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Abstract
The main objective of the current paper is to offer a preliminary study of a hitherto unknown Byzantine translation of al-Majūsi’s Kitāb al-malakī preserved in a single manuscript: MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, supplément grec 638 (fourteenth century). After a brief introduction, the Paris manuscript is presented and described, and its content – a Greek translation of the first part of al-Majūsi’s Kitāb al-malakī – identified. The study then focuses on John Dioikêtês of Constantinople, responsible for the Greek text, showing that it is no less than the translator of the Arabic work as well as the copyist of the manuscript. The last part formulates an hypothesis as to where the manuscript could have been produced, and gives some details on its subsequent story. An Appendix compares Greek text samples of the Paris manuscript with Arabic text samples of the Kitāb al-malakī (based on two editions and a manuscript), showing that the Greek text is a translation of the Arabic.
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1. Introduction

The role of Arabic translations, from Baghdad in particular, in the transmission of antique Greek medical knowledge has long been emphasized. However, the reversed scheme, from Arabic to Greek, is far less studied. Fortunately, it is the object of recent and still on-going research (as the present cluster of articles shows) that falls into the scope of a more general study of translations from Arabic to Greek.¹ This field offers multiple points of interest: because it is less studied, it allows us to bring to light new research perspectives on the history of medieval medicine in the Mediterranean. It also demonstrates the diversity of Arabic-to-Greek translators’ production: the Byzantines, especially in the Palaeologan era (1261–1453) – a paradoxical period of political decline and scientific Renaissance – demonstrated an acute curiosity with regard to Arabic medical knowledge. Among other examples, the case of the Greek version of the *Provisions of the Traveller* (Ἐφόδια τοῦ ἀποδημοῦντος) by Ibn al-Jazzār is interesting: in that period, not only were the majority of preserved manuscripts copied, but a revised version was also made, probably in the milieu of physicians and scholars in the first half of the fourteenth-century in Constantinople.² Finally, through a meticulous analysis of books containing these translations, it is possible to cast new light on how this Arabic knowledge was read and understood by Greek medieval scholars.

As a consequence, it is of major importance to carefully reconstruct this Arabic-to-Greek transmission phenomenon: therefore, scholars must endeavour to


identify new Greek medical texts that are, in fact, translations from the Arabic, in order to obtain a more faithful picture of this production. A return to the manuscripts themselves appears to be the only solution to make real progress. In the medical field, they have been relatively little analysed, even though they contain unexpected treasures that only a thorough inquiry could bring forth: some are complex miscellany volumes, often – understandably – insufficiently described in catalogues; other contain anonymous texts, the origin of which can only be found through an analysis of their sources. It is therefore necessary to combine knowledge of Arabic, knowledge of Greek and Arabic medical literature, and expertise in the field of manuscripts in order to obtain tangible results.

I would like to give, in this paper, an example of these results, demonstrating that there still remain, hidden in manuscripts, noteworthy texts which, in certain cases, enrich remarkably our understanding of transfers of knowledge between Arabic and Greek cultures.

I have recently discovered a Greek manuscript containing a Byzantine translation from the Palaeologan era of books VI–X of the first part of ‘Alī ibn al-Abbās al-Majūsī’s Kāmil ṣinā‘a al-ṭibbiyya (known also as Kitāb al-malakī) (tenth century), one of the most famous medieval Arabic medical encyclopedias. This mutilated unicum is the autograph book of a trilingual scholar from Constantinople, active in the first half of the fourteenth century, whose identity remains for the moment full of mystery. This preliminary work aims to present this discovery and lay the groundwork for a larger study that I am currently preparing.

II. MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, supplément grec 638: A Medical Manuscript of Exceptional Value

II.1. Presentation

MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, supplément grec 638 belongs to the part of the Supplément grec collection that has not yet been described in a modern catalogue, unlike the first and last parts (Supplément grec 1–150 and 901–1371). It has not been digitalized nor microfilmed, which is one of the reasons why it has remained unknown to this day. According to Hermann Diels’s catalogue of medical Greek manuscripts, this manuscript, thought to be from the fifteenth century, is the only one to bear the work of a little known (to say the least) author, here given in its Latin form: Ioannes Diœcetas Constantinopolitanus. Only books VI–X of his work,
cautiously named in Diels, between square brackets, [Τέχνη ἰατρικῆ?], are present in the book; in the catalogue’s supplement can be read a title, τῆς τελείας τῆς ἰατρικῆς βιβλία, found by Diels’s collaborator Max Treu (1842–1915). Neither Alain Touwaide’s Census nor his new edition of Diels’s catalogue offer complementary information on the work.

This Ioannes (PLP 8442) is otherwise unknown. The few references made in further prosopographical repertoires come from Diels’s catalogue which draws partly on Henri Omont’s Inventaire, whose description is very brief:

638. Joannis Diœcetae Constantinop. de medicina libri VI.–X., cum notis arabicis. XV s. Parch. et pap. 154 fol. P.

One learns however – and this is of particular interest – that the book is accompanied by « Arabic notes » (cum notis arabicis), that it is made both of paper and parchment (Parch. et pap.), and finally that it is of reasonable thickness (154 folios) and small dimensions (P). In the absence of a new catalogue of the Supplément grec collection, this description is the most recent at our disposal.

II.2. MSS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, supplément grec 1121 and 1122’s descriptions

The Bibliothèque nationale holds, however, a hand-written catalogue by librarians and scholars Emmanuel Miller (1812–1886) and Carle Wescher (1832–1904), in two
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volumes: MSS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, supplément grec 1121 and 1122. MS suppl. gr. 1121 contains the description of suppl. gr. 1–655 and MS suppl. gr. 1122, datable by an « Avis au lecteur » of 1869 (fol. 1v), that of suppl. gr. 607, 609–913: our manuscript is therefore described twice. Here is a transcription of the description in MS suppl. gr. 1121, in Latin (fol. 246r):

DCXXXVIII
Codex partim membranaceus, partim chartaceus, in octavo, a Mina | Minoïde ex Oriente allatus, quo continentur:
Joannis Constantinopolitani, cognomine Διοικητοῦ, libri de Medicina | VI, VII, VIII, IX, X. Initium libri sexti ac finis decimi desiderantur.
Constat hic codex fasciculis undecim numeratis, a numero κηʹ ad | numerum ληʹ. Sunt folia 154 vel paginæ 308. Accedunt marginibus notulae aliquot arabice scriptae. Scriptura codicis videtur ad saeculum decimum quartum referenda.

MS suppl. gr. 1122’s description, written in the same hand, gives more or less the same information, this time in French (fol. 27r):

Suppl. gr. n° 638 M. 496
Manuscrit sur vélin et sur papier.
Petit format.
Écriture du XIVe siècle.
Ce ms. renferme une partie de l’ouvrage de Jean Διοικητῆς de Constantinople sur la Médecine.
Il contient:
le livre VI (moins le début)
le livre VII
le livre VIII
le livre IX
le livre X (la fin manque)
Il se compose de onze cahiers numérotés depuis κηʹ jusqu’à ληʹ, | formant 154 feuillets ou 308 pages.
Il porte en marge un grand nombre de mots arabes.

Below are written in the same hand, with a pencil, the words: « non relié » and, below again, « D ».

These two descriptions teach us more about the book: MS Paris suppl. gr. 638 constitutes one part of an originally complete manuscript, since it contains only quires 28–38. Books VI and X are incomplete, mutilated at the beginning (book VI) and the end (book X). Moreover, the indication of the number of quires and the total number of folios allows us to determine the type of quires we are dealing with: supposing that the quires belong to the same type (and they do, as we shall
see), if eleven quires correspond to 154 folios, then each quire is composed of 14 folios: these are septenions. Secondly, one can presume that the original volume was very thick: if quires lost in the beginning were also septenions, then they should have contained 378 folios. Therefore the volume, without taking into account lost quires at the end (the number of which is unknown), should have comprised at least 532 folios. Finally, these descriptions interestingly propose a different dating than Omont’s: the fourteenth century, and not the fifteenth (dating accepted by Omont and, after him, Diels). This is not surprising: dating discrepancies are frequently observed, especially between the fourteenth and the fifteenth century, and it is not uncommon that a manuscript thought to be from the fifteenth century should be in fact correctly dated to the fourteenth. I will show below that this is the case here.

II.3. Minas Minoidis’s description

A fourth and last description of MS Paris suppl. gr. 638 can be read on the recent guard-leaves of the manuscript itself. Written in violet ink, it is in Greek and French, and is by the hand of Minas Minoidis,11 who was mentioned in MS suppl. gr. 1121’s description (a Mina Minoïde ex Oriente allatus). Here is a transcription:

The author’s identity is no clearer, but the number of chapters in each book is given: 36 in book VI (the manuscript starts at chapter 13), 18 in book VII, 22 in book VIII, 41 in book IX, 1312 in book X. Before going into the details of the content, let us begin with a brief codicological description of the manuscript.

11 The name is spelled in French « Minoïde Mynas », but I follow here the spelling adopted in an English-written contribution by a specialist, Zisis Melissakis (ZISIS MELISSAKIS, ‘‘Monsieur le Ministre, je fais un catalogue de la bibliothèque de chaque couvent’: Minas Minoidis and the First Effort to Produce Systematic Catalogues of the Libraries of Mount Athos », in ANDRÉ BINGGELI, MATTHIEU CASSIN, MARINA DETORAKI [eds.], Bibliothèques grecques dans l’Empire ottoman, Brepols, Turnhout 2020 [Bibliologia, 54], p. 399–410). On this character (with bibliography), see below.
12 There are actually 12 chapters in book X.
II.4. Codicological analysis

MS Paris suppl. gr. 638 is today bound in a Gardien 1873 red binding with, on the back, the words *Tractatus | De | medicina*. The mention « non relié » in MS suppl. gr. 1122’s description is therefore older than 1873. The book is of small dimensions (220 × 150 mm, written surface 180 × 115 mm) and is formed of a unique codicological unit.

The volume is indeed composed of parchment and paper: each of the 11 quires is constituted by a bifolium of parchment enveloping six bifolia of paper. This process, used in order to protect the quires, is not at all common, as we shall see. The quires are septenions, a quire-type very rare in Greek manuscripts.\(^{13}\) They are all complete, a fact which indicates that the parchment at the beginning and the end has well fulfilled its assigned role. They were not originally numbered; only numbered by a later hand on the recto of the first folio and the verso of the last folio of each quire, in the middle of the lower margin (thus on parchment). A second quire numbering is visible, from another hand, starting with βʹ and ending with υβʹ, partially erased, next to the first numbering.

The parchment is very thin and of bad quality; the paper is quite thick and stiff. It shows thin wire-lines, running at a right angle to the writing line (in-quarto folding). Two watermarks are visible: *Aigle*, very similar to Mošin-Traljić 34 (*a.* 1323) and *Lettre A* of a very peculiar type, very similar to Mošin-Traljić 5094 (*a.* 1325 [1315–1320]).\(^{14}\) The watermarks lead us to a dating in the first half of the fourteenth century, corresponding to Miller and Wescher’s dating.

The manuscript was copied by a single scribe whose small, scholarly, fast and sharp writing is very well mastered and presents some likeness to that of Maximos Planoudès (c. 1255–c.1305, RGK I 259bis; II 357).\(^{15}\) The *mise-en-page* is quite dense (30 lines per page) but the margins leave some space for potential notes. There is no line break, except for new chapter beginnings or some important divisions within chapters; in most cases, the structuring of ideas within chapters is made by little blanks in the writing line by the scribe, corresponding to major articulations of the argumentation.

\(^{13}\) Jean Irigoin underlines the rareness of this type of quire, and says that he encountered it only in mixed quires (parchment and paper) (Jean Irigoin, « Typologie et description codicologique des manuscrits de papier », in Dieter Harlfinger, Giancarlo Prato [eds.], *Paleografia e codicologia greca. Atti del II Colloquio internazionale [Berlino-Wolfenbüttel, 17–21 ottobre 1983]*, 2 vol., Edizioni dell’Orso, Alessandria 1991 [Biblioteca di Scrittura e Civiltà, 3], vol. 1, p. 275–303, here p. 283).


Fig. 1: MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, supplément grec 638, fol. 18r (Copyright BnF)
III. A Greek Translation of Al-Majūsī’s Kāmil šīnā ′a al-ṭibbiyya (as Known as ‘Kitāb al-malakī’) (10th cent.)

The work in the manuscript is not at all easy to identify since the manuscript, mutilated in the beginning, does not have a title. Moreover, it does not seem to be preserved in any known Greek manuscript. It is a perfectly organized medical treatise and, obviously, of a very high level. The content is mostly theoretical: it is not a practical medical handbook describing drugs and their posology, but more of an encyclopedia allowing one to identify illnesses and their causes. Each book is preceded by its title and an index of chapters. Book VII teaches the reader how to recognize the general signs of illnesses (περὶ τῆς διαγνώσεως τῶν καθόλου σημείων τῶν νόσων), book VIII describes illnesses that manifest through sensation (περὶ τῶν σημείων τῶν ἐπιφαινομένων τῇ αἰσθήσει νόσων καὶ τῶν αἰτιῶν αὐτῶν), book IX the signs of affections which affect internal organs (περὶ τῶν σημειώσεων τῶν παθῶν τῶν ἐνδον μελῶν), book X does not have a title but focuses on prognosis and crises.

Thanks to the title, the reader learns that books VII to IX belong to the first part (μέρος [books VII–VIII] / τμῆμα [book IX]) of the treatise, book VII’s title specifying that it is the « theory » (λόγος ἑβδομος τοῦ πρώτου μέρους ἢτοι τῆς θεωρητικῆς). Thus the treatise is very firmly divided into parts (μέρος / τμῆμα), probably two (theory and practice), books (λόγος) and chapters (κεφάλαιον). Its overall title is then given (in the genitive): the « perfect book of medical art » (τοῦ τελείου βιβλίου τῆς ἱατρικῆς τέχνης), a very uncommon title (not to say unknown) amongst Greek physicians.

This title is in fact the precise translation of Kitāb kāmil šīnā ′a al-ṭibbiyya, (« Perfect book of medical art »), an encyclopedia best known as Kitāb al-malakī (« Royal book ») by ′Alī b. al-ʿAbbās al-Majūsī (tenth century). The Kitāb al-malakī has the same structure as the Greek text in the manuscript: two parts (theory and practice), each one containing ten books which offer a variable number of chapters. The number of chapters for books VII–X is the same as in the Greek text in the manuscript, with the same topic. The comparison I made between the Greek and the Arabic text on several text samples confirms that the Greek is a translation from the Arabic (see Appendix).

Kitāb al-malakī is undoubtedly one of the jewels of Arabic medical literature. Written by the Persian physician ′Alī b. al-ʿAbbās al-Majūsī (tenth century), it constitutes the clearest summary of Galenism as it was received by the Arabs.16

The treatise has been very popular: 128 Arabic copies are preserved to this day, according to the most recent list made by Gérard Troupeau. The vast majority of copies do not comprise the complete treatise, but often either only the first or the second part in its entirety, or sections of one or the other part.

The Kitāb al-malakī furthermore circulated in numerous translations, including Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic. However, its fortune in the West is due to the translation into Latin made by the famous Constantine the African (eleventh century), under the title Pantegni, which is considered as the first encyclopedic medical text in Latin. While the first part (Theorica Pantegni) corresponds more or less to the theoretical part of the Kitāb al-malakī, the second (Pratica Pantegni) is in fact a patchwork of translations of other Arabic medical texts, some pre-Salernitan, embedded in occasional chapters of the original work. Stephen of Pisa / Antioch (twelfth century) is responsible for a later Latin translation of the Kitāb al-malakī, with a less widespread circulation, under the title Regalis dispositio. This translation is faithful to the Arabic original.

The Greek translation contained in MS Paris suppl. gr. 638 completes this rich textual transmission and helps us to better understand the role of Greek versions in the transmission of Greek medical knowledge in the Middle Ages. This translation is a supplementary piece of evidence that the Palaeologan era plays a prominent role in the study and transmission of scientific texts, Arabic ones in particular.


18  For an overview of these translations, see RON BARKAI, « The Judeo-Arabic and Hebrew Versions of the Kitāb Kāmil al-ṣināʿa », in BURNETT, JACQUART, Constantine the African, p. 57–70.

19  For an overview of the Pantegni, see JACQUART, MICHEAU, La médecine arabe, p. 103–106; the major study on it remains the volume edited by Charles Burnett and Danielle Jacquart (BURNETT, JACQUART, Constantine the African).

IV. The Mysterious John of Constantinople, dioikêtês and Trilingual Translator of the Book

Who is the translator? It is the same Ioannes Dioctas Constantinopolitanus we encountered as author of the book in Diels’s catalogue. He gives his name in the titles of books VII, VIII and IX, here according to that of book VII (fol. 23r), the most developed:

Λόγος ἔβδομος τοῦ πρώτου μέρους ἣτο τῆς θεωρητικῆς τοῦ τελείου βιβλίου τῆς ἰατρικῆς | τέχνης τοῦ εὐγνωμονοῦ διοικητοῦ. Ἐκδοσὶς Ιωάννου Διοικητοῦ Κωνσταντινουπολίτου τριγλώσσου υἱοῦ Διοικητοῦ Μιχαήλ. Περὶ τῆς διαγνώσεως τῶν καθόλου σημείων τῶν νόσων καὶ εἰσὶ κεφαλαία δεκακότερα.

Book VII of the first part i.e. theory of the perfect book of the medical art by he who is known as διοικητής. Edition / treatise by John, διοικητής, from Constantinople, trilingual, son of Michael διοικητής. On the recognition of general signs of illnesses, and there are 18 chapters.

Something strikes us immediately: John Διοικητής does not present himself as translator, but rather as author of the treatise. Yet the comparison of the chapters unquestionably shows that the Greek text is a translation of the Arabic, without modification. The word ἐκδοσὶς is employed: it means an « edition », but also a « publication », a « treatise », an « account », e.g., it is the meaning it has in the title of an adaptation from around 1435 by Michael Chrysokokkês of Immanuel Bonfils of Tarascon’s (fourteenth century) Hexapterygon (treatise of Jewish astronomy). Interestingly, this is also a treatise translated (or at least adapted) from another language: Μιχαὴλ νοταρίου τῆς μεγαλῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χρυσοκόκκη, ἐκδοσὶς γεγονυῖα εἰς τὸ ἱουδαϊκὸν ἑξαπτέρυγον κατὰ τὸ ᾲμιν ἐπὶ τῆς ἑρήμης τοῦ παντός.21 In the title of book IX, σύνταξις (composition) is used, whereas in the titles of books VIII and X, only the genitive is given. Perhaps one should not pay too much attention to the words chosen here: these variations can also be attributed to variants in the Arabic exemplar. For instance, in MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, arabe 2871 (a. 1261, containing only the treatise’s first part), taʿlīf (root ɬLF, « form », « unite », « join ») is mostly used, but, for book I, one reads taṣnīf (root ɬNF, « arrange, organize », possibly what the translator was reading for book IX) : these are all taf’il forms of verbs, and thus can easily vary by scribal choice with only slightly different meanings.

John names himself διοικητής. It corresponds to a specific office in Byzantium. Originally, it was borne only by a fiscal official, but was replaced in 1109 by that of

praktor (πρακτόρ). It is still mentioned in the lists of pseudo-Kodinos’s De Officiis (fourteenth century), the main source for the knowledge of hierarchy and ceremonial rules in the middle of the fourteenth century, still under the form μέγας διοικητής. However this office « doesn’t have any function » and appears to be honorific. A survey in the Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit shows that the only John who bears this title is John Doukas Balsamon (PLP 91427), megas dioikêtês of Thessalonica in 1355, known from a unique act of the monastery of Docheiariou. He is known neither as translator from the Arabic nor as engaging in any scientific or medical activity whatsoever. John διοικητῆς’s father, Michael (Μιχαήλ), himself διοικητῆς, is not known from other sources.

However there is some evidence that διοικητῆς could also have become a family name, as is the case with other offices, e.g. Oikonomos or Grammatikos, offices which became widespread family names in Byzantium. In fact, it is possible to identify another probable member of this Dioikêtês family, Manouël (Μανουήλ). This Manouël is mentioned in two Athos acts dated 1342: one praktikon (January 1342) and one chrysobull (November 1342, issued by John V Palaiologos). Both acts grant a series of possessions, the praktikon to John Margaritês (value: 55 hyperpyra) and the chrysobull to George Margaritês (value: 50 hyperpyra). The Margaritês were supporters of John V Palaiologos in the civil war between John V Palaiologos (and his mother, Anna, the patriarch John Kalekas and John Apokaupos) and John Cantacuzênos, who proclaimed himself co-emperor. It is therefore no wonder that these possessions were taken away from supporters of John Cantacuzênos, amongst whom was Manouël the Dioikêtês, oikeios of John Cantacuzênos. The praktikon speaks of a land that belonged to « Sir Manuel the dioikêtês » (κυροῦ Μανουήλ τοῦ διοικητοῦ), whereas in the chrysobull by John V, the land belonged to the « unfaithful Manuel the dioikêtês » (τοῦ ἀπίστου Μανουήλ. 26  Edition in Paul Lemerle, « Un praktikon inédit des archives de Karakala (janvier 1342) et la situation de la Macédoine orientale au moment de l’usurpation de Cantacuzène », Χαρακτηρισμοί εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδου, vol. 1, Η ἐν Αθήναις Ἀρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, Athens 1965, p. 278–298 (repr. in Paul Lemerle, Le monde de Byzance: histoire et institutions, Routledge, London 1978 [Collected Studies Series, 86], n° XVIII).


25  For all this prosopographical excursus, I am very much indebted to Raúl Estangüi Gómez (University Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne), whom I thank very warmly, for telling me about these documents.

The editors of the acts (along with the PLP: PLP 16684) thought that Manouêl had the office of dioikêtês, but since this office didn’t exist anymore at this period (megas dioikêtês was used, and it was honorific) and that no other patronym is given in the acts, one can reasonably presume that dioikêtês is in fact his family name. Manouêl was indeed a supporter of John Cantacuzênos and was appointed with the charge of governor (κεφαλή) of Thessalia in 1359. Given the rarity of this patronym, it is probable that this Manouêl belongs to the same family as John or his father Michael. Complementary prosopographical research could allow us to know more about these historical characters.

V. MS Paris Suppl. Gr. 638, John Diaikêtês’s Autograph Manuscript

There is more: MS Paris suppl. gr. 638 is the translator’s autograph manuscript, as confirmed by several pieces of evidence.

First of all, the numerous marginal notes. The book is indeed completed, as has been seen in the descriptions, by « Arabic notes ». A close examination shows that these are notes in Arabic, and not notes in languages written in the Arabic alphabet (Turkish or Persian). They are in their vast majority isolated nouns or group of nouns, for instance, fol. 55v: ﺟﺪري (judarī/jadarī, smallpox), ﺟﺬام (judhām, leprosy). Whole sentences are rarely found (e.g. fol. 92v). Arabic notes in medical Greek manuscripts at this period are fairly rare. But most importantly, two facts make them key elements of the puzzle: first, they are written in the main scribe’s hand, who was without doubt, as we shall see, a native Greek speaker from Constantinople, and perfectly coeval to the writing of the manuscript; secondly, these notes correspond to blanks in the Greek text, showing that the work is in progress: the copyist, who is also the translator, has the Arabic text in front of him and translates. From time to time, he struggles with a word that he cannot read, translate, or translate as he wishes. Consequently he leaves a blank in the Greek text, and writes the Arabic word in the opposite margin, perhaps in anticipation of a future revision of the work.

29 KRAVARI, « Nouveaux documents… », p. 297, lines 11–12 in the edition. The name Μανουηλ, originally at the end of the line, has disappeared because of a mutilation, but its restitution is made by Kravari thanks to the praktikon edited by Lemerle.


31 Marie Cronier knows about around ten Dioscorides manuscripts with Arabic notes, from all periods, but the case of Dioscorides is in itself rather specific due to its vast and multilingual transmission.
Fig. 2: MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, supplément grec 638, f. 55v (Copyright BnF)
Another important element escaped those who made the descriptions of the manuscript: the presence, on four folios in the book, of Latin medical notes, written in a proficient writing which proves again to be the scribe’s writing. Therefore he knew and could write three languages: Greek, Arabic and Latin, which is quite exceptional in medical literature and Greek medical manuscripts. It should also be linked to the adjective τριγλώσσου used by John Dioikêtêς to describe himself in the title of book VII: it seems obvious that it also qualifies the copyist of the manuscript, therefore they are one and the same person and the manuscript is an autograph.

The last argument is codicological: the manuscript is obviously of personal use. There is no decoration and the mise-en-page is very dense, with numerous marginal notes in Arabic, Greek and Latin. The Arabic words, in particular, transcribed such as they were read by the translator (diacritical signs are not systematically noted) are here only for the translator himself, and would not have been of any use for the random reader. The quire type, very rare, along with the use of a bad quality parchment to protect the quires, leads me to consider the manuscript as a workbook, made by and for its author.

At which stage of the work are we? It is clearly not the draft of the translation’s first version, but a clean copy of the draft. For instance, the chapter initials, both in the indexes and in the text, have been omitted by the copyist, in anticipation of a future rubrication, probably in vermilion ink. The numerous Arabic words in the margins testify to the persistent difficulties of the translator, despite his high level of proficiency in Arabic.

It is not possible at the moment to determine the possible Arabic exemplar(s) that were used by our translator. My punctual collations of a couple of digitalized manuscripts did not allow me to find an answer. To do so, a survey of the Arabic manuscript tradition, lacking today, would be necessary. The most recent (2018) edition by Khâlid Ḥarbî is based on three manuscripts, but the reasons for choosing these three in particular as well as the edition principles are not explained.

---

32 I would like to express my gratitude to Jérémie Delmulle, Dominique Poirel (Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes, Paris), and Iolanda Ventura (Alma Mater University of Bologna), for their help in the deciphering of the notes and comments on the writing.

33 A preliminary work based on manuscripts preserved in Paris has been made by Gérard Troupeau, « Les manuscrits du Kāmil ṣīnā’a à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris », in Burnett, Jacques, Constantine the African, p. 48–56. He chose three manuscripts of different origins (one Syrian, one Iraqi and one Spanish) and compared the lists of chapters for the first five books of the first part of the treatise, as well as the chapters’ first lines. His conclusion is that the text is completely identical in the three manuscripts.

VI. Origin and Subsequent Story of the Manuscript

We know that the translator and copyist was from Constantinople. This does not imply that he was necessarily active there, nor that the manuscript was produced there. Its codicological structure (mixed septenions, parchment and paper) is most rare. A quantitative investigation of mixed quires in manuscripts in several languages (Arabic, Greek, Latin, Hebrew) was made about thirty years ago by a group of scholars who specialized in the codicology of western and eastern manuscripts: its first results conclude that it is not possible, in the case of Greek manuscripts, to link this codicological habit to a specific region, even though it seems primarily Western (it is found in Arabic manuscripts of Spanish origin, and it was well developed in Hebrew and Latin manuscripts). This corroborates Jean Irigoín’s conclusions, according to which mixed quires were used only in Southern Italy and Sicily, as well as in Venice-ruled regions (Ionian Islands, Morea, Crete).

In any case, the very rare quire-type (septenions), combined with this mixed composition, seems to exclude Constantinople as the place of production. Had this been the case, one could barely understand why the copyist-translator specifies that he is from Constantinople. Moreover, one can spot catchwords at the end of the quires, in the right lower corner of the verso: it is clearly a Western codicological habit, and is to be found almost exclusively in Renaissance Greek manuscripts, under the influence, precisely, of Western habits. Before the Renaissance, it is very scarcely used in Greek manuscripts: one can think of manuscripts copied by the scribe Ioannikios (RGK II 283; III 341) and his collaborators, as well as that of Maximos Planoudès.

35 The adjective Ἐκωνσταντινουπολίτης in my opinion means that he indeed comes from Constantinople. The Greek community used to clearly mention their place of origin, through adjectives (Ἀρμόνιος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος [see MARIA PAPANICOLAOU, « Ἀρμόνιος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος. Bibliofilo e copista, maestro di greco e diplomatico », Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata, 52 [1998], p. 283–301], Κύριλλος Ναυπάκτιος [RGK I 222; II 310]) or expressions such as ἐκ Ἐκωνσταντινουπολίτους (copyist George Basilikos, see MORGANE CARIOU, « La production manuscrite de Georges Basilikos », in MARIE CRONIER, BRIGITTE MONDRAIN [eds.], Le livre manuscrit grec: écritures, matériaux, histoire. Actes du IXe Colloque international de Paléographie grecque, Paris, 10-15 septembre 2018, Association des amis du centre d’histoire et de civilisation de Byzance, Paris 2021 [Travaux et mémoires 24/1], p. 483–519), especially when in exile after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople and Greece.


Thus, I am inclined to locate the creation of this manuscript in a contact zone (probably peripheral) between communities (Greek, Arabic and Latin) in the Mediterranean basin, predominantly Latin: could it be Crete? The Morea? If Minas Minoidis had found the manuscript in continental Greece – and there is some evidence for that, as we shall see – one might consider this last region, but we do not know if Arabic manuscripts were in circulation there. Cyprus (and to a certain extent Rhodes) is also a possibility, given the connections between Arabic, Latin and Greek communities on the island, as well as the flourishing medical school of nearby Damascus in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.39

What do we know of the subsequent story of the manuscript? A cautious examination of the book shows that it has Greek notes from at least two other later hands, which is an element of interest. Moreover, the manuscript has, on fol. 22v and 23r, two marks of ownership of a certain John Palaiologos (Ἰωάννης ὁ Παλαιόλογος), perhaps from the fifteenth century according to the writing, entirely different from that of the main copyist, despite their identical names.40 Such a family name arouses in many respects curiosity, though I have not yet been able to identify it with a historical figure: there are many Ἰωάννης ὁ Παλαιόλογος and it would demand very cautious work on prosopography, combined with an analysis of the writing, to obtain firm results.

The next chronological milestone is Minas Minoidis (1788 or 1798–1859), a flamboyant character, Greek professor, adventurer and scholar who carried out, on behalf of the French Government, three missions in the Near East from 1840 to 1855 to acquire manuscripts.41 The archives and correspondence of Minas should

39 On this question, see the recent contribution by Marie Cronier on a Greek medical manuscript of the Austrian National Library of Vienna (Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, med. gr. 21, fourteenth century), probably produced in Cyprus or, but less probably, Rhodes: MARIE CRONIER, « Le copiste du Vindob. med. gr. 21 (XIVe s.), un traducteur de l’arabe au grec », in MARIE CRONIER, BRIGITTE MONDRAIN (eds.), Le livre manuscrit grec: écritures, matériaux, histoire. Actes du IXe Colloque international de Paléographie grecque, Paris, 10–15 septembre 2018, Association des amis du centre d’histoire et de civilisation de Byzance, Paris 2021 (Travaux et mémoires 24/1), p. 279–304. However, the Vienna manuscript and our Paris manuscript are quite different from a codicological point of view.

40 Note on fol. 22v: τὸ παρὸν χαρτίον ἐναι ἐμοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Παλαιόλογου –; note on fol. 23r, same hand: ἴστροςοφιν καλὸ ἐμοῦ.

be thoroughly examined in the hope to find a clue as to where he could have found the manuscript; research into the material published by Omont does not allow one to advance further; one learns only that the manuscript appears in an inventory, drawn up by Minas, of books he had temporarily left at « MM. Abbott frères à Salonique » on 15 August 1842. An investigation into the origin of the other manuscripts in this inventory could help to determine one or several possible places. It is well known that Minas spent a lot of time in the Mount Athos monasteries, whence he took a great number of manuscripts, including medical ones (in particular from the rich monastery of Lavra), but there is no evidence that our manuscript comes from there.

The rest of the Romanesque story of manuscripts acquired by Minas is well known: Minas sent two shipments to France, the first one of eleven manuscripts on 18 November 1842, the other of forty-five manuscripts on 5 August 1844. Most of his findings remained at his residence in Paris, for reasons that have not yet been clarified. It was only after his death, especially during the inheritance process on 5 May 1860, that the manuscripts he had kept were classified in an inventory by an official receiver. They should have been sold by 14 May but the day before, the ministry of public instruction seized the eighty volumes that had been described in the inventory; they were deposited in the Bibliothèque Mazarine on 16 May before joining, almost four years later, on 12 February 1864, the collections of the Bibliothèque nationale de France. Despite all that, around thirty manuscripts still remained untraceable, kept in the house of the son of one of Minas’s creditors. They were found in 1898 and were once and for all put in the Bibliothèque nationale. Our manuscript belongs to the selection which was at Minas’s residence, then seized by the ministry: it was already in the collections of the Bibliothèque nationale in 1869, in the catalogue made by Emmanuel Miller and Carle Wescher. Most importantly, it is found in the abridged copy by Charles Darenberg (1817–1872, historian of medicine and then librarian at the Bibliothèque Mazarine) of a now lost catalogue by Minas himself, that roughly

---

42 Omont, « Minoïde Mynas », p. 399 (Appendix III, 1). Our manuscript bears the number XXXIV, and is described as from the tenth century. The same number is found on fol. 1r of the manuscript, in the upper margin.


44 These manuscripts are described by Minas in the official report addressed to the ministry of public instruction; our manuscript is not there, it consequently belongs neither to the first nor the second shipping.
corresponds to the manuscripts written in the official inventory that should have been sold.45

VII. Conclusion

MS Paris suppl. gr. 638 is a testimony of exceptional value of a translation undertaken somewhere in a peripheral region of the Mediterranean in the first half of the fourteenth century by a trilingual scholar from Constantinople. It is a new example of Arabic medical material translated into Greek, and the material in question is nothing less than one of the most famous and remarkable Arabic medieval encyclopedias. Many questions remain unresolved. Did John Dioikêtês translate the totality of this enormous work? Or only the first, theoretical part, which offered him clear, innovative data from which he could benefit the most? Is there any relation between this Greek translation and the two Latin translations (one by Constantine the African, the other by Stephen of Pisa)?

In any case, the investigation hereby proposed is merely a beginning; the translation methodology will be scrutinized, and compared to other translations from the Arabic; the Latin notes and their content will also be cautiously analyzed, as well as the other Greek marginal notes. Finally, a diplomatic edition of the Greek translation will be offered, in the hope that it will stimulate the studies of scholars in the field of Arabic medicine, on al-Majūsī and the manuscript tradition of the work, which are sorely lacking in current research.

45 See Omont, « Minoïde Mynas », p. 399 (Appendix V), p. 411–417. This copy by Daremberg is today the MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, suppl. gr. 728, digitalized on Gallica: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8585608f/f1>. Our manuscript, which bears the number 26, is described on fol. 32r. The description is quite interesting, since it delivers pieces of information lacking in the other notices (or different from them): the manuscript is thought to be from the eleventh century; the title of book VII is given in its entirety; John Palaiologos’s possession mark of fol. 22v is quoted (albeit erroneously τόδε βιβλίον ἐνα Ιωάννου τοῦ Παλαιολόγου).
Appendix

Text samples of each of the preserved books, in Greek and Arabic

The Arabic text of the Kitāb al-malakī comes from the recent edition by Khālid Ḥarbī (= Ḥarbī), published in Alexandria in 2018; it is the most recent text at our disposal. I collated this edition with that of Būlāq (= Būlāq) [1887], with which there are only a few discrepancies. Finally, I collated both editions with MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ar. 2871 (a. 1261 = MS 2871), which Gérard Troupeau at the time considered to be a very good manuscript, on the basis of the text samples he worked on. In some cases, the Greek text is closer to the manuscript than the Arabic editions; in these instances, the manuscript’s variant in footnote is in bold. For the Greek text, the spelling of the manuscript has been retained (especially the accents on the verb εἶναι), but I have added subscribed iotas where necessary; for the Arabic, I have respected the spelling of the edition.

Book VI, chapter 36 (end)

* Greek: Paris suppl. gr. 638, fol. 22v

Καὶ ἡμεῖς τεμοῦμεν τὸν λόγον ἡμῶν τὸν περὶ τούτου κατὰ τὸν παρόντα τόπον, καὶ ληψόμεθα ἐν τοῖς ἑπομένοις καὶ ἐστὶν ἀνάμνησις τῶν σημείων καὶ τῶν δηλώσεων τῶν σημαινόντων τά πάθη καὶ τὰς νόσους, τοῦ γίνεσθαι τὸν λόγον ἡμῶν περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως ἐξερχομένων τέλειων καὶ ἀληθεύετον. Καὶ δοξαζέσθω θεὸς μήτηρ τε αὐτοῦ ἡ πανεύδοξα θεότοκος τι μάσθω καὶ ὑμνήσθω διὰ παντός.


47 AL-MAJOSI, Kāmil šinā’ a al-tibbiyya, 2 vol., Būlāq 1877.
48 The manuscript is available on Gallica: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b11002062z/>., accessed August 2021. The foliation, modern and Western, has been given as it would have been for a Western manuscript which is read from left to right. As a consequence, the folio numbers are systematically placed in the upper margin or the right-hand folio, when the reader has the volume open before him, whereas they should be on the left folio. Thus, below, fol. 20v = folium on which one finds the number 20.
49 GÉRARD TROUPEAU, « Les manuscrits du Kāmil šinā’ a la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris », in BURNETT, JACQUART, Constantine the African, p. 48-56, here p. 55 : « En cas d’une édition critique du Kāmil as-sinā’ a, je crois qu’il faudrait prendre en considération certains manuscrits anciens de la collection parisienne, en particulier le très bon manuscrit de la première partie, le MS 2871 ». 
A Hitherto Unknown Greek Translation of Al-Majūṣī’s Kāmil šinā’ a al-ṭibbiyya

وَنَنْفَعُ كَلاَمَانَا فِي هَذِهِ الْمَوْضُوعِ وَنَأْخُذُ فِيهِمَا بِتَلُوعُهُ وَهُوَ ذَكْرُ الدَّلَائِلِ والْعَلَامَاتِ الَّتِي تَنَادُى ە عَلَى سَائِرِ الْعُلَمِ وَالأَمْرَاتِ لِيَكُونَ كَلاَمَانَا فِي الأُمُورِ الْخَارِجَةِ عَنَّ الْأَمْرِ الطَّبِيعِيِّ تَأَا وَاضِحًا وَالْغَسْوِ ە عَلَى مَعْنَى عَلَى تَمَامِ مَا نَفَتِّدُ إِلَيْهِ إِنَّهُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ قَدِيرٌ وَهُوَ حَسَبِي وَنَعْمَ الوَكِيلُ. ۖ

Book VII (beginning)

• Greek: Paris suppl. gr. 638, fol. 23v

[Δ]εδηλώκαμεν τὴν ἐφ’ ἑκάστην τῶν συμπτωμάτων καὶ τῶν αἰτιῶν διάθεσιν τῶν συμπτωμάτων αἰτίων. Καὶ ἡμεῖς δηλόσωμεν ἐν τῶδε τῷ τόπῳ ἑκάστην τῶν νόσων καὶ τῶν συμπτωμάτων τῶν ἑπομένων αὐτάς, καὶ εἰσὶν τὰ σημεῖα καθ’ ἃ δηλοῦται τὰ καθ’ αὐτά καὶ ὀνομάζεται ἐκεῖνο ἐπίστημη τῶν σημείων.


قد بَيْنَتِ النَّحَنَ وَنَبْيِنَ فِي هَذِهِ الْمَوْضُوعِ وَنَأْخُذُ فِيهِ مَا نَقْصُدُ إِلَيْهِ إِنَّهُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ قَدِيرٌ وَهُوَ حَسَبِي وَنَعْمَ الوَكِيلُ.

Book VII, chapter 13

• Greek: Paris suppl. gr. 638, fol. 48r.

[Κ]εφάλαιον εγ’. περὶ τῆς ποιότητος τῶν τοῦ οὐροῦ σημείων καὶ διαιρέσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῆς τάξεως τοῦ οὐροῦ καὶ τοῦ σημαινομένου καθ’ αὐτό.

[Ὁ]τι τὰ σημεία τὰ λαμβανόμενα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐροῦ γίνεται ἀπὸ τῆς ὑδατότητος τῆς διακεχυμένης τῷ κλοκείῳ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ διακεκριμένου καὶ ὑφιζόντος ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἡ δὲ ὑδατότης διχῶς· εἰς χρῶμα καὶ εἰς σύστασιν. Καὶ κατὰ μὲν τὸ χρῶμα διασημαίνεται ὡς τῶν χυμῶν διάθεσις καὶ ὡς τῆς σφάζως καὶ ἡ ἀπώσια τῆς σφάζως. Τὸ δὲ χρῶμα διαιρεῖται ἐπταχῶς: λευκόν, χρυσόν, πυρὸν καὶ ἔστι χρώμα πυρός, ἐρυθρὸν διαυγὲς καὶ ἔστι χρώμα τριχῶν κρόκου, ἐρυθρὸν ζοφῶδες καὶ ἔστι χρώμα αἵματος, μέλαν.

50 ذلك من add. MS 2871
51 يدل MS 2871
52 على om. MS 2871
53 وهو حسي ونعم الوكيل om. MS 2871
54 للأمراض والعلاج MS 2871
55 تسمي MS 2871
56 ثلاث MS 2871
57 ἐν s.l.
58 λεπτὸν a.c.

الباب الثالث عشر في كيفية الاستدلال من اللون، وأما أثناء التقييم في صفه أوانه. وما يدل عليه
إن الاستدلال الأخذ من اللون يكون من المانية المسكينة في الفارغة ومن الشيء الذي تميز ويرشب فيها. أما المانية
فتنقسم جسمين أجداد اللون والثاني القوام، أما اللون فيستدل منه على حال الأخلاق ونضجه وعمده للنضج،
ينقسم إلى ستة أقسام، وهي الأبيض والأزرق الأدج وناري وهو لون النار والأحمر الناصع وهو لون شرر
الزعفران والأحمر القاني وهو لون الدم والأسود.

Book VIII, chapter 20, a few lines after the beginning

• Greek: Paris suppl. gr. 638, fol. 76r–v.

καὶ ἡμεῖς δηλώσομεν πρῶτον τοῦ γινώσκειν ποῖα τὰ δάκνοντα, καὶ πρῶτον ὁ λυσσῶν κύων. ἐν
καὶ λέγω ὅτι τὸ φάρμακον τοῦ λυσσῶντος κυνὸς ξηρὸν καὶ ἡ πλείστη τούτου βλάβη γίνεται
τῷ ἐγκεφάλῳ. καὶ οὕτω γίνεται ἐκ τούτου ὁ σπασμὸς καὶ ὁ φόβος τοῦ ὕδατος. καὶ ὁ λυσσῶν,
ὅταν δάκῃ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, συμβαίνει αὐτῷ συμπτώματα φαῦλα. καὶ ὅταν οὐκ ἐπισπεύσει ὁ δηχθεὶς
τὴν θεραπείαν, θνῄσκει. καὶ χρὴ πρῶτον τοῦ γινώσκειν τὰ σημεῖα τούτου τοῦ κυνὸς τοῦ
παραφυλάσσει τοῦτον καὶ γινώσκειν ὡς ἡ δῆξις αὐτοῦ δῆξις λυσσῶντος καὶ
θεραπεύειν καθ’ ὃ δεῖ τοῦ θεραπεύειν αὐτό. καὶ τὰ σημεῖα αὐτοῦ ὃτι γίνεται ὡς μαινόμενος
καὶ κωλύεται απὸ τροφῆς καὶ πότου καὶ βιάζεται τῇ δίπσᾳ καὶ οὐ πλησιάζει τῷ ὕδατι καὶ
φεύγει αὐτὸ καὶ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκφέρει τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξεῖσι
τοῦ στόματος ἄφρος ὅμοιος ἀφρῷ ἐξερχομένῳ ἀπὸ τῶν τῶν καμήλων στομάτων ὅταν
ἀρώμει.


وحنن نين أولا أعلاه ما كان منها بعض، وأول ذلك ذلك الكتاب فقاول إن سم الكتاب الكتاب باسم مجفف
وأكثر مصريته، بالذات وذلك صار يحدث عنه التشنج والفرز من الماء، والكتب الكتب مثل بعض إنسان،
وعبرت له أعراض رفيعة عن كل ما يذكر المعارض علامة هلك فيفيما لذا أن تعرف أولاء علامات الكتاب
لقوته، إن وجدت
لليملا، أن نهيئها كتاب كتاب في做什么 ما يبني فإي أن يجعله، وعلئله أن يصير كالمجنون ويتمتع من الأكل والشرب

59 بِ MS 2871
60 و add. MS 2871
61 اللون MS 2871
62 النضج MS 2871
63 سبعة MS 2871
64 والأنجر MS 2871
65 باباً ومحفظا MS 2871
66 تكون add. MS 2871
67 الآنسان MS 2871
68 وينبغي أولا أن تعرف علامات هذا الكتاب MS 2871
69 وينبغي بهينه MS 2871
70 وينبغي بهينه MS 2871
A Hitherto Unknown Greek Translation of Al-Majūsī’s Kāmil ṣinā’a al-ṭibbiyya

Book IX, chapter 35

• Greek: Paris suppl. gr. 638, fol. 128v.

[K]εφάλαιον λα· περὶ τῶν παθῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐν τῇ κύστει.

[Τ]ὴ δὲ πάθη τὰ γενόμενα ἐν τῇ κύστει εἰσὶν ὁ γεννόμενος ἐν αὐτῇ λίθος καὶ τὸ ἀπόστημα καὶ ἡ πληγὴ καὶ ἡ στραγγουρία καὶ ἡ ἀκούσιος ἔκκρισις. Ο ἡ γενομένη ἐπίβαλλε ἐπὶ τῶν αἰτιῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λίθος καὶ τὸ ἀπόστημα καὶ τὴ ἀπάξια αὐτῶν καὶ τὴ δυνάμει τῆς ὁρέξεως αὐτῶν τῆς τροφῆς, ὥστε ἐπιμνήσθημεν ἀπὸ τῶν αἰτιῶν ἐν τῇ κύστει καὶ ἡ ἀκούσιος ἔκκρισις. Καὶ πλεῖστον γίνεται τὸ πάθος ἐν τοῖς παισὶ τῇ ὑγρότητι τῆς κράσεως καὶ τῇ ἀταξίᾳ αὐτῶν καὶ τῇ δύναμει τῆς ὀρέξεως τῆς τροφῆς, διότι ἐπιμνήσθημεν πολλάκις, καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῆς χρήσεως τῶν τροφῶν τὰ περιττώματα τὰ παχέα.

• Arabic: Harbī, vol. 3, p. 331 (ch. 34) = Būlāq, vol. 1, p. ۰۸۳ (p. 380, ch. 35) = MS 2871, fol. 152r (ch. 35).

الباب الرابع٧١ والثلاثون في العدل الحادثة في المثانة وأسبابها وعلاماتها٦٨. فأما العدل الحادثة في المثانة فهي الحصى المولد فيها والورم والقرحة وتعثر البول وأسره وخروجه من غير إرادة: أما الحصاة٦٩ فولدها عن الأسباب التي ذكرناها في الكلى وهي الخطط العضلي الزج وحراة جرم المثانة وضيق رقبتها. وأكثر ما يحدث هذه الظاهرة في الصبيان على طريقة مزاجهم وشرتهم وقوة شهبتهم للأنظمة كما ذكرنا أعلاه وكثيرا ما يستعملون٧٠ من الأغذية المولدة لالغتصان العضلي.

Book X, chapter 1

• Greek: Paris suppl. gr. 638, fol. 140r.

[K]εφάλαιον α· περὶ τῶν σημείων τῶν ἀγγελλόντων τὸ γεννησόμενον καὶ διαφρέσεως αὐτῶν.

[Φ]ημὶ ὡς ἡ ὀφέλεια τῆς ἐπιστήμης τῶν γενομένων οὐχ ἦτον τῆς ὀφέλειας τῆς ἐπιστήμης τῶν ἐνεστῶτων σημείων πλὴν ἔχει μαζόνα τὴν ὀφέλειαν καὶ εὐγνώστερα τὰ σφάξαμα. Κάκειον ός τὰ σημεία τὰ ἀπαγγέλλοντα τὴν δυναμομένην νόσου ταῦτα γίνεται ἐν τοῖς ὑγείς σώμασι. Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀγγέλλει σωτηρίαν τῆς νόσου, τὰ δὲ ἀγγέλλει
φαυλότητα τῆς νόσου καὶ σφάλμα ἑπάτη ἀπόλειαν. Καὶ ταῦτα τὰ τρία εὑρίσκεται ἐν τοῖς νοσοῦσιν εἰς τοίς νοσοῦσιν σώμασι.


الباب الأول في ذكر صفة جملة الكلام على الدلال المنذرة وتقسيمها وأسبابها وعائلاتها.

اعلم أرشيدك الله تعالى إن الدلال المنذرة الدالة على ما هو كائن ليس هي بدون المنقحة بعلم العلامات الدالة على ما هو خاص بل هي تكون [أعظم] ؛ فغا وأجل خطر، وذلك المنذرة 81 من ما يذكر لمصر، 82 وسياج وهذا يكون في أيدان الأصحاء ومنها ما قد يذكر 83 بالسلامة من المرض، ومنها ما يذكر برداة المرض والخطر فيه، ومنها ما يذكر بالهلاك.

وهذه الثلاثة 84 توجد في أيدان المرضى.

77 σφάλμα s.l., ἀπαθίαν in ras.
78 νοσοῦσι s.l., ἥγεσιν in ras.
79 الباب الأول في الدلال المنذرة بما هو كائن وتقسيمه MS 2871.
80 أقول إن المنقحة بعلم العلامات الدالة MS 2871.
81 ما هو كائن ليس بدون MS 2871.
82 بل هو أعظم بدون المنقحة MS 2871.
83 وذلك أن العلامات المنذرة Būlāq + MS 2871.
84 بمرض MS 2871.
85 ينشر MS 2871.
86 ثلاثة MS 2871.
A Hitherto Unknown Greek Translation of Al-Majūsī’s Kāmil șīnā’a al-ṭibbiyya
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