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Abstract

In this article, I discuss the legacy of Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī\textquoteleft s commentary on Avicenna\textquoteleft s *Canon of Medicine* in Islamic medical commentary after 1100. I argue that Faḥr al-Dīn\textquoteleft s legacy lies in the exegetical practises, the method of verification (*tahqiq*\textsuperscript{1}) 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\textquoteleft s commentary on Avicenna\textquoteleft s *Pointers and Reminders* are present in the commentary on the *Canon*, even if Faḥr al-Dīn\textquoteleft 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\textquoteleft s prescription about exegetical best-practice in his Hippocratic commentaries and Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā al-Rāzī\textquoteleft s (d. ca. 925) introduction to *Doubts on Galen*, I argue next that Faḥr al-Dīn\textquoteleft s introduction of the verification method into the Islamic medical discourse was a watershed moment in the tradition. I use Ibn al-Quff\textquoteleft 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.
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1 Introduction

Abū al-Farağ ibn Ya'qūb ibn Ishāq Ibn al-Quff (d. 1286) is not much known outside the field of medieval Islamic medicine\textsuperscript{1}. He was born in 1233 and was raised in a Melkite Christian family in Karak.

---

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-Nafs (d. 1288). 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-Šifāʾ). 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.

'Ἐν ὃ νοσηματί ὑπνος πόνον ποιεῖ, θανάσιμον: ἥν δὲ ὑπνος ὑφεληγ, οὐ θανάσιμον.

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


2. Ullmann, Medizin, 176.


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 (mabāḥīṭ),” each of which covers a variety of different topics that Ibn al-Quff believes are necessary for explaining Hippocrates often cryptic words. 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 Aphorims ii.1 into ten investigations, 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 (kāfīy- at ḥudāṭīḥi), the reason why there is a need for it (al-ḥāğa ilā al-nawm) and its relation to pain. Additionally, several other investigations are committed to clarifying the nature of pain (al-ваغاز) 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-ittisāl, for example, a broken arm or a cut) or a noxious or unhealthy mixture of the primary qualities cold, hot, moist, and dry (sū’ al-mizāḡ, pain in fevers and a painful swelling). 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

---


phrase in his commentary on this aphorism. A number of other sources from among the "recent scholars (al-muta'ṭhirin)," however, are mentioned also.7

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, 'Ali ibn 'Abbās al-Mağūsi] and Abū Sahl al-Masiḥi; or it is caused by [both dissolution of continuity] and an irregular noxious mixture according to what the Šayḫ al-Ra'īs held; or it is caused by the noxious irregular mixture in itself according to what the imāms Faḫr al-Dīn ibn al-Ḥaṭīb and the Judge Abū al-Walīd Ibn Ruṣd held.

Galen, 'Ali ibn 'Abbās al-Mağūsi, Abū Sahl al-Masiḥi, 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.8 On the other hand, Faḫr al-Dīn al-Rāzī is hardly a name that one would expect to find in a list of major medical figures. How does Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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,


we would not guess that his medical thought would rank with the likes of Avicenna, Galen or al-Mağūsi in the mind of a thirteenth-century physician such as Ibn al-Quff. 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 how Avicenna’s philosophical and medical thought was received and studied in different parts of the medieval Islamic world.\(^9\) Endress presents compelling evidence for


\(^10\) 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.” With regard to medicine, Faḥr al-Dīn’s commentary on the Canon inaugurated a tradition of philosophical interest in Book One (the Generalties, Kulliyāt) 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 Sinā’s al-Qānūn fī l-Ṭibb, mostly, it is true, confining themselves to the part on theoretical medicine, al-Kulliyāt. The jurists and theologians who were facinated 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, staring from Ibn Sinā’s own pupils, wrote commentaries, epitomes and quaestiones on his physiological and medical theory.”

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.

In the Sharḥ al-Kulliyāt, 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 Sinā. 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 'Ali in this art. He also said: The expression of al-Maṣḥī 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-Ḥārīṣ Ibrāhīm ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Sulāmī al-Miṣrī al-Maġribī (d. 1221). It is clear that in addition to finding more to esteem in al-Maṣḥī'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 his *Sources of Lore on the Ranks of the Physicians* (*‘Uyūn al-anbā’ fi ṯabāqāt al-ʿāṭibbā’*), 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-Quaff's medical teachers, and, along with Naḡm al-Dīn ibn al-Minfaḥ (d. ca. 1252), Muwaffaq al-Dīn Yaʿqūb al-Sāmīrī (d. 1282) and Ibn al-Nafis, all of whom wrote commentaries on the *Canon*, exerted a great influence on Ibn al-Quaff after he moved with his father to Damascus.¹⁴ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a records that Yaʿqūb 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 (*waḥarrara má fi aqwālihim mina l-mabāḥīṭ*).”¹⁵ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a records too that al-Sāmīrī wrote a book that “solves Naḡm al-Dīn ibn al-Minfaḥ's doubts on the *Generalities* of the *Canon.*”¹⁶ He writes

---

16. Ibid. This recalls the earlier, lost work by Ibn Abī Şādiq entitled *Resolving Rāzī’s Doubts on Galen’s Books* (*Ḫall šūkūk al-Rāzī ‘alā kutub Ǧālīnūs*), in which he responds to Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā's doubts on Galen's medical and philosophical works. See Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *‘Uyūn al-
that Ibn al-Minfaḥ wrote a commentary entitled Book on the Omissions in the Book of the General-ites (Kitāb al-muhmalāt fī Kitāb al-Kulliyāt), though it is unclear whether this is identical to the book of Ibn al-Minfaḥ’s “doubts” on the Generalities mentioned in al-Samiri’s entry later in ‘Uyūn al-anbā’.

What is more, according to Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a, in his early years in Karak, the city of his birth, Ibn al-Quff studied philosophy with Fāhr al-Dīn’s notable student Šams al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥāmid ibn Ḥīsā al-Ḥusrawshāhī (d. 1254). Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a knew al-Ḥusrawshāhī personally, and relates the following story:

One day, I [Ibn Abī Uṣaybi’a] saw him [al-Ḥusrawshāhī] when a Persian scholar brought him a book written in a subtle hand, in Baghdādī size and Mu’tazī 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, Fāhr 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 Fāhr al-Dīn should be mentioned in the same breath as, say, Abū Sahl al-Masili, ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās al-Maġūṣī or even Avicenna and Galen.

---

*anbā’, 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.


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

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.20 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-'Ībīšī'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 Easter 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-Rashid Abū l-Khayr Ibn al-Ṭabīb's Risālat al-Bayān al-Aẓhar fī l-radd 'alā man yaqūlu bi-l-qāḍā' wa-l-qadar,” Intellectual History of the Islamicate World 2 (2014): 143–69. Barbara Roggema, “Ibn Kammūna's and Ibn al-'Ībīšī’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 Faḫr al-Dīn's medical or philosophical views. In short, how do we reconcile the mounting historical evidence that Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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 (tahqīq) into medieval Islamic medical discourse. I argue, too, that the vehicle for bringing the methods of verification to medical authors was Faḫr 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. 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 (tahqīq)." 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-Nafīs' commentary on Avicenna's Canon of Medicine, where, for example, he made novel contributions to the anatomy of human respiration. Fancy has also drawn attention to how

22. Nahyan Fancy, Science and Religion in Mamluk Egypt: Ibn al-Nafīs, Pulmonary Transit and
these scientific innovations were received by commentators on the *Canon* and epitomes of the *Canon* such as the *Epitome* (*al-Muğiz* or *al-Muğaz*). Yet, Fancy has suggested that Ibn al-Nafis was an active participant in the post-classical tradition of verification, 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. 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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn. Likewise, Shihadeh has tirelessly recorded the numerous intellectual debts that Faḫr al-Dīn owed his predecessors such as Avicenna (d. 1037), Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā al-Rāzī (d. ca. 925), Ibn al-Hayṭam (d. 1039), Abū Ḥāmid al-Ġazālī (d. 1111) and Abū al-Barakāt al-Baḍāḍī (d. before 1100).


1164–1165), as well as his less famous contemporaries, such as Šaraf al-Dīn al-Maʿūdī (d. before 1208) and Ibn Ġaylān-al-Balḥī (d. ca. 1194).\(^5\) Nevertheless, Wisnovsky and Shihadeh single out Faḥr ḏ-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 ḏ-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.\(^6\) In his autobiographical remarks in his introduction to his commentary on the *Canon of Medicine*,\(^7\) Qutb ḏ-Dīn al-Šīrāzī (d. 1311) observes that early commentaries on the *Canon* by those “eminent scholars who emulated his [Faḥr ḏ-Dīn’s] writings (*al-šurūḥu l-latī li-l-muqtafīna āṭāruhu mina l-fuḍālā‘*) such as Qutb ḏ-Dīn al-Miṣrī, Afḍal ḏ-Dīn al-Ḥūnaġī, Rafi’ ḏ-Dīn al-Ǧīlī (d. 641/1244)\(^8\) and Naǧm ḏ-Dīn al-Nahṯgawānī (d. 1252) did not add anything of substance to what the Imam [Faḥr ḏ-Dīn al-Šīrāzī] 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 nazrūn yasīrūn layṣa lahu qadrūn*).\(^9\)

Endress, on the other hand, focuses primarily on the reception of the *Canon* prior to Fāhr ad-Dīn's commentary by the likes of Ibn al-Tīmilī (d. 1165), who “introduced the Ibn Sinā's *Qānūn* into the study of medicine,” Ibn Īmay' (d. 1198) and Ibn Ṯaylān 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-Tīmilī'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.30 Endress says: “While the physicians,” such as Ibn al-Tīmilī and Ibn Īmay', “took to reading Ibn Sinā's *Qānūn*, the philosophers, and the philosopher-physicians starting with Fāhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, in their turn started reading theoretical medicine in the *kulliyāt* of Avicenna's ever more popular handbook.”31

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 Fāhr 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 Fāhr al-Dīn played in the *Canon* commentary tradition, there has been no effort to qualify the types of exegetical methods Fāhr 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 Fāhr al-Dīn's *Pointers* commentary, all of which fall


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 (tahṣīl),” “verification (taḥqīq)” and “painstaking investigation (istiqaṣā)” to refer to different aspects of his method of analysis which he uses in composing commentaries and original philosophical works. 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

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 Zakariyya al-Rāzī in *Doubts on Galen* (*Kitāb al-Šukuk ālā Ġālinūs*) 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 Ṣādiq (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 Faṭr 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 and textual traditions until at least the seventeenth century. I offer a detailed analysis of the two instances in which Ibn al-Quff cites Faṭr 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 Faṭr 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 Faṭr al-Dīn’s Introduction to the Commentaries on the *Canon* and Pointers

According to Altaṣ, Faṭr al-Dīn’s commentary on the *Canon of Medicine* is possibly the first lemmatic commentary he composed on a work by Avicenna. Altaṣ 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-Qifti’s account of Faṭr al-Dīn’s career in dating it to 580/1184. Altaṣ says the

---


following:

Written between 573–574/1177–1178. Written in Saraḥs before the Mabāḥīt and Mulahhaṣ. This work, which in the text itself is called Šarḥ muṣkilāt 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 Sinā’s medical work the Canon. Whilst Rāzī was a guest of the physician Ṭiqat al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Saraḥṣī, this work was a result of research and discussion between them, and was dedicated to him on account of [al-Saraḥṣī’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 Nur al-Dīn al-Ṣābūnī died 16 Safar 580/30 May 1184 and, since Mabāḥīt and Mulahhaṣ 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-Fīrāsa is mentioned.

Thus, in support of his chronology, Altaṣ cites the fact that the commentary on the Canon is cited in the Investigations in the East (al-Mabāḥīt al-Mašriqiya), which Altaṣ says was written around 574–575/1178–1179, and in the Précis of Logic and Philosophy (al-Mulahhaṣ fi l-mantiq wa-l-ḥikma), which Altaṣ says was written no later than 580/1184. 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-ʾitidāl) and imbalanced mixture of the primary qualities hot, cold, wet and dry.

36. Ibid., 112.
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 Fahr al-

grateful to Bilal Ibrahim for supplying me with a copy of this text.
Din’s career. Altas’s early dating of the Canon, however, sits uneasily with the idea suggested by Ibn al-Qifti—an idea which Altas appears to second—that the commentary on the Canon was written during the early part of Fahr al-Din’s purported sojourn into Transoxiana. Frank Griffel has expressed strong reservations about the extent and accuracy of Ibn al-Qifti knowledge of Fahr al-Din’s early career. Indeed, if it were written as early as Altas says, I find somewhat suspicious Fahr al-Din’s references to ‘Abd al-Karim al-Sarahsi as the patron for the Canon commentary who helped him during and after his stay in Sarahsi. For it was purportedly his stay at Sarahsi that marked the opening stages of Fahr al-Din’s sojourn to Bukhara. Fahr al-Din must have been in Transoxiana some time prior to Nur al-Din al-Sabuni’s death on 16 Safar 580/30 May 1184, since this event is mentioned in the Munazarat. Yet, the story about Sarahsi 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 574/1178–1179, much earlier in Fahr al-Din’s career that previously thought. In fact, several features of this commentary bear out this conclusion. Fahr al-Din’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. Nevertheless, in the the brief remarks in the introduction to the

38. Ibid., 103. Though rejecting the dating of the Canon commentary to 580/1184, Altas accepts that Fahr al-Din wrote the commentary for ‘Abd al-Karim al-Sarahsi whilst in Sarahsi on his way to Transoxiana.

39. Frank Griffel convincingly shows that most of al-Qifti’s account of Fahr al-Din’s earlier career is flawed, and that, in general, we have very little reliable information about this period in Fahr al-Din’s life. See Frank Griffel, “On Fakhr al-Din al-Razi’s Life.”


Canon commentary that touch on metacommentary, it is evident that Fahr al-Din 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 Fahr al-Din 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 philosopohical debates based on Avicenna’s writings. On the other hand, in the introduction to the Canon we see a Fahr al-Din who struggles to identify what aspects of his commentary method he believes are novel. Shihadeh observes that Fahr al-Din deliberately employs terms such as “gleaning (taḥṣil),” “critical investigation,” “verification (taḥqīq),” “blind imitation (taqlid),” “painstaking investigation (istiqṣā’),” “in depth probing (ta’ammaq),” “certainty (yaqīn),” “doubt (ṣakk),” “procedure (tartib)” 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 Fahr al-Din recognised as forming the backbone of his method of exegesis and his philosophical method more generally. Shihadeh shows that by around 578–580 when Fahr al-Din was composing the commentary on Pointers as well as the early philosophical works such as Précis and Investigations in the East, Fahr al-Din was able to assign these terms a precise meaning in relation to his exegetical method. For example, Fahr al-Din describes the process of “gleaning (taḥṣil)” in detail:42

of gleaning (taḥṣil) 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 conclusion…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.

42 Shihadeh, “Al-Razi’s Commentary,” 300.
Likewise, the ordering of the book or commentary he describes as follows:\footnote{Ibid.}

our novel ordering (\textit{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 Faḫr al-Dīn characterises what he names “painstaking investigation” as follows:\footnote{Ibid.}

the painstaking investigation (\textit{istiqṣāʾ}) of questions and answers, and the in-depth probing (\textit{taʿammuaq}) of the oceans of problems in such a way that the proponent of each thought-system (\textit{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 (\textit{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) Faḫr al-Dīn provides a conclusion to the problems under discussion. This step-by-step procedure is what the terms “ordering (\textit{tartīb})” and “synthesising (\textit{talfiq})” in the process of compiling or commenting on a book refer to. In similar fashion, “painstaking investigation (\textit{istiqṣāʾ}) 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 Faḫr al-Dīn can find or can supply on his own on the basis of the proponents’ own
principles. If arguments are weak or none are forthcoming from the text, Faḫr 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-ʿuqūl), Faḫr 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, Faḫr al-Dīn uses “taḥṣīl,” “tartīb,” “taʿammūq,” “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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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, Faḫr al-Dīn, speaking about himself in the third-person, says:

العلم صار كلاً في هذا الزمان على كل أصحابه وويلًا على محبيه وطلابه. فترى الرجل بعد أن أفنى في تحصيله زمانه وفوق فيه أثره وأقرانه وتعيين بحل الغموض في العلوم وإظهار ما فيها من السر المكروه معلومًا بسبب ذلك عن جميع المسارات مدقعًا عن كل المباعي والطلاب.

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 [Faḫr al-Dīn is referring to himself] who has spent his years acquiring it [that is, knowledge, sc. al-ʿilm] 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 Faḫr al-Dīn uses *tartib* with its lexical meaning of *ordering*:

> تم لما ساعد التوفيق على تلخيص هذا الكتاب وتهذيبه وتحريره وترتيبه جعلته باسم الشیخ الإمام الفاضل الحکیم المحترق ثقة الدين شرف الإسلام سید الحکماء والأطباء عبد الرحمن بن عبد الكريم السرخسی.

Divine help having aided me in composing this book, refining it, drafting it and arranging it, I dedicated it to 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, *tartib* 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 Faḫr al-Dīn says were steps in the physical task of writing the book, from its initial write-up (*talḥīṣīhī*) to putting in its final arrangement (“arranging it (*tartibīhī*)”).

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 Faḫr 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 أدرت الخوض في عبابه والترقی في غاية الوصول إلى لبابه والترقی في أغواره والترقی إلى أبواه.

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:

The scholars being in agreement that the Canon by al-Šayḫ al-Raʿīs 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 (ʿayūn, 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 Ğumayʿ’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 (muʿḍilāt) 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 Faḫr al-Dīn’s Commentary on the Canon

This is what Faḫr al-Dīn says; what he does in the commentary on the Canon is quite another story. That is, after analysing Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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 Wisnosky 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 is adds further evidence to the claim that the commentary on the Canon was written well before 583/1184. For it seems that by the time Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn barely alludes to this fact. I shall substantiate this claim by examining how Faḫr al-Dīn comments on a chapter (faṣl) on compound diseases (al-amrād al-murakkaba) in his commentary. Following Shihadeh, I first examine how Faḫr al-Dīn imposes his understanding of the chapter’s structure by lemmatising the text into separate “research topics (abḥāṯ, mabāḥīṯ, buḥūṯ sg. baḥt).” After this, I shall examine the various techniques Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn partitions the chapter.

**Definition of compound diseases; examples; swellings (awram, sg. waraḍ); every kind of disease is found in cases of swelling; wherever there is swelling there is dissolution of continuity (tafarruq al-ittṣāl)**

- Parts of the body are affected by swelling; bones are affected by swelling; food can cause body parts to swell;

**Definition of catarrh (nazla);**

**Causes of swelling; swellings are prone to having natural and unnatural discharges;**

Swelling can be classified according to its properties (fuṣīd, sg. faṣīl); 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 (al-māṭa‘a) and air (al-rīḥa‘a); division of swelling into hot swelling and swelling that is not hot; hot swelling caused by phlegm conventionally called ḥaḍīmi; hot swellings caused by yellow bile conventional called ḥumra; abscesses (ḥurāq) and plague (tā‘ān); how hot swellings appears at the beginning, middle and end; swelling resolves either by dissolving (ṭabbul), or it suppurates (taqyyuḥ), pus gathers (gam’ midd), or a the swelling transforms into a tumour (istihāla ilā l-ṣalāba).

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 (al-sarafīn) and swellings in the glands (al-ṣudud) such as scrofula (al-ḥanazīr) and leprous growths (al-sula‘); distinction between tumours and cancer.

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 (al-istīṣqā‘); 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 (al-ṣudūm); 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 (katub al-ṭafṣil)

---

### Fāhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Commentary on the Canon of Medicine*

**Block A:** “This discussion calls for four investigations (mabāḥīṭ):”

1. Divisions of diseases that are in aggregate (al-amraḍ al-muğṭami‘a)
2. How a single disease comes about from a number of diseases in aggregate
3. The reality of swelling
4. Clarifying that swelling is a compound disease

**Block B:** “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.”

**Block C:** “This begins the division of swellings.”

**Block D:** “The purpose of this discussion is to search for not the conditions of swelling, but for certain rulings about the cause of swelling.”

**Block E:** “Now he turns to explain the division of swellings.”

**Block F:** “He turns once again to division, commencing with the division of cold swellings, which are four...”

1. Scrofula and leprous growths are not black bilious but phlegmatic.

**Block G:** “...and the rest of the section is obvious (wa-bāqĩ l-faṣīl zāhīr).”
The *Canon*, Book One was well-known for its divisions, subdivisions, and sub-subdivisions, and increasingly minute structure.46 Indeed, the fact that it is well-structured is considered by some to be its only redeeming quality.47 Nevertheless, Faḫr al-Dīn’s division of this chapter into seven blocks introduces further structure into the chapter (fasḥ), 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.48 While the rest of the chapter is not divided further into “investigations (mabāḥit),” Faḫr al-Dīn divides the chapter into blocks of text based on how the chapter flows logically from block to block.49

In his commentary on the chapter on compound diseases, Faḫr al-Dīn carries out many of the exegetical tasks that Shihadeh and Wisnovsky identify in the commentary on *Pointers.*50 Two brief examples from the commentary on the sections on compound diseases suffice to illustrate how much Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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-ʿaʾdāʾ al-layyīna), and something that resembles swelling in the

49. Ibid.
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.\textsuperscript{53}

About which Faḥr al-Dīn has the following to say:\textsuperscript{52}

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 (\textit{lā yatamaddadu}\textsuperscript{50}), 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]


\textsuperscript{52} For lemma from the \textit{Canon}, see Avicenna, \textit{al-Qānūn fī l-ṭibb}, 1:76–7.

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{stretching} like an inflated balloon, for example). For the meaning of tamaddada as increasing in size from drawing in or attracting, see Freytag, \textit{Lexicon Arabico-Latinum}, 4:159, c.i: "extendit trahendo rem" and Kazimirski, \textit{Dictionnaire Arabe-Français}, 2:1076, c.i: "Tirer pour allonger, allonger en tirant." Unfortunately, this sense is recorded for yatamaddadu when it is used \textit{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 superfluitities, the teeth would not turn green and black [from rotting], for this happens because the superfluitities 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].

Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn, this sentence marks the beginning of a new discussion about where in the body swelling can occur. Faḫr 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 šabihun 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 Faḫr 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 Zakariyā 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 Faḫr 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 Zakariyā that bones and the brain do not swell. Faḫr al-Dīn pursues this goal in several stages. First, he paraphrases Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā'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 Zakariyā’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 Zakariyā, 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 Zakariyā’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 Zakariyā’s views about how bones and the brain increase in size. In Section Four, we shall see that Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā 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 Zakariyā had in mind in the *Outstanding Book*. As the passage is quoted by Ibn al-Quff, Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā refers to expanding not in the sense of *growth* but in the sense of the body part’s *physical qualities* (hard and soft), which, according to Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā, 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 Zakariyā’s “minor premise,” Faḥr al-Dīn offers a deliberately tendentious interpretation of Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā’s claim. Faḥr al-Dīn ignores, in effect, the fact that Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā’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 Zakariyā would not have disputed in the first place—were sufficient to undermine Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā’s position.54

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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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, Faḫr al-Dīn gives all his attention to resolving a conflict between Avicenna and earlier medical authorities, ‘Alī ibn ‘Ab-bās al-Maḡūṣī (fl. 4th/10th c.) and Abū Sahl al-Mishīḥī (d. 1010), who classified scrofula (*al-ḥanāzīr*) and leprous growths (*al-sula*) as types of swelling caused by phlegm rather than black bile.

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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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, Faḫr al-Dīn gives all his attention to resolving a conflict between Avicenna and earlier medical authorities, ‘Alī ibn ‘Ab-bās al-Maḡūṣī (fl. 4th/10th c.) and Abū Sahl al-Mishīḥī (d. 1010), who classified scrofula (*al-ḥanāzīr*) and leprous growths (*al-sula*) as types of swelling caused by phlegm rather than black bile.
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 Šayḫ 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†; 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 Faĥr 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 Faĥr 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 fi ʿl-ṭibb, 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]...”
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 (masāmir).” For he [namely, Avicenna] dedicated a chapter to boils, in which he speaks about swellings from black bile.”

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 (ʿaṣīda)⁵⁷, 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-ʿaṣīd) 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.

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 ʿaṣīda and ʿaṣīda have the same meaning. Albert Kazimirski, Dictionnaire Arabe-Français (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1860), 2:270 (ʿaṣīda): “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-‘aṣab) 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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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 (yummatan wa-yusratan), but they cannot be compressed when they are palpated.

He expands the text by introducing subdivisions that Avicenna does not: in E, Faḫr 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 (tabtadi‘u fi awwali kawnihā ‘ṣulbatan).” Faḫr 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. Faḫr 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, Faḫr 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, Faḫr al-Dīn observers that in the present chap-
ter these diseases are classified under the kinds of swelling that are caused by black bile (al-sawdāwīya). Al-Maḡūsī, al-Masīḥī and Avicenna elsewhere in Book One, however, class them as swellings caused by phlegm (balğamiya). In sections C and D, Faḫr al-Dīn attempts to find some way of harmonising the inconsistency in Avicenna’s classifications. In C, Faḫr al-Dīn says that in this passage, Avicenna only meant to say that swellings in the glands were caused by black bile, and that leprous growths and scrofula merely resemble (tuṣbihu) swellings in the glands. In D, Faḫr al-Dīn quotes the chapter on leprous growths (al-sula’) in the Canon, Book One, in which Avicenna declares that these kinds of growths are “phlegmatic abscesses (dubaylāt balğamiya) 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 phlematic and black bilious swellings, Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn’s exegetical method, in practice in the commentary on the Canon Faḫr 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. Faḫr al-Dīn introduces further subdivisions into the Canon’s original division into sections; he is makes explicit the logical links between sections, and even between textblocks in a single chapter; he divides his commentary into investigations (mabāḥīṯ), which tend to focus on more philosophical principles; and he prefaxes each commentary unit with a division into themes or topics to be pursued.

Furthermore, Shihadeh identifies a handful of “exegetical tasks” that Faḫr al-Dīn performs in the commentary on Pointers and Reminders. They are present in the commentary on the

---

58. Compare this list with the one in Shihadeh, “Al-Rāzi’ Commentary,” 313: “1. Identifying the
Canon as well. Among the exegetical tasks that Faḫr 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, there is no doubt that medieval Islamic physicians would have taken Galen's prescriptions

unstated conclusion of an argument (gharad, maqsūd, 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."

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 Abi Ṣādiq’s (d. after 1067) exegetical strategies imitate Galen’s actual commentary practice more than Galen’s restrictive prescriptions in his Hippocratic commentaries.⁶⁰ That is to say, the shifts evident in Ibn Abi Ṣādiq’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.”⁶¹ 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 Muhammad ibn Zakariyā al-Rāzī (d. ca. 925) at the opening of his Doubts on Galen (Šukūk ʿalā Ġalīnūs) 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.


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

In brief introductory remarks to the commentary on the Aphorisms, Book Three, Galen takes an opportunity to attack an 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.\footnote{Arabic: Galen, Tafsīr Ġālīnūs 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, Galeni Opera Omnia, ed. Karl G. Kühn, vol. 17b (Leipzig: Car. Cnoblicii, 1829), 561–2. Translation is based on the Arabic.}

Ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῶν εἰς τοὺς ἀφορισμοὺς ὑπομνήματων τῶ ἐπερι τῶν κατὰ τὰς ὁρας τέ καὶ ἡλικίας Ἰπποκράτει γεγραμμένων ἐξηγησόμεθα. μάλιστα μὲν οὖν ἃν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἄσαφες ἐστὶ σαφηνίζοντες, ἐργον γὰρ τοῦτο ἵσιν ἐξηγήσεως, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἐκάστου τῶν ὀρθῶς εἰρημένων προστιθέντες, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τούτ’ ἐστιν θὸ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν γίνεσθαι. θαυμάζω δὲ κανταῦθα τὴν ἀνωμαλίαν τοῦ Λύκου γράφοντος μὲν, ὡς φησιν, ἐξηγήσεις Κοΐντου τοῦ διδάσκαλου, μηδεὶ δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὰς ὁρας καὶ ἡλικίας εἰρημένων προσθέντος πίστιν ἀποδεικτικὴν, ἀλλ’ εἰς ἐμπειρίαν καὶ τήρησιν ἀναπέμψαντος ἄπαντα, καίτοι γ’ ἄλλος πολλοὺς ἀφορισμοὺς ἐξηγούμενος αὐτὸς ἐπισκέπτεται λογικῶς ὑπέρ τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀληθείας, οὐκ
Emergence of Verification [v9]

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 (ṣarḥ al-ġāmiḍ min qawlihi, ḍan āyūtī ḍaṣafī ṣattī ṣawḥulhūnṭeṣ) in Hippocrates' words because this is what is proper to interpretation (al-amru al-hāṣṣu b-t-tafsīr, ʾɪrṣu ḍaṣṣū ṭoṭuṭ ṣiṣu ʾeṣṣun ʾeṣṣun ṣeṣṣeṣuṣ). 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 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.
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). 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’ Aporhisms commentary, Lukas uses reason to offer reasons for why what Hippocrates says is true. Yet, in his commentary on Aporhisms, 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,” 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 Aporhisms, 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.

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:67

κακῶς οὖν ὁ Κόιντος ἔξηγεται καὶ ταύτα τὰ βιβλία καὶ τὰ τῶν Ἀφορισμῶν, ἕνορκε· ὡς ἔγραψε· “περὶ δὲ τῶν ὁρέων, ἢν μὲν ὁ χειμῶν αὐχμηρὸς καὶ βέβαιος γένηται, τὸ δὲ ἔχρι ἐποµβρον καὶ νότιον, ἀνάγκη τοῦ θέρους πυρετοὺς ξέις καὶ ὀφθαλµιας καὶ δυσεντερίας γίνεσθαι.” τῇ πείρᾳ γὰρ μόνη τούτῳ ἐγνώσθαι φησιν ὁ Κόιντος ἄνευ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν λογισµοῦ, πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀµαρτάνων, **ὥστε τὰς αἰτίας, ὡν εἴπε κατὰ τοὺς Ἀφορισµοὺς τούτους ὁ Ἱπποκράτης, αὐτὸς

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 (*faḍilatān*). 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.68

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.69 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-mizāǧ, ἡ κράσις) 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 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.

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.”

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.

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.

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.

---
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namely clarifying what is obscure. Galen lists several other important exegetical norms, however, many of which he does not mention in LL1–2.73

[13b] 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, Taftūr Ġālinūs li-kītāb Afidimiyā, fol. 155b, ll.8–17. Compare with Galen, Galeni In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum VI, 413, ll.5–16.
earlier commentaries written on Hippocratic texts. In L3α, 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.74

Πρὸ τῆς τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐξηγήσεως ἅμειν όν ἄκοιναι καθόλου περὶ πάσης ἐξηγήσεως, ὡς ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις αὐτῆς, ὅσα τῶν ἐν τοῖς συγγράμμασιν ἐστιν ἄσαφη, ταύτ' ἐργάσασθαι σαφῆ, τὸ δ’ ἀποδείξαι τι τῶν γεγραμμένων ὡς ἄληθές ἢ ὡς ψεύδος ἐλέγξαι, καὶ εἰ κατηγόρησε τις σοφιστικῶς ἀπολογήσασθαι, κεχώρισται μὲν ἐξηγήσεως, ἐξείτο τε γένεσθαι πρὸς ἀπάντων ὡς εἰπεῖν τῶν γραφόντων ὑπομνήματα. καὶ νὴ Δία ὡς ὡς ἦν κωλύει καὶ τοῦτο μετρίως ἄπτεσθαι τὸν ἐξηγητὴν. τὸ δ’ ἀγωνίζεσθαι τελῶς ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ γράφοντος δογμάτων ἐκπέπτωκε τὸν ὁρὸν τῆς ἐξήγησεως. οὐ πρὸς τούτον οὖν τὸν σκοπόν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν εἰρημένον ἀποβλέπων ἐγὼ προσθῆκον ταῖς ὁντος ἐξηγήσεσιν ἕκαστοτε 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,

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 (πίστις). 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,” and in L3b he criticises commentators
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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 Zakariyā al-Rāzī's Doubts on Galen: A “Commentary?”

* tatwīl.
Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā al-Rāzī was deeply influenced by Galen. In the introduction to *Doubts on Galen*, Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā records the fact that he owes Galen a debt of gratitude greater than he owes to any other person. Yet, it is clear that Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā 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 Zakariyā’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.

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 form him, as Galen himself has mentioned in his book *On the Uses of the Parts of the Body*,

---
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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 Zakariyā 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 Zakariyā 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 Zakariyā, 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.\(^7^8\) 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 Zakariyā 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 Zakariyā about Galen's philosophical example and what he sought to imitate in Doubts on Galen.\(^7^9\)
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\]

This is how Muhammad ibn Zakariyā 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 Zakariyā'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-

\[
\text{78. al-Rāzī, Kitāb al-šuḵūk, 41.}
\]

\[
\text{79. Ibid., 42.}
\]
ic commentaries, it strikes me as unlikely that Muhammad ibn Zakariyā 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 Muhammad ibn Zakariyā 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.80

Based on his work on the commentary tradition on Avicenna’s *Pointers and Reminders*, Robert Wisnovsky has identified several exegetical functions that verification (*tahqiq*) in Avicenna’s *Pointers* had.81 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.82 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.
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”;83 “[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.”84 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.”85 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
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attacked and undermined the position expressed in the matn, and presented proofs in support of their own opposing positions.86 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-Farağ 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.87

86. Ibid., 356–7.

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 (yakûnu ma’ahâ waramu l-dimâg=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 (farâniṭis, al-sirsâm⁸⁸), erysipelas (al-ḫumra) and lethargic fever (liṭarγûs⁸⁹) and a form of swelling with very severe symptoms called “ṣubârā(?).” This classification of fevers is derived directly from the Canon, Book Three, in which fevers in the head are discussed.⁹⁰ 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 Zakariyā and Faḥr al-Din’s defense of Avicenna’s doctrine in the Canon that bones and the brain swell against Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā’s view that they do not.⁹²
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Having understood this, we say: “In his book that is known as The Outstanding [Book] (al-Fāhir) [Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā] 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 Zakariyā’s “minor premise (ṣuğrāhu)” 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 Zakariyā would have constructed against Faḥr al-Dīn’s criticisms based on the medical theory that both thinkers shared. Ibn al-Quff defends Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā, 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 (iḏā anṣafnā),” Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā 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 Fahr al-Din'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.

واللاري أن يجيب عن هذا الأول ويقول الممتحن الحاصل للفهم والدماغ باتسو غير الممتحن الحاصل لهما بالورم من جهة الفاعل والمادة ونفس الممتحن. أما الفاعل فإن الفاعل للنسم الطبعة البذنية المولدة بدور الدين والفاعل للفهم دفع الطباعة للمادة السوية أو حركتها أو هي نفسها. وأما المادة فإن المادة النسم مادة صالحة مأولة ومادة الورم مادة مؤمذة. وأما نفس الممتحن فإن الورم في النسم في الأفكار الثلاثة على التناسب الطبيعي. والزيادة في الورم في بعض الأفكار دون بعض. وإذا كان النسم مغايرة للممتحن بهذه الأمور فلا يجوز أن يقص أحدها على الآخر. والجواب عن النتيجة أن نفيه الغداء في جهور الأعضاء أمر طبيعي متألف. وإذا كان كذلك فلا يلزم من قول الطبيعى قول ما ليس طبيعي. والجواب عن النتيجة قوله إن الدماغ لرج إما أن يعي بالموجة الدسمة أو غلف القوي مع قول الممتحن كالخاطىء. وإن عمي بها الأولى فقل فلن تقبل الممتحن حتى الصبيح قد دلنا على أن جوه الدماغ ليس هو كذلك. والجواب عن الربع أن سواه الأنسان وضحاؤها لا يقارب زيادة البينة. وإذا كان كذلك فليس ذلك لتقبل فضل ورد عليه بل ذلك لفساد مراحلها في نفسها حسب أنها لم يحل الغداء الورد عليها ما يميني وندعاه به. والجواب عن الحاصل ما ذكرناه في الأول أو قول لو وسم الأنسان وحصل له ما ذكره فلا ينبغي أن يقص عليها العلم فإن جوهها غير حروف العلم ويدعى على هذا العقل والنقل. أما الأول فمن وحشي أحدهما أنها أقوى حسا من العلم إلى الأطباء يعتمدون أن العلم عدمية الحس والأنسان لها حق. وأما الثاني فإنا إذا عرضنا الأنسان للفساد فإنا نرى الفساد يسرب إلى بعضها دون بعض ويظهر هذا ظهوراً يبا في أنسان الحيونات الطبيعة البحت. وأما النقل فإن الإمام أبوطاطس يقول في خمسة الفصول البارزة للعلم والإنسان والخصب والدماغ والجواب. وأنا الحار فقاعد موافق لها. فأقول الأنسان بالذكور جميعه عن العلم.

واعلم أننا أقصينا في هذه المسألة كان الحق فيها مع الرازي في أمر العظام والدماغ. وذلك لم جري الشقيق الرئيس بحدثة اليوم فيها. بل قال بعرض لها شيء سبيه بالورم يفظظه في حجمها ولبيد طليها ولا يرغب أن يكون القابل للدماغ بالورم يقبل الورم بالفصل. ومع هذا هذا الفقر الذي ذكرنا إنه يصح ويضمن في سس السن لأن الأعضاء فيه تمكن قابلة للبسم. وأنا بسماله فإن جزاه يوم خلاها لما ذكر الرازي حتى أنه في بعض الأفكار تفسير الشؤون ويفضح عن الفنف.
[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 statement 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 Zakariyā recalls the “painstaking investigation (al-istiqṣā')” 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.” It is noteworthy that Ibn al-Quff does not construct counterarguments in defense of Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā’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-insāf), played a central role. It is his commitment to impartial consideration of Faḥr al-Dīn’s, Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā’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-

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."94 Like Faḥr al-Dīn, the goal of the critical attitude that Ibn al-Quff adopts toward Avicenna, Muḥammad ibn Zakariyā 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."95 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 Qurʾān 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.96

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-Ḥusrawšāhi 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 Faḫr al-Dīn held that only noxious irregular mixtures cause pain. Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn’s exegetical practice, the following discussion will focus on questions relating to the aetiology of pain.

Faḫr 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. Faḫr 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. Faḫr al-Dīn says:

البحث الرابع وهو أن الشيخ زعم أنه ليس كل سوء مزاج مختلف مؤلما بل الحر والبارد مؤلما بالذات والياس مؤلما بالعرض لأنه يبعه تفرق الاتصال من شدة القبض. وأما الرطب لا يؤلما بالينة لأن الحر والبارد كفيفين فعالان والياس والرطب كفيفين انفعالان قائمهما ليس بأن يؤثر بهما جسم في جسم بل بأن يتأثر من جسم. واعلم أنك قد عرفت أن عند الشيخ سوء المزاج سبب ذات للألم عند جالينوس سوء المزاج إما يؤلما لأنه يبعه تفرق الاتصال. فإذا أخذنا بمذهب جالينوس لم أن بقال الحر والبارد مؤلما لأنه من شأنهما تفرق الاتصال وليس من شأن الرطب والياس ذلك. وأما إذا أخذنا بمذهب الشيخ بطل هذا الفرق. بل يجب أن يحكم بأن سوء المزاج الرطب أو الياس مؤلما بالذات لأن حد الألما عند إدراك المناما والرطب والياس الخراجان عن الاعتدان منافى فيكون إدراكهما إدراكا للمناما وهذا هو نفس الوجه. فإن قيل: الشيء، إنما يحسن إذا انفع عن غيره والرطوبة والياسية كفيفين انفعالان لا فاعلان فلا ينفع الحاس عنهما فلا بدرهما. وإذا لم يمكن إدراكهما لم يكونوا موجودين بالذات. فقال: إن الشيخ في كتاب النفس
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 most 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 (ḥāḍā huwa nafsu l-waġaʾi).

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 Faḫr 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-munāfī); (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, Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn discusses in investigation one. P1 is disputed, however, and receives all Faḫr 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*.97

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 (yuṣanū) 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-maḥṣūṣ] 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-maḥṣūṣ] 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-dāṭihā),” 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 sliperiness, the comperssion, 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*, Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn's attention in the commentary on the *Canon*. The same is true of Ibn al-Quff. We pick up the story of the exchange between Ibn al-Quff and Faḫr 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 what Galen and Avicenna had said about aetiology of pain in their works. The discussion here is broader than the one Faḫr 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, Faḫr 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 (ジャーび) 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 (بی-واسیةثی)”
   a. Two Proofs
      i.  Proof One
      ii. Proof Two
   b. 2. Summary of Avoerroes' position
      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-fāṣīlu ḍālinūsu wa-ṣīratuhu),” observing, however, that “we do not find that they have any proof (dahīl)” 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:88

The Judge Abū al-Walid 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.

---

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 most, 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 Sinā 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 Sinā 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 ʾimām [that is, Ibn Ruṣd], 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 Faḫr al-Din's position based on what Ibn al-Quff purports is a complete survey of Faḫr
الكابيل
Emergence of Verification [93]

al-Din's writings (hāda mağmū'u mā dakarahu l-imāmū Fahr al-Din fi ǧami'i taṣānīfī), and then presenting as many objections to it as he can muster.

وأصحت الإمام فاخر الدين بن الخطيب على صحة ما ذهب إليه إيجابية خمسة أحاديث أن القرآن والاجتماع للفوانين مترادتان. وقد أثاروا على أن القرآن أمر عصم وهو عدم الأحكام عن ما من شأنه أن يكون مصقاً ووجود. وإنما لا شك أنهم أمران وحيدين والأمر العصمي لا يعني أن يكون عليه للأمر الواحد فتفرق الأحكام لا يعني أن يكون عليه الألف. وإنما أن الآلهة إذا كانت في غاية الحيلة وقطع بها عصر قطعاً سيئاً لا يحسم بذلك الفرق في أول الأمر إنما يظهر الأمر بعد ذلك بلحة. فلو كان الفرق للذاته ملؤاً لاستحاض الفنفف عن أم. فالمفاوض عليه من ذلك أَنَّ التفريق إنما كان لأن في أول الفنفف لم يحص سوء المراج فلا جرم لم يحص الألف عن. ثم لما حصل سوء المراج بعد ذلك حصل الألف. وإنها أن الأغذى والماء إنما يحملان نتفرق الأحكام العصمية ليتفنف في الفنفف الفضائل الأخرى النقدية مع أن ليس هناك أم. ومعلوم أن إنما يلزم أن هذه الفرق أمر طبيعي ولم يحدث عن سوء المراج، وذلك بدأ على أن التفريق ليس هو سبب للألف لأنه يفظ بل لما يتبع عن سوء المراج. وإلا لم يكن كذلك علمنا أن زيادة الألف في النسبة إنما يحصل من سوء المراج لا من فترق الأحكام. وخدمها أن البنين إنما خلقت قبل صورته النسبية بالمراج المعين فما دام المراج المعين باقياً استهام روان تلك الصورة فيكون السبب القوي في حدوث الفنفف والألف ثناً واثناء.

هكذا المراج لا الفرق.

هذا مجوع ما ذكره الإمام فاخر الدين في جميع تفصيفه، والتجار بعضًا تمسك به ولاًً أً وأجهزه، أَنَّ التفريق يحمله لا محالة كون الأعضاء فافقة للكمال التكريكي اللاقية بها وهو لا محالة مما يمكن أدركه كحال سوء المراج. فإن إيجابية للموقع لأجل فنان العصم إعداد المراج الذي هو كمال. وإن كان كذلك فإن يكون موضعاً من هذه الجهة. فمثلاً، تقول: ما الساعد من أن يقال إن التفريق من حصل كان على فضاء الألف كما يقول الإمام فاخر الدين من فضاء السوء المراج عليها عند كونه كذلك، وذلك لأن كمال الأعضاء واستمدادها لما يضاف عليها من الصورة المفسدة بمراج مخصوص وغير مخصوص وما دام المراج والهيئة نبلة استهام روان تلك الصورة. وإنما إذا رأى أو أخذها استعمالاً لاستهام ما استعماله عند كونه على حالتها الطبيعية. فالحاصل أن هذه أمر مععدة لا فاعلة. ويمكني قبول الشهود هاهنا أسباب العنصرة في جسم ليس بمراة السبب الفاعلي بل القابل.

والكابيل هو معدل الفنفف. ومع ذلك فقول: الإمام وقفا فيما يحب أن فإنه يدعي أن التفريق موجب للألف أي لسوء المراج وهذا أمر وجدي. والتجار عن تعنصه به ثانياً: الآلة المشروفة عند قطعها للعطاء لا يحلوا إنا أن تكون شاعرين بذلك عن حصوله أو لا تكون شاعرين. فإن كان الأول استهام تخلصت الألف والفنفف. وذلك لأن الألغام والاحساس يتم بينهم أحداثاً إتفاق الجانبين من محسوبها الخاص بها والثاني الشعور بذلك التفاصيل. فمنها حصل الطبق القصير وذلك بذلك الشعور والعمل به استهام تخلصت الألف عن الفنفف حاكمة ذلك. وإنما إن لم تكون شاعرين بذلك بل فاعلين عن تخلص الفنفف حينئذ غني أن تخلصه ليس لأن التفريق غير موجب للنوعية في عدم شعورنا به وذلك لانصرف الفنفف المفكرة في هذا الوقت إلى ما هو أَنِّيُهُ مِن ذلك. وقد بسطنا القول في هذا الجواب في شرحنا لكلمات القانون، والتجار عمدا تمسك به ثانياً تقول نحن: لا نمم حصول الفرق للأعضاي في حال السماء
The imān 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.99

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, ‘adami) and 1x, n.1 (hypartic, wuğüdi).
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 mix-
ture. 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 impossi-
ble 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 Faḍr 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 Faḍr al-Dīn says about
the noxious mixture that rushes into them [the body parts, sc. al-ʿaḍāʾ] 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
cesses. In the case that both or one of them ceases, it [the body part, sc. al-ʿudw] 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 Šayḫ’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—concurs 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 instrinsically, 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 Faḫr al-Dīn’s arguments that noxious irregular mixtures are the only intrinsic cause of pain, Ibn al-Quff shows that none of Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn’s thought on the aetiology of pain, for his words recall some of the themes and prescriptions that Faḫr 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 (ṣūʿ al-mizāḡ al-muḥtalif), which causes pain, and a regular noxious mixture (ṣūʿ al-mizāḡ al-muttafīq), which does not cause pain, Ibn al-Quff says that he treats this question “in great detail (aṭnabnā)” and “confirms it (taqrīrihi)” exhaustively “from the imām’s point of view and on the basis of doctrines he adheres to, by way of authoritative texts and reason (mīn ḥikātī l-imāmī fīmā tamassaka bihi mina l-wuḡūhi l-naqliyatī wa-l-˓aqliya).” First, Ibn al-Quff’s reference to the fact that his analysis proceeds from the “authoritative texts and reason” recalls similar phrases in Faḫr al-Dīn’s commentary on the Canon. For example, in the second investigation in his commentary on the section on pain in the Canon, Faḫr 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, Faḫr 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 Ṽaqīl, 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-Masʿūdī in early works such as the Rebuttals (Ḡawābāt).

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 Faḫr al-Din was important to Islamic physicians in the thirteenth century, it cannot be because Faḫr al-Din'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. 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 Faḫr al-Din al-Rāzi'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 Faḫr al-Din 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 Faḫr al-Din composed the commentary on the Canon before setting out to Transoxiana, as well as the references to Faḫr al-Din's patron 'Abd al-Karim al-Saraḥṣi, should be treated with a caution. I show that an early date for the Canon com-

100. In assessing Faḫr al-Din's contributions to Arabic logic, Khaled El-Rouayheb comes to conclusions that are similar to mine in relation to medicine (El-Rouayheb, Relational Syllogisms, 49). He observes that Faḫr al-Din'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, Faḫr al-Din's contributions affected mostly how these discourses unfolded rather than what they stated. Summarising Ibn Ḥaldūn's comments about Faḫr al-Din's contributions to the logic curriculum, El-Rouayheb says that "starting with Rāzi, 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."
Avicenna, wrote Ibn that the large attention writing ed Aphorisms m of al-Rızī’s recommendations, the twelfth century, Galen 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 Zakariyā 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 Hippocrates’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 Zakariyā 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 Zakariyā’s criticisms. While engaging is 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 Aphorisms, 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 Zakariyā, 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 synthe-
sises Avicenna with other Arabic and Greek medical authorities is typical of Faḫr al-Dīn’s style of
inquiry. Gerhard Endress says that where al-Gazālī gradually adopted and synthesized parts of Avi-
cenna’s philosophical thought over a lifetime, Faḫr al-Dīn received Avicenna’s thought and
methodology at a time in which it had already become widespread in various disciplines, was be-
ing introduced into madrasa curricula by prominent legal and kalām scholars from Cairo, Damas-
cus and into Transoxiana, and was being synthesised into an increasingly unified picture of the Is-
lamic sciences and their interrelationship. 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-Mīnfaḥ, Ibn al-Nafīs, Ya’qūb al-Sāmīrī and
Šams al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥusrawāshī, 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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr al-Dīn’s influence on medical discourse at the end of the
thirteenth century, in a thinker who was clearly steeped in Avicunnian and Galenic medical and
philosophical lore.
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Appendix

The following three texts are referred to extensively in this paper. The stemma for Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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 Faḫr 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.
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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.
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102. There is a partial transcription of Faḫr al-Dīn’s introduction in based on the manuscript Konya, Yusuf Ağa ms. 4983; see Albert Dietrich, *Medicinalia Arabica: Studien über arabisch medizinische Handschriften in türkischen und syrischen Bibliotheken* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), 78–9.

103. There is a partial transcription of Faḫr al-Dīn’s introduction in based on the manuscript Konya, Yusuf Ağa ms. 4983; see Albert Dietrich, *Medicinalia Arabica: Studien über arabisch medizinische Handschriften in türkischen und syrischen Bibliotheken* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), 78–9.
أما بعد حمد الله ۱۰۴ مقدر الأمورة والأجزاء ومدير القوى والأعضاء، ومعد ۱۰۵ أصناف الداء ومعد ۱۰۶ أنواع الدواء، والصلاة ۱۰۷.

على محمد ۱۰۸ صديق الأنيبية وعلى آل وأصحابه صفوة الأنيبية.

فإن الله تعالى لما وقفي لل الوصول إلى مدارج ۱۰۹ المناهج الحكمية والترقي إلى مدارج المحاكمات الحكمية والاطلاع على نهایات أقدام العقلاء ۱۱۰ والاطلاع بانتظار مباغي ۱۱۱ الفضلاء وكان من جملة العلماء الشريفة علم الأبدان الذي جعله الصادق ۱۱۲ الصدوق قريباً ۱۱۳ لعل الأدبان وختص من الفضائل أبداً ۱۱۴ أولاً في معموم ۱۱۵ الحالة في كله حين وآن وعير ۱۱۶ ومان ۱۱۷، وأما ناثيًا

[۱۰۴] اُلْهَمَّ ۱۰۴

[۱۰۵] جَاهِدِ ۱۰۵

[۱۰۶] مَعَ ۱۰۶

[۱۰۷] أَنْوَاعَ ۱۰۷

[۱۰۸] مَعْدُ ۱۰۸

[۱۰۹] أَصْنَافِ ۱۰۹

[۱۱۰] مَعْدِ ۱۱۰

[۱۱۱] أَنْوَاعِ ۱۱۱

[۱۱۲] اَلْتَرْقِيَ ۱۱۲

[۱۱۳] إِلَيْهِ ۱۱۳

[۱۱۴] أَلْتَرْقِ ۱۱۴

[۱۱۵] الْعَلَا ۱۱۵

[۱۱۶] الْعَلَا ۱۱۶

[۱۱۷] أَلْتَرْقِ ۱۱۷

[۱۱۸] الْعَلَا ۱۱۸

[۱۱۹] الْعَلَا ۱۱۹

[۱۲۰] الْعَلَا ۱۲۰

[۱۲۱] الْعَلَا ۱۲۱
قلنا موضع 122 نظرة 123 بدن الإنسان الذي هو أشرف الأجسام في هذا المكان. وأما لاحظة فلا اعتضاء مقاعد 124 قواعده واضح الحجة 125 ولا يلبث الإنسان. ولمما وقفت على كمال هذا العلم ومفعمة وعلم درجه ومرتبه أدرت الوعي في غابة 126. والغريب في غابة 127 الوصول إلى لبابة والمتمق 128 في أهواه 129. والغريب إلى آبائه. ولمما كان كتفي القلقان (التي 120) للرئيس أحسن كتفي ومصف في هذا الباب بتفريق أولوي الأدبثم أن الكتب الأول منه تميز 131. سائر كتفي بالمطلقات الحكيمه والمغرقي العلمي والمغرقي العريب. والأسرار الجعيبة التي 132 حارب أذن به أنباء جهل عن إدراكها وحارب قوامه 133 عن الوصول إلى دري أفلاها صرفت نهاية وكدى 134 وكدي 135 وثبت 136 غابة وهمي وهمي 138 إلى تفسير عيونه وشرح مثيره 139 واستخراج مشكلاته 2a [G] واستخراج معضلاته [Ox]

---

122. موضع [Ox, G : جوهر P].
123. نظرة [Ox, G : نظرة P].
124. مقاعد [Ox, G : مقاعد P].
125. الحجة [Ox, G : الحجة P].
126. غيبة (بتهابه) [P, G : غيبة P, G].
127. والغريب في غابة [Ox : om. P, G].
128. الوصول [Ox, G : الوصول P].
129. والغريب [Ox, G : الغريب P].
130. أهواه [Ox, G : أهواه P].
131. تميز [Ox, P : تميز (أهواه) G].
132. عن [Ox, G : عن P].
133. الذي [إحنا] [Ox, P : الذي (إحنا) G].
134. وحارب قوامه [Ox, G : وحارب قوامه P].
135. وكدي [Ox, G : وكدي P].
137. وثبت [Ox, G : وثبت P].
138. ومهم [Ox : om. P].
139. فنونه (إحنا) [Ox, P : فنونه (إحنا) G].

---

141. ] G: مساهلاته Ox.  
142. ] G: مساهلاته Ox.  
143. ] G: مساهلاته Ox.  
144. ] G: مساهلته Ox.  
145. ] G: مساهلته Ox.  
146. ] G: مساهلته Ox.  
147. ] G: مساهلته Ox.  
149. ] G: مساهلته Ox.  
150. ] G: مساهلته Ox.  
151. ] G: مساهلته Ox.  
152. ] G: مساهلته Ox.  
إن الزمان تابع 156 للأدلاء بع النتيجة للأخس 157 الأول
والتمثيلي في قوله 158: 

أذم إلى هذا الزمان أهله فأعلمهم قدما وأحرمهم 160. وقد
وأكرمه كتب وأصرهم عمي 161 وأشهدهم فيه 162. وأصححهم فرد
بل العلم صار كلاً في هذا الزمان على كل أصحابه ووبيلاً 163 على محجمه وطلبه. فترى 164 الرجل بعد أن أقي في تحسينه من فاق
فيه أثداء وأقواه [G 2b] وتعين 165 بحل 166 الوعوض في 167 العلوم 168. ووافق ما فيها من السر المكمن ممتنعًا بسبب ذلك عن جميع
المبادرات مرفوعًا عن كل المباع والطلبات 169. هذا ولكن الله تعالى بفضله العميم وفطله الحسيم 170. وإعفاء العام وإكرامه النام عوض
[Ox 5b] أهله العلمن من السعودات 171. الحسيمة الحسابية بالساعدة الكريمة العقلية، ومن القلادة الدينية 172 باللالة القرية.


---


174. [نافيس] [Ox, G: فيم]

175. [المملكة] [Ox, G: للملكة]

176. [بلدة] [Ox, G: لبلدة]

177. [الروحيين] [Ox, G: للروحيين]

178. [سبحانه وتعالى] [Ox: om. P.]

179. [تدعية] [Ox: om. P.]

180. [الشيف الإمام الفاضل] [Ox, G: om. P.]

181. [المحقق] [Ox, G: om. P.]

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

183. [السرخسي] [Ox, G: السرخسي]

184. [حوباه وذاته: (أذافره)] [Ox, P (١٨٥٤٨), om. G.]

185. [فاته] [Ox, P (٢٦٨٣٨), om. G.]

186. [رفاغ] [Ox, G: فراغ, G, P (١٨٦٤٨.]

187. [وادرهالي: (رادرارات)] [Ox, G: فيم]

188. [ألفاه] [Ox, G: P.]

189. [كثرها] [Ox, G: P.]
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Oxford, Bodleian Library, ms. Arch. Seldon A 64, fol. 196a, l.2–109b, l.17.


191. [Ox : ] فإنها P.

192. [Ox, P : ] مناقشته (بمساءله) G.

193. [Ox : ] لائحة P.

194. [Ox, P : ] الفن (الإرباع) G.

195. [أهـ ] ad. add. في P, G.

196. [Ox, P ( geopolitics ) : ] من P, G.


200. [Ox : ] مفصل السور والمنتقى G.

201. [Ox, G : ] أشرع P.


203. [Ox, G : ] كتاب P.

204. [Ox, G : ] ترتيبه P.
Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, MS hebr. 1208, fols. 69a, l.16–72a, l.16.

Gotha, Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek, MS or. 1916, fols. 101a, l.5–105a, l.1.

الفصل الخامس في الأعراض المركبة إلى قوله: والروم يعرض للأعراض المركبة. التفسير هذا الكلام يستدعي أربعة مباحث. الأول ذكر أقسام الأعراض المجمعة. الثاني أنها كيف ينبغي أن يكون حتى يحصل من اجتماعها. الرابع بيان كونه مرضًا مركبًا.

البحث الأول فاعلم أن اجتماع الأعراض على سنة أوجه، الأول أن يوجد مع المرض المزاجي مرض آخر مزاجي. الثاني أن يوجد مع المرض المزاجي مرض تركيبي كما إذا كان مع الحمى دملًا. الثالث أن يوجد مع فرق اتصال كما إذا كان مع الحمى فرحة. الرابع أن يوجد مع المرض المزاجي مرض تركيبي كما إذا حدث في المجاري، ويضيفها فإنه زيادة في المقدار ويدخل المزاجي. الخامس أن يوجد مع المرض المزاجي مرض تركيبي كما إذا قطع سلامية عن سلالات الأصابع فإنه من حيث هو فرق فهو من جنس فرق الأصابع. ومن حيث أنه نقصان.

---

205. ] Ox, G: أدل P.
206. ] Ox: الروم G.
207. ] Ox: عن G.
209. ] Ox: إنتمتعوا G.
210. ] Ox, G: أدل P.
211. ] Ox, G: أدل P.
212. ] Ox, P (ךיה): om. G.
213. ] Ox: إنتمتعوا G.
214. ] Ox, P: ويضيفها (ךיה) G.
215. ] Ox, G: قد P.
217. ] Ox, G: وهو G.
218. ] Ox, G: أدل P.
220. ] G, P: الزمان G.

---

البحث الثاني، في أنها كيف ينبغي أن يكون حتى يحصل من اجتماعها مرض واحد. فقولهم: لما حصلت الأنواع السنة من المرض فيها فلم يحصل من اجتماعها مرض واحد بل وكل واحد منها تميز بنفسه عن الآخر، ولكن واحد منها 223 سبب على حدة وعلاج على حدة حتى أنه لم زال الواحد 220 منها بقي الباقي، فأما إذا حصل من اجتماعها حقيقة واحده ذات سبب معين وعلاج معين ويحيث أنه متي زال البعض زال الباقى كان ذلك مرضًا متعدى 221 مركبا 221 عن أنواع الأمراض.
البحث الثالث في حقيقة الورم. اعلم أن بين الأعضاء السبعة فرجاً كثيرة ولكنها غالبًا جافية عن الحس في الأعضاء، لاتباع
بعضها على البعض. ولكنها ظاهرة في الأعضاء الصلبة كمتشابه العظم 218 ثمن أن 218 متم الاصب علی شيء من العروق
ملاحظات لولا العروق العظام التي في العضو تم تمرسي إلى العروق 234 الصغير ولا يزال كذلك حتى تمزق 234 جميع العروق الصغيرة والكبيرة
ثم أن الفضل إن كان أكثر من ذلك، وكانت رزمة الاعصاب بالفجوة 242 أفواه G [القرون اللبية 241] ومنها الفضل
على علاج الفجوة التي في حرم الأعضاء، التي يمكن توصها. ولا شك أن ذلك يغلي على بحثه وتحبس من في العضو بعد
مراجع مختلف في إحصاء العضو تمتد وانصاب فضل وإحساس بالرما. فانتماء في ذلك 245 هو الورم [Ox 107] وجد أنه تمدد
بحدث 246 للعضو من قبل اختبار مادة رذيلة 247 إلى. فإذنا فنا تمد ولم نقل علی حتى تدخل فيه الأورام الريحية 248.

---

233. OX, P: [P.]
234. جرجا] OX, G: [G.]
235. مختلفة] OX, P: [G.]
239. ملاحظات] OX, G: [G.]
240. ملاحظات لولا العروق العظام التي في العضو تم تمرسي إلى العروق) OX: om. G.
241. تمملا] OX, G: [G.]
248. OX, P: om. G.
البحث الرابع في أن الورم مرض مركب من الأجزاء الثلاثة إما أن فيه سوء مراح مادي فلان فيه خطط محسوب ثم أن سوء المراح

وجب تفرق الأقسام وهو توسيع تلك المناشف ثم أن تلك المادة بعد تفريقها للاتصال تغير الشكل وتزيد في مقدار [P 70a]

العضور وربما يزيد. العضور بحيث يسمع أن يقرب مما من شأنه أن يقرب منه أو يعد مما من شأنه أن يعد عليه وذلك هو مرض

العضور.

قال الشيخ: والورم يعرض للأعضاء اللينة إلى قوله وكل ورم ليس له سبب باد.

t النفس: لما فرغ بيان حقيقة الورم شرع في بيان العضور الذي يعرض له الورم. ومن الناس من رهن أن العضور الصلب كالعظم أو

اللين. كالمدماغ فإنه لا ينجم لأنه لا ينجم ولا ينجم. ويصر قيسهم كاذبة. أما أولى لأن الدماغ العظم يعوض لهما

السم والشمو لا يكون إلا بالدماغ. وأما ثانيا لأن كل واحد منهم يعذب. وذلك إنما يكون بفضل جوه الدماغ فيه. فبما من

هذين الوجوهين فسوف الأجزاء الغذائية فيه، فإن ذلك الأجزاء كما أنها قد تصلح تفتكون غساء أمكن أيضا أن تفسد. وإذا فسدت

أوجيت التمديد وذلك هو الورم [G 102b]. وأما ثانيا فلان جوه الدماغ وإن كان رطبا إلا أن فيه لزوجة والعظم أيضاً كذلكك

249. ] Ox, G: أعلاً P.
250. ] Ox, P: تفرق (بمرج).
251. ] add. المندفع G.
252. ] P: يزيد (ويسود).
255. ] Fرغ من G: P.
256. ] أعلاً P.
257. ] P: أعلاً (لا يذكر P).
258. ] G: بالتمد P.
259. ] Ox، P: ولان P.
261. ] Ox، P: G.
263. ] Ox، P (بال] التمد P.

قال الشيخ: وكل وم ليس له سبب باد ثم سيء البديل [271a] يتضمن انتقال مادة من عضو إلى ما تحته فيمسى [271a].


264. [Ox, G: تمدهم] P.
265. [Ox, G: هذا] P.
266. [Ox: فالعالم G: الالئذاب] P.
267. [Ox, G: نقل] P.
268. [G, P: كان (الخاطرة)] OX.
269. [Ox, G: تخصير] P.
270. [Ox, G: بنمذ] P.
271. [Ox, P: الفضلات (الكشفى)] G.
272. [Ox, G: خمساً] P.
274. [Ox, G: ماتورة (الكشفى) قابلة] P.
275. [Ox, G: المحادية الاسمزاب] P.
276. [Ox, G: إذا] P.
277. [Ox, P (الانسحاب): ا_heads (الكشفى)] G.
278. [Ox, P: المادي G: المئذ] P.
279. [Ox, G: نعم] P.
280. [Ox, G: هذا] P.
281. [add: تقسيم] G.
282. [Ox, P: (ويدعو إليها اheadline الكلاز مالالوئز ألليزت) G: om.]
283. [Ox, G: إذا] P.
من عضو آخر فيه. وأما أن لا يكون الطين 284 الأول هو النزلة. وإعلم أن هذا لأن مبطنة يكون ل�性ة: قوة العضو الدافع وضعف القابل وكثرة المادة ونسخة الصدري وضعف غزارة العضو القابل 286 وكون القابل أسفل من الدافع. ومن أخطارها وم دقف ذلك من فصل مدة 287 أصبحت إليه من غيره وتم حديث قليلا احتكم 288 الأمين.

قال الشيخ: ومن أن يكون النسيم إلى قوة والأورام قد تنقض بفصول مختلفة.


قال الشيخ: والأورام قد تنقض بفصول مختلفة إلى قوة وأما الأورام الغير الجيدة 293.

الخبير: الآن عاد إلى بيان 296 تقسيم الأورام وذلك التقسيم يمكن به إعطاء عناية كبير إلى أن أولي الفصول بالاعتبار الفصول الكائنة عن الأسفل النسيمة للأورام وهي سنة: الأخلات الأربعة 297 والثانية والثاني. لم أنه جعل هذا التقسيم علة لبعض آخر من التقسيم وهو

 Fälle: [Ox, P] = (الكلمة G) والقسم

وامرأة 288

all this omitted by G.

Fälle: [Ox, P] = (المادة: الأورام G, P)

Fälle: [Ox, P] = (كل: كون G, P)

Fälle: [Ox, P] = (من G, P)

Fälle: [Ox, P] = (الثانية G)

تقسيم الأورام بحسب كيفية تجربتها وروعتها، وإنما جعل التقسيم الأول على النحو التالي لتقسيم الثاني لأن الأخطاء الأولى والثانية والثالثة مشتركة في أنها مادة واما باردة ولازم من انحاصر وامة الورم في تلك السنة 300. أحيانًا، كاسبة في الورم في هاتين الكتبتين وتظهر مما 301. نقلًا أن تقسيم الأورام بالأمر السبب المأهولة تقسيم الفصول 302. وتقسيمها بالترجمة وحرية التكوين بالمحور، ثم هناك شكل 303. وهو أنه في هذا الموضع جعل الأورام السائحة نواع 304. في مقابلة الأورام الكلية. وأما في المقالة الذي ذكر فيها ملاحظات الأورام الباردة من هذا الكتاب جعل الأورام السائحة نواع 305. من الأورام الكلية. فإنه قال: الأورام الباردة 306. إذا أن تكون بلغية أو سواوية أو رحبية، والأورام الكلية إذا سائحة بلغية [G 103b] ونستم أوراما رخوة واما مالية كما يعترض (b) لعوض ما أن يجتمع فيه، كامستماع 307. في هذا 308. كلامة. ولا شك أن الأورام المائية إذا أن تكون داخلة تحت البلغمة أو لا تكون في مكان لمحتالة في أحد الموضعين مستدركًا، ولعله إذا جمع سمي خراجا. فاعلم أن هذا نوع آخر من التقسيم وهو أن الورم كيف ما كان إذا أن يكون قد جمع أو لم يجمع؛ والل أول يسمى خراجا. ثم عبر 309. أن الخراج الذي يكون من جنس دري، فإنما أن يكون وفقاً في النحوم الصغيرة وهي المعين 310. خراف الأدن والأول والثانية إذا أن لا يكون وفعاً فيها. فالأول يسمى طاعنًا، ولعل الأورام الحادة 311. كاستماع. [v.9]

298. لأن [Ox: om. G.
299. الأرصة [Ox: G: ألد ألد P.
300. السنة [Ox: G: علامة P.
301. مما [Ox: G: إما P.
302. بالفصل: (كالكسيزي) [Ox: P]
303. نوع ع [Ox: G: نوع ع P.
304. الذي يذكرها في (الدود: ميدنlayح) [Ox: P]
305. ملاحظات [Ox: P: ملاحظات G.
306. نوع ع [Ox: G: نوع ع G.
307. من هذا الكتاب ... قال الأورام الباردة [Ox: G: om. P.
308. كاستماع [Ox: G: كاستماع P.
309. هذا [Ox: G: كاسدين P.
310. عبر [G: om. P.
311. قد جمع أو ... إذا أن يكون [G: om. Ox.
312. المعين [Ox: G: الميئاء P.
313. وفعا [Ox: G: كاسدين P.
314. الحادة [لها G.
ابتداءً فيه يندفع الخلط ويظهر الحجم ثم يتمتد في ربيده مع الحجم وتمتد ثم وقفتِ ثم يأخذ في الانحفاظ فيضحت [818] بتخلل
أو فتح. فاعلم أن هذا316 بيان حكيم من أحكام اليوم الحار317 وهو318 بالحقيقة حكيم من أحكام مطلق المرض لأن لكل مرض319 هذه الأوقات الأربعة على ما سبأني. وقوله: ومان320 أمو إما321 تحلل وأما322 جمع مدة وآما استحالة إلى الصلاة. فاعلم أنه لما ذكر أن اليوم له انتهاء أراد أن يشرح حاله عند الانتهاء، فبيان ذلك أن اليوم إذا323 حدث في العضو فإما أن يغلب الفضل العضو أو العضو الفضل، فإن غلب العضو الفضل دفعه ففرق324 وإن كان مما يمكن نضجه وإحالته325 إلى الدم السحود كالنفخ326 الدهون ففل327 وإن كان دما فيه حدة وحرارة عده ورد إلى حالته الطبيعية. وكل ذلك ينسى تحلل الأورام وهو328 أحمد329 وجهو شفافها، وبعد ذلك

315. وقفت [ج]: وقفت [ب]
316. هذا [ج]: هذا [ب]
317. الحار [ج]: الحار [ب]
318. هو [ج]: وهو [ب]
319. من [ج]: مرض [ب]
320. ونهاية [ج]: ومال [ب]
321. إما [ج]: إما [ب]
322. واما [ج]: وما [ب]
323. إذا [ج]: إذا [ب]
324. ففرق [ج]: ففرق [ب]
325. كباببغم [ج]: كالنفخ (فلوت) [ب]
326. واللحم [ج]: فصل (فلوت) [ب]
327. وهو [ج]: وهو [ب]
328. أحمد [ج]: أحمد [ب]
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أما جعلناها بلغة لأن أصل ذلك العصبة. بل عم عرشه أن يس فارداً غلظة هذا كلامه في هذا الموضوع. وبالجملة فكلاهما في هذا المعنى مشرور. ولقيه الأورام العضلية السوداوية تبادل في أول كونها صملاً وقد تنقل إلى الصلابة وخصوصا الدهمية. وقد يعرض ذلك أيضاً في البلغة أجحان. فالمراد منه أن أحد نوعي الورم مسوداوي وهو 366 الصلابة قد يكون بكونه عن خلف حدث 367 له ابتداء وقد يكون حدوته من قبل أن يحصل نوع آخر من الورم ثم أن مادته تغطي قصير الورم صلابة وأكثر 370 ذلك فإنه يقع في الورم الدموي وقد يكون أيضا في الورم البلغي. فأما 371 ما ذكره في باب 372 الفرق بين الغدد والسلع وبين تغذى الورم فكله ظاهر والذي 373 يلمع ب أن تغذى الورم لا يتحرك إلى قدم ولكن بل يشبه 374 ويبقى تغذى إلى الحجاب كلها.

وباقي النص (G 105a ظاهر).
C. On Pain and Pleasure


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

Paris, Bibliothèque 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.

The ninth chapter in Asas (380) refers to the last chapter in the commentary (381).

The first sentence of the commentary (382): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof: the first sentence of the commentary (383): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof: the first sentence of the commentary (384): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:

The first sentence of the commentary (385): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:

The first sentence of the commentary (386): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:

The first sentence of the commentary (387): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:

The first sentence of the commentary (388): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:

The first sentence of the commentary (389): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:

The first sentence of the commentary (390): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:

The first sentence of the commentary (391): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:

The first sentence of the commentary (392): "It is clear that in this chapter, the commentary contains a sentence from the text." The proof:
يمكننا أن نعلق فيه 393 ما ينافي 394 بناءً وما يكون متناقضاً له. ففي تلك الحالة إدراك الملائم والمنافي يكون حاسلة وإن لم يكن الألم والملامحة بل وقت كونها ملتئم هكذا يعاقب ما ينافي كونها 395 والعكس. فإذا كان إدراك المنافي ممكن 396 الحصول عند وجود اللهد والألم يمنع 397 الحصول عند وجود اللهد والألم يمنع للإدراك 398. فإن في اللهد إدراك الملائم الحاصل وفي الصورة التي (أ. هـ 1320) ذكرتها الملائم صبها 400 غير حاسلة فانفع الإشكال 401. فقوله آما لا هذا 402 زيادة في الهد وهي مع ذلك غير ذاتية للإشكال 403 (أ. هـ 1324) لعيبه أنه حفل 403 في أمراضه الأولمبية حراة في طبيعته فنهاك إدراك المنافي الحاصل موجود مع أن الألم غير موجود. فإن في الحالة في هذه الصورة هو العمل 404 يوجد المنافي لا إدراك المنافي والعمل غير والإدراك غير 405. فقول الإدراك على قسمين منه ما يوقف على حصول مدركه 406 في الخارج ومنه ما لا

---

401. السؤال: (أЛАلشلأ) الإشكال G, P: om. Ox, G.

402. هذا [G: (رداه)].

403. حصل: G, P: (ألاشلأ).

404. التعليم: G, P: (ألاشلأ), Ox, G.

405. غير: G, P: (زير), Ox, P: (ألاشلأ), G, Ox: Om. G.

406. مدركه: G, P: (إدراك), Ox: G.
باتوقف. والإفراغ الأول đem إلى إدراك الملائمين غفيق ولفيق في
الإدراكات الحسية ولفيق والملائمين العقلية. وهذا مخالفة عن كلاً من الفصل بين
الإدراكات الحسية ولفيق والملائمين العقلية. فإذا لم تكن حيّاً من الإعراب بأن
اللائحة مع الفصل بين الملائمين أنفس امتحانّا، فإن بالملائمين أنفس امتحانّا،
وانعكّس الوصف باللائحة المع الفصل بين الملائمين أنفس امتحانّا. ومن فضيله
في اللائحة العقلية أنهم حذرو أن إدراك الملائمين وأنعكّس [١٠٣] على أن العلم بالBABY والعلم بالملائمين قد يكون حاصله عندما لا

407. نقص تكامل [١٠٣] G. والملائمين Ox, P.
408. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
409. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
410. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
411. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
412. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
413. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
414. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
415. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
416. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
417. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
418. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
419. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
420. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
421. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
422. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
423. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
424. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
425. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.
426. نقص تكامل G. والملائمين Ox, P.

Vor saus und ruh. Rechts und links.

427. ] Ox, P (دید) G. جمل: فالجملة G.


429. ] Ox, P (_rat) [Ox, G. عش: (کلئسی) G.

430. ] Ox, G: (کمر) P. قالوا.

431. ] Ox, G: (نمد) P. جرم.

432. ] Ox: (دلی) [Ox: (ومن) G. لنفس G.


434. ] Ox, G: ملازم.

435. ] Ox, G: (واکلئپولئم) P. om. G.

436. ] Ox, G: (بکره الیب) P. اللحظة الثاني.

437. ] Ox, P (وچ) P. هذا.

438. ] Ox, P (من) G. بين.


440. ] Ox, G: (که) P. الأمر.

441. ] add. and del. in text G. وموضع.

442. ] Ox, G: (وچ) P. معلوم.

443. ] Ox, P (البکره) G. للآمر.

444. ] post. et del. (سپر) (مکان) P. علة.
للذين، والثاني وهو أن التغذى والنمو إنما يحصلان بأن يتفرق الأجزاء على الضعفاء بهدف في الفرض المستجذبة. ولذلك يدل على أن النفق ليس سببا للذين لأنه يتفرق لما يكون من سوء المزاج. فيحينن مهما إلى بيان أن اتصال العضو يتفرق عند التغذى والنمو. وذلك بالنفل ولث بالبركان ثانيا. أما النفل فقد صرح الشيخ في ذلك في مواضع من كتاب الشفاء فمنها أنه حكى في الفصل السادس من المقالة الثانية من الفن الأول من الطبيعي في أصحاب الخلاء أنهم احتاجوا على وجود الخلاء بأن قالوا: إنما مما لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو لمن هو L
الفصل التاسع 461 فقال: وأما الحديث النامي فإن الغذاء ينفرد بين متسامين من أجزاء الأعضاء يحترقها 462 بالتفسير. 463 بقوة فيتيسكر

بنهما [133a] Ox G 129a [فيما ادعيناه 465 في الفصل الناسم 468 من القرن الثالث 469 من الطبيعة في بيان كيفية النمو: يجب أن يكون الأيدياد مستمرا على تناسب مؤد 470 إلى كمال

النشوء] ويكون الوراد قد فسد واستحال إلى شاكئة المرور عليه والمرور عليه 471 قد نما متنا في الأطراف منها 472 إلى كمال

النشوء] ففي هذا الوراد 473 يدخل المرور عليه نافذا في خلل تجديه 474 في جسمه يبدع له المرور عليه إلى أطراف على

نسبة واحدة في نوعه 475. ومنها أنه قال في الفصل الأول من المقالة [P 89a] G الثانية 480 من علم النفس: "أما الدنيا فإنها تدف في

______________________________

461 ] Ox, G: نذاء أتافلأ ذات P.
462: يدلها ] Ox, G: يدلها P.
464: فيتيسكر ] Ox G: لتسكن P.
466: ادعيناه ] Ox, G: P.
467: قال ] Ox, G: om. P.
468: الناسم ] Ox, G: أذال P.
469: الثالث ] Ox, G: أذال P.
470: مؤول ] Ox, G: دولمود P.
471: النشوء ] Ox, G: دولمود P.
472: شاكئة ] Ox G: مشاكل P.
475: post add. et del. in textu ذلك Ox.
476: الوراد ] Ox, G: دولمود P.
477: يدخل ] Ox: G.
478: تجديه ] Ox, G: نذاء P.
480: السلطة ] Ox, P (كلات): G.
الطول أكثر كثيرًا مما تأبى في العرض. والنزادة في الطول أصعب من النزادة في العرض وذلك لأن النزادة في الطول يحتاج فيها إلى تنفيذ الغذاء في الأعضاء الصلبة من العظام والعصب تنفيذا في أجزائها طولا لتمسها وبعد 488 إن النزادة في العظام. وأما الهرم فلا.

هذه المواضع الثلاثة صريح في أن النمو لا يحدث إلا عند تفرق الأقسام هناك وإن حصل تفرق الأقسام 487. أما الأعضاة لا شك أنها في التحلل ولا معنى للتخلل إلا أن تفصل عن العضو 489. كان متصلا به والتحلل إلى الغذاء للانصاق مثل ذلك الجزء بالعضو. فإن تفرق الأقسام شيء لا يخلو الأعضاة عنه في أكثر الأوقات ثم أن هذا التفريق 490 يتبين شيئا يختص به 491 يظهر العضو دون بطن لأن الصحح هو الحرة وهي سارية في ظاهر العضو وبلاء فوجب أن يتحلل من الأجزاء من بطن 492. العضو كما يتحلل من ظاهره 493. والتحلل لا ينتم إلإ بفرق الأقسام 494 فإن قبل النزادي والنمو وإن كان لا

---

481. [Ox: مطيره: P: om. G.
482. [Ox, P (اللذم), Rahman: G. 
483. [Ox, P (اللذم), Rahman: G. 
484. [Ox, P (اللذم), Rahman: G. 
485. [Ox, G: دم P. 
486. [Ox, G: دم P. 
487. [add. لسع نفسه G. 
488. [G, P (اللذم), Raman: G. 
489. [G, P (اللذم), Raman: G. 
490. [G, P (اللذم), Raman: G. 
491. [G, G: متفصل G. 
492. G (اللذم), Raman: G. 
493. [Ox: مctlz G. 
494. [Ox, G: P. 
495. [Ox, P (اللذم), Rahman: G. 
496. [Ox, G: P. 
497. [Ox, G: P. 
498. [Ox, G: P. 
يتيمان إلا يتفرق اتصال العضو٣٤٣٥ لكن ذلك تفرق في أجزاء صغيرة جدًا ففلس٤٠٩ ذلك التفرق لا يحصل الألم. فقول: إن كل واحد من تلك التفرقات٣٠٨ فإن كان صغيرًا جدًا. ولكن تلك التفرقات كثيرة جداً لأن التغذى والنمو شيء غير خاص بحول من البدين دون جزء بل هما حاصلان في جملة الأعضاء وهم لا يتيمان١٠٠ إلا بهذا النوع من التفرق. فإن٣٠٨ هذا النوع من التفرق أمر حاصل في جملة الأعضاء وإذا كان كذلك فلو كان اتصال الأعضاء٢٠٥ من حيث أنه تفرق مؤلمًا٢٠٥ لكان الألم حاصله٢٠٧ في جملة البدين ولهما لم يكن٣٠٨ كذلك علمنا أن التفرق لذاته غير مؤلم بل إما يحل معه سوء مراجع. فإنقيل: هذه التفرقات مؤلمة٢١٠ إلا أن تلك الألم لذا دامت بطفل الشعر بها١٤١. فقول: أما أولاً فنحن لا تعسي بالألم١٤٢ إلا هذا الأمر المحسوس ولا نشك أنه غير حاصل بسبب التغذى والنمو وليس كلاماً إلا في ذلك فإن١٤٣ أتيم١٤٤ أما آخر كان وقوع الاسم عليه وعلى ما نحن فيه باشترك الاسم. وأما ثانياً فإن الوجع الحاصل من تفرق الأعاص لم صار لكونه١٤٣َ٥ ملأوه غير محسوس وجب أن يكون كل وجد.

[Emergence of Verification 99]

Ox: om. G, P.

1. [Laetrile] Ox, G: P (صغير)

518. [v.518] Ox, G: إرائه P.
519. فجاء [v.519] G, P.
520. قد [v.520] supra lin. et del. G.
521. ول [v.521] P, G:
522. تخفت [v.522] G, P.
523. المراح [v.523] G, P.
524. جرم [v.524] G, P:
525. المراح [v.525] G, P:
526. مما ينكر [v.526] G, P.
527. علة [v.527] G, P.
528. مع أن ... الاعدال الحروج [v.528] G: om. P, P.
529. دامت [v.529] G, P:
530. ممثلة G, P (ممثلة), in marg. G, P.
531. تفيض [v.531] G, P:
532. فالحاصل [v.532] G, P:
533. فلا [v.533] G, P.
البحث الثالث في أن سوء المراج المختلط مؤلم 534. مذهب جالينوس أن السبب الذاتي للألم هو التفرق ومذهب الشيخ أن السبب الذاتي للألم إما تفرق الانفصال إما سوء المراج المختلط. وأما نحن فنطلق أن السبب الذاتي هو سوء المجاية فقط.

مني كثرت في السطح كان البعض قريبا من البعض وصائر السطوح صغيرة جدا. فإذا حصلت آلآم في [P90] مواقف
الفرقاط [554] في ذلك المواقف وقرب بعضها من البعض [555] وصغير ما بينها من السطوح نفست كون الواقع
مشابها وإن لم يكن في نفس الأمر كذلك، وهذا [558] كما أنا إذا دقتنا [559] الدمام والاستعداد والتنحير،
والنبرة دقيقة ناعمة وخلطنا البعض بالبعض بابا [562] فإنه يظهر في الحص للمجموع [563] ينفرد على حدة وإن لم يكن في نفس الأمر كذلك، وإذا كان

| 552. | [P90] حصلت | [560] خلطنا |
| 553. | [P90] المواقع: (لاعفورك) (لاعفورك). |
| 554. | [P90] فلكرارة: [P90] |
| 555. | بعض: (لاعفورك). |
| 556. | يثبتنا |
| 557. | [P90] الواقع: (لاعفورك) |
| 558. | وهذا |
| 559. | [P90]نفقنا (لاعفورك) |
| 560. | [P90] والتنحير |
| 561. | خلطنا |
| 562. | [P90] بابا |
| 563. | [P90] للمجموع (لاعفورك). |
| 564. | [P90] لون |
| 565. | [P90] مفرد: (لاعفورك) |
| 566. | [P90] يكون |
| 567. | هذا |
| 568. | [P90] يكون |
| 569. | [P90] الثانية |
| 570. | قال |
| 571. | [P90] موجود |

- 111 -
الاتصال عن المرد لا يكون حيث يبرد 572 في أطراف الموضع المرتد 573. ولقلق 574 أنه يقول الموضع إذا يبرد 575 فإنه ينقض 576 من ذلك الانقباض أن تتمدد أطرافه عن أطراف الموضع الحاول 577 أن تنضغط 578 أجزاءه المرتدة بعضها في بعض وإكلا 580 الأول يقاله إذا تمدد طرفه عن طرف الموضع الحاول انفصل عليه رجول 581 النفرق. وأما 582 الثاني G 131a فأن الضغط بسبب لنفرق الاتصال وذلك جعله الألم الضاغط قسمًا من أقسام الأ ولم يقال 583. وأيضا فإن الموضع المرتد 584 يمكن أن يكون بعضه أربد من البعض وجينين ينفصل الأربد عن البارد. وإذا كانت هذه الاحتمالات قافية 586 لم يكن القياس برهانًا. الحجة الثالثة 587 قال الوجع لا محالة إحساس بمثير مناف يغص 588 من حيث هو مناف والحمد يعكس 589.

---

572. عن ] Ox, G: تُل P.
573. برد ] Ox, G: برد (يبرد) P.
575. المبرد ] Ox, P: المبرد (المالحبر) G.
576. وقلق ] Ox, P: وقلق G.
577. يتبرد ] Ox, P: يتبرد (تبرد) G.
578. ويرضع ] Ox, G: om. P.
579. تنضغط ] Ox, G: تنضغط P.
582. أما ] Ox: om. G.
583. الثاني ] Ox, G: ألب P.
584. الألم ] Ox, G: الألم (الألم) P.
585. المبرد ] Ox: المبرد (المالحبر) P.
587. يمكن ] G: يمكن P.
588. الثالثة ] Ox, G: ألب P.
589. نعصر ] Ox: نعصر P.
590. يعكس ] Ox, G: يعكس P.
وكيل محسوس منافق 591 من حيث هو منافع موجع. ولقال أن يقول إن كنت تجعل 593 اسم الوجع اسمًا لإدراك المنافي 594 فذلك مما لا منازعة 599 فيه. ولكننا نجد من أنفسنا أرا مخصصًا منصوبًا في نفسه إذا جعلنا الوجع اسمًا لذلك الأمر الوثدي 596 لم 597 يلزم بالضرورة أن يكون ذلك 598 أمر هو تصريح 599 إدراك المنافي بل احتتم ذلك واحتمل أيضًا 600 غيره وهو أن يكون الألم حالة أخرى مغايرة لإدراك المنافي حاضلة معه. ومن كان ذلك محتملاً لم يكن 601 الجرم بأن إدراك المنافي ألم، فثبت أن هذه الحجج 602 غير براهينة. ويمكن أن يمسك في إثبات المطلوب بأن 603 لسعة العقبة أشد إيلاماً من الجراحة العظيمة. فلو 604 كان الاحتمال هو تفرق الاتصال فقط لكانت الجراحة العظيمة أقوى في الإيلام منها، ولما لم يكن كذلك عننا أن زيادة الألم من سعة العقرب إنما حصل من سوء الوعي لا من تفرق الاتصال [606].

591. } Ox, G: علم P.
592. } مناف G: الدعم.
593. } OX: تعلم G.
595. } منازعة G.
596. } G, P (الوحداني: (الوحدة) P).
597. } لم P.
598. } Ox: om. G.
599. } OX: Lصيح G: رد P.
600. } أيضاً G: أما P.
601. } Ox, G: إن P.
602. } OX, G: ألاحذه P.
603. } Ox, G: إذا P.
604. } Ox, G: في P.

605. [Ox, G: ألد] P.
606. [Ox, P: G: (جلابة)] مؤلماً
607. [Ox: P: G: (جلبت)] مؤلماً
608. [Ox, P: G: (جلبت)] لأنه لا G.
609. [Ox: P: G: (جلبت)] التقييض
610. [Ox, G: فلأ] P.
611. [Ox, P: G: (جلبت)] الديثة
612. [Ox: G: مؤلماً]
613. بتأثر | [Ox: P: G: (جلبت)]
614. بل بأن يتأثر من جسم | [Ox: om. G.
615. [Ox, G: ألد] P.
616. [Ox: P: G: (جلبت)] أو البابس
617. [Ox: P: G: (جلبت)] أو البابس
618. [Ox: om. G.
619. [Ox: G: مناقشة
620. [Ox: G: (جلابة)] فكون
621. [Ox: G: (جلابة)] أدرك المناقشة
622. [Ox, G: دد] P.
تبدو الرأي، إنما يحس إذا الفعل عن غير الروحية والبوسية كيفينان انفعالان لا فاعتلان
624 فلا يفعل الحاس عنهم فلا
625 يدركهما. وإذا لم يمكن إدراكهما
626 لم يكونا موجودين بالذات. فقد ول: إن الشي ب في كتاب النفس بين فساد قول
627 في قول الروحية والبوسية غير محسوسين بحاسة النفس وبين في قول الاستفسات أن الرطوبه
628 سريعة الفول للفكاك
629 غير محسوسه.
والظاهر أنه أراد بالرطوبه التي زعم أنها محسوسه للن. وعلى الجملة فلا شك أن الرطوبه بمعنى البلاء محسوسه. وإن شئت الاستفساء في ذلك فارج إلى ما قاله في الفصل الثالث من المقالة الثانية
630 من علم النفس من الشفاء لتطمئن نفسك. وأما الذي يقول إن الرطوبه والبوسية كيفينان انفعالان فكذلك
631 أكلتامات ذكرها (136a) في فصل الأركان ولا
632 يوجب شيء منها أن لا يكونا محسوسين.
633 وإذا لبت أنهما محسوسان فقد
634 كونهما خارجين عن الأعدال كانا متناقضين
635 فيكون إدراكهما
636

623. ] Ox, G: om. P.


625. ] P (بأضففاء): Ox, G.


630. ] G: ألد P.

631. ] G: ألد P.

632. ] G: كاهل P.


634. ] Ox, G: لا P.

635. ] Ox, G: يودي مسأ: (دوام) G.

636. ] G: يكون محسوسا

637. ] G: بعد: (فلزما) P.

638. ] G: كانا P.

البحث الخامس في تفصيل الكلام في اللفظ الحسي. قال جايلوس: اللفظ والألفة يبدوان في الحواس كلهما وكلما كان الحس أكمل كانت مفهمة مع الورد أكثر فكانْ الألفة أقوى. والطف الحواس أبصر لأنه يتبين وهو الذي يشبه 653 النار التي

640. G: فيجب Ox: وربك P.
642. G: [دـ] Ox, P (رضا) G.
643. G: [دـ] Ox, P (رضا) G.
645. G: [دـ] Ox, P (رضا) G.
646. G: [دـ] Ox, P (رضا) G.
647. G: [دـ] Ox, P (رضا) G.
هي ألطاف العناصر فلا جرم، لا تكون اللوحة والأدي في البصر إلا قليلًا. والسمع أقل لطافة من البصر لأن الله الهواء المفروع فلا جرم صارت اللوحة والأدي في هذه الحاسة أكثر منها في البصر. ثم الن سم أقل لطافة من السمع لأن محسوسه بخار وهو أغلظ من الهواء فلا جرم. صارت اللوحة والأدي في البصر أكثر منها في السمع. والذوق أغلظ من الن سم لأن الله الوطية العذبة وهي في درجة المعاء فلا جرم صارت اللوحة والأدي في الذوق أكثر. واللمس أغلظ من جميع الحواس لأنه في قياس الأرض كانت مقامه مع الوارد: أقوى وأبك فلا جرم صارت اللوحة والأدي فيها أقوى. وقال الشيخ في الفصل الثالث من المقالة الثانى من علم النفس الحواس منها ما لا تدة لها في محسوسها ولا أدرك ومنها ما يندد ويدخل في بعوضة المحسوسات.[G 132b] فأما التي لا تدة فيها فتمبل البصر فإن لا يندد بالألوان ولا ينتمي بل النفس تأمل بذلك وينتمي من داخل وكذلك الحال في الأدن فإن

P: G
656. جرم ] P, G: مم جم
657. تكون ] Ox, G: يمزج P
658. اللوحة والأدي ] Ox, G: ألاسنا ألاللات P
659. قليل ] Ox, G: كلالات P
660. المفروع: } ألاسنا ألاللات  ) P, G: Ox
661. جرم ] Ox, G: من جم P
662. جرم ] Ox, G: من جم P
663. آلهة ] Ox, G: محسوسه G
664. جرم ] Ox, G: من جم P
665. جرم ] Ox, G: من جم P
666. فيها ] Ox, G: منججت P
667. الثالث ] Ox, G: ألا P
668. الثلاثة ] Ox, G: ألا P
669. محسوسه ] Ox, G: مكوس P
670. ونكم ] Ox, G: ورم P
تألّمت الأذن 672 أفة 673 فليس 675 ألم من حيث تسمع أو تشعر بل من حيث تلمس لأنه يحدث فيها 676 ألم لمسي وكذلك 677 يحدث فيه بروز ذلك لدة لمسية 678. وأما النسم وهي بالكيفية 682 بركة منيفة أو ملائمة. وأما النسم فإنه قد يلائم بالكيفية 680 الملموسة ولدت بها وقد يلائم ولدت 681 غير توسط كيفية هي المحسوس 682. [P P 91b]

والتيامه 686، 682، 678، 675، 674، 671.

لا يمكنني قراءة النص الأصلي بشكل طبيعي. يرجى تقديم النص الأصلي الذي يمكنني قراءته بشكل طبيعي.
الأصوات كان ذلك إدراكا للعلامة فإن لا يكون ذلك الإدراك لدرجة فيكون قوله البصر لا ينفذه بالألوان والأدن لا ينفذه بالأصوات مستدركًا. إنما أن يكون تطهيره للذات بأنها إدراك الملامح مستدركًا.

البحث السادس

باب الأم واللدنة

فصل في الرذ على من جعل اللدنة أما علمها. إن محمد بن زكريا جعل اللدنة أمرًا علميًا ونعم أنها عبارة عن الخروج عن الحالة الغير الطبيعية وسبب هذا العلم أن اللدنة لا تتم إلا بإدراك والإدراك البشري وخصوصا النفسي. إنما يحصل بالنفع عن الاضداد. فإذا استقامت الكيفية لم يحصل الفعال فلم يحصل الشعور فلا تحصل اللدنة. ولم لا تحصل اللدنة النفسية إلا عند تبدل الحال الغير الطبيعي فإن اللدنة نفسها هي ذلك الفعال [G133a] والذي يدل عليه أن اللدنة أمر وجودي ووجه.

---

690. فيما ] Ox, G: P.
691. الإدراك ] Ox, G: P.
692. مستدركًا ] Ox, G: P.
693. والله أعلم G.
694. إدراك الملامح مستدركًا ] Ox, G: P.
696. فيما ] Ox, G: P.
697. عدمًا ] Ox, G: P.
698. الغير ] Ox, P: (الأصل) G.
699. والإدراك ] Ox, P: (الأصل): om. G.
700. العلامة ] Ox, G: P.
701. المسية (الإنسانية) ] Ox, P: (الأصل) G.
702. الغير ] Ox, P: (الأصل) G.
703. في ] Ox, G: P.
704. في ] Ox, G: P.
705. مهمل ثم يذكر هنا من الأصل بل هو يباد من عدة نسخ أن كل هذه المواضع سقطت من الأصل للشرح.
فصل في حقيقة اللذة والألم. لما ثبت أنهما أؤمناً في ترتيب، فاعلم أن الغالب على كلام الشيخ أن اللذة هي إدراك الملائم والملائم.

هو الكمال الخاص بالشيء فإنه ذكر في القانون أن الوجع هو الإحساس بالشريعة. وذكر في الفصل الأخبار من المقالة التامة من إلزامة الشريعة فإنه ذكر أن اللذة ليست إلا إدراك الملائم من جهة ما هو ملائم. وذكر أيضاً في فصل العارد من المقالة التامة أن القوى المشتركة في شعورها بواقعها وهو الخبر واللذة الخاصة. وذكر في الأدلة الفلبية أن اللذة إدراك الحصول بالقوة الممكنة إلا أنه ذكر في آخر هذا الفصل من هذا الكتاب ما تنافض ذلك فإنه بليغ أن بين السبب لغلظ من جعل اللذة عبارة عن الخروج عن الحالة الغير الطبيعية فقال قد بين أن السبب في عدم الإدراك بما يستقر من الكمالات المحسوس هو عدم الإدراك وسبب اللذة عند [137ب] ابتداء الخروج إلى الحالة الطبيعية هو حصول الإدراك، ولما عرض أن

705. [Ox, G: الأثر التي] P.
706. [Ox, G: مدرس] P.
707. [Ox, G: ه] P.
708. [Ox, P: الهيا] G.
709. [Ox, G: ل P.
710. [Ox, G: بمواقفها] P.
711. [Ox, G: معاملاتها] P.
712. [Ox, P: يحصل: (الذكور)] G.
713. [Ox, G: هذا] P.
714. [Ox, G: هذا] P.
715. [Ox, P: بين] G.
716. [Ox, G: om. P.
717. [Ox, G: الغير] P.
718. [Ox, G: اللابدية] P.
720. [Ox, P: بين] G.
721. [Ox, P: إلى] G.

وإذ قد عرفنا انضباط قول الشهيد في حقيقة النحلة فلمرجع إلى عقولنا وتشنمنا فلعلنا ندرك الحق. فقول الألم والنحلة حالتنا نحدها من النفس وهم غياب عن الجهد. [734]

735. ] Ox, P (٦٣) هو: G.
736. ] Ox: لانه: G وقول: P.
737. ] Ox: قد يكون حاسلاً ... عدم الألم وذلك G: om. P.
738. ] G: البغيرة: P.
739. ] Ox: ونرف العروض اتقليله شيء لا آدره ألمترة كه رك: P: om. G.
740. ] Ox, G: الشهد P.
741. ] G: المثل: P.
743. ] G: في غير (ثم): P.
744. ] G: أسلم: P.
745. ] G: باكون مكلا: P.
746. ] G: om. P.
ينفع عنها الحاس بل كيفية منفعته. قبل له إن الشيخ بين في 747 ... <748 آن الرطوبة محسوبة ولأنا نجد تفرقة بين 750 البار وبين الماء 754 وليس ذلك إلا للإحساس 755 بالرطوبة وأما في اللذة 756.

748. vacat Ox.
749. آن ] Ox, G: om. P.
750. كيف يفعل وتدعاه وتدعاه لفظاً تدعاه P.
752. نجد G: نجد P.
754. والما (אברך ארצה) ] ونجد P.
755. للإحساس ] Ox, G: om. P.
757. محلما لم يذكر في نسخ الأصل ولا في غيره ولعله يسقط in marg. Ox.