INTRODUCTION

The Hippocratic Corpus marks in many respects the beginning of Western medicine. For scholars of medical theory and practitioners alike its works remained essential reference texts for more than two millennia. The Epidemics play a key role in this corpus. As Renehan observes: “[t]o state that the ... Epidemics constitute one of the chief glories of the Hippocratic corpus is to indulge in a cliché”.¹

The seven books of the Epidemics contain a broad range of disparate material, for example case histories, observations, medical maxims and prognostic advice collected by different authors at different times.² Especially the often very detailed case histories have attracted the attention of numerous commentators and physicians. They were without precedent at the time and represent a milestone in the development of medical theory and practice.

Early on critics and commentators questioned the authenticity of individual Hippocratic writings, including the various books of the Epidemics. Galen, who commented on a broad range of Hippocratic texts (including most books of the Epidemics), elaborated his views on what he thought genuine or spurious on numerous occasions throughout his commentaries. Concerns over authenticity often served to disqualify writings that were at odds with his interpretation of Hippocratic medical doctrine.³ According to Galen, only Books 1 and 3 were genuinely Hippocratic. He regarded Books 2 and 6 as compilations of authentic material produced by Hippocrates’ son Thessalus and dismissed Books 4, 5 and 7 as forgeries.⁴

Galen wrote an extensive commentary on those books he considered genuine,⁵ the longest and perhaps most important of his many Hippocratic commentaries. It

³ Cf. Mansfeld, Prolegomena, p. 176 with n. 312.
⁵ Cf. Manetti and Roselli, Galeno commentatore, p. 1540–1542 (Commentary on Epidemics 1), 1548–1549 (Commentary on Epidemics 2), 1552–1553 (Commentary on Epidemics 3) and 1553–1554 (Commentary on Epidemics 6).
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is a self-contained work in which Galen quoted portions of the text of variable size, the lemmata, and then commented on them in the form of a ὑπόμνημα.¹ Proceeding through the text lemma by lemma (albeit not in a complete fashion; he left out a number of mostly short sections of the Hippocratic text),² Galen not only explained terminology and relevant medical issues, but also entered into sometimes lengthy discussions of philological matters and textual exegesis and, in his Commentaries on Books 2, 3 and 6, engaged in vigorous polemics against contemporary and past physicians.³

The Greek original of Galen’s commentary has not survived complete: only his Commentaries on Books 1 and 3 are extant in full;⁴ we have roughly six and a half of the eight original parts of his Commentary on Book 6;⁵ and only short fragments of his Commentary on Book 2 have been preserved.⁶ The reconstruction of the extant Greek text has been further complicated by the very grave deficiencies of the Greek manuscript sources.⁷

It is tempting to speculate that Galen’s distinction between the genuinely Hippocratic Books 1 and 3 and the slightly less respectable Books 2 and 6 – compiled from what he considered genuine Hippocratic material, but not by the great Hippocrates himself – somehow contributed to the complete loss of Galen’s Commentary on Book 2 and the partial loss of his Commentary on Book 6 between the ninth century (when there were still enough Greek manuscripts available to produce the Arabic translation discussed below) and the compilation of extant manu-

¹ The hypomnematic genre covered writings ranging from notes and notebooks to elaborate literary productions. Common to all was their scientific or technical character. Cf. F. Montanari, Hypomnemata, in: Der neue Pauly, ed. by H. Cancik and H. Schneider, Stuttgart and Weimar 1996–, vol. 5, col. 813–815.
² Galen left out sixteen passages from Book 1 of the Epidemics. Four of them were omitted from the first part of his Commentary on Book 1: καὶ – περιεγένετο (II 606,1–3 L. = I 181,19sq. Kw.); περὶ μὲν τὰ φησινόδεα ταῦτα (II 610,1sq. L. = I 182,19 Kw.); καὶ – τεταίρικες (II 610,6–9 L. = I 183,1–4 Kw.); τυρετός – τρόπον (II 612,1–3 L. = I 183,7–10 Kw.). The remaining twelve, among them the longest, were left out in the second part of the Commentary on Book 1. They are: ἐκάστοι – ἐγίνοντο (II 618,9sq. L. = I 185,15sq. Kw.); ἐγίνετο – ταῦτα (II 630,6sq. L. = I 189,1–3 Kw.); ἐγίνετο – ταῦτα (II 632,2–7 L. = I 189,8–13 Kw.); καὶ ἐν πυρετοῖς (II 646,11–648,6 L. = I 193,7–18 Kw.); κοιλίαι – Κριτία (II 648,8–11 L. = I 193,20–23 Kw.); Βίωνι – γυναικί (II 650,1–3 L. = I 194,3–5 Kw.); γυναιξί – ἀπέσανεν (II 658,6–12 L. = I 196,6–13 Kw.); οἶσι Ἐρμίππῳ τῷ Κλαζομενίῳ (II 660,5 L. = I 196,23 Kw.); άρτιν – ἀνταγόρεω (II 662,3–664,12 L. = I 197,7–198,3 Kw.); ἀντι – γναφεῖ (II 666,5–9 L. = 198,10–13 Kw.); και ἐστι – κρίσει (II 668,4–9 L. = I 198,21–199,4 Kw.). There are no such omissions in the third part of the Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics.
⁵ Edited by E. Wenkebach, Gal. In Hipp. Epid. VI comm. (CMG V 10,2,2). Franz Pfaff supplied a German translation of the Arabic version in places where the Greek text was lost.
⁶ Pfaff’s German translation of the Arabic version of Galen’s Commentary on Book 2 was published as part of CMG V 10,1.
scripts by the scholars who prepared the Aldine editions of Galen (1525) and Hippocrates (1526). Galen himself confirmed that he did not consider Book 2 as important as Books 1 and 3. In a remark at the end of the first part of his Commentary on Book 2 he noted that since it consists of a compilation of notes rather than a polished text, only students with time on their hands should study it. For people who have read all those books in which Hippocrates has laid down conclusive judgments on medical matters, reading Book 2 is superfluous since its author was still in the process of studying certain medical issues and had not yet finalised his position on many of them.

Galen did not write his commentaries on the individual books of the Epidemics at the same time. They were composed at different points in his career and with different audiences in mind. The Commentary on Book 1, the earliest of the group, belongs to a category of commentaries which Galen had not written for circulation among a wider audience. Rather, as he explained in On my Own Books, they were written for himself or a close circle of friends. He mostly concentrated on medical issues and dispensed with the discussion of variant readings and especially the polemical references to his predecessors that form such a prominent characteristic of the later Commentaries on Books 2, 3 and 6. Irrespective of their date of creation, his purpose in all four commentaries on the Hippocratic Epidemics was to explain and interpret the text and present his readers with a more lucid, updated “Hippocrates” in his own, Galenic mould.

While the Greek textual tradition is incomplete, we have another crucial witness for the complete text of Galen’s commentary preserved almost intact: the me-

1 Cf. Wenkebach, Beiträge zur Textgeschichte (parts I and II). To expand the abbreviated Hippocratic lemmata in the main manuscript for Galen’s commentary, Wenkebach consulted an additional manuscript of the Hippocratic text (Wenkebach, Beiträge zur Textgeschichte I, p. 32–36). The two-volume Aldine Hippocrates edition which included the Epidemics and the Galen volume that contained Galen’s commentary on this text were not only published within days of each other in April 1526 but essentially relied on the same sources (P. Potter, The Editiones Principes of Galen and Hippocrates and their Relationship, in: Text and Tradition, p. 250sq., 258).
3 On the chronology of Galen’s writings, cf. Manetti and Roselli, p. 1530 n. 2 with further references.
4 Gal. De libris propr. 9.1, in: Galien, Sur l’ordre de ses propres livres, Sur ses propres livres, Que l’excellent médecin est aussi philosophe, ed., transl. and comm. by V. Boudon-Millot, Paris 2007 (Collection des Universités de France), p. 159,10–13; XIX 33 K.; cf. P. N. Singer, Galen. Selected Works, transl., Oxford and New York 1997 (The World’s Classics), p. 3. Cf. von Staden, Staging the Past, p. 135–144 on Galen’s distinction between “private” and “public” commentaries. Cf. also J. Jouanna, La lecture du traité hippocratique de la Nature de l’homme par Galien. Les fondements de l’hippocratismes de Galien, in: Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation, ed. by M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, Paris 2000 (Bibliothèque d’histoire de la philosophie, nouvelle série), p. 277sq., who adds a chronological and scholarly dimension to these two categories of commentaries: the former was composed during his first stay in Rome (162–166); with his personal library still in Pergamum, Galen did not have access to the writings of all his predecessors. The latter group was composed during his second stay (after 168), after he had brought his personal effects to Rome, and he was now able to quote and discuss the Hippocratic commentaries of his predecessors in depth.
6 Cf. von Staden, p. 133sq.
Galen’s commentary was translated into Arabic in the mid-ninth century, based on a Syriac intermediate version. The translation was undertaken as part of a comprehensive effort to translate the entire Greek medical, scientific and philosophical literary heritage into Arabic that lasted for two centuries (ca. 750–950). The author of this particular translation was the celebrated Hunayn ibn Ishāq (d. ca. 870), an accomplished translator and practising physician serving at the courts of a succession of ʿAbbāsid caliphs in Baghdad. This text was one of more than 100 Galenic works Ḥunayn translated into Arabic. Embedded in Galen’s commentary and in the context of Galen’s interpretation, the Hippocratic Epidemics exerted a massive influence on medical theory and practice in the Islamic world.

In addition to its value for the study of Islamic medicine, there are two main reasons why the Arabic version of Galen’s commentary deserves attention. The first is that it gives us access to a much older stage of the textual tradition than the extant Greek manuscripts: not only is the main witness for the Arabic translation, the thirteenth-century ms. Scorialensis arab. 804, older than any of the extant Greek manuscripts, which Wenkebach dates to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the Arabic translation was in addition produced on the basis of a Greek text that was at least another three centuries older. The second reason for undertaking an edition of the Arabic version is the crucial role it played in establishing Wenkebach’s Greek edition, which will be explained in detail below.

On the following pages I shall first introduce the primary (manuscript) sources and secondary witnesses for the Arabic translation of Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics and discuss the role it played in establishing the text of the Greek edition published by Ernst Wenkebach and Franz Pfaff from 1934 onward (A). The second part of the introduction (B) will deal with the textual history of the Arabic translation and comment on translation methods and style. The final part (C) lays out the editing principles and the stylistic and terminological choices made in translating the Arabic text into English.

A. The sources

I. Direct transmission

The Arabic translation of Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 the Hippocratic Epidemics has survived in a unique manuscript, Scorialensis arab. 804. We have two further manuscript sources for the Hippocratic lemmata: Parisinus arab. 6734, an
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excerpt of the lemmata from the commentary; and Istanbul, Ayasofya 3642, which contains a lemmatic commentary on Books 1–3 and 6 of the Hippocratic Epidemics by the Damascene physician Ibn al-Nafīs (d. 1288), author of several commentaries on Hippocratic writings and numerous other medical works. The Hippocratic lemmata in his commentary were excerpted from Ḥunayn’s translation of Galen’s commentary.1

The following manuscript sources constitute the direct transmission of the text:

Scorialensis arab. 804; s. XIII, fol. 1v–43v
Parisinus arab. 6734; s. XIII, fol. 1r–19r
Istanbul, Ayasofya 3642; s. XIV/XV, fol. 1r–45v

a) Scorialensis arab. 804

The manuscript contains Galen’s commentaries on the first three books of the Epidemics: Book 1 (fol. 1v–43v), 2 (fol. 43v–124r) and 3 (fol. 124r–182r). The title page (fol. 1r) is written in a hand different from the main hand of the rest of the manuscript. The text is partly cut off on the right side. It reads as follows:

“... on (Book) 1 of the Epidemics by Hippocrates, commentary by Galen. It contains the first part of the Commentary on Book 1 and the second and third parts; and the first part of the Commentary on Book 2 and the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth parts; and Book 3: the first part of Galen’s Commentary on Book 3 and the second and third parts.”2

1 Cf. Pormann, Case Notes, p. 269–271.
4 The Arabic nomenclature for the Hippocratic Epidemics and Galen’s commentary as a whole and its subdivisions is somewhat ambiguous. The Arabic translation calls the Hippocratic Epidemics as a whole “book” (kitāb). Both the individual books of the Epidemics as well as the further subdivision of these books introduced in Galen’s commentary are called maqāla, lit. “treatise”. In accordance with the usage widely established in the secondary literature, the term maqāla in the sense of “book” of the Hippocratic Epidemics is translated as “book”. When maqāla refers to subdivisions of these books, it is translated as “part”. Where the translation of kitāb and maqāla as “book”...
The manuscript does not provide any information about its scribe and date. A colophon at the end of the Commentary on Book 3 (fol. 182v) informs the reader that this manuscript formed part of a two-volume set that included the Commentary on Book 6. It reads:
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The end of the third part of Book 3 of the Epidemics by Hippocrates, commentary by Galen. Book 6 follows in the second volume, granted thanks to God, his gracious assistance, blessing and benediction.”

The second volume referred to in this colophon has not survived, but another copy of the Commentary on Book 6 is extant: ms. Madrid, Scorialensis arab. 805, also held at the Escorial.1 In the German introduction to the edition of Galen’s Commentary on Books 1 and 2 Franz Pfaff claimed that Scorialensis arab. 804 carried an additional note to the effect that the copy was produced in the year 607 AH.2 There is no such note in E, but the colophon of Scorialensis arab. 805 (fol. 195’20) specifies that “this (manuscript) was copied in Rabīʿ al-Awwal of the year 607 (AH)” (wa-ḏālika munsaḫun r abīʿa l-awwala ‘āmi sabʿatin wa-sittimiʾatīn), corresponding to August 1210 CE. On the basis of its writing style Pfaff suggested that E also cannot have been produced much later than this date.3 Given the notorious difficulty of manuscript dating on the basis of writing alone, we are not in a position to verify his claim.

The paper of the manuscript is thick and of a light brown colour with a page size of 20 cm by 28 cm. With the exception of occasional worm holes in the margins it is well preserved but still bears traces of water damage sustained during a fire at the Escorial in 1671 that claimed a substantial part of its holdings, including many Arabic manuscripts. According to a catalogue of the Escorial library compiled in 1577 it was in possession of two Arabic manuscripts of Galen’s Commentary on Books 1–3 and one manuscript of his Commentary on Book 6.4 One of the former must be the present manuscript, the current Scorialensis arab. 804, while the latter is most likely identical with Scorialensis arab. 805. Since the second, lost copy of the Commentary on Books 1–3 and the sole copy of the Commentary on Book 6 have consecutive shelf marks in the 1577 catalogue, it is tempting to assume that they constituted a two-volume set. The two extant manuscripts are therefore probably the two surviving halves of different two-volume sets.5

1 Renaud, p. 19sq., no. 805; Casiri, vol. 1, p. 251–253, no. 801; cf. also Cano Ledesma, p. 322.
2 Pfaff, in: CMG V 10,1, p. XXXII.
3 Ibid.
4 N. Morata, Un catálogo de los fondos árabes primitivos de El Escorial, Al-Andalus 2, 1934, p. 107, nos. 33 and 35 (shelf marks I.6.11 and I.6.17); and no. 36 (shelf mark I.6.18).
5 Cf. Pormann, Case Notes, p. 264sq.
There are three foliation systems in evidence, two with Latin numbers and one with Arabic abǧad numerals. Of the former, a modern one with numbered labels in the upper left hand of each recto page next to the parallel abǧad numerals counts from title page to end; the other, presumably added by a reader or librarian soon after the manuscript became part of the Escorial collection, counts from the back of the manuscript to the front with numbers written in the top right corner of each verso page. Folio references in the present edition will be based on the modern foliation.

The text is written in a medium-sized and well-spaced but rather inelegant and casual maǧribi hand. There are 30 lines of text per page; the scribe did not use catchwords. Dotting is frequent, including final yāʾ, but uneven and decreasing over time with frequent mishaps, for example intermittent instances of writing nāfīḍ (“shivering fits”) instead of nāqiṣ (“missing”, “insufficient”), two words that are only distinguished by the placement of dots. Proper names are almost invariably undotted. Vowel signs are used sparingly, but the scribe occasionally provided genitive or accusative tanwīn and consistently placed mādda above the letter alif where modern orthography would prefer alif followed by hamza, for instance in verbal nouns of the eighth form or words such as samāʾ (“heaven”, “sky”). With very few exceptions the scribe omitted hamza, often but not always correctly replacing it with the long vowel corresponding to its kursī. There is no evidence for the use of ihmāl signs. The only punctuation of the manuscript consists of occasional intihāʾ signs in the shape of a circle with a dot at the centre.

The scribe used a black ink that has now slightly faded to a dark brown. A number of longer marginal notes, among them a very long annotation on the right hand side and bottom of fol. 4v, were written in a different hand and a slightly more faded ink, now dark brown. The illegible lines of apparently reversed Arabic text at the bottom of the facing page (fol. 5v) suggest that the scribe closed the book and the not fully dried out ink at the bottom of fol. 4v left an imprint on the opposite side. Incidentally, the hand that wrote this note is identical with the hand of one of the annotators of Scorialensis arab. 805 and that of the likely author of ms. Milan, Ambrosianus B 135 sup., a seventeenth-century manuscript that preserves the Arabic version of Galen’s Commentary on Book 2 and the last parts of the Commentary on Book 6 of the Hippocratic Epidemics, exactly those parts that had been lost in Greek. These notes will be discussed below. Another annotator wrote a number of shorter marginalia, mostly consisting of a word or two, in black ink that has now faded to grey. This scribe also occasionally added dots and made corrections directly in the text, for example re-writing illegible words or inserting letters and short words. In addition to the various Arabic annotations the manuscript contains a number of short Hebrew and Judaeo-Arabic notes in black ink that has faded to brown.

The manuscript follows Galen’s own division of his commentary based on the books of the Hippocratic text. The commentaries on individual Hippocratic books are further subdivided into “parts” or chapters: the Commentary on Book 1 has three such parts, that on Book 2 six, that on Book 3 three and that on Book 6 eight.

1 On p. 15.
2 Cf. Pormann, Case Notes, p. 264.
As noted above, in the Arabic version both the individual books of the Hippocratic Epidemics and the parts into which Galen subdivided his commentaries on these books are (somewhat confusingly) termed *maqāla* (“treatise”), a generic appellation for a piece of writing. They are set off in the manuscript with larger headlines written with different ink and a wider reed. In addition to titles for books and parts, the scribe inserted a small number of other “headlines” which are distinguished from the surrounding text in the same way. Such headlines appear for example at the beginning of the short preface introducing the case histories in the third part of the Commentary on Book 1 and at the top of about half of the individual case histories that follow.

The commentary is further divided into Hippocratic lemmata and Galen’s explanations, respectively introduced with “Hippocrates said” (*qāla Abuqrāṭ*) and “Galen said” (*qāla Ğālinūs*). The text also contains a total of seventeen notes by the Arabic translator, ranging in length from three lines to a full manuscript page. These are introduced by “Ḥunayn said” (*qāla Ḥunayn*). With very few exceptions the introductory formulae for lemmata and comments and those for the translator’s notes are also written with different ink and in a thicker script.

Scribal corrections in ms. E take a number of different forms. To cancel redundant text, the scribe and annotators put dashes above it and marked the beginning and end with small circles. The same signs are used to mark words for which variant readings or emendations are provided in the margins, often distinguished with a correction mark, the word “correct” (*ṣaḥḥa*). In the case of insertions a hook written above the line points to the margin of the folio where the words to be inserted are written.

Some marginalia have faded or were washed out as a result of the water damage the manuscript sustained but most are still legible. 110 of those are written in Arabic. The large majority consists of single-word insertions and minor corrections but there is a substantial number of longer insertions of up to 5 lines of text (for instance on fol. 4v and 18v).

There are at least two hands in evidence. One of them, the author mainly of longer notes, wrote a number of other marginal annotations which can be found all through E. Similarities in the writing style suggest that he is David Colville (d. 1629), the scribe who copied the abovementioned Ambrosianus B 135 sup., which contains Galen’s Commentary on Book 2 and parts of his Commentary on Book 6 of the Hippocratic Epidemics. According to a note Colville wrote at the beginning of this manuscript (fol. 1v) he found the text of the Commentary on Book 2 “in several manuscripts” (in pluribus exemplaribus). At least one of them may have been the second exemplar of the Commentary on Books 1–3 catalogued in 1577, the likely source for his marginal additions. Colville’s marginalia may therefore represent the beginnings of a collation of two or perhaps even more manuscripts.

Roughly 120 marginalia are written in Hebrew or Judaeo-Arabic (Arabic written in Hebrew letters), most of them consisting of single words, but there are again numerous longer annotations of up to 6 or 7 short lines (e.g. on fol. 3v, 12v and

---

1 Cf. p. 67 below and Vagelpohl, In the Translator’s Workshop on the contents and significance of these notes.
Several such notes seem to mark definitions or other places of interest, for example one in the right-hand margin of fol. 1v that reads: “What is the meaning of the term ‘Epidemics’”. They are, however, difficult to read and written so close to the outer edge of the folia that many have been cut off by an overzealous bookbinder. The longer notes seem largely to consist of headings or indicate the subject matter of the passage they refer to. There is no evidence for additional readings, conjectures and the like. Over long stretches of the manuscript single or double Hebrew letters are also used to mark and number the beginning of sections of Galen’s commentary.

The only substantial gap in the manuscript affects the first part of the Commentary on Book 1 and was caused by the loss of two folia before fol. 8r. The missing text corresponds to six pages of the Wenkebach edition. Portions of it, especially the Hippocratic lemmata, can be restored on the basis of other witnesses. Other (relatively infrequent) unmarked lacunae seem to be the result of scribal oversight or defective sources.

In addition, there are a number of other differences between the text of the Hippocratic lemmata transmitted in E and that transmitted in the other manuscripts. Some examples:

1. Omissions

P. 294,2 الوافئيين om. E
P. 486,2 وأصابها نقل om. E
P. 486,10 رأسها om. E (lac. 1 verb. rel.)
P. 488,4 من داخل om. E
P. 488,5 يسكن om. E (lac. 1 verb. rel.)

Other omissions were filled in by the annotators of the manuscript:

P. 210,8 أن om. E, in marg. add. E
P. 212,3 البحران om. E, in marg. add. E
P. 220,2 أحواله om. E, in marg. add. E

1 Cf. Pormann, Case Notes, p. 264 n. 45.
2 CMG V 10,1, p. 29,25 ὁ λεπτότατος–35,29 θέρος.
3 The Arabic text of this section (p. 136,9–144,6) has been reconstructed from the other primary and secondary witnesses, namely Ibn Riḍwān’s excerpts (for Galen’s comments) and manuscripts P and A (for the Hippocratic lemmata). Since Ibn Riḍwān’s excerpts are redacted, they have been set in a smaller type in the edition and translation to distinguish them from the surrounding text. Ellipses indicate sections of the commentary that are not covered by Ibn Riḍwān. The speakers are unmarked in Ibn Riḍwān’s text and the excerpted Hippocratic lemmata in ms. P; I have added them in brackets in text and translation.
2. Additions

P. 308,12 post رعاف دم E
P. 422,3 post ينم في E
P. 452,10 post اعتراها به E
P. 480,3 post وظهر به E
P. 492,12 ante سائر حالاتها في E

3. Peculiar errors

P. 166,19 هذا المرض [هذه المادة] مرض وقت ex E³
P. 166,20 تثبت تلبث E
P. 180,4 الشتاء السماء E
P. 236,7 وتستضعف [وتستصعب] E
P. 274,6 الصدر غير الصدعين E
P. 308,5 الحادثة الحادة E
P. 328,2 فتوجه اتفوق E
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. fonds arabe 6734 (P),1 128 folios, dated to the thirteenth century.2 The manuscript, a composite volume (maǧmūʿa) of medical texts, contains Book 1 of the Hippocratic Epidemics excerpted from Galen’s commentary (fol. 1r–19r).3 Besides a few shorter treatises the manuscript also includes synoptic Arabic and Syriac versions of the Hippocratic Aphorisms (fol. 29v–92v) and Prognostic (fol. 93r–127v).

There is no title page or introductory note, and the manuscript launches directly into the Hippocratic Epidemics.4 The text of the Epidemics itself does not provide any information about the copyist but at the end of the parallel Syriac and Arabic texts of the Hippocratic Aphorisms (fol. 92v) the same scribe recorded the following colophon:

نجرت فصول أبقراط ... في عاشر تشرين الأوّل سنة ألف وخمسمائة وسبعة عشر لملك الإسكندر سنة ستّمائة للهجرة. كتبه بهنام بن الحدّاد المنطبيّ.

“Hippocrates’ Aphorisms were completed ... on the tenth of Tišrīn al-Awwal (i.e. October) of the year 1517 (according to the calendar) of king Alexander (i.e. the Seleucid calendar) and the year 602 AH. The physician Bahnām ibn al-Ḥaddād wrote it.”

1 Catalogued by Blochet, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes, p. 350sq., no. 6734; cf. also Sezgin, Medizin, p. 29.
Since the other components of the manuscript seem to be written in the same hand, we can assume that they were also copied by Bahnām ibn al-Ḥaddād and finished the same year, which corresponds to 1205 CE.¹

The manuscript paper varies in quality but is on the whole rather poor with a page size of ca. 12.5 cm by 17 cm. The manuscript is relatively well preserved; the foliation in the top left corner of the recto pages is legible, albeit sometimes faded.

The scribe wrote in a large, hurried-looking and “rather inelegant” nasḫ script.² There are 17 lines of text per page and no catchwords. Diacritical dots are almost completely absent, final yāʾ is undotted and personal names in particular lack diacritics. Except for a few instances of accusative tanwīn, the scribe also dispensed with vowel signs, mādda and hamza. The latter is consistently replaced with its kursī. There is no evidence for the use of ihmāl signs. A small number of intibāʾ signs shaped like the East Arabic-Indic numeral 5/۵, the only form of punctuation used in the text, mark the end of some sections. The ink used in the text body is brown and often quite dark. It is faded in a few places but otherwise clearly legible. Corrections are made directly in the text; the scribe occasionally struck out words and added material above the line.

Various annotations are visible in the margin. They are very unevenly distributed: except for Syriac numbering letters, there are no notes in the margins of fol. 11v–18v. In addition to these Syriac numbering letters, which indicate the beginnings of case descriptions and other important sections, there is a Syriac note on fol. 4v. The other annotations are written in Arabic and were added by the scribe of the main text; several of them, introduced by “Galen said” (qāla Ǧālīnūs), contain short, often summarised excerpts from Galen’s commentary.³ Many of these notes, hard to read because they were written in the same ink but in a smaller, narrower script, have partly or completely faded or been washed out by water damage. The little that remains is often too short to assign to particular passages in the commentary.

The scribe marked the main divisions of the text with short headings in the text body,⁴ sometimes distinguished from the surrounding text with red ink. Additional rubrication, also in red ink, marks the beginning of the third katastasis and introduces individual case descriptions in the third part of the Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics.

The following examples illustrate the not infrequent errors and scribal lapses in this manuscript:

3. On fol. 1r, 1v, 2r, 4v, 5v, 6r, 6v, 9r, 9v and 11r. These annotations are discussed in detail on p. 42–46.
4. E.g. “the first part of the Epidemics” (al-maqālatu l-ūlā min kitābi Ibīḏīmiyā) on fol. 1r. The second part begins on fol. 2v1, the third on fol. 9v10. The latter is puzzlingly introduced with the heading “the chapter that Galen put at the beginning of the fourth part of his commentary” (al-faṣlu llaḏī ǧaʿalahū Ǧālīnūs awwalan li-l-maqālati l-rābiʿati ʿinda tafsīrihī).
5. The katastasis is erroneously labelled “the third part” (al-maqālatu l-talīṭatu, fol. 6v2), but then correctly introduced with “this is the third climatic condition” (hāḏighiḥ hālū l-hawāʾi l-talīṭati, fol. 6v3).
1. Omissions

P. 86,9 في الخريف om. P
P. 124,3 ما يكون om. P
P. 244,10 ثم تفقد om. P
P. 370,7sq. أو – بالليل om. P
P. 478,11 الذي – فريبينيكس om. P
P. 484,18-486,2 والكرب – الشراسيف om. P
P. 492,3sq. وبانت – يسير om. P
P. 498,1 عند هيكيل om. P

2. Additions

P. 162,1 post حمّيات حادة P
P. 176,12 post عاصف P
P. 266,10 post ويبغي لك P
P. 270,4 ante الصناعة P
P. 308,4 post أعراض P
P. 330,17 ante البحران P
P. 378,17 post أطولها P
P. 484,10 ante اليوم الثاني P

3. Transpositions

P. 162,1sq. ولم – طويلة لم تكن بالقوية P
P. 344,6 وأمر المريض وأمر المريض P
P. 344,8 وبالجملة جزء P
P. 344,11 والبراق والفياء P
P. 376,14sq. الحمّى فيها P
4. Peculiar errors

Another notable feature are frequent errors in the use of nominative and accusative. In 96 cases the scribe of P wrote nominative singular indefinite forms of nouns and adjectives where Arabic grammar requires and where the other two manuscripts correctly use accusative forms. This seemingly systematic behaviour affects not just isolated words but entire word groups.  

1 E.g. in lemma II 31 (fol. 4r13): *yasīrun radi'ān nīyun* (“insignificant, bad and raw”) instead of *yasīran radi'ān nīyān* (p. 234,7); lemma II 62 (fol. 6r12): *muttaṣilūn da‘īmūn ṣa‘ābūn* (“uninterrupted, persistent and oppressive”) instead of *muttaṣilūn da‘īmūn ṣa‘āban* (p. 284,8); and lemma III 28 (fol. 17v2): *bawlūn abyāda ṭabīhūn kādirūn maṭūrūn* (“white, thick, turbid and scattered urine”) instead of *bawlūn abyāda ṭabīhūn kādir ān maṭūrān* (p. 484,14).

2 Catalogued by İhsanoğlu et al., Catalogue of Islamic Medical Manuscripts, p. 2; cf. Sezgin, p. 35. A corresponds to ms. AS in Pormann, Case Notes, p. 269.

3 Cf. P. Bachmann, Quelques remarques, p. 303. This dating coincides with that of İhsanoğlu et al., p. 2, who seem to depend on Sezgin.

4 The first part of the Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics can be found on fol. 1r1–7v23, the second on fol. 8’1–26’3 and the third on fol. 26’3–45’22.

5 Labelled C in Pormann, Case Notes, p. 270.
not available for inspection. Peter Bachmann, who studied both manuscripts and
undertook a thorough comparison, demonstrated that the Cairo manuscript is a
direct descendant of A and maintained that it has no value for the reconstruction
of the text of Ibn al-Nafis’ commentary.¹

In addition to three sigla the title page of A (fol. 1r) contains six notes in differ-
ent hands. The title itself reads:

كتاب إيديميا لأبيقراط وتفصيمه الورافد شرح الشيخ علاء الدين النفيس يعمده الله
برحمته

“The Epidemics by Hippocrates. It means ‘the visiting disease’. Commentary
by the šayḫ ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Nafis, may God support him with his mercy.”

The manuscript paper is cream-coloured, the pages measure 17.5 cm by 25.6
cm. A single darker folio with Hebrew wr iting is bound at the end of the volume.
The manuscript is generally very well preserved but has occasional worm holes at
the bottom. The only continuous foliation, pencilled Arabic-Indic numerals at the
top left of recto pages, seems to bee a more recent addition.

Ibn al-Nafis’ commentary was written out in a careful, medium-sized
script. On the first 169 folios there are 23 lines per page. The remaining folios are
more tightly spaced with 27 lines per page but the writing style is similar enough to
assume that they were written by the same person. The scribe often placed catch-
words at the bottom left of verso pages.

The dotting of the text is frequent and consistent but decreases over time. It
includes dots underneath final yāʾ and also underneath final yāʾ representing alif.
Proper names are dotted, albeit not always correctly and consistently. On the last,
more tightly written folios, dotting decreases substantially and the scribe stopped
dotting final yāʾ. Vowel signs are used sparingly and also decrease towards the end
of the manuscript. Hamza is almost completely absent. There are occasional ihmāl
signs underneath the letters ḥāʾ and ‘ayn. The only punctuation consists of a very
small number of intihāʾ signs, first in the form of the East Arabic-Indic numeral
5/۵ and later also in the shape of the Greek letter φ. These signs are used inter-
changeably; their number increases on the last, more tightly written folios.

A dark brown or black ink, now slightly faded to a lighter brown, was used for
the main text. The second part of the manuscript seems to have been written with a
darker ink. There are no visible divisions between the Hippocratic “books”, the
commentary runs without interruption from the beginning of Book 1 to the end
of Book 6. The text contains minimal rubrication in the form of key phrases that
mark textual divisions. They are written in red ink and, after fol. 54, in the same
black ink used for the rest of the text, making the rubrics almost indistinguishable
from the surrounding writing. The ink used for the rubrics seems to vary slightly
throughout the text, it is sometimes darker, sometimes the writing is slightly thick-

¹ Bachmann, Quelques remarques, p. 304. His conclusions are based on the fact that the Arabic
transliterations of Greek names are identical in both manuscripts and that they share the same
grammatical errors and a lacuna in the Commentary on Book 6 of the Epidemics.
er than the surrounding text. Starting with fol. 140r the rubrics are substantially thicker and stand out well. The phrase “Hippocrates said” (qāla Abuqrāṭ) marks the beginning of a lemma, the word “explanation” (šārh) introduces Ibn al-Nafis’s comments. Inside longer comments the rubricated expression “his words” (qawluhū) signals a transition from one section of the lemma to the next.

There are very few corrections or cancelled words in the text body. Infrequent marginalia, written in different hands, mostly consist of individual words, sometimes in conjunction with the correction marker (ṣaḥḥa, “correct”); very few longer annotations supply missing text.\(^1\) In the second half of the manuscript the scribe sometimes indicated missing words with blank spaces but there are very few examples of longer gaps.\(^2\)

Besides the characteristics described above, the manuscript displays a number of divergences from the other sources, among them the following:

1. Omissions

   P. 240,7 ومن – الأشياء om. A
   P. 298,1 يرقان – وأصابهم om. A
   P. 304,11 ذلك إلى om. A
   P. 342,3 ونقطع – وأما om. A
   P. 444,10 كان – تحتمل om. A
   P. 462,3sq. فيه – القائم om. A

2. Additions

   P. 122,4 post قليلًا جدًا add. A
   P. 282,1 ante حارته وقته و حرارة add. A
   P. 284,3 post ورباح باردة add. A
   P. 284,11 ante هذه وقت add. A
   P. 298,1 post مثل أصاب مثلكما أصاب om. A
   P. 456,2 post للأيسر الجزء add. A
   P. 474,4 ante نائب الحمى أنواع add. A

\(^1\) E.g. on fol. 20r and 139v.
\(^2\) Blanks e.g. on fol. 114r, 115r, 116v, 116r and 139v. On fol. 117v, a single line of text seems to be missing after yuridu najwa (“he means around”). On fol. 150r, the text breaks off after fa-ammā (“as for”) and the scribe left ca. 2,5 lines empty.
P. 478,11 post فلازومينس add. A

3. Transpositions

P. 432,4 يسير براز trsp. A
P. 442,1sq. أصابه بحران بعرق trsp. A
P. 462,4 مرة فيه trsp. A
P. 488,2 كان قد trsp. A

4. Peculiar errors

P. 86,10 متواترة A
P. 118,15 متواترة A
P. 212,2 دورانها دورًا A
P. 244,10 فصصوي فصصولي A
P. 248,14 الأشياء الأسان A
P. 336,14 الفصص الفصصأ A
P. 344,6 فأمًا أوأمر A
P. 402,4 ابتدأت أخذت A
P. 488,13 وتتوبرع A

d) The relationship between the manuscripts

We only have a single witness for Galen’s comments on the Hippocratic Epidemics but we can at least compare the text of the Hippocratic lemmata transmitted in the main manuscript E with that of manuscripts P and A and attempt to determine their relationship. The dating of P (1205) and the date of Ibn al-Nafis’ death (1288) obviously eliminate the possibility that the excerptor of the P tradition depended on Ibn al-Nafis’ commentary.

Galen did not quote or comment on the Epidemics in its entirety but omitted a certain amount of material. Both P and A follow this “pruned” Hippocratic text, a sure sign that the Hippocratic lemmata were excerpted from a copy of Galen’s commentary rather than taken from an independently transmitted Hippocrates source. In the case of P additional confirmation comes from two other directions: first, the text of Book 1 of the Epidemics transmitted in P is, like Galen’s commen-

1 Cf. above, p. 13 with n. 2.
tary, further divided into three parts (called *maqāla*, “treatise”), a division that is absent from the original Hippocratic text. Second, in addition to quotations from Galen’s commentary written in the margins of *P*, the text itself contains a few short fragments of Galen’s comments.¹ These fragments consist either of Hippocratic lemmata that Galen reiterated in his commentary or of short thematic headlines for sections of Galen’s Commentary on Book 1. There are three instances of the first type:

P. 142,12  
*wa-minhum – al-waqti* (“Some began to develop consumption at that time”), fol. 1 11 between lemma I 19 and 20 = ἔστι δ’ οἷσι ήρξατο πρῶτον τότε (CMG V 10,1, p. 36,5). This is a slightly modified version of the first half of the preceding lemma (I 19).

P. 150,1sq.  
*wa-kānat – ḥāddatun* (“The symptoms most of them suffered from were acute continuous fevers with chills”), fol. 1 13sq. between lemma I 21 and 22 = ἦν δὲ τοῖς πλείστοισιν σύντον <τά> παθήματα τοιάδε: φρικώδεες πυρετοί, συνεχέες, δέες (CMG V 10,1, p. 36,17sq.). This is a quotation from another, later lemma (I 24).

P. 202,15–17  
*ammā – al-ṟ abīʿi* (“their bodies were mostly healthy in winter. But at the beginning of spring many or most fell ill’. He then described the diseases that occurred in spring”), fol. 3 6–8 between lemma II 13 and 14 = “κατὰ χειμῶνα μὲν ὑγιηρῶς εἶχον τὰ πλείστα. πρωὶ δὲ τοῦ ἁρπο τιμει καὶ οἱ πλείστοι διήγον ἐπινόσως”. εἶτα περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἦρι γενομένων διελθῶν (CMG V 10,1, p. 56,5–8). In this instance Galen quoted a previous lemma (II 5), and a few words of Galen’s own comments slipped into the excerpt.

The second type of Galen fragments in *P*, thematic headlines, occurs four times:

P. 282,15  
*sifatu – al-ṯāliṯati* (“Description of the third climatic condition”), fol. 6 3 at the beginning of lemma II 62 = [Τρίτη κατάστασις]² (CMG V 10,1, p. 81,8).

P. 418,1  
*dikru l-mardā llaḏina waṣafa ḥālātabum Buqratu fi l-maqālati l-ūlā mina l-ʾuzți l-auwwali (?) min kitāb Ibīḏīmiyā (“accounts of the patients whose conditions Hippocrates described in the first book of the first part (?) of the Epidemics”), fol. 11 3sq. between lemma III 17 and 18: an adaptation of the headline Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ τῶν Ὑπιθημίων γεγραμμένων ἄρρωστῶν (CMG V 10,1, p. 126,11sq.).

P. 488,1  
*qiṣṣatu – maḥmūmum* (“The case of the man who dined while having a fever”), fol. 18 1 at the beginning of lemma III 29 (this and the other headlines that introduce several case histories in the Arabic translation are not part of the Greek version).

P. 490,16  
*qiṣṣatu* (“the case history”), fol. 18 2 at the beginning of lemma III 30.

¹ Cf. Degen, An Unknown Manuscript, p. 274sq.

² Wenkebach deleted the headline from the Greek text.
The number of transmitted Hippocratic lemmata varies slightly between the manuscripts. Two lemmata extant in E and P are missing in A:

P. 208,15sq. *wa-li-ḑālika* – *al-tarki* (“Hippocrates therefore said: Their crisis was very regular, most of them had it on the seventeenth day including the days it intermitted.”) = II 18 Ἐκρίνετο τούτοισι πάνυ εὐτάκτως, τοῖσι πλείστοισι ἐξ ἑπτακαίδεκα ἡμέρῃσιν (CMG V 10,1, p. 58,1–3). A may have omitted this lemma because the introductory “Hippocrates said” (*qāla Abuqr āṭ*) was, as is the case in E, not rubricated and therefore harder to distinguish from the surrounding text.

P. 228,7sq. *ṯumma* – *kānat* (“They abated somewhat but then, after a pause, soon again flared up in the most violent manner”) = II 25b Σμικρά διακουφίζοντες καὶ ταχὺ πάλιν ἐξ ἐπισχέσεως βιαιοτέρως παροξυσόμενοι (CMG V 10,1, p. 64,1sq.). This (correctly rubricated) lemma may have been omitted because the immediately preceding Galenic comment suggests that it is part of a quotation from Galen’s Critical Days.

Two lemmata extant in E and A are missing in P:

P. 230,11sq. *wa-ammā* – *ḍar ar an* (“But these [people] sweated very little. When they did, the sweating did not alleviate their diseases at all but did the opposite, that is, it caused harm.”) = II 27 Τοῦτοισιν ἐλάχιστοι, κουφίζοντες οὐδέν, ἀλλ’ ὑπεναντίως βλάβας φέροντες (CMG V 10,1, p. 64,25sq.).

P. 336,1 *wa-kāna* – *al-malʿabi* (“They lived at the theatre.”) = II 85b κατέκειτο παρὰ τὸ θέατρον (CMG V 10,1, p. 99,22). P left this passage out because it repeats a phrase from the beginning of the preceding lemma (II 85), but was rubricated as an additional lemma in E and A.

In one instance both P and A pass over a lemma that repeats the end of the preceding lemma:

P. 280,10 *wa-akṯaru* – *al-ṣibyānu* (“Most who develop convulsion in this condition are children”) = II 59 [ὡς] Τὸ πολὺ δὲ παιδίοισιν ἐν τοῖσι τοιούτοισιν οἱ σπασμοι μάλιστα (CMG V 10,1, p. 80,10sq.).

The evidence presented above again confirms that the lemmata transmitted by both A and P were excerpted from Galen’s commentary, not an independent Hippocratic source. The excerptors apparently omitted material they recognised as superfluous and also occasionally added Hippocratic material they found in Galen’s comments.

In addition to the number of transmitted lemmata there are numerous other textual differences. A large proportion of these differences consists of omissions of single words such as prepositions, particles and pronouns from one of the three manuscripts. The number of shared omissions is limited:
Direct transmission

1. Omissions in P and A

P. 198,6 عَلَلْ om. P A
P. 280,12 مِن om. P A
P. 332,1 إِثَّنَاهُ om. P A
P. 432,5 يُوجِعُ om. P A
P. 446,6 كَلَّهُ om. P A
P. 452,9 أُمَّا om. P A
P. 452,15 بِطْنَهَا om. P A
P. 472,12 إِنَّ ارْتِمَ om. P A
P. 480,4 مَعِه om. P A
P. 492,3 فِجَاء om. P A
P. 498,8 أَمَلَسْ om. P A

2. Omissions in E and P

P. 156,16 يَقِمُ om. E P
P. 246,16 بِه om. E P
P. 440,10 إِلَى – هُوَ om. E P
P. 460,10 يَسْكُن om. E P
P. 486,2 فِي – الْشِّرَاضِيف om. E P

The next two words in the last item are also missing in E. This chunk must also have been dropped at a later stage. Its omission results in a sentence that does not fit the context: according to the least complete version of the passage, that of E, the symptoms in the patient’s head lessened instead of the symptoms in her abdomen. The lemma, however, does not mention any symptoms affecting the head. That the scribe of E did not flag or fix this problem may suggest that his immediate source(s) already contained a shortened version of the lemma.

3. Omissions in E and A

P. 180,12 فِي om. E A
Additions consist exclusively of a single word, almost always prepositions, conjunctions or particles. P adds most words (23), followed by A (14) and E (6); only one addition is attested by more than one witness. The distribution and nature of additions in P and A suggest that they are not derived from manuscript sources that represented a textual tradition different from that of E. More likely, they are the result of editorial interventions: they consist of repetitions of nouns or of prepositions and particles that clarify the text and normalise the style of the lemmata.

The majority of errors peculiar to individual manuscripts consist of obvious misreadings and copying errors. Some instances illustrate how each scribe of the three manuscripts reacted differently to problems and ambiguities that apparently already existed in the exemplars of the E tradition (the dotting is represented as it appears in the manuscripts):

P. 132,13 وقال ما:A: وقلما E: وقالما P

P. 176,10 وكان كان:A: واد كان كان E: وكان كان P

P. 208,5 بادى بها:A: بادى بها E: بادى بها P

P. 238,14 يقودوا:A: يقودوا E: يقولوا P

P. 298,3sq. احالف بهم:A: الت حماهم E: الت حالهم P

P. 302,11 نحو وقت:A: نحو وقت E: نحو وقت P

P. 422,6 متصلة:A: متصلة E: متصلة P

P. 430,12 بالحال:A: بالحال E: بالحال P

P. 474,5 حساب مما:A: حساب مما E: حساب مما P

P. 492,4sq. بها ذلك:A: بها ذلك E: بها ذلك P

P. 498,6 كلمة:A: وكلها E: وكلها P

In some of the more complicated cases listed above the quality of the exemplar(s) of A, which also often preserves the dotting of problematic terms, is higher than that of P and E. The same phenomenon can be observed particularly well in transliterated terms such as Greek names. Some examples:
These findings suggest the following: first, they again confirm that it is impossible that P or another copy of the pseudo-independent Hippocratic tradition it represents was the only source for the scribe of A or Ibn al-Nafis, the original author. Second, the excerptors who compiled the Hippocratic material that went into P and A did not extract the lemmata from E itself but from one or more manuscripts that reflect the same tradition but were slightly more complete. This source (or these sources) may or may not have been identical with the additional manuscript(s) of Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics available to David Colville, the annotator of E. Instances of omissions that affect both E and P also suggest that the sources used for P and A were not identical.

Even though the number and extent of the variants in the Hippocratic lemmata show that P and A depend on sources other than E, we can conclude with some confidence that neither manuscript steps outside of the textual confines of the E tradition: the additional sources they rely on consist of one or more copies from the same branch of the tradition represented by E.

At the same time the quality of the lemmata recorded in A, which corrects some mistakes made by the scribes of E and P and also preserves much more correct and precise transliterations of the many personal names in Book 1 of the Epidemics, suggests that the scribe of A had access to a text that, while belonging to the same tradition, was superior to E.

We know from David Colville’s annotations to Scorialensis arab. 805 and the 1577 Escorial catalogue that the Escorial Library possessed at least one more manuscript of Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 and that both E and this other manuscript contained both the Commentaries on Book 1 and on Book 2. Since the text and transmission history of the Commentary on Book 2 is, thanks to the efforts of David Colville, much better documented than that of the Commentary on Book 1, the quality of the text of the former as preserved in E holds valuable clues for evaluating the quality of the text of the latter in the same manuscript:
The variants between the versions of the Commentary on Book 2 of the Epidemics transmitted in E and Colville’s text in Ambrosianus B 135 sup. together with the variants he recorded in its margins suggest that there were numerous differences between his sources.\(^1\) Of some interest are blanks (*vacat*) in the manuscript that, as noted above, may indicate unreadable words in the source manuscripts. There is a surprisingly large number of them in E (45), most of them in the Commentary on Book 2 with a notable concentration in its sixth part. In many cases (20 of the 45) the blank corresponds to a single missing word that is preserved in the Ambrosianus. In other cases, however, the gap amounts to between two and five words\(^2\) or even more, for example two gaps of six and one each of eight and thirteen words. The size of the blank does not necessarily correspond to the length of missing text; it seems more of a standardised indicator for missing text. In two cases blanks do not correspond to extra material preserved in any of the other manuscripts of the Commentary on Book 2.

The Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics seems to have been in a better state, there are only three blanks corresponding to a single word each.\(^3\) The small number of such incidents does not allow us to draw any firm conclusions but it may indicate that the source(s) for E were in better shape at the beginning and deteriorated somewhat toward the end. Overall Colville’s text of Galen’s Commentary on Book 2 recorded in the Ambrosianus turns out to be a substantial improvement over the same text preserved in E. Based on the state of the Commentary on Book 2, it is prudent to assume that the text of the Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics preserved in E is not entirely reliable. We already noticed that P and A often have better readings of the Hippocratic lemmata than E.

The extant material does unfortunately not allow us to clarify the relationships between the three manuscripts in detail. The nature of the textual differences outlined above as well as the clear evidence for scribal interventions in P and A and the likelihood of contamination mean that we are not in a position to construct a stemma. We find a large number of errors and omissions peculiar to each manuscript but relatively few shared errors, which are evenly distributed. This suggests at the very least that P and A do not depend directly on each other or on E but were individually excerpted from one or more witnesses to the E tradition that preserved a better text.\(^4\)

\(^{1}\) Cf. the examples listed by Pormann, Case Notes, p. 263–267.

\(^{2}\) Six instances of a two-word gap, seven of a three-word gap and three each of four- and five-word gaps.

\(^{3}\) The first (p. 156,7), located in a Galenic comment on lemma I 27, can be filled in on the basis of a parallel text in al-Rāzī’s Comprehensive Book (*al-Kitāb al-Ḥāwī*; see below, p. 37); the second (p. 486,10) in lemma III 28 and the third (p. 488,5) in lemma III 29 can be filled in from both P and A.

\(^{4}\) See also G. de Callataï and B. Halfplants, Epistles of the Brethren of Purity. On Magic I. An Arabic Critical Edition and English Translation of Epistle 52a, ed. and transl., Oxford 2011, p. 71–74 on the problem of constructing stemmata from seemingly heavily contaminated manuscripts that were produced under different circumstances and following different methods than those copied in medieval European scriptoria.
II. Indirect transmission

The Arabic version of Galen’s commentary immediately became an important medical teaching tool. In addition to numerous quotations and paraphrases in original Arabic medical works, several Arabic-speaking physicians wrote their own commentaries on parts or all of the Hippocratic Epidemics, which had become available as part of Galen’s commentary. The reception history has been treated in detail elsewhere;¹ the following remarks will describe in chronological order those sources that are of particular importance for the indirect transmission of the Commentary on Book 1.

With the exception of Ibn Riḍwān, al-Ruhāwī and the anonymous annotator of Parisinus arab. 6734 all of the following sources paraphrased or summarised rather than quote verbatim. They therefore have relatively little to offer for the reconstruction of the Arabic text of Galen’s commentary, but their writings frequently preserve key terms and phrases and were sometimes helpful in interpreting otherwise problematic passages. For this reason the apparatus also occasionally records instructive variants from these less accurate sources.

a) Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq (d. 873)

The translator of the commentary, Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq,² produced a range of summaries and didactic texts in question-and-answer format centred either on individual Galenic works or on fields of medicine, for example a collection of Aphorisms drawn from the Epidemics (Fuṣūl istaḥmāqābā min kitāb Ibīḏīmiyā) and Questions on Urine extracted from Hippocrates’ Epidemics (Masā’il fī l-bawl intaza’ābabā min kitāb Ibīḏīmiyā lī-Abuqrāḥ).³ Most of these texts are lost but some quotations are preserved in later works such as the Comprehensive Book (al-Kitāb al-Ḥāwī) by the Persian polymath al-Rāzī (d. 925).

Of Ḥunayn’s Summaries of the Contents of Books 1, 2 and 3 of Hippocrates’ Epidemics in the Form of Questions and Answers (Ǧawāmiʿ maʿānī l-maqāla al-ūlā wa-l-ṯānīya wa-l-ṯāliṯa min kitāb Ibīḏīmiyā lī-Abuqrāḥ ʿalā ṭarīq al-masʾala wa-l-ǧawāb) only those parts have survived that were drawn from the Commentary on Book 2 and the parts of the Commentary on Book 6 that are lost in Greek,⁴ but the Summaries also became an important source for al-Rāzī. This text is probably identical with a summary in question-and-answer format Ḥunayn mentioned in his Epistle (al-Risāla), a letter to a sponsor in which he gives a description of translations of Galenic texts he and his associates produced and also commented on his

¹ Cf. e.g. Hallum, The Arabic Reception.
³ Hallum, p. 187.
⁴ Cf. Hallum, p. 188sq.
sources and the translation process. He wrote that he produced an abridgement of Galen’s commentary in Syriac which was then translated into Arabic by ʿĪsā ibn Yahyā, one of his associates. Ḥunayn’s “answers” in the Arabic version of the Summaries are often so close to the Arabic text of his translation of Galen’s commentary that we can safely assume that ʿĪsā used this translation when he rendered Ḥunayn’s Syriac Summaries into Arabic.

b) Ishāq ibn ‘Alī al-Ruhāwī (fl. 870)

Little is known about the author of an important treatise on medical deontology, the Ethics of the Physician (Adab al-ṭabīb). He was probably a Jewish physician active in Edessa in the second half of the ninth century. Apart from a mention in Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a’s (d. 1270) Sources of Information on the Classes of Physicians (‘Uyūn al-anbāʾ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbāʾ), which commends him as an excellent physician, expert in Galenic medicine and author of valuable medical writings and lists a number of titles of his works, no other bio-bibliographical source offers any information.

The Ethics of the Physician contains quotations from a wide range of medical and philosophical works, especially the Hippocratic corpus, Galen and Aristotle. Three of his quotations from the Epidemics commentary were taken from the Commentary on Book 1.

Ruhāwī, Adab In Hipp. Epid. I comm.
135,14sq. p. 264,17
118,16sq. p. 266,10sq.
150,17–151,2 p. 270,4sq.

These quotations, which reproduced the wording of Ḥunayn’s translation verbatim, are particularly significant because al-Ruhāwī was the first author known to us to quote the Arabic translation of Galen’s commentary; he must have consulted the text around or not long after Ḥunayn’s death.

c) Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyāʾ al-Rāzī (d. 925)

Both the translation of the commentary and Ḥunayn’s various summaries and excerpts became important sources for al-Rāzī’s abovementioned monumental col-

---

1 Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq, p. 42,18sq. (Ar.).
2 Cf. Pormann, Case Notes, p. 261sq.
lection of medical lore, the Comprehensive Book.\(^1\) Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics is quoted forty times in all, with most of the material taken from its third part:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIX 42,6–11</td>
<td>p. 156,7–13</td>
<td>XIV 93,7–9</td>
<td>p. 400,11–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 42,12–43,2</td>
<td>p. 234,6–8</td>
<td>XIV 93,10–14</td>
<td>p. 400,16–402,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI 249,3–5</td>
<td>p. 256,8–11</td>
<td>XVIII 50,3sq</td>
<td>p. 406,10sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI 249,5–9</td>
<td>p. 262,4–11</td>
<td>XVIII 219,3sq</td>
<td>p. 406,10sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII 49,3–5</td>
<td>p. 274,5–7</td>
<td>XVIII 50,4sq</td>
<td>p. 406,12sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII 49,5sq</td>
<td>p. 276,9–11</td>
<td>XVIII 219,5sq</td>
<td>p. 406,13–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII 49,7–9</td>
<td>p. 276,14sq</td>
<td>XVIII 50,7–12</td>
<td>p. 408,6–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII 49,10sq</td>
<td>p. 280,11</td>
<td>XVIII 219,7–11</td>
<td>p. 408,6–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII 49,9sq</td>
<td>p. 280,12</td>
<td>XVIII 50,15–15</td>
<td>p. 408,13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII 49,10</td>
<td>p. 282,1sq</td>
<td>XVIII 50,15–51,1</td>
<td>p. 410,7–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII 49,12sq</td>
<td>p. 282,12sq</td>
<td>XVIII 51,3–5</td>
<td>p. 410,12–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 43,4sq</td>
<td>p. 314,2–5</td>
<td>XVIII 51,6sq</td>
<td>p. 410,15sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 93,5</td>
<td>p. 370,8sq</td>
<td>XVI 203,7–204,7</td>
<td>p. 420,16–422,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 92,1</td>
<td>p. 374,16sq</td>
<td>XVI 204,8–205,1</td>
<td>p. 424,2–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 92,3</td>
<td>p. 376,4–7</td>
<td>XVI 205,6sq</td>
<td>p. 426,8sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 92,1sq</td>
<td>p. 376,8–10</td>
<td>XIX 238,14–239,2</td>
<td>p. 462,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 92,7</td>
<td>p. 394,11</td>
<td>XIX 139,12sq</td>
<td>p. 464,15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 92,7–15</td>
<td>p. 396,5–14</td>
<td>XIX 43,6–9</td>
<td>p. 466,5–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 92,16</td>
<td>p. 396,16</td>
<td>XIX 43,9sq</td>
<td>p. 466,3sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 93,1–4</td>
<td>p. 398,1–6</td>
<td>XIX 238,14–239,2</td>
<td>p. 466,5–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 93,5sq</td>
<td>p. 400,4sq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In five instances the author specified that his source was not the Galenic text itself but Ḥunayn’s Summaries, which he calls Questions (Masāʾil):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rāzī, Ḥāwī</th>
<th>In Hipp. Epid. I comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIX 42,4sq</td>
<td>p. 156,6sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII 255,2–4</td>
<td>p. 294,7–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII 255,5sq</td>
<td>p. 296,8–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII 255,7</td>
<td>p. 312,8–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX 53,6sq</td>
<td>p. 314,2–5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of al-Rāzī’s quotations from the Commentary on Book 1 are verbatim, they invariably consist of summarising paraphrases.\(^2\) Unless he explicitly mentions

---


2 Al-Rāzī’s approach has been studied by a number of authors, among them J. Bryson, The Kitāb al-Ḥāwī of Rāzī (ca. 900 AD), Book One of the Ḥāwī on Brain, Nerve and Mental Disorders: Studies in the Transmission of Texts from Greek into Arabic into Latin, Ph. D. thesis, Yale 2000, p. 19–73; L. Garofalo, Alcune questione sulle fonti greche nel Continens di Razze, Medicina nei Secoli 14, 2002, p. 383–406, e.g. p. 397; Pormann, The Oriental Tradition, p. 60–64 (on quotations from Paul of Aegina’s Pragmateia); and U. Weisser, Die Zitate aus Galens De methodo medendi im Ḥāwī des Rāzī, in: The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism. Studies in the Transmission of
the Summaries as his source, al-Rāzī’s summarising approach makes it difficult or even impossible to distinguish between paraphrases and summaries based on the Galenic text or Ḥunayn’s Summaries. His main source, however, may have been the Summaries rather than the full Galen commentary. The following remark about his use of the commentary suggests that he preferred the condensed and better organised Summaries when comparing his own case notes to the case histories recorded in the Hippocratic Epidemics:

أمثلة من قصص المرضى وحكايات لنا نواذر، يرد إلى هننا ما في مسائل إبيذيميا وما في إبيذيميا، وإيّاك والتواني في ذلك فإن فيها نفعاً عظيماً جداً، وخاصّة من المسائل. فإني قد جمعنا هذه الأمثلة هننا، وأردنا أن نجمع مسائل إبيذيميا إليها، ثمّ نقيس عليها إن شاء الله.  

“Examples from case histories and our own accounts of unusual cases. The (material) from Questions on the Epidemics and the Epidemics is quoted here. Take care not to neglect them: they are extremely useful, especially those from the Questions. We have collected these examples here and intended to combine them with the Questions and then compare them, God willing.”

The value of al-Rāzī’s compilation for reconstructing the wording of the Arabic translation of Galen’s commentary is admittedly limited, but his extensive extracts frequently preserve the terminology of the Galenic text and accurately convey the meaning of the passages he quoted.

The Commentary on Book 1 is also quoted once in another of al-Rāzī’s writings, his Doubts against Galen (al-Šukūk ʿalā Ǧālīnūs). The quotation, which falls into two parts, covers a Hippocratic lemma and is in fact a shortened version of a passage already quoted in the Comprehensive Book:

Rāzī, Šukūk In Hipp. Epid. I comm.
169,1–3 ʿAbd al-Ǧanī p. 400,16–402,1
169,3–4 ʿAbd al-Ǧanī p. 402,4sq.


1 Rāzī, Ḥāwī XVI, p. 189,4–8.

2 Cf. also the slightly different translation in Hallum, p. 194 and Pormann, Medical Methodology, p. 107. M. Meyerhof, Thirty-three clinical observations by Rhazes (circa 900 A.D.), Isis 23, 1935, p. 332 (En.) and 1,2–11 (Ar.) quotes another version of this passage transmitted in a single manuscript. His translation is somewhat marred by the fact that he took masāʾil to refer to “questions” in general and not to a specific treatise by Ḥunayn. Cf. Pormann, Medical Methodology, p. 107 n. 52.

A generation after al-Rāzī another physician working at various Baghdad hospitals wrote a Medical Compendium (Kunnāš al-ṭibb) in which he quoted a wide variety of medical and non-medical sources.

Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 appears four times in chapter 29 of al-Kaskarī’s Compendium:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaskarī, Kunnāš</th>
<th>In Hipp. Epid. I comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304,10sq. Šīrî</td>
<td>p. 370,7–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304,12 Šīrî</td>
<td>p. 374,16–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304,15sq. Šīrî</td>
<td>p. 412,13sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304,16sq. Šīrî</td>
<td>p. 414,8sq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The material is in all instances taken from the final part of Galen’s commentary. Rather than quote verbatim, the author variously shortened, extended or paraphrased the text. Even where he stayed close to it, he varied individual terms. Compared to al-Rāzī, however, al-Kaskarī apparently followed his source more closely.

e) Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Riḍwān (d. 1068)

The Cairene physician Ibn Riḍwān compiled an extensive collection of extracts from Galenic works entitled Useful Passages (Kitāb al-fawāʾid). The choice of material, often quoted verbatim or only slightly paraphrased and interspersed with occasional comments, roughly follows the order of the works Ibn Riḍwān quoted from and seems to have been motivated by its practical use for medical students and practicing physicians.

Galen’s Commentaries on Books 1, 2, 3 and 6 of the Hippocratic Epidemics are covered most extensively: of the 241 folios of the manuscript, Cantabr. Dd. 12. 1., which comprises extracts from thirteen different medical works, 70 are filled with quotations from these works. Almost a hundred individual passages quote the translation of the Commentary on Book 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fol. 128’11–1’1</td>
<td>p. 70,6–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 128’1–5</td>
<td>p. 70,15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 128’5–9</td>
<td>p. 74,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 128’10–12</td>
<td>p. 74,17sq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Cf. Pormann, Theory and Practice, p. 222sq., 228 and al-Kaskarī, p. 136 (also his analysis of sample quotations from Galen’s Commentary on Book 2 of the Hippocratic Epidemics, p. 131–135).
4 Cf. Ullmann, Die Medizin, p. 158sq.
5 The text, extant in a single manuscript (Cambridge, University Library, ms. Cantabr. Dd. 12. 1), is as yet unedited; see E. G. Browne, A Hand-List of the Muhammadan Manuscripts, including all those written in the Arabic character, preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge 1900, p. 307sq., no. 1386. Cf. Hallum, p. 201sq.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio Numbers</th>
<th>Page Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fol. 128r17–129r6</td>
<td>p. 88,11–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 129r17–129r11</td>
<td>p. 90,3–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 129r9–14</td>
<td>p. 92,3–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 129r2–16</td>
<td>p. 94,1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 129r17–129v11</td>
<td>p. 100,1sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 129v17–129v11</td>
<td>p. 124,8sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 129v13–16</td>
<td>p. 128,14sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 129v16sq.</td>
<td>p. 132,8sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 130v6–131r2</td>
<td>p. 140,4–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 131r5–8</td>
<td>p. 142,3sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 131r10–12</td>
<td>p. 144,1–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 131r12–14</td>
<td>p. 148,3sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 131r15–v6</td>
<td>p. 184,15–186,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 133r11–17</td>
<td>p. 188,5sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 133r12–14</td>
<td>p. 188,6–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 133r15–134r10</td>
<td>p. 190,11sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 133r17–133r6</td>
<td>p. 194,18–196,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 134r10–14</td>
<td>p. 198,11sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 134r12–14</td>
<td>p. 204,4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 134r1–4</td>
<td>p. 212,7–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 134r4–10</td>
<td>p. 212,13–214,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 134r10–14</td>
<td>p. 216,2–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 134r15–135r1</td>
<td>p. 220,4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r1–3</td>
<td>p. 224,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r4sq.</td>
<td>p. 228,3–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r5sq.</td>
<td>p. 228,7sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r6sq.</td>
<td>p. 228,13–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r7–11</td>
<td>p. 230,1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r11–14</td>
<td>p. 230,15sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r14–16</td>
<td>p. 232,3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r2sq.</td>
<td>p. 234,4–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r3–5</td>
<td>p. 240,1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r5–8</td>
<td>p. 240,11–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r8–14</td>
<td>p. 242,1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r14–16</td>
<td>p. 242,7–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 135r16–136r2</td>
<td>p. 244,6–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r2sq.</td>
<td>p. 248,4sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r13–15</td>
<td>p. 248,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 254,1–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r15–14</td>
<td>p. 256,8–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r16–17</td>
<td>p. 256,14–258,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 262,4sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r14sq.</td>
<td>p. 266,10sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r15–6</td>
<td>p. 268,8–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r6sq.</td>
<td>p. 270,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r17–v1</td>
<td>p. 270,9sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r17–v1</td>
<td>p. 270,17–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 276,13sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r15–15</td>
<td>p. 276,8–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r15–15</td>
<td>p. 288,1sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r14sq.</td>
<td>p. 292,12–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r15–16</td>
<td>p. 294,12–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 136r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 298,12–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 304,16–306,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r14sq.</td>
<td>p. 308,1sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–v6</td>
<td>p. 310,19–312,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r14sq.</td>
<td>p. 312,15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–138r1</td>
<td>p. 324,7–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 338,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 342,10–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–139r5</td>
<td>p. 350,7–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r14sq.</td>
<td>p. 352,2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–139r5</td>
<td>p. 352,5–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–140r1</td>
<td>p. 390,1–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 406,12–408,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r13sq.</td>
<td>p. 416,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–140r1</td>
<td>p. 416,4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 418,7–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–140r1</td>
<td>p. 426,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 438,16sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–140r1</td>
<td>p. 440,2–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 442,13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–140r1</td>
<td>p. 448,6–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 448,15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–140r1</td>
<td>p. 456,12sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 456,14–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–140r1</td>
<td>p. 470,3–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 138r12sq.</td>
<td>p. 486,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 137r15–140r1</td>
<td>p. 490,3–5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ibn Riḍwān’s Useful Passages is the most important Arabic secondary source for the text of Galen’s commentary not only because of the number and length of
Indirect transmission

quotations it preserves but also because of his method: a full third of these quotations are verbatim and the remaining two thirds are close paraphrases.

f) Abū ʿImrān Mūsā ibn ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Maymūn (Maimonides) (d. 1204)

The great Jewish philosopher and physician Maimonides\(^1\) wrote a number of important medical treatises, among them a commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms. His most important work for the indirect transmission of Galenic texts is his Medical Aphorisms (Kitāb fuṣūl al-ṭibb) in twenty-five volumes, in which Maimonides collected roughly 1500 quotations from a wide range of Galenic works arranged according to subjects.\(^2\) Translated into Latin as early as the thirteenth century and printed twice in the fifteenth, this digest of Galen's most important writings became an important conduit for Galenic medical knowledge to the Latin-speaking West.\(^3\)

Galen's Commentary on Book 1 of the Hippocratic Epidemics was one of the many translated texts Maimonides used and quoted from extensively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X 48: III 13,15sq. (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 136,9–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV 12</td>
<td>p. 136,9–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV 12</td>
<td>p. 140,12sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 43: III 12,14–16 (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 160,10–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII 17</td>
<td>p. 204,4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV 12</td>
<td>p. 212,7sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 40: III 12,4–6 (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 212,13–214,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 10: I 36,1–3 (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 220,4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII 90</td>
<td>p. 240,13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX 58: II 72,1sq. (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 242,1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 2: II 42,8–10 (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 256,8–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 14: II 45,6–10 (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 262,4–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV 12</td>
<td>p. 304,16–306,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII 48: II 36,4–6 (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 430,1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII 28: II 48,5–8 (Ar.) Bos</td>
<td>p. 440,2–8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of these quotations reproduce the original verbatim. Maimonides explained his approach in the introduction to the first volume of the Medical Aphorisms:

---

\(^1\) Cf. on Maimonides' medical writings Ullmann, Die Medizin, p. 167–169 and Bos in: Maimonides, Medical Aphorisms 1–5, p. XI sq. with further references.

\(^2\) Cf. Ullmann, Die Medizin, p. 167sq. and Hallum, p. 205sq. A complete edition and translation of the Arabic text is currently being prepared by Gerrit Bos, who has so far published the first fifteen books (Maimonides, Medical Aphorisms 1–5, 6–9 and 10–15).

“I do not claim to have authored these aphorisms that I have set down in writing. I would rather say that I have selected them – that is, I have selected them from Galen’s words from all his books ... most of the aphorisms that I have selected are in the very words of Galen ...; (in the case of) others, the sense (expressed) in the aphorism is partly Galen’s words and partly my own; (in the case of) yet other aphorisms, my own words express the idea that Galen mentioned.”

Even though Maimonides routinely abbreviated Galen, expanded passages he found obscure and added critical and explanatory notes, some of which refer to his own experience as a practicing physician, he mostly stayed close to Galen’s text.

g) The anonymous annotations of Parisinus arab. 6734

The scribe of manuscript P, which contains the excerpted Hippocratic lemmata from Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 of the Epidemics, supplemented his text with a number of brief annotations drawn from Galen’s commentary. Some of these annotations have been destroyed by water damage or faded away; those that survive show that their author summarised and rearranged the text but also quoted a few passages verbatim. Since they are potentially very valuable for the reconstruction of Hunayn’s translation but only accessible in manuscript form, these annotations will be quoted in full below.

Of the five annotations on fol. 1r, three are illegible. A note at the top of the page, refers to the term “epidemic” (iḍīmiyā) and reads “that is, the visiting diseases” (ay l-amrū āḍu l-wāfidatu). Of another note at the bottom of the page, which is apparently derived from Galen’s comments on lemma I 11 (cf. p. 138,4–15), the following words are still legible:

Those caused by sharp matter are called tumours. What is different (?) ... is called swelling ... He said ... this for all who (?) ... because it is called ‘phlegmone’ ... swellings.”

1 Maimonides, Medical Aphorisms 1–5, p. 2sq.
3 The annotations are referenced in the similia apparatus as “annot. in Hipp. Epid. 1”, variants are recorded in the critical apparatus under the siglum of the manuscript (P).
The exact relationship between this note and Hunayn’s translation cannot be established because the corresponding text was on a lost folio of E.

The same applies to two notes in the right margin of fol. 1v, the first of which refers to Galen’s comments on lemma I 13 and the second to those on lemma I 19. They read as follows:

Galen: Dry coughing is caused by a dry windpipe without waste, by a defect in the respiratory organs or by liquids ... that have not been excreted because of two things ... because the moisture is abundant and thin ... passes into the lungs ... the air has expelled and cast it out.” (cf. p. 140,4–8)

Galen said: Know ... caused by discharges that descend to the lungs ... that occur ...” (cf. p. 144,5sq.)

On the bottom of the page the annotator quoted almost verbatim from Galen’s comments on lemma I 24:

Galen said: When the Greeks say ‘symptoms’, they normally mean unnatural occurrences that happen to the bodies.” (= p. 150,5sq.)

The next annotation, towards the top of the left of fol. 2v, is mostly washed out, but at the end there are verbatim correspondences with Galen’s comments on lemma I 24:

Galen said: ... An imperfect mixture of the parts ... An imperfect mixture of the parts ... May...
“Galen said: (It) increases ... sometimes ... sometimes ... that duplication is that the humor ... it consist of different parts and is mixed: one part is sharp and bilious, another putrefied phlegm.” (= p. 152,2sq.)

While the note in the middle of the left margin of fol. 2r has become illegible, the legible parts of the note beneath quote verbatim from Galen’s comments on lemma I 27:

قال جالينوس: ... الحرارة فيها كثيرة منتَهية في البدن أخلاطاً غليظةً فتحدث لها شبيه الغليان والتبُور.

“Galen said: ... with abundant and burning heat ... thick humours in the body and brings them to a state resembling boiling and agitation.” (= p. 156,10sq.)

The first of the two Arabic comments on fol. 4v, situated at the top of the page, is too fragmentary to determine what it refers to. The second, at the bottom of the page, summarises some points Galen made in his comments on lemma II 32:

قال جالينوس: ... أنه لم تكن ... منه منفعة ... ... آلات النفس ما ينفث منه.

“Galen said: ... that there was no ... benefit from it ... the respiratory organs what is expectorated from them.” (cf. p. 236,4sq.)

On the right hand side, the same or another annotator wrote the following Syriac note, which does not seem to be derived from Galen’s Commentary on Book I of the Hippocratic Epidemics:1

"Galen: Cooling of ... or of a large swelling in the intestines."

The next, more substantial annotation at the bottom of fol. 5r quotes almost verbatim from Galen’s comments on lemma II 47:

قال جالينوس: ليس شيء من الأمراض يمكن أن يقضي دون أن يحدث فيه النضج منفعة الأشياء الخارجة عن الطبيعة إلى الحال الطبيعية وليس الإضداد شيء ؤعفر فقصر الشيء الذي أُنجِح إلى طبيعة الشيء الذي يضُبطه.

1 My thanks go to Grigory Kessel for transcribing this note.
“There is no disease that could possibly cease without concoction taking place. The concoction of a disease is the transformation of unnatural things into a natural state. Concoction is nothing but ... of the thing that was brought to concoction to the nature of the thing that concocts it.” (= p. 252,17–254,3)

A note at the bottom of fol. 6r shortens and rearranges Galen’s comments on lemma II 59:

قال جالينوس: يسرع إليهم ذلك لبين عصبهم وضعفها.

“They affect children quickly because their nerves are tender and weak.” (cf. p. 280,11)

A similarly shortened and rearranged annotation extracted from Galen’s comments on lemma II 61 can be found at the bottom of fol. 6v:

قال جالينوس: لضعف الطبيعة فيهم عن الدفع بالقيء أو الرعاف يعرض ذلك فيهم.

“Galen said: Because their nature is too weak to expel through vomiting or nosebleed this affects them.” (cf. p. 282,12–14)

A note at the top of fol. 9r sums up some information Galen gave in his comments on lemma II 83:

قال جالينوس: قد يمكن أن تنحل الخرجات التي عند الآذان باستفراغ يعرض ... ...

ممدًا (؟) ونضح.

“Galen said: Tumours by the ears may dissolve by an excretion that takes place ... extended (؟) and concoction.” (cf. 328,17–330,3)

At the bottom of the same page the annotator summarised parts of Galen’s comments on lemma II 86:

قال جالينوس: يعتقد (؟) أن هذان ماتا لأن الأخلاط التي كانت سبب الحميات لم تكن نضجت ولولا ذلك فما ماتا وليس كل من يعرض له هذا ...

“Galen: He assumes (؟) that these two died because the humours that caused the fevers were not concocted. Had it been otherwise, the would not have died. Everyone who experiences this ...” (cf. 338,9–11)
The sources

Two further notes, one on fol. 9r which seems to refer to the comments on lemma II 85, the other on 9v which apparently refers to the comments on lemma II 88, are too fragmentary to match with any specific passage in the commentary:

قال جالينوس: إنَّ الذي جاء بحرانه في السادس ... ... ... آيام والآخر جاء ... 

“Galen said: Those who have a crisis on the sixth ... days and the other comes ...”

قال جالينوس: كان الرعاف ينقص ...

“Galen said: The nosebleeds diminished ...”

III. Wenkebach’s Greek edition and the role of the Arabic translation

The Arabic version of Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 of the Hippocratic Epidemics played an important role in establishing the authoritative edition of the Greek text of the commentary by Ernst Wenkebach and Franz Pfaff,1 which appeared in this series in 1934. Wenkebach found the Greek manuscript tradition so corrupt that, mediated by Franz Pfaff’s German translation, he used Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq’s translation codicis instar while taking care not to project the relative prolixity of the Arabic version back into his Greek text.2 From Wenkebach’s separate study on the state and reconstruction of the prooemium of the Commentary on Book 13 we know that Pfaff’s translation helped in filling short gaps and verifying readings in the Greek text. To fill longer gaps, for example the lost beginning of the prooemium, the editors printed Pfaff’s German translation of the Arabic. Throughout the text of the Commentary on Book 1 Wenkebach’s apparatus attests to the crucial importance of his Arabic witness.4

Wenkebach’s procedure was, as he himself openly acknowledged, not without risks. He was aware of Ḥunayn’s tendency to expand the text by inserting glosses and explanatory remarks and by using synonymic doublets or hendiadys to render certain terms.5 His effort to prevent these accretions from influencing the edited

1 Wenkebach, in: CMG V 10,1, p. XXIsq. The volume was reviewed e.g. by E. T. Withington, The Classical Review 49, 1935, p. 205; P. Chantraine, Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes 62, 1936, p. 357sq.; Kind; Diller; and Alexanderson.
2 Wenkebach, in: CMG V 10,1, p. XXIsq. The almost insurmountable problems of the Greek tradition were also noted e.g. by Kind, col. 817–819.
3 Wenkebach, Das Proömium.
5 The nature and extent of these expansions will be discussed below in the section on translation style (p. 49 – 57).
Greek text were remarkably successful, even though some of his reviewers found additions that had slipped through.\textsuperscript{1}

The quality of Wenkebach’s reconstructed Greek text also depended to a considerable degree on the reliability of Pfaff’s reading and translation of the Arabic version. Pfaff explained his careful and measured approach as a translator in a separate preface to the 1934 edition.\textsuperscript{2} Most of Pfaff’s work has stood the test of time but his translation can be obscure and has its share of problems.\textsuperscript{3} For his work on the Commentary on Book 1 Pfaff relied exclusively on ms. E, which he seems to have regarded as an unproblematic witness. In his preface he also claimed that there were no substantial differences between the Arabic text of the Commentary on Book 2 transmitted in E and the second main witness, Ambrosianus B 135 sup.; we now know that the latter is the better source. His trust in E may have blunted his critical impulses at times, and he was unable to take into account any of the additional sources available now, for example P and especially A with their often better readings of the Hippocratic lemmata, or important secondary witnesses introduced above such as Ibn Riḍwān’s Useful Passages.

The potentially problematic relationship between Wenkebach’s Greek text and the Arabic translation on the one hand and the quality of the Arabic text and German translation produced by Franz Pfaff on the other provided a powerful incentive to take a fresh look at the Arabic textual tradition. In the course of establishing and translating the Arabic version, a number of additional issues came to light, for example additions Wenkebach made on the basis of Pfaff’s translation that could not be confirmed or need to be corrected,\textsuperscript{4} or some Arabic passages that may well be based on lost sections of the Greek original.\textsuperscript{5} The present edition of Galen’s commentary is therefore an indispensable tool to understand the text of Galen’s Commentary on Book 1 of the Hippocratic Epidemics. It also represents a crucial first step in disentangling the Arabic and Greek strands in Wenkebach’s edition, re-evaluating the Greek text and rectifying the problems that were introduced through the medium of Pfaff’s Arabic-German version.

\section*{B. The Arabic translation}

\subsection*{I. Textual history}

At the beginning of this introduction we outlined some of the problems associated with the transmission of the Hippocratic Epidemics and the fate of Galen’s commentary. Its transmission history and the character and problems of the extant

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Diller, p. 267sq.; Alexanderson, p. 122 and 124.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{2} Pfaff, in: CMG V 10,1, p. XXXIII.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{3} Cf. G. Strohmaier, Galen in Arabic: Prospects and Projects, in: Galen: Problems and Perspectives, p. 189, who calls it “not very reliable”; concrete examples of translation problems in Garofalo, I commenti alle Epidemie (on Galen’s Commentaries on Books 1 and 2 of the Epidemics) and I commenti a Epidemie III e VI, Galenos 4, 2010, p. 229–258 (on the Commentaries on Books 3 and 6).
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{4} Examples can be found in the Notes at p. 503, 504, 512, 540, 546, 552, 593, 603 and 606.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{5} See e.g. p. 541 \textit{ad} p. 248,9–11 and p. 546 \textit{ad} p. 268,1sq.