



# The Emergence of Verification (taqīq) in Islamic Medicine

**DOI:**

[10.1163/18778372-04701001](https://doi.org/10.1163/18778372-04701001)

**Document Version**

Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Karimullah, K. I. (2019). The Emergence of Verification (taqīq) in Islamic Medicine. *Oriens*, 47(1-2), 1-113. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18778372-04701001>

**Published in:**

Oriens

**Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Takedown policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact [uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk) providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



# The Emergence of Verification (*taḥqīq*) in Islamic Medicine: The Exegetical Legacy of Faḥr al-Dīn ar-Rāzī's (d. 1210) Commentary on Avicenna's (d. 1037) *Canon of Medicine*

Kamran I. Karimullah

The University of Manchester

karimullah.kamran@manchester.ac.uk

## Abstract

In this article, I discuss the legacy of Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's commentary on Avicenna's *Canon of Medicine* in Islamic medical commentary after 1100. I argue that Faḥr al-Dīn's legacy lies in the exegetical practices, the method of verification (*taḥqīq*) he introduced into Islamic medical scholarship through his commentary on the *Canon*. I first argue that the features that characterise the method of verification in works such as Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on Avicenna's *Pointers and Reminders* are present in the commentary on the *Canon*, even if Faḥr al-Dīn's introduction to the latter work does not allude to these practices in the way that the introductions to his later works do. Based on an analysis of Galen's prescription about exegetical best-practice in his Hippocratic commentaries and Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī's (d. ca. 925) introduction to *Doubts on Galen*, I argue next that Faḥr al-Dīn's introduction of the verification method into the Islamic medical discourse was a watershed moment in the tradition. I use Ibn al-Quff's (d. 1286) commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* to show how these methods were imitated by later medical commentators. The final section illustrates the enormous exegetical interest that the *Canon of Medicine* attracted, suggesting other promising trajectories for research into Faḥr al-Dīn medical legacy.

Keywords: *taḥqīq*; Islamic medicine; Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī; Ibn al-Quff; Galen; Avicenna; *Canon of Medicine*

## 1 Introduction

Abū al-Faraġ ibn Ya'qūb ibn Ishāq Ibn al-Quff (d. 1286) is not much known outside the field of medieval Islamic medicine.<sup>1</sup> He was born in 1233 and was raised in a Melkite Christian family in Karak

---

1. For his life and scholarly upbringing, see Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *'Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*, ed. Augustus Müller (Königsberg: self-published, 1884 [reprinted Hants, UK: Gregg International, 1972 ]), 2:273–4. The standard biography is Sami Hamarneh, *The Physician, Therapist and Surgeon: Ibn al-Quff* (Cairo: Atlas Press, 1974). For his other works, see *GAL* I, 649 and *GALS*, I,

in Greater Syria. He came from a scholarly medical family, and it is obvious from his writing that he had a very rigorous education, not only in medicine, but in philosophy, Arabic philology and literature. He was the student of several important physicians, among them the great biobibliographer Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a (d. 1270) and the physician Ibn al-Nafīs (d. 1288).<sup>2</sup> He eventually moved with his family to Damascus, where he continued to study medicine and worked as a physician for the Ayyūbid rulers. He wrote monographs on surgery and therapeutics, and massive commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* and Avicenna’s *Canon of Medicine*.

Ibn al-Quff’s erudition is apparent in his commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*, where he cites a huge number of Greek and Arabic authors on a wide variety of topics. Aside from Galen and Hippocrates, there are numerous citations from the physics, especially the psychology, of Avicenna’s *The Healing* (*al-Šifā’*).<sup>3</sup> Take for example Ibn al-Quff’s long commentary on the *Aphorisms*, Book Two, aphorism one, in which Hippocrates speaks about pains that occur during sleep.<sup>4</sup>

Ἐν ᾧ νοσήματι ὕπνος πόνον ποιεῖ, θανάσιμον· ἦν δὲ ὕπνος ὠφελῆς, οὐ θανάσιμον.

قال أبقراط: إذا كان النوم في مرض من الأمراض يحدث وجعاً فذلك من علامات الموت، وإذا كان النوم ينفع فليس ذلك من علامات الموت.

---

899 and Ullmann, *Die Medizin im Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 176–7.

2. Ullmann, *Medizin*, 176.

3. For instances in which Ibn al-Quff cites from the *Book on Demonstration* (*K. al-Burhān*) in the *Logic* of *The Healing*, see Kamran I. Karimullah, “Avicenna and Galen, Philosophy and Medicine: Contextualising Discussions of Medical Experience in Medieval Islamic Physicians and Philosophers,” *Oriens* 45 (2017): 105–49.

4. Greek: Caroline Magdelaine, *Histoire du texte ed édition critique, traduite et commentée des Aphorismes d’Hippocrate* (PhD diss., Université de Paris-Sorbonne IV, 1994) 2:386. Arabic: Galen, *Tafsīr Ġālīnūs li-Fuṣūl Abuqrāt*, trans. Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq, ed. Taro Mimura (The University of Manchester, 2012–2017), doi: 10.3927/51689327 .

Hippocrates said: During a certain illness when sleep causes pain, that is one of the signs of death. If sleep is beneficial, this is not one of the signs of death.

Ibn al-Quff divides his commentary on this and all other aphorisms (there are around 350 of them in total) into a number of “investigations (*mabāḥiṭ*),” each of which covers a variety of different topics that Ibn al-Quff believes are necessary for explaining Hippocrates often cryptic words.<sup>5</sup> In most cases, the first investigation is given over to explaining the connection (*ṣila*) between the current aphorism and the one that precedes it. Before commenting on the Hippocratic text, Ibn al-Quff normally devotes several investigations to basic definitions, philosophical questions, and some medico-philosophical debates. He divides his commentary on *Aphorisms* ii.1 into ten investigation, and before he launches into an explanation of this aphorism on the relation between pain and sleep, he discusses topics such as what sleep is (*ḥaqīqat al-nawm*), how it comes about (*kayfiyyat ḥudūṭihi*), the reason why there is a need for it (*al-ḥāḡa ilā al-nawm*) and its relation to pain. Additionally, several other investigations are committed to clarifying the nature of pain (*al-waḡaʿ*) and its aetiology. Throughout, Ibn al-Quff draws mainly on Galen. In the long sections in the commentary treating the nature and causes of pain, he makes extensive use of Galen’s idea that pain is caused by dissolution of continuity (*tafarruq al-ittiṣāl*, for example, a broken arm or a cut) or a noxious or unhealthy mixture of the primary qualities cold, hot, moist, and dry (*sūʿ al-mizāḡ*, pain in fevers and a painful swelling).<sup>6</sup> In the fifth investigation, in which he explains the import of the phrase “...when sleep causes pain...,” Ibn al-Quff first mentions what Galen had to say on this

---

5. A preliminary description of the structure of Ibn al-Quff’s commentary may be found in Franz Rosenthal, “‘Life is Short, the Art is Long’: Arabic Commentaries on the First Hippocratic Aphorisms,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 40 (1966): 226–45, 241–4. Now see Peter E. Pormann and N. Peter Joosse, “Commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* in the Arabic Tradition: The Example of Melancholy” in *Epidemics in Context: Greek Commentaries on Hippocrates in the Arabic Tradition*, ed. Peter E. Pormann (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 211–49, 235–40.

6. For the Greek tradition, see Phillip H. De Lacy, “Galen’s Concept of Continuity,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 355–69.

phrase in his commentary on this aphorism. A number of other sources from among the “recent scholars (*al-muta’ḥḥirīn*),” however, are mentioned also.<sup>7</sup>

اعلم أولاً أنّ هذه العبارة فيها مسامحة فإنّ النوم ليس هو المحدث للوجع والضرر بل المحدث لذلك إمّا تفرّق الاتّصال بذاته على ما يراه الفاضل جالينوس بحسب المشهور عنه. ومن المتأخّرين صاحب الكامل وأبو سهل المسيحي، وإمّا هو وسوء المزاج المختلف بذاتهما على ما ذهب إليه الشيخ الرئيس رحمه الله، وإمّا لسوء المزاج المختلف بذاته على ما ذهب إليه الإمامان فخر الدين بن الخطيب والقاضي أبو الوليد بن رشد.

Know, first, that there is some inaccuracy in this statement [by Hippocrates], for it is not sleep that causes pain and harm. Rather what causes that is either the dissolution of continuity in itself as Galen holds according to what is well-known of his doctrine, as well as the author of the *Complete [Book of Medicine, ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās al-Māḡūsī]* and Abū Sahl al-Masīḥī; or it is caused by [both dissolution of continuity] and an irregular noxious mixture according to what the *Šayḥ al-Ra’īs* held; or it is caused by the noxious irregular mixture in itself according to what the *imāms* Faḥr al-Dīn ibn al-Ḥaṭīb and the Judge Abū al-Walīd Ibn Rušd held.

Galen, ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās al-Māḡūsī, Abū Sahl al-Masīḥī, Avicenna—these are authors who are famed for their contributions to Arabic medicine. Even Averroes’ modest contributions to the field are well-known because of his *Book of General Principles*.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī is hardly a name that one would expect to find in a list of major medical figures. How does Faḥr al-Dīn find his way into a list of august medical authorities in a late thirteenth-century medical commentary in late Ayyūbid-early Mamlūk Damascus?

This text raises two questions that require consideration. First, based on what we currently know about Faḥr al-Dīn’s contributions to logic, theology, philosophy, physics and Qur’ān exegesis, as well as what is known about his scholarly career, patronage, writings and intellectual interests,

7. Ibn al-Quff, *al-Uṣūl fi šarḥ al-Fuṣūl*, ed. ARABCOMMAPH (The University of Manchester, 2012–2017), doi: 10.3927/52131995.

8. Manfred Ullmann, *Medizin*, 166. See Emilie Savage-Smith and Peter E. Pormann, *Medieval Islamic Medicine* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 166.

we would not guess that his medical thought would rank with the likes of Avicenna, Galen or al-Mağūsī in the mind of a thirteenth-century physician such as Ibn al-Quff.<sup>9</sup> Why does Faḥr al-Dīn warrant such respect in Ibn al-Quff's eyes?

Second, there is a sense in which Faḥr al-Dīn's actual medical doctrines are not important to Ibn al-Quff. His commentary is more than a quarter of a million words long, and Ibn al-Quff cites dozens of medical authorities hundreds of times. Yet, Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon* is cited only twice: once on the subject of swelling, and once on the topic of pain. And on neither occasion does Ibn al-Quff agree with Faḥr al-Dīn's medical viewpoint. In what ways was Faḥr al-Dīn important to Ibn al-Quff if not from the perspective of medical doctrines?

To my mind, the first question is somewhat easier, and will be addressed in what remains of this section. The second is more difficult. It will be considered in the remaining sections.

Gerhard Endress has collected bio-bibliographical, codicological and prosopological evidence that details how Avicenna's philosophical and medical thought was received and studied in different parts of the medieval Islamic world.<sup>10</sup> Endress presents compelling evidence for

---

9. For example Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī appears nowhere in Peter E. Pormann and Savage-Smith's *Medieval Islamic Medicine*. In Manfred Ullmann's *Die Medizin im Islam* he is mentioned as the author of a text on medical hygiene, of a short treatise on poisons (Ullmann, *Medizin*, 191, 339) and as the intellectual adversary of 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Bağdādī (d. 1231) (*ibid.*, 171). By contrast, Faḥr al-Dīn's "uneven" legacy in logic is well-known; see Khaled El-Rouayheb, *Relational Syllogisms and the History of Arabic Logic, 900-1900* (Leiden: Brill, 2010); in theology, see Ayman Shihadeh, "From al-Ghazali to al-Razi: 6th/12th Century Developments in Muslim Philosophical Theology," *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 15 (2005): 141–79; in philosophy and physics, see Bilal Ibrahim, "Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Ibn al-Hayṭam and Aristotelian Science: Essentialism versus Phenomenalism in Post-Classical Islamic Thought," *Oriens* 41 (2013): 379–431; for Qur'ān exegesis, see Tariq Jaffer, *Rāzī: Master of Quranic Interpretation and Theological Reasoning* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), especially Chapter Two. For his life and patronage, see Frank Griffel, "On Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Life and the Patronage He Received," *Journal of Islamic Studies* (2007): 313–44.

10. Endress, "Reading Avicenna in the Madrasa."

Faḥr al-Dīn's influence on the development of the rational sciences between the Nile and the Oxus and into Transoxiana. He sees the famed commentaries, refutations, and arbitrations on Avicenna's philosophical and medical works written in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and later as inspired by Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's critical but appreciative attitude toward Avicenna's philosophy. Endress shows how the "reading of Avicenna, his commentators, epitomators, and theological critics," which became an integral part of madrasa education between the Nile and the Oxus, was greatly influenced by the "school of Faḥr al-Dīn."<sup>11</sup> With regard to medicine, Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon* inaugurated a tradition of *philosophical* interest in Book One (the *Generalties, Kullīyāt*) of the *Canon of Medicine*, a tradition which proved to be long-lived in the Central and Eastern regions of the medieval Islamic world. About the philosophers who took interest in and wrote commentaries on the *Canon*, Endress says that "we find them reading and commenting upon Ibn Sīnā's *al-Qānūn fī l-Ṭibb*, mostly, it is true, confining themselves to the part on theoretical medicine, *al-Kullīyāt*. The jurists and theologians who were fascinated by his writings of philosophical theology, criticising while commenting, and struggling with the obstacles it presented for the faith, found in the *Qānūn* a welcome exposition of natural and medical sciences. A long sequence of 'philosophers', philosopher-scientists and philosopher-jurists, starting from Ibn Sīnā's own pupils, wrote commentaries, epitomes and quaestiones on his physiological and medical theory."<sup>12</sup>

The interest shown in the *Canon* among members of what Endress calls Faḥr al-Dīn's "school" was an important element of Faḥr al-Dīn's legacy to madrasa educational praxis. For it seems that some of Faḥr al-Dīn's pupils were as fond of challenging Faḥr al-Dīn's authority as much as Faḥr al-Dīn enjoyed challenging Avicenna's.<sup>13</sup>

In the *Sharḥ al-Kullīyāt*, I found him give precedence to al-Masīḥī whilst Ibn al-Khaṭīb [that is, Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī] favours the *Shaykh* Abū 'Alī ibn Sīnā. These are his own words: [Abū Sahl] al-Masīḥī is more knowledgeable about the art of medicine, and our teachers

---

11. Ibid., 397.

12. Ibid., 391–2.

13. Ibid., 405–6.

used to give him precedence over many others, who they deemed more competent than Abū ‘Alī in this art. He also said: The expression of al-Masīhī is clearer and more lucid than the discourse of the *Shaykh*.

The above is an assessment of Avicenna’s *Canon of Medicine* by one of Faḥr al-Dīn’s most distinguished students, Quṭb al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥārīṭ Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Sulamī al-Miṣrī al-Maġribī (d. 1221). It is clear that in addition to finding more to esteem in al-Masīhī’s medical thought than Avicenna’s, Quṭb al-Dīn al-Miṣrī also faults Faḥr al-Dīn’s inordinate devotion to all things Avicennian.

The report of Quṭb al-Dīn al-Miṣrī’s words is by Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a (d. 1270), recorded in the his *Sources of Lore on the Ranks of the Physicians* (*‘Uyūn al-anbā’ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā’*), one of the best historical sources on the development of the commentary tradition on the Avicenna’s *Canon*. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a was a physician-historian who was keenly aware of the influence Faḥr al-Dīn exerted on medical discourse in the late thirteenth century. As it happens, Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a was also one of Ibn al-Quff’s medical teachers, and, along with Naġm al-Dīn ibn al-Minfāḥ (d. ca. 1252), Muwaffaq al-Dīn Ya‘qūb al-Sāmīrī (d. 1282) and Ibn al-Nafīs, all of whom wrote commentaries on the *Canon*, exerted a great influence on Ibn al-Quff after he moved with his father to Damascus.<sup>14</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a records that Ya‘qūb al-Sāmīrī wrote a commentary on the *Generalities* of the *Canon*, “in which he included what Ibn al-Ḥaṭīb [Faḥr al-Dīn] al-Rāzī had said in his commentary on the *Generalities*, as well as what al-Quṭb al-Miṣrī had said in his commentary on it, and also what others had said, laying out in detail the topics requiring investigation in their statements (*wa-ḥarrara mā fī aqwālihim mina l-mabāḥiṭ*).”<sup>15</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a records too that al-Sāmīrī wrote a book that “solves Naġm al-Dīn ibn al-Minfāḥ’s doubts on the *Generalities* of the *Canon*.”<sup>16</sup> He writes

---

14. Ullmann, *Medizin*, 176.

15. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, *‘Uyūn al-anbā’*, 2.273.

16. Ibid. This recalls the earlier, lost work by Ibn Abī Ṣādiq entitled *Resolving Rāzī’s Doubts on Galen’s Books* (*Ḥall ṣukūk al-Rāzī ‘alā kutub Ğālīnūs*), in which he responds to Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā’s doubts on Galen’s medical and philosophical works. See Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, *‘Uyūn al-*



that Ibn al-Minfāḥ wrote a commentary entitled *Book on the Omissions in the Book of the Generalities* (*Kitāb al-muhmalāt fī Kitāb al-Kullīyāt*), though it is unclear whether this is identical to the book of Ibn al-Minfāḥ's "doubts" on the *Generalities* mentioned in al-Sāmīrī's entry later in *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ*.<sup>17</sup> What is more, according to Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, in his early years in Karak, the city of his birth, Ibn al-Quff studied philosophy with Faḥr al-Dīn's notable student Šams al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn ʿĪsā al-Ḥusrawšāhī (d. 1254).<sup>18</sup> Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa knew al-Ḥusrawšāhī personally, and relates the following story:<sup>19</sup>

One day, I [Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa] saw him [al-Ḥusrawšāhī] when a Persian scholar brought him a book written in a subtle hand, in Baghdādī size and Muʿtazilī cut. When he opened it, he proceeded to kiss it and put it upon his head. I asked him about this, and he said: This is the handwriting of our *shaykh*, the Imām Fakhr al-Dīn, son of the *khaṭīb*, may God have mercy on him. My esteem for him grew because of his reverence for his *shaykh*.

This, then, represents the intellectual milieu in which Ibn al-Quff studied medicine and philosophy. Between the middle and the end of the thirteenth century, far from being a marginal medical authority, Faḥr al-Dīn had become important to medieval medical discourse between the Nile and Oxus through his outstanding students, who evidently revered him, and imitated his analytical method in their medical writings. It is not surprising, then, that Faḥr al-Dīn should be mentioned in the same breath as, say, Abū Sahl al-Masīhī, ʿAlī ibn ʿAbbās al-Maḡūsī or even Avicenna and Galen.

---

*anbāʾ*, 2.23, l.2. Ayman Shihadeh classifies books of this kind as sub-genre of "counter-aporetic texts" that "emerged in parallel to aporetic texts"; see Ayman Shihadeh, *Doubts on Avicenna* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 47.

17. Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ*, 2.266.

18. Ibid., 2.273, l. 26; The entry on al-Ḥusrawšāhī is in Ibid., 2.266.

19. Arabic: Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ*, 2.173, ll.8–12. The translation is Endress': Endress, "Reading Avicenna in the Madrasa," 406–7.

So much for the first question. Let us turn to the second. The above considerations show that Faḥr al-Dīn's thought rapidly gained traction in Muslim and non-Muslims scholarly circles.<sup>20</sup> Yet, Ibn al-Quff cites Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon* twice, and never with approval. What

---

20. Faḥr al-Dīn's philosophical works influenced theological debates among Coptic and Syriac Orthodox Christian in the thirteenth century. Barbara Roggema has pointed to the late thirteenth-century Jewish philosopher Ibn Kammūna (d. 1284) and to the Christian Ibn al-'Ibrī's (a.k.a. Barhebraeus, d. 1286) critiques of Faḥr al-Dīn's arguments for the veracity of Muḥammad's claim to prophethood. Ibn al-Quff's own writings clearly demonstrate how influential Faḥr al-Dīn had become in medical circles among thirteenth century Eastern Christian scholarly communities. And manuscript evidence also points to the concern that medieval Jewish scholars and scribes had for Rāzī's medical works. For example, in Paris in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, there is a medieval manuscript (dating to around the 15th century) of Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon of Medicine* written in Mashait Judeo-Arabic. The manuscript serves as a faithful record of Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon*, though the scribe has seemingly taken liberties with portions of the text that too strongly recall Islamic religious symbols and pious formulas and prayers (see Tzvi Langermann, "Criticism of Authority in the Writings of Moses Maimonides and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī," *Early Science and Medicine* 7 (2002): 255–74). So the solution to the second riddle is that by the end of the thirteenth century, it appears that Faḥr al-Dīn's medical and philosophical thought was not, in fact, restricted to Muslim learning institutions, but was embraced with enthusiasm in Christian and Jewish scholarly circles, even if his actual theological and philosophical doctrines were not accepted. See Hidemi Takahashi, "Reception of Islamic Theology among Syriac Christians in the Thirteenth Century: The Use of Fakhr al-Dīn' al-Rāzī in Barhebraeus' Candelabrum of the Sanctuary," *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 2 (2014): 170–92; Gregor Schwarb, "The 13th Century Copto-Arabic Reception of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: Al-Rashīd Abū l-Khayr Ibn al-Ṭabīb's *Risālat al-Bayān al-Aḥḥar fī l-radd 'alā man yaqūlu bi-l-qadā' wa-l-qadar*," *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 2 (2014): 143–69. Barbara Roggema, "Ibn Kammūna's and Ibn al-'Ibrī's Responses to Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Proofs of Muḥammad's Prophethood," *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 2 (2014): 193–213.

is more, no other post-classical commentator on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* cites Faḥr al-Dīn's medical or philosophical views. In short, how do we reconcile the mounting historical evidence that Faḥr al-Dīn was highly influential in Muslim and non-Muslim medical, philosophical and theological circles with the fact that post-classical medical authors turned a deaf ear to his medical doctrines themselves?

The answer lies, in my view, in looking at not what medical authors say but how they say it. In this article, I shall argue that Faḥr al-Dīn's legacy on post-classical Islamic medicine lies in the fact that he was the first to introduce the exegetical methods of verification (*taḥqīq*) into medieval Islamic medical discourse. I argue, too, that the vehicle for bringing the methods of verification to medical authors was Faḥr al-Dīn's influential commentary on Avicenna's *Canon of Medicine*.

Recent studies in the history of Arabo-Islamic medicine and philosophy have highlighted the importance of commentary as a venue for authors to explore and debate topics that were relevant to philosophy and medicine.<sup>21</sup> Robert Wisnovsky has pointed out that in the post-classical period, philosophical commentary served a "wide variety of functions," only one of which was explaining what the author said and suggesting reasons that compelled him to say it. Central to the commentary activity that thrived in the post-classical period of Islamic intellectual history stands "verification (*taḥqīq*)." For commentators, verification was both an exegetical *method* as well as normative *ideal*. In other words, "verification" picks out a set of exegetical activities that commentators after 1100 practiced when commentary on philosophical texts. Yet, as time progressed verification served as a rubric prescribing how commentators ought to approach exegetical activity.

What is more, verification was not a method that was restricted to philosophical exegesis. Nahyan Fancy has shown how philosophical and theological considerations played an important role in Ibn al-Nafis' commentary on Avicenna's *Canon of Medicine*, where, for example, he made novel contributions to the anatomy of human respiration.<sup>22</sup> Fancy has also drawn attention to how

---

21. "Medical Commentaries: A Preliminary Examination of Ibn al-Nafis's *Shurūḥ*, the *Mūjaz* and Commentaries on the *Mūjaz*," *Oriens* 41 (2013): 525–545.

22. Nahyan Fancy, *Science and Religion in Mamluk Egypt: Ibn al-Nafis, Pulmonary Transit and*

these scientific innovations were received by commentators on the *Canon* and epitomes of the *Canon* such as the *Epitome* (*al-Mūǧīz* or *al-Mūǧāz*). Yet, Fancy has suggested that Ibn al-Nafīs was an active participant in the post-classical tradition of verification,<sup>23</sup> an exegetical method as well as an attitude toward textual authority that is not normally associated with *medical* commentary but with the traditions of *philosophical* exegesis that originated in the lands East of Baghdad and in Transoxiana after 1100, and which coalesced from critical engagement with Avicenna's philosophical texts.<sup>24</sup> Basing their observations on the commentary tradition growing out of the critical reception of Avicenna's *Pointer and Reminders*, Robert Wisnovsky and Ayman Shihadeh have concluded that Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī played a prominent role in promulgating the verification method in philosophical circles, documenting at length the complex, centuries-long factors that give rise to the exegetical tradition of verification after 1100. Wisnovsky has identified a "spectrum" of methods that characterise verification, all of which were common commentary practice prior to Faḥr al-Dīn. Likewise, Shihadeh has tirelessly recorded the numerous intellectual debts that Faḥr al-Dīn owed his predecessors such as Avicenna (d. 1037), Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī (d. ca. 925), Ibn al-Haytam (d. 1039), Abū Ḥāmid al-Ġazālī (d. 1111) and Abū al-Barakāt al-Baġdādī (d. before

---

*Bodily Resurrection* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

23. Nahyan Fancy, "Womb Heat versus Sperm Heat: Hippocrates against Galen and Ibn Sīnā in Ibn al-Nafīs's Commentaries," *Oriens* 45 (2017): 150–75.

24. On *taḥqīq* in the early period, see Robert Wisnovsky, "Avicennism and Exegetical Practice in the Early Commentaries on the *Ishārāt*," *Oriens* 41 (2013): 349–78. Ayman Shihadeh, "Al-Rāzī's (d. 1210) Commentary on Avicenna's Pointers: The Confluence of Exegesis and Aporetics," in *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, eds. Khaled El-Rouayheb and Sabine Schmidtke (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 296–325. For the early modern period, Khaled El-Rouayheb, "Opening the Gate of Verification: The Forgotten Arab-Islamic Florescence of the 17th Century," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 38.2 (2006): 263–81. El-Rouayheb, *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century: Scholarly Currents in the Ottoman Empire and the Maghreb* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), especially Chapter One. See Chapter Two of Shihadeh, *Doubts on Avicenna*, 44–9.

1164–1165), as well as his less famous contemporaries, such as Šaraf al-Dīn al-Ma‘ūdī (d. before 1208) and Ibn Ġaylān al-Balḥī (d. ca. 1194).<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, Wisnovsky and Shihadeh single out Faḥr al-Dīn as the most important post-Avicennian scholar to practice verification in his commentary on the *Pointers and Reminders* and to embody it as an ideal to be mimicked by later exegetes.

Albert Iskander and Gerhard Endress have shown that Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary on Avicenna’s *Canon of Medicine* was crucial for determining how Avicenna’s medical thought was received in medical and philosophical circles in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.<sup>26</sup> In his autobiographical remarks in his introduction to his commentary on the *Canon of Medicine*,<sup>27</sup> Quṭb al-Dīn al-Širāzī (d. 1311) observes that early commentaries on the *Canon* by those “eminent scholars who emulated his [Faḥr al-Dīn’s] writings (*al-šurūḥu l-latī li-l-muqtafīna ātāruhu mina l-fuḍalā*)” such as Quṭb al-Dīn al-Miṣrī, Afḍal al-Dīn al-Ḥūnağī, Rafī‘ al-Dīn al-Ġīlī (d. 641/1244)<sup>28</sup> and Nağm al-Dīn al-Naḥğawānī (d. 1252) did not add anything of substance to what the Imam [Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī] had written. They wrote what he had written, and were silent about what he omitted, save for trifling, paltry things of no value (*allāhumma illā ma huwa nazrun yasīrun laysa lahu qadrūn*).<sup>29</sup>

---

25. Shihadeh, *Doubts on Avicenna*, Chapter One. Shihadeh, “From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī: 6th/12th Century Developments in Muslim Philosophical Theology,” *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 15 (2005): 141–79.

26. See the introduction to Albert Z. Iskander, *A Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library* (London: The Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 1967), 33–50. Endress, “Reading Avicenna in the Madrasa.”

27. Paraphrased in John Walbridge, *The Science of Mystic Lights: Quṭ al-Dīn Shīrāzī and the Illuminationist Tradition in Islamic Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002), 7–18. I am grateful to Nahyan Fancy for bringing this passage to my attention and correcting errors I had made in its interpretation.

28. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, *‘Uyān al-anbā’*, 2.171–2.

29. Quṭb al-Dīn al-Širāzī, *Durrat al-tāğ li-ğurrat al-Dubāğ*, ed. Muḥammad Miškāt (Tehran: Mağlis, 1938–1942), *dāl*, ll.16–19 (texts begins on *ḥā*, n.2).

Endress, on the other hand, focuses primarily on the reception of the *Canon* prior to Faḥr ad-Dīn's commentary by the likes of Ibn al-Tilmīd (d. 1165), who "introduced the Ibn Sīnā's *Qānūn* into the study of medicine," Ibn Ğumay' (d. 1198) and Ibn Ğaylān al-Balḥī, all of whom composed critical glosses on selected passages, confined themselves mainly to philological problems relating to the different recensions of the *Canon of Medicine* originating from Ibn al-Tilmīd's medical circle or lexicographical problems having to do with names of drugs and parts of the body. None of these authors are recorded to have written full, lemmatic commentaries on any single book.<sup>30</sup> Endress says: "While the physicians," such as Ibn al-Tilmīd and Ibn Ğumay', "took to reading Ibn Sīnā's *Qānūn*, the philosophers, and the philosopher-physicians starting with Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, in their turn started reading theoretical medicine in the *kullīyāt* of Avicenna's ever more popular handbook."<sup>31</sup>

The evidence adduced by Endress and Iskander suggests that the *Canon*, like Avicenna's philosophical works, went through a complex process of critical reception. Both authors, too, conclude that Faḥr al-Dīn played an important role in shaping the medico-philosophical commentary tradition on the *Canon*. Yet, despite the fact that Endress and Iskander have highlighted the central role Faḥr al-Dīn played in the *Canon* commentary tradition, there has been no effort to qualify the types of exegetical methods Faḥr al-Dīn employed in his commentary or how these methods and his text influenced physicians after the twelfth century. Both shortcomings will be righted in the following pages.

In Section Two, I turn to the question of whether the set of exegetical techniques and norms located by Wisnovsky and Shihadeh in Faḥr al-Dīn's *Pointers* commentary, all of which fall

---

30. Endress, "Reading Avicenna in the Madrasa," 384–5. See Daniel Nicolae's valuable dissertation: Daniel S. Nicolae, "A Medieval Court Physician at Work: Ibn Jumay's Commentary on the *Canon of Medicine*" (PhD diss., Oxford University, 2012); Ayman Shihadeh, "A Post-Ghazālīan Critic of Avicenna: Ibn Ghaylān al-Balkhī on the *Materia Medica* of the *Canon of Medicine*," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 24 (2013): 135–74.

31. Endress, "Reading Avicenna in the Madrasa," 383.

under the term *verification*, and which Faḥr al-Dīn played such an important role in promoting across the medieval Islamic world in Avicennian *philosophical discourse* after the twelfth century, are present in Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon*. The evidence I consider falls into two categories. I first analyse the language of Faḥr al-Dīn's introduction to the commentary on the *Canon*. In later works such as the commentary on *Pointers*, Shihadeh has argued that Faḥr al-Dīn deliberately uses terms such as “gleaning (*taḥṣīl*),” “verification (*taḥqīq*)” and “painstaking investigation (*istiḡṣā*)” to refer to different aspects of his method of analysis which he uses in composing commentaries and original philosophical works.<sup>32</sup> While several of these terms appear in the introduction to the *Canon* commentary, they retain their lexical meanings; they are not used as technical terms alluding to exegetical strategies to be employed in the commentary. When we compare, however, what Shihadeh has called the “macrostructure” of the *Pointers* with the macrostructure of Faḥr al-Dīn's *Canon* commentary, as well as the exegetical techniques Faḥr al-Dīn employs *in practice* in both works, it becomes clear that the methods falling under the broad rubric of verification that underlie Faḥr al-Dīn's mode of analysis and composition in the *Pointers* commentary are evidently at work in the commentary on the *Canon*.

In Section Three, I analyse the precursors to Faḥr al-Dīn's methods of verification at work in the *Canon* commentary, seeking to gauge to what extent they existed in Islamic *medical discourse* prior to Faḥr al-Dīn. This question boils down to how prescriptions about how to do commentary in the Islamic medical tradition existed before 1100. In the medical tradition, the main source was Galen, whose influence on medieval Islamic medical and philosophical discourse was immense. There are several passages in Galen's Hippocratic commentaries that we know were translated into Arabic in which Galen broaches the topic of “metacommentary,” and in which he makes explicit prescriptions (and proscriptions) about how to do medical commentary. After analysing the relevant passages, I conclude that while many if not all the individual elements of the verification method were used by commentators prior to Faḥr al-Dīn, the unification of these elements, these diverse exegetical practices into a unified method for medical writing was wholly

---

32. Shihadeh, “Al-Rāzī's Commentary,” 299–300.

new in the Islamic medical commentary tradition. On the other hand, the analysis of these texts from Galen makes me doubt that the vaguely exegetical techniques used by Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā al-Rāzī in *Doubts on Galen* (*Kitāb al-Šukūk ‘alā Ğālīnūs*) were ever regarded by Islamic physicians as a model for carrying out exegesis in medical texts. Even the exegetical strategies used by the great eleventh-century commentator Ibn Abī Šādiq (d. after 1067) in his commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* are strongly beholden to Galen’s prescriptions about what counts as good exegesis. I conclude that Faḥr al-Dīn’s venture into the Islamic medical discourse in the form of his commentary on the *Canon* was unprecedented.

Finally, in Section Four I claim that this relatively brief venture would prove to be pivotal, shaping Islamic medical discourse and textual traditions until at least the seventeenth century. I offer a detailed analysis of the two instances in which Ibn al-Quff cites Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary on the *Canon*. I highlight the many features shared by the exegetical techniques and ways of structuring the commentary that are present both in Ibn al-Quff’s commentary on the *Aphorisms* commentary and in Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary on the *Canon*. I argue that Ibn al-Quff’s commentary on the *Aphorisms* represents a more mature, refined and elegant embodiment of verification techniques in post-classical Islamic medical discourse. This observation suggests that by the end of the thirteenth century verification in the medical discourse was not only a collection of techniques, but a model to be imitated.

## 2.1 Comparison of Faḥr al-Dīn’s Introduction to the Commentaries on the *Canon* and *Pointers*

According to Altaş, Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary on the *Canon of Medicine* is possibly the first lemmatic commentary he composed on a work by Avicenna.<sup>33</sup> Altaş dates the commentary 573–574/1177–1178, which is well before the date assigned to it by Emilie Savage-Smith and others, who follow Ibn al-Qifṭī’s account of Faḥr al-Dīn’s career in dating it to 580/1184.<sup>34</sup> Altaş says the

---

33. Altaş, Eşref, “Fahraddin er-Râzî’nin Eserlerinin Kronolojisi,” in *İslâm Düşüncesinin Dönüşüm Çağında*, eds. Ömer Türker and Osman Demir (Istanbul, ISAM, 2011), 91–164, 103.

34. Emilie Savage-Smith, *A New Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Volume I: Medicine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 245 [Entry No. 56].



following:

Written between 573–574/1177–1178. Written in Saraḥs before the *Mabāḥiṭ* and *Mulaḥḥaṣ*. This work, which in the text itself is called *Šarḥ muškilāt al-Kitāb al-Qānūn* (sic), but to which Rāzī refers in different ways, is a commentary on the first two fanns of the theoretical part of Ibn Sīnā's medical work the *Canon*. Whilst Rāzī was a guest of the physician Tīqat al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Abd al-Karīm al-Saraḥsī, this work was a result of research and discussion between them, and was dedicated to him on account of [al-Saraḥsī's] hospitality. Ibn al-Qifṭī says that Rāzī was his guest in Saraḥs during his journey to Bukhara in about 580/1184, and wrote it for him. However, Rāzī's debates in Bukhara mention that Nūr al-Dīn al-Šābūnī died 16 Safar 580/30 May 1184 and, since *Mabāḥiṭ* and *Mulaḥḥaṣ* were written around 575/1179 prior to his sojourn to Transoxiana, the most suitable date for the work is between 573–574/1177–1178. There are references to the commentary on the *Canon* as one of “our great books,” “our great book” and also *al-Firāsa* is mentioned.

Thus, in support of his chronology, Altaş cites the fact that the commentary on the *Canon* is cited in the *Investigations in the East* (*al-Mabāḥiṭ al-Mašriqīya*), which Altaş says was written around 574–575/1178–1179,<sup>35</sup> and in the *Précis of Logic and Philosophy* (*al-Mulaḥḥaṣ fī l-manṭiq wa-l-ḥikma*), which Altaş says was written no later than 580/1184.<sup>36</sup> Evidence for the *Canon* commentary being composed before 574–5785/1178–1179 lies in a citation of the commentary in a discussion of the meaning of the balanced (*al-i'tidāl*) and imbalanced mixture of the primary qualities hot, cold, wet and dry.<sup>37</sup>

---

Ibn al-Qifṭī, *Tārīḥ al-ḥukamā'*, eds. Augustus Müller and Julius Lippert (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903), 291.

35. Altaş, “Kronolojisi,” 109.

36. Ibid., 112.

37. Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Mabāḥiṭ al-mašriqīya fī 'ilm al-ilāḥīyāt wa-l-ṭibīyāt* (Hyderabad: Maṭba'at majlis dā'irat al-ma'ārif al-Nizamiyah, 1343 [1924 or 1925]), 2:159, l.20–160, l.11. I am

وإذا عرفت معنى المعتدل عرفت أيضا معنى غير المعتدل. فنقول: "الخارج عن الاعتدال إما أن يكون خارجا في كيفية واحدة فقط أو في الكيفيتين معا. أما القسم الأول وهو أن يكون معتدلا في أحد المتضادين وخارجا عن الاعتدال في أحد المتضادين الآخرين فلنفرض الاعتدال حاصلًا في الرطوبة واليبوسة فتكون الغالبة حينئذ إما للحرارة أو للبرودة. فهذان قسمان. ولنفرض الاعتدال حاصلًا في الحرارة والبرودة فتكون الغلبة حينئذ للرطوبة أو لليبوسة. فهذان قسمان آخران. وإما أن يكون خروجه عن الاعتدال في الكيفيتين، فلنفرض كون الحار غالبا فإما أن يكون الغالب معه الرطوبة أو اليبوسة، وهذان قسمان. ولنفرض كون البارد غالبا، فإما أن يكون الغالب معه الرطب أو اليابس، هذان قسمان آخران. فهذه الأقسام الثمانية أقسام للخارج عن الاعتدال. أما المعتدل فهو قسم واحد. فالأمزجة إذا تسعة. فهذا ما يليق بالحكمة من البحث عن أمر المزاج. وأما ما وراء ذلك فقد ذكرناه في شرح القانون."

Having recognised the meaning of the balanced mixture, you know, then, the meaning of the imbalanced mixture. We say: "What deviates from the balanced mixture deviates either in one quality or in two qualities together. The first kind is balanced in relation to one [pair of qualities] that are opposed to each other, but deviates from the balance in relation to the other [pair of qualities] that are opposed to each other. Let us suppose, then, the dry and the moist are balanced, and thus, what predominates shall be either the hot or the cold, and these, then, are two kinds [of imbalanced mixture]. Now suppose that there is a balance between hot and cold, what predominates shall be either the dry or the moist. These are two further kinds of [imbalanced mixture]. As for the deviation from the balance in two qualities, suppose that the hot predominates, in which case the quality that will predominate with it shall be either the moist or the dry. That is two further kinds [of imbalance]. Let us suppose that the cold predominates, in which case the quality that will predominate with it shall be either the moist or the dry. That is two more kinds [of imbalance]. These eight kinds are the kinds of deviation from the balance. As for what is balanced, it is a single kind. The mixtures, then, are nine." This investigation into the the nature of the mixture is the amount that is appropriate to mention in relation to philosophy. What exceeds this I have discussed in the commentary on the Canon.

Assuming that these insertions were not made in later drafts of the commentary—an admittedly tendentious assumption — this allows us to date the *Canon* commentary to quite early in Faḥr al-

---

grateful to Bilal Ibrahim for supplying me with a copy of this text.

Dīn's career.<sup>38</sup> Altaş's early dating of the *Canon*, however, sits uneasily with the idea suggested by Ibn al-Qiftī—an idea which Altaş appears to second—that the commentary on the *Canon* was written during the early part of Faḥr al-Dīn's purported sojourn into Transoxiana. Frank Griffel has expressed strong reservations about the extent and accuracy of Ibn al-Qiftī knowledge of Faḥr al-Dīn's early career.<sup>39</sup> Indeed, if it were written as early as Altaş says, I find somewhat suspicious Faḥr al-Dīn's references to 'Abd al-Karīm al-Saraḥsī as the patron for the *Canon* commentary who helped him during and after his stay in Saraḥs. For it was purportedly his stay at Saraḥs that marked the opening stages of Faḥr al-Dīn's sojourn to Bukhara. Faḥr al-Dīn must have been in Transoxiana some time prior to Nūr al-Dīn al-Şābūnī's death on 16 Safar 580/30 May 1184, since this event is mentioned in the *Munāẓarāt*. Yet, the story about Saraḥsī does not seem to me to provide reliable evidence for dating the commentary on the *Canon* or for the conditions under which it was composed.

We can conclude, then, that the commentary on the *Canon* was probably written before 574–575/1178–1179, much earlier in Faḥr al-Dīn's career than previously thought.<sup>40</sup> In fact, several features of this commentary bear out this conclusion. Faḥr al-Dīn's introduction to the commentary on the *Canon* breaks from late antique models for writing prolegomena prior to beginning to read or write a commentary.<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, in the brief remarks in the introduction to the

---

38. Ibid., 103. Though rejecting the dating of the *Canon* commentary to 580/1184, Altaş accepts that Faḥr al-Dīn wrote the commentary for 'Abd al-Karīm al-Saraḥsī whilst in Saraḥs on his way to Transoxiana.

39. Frank Griffel convincingly shows that most of al-Qiftī's account of Faḥr al-Dīn's earlier career is flawed, and that, in general, we have very little reliable information about this period in Faḥr al-Dīn's life. See Frank Griffel, "On Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Life."

40. See Savage-Smith, "A New Catalogue," 245. Ayman Shihadeh, *The Teleological Ethics of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 8.

41. Kamran I. Karimullah, "Assessing Avicenna's (d. 428/1037) Medical Influence in Prolegomena to Post-Classical (CE 1100-1900) Medical Commentaries: Ibn Abī Şādiq (d. after 460/1067), 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī (d. 629/1231), Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209)," *Mélanges de*

*Canon* commentary that touch on metacommentary, it is evident that Faḥr al-Dīn struggles to articulate what exactly the distinctive features of his exegetical practice are. Based on an analysis of the introduction to the commentary on *Pointers and Reminders*, Shihadeh presents a Faḥr al-Dīn who was at a stage in his career in which he was able to clearly articulate the key elements of his exegetical and philosophical method that he *as a matter of course* brought to bear on philosophical debates based on Avicenna's writings. On the other hand, in the introduction to the *Canon* we see a Faḥr al-Dīn who struggles to identify what aspects of his commentary method he believes are novel. Shihadeh observes that Faḥr al-Dīn deliberately employs terms such as "gleaning (*taḥṣīl*)," "critical investigation," "verification (*taḥqīq*)," "blind imitation (*taqlīd*)," "painstaking investigation (*istiḡṣā'*)," "in depth probing (*ta'ammuq*)," "certainty (*yaqīn*)," "doubt (*šakk*)," "procedure (*tartīb*)" and "well-organised compilation (*talfīq*)" not as merely rhetorical flourishes by which he seeks to commend himself and his work to his patron, but as a constellation of terms that pick out the elements that Faḥr al-Dīn recognised as forming the backbone of his method of exegesis and his philosophical method more generally. Shihadeh shows that by around 578–580 when Faḥr al-Dīn was composing the commentary on *Pointers* as well as the early philosophical works such as *Précis* and *Investigations in the East*, Faḥr al-Dīn was able to assign these terms a precise meaning in relation to his exegetical method. For example, Faḥr al-Dīn describes the process of "gleaning (*taḥṣīl*)" in detail:<sup>42</sup>

of gleaning (*taḥṣīl*) what we have found in the books of our predecessors...in such a way that we select the pith (*lubāb*) from each topic, avoiding excessive prolixity and concision...and opting instead to provide lucid discussions. Our procedure is to separate problems from one another, then either confirm or disconfirm each, then discuss problematic objections and difficult counterarguments, and, if we are able, provide satisfactory solutions and conclusive answers.

---

*l'institut dominicain d'études orientales* 32 (2017): 93–134.

42. Shihadeh, "Al-Rāzī's Commentary," 300.

Likewise, the ordering of the book or commentary he describes as follows:<sup>43</sup>

our novel ordering (*tartīb*) and synthesising, which demands that whoever commits himself to it to consider all possible objections and counterarguments, while avoiding pointless interpolation and undue prolixity.

And Faḥr al-Dīn characterises what he names “painstaking investigation” as follows:<sup>44</sup>

the painstaking investigation (*istiḡṣāʿ*) of questions and answers, and the in-depth probing (*taʿammuq*) of the oceans of problems in such a way that the proponent of each thought-system (*madhab*) may find this book of mine more beneficial than books written by proponents of that very thought-system. For I will provide from each discussion its best part (*zubda*)... If I do not find any worthwhile discussion in the sources of the proponents of that thought-system to support their views, I will myself come up with the best defense possible to affirm these views.

In these introductions, the process of gleaning from the books of earlier authors refers to a method of analysis that unfolds in a definite order: (a) first, to identify and separate out conceptual problems in the text to be dealt with in turn; and (b) then to survey possible solutions to these problems, discarding the false and retaining those that are true. Of the possibly true doctrines, (c) each is subjected to further criticism. Finally, should any solution remain standing after being subjected to thorough vetting, (d) Faḥr al-Dīn provides a conclusion to the problems under discussion. This step-by-step procedure is what the terms “ordering (*tartīb*)” and “synthesising (*tafīq*)” in the process of compiling or commenting on a book refer to. In similar fashion, “painstaking investigation (*istiḡṣāʿ*)” includes certain, well-defined elements. It involves, first, impartially surveying doctrines offered by different schools about a particular problem under discussion. Each viewpoint is rehashed in such a way that they are presented in the best possible light, supported by the best arguments that Faḥr al-Dīn can find or can supply on his own on the basis of the proponents’ own

---

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid.

principles. If arguments are weak or none are forthcoming from the text, Faḥr al-Dīn sees supplies arguments that proponents of a doctrine would have agreed with had they supplied them.

Thus, in works written around 573/1178 or thereafter, such as the commentary on *Pointers*, *Précis*, *Investigations in the East* and *Frontiers of the Intellects* (*Nihāyāt al-‘uqūl*), Faḥr al-Dīn is conscious of and able to give clear expression to what he saw as the key elements in his exegetical procedure. This is not the case in the commentary on the *Canon of Medicine*. To be sure, Faḥr al-Dīn uses “*taḥṣīl*,” “*tartīb*,” “*ta‘ammuq*,” “*lubāb*” and other words that frequently accompany the light/dark, climbing/descending, knowledge/ignorance, rhetorical/demonstrative, enlightened patron/social-climbing ignoramus, poverty/wealth and the other common motifs in Faḥr al-Dīn’s prolegomena to his early philosophical works. These words, however, are used with their lexical meanings; they do not allude to aspects of Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary method. Bemoaning the privations that genuine scholars in his day suffered owing to the fact that ignorant patrons are not able to distinguish the true scholar from the counterfeit, Faḥr al-Dīn, speaking about himself in the third-person, says:

العلم صار كلاً في هذا الزمان على كل أصحابه ووبالا على محبيه وطلابيه. فترى الرجل بعد أن أفنى في تحصيله زمانه وفاق فيه أترابه وأقرانه وتعين بحل الغوامض في العلوم وإظهار ما فيها من السر المكتوم ممنوعاً بسبب ذلك عن جميع المرادات مدفوعاً عن كل المباغي والطلبات.

These days knowledge has become a burden for those who possess it and a curse on those who love it and pursue it. You see that the man [Faḥr al-Dīn is referring to himself] who has spent his years acquiring it [that is, knowledge, sc. *al-‘ilm*] and has distinguished himself from his contemporaries and his peers by the fact that he has provided solutions to unclear matters in the sciences and has brought to light in them secrets that had been hidden—[you shall see this man] barred from every desirable thing and prevented from all wishes and pursuits.

In this text *taḥṣīl* simply means to acquire something—in this case, philosophical knowledge—whereas in later texts *taḥṣīl* refers to a procedure for reading, writing and commenting on books, mainly by Avicenna.

Likewise, in the introduction to the commentary on the *Canon*, we see that Faḥr al-Dīn uses *tartīb* with its lexical meaning of *ordering*:

ثم لما ساعد التوفيق على تلخيص هذا الكتاب وتهذيبه وتحريه وترتيبه جعلته باسم الشيخ الإمام الفاضل الحكيم المحقق ثقة الدين شرف الإسلام سيد الحكماء والأطباء عبد الرحمن بن عبد الكريم السرخسي.

Divine help having aided me in composing this book, refining it, drafting it and arranging it, I dedicated it to the the the eminent *ṣayḥ*, the verifying philosopher who embodies religion's trust and Islam's nobility, the master of the philosophers and the physicians 'Abd al-Karīm al-Saraḥsī.

In this passage, *tartīb* does not refer to the step-by-step process of surveying earlier authorities, subjecting them to criticism, retaining what is left and offering conclusions; the idea of arranging simply appears in the list of activities Faḥr al-Dīn says were steps in the physical task of writing the book, from its initial write-up (*talḥīṣihi*<sup>45</sup>) to putting in its final arrangement (“arranging it (*tartībīhi*)”).

Similarly, “pith (*lubāb*)” and probing deeply (*ta‘ammuq*)” appear in the introduction to the *Canon* commentary. Here, however, they are simply used for their rhetorical value, in a sentence in which Faḥr al-Dīn begins to describe how his initial interest in medicine was the spark that led him to eventually read Avicenna's *Canon* with the diligence and critical acumen for which he would become famous.

ولما وقفت على كمال هذا العلم ومنفعته وعلو درجته ومرتبته أردت الخوض في عبابه والترقي في غاية الوصول إلى لبابه والتعمق في أغواره والترقي إلى أنواره.

Having understood the fact that this science [namely, medicine, sc. *al-ṭibb*] is perfect, that it is useful, and has a lofty rank, I desired to plunge into its waves, advance to the farthest limits of reaching its pith, plunge deeply into its depths, and ascend to its lights.

---

45. For this meaning of *lahḥaṣa/talḥīṣ*, see Manfred Ullmann, *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache*, vol. 2/1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), 428 [*lahḥaṣa*], 429 [*talḥīṣ*].

The closest we get to a description of the methodology Faḥr al-Dīn says he will follow in the commentary on the *Canon* is the sentence immediately following the one cited above:

ولما كان كتاب القانون للشيخ الرئيس أحسن كتاب صنف في هذا الباب باتفاق أولي الألباب ثم أن الكتاب الأول منه تميز عن سائر كتبه باللطائف الحكمية والدقائق العلمية والنكت الغريبة والأسرار العجيبة التي حارت أذهان أبناء الزمان عن إدراكها وخارت قواهم عن الوصول إلى دري أفلاكها صرفت نهاية وكدي وكدي وثبتت غاية وهمي وهمي إلى تفسير عيونه وشرح متونه واستيضاح مشكلاته واستخراج معضلاته والاعتذار عن مساهلاته إن وقعت في أثناء كلماته وامتحانات لعقول المتعلمين ضمنيتها في سياق عباراته.

The scholars being in agreement that the *Canon* by *al-Šayḥ al-Ra'īs* is the best book written on this subject [namely, medicine], and, further, the first book being distinguished from all the other books in it [that is, the other four books of the *Canon*] by the fact that it contains philosophical subtitles, scientific intricacies, strange anecdotes and astonishing secrets that the minds of ordinary people are a loss to grasp and their faculties are too feeble to reach the glittering lights of their [secrets'] stars, I directed my ultimate purpose, exerted every effort and gave my whole mind and attention to interpreting its principal sections, commenting on its main parts, making what is problematic in it clear, bringing out the things in it that present difficulties, finding excuses when there is inaccuracy should it appear in the midst of the discussion; and I appended tests for students' intellects as the statements proceed.

In this sentence Faḥr al-Dīn distinguishes the primary or main portions (*ʿuyūn, mutūn*) of the the *Canon* from those that are, for him, secondary. In some ways recalling the method used by Šaraf al-Dīn al-Maʿūdī in his commentary on *Pointers* but also Ibn Ğumay's glosses on the *Canon*, Faḥr al-Dīn commentary on *Canon*, Book One proceeds *faṣl-by-faṣl*. At no point does Faḥr al-Dīn say that he will consult with earlier medical or philosophical authorities, glean their books for solutions for problems in Avicenna's text, or even resolve the difficulties (*mu'dilāt*) in the text. Far from engaging in an impartial survey of every known authority and systematically vetting the true from the false, Faḥr al-Dīn adopts (or says he will adopt, the reality is quite different, see below) a somewhat Galenic exegetical attitude in the commentary on the *Canon*. Far from committing himself to "gleaning," "critical verification," or "painstaking investigation" Faḥr al-Dīn merely says that he will



bring difficulties and problems in the text to light so that they can be made the subject of special discussion; he does not propose to provide solutions.

## 2.2 Commentary Strategies in Faḥr al-Dīn's Commentary on the *Canon*

This is what Faḥr al-Dīn *says*; what he *does* in the commentary on the *Canon* is quite another story. That is, after analysing Faḥr al-Dīn's introduction and comparing it to the exegetical strategies that he uses in the commentary on the *Canon*, it seems to me that there is a gap between Faḥr al-Dīn's ability to speak about his exegetical method and the commentary techniques he uses in practice. As we shall see, the techniques he uses in the commentary on the *Canon* are in line with those identified by Shihadeh and Wisnovsky in his later commentary on *Pointers and Reminders* and in his later philosophical writings such as *Investigations in the East, Frontiers of the Intellects* and the *Précis of Logic and Philosophy*. To my mind, this adds further evidence to the claim that the commentary on the *Canon* was written well before 580/1184. For it seems that by the time Faḥr al-Dīn sat down to compose the *Canon* commentary, many of the analytical techniques he would use in later works were present in his exegetical repertoire *in practice*. Yet, it appears that they had not by this time coalesced in his mind in a way that permitted him to speak about them in definite terms as he would in later writings.

In short, I claim that the analytical techniques in the commentary on the *Canon* closely resemble those used in *Pointers* despite the fact that in the introduction Faḥr al-Dīn barely alludes to this fact. I shall substantiate this claim by examining how Faḥr al-Dīn comments on a chapter (*faṣl*) on compound diseases (*al-amrāḍ al-murakkaba*) in his commentary. Following Shihadeh, I first examine how Faḥr al-Dīn imposes his understanding of the chapter's *structure* by lemmatising the text into separate "research topics (*abḥāt, mabāḥit, buḥūt* sg. *baḥt*).” After this, I shall examine the various techniques Faḥr al-Dīn employs to interpret what Avicenna's *says* on compound diseases.

The following table provides a summary of Avicenna's discussion of compound diseases in the *Canon* and shows how Faḥr al-Dīn partitions the chapter.

<p>Avicenna, <i>Canon of Medicine</i>, vol. 1, ed. Rağab, 1:76–7.</p> <p>Definition of compound diseases; examples; swellings (<i>awrām</i>, sg. <i>waram</i>); every kind of disease is found in cases of swelling; wherever there is swelling there is dissolution of continuity (<i>tafarruq al-ittṣāl</i>)</p> <p>Parts of the body are affected by swelling; bones are affected by swelling; food can cause body parts to swell;</p> <p>Definition of catarrh (<i>nazla</i>);</p> <p>Causes of swelling; swellings are prone to having natural and unnatural discharges;</p> <p>Swelling can be classified according to its properties (<i>fuṣūl</i>, sg. <i>faṣl</i>); best division of swelling based on the matter that causes it; matter that causes swelling is the four humours (black bile, yellow bile, phlegm, blood), watery fluids (<i>al-mā'īya</i>) and air (<i>al-rīḥīya</i>); division of swelling into hot swelling and swelling that is not hot; hot swelling caused by phlegm conventionally called <i>flağmūnī</i>; hot swellings caused by yellow bile conventional called erysipelas (<i>ḥumra</i>); abscesses (<i>ḥurāğ</i>) and plague (<i>ṭā'ūn</i>); how hot swellings appears at the beginning, middle and end; swelling resolves either by dissolving (<i>taḥullul</i>), or it suppurates (<i>taqayyuh</i>), pus gathers (<i>ğam' midd</i>), or a the swelling transforms into a tumour (<i>istiḥāla ilā l-ṣalāba</i>)</p> <p>Swellings that are not hot are caused by black bile, phlegm, watery fluid and air; three kinds of swellings caused by black bile; tumours, cancer (<i>al-saraṭān</i>) and swellings in the glands (<i>al-ğudud</i>) such as scrofula (<i>al-ḥanāzīr</i>) and leprous growths (<i>al-sula'</i>); distinction between tumours and cancer</p> <p>Two kinds of swellings caused by phlegm: hard swellings and light leprous growths; swellings caused by phlegm differ based on whether the phlegm that causes them is soft or hard; swelling caused by water; dropsy (<i>al-istisqā'</i>); swelling caused by air; dissolution of continuity in the body's passageways does not suppuration in bodies that have a balanced mixture; dissolution of continuity causes suppuration when the body parts are affected by swelling, for example dropsy or elephantiasis (<i>al-ğudām</i>); abscesses in the summer time are gangrenous when they last for a long time; you shall a full treatment of dissolution of continuity in the books that delve into the details (<i>kutub al-taḥṣīl</i>)</p>	<p>Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, <i>Commentary on the Canon of Medicine</i></p> <p><b>Block A:</b> “<i>This discussion calls for four investigations (mabāḥiṭ):</i>”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Divisions of diseases that are in aggregate (<i>al-amrād al-muğtami'a</i>)</li> <li>2. How a single disease comes about from a number of diseases in aggregate</li> <li>3. The reality of swelling</li> <li>4. Clarifying that swelling is a compound disease</li> </ol> <p><b>Block B:</b> “<i>Having brought the exposition on the reality of swelling to an end to a close, he (Avicenna) begins the exposition on the body parts that are affected by swelling.</i>”</p> <p><b>Block C:</b> “<i>This begins the division of swellings.</i>”</p> <p><b>Block D:</b> “<i>The purpose of this discussion is to search for not the conditions of swelling, but for certain rulings about the cause of swelling.</i>”</p> <p><b>Block E:</b> “<i>Now he turns to explain the division of swellings.</i>”</p> <p><b>Block F:</b> “<i>He turns once again to division, commencing with the division of cold swellings, which are four....</i>”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scrofula and leprous growths are not black bilious but phlegmatic.</li> </ol> <p><b>Block G:</b> “<i>...and the rest of the section is obvious (wa-bāqī l-faṣli zāhir).</i>”</p>
--	--

The *Canon*, Book One was well-known for its divisions, subdivisions, and sub-subdivisions, and increasingly minute structure.<sup>46</sup> Indeed, the fact that it is well-structured is considered by some to be its only redeeming quality.<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, Faḥr al-Dīn's division of this chapter into seven blocks introduces further structure into the chapter (*faṣl*), which is the smallest unit in *Canon*, Book One. In the case of the chapter on compound swellings, he devotes four investigations to issues of definitions and accounting for the fact that Avicenna devotes all of a chapter on compound diseases in general exclusively to kinds of swelling. As in the *Pointers*, he introduces the first block with an outline of its contents.<sup>48</sup> While the rest of the chapter is not divided further into "investigations (*mabāḥiṭ*)," Faḥr al-Dīn divides the chapter into blocks of text based on how the chapter flows logically from block to block.<sup>49</sup>

In his commentary on the chapter on compound diseases, Faḥr al-Dīn carries out many of the exegetical tasks that Shihadeh and Wisnovsky identify in the commentary on *Pointers*.<sup>50</sup> Two brief examples from the commentary on the sections on compound diseases suffice to illustrate how much Faḥr al-Dīn's exegetical methods in the *Canon* commentary share with those he employs in the commentary on *Pointers*.

The first example takes us to Block B, in which Faḥr al-Dīn comments about the places in the body that are prone to swelling. Block B is a single sentence, in which Avicenna says: "Swelling affects the soft parts of the body (*al-a'dā' al-layyina*), and something that resembles swelling in the

---

46. Pormann and Savage-Smith, *Medieval Islamic Medicine*, 70. Ullmann, *Medizin*, 153.

47. Emilie Savage-Smith, "Medicine in Medieval Islam," in *The Cambridge History of Science Volume 2: Medieval Science*, eds. David C. Lindberg and Michael H. Shank (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 139–67, 148. Ullmann, *Medizin*, 154: "So groß die Wirkung des *Qānūn* in Morgenland und Abendland auch gewesen ist, so liegt doch die Bedeutung des Werkes nicht etwa in neuen Erkenntnissen, die es vermitteln könnte, sondern in der Systematisierung und umfassenden Darstellung des damaligen medizinischen Wissens."

48. Shihadeh, "Al-Rāzī's Commentary," 309.

49. *Ibid.*

50. Shihadeh, "Al-Rāzī's Commentary," 310. Wisnovsky, "Avicennism," 354–7.

bones makes their mass viscid because of it and the moistures in them increase. Nor is it unusual when [body parts] that are prone to increase in size because of receiving nutriment, do, in fact, become enlarged when the [spoiled] nutriment penetrates into them or comes about in them.”<sup>51</sup>

About which Faḥr al-Dīn has the following to say:<sup>52</sup>

التفسير: لما فرغ بيان حقيقة الورم شرع في بيان العضو الذي يعرض له الورم. ومن الناس من زعم أن العضو الصلب كالعظم أو اللين كالدماع فإنه لا يتورم لأنه لا يتمدد وما لا يتمدد لا يتورم. وصغرى قياسهم كاذبة. أما أولا لأن الدماغ والعظم يعرض لهما النمو والنمو لا يكون إلا بالتمدد. وأما ثانيا لأن كل واحد منهما يفتدي. وذلك إنما يكون بنفوذ جوهر الغذاء فيه. فثبت من هذين الوجهين نفوذ الأجزاء الغذائية فيه. فذلك الأجزاء كما أنها قد تصلح فتكون غذاء أمكن أيضا أن تفسد. وإذا فسدت أوجبت التمدد وذلك هو الورم. وأما ثالثا فلأن جوهر الدماغ وإن كان رطبا إلا أن فيه لزوجة والعظم أيضا كذلك فيكون تمددهما من هذا الوجه ممكنا. وأما رابعا فالعظام لو لم تقبل نفوذ الفضلات لما كانت الأسنان تخضر وتسود. فإن ذلك لنفوذ الفضول فيها. وأما خامسا فقد خلقت الأسنان مائلة للنمو أبدا حتى أن السن المحاذية لموضع السن الساقطة تزداد طولاً إذ كانت الزيادة ترد عليها ولا يقابلها الانسحاق.

Commentary: Having brought his [Avicenna's] exposition on the reality of swelling to a close, he begins to explain which parts of the body swell. There are some who thought that hard parts of the body, like bone, or soft ones, like the brain, do not swell because they do not expand (*lā yatamaddadu*<sup>53</sup>), and what does not expand does not swell. The minor premise of their syllogism, however, is false. Firstly because the brain and bones grow and growth happens only when [the body part's bulk] expands. Secondly, [the premise is false]

51. Avicenna, *al-Qānūn fī l-ṭibb*, ed. Qāsim M. Raḡab (Baghdad: Dār al-muṭannā, ca. 1970), 1:76, ll.23–5. Hereafter cited as: Avicenna, *Canon*.

52. For lemma from the *Canon*, see Avicenna, *al-Qānūn fī al-ṭibb*, 1:76–7.

53. The Journal's reviewer rightly notes that in this instance *yatamaddadu* refers to the expanding that comes about when bulk is added to the body part, not to expanding in the sense of *stretching* like an inflated balloon, for example). For the meaning of *tamaddada* as increasing in size from drawing in or attracting, see Freytag, *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, 4.159, c.1: “extendit trahendo rem” and Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français*, 2.1076, c.1: “Tirer pour allonger, allonger en tirant.” Unfortunately, this sense is recorded for *yatamaddadu* when it is used *transitively*, not *intransitively* as Faḥr al-Dīn uses it here.

because each of them receives nutriment, which happens when the food's substance penetrates it [brain or bone]. From these two considerations, it is established that the nutritive parts penetrate into it. Just as these parts are healthy and, consequently, they become nutriment, likewise, they spoil, and when they spoil, they necessitate [unhealthy] expanding [of the part's bulk], which is swelling. Thirdly, [it is false] because even though the brain's substance is moist, there is, nevertheless, a viscid quality in it, and similarly in the bones. From this consideration, it is possible for them to expand. Fourthly, [it is false] because if the bones were not liable to being penetrated by superfluities, the teeth would not turn green and black [from rotting], for this happens because the superfluities penetrate them. Fifthly, [it is false] because by nature the teeth grow constantly, such that the tooth that is adjacent to the place where a tooth has fallen out increases in length because it receives the extra [nutriment] that nourishes it, nor does pounding the tooth oppose this [growth].

Faḥr al-Dīn alerts the reader to the fact that in this passage Avicenna transitions from the prefatory remarks about definitions of swelling at the beginning of the chapter. According to Faḥr al-Dīn, this sentence marks the beginning of a new discussion about where in the body swelling can occur. Faḥr al-Dīn, who evidently found nothing to dispute in Avicenna's words, nevertheless seems to have found Avicenna's talk about "something like swelling (*šay'un šabīhun bi-l-waram*)" that affects the bones worth commenting on at greater length. This is not only because the expression is somewhat obscure, but because Faḥr al-Dīn was aware that a medical authority—he does not say who, but we shall see presently that it is the view of Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī—was of the view that bones do not swell, a belief that stands in direct conflict with Avicenna's. The ultimate objective of Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on this sentence of the chapter on compound diseases and swelling is to defend Avicenna's statement against possible objections by those who hold with Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā that bones and the brain do not swell. Faḥr al-Dīn pursues this goal in several stages. First, he paraphrases Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's argument, placing it in syllogistic form.

Minor Premise: the bulk of bones and of the brain do not expand;

Major Premise: what does not expand in size in this way does not swell.

Conclusion: the bones and brain to not swell.

Next, he identifies the Minor Premise as false, concluding thereby that Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's conclusion is false because it does not follow from true premises. Faḥr al-Dīn then produces a battery of arguments, asserting, against Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā, that the bulk of the bones and the brain do in fact expand as a natural consequence of drawing in nutriment from food. Faḥr al-Dīn does not say so here, but all these concepts are borrowed from Avicenna's *On the Soul* in the physics of *The Healing* (see Section Four below).

Many of these arguments are dialectical, intended primarily to undermine or create doubt about the truth of Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's doctrine rather than to refute it outright. One major shortcoming in Faḥr al-Dīn's argument is that he misinterprets—most likely deliberately—Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's views about how bones and the brain increase in size. In Section Four, we shall see that Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā does not say that the brain and bones do not *increase in size by attracting* nutriment to them, which is the sense conveyed by *tamaddud* in this set of passages. This process is precisely how growth as a *natural process of gradually expanding in bulk* was understood to occur by medieval Islamic physicians. This sense of expanding was not what Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā had in mind in the *Outstanding Book*. As the passage is quoted by Ibn al-Quff, Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā refers to expanding not in the sense of *growth* but in the sense of the bod part's *physical qualities* (hard and soft), which, according to Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā, do not permit the body part to expand (*tamdīd*) in a way that accommodates swelling. Thus, in order to bolster his argument that the brain and bones swell, and in order to undermine Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's "minor premise," Faḥr al-Dīn offers a deliberately tendentious interpretation of Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's claim. Faḥr al-Dīn ignores, in effect, the fact that Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's claim is directed at the *physical qualities* of the brain and bone that make them unsuited to swelling. Instead, he pretends that arguments about *expanding as a form of growth*—arguments which Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā would not have disputed in the first place—were sufficient to undermine Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's position.<sup>54</sup>

---

54. Faḥr al-Dīn's arguments here are less than demonstrative. His claim that he avoids arguments that "are only intended to refute and defeat an opponent," arguments which he

The second example from the chapter on compound diseases reveals other exegetical strategies in the commentary on the *Canon* that are present in the commentary on *Pointers and Reminders*. As we saw in the Table, Block G is the final section of this chapter that Faḥr al-Dīn comments on. The Table shows that Block G is a rather long portion of the chapter, which discusses several different topics. According to Faḥr al-Dīn's understanding of the text's structure, Avicenna's primary aim is to discuss cold swellings, which may be caused by various kinds of matter in the body: phlegm, black bile, air or watery fluid. In the commentary, however, Faḥr al-Dīn gives all his attention to resolving a conflict between Avicenna and earlier medical authorities, 'Alī ibn 'Abbās al-Maḡūsī (fl. 4th/10th c.) and Abū Sahl al-Misīḥī (d. 1010), who classified scrofula (*al-ḥanāzīr*) and leprous growths (*al-sula'*) as types of swelling caused by phlegm rather than black bile.

التفسير: ثم أنه عاد مرة أخرى إلى التقسيم وشرع في تقسيم الأورم الباردة وهي أربعة: السوداوية والبلغمية والمائية والريحية. ثم قسم السوداوية إلى أقسام ثلاثة: الصلابة والسرطان وأجناس الغدد التي منها الخنازير والسلع. وهاننا بحث وهو أن الخنازير والسلع ليست سوداوية بل بلغمية لأن الشيخ قال في المقالة التي يذكر فيها الأورم الباردة من هذا الكتاب: "الأورم البلغمية إما ساذجة بلغمية كما يعرض لعضو إن يجتمع فيه ماء، وإما مائية<sup>55</sup> وإما دبيلات لينة كالسلع اللينة، وإما مستحصفة كالخنازير والسلع الصلبة." وأما المسيحي فإنه قال في آخر كتاب الأورام: والخنازير أورام تحدث عن بلغم غليظ فتصلب عندما يبقى في اللحم. وأما صاحب الكامل فإنه أورد السلع والخنازير في باب الأورام البلغمية، وحصر الورم السوداوي في الجنسيتين الباقيين. ويمكن أن يقال: الشيخ لم يجعل الخنازير والسلع من الأورام السوداوية بل جعل من هذا الباب الغدد التي منها الخنازير والسلع على معنى أن الغدد التي تشبه الخنازير والسلع داخلية في الأورام السوداوية وهي التي تسمى مسامير فإنه أفرد في المقالة التي يتكلم فيها على الأورام السوداوية لهذه المسامير فصلا؛ أو يقال: إنه قال في باب السلع إنها دبيلات بلغمية تحوي أخلاطا غليظة بلغمية أو متولدة عن البلغم كالحم أو كعصيدة أو كعسل أو شيئا صلبا لا يبعد أن يجب إلحاقها بالسوداوية إلا أنا جعلناها بلغمية لأن أصل ذلك العصيد بلغم عرض له أن يبس فإزداد غلظا؛ هذا كلامه في هذا الموضوع. وبالجملة فكلامه في هذا المعنى مضطرب. وقوله: "الأورام الصلبة السوداوية تبتدئ في أول كونها صلبة وقد تنتقل إلى الصلابة وخصوصا الدموية وقد يعرض ذلك أيضا في البلغمية أحيانا"، فالمراد منه أن أحد نوعي الورم السوداوي وهو الصلابة قد يكون تكونه عن خلط محدث له ابتداء وقد يكون حدوثه من قبل أن يحصل نوع آخر من الورم ثم أن مادته تغلظ فيصير الورم صلابة وأكثر ذلك إنما يقع في الورم الدموي وقد يكون أيضا في الورم البلغمي. فأما ما ذكره في باب الفرق بين الغدد

criticises vociferously in the introductions to other works, is here revealed to be more a motif for promoting his work to his colleagues and patrons than historical fact.

55. وتسمى أوراما رخوة وإما مائية كما يعرض لعضو ما أن يجتمع فيه ماء Ox, P, G ] كما يعرض لعضو إن يجتمع فيه ماء، وإما مائية *Canon*. كاستسقاء يخصه

والسّلع وبين تعقد العصب فكله ظاهر والذي يلحقه به أن تعقد العصب لا يتحرك إلى قدام وخلف بل يمّنة ويسرة. وأما السّلع فإنها يتحرك إلى الجوانب كلها وباقي الفصل ظاهر.

[A] Commentary: he turns once again to classifications [of swelling], commencing with the classification of cold swellings, which are four: those from black bile, phlegm, watery fluid, and air. Then he divides those from black bile into three: tumours, cancer and kinds of swelling in the glands, among which are scrofula and leprous growths.

[B] At this juncture an inquiry arises, namely, that scrofula and leprous growths are not from black bile, but from phlegm. For in the discourse in this book [namely, in *Canon*, Book One] in which cold swellings are discussed, the *Šayḥ* says: “Swellings caused by phlegm are either purely phlegmatic †such as when a body part is affected by water that accumulates in it; or they are from watery fluid†,<sup>56</sup> or they are abscesses such as scrofula and hard leprous growths.” At the end of the book on swellings, al-Masīḥī says: “Scrofula is swellings that are caused by thick phlegm that hardens when it remains in the flesh.” And the author of the *Complete [Book of Medicine]*, al-Mağūsī, includes leprous growths and scrofula in the chapter on swellings from phlegm and restricts swellings from black bile to the remaining two categories.

---

56. As in other instances in which Faḥr al-Dīn quotes the *Canon*, all three manuscripts transmit a corrupt text. My analysis of the transmission history of the commentary on the *Canon* is in its preliminary stages. At this point, it is not clear whether the error was in Faḥr al-Dīn’s copy, or whether the all three manuscripts share a corrupt exemplar early in the stemma. The collation evidence suggests the latter scenario is most likely. Compare with the original (Avicenna, *al-Qānūn fī l-tibb*, 1:77, ll. 25–26: “...they are called hard swellings; or they are caused by watery fluid, such as when a body part is affected by water that accumulates in it such as dropsy that is localised in it [the body part]...”



[C] One could say: “The *Šayḥ* did not classify scrofula and leprous growths among the swellings that are from black bile; rather, he included in this category [that is, category of swellings caused by black bile] swellings in the glands, among which are scrofula and leprous growths, the reason for which is that the swellings in the glands, which resemble scrofula and leprous growths, are classified as black bilious swellings, and they are what are called “boils (*masāmīr*).” For he [namely, Avicenna] dedicated a chapter to boils, in which he speaks about swellings from black bile.”

[D] Or one could say: “In the chapter on leprous growths, he said that they are abscesses from phlegm that contain viscous humours, or that are generated from phlegm that is like flesh, flour gruel (*‘aṣīda*)<sup>57</sup>, honey or something hard. It is not implausible that they should be included among the [swellings] from black bile, though we classify them as those from phlegm because the origin of that gruel-like mixture (*al-‘aṣīd*) is phlegm that has dried, and becomes viscous as a result.” These are his words in that passage. In sum, his words on this matter are confused.

[E] He says: “When they first form, tumorous swellings from black bile begin as hard growths, which sometimes turn into tumours, especially those [tumours] caused by blood, though it sometimes happens also in those caused by phlegm.” He means by this that one of the two kinds of swelling from black bile, namely tumours, sometimes come about from humours that generate at the outset, or they come about because there is another kind of swelling [in the body part], after which the matter [in the swollen part] becomes viscous and, as a consequence, the swelling becomes a tumour. This mostly happens in cases of swelling from blood, but sometimes it happens in cases of swelling from phlegm.

---

57. See Reinhard Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* (Leiden: Brill, 1881), 2:133, where he says that *‘aṣīda* and *‘aṣīda* have the same meaning. Albert Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1860), 2:270 (*‘aṣīda*): “a kind of thick gruel made from flour butter mixed with boiled water, and butter or honey (from original French).”

[F] The distinctions he draws between, on the one hand, swelling in the glands and leprous growths and sinewy lumps [on the skin] (*ta'aqqud al-ʿaṣab*) on the other are all obvious, the upshot of which is that [when they are palpated] the sinewy lumps do not move to the front or the back but only to the left and right, whereas the leprous growths move to in all directions.

[G] The rest of the chapter is clear.

It is evident that much of Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary is given to explaining the meaning of the text. He does this by means of various strategies. He merely restates Avicenna's words: in A, the division of swellings caused by black bile at the beginning of Block G is rephrased using a slightly different sentence structure.

He paraphrases and digests: in F, Avicenna makes several distinctions between swelling in the glands and leprous growths and sinewy lumps, all of which Faḥr al-Dīn say boil down to the fact that when leprous growths and swellings in the glands are palpated, they can move horizontally or vertically, and they can be compressed, whereas the sinewy knots on the skin can only be shifted from side to side (*yumnatan wa-yusratan*), but they cannot be compressed when they are palpated.

He expands the text by introducing subdivisions that Avicenna does not: in E, Faḥr al-Dīn divides tumours according to how they are generated, a division which is not in Avicenna's text, but clarifies Avicenna's claim that when tumours are caused by black bile they "begin as hard growths (*tabtadī'u fī awwali kawnihā ṣulbatan*)."<sup>1</sup> Faḥr al-Dīn says that there are two kinds of tumours, those that immediately form as tumours caused by black bile and others that are caused by other humours but become tumorous after the humours become gradually viscous. Faḥr al-Dīn implies that in E, Avicenna is speaking about the former rather than the latter.

On the other hand, much of the text is given to drawing out doubts in Avicenna's text by referring to earlier medical authorities and to other passages in the *Canon*, Book One. Thus, Faḥr al-Dīn commits an inquiry (*baḥt*) (from sections B to D) to highlighting an inconsistency in the classification of leprous growths and scrofula. In B, Faḥr al-Dīn observes that in the present chap-

ter these diseases are classified under the kinds of swelling that are caused by black bile (*al-sawdāwīya*). Al-Mağūsī, al-Masīhī and Avicenna elsewhere in Book One, however, class them as swellings caused by phlegm (*balġamīya*). In sections C and D, Faḥr al-Dīn attempts to find some way of harmonising the inconsistency in Avicenna's classifications. In C, Faḥr al-Dīn says that in this passage, Avicenna only meant to say that swellings in the glands were caused by black bile, and that leprosy and scrofula merely *resemble* (*tušbihu*) swellings in the glands. In D, Faḥr al-Dīn quotes the chapter on leprosy (*al-sula'*) in the *Canon*, Book One, in which Avicenna declares that these kinds of growths are "phlegmatic abscesses (*dubaylāt balġamīya*) that contain humours that are phlegmatic or that are generated from phlegm," after which he immediately adds the hedge that "it is not implausible that they should be included among" black bilious swellings. Unable to find a compelling excuse for Avicenna in C, and citing a text from the *Canon* in which Avicenna says, in effect, that leprosy and scrofula are phlegmatic and black bilious swellings, Faḥr al-Dīn, throws up his hands in last sentence of D, saying that Avicenna's classification of leprosy and scrofula is "confused (*muḍṭarib*)."

A thorough analysis of this chapter, therefore, makes it clear that in spite of the fact that the introduction to the commentary on the *Canon* does not allude to the central elements of Faḥr al-Dīn's exegetical method, *in practice* in the commentary on the *Canon* Faḥr al-Dīn undertakes exactly the same types of exegetical tasks that he does in the commentary on *Pointers and Reminders* and in original philosophical works written prior to 580/1184. As we have seen, what Shihadeh calls the "macrostructure" of the *Canon* commentary is virtually identical to the macrostructure of the commentary on *Pointers*. Faḥr al-Dīn introduces further subdivisions into the *Canon's* original division into sections; he makes explicit the logical links between sections, and even between text-blocks in a single chapter; he divides his commentary into investigations (*mabāḥiṭ*), which tend to focus on more philosophical principles; and he prefaces each commentary unit with a division into themes or topics to be pursued.

Furthermore, Shihadeh identifies a handful of "exegetical tasks" that Faḥr al-Dīn performs in the commentary on *Pointers and Reminders*.<sup>58</sup> They are present in the commentary on the

---

58. Compare this list with the one in Shihadeh, "Al-Rāzī' Commentary," 310: "1. Identifying the

*Canon* as well. Among the exegetical tasks that Faḥr al-Dīn performs in this chapter are:

1. Explaining the organisation of the chapter and the relationship between its parts;
2. Defining the key concepts in the chapter under discussion;
3. Highlighting inconsistencies in Avicenna's thought;
4. Comparing Avicenna's statements in the *Canon* to the views of earlier medical authorities;
5. Explaining Avicenna's words using concepts drawn from *The Healing*;
6. Defending Avicenna against criticism;
7. Attacking earlier authors whose views conflict with Avicenna's;
8. Breaking arguments down into the form of syllogisms;
9. Introducing new concepts, terms and divisions to make Avicenna's words clear.

### 3 The Genesis of *Verification (taḥqīq)* in the Islamic Medical Tradition

#### 3.1 "Metacommentary" in Galen: Rules for Exegetes in Classical Islamic Medicine

In the tradition of medieval Islamic medical commentary, Galen's numerous Hippocratic commentaries, nearly all of which were translated into Arabic by Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq (d. 873), stood as a model to imitate. Even if Galen's actual practice and written prescriptions were frequently at odds,<sup>59</sup> there is no doubt that medieval Islamic physicians would have taken Galen's prescriptions

---

unstated conclusion of an argument (*gharaḍ, maqṣūd, maṭlūb*); 2. Identifying an unstated premise of an argument; 3. Expounding the argument in a stricter syllogistic presentation, using plainer language; 4. Expounding the views advanced in the passage, or the broader philosophical theory; 5. Defining philosophical terms; 6. Explaining the broader organization of the text by showing how the views advanced and the argument's premises relate to earlier and later sections; in some cases, the broader discussions in which the section occurs are summarized; 7. Providing relevant additional material from other Avicennan works, especially the *Shifā'*; 8. Contextualizing these views by placing them within wider debates and identifying contrary views, whether or not these are hinted at in Avicenna's text."

59. See Heinrich von Staden, "Staging the Past, Staging Oneself: Galen on Hellenistic Exegetical Traditions," in *Galen and the World of Knowledge*, eds. Christopher Gill, Tim Whitmarsh and John Wilkins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 132–56, especially 134–5; von Staden, "A Woman Does Not Become Ambidextrous': Galen and the Culture of Scientific

about how and how not to do commentary with the utmost seriousness. A recent study of exegetical strategies in the Arabic commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* shows how Ibn Abī Šādiq's (d. after 1067) exegetical strategies imitate Galen's actual commentary practice more than Galen's restrictive prescriptions in his Hippocratic commentaries.<sup>60</sup> That is to say, the shifts evident in Ibn Abī Šādiq's commentary on the *Aphorisms* do not involve the broad shifts in commentary structure, argumentative style, medical-philosophical authority and discursive strategies that Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary inaugurates, beginning largely with his students in the thirteenth century.

According to classics scholars such as Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld and Rebecca Flemming, Galen seems to have given considerable thought to what Barnes refers to as questions of "metacommentary."<sup>61</sup> In addition to devoting two complete works to this question, works which are, unfortunately, lost, Galen scatters remarks touching on metaexegetical issues in his Hippocratic commentaries. Here, we are fortunate to have many of these passages in Greek as well as Arabic. Only by exploring Galen's scattered remarks and comparing them with remarks made by Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā al-Rāzī (d. ca. 925) at the opening of his *Doubts on Galen* (*Šukūk 'alā Ġālīnūs*) can we appreciate how unorthodox Faḥr al-Dīn's exegetical method in the *Canon* must have appeared to scholastic physicians in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

---

Commentary," in *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, eds. Roy Gibson and Christina Shuttleworth Kraus (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 109–39.

60. Kamran I. Karimullah, "Transformation of Galen's Textual Legacy from Classical to Post-Classical Islamic Medicine: Commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*," *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 5 (2017): 311–58, especially 329–41.

61. Jaap Mansfeld, *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled Before the Study of an Author or a Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 135–9. Rebecca Flemming, "Commentary," in *The Cambridge Companion to Galen*, ed. Richard J. Hankinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 323–54, 336–40. Jonathan Barnes, "Metacommentary," in *Method and Metaphysics: Essays in Ancient Philosophy I*, ed. Maddalena Bonelli (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 195–210.

Mansfeld, Barnes and Flemming have identified several passages in Galen's Hippocratic commentaries in which Galen speaks about the norms that dictate what good medical exegesis is. These texts are Galen's introduction to his commentary on (1) the Hippocratic *Epidemics*, Book One; (2) the introduction to his commentary on the Hippocratic *Epidemics*, Book Six; a brief introduction to his commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*, Book Three; and finally, (4) his introduction to his commentary on the Hippocratic *On Fractures*, the latter of which was translated into Syriac by Ḥunyan, but which is no longer extant.<sup>62</sup>

In brief introductory remarks to the commentary on the *Aphorisms*, Book Three, Galen takes an opportunity to attack a physician named Lukas, who seems to have penned a complete commentary on the *Aphorisms*. Rather than faulting any particular doctrine Lukas held, Galen criticises his peer for failing to comment on Hippocrates' text in the correct way, namely the way that Galen thought commentaries should be written.<sup>63</sup>

Ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῶν εἰς τοὺς ἀφορισμοὺς ὑπομνημάτων τῷδε περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ὥρας τε καὶ ἡλικίας Ἱπποκράτει γεγραμμένων ἐξηγησόμεθα. μάλιστα μὲν οὖν ὅσον ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀσαφές ἐστι σαφηνίζοντες, ἔργον γὰρ τοῦτο ἴδιον ἐξηγήσεως, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἐκάστου τῶν ὀρθῶς εἰρημένων προστιθέντες, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἔθος ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν γίνεσθαι. θαυμάζω δὲ κἀνατύθα τὴν ἀνωμαλίαν τοῦ Λύκου γράφοντος μὲν, ὡς φησιν, ἐξηγήσεις Κοῖντου τοῦ διδασκάλου, μηδενὶ δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ὥρας καὶ ἡλικίας εἰρημένων προσθέντος πίστιν ἀποδεικτικὴν, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐμπειρίαν καὶ τήρησιν ἀναπέμψαντος ἅπαντα, καίτοι γ' ἄλλους πολλοὺς ἀφορισμοὺς ἐξηγούμενος αὐτὸς ἐπισκέπτεται λογικῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀληθείας, οὐκ

---

62. John C. Lamoreaux, *Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq on His Galen Translations* (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 2017), 96–7 [§95].

63. Arabic: Galen, *Tafsīr Ḡālīnūs li-fuṣūl Abuqrāt*, trans. Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq, ed. Taro Mimura (The University of Manchester, 2012–2017), <http://dx.doi.org/10.3927/51689446>. Greek: Galen, *Galenī Opera Omnia*, ed. Karl G. Kühn, vol. 17b (Leipzig: Car. Cnoblicii, 1829), 561–2. Translation is based on the Arabic.

ἀρκούμενος μόνῃ τῇ πείρᾳ. ὅτι δ' οὐ δυνατόν ἐστὶ μόνῃ τῇ πείρᾳ τοιαύτην ἀθροῖσαι θεωρίαν Ἱπποκράτης τε αὐτὸς ἐνδείκνυται τοῦτο καὶ προδόντος ἐπιδειχθήσεται τοῦ λόγου.

إِنِّي مفسّر في هذه المقالة الثالثة من تفسير كتاب الفصول ما ذكره أبقراط في هذا الكتاب من أمر أوقات السنة والأسنان. وأكثر قصدي إنّما هو لشرح الغامض من قوله، لأنّ ذلك هو الأمر الخاصّ بالتفسير، وتكلّف مع ذلك أن أتى بالبرهان على شيء شيء ممّا قاله أبقراط وأصاب به، لأنّه قد جرت العادة بأن يفعل ذلك في التفسير. وإنّ بعض ما أعجب منه من أمر لوقش أنّ أمره ل يشبه بعضه بعضاً في تفسيره لهذا الكتاب، وذلك أنّه كتب تفسيراً لهذا الكتاب أخذه برعهم<sup>64</sup> عن قوانطس معلّمه ولم يأت على شيء ممّا ذكره أبقراط في أوقات السنة والأسنان بحجّة برهانية، لكنّه اقتصر في جميع ما ذكره فيه على التجربة والرصد على أنّه في تفسيره لفصول آخر كثيرة يبحث عن صحّة ما قيل بطريق القياس ولا يقتصر على التجربة. وقد دلّ أبقراط على أنّه لا يمكن أن يجمع هذا الباب من العلم بالتجربة وحدها دون القياس وسأبيّن ذلك فيما بعد.

[L1] In this third book of the commentary on the Book of the *Aphorisms*, I shall explain what Hippocrates mentions about the seasons of the year and the ages in the person's life. My primary objective is to explain what is obscure (*śarḥ al-ġāmiḍ min qawlihi*, ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀσαφές ἐστὶ σαφηνίζοντες) in Hippocrates' words because this is what is proper to interpretation (*al-amru al-hāṣṣu b-t-tafsīr*, ἔργον γὰρ τοῦτο ἴδιον ἐξηγήσεως). Consequently, I am unwilling to carry out demonstration for each and every statement that Hippocrates made and was correct about. For that one does this is the convention in interpretation. One of the surprising things about Lukas' commentary on this book [namely, the *Aphorisms*] is that some parts of his commentary on this book do not resemble other parts. For he composed a commentary on this book, which he took, so they say, from his teacher Quintus, in which he [Quintus] does not supply a demonstrative proof for a single thing that Hippocrates mentioned about the seasons of the year and the ages of people. Rather, whatever is confined entirely to his medical experience and observation. Yet, in his interpretation of many other aphorisms, he searches for the truth of what was said using reason. Yet, Hippocrates has indicated that it is not possible to collect knowledge in this field relying solely on experience and not on reason. I shall demonstrate this in what follows.

64. [ برعهم ] conieci (ὦ φυσιν Kühn): برعهم Mimura.

Here Galen criticises Lukas, who appears to have been writing a generation before Galen, if he was in fact a direct student of the anatomist Quintus (d. ca. 145), the latter of whom was a well-known physician who taught several of Galen's teachers such as Pelops (fl. ca. 150) and Numisanus (d. before 151).<sup>65</sup> In these brief remarks, Galen manages to pack three distinct criticisms of Lukas and Quintus. The first is that he picks on the fact that Lukas does not interpret Hippocrates *consistently*. In other writings, or possibly in other parts of Lukas' *Aphorisms* commentary, Lukas uses reason to offer reasons for why what Hippocrates says is true. Yet, in his commentary on *Aphorisms*, Book Three, Lukas' commentary is, in Galen's view, merely a collection of observations and medical experiences.

The second criticism is less about Lukas than about Quintus. Though on other occasions Galen praises Quintus as "the best physician of his generation,"<sup>66</sup> in this instance Galen criticises Quintus for falling under the influence of the empiricist doctrine that eschews medical reasoning and stipulates that medical experience alone is sufficient for practicing as well as discoursing about medicine. Yet, here Galen's criticism is mainly methodological. In this passage, Galen criticises Quintus for commenting on Hippocrates using an exegetical method that Hippocrates himself rejected. In Galen's eyes, the problem is not so much that Quintus commented in the style of an empiricist, but that when interpreting a Hippocratic work Quintus failed to *follow the exegetical principles to which the author himself subscribed*. In effect, Galen takes Quintus to task for using only empirical observation when discussing the *Aphorisms*, whereas in other writings Hippocrates had indicated that "it is not possible to collect knowledge in this field relying solely on experience and not on reason." Galen charges that, in this case at least, Quintus failed in his duties as a commentator because the exegetical method he adopts is not based on the principles of textual interpretation that Hippocrates himself endorsed.

---

65. Vivian Nutton, "Galen of Pergamum", in *Brill's New Pauly: Antiquity volumes*, eds. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (Leiden: Brill, 2006), doi: 10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e417950.

66. Galen, *Galen De praecognitione* [Galen's *On Prognosis*] (CMG V 8,1), ed. Vivian Nutton (Berlin: Academy of Science, 1979), 71. Galen, *Opera Omnia*, 14:602.



Galen faults Lukas for inconsistency. In most cases he uses reason to supply the unstated principles for why what Hippocrates says is true. Galen, however, characterises Lukas' commentary on *Aphorisms*, Book Three as a laundry-list of observations and subjective impressions drawn from medical experiences without any underlying principles that rationalise Hippocrates' dicta. Yet, it seems to me that Lukas would not escape Galen's ire if he had consistently provided demonstrative arguments either, for it is clear that above all, *Galen does not see demonstration as suitable element in medical exegesis*. Indeed, Galen contrasts the type of interpretation he supplies with the kind that Lukas and Quintus provide. Whereas they (consistently or inconsistently) engage in arguments that use demonstration, Galen feels that the commentator's "proper business" is "explaining what is obscure" in Hippocrates' words.

These three themes are present, too, in Galen's introductions to his commentary on the Hippocratic *Epidemics*, Book One and Book Six. Before launching into his interpretation of *Epidemics*, Book One, Galen refers again to Quintus' failures as a Hippocratic exegete. Once again, he remarks about the fact that in speaking about the medical statements that Hippocrates makes about the seasons and the ages of people's lives, Quintus relied entirely on medical experience and failed to use reason in his commentary. According to Galen, then, Quintus' first error was that "he claimed that these things [medical rules about seasons and ages] are known only through experience without there being any reasoning about the cause that inevitably give rise to them." Galen continues in the following words:<sup>67</sup>

κακῶς οὖν ὁ Κρίντος ἐξηγείται καὶ ταῦτα τὰ βιβλία καὶ τὰ τῶν Ἀφορισμῶν, <ἐν> οἷς ᾧδὲ πῶς ἔγραψε· “περὶ δὲ τῶν ὥρέων, ἦν μὲν ὁ χειμῶν ἀύχμηρός καὶ βόρειος γένηται, τὸ δὲ ἔαρ ἔπομβρον καὶ νότιον, ἀνάγκη τοῦ θέρους πυρετοῦς ὄξεις καὶ ὀφθαλμίας καὶ δυσεντερίας γίνεσθαι.” τῇ πείρᾳ γὰρ μόνῃ τοῦτο ἐγνώσθαι φησὶν ὁ Κρίντος ἄνευ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν λογισμοῦ, πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸ τοῦθ' ἀμαρτάνων, \*\* ὅτι τὰς αἰτίας, ᾧν εἶπε κατὰ τοὺς Ἀφορισμοὺς τούτους ὁ Ἱπποκράτης, αὐτὸς

---

67. Greek: Galen, *In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum I commentaria III*, eds. Wenkebach and Pfaff, CMG V 10,1 (Leipzig et Berlin 1934), 6–7. Arabic: Galen, *Galeni In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum I commentariorum I-III*, Suppl. Or. V 1, ed. Uwe Vagelpohl (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 74–6.

αὐθις ἐν τῷ Περὶ ὑδάτων καὶ ἀέρων καὶ τόπων ἔγραψεν, εἴθ' ὅτι τὸ χρήσιμον μέρος τῆς διδασκαλίας ὑπερέβαινεν. ἀρεταὶ μὲν γὰρ εἰσιν ἐξηγητῶν δύο αὐταὶ, τὸ τε τὴν γνώμην φυλάσσειν τοῦ συγγράμματος καὶ τὸ τὰ χρήσιμα διδάσκειν τοὺς ἀναγνωσομένους αὐτοῦ τὰ ὑπομνήματα, διέφθειρε δὲ ἀμφοτέρας ὁ Κόϊντος ἐν τῷ μὴ συνάπτειν τῇ καταστάσει τοῦ περιέχοντος ἡμᾶς ἀέρος τὰ πλεονάσαντα νοσήματα, συνάπτεσθαι μὲν αὐτὰ βουλομένου τοῦ Ἱπποκράτους αὐτοῦ, προγνῶναι δ' ἐσόμενα καὶ κωλύσαι συνιστάμενα καὶ ἰάσθαι γενομένα μὴ δυνησομένων ἡμῶν ἄνευ τοῦ γνῶναι τὴν γενομένην ἐν τῷ σώματι διάθεσιν ἐκ τῆς δυσκρασίας τοῦ περιέχοντος. οὕτως γὰρ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπασῶν καταστάσεων τὰς δυνάμεις αὐθις ἐξευρίσκειν δυνησόμεθα.

وأول خطائه أنه لم يعلم أن أبقراط قد وصف أسباب تلك الأشياء التي ذكرها في كتاب الفصول <و> في كتابه في الماء والهواء والمواضع، والثاني أنه تجاوز وترك أنفع ما يتعلم في هذا الباب. وذلك أن للتفسير فضيلتين: إحداهما أن يحفظ معنى الرجل الذي يفسر كلامه ولا يزول عنه، فالأخرى أن يعلم من يقرأ تفسيره ما ينتفع به. وقد أفسد قوينطس هاتين الفضيلتين جميعاً بتركه إيجاب حدوث الأمراض التي ذكر أبقراط أنها تكثر في كل وقت واحد من أوقات السنة على حال الهواء المحيط بالأبدان فيه. وأبقراط يريد أن حدوث تلك الأمراض واجب عن مزاج الوقت الذي تحدث فيه. ونحن لا نقدر أن نتقدم فنعلم أن تلك الأمراض ستحدث ولا أن نمنع من حدوثها ولا أن يبرئها إذا حدثت دون أن نعلم الحال الحادثة في البدن من فساد مزاج الهواء. فبهذا الطريق قد نصل نحن أن نستخرج ونعرف قوى جميع حالات الهواء التي لم يذكرها أبقراط مع ما ذكر.

[L2] His first error was that he was not aware that Hippocrates described the causes of the things he mentioend in the *Aphorisms* and in his book on waters, airs and places. The second was that he passed by and left out the most useful [part] of this chapter's teaching. For a commentary has two virtues (*faḍīlatāni*). The first is that it preserves the thought of the man whose words it comments on and does not deviate from it. The second is that it teaches those who read the commentary what is useful for them. But Quintus spoiled both virtues by ignoring that the diseases which Hippocrates said frequently appear during each individual season inevitably occur as a consequence of the air surrounding the bodies during it. Hippocrates, however, means that the occurrence of the diseases is inevitably due to the mixture of the season in which they occur. We cannot predict that these diseases will occur, prevent their occurrence or cure them when they occur without knowing the condition that prevails in the body based on the corruption of the air. With this

method, however, we are in a position to deduce and learn the powers of all the climactic conditions Hippocrates did not mention in addition to those he did mention.<sup>68</sup>

As in L1, Galen refers in L2 to the fact that Quintus failed to interpret Hippocrates according to Hippocrates' stipulation that medical discourse arises from a combination of medical experience and reason. Yet, Galen censures Quintus in L2 for two other reasons, which are not mentioned in L1. In L1, Quintus was censured for not adopting Hippocrates' medical methodology whilst interpreting Hippocrates' text. In L2, Quintus is censured for "deviating from" and not "preserving" Hippocrates' thought. In this passage, Galen suggests that *preserving the author's intention is accomplished by referring to other parts of the author's corpus of medical writings*. Thus, Galen says that in order to interpret what Hippocrates says in the *Epidemics*, Quintus should have referred to what Hippocrates says about the seasons and ages in the *Aphorisms*, Book Three and in *Airs, Waters and Places*. The second virtuous characteristic of exegesis is that the comments be "useful." Rebecca Flemming has shown that this is a common theme in Galen's meta-exegetical digressions.<sup>69</sup> In L2, however, "useful" does not mean that the details provided by the commentator should be directly relevant to medical practice. In this passage, it is evident that Galen links the requirement that commentaries be useful to their *ability to expand our medical knowledge by deduction from medical principles that supply the causes for the observed phenomena*. In L2, therefore, Galen avers that Quintus' commentary is not useful to the reader because it does not assist him in recognising that the medical principle that what relates the climactic conditions and the diseases in the body is the mixture (*al-mizāğ*, ἡ κρᾶσις) that is particular to every season. Had Quintus' commentary explicitly mentioned the principle that the mixtures of each season causes disease by altering the mixtures in the body, the reader would have been able to infer "the powers of all the climactic conditions Hippocrates did not mention" and also to understand why Hippocrates assigns powers to those climactic conditions he does mention in his writings.

---

68. Translation is Vagelpohl's.

69. Flemming, "Commentary," 337–9.

Near the end of the Hippocratic *Epidemics*, Book Six, Hippocrates cryptically remarks: “In cases of thinning, there is a spasm prior to death, the navel bulges out and becomes distended, and sores appear on the gums and around the teeth.”<sup>70</sup> Before offering his own interpretation, Galen takes the opportunity to make some remarks about the best way to interpret Hippocrates’ works when one encounters an obscurity in the text. Galen contrasts his commentaries as well as his exegetical method with those adopted by his predecessors.<sup>71</sup>

إني متى وجدت المعنى في كل واحد من هذه الأفاويل معنى بينا وايضحا وهو مع ذلك صحيح حقيقي ألغيت ذكر المفسرين لكتب  
أبقراط تجنبنا مني للتطويل. ومتى لم أقدر على الوقوف على المعنى قول من الأفاويل لغموضه ولا على أن تسكن نفسي إليه على أني  
قد عرفت معنى قائله فيه بالحقيقة فإني عند ذلك أذكر من فسر هذا الكتاب من أولئك المفسرين الذين لهم التفاسير المشهورة

[L3a] When I encounter in some of these statements an evident and clear meaning that is likewise correct and genuine, I omit what the commentators on Hippocratic works have mentioned so that it [the commentary] does not become too long.<sup>72</sup> When I am not able to grasp the meaning of a certain statement because it is unclear, and I myself am not sure that I truly know the speaker’s meaning, in this situation, of those who have commented on this book, I mention only those commentators who have commentaries that are famous.

Galen then lists several commentaries that he read on the *Epidemics* and other commentaries on Hippocrates’ books. He insists again, however, that he is afraid of burdening the reader with a commentary that is too long and, in spite of its length, fails to achieve the end of all good exegesis,

70. Hippocrates, *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, ed. Émile Littré, vol. 5 (Paris: Baillière, 1846), 338.

71. Galen, *Tafsīr Ḡālīnūs li-kitāb Afidīmiyā*, trans. Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq (Madrid, Escorial Library, MS arabe 805), fol. 155a, ll.21–5. Compare with Galen, *Galenī In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum VI commentaria I-VI* (CMG V 10,2,2), ed. Ernst Wenkebach, transl. Franz Pfaff (Berlin: Academy of Sciences, 1956), 412, ll. 15–21.

72. Reading “...dikru l-mufassirīna...” as an objective genitive annexation.

namely clarifying what is obscure. Galen lists several other important exegetical norms, however, many of which he does not mention in LL1–2.<sup>73</sup>

ولا رأيت أيضا أن أذكر جميع أولئك المفسرين في هذه التفاسير التي كتبتها الآن، لكنني اقتصررت على ذكر المشهورين منهم ومن قال في شرح من الأقاليل الغامضة شيئا مقنعا فإني قائل في هذا الموضوع أيضا شيئا قد سمعتموني أقوله دائما وهو أن الأقاليل الغامضة التي تجرى مجرى الرمز ليس يستحق أحد أن يصدق في تفاسيرها سوى قائلها وحده وأما غيره من سائر الناس فمنهم من لا يبلغ تأويله إلا المقدر الذي يكون به مما يقبل ويقنع به، ومنهم من يكتب ما لا يفهم ويعقل، ومنهم من يكتب في شرح الأقاليل القديمة التي سرهم شرحها ما هو أغمض منها. وذلك أن جميع الناس إلا القليل منهم يحرصون على قراءة الكتب الغامضة التي هي في غاية الغموض الجارية مجرى الرمز على المعلمين وما كان منها أيضا إنما يرضى فهمه أولئك المعلمون فقط. ولست أدري ما الذي يدعوهم إلى ذلك.

[L3b] Yet, I do not think that it is appropriate to cite all these commentators in these commentaries that I have been writing at present. Rather, I limit myself to mentioning those that are well-known, and who says something that instills conviction whilst commenting on obscure statements. Yet, I too shall say something here that you always hear me say, namely in the case of an obscure statements that are like a riddle, only the person who originally spoke it is entitled to affirm the interpretation of as correct. As far as all other people are concerned, there are among them whose interpretation reaches only to the extent of what is acceptable and convincing [to others], there are others who write things that are not coherent nor intelligible, and yet others, when explaining an old word whose interpretation they find amusing, they write something that is even more obscure than it [the original author's statement]. For all but a few people are eager to read with teachers books that are so obscure that they are like riddles, as well as books that only those teachers have made it their concern to understand. Yet, I do not know what cause they have to do that.

Thus, in LL3a–b, Galen mentions several other characteristics that good commentaries must have. In these comments, Galen is concerned with how the commentator should use and interact with

---

73. Galen, *Tafsīr Ġālīnūs li-kitāb Afīdūmiyā*, fol. 155b, ll.8–17. Compare with Galen, *Galenī In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum VI*, 413, ll.5–16.

earlier commentaries written on Hippocratic texts. In L3a, Galen makes the general recommendation that there is *no need to mention any other interpretations of the text when the author's intent is clear*. Galen says that the only time he feels the *need to mention interpretations offered by other commentators is when he cannot make sense of Hippocrates' words and he is not sure that he has understood Hippocrates correctly*. Even in such cases, Galen discourages the reader from consulting every commentary they know of. He recommends, rather, limiting oneself to *well-known commentaries and to those that "provide a satisfactory interpretation of the text."* Galen insists that in cases where Hippocrates' intended meaning cannot be inferred from the text in a satisfactory way, *no interpreter has the right to believe that his own interpretation is the correct one*.

Lastly, at the beginning of his commentary on the Hippocratic *On Fractures*, Galen touches on a variety of metaexegetical themes, some of which we have already encountered in LL1–3. What is especially noteworthy about his remarks in L4 is that he distinguishes the way he understands how best to comment on Hippocratic texts from the way Hippocrates was commonly interpreted in his day.<sup>74</sup>

Πρὸ τῆς τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐξηγήσεως ἀμεινον ἀκηκοέναι καθόλου περὶ πάσης ἐξηγήσεως, ὡς ἔστιν ἡ δύναμις αὐτῆς, ὅσα τῶν ἐν τοῖς συγγράμμασιν ἔστιν ἀσαφῆ, ταῦτ' ἐργάσασθαι σαφῆ. τὸ δ' ἀποδείξαι τι τῶν γεγραμμένων ὡς ἀληθές ἢ ὡς ψεῦδος ἐλέγξει, καὶ εἰ κατηγορήσῃ τις σοφιστικῶς ἀπολογήσασθαι, κεχώρισται μὲν ἐξηγήσεως, εἴθισται δὲ γίνεσθαι πρὸς ἀπάντων ὡς εἰπεῖν τῶν γραφόντων ὑπομνήματα. καὶ νῆ Δία οὐδὲν κωλύει καὶ τούτου μετρίως ἀπτεσθαι τὸν ἐξηγητήν. τὸ δ' ἀγωνίζεσθαι τελέως ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ γράφοντος δογμάτων ἐκπέπτωκε τὸν ὄρον τῆς ἐξηγήσεως. οὐ πρὸς τοῦτον οὖν τὸν σκοπὸν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν εἰρημένον ἀποβλέπων ἐγὼ προσθήσω ταῖς ὄντως ἐξηγήσεσιν ἐκάστοτε βραχέα τῆς πίστεως ἕνεκα τῶν εἰρημένων.

Before I begin the interpretation of these [chapters] in turn, it is worth making a statement in a general way about all interpretation, namely, that it is the capacity to make clear what is unclear in the text itself. Demonstrating that something written in the text is true,

---

74. Galen, *Galenus opera omnia*, ed. Karl G. Kühn, vol. 18b (Leipzig: Car. Cnoblicii, 1829), 318–9. Barnes, “Metacommentary,” 199. Mansfeld, *Prolegomena*, 135–6. Flemming, “Commentary,” 336–7.

or exposing it as false, or defending it if it is subjected to sophistical criticism—these have nothing to do with interpretation, though it is the custom of practically everyone who writes commentaries to do this. Certainly, nothing prevents one from undertaking this [kind] of interpretation in a moderate way. Yet, to exert oneself completely on behalf of the author’s doctrines falls outside the boundaries of interpretation. I certainly do not turn towards this purpose [in my commentaries], but to saying things that in every instance focus intently on interpretation that is to the point and that instills conviction [in the reader] because of what is said.

Unsurprisingly, Galen reiterates the now familiar claim that the purpose of commentary is to make the author’s intended meaning clear. Further, Galen states more forcefully than before his belief that dialectics, polemics and demonstration have no place in exegesis. In other words, *arguments about whether a certain doctrine is true or false have no place in Galen’s view of the types of activities proper to commentary*. This requirement strikes me as remarkable, and, indeed, Galen himself adds as an aside that virtually everyone who comments on Hippocrates engages in a variety of discursive activities that do not reflect Galen’s model of what commentary should be.

Finally, Galen concludes L4 by drawing attention to the relation between interpretation and certainty or conviction (πίστεις). Generally, for Galen an important objective of commentary is that upon reading the commentary, the reader is convinced that the commentator’s interpretation of the passage is a true reflection of what Hippocrates intended to say. The objective is not, in other words, to argue about whether what Hippocrates said is true, but that there is conviction that he has understood Hippocrates’ thought correctly. While Galen admits in L3a that in some cases, Hippocrates’ text may be so unclear that there he is unsure about what meaning Hippocrates intended to convey, for the adept commentator these cases must be the exception rather than the rule. Galen seems to believe that two factors go into instilling conviction about the commentator’s interpretation: one, that *it is to the point*; and two, that it is stated *clearly*. Thus, in L3a Galen states that he avoids offering interpretations that “ramble on,”<sup>75</sup> and in L3b he criticises commentators

---

75. “...um nicht weitläufig zu werden, in Wenkenbach’s edition, 412, l.18: *tağannuban minnī li-l-*

who offer interpretations of the Hippocratic text that are more incoherent, obscure and difficult to understand than the original. Interpretations that do not have either quality are unlikely to instill conviction in the reader that what they have read is a true representation of Hippocrates' intended meaning.

We may summarise the characteristics that exegesis should have according to the meta-exegetical discussions scattered throughout Galen's Hippocratic commentaries.

- 1) Follow the exegetical principles to which the author himself subscribed;
- 2) Demonstration is not a suitable element in medical exegesis
- 3) Arguments about whether a certain doctrine is true or false have no place in Galen's view of the types of activities proper to commentary;
- 4) No interpreter has the right to believe that his own interpretation is the correct one;
- 5) There is no need to mention any other interpretations of the text when the author's intent is clear. Galen says that the only time he feels the need to mention interpretations offered by other commentators is when he cannot make sense of Hippocrates' words and he is not sure that he has understood Hippocrates correctly;
- 6) He recommends, rather, to limit oneself to well-known commentaries and to those that "provide a satisfactory interpretation of the text";
- 7) Commentaries have to be useful to their ability to expand our medical knowledge by deduction from medical principles that supply the causes for the observed phenomena;
- 8) Preserving the author's intended meaning is accomplished by referring to other parts of the author's corpus of medical writings;
- 9) Commentary should instill *conviction* that the interpretation of Hippocrates is correct. This is achieved by making the commentary *to the point*, and ensuring that it is stated *clearly*.

### 3.2 *Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī's Doubts on Galen: A "Commentary?"*

---

*taṭwīl.*



Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī was deeply influenced by Galen. In the introduction to *Doubts on Galen*, Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā records the fact that he owes Galen a debt of gratitude greater than he owes to any other person.<sup>76</sup> Yet, it is clear that Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā is not thinking only of his debt to Galen's philosophical learning and medical lore. From his words, it is clear that he sought to imitate Galen's philosophical praxis as well as Galen's views about the relationship between truth and argumentation. Indeed, he considered a firm, even tenacious commitment to arguing about truth as a central tenant in Galen's philosophical praxis. This element of Galen's philosophical and medical legacy left a lasting impact on Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's writing. Indeed, it is evident from the introduction to *Doubts on Galen* that imitating this very aspect of Galen's philosophical praxis inspired him more than any motive.<sup>77</sup>

وبودي يشهد الله أن هذه الشكوك التي ذكرتها في هذا الكتاب لم تكن في كتب هذا الرجل الحبر الفاضل ... لكن صناعة الطب والفلسفة لا تحتتمل التسليم للرؤساء والقبول منهم ولا مساهلتهم وترك الاستقصاء عليهم ولا الفيلسوف يحب ذلك من تلاميذه والمتعلمين منه كما قد ذكر ذلك أيضا جالينوس في كتابه في منافع الأعضاء حيث وبخ الذين يكلفون أتباعهم وأشييعهم القبول منهم بلا برهان. وكان أكثر ما جرأني وسهل علي أن هذا الرجل لو كان حيا حاضرا لم يلمني على تأليف هذا الكتاب ولم يتقل ذلك عليه إشارا منه للحق وحا لتقصي المباحث بلبوغ أواخر لها بل كان يجد ونشاط إلى تصفحه والنظر فيه وإما حل جميع الشكوك التي فيه وحمدني على أن صرت سببا لأن يكون كلامه في هذه المواضع السكوك فيها صار له فضل بيان وحراسة عن المطاعن على ما كان عليه قبل وإما رجع عنه كلها فكان يحمدني حمدا أكثر إذ صرت منبها له على السهو والغفلة الموكلة بالبشر وإما حل بعضها ورجع عن بعض وكان يجتمع فيه الأمران.

With God as my witness, I wish these doubts that I have mentioned in this book were not in the books of this eminent, learned man .... Yet, the arts of philosophy and medicine do not tolerate submitting to authorities, [uncritically] accepting [what they say], indulging them and refraining from taking their words at face-value. Nor did Aristotle (literally, “the philosopher (*al-faylasūf*)”) like to see this in his disciples and the people who learn from him, as Galen himself has mentioned in his book *On the Uses of the Parts of the Body*,

76. Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī, *Kitāb al-šukūk li-l-Rāzī*, ed. Muṣṭafā L. ‘Abd al-Ġanī (Cairo: Maṭba‘at dār al-kutub wa-l-waṭā‘iq al-qawmīya, 2005), 39.

77. Ibid., 40–1.

where he censured those who demand that their followers and adherents accept them without proof. Yet, what encouraged me above all else and what facilitated me was the fact that were this man alive and present [in front of us], he would not have rebuked me for composing this book, nor would that have vexed him, for he used to esteem truth, liked to undertake exhaustive investigations and to reach the limits of them. Rather, he would have turned to scrutinise and examine them with due earnestness and diligence, in which case he would have resolved all the doubts that are in it and praised me because I would have become a reason for the fact that his words in this or that doubtful passage benefit from greater clarity and are fortified against reprobation based on what he had affirmed previously; or, he would renounce all of them, in which case he would praise me even more since I would have drawn his attention to the forgetfulness and inattentiveness that mankind has been burdened with; or he would have resolved some and renounced some, in which case both [reasons for Galen's praise] would have accrued to me.

Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā looked to Galen's own example for reassurance that he was being faithful to Galen's legacy whilst writing *Doubts on Galen* in a way that was both (1) exhaustive and (2) directed not towards clarifying Galen's words when they were unclear, but showing that Galen's views are false, contradictory or lack corroborating evidence. Following Galen's example, then, Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā sought to settle whether a huge number of philosophical and medical doctrines collected from Galen's entire corpus were, in fact, true or false by supplying evidence, constructing proofs, bringing forward counterexamples, and highlighting contradictory statements in different texts in the Galenic corpus. He justifies the fact that *Doubts on Galen* was written to be (1) exhaustive by alluding to the fact that Galen himself "liked to undertake exhaustive investigations and to reach the limits of them." He justifies the fact that *Doubts on Galen* is written to be (2) critical and directed by dialectical ends because he saw that Galen esteemed truth highly, to the extent that he believed that Galen would never fail to defer to the true doctrine once it was demonstrated to him.

Of course, other Greek philosophers stood as philosophical exemplars for Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā, particularly philosophers who are famous for criticising the authors and teacher to whom

they owed the greatest debt, such as Aristotle and Plato, Theophrastus and Aristotle, and Themistius and Aristotle.<sup>78</sup> He respects the fact that in each case the student deferred ultimately to the doctrine he felt was true rather than to the doctrine his teacher had held. Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā includes Galen among these august personalities. He admired, too, Galen's attitude toward truth mixed with a "tireless" polemic against false doctrines. It was Galen's deference to truth combined with an exhaustive and relentless (if not frequently long-winded) pursuit of it that impressed Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā about Galen's philosophical example and what he sought to imitate in *Doubts on Galen*.<sup>79</sup>

فأما جالينوس فلست أحتاج أن أقول في كثرة رده على القدماء والأجلة من أهل زمانه وصبره على ذلك وقوته والإطالة فيه إذ كان ذلك أكثر من أن أحصيه وإذ ذلك بين لقارئ كتبه أن ذلك أعظم همته ولا أحسب نجا منه أحد من الفلاسفة ولا من الأطباء إلا مشدوخا وجل كلامه عليهم حق بل لو شئت لقلت كله حق. وذلك مما يدل على سعة علمه وذكاء طبعه وكثرة تحصيله.

[L6] I do not need to speak about how frequently Galen used to refute the ancients and the eminent thinkers of his age, how tirelessly he [pursued them], how forceful it [his refutation] was, nor how extensive. For it [refutation] was more than can be enumerated, and it is evident to anyone who reads his books that this was what occupied him the most. I reckon that not a single one of the philosophers and physicians escaped his criticism without being devastated by it. Most of what he said criticising them was true; indeed, one could say all of it was true. This indicates how vast his knowledge was, how quick-witted his nature, and how many sources he used to draw from (*wa-kaṭrati taḥṣīliḥi*).

This is how Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā characterises Galen's refutations and polemics against his predecessors and contemporaries. Yet, it equally characterises his own objectives and the structure of *Doubts on Galen*. These, then, are the motives that precipitated Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's critical activity in *Doubts on Galen*, and that structured the argument and content of the book. Given the nine elements of good commentary and interpretation that Galen prescribed in his Hippocrat-

---

78. al-Rāzī, *Kitāb al-ṣukūk*, 41.

79. Ibid., 42.

ic commentaries, it strikes me as unlikely that Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā would have classed the critical activity he engages in *Doubts on Galen* as *commentary* or *interpretive* activity. In the Greek philosophical and medical commentary tradition, Galen observes that, as a matter of course, commentators engaged in polemical debates about the objective truth of this or that doctrine. They constructed proofs, cited empirical evidence, highlight contradictory statements in different texts, defended Hippocrates or Aristotle from criticism, or even, as Galen sometimes does, criticises Hippocrates for various reasons. All these activities are directed at resolving whether a certain Hippocratic doctrine is true. And all these activities Galen excludes from falling with the scope of proper commentary activity. For me, this suggests that Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā composed *Doubts on Galen* in imitation of Galen's philosophical and medical praxis, which aimed at thoroughly and critically discovering, corroborating and defending true doctrines, refuting and uncovering false doctrines, all the while avoiding partisanship and unthinking deference to medical and philosophical authority. He did not, in other words, compose *Doubts on Galen* in imitation of Galen's exegetical method in his Hippocratic commentaries.<sup>80</sup>

Based on his work on the commentary tradition on Avicenna's *Pointers and Reminders*, Robert Wisnovsky has identified several exegetical functions that verification (*taḥqīq*) in Avicenna's *Pointers* had.<sup>81</sup> Some of these techniques fall within the scope of the Galen's prescriptions about exegetical practice. Verification plays an expository role when commentators provide alternate readings of words and phrases based on their knowledge of *Pointers'* transmission history. Often this expository function is accomplished by using "synonyms to gloss key pieces of conceptual vocabulary" whilst at others they supply complete definitions.<sup>82</sup> Wisnovsky also observes that verification sometimes involved harmonising "apparently incongruent theories put forth by the

---

80. On the different styles and conditions under which the Hippocratic commentaries were written, see von Staden, "Staging the Past, Staging Oneself," 135–44.

81. Robert Wisnovsky, "Avicennism," 354–7.

82. Wisnovsky observes that these techniques were well-established among Greek Aristotelian commentators. See Wisnovsky, "Avicennism," 355.

*matn*'s author in other works with those found in the *matn*." Naturally, this agrees with Galen's stipulation that, whenever possible, the text under discussion should be interpreted using other texts in the Hippocratic corpus.

Galen would have excluded most of the other functions played by verification, however, as being unsuited to *commentary*. For example, Wisnovsky says that several functions of verification implied some *transformation* in the author's text: "Commentators supplied new proofs of propositions that were left unproven in the *matn*";<sup>83</sup> "[c]ommentators changed the order of proofs contained in the *matn*, or changed the order of the premises in those proofs; commentators made corrections to weak portions of proofs contained in the *matn*; commentators supplied replacement proofs for weaker proofs contained in the *matn*; and commentators criticized and revised the new proofs of previous commentators."<sup>84</sup> These activities not only violate the stipulation that proof and demonstration be avoided in commentary. They go directly against the ultimate purpose of the commentary, which is to make what clear what is obscure, whereas supplementing, fixing or replacing proofs in the text with alternative proofs seems to go well beyond the scope of commentary activity allowed by Galen. Wisnovsky says that verification frequently involved *harmonising* "the author's theories with the apparently incongruent theories of other authorities and schools. The commentator did this by excavating, and exposing, what he then argued was the true common basis underlying the apparently incongruent positions."<sup>85</sup> Once again, Galen did not believe that commentary on a Hippocratic text should involve non-Hippocratic *methods* or deriving insight from non-Hippocratic authorities, especially other Hippocratic commentators. Whereas Galen permits referring to the "famous" Hippocratic commentaries in exceptional circumstances, verification makes harmonising seeming incongruities between authorities a matter of course. Wisnovsky says: "When commentators found the theories set forth in the *matn* to be irreparable—or if they had no interest in repairing the author's *matn*, or systematizing the author's philosophy, or harmonizing the author's philosophical positions within the positions of apparent rivals—they

---

83. Ibid., 355.

84. Ibid., 356.

85. Ibid.

attacked and undermined the position expressed in the *matn*, and presented proofs in support of their own opposing positions.”<sup>86</sup> This last and what might be called most “radical” function of verification in the post-classical Islamic philosophical tradition is unambiguously excluded by Galen’s vision of how commentary should function. For Galen does not countenance outright rejection of the author’s doctrines. Verification is a commentary function in which the commentator constructs arguments about whether a certain doctrine is true or false. Not only does Galen frown on such activities in commentaries, Galen holds that in case the proper interpretation of the author’s words is in doubt, the commentator does not have the license to hold that his interpretation is the correct one.

It is clear, then, that the most fundamental functions that Galen assigns to medical commentary are incompatible with the functions that post-classical commentators assigned to verification. Likewise, while it is true that several of the vaguely “exegetical” tasks that Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā performs in *Doubts on Galen* are tasks that a “verifying” commentator would undertake as well, to my mind it is hardly likely that Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā compose this book in his capacity as a Galenic commentator, as a *šāriḥ* or *mufassir*, but in his capacity as a philosopher who has taken Galen as his exemplar. As a consequence, when Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī wrote his commentary on the *Canon* using the verifying mode of commentary on Avicenna’s philosophical works, this appears to have been a watershed moment in the history of Islamic medical discourse. I shall argue that this was in fact a watershed moment in the next section by looking at how the late thirteenth-century Melkite physician Abū al-Faraġ Ibn al-Quff referred to Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary, and imitated Faḥr al-Dīn’s method in his great commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*.

#### 4 The Legacy of the Commentary on the *Canon* in Medical Writing at the end of the Thirteenth Century

##### 4.1 *Ibn al-Quff and Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī on Swelling: An Exchange*

The “exchange” between Ibn al-Quff and Faḥr al-Dīn is precipitated by *Aphorisms* iv.72, in which Hippocrates speaks about the prognostic value of urine:<sup>87</sup>

---

86. Ibid., 356–7.

87. Greek: Magdelaine, “Histoire,” 2:426. Arabic: Galen, *Tafsīr Ġālīnūs li-Fuṣūl Abuqrāṭ*, trans.

Ὅκόςοισιν οὐρα διαφανέα λευκά, πονηρά· μάλιστα δὲ ἐν τοῖσι φρενιτικοῖσιν ἐπιφαίνεται.

قال أبقراط: إذا كان البول شفافاً أبيض فهو رديء وخاصة في الحميات التي يكون معها ورم الدماغ.

Hippocrates said: when urine is transparent and white, it is a bad sign, especially in fevers that are accompanied by swelling in the brain.

Ibn al-Quff divides his commentary on this aphorism into seven investigations, in the third of which he takes the opportunity to speak at length about what Hippocrates means when he says that clear urine is “accompanied by swelling in the brain (*yakūnu ma‘ahā waramu l-dimāġ=en toisi phrenetikoisin epiphainetai*).” Ibn al-Quff discusses different kinds of fevers each of which is accompanied by swelling in the brain. He mentions several different types, such as phrenitis (*farānīṭis, al-sirsām*<sup>88</sup>), erysipelas (*al-ḥumra*) and lethargic fever (*lītarġūs*<sup>89</sup>) and a form of swelling with very severe symptoms called “*ṣubārā(?)*<sup>90</sup>.” This classification of fevers is derived directly from the *Canon*, Book Three, in which fevers in the head are discussed.<sup>91</sup> Common to all these diseases as they are described in the *Canon* is the fact that the brain is affected by swelling. The claim that the brain swells is what provokes Ibn al-Quff to cite Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā and Faḥr al-Dīn’s defense of Avicenna’s doctrine in the *Canon* that bones and the brain swell against Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā’s view that they do not.<sup>92</sup>

---

Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq, ed. Taro Mimura (The University of Manchester, 2012–2017), doi: 10.3927/51931732.

88. Manfred Ullmann, *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), 742 [Entry ἡ φρενίτις]. Avicenna, *Canon*, 2:44.

89. Ullmann, *Wörterbuch*, 391 [Entry ὁ (ἡ) λήθαργος]. Avicenna, *Canon*, 2:50.

90. Avicenna, *Canon*, 2:50.

91. *Ibid.*, 44–52.

92. Ibn al-Quff (d. 1286), *Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms*, ed. ARABCOMMAPH (The University of Manchester, 2012–2017), doi: 10.3927/52132103. MS, London, British Library, Or. 1348 suppl., fols. 122b, l.42–3a, l.13.

إذا عرفت هذا فنقول: ذهب الرازي في كتابه المعروف بالفاخر إلى أن الدماغ لا يرم وكذلك العظم. قال: "وذلك لأن حدوث الورم موقوف على التمديد فما لا يقبل التمديد لا يرم. والعظم لا يقبل التمديد لصلايته فلا يرم. وأما الدماغ فإنه للينة لا يقبل التمديد فلا يرم." وذهب الرئيس إلى أنهما يرمان. قال في الفصل الخامس والعشرين من كليات القانون حيث تكلم في الأمراض المركبة: "والورم يعرض للأعضاء اللينة وقد يعرض للعظام شيء شبيه بالورم ويغلظ له حجمها ويزداد طولها ولا يغرب أن يكون القابل للزيادة بالنمو يقبلها بالفضل إذا نفذ فيه." قال الإمام فخر الدين محتجا للشيخ: قول الرازي إن العظم لا يرم وكذلك الدماغ قول فاسد من وجوه خمسة...

Having understood this, we say: "In his book that is known as *The Outstanding [Book]* (*al-Fāḥir*) [Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā] al-Rāzī holds that the brain does not swell, nor does bone. He said: 'That is because the occurrence of swelling depends on expanding, for what does not expand does not swell. Yet, bone is not prone to expand because it is hard, so it does not swell. Owing to the fact that the brain is soft the brain does not expand, and so it does not swell.' Avicenna holds, however, that they both expand, for in the twenty-fifth (sic) chapter of the *Generalities* of the *Canon* where he speaks about compounds diseases, he says: 'Swelling affects the soft body parts, and sometimes the bones are affected by something that resembles swelling, making their bulk viscous and they increase in length. Nor is it unlikely that what is prone to increase in size by growing is also prone to increase in size by superfluity when it penetrates it.' Adducing evidence in support of Avicenna, Faḥr al-Dīn says that Rāzī's statement that neither the bones nor the brain swells is false (*fāsid*) on the basis five considerations..."

Ibn al-Quff then carefully paraphrases Faḥr al-Dīn's five arguments against what the latter called Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's "minor premise (*ṣuḡrāhu*)" that the bones and brain do not expand. After this synopsis Ibn al-Quff weighs in on the debate. First, he presents what he believes the counterarguments Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā would have constructed against Faḥr al-Dīn's criticisms based on the medical theory that both thinkers shared. Ibn al-Quff defends Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā, pointing out that Faḥr al-Dīn focused on the wrong sense of expansion in his *Canon* commentary, and that it is "not possible to compare" these senses with each other. After reviewing the arguments, Ibn al-Quff says that "if we judge impartially (*idā anṣafnā*)," Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā is correct in thinking that the bones do not swell. Ibn al-Quff agrees with Faḥr al-Dīn in principle



that the brain swells, but he does not make use of Faḥr al-Dīn's arguments, relying, rather, on medical experience (or reports based on medical experience) to argue that the brain swells. Lastly, Ibn al-Quff exculpates Avicenna from error by drawing attention to the fact that, when read with proper care, Avicenna does not say explicitly that the bones swell.

وللرازي أن يجيب عن هذا الأول ويقول التمديد الحاصل للعظم والدماغ بانمو غير التمديد الحاصل لهما بالورم من جهة الفاعل والمادة ونفس التمديد. أما الفاعل فإن الفاعل للمنو الطبيعية البدنية الموكلة بتدبير البدن والفاعل للورم دفع الطبيعة للمادة المورمة أو حركتها أو هي بنفسها. وأما المادة فإن مادة النمو مادة صالحة مألوفة ومادة الورم فاسدة مؤذية. وأما نفس التمديد فإن الزيادة في النمو في الأقطار الثلاثة على التناسب الطبيعي. والزيادة في الورم في بعض الأقطار دون بعض. وإذا كان النمو مغايرا للتمديد بهذه الأمور فلا يجوز أن يقاس أحدها على الآخر. والجواب عن الثاني أن نفوذ الغذاء في جوهر الأعضاء أمر طبيعي مألوف. وإذا كان كذلك فلا يلزم من قبول الطبيعي قبول ما ليس بطبيعي. والجواب عن الثالث قوله إن الدماغ لزج إما أن يعني باللزوجة الدسومة أو غلظ القوام مع قبول التمديد كالمخاط. فإن عني بها الأول فتلك لم تقبل التمديد حتى تتورم. وإن عني بها الثاني فهو باطل فإن التشريح قد دلنا على أن جوهر الدماغ ليس هو كذلك. والجواب عن الرابع أن سواد الأسنان واخضرارها لا تقارنه زيادة البتة. وإذا كان كذلك فليس ذلك لقبول فضل وارد عليها بل ذلك لفساد مزاجها في نفسها بحيث أنها لم يحل الغذاء الوارد عليها على ما ينبغي وتغتذي به. والجواب عن الخامس ما ذكرناه في الأول أو نقول لو ورمت الأسنان وحصل لها ما ذكره فلا ينبغي أن يقاس عليها العظام فإن جوهرها غير جوهر العظام ويدل على هذا العقل والنقل. أما الأول فمن وجهين أحدهما أنها أقوى حسا من العظام بل الأطباء يعتقدون أن العظام عديمة الحس والأسنان لها حس. وأما الثاني فإننا إذا عرضنا الأسنان للفساد فإننا نرى الفساد يسرى إلى بعضها دون بعض ويظهر هذا ظهورا بينا في أسنان الحيوانات العظيمة الجثث. وأما النقل فإن الإمام أبقراط يقول في خامسة الفصول البارد ضار للعظام والأسنان والعصب والدماغ والنخاع. وأما الحار فنافع موافق لها. فأفرد الأسنان بالذكر ميزها عن العظام.

واعلم أنا إذا أنصفنا في هذه المسألة كان الحق فيها مع الرازي في أمر العظام ودون الدماغ. ولذلك لم يجزم الشيخ الرئيس بحدوث الورم فيها. بل قال يعرض لها شيء شبيه بالورم يغلظ له حجمها ويزداد طولها ولا يغرب أن يكون القابل للزيادة بالنمو يقبل الزيادة بالفضل. ومع هذا فهذا القدر الذي ذكره إنما يمشي ويصح في سن المنو لأن الأعضاء فيه تكون قابلة للنمو. وأما الدماغ فإن جرمه يرم خلافا لما ذكره الرازي حتى أنه في بعض الأوقات تتفسخ الشؤون ويتفسخ عظم القحف.

[Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā] Rāzī would reply to this first [objection], saying: "The expanding that happens to the bone and the brain by growing differs from the expanding that occurs to them when they swell with regard to the efficient cause, the material [substrate], and the stretching itself. The efficient cause of growing is the bodily nature that is responsible for managing the body. The efficient cause of swelling is the nature that repels the matter that causes the swelling, or that the matter moves or the matter itself. The material

[substrate] of growth is matter that is healthy and is what the body is accustomed to, whereas swelling matter is spoiled and harmful. As for the expansion itself, the increase in size by growing is in three dimensions according to the natural proportions, whereas the expanding that happens from swelling is in some dimensions and not in others. Thus, seeing that growth differs from expanding in these three ways, it is not possible to compare one of them with the other.” The response to the second [objection] is that the way that nutriment penetrates the body parts’ substance is something familiar and customary. That being the case, that [the body part] accepts what is not natural does not follow from the fact that the body parts accept what is natural. The response to the third [criticism]: “When he says that the brain is viscous, he is referring either to the fact that it is greasy or that its substance is viscous whilst also having the capacity to stretch, such as what is fibrous. If by this [statement] he refers to the first sense [namely, that it is greasy], this is not liable to stretching so that it swells. If, by it, he means the second [sense of viscous], [his statement] is false, for anatomy shows us that the brain’s substance is not like that.” The response to the fourth [criticism] is that the teeth becoming black and green is not accompanied by an increase [in size] at all. If this were so, it would not be because it receives the superfluities that give it nutriment. It is, rather, because the tooth’s mixture itself is corrupted so that the food that comes to it does not dissolve in the manner that it should when it receives nutriment. The response to the fifth [criticism] is like what was mentioned in connection with the first [criticism]. Or, he should say: “Even if the teeth were to swell and what he describes were to happen, it would still not be appropriate to compare them to bones because their substance is not like the bones’ substance.” Both reason and authoritative text (*al-‘aql wa-l-naql*) indicate that this is true. [Reason indicates it is true] from two considerations. The first is that they [teeth] are more sensitive than bones. The physicians even believe that the bones do not have any sensation, whilst the teeth have sensation. The second consideration is that when we expose the teeth to corruption, we see that the corruption flows to some of them but not to others. This [phenomenon] is evident in the teeth of animals with large carcasses. The proof from authoritative texts is that in the fifth book of the *Aphorisms*, Hippocrates says: “Cold harms the bones, teeth, nerves,

brain and spinal marrow. Hot brings benefit and is favourable for them.” Thus he singled out the teeth for mention to differentiate them from the bones.

If we judge impartially on this question, know that Rāzī is correct with regard to the bones but not the brain. For this reason Avicenna did not make a definitive statment about swelling affects them. He said: “Something that resembles swelling, thickening its bulk thereby and increasing it in length. Nor is it unlikely that what is liable to increasing in size by growing is also liable to increasing in size by superfluity.” Nevertheless, this capacity that he mentions only holds and is true in relation to the age of growth because during it the body parts are liable to growing. Contrary to what Rāzī mentions, on the other hand, the brain swells, so much so that at times the cranial sutures and the bones in the cranium burst.

The similarities between the macrostructure of Ibn al-Quff’s commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* and Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary on the *Canon* are evident. What is more, in Ibn al-Quff we find the techniques of verification being used in a more refined manner than we find them in Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary on the *Canon*. The manner in which Ibn al-Quff defends the absent Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā recalls the “painstaking investigation (*al-istiḡṣā*)” that Faḥr al-Dīn claimed in later works to practice, where in the case that he did not find “in the sources of the proponents of that thought-system to support their views,” he would “come up with the best defense possible to affirm these views.”<sup>93</sup> It is noteworthy that Ibn al-Quff does not construct counterarguments in defense of Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā’s views because he fully agrees with them, but because this kind of rigorous consideration of all aspects of the argument was required by the model of exegesis he followed, in which impartiality (*al-inṣāf*), played a central role. It is his commitment to impartial consideration of Faḥr al-Dīn’s, Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā’s and Avicenna’s views that leads Ibn al-Quff to disagree with all of them and to offer his own views on the matter. Once again, Ibn al-Quff’s impartiality recalls another pillar of Faḥr al-Dīn’s exegetical method, namely the anti-

---

93. Quoted from *Frontiers of the Intellects (Nihāyāt al-‘uqūl)*, quoted and translated in Shihadeh, “Al-Rāzī’s Commentary,” 300.

thetical attitude he adopts toward partisanship. For Faḥr al-Dīn as well as Ibn al-Quff, it seems, in order to arrive at the truth, it was important to understand and critique earlier systems, but also “steer clear of both the traditional Avicennists’ uncritical imitation and the counter-Avicennists’ fixation on refutation.”<sup>94</sup> Like Faḥr al-Dīn, the goal of the critical attitude that Ibn al-Quff adopts toward Avicenna, Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā and Faḥr al-Dīn is not to engage in refutation or apologetic as an end in themselves; the criticism is, for Faḥr al-Dīn as well as Ibn al-Quff, “methodical.”<sup>95</sup> Finally, Ibn al-Quff’s appeal to “reason and authoritative texts (*al-‘aql wa-l-naql*)” recalls a familiar practice in Faḥr al-Dīn’s exegetical repertoire in the *Canon of Medicine*. Whereas in other authors in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the idea of authoritative text (*naql*) means texts such as Qur’ān and *ḥadīth*, for Faḥr al-Dīn as well as for the Melkite Christian Ibn al-Quff *naql* here does not mean revelation, but any other authoritative medical or philosophical text, such as Hippocrates’ *Aphorisms*, Avicenna’s *Canon* or, as we shall see below, thy physics of *The Healing*. In other words, we find that how Ibn al-Quff thinks about medical authority and the task of medical commentary mirrors to a great degree how Faḥr al-Dīn thought about philosophical authority and the task of philosophical commentary. For Faḥr al-Dīn, methodically criticising Avicenna’s philosophical works using Avicenna’s writings as well as the works of earlier authors was not only the best way to comment on a text by Avicenna, but also to compose original works in philosophy. There is no question that Hippocrates and Galen remained central to Ibn al-Quff’s thought. As we have seen, however, there is a sense in his commentary practices, in which Avicenna now occupied a privileged position, methodically criticising Avicenna’s medical and philosophical works as modeled by Faḥr al-Dīn was the the best way to comment not only on Avicenna’s texts, but on Hippocrates’ *Aphorisms* as well.<sup>96</sup>

#### 4.2 Ibn al-Quff (d. 1286) and Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī on Pain and Pleasure: The Other

---

94. Ibid., 299.

95. Ibid.

96. These conclusions are noteworthy. They are not surprising, however, given Ibn al-Quff’s education at the hands of Faḥr al-Dīn’s students such as al-Ḥusrawšāhī and other physicians who engaged in the *Canon*-commentary tradition, such as al-Sāmīrī, Ibn al-Nafīs and Ibn al-Minfāḥ.

## Exchange

Pain and pleasure were apparently a point of considerable dispute among medieval Islamic physicians. As we saw at the beginning of this article, Ibn al-Quff identifies three distinct positions in the debate. Ibn al-Quff says that Galen held that pain is caused by dissolution of continuity only, not noxious irregular mixtures; Avicenna believed that both cause pain; and Averroes and Faḥr al-Dīn held that only noxious irregular mixtures cause pain. Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on this section of the *Canon* centres on two major problems relating to pain and pleasure: first, the definition of pain and pleasure; second, their aetiology. In order to draw out elements of Ibn al-Quff's and Faḥr al-Dīn's exegetical practice, the following discussion will focus on questions relating to the aetiology of pain.

Faḥr al-Dīn disputes Avicenna's and Galen's views on the aetiology of pain, holding that that noxious irregular mixtures *of any quality* can cause pain intrinsically, not just irregular mixtures of the active qualities. For in the *Canon of Medicine*, Avicenna held that while both dissolution of continuity and noxious mixtures cause pain, in the case of the latter, the mixtures must be of the active qualities, cold and hot, rather than the passive qualities, dry and moist. The latter, according to Avicenna, do not cause pain, intrinsically, that is, because they are noxious mixtures. Rather, they cause pain because they lead to dissolution of continuity, which in such a scenario is the real cause of the pain. Faḥr al-Dīn feels that this distinction is not consistently upheld in Avicenna's writings, alluding to a key passage in *On the Soul*, in which Avicenna seems to hold the opposite view. Faḥr al-Dīn says:

البحث الرابع وهو أن الشيخ زعم أنه ليس كل سوء مزاج مختلف مؤلماً بل الحار والبارد مؤلمان بالذات واليابس مؤلم بالعرض لأنه يتبعه تفرق الاتصال من شدة التقييض. وأما الرطب لا يؤلم البتة لأن الحار والبارد كقيمتان فعالتان واليابس والرطب كقيمتان انفعالتان فوامهما ليس بأن يؤثر بهما جسم في جسم بل بأن يتأثر من جسم. واعلم أنك قد عرفت أن عند الشيخ سوء المزاج سبب ذاتي للألم وعند جالينوس سوء المزاج إنما يؤلم لأنه يتبعه تفرق الاتصال. فإذا أخذنا بمذهب جالينوس لزم أن يقال الحار والبارد مؤلمان لأن من شأنهما تفرق الاتصال وليس من شأن الرطب واليابس ذلك. وأما إذا أخذنا بمذهب الشيخ بطل هذا الفرق. بل يجب أن يحكم بأن سوء المزاج الرطب أو اليابس مؤلمان بالذات لأن حد الألم عنده إدراك المنافي والرطب واليابس الخارجان عن الاعتدال منافيان فيكون إدراكهما إدراكاً للمنافي وهذا هو نفس الوجع. فإن قيل: الشيء إنما يحس إذا انفعال عنه غيره والرطوبة واليبوسة كقيمتان انفعالتان لا فاعلتان فلا ينفعل الحاس عنهما فلا يدركهما. وإذا لم يمكن إدراكهما لم يكونا موجعين بالذات. فنقول: إن الشيخ في كتاب النفس

بين فساد قول من يقول الرطوبة واليبوسة غير محسوسين بحاسة اللمس. وبين في فصول الاسطقسات أن الرطوبة بمعنى سرعة القبول للأشكال غير محسوسة. والظاهر أنه أراد بالرطوبة التي زعم أنها محسوسة البلة. وعلى الجملة فلا شك أن الرطوبة بمعنى البلة محسوسة. وإن شئت الاستقصاء في ذلك فارجع إلى ما قاله في الفصل الثالث من المقالة الثانية من علم النفس من الشفاء لتطمئن نفسك.

The fourth investigation, which is that the *Šayḥ* thought (*zaʿama*) that not every irregular noxious mixture is painful, but that the hot and the cold are painful intrinsically, and the dry is painful accidentally because dissolution of continuity accompanies it because the contracting it causes is intense. On the other hand, the moist is not painful at all. This is because the hot and the cold are active qualities, and the dry and the moist are passive qualities. Their substance is not such that through them a body makes an impression on another body, but a body is impressed by a body.

Know that you have learned that according to the *Šayḥ*, the noxious mixture is an intrinsic cause of pain, whereas according to Galen, the noxious mixture is painful because dissolution of continuity follows from it. If we were to adopt Galen's view, it would follow that one would say that hot and cold are painful because their nature is such that they dissolve continuity, but it is not in the nature of the moist and the dry to do that. If we were to adopt the *Šayḥ*'s view, this distinction would disappear. Rather, it is necessary to judge that the moist and dry noxious mixtures are painful intrinsically because the definition of pain according to him [Avicenna] is perceiving what is contrary, and the moist and the dry that diverge from the balance are what is contrary, and thus perceiving them is perceiving what is contrary; but this is precisely what pain is (*hādā huwa nafsu l-waġaʿi*).

If one were to say: "Something is sensed when something else is impressed by it; yet the moist and the dry are passive rather than active qualities. The sense faculty is not, therefore, impressed by them and so it does not perceive them; and if it is not possible that they are perceived, they are not intrinsically painful." We say: "In the *Book of the Soul*, the *Šayḥ* demonstrates that the statement of the one who says that the moist and the dry are not sensed by the faculty of touch is false. In the chapters on the elementary qualities, he demonstrates that the moist is not sensed, when it has the sense of *being quick to accept*

*forms*. It is apparent, however, that by the moist that he thinks is sensed he refers to wetness. In sum, there is not doubt that the moist is sensed. If you desire to investigate the question exhaustively, refer to what he says in Chapter Three, Discourse Two of *On the Soul of The Healing* to reassure yourself.”

There are several premises that Faḥr al-Dīn brings to bear in this argument. It seems he has something like the following syllogism—string of Barbaras in fact—in mind.

(P1) Every kind of irregular mixture is sensed by the sense faculties (disputed); (P2) every irregular mixture sensed by the sense faculties is perceived (granted because every sensation (*ḥiss*) is a kind of perception (*idrāk*); (P3) every perception of the irregular mixture is perception of what is contrary (granted, *idrākun l-l-munāfi*); (P4) every perception of what is contrary is painful (definition of pain); (Conclusion) therefore every kind of irregular mixture is painful.

In order to arrive at the sought after Conclusion, Faḥr al-Dīn takes Premises 2–4 for granted in this investigation. P2 is assumed because sensation (*al-ḥiss*) is a species of perception (*al-idrāk*). P3, namely that an irregular mixture is something that is contrary to the natural balance, is premise that is put forward as early as Galen, who held that an irregular mixture of the (active) qualities may cause pain by generating dissolution of continuity in a body part. It is also a topic that Faḥr al-Dīn discusses at some length in investigation three in the commentary on this section of the *Canon*. Finally, P4 is simply the definition of pain stated by Avicenna at the beginning of this section of the *Canon*, which Faḥr al-Dīn discusses in investigation one. P1 is disputed, however, and receives all Faḥr al-Dīn’s attention in investigation four above. For in the *Canon* Avicenna argues that not every kind of irregular mixture is sensed by the sense faculties directly; only the ones that leave an impression on the sense faculties directly (hot and cold). On the contrary, the passive qualities are by definition not able leave an impression, so they are not sensed directly. So they are not perceived. To argue for P1 and undermine Avicenna in the *Canon*, he cites Avicenna in *The Healing*:<sup>97</sup>

---

97. Avicenna, *Avicenna’s De Anima*, ed. Fazlur Rahman (London: Oxford University Press,

والأمور التي تلمس فإن المشهور من أمرها أنها الحرارة والبرودة والرطوبة واليبوسة والخشونة والملاسة والثقل والخفة ، وأما الصلابة واللين واللزوجة والهشاشة وغير ذلك فإنها تحس تبعاً لهذه المذكورة. فالحرارة والبرودة كل منهما يحس بذاته لا لما يعرض في الآلة من الانفعال بها ، وأما الصلابة واللين واليبوسة والرطوبة فيظن أنها لا تحس لذاتها بل يعرض للرطوبة أن تطيع لنفوذ ما ينفذ في جسمها ويعرض لليبوسة أن تعصى فتجتمع العضو الحاس وتعصره، والخشونة أيضاً يعرض لها مثل ذلك بأن تحدث الأجزاء الناتية منه عصراً ولا تحدث الغائرة شيئاً، والأملس يحدث ملاسة واستواء ، وأما الثقل فيحدث تمعداً إلى أسفل والخفة خلاف ذلك. فنقول لمن يقول هذا القول إنه ليس من شرط المحسوس بالذات أن يكون الإحساس به من غير انفعال يكون منه ، فإن الحار أيضاً ما لم يسخن لم يحس وبالْحَقِيقَةُ لَيْسَ إِنَّمَا يَحْسُ مَا فِي الْمَحْسُوسِ بَلْ مَا يَحْدُثُ مِنْهُ فِي الْحَاسِ حَتَّى أَنَّهُ إِنْ لَمْ يَحْدُثْ ذَلِكَ لَمْ يَحْسُ بِهِ ، لَكِنِ الْمَحْسُوسُ بِالذَّاتِ هُوَ الَّذِي يَحْدُثُ مِنْهُ كَيْفِيَّةٌ فِي الْآلَةِ الْحَاسَةِ مُشَابِهَةٌ لِمَا فِيهِ فَيَحْسُ ، وَكَذَلِكَ الْإِنْعِصَارُ عَنِ الْيَابِسِ وَالْخَشْنِ ، وَالتَّمْلَسُ مِنَ الْأَمْلَسِ ، وَالتَّمَدُّدُ إِلَى جِهَةِ مَعْلُومَةٍ مِنَ الثَّقَلِ وَالْخَفِيفِ ، فَإِنَّ الثَّقَلَ وَالْخَفَةَ مِيلَانِ وَالتَّمَدُّدُ أَيْضاً مِيلٌ إِلَى نَحْوِ جِهَةٍ مَا ، فَهَذِهِ الْأَحْوَالُ إِذَا حَدِثَتْ فِي الْآلَةِ أَحْسَ بِهَا لَا بِتَوْسِطِ حَرٍّ أَوْ بَرْدٍ أَوْ لَوْنٍ أَوْ طَعْمٍ أَوْ غَيْرِ ذَلِكَ مِنَ الْمَحْسُوسَاتِ حَتَّى كَانَ يَصِيرُ لِأَجْلِ ذَلِكَ الْمَتَوَسِّطِ غَيْرِ مَحْسُوسٍ أَوْلَى أَوْ غَيْرِ مَحْسُوسٍ بِالذَّاتِ بَلْ مَحْسُوساً ثَانِياً أَوْ بِالْعَرَضِ

The conventional view is that the conditions that are sensed by touch are that they are hot and cold, moist and dry, rough and smooth and heavy and light. Hard and soft, viscous and crumbly and others are sensed as a result of these aforementioned [qualities]. Hot and cold, therefore, are sensed in themselves, not as a consequence of the impression that is left on the faculty of sense by them. It is thought (*yuzannu*) that hard and soft, and dry and moist are not sensed intrinsically. Moisture, rather, [according to this doctrine] has the characteristic that it yields to what enters into its body; and the dry has the characteristic that it resists and so it contracts the sensitive body part and compresses it. The rough also has a similar character by which the parts that protrude from it [the rough object] and produce compression [on the sense faculty], whereas the parts that descend down do not produce anything [in the sense faculty]. The smooth produces smoothness and levelness. The heavy produces extending downward and the light is the opposite of that.

We say to the person who says this: "It is not a condition of the object that is sensed in itself that the perception is made without an impression. For as long as what is hot is not heated, it is not sensed. In reality, it is not what is in the sense object that is sensed, but



what it [the sense object] brings about in the sense faculty, such that if it were not to bring it about, it would not be sensed. The object that is sensed in itself, rather, is what produces a quality on the sensory faculty that resembles what is in it so that it [the sense object, sc. *al-maḥsūs*] is sensed. The case is similar in the case of the compressing that is caused by the dry and the rough, and the slipperiness caused by the smooth, and the expanding in the suitable direction in the case of the heavy and the light. For heaviness and lightness are a kind of inclination, likewise expanding is inclining in a certain direction. When these conditions, therefore, come about in the faculty of sense, it senses them [in themselves], not by means of hot, cold, colour, taste or some other type of object of sense such that it [the object of sense, sc. *al-maḥsūs*] should not be an object that is not sensed in a primary way, or object that is not sense in itself, but it is an object sensed in a secondary manner or accidentally.”

In this passage, Avicenna says that the moist and the dry are sensed by the sense faculties “in themselves (*li-dātihā*),” meaning *directly*, without the need for a mediating, active quality to leave an impression on the sense faculty. Avicenna says that what is sensed by the sense of touch is the quality that the sense object generates in the sense faculty; it does not perceive the sense object itself. The faculty that is responsible for the sense of touch does not sense the heavy object or the light object or the moist or dry object itself; it sense the qualities (for example, the inclination, the slipperiness, the compression, the expanding, the wetness) that these object imbue the sense faculty with. Faḥr al-Dīn seems to think, then, that when we understand the perception of qualities this way, there is some incompatibility between Avicenna’s statement in the *Canon* and *The Healing*. In the *Canon*, Avicenna holds that pain is caused by an noxious irregular mixture of only the active qualities, cold and hot, whereas the moist and dry are passive, so they do not cause pain. Yet, it is clear that in *On the Soul*, Avicenna says that not only cold and hot but also sense objects that have moist and dry qualities have the capacity to leave an impression on the sense faculties in such a way that they are perceived. Faḥr al-Dīn argues, in effect, that based on Avicenna’s words in *On the Soul*, dry and moist are active qualities, in the sense that they too can leave an impression on the sense faculties. Yet, if we admit that they are active qualities, then irregular mixtures of dry and

moist should be able to cause pain. Thus, in this investigation in the commentary on the *Canon*, Faḥr al-Dīn seeks, in effect, to bring the views Avicenna expresses in the *Canon* into line with the views he expresses in *The Healing*.

We have seen that the aetiology of pain consumes a large portion of Faḥr al-Dīn's attention in the commentary on the *Canon*. The same is true of Ibn al-Quff. We pick up the the story of the exchange between Ibn al-Quff and Faḥr al-Dīn in the sixth investigation in Ibn al-Quff's commentary on *Aphorisms* ii.72, in which Ibn al-Quff offers an overview of the what Galen and Avicenna had said about aetiology of pain in their works. The discussion here is broader than the one Faḥr al-Dīn discusses in investigation four above. Here, Ibn al-Quff is interested in resolving the question of whether dissolution of continuity *alone* causes pain, a point that, as we shall see, Faḥr al-Dīn argues for at length in the third investigation of his commentary on this portion of the *Canon*. Where Ibn al-Quff says that Galen thought that pain was caused by dissolution of continuity *exclusively*, Avicenna held that an irregular noxious mixture also caused pain. Investigation six surveys a number of arguments for the view that dissolution of continuity causes pain. Table 2 presents the argumentative macrostructure of Ibn al-Quff's sixth investigation.

- A. Summary of the contents of the investigation
- B. Proof for the position that dissolution of continuity causes pain
1. Ibn al-Quff supplies one proof in Galen's name
- C. Proofs for the position that a noxious irregular mixture causes pain
1. There are five proofs
    - a. Avicenna's three proofs
      - i. Proof One
      - ii. Proof Two
      - iii. Proof Three
    - b. Faḥr al-Dīn's proof
      - i. Proof Four
    - c. Ibn al-Quff's proof
      - i. Proof Five
- D. Objections to five proofs
- a. Objection to Proof One (copied from Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary)
    - i. First doubt on Faḥr al-Dīn's Objection to Proof One
    - ii. Second doubt on Faḥr al-Dīn's Objection to Proof One
  - b. Objections to Proof Two
    - i. Objection One
    - ii. Objection Two
  - c. Objection to Proof Three
  - d. Objection to Proof Four
  - e. Objection to Proof Five
- E. Survey of Faḥr al-Dīn position that the noxious irregular mixture is the intrinsic cause of pain and the dissolution of continuity does not cause pain
- a. Five proofs
    - i. Proof One
    - ii. Proof Two
    - iii. Proof Three
    - iv. Proof Four
    - v. Proof Five
- F. Rebuttal of Faḥr al-Dīn's proofs for his position (stated in E)
1. Rebuttal (*ḡawāb*) of Proof One
    - i. First Rebuttal of Proof One
    - ii. Second Rebuttal of Proof One
  2. Rebuttal of Proof Two
  3. Rebuttal of Proof Three
  4. Rebuttal of Proof Four
  5. Rebuttal of Proof Five
- G. Survey of Averroes' view that the noxious irregular mixture causes pain and intrinsically that dissolution of continuity causes pain "by means of it (*bi-wāsiṭatīhi*)"
- a. Two Proofs
    - i. Proof One
    - ii. Proof Two
  - b. 2. Summary of Avoerroes' postion
    - i. Quote from the *Generalities*
- H. Conclusion: Averroes position is the correct one.

Table 2: Argumentative Structure of Investigation Six in Ibn al-Quff's commentary on *Aphorisms*

ii.72

As usual, Ibn al-Quff begins with “Galen and his ilk (*al-fāḍilu Ġālīnūsu wa-š'atuhu*),” observing, however, that “we do not find that they have any proof (*dalīl*)” for their position. Ibn al-Quff then proceeds to supply evidence for their view. Surprisingly, Ibn al-Quff sides with Averroes on this question in no uncertain terms:<sup>98</sup>

واحتج القاضي أبو الوليد بن رشد على صحة مذهبه بوجهين أحدهما أن تفرق الاتصال عبارة عن حركة الأجزاء بعضها على بعض والحركة المذكورة من شأنها أن يتبعها سوء المزاج كما أن مقابل هذه الحركة يتبعه مقابل ذلك. فالموجب للوجع بالذات هو سوء المزاج فقط. وثانيهما أنه قد يتبين في كتاب النفس أن هذه الحاسة إنما تحس حساً أولياً بالكيفيات الأربع التي هي الحرارة والبرودة والرطوبة واليبوسة. وإذا كان كذلك فالألم إنما يعترينا من إفراط محسوساتها الخاصة بها كما تعترى سائر الحواس. ولو كانت هذه الحاسة أعني حاسة اللمس إنما يحدث لها الوجع بتفرق الاتصال لكان محسوسها الخاص بها إنما هو تفرق الاتصال فقط على ما يقوله الفاضل جالينوس أو يكون لها محسوسان بذاتيهما على ما يقوله ابن سينا. وإذا كان كذلك فالألم إنما يعترينا من إفراط محسوساتها الخاصة بها على نحو ما يعترى سائر الحواس. فإن العين إنما تتألم بإفراط الألوان وخروجها عن التوسط وكذلك حال اللسان مع الطعوم والسمع مع الأصوات والشام مع المشمومات وإنما تفرق الاتصال شيء يعرض عن الكيفيات المفرطة ونفس الإحساس إنما هو للكيفيات. فحاصل ما ذكره هذا الرجل أن السوء المزاج هو المؤلم بذاته وأن تفرق الاتصال إيلامه بواسطته. قال في كتاب المعنون بالكليات حيث تكلم في أمراض حاسة اللمس: وليس سبب الوجع تفرق الاتصال كما يقوله جالينوس ولا هو والسوء المزاج بالذات على ما يقوله ابن سينا. واعلم أنني لما نظرت فيما قيل في هذه المسألة لم يصح عندي سوى ما ذهب إليه هذا الإمام قدس الله روحه.

The Judge Abū al-Walīd ibn Rušd adduced proof for his viewpoint from two perspectives. One of them is that dissolution of continuity is an expression about parts that move each other. It is the nature of the motion mentioned that the noxious mixture results from it, just as the opposite of this result from the opposite of this motion. What necessitates pain intrinsically is, therefore, the noxious mixture alone.

98. Ibn al-Quff, Ibn al-Quff, *al-Uṣūl fī šarḥ al-Fuṣūl*, ed. ARABCOMMAPH (The University of Manchester, 2012–2017), doi: 10.3927/52131995 [Commentary on Aphorisms, Book Two]; (MS, London, British Library, ms. or. 1348), fol. 26a, ll.3–16; (MS, Istanbul, Yeni Camii, ms. 919), fols. 58a, l.24–b, l.12.

The second [perspective] is that he [Aristotle] explained in the *Book on the Soul* [that is, referring to Aristotle's *On the Soul*] that this sense faculty [namely the sense of touch, sc. *al-ḥāssa al-lamsīya*] only senses the four qualities, namely hot, cold, dry and moist, directly. This being the case, pain, then, can only affect them when the sense objects that are particular to it are in excess, just as they [the sense objects in excess] affect all the sense faculties. If this sense faculty, that is the sense of touch, were only affected by pain by means of dissolution of continuity, [either] the object of sense that is particular to it would be the dissolution of continuity itself only, according to what Galen says, or there would be two objects of sense [namely, the dissolution of continuity, and the sense object that is particular to the sense of touch], as Ibn Sīnā holds. That being the case, pain affects it [the sense of touch] when the object of sense that is particular to it is in excess, just as it affects the other faculties of sense. The eye, therefore, feels pain when colours are in excess, and they deviate from the balance. Likewise, the tongue in relation to tastes, hearing in relation to sounds and smell in relation to odours. Continuity is dissolved by something that is caused by qualities that are in excess, but the qualities themselves are what is perceived by [the faculties].

The upshot of what this man has mentioned is that the noxious mixture causes pain intrinsically, whereas dissolution of continuity causes pain by means of it. In the book entitled *Generalities* where he speaks about diseases that affect the sense of touch he says: “The cause of pain is not dissolution of continuity, as Galen says, nor is it the noxious mixture in itself as Ibn Sīnā says.”

Know that when I examined what has been said on this issue, the only [viewpoint] I believe to be true is the one propounded by this *imām* [that is, Ibn Rušd], God sanctify his spirit.

Be that as it may, given the length of Sections E and F in Table 2 and in spite of what Ibn al-Quff says in praise of Averroes, it is clear that his main concern in this investigation lay in presenting a synopsis of Faḥr al-Dīn's position based on what Ibn al-Quff purports is a complete survey of Faḥr

al-Dīn's writings (*hāda maḡmū'ū mā dakarahū l-imāmu Faḡr al-Dīn fī ḡamī'i taṣānīfi*), and then presenting as many objections to it as he can muster.

واحتج الإمام فخر الدين بن الخطيب على صحة ما ذهب إليه بوجوه خمسة أحدها أن التفرق والانفصال لفظان مترادفان. وقد اتفقوا على أن الانفصال أمر عدمي وهو عدم الاتصال عن ما من شأنه أن يكون متصلًا والوجع. والألم لا شك أنهما أمران وجوديان والأمر العدمي لا يجوز أن يكون علّة للأمر الوجودي فتفرق الاتصال لا يجوز أن يكون علّة للألم. وثانيها أن الآلة إذا كانت في غاية الحدّة وقطع بها عضو قطعًا سريعًا لا يحسنّ بذلك القطع في أول الأمر بل إنّما يظهر الألم بعد ذلك بلحظة. فلو كان التفرق لذاته مؤلّمًا لاستحال تخلف الألم عنه. فلمّا تخلف عنه علم من ذلك أن التخلف إنّما كان لأنّ في أول القطع لم يحصل سوء المزاج فلا جرم لم يحصل الألم عنه. ثمّ لمّا حصل سوء المزاج بعد ذلك حصل الألم. وثالثها أن الاعتداء والنماء إنّما يحصلان بتفرق اتصال العضو لينفذ في الفرج المستحذية الأجزاء الغذائية مع أنه ليس هناك ألم. ومعلوم أنه إنّما لم يؤلم لأنّ ذلك التفرق أمر طبيعي ولم يحدث عنه سوء مزاج. وذلك يدلّ على أن التفرق ليس هو سبب للألم لأنّه تفرق بل لما يتبعه من سوء المزاج. ورابعها أن لسعة العقرب أشدّ إيلاّمًا من الجراحة العظيمة فلو كان المؤلم هو تفرق الاتصال فقط لكانت الجراحة العظيمة أقوى من الإيلاّم منها. ولمّا لم يكن كذلك علمنا أنّ زيادة الألم في اللسعة إنّما يحصل من سوء المزاج لا من تفرق الاتصال. وخامسها أن البدن إنّما اختصّ وقيل صورته المعينة بالمزاج المعين فما دام المزاج المعين باقيا استحال زوال تلك الصورة فيكون السبب القوي في حدوث اللذة والألم ثبوتًا وانتفاء هكذا المزاج لا التفرق.

هذا مجموع ما ذكره الإمام فخر الدين في جميع تصانيفه. والجواب عمّا تمسك به أوّلًا من وجهين. أحدهما أن التفرق يلزمه لا محالة كون الأعضاء فاقدة للكمال التركيبي اللائق بها وهو لا محالة ممّا يمكن أدراكه كحال سوء المزاج. فإنّ إيجابه للوجع لأجل فقدان العضو اعتداله المزاجي الذي هو كماله. وإذا كان كذلك فيكون موجعًا من هذه الجهة. وثانيهما نقول: ما المانع من أن يقال إنّ التفرق متى حصل كان معدًّا لفيضان الألم كما يقوله الإمام فخر الدين من فيضان السوء المزاج عليها عند كونها كذلك. وذلك لأنّ كمال الأعضاء واستعدادها لما يفاض عليها من الصورة الصحيحة بمزاج مخصوص وتركيب مخصوص فما دام المزاج والهيئة باقيين استحال زوال تلك الصورة. وأمّا إذا زالا أو أحدها استعدّ لمقابل ما استعدّ به عند كونه على حالته الطبيعية. فالحاصل أنّ هذه أمور معدّة لا فاعلة. ويكون معنى قول الشيخ هاهنا أسباب الوجع منحصرة في جنسين ليس المراد به السبب الفاعلي بل القابلي. والفاعل هو مبدأ الفيض. ومع ذلك فنقول: والإمام وقع فيما هرب منه فإنّه يدّعي أنّ التفرق موجب للألم أي لسوء المزاج وهذا أمر وجودي. والجواب عمّا تمسك به ثانيًا: الآلة المفروضة عند قطعها للعضو لا يخلوا إمّا أن نكون شاعرين بذلك عند حصوله أو لا نكون شاعرين. فإن كان الأوّل استحال تخلف الألم والوجع. وذلك لأنّ الانفعال والإحساس يتمّ بشيئين أحدهما انفعال الحاسة من محسوسها الخاصّ بها والثاني الشعور بذلك أنفعال. فمتى حصل القطع المذكور مع الشعور بذلك الانفعال والعلم به استحال تخلف الألم عنه والبدية حاكمة ذلك. وأمّا إن لم تكن شاعرين بذلك بل غافلين عنه تخلف الوجع حينئذ غير أنّ تخلفه ليس لأنّ التفرق غير موجب للوجع بل لعدم شعورنا به وذلك لانصراف القوة المفكرة في هذا الوقت إلى ما هو أهمّ من ذلك. وقد بسطنا القول في هذا الجواب في شرحنا لكليات القانون. والجواب عمّا تمسك به ثالثًا نقول نحن: لا نمنع حصول التفرق للأعضاء في حال النماء

والاعتداء لأنّ الغذاء ينفذ في أجزاء خالية في البدن وكيف نقول هذا وقد ثبت في غير هذا الفنّ عدم الخلاء لذاته. ولو قلنا به لزم أن لا تزيد الأعضاء البتّة بالغذاء في حال النماء غير أنّ هذا التفريق لما كان طبيعيًا مألوفًا أي صادر عن الطبيعة المدبّرة للبدن وبه كمال الأعضاء وهو في أجزاء صغيرة صار طبيعيًا مألوفًا غير مؤلم. والإمام قدّس الله نفسه يوافقنا على مثل هذا. فإنّ حرارة المدقوق عنده حرارة غريبة مباينة للطبيعة مع أنّها غير مؤلمة. وما سبب هذا إلا أنّها لمّا تمكّنت في الأعضاء ألفتها وصارت غير مؤلمة. فإذا كانت هذه الحرارة مع منافاتها للطبيعة إذا طال زمانها وألفتها الأعضاء صارت غير مؤلمة، فما عسى أمر صادر عن الطبيعة المدبّرة للبدن وبه كمال الأعضاء وهو حاصل دائمًا وفي أجزاء صغيرة؟ وقد أطنبنا في هذا الجواب وفي تقريره من جهة الإمام فيما تمسك به من الوجوه النقلية والعقلية في شحرننا لكليات القانون. والجواب عمّا تمسك به رابعًا قد ذكرناه. والجواب عما تمسك به خامسًا نقول: ليس يقول البدن لصورته المعينة بمزاجه الخاصّ به فقط بل وبتركيبه فإنّه لا بدّ من اعتبار التركيب مع اعتبار المزاج على ما تقدّم.

The *imām* Faḥr al-Dīn ibn al-Ḥaṭīb adduces five proofs that the viewpoint he maintains is correct.

The first of them is that “dissolution” and “being disconnected” are synonyms, and they all agree that being disconnected is a privative state of affairs, namely the absence of continuity in what is naturally inclined to be continuous. Yet, there is no doubt that aches and pain are hypartic states of affairs, and it is not possible that a privative state of affairs causes a hypartic state of affairs. Therefore, dissolution of continuity cannot be the cause of pain.<sup>99</sup>

The second is if the instrument is extremely sharp and the limb is cut very quickly, initially there is no sensation of the cut, but the pain becomes apparent a few moments after that. Yet, if dissolution of continuity in itself caused pain, it would be impossible for the pain to be delayed. Since it is, in fact, delayed, one knows that there is a delay because at the beginning of the cut, the noxious mixture has not come about, and necessarily, the pain that it causes does not come about. Then, once the noxious mixture comes about, there is pain.

The third is that nutrition and growth come about when the continuity of the body part is dissolved so that the nutriment is able to enter the nutritive elements in the gaps that are

---

99. For the terms “privative” and “hypartic,” see Fritz W. Zimmermann, *Al-Farabi’s Commentary and Short Treatise on Aristotle’s De Interpretatione* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 29, n.2 (privative, *‘adamī*) and LX, n.1 (hypartic, *wuḡūdī*).

adjacent to each other. Yet, there is no pain. It is known that it is not painful because that dissolution of continuity is a natural state of affairs that does not generate a noxious mixture. This indicates that dissolution of continuity does not cause pain because it dissolves, but because a noxious mixture results from it.

The fourth is that the scorpion's sting is more painful than a serious wound, but if what causes pain were the dissolution of continuity only, the serious wound would be stronger than it in causing pain. Since this is not the case, we know that the fact that the greater in scorpion's sting is from the noxious mixture not the dissolution of continuity.

The fifth is that before its form is determined the mixture that is particular to the body is determined for it, so as long as the mixture that is determined for it persists, it is impossible for its form to cease. Thus, the potent cause in bringing about pleasure and pain is that there is a stable [state of affairs] followed by their withdrawal. But the mixture is like this, not dissolution. This is the sum of what the *imām* Faḥr al-Dīn has mentioned on this issue in all his writings.

The rebuttal to what he claimed first is from two perspectives. One is that dissolution of continuity necessarily entails that the body parts lose the perfection in the composition that befits them, and this is something that is necessarily perceived, just as in the case of the noxious mixture. Thus, [dissolution of continuity] necessitates pain because the body loses the balance in its mixtures, which is the perfection proper to it. That being the case, it [dissolution of continuity] causes pain in this way.

The second, we say: "What stops one from saying that when dissolution of continuity comes about, creates the disposition for the pain to rush in just as Faḥr al-Dīn says about the noxious mixture that rushes into them [the body parts, sc. *al-a'dā'*] when they are like that? That is because the body parts' perfection is owing to the fact that they are disposed to have the healthy through a particular mixture and a particular composition. Thus, as long as the mixture and the composition endure, it is impossible that the [healthy] form ceases. In the case that both or one of them ceases, it [the body part, sc. *al-ʿuḍw*] becomes disposed to the opposite of what it was disposed to when it was in its natural condition.



The upshot is that these states of affairs dispose the body part, they do not act as the agent. The meaning of the *Šayh*'s statement here “the causes of pain are two kinds” refers not to the active cause, but to the cause that disposes, whereas the active one is the principle of the rushing in [of pain]. In light of this, we say: “The *imām* here has fallen victim to what he sought to avoid. For he claims that dissolution is what necessitates pain, that is, the noxious mixture, yet this is a hypartic state of affairs.”

The rebuttal to what he claimed second is that at the moment that the hypothesised instrument cuts the body part, either we feel it or we do not. If we feel it, it is impossible that the aching and pain is delayed. That is because the impression and the perception is fulfilled by two things. The first is that the sense faculty is impressed by the object of sense that is particular to it; the second is the feeling that is from the impression. Thus, when the aforementioned cut happens accompanied by the feeling of that impression as well as the knowledge of it [the cut], it is impossible that the pain caused by it should be delayed, and primitive reasoning (*al-badīha*) forms this judgment. If we do not feel it, being oblivious to it, the painful sensation is delayed at that time. The delay, however, is not because dissolution does not necessitate pain, but because the feeling we have of it is non-existent. This is owing to the fact that at that moment, the faculty of thinking has been diverted to what is more urgent than that. In our commentary on the *Generalities* of the *Canon*, we have provided an extensive rebuttal.

The rebuttal to what he claimed third, we say: “We do not say that it is impossible that dissolution affects the body parts while they grow and while they receive nutrition because the nutriment enters into the parts of the body that are empty; whereas in another discipline [namely, physics] it is established that the void is intrinsically non-existent.” For if we were to say this, it would follow that the body parts do not increase in size at all by receiving nutrition when the body grows. Yet, when the dissolution is natural and familiar, that is, it proceeds from the nature that manages the body and through it [the body parts] attain their perfection, and further, that it happens in certain small parts, it [the dissolution] becomes natural and familiar, and so is not painful. The *imām*—God sanctify his

soul—concur with us in a case that is analogous, for according to him, the heat of the person with hectic fever is an extrinsic heat that is at odds with the nature, and yet it is not painful. What can the reason for this be save that when it [the heat] settles in the body parts, they become accustomed to it, and so it is not painful. So if the heat stands at odds with the nature, when its duration is long and becomes familiar to the body parts, and nevertheless, it is not painful, how should it [dissolution] be with something that proceeds from the nature that manages the body and through which the body parts attain their perfection, and it always comes about in parts that are small? In our commentary on the *Generalities of the Canon*, we have treated this rebuttal and confirmed it in great detail from the *imām's* point of view and on the basis of doctrines he adheres to, by way of authoritative texts and reason.

The rebuttal to what he claimed fourth we have already mentioned. The response to what he claimed fifth is that we say: “It is not the case that the body only receives its proper form from the mixture that is particular to it; it also receives it [proper form] from the body’s composition. For it is necessary to consider its composition as well as its mixture as discussed earlier.”

This text richly illustrates the different ways in which Faḥr al-Dīn’s thought and practice influenced how Ibn al-Quff composed the commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*. Above all, this influence is not evident owing to the fact that Ibn al-Quff agreed with Faḥr al-Dīn’s views. For, as is plain, Ibn al-Quff agrees ultimately with Averroes on the question of the aetiology of pain. What is more, the above passage represents a series of objections all of which are directed at undercutting Faḥr al-Dīn’s doctrine. As we have also seen, Ibn al-Quff also rejects Faḥr al-Dīn’s view that noxious mixtures of any quality cause pain intrinsically, not accidentally. Yet, how Ibn al-Quff structures his argument and the techniques he employs in this investigation imitate Faḥr al-Dīn’s verification techniques. In imitation of Faḥr al-Dīn’s prescriptions about gleaning and painstaking investigation, Ibn al-Quff collects and critiques a large number of medical authorities. He dispassionately surveys each viewpoint, and arrives at the what he believes to be true (Averroes’ doctrine) by testing each viewpoint by constructing counterarguments against them to see if they are able to bear

thorough criticism. Through a series of rebuttals to Faḥr al-Dīn's arguments that noxious irregular mixtures are the only intrinsic cause of pain, Ibn al-Quff shows that none of Faḥr al-Dīn's arguments are demonstrative. Whereas it is normal for Ibn al-Quff to defend Galen against criticism in his commentary on the *Aphorisms*, in this particular point, Ibn al-Quff faults Galen explicitly, siding instead with Averroes, who was much less influential as a medical authority.

Finally, in the rebuttal of Faḥr al-Dīn's third argument in investigation six, Ibn al-Quff says that he deals with this question at greater length in his commentary on the *Canon*. What is noteworthy, however, is the words Ibn al-Quff uses to speak about how he addresses Faḥr al-Dīn's thought on the aetiology of pain, for his words recall some of the themes and prescriptions that Faḥr al-Dīn refers to in his introductions to his philosophical commentaries and philosophical *summas*. Alluding to Avicenna's distinction in *On the Soul* between an irregular noxious mixture (*sū' al-mizāğ al-muḥtalif*), which causes pain, and a regular noxious mixture (*sū' al-mizāğ al-muttafiq*), which does not cause pain, Ibn al-Quff says that he treats this question "in great detail (*aṭnabnā*)" and "confirms it (*taqrīhi*)" exhaustively "from the *imām*'s point of view and on the basis of doctrines he adheres to, by way of authoritative texts and reason (*min ḡihati l-imāmi fīmā tamassaka bihi mina l-wuğūhi l-naqlīyati wa-l-'aqlīya*)." First, Ibn al-Quff's reference to the fact that his analysis proceeds from the "authoritative texts and reason" recalls similar phrases in Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon*. For example, in the second investigation in his commentary on the section on pain in the *Canon*, Faḥr al-Dīn says that the proposition that the continuity of the body parts is dissolved when they receive nutriment "requires explanation, first on the basis of authoritative texts, and then on the basis of demonstration second." Likewise, after apparently concluding a survey of Avicenna's doctrines on the nature of pleasure, Faḥr al-Dīn says, having recognised that Avicenna wavers on the nature of pleasure, "let us now consult our intellects" so that "we perceive the truth." This reference to a methodological deployment of *naql*, meaning surveying mainly Avicenna's medical and philosophical words for relevant material on the question under discussion, and *'aql*, using syllogistic reasoning to problematise the principles underlying Avicenna's statements in the *Canon*, is clearly analogous to the methods of gleaning and verification as described by Shihadeh with reference to the commentary on the *Pointers and Reminders*. Second, it

is important to recognise that Ibn al-Quff is careful to say that his rebuttal to Faḥr al-Dīn's arguments are confirmed (*taqrīr*) on the basis of doctrines that Faḥr al-Dīn himself upheld, rather than introducing propositions into the discussion, for which there is no textual evidence that Faḥr al-Dīn would have agreed with them. Ibn al-Quff is careful, in other words, to distinguish his rebuttals to Faḥr al-Dīn from the kind of criticism that Faḥr al-Dīn condemns his contemporaries, such as al-Mas'ūdī in early works such as the *Rebuttals* (*Ġawābāt*).

The evidence in the section shows that Ibn al-Quff's commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* is modelled on Faḥr al-Dīn's exegetical practices both in how it structures the text under examination and the different exegetical tasks the commentator performs. All the macrostructural features as well as many of the the exegetical elements that make up the method of verification in Faḥr al-Dīn's commentaries on Avicenna's works are present in Ibn al-Quff. Above all however, we see in Ibn al-Quff's commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* a greater shift taking place in the Islamic medical tradition, one that Faḥr al-Dīn can by no means be said to be the main protagonist. It is not only that the medical and philosophical works of Avicenna are used with increasing frequency to understand and criticise the ideas of Hippocrates and Galen, but that the methods and textual norms for interpreting a text that were developing in eleventh- and twelfth-century Islamic scholarly circles, especially those in Transoxiana, were being introduced into a medical tradition, in which they had until that time occupied a peripheral position.

## 5. Conclusion

I began this paper by drawing attention to the fact that the great thirteenth-century physician Ibn al-Quff treats Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī as a major medical authority, in the same rank as Galen and Avicenna. This fact is puzzling in light of how little attention in previous scholarship has been given to Faḥr al-Dīn's contributions to medicine. I showed, however, that by the end of the thirteenth century, Faḥr al-Dīn was esteemed highly by physicians and philosophers. For his part, the authority that Ibn al-Quff allots to Faḥr al-Dīn's medical thought is in large part owing to the fact that he was educated in the Levant at a time when Faḥr al-Dīn's students and their successors had made their impact on Islamic medicine through their commentaries on the *Generalities* of the *Canon* as well as on Avicenna's philosophical works. Yet, despite Ibn al-Quff's regard for Faḥr al-Dīn as an authority, it is puzzling that Ibn al-Quff rarely cites Faḥr al-Dīn's medical writings, and when he does,

herarely agrees with him. If Faḥr al-Dīn was important to Islamic physicians in the thirteenth century, it cannot be because Faḥr al-Dīn's medical doctrines or writings themselves were extremely popular. I have argued that the answer to this puzzle should be sought not in what doctrines Ibn al-Quff puts forward but in how he constructs the arguments for the doctrines he holds.<sup>100</sup> I have argued that the collection of techniques of verification, which came to be used for interpreting mainly Avicennian philosophical texts, come to be used with increasing frequency in the medieval Islamic East after the twelfth century. What is more, I have argued that Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's commentary on the *Canon of Medicine* played an important role in introducing these exegetical methods into the Islamic medical discourse. I have collected evidence that leaves no doubt that Faḥr al-Dīn uses these techniques in his commentary on the *Canon*. I argue that the *Canon* commentary was likely written before, probably well before, 580/1184. This conclusion leads me to conclude that the references to Saraḥs as the town in which Faḥr al-Dīn composed the commentary on the *Canon* before setting out to Transoxiana, as well as the references to Faḥr al-Dīn's patron 'Abd al-Karīm al-Saraḥsī, should be treated with a caution. I show that an early date for the *Canon* com-

---

100. In assessing Faḥr al-Dīn's contributions to Arabic logic, Khaled El-Rouayheb comes to conclusions that are similar to mine in relation to medicine (El-Rouayheb, *Relational Syllogisms*, 40). He observes that Faḥr al-Dīn's contributions to Arabic logic are "uneven," frequently affecting the formal structure of the discipline, and involving shifts in argument style, writing style and genre rather than offering dramatically new insights into individual logical doctrines. In other words, Faḥr al-Dīn's contributions affected mostly *how* these discourses unfolded rather than *what* they stated. Summarising Ibn Ḥaldūn's comments about Faḥr al-Dīn's contributions to the logic curriculum, El-Rouayheb says that "starting with Rāzī, logicians ceased to be interested in covering all the books of Aristotle's *Organon*, and instead reoriented the field toward a more focussed study of the five predicables, definition, propositions and their immediate implications, and the formal syllogistic. Ibn Khaldūn did not, however, indicate whether Rāzī should be credited with any substantial contributions besides this shift in focus."

mentary is corroborated by the fact that at the time of composing the commentary on the *Canon* Faḥr al-Dīn was not yet able to articulate the important elements in his analytical method.

In attempting to gauge the legacy of Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon* in Islamic medical discourse after the twelfth century, I have contrasted the divergences between Galen's prescriptions about how to write commentary and the methods of verification that Faḥr al-Dīn uses in the *Canon* commentary. While I accept to some extent Shihadeh's distinction between exegetical and aporetic genres, I do not think that Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī's exegetical activity in *Doubts on Galen* would have been viewed as *proper to a commentary* by the physicians of the twelfth or thirteenth century. Ibn Abī Ṣādiq, who probably died near the end of the eleventh century, uses a host of exegetical strategies in his commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*. Many of the strategies he adopts in interpreting Hippocrate's words conform to the prescriptions Galen made about what good commentary should be. On the other hand, he frequently violates Galen's recommendations, especially when it comes to defending Galen against Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī in *Doubts on Galen*. In these instances, we find Ibn Abī Ṣādiq departing from the business of commenting on the Hippocratic text to rebut Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā's criticisms. While engaging in such dialectic is proscribed by Galen in commentary, in practice Galen frequently engaged in such dialectic in his Hippocratic commentaries.

The exegetical techniques used by Ibn Abī Ṣādiq in his commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorismism*, for example, do not, in other words, represent a new vision of commentary as a unified method for carrying out medical research, nor do they precipitate changes in the way medical writing and research were carried out by scholastic physicians after the twelfth century. My contention has been that Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on Avicenna's *Canon of Medicine* is response in large part for introducing the method of verification into Islamic medical writing, and to changing the exegetical forms and strategies, argument types and medical and philosophical authorities that were relevant in medical discourse. I have shown how by the end of the thirteenth century, Ibn al-Quff wrote his commentary on the *Aphorisms* in the same aporetic spirit as Faḥr al-Dīn wrote his *Canon* commentary. Of course, Galen remained important for Ibn al-Quff, and so did Avicenna, Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā, Hippocrates and a huge number of medical and philosophical

authorities whom Ibn al-Quff refers to in his *Aphorisms* commentary. Yet, the structure of Ibn al-Quff's commentary as well as his attitude toward research, argument style, and the way he synthesises Avicenna with other Arabic and Greek medical authorities is typical of Faḥr al-Dīn's style of inquiry. Gerhard Endress says that where al-Ġazālī gradually adopted and synthesised parts of Avicenna's philosophical thought over a lifetime, Faḥr al-Dīn received Avicenna's thought and methodology at a time in which it had already become widespread in various disciplines, was being introduced into madrasa curricula by prominent legal and *kalām* scholars from Cairo, Damascus and into Transoxiana, and was being synthesised into an increasingly unified picture of the Islamic sciences and their interrelationship.<sup>101</sup> Analogously, during his medical education Ibn al-Quff (like his contemporary Ibn al-Nafīs) would have been introduced to Avicenna's philosophical and medical writings by his teachers Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, Ibn al-Minfāḥ, Ibn al-Nafīs, Ya'qūb al-Sāmīrī and Šams al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥusrawšāhī, all of whom were active participants in adapting and refining the exegetical practice of verification in Islamic medical and philosophical discourse. This is not to say that Ibn al-Quff formally identified with a school of philosophical medicine that traced its pedigree to Faḥr al-Dīn. I for one am certain that Ibn al-Quff was a practicing physician, and his book on surgery is too detailed to be merely a stale theoretical exercise. Unlike several members of Faḥr al-Dīn's school, Ibn al-Quff is reported to have written a commentary on all five books of the *Canon of Medicine* rather than just on *Book One (Generalities)*. It is plain too from his *Aphorisms* commentary that Ibn al-Quff's interests in medicine ranged far beyond the discipline's theoretical principles. Nevertheless, I have discussed elements in Ibn al-Quff's medical writing and medical thought that make evident Faḥr al-Dīn's influence on medical discourse at the end of the thirteenth century, in a thinker who was clearly steeped in Avicennian and Galenic medical and philosophical lore.

---

101. Endress, "Reading Avicenna in the Madrasa," 402.

## Bibliography

- Altaş, Eşref. "Fahraddin er-Râzî'nin Eserlerinin Kronolojisi." In *İslâm Düşüncesinin Dönüşüm Çağında*, edited by Ömer Türker and Osman Demir, 91–164. Istanbul, ISAM, 2011.
- Avicenna. *Al-Qānūn fī l-ṭibb*. Edited by Qāsim M. Rağab, 3 vols. Baghdad: Dār al-muṭannā, ca. 1970.
- Avicenna, *Avicenna's De Anima*. Edited by Fazlur Rahman. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Barnes, Jonathan. "Metacommentary," In *Method and Metaphysics: Essays in Ancient Philosophy I*, edited by Maddalena Bonelli, 195–210. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- De Lacy, Phillip H. "Galen's Concept of Continuity." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 355–69.
- Dietrich, Albert. *Medicinalia Arabica: Studien über arabische medizinische Handschriften in türkischen und syrischen Bibliotheken*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966.
- Dols, Michael. *Majnūn: The Madman in Medieval Islamic Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Dozy, Reinhard. *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1881.
- El-Rouayheb, Khaled. *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century: Scholarly Currents in the Ottoman Empire and the Maghreb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- El-Rouayheb, Khaled. *Relational Syllogisms and the History of Arabic Logic, 900–1900*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- El-Rouayheb, Khaled. "Opening the Gate of Verification: The Forgotten Arab-Islamic Florescence of the 17th Century." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 38 (2006): 263–81.
- Endress, Gerhard. "Reading Avicenna in the Madrasa: Intellectual Geologies and Chains of Transmission of Philosophy and the Sciences in the Islamic East." In *Arabic Theology, Arabic Philosophy. From the Many to the One: Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank*, edited by James E. Montgomery, 371–423. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- Fancy, Nahyan. "Womb Heat versus Sperm Heat: Hippocrates against Galen and Ibn Sīnā in Ibn al-Nafīs's Commentaries." *Oriens* 45 (2017): 150–75.
- Fancy, Nahyan. "Medical Commentaries: A Preliminary Examination of Ibn al-Nafīs's Shurūḥ, the Mūjaz and Commentaries on the Mūjaz." *Oriens* 41 (2013): 525–45.
- Fancy, Nahyan. *Science and Religion in Mamluk Egypt: Ibn al-Nafīs, Pulmonary Transit and Bodily Resurrection* (New York: Routledge, 2013).
- Flemming, Rebecca. "Commentary." In *The Cambridge Companion to Galen*, edited by Richard J. Hankinson, 323–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Galen. *Tafsīr Ġālīnūs li-kitāb Afīdīmiyā*. Translated by Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq. Madrid, Escorial Library, MS arabe 805.
- Galen. *Tafsīr Ġālīnūs li-Fuṣūl Abuqrāt*. Translated by Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and edited by Taro Mimura. The University of Manchester, 2012–2017. doi: 10.3927/51689327 [Commentary on *Aphorisms*, Book Two].



- Galen. *Tafsīr Ḡālīnūs li-fuṣūl Abuqrāt*. Translated by Ḥunayn ibn Iṣḥāq and edited by Taro Mimura. The University of Manchester, 2012–2017. doi: 10.3927/51689446 [Commentary on *Aphorisms*, Book Three].
- Galen. *Tafsīr Ḡālīnūs li-fuṣūl Abuqrāt*. Translated by Ḥunayn ibn Iṣḥāq and edited by Taro Mimura. The University of Manchester, 2012–2017. doi: 10.3927/51931732 [Commentary on *Aphorisms*, Book Four].
- Galen. *Galenī In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum I commentariorum I-III, Suppl. Or. V 1*. Edited by Uwe Vagelpohl. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Galen. *Galenī De praecognitione (CMG V 8,1)*. Edited by Vivian Nutton. Berlin: Academy of the Sciences, 1979.
- Galen. *In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum I commentaria III (CMG V 10,1)*. Edited by Ernst Wenkebach, translated by Franz Pfaff. Berlin: Academy of the Sciences, 1934.
- Galen. *Galenī In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum VI commentaria I-VI (CMG V 10,2,2)*. Edited by Ernst Wenkebach and translated by Franz Pfaff. Berlin: Academy of the Sciences, 1956.
- Galen. *Galenī Opera Omnia*, ed. Karl G. Kühn, 20 vols. Leipzig: Car. Cnoblicii, 1821–1833.
- Griffel, Frank. “On Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s Life and the Patronage He Received.” *Journal of Islamic Studies* (2007): 313–44.
- Hamarneh, Sami. *The Physician, Therapist and Surgeon: Ibn al-Quff* (Cairo: Atlas Press, 1974).
- Hippocrates. *Oeuvres complètes d’Hippocrate*. Edited by Émile Littré. 10 vols. Paris: Baillière, 1839–1861.
- Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a. *‘Uyūn al-Anbā’ fī Ṭabaqāt al-Aṭibbā’*. Edited by Augustus Müller, 2 vols. Königsberg: self-published, 1884 [reprinted Hants, UK: Gregg International, 1972 ].
- Ibn al-Qifṭī. *Tārīḥ al-ḥukamā’*. Edited by Augustus Müller and Julius Lippert. Leipzig: Dieterich’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903.
- Ibn al-Quff. *al-Uṣūl fī ṣarḥ al-Fuṣūl*. Edited by ARABCOMMAPH. The University of Manchester, 2012–2017. doi: 10.3927/52131995 [Commentary on *Aphorisms*, Book Two].
- Ibn al-Quff. *al-Uṣūl fī ṣarḥ al-Fuṣūl*. Edited by ARABCOMMAPH. The University of Manchester, 2012–2017. doi: 10.3927/52132103 [Commentary on *Aphorisms*, Book Four].
- Ibn al-Quff. *al-Uṣūl fī ṣarḥ al-Fuṣūl*. MS, London, British Library, ms. or. 1348.
- Ibn al-Quff. *al-Uṣūl fī ṣarḥ al-Fuṣūl*. MS, Istanbul, Yeni Camii, ms. 919.
- Ibrahim, Bilal. “Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Ibn al-Hayṭam and Aristotelian Science: Essentialism versus Phenomenalism in Post-Classical Islamic Thought.” *Oriens* 41 (2013): 379–431.
- Iskander, Albert Z. *A Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library*. London: The Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 1967.
- Jaffer, Tariq. *Rāzī: Master of Quranic Interpretation and Theological Reasoning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

- Karimullah, Kamran I. "Transformation of Galen's Textual Legacy from Classical to Post-Classical Islamic Medicine: Commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*." *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 5 (2017): 311–58.
- Karimullah, Kamran I. "Assessing Avicenna's (d. 428/1037) Medical Influence in Prolegomena to Post-Classical (CE 1100-1900) Medical Commentaries: Ibn Abī Šādiq (d. after 460/1067), 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī (d. 629/1231), Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209)." *Mélanges de l'institut dominicain d'études orientales* 32 (2017): 93–134.
- Karimullah, Kamran I. "Avicenna and Galen, Philosophy and Medicine: Contextualising Discussions of Medical Experience in Medieval Islamic Physicians and Philosophers," *Oriens* 45 (2017): 105–49.
- Kazimirski, Albert. *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français*, 2 vols. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1860.
- Lamoreaux, John C. *Hunayn ibn Ishāq on His Galen Translations*. Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 2017.
- Langermann, Tzvi. "Criticism of Authority in the Writings of Moses Maimonides and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī." *Early Science and Medicine* 7 (2002): 255–74.
- Magdelaine, Caroline. *Histoire du texte ed édition critique, traduite et commentée des Aphorismes d'Hippocrate*, 3 vols. PhD diss., Université de Paris-Sorbonne IV, 1994.
- Mansfeld, Jaap. *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled Before the Study of an Author or a Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Nicolae, Daniel S. "A Medieval Court Physician at Work: Ibn Jumay's Commentary on the *Canon of Medicine*." PhD diss., Oxford University, 2012.
- Nutton, Vivian. "Galen of Pergamum." In *Brill's New Pauly: Antiquity volumes*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. Leiden: Brill, 2006. doi: 10.1163/1574-9347\_bnp\_e417950.
- Pormann, Peter E. and N. Peter Joosse. "Commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* in the Arabic Tradition: The Example of Melancholy." In *Epidemics in Context: Greek Commentaries on Hippocrates in the Arabic Tradition*, edited by Peter E. Pormann, 211–49. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012.
- Pormann, Peter E. and Emilie Savage-Smith. *Medieval Islamic Medicine*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- al-Šīrāzī, Quṭb al-Dīn. *Durrat al-tāġ li-ġurrat al-Dubāġ*. Edited by Muḥammad Miškāt. Tehran: Maġlis, 1938–1942.
- al-Rāzī, Faḥr al-Dīn. *al-Mabāḥiṭ al-mašriqīya fī 'ilm al-ilāhīyāt wa-l-ṭibī'iyāt*, 2 vols. Hyderabad: Maṭba'at majlis dā'irat al-ma'ārif al-Nizāmīyah, 1343 [1924 or 1925].
- al-Rāzī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā. *Kitāb al-šukūk li-l-Rāzī*. Edited by Muṣṭafā L. 'Abd al-Ġanī. Cairo: Maṭba'at dār al-kutub wa-l-waṭā'iḳ al-qawmīya, 2005.
- Roggema, Barbara. "Ibn Kammūna's and Ibn al-'Ibrī's Responses to Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Proofs of Muḥammad's Prophethood." *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 2 (2014): 193–213.
- Rosenthal, Franz. "'Life is Short, the Art is Long': Arabic Commentaries on the First Hippocratic Aphorisms." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 40 (1966): 226–45.

- Savage-Smith, Emilie. "Medicine in Medieval Islam." In *The Cambridge History of Science Volume 2: Medieval Science*, edited by David C. Lindberg and Michael H. Shank, 139–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Savage-Smith, Emilie. *A New Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Volume I: Medicine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Schwarb, Gregor. "The 13th Century Copto-Arabic Reception of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī: Al-Rashīd Abū l-Khayr Ibn al-Ṭabīb's *Risālat al-Bayān al-Aẓhar fī l-radd 'alā man yaqūlu bi-l-qaḍā' wa-l-qadar*." *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 2 (2014): 143–69.
- Shihadeh, Ayman. "Al-Rāzī's (d. 1210) Commentary on Avicenna's Pointers: The Confluence of Exegesis and Aporetics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Philosophy*, edited by Khaled El-Rouayheb and Sabine Schmidtke, 296–325. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Shihadeh, Ayman. *Doubts on Avicenna*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Shihadeh, Ayman. "A Post-Ghazālian Critic of Avicenna: Ibn Ghaylān al-Balkhī on the *Materia Medica* of the *Canon of Medicine*." *Journal of Islamic Studies* 24 (2013): 135–74.
- Shihadeh, Ayman. *The Teleological Ethics of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Shihadeh, Ayman. "From al-Ghazālī to al-Rāzī: 6th/12th Century Developments in Muslim Philosophical Theology." *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 15 (2005): 141–79.
- Von Staden, Heinrich. "Staging the Past, Staging Oneself: Galen on Hellenistic Exegetical Traditions." In *Galen and the World of Knowledge*, edited by Christopher Gill, Tim Whitmarsh and John Wilkins, 132–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Von Staden, Heinrich. "A Woman Does Not Become Ambidextrous': Galen and the Culture of Scientific Commentary." In *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, edited by Roy Gibson and Christina Shuttleworth Kraus, 109–32. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Takahashi, Hidemi. "Reception of Islamic Theology among Syriac Christians in the Thirteenth Century: The Use of Fakhr al-Dīn' al-Rāzī in Barhebraeus' *Candelabrum of the Sanctuary*." *Intellectual History of the Islamicate World* 2 (2014): 170–92.
- Ullmann, Manfred. *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002.
- Ullmann, Manfred. *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970–1983.
- Ullmann, Manfred. *Die Medizin im Islam*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Walbridge, John. *The Science of Mystic Lights: Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī and the Illuminationist Tradition in Islamic Philosophy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Wisnovsky, Robert. "Avicennism and Exegetical Practice in the Early Commentaries on the *Ishārāt*." *Oriens* 41 (2013): 349–78.
- Zimmermann, Fritz W. *Al-Farabi's Long Commentary and Short Treatise on Aristotle's De Interpretatione*. London: Oxford University Press, 1981.

## Appendix

The following three texts are referred to extensively in this paper. The stemma for Faḥr al-Dīn's commentary on the *Canon of Medicine* requires a separate study. It would be rash to speculate at this point about the stemma given the fact that I have only a partial collation based on three manuscripts. Collation suggests, however, that the Judeo-Arabic manuscript stands on another branch of the stemma in relation to the Oxford and Gotha manuscripts. The errors that all three manuscripts transmit when Faḥr al-Dīn quotes the *Canon* and *The Healing* should not necessarily be taken as implying that all three are drawn from the same branch in the stemma, since it likely that what appears to be a scribal error is, in fact, a faithful representation of Faḥr al-Dīn's copies of these texts. There is ample evidence that the text of the *Canon* remained unstable until the thirteenth century. For example, see Chapter Two of Daniel S. Nicolae, "A Medieval Court Physician at Work: Ibn Jumay's commentary on the *Canon of Medicine*." Since there is no critical edition of the *Canon*, nor, incidentally, does it look like there ever will be in the near future given the vagaries of long-term funding for academic research in Europe, it is impossible to do more than speculate about stemmatic issues at this point.

### A. Introduction to the Commentary on the Canon<sup>102</sup>

Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Arch. Seldon A 64 [Ox], fols. 4b, l.1–6a, l.2.

Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, MS hebr. 1208 [P], fols. 1a, l.1–2a, l.5.

Gotha, Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek, MS or. 1916 [G], fols. 1b, l.1–3a, l.6.

[G 1b][Ox 4b] بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، عفوك اللهم

قال الشيخ الإمام الصدر الكبير العلامة فخر الدين ضياء الإسلام تاج المحققين حجة الحق محمد بن عمر بن الحسين الرازي رحمه

الله<sup>103</sup>.

---

102. There is a partial transcription of Faḥr al-Dīn's introduction in based on the manuscript Konya, Yusuf Ağa ms. 4980; see Albert Dietrich, *Medicinalia Arabica: Studien über arabische medizinische Handschriften in türkischen und syrischen Bibliotheken* (Göttigen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), 78–9.

103. [Ox : om. P, G.] عفوك اللهم قال ... الرازي رحمه الله

[P 1a] أما بعد حمد<sup>104</sup> الله<sup>105</sup> مقدر الأمزجة والأجزاء ومدبر القوى والأعضاء ومبعد<sup>106</sup> أصناف الداء ومبديع أنواع<sup>107</sup> الدواء، والصلاة على محمد<sup>108</sup> سيد الأنبياء وعلى آله وأصحابه صفوة الأولياء<sup>109</sup>.

فإن الله تعالى لما وفقني للوصول إلى مدارج<sup>110</sup> المناهج<sup>111</sup> الحكمية والترقي<sup>112</sup> إلى معارج<sup>113</sup> المباحث الحكمية<sup>114</sup> والاطلاع على نهايات أقدام العقلاء<sup>115</sup> والاضطلاع بتلخيص مباحي<sup>116</sup> الفضلاء وكان من جملة العلوم الشريفة علم الأبدان الذي جعله الصادق الصدوق قريناً<sup>117</sup> لعلم الأديان واختص من الفضائل<sup>118</sup> أما<sup>119</sup> أولاً فبمعموم<sup>119</sup> الحاجة إليه في كل حين وأوان وحيز<sup>120</sup> وزمان<sup>121</sup>، وأما ثانياً

- 
104. P. אלהםד : Ox, G. ] حمد
105. P. אנה. add. ] الله
106. G. מעד : P מעד : Ox. ] مبعد
107. G. اصناف : (אנואע) : Ox, P. ] أنواع
108. P. סיידנא מוסי נבי אלה : Ox, G. ] محمد
109. G. وبعد. add. : אלאוליה (الاوليه) : Ox ] الأولياء
110. Ox. مداريج : G. (מדארג) P ] مدارج
111. P. אלמנהאג : Ox, G. ] المناهج
112. P. אלתראקי : Ox ] والترقي
113. G. om. : Ox, P. ] المناهج الحكمية والترقي إلى معارج
114. P. אלעלמיה : Ox, G. ] الحكمية
115. P. om. : Ox, G. ] والاطلاع على نهايات أقدام العقلاء
116. Ox. in marg. G. معاني : (מנאגי) : Ox, P. ] مباحي
117. P. קריבי : Ox, G. ] قريناً
118. P. פאמא : Ox, G. ] أما
119. P. פלעמום : Ox. فيمعموم : Ox. in marg. G. ] فبمعموم
120. G. om. : P. ווקת : Ox. in marg. : Ox. ] ووقت وحيز
121. G. om. : Ox, P. ] وزمان

فلأن موضوع<sup>122</sup> نظره<sup>123</sup> بدن الإنسان الذي هو أشرف الأجسام في هذا المكان. وأما ثالثًا فلاعتضاد مقاعد<sup>124</sup> قواعده بواضح  
 الحججة<sup>125</sup> ولائح البرهان. ولما وقفت على كمال هذا العلم ومنفعته وعلو درجته ومرتبته أردت الخوض في عبابه<sup>126</sup> والترقي في غاية<sup>127</sup>  
 الوصول<sup>128</sup> إلى لبابه والتعمق<sup>129</sup> في أغواره<sup>130</sup> والترقي إلى أنواره. ولما كان كتاب القانون للشيخ الرئيس أحسن كتاب صنف في هذا  
 الباب باتفاق أولي الألباب ثم أن الكتاب الأول منه تميز<sup>131</sup> عن<sup>132</sup> سائر كتبه باللطائف الحكمية والدقائق العلمية والنكت الغريبة  
 والأسرار العجيبة التي<sup>133</sup> حارت أذهان أبناء الزمان عن إدراكها وخارت قواهم<sup>134</sup> عن الوصول إلى دري أفلاكها صرفت نهاية وكدي<sup>135</sup>  
 وكدي<sup>136</sup> وثنيت<sup>137</sup> غاية وهمي وهمي<sup>138</sup> إلى تفسير عيونهم وشرح متونه<sup>139</sup> واستيضاح مشكلاته [G 2a] واستخراج معضلاته [Ox]

- 
122. P. וצווע : Ox, G [ موضوع ]  
 123. P. נטרייה : Ox, G [ نظره ]  
 124. P. מקאצד : Ox, G [ مقاعد ]  
 125. P. אלחגג : Ox, G [ الحججة ]  
 126. Ox. גביה : P, G [ عبابه (עבאבה) ]  
 127. Ox : om. P, G. [ والترقي في غاية ]  
 128. G. والوصول : P ואלוצול : Ox [ الوصول ]  
 129. P. ואלתגמק : Ox, G [ والتعمق ]  
 130. P. אחואזה : Ox, G [ أغواره ]  
 131. G. ממיז : (תמיז) Ox, P [ تميز ]  
 132. P. עלי : Ox, G [ عن ]  
 133. G. الذي : (אלתי) Ox, P [ التي ]  
 134. P. וגאחת עקולהם (وجارت عقولهم) : Ox, G [ وخارت قواهم ]  
 135. P. פכרי : Ox, G [ وكدي ]  
 136. Ox : om. Ox. (וכדי), G, in marg. P [ وكدي ]  
 137. P. ותבת : G وثبت : Ox [ وثبت ]  
 138. Ox : om. P. [ وهمي ]  
 139. G. פנונה : (מתונה) Ox, P [ متونه ]

[f.5a] والاعتذار عن مساهلاته<sup>140</sup> إن وقعت في أثناء كلماته وامتحانات لعقول المتعلمين ضمنيتها<sup>141</sup> في سياق<sup>142</sup> عباراته. ولما ساعدني التوفيق على هذا المطلب العظيم والمقصد الكريم وظفرت فيه بالمقصد الأقصى<sup>143</sup> وفزت بالقدر المعلي لم أجد<sup>144</sup> في زماني أحدًا ينشط لظهور هذا المرام<sup>145</sup> ويهتز لسماع هذا الكلام وكيف والعلم صارت معالمه مدروسة<sup>146</sup> وأعلامه منكوسة وآثاره مطموسة<sup>147</sup> وطوالعه منحوسة، وأصبح<sup>148</sup> الجهل باهر الرايات ظاهر<sup>149</sup> الآيات وصار أهله فائزين بغايات المقاصد والمآرب<sup>150</sup> واصلين إلى نهايات الأماني والمطالب واجدين للمناصب<sup>151</sup> الرفيعة الشريفة نائلين للمراتب العلية المنيفة. ثم هم<sup>152</sup> في ذلك درجات متفاوتة [P 1b] ومقامات متباينة. فكل من كان في عمق<sup>153</sup> بحر الحمق أوحج<sup>154</sup> وعن ضياء المعقول والمنقول أخرج كان إلى أوج الإقبال والقبول أوصل وعند أبناء الزمان أعلم وأفضل ولله رد<sup>155</sup> القائل:

140. Ox. مساهلاته : in marg. Ox. : مساهلات ] P מסה לאת : G ] مساهلاته

141. Ox : ضمנתها ] P צמנתה :

142. G. سياقات : P סיאקאת : Ox ] سياق

143. P. אלאעלי : Ox. in marg. Ox. : الأسنى : G, Ox. ] الأقصى

144. P. ארי (اری) : G, Ox. ] أجد

145. P. אלמדאם : G, Ox. ] المرام

146. G. מדוסה : (מדרוסה) Ox, P ] مدروسة

147. P. מטמונה : G, Ox. ] مطموسة

148. P. אצבג : G, Ox. ] وأصبح

149. Ox. ظاهره : G, (טאהר) P ] ظاهر

150. P. אלמתארב : G, Ox. ] المآرب

151. P. אלמנאצב : G, Ox. ] للمناصب

152. Ox. : G, P (אן להם) : in textu Ox. : add. post et del. Ox. ] هم

153. P. גמק : G, Ox. ] عمق

154. P. (אובג) : G, Ox. ] أوحج

155. Ox. : om. P (דד) : P ] رد

إن الزمان لتابع<sup>156</sup> للأندل تبع النتيجة للأخس<sup>157</sup> الأردل

وللمتنبي<sup>158</sup> في قوله<sup>159</sup> :

أذم إلى هذا الزمان أهيله فأعلمهم قدم وأحزمهم<sup>160</sup> وغد

وأكرمهم كلب وأبصرهم عمى<sup>161</sup> وأشهدهم فهد<sup>162</sup> وأشجعهم قرد

بل العلم صار كلاً في هذا الزمان على كل أصحابه ووبالاً<sup>163</sup> على محبيه وطلابه. فترى<sup>164</sup> الرجل بعد أن أفنى في تحصيله زمانه وفاق فيه أترابه وأقرانه [G 2b] وتعين<sup>165</sup> بحل<sup>166</sup> الغوامض في<sup>167</sup> العلوم<sup>168</sup> وإظهار ما فيها من السر المكتوم ممنوعاً بسبب ذلك عن جميع المرادات مدفوعاً عن كل المباغي والطلبات<sup>169</sup>. هذا ولكن الله تعالى بفضله العميم وطوله الجسيم<sup>170</sup> وإنعامه العام وإكرامه التام عوض المرادات [Ox 5b] أهل العلم من السعادات<sup>171</sup> الخسيسة الحسية بالسعادة الكريمة العقلية، ومن اللذة الدنية الدنيوية<sup>172</sup> باللذة الشريفة

- 
156. P. למאבע : Ox, G ] لتابع .
157. P. למלאכס : Ox, G ] للأخس .
158. G. فالمتنبي : P. ואלמתנבי : Ox ] وللمتنبي .
159. G. حيث قال add. ] قوله .
160. P. ואחד מנהם : Ox, G ] وأحزمهم .
161. P. גם : Ox, G ] عمى .
162. P. פרד : Ox ] فهد .
163. G. وبال : P. וובאל (ووباله) : Ox ] ووبالا .
164. P. פתרי : Ox ] فترى .
165. P. תעין : Ox, G ] وتعين .
166. G. في حل : (בחל) Ox, P ] بحل .
167. G. من : (פי) Ox, P ] في .
168. P. אלעלם : Ox, G ] العلوم .
169. P. ואלמטאלבאת : Ox, G ] والطلبات .
170. P. אלחסים : Ox ] الجسيم .
171. (אלסעאדה) : Ox : G, P ] السعادات .
172. P. אלדנויה : Ox : G ] الدنيوية .



الأخروية. وهيئات أن<sup>173</sup> تقايس<sup>174</sup> الملائكة<sup>175</sup> بالحدادين، وأي مناسبة لظلمة الكفر إلى أنوار الدين وأي مشابهة للذة الحمار في قببه  
وذبيبه بلذة<sup>176</sup> الروحانيين<sup>177</sup> وابتهاجهم بدوام قربهم من جوار رب العالمين. وله سبحانه وتعالى<sup>178</sup> تحت كل محنة لطيفة خفية ووراء  
كل حادثة حكمة شريفة مرضية.

ثم لما ساعد<sup>179</sup> التوفيق على تلخيص هذا الكتاب وتهذيبه وتحريه وترتيبه جعلته باسم الشيخ الإمام الفاضل<sup>180</sup> الحكيم المحقق<sup>181</sup> ثقة  
الدين شرف الإسلام سيد الحكماء والأطباء<sup>182</sup> عبد الرحمن بن عبد الكريم السرخسي<sup>183</sup> حرس الله أيامه<sup>184</sup> فإنه<sup>185</sup> بعد أن تحلى  
بالعلم الكثير والفضل العزيز والطريقة الفاضلة الرضية والسنة الحسنة السنية كثر إحسانه إلي وإنعامه علي وطال انجذاب خاطره إلى ما  
يتعلق بصلاح حالي وإفراغ<sup>186</sup> بالي حالتي إقامتي وارتحالي<sup>187</sup> فأردت أن أكتب هذا الكتاب باسمه لأغراض ثلاثة. الأول<sup>188</sup> أن كثيرا<sup>189</sup>

173. Ox, in marg. Ox : انى G, P (אן), in marg. Ox.

174. Ox : יקאס P. ] تقايس

175. Ox, G: אלמליכה P. ] الملائكة

176. Ox, G : ללדה P. ] بلذة

177. Ox, G : אלוהאניון P. ] الروحانيين

178. G. سبحانه : om. P : Ox ] سبحانه وتعالى

179. ساعد. supr. lin. ] شاهد

180. Ox, G : om. P. ] الشيخ الإمام الفاضل

181. Ox, G : om. P. ] المحقق

182. Ox, G : om. P. ] شرف الإسلام سيد الحكماء والأطباء

183. Ox, G : אלסרכסי P. ] السرخسي

184. G. حوباه وذاته : (איאמה) P, Ox ] أيامه

185. om. G. : (פאנה) P, Ox ] فإنه

186. G, P (ופראג) : فراغ : Ox ] وإفراغ

187. Ox : وارتحالي : (וארתחאלי) P, G ] وارتحالي

188. Ox, G : אלأولي P. ] الأول

189. Ox, G : כתירה P. ] كثيرا

من هذه<sup>190</sup> المباحث تُلجِصَتْ بمجاورته ومحاورته وتُهدَّبَتْ<sup>191</sup> بمنافسته<sup>192</sup> ومناقشته. الثاني ليكون قضاءً لبعض حقوقه. الثالث لوثوقي<sup>193</sup> بقوته في هذا العلم<sup>194</sup> وتحقيقه، فإني وجدته واقفًا على [G 3a] فروع هذا العلم وأصوله لا سيما على أبواب هذا الكتاب وفصوله فعرفت أنه<sup>195</sup> الذي يعرف قدر ما استخرجته [P 2a] من النكت العلمية والغرائب الحكمية التي لا توجد في شيء من المصنفات التي للقدماء والمتأخرين ولم يشتمل عليها كتاب أحد من<sup>196</sup> السالفين السابقين<sup>197</sup>. ولما عرمت [Ox 6a] على ذلك استعنت بالله عز وجل<sup>198</sup> في ذلك<sup>199</sup> محصل الصور والمعاني مفصل السور والمثاني<sup>200</sup> وهذا حين أشرع<sup>201</sup> في شرح مشكلات<sup>202</sup> كتاب<sup>203</sup> القانون على ترتيبه<sup>204</sup>.

### B. On Compound Diseases

Commentary refers to Avicenna, *al-Qānūn fi al-ṭibb*, ed. Qāsim M. Raḡab (Baghdad: Dār al-muṭannā, 1970), 1:76, l.14–77, l.33.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Arch. Seldon A 64, fols. 106a, l.2–109b, l.17.

- 
190. هذه ] in marg. Ox, G : om. Ox.
191. وتُهدَّبَتْ ] Ox : ותהדת P.
192. مناقشته : (במנאפסתה) Ox, P ] بمنافسته.
193. لوثوقي ] Ox : לתוקי P.
194. العلم ] Ox, P : (אלעלם) الفن : G.
195. أنه ] add. הו P, G.
196. من ] Ox, P : (מן) om. G.
197. السابقين ] P (אלסאבקיז), G, in marg. Ox: om. Ox.
198. عز وجل ] Ox : تعالى G: om. P.
199. في ذلك ] G, P : (פי דלך) om. Ox.
200. مفصل السور والمثاني ] Ox : om. P.
201. أشرع ] Ox, G : אסרע P.
202. مشكلات ] add. כליات in marg. Ox.
203. كتاب ] Ox, G : om. P.
204. ترتيبه ] Ox, G : אלתרתיב P.

Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, MS hebr. 1208, fols. 69a, 1.16–72a, 1.16.

Gotha, Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek, MS or. 1916, fols. 101a, 1.5–105a, 1.1.

الفصل الخامس<sup>205</sup> في الأمراض المركبة إلى قوله والورم<sup>206</sup> يعرض للأعضاء المركبة.

التفسير هذا الكلام يستدعي أربع<sup>207</sup> مباحث. الأول ذكر أقسام الأمراض المجتمعة. الثاني أنها كيف<sup>208</sup> ينبغي أن يكون حتى يحصل من اجتماعها<sup>209</sup> مرض واحد. الثالث<sup>210</sup> حقيقة الورم وحده. الرابع<sup>211</sup> بيان كونه مرضا مركبا.

البحث الأول فاعلم أن اجتماع الأمراض على ستة أوجه، الأول أن يوجد مع المرض المزاجي مرض آخر مزاجي. الثاني أن يوجد معه مرض تركيبى كما إذا كان مع الحمى دمل<sup>212</sup>. الثالث أن يوجد معه تفرق اتصال<sup>213</sup> كما إذا كان مع الحمى قرحة. الرابع أن يوجد مع المرض التركيبى مرض تركيبى كما إذا حدث في المجاري ورم يضيقتها<sup>214</sup> فإنه زيادة في المقدار وسد<sup>215</sup> للمجاري<sup>216</sup> وهو<sup>217</sup> مرضان. الخامس<sup>218</sup> أن يوجد مع المرض التركيبى تفرق اتصال كما إذا<sup>219</sup> قطع سلامية من سلاميات الأصابع فإنه من حيث هو قطع فهو من جنس تفرق الاتصال<sup>220</sup> ومن حيث أنه نقصان [P 69b] العدد فهو من جنس أمراض التركيب. السادس أن تجتمع الأجناس الثلاثة

- 
205. Ox, G: P. אלה ] الخامس
206. Ox: G. المرض ] الورم
207. Ox: G. عو : ] أربع
208. Ox, P (כיר): om. Ox. G, in marg. ] كيف
209. Ox, G: P. אגתמאעה ] اجتماعها
210. Ox, G: P. אלג ] الثالث
211. Ox, G: P. אלד ] الرابع
212. Ox, P (דמל): om. G. ] دمل
213. Ox, G: P. אלאתצאל ] اتصال
214. Ox, P (יציקהא): G. וضيقتها ] يضيقتها
215. Ox, G: P. סדת ] سد
216. Ox, P (ללמגארי): G. المجاري ] للمجاري
217. Ox, G: P. והמא ] وهو
218. Ox, G: P. אלה ] الخامس
219. G, P (אדא): om. Ox. ] إذا
220. add. P. והו ] الاتصال

بمنزلة العين إذا كان بها رمد وقرحة قد انفجرت<sup>221</sup> وخرجت الطبقة القرنية [G 101b] وزال ثقب الحدقة عن موضعها<sup>222</sup> ونزل<sup>223</sup> فيها الماء ونبت فيها ظفرة. فإذا كان كذلك فقد حدث بها ستة أمراض أحدها الرمد وهو ورم حار والثاني انفجار القرحة<sup>224</sup> وهو تفرق الاتصال والثالث نتوء الطبقة العنابية وهو مرض آلي من باب المقدار. الرابع زوال الثقب [Ox 106b] عن موضعه وهو مرض آلي من باب الوضع. الخامس<sup>225</sup> الماء وهو مرض آلي من باب<sup>226</sup> السدة. السادس الظفرة وهو مرض آلي من باب زيادة العدد. فهذه ستة أمراض حادثة في عضو واحد.

البحث الثاني<sup>227</sup> في أنها كيف ينبغي أن يكون حتى يحصل من اجتماعها مرض واحد. فنقول: لما حصلت الأنواع الستة من المرض فيها فلم يحصل من اجتماعها مرض واحد بل<sup>228</sup> كل واحد منها متميز بنفسه عن الآخر، ولكل واحد منها<sup>229</sup> سبب على حدة وعلاج على حدة حتى أنه لو زال الواحد<sup>230</sup> منها بقي الباقي. فأما إذا حصل من اجتماعها حقيقة واحدة ذات سبب معين وعلاج معين وبحيث أنه متى زال البعض زال الباقي كان ذلك مرضاً متحداً<sup>231</sup> مركباً<sup>232</sup> عن أجناس الأمراض.

- 
221. G. انفجرت: Ox ] انفجرت .  
 222. P. וצעדה: Ox, G ] موضعها .  
 223. G. فنزل: Ox ] ونزل .  
 224. G. الدم: (אלקרחת) Ox, P ] القرحة .  
 225. P. ה: Ox, G ] الخامس .  
 226. G. om. Ox: ] الماء وهو مرض آلي من باب .  
 227. P. אלב: Ox, G ] الثاني .  
 228. G. كان add. ] بل .  
 229. P. מנהלא: Ox, G ] منها .  
 230. G. البعض: (אלואחד) Ox, P ] الواحد .  
 231. P. מתכדא: Ox, G ] متحداً .  
 232. P. מתרכבא: Ox, G ] مركباً .

البحث الثالث<sup>233</sup> في حقيقة الورم. اعلم أن بين الأعضاء البسيطة فرجا<sup>234</sup> كثيرة ولكنها<sup>235</sup> غائبة عن الحس في الأعضاء اللينة لانطباق بعضها على البعض<sup>236</sup>. ولكنها ظاهرة في الأعضاء الصلبة كمشاش العظم<sup>237</sup> ثم أنه<sup>238</sup> متى انصب خلط إلى شيء من العروق ملأت<sup>239</sup> أولا العروق العظام التي في العضو ثم يسري إلى العروق<sup>240</sup> الصغار ولا يزال كذلك حتى تملأ<sup>241</sup> جميع العروق الصغار والكبار ثم أن الفضل إن كان أكثر من ذلك وكانت زحمة الانصباب باقية انفجرت<sup>242</sup> أفواه [G 102a] القروق الليفية<sup>243</sup> وسال منها الفضل على<sup>244</sup> التجاويف التي في جرم الأعضاء اللينة التي يمكن توسعها. ولا شك أن ذلك الخلط يؤثر بكميافته ويحس منه في العضو بسوء مزاج مختلف فيحصل في العضو تمدد وانصباب فضل وإحساس بالمنافي. فالثاني في ذلك<sup>245</sup> هو الورم [Ox 107a] وحده أنه تمدد يحدث<sup>246</sup> للعضو من قبل انصباب مادة رديئة<sup>247</sup> إليه. وإنما قلنا تمدد ولم نقل غلظ حتى تدخل فيه الأورام الريحية<sup>248</sup>.

- 
233. Ox, P: ג P. ] الثالث
234. Ox, G: פרגה P. ] فرجا
235. Ox, P: לכן G. ] لكنها
236. Ox: بعض G, P (בעצ). ] البعض
237. Ox: العظام G, P (אלעטאם). ] العظم
238. Ox: او G: ] أنه
239. Ox: מלא P. ] ملأت
240. Ox : om. G. ] ملأت أولا العروق العظام التي في العضو ثم تسري إلى العروق
241. Ox, G: ימלא P. ] تملأ
242. P, G: انفتحت (אנפתחת) Ox: ] انفجرت
243. Ox, G: אללינת P. ] الليفية
244. Ox: الى G, P (אלי). ] على
245. Ox: وذلك G, P (ודלך). ] فالثاني في ذلك
246. Ox, G: (فيحدث) P. ] يحدث
247. Ox, P: (רדיית) G. ] رديئة
248. Ox, P: om. G. ] وإنما قلنا تمدد ولم نقل غلظ حتى تدخل فيه الأورام الريحية

البحث الرابع<sup>249</sup> في أن الورم مرض مركب من الأجناس الثلاثة إما أن فيه سوء مزاج مادي فلأن فيه خلط منسوب ثم أن سوء المزاج  
يوجب تفرق<sup>250</sup> الاتصال وهو توسيع تلك المنافذ ثم أن تلك<sup>251</sup> المادة بعد تفرقتها للاتصال تغير الشكل وتزيد في مقدار [P 70a]  
العضو وربما يزيد<sup>252</sup> العضو بحيث يمتنع أن يقرب مما من شأنه أن يقرب منه<sup>253</sup> أو يبعد مما من شأنه أن يبعد عنه وذلك هو مرض  
العضو.

قال الشيخ: والورم يعرض للأعضاء اللينة إلى قوله وكل ورم ليس له سبب باد<sup>254</sup>.

التفسير: لما فرغ<sup>255</sup> بيان حقيقة الورم شرع في بيان العضو الذي يعرض له الورم. ومن الناس من زعم أن العضو الصلب كالعظم أو  
اللين<sup>256</sup> كالدماع فإنه لا يتورم لأنه لا يتمدد وما لا يتمدد لا يتورم. وصغرى قياسهم كاذبة. أما أولاً<sup>257</sup> لأن الدماغ والعظم يعرض لهما  
النمو والنمو لا يكون إلا بالتمدد<sup>258</sup>. وأما ثانياً لأن<sup>259</sup> كل واحد منهما يفتدي. وذلك إنما يكون بنفوذ جوهر الغذاء فيه<sup>260</sup>. فثبت من  
هذين الوجهين نفوذ الأجزاء الغذائية فيه. فتلك<sup>261</sup> الأجزاء كما أنها قد تصلح فتكون غذاء أمكن أيضاً أن تفسد. وإذا فسدت<sup>262</sup>  
أوجبت التمديد<sup>263</sup> وذلك هو الورم [G 102b]. وأما ثالثاً فلأن جوهر الدماغ وإن كان رطباً إلا أن فيه لزوجة والعظم أيضاً كذلك

- 
249. Ox, G: אלד P. [ الرابع ]  
250. G: تفريق (תפרק) Ox, P [ تفرق ]  
251. G: المنافذ add. [ تلك ]  
252. Ox, G: يصير (יזיר) P [ يزيد ]  
253. G, P: om. Ox. (מנה) [ منه ]  
254. G, P: om. Ox. [ باد ]  
255. P: פרג ען G: من add. [ فرغ ]  
256. Ox, G: ואללין [ أو اللين ]  
257. om. Ox, G. (אמא אולא) P [ أما أولاً ]  
258. P: בתמידד Ox, G: [ بالتمدد ]  
259. P: פלאן G: ولان Ox: [ لأن ]  
260. om. G. (פיה) Ox, P [ فيه ]  
261. P: ותלך Ox, G: [ فتلك ]  
262. G: انفسدت Ox, P: [ فسدت ]  
263. G, P: التمدد Ox: [ التمديد ]

فيكون تمدهما<sup>264</sup> من هذا<sup>265</sup> الوجه ممكنا. وأما رابعا فالعظام<sup>266</sup> لو لم تقبل<sup>267</sup> نفوذ الفضلات لما [Ox 107a] كانت<sup>268</sup> الأسنان تخضر<sup>269</sup> وتسود. فإن ذلك لنفوذ<sup>270</sup> الفضول<sup>271</sup> فيها. وأما خامسا<sup>272</sup> فقد خلقت الأسنان<sup>273</sup> مائلة<sup>274</sup> للنمو أبدا حتى أن السن المحاذية<sup>275</sup> لموضع السن الساقطة تزداد طولاً إذ<sup>276</sup> كانت الزيادة ترد عليها ولا يقابلها الانسحاق<sup>277</sup>.

قال الشيخ: وكل ورم ليس له سبب باد ثم سببه البدني<sup>278</sup> يتضمن انتقال مادة من عضو إلى ما تحته فيسمى<sup>279</sup> نزلة.

التفسير: هذا<sup>280</sup> شروع منه في تقسيم<sup>281</sup> الأورام. واعلم أنه يمكن تقسيمها على وجه كثيرة بعضها بالفصول الذاتية وبعضها بالخواص العرضية. وهذا الذي ذكره الآن تقسيم بالخواص العرضية<sup>282</sup>. فإننا<sup>283</sup> نقول: الورم إما أن يكون حدوثه بسبب مادة رديئة نزلت إلى العضو

- 
264. Ox, G: P. תמדדהא ] Ox, G: P. تمدهما ] Ox, G: P.
265. Ox, G: P. הזה ] Ox, G: P. هذا ] Ox, G: P.
266. Ox: P. פאלעטם ] Ox: P. فلان العظام ] Ox: P. فالعظام ] Ox: P.
267. Ox, G: P. יקבל ] Ox, G: P. يقبل ] Ox, G: P.
268. Ox: P. (כאנת) ] Ox, G: P. كانت ] Ox, G: P. كان (كانت) ] Ox, G: P.
269. Ox, G: P. חכדר ] Ox, G: P. تخضر ] Ox, G: P.
270. Ox, G: P. בנפוד ] Ox, G: P. لنفوذ ] Ox, G: P.
271. Ox, P: (אלפצול) ] Ox, P: G. الفضلات ] Ox, P: G. (ألفظول) ] Ox, P: G.
272. Ox, G: P. כאמסת ] Ox, G: P. خامسا ] Ox, G: P.
273. Ox, P: om. G. (אלאסנאן) ] Ox, P: G. الأسنان ] Ox, P: G.
274. Ox: P. (קאבלת) ] Ox: P: G. قابلة ] Ox: P: G. مائلة ] Ox: P: G.
275. Ox, G: P. אלמגאדבת ] Ox, G: P. المحاذية ] Ox, G: P.
276. Ox, G: P. אדא ] Ox, G: P. إذ ] Ox, G: P.
277. Ox, P: (אלאנסחאק) ] Ox, P: G. الانسحاق ] Ox, P: G.
278. Ox, G: P. אלדי ] Ox, G: P. البدني ] Ox, G: P.
279. Ox, G: P. יסמי ] Ox, G: P. فيسمى ] Ox, G: P.
280. Ox, G: P. הזה ] Ox, G: P. هذا ] Ox, G: P.
281. G: add. ] Ox, G: P. لأقسام ] Ox, G: P. تقسيم ] Ox, G: P.
282. Ox, P: om. ] Ox, P: G. (והדא אלדי דכרה אלאן תקסים באלכואצ אלערצית) ] Ox, P: G. وهذا الذي ذكره الآن تقسيم بالخواص العرضية ] Ox, P: G.
283. Ox, G: P. ונא ] Ox, G: P. فإننا ] Ox, G: P.

من عضو آخر فوقه. وأما أن لا يكون والقسم<sup>284</sup> الأول هو النزلة. واعلم أن هذا لانصباب يكون لأمر ستة: قوة العضو الدافع وضعف القابل وكثرة المادة وسعة<sup>285</sup> المجاري وضعف غاذية العضو القابل<sup>286</sup> وكون القابل أسفل من الدافع. ومتى حدث في عضو من الأعضاء ورم دفعة فذلك من فضل مدة<sup>287</sup> انصبت إليه من غيره ومتى حدث قليلا قليلا احتتمل كلي<sup>288</sup> الأمرين.

قال الشيخ: وربما كان السبب المادي إلى قوله والأورام قد تفضل بفضول مختلفة.

التفسير: ليس الغرض من هذا الكلام البحث عن أحوال الورم بل<sup>289</sup> عن حكم من أحكام سبب الورم وهو أن سبب [P 70b] الورم قد يكون حاصلًا ومع ذلك لا يورم [G 103a] وذلك عندما يكون الخلط الرديء الفاعل للورم مغمورا<sup>290</sup> في الأخلاط الجيدة. فإذا استفرغت الأخلاط الجيدة إما [Ox 108a] استفراغا طبيعيا كما يعرض للنساء<sup>291</sup> في<sup>292</sup> الأراضع أو غير طبيعي كما يعرض لجراحة تسيل دما محمودا بقيت الأخلاط الرديئة خالصة مفردة فيتأذى<sup>293</sup> بها الطبع ودفعها. وربما<sup>294</sup> كان وجه دفعها إلى الجلد فحدثت أورام ويشور.

قال الشيخ: والأورام قد تفضل بفضول مختلفة إلى قوله وأما الأورام الغير الحادة<sup>295</sup>.

التفسير: الآن عاد إلى بيان<sup>296</sup> تقسيم الأورام وذلك التقسيم يمكن بيانه من وجوه كثيرة إلا أن أولى الفضول بالاعتبار الفضول الكائنة عن الأسباب المادية للأورام وهي ستة: الأخلاط الأربعة<sup>297</sup> والمائية والريح. ثم أنه جعل هذا التقسيم علة لنوع آخر من التقسيم وهو

284. G. فالقسم: (ואלקסם) Ox, P [والقسم]

285. P. וסדת : Ox [وسعة]

286. all this omitted by G.

287. Ox, G. مادة: (מדת) P [مدة]

288. P. כל : G. كون : Ox [كلي]

289. P. אל add. [بل]

290. P. מעמירא : Ox, G. [مغمورا]

291. G. للناسى : Ox [للنساء]

292. G. من : Ox [في]

293. Ox, G. [يتأذى]

294. P. פרבמא : Ox, G. [وربما]

295. P. אלקאדת : Ox, G. [الحادة]

296. Ox. om. (ביאן) : Ox, P, in marg. G. [بيان]

297. P. אלד : Ox, G. [الأربعة]



تقسيم الأورام بحسب كفيته في حرارتها وبرودتها. وإنما جعل التقسيم الأول علة للتقسيم الثاني لأن<sup>298</sup> الأخلاط الأربعة<sup>299</sup> والمائية والريح مشتركة في أنها إما حارة وإما باردة ويلزم من انحصار مادة الورم في تلك الستة<sup>300</sup> انحصار كيفية الورم في هاتين الكيفيتين ويظهر مما<sup>301</sup> قلنا أن تقسيم الأورام بالأور الستة المادية تقسيم الفصول<sup>302</sup> وتقسيمها بالحرارة والبرودة تقسيم بالعوارض. ثم هاهنا شك وهو أنه في هذا الموضوع جعل الأورام المائية نوعاً<sup>303</sup> في مقابلة الأورام البلغمية. وأما في المقالة الذي يذكر فيها<sup>304</sup> معالجات<sup>305</sup> الأورام الباردة من هذا الكتاب جعل الأورام المائية نوعاً<sup>306</sup> من الأورام البلغمية. فإنه قال: الأورام الباردة<sup>307</sup> إما أن تكون بلغمية أو سوداوية أو ريفية، والأورام البلغمية إما ساذجة بلغمية [G 103b] وتسمى أوراماً رخوة وإما مائية كما يعرض [Ox 108b] لعضو ما أن يجتمع فيه ماء كاستسقاء<sup>308</sup>؛ هذا<sup>309</sup> كلامه. ولا شك أن الأورام المائية إما أن تكون داخلية تحت البلغمية أو لا تكون فيكون كلامه لا محالة في أحد الموضوعين مستدركا. وقوله: وإذا جمع سمي خراجاً. فاعلم أن هذا نوع آخر من التقسيم وهو أن الورم كيف ما كان إما أن يكون قد جمع أو لم يجمع؛ والأول يسمى خراجاً. ثم عبر<sup>310</sup> أن الخراج الذي يكون من جنس رديء فإما أن يكون<sup>311</sup> واقعا في اللحم الضعيفة وهي المغابن<sup>312</sup> وخلف الأذن والأربية وإما أن لا يكون واقعا<sup>313</sup> فيها. فالأول يسمى طاعونا. وقوله: وللأورام الحادة<sup>314</sup>

- 
298. Ox: om. G. ] لأن
299. Ox, G: אלדד ] الأربعة
300. Ox, G: אלסנת ] الستة
301. Ox, G: מא ] مما
302. Ox, P ] بالفصول (באלפציל)
303. Ox: نوعين ] نوعاً
304. Ox, P ] الذي يذكر فيها (אלדי ידכר פיהא)
305. Ox, P ] معالجه (מעאלגאת)
306. Ox: نوعين ] نوعاً
307. Ox, G: om. P. ] من هذا الكتاب ... قال الأورام الباردة
308. Ox, G: כאלאסתסקא ] كاستسقاء
309. Ox, G: הזה ] هذا
310. G: om. P. ] عبر
311. G: om. Ox. ] قد جمع أو... فإما أن يكون
312. Ox, G: אלמעאפן ] المغابن
313. Ox, G: ואקעת ] واقعا
314. G. لها. add. ] الحادة

ابتداء فيه يندفع الخلط ويظهر الحجم ثم يتزايد فيزيد معه الحجم ويتمدد ثم وقوف<sup>315</sup> ثم يأخذ في الانحطاط فينضج [P 71a] بتحلل أو قيج. فاعلم أن هذا<sup>316</sup> بيان حكم من أحكام الورم الحار<sup>317</sup> وهو<sup>318</sup> بالحقيقة حكم من أحكام مطلق المرض لأن لكل مرض<sup>319</sup> هذه الأوقات الأربعة على ما سيأتي. وقوله: ومأل<sup>320</sup> أمره إما<sup>321</sup> تحلل وإما<sup>322</sup> جمع مدة وإما استحالة إلى الصلابة. فاعلم أنه لما ذكر أن الورم له انتهاء أراد أن يشرح حاله عند الانتهاء. وبيان ذلك أن الورم إذا<sup>323</sup> حدث في العضو فإما أن يغلب الفضل العضو أو العضو الفضل. فإن غلب العضو الفضل دفعه فرقه<sup>324</sup> وإن كان مما يمكن نضجه وإحالته<sup>325</sup> إلى الدم المحمود كالبلغم<sup>326</sup> العذب فعل<sup>327</sup>، وإن كان دما فيه حدة وحرافة عدله وردة إلى حالته الطبيعية. وكل ذلك يسمى تحلل الأورام وهو<sup>328</sup> أحمد<sup>329</sup> وجوه شفاءها، وبعد ذلك

---

315. P. וקף Ox, G: [ وقوف ]

316. P. הדה Ox, G: [ هذا ]

317. P. אלוחר Ox, G: [ الحار ]

318. G. هو Ox: [ وهو ]

319. G. من add. [ مرض ]

320. P. om. G : ونهاية Ox: [ ومأل ]

321. P. אלי Ox, G: [ إما ]

322. P. או Ox, G: [ وإما ]

323. P. אך Ox, G: [ إذا ]

324. G. om. P : פוקה Ox: [ فرقه ]

325. P. Ox, G: [ وإن كان مما يمكن نضجه وإحالته ] (ואנ כאן ממא ימכן נכגה ואחאלתה) :  
G. انصحته واحالته

326. G. واللعم Ox: [ كالبلغم ]

327. G. فصل: (פעול) Ox, P: [ فعل ]

328. P. והדה Ox, G: [ وهو ]

329. P. אהד Ox, G: [ أحمد ]

في الصلاح أن ينضح، والنضح يلحقه<sup>330</sup> [G 104a] بالضرورة<sup>331</sup> أمران أحدهما تولد المدة والآخر جمعها<sup>332</sup>. ثم<sup>333</sup> ذلك<sup>334</sup> الجمع إما أن يكون إلى قرحة موصوفة بوصفين أحدهما أن يكون أعظم القرحة<sup>335</sup> القريبة [Ox 109a] منه<sup>336</sup> والآخر<sup>337</sup> أن يكون<sup>338</sup> أقلها خطراً، وإما أن تكون إلى قرحة موصوفة بأحد هذين الوصفين وهو<sup>339</sup> أن يكون أعظم القرحة القريبة إلا أنها ليست قليلة الخطر أو تكون<sup>340</sup> قليلة الخطر إلا أنها ليست أعظم القرحة القريبة منه. والقسم<sup>341</sup> الأول أقرب الثلاثة إلى السلامة. واعلم أن أورام المفاصل لا تجمع لأن رطوباتها مخاطية فإذا كثرت حتى تبل<sup>342</sup> اللحم الذي حول المفاصل أحدثت أوراماً شبيهة بأورام الاستسقاء. هكذا قاله صاحب<sup>343</sup> الكامل في باب النقرس. وأما القسم الثالث<sup>344</sup> وهو صيرورة الورم صلماً فهو ظاهر. قال الشيخ: وأما الأورام الغير<sup>345</sup> الحارة إلى قوله وأما جنس الأورام البلغمية.

- 
330. P. תבעה, G: Ox, ] يلحقه ]  
 331. P. om. : G, Ox ] بالضرورة ]  
 332. Ox. جمعها : (גמעהא) G, P ] جمعها ]  
 333. P. יכון, G: Ox, ] ثم ]  
 334. (דלך) G, P ذلك : Ox ] ذلك ]  
 335. G. للقرح : (אלקרח) Ox, P ] القرحة ]  
 336. G. والى add. et del. ] منه ]  
 337. G. om. : (אלאכר) Ox, P ] والآخر ]  
 338. G. الى قرحة هو add. et del. ] أن يكون ]  
 339. G. om. : (אלי קרחת מוצופת באחד הדין אלוצפין והו) Ox, P ] إلى قرحة من... هذين الوصفين وهو ]  
 340. G. وان يكون : (או תכין) Ox, P ] أو يكون ]  
 341. G. فالقسم : Ox ] والقسم ]  
 342. P. תכל, G: Ox, ] تبل ]  
 343. G. الكتاب add. ] صاحب ]  
 344. P. אלג, G: Ox, ] الثالث ]  
 345. G. غير : (אלגיר) Ox, P ] الغير ]

التفسير: ثم أنه عاد<sup>346</sup> مرة أخرى إلى التقسيم وشرع<sup>347</sup> في تقسيم الأورام<sup>348</sup> الباردة وهي أربعة: السوداوية<sup>349</sup> والبلغمية والمائية والريحية. ثم قسم السوداوية إلى أقسام ثلاثة: الصلابة والسرطان وأجناس الغدد التي منها الخنازير والسلع<sup>350</sup>. وهاهنا بحث وهو أن الخنازير والسلع ليست سوداوية بل بلغمية لأن الشيخ قال في المقالة التي يذكر فيها الأورام الباردة من هذا<sup>351</sup> الكتاب الأورام البلغمية إما ساذجة بلغمية كما يعرض لعضو إن يجتمع فيه ماء، وإما مائية وإما ديبيلات لينة كالسلع اللينة، وإما مستحصفة كالخنازير والسلع الصلبة. وأما المسيحي فإنه قال في آخر<sup>352</sup> كتاب الأورام: والخنازير أورام تحدث عن بلغم غليظ فتصلب عندما [P 71b] يبقى في اللحم. وأما صاحب [G 104b] الكامل فإنه أورد السلع والخنازير في باب الأورام البلغمية، وحصر<sup>353</sup> الورم السوداوي في الجنس<sup>354</sup> الباقيين. ويمكن أن يقال: الشيخ [Ox 109b] لم يجعل الخنازير والسلع من الأورام السوداوية بل جعل من هذا الباب الغدد التي منها الخنازير والسلع<sup>355</sup> على معنى أن الغدد التي تشبه الخنازير والسلع داخلة في الأورام السوداوية وهي التي تسمى مسامير فإنه أفرد<sup>356</sup> في المقالة التي يتكلم<sup>357</sup> فيها على الأورام السوداوية لهذه المسامير فصلا؛ أو يقال: إنه قال في باب السلع إنها ديبيلات بلغمية تحوي أخلاطا غليظة بلغمية<sup>358</sup> أو متولدة عن البلغم كالحم أو كعصيدة<sup>359</sup> أو كعسل أو شيئا صلبا لا<sup>360</sup> يبعد أن يجب إلحاقها بالسوداوية إلا

- 
346. G. اعاده: (לאד) Ox, P ] عاد
347. G. om. Ox : وشرح (ושרע) P ] وشرع
348. G. om. Ox, P : (פי תקסים אלאוראם) Ox, P ] في تقسيم الأورام
349. P. אלמדאויית Ox, G ] السوداوية
350. Ox. om. G : ] السلع
351. P. הדה Ox, G ] هذا
352. G. كلامه في add. ] آخر
353. G. Ox, وخص (והצאר) P ] وحصر
354. P. אלגכסיין Ox, G ] الجنسين
355. G. بالسلع: Ox ] بل جعل من هذا الباب الغدد التي منها الخنازير والسلع
356. P. אגוד Ox, G ] أفرد
357. P. תכלם Ox, G ] يتكلم
358. P. בלגמית גליטת Ox, G ] غليظة بلغمية
359. G. عصيدة: (כעצידמ) Ox, P ] كعصيدة
360. P. ולא: Ox, G ] لا

أنا جعلناها<sup>361</sup> بلغمية لأن أصل ذلك العصيد<sup>362</sup> بلغم عرض له أن يبس فازداد غلظا؛ هذا كلامه في هذا الموضوع. وبالجملة<sup>363</sup> فكلامه في هذا<sup>364</sup> المعنى مضطرب. وقوله الأورام الصلبة السوداوية تبتدئ في أول كونها صلبة وقد تنتقل إلى الصلابة وخصوصا الدموية وقد يعرض ذلك أيضا في البلغمية أحيانا. فالمراد منه أن أحد نوعي الورم<sup>365</sup> السوداوي وهو<sup>366</sup> الصلابة قد يكون تكونه عن خلط محدث<sup>367</sup> له ابتداء وقد يكون حدوثه من قبل أن<sup>368</sup> يحصل<sup>369</sup> نوع آخر من الورم ثم أن مادته تغلظ فيصير الورم صلابة وأكثر<sup>370</sup> ذلك إنما يقع في الورم الدموي وقد يكون أيضا في الورم البلغمي. فأما<sup>371</sup> ما ذكره<sup>372</sup> في باب<sup>373</sup> الفرق بين الغدد والسلع وبين تعقد العصب فكله ظاهر والذي<sup>374</sup> يلحقه<sup>375</sup> به أن تعقد العصب لا يتحرك إلى قدام وخلف بل يمته<sup>376</sup> ويسرة<sup>377</sup>. وأما السلع فإنها يتحرك<sup>378</sup> إلى الجوانب كلها وباقي الفصل [G 105a] ظاهر<sup>379</sup>.

- 
361. P. אנהא געלהא : Ox, G ] أنا جعلناها
362. Ox : om. G. العصب : (אלעציד) P ] العصيد
363. om. Ox. (ובאלגמלת) G, P ] وبالجملة
364. P. הדה : Ox, G ] هذا
365. Ox, G: om. P. ] الورم
366. Ox, G: P. ודי ] وهو
367. G. فيحدث : (מחדת) Ox, P ] محدث
368. P. אנה : Ox, G ] أن
369. P. לה add. ] يحصل
370. G. فاكثر : (ואכתר) Ox, P ] وأكثر
371. G. واما : (פאמא) Ox, P ] فأما
372. G, P (דכר). ذكر : Ox ] ذكره
373. om. Ox, G. (באב) P ] باب
374. P. ואלתי : Ox, G ] والذي
375. P. תלחקה : Ox, G ] يلحقه
376. P. דמנא : Ox, G ] يمته
377. P. יסרא : Ox, G ] ويسرة
378. P. תתחרך : Ox, G ] يتحرك
379. G. والله الموفق add. ] ظاهر

**C. On Pain and Pleasure**

Commentary refers to Avicenna, *al-Qānūn fī al-ṭibb*, ed. Qāsim M. Raḡab (Baghdad: Dār al-muṭan-nā, 1970), 1:108, l.4–109, l.16.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Arch. Seldon A 64 [Ox], fols. 131b, l.10–138, l.9.

Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, MS hebr. 1208 [P], fols. 87b, l.25–92, l.17.

Gotha, Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek, MS or. 1916 [G], fols. 127b, l.9–133b, l.13.

الفصل التاسع عشر<sup>380</sup> في أسباب الوجع على الإطلاق إلى آخره<sup>381</sup>.

التفسير<sup>382</sup>: اعلم أن في هذا<sup>383</sup> الفصل مباحث لا بد من استقصاء النظر<sup>384</sup> فيها.

البحث الأول في حد اللذة والألم<sup>385</sup>. فنقول<sup>386</sup>: الحد المشهور للذة أنها إدراك الملائم. وذكر<sup>387</sup> في الأدوية القلبية أنها إدراك مخصوص<sup>388</sup> لحصول<sup>389</sup> الكمال الخاص بالقوة المدركة. [P 88a] وبالْحَقِيقَةُ لا تفاوت بين الحدين. فإن الكمال الخاص بالقوة المدركة هو تفسير<sup>390</sup> الملائم. وأما الألم فهو إدراك المنافي. ثم لقائل أن يقول: إن<sup>391</sup> الوقت الذي يكون فيه لا ملتذين ولا متألمين<sup>392</sup>

- 
380. P. יט [ التاسع عشر ] Ox, G.
381. P. התפסיר (אלתפסיר) add. [ آخره ]
382. P. התפסיר (אלתפסיר): om. Ox, G.
383. P. הדה [ هذا ] Ox, G.
384. G. البحث [ النظر ] Ox, P.
385. G. الالم واللذة [ اللذة والألم ] Ox, P.
386. G. (פנקול) [ فنقول ] Ox, G.
387. G. ذلك [ ذكر ] Ox.
388. Ox: om. G, P. [ مخصوص ]
389. G. بحصول (להצול) [ حصول ] Ox, P.
390. P. נפס Ox تغيير [ تفسير ] G.
391. Ox, G: om. P. [ إن ]
392. P. אלמלתדין ו מתאלמין [ لا ملتذين ولا متألمين ] Ox, G.



يتوقف. والأول<sup>407</sup> هو الحواس الخمسة<sup>408</sup> فقولكم<sup>409</sup> اللذة إدراك الملائم إن عنيتم به<sup>410</sup> القسم الأول لزمكم حصر الألم واللذة في الإدراكات الحسية ونفا<sup>411</sup> اللذات<sup>412</sup> والآلام<sup>413</sup> العقلية. وهذا مخالف الحق ولما هو كالمتمفق عليه بين<sup>414</sup> الفلاسفة وإن<sup>415</sup> عنيتم به ما يتناول<sup>416</sup> القسمين لزمكم الشك المذكور. فإذا لا بد هاهنا من الاعتراف بأن<sup>417</sup> اللذة العقلية أمر مغاير<sup>418</sup> لنفس<sup>419</sup> العلم حاصل معه. وأما اللذة الحسية فهل هي أمر حاصل مع الإحساس بالملائمات أو هو نفس الإحساس بهذا<sup>420</sup>، وذلك<sup>421</sup> المشكل<sup>422</sup>. ومما نقوله<sup>423</sup> في اللذة العقلية أنهم حدوه بأنه إدراك الملائم واتفقوا<sup>424</sup> على<sup>425</sup> أن العلم بالباري والعلم بالمقدمات<sup>426</sup> قد يكون حاصله عندما لا

- 
407. (פאלאול) Ox, P فالاول G: [ والأول ]  
 408. om. G. (אלכמסת) Ox, P ] الخمسة  
 409. P. פנקול להם : Ox, G ] فقولكم  
 410. P. חסתל' בהא : Ox, G ] به  
 411. G. وتبقى : (ונפי) Ox, P ] ونفا  
 412. G. הדات : (אללדת) Ox: P ] اللذات  
 413. (ואלאלאם) G, P والالم : Ox ] والآلام  
 414. Ox. من : (ביז) G, P ] بين  
 415. G. فان : (ואך) Ox, P ] وإن  
 416. Ox. נاول : (יתנאול) G, P ] يتناول  
 417. G. ان : Ox ] بأن  
 418. Ox, G: om. P. ] القسمين لزمكم الشك المذكور فإذا لا بد هاهنا من الاعتراف بأن اللذة العقلية أمر مغاير  
 419. P. נפס : Ox, G ] لنفس  
 420. Ox. لهذا : (בהדא) G, P ] بهذا  
 421. Ox. فذلك : (ודלך) G, P ] وذلك  
 422. P. משכל : Ox, G ] المشكل  
 423. P. טקולה : Ox, G ] نقوله  
 424. Ox. واتفق : (ואתפקוא) G, P ] واتفقوا  
 425. Ox. ذلك add. ] على  
 426. P. بالمتفاوت (באלמתפאות) : Ox بالمفارقات : G ] المقدمات



تحصل اللذة فدل<sup>427</sup> على أن اللذة مغايرة لهذا العلم. وأيضا فالعلم بالباري لذيد<sup>428</sup> مع أنه ليس علما بشيء ملائم لأن الملائم قد يفسر بما يكون كمالاتا خاصا بالشيء والباري ليس هو كمالاتا خاصا بشيء<sup>429</sup>. فإن قالوا<sup>430</sup> إن العلم به كمال خاص بالنفس فلا جرم<sup>431</sup> يكون لذيدا فنقول<sup>432</sup>: فرق بين نفس الكمال وبين العلم بالكمال فهنا العلم هو نفس الكمال لا أن معلومه هو [P 88b] الكمال. فالعلم [Ox 132b] هو الملائم لا أنه علم شيء آخر هو الملائم فكان من الواجب عليكم أن يقولوا اللذة هو<sup>433</sup> حصول [G 128b] الملائم لا أنه إدراك الملائم لأن العلم هو نفسه ملائم لا أنه إدراك لشيء ذلك الشيء ملائم<sup>434</sup>. وبالجملة فنقول [...] <sup>435</sup>

البحث الثاني<sup>436</sup> في أن تفرق الاتصال مؤلم. هذا<sup>437</sup> متفق عليه بين<sup>438</sup> الجمهور من الفلاسفة والأطباء ولي فيه شكوك. الأول أن التفرق<sup>439</sup> والانفصال لفظان مترادفان وقد اتفقوا على أن الانفصال أمر<sup>440</sup> عديم وهو عدم الاتصال عما من شأنه أن يكون متصلا<sup>441</sup>. والوجع لا شك أنه أمر وجودي<sup>442</sup> والأمر العدمي لا يجوز أن يكون علة للأمر<sup>443</sup> الوجودي. فتفرق الاتصال لا يجوز أن يكون علة<sup>444</sup>

- 
427. G. فيدل: (פדל) Ox, P ] فدل
428. Ox. ازید: (לדיד) G, P ] لذيد
429. G. بشيء: (באלי) Ox, P ] بالشيء
430. P. קיל: Ox, G ] قالوا
431. P. גזם: Ox, G ] جرم
432. G. om. : לדיד פנקול : Ox ] لذيدا فنقول
433. G. هي: (הו) Ox, P ] هو
434. P. הו אלמלאים: Ox, G ] ملائم
435. om. Ox, G.
436. P. בחת אלב: Ox, G ] البحث الثاني
437. P. הזה: Ox, G ] هذا
438. G. من: (בין) Ox, P ] بين
439. G. التفريق: (אלתפרק) Ox, P ] التفرق
440. P. אמור: Ox, G ] أمر
441. G. del. in textu. add. والموضع ] متصلا
442. P. מוגודי: Ox, G ] وجودي
443. G. الامر: (ללאמר) Ox, P ] للأمر
444. P. ללאמר אלוגודי add. post. et del. ] علة

للألم<sup>445</sup>. الثاني وهو أن التغذية والنمو إنما يحصلان بأن يتفرق<sup>446</sup> اتصال العضو وينفذ في الفرج المستجذبة<sup>447</sup> للأجزاء<sup>448</sup> الغذائية مع أنه ليس هناك ألم. ومعلوم أنه<sup>449</sup> إنما لم يؤلم لأن ذلك التألم والتفرق<sup>450</sup> أمر طبيعي ولم يحدث عنه سوء مزاج<sup>451</sup>. وذلك يدل على أن التفرق ليس سببا للألم لأنه تفرق لم يكن<sup>452</sup> معه من سوء المزاج<sup>453</sup>. فيحتاج هاهنا إلى بيان أن اتصال العضو يتفرق عند التغذية والنمو<sup>454</sup>. وذلك بالنقل أولا ثم بالبرهان ثانيا. أما النقل فقد صرح الشيخ بذلك في مواضع<sup>455</sup> من كتاب الشفاء فمنها أنه حكى في الفصل السادس<sup>456</sup> من المقالة الثانية من الفن الأول من الطبيعيات عن أصحاب الخلاء أنهم احتجوا<sup>457</sup> على وجود الخلاء بأن<sup>458</sup> قالوا<sup>459</sup> النامي إنما نما<sup>460</sup> لنفوذ شيء فيه. ولا شك أن ذلك الشيء ينفذ لا في الملاء بل في الخلاء، ثم أنه أجاب عن ذلك في

- 
445. G. الالم: (ללאדם) Ox, P ] للألم
446. Ox. تفرق: (יתפרק) G, P ] يتفرق
447. G. المسحده: Ox المسحده: (אלמסתגדבת) P ] المستجذبة
448. Ox, G. الأجزاء: (ללאגזא) P ] للأجزاء
449. G. om. (אנה): Ox, P ] أنه
450. G. التألم والتفرق: (אלתפרק) Ox, P ] التفرق
451. G. om. Ox, G. (מזאג): P ] مزاج
452. G. لم يكن: (בל למא יכון) Ox, P ] بل لما يكون
453. P. مزאג: Ox, G. ] المزاج
454. P. וענד אלנמו: Ox, G. ] والنمو
455. P. מוצע: Ox, G. ] مواضع
456. P. אלז: Ox, G. ] السادس
457. P. אחתאגוא: Ox, G. ] احتجوا
458. P. פאן: Ox, G. ] بأن
459. P. קאלו: Ox, G. ] قالوا
460. P. ינמו: Ox, G. ] نما

الفصل التاسع<sup>461</sup> فقال: وأما حديث التامى فإن الغذاء ينفذ بين متماسين من أجزاء الأعضاء يجرلها<sup>462</sup> بالتنفيذ<sup>463</sup> بقوة فيتسكر<sup>464</sup> بينهما [Ox 133a] ويتفسح<sup>465</sup> الحجم. هذا لفظ الشيخ وهو صريح [G 129a] فيما ادعيناه<sup>466</sup>. ومنها أنه قال<sup>467</sup> في الفصل الثامن<sup>468</sup> من الفن الثالث<sup>469</sup> من الطبيعيات في بيان كيفية النمو: يجب أن يكون الازدياد مستمرا على تناسب مؤذ<sup>470</sup> إلى كمال النشوء<sup>471</sup> ويكون الوارد قد فسد واستحال إلى شاكلة<sup>472</sup> المورد عليه والمورود عليه<sup>473</sup> قد نما ممتدا في الأقطار متجها<sup>474</sup> إلى<sup>475</sup> كمال النشوء فيجب أن يكون هذا الوارد<sup>476</sup> يداخل<sup>477</sup> المورد عليه نافذا في خلل تحذيه<sup>478</sup> في جسمه يندفع له المورد عليه إلى أقطاره على نسبة واحدة في نوعه<sup>479</sup>. ومنها أنه قال في الفصل الأول من المقالة [P 89a] الثانية<sup>480</sup> من علم النفس: "وأما المربية فإنها تزيد في

- 
461. P. הדא אלפצל אלט : Ox, G ] الفصل التاسع .
462. P. יחרכהא : Ox, G ] يجرلها .
463. Rahman. بالتغذية : (באלתנפיד) Ox, G, P ] بالتنفيذ .
464. P. פיסכן : G لتسكن : Ox ] فيتسكر .
465. P. וינפסח (وينفسح) : Ox, G ] ويتفسح .
466. P. דעינאה : Ox, G ] ادعيناه .
467. P. om. ] قال .
468. P. אלח : Ox, G ] الثامن .
469. P. אלג : Ox, G ] الثالث .
470. P. אלמוגוד : Ox, G ] مؤذ .
471. P. אלנומו : Ox, G ] النشوء .
472. P. משאכלת : G مشاركة : Ox ] شاكلة .
473. G. om. : (עליה) : Ox, P ] عليه .
474. G. om. : (מתגהא) : Ox, P ] متجها .
475. Ox. ذلك add. et del. in textu إلى post .
476. P. אלכמאל : Ox, G ] الوارد .
477. G. ידצל : Ox ] يداخل .
478. P. יחדתה : Ox, G ] تحذيه .
479. Ox. om. : (פי נועה) : G, P ] في نوعه .
480. G. الاولى : (אלתאנית) : Ox, P ] الثانية .

الطول أكثر كثيرا<sup>481</sup> مما تزيد في العرض. والزيادة في الطول أصعب من الزيادة في العرض وذلك لأن الزيادة في الطول يحتاج فيها إلى تنفيذ الغذاء<sup>482</sup> في الأعضاء الصلبة من العظام والعصب تنفيذا في أجزائها طولا لتنميتها وبيعد<sup>483</sup> بين<sup>484</sup> أطرافها. “واعلم أن كلامه في هذه<sup>485</sup> المواضع الثلاثة صريح في أن النمو لا يحصل إلا عند تفرق الاتصال هناك وإن حصل<sup>486</sup> تفرق الاتصال<sup>487</sup>. وأما البرهان فلأن الأعضاء لا شك أنها في التحلل ولا معنى للتحلل إلا أن ينفصل<sup>488</sup> عن العضو<sup>489</sup> جزء<sup>490</sup> كان متصلا به وإلحاجة<sup>491</sup> إلى الغذاء للإلصاق<sup>492</sup> مثل ذلك الجزء بالعضو. فإذا تفرق الاتصال شيء لا يخلو<sup>493</sup> الأعضاء عنه في كثير الأوقات ثم أن هذا التفرق<sup>494</sup> ليس شيئا يختص به<sup>495</sup> ظاهر العضو دون باطنه لأن المحلل هو<sup>496</sup> الحرارة وهي سارية في ظاهر العضو وباطنه فوجب أن يتحلل من الأجزاء من باطن [Ox 133b] العضو كما يتحلل من ظاهره<sup>497</sup> والتحلل لا يتم إلا بتفرق الاتصال<sup>498</sup> فإن قيل التغذى والنمو وإن كانا لا

- 
481. Ox: כתירת P: om. G. ] كثيرا
482. Ox, P (אלגדא), Rahman: الفضل G. ] الغذاء
483. Ox, Rahman: وينفذ G, P (וינפד). ] وبيعد
484. Ox, P (ביד) ] بين
485. Ox, G: הדי P. ] هذه
486. Ox, G: תצל P. ] حصل
487. G. לעל נקצ add. ] الاتصال
488. Ox. مفصل: (ינפצל) G, P ] ينفصل
489. Ox. شي add. ] العضو
490. Ox, G: הר P. ] جزء
491. Ox, G: פאלחאגא ] وإلحاجة
492. Ox: P (אלצאק) ] اللصاق G: للإلصاق
493. Ox: יخلו G: תכלו P. ] يخلو
494. Ox, G: אלתפריק ] التفرق
495. Ox, P (בה): om. G. ] به
496. Ox, G: הי P. ] هو
497. Ox, G: om. P. ] ظاهره
498. Ox, G: לתצלא ] الاتصال

يتمان إلا بتفرق اتصال العضو<sup>499</sup> لكن ذلك تفرق في أجزاء صغيرة جدا فلصغر<sup>500</sup> ذلك التفرق لا يحصل الألم. فنقول: إن كل واحد [G 129b] من تلك التفرقات<sup>501</sup> وإن كان صغيرا جدا. ولكن تلك التفرقات كثيرة جدا لأن التغذية والنمو شيء غير مختص بجزء من البدن دون جزء بل هما حاصلان في جملة الأعضاء وهما لا يتمان<sup>502</sup> إلا بهذا النوع من التفرق. فإذا<sup>503</sup> هذا النوع من التفرق أمر حاصل في جملة الأعضاء وإذا كان كذلك فلو كان تفرق اتصال<sup>504</sup> الأعضاء<sup>505</sup> من حيث أنه تفرق مؤلما<sup>506</sup> لكانت<sup>507</sup> الآلام حاصلة في جملة البدن ولما لم يكن<sup>508</sup> كذلك علمنا أن التفرق لذاته غير مؤلم بل إنما يؤلم إذا حصل معه سوء مزاج. فإن قيل: هذه التفرقات مؤلمة<sup>509</sup> إلا أن تلك الآلام لما دامت بطل<sup>510</sup> الشعور بها<sup>511</sup>. فنقول: أما أولا فنحن لا نعني بالألم<sup>512</sup> إلا هذا الأمر المحسوس ولا شك أنه غير<sup>513</sup> حاصل بسبب التغذية والنمو وليس<sup>514</sup> كلامنا إلا في ذلك فإن<sup>515</sup> أتيتم<sup>516</sup> أمرا آخر كان وقوع الاسم عليه وعلى ما نحن فيه باشتراك الاسم. وأما ثانيا فلأن الوجد الحاصل من تفرق الاتصال لما صار لكونه<sup>517</sup> مألوما غير محسوس وجب أن يكون كل وجع

- 
499. Ox: om. G, P. ] فإن قيل التغذية ... بتفرق اتصال العضو
500. G. واصغر : (פלצגר) Ox, P ] فلصغر
501. Ox, P ] من تلك التفرقات (מן תלך אלתפרקאת)
502. Ox, G: P. ] يتمان
503. Ox, G: P. ] فإذا
504. Ox, P ] الاتصال (אתצאל)
505. Ox, P ] للأعضاء (אלאעצא)
506. Ox, P ] مؤلما (מולמא)
507. Ox. ] لما كانت (לכאנת)
508. G. ] كان ليس (לם יכן)
509. P. ] مؤلمة (מולמא)
510. G. ] بطلت من (בטל)
511. P. ] الشعور بها (אישעיר בה)
512. om. G. ] بالألم (באלאלם)
513. om. G. ] غير (גיר)
514. P. ] ليس (ליסט)
515. P. ] فإن (וآن)
516. P. ] أتيتم عنيتهم (אתיתם עניתם)
517. G. ] لكونه (לכונה)

يُحصل عن تفرق الاتصال أن لا<sup>518</sup> يكون محسوساً لأن حكم الشيء حكم<sup>519</sup> مثله. وذلك يلزمه أن يكون كل وجع محسوس فهو غير صادر عن تفرق الاتصال. وليس مطلوبنا إلا ذلك. ومنها أنه قد<sup>520</sup> يصيب العضو جراحة ثم أنها لا تؤلم في أول الأمر بل إنما يظهر الألم بعد ذلك بلحظة. ولو<sup>521</sup> كان تفرق [P 89b] الاتصال لذاته مؤلماً لاستحال يخلف الألم عنه [Ox 134a]. فلما تخلف علم أنه إنما تخلف<sup>522</sup> لأن في الأول لم يحصل سوء المزاج<sup>523</sup> فلا جرم<sup>524</sup> لم يحصل الألم، ثم لما حصل سوء المزاج<sup>525</sup> بعد ذلك [G 130a] حصل الألم. فإن قيل: الحس شاهد بأن تفرق الاتصال مؤلم فما عذرکم<sup>526</sup> عنه؟ فنقول: العذر عنه واضح وهو أن تفرق الاتصال يلزمه سوء المزاج وذلك هو المؤلم. فإن قيل: فقد جعلتم تفرق الاتصال علة<sup>527</sup> لسوء المزاج مع أن التفرق أمر عدمي وسوء المزاج أمر وجودي. فنقول: بدن الإنسان مركب من العناصر التي تقتضي طبيعة كل واحد منها الخروج مع أن تفرق الاتصال الخروج<sup>528</sup> عن الاعتدال ثم أنها ما دامت<sup>529</sup> متصلة<sup>530</sup> انكسر البعض ببعض وحصل الاعتدال. فإذا تفرقت بقية طبيعة كل واحد منها خالية عما يعوقها عن إفاضة تلك الكيفيات الخارجة عن الاعتدال فحينئذ تفيض<sup>531</sup> عنها تلك الكيفيات. فالحاصل<sup>532</sup> أن السبب الفاعل لسوء المزاج هو طبيعة كل واحد من البسائط إلا أن اختلاطها صار مانعاً من ذلك فلما<sup>533</sup> تفرق الاتصال فقد عدم المانع فحينئذ تعود الطبيعة مقتضية لفعالها. فهذا غاية ما عندي في هذا البحث.

- 
518. Ox, G: P אלא ] أن لا
519. Ox, G: P חכמא עלוי ] حكم
520. G: وجب ] supra lin. et del. قد
521. G: وان:(ولو) Ox, P ] ولو
522. Ox, G: P תחלתו ] تخلف
523. Ox, G: P מזאג ] المزاج
524. Ox, G: P גזם ] جرم
525. Ox, G: P מזאג ] المزاج
526. Ox, G: P פאעדרכם ] فما عذرکم
527. Ox, G: P סבבא ] علة
528. G: om. Ox, P. ] مع أن ... الاتصال الخروج
529. Ox, G: P דם דמת ] دامت
530. Ox: معتدلة ] G, P (מתצלח), in marg. متصلة
531. Ox, G: P יקבצ ] تفيض
532. Ox, G: P ואלחאצל ] فالحاصل
533. Ox, G: P פכמא ] فلما

البحث الثالث<sup>534</sup> في أن سوء المزاج المختلف مؤلم<sup>535</sup>. مذهب جالينوس أن السبب الذاتي للألم<sup>536</sup> هو التفرق ومذهب الشيخ أن السبب الذاتي للألم<sup>537</sup> إما تفرق الاتصال وإما سوء المزاج المختلف. وأما نحن فنظن أن السبب الذاتي هو سوء المزاج فقط. واعلم أن كل ما دل على أن التفرق<sup>539</sup> ليس سببا ذاتيا للألم فهو يدل على أن سوء المزاج يجب أن يكون سببا ذاتيا لأنه ليس هاهنا ثالث. وهاهنا نريد أن نذكر ما<sup>540</sup> يدل على أن سوء المزاج المختلف مؤلم من غير [Ox 134b] أن يبني ذلك على كون<sup>541</sup> التفرق مؤلما أم لا. وذكر الشيخ في<sup>542</sup> ذلك وجوها ثلاثة. الأول أن الوجع<sup>543</sup> [G 130b] قد يكون متشابه<sup>544</sup> الأجزاء في العضو الوجع وتفرق الاتصال لا يمكن أن يكون متشابه الأجزاء لأنه<sup>545</sup> لا بد من انتهاء القسمة إلى آحاد ولا يكون في شيء منها تفرق. فإذا وجد الوجع<sup>546</sup> في الأجزاء الخالية عن تفرق الاتصال لا يكون عن<sup>547</sup> تفرق الاتصال. ولقائل<sup>548</sup> أن يقول إنا لا نسلم<sup>549</sup> كون الوجع متشابه الأجزاء في الحقيقة بل قد يكون متشابه<sup>550</sup> الأجزاء في الحس ولا يلزم من ذلك أن يكون متشابه الأجزاء في الحقيقة لأن التفرقات<sup>551</sup>

- 
534. Ox, G: אלג: ] الثالث P.
535. Ox, G: יולם ] مؤلم P.
536. G: המلائם: (ללאדם) ] للألم Ox, P.
537. G: המلائם هو: Ox: ] للألم Ox.
538. Ox, G: om. P. ] هو التفرق ومذهب...السبب الذاتي للألم
539. Ox, G: תפרק ] التفرق P.
540. Ox, G: כמא ] ما P.
541. P: אלכון add. ] كون P.
542. G: کتاب add. post et del. in textu ] في P.
543. Ox: הווע: (אלוגע) ] الوجع G, P.
544. P: משאבה: ] متشابه Ox, G.
545. Ox, G: om. P. ] لأنه
546. Ox: הווע: (אלוגע) ] الوجع G, P.
547. G: מן: (ען) ] عن Ox, P.
548. G: ואמא: (ולקאיל) ] ولقائل Ox, P.
549. P: לכם add. ] نسلم P.
550. P: משאבה: ] متشابه Ox, G.
551. G: המתפרقات: (אלתפרקאת) ] التفرقات Ox, P.

متى كثرت في السطح كان البعض قريبا من البعض وصارت السطوح صغيرة جدا. فإذا حصلت<sup>552</sup> الآلام في [P 90a] مواضع التفرقات<sup>553</sup> فلكثر<sup>554</sup> تلك المواضع وقرب بعضها من البعض<sup>555</sup> وصغر ما بينها من السطوح يشته<sup>556</sup> على الحس فنظن كون الوجع<sup>557</sup> متشابهها وإن لم يكن في نفس الأمر كذلك. وهذا<sup>558</sup> كما أنا إذا دققنا<sup>559</sup> المداد والاسفيداج والزنجفر<sup>560</sup> والزرنج دقا ناعما وخلطنا<sup>561</sup> البعض ببعض يابسا<sup>562</sup> فإنه يظهر في الحس للمجموع<sup>563</sup> لون<sup>564</sup> ينفرد<sup>565</sup> على حدة وإن لم يكن<sup>566</sup> في نفس الأمر كذلك. وإذا كان هذا<sup>567</sup> الاحتمال قائما لم يكن<sup>568</sup> القياس برهانيا. الحجة الثانية<sup>569</sup> قال<sup>570</sup> البرد موجه<sup>571</sup> حيث يقبض ويجمع وحيث يبرد وتفرق

- 
552. P. חצל ] Ox, G: حصلت
553. G. الفرقات: (אלתפרקאת) ] Ox, P: التفرقات
554. Ox. فلكثر: (פלכרתת) ] G, P: فلكثر
555. G. بعض: (אלבעצ) ] Ox, P: البعض
556. P. חשתבה ] Ox, G: يشته
557. Ox. الوضع: (אלוגע) ] G, P: الوجع
558. P. והכדא ] Ox, G: وهذا
559. G. ادقنا: (דקקנא) ] Ox, P: دققنا
560. P. ואלזנגפור ] Ox, G: والزنجفر
561. G. خلط: (כלטנא) ] Ox, P: خلطنا
562. P: om. Ox, G: يابسا
563. G. المجموع: (ללמגמוע) ] Ox, P: للمجموع
564. P. אן ] Ox, G: لون
565. G, P (מפרד) مفرد: ] Ox: ينفرد
566. P. יכון ] Ox, G: يكن
567. P. הדה ] Ox, G: هذا
568. P. יכון ] Ox, G: يكن
569. P. אלב ] Ox, G: الثانية
570. G. بان: (קאל) ] Ox, P: قال
571. P. מוצע ] Ox, G: موجه



الاتصال عن<sup>572</sup> البرد لا يكون حيث يبرد<sup>573</sup> بل<sup>574</sup> في أطراف الموضع المتبرد<sup>575</sup>. ولقائل<sup>576</sup> أن يقول الموضع إذا تبرد<sup>577</sup> فإنه ينقبض ويعرض<sup>578</sup> من ذلك الانقباض أن تتمدد أطرافه عن أطراف الموضع الحار وأن تنضغط<sup>579</sup> أجزاؤه المتبردة بعضها في بعض وكلا<sup>580</sup> الأمرين سبب لتفرق الاتصال لها<sup>581</sup> [Ox 135a]. أما<sup>582</sup> الأول فلأنه إذا تمدد طرفه عن طرف الموضع الحار انفصل عنه فحصل التفرق. وأما [G 131a] الثاني<sup>583</sup> فلأن الضغط سبب لتفرق الاتصال ولذلك جعلتم الألم الضاغط قسما من أقسام الألم<sup>584</sup>. وأيضا فلأن الموضع المتبرد<sup>585</sup> يمكن أن يكون بعضه أبرد من البعض وحينئذ ينفصل الأبرد عن البارد<sup>586</sup>. وإذا كانت هذه الاحتمالات قائمة لم يكن<sup>587</sup> القياس برهانيا. الحجة الثالثة<sup>588</sup> قال الوجع لا محالة إحساس بمؤثر مناف بغته<sup>589</sup> من حيث هو مناف والحد ينعكس<sup>590</sup>

- 
572. Ox, G: [ Ox, G: ] عن P. מן  
573. Ox, P: (יברד) [ Ox, P: ] يبرد G.  
574. G, P: (בל) [ G, P: ] بل om. Ox.  
575. G: (אלמתברד) [ Ox, P: ] المتبرد G.  
576. G: (ולקאיל) [ Ox, P: ] ولقائل G.  
577. G: (תברד) [ Ox, P: ] تبرد G.  
578. Ox, G: om. P: [ Ox, G: ] ويعرض  
579. Ox, G: תצגט [ Ox, G: ] تنضغط P.  
580. Ox: (וכלא) [ G, P: ] كلا G.  
581. G: om. Ox, P: [ G: ] لها  
582. Ox: om. G: [ Ox: ] أما  
583. Ox, G: אלב [ Ox, G: ] الثاني P.  
584. Ox, G: אלאלאם [ Ox, G: ] الألم P.  
585. Ox: G: (אלמתברד) [ Ox: ] المتبرد P.  
586. Ox: النار [ G: ] البارد G.  
587. P: (תכון) [ Ox: ] يمكن كون G: [ Ox: ] يكن  
588. Ox, G: אלג [ Ox, G: ] الثالثة P.  
589. G: בער [ Ox: ] بغته G.  
590. Ox, G: (ינעכס) [ Ox, G: ] ينعكس P.

وكل<sup>591</sup> محسوس مناف<sup>592</sup> من حيث هو مناف موجه. ولقائل أن يقول إن كنت تجعل<sup>593</sup> اسم الوجد اسما لإدراك المنافي<sup>594</sup> فذلك مما لا منازعة<sup>595</sup> فيه. ولكننا نجد من أنفسنا أمرا مخصوصا متميزا في نفسه فإذا جعلنا الوجد اسما لذلك الأمر الواحداني<sup>596</sup> لم<sup>597</sup> يلزم بالضرورة أن يكون ذلك<sup>598</sup> الأمر هو لصيق<sup>599</sup> إدراك المنافي بل احتمال ذلك واحتمل أيضا<sup>600</sup> غيره وهو أن يكون الألم حالة أخرى مغايرة لإدراك المنافي حاصله معه. ومتى كان ذلك محتملا لم يكن<sup>601</sup> الجزم بأن إدراك المنافي ألم، فثبت أن هذه الحجج<sup>602</sup> غير برهانية. ويمكن أن نتمسك في إثبات المطلوب بأن<sup>603</sup> لسعة العقرب أشد إيلاما من الجراحة العظيمة. فلو<sup>604</sup> كان المؤلم هو تفرق الاتصال فقط لكانت الجراحة العظيمة أقوى في الإيلا من الإيلا منها. ولما لم يكن كذلك علمنا أن زيادة الألم من لسعة العقرب إنما حصل من سوء المزاج لا من تفرق الاتصال [P 90b].

- 
591. P. פכל ] Ox, G. وكل
592. G. בער. add. ] مناف
593. G. תעלם ] Ox: تجعل
594. G. اسم الإدراك للمنافي: (אסמא לאדראך אלמנאפי) ] Ox, P. ] اسما لإدراك المنافي
595. G. نزاع ] Ox: منازعة
596. Ox. الواحداني: (אלוחדאני) ] G, P. ] الواحداني
597. P. לא ] Ox, G. ] لم
598. G. om. ] Ox: ذلك
599. P. הו ] G: نفس ] Ox: لصيق
600. G. om. ] Ox: أيضا
601. P. יכון ] Ox, G. ] يكن
602. P. אלהגת ] Ox, G. ] الحجج
603. P. אן ] Ox, G. ] بأن
604. P. ולו ] Ox, G. ] فلو

البحث الرابع<sup>605</sup> وهو أن الشيخ زعم أنه ليس كل سوء مزاج مختلف مؤلماً<sup>606</sup> بل الحار والبارد مؤلمان<sup>607</sup> بالذات واليابس مؤلم بالعرض لأنه<sup>608</sup> يتبعه تفرق الاتصال من شدة التقبيض<sup>609</sup>. وأما الرطب لا<sup>610</sup> يؤلم البتة<sup>611</sup> [Ox 135b] لأن الحار والبارد كقيمتان فعالتان<sup>612</sup> واليابس والرطب [G 131b] كقيمتان انفعالتان قوامهما ليس بأن يؤثر بهما جسم في جسم بل بأن يتأثر<sup>613</sup> من جسم<sup>614</sup>. واعلم أنك قد عرفت أن عند الشيخ سوء المزاج سبب ذاتي للألم وعند جالينوس سوء المزاج إنما يؤلم لأنه يتبعه تفرق الاتصال. فإذا أخذنا<sup>615</sup> بمذهب جالينوس لزم أن يقال الحار والبارد مؤلمان لأن من شأنهما تفرق الاتصال وليس من شأن الرطب واليابس ذلك. وأما إذا أخذنا بمذهب الشيخ بطل هذا الفرق بل يجب أن يحكم بأن سوء المزاج الرطب أو اليابس<sup>616</sup> مؤلمان بالذات لأن حد الألم عنده إدراك المنافي والرطب واليابس<sup>617 618</sup> الخارجان عن الاعتدال منافيان<sup>619</sup> فيكون<sup>620</sup> إدراكهما إدراكاً للمنافي<sup>621</sup> وهذا<sup>622</sup> هو نفس الوجع. فإن

- 
605. Ox, G: אלוך P. [الرابع]
606. G: مؤلم (مولمא) Ox, P. [مؤلماً]
607. P: مولمא G: يؤلمان Ox: [مؤلمان]
608. G: لا (לאנה) Ox, P. [لأنه]
609. (אלתקבצ) G, P: التقبض Ox: [التقبيض]
610. P: فلا Ox, G. [لا]
611. G: اصلاً (אלבתת) Ox, P. [البتة]
612. G: فاعلتان Ox: [فعالتان]
613. P: add. גסם [يتأثر]
614. G: om. Ox: [بل بأن يتأثر من جسم]
615. P: אגדנא Ox, G. [أخذنا]
616. (ואליאבס) G, P: واليابس Ox: [أو اليابس]
617. P: אליאבס Ox: [واليابس]
618. G: om. Ox: [مؤلمان بالذات ... والرطب واليابس]
619. G: منافيا Ox: [منافيان]
620. G: فكون Ox: [فيكون]
621. G: ادراك المنافي Ox: [إدراكاً للمنافي]
622. P: והזה Ox, G. [وهذا]

قيل: الشيء إنما يحس إذا انفعَلَ عنه غيره والرطوبة واليبوسة<sup>623</sup> كقيمتان انفعالتان لا فاعلتان<sup>624</sup> فلا ينفعَل الحاس<sup>625</sup> عنهما فلا يدركهما. وإذا لم يمكن إدراكهما<sup>626</sup> لم يكونا موجعين بالذات. فنقول: إن الشيخ في كتاب النفس بين فساد قول<sup>627</sup> من يقول الرطوبة واليبوسة غير محسوسين بحاسة اللمس وبين في فصول الاسطقسات أن الرطوبة بمعنى<sup>628</sup> سرعة القبول للأشكال<sup>629</sup> غير محسوسة. والظاهر أنه أراد بالرطوبة التي زعم أنها محسوسة البلة. وعلى الجملة فلا شك أن الرطوبة بمعنى البلة محسوسة. وإن شئت الاستقصاء في ذلك فارجع إلى ما قاله في الفصل الثالث<sup>630</sup> من المقالة الثانية<sup>631</sup> من علم النفس من الشفاء لتطمئن نفسك. وأما الذي يقال<sup>632</sup> إن الرطوبة واليبوسة كقيمتان انفعالتان فكذلك<sup>633</sup> تأويلات ذكرناها [Ox 136a] في فصل الأركان ولا<sup>634</sup> يوجب<sup>635</sup> شيء منها أن لا يكونا محسوسين<sup>636</sup>. وإذا ثبت أنهما محسوستان فعند<sup>637</sup> كونهما خارجتين عن الاعتدال كانتا<sup>638</sup> متنافيتين<sup>639</sup> فيكون إدراكهما [G]

- 
623. Ox, G: om. P. ] واليبوسة
624. G, P (פאעלחאן): om. Ox. ] فاعلتان
625. Ox, G. الحس: (אלחאס) P ] الحاس
626. Ox. فلا يدركهما ادراكهما: Ox. corr. in marg. G, ] وإذا لم يمكن إدراكهما
627. om. Ox. (בין פסאד קול) G, P ] بين فساد قول
628. G. ان add. ] بمعنى
629. P. והי add. ] للأشكال
630. P. אלג: Ox, G ] الثالث
631. P. אלג: Ox, G ] الثانية
632. P. קאל: Ox, G ] يقال
633. P. פדלך: Ox, G ] فكذلك
634. P. לא: Ox, G ] ولا
635. G. יודי סא: Ox, P (יוגב) ] يوجب
636. P. יכונאן מחסוסין: G. يكون محسوسا: Ox ] يكونا محسوسين
637. G. בעד: (פענד) Ox, P ] فعند
638. P. כאנא: Ox, G ] كانتا
639. P. מתנאפסין: Ox, G ] متنافيتين

[132a] إدراكا للمنافي فيتحرى<sup>640</sup> أن يكون وجعا. وللمسيحي إشارة إلى قريب مما ذكرنا<sup>641</sup> فإنه قال في كتاب الأسباب والأمراض والأعراض: متى كان سوء المزاج المختلف في الحرارة والبرودة كان<sup>642</sup> [P 91a] الألم أشد ومتى كان في الرطوبة واليبوسة كان أضعف أو لم يكن. واعلم أن هاهنا بحثا<sup>643</sup> آخر وهو أن بعضهم سلم أن سوء المزاج الرطب لا<sup>644</sup> يؤلم بالذات لكنه زعم أنه مؤلم<sup>645</sup> بالعرض لأن الرطوبة مرخية<sup>646</sup> والإرخاء ممدد والتمديد<sup>647</sup> سبب لتفريق الاتصال فالرطب مؤلم<sup>648</sup> بالعرض كما أن اليابس لإفادته التقيض<sup>649</sup> مؤلم.

البحث الخامس<sup>650</sup> في تفصيل الكلام في اللذات الحسية. قال جالينوس: اللذة والألم يحدثان في الحواس كلها وكلما كان الحس أكثف كانت<sup>651</sup> مقاومته مع الوارد أكثر فكان<sup>652</sup> الألم واللذة أقوى. وألطف الحواس<sup>653</sup> البصر لأنه يتم بالنور الذي<sup>654</sup> يشبه<sup>655</sup> النار التي

- 
640. P. ויוגב Ox: فيجب G: ] فيتحرى  
 641. (דכרנאה) G, P ذكرناه Ox: ] ذكرنا  
 642. G. فان (כאן) Ox, P ] كان  
 643. G. بحث (בחנתא) Ox, P ] بحثا  
 644. P. לם Ox, G: ] لا  
 645. G. أن يؤلم (אנה מולם) Ox, P ] أنه مؤلم  
 646. G. من جهه (מרכית) Ox P ] مرخية  
 647. G. والتمدد (ואלתמדיד) Ox, P ] والتمديد  
 648. Ox, G: om. P. ] مؤلم  
 649. G, P (אלתקבצ) التقيض Ox: ] التقيض  
 650. P. אלה Ox, G: ] الخامس  
 651. G. كان (כאנת) Ox, P ] كانت  
 652. G, P (וכאן) وكان Ox: ] فكان  
 653. P. באלחזואס Ox, G: ] الحواس  
 654. P. אלתי Ox, G: ] الذي  
 655. Ox. שביה (ישבה) G, P ] يشبه

هي أطف العناصر فلا جرم<sup>656</sup> لا تكون<sup>657</sup> اللذة والأذى<sup>658</sup> في البصر إلا قليلا<sup>659</sup>. والسمع أقل لطافة من البصر لأن آتته الهواء المقروع<sup>660</sup> فلا جرم<sup>661</sup> صارت اللذة والأذى في هذه الحاسة أكثر منها في البصر. ثم الشم أقل لطافة من السمع لأن محسوسه بخار وهو أغلظ من الهواء فلا جرم<sup>662</sup> صارت اللذة والأذى في الشم أكثر منها في السمع. والذوق أغلظ من الشم لأن آتته<sup>663</sup> الرطوبة العذبة وهي في درجة الماء فلا جرم<sup>664</sup> صارت اللذة والأذى في الذوق أكثر. واللمس أغلظ من جميع الحواس لأنه في قياس الأرض فكانت مقاومته مع الوارد [Ox 136b] أقوى وأبطأ فلا جرم<sup>665</sup> صارت اللذة والأذى فيها<sup>666</sup> أقوى. وقال الشيخ في الفصل الثالث<sup>667</sup> من المقالة الثانية<sup>668</sup> من علم النفس الحواس منها ما لا لذة لها في محسوسها<sup>669</sup> ولا ألم ومنها ما يلتذ ويألم بتوسط المحسوسات [G 132b]. فأما التي لا لذة فيها فمثل البصر فإنه لا يلتذ بالألوان ولا يألم بل النفس تألم بذلك وتلتذ من داخل وكذلك<sup>670</sup> الحال في الأذن فإن

- 
656. P, G: יתם ] جرم .
657. Ox, G: יכון ] تكون .
658. P: אלאלם ואללדת Ox, G: ] اللذة والأذى .
659. P: קלילה Ox, G: ] قليلا .
660. Ox, G: המפروع : (אלמקרוע) P ] المقروع .
661. P: גזם Ox, G: ] جرم .
662. P: גזם Ox, G: ] جرم .
663. G: محسوسه : Ox ] آتته .
664. P: גזם Ox, G: ] جرم .
665. P: גזם Ox, G: ] جرم .
666. P: מנהמא : Ox, G: ] فيها .
667. P: אלג Ox, G: ] الثالث .
668. P: אלב Ox, G: ] الثانية .
669. P: מחסוסאתהא : Ox, G: ] محسوسها .
670. P: וכדא Ox, G: ] وكذلك .

תألמת<sup>671</sup> الأذن<sup>672</sup> آفة<sup>673</sup> من صوت شديد والعين من لون مفرط كالضوء<sup>674</sup> فليس<sup>675</sup> تألم من حيث تسمع أو تبصر بل من حيث  
 تلمس لأنه يحدث فيها<sup>676</sup> ألم لمسي وكذلك<sup>677</sup> يحدث فيه بزوال ذلك لذة لمسية<sup>678</sup>. وأما الشم والذوق فيألمان<sup>679</sup> ويلتذنان إذا تكيفا  
 بكيفية منافرة أو ملائمة. وأما اللمس فإنه قد يألم بالكيفية<sup>680</sup> الملموسة ويلتذ بها وقد يألم ويلتذ<sup>681</sup> بغير توسط كيفية هي المحسوس<sup>682</sup>  
 [P 91b] الأول بل بتفرق الاتصال والتيامه<sup>683</sup>. واعلم أن الذي<sup>684</sup> قاله الشيخ مشكل لأنه<sup>685</sup> حد اللذة بأنها إدراك الملائم ولا شك أن  
 الملائم للقوة الباصرة هو الألوان<sup>686</sup> وللقوة<sup>687</sup> السامعة هو الأصوات فالقوة الباصرة إذا أدركت الألوان والقوة السامعة<sup>688</sup> إذا أدركت<sup>689</sup>

- 
671. P. נאלם ] Ox, G ] تألم ]  
 672. P. אלאדאן ] Ox, G ] الأذن ]  
 673. P. (אפת): om. Ox, G. ] آفة ]  
 674. G. الضو: (כאלצו) ] Ox, P ] كالضوء ]  
 675. P. פלם ] Ox, G ] فليس ]  
 676. P. פיהא ] Ox, G ] فيه ]  
 677. P. ודלך ] Ox, G ] فلذلك ] وكذلك ]  
 678. G. لان كل لده لمسه: (בזואל דלך לדת למסית) ] Ox, P ] بزوال ذلك لذة لمسية ]  
 679. P. פינלאאן ] Ox, G ] فيألمان ]  
 680. G. بلا كفه: (באלכيفית) ] Ox, P ] بالكيفية ]  
 681. P. אן ילתד ] Ox, G ] ويلتذ ]  
 682. P. אלמחוסוס ] Ox, G ] المحسوس ]  
 683. P. אלקמאמה ] Ox, G ] والتيامه ]  
 684. P. מא ] Ox, G ] الذي ]  
 685. G. באה: (לאנה) ] Ox, P ] لأنه ]  
 686. om. Ox. (ללקות אלבאצרת הו אלألואן) ] G, P ] للقوة الباصرة هو الألوان ]  
 687. P. والقوة: (וללקות) ] Ox, P ] وللقوة ]  
 688. הו אלأצواח פאלקות אלבאצרת אدا אدرکت אלألואן ] P ] هو الأصوات فالقوة الباصرة إذا أدركت الألوان والقوة السامعة ]  
 (ואלקות אלסאמט): om. Ox, G. ]  
 689. P. הו ] Ox, G ] إذا أدركت ]

الأصوات كان ذلك إدراكا للملائم فإما<sup>690</sup> أن يكون ذلك الإدراك<sup>691</sup> لذة فيكون قوله البصر لا يلتذ بالألوان والأذن لا يلتذ بالأصوات مستدركا<sup>692</sup> وإما أن يكون تحديده للذة بأنها إدراك الملائم مستدركا<sup>693</sup> .<sup>694</sup>

البحث السادس<sup>695 696</sup>

[Ox 137a] باب الألم واللذة

فصل في الرد على من جعل اللذة أمرا عدميا. إن محمد بن زكريا جعل اللذة أمرا عدميا<sup>697</sup> وزعم أنها عبارة عن الخروج عن الحالة الغير<sup>698</sup> الطبيعية وسبب هذا الظن أن اللذة لا تتم إلا بإدراك والإدراك<sup>699</sup> الحسي وخصوصا للمسّي<sup>700</sup> إنما يحصل بالانفعال عن الضد، فإذا استقرت الكيفية لم يحصل الانفعال فلم يحصل الشعور فلا تحصل اللذة. ولما لم تحصل اللذة للمسّي<sup>701</sup> إلا عند تبدل الحال الغير<sup>702</sup> الطبيعي ظن أن اللذة نفسها هي ذلك الانفعال [G 133a] والذي يدل<sup>703</sup> على أن اللذة أمر وجودي وجوه<sup>704</sup>

- 
690. P. פאמאן Ox, G: ] فإما
691. P. אדראך Ox, G: ] الإدراك
692. P. מסתדרכת Ox, G: ] مستدركا
693. G. والله أعلم. add. ] مستدركا
694. P. om. Ox, G: ] وإما أن يكون تحديده للذة بأنها إدراك الملائم مستدركا
695. P. om. Ox: ] البحث السادس
696. in marg. مهمل.
697. P. עדמית Ox, G: ] عدميا
698. G. غير: (אלגיר) Ox, P: ] الغير
699. G. om. (ואלדראך) Ox, P: ] والإدراك
700. P. אללמס Ox, G: ] للمسّي
701. G. المسية: (אללמסית) Ox, P: ] للمسية
702. G. غير: (אלגיר) Ox, P: ] الغير
703. P. יכון Ox, G: ] يدل
704. in marg. مهمل لم يذكر هنا من الأصل بل هو بياض من عدة نسخ أظن هذه المواضع سقطت من الأصل للشارح.



فصل في حقيقة اللذة والألم. لما ثبت أنهما أمران ثبوتان<sup>705</sup>، فاعلم أن الغالب على كلام الشيخ أن اللذة هي إدراك الملائم والملائم هو الكمال الخاص بالشيء فإنه ذكر في القانون أن الوجد هو الإحساس بالمنافي. وذكر<sup>706</sup> في الفصل الأخير من المقالة الثامنة<sup>707</sup> من إلهيات<sup>708</sup> الشفاء أن اللذة ليست إلا إدراك الملائم من جهة ما هو ملائم. وذكر أيضا في فصل المعاد من المقالة التاسعة<sup>709</sup> أن القوى تشترك في شعورها بموافقها<sup>710</sup> وملائمتها<sup>711</sup> هو الخير واللذة الخاصة. وذكر في الأدوية القلبية أن اللذة إدراك لحصول<sup>712</sup> الكمال الخاص بالقوة المدركة إلا أنه ذكر في آخر هذا<sup>713</sup> الفصل من هذا<sup>714</sup> الكتاب ما يناقض ذلك فإنه بعد أن بين<sup>715</sup> السبب لغلط من جعل اللذة<sup>716</sup> عبارة عن الخروج عن الحالة الغير<sup>717</sup> الطبيعية<sup>718</sup> فقال قد<sup>719</sup> بين<sup>720</sup> أن السبب في عدم الالتذاذ بما يستقر من الكمالات المحسوسة هو عدم الإدراك وسبب اللذة عند [Ox 137b] ابتداء الخروج إلى<sup>721</sup> الحالة الطبيعية هو حصول الإدراك، ولما عرض أن

- 
705. P. תבויחתאן Ox, G: ] ثبوتان
706. P. פדכר Ox, G: ] وذكر
707. P. ה Ox, G: ] الثامنة
708. G. الالهيات: (אלאהיאת) Ox, P: ] إلهيات
709. P. ט Ox, G: ] السابعة
710. P. במואפקתהא Ox, G: ] بموافقها
711. P. ומלאימהא Ox, G: ] وملائمتها
712. G. بحصول: (לחצול) Ox, P: ] لحصول
713. P. הדה Ox, G: ] هذا
714. P. הדה Ox, G: ] هذا
715. G. ثبت: (בין) Ox, P: ] بين
716. P. om. Ox, G: ] اللذة
717. P. אלגיר אלם G: غير Ox: ] الغير
718. P. אלטביעת Ox, G: ] الطبيعية
719. Ox. فقد: (קד) G, P: ] قد
720. G. بين: (תביין) Ox, P: ] تبين
721. G. عن: (אלי) Ox, P: ] إلى

كان حصول<sup>722</sup> الإدراك مع الخروج عن الحالة الطبيعية عرض أن<sup>723</sup> كانت اللذة مع الخروج عنها فظن أن ذلك سببا<sup>724</sup> وليس كذلك بل السبب هو إدراك حصول<sup>725</sup> الكمال لا غير. فهذا<sup>726</sup> هو سبب<sup>727</sup> اللذة. أقول إنه لما جعل أدرك الملائم سببا للذة<sup>728</sup> وجب أن يكون مغايرا للذة [P 92a] لأن الشيء لا يكون سببا لنفسه وهو قد جعل إدراك الملائم نفس اللذة في سائر المواضع فبين القولين تناف. وأيضا ذكر في الفصل الثالث<sup>729</sup> من المقالة الثانية<sup>730</sup> من علم النفس إن الحواس<sup>731</sup> [G 133b] منها ما لا لذة لها في محسوساتها ولا ألم. ومنها ما يلتذ ويألم بتوسط المحسوسات،

الفصل إلى آخره<sup>732</sup>

وإذ قد عرفنا اضطراب قول الشيخ في حقيقة اللذة فلنرجع إلى عقولنا ولنجتهد فلعلنا ندرك الحق. فنقول الألم واللذة حالتان<sup>733</sup> نحدهما من النفس وهما غنيان عن الحد [....]<sup>734</sup>

- 
722. P. אלחצול : Ox, G. ] كان حصول
723. Ox: om. G. ] كان حصول الإدراك م... الطبيعية عرض أن
724. P. הו סבבהא : G سببها : Ox ] سببا
725. G. هو حصول : P הו הצפל אדראך : Ox ] هو إدراك حصول
726. G. وهذا : (פהדא) Ox, P ] فهذا
727. G. السبب في : (סבב) Ox, P ] سبب
728. (ספפ אללדת) G, P سبب اللذة : Ox ] سببا للذة
729. P. ג Ox, G ] الثالث
730. P. ב Ox, G ] الثانية
731. P. om. G: ان الحواس. add. ] إن الحواس
732. in marg. مهمل.
733. G. حاكمان : (חאלתאן) Ox, P ] حالتان
734. Ox. in marg. مهمل

فنقول لا يجوز أن يقال حقيقة الألم هي<sup>735</sup> الإدراك المنافي وذلك لأن إدراك المنافي<sup>736</sup> قد يكون حاصله مع عدم الألم وذلك<sup>737</sup> يوجب تغييرهما<sup>738</sup>. والدليل [Ox 138a] على أن إدراك المنافي قد يكون<sup>739</sup> حاصلًا مع عدم الألم أن سوء المزاج الرطب أمر محسوس مع أن التجارب الطبية تشهد<sup>740</sup> بأنه غير مؤلم إلا إذا كان ماديا فتورث<sup>741</sup> تلك المادة تمديدا فيرجع للتفرق<sup>742</sup> الحاصل من التمديد. فأما مجرد الإحساس بسوء المزاج الرطب غير<sup>743</sup> مؤلم، فلما حصل الإحساس بالمنافي ولم يحصل الوجع<sup>744</sup> عرفنا تغييرهما. فإن قيل<sup>745</sup> الرطوبة غير<sup>746</sup> محسوسة لأن الإحساس إنما يكون بأن ينفع الحاس عن المحسوس والرطوبة ليست كيفية فاعلة حتى

---

735. G. هو: (הי) Ox, P ] هي

736. P. ודלך G: لانه Ox: ] وذلك لأن إدراك المنافي

737. Ox: om. P. ] قد يكون حاصله ... عدم الألم وذلك

738. P. תגירהמא : Ox ] تغييرهما

739. P: om. G. יוגפ תגירהמא ואלדליל עלי אן אדראך אלמנאפי קד יכון : Ox ] حاصله مع عدم ... المنافي قد يكون

740. P. תשתהד Ox, G: ] تشهد

741. P. פתותר Ox, G: ] فتورث

742. P. אלתפרק : G والا add. ] للتفرق

743. G. פגיר (גיר) Ox, P ] غير

744. P. אלאלם Ox, G: ] الوجع

745. P. באן קבל Ox, G: ] فإن قيل

746. Ox, G: om. P. ] غير

ينفعل عنها الحاس بل كيفية منفعله. قيل له إن الشيخ بين في <sup>747</sup> <...> <sup>748</sup> أن <sup>749</sup> الرطوبة محسوسة <sup>750</sup> ولأنا <sup>751</sup> نجد <sup>752</sup> تفرقة <sup>753</sup> بين  
التراب وبين الماء <sup>754</sup> وليس ذلك إلا للإحساس <sup>755</sup> بالرطوبة وأما في اللذة <sup>756</sup> <sup>757</sup>,

747. Ox, P (פי): om. G. ] في

748. vacat Ox.

749. Ox, G: om. P. ] أن

750. P. כיפית פאעלות חתי ינפעל עכהא אלחאס : Ox, G ] محسوسة

751. Ox : ولا G, P (ולא). ] ولأنا

752. Ox : نجد G: תגד P. ] نجد

753. Ox, G, P (תפרקת): in marg. Ox. ] تفرقة

754. G. والماء : (ובין אלמא) Ox, P ] وبين الماء

755. P. אלאחסאס : Ox, G ] للإحساس

756. om. G. ] (ואמא פי אללדת) Ox, P ] وأما في اللذة

757. in marg. Ox. ] مهلم لم يذكر في نسخ الأصل ولا في غيره ولعله يسقط. add. ] اللذة