-ǧinsi | [5] faṣlun [6] (at p. 226, 3) faṣlun |
| V, 5 | | | faṣlun fī l-naw'i | [5] faṣlun fī l-naw'i | [7] faṣlun (= V, 5 + V, 8) |
| V, 6 | VI Capitulum de differentia et eius certitudine ↓ | al-sādīsu faṣlun fī l- faṣli wa-taḥqīqihī ↓ | faṣlun fī ta'rīfi l-faṣli wa-taḥqīqihī (s [=5] mg.) | [6] faṣlun fī (ta'rīfati add. mg. a.m.) l-faṣli wa-taḥqīqihī | [8] faṣlun |
| V, 7 | V Capitulum de assignanda comparatione definitionis et definiti ↑ | al-hāmīsu faṣlun fī ta'rīfi l-haddi wa-l-mahdūdi ↑ | faṣlun fī ta'rīfi munāsabati l-haddi wa- l-mahdūdi (س [=6] mg.) | [7] faṣlun fī ta'rīfi munāsabati l-haddi wa-l-mahdūdi | [9] faṣlun |
| V, 8 | | | faṣlun fī l-haddi wa- aǧzā'ihī (ز [=7] mg.) | faṣl fī l-hadd add. mg. a.m. | ↑ |
| V, 9 | VII Capitulum de comparatione definitionis cum partibus suis | al-sābi'u faṣlun fī munāsabati l-haddi wa- aǧzā'ihī | faṣlun fī munāsabati l- haddi wa-aǧzā'ihī (ح [=8] mg.) | [8] faṣlun fī munāsabati l-haddi wa-aǧzā'ihī | [10] faṣlun |

Appendix B. The Identification of Siglum 𐤀 (H) in the Cairo Edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* of the *Šifāʾ*

I have pointed out elsewhere that the apparatus criticus of the Cairo edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* presents occasionally, beside the five sigla corresponding to the five manuscripts listed in the introduction (one from the al-Azhar Library in Cairo, three from the Dār al-Kutub Library in Cairo, and one from the British Museum in London), a further siglum (𐤀): my hypothesis was that this siglum might indicate the use of a further codex, namely the ms. Dār al-Kutub 262 mentioned by G.C. Anawati, editor and French translator of the *Ilāhiyyāt*, in the introduction of his translation.⁵⁰ I am now in a position to corroborate this hypothesis and to assess that the Cairo edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* is based on six manuscripts, namely the five listed in the introduction, which are constantly consulted and quoted in the apparatus, plus ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub 262, which is occasionally referred to.

In the aforementioned study, I had noticed seven occurrences of the siglum 𐤀 in the apparatus of the Cairo edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt*.⁵¹ This list was not meant to be exhaustive and remains provisional even now, since other occurrences of the same siglum can surely be found. The sample of cases taken into consideration, however, is wide enough to guarantee a plausible identification of the codex labeled as 𐤀 by the Cairo editors. As a matter of fact, direct inspection of ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub 262 by means of a photographic reproduction has allowed me to observe that all these occurrences correspond exactly to *lectiones* of the manuscript in question.⁵² The extent of the use of ms. Dār al-Kutub 262 in the Cairo edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* remains uncertain. The occurrences I have found range on treatises VII–IX. What is sure is that its consultation by the Cairo editors is not systematic, since in these very treatises variant readings attested by our manuscript are neglected in the apparatus.⁵³ Since the denomination “Dār al-Kutub 262” designates apparently a collection of nine volumes that cumulatively contain a complete copy of the *Šifāʾ*,⁵⁴ the eventual presence of the siglum 𐤀 in

⁵⁰ Bertolacci, *The Reception*, 483, n. 4.

⁵¹ VII, 2, p. 312, 8; VIII, 2, p. 339, 18; p. 355, 3; VIII, 6, p. 355, 3; p. 355, 16; VIII, 7, p. 364, 2; p. 364, 9; IX, 2, p. 384, 18.

⁵² In the last occurrence (IX, 2, p. 384, 18) the apparatus of the Cairo edition presents a misprint: the variant reading recorded in it is not *intiḡālahū* (which is, in fact, the edited reading), but *intiḡālan*, attested, among others, by ms. Dār al-Kutub 262.

⁵³ The variant reading *fā-yaḡūzu*, for example, which the apparatus ad IX, 2, p. 384, 17 ascribes to the Tehran lithograph and ms. M only, occurs in fact also in Dār al-Kutub 262. Likewise, the variant reading *mā ʿalayhi*, ascribed in the apparatus ad IX, 1, p. 373, 3 to mss. B Ġ D only, occurs in fact also in Dār al-Kutub 262 as a marginal correction.

⁵⁴ In Avicenne, *La Métaphysique du Šifāʾ*. Livres I à V. Traduction, introduction, notes et

the apparatus of the Cairo editions of other parts of the *Šifā'* might be indicative of the use of this codex.

Assuming that the identification proposed here is correct, the list of testimonia that appears at p. 31 of the introduction of the Cairo edition of the *Ilāhiyyāt* (nn. 1–8 below) can be updated and incremented as follows:

- 1) Tehran lithograph (= ط)
- 2) Annotations in the Tehran lithograph (= طا)
- 3) Ms. Cairo, Al-Azhar, Baḥīt 331 *falsafa* (no date) (= ب)
- 4) Annotations in the ms. Al-Azhar, Baḥīt 331 *falsafa* (= ب)
- 5) Ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 144 *ḥikma* (684H/1285) (= ج)
- 6) Ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 894 *falsafa* (no date) (= د)
- 7) Ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 826 *ḥikma wa-falsafa* (1084H/1673) (= ص)
- 8) Ms. London, British Museum (now: British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections), Or. 7500 (no date) (= م)
- 9) Ms. Cairo, Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 262 *ḥikma wa-falsafa* (1337H/1918, copied by Maḥmūd Qāsim from an exemplar of 992H/1584) (= هـ *passim*)

commentaires par Georges C. Anawati (Paris: Vrin, 1978), 19–20, G.C. Anawati presents this manuscript, which he names ms. 262 *ḥikma*, as a complete copy of the *Šifā'* in nine volumes and states: “C’est une copie faite par le soins de Dār al-Kutub par divers copistes, terminée en 1337 H (1918), sur un manuscrit remontant à 992H./1584.” The photographic reproduction I have consulted regards an independent codex, which contains only the *Ilāhiyyāt*. It is difficult to assess to which of the nine volumes mentioned by Anawati it corresponds. The colophon reports the name of the scribe (Maḥmūd Qāsim ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qāsim ibn ‘Alī) and the date of copy (1337H). The same Qāsim is responsible for marginal annotations, like the one regarding the number of chapters of treatise V at the beginning of this treatise: he signals that the number of eight chapters that the manuscript reports (see above, n. 35) is puzzling, since “Once treatise V is completed, we find that it is [made of] nine chapters, not eight.” It would be tempting to identify the copyist and annotator of the manuscript with the Maḥmūd Qāsim who, fifty years later, figures as editor of part of the natural philosophy of the *Šifā'* in the series of editions published in Cairo between 1952 and 1983 (Ibn Sīnā, *al-Šifā', al-Ṭabī'iyyāt, al-Samā' wa-l-'Ālam, al-Kawn wa-l-Fasād, al-Af'āl wa-l-Infi'ālāt*, ed. by Maḥmūd Qāsim [Cairo: Dār al-kitāb al-'arabī li-l-ṭibā'a wa-l-našr, 1969]).

Bibliography

- Al-Rahim, Ahmed H. "Avicenna's Immediate Disciples: Their Lives and Works." In *Avicenna and His Legacy: A Golden Age of Science and Philosophy*, ed. by Y. Tzvi Langermann. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009, 1–25.
- Averroes. *On Aristotle's "Metaphysics": An Annotated Translation of the So-called "Epitome"*, ed. by Rüdiger Arnzen. Berlin [a. o.]: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Avicenna / Avicenne. → Ibn Sīnā
- Avicenna Latinus. *Liber de Philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, I–IV*, ed. by Simone Van Riet. Louvain-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1977
- . *Liber de Philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, V–X*, ed. by Simone Van Riet. Louvain-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1980
- . *Liber de Philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, I–X: Lexiques*, par S. Van Riet. Louvain-la-Neuve-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1983.
- Bertolacci, Amos. *The Reception of Aristotle's Metaphysics in Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā': A Milestone of Western Metaphysical Thought*. Leiden [a. o.]: Brill, 2006.
- . "On the Manuscripts of the *Ilābiyyāt* of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Šifā'*," in *Islamic Thought in the Middle Ages: Studies in Text, Transmission and Translation, in Honour of Hans Daiber*, ed. by Anna Akasoy and Wim Raven. Leiden: Brill, 2008, 59–75.
- . "The 'Ontologization' of Logic. Metaphysical Themes in Avicenna's Reworking of the *Organon*," in *Methods and Methodologies: Aristotelian Logic East and West 500–1500*, ed. by Margaret Cameron and John Marenbon. Leiden [a. o.]: Brill, 2011, 27–51.
- . "A Community of Translators: The Latin Medieval Versions of Avicenna's *Book of the Cure*," in *Communities of Learning: Networks and the Shaping of Intellectual Identity in Europe 1100–1500*, ed. by Constant J. Mews and John N. Crossley. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, 37–54.
- . "On the Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics before Albertus Magnus: An Attempt at Periodization," in *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics*, ed. by Dag N. Hasse and Amos Bertolacci. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012, 197–223.
- . "A Hidden *Hapax Legomenon* in Avicenna's Metaphysics: Considerations on the Use of *Anniyya* and *Ayyiyya* in the *Ilābiyyāt* of the *Kitāb al-Šifā'*," in Proceedings of the Conference *The Letter Before the Spirit. The Importance of Text Editions for the Study of the Reception of Aristotle*, Huygens Instituut, Den Haag (The Hague), 2–5 June 2009, ed. by Aafke van Oppenraay and Resianne Smidt van Gelder-Fontaine. Leiden: Brill, in print.
- Gacek, Adam. *Arabic Manuscripts: A Vademecum for Readers*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Glasner, Ruth. *Averroes' Physics: A Turning Point in Medieval Natural Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Gutas, Dimitri. *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works*. Leiden [a. o.]: Brill, 1988.
- . "The Study of Avicenna. Status Quaestionis atque Agenda." *Documenti e Studi sulla Tradizione Filosofica Medievale* 21 (2010): 45–64.
- Ibn Sīnā. *Al-Ilābiyyāt min al-Šifā' li-Šayḥ al-Ra'īs Abū 'Alī Ḥusayn Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn Sīnā ma'a ta'liqāt*. Tehran, 1885, vol. I, 266–567.

- . *Al-Šifāʾ, al-Ilāhiyyāt (1)*, ed. by Gürğ Ş. Qanawātī and Saʿīd Zāyid. Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-ʿamma li-šūʿūn al-maṭābiʿ al-amīriyya, 1960.
- . *Al-Šifāʾ, al-Ilāhiyyāt (2)*, ed. by Muḥammad Y. Mūsā, Sulaymān Dunyā and Saʿīd Zāyid. Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-ʿamma li-šūʿūn al-maṭābiʿ al-amīriyya, 1960.
- . *Al-Ilāhiyyāt min Kitāb al-Šifāʾ*, ed. by Ḥasan Ḥasan Zādah al-Āmulī. Qum: Maktab al-iʿlām al-islāmī, Markaz al-našr, 1418 H.q., 1376 H.š. (= 1997/8).
- . *Al-Šifāʾ, al-Ṭabīʿiyyāt, al-Samāʾ wa-l-ʿĀlam, al-Kawn wa-l-Fasād, al-Afʿāl wa-l-Infīʾālāt*, ed. by Maḥmūd Qāsim. Cairo: Dār al-kitāb al-ʿarabī li-l-ṭibāʾa wa-l-našr, 1969.
- . *Al-Šifāʾ, al-Ṭabīʿiyyāt, al-Hayawān*, ed. by ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm Muntaṣir, Saʿīd Zāyid and ʿAbd Allāh Ismāʿīl. Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-miṣriyya al-ʿamma li-l-taʿlīf wa-l-našr, 1970.
- . *Die Metaphysik Avicennas enthaltend die Metaphysik, Theologie, Kosmologie und Ethik*, übersetzt und erläutert von Max Horten. Halle a. S. [a. o.]: Rudolf Haupt, 1907; repr. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1960.
- . *La Métaphysique du Šifāʾ*. Livres I à V. Traduction, introduction, notes et commentaires par Georges C. Anawati. Paris: Vrin, 1978.
- . *The Metaphysics of The Healing: A parallel English-Arabic text*. Translated, introduced, and annotated by Michael E. Marmura. Provo (Utah): Brigham Young University Press, 2005.
- . *Libro della Guarigione: Le Cose Divine di Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā)*, a cura di Amos Bertolacci. Turin: UTET, 2007.
- . *Avicenna's Deliverance: Logic*. Translation and Notes by Asad Q. Ahmed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . → Avicenna Latinus
- Janssens, Jules. "Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), Latin Translations of," in *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy Between 500 and 1500*, ed. by Henrik Lagerlund. Berlin: Springer, 2011, vol. I, 522–527.
- Kruk, Remke. "Ibn Sīnā on Animals: Between the First Teacher and the Physician," in *Avicenna and His Heritage: Proceedings of the International Colloquium "Avicenna and his Heritage"*, Leuven-Louvain-la-Neuve, 8–11 September 1999, ed. by Jules Janssens and Daniel De Smet. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002, 325–341.
- Musallam, Bāsim F. "Avicenna. Biology and Medicine," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, vol. III. London-Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987, 94–99.
- Reisman, David. C. *The Making of the Avicennan Tradition: The Transmission, Contents, and Structure of Ibn Sīnā's al-Mubāḥaṭāt (The Discussions)*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.