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On the Authorship of the Syriac *Prognostics*

Kamran I. Karimullah (Manchester)

*Abstract*

The Syriac translation of the Hippocratic *Prognostics* is preserved in the bilingual Syriac-Arabic manuscript Bibliothèque nationale du France Paris ms. arabe fonds ancien 6734 (hereafter referred to as P7). Jacques Jouanna has ascribed the Syriac translation to Ḥunyan b. Ishāq (d. 873). Yet, comparing the translation styles of the Syriac and Arabic translations and how their translators understood the Greek text reveals that there is reason to doubt Ḥunyan's authorship of the Syriac *Prognostics*. First, I point to evidence that the Arabic *Prognostics* preserved in P7 is a contaminated version of Ḥunyan's Arabic *Prognostics*, as P7's scribe modified Ḥunayn's Arabic *Prognostics* by collating the Arabic text with the parallel Syriac text. Second, Ḥunayn's Arabic translation of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* vi.52 and nearly identical passage in the *Prognostics* shows that Ḥunayn's translation style and interpretation of the same Greek text are not always consistent from text to text. Yet, I argue that these inconsistencies are mainly terminological. They are not grounds for dismissing the value of evidence provided by analysing translation style and interpretation. Thus, in the final section of this article, I compare a number of passages from the Greek *Prognostics* with the Arabic and Syriac translations. These examples show that in translating the *Prognostics*, Ḥunayn and the Syriac translator adopt widely differing translation techniques and interpretations of the Greek text. These findings lead me to conclude that the Syriac *Prognostics* was not translated by Ḥunayn.
I. Historical and Text Critical Challenges to Ḥunayn’s Authorship of the Syriac Prognostics

It is well-known that the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France fonds arabe 6734 (hereafter referred to as P7), contains a portion of a translation of the Hippocratic Prognostics.¹ Jacques Jouanna has used the Arabic and the Syriac translations of the Prognostics in his recent edition of the Greek text.² More than earlier editors of the Greek text, Jouanna has recognised the Arabic and Syriac translations’ value for reconstructing the original Hippocratic text, arguing that Ḥunayn’s 9th-century Arabic and Syriac translations were based on a lost Greek manuscript that is “three centuries earlier than the Greek manuscripts of Galen, the oldest of which dates from the thirteenth century.”³ Citing the Missive to ‘Alī b. Yahyā,⁴ in which Ḥunayn describes how the translation of Galen’s commentary on the Hippocratic Prognostics unfolded, Jouanna sees the Syriac and Arabic translations as arising in the 9th-century as part of larger scholarly effort, which


2. The manuscripts are dated to the 9th-century in both the Arabic and Syriac translations of the Prognostics. The Arabic manuscript is the oldest of which dates from the thirteenth century. Citing the Missive to ‘Alī b. Yahyā, in which Ḥunayn describes how the translation of Galen’s commentary on the Hippocratic Prognostics unfolded, Jouanna sees the Syriac and Arabic translations as arising in the 9th-century as part of larger scholarly effort, which


culminated in a translation of Galen's commentary on the *Prognostics* into Arabic, a task which was eventually carried out by 'Isā b. Yahyā, a pupil of Ḫunayn who based his Arabic of Galen's commentary on Ḫunayn's Syriac. According to his own testimony, Ḫunayn translated the Hippocratic *Prognostics* twice, first into Syriac and then into Arabic.

This translation was carried out by Ḫunayn for his patron Salmawayh. After this, Ḫunayn was commissioned by Ibrāhim b. Muḥammad b. Mūsā to translate the *Prognostics* itself into Arabic. The third version of the Hippocratic *Prognostics* is preserved in 'Isā b. Yahyā's translation of Galen's commentary on the *Prognostics*. In spite of the fact that Ḫunayn attempted to reconstruct the original Hippocratic text as best he could with the aid of texts from the direct transmission tradition, Jouanna says that Ḫunayn's Arabic translation was still influenced by Galen's commentary. For, as Jouanna observes, whenever there is a divergence between "the Galenic and Hippocratic tradition, the readings of the Arabic translation generally side with Galen's lemmas."

There are discrepancies between Bergsträsser's and Lamoreaux's editions of the *Missive*, the latter of which is based on the earlier recension of the Arabic text. These discrepancies are relevant to Jouanna's assessment of the authorship of

---


6. Jouanna, *Introduction to Pronostic*, p. CLXVII. In his critical apparatus, Jouanna includes these recensions in the group of recensions going back to Galen. See Jouanna, *Introduction to Pronostic*, p. CCLXXXII.

There are two details omitted from the earlier recension of Ḥunayn's letter that are directly relevant to Jouanna's argument and his understanding of the value that should be accorded to the Arabic and Syriac translations in reconstructing the direct transmission of the Greek Prognostics. One is that in the earlier recension of the Missive, Ḥunayn does not claim to have translated merely the Hippocratic lemmata (fuṣūṣ) of the Prognostics into Arabic for Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Mūsā. Second, Ḥunayn says that he himself translated Galen's commentary on the Prognostics into Arabic. He does not allude to any role that ʿĪsā b. Yahyā may have had in translating Galen's commentary. Lamoreaux observes that many of the differences between the earlier and later recensions of the Missive involve additional information supplied by Ḥunayn's colleagues during or after his death.8 Yet, the details contained in the two recensions are inconsistent. The earlier recension makes no mention of Ḥunayn's separate efforts to translate the Hippocratic lemma apart from Galen's commentary, stating, rather, that Ḥunayn translated only Galen's Prognostics commentary. We might say that the later recension corrects or supplements with further details Ḥunayn's somewhat inaccurate account of how the process of the Arabic translation of the Prognostics and Galen's commentary proceeded. But this would be entirely speculative. There is now reason to doubt the veracity of the entry on Galen's commentary on the Prognostics in the Missive to 'Alī b. Yayā as it is preserved in Bergsträsser's edition. Yet, this detail reduces the evidence for Jouanna's claim that Ḥunayn made a deliberate effort to reconstruct the Hippocratic lemma of the Prognostics apart

7. Lamoreaux, Hunayn ibn Ishāq, p. 97 [§97].
from Galen's commentary. For Jouanna, the Syriac Prognostics is a result of Ḥunayn's efforts to translate Galen's commentary on this book, whereas Ḥunayn's Arabic translation of the Prognostics was carried out to reconstruct the original Hippocratic text. Nevertheless, Jouanna says that the two efforts were closely related.

Based on this series of observations about the Syriac tradition [...] compared to the Arabic tradition [...], we can formulate the hypothesis that the Syriac translation served as the preparatory model for the translation into Arabic that Ḥunayn agreed to do for Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Mūsā. In order to establish this preparatory model, Ḥunayn reworked the translation of the lemmas contained in the Syriac Hippocratic-Galenic recension of the text prepared for Salmawayh, which Ḥunayn completed by supplying in Syriac the lemmas that Galen did not recopy [in his commentary]. The Arabic translation by ‘Isā b. Yahyā was carried out based on the Syriac translation made by Ḥunayn. This Syriac translation [...], which served as a model for Arabic Hippocratic-Galenic translation does not survive.⁹

Yet, Lamoreaux tellingly omits the later recension's report from his edition. This omission suggests that, in fact, Ḥunayn did not necessarily make a deliberate and effort to reconstruct the Hippocratic lemmata that was independent from the indirect transmission history of the Hippocratic lemma from Galen. Instead, it suggests that both the Arabic and the Syriac Prognostics with us today were originally extracted from Arabic and Syriac translations of Galen's Prognostics commentary.

While it is not disputed that the Arabic Prognostics was authored by Ḥunayn, the question of the authorship of the Syriac Prognostics has never been broached.⁹ Yet, Jouanna has stated that P7 preserves Ḥunayn's Syriac

---

⁹ Jouanna, Introduction to Pronostic, p. CXCVI.

10. In 2013, N. Peter Joosse asserts (N. Peter Joosse, “A Newly-Discovered Commentary on the Hippocratic Prognostic by Barhebraeus: Its Contents and Its Place within the Arabic Taqdīmat al-maʿrifa Tradition” Oriens (2013): pp. 499–523, p. 519) that the “text of the Prognostics in this MS has not yet been studied.” Sadly, the judgment still rings true three years later: Grigory Kessel (Grigory Kessel, Appendix to Hunayn ibn Ishaq on His Galen Translations (Salt Lake City: Brigham Young University, 2016), p. 180) says that “[b]asically no study has been done on the text.” Based on Klamroth's edition, Oliver Overwien and Uwe Vägelpohl translated the Arabic Prognostics into German, which is published in Hippocrates, Pronostic, pp. 273–298 (“Appendice I: la traduction arabe du Pronostic”).
translation because it shows, “in effect, all the characteristics of Ḥunayn's Arabic translation of the Prognostics.” By this, Jouanna only means that while both texts have elements drawn from both the direct and indirect transmission of the Prognostics, the influence from the Galenic transmission of the text tends to serve as the basis for both translations. The strongest evidence that Ḥunayn had access to at least one manuscript directly transmitting the Greek Prognostics is from a passage at the beginning of the work and from a series of parallel passages from Prognostics 15 to 17. In both cases, Jouanna draws attention to the fact that the Syriac and the Arabic translations share the same readings in places where Galen's transmission of the Greek text omits them. Take for example, the first instance cited by Jouanna, in which the Galenic transmission of the Prognostics omits the last section of Prognostics 1, whereas manuscripts directly transmitting the Hippocratic lemma as well as the Arabic and Syriac contain this final section.

[1] In this way would he be justly admired, [2] and would be a worthy physician. [3] For those who could survive, he [the physician] shall be yet more able to preserve them. [4] Having taken precautions against every incident well in advance, [5] what he anticipates and predicts in each case of whom shall die and whom shall survive is faultless.

Ḥunyan renders the Greek into Arabic as follows:

[F] إنه إذا سلك هذا الملك عجب الناس منه وحق لهم أن يعجبوا فكان طبيبا فاضلا. وذلك أنه يقدر فيمن يمكن أن يسلم أن يكون أخر أن يحفظن على ما ي ينبغي إذ كان يسبق قبل مدة طويلة فيري فيما يقابل به كل واحد من الأموات. وإذا تقدم وعرف وسبق وأذن بموت من يستلم لم يلمنه لاحم.


[1] If he [the physician] proceeds in this manner, people are amazed by him and

11. Jouanna, Introduction to Pronostic, p. CLXXXIX.
12. Jouanna, Introduction to Pronostic, CXCII–CXCV.
13. Hippocrates, Pronostic, p. 3 = Littré, Oeuvres, p. 113.
they would be right to be amazed, [2] so he would be an esteemed physician. [3]  
For in cases of those who can survive, he is better able to preserve him [the patient] in the manner required, [4] since for a long time in advance he would have made a statement about what is contrary to each and every condition. [5]  
So when he knows in advance (ida ṭaqaddama wa-‘araʃa) and forewarns (sabaqa wa-andara) of the death of the patient who will die and announces the recovery of the person who will recover, [6] no one would censure him.

And the Syriac runs as follows:

[1] In this way people are rightly amazed with him, [2] and he will be an excellent physician. [3]  
And for those [patients] who have the ability to escape [from disease], he is more able to save [them], [4] having taken each of them into account in advance. [5]  
And when he knows in advance who is ready to die and who is ready to live, and informs about them in advance, [6] he is blameless.

Both the Syriac and Arabic accurately render the Greek text, which according to Jouanna is not typically transmitted by the Galenic tradition. What is more, in this instance at least the translations have only slightly different translation styles, the Arabic attempting to be more idiomatic than the Syriac. In an example that is typical in this text, the Syriac translator renders the Greek privative alpha adjective ἀναίτιος with the Syriac là ḥadilā, whereas the Arabic translator opts for the idiomatic lam yalumhu lā'im. The translations are also characterised by some similarities. For example, there is the interesting use of hendiadys in both texts, which is typical in Arabic translations, but do not appear with as much frequency in the Syriac Prognostics. In the Arabic, Ḥunayn uses a pair of conjoined perfect verbs to render a single Greek participle. Thus taqaddama wa-‘araʃa is used to render the Greek προγιγνώσκων and wa-sabaqa wa-andara is used to render the Greek προσαγωγέων. Here the preclitic προ- is rendered in Arabic using the two perfect verbs taqaddama and sabaqa. In similar fashion, the Syriac combines the perfect verb qadem with the perfect verb yada' to render προγιγνώσκων, and qadem

15. In this and all further transcription and translations of the Syriac manuscript, I benefitted from the kind assistance of Natalia Smelova. Nevertheless, the transcriptions, translations, and any errors in them are mine.
with the infinitive mevdaq to render προαγορεύων. Each translator also adopts a freer translation of [1], in which the Greek optative in the Arabic is rendered using an indicative sentence adding the word “people (al-nāš),” “people are amazed by him (Ar. ‘aḡiba al-nāsu minhu),” and the Syriac in similar fashion adds “people (nāš)” to a nominal sentence, “people are rightly amazed by him (meṯdma beh nāš zādqāt).”

At first sight, then, LL2–3 would appear to support Jouanna's contention about Ḥunayn's authorship, both in the fact that each preserves the direct transmission of the Hippocratic lemma and that the translations exhibit, despite some differences, features of Ḥunayn's translation technique. Indeed, Jouanna concludes that “it appears that the Syriac tradition of the Prognostics on its own behaves like the Arabic tradition of the Prognostics on its own, namely that it originated from Galen's lemmas that are regrouped, and then completed by making recourse to the direct tradition for the parts that Galen did not recopy [into his commentary].”

It is tempting to use the fact of shared readings preserving the direct tradition against the Galenic transmission as evidence for Ḥunayn's authorship of the Syriac and the Arabic. Yet, without the positive

16. Jouanna, Introduction to Pronostic, pp. CXXII.

17. Oliver Overwien has faulted Caroline Magdelaine (Overwien, “Paradigmatic Translator,” p. 165) for falling prey to misusing the evidence in this way in her brilliant edition of the Hippocratic Aphorisms: “her [Magdelaine’s] conclusion that the Syriac text was also produced by Ḥunayn is not entirely compelling as she solely focused on the Greek sources without taking into consideration the Syriac translator and his working methods. In other words: Even if both the Syriac and Arabic versions have the same Galenic origin, the translator has not necessarily to be the same person.” In his own article, Overwien proceeds in the manner of Jouanna and Magdelaine. He compares the Arabic and Syriac with the Greek original, arriving (ibid. p. 174) at the conclusion that “both the Syriac and Ḥunayn's Arabic translation belong to the same textual tradition. First, they are both based on the Hippocratic lemmata of the Galenic commentary on the Aphorisms, and second, their common source is characterised by readings which clearly separate it from the existing Greek version of this text.” He escapes the criticism levelled against Magdelaine because he devotes a section to comparing the translation technique in the Syriac and Arabic Aphorisms. He concludes (ibid.) that the translators are both Hunayn because the amplifications to the Greek, which occur in both the Syriac and Arabic, are “usually almost identical.” Taro Mimura (see n.19 below) has cast serious doubt on Overwien's conclusions.
evidence supplied by so-called indicative “errors” or “variants,” there is no way to judge whether the variants between the Syriac and Arabic translations are peculiar errors of the Syriac and Arabic manuscripts or genealogical errors arising inherited from the Greek apograph, which are relevant to deciding where the Arabic and Syriac fall on the stemma. The need for data based on indicative errors rather than shared readings is especially urgent in the case of a textual tradition such as the Prognostics, where the likelihood of contamination between Galenic and direct transmission is high. After all, there is every reason to expect that Greek scribes well before the 6th century would have recognised the discrepancies between the direct and indirect transmission of the Prognostics, supplementing Galen's lemmas in some cases but declining to do so in others. In other words, if the Arabic and Syriac Prognostics both display elements drawn from the direct transmission of the Hippocratic lemma, there is every reason to expect that these elements had crept into an already contaminated Galenic transmission tradition of the Prognostics prior to Ḥunayn. What Jouanna takes to be a deliberate effort on Ḥunayn's part to reconstruct the original Prognostics in Arabic and Syriac is thus more likely, given Lamoreaux's version of the report about the translation of Galen's Prognostics commentary in the Missive to 'Ali b. Yahyā, a result of contamination in the Galenic branch of the stemma. This process of contamination continued in Arabic as well. In P7, for example, there are numerous instances of contamination, in which the scribe has altered Ḥunayn's Arabic translation based on the Syriac text. Taro Mimura has shown how P7's scribe, Bahnām, modified Ḥunayn's Arabic translation of the Hippocratic Aphorisms on the basis of the parallel Syriac

18. See Paul Maas, Textual Criticism (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 8–9: “if a scribe does not deviate from his exemplar, it is often impossible to establish the relation of the witness to its exemplar and the other descendants of the exemplar. E.g. if F has made no special error in the process of copying from δ, we cannot say whether J depends directly on δ or goes back to δ through F (italics in the original).” On the central role played by “indicative errors” in textual criticism, see ibid. pp. 42–49.

19. See Mass, Textual Criticism, pp. 7–8. As we shall see, P7 itself is an excellent example of the highly contaminated state of the Arabic transmission of the Prognostics.
Aphorisms. And a similar process of contamination may be observed in the the Prognostics. For example, in the Prognostics 1, Hippocrates speaks in a general way about the benefits and difficulties of prognosis. He says that whilst it is impossible to restore all patients to perfect health, it is nevertheless highly desirable to be able to how the patient’s disease will end. To assist the physician in making accurate prognoses about how individual diseases will terminate, Hippocrates says that

\[ L4 \] γνώντα σὺν χρή τῶν παθέων τῶν συναυτών τὰς φύσιας ὧκόσιν ὑπὲρ τὴν δύναμιν εἰσὶ τῶν σωμάτων, ἀκα δὲ καὶ εἴ τι θείον ἔστειν ἐν τῇσι νούσοισι, καὶ τούτων τὴν πρόνοιαν ἐκμαρναθάνειν.

it is necessary for the physician to know the natures of these diseases that overcome the body, likewise, there being something divine in the the diseases, to be fully acquainted with prognosis.

The Arabic in P7 reads as follows:

\[ L5 \] ي ينبغي أن يعرف الطبيب طبائع تلك الأمراض التي هي مجاورة لقوة الأبدان. وإن كان أيضا مع ذلك في الأمراض شيء إلهي فقد ينبغي أن يكون الطبيب سابق النظر فيه خيرا. ي ينبغي ABCBağd || إلهي P7 : om. ABCBağ || إلهي || P7 : in marg. ي ينبغي سماوي ح ABCBağ

It is necessary, then, that the natures of these diseases that overcome the body's strength be known. If, in addition, there is something divine in the diseases, it is then necessary that the physician be experienced with prognosis.

It is evident from the different inks used by Bahnâm and the later annotators that Bahnâm had originally written “divine (ilâhi)” in the text rather than “heavenly (samâwi),” the latter of which is the text attested to by the direct transmission of the Prognostics by Klamroth and the Hippocratic lemmas of the Prognostics preserved in Bağdâdi’s commentary on the Prognostics. The same annotator then provides a note that draws on the Arabic translation of Galen's commentary on the Prognostics to justify why “heavenly” is the correct reading. For, as Jouanna has


noted, Galen interprets “divine” in this passage to refer to atmospheric factors that Hippocratic medicine holds responsible for causing disease.⁹³

By [“heavenly”] he means the condition of the air that surrounds bodies. It is said that [it means] planetary conjunctions and the conditions of the moon; it is said that [it means] the disease that is called “epidemic diseases (al-amrāḍ al-wāfida).” The one who surmised that he meant epilepsy (al-ṣar’) or lovesickness (al-‘išq) was mistaken for their illness is called “divine (fa-innahumā yusammayānī maraḍuhumā ilāhiyyan).”

Contamination of the Syriac and Arabic texts undermines the value of the Arabic Prognostics in P7 from a text critical perspective, for the contamination makes it virtually impossible to distinguish a peculiar error or variant in the manuscript from a transmitted error or variant. Taken naively, ilāhiyyan in P7 would appear to preserve Ḥunayn’s original translation because it is closer to the Greek text than samāwī. But given Ḥunayn’s well-known sensitivity to the theological sensibilities of his patrons,⁹⁴ it is virtually certain that samāwī is the original reading, whereas the appearance of ilāhiyyan in P7 is precipitated by the fact that the scribe compared and “corrected” the Arabic text based on the Syriac. Thus, the contamination in the Arabic Prognostics in P7 leads to a situation in which shared correct readings between the Arabic and Syriac are not necessarily owing to the fact that they were copied from the same Greek manuscript or from Greek manuscripts from the same branch of the stemma. The commonalities between the Arabic and Syriac in P7 may just as well be a result of the scribe altering the Arabic based on the Syriac, which is precisely what type of contamination appears in the Arabic Aphorisms and Prognostics in P7:

---


In sum, new analysis of Ḫunayns Missive to ʿAli b. Yahyā suggests that both the Arabic and possibly the Syriac Prognostics were extracted from Galen’s lemma, and that Ḫunayn did not necessarily make an extensive effort to collate Galen’s transmission of the Prognostics with the direct transmission of the Hippocratic text. Second, shared correct readings do not show that Ḫunayn and the Syriac translator each had access to direct and indirect transmissions of the Greek Prognostics and that they reassembled the text based on an analysis of both witnesses. Positive evidence for Jouanna’s claim can only be had by so-called indicative errors or variants. Yet, these data are hard to identify reliably because the Arabic Prognostics in P7 at least is heavily contaminated. The data collected by Jouanna certainly do not demonstrate—and this is the point—that the translator of the Arabic and Syriac Prognostics is the same individual.

LL1–3 show that in order to settle the question of Ḫunayn’s authorship of the Syriac Prognostics in a more satisfactory manner, a more thorough analysis of the translation style and interpretation of the Greek texts adopted by each translator is required. In the following sections I consider number of examples, which afford evidence that P7 does not preserve the Syriac of Ḫunayn’s translation of the Prognostics extracted from his Syriac translation of Galen’s commentary.

II. Limitations on the Method of Using Translation Style to Undermine Ḫunayn’s Authorship
As was noted earlier, in order to prove that Ḫunayn is the translator of the Syriac Prognostics Jouanna relies on the fact that the Arabic and Syriac Prognostics consistently side on the same side of the Prognostic’s stemma, sometimes siding with the direct transmission and sometimes with the indirect transmission. Jouanna uses these facts to add weigh to the value of the Arabic and Syriac Prognostics because they represent a version of the Prognostics transmitted by Galen with supplements drawn from the direct transmission of the Hippocratic text. Yet, I think that Ḫunayn’s authorship of the Syriac Prognostics is unlikely. In the following pages, I shall approach this question by contrasting the translation
styles of the Syriac and Arabic Prognostics, and contrasting how the translators interpret the Greek lemma in different ways.

Yet, there are certain limitations to this method. It cannot be the case that mere differences in terminology and minor differences in interpretation necessarily undermine single authorship of two texts. Consider the following example of parallel texts from the Greek Aphorisms and Prognostics, which Ḥunayn translates in different ways. Yet, no one seriously doubts Ḥunayn’s authorship of either translation.

In the introduction to his edition of the Hippocratic Prognostics, Jouanna devotes several pages to comparing this passage from the Prognostics with a nearly identical passage in the Hippocratic Aphorisms vi.52. Jouanna includes Ḥunayn’s Arabic translation in the critical apparatus to this passage, but the Syriac is noticeably absent. In fact, the Syriac translation of the Prognostics differs noticeably from the Syriac translation of Aphorisms vi.52. First the Greek Prognostics:

[L7] Σκοτεῖν δὲ χρῆ καὶ τὰς ὑποφάσιας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐν τοῖσιν ὑπνοισιν· ἢ γάρ τι υποφαίνεται τοῦ λευκοῦ ἐμμαλαλλομένων τῶν βλεφάρων, μὴ ἐκ διαρροῆς ἢ φαρμακοποιήσις ἐόντι, ἢ μὴ εἰθισμένων οὕτω καθεύδειν, φλαῦρον τὸ σημεῖον καὶ θανατώδες σφόδρα.


It is necessary to examine what shows from the eyes during sleep, for if some of the white of the eyes appears whilst the lids are shut, but not because of diarrhoea, taking drugs, or because it is [the patient’s] habit to sleep this way, it is a bad sign and extremely deadly.

Now the Greek of the Aphorisms, vi.52:

[L8] Σκοτεῖν δὲ χρῆ καὶ τὰς ὑποφάσιας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐν τοῖσιν ὑπνοισιν· ἢ γάρ τι υποφαίνεται τοῦ λευκοῦ, συμβαλλόμενη τῶν βλεφάρων, μὴ ἐκ τοῦ διαρροῆς ἢν τι ή φαρμακοποιήσις, φλαῦρον τὸ σημεῖον καὶ θανατώδες σφόδρα.

It is necessary to examine what shows from the eyes during sleep, for if part of the whites of the eyes appears, the lids being shut, without it being caused by diarrhoea or taking a drug, it is a bad sign and extremely deadly.

Arabic Aphorisms:

قال أبكر: قد يبلغ أن ينفَقُنَّ بَاطُنُ العين في وقت النوم فإن تبَنَّ شئٍ من بِباش العين الحُفن متعلق، وليس ذلك
Hippocrates said: it is necessary to examine the inside of the eye during sleep. Then if part of the white of the eye shows and the lid is shut and this is not following diarrhoea or taking a drug, this is a bad sign and is very deadly.

**Arabic Prognostics:**

It is necessary to examine what appears from the inside of the eyes during sleep. If part of the whites [of the eyes] appears and the eyelids are shut, but this is not because of diarrhoea or taking a purgative drug, nor is he [the patient] the kind whose habit is to sleep with his eyes in this condition, this is a bad sign and is extremely deadly.

Many of the differences between the Arabic translations are, thus, not significant, relating mainly to word choice. For example, Hunayn uses *dalīl* and *ʿalāma* to render τὸ σημεῖον; he uses *qattāl* in one instance and *muhlika* in another to translate ἄνατωδῆς; in the Aphorisms, Hunayn uses *tabayyana* to translate ύποφαίνεται but uses *zahara* in the Pronostics; he uses *ʿayn* in the singular in the Aphorisms but in the plural *ʿaynayn* in the Prognostics for τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, and likewise τῶν ἐμφαράνων in the Arabic Aphorisms is translated using the singular ḏafn “eyelid” but the plural ḏafnayn (“eyelids”) in the Arabic Prognostics. Lastly, διαφορής is translated in the Aphorisms as *iḥtilāf* but in the Prognostics as *darab*.

Yet other differences between the two translations are more substantial, with the Arabic Prognostics at times showing a slightly higher frequency of explication than Hunayn uses in the Aphorisms. For example, the Hunayn twice translates φαρμακοποιής using *šurb dawāʾ*, but in the Prognostics Hunayn explicates further by adding *šurb dawāʾ mushil*. Hunayn’s translations of the difficult word ύποφάσιας are different in each text. In the Aphorisms, Hunayn translates this term slightly inaccurately as the inside of the eye (bāṭin al-ʿayn)

---

25. P7, fols. 97a, line 8–97b, 2.
whereas in the Prognostics Ḥunyan uses a longer Arabic clause “what appears from the inside of the eye (mā ṭūḥara min bāṭini l-ʿaynaynī)” to capture the meaning of the Greek term. In the Aphorisms, Ḥunyan interprets the ḫ in “μὴ ἐκ διαρροίης [... ]” as meaning that there is only prognostic value in observing the eyes during sleep if the observation is not following in the wake of diarrhoea (laysa ḏālika bi-ʿaqibī ʿḥtilāfīn). On the other hand, in the Prognostics, Ḥunyan understands ḫ to have a causative sense, so that the eyelids are not shut because of diarrhoea (tumma lam yakun ḏālika ḍan ʿarabīn). Finally, Ḥunyan translates the genitive absolute συμβάλλομενων τῶν βλεφάρων differently in the Aphorisms and the Prognostics.

Likewise, the translation of the identical Greek phrase in the Syriac Aphorisms is different from the translation of the nearly identical phrase in the Syriac Prognostics. The Syriac translator of the Aphorisms understood τὰς ὑποφάσις to mean the inside of the eyes, just as the Arabic Aphorisms and Prognostics use bāṭin to render the Greek word. In the Syriac Aphorisms, then, we read:

[Syriac Aphorisms 11]

It is necessary to examine the inside of the eyes during sleep, if whilst the eyelids are shut something white appears from the eyes, without the illness being being because of diryāhā, what flows from the stomach, or having taken a drug, it is bad and extremely dangerous.

However, in the Syriac Prognostics, the Greek is rendered as follows:

[Syriac Prognostics 12]

It is necessary to look also at the ḥōvāfōsīs—that is, what is manifest from the inside the eye—during sleep. If something from the whites appears while the eyelids are closed, if it is not from diarrhoea and from taking a drug, and this

26. Overwien analyses (Overwien, “Paradigmatic Translator,” pp. 166–167) the the same pair of texts, but arrives at a different conclusion.

[person] does not have the habit of sleeping this way, this is a bad sign and is extremely deadly.

Some of the differences between the two Syriac translations are evident but do not constitute evidence for or against single authorship.\textsuperscript{28} For example, a minor difference is that the Greek ἐκ, which is used to convey a causal sense in these passages, is rendered in the Syriac Aphorisms with li- and in the Syriac Prognostics with min 'ilt. On the other hand, there are several noteworthy differences between the Syriac translations. The first is that the Prognostics opts to transliterate the Greek υποφάσιας and then to supply an explanatory gloss of the term, whereas the Syriac Aphorisms directly translates the phrase. Significantly, the translation in the Prognostics shows a different understanding of what υποφάσιας means in comparison with the Syriac Aphorisms. The latter somewhat problematically, translates the phrase as “the inside of the eyes,” which resembles the slightly inaccurate translation of υποφάσιας in the Arabic Aphorisms bāṭin al-ʿayn. Though the Prognostics uses the technique of transliteration followed by explanation, the interpretation of υποφάσιας as “what is manifest from the inside of the eyes,” is more accurate than the Syriac or Arabic Aphorisms. Thirdly, the translator (or translators) of the Syriac Prognostics and Aphorisms choose to translate διάρροια differently. The Syriac Aphorisms evinces a more literal understanding of the Greek text, which is closer to the lexical sense of “what flows” from the belly. The Syriac Prognostics shows greater appreciation for the Greek medical terminology, using the Syriac dayelā to translate the Greek term. Once again, the Syriac translator of the Prognostics transliterates the Greek διάρροια and then follows it with a brief explanation of its meaning.

Thus, we have before us four different renderings of nearly the same Greek text in Syriac and Arabic, all of which have been ascribed to Ḥunayn. Yet, these translations differ not only in the literalness of the translation and word choice for

\textsuperscript{28} Overwien (Overwien, “Paradigmatic Translator,” p. 167) also observes that both “Syriac translations are obviously not identical, but that was not necessarily to be expected as they were written independently of each other.”
III. Evidence against Hunayn’s Authorship

Example 1

An instructive example is in Prognostics 7, where Hippocrates speaks about a type of severe swelling affecting the entire area of the belly, or the “hypochondrium (τῷ ὑποχόνδριον, mā dūna al-šarāsif).”

When a swelling occurring in the belly is hard and causes pain, it is very bad when it occupies this entire area.

When it is in one of the sides, it is freer from danger when it is to the left.

The Syriac Prognostics reads as follows:

The swelling in the hypochondrium, which is hard and painful, is also bad, if [it is] in the entire hypochondrium. If [...] of the side, there is no danger when [...] on
the left.
A comparison of the Greek, Arabic and Syriac texts yields two important results.
First the Syriac and the Arabic translators adopt different translation techniques.
In the Arabic, Ḥunayn uses the explicative translation mā dūna al-šarāsīf (literally “what is below the ribs”), which captures the meaning and etymology of τὸ ὑποχόνδριον. In addition, in order to avoid repetition and perhaps to produce a more elegant translation, Ḥunayn replaces the second instance of τὸ ὑποχόνδριον in the passage with the fi ḏālika l-mawḍi’ (literally, “in this place”). The Syriac translator on the other hand simply transcribes “ὑποχόνδριον” twice, on both occasions without supplying a Syriac gloss of the term.

Finally, there is the problem of how the Greek privative elative ἀκίνδυνότερόν (“freer from danger”) is translated by the Arabic and Syriac translators. The Arabic translator uses the phrase fa-aslama minhu (“it is sounder, safer...”) in order to mimic the morphology of the Greek comparative. On the other hand, the Arabic translator makes use of a cognate of the verb salima (to be sound, free from) to render the sense of the Greek privative ἀκίνδυνος (free from danger). Sadly, the Syriac portion of this text has been damaged by water so what Bahnām originally wrote in the manuscript has disappeared. However, a later scribe or annotator has overwritten portions of the Syriac text, though it is unclear whether this was done before or after the manuscript was affected by water damage and whether the later scribe was faithful to Bahnām’s original. In the portion of the Syriac text in which the translation of ἀκίνδυνότερόν should appear, this later hand has written “(...) which is dangerous (de-qinḏōnōs).” Obviously, this is the opposite of the sense conveyed by the Greek text, and, to that extent, unlikely to have been originally copied by Bahnām. In Sergius’ translation of Galen’s On Simple Drugs, Books Six, the phrase “because it dries without biting (ἐκ τοῦ ξηραίνειν ἄθρηκτως)” is translated into Syriac using categorical negation ḫā́ ḫa-aslama ṣūn. In the Syriac

of Galen's *On Simple Drugs*, Sergius renders the Greek privative in a similar manner. When Galen somewhat ambiguously says that hemp "dissolves flatulence (ἀφυσός)," this can mean that hemp is *without flatulence, relieves flatulence* or does *not produce flatulence*. Retaining something of Galen's ambiguity, Sergius says that hemp is "does not produce flatulence at all (πλῆθος τῶν πρωΐ ἔστι ὡσπερ τὸ ἅπαξ, ἀνθρώπῳ ξύνηθές πλείονα νυκτὸς, [L16])". Once more, the Greek privative is rendered into Syriac using the categorical negation, here of an active participle. Whatever the case may be, it is clear that the Syriac does not attempt, as Ḥunayn's Arabic does, to mimic the Greek morphology by using a comparative. Whilst Ḥunayn's Arabic translation dispenses with the privative morphology and follows the Greek comparative, the Syriac uses a privative construction but simply dispenses with the Greek comparative.

*Example 2*

In *Prognostics* 11 (a), Hippocrates speaks about the qualities of feces and the regular times and frequencies for defecating during the day and night.\(^{32}\) [L16] Ἀλλὰ χρῆ κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐσιόντων ἡ δις ἡ τρίς τῆς ἡμέρας ὑποχωρέειν, καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς ἕπαξ, πλείονα δ᾿ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωῒ, ὑσπερ ἔξυνηθές ἐστι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. τῶν ἐσιόντων Littré: τῶν ἐσιόντων C'MV trans. ante πλῆθος GalL || πλῆθος C'V GalL(VRPF Ar): πλείστον M

But it is necessary to evacuate in proportion to the quantity of nourishment given, either two or three times during the day, and once at night, the largest quantity being in the morning, as is the person's habit.

In the Greek, the final statement "as is the person's habit" is vague. Jouanna supplies the gloss that the largest quantity of nourishment should be taken in the morning as is the person's habit when *he is healthy*. It seems that the Arabic translator understood the lemma to mean something else.

\[^{33}\] 33. P7 fol. 107a.

---


33. P7 fol. 107a.
But it is necessary for the discharges to be according to amount that nourishes the body, twice or three times during the day and once during the night, and mostly toward the morning, whatever the habit of *rising* that person has.

To my mind, Hunayn's Arabic is equally ambiguous. The antecedent for the masculine singular pronominal enclitic *wa-yakānu akṭaruhu* is most plausibly the *mā* in “*mā yaridu al-badana* (what nourishes the body),” but it may also be the “what is discharged (*al-birāz*).” Thus, the *habit of rising* referred to may, on the first interpretation, be the number of times a day the patient typically rises to eat, or, on the second interpretation, the number of times during the day and night the patient rises from sleep to defecate.

The Syriac Prognostics offers a surprising explicitation.

But it is necessary that in the nourishment taken in is equal in proportion to the amount that is expelled, two times a day, or three, or once in the night, since the greater amount is *expelled* in the morning, or as is the person's habit.

Once again, we see that the interpretations by the two translators do not harmonise well. Both supply explicative translations, but the explanations of the Greek text they provide are quite different, suggesting that each interprets the text differently. Clearly recognising the divergence between the two translations, Arabic annotators in P7 attempt to supply explanations that harmonise the two translations. One annotator says that in this passage “*habit* (*āda*)” means “his [the patient's] habit of rising whilst he is health (*ādatuḥu fī šihhatihī an yaqūma*).”

Another annotator adds a longer note:

The purport [*al-zāhir, of this passage*] is that it is necessary that [what is expelled] be more than the nourishment given if (...), because it increases the amount of the disease matter. It [expulsion] is only once (*marratan*) during the night because the nature descends in order to concoct the matter and to nourish the faculty, and (...)

---

at the time of rising [from sleep].
The above example is an example of explicitation by the Arabic and Syriac translators. However, the understandings of the passage are clearly different, suggesting that, in this case at least, the Arabic and Syriac translators are not one and the same person.

**Example 3**

It is advantageous when round worms are expelled along with excrement as the disease proceeds toward the crisis.

Hunyan translates the text in the following way:

It is also advantageous that round tapeworms are expelled with the excrement as the disease advances towards the crisis.

Two aspects of this set of texts merit our attention. In his edition of the Arabic Prognostics, Martin Klamorth ventures that Hunyan omitted στρογγύλας from his Arabic translation, simply translating ἑλµινθας στρογγύλας with a single Arabic word حياة. This is not correct, however, for we learn from Manfred Ullmann that حياة was, in fact, a word Hunyan frequently used to translate words referring to parasitic worms in the intestines. In other words, we have another case here of Hunyan opting for a less literal translation that seems to have accorded with lexical Arabic usage. On the other hand, the translator of the Syriac Prognostics

---


36. P7 fol. 107a, line 15–107b, line 2.


once again renders the Greek literally with “literally, round tapeworms.” Such a literal rendering is inconsistent with Ḥunayn's well-known tendency to avoid rendering the Greek literally.

The second point is the following. If the three manuscripts used by Klamroth, which I have collated with P7, are correct, the Greek manuscript used by Ḥunayn to translate appears to have had the incorrect τοῦ νοσέοντος “the sick person” rather than τῆς νούσου “the disease,” which is the unanimous reading of the Greek manuscript tradition. The manuscript used by Ḥunayn, then, appears to have been copied incorrectly. The Syriac Prognostics correctly translates the Greek τῆς νούσου with “disease, illness.” Recognising that the Arabic contains a different reading, an annotator appears to have corrected the Arabic in P7 based on the Syriac translation. It is important to recognise that this both Bahnām and later annotators tended to correct the Arabic based on the Syriac, not necessarily because they were able to compare each translation with the Greek original, but because these scholars appeared to weigh the testimony of the Syriac more than the Arabic. This suggests that Ḥunayn was not in fact the translator of this passage of the Syriac Prognostics, since it strikes me as highly unlikely that Ḥunayn would correctly translate the lemma in the first stage of the translation of the Prognostics and then adopt an a reading that has no basis in the manuscript tradition.

Example 4
A few lines after the lemma presented in Example 4, Hippocrates turns to discuss the colour and texture of feces that indicates a bad outcome for the disease.39

\[ \text{[L23]} \text{ἲθαρές δὲ κάρτα, ἢ λευκόν ἢ χλωρόν ἰσχυρῶς ἢ ἀφρώδες διαχωρέειν, πονηρὰ ταῦτα πάντα.} \]

χλωρόν om. V || post χλωρόν add. ἢ ἐρυθρόν MV sed non hab. CSYXG’ LatI GalL(VRPF Ar) GaIT GalPorrh StephL || ταῦτα πάντα C M GalL(VRF Ar dies alles) GalPorrh : πάντα ταῦτα V LatI (omnia haec) GalL(P) ταῦτα StephL

Discharging what is extremely watery, white, strongly yellow or frothy is all bad.

---

Discharging what is watery and extremely fine, white, intensely yellow and frothy is all bad.

Discharge that is very watery, white, or pale—all these are bad.

Here is another example in which the translation style adopted by Hunayn and the Syriac translator differ noticeably. Hunayn's translation endeavours to capture the Greek in a precise manner. Hunayn also uses the Arabic zabadi (foamy, frothy, having drosses) to accurately render the Greek ἀφρῶδες. The Syriac translation on the other hand does not attempt to capture the sense of the Greek as accurately as Hunayn as he assigns a single Syriac word "mayānāyā" to capture the Greek ὑδαρές. Finally, it is noteworthy that the appropriate Syriac word corresponding to the Greek ἀφρῶδες is absent. In the Hippocratic Aphorisms vii.27 (ed. Pognon, p. 30) we have the following:

Those whose discharges are frothy in cases of diarrhoea, something of these descends from the head.

This is a translation of the Greek Hippocratic Aphorisms vii.30:

In those who in cases of diarrhoea have frothy discharges, these descend from the head.

Given this, we would expect to encounter the Syriac word ṭawālandingi in this portion of the Syriac Prognostics. It would be a mistake, however, to make too much of this omission, since its absence is most likely due to scribal omission since.

Example 5

Finally there is the following example from Prognostics, where Hippocrates speaks

40. P7 fol. 107b, line 5.

again about making medical predictions based on the colour of the urine.\footnote{Hippocrates, \textit{Pronostic}, p. 34 = Littré, \textit{Oeuvres}, p. 141.}

\footnote{P7, 109b, line 4–9.}

[H28] Ἐστὶν δὲ πυρρόν τε ἢ τὸ οὖρον καὶ λεπτόν, ἀπετείνεται τὸ νόσημα εἶναι ἐι δὲ καὶ πολυχρόνων ἑλθε τοιοῦτον ἐξο, κύδινυς μὴ οὐ δυνηθεί τὸ ἄνθρωπος διαρκέσαι, ἐστὶν δὲ πεπανθῆ ἢ νοῦς.


As long as the urine is \textit{flame-coloured} and fine, [this condition] indicates that the disease is not concocted. If, in addition, it lasts a long time, there is a danger lest the individual not be have the strength to last until the disease is concocted. \textit{ Hunayn translates the Greek into Arabic as follows:}

As long as the urine is \textit{yellow} and its substance is fine, [this condition] indicates that the disease had not yet been concocted. If, in addition to that, its duration is long, there is \textit{no assurance} that the patient will last until his disease is concocted. \textit{The Greek is translated into Syriac as follows:}

Whilst it [urine] is (...) \textit{burning} (...), and equally fine, [this condition] indicates that the illness is not concocted. If the duration of time persists, there is a \textit{danger} lest the patient persist as long as the disease is \textit{received}. Once again, several observations are in order. First, in Arabic \textit{Hunayn simply translates \textit{πυρρόν} as yellowish-red (\textit{asfar}), though the Greek literally means “flame coloured.”\textit{ Hunayn's choice is seems to be based on how Galen understood the Hippocratic lemma. In his commentary on the \textit{Prognostics}, Galen understands Hippocrates to be speaking urine that is yellowish-red not that causes a burning sensation upon exiting the body.}

\footnote{L31} Τὸ κατὰ φύσιν οὖρον μετρίως ἐστὶν ὄχρον ώς ὅ ἐν ἐκ τοῦ περιθέντος ύγροῦ γεγονός ὀλίγον τε τῆς ξανθῆς χρόλης προσειληφός, ὅταν δὲ ἦτοι πλεῖον [ὦ] αὐτῇ τοῦ δέοντος ἢ...}
The urine that is balanced according to nature is yellow. Should what was digested be moist, a small amount of yellow bile is added. When there is either a larger amount [of the bile] than necessary or the extremely extremely pure is not mixed in the urine, it appears yellowish-red.

The Syriac translates the Greek literally by using the word “fiery (nōrānāyā),” which is not a Syriac word that is used to refer to colour but to heating and burning.

Second, Ḥunayn translates the Greek “kindunos mē ou dunēsetai” with the phrase fa-laysa yu’manu an, which is normally used by Ḥunayn to convey the idea that there is a possibility or a danger that some event will occur. While Ḥunayn's translation overlooks the notion of the patient's strength spoken about in the Arabic, Ḥunayn's Arabic correctly conveys the sense that if the disease last for too long, there is a possibility that the patient will not survive to reach a pont where his illness is properly concocted. The Syriac strikes me as somewhat mysterious. As it stands, the Syriac appears to convey the opposite of the sense of the Greek phrase. The phrase mē, Ḥunayn's proper convey the sense of the Greek kindunos mē (“there is a danger lest...”), but the the negative particle oū belonging to ḍunēsetai may be missing from the text. In addition the imperfect verb ḥēṣētai seems out of place, though this is more likely because of textual corruption. Whatever the case may be, it is clear that Ḥunayn and the Syriac translator adopt two different approaches to the same Greek text.

IV. Conclusion

In order to prove that Ḥunayn authored the Syriac text preserved in P7 Jacques Jouanna highlights that the Syriac and Arabic Prognostics are translated according to Ḥunayn's idiosyncratic text critical method for reconstructing the Hippocratic Prognostics. Jouanna does not say that Ḥunayn translated from a single Greek text, either of the Prognostics or Galen's commentary. Rather, Jouanna sees Ḥunayn

working with several Greek manuscripts, ultimately producing a hybrid Syriac and Arabic version of the *Prognostics* for which, on Jouanna's account, no single Greek archetype exists. In his idiosyncratic translation-editing technique, Ḫūnayn relies ultimately on the Galenic recension of the *Prognostics*, but supplements it too by referring to manuscripts that transmit the Hippocratic text directly. As evidence for his claim, Jouanna cites numerous instances in which the Arabic and Syriac text share readings, sometimes both siding with the direct transmission other times both siding with one or other the the Galenic recensions of the *Prognostics*. This signature editorial technique displayed by the text of the Arabic and Syriac *Prognostics*, a technique which is peculiar to Ḫūnayn in Jouanna's eyes, leads Jouanna to conclude that both translations are Ḫūnayn's.

Yet, the evidence reviewed above suggests that Jouanna's conclusion needs to be reassessed. First, I have highlighted inconsistencies between the earlier and later recensions of Ḫūnayn's *Missive Ṭāl b. Yahyā*. If we adopts Lamoreaux's version of the *Missive*, both the Arabic and the Syriac *Prognostics* are extracted from Ḫūnayn's Arabic and Syriac translations of Galen's commentary, since the testimony for Ḫūnayn's individual efforts to reconstruct the *Prognostics* using manuscripts transmitting the direct and indirect tradition may be unreliable. If this is true, then the places where the Arabic and Syriac *Prognostics* preserve parts of the text not transmitted by the Galenic tradition are likely a result of *contamination in the Greek tradition* rather than a result of any special effort by Ḫūnayn to reconstruct the Hippocratic lemma from a variety of Greek manuscripts. Second, I have examined the question of Ḫūnayn's authorship of the Syriac *Prognostics* from the perspective of the author's translation technique and interpretation of the Greek text. Though this method has some limitations. I discuss an important instance in which Ḫūnayn's Arabic translations of similar Greek texts in the *Prognostics* and the *Aphorisms* differ in terminology and interpretation. Nevertheless, I have identified a number of stylistic and interpretive divergences between the Syriac and Arabic translations that are impossible if we assume Ḫūnayn is responsible for both texts. I have pointed to
places where the Syriac clearly retains the correct reading of the Greek text whilst the Greek text used by Ḥunyan in his Arabic translation appears to have been corrupt. Finally, I have highlighted several instances in which Ḥunayn's interpretation of the Greek is at odds with how the Syriac translator understood the text. Taken together, these examples speak against Ḥunayn's authorship of the Syriac Prognostics.

If Ḥunayn did not write the Syriac Prognostics, who did? Sergius immediately comes to mind. Yet, LL1–3 discussed at the beginning of this paper are more reminiscent of Ḥunayn's translation style than Sergius'. Nor is there any positive, textual evidence that the Prognostics preserved in P7 is Sergius'. Though the translation style in the Prognostics is generally closer to Sergius' than Ḥunayn's, we lack parallel passages in the Syriac Prognostics and in other texts ascribed with confidence to Sergius to verify this hypothesis. While the question of who authored the Syriac Prognostics may never be adequately answered, I think the above evidence argues strongly against Ḥunayn's authorship. However, Sergius' and Ḥunayn's authorship will not be comprehensively resolved until corpus-based techniques are developed to analyse Syriac translation techniques for different translators. Fortunately, preliminary steps are being taken in this direction.45

Whatever the case may be, these results confirm those arrived at earlier by Taro Mimura. With Mimura, I conclude that P7 contains heavily contaminated versions of Ḥunyan's Arabic translations of the Aphorisms and the Prognostics. These texts have been altered to various degrees by Bahnâm, P7's scribe, and by later annotators on the basis of the parallel Syriac text. The scribe and the annotators worked in a scholarly environment in which Arabic was the language of science. P7 is heavily annotated, but entirely in Arabic, whereas there are no corrections or notes in Syriac in the margins. Yet, it is clear that for Bahnâm and the annotators, the Syriac translation, preserved in the right column of P7,

45. The project by Grigory Kessel and others with the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften) called HunaynNET: Transmission Of Classical Scientific And Philosophical Literature From Greek Into Syriac And Arabic shows real promise.
possessed a textual authority that was not shared in their eyes by Ḥunayn's Arabic translation. Mimura has shown how Bahnām altered phrases in the Arabic Aphorisms when the Arabic and Syriac Aphorisms disagreed on a reading. He has also shown that Bahnām rearranged or omitted aphorisms according to the structure and contents of the Syriac Aphorisms. Mimura suggests that Bahnām and the annotators made these changes not necessarily because they recognised that the Syriac was more consistent with the Greek than the Arabic, but out of deference to the Syriac text. In like manner, I have shown how Bahnām replaced Ḥunayn's “heavenly” with “divine” based on the Syriac parallel. I have also pointed to places where annotators recognised the differences between the Arabic and Syriac, sometimes correcting the Arabic text, and other times making notes in the margins that attempt to harmonise the translations.